UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 12

JULY 12, 1966, TO JULY 20, 1966
(PAGES 15189 TO 16538)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v. 112
pt. 12

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove—with its unmarred opportunity we bless Thee:

For our body rested by the night;

For mind and spirit waking to another day;

For the dear familiar things of home;

For those we love, and for the love that comes to us beyond our own deserving;

For life to live, and work to do.

Keep us from the ingratitude that would take Thy continual gifts for granted, and help us to find, instead, in every experience of the day, the width and depth of joy to which we may be alive; curb our temptations to speak harshly, and from hasty and bitter tongue.

When this day ends may there be less for which we need to be forgiven and more for which we may be glad because we shall have tried to let the goodness of God express itself through our obedient mind and heart and will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 11, 1966, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 30, 1966,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on July 2, 1966, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 13650. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13652. An act to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government; and

H.R. 14182. An act to provide for judgments for costs against the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on July 6, 1966, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 2266. An act to authorize the Attorney General to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to certain objects of art;

S. 2999. An act to amend section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965; 79 Stat. 1068);

H.R. 1535. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 2035. An act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices;

H.R. 6125. An act to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 12322. An act to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton;

H.R. 13417. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes;

H.R. 14050. An act to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; and

H.R. 14312. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480 AGREEMENTS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements, for the month of June 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Pilar S. Barry from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on September 1, 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Chun Hung Sue from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting adjustment of status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"S. CON. RES. 33

"(By Mr. Friedman)

"A concurrent resolution to memorialize the United States Congress to take appropriate action to make political subdivisions of the State eligible to receive surplus donable property.

"Whereas Congress has enacted laws which provide for the donation of Federal surplus personal property, and

"Whereas emphasis has been placed on reducing government inventories of stockpiles of equipment, supplies and donable property no longer needed by Federal agencies because of oversupply, obsolescence, and the ever-changing requirements of the military, political, and international situations, and

"Whereas surplus property is made available by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for allocation and donation to nonprofit tax-exempt school systems, colleges, universities, hospitals, clinics, medical institutions, health centers, civil defense units, and to tax-supported school systems, and

"Whereas the utilization of surplus property by such agencies is of utmost importance in the development of these services to the people, and

"Whereas the schools, educational institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, and civil defense units have acquired millions of dollars worth of such donable property, and

"Whereas other governmental subdivisions of the State of Louisiana should be authorized to request, acquire and use surplus property: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and requested to take immediate action to authorize the distribution of surplus property to local political subdivisions of the State; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the presiding officers of the two houses of the United States Congress and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"C. C. AYCOCK,
"*Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.*
"VAIL M. DELONY,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution adopted by the Midwest Conference of Mailer Unions, held in St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1781, relating to the prohibition of interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from the Richard E. Hourigan Post No. 594, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Norwich, Conn., praying for the enactment of House Joint Resolution 9; ordered to lie on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1370)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed.

Mr. President, I serve notice on the leadership on both sides of the aisle that upon making these printings available, the committee will be ready to take up, at any time suggested by the leadership, the appropriations bill for agriculture.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and the report will be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development; and

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, and Dr. Pauline Tompkins, of Maine, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3601. A bill to provide for the completion of the Senate Office Building authorized by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029); and

S. 3602. A bill to prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3603. A bill for the relief of Randal E. Conner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S.3604. A bill for the relief of Mario Inoue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3605. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio J. Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S. 3606. A bill to provide assistance to first processors of agricultural commodities who have suffered substantial losses because of the economic impact of commodity programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 3607. A bill for the relief of Doctor Mallappa Amravati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3608. A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as D.D.T.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 3609. A bill to repeal section 7 of the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

STUDY OF WEST-CENTRAL FRONT EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. TYDINGS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 282) to authorize a study of needs and costs of remedial action to restore the original Capitol, and of the west-central front extension of the Capitol, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above resolution, printed in full, when submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE, which appears under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, has that request been cleared with the minority staff?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO MEET DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE SENATE THIS WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I have consulted the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the ranking minority member of the committee, on this request—that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate this week and next week. We will be considering the unemployment insurance bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article, "West Virginia's Do-It-Yourself Forest," by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, from July 1966 issue of American Motorist magazine.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address by Vice President HUMPHREY at NAACP convention on July 7, 1966.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE STRIKING OF MEDALS TO COMMEMORATE THE 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF POLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1334, H.R. 139.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 139) to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment on page 2, line 12, after "31" to strike out "1966" and insert "1967."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report (No. 1369), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill would provide for the striking of not more than 1 million medals to commemorate the founding of the Polish nation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike and furnish the medals to the Polish American Congress, Inc. The medals shall be of such sizes, materials and designs, and shall be so inscribed, as the Polish American Congress, Inc., shall determine with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. No medal shall be made under this bill after December 31, 1967.

The medals would be struck at no cost to the United States since the bill requires that security satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury shall be furnished for the payment of the costs of their production.

The following excerpt from a speech made by Senator MUSKIE on May 7, 1966, shows the appropriateness of this medal:

"One thousand years ago, Poland entered upon the stage of world history and embraced Christianity.

"Ever since, she has had an impressive and meaningful influence upon Western civilization; an influence that has enriched the life of Western man; an influence that has contributed to the development of Western political institutions and concepts; an influence that has been exerted by Polish leaders who have been, at the same time, leaders in the Western World; an influence that gives us reason, as Poles, on this millennium anniversary, to be proud of our heritage and what it has meant for mankind.

"It is appropriate, therefore, that we should create occasions such as this to review that heritage, to take satisfaction from it, but more important, to draw meaning from it as we contemplate today's world and the unknown future.

"There is much of glory in Poland's past—glory which was the product of the love of liberty, fierce independence, intense patriotism, and courage so characteristic of the Polish people.

"And because of her geographic position, Poland has had ample opportunity to put these qualities to the test.

"On two important occasions in a thousand years, Poland was the first line of defense against invading hordes from the east. She held her line proudly, and the Eastern dreams of conquering Europe were dashed.

"Every Pole remembers that in 1241, Prince Henryk Pobozny at the cost of his life forced the Mongol invaders to retreat to Asia in the Battle of Legnica.

"Every Pole remembers that, in 1683, Poland put an end to Turkish expansion in Europe, when the great Jan Sobieski went to the aid of Vienna, and, in a decisive battle, routed the Turks.

"And no Pole will ever forget that, even under the burdens Poland has carried in this century, she has fought gallantly in the cause of freedom.

"In 1920, Polish armies, led by Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, arrested the march of the Bolsheviks on Germany, and the victory, known as the miracle on the banks of the Vistula, was credited with saving Europe from communism.

"In 1939, Poland was the first to feel the military heel of the Nazis at the start of World War II.

"Outmatched at the start by Germany's motorized military machine, Poland was stung 17 days later by an attack on the east front by Russia.

"Alone and isolated, unable to defend herself on her homeland, she refused to play a passive role in the war.

"Without delay, the Polish Army, Navy, and Air Force, 80,000 strong, regrouped in France, fought at the side of France, then with the British, and later on, in Norway, North Africa, Italy, Normandy, Belgium, and the Netherlands. In the famous Battle of Britain in 1940, Polish airmen were responsible for 15 percent of the German air losses. Altogether, more than 300,000 Poles served with the Allied Forces during the war. Meanwhile, at home, Poland built one of the strongest underground networks in Nazi-occupied Europe.

"This is a valiant record for a Nation which was attacked and overrun by two nations almost before the rest of the world recognized that a global war had begun.

"It is the record of a Nation which, for a thousand years, has never rejected the burdens of freedom. And, despite the bitter disappointments of the postwar years, the spirit of freedom has never died. The Poznan uprising of 1956 was a vivid expression of that spirit. It still burns today among Poles, both in and out of Poland, and always will.

"The same qualities which brought glory on the field of battle, were the inspiration for achievement in the works of peace.

"Poland's history sings of human and cultural progress.

"Encouraged by centuries of reverence for individual freedom, the arts and sciences flourished.

"Even a partial list is impressive:

"Europe's first ministry of education resulting from the constitution of 1791;

"Mikolaj Kopernik, one of Europe's outstanding scholars in the 16th Century, and the father of modern astronomy;

"Ludwik Zamenhoff, the inventor of the language of Esperanto;

"Madame Marie-Curie-Sklodowska, world-famous for the discovery of raduim;

"In the field of literature, Wladyslaw Reymont and Henryk Sienkiewicz, winners of Nobel prizes, Reymont for his novel "The Peasants," and Sienkiewicz for "Quo Vadis"; and the world renowned Jozef Conrad-Korzeniowski, author of "Lord Jim" and other novels.

"In no field has the glory of Poland shone more brightly than in the field of music. Frederic Chopin is a gift to the ages. His brilliant compositions will delight the souls of men as long as music is heard. And in our times, the world has thrilled to the incomparable Paderewski, Rubinstein, Landowska, and Rodginski.

"These glories are but the beginning of the Polish story.

"Epecially impressive have been Poland's contributions to the ideals and concepts of democracy.

"In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, Poland was the largest and most civilized powerful state in central and eastern Europe.

"And the significant fact is that this achievement was built on a series of fundamental concepts of liberty:

"The 'Nemineh Captiuabus' in 1425 which guaranteed personal liberty of the citizens;

"The 'Statutes of Nieszawa' in 1454 which established a bicameral parliamentary system;

"The 'Nihil Novi' in 1505 which made the Crown powerless to legislate without consent of the two chambers;

"Beginning in 1573, election of the kings of Poland, and a new set of laws known as 'Pacta Conventa' which gave citizens the right to withdraw allegiance to the king if he transgressed any law or broke any stipulation under which he was elected.

"These and other concepts are striking examples of a nation's will to be free of tyranny.

"It was the custom for nations seeking empires to subjugate weaker nations and to build autocratic central authority.

"Not in Poland. Internally, she decentralized authority. Internationally, she sought to win the hearts of her member nations. She undertook to gain their loyalty, not by coercion, but by making them political and cultural partners.

"The free union of Poland and Lithuania, concluded in 1413, is unique in the history of international relations. The treaty puts at the very basis of the union the Christian principle of love.

"An attitude of tolerance and respect for local institutions, religion and language was taken by Poland toward her vassal states.

"The immense dominions of the Polish crown were divided into 34 Provinces, all of which enjoyed all the privileges and benefits of broadly conceived self-government.

"Eventually, the degree of local independence contributed to the several partitions of Poland in the 18th century. However, she responded to the internal turmoil by writing the constitution of 1791, a remarkable document in its day. It balanced individual freedoms against the needs of the nation.

"Class distinction was ended. Towns obtained administrative and judicial autonomy and parliamentary representation. Peasants were placed under the protection of law. Measures aimed at the abolition of serfdom were sanctioned.

"What is there, then, in all this thousand years of history as a Christian nation which has particular pertinence to our day, to our times, and to our future?

"Belief in God—yes—with a faith which relates God's will and God's justice and God's compassion to the destiny of Poles and Poland, as in that great national symbol, the Black Madonna.

"And so Poles have believed in and fought for the dignity of man.

"As they have believed in and fought for the independence of Poland.

"And as they have believed in and fought for freedom from tyranny.

"These beliefs have written our history, inspired our leaders and our people, shaped our institutions, produced our culture, our literature and our music. These beliefs are Poland—the Poland which the world knows and honors and respects—the Poland of history—the Poland which lives in the hearts and minds of all Poles.

"This is the Poland which, in the Warsaw Conference of 1573, guaranteed free worship of any religion.

"This is the Poland, whose non-Jewish Poles, hid 300,000 Jews from the searching German Nazis, notwithstanding the threat of the death penalty if caught.

"This is the Poland whose Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the father of American artillery, fought for American independence and then authorized the sale of the lands given him by a grateful America, the proceeds to be used to free and educate slaves.

"This is the Poland whose Kasimir Pulaski, the father of American cavalry, died in the same cause."

AMENDMENT TO THE BILL

The bill as introduced provided that no medals shall be minted under the bill after December 31, 1966. This would allow only a few months for the Bureau of the Mint to prepare for the minting of these medals. The bill has been amended to extend the time in which medals may be minted under this bill to December 31, 1967.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is personally very gratifying to me that in passing H.R. 139 today we provide for the striking of up to 1 million medals to commemorate the founding of the Polish nation.

It was 1,000 years ago that Poland embraced Christianity and began her proud history as a Christian nation.

Over this course of time the contributions of Poland to the world have been essential to the advance of civilization. Poland has constantly been identified with moves to enhance the dignity of man.

Poles have believed in and fought for freedom. Our own nation owes a great debt to valiant Poles like Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the father of American artillery, and Kasimir Pulaski, the father of American cavalry.

The ideas and energy of Polish people have helped shape our history and our culture. Poles have infused an independent and vital spirit into the personality of America, and we are all better for it.

Mr. President, on this occasion I salute again the millennium of the Polish Nation. The medals to be struck as the result of passage of this bill will help preserve in the minds of all of us a lively awareness of the glorious history of the Polish people.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. A. G. L. McNAUGHTON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I have been informed of the passing of Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, who has been called the "father" of the Canadian Army. General McNaughton was considered Canada's "first soldier" and had served with extraordinary distinction in two world wars. He was also a scientist, engineer, and diplomat and served his country without interruption from 1909, when he joined the Canadian Militia, until 1962, when he retired as Chairman of the International—United States-Canada—Joint Commission. It was my privilege to get to know General McNaughton while he was a member of that Commission, of which our distinguished colleague from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] was the U.S. Chairman; and in that capacity I knew of General McNaughton's extreme interest in the Columbia River Basin Treaty. I recall that we had our differences about whether or not the Libby Dam in northwestern Montana should be built, because it would inundate a large amount of Canadian land in British Columbia.

I informed General McNaughton, as I later informed our colleagues in the Canadian Parliament who represented that country at the Joint Canada-United States Parliamentary meetings, of which the senior Senator in this body, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], was Chairman, that as far as I was concerned, while I would like very much to see Libby Dam built, I would far rather see a good Columbia River Basin Treaty which would be a benefit to both countries. If that meant a loss of Libby Dam, I was prepared to accept it. Fortunately, during the period when General McNaughton was Chairman of the Joint Commission, a Columbia River Basin Treaty was agreed to, and has now been accepted by both countries.

General McNaughton always fought for Canada, and always placed Canada first in his thoughts and actions. He was not only a great Canadian, but he was a great North American as well. His contributions to the development of his own country will never be forgotten, nor will his contributions to the defense of the free world in two world wars be forgotten. Rather, they will serve as monuments to this great man, who contributed so much to his country and to the Western World, and asked so little in return.

It is with deep sadness that I make this statement, and I extend to General McNaughton's family my deepest personal sympathy in their hour of sorrow. I also extend to Canada our deepest regrets that such a great man has passed to his reward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert two newspaper articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post of today on the passing of General McNaughton.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1966]

GEN. McNAUGHTON DEAD; SHAPED CANADIAN ARMY

OTTAWA, July 11.—Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, the controversial and versatile father of the Canadian army, died early today at his summer home in Montebello, Que.

He was 79 and was living in semiretirement and apparent good health.

He will be buried Wednesday with full military honors in Ottawa, the nation's capital that involved him in both great triumph and defeat during a distinguished career spanning more than 50 years.

Gen. McNaughton, born in Saskatchewan in 1887, built a career as a scientist, politician, soldier, and diplomat on outspoken honesty and bluntness.

As head of the army, he was involved personally in the two big Canadian military crises of World War II. He also became a world authority on atomic energy and spoke for the West in dealings with Russia in the 1940s.

And later as Canadian chairman of the International Joint Commission, he gained hard-won concessions for his country in negotiations with the United States for use of Columbia River power.

Andrew George Latta McNaughton began his career in the public service in 1909 when he entered the militia.

When World War I broke out, he used scientific training as an engineer to build a solid reputation as a gunnery officer. By the end of the war, he was Canadian artillery commander.

He continued his way up the military ladder during the inter-war years and became Chief of General Staff in 1929 at the age of 42.

He trained Canadian troops for the first three years of World War II but retired before he could lead them into battle after a policy split with the government.

Gen. McNaughton vigorously opposed splitting Canadian troops to send a corps to Italy. He maintained they should be kept together as an army for the main push in Europe.

He stepped down in 1943 when the government didn't support his stand.

BACK IN SERVICE

But the conscription crisis led to his return to public life in November 1944, as Defense Minister when he firmly supported Prime Minister Mackenzie King in opposing conscription for overseas service.

Appeals for volunteers failed and a month later conscription for home service was introduced.

His career then hit a snag when he failed twice in 1945 to win election as a member of parliament.

But the man who learned to fight back during his early life on the prairies refused to quit and plunged ahead into a new career in the public service.

He made his way back to the top in 1948 when he became permanent Canadian Delegate to the United Nations.

In 1950, he was appointed to the International Joint Commission handling boundary water disputes between Canada and the United States.

His hard-headed bargaining won for Canada unexpected concessions in the Columbia River controversy when the U.S. agreed to pay back both power and cash in return for downstream benefits.

He stepped down as Canadian chairman of the Joint Commission in 1962, claiming he was fired by then Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, and had lived in semiretirement since that time.

But he had written his name into Canadian, and world, history.

[From the New York Times, July 12, 1966]

GEN. McNAUGHTON OF CANADA DEAD

OTTAWA, July 11.—Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, often called the "father" of the Canadian Army, died of a heart attack today at his summer home in nearby Montebello, Que. He was 79 years old.

Considered to be Canada's foremost soldier, General McNaughton was also a scientist, an engineer and a diplomat. He was in the public service without interruptions from 1909, when he joined the Canadian militia, until 1962, when he retired as chairman of the International (United States-Canada) Joint Commission.

Gen. Andrew George Latta McNaughton, known as Andy to his World War II troops, was once described by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana as "one of the most determined men to come up against in negotiations. He is an extreme nationalist—and I say this in the good sense."

The Senator's observation, made when General McNaughton was trying to wring concessions from the United States in the Columbia River Treaty, is descriptive of the soldier-scientist who also served as Canada's

Defense Minister and its United Nations representative.

General McNaughton was the first Canadian officer to reach the rank of full general and to command a full Canadian army.

General McNaughton was called the "father" of Canada's Army because he insisted that the ground forces that he led in World War II should be considered as an army.

The general who was wounded twice in World War I in France, took command of all Canadian forces overseas during World War II. He called the First Canadian Division, a group of volunteers that he took to Britain in 1939, "a dagger pointed at the heart of Berlin."

When the First Division arrived in British waters, General McNaughton went out on a patrol boat to meet the incoming transport ships. He stood in the prow of his cutter waving to his men to the chorus "We want Andy."

"I have never done anything else but talk of an offensive in Europe," he told President Roosevelt when the volunteers were in training in England. "We intend to give it to the Hun—right in the belly."

OPPOSED OTTAWA PLAN

But before he could lead them into battle, however, General McNaughton was recalled to Canada in a dispute with Ottawa over their deployment. He vigorously opposed the Government's plan to split the forces by sending a corps to Italy. General McNaughton maintained that the forces should be held intact for the great asault on northwest Europe. He stepped down in late 1943 after the contingent was sent to Italy.

His recall was a disappointment for the officer with the unruly crop of close-cut graying hair even though he had been promoted to lieutenant general.

As a brigadier at the age of 31, he had commanded Canada's heavy artillery at the close of World War I. The boy who had once fashioned a cannon from a discarded boiler and fired potatoes at gophers was credited with inventing an artillery-firing system that was called "the box barrage" because it boxed in the enemy. General McNaughton, however called the system "evolution, not invention."

After he returned from Britain in early 1944, General McNaughton fought several other losing battles on the home front.

BEATEN TWICE AT POLLS

He became Defense Minister in 1944 and tried without success to send casualty replacements on a volunteer basis. The Government again opposed him, sending conscripts, and General McNaughton resigned after less than a year in the post. Just before he resigned, the general suffered two defeats at the polls when he tried to run for a seat in Commons.

In 1946, General McNaughton was named Canada's representative to the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations, and, two years later, its permanent representative with a seat on the Security Council.

A debate over control of nuclear weapons had been going on for several years in and out of the United Nations when the Soviet Union exploded an atomic bomb in 1949.

General McNaughton maintained that the principal duty of an international control authority should be to warn other nations rather than to punish violators. He said that he believed "that a majority in the commission recognized that, in the event of a long war between powers having atomic facilities, there could be no certainty of preventing the eventual use of atomic weapons."

The general also formulated a plan to demilitarize Kashmir and thus pave the way for a plebiscite to settle the dispute over that princely state between India and Pakistan. Pakistan agreed to the proposal, but India balked.

An earnest, intense man, General McNaughton was not without his moments of dry humor. At a dinner in 1948 at Lake Success the general was talking with the guest of honor, Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet delegate, when the talk turned to apples. The late Henry A. Wallace had asked General McNaughton to suggest a couple of good Canadian varieties for Mr. Gromyko.

"Well," the general said, "we have McIntosh Reds and also the Northern Spy."

In 1950, General McNaughton became chairman for Canada of the International Joint Commission with the United States. The commission was set up to negotiate common boundaries and water disputes. Among its most important achievements was the Columbia River Treaty, of which the general was a principal negotiator and later a severe critic.

The general said that Canada has been "sold down the river" by the treaty under which the United States would receive electric power from Canadian sources upstream. The treaty was signed in 1962 and ratified in 1964.

When his retirement from the commission was announced in 1962, General McNaughton said he had been arbitrarily removed from his job and denounced Prime Minister John Diefenbaker as a "dictator."

Last year, the general told the Canadian Engineering Institute that "Canada has no obligation whatsoever to export water that is contained entirely within her boundaries. And even if such export is made eventually," he added, "the water would be sold as a commodity with 100 per cent of the price going to its owner, Canada."

After his retirement from the commission, General McNaughton took every opportunity to counter a proposal to divert water from the Canadian Rockies to the southwestern United States. His argument was that once water is sold it is a lost birthright never to be retrieved.

"We should reject with the greatest firmness any proposals for United States use of Canadian waters that relegate us to the role of 'hewers of wood and drawers of water,'" he said.

CO-INVENTOR OF DIRECTION FINDER

General McNaughton was born Feb. 25, 1887, in the tiny Saskatchewan village of Moosomin. His father ran a trading post. He attended the Bishop's College School in Quebec and McGill University in Montreal, where he received bachelor's and master's degrees in science. He became an instructor in electrical engineering and mathematics at McGill in 1912.

In 1926, General McNaughton was a co-inventor of a cathode ray direction finder that was used by aviators to get bearings over mountainous areas.

General McNaughton became president of the National Research Council in 1935. He worked on the application of pure science to practical industrial problems and organized a high voltage laboratory. He left the council in 1939 to resume military command.

General McNaughton was promoted to major general and appointed Chief of the General Staff at Ottawa in 1929. He was promoted to general when he retired from the Army in 1944.

HELD SIX HONORARY DEGREES

The general was Companion of the Bath, Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George and the recipient of the Distinguished Service Order.

He held honorary degrees from six universities and was an honorary fellow of many engineering societies in Canada, the United States and in Britain.

General McNaughton is survived by his widow, the former Mabel C. S. Weir; two daughters, Miss Leslie Anita McNaughton and Mrs. T. B. McDougall of Ottawa; and two sons, Andrew R. L. McNaughton of Montreal and Col. Edward M. D. Leslie (who had his name legally changed). A third son, Squadron Leader Ian McNaughton, was killed in a 1942 bombing raid.

In announcing General McNaughton's death to Commons, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson said that "his value to his country was equaled only by his courage and usefulness. He was warm-hearted, whole-souled and high-minded. There was nothing mean about him and much that was brave and wise."

The flag atop the Peace Tower in Ottawa was lowered to half-staff. Flags of all units of the Canadian armed forces will be lowered Wednesday, the day that a funeral with full military honors will be held at 2:30 P.M. at Christ Church Cathedral in Ottawa.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I read of the passing of one of the most colorful statesmen of this century. I refer to the distinguished Canadian, Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, with whom I was privileged to serve on the International Joint Commission. Many of the problems we dealt with had to do with the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Columbia Treaty.

General McNaughton possessed unusual qualities. Soldier, engineer, scientist, statesman—he combined all of these careers into a life of action and accomplishment. History will record his deeds and historians will relish the color and energy which characterized all his work.

The general was a thorough student and researcher, an articulate spokesman, and with it all he was a tough bargainer for his beloved Canada.

He knew how to assemble his facts, present them forcefully, and defend his position with tenacity. If compromise seemed to come hard for him, it was because he had set for himself a goal never short of victory.

Away from the bargaining table he was jovial and friendly. A brilliant conversationalist, a great student, world traveler, veteran of many a skirmish on the field of battle or at a diplomatic conference, he was a man to appreciate; to respect.

Mrs. Jordan and I have enjoyed the hospitality of the McNaughton home. We join his many friends in Canada and throughout the world in expressing our deep sympathy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sure that all people who knew General McNaughton or the work in which he was engaged for almost two generations, will join the distinguished majority leader and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] in expressing regret at his passing and extending our sympathy to his family and to the people of Canada.

General McNaughton was a man of very strong convictions, but invariably his convictions were based on what he deemed best for his country and its people.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made reference to the development of the Columbia River. I think that he belittled his own part in that program, that treaty, and that later development that is now underway.

A few years ago there was a rumor throughout Canada that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would oppose the Columbia River Treaty unless he got the Libby Dam.

It happened that many Members of the Canadian Parliament were visiting us at about that time. They had heard this rumor. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] appeared before that group and told them that he did want the Libby Dam, but that he was not going to oppose development of the Columbia River system whether he got the Libby Dam or not.

After he left the room one of the Members of the Canadian Parliament said, "He is a whole lot nearer getting the Libby Dam than he ever was before."

I believe that that was the turning point in the discussions which finally led to the treaty and the development of the Columbia River. I wish at this time to give to Senator MANSFIELD the credit which he would never think of taking for himself.

A BILL TO PROTECT THE CAPITOL BUILDING OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills relating to the preservation of the historic U.S. Capitol. The first provides that no work could be carried out which would alter the proportions, change the size, or modify the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner unless such a project is specifically authorized by congressionally enacted legislation passed after the date of this bill.

It would also provide for a U.S. Capitol Building Commission to make a yearlong study of present and anticipated future needs of the Congress with respect to the Capitol, including work space for Members of Congress, congressional committees and staff, and facilities for visitors to the Capitol.

The Commission would be directed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development of the Capitol to serve these needs. The plan would preserve, to the greatest extent possible, the historical integrity and proportions of the building, with particular emphasis given to preserving the existing architectural design. The Commission would have as its members Senators and Representatives; architects chosen by the President after nomination by the American Institute of Architects; a political scientist and a historian, nominated by their respective professional associations and appointed by the President; the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission; and public members.

The second bill would provide for the completion of the New Senate Office Building in order to provide additional working space for Senators and Senate committees and their staffs. The building completion would be under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, and the bill provides for consultation with a committee designated by the American Institute of Architects.

Mr. President, the proposed extension of the west front of the Capitol should not be allowed to take place, and should certainly not be allowed to take place now.

Neither bill is dependent upon the other. Each bill could be passed separately from the other. The introduction of the bill for the completion of the Senate Office Building does point up that functions properly carried on in the Senate Office Building could be cared for by the completion of that building, as the original act of 1948 contemplated, and that those activities could be carried on there rather than by turning the Capitol partly into an office building.

We have been told by the Architect of the Capitol and his subordinates, that the west front of the building would be safe for 5 years. Yet after not much more than one of those 5 years, the Architect tells us that there is only one way in which to treat the building—by grafting on it a large area, composed primarily of auditoriums and cafeterias. We have not seen any thorough study showing us that this is the only way to save the building. To the contrary, an engineering study by the Fine Arts Commission of the United States shows the feasibility of restoring the west front without the proposed extension. And even if extension is ultimately to be decided upon, we have the time—we must take the time—to explore the alternatives so that we will not heedlessly and recklessly deface the Capitol. The first of the two bills I introduce today would assure adequate consideration of the alternatives in two ways: it would stop the extension of the west front unless specifically authorized after the bill was passed, and it would provide for a yearlong study by a Commission of the needs of Congress with respect to the Capitol. The Commission would contain Senators and Representatives of both parties; it would contain a historian and a political scientist; it would contain qualified architects; it would contain the Chairmen of two Federal agencies vitally involved in the future of the Capitol—the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capitol Planning Commission; and the public would be represented. This Commission would have a year in which to make a study and report to us. Surely, we can wait that long before acting on such an important, architecturally sound, historic, and beautiful building.

My second bill, to provide for completion of the New Senate Office Building, would take constructive action to solve a serious problem we have—lack of space. This constructive action would be far superior to the destructive action the Architect of the Capitol has announced to us. We cannot work effectively without adequate space, and we are without adequate space. If the New Senate Office Building were completed, it is possible that some facilities now in the Senate wing of the Capitol could be moved to the Senate Office Buildings, thus providing space in the Capitol for some of the facilities which the Architect of the Capitol would have placed in the west front extension. An example would be new conference meeting facilities.

We are told that the west front expansion would cost $34 million. That is the estimate we hear now. But we have heard estimates of that sort before. And if we are going to spend money on building on Capitol Hill, let us spend a portion of that $34 million constructively—on the New Senate Office Building—and save some of that figure at the same time we save the Capitol from being defaced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of these bills be printed in full in the RECORD and that they may lie at the desk for 48 hours for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD and lie at the desk as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bills, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3601. A bill to provide for the completion of the Senate Office Building authorized by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029):

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purpose of providing additional working accommodations for Members and Committees of the United States Senate, the Senate Office Building Commission, after consultation with a committee designated by the American Institute of Architects, is authorized to complete the construction of the Senate Office Building authorized by the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1029), by enlarging the east wing of such building to a height to correspond with the other wings thereof, and to prepare all necessary designs, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

(b) In carrying out its duty under this Act, the Senate Office Building Commission is authorized (1) to provide for such equipment, such connections with Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such structural and other changes in the existing Senate Office Building authorized to be enlarged by this Act and in the subway and tunnel systems, as may be necessary; and (2) to do such landscaping as may be necessary by reason of the construction authorized by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Senate Office Building Commission is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for materials, supplies, equipment, accessories, advertising, travel, personnel and other services, and any other items required for the proper completion of the project, and to obligate in full the total amount herein authorized, prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

SEC. 3. Upon completion of the project authorized by this Act, the building and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same shall be subject to the provisions of the Act of June 8, 1942 (40 U.S.C. 174 (c) and (d)), and the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718), in the same manner and to the same extent as the existing Senate Office Buildings and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized such sums as may be necessary to carry out the construction authorized by this Act, including the preparation of all necessary designs, plans, and specifications.

S. 3602. A bill to prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future

needs of the Congress with respect to such building:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—INCREASES IN SIZE OF CAPITOL BUILDING REQUIRING APPROVAL OF THE CONGRESS

SEC. 101. On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, no work shall be carried out with respect to any project which would alter the proportions, change the size, or modify the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, unless such project has been specifically authorized by legislation enacted by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the "United States Capitol Building Commission" (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission") which shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom two shall be appointed from the majority party and two from the minority party;

(2) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, of whom two shall be appointed from the majority party and two from the minority party;

(3) The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts or his designee;

(4) The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission or his designee;

(5) Three members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least six outstanding architects nominated by the American Institute of Architects;

(6) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Historical Association nominated by such Association;

(7) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Political Science Association nominated by such Association; and

(8) Two members from private life, appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The President of the United States shall designate as Chairman one of the members appointed pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of subsection (a) of this section. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Nine members of the Commission, of whom at least five shall have been appointed pursuant to paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of subsection (a) of this section, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(e) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949. The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55(a)), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 202. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraph (3) or (4) of section 201(a) of this Act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular positions when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Such members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 201(a) of this Act shall each receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 203. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and analysis of the present and anticipated future needs of the United States Congress with respect to the Capitol Building, including work space for the Members of Congress, committees of Congress, and staff personnel thereof, and facilities required for the convenience of visitors to the Capitol Building. It shall be the further duty of the Commission, on the basis of such study and analysis, to prepare and recommend a comprehensive and detailed plan for the suitable development of the Capitol Building in order to meet the aforementioned needs. Such plan shall be prepared with the goal of preserving for future generations the historical integrity and proportions of the Capitol Building, with particular emphasis upon preserving the existing architectural design.

SEC. 204. During the course of its study the Commission may submit to the President and the Congress such reports as the Commission shall consider advisable. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than one year following the date of the first meeting of the Commission.

SEC. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appointed to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 206. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required under section 204 of this Act.

PROHIBITION OF SALE OR SHIPMENT FOR USE IN THE UNITED STATES OF DDT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to ban the manufacture of DDT for any use in this country.

DDT was first used in the 1940's to control mosquitoes, flies, and other disease carriers. But strains resistant to the pesticide developed, making spraying less effective. DDT also was used on farm and forest land insects but some of these also developed resistance.

As a result, the industry in recent years has marketed a long list of more selective and short-lived substitutes, making DDT technologically obsolete.

One reason it still is used—for such things as spraying for Dutch Elm disease—is that it is easy to obtain and easy to apply. Another is its low cost of around 18 cents a pound, compared with up to $2.50 a pound for some other common pesticides.

DDT, although sold commercially less than 25 years, has polluted the environment on a worldwide basis. In only one generation it has contaminated the atmosphere, the sea, lakes and streams, and infiltrated the fatty tissue of most of the world's creatures.

The National Wildlife Federation reports roughly 75 percent of specimens of fish, birds, and mammals collected from various parts of the world, including the Arctic and Antarctic regions, contained DDT, or what it becomes after metabolism.

California marine scientists collected several hundred samples of fish and shellfish from the Pacific, in both salt water bays and the open sea. They reported 396 of the 400 samples analyzed contained measurable DDT residues.

Interior Department scientists collected 15 samples of air from 9 different locations throughout the country and analysis showed that all contained DDT residues.

The long-range biological effects of this global contamination, which is building up every day that use of DDT continues, are not yet known but the potential is present for a national calamity. Indeed the damage already done is colossal.

DDT remains in toxic form in soil, water, air, and living plants and animals for many years after it is applied. It drifts with the air, flows with the rivers, falls with the rain. So even if the June 30, 1967, cutoff in this bill is approved DDT will persist as a troublesome residue in our ecological system for years to come.

This pesticide is one of the most persistent—remaining toxic for 10 years or more after application—of the more than 60,000 available chemical preparations now registered by the Federal Government.

In connection with this characteristic, its tendency to concentrate in the food chain and cause sublethal chronic effects on fish and wildlife is well established. These effects—which include lowered reproduction, reduced numbers of normal offspring, and sudden death of the organism under stress—mark DDT as a most serious environmental threat.

Whether humans will suffer these same ill effects after longtime exposure to small amounts of DDT still is undetermined.

Banning DDT is consistent with recommendations of two highly regarded Presidential panels that have reported in the last 3 years.

The most important recommendation of the Wiesner Committee in 1963, in my judgment, was the one urging cutbacks in the use of such persistent pesticides as DDT. The panel recommended:

> The accretion of residues in the environment (should) be controlled by orderly reduction in the use of persistent pesticides. As a first step, the various agencies of the Federal government might restrict wide-scale use of persistent insecticides except for necessary control of disease vectors. The federal agencies should exert their leadership to induce the States to take similar actions.

> Elimination of the use of persistent toxic insecticides should be the goal.

The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee last November also dealt with this point. It recommended:

> Research should be encouraged toward the development of pesticides with greater specificity, additional modes of action, and more rapid degradability than many of those in current use.
>
> Pesticidal effectiveness should be increased and total environmental contamination decreased by further research leading to the more efficient application of pesticides to the target organisms.

DDT is manufactured and sold in large quantities in this country.

Data collected by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], shows U.S. chemical companies manufactured 164,180,000 pounds of DDT in 1960, 171,483,000 pounds in 1961, 167,032,000 in 1962, 178,913,000 in 1963, and 124 million in 1964.

Total production in the 10-year period ending in 1963 was 1,472,727,000 pounds.

This bill would have no effect on the thousands of widely used and less persistent pesticides. These include the many fungicides, insecticides, rodenticides, herbicides, germicides, nematocides, defoliants, repellants, dessicants, and growth regulators.

The evidence is overwhelming that DDT is doing irreparable harm to our surroundings.

One characteristic that makes it so harmful is that it is involved in biological magnification—the ability of organisms to absorb a chemical such as DDT in amounts greatly exceeding those in their surroundings.

A classic example of biological magnification in a food chain occurred in Clear Lake, Calif., in 1957.

To control a troublesome flying insect that hatches in the lake, the water was treated with the insecticide DDD—similar to DDT—to yield a concentration of 0.02 parts per million. Plankton—microscopic waterborne plants and animals—in the lake accumulated the DDT residues at 5 parts per million. Fish that ate the plankton concentrated the DDD in their fat to levels ranging from several hundred to up to 2,000 parts per million. Grebes, diving birds like loons, fed on the fish and died.

The highest concentration of DDT found in tissues of grebes that ate the poison-carrying fish was 1,600 parts per million.

DDT also is involved in another phenomenon. This is the synergistic effect of DDT and certain other chemicals when they occur together.

Research at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center shows, for example, that DDT and 2,4-D fed together had several times greater toxicity to mallard ducks than either fed separately.

DDT is a broad spectrum poison, too, meaning it kills a wide range of friendly insects at the same time that it hits target pests. This characteristic upsets the balance of nature much more than the more selective pesticides do.

DDT, for example, is used against the codling moth in apple orchards but does not control leafrollers, aphids, mites, and scale insects on the same trees. Instead, DDT kills some of the natural enemies of these pests. Oddly enough, DDT destroys the predatory mites which prey on the plant-eating mites but does little harm to the latter.

Considerable research on DDT over the past 20 years shows other highly disturbing findings regarding its effect on our surroundings.

Robert J. Anderson, Assistant Surgeon General and an authority on environmental health, ably summed up the thousands of studies of the effects of DDT on the health of nearly all forms of life in a talk about a year ago. This is a major excerpt:

> Most studies of DDT and man's health, however, have been limited in epidemiological design and of relatively short duration. So we are by no means certain of our health's safety after many years or a lifetime of continuous exposure to minute quantities. We know that repeated small dosages in test animals have produced more significant cellular changes in the liver than have a few massive doses. In man this presumably could cause serious consequences to individuals already burdened by disease.
>
> Of concern, too, is the effect of DDT on reproductive systems, as demonstrated in numerous bird and animal studies. Rats fed diets containing from 50 to 600 ppm. of DDT showed a progressive decline in the percentage of young successfully weaned, compared to control rats fed diets containing up to 10 ppm. No effect on the number of rats born alive was evident in the first generation. However, in the second generation those rats which had experienced maximum exposure produced very few living young, of which none survived the nursing period. In wild duck eggs residues are known to have a marked effect on reproduction of some species. Pheasant studies in California have shown the loss of reproductive ability in hens after exposure to DDT used in agriculture.
>
> The variable potency of DDT to various species is well demonstrated by marine life. Commercial shrimp die from exposure to less than 0.001 ppm. On the other hand oysters exposed to minute concentrations have shown an ability to accumulate residues 70,000 times greater than the amount present in environmental waters.
>
> DDT . . . has been shown to induce tumors and liver cancer in rainbow trout after dietary exposure to 80 ppm over periods of 15 to 20 months. Up to now there is no evidence it has caused cancer in man. However, even though its chemical structure does not suggest it likely to be carcinogenic, it nevertheless remains under investigation.

DDT has a tendency to accumulate in the yolk sac of eggs of birds and fish and these higher concentrations cut fertility and the ability to reproduce. It also has been shown that DDT is transferred from the mother through the placenta into the fetus of dogs, rabbits, mice and men.

Increased concentrations in the environment most certainly threaten the survival of a great variety of marine life, insects, and wildlife.

New York State studies since 1956 have shown conclusively that failure of lake trout to reproduce in many lakes is caused by DDT. Investigators showed that levels of DDT of more than 3 parts per million in lake trout eggs caused virtually complete mortality of the fry.

Low reproductive success of a colony of herring gulls in the Lake Michigan area is blamed on DDT in gull eggs. The average levels found in the eggs were 19 parts per million of DDT, 6 parts per million of DDD, and 202 parts per million of DDE.

Recent field studies also showed that eagle eggs collected in the field contained from 2 to 27 parts per million of DDT residues, a level considered high enough to cause a serious hatching problem.

One of the other serious consequences of using DDT and similar pesticides is that they don't stay where they are applied. Pesticide residues, as a result, continue to spread rapidly throughout the world.

John L. Buckley of the Interior Department, speaking at a symposium sponsored by the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources in 1963, said this about the problem:

> If these pesticides stayed where we placed them until they become biologically innocuous, our problem would be considerable, but its solution relatively simple. In point of fact, they don't. An increasing body of evidence shows pesticide residues to be nearly ubiquitous. Recent studies reported to the Congress by the U.S. Public Health Service show at least traces of one of the more chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides in virtually every major river system in the United States. Sampling of air for pesticides has not been extensive, but residues of DDT were found in 15 of 15 samples examined from 9 different locations in the country. DDT residues are found in virtually all samples of human fat examined in the United States. . . .

The Interior Department has repeatedly expressed to Congress its deep concern over the way pesticides have turned up in unlikely places. It reports DDT residues in penguins and seals in Antarctica and in animals in the far north, both areas far removed from spray programs.

The reports of delayed poisoning by DDT point to further serious consequences of continued use of this pesticide.

Richard Bernard, in a highly significant study at Michigan State, fed two groups of captive English sparrows the same diet with the exception that a small sublethal dose of DDT was added to one group. Both groups of birds fared well and got fat. After several months both groups were starved for 16 hours, and at the end of that time all of the sparrows that had accumulated much DDT in their fat had died. None of the sparrows in the non-DDT group was affected.

Both groups seemed to be equally well and active before the 16-hour fast started.

This study, and others that are similar, show that when birds, fish, mammals, or humans with significant concentrations of DDT in their fat become ill, are starved, or otherwise lose weight, the fat containing DDT is absorbed quickly into the bloodstream.

Although DDT residues accumulate in humans at levels not considered harmful at this time, levels in greenhouse workers, spray pilots, and others with occupational exposure reach levels high enough to be considered alarming.

The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee noted that these exposed workers sometimes show marginal or definite impairment of an important bodily function as a result of this DDT exposure.

DDT has been recognized as a serious environmental threat in Wisconsin, where its uses have included widespread spraying since 1957 to combat Dutch Elm disease.

The Wisconsin Conservation Department became so concerned that on March 11, it issued a special DDT warning to guide its employees. This warning reaffirmed previous orders to discontinue immediately the use of DDT in all department spraying programs and on all department lands.

It also noted that State permits for the use of DDT in Dutch Elm disease control programs after April 15 would no longer be issued. These permits have been required for several years.

This important announcement was issued by Director L. P. Voigt after careful and extensive laboratory testing showed DDT contamination of birds, wildlife, lakes, and rivers in Wisconsin.

A large number of Wisconsin communities became aware of this new evidence and stopped using DDT in community spraying programs. Less toxic and persistent pesticides have been substituted.

DDT was widely used in agriculture in the past, but new pesticides that are more selective and less persistent now are being sold.

I was surprised recently to discover that the U.S. Department of Agriculture still recommends DDT for widespread commercial use. The official recommendations, "Suggested Guide for the Use of Insecticides To Control Insects Affecting Crops, Livestock, and Households 1965," show 366 instances where DDT is suggested. However, in all but 30 of these instances, another pesticide also is recommended.

The Department, aware of the many dangers of using DDT, specifies detailed restrictions on use of DDT in most instances where it is recommended. This reflects growing concern over the problem of DDT residues showing up in food and animal feed.

Examples of their warnings are:

> Do not use cottonseed treated with DDT for food or feed. Heavy doses of DDT may injure beans. Do not feed clover plants treated with DDT, or ensilage made from treated plants, to poultry, dairy animals, or animals being finished for slaughter. Do not apply DDT to forage to be sold or shipped interstate. Do not use DDT-treated tops for food or feed. Do not use DDT after appearance of any part to be eaten.

It is obvious from these examples that truck gardeners, farmers, and others must exercise the utmost caution in using this dangerous pesticide.

Although DDT has been widely used in orchards, heavy accumulations in orchard soils now are causing serious problems. A recent survey of 35 orchards in Indiana, for example, showed some had DDT residues greater than 100 pounds per acre. Some went as high as 400 pounds per acre. At known disappearance rates, it will take many years for these toxic residues to disappear.

The uptake of pesticides from soils by translocation into plants does take place. However, research in this area is not highly developed and the full extent of this contamination of growing things is not yet known.

The presence of DDT in food has become so common that the Federal Government recently changed its guidelines for removing contaminated foods from the market. A joint announcement of the Agriculture Department and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said, in part:

> Tolerances will be fixed for low levels of pesticides occurring inadvertently in some foods. The practice of allowing the use of pesticides on a "no-residue" basis will be ended because it is not realistic.
>
> Where a safe, low-level tolerance cannot be established, "zero tolerances" will be set as a basis for removing contaminated foods from the market.

There has been considerable controversy over tolerances, which allow a certain amount of pesticide residue to remain in or on food that is sold. And the pesticide that causes the most residue trouble in food is DDT.

The Congress, in my judgment, should respond to the public's concern over continued development and wide usage of pesticides, such as DDT, that have broad spectrum action and a high degree of environmental persistence. There probably are hundreds of registered pesticides that should not be used. This is an area that I intend to follow up later.

But DDT should be singled out for special consideration because it is so harmful that it is in a class by itself. It is one pesticide we certainly can and must get along without. It is one of those with the highest persistence. It has the grave flaw of ecological magnification in food organisms. And it has adequate and plentiful substitutes.

This bill will retire DDT from commercial sale in this country and, hopefully, allow it to disappear from our surroundings before permanent damage has been done to fish, wildlife, and even to ourselves.

One thing that 20 years of DDT has proved is that rapidly breeding and mutating forms of life, such as flies and other common insects, have been able to develop immune strains. There is the dangerous likelihood that more and larger members of the animal kingdom are unable to develop a comparable immunity.

We do not know the long-term effect of DDT on humans but the evidence of its devastating effect on wildlife should be due cause for alarm. What a great irony it would be in our frantic effort to kill insects, we eliminated man, making the world safe for bugs.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 1 week in order that other Senators who care to do so may add their names as cosponsors. Also I ask unanimous consent that certain articles and editorials, relating to DDT, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the bill will lie on the desk, and the articles and editorials will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 3608) to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The articles and editorials, presented by Mr. NELSON, are as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Jan. 7, 1966]

STATE FISH SWIMMING IN DDT WATERS

(By Don L. Johnson)

MADISON, WIS.—If the same analytical yardstick were applied as is used on red meat, fish in many Wisconsin waters could be classed unfit for human consumption—because of high pesticide content. However, the meat yardstick does not apply to fish, and authorities say there is no evidence of an acute health hazard.

The problem of pesticides in fish appears to be most serious in the most populated areas of the state—and in Lake Michigan where all commercial species of fish show significant contamination from DDT.

Those facts have been garnered from data compiled by the state's conservation and agriculture departments, and from other official sources.

State and federal agencies have been collecting mounting evidence of the situation in recent months, but have been reluctant to publicize their findings. Most plead that the results thus far are incomplete, and inconclusive.

But in every instance officials also have expressed fear that publicity would produce public panic and do great damage to the commercial fishing and recreation industries.

Several stressed that, viewed in proper context and perspective, there is no cause for alarm about hazards to human health.

More serious views were expressed on the probable effects of present and potential pesticide levels on the reproductive rates of fish and fish eating birds.

It was also learned that the Great Lakes fishing industry already virtually has lost its major market for alewives—an abundant species which has been in demand only for animal foods. Many mink ranchers have become convinced that feeding the fish has had an adverse effect on the reproductive rate of their animals. Pesticides have been blamed.

Federal studies are under way to determine the truth, and to find ways of removing the residues from the fish if necessary.

Removal of the residues probably will also be required before the fish can be processed into "fish flour" which has received considerable publicity as a possible low cost food for humans.

However, maximum allowable limits of pesticides such as set for other foods have not yet been established for fish.

In many instances, fish taken from state waters have been found to have many times the limit allowed in beef fat or vegetables—seven parts per million. While all authorities agreed that the findings were a matter for concern, these points were made in interviews:

The situation in Wisconsin is not any worse, and may be better, than in other comparable areas in the country. It is certain that some states have more serious pesticide problems. The problem, in fact, has become global.

Fish fillets cannot be compared to beefsteak if allowable pesticide limits are to be considered. DDT and related compounds tend to concentrate in fatty tisses. Fish fat, concentrated in the viscera and just under the skin, is largely discarded before the fish is eaten.

People eat fewer fish sticks than hamburgers. A government estimate sets the average annual per capita consumption of commerical fish at 10 pounds. Not many people have the opportunity to eat many muskies either. Generally speaking, the species most abundantly caught—the panfish—are lowest in pesticide residues. The materials tend to concentrate in fish.

The tolerances set by the federal government are far lower than what are considered "safe" levels. A wide safety margin has been sought in setting the standards.

Studies so far have indicated that man may be subjected to substantial dosages of DDT over considerable periods of time without observable effects, and that the compound does not build up almost unendingly in the body as it may on land or in water. Some research has shown that an equilibrium is reached, after which DDT is excreted at about the rate the body takes it in.

Research so far has shown that the level of DDT in humans in the United States has remained fairly constant in recent years, although considerably higher than levels found in Europeans. The range is about 10 to 12 parts per million in the fat.

Such reports, while encouraging, have made even more difficult the determination of where danger—if any—lies.

"This would appear to be more serious to fish than to humans," said Dr. Arthur Van Duser, of the state board of health, when informed of the conservation department's findings.

"Nobody's completely sure of what the long term effects of small amounts of these materials may be," he added. "It is assumed that they will not produce any effects—but that has neither been supported nor refuted, scientifically or satisfactorily."

Dr. Van Duser said that the board of health is kept advised of the results of test on foods being made continually by the state department of agriculture. He noted that the board has the power to act if any evidence of a health hazard is seen.

Donald N. McDowell, director of the state department of agriculture, said that he saw no potential hazard to human health "at this stage of the game."

He added that he felt that present controls were adequate, and said that he expected the answer to the problem to come from current chemical research for more degradable selective poisons.

(A degradable poison is one which does not remain lethal long after it's accomplished its purpose. One of the big objections to DDT and some related chemicals is that it persists in toxic form for years, causing buildups in land and water, and living organisms.

(A selective poison is one which is aimed at a specific target, in contrast from the "broad spectrum" compounds which affect many forms of life.)

The discovery of a high level of DDT in a single muskie triggered the conservation department's study last summer. The fish was taken from a northern lake where muskie reproduction was believed to be poor.

In New York, biologists have linked high pesticide levels to widespread reproductive failures in lake trout.

Walleye eggs sampled from some Wisconsin waters have shown DDT levels in the same range as that found lethal to lake trout eggs in New York. But the Wisconsin department has emphasized that much more study is needed before anything conclusive can be said about the situation here.

Of hundreds of fish collected from 30 bodies of water around the state all were found to contain DDT. With some exceptions, levels were lowest in the wooded north.

The highest levels were found in Lac La Belle, bordered by the city of Oconomowoc. Some perch showed as much as 242 parts per million in their fat.

Lake Kegonsa in Dane county also yielded very high readings.

The department of agriculture's monitoring program has revealed high levels of DDT in Lake Michigan and Green Bay fish, where University of Wisconsin researchers have also been encountering high readings. Prof. J. J. Hickey, who is heading a study of the effect of pesticides on fish eating birds, noted that a chub had 76 parts per million DDT in its fat. High readings—some higher—were noted in all other species studied.

Hickey commented that he was not qualified to say what effects of such levels might be on humans, but he said that "a herring gull eating such a fish is living dangerously."

[From Outdoor Life, August 1966]

LET'S NOT KILL OURSELVES—PESTICIDE BUILDUP AND ITS DISASTROUS RESULTS ARE MENACING FISHING'S FUTURE, PERHAPS MAN HIMSELF

(By David B. Peakall and Ben East)

In March of 1956, New York fisheries men found themselves with a major mystery on their hands. The previous fall, 348,000 eggs had been stripped from lake trout netted in Lake George. It was a routine operation intended to supply young trout for planting, and it went along uneventually until the fry hatched.

Little fish come into the world with a bulging yolk sac from the egg attached to their bellies, and this serves as their only source of food during the first few days of their lives. As the trout fry from Lake George started to absorb this built-in food supply, they began to die. Within a month the entire lot was dead.

Some mortality is normal among newly hatched fish, but a 100 percent loss was unknown. That fall, more eggs were collected from Lake George, and again the fry died as the yolk sacs were used up. The same thing happened in the fall of 1957 and again in 1958, even though the eggs were distributed among different hatcheries for hatching and rearing.

The watershed in which Lake George is located had been heavily sprayed with DDT since 1951, and starting about that same time lake trout fishing had been falling off and few small trout had been taken. Something was interfering with natural reproduction. With that much to go on, the New York Conservation Department took the trail of DDT as the suspect in the hatchery die-off.

In the fall of 1960, lake trout from 12 different lakes were netted and stripped. Little DDT had been used on some of these lakes; others had been sprayed abundantly. Intensive studies got under way, and by 1962 the case was solved.

It was found that if the yolk sac contained a concentration of DDT residues greater than three parts per million, the tiny trout died as they absorbed it. You can think of one part per million—usually written p.p.m.—as equivalent to one short step in the total walking distance between New York City and Niagara Falls, or one ounce in a 30-ton carload of flour. Amounts greater than three p.p.m. were discovered in spawn from four of the lakes that figured in the study. So serious had the problem become by 1963 that the use of DDT was banned on all state lands in New York watersheds where lake trout are found.

Some shocking discoveries were made along the way, too. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration fixes rigid maximums for the amount of pesticide residues permitted in food marketed in interstate commerce for human use. These maximums are at levels considered safe for prolonged consumption. Careful studies with laboratory animals resulted in the setting of the maximum allowed in meat fat, where such residues concentrate, at seven parts of DDT per million. No residues at all are permitted in milk. The oil of lake trout from Lake George was found to contain up to 850 p.p.m. In other words, trout were being caught and eaten that contained more than 100 times the concentration of DDT that would cause meat (to say nothing of milk) to be condemned as unsafe for human use.

Admittedly, the levels fixed by the Food and Drug Administration leave a wide margin of safety. Nevertheless, it is certainly cause for concern that the oil of lake trout in half the lakes studied in New York contained more than 10 times the amount of DDT permitted in meat, and in Lake George over 100 times the allowable maximum.

Fish themselves are able to survive such high concentrations of the poison only because they take it in slowly over a period of time, accumulating it so gradually that it is not immediately toxic. Most of it is stored in an unchanged state in the fat or oil of the fish and is more or less harmless to them as long as it stays there. If the full dose were taken at one time (and this has happened in countless instances of pesticide spraying), death would be certain and prompt.

There are dangers in the stored DDT, too. First, as in the New York case, its concentration in the eggs may be so great as to kill off the fry and put an end to reproduction. Second, the high concentration of residues may kill anything that feeds on the fish, including, in extreme instances, man himself. Finally, if the fish are forced to use up their oil, as in times of food shortage or on spawning migrations, they have little chance of survival.

The New York case is not an isolated one. Rather it is typical of many that have cropped up in just about every part of the country in recent years. Weighing all the evidence, there is no escaping the conclusion that an almost-invisible threat, insidious but as grave as any in their history, hangs over the future of both fishing and hunting. But most sportsmen are blissfully unaware of it.

It has been four years since Silent Spring, the late Rachel Carson's controversial best seller on pesticides and their dangers, burst on the United States like a bombshell, sounding warnings that many argued were far-fetched but at the same time raising vital questions that are not yet answered.

The controversy kindled by the book still echoes in and out of government circles, both state and federal. Ever since it was published, the U.S. Department of the Interior, parent agency of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has fought what Secretary Stewart Udall calls a seesaw battle—gaining some ground, losing in other areas—against the hazards Rachel Carson foretold. Many state fish and game departments have waged similar fights.

The President's Science Advisory Committee has prepared reports on pesticides. A Federal Committee on Pest Control made up of representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare has been created. Much research has been done, public symposiums have been held, and many states have created coordinating committees to regulate the use of pesticides.

However, most people have heard little about this continuing conflict, and, while concern among scientists and researchers has grown, public interest has died down since the initial shock of Silent Spring wore off. In general, hunters and fishermen have not shown much concern. Their indifference is unfortunate. There is ample reason for them to worry, and state after state can supply the proof.

In gathering material for this article, the authors put the following question to every fish and game department in the country: "Have there been any instances of pesticide spraying in your state within the last three or four years known to have had detrimental effects on fish or game?"

Of the 49 states that replied, 30 answered in the affirmative and cited specific examples of fish or game kills or other adverse consequences. Two had no information. Many others stressed that, though they have no proof, they strongly suspect that there have been cases of injurious effects of pesticides on wildlife. Still others said they were more deeply concerned about the long-range threat to game and fish than about outright kills. Quite a few think the situation has improved in the last two years. Some are now represented on boards or committees that pass on all spraying projects, and many more would like to be. The replies leave no room for doubt that the problem is a major one of nationwide concern.

"Your question deals with one of the most complicated, potentially far-reaching, and frustrating areas of natural resource affairs," was the comment of P. W. Schneider, director of the Oregon Game Commission. And Dale Henegar, chief of fisheries in North Dakota, adds, "There are probably no more than 20 scientists in the country qualified to speak on this subject."

Cole Wilde, chief of fisheries in Connecticut, voiced the attitude of most state game departments when he told Outdoor Life, "Pesticides are most certainly a threat to fish and wildlife. The present hazard seems to be one of accumulation and delayed damage rather than major outright kills." Harry Woodward, director of Colorado's game department, echoes Wilde with these words: "The use of pesticides in many cases is dangerous to wildlife, and we do not know enough about their residual effects."

To understand how residues of DDT and other pesticides build up in fish and other living creatures, one has only to consider the food chains that exist in nature. Small fish eat plankton and insects, big fish eat small ones, and birds and animals eat big fish.

Several years ago, Clear Lake, in California, provided what is still considered a classic example of poison buildup along a food chain. The lake was treated with DDD, a close relative of DDT, at the very low concentration of only two one-hundredths of a part per million, to kill off gnats. A colony of some 2,000 fish-eating grebes that had nested there for years promptly ceased to breed, and there was a severe die-off among those that wintered on the lake.

Studies revealed plankton from the water contained five p.p.m. of DDD residues. The plankton had concentrated the pesticide 250 times. Small fish contained up to 300 p.p.m., large fish up to five or six times that amount, and the grebes 2,000 p.p.m., a final concentration of 100,000 times the original application.

Studies carried out in 1963 and 1964 in the Green Bay area of Lake Michigan by researchers at the University of Wisconsin showed that although shallow-water muds contained only one one-hundredth p.p.m. of pesticide residues, small crustaceans on which fish feed averaged one half p.p.m., and alewives more than three p.p.m. Old-squaw ducks, which feed on the alewives during winter migration, averaged as high as 70 p.p.m., and gulls, also fish-eaters and residents the year around, had up to 2,400 p.p.m. in their body fat. Heavy concentrations also were found in gull eggs and in chicks found dead.

About 70,000 pounds of DDT a year have been used in Door County, Wisconsin, where these studies were made, and orchard areas on the Michigan side of Lake Michigan are sprayed about as heavily. The researchers concluded that the same type of buildup that took place at Clear Lake, and has been reported since in other places, is now happening in Lake Michigan. Gull nesting success in the Green Bay area has fallen to the lowest level ever reported anywhere. Dead gulls and loons by the thousands have been found along the Lake Michigan beaches in recent years, and, though botulism is believed to be the cause, pesticide residues have been found in the dead birds and nobody knows to what degree these may have contributed to the kill.

Laboratory studies by the Fish and Wildlife Service show that creatures other than fish and birds have a similar capacity to concentrate pesticides. In one experiment, oysters were placed in a tank containing only one tenth of a part in a *billion* of DDT. A full part per billion is equivalent to one fifth of an inch as compared with the total distance across the United States. A week later, the oysters contained seven parts per million, 70,000 times the concentration of DDT in the surrounding water. "They soak the stuff up like sponges," one scientist said.

One part per billion, or even one part per million, of these poisons may seem like too little to worry about. But three important things about them have to be remembered: how little it may take to kill, how long they can last and how far they can travel, and their cumulative effects.

Only last year, the Department of the Interior revealed that its tests had shown that amazingly small amounts can be fatal to shrimps, crabs, and other aquatic life. One part of DDT per billion, for example, was sufficient to kill blue crabs in eight days, and shrimps exposed to less than one half of a part per billion were killed or paralyzed within 48 hours.

It is the long-lasting pesticides, known as stable or persistent because they do not break down and become harmless soon after they are applied, that pose the greatest threat.

Four major groups of poisons are used to control insects, bird and animal pests, weeds and brush. The first is the chlorinated hydrocarbons such as DDT (the best known of all), dieldrin, aldrin, chlordane, heptachlor, 2,4–D, and 2,4,5–T. The second group, made up of organic phosphorus compounds, includes Malathion, parathion, phosdrin, and others. The third consists of a wide variety of other organic compounds, including rotenone, pyrethrum, nicotine, and strychnine. The fourth are inorganic materials, including copper sulphate, arsenic, cyanide, thallium and the deadly 1080 used widely in predator and rodent control.

Of the four groups, it's the DDT family that remains active longest. These compounds are among the most durable poisons ever concocted by man. President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee regarded their threat as being so grave that it recommended, in its 1963 report, total elimination of their use as the government's ultimate goal. To date, no great headway has been made in that direction, however.

The gallon of DDT spray washed into a stream, then to a lake, and finally to the sea does not disintegrate in a few weeks or a few months and become harmless. Instead, it is rapidly absorbed and stored by all forms of aquatic life, travels wherever the living organism travels, and remains virtually unchanged for long periods of time. It is in these living things, rather than in the water itself, that it is largely found. And for that reason, once it reaches the ocean there is almost no limit to how far it and other gallons like it may be carried or how long they may endure as poisons in the food chain.

It has been known for years that sharks, tuna, and other fish that rarely come close to shore carry pesticide residues as high as 200 p.p.m. in their oil. In 1965, a new shudder of apprehension went through many scientists when it was revealed that minute traces of DDT had been found in penguins and seals in far-off Antarctica. No spraying has ever been done within thousands of miles of that remote land. The pesticide must have reached the penguins and seals through residues in their food chain.

No sportsman expects to hunt or fish there, so many may be inclined to say, "So what?" But the discovery of DDT in Antarctic birds and animals is startling proof of how long the poison remains intact, how universally it is becoming distributed, and how it is building up, slowly but steadily, in even the most remote ocean on earth. Competent scientists called the situation a terrifying one.

Birds that feed on fish carrying these residues suffer a disastrous chain effect, too. The bald eagle and osprey, both fish-eaters, appear to be headed for extinction as a consequence of pesticides reaching them in their food. The eagle population has shown a drastic slump in the Eastern half of the country, and nesting success has fallen to a low level. The osprey is on the way out all through the Northeast.

Even more surprising is the fact that a third bird, the peregrine falcon, a big, bird-eating hawk that does not take fish, has vanished completely from its former nesting range in the East. No one is sure why, but in Great Britain, where the same thing is happening, studies have put the blame on pesticides, apparently accumulated by insect-eating birds and passed on to the hawks.

As we have already said, New York is far from the only place where serious fish problems have arisen in recent years as a result of indiscriminate use of pesticides. Let's look at a few examples.

Sebago Lake in Maine has long been known for its excellent landlocked salmon fishing. It's a big lake, more than 10 miles long, with towns, resorts, fishing camps, and cottages around much of the shore. In the late 1950's, heavy spraying with DDT was begun to control mosquitoes and blackflies.

About that same time, salmon fishing began to fall off sharply, and it was learned that the growth rate of the landlocks was declined each year. In 1957, the average weight of a six-year-old Sebago salmon was two pounds 13 ounces. By 1962, it had plummeted to one pound seven ounces.

Suspecting that DDT was behind it Maine's Department of Inland Fisheries and Game launched a study in 1962 and by 1963 had found that the fat of Sebago landlocks contained from 56 to 782 p.p.m. of DDT, averaging 264 p.p.m. The average concentration of the pesticide had increased almost threefold in a single year.

A voluntary campaign to halt the spraying was started among property owners around the lake and was supported by the department. All use of DDT was stopped, and last year Ronald T. Speers, commissioner of inland fisheries and game, reported a marked recovery of the salmon population.

In Wyoming last August, a heavy kill of trout was reported following spraying for thistle control, another kill of 13,000 pounds of ling and crappies in Ocean Lake followed the application of herbicides in drainage ditches to control vegetation, and the fish population in the DuNoir River has dropped sharply as a result of mosquito-control spraying by private landowners.

The southern and eastern sections of Arkansas have had numerous fish kills in recent years. State fisheries men predict that pesticide use will increase and spread to areas not now threatened, until it involves almost all of the state's land area. But, though kills are a serious problem, the destruction of fish habitat is recognized as the major threat.

From July of 1963 to June of 1964, 21 cases of fish kill were reported in California. In the 12 months after that, five incidents were recorded, including one kill of 1,500 trout from pear-orchard spraying. Fish killed in that state in the past have ranged as high as hundreds of thousands a year, but the situation has improved. Of even greater concern than outright kills, however, are the indirect effects on fish and wildlife.

Between 1952 and 1957, DDT was used on 5,000,000 acres of forest land in New Brunswick to control spruce budworm. But hatchery waters were sprayed by mistake or because of negligence, and the result was a devastating 90 per cent loss of yearling Atlantic salmon and a 70 percent loss of two and three-year-olds. The hatcheries were all but put out of business. In addition, there was a serious loss of young wild fish, plus the virtual elimination of aquatic insects, in the Miramichi and Restigouche Rivers.

All use of DDT has been halted in New Brunswick in recent years and other chemicals are being used in its place. Fish and Wildlife Branch officials told Outdoor Life that no fish kills have occurred in more than three years. As a result, the salmon fishing has made a strong comeback in both rivers. Spring and fall fishing were good in 1964 and excellent in 1965.

There's a fly in the ointment, however. Fish and wildlife officials are well satisfied with the present situation so far as fish are concerned. But they're worried about woodcock and partridge, both of which are showing substantial amounts of pesticide residues, the long-range effects of which are not yet known.

At the Wolf Lake fish hatchery in Michigan in 1964, an airplane spraying a trailer court to control mosquitoes made several passes over hatchery ponds that held 200,000 muskellunge fry and several million sucker fry. The latter were being reared as food for the young muskies. The suckers were wiped out. Of the muskies, 20,000 died at once, and the rest were lost for lack of forage fish. The incident cost Michigan its entire year's production of muskellunge for stocking.

For three years, the shoreline of Horace Lake in New Hampshire was sprayed with DDT for mosquito and blackfly control. The result each year was virtually complete loss of young-of-the-year smallmouth bass. Cottage owners have now been induced to use another pesticide. Also in New Hampshire, in Winnisquam Lake, lake trout are storing up heavy concentrations of DDT and passing on the residues to eggs and fry. The governor has now forbidden all state agencies to use DDT.

In Wisconsin, where there have been no proved cases of big fish kills, a study of 30 lakes last year revealed pesticide levels in fish that are higher in several cases than those known to have been fatal elsewhere. "We must be very close to trouble in some areas, at least in terms of reproduction," said Conservation Director L. P. Voigt. He has prohibited all use of DDT by his department.

Also in Wisconsin, perch and chubs from Lake Michigan now show levels of DDT residues so high that commercial fishermen are beginning to worry about the consequences to their industry. And mink ranchers are turning away from using Lake Michigan alewives for mink food in the belief that pesticides in the alewives are affecting mink reproduction adversely.

The most spectacular fish kills ever caused by pesticides have been those in the lower Mississippi River, from Memphis to the Gulf of Mexico. In the winter of 1963–64, following several years of varying losses, an estimated 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 fish died there, including catfish, sea trout, buffalos, and others. It turned out that endrin, one of the most toxic of the chlorinated hydrocarbons, was the chief offender. Said the American Association for the Advancement of Science, "The Mississippi disclosures constitute a panic notice that pesticides threaten the public welfare in a variety of ways that require remedial action."

Entirely apart from the disastrous results, both immediate and long-range, that pesticides often have on fish populations and consequently on fishing, they pose a further grave threat to the fisherman himself. How is he to know when their residues reach levels that may endanger his own health if he eats the fish he catches?

What many people do not realize is pesticides are about equally poisonous to all forms of life, up to and including humans. The amount required to kill a mosquito, a mouse, or a man is roughly the same on a weight-for-weight basis. Since the mouse is larger than the mosquito, the dose of DDT lethal for him is correspondingly bigger, and it's bigger yet for bigger creatures. Nevertheless, the contaminated fish that cause a major die-off of birds would also be fatal to a man if he ate enough. The single lethal dose for an adult human is only about one third of an ounce.

As Cliff Bosley, a water-pollution analyst for the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, puts it, "Compounds such as DDT, endrin, aldrin, dieldrin, and heptachlor that are known to build in the tissues of fish and animals will also build in man's tissues. Each time a human consumes a piece of flesh from an animal or fish containing an insecticide, the amount of the chemical in that flesh is transferred to and stored in his tissues. And man, too, has the lethal level of these compounds."

Short of death, what are the long-term hazards of the residues in the human body? They are not easy to assess. At hearings on pesticides held by the U.S. Senate in 1963, a wide range of expert medical testimony was presented. A minority of those testifying considered the risk grave and went as far as to link pesticides with blood cancer. The majority view, however, was that present levels are not harmful. For the most part, witnesses from private clinics were antipesticide, public health officials steered a middle course, and those employed by the chemical companies that make the poisons laughed at all fears. Actually, the answer is not known.

But the average level of DDT in human fat in this country rose from five p.p.m. in 1958 to 12 p.p.m. in 1963, and that is disquieting to many. Small amounts of other chlorinated hydrocarbons have recently been detected in humans, too, and the situation is now serious enough so that the Federal Committee on Pest Control last fall approved a new and comprehensive program for monitoring the levels of residues in people as well as in fish, wildlife, foods, soil, and water. From now on, regular checks will be made on man as well as on carp and mallard ducks.

With pesticides, as with the controversy that swirls around lung cancer and smoking, it is difficult to prove a connection between cause and effect. But few medical authorities would rule out the possibility of a link between pesticide residues and some form of disease. President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee warned flatly in 1963 that, "Although pesticides remain in small quantities, they may eventually affect human health."

Certainly the available evidence indicates that if unregulated spraying continues at the present rate, and using the materials that have been used most commonly up to now, it can be only a question of time before fishermen in many parts of the country may have to ask themselves whether the catch they take home is safe to eat. After all, the poison that can kill a gull can also kill a man if he takes enough of it.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 17, 1966]

SCIENTISTS WORRIED: WE'RE ALL CARRYING DDT BUILD-UP APPEARS DANGEROUS AS INFECTED PLANKTON EATEN BY FISH KILLS BIRDS

(By Irving S. Bengdsdorf)

Snowy owls in the Arctic, residents of Los Angeles, New York, London, Berlin, Moscow and Tokyo, and Adelie penguins and crab-eater seals in the Antarctic—all are carrying around some DDT in their body fat.

Within all of us is stored some DDT that was sprayed—somewhere far away, sometime long ago—in an attempt to kill some insects.

Is the amount of DDT and other organochlorine insecticides stored in the fat in our bodies hazardous to our health?

All present evidence suggests that it is not. The 200,000 men spraying DDT for the World Health Organization in its fight to eradicate malaria and other diseases inhale much more DDT in one hour than the average American consumes with his meals each day.

And none of the DDT-spraymen have reported ill.

But safe levels for some of the more dangerous pesticides are not known.

Biologists are worried, however, about "ecological magnification"—the fact that a creature can accumulate a higher concentration of DDT within itself than exists in its external surroundings.

CREATURES OF BIOLOGY

An example: At Clear Lake,, Calif., gnats were killed with DDD—an insecticide similar to DDT. Thirteen months later the lake's plankton—microscopically tiny plants—had 500 times the DDT-concentration in the water. Fish that ate the plankton had even greater concentrations and the fish that ate these fish contained higher concentrations yet. The birds that ate these fish died. Their fat contained concentrations of DDD 100,000 times greater than in the water.

Birds and fish are creatures of biology as is man. We do not know how great is the potential threat to man, if any. But with increasing pollution of our globe, biologists are disturbed about low-level pesticide contamination, in general, and ecological magnification, in particular.

The issue is further confused by the recent development of instruments that have the remarkable ability to analyze for extremely small amounts of DDT and other organochlorine insecticides. We now easily can detect DDT in parts per billion.

A part per billion roughly is about one ounce of material in 30,000 tons! With such analytical techniques it is difficult to find any milk in California totally free of DDT. It has been stated: "The gentle cow, which produces wholesome milk one day according to one method of analysis, may produce 'contaminated' milk the next day after more sensitive methods of detection are used."

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

What do residues as small as parts per billion mean? The techniques to detect DDT have far outrun our understanding of what biological effects such tiny residues may have.

The White House recently released a report entitled "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment" prepared by a group of 15 distinguished scientists forming the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

The panel concluded: "Some 20 tons of DDT residue is contained in the bodies of the people of this country: the average amount for each individual is thus about a tenth of a gram (there are 28.35 grams in an ounce). Measurable amounts of dieldrin and other organochlorine insecticides also have accumulated in our bodies. Clear-cut adverse effects on health of these small accumulations have not been recognized."

But then the panel adds, "However, animal experiments have not yet demonstrated safe levels for some of the more dangerous pesticides."

Dr. Colin M. McLeod, deputy director of the Office of Science and Technology, recently stated, "The small amounts of DDT and related compounds that are present in the fatty tissue of all of us, wherever we may live, and in that of most other living things including Antarctic penguins, has not been shown to be harmful."

But, then Dr. MacLeod puts his finger on what is bothering biologists:

"On the other hand, one has an uneasy feeling about these highly toxic materials being sequestered in the bodies of so many different kinds of animals especially since we still don't know in any detail the nature of the toxic effect or affects.

It is this low-level pollution of the living creatures of our environment—including ourselves—which disturbs biologists. For with every day that passes our entire planet continues to be polluted with organochlorine insecticides, especially DDT.

SHOWS CHANGE POWER

The present worldwide contamination by insecticides is an example of the power man has acquired since World War II to alter completely his global surroundings.

Twenty-four years ago, DDT was an esoteric chemical, unknown even to professional chemists. Today, it is found as a residue in every creature's body.

Nor are the oceans immune. Drs. D. B. Menzell, R. W. Risebrough and D. J. Martin Jr. of the University of California's Institute of Marine Resources and Department of Nutritional Science at Berkeley collected hundreds of samples of fish and shellfish from both salt water bays and the open ocean—from Seattle to Galapagos and from San Francisco to Hawaii.

They now report that of over 400 samples analyzed, "We have found only four individuals without some measurable (DDT) residue. The residues we have detected are not a human health hazard under the present assumptions used in the establishment of pesticide tolerances."

But, the UC scientists also are concerned. For they find that the level of DDT in the ovaries of the collected creatures is 10 times that of the level of DDT in the rest of the body.

MATCH OTHER FINDINGS

These results go along with previous work that DDT shows a tendency to prefer to accumulate in the eggs of birds as compared to the bird's body. Higher concentrations of DDT in the eggs may affect the fertility and ability to reproduce of both fishes and birds.

The Berkeley workers add:

"The occurrence of DDT residues in marine bays and estuaries is particularly important and deserving of more study since the bays and estuaries form the 'nursery' for many of the commercially important species of food fishes."

And the "nurseries" of mammals also are contaminated. For DDT can be transferred from the mother through the placenta into the fetus of dogs, rabbits, mice and men.

A recent university of Miami study of both unborn and stillborn human infants revealed they also contained DDT-residues. There is no evidence that DDT was the cause of the stillbirths.

Such studies have led Dr. Wayland J. Hayes Jr. of the Communicable Disease Center, Public Health Service, Atlanta, Ga., to comment, "It follows that we do not begin to reach a steady state of DDT storage after birth, but rather are born and probably conceived with it. Dieldrin, too, is transferred to the fetus in mice."

Adelie penguins and crabeater seals never leave the Antarctic. And their food consists of local fish and shellfish which also do not migrate. Neither the penguins, the seals, or their food supply ever gets near any place that has been sprayed with DDT.

Then how do they get DDT into their bodies? We do not know.

One possible clue is furnished by the recent research of D. C. Abbott, R. B. Harrison, J. O'G. Tatton and J. Thomson at the Laboratory of the Government Chemist, London. They collected London rainwater and snow at two stations from February to July 1965 and detected DDT and six other organochlorine pesticides in the water.

LIKED TO ATMOSPHERE

The British chemists conclude: "Present results suggest that the atmosphere carries either as vapor or by occlusion on dust particles, small amounts of the organochlorine pesticides in common use in the United Kingdom and that they are 'scrubbed out' by rain and snow."

And if this is true for Britain, it also is true for the United States, Russia and every other nation. Large-scale sprayings of insecticides may be the artificial, small-scale, man-made equivalents of natural volcanic eruptions—where instead of ashes and dust, insecticides are spewed throughout the globe.

How did we get ourselves into this situation? It all began 24 years ago with the highest of motives—the saving of human lives.

DDT first made its appearance in 1942, during World War II. It was put to work immediately in the killing of lice which carry typhus and mosquitoes which carry malaria, yellow fever, dengue, filariasis and encephalitis. And it worked.

QUALIFIES AS "MIRACLE"

DDT's record in eliminating malaria alone would qualify it as one of the "miracle" chemicals of the century. It cut the death rate from malaria in Ceylon by 34% in a year and reduced the number of malaria cases in India from 75 million in 1952 to 100,000 by 1964!

The 10-year malaria eradication program of the United Nation's World Health Organization, using a billion pounds of DDT, already has freed 1.2 billion people from the malaria menace and has wiped out yellow fever from 16 countries in the western hemisphere.

The discovery of DDT must stand as a milestone in the history of the control of epidemic diseases.

Dr. J. M. Barnes of the Toxicology Research unit, Medical Research Laboratories, Surrey, England, concludes:

"The evidence is substantial that the use of pesticides has benefited mankind without injuring the health of those who use them correctly."

From medicine and hygiene, DDT was turned to agriculture and forestry—to kill insects that destroy grains, vegetables, fruits and trees. It resulted in greater yields of crops per acre, better looking unblemished fruit, and the loss of fewer trees.

CHEAP AND SAFE

DDT is cheap, easy to apply, relatively safe to handle, kills a wide variety of insects and stays around unchanged for a long time. Production of DDT in the United States zoomed from nothing in 1942 to 124 million pounds in 1964.

DDT's ability to hang around long after it has been sprayed—its persistence—is thought to be its chief virtue. But it also is the persistence of DDT and other organochlorine insecticides which give rise to the present environmental pollution problem.

Almost all materials can be placed into one of two groups: those that dissolve in water and those that dissolve in fats. It turns out DDT belongs to the second category. It is soluble in fats.

EXPLAINS HEAVY LOAD

And once DDT finds its way into the fat of a creature, its persistence lets it stay unchanged for long times. And as the creature eats more food contaminated with DDT, the amount of DDT in its fat increases.

That's how a creature may attain a greater concentration of DDT inside of itself than there exists in its external surroundings.

Consider the details of this ecological magnification at Clear Lake. Clouds of gnats around the lake were a nuisance and so it was decided in 1958 to control them by adding DDD. Enough DDD was added so that the lake finally contained 20 parts per billion of insecticide (20 ounces of DDD for every billion ounces of water).

Thirteen months later, the amount of DDD in the lake's plankton was 10 parts per million: a concentration of DDD in the plankton 500 times greater than in the water.

And the "vegetarian" fish that ate the plankton had 903 ppm. of DDD in their fat. And the carnivorous fish that ate the fish that ate the plankton had 2,690 ppm. DDD in their fat. And the grebes, the birds that ate the fish that ate the fish that ate the plankton, had 2,134 ppm. DDD in their fat. And the grebes died.

The concentration of DDD in the dead grebes was 100,000 times as great as in the lake water. For like DDT, DDD also is persistent.

Recently, Eldridge G. Hunt of the California Department of Fish and Game added, "We have sampled animal populations at Clear Lake periodically since 1958 and find (eight years later) that high (DDD) residue levels still occur in the older fish."

And in all these cases, harm was done to creatures which were not the original target of the insecticide. Hunt continues, "Results of both field and laboratory studies have shown that the biological magnification of pesticides CAN result in death or debility in non-target animals and can adversely affect their reproduction. It is disconcerting to biologists to know that populations of certain wild species are declining, some to the point of near extinction, but not to know why."

This is one of the problems worrying biologists: the potential hazard, by little understood, low-level, persistent pesticide-contamination, to "non-pest" creatures through magnification by ecological food-chains—one creature eating another.

What to do? The Environmental Pollution Panel states:

"We now know that the full effects of environmental changes produced by pollution cannot be foreseen before judgments must be made. The responsible judgment, therefore, must be the conservative one. Trends and indications, as soundly based as possible, must provide the guidelines: demonstration of disaster is not required."

Can we maintain our present superb agricultural production if the use of DDT and other organochlorine and organophosphorus insecticides is reduced? Apparently, we can.

DDT MAY KILL BIRDS AFTER OVER A MONTH

WASHINGTON (Science Service).—The lethal effects of pesticides take their toll in birds even after 40 days of eating nothing but food free from any poison, it was reported recently.

In controlled studies, two researchers of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Md., fed 27 cowbirds a diet containing 500 parts per million of DDT, dissolved in cottonseed oil and mixed with turkey food. Thirteen birds died in 12 days, seven died in eight days after which time the remaining seven birds were put on a clean diet. Four of these seven died after 2, 9, 40 or 93 days on a clean diet, three survived for 112 days and were killed for observation. Severe tremoring or trembling typical of DDT poisoning were observed in the dying birds, the researchers reported in a recent issue of Science.

Autopsies of all the birds showed conditions common to cowbirds succumbing to DDT—fat was essentially gone from the visible storage sites. The residues in the brains were similar to those reported for robins, sparrows, eagles, and white rats.

In attempting to establish the exact lethal levels of pesticides, the scientists found that residue DDT levels varied widely. The lowest level, however, of pesticides taken to inflict serious danger and possible death was found to be 30 parts per million of DDT and DDD combined in the brain.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Apr. 17, 1966]

PESTICIDE PROBLEM TRULY IS REAL

(By Clay Schoenfeld)

When Rachel Carson sounded her alarm several years ago against the indiscriminate use of non-degradable chemical pesticides, there was an immediate and violent reaction from the agricultural community.

"Why worry about a few dead robins or eagles or ospreys," they said. "The chemical control of weeds and bugs is essential to profitable farming."

Now farmers and other commercial interests are beginning to join the "sentimental conservationists" in a concern about what we may be doing to our environment through the use of persistent sprays.

LITTLE BIT HURTS

Soil scientists, for example, are beginning to speculate that pesticides have a deleterious effect on the bacteria associated with leguminous plants in "fixing" nitrogen. Dairy scientists are beginning to wonder just how much DDT man can tolerate in his milk supply.

The U.S. Department of Interior revealed the other day that amazingly small amounts of pesticides can kill commercial shrimps, crabs, and oysters. One part of DDT in one billion parts of water was found to kill blue crabs in eight days. (One part per billion is the relationship one ounce of chocolate syrup would bear to 10 million gallons of milk.)

Now comes the Conservation Department with a report that DDT, DDD, DDE, and Dieldrin are beginning to show up in Wisconsin fish—adults, fingerlings, and eggs. In some cases the poison levels are "mere traces". In other cases the levels appear to be at a point where "things begin to happen," says Biologist Don Thompson. The minute chemical poisons begin to threaten the resort industry, we have a different ball game in Wisconsin.

ORDER STOPS USE

The situation is serious enough that Conservation Director L. P. Voigt has urged all users of pesticides to substitute degradable types, even though they may be less effective and more expensive. Voigt has issued orders that no DDT is to be used by department personnel on state lands.

"Until we know more about chlorinated hydrocarbons and their effect on wildlife and man, the sensible and logical procedure is to use other chemicals," Voigt says.

The problem is that chemicals used for the control of mosquitoes and weeds and other pests have a tendency to remain in the soil or water until picked up by other plants and animals. These may be eaten in turn by larger animals or birds. Each animal tends to increase the quantity in its body until the "end consumers" get the biggest doses.

CENTER PLANNED

The State Legislature will have a chance to join in pesticide control when it returns to Madison in May. One pending bill would give the State Department of Agriculture new authority to set rules on the use of pesticides, their sale, labeling, distribution, storage, and packaging. A companion bill would set up a State Pesticide Council to make continuing studies of pesticide problems, keep track of research efforts, and recommend legislation as needed.

The University of Wisconsin has tentative plans for setting up a Toxicology Center where research into the pesticide effects and controls could be stepped up.

Public concern over pesticides is genuine and mounting. Until more is known about these agricultural tools and their effects, until less persistent and toxic alternatives are found, "the wise way is to use the procedure that will least upset the balance of nature," as Voigt says.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Jan. 29, 1966]

FISHERMEN UPSET BY LAKE PESTICIDES

(By Don Johnson)

Recent reports of pesticide concentrations in some Wisconsin waters are causing concern in the state's commercial fish industry.

Spokesmen say that public reaction could deal another crippling blow to Great Lakes fishermen, only now recovering from effects of a botulism scare in 1964.

Such a reaction, they said, could also mean declining sales of fish caught elsewhere.

Most of the fish and seafood handled commerically in Wisconsin comes from Canadian lakes, the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and Alaska, Iceland, and the Gulf of Mexico, the spokesmen point out.

"This could put a stigma on fish—all fish—and how do you remove it?" asked Gerald Bolda, Jr., Milwaukee, president of the Wisconsin Fisheries council.

He, along with other commercial fish dealers, stressed that there has been no evidence that fish from the Great Lakes are unsafe to eat.

No federal tolerances have been established for pesticides in fish.

Information released earlier this month by the state agricultural department, the conservation department and University of Wisconsin wildlife researchers revealed that "significant" amounts of DDT had been found in the tissues of fish taken from several inland lakes and outlying waters—Lake Superior and Lake Michigan.

(*The chemical name for DDT is dicchlorodiphenyl-trichloroethane. It is manufactured from the sedative chloral hydrate, monochlorbenzene and sulfuric acid. It can be prepared as a dusting powder or as an oil or water solution for spraying. It is used as a pesticide.*)

In some instances, the reports showed, the fish contained far more DDT than is permitted in meat or vegetables sold for human consumption.

Smoked chubs, particularly from the Door county area, showed the highest DDT contents in analysis made in the state laboratories, according to the reports.

Lake Michigan perch also contained high levels. They exceeded the 242 parts per million found in the fat of perch from Lac La Belle at Oconomowoc, which the conservation department identified as one of the inland lakes most contaminated with pesticides. The federal maximum in beef fat, by comparison, is 7 parts per million.

Checking by the agriculture department has found only traces of pesticides in fish and seafoods imported to the Wisconsin market—with the exception of some Canadian samples. There, it appears, some water is approaching DDT levels found in Wisconsin lakes.

Some spokesmen for the fishing industry maintained that the less said about the situation the better.

Others are hopeful that reports will arouse public concern about controlling the pesticide buildup, without frightening them away from the fish counters. Such fears, they say, are foolish.

There is evidence that humans may be able to tolerate a lot of DDT—far more, perhaps, than once believed.

Perhaps it is even questionable that enough DDT to harm a human could collect in fish.

Lawrence Fisher, president of the Wisconsin Fishing Co., Green Bay, said that reports of pesticides in fish were "probably alarming to people who might think the fish they buy is produced in Wisconsin."

"That isn't the case at all," he said.

Fisher added that he did not see any danger in present pesticide levels in the big lakes.

He expressed optimism for the future of Great Lakes fishing—based on proposed plans for pollution cleanups and what appear to be thriving populations of commercial species in the lakes at present.

Others did not take such a cheerful view, however.

Bolda said that going to Washington to get support for a cleanup of Great Lakes pollution was "like going up against a stone wall."

He said that public understanding of the problem was important:

"We don't want a liquid desert out there," he said.

Although no pan fish or game fish are marketed from Wisconsin's inland waters, many dealers do handle some fish caught from the Great Lakes.

Two hundred eighty-six commercial fishermen are still licensed on Lake Michigan and 64 on Lake Superior. Their annual catch of chubs, perch, herring, whitefish, and smelt totals about seven million pounds, valued at about 1.5 million dollars.

Not all of the catch is sold in Wisconsin.

Only a few test hauls are now permitted to be made for lake trout—once the big income producer on the lakes. With control of the sea lamprey, and an extensive restocking program, there have been growing hopes that the trout will make a comeback.

Already, the commercial fishermen have lost a major market for alewives—an abundant species sought only for animal food. Mink ranchers have blamed DDT in the fish for reproductive losses in their animals.

Federal research into that, and related problems, is under way.

Whether the federal food and drug administration will establish pesticide tolerances for fish—and if so, at what levels—remains unknown.

"I don't think anybody thought about this stuff getting into fish when the other tolerances were set," said Donald McDowell, director of the state agriculture department, in a recent interview. "They just thought about the farmer spraying his cow, and his crops, and the crops the cows ate."

Fish are far more susceptible than humans—and in New York it was found that less than 3 parts per million of DDT in lake trout eggs meant virtually no trout survival. Levels of that magnitude have already been found in the eggs of some Wisconsin fish.

So, from the public health standpoint, the problem of pesticides in fish might solve itself.

Before fish become toxic to people, conservationists grimly agree, it could be that there will be no fish to worry about.

STUDY LINKS DDT TO FISH DECLINE

(By Tim Wyngaard)

MADISON.—That pesticide a summer cottage owner sprays to control mosquitoes may help to kill muskies in one of Wisconsin's sparkling blue northern lakes.

The drop of walleye reproduction in the southern counties of the state is due to the same type of indiscriminate use of pesticides, according to a study conducted by the State Conservation Department and the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF).

The state conservation agency is starting to do something about the problem, according to the department's publication, the Wisconsin Conservation Bulletin.

Mosquito control on conservation department recreation areas no longer will be carried out with the widely used pesticide DDT, the department has decided.

Other commercially available pesticides will be used. DDT has been found, in other studies, to have a long active life chemically.

Worst of all, it has the ability to be "magnified" biologically as it passes through the food chain of plants and animals. As it becomes more concentrated in higher forms of life, it likewise becomes more powerful.

Other pesticides have many of the same attributes, but DDT has proved to be so popular, powerful and persistent that the agency feels that action must be taken to reduce its use in some manner.

"This is not to say that its use will not continue at a high level, however," says the Bulletin.

But it may be that the department will find it necessary to restrict its use in some way among other state agencies and the general population, the article implies.

"We will have to decide how far such contamination can be permitted to go in view of the department's mandate contained in Wisconsin's conservation law. This act calls for 'an adequate and flexible system for the protection, development and use "of the state's natural resources," the Bulletin says.

Pesticide use has great affects on fish and other wildlife forms, the Bulletin notes.

"This makes pesticides everybody's business," the article concludes.

The article, prepared by department research and planning director Donald R. Thompson, relates results of a survey of the presence of DDT and another pesticide, dieldrin, in Wisconsin water's after irregularities in spawning at a northern fish hatchery and in southern state waters.

Last spring almost 600 fish of 13 different species were collected from 31 bodies of water. Fish were combined into groups to make up about 125 samples of several fish each, except that all large game fish, including all muskies were analyzed separately.

All samples of fish, no matter what the species or the location from which they were obtained, were found to contain traces of DDT. Traces found measured from one part in a million up to almost 250 parts per million of DDT or its derivitives in the fish fat tissue.

Generally, highest findings were made in fish from southern and east central lakes.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 22, 1966]

The Worry About DDT

In spite of disturbing questions raised by reputable scientists and researchers, at least three Milwaukee suburbs will use DDT to spray elms this year in the battle against Dutch elm disease. Whitefish Bay, Fox Point and Shorewood will spray by helicopter.

River Hills also will campaign by air against the elm bark beetle but it will use the less persistent and thus presumably safer chemical, methoxychlor. The city of Milwaukee hasn't sprayed with anything since the fall of 1964. This year it will continue injecting the chemical, TCPA, into the circulatory systems of its street elms. The technique offers no threat to wildlife.

The worrisome thing about such chemicals as DDT is how little we know of their cumulative effects on wildlife and even on human beings. What little we do know is unsettling. DDT has an awesome ability to persist in toxic form. It has been found in the systems of penguins and seals in the antarctic and birds and mammals in other remote parts of the world.

University of Wisconsin researchers found that DDT residues in Lake Michigan get into the systems of tiny animals. Fish feed on the animals, birds eat the fish. At each stage in the food chain the chemical builds up in higher concentrations. Measurable residues of DDT have been found in 13 species of fish, both commercial and game, from 30 different lakes or flowages in 11 Wisconsin counties. The conservation department was disturbed enough by the phenomenon recently to reiterate an order barring use of DDT for spraying on state lands.

Federal fish and wildlife service researchers say that pesticides may cause mass fish deaths, "or they can cause insidiously delayed damage to the reproductive capability of mammals, fish and birds."

The challenge is to find more selective, more efficient, less toxic and less persistent chemicals to control insect pests. Enough genuine doubt has been thrown on DDT to suggest the use of less persistent pesticides even if the cost is higher and the effect on insect pests is not as dramatic.

Residues of DDT Found in State Fish

Madison, Wis.—The state conservation and agriculture departments confirmed Friday that measurable residues of DDT have been found in 13 species of fish, both commercial and sport, from 30 different lakes or flowages in 11 Wisconsin counties.

The cautiously worded announcement was made after months of conferences. Officials, concerned over possible reaction by the resort and fishing industries, emphasized that similar residues had been found in fish in other states and that no evidence of harm to humans was found.

Tests were made last summer by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation with $2,500 in conservation department funds. Additional tests for dieldrin, another persistent hydrocarbon pesticide, were financed by the University of Wisconsin department of wildlife management.

LIVE FISH POOLED

Several hundred live fish were pooled to provide separate samples generally numbering 3 to 12 fish each. DDT residues ranging up to five parts per million (on a whole fish basis) were found in all samples.

Dieldrin was detected in 76% of the samples with the highest amount being .07 parts per million.

How close to death or reproduction failure the fish were could not be determined because these vary with rate of intake, condition of fish and amount of stress.

POSSIBLE SOURCES

Seven samples of spawn were analyzed. A DDT residue of 2.8 parts per million was found in one sample of walleye eggs (in New York 2.9 parts per million has been found lethal to trout eggs).

Possible sources of contamination appeared to be the use of insecticides by cottages, resorts and camping areas and for control of mosquitoes and Dutch elm disease and of pesticides for farming.

Highest levels were found in fish from Lac La Belle in Waukesha county, surrounded by Oconomowoc and its suburbs. Lowest levels were in areas of little human activity or farm drainage—Knutson lake in Sawyer county, Escanaba and Palmer lakes in Vilas county and Murphy flowage in Rusk county.

An agriculture department statement said that in view "of the obscurity of causes and corrective action" and the unknown chronic and acute physiology effects of pesticides, "it seems logical to move very cautiously, to avoid unduly alarming the public and to avoid damage to the worldwide (fishing) industry without sound scientific basis."

CONCERNED OVER DEATHS

The conservation department had been concerned for years about muskie deaths at its Woodruff hatchery.

The agencies also are studying the effects of forest insect spraying in Douglas county and making DDT analyses of animals and birds.

Many animals have been found to have residues, but generally at low levels. The agriculture department's responsibility is protection of human food, while the conservation agency's concern is wildlife.

For this reason the agriculture agency is interested in measurements on a whole fish basis which a consumer will eat, while conservation officials look at the amount of residue in fish fat.

ABSORBED INTO FAT

Fish absorb DDT into their fat which they draw upon in time of stress or starvation. They can take in small amounts of DDT and store it up over long periods of time until they have to draw on the fat. In the Mississippi river kill three years ago, this apparently proved fatal to millions of fish.

Single doses of one part per million in the laboratory have been fatal to fish.

As far as is known, humans seem to throw off DDT after a certain level. Prisoners have taken 100 parts per million in tests without noticeable effects.

Conservationists are concerned with the effects of residues in birds and animals that eat fish, as well as the buildup in the environment.

DDT FOUND ELSEWHERE

Agriculture department tests of fish from Lake Michigan and Superior, the Mississippi river and Canadian waters showed residues in approximately the same range as in the Wisconsin lakes.

J. J. Hickey, UW professor of wildlife, also has found four parts per million of DDT in Lake Michigan fish.

Species in the inland lake tests included carp, red horse, suckers, bluegills, rock bass, crappies, perch, lake trout, splake, largemouth bass, walleye and northern pike and muskie.

The number of samples, bodies of water and species, by county, were.

Washburn, 1–1–1; Sawyer, 23–6–7; Rusk, 7–1–4; Iron, 7–2–3; Vilas, 42–9–9; Oneida, 20–5–5; Marathon, 3–1–3; Green Lake, 2–1–2; Calumet, 5–1–3; Dane, 8–2–4; Waukesha, 6–1–4.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 30, 1966]

Pesticides Found in Unborn Babies—Traces Are Higher Than in Children Up to 5 Years

(By Harold M. Schmeck)

Washington, Jan. 29.—Traces of pesticides have been found in the tissues of stillborn and unborn human babies.

In some cases the concentrations of pesticides in the fetus were almost as high as those of the mother or young adults of comparable age. The traces have been found as early as the 22d week of the infant's development in the womb, according to a study to be published soon.

In all cases, the traces were small and the study report made no suggestion of any casual relationship between the stillbirths and the presence of pesticides.

The pre-birth traces were found to be substantially higher than those of children in the age group from infancy to 5 years, and tended to resemble those of the adult population. The pre-birth group included six babies. There has been previous research in animals suggesting that such traces might be found in humans.

CONCENTRATIONS FADE

The data indicate, one of the authors of the study said, that the fetal tissue behaves like that of the mother and that there is transmission of pesticides from the mother to her unborn child. After birth the similarity in pesticide concentrations seem to fade for several years. This possibly is partly because the infant is less exposed to the chemicals.

The findings were made in the course of a continuing study of pesticide concentrations in the tissues of persons of all age groups. So far 71 individuals have been studied altogether including four stillborn infants and two unborn infants who died when their mothers were killed in accidents.

All the individuals studied appeared to have been healthy before their deaths through accidents. The study was done in Florida.

Studies of pesticides in young children and human fetuses have not previously been reported in this country, the authors said. Therefore, no comparisons could be made with pesticide levels of persons in other parts of the country. The adults studied in the program did correspond closely with findings of other studies throughout the United States, however.

The pesticides studied included DDT, and its breakdown products, and also aldrin, dieldrin and lindane. DDT and dieldrin were found in highest concentrations. The amounts were described as only traces, but they have become measurable in recent years because of sophisticated analytic techniques such as gas chromatography.

Pesticide traces were found in fat tissue, liver, kidney and brain. The greatest concentration was in fat, the DDT average for stillborn children being 7.51 parts per million while the comparable figure for persons 30 years old or more was 7.8 for children up to 5 years it was only 2.9 parts per million.

The scientists involved in the study emphasized that they had found no evidence linking the pesticides with the cause of the stillbirths. They said they had no reason to suspect such a relationship.

The continuing study is being done by specialists of the University of Miami School of Medicine, the Dade County Department of Public Health and the Dade County Medical Examiner's office. Authors of the report are Miss Vera Fiserova-Bergerova, Dr. John E. Davies, Dr. Joseph H. Davis and Dr. Jack L. Radomski.

TO BE PUBLISHED SOON

The report is to be published in a forthcoming issue of Industrial Medicine and Surgery, Dr. Davies said. Earlier this month the scientists described their findings at a conference held in connection with the opening of a new laboratory in Miami of the United States Public Health Service's Office of Pesticides.

The study, and 11 other more recently stated ones like it throughout the country, are sponsored by the Office of Pesticides, of which Dr. Robert W. Weiger is chief.

In recent years there has been much interest in all the environmental influences that might affect an unborn baby because of the possibility that some of these influences may be among the cause of birth defects. In a telephone interview Dr. Davies said his studies had not revealed any such relationships in the case of the pesticides.

He said, however, that he considers the finding of pesticide traces in the unborn as early as the 22d week of development a matter of importance. Its significance must be investigated, he said.

RESOLUTION: TO STUDY WEST FRONT ALTERNATIVES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am submitting today, for myself and Senators BREWSTER, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MCCARTHY, MONDALE, MONRONEY, NELSON, TYDINGS, and LAUSCHE, a resolution which would give us some basis for a rational decision on how best to meet the problem of the deterioration of the west front of the Capitol.

The proposal put forth by the Architect of the Capitol a month ago would give us only one course of action—his $34 million fiasco—and that would be on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

I have already stated on the floor of the Senate many times why the Architect's proposal is unacceptable in its present form. So have a number of other Senators.

However, we all recognize the need to make some decision on the problem of the west front. This resolution would help us do that.

Specifically, it calls for an engineering study, under supervision of the Public Works Committee, of the costs we could expect to be incurred in restoring the west front in its present design and location.

The Architect did not tell us this. His view is simply that only by expanding—and thus ruining architecturally—the Capitol can we solve the problem before us.

This measure also would give us an independent evaluation of the extension proposal, and whether it should indeed cost $34 million.

And, finally, the firm selected to conduct the study would be instructed to report to the Senate any third alternative that might be found feasible.

Mr. President, I think this is a sound approach to an extremely important question. I ask that this resolution lie on the table for 10 days so that other Senators who desire to join in sponsoring it may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining (1) the structural condition of the west-central portion of the United States Capitol Building (extending from the House connection to the Senate connection) and of adjacent terrace walls, (2) whether remedial action requires the extension of the west-central front and its reconstruction in marble, (3) the costs involved in remedial action restoring and preserving the original structure of the west-central portion of the Capitol Building without the proposed extension of the west-central front of the Capitol Building, (4) the costs involved in extending, in marble, the west-central front of the Capitol Building, and (5) whether any other means of preservation and restoration is deemed feasible and advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than March 1, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

AMENDMENT NO. 638

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 20, 1966, I cosponsored a Republican effort to bring private enterprise into the antipoverty program. It took the form of a proposed amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. The amendment was introduced by my friend, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. It proposed the creation by Congress of a private profitmaking corporation empowered to undertake a wide variety of tasks currently being attempted by Federal agencies under the administration's antipoverty program.

The reasons for our proposal, and the amendment I now submit to the Senate, rest on the very economic foundations of this great Nation. Our Founding Fathers sought to strike at poverty and to encourage Americans, through their own exertions and through competition, to fulfill the dreams and ambitions that brought them to this land. By and large, the early colonists were a poor and disadvantaged people. But they were blessed with the courage and faith to create a freedom under which a newly organized, self-governing society could grow and prosper. Their belief in the benefits of a free, competitive economic system was the essential factor in America's future prosperity and growth.

Today, the United States stands as a living symbol to the faith of those first Americans. This country represents to most of our 200 million people a fulfillment of man's desire to stand on his own, the basis of a successful free and private enterprise system. It is the continuing belief in the value of this system which supports the introduction of the proposal by my able colleague from New York and also the amendment I now offer to the Senate.

Mr. President, the goal of the antipoverty program is to assist the underprivileged citizens of this Nation. It seeks to reach into the darkness of an impoverished and disadvantaged segment of our society and bring the light of opportunity: the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

But opportunity can never result from merely extending the long arm of government into every nook and cranny of our economy and society. It is this approach, unfortunately, which has characterized the failures of the antipoverty program; failures which have largely ignored the economic system that guides opportunity in America today.

The present program attempts, through the Economic Opportunity Act, to train and to teach the disadvantaged, but it ignores the need for personal incentive. It strives to unite community action behind the war on poverty, but fails adequately to incorporate the economic weapons of private enterprise. It seeks to provide financial assistance to the poor, but fails to give them a chance for full participation in the operations of our economy.

Public expenditures alone cannot accomplish the goals of this program. To be successful, the war against poverty must recognize the need—and the desire—of man to help himself. It must recognize the necessity for man to participate fully in the broad range of American society.

Members of the Republican minority have consistently advocated a larger role for private industry in the antipoverty program. Last year, along with 21 of my Republican colleagues, I coauthored S. 2509, the Human Investment Act, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. It would provide tax incentives to encourage private industry to offer job training oportunities. I regret that the Senate has yet to take action on this measure.

The Human Investment Act, together with the proposed Economic Opportunity Corporation, are two examples of constructive, creative thinking for a broader role of private industry in the antipoverty program. These are workable alternatives to expanding the arm of Federal Government into every precinct of American society. Our goal is really not antipoverty but, rather, a decent standard of living for every citizen. The wealth of this Nation has been built by the dynamic forces of free bargaining in our free society and in our open market.

Today, the administration persists in controlling those aspects of the program in which the efforts of private enterprise would prove more efficient and effective than those of the Government. Under the Job Corps program, for example, the efforts of Government can be surpassed by those of the private sector of our economy. At the present time, the Government spends an average of $899 per person for 800 hours of vocational training, a figure which does not include the extensive overhead costs and administrative costs that are always incurred. Private enterprise, on the other hand, is now training the same Job Corps skills for a price well below that of the Government; and one which does include overhead and administrative costs for the same training period. A chart containing information from both business and Government sources, which I ask be printed in the Record at this point, presents this analysis of the training costs of various job skills undertaken by both private enterprise and the Job Corps. In each instance, the private programs reflect a considerable saving compared to the costs of Government.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vocational training costs per 800 hours

	Private programs (includes all training, administrative, overhead, and capital depreciation costs)	Jobs Corps (direct teaching and training costs only; average cost figure released by OEO)
Electronic computer repairman	$800	$899
Drycleaner	885	899
Radio-TV repairman	640	899
Stenographer	525	899
Hospital orderly	880	899
Auto mechanic	700	899
Machinist	700	899
Average cost figures	730	899

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no economic or administrative reason exists why Government should control this aspect of the program. There are numerous other areas, besides manpower training, in which private enterprise can be encouraged to take an effective role in the antipoverty campaign, such as urban development, housing, and efforts to assist small business.

Congress should clearly state its intent to encourage maximum participation by private enterprise in fulfilling the goals and policies of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the act should be administered accordingly. It should not be a matter of discretion with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Private enterprise should be given a priority in carrying out those functions of the statute in which its operations prove as effective as those of the Government.

I offer the following amendment to be incorporated in the declaration of purpose clause of the Economic Opportunity Act:

> It is the sense of the Congress that it is necessary to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of the United States in all such efforts to further the policy of this Act. It is the intent of the Congress that, consistent with achieving the objectives of this Act, whenever the utilization of resources of the private sector of the economy would be at least as effective as the resources of the government, private enterprise should be given priority in carrying out programs authorized by this Act.

That priority should be written into the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, which would declare congressional intention in accordance with what I have just read, lie at the desk until Friday of this week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The amendment (No. 638) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE 2-YEAR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID PROGRAM

AMENDMENT NO. 639

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the foreign aid bill (S. 3584) which we will be discussing at the end of the week.

The amendment is on behalf of myself and Senators Fong, Harris, Inouye, Moss, and Nelson. I have assurances of a considerable degree of additional support for the amendment.

Mr. President, the amendment would propose an across-the-board, 2-year authorization for the economic aid portion of the foreign aid bill.

The Foreign Relations Committee's decision, by a split vote, to reject the President's request that economic aid be authorized for a 5-year period represents a serious setback for the more effective administration of economic aid.

For many years now, distinguished leaders of business, the academic world and government have testified before the committees of Congress urging the adoption of a policy of multiyear authorizations for foreign aid to increase its efficiency and to permit aid recipients to plan their own efforts more effectively. I agree with this approach.

I disagree with those who hold that approval of multiyear authorizations would result in the lessening of congressional control over foreign aid. Checks are available both through the appropriations process and by retaining the right to terminate any aspect of the program, should there be proper justification.

I intend to argue these points fully during the coming debate on the foreign aid bill.

I repeat. We have been told time and time again that a multiyear authorization is absolutely indispensable. There is no diminution of the amount of congressional control that we have. We have congressional control through appropriations and also through legislative oversight.

The only thing that we do through a 1-year authorization procedure is stand in our own way in terms of making the aid as effective as it should be.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

I shall do my utmost to have it adopted, together with the aid of Senators who are cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 640

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Polution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 642

Mr. COOPER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2947, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AID SHOULD BE CUT OFF TO MILITARY JUNTAS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 641

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The recent military coup d'etat in Argentina represents another setback to constitutional and democratic government in Latin America and to U.S. principles as well. It will not be the last military coup unless the United States puts aspiring military dictators on notice that we will reject such designs in this hemisphere. We have certainly been firm about rejecting Communist designs on this hemisphere.

I believe that the United States can put aspiring military dictators on notice and discourage their plans by giving standing notice that those who come to power by unconstitutional means will not receive U.S. aid.

For too long the United States has publicly scolded but, on occasion, privately accepted military takeovers. All they seemingly had to do was to dredge up an alleged Communist threat and make some vague promises about future free elections to garner U.S. support. Certainly, in some cases, there was a real Communist danger. In many, however, there was only a legitimate civilian government trying to struggle with the vast problems a developing nation confronts.

I believe it is specious and dangerous to argue, as many have, that we should tolerate rightist but condemn leftist dictatorships. If we quietly condone the former while we only condemn the latter, the longrun result will be the disenchantment of the people of Latin America and the strengthening of the Communist cause, and we would forfeit the most precious assets of a democracy: principle, public trust, and confidence.

There are those who have already abandoned hope in democratic development in Latin America as a whole, preferring to place their reliance instead on the young, progressive type of military government which has emerged in some places in the hemisphere in recent years. The economic and social goals of the Alliance for Progress, it is said, may more quickly and easily be reached by the methods available to such governments than by the trials and errors of democracy. But while some significant reforms have undoubtedly been pushed through by military regimes in certain Latin American countries, and while a progressive military regime is preferable to a reactionary one, the promotion and encouragement of Latin American military regimes in politics is not a policy goal for which Americans can feel any enthusiasm.

The United States has acted properly by suspending diplomatic relations with Argentina. We should withhold recognition from the new regime there until we get firm assurances of a return to civilian constitutional rule, of the holding of free elections and of the reapplication of human and civilian rights and liberties within a reasonable time period.

I, therefore, submit an amendment to the foreign aid bill to cut off economic and military aid to military juntas in Latin America, subject to the President's authority to restore such aid if required by the national security interest. Its purpose is to put would-be military takeover regimes on notice that our support, both economic and military, would not be automatic.

At present, would-be military regimes may be counting on the fact that they are not specifically precluded from receiving U.S. aid. My amendment, if adopted, would remove certainty from this calculation. It would narrow the gap that presently exists in U.S. policy between different forms of nonconstitutional government.

As a practical mater, this gap cannot be closed with one blow. The President, under my amendment may make the distinction between military regimes in terms of our national interest. It is possible, for example, to make a distinction between a military regime which comes to power as the only alternative to a Communist takeover and a military regime which usurps power from a legitimate elected civilian government where no real Communist threat exists. If the President should decide to give recognition and aid to a military regime, he must first demonstrate to Congress that the national security interest did, in fact, require this and the military regime itself must demonstrate its good faith by taking concrete steps toward the resumption of constitutional government.

The examples of Brazil and Argentina show that such a distinction can be made.

In the case of Brazil, there was a widespread feeling that it was necessary to thwart an imminent seizure of leftist dictatorial power with the connivance and in the interest of international communism. Also, new elections for President and the national and state legislatures have been promised and are scheduled to take place this October and November, respectively.

In Argentina, there was no corresponding Communist threat. The economic situation was admittedly tough, but the problems could have been dealt with by the civilian authorities given the strong support of those who chose instead to overthrow the duly elected Illia government. And as of now, there is no evidence that there will be a quick return to civilian constitutional government in Argentina.

I believe that the United States should show its displeasure with the actions of the Argentine military regime by cutting off—subject to the President's authority to restore—military and economic aid. The stopping of this aid, totaling $14.4 million in fiscal year 1966—$1.9 million economic and $12.5 million military—while not significant economically, would be an important symbolic act.

We must encourage constitutional government in Latin America. Former President Illia's government—and I was in Argentina in March for the meetings of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council—had its troubles, very real troubles, but that is the course of democracy. If, every time there are troubles in a Latin American country and the only solution will be a military or a leftist takeover, then stability will never come to Latin America.

It is for these reasons that I hope the Senate will look favorably upon the amendment which I propose. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 641) is as follows:

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any Member State of the Organization of American States the government of which came into power by the unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government which had been acting in accordance with its constitutional mandate, unless (1) the President finds that the prohibition against furnishing such assistance is contrary to the national security interest of the United States, or (2) the President is satisfied that the government of such Member State has agreed to take appropriate steps, within a reasonable time, for the restoration of constitutional government, the holding of free elections, and the application of human and civil rights and liberties within such Member State.'"

WATER FOR PEACE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, since the beginning of time, the people who have inhabited the western portion of this continent have been faced with one central, controlling fact of existence: Without water there can be no progress, no peace, and, indeed, no life itself. The pueblo ruins preserved in Mesa Verde National Park bear silent witness that, even during the days when Mongol hordes were invading Europe, water was the lifeblood in what is now the western part of the United States—and drought meant death, destruction, and decay.

We of the American West have learned this grim lesson, and we have learned the lessons of water conservation. We have been frugal and thoughtful in making do with that which we had.

Just a few short years ago it was the common belief that only the western half of America had any water problems. There was plenty of water east of the

Mississippi River—all you had to do was turn on the tap.

Yet, today, the northeastern part of this Nation—where one-third of our population live and work—is entering the fifth year of the most severe drought in the history of the region. Our Great Lakes are dying of pollution, and every major river system, east and west, suffers under growing loads of pollutants.

We are gearing to clean up the mess we have made of our water resources. Hopefully, there is still time.

In 1963, Congress enacted the Land and Water Conservation Act—basically a recreation measure with water conservation benefits. In 1964, we approved the Water Resources Research Act. In 1965, we passed the Water Resources Planning Act, and the Water Pollution Control Act, and we accelerated the program to desalt ocean and brackish waters. The Clean Rivers Act of 1966 has received committee approval, and will be before this body later on this week.

Meanwhile, the old, established water programs continue. The 60-year-old reclamation program moves on to develop the water resources of the West, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers presses ahead with its active program of civil workers throughout the Nation.

The water picture throughout the world is as equally distressing as the one at home. Some 90 percent of the people in the less developed nations lack adequate water service or are being supplied with unsafe water. In 79 of the major nations of the world, only 11 percent of the people have water supply systems rated good or fair. The remaining 89 percent have unsatisfactory or grossly unsatisfactory water supplies. In some parts of the world, people exist on 3 gallons of water per day.

Unsafe water causes the death of 5 million children per year and incapacitates another 500 million people. The problems of famine are increasing, and increased water supplies are needed merely to maintain current starvation levels in many lands—much less improve the quality of life.

The impact of population growth alone on water resources is frightening. From the beginning of time to the birth of Christ, the total world population was one-quarter of a billion people. Eighteen hundred and thirty years later, the world's population stood at 1 billion. A century later, this figure doubled—and, in the past 36 years, another billion people have been added. By 1980, it is estimated that 4 billion people will live on this planet, and that by the beginning of the 21st century there will be 6 billion.

Yet, there is no more water on this planet than there was when the pharaohs built the pyramids, when Hannibal crossed the Alps, or when Christ was crucified.

Obviously, something must be done. While there are billions more people than at the dawn of creation, there is not a single additional drop of water. The stake that this world has in water cannot be understated. For centuries, man has been trying to find ways to supply himself with water and to use it properly. Where he has failed, the consequences have been tragic because a thirsty man is also a hostile man. If history teaches any lesson, it has taught us that no civilization has climbed on a falling water table, on polluted streams, or on arid acres.

Mr. President, last October, President Johnson called for a water for peace program. In addressing the first international symposium, the President said:

> Since the beginning of time, fresh water has been one of humanity's precious needs. For it, wars have been fought. Without it, whole civilizations have vanished from the earth. . . . Our generation can end all that. We have the power—the power of science. But if we are to use that power effectively, we must work together. The earth's water belongs to all mankind. Together, we must find ways to make certain that every nation has its share, and that there is enough for all.
>
> Today, I want to announce the beginning of a "Water for Peace Program." Under this new program, we will join in a massive, cooperative, international effort to find solutions for man's water problems. The United States is prepared to contribute its share of the resources needed for an international crash program to deal with world water resources. We ask other nations to join with us now in pursuit of a common objective—water for all humanity. Let future generations remember us as those who freed man forever from his most ancient and dreaded enemies, drought and famine.

Responding to the President's initiative, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Secretary of State Dean Rusk joined together to begin this assault on humanity's water problems. Task forces representing the finest water resources talent in the Federal Establishment have been working since then to develop a cooperative, international program to achieve the objectives of the Johnson administration. This program, when it is finally formulated, will be presented to Congress for its consideration. It is, I am told, based on the premise that the interests of the United States in a peaceful world are paramount, that water is a global problem, and that all nations should contribute their fair share to improve the lot of all nations.

In addition to a substantive, long-term program to achieve the goal of water for mankind, President Johnson has planned an International Conference on Water for Peace—a conference which could easily be the most important of this generation. This meeting, however, will be more than the usual international meeting for the exchange of technical and scientific information. Delegates at a ministerial level will attend the conference so that specific problems can be identified and specific action programs and policies can be discussed. In a certain sense, the International Conference on Water for Peace will be the prolog to a vast, cooperative effort to develop the water resources of this planet.

This international conference, which also could be the largest international meeting held in the Nation's Capital, is the most effective means of bringing together representatives of governments to focus attention of the massive water problems which we all share in common. The subject matter to be covered at this meeting will be extensive:

Municipal and industrial water requirements; urban and rural supply problems and solutions, including health; water pollution; water for agriculture and fisheries; development and management of international river basins for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water supply, fish and wildlife, and outdoor recreation; water desalination, including atomic dual-purpose plants; collection and dissemination of scientific data; water reuse; weather modification; water economics; and international water law.

There will be many things that we will teach—and, equally, there will be many things we can learn from other nations in this endeavor.

There are many reasons why I support the President's water-for-peace program, and why today I urge my colleagues to support the International Conference on Water for Peace. I will cite only one:

Despite aggressive efforts, famine stalks this planet. A 35-percent increase in world food production is required merely to keep up with population growth. Two-thirds of the people of the world live on an inadequate diet. This is not a world which we want to bequeath to the next generation. It is not a world of which we can be proud. It is not a world on which we have intelligently expended our talents and our time. It is, rather, a world which bespeaks of our neglect, our indifference, and our ignorance.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced, on June 15, Senate Joint Resolution 167 that would authorize President Johnson's International Conference on Water for Peace. I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor, and I commend the resolution to my colleagues for their endorsement.

Whether we like it or not, this Nation and this globe are faced with water problems which could spell the end to civilization as we know it—and, if we are to solve these problems, we are going to have to explore all avenues of research, supply, reuse, and conservation. It is time that we begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Utah will be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK DI LUZIO TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 20 will conduct a hearing on the nomination of Frank Di Luzio to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

President Johnson on July 5 nominated Mr. Di Luzio to be in charge of water resources research, water pollution, and similar water programs in the Department of the Interior.

The hearing will begin at 10 o'clock a.m. in Room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. Di Luzio, of Kensington, Md., was staff director of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences from April 1963, until his appointment as Director of the Office of Saline Water in December 1964. In the new position, he would continue to supervise the saline water program.

REPUBLICAN CALL FOR HIGHER TAXES ECONOMICALLY WRONG AND UNSOUND

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday a group of eminent Republicans contended that if the administration or the Congress were to increase spending then Federal taxes should be increased.

Mr. President, there will be substantial opportunities for the Congress to cut spending in various construction programs, the space programs, and elsewhere without seriously impeding the national defense, or the building of a better America and a better world.

There may have been a time for a cross-the-board tax hike. In fact, a strong case can be made against the action of the last Congress in 1964 reducing taxes by some $11 billion.

But, Mr. President, the economic case against a tax increase today is very strong indeed. Opposition to a tax increase right now is a matter of solid economic sense, not political advantage. President Johnson is right in not calling for a tax increase.

This morning's newspapers reported that unemployment continues at 4 percent, well above the February low of 3.7 percent.

To raise taxes when unemployment is not declining is not only bad economics, it is cruel.

But the advocates of a tax hike argued yesterday that without such action, the country will suffer inflation.

This morning's newspapers reported that wholesale prices were stable again last month. They remain at virtually the same level they reached in February. That is 6 months of stability. And it is clear that wholesale prices lead, and to a very considerable extent determine, retail prices.

Last month retail prices, the Consumer Price Index, rose only one-tenth of 1 percent, a figure the economists call not statistically significant.

Mr. President consider what 51 of the Nation's economists in Government, labor unions, industrial corporations, universities and research organizations, investment firms, and commercial banking said in reply to a midyear questionnaire by financial commentator J. A. Livingston.

Do they expect an out-of-control booming economy, runaway inflation?

First they expect a tapering off—that is right, a tapering off in the rate of growth of the economy.

The second half increase this year will be 2.8 percent, followed by an increase of 2.6 percent in the first half and 2.2 percent in the second half of 1967. This is an increase in the gross national product. This increase will be achieved, according to these economists, without major inflation. The economists are betting that the cost of living will rise only 4 percent during the 18 months. There is solid statistical support for this position.

The weekly hours of work, according to economic indicators, were: February, 41.6; March, 41.5; April, 41.5; and May, 41.4. It is clear that our work force is expanding and it is unnecessary for us to have as much overtime as in the past.

Weekly earnings were the same in May as they had been in April. There is no indication that they increased last month.

Total industrial production has been rising since March at about one-half of the rate in 1963. Installment credit increased last month by the lowest amount since 1965. The stock market is down. Sensitive commodities, according to labor statistics, indicate we are more likely to have a falloff.

All of these statistics, together with the views of the competent nonpolitical economists, indicate that this is a bad time for a tax increase, and that it would be a serious mistake for the President to recommend it, or for Congress to adopt it.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has appeared recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a series of five articles on Vietnam by the distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Richard Dudman.

Mr. Dudman has made a number of journeys to Vietnam and southeast Asia in recent years. At the end of each, he has reported his firsthand observations in articles of exceptional candor, objectivity, and balance. Subsequent developments have frequently attested to the accuracy of Mr. Dudman's reporting and to the acuteness of his perceptions.

The present series of articles helps to bring a measure of order and understanding to the confusing flow of events in Vietnam. The articles do not make pleasant reading but they are well worth the attention not only of the readers of the Post-Dispatch but of all thoughtful Americans and of the Senate and the officials of the Government who have responsibilities involving Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the series of five articles previously referred to be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Revolutionary Developments," Vietnam Pacification Venture, Raises Some Serious Doubts—Mild Bureaucratic Scramble Going on Among U.S. Officials To Take Part in Newest Effort of "Other War"

(By Richard Dudman)

(Note.—*Richard Dudman has just returned from a two-month assignment in Viet Nam covering the political crisis and military developments. It was his third assignment there since 1962. This is the third in a series of articles on the situation and prospects.*)

Washington, July 6.—"Revolutionary development," the latest pacification program in Viet Nam, has received heavy promotion and has stirrred great expectations but its test of performance still lies ahead. The prospects appear only marginal.

This "other war" was given a strong send-off by President Lyndon B. Johnson when he told the South Viet Namese leaders at Honolulu that he was "determined not only to achieve victory over aggression, but to win victory over hunger, disease and despair."

So far, the chief result of the Honolulu meeting has been a political crisis that paralyzed much of the pacification and military effort for three months.

But so much money and importance have been given to the program that there has been something of a bureaucratic scramble among officials of the Embassy, the Agency for International Development, the Information Service and the Central Intelligence Agency, each trying to get a big piece of it. In a place where careers can easily be destroyed, there is a feeling that reputations can be made in the Revolutionary Development business.

On paper, the new program shows great promise and is a big improvement over the old "strategic hamlets" and the various other plans for organizing the population and ferreting out the Viet Cong.

The new plan calls for a combination of self-defense, good government, economic aid, welfare assistance and population and commodity control to cut off support to the insurgency.

The first 90-day class of 4800 cadres finished training a month ago at a special school run by Viet Namese officers assisted by the CIA at Vung Tao. Plans call for training 20,000 this year and eventually 150,000 of these pacification agents.

They learn techniques of paramilitary defense and rural organization as well as such political tricks as how to spread rumors, how to set up demonstrations, and how to counter antigovernment or anti-American demonstration when, say, a friendly village has been bombed by mistake.

Perhaps the most important part of the course is an effort to implant patriotism in a hurry. This political motivation training includes drills in Viet Namese slogans, songs and in the history of the nation's heroes. Discussion groups cover French colonialism, the history of the Diem regime, past government mistakes, third-country assistance, and the reason for United States intervention.

(Group leaders describe the United States and South Viet Nam as two houses in the same village. The South Viet Namese house has caught fire. If the fire spreads, the American house could burn, too. So the United States is helping put out the fire now.)

These first cadres, organized into 59-man teams, now have moved into hamlets in relatively secure areas. Their task is to help the residents take over their own defense, root out any Viet Cong agents, govern themselves effectively and support the Saigon government. After three to five months, when this job is supposed to be completed in the first group of hamlets, each team will move on to another hamlet and begin again there.

Subteams are assigned to organize community defense, handle political indoctrination and help the people get available public services from the government.

The key to success is a six-man census-grievance subteam, which studies and reports on the economic level, political beliefs, religious affiliation, aspirations and complaints of every family in the hamlet. Information is gathered through a confidential interview every 10 days with every person in the hamlet over 10 years old.

A tacit quid pro quo is the real significance of the census-grievance group. It serves as an intelligence unit. In return for protection, help, sympathy and advice, the hamlet residents are expected to tell which of their neighbors are or might be working for the Viet Cong.

Subsequent investigations are intended to prevent mistakes, as when someone tagged as a Viet Cong agent actually is an undercover government agent or has been accused falsely because of personal or factional malice.

Despite official enthusiasm for this new pacification effort, serious doubts and reservations are expressed privately even by some of the men most dedicated to trying to make it succeed.

The very ballyhoo that has surrounded the program is cause for some misgiving. Some of these officials urge that it be considered a 10-year effort, not a quick formula for victory.

"Don't ask us to show any results at all in the first two years," said one. "The time to begin to judge success or failure will be about four years from now.

"We'll have all kinds of problems at first. Some of the cadres will be terrible. Some of them will rape, loot, steal, extort and try to live like kings. Some will turn out to be Viet Cong agents, infiltrated into the program as provocateurs."

The wholesale nature of the program arouses some doubts also. An official asks, "Where are we going to find 150,000 cadres when we are already short of administrators to run the government and even recruits for the army?"

There is a question also, whether this instant patriotism can be achieved among a mixture that includes former strategic hamlet cadres under the Diem regime and members of political and religious factions that often fear and distrust one another more than the Communists.

Political action teams in some of the northernmost provinces have been drawn largely from the Viet Nam Quoc Daa Dang, a political party that bitterly opposes the majority Buddhist movement there.

About all, there is a question of conflict between the pacification program and the changing nature of the military effort.

The announced strategy line calls for military action to extend the area of government control gradually. Behind this widening security screen, the revolutionary development program is intended to proceed with pacification.

But the military effort is increasingly aimed at breaking the back of North Viet Namese and main force Viet Cong armies. Methods being used are increasingly "search and destroy" and "search and clear." The old concept of "clear and hold" is being postponed.

"The oil slick strategy is pretty well down the drain," a briefing officer tells newly arrived correspondents. "It was all right when all we had was a few guerrillas. Now, with all these northern troops coming in, the oil slick system isn't worth a damn."

American combat commanders take pride in their growing offensive capability against enemy units, whenever they can be found. But they concede generally that territory cannot be held until the South Viet Namese forces are prepared to follow up with occupation of the ground. This has happened only rarely so far.

Apparent progress in the heavily populated Mekong delta, where ground fighting still is a South Viet Namese monopoly is largely the result of local accommodations between Viet Cong and government commanders. Neither pushes the other too hard.

As a result, when a political action team distributes blankets, rubber sandals and bulgur (parched, cracked) wheat in a hamlet, it sometimes is taken for granted that Viet Cong agents will come in the night and demand half of the new supplies.

As the war intensifies, United States forces rely increasingly on bombs and artillery. Commanders concede that targets sometimes are selected on inaccurate or outdated intelligence, so that whatever Viet Cong were present have fled. Much of the artillery fire is "harassing and interdiction" fire aimed merely at likely places of enemy travel and concentration with the results unobserved. Much of the bombing and shelling is simply at the request of Viet Namese commanders, with no independent American check on the validity of the targets.

A pattern is emerging in which bombs and shells pound the countryside, civilians are encouraged and helped to move to the cities as refuges, and anybody left in an area is assumed to be hostile. When all resistance has been smashed, the idea is that the people will be transplanted back and helped, through revolutionary development, along the road to pacification.

The immediate military objective has come to be to kill the Viet Cong—or, as a Viet Namese general kept shouting at a recent cocktail party, "zap the V.C.! zap the V.C.!"

Some of the men most deeply involved in making Revolutionary Development work consider that the military and pacification efforts are working at cross purposes. They believe that mounting civilian casualties and the destruction of the social fabric of the countryside help the Viet Cong more than they help build an effective non-Communist society.

One of the officials most widely respected as a pacification expert would like to see a prohibition on all artillery fire on unobserved targets and all bombing and shelling based merely on intelligence reports.

"Killing the Viet Cong is not the answer," he says. "The answer is to give Viet Nam a government and an economy that will compete with the Viet Cong."

Disagreement by U.S. Officials Over the Ouster of General Thi and Suppression of Buddhists—Some Consider Officer's Dismissal as Bad Blunder That Led to Political Difficulties in Viet Nam

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON.—The day after Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi was dismissed as commander of South Viet Nam's First Corps, Gen. William C. Westmoreland invited him to go to the United States for a medical checkup and treatment.

"If this offer appeals to you, I wish you would let me know and I will immediately make all the necessary arrangements," Westmoreland wrote.

But Gen. Thi wanted no medical treatment. In dismissing him, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky had said that Thi suffered from a nose ailment, apparently referring to Thi's chronic sinus trouble. Thi later made a joke of the matter and said that his only nose trouble was that the political maneuvering smelled bad.

To plot-minded Viet Namese, Gen. Westmoreland's letter looked like part of a scheme to break the political power of the Buddhists in the country's northernmost provinces. They already had assumed that President Lyndon B. Johnson's meeting with Ky at Honolulu had included a secret understanding that the United States would keep Ky in power indefinitely. Indeed, Ky began acting as if he had such a guarantee.

Actually, Westmoreland's invitation was doubtless merely a generous gesture to a fellow officer. And President Johnson certainly made no under-the-table deal with Ky at Honolulu.

But the events of the three-month political crisis that was touched off by Thi's dismissal suggest that the United States since then advised and assisted Ky in subduing the Buddhist political movement.

American planes moved three Viet Namese battalions to De Nang for the first nearly disastrous confrontation with dissident troops. American advisers accompanied the loyal battalions when they returned in May to besiege the pagodas and smash the rebellion.

Later in Hue, American officers took part in marathon meetings that eventually led to the use of combat police and Viet Namese marines and airborne troops to move Buddhist altars out of the streets, arrest the ringleaders and suppress the anti-government movement. American planes carried the troops.

There have been deep disagreements among American officials in Viet Nam over what could and should be done about the Buddhist dissidents.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge was said to have given some sort of cautious approval to the dismissal of Thi, whom the embassy in Saigon regarded as an ambitious troublemaker who was soft on the Buddhists. But Americans who worked with Thi in Hue and Da Nang considered him one of the country's most effective military leaders and one of the few persons who could deal effectively with the Buddhists there.

"Getting rid of him was the worst blunder of the war," a high United States Marine officer said. "I don't know if this country has any patriots, but Thi is the nearest thing to one I've seen."

Aids of Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, commander of Marine forces in Viet Nam, with headquarters in Da Nang, said he felt that he had been stabbed in the back.

The Embassy was shocked at the uproar over Thi's dismissal. There was a scramble as officials tried to escape any responsibility for the move. They all but washed their hands of Ky, giving him less than a 50–50 chance. One said, "We're ready to take him by the hand and go to the cliff's edge, but we're not going over the precipice with him." They advised Ky strongly to give in to Buddhist demands for early national elections. Then, as Ky toughened his stand and showed signs of surviving, the dominant view at the embassy came to be that the young air force commander offered the best chance of stability. With American encouragement, he made it clear that he would remain in power at least a year longer and that the elections set for Sept. 11 would merely choose delegates to draft a constitution.

Two broad assumptions underlay the embassy decision.

First, the dominant view of the Viet Cong is that it lacks the essentials of the powerful nationalistic movements like the National Liberation Front in Algeria. Instead, the Viet Cong is seen as relying solely on coercion and terror and not at all on persuasion.

The second assumption is that the militant leaders of the Buddhist political movement are acting in the interests of the Viet Cong, if they are not actually the agents of the Communist-led conspiracy.

Thus the Viet Cong are considered to pose no political threat. Even if they did, the Buddhist movement is seen as no proper force to oppose it.

One high official speculated that the September elections would show a 10 to 12 per cent Viet Cong vote and a 35 to 40 per cent Buddhist vote. "If you take them together, that's a dangerous combination," he said.

Independent inquiry suggests that these assumptions are nonsense. A dissenting view expressed privately by some American officials in Viet Nam seems to fit the facts of the situation better.

In this view, the Viet Cong movement is truly a political force, the most powerful in the country. Although it does increasingly use terror and coercion, it continues to attract considerable willing support and manpower by posing as the defender of the people against government corruption and colonialist intervention.

The Buddhist movement, say these dissenters, is the second most powerful political force in a country that is about 80 per cent nominally Buddhist. It overthrew the Diem regime and several subsequent governments and came close to toppling Ky.

Contrary to some reports, only a small minority of the Buddhist leaders sympathize with the Viet Cong or even would consider negotiating with the guerrilla movement.

Most Buddhists among many who have been questioned on the point are vehemently anti-Communist. Their belief seems to be not that they could make peace with the enemy, but that a government in which they were well represented could be more effective in fighting the enemy.

Even Thich Tri Quang, the most militant of the Buddhist strategists, until recently described his anti-Americanism as nothing more than a tactical device and spoke strongly against the Communists.

More recently, embittered over the shooting of monks and nuns in Da Nang, he said he had come to hate America and might reach the point of warning his followers that unless the U.S. troops departed every Viet Namese woman would become a prostitute.

Allowing for a politician's exaggeration, it must be conceded that prostitution in Viet Nam is increasing rapidly. Other grievances include mounting inflation, overcrowded cities, uncollected garbage on the main streets of Saigon, and massive traffic jams as military vehicles, motorbikes, pedicabs and big American automobiles of newly rich Viet Namese try to bluff their way through the shoddy, bursting capital.

More moderate Buddhist leaders differ as to tactics but agree as to objectives. They want representative government, an end to favoritism and corruption, and, as soon as possible, an end to the war.

They want to drive out the Communists, but they object to having their country used as a practice field for counterinsurgency operations. They object also to what they see as outside control of the issue of war and peace.

If these goals and objections seem contradictory and fuzzy minded, that does not mean that the Buddhists are dominated by the Viet Cong. Even the student mob that sacked and burned the American library and the consulate in Hue was essentially an extremist nationalist group, infiltrated by the Viet Cong no more than militant civil rights groups in the United States are infiltrated by the Communists.

The failure of the Buddhists to overthrow the Ky government probably is partly a result of Ky's forceful use of police and troops and also of a deep belief by many Buddhists including most of their leaders in the importance of patience and nonviolence.

The outlook for the elections is that Ky will make wide use of his promise to exclude pro-Communists and "neutralists" and contrive to maintain his military clique in power.

As for the Buddhist movement the price of temporary stability may well be that the best potential anti-Communist political force is being either destroyed or driven into diehard anti-Americanism.

Washington Again Is Much More Optimistic Than Saigon Over Prospect of Ending War Soon—Difference Partly the Result of False Statistics

(By Richard Dudman)

Washington, July 7.—Once again, Washington is being far more optimistic than is Saigon about the war in Viet Nam.

The current hopeful mood here, encouraged by the White House, the Department of State and the Pentagon—with assurances that this time they really mean it—scarcely matches the general view in Saigon that a long war lies ahead.

Part of the explanation for this discrepancy lies in a falsity in the statistics used to paint a rosy picture of progress.

Another part is a pair of serious omissions in the flood of figures that makes this the most highly quantified war in history.

Still another part of the explanation is a number of influences and pressures that cause many of those along the chain of information reporting to accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative.

The statistics in question are the enemy "body count" and the "kill ratio," two important yardsticks by which progress is measured in the military effort to destroy the Viet Cong guerrilla organization and its reinforcements from North Viet Nam.

As every military operation progresses, Americans on the scene give their headquarters in Saigon a daily report of how many enemy soldiers have been killed. Most commands also keep tally of the "K.B.A." (killed by air) estimate, generally a higher figure, for their own records. They also estimate how many enemy bodies may have been dragged away. But the kill totals reported to Saigon are supposed to be not an estimate but a true figure based on actual count of bodies.

Any overstatement of the number of enemy troops killed improves the kill ratio, which is a weekly figure obtained by comparing Allied killed in action with enemy killed in action.

Although some commands are conscientious in making the count and some battles are more conducive than others to this score keeping, many of the men doing the fighting acknowledge freely that the "body count" is partly fiction.

One clear indication that this is the case is the fact that reports of enemy prisoners of war often break them down into Viet Cong and "Viet Cong suspects," whereas there is no such breakdown for bodies.

"We kill no suspects," said a high-ranking American information officer in Saigon. "When they're dead, they're VC."

Some officers and enlisted men insist that their body counts are scrupulously accurate. Others tell of instances where men, women and children have been included in the totals. In some cases, they point out, bodies are almost indistinguishable after a bombing, artillery or napalm attack.

Other instances are cited by men who participate in these counts, in which a quota is set in advance, obtained by multiplying "friendly" deaths by five or 10. Afterwards, the men making the actual count just go through the motions to reach the predetermined total.

An American lieutenant colonel with long experience as an adviser to Viet Namese forces says that their totals for enemy soldiers killed are frequently inflated.

"It's a case of accurate reporting of false information," he says. "American officers get the figures from Viet Namese officers, who get them third of fourth hand from Viet Namese sources. At each level, there is a tendency to minimize the bad news and exaggerate the good news."

A high official of the Agency for International Development gives reason to doubt the rising totals for the "open arms" program for enemy defectors. He says that a sizable number of them disappear after being fed and clothed for a few weeks in the relatively comfortable amnesty camps.

"We believe that the Viet Cong is using the open arms program for their own R and R," he says.

("R and R" is American military slang for the rest and recreation program under which each U.S. military man gets a week's leave in Hong Kong or Bangkok or some other place to break his year's tour of duty.)

Official insistence on the absolute accuracy of such figures makes it difficult to learn the extent of these exaggerations in official statistics.

One of the omissions in the statistical picture is caused by a flat prohibition on reporting of allied casualties in any individual engagement. As a result, a dispatch must say, for example that 381 Viet Cong were killed, and American and Viet Namese casualties were "light," "moderate," or "heavy." Figures on the American and Viet Namese casualties are given out only in weekly totals.

A correspondent in the field often can learn the exact number of allied casualties. But reporting them in a dispatch is grounds for suspension of his accreditation.

The men on the ground sometimes complain that when a platoon or company is virtually wiped out the casualties are called "moderate" by diluting them in total losses for the entire company or battalion.

It is clear that the system tends to lessen the public impact of American and Viet Namese government defeats. The reason given for imposing it last year was that precise figures on Allied casualties would help the enemy.

The other place where statistics are lacking is in civilian casualties resulting from bombing and artillery attacks by American and Viet Namese government forces.

"We don't keep them. Maybe the other side does," said a briefing officer when questioned about civilian casualties in an intensive American bombing and shelling attack in a heavily populated area in Quang Ngai province. The officer had just given precise figures on enemy troops whose bodies had been counted in a subsequent ground sweep.

Comparable figures on civilian casualties, if kept, would provide a guide to the effectiveness of a directive issued several months ago by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Commander of U.S. forces in Viet Nam.

Westmoreland warned that "the use of unnecessary force leading to noncombatant casualties in areas temporarily controlled by the Viet Cong will embitter the population, drive them into the arms of the Viet Cong, and make the long-range goal of pacification more difficult."

The directive also said: "With due regard to security and success of the mission, whenever possible the people will be warned of impending air-strikes or operations by leaflets and broadcasts."

But an Army information officer in Saigon says that warnings allowed the Viet Cong to escape and are now given only infrequently.

"We require a report from some Viet Namese official in the area—a province chief or a district chief—that the people in the target zone are all unfriendly," he said. "We give a warning only when we're after something other than personnel, like an enemy ammunition factory, when we don't care whether the people get out or not."

Maj. Gen. James Humphreys, assistant director for health at the American aid mission in Viet Nam, says there are times when there are a great many more civilian casualties than military casualties in this war. He says, however, that sometimes the civilian casualties are less.

Among the less tangible influences on information about the war is the one-year tour of duty for military men. Whatever its merits for service morale, it has the disadvantage of giving an individual little perspective for judging progress in carrying on the war. He sometimes believes he is liberating a hamlet or clearing a road that has been in Viet Cong hands for 20 years, whereas the same hamlet or road was classed as secure as recently as three years ago.

As a result, says a lieutenant colonel who has been in Viet Nam for many years, there is a tendency to look on the bright side and send up the "positive" reports that are generally more pleasing to superiors.

"We live in what sociologists call a success-oriented society," says this officer. "Optimism and positive reporting may work well in running a corporation, but out here they just bring delusion and perpetuation of errors."

Civilian administrators who do not share the official optimism tend to keep their thoughts to themselves. Some of these say privately that it would not be good for their careers to let their doubts and reservations show up in their reports.

The comment is sometimes heard that it would be unwise to resign or ask for transfer because that would mark a man as a dissenter, and dissent in Viet Nam is akin to disloyalty. The way to keep a career intact is to look on the bright side.

NEW QUESTIONS AFTER ESCALATION OF WAR—THUS FAR UNITED STATES HAS WON ONLY A STALEMATE

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—The best that can be said for the massive American military buildup in South Viet Nam over the last year is that it has achieved a military stalemate.

The new escalation—bombing the oil installations at Hanoi and Haiphong—thus must be counted as another effort to use American armed might to break this stalemate.

Earlier such efforts have failed to break the stalemate. They included the use of American troops for general offensive combat, intensified bombing in North and South Viet Nam, and the landing of additional American forces as fast as possible short of mobilization of the reserves.

What the American escalation achieved as early as last fall was to avert imminent military defeat. United States officials who denied early last year that the Viet Cong guerrillas were winning now say that American combat forces entered the war barely in time to prevent the utter collapse of the South Viet Namese army.

What the escalation has failed to do is to show any solid tread toward victory.

A reporter returning to Viet Nam after a year's absence notices two things above all.

First, overwhelming American military strength has removed any question of military defeat. Whenever enemy troops mass for an attack, their defeat is virtually automatic. American artillery, bombs and troops are brought to bear so quickly that the Communist forces must resort to hit-and-run tactics. To stand and fight means annihilation.

Additional armed power, as yet unused, is on hand to back up possible future decisions. American aircraft carriers on station off the Viet Namese coast carry a wide range of nuclear weapons. Marines clear the hangar decks of all unauthorized persons during regular loading drills using nuclear bombs.

The second major point is that, despite constant pounding by the tremendous American military machine, the Communist forces are at least holding their own or perhaps doing a little better than that.

Roughly 10 per cent of the land area of South Viet Nam, about the same as a year ago, is rated under secure government control. Even the "secure" areas are subject to mortar attack, terrorist bombings and forays by bands of guerrillas.

Nearly half the population lives in these so-called secure areas, mainly Saigon and other coastal cities. The rest lives either under outright Viet Cong domination or in areas where the guerrillas move with relative freedom at night.

These population figures, like the area figures, have changed little in the last year.

Despite figures showing an enemy "kill" running from 3000 to 6000 a month, American estimates of enemy strength continue to increase. The Pentagon's current estimate is 255,000 to 270,000, compared with 230,000 at the first of this year and 106,000 at the beginning of 1965.

Infiltration from North Viet Nam obviously accounts for part of the steady net increase in enemy strength. But there is much doubt and disagreement over how the stream of men and supplies enters South Viet Nam.

The fact that the men and material keep coming despite heavy bombing of the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail leads some military men to suspect that the importance of the trail is overrated or that other routes may be more important.

Some officers believe that the hard-surface road visible from the air amounts to a stage set—a route built for bombing while the bulk of the traffic moves along parallel paths obscured by the jungle canopy. The Communist Chinese used that trick in supplying Viet Namese besieging Dien Bien Phu in 1954.

Others are convinced that much of the infiltration is by sea, either by landings on the long, rugged coastline or travel up the Mekong river, with transfers to sampans sailed into Viet Nam from Cambodia through the network of canals and streams that run through the huge delta.

Navy officers admit the impossibility of registering the many junks that sail in coastwise trade or performing more than a spot check on their cargoes. Ocean-going ships steam up the Mekong without any effective check on their cargoes.

A high Navy officer says: "I wish we could devise a practical way of controlling infiltration through the canals. We know there is relatively free movement between Cambodia and South Viet Nam. But it would be suicide to operate small naval vessels in those canals, since the whole area is under Viet Cong control."

Another American official suspects that most of the infiltration is through Cambodia. He supposes that no one wants to acknowledge the fact because it would remove the justification for bombing the routes in Laos and North Viet Nam.

If the views of the responsible civilian and military leaders directing the operation in Viet Nam can be summed up in a few words, most of them believe that they see slow progress, that the right formula is being devised, and that, given persistence in the field and patience at home, the country can eventually be pacified. Estimates range from several years to as long as 10 years or more.

A sizable minority, including some highly placed officials, remains deeply skeptical of the value of bombs, artillery and napalm in suppressing what is seen as essentially a political insurgent movement. This group doubts that the present formula ever will succeed.

Few share the optimistic estimate being circulated by Administration officials in Washington that the major fighting will be over by the end of 1967.

Another minority, including some top military leaders, had been restless at restraints on bombing targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area and welcomed the decision to bomb the oil and gasoline tank farms.

Such slim hopes as there are for an early end of the conflict rest on the supposition that more troops and more bombing must eventually break the will of Hanoi to continue the fight.

Some observers are impressed by reports of prisoner interrogation indicating that captured North Viet Namese now believe that their side faces defeat. Others concede that enemy morale may be sagging, but await what they consider a clearer indication, in the form of mass defection of Communist forces in squad or platoon strength.

American planes are delivering explosives at twice the rate of the peak month of the Korean war. Roughly, 10 tons of explosives are being fired for every enemy soldier counted as killed.

American planes make about 100,000 flights a month, including helicopter and reconnaissance missions. That means between 10 and 30 flights for every enemy counted as killed, when combat strikes alone are considered the ratio is two to three sorties for each enemy killed.

Officials cite as another indication of faltering enemy morale the fact that the Communists have been avoiding large-scale confrontations with American forces. But this trend cuts two ways. American commanders continually hope for set-piece battles where they can fix an enemy battalion or regiment as the best chance of smashing the elusive foe.

As these set-piece battles disappear, ambush and terrorism are on the increase. A Marine regiment commander says that fully half his casualties are from mines, booby traps, snipers or poisoned bamboo "pungee sticks" hidden in grass or shallow water.

The dominant view among responsible Americans in Viet Nam, even among those who support the bombing of North Viet Nam, is that those raids are really a side issue. They believe that the outcome will be determined in South Viet Nam.

Heavy emphasis in Washington on Hanoi as the source of aggression tends to obscure the fact that the Viet Cong are fighting what continues to be an important degree a civil war in South Viet Nam. And through its political arm, the National Liberation Front, the Viet Cong continue to operate an effective shadow government that rules much of the country.

Viet Namese political leaders in the populous Mekong delta say that the enemy continues to collect taxes in rural areas and even in provincial capitals. They say also that the Viet Cong continue to recruit troops in the delta.

As the intensity of the war has increased, the Viet Cong have resorted increasingly to coercion in taxing and recruiting troops. But, particularly in the delta, the guerrilla force still relies largely on persuasion.

Rice merchants in the big cities have a grudging respect for the Viet Cong tax collectors. Some of these merchants prefer to ship rice through solid Viet Cong territory because the first Communist checkpoint will give a receipt that will be honored all the way. The merchants complain that a shipment moving by government controlled route must pay legal and illegal taxes to government collectors over and over again along the whole route. They find it cheaper to pay the Viet Cong.

As the years pass and the war continues to escalate, Viet Nam is said to demonstrate ever more clearly the limitations of overwhelming military power in dealing with a political insurgency.

YEARS-LONG U.S. BUILD-UP FORECAST; ROLE OF VIET NAM TROOPS DIMINISHING—600,000 AMERICANS MAY BE IN WAR LATE NEXT YEAR

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—A G.I. folksinger was entertaining American officers at An Khe with a ballad for a popular battalion commander being rotated home at the end of his year in Viet Nam. This was the refrain:

> "So in Viet Nam we will stay,
> Forever if need be.
> To guard the hopes of freedom
> Is our destiny."

The singer's "forever" was artistic exaggeration, of course, but most indications suggest that the American military effort in Viet Nam will require many more American troops, many more billions of American dollars, and time reckoned not in months but in years.

Barring collapse of the enemy's will to fight—an eventuality that still is more hope than expectation—the direction promises to be steadily upward in American manpower commitments, intensity of bombing in South Viet Nam, intensity of attacks on North Viet Nam and employment of American combat troops in offensives against the enemy.

American officers on the scene speak in terms of 400,000 men there by the end of this year and possibly 600,000 by the end of 1967. Some speak seriously of needing a total American buildup of 1,000,000 men.

As the American build-up progresses, South Viet Namese forces play a relatively less important role. Some of their units win American praise, and their heavy casualties prove that they still are doing a big share of the fighting. But there is continuing criticism that they lack aggressiveness and good leadership and that most of their units are infiltrated by Viet Cong agents.

Operation Georgia, launched recently south of Da Nang after supposedly secret joint planning by U.S. and Viet Namese marines, was announced in advance by radio Hanoi.

South Korean forces in Viet Nam, now numbering about 20,000 and expected to rise soon to 40,000, are considered first class troops in aggressiveness, discipline and general fighting ability.

"They go through an area and kill everything in sight," says an American officer recently.

Some American officials believe, however, that their high "kill ratio"—running up to 20 enemies killed for every Korean killed—must mean that many noncombatant men, women and children are counted among the enemy dead.

The trend is evident that the war is being taken over by the American forces and to some extent, by the South Korean forces, which are financed by the United States.

The base at An Khe, where the ballad singer sang of staying forever seems to be the wave of the future for the war in Viet Nam. It is 100 per cent American operation.

An Khe is headquarters for the American First Cavalry Division (Air Mobile), which keeps its helicopter-borne troops out on operations an average of 68 per cent of the time, hunting and trying to destroy nine enemy regiments thought to be skulking in the jungles of the central highlands.

A striking feature of the huge base, which contains the largest heliport in the world, is that no Viet Namese national is allowed inside.

At most other American bases, Viet Namese troops guard the perimeter, and there are Viet Namese laborers, truck drivers, cooks, waiters, laundrymen, maids and bartenders. At An Khe, the men of the First Cavalry do those jobs themselves except when they can go off base to the Viet Namese shack town that has mushroomed outside the gate, to get their clothes laundered or their trucks washed.

Officers attribute to this quarantine policy the fact that An Khe is one of the few bases never yet infiltrated. Mortar attacks and satchel-charge raids at other bases are traced to espionage by Viet Cong agents among the Viet Namese workers.

Even the security of Route 19, the base's road link with the coast, is put into the hands of Americans and South Koreans. They guard the bridges along the dangerous stretch of Highway, the explanation being that South Viet Namese troops can be used better elsewhere.

Military leaders speak of sending a similar division to the densely populated Mekong delta, south and west of Saigon, until now the military responsibility of Viet Namese government forces.

Although the delta has been considered well along the way to pacification, the apparent progress now is regarded by some as attributable to tacit agreements by Viet Namese and Viet Cong local commanders not to bother each other too much. Eighty per cent of the Delta's huge rice crop is taxed by the Viet Cong.

American advisers complain that the Viet Namese troops, who set up hundreds of elaborate ambushes every night, chatter and play their transistor radios so loudly that the traps rarely are sprung.

The announced strategy of having Viet Namese troops move in to hold ground gained by the Americans is more and more being put off. The main effort is to use American military force to break the back of enemy strength in the south and to persuade Hanoi that it should give up the fight.

The latest upward step, considered for many months before the President ordered it last week, is the bombing of oil storage depots near Hanoi and Haiphong.

Other steps being discussed include mining the Haiphong harbor, bombing industrial targets and taking some battleships out of mothballs and using them to bombard positions near the coast.

There is serious talk of an American ground offensive against North Viet Nam. Some high-ranking officers say this would be more likely than the often-mentioned possibility of a ground offensive from Thailand across Laos to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail.

Carried to its logical conclusion, the Americanization of the war could conceivably lead to a complete American takeover of South Viet Nam. A widely respected American commander advocates this course privately in so many words.

"We should occupy and rule this country," he says, "instead of pretending to respect the sovereignty of a government that really is only temporary and illegal and could change tomorrow.

"It would be more efficient, and probably the end result would be better, if we abandoned the idea of assistance and pacification and settled for subjugation, regarding South Viet Nam as an enemy country.

"That's what we did in Korea, Germany and Japan. Can you honestly deny that the results you see now in those countries are better than anything we have reason to expect the way things are going here in Viet Nam?"

China's entry into the war would, of course, change everything. But an Administration official told a group of Congressmen recently, "If anyone had said a year ago that we could do what we're doing now without China's coming in, I'd have said he was crazy."

Another possibility is that the toughening American military blows at last will break down the enemy's will to continue the war.

Still another is some new political crisis throwing the country into such a turmoil that the United States would withdraw.

Barring some such development, the present trend seems clear. It is toward indefinite occupation by an American force of hundreds of thousands of men.

ONE INTEREST RATE RISE BRINGS ON ANOTHER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, sometimes when one reads about tight money or is shown an index of average charges in interest rates, it has a rather cold, abstract, and impersonal flavor. This is not so for those who are having to face their bankers and listen to the interest demands which the bankers make, not necessarily because of their cupidity but because of their inability to do otherwise because of the lack of reserves supplied by the banking system.

For some time now attempts have been made to control the expansion and growth of the economy through monetary measures, that is to say, tight money, higher interest rates, and a rationing of credit.

When the news of increasing interest rates occupies large parts of the financial journals, those people who read them tend to skip over them; and, of course, many people are not regular readers of the financial journals so that they are unaware of the day-to-day happenings.

The Wall Street Journal undertakes to keep its readers advised of significant money market changes, and from the last week of June, I have collected the following examples of monetary policy at work. Note that these include some increase in interest paid as well as interest asked since the spiral goes on and on. These items are essentially headlines, or a selection of a key sentence from a number of stories. Note, moreover, that these are not one story but literally scores of stories from which these disturbing headines have been taken.

The point which I wish to make is that interest rate rises begun at one point tend to spread throughout the economy—that one rise here prompts another rise there—and no one can be sure where the spiraling process is going to lead us. There is no ceiling that appears to hold, unless it may be that of a "bust," which, of course, none of us would want.

These news stories about rising interest rates collected from one short period of a week are not only telling what is happening but should give concern as to whether there is any gain to be expected from competitive boosting of rates.

The sheer numbers of these separate news stories seems to me to add a new dimension to the news itself.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point excerpts from articles published in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS, WALL STREET JOURNAL, JUNE 27

Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn, the nation's second largest mutual savings bank, will pay a 5% annual divident rate—up from 4½—on regular savings in the quarter beginning July 1. Dime was the second New York savings bank to announce an increase.

In Los Angeles, Lytton Savings and Loan Association, one of the country's biggest associations, joined giant Home Savings & Loan Association in breaking through the S&L interest-rate "ceiling" by offering 5¼% on regular savings and 5¾% on special bonus accounts, effective July 1. Security Savings & Loan Association, a subsidiary of California Financial Corp., has also adopted these higher rates. Three smaller associations in the San Francisco area previously announced they would begin paying 5¼% on passbook accounts, but they didn't change their rates on bonus accounts.

Home Savings, a subsidiary of privately held H. F. Ahmanson & Co. announced late Thursday that starting July 1 it would pay 5¼% on passbook accounts and 5¾% on special accounts of at least $5,000 held for a minimum of 3 years. (Home Savings is the nation's biggest S&L in terms of its savings and assets, which total more than $2 billion).

The California Savings and Loan League, a trade group, expects a period of hesitation by other S&Ls on whether to follow Home and Lytton. "The members are generally unhappy about the breakthrough because they feel the 5% passbook and 5½% bonus rates will attract as much money at less cost as the higher rates will," said the executive vice president of the league. He said it would be a "mathematical necessity" for those S&Ls that go higher than the 5% authorized as of July 1 to raise their charges on real estate loans to as high as 8%. The S&Ls generally charged 6% or 6.25% on new home loans during the first quarter of the year, when the prevailing savings-rate level in the area was 4.85%, and charged about 7% during the second quarter after several went to 5% on savings.

Several large New York banks are paying 5% on special CDs covering funds left with them for nine months, or even only six months in some cases. A minimum deposit of $2,500 is usually required, but some smaller New York banks are paying as much as 5½% on savings certificates in denominations as small as $100 or even $25. Most New York savings banks are offering 4½% on regular savings.

Effective immediately, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., a commercial bank, said it will offer a 5% savings certificate. The certificates will have a 2-year maturity and will be sold in minimum amounts of $1,000 and additional multiples of $100. Mellon is currently offering 4.25% savings certificates with a maturity of 6 months, and 4.5% savings certificates with a maturity of 12 months, both available in minimum amounts of $100.

[During April, the first month of the present quarter, New York savings banks had a total net outflow of $300.7 million, although part of the drain was offset by net deposits of $77.3 million in May. This compared with a net outflow of $71.7 million in April 1965, and net deposits of $104.7 in May 1965.]

Pressures are building on New York banks for an increase in the rate they charge for loans to securities brokers. An increase in the broker-loan rate often is a prelude to a boost in commercial banks' prime rate. Both the broker-loan and the prime rates currently are 5½%. There is a growing feeling that the broker-loan rate will be increased to 5¾% or 6%. A panel of bankers at the annual convention of the New York State Bankers Association emphasized that bank rates will edge up further as banks continue a policy of making loans more selectively. The panel also predicted that the Federal Reserve System will continue to apply credit brakes to the economy during coming months, although they said they didn't expect an increase in the discount rate charged by Federal Reserve District banks for loans to member commercial banks.

Speculation over an increase in the broker-loan rate was spurred June 24 when a major New York bank raised its rate to 5¾% on certain broker loans, although it continued to charge the prevailing 5½% to most brokers. The institution had been charging 5¾% to some brokers ever since March when the basic broker-loan rate was raised to 5½% from 5%. But on June 24 the bank brought more loans under the 5¾% rate because of rising costs to the bank of funds obtained in the short-term money market. [The bank referred to was later identified as Chase Manhattan.]

One banker noted that the entire lending-rate structure has been subject to strong upward pressure in recent weeks, and it was "nip and tuck" whether there will be an increase in the prime rate in coming months. This rate was increased to 5% from 4½% in December, and then was raised to 5½% in March. The December increase was prompted by an increase in the Federal Reserve's "discount rate" to the current 4½% from 4%.

Other lending rates also have been rising in recent months; most major New York banks only two weeks ago increased by 50 cents per $100 their charge for automobile and most other instalment loans. The rising lending charges and moneymarket rates have stemmed partly from Federal Reserve efforts to tighten credit to curb inflation. In the money market June 24, the New York Federal Reserve Bank said the rate on Federal funds reached 5½% on most transactions, a record high "prevailing rate." At least one transaction occurred at 5⅝%, a rate which made its debut only June 23.

EXCERPTS, WALL STREET JOURNAL, JUNE 28

Chemical Bank New York Trust Co. announced it would pay 5½% on negotiable CDs maturing in as little as 60 days; the bank had formerly been paying the 5½% only on negotiable CDs maturing in 180 days and longer. First National City Bank posted a 5½% CD rate on those of 120 days and longer; the bank had formerly paid the 5½% maximum on the CDs due in 180 days and longer. Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. and Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. applied the maximum 5½% posted rate to their 180-day-and-longer CDs; they had formerly been paying that 5½% top rate on CDs maturing in 270 days and longer. The increases announced by Chemical and the others on the CDs came early yesterday before the late afternoon move by the Federal Reserve Board boosting to 5% from 4% the reserves member banks must hold against certain time deposits other than savings deposits.

Six dealers in bankers acceptances increased their rates ⅛ percentage point. The increased rate quoted by Discount Corp. of New York; Briggs, Schaedle & Co.; and Salomon Brothers & Hutzler was 5⅝% bid, 5½% offered on acceptance due in 1 to 90 days and 5¾% bid, 5⅝% offered on 91-to-180 day maturities. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.; M & T Discount Corp.; and First Boston Corp. are quoting the same increased rate as the other three on acceptances due in 31 days and longer. But on 1-to-30 day acceptances, they are quoting a rate of 5½% bid, 5⅜% offered.

In the commercial paper sector, Associates Investment Co. increased by ⅛ percentage point to 5½% its rate on the 60-to-209 day maturity range of the IOUs it issues and sells directly to investors. The company left unchanged at 5⅜% its rate on 30-to-59 day paper and unchanged at 5½% its rate on 210-to-270 day paper. The prevailing rate on directly placed commercial paper is 5⅜% across the board on paper due from 30 to 270 days. A number of major finance companies are quoting above this prevailing scale, however. For instance, Walter E. Heller & Co. is paying a 5½% rate on paper due from 30 to 270 days.

In a surprise action, the Reserve Board voted unanimously to set a 5% reserve requirement on time deposits—other than regular savings account deposits—in excess of $5 million at each member commercial bank. "The action," the Board said, "should exercise a tempering influence on bank issuance of time certificates of deposit." It will also, the Board stated, serve to apply a moderate additional measure of restraint upon the expansion of banks' loanable funds and thus reinforce the operations of other instruments of monetary policy in containing inflationary pressures. [The Reserve Board also acted to bring certain promissory notes under the reserve and interest rate regulations as of September 1, covering those issued on or after yesterday.]

A New York banker said he figures that as a result of setting aside somewhat more cash reserves at the district reserve bank it will henceforth cost his institution for a 5.5% CD another 0.38%, instead of 0.32% currently; in addition to paying the 5.5% in this instance to the investor, the bank figures it incurs the additional expense for leaving cash at the Federal Reserve where the funds cannot earn interest and for an insurance fee paid on the deposit to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.

[Time and savings deposits at member banks rose 5% in the first five months of this year, compared with a 7.5% gain in the like period of last year. In contrast, the Board said it estimated that investment by individuals in marketable securities was "four times as large in the first quarter of this year as in the first quarter of 1965." Banks suffered a $1.2 billion decline in passbook savings deposits between last December 3 and May 11, the report showed, but in the same span their consumer-type certificates and similar instruments gained $5.3 billion, or 40%. The bulk was in savings certificates and other nonnegotiable certificates, up by $4.2 billion.]

Only half as many banks raised rates on consumer-type time deposits between March 2 and May 11 as between December 3 and March 2. As of May 11, the "vast majority" were paying top rates that didn't exceed 4.5% on any such deposits and rates in excess of 5% were "infrequent," the Board said.

More thrift institutions in the New York metropolitan area and elsewhere in the United States increased their dividend rates for the period beginning July 1 in their continuing battle with commercial banks for savers' dollars. Williamsburgh Savings Bank and Kings County Savings Bank, both in the borough of Brooklyn, said they would pay a 5% annual dividend, up from 4½%, on regular savings in the quarter beginning Friday. Rate increases were also posted by four more savings and loan associations in Southern California. In Atlanta, Georgia, major savings and loan associations introduced 5% "savings certificates" beginning at mid-year in an effort to stem the flow of savings from their institutions. The higher rate in Georgia, authorized recently by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, will take effect July 1 on savings certificates in denominations of $1,000 or more and covering funds left with the savings and loans for six months or longer.

Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn decided to limit new deposits from charitable and religious organizations to $25,000. New York savings banks have been permitted under a 1957 law to take unlimited deposits from religious and charitable organizations. A spokesman for the bank said that the bank had found institutional deposits "too volatile" since the start of 1966, when yields offered by commercial banks on special "CDs" became more attractive. Dime Savings had more than $100 million of institutional funds on deposit at year-end, but these funds have narrowed to only about $32 million at present as the depositors sought higher yields elsewhere.

In Southern California four savings and loan associations announced they will start paying 5¼% on regular savings and 5¾ on special bonus accounts starting Friday. The move followed last week's puncture of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board's 5% dividend-rate "ceiling" in California by Home Savings and Loan Association and Lytton Savings and Loan Association. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recently increased to 5% from 4.85% the maximum rate associations can offer without their losing their right to borrow from their district Home Loan Bank; the Board's new 5% rate "ceiling" is to take effect Friday.

Yields on the Treasury's latest issue of 13-week bills edged down, but those on the 26-week issue increased slightly. The return to investors on the 13-week issue dropped to 4.435%, the lowest since December 13 when the yield was 4.391%. The average yield last week was 4.470%. The average yield on the companion 26-week issue rose to 4.610% from 4.591% the week before.

Government bond prices dipped sharply yesterday amid forecasts of possibly higher interest rates, including those charged by banks for loans to securities brokers. Markdowns ranging to ½ point were common on compounding of interest or shorter terms to earn the high rates. By actual measurement, it turns out that nearly 30 percent of the nonclassified advertising in this single daily eastern edition of the Wall Street Journal is bank advertisements—not merely institutional—literally begging for funds.

I ask if it is not quite a commentary upon the interest-rate picture today to find that the advertisements inserted by financial institutions competing for funds to lend at higher and higher interest rates take up not far from one-half as much space as that of all the rest of the advertisements—airplanes, new stock issues, men's clothing, hotels, chemicals, and so forth, and so forth—combined? I certainly cannot dismiss the present competitive tight-money situation as a healthy one.

RISING INTEREST RATES EVEN AGAINST SEASONAL TREND

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have previously commented upon the way interest rates have been moving up so rapidly in recent weeks and months. A small table prepared by the research department of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and released July 8, I think, will be of interest to Members of the Senate and observers in underscoring how selected interest rates have been going up at a time when credit demands during the first half of a calendar year would ordinarily be expected to be less than in the latter half.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Selected interest rates

	Week ending July 9, 1965	Week ending Jan. 7, 1966	2 days ending July 6, 1966	Percentage increase, last half 1965	Percentage increase, 1st half 1966
Corporate Aaa	4.47	4.73	5.12	+5.8	+8.2
State and local Aaa	3.17	3.40	3.64	+7.3	+7.1
Prime rate	4.50	5.00	5.75	+11.1	+15.0
Large certificates of deposit	4.25	4.80	5.50	+12.9	+14.6
Commercial paper 4 to 6 months	4.38	4.75	5.63	+8.4	+18.5
Bankers acceptances	4.25	4.75	5.50	+11.8	+15.8

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, July 8, 1966.

REV. WILLIAM BUCKNER, AUSTIN, TEX.—PASTOR AND LAWYER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, down in my State, there is a gentleman by the name of the Reverend William Buckner who is literally practicing what he preaches. The citizens of Austin, and the members of the Presbyterian churches in that capital city, have a reason to be proud of his deeds.

Beside his knowledge of the laws of the church, he is also a scholar of the laws of man. Reverend Buckner practices his ministry in the courthouse as well as in the sanctuary of his church, by running a legal aid service for indigent families and financially hard-pressed persons.

The story of his dual role as pastor and lawyer was told in a recent issue of the magazine Presbyterian Life. Since Reverend Buckner's activities exemplify the finest of private charitable activities, I ask that the article "Pastor and Lawyer," by Mildred M. Hermann, be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASTOR AND LAWYER: WILLIAM BUCKNER OFFERS A HIP-POCKET LEGAL-AID SERVICE IN AUSTIN, TEX.

(By Mildred M. Hermann)

About three years ago word began to spread through the pancake and hamburger houses near Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Texas that one of the regular student customers was already a full-fledged lawyer.

A busboy finally asked the student, seminarian William P. Buckner III, if the rumor were true. Yes, he had been admitted to the bar in 1957, replied Buckner, who is a graduate of Baylor University and its Law School. Did the busboy's question mean that he needed legal help? It did.

Later an Austin minister sent a narcotics addict to the seminary for assistance. Bill Buckner, as part of his fieldwork assignment, spent two weeks hunting a job for the man. Then he took the direct aproach and called Hank Brown, the state AFL-CIO president. Brown interviewed the addict and found him a job.

Still later Buckner visited a young prisoner charged with double murder. At the youth's request, the seminarian called in a "real minister"—an Austin Seminary professor. Afterward the two men went to a detention home to tell the prisoner's girl friend, a minor, that he was "sorry" he had kidnapped and involved her.

"You're from the church?" the girl questioned when the two men introduced themselves. "That place where people hear a sermon?"

A number of studies had documented the needs of the people living in East Austin parish, where all three of these incidents took place. But through his personal experiences Bill Buckner became convinced that he could combine his theological and legal training to offer a unique service. With support from synod and presbytery, and new-church-development funds from the Board of National Missions, he launched an experimental ministry in February, 1965. At the time the thirty-two-year-old Buckner was newly ordained and just married.

"A hip-pocket legal-aid service run by a man hungry to preach" was the way Bill Buckner recently described his work for a former colleague. Most of the times the minister-lawyer's base of operations is a store with a plate-glass front at 1205-A East Eleventh Street. Partitions mark off a law office and waiting room up front. Behind them is a chapel with a borrowed white communion table and a cross put together from scrap lumber.

A placard reading "St. Augustine United Presbyterian Chapel" swings below larger signs of an investment company, a barber shop, and a beauty school. To have hung out a lawyer's shingle would have defeated the intent of Bill Buckner's program, for its aim is not merely to offer desperately needed legal aid to the poor. It is to provide eventually a fully-rounded United Presbyterian ministry in a community that some observers believe is as potentially explosive as Watts or Harlem.

A sentence on the chapel's big front window spells out its purpose for passersby: "We preach Christ in word (. . . sermon), and we preach Christ in deed by trying to help those who are in trouble with the law and who cannot afford legal advice and cannot be helped by the legal-aid clinic."

The clinic mentioned in the sentence is part of the teaching program of the University of Texas Law School. Students take cases they are equipped to handle; faculty members check their work. Until St. Augustine's program began, the clinic provided the only free assistance of its kind in the city. Soon Austin will have a third agency, a legal-aid society, which the bar association is organizing, in part with anti-poverty funds.

Law students who have worked in both the university clinic and St. Augustine Chapel say that the church unit has the psychological advantage of being where the people who need its services are. Student volunteers find that the university atmosphere intimidates some would-be clients for the law-school clinic. The new legal-aid society will be in the courthouse, which means one thing—jail—to many residents of East Austin.

"We need Buckner," says Travis County Sheriff T. O. Lang, a concerned Lutheran layman, "because we [the law-enforcement bodies] seem the natural enemy in the eyes of East Austin."

Although readily available in his street-side, glassed-in office, Bill Buckner spent a lonely first two months on the job. It was only when he returned to his student routine and started appearing in the local lunch spots and night places that people began to take their problems to him at the chapel.

Now welfare workers refer cases to him. So do businessmen, public-health nurses, and ministers of many churches, including the Roman Catholic. Agencies making referrals include the university legal-aid clinic, hospitals, and a juvenile home. On several occasions he has served by request as co-counsel to court-appointed attorneys handling criminal cases for the indigent.

Mr. Buckner's cases range from the simple to the intricate. A letter he wrote ended the threats with which a correspondence school was holding a girl in terror about nonpayment for a course she had discontinued. In another instance, the lawyer-minister helped two very young couples of waiters and waitresses untangle their previous marital complications; later he married them in a double wedding with all the frills in a borrowed suburban sanctuary. In a third case, he helped a Mexican grandmother obtain citizenship papers. Then he worked up the necessary documents so that she could adopt a near-blind, abandoned teen-age granddaughter.

Buckner has been working in tandem with the court and a Southern Presbyterian lawyer, who volunteered his help, to keep a Federal probationer from returning to jail. "When I first met [Bill], I was just about one step short of returning to prison," the parolee has written. "I had no self-respect and my family was just . . . going by the boards. Through his counseling, compassion, and more occasionally a good psychological jolt, [Bill] has helped me come from longer term Treasury issues on some dealers' quotation sheets. Investment-quality corporate bonds trading in the secondary market were mostly ⅛ to ¼ point lower. Trading in both sectors was described as quiet.

EXCERPTS, WALL STREET JOURNAL, JUNE 29

Thrift concerns throughout the country were authorized by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to pay up to 5% annual interest on six-month savings certificates of at least $1,000. Until now, savings and loan associations have been limited to 4¾% on such certificates except in a few areas where keen competition with commercial banks led the board to permit 5% rates. The move was aimed at reducing "the drain on available mortgage funds for housing caused by the widespread practice of commercial banks of paying 5% or more on consumer-type certificates of deposit."

Dividend rates on savings in California savings and loan associations would be controlled by a state official for 1 year under legislation proposed by the California Savings and Loan League. The bill introduced in the state senate is an outgrowth of the recent rate-rise competition in the state. The bill would permit the California savings and loan commissioner "to halt spiraling rates when he thinks it is in the public interest to do so."

Withdrawals by savers are heavy as the second quarter draws to a close, several leading New York savings institutions reported. Officials assumed most of the outflow was going to commercial banks offering certificates of deposit paying at least 5%.

A World Bank offering of 5⅜% bonds totaling $175 million was accorded a warm reception by investors after reaching the market at 99¾, to yield 5.39%. The previous record yield on a World Bank issue of long-term U.S. dollar bonds was 5% on a $125 million offering in February 1960.

While large-denomination CDs issued by big banks generally can be sold in the money market to obtain cash in advance of maturity, it's the consumer-sized certificates, in amounts as small as $25, that associations complain are luring funds away from them and decreasing their ability to finance home construction. The Home Loan Bank Board's aim is also to deter "further escalation in competitive interest rates."

Mr. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, made clear that the board only reluctantly permitted the higher passbook rate. A "more appropriate" approach would have been to "reduce the widespread availability of consumer CDs," he said, presumably through action that the Federal Reserve has been unwilling to take.

The average interest rate charged on business loans by seven major New York city banks rose sharply in the first half of June from the first half of March, but the number of loans declined a bit, according to a quarterly survey by the New York Federal Reserve Bank. The Reserve Bank said the average rate on short-term loans due on demand or in a year or less climbed to 5.58% in the first 15 days of June from 5.35% in the like March period, and 4.64% in the first 15 days of June 1965. The average rate on term loans due in more than a year rose to 5.47% in the first half of June from 5.31% in the March period and 4.70% in the June 1965 period. A spokesman said the latest average interest rates for both categories of loans were the highest since the Reserve Bank began such surveys in 1938. The Reserve Bank attributed the sharp rise mainly to the March 10 increase to 5½% from 5% in the banks' prime rate—their minimum charge for loans to their biggest and most credit-worthy customers.

Government issues led the bond markets to lower ground yesterday. Markdowns ranging to more than ⅝ left long-term Treasury bonds only about a half-point above their 40-year price lows established in early March. Treasury-bond specialists attributed the decline in their market to the Federal Reserve Board's action increasing to 5% the reserve requirement for certain time deposits in excess of $5 million at each member bank. Since late 1962, banks have had to keep a 4% reserve. The move "heightened speculation that the Board may soon raise the discount rate from the present 4½%." The Treasury's 4¼% bonds of 1987–92, usually considered the bellwether of long-term Government issues, fell 18-32 yesterday on some dealers' quotation sheets to close at 92 18-32 bid, 92 26-32 asked. The key 4¼s have thus far in 1966 ranged from a high of 96 22-32 bid first set January 6 to a low closing bid of 91 30-32 set March 2. The yield at yesterday's asked price was figured at about 4.73.

The practice of major New York City banks charging a "split" rate up to as much as 5¾% on loans to securities brokers became more widespread yesterday.

EXCERPT, WALL STREET JOURNAL, JUNE 30

The "prime" rate on loans to business was raised to 5¾% from 5½% by Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., New York's fifth largest bank. First National Bank of Chicago, that city's second largest, said it was following suit. Although the rise in interest rates generally has been accelerating in recent weeks, the increase in the basic lending charge by Chemical Bank took most banks by surprise. Other major New York banks said they're studying the situation.

However, as a discount-rate rise would tend to give further upward thrust to rates generally, it is believed that both Administration and Federal Reserve officials would prefer to avoid an early increase. Because of the swift changes in interest rates of many kinds, the monetary authorities are said to concede that their "visibiliy is lower than usual" and that the course they'll have to take is even less predictable than usual.

Coinciding with this continuing increase in bank loan volume, the Federal Reserve has been pressing down further on the banks' reserves of available loan funds. In the latest statement week, for instance, the banking system had a minus or net borrowed reserves of $417 million on average, the biggest reserve deficit in six years.

Several more California savings and loan associations—most of them small—announced they would offer a 5¼% dividend rate on regular passbook accounts beginning Friday.

The highest yield on the Treasury list yesterday for bonds maturing in more than 10 years was 4.83%, provided by the 4s of 1980. A 4.73% yield was offered investors by the 4-¼s of 1987–92, usually considered the bellwether of long-term U.S. Government bonds.

Commercial paper rates rose across a broad front in the money market yesterday. Eleven large sales finance companies announced a rate of 5.5% on the promissory notes they issue and place directly with investors from 30 to 270 days. Before yesterday's move, most finance companies were paying 5-⅜% on paper maturing from 30 to 270 days, although some were already at the 5.5% level on their intermediate and long-term maturities.

EXCERPTS, WALL STREET JOURNAL, JULY 1

Basic lending charge increase spread to major banks throughout the country and speculation arose regarding the possibility of a further advance. In line with the action announced late Wednesday by Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., key banks in leading cities raised their minimum charge on business loans to 5-¾% from 5-½%. Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, also raised a special charge for some loans to securities brokers and dealers by a half point to 6%. While other major New York banks set their rate for such loans at the 5-¾% level for business loans generally, the Morgan action created some doubt whether the 5-¾% prime rate might long stay in effect or move still higher.

More major mutual savings banks in New York boosted their dividend rate on regular savings accounts to 5% from 4-½% for the period beginning today.

At least two more savings and loan associations announced 5% six-month certificate plans under the newly relaxed rules of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

In the span of about an hour after the banks' customary 9 a.m. opening, scores of large banks in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Dallas, Philadelphia and elsewhere posted the boost in the basic business lending fee, or "prime" rate.

At 5¾%, the prime rate is the highest since the rate first came into general use in the early 1930s. The latest increase is the third in the bank's basic lending charge in six months; the two previous increases were each by a one-half percentage point.

The Federal Reserve System continues to maintain pressure on the reserves of its commercial-bank members in an effort to moderate surging credit demand, latest figures from the New York Federal Reserve Bank indicate. Although the minus reserve figure of the latest week shrank a bit from the previous week's level, it was still well within the range that many banking experts regard as reflecting a tight money policy.

A wave of last-minute announcements by California savings and loan associations on dividend rates they plan to pay savers for the quarter beginning today established 5¼% as the prevailing yield on passbook accounts among the savings concerns in in the state. At that rate, the associations will pierce a 5% "ceiling" imposed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

U.S. Government bonds posted markdowns ranging to ¾ point yesterday in what was described as moderately active trading. The losses left the prices of many long-term issues within ⅛ point of their 40-year lows, established in March.

Savings concerns in California stepped up their rate war after Federal regulators demolished as unenforceable their limits on dividend rates most savings and loan associations can pay savers. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board decision was issued Friday after most major California savings and loans had chosen to ignore its newly posted 5% ceiling on passbook accounts. Following the Board's announcement, most associations in the state said they would pay 5.25% on regular passbook accounts and 5.75% on special bonus accounts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, no great purpose would be served by continuing with the newspapers of another week covering similar headlines. Another graphic way, however, to look at the competitive interest-rate situation into which we have fallen is the amount of space given over to the near frantic advertising for money by savings institutions. In the paper of Tuesday, July 5, there are—as there have been on many recent days—half-page advertisements by both the east coast and west coast institutions offering such things as "new extra high rates," "special high rates," and a "flexible high rate" for loanable funds. Many of the ads run in terms of so-called bonus accounts where the competition expresses itself in more frequent

CASUAL DRESS AND CAR POOLS

Students dress casually. Some go barefoot. During a mid-morning break they can get soft drinks from a vending machine. Eighty of the students come in car pools. The rest are from the Allison area where the school is located.

"The only strict rule is that the cars (parked near the school) don't move during the half hour break period," Olson says.

Students enrolled this summer are from Aplington, Coulter-Alexander-Latimer (CAL), Clarksville, Dumont, Greene, New Hartford, Parkersburg and Hampton. The eight from the Hampton (Franklin county) schools pay $15 tuition.

Karen Barnhart, 16, of Greene, who will be a high school junior this fall, took her second summer session this year.

"It's really interesting and it really helps," she said.

Mrs. Barbara Swanson, 25, an instructor at State College of Iowa, teaches English composition to the Allison-Bristow summer students.

"The students are real responsive," Mrs. Swanson said. "Basically, they are all good students. If they want their papers graded we grade them, if not we don't."

STUDENTS' INTEREST MAKES IT A THRILL FOR INSTRUCTORS

The art, biology and English students do not get final class marks; the math students do because they want them.

Sophus F. Peterson, a regular English instructor at Mason City Junior college, teaches literature to the summer students. "This is my first experience with this," Peterson said. "It's really a thrill because the kids are intensely interested. The incentive is there. The kids are here because they want to learn.

"You don't have to break your back trying to get them interested. They understand more than some college freshmen do."

This summer 32 students enrolled in English, 41 (some seventh and eighth graders) took art, and 36 enrolled in the mathematics and biology courses (18 in each subject).

Janelle Madsen, 16, of Parkersburg, says the math course includes a book report, the reading of two magazine or newspaper articles on the subject and two research papers.

Don Harmon, math teacher at Aplington, is the summer course instructor. A modern approach to problems is taught. Biology is taught by Wayne Anderson, science instructor at Hampton High. "The students get a good exposure to a lot of aspects of biology," Anderson says. "They learn, for instance, about the soil compositions in their own areas."

The summer school this year has John Kohler and John McDermott as art teachers. Kohler is a master of fine arts candidate at Cranberry Academy, Bloomfield Hills, Mich. McDermott is a commercial artist in Cedar Rapids.

TO USE AND UTILIZE THEIR IMAGINATIONS

"The two of them represent two different approaches to art," says Co-ordinator Olson. "Where else could our students get exposed to this? In a regular school, these two wouldn't have enough credits to teach."

McDermott said his first teaching experience this summer was "tremendous." He taught the students "planes and forms," so they know what's under the skin.

Kohler says he tried to impart a "basic understanding of what the nature of art is as opposed to just a lot of information."

"I didn't want to just 'busy' them," Kohler explains. "I tried to get them to use and utilize their imaginations and see things around them in a different light. There are all kinds of things in Iowa to inspire an artist."

The success of the Allison experiment has caused some comment. One doubter wondered how such a program could be financed without federal aid. "Is it just a Republican rich kids school?" he asked.

THE SECOND SMALLEST COUNTY SEAT IN IOWA

Not so, say Olson and Principal Loren Blumhagen. The students are from all economic levels. The program is locally-financed and the teachers get only nominal salaries.

One educator voiced the opinion that if a summer enrichment program can be held in Allison, the second smallest county seat town in Iowa (Population, 952—1960 census) it should be started in other places.

"Our schools have been handcuffed by habit," he said. "Some European countries have school almost year-round. The 9-month school term here is a holdover from the past when manpower and muscle power were important things, especially in rural areas."

Still another official believes it "just doesn't make sense, with all the money invested in schools, that we let them stand idle one-fourth of the year."

They are working on solutions to these dilemmas at Allison.

THE HISTORIC SITES BILL—S. 3035

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the 89th Congress may well be remembered as the Congress which at last recognized the need to stop the destruction of our environment. We are realizing, almost too late, that a concerted national effort is needed now if we and future generations are to still enjoy fresh air, sparkling clear waters, a walk in the woods, a pleasing cityscape.

The tangle and noise of urban ghettos, the garishness of billboard alleys, the pollution of our waters, the jumble of poorly planned suburbs, the ripping up of the landscape have finally forced us to take an uncomfortable look at the tragic effects of a thoughtless rush toward progress.

We are at last coming to realize an important point:

It makes no difference that progress brings us a more comfortable and efficient life, if we have no pleasant place in which to live it.

The quality of our surroundings is vitally important to the quality of our lives.

Yesterday the Senate passed S. 3035, which provides for a national survey of historic properties and matching funds for their acquisition and preservation. This bill is related to this new concern for our environment. We must leave a country to future generations which is both livable and meaningful.

As Sidney Hyman said so well in "With Heritage So Rich":

> A nation can be a victim of amnesia. It can lose the memories of what it was, and thereby lose the sense of what it is or wants to be.
>
> It can say it is being "progressive" when it rips up the tissues which visibly bind one strand of its history to the next. It can say it is only getting rid of "junk" in order to make room for the modern.
>
> What it often does instead, once it has lost the graphic source of its memories, is to break the perpetual partnership that makes for orderly growth in the life of a society.

Our significant historic sites are vitally important tangible links with the values of the past. Their preservation is essential. But the tragic fact is that it is already almost too late. The excellent study by the special committee of the Conference of Mayors, "With Heritage So Rich," tells us that almost half of the buildings recorded in the last 30 years as worthy of preservation by the Historic American Buildings Survey have already been destroyed by bulldozers and neglect.

The report documents a few of the many losses:

A great old mansion is burned to make room for a shopping center, as the local fire department uses it for a firefighting drill.

A building ordered preserved by the local government is "accidentally" rammed with a car by a parking lot attendant to render it irreparable—by prearrangement with the owner.

The first inn on an overland stage route is ripped down to be replaced by a restaurant.

Granted, we cannot, nor do we want to save everything old. But the most significant, the most beautiful should be saved and woven in with the modern, just as the fabric of our American culture and government is a blend of the old and the new.

I am told that in the next 40 years we will build one building for every one now standing. The pressures for more space for highways, suburbs, industry will intensify. Our present preservation programs are inadequate to resist these pressures even when it is in the national interest to do so.

The present plans for the expansion of the west front of the Capitol, completely wiping away the last vestiges of the work of architects Thornton, Bullfinch, Latrobe and the terraces of pioneer landscape architect Olmstead, are a perfect example of the disrespect we show our history.

Never in the course of this proposal has a historic preservation specialist been asked how much it would cost to restore the front.

It is vitally important that we inventory what we have of historic value in this country before it is too late. Present efforts to locate significant buildings before they are destroyed have been described as going up a down escalator. About 90,000 buildings still need to be inventoried. At the current rate, it will take 75 years to finish the work.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin is considered one of the finest historical societies in the country. Yet even this agency has been unable to do what needs to be done in Wisconsin.

Leslie H. Fishel, director of the society, writes:

> It is essential to have a national survey of historic buildings. In Wisconsin, we are currently carrying on such a survey at a turtle's pace because of a lack of staff. We hope to have evaluated completely 26 historic structures by the end of June. These will be structures of possible statewide significance, but there are many more to be inventoried, not to mention plethora of buildings which have local significance and which deserve, at the very least, to be identified.

Bill S. 3035 is an important step toward a responsible national policy regarding this Nation's historic landmarks.

a bum and a social misfit to a new start in becoming a responsible and solid member of the church and community."

In Buckner's view, his role as both minister and lawyer has two parts. One is "cleaning up after the grenade explodes," precipitated by family upset, race prejudice, lack of education, lethargy, injustice, or emotional instability. The other is preventing the explosion.

He cites the problems that brought three women into the chapel one day we were interviewing him. An Anglo grandmother wanted to adopt an illegitimate grandson. A Spanish teen-ager wanted to legitimize her baby. A middle-aged Negro woman wanted to work out the details of the divorce that seemed her children's only bulwark against the drunken despair of their father. (Buckner agrees to handle a divorce case only after the pastor of both husband and wife recommends divorce without reservation. If they have no minister, he finds one for them.)

What would have happened if the concern of the Protestant community had reached out to these women many years ago? Buckner wonders. If there had been "real love that is aware of people's need," he conjectures, would someone in a church have found a lawyer to advise the elderly woman? Would someone have helped the teenage mother "get enough family love" so that she might have stayed in school and found a real marriage? Would someone have given the Negro couple a chance by providing a decent education and job for the husband?

The persons who outlined the specifications for St. Augustine Chapel wrote that its ministry should include, in addition to the restoring of individuals, using the "good offices of the church . . . in bringing about social, economic, and political harmony . . . to the end that social justice might be brought about."

Minister Buckner uses the "good offices" in varied ways. When Austin church people ask what they can do to help with his work, he asks, "Do you pay your employees the Federal minimum wage? Do you include them in Social Security?" He is co-chairman of a state group called COMIDA, Committee on Minimum Income for Deprived Americans. (In Spanish, the word means "food.") Representatives of church, labor, business, civic, and charitable organizations formed COMIDA to work for legislation that would provide a state minimum wage and to extend the Federal minimum to workers not covered by the interstate provisions of the bill.

Buckner is also a strong advocate of "counsel-care," an envisioned system that would provide legal aid for impoverished families through an attorney of their choice.

"I keep wondering what people would do if St. Augustine didn't exist," mused a Jewish law student as he thought back over his few months of volunteer work at the chapel. "One woman would have lost her kids if we hadn't filed for her. A man would have landed in jail for a stupid attempt to pass a forged check if we hadn't arranged for him to pay the money off a little at a time. A devout Roman Catholic would probably have killed herself trying to care for a mentally incompetent husband if Bill hadn't arranged for a chancery court divorce."

The student's law curriculum had included a seminar on civil rights, but it had had little influence on his views. Then his work at the chapel gave him a firsthand look at "the heartache, the breaches of civil rights, stupidities, and fears" in East Austin. "I finally learned," he said to the obvious satisfaction of Mr. Buckner, "that you have got to sympathize with people in their weakness and help them overcome what makes them weak."

In Austin there are five other United Presbyterian congregations, including a suburban new-church-development project. In their eyes, it is not St. Augustine Chapel that is attempting to minister in East Austin, but all United Presbyterians.

"People ask us what we're trying to do in East Austin," says the Reverend William P. Caldwell, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, which helps support the chapel. "I say that we're trying to make a witness in the community. We can't take on all the social needs, but we can show we care."

PRIVACY REVIVED

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, "the right of privacy," stated a recent editorial in the American Bar Association Journal, "has long been neglected." In the meantime, however, the article points out:

> We have been steadily subjected to increased activity by inspectors, moralists and censors of all kinds, governmental and nongovernmental.

The June 1966 issue of the ABA Journal includes a most thought-provoking editorial on the concept of privacy. I urge all of my colleagues to read this, and ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the editorial referred to.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVACY REVIVED

A surprising but welcome feature may be found in the recent birth control decision of the Supreme Court, *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965).

The Court in that case held that a Connecticut statute prohibiting the use of contraceptive devices and the aiding or abetting of persons using such devices was unconstitutional and void as invading the right of privacy. The Court's opinion, in which five justices concurred, was written by Mr. Justice Douglas; separate concurring opinions were written by Mr. Justice Goldberg and by Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice White. Justices Black and Stewart dissented.

We take no position and express no view on the merits or demerits of birth control. Our interest lies in the broad statement that "the right of privacy which presses for recognition here is a legitimate one". However difficult it may be to follow the road blazed by Mr. Justice Douglas through the constitutional rights of association and the peripheral rights, under the first and other amendments, and to envisage exactly the contents of these penumbras, we are wholeheartedly in favor of the exhumation and revivification of the right of privacy.

Many years ago, in 1890, the future Mr. Justice Brandeis and Samuel D. Warren in an article in the *Harvard Law Review* made a gallant attempt to convince the legal world that a right of privacy should be recognized and protected by the courts.

In spite of the citations by Mr. Justice Douglas of cases regarding the rights of privacy and repose, it appears to us that during the intervening years the basic idea has been neglected. Meanwhile, we have been steadily subjected to increased activity by inspectors, moralists and censors of all kinds, governmental and nongovernmental.

May this decision mark a turning of the tide!

IOWA'S MOST UNUSUAL SUMMER CLASSES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an article which does much to dispute the feeling that today's youth are apathetic about education appears in the Picture magazine section of the Des Moines Sunday Register of July 10.

Written by Nick Lamberto, the article details what is termed "Iowa's Most Unusual Summer Classes," where high school students attend "just to be learning."

What is unique about this program, now in its fourth year, is that it is being financed without Federal aid. The program, in Butler County, is locally financed and the teachers get only nominal salaries.

I believe this article merits the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOWA'S MOST UNUSUAL SUMMER CLASSES—HIGH SCHOOLERS GO JUST TO BE LEARNING

(By Nick Lamberto)

If you think Iowa youngsters are apathetic about acquiring knowledge, what happens at the Allison-Bristow Community High School for six weeks each summer will soon change your mind.

The fourth annual Butler county summer school enrichment program this summer attracted 109 students who took courses in art, mathematics, English and biology without any promise of extra credit but "just to be learning something more."

Guy Olson, county guidance counselor, is credited with spearheading the drive for the summer sessions after Supt. B. J. Tatum of Greene asked him in 1962: "What can we do for our rural youths?"

"FANTASTIC CO-OPERATION" MAKES PROGRAM POSSIBLE

The answer is the summer program Olson says is "unique in this country, the only one of its kind in a rural co-operative school area."

"Credit for the courses is up to the local school, but the courses do qualify under the North Central school standards," Olson explains. "Some students get 'honors' by competing with themselves, comparing, for instance, English themes they wrote the first and last weeks of the 6-week course."

Olson says that without the "fantastic cooperation" of officials, local school boards, superintendents, principals and teachers, the program wouldn't be possible.

This summer $5,000 was budgeted for the enrichment program. The cost is divided equally between the county school board and the local school board. Most students pay $5 for books and supplies.

Olson is so enthusiastic about the program that he worked the first two summers on it without pay. Some of his friends jokingly refer to it as "Guy Olson's summer school."

"I'm willing to promote anything that's good—just give me an idea," Olson answers.

When the idea was broached, some dissenters viewed the summer program as a "waste of time." Others said farmers couldn't spare their children from work during the summer. One opponent said, "Summer is the time for the kids to relax and play."

But the program prospered and grew, mainly because of the prodding of Olson and the interest of the children and their parents. Classes are from 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. five days a week. One of the 35 farm youths enrolled last year said, "I get as much from six weeks of summer school as I do the rest of the year."

One farm father voiced the sentiments of many when he said the summer school didn't handicap the work program on his farm at all. "Hay-making doesn't start until after dinner anyhow," he added.

I hope that it will receive prompt approval by the House, for unless we act quickly, the environment we bequeath to future generations may be devoid of precious, tangible links with the people and events which have made this Nation great.

SALUTE TO DEMOPOLIS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, just recently I began a series of talks about the tourist attractions of my State of Alabama. From Alabama's mountains and Tennessee Valley lakes in the north to its moss-hung trees and white beaches along the gulf coast, the State is a virtual paradise.

Today, I would like to invite you to come to Demopolis and Marengo County, on U.S. Highway 80 and the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers. I have chosen Demopolis for several reasons, among them the fact that the Birmingham Post-Herald in Birmingham has just published an article by Richard Miles about Demopolis and the vine and olive colony from which it sprang. The charm of Demopolis is great, and it deserves to be visited by every American tourist who is interested in the development of this land.

The settlement of the Demopolis area began when a group of French aristocrats, at the fall of Napoleon, secured a grant and came to start a new venture growing olives and grapes. That colonization effort failed, but some of the family names of the French settlers remain in the area. Later other settlers came in and Demopolis became a center for the planters of the region, and fine homes were erected. One of the most remarkable of these is Gaineswood, one of the finest examples of Greek Revival architecture in the South. There are other fine ante bellum homes in the area, and one of the most charming churches in the country is located at Prairieville, a few miles east on 80.

River improvement on the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers has created a 10,000-acre lake here at Demopolis, with 397 miles of shoreline, filled with pike, bass, catfish, pickerel, perch, bream, and other fish. There are ample opportunities for every kind of water sport in this river area around Demopolis.

I shall not consume the time of the Senate to describe the architectural features of Gaineswood or the other homes open for viewing in and around Demopolis. There are fine homes all along the ridge above the Warrior River, extending to Tuscaloosa—just an hour's drive away. Tuscaloosa also offers much of interest. It is the seat of the University of Alabama, my own alma mater, and is one of the most beautiful cities in America.

U.S. 11, U.S. 43, U.S. 80, Interstate 59—they all take one to this lovely part of Alabama, where visitors will experience authentic southern hospitality and discover for themselves what Alabama is like. Incidentally, Tuscaloosa was the base from which Carl Carmer developed his best selling book, "Stars Fell on Alabama."

I repeat my invitation to visit Alabama, all of it. I can think of no better starting point than the Tombigbee country.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MOVING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—H.R. 10607

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I was pleased to be present on the floor yesterday at the time of passage of legislation providing for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees of the Government. There was wide recognition of the necessity for this legislation which had the backing of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office, and labor unions and Federal employee organizations.

This measure was vitally needed by those in the Government who, for reasons of employment, find it necessary, from time to time, to transfer their living quarters. There is a significant cost involved in transferring one's domicile from city to city and the cost is, of course, commensurate with the number of members in the family.

Such a transfer is both costly and time consuming and necessitates a visit to the new area prior to the move for house-hunting purposes, traveltime and expenses, moving expenses, and settlement expenses.

It was my pleasure to cosponsor similar legislation earlier this session. The bill which I cosponsored would have exempted from taxation funds received by employees as reimbursement for moving expenses.

I will continue to support this bill, and it is my hope that this legislation will be acted upon this session.

At the same time, however, I am pleased that this bill was acted upon favorably yesterday. There was a great need for this legislation to bring our own Government employee policies in line with the progressive actions of private industry.

McGOVERN'S SERVICE TO OUR FARM PRODUCERS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I was one of 43 Senators who joined in Senate Concurrent Resolution 88, known as the farm parity resolution, offered recently by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and passed without a dissenting voice by the Senate on June 16.

As we all know, the resolution proved a very effective measure even before its passage by the Senate. Moves to freeze or soften farm prices were halted, and steps to improve farm income were resumed. By directing attention to the parity price goal in enacted law in an emphatic, well-timed move, which many of us were glad to support, the Senator from South Dakota quickly and effectively got the results for agricultural States and for food producers which were sought.

I was pleased to learn, from an editorial in the Salem, S. Dak., Special, sent to me by a constituent, that the Senator's service has been recognized in his own State. I ask unanimous consent to put in the Record the editorial, captioned "McGovern Raises Voice" which appeared in the July 7 issue of the Salem Special.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Salem (S. Dak.) Special, July 7, 1966]

McGovern Raises Voice

On June 16 a very important Senate Concurrent Resolution, drafted and sponsored by South Dakota's junior Senator George McGovern passed the Senate unanimously.

That resolution, which will have a long-lasting effect on all residents, urban as well as rural, throughout the food producing states of our country, is known as the farm parity resolution.

It directed, in part, "that no action taken by an agency of Government for the purpose of preventing, or the likely result of which will be to prevent, the price of an agricultural commodity selling below parity, from rising to parity."

This is singularly important to South Dakota since the major source of this state's income, ($675 million gross income in 1964.) is derived from agriculture. However, while net farm income, across the US, in 1965 totaled $14.1 billion, about $1.2 billion above 1964, most farm prices remain below parity and seem to be dropping.

As Senator McGovern pointed out, in April, 1966, farm prices were 80 percent of parity. On May 15 they had dropped to 79 percent of parity.

The entire purpose of Senator McGovern's proposal is to help assure the farmers a greater share of the income which rightfully belongs to them. He contends that this share should not be lost to them by someone other than the producers of the raw materials. And this is as it should be. It doesn't make any sense to take less for something you make or grow, just so the middleman can up his and thereby reaps the profits.

Certainly the government, itself, ought to be extremely concerned about the prosperity of this country's farmers, who are actually called upon to provide the food and fiber for the greater share of the world's population. Obviously it has taken a resolution, such as proposed by Senator McGovern, to make the government aware of its responsibilities in this regard.

For already the Resolution has had marked effect. Actions to freeze farm prices have been halted. The Commerce Department's hide export limitation order has been modified and Senator McGovern is working to have it rescinded altogether. Feed grain dumping has stopped. The Defense Department has rescinded its instruction to purchasing agencies to cut pork purchases. A wheat acreage increase has been announced for 1967 and further action on wheat is under consideration. Moves have been made, and more are in the making, to bolster dairy income.

All South Dakotans owe a debt of gratitude to Senator McGovern for his foresightedness and guidance in drafting this Resolution and for pointing out the real necessity for such action.

As is so often the case, unless someone stands up to speak in defense of an important issue, often times it continues down the same path with little or no attention. In this case Senator McGovern raised his voice, from the call of his constitutents, and it will be sometime before we will fully realize all the benefits to be derived from his actions on this matter.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the July 6 issue of the Washington Post there was an article by Joseph Alsop entitled "The President's Decision," which also fits the same philosophy expressed in the editorial I placed in the Record, explaining the rationale behind the stepped-up bombing of North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President's Decision

(By Joseph Alsop)

The President's decision to intensify the bombing of North Vietnam, so long anticipated, has been warmly welcomed by the country. The first public opinion tests have already been taken, and they show an overwhelming majority behind Lyndon Johnson on this occasion.

This will surprise a lot of people here in Washington, because this is the place where criticism of Presidents reaches the highest decibel level. But in reality the opposition to his Vietnamese policy is largely restricted to a sector of the intellectual community, a sector of the press, mainly on the East Coast, and a small minority in the Senate.

Being very vocal people, the critics are extremely audible; but they do not speak for the voters.

Among the voters, as many earlier public opinion tests have clearly shown, there was mounting disquiet before the recent bombing decision. But the disquiet mainly arose from the appearance of aimlessness inflicted on the President's Vietnamese policy by his repeated concession to his exceedingly vocal critics. This has now been cured, with the result above-noted.

Ironically enough, the new bombing decision might not have been taken, or might at least have been further deferred, if it had not been for the powerful contribution of the people who most loudly deplore it. In the final round of the interminable argument in the White House, a very great role was in fact played by the political intelligence concerning the North Vietnamese assessment of the war.

The message of the intelligence was both clear and well buttressed with facts. It indicated that the North Vietnamese leaders still count on winning the war in South Vietnam, not in South Vietnam, but in Washington, precisely as the Vietminh won their war against the French in Paris.

It indicated further that whenever this reliance on a failure of American willpower began to be questioned, it was invariably strengthened again by another speech by Senator Wayne Morse of something else of that sort.

Thus the need to show that the United States really does mean business was one of the three principal factors in the President's decision.

Another factor was, of course, purely military. Bombing the fuel stores was the obvious, indeed the only logical, response to the increasing North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam, which has reached the point of a nearly complete Northern takeover of the Communist war effort in the South.

Furthermore, dispersal of the Northern fuel stores was beginning, which made the response fairly urgent.

Finally, the main obstacle to the decision was removed by the restoration of comparative political stability in South Vietnam. The bombings would have been made much earlier, perhaps, if it had not been for the political troubles in the South that began in March and continued for so many long weeks.

Given these factors, it is hard to see what the President's opponents really want him to do. Quite aside from the facts that trying to win is the usual thing to do in a war, there is no evidence at all that any of the opposition's proposed solutions have the smallest relation with a practical situation.

Negotiations have been persistently refused by Hanoi, quite largely because of the false encouragement given to Hanoi by the attacks on the President by the critical minority in the United States.

Even the dissident Buddhist, Thich Tri Quang, has publicly denounced the slightly different proposal of Senator Robert Kennedy that negotiations be sought with the Vietcong and that places in the government be offered to Vietcong leaders.

No South Vietnamese of the smallest standing, however much opposed to the government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, has either called for immediate negotiation with Hanoi, or has endorsed Senator Kennedy's halfway house. Nor has any South Vietnamese of any standing, including all those who tried to overthrow the Ky government, shown the smallest inclination to join the Vietcong.

By any rational test, the position in South Vietnam ought therefore to be clear to everyone. As to the position in this country, it is only necessary to look at the most politically sensitive group in Washington—the 77 Democratic freshmen in the House of Representatives, who must seek reelection in November.

The head of the freshmen's Eighty Nine Club is from the old isolationist heartland, southern Indiana; and his district was almost continuously represented by Republicans from 1940 until 1964. Yet Representative Lee Hamilton says, "I support the President without qualification, because I think he's right, and that is what my people want, too."

Among the more left-wing Democratic members of the Eighty Nine Club, there is a sprinkling of members like the Club's able vice chairman, Representative Patsy Mink of Hawaii, who says, "I support the President's policy, but I would like to see more done to get negotiations"—whatever that may mean.

Careful checks in fact reveal no more than two or three of these 77 Democratic freshmen who may take an overtly critical line on the stump in the autumn.

You could have no stronger confirmation of the post decision test of public opinion.

CONGRESS SHOULD APPROPRIATE $110 MILLION FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM THIS YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was deeply disappointed that the Senate Appropriations Committee saw fit to appropriate only $105 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren for fiscal 1967. This was $3 million less than the Senate appropriated last year. It would permit a 5-percent increase in the rate at which the Federal Government reimbursed the States for program expenses but it would not fully restore the 10-percent cutback in the reimbursement rate that was necessitated this year by the lack of sufficient funds.

Furthermore it would take no account of the increase in the school age population. If this increase accounted for a proportionate increase in school milk program participation, an additional $2 million would be necessary to take care of additional participants. Finally the $105 million makes no allowance for program expansion.

I am carefully exploring the advisability of asking my colleagues, 67 of whom cosponsored my bill setting a $110 million floor under the milk program for fiscal 1967, to amend the agriculture appropriations bill on the floor of the Senate to provide $110 million for the program. This is no reflection on the magnificent work Senator Holland has done in behalf of the program, both in the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee. It is merely an indication of my concern lest the schoolchildren of America be shortchanged in any way.

RESOLUTION PROPOSING A U.S. FISHERY POLICY FOR THE EASTERN NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, concern continues in the Pacific Northwest over the continued fishery offshore by a growing fleet of vessels from the Soviet Union. Many of our citizens are concerned over the security aspects of the Soviet appearance, others are aware of the dangers to the fishery stocks in the adjacent sea, some of which our fleets are not harvesting.

In Seattle, Wash., recently, four of the major fishery organization representatives made a thorough study of the problem and agreed to a "U.S. Fishery Policy for the Eastern North Pacific Ocean."

Mr. President, I commend these organizations for their interest in the problem and recommend that the policy be a matter for close study by the Members of this body.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Resolution Proposing a U.S. Fishery Policy for the Eastern North Pacific Ocean

Whereas both inshore and high seas fishing off the West Coast of the United States holds great potential from the standpoint of economic activity for United States citizens as well as from the standpoint of providing needed food, and

Whereas this potential if it is to be fully realized requires the implementation of a sound fisheries policy by the United States so as to encourage expansion by the U.S. fishery industry into hitherto unexploited fishery stocks, to provide for an adequate conservation program for all stocks of fish so as to maintain their productivity on a permanently sustained yield basis as far as is practicable, and to assure the protection of existing fully developed fisheries so they may not be unnecessarily harmed during any expansion into new fisheries, and

Whereas this policy is most urgently needed now that large numbers of foreign fishing vessels are operating on the high seas fishing grounds off the West Coast of the United States: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the undersigned organization urge the United States government to take the following action to protect all stocks of fish found off the West Coast of the United States:

1. Pass immediately pending legislation to extend U.S. jurisdiction over fisheries from the present three miles to twelve.

2. Initiate efforts as soon as possible to secure extended jurisdiction beyond twelve miles through international agreements wherever adequate protection of fisheries resources off the United States cannot be secured otherwise.

3. Continue efforts to secure international recognition of the abstention principle for

the protection of fully developed and utilized fisheries such as those of salmon and halibut.

4. Press for efforts to prevent depletion of stocks of fish off our shores not covered by the abstention doctrine such as ocean perch, bottom fish other than halibut, hake, anchovies, etc. This should be based upon the terms of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas and should be pressed against all foreign fishing, irrespective of whether or not the countries involved in such foreign fishing are signatories to the Geneva convention.

5. Monitor the operations of all foreign fishing off our coasts to provide the basis for an immediate protest if such fishing appears to endanger the continued maximum sustained productivity of the stocks fished. The United States government under this recommendation and the precedent set by the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, should contact the Soviet Government and ask that government to provide scientific proof that continuation of their present fishing off our shores will not deplete the stocks of fish being taken to levels below that of maximum sustained yield.

6. Make immediate contact with the governments operating fishing vessels off our shores with the aim of minimizing or preventing international incidents involving loss of gear, vessels and lives, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to all Senators and Congressmen from the Pacific Northwest States and to all appropriate government agencies.

ASSOCIATION OF PACIFIC FISHERIES.
SEATTLE, WASH.
DEEP SEA FISHERMEN'S UNION.
SEATTLE, WASH.
FISHING VESSEL OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
SEATTLE, WASH.
NORTHWEST FISHERIES ASSOCIATION.
SEATTLE, WASH.

NEED FOR EXPANSION OF FACILITIES OF THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, cattle raisers in my State are concerned over the need for expansion of facilities of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Just the other day I received a copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association in support of an increase in funds for the Division.

The secretary and general manager of the association, Mr. Joe S. Fletcher, pointed out in a letter to me that it is imperative that the Division be a strong, efficient organization. To that end, as he points out, it is important that the funds made available to the Division keep pace with the expanding workload which constantly faces it.

So that other Senators may give this matter their attention, I ask that the text of the resolution be entered in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

(Passed by board of directors, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, June 18, 1966, at Wichita Falls, Tex.)

Whereas the cattle industry of the Southwest has benefited greatly from the work of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas the activities regulated by this division have increased greatly without commensurate expansion in personnel and travel budgets; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Directors of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association go on record as favoring a $200,000 increase in division funds awaiting the action of the Congress and that appropriate officials be so advised.

PRESSURES GROW IN MONEY MARKET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our military commitment in Vietnam is not alone escalating these days. Interest costs throughout the land are also on a high-speed elevator upward. The skyrocketing cost of money and the unprecedentedly tight state of the Nation's money markets are part of the hidden cost which—as individual householders and as a nation—are paying for this expanding "dirty little war." As H. Erich Heinemann reports in today's New York Times:

> There is nothing in sight . . . that would promise relief from the pressure for higher interest rates. . . .

Rapidly rising interest rates have not only raised the cost of everyone's borrowing—from the Federal Government to the teenage car buyer. They have not only made the risk of a downturn in corporate investment—the engine of our prosperity—a clear and present danger. They have not only reduced the homebuilding industry, which is utterly dependent upon borrowed funds, to its most depressed state in years. They have also set off a rate war between savings institutions and a political war between the agencies responsible for the competing groups of such institutions. In his New York Times article, Mr. Heinemann reports that the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. stated in its most recent bond letter:

> These pressures [for higher rates] finally appear to have taken hold in the last few weeks and the brakes have begun to screech. The question now seems to be: "Who will be hurled through the windshield."

Mr. President, I submit that it is the American economy, and its unmatched record of growth, stability, and prosperity, which is about to be hurled through the windshield into financial distress and economic dislocation due to the reckless and uncontrolled escalation in interest rates and monetary tightness.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in New York Times for July 12, "Pressures Grow in Money Market," by H. Erich Heinemann, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESSURES GROW IN MONEY MARKET—BORROWING COSTS CONTINUE TO MOUNT AS INCREASE IN THE DISCOUNT RATE IS AWAITED—TREASURY BILLS AT HIGH—FEDERAL FUNDS TRADED AT RECORD LEVELS—CHARGES TO BOND DEALERS RISE

(By H. Erich Heinemann)

The money market was on tenterhooks yesterday, waiting for the Federal Reserve to raise its 4½ per cent discount rate.

The common assumption was the short-term interest rates have soared so far above 4½ per cent that the money managers now have no choice but to bring their own lending rate in line with interest charges in the free market.

The discount rate has been at 4½ per cent since last Dec. 6.

Meanwhile, heavy upward pressure on interest rates in the following areas continued in what one banker called a "wild, swinging market."

For the second week in a row, the yield on United States Treasury bills—"the closest thing to cash"—surged to an historic high. Three-month bills were auctioned at an average rate of 4.876 per cent, and six-month bills went at 4.999 per cent. These rates were up from 4.731 per cent and 4.915 per cent, respectively, the week before.

At least one major finance company, Walter E. Heller & Co. of Chicago, increased to 5⅝ per cent the rate that it pays on unsecured notes that it sells directly to investors for all maturities from 30 to 270 days. Previously, the Heller Company had been 5½ per cent across the board—a rate that it is continuing to pay on paper from five to 29 days.

For the second business day in a row, a substantial volume of Federal funds transactions—interbank loans of temporarily surplus reserve funds—took place at a record level of 5¾ per cent.

NO RELIEF SIGHTED

Government bond dealers, also for the second day in a row, had to pay up to 6½ per cent in order to obtain funds from major New York City banks, and there were rumors—which were denied—that further increases were in the works in the rates that New York City banks charge on loans secured by stock market collateral—so-called brokers' loans.

A 6 per cent rate on brokers' loans has become fairly general within the last day or two.

In analyzing the situation, money-market specialists could see nothing in sight yesterday that would promise relief from the pressure for higher interest rates and correspondingly lower prices for fixed-income securities.

The Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company observed in its latest weekly bond letter that "the cumulative pressures of an ever-expanding economy, working against broad and spreading monetary controls designed to slow the expansion, finally have culminated in a severe money pinch."

"These pressures," the bank added, "finally appear to have taken hold in the last few weeks and the brakes have begun to screech. The question now seems to be—'who will be hurled through the windshield?' "

Argus Research Corporation, an investment advisory concern, said that "the scramble for cash in the past couple of weeks has reached a stage only very rarely experienced in this country during the 20th century."

Assuming no sudden break in Vietnam, commented S. F. Porter in her widely read bond letter, Reporting on Governments, a severe squeeze in bank credit—quite probably the tightest in modern history—should become painfully apparent as the fall upturn in loan demand gets under way.

For the money market, the problem posed by the upward pressure on interest rates has a number of complex facets.

An increase in the discount rate, some market observers believe for example, would not be an event of major importance in the money market.

The discount rate, they argue, has lost much of its former importance as the interest rate from which all other rates are scaled. But even these skeptics concede that the discount rate does have great psychological importance. And they freely admit that the current surge in interest rates and generally price weakness in practically all fixed-income obligations stems from market anticipation that the discount rate will be increased.

MISS VELMA LINFORD, DISTINGUISHED WYOMING EDUCATOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] had intended to make an insertion in the Record today, but was called away from Washington because of the death of his father.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement be prepared and the newspaper article he wished to bring to the attention of the Senate be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McGee

My State of Wyoming holds the proud distinction of being the first State in the Union to take the lead in insuring equal rights for women by passage of the first legislation giving women the right to vote.

Wyoming is proud of her record and she is proud of her women. Throughout our history the women of our great State have made distinguished contributions that have not been confined to our borders but to the benefit of the entire country.

One such outstanding Wyoming woman is Miss Velma Linford. Beginning her Wyoming career as a school teacher in northwest Wyoming, Velma was elected to serve for eight years as our State superintendent of education where she made significant contributions to both the quantity and quality of education.

Today, Miss Linford continues to maintain a career of public service and dedication helping people all across the United States as a special assistant for Project Development at VISTA.

Miss Linford was the subject of a July 10, 1966, feature story in the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1966]

Arctic Villagers All Know Vista's Velma

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

When Western historian Velma Linford wrote her thesis for her master's degree she set out to prove that the beautiful adventuresses in Rocky Mountain literature had real-life prototypes.

She failed.

The heroines in the Western novels were invariably fair of face and form, as well as tough and daring.

The women in real life were adventurous and tough, but they were seldom beautiful. They won the West by hard work, and most of them were mothers and homebodies.

"I was quite perturbed," Miss Linford confessed. "The real women just didn't fall into a type."

That was one of few failures in the life of the Wyoming-born redhead who is Vista's expert on rural poverty.

Her formal title is Special Assistant to the Associate Director for Project Development.

But Miss Linford, a no-nonsense type Westerner who can pluck a discomfiting stay from her waisteline region and toss it into the nearby wastebasket without interrupting the trend of conversation, likes to think of herself as a generalist, rather than a specialist.

Her work is establishing Vista projects in places where the poor have a need for services and welcome a person-to-person relationship with a fellow American willing to serve in the midst of poverty.

This farflung operation Miss Linford has carried on with such peripatetic vigor that the residents of 300 isolated villages in Alaska, some a hundred or more miles within the Arctic Circle "all know Velma," according to a staff colleague.

Reaching these outposts to inspect projects being carried out by 61 Vista volunteers is a rugged exercise in circling the tundra or coastline while the bush pilot hunts a landing spot and incidentally remarks the whereabouts of a walrus he will tell the villager's hunters about as soon as he puts the rickety little plane down.

Developing the Alaskan projects has been one of the most satisfying parts of Miss Linford's job. Poverty there is the most abject in the United States, she observes, and because of the unusual opportunity to participate in an emerging culture the volunteers attracted there have a special enthusiasm which she shares.

She tells with delight of the good works of young Americans, some hardly out of their teens in the remote, isolated locales.

One 20-year-old boy in a village of 122 Eskimos felled trees to build an electrification plant through Community Action Program funds, bringing light to help children study during the long Arctic winters.

Another improved a village economy by bringing in a generator to operate freezers. The fishermen were able to ply their trade only one month of the year and were sacrificing profits for quick sales until the Vista volunteer found a way to extend their marketing year-round.

An archeology student taught the village elders to read and write so they could draw up council resolutions.

The same volunteer taught the Eskimos to read their own language as well as English and further enriched their culture by Christmas carols—in Yiddish.

Other Vista projects are occupying the attentions of some 2,000 18-to-80-year-olds in all parts of the continental United States and the Virgin Islands.

A training program for some of the new volunteers is now being conducted on a Navajo reservation and 25 others are in process elsewhere, some in heavily populous cities where, according to Miss Linford, poverty breeds a loneliness even more acute than in the isolated rural settings.

One project is in America's oldest city. This is Akima, N.M., where the Pueblo Indians built their "Sky City" from desert adobe before white civilization came to the continent.

Miss Linford thinks of Vista as "a new outreach" to the hard-to-reach.

"Vista," she says, "is the expression of a need for Americans to actually contribute their talents and energies toward changing things they think should be changed. This is a new outreach that is becoming more understood. I think it will have a powerful effect on hard-to-reach individuals."

She adds that many school dropouts could be kept in the educational system if it were possible to reach their parents in time.

"Sixty-eight per cent of the parents were dropouts," she explains her reasoning. "The children drop out because their parents did not see school as offering something their children could profit by."

In some of the rural areas and on Indian reservations, parents are loath to educate their children because experience has shown them that educated children seldom return willingly to take up primitive existence with their uneducated parents.

Besides helping the boxed-in poor people who need educational, health, welfare and other services, during an extreme manpower shortage in all these fields, Vista is helping the restless and boxed-in young people of the middle class to find focus for their lives.

About one-third of them volunteer to stay in a second year after completing a year's duty and about one half of all Vista volunteers are willing to go wherever sent. Others have a particular place of service in mind, such as Appalachia, or prefer to work in their own hometowns.

Miss Linford served eight years as Wyoming's elected state superintendent of education before coming to Washington. Descended from Mormon homesteaders who went West with Brigham Young, she began her public career as a grade school teacher in Star Valley.

During a 20-year fight to win retirement and other benefits for school teachers, it came to her that things are more successfully accomplished on a state rather than local level.

Proud feathers in her cap were the establishment of special funds for the educable retarded in every school; programs for the non-educable retarded in every community, braille books and tape recorders for the blind in graded classes, and a state-operated oral school for the deaf.

"We brought our children home," she said with a slight tremor in her voice. Previously the state had boarded out its problem children, the deaf, the blind and the mentally retarded.

Miss Linford thinks of her careers as an exercise in opening doors, of which her Wyoming experiences were one; her Vista experiences another.

"You asked me whether I missed Wyoming," the author of the textbook, "Wyoming, Frontier State," concluded the interview.

"I am just overcome with nostalgia every time I return. But once I am back again, I am involved in a program that is important to Wyoming and is important to the entire Nation."

WALT ROSTOW, KEY ADVISER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, also on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement prepared by him relative to an article about Mr. Walt Rostow, published in the Washington Post of July 10, 1966, and the article itself.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McGee

The July 10, 1966, edition of the Washington Post carried an excellent article by Chalmers Roberts on Mr. Walt Rostow, a key adviser to President Johnson and one of the most articulate proponents of administration policy in southeast Asia.

The article gives an excellent insight into both the man and the policy he espouses so intelligently.

Rostow Riding High in Administration as the Rock of Johnson's Viet Policy—Held Same Strong Views Under Kennedy

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Before an audience of foreign journalists recently, President Johnson heaped so much praise on Walt Whitman Rostow that the Presidential aide seemed, in the words of one of the visitors, to puff up "as proud as a peacock."

Rostow has reason to be proud and he has reason to be as happy as a bureaucrat can be. His long-time tough recommendations for the Vietnam war are now Johnson policy.

As far back as June, 1961, Rostow was saying that the kind of "operation run from Hanoi against South Vietnam is as clear a form of aggression as the violation of the 38th parallel by the North Korean Army in June, 1950."

In October, 1961, after a visit to Vietnam, Rostow backed a recommendation by Gen. Maxwell Taylor that an American military task force of perhaps 10,000 men be sent for self-defense and perimeter security and, if the South Vietnamese were hard pressed, to produce an emergency reserve. That report as much as anything led President Kennedy to take the irreversible steps into the Vietnam war.

In addition, as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has since recounted, "Rostow argued so forceibly for a contingency plan of retaliation against the North, graduated to match the intensity of Hanoi's support of the Vietcong, that 'Rostow Plan 6' became jocularly established in the contingency planning somewhere after SEATO Plan 5."

It was not, however, until February, 1965, that a new President, Lyndon Johnson, adopted that proposal. And not until last month did the President agree with the Rostow thesis that the North's oil supplies should be attacked.

In short, Rostow is now in his element. He is without doubt one of the key men in Government today, physically occupying the White House basement office long used by McGeorge Bundy before he went off to head the Ford Foundation.

Rostow as yet has neither the broad Presidential charter that Bundy had nor the power within the bureaucracy that Bundy exercised. But, if the Johnsonian compliments mean anything, he certainly is moving in that direction.

In fact, it is a case of a return to the beginning for Rostow. It began at the start of the Kennedy administration as Bundy's top assistant.

In those days Rostow was the long-range thinker for the New Frontier (some, in fact, credit him with first suggesting that sobriquet to JFK when he was a campaign speech writer in 1960).

But when President Kennedy dumped Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of State in mid-1961, Rostow was shipped over to the State Department to be Counselor, and chairman of the Policy Planning Staff.

TOO MUCH OF A HAWK?

There he produced all sorts of long-range papers, but many in the Foreign Service considered him either something of a dreamer or too much of a hawk on Vietnam. The word got around that he wasn't to be taken too seriously and he seemed largely out of touch with the day-to-day crises that dominate the department.

Rotsow found an outlet for his massive energies in Latin American affairs. In 1964 he became the American representative on CIAP, the Spanish initials for the Inter-American Committee for Alliance for Progress. His enthusiasm and optimism bubbled over to the point were—again—many felt he was unrealistic.

To understand Rostow, then and now, one has to know a bit about the man and his background. Now 49, he has an A.B. and Ph. D. from Yale. A Rhodes Scholar at Oxford and a wartime major in the OSS, he was a professor of economic history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1950 until he came to the White House.

Schlesinger has aptly called him an "economic historian turned social philosopher." In 1959 Rostow wrote what the London Economist called "the non-Communist manifesto," a series of lectures which became a book on "The Stages of Economic Growth."

Some critics said his manifesto was as rigid as that of Marx (whom he once dubbed "a city boy" to explain Communist agricultural failures) because Rostow divided all the world's nations neatly into five stages of development.

LIKES TO PHILOSOPHIZE

Nothing delights the chunky Rostow, eyes beaming intensely through metal rimmed glasses, sleeves rolled up and hands clasped behind his head, then to lean back in his chair and philosophize. A lot of this sort of private talk later turns up on the lecture platform or between hard covers.

The relative performance of India and China "may very well determine the outcome of the ideological struggle for Asia." (1955)

"Communism is a technique for seizing and holding power in sick societies." (1957)

"Doctrinally, Marxism is increasingly viewed by the young as a voice from the past, not as a guide to the present and the future; and Communism, as a technique for organizing either an advanced or an underdeveloped society, is increasingly perceived as inefficient and reactionary, as well as profoundly inhumane." (1962)

"This debate within the (Atlantic) Alliance is perhaps the greatest Constitutional question that this country has been involved in since we set ourselves up in the 1780," (1963)

"We are evidently at the beginning of the third major effort since 1945 to establish whether or not it is possible for the Soviet Union and the West to live together on this planet under conditions of tolerable stability and low tensions." (1963)

That word "tolerable" incidentally, is a Rostow favorite. It is the kind of a word that got him into an ironic fuss early in the Kennedy years with Sen. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the GOP leader. Some right-wing Republicans had jumped on reports about a secret Rostow long-term policy paper and DIRKSEN attacked him for "fuzzy thinking" because Rostow was said to believe that the Communists were "mellowing."

A HORSE LAUGH

This brought a horse laugh from everybody who knew Rostow, since his passion for both economic growth and anti-Communist guerrilla warfare has brought him the title of "Chester Bowles with machine guns." Rostow went up to the Capitol and convinced DIRKSEN et al. that he was as tough as they about the Communists.

Indeed he is, though with a higher degree of sophistication. It was Rostow and Jerome T. Wiesner, later to be the Presidential science adviser, who told the Russians in Moscow seven weeks before the Kennedy inauguration that if they wanted better relations with the United States they had better release two American fliers without being asked and without attempting to bargain. Nikita Khrushchev did just that.

Rostow has been in the public prints mostly for his quotable prose. Once, however, he pulled a blooper with international repercussions. In Ottawa with President Kennedy in 1961, he carelessly left behind a secret memo on which the President had made some scribbed comments.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker angrily claimed the President had written "SOB" beside a reference to him. The incident put a strain on Canadian-American relations, especially since Diefenbaker was correct.

But Rostow survived that blooper as he has survived the Siberia of State's Policy Planning Staff, the criticism of his economic theory, the scoffing at his ebullient prose, his hawk-like proposals and all the rest.

Last week Rostow was one of three officials dispatched by President Johnson to Los Angeles to sell the Administration's story on Vietnam. And characteristically, it was Rostow who did most of the talking to the sometimes skeptical governors and apparently to good effect.

For such reasons there is not much time anymore for tennis or swimming for Walt Whitman Rostow, a fellow who has come a long way from Oxford and MIT.

BOMBING OF MILITARY TARGETS NEAR HANOI AND HAIPHONG

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the lead editorial in the Air Force Times of July 13 clearly focuses attention on what was involved in the recent order to bomb military targets near the Hanoi and Haiphong areas.

I think it speaks for itself.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Bombings," be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Air Force Times, July 13, 1966]

THE BOMBINGS

The loud protests against American bombing of military targets near Hanoi and Haiphong reveal more about the protesters than they do about the U.S. attacks.

The same voices continue to remain silent although the Viet Cong has murdered and kidnapped more than 24,000 South Vietnamese civilians since 1964. They were silent when the VC bombed the U.S. embassy and killed and wounded civilians. The numerous bombings of restaurants in Saigon have claimed more civilian than military lives.

The U.S. attacks on the oil storage tanks, clearly military targets, were carefully designed to limit civilian casualties. In the U.S. case the object of the attacks were military supplies. The Communist side's principal targets were civilians. The protesters are in a peculiar moral position.

Particularly galling are the squawks from the British government about the U.S. bombing. Britain disassociated itself with the action, its Prime Minister declared. It seems to us that Britain long ago disassociated itself with all U.S. involvement in Vietnam; it has sent no troops to back us up, and British-owned ships have continued to carry supplies to the enemy.

The U.S. decision to go after the military targets on the fringes of Hanoi and Haiphong was long overdue.

While we are on the subject of the bombing raids over these flak-heavy targets, we are reminded that there is a significant inequity which needs correction in the matter of combat pay and income tax exclusion.

Some of the attacks on the North were made by Navy carrier-based planes of the Seventh Fleet. The support people—mechanics, deck crews, stewards, etc.—get both combat pay and income tax exclusion because their vessels are declared to be in combat zones.

The men supporting the AF part of the raid do not get the same benefits unless they are stationed in Vietnam.

The Communists claim that the AF flights originated in Thailand. The U.S. and Thailand have not admitted this for various reasons—but there are 20,000 U.S. servicemen in Thailand.

There is little doubt that the mission did originate from some area outside the combat pay and tax break zones. We believe the rules should be changed so AF men supporting the combat operations in the same way the carrier-based men do should get the same financial breaks.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems that everybody is against wiretapping, bugging, and other forms of invasions of privacy—subject to certain exceptions. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is attempting to determine what, if any, exceptions should eventually be written into law. Art Buchwald, writing in the June 19, 1966, issue of the Washington Post, has, in a humorous vein, pointed out some of our problems.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, this article entitled "Still a Few Bugs."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1966]

STILL A FEW BUGS—A PRIVATE EYE IS ALL FOR AMERICAN PRIVACY—WITH A FEW EXCEPTIONS

(By Art Buchwald)

Anyone who has been keeping up with Senator EDWARD LONG's invasion-of-privacy hearings is outraged to discover how much bugging and wiretapping has been going on in the United States. It appears that nobody is safe any more from the "big ear" and it is hoped that some legislation will be passed soon to protect the rights of the American citizen.

I discussed this subject with Sampson Klutznick, a private detective who assured me that most private detectives were as much against bugging as their victims. He said, "They should pass strong laws making it a crime to bug or wiretap any American citizen."

"That's for sure," I said.

"Of course, we'll have to exempt the FBI, because they must tap wires and bug people to find out who the criminals and Communists are in the United States."

"Yeah, I guess so."

"And we should let the Internal Revenue Service continue bugging Americans so we know who aren't paying their taxes."

"Naturally," I said.

"And then we can't forbid the Post Office from listening in to find out what people are writing dirty books."

"That's for sure," I agreed.

"And the CIA can't be included in the law because there has to be counterspying. And the local police must be permitted to bug college campuses to find out what the students are up to."

"I would hate for local police not to," I said.

"Then it's also very important that big companies be allowed to bug other big companies."

"What for?"

"To find out if they're being bugged."

"I hadn't thought of that."

"And," he said "I don't think the law should apply to private detectives looking for evidence in divorce cases."

"You don't?"

"Of course not. It's very important that a divorced person have a solid case against the guilty party, and how could we get it if we didn't use all the latest scientific devices?"

"But you would only bug the guilty party?"

"That's correct. An innocent person would have nothing to fear."

"What other exceptions would you make in passing a strong anti-wiretap law?"

"Politicians should be allowed to bug one another during a political campaign, and unions should be allowed to bug management, and management should be allowed to bug the unions, and salesmen could still bug customers, and members of the board of education should be allowed to bug teachers."

"Shouldn't anybody be permitted to listen in on clergymen?"

"Only if the clergymen are involved in civil rights or anti-Vietnam war demonstrations."

"If those are the only exceptions," I said, "I think we could live with the law."

"The law should have teeth in it," Klutznick said, "or pretty soon the American people will have no privacy at all. Don't you agree?"

"One hundred per cent," I said. "Hey, is that a microphone in your martini?"

"Yes it is," he replied. "My job is to bug anybody who voices any opinion on bugging."

"But that's a violation of my constitutional rights."

"Maybe so, but how else are we going to know who is for the law and who is against it?"

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is indeed gratifying and encouraging to note that a number of my distinguished colleagues in the House have approved in principle my bill providing for the appointment of a registered professional architect to supervise all future Capitol construction and renovation. Such proposals will effectively prevent the further desecration of our noble Federal structures at the abusive hands of Mr. J. George Stewart.

The measures introduced by the able Congressmen, Mr. President, are not unlike those which I myself sponsored in the first session of this Congress, and I am, of course, in wholehearted agreement with the goals which they were designed to achieve. The sizable expenditures which we annually apropriate for Capitol construction and renovation as well as a recognition of the prominent place which these structures occupy as elements of our national heritage makes the acquisition of a skilled, knowledgeable, and technically competent architect an indispensable necessity. Furthermore the elimination of unnecessary extravagance and the protection of the esthetic purity resulting from such professional supervision are most necessary.

Vigilance and discretion demand that we assign such projects to none save the most expert and masterful of the architectural profession.

> Men who would lay their unhallowed hands on these sacred structures—

A recent editorial observed—

> are indifferent to the glorious episodes of our past, ignorant of the architectural merit of some of the greatest buildings of the world and indifferent to every consideration of national pride and honor.

Surely no expert knowledge should be compromised in the historic undertakings.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Morris Ketchum, Jr., president of the American Institute of Architects; a transcript of a radio broadcast by Edward P. Morgan, and certain newspaper articles and editorials relating to the proposed extension be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington,D.C., June 27, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The American Institute of Architects is deeply concerned that proposals for the extension of the West Front have been approved by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

We are inalterably opposed to this extension. We are cognizant that the facilities of Congress must grow wtih the Nation and the increased demands upon the Congress. However, it is patently obvious that this one building cannot be continually extended and expanded until it is shapeless and functionally impractical. At some time this construction must stop. We urge that it be now, while the quality and uniqueness of the creativity of Thornton, Bulfinch, and Olmsted still remain as examples of our national heritage.

The AIA recognizes the state of disrepair and structural weakness that exists and that the West Front must be strengthened. This can be done and the West Front can either be restored or rebuilt without destroying the beauty of proportion and detail that comprise the Capitol's present aesthetic appearance.

We ask that you oppose this extension, and urge your support of comprehensive planning for the future needs of Capitol Hill so that these needs can be planned and provided with the advice of an impartial, professional group constituted to render such service to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS KETCHUM, Jr.,
President.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

JUNE 24, 1966.—After the British Redcoats burned the U.S. capitol in 1814 in the War of 1812, Congress had to move to a tavern called Blodgett's Hotel. Presumably this could have served the legislators as a permanent meeting place since, as legend has it, politicians most comfortably gather in smoke-filled hotel rooms. Blodgett's had a cloakroom too. Lobbyists traditionally contact lawmakers in cloakrooms. So everything was fine and dandy. But then some busybody insisted on restoring the capitol building and there has been nothing but trouble ever since. Additions here, alterations there; all very unsettling. So I, for one, simply cannot see what the fuss is all about when an ex-Congressman from Delaware named J. George Stewart steps courageously forward and starts to bury all this history under a facade of freshly-cut marble.

Nobody, of course, is more eminently qualified for this delicate but heroic task than Stewart. He is not now and never has been a card-carrying architect and, as far as I know, never intends to be one. He does operate with the title of architect of the capitol and it was under that cover that he executed—one might even say, murdered—his most famous work, the Rayburn Building, named in travestied memory of the late Speaker of the House. Into this crypto-fascist-style mausoleum, jestingly referred to as a Congressional office building, Stewart poured all of his supervisory talents and by some reports, considerably more than one hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money. The result, naturally, was a happy combination of superlatives—the ugliest and most expensive edifice of its kind ever erected on the face of the earth. Perhaps the happiest note of all was the fact that it cost only approximately twice as much as Stewart originally said it would. With such a monument around, the Great Society doesn't need urban renewal, it needs a camouflage corps.

But now, oh let joy be unconfined, we are about to be treated to another sterling Stewart contribution to the beautification of Washington. At a starting price of just $34,000,000—a steal, really—he is going to stick the west front of the capitol out a maximum of 88 feet so it can house more offices, two big auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms seating more than a thousand people and an information lobby to take care of the tourist explosion. The sheer beauty of the Stewart plan is that in one fell swoop, or in what may come to be know as one swell foop, it will destroy the capitol's historic vestiges—the last traces of the original work of Thornton, the West Indian doctor who won the $500 first prize for the building's first design; the embellishments of Latrobe, the contributions of Bulfinch, the famous Boston architect, and the terrace with its majestic flights of steps designed by Frederick Law Olmstead. You don't hardly get a demolition job like that anymore.

Indeed, while he's at it, Stewart might well consider razing the whole structure, including his other handiwork, the east front, which cost $22,000,000, the customary double of his beginning estimate. Then the space could be used for a parking lot, which Washington needs anyway and the Congress could move down the street to Union Station and thus save that little-used landmark from destruction.

An alternative plan, which I like better, would be to let Stewart run rampant on a field of bad taste across the entire face of L'Enfant's famous city. Thus with his ravenous appetite for eating places, we could hope to see a Stewart restaurant revolving around the tip of the Washington Monument to rival the space needle in Seattle. The lethal hydroplane races could be shifted from Hains Point to the reflection pool, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials could be converted into public restrooms and shoe shine parlors. The cherry trees around the tidal basin would of course be cut down because they obstruct the view that billboards would supplant. And it might be a good idea to install a couple of gas pumps on the Pennsylvania Avenue side of the White House. Their revenue could help finance the Stewart master plan.

Don't be so timid as to think all this is impossible. The Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, including those well-known aesthetes and city planners, Vice President HUMPHREY, Speaker MCCORMACK and Minority Leaders FORD and DIRKSEN, has already blithely gone along with Stewart's west front job. All he needs now is money. He figures he can easily wheedle that out of the Congress with the argument that the front's ancient sandstone blocks are crumbling and a jet's sonar boom may bring the whole building down, dome and all. After careful study, the Fine Arts Commission reports the capitol can be repaired, restored and its priceless architectural history preserved, all at a trifle of the cost of Stewart's folly. That would be the sensible way to do things. But thank Heaven that's not the way things are done in this crazy, wonderful town. Ask George Stewart.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 24, 1966]

THE CAPITOL

Today's guest editorial is really two editorials on the same subject, namely, the proposal by the Architect of the Capitol to alter the building's West Front. The first involves a letter from William Walton, chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, to Vice President HUMPHREY and Speaker MCCORMACK. It goes like this:

"The Commission of Fine Arts has asked me to express its grave concern over proposals to alter the West Front of the Capitol. The Commission, established by Congress in 1910 to advise the President and the Congress on matters of art, feels that this is the single most important architectural proposal of the 20th Century. We have therefore studied the matter deeply and come to the conclusion that to erase this great historic facade would be a national tragedy.

"The Capitol as a whole is one of the great buildings of the world, comparable in size and shape to St. Peter's in Rome and St. Paul's in London. While it finally cannot rank with either of them in architectural purity, it has a style and a quality that is unique.

"It has been developed piece by piece as this Republic grew from a small nation to become the greatest world power. And that history is reflected in the architecture of the West Facade. In the process of growth the Capitol has taken on a patriotic symbolism that scarcely needs to be pointed out. Unquestionably it is the single most important building in our great Republic, expressive of our noble ideals and great achievements. To preserve it, other lesser needs such as those for additional office space, restaurant facilities, and tourist accommodations must be set aside for a larger goal.

"The Commission has made a very careful study of the Congressional proposal with special attention to the engineering report by the Thompson and Lichtner Co. On our own we have sought the advice of an independent structural expert with considerable experience in analyzing old buildings. Our report indicates that it is feasible even tho difficult, to restore the original walls or partially rebuild them in their present location. We strongly support this view . . .

"In the meantime the Commission believes that it is of the greatest importance that no steps be taken which might make inevitable the vandalism of the Capitol's historic and beautiful West Facade."

The second statement is from Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who said:

"I desire to solicit the interest of Senators in a bill which I am thinking about introducing to designate the U.S. Capitol building as a National Historical Landmark. As I understand it, this would have the effect of making it a Federal offense for anyone to deface, mutilate or in any other way desecrate it. It would apply to all persons, including architects, nonarchitects, and nominal architects.

"I come from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where we have many national landmarks. We do not like to see our landmarks 'improved'—we are quite happy with them the way they are. If someone proposed to 'beautify' Independence Hall in Philadelphia with the addition of a modernistic hot-dog stand—or even a colonial reproduction of a hot-dog stand—we would strenuously object.

"I do not believe we should do less for the U.S. Capitol building. It, too, is a national shrine. It is as much entitled to protection against vandalism—whether from high places or low—as Independence Hall or Old Swedes' Church.

"It is true that we do not have our own Architect at Old Swedes' Church. This is an advantage. Not only does this save us a great deal of money—it has also tended to have a beneficial effect on the state of preservation of this fine old building. This is all the more reason why the U.S. Capitol, which does not have this advantage, should be given the protection which the bill which I am contemplating introducing in the Senate would afford."

To all of which we add a fervent "Amen!"

[From the Washington Post]

MATTER OF FACT: OUR FOREFATHERS' GLORY

(By Joseph Alsop)

The first point to note about the official Architect of the Capitol is that he never has been, is not now, and never will be an architect.

J. George Stewart is an amiable, aging Republican congressional lame duck from Delaware, who was named architect of the Capitol by President Eisenhower. This was an appointment almost as whimsical as the Emperor Caligula's famous nomination of his favorite horse to the Roman consulship; and it has produced far more practical results, all of them perfectly godawful.

The worst of the damage might have been prevented by the normal operation of the laws of pork and patronage, if the Architect of the Capitol did not have such a remarkable gift for attaching himself to speakers of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, however, at the very first leaders' meeting held by President Kennedy, Sam Rayburn's opening remark was:

"Now Mr. President, I want you to keep on George Stewart. He's a good man, and I want him to stay on the job."

Stewart was kept on, and therefore the great speaker and doughty old patriot is now cruelly commemorated by the Rayburn Building. It cost the taxpayers close on $130 million and is certainly the most monstrously ugly, ludicrously wasteful and vulgarly pretentious structure erected anywhere in the Western world since Joseph Stalin ruthlessly inflicted his Palace of Culture on the defenseless city of Warsaw.

After Speaker Rayburn died, one of President Kennedy's cherished projects was the replacement of the Architect of the Capitol with an honest-to-God architect. But the President was killed before the deed was done. And in very short order thereafter, non-architect Stewart apparently managed to attach himself to Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK.

So J. George Stewart's fell career continues. In fact, it is grimly appropriate to remember him at this holiday time dedicated to the founding of this republic. For the great non-architect is now planning the destruction of one of the last architectural mementoes of the Founding Fathers, the superb Bulfinch-Latrobe West Front of the Capitol itself.

It is an extraordinary record. It began with the new Senate Office Building, which seemed impossible to surpass in extravagance, impracticality and tastelessness until the Rayburn Building was constructed. Then followed the extension of the Capitol's East Front, with the machine-made marble exterior and the new interiors that appear to have been imitated from the costly men's rooms in the Moscow subway. The Rayburn Building followed. And now the West Front is to be extended, and this time, instead of an exact though machine-made copy as on the East Front, we are to have improvements on Latrobe and Bulfinch by non-architect Stewart.

If you seek the answer to this mystery of mounting horror in Stewart's lair in the Capitol basement, you find a kindly though occasionally testy old gentleman, with an antique congressional air about him. If you ask him if there is any committee of design to pass on his projects, he answers cheerfully that "it's usually confined to the leadership."

There is more to it than that, of course. Just how the pork and patronage work in this case is not immediately apparent. But there is an enormous amount of both, as the price tag on the Rayburn Building indicates; and it can hardly be accidental that the same architects' names seem to appear again and again as Stewart's "associates."

One imagines them all together, cheerfully opening their meeting with the famous remark with which Speaker Tom Reed once opened a session of the House: "Well, gentlemen, what outrage shall we perpetrate today?" They can go forward with a high measure of grisly confidence moreover, since non-architect Stewart not only has a knack for attaching himself to Speakers of the House, but is also a great one for doing costly little favors for lesser members of the House and Senate.

Does an eminent lawmaker desire redecoration of two of the Capitol's finest old rooms in pure Pedernales-Baroque? The job is done, instanter. Is there a demand for more Capitol-hideaways, for such congressional leisure-time pursuits as ingestion of bourbon and branch water? Then more than 100 can be provided by destroying the historic West Front. And does this cost the taxpayers incalculable sums of money? Yes, of course, but it does not matter in the least.

In our century, of course, deprovement is the trend, rather than improvement. But surely the old Capitol, our forefathers' glory, which shows they had so much better taste than we do, might at least be spared amid the general desecration. Surely, this thing can be stopped before it is too late.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1966]

West Front Still Stands

Congress, after an absence of some days, has returned to the city to find the Capitol still intact. The patience Architect Stewart has shown in not starting the rebuilding of the West Front is surprising, but it seems he is bound to let the members actually vote funding the project. The Congress's great weapon against the Executive, the power of the purse, can be used as well to stop the grandiose building schemes of its own leadership. Congress can veto the West Front extension, and in this election year it would be a wise decision.

Yet if the most senseless, unjustifiable and crude undertaking of the Stewart Era is not to become inevitable, preservation legislation must be adopted. When plans for the extension were being drawn, the members of Congress were not consulted, nor was any architectural or historic group with a legitimate interest in the Nation's most important monument. How can historic vandalism be a distant concern to our lawmakers when it is being perpetrated on their own temple? For although the American Institute of Architects drew on the unbecoming cloak of professional etiquette and refused to say so, the extension plan is a thoroughly unsatisfactory design. Mr. Stewart and his pet architects deserve the rebuke the great Macauley delivered to John Dryden:

"His imagination resembled the wings of an ostrich. It enabled him to run, though not to soar."

[From the Moline Daily Dispatch, July 7, 1966]

Improving on National Capitol

For reasons hard to fathom, some influential people in Washington are bent on "improving" the Capitol's west front. They want to tack on a facade of white marble to enclose several new eating places for tourists and 109 new offices for congressmen who already have ample office space elsewhere. There would also be some conference rooms and a couple of movie auditoriums.

This attempt does not set well with those who like the Capitol the way it is, or at least want its remaining architectural integrity preserved. Opponents of the west front project include Washington's Fine Arts Committee, which has called the undertaking a "national tragedy," and the American Institute of Architects. Rep. SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of New York, is so exercised that he is forming a National Committee of One Million to Save the United States Capitol.

The sandstone wall of the west front does need attention, but that can be provided without destroying the original facade. Nor does it seem essential that tourists be able to dine in the capitol while gazing down the mall. But if the public does not protest, the funds may be appropriated and we will soon have yet another example of Washington "improvement" in grossly bad taste.

[From the Daily Defender, July 7, 1966]

Inside Washington

(By Henry Cathcart, Washington Correspondent)

CAPITOL'S CHANGE SPARKS CONTROVERSY

WASHINGTON.—Congress always seems to be able to find a new controversy in which to embroil itself. Usually they are partisan in nature, but every so often some congressional group stimulates one which divides the members in ways that defy political description.

In recent years, Congress has developed a new era of controversy—the building and maintenance of the Capitol and its contiguous office buildings and other structures.

It goes into a lot of controversy over construction of a new Senate Office Building and added a lot more in the construction of the Rayburn House Office Building.

Apparently undaunted, a bipartisan congressional group has approved plans to extend the West Front of the Capitol at a cost of $34 million.

The group has the power to approve the plans, but Congress itself must appropriate the necessary money, and here is where the differences will be fought out.

The plan would increase the size of the Capitol by about 25 per cent. Its proponents say it is necessary because the West Front is crumbling and something must be done about it. The idea is to extend the portion to place it in architectural harmony with the size and balance of the rest of the structure.

Opponents are legion. They include senators and representatives, people opposed to governmental extravagance, and most important of all, people who are interested in preserving historic structures in Washington. Among the latter group is no less an organization than the American Institute of Architects.

The AIA is opposed because it would obliterate all that now remains of the original external portion of the Capitol that dates back to the early days of the Republic.

One senator says the new area will be used partly as a restaurant, and he feels the present restaurants are losing enough money already.

If you want to see the Capitol in its present form, don't hurry. It'll be here for awhile.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1966]

Congress Facing Fight on Capitol—Plan To Extend West Front Stirs a Sharp Debate

(By Marjorie Hunter, special to the New York Times)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Congress returns this week from a long holiday to resume the increasingly bitter "battle of the West Front."

The plan to extend the crumbling West Front of the Capitol was unveiled shortly before Congress recessed nearly two weeks ago for the Fourth of July holidays.

Until then, Congress has been preoccupied this year with the war in Vietnam, the fall election campaigns and stretching the budget to meet domestic needs.

The proposal for altering the Capitol was quickly seized on as a new issue for debate. The howls of protests virtually shook the already weakened walls and prompted a small flood of bills designed to halt the change.

"More Capitol Punishment," cried agonized critics, who had failed a few years ago to halt a similar extension of the East Front.

Their protests rang loudly in the House and Senate chambers: "A temple profaned." "A national tragedy," "Outright vandalisms."

Outraged cries have come, too, from the Federal Fine Arts Commission, which has final say over the design of all Federal buildings in Washington except the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings: from the American Institute of Architects; and from the National Capitol Landmarks Committee.

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat of upstate New York, drew cheers from both sides of the aisle late in June when he announced formation of a National Committee of One Million to Save the United States Capitol.

"The nation's schoolchildren, with their pennies, once saved the great historic U.S.S. Constitution, Old Ironsides," Mr. Stratton noted.

"Patriotic and educational groups with their letters and their telephone calls can surely preserve the nation's Capitol for generations still to come," he said.

So far, the outcry has failed to sway the bipartisan Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol. It has not budged an inch from its recommendation for the extension of the West Front.

The commission, created by Congress 11 years ago, is headed by House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat of Massachusetts. Other members are Vice President HUMPHREY, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSON of Illinois, Senator Minority leader; GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, House minority leader, and J. George Stewart of the Capitol.

The commission's plan calls for the most extensive renovation of the Capitol since the "new" House and Senate wings were added a century ago. It would cost an estimated total of $34-million and take about four years.

The West Front's central section, completed in the 1820's would be extended 44 feet; the old House and Senate wings, built about 1817, would be extended 88 feet; and small connecting corridors would be advanced 88 feet.

The old walls, built of sandstone blocks, would remain standing, but would become part of the interior wall structure. The new facade would be of Georgia marble.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1966]

All Is Not Quiet on U.S. Capitol's Historic West Front

(By Elsie Carper, Washington Post staff writer)

The history of the Nation is told in the United States Capitol Building.

There is the basic Capitol, designed by Dr. William Thornton in the 1790's, Benjamin Latrobe's wing added in the early 1800's, and Charles Bulfinch's central portico of the 1820's

The combination of their work has been regarded as an architectural masterpiece.

But six years ago, the east walls were covered over by a marble extension.

NEW MARBLE WALL

Now the west side, crumbling and patched, is due to be removed, too. As soon as architects complete their drawings and Congress authorizes the money, the West Front will disappear behind a new marble wall.

Writing recently in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, Francis D. Lethbridge said of the Capitol:

"It is the wonderful building it is, in part at least, because it still exhibits each of the stages of its development as a distinct part in the composition of the total mass of the building."

The late Leicester B. Holland, chairman of the American Institute of Architects'

Preservation of Historic Buildings Committee, once described the Capitol as the only building that tells the story of the history of American architecture as the cathedrals and palaces of Europe do.

Demands for more space within the Capitol have dictated the plan to extend the West Front as they did the East Front.

POSSIBILITY DISMISSED

The Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, which ordered the West Front expansion, does not contend the walls cannot be repaired. It has dismissed that possibility.

The proposed extension, ranging from 44 to 88 feet, will give Congress 4½ acres of floor space, increasing the size of the building 25 per cent.

The cost will be high $34 million.

For these reasons, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the American Institute of Architects and a number of Congressmen are urging an independent review of the extension proposal.

Before the West Front extension plans were announced, legislation was introduced to establish a national council to advise the President and Congress on matters of historic preservation.

The pending legislation creates a national register of structures and sites of historic, architectural, archaeological and cultural importance.

Testifying for the bill, National Trust Chairman Gordon Gray proposed a first category of prime national monuments—the Capitol, the White House, Mt. Vernon and Monticello—none of which could be altered without advisory board approval.

After the West Front extension was announced, Gray renewed the proposal for an independent review in a letter to House Speaker John W. McCormack (D.-Mass.), chairman of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

THE FULLEST APPRECIATION

"If, pending enactment of the legislation," Gray wrote, "national leaders from outside the Congress were asked to sit with the Commission for review purposes, the Commission's problems would be better understood and its members would gain the fullest appreciation of the concern of the people for their Capitol.

"Such a review process would give satisfaction to all concerned and be evidence of the best effort to accommodate progress while saving for the American people their historic, architectural, and cultural heritage."

The American Institute of Architects adopted a resolution at its recent convention in Denver urging Congress to set up an impartial commission of experts to pass on Capitol Hill construction.

A dozen bills to this effect have been introduced in the House. The legislation would establish a nine-member Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol.

The President would appoint seven members from names recommended by the American Institute of Architects, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Council on the Arts and Humanities and the Commission of Fine Arts. One member would be appointed by the House Speaker and one by the President pro tempore of the Senate from among individuals in private life.

KEY PROVISO

The Senate's Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee has approved a bill for long range planning for all Capitol Hill construction with a proviso requiring approval by the House and Senate Public Works Committees before any major modifications could be made to the Capitol Building.

The Committees would be in a position to evaluate the demands for additional space within the main walls of the Capitol.

An analysis of floor plans for the West Front extension shows that most of the space will be given over to eating (two cafeterias and four dining rooms), a tourist center (two auditoriums and a reception area) and private hideaways for members of Congress. Plans provide for 115 small offices.

Congress will gain only one committee room. One joint conference room (one already in the East Front is rarely used), one conference room, two subcommittee rooms, and two document rooms.

Another request is for a giant underground vault. Capitol Architect J. George Stewart said the Clerk of the House wants all House papers from the beginning of the Republic to the Civil War brought back from the National Archives and stored in the Capitol.

Commenting on the insatiable demand for space within the Capitol, Lethbridge wrote in the AIA Journal:

"There is bound to be a limit to the amount of space that can be added to the main body of the Capitol without its becoming a formless and confused mass, and that limit might as well be accepted now as ten years from now when irreparable damage might already have been committed.

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1966]

Only Three Men Approved U.S. Capitol Extension

(By Elsie Carper, Washington Post staff writer)

Senator A. S. Mike Monroney (D-Okla.) shook his head in disbelief.

J. George Stewart had just informed Monroney's subcommittee that the decision had already been made. The West Front of the Capitol was going to be extended at a cost of $34 million.

All Congress had to do now, Stewart told the mouths-agape committeemen, was appropriate the money, because it would not be asked to review the plans.

Monroney was under the impression, he told Stewart, that Congress would decide whether the west walls, the last remaining portion of the original building, would be repaired in their present location to retain "the grace of the old Capitol," or whether they were to be extended to add more space.

Not so, said Stewart, who holds the title of Capitol Architect. He said Congress had turned that decision over to the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, a five-member group headed by House Speaker John W. McCormack (D-Mass.).

Stewart said the Commission had held a meeting that morning and given the go-ahead for the extension.

Stewart serves on the Commission. Other members, besides McCormack are Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.) and House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.).

THREE MADE DECISION

The decision to extend the Capitol's West Front was made by just three of the Commission members, and those three (Stewart, McCormack, and Dirksen) had decided in closed meeting, to change the western face of the 165-year-old Capitol Building.

Since that day, three weeks ago, when Stewart broke the news to Monroney's Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, members of Congress, including Monroney, have said they are not convinced that the expensive addition is necessary or justified.

Legislation has been offered in both the House and Senate to revoke the decision of the three men. Congress could, if it wanted to, refuse to appropriate the money.

One Congressman, Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) questions whether the Commission has legal authorization to make such decisions.

Congress, Reuss contends, never consciously authorized the West Front project. Indeed, the record shows, Congress has never debated the issues, much less the specific plan approved by the three members of the Commission.

"In fact," claims Reuss, "the putative authorization for the extension of the West Front came into the law surreptitiously without the mind or attention of Congress ever being focused on the issues involved."

QUESTIONS RAISED

For Reuss and other opponents of the Capitol alterations, the issues are simple:

Should Congress destroy the last vestige of the original Capitol to obtain 4½ acres of additional floor space?

Are the present walls in such precarious condition that they cannot be repaired and instead must be buttressed by an extension of up to 88 feet?

Can Congress justify spending $34 million at a time when it has cut back on other expenditures because of the war in Vietnam?

"Surely it would be a breach of trust," Reuss claims, "for Congress to permit a radical alteration of the remaining portion of the original Capitol Building without an opportunity for the public, including the Nation's great architects and engineers, to make their views known to Congress.

"Congress should not allow such a project to go forward without the most exhaustive debate and consideration. . . ."

YEAR 1956 BASIS FOR ACTION

Whether the Commission has authority to order the West Front work turns on a clause in the 1956 Legislative Appropriations Act.

At that time, Congress granted the Commission the power to "provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement" of the central portion of the Capitol "in substantial accordance" with Scheme B of a plan submitted to Congress in 1905 and later rejected.

The language was approved without a word of explanation demanded or given when the measure was before the House and Senate. Congress was preoccupied with a controversy over staff salaries in the same bill.

Scheme B provided for the extension of the East Front and the refacing of the old west walls in marble in their present location.

Nothing was said about extending the west walls but the authorization added this proviso: "But with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities . . . as may be approved by said Commission."

Stewart and the Commission are relying on this clause, saying it gives them the power to proceed with the West Front extension.

As basis for this contention that the extension should not go forward without careful study, Reuss has studied all proposals to alter the Capitol going back more than a century when the great dome was added.

At no time, his research shows, was any consideration given to moving the west wall.

Until Stewart took over as Architect and started looking around for ways to expand the Capitol, the West Front with its Bulfinch portico and its sweeping terraces, was considered a masterpiece to be preserved.

AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. publishes a fine periodical for its employees and for its industrial customers. It is known as "Big Magazine."

The current edition contains a fascinating article on the construction of the Amistad Dam in my State. Its author, Mr. Clarence J. LaRoche, has provided a very interesting and entertaining account of this mammoth project.

As I am sure Senators are aware, the Amistad Dam was begun 5½ years ago at the time of a meeting in Del Rio, Tex., between the President of the Republic of Mexico and President Eisenhower, at which plans for the dam were finalized. The dam sits astride the Rio Grande and is over one-quarter completed at this time. I ask consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues can read for themselves of the problems and rewards involved in construction of so great a project.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN AMISTAD WILL TAME RIO GRANDE

(By Clarence J. LaRoche)

Water is scarce in the dry, desert lands of the American Southwest, and nowhere in this vast expanse of dazzling blue skies, soaring temperatures and brazen sun can it be drier than in the Judge Roy Bean country.

The Judge made his own rules, held court and dispensed beer in a little shack just west of the Pecos River. He had a hand in bringing civilization to the West, questionable through his justice reputedly was at times.

Langtry, where Judge Bean set up his combination beer-and-justice business, is on the river Americans call the Rio Grande and Mexicans el Rio Bravo. Both names are Spanish and both appropriate for the river.

Grande is the word for big or large, bravo in this sense is wild. The river dividing the United States and Mexico has, at times, been both. So wild and ferocious has it been that devastations through the years have cost millions of dollars, pesos, and lives. Its latest flood a dozen years ago devastated three Mexican cities and two on the Texas side.

Today a third Spanish word has been introduced along the domain of Judge Bean. It is amistad. As grande and bravo, amistad is a Spanish word. Unlike the rio's meanings, amistad exudes amity and friendship.

President Dwight Eisenhower of the United States and President Adolfo Lopez Mateos liked that word "amistad." They liked it better than "diablo." That's devil in Spanish, and it was appended to a periodically roaring river on the Texas side that emptied into the Rio Grande.

The presidents also figured "diablo" never would do for any project that might be built and dedicated to the friendship and amity of the American and Mexican people. When they met in Del Rio, Texas in October, 1960, to discuss a dam on the Rio Grande, they decreed it should be called Amistad Dam, and in Spanish, Presa Amistad.

This spring, five and a half years after the meeting, Amistad Dam is over one-fourth completed. It is the second dam astraddle the Rio Grande under the historic U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty of 1944.

First one was Falcon Dam, downstream from Amistad and named for Blas Maria de la Garza Falcon, one of the first great Spanish colonizers in the Southwest.

Falcon Dam was dedicated by President Eisenhower and Mexican President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines in October, 1953. Nine months later, the dam more than paid for itself by corraling the massive Rio Grande flood of 1954, saving the rich tropical lands of the Texas and Tamaulipas valley, and saving cities between Zapata and the Gulf from inundation on the coastal prairies.

Amistad Dam, as Falcon, will be dedicated to three basic activities: control floods, conserve water, develop electric energy. Both countries will share in the products, as they do at Falcon.

At some future date, after dam completion, ultimate electric energy output by power plants on both sides will be 323 million kilowatt hours—divided equally between the two nations. Cost of constructing the power plants will be carried out separately by each country. Estimated cost is at least $50 million.

Cost of Amistad is being shared on this basis: United States, 56 percent, contracted for $51,856,000; Mexico, 41 percent, contracted for $18,406,725.

A combination of four widely separated firms joined for the big job on the Texas side: Perini Corp., Framingham, Mass., the managing firm with chief responsibilities for the project; C. H. Leavell Co., El Paso, Tex.; Vinnell Corp., Alhambra, Calif.; and J. A. Jones Construction Co., Charlotte, N.C. Firm contracted to carry out the Mexican portion of the construction is La Victoria y Asociados, S.A.

Overseeing the huge project for their governments are the engineering arm of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the U.S.; and engineers of the Ministry of Hydraulic Resources for the Mexican section of the IBWC.

Amistad Dam, 12 miles up-river from Del Rio and a mile downstream from where the Devil's River empties into the Rio Grande, is primarily of earth embankment construction. It has rock, riprap, and a concrete section 2,182 feet long blocking the Rio Grande. This section is anchored to two cliffs.

Foundation of the concrete section is below the river bed, rising 285 feet. From level of river bed, the dam will be 254 feet high. Amistad Dam will be 6.06 miles long, with 4.04 miles in the State of Coahuila and 1.61 miles in the State of Texas. The dam is not set in a straight line, but, rather, is an elongated "s."

Work quantity allotments are these: Mexico—move and place 7.5 million cubic yards of earth embankment; 1.7 million cubic yards of rock excavation; place 765,000 cubic yards of concrete; and furnish and install three million pounds of structural steel; United States—move and place six million cubic yards of earth embankment; 1.3 million cubic yards of rock excavation; place 900,000 cubic yards of concrete; and furnish and install 10 million pounds of structural steel.

The American and Mexican contractors will do considerable exchange of equipment. In addition, much of the equipment used by the Mexican firm is either American in origin or manufactured in Mexico under U.S. design, such as tires from Compañia Hulera Goodyear Oxo, which parallel tires used by equipment of the U.S. contracting firm from Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

At present, the American contractors are doing their portion of the dam's concrete structure on the U.S. side, while the Mexican firm is blasting and earth-moving on its side. When the concrete work is finished on the U.S. side, the Mexican firm begins this task from their side and the Americans go about rockblasting and earthmoving.

When the changeover takes place, the Mexican contracting firm will utilize the aggregate complex, cooling system, and concrete batch plant of the U.S. firm on the Texas side. Concrete for the structure must be cooled to a temperature ranging between 40 and 50 degrees. The Rio Grande provides gravel and underground strata the clear, mud-free water for concrete.

Amistad's barrier will back water some 86 miles up the Rio Grande, flooding areas of the Devil's and Pecos Rivers and lapping at old Judge Bean's Langtry. It will store water coming down from the Rio Conchos of Chihuahua in Mexico, the Rio Grande, and the Pecos and Devil's in Texas.

Reservoir to be created by Amistad Dam will not set any world records, but in the sunburned Southwest it will be another major oasis in the gradually-growing numbers of man-made lakes.

At that, it will be the 20th largest in North America. At maximum elevation of water level at the dam, the lake will spread over 138 square miles. Superstorage will be 5,660,000 acre-feet; flood storage, 5,325,000 acre-feet; and conservation storage, 3,550,000 acre-feet.

This Amistad Lake will spread over some of the most spectacular canyon country in either the Southwest or the Mexican Northeast. Because of the area's 2,000-foot plus elevation, fall and winter will provide warm, sunny days and crisp, sometimes freezing, nights; and summers will be hot, of course, but cool in the shade, and breezy-cool in the black velvet starry nights of summer.

Only sporting event of the old Judge Roy Bean era was the outlawed, Texas Ranger-harassed boxing match Feb. 21, 1896 between Ruby Bob Fitzsimmons and Peter Maher.

It is immaterial that the Judge probably had the beer concession and that Fitzsimmons knocked out Maher in the first round. The fight was held on a banco (island) in mid-Rio Grande and crowds lined banks on both sides to watch the fisticuffs.

When Amistad Lake overlaps itself into this vast U.S.-Mexican expanse, a new breed of international sports fan will be in evidence—the fisherman, water skier, scuba diver, and do-it-yourself sportsman of land and water.

THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, throughout the country, communities look to New Haven, Conn., as an example of what can be done to rebuild and revitalize a once-aging city. For today New Haven is one of our Nation's most forward-looking urban centers.

New Haven has rebuilt, restored, and redeveloped commercial and living areas. Intriguing new structures rise alongside restored buildings of old. And within these settings of concrete, brick, and steel, New Haven is taking giant strides to make poverty, unemployment, and illiteracy handicaps of the past.

Richard C. Lee, New Haven's mayor for 13 years, deserves much of the credit for his city's amazing record of achievement. He has helped turn dreams into reality. He has translated plans into concrete design by using the "vision, patience, tenacity, and leadership—the qualities in men which inspire action, make things possible and get things done."

On June 17, 1966, Mayor Lee addressed the Yale alumni seminar. At that time he gave an inspiring account of New Haven's success story, which is of interest to all who are concerned with urban problems today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Richard C. Lee's speech, entitled "The Art of the Possible," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE

(Remarks of Mayor Richard C. Lee, before the Yale alumni seminar, June 17, 1966)

Mr. Weaver, Professors Johnstone, Scully and Tunnard, ladies and gentlemen:

The University, in its wisdom, has given me a difficult assignment, for most politicians are usually busy getting things done on instinct and intuition, and can take little time for reflection. This, as a result, is an assignment I have thoroughly enjoyed, for the subject of my talk is "The Art of the Possible."

This is a short, deceptively simple and yet profound definition of politics. It is profound, I believe, because presumably the most important qualities of a politician are vision, patience, tenacity, and leadership—in other words, the qualities in men which inspire action, make things possible and get things done.

What does "The Art of the Possible" mean in a discussion about the control of urban design? What does it not mean? How broad is its application? Are we talking about New Haven or all of urban America?

I neither have been guided nor advised, directed nor misdirected, which I assume will be obvious as I proceed. What I say, therefore, is my own interpretation of the phrase.

The subject gives me an opportunity to talk in terms a Mayor does not often get to use, to talk of the blending of the ideas of the visionary and the dreamer with those of people of action; people who have the political skills and the daring, people willing to move, not just mountains, but people. People who set out, for example, to change the image of an old New England town to a modern, thriving, progressive and great American city.

I believe a city can be as great, as glorious, as magnificent as it wishes. A city can be as great as the dreams of its thinkers, as fine as the ambitions of its citizens, and as beautiful as its leaders desire.

How can it be done? How is the creation of art made possible? How and for what reason do we build or rebuild our cities?

The word "art" implies discipline and a set of rules. Architecture has its rules. Planning has its rules. Politics has its rules. Building a city has its rules.

Perhaps the clearest statement of the rules of building has come not from a politician, nor from a planner or an architect, but from Yale's late President, A. Whitney Griswold.

Mr. Griswold's rules were directed to the University's building program, but they can be expanded, with little change, to the planning and building of any city.

These are his words:

"There are, I think, two simple rules which Yale should strive to follow in its architectural policy. Both rest on the fact that the periodic construction of new buildings has always been and always will be a necessity that can be neglected only at the cost of retrogression and ultimate decline. The first rule is that each new building should be truly functional . . . it should do what it is supposed to do with the utmost efficiency in terms of its stated purpose. The second rule is that each should come as close to the ideals for a building of its kind as the architectural genius of its era is capable of bringing it."

But beyond rules—and even Whitney Griswold's definition went beyond rules—the defining, planning and building of a city is the creation of a form of art to inspire all men.

An artist of our time—the great architect Philip Johnson—has rhapsodized the inspiration which can come from a building. He once said:

"I would rather sleep in the nave of Chartres Cathedral with the nearest john two blocks down the street than I would in a Harvard house with back-to-back bathrooms."

The role of a Mayor in America today, as I view it, is, among many other things, to be inspirational. The role of a Mayor is to meld the views of many, to bring together the esthete and the worker, the politician and the educator, the institution and the industry, the neighborhood and the central city.

The Mayor must prod his people into action. He must set forth his own goals. He must lead his community into an understanding of what one side wants, what the other side desires, and what each will accept. He must build the spirit of the community. He must instill the conviction, even, as the rebuilding process is in ferment, that the City is the physical expression of our civilization and can become the finest expression of the ideals and beliefs of democracy.

And while these programs are underway, and while the intellectual or the educator proclaims disagreement or criticizes, the Mayor must also face the wrath, the doubting, and the criticism of those to whom every two years he turns for support and for renewal of his responsibility. Alas! Unlike some of his critics, he has neither tenure nor security.

The job of a Mayor is not the job of a professor. The role of an elected community head is not that of a University President. The Mayor must deal with all levels of community life, and all of the people—the young and the old, the educated and the uneducated, the rich and the poor.

What is possible in a city? Who knows what is possible until he has tried to achieve it?

Who can say that a city should settle for less than the best, until, at least, he has tried for the best and been forced to withdraw, to regroup his powers and to try again; only to be repulsed again and to engage in another strategic maneuver. Or, finally, forced to compromise after long hours and days and months, even, of negotiation, debate, discussion, pleas, and demands?

Who can say what is possible or what is impossible, or who can say that we should listen to the crass materialists of the far-right or the utopian perfectionists of the far-left, when it is our function rather to inspire and to lead?

After thirteen long, stormy, but thoroughly enjoyable years, I have found that to convert enthusiasm and excitement to sacrifice and dedication, is not an easy task.

What I have found, also, is that "The Art of the Possible" is many things. It is the art of dealing with people. It is the art of politics. It is sometimes the art of compromise, but it is fundamentally the art of getting things done.

We have practiced this art for thirteen years in New Haven. We have not always been successful, but, on balance, we have produced results beyond our fondest dreams. In New Haven we have exceeded the possible.

We began with a broad view of the City, planning not in physical terms alone, but, as well, in terms of economics, housing, visual design, development of our human resources and a dozen other factors which mold and shape the life of a modern city.

We looked at a tired, neglected Nineteenth Century industrial town, and we saw there the strong pattern of the original Nine Squares plan for New Haven. And more important, we saw that the beautiful Central Green was still the meeting place of commerce, government, law and education.

Our planning cherished this magnificent and historical urban place. We based our rebuilding on its strong and clear pattern.

We began with New Haven's most serious problem—the old Oak Street which those of you who knew it will remember as the worst slum in New England at that time.

Despite New Haven's three-century history of city planning, despite the fact that New Haven had one of the first Planning Commissions in America, this fester grew and spread. It grew and spread not only under the nose of the City, but under the nose of Yale—a rancid slum ignored not only by the politicians, but by the business and academic community, as well. In 1950, there was only one solution to the problem of Oak Street—total clearance.

The plans of the City were then, and are now, reviewed by all interested individuals and groups—both city-wide and neighborhood.

When the time came to rebuild, our plans, among many other recommendations, prescribed an expressway which would reestablish the connection between downtown New Haven and the rest of the metropolitan area. These plans also prescribed the extensive revision of residential living patterns. And, today, where once was our worst slum, is now some of our best housing. These new apartments brought premium buying power within walking distance of the Green and our traditional commercial center—an important asset in the revitalization of the economy of our central city.

In the beginning, the economics of urban renewal were new and untried. Its political support was at best an unknown, for we were tampering with people's lives and habit patterns on a scale never before attempted in a democracy.

But our first project—Oak Street—proved that redevelopment was economically feasible. It proved that redevelopment need not be political suicide. And it proved that urban renewal was indeed a potent and effective tool for achieving many of the City's comprehensive planning objectives.

Since Oak Street, the story of New Haven has been a story of evolution—step by painful step. Each new project was made possible only by the cumulative, demonstrated success of everything that had come before.

Our basic concern, of course, was not just to survive, but to succeed, for we were pioneers in the very broadest sense. We were pioneers in the economic and human factors of urban renewal. Design? Immortal architecture? Beauty and aesthetics? These were not, then, important problems, as they are today.

I doubt, really, if any of us in New Haven at the time, including Yale, recognized both the problems and the opportunities before us as we began this gigantic program of reconstruction. Our basic concern—indeed, our basic need, above all else, was simply to prove what was feasible and what could be done, and to prove, also, that we were right, and, indeed, we did.

Always we were guided by a plan—or a vision, if you will—of what New Haven could be.

Our total view of the City indicated that the next most urgent problem—after eliminating the Oak Street slum—was to re-establish the economic strength and vitality of the center city. Through urban renewal a complex of new commercial buildings has made a bridge, both literally and figuratively, from the Oak Street Connector to the Green—from the new to the old.

Downtown New Haven now has a vitality and drama where for years there was the monotony of "for rent" signs, second-hand stores and gin mills.

We have done more than just meet the challenge of the suburban shopping centers. Downtown is now a night-time place as well as a daytime place. New stores; new housing near downtown; the Oak Street Connector and peripheral parking. These together—with much yet to come—are beginning to create a new and vibrant commercial center with quality and variety, action and excitement, elegance and tradition.

I must, in passing, address myself to the critics of the aesthetics of our new downtown. It has been said our department stores are too commercial. What else can a department store be but commercial? Every building has its critics, and this includes the Art & Architecture building which I consider magnificent, and which was designed by Paul Rudolph. Paul Rudolph, in turn, when he looked at Church and Chapel Streets, told me he intended to write a paper entitled, "The Rise and Fall of the Curtain Wall." It rhymes. It's nice. But, who is right? Who knows?

Again, what building of any consequence does not have its detractors or its critics? But the point about any downtown is that the structures are commercial first, and all else second. Their commercial success—not their artistic merit—is the key to the success of New Haven's entire re-construction. It is a fact—perhaps some would say a harsh fact—of urban life that decisions on planning, or architecture, on economic development cannot be divorced from politics.

As a Mayor I can tell you that every building which is demolished, every school which is built, every tax dollar which is spent, every business which is relocated, has its political consequence—positive or negative. The politician, the planner or the architect who forgets, or ignores, that fact does so at his peril.

In New Haven, politics is the servant of progress, as it should be. A record of genuine progress can be the most effective of political platforms—although this does not necessarily follow.

Even progress must be justified, for progress means dislocation and change to many families and businesses. An action that may seem absolutely necessary to some, may also to others mean the loss of a long tradition, a business clientele or a favorite neighborhood.

The people, the places and the tradition which progress touches make the principal definition of what is possible. For in the end, it is the people who must be served.

In the building of a city, the first goal is to build a framework for commerce, culture, economic progress and most important of all, for decent family living.

It is precisely the commercial success of our new downtown that has made the whole city—skeptics and old faithful alike—a community of believers. It has provided the economic and political impetus for the city to pursue all its other planning objectives on a broader scale and with greater daring, vigor and confidence.

We have been able to attack the problems of our old residential neighborhoods on a scale unequalled in the United States. We have seven renewal projects outside downtown which include nearly a third of the City and more than half our population. Neighborhood renewal—in New Haven, at least—employs an entire arsenal of tools and approaches.

We try to preserve all that is good in an area, and build a spirit of neighborhood interest, optimism and confidence. We demolish only that which is beyond repair and provide new facilities to meet every community need from shopping to libraries. We commission those we consider to be the best available architects to design housing, schools and even fire stations. We have a record of quality civic design second to none.

We rehabilitate existing housing and encourage historic preservation. No city in America has done nearly as much in rehabilitation as has New Haven.

Restoration has become an accepted part of the new life of our city. The elegance of yesteryear, wherever possible, has not only been preserved, but restored. Nearly 9,000 dwelling units—some 15 per cent of our housing supply—have been rehabilitated by private property owners.

In the area of historic restoration, we in New Haven are fortunate indeed that we have now an organization known as the New Haven Preservation Trust. But the tragedy is, the Preservation Trust should have been formed a century ago. If it had been, Eli Whitney's home would not be used today for commercial purposes. Noah Webster's home would not have been taken down plank by plank, shingle by shingle, and transported to the Ford Museum in Dearborn, Michigan—something which happened in my lifetime.

And the home of Benedict Arnold—an important name in history, what ever you may think of his patriotism—would not have been demolished in the early part of this century to make way for a lumber yard.

Nor have we restricted ourselves to the physical rebuilding of our neighborhoods. We have also attacked the problems of poverty and dependency, of illiteracy and unemployment, of misery and despair. More than 5,000 persons have received job training, re-training and placement in the past four years.

More than 600 persons, not immigrants, are enrolled in adult literacy programs, at one end of the scale, and at the other an equal number of three and four-year-old children are getting their first exposure to the world of books and music and ideas in the pre-kindergarten programs of Operation Headstart. Our education program has been reviewed and renewed to give all our students the chance to develop to their fullest potential.

Controls over design in New Haven come second to these human problems. The public acceptance and implementation of design controls depends on broad based concern. First we had to attack the slums and the misery and despair they produce.

In the early fifties, New Haven and other cities such as Philadelphia, Boston and San Francisco, were fighting for survival, and our political basis for this fight was unsure.

In these early days we were giving all our energy—working around the clock—merely to interest developers to build in downtown. Now that some measure of success is ours, it is easy to forget the days when just to secure a developer was reason for celebration. We had little to sell but a vision, and at that time investors wanted more than a vision.

One look at our cities is enough to convince anyone that concern for design has been lacking. When assistance to rebuild was finally offered to cities by Congress in the Housing Act of 1949—the goal was to eliminate slums and blight. No mention was made of design.

Our years of hard work have resulted, now, in a competition among developers for land. We can now demand good design, for if a developer does not meet our requirements there is another waiting who will.

Now we can boast of significant buildings, scattered throughout the City. The list of architects whose works grace our skyline reads like an honor roll of the most distinguished designers of our time.

Yale, of course, has joined in this crusade—indeed, perhaps began it. Sometimes it has been difficult to ascertain who started all this talk of a gallery of great architecture in such a little community as New Haven. But the truth is that the City and Yale, together, are clients for some of the most distinguished buildings in America.

The Saarinen Rink is a symbol to many—a pregnant turtle to some, a fishback whale to others, and a Viking ship in full sail to yet others. It is, nonetheless, an exciting building, and, like anything new or different, it has detractors as well as admirers.

Similarly, the Temple Street Garage, designed for the City by Paul Rudolph, once described in a political campaign as the Portland Cement Palace, is praised by many, snorted at by some and scornfully referred to by still others as a Roman Ruin created for the Twentieth Century.

The Morse and Stiles Colleges were designed by the late Eero Saarinen, some say to stand until the year 2261. If they do, the Portland Cement Palace will be there to serve the students' cars which, Vince Scully or no, will still be a problem.

Even the Beinecke Rare Book Library is not without its critics. Designed by one of the fine firms in America—Skidmore, Owings & Merrill—and among its student detractors, known irreverently as the Redemption Center.

The Skidmore firm, for the City of New Haven, also did the Conte School in Wooster Square—a fascinating elementary school which has for a backdrop old-fashioned gas tanks rising 200 feet into the air. An aesthetic non-sequitor, but of practical necessity in a community where people live and work.

The Kline Science Center, which was designed by Philip Johnson, has been criticized and has been given a nickname by Yale students: The Tootsie Roll Special.

Our own new Hill High School, designed by Kevin Roche of Saarinen—not even as yet finished, landscaped, or occupied—already has been called austere, cold, severe, and has been referred to as the Monumental Pillbox.

Why do I mention, in such casual terms, the building program of Yale and New Haven? Why do I repeat the irreverent, if not downright snide descriptions, of many among us who like or dislike such structures as these?

My point is simple: architecture is like art—indeed, it is art. There are some people who like modern and some people who like traditional; there are some who like the Beinecke Rare Book Library and some who do not. There are some who criticize Philip Johnson's Science Center, and some who worship its every stone. There are some who sneer at the raw power of the Hill High School or the Rudolph Garage.

But all acknowledge the presence of these buildings, and few, if any, communities in America of our size have such a collection of buildings which meet the two rules of the late President Griswold—function and the artistic expression of contemporary achitectural genius.

But no single building and no group of buildings—how ever magnificent they may be—can make a city beautiful. The buildings are enormously important, to be sure. But more important is the overall planning and structuring of the entire city.

The City should be the finest expression of man's activity and ideals and beliefs.

The City should be the finest stage for culture and the arts.

The City should be the market place where all people meet on equal terms—to trade, to live, to work and to dream.

And should anyone ever forget one other factor, I would stress and re-emphasize it now: a city is a place where people are born, where people live, where people are educated and where people die; a city is not only a place of residence, it is a place of employment, a place of culture, a place of learning and relaxation, and a place of history and tradition. I will say again what we all know—a city is, first and foremost, its people.

A city is the highest expression of civilization. Its buildings express the wonder of religious belief, the efficiency and sometimes the greed of business; the mobility of modern man and the deep roots of history.

Do even the taste-makers know what we have built? Is a building great and timeless, or is it merely a fad? We can only strive to know more of what we want and why. You can almost be sure that a building over fifty years old has been both loved and hated by the taste-makers.

We politicians look to all groups for the answers. We look to the scholars and the businessmen, and to the large family and to the senior citizen. And yes—we look to the investor and to the Preservation Trust.

We must know what a building and a city should be before we can know how to build. We try along the way to develop a sense of good taste, or the knowledge, or the proper advice to enable us to sort out the sham from the honest attempt at art.

And so we talk of "The Art of the Possible." What do we really mean? Do we really mean the perfect versus the imperfect? Do we really mean the ideal as opposed to the compromised? No, I don't think we mean any of those things.

I think that each of us, in his own way, who is engaged in the great battle to rebuild our cities, and, indeed, therefore, to rebuild urban America—has in his heart and in his mind—and in his soul—the desire to improve his city in terms of brick and steel, in terms of concrete and motar, and in terms of opportunities for all people of what ever race or creed.

It means, I suppose, from my standpoint as Mayor, that when I seek out the possible, that I think of the words written recently by a Yale man in his comments as he returned for his class reunion:

"I love every square inch of Yale—the past as it is symbolized by the statue of Nathan Hale, the future as it is symbolized by the Kline Science Center. Yale is not a place, not a prep school for Wall Street—it is a faith, a hope, a belief in what is best in man."

Isn't that really how a Mayor feels about his city?

Isn't that an expression of the faith we all share in the goals we strive to reach—to rebuild and make more liveable the urban centers of modern civilization? The "Art of the Possible" is one way of stating these goals, but I like best the words of that nostalgic Yale alumnus who spoke from his heart and his memories and his youth.

THE NEW STATE DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear that the State Department has liberalized its restrictions on travel to the five countries—North Korea, North Vietnam, China, Albania, and Cuba—with which the United States has no diplomatic relations.

Until yesterday, only reporters, doctors, scholars, scientists in medicine or public health, Red Cross personnel and persons with compelling humanitarian reasons were eligible for passport validation to these countries.

Now, as I understand it, under the new regulations, all individuals involved in commercial, educational, athletic, cultural, public affairs and professional fields will be eligible.

This is a definite step in the direction of more fully realizing the American citizens' basic right to travel. It indicates a recognition by the State Department that existing regulations were unduly restrictive.

It is my understanding that there are regulations being developed by the State Department at the present time describing this liberalization in detail. It is my further understanding that under these regulations there will be established an automatic category encompassing professional reporters, doctors or scientists in the field of medicine or public health, scholars with a postgraduate degree or its equivalent engaged in research, and representatives of the American Red Cross. For those in this category the legal right to travel to restricted areas is established automatically, and denial of the right to travel would be subject to judicial review.

With respect to all other persons declared eligible under the new policy, applications for clearance will not be approved automatically. A State Department evaluation of the benefit to the United States and to the citizen traveler of such travel will determine whether permission should be given in any particular case. The establishment of a legal right to travel for some categories of travelers is in my judgment an important advance in this troublesome field. Nevertheless it remains the case that for the average American traveler and for many of the newly declared eligible applicants the power to forbid travel by American citizens to certain areas of the world continues to reside in officials of the State Department, to be exercised in a discretionary manner without clear or precise standards, and without any effective means for judicial review.

I am, therefore, still concerned about the state of affairs which exists in this area of the law and I urge the State Department to make every effort to insure as great a degree of specificity as possible in the framing of its regulations, and to seriously consider still further liberalizations.

I have expressed my views on this subject recently on several occasions. I believe the right to travel whether at home or abroad, is one of our most precious rights; it is basic to our tradition and closely related to the constitutional rights protected by the first and fifth amendments of our Bill of Rights. For that reason, I do not believe that Government officials should have the power to declare certain areas of the world off limits for American travelers except in cases of the utmost gravity and under clear standards set by Congress.

The danger that such power can be abused is testified to by the area restrictions which are still in effect. When Mr. Philip Heymann, Acting Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, I questioned him at some length about the reasons underlying the continuation of these area restrictions.

The reason given for restricting travel to these areas is that they are not recognized by the U.S. Government; lacking consular representation in these countries, we cannot adequately protect our citizens traveling there. But the fact is there are many remote areas of some countries where travel is permitted which are far more risky for an American traveler than Albania or North Korea or China, where any American is closely watched and his movements closely regulated. Indeed, Mr. Heymann, when I questioned him about this, admitted that there was scant justification, if any at all, for continuing our area restrictions on Albania, and I found his explanations of the need for such restrictions with respect to the other areas in question rather unconvincing.

I pointed out to Mr. Heymann that if travel to those areas is to be restricted, I would place the burden on these totalitarian countries to restrict it. After all, we base the appeal of our system on the fact that we are an open society which does not restrict basic freedoms because of fear of what a few may do.

I think the case for area restrictions still remains to be made by the State Department. And for that reason, although I am pleased with yesterday's liberalization, I think much still remains to be done before this precious right to travel has been afforded the full protection it deserves.

REGULATION OF COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION SYSTEMS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a resolution by the Texas Association of Broadcasters on CATV legislation. Being vitally connected with any measure which would control this form of communication, I think it necessary that their views be adequately studied.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Resolution by the Texas Association of Broadcasters, Austin, Tex.

By unanimous vote, the Texas Association of Broadcasters' Board of Directors in attendance at the quarterly Board session of the Texas Association of Broadcasters, June 18, 1966, at the Crest Hotel in Austin, resolved as follows:

"1. In favor of legislation which would prohibit the transmission of program material and information to which the sender did not have clear title, or performance rights therein. (This should be accomplished by enactment of a new section of the Federal Communications Act, or by broadening the provisions of Section 325).

"2. Supporting legislation which would prohibit the origination of any programming material whatsoever by CATV systems.

"3. In favor of CATV legislation which would require the FCC to provide equal protection to all markets, regardless of size.

"4. Advocated a regulation which would require CATV systems to transmit the commercial breaks before and after a non-duplicated program on a local TV station."

RESEARCH: KEY TO FUTURE OF IDAHO'S SALMON AND STEELHEAD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I remember clearly how, as a boy, I unquestioningly assumed that the giant salmon and steelhead that ran in Idaho's rivers and streams were evidence of nature's limitless bounty. I say "limitless" because at that time there was no legal limit on the number of salmon and steelhead that could be taken, nor on the means that could be used to bring them ashore.

Just three decades later Idaho's waters were closed to salmon and steelhead fishing due to the small number of the mighty fish escaping from the Pacific to their mountain spawning grounds. The future of salmon and steelhead fishing—and I am one of those optimists who believes it can have a future—depends upon discovering why the run is diminishing. Research is the key.

The Interior Department appropriations for fiscal 1967, approved by the Congress in May, contains $249,000 in research funds not included in the original budget but added by the Appropriations Committee at my request. The need for these funds and their bearing on the future of salmon and steelhead fishing is explained by Jim Humbird in the current issue of "Idaho Wildlife Review," published by the Idaho Fish and Game Department.

Humbird's excellent article explains the many problems that must be overcome by State and Federal fish biologists. To explain the use to which Federal and State research funds will be dedicated, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Salmon-Steelhead and the Future

(By Jim Humbird)

Idaho accepts the challenge of maintaining sport fishing for chinook salmon and steelhead trout for present and future generations. Its forces are mobilized and joined with those of Oregon and Washington to develop a four-pronged attack on problems that appear overwhelming to cynics throughout the Pacific Northwest.

Federal and tri-state fisheries management agencies are pooling more technical knowledge, time and money than ever rallied before to achieve the goal. They must somehow overcome (1) "losses" of adult upstream fish migrants, (2) downstream migrant mortality, (3) changes in river environment, and (4) reduced production rate of chinook salmon and steelhead trout.

Pessimists declare that these are impossible problems to overcome, that the end of the inland salmon-steelhead fishing era is nigh. They say that in just 35 years Idaho fishing regulations spanned the days of abundance, when the spearing and clubbing of oceangoing fish was legal to complete closure of all salmon angling last year.

"Not so," says knowledgeable people ready to meet the challenge. All three races of salmon coming to Idaho to spawn three-score years ago or more were in a slump for reasons far less apparent than now. Old records show that escapement of spring and summer chinook salmon into this state in 1938, 1942 and 1944 was somewhat less than last year's long-time low. These declines in numbers led to the Idaho regulatory ban against all spearing and snagging of fish in 1945.

THE THIRTY YEARS OF CONCERN

Not until 1935 (only 31 years ago) was there any apparent concern about the possible future of chinook salmon in Idaho. That was the date when a daily bag limit of two salmon and three in possession was established. The same State Legislature, however, allowed seining of salmon in the Snake River from Lewiston to Captain John Creek, and the sale of such fish without a permit.

The first mention of salmon and steelhead in any Idaho laws was in 1893 when the State Legislature made it illegal to use seines, nets, spears and the like for capturing any fish except salmon, salmon-trout (presumably steelhead) and sturgeon.

The first year-round salmon closure on spawning streams was made on a portion of Redfish Lake Creek in 1956, and on Yankee Fork the following year.

The use of regulations became more intensive in 1960 with the limitation of one single hook and no treble hooks larger than 5/16 inch point to shank on the South Fork of the Salmon River. This was amended the next year by outlawing any double, treble or multiple hooks in the same waters, and also on a portion of the Selway River. The latter regulation was deleted in 1963, but Bear Valley and Sulphur creeks were added to the restriction.

Further limitations on fishing gear came last year to the South Fork of the Salmon when sinkers were required to be fastened 18 inches above the hook and no extra weight attached to hook or lure.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

But there is no denying that the challenges ahead are great. A count now is underway at the mouth of the Columbia River to learn how many spring-chinook salmon will leave the ocean to spawn this year. Some 122,000 fish are expected in this escapement above all commercial fishing and most Indian fishing, at a point in the Bonneville Reservoir just below The Dalles Dam.

This should allow about 84,000 spring-chinook salmon to pass through the fishway at McNary Dam, and 32,00 at Ice Harbor Dam just above the confluence of the Columbia and Snake rivers. Most of these fish are destined for Idaho, for Gem State fishermen, and for seeding spawning beds in headwater streams nearly a thousand miles from the Pacific Ocean.

One of the great challenges is learning why about 29 per cent of last year's spring chinook salmon could not be accounted for during their passage from Bonneville Dam through the reservoir; why another 34 per cent were "lost" from The Dalles Dam and reservoir to McNary Dam; and why 38 per cent more fish did not complete the troubled journey to Ice Harbor Dam.

Similar unexplained disappearances totalling many thousands of fish are experienced with summer and fall races of chinook salmon, as well as steelhead trout, through these river barriers.

Downstream salmon and steelhead migrants, or smolts, heading for a long sojourn in lush ocean pastures after being hatched in Idaho, likewise suffer huge losses, posting another serious challenge to fisheries management people. Studies show that there may be a 10 per cent loss of smolts which pass through turbines at each of the dams.

Assuming that the gauntlet will include ten dams on the Snake and Columbia rivers between Idaho and the Pacific Ocean, the expected loss of downstream migrants will be in the neighborhood of 65 per cent of the numbers trying to get through! In cold figures, this means that about 350,000 smolts will reach the ocean for every million young salmon and steelhead starting the trip.

The brutal fact is that about three times as many smolts will be needed to offset downstream losses in the turbines of dams now built or planned in order to get the same number of smolts to the ocean.

Increased production of Idaho smolts and young steelhead trout can be achieved through the use of conventional fish hatcheries, by fully using all natural rearing areas and building a chain of rearing ponds within the back country drainages of the river systems involved, notably the Clearwater and Salmon systems. Much of this work already is underway.

RESEARCH ON THE MOVE

This year, federal and tri-state fisheries management people will make a study of the Columbia River Indian harvest of fish and develop gear for tagging studies to be conducted in 1967.

Next year, the research team will work in the Bonneville-Dalles area to learn how accurate the fish counts are at the facilities of the two dams. Unknown factors at present include:

(1). fallback of fish over the dams and recounting,

(2). boat lock passage of fish through the dams in both directions,

(3). tributary stream turnoffs that may account for some of the fish "losses" between dams, and

(4). death of fish from injuries and other causes.

The same type of study is planned for 1968 in the reservoir-river areas of McNary, Ice Harbor and Priest River.

ACTION BASED ON FACTS

Corrective action will be taken as the facts are known during and following the "crash" study program.

(1). to account for adult fish that never reach Ice Harbor Dam,

(2). to reduce losses,

(3). to determine the mortality rates of smolts more precisely,

(4). to develop means for safer passage of adult fish runs and downstream migrants, and

(5). to increase Idaho's production of smolts.

With this kind of research program leading to corrective action as needed, all is not lost for inland sports fishing of salmon and steelhead.

THE CONDITION OF THE BRITISH POUND STERLING

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, talk about the British pound sterling has long been the best available indicator of the health of the world's money system. During recent years, the world has come to realize that the weakness of the pound reflects as much disequilibrium in the world's finances as it does stagnation in Britain's economy. Now the rumors of sterling devaluation have begun again—less than a year after the most recent crisis-inspired rescue operation.

The coming sterling crisis, which Clyde Farnsworth reports on from London in the New York Times, is even more disturbing than those which the world has already survived. For it comes against a background of skyrocketing interest rates, mounting economic nationalism, and growing international financial dislocation. Because of the pound sterling's position as a major vehicle of international trade and finance, trouble for the pound has always had worldwide implications. Because of the pound's chronic weakness, speculative—-and sound—opinion has long concentrated upon it as the weak link in the international chain of economic and financial relations. In recent years, great efforts have been made to shore up the pound and preserve the stability of the world's money. Every day that passes calls evermore into doubt the effectiveness of these efforts.

Devaluation of the pound—if and when it comes—will not only be the outcome of Britain's troubled economic conditions. It is also certain to set off a chain of competitive devaluations as to other trading nations seek to protect themselves against suddenly cheap British exports. It will mean that the United States—which has inspired, led, and backed the official effort to protect the pound—will face a wall of undervalued currencies and an onslaught of underpriced imports. It may finally signal an end to the present system of fixed foreign exchange parties and of currencies artificially tied to gold.

The threat of a new sterling crisis has major implications for Americans. We must recognize that last-minute rescue operations are no substitute for long-range, rational programs for stability. We must face the fact that short-term emergency dollars which are pumped in during a crisis to save the pound are no substitute for long-term productive dollars which are desperately needed all over the free world as the solid financial base for continued economic prosperity.

We must begin to face up to the fact that the current international monetary system is not immutable and that there is nothing sacred about gold. And we must make clear to ourselves and to the world that American prosperity and American income and American jobs are not to be sacrificed in the high-minded pursuit of international economic ideals—while the rest of the world gets on with the business of international economic competition.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the article "Britain May Face New Pound Crisis," by Clyde Farnsworth, in the New York Times of July 11, 1966, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN MAY FACE NEW POUND CRISIS—OMINOUS SUGGESTIONS MADE THAT DEVALUATION MAY BE PREFERABLE WAY OUT—POLICY BEING CRITICIZED—MINISTER OF FINANCE POINTS TO ECONOMY AS PLUNGING "DEEPER AND DEEPER"

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

LONDON, July 10.—Britain is headed for her fourth and possibly most severe sterling crisis since the Labor Government came to power in October, 1964.

Ominous suggestions that devaluation may be the preferable way out are being heard increasingly.

The Observer, a supporter of the Government, devoted its editorial page to the problems of the pound today and concluded:

"The solemn fact is that Britain has now got to the point where even the pains of a forced devaluation might be less damaging than the slow decline which must result from refusing to face the fact that our currency is overvalued."

The left-leaning New Statesman warned that "time is running out on the Government."

PICKS UP THEME

William Rees-Mogg, an influential Tory columnist for The Sunday Times, picking up this theme, said: "The really alarming thing is that time is running out while the Government pursues a policy which cannot decide the issue one way or the other."

The French have long believed that Britain will have to devalue the pound if she really wants to join the European Common Market.

Hints of this were dropped by French Premier Georges Pompidou in his meeting with Prime Minister Harold Wilson last week. He spoke of "sacrifices" made by France and her own devaluation of the franc in 1958.

French Finance Minister Michel Debré commented more directly about the British position last week before members of the Paris Bourse (stock exchange).

DEEPER AND DEEPER

"The British economy plunges deeper and deeper with every passing day," he said, adding that "the British Government refuses to face its real responsibilities, and to take the measures required by the situation."

The growing pressure on the pound, which has dropped the exchange rate for sterling to its lowest levels since November, 1964, is a reflection of pessimism both here and in foreign financial centers.

In the last four months, British reserves have fallen by more than £200-million ($560-million). The precise figure is unknown because of undisclosed borrowings from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Britain's total reserves now stand only slightly higher than her over-all borrowings taken out to meet earlier crises of the last 20 months.

This would not be viewed so pessimistically were it not for miscalculations in the Government's efforts to slow domestic consumption, a big battle brewing within the Labor party over the desirability of curbing wage increases and the inexorable rise in interest rates abroad, pulling short term funds from London to other financial centers.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, James Callaghan, conceded publicly last week for the first time that Britain would not get external payments into balance until sometime next year.

In the first quarter of this year, the deficit was £99-million ($277-million) with imports rising faster than exports and long-term capital flowing outward at a high rate in anticipation of fresh budgetary restrictions on foreign investments.

DOUBTS ARE CAST

The long seamen's strike has cast doubts over the improvement to be expected in the second quarter.

The Treasury's target for payments equilibrium had always been the end of this year, though it had been conceded privately in Whitehall long before the Chancellor's statement last week that the target would not be reached.

Besides the expected stiffer curbs on foreign investment, the latest budget created machinery for a powerful new deflationary tax.

It levies a tax on workers in the service industries. Manufacturing companies will have to pay too, but they will get rebates and premiums for their workers a few months after paying the tax.

There are many complaints about the inequalities of the new tax, but the chief complaint is that it does not begin hitting the economy, squeezing out funds and thereby lowering the over-all rate of consumption and hopefully imports, until September.

The chief question now is whether sterling can wait. The Government is reluctant to take new measures now because of the risk that another dose of restrictions would condemn the country to economic recession, stagnation and unemployment for a long time.

WEST VIRGINIA'S UNSUNG SPAN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in this period of appreciation for our country's natural beauty, I wish to offer for enjoyment an article written about "West Virginia's Unsung Span," a natural bridge in Roane County.

The article was written by William Blizzard and appeared in the Sunday Gazette-Mail of Charleston, W. Va., on June 26, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD for others to read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Nearly everyone has heard of the famous natural bridge near Lexington, Va. It has been sketched, photographed and written about for more than 100 years, and was a talked-of attraction even before it was purchased from George III by Thomas Jefferson in 1774.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has used its natural bridge to good advantage as a magnet for tourist dollars. Any sensible state would do so.

Yet there is a state with a natural bridge almost twice as long as the famous one in Rockbridge County, Va., which has never told a tourist about its rocky prize. This natural bridge may be one of the four or five longest in the United States, yet the state which possesses it has contrived to keep that possession a secret.

The secret has been so well kept, in fact, that not even the residents of this close-mouthed state know about it—or at least not many of them do. This natural bridge has never earned a tourist dollar, and has never even been seen by a tourist who was lured by a travel folder.

There seems only one reason for such secrecy about such a natural wonder: The state in question is afraid someone will steal it.

It would be difficult to cart away, undetected, a chunk of solid sandstone 150 feet long, 20 feet thick, and 40 feet wide, but the fear of such theft is the only plausible reason for not telling the world about it.

What is the name of this state so endowed with natural wonders that it is unwilling to advertise a natural bridge at least 150 feet long? Surely, tourist money is not needed in a state so indifferent to the potential tourist interest of such a natural bridge.

You may judge for yourself. The name of the state is West Virginia.

To be fair with the Department of Commerce and others who attempt to promote West Virginia, the unpromoted Mountaineer natural bridge has certain drawbacks. Yet it does exist and appears to be one of the longest in the United States.

Its main drawback is lack of height, although that didn't discourage Napoleon. The Virginia bridge near Lexington, for example, is 215 feet high, although it is only 90 feet long.

In Powell County, Ky., in that state's Natural Bridge State Park, is a natural stone bridge 92 feet high, although it has a span of only 76 feet.

The West Virginia natural bridge is only about 45 feet high, but it should be worth a few thousand words in any publicity man's brochure, and, over a period of years, several thousand dollars in the West Virginia till.

The really big, long natural bridges are in the West, with Utah leading the rest of the country by quite a few bridges and quite a few feet in length and height. But the longest natural bridge in the East appears to be, without question, in West Virginia.

I have been unable to find any official measurements on the bridge, or any officials who ever heard of it. So I'll give my own estimates, against the time more accurate measurements are made.

West Virginia's natural bridge, I'd guess, is between 150 and 200 feet long, depending upon where you begin and end your measurements. The width is between 40 and 50 feet, the thickness about 20 feet.

From the bottom of the span to the ground at the highest point is about 25 feet, about six feet at the lowest. The span itself is of massive sandstone capable of bearing great weight. Something over a decade ago a gas well was drilled in the area, and the heavy drilling machinery was carried over the bridge, which was made into a part of the gas-rigger's road.

There is one other drawback to the West Virginia natural bridge, from an ad man's point of view. This has to do with the way in which it was formed and the terrain surrounding it.

Erosion carved it, of course, as it created all natural bridges. But with the more photogenic bridges the span stands alone and isolated with blue sky showing beneath the arch. Not so the West Virginia bridge; there is a hill behind it, a not-unexpected sight in West Virginia.

Still, this is no major difficulty. With a little work and considerable chopping and sawing away of trees and underbrush, the West Virginia natural bridge can look mighty pretty on a color postal card. It will even look good to the weekend button-pusher.

Just now, even Ansel Adams couldn't do much for it. Because of trees and underbrush and the lack of a prepared viewing area, you simply can find no position from which to photograph the entire bridge. Rectifying this situation offers no problem except cost.

You may wonder where this bridge is, and I'll get to that presently. First, a little more about the bridge and its surroundings.

This natural bridge, oddly enough, is not mentioned in any state geological survey. It has been cut by a small stream which residents say is now nearly dry during the entire year, but the geological identity of the sandstone is unknown to me. Several massive sandstones outcrop in the area.

The natural bridge was once part of a thick sandstone outcrop on a hillside, and a stream flowed over it, forming a waterfall. But about 40 or 50 feet from the edge of the waterfall a fissure developed in the stone and the stream dropped through it.

In time, abrasive stream action widened the fissure until it was about 100 feet long and 20 or more feet wide. In this manner, a "bridge" was isolated from the main body of the outcrop. At the same time, the stream cut away the softer materials underneath the span, so that the natural bridge became as it is today.

The cutting stream has apparently decreased in size. It was a mere trickle on my recent visit. Behind the bridge itself, but separate from it, is an undercut shelter of sandstone under which a man may stand if he is not too tall.

For many years, according to my informants, picnickers have visited this area, a cool oasis in summer. Horses and cows also loaf under the bridge, as I was quick to discern, and you will be quick to discern, too, if you get to the area in the near future.

It is not unlikely that stone-age man used this bridge and the associated shelter as a dwelling. It is certain that the first settlers of Spencer used a somewhat similar shelter formation, perhaps composed of the same sandstone stratum, for a home (State Magazine of March 6, 1966).

The natural bridge is about 18 miles from Spencer. One way to get there from Charleston is to take W. Va. 4 to the intersection of W. Va. 36 a few miles south of Clay. From there, continue west on W. Va. 36 to a town called Left Hand.

On top of the first hill past Left Hand (Vineyard Hill) going toward Spencer, turn off on a rock-base road on the left for about two miles, keeping left at all major intersections. On the top of another hill turn left on another, miserable-looking, rutted dirt road for about one-half mile, and that's as far as your car will go.

You will be in the yard of Earl Nida (pronounced by most people as Nighdee), and you will have to walk about one-half mile to see the bridge. Nida is accustomed to the curious and won't mind giving directions.

He does not, however, own the natural bridge. According to Nida, it belongs to Clark Johnson, whose postoffice address is Looneyville.

If you make this trip, you will see a bonafide natural bridge, the longest, I believe, in the East. It badly needs development, and you may be disappointed in what you find, although it is as nearly like what I have described as I can make it.

This natural bridge, most unnaturally unheard of, is in Roane County, in Geary District. The key to finding it is in finding Vineyard Hill, just past Left Hand, going west. You'll know if you missed Vineyard Hill when you look around and find yourself in Clover.

That's where all West Virginians would be if they were receiving the benefits of their state's natural advantages and natural resources.

BLACK POWER AND WHITE HELP

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of July 11, entitled "Black Power and White Help," is worthy of attention of all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK POWER AND WHITE HELP

At his press conference the other day, President Johnson expressed an almost paternal impatience with the Negroes who have raised the cry of "black power." He scolded them gently, saying that the Government is already doing everything it can. His sentiment is probably widely shared, but we fear it may be missing an important part of the point of the new militancy.

What the President implies when he says the Government is doing everything it can is that practically everything must be done by the Government. That view causes Administration officials and others to interpret any expression of Negro unrest, even an outcry of disgust at the white man's "help" so far, as a plea for more of the same Governmental remedy.

The "black power" term, coined by Stokely Carmichael of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Floyd B. McKissick of the Congress of Racial Equality, is of course vague in meaning. One could possibly argue that it is merely a slogan calling for greater legitimate Negro activity in Negro affairs, but the goading language hints at something more sinister and violent, whether or not it's intended to.

But if the exact intent or direction of this offshoot of the civil rights movement is fuzzy, its origin shouldn't be. The "black power" cry is first of all a wail of anger born of frustration—the frustration of the Negro's unhappy history in this country and, more pointedly, the frustration of recent over-optimism and subsequent waning hopes.

Ever since the first rumblings of the civil rights movement the Negro has been promised a new world, by his own leaders and by politicians generally. Someone will get you a job. Someone will rebuild your city. Someone will take care of your family. Someone will give you equality.

And in most cases the "someone" was the Federal Government. The Negro's role was to threaten and cajole the Government, then the Government would do the rest.

These were plainly impossible promises, and all the more so because the Negro was led to believe his gratification would come instantly and easily. It was mostly a dream, the stuff of which political victories are made; the laws and programs have better served the politicians who invented them than their nominal beneficiaries. Who could be surprised that disappointment and distrust are the consequences?

Negro leaders who have expressed horror at the violent turn of things are not free of blame. Not only have they encouraged the belief that Federal magic produces "equality," but in the process of needling the Government to do their bidding they have also fostered the principle that the individual must obey only those laws he deems just.

The moderate leaders now say the militants have gone too far, but it was they who drew the murky principle. It is a small philosophical step from preaching scorn for the law to advocating "taking" by force what is "rightfully yours."

So with all these pigeons coming home, the wonder really ought to be that "black power" hasn't attracted a wider following. That it hasn't is a credit to the majority of the Negro people, who evidently agree with Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that it could lead to a self-defeating racism full of potential for further trouble.

Stripped of its emotive racist overtones and properly channeled by responsible leaders, "black power" could actually be made to go in a quite different direction. For it's plain that many Negroes are realizing the limits of appealing to others and beginning to yearn for direct Negro initiatives to achieve the social, political and economic advancement they want. Constructive programs of self-help may not work quickly and easily, but they are nonetheless essential.

Perhaps this will prove to be too optimistic an assessment of "black power," given the demagogic way it is currently being bandied about. Certainly it is likely to be unduly hopeful if the politicians hear only a plea for new Governmental promises and then go on feeding the fires of the present frustration.

AMERICA NEEDS A STRONG RESERVE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, we are facing a continuing attempt by the Department of Defense to merge the military Reserve services of our Nation with the National Guard units of the several States.

The new plan of the Department is in reality merely a rehash of the plan so emphatically rejected by Congress 1 year ago. Of course, this year's model is in a little different package than the original proposal, but it is all too plain that the new plan is only an attempt by Secretary McNamara to accomplish by legislation what he has been unable to complete by executive mandate.

While it is thoughtful of the Secretary of Defense to give us an opportunity to rubberstamp his actions, I for one feel that the reasons which led us to reject this plan 1 year ago compel us to likewise reject this new version of it. Indeed, events since that time in Vietnam and elsewhere make it mandatory that we reject any and all actions that would weaken the effectiveness of our Reserves.

Apparently, the Defense Department has forgotten the reasons we gave for rejecting this plan last year. Since the Secretary has offered us the same plan as the one we turned down then, he can have no objection if we repeat some of the reasons which led to our action. First, however, I wish to focus your attention on a problem which has arisen as a direct result of the merger plan and the Defense Department's failure to comply with our rejection of it.

Every day the mail brings me letters from fellow Texans seeking clarification of the status of the Reserve. Some of these veterans of World War II, Korea, and the Berlin callup do not even plead the case of the Reserve; they simply wish to know where they stand.

It is not hard to understand the confusion of the men in the ranks of our Reserve organizations. How could they be anything but confused when they read one day that the Congress of the United States has positively rejected a plan to abolish their outfits and the next that the Department of Defense is moving ahead full speed with the plan? When I answer these letters, I am at a loss to explain why the Secretary of Defense refuses to obey an obvious congressional mandate.

Surely the Secretary cannot contend that he does not understand our determination to maintain an adequate Reserve force. In 1965, when the merger plan came before this body, we rejected it and provided funds for both National Guard and Reserve structures. Furthermore, we included language in the appropriations act which was designed to prevent the merger and to forestall any major shakeup of the Reserve program.

On September 29, 1965, the President signed the appropriations act for the Department of Defense, containing this language and prohibiting the abolition of any sizable element of the Reserves. On the next day, September 30, Secretary McNamara announced the dissolution of 10 major combat units including the trained 6 combat units of the U.S. Army Reserve. This was, of course, contrary to the express will of Congress as concurred in by Presidential signature.

Last October, when the Secretary of Defense announced his decision to inactivate some 750 Reserve units with an aggregate strength of 55,220 men, we unanimously adopted a resolution in the Armed Services Committee, on which I serve, asking that the implementation of the plan be delayed.

We did this because the inactivation plan came so late in the legislative year that we did not have adequate time to assess its merit. The Secretary ignored our request and proceeded immediately to deactivate the units. It is easy to see how a Reserve member might be concerned by the Defense Department's obvious disregard of congressional opinion.

And today, the Defense Department is continuing its Reserve reduction plan in defiance of the stated will of Congress. According to Department directives, a number of Air Reserve units will be abolished by October of 1966. Some of these units are the same ones which so recently demonstrated their value to this country's military effort by logging more than 1 million air passenger miles and more than 5¼ million ton-miles flying men and cargo to Vietnam.

It is not true military preparedness to disband a unit while it is being used to support a combat effort. Such a policy not only lessens the number of men serving in a vital area but also has a debilitating effect on the morale of the remaining men.

I would like to share with Senators a letter written to me by a member of the Reserve in Texas, because it expresses the concern for the future of the Reserve shared by its many dedicated members.

When speaking of the confusion caused by the revival of the merger plan, the letter reads:

> We feel that the many years of service we have contributed to the defense of our country entitle us to more consideration in the form of information as to our future status . . . The Department of Defense is not just dealing with units on paper or with machines, but with the hearts and minds of thousands of dedicated Reservists . . . Could you please enlighten us?

I hope that I shall be able to answer "yes."

Yes, we will not be content to merely bury the merger plan again and hope that the Defense Department will return to its job of strengthening our long-range national security rather than continue on its present course of weakening it.

Yes, we agree that the annual revival of the merger plan has such a damaging effect upon the morale and readiness of the Reserve that we cannot be content to indicate only our present disapproval of it. Instead we will reject the plan once and for all and make it unmistakably clear that we do not intend to allow the Reserve program to fall into a sort of Defense Department limbo of uncertainty.

I hope that I shall be able to answer "yes," for if I cannot, the future of the Reserve is in grave danger. How can we honestly expect to have a dedicated and prepared Reserve when its members do not know from one day to the next if there will even be a Reserve?

And we do need the Reserve. This country needed a strong, well-equipped Reserve last year when we rejected this merger plan, and it needs one today. The policies followed by the Department of Defense are not providing for such a Reserve.

First of all, the merger plan abolishes 6 Army Reserve divisions—55,000 trained, experienced officers and men anxious to serve. Perhaps the events of the last year have convinced the Secretary of Defense that a reduction in manpower of this size is feasible, but I question this. No doubt many of our young men called away from jobs and families by the steadily increasing selective service drafts are likewise unable to understand why our Department of Defense has chosen this time to reduce the number of men available for defense.

A year ago, we were told that these 55,000 men would be used to bring National Guard units up to 80 percent of full strength and thus provide this country with a more effective defense force. The history of the past year has not substantiated this hope. Since the reservists are in no way obligated to join the National Guard, many of them have understandably refused to give up an experienced and honored unit for a strange new one.

More important, many would-be transferees are not geographically located with respect to a National Guard unit to enable them to apply their particular skills where needed. Of the 55,000 men in the U.S. Army Reserve units inactivated by the Defense Department last fall, only 783—or 1½ percent of the total—voluntarily joined Army Reserve National Guard drill paid units. Perhaps there is some new justification for this aspect of the merger plan. If so, I would be very interested in hearing it because the old reason is even less persuasive now than it was a year ago.

Perhaps this reorganization would save $150 million as the Defense Department claims; probably not. Even so, this amount is small indeed when compared with the immeasurable damage which might result to this Nation if we were caught short in time of need.

Perhaps we did not need the presence of an effective Reserve in the Cuban missile crisis and the Berlin callup of a very few years ago, but I for one was glad the Reserves were there. Perhaps our enemies would have backed down from a possible nuclear war anyway—perhaps.

While I commend the Defense Department for all its efforts to save the taxpayer money, I must point out that the amount allegedly lost under the present Reserve system organization is very little indeed when one considers the insurance policy it purchases.

The total reduction in manpower of 120,000 men caused by the merger is a highly questionable "improvement" at best. With many knowledgeable observers predicting that our Vietnam commitment may soon equal the one we had in Korea, it seems difficult, extremely difficult, to justify any reduction whatsoever in our armed strength.

Furthermore, with the great number of options open to those hostile to the interests of this country—trouble in Berlin, a flareup in the Middle East, a new Congo, or renewed hostilities in the Dominican Republic—it is very difficult indeed to predict what our contingency requirements may be in the immediate future. There is serious doubt that the reduced Reserve strength meets our war plan requirements.

As I recall, a part of the McNamara argument supporting the reduction of Army Reserve combat divisions was that they were not required by contingency plans. I expect that at the time this assessment was made, more than a year ago, the Defense Department did not seriously expect that it would have to activate a 17th division in the Army and a 4th division in the Marine Corps active forces.

There is quite an inconsistency here. The Defense Department is building up the active forces while at the same time it is reducing its Reserve components. This does not make sense. History has taught us all too many times that it is far better to bear the expense of preparedness than to risk the disaster of unpreparedness.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION—PRESENTATION BY DR. ROGER A. FREEMAN

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I recently had the great privilege of participating in a colloquium dealing with the economic aspects of higher education. The colloquium was sponsored by the College Scholarship Service and the College Entrance Examination Board, and was held at Lake Geneva, Wis.

Among the very distinguished educators who participated in this colloquium was Dr. Roger A. Freeman, who currently is senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, located at Stanford University. Dr. Freeman and I have long shared a deep interest in finding more effective means to provide financial assistance to institutions of higher education and to the families of students at those institutions who are faced with the burden of meeting the rising costs of a college education.

Dr. Freeman has shared his knowledge of this subject with our committee in both Houses of Congress, and his testimony has been of immeasurable help in our consideration of legislation dealing with higher education. His presentation at Lake Geneva, I found to be a most penetrating and enlightening analysis of the problems of higher education costs pointing out the decreasing utility of present means for financing higher education and supporting strongly the tax credit approach as a sound means for solving at least a part of this problem.

We have twice during the past years debated this proposal in the Senate, and recent polls disclose that 70 percent of the people from all income levels across the country are in favor of tax credits for the purpose of helping students obtain a college education and over 89 percent of the president and trustees of the country's educational institutions replying to a poll on the subject conducted by the Citizens Committee on Higher Education. Mr. President, I ask that Dr. Freeman's presentation entitled: "Aiding Higher Education Through Income Tax Credits for Tuitions and Gifts," be printed in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Aiding Higher Education Through Income Tax Credits for Tuitions and Gifts

(By Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, colloquium on the economic aspects of higher education, College Scholarship Service, College Entrance Examination Board, Lake Geneva, Wis., May 22–25, 1966)

During the past five years federal aid to education has truly come into its own. Programs authorized by the 87th, 88th and 89th Congress, each of which was in turn designated "the Education Congress," rewarded faithful and intense efforts which have been active on Capitol Hill and throughout the nation for over 100 years. Repeated rebuffs, defeats and frustrations, extending over decades, did not deter nor discourage the protagonists of federal aid. They came back each time, heads bloody but unbowed, to fight another day, till the political climate was right and their unceasing toil came to fruition in the 1960's.

Federal spending for education jumped from $1.1 billion in 1962 to $4.2 billion in recommended new obligational authority in fiscal 1967, according to the functional breakdown in the President's Budget of January 1966. And if other funds are added which are channeled into education or related to it but not so labeled in the budget, the total now runs over $10 billion, or almost one-fourth of all educational expenditures in the United States. Whether we view these developments with pride and enthusiasm or with concern and regret—and there are undoubtedly adherents of both viewpoints in this audience—we can all agree that the events of the 1960's constitute a major breakthrough in national government action in the field of education which may well be only the forerunner of greater things to come.

If federal funds have not yet brought affluence to our schools and colleges, they have certainly assisted in various facets of their activities. But the most intriguing aspect may well be that Congress never saw fit to grant aid in the form or for the purpose for which the leaders in the century-old campaign had demanded it; for the general support of operations, to be used at the discretion of the established educational authorities—boards of education, boards of trustees and their administrators. The huge federal monies are fragmentized, minutely earmarked to multitudes of special programs and projects, many of them new or to be inaugurated and not part of the established curriculum or operations. Institutional support has remained a fond but seemingly unrealizable dream. All of the federal funds are closely directed and controlled by the Washington agencies that parcel them out and supervise their spending.

Although in a few big universities the federal sources now total almost as much as all their other revenues combined, very little of the federal money can be applied to the purpose that used to be regarded as the paramount task of educational institutions and is their most expensive: the general instruction of pupils through the 12 grades and for four years of undergraduate study. That problem, the toughest in the financing of education, rests as firmly as ever in the laps of governing boards and administrators. The core of the instructional budget is of course faculty salaries. It is not only the biggest item on the expenditure side. It is the most crucial one in determining the caliber of the faculty and thus of educational quality. And it is the hardest to come by. But with only few exceptions none of the federal funds can be used to pay the salaries of teachers for the regular courses of instruction, to hire more faculty members and to pay them better wages. Nor is such relief in sight from Washington.

This is true for the common schools as well as for IHL (Institutions of Higher Learning). The spokesmen in the fight for federal aid to schools had long demanded "Federal Aid without Federal Control." They envisaged a general subsidy, similar in form to the state school aid by which now almost $10 billion are distributed annually to provide 39% of current public school income. But the national government does not seem prepared to grant school boards as much autonomy as state legislatures do. Extensive campaigns and annual battles, stretching over decades, for federal aid to school operations (or teachers' salaries) and for classroom construction wound up with more than a score of programs, many of them new and all of them specified by Congress and tightly regulated by the U.S. Office of Education: special curricula for children of low-income parents, supplemental educational centers, selected fields of occupational training, counseling and guidance, school lunches, some types of instructional and library materials and textbooks, in-service training of personnel, etc. But no help with paying teachers' salaries or building classrooms.

Events in higher education offer a close parallel. President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1946–48 recommended gradually rising amounts of federal grants for operations and construction at public IHL. It brought no action, particularly when the Association of American Universities, soon after, sponsored the Commission on Financing Higher Education which flatly declared: "This Commission has reached the unanimous conclusion that we, as a nation, should call a halt at this time to the introduction of new programs of direct federal aid to colleges and universities."

But a few years later, when attempts to obtain indirect aid to higher education through tax relief were making no headway, the sentiment for direct aid gained ground in academic circles. The National Science Foundation, in its 1960 report, expressed the prevailing view among many proponents of federal aid to higher education: "The situation appears to call for general aid to U. S. universities patterned somewhat after that provided universities in the United Kingdom by the University Grants Committee. In any event, the question arises of direct subsidy to educational institutions in order to increase the overall strength of their departments and to provide greater flexibility in their administration."

Soon after, the chairman of President Kennedy's Task Force on Education, President Frederick L. Hovde of Purdue University, testifying for federal aid, told the U. S. House Education Committee "that the highest priority need of colleges and universities, both public and private, is for general support and particularly for faculty salaries." Congress responded by enacting almost two dozen new programs allocating federal funds to higher education, totalling several billions of dollars. But not a cent for general support or faculty salaries.

Only two federal education programs permit the recipients broad discretion in the use of funds, one for IHL and one for the common schools: the Morrill program originally signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862 and the impacted-areas program of payments in lieu of taxes to school districts burdened by local federal establishments. The first, the so-called land-grant program to colleges for the agriculture and mechanic arts, is now to be abolished according to recommendations of the President in January 1966 (save for a 60-year old permanent appropriation of $50,000 annually for each state) and the impacted-areas program is to be cut in half, from $411 million to $211 million. This clearly expresses the aims and direction of federal policy in education: the only programs which leave some discretion in the hands of local education authorities are to be cut or eliminated at the same time at which the number and amounts of specified and closely controlled programs are being expanded at an unprecedented rate.

The writing on the wall is unmistakable: The motto under which the federal aid to education movement began, the banner under which it fought for generations, "Federal Aid without Federal Control," seems to be in the process of being turned around and reversed.

At recent conventions of school administrators (AASA) and school boards (NASB) it appeared that many of their members are having second thoughts about some of the proffered forms of federal aid but find themselves in the situation of Goethe's apprentice magician who was unable to restrain the forces he had unleashed. Many officials of IHL feel likewise and have given vent to their unhappiness. I want to quote a typical statement, by the head of the country's largest university, President Clark Kerr of the University of California:

"A university's control over its destiny has been substantially reduced. [Federal] funds . . . commit some of the university's own funds; they influence the assignment of space; they determine the distribution of time as between teaching and research; to a large extent they establish the areas in which a university grows the fastest; almost imperceptibly a university is changed."

Dr. Kerr added, "I question whether the federal government should go into such details and take the judgment away from the states."

Similar thoughts were expressed even more sharply by Gerard Piel, publisher of *Scientific American*:

"The Federal grant universities have weakened their autonomy and so their capacity to fulfill their function as the corporate agents of free inquiry. They have explicitly surrendered this function to the extent that they have undertaken to serve as the executors of Federal policies and programs, for to that extent they have compromised their standing as centers for the independent criticism and surveillance of those policies and programs. The citizen has never had greater need of the protection afforded by the university than in the present epoch of centralization of power in the national state. But our great universities are engaged in abrogating their commitment."

Such utterances do not mean that school or university administrators or recipient researchers would want to give up federal funds or quit trying to get more. Rare indeed is the man who once having partaken of the sweet taste of federal cash can ever again resist its lure, no matter what its price. The monies provided valuable benefits in special areas and afford relief from certain pressures. But it is apparent that hopes for an easing of controls are bound to be disappointed. The evidence points at a steadily growing federal influence on the operation of schools and IHL.

The largest chunk of federal money, about $1.8 billion annually goes for research grants and contracts. That those funds have helped to advance our knowledge, particularly in the natural and life sciences, that they have enabled some universities to add eminent scholars to their faculty at very respectable salaries—usually by hiring them away from other colleges—that they have assisted in important tasks of the national government is beyond doubt. It is also agreed that they have not aided the recipient IHL financially and are therefore correctly not listed as aid to education in the U.S. budget. Some even hold that federally sponsored research is not paying its way and imposes a burden on the institutions.

A serious aspect of the federal research grants is their concentration among a small number of big universities: more than 90% of the money goes to 5% of all IHL which leaves the remaining 95% of institutions relatively poorer off than they were before. This has led to a "brain drain" from the medium and smaller institutions to the big, to an undue concentration of talent in a few places. It is making "the rich richer and the poor poorer," encourages a "flight from teaching," and causes grave imbalances and innumerable administrative difficulties within institutions and between the universities and federal departments.

Three congressional committees, headed respectively by Representatives Elliott, Daddario and Reuss, have investigated the problem in recent years and had some harsh words to say about the detrimental effect of the present system of allocating federal research grants, in unbalancing the program of the small number of recipient institutions and weakening the overwhelming majority of American colleges. But they were no more able to agree on a politically feasible alternative than the academic community.

Of the remaining $1.3 billion in federal funds for higher education in the President's budget for 1966/67, $338 million are for various forms of student aid, $278 for construction and student loans and $518 million for construction grants. This leaves about $200 million for a dozen largely peripheral activities such as community services, teachers and counselors institutes, education of handicapped, civil rights activities, developing institutions, foreign areas training, instructional equipment, etc. Under present projections IHL will spend more than $7 billion for instructional and general purposes in the academic year 1966/67 and the federal contribution to this will thus be insignificant.

Construction grants, initiated in 1963 and expanded in 1965, are presently by far the most helpful form of federal aid to IHL. They assist hundreds of institutions in building needed classrooms, libraries, laboratories, etc. But they offer no relief on current operations because IHL almost never use current income for major construction purposes. Public IHL depend for building funds on earmarked state appropriations and proceeds of state bond issues while private IHL rely on dedicated donations.

The fact is that construction seldom presents as pressing or difficult a financial problem as faculty salaries because building funds are usually easier to obtain than unspecified general revenues. This is why IHL do not borrow to finance academic buildings, in contrast to private business and individuals who commonly raise funds for major capital outlays through long term loans. It is not that IHL could not sell their bonds at reasonable rates if they wanted to, but they have for many years entered the money market as investors rather than as borrowers (except for "self-financed" residence and dining halls). Their reason: future principal retirement and interest would cut into current revenues and restrict general operating funds. And college administrators and trustees are far more concerned about strengthening current fund income needed to pay faculty and other salaries than about construction money. They can have a great university in ancient or mediocre buildings—but not with a mediocre faculty. And whether we like it or not, the level of income that IHL are able to offer is a major—and possibly *the* major—factor in influencing the decisions of many of our most talented young men and women to choose an academic career rather than some other professional or business vocation. There is a positive correlation between faculty salaries and the caliber of professors in years to come. Buildings can be completed in two years or less but it takes close to a generation to build an eminent faculty.

To be sure, academic salaries have shown a most gratifying advance in recent years. They improved 47% (in price-adjusted dollars) over the past 10 years, compared with a general income increase of only half that size (professors + 55%, associate professors + 49%, assistant professors + 45%, instructors + 40%; per capita income + 24%).

But this has not quite made up for the lag in preceding decades and may not be adequate to meet competition, from government, industry and the professions unless the steep advance of the past decade is continued. Whether this is possible depends on whether IHL will be able to increase their current operating funds at a far more rapid rate than enrollment. And enrollment, as we all know, will continue to climb steeply in the next few years when a growing segment of the tidal wave of postwar babies which is now graduating from the high schools will seek admission to colleges.

State support of IHL has almost tripled in the past ten years, a far faster increase than almost anybody expected. With rapid enrollment growth in the common schools a thing of the past, the states are certain to keep raising their support of higher education not only in absolute terms but in relation to national income and to their revenues.

But there are also some clouds on the horizon. Until almost 1950 enrollment was about evenly divided between public and private IHL. Then the picture changed: more than three-fourths of the subsequent increase went to state and municipal institutions. Present prospects are that about 70% of all students will be in public institutions by 1970 and 80% prior to 1980. This shift will continue as long as the "tuition gap" keeps widening. The ratio between average tuitions in public and private IHL climbed from 1:3 ten years ago to 1:4 at the present time. For students who live on campus the gap is of course far narrower because room and board charges differ little. But total costs of attendance still average about 50% higher in private IHL than in state institutions.

It is therefore not surprising that a disproportionate and steadily growing share of the enrollment load rests on state institutions which dilutes even the dramatic appropriations boosts that legislatures have been voting regularly year after year. But the most serious impact of the shift to public IHL will be on private colleges some of which will be weakened to such an extent that their ability to offer a high-grade education and to continue in operation become increasingly doubtful.

To be sure, the big, well-known and well-endowed private universities and prestige colleges will weather the storm, possibly not without difficulty, but with certainty and a margin of safety. But hundreds of liberal arts colleges will not survive. Already, private colleges pay their faculty, on the average, over a thousand dollars a year less than state colleges. This cannot but affect the quality of the teaching staff they are able to attract and keep. Who will then want to pay a college with an inferior faculty four times as high a tuition as he would have to pay a state college? And as many private colleges under economic pressure lower their admission standards they will become havens for students who are more amply endowed financially than intellectually.

Voluntary donors have continued to increase their contributions to IHL but, save for old and well-established institutions, not at a rate adequate to meet all needs. Nor are spectacular boosts likely to boost as long as a perverse tax system discourages potential givers who are not in the highest tax brackets from making regular and sizable gifts to the college of their choice.

This will force IHL to keep boosting tuitions, whether they like it or not. At recent congressional hearings U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe warned that costs to undergraduates in public IHL had soared from $850 a year in 1940 to $1560 in 1965, in private IHL from $110 to $2370. What Mr. Howe did not mention is that the rate of increase—85% and 115% respectively—was less than that of consumer prices—125%—and far less than the simultaneous increase of 320% in per capita disposable personal income.

To put this in a capsule: the cost of college attendance to the student is now about half as much as it was twenty-five years ago in relation to per capita disposable personal income although per student expenditures of the institutions have climbed about as fast as personal income. In fact, all current expenditures of IHL now equal more than twice as large a percentage of the national income as they did in 1940—1.0% in 1940, 2.3% in 1965. This suggests, as most of us have suspected right along, that the student still gets a bargain in higher education. Higher education is not overpriced but, as Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton of the University of Chicago once told a group of university administrators, "It's hard to sell a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away."

The comparisons I used do not at all imply that families now find it easier to pay for college. Quite the contrary. The percentage of our young people who enter college has multiplied more than 2½ times in the past 25 years. A family that formerly counted itself fortunate if it managed to put one son through college will now try to enable several or all of its children to acquire a higher education. And it must do so if those young men and women later on are to fill any but manual jobs. The impact on average family finances has thus become much harder and in some cases disastrous. At a cost of 4 years of undergraduate education between $10,000 and $20,000 for each child, the burden is commonly far heavier than the requirements of mortage interest, state and local taxes, medical expenses or casualty losses—for which the tax law grants relief. Nonrecognition of college costs in evaluating a family's burden for tax purposes may have been justified in days when attendance was the privilege of a small well-to-do minority. It no longer is.

Students can keep costs to a minimum by attending a local college while living at home, and by working, and they can bear expenses more easily by borrowing. Their families can help greatly by systematic saving before the son or daughter reaches college age.

Nevertheless, students from families in the low income brackets will usually need a scholarship. Nobody knows how many scholarships are presently available but many believe that their number and amounts are inadequate. The Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, on the other hand, resolved in November 1965 (as it had done before) that "the association continues to oppose a general federal scholarship program, a) in the absence of evidence that it would in fact assure college attendance for an appreciable number of students who cannot now enroll under existing programs, b) in view of the higher priority needs for other forms of federal aid to education."

Over half a million additional scholarships will be made available by the new federal program of "opportunity grants," mostly to students from families with an income under $5,000. This leaves as the group which most urgently needs help with meeting college costs the group from which most college students come: the middle income families. It is the thought of those families that restrains many boards of trustees from raising tuitions to the level which their financial requirements call for (for students from lowest income backgrounds, tuitions can always be wholly or partially abated). Moreover, many private institutions feel that they cannot disregard the competition from public IHL which charge the student only a small fraction of the cost of his instruction.

To sum up the prospects: the strong and continuing shift of enrollment from private to public IHL further aggravates the serious financial situation in higher education. It increases the burdens of state taxpayers out of proportion, multiplies the problems at state IHL and at the same time weakens many or most of the private institutions. The nation's IHL will find it extremely difficult to boost their current revenues from state, donor and student sources at a rate which is sufficient to raise faculty salaries adequately to attract and keep enough of our most talented men and women as teachers for the new generation. Many institutions will manage to get by, somehow, through savings from greater operational efficiency and by sacrifices of their supporters. State institutions may have to forgo programs they deem important but they will survive and expand their enrollment. Numerous private colleges will lose the struggle, sooner or later.

Can the national government render effective help during these years of greatest strain? Not so long ago the question would have been whether the national government should aid higher education financially. But this is no longer an issue in academic or political circles. Both major parties have for years favored federal financial aid to higher education. The question is no longer one of whether but of how. How can the federal government provide effective aid for the major purposes of higher education?

We all know why no proposal for general operational support has ever been adopted or has much chance of being enacted for as far as we can see ahead: If the plan allocated funds only to public institutions—as the Zook Commission suggested in 1948—it would sound the death knell for a large percentage of the country's 1300 private IHL. If it included all private IHL on an equal and nondiscriminatory basis it would run head-on into the church-and-state controversy which had proven an insuperable obstacle to all such proposals. And if it allocated funds only to public and private secular institutions it would, in effect, offer an incentive premium to denominational institutions to sever their church ties. That would be like putting a penalty on the exercise of religion, a step that Congress is unlikely seriously to consider.

There is no simple way out of this dilemma. Some members of Congress will not vote for federal aid to higher education if it includes private IHL and some won't vote for it if it excludes them. We have reached an impasse and the truth is that there is no way in which effective aid can be rendered to IHL by the direct subsidy method. But the goal can be approached by indirect methods, by helping those who now support higher education to finance it more adequately. The three major non-federal sources for IHL are: states, students and donors. To aid states would solve nothing because they are blocked from subsidizing denominational IHL by the First Amendment and the Supreme Court as effectively as the national government. But students and their parents and donors can be assisted in better financing the institutions through a method which has found strong support in both political parties: federal income tax credits for tuitions and gifts. And thus, by the circuitous process of investigation and elimination of alternative routes I have arrived at what has been announced as the subject of my talk: tax credits for higher education.

Some forms of tax relief for education have long been established. The idea of helping IHL and their supporters through income tax concessions has been around for about 15 years, when the Yale Alumni Board first suggested it. I am not going to recount to you now the history of several dozen plans and hundreds of congressional bills for tax exemptions, deductions and flat percentage credits, for a very simple reason: none of those bills was ever seriously considered by a committee or the body of either the House or the Senate because none of those plans could have achieved what it set out to do. But I will give you a short rundown of the more promising developments in the past 3 years.

In May 1963 I was asked by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to testify on the then pending presidential proposal for aid to education. I concluded after studying the recommendations that they offered little tangible help with the major financial problems of IHL. Further, that various tax relief proposals, though equally well intentioned, suffered from a similar shortcoming.

It was apparent to me that IHL could be federally helped only through indirect means, that such a measure would have to aid institutions as well as the students and their parents, and that a rather intricate scheme was required to do justice both to high-tuition and low-tuition, to public and private IHL. I then conceived the idea of a graduated or sliding scale of federal income tax credits for tuition, coupled with credits for donations.

I presented such a plan to the committee on May 27, and on June 6 the then assistant majority leader Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, quoting from my testimony, announced on the floor of the Senate that he had introduced a bill to implement the plan:

"It is essential that an across-the-board tax credit program be initiated to assist every person currently facing the considerable expenses associated with higher education.

"The sliding tax credit schedule provides a sensible and workable system of federal assistance that helps every student, indirectly helps both public and private institutions, and does so in a manner that in no way interferes with individual or institutional freedom or policies. This bill, providing for a declining tax credit for expenditures on tuition, fees, books and supplies mitigates the distortion found in the large majority of bills that rely on tax deductions, additional exemptions, or non-variable tax credit. . . .

"While this tax credit proposal would not solve all the financial problems related to higher education, it would represent a significant contribution well within our national means. It would provide this assistance in a manner that avoids any argument about federal control of education and also the nagging question of church-state relations. Moreover, it would provide this aid without having to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer the program.

"Support in the Congress has been growing for this general approach to the problem of federal aid to higher education. I know the appropriate committees in both Houses are giving these proposals careful scrutiny and consideration. I hope that the Administration will consider seriously requesting such legislation from the Congress."

The graduated, or declining, percentage tax credit plan rapidly gained sponsors in both political parties and soon commanded a majority in the Senate. More than a hundred companion bills were introduced in the House. It was said in a Senate floor debate that "this should be called the Humphrey-Ribicoff-Goldwater-Keating bill" indicating that the supporters extended over the whole range of the political spectrum and that the plan seemed headed for early enactment.

But when the new administration turned against it early in 1964, the proposal failed in the Senate with a vote of 48 to 45 on February 4, 1964. U.S. News and World Report described the final vote:

"Barriers raised against the plan were on a rare scale. The Johnson Administration used every ounce of influence it could muster. . . . The final 48-to-45 count did not reveal the full strength of the drive for aid to parents of college students.

"As the roll call neared its end, the tally stood 44 to 44, then 45 to 45. It was at this point that the drive was halted by Administration supporters who, though backing the plan, had pledged their votes against the amendment if those votes were needed to block the bill. These Senators quickly went to the floor and cast the 'no' votes that defeated the Ribicoff amendment."

The Washington Post reported:

"This key roll call closed in breathtaking finish, with Democratic leaders producing the winning margin against the Amendment in the last few minutes of the tally.

"The leadership heat was really on, following a morning legislative conference on the tax bill at the White House. At least three 'loyal' Democrats, who were listed as cosponsors of the original Ribicoff college education amendment, cast their votes with the leadership to defeat it on the showdown."

The bill was resubmitted in the 89th Congress, co-sponsored by 18 Democratic and 17 Republican Senators and voted on, in the form of an amendment to a pending tax bill on March 9, 1966. It lost 47 to 37. Newspaper reports indicate what caused the defeat.

The Washington Post wrote:

"Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, former top White House congressional lobbyist, was rushed into the breach in the Senate last week. He was called on to help defeat the amendment of Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, to give parents a tax credit to offset the cost of college education.

"Without O'Brien, the Ribicoff amendment was slated to pass by a 46-to-44 vote. When O'Brien and White House aides got through twisting arms, nine Senators who had and surveillance of those policies and programs. The citizen has never had greater need of the protection afforded by the university than in the present epoch of centralization of power in the national state. But our great universities are engaged in abrogating their commitment."

Such utterances do not mean that school or university administrators or recipient researchers would want to give up federal funds or quit trying to get more. Rare indeed is the man who once having partaken of the sweet taste of federal cash can ever again resist its lure, no matter what its price. The monies provided valuable benefits in special areas and afford relief from certain pressures. But it is apparent that hopes for an easing of controls are bound to be disappointed. The evidence points at a steadily growing federal influence on the operation of schools and IHL.

The largest chunk of federal money, about $1.8 billion annually goes for research grants and contracts. That those funds have helped to advance our knowledge, particularly in the natural and life sciences, that they have enabled some universities to add eminent scholars to their faculty at very respectable salaries—usually by hiring them away from other colleges—that they have assisted in important tasks of the national government is beyond doubt. It is also agreed that they have not aided the recipient IHL financially and are therefore correctly not listed as aid to education in the U.S. budget. Some even hold that federally sponsored research is not paying its way and imposes a burden on the institutions.

A serious aspect of the federal research grants is their concentration among a small number of big universities: more than 90% of the money goes to 5% of all IHL which leaves the remaining 95% of institutions relatively poorer off than they were before. This has led to a "brain drain" from the medium and smaller institutions to the big, to an undue concentration of talent in a few places. It is making "the rich richer and the poor poorer," encourages a "flight from teaching," and causes grave imbalances and innumerable administrative difficulties within institutions and between the universities and federal departments.

Three congressional committees, headed respectively by Representatives Elliott, Daddario and Reuss, have investigated the problem in recent years and had some harsh words to say about the detrimental effect of the present system of allocating federal research grants, in unbalancing the program of the small number of recipient institutions and weakening the overwhelming majority of American colleges. But they were no more able to agree on a politically feasible alternative than the academic community.

Of the remaining $1.3 billion in federal funds for higher education in the President's budget for 1966/67, $338 million are for various forms of student aid, $278 for construction and student loans and $513 million for construction grants. This leaves about $200 million for a dozen largely peripheral activities such as community services, teachers and counselors institutes, education of handicapped, civil rights activities, developing institutions, foreign areas training, instructional equipment, etc. Under present projections IHL will spend more than $7 billion for instructional and general purposes in the academic year 1966/67 and the federal contribution to this will thus be insignificant.

Construction grants, initiated in 1963 and expanded in 1965, are presently by far the most helpful form of federal aid to IHL. They assist hundreds of institutions in building needed classrooms, libraries, laboratories, etc. But they offer no relief on current operations because IHL almost never use current income for major construction purposes. Public IHL depend for building funds on earmarked state appropriations and proceeds of state bond issues while private IHL rely on dedicated donations.

The fact is that construction seldom presents as pressing or difficult a financial problem as faculty salaries because building funds are usually easier to obtain than unspecified general revenues. This is why IHL do not borrow to finance academic buildings, in contrast to private business and individuals who commonly raise funds for major capital outlays through long term loans. It is not that IHL could not sell their bonds at reasonable rates if they wanted to, but they have for many years entered the money market as investors rather than as borrowers (except for "self-financed" residence and dining halls). Their reason: future principal retirement and interest would cut into current revenues and restrict general operating funds. And college administrators and trustees are far more concerned about strengthening current fund income needed to pay faculty and other salaries than about construction money. They can have a great university in ancient or mediocre buildings—but not with a mediocre faculty. And whether we like it or not, the level of income that IHL are able to offer is a major—and possibly *the* major—factor in influencing the decisions of many of our most talented young men and women to choose an academic career rather than some other professional or business vocation. There is a positive correlation between faculty salaries and the caliber of professors in years to come. Buildings can be completed in two years or less but it takes close to a generation to build an eminent faculty.

To be sure, academic salaries have shown a most gratifying advance in recent years. They improved 47% (in price-adjusted dollars) over the past 10 years, compared with a general income increase of only half that size (professors + 55%, associate professors + 49%, assistant professors + 45%, instructors + 40%; per capita income + 24%).

But this has not quite made up for the lag in preceding decades and may not be adequate to meet competition, from government, industry and the professions unless the steep advance of the past decade is continued. Whether this is possible depends on whether IHL will be able to increase their current operating funds at a far more rapid rate than enrollment. And enrollment, as we all know, will continue to climb steeply in the next few years when a growing segment of the tidal wave of postwar babies which is now graduating from the high schools will seek admission to colleges.

State support of IHL has almost tripled in the past ten years, a far faster increase than almost anybody expected. With rapid enrollment growth in the common schools a thing of the past, the states are certain to keep raising their support of higher education not only in absolute terms but in relation to national income and to their revenues.

But there are also some clouds on the horizon. Until almost 1950 enrollment was about evenly divided between public and private IHL. Then the picture changed: more than three-fourths of the subsequent increase went to state and municipal institutions. Present prospects are that about 70% of all students will be in public institutions by 1970 and 80% prior to 1980. This shift will continue as long as the "tuition gap" keeps widening. The ratio between average tuitions in public and private IHL climbed from 1:3 ten years ago to 1:4 at the present time. For students who live on campus the gap is of course far narrower because room and board charges differ little. But total costs of attendance still average about 50% higher in private IHL than in state institutions.

It is therefore not surprising that a disproportionate and steadily growing share of the enrollment load rests on state institutions which dilutes even the dramatic appropriations boosts that legislatures have been voting regularly year after year. But the most serious impact of the shift to public IHL will be on private colleges some of which will be weakened to such an extent that their ability to offer a high-grade education and to continue in operation become increasingly doubtful.

To be sure, the big, well-known and well-endowed private universities and prestige colleges will weather the storm, possibly not without difficulty, but with certainty and a margin of safety. But hundreds of liberal arts colleges will not survive. Already, private colleges pay their faculty, on the average, over a thousand dollars a year less than state colleges. This cannot but affect the quality of the teaching staff they are able to attract and keep. Who will then want to pay a college with an inferior faculty four times as high a tuition as he would have to pay a state college? And as many private colleges under economic pressure lower their admission standards they will become havens for students who are more amply endowed financially than intellectually.

Voluntary donors have continued to increase their contributions to IHL but, save for old and well-established institutions, not at a rate adequate to meet all needs. Nor are spectacular boosts likely to boost as long as a perverse tax system discourages potential givers who are not in the highest tax brackets from making regular and sizable gifts to the college of their choice.

This will force IHL to keep boosting tuitions, whether they like it or not. At recent congressional hearings U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe warned that costs to undergraduates in public IHL had soared from $850 a year in 1940 to $1560 in 1965, in private IHL from $110 to $2370. What Mr. Howe did not mention is that the rate of increase—85% and 115% respectively—was less than that of consumer prices—125%—and far less than the simultaneous increase of 320% in per capita disposable personal income.

To put this in a capsule: the cost of college attendance to the student is now about half as much as it was twenty-five years ago in relation to per capita disposable personal income although per student expenditures of the institutions have climbed about as fast as personal income. In fact, all current expenditures of IHL now equal more than twice as large a percentage of the national income as they did in 1940—1.0% in 1940, 2.3% in 1965. This suggests, as most of us have suspected right along, that the student still gets a bargain in higher education. Higher education is not overpriced but, as Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton of the University of Chicago once told a group of university administrators, "It's hard to sell a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away."

The comparisons I used do not at all imply that families now find it easier to pay for college. Quite the contrary. The percentage of our young people who enter college has multiplied more than 2½ times in the past 25 years. A family that formerly counted itself fortunate if it managed to put one son through college will now try to enable several or all of its children to acquire a higher education. And it must do so if those young men and women later on are to fill any but manual jobs. The impact on average family finances has thus become much harder and in some cases disastrous. At a cost of 4 years of undergraduate education between $10,000 and $20,000 for each child, the burden is commonly far heavier than the requirements of mortage interest, state and local taxes, medical expenses or casualty losses—for which the tax law grants relief. Nonrecognition of college costs in evaluating a family's burden for tax purposes may have been justified in days when attendance was the privilege of a small well-to-do minority. It no longer is.

Students can keep costs to a minimum by attending a local college while living at home, and by working, and they can bear expenses more easily by borrowing. Their families can help greatly by systematic saving before the son or daughter reaches college age.

Nevertheless, students from families in the low income brackets will usually need a scholarship. Nobody knows how many scholarships are presently available but many believe that their number and amounts are inadequate. The Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, on the other hand, resolved in November 1965 (as it had done before) that "the association continues to oppose a general federal scholarship program, a) in the absence of evidence that it would in fact assure college attendance for an appreciable number of students who cannot now enroll under existing programs, b) in view of the higher priority needs for other forms of federal aid to education."

Over half a million additional scholarships will be made available by the new federal program of "opportunity grants," mostly to students from families with an income under $5,000. This leaves as the group which most urgently needs help with meeting college costs the group from which most college students come: the middle income families. It is the thought of those families that restrains many boards of trustees from raising tuitions to the level which their financial requirements call for (for students from lowest income backgrounds, tuitions can always be wholly or partially abated). Moreover, many private institutions feel that they cannot disregard the competition from public IHL which charge the student only a small fraction of the cost of his instruction.

To sum up the prospects: the strong and continuing shift of enrollment from private to public IHL further aggravates the serious financial situation in higher education. It increases the burdens of state taxpayers out of proportion, multiplies the problems at state IHL and at the same time weakens many or most of the private institutions. The nation's IHL will find it extremely difficult to boost their current revenues from state, donor and student sources at a rate which is sufficient to raise faculty salaries adequately to attract and keep enough of our most talented men and women as teachers for the new generation. Many institutions will manage to get by, somehow, through savings from greater operational efficiency and by sacrifices of their supporters. State institutions may have to forgo programs they deem important but they will survive and expand their enrollment. Numerous private colleges will lose the struggle, sooner or later.

Can the national government render effective help during these years of greatest strain? Not so long ago the question would have been whether the national government should aid higher education financially. But this is no longer an issue in academic or political circles. Both major parties have for years favored federal financial aid to higher education. The question is no longer one of whether but of how. How can the federal government provide effective aid for the major purposes of higher education?

We all know why no proposal for general operational support has ever been adopted or has much chance of being enacted for as far as we can see ahead: If the plan allocated funds only to public institutions—as the Zook Commission suggested in 1948—it would sound the death knell for a large percentage of the country's 1300 private IHL. If it included all private IHL on an equal and nondiscriminatory basis it would run head-on into the church-and-state controversy which had proven an insuperable obstacle to all such proposals. And if it allocated funds only to public and private secular institutions it would, in effect, offer an incentive premium to denominational institutions to sever their church ties. That would be like putting a penalty on the exercise of religion, a step that Congress is unlikely seriously to consider.

There is no simple way out of this dilemma. Some members of Congress will not vote for federal aid to higher education if it includes private IHL and some won't vote for it if it excludes them. We have reached an impasse and the truth is that there is no way in which effective aid can be rendered to IHL by the direct subsidy method. But the goal can be approached by indirect methods, by helping those who now support higher education to finance it more adequately. The three major non-federal sources for IHL are: states, students and donors. To aid states would solve nothing because they are blocked from subsidizing denominational IHL by the First Amendment and the Supreme Court as effectively as the national government. But students and their parents and donors can be assisted in better financing the institutions through a method which has found strong support in both political parties: federal income tax credits for tuitions and gifts. And thus, by the circuitous process of investigation and elimination of alternative routes I have arrived at what has been announced as the subject of my talk: tax credits for higher education.

Some forms of tax relief for education have long been established. The idea of helping IHL and their supporters through income tax concessions has been around for about 15 years, when the Yale Alumni Board first suggested it. I am not going to recount to you now the history of several dozen plans and hundreds of congressional bills for tax exemptions, deductions and flat percentage credits, for a very simple reason: none of those bills was ever seriously considered by a committee or the body of either the House or the Senate because none of those plans could have achieved what it set out to do. But I will give you a short rundown of the more promising developments in the past 3 years.

In May 1963 I was asked by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to testify on the then pending presidential proposal for aid to education. I concluded after studying the recommendations that they offered little tangible help with the major financial problems of IHL. Further, that various tax relief proposals, though equally well intentioned, suffered from a similar shortcoming.

It was apparent to me that IHL could be federally helped only through indirect means, that such a measure would have to aid institutions as well as the students and their parents, and that a rather intricate scheme was required to do justice both to high-tuition and low-tuition, to public and private IHL. I then conceived the idea of a graduated or sliding scale of federal income tax credits for tuition, coupled with credits for donations.

I presented such a plan to the committee on May 27, and on June 6 the then assistant majority leader Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, quoting from my testimony, announced on the floor of the Senate that he had introduced a bill to implement the plan:

"It is essential that an across-the-board tax credit program be initiated to assist every person currently facing the considerable expenses associated with higher education.

"The sliding tax credit schedule provides a sensible and workable system of federal assistance that helps every student, indirectly helps both public and private institutions, and does so in a manner that in no way interferes with individual or institutional freedom or policies. This bill, providing for a declining tax credit for expenditures on tuition, fees, books and supplies mitigates the distortion found in the large majority of bills that rely on tax deductions, additional exemptions, or non-variable tax credit. . . .

"While this tax credit proposal would not solve all the financial problems related to higher education, it would represent a significant contribution well within our national means. It would provide this assistance in a manner that avoids any argument about federal control of education and also the nagging question of church-state relations. Moreover, it would provide this aid without having to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer the program.

"Support in the Congress has been growing for this general approach to the problem of federal aid to higher education. I know the appropriate committees in both Houses are giving these proposals careful scrutiny and consideration. I hope that the Administration will consider seriously requesting such legislation from the Congress."

The graduated, or declining, percentage tax credit plan rapidly gained sponsors in both political parties and soon commanded a majority in the Senate. More than a hundred companion bills were introduced in the House. It was said in a Senate floor debate that "this should be called the Humphrey-Ribicoff-Goldwater-Keating bill" indicating that the supporters extended over the whole range of the political spectrum and that the plan seemed headed for early enactment.

But when the new administration turned against it early in 1964, the proposal failed in the Senate with a vote of 48 to 45 on February 4, 1964. U.S. News and World Report described the final vote:

"Barriers raised against the plan were on a rare scale. The Johnson Administration used every ounce of influence it could muster. . . . The final 48-to-45 count did not reveal the full strength of the drive for aid to parents of college students.

"As the roll call neared its end, the tally stood 44 to 44, then 45 to 45. It was at this point that the drive was halted by Administration supporters who, though backing the plan, had pledged their votes against the amendment if those votes were needed to block the bill. These Senators quickly went to the floor and cast the 'no' votes that defeated the Ribicoff amendment."

The Washington Post reported:

"This key roll call closed in breathtaking finish, with Democratic leaders producing the winning margin against the Amendment in the last few minutes of the tally.

"The leadership heat was really on, following a morning legislative conference on the tax bill at the White House. At least three 'loyal' Democrats, who were listed as cosponsors of the original Ribicoff college education amendment, cast their votes with the leadership to defeat it on the showdown."

The bill was resubmitted in the 89th Congress, co-sponsored by 18 Democratic and 17 Republican Senators and voted on, in the form of an amendment to a pending tax bill on March 9, 1966. It lost 47 to 37. Newspaper reports indicate what caused the defeat.

The Washington Post wrote:

"Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, former top White House congressional lobbyist, was rushed into the breach in the Senate last week. He was called on to help defeat the amendment of Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, to give parents a tax credit to offset the cost of college education.

"Without O'Brien, the Ribicoff amendment was slated to pass by a 46-to-44 vote. When O'Brien and White House aides got through twisting arms, nine Senators who had planned to support the amendment were peeled away."

The Washington Star wrote:

"A supporter of the amendment said the White House 'snapped the whip' and 'lashed' Senators into line against the proposal.

"White House pressure persuaded even some of the amendment's cosponsors to vote against it."

The New York Herald Tribune wrote:

"Senate sources reported that Presidential appointments Secretary W. Marvin Watson had called key legislators on the eve of the showdown and told them that 'they were through' at the White House if they backed the Ribicoff plan.

"Mr. Watson, these sources said, emphasized that he was speaking for the President who, they said, was prepared to deal them out of all Federal patronage and projects if 'you cross him on this vote.'"

I have quoted newspaper reports extensively in order to demonstrate that this issue developed into a test of strength between the President and Congress and that Congress, as it usually has in the past 2½ years, lost. What this indicates for the future of the plan, I refrain from speculating on.

But I do want to give you the main features of the plan, and discuss some of the objections to it.

The tuition tax credit plan—whose percentage scale was slightly modified from my original proposal by a group of senators who had banded together to promote the idea—would permit anybody who pays for tuitions, fees, books and supplies for a student at an IHL (whether the payer be the student himself, his parents or a benefactor) 75% of the first $200, 25% of the next $300 and 10% of the next $1,000. This means that expenses of $300 would allow a credit of $175 (58%), expenses of $1500 a credit of $325 (22%). The scale is heavily weighted in favor of the low-tuition institutions where it wipes out the greater part or most of the tuition cost. The credit starts tapering off from an income of $25,000 on and vanishes at $57,500.

The Treasury Department estimated that the Ribicoff-Dominick plan (so named after its main sponsors in the Senate) would cost $750 million a year, gradually rising to $1.3 billion, and that 62% of the credits would accrue to beneficiaries with an income between $3,000 and $10,000, 91% to persons with an income under $20,000.

In other words: the tax credit plan offers little or nothing to the rich, little or nothing to the poor and aims at easing the future college burden of the vast majority of students who come from families "in between." Students from families with so low an income that they pay no or little income tax probably account for less than 10% of the enrollment. Most of them, as I mentioned earlier, are probably on a scholarship of one type or another. The granting of tuition tax credits would not only free more scholarships for students from a low-income background, it would also stimulate thousands of potential donors to offer scholarships to needy students for which they would receive credits on their income tax.

Some have declared tuition tax credits to be unfair because they would provide no direct benefits to persons who pay no income tax. That is like saying that for example the 1964 income tax deduction was unfair to low-income persons who pay no tax because they did not benefit from the cut; or that personal exemptions and deductions are unfair to persons whose income is wholly derived from social security, unemployment compensation or public assistance because they cannot take advantage of them.

If, however, it were felt desirable to make direct benefits available to persons who pay no income tax, the tax credits could be made absolute, as I suggested to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare and Finance Committees: a potential recipient would compute his income tax including his tuition tax credit and if his return winds up with a final net credit it would be paid to him, like any other net credit on an income tax return.

Some have even claimed that tuition tax credits would be unfair to persons who have no college expenses. That is like saying that deductions for medical expenses, casualty losses or state taxes are unfair to persons who incur no such outlays. I do not believe that such contrived and specious arguments deserve to be taken seriously.

You may have noted that I referred to benefits to students and their parents while earlier I was talking about helping the institutions. Opponents to educational tax credits have criticized the suggestion that both, institutions and students, would be benefited. Obviously, they say, it can be only one or the other.

But this is a misunderstanding. IHL have been steadily boosting their tuitions and if they continue to do—as they most certainly will—tax credits will enable them to receive substantial additional revenue without imposing a commensurate burden on their students. A significant share of the tuition increase will be borne by the Treasury and not by the students. Thus the benefits will in all likelihood be split between students and institutions.

The Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges wrote in a circular letter dated February 27, 1963:

"While the plan has been 'sold' to many parents as a means of getting financial relief from the federal treasury for the cost of sending children to college, it was in origin and is in its primary intent, a plan to siphon off substantial amounts from the federal treasury for support of colleges and universities."

Opponents in the 1964 and 1966 debates quoted repeatedly from my statements to the two Senate committees in order to prove that what I really intended to do was to help institutions more than parents. I may as well admit that I do not regard the aim to aid colleges and universities at this point in time to be of a sinister nature nor a nefarious plot which needs to be unmasked. I can see nothing wrong with helping students and their families support the college of their choice. Aid to parents and to institutions are simply two sides of a coin which cannot be divided though some pretend that the one side they are looking at is the whole coin. It seems to me that the charge that a plan would "siphon off substantial amounts from the federal treasury for the support of colleges and universities" comes in particular ill grace from groups which have long been leading a campaign to channel large federal funds into higher education—provided that their member institutions and no others were the only beneficiaries.

Nobody has ever seriously asked whether the tax law permits the deduction of gifts for educational, charitable and religious activities because it wants to aid the donor or the activity. We take it for granted that it is the intent of the provision to help the giver give, to motivate and enable him to give more for a cause that is held to be in the public interest. Similarly, tuition tax credits are not intended to help the taxpayer as such but to help him support the college of his choice.

It is significant that the cost of tax credits and their impact on the U.S. budget deficit are being quoted as an argument by groups which advocate sharply increased federal spending for purposes in which they have a stake. The budget deficit, it seems, is of concern only when it is occasioned by a reduction in revenues through tax credits, but irrelevant to the extent to which it is caused by direct federal expenditures.

Opponents say that institutions could benefit from tax credits only if they boosted tuitions and that higher tuitions would raise barriers for students from low-income backgrounds who would receive no benefits from the credits. The fact is of course that tuitions have been climbing steadily and will certainly continue to do so. The U.S. Office of Education prepared a projection—assuredly not based on the possible approval of tax credits—according to which average tuitions will rise from $222 in 1964/65 to $760 in 1980/81 at public IHL, and from 831 in 1964/65 to $1815 in 1980/81 at private IHL. Those are very steep boosts which families will find hard to bear unless they are granted relief in some form.

It is frivolous and nearly slanderous to charge—as some have—that boards of trustees would boost tuitions simply for the purpose of raiding the treasury, if income tax credits were made available. Boards approve tuition increases only when the financial needs of the institutions demand it—and often not even then. The question is whether students will have to bear the whole impact or only part of it. It is obvious that students from low-income backgrounds can easily be protected by being given a reduction or exemption from tuition boosts.

Another form of income tax credit can be at least as beneficial to institutions as tuition tax credit, if not more so: credits for donations. On the whole, voluntary contributions have been showing a healthy and encouraging upward trend which appears to be continuing. But the gifts are too heavily concentrated among a limited number of wealthy individuals and families, and among a small number of "name" institutions. Most others get merely the crumbs. The great majority of alumni, who acquired their education at a fraction of the true cost they caused their alma mater, do not now regularly contribute to the education of new generations through gifts to IHL. Under our progressive tax rate scale, gifts cost persons in the high tax brackets only 40% or 30% of the amount. But for taxpayers in the lower brackets the net cost may be up to 86%. This acts as an effective deterrent to the great mass of middle- and low-income earners.

If an individual could deduct up to say $100 or $500 in gifts to IHL from his tax liability, hundreds of thousands, or possibly millions, of alumni and others would be willing to obligate themselves to a regular annual contribution to their alma mater, or to some other institution in which they are interested. The advantage of such a plan would not only be the additional funds flowing into higher education but the wider and more even distribution of gifts among IHL and the lessened dependence of some institutions on a few wealthy donors. A college can plan ahead with much greater assurance if it has 10,000 annual contributors of $100 each than if it tries and hopes to get $1 million from one individual. Gift tax credits, with a higher ceiling, say $5,000, should also be available to corporations whose boards of directors would then find it far easier to justify to their stockholders regular contributions to higher education.

I probably should mention another objection to educational tax credits, namely that they would open another loophole in our tax structure. This would be a valid argument if the federal income tax otherwise were comprehensive. The fact is however that less than half of all personal income is subject to the tax because 55% of the personal income, or about $300 billion annually, now escapes income taxation because of deductions, exemptions, exclusions and credits. And while I am at this I may as well slay a widely believed myth of who the beneficiaries of these so-called loopholes are: in the lowest income group, under $3,000 adjusted gross income annually, only 26% of

AGI is taxed. The percentage then rises with income and equals 80% of incomes from $25,000 on up.

As long as the tax law is so generous, and there is not the remotest chance that this will ever be changed to a significant degree, why should education remain a stepchild? Four years ago, Congress authorized, at the President's recommendation, tax credits for investment in industrial plants. Then Presidents Kennedy and Johnson proposed tax credits for political contributions. Some may of course feel that plant investment and political contribution merit greater consideration than education and they are certainly entitled to that belief. This is a question of relative values for which there is no factual proof.

In conclusion: It seems to me that federal income tax credits for college expenses and donations are the most effective way by which the national government can aid higher education. In fact, they are the only method by which it can assist with the most crucial problem in college finance: how to supply the institutions with funds to hire not only more teachers but to attract to the academic profession the nation's most talented men and women.

Polls by the American Council on Education, by the Citizens National Committee on Higher Education, by the Columbia Broadcasting System and others prove that educational tax credits have the overwhelming support of administrators of colleges and universities as well as of the American public at large.

Only one group showed a slight majority in opposition: the presidents—but not the trustees—of state universities and colleges. They are, in my opinion, working against their own interest. Tax credits which aid both public and private IHL would help to distribute the enrollment load more evenly, relieve pressures on state institutions and augment the revenues of public and private IHL alike. The sliding scale formula incorporated in the Ribicoff-Dominick plan is heavily weighted in favor of public institutions. I may now admit that I originally expected public IHL to support the idea enthusiastically while private IHL would complain that the formula was slanted against them. In that expectation I was apparently in error. But in the position they are taking, the heads of public IHL opposing educational tax credits are in my opinion grievously mistaken—as are the heads of a few private universities who have been successful in attracting a large share of the federal research grants as well as sizable gifts from affluent donors and, being beati possidentes, see no reason for a change in the status quo. I trust that sooner or later they too will see the light.

I can offer only one possible explanation for the vehement and sometimes emotional opposition of some circles to educational tax credits: tax credits would strengthen the decision-making power of the individual institutions and their governing boards over the spending of their funds and widen the choice of students and parents in the selection of a college. But many observers are convinced that today's world calls for a stronger national policy or policies in education, that such policies can best or only be carried out if the national government sets the course, parcels out money in small amounts for specified purposes and controls its spending. They believe that a unified public policy is best implemented through public institutions, and that diversity in higher education is divisive, undesirable and should be restricted to the smallest possible segment of students. They naturally favor a continuation of the present trend of multiplying earmarked grants and are unalterably opposed to educational tax credits. To be sure, some believers in a stronger national government have had second thoughts about concentration of power and the weak position in which it places nonconformists, when they came to disagree with certain federal policies in the last year or two. But their dissent happens to concern foreign policy and they have not applied the lesson from their current brush with centralized power to their stand on domestic policy.

It is easy to predict what will happen if present trends continue. At the 1960 convention of the Association of American Colleges, President Louis T. Benezet of the Claremont Graduate School and University Center said:

"We may expect to see the monumental construction of state university metropolises on the one hand and on the other the disappearance of most of the private colleges—perhaps in a state junior college system, or possibly into mental hospitals, another growing public need."

This, it seems to me, is a realistic outlook. Whether the future it envisages is desirable or not is a matter of political philosophy.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

IRRIGATION PROJECT FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1333, S. 3034.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 6, line 17, after "Hay Springs," to strike out "Nebraska," and insert "Nebraska;" on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

Devil Canyon project, on the Sustina River about midway between the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska;

At the beginning of line 9, to strike out "completion" and insert "completion of such studies:"; on page 12, in line 6, after the word "in" to strike out "northwestern" and insert "northeastern"; on page 14, line 21, after the word "of" to strike out "Douglass" and insert "Douglas,"; on page 15, line 3, after "Sec. 3." to strike out:

The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on—

(a) the following proposals, presently scheduled for initiation on or before June 30, 1967:

REGION 1

Umpqua River project, Azalea division, on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon.

REGION 2

North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California.

REGION 3

Boulder Canyon project, All American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit, on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California.

Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

REGION 6 .

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota.

REGION 7

Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas; and

(b) the following proposals, presently scheduled for initiation after June 30, 1967:

REGION 1

Chehalis River project, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon.

REGION 2

Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

REGION 4

Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah.

REGION 5

Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

REGION 6

Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota.

REGION 7

Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on the following proposals:

REGION 1

Umpqua River project, Azalea division on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

Chehalis River project, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho Water Development project, Bruneau division in the vicinity of Bruneau in southwest Idaho;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit.

REGION 2

North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California;

Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

REGION 3

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

REGION 4

Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

Price River project, Price River Basin in eastern Utah.

REGION 5

Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

REGION 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flat and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Lower Bighorn division, Hardin unit on the Bighorn River near Hardin, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

REGION 7

Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas.

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming.

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Kanaska division, Nelson Buck union on Beaver Creek in northwestern Kansas.

On page 21, in line 9, after "SEC. 4." to strike out "The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on additional proposals when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources." and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary may accelerate feasibility studies authorized by law when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources."; and in line 16 insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes", approved June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 2";

(2) by striking out "That" at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, that"; and

(3) by inserting at the end of such section two new subsections as follows:

"(b) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest to receive financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system shall receive such assistance only from the net revenues of that system as provided in this subsection, and that their construction shall be so scheduled that the financial assistance, together with similar financial assistance for previously authorized reclamation projects (including projects not receiving financial assistance for which the Congress hereafter may authorize financial assistance) will not cause increases in the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration. In no event shall such financial assistance from net revenues be required in any case before the last year of the period authorized by law for repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the water users; nor shall any such project receive such assistance prior to the year 2026; nor shall the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest average more than $30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years beginning with the year 2026. Any analyses and studies authorized by the Congress for reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section. As used in this section, the term 'net revenues' as determined from time to time means revenues not required for the repayment of (1) all costs allocable to power at projects in the Pacific Northwest then existing or authorized, including the cost of acquiring power by purchase or exchange, and (2) presently authorized assistance from power to irrigation at projects in the Pacific Northwest existing and authorized prior to the date of enactment of this subsection."

"(c) On December 20, 1974, and thereafter at intervals coinciding with anniversary dates of Federal Power Commission general review of the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Secretary of the Interior shall recommend to the Congress any changes in the dollar limitations herein placed upon financial assistance to Pacific Northwest reclamation projects that he believes justified by changes in the cost-price levels existing on July 1, 1966, or by other relevant changes of circumstances."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

(a) to perform such additional analysis and studies as may be required on the following proposals which are pending before the Congress:

REGION 1

Chief Joseph Dam project, Chelan division, Manson unit, along Lake Chelan in north-central Washington;

Columbia Basin project, third powerplant, on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division, on Jumpoff Joe Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Tualatin project, first phase, on the Tualatin River, near the city of Portland, Oregon;

Walla Walla project, Touchet division, on the Touchet River in southeastern Washington;

Yakima project, Kennewick division extension, near the mouth of the Yakima River in south-central Washington.

REGION 3

Lower Colorado River Basin project, in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

REGION 5

Canton project on the Canadian River below the existing Canton Reservoir in northwestern Oklahoma;

Columbus Bend project on the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas;

Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas.

REGION 7

Missouri River Basin project, Midstate division, on the north side of the Platte River in central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, North Loup division, on the North Loup and Loup Rivers in east-central Nebraska; and

(b) to complete his analysis and studies and to prepare and process reports on the following proposals, which he anticipates will be completed or substantially completed on or before June 30, 1966:

REGION 1

Challis project, Challis Creek division, on Challis Creek in southern Idaho;

Rathdrum Prairie project, Prairie division, East Greenacres unit in Idaho, along the Idaho-Washington State line east of Spokane, Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Illinois Valley division, on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Mountain Home division, in the Snake River Basin near the cities of Boise and Mountain Home, Idaho;

Umpqua River project, Olalla division, on Olalla and Lookingglass Creeks in the south Umpqua Basin in southwestern Oregon;

Upper Snake River project; upper Star Valley division, on Salt River and Cow Creek, near the town of Afton, Wyoming;

Willamette River project, Monmouth-Dallas division, on the west side of the Willamette River in the vicinity of Monmouth and Dallas, Oregon;

Willamette River project, Red Prairie division, along the South Yamhill River near the town of Sheridan, Oregon;

Yakima project, Bumping Lake enlargement, on Bumping River in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

REGION 2

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, initial phase, in and adjacent to the Cosumnes River Basin east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, peripheral canal in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, Kellogg unit, south of the city of Antioch, California;

Central Valley project, east side division, initial phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Sacramento River division, West Sacramento canal unit, on the west side of the Sacramento River Valley and in the Putah Creek Basin in California;

Central Valley project, San Felipe division, in the Santa Clara and Pajaro River Basins in the central coastal area of California;

Sespe Creek project, on the Santa Clara River and tributaries in southern California;

Walker River project on the Walker River in west-central California and east-central Nevada.

REGION 4

Bear River project, first phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho.

REGION 5

Chikaskia project on the Chikaskia River in south-central Kansas and north-central Oklahoma;

Cuero project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas;

Liberty Bottoms project on the Red River below Denison Dam in south-central Oklahoma;

Mountain Park project in the vicinity of Altus, Oklahoma;

San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division, in the Rio Grande Basin in south-central Colorado.

REGION 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit (exclusive of Mitchell area), involving the diversion of water from the existing Oahe Reservoir into the James River Valley;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Wagner unit on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Fort Randall Dam in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, Jefferson and Whitehall units on the Big Hole and Jefferson Rivers above Canyon Ferry Dam in southwestern Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, West Bench unit, on the Big Hole River in southwestern Montana near the town of Dillon;

Missouri River Basin project, White division, Pine Ridge unit, on the White River in southwestern South Dakota.

REGION 7

Mirage Flats project on the upper Niobrara River near Hay Springs, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Cedar Rapids division, on the Cedar and Loup Rivers near Spalding, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, lower Niobrara division, O'Neill unit, on the lower Niobrara River in north-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Ellis unit, on Big Creek in west-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, South Platte division, Narrows Unit, on the South Platte River near Fort Morgan, Colorado.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue feasibility studies on the following proposals, which are presently under study and which will require further study before completion of such studies:

REGION 1

Burnt River project, Dark Canyon division, on the Burnt River in west-central Oregon;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Okanogan unit, on the Okanogan River in north-central Washington;

Deschutes project, Central division, in the Deschutes and Crooked River Basins in central Oregon;

Flathead River project, encompassing the Flathead River Basin in northwestern Montana;

Grand Ronde project on the Grande Ronde River in northeastern Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Applegate Valley division, on Applegate Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, near the city of Grants Pass, Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Medford division, on the Rogue River in the vicinity of the town of Medford, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Garden Valley division, along the Payette River and in the general vicinity of Boise, Idaho;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Weiser River division, in the Weiser River Basin in Idaho.

Umatilla Basin project, encompassing the Umatilla River Basin, centering near the town of Pendleton, Oregon;

Upper Snake River project, American Falls Dam replacement on the Snake River near the city of American Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Lynn Crandall division, on the Snake River below Palisades Dam in southern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project Salmon Falls division, south of the Snake River, near the city of Twin Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Snake Plains recharge division, encompassing the Snake River Plains area north of the Snake River insouthern Idaho;

Walla Walla project, Marcus Whitman and Milton-Freewater divisions, in the Walla Walla River Basin in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington;

Willamette River project, Carlton division, on the Yamhill River in northwestern Oregon;

Willamette River propect, Molalla division, on the Molalla and Pudding Rivers in northwestern Oregon;

Yakima project, Ahtanum unit, on Ahtanum Creek in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

REGION 2

Central Valley project, American River division, Placerville Ridge unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, Fair Play unit, on the Middle Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, East Side division, ultimate phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Stanislaus River division, Sonora-Keystone unit on the Stanislaus River in the general vicinity of Sonora, California;

Lompoc project on the lower Santa Ynez River in southern California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, English Ridge unit, on the upper Eel River and in the Putah Creek and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, Knights Valley unit in the Russian River Basin and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, ultimate phase, in the Eel River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Klamath River division, in the Lower Klamath River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Trinity River division (exclusive of Paskenta-Newville Reservoir), encompassing that portion of the Trinity River Basin below the existing Lewiston Dam of the Central Valley project, the upper portion of the Mad and Van Duzen Rivers and the west side tributaries of the Sacramento River in California;

North Coast project, lower Trinity River division. Paskenta-Newville Dam and Reservoir on Stony and Thomes Creeks in the Sacramento River Basin in California;

Ventura River project extension in the Ventura River Basin near Ventura, California;

Washoe project, Hope Valley division, on the Carson River in California and Nevada;

Washoe project, Newlands extension division, on the lower Carson River near the city of Fallon, Nevada.

REGION 3

Black River-Springerville-Saint Johns project on the Black River and Little Colorado River near Springerville and Saint Johns, Arizona;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Coachella division, on the Coachella Canal in southern California;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Imperial division, on the All-American Canal and the Imperial Valley distribution system in southern California;

Flagstaff-Williams project, near the cities of Flagstaff and Williams, Arizona;

Kingman project, on the Colorado River and near the city of Kingman, Arizona;

Moapa Valley pumping project in the Muddy River Basin in southern Nevada;

San Pedro-Santa Cruz project in the San Pedro and Santa Cruz River Basins in southeastern Arizona;

Upper Gila River project on the Gila River and its tributaries in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona.

REGION 4

Bear River project, second phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho;

Central Utah project, ultimate phase, Uintah unit, on the Whiterock and Uinta Rivers in northeastern Utah.

REGION 5

Brantley project on the Pecos River upstream from Carlsbad, New Mexico;

Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in the San Antonio River Basin in Texas;

Eastern New Mexico water supply project in northeastern New Mexico;

Nueces River project on Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas;

Portales project near the town of Portales in eastern New Mexico;

Retrop project on the North Fork of the Red River in the vicinity of the W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma;

Rio Grande water salvage project, New Mexico division, on the Rio Grande River between the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and the existing Caballo Reservoir;

Texas Basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

REGION 6

Missouri River Basin project, Big Horn Basin division, Shoshone extension unit, Polecat Bench area, in northwestern Wyoming near the city of Powell;

Missouri River Basin project, Cannonball division, Mott unit, on the Cannonball River in southwestern North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Helena-Great Falls division, Fort Benton unit, on the

Missouri River in north-central Montana near the town of Fort Benton;

Missouri River Basin project, Musselshall division, Lower Musselshell unit, on the lower reaches of the Musselshell River near the town of Mosby, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Powder division, Kaycee unit, on the Middle Fork and main stem of the Powder River in northeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Marias division, Marias-Milk unit, in the Marias and Milk River Basins in north-central Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Pollock-Herreid unit, on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Sun-Teton division, Sun-Teton unit on the Sun and Teton Rivers in the vicinity of Great Falls, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Billings pump unit, at the city of Billings, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Cracker Box and Stipek units, along the Yellowstone River near the town of Glendive, Montana.

REGION 7

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Little Blue unit, along the Little Blue River in south-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division Sunbeam unit, on the West Fork of the Big Blue River in southeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Laramie division, Wheatland unit, on the Laramie River in southeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Mount Evans division, Upper South Platte unit, on the South Platte River near the city of Denver, Colorado;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, La Prele unit, on La Prele Creek, near the town of Douglas, Wyoming.

ALASKA

Lake Grace project on Grace Creek on Revillagigedo Island, Alaska;

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on the following proposals:

REGION 1

Umpqua River project, Azalea division on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

Chehalis River project, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho Water Development project, Bruneau division in the vicinity of Bruneau in southwest Idaho;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit.

REGION 2

North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California;

Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

REGION 3

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

REGION 4

Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

Price River project, Price River Basin in eastern Utah.

REGION 5

Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

REGION 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Lower Bighorn division, Hardin unit on the Bighorn River near Hardin, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

REGION 7

Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Kanaska division, Nelson Buck union on Beaver Creek in northwestern Kansas.

Sec. 4. The Secretary may accelerate feasibility studies authorized by law when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources.

Sec. 5. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes", approved June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 2";

(2) by striking out "That" at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, that"; and

(3) by inserting at the end of such section two new subsections as follows:

"(b) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest to receive financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system shall receive such assistance only from the net revenues of that system as provided in this subsection, and that their construction shall be so scheduled that the financial assistance, together with similar financial assistance for previously authorized reclamation projects (including projects not receiving financial assistance for which the Congress hereafter may authorize financial assistance) will not cause increases in the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration. In no event shall such financial assistance from net revenues be required in any case before the last year of the period authorized by law for repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the water users; nor shall any such project receive such assistance prior to the year 2026; nor shall the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest average more than $30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years beginning with the year 2026. Any analyses and studies authorized by the Congress for reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section. As used in this section, the term 'net revenues' as determined from time to time means revenues not required for the repayment of (1) all costs allocable to power at projects in the Pacific Northwest then existing or authorized, including the cost of acquiring power by purchase or exchange, and (2) presently authorized assistance from power to irrigation at projects in the Pacific Northwest existing and authorized prior to the date of enactment of this subsection."

"(c) On December 20, 1974, and thereafter at intervals coinciding with anniversary dates of Federal Power Commission general review of the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Secretary of the Interior shall recommend to the Congress any changes in the dollar limitations herein placed upon financial assistance to Pacific Northwest reclamation projects that he believes justified by changes in the cost-price levels existing on July 1, 1966, or by other relevant changes of circumstances."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the measure now before the Senate, S. 3034, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals. This bill, which I introduced by request, was submitted by the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 8 of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (Public Law 89–72, 79 Stat. 213) provides:

> Sec. 8. Effective on and after July 1, 1966, neither the Secretary of the Interior nor any bureau nor any person acting under his authority shall engage in the preparation of any feasibility report under reclamation law with respect to any water resource project unless the preparation of such feasibility report has been specifically authorized by law, any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

To fulfill this requirement, it became necessary for the Department of the Interior to submit the pending legislation.

The principal purpose of S. 3034, as reported, is to enable the Secretary of the Interior to continue feasibility investigations of certain water resource proposals now pending and to authorize initiation of new ones. Most of these studies are embodied in sections 1 and 2 of the bill. These two sections give the Secretary the authority to continue work on feasibility studies which were begun under the authority of preexisting law. Section 3 authorizes the Secretary to commence work on 18 new feasibility grade studies.

Several amendments which would have added new studies to section 3 were considered. As a matter of policy, the committee decided that feasibility studies should be undertaken only for those projects with a preliminary reconnaissance investigation substantially completed indication that it would be advisable to make a feasibility study as soon as practicable. This policy will provide for an orderly sequence of feasibility study authorization. It will give the Congress an opportunity to analyze and evaluate the results of a preliminary investigation in deciding whether to authorize the Secretary to undertake a feasibility grade study.

The committee's Report No. 1368 details the bill, and the amendments, which the committee adopted for the information of the Senate.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to comment on section 5 of the bill, which was added by unanimous vote of the committee.

Public Law 89–448, enacted by the Congress only last month, authorized a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam. In an amendment proposed by the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Law 89–448 also established a form of basin account for the Pacific Northwest. It requires the Secretary of the Interior to maintain and present annually to the President and the Congress a consolidated system repayment study for all the projects in the Federal Columbia River Power System. That study will also include costs of all reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest, even though they have no power feature, to the extent that such costs, with the approval of the Congress, have been assigned for repayment out of power revenues. The law further provides that at reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest hereafter authorized, the portion of the construction costs which is allocable to irrigation but beyond the ability of the water users to repay within the repayment period prescribed by law for that project—and cannot be returned within that period from other project sources of revenue—shall be charged to and returned from power revenues of the Federal Columbia River Power System unless otherwise provided by law.

This concept of financial assistance from power to irrigation, a concept which the Congress has approved many times, involves a delicate balancing of equities between power consumers and irrigators. The cost of many—perhaps most—of the remaining undeveloped reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest is too great for the water users to repay. I am speaking of good, desirable projects—projects that are engineeringly and economically feasible and should be built both to meet local needs and to strengthen the Pacific Northwest and the entire country. On the other hand, financial assistance from power to irrigation does increase the total obligation that power users must repay. Obviously such assistance could reach a total so great as to impose an unfair burden on the power users.

Everyone, including power and water users, wants to keep power rates as low as possible, consistent with sound business principles. At the same time, everyone, including power and water users, also desires the development of worthy irrigation projects to proceed expeditiously.

Last month, when I asked the Senate to concur in Chairman ASPINALL's amendment to S. 1761—subsequently Public Law 89–448—creating a basin account for the Pacific Northwest, and providing financial assistance to new reclamation projects, I posed the dilemma in this way and suggested a solution:

> But I believe there is even a more basic reason why the people of the Pacific Northwest have been concerned about legislation to create a regional basin account. The purpose of such an account, in simple terms, is to provide a mechanism whereby power consumers can subsidize worthy irrigation projects. In the Pacific Northwest, the public is very concerned about the Bonneville power system rates. With the region facing a transition from all hydroelectric generation to hydro-plus-steam in the next decade or sooner, this concern is becoming more acute. One needs only to recall the strenuous objections last year to a proposal for a 3-percent increase in those rates. These objections streamed forth from all segments of the regional economy, and both sides of the political aisle. This increase was unanimously approved as reasonable by the Federal Power Commission after lengthy oral arguments. The lesson, however, was clear. We do not want it to happen again.
>
> On the other hand, the people of our region, including those in the great population centers on the coast which have ample rainfall, also support reclamation projects to put water on dry lands. The economic benefits from such projects are recognized to be regional and national in scope. Labor unions, railroads, trucks, barge lines, banks, wholesalers, distributors, insurance companies—indeed all segments of the economy share in the benefits of new irrigation projects.
>
> And so we have the fundamental problem of the basin account: How can we reconcile the partly conflicting, but partly complementary, interests of the power consumers and the irrigators in the Pacific Northwest? . . .
>
> The problem then is to develop ground rules to protect the legitimate interests of both the power users and the water users, keeping in mind the overall public interest of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation. It is my view that reasonable limitations on the amount or timing of assistance to irrigation are required. Such a limitation is necessary to assure that financial assistance to irrigation will not cause an increase in power rates.

Section 5 of S. 3034 will amend Public Law 89–448 to provide the reasonable limitations which I referred to. Basically, section 5 requires that the construction of new reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest be so scheduled that the total financial assistance from power to irrigation for both the newly authorized projects and those previously authorized will not cause an increase in Bonneville Power Administration rates.

That requirement is implemented in three ways:

First. Financial assistance from power revenues to newly authorized reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest, or to presently authorized projects in that region for which Congress hereafter may authorize financial assistance, will not fall due prior to the year 2026.

Second. No financial assistance from power to irrigation at either a newly or previously authorized project in the Pacific Northwest will be due before the last year of the repayment period for the water users.

Third. The total of all assistance, for both existing and future reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest, cannot exceed an average of $30 million annually over any period of 20 consecutive years beginning with the year 2026.

Assistance from power to irrigation will be paid only from the net revenues of the Federal Columbia River Power System. Analyses and studies authorized by the Congress for reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest are to be prepared in accordance with the criteria I have outlined and with the provisions of section 5 of S. 3034.

There are two reasons for scheduling financial assistance to new reclamation projects to begin in the year 2026. One is the fact that water users ordinarily are given a period of 60 years—a 10-year development period plus a 50-year repayment period—to repay their share of the costs allocated to irrigation. The same period should be, and normally is, available for the repayment of financial assistance from power to irrigation. Chairman ASPINALL, explained this when the House was debating H.R. 7406, which became Public Law 89–448:

> If the Congress follows the procedure that it has followed for several years, the payout period (for assistance from power to irrigation) will be 50 years plus an additional 10 years for the development of any separate block. The payout on that particular project will have to take place within that 50-year period. Just as under our section 2 the payout period for all these projects is exactly what was provided in the original authorization.

Financial assistance for a project receiving water in 1966 would not be due, under the first criterion above outlined, until 2026.

The second reason for selecting that date is the fact that by 2026 the repayment of the present power investment in the Federal Columbia River Power System should be virtually completed. However, it must be recognized that a project authorized today obviously would not begin to receive water for at least several years. The construction period alone would take that much time. Because the 60-year repayment period does not begin to run until water is available on the first unit of a new project, the earliest date that financial assistance would be required for a project authorized today would probably be somewhere between 2030 and 2035. For this reason, delaying the payment of assistance for new projects until 2026 imposes no practical limitation on the authorization of new irrigation projects. At the same time it protects the power users by deferring the payment of assistance until the present power investment is substantially repaid and funds are available for such assistance without causing an increase in power rates.

Scheduling the due date of financial assistance from power consumers to water users in the last year of the repayment period for the water users causes no problems for the water users. Yet it helps the power users by keeping interest costs as low as possible. Deferring the payment of the assistance until the end of the repayment period helps carry out the objective that financial assistance from power to irrigation will not cause increases in power rates. This requirement is applicable to irrigation assistance at all projects, existing and future, and not to just newly authorized projects. There is no waiver or wiping out of the obligation to pay the irrigation assistance. That payment will be made in full—but it will not be made prior to the last year of the water users' repayment period. Nor does this mean that no irrigation assistance at all will be paid until 2026. Some $290 million of presently authorized irrigation assistance will be paid prior to that date.

The payment of assistance from power to irrigation within the same repayment period as the water users have and the deferral of such payment as late as possible within that repayment period are not new policies. They have been followed for some time in other river basins—the Missouri and Colorado River Basins and the Central Valley of California—as well as in the Pacific Northwest. S. 3034 in this respect merely gives statutory recognition to what is being done in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere today.

Various groups in the Pacific Northwest, representing power users, water users, and water officials of the States and other State and Federal agencies have long been concerned with proposals for a basin account and for assistance from power to irrigation. Neither an unlimited amount of such assistance nor any retarding of desirable irrigation development was acceptable. The problem has been to find some means which recognizes and protects the legitimate interests of both the power users and the water users—one which reconciles their partially conflicting requirements—in a manner consistent with the best interests of the region and the Nation.

The scheduling of new reclamation projects so that the total assistance from power for all reclamation projects, existing and future, will not cause an increase in power rates, is the basic principle for solving the dilemma. To further implement it, agreement has been reached on a formula under which the total of all assistance for both existing and future reclamation projects within the Pacific Northwest cannot exceed an average of $30 million in any period of 20 consecutive years beginning with the year 2026. Originally some different annual dollar amounts were considered, some smaller and one or two larger, but all have agreed now to an average of $30 million annually. Public power groups, Bonneville direct service and indirect service industrial customers, reclamation groups, the Bureau of Reclamation and State water resource groups have concurred. This proposal is accepted by various of our Governors as well.

In any 20-year period after 2025, $600 million will be available for assistance from power to irrigation. Bear in mind this amount is only the financial assistance from power to irrigation. In addition, there will be the portion of the construction costs to be repaid by the irrigators and by municipal and industrial water supply users, as well as the portion of these costs allocated to other purposes, such as recreation, fish and wildlife, and pollution and flood control. Assistance from power to reclamation of $600 million will make possible a reclamation program of $1 to $2 billion in a given 20-year period. This will require annual appropriations of more than $50 million for the construction of reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest. That amount is substantially in excess of what, historically, actual appropriations for that purpose have been. The formula, rather than restricting new reclamation projects, will permit and encourage an accelerated reclamation development.

For that reason, section 5, subsection (c) directs the Secretary of the Interior to review and to recommend to the Congress, on the anniversary dates of the Federal Power Commission review of Bonneville Power Administration power rates beginning December 20, 1974, any changes in the dollar limitation which he believes to be justified by changes in price levels existing on July 1, 1966, or by other relevant changes in circumstances. Changes in Bonneville's costs, changes in national goals concerning the bringing of new lands under water, and the use of other sources of revenue to assist irrigation are examples of a relevant change in circumstances. There may well be others. A periodic review will bring them to the attention of the Congress which can increase or decrease the dollar limitation in such manner as it deems fair and appropriate in the light of the changed conditions.

There are some existing projects in the Pacific Northwest which are not now authorized to receive assistance from power revenues or which are authorized to receive an inadequate amount of assistance to permit all irrigation costs to be repaid within a 10-year developmental period and a 50-year repayment period.

They include the following:

Idaho: Boise, Black Canyon.

Oregon: Deschutes, north unit; Grants Pass; Owyhee; Rogue River, Talent; Umatilla, Hermiston; Umatilla, west extension; Vale.

Washington: Yakima, Kennewick; Yakima, Roza; Yakima, Kittitas.

The principle of equality of treatment may require the extension of financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River Power System to some or all of these projects. I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to review this problem and submit to the Congress his recommendations for any such assistance which he finds to be needed and desirable. The matter will be fully examined at committee hearings on a project-by-project basis, and the Congress thereafter can take such action as it finds appropriate.

The groups in the Pacific Northwest which have been working on this problem are to be commended for reaching agreement on the equitable solution embodied in S. 3034. The criteria in that bill protect the power user, yet permit an accelerated reclamation development. They achieve a proper balance between the interests of the power users and the water users—one in which all the Pacific Northwest can join in advancing its economic well-being.

The bill was reported unanimously, and I heartily recommend it to the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and acted upon accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to add my endorsement to S. 3034 as amended by the committee, and I wish to address myself especially to the comments on section 5 of that bill as amended in the committee.

Public Law 89–448, enacted June 14, 1966, authorized the construction of a third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam. This act provided also for financial assistance to reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest hereafter authorized. This financial assistance beyond the repayment ability of water users is to come from power revenues from the Columbia Basin power system.

Public Law 89–448 thus established for the first time in the Pacific Northwest, a basin account without reference to State boundaries, but the act did not set up criteria to protect the legitimate equities of the power user and the water user.

The bill before the Senate today does establish the ground rules so necessary to implement a basin account. I believe it is a good bill and I urge its passage.

The bill provides that the basin account will be funded on the basis of $30 million per year in any 20-year period in such a way as to cause no increase in power rates. All reclamation projects in the Columbia Basin will be considered on a merit basis irrespective of State boundaries. In order to provide for adjustments because of price level changes or other relevant changes of circumstance, the Secretary of Interior is directed to review and recommend to Congress at 5-year intervals any changes in the dollar limitation which he believes justified.

Congress can make any adjustment in the limitation it believes to be fair to both the power users and the water users under the conditions then existing.

In the Northwest we are especially favored with an abundance—sometimes a superabundance—of potable water. This is not to say that our water is always available in the right place at the right time. The problems of distribution are always with us. How to capture nature's rainfall on our watersheds and then by proper storage and supply management mold this water resource to best achieve its multipurpose benefits is a real challenge, but one that is richly rewarding. These multipurpose benefits must include domestic, industrial, reclamation, power, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife. No longer can we tolerate single-purpose planning.

One basic point I wish to emphasize is the interdependence of land and water. Any serious study or planning for one must necessarily and inevitably involve the other. Sound water resource development depends first of all on a healthy, well-maintained watershed. This is of primary importance.

Insofar as the upstream States are concerned, this legislation marks a breakthrough in water resource development. Too often the upstream States of a river basin are short changed in the allocation of benefits from powerplants downstream. Because the big powerplants are generally located downstream and because most of the power is used in downstream population centers, the argument has been made that all of the benefits should accrue to downstream areas.

This legislation gives recognition, at long last, to the very important factor of watershed contribution. Canada's watershed contribution has been recognized and rewarded by payments made to Canada under treaty amounting to more than one-quarter billion dollars.

This will pay Canada's entitlement to a share of increased production at U.S. plants downstream made possible by yet-to-be-built storage of Canadian water for a period of 30 years only. The significant fact here is that an accord was reached and consummated in a treaty, thus indicating, at the international level, a meeting of trained minds as to the value of upstream watershed and storage resources.

Likewise, the upstream watershed and storage resources of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Oregon make a contribution similar to and perhaps even greater than that to be made by Canada. This watershed contribution is being recognized and rewarded, for the first time by this amendment.

In order to show where the water originates that turns the turbines in the main stem Columbia River Federal powerplants, I asked the Geological Survey to provide data showing the following:

First. Political subdivision which supplied water to each of six Federal power projects; namely, Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, John Day, The Dalles, and Bonneville,

Second. The average flow in cubic feet per second at each site by each political subdivision,

Third. The percentage of the total average flow at each site by each political subdivision, and

Fourth. The gross head at each powersite.

The data thus prepared by the Geological Survey is presented in a table which I ask unaminous consent to have reproduced at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Contribution to flow of Columbia River at site indicated*

Political subdivision	Grand Coulee Dam		Chief Joseph Dam		McNary Dam		John Day Dam		The Dalles Dam		Bonneville Dam	
	Cubic feet per second	Percent	Cubic feet per second	Percent	Cubic feet per second	Percent	Cubic feet per second	Percent	Cubic feet per second	Percent	Cubic feet per second	Percent
British Columbia, Canada	70,400	61.0	70,400	61.0	73,800	39.8	73,800	39.1	73,800	37.9	73,800	36.5
Montana	27,200	23.6	27,200	23.6	27,200	14.7	27,200	14.4	27,200	14.0	27,200	13.4
Idaho	13,000	11.3	13,000	11.3	52,400	28.2	52,400	27.8	52,400	26.9	52,400	25.9
Washington	4,700	4.1	4,700	4.1	19,300	10.4	19,300	10.3	19,300	9.9	24,400	12.1
Wyoming					7,300	3.9	7,300	3.9	7,300	3.7	7,300	3.6
Utah					(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	
Nevada					800	.4	800	.4	800	.4	800	.4
Oregon					4,900	2.6	7,800	4.1	14,100	7.2	16,400	8.1
Total	115,300	100.0	115,300	100.0	185,700	100.0	188,600	100.0	194,900	100.0	202,300	100.0
Average flows computed for period 1943–57 [2]	114,500		114,500		186,200		189,200		195,300		202,600	

[1] Negligible.

[2] These are accurate figures of flow computed several years ago. Note that the summations for political subdivisions, as approximately computed, check these figures well within 1 percent:

[In feet]

	Grand Coulee Dam	Chief Joseph Dam	McNary Dam	John Day Dam	The Dalles Dam	Bonneville Dam
Gross head	343	179	92	113	91	67

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, this table provides the basis for some interesting computations. A basic fact of hydroeconomics is that power is the product of water volume times the head through which it drops as it passes through the turbines.

For example, because of these two factors, volume and head, we find that water from either of the two upstream States of Montana or Idaho produce several times the power at the plants downstream than is produced by water originating from downstream watersheds.

From the viewpoint of a Senator from the upstream State of Idaho recognition of the full significance of this factor of watershed contribution is the most important feature of this basin account legislation. Under the guidelines set up here, we can go forward with a sound reclamation program without doing violence to power rates. Basinwide in concept, basinwide in implementation, this legislation should go a long way to preventing contentious geographical arguments. Let each project be judged on its merits regardless of State boundaries.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, while there are many sections of S. 3034 that bear upon the future development and conservation of Idaho's land and water resources, one section in particular is of paramount interest to the entire Pacific Northwest. It is to this section—establishing a northwest basin account—that I address myself today.

The specific examples I will cite lie within my own State of Idaho, for it is with Idaho's development potential that I am most familiar. Yet the principles underlying the establishment of a basin account are applicable in equal measure to every State in the Northwest wherein a river rises to swell the currents of the Columbia River, turning the great power generators in the Federal dams on the Columbia and Lower Snake.

When the first of these great dams were built in the midthirties, President Roosevelt envisioned a network of reclamation and power projects that would open up vast new lands in the Pacific Northwest to agriculture and industry. The largest of the early dams—Grand Coulee—has more than lived up to Roosevelt's expectations. Recently, we approved another powerplant for Grand Coulee, to provide more service, to produce more revenue for the Bonneville Power Administration, and to add even greater potentiality to the economic growth of the entire Northwest.

In adding to the authorization for the new Grand Coulee powerplant the original provision for a basin account for the entire Federal power system on the Columbia River, we were assuring the growth and development of the entire Pacific Northwest at a crucial time in our national history. We were taking action to end a slow strangulation upon land

and water resource development that would otherwise set in.

We in the West have long known—and have seen the rich tangible results—of applying proper quantities of water to what appears to be arid land. The desertlands of the West are unbelievably fertile when adequate water supplies are applied. My own State of Idaho has been a pioneer in the development of desertlands. The twisting canyons of the Snake River that cut through Idaho from the Wyoming border to the Oregon-Washington State line, channeling the flow of the Snake into the Columbia River, pass through much arid land. Yet over the years, reclamation projects developed along the Snake River, have diverted those waters onto the desert and converted the once-barren sagebrush lands into some of the world's richest and most fertile farmlands.

But reclamation in Idaho has fallen short of our available water supply. Our people watch millions of acre-feet of water flowing past their doorsteps, running downstream to turn the Federal power generators on the Columbia River, without first being put to beneficial use upstream. It would be bad enough were the waters of the Snake River merely passing through Idaho in their rush to swell the torrent of the Columbia. But the irony becomes more pronounced when Idaho farmers—who in 1964 produced more than 2 million tons of fine potatoes and 3 million tons of sugar beets, all on irrigated lands—reckon that it is water which originates in Idaho that turns the Snake River into the surging giant that it is. When the Snake River enters Idaho at our eastern border, it carries an average annual flow of 4 million acre-feet. In its passage through Idaho, scores of tributaries, rising in the snow-capped mountains of my State, pour nine times that amount of water into the Snake River, so that by the time it passes into Oregon and Washington, the average annual flow is more than 38 million acre-feet.

One would think that with such bounty, there would be no problem in utilizing this great flow to make the Idaho deserts bloom. Yet, for many years, we have not had a major new reclamation project started in Idaho. The reason for the retarded development has been the problem of finances. Reclamation projects carry a heavy burden of reimbursable requirements. The cost of construction must be repaid to the Federal Government over a 50-year period. But if the full cost of the irrigation portion of a multiple-purpose project were charged to the water user, the cost of such water would be prohibitive; and no farmer could afford to produce crops under such circumstances. So the water has run untouched through Idaho. While the land lay barren, that same flow of water, a few miles downstream, was generating Federal power, which in turn was sold to municipal, industrial and private power users, at reasonable, but profitable, rates.

These revenues, Mr. President, produced as the result of upstream water contributions to the Federal power dam system, conferred no benefit to the upstream lands.

It is to put an end to this inequity and to make the upstream residents, on every tributary of the Columbia Basin drainage, equal partners in the entire basin development, that the basin account provision has been perfected for inclusion in S. 3034.

As set forth in the bill, it is designed to be fair to both the power user and the water user. It authorizes an average annual allocation of up to $30 million from the future net revenues to the Bonneville power system to underwrite the construction of new reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest. By supplementing the amount that the irrigator can reasonably repay, the basin account provision will end two decades of stagnation in water and land resource development in Idaho, and provide the needed impetus to meet the growing food and industrial demands of the coming century.

As written, the basin account section quite clearly states that such financial assistance for future reclamation projects shall come from surplus funds, accumulating as the dams are paid off, over and above all costs allocable to power, so that neither the power rates, or reasonable provision for future additions to the system, will be jeopardized. It sets a limit upon the amount of such surplus revenue that can be utilized for reclamation project assistance, but provides for periodic review to determine whether future changes in these limits should be made.

In short, Mr. President, the perfected basin account provisions of S. 3034 at long last make upstream and downstream interests throughout the Columbia-Snake River drainage partners in the development of the entire basin.

By opening new lands and improving present yields, by making further industrial and municipal waters available through future reclamation projects, more electrical power consumers will be added to help maintain a balanced economy throughout the basin.

But most importantly, Mr. President, our entire national interests are being served. We will be moving constructively to assure an adequate food base for the more than 300 million Americans who will crowd our cities by the start of the next century.

It is for these reasons that I urge Senate passage of S. 3034. In doing so, I want to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the way in which he has cooperated in finding a statutory formula that would be reasonable and fair to his State, to my State, and to each of the other States on the Columbia-Snake River Basin. It is a formula which will protect the legitimate interests of the public power users and also assure the comprehensive development of new farmland upstream.

I think this makes it possible, for the first time, for every State in the Pacific Northwest to find a common interest in the great Federal investment that has been made in the water resources of our region.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] for their fine cooperation in working with the chairman over a period of several years and, more immediately, during the past several months in an endeavor to find a workable solution to the problem alluded to by these two distinguished Senators.

I think that we have found a solution and I commend them both most highly for their very helpful cooperation.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee for the fine spirit of cooperation which prevailed in our discussion and deliberation on this subject, which has been a problem in the Northwest for so long.

We have reached a workable solution by which we can go forward on a sound program of water resource development without discrimination and without geographical problems.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to make a little legislative history on this matter.

First of all I should like to comment about a practice which is growing more common day by day in the Senate, and which I think is not a good practice for the Senate or for the legislative process. That is the practice of calling up bills sometimes even before the reports are available to the committee.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I knew what was in the bill and I know what is in the report.

There is no overwhelming time consideration involved in this matter which would not permit the matter to go over until Senators have been permitted time to examine the entire subject as reported and acted upon by the committee.

Even though certain language in the report had been agreed to, the facts are that the report was not available to my office all morning and was not available to me until I came on the floor a half hour ago.

I do not want to be critical of the chairman of the committee because, as I have tried to make clear, I was fully informed all the way along, and the language which is in the report is the language which has been agreed upon. However, it seems to me that this is a very bad way to legislate.

I mention this here because the occurrences have become more frequent, and these are matters on which it is important that the entire Senate, and not merely those particularly interested in a phase of the legislation, understand the legislation.

Last year, and I believe it was on one of our major bills, we did not even have a copy of the report until after the debate had been going on for 3 days. If someone wants to say that this is a heck of a way to run a railroad, I will agree with him entirely. It does not make for good legislation. It does not give the Senators a chance to be informed. While I told the chairman of the committee that I would not object to taking the bill up today, I do feel that this is bad practice. This bill was ordered reported on June 28, but the report was filed only yesterday. I might add that by the unanimous consent order of June 30, 1966, all committees were authorized to file reports during the Independence Day recess.

As a matter of fact, there are not even copies of the bill on the desks of Senators today, nor copies of the report.

Speaking to the merits of the bill, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported last year a bill which required legislative authorization of feasibility studies conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation. The pending bill is the first one under that which provides legislative authorization for feasibility studies.

We had an understanding in committee that it would be the practice of the committee—and I think we ought to set this forth as it is contained in the report—that only those projects upon which there had been a reconnaissance report or preliminary survey which disclosed that the projects were probably feasible would be considered for authorization of feasibility studies.

As I understand it, and as I recall the meeting of the committee, it was the agreement of the committee that they did not believe that any project should be considered for a feasibility authorization until the preliminary study indicated that there was a probability that it would be found economically feasible.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if that is not his recollection of the understanding of the committee and the agreement it reached.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Colorado is correct, the point being that it would be unwise to undertake a feasibility study, for example, if the reconnaissance study had not been completed or of at least substantially completed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe this is fairly important, because with the new legislation which Congress passed last year, this does change the whole method of operation upon reconnaissance studies or preliminary investigations and feasibility studies. With the new legislation, I believe it is important that the record be clear as to what we are doing and what it is the intention of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to do: that after reconnaissance surveys have been made, they will not be considered for a feasibility study or authorized for a feasibility study unless the preliminary reconnaissance report indicates an economic feasibility.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think this short legislative record ought to make clear to everyone exactly what the situation would be, so that the committee or Congress will not be asked to participate in the authorization of feasibility studies where the prerequisites have not been met.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is again correct.

The entire matter has been set out in the RECORD in detail. I believe that the point that the Senator from Colorado is emphasizing here is one that Senators should be fully cognizant of, because many Senators will be inquiring about specific projects.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the paragraphs on pages 9 and 10 of the report, referring to two projects in Colorado, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In region 7 in the State of Colorado, two units, the Cache la Poudre and St. Vrain, Long's Peak division, Missouri River Basin project, were called to the committee's attention and were given special consideration. It is the judgment of the committee that the reconnaissance level survey on St. Vrain should be completed without delay and before January 1, 1967. The reconnaissance investigation on Cache la Poudre (discussed on p. 63 of the hearings on S. 3034) should be reconsidered and a revised report submitted to the committee as soon as practicable.
>
> REQUEST BY SENATOR ALLOTT
>
> Missouri River Basin project, Long's Peak division, St. Vrain unit.
>
> Missouri River Basin project, Long's Peak division, Cache la Poudre unit.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this refers to two projects in Colorado which I think fall clearly within the rule which I have just tried to explain and to make specific.

One of these projects is the Cache la Poudre. A sort of semireconnaissance report has been submitted on this project, indicating that perhaps it will not be economically feasible. The report directs the Department of the Interior to submit a revised report to the committee on the Cache la Poudre, so that we will have some certainty as to whether or not an economic feasibility may be projected.

If it is not, of course, we can then study it and see if the proposal can be altered so that economic feasibility might be achieved, and authorize a feasibility study. If not, it would, of course, not be eligible for a feasibility study.

With respect to the St. Vrain project, Long's Peak division, of the Missouri River Basin project, this is now under a reconnaissance study; and the Bureau has been directed to report this reconnaissance study to the committee for action upon feasibility—providing it is favorable—by January 1, 1967. I simply wish to say that although this is a little different from the action I believe was actually taken in committee, this is completely satisfactory to the Senator from Colorado. It was done with the complete cooperation and with the full knowledge of my office and myself, and I think it will work out for the benefit of the entire reclamation program.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have one brief comment.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to say that we certainly do not make it a practice to file a report the day before and get it before the Senate a few hours before the time the bill is taken up, although that is within the Senate rules, as long as the report is ready at the time of being called up, if it is on the calendar.

However, we are confronted with an unusual situation at this time, in that section 8 of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act—Public Law 89–72, 79 Stat. 213—that I alluded to in my remarks makes it very clear that neither the Secretary of the Interior, nor any bureau, nor any person acting under his authority, shall engage in the preparation of any feasibility report under reclamation law with respect to any other water resource project unless the preparation of such feasibility report has been specifically authorized by law.

What I have just mentioned became effective on July 1, 1966. So that there is a real question here as to the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed on feasibility studies since July 1.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to emphasize this, because I think this points up the need to act expeditiously.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, S. 3034, sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] deserves immediate consideration and passage. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals.

Section 8 of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act states that after July 1, 1966, the Secretary of the Interior shall not engage in the preparation of any feasibility report under reclamation law unless such a report has been specifically authorized by law. S. 3034 would enable the Secretary of the Interior to perform additional analysis and study on proposals pending before Congress, to prepare reports on proposals which have been substantially completed, and to continue unfinished studies.

Since the decision to undertake a feasibility study is of great importance in determining whether a reclamation project should be authorized, Congress should be responsible for judging all authorizations for feasibility studies. After the Secretary of the Interior completes such studies, they are submitted to Congress for consideration. Thus, with authorization of both feasibility studies and projects, Congress can coordinate planning and development of irrigated agricultural lands.

The bill before us today authorizes feasibility studies of projects throughout the western part of the United States. Included in these studies are six in Texas which are worthy of note: the Columbus Bend project in the Lower Colorado River Basin; the Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers; the Cuero project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas; the Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in San Antonio River Basin; the Nueces River project on the Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi; and the

Texas basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

S. 3034 is important in our national program of water resource development. The Secretary of the Interior needs this authorization to continue the analysis of proposed reclamation projects. I urge my fellow Senators to join me in the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 1326 (S. 3112) a bill to amend the Clear Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] may have 15 minutes to speak, regardless of the rule of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A PENALTY FOR USING U.S. COAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, ministers of the European Coal and Steel Community nations meet this week in Luxembourg to discuss and possibly act on a proposal which is of direct concern to our Nation and the bituminous coal industry. By instituting a two-part subsidy plan, the Community's High Authority hopes to cut sharply into the favorable price differential which now enables U.S. coal to compete effectively in European energy markets.

The possibility that such an action could be taken by the Coal and Steel Community is a distressing one, in my opinion. While seeking to strengthen the European coal industry, the High Authority seems willing to impose substantially higher costs on steel producers in the six-nation area. The effect can only be higher prices for virtually all types of goods throughout all of Europe.

In an address last month before a joint luncheon of the National Coal Association and the Coal Exporters Association of the United States, the Vice President touched on this very point. Speaking directly to representatives of the Coal Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe who were present at the Washington luncheon, the Vice President said:

> American coal can help you reduce your energy costs. It can help restrain inflationary forces in your economies. For as you well know, the cost of energy, the price of energy for your industry is a part and sometimes a substantial part of the cost of every product. Your products become more competitive as you are able to reduce the cost of their production.

No one can question the fundamental truth of the Vice President's words, but the High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community appears to believe it is doing something good by increasing the cost of coking coal used in steel mills in its member countries.

At present, U.S. coking coal enjoys a price advantage of about $4 per ton, as delivered in Europe, over coking coal produced in Europe. By purchasing American coal, European mills produce steel at substantially lower cost, and everyone benefits. Now the High Authority is recommending that member governments be required to pay a subsidy on U.S. coking coal consumed in steel production in their countries. According to reports, these subsidies would amount to about 80 percent of the current price differential. The payments would go into a Community fund and would be used to pay out subsidies on coking coal mined in one ECSC country and consumed in steel mills in another.

Specific details apparently have not yet been worked out. But the threat of this action is one we cannot overlook here at home. The reasons are quite simple.

The fact that American coal can compete in foreign energy markets is a tribute to the thoroughly modern coal industry which is now producing coal in increasingly greater volume at remarkably low cost. The average American miner's production is now something on the order of 17 tons per day. On the continent, the most efficient of his counterparts is the West German miner who produces about 3 tons of coal per day.

American efficiency in moving coal to ports contributes substantially to the maintenance of low costs. Efficient coal-handling equipment at Norfolk and Newport News enables large quantities of high-quality coal to be loaded rapidly aboard huge colliers, again at remarkably low cost. And everyone benefits, including the ultimate consumer of European products made with the energy contained in coal mined in the United States.

An important aspect, as I see it, is that coal exports mean a great deal to our balance of payments. The Vice President agrees that this is so, for at the meeting of the Coal Exporters Association and the National Coal Association he had this to say:

> Our coal export tonnage has increased steadily over the past fifteen years. For this we are very grateful. Last year we exported about half a billion dollars' worth of coal, something like ten percent of our total output of coal. May I on behalf of the government of the United States express a note of thanks to the exporters of coal for your helpfulness in this balance of payments situation. I am convinced that the strength of the dollar is in many ways underwritten by the volume of coal exports.

The Vice President also said we are able and willing to export even more coal, and our producers and coal exporters certainly would welcome the opportunity to do so. But a proposal such as that being advanced by the ECSC High Authority at the meeting in Luxembourg this week would have serious repercussions on this Nation's coal industry. It would, for one thing, upset the delicate balance-of-payments situation to which coal now contributes about $500 million annually. At a time when this contribution should be increasing, our friends in Europe who have benefited so materially from the availability of abundant, economical, and dependable American coal, want to force us from their coking coal market at considerable cost to all of their people.

In his remarks at the recent coal luncheon, the Vice President also cited an old New England saying:

> A rising tide lifts all the boats.

He went on to say, specifically to the visitors from the Economic Commission for Europe:

> This is just a simple way of saying that what helps someone else helps you. The rising tide of international trade can benefit all of us and every industrialized nation or every nation that hopes to have industrialization knows the importance of energy fuels, and knows indeed the importance of coal.

We hope our friends in Europe will realize that the step proposed by the High Authority is one which would set into motion a "falling tide" which would ultimately provide no long-term help to the nations of the Coal and Steel Community or to our own Nation. A drastic step such as that proposed would, in my opinion, almost certainly set off a wave of inflation which Europe is in no position to afford. The ability of European-produced goods, including steel, to compete in world markets certainly would be undermined in the long run.

Industry in Europe has come to rely on American coal. This vital product of our mines, in West Virginia and its sister coal-producing States, contributes heavily to the maintenance of strong free-enterprise systems throughout the world, and the coal industry can meet competition in every nation in which it is used.

Continued expansion in production of coal for use at home and abroad means new job opportunities in the hard-pressed coal regions. If, however, a substantial portion of our foreign coal markets is to be reduced, or lost altogether, new employment in the mines just will not materalize at a time when it is most needed. And the action suggested by the High Authority certainly would upset our balance-of-payments situation.

I know Government officials who are responsible for expanding coal exports are concerned, deeply concerned, over the possibility raised by this proposal to subsidize European coking coal at our expense. I know also that the State Department is aware of the situation and doubtless will express through diplomatic channels our Government's official concern.

This one step may be all that is needed to bring the ministers meeting this week in Luxembourg to the realization that American coking coal, dependable and economical, is vital to the economic welfare of the European steel industry and the industries throughout Europe which rely on its products. I am sure we can depend upon our diplomatic representatives in Europe to remind the governments of the Coal and Steel Community nations of something else the Vice President said at the coal luncheon last month:

> I submit that this rising tide of international trade can benefit particularly the people of our countries who depend on coal for warmth, for the human needs, for industrial progress and strength, and for the means towards a better and a more prosperous life.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3112) to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, sometime shortly before 2 o'clock p.m., I hope to suggest the absence of a quorum so that members of the Public Works Committee may proceed to request a yea-and-nay vote on Calendar No. 1326, S. 3112, the pending business. It has been agreed with the leader of the majority that at 2 o'clock p.m. we will proceed to vote, on the assumption that a yea-and-nay vote will be ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the Senate proceed to vote at 2 o'clock p.m. on the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from California ask also that rule XII be waived?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that rule XII be waived in connection with my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a little less than 3½ years ago, the late Senator McNamara, of Michigan, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, created the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. Our first major legislation from that subcommittee was the Clean Air Act of 1963. That legislation launched a vigorous Federal program to aid the States and local governments to combat the ever-increasing threat of polluted air. Last year, we amended the Clean Air Act to initiate controls on harmful automotive exhaust emissions, and we added the Solid Waste Disposal Act to our arsenal of weapons in the fight for an improved environment.

Today, we bring to the Senate additional amendments to the Clean Air Act. These amendments have the vigorous backing of the members of the Public Works Committee, on both sides of the aisle. They are evidence of the continued concern of our committee with the problems of air pollution and of the determination of our chairman, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], to maintain our search for improved ways of reducing the hazards of air pollution.

Today's legislation is a step forward, but it is not the end of our efforts. We cannot rest until we have removed the threats to man's health, well-being and economic advancement which man himself creates in a modern, technological society.

S. 3112 amends the Clean Air Act in order to provide for a stronger, more effective air pollution control effort at the Federal, State, and local level.

S. 3112, as reported, is based on legislation proposed by the administration. The primary purposes of the bill are to consolidate appropriation authorizations in the Clean Air Act and to authorize funds to continue the program through 1969.

S. 3112 institutes a new grant program to allow air pollution control agencies up to one-half of the cost of maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution, and authorizes the Secretary to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies in an amount up to three-fifths of the cost of maintaining regional air pollution control programs.

S. 3112 removes the limitation in existing law that no more than 20 percent of the sums appropriated annually under the act may be used for support of air pollution control programs, and provides that in determining the eligibility for a program grant nonrecurrent expenditures of the participating agencies in the preceding year shall not be considered.

Finally, S. 3112 provides that grants for interstate programs, subject to the 12½-percent limitation, shall be allocated by the Secretary according to the portion of such grant that is chargeable to any one State.

Mr. President, last year the Congress enacted major legislation dealing with the specific problem of pollution emanating from automobiles. That legislation has resulted in promulgation, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of regulations relating to the control of harmful motor vehicle exhausts. Those regulations will require installation of automobile exhaust control devices on all 1968 model automobiles.

Last year's amendments also provided a mechanism for abatement of international air pollution; for acceleration of research concerning methods of control of pollution from motor vehicles and the emission of oxides of sulfur; for public conferences directed toward the prevention of new or more aggravated interstate air pollution problems; and for construction, staffing, and equipping facilities needed by the Department to carry out its responsibilities under the act.

The additional requirements imposed by last year's legislative action require additional funds if the programs authorized are to be adequately and effectively pursued.

The committee bill has, therefore, authorized the requested $46 million for 1967 and provided $70 million for 1968, and $80 million for 1969. These authorizations will provide adequate funds to carry out the new maintenance grant program authorized by this act and give the Division of Air Pollution sufficient funds to support essential research programs. The $46 million authorized for 1967 represents a $10 million increase over existing authorization. This increase is, in part, required by the expanded program of research into the control of sulfur emissions and automobile emissions and includes $7 million as the added cost of maintenance grant program.

The authorizations for 1968 and 1969 represent similar increases in the activities of the division and $10 and $13 million, respectively, to carry out the maintenance grant program.

On the latter point, the committee is convinced of the desirability of providing Federal aid to continuation of air pollution control programs. Existing program grants have stimulated State and local activity by providing Federal matching funds for new or improved programs. They were not designed for sustained State and local control efforts necessary to cope with a continuing air pollution problem. This has discriminated against States and localities who initiated their own excellent programs prior to the Clean Air Act and it has worked a hardship on other States and localities.

Therefore, the committee considers the provision of S. 3112, authorizing the Secretary to make grants for maintaining air pollution control programs, to be essential. The 50-percent matching grant program to State and local agencies and the three-fifths matching grant program to regional agencies should provide adequate incentive for maintenance of this effort.

The committee has further provided that nonrecurrent expenditures of pollution control agencies will not be considered in determining the eligibility for a grant. Many factors may justifiably cause the level of expenditures by a pollution control agency to fluctuate, including, for example, nonrecurrent costs of equipment, of facilities, acquisition of property, or the initiation of studies concerning air quality or other matters. Where the overall workability of the air pollution control program is not impaired, fluctuations in expenditures should not make local agencies ineligible for Federal matching grants support.

S. 3112 deletes the provision in the Clean Air Act which limits the total for grants in support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any fiscal year.

The existing act imposes a fixed relationship between grant funds to the total appropriations for all Federal air pollution activities. Air pollution and the possibilities for control action are subject to rapid change. Over a period of time, the pattern of needs and desirable program balance with respect to research, technical assistance, training, Federal abatement activities, grants to State and local control agencies, and other activities may vary considerably. The committee believes it would be wise to leave the determination of the relative emphasis to be given to each of these activities to the annual budgetary and appropriation process so that judgments may be based upon the overall requirements existing at the time.

Mr. President, these are the major provisions of the legislation pending before the Senate. However, there are two other matters which the committee examined during its hearings on S. 3112 which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, it is the philosophy of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and its chairman that discussions limited to pending legislation are not sufficient when dealing with pollution of our air and water environment. The subcommittee has tried to develop as much information as is available on potential problems in order to inform the public of existing or potential threats to our environment which may require additional administrative or legislative action.

An example of this is the question of contamination of the atmosphere from lead and beryllium. The subcommittee learned in its hearings that there is a potential danger to the public health from the use of beryllium in large quantities in rocket firing. On the basis of the information received relative to this subject, the committee, in its report, has recommended that the Public Health Service develop such guidelines as may be necessary to insure the protection of public health and safety against the adverse effects of beryllium dispersed into the atmosphere by rocket firings.

The subcommittee's hearings on environmental lead contamination raised many unanswered questions. It is well known that lead is a toxic substance; that it is an element not natural to the human body, and that, absorbed in large quantities, it can have toxic results. These facts have been common knowledge in lead industries for many years and have resulted in strict procedures for the protection of workers in those industries. The results of that program have been impressive.

However, the problem of adverse effects of lead contamination goes far beyond the clinical injuries of workers in lead using industries. We are concerned with the subclinical effects of long-term low levels of exposure.

Lead in the atmosphere, attributable to automobile exhaust emissions, has greatly increased over the past three decades. There is no unanimity among the experts as to the danger or lack of danger from this increase.

There is some evidence that pregnant women and younger children retain a proportionately greater amount of lead which they ingest from the environment and are more susceptible to its toxic effects. Other evidence indicates that relatively small—compared with industrial standards—concentrations of lead are capable of producing intellectual disabilities and retardation in children, and that some types of diseases including kidney, liver, blood, and bone problems, render the body more susceptible to lead toxicity.

The committee notes suggestions in the work of scientists in this country, Russia and Great Britain, the lead in amounts and concentrations much less than levels traditionally connected with lead poisoning are capable to producing serious effects on the central nervous system and particularly the production and maintenance of red blood cells.

This evidence is, at present, only fragmentary and controversial. However, it is important to note that the standards of safety developed for health of male adults working in lead industries are not necessarily relevant to problems of long-term, low levels of exposure, particularly for those who retain higher than normal amounts of lead and who are more vulnerable to toxic effects of lead.

This information, developed during the course of the hearings, suggests that both the committee and those agencies charged with protection of the public health should further investigate the following questions regarding lead in the atmosphere:

First. What are the cumulative effects of subclinical exposure over long and short periods of time?

Second. What dangerous effects of abnormal storage in the bones are likely to result from the normal course of events and from accidents resulting in massive bleeding and dissolution of bone tissues?

Third. What synergistic effects can be anticipated with subclinical concentrations of lead combined with other environmental and somatic agents, either those present in significant quantities now or projected for the future?

Fourth. Are present levels dangerous either clinically or subclinically in the ways suggested?

Fifth. Are levels in danger of increasing to hazardous levels?

Sixth. Are levels reaching a point where unpredictable incidents of a lead or nonlead nature can cause toxicity?

Because the majority of atmospheric lead is held to come from lead compounds in auto exhaust, there is a need to concentrate on this aspect of the problem—to develop further information about subclinical effects of moderate lead concentrations—to evaluate proposals to eliminate lead from gasoline both from technical feasibility as well as the economic aspect—to hear testimony on alternatives to internal combustion—and especially to determine whether any existing governmental body presently has the authority, mechanism, and financing to control the lead in the atmosphere from auto exhausts.

Mr. President, it is not enough that the Federal Government should stimulate industry to develop and demonstrate means of control from automobile exhausts.

Because competition is the watchword of American enterprise, the Federal Government should stimulate reasonable alternatives to internal combustion. Predictable increases in urban air pollution may one day dictate elimination of presently conceived modes of transportation from that urban environment. Alternatively, the automobile industry must be encouraged to develop its combustion processes so as to limit, to the maximum extent economically feasible, emissions of air pollutants.

The committee report recommends an interdepartmental task force to investigate means of reducing air pollution by use of new methods of transportation not involving internal combustion engines. Such a task force should consider advanced methods of electrified rapid transit, battery operated vehicles, and the prospects of developing the fuel cell for commercial use.

Urbanization is not reversible. Though many of us from nonurban areas would like to believe that clean air and open space are avaliable to all the people, this is not the case.

If we are to live in an urban society, then efforts must be made to adequately protect the public from the hazard associated with polluted air. This cannot be a secondary goal nor can it be an effort which will take place sometime in the future.

The problem confronts us now and must be dealt with now. The Federal Government has the opportunity and the obligation to provide the leadership in this effort. Should we fail, another Donora, Pa., is not unlikely.

There rests on the shoulders of those of us who legislate today the responsibility to provide a healthy environment for those who will grow up in our cities tomorrow. This will be the pattern of future legislation and will direct the efforts which I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution will make.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss another matter which came to the attention of the subcommittee, raising serious question of public policy.

The subcommittee heard representatives of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, and the American Petroleum Institute, discuss a contract pursuant to which the Bureau would conduct a research program for API at API's expense.

The committee's attention was directed to this subject by a Department of Interior press release which noted:

> Lead is toxic, and because increasingly large amounts of it are released into the atmosphere from auto exhausts, considerable interest has been aroused in research on possible new types of unleaded motor fuel to reduce air pollution.

The toxicity of lead and the potential poisoning of the atmosphere from lead have been discussed earlier in this report. The fact that an agency of the Federal Government was apparently performing research on this subject for a private group when the results of the research might have an adverse effect on the sponsoring group concerned the committee.

In testimony from Dr. Walter Hibbard, Director of the Bureau of Mines, the committee learned:

> It should be emphasized that the Bureau of Mines neither professes competence nor considers as part of its research mission the health effects of automotive emissions as air pollutants. This properly is a responsibility of the Public Health Service. The Bureau's research on fuels combustion is organized to (1) identify and measure the effluents that are generated in fuel use, and (2) study the interdependence of factors in the vehicle and combustion system.

However, the committee was extremely concerned by a clause in the contract between the Bureau and API which prohited release of any information prior to the completion of the study "without prior written approval of the other party." The committee feels that in a matter such as the question of lead in gasoline, the primary contributor to lead in the atmosphere; the findings of Federal research should not be bound by potential private economic-based decisions.

The committee does not object to the performance of research by Federal agencies on behalf of private organizations in areas where questions of the general welfare are not involved. However, the potential health hazard from lead in the atmosphere is of sufficient concern that the committee feels this type of research program to be potentially adverse to the public interest.

Mr. President, the fact that a Federal agency performs research on behalf of a private organization is not, by definition, contrary to public policy. However, in this particular instance, the potential health hazard from lead in the atmosphere is of sufficient concern that I feel this type of research program to be potentially adverse to the public interest. In its report, the committee recommended:

First. That agreements between Federal agencies and private organizations not include restrictive contractual provisions relating to the release of such information as may be developed during the period of research;

Second. That the research program in this particular instance be constantly reviewed by the division of air pollution in order that that agency may have early access to any information developed relative to public health; and

Third. That in the future, the Bureau of Mines specifically, and other agencies in general, inform the Congress of the purpose, intent, cost, contractual limitation of, and participants in any study by any Federal agency, financed by a private organization, at least 90 days prior to signing any agreement to carry out such a study.

If the Bureau of the Budget does not approve a Federal research program and if the Congress is not given an opportunity to authorize such a research program, it seems to me that a Federal agency is going beyond its legislative limitations in seeking out private financing to perform any research activity. Therefore, the committee has recommended that Federal agencies not enter into research contracts on behalf of private agencies wherein a question of private economic interest as versus the general welfare are involved.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to take note of another important issue.

Hearings were held by the committee on S. 3400, introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, which would amend the solid waste disposal act relative to the disposition of junked automobiles. In addition to hearing Senator DOUGLAS, the committee also heard witnesses from the division of solid waste and the scrap industry.

The committee was impressed by Senator DOUGLAS' proposal and testimony, and believes the purpose of ridding the Nation of the blight created by junked automobiles, while preserving the valuable resources associated with the junked automobile, is a goal worthy of achievement.

However, S. 3400 presents the committee with complex problems and the testimony received emphasized these complexities. In the interest of early reporting of the Clean Air Act amendments, the committee decided to delay action on S. 3400 until further information could be received and the necessary study of the legislation could be performed.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending legislation.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish at this point to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Public Works [Mr. RANDOLPH], to the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and to all members of the subcommittee and the full committee for the dedicated cooperation and participation which they have given, over a period of 3 years, to the consideration of the problems of air and water pollution. I think it is not inappropriate for me to say that much creative legislation in these fields has come out of the subcommittee and the full committee, which would not have been possible without the contributions of my dedicated colleagues on the subcommittee and the staffs of the committee. I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that portion of the committee report (No. 1361) which relates to the lead problem.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR POLLUTION FROM LEAD AND OTHER SUBSTANCES

During the hearings on S. 3112, the subcommittee heard testimony of an exploratory nature on the question of contamination of the atmosphere from lead and other substances. At these hearings information was presented regarding the questions of atmospheric contamination from beryllium and lead.

Dr. Harriet L. Hardy, assistant medical director, Occupational Health Service of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, an expert on beryllium toxicology, testified that the general population may be in great danger of poisoning from beryllium released by the firing of rockets.

She stated, "The use of beryllium in large quantities in rocket firing is in my opinion unwise. My opinion is based on the impossibility of control of weather and likelihood of technical accident."

Since beryllium has been shown to be incurably damaging to individuals exposed to only small airborne amounts, the Federal Government has a critical responsibility in minimizing exposure to the population from its facilities and programs, including rocket firing. The committee recommends that the Public Health Service consider the standards developed by the National Academy of Sciences, and early adopt and promulgate such guidelines as might be necessary to insure the protection of public health and safety against the adverse effects of beryllium dispersed in the area of rocket firings.

The committee heard a good deal of expert testimony about classical or clinical lead poisoning, derived primarily from occupational experience, and about the safe body levels of lead with respect to concentrations in blood, urine, etc.

The hearings, however, did not provide definite answers to the question of whether present or foreseeable concentrations of lead in the air are dangerous to the general population at levels substantially lower than those associated with clinical lead poisoning.

Representatives of the lead industries and gasoline producers and Dr. Robert A. Kehoe of the Kettering Laboratories contended that levels of lead in the atmosphere have not increased in recent years (from 5 to 30 years); that present or foreseeable levels are not dangerous to the population as a whole; and that workers who are occupationally exposed to lead already receive adequate protection.

Officials of the Public Health Service displayed more concern about the potential dangers of adverse subclinical effects and less certainty about current findings, but were divided as to whether the situation demanded immediate legislative action.

One witness expressed extreme alarm. Dr. Clair C. Patterson, a geophysicist at the California Institute of Technology, suggested that any level of lead in the atmosphere represents an inestimably dangerous increment over values which prevailed during the evolution of the human physiology. Analyses of ice deposits and inference from contemporary data indicate the concentration of lead in the atmosphere has increased tremendously since the introduction of lead antiknock compounds in gasoline in the early 1920's, according to Dr. Patterson. His data indicated that this increase has been a hundredfold.

The Survey of Lead in the Atmosphere of Three Urban Communities (known as the

Tri-City study), published by the U.S. Public Health Service and cited by several witnesses, states that concentrations vary in relation to the amount of auto exhausts in the area, a function of volume of traffic and speed of travel. This involves a range from 1 to 3 micrograms of lead per cubic meter of air in rural and residential areas to over 50 micrograms per cubic meter of air near and on Los Angeles freeways.

Dr. Robert A. Kehoe, professor emeritus of occupational medicine, Kettering Laboratory, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, and others, presented information about various safe levels of lead in the body, gained through long experimentation in occupational health laboratories. Some of these levels have been developed as indicators of danger, so that when a worker has 0.06 mg. of lead per 100 gms. of blood, or 0.10 mg. of lead per liter of urine, he is removed from exposure to lead. These levels are only with respect to the possibility of clinical lead poisoning. Dr. Kehoe had earlier stated at the Lead Symposium sponsored by the Public Health Service in December 1965, that the above levels are the points below which clinical poisoning can safely be assumed not to occur, and do not represent a point above which lead poisoning will necessarily occur.

This knowledge may not be adequate to assess the threat of general atmospheric lead levels to the population as a whole. The population is not faced with the immediate threat of concentrations of lead approaching the levels of industrial exposure which are judged marginal with regard to clinical poisoning, but there is a gap in existing knowledge as to whether clinical lead poisoning is the only manifestation of the deleterious effects of lead and whether lead's toxicity is a function only of concentrations commonly thought to be associated with classical poisoning.

There is some evidence that pregnant women and younger children retain a proportionately greater amount of lead which they ingest from the environment and are more susceptible to its toxic effects. Also evidence indicates that relatively small (compared to industrial standards) concentrations of lead are capable of producing intellectual disabilities and retardation in children, and that some types of diseases including kidney, liver, blood and bone problems render the body more susceptible to lead toxicity.

This evidence is, at present, only fragmentary and controversial. However, it is important to note that the standards of safety developed for health of male adults working in lead industries are not necessarily relevant to problems of long-term, low levels of exposure, particularly for those who retain higher than normal amounts of lead and who are more vulnerable to toxic effects of lead.

The committee notes from other information that there are suggestions in the work of scientists in this country, Russia and Great Britain, that lead in amounts and concentrations much less than levels traditionally connected with lead poisoning are capable of producing serious effects on the central nervous system and particularly the production and maintenance of red blood cells.

Dr. Patterson stated in his article, "Contaminated and Natural Lead Environments of Man" (September 1965, Archives of Environmental Health):

"It has recently been maintained, on the basis of experimental evidence from animals, that pathologic and histologic changes of the brain and spinal cord together with functional shifts in the higher nervous activity are induced by exposures to atmospheric lead concentrations corresponding to those exposures now experienced by dwellers in most large American cities."

Some evidence suggests that lead competes with other metals for positions in the vital enzyme systems, and may either disrupt the systems directly or produce other substances which then have toxic effects. Further, the biochemistry of clinical lead poisoning is not yet known and much research must be done (and supported) on the effects of lead on normal and abnormal cell metabolism and its action in neurochemistry.

Even well-developed industrial safety standards have been unable to prevent an occasional acute overexposure to lead. It may be difficult also to set standards which provide realistic levels and at the same time avoid incidents of overexposure. For example, an individual may be exposed to what has been established as a safe level of atmospheric lead, and then eat apples contaminated with lead insecticide to a high but similarly permissible level, and be poisoned in a clinical sense.

The committee recognizes that conflicts exist as to the scope and extent of the problem. Mr. Felix E. Wormser, consultant and former president, Lead Industries Association, Inc., of New York, and Mr. P. N. Gammelgard, director, Committee for Air and Water Conservation, American Petroleum Institute, stated that in their opinion no danger exists from lead in the atmosphere. Dr. Patterson stated that in his opinion there is extreme danger from present levels. Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Richard Prindle, Chief of Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and other officials from the Public Health Service suggested that danger is minimal now, but extant, and research and surveillance must expand.

Dr. Patterson contended that levels are increasing at dangerous rates, and noted the differences between concentrations in rural and urban atmosphere and rural and urban dwellers. He cited the Tri-City study statistics. Both Mr. Wormser and Mr. Gammelgard testified that, on the basis of their interpretation of the Tri-City study, they found present levels of lead contamination to be low and not a hazard, and that there is no evidence of an increase of lead in the atmosphere in the last 5 years. Mr. Wormser stated under questioning from Senator MUSKIE that although the Tri-City study did not expressly draw this conclusion, he concluded from its evidence that present levels of lead in the atmosphere did not constitute a hazard to the public health.

In reviewing testimony and material on the problem of lead contamination the committee finds several basic questions which demand answers:

(1) What are the cumulative effects of subclinical exposure over long and short periods of time?

(2) What dangerous effects of abnormal storage in the bones are likely to result from the normal course of events and from accidents with massive bleeding and dissolution of bone tissues?

(3) What synergistic effects can be anticipated with subclinical concentrations of lead combined with other environmental and somatic agents, either those present in significant quantities now or projected for the future?

(4) Are present levels dangerous either clinically or subclinically in the ways suggested?

(5) Are levels in danger of increasing to hazardous levels?

(6) Are levels unnaturally high (though safe) to the point where unpredictable incidents of a lead or nonlead nature can cause toxicity?

LEADED GASOLINE

An associated problem which the committee feels deserves further investigation is the feasibility or desirability of eliminating lead in gasoline as a means of diminishing environmental lead contamintion. There is controversy over the cost and economic effect of eliminating lead compounds from gasoline. The majority of atmospheric lead is held to come from lead compounds in auto exhausts. Further hearings should concentrate on this aspect of the problem before any legislative or administrative control action can be taken.

The Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart, said that he would want the lead in gasoline eliminated immediately if there were a nontoxic substitute available, and further agreed that economic necessity inhibits immediate elimination of lead. Even more, Dr. Prindle said that it is vitally important to hold levels of lead constant until studies have been carried out and hazards are adequately assessed. In fact, he agreed with Senator MUSKIE that in the face of current evidence regarding the relationship between atmospheric lead and health hazards, a safe substitute for lead in gasoline should be sought as quickly as possible.

Mr. Vernon MacKenzie, Chief of the Division of Air Pollution, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said in his testimony, "dramatic change will be needed to effect dramatic improvements in the quality of the air, and present controls are producing only gradual change."

Hearings would be justified to explore further information about subclinical effects of moderate lead concentrations, to evaluate proposals to eliminate lead from gasoline both for technical feasibility and economics, to hear testimony on alternatives to internal combustion and, especially, to determine whether any existing governmental body presently has the authority, mechanism, and financing to control the lead in the atmosphere from auto exhausts.

SEEKING ALTERNATIVES TO INTERNAL COMBUSTION

New advanced approaches and techniques are required if we are to meet the pollution problems of combustion engine vehicles. With 90 million cars, trucks, and buses operating on the Nation's roads, crossing political boundaries without restriction, and discharging pollutants in all parts of the country, the need for national solutions is self-evident. This was the conclusion of the 1965 report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, which declared:

"We recommend that the Federal Government exert every effort to stimulate industry to develop and demonstrate means of powering automobiles and trucks that will not produce noxious effluents. Less complete steps to reduce pollution from automobile exhausts will certainly play an important role. We must strive for more acceptable mass transportation. We must follow carefully the results of California's imposition of special regulations, and be prepared to extend those that prove effective to other smog-ridden localities. But we must also be prepared, as soon as reasonably may be, to take more drastic action, if, as, and when necessary. The development of alternative means of mobile energy conversion, suitable for powering automotive transport of all kinds, is not a matter of 1 year or a few years. Thus, if fuel cells, or rechargeable batteries, or other devices are to be developed in time to meet the increased threat, we need to begin now."

Gasoline and diesel engines of motor vehicles are major contributors to air pollution. Policy decisions on accommodating greater traffic in cities have important impact on the degree of pollution in urban areas. Some estimates have been made which show that the application of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon controls to the type of engine currently employed may be expected to hold the line until about 1980, after which time the increased number of motor vehicles on our streets and highways will result in a worsening of the situation. Testimony was received suggesting that in Los Angeles the growth of freeways and auto traffic is canceling out gains made in controlling other sources of air pollution.

The Environmental Pollution Panel pointed out that the energy loss through incomplete combustion is about 15 percent of the fuel heat value and is equivalent to 1 million gallons of gasoline daily for Los Angeles. For the Nation, this amounts to a loss of energy corresponding to 10 billion gallons of gasoline per year. "Not only air pollution control but also conservation and wise use of our natural resources demand careful attention to the reduction of this detrimental waste," the panel stated.

Gasoline consumption in the United States rose from 40 billion gallons per year in 1950 to an estimated 70 billion in 1964. It is estimated that by 1980 the use of gasoline in the Los Angeles area will have increased by a factor of four since smog was first noticed around 1945. Parallel with the increase of fuel is the emission of pollutants. "The partial control of emission predicted for the coming years cannot keep up with this increase," the panel declared. "Research and development directed toward improvement in combustion and greatly reduced emissions should be promoted at universities and government laboratories. These studies should include radical changes in engine design and the development of, for example, the fuel cell for practical use."

In view of the interrelationship between air pollution caused by motor vehicles and overall urban planning, the committee urges that the administration form an interdepartmental task force to investigate means of reducing air pollution by use of new methods of transportation not involving the internal combustion engine.

A variety of projects deserve more detailed scrutiny and study. Electrification of mass transit, use of battery-operated delivery vehicles and autos, and prospects for fuel cells to run individual passenger cars, all suggest research possibilities. The Federal Government should insure that research, development, and demonstration work in this area is carried on at maximum levels consistent with orderly progress.

Coordination and interchange of ideas should be encouraged. The subcommittee received testimony that 15 Federal agencies are presently funding a total of 86 projects in battery research; the objectives and results of this work as it relates to transportation should be evaluated and the most efficient method of arriving at desired goals determined. Advisory committees formed from industry and trade groups might assist in this process. Foreign experience should be tapped. (The Electricity Council of Great Britain predicts that within the next 10 years 1 million battery-driven automobiles will be in operation in Great Britain.)

Urban planning, public works, zoning, and licensing questions are inexorably intertwined with pollution problems. Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in the area of transportation. The aim should be to combine the best thinking on air pollution, urban development, and transportation to deal with a problem which could literally smother cities in smog and smoke unless new approaches are developed and utilized.

The task force should provide Congress and the country with suggested guidelines for rational planning of future transportation as it relates to air pollution.

Burgeoning population, increasing number of vehicles, growing air pollution—all these factors indicate that to continue to solve this problem with piecemeal measures is unacceptable. Plans for new federally supported freeways should not be allowed to cancel out Federal efforts to halt air pollution. Dumping thousands of cars off the end of an eight-lane highway into an urban complex is not the answer to either transportation or air pollution problems.

The committee therefore recommends that the task force develop a plan for a "model environment" including such proposals as will both meet the economic needs of a rapidly expanding nation and adequately protect the public from the hazards associated with polluted air.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished floor manager of the bill for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I wish to add a few comments to the concise report on the pending legislation which has just been made by the junior Senator from Maine.

His words reflect his thorough understanding of the legislation as well as his belief in the urgent need for all levels of government to attack the air pollution problem.

I know that as a result of his able chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution over the past 3 years, the public is now much more aware of the seriousness of the air pollution menace.

Yet the peril continues. Air pollution is still a widespread and growing hazard to the health and welfare of our citizens.

State and local governments, in cooperation with the Federal Government, have stepped up air pollution control programs.

But our increasing industrialization, urbanization, and improved standards of living, as well as our expanding population, have combined to offset these advances. The battle is far from won.

The bill we are considering today was introduced by the junior Senator from Maine, and I am happy to count myself among the 15 Senators of both parties who cosponsored it.

It does not establish new policies in the fight against air pollution. Its effect, however, is to reemphasize the intent of the basic 1963 Clean Air Act by increasing the amount of money available for grants to air pollution control agencies. Also, in light of experience gained since the act has been in force, it improves standards and procedures involved in extending grants.

We hope these grants will be well used. We hope they will spur quicker and more effective action against air pollution.

In this effort it is well to recall the policy established by Congress in enacting the Clean Air Act, namely that—

> The prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local government; and * * * that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

The Federal Government is in the role of a partner in combating this nationwide peril. It must team up with all levels of government to get the job done.

Also involved in this effort are the industries who, as good citizens, strive to control air pollution. And we also look to our universities for additional research to help identify and control possible new air pollutants.

We all look to a better tomorrow. Certainly this does not include a world of thin haze which menaces the health of our children.

Civilization cannot advance in a murky, unhealthy atmosphere.

The bill we are considering today will help clear the air.

I thank the Chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. A number of us are very much interested in both air and water pollution and the process of using some form of tax abatement to accelerate the normal process of research and development and the use of new facilities.

I note with great interest that the committee in its report recommends a possible hydroprecipitator as a suitable subject to study.

Would the Senator tell us something about the committee's thinking on that subject.

Mr. MUSKIE. I think it is accurate to say that all members of the subcommittee, and I suppose all members of the full committee, are wholly in accord with the idea of tax incentive for purchase of water and air pollution control equipment. Indeed, the ranking minority member, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], has introduced legislation to that effect.

If this committee had jurisdiction over that subject, that kind of legislation would be on the floor. Unfortunately, we did not have such jurisdiction, but we are wholly in accord with the position of those Senators sponsoring tax-incentive legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, amendments could be offered to the legislation. I realize that it is probably not as choate in this bill as it would be in water pollution control legislation. However, the committee has not evaluated the consideration of what might be done in this field because the subject was not within its jurisdiction.

Mr. MUSKIE. There was a great deal of testimony in relation to this matter even though it was realized that the committee did not have jurisdiction. The subject was discussed among ourselves. I believe that we have a rather firm and well-defined position on the subject and that we may take the opportunity, in some fashion, to communicate our position to the appropriate committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Maine. While I did not serve on the subcommittee which considered the bill, I attended some of the hearings and I attended a good many hearings on the water pollution control bill.

Many witnesses spoke on the necessity of providing tax incentive to private industry to construct antipollution facilities. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] when testifying before the committee made as one of the main points of his testimony that the problem was two pronged.

The Senator from Connecticut pointed out correctly that assistance by the Federal Government to communities is required. But he also emphasized, and I concur, that tax incentives to industry are required, for the problem of pollution control cannot be met without a massive and expensive effort by private industry. The facilities required of them do not contribute to their earnings, but serve a social purpose. Many are assuming the responsibility and they should be encouraged.

The Senator from Connecticut has introduced a bill which would give a faster tax writeoff for pollution control facilities constructed by industry. I have introduced, with the chairman of the committee, Senator RANDOLPH, a bill which would provide an investment tax credit. In the discussion in committee all the members of the committee including the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, voiced their belief that tax legislation should be enacted to provide incentive to industry. Before closing I would like to add my congratulations to the Senator from Maine, and his committee for developing the reported bill. I am glad that our full Committee on Public Works supports the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduced a bill, S. 3598, yesterday. My bill would provide tax treatment for expenditures incurred in the construction of facilities to abate air and water pollution.

The bill has been referred to the Committee on Finance, and it is lying on the desk this week for the benefit of Senators who may wish to cosponsor the bill. A number of Senators have already done so.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Maine that we shall press for early action in the committee, as I am a member of the committee.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am delighted to have my colleague on the committee.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I arrived in the Chamber during the statement of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

The Senator may recall that, approximately 2 years ago, I offered an amendment to the tax bill. My amendment provided for a rapid tax writeoff for air and water pollution devices. The Senate agreed to the amendment overwhelmingly. However, the amendment was deleted in conference.

The executive branch has not yet favored the proposal that there be a fast tax writeoff for air and water pollution devices. I think that they are very shortsighted to this extent. It seems to me that, despite all the money we are spending for air and water pollution control at the governmental level, we will never solve the problem of air and water pollution unless we have the complete cooperation of industry.

Our problem in this connection is that throughout the country there are many old plants. Many of these plants are unproductive.

Air and water pollution control devices are expensive. And thus the State authorities are faced with a great dilemma when they ask industry to stop polluting the air and water immediately.

The Governor of the State and the State authorities find themselves under great pressure. The town fathers, the labor unions, and the chambers of commerce are not willing to force an old industry to make expenditures, because they might mean the loss of an industry that has been established in the State for many years.

I have noted a great advance in the interest of industry in its responsibility to eliminate air and water pollution. If we are to achieve our goal and eliminate air and water pollution, we should encourage industry to install air and water pollution control devices. There is a general public interest that goes beyond that of the individual manufacturer who has an old antiquated plant. The public has a definite interest. The way in which that interest can be shown is by giving a fast tax writeoff to industry for the installation of air and water pollution control devices.

The cost to the Federal Government, depending on what might be contained in the bill, could range from $25 million to $200 million a year. When we consider that this committee under the leadership of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will soon bring in a $6 billion water pollution control bill, the small sum of money that would be lost in tax revenue is infinitesimal. We will never achieve real and effective air and water pollution control in America until we have the complete cooperation of American industry. It is most essential, as I testified before the committee.

I introduced a bill some 2 years ago as a result of my experience as a Governor, as a member of the Cabinet working in this field, and as a U.S. Senator.

I note with great interest the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is a member of the Committee on Finance. I believe that if the administration still persists in opposing proposals such as this, those interested in the proposal should introduce this kind of a bill as an amendment to some tax legislation and have the Senate vote on this matter again.

I am sure that the Senate will repeat its approval of some 2 to 3 years ago. I have a very high regard for the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I am sure that there may be variations between his bill and the bill of the Senator from Kentucky. However, I am equally sure we will be able to work out a satisfactory bill and have effective air and water pollution control.

Air pollution, as a byproduct of our increasingly industrialized and urbanized Nation, is a growing threat to the health and welfare of the American people. Research and study of air pollution continues to provide evidence of the insidious effects of increasing contamination of the air we breathe and in which all human activities take place. We know that air pollution can build up to high levels which can cause acute illness and death. Of even greater concern, perhaps, is the long-range and subtle effect on human health of the lower levels of pollution found in most of our cities when breathed daily over a period of months and years. Among the diseases which have been associated with air pollution conditions found today in many urban areas of our country are lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and even the "common cold."

In addition to these threats to human health, air pollution causes billions of dollars of losses resulting from the soiling, corrosion, and deterioration of buildings, clothing, rubber, stonework, and other materials. Even our precious and irreplaceable art treasures are now recognized as subject to destruction by this menace. Air pollution reduces visibility and is, thereby, a factor in ground and air transport accidents. Recent research has now indicated that air pollution can even have an adverse effect on our weather, particularly in urban areas.

That is why the first bill I introduced as a Senator was the Clean Air Act of 1963.

In the brief period since the passage of the Clean Air Act late in 1963, considerable progress has been made in mounting a national program for the control of air pollution involving the efforts of all levels of government, public and private, research organizations, and others, under the leadership of the Federal air pollution program.

The Clean Air Act substantially modified the role of the Federal Government in air pollution control as contrasted with its role under prior legislation. New mechanisms within the Federal Government for participation in, and stimulation of, the national effort to abate and control air pollution, were provided. Its provisions are broad and they range into fields which the Federal effort had not previously entered. Briefly, the Clean Air Act authorizes continuation and substantial augmentation of the research, technical assistance, and training activities of the Federal air pollution program carried on by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare since 1955. The act, however, went far beyond prior legislative authority by assigning to the Department several new responsibilities in the area of air pollution control. It established, for the first time, a program of grant assistance to State, regional, and municipal air pollution control agencies to stimulate and assist State and municipal governments to develop and improve control programs. It also authorizes Federal action to secure abatement of interstate problems, thereby providing some recourse for relief from air pollution which may be endangering the health and welfare of a population in one State but for which, no effective legal remedies to correct the situation are otherwise available. Other provisions of the Clean Air Act direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop and promulgate criteria of air quality for the guidance of control agencies and other governmental bodies desiring to establish enforceable standards of air quality, to conduct studies and investigations leading to the development of practical low-cost methods of removing sulfur from fuels in order to reduce the amount of atmospheric sulfurous pollution caused by the burning of sulfur-containing coal and oil, to develop prototype devices and procedures of air pollution control and to establish a procedure for the regulation of air pollution discharged from buildings and other facilities under Federal jurisdiction. I was proud to have been the coauthor of that landmark legislation.

Last year, the Clean Air Act was amended and strengthened by Public Law 89-272 to add major new responsibilities for the prevention and control of air pollution. Perhaps the most significant aspect of these amendments was reflected in the decision that the Federal Government must take action to control the present and increasingly growing problem of air pollution from motor vehicles. Under this legislation and the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, beginning with the 1968 model year, all new foreign and domestic motor vehicles and engines introduced into commerce in the United States must conform to Federal standards governing the emissions of air pollutants. Although this measure represents an important step in the control of air pollution from motor vehicles it is widely recognized that it is far from a complete solution of the problem since the percentage reductions in emissions from the internal combustion engine which can be achieved will, in time, be overcome by the increasing number of motor vehicles which will be traveling on our highways and streets. The act will, however, prevent aggravation of the problem and provide some time during which more radical and permanent solutions to the problem can be developed.

Other provisions of the amendments enacted last year include authority to the Secretary to take action to abate international air pollution problems caused by sources located in the United States; to hold public conferences directed toward the prevention of new or more aggravated air pollution problems; to accelerate research concerning methods for controlling pollution from motor vehicles and emissions of oxides of sulfur; and to construct, staff, and equip facilities needed by the Department to carry out its responsibilities under the act.

In enacting the Clean Air Act, the Congress authorized appropriations for a 3-year period ending fiscal year 1967. In providing this time cutoff, it was fully recognized that our air pollution problems will not have been solved in that time. It was the intent of Congress, however, to provide an opportunity to evaluate and assess progress made, to determine what modifications in the Federal program might be needed, and the necessary financial resources which must be made available if the objectives of the act are to be achieved.

Within this framework, therefore, S. 3112 extends and substantially increases the appropriation authorizations for the Federal program through fiscal year 1969. The increases provided in S. 3112 are clearly necessary if the wide range of responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to the control of air pollution is to be carried out in an adequate manner and if the progress and momentum gained under the first several years of the Federal program is to be sustained.

In addition to extending the appropriation authorizations under the act, S. 3112 would authorize the initiation of a new grant program which will properly reflect the Federal interest in providing financial support to State and local governments in exercising their primary responsibility for controlling air pollution at its sources. Under the existing provisions of the Clean Air Act, Federal grant support is limited to short-term stimulatory grants for projects directed toward the development, establishment, and improvement of programs. Although this limited grant program has been highly successful in stimulating greatly increased efforts at the State and local level, it is clear that sustained efforts by State and local governments over a long period of years is necessary if adequate control of air pollution is to be effected. S. 3112 would meet this need by authorizing Federal grants for the maintenance of State and local air pollution programs in an amount up to one-half of the total cost of such programs. Incentives for the conduct of regional or interjurisdictional programs are incorporated in S. 3112 by the provision authorizing Federal grants up to 60 percent of the cost of such programs.

In summary, in extending the Federal air pollution control program, in increasing the amounts of Federal financial resources committed to this serious environmental problem, and in providing a basis for strengthening the abilities of State and local governments to cope with their air pollution problems, S. 3112 should command the support of all who are concerned with this growing threat to the Nation's health and welfare.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the time for the vote be extended 5 minutes, so that I may yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and that rule XII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe it is important for the record of this debate to indicate the general agreement of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works with the proposals which have been advanced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The Senator from Kentucky is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works.

I have joined in at least two of these approaches, because I believe it is important that industry have not only the opportunity but also the incentive, through one or more methods, whereby the financial burden of air and water pollution control systems will be lessened. In other words, give industry the incentive to do the job.

It is popular for people to speak in vigorous terms against private industry in matters of air and water pollution abatement. We must be careful in attacking private industry in this instance, because in the State of West Virginia, as in many other States, private industry has gone forward in this respect at considerable expense, involving millions of dollars in non-revenue-producing facilities. The increased costs to the companies should be borne at least in part by the people of the United States, as a whole.

As the Senator from Connecticut has said—we know the viewpoints of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]—Congress has the responsibility, through incentives to private industry, to bring industry into this effort to a greater degree. In other words, the programs and the progress should not be stimulated by the Government alone. The need prevails for the cooperation and coordinated understanding of industry and Government. The need is for a partnership.

I speak strongly about this matter, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, not only aware of my responsibility but also realizing that within the committee there is strong sentiment—almost a unanimity—that although we do not have the jurisdiction for tax incentive legislation we realize that the Congress has a responsibility in this matter.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I wish to ask the Senator from West Virginia this question: From his experience as chairman of the great committee that has done much in the field of air and water pollution, is there any question in his mind that unless the complete cooperation of American industry is obtained, effective air and water pollution control cannot be achieved purely on a governmental level?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from West Virginia be extended 5 minutes, and that rule XII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the concentrations of population together with the technological and economic development of our country caused those of us within the committee to realize that we must not disparage what has been done, but that we must attack this problem in an all-out effort. We shall approach it in less than a forthright manner if we attempt to make it only a Government-sponsored program, without providing industry with an incentive to move as a partner in the program of progress.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does the Senator from West Virginia have in his mind the same question that the Senator from Connecticut has in his concerning the advisability of the Government operating in separate compartments? One part of the executive branch wants to clean the air and the water and recommends substantial sums, running into hundreds of millions of dollars, to do so, while yet another branch of the Government demurs, when a really effective job could be done by providing tax incentives that would be only a fraction of what the Government could expend.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him on the proposal for a tax incentive for the parents of the country to offset the cost of tuition for their sons and daughters at the college level. Our philosophy is the same on this subject.

I shall yield further, if the Senator desires, but I think we have a concept of our responsibility which causes us to believe that private industry will cooperate. Let us not believe that private industry is reluctant or is holding back. Private industry is ready to move in this area, and, in fact, has already moved.

I know of a steel company in West Virginia which has expended $2 million for air pollution abatement and air control facilities. That company actually made an expenditure which was difficult to justify, but in a desire to move forward and to indicate its cooperation and its leadership, it made that commitment of the sum which I have mentioned.

The limitation of time causes the chairman of the committee not to speak longer; but I wish to express certain conclusions which I have reached, so that I want those conclusions to be a matter of record.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I am gratified to be a cosponsor of S. 3112. This legislation, while it may not be the type of congressional activity which receives great public or media recognition, is a significant step toward control of the critical air pollution confronting our Nation.

S. 3112 provides a needed further stimulant to State pollution control agencies which, having been stimulated into action by previous legislation providing Federal grant funds, need continued aid to maintain these programs.

This is particularly significant in my State of West Virginia, where pollution of the atmosphere is a difficult problem, but where the State, accepting its primary responsibility in this area, has attempted to cope with the situation. Without continued Federal support it is highly unlikely that West Virginia or, for that matter, most of the 33 States with pollution control programs will be able to continue their commitments to protection of the public health and welfare from contamination of our air environment.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the recently released regulations covering air pollution from Federal facilities. I ask unanimous consent to have these regulations printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the order, issued on June 3 requires that plans for new Federal facilities and buildings in the United States include provisions for air pollution control measures necessary to comply with the standards issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In addition, the President has directed the head of each agency to examine existing installations and to present to the Bureau of the Budget by July 1, 1967, an orderly schedule for bringing all such installations to the required standards.

The President has noted that a major difficulty in writing the order was the lack of an economically feasible technology for controlling emissions of sulfur. The Congress called attention to the problem in last year's amendments to the Clean Air Act.

The President has directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore with the Bureau of the Budget the feasibility of increasing still further the Federal effort to determine a solution of the sulfur emission problem.

However, as President Johnson also has pointed out, a major part of the responsibility for sulfur research rests with the utilities, the coal and oil industries, and other groups which feel the economic efforts of the more stringent air pollution regulations.

Mr. President, during the hearings on S. 3112 I specifically requested Vernon Mackenzie, Chief, Division of Air Pollution, to comment on this order as it relates to the sulfur emission problem.

Mr. Mackenzie's comments to the committee were of considerable significance to those of us who represent areas where coal performs a major role in the economy. I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The sulfur pollution problem in some sections of the country in our opinion has reached virtually a critical stage.

In my view, there are areas in the country in which I believe the sulfur pollution is actually dangerous to human health. On this account we have given the control of sulfurous pollution a high priority in our overall program, both with respect to research undertakings, and also an evaluation of the various steps that can be taken on an interim basis until we have better technical answers to deal with the problems.

There are a number of these things that can be done now, such as substitution of fuels having lower sulfur content, the use of very tall stacks to improve dilution and dispersion of the combustion gases from large sources, and by planning new installations in areas where the pollution problem is not as critical as in some others.

These things we regard, however, only as temporary expedients. We do not know currently the most effective way in which to deal with this problem on a long-range basis.

There are attempts going forward through research to develop procedures by which sulfur can be removed from the fuels. Some of these are technically feasible at the present time, particularly with respect to petroleum fuels, but at a cost which has not been acceptable to many users, particularly in industry and elsewhere.

With respect to coal, the situation is less promising with regard to removal of the sulfur from the fuel. We do not have a good technology developed for this purpose as is the case with respect to oil, although work is still proceeding on this aspect of the problem, also.

Perhaps the most promising technical area for further development, particularly as related to the emission of sulfurous compounds by large fuel users, is concerned with the technology of removing sulfur compounds from the combustion gases. Here there have been developed on a laboratory scale and on a small pilot plant scale a number of processes that we think have real technical promise of application for removal of sulfur from the stack gases. This development work is being prosecuted both by public agencies and by private organizations. I am hopeful that, within perhaps the next 5 years, there will be improved tools that we will have available to deal with the problem by this route.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the committee report indicates that a major part of the research effort of the division of air pollution is devoted to the question of sulfur emissions. This is gratifying to me and to the people of West Virginia. I sincerely hope that this research is intensified and will soon result in economically feasible methods of control.

Mr. President, the problem of air pollution is one of the most critical in the Nation. Though not absolutely demonstrated, it is difficult to believe that there is no relationship between polluted air and the increase in such respiratory illness as emphysema and chronic bronchitis.

The obligation of the Congress to meet this problem with all the facilities of the Federal Government, providing maximum aid to the States, is obvious.

Mr. President, I assure you and my colleagues that the Committee on Public Works, through its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, chaired by the knowledgeable Senator [Mr. MUSKIE], is going into these problems in a depth and scope as we have never done before. I do not disparage what we have already achieved, but all that any American citizen has to do is to travel throughout this country and to see and sense and feel what is happening and know that we must purify our air and clean our water. This is a challenge which we legislatively here must accept.

In conclusion, I wish to express not merely a gracious pleasantry, but genuine appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution for the diligence with which he has continued the hearings, week in and week out, month in and month out, over a period of years.

It is important for us in Congress to express our thanks to persons who are knowledgeable in subjects of this type. This is a new area in which Congress has responsibility. I feel certain that the knowledgeable leadership of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] will be called on in the months and years ahead. The Committee on Public Works shall attempt to move vigorously into this area, not bypassing industry, but with the support of industry, so far as that is possible, with cooperative, coordinated efforts, we believe that such efforts will be successful.

Exhibit 1

Executive Order 11282—Prevention, Control, and Abatement of Air Pollution by Federal Activities

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States and in furtherance of the purpose and policy of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857), it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Policy.*—The heads of the departments, agencies, and establishments of the Executive Branch of the Government shall provide leadership in the nationwide effort to improve the quality of our air through the prevention, control, and abatement of air pollution from Federal Government activities in the United States. In order to achieve these objectives—

(1) Emissions to the atmosphere from Federal facilities and buildings shall not be permitted if such emissions endanger health or welfare, and emissions which are likely to be injurious or hazardous to people, animals, vegetation, or property, shall be minimized. The procedures established in section 3 of this Order shall be followed in minimizing pollution from existing facilities and buildings.

(2) New Federal facilities and building shall be constructed so as to meet the objectives prescribed by this Order and the standards established pursuant to section 5 of this Order.

(3) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, in administering the Clean Air Act, as amended, provide technical advice and assistance to the heads of other departments, agencies, and establishments in connection with their duties and responsibilities under this Order. The head of each department, agency, and establishment shall establish appropriate procedures for securing advice from, and consulting with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(4) The head of each department, agency, and establishment shall ensure compliance with section 107(a) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857f(a)), which declares it to be the intent of Congress that Federal departments and agencies shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling pollution of the air.

Sec. 2. *Procedures for new Federal facilities and buildings.*—A request for funds to defray the cost of designing and constructing new facilities and buildings in the United States shall be included in the annual budget estimates of a department, agency, or establishment only if such request includes funds to defray the costs of such measures as may be necessary to assure that the new facility or building will meet the objectives prescribed by this Order and the standards established pursuant to section 5 of this Order. Air pollution control needs shall be considered in the initial stages of planning for each new installation.

Sec. 3. *Procedures for existing Federal facilities and buildings.* (a) In order to facilitate budgeting for corrective and preventive measures, the head of each department, agency, and establishment shall provide for an examination of all existing facilities and buildings under his jurisdiction in the United States and shall develop and present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by July 1, 1967, a phased and orderly plan for installing such improvements as may be needed to prevent air pollution, or abate such air pollution as may exist, with respect to such buildings and facilities. Subsequent revisions needed to keep any such plan up to date shall be submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with the annual report required by paragraph (b) of this section. Future construction work at each such facility and the expected future use of the facility shall be considered in developing such a plan. Each such plan, and any revision therein, shall be developed in consultation with the Secretary of Health. Education, and Welfare in order to ensure that adoption of the measures proposed thereby will result in the prevention or abatement of air pollution in conformity with the objectives precribed by this Order and the standards prescribed pursuant to section 5 of this Order.

(b) The head of each department, agency, and establishment who has existing facilities and buildings under his jurisdiction in the United States shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by July 1, 1968, and by the first of each fiscal year thereafter, an annual report describing progress of his department, agency, or establishment in accomplishing the objectives of its air pollution abatement plan.

Sec. 4. *Objectives for Federal facilities and buildings.* (a) Except for discharges of radioactive emissions which are regulated by the Atomic Energy Commission, Federal facilities buildings shall conform to the air pollution standards prescribed by the State or community in which they are located. If State or local standards are not prescribed for a particular location, or if the State or local standards are less stringent than the standards established pursuant to this Order, the standards prescribed pursuant to section 5 of this Order shall be followed.

(b) The emission of flyash and other particulate matter shall be kept to a minimum.

(c) Emission of sulfur oxides shall be minimized to the extent practicable.

(d) Wherever appropriate, tall chimneys shall be installed in order to reduce the adverse effects of pollution. The determination of chimney height shall be based on air quality criteria, land use, and meteorological, topographical, aesthetic, and operating factors.

(e) Solid fuels and ash shall be stored and handled so as not to release to the atmosphere dust in significant quantities. Gasoline or any volatile petroleum distillate or organic liquid shall be stored and handled so as not to release to the atmosphere vapor emissions in significant quantities.

(f) In urban areas refuse shall not be burned in open fires and in rural areas it shall be disposed of in such a manner as to reasonably minimize pollution. Refuse shall not be left in dumps without being covered with inert matter within a reasonably short time. Whenever incinerators are used they shall be of such design as will minimize emission of pollutant dusts, fumes, or gases.

(g) Pollutant dusts, fumes, or gases (other than those for which provision is made above) shall not be discharged to the atmosphere in quantities which will endanger health or welfare.

(h) The head of each department, agency, and establishment shall, with respect to each installation in the United States under his jurisdiction, take, or cause to be taken, such action as may be necessary to ensure that discharges of radioactive emissions to the atmosphere are in accord with the rules, regulations, or requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission and the policies and guidance of the Federal Radiation Council as published in the Federal Register.

(i) In extraordinary cases where it may be required in the public interest, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may exempt any Federal facility or building from the objectives of paragraphs (a) through (g) of this section.

Sec. 5. *Standards.* (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe standards to implement the objectives prescribed by paragraphs (a) through (g) of section 4 of this Order. Such standards may modify these objectives whenever the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine that such modifications are necessary in the public interest and will not significantly conflict with the intent of this Order. Prior to issuing any changes in such standards, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall consult with appropriate Federal agencies and shall publish the proposed changes in the Federal Register thirty days prior to their issuance. All such standards prescribed by the Secretary shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) The permits authorized by section 107(b) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857f(b)), may be used to carry out the purposes of this Order as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem appropriate.

Sec. 6. *Prior Executive Order superseded.* Executive Order No. 10779 of August 20, 1958, is hereby superseded.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *May 26, 1966.*

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works for his remarks and for the wholehearted cooperation and dedicated contribution he has made to this effort during my association with him on the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the colloquy which has just been going on points up a question that I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time for 2 additional minutes, and to waive rule XII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. I had the privilege of serving with the Senator on his subcommittee a couple of years ago and we discussed the matter of the need for private industry to join in such a program and the need for tax incentives.

I joined the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] in the sponsorship of his bill. I hope that that matter will be pursued.

However, the language of this bill leaves open a possibility for interpretation. I wish to direct to the attention of the manager of the bill section 104(a), line 20, page 2 of the bill which says:

> Sec. 104. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, and grants to such agencies up to one-half of the cost of maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution:

Suppose a program by one of these agencies includes the reimbursement in whole or in part to private industry for installing air pollution control equipment. Would it be the interpretation of the Senator that the pending bill would permit the use of Federal funds to go to that agency for the purpose, in turn, of reimbursing private industry under those circumstances?

Mr. MUSKIE. With respect to the question of the Senator, I have my own thoughts. This is a question which he addressed to me earlier in private.

I would say it is clearly not the intent of the act to make that possible and I do not think the effect of the language would make it possible.

I refer to the attention of the Senator the statement made by Mr. Vernon G. Mackenzie, Assistant Surgeon General, Chief, Division of Air Pollution, Public Health Service, in which he says:

> As you know, Mr. Chairman, these grants are intended to stimulate new or increased control activity on the part of State and local agencies. To this end, grants are made only to agencies which increase their own contributions to their budgets for control activities.

The program grant provision is not intended to underwrite or assist industrial installation of air pollution control facilities. That is the objective of the tax features we talked about earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 3 additional minutes, and that rule XII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I said a while ago that I did not sit on the subcommittee, although I am the ranking member of the full committee.

Great tribute has been paid and rightfully so to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. He has shown exceptional leadership and initiative.

I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], as the ranking Republican of that subcommittee, assiduously attended all meetings, devoted himself to the great problems of air pollution, and worked with the distinguished chairman of the committee to be able to develop a bill which will be of great value today and in the future of our country.

I congratulate both of the Senators for the work which they have done.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator. I associate myself with the remarks that the Senator has made with reference to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving 2 years on the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

I wish to join the chairman of the committee [Mr. RANDOLPH] in endorsing the remarks he made with respect to the chairman of the Committee on Air and Water Pollution.

I wish to say on this issue, which is of great concern to me, that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is providing more distinguished and thoughtful leadership than any other man in Congress, or anywhere in the United States.

I join the Senators in congratulating him for his thoughtful and fruitful work.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and that the reading of the amendments be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I urge the immediate passage of S. 3112, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1966. The Senate and the entire country are deeply indebted to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] for his outstanding leadership in the field of air pollution control. It is in large measure due to his untiring efforts that the Nation finally is recognizing the significance of this problem. The importance of the legislation before us now cannot be overestimated. Air pollution poses a real threat to our national health and welfare. This bill is the next step in the Federal program to control air pollution. It is an effective means to combat that problem.

In 1963, Congress passed the Clean Air Act which created within the Federal Government a mechanism to increase the national effort to abate and control air pollution. The act authorized substantial augmentation of the Federal air pollution program carried on by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare since 1955. It also established a program of grant assistance to State, regional, and municipal air pollution control agencies.

Again, in 1965, Congress, acting in the national interest and recognizing the increasing gravity of the air pollution problem, passed S. 306 which established a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory and amended the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles.

It is our duty to strike the next blow in the battle against air pollution; S. 3112 offers us this opportunity by making the use of appropriations under the Clean Air Act more flexible and authorizing grants to air pollution control agencies.

More than 60 percent of the population of the United States is confronted by the problem of air pollution. The movement of an ever-larger percentage of population into urban areas has concentrated the discharge of waste products from combustion into a very small proportion of the atmosphere. A consistent relationship between air pollution and population has been determined. At the present time 53 percent of our citizens live on less than 1 percent of our land area. As urbanization increases, the problem of air pollution is intensified. It is imperative that we meet the challenge of air pollution now before it becomes uncontrollable.

Air pollution has many insidious effects. It harms health, reduces our crop yield, damages property, and offends our senses. There is strong evidence that air pollution is associated with a number of respiratory ailments. The cost of illness, of decreased strength, and of shortened lifespan is incalculable. Human suffering bears no price tag. Property damages attributed to air pollution are currently $65 per capita per year. Air pollution causes accelerated deterioration of materials and structures and increases maintenance and replacement expenditures.

Clean, pure air is a part of our national heritage. What more valuable gift can we leave to our descendants than an atmosphere freed from offensive and noxious gases? We must control air pollution now while we are able. S. 3112 will be indispensible in combating the menace of air pollution. The bill increases the annual authorization for air pollution control and abatement programs to $46 million a year for this fiscal year, $70 million for fiscal 1967–68, and $80 million for 1968–69. The legislation would permit 50–50 matching grants to air pollution control agencies and three-fourths matching grants to intermunicipal and interstate agencies for maintaining control and abatement programs. It provides three-fifths matching grants for regional air control programs. These new grants are in addition to the existing matching grants to air pollution control agencies and matching grants to intermunicipal and interstate agencies for developing, establishing, or improving such programs.

Clean air is the most vital of our national resources. I urge the immediate passage of S. 3112 to further combat the air pollution problem.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, without question, control of air quality and pollution reduction is a great problem, and it is a problem for which solutions are within our power.

The technological solution to air pollution has proved a thorny problem for engineers, but methods are being developed to solve the problems of air pollution. Legislation passed in the 88th Congress and amendments made in the 1st session of the 89th Congress have provided considerable impetus for those already working on the problem.

The legislation passed in the 88th Congress provided for a 3-year program so that Congress could review the progress made as a result of Federal activity. I concur with the committee that such review procedures should remain in effect, as is provided in the present legislation.

I was pleased to note in the report the progress which has been made in the development, by a private concern, of apparatus which promises to control incinerator waste and which could be used to reduce air contamination from incinerator waste emanating from large apartment or office building complexes in cities.

The present bill, S. 3112, would provide for continuation of Government assistance to State and local officials to deal with this problem. Progress has been made in controlling air quality, but additional financial resources are necessary if we are to realize our objectives in this area. S. 3112 has my complete support.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to again congratulate the distinguished chairman for his vision and for the leadership he has given this Nation in the fields of air and water pollution.

In my judgment, the pollution problem is one of the most serious domestic problems facing our country today. While serious, it is not yet critical. But time is not on our side. It is running out. Delay will not only be costly in terms of dollars, but even more important, will be the possible detriment to human health and the interference with the general well-being of our society.

Damage resulting from air pollution in this country has been estimated at $11 billion a year. Economic losses alone indicate the need for action. It has been estimated that agricultural losses in California alone total approximately $132 million annually. Pollution contributes to the deterioration and corrosion of our physical structures. The consumer may see the effects of pollution by the need for more frequent trips to the laundry. Even more important are the adverse effects that pollution may have on human health. Evidence grows associating air pollution with certain respiratory disorders, such as asthma, bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer. While the evidence is not conclusive, a strong suspicion is present, and one thing is certain, air pollution does not do us any good.

Although there has been a great deal of activity lately in the air pollution field, probably due in no small part to the Clean Air Act, it appears to me that the Nation has not fully grasped the seriousness of the air pollution problem. This is true despite the fact that polluted air is daily gasped by all too many Americans.

For some reason the American public has the impression that the air pollution problem only exists in Los Angeles and a handful of other cities. Over the years, I have had the pleasure of flying across this Nation and seeing much of the country. In so doing, I can say that contrary to this popular notion, Los Angeles is not the only area with a major pollution problem. While it may have been true at one time that Los Angeles alone had a pollution problem, one can clearly see that today air pollution is a national problem and a growing one.

Take the Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., for example. Our Capital City truly is a beautiful one. The millions of tourists who flock to Washington yearly cannot help but return to their respective States with a better understanding and a better appreciation of what America is all about. Washington continues to be a great source of inspiration to me personally. This is why I view with great concern the inadequate pollution programs in the District of Columbia area. For Washington, although a great inspirational and beautiful city, is also from an air pollution standpoint, a dirty city. Experts say, it is many times dirtier than the city of Los Angeles. That such is the case saddens me as it should all Americans, for it should not be. For Washington has no substantial industry and far better meteorological conditions than Los Angeles. Such pollution is also inexcusable because modern technology has advanced to such a state that most of the pollutants from stationary sources can, and should be, reduced or eliminated. In Los Angeles County a vigorous and effective program to abate air pollution from stationary sources is paying off. Aimed at reducing air pollution levels from stationary sources to those existing in 1940, the goal has almost been reached. Los Angeles County's control program for stationary sources has kept more than 5,000 tons of contaminants out of the air daily. The District of Columbia area could also achieve similar results by eliminating or reducing pollutants from stationary sources. It can and should be done.

Under the Clean Air Act, Federal action is authorized to abate interstate air pollution problems. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may take such action on his own initiative or after consultation with the officials of the States involved or at the request of the States. It is my understanding to date Federal authority has been invoked in eight interstate areas. Certainly the Federal Government has a particular responsibility in the Nation's Capital. It is for that reason that I urge the Secretary to initiate the necessary actions to stop the unnecessary pollution of the air in the Nation's Capital. The Federal City, pollutionwise, should be a model city of clean air.

I only wish, Mr. Chairman, that the State of California was making as rapid progress in controlling the pollution from the automobile as we have made in controlling pollution from stationary sources. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Although we are making progress, the truth of the matter is that we have to run as fast as we can to stand still. This is so because of our rapidly growing population which is expected to double by the end of this century, and the increasing number of autos.

On May 27, the Air Pollution Control District of the County of Los Angeles issued its report to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles regarding the status of air pollution control in Los Angeles County and the prospects of success of the current control programs. Their conclusions were: one, current motor vehicle control programs will not achieve acceptable air quality in Los Angeles in the next decade, and two, control of motor vehicle emissions must be intensified and accelerated if Los Angeles County is to have acceptable air quality by 1980.

Since it has been estimated that emissions from the motor vehicle are responsible for about 80 percent of the Los Angeles problem, and a substantial contribution elsewhere, we must do better. In California all 1966 and later model cars must meet California standards that limit the amount of hydrocarbons to 275 parts per million and carbon monoxide to 1.5 percent. Standards have been adopted to further reduce these exhaust emissions in the case of hydrocarbons from 275 parts per million to 180 parts per million, and carbon monoxide from 1.5 percent to 1 percent by 1970.

Mr. President, I would also urge that the automobile industry of this country give the problem of air pollution the top priority to which it is entitled. I feel very confident that the industry if it focuses the skills and abilities of its personnel will find solutions to the pollution problem. In any event, the industry should move and move quickly, for I can say that the public is demanding answers to the problem of air pollution.

Also, Mr. President, I believe it imperative that the Federal, State, and local governments undertake educational programs designed to make the public aware of the air pollution problem. In this effect, I would hope that such voluntary groups as the tuberculosis association might join in such a campaign in view of the increasing statistical evidence showing some relationship between respiratory problems and pollution.

Finally, although I understand this lies outside the jurisdiction of this Public Works Committee, I believe the Federal Government should provide a tax incentive to private industry to anyone who acquires, constructs, or installs air pollution devices that have been certified.

In conclusion, I believe that the work of this Air Pollution Subcommittee is as important as that carried on anywhere in the Congress. Indeed, if we are to pass only the benefits of our great civilization and unsurpassed technology to future generations without eliminating or at least controlling some of its undesirable byproducts, such as pollution, we may be cursed rather than praised. We in this country must learn to conserve our air and water resources, just as we learned to conserve other natural resources. We have already been given a glimpse of the folly of the failure to do otherwise.

In closing, I again congratulate the chairman and my colleagues for their work in keeping the air pollution problem before our people and for their efforts in bringing S. 3112 before the Senate. I feel confident that the enactment of S. 3112, which establishes maintenance grants and increases the authorization by $9 million during fiscal year 1967, will help us to continue the battle against air pollution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the bill we are about to pass today is an important addition to the Clean Air Act. The increase in annual authorization for air pollution control and abatement programs to $46 million per year and the establishment of 50-50 matching grants for maintenance of these programs reflects the determination of the Senate to eliminate pollution in the atmosphere.

The death in 1962 of 340 people in London due to smog is a bitter reminder that the pollution of the air we breathe is a serious problem. Air affects our health. There is strong evidence that chronic bronchitis and lung cancer are associated with contaminated air. Air affects property. Approximately $11 billion is lost per year through the accelerated deterioration of materials. Air affects agriculture. Grapes, tobacco, barley, and broccoli are but a few of the crops that have been harmed in at least 19 States. Polluted air affects our esthetic sense. Flowers have trouble growing in smog-covered cities, buildings and statues are eroded, and blue skies are turned grey and ugly. The overall harm to our environment and our people caused by air pollution is a shocking indictment of the entire Nation. Only a massive cooperative effort on the part of Federal, State, and local governments, coupled with ordinary citizens, can lick the problem. I believe we have begun this effort.

The bill does not affect any essential change in the Clean Air Act. Rather it supplements this act and is a good example of the ability of the Senate to respond quickly to new problems as they arise. Over the passage of time, it is inevitable that some legislation must be improved. This improvement should be done with both speed and wisdom.

Under the effective leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] the Public Works Committee acted with dispatch and with great wisdom in recommending this bill to the Senate. I am proud to have cosponsored this bill and to have worked under Senators MUSKIE and RANDOLPH for its enactment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York subsequently said: Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to support S. 3112, a bill improving the Clean Air Act. This legislation will authorize the Federal Government to pay for the operation of municipal, intermunicipal and interstate air pollution control programs. It will also remove a restriction on the use of appropriated funds for this purpose, until this time a limit of 20 percent.

This bill authorizes a total of $46 million in 1967, $70 million in 1968, and $80 million in 1969 for Federal air pollution activities. And with this legislation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can pay up to half the expenses of a municipal pollution control program and three-fifths of the costs of an intermunicipal or interstate program.

This additional authority and these funds are needed to help expand the air pollution programs that have been started during the last few years. We have used Federal funds to help stimulate local and State activities and these units of government have increased their expenditures by 50 percent in the last 2 years. Most municipalities, however, are hard pressed to meet the many financial challenges of growth and renewal and badly need assistance in meeting this new threat.

New York City, for example, spent $1,347,000 for its air pollution control program in 1965–66. The Federal Government contributed $190,173 or 14 percent of this total. Most of New York City's money is used to pay the personnel of the department of air pollution control, with less than one-fourth of its funds available to purchase new equipment. This means that a city of 7 million operates only four sampling stations that continuously monitor at least 4 of the major pollutants. It means that a country that prides itself on its technological capabilities does not arm its air pollution control officers with anything approaching the types of equipment needed to meet this threat.

The additional support made available for pollution control programs by this bill will make it possible to expand New York City's program and to begin the purchase of data collection systems that will provide full information on air pollution.

In a larger sense, however, we have only begun to come to grips with this threat to our environment. Our pollution experts point out that with the expected growth in the number of cars on our streets and highways, and the expected increase in electrical power production, the level of pollution in our communities will increase rather than decrease. Even the expected gains from the automobile exhaust control devices that are required by the Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act of 1965 will be lost by the late 1980's. The increase in cars, more than 130 million by 1985, will bring the level of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon pollution back up to the level that exists today. And, although we will reduce the level of these two pollutants with the new control devices, the device has no effect whatsoever on the nitric oxides produced by the gasoline engine. There are even some indications that the new device will increase the amount of nitric oxides produced by a car.

Similarly, although our electrical power needs are expected to increase threefold by 1980, only nuclear power eliminates air pollution. We do not yet have an economic way to remove sulfur from coal or fuel oil, a necessary step if we are to lower the amount of sulfur dioxide in our atmosphere.

The major danger from air pollution is one of health. Most of us know that carbon monoxide in a closed garage can kill us, but fewer know of the indirect dangers. For air pollution affects the health of millions who are unaware of its threat.

In the absence of precise and overwhelming medical findings, there has been a reluctance to state that air pollution is a cause of lung and circulation diseases or cancer. Medical experts point out that on the basis of current information, they cannot tell whether a pollutant causes a disease. They do, however, admit that air pollution places an additional load on those suffering from other diseases. And they agree that many pollutants severely restrict the oxygen-carrying qualities of our blood, reducing our ability to fight other diseases.

Yet, as early as 1932, the U.S. Public Health Service surveyed American cities to find out whether there was any connection between air pollution and disease. They found that the four most polluted cities at the time—Pittsburgh, Boston, Baltimore, and St. Louis—also had the highest proportion of pneumonia deaths in the country.

Again, in 1957, the Canadian Select Committee on Air Pollution and Smoke Control stated that—

> Although scientific evidence about the effects of air pollution on human health is far from complete, enough proof exists to make it abundantly and increasingly clear that air pollution is injurious to both physical and mental health. Under certain combinations of circumstances it can be fatal. It fosters disease, and is very probably a major cause of lung cancer, if not of other forms of malignancy.

Within the last several years, medical investigations in Buffalo found that air pollution may double our chances of dying from lung diseases. The health records of people living in the path of Buffalo's industrial smoke was compared with those of people living outside the smoke path. The records showed that twice as many—6 percent—people between 50 and 70 in the polluted area died from lung diseases as those who lived elsewhere—3 percent.

In 1949, only 915 deaths in the United States were attributed to emphysema. By 1961, this figure had climbed to 10,269. Last year, emphysema killed an estimated 60,000 Americans according to Dr. John H. McClement, chief of the chest service at New York's Bellevue Hospital. Emphysema also disables 1 out of every 14 of our workers over 45, according to the Social Security Administration.

Emphysema does not strike with the suddenness of a heart attack or pneumonia. Many victims are unaware of its presence until more than 50 percent of their lung capacity is destroyed. And once this destruction takes place, it cannot be reversed. The victim only receives half as much oxygen as before and is limited in what he can do. And the extra burden placed on his blood system bring a host of heart and circulation problems.

The significance of this increase in the number of emphysema cases is that it has been linked to air pollution. British medical investigators have found a close correlation between this disease and the amount of fuel burned and the amount of sulfur dioxide and soot in the air. Our National Institutes of Health state that:

> It is probable that air pollution also contributes to the emphysema problem in the United States cities with smog problems; but the extent of that contribution remains to be accurately assessed.

Most recently, the National Academy of Sciences has reported that, although there is a lack of precise information, "there is undoubtedly a major health hazard under certain atmospheric conditions in larger cities."

I do not think that we can ask our medical and scientific experts to be more precise at this time. They have established the relationship between pollution and disease. It is up to us to reduce the level of pollution.

We do not even have agreement today on the levels of air pollution that are considered uncomfortable or unhealthy for the individual on the street. Congress has asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop criteria for this purpose, but to date they are not available.

California, for example, has established a set of standards classifying the amount of pollution found in the air at any one time. This standard has three categories; an adverse level at which the pollutant is irritating to the nose and eyes of an individual and can damage plant life and property; a serious level where exposure to the pollutant is likely to lead to chronic disease and a change in the functions of an individual who is sensitive to pollution although it may not affect a strong healthy person, and an emergency level, where a pollutant will lead to acute sickness or death in a sensitive group of persons.

California then goes on to state that 1 part per million of sulphur dioxide for 1 hour or 0.3 part per million for 8 hours is an adverse level. Five parts per million of sulphur dioxide for 1 hour is considered a serious level. And 10 parts per million is considered an emergency level.

When we compare California's standard for sulfur dioxide with average conditions in New York City during January 1965, we find that the adverse level was exceeded on more than half of the days of that month. The adverse level was exceeded for a 24-hour period on 17 days of the month.

The adverse level of sulfur dioxide has also been exceeded in a number of other cities. In February 1963, the average level of sulfur dioxide in Washington, D.C., exceeded the adverse level as defined by California. Yet no public warning was given because Washington, D.C., does not yet have a standard for pollution.

Similarly, in February 1965, Chicago registered an average sulfur dioxide level of 0.27 for the month, a level of 0.55 for a 24-hour period, and a level of 1.14 for an hour. And Cleveland experienced 2 hours in January and February 1965 when the sulfur dioxide level reached 0.54 and 0.55, respectively.

In view of the expected growth in electrical power generation, there is no question that many of our cities will have sulfur dioxide concentrations in excess of the adverse level as established by California. This level is already being exceeded in a number of cities. We have only touched on the regulations and practices that must be established if the sulfur dioxide content of our air is to be lowered.

California has also established standards for carbon monoxide. No adverse level has been set. A total of 30 parts per million for 8 hours or 120 parts per million for 1 hour is considered a serious level. And the emergency level is considered to be somewhere between 120 and 240 parts per million.

New York City also considers 30 parts per million of carbon monoxide for a 24-hour period to be dangerous. Yet New Yorkers and commuters from surrounding communities have been exposed to carbon monoxide concentrations ranging from 100 to 200 parts per million.

During the recent transit strike in New York City, carbon monoxide measurements were taken in the Lincoln, Battery, and Holland Tunnels. The average concentrations taken from the entrace to the exit of these tunnels were 44, 54, and 34 parts per million, respectively. And at a number of spots in these tunnels, levels of 100 to 200 parts per million were recorded.

Although many pollution experts discount carbon monoxide levels near major highways, these levels are of significance to those who drive continually in heavy traffic or have jobs that constantly expose them to carbon monoxide. It is no wonder that several blood samples taken from taxicab drivers in one of our cities showed a carbon monoxide level between 8 and 20 percent, considered enough by the Public Health Service to affect their driving.

Unfortunately, this picture of tentative pollution safety levels set by some States and communities with little agreement between them is repeated for other pollutants. The result has been one of confusion and discouragement for those who have attempted to clean up our air.

We can make more progress in our efforts to control air pollution if we establish a Federal safety code for the major pollutants. This code, establishing an adverse and a serious level for each of the significant pollutants, could be used as a guideline by communities concerned with this problem. This code should set a level for a pollutant that will protect all members of the community, the very young and the old and those most sensitive to the effects of this pollutant as well as those more able to withstand the effects of pollution. For these groups suffer most when pollution levels rise. There is no doubt in the minds of our doctors that pollution takes a toll of these groups—a toll that is reflected in the death records of most major cities.

In looking toward future legislation, I believe that major emphasis must be given to air pollution research and development. For this is an area where a major investment will pay dividends.

We need to experiment with new processes for removing sulfur from coal and fuel oil. In much the same way that we have built experimental desalinization plants, we should build sulfur extractors. It should be possible to develop an economic way of doing this.

We also need a major investment in power transmission technology so that we can carry electric power from powerplants located near our coal mines to our cities. Significant decreases in the cost of this form of power transmission can make it possible to build our new powerplants away from the cities.

And we also must continue our development of economical nuclear power to provide pollution-free power generators in our cities.

We also need to explore ways to eliminate pollution from automobile engines. A method of reducing the amount of nitric oxide in engine exhausts is essential and ways of further reducing the carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon exhausts are needed. The Public Health Service should establish a broad development program to reduce pollution from the gasoline engine.

We also need to explore the possibilities of electric cars. Recent advances made with electrical batteries in space craft and submarines are providing us with the technology for battery driven cars. The British are already moving forward on plans to develop an effective electric car which will aid materially in reducing air pollution. Mr. A. N. Irens of the British Electricity Council has suggested that Britain may have over a million electric cars within the next 10 years. He stated that, "the era of the battery-driven car need not be far away. Given enterprise, courage, and swift action, the battery-driven car will be the town car of the future."

The battery-driven car can be a practical vehicle for suburban and city driving. Although it will not provide the same acceleration or high speeds that present cars have, it will provide any power required for local streets and roads.

An effective air pollution control program also requires coordination with other major Federal programs. Our national fuel policies, affecting the availability of better grade fuel oil, the development of natural gas, and the utilization of coal, need to be related to our air pollution problems. Our transportation programs, aimed at reducing the number of cars on our highways and the stop and go driving in our cities, also bear a direct relation to our air pollution problem.

I do not think that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now has the authority to effect this coordination. Perhaps what we need is a Federal Council on Air Pollution with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare acting as the lead agency to handle these problems.

I have mentioned these air pollution problems and suggested some approaches not so much as a comment on this bill as a comment on the nature of the problem and the direction in which we must move. And although there may be differences of opinion about what we must do, there can be no disagreement on the need to solve this problem.

In discussing another health problem, cigarette smoking, it was pointed out that the individual had a choice as to whether he would smoke. There was no choice, however, for the 360 people in New York City who died in 1963 in one incident because of an increase in the pollution of the air. And there is no choice for the millions who will have their lives shortened because our air is contaminated. It is our responsibility to reduce the level of pollution to a point where no individual's health is threatened.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** (Mr. McIntyre in the chair.) Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll on final passage.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson
Bass
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Griffin
Gruening
Hayden
Kennedy, N.Y.
McClellan
McGee
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (S. 3112) was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the amendments to the Clean Air Act just endorsed by the Senate marks another triumph for the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] whose strong record in this field is already clearly established. His able handling of the proposal was in large measure responsible for its unanimous approval by the Senate. We are indeed grateful for Senator Muskie's vigorous advocacy on this measure and for the capable manner in which he directed its passage.

But the Senator from Maine is not alone in deserving praise for today's success. The junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] are also to be highly commended for their cooperative leadership, so essential to a victory of this magnitude.

We also thank the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] for his strong and articulate support as well as for the capable assistance of the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 13651) to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT TO STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND FOOD SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1325, S. 3467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the National School Lunch Act, as amended, is amended—

(A) By inserting in section 3 before the period at the end thereof the following phrase: "and other than sections 13 through 15 and section 17".

(B) By inserting in section 6 after the word "Act" where it first occurs the following: "(other than section 13 through 15 and section 17)".

(C) By adding at the end of subsection (d) of section 12, the following new paragraph:

"(8) 'Nonprofit institution' means any public or private institution, except a school or other educational institution of higher learning, which provides for the care and training of children and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

(D) By adding at the end of the Act the following new sections:

"SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

"AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $115,000,000; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years not to exceed $120,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this section 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia. The Secretary shall administer the special milk program provided for by this section to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided for by Public Law 85–478 as amended, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966.

"SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

"AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 14. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $7,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $10,000,000, to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a pilot program to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit breakfast programs in schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and in schools to which a substantial proportion of the children enrolled must travel long distances.

"APPORTIONMENT TO STATES

"(b) Of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 3 per centum for apportionment to Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. Such funds shall be apportioned among such States on the basis of the ratio of the number of children of ages five through seventeen in each such State to the number of all children of ages five through seventeen in all such States.

"(c) Of the remainder of the funds appropriated, the Secretary shall for each fiscal year, (1) apportion the first $2,500,000 equally among the States, other than Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, and (2) apportion the remainder among such States on the basis of the ratio of the number of children in each State of ages five through seventeen in families with incomes of less than $2,000 per annual plus the number of children of ages five through seventeen in families with incomes of more than $2,000 per annum from payments under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's program of aid to families with dependent children to the total number of such children in the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"STATE DISBURSEMENT TO SCHOOLS

"(d) Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to schools selected by the State educational agency, to reimburse such schools for the cost of obtaining agricultural and other foods for consumption by needy children in a breakfast program and for the purpose of subsection (e). Such food costs may include, in addition to the purchase price, the cost of processing, distributing, transporting, storing, and handling. Disbursement to schools shall be made at such rates per meal or on such other basis as the Secretary shall prescribe. In selecting schools, the State educational agency shall, to the extent practicable, give first consideration to those schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and to those schools to which a substantial proportion of the children enrolled must travel long distances.

"(e) In circumstances of severe need where the rate per meal established by the Secretary is deemed by him insufficient to carry on an effective breakfast program in a school, the Secretary may authorize financial assistance up to 90 per centum of the operating costs of such a program, including cost of obtaining, preparing, and serving food. In the selection of schools to receive assistance under this section, the State educational agency shall require applicant schools to provide justification of the need for such assistance.

"NUTRITIONAL AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

"(f) Breakfasts served by schools participating in the school breakfast program under this section shall consist of a combination of foods and shall meet minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research. Such breakfasts shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost only to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the breakfast. In making such determinations, such local authorities should, to the extent practicable, consult with public welfare and health agencies. No physical segregation of or other discrimination against any child shall be made by the school because of his inability to pay.

"NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

"(g) If in any State the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this section to nonprofit private schools, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds apportioned to any such State under subsections (b) and (c) of this section an amount based on the ratio of the number of children enrolled in nonprofit private schools within the State to the total number of children enrolled in all schools within the State. The Secretary shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to the nonprofit private schools within such State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are required of a State educational agency disbursing funds made available under this section.

"NONFOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

"AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 15. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to formulate and carry out a program to assist the States through grants-in-aid and other means to supply schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist with facilities, other than land and buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food to enable such schools to establish, maintain, and expand school food service programs.

"APPORTIONMENTS TO STATES

"(b) The Secretary shall apportion the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section among the States during each fiscal year on the same basis as apportionments are made under section 4 of this Act for supplying agricultural and other foods, except that apportionment to American Samoa for any fiscal year shall be on the same basis as the apportionment to the other States. Payments to any State of funds apportioned for any fiscal year shall be made upon condition that one-fourth of the cost of any facilities financed under this subsection shall be borne by State or local funds.

"STATE DISBURSEMENT TO SCHOOLS

"(c) Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to assist schools, which draw attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and which have no, or grossly inadequate, facilities, to conduct a school food service program, and to acquire such facilities. In the selection of schools to receive assistance under this section, the State educational agency shall require applicant schools to provide justification of the need for such assistance and the inability of local tax sources to finance the food service equipment and facilities needed. Disbursements to any school may be made, by advances or reimbursements, only after approval by the State educational agency of a request by the school for funds, accompanied by a detailed description of the facilities to be acquired and the plans for the use thereof in effectively meeting the nutritional needs of children in the school.

"NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

"(d) If in any State the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this section to nonprofit private schools in the State, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds apportioned to such State under subsection (b) an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of lunches, consisting of a combination of foods and meeting the minimum requirements prescribed by the Secretary under section 9 of this Act served in the preceding fiscal year by all nonprofit private schools participating in the program under section 2 within the State, as determined by the Secretary, bears to the participation rate for the State. The Secretary shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to the nonprofit private schools within such State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are required of a State educational agency disbursing funds made available under this section.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 16. The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under sections 13 through 17 of this Act and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified.

"STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"Sec. 17. The Secretary may utilize funds appropriated under this section for advances to each State educational agency for use for its administrative expenses in supervising and giving technical assistance to the local school districts in their conducting of programs under this Act. Such funds shall be advanced only in amounts and to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary to assist such State agencies in the administration of additional activities undertaken by them under sections 11, 14, and 15 of this Act. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"UTILIZATION OF FOODS

"Sec. 18. Each school participating under section 14 of this Act shall, insofar as practicable, utilize in its program foods designated from time to time by the Secretary as being in abundance, either nationally or in the school area, or foods donated by the Secretary. Foods available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 1058), as amended, or purchased under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, or section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1212), may be donated by the Secretary to schools, in accordance with the needs as determined by local school authorities, for utilization in their feeding programs under this Act.

"NONPROFIT PROGRAMS

"Sec. 19. The food and milk service programs in schools and nonprofit institutions receiving assistance under this Act shall be conducted on a nonprofit basis.

"STATISTICAL DATA

"Sec. 20. Data on numbers of children of ages five through seventeen and on per capita income shall be made available by the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary and, except where otherwise expressly stated in this Act, shall be the latest available. Data on the numbers of children, ages five through seventeen, in families with incomes of more than $2,000 per annum from payments under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's program of aid to families with dependent children shall be provided by that Department.

"REGULATIONS

"Sec. 21. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out this Act.

"PROHIBITIONS

"SEC. 22. (a) In carrying out the provisions of sections 13 through 15 of this Act, neither the Secretary nor the State shall impose any requirements with respect to teaching personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, and materials of instruction in any nonprofit institution.

"(b) The value of assistance to children under this Act shall not be considered to be income or resources for any purpose under any Federal or State laws including, but not limited to, laws relating to taxation, welfare, and public assistance programs. Expenditures of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of food programs for children shall not be diminished as a result of funds received under this Act.

"PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 23. The Secretary may extend the benefits of school feeding programs under this Act to include preschool programs operated as part of the school system.

"CENTRALIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 24. Authority for the conduct and supervision of Federal programs to assist schools in providing food service programs for children is assigned to the Department of Agriculture. To the extent practicable, other Federal agenices administering programs under which funds are to be provided to schools for such assistance shall transfer such funds to the Department of Agriculture for distribution through the administrative channels and in accordance with the standards established under this Act.

"NO CHANGE IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"SEC. 25. The Secretary shall administer sections 1 through 12 of this Act to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered those sections during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1967 FOR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT FOR THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, we seek complete and final action on the bill authorizing appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and for research, development, test, and evaluation of weapons systems for the Armed Forces.

The bill agreed to by the conferees totals $17,480,759,000. This is $310,700,000 more than the version of the bill as it passed the Senate and $377,300,000 less than the House bill. The total is $553,800,000 more than was proposed by the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a tabulation comparing the amounts for procurement and for research and development as they were proposed by the Department of Defense, approved by the House and the Senate, and agreed to in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to cover every item that was in disagreement but I shall comment on some of the more important ones.

PROCUREMENT

The conferees agreed to include $12 million for additional aircraft and electronic equipment to expand airborne telecasting facilities in Vietnam, and $25 million for the procurement of more modern aircraft to evacuate sick and injured members of the Armed Forces.

In the shipbuilding program, the Senate had deleted two conventionally powered guided missile destroyers at a cost of $145,100,000 and added one nuclear-powered guided missile frigate at a cost of $150 million.

The House had extended the authority granted last year for a guided missile frigate in the amount of $130,500,000 and it had authorized a new nuclear-powered guided missile frigate for $127,800,000 in addition to continuing the two conventionally powered guided missile destroyers in the program.

Under the conference agreement the extension of the authority for last year's nuclear-powered guided missile frigate in the amount of $130,500,000 is included and the two conventionally powered guided missile destroyers are authorized in the amount of $145,100,000. The conferees also agreed to include in the authorization $20 million for long leadtime items for an additional nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

The language accompanying the renewed authorization for the construction of the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate that was initially authorized last year provides that the contract for the construction of this ship "shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest."

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The authorization of appropriations for research and development that has been agreed to in conference is $128,100,000 more than the Senate bill.

Of this amount $10.8 million is for the Army and is intended to be applied to the heavy-lift helicopter program and to the advanced aerial fire support system.

The conferees agreed on an increase in the Navy R.D.T. & E. authorization of $52.5 million. Substantial parts of this increase are intended for work on the Condor missile and the deep submergence program.

For the Air Force research and development, the conference agreement provides $64.8 million more than the Senate bill. Fifty million dollars of this is for the manned orbiting laboratory, $3 million is for research in vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft, and $11.8 million is to be added to the $11 million already in the bill for the advanced manned strategic aircraft that is becoming known as AMSA.

MILITARY PAY

Mr. President, this is a rather important provision that was agreed to in the conference: The Senate conferees agreed to provisions increasing the basic pay of members of the uniformed services by 3.2 percent beginning on July 1 of this year, or the first day of the month in which the pay increase for Federal employees is effective, whichever is later.

The annual cost of this increase is approximately $356 million. Since the pay of civilian employees of the Government apparently is to be increased, it is important that members of our Armed Forces and other uniformed services receive comparable treatment.

WEAPONS SYSTEMS

The House bill had contained a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress all the pertinent details before eliminating or substantially reducing a major weapons system. The provision also required that the Congress through its Committees on Armed Services must advise the Secretary of Defense of its recommendation on the proposed action within 90 days. This provision has been modified. The conferees have agreed to a provision that requires notice to the Congress before the Secretary of Defense initiates a substantial reduction or elimination in a major weapons system, but omits the requirement for congressional advice before the proposed action can be accomplished.

Mr. President, I think that I have touched upon the most important items that were involved in the conference. Several items of very substantial size were identical in the bills as passed by both Houses, and therefore were not at issue before the conferees. We hope that this bill will take care of the needs of the services and of our men in uniform, who in considerable numbers are risking their lives daily in Vietnam on the orders of their Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and with the approval of Congress. We may have to face similar conflicts elsewhere, or even more farflung operations in some other quarter of the globe.

Congress, Mr. President, has not been derelict in undertaking to provide for the men in the armed services. We have, each year for the last several years, appropriated or authorized more funds than the Department of Defense requested or expended. I think it is very unfair if Congress has in any degree been blamed for shortages and for breakdowns in the system of distribution, when we have provided every dollar that has been requested of us for the armed services by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to try to answer any questions about the action of the conferees. If there are no questions, I urge approval of the conference report.

EXHIBIT 1

[In thousands]

	DOD request	Senate	House	Conference
Procurement:				
Aircraft:				
Army	$592, 500	$612, 400	$612, 400	$612, 400
Navy and Marine Corps	1, 422, 200	1, 422, 200	1, 442, 200	1, 434, 200
Air Force	3, 961, 300	4, 016, 300	4, 067, 500	4, 041, 300
Missiles:				
Army	356, 500	510, 000	510, 000	510, 000
Navy	367, 700	367, 700	367, 700	367, 700
Marine Corps	17, 700	17, 700	17, 700	17, 700
Air Force	1, 189, 500	1, 189, 500	1, 189, 500	1, 189, 500
Naval vessels: Navy	1, 751, 300	1, 756, 200	2, 009, 600	1, 901, 800
Tracked combat vehicles:				
Army	359, 200	359, 200	359, 200	359, 200
Marine Corps	3, 700	3, 700	3, 700	3, 700
Subtotal	10, 021, 600	10, 254, 900	10, 579, 500	10, 437, 500
Research, development, test, and evaluation:				
Army	1, 518, 900	1, 528, 700	1, 581, 700	1, 539, 500
Navy	1, 748, 600	1, 748, 600	1, 891, 300	1, 801, 100
Air Force	3, 053, 800	3, 053, 800	3, 221, 500	3, 118, 600
Defense agencies	459, 059	459, 059	459, 059	459, 059
Emergency DOD fund	125, 000	125, 000	125, 000	125, 000
Subtotal	6, 905, 359	6, 915, 159	7, 278, 559	7, 043, 259
Total	16, 926, 959	17, 170, 059	17, 858, 059	17, 480, 759

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the other conferees upon this report. It is my feeling that this is an important step that has been taken to provide the proper weapons for our Defense Establishment.

Personally, I am most anxious to see the Defense Department proceed with the building of more nuclear ships. Now, in the modern age, conventional ships are antiquated, and it is my feeling that the Defense Department should not hesitate to go forward and provide these ships at the earliest possible date.

It is also my feeling that we should provide for the advanced manned planes. It is just a question of time until we do it, and I think if we delay it, our defense will be hampered. I do not visualize a time when manned planes will not be needed. Some call this the missile age. It is truly a missile age; but missiles alone are not sufficient. The Chiefs of Staff of the armed services have testified that we need the planes, the nuclear ships, and many other things that they have recommended. I feel that we should leave nothing undone, but provide everything possible to the Defense Establishment, not only to fight the war in Vietnam, but also to protect this country against the menace of communism throughout the world.

Again I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia upon his great service.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished fellow Senators, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

I wish to reemphasize what Senator THURMOND has said about the advanced manned strategic aircraft. We must think in terms of a balanced deterrent force; and I believe every military expert in the country agrees that we must proceed as quickly as possible with the development of advanced manned strategic aircraft. I do not foresee the day when we can put our entire reliance on one system of defense. We must think in terms, not just of one deterrent, but a whole spectrum, a whole family of deterrents.

So I certainly urge that the Senate pay close attention to all that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said here today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the committee who was most helpful in working out an agreement on this bill in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate those statements.

Mr. President, as a member of the conference, I heartily approve of the report.

The main differences, really, between the House and the Senate, outside of difficulties on the procurement of certain items, was in the language of the report, particularly with relation to naval vessels. I believe we have worked out compromise language in our report that will take care of the problem. In each instance where that problem existed, we have put it up to the President of the United States. If, in the interests of national security, he believes that certain vessels should be built, then they shall be built. To this the conference agreed.

If he reports adversely, or if he does not make such a report, then the vessel will not be built. That was the essential difference between the two committees. This was worked out under the leadership of the Senator from Georgia.

I think that the conference report is an excellent one. I appreciate the services of the chairman of our committee in this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his help.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Is it possible to state now with any degree of accuracy the extent to which the war in Vietnam has increased our normal defense expenditures, or the rate of monthly or yearly expenditures that can be attributed to the war in Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, that is, of course, a question that cannot be answered precisely.

The Secretary of Defense made the statement yesterday that the war in Vietnam was increasing the expenditures of the Department of Defense by $1 billion a month. That would be $12 billion a year. It is my own opinion that the war in Vietnam is costing us a good deal more than that amount. I think that it will run closer to $2 billion a month, perhaps somewhere between $1.5 billion and $2 billion a month.

A tremendous expenditure is required to supply men who are 10,000 miles across the ocean with all of the complicated weapons systems we have today, as well as the necessary hospital facilities.

We have had to build new port facilities there in order to have places at which to unload the ships that carry the ammunition, the food, the clothing, and the medicine over to our men who are fighting a war in a very primitive land.

In my judgment, the expenditures would total considerably over $1 billion a month.

Mr. COOPER. That is my belief.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not like to take issue with a man for whom I have as high a regard as I do for the Secretary of Defense. He does have a marvelous mind, especially with computations.

Mr. COOPER. I know that the Senator and all of us want to provide without stint all necessary supplies for our forces. But I think it is important for the Congress and the country to know what the cost is so that the necessary measures will be taken.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The greatest cost involved in this war is in the deaths and the maiming of our young men. We cannot compute that in dollars and cents.

Mr. COOPER. I agree wholeheartedly that the greatest cost is that which those bear who fight and serve in our Armed Forces.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The financial cost, in my opinion is somewhere between $1.5 billion and $2 billion a month.

Mr. COOPER. It is most important that our men receive all necessary supplies. There is no question about that. There have been reports that there has been a serious depletion of existing stocks of ammunition and equipment. I do not know that this is true. Does that situation exist?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. In the earlier stages of the war there were some temporary shortages of some types of conventional ammunition and weapons. However, most of those shortages have been rectified now. While there will always be breakdowns in distribution as long as human factors are involved, in my opinion we have the production channels open now that will enable us to supply our forces to the extent that we can get the material to the men in the field.

Mr. COOPER. I am happy to hear the statement of the Senator. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that production is going forward at such a rate that we can adequately supply the troops in Vietnam and all those who support them, and at the same time take care of our military needs at home and in other parts of the world required for security?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not too sure about whether we are as well prepared in other parts of the world. I thought the question of the Senator was directed to Vietnam.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. That is what I wanted to inquire about first.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Undoubtedly we have drawn heavily on our reserves in this country and in Europe to provide for the great emergency which existed at the outset of the war.

Mr. COOPER. Are any steps being taken to correct any military deficiencies in our country and in the areas of the world in which we do have commitments?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We have been assured that steps have been taken to do so. All the Congress can do is to provide the authority and the money and urge the executive branch of the Government to see that we do have adequate supplies.

I realize that after the Korean war we had several billions of dollars worth of arms and equipment left over, for which we then had no need. I think it is much better to have more than we need than not to have enough. In my opinion it is nothing short of criminal for a country as rich as ours, the greatest and most powerful that has ever existed in civilization, to send one of its sons into battle without modern equipment, and plenty of such equipment, with which to wage war.

I would much prefer to have too much and have some arms and weapons left over than to have one GI lose his life for the lack of them.

Mr. COOPER. I agree wholeheartedly. Now that the die seems to be cast in the course of the war in Vietnam I think it is imperative that we have sufficient supplies for our forces, and also have the necessary supply reserves at home to meet obligations and assure the security of our country.

We have confidence in our country. We have great confidence in the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the other committee members.

Does the committee have procedures by which the committee reviews from time to time with the Secretary of Defense the questions which we have just been discussing?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. We have not done so within the last few days. However, we will hold a hearing before the Appropriations Subcommittee the first of next week, and we hope to begin to review the situation as it relates to all of these items. In addition, the Subcommittee on Preparedness, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], holds periodic hearings and has a considerable staff in the field to examine into the actualities of the reports we receive.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we have tried constantly in the Preparedness Subcommittee to make sure that there are sufficient ammunition and supplies in Vietnam. I think the reports that have come to us are essentially that there have been enough.

The great question concerns whether we have depleted some of our other forces. I think that we have done so in the past, but that that situation is being corrected.

One of the worst shortages existed with relation to helicopters. However, helicopters are being built in number so that there will be an adequate supply of modern helicopters.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, that all of my suggestions with reference to handling this war have not been followed, and not all of my suggestions for arming and equipping our forces have been adopted.

Specifically, I think some proved and reliable weapons have been abandoned too fast, before more fancy and sophisticated successors have been fully tested and have had their reliability demonstrated. In my opinion, the Navy proceeded too hurriedly in replacing guns with missiles on destroyers and cruisers. Some of these missiles have not performed as expected, and we have incurred large costs in trying to improve them.

We are living in a revolutionary age as far as weapons development is concerned and we must exert strenuous and resourceful efforts to stay ahead of potential enemies in new weapons. But we should not reject effective weapons simply because they have been in use for a long period.

For example, in my opinion, we have made a tragic mistake in not reactivating one of our battleships. With its 16-inch rifles, it could have done the work that a great many Navy and Air Force planes have done, and it could have done so without losing a single man.

Those guns can hurl a 2,000-pound shell, which is heavier than any bomb we are dropping there, up to 44 miles, and do so with deadly accuracy, and without endangering a single American boy.

I have urged that the Department of Defense reactivate one of these battleships and bring it into service, because a great deal of this bombing is carried on within range of the guns of a battleship.

Last year we lost 275 fixed wing aircraft and 76 helicopters as a result of hostile action in Vietnam. Some of these aircraft cost $3 or $4 million apiece. We have lost many fine youths who were flying those planes, the value of whose lives, particularly to their friends and loved ones, is incalculable in financial terms.

Much of the air assault work could have been done by the long-range guns of a battleship. But up to now, Department of Defense officials have been absolutely adamant in their refusal to activate a battleship.

I shall continue to insist that we activate a battleship and send it to Vietnam, in order that its tremendous accuracy and its relatively low cost and the fact that its use does not so greatly jeopardize the lives of our men can be employed in attacking targets now being attacked by aircraft at tremendous expense in the lives of pilots and crews of our aircraft and in dollars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick with respect to this matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURN NAVY ON VIETNAM

The President's problem, in grappling with the Viet Cong, is in part a problem in one-upmanship. His task is to increase the pressure without actually escalating the war.

"We must continue to raise the cost of aggression at its source," said the President in his Saturday press conference. Then the President added a comment that suggests he may be overlooking one appealing means toward that end. He said: "And that is the sole purpose of our use of air strength against selected military targets."

Air strength alone? Off and on over the past nine months, various voices have been heard, suggesting an old-fashioned supplement: the potential firepower of naval guns.

Hindsight is always so much better than foresight! If only some hard thought had been given five or ten years ago to the continuing uses of conventional navy weapons, the whole course of the war in Viet Nam might have been altered. But it was perhaps inevitable that in the concentration on such fantastic deterrents as the Polaris submarine—especially when there was never enough money to go around—most naval attention turned toward weapons of the future.

A LOST ART

In this process, the Navy regrettably, if understandably, has tended to neglect the art and science of naval gunnery. As Colonel Robert D. Heinl has written in U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, serious training of gunnery officers "simply ceased about 10 years ago and has never been revived. The annual advanced course in gunnery, given each summer at Quantico, hasn't been held in almost a decade. Necessary small-scale charts no longer are being produced. The rear turrets vanished from the cruisers Boston and Canberra and guided missiles appeared in their place. And the really big guns—the 16-inchers—vanished into cosmolene and mothballs.

Is it too late to consider a tactical change that would adapt these old weapons to the war in Viet Nam? At the very top of the Navy—at the level of Admiral David L. McDonald, chief of naval operations—there is not much interest in the concept, though it is notable that several months ago McDonald asked permission to get one mothballed 8-inch cruiser into full active duty in the Pacific and to bring another to 30-day readiness in the Reserves. The request was turned down for budgetary reasons, and McDonald did not pursue it.

WANTED: A BATTLESHIP!

Others have seized on the idea with greater vigor. Colonel Heinl, now retired from the Marine Corps, is one of the country's leading authorities on the use of naval firepower. He was formerly director of the Gunfire School at Quantico. His article last September in the Naval Institute Proceedings sparked a major discussion within the profession.

"The question of reactivating a battleship," he wrote, "ought to be carefully considered. We are now regularly conducting shore bombardment in Viet Nam, using 5-inch and 6-inch guns. Think how much greater return we could realize from the virtually doubled range inland and enormously multiplied hitting power of 16-inch projectiles, and how much more economical such gun strikes would be than air attacks against the same targets."

The same arguments were advanced early this year by Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., vice-chairman of the U.S. delegation on the UN's military staff committee. He recommended flatly that the Missouri be taken out of her mothballs at Bremerton, Wash., and restored to active service at the earliest possible moment.

A few weeks after McCain's proposal, the civilian magazine "Navy" in February carried a major article, "Bring Back the Big Guns." In its June issue, the magazine returns to the theme with a piece by Dr. Howard D. Greyber, a British professor of mathematics who writes with bell-like authority.

JOB FOR "MIGHTY MO"

These combined arguments make sense. The Missouri's big guns can deliver the same conventional explosives in three hours that otherwise would require 500 fighter-bombers. This punch can be delivered with high accuracy, at relatively low cost, and at almost no risk of a serviceman's life. At the time the Missouri was decommissioned her guns could loft a 2,300-pound projectile for 21 statute miles. Today, says Dr. Greyber, new propellants make it possible to shoot a 2,000-pound projectile up to 44 miles, or a 1,700-pound shell up to 50 miles. The peculiar geography of South Viet Nam makes it possible for only six turrets to cover 85 per cent of the critical area.

Aerial bombing carries political and psychological connotations that naval bombardment, for some reason, does not. Certainly planes are required for targets beyond the potential reach of the "Mighty Mo," and no man in his right mind would suggest that other naval advances be abandoned. The building of a new nuclear fleet is more important than a return to techniques that began with Drake against the Spanish Armada.

Yet in congressional hearings two months ago, Admiral McDonald testified that "every day of the year, General Westmoreland asks for naval gunfire support." The Navy now is sending destroyers to do a battleship's job. If we had the big guns off shore, Lyndon Johnson might get his added pressure, for only 16 inches of escalation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee and the Military Authorization Conference Committee members for evolving a meaningful and viable program satisfactroy to both Houses. I am extremely pleased to see that the military pay increase has been incorporated so that the members of our Armed Forces may receive equal consideration along with our civil servants. It is gratifying to see that the conferees stipulated that our uniformed services personnel should receive an adjustment in their compensation at the same time as one is provided all classified Federal employees. The effective date of July 1, 1966, the first day of the month in which the compensation of Federal employees is increased, is highly commendatory and brings into line the recognition which our military members deserve. In view of the enormous sacrifices our servicemen are making in southeast Asia, and will continue to make in support of U.S. policies, the Congress can do no less than to take this modest step in recognizing the personal and family needs of our men in uniform.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope that the report will be agreed to. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Morse

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson
Bass
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Dodd
Griffin
Gruening
Hayden
McClellan
McGee
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So the report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT TO STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND FOOD SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children.

(At this point, Mr. MCINTYRE assumed the chair.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am delighted that we are at last considering the school lunch and special milk program bill.

The bill adheres very closely to the law that was enacted by the Congress 20 years ago. I am proud to say that I was a cosponsor of the original school lunch bill. In an effort to broaden the nutritional program for the children of the country, an effort was made by the administration to attach to the school lunch program amendments that would lead us into the field of taking care of children out of school. After careful study of the administration program, and after hearing witnesses on the subject, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided to simply broaden the school lunch program and other feeding programs relating to child nutrition, but, confine them to in-school programs, and not out-of-school programs.

That was one of the chief differences between what the administration first desired and what the committee unanimously adopted.

I wish to emphasize that the measure before us in no manner changes nor even contemplates any changes in the manner that the national school lunch program and the special milk program have been administered in the past. These two programs are among the most effective and best administered programs ever enacted into law. They represent the highest type of Federal-State cooperation which is seldom achieved but always sought after in legislation, and I want them to remain at this high level of efficiency. Controversy and politics have been kept out of the operation of the school lunch and school milk programs and a great deal of good has been accomplished with the small Federal expenditures that are involved.

Now when I say "small," Mr. President, I mean in proportion to the full amount which is expended on the school lunch program. The Federal Government contributes only about 20 to 22 percent of the total cost of this program. The rest of it is contributed by the local and State authorities, and also by the parents of the schoolchildren.

As I have just indicated, I have long been associated with the school lunch program and I want it to remain, as closely as possible, to the way it is now being administered. It is my belief that under no circumstances should we add any programs relating to out-of-school lunches or out-of-school breakfasts—in any manner to be handled other than within the schools.

I have long been a dedicated proponent of the national school lunch program. As a matter of fact, I was cosponsor of the original act in 1946. This is one of those pieces of legislation that goes about its business quietly—does its job—and we are very seldom called upon to review or consider substantive changes. The last amendments to the National School Lunch Act were introduced and passed in 1962.

Twenty years ago the Congress stated as its purpose in enacting the national school lunch program: "as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural and other food."

Those words are sound today just as they were when they were first written.

I know of no legislative enactment that commands broader support in the Congress than the national school lunch program. I know of no legislative enactment that commands broader support in State and local communities from coast to coast.

In recent weeks some confusion has arisen as to the intent and purpose of the administration's proposals to broaden the coverage of the act and make it still more effective in providing improved nutrition for the children of this country.

I want to assure the Senate again that under the bill now before it, the national school lunch program and the special milk program, as we have known them, remain intact. They will continue to be administered and operated in precisely the same form as they now are.

But, because of the increasing emphasis on preschool programs run by the school systems, we have clarified the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make these children eligible for the lunch program. This broader coverage is the only aspect of the basic national school lunch program that has been touched.

We have used the basic School Lunch Act on which to build several other approaches to improving the nutrition of children:

First, we have provided authority for the special milk program which expires June 30, 1967, to be extended through fiscal year 1970 in essentially the same form as S. 2921, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], for himself and other Senators. Because the milk program is essentially a nutrition program for children, we feel that authority for its continuation appropriately belongs in this bill. We have also stipulated that, to the extent practicable, the Secretary shall administer the milk program in the same manner as he administered it in fiscal year 1966. This stipulation is not intended to put the Secretary in an administrative straitjacket, but it is intended to convey to the Secretary that the Senate is more than satisfied with the way in which this program has been operated in the past, and to put the Secretary on notice that any substantive change would be most undesirable.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 20 minutes on the Ribicoff amendment when it is placed before the Senate—10 minutes under the control of the chairman of the committee, 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. This has been cleared, as far as I know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his reference to S. 2921 and to say that I am grateful to him, to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and to the other members of the committee for having incorporated S. 2921 into the bill.

Section 13 on page 12 achieves virtually everything which the 67 cosponsors of the school milk bill which I introduced wanted to achieve. It does it in almost precisely the same way we wanted it—that is, at the $110 million in 1967, $115 million in 1968, and $120 million therefrom level.

I want to reaffirm what I think other Senators strongly feel; namely, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was wise in doing its best to maintain the program in the same way it has in the past, and not to have a program for the needy or a welfare program but a program for all the children of America. I think it is a program which will reach the needy much more effectively and on a much more widespread basis than if we had concentrated on a means test, as had been proposed. This is a fine bill. It saves a school milk program that would otherwise have suffered an 80-percent reduction.

Again, I thank the Senator from Louisiana and congratulate him and express my gratitude to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana, my chairman, has just said. I agree that it is the intent of the committee that the Secretary shall administer the school lunch program and the school milk program just as he has been administering them in the past, although, as the Senator from Louisiana said, we are not putting it in a straitjacket. We realize that, under existing law, there can be variations. But, one thing which the committee insisted upon was that the school milk program and the school lunch program must not be incorporated as part of the poverty program. If there are proposals to have lunches, snacks, or anything like that in the programs set up under the poverty law, they should be provided for by an amendment to that law and not to the school lunch program.

I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will agree it is not our purpose that any of the money authorized to be appropriated in this bill would be used for any part of the poverty program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. These programs have worked.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The poverty program, however, is far from being a workable operation up until now. Perhaps it will be in the future. We have been able to get a few approvals of Vermont projects through in the last few days, but they have been very slow in coming and they are finding it very, very difficult to find administrative personnel to operate the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct in saying that the committee was not in favor, in any manner, of connecting this program with the poverty program.

Mr. AIKEN. That is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. The school lunch program has been a great success. The reason for it is that there has been complete cooperation between the Federal Government and the local government, as well as the recipients of this great program. It has not been necessary to tinker with the bill very much over a period of 20 years. It has worked very well. I attribute that to the fact that the local people took a great interest in the program and they are really responsible for the excellent manner in which it has been administered.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it was the unanimous consensus of the Agriculture Committee that we should not jeopardize programs which have worked for the purpose of bolstering programs which so far have not worked satisfactorily. I hope that the projects under the poverty program will work, but until they do work satisfactorily I do not think we should involve the school lunch program with them. They should first show their capabilities of being effective, and even then I think they should be kept separate.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will also recall, I am sure, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was adamant in providing that the school lunches and school breakfasts must be served in the schools and not off the premises.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will remember the efforts which were made to include provision to feed children off school premises and that we objected to that. This additional school breakfast program which we are providing for here, which is more or less a pilot program, will be administered in the schools in much the same manner as the original school lunch program.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, the special milk program applies to summer camps.

Mr. ELLENDER. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. And to nonprofit camps and to other programs into which the school lunch programs do not fit.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I suppose we could—and maybe we will some day—undertake to give these children three meals a day in their own homes the year round.

Maybe we should. Certainly, I am in favor of their having enough to eat so they can grow up healthy.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to the Senator from Vermont that we have two agencies of Government that are attempting to assist in feeding children off the school premises. They are the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the economic opportunity program of Mr. Shriver. I understand those programs are working pretty well.

I wish to emphasize that our committee was adamant in not wanting to disturb the school lunch program as we understand it and as it has been operated for the past 20 years.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. I would be in favor of giving lunches in the Headstart program to youngsters who needed them, but I would not be in favor of charging them to the school lunch program or authorizing an appropriation for them to be charged to the school lunch program.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a matter of administration.

Mr. AIKEN. There is a great difference in the administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what concerned our committee. The school lunch program has been ably administered through the cooperative effort of the Federal Government and the local people as well as the local governments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding from what the Senator from Louisiana has thus far said that under the school lunch program the local officials, including in some instances the parents, pay 75 percent of the cost and the Federal Government 25 percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The program as it has been administered for the last two decades or more has been confined to the provision of lunches for school?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A new thought has arisen that, in addition to lunches in school, the Federal Government should provide lunch in the home?

Mr. ELLENDER. Outside of school, yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If, under this program, we begin providing lunches for children in the homes, as distinguished from children in the schools, what is likely to become of the willingness of the local boards and families to pay 75 percent of the cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, they will want Uncle Sam to pay the whole amount. I doubt if we would get the cooperation that is now in evidence under the school lunch program. There is no doubt in my mind that we would probably destroy the school lunch program as we now know it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, the 75 percent is now willingly paid to finance the whole program, but if we begin providing lunches for children in their homes, we will probably destroy the principle of the 75–25-percent basis. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the opinion of the committee. That is why we reported the bill as we did, making it a strictly in-school program, but added to it, as I shall point out later in my remarks, a pilot breakfast program which shall be operated on the same basis as the school lunch program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Second, we have provided a 2-year pilot school breakfast program for children from low-income families and for children who must travel long distances to school. In urban areas there are thousands of children in low-income families where the mother must leave for work before the children leave for school. It is difficult in these circumstances to have an organized, orderly family breakfast. In rural areas, many children travel an hour or more by bus and then have to wait around for school to begin. Even if these children have had a good breakfast at home, it is still a long time until lunch. In both cases, the attention span and conduct of the child are adversely affected.

The State educational agency will select the schools for participation in the breakfast program. The Federal funds provided will be used to help meet the food costs of a breakfast served to needy children. Where a program is in operation, all children may participate. Those who can afford to pay, will pay. It is our hope that even the needy children will pay a token price for the breakfast. As in the case of the lunch program State and local sources will need to pay for a part of the total program costs.

Third, although there is at present authority for nonfood assistance in the National School Lunch Act, this section of the act has not been funded for many years. The language of this section does not lend itself to concentrating Federal funds on providing equipment only to those schools than can demonstrate a lack of local resources to provide such equipment. For this reason, we have provided a new approach whereby schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist may apply for equipment assistance to the State educational agency. Accompanying such a request must be a justification of a need for such assistance and a detailed description as to the facilities to be acquired and plans for their use in improving nutrition for attending children. Payments of Federal funds to the States for this program are to be made on condition that State and local sources will bear one-fourth the cost of such equipment.

Fourth, for 20 years, State educational agencies have administered the national school lunch program without Federal funds to help defray their costs of administration. We recognize that these agencies will have difficulty in obtaining sufficient additional funds to enable them to undertake the additional responsibilities required of them by the bill and by section 11 of the act. Section 11 of the existing National School Lunch Act, which provides for special assistance to particularly needy schools, requires a careful analysis of the economic situation in the area from which each school wishing to participate draws its attendance. These schools will also require more time and attention in terms of technical assistance to initiate and maintain an effective lunch program. This will be equally true in the case of the proposed breakfast program and most certainly the provision for equipment will require detailed and expert attention from the State educational agency. It is for these reasons that we have authorized the appropriation of funds to these agencies in the administration of special assistance, school breakfast and nonfood assistance activities.

The whole purpose of these amendments to the National School Lunch Act is to strengthen our national effort to improve nutrition among children. There is no question but that additional authority and funds are needed for this purpose. There is also no doubt that the U.S. Department of Agriculture is the one agency in the Federal Government best qualified to administer this national effort. During the past several years, other agencies have moved into the child nutrition field using their own funds and authority. We do not doubt that they moved to fill a need that the Department of Agriculture was not in a position to meet. With this legislation we want to make it abundantly clear that the administration of school food service programs is to be centralized in the Department of Agriculture.

That Department has the established lines of administration and communication through State educational agencies and local school authorities. The national school lunch program has long been cited as one of the best examples in the Nation of Federal-State-local cooperation. At every step of the way—from the Department to the State educational agency to the local school lunch manager—each person involved knows exactly what is required of him. The nutritional requirements that must be met under the type A lunch as a condition of receiving Federal support are known, understood and accepted as in the best interest of the children served. The Department of Agriculture, the States and the school districts have long made use of the workshop technique to exchange ideas and to train those managing and operating what is in effect a multitude of small businesses in schools throughout the country that must serve attractive, nutritious meals on a limited budget and on a nonprofit basis.

The entry of other agencies with their own regulations and approaches can only confuse what should be a coherent, coordinated effort to improve nutrition among our schoolchildren.

The national school lunch program has a number of features that have stood the test of time, and therefore must be preserved, and as a matter of fact are preserved under this bill.

First, responsibility for program administration is placed in State educational agencies. They select schools for participation, take agreements with participating schools, pay reimbursement claims from funds advanced to the States by the Department of Agriculture and supervise operations in the local schools within the policies and regulations established by the Department of Agriculture. When the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse funds to private schools, the U.S. Department of Agriculture undertakes to do so directly.

Second, the act contains a specific formula for the apportionment of appropriated funds among the States for the regular school lunch program. The act also contains a specific formula under section 11 for the disbursement of funds among the States to provide for particularly needy schools.

Third, the act provides authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish nutritional standards based on tested nutritional research. These standards have resulted in the widely known type A lunch that includes a half pint of milk, fruits and vegetables, bread and butter or fortified margarine. This lunch will meet one-third to one-half a child's daily nutritional requirements. Within this pattern, the local school is free to serve any kind of food it wishes.

Fourth, the act contains a requirement that lunches be served free or at a reduced price to children who cannot afford the full price of a lunch. The national school lunch program was never intended to be a free lunch program. In most situations where the proportion of needy children in a school is relatively low, the cost of reduced price or free lunches can readily be met by local resources. In many schools in low-income districts, however, this is simply not possible. It was in recognition of this simple fact of life that Congress approved section 11 in 1962. This section provides for special assistance to schools drawing attendance from particularly needy areas.

Section 11 was funded for the first time in fiscal year 1966. The Congress approved the sum of $2 million for a series of demonstration projects. The results of those projects are described on page 7 of the committee report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1360) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> A total of 831 schools in all 50 States and the District of Columbia participated in the projects. The number of children enrolled in these schools totaled 325,000. Nearly 137,000 children, or more than 60 percent of the total enrollment, participated on a daily basis.
>
> Eighty-two schools operated lunch programs for the first time. Some two-thirds of the children enrolled in these schools participated in the lunch program. Although complete data are not available for every project, preliminary indications are that over 50,000 needy children received lunches at school for the first time.
>
> In North Carolina, six schools participated in the demonstration project. Prior to the new program, less than one-third of the total enrollment of 6,400 children were participating in the lunch program. As a result of the additional assistance provided the student participation increased from 2,060 to nearly 5,000.
>
> In California, 20 schools were approved for special assistance with an average daily attendance of 13,840 children. Here, the increase in participation as a result a reducing the lunch price from 30 cents to 20 cents, was 65 percent. In addition, there was a decrease in the number of lunches previously served free because more children could afford to pay the lower price for the lunch.
>
> In Pennsylvania, 25 urban and rural schools with an enrollment of 9,000 children were approved as demonstration projects. Lunch prices were reduced from an average of 31.7 cents to 15.7 cents in these schools. As a result, the level of program participation increased by one-third and the number of free lunches provided more than doubled.
>
> In Georgia, 20 needy schools were approved as demonstration projects. Lunch prices were substantially lowered because of the additional funds provided and the level of participation increased from 63 percent of enrollment to 84 percent.
>
> In Tennessee, it was possible to initiate a lunch program for the first time in 16 schools which had previously been unable to finance a lunch program. With the special assistance funds it was possible to establish lunch prices in these 16 programs at 10 to 16 cents with the result that nearly 90 percent of the 1,300 children in these schools were able to receive a lunch at school for the first time.
>
> In order to assist the States to meet their added supervisory functions in administering section 11, the bill authorizes appropriations for advances to States where necessary for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. In my own State the State department of education approved 13 schools with a total average daily attendance of 13,302 students as demonstration projects eligible for section 11 funds. As a result of the additional assistance, lunch prices in these schools dropped from an average of 16.6 cents to an average of 8.2 cents; and student participation increased 40 percent, from 6,384 to 8,912. Prior to the demonstration projects, participation in the 13 schools was 48 percent. With the additional assistance they were able to increase participation in the school lunch program to 67.4 percent. The new low price made it possible for more children to pay their way and the free lunches dropped significantly. But most important, teachers report that the additional children that now receive the lunch are physically improved, more alert, and more responsive in class.

In describing the bill now before us, I have spent some time discussing the existing school lunch program, and the successful results that have been obtained under it. My purpose is to show the background for the present bill, and illustrate the successful administrative organization that would be used to carry it out. In order that there may be a clear understanding as to exactly what the bill does, I shall summarize its provisions at this time.

First, the bill makes absolutely no change in the school lunch program or special milk program, but requires that each of those programs be carried on in the same manner as the past. The authority for the special milk program would be extended through fiscal 1970.

Second, Federal assistance to school feeding programs would be centered in the Department of Agriculture.

Third, the authority of the Secretary to extend school feeding programs to include preschool programs conducted as part of the school system would be affirmed.

Fourth, two new programs would be authorized, namely, a 2-year pilot breakfast program, and a permanent nonfood assistance program.

Fifth, an appropriation would be authorized to provide assistance where necessary to enable States to meet their additional administrative expenses incurred as a result of the additional duties imposed by the bill and section 11 of the act.

Separate appropriations are authorized for each of the two new programs, for assistance to States for administrative expenses, for the school lunch program, and for the special milk program. It was the intention of the committee that each of these programs should stand on its own base, and that neither of the existing programs should be affected by the addition of the new programs.

A detailed explanation of the provisions of the bill appears on pages 11 through 15 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that those pages of the report (No. 1360) be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VI. SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

SECTION 1—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Section 1(A) keeps the appropriation authorization for the national school lunch program separate from those for the new programs provided by the bill.

Section 1(B) excludes funds appropriated for the new programs from section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, which provides that part of the funds may be used for Department administrative expenses and part may be used for direct food purchases.

Section 1(C) defines "nonprofit institution" as an institution, other than a school, which provides for the care and training of children and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Section 1(D) adds new sections 13 through 25 to the National School Lunch Act. The new sections are as follows:

Section 13—Special Milk.
Section 14—School Breakfast.
Section 15—Nonfood Assistance.
Section 16 through 25—General Provisions.

NEW SECTION 13—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

New section 13, which provides for the special milk program is identical to section 2 of the act of July 1, 1958, the current authority for the special milk program, except (1) the current authority runs only through June 30, 1967, while the new authority runs through fiscal 1970; (2) appropriations would be limited to not more than $110 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; not more than $115 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and not more than $120 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years; and (3) new section 13 requires the Secretary to administer the program in the same manner as in the past. This last change was considered necessary to make clear the intention of Congress that the course of the program is not to be changed. The language of the existing law provides the Secretary with very broad authority as to the manner in which the program is to be conducted. He might administer it in the same general manner as in the past; or he could place much greater emphasis on assistance to schools in low-income areas, schools without school lunch programs, or otherwise change the course of the program. The change described in item (3) above would require the Secretary to administer the program insofar as practicable in the same manner as in the past. Since the new authority would be part of the National School Lunch Act, the general provisions of that act would be applicable.

NEW SECTION 14—PILOT BREAKFAST PROGRAM

New section 14 provides for a pilot school breakfast program for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Subsection (a) authorizes appropriations for such program in schools serving children from low-income areas and in schools drawing attendance from children who have to travel long distances. The appropriation for fiscal 1967 could not exceed $7.5 million. The appropriation for fiscal 1968 could not exceed $10 million.

Subsections (b) and (c) provide for apportionment to States. Three percent would be apportioned to Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, on the basis of the number of children ages 5 through 17. From the balance the other States would each receive, first, a basic grant of about $49,000 (a total of $2,500,000 equally divided) and, second, additional funds on the basis of need as indicated by the number of children in the State, ages 5 through 17, in families with income of less than $2,000 plus children, ages 5 through 17, in families with incomes of more than $2,000 per annum from payments under the program for aid to families with dependent children.

Subsection (d) requires States to disburse funds to schools found eligible by the State educational agency at rates per meal that will be established by the Secretary. These funds are to be spent only for food for needy children.

Subsection (e) provides that in instances of severe need. the Secretary may authorize assistance up to 90 percent of the operating cost of a breakfast program, including the cost of obtaining, preparing and serving food. In these schools Federal funds could be disbursed in amounts in excess of the per meal rates described in subsection (d) and could be used to cover costs of preparation and serving in addition to the cost of the food itself. Assistance under subsection (e) would be given only if the applicant school showed the need for such assistance.

Subsection (f) requires meals served under this section to meet nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research and to be served free or at reduced cost only to those children found, by local school authorities, to be unable to pay the full cost. This is generally similar to the requirement contained in the existing National School Lunch Act.

Subsection (g) provides that the Department of Agriculture will administer the program in nonprofit private schools in those States whose educational agency is forbidden, by law, to disburse funds to other than public schools. This is similar to the method followed under the National School Lunch Act.

NEW SECTION 15—NONFOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

New section 15 provides for a permanent nonfood assistance program in schools drawing attendance from poor economic areas.

Subsection (a) authorizes appropriations to assist States in helping such schools acquire facilities, other than land and buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food.

Subsection (b) provides that funds shall be apportioned among the States on the same basis as school lunch funds under section 4. Payments to States are made on condition that one-fourth of the cost of any facilities financed shall be borne by State or local funds.

Subsection (c) permits the State educational agency to disburse funds to eligible schools by advance or by reimbursement only on request from the school, accompanied by a detailed description of the facilities to be acquired and plans for their use to improve the nutritional needs of the children in the school. Applicant schools would have to show the need for such assistance and the inability of local tax sources to finance the facilities.

Subsection (d) requires the Department of Agriculture to administer the program in nonprofit private schools in those States where the State educational agency is not permitted, by law, to disburse funds to other than public schools.

NEW SECTION 16—PAYMENTS TO STATES

New section 16 provides that the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of Treasury payments to be made to any State under the new provisions and the Secretary of Treasury shall make the payment. This is the same procedure currently used under the national school lunch program.

NEW SECTION 17—STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

New section 17 authorizes the appropriation of funds needed to assist State educational agencies in the administrtaion of additional activities undertaken under sections 11, 14, and 15 (the existing provision for special school lunch assistance in low-income areas, and the new provisions for school breakfasts and nonfood assistance).

NEW SECTION 18—UTILIZATION OF FOODS

New section 18 requires schools participating in the breakfast program to use to the extent practicable foods designated by the Secretary as being in abundance, and to receive foods donated by the Department of Agriculture.

NEW SECTION 19—NONPROFIT PROGRAMS

New section 19 requires all food and milk service programs receiving assistance under the act to be operated on a nonprofit basis. This is similar to the requirement under the National School Lunch Act.

NEW SECTION 20—STATISTICAL DATA

New section 20 provides that information on numbers of children, ages 5 through 17, and on per capita income shall be made available by the Secretary of Commerce and, unless otherwise specified, shall be the latest available. Data on the numbers of children, ages 5 through 17, in families with incomes of more than $2,000 per annum from payments under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's program of aid to families with dependent children shall be provided by that Department.

NEW SECTION 21—REGULATIONS

New section 21 authorizes regulations.

NEW SECTION 22—PROHIBITIONS

New section 22 prohibits—

(*a*) The Secretary and the States from imposing any requirements with respect to teaching personnel, curriculum, or materials of instruction in carrying out the special milk or other programs added to the National School Lunch Act. A similar provision now applies to the national school lunch program.

(*b*) The value of assistance to children under the National School Lunch Act from being considered as income or resources for purposes of other programs.

(*c*) State and local expenditures for food programs for children from being reduced as a result of funds received under the National School Lunch Act.

NEW SECTION 23—PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS

New section 23 authorizes the Secretary to extend the benefits of school feeding programs under the act to preschool programs operated as part of the school system.

NEW SECTION 24—CENTRALIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION

New section 24 would centralize in the Department of Agriculture the administration of all Federal programs to provide assistance to school food service programs. To the extent practicable other Federal agencies would be required to transfer to the Department of Agriculture any funds to be used for such assistance. The purpose of the Committee is that Federal assistance not be dissipated by being divided among various agencies and administered under varying regulations through varying local agencies.

In view of the proliferation of child feeding programs in schools, sponsored and financed by several agencies of the Federal Government, under varying regulations and standards, it seems time to express the intent of Congress that these programs be brought under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. It would be difficult to find a program that has been operated more effectively and efficiently or to the greater benefit of children than the national school lunch program. The thousands of schools throughout the country that participate in this program know precisely what is required of them. The lines of administration and communication are clear. The mutual responsibilities of the

Department of Agriculture, the State educational agency, and the local school authorities are thoroughly understood by all. The technical assistance resources, the workshop and other techniques used by State and local groups throughout the country for training their school lunch personnel are well established and effective.

The national school lunch program is the largest food service of its kind in the world. It is logical, therefore, that full use be made of the expertness acquired in 20 years of operating this program.

NEW SECTION 25—NO CHANGE IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

New section 25 requires the school lunch program to be administered in the same manner as in the past.

There has been considerable misunderstanding recently as to the prospects for continuing the national school lunch program in its present form. The committee is thoroughly convinced that there was no intent to change the basic national school lunch program in any way. To assure that no such change can occur and to express full confidence in the existing administration and operation of the program, section 25 provides that:

"The Secretary shall administer sections 1 through 12 of this act to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered those sections during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966."

This language is not intended to inhibit program administration. It is intended to indicate the committee's endorsement and approval of the approach now being followed in program administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate provides for several new desirable programs. All of these are limited to in-school activities. It is a good bill. It will strengthen the existing successful National School Lunch Act. I hope that the Senate will give it its unanimous approval.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has stated that efforts have been made to expand the school lunch program so that lunches will be provided for needy children outside of the school, in the home.

My question is, do we or do we not now have in existence programs which are constructed so as to provide aid to the poverty stricken?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For one, do we have what is known as the program of aid to families with dependent children?

Mr. ELLENDER. We do have that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that program has been in existence for perhaps 20 or more years. Is there not a special program of the Job Corps under the economic opportunity program to train the poor for work?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is such a program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is also Project Headstart which involves getting infant children into school in advance so that they will be prepared to catch up with intellectually brighter children.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is more or less a prekindergarten program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition to the present Project Headstart under the economic opportunity program, are some services provided in the bill for the kindergarten program?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, but that is to be managed by a different organization.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand it, in addition to the existing program of providing aid to the poverty stricken and the school lunch program, it has been recommended or proposed that we start a new program under the school lunch program to provide lunches in the homes of children when the children are away from school.

Mr. ELLENDER. That proposal was presented to us some time ago. That proposal was that the Department of Agriculture handle this in connection with the school lunch program. The committee refused to go along with that proposal. As a matter of fact, I introduced a bill and added the program that I have described here, a pilot program for breakfast and a program to assist communities which are unable to provide nonfood equipment to serve the lunches.

The committee provided for these additional programs to operate in the same manner as the school lunch program, an in-school program and not an out-of-school program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the purpose of making the record complete, can the Senator from Louisiana state what the cost of the program as envisioned in the pending bill would be?

Mr. ELLENDER. The cost would be $152 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that would cover one-fourth of the cost.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, assuming that the local share would continue at about past levels.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Six hundred eight million dollars would be spent in the Nation, $450 million of which would be borne by the local people.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is essentially correct. That expense would be borne by local governments and, of course, by the parents who would give the children the money to pay for their lunch.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I expect to vote for the bill. I strongly support the school lunch program and the school milk portion of it. I strongly support the Senator from Louisiana, who has greatly improved the bill over the original form in which it was at the time he introduced it by request, I believe, of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I have grave doubts as to the special breakfast program. I do not think it will work on the basis of time. I think that it will require an additional staff of people, or people working additional hours. I think that it will not work in nicely with the home programs of the children. It is difficult for me to see how a program can be worked out on the basis of taking care only of those children who have not had an adequate breakfast at home, or who have had to travel abnormal distances to get to school.

I believe the record shows that it was not supposed to take care only of those children, but was also to be addressed to a much larger number of children. I do not think that it is practical as addressed to a larger number of children, because the average child would get his breakfast at home, and I think it would be an adequate and better breakfast than he would get from the school breakfast program.

I think the features of the bill continue the very much appreciated programs that have been used throughout the Nation and continues them on a satisfactory basis.

I shall vote for the bill. I simply want the RECORD to show that I have grave doubts about the breakfast program. I have doubts whether the program will work out as well as expected. I am particularly fearful that the cost of the breakfast program will prove to be much greater than anticipated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Louisiana for his presentation. I subscribe to the bill that he has presented. I think it is sound, and I shall gladly vote for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida. I think the school lunch program and the milk program are very beneficial and worthwhile programs. I have grave doubts as to the breakfast program. It seems to me that if we were to provide lunch for the schoolchildren, that would be adequate provision. I fear that if we provide breakfast, there will next be a demand that we provide lunch and supper for the children. There will next be a demand that we provide breakfast, lunch, and supper for the adults. I can see that this might be the entering wedge to practically guaranteeing all meals to all people, and this, to my way of thinking, would be very objectionable and would truly constitute a welfare state.

I commend the Senator for the splendid work done on the bill, but I question sincerely the wisdom and the practicality of including the provision for breakfast.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the breakfast program is a pilot program and is limited to 2 years. It is limited in the amount that can be spent. It would operate on the same basis as the present school lunch program. The meal would be served on the school premises.

Mr. THURMOND. I understood that.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has mentioned furnishing supper to the children. Of course, the children would not stay in school until 6 or 8 o'clock in the evening. I do not know what the Senator has in mind, but I feel as he does about some of these welfare programs. I feel that they go a little too far.

I point out that the committee was very careful to see that this program was to be administered in school and not at the homes of the children.

The original bill might have required the service of food out of school. However, we were careful to see that the program would be administered in the same manner as the school lunch program.

I have no doubt that, if there are any flaws in the breakfast program, they can be discovered within the next 2 years.

The breakfast program would be limited to 2 years. I think it is a good idea that we discover whether the program can be accomplished under the bill. I am sure that efforts will be made to handle the program in the same manner as the school lunch program.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is nothing so permanent as a temporary Federal program. I predict that once this program has been instituted, even though it is on a pilot basis, it will become a permanent program, and that it will be impossible then to cut it off. I believe the Senator from Louisiana would probably agree that once a program continues for 2 years, it is here to stay.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be a good idea to institute this program for children who attend school and are unable to obtain food because their parents are poor or because they must travel many miles to school.

Mr. THURMOND. Is this breakfast program to be limited now to poor children in school?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It is hoped that the program will be managed and administered the same as the school lunch program, and that efforts will be made to have the children pay.

Mr. THURMOND. But any child could get the breakfast under this program, just as they get lunch, as I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. THURMOND. I believe it is a good bill. However, I wish to go on record as stating that I feel it is unwise and impractical to include the breakfast in the program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Only a small percentage of the school children of this country receive free school lunches or reduced-price lunches. In my State, 8 percent of the school children receive such lunches. How many are free, I do not know. Nine-two percent of the children pay the full value.

In one or two States, a much higher percentage of school children receive school lunches free or at a discount. I believe that the District of Columbia has the highest percentage of free lunches in the country. Guam, or another of our territories, receives 100-percent free.

The average percentage of children who receive free or reduced-price lunches is less than 10 percent, and in some States, it is as low as 2 or 3 percent; the rest pay for the lunches.

Under the poverty program, all children receive free school lunches. We were asked to put this program under the poverty program. The recommendation was to slash the school lunch program and to virtually scuttle the school milk program. The committee unanimously agreed not to do that, because these programs have worked. Why scuttle them for the purpose of building up a program which so far has not worked satisfactorily? I hope that the program will work satisfactorily as time goes on and as capable personnel can be employed. But why scuttle programs that have worked, in order to build up a program which has yet to prove itself?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I direct my questions also to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

I am happy to support the bill, S. 3467, to continue the special school milk program and amend the School Lunch Act.

I have been glad to help work out some of its provisions in the Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve.

I would like to say, first, to those who have spoken about the breakfast program, that in committee I believe we all expressed some concern about its implications. However, as the chairman pointed out, it has been limited to 2 years, and the appropriation authorization for this pilot program has been limited. Also, it was thought that by placing the pilot program in the bill, it would be kept from the jurisdiction of other agencies. Now I move to another concern, respecting the operation of the existing permanent school lunch program.

One feature of the school lunch program has always troubled me. We know that in the school lunch program all children are eligible to receive a school lunch. The law provides that lunches "shall be served without cost, or at a reduced cost, to children who are determined by local authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the lunch."

The local school authorities may try to realize that provision by charging some students more than the actual local cost of the lunch, so that this added income can be used in reducing the cost for the neediest children. But in many school districts, where a great proportion of children are from families of low income, not enough students can pay an additional amount so as to supply the funds which are required to reduce the cost for the neediest children.

I believe this is a gap, and a weakness in the school lunch program. It works, in many cases, to deprive the neediest children of receiving any lunch at all. If the local school districts cannot fund the program, they do not have the school lunch program. It means that the neediest children do not get any lunch.

Section 11 of the Act authorizes appropriations to help meet this need—which is the reason I addressed myself to the distinguished Senator from Florida. It is designed to help the school children in the United States, estimated at 10 percent of the national total, who are the neediest. But it can be funded only if the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations supply some funds to meet this need.

I understand that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has testified that $20 or $25 million could meet this need. We are already providing funds which exceed $300 million as the Federal Government's part of the school lunch program. Yet the ironic fact is that the children who are the poorest, and cannot contribute any funds, may get no lunch.

For example, a family having four or five children in school, and scarcely able to pay a penny, at 25 or 30 cents should pay $1 or $1.50 a day, but cannot do so. If the cost of their lunch cannot be made up by others, they will have no lunch. In school districts having many such families, they just do not have a school lunch program. So I believe this is a serious gap in the operation of the school lunch program.

The authority to remedy this defect is provided in the act. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Appropriations will examine this question carefully and will supply some additional funds for section 11, even if it has to reduce appropriations for the total program, so that the neediest children may be helped. I must say that I think this would be a much finer thing to do than to start a school breakfast program.

I appeal to the Committee on Appropriations to see if provision cannot be made for school lunches for the neediest children. Last year the amount provided was $2 million. It helped some. Perhaps this year the committee can provide a more nearly adequate proportion of the total school lunch funds to help the neediest schoolchildren in the country, and I mean the neediest—those who need the school lunch more than thousands who are now receiving it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Kentucky doubtless recalls that many school districts were so poor that they could not even provide for the nonfood costs of the school lunch program.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now we are providing it, and we must make a case. It is my belief that we shall be able to take care of many of the poorer schoolchildren who are not now receiving school lunches.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky addressed his question, in part, to me.

Mr. COOPER. I did so because I know that the Senator from Florida is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, just as is my friend the Senator from Louisiana. I mean what I say. I appeal to the Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to say that we have had some experience under section 11, to which the Senator refers. I am speaking now as one member of the subcommittee which has to do with agriculture appropriations, of which subcommittee the Senator from Louisiana is also a member and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is an ex officio member. There may be other Senators in the Chamber who are also members.

For some years there has been quite a difference of opinion between the members of the Committee on Appropriations of this body and the members of the Committee on Appropriations of the other body as to whether section 11 should be activated. Last year, for the first time, we were able to persuade the committee of the other body to go along with us by providing, as a beginning, a figure of $2 million for the taking up of the school lunch program in areas where there were children so poor that they could get no lunch, and where the districts were so poor that they could not participate.

Our committee had put this item in the bill before but had failed to maintain it in conference. But in conference last year the other body accepted this item, $2 million was provided, and a beginning was made in meeting this particular matter.

I have before me the testimony of the authorities from the Department of Agriculture who testified on this particular matter this year. They testified that they would like to have $19.3 million for special assistance under section 11; that is, as compared with the $2 million. The testimony further showed that they expected this program to become a very much larger program in the future.

As a matter of fact, both our Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is a distinguished member, were somewhat alarmed over the fact that the authorities wanted to make all of these programs social welfare programs rather than the type programs they had been.

In connection with this particular bill, as it came from the department, my recollection is that one of the main objections that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] had to it in its original form—and he is entitled to great credit for having improved it before we reported it out of committee—was that they sought to make it almost exclusively a social welfare program, with respect to teachers and individuals as distinguished from children, as to who was entitled to receive the benefits of the program and who was not. We felt that that was the wrong approach both in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Appropriations, and many changes have been made in the bill to get away from that position.

The fact is that no one knows how big this section 11 effort could become, and no one knows what the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations of the other body will be this year.

We were all somewhat alarmed at the tendency that appeared to make the entire program a welfare program and reduce greatly these well-established programs, the school lunch program and the school milk program.

The budget this year reduced the special milk program from $103 million to $21 million. I do not recall the amount of the reduction of the school lunch program. It is not that great. My recollection is it decreased $23 million from what it was the year before. It had been explained that the school lunch program was not meeting all of the needs it was designed to meet and the tendency was to make social welfare programs out of these two programs.

I wish to say to the Senator that our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations will give attention, as we have in the past, to section 11. What the result will be I can give no guarantee, but we are disturbed.

I speak not only for myself but also for others who serve on both committees. We are disturbed at the manifest intention to make a welfare program out of these programs which have been pretty well established. Both the school lunch program and the school milk program control life in so many of our communities in our Nation.

We will give close attention to section 11, if that answers the question propounded by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. It was last year that the first appropriation, as I remember, was made available under section 11 for this purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was the first appropriation, and it was only a trial run.

Mr. COOPER. I supported the position of the chairman and the Senator from Florida that the school lunch program should be kept in the control of the Department of Agriculture and the local school authorities, and not be allowed to branch out into programs being carried on under the Antipoverty Act. I agree with that.

I have made my point about the operation of the school lunch program in areas where, unfortunately, the majority of the pupils come from very low-income families. I think the consequence has been that in the lowest income school districts in the United States, their children, the poorest children in the country, have been outside the operation of the school lunch program.

The provision in the act designed to meet this situation is section 11, which specifically authorizes the appropriation of funds to help those school districts have a lunch program their children can afford.

I know that the problem of administering a lunch program in such school districts is often very difficult. It is difficult in my own State, particularly in the eastern part, the section where I live.

I do feel at times that many of the programs which have been authorized by the Congress grow until they overlap and that they are not as effective as they should be. Some are wasting money, and that always troubles me because I would like to see these programs reach their purpose, and actually help the people. I do not think that it is happening in many instances.

The school lunch program is a good program, which has been operating a long time, effectively administered on the whole under the authority of the Department of Agriculture. But I did want to call attention to the fact that, unfortunately, it sometimes does not help the poorest children.

Mr. President, I had prepared a somewhat fuller statement of my views on this subject, and ask that it be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Cooper in Support of Section 11 Funds

I am very glad that the committee report, on page 6, includes a discussion of Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act. While the bill before us today does not deal directly with the problem of providing school lunches to those who cannot afford to pay, I believe it is very important to keep this specific purpose of the act in perspective, and to direct the operation of the school lunch program with a better sense of priorities to the goals we seek.

As I understand, the school lunch program has three fundamental purposes: First, to provide a nutritious hot lunch to children at their schools, to better insure their health. Times have changed since most children could walk home for lunch, patronize a neighborhood snack shop, or carry a sandwich and apple in a pail. Second, the school lunch program has provided the most constructive and valuable outlet for surplus agricultural products, and those supported by government programs, including dairy products and canned fruits and vegetables. But it is far more than that. Third and very important, it provides effective assistance to those families which are needy—by providing good food in the school lunch for growing children who, in many cases, have no other decent meal.

It is this last purpose which I believe deserves greater attention and emphasis, and which should be assigned a higher priority.

It is widely recognized that the National School Lunch Act has always contained the provision, in Section 9, that lunches "shall be served *without cost* or at a *reduced cost* to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the lunch". But, I think it is less well known that this authority in Section 9 does not provide Federal funds for this purpose. Specific funds to meet this purpose were separately authorized in 1962 by Section 11. In fact, Section 11 was funded for the first time at the very modest level of $2 million for a portion of the last school year.

I recall the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, cited in the committee report, that nearly 1½ million children would qualify for, but do not receive, a reduced-price or free lunch. As I understand, a Federal appropriation of $26 million is estimated as the amount needed to fulfill this purpose. I have supported the annual appropriation of approximately $100 million annually for the special milk program, which is in addition to the half pints of milk provided in every "Type A" lunch, and the Federal share of approximately $300 million annually representing about 20% of the cost of the entire school lunch program. I point out that the amount necessary to effectively implement Section 11 and assure that the neediest school children can receive a lunch would be less than 10% of that total cost. I present this fact because it seems to me a purpose which deserves to be assigned a priority not less than that for a pilot breakfast program, assistance for equipment for schools in needy areas, or State administrative funds—as provided in the bill before the Senate today.

I would like to describe briefly the need for more adequate funding of Section 11. To do so seems to me consonant with the policy of the Congress and the Administration in directing greater assistance to recognized areas of need, both in the heart of urban centers and in isolated rural areas having concentrations of large numbers of low-income families.

In a great many schools, the price charged pupils for the lunch, perhaps 25¢, may provide 2 or 3¢ which can be used to finance free lunches for 10% of the pupils who cannot afford to pay. But, in many of the schools where a large number—one-third or one-half or more of the children—are from families who find it hard or impossible to pay for the school lunch, the local authorities have found no way to finance the program, and the school *simply will not have the lunch program at all.*

In other schools, it is impossible to increase the price of the lunch so as to provide sufficient reduced-price lunches to children in somewhat less fortunate circumstances—especially when the entire school serves a low-income community. In these schools, which have the lunch program, perhaps only half the children participate—and those which should really be the first priority beneficiaries of the program, do not get the lunch.

It is the function of Section 11 to meet this problem, and I think it incumbent upon the Administration and the Congress, and the friends of the school lunch program across the country, to pursue more vigorously this purpose.

The bill before the Senate today recognizes our desire that child nutrition programs in the schools be centered in the Department of Agriculture. But, if the humane purpose of insuring that a hot school lunch is made available—and not last, but first—to those who have less food at home and are in the most difficult circumstances is not to be met by the Department of Agriculture, it is only natural that those charged with the education programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and with the anti-poverty programs, should seek to correct the default of the Department of Agriculture in seeking, and of the Congress in providing, a reasonable share of the total school lunch costs for the purposes of Section 11.

I am glad that in the State of Kentucky, as cited in Secretary Freeman's testimony, demonstration projects were undertaken in 54 schools last year, largely in eastern Kentucky, providing reduced-price lunches. I point out that it is the policy of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out this program, not simply to provide lunches without cost to some students, and at the usual charge to others. Rather, the Department has encouraged a reduction in the price of the lunches to 15¢ or even 10¢ in schools with large populations of needy children. This gives all an opportunity and an obligation to contribute. It also results in a much higher proportion of the pupils actually participating in the hot lunch program.

I know that the bill before us today is directed primarily to extension of the special milk program, and authority for pilot breakfast and equipment programs in needy areas. The question of more adequate funding for Section 11 will be before the Senate later this week in connection with the Agricultural Appropriations Act and, perhaps later this year or early next year, in the President's request for supplemental appropriations. But, I did want to take this opportunity to discuss the financing of lunches for the neediest students, because it seems to me a fundamental purpose of the school lunch program which has been neglected.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his comments. I believe that this colloquy has brought out a fact which is worthwhile having in the RECORD; that is, that both the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Appropriations Subcommittee have problems to handle that are very far from being directly related to agricultural life. Some of them tend to be more social in nature than otherwise. One is the school lunch program, another is the special school milk program, and another is the food stamp program. Then, there is the food-for-freedom program which we are going to mark up tomorrow.

All of us are aware of the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which deals with the same subject, have to deal with a great many subjects that are not directly agricultural problems.

I wish to say for the RECORD that while I have not always agreed with the decisions of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, these problems could not be entrusted to anyone with a bigger heart or more humanitarian viewpoint. I give him public credit here for those qualities. I am sure that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who observed him work out these problems in committee, know that this is the case.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 637

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 637, which has been slightly modified, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is as follows:

On page 11, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"TITLE I—NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AMENDMENTS"

On page 22, after line 12, add the following:

"TITLE II—SPECIAL SUMMER LUNCH PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Special Summer Lunch Program for Children Act'.

"Declaration of purpose

"SEC. 202. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of this title to further safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by establishing a special summer lunch program for children to complement the regular school lunch program carried out under the National School Lunch Act.

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 203. For each fiscal year there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Special summer lunch program for children

"SEC. 204. The Secretary shall formulate and carry out a special summer lunch program for children as provided in this title under which lunches shall be made available for children between the ages of three and eighteen, inclusive, attending public recreation centers, public or private nonprofit day camps, public or private nonprofit neighborhood child centers, public or private nonprofit summer camps, or any similar public or private nonprofit activity organized to promote the health or recreation of children, including a community action program organized for such a purpose and approved under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (all of the foregoing hereinafter referred to as 'summer youth centers'). The sums appropriated for any fiscal year for carrying out such program, excluding the sum specified in section 205, shall be available to the Secretary for supplying agricultural commodities and other foods for the program in accordance with the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall apportion among the States during each fiscal year not less than 75 per centum of the funds made available for such year for supplying agricultural commodities and other foods under the provisions of section 203 of this title. The Secretary shall apportion funds among the States on the same basis, insofar as practicable, as funds are apportioned under section 4 of the National School Lunch Act to carry out the national school lunch program. The program authorized under this title shall be carried out in a State only during the summer vacation period when the elementary and high schools of such State are normally closed or open only on a limited summer schedule.

"Nonfood assistance

"SEC. 205. Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out the special summer lunch program for children authorized by this title, $8,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of providing during such fiscal year, nonfood assistance for such special program pursuant to the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall apportion among the States during each fiscal year the aforesaid sum of $8,000,000, and such apportionment among the States shall be on the same basis as the apportionment of funds for agricultural commodities and other foods is made under section 204 of this title.

"Direct Federal expenditures

SEC. 206. The funds appropriated for any fiscal year for carrying out the provisions of this title, less not to exceed 3½ per centum thereof hereby made available to the Secretary for his administrative expenses, and less the amount apportioned by him pursuant to sections 204, 205, and 210, shall be available to the Secretary during such year for direct expenditure by him for agricultural commodities and other foods to be distributed among the States and summer youth centers participating in the special program under this title in accordance with the needs as determined by the appropriate local authorities. The provisions of law contained in the proviso of the Act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 323), facilitating operations with respect to the purchase and disposition of surplus agricultural commodities under section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, shall, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, also be applicable to expenditures of funds by the Secretary under this title.

"Payments to States

"Sec. 207. Funds apportioned to any State pursuant to section 204 or 205 of this title during any fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State for disbursement by the appropriate State agency, in accordance with such agreements not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as may be entered into by the Secretary and such State agency, for the purpose of assisting summer youth centers of that State during such fiscal year, in supplying (1) agricultural commodities and other foods for consumption by children between the ages of 3 and 18, inclusive, and (2) nonfood assistance in furtherance of the special summer lunch program for children authorized under this title. Such payments to any State in any fiscal year shall be made upon the condition that an amount equal to not less than 10 per centum of such payments will be matched during such year from sources within the State determined by the Secretary to have been expended in connection with the special summer lunch program for children carried out under this title. For the purpose of determining whether the matching requirements of this section and section 210, respectively, have been met, the reasonable value of donated services, supplies, facilities, and equipment as certified, respectively, by the appropriate State agency and in case of summer youth centers receiving funds pursuant to section 210, by such summer youth centers (but not the cost or value of land, of the acquisition, construction, or alteration of buildings or commodities donated by the Secretary, or of Federal contributions, or the cost or value of any facility paid for in whole or part with funds counted as matching funds under the National School Lunch Act), may be regarded as funds from sources within the State expended in connection with the special summer lunch program. The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified.

"State disbursement to summer youth centers

"Sec. 208. Funds paid to any State during any fiscal year pursuant to section 204 or 205 of this title shall be disbursed by the appropriate State agency, in accordance with such agreements approved by the Secretary as may be entered into by such State agency and the summer youth centers in the State, to those summer youth centers in the State which the State agency, taking into account need and attendance, determines are eligible to participate in the special summer lunch program for children authorized by this title. Such disbursement to any summer youth center shall be made only for the purpose of reimbursing it for the cost of obtaining agricultural commodities and other foods for consumption by children in the special summer lunch program for children and nonfood assistance in connection with such program. Such food costs may include, in addition to the purchase price of agricultural commodities and other foods, the cost of processing, distributing, transporting, storing, or handling thereof. In no event shall such disbursement for food to any summer youth center for any fiscal year exceed an amount determined by multiplying the number of lunches served in the summer youth center under the special summer lunch program for children during such year by the maximum Federal food-cost contribution rate for the State, for the type of lunch served, as prescribed by the Secretary.

"Nutritional and other program requirements

"Sec. 209. Lunches served by summer youth centers under this title shall meet minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary on the basis of tested nutritional research. Such meals shall be served without cost or at a reduced cost to children who are determined by local authorities to be unable to pay the full cost of the lunch. No physical segregation of or other discrimination against any child shall be made by the summer youth center because of his inability to pay. Lunch programs under this title shall be operated on a nonprofit basis. Each summer youth center shall insofar as practicable, utilize in its lunch program commodities designated from time to time by the Secretary as being in abundance, either nationally or in the summer youth center area, or commodities donated by the Secretary. Commodities purchased under the authority of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, may be donated by the Secretary to summer youth centers, in accordance with the needs as determined by local authorities, for utilization in the special summer lunch program under this title.

"Nonprofit private summer youth centers

"Sec. 210. If, in any State, the appropriate State agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this title to nonprofit private summer youth centers in the State, or is not permitted by law to match Federal funds made available for use by such nonprofit private summer youth center, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds apportioned to any such State under sections 204 and 205 of this title an amount which would otherwise be made available, as determined by the Secretary, to such State on account of such nonprofit private summer youth centers in the State. The Secretary shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to the nonprofit private summer youth centers within such State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are authorized or required with respect to the disbursements to other summer youth centers within the State by the appropriate State agency, including the requirement that any such payment or payments shall be matched, in the proportion specified in section 207 for such State, by funds from sources within the State expended by nonprofit private summer youth centers within the State participating in the special summer lunch program for children under this title. Such funds shall not be considered a part of the funds constituting the matching funds under the terms of section 207.

"Miscellaneous provisions and definitions

"Sec. 211. (a) States, the appropriate State agencies, and summer youth centers participating in the special summer lunch program for children under this title shall keep such accounts and records as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to determine whether the provisions of this title are being complied with. Such accounts and records shall at all times be available for inspection and audit by representatives of the Secretary and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of five years, as the Secretary determines necessary.

"(b) The Secretary shall encourage, and in cases in which he determines appropriate, require as a condition of eligibility to participate, the use of existing facilities utilized for serving lunches under the national school lunch program.

"(c) The Secretary may, during the first fiscal year in which a program is in effect under this title, make such adjustments as he deems appropriate in order to provide for the effective and equitable administration of this title.

"(d) The Secretary shall incorporate in his agreements with the appropriate State agencies the express requirements prescribed in this title with respect to the operation of the special summer lunch program for children insofar as they may be applicable and such other provisions as in his opinion are reasonably necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"(e) For purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'State' means any of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa.

"(2) The term 'appropriate State agency' means the agency or body of the State designated by the State legislature to administer in the State the special summer school program authorized by this title.

"(3) The term 'private nonprofit' as applied to any of the summer child centers described in section 204 of this title means a summer child center operated by a private school or organization exempt from income taxes under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(4) The term 'nonfood assistance' means equipment used by summer youth centers in storing, preparing, or serving food for children under this title."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and to provide for a special summer lunch program for children".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Who yields time?

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] be added as cosponsors to amendment No. 637.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, first, let me commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and his committee for bringing to the Senate an outstanding and humanitarian bill to improve nutrition, the school lunch programs, and the special school milk programs as we have known them in the past.

I fully support the Child Nutrition Act as it was reported to the Senate. It is an excellent bill and provides much-needed improvements in our existing national school lunch program and special milk program.

One notable feature of this bill is the initiation of a pilot breakfast program. This would give help to the many needy children who start the day hungry, and so have a painful time doing a morning's work.

My amendment recognizes the fact that despite the excellence of the school lunch program, hunger takes no vacation. My amendment would establish a special summer lunch program for young people throughout the land—young people from 3 to 18 years old. Those children who could pay for their lunches would do so. But for the almost 2 million who cannot, the program would spell the difference between hunger and health.

Our excellent school lunch program, improved by this bill, recognizes and helps our needy children 9 months of the year. But a child's need to eat does not disappear when school is out for the summer. These hungry children do not simply disappear when our schools close in June.

During the academic year, the lunch program, authorized under the National School Lunch Act, provides nourishing food to elementary and secondary school students in their schools. My amendment would complement the regular program. It would permit public recreation centers—public or private nonprofit day camps—public or private nonprofit neighborhood child centers—public or private nonprofit summer camps—or any other public or private nonprofit activity organized to promote the health or recreation of children—to serve lunches to children during summer recesses.

Such a summer lunch program is badly needed. During the 3 months of the year when children do not attend school, they should have the nutritional advantage of at least one decent, well-balanced meal a day.

We are discussing children here, not statistics. But statistics tell us the extent of the need.

Although most students who now get lunches when school is in session pay for their food and so bear a substantial part of the cost of this program, about 10 percent of all students in participating schools are unable to pay the price of lunch. The percentage in the cities runs much higher. The children in the nationwide 10 percent receive their meals free, or at a reduced cost.

This year, over 18 million children were receiving lunches under the National School Lunch Act. Almost 2 million of these received their lunches at little or no cost. The questions that haunt our national consciences are these: How are they getting fed when schools are not in session? How are they getting fed in the summers—on the weekends—and during holidays? What do they do for breakfast or for dinner?

In many communities, especially in the schools in the slums, children drag themselves to school when they are ill—just to pick up their lunches. Children have been known to take their lunches and sneak away from school at midday—so their brothers and sisters at home could have a bite or two of decent food. Children have been known to race to school early to get to the teacher first and reserve any lunches that may be left over from schoolmates who are absent. I am deeply grieved that any American child be so deprived.

Throughout our land, children are going hungry during school except for school lunches. And once school is out of session, they just plain go hungry. This is the largest single justification and a clearly indisputable argument for extending the regular school lunch program to cover the out-of-school summer activities of young children, particularly those in need.

I do not think we show much respect for the facts—or compassion for the hunger of children—or commonsense as to what is good for the Nation's future—if we accept our responsibilities to our needy youngsters only during the 180 or 190 days a year when school is officially in session. For although the schools take a vacation, young stomachs—and hunger—do not.

In the last few years, this Nation has shown a new awareness of the persistence of poverty in the midst of abundance. We have realized too that the young—the children of the poor—constitute a disproportionate percentage of all the poor. Experts estimate that some 17 to 23 million young people—or from one-fourth to one-third of all our children—are growing up in deprivation.

Poverty breeds ignorance, crime, and disease. People who are hungry are more apt to steal, get sick, and turn their backs on learning. Let us do the reasonable thing. Let us put a stop to hunger. Let us take every possible step to unravel the fabric of poverty in our land.

Summers are always an especially restless time in our slums. Children with free time on their hands—hungry children—often get into trouble. Of course, making lunches available to such children during the long, hot summer is not by itself going to solve this problem. Yet it is one of the many steps that can be taken to improve the outlook and stimulate the hope of those who feel they have nothing to lose and everything to gain by violence and lawlessness and contempt for society.

Under the summer program I am proposing, States will be generally required to match every $1 of Federal expenditure with 10 cents from State sources.

For those with a pragmatic turn of mind, we can find economic justification for the program I propose—as well as moral and social grounds. This program would reap a veritable harvest of benefits—benefits far in excess of the Federal money and surplus food involved.

Let us look at a few: Strong, well-fed youth; more income for the farmer; huge market for food trades; jobs for lunchroom personnel; constructive outlet for abundant commodities; and, of course, well-nourished students, receptive to continued instruction.

And consider the other benefits which might arise from a summer lunch program. Children who ordinarily would play listlessly on the streets or roam aimlessly in slum neighborhoods might go to wholesome recreational activities at public playgrounds and day centers. Summer day centers, especially in low-income neighborhoods, are an important barrier to antisocial activity. We already have evidence that with the additional attraction of needed free lunches, such playgrounds and centers will be used more broadly and constructively.

In the past, school lunch programs generally have not been extended through the summer months for two reasons. First, under existing legislation, attendance at a school or at activities described by local educational agencies as school activities is a requirement for participation in the school lunch program. Second, the amount of Federal money available to the States under the present program is not enough for them to set up lunch programs during the summer.

My amendment conceives the summer lunch program as part of the war on poverty and not an exclusive school activity. My amendment would provide the funds necessary to make lunches available to children at various recreation centers, as I have outlined. It would include community action programs organized under the Economic Opportunity Act.

The Federal Government has shown itself to be deeply committed to the health and welfare and fitness of its people. Local government and private organizations have shown their willingness and desire to achieve these ends as well. We know, however, that local and private groups have limited resources; they cannot do the needed job alone. The truly American partnership of Federal, State, and local agencies can accomplish what is urgently needed.

The legislation I propose and urge you to support will strengthen this partnership and will serve a highly admirable goal—the health, happiness and well-being of our Nation's children.

It will correct the bill's one basic fault, that it is a 9-month program designed to take care of the health and food needs of children during school months only.

Unfortunately for children, hunger does not take a vacation. Unfortunately for children, hunger is still around during the summer months. Unfortunately, children can be just as hungry in July or August as they can be in March, April, November or December.

We must face the fact that if we are to take care of the health needs of the children of America, we must take care of the health needs of the children all year around.

These youngsters play on the city streets. They wander around aimlessly. They get just as hungry in summer if they lack food and sustenance.

It is true that the school lunch program takes care of some 18 million children. It is also true that my amendment would not take care of all the problems of those 18 million children. But, out of those 18 million who are fed during the 9 months of the school year, approximately 2 million receive their lunches free. They are children whom the school authorities determine to be on the poverty level, who cannot afford to make a contribution to pay for their lunches during the school year. But these children are still hungry, and I think that based on humanitarian and practical principles we should take into account the possibility of feeding them during the summer months.

How would this work out, and how practical would it be?

Last year, I received a call from a volunteer worker in the District of Columbia. She had worked in the school system, among the poverty-stricken children in the District, and she was concerned over the fact that the only square meal many of these children received was during the school lunch period.

I do not know this woman, and I never did get to meet her, but she called me up and said, "Senator RIBICOFF, what happens to children during the summer months?"

I started to look around and make inquiries and found that it is true that these children had nothing to eat. I called various authorities in the District of Columbia. They discovered that they could possibly work something out in the Office of Economic Opportunity, through a community action program. One was started called "Summer Adventures for Youth in the District of Columbia." Part of that program was a day-camp program built around the school lunch program in the schools of the District of Columbia and the recreation areas which served lunches to children. We found that this brought in 8,000 youngsters to be fed. Thus, instead of 8,000 children being on the streets, they were part of an organized recreation program.

These 8,000 youngsters program had a step-up program which evolved to take care of children 6 years old to 15 as against children 3 years old to 6. This year there were some 9,000 youngsters in this particular program being fed out of 50 centers. There were 2,000 block components under block leaders who supervised. We served 9,000 lunches in the District of Columbia.

Therefore, out of commonsense and plain humanity, should we not take into account the basic problem of hungry youngsters?

Hunger does not take a vacation. It is as simple as that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I should like to commend the Senator from Connecticut for his great leadership in proposing this very important amendment. However, I should like to ask him a question and bring to the Senator's attention this phrase in the amendment, "summer schedule and summer vacation period."

I am certain the Senator realizes that there are several places in the United States where, because of unusual community circumstances, the summer vacation does not necessarily come in June, July, or August. We have one such community in Hawaii where the summer schedule comes in the fall months, when the coffee crop is harvested. Would the Senator's amendment cover those areas where the so-called vacation falls at a time other than the usual summer period?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is my intent that the amendment cover a situation such as the Senator mentions, or areas in the United States where, because of special circumstances—economic, agricultural, or weather—there is a period substituted for summer as we usually consider it.

I would intend that my amendment cover the situation to allow the lunch program to be extended to that period that is substituted for the normal summer months in a State like Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for calling of the quorum not be taken out of the time allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am happy to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

THE NEED FOR A SUMMER LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, first, let me compliment the Senator from Connecticut for the introduction of his amendment. I am delighted to join him and hope that the rest of the Senate will join him in adopting the amendment.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate's favorable consideration of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, to amend S. 3467 by the insertion of S. 2121, Amendment No. 637. By the addition of S. 2121, we would establish a special summer lunch program for children in summer youth centers. The special summer lunch program would complement the regular school lunch program by providing lunches free or at reduced cost to children in summer camps and other similar institutions, on the same administrative basis as that of the regular school lunch program, which runs from September to June. I am privileged to cosponsor the bill with Senator RIBICOFF and support his efforts on behalf of the Nation's children.

If the Senate accepts Senator RIBICOFF's amendment, such a step would be an important one toward providing for the adequate nutrition of the Nation's needy children on a year-round basis. We are making continual strides forward in providing for the adequate nutrition of our needy children; programs such as the pilot breakfast and nonfood assistance programs proposed in the bill now under discussion—S. 3467—witness to this fact.

The next logical step is to provide for the nutritional needs of these needy children on a year-round basis. Our concern here is for child nutrition, Mr. President, and children are hungry 12 months a year, not just from September to June. It seems worse than foolish to provide needy children with what often is their only adequate meal of the day for 9 months of the year, and then during the summer months to suspend the concern for their welfare which the school lunch program represents. The special milk program has already set the precedent: It is run on a year-round basis. The rounding out of our child nutrition program seems hardly complete without the inclusion of a summer food assistance program to aid those children who most need our help.

Since he originally introduced S. 2121, Senator RIBICOFF has made two changes in the bill, now offered as amendment No. 637. Both changes are designed to make the measure a more effective instrument in meeting the nutritional needs of the greatest number of children. The first would change the age limits for eligibility for the program from 6 to 16, to 3 to 18 years; the second would increase the appropriation authorization from $5 to $8 million. Preschool participants in summer day camps and child care centers could have lunch now, too; so could the high school assistants who help care for the children. The amendments are in the spirit of the entire act, in the spirit of satisfying the hunger of the Nation's children as completely and as effectively as we can.

The Senator from Connecticut has had experience in this general field of providing for those within the realm and sector of the economy who basically, while they do not want to go to charity, need help. With the Senator's background as a Governor, with his background as a member of the Cabinet, as one who was instrumental in having put through a medicare program, and providing for better administration in the field of welfare, I urge that the Senate adopt his amendment as a great step forward.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] as a cosponsor of the amendment which is pending before the Senate. I commend the Senator from Connecticut for his great leadership and his vision in this field, which has been established in the past as the school lunch program and is now being expanded in areas where there is the greatest need.

I think all of us will have to agree with the proposition that children who are not adequately nourished while attending school cannot be expected to accomplish what is needed in the way of educational goals. That should not be so in the great affluent society which we have in the United States.

I think the way has been pointed by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut by which there can be a great remedy of a deficiency in our program to provide for our children the greatest opportunity possible. We have recognized officially in America that the foundations of this Republic are built on an educated electorate, and we want our children to have the greatest opportunity that it is possible for us to provide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield the Senator from Utah 1 additional minute.

Mr. MOSS. I gladly support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. I think it completes the bill.

I support the bill wholeheartedly. I think it is an important bill to continue the programs we have started upon and to expand and enlarge them in the way pointed by the bill and by the amendment which is pending. Therefore, I strongly support the amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

For the past hour and a half we have been discussing the school lunch bill. The pending amendment would go far beyond the purposes that are fundamental to our support of the school lunch program. The amendment provides for lunch programs for children attending public recreation centers, day camps, neighborhood child centers, summer camps, or similar youth centers.

These may be good programs, but they do not belong in the school lunch program.

As I pointed out, the school lunch program has been in effect for 20 years and it is confined to schools. It has done a good job because it has been administered at the local level, by the school authorities, and by fathers and mothers who benefited from the school lunch program.

To extend the program to summer camps might be good, but it would not be good to put it under the school lunch program.

There are programs being fostered by the Office of Economic Opportunity in order to take care of summer camps. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has programs in which summer school children are taken care of. Under the special milk program, the Department furnishes milk for its camps.

Let us not put the administration of those programs under the Department of Agriculture and try to do for those programs what is now being done in the schools. The proposed programs are out of school, whereas the school lunch programs are confined to schools.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would it be possible for the school and local district authorities which are used in the school lunch program and special milk program to distribute the milk under this proposed program in the various centers where children would be gathered away from the school and outside the school?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. As I have said, the school lunch program has been very effective in the past. It is because of the cooperation of the school authorities and mothers and fathers that the program has been effective. The school authorities have nothing to do with public recreation centers, neighborhood child centers, and many other out-of-school programs. I do not believe we ought to confuse and diffuse the highly satisfactory camps we now have by adding programs, the feasibility of which, we have not explored.

I yield such time as he may want to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask only for such time as I may need for two or three questions about the amendment. First, I want to commend the Senator from Connecticut for having such a worthy objective as wanting to see that children have enough to eat in the summertime. I have noticed that a bill in the House, identical to the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut, was referred to the Education and Labor Committee, where it can very well become an amendment to the poverty program. I believe that is where it should go.

The Senator from Connecticut is now proposing a rather dubious course or route for reaching a worthy objective.

The first question I would like to ask him is how much this amendment will cost?

Mr. RIBICOFF. My amendment will cost one-third of the amount provided for the school lunch program. Since the amount budgeted for 9 months is $180 million, it is estimated my amendment will cost one-third, or some $60 million.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would take effect on passage?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The amendment would take effect on passage.

If I may reply to the Senator's comments, it is true that it is rather surprising that the Committee on Education and Labor in the House has reported a separate bill similar to my amendment. It does not give authority to the poverty program, but to the Department of Agriculture. It seems to me it has gotten out of the hands of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. It provides substantial increases in the poverty program, to be charged to the Department of Agriculture.

The Senator from Connecticut has said his amendment is going to cost $50 or $60 million. The amendment provides that $8 million shall be provided the Secretary for the purpose of providing nonfood items, I suppose stoves, refrigerators, and so forth.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. May I also point out that the administration has already allocated $8 million in the proposed budget for that purpose.

I point out further, in answer to the query made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, that that is exactly what is intended by the amendment, that this will be administered by the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural authorities who understand the problem.

I point out to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor gives the authority, not to the poverty program, but to the Secretary of Agriculture.

So we are being whipsawed here, because of the failure to recognize that this is the obligation of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has the knowledge, the ability, and the experience, and what I am trying to prevent is the setting up of another bureaucracy, at great cost, to administer a summer lunch program.

The Department of Agriculture has the experience with summer lunch programs, and I see nothing sacred in the title, the name of a bill, "The School Lunch Program." We are talking about hungry children; we are not talking about the name of a program. If hungry children can be fed in the summertime through the mechanics and the organization of the school lunch program, why cannot the U.S. Senate forget the name and see that hungry children on vacation are fed? They are just as hungry in July and August as they are in March and April.

Mr. AIKEN. Has that bill passed the House?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, it is before the Rules Committee now.

Mr. AIKEN. When it passes the House and comes to the Senate, I think the Senate should put it in its proper perspective. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that the Department of Agriculture is far better equipped to handle these programs.

But I hope that Senators, before they vote on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, will keep in mind that they will be taking $40 to $50 million out of the school lunch program to operate the summer lunch programs. I am not opposed to summer lunch programs, I want the Senator to understand that. I am opposed to the proposed method of doing it.

The House has approved $157 million for the school lunch program this year. The Senate has increased that figure by about $10 million.

The question is, do we want to take at least one-third away from the school lunch program to operate a summer program, no matter how worthy it is? That is one of the questions. We should understand that to the extent we appropriate for this other program, we are taking away from the school lunch program itself.

I have one other question—at least one, perhaps two.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I answer the question on appropriations first for the distinguished Senator?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. This will not take money away from the school lunch program. This is an authorization, and the Appropriations Committee will have to appropriate. Basically, the $60 million——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Has time on the bill expired?

Mr. AIKEN. Is there time remaining on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. No time remaining on the bill?

I ask unanimous consent that we may have an additional 10 minutes, because I assumed there was time remaining on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator from Vermont made the query as to what the summer program would cost. I made the point that I was estimating the $60 million from the $180 million allocated for the 9 months for the school lunch program; I assumed that for 3 additional months, the cost would be about an additional $60 million. But the additional $60 million would not come out of the $180 million; it would have to be appropriated by the appropriations committee.

Obviously it would not be this summer. By the time it gets through the Senate, through the House, and through conference, we will be into another school year. We are now talking about the summer of 1967, instead of 1966.

So we will not be taking any money out of the normal school lunch program. We are talking about an authorization for the summer of 1967, for which the money would have to be appropriated.

Mr. AIKEN. But the cost of this program will come out of the appropriation for the school lunch program.

Mr. RIBICOFF. No; only if the appropriations committee and Congress so funded it.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill which is now before us, which the Senator proposes to amend, has a limit.

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, there is no limit. "For each fiscal year there is hereby authorized to be appropriated."

Since this summer is nearly over, we cannot use the money now, because it will not be the law during the summer of 1966. It will only take effect for the summer of 1967. This is an authorization for the summer of 1967 and beyond. What will have to happen is, the appropriations committee will have to appropriate for the summer of 1967.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator's amendment would take effect immediately.

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, it would not. It would have to take effect in the summer of 1967, because it will not become law during the summer of 1966. This provision would have to be passed by the House, and then would have to go to conference, and could not become law this summer. It would therefore take effect the summer of 1967.

Mr. AIKEN. It was my understanding that it was to take effect on passage.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is also my understanding. Only when the bill becomes law.

Mr. AIKEN. Another question. The Senator understands, does he not, that the Federal Government pays 20 percent of the cost of the school lunch programs?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's amendment provides that the Federal Government pay 90 percent of the cost of the summer programs.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. So the percentage to come out of the school lunch program would be that much heavier for the summer programs.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Again may I say, we do not understand one another. The record should be made clear: It is my intention that the summer lunch program will not in any way come out of the appropriations, for the normal school lunch program. This is an amendment setting up a special program for feeding children during the summer months. It is not to come out of the normal school lunch program, but only out of the summer lunch program, which will have to be funded by appropriations by the proper appropriations committee.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is getting me confused, if not himself, because his amendment says the State shall pay not less than 10 percent for the summer lunch program. The States pay 80 percent of the cost of the school lunch programs.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But this is a separate program, and is an amendment to the bill that is before us.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, in the Senator's opinion, this program is a far more important program than the school lunch program, in that the Federal Government should pay 90 percent of this cost, and only 20 percent of the cost of the school lunch program?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not think it is more important, but if it will change the Senator's point of view, I will be glad to accept an amendment to make it 20 percent and 80 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. Twenty percent for the Federal Government?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Eighty percent for the Federal Government and 20 percent for the States.

Mr. AIKEN. That would only be four times as much cost to the Federal Government as the school lunch program?

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is a program for the summertime, and we recognize the basic need.

Mr. AIKEN. This program is intended to bolster the poverty program, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I say to the distinguished Senator, this program is intended to feed hungry children in the summertime. It is as simple as that.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a very worthy objective, and if it comes before the Senate in the proper form, I shall be delighted to support the Senator.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I say the proper time is now, when children are hungry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. No funds from the Federal school lunch program can be dispersed to segregated summer camps; is that correct?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. We have in my State summer camps, for example, for girls and boys of certain classes. They would not be eligible?

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is for nonprofit summer camps. If the Senator has a camp in his State which is a profitmaking venture, this program would not apply at all. It is for nonprofit camps. I am thinking of charity camps, such as are run all over the country by different charitable organizations.

Mr. AIKEN. But they would have to be nonsegregated in order to qualify for Federal assistance?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Just one more question——

Mr. RIBICOFF. And I believe funds for a school lunch program cannot be paid, at the present time, to segregated schools.

Mr. AIKEN. And I voted for that, too.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. One further question: If a State decides not to go into this summer camp business, the Federal Government then could bypass the State and deal directly with a community or a group?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. It would have to be done through an agency set up by the State itself. If the State does not set up an agency, the Federal Government cannot come in and administer the program separate and apart from the State.

Mr. AIKEN. Section 210 of the amendment of the Senator states:

> If, in any State, the appropriate State agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this title to nonprofit private summer youth centers in the State, or is not permitted by law to match Federal funds made available for use by such nonprofit private summer youth center, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds apportioned to any such State under sections 204 and 205 of this title an amount which would otherwise be made available, as determined by the Secretary, to such State on account of such nonprofit private summer youth centers in the State. The Secretary shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to the nonprofit private summer youth centers within such State for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions as are authorized or required with respect to the disbursements to other summer youth centers within the State by the appropriate State agency, including the requirement that any such payment or payments shall be matched, in the proportion specified in section 207 for such State, by funds from sources within the State expended by nonprofit private summer youth centers within the State participating in the special summer lunch program for children under this title.

If that does not authorize the bypassing of a State, I do not know what it does. It does provide that if the people of the community or the church running the camp schools desegregate and contribute up to 10 percent of the funds, the Federal Government will pay 90 percent.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I know that, especially in a State like Vermont or Connecticut, there are many communities and organizations, be they the YMCA or any of the various church groups, or the New York Herald Tribune Fresh Air Fund, or the Hartford Times Fund for Children, which run camps for children.

Let us say that the State of Vermont does not feel that it has any obligation to take care of children from Boston or New York who come to a charitable camp. Perhaps some youngsters come from the slums of Harlem. Under those circumstances, if the State of Vermont does not want to put up the 10 percent, I think it only fair that, if the charitable organization puts up 10 percent of the funds to feed the hungry children, the Secretary of Agriculture should provide funds. We are talking about hungry children.

It is a different situation than if Burlington, Vt., or Hartford, Conn., had a recreation center in which the State participated.

We are talking about the many camps that are run by eleemosynary institutions all over the country. There is no reason why the State of Vermont should put up its funds to feed these people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wanted to clarify the position of whether the Federal Government should be permitted to bypass a State government.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Under those circumstances the Secretary could make arrangements with the charitable organization.

Mr. AIKEN. I think he could, too. The Senator from Connecticut has a very kind motive and worthy objective. If he were to take the proper approach to achieve his objective, I would help him.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

RANDOLPH COSPONSORS RIBICOFF SUMMER LUNCH PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO CHILD NUTRITION ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be a cosponsor of S. 2121, the original bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut to create a summer lunch program; and I am honored today to join with him again in offering a slightly revised version of this bill as an amendment to S. 3467, to amend the National School Lunch Act.

At present, at least 191,663 children in West Virginia benefit during the school year from the assistance given under the National School Lunch Act. But the school year ends in June and does not begin again until September. In the intervening summer months, while many of these children are remembered by State, local, and Federal agencies through recreational and educational programs, they are forgotten in terms of their physical nourishment. This amendment would help to alleviate the inequity of the present situation.

Surely, if we can substantiate the need for a school program by pointing out, as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did in its report—

> There is no question but that thousands of children arrive at school hungry and this inevitably affects their span of attention and conduct. . . . In urban areas, thousands of children are in families where the mother must leave for work long before the children leave. . . . Breakfast tends to be a neglected meal—

Then we can substantiate the need for a program to feed those who are daily engaging in community recreational activities. If a child is too hungry to sit still in a class daily, he or she is certainly too hungry for supervised daily exercise.

I urge Senators to join with us in adopting an amendment to the bill which, while relatively inexpensive, is designed to meet a very pressing need.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to join the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in cosponsoring his amendment to provide summer lunches for those children who would otherwise not receive an adequate meal.

This is an important amendment because it extends to the summer months assistance that we provide during the rest of the year. We have already recognized our responsibility to assist certain children during the 9 months of the year that they attend school. Both as a matter of logic and as a matter of compassion school lunches should be provided during the vacation period.

Senator RIBICOFF has suggested that the summer lunches to be authorized by this amendment can be provided through public and private summer schools and others groups and associations caring for children during the summer months. Many of the same institutions that provide lunches during the school year would continue to provide these lunches during the summer under the new program.

We have agreed in the past that the hungry child unable to afford a decent meal is not responsible for this situation. And we have acted to remedy this with an effectively administered school lunch program. The school child may take a vacation from school, but he does not take a vacation from hunger.

I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Douglas
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Tydings
Yarborough

NAYS—42

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Russell, S.C.
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson
Bass
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Gruening
Hayden
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. RIBICOFF's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the special milk program for schoolchildren has been in operation since 1954, and it has been received with the enthusiastic support of the school systems and other participating outlets. It is a program of proven worth.

At a time when a high percentage of young Americans cannot meet the physical qualifications of the military services because of defects traceable to nutritional deficiencies, earlier efforts by the administration to drastically cut back the funding of this program were, in my opinion, "penny wise and pound foolish." The requested budget cut of $82 million in the special milk program would deny supplemental milk to about 80 percent of our schoolchildren, who are now benefiting from this program.

Last year we enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which authorized more than $1.3 billion in the first year in aid to school systems to feed the hungry minds of the young, and we know that the program will be expanded in subsequent years. It seems incredible that efforts should now be made to seriously cripple a program that is designed to feed the hungry bodies of the young.

The value of this program to the health and dietary habits of schoolchildren is well recognized by school authorities. Increased school attendance and an improved approach to learning are among some of the benefits observed by teachers and school administrators. Obviously, a higher rate of school attendance and an improved learning attitude are factors essential to achieving maximum benefits from our expenditures under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is false economy to spend billions to improve the quality of our primary and secondary educational systems, and at the same time cut back drastically on a program that has proven its worth in getting the child to school in a receptive frame of mind.

We have heard much about poverty in the past 2 or 3 years. In the final analysis, the only truly effective weapon against poverty is education and training, for it is only through education and training that we can hope to achieve lasting results in our efforts to combat poverty. To that end, the special milk program can be an effective tool in helping children obtain basic education—a prerequisite for job training—by improving learning attitudes and increasing school attendance.

The House Appropriations Committee, in its report on the fiscal year 1967 agriculture appropriations bill, pointed out that the special milk program has been so successful that it has been adopted in many other countries. Dried milk in large quantities has been shipped overseas under Public Law 480, our food-for-peace program, for use in the schools in those countries which we are supplying aid. Should we do less for our own children?

According to departmental figures, 85,929 schools and 6,076 child-care institutions and summer camps participated in this program last year, and about 3 billion half pints of milk were made available and consumed. In my own State of Colorado, there were 1,200 participating outlets, dispensing nearly 27 million half pints of milk under this program. These figures are mute evidence of the success of the program, and while I am sure that the program can be improved, the fact is that milk, whose high nutritional value has been recognized by physicians and dieticians for generations, has been getting into the stomachs of our children in greater quantities as a result of the special milk program. It is difficult to argue with success, and this program has been a success. Because of the demonstrated success of that program, I was happy to join with 62 of my colleagues in sponsoring S. 2921, a bill which would make the special milk program a permanent program.

Essentially, the provisions of S. 2921 have been incorporated into and made a part of the measure we have before us today, as section 13. The special milk program would be made a permanent program, and the Secretary would be required to administer the program in the same manner as it has been administered in the past. This requirement, coupled with the increases in authorization provided, makes the intention of Congress clear—that the program is not to be changed.

While section 13 of S. 3467 would only expand the special milk program to a minor degree, in my opinion, it would be money well spent, for who can put a price tag on the health and well-being of our children? I know of no better investment that this country can make—it is an investment in the future.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the bill we are considering today, as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is, I feel, one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider during this session of the Congress. It involves the health of the schoolchildren of our country.

Many of us in the Congress were very disturbed when the administration budget recommended cuts in the school lunch and special milk programs. This would have been a poor place to have made cuts in expenditures.

I am especially proud, therefore, to have had an opportunity to lend my support to this legislation, designed to assure a balanced and nutritional diet for our school-age children. S. 3467 will extend the National School Lunch Act, one of the great programs of our country, and will guarantee that the less fortunate children attending our schools will have at least one, and in some instances two, nutritional meals per schoolday.

I am especially happy that the committee has included in this bill a section which will extend the special school milk program through 1970, and which will provide for adequate funding of the program up to a maximum of $120 million per year. With the extension of this program through 1970, we will make it possible for school administrators throughout the country to plan adequately to provide milk for our schoolchildren. I was a cosponsor of the Proxmire bill to do this, S. 2921.

Also, I am very glad that the committee has included in this bill a new pilot program to provide breakfast under the school lunch program. This pilot program is designed to operate in those school systems which are located in areas of very low economic condition and in those areas where children must ride long distances from their homes to school.

I am also happy, Mr. President, that the bill we are considering provides for a nonfood assistance program. This program is designed to assist those schools located in areas of depressed economies, which are not now able to provide a school lunch program due to a lack of adequate facilities, to acquire adequate facilities to prepare meals for their school lunch programs.

Mr. President, by the enactment of this bill we will be accepting our responsibility to assure that in a great nation of abundance little children will not have to suffer from hunger and malnutrition. The enactment of this measure moreover, will be a real tribute to the productive capacity of American agriculture.

I commend the most able chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the entire Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the fine job they have done on this legislation. I trust the bill will be speedily and overwhelmingly passed by the Senate.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to support S. 3467, the Child Nutrition Act. As reported recently by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, this bill would do much to strengthen and expand food service programs for our children. The committee, and especially its chairman, Senator ELLENDER, is to be commended for this forward-looking, much needed legislation.

I wish especially today, Mr. President, to call attention to section 15, which would provide for assistance to schools for food service facilities. Although the National School Lunch Act has authorized such assistance for some years, it has not been properly funded nor has congressional plans been made clear. This bill would authorize such aid on a project basis where specific need can be demonstrated.

Despite the rapid expansion of the school lunch program in the last 20 years, there are large numbers of children who do not receive the type A or a complete lunch at school each day—and many of these children are those who need it the most. These 9 million youngsters, a significant proportion of whom are in the needy category attend schools where lunch facilities are not available. Frequently, the school which have been unable to have a lunch program are small ones, located in rural areas. The same problem exists in the older schools in the economically distressed areas of our cities where limited financial resources make it impossible to provide a lunch service. In contrast, the wealthier suburban areas have been able to finance a lunch program in their schools.

This lack of food service facilities is not a problem which exists in only a few States or in only a few areas. Rather, it is an extensive problem and steps need to be taken to help provide food service in these schools where the local communities need this help.

Since the national school lunch program is locally oriented, the responsibility for providing food service equipment is likewise a local one. However, many of the economically distressed areas are not financially able to bear the whole of this burden. Further, educators have found that "you cannot teach a hungry child"—and the noticeable improvement in attendance, attention span, and academic achievements when a lunch service is initiated attest to the validity of this principle.

It is for these reasons, therefore, that I firmly believe that every schoolchild regardless of his parent's income or his neighborhood should have the opportunity to have an adequate nutritious school lunch and strongly support the inclusion of section 15—to assist the schools in low-income areas to acquire food service equipment.

This section does not completely relieve the local community of either its financial responsibility or its social obligations for providing nutritious lunches to its children. To the contrary, it contemplates the supplementation of the Federal funds because one-fourth of the cost of any new food service equipment must be borne locally. Also involved is the determination of local needs, the development of a project type application, and justification of need for such assistance by the community.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I enthusiastically endorse the amendments to the National School Lunch Act proposed in S. 3467. I especially applaud the extension of the special milk program and the Agriculture Committee's emphasis that this vital program should be administered as it has been in the past. The authorizations—essentially as stipulated in S. 2921, which I cosponsored—signify an adequate level of funding for a program that has contributed significantly to the improvement of child nutrition throughout the country. In Nevada, these authorizations mean that schoolchildren in 189 public school attendance areas will continue to receive, at reduced cost, 500,000 one-half pints of whole fluid milk monthly.

This program has been immensely successful in my State and other States since its inception in 1954. It is therefore appropriate that it be included as part of the total, coordinated child nutrition program in the legislation before us. A major part of this coordinated program is the national school lunch program. As specified by the committee, this highly successful program will continue to be operated along the same lines as in the past. It will therefore enable 19,083 Nevada children in 112 public school attendance areas to continue to receive well-balanced lunches.

The benefit of nutritious lunches and milk for schoolchildren is irrefutable: regardless of their family income bracket, children with hungry stomachs must be fed so that their hungry minds can learn. Schoolchildren, however, are not the only beneficiaries of this legislation.

As stated in the committee report, the school lunch program also increases the market for American farmers. Of particular importance is the market provided for the American dairy farmer by the special milk program: the milk consumed under this program represents almost 3 percent of all nonfarm consumption of fluid whole milk. This is not a negligible factor in an enterprise that is vulnerable to marginal swings in production.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the Nation's schoolchildren and the dairy industry, I urge the passage of this important bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for some years now, a highly successful program of assistance to schools for school lunch programs has been in effect. The genesis of this program was in the 1930's, when the Department of Agriculture was given authority to donate surplus foodstuffs to schools so that needy children could be supplied free lunches.

The program has evolved since that time with the major change coming in 1946 at the time of passage of the National School Lunch Act, which provided for continuity of the program regardless of the particular market situations for farm products as they vary from year to year.

That the program has been successful and has accomplished a definite good is incontestable. Responsibility for the program administration was left at a State level and at a local school board level. Therein, I think, lies one important reason for the success of the program. The wiser decision followed, in a number of instances, when it was left to the discretion of local boards, school officials, and parents and teachers associations.

Before the Senate today is a bill which would expand the program by incorporating new programs, including a special milk program.

I am a cosponsor of S. 2921, a bill which would provide and make permanent a national program to make surplus milk available to needy schoolchildren.

The present legislation has been revised from its original form so that the program provided for in S. 2921 has been substantially embodied in this bill. Those provisions which have worked so well in the present program are retained in this bill.

The benefits to needy children are obvious. Although this is the primary objective of the Child Nutrition Act, farmers will benefit in that there will be an increased market for meats, poultry, eggs, fruits and vegetables, and milk and dairy products. It is estimated that the program will provide a total annual business of about $1.5 billion for farmers and ranchers. Federal contributions account for only 20 percent of this amount.

It is also significant that local merchants who provide the food and services for the program are major beneficiaries.

This seems a deserving and worthwhile program, Mr. President, which has a history of successful administration. I supported the special milk program proposal, and I support and will vote for this worthy legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM FOR CHILD NUTRITION—S. 3467

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I urge the Senate's favorable consideration of S. 3467, as amended by the Senate Agriculture Committee. The present welfare of the Nation's schoolchildren is a subject of overwhelming importance to all of us, for it will help determine the future welfare of the entire Nation. The bill as amended will, I believe, be a significant step in the effort to insure an adequate standard of nutrition for all children, regardless of the parents' economic status.

The pilot breakfast and nonfood assistance programs are aimed specifically at insuring that no needy child face the prospect of attempting to learn on an empty stomach. These proposals go far toward equalizing the very opportunity to learn—and surely the equal opportunity to learn is the basic ingredient in the operation of any democratic system.

I am especially concerned with the special milk program section 13, of the bill, now under consideration. In the 11 years of its existence, the special milk program has provided milk free or at reduced prices to literally millions of schoolchildren. This concrete investment in the Nation's future cannot be jeopardized, either by uncertainty of continuance or by inadequate funding.

It was my fear, earlier in the year, that both of these eventualities would in fact come to pass in the original, unamended version of S. 3467, which extended the program for 4 years and established a ceiling of $100 million—a ceiling inadequate to provide for projected program expansion in the future.

In the face of these threats to the program's future I cosponsored a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Senator PROXMIRE. The bill, S. 2921, would establish the special milk program on a permanent basis with minimum appropriations guidelines.

I was pleased to see that the Agriculture Committee amendments, while they do not duplicate Senator PROXMIRE's proposal, come within my expectations and assure us that the needed expansion of the program will take place. Appropriations guidelines of $110 million for fiscal year 1967; $115 million for 1968; and $120 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 have been established as Federal appropriations ceilings. Thus the continued operation of the program along its present lines—lines which have proven so successful over the past 11 years—is further insured. The Secretary of Agriculture is required by S. 3467 to administer the program as closely in line with past policies and practices as is feasible.

I urge the Senate's approval of S. 3467, the Child Nutrition Act, which is so important to the welfare of our Nation's children and the future of our country. I commend Senator PROXMIRE for so successfully guiding the effort to insure the continued success of the special milk program.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I would like to express my strong support for S. 3467. The bill reaffirms the confidence of the Congress in the approaches, administration, and operation of the 20-year-old National School Lunch Act. The lines of administration remain intact for the new proposals—from the U.S. Department of Agriculture through the State educational agency to the local school. Local school boards retain the basic operating responsibility. There will be required the same kind of sustained local initiative and support that is so essential to a sound lunch program. In the case of the breakfast program, there will be nutritional standards that eligible schools will agree to meet as a condition of Federal support. They have been doing this for years under the lunch program and have found these standards to be reasonable and helpful.

I want to emphasize particularly that these new programs do not mean a reduction in the old school lunch program, or in the special milk program funds. Proposals to cut them have been defeated and that fact has now been accepted. The act before us extends the milk program for 3 years beyond next June 30. The school lunch program is expanded to provide greater assistance to the children of needy families, facilities for serving food where a school district cannot afford them, and school breakfasts where need exists.

Local school authorities will determine those students who can afford to pay little or nothing for food service at school. They are urged to consult with local health and welfare authorities to the extent possible to assure that they are reaching the neediest children. This is nothing new. The schools have been doing this under the school lunch program for 20 years in a limited degree. Wherever these programs are in operation, they are open to all children and those who can afford to pay the price of the meal are expected to do so.

Most of the food for the breakfast program and all of the milk for the milk program will be purchased from local merchants and the same will be true of the equipment procured to initiate or expand food service.

Right now, the national school lunch program is a $1.5 billion big business that is handled by thousands of small businesses from coast to coast. The Federal Government pays only about one-fifth of the cost. The people who manage these lunch programs are serious and dedicated and they can be expected to apply their skills and talents to make effective use of the new activities we are making available to them. They know and understand the importance of good nutrition for children and they know and understand how to go about providing this good nutrition. This sounds easy, but it is not. There are the day-in, day-out problems of menu planning, food storage and sanitation and budgeting to provide an attractive meal at the lowest possible cost.

Our school lunch and milk programs are this Nation's finest insurance of a strong, healthy, mentally alert generation of young Americans. I hope the bill will be overwhelmingly approved.

RANDOLPH SUPPORTS VITAL SCHOOL MILK-SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM OF BENEFIT TO WEST VIRGINIA CHILDREN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my privilege and my responsibility to support S. 3467, to amend the National School Lunch Act. I had, earlier in this session, cosponsored two similar bills and had hoped to see them enacted into law. The legislation before us today, however, will strengthen the existing program and provide for a needed 3-year extension of the benefits being realized by our children through the assistance this program affords.

Over the past few months, I have received many letters from constituents in West Virginia pertaining to the school milk and school lunch legislation. The writers expressed concern that certain originial proposals sent to the Congress in the first months of this session would tend to weaken these beneficial assistance programs. These West Virginians are among many of our American citizens who have come to depend on the benefits our children receive through the free or reduced-price milk and lunch assistance in our elementary and secondary schools.

In my State, Mr. President, we have 1,402 schools where 191,663 children, or 42.3 percent of our total elementary and secondary school enrollment, benefit from this sustenance. According to the most recent data available, 15.7 percent, or almost one-sixth, of the 31,608,541 school lunches served in West Virginia in 1964–65 were free or reduced-price lunches made available under the National School Lunch Act.

For the benefit, therefore, of almost 200,000 West Virginia children, who need the nourishment afforded under the provisions of this act, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and his fine colleagues, who have recommended to us a bill which is reasonable, practicable, and responsive to the needs of the Nation's children.

STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for a generation now our American education effort has been strengthened by the national school lunch program. We have learned through experience that the learning process functions best when a child has enough to eat. We know that good nutrition is basic to a healthy, alert child, and to an inquisitive mind.

This year more than 18 million children will receive nutritious lunches at school. About 2 million of these will be free or at reduced prices for children who could not otherwise afford them. In some cases this will be the only well balanced meal the child will receive all day. The program has grown steadily over the years but there are still 9 million children in schools with no food service. One million of these are children of poverty who should have a free or reduced-price meal.

S. 3467 will carry forward the good work of the National School Lunch Act. Under the special milk program for children the dietary benefits our youngsters have been receiving from subsidized milk will be assured through 1970. However, I would have preferred to have this program made permanent, as it would be in the Proxmire bill, S. 2921, of which I am a cosponsor. Under the nonfood assistance program schools without food service facilities will be eligible for Federal assistance up to 75 percent for food service projects to meet their students nutritional needs.

A new and particular valuable feature of S. 3467 is the pilot breakfast program. Schools whose students come from poor economic areas and those whose students must travel long distances will be eligible. Thousands of children arrive at school hungry and this inevitably effects their span of attention and conduct. In rural areas, children frequently ride the bus for as much as an hour or more and then stand around and wait for school to start. These children leave home early and time often does not allow for adequate breakfast. They often must wait for 6 to 8 hours for lunch. In urban areas, thousands of children are in families where the mother must leave for work long before the children leave for school. Breakfast tends to be a neglected meal. The new program authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide up to 90 percent of the operating costs of programs to provide free or reduced-price breakfasts for students in these schools.

This program has wide support in Texas by those whose experience has made them most keenly aware of the good it will accomplish. I request the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert a letter from Mr. Charles M. Hicks, chief consultant of the school lunch program of the State of Texas, who notes that "the bill includes the best features of the President's Child Nutrition Act of 1966—H.R. 13361."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY,
Austin, Tex., June 17, 1966.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I have studied S. 3467 by Senator ELLENDER of Louisiana which was introduced in the Senate on June 6, 1966. I am highly in favor of this bill as it does not reduce the amount of funds for the lunch and milk programs but it includes the best features of the President's Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (H.R. 13361). You have always supported the lunch and milk programs and I feel sure you will support S. 3467.

We have had an increase in the lunch program the last few months of the past school year. Many school districts used part of their Title I funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for additional free lunches. Our records show that

> $2,742,962 of Title I funds were budgeted for food service out of the $74,337,711 allocated to Texas. For the last several years the increase in the appropriation for school lunch has been enough to take care of our increase in participation and allow us to reimburse schools 5 cents per lunch. However, for the year just completed, we had to reduce the rates in April to 3 cents per lunch and we estimate that the rate for May will also be 3 cents. This is less than the reimbursement for extra milk.
>
> Houston entered the Special Milk Program on September 20, 1965 and San Antonio on February 24, 1966.
>
> I estimate that Texas schools will serve 150,000,000 lunches under the National School Lunch Program in 1966-67. This will require 7½ million dollars in order to reimburse schools 5 cents per lunch. I hope that Congress will provide enough funds for us to reimburse schools 5 cents. I urge you to support and use your influence in behalf of sufficient appropriation for 5 cent reimbursement for all schools.
>
> Also, I am interested in Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act. We used the funds allocated to Texas this past year and we were able to help 31 schools extend their program. I hope Congress will appropriate at least 12 million dollars for this section, which is the amount the President recommended in the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.
>
> We appreciate the support you have given these programs in the past.
>
> With kindest personal regards, I am,
> Sincerely,
>
> CHAS. M. HICKS,
> *Chief Consultant, School Lunch Program.*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, let the good work go forward. Let it not be said in our land of abundance any child is unable to learn because he is hungry.

CENTRALIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I would like particularly to call to the attention of my colleagues, the committee's firm statement in the report on S. 3467 on the need for centralization of administration of child feeding programs. I thoroughly concur with what they had to say in this respect:

> New section 24 would centralize in the Department of Agriculture the administration of all Federal programs designed to provide assistance to school food service programs. To the extent practicable other Federal agencies would be required to transfer to the Department of Agriculture any funds to be used for such assistance. The purpose of the Committee is that Federal assistance not be dissipated by being divided among various agencies and administered under varying regulations through varying local agencies.
>
> In view of the proliferation of child feeding programs in schools, sponsored and financed by several agencies of the Federal Government, under varying regulations and standards, it seems time to express the intent of Congress that these programs be brought under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. . . .

There was considerable discussion on this point in the committee hearings. We are in no way criticizing the efforts of these other agencies. There is still a great deal to be done in the way of improving child nutrition in this country and these other agencies were simply responding to a need. Now that we are moving to broaden the authority of the Department of Agriculture in child food service, we want to make it as clear as possible that this agency and its cooperating State and local authorities bear the full responsibility for closing existing gaps.

There was testimony from public witnesses as to the confusion that has arisen in States and in communities over divided authority in this field. We need to get back on the track in this respect and I believe the committee's statement does the job.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad today to support S. 3467, the bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to include a 3-year extension of the special milk program, a pilot breakfast program, and nonfood assistance to schools unable to finance feeding facilities.

Over the years, the school lunch program has been one of our most constructive means of disposing of surplus agricultural commodities. It has also, during its 20-year operation, proved to be one of the best examples of cooperation among the Federal, State and local authorities, with the local communities and school boards assuming the largest responsibility. But, its greatest purpose is to help in providing a nutritious hot lunch to schoolchildren, and certainly to those children who are the neediest.

As pointed out in the report of the Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve, children received surplus foods through the schools as early as the 1930's although the availability of the foods fluctuated. Within the next decade, section 32 funds were made available for a lunch program, but it was not until 1946 that the program was put on a permanent basis.

I first came to the Senate in 1947, and it has been my pleasure to support the school lunch program ever since, as I have supported the special milk program, the foodstamp program, and disposal of surplus foods through Public Law 480. These programs are good programs. I introduced the amendment, which was enacted into law, providing that surplus foods should be available to our own people first before donation or sale abroad. I have also urged Secretaries of Agriculture to provide a better variety and increase the nutritional value of the foods distributed to needy families.

During the 1964-65 school year, 2.8 billion lunches were served in 71,000 schools throughout the country. In my State of Kentucky, over 77 million lunches were served, of which 13.7 percent were served at a reduced price; and it is estimated that the total number of hot meals will reach 80 million lunches in Kentucky in the 1966-67 school year. Kentucky has made fine progress under this program, and I call attention to the diligence and foresight of Mr. C. E. Bevins, the Kentucky director of school lunch, who has directed assistance into a great many remote and rural schools, even before the Congress provided funds under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act. Many of these districts, lacking funds to set up a lunch program, were able to secure money through the Economy Opportunity Act or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, both of which I have supported in the Senate.

Last year, I urged and supported the amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill, to provide the first $2 million for special assistance under section 11, added by the Congress in 1962; and, under its first allocation under section 11, Kentucky opened programs in 54 schools. I hope very much the Senate Appropriations Committee will recommend the full $6.5 million for section 11, as requested by the administration, to reach the neediest children; and this amount can be provided by reducing appropriations for other sections of the bill.

Earlier this year, Mr. Bevins published a comprehensive survey of the feeding programs in Kentucky. And Secretary Freeman, testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee on June 21, summarized the growth of the program in my State. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks about Kentucky appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In the winter of 1962-63, through the vigorous cooperation of the Kentucky State school lunch staff and local officials, we tried another approach to getting a lunch program started in isolated one- and two-room schools in the Appalachian area of eastern Kentucky.
>
> In the course of several months we were able to start a lunch program in 380 schools with an enrollment of about 11,000 children. In most of these schools, space for food storage, preparation, and service was virtually nonexistent. Sanitation facilities were no better. But the job was done, using two-burner hotplates, second-hand refrigerators and asking the children to bring a plate and utensils from home.
>
> The State School Lunch Director diverted extra Federal school lunch money to these schools as well as extra donated commodities to provide a type A lunch. As you can well imagine, this whole program required an enormous effort and cooperation among all those involved, and the results in terms of improved health, attendance, and attention among participating children made the effort more than worthwhile.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in the budget request for fiscal 1967, the administration proposed that Federal appropriations be reduced from the $103 million appropriated last year for the special milk program, to $21 million, and that funds for the National School Lunch Act be cut by $19 million, reducing the Federal contribution by 1 cent a lunch. I joined Senator PROXMIRE's bill, S. 2921, to express the sense of the Congress that the administration spend on the milk program the funds appropriated by the Congress—as $3 million were impounded during fiscal 1966—and in my statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee, I urged the full funding of the school lunch and milk programs.

I am glad that the administration has made several revisions in its proposal, and I support the bill as reported by the Agriculture Committee. The committee bill would center all the school food distribution programs in the Department of Agriculture, rather than to coordinate these programs with those under the poverty program as originally planned by the administration. I note particularly that the program will be administered as before, by local school authorities, assisted by the parent-teacher's associations and other local citizens. Its cost is about the same. It is an established program for schoolchildren.

Schoolchildren, mothers, PTA groups, and school officials are looking to the Congress to assure the continuation and improvement of the school lunch and special milk programs, and the bill the Senate will adopt today is evidence that we will not disappoint them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters I have recently received on this subject from the Honorable Harry M. Sparks, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Kentucky, and from Mr. C. E. Bevins, who is in charge of the school lunch program, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Department of Education,
Frankfort, Ky., June 17, 1966.

Hon. John Sherman Cooper,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cooper: While attending the Southern States Work Conference last week at Daytona Beach, Florida, it was announced that Senator Ellender of Louisiana introduced a bill in the Senate which would amend the National School Lunch Act. This amendment, if passed by Congress, would give Kentucky a better school lunch and special milk program than we have enjoyed in the past. It is our feeling, in Kentucky, that this bill is the one which would be more helpful to Kentucky than the administration's Child Nutrition Act. It is, if the information I have received is correct, a continuation of what we have been doing supplemented by the newer concepts which are being promulgated.

On behalf of Kentucky school officials, the State Department of Education and all Kentucky school pupils, we wish to express our appreciation for the support you have given to the school lunch and special milk program of the past and know you will want to continue to help Kentucky as much as possible in the future. For all this, we are grateful.

Very truly yours,
Harry M. Sparks,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Department of Education,
Frankfort, Ky., June 17, 1966.

Hon. John Sherman Cooper,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Cooper: I have reviewed Senate Bill 3467 and find that it contains provisions for a continuation of the present School Lunch and Special Milk Program and includes certain aspects of the Child Nutrition Act which will strengthen the school food service program in Kentucky. It is my understanding that action will be taken in the Senate on this Bill early in the week of June 20. It is my feeling that the Ellender Bill is much to be preferred over the Child Nutrition Act, and I hope that it will be possible for the Kentucky Senators to support it.

I am writing to the members of the House from Kentucky and hope that the House can lay aside the Child Nutrition Act and take action on the Ellender Bill if they are given an opportunity to do so.

On behalf of the boys and girls of Kentucky, thank you very much for all that you have done on their behalf and for a continuation of such consideration in the years to come.

Very truly yours,
C. E. Bevins,
Director, Division of School Lunch.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendments to the National School Lunch Act that we are considering today in S. 3467 are good, sound and necessary if we are to provide a comprehensive, coordinated program to improve child nutrition in this country. We have come a long way under the national school lunch program and these amendments are intended to put us within reach of a goal that we have long sought and accepted as only reasonable in a country as rich as this one in agricultural resources and as expert in meeting and solving problems.

Under section 14 of S. 3467, provision is made for a 2-year pilot breakfast program in schools drawing attendance from children of low-income families and for schools where a substantial proportion of the children travel long distances. I want to stress here that this new activity is to be initiated on a short-term, pilot basis. This is the approach that in the long run will result in sound legislative authority and effective program operations.

There are thousands of children who arrive at school hungry for a variety of reasons. Section 14 is intended to meet two of these reasons head on. In rural areas, children frequently ride a bus for an hour or more to get to school and then wait around in the schoolyard for an extended period waiting for the bell to ring. Even if time had permitted them to have a breakfast at home, it may be 5 to 6 hours before they have lunch.

In urban areas, there are thousands of children in families where the mother must leave for work long before the children leave for school. An organized family breakfast is rare and breakfast tends to be the neglected meal.

The importance of breakfast and other efforts to improve child nutrition are stated forthrightly in a publication issued jointly by the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity, "Education: An Answer to Poverty." This publication states:

> Hungry children are nonlearning children. . . . Scientific studies have shown conclusively that the process of learning virtually ends when a human being becomes uncomfortably hungry. When a child appears at school in the morning having had little or no breakfast, he might just as well have stayed home. The teacher's effort is wasted. The curriculum, the long hours of professional preparation, the value of textbooks and teaching aids are lost upon him. Similarly, a child without lunch loses most of the value of a school afternoon. A hungry child not only injures himself, but his discomfort may subtly disturb the teachings of a whole class.

The breakfast program proposed under S. 3467 is based on the experience and approaches followed in the national school lunch program. Nutritional standards are now being developed by the nutritional experts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—not just for purposes of this amendment but because of increasing interest on the part of many schools as to the best combinations of foods for a breakfast to meet the needs of children.

The program under consideration today will be available to all children in schools selected by the State educational agency for participation. Those who can afford to pay will be expected to do so. The Federal funds made available will be used to help meet the cost of underwriting the breakfast for those who can afford only a token payment or who cannot afford to pay even a few cents.

In the selection of schools, the State educational agencies will be asked to give particular consideration to those schools that are eligible for assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is to assure a reasonably uniform interpretation of need among the several Federal agencies concerned with strengthening programs for disadvantaged children.

In situations of very severe need, the Secretary is authorized to provide up to 90 percent of the operating costs of the program. In most cases, however, the Federal assistance will be limited to providing the food needed for the breakfast. As in the national school lunch program, State and local sources will defray the costs of labor and overhead.

Although I have outlined only the provisions of the breakfast program, I believe every phase of S. 3467 warrants our support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator From Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs.

Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson
Bass
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
McClellan
McGee
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (S. 3467) was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the passage of the child nutrition measure which expands our school lunch program, the Senate again witnessed the effective and highly able leadership of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the great chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Both vigorous and articulate, his strong handling of the measure assured swift approval. But the action was typical for most measures backed with the exceptional talents of Senator Ellender.

And to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], goes equally high commendation for his characteristically outstanding leadership which assured a decisive victory for this measure. As always, we are most grateful for Senator Aiken's outstanding cooperative efforts.

Perhaps no Senator deserves more credit for or may share more justly in this great success for our Nation's youngsters than the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire]. We all know how long and how vigorously he has pressed for an expanded school lunch program. So today's success indeed is an achievement for Senator Proxmire, won largely by his strong and abiding devotion.

Others too played vital roles in obtaining the Senate's unanimous acceptance of this measure. I refer to the effective advocacy of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and to the persuasive cooperative assistance of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff].

But most of all we are again grateful for another unanimous adoption of a proposal achieved with the splendid cooperation of all Senators.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Thursday of this week the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations intends to report to the Senate a committee resolution proposing the creation of a Senate Committee on Intelligence Operations.

Over the past several months, the question of the proper exercise of the Senate's responsibility for foreign intelligence operations, and particularly of the Central Intelligence Agency, has been the subject of considerable comment in the press and some debate on the floor of the Senate. This is a most serious matter which involves the constitutional responsibility of the Senate of the United States. When the Senate is called upon to make a decision in this matter, it should be permitted to act on the merits and substance of the issue. I am hopeful the issue will not be obscured by irrelevant arguments.

Although the Central Intelligence Agency has rarely been the subject of legislation and of congressional comment infrequently over the years, much attention and discussion has been devoted to the problem of congressional supervision of that Agency. This concern was reflected in the 1955 Hoover Commission recommendation that "the Congress consider creating a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy." The concern was further reflected in the debate in the Senate in 1956 on the resolution offered by the present majority leader [Mr. Mansfield]. The present proposal is much more modest than that recommended by the Hoover Commission. It relates only to the Senate. It would provide for a nine-member committee composed of three members each from the Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations Committees, and it would be empowered to keep itself informed of activities in the field of foreign intelligence operations. The practical effect of the resolution would be to add three members of the Foreign Relations Committee to the present CIA oversight subcommittee. Its effect would be to authorize the Central Intelligence Agency to provide to three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations information it now provides to selected members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and to the nine members of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

What is at stake is nothing less than the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent to the foreign relations of the United States. In the Senate the burden of this responsibility is assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Standing Rules of the Senate list, among other areas of jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally" and "intervention abroad and declarations of war." Leaving aside the matter of interventions abroad, in which one would certainly have to include the Bay of Pigs, the responsibility of the committee for the "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally" makes it clear that the Committee on Foreign Relations does have at least partial responsibility for the Central Intelligence Agency and other agencies which operate more or less exclusively in the foreign relations area. Its jurisdiction appears, from a reading of the rules of the Senate, much clearer in this matter than that of the Armed Services Committee, whose jurisdiction under the rules would not appear to extend to areas where the foreign relations of the United States are concerned. The jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee derives—and this is apparently the case made by its distinguished chairman—from the precedent of the Senate that legislative oversight of a Government agency is traditionally vested in the committee which reported the bill by which the agency was created.

In this connection the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has suggested that if the Foreign Relations Committee can claim representation on the CIA oversight committee, then the Armed Services Committee should have representation on the Foreign Relations Committee. I would certainly have no objection to that if it could be demonstrated that the Secretary of State refused to make available to the Armed Services Committee information he was willing to make available to the Foreign Relations Committee. As Senators are aware, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has advised the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that he is unwilling to make available to members of that committee information that is made available to selected members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and to the President's Advisory Board.

The issue then turns on whether or not the Central Intelligence Agency does, in fact, carry out actions which affect the foreign relations of the United States. It is my judgment that it does, and that, further, its role in this area has increased over the years and is still increasing. It is not relevant to contend that the CIA is not authorized to make foreign policy. Of course, it is not so authorized. The foreign policy of the United States is "made" by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate and, to a lesser extent, of the whole Congress. But I believe it is difficult to argue against the conclusion that the CIA has in the past and does by its present actions continue to create situations to which policy must be adjusted. In such cases, whether it is "making" policy or merely "influencing" policy is largely a question of semantics.

This aspect of its activities, as opposed to its purely intelligence-gathering role, has been called by some an expansion of its original mandate. In 1963, former President Harry S. Truman wrote:

> For some time I have been disturbed by the way the CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and at times a policy-making arm of the Government. This has led to trouble and may have compounded our difficulties in several explosive areas.
>
> I never had any thought that when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peacetime cloak and dagger operations. Some of the complications and embarrassment that I think we have experienced are in part attributable to the fact that this quiet intelligence arm of the President has been so removed from its intended role that it is being interpreted as a symbol of sinister and mysterious foreign intrigue—and a subject for cold war enemy propaganda.

Public debate on this important matter has unfortunately been hampered by irrelevant considerations.

First, some have suggested that if we pass this resolution, we would be implying that the present committee and its chairman have been derelict in their duty. This is not at all the opinion of members of the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator from Georgia has served this body ably, with distinction and dedication for many years. He serves it today as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and as chairman of the Joint CIA Subcommittee of those two standing committees. He serves it as a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He also serves as a member of the Democratic Policy Committee and of the Democratic Steering Committee. He was also a member of the Warren Commission which investigated the assassination of President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I suggest rather that it is the Foreign Relations Committee which would be guilty of dereliction if it did not seek to provide itself with the information which it requires to fulfill its constitutional responsibility. Rather than making a claim to be included, we are attempting to resist exclusion from an area in which we have a right to knowledge. The committee is not muscling in.

Second, it has been suggested that individuals who serve as sources of information for the CIA would be compromised or even their lives threatened if members of the Foreign Relations Committee were permitted to exercise their responsibility. It has even been suggested that the very discussion of the CIA on the floor of the Senate may imperil lives—one presumably excepts those instances where Senators have risen to defend the CIA. I believe there is no substance to these charges. For the Foreign Relations Committee to fulfill its responsibility, it is not necessary, in my judgment, for it to know the identity of the individuals who may serve the CIA as sources. Our proper concern is policy, and the actions which can have a determining effect on that policy.

Third, it has been implied that some Members of the Senate cannot be trusted with information which involves the national security of the United States.

All members of the Senate appreciate the distinction between information relating to the national security and the kind of information which in no way involves the national security. I believe it serves no useful purpose to debate whether one committee or another, or one side of the aisle or the other, is more frequently the source of leaks. But I do not know of a single instance in which a member has divulged information affecting the national security which was made available to him in the Foreign Relations Committee.

If it is the judgment of the Senate that the present membership of the Foreign Relations Committee is unreliable, then consideration should be given to changing its membership. The important thing is that the Foreign Relations Committee be in a position to meet its responsibilities.

Fourth, some have stated that the number of persons with access to information about the Central Intelligence Agency ought to be quite limited. I would agree with that. I cannot agree that the addition of three members of the Foreign Relations Committee to the present subcommittee would inordinately increase the number. Rather, the contrary may well be the case; for if the Senate fails to act on this resolution, if it fails to establish a formal structure for oversight of the CIA, the present arrangement, whose informal nature permits considerable expansion beyond nine will be continued.

Let us examine the present situation. In the Senate, the CIA Subcommittee has a potential membership of nine—five from Armed Services and four from Appropriations—although at present only seven Senators are actually serving because of overlapping membership on the two committees. In the House, oversight of the CIA is exercised by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS; this subcommittee is composed of the 11 ranking members of the Armed Services Committee including, in addition to the chairman [Mr. RIVERS], Congressmen PHILBIN, HÉBERT, PRICE, FISHER, HARDY, BENNETT, BATES, ARENDS, O'KONSKI, and BRAY. Oversight of the CIA is also exercised by the House Appropriations Committee, which has always declined to state publicly: One, who the members are who perform this function; two, how many members are involved; three, how they are selected; four, whether a subcommittee exists to perform this function. We just do not know how many House Members are involved. We do know, however, that the nine members of the President's Advisory Board are included among those who receive full information and also that a number of members of the Bureau of the Budget are informed as to CIA activities.

Mr. President, one may surely assume that nine responsible Members of the Senate of the United States will guard at least as carefully as an undetermined number of Members of the House, nine members of the President's Advisory Board, or any one of the thousands of members of the executive branch, information affecting the national security of the United States and the lives of its citizens.

Finally, it has been suggested that there is no need for members of the Foreign Relations Committee to receive CIA information because there is a new Director. But those in favor of the Foreign Relations Committee's playing a role have never suggested that the person of the Director had any relation to the problem. Actually it is irrelevant, for this problem of the CIA's foreign policy role has developed over the years, under a series of Directors.

It is my judgment that to permit the Foreign Relations Committee to share this responsibility would strengthen the CIA and help protect it from some of the charges that are made; for by acting to formalize the oversight structure, the whole Senate would be meeting its responsibility more effectively. This in turn would lead to increased public confidence that the CIA is being adequately controlled, a confidence that to some extent now appears lacking.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS AND CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1332, S. 2947, the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had

been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966".

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after section 18, as added by this Act, a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE II—CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION PROGRAM

"Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966'.

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 202. It is the purpose of this title to authorize pollution control and abatement programs designed to reclaim, restore, and maintain the natural waters of the Nation through the preparation and development of comprehensive river basin pollution control and abatement plans and through the establishment of economic incentives to encourage waste treatment consistent with water quality standards effected as a result of section 10(c) of this Act.

"Planning agencies

"SEC. 203. In furtherance of the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall, at the request of the Governor or Governors of one or more States, designate a planning agency which provides for adequate representation of appropriate Federal, State, interstate, local, or when appropriate, international interests in the river basin or portion thereof involved and which is capable of developing an effective, comprehensive water quality control and abatement plan that is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan.

"Comprehensive river basin plans

"SEC. 204. Each planning agency designated pursuant to section 203 of this title shall develop a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan which is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan and which—

"(1) is consistent with any water quality standards established for interstate waters within the river basin pursuant to section 10(c) of this Act;

"(2) recommends such treatment works and sewer systems as will provide the most effective and economical means of collection, storage, treatment, and purification of wastes and provides means to encourage both municipal and industrial use of such works and systems; and

"(3) provides for maintenance and improvement of water quality standards within the basin or portion thereof and includes proposed methods of adequately financing those facilities as may be necessary to implement the plan.

"Submission of plan

"SEC. 205. Upon completion of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof, each planning agency shall transmit the plan to the Governor of each State, each interstate agency, international commission, and each local agency covered by the plan or portion thereof. Each such Governor, agency, or commission shall have sixty days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan to submit views, comments, and recommendations. The planning agency shall consider such views, comments, and recommendations and may make appropriate changes or modifications in the proposed plan. The planning agency shall then submit the proposed plan to the Secretary together with the views, comments, and recommendations of each such Governor, agency, or commission.

"Review within Federal Government

"SEC. 206. (a) Upon receipt of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof from a planning agency, the Secretary shall transmit it to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council, and, when appropriate, the Secretary of State, for review.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council, and the Secretary of State, shall notify the Secretary of the Interior, within sixty days, of the results of their review.

"(c) The Secretary shall review the plan or portion thereof and the recommendations received under subsection (b) and under section 205, and, if he determines that the plan or portion thereof adequately and effectively complies with section 204 of this title, he shall approve the plan or portion thereof.

"Grant program for treatment works

"SEC. 207. After designation of an appropriate planning agency for any river basin or portion thereof, the Secretary may accept applications from and make grants to local, State, or interstate agencies from such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 8 of this Act to assist in financing construction of treatment works within such river basin or portion thereof subject to the following limitations:

"(1) the amount of the grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable construction costs of such treatment works;

"(2) no application for a grant shall be approved until the Secretary determines that the proposed project (a) is consistent with and carries out the purpose of this title, (b) will be properly and efficiently operated and maintained, (c) is designed so that an adequate capacity will be available to serve the reasonably foreseeable growth need of the area, (d) when located, in whole or in part, in urbanized areas, meets any requirements with respect to planning and programing as have been prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to water and sewer projects under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and (e) provides, when appropriate, for joint waste treatment;

"(3) no grants shall be available to assist in financing the construction of any such works which are receiving a Federal grant under other provisions of law, except the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 or title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965;

"(4) no application for a grant shall be approved unless the Governor of the State in which the project is located provides satisfactory assurance that statewide water quality standards consistent with section 10(c) of this Act are in effect or will be established in such State;

"(5) no application for a grant shall be approved unless the State in which the project is located agrees to provide not less than 30 per centum of the estimated total project cost; and

"(6) no application for a grant shall be approved for any project in such river basin or portion thereof after three years following the date of designation of such planning agency unless such project is in conformance with a plan approved pursuant to section 206(c).

"Labor standards

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects for which grants are made under section 207 shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14, 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Approval of grants from other agencies

"SEC. 209. After the Secretary approves a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof for a river basin or portion thereof, an application for a grant to assist in financing the construction of treatment works in such basin or portion thereof made under any other provision of law shall not be approved by the head of any other Federal agency, by the Appalachian Regional Commission or other regional commissions established pursuant to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 unless it substantially conforms, in the judgment of the Secretary, to such plan.

"Authorization of planning expenses

"SEC. 210. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 204 of this title, the Secretary is authorized to pay such expenses of each planning agency as are necessary to implement formulation of the plan. Each planning agency shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Secretary.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, which sums shall be available until expended.

"Definitions

"SEC. 211. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'planning agency' includes, but is not limited to, interstate agencies, or commissions established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress;

"(2) the term 'local, State, or interstate agencies' includes agencies of States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of a State, public corporate bodies, public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, Indian tribes, conservancy districts, interstate agencies, or commissions established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress;

"(3) the term 'construction' includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action necessary to the construction of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works; and

"(4) the term 'river basin' includes, but is not limited to, land areas drained by a river and its tributaries, streams, coastal waters, estuaries, bays, and lakes.

"Other authority not affected

"SEC. 212. Nothing in this title shall be construed to displace, supersede, limit, or modify any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or two or more States and the Federal Government or to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, the Permanent Engineering Board and the United States operating entity or entities established pursuant to the Columbia River Basin Treaty, signed at

Washington, January 17, 1961, or the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the heading above section 1:

"TITLE I—WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM"

SEC. 202. (a) Effective July 1, 1967, section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended in subsection (d) by striking out all of paragraph (2) of such subsection, and inserting a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection there is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $30,000,00 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1970, and each fiscal year thereafter, and sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

(b) Section 5 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g)(1) The Secretary shall, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Water Resources Council, and with other appropriate Federal, State, interstate, or local public bodies and private organizations, institutions, and individuals, conduct and promote, and encourage contributions to, a comprehensive study of the effects of pollution, including sedimentation, in the estuaries and estuarine zones of the United States on fish and wildlife, on sport and commercial fishing, on recreation, on water supply and water power, and on other beneficial purposes. Such study shall also consider the effect of demographic trends, the exploitation of mineral resources and fossil fuels, land and industrial development, navigation, flood and erosion control, and other uses of estuaries and estuarine zones upon the pollution of the waters therein.

"(2) In conducting the above study, the Secretary shall assemble, coordinate, and organize all existing pertinent information on the Nation's estuaries and estuarine zones; carry out a program of investigations and surveys to supplement existing information in representative estuaries and estuarine zones; and identify the problems and areas where further research and study are required.

"(3) The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a final report of the study authorized by this subsection not later than three years after the date of enactment of this subsection. Copies of the report shall be made available to all interested parties, public and private. The report shall include, but not be limited to—

"(A) an analysis of the importance of estuaries to the economic and social well-being of the people of the United States and of the effects of pollution upon the use and enjoyment of such estuaries;

"(B) a discussion of the major economic, social, and ecological trends occurring in the estuarine zones of the Nation;

"(C) recommendations for a comprehensive national program for the preservation, study, use, and development of estuaries of the Nation, and the respective responsibilities which should be assumed by Federal, State, and local governments and by public and private interests.

"(4) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000 per annum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(5) The term 'estuarine zones' means an environmental system consisting of an estuary and those transitional areas which are consistently influenced or affected by water from an estuary such as, but not limited to, salt marshes, coastal and intertidal areas, bays, harbors, lagoons, inshore waters, and channels.

"The term 'estuary' means all or part of the mouth of a navigable or interstate river or stream or other body of water having unimpaired natural connection with open sea and within which the sea water is measurably diluted with fresh water derived from land drainage."

SEC. 203. Section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"Grants for research and development

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of—

"(1) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other wastes from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, or

"(2) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate advanced waste treatment and water purification methods or new or improved methods of joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes,

and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the conduct of research and demonstrations relating to the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes; except that not to exceed 25 per centum of the total amount appropriated under authority of this section for any fiscal year may be expended under authority of this sentence during such fiscal year.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary;

"(2) No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 75 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; and

"(3) No grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration for the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

"(c) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (1) of subsection (a), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose; and

"(2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $25,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (2) of subsection (a), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose.

Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant or contract for the purpose of either such clause (1) or (2) shall be made for any project in any fiscal year in an amount exceeding 12½ per centum of the total amount authorized for the purpose of such clause in such fiscal year."

SEC. 204. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out "and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $10,000,000".

SEC. 205. Effective after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary: *Provided,* That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further,* That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality, the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs."

SEC. 206. Subsection (c) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting after "The allotments of a State under the second, third, and fourth sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section" a comma and the following: "except that in the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1972, shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and adequate funds had been available. In the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which was constructed with assistance pursuant to this section but the amount of such assistance was a lesser per centum of the cost of construction than was allowable pursuant to this section, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if adequate funds had been available."

SEC. 207. Effective after June 30, 1967, subsection (d) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out all beginning with "and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967" through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

Sec. 208. Section 8(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by deleting, in the first sentence, the words "amount of such grant" and insert in lieu thereof "total construction costs".

Sec. 209. Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h)(1) Upon application the Secretary may make a loan to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency to which he has agreed to make a grant pursuant to this section, for the purpose of helping to finance its share of the cost of construction for which such grant is to be made. Any such loan shall be made only (A) after the Secretary determines that such State, municipality, or agency has made satisfactory provision for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works being constructed after completion of such construction, and (B) if such State, municipality, or agency shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Secretary determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this section. Loans pursuant to this subsection shall bear interest at a rate which the Secretary determines to be adequate to cover the costs of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made pursuant to this subsection.

"(2) Loans pursuant to this subsection shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Secretary to be appropriate but not exceeding forty years.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection but not to exceed a total of $250,000,000. No loan or loans pursuant to this subsection with respect to any one project shall exceed an amount equal to 10 percentum of such total."

Sec. 210. Section 10(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting before such paragraphs a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) Whenever the Secretary, upon receipt of reports, surveys, or studies from any duly constituted international agency, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) of this section which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a foreign country is occurring, and the Secretary of State requests him to abate such pollution, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency of the State in which such discharge or discharges originate and to the interstate water pollution control agency, if any, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies, if he believes that such pollution is occurring in sufficient quantity to warrant such action. The Secretary, through the Secretary of State, shall invite the foreign country which may be adversely affected by the pollution to attend and participate in the conference, and the representative of such country shall, for the purpose of the conference and any further proceeding resulting from such conference, have all the rights of a State water pollution control agency. This paragraph shall apply only to a foreign country which the Secretary determines has given the United States essentially the same rights with respect to the prevention and control of water pollution occurring in that country as is given that country by this paragraph. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, amend, repeal, or otherwise affect the provision of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty between Canada and the United States relative to the control and abatement of water pollution in waters covered by that treaty."

Sec. 211. Section 10(d)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as redesignated by this Act) is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "In addition, it shall be the responsibility of the chairman of the conference to give every person contributing to the alleged pollution or affected by it an opportunity to make a full statement of his views to the conference."

Sec. 212. Section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (k) to read as follows:

"(k)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose alleged activities result in discharges causing or contributing to water pollution, or whose activities may affect the quality of the waters involved in such conference, to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of such discharges and the use of facilities or other means to prevent or reduce such discharges by the person filing such a report. After such conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such additional reports to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes, and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures."

Sec. 213. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by adding immediately after section 16 two new sections to read as follows:

"Cost estimate and study

"Sec. 17. In order to provide the basis for evaluating programs authorized by this Act, the development of new programs, and to furnish the Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1972, the Secretary, in cooperation with State water pollution control agencies and other water pollution control planning agencies, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act; a comprehensive study of the economic impact on affected units of government of the cost of installation of treatment facilities; and a comprehensive analysis of the national requirements for and cost of treating municipal, industrial, and other effluent to attain such water quality standards as established pursuant to this Act or applicable State law. The Secretary shall submit such detailed estimate and such comprehensive study of such cost for the five-year period beginning July 1, 1968, to the Congress no later than January 10, 1968, such study to be updated each year thereafter.

"Study of pollution from boats and vessels

"Sec. 18. (a) For the purpose of protecting the public health and welfare, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Commerce, shall conduct a study of the extent of pollution from boats and vessels on such part of the Great Lakes as is under the jurisdiction of the United States, in harbors or ports of such lakes under such jurisdiction and on other navigable waters of the United States, and shall report the results of such study, together with recommendations for an effective program to control the dumping of refuse and the discharge of waste from boats and vessels on such waters, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1967.

"(b) The Secretary shall appoint a technical committee to meet at his discretion and advise in the formulation of recommendations pursuant to this section. Such committee shall be composed of representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Army, and Commerce, the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, owners and operators of Great Lakes vessels, and such other persons as the Secretary may determine. Members of such technical committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings of such committee or otherwise engaged on business of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the term—

"(1) 'Waste' includes human toilet waste, wash and laundry waste, and kitchen and galley waste; and

"(2) 'refuse' includes garbage, dunnage, and other trash."

Sec. 214. Section 13 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U.S.C. 407) is amended by inserting after the word "thereby" in the second proviso the following: "and whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that it is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.),".

Sec. 215. Effective thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Oil Pollution Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 604; 33 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), is amended to read as follows: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Oil Pollution Act, 1924'.

"Sec. 2. When used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"(a) 'oil' means oil of any kind or in any form, including fuel oil, sludge, and oil refuse;

"(b) 'person' means an individual, company, partnership, corporation, or association; any owner, operator, master, officer, or employee of a vessel; any owner, operator, officer, or employee of a shore installation or terminal facility; and any officer, agent, or employee of the United States;

"(c) 'terminal facility' means any pier, wharf, dock, or similar structure to which a vessel may be moored or secured, or upon, within, or contiguous to which equipment and appurtenances dealing with oil may be located, including, but not limited to, storage tanks, pipelines, pumps, and oil trucks;

"(d) 'shore installation' means any building, group of buildings, manufacturing or industrial plants, or equipment of any kind adjacent to the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines of the United States, upon, within, or contiguous to which equipment and appurtenances dealing with oil may be located, including, but not limited to, storage tanks, pipelines, pumps, and oil trucks;

"(e) 'discharge' means any accidental, negligent, or willful spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, or other release of liquid; and

"(f) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. (a) Except in case of emergency imperiling life or property, or unavoidable accident, collision, or stranding, and except as other wise permitted by regulations prescribed by the Secretary as hereinafter authorized, it is unlawful for any person to discharge or permit the discharge from any boat, vessel, shore installation, or terminal facility of oil by any method, means, or manner into or upon the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines of the United States.

"(b) Any person discharging or permitting the discharge of oil from any boat, vessel, shore installation, or terminal facility into or upon the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters of the United States shall remove the same from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines immediately. If such person fails to do so, the Secretary may remove the oil or may arrange for its removal, and such person shall be liable to the United States, in addition to the penalties prescribed in section 4 of this Act, for all costs and expenses reasonably incurred by the Secretary in removing the oil from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines of the United States. When the oil has been discharged from a boat or vessel, these costs and expenses shall constitute a lien on such vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in rem. When the oil has been discharged from a shore installation or terminal facility, these costs and expenses may be recovered in proceedings by libel in personam.

"(c) The Secretary may prescribe regulations which—

"(1) permit the discharge of oil from boats or vessels in such quantities, under such conditions, and at such times and places as in his opinion will not be deleterious to health or marine life or a menace to navigation, or dangerous to persons or property engaged in commerce on coastal, interstate, or navigable waters;

"(2) relate to the loading, handling, and unloading of oil on or contiguous to boats or vessels, shore installations, and terminal facilities; and

"(3) relate to the removal or cost of removal, or both, of oil from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters and adjoining shorelines of the United States.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any person who violates section 3(a) of this Act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment for each offense.

"(b) Any boat or vessel other than a boat or vessel owned and operated by the United States from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3 (a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000. Clearance of a boat or vessel liable for this penalty from a port of the United States may be withheld until the penalty is paid. The penalty shall constitute a lien on the boat or vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in rem in the district court of the United States for any district within which the boat or vessel may be.

"(c) The owner or operator of a shore installation or terminal facility from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000 which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in personam in the district court of the United States of the district within which the shore installation or terminal facility is located.

"(d) Any person who violates any regulation prescribed under section 3(c) of this Act shall, if there has been no discharge of oil, be liable for a penalty of not more than $100.

"SEC. 5. The Commandant of the Coast Guard may, subject to the provisions of section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 239), suspend or revoke a license issued to the master or other licensed officer of any boat or vessel found violating the provisions of section 3 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. In the administration of this Act the Secretary may, with the consent of the Commandant of the Coast Guard or the Secretary of the Army, make use of the organization, equipment, and agencies, including engineering, clerical, and other personnel, employed by the Coast Guard or the Department of the Army, respectively, for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters. And for better enforcement of the provisions of this Act, the officers and agents of the United States in charge of river and harbor improvements, and persons employed under them by authority of the Secretary of the Army, and persons employed by the Secretary, and officers of the Cutsoms and Coast Guard of the United States shall have the power and authority and it shall be their duty to swear out process and to arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who may violate any of said provisions: *Provided*, That no person shall be arrested without process for a violation not committed in the absence of some one of the aforesaid persons: *And provided further*, That whenever any arrest is made under the provisions of this Act the person so arrested shall be brought forthwith before a commissioner, judge, or court of the United States for examination of the offenses alleged against him and such commissioner, judge, or court shall proceed in respect thereto as authorized by law in cases of crimes against the United States.

"SEC. 7. This Act shall be in addition to other laws for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters and shall not be construed as repealing, modifying, or in any manner affecting the provisions of such laws."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President, President pro tempore, or Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF BOB PERRY, ASSISTANT TO THE PHYSICIAN OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with the deepest regret and sadness that I advise the Senate of the passing of Bob Perry, assistant to the physician of the Capitol. Illness came upon him suddenly, and he died early this morning after a brief confinement in Bethesda Naval Hospital.

During the 15 years in which he served in the physician's office, Bob Perry discharged his duties with a sure competency, a warm courtesy, and a friendly cheerfulness which endeared him to all of us. Bob Perry was among the most respected of men on Capitol Hill. His friends were legion both on the House and Senate sides. I doubt that there is an office in the Congress whose staff has not been helped through a minor ache or pain or more serious difficulties at one time or another by Bob Perry. There is not a Member of Congress who has not known his careful ministrations. I feel his loss as a deeply personal one because his kindness and understanding toward me were unfailing.

As a career man in Congress, no less than in the Navy, as a human being and humanitarian, Bob Perry was a fine public servant. His family and loved ones have every reason to be proud of his memory. Mrs. Mansfield and I extend to them our deepest sympathies on their loss.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had planned to make this speech earlier today, but as a matter of courtesy I postponed it until we finished the bill upon which we have just voted.

I make this speech on some salient issues in the airline strike in behalf of the Emergency Board and through the Emergency Board on behalf of the administration.

Today Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz reported "no progress" in the 5-day-old strike by the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines.

From all appearances, this could be a long strike. I say this because the union and airlines reached no agreement after collective bargaining for some 5 months and mediation with the National Mediation Board over a 3-month period.

The IAM union then refused arbitration proffered by the National Mediation Board under the Railway Labor Act procedure. The union set a strike deadline of April 23, 1966, which was only averted by the President creating an Emergency Board on April 21. I was appointed Chairman of the Board along with Mr. David Ginsburg, prominent Washingtonian and a lawyer very knowledgeable in the labor relations field, and Dr. Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government at Harvard University, assistant dean at

Harvard, and a distinguished and practical economist. The Emergency Board met at the convenience of the union and airlines. We heard all the testimony and evidence either side desired to offer. We made a record of testimony and exhibits of 3,000 pages. As a quasijudicial board we based our report and recommendations on the record of hearings made by the parties.

With regard to that record, I want to say that the IAM Union did not maintain their burden of proof on several issues.

Mr. P. L. Siemiller, president of the IAM, sent a telegram to the President in which he stated:

> In our opinion the appointment of such a Board (Emergency Board) would be a total waste of time at the taxpayers expense.

This telegram was union exhibit No. 1 at the Emergency Board hearings. In fact, the first argument of counsel for the union at the Emergency Board hearings was opposition to the hearing being conducted by the President's Emergency Board. He based his opposition on the false assumption that the Board was bound by a 3.2 guideline and that therefore the hearing was of little value for consideration of the merits of the case.

I want the Senate and the country to know that at that point in the hearing—as the transcript will show—I made it clear that the Board was not bound by the Presidential guidelines nor by any obligation to, or control by, the administration in reaching the findings. I made it clear to the parties that such a charge against the Board was a reflection not only upon the Board but also upon the President of the United States. The Board made clear that the function of the Board was to hear the evidence presented by the union and airlines—consider it with the interests of both parties and the public interest in this national dispute—and to reach a just and fair settlement on the record for the workers, the airlines, and in the public interest. The burden of proof rested on each issue in accordance with which side was the proponent of the issue.

The Board followed this procedure and rendered its report to the President on June 5, 1966, based upon the evidence submitted by the parties to the dispute.

Mr. President, if the union is now disappointed with the fact that it did not sustain its burden of proof on a given issue, that is not the fault of the Board. Its failure to sustain its burden of proof is no justification for calling the strike.

The Board's recommendations provided substantial increases in the wages of the workers—48 cents per hour for mechanics, over a 3½-year period, from $3.52 per hour to $4 per hour; an eighth holiday, Good Friday; a fourth week of paid holiday after 15 years' service in addition to the present vacation of 2 weeks after 1 year, and 3 weeks after 10 years; and other recommendations on local issues favorable in some instances to the union and some to the airlines.

In regard to the Board's recommendations on the 3½-year contract, one of the issues before the Board was whether the recommendations of the Board should be retroactive to January 1, 1966.

As the Chairman has pointed out, the Board could have recommended a 3-year contract running from July 1, 1966, but the Board decided to give retroactivity to January 1, 1966, and to provide for a 3½-year period instead of a 3-year period. In view of the fact that retroactivity was granted, I want to say most respectfully that the union, in the opinion of the Board, did not sustain any burden of proof for a limitation of the contract to a 3-year period.

In view of the union's request for retroactivity, it was the opinion of the Board that the union was entitled to retroactivity, but only on condition that the period of the contract should extend for 3½ years.

Mr. President, I want to make this additional comment in regard to the union's request for a so-called escalator clause. If we read the newspapers in regard to the statements the union is now making about an escalator clause, we will find nothing in the statement that describes the kind of escalator clause they request.

When we refer to the cost-of-living escalator clause in a labor contract—and such clauses exist in some contracts, but a decreasing number of contracts—the evidence in the case shows a great decline in the granting of escalator clauses either through collective bargaining or by arbitration. But an escalator clause is a clause which provides for an automatic increase in wage rates if the cost of living goes up a fixed percentage, which may be set out in the agreement, but also provides for a reduction in wages if the cost of living goes down.

The request of this union was a request for a one-way street. The union was not offering a proposal for an escalator clause to provide for a decrease in wage rates if the cost of living went down, only if the cost of living went up.

What the Board provided was that if the cost of living went up 1 percent or more over the average period since December 1966, there could be a reopener on wages, but the reopener on wages was to be decided by a board of arbitration to be selected by the parties. In case they could not agree upon the membership of the board, the board would be chosen from a list of arbitrators to be selected by the Secretary of Labor.

It was not a reopening clause which permitted the right to strike during the life of the contract, but only the reopener within the life of the contract for the adjustment of wages in relation to the formula which the board set out in respect to changes in the cost of living.

The Board—impressed by the union's concern about inflation—provided for a reopener on wage negotiation if, by December 1967, the cost of living since December 1966 has increased 1 percent or more over the average annual increase in the consumer price index during the 5-year period, 1962–66.

Prior to the report being made to the President, the IAM union representative—Mr. Ramsey—and the airlines representative—Mr. Curtain—requested to meet privately with the Board.

Mr. President, they made that request after I had formally closed the hearings, at about 20 minutes to 1, after the noon that the hearings were closed, and after the long record had been made during the preceding 3 weeks on the case.

I set an informal hearing for 3 o'clock that afternoon. At the 3 o'clock meeting the IAM representative stated to the Board that he had no authority to discuss a settlement; and further, that in all probability whatever recommendations were to be made by the Board to the President, the union would reject them.

I said to counsel for the union that in my 32 years of settling labor disputes, never before had I been presented with a suggestion from the representative of a union that the decision which had not even been written yet, and the record which had not even been analyzed by the Emergency Board, would, in all probability, be rejected by the union.

In other words, this union was saying to the Board, "regardless of what your findings and report may be, we probably will reject them." He asked that the Board make itself available to serve as mediator after the Board's report was submitted to the parties.

All of this, in retrospect, gives cause for believing that apparently this union throughout the hearings was itching for a strike. In other words, what the union was saying to the Board at the informal hearings, which were held after the formal hearings had closed, was: "Regardless of what your findings may be, we will reject them."

Counsel pointed out that this is a policy which had been followed by this particular union in connection with other emergency meetings. But counsel for the union and for the carriers asked the Board, under the circumstances, if it would make itself available to serve as mediators after the Board's report was submitted to the President.

I stated to the counsel for the union and for the carriers that I had never encountered a position such as was taken by the union. I pointed out that under the Railway Labor Act the Emergency Board would go out of existence when we filed our report with the President, and that therefore the Board could not accept the suggestion made by both counsel that the Board make itself available to mediate differences which might arise over the Board's report, which had not even been written. However, the next day counsel for the union and carriers went to Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary Reynolds and asked them to arrange to have me appointed as a special mediator after the Board's report was filed with the President.

When Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary Reynolds reported that to the Board, I told them it would be an improper course of action for me to follow. I made clear that if the President wanted any member of the Board to act on the case after the Board filed its report, then the entire Board should be appointed as a Mediation Board, as was done by President Roosevelt in 1941 in the National Railroad case.

I happened also be chairman of that Emergency Board. However, I made clear to Secretary Wirtz and Assistant

Secretary Reynolds that I doubted the wisdom of following such a course of action in this case; that under no circumstances would I involve myself further in the case except on request of the President along with the other members of the Board.

Coupled with the history of collective bargaining and mediation, and the failure to present a case for the union demands during the hearing, I can only conclude that the IAM Union representatives believe the bargaining power they have in striking this vital industry could produce a settlement in accordance with their demands.

I believe this to be unfair to their own membership as well as to the people of this great Nation. A nation which is now involved in Vietnam is in need of one of its vital industries—the transportation of people and material over our airways. Although I am opposed to our involvement in the war in Vietnam, nevertheless we are in it. Until we can change our foreign policy in Vietnam we have a duty to forgo strikes in every instance where peaceful procedures are available to the disputants. Such procedures are available in this case.

I further remind Senators that these carriers represent over 60 percent of the domestic trunkline industry as measured by passenger miles. The IAM represents 35,399 of the 5 airlines employees.

Why has the IAM Union leadership called this strike, which is clearly not in the national interest, nor in the interest of the workers and employees in this great transportation industry?

It is clearly not a fight for union security, since this union has represented these employees for decades. There is no question of the right of the union to exist and represent these employees.

It is not a struggle for higher pay in an underpaid industry. It is not a strike that seeks to guarantee to the union the right to bargain. It enjoys that right.

Collective bargaining in this industry over the years has had a fairly good record.

Ten years ago employees of the airlines involved in this strike were very well paid. They earned more per hour than the workers in all but five of our manufacturing industries.

I make these statements about what the record of our hearings shows because the union propaganda released to the press seeks to give the impression that these employees are grossly underpaid. The record does not support the assertion of the union. The union failed to sustain the burden of proof of showing that, on the wage issue, employees of the union are grossly underpaid.

In the succeeding decade, airline wages have increased faster than those of most other workers. Average straight time earnings of manufacturing workers increased 39 percent between 1956 and 1966. But the airline workers represented by IAM have had increases amounting to 56 percent compared with 39 percent for manufacturing workers in the country.

Now, and in every year since 1962, the average hourly earnings of the workers represented by IAM on these five airlines have exceeded those in any manufacturing industry and have passed those earned by railroad maintenance employees.

The airline employees represented by the IAM have also enjoyed fringe benefits that compare most favorably with those of employees of other industries. For example, the pension benefits resulting from a good percentage of contributions made by the employers have been better than benefits in such leading industries as automobiles, aerospace, or steel. In fact, in my judgment, the trend in regard to pension benefits and welfare benefits is in the direction of having employers assume most, if not all of the cost of the payment for those benefits on the economic theory that these benefits shoud be considered as a part of the wage cost.

Take a look at the transcript of the record that was made before our Board. The union representatives failed to present any evidence that would justify the Board's granting a recommendation that would require the airlines to pay more, if not all, of the cost of the pension and welfare benefit funds.

The Board could not try the case for counsel for the union. That was his responsibility; not the responsibility of the Board. The Board had to take the record which counsel for the union made for the union and render a judicial decision on that record. That is what is required in a quasi-judicial hearing.

What the parties might be able to mediate between themselves in further mediation is another matter, and is not within the province of the Board.

With regard to the union's objections to the report of the Board, in that it did not get anything with regard to welfare and pension benefits, I point out it is no one's fault but the union's, for the record shows that it failed to make a case in support of that issue.

Had the union sustained its case by a preponderance of the evidence, there is no question what the position of this Chairman and his two colleagues on the Board would have been. The union's request would have been granted. But a request cannot be granted without supporting evidence.

Similarly, vacation and other benefits of the airline employees compare favorably with those in other industries. But in this case, Mr. President, the union won a great breakthrough on the vacation issue, for the union obtained from this Board—we were satisfied that the evidence supported the union's position—a 4 weeks' vacation with pay after 15 years of service.

Mr. President, one can count on the fingers of his 2 hands—in fact, one cannot find 10 major collective bargaining agreements in American industry under which the employee gets 4 weeks' vacation after 15 years of service. It was pointed out by the union, and it had great weight with the Board, that, after all, this involves a 24-hour-a-day, 52-week-a-year, 365-day-service requirement from the employees who work for the airlines. Airlines operate 24 hours a day; therefore, these workers, because of the very nature of the industry, do not have all of the time available to them that exists in an industry that does not have to operate on a 24-hour basis.

This means, for example, in the working out of the scheduling of shifts in the airlines, that a worker's economic freedom is somewhat limited by the very nature of the industry. We weighed all those factors, and we gave the union what I considered—as I said at the meeting with the parties when I explained the recommendations of the Board—what we considered to be a very important pace-setting breakthrough in regard to a vacation allowance, by allowing them 4 weeks after 15 years of service.

If the union accepted the recommendation of the Emergency Board, an airplane mechanic would make during the coming year $3.64 an hour. Without any overtime, this would amount to about $650 a month. Contrast airline wages with the average of $2.70 an hour, including overtime, now earned in manufacturing, or the $1.91 an hour now earned in retail trade, and it will be seen that the union did not suffer any discrimination in the recommendations of the Board.

In a labor dispute such as this, all the wage discussion revolves around what is called the pace-setting rate. The pace-setting rate in this industry is $3.52 for the mechanic who has reached the high point of pay.

What did the union ask for? Four dollars and four cents in 36 months. What did the Board recommend? Four dollars in 42 months, which included retroactivity to January 1, 1966.

Mr. President, I have been involved in several hundred labor settlements in the last 32 years, and I do not know of a single wage settlement in which I have ever been involved that, in my judgment, was more fair, on the basis of the evidence submitted to a quasi-judicial tribunal of which I was a member, than our recommendation of $4 for this pace-setting rate, after 42 months.

Therefore, in fairness to the Board, and in fairness to the President, who appointed the Board, I must answer the misleading propaganda of the union that appears in the daily press these days, seeking to give the false impression that the recommendations of the Board in some way discriminated against the union.

Mr. President, the union got a good wage settlement. It got a noninflationary wage settlement—and I shall have something to say, before I finish this speech, about the demands of the union for an inflationary wage settlement.

Furthermore, I think this is a good place for me to make an additional point in regard to another gain that the union made in regard to wages which its proof justified. The airlines have, for a long time, had a series of time steps that an employee had to work through before he reached, for example, the $3.52 rate for mechanics. They had similar time schedule wage steps that all their other employes falling within the jurisdiction of this case had to work through before they received the top rate.

Sometimes those wage steps would be 2, 3, 4, or 6 months. In other words, they would hire an employee at a given rate, and then in 2, 3, 4, or 6 months, depending upon what the particular job classification was, he would receive the next increase in wages, and then a third and then a fourth increase. In fact, in one case, as I recall the evidence, the employees had to go through five steps.

The carriers, in the opinion of the Board, did not sustain their burden of proof on this issue, for it was the carriers who sought to retain this method of time-step scheduling of wage rate payments. The Board eliminated the first step and the next to the last step, so that if there was a three-step schedule, the workers would start at the second step and then move to the third step. If it was a four-step program, we eliminated the second step and the third step. We eliminated two of the steps that previously had prevailed in regard to their reaching the maximum wage rate. We pointed out that any further adjustment of this matter of wage step increases was a subject for collective bargaining in the next agreement.

Under examination by the Board, as the transcript of the record will show, the carriers could not sustain, for example, a wage-step requirement for a pastry baker in the lunchroom—and those employees fall under the jurisdiction of the union in this case—by hiring a pastry baker in the first place on the assumption that he can bake pastry, and then requiring that he cannot receive the top wage until he goes through three or four of the so-called wage steps. In fact, the carriers did not sustain their burden of proof that there is any justification for keeping a wage rate time schedule increase program for mechanics in the number of wage steps that presently exist.

So we eliminated two of those steps. But, Mr. President, we hear not a word from the union, in the releases that it makes to the public, in regard to the substantial wage increase that the Board granted these workers. For they would arrive at the $3.52, or at their top wage rate in the other job classifications, in much less time, under the new contract that we recommended, than would be the case under the old contract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. In just a moment.

The union made its case on this point, but the carriers failed to make their case; and if Senators will read the decision of the Board, they will see that the Board made very clear to the parties the reason for its granting this request of the union.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Board concluded that the steps required by the employer for an employee to reach the maximum salary were too great a burden upon the employee and that, therefore, two steps should be eliminated in order to allow the workers to reach the maximum pay more quickly.

Mr. MORSE. That is one way of putting it. The Senator from Oregon puts it another way. The employers failed to show that this amount of time was necessary in order to provide for a top mechanic. In many instances a top mechanic is hired in the first instance, and he should be started at $3.52 in the beginning.

The carriers failed to show that any considerable amount of time was needed for the so-called training of a mechanic, and certainly it would not require the same amount of time that would be required to train a cook, a pastry cook, a ramp man, or a cleaner to use the utensils required to clean a plane after it lands.

A great deal of time is required before those men get the top rate of pay. We eliminated those two steps.

We said to the employers, "The next time you negotiate a contract, you ought to see what you can do about eliminating more steps. You know what the requirements are in the industry to give the employees sufficient training to earn the amount of money that the next step justifies."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have heard what the Senator said. Am I correct in my understanding that the steps required by the employers were far greater in point of time than was needed to prepare the employee for an efficient fulfillment of the task required by the particular job?

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what the Board found. That is the reason why we eliminated two steps. The effect was to give a wage increase to the employees. It means that another man is employed in the first instance and he gets his wage increase very quickly. It means that it helps the people up the line because we eliminated the next to the last step, and there are thousands of employees who are now in the second step. It is a four-step progression. They call them progression rates. If they are on the second rate of progression, and there are four progression steps before they get to the top pay, our decision eliminates the third step completely, and the employees would go from the second step to what is now the fourth step. That is a wage increase, and a substantial wage increase.

I make this statement in fairness to the Board and in fairness to my President. Let us not forget that the President studied this report. He received the report on Sunday and he studied the report until he met with us on Tuesday.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that I marvel at the detailed knowledge of the President concerning the technical matters that are in the report. It is a highly complex case.

As we sat down to explain the report to the President, there were very few points in regard to which he needed any explanation. He had so thoroughly studied the report that he was very familiar with what the Board had done. On the basis of his familiarity and our answers to the questions he put to us, he issued the statement which is already a part of the RECORD, in which he endorsed the report of the Board and recommended that the parties settle their differences within the framework of the report.

The President recognized from the beginning, as did the Board, that under the Railway Labor Act the parties are under no obligation automatically to accept the recommendation of an emergency board, and frequently they do not.

They have 30 days in which to negotiate further between themselves in regard to possible modifications of the Board's report on the basis of learning from the report what they did not show in the case itself and on the basis of presenting additional evidence in a collective bargaining mediation settlement—not before the Board. The Board, as I said before the Senator from Ohio entered the Chamber, sat as judges and quasi-judicial officers and judged the case on the basis of the evidence submitted.

The act itself provides for a mediation adjustment for a 30-day period.

The Senator will see before I finish my statement that a peaceful procedure is available to the parties and that there is no justification for a strike. The union is not in jeopardy.

There is no question here of the right of the union to be protected in its collective bargaining right. Therefore, in this period of crisis, as I said earlier in my speech, in my judgment there is not the slightest justification for the union to try to coerce its demand upon the public, the airlines, and the Government by way of a picket line.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the purpose of information on my part, were all of the airlines involved in the dispute?

Mr. MORSE. No; only the employees of the five airlines that fall under the contract with the IAM. They consisted of the mechanics, the ramp men, the various service employees, and some of the restaurant employees who are organized—the so-called nonoperating employees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would that include the captains and the navigators?

Mr. MORSE. No. I think the best analogy I can give is the railroad industry. In the railroad industry we have the five operating brotherhoods and the nonoperating brotherhoods. It is the nonoperating unions within the five airlines that are involved.

The Emergency Board recommended a settlement that is both fair and generous to the workers yet in keeping with our policies of minimizing inflationary pressures. The union demands would raise the cost of settlement about 50 percent above the cost of the contract recommended by the Board. If these union demands were to be met, how could we continue to ask for restraint and moderation by workers in other industries? If these union demands were to be met and then were matched by others, what would hapen to the cost of living of the American people?

I think it is particularly appropriate for me to point out that over in the wings on this great economic stage involving labor relations at the present time in America is a long waiting line of participants waiting to walk out on the stage.

Contract after contract is awaiting negotiation. Potential dispute after potential dispute is waiting in the wings of this great industrial theater to participate in the act.

Mr. President, if this union is permitted to blow the lid off as far as any inflationary control is concerned—and I believe in voluntary inflationary control—I want to say this afternoon to the Senate what I think will soon become the obligation and responsibility and duty of Congress; that is, to pass a package of legislation that I hope will not have to be passed. That concerns legislation for control of inflation. If this union is successful in bringing to an end voluntary inflationary control whereby management and labor apply sensible rules of reason to the economy of this country, there is no doubt that inflation will inflame the economy of this country and burn up the dollar as far as its present value is concerned unless inflationary control legislation is passed.

Mr. President, I have great difficulty, as my record in the Senate indicates, in reconciling inflation control legislation with a free economy. A free economy is a precious possession for the American people to retain and to maintain because of its direct relationship to political freedom. Political freedom cannot be separated from economic freedom. I have said this ad infinitum during my service in the Senate, and it is a truism that is unanswerable.

As one who need not apologize to any labor leader or to any management leader for my record of trying to settle labor disputes on the basis of the evidence involved in cases, I make my plea again this afternoon, as I have many times in the past, to the participants in this dispute. I ask them to substitute the rule of reason for the picket line or for any adamant refusal on the part of management. I ask them to consider any adjustment, noninflationary in nature, of the issues involved in this dispute, and to settle the case within the framework of that precious system of economic freedom that we call free collective bargaining.

That is the issue, and all the semantics, all the emotionalism, and all the name calling by the participants in this dispute will not change the reality of that truism.

That is why I speak this afternoon, under an obligation, in my judgment, to my colleagues on the Board and under an obligation to the President of the United States, who appointed the Board, and in support of the position that the President has taken concerning the recommendation of the Board. I plead again that the officers and the members of this union withdraw the picket lines, go back to work, and get back to the mediation table. That is the responsibility of this union.

If that course were followed, the carriers would have a corollary responsibility of seeking to work out, wherever justified by the facts and the evidence, an adjustment of the disputes that exist. That is what the Railway Labor Act contemplates and requires.

If both sides would meet on the basis of that approach, I am satisfied that by the exercise of such industrial statesmanship, great losses to this Republic could be avoided.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To what extent do the demands at present of the union exceed the award that was made by the Board?

Mr. MORSE. By 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Board listened to the arguments of the union and the arguments of the employers and made an award, but it fell 50 percent short of what the unions wanted. What does the 50 percent mean in dollars?

Mr. MORSE. We granted an award that would have amounted to about a $76 million increase. The union asked for $130 million. I understand that the union is now down to $114 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the Board, in its appraisal of all the claims of the union and the employers, granted $76 million?

Mr. MORSE. $76 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The unions are not content with that and have decided to paralyze the movement of the airplanes of the country.

Mr. MORSE. They decided to go on strike.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, that means paralyzation in the main.

Mr. MORSE. I think it means an unjustifiable blow to the economy of the country. I think it also is unfair to the public, for reasons I shall set forth shortly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Have the employers been willing to go beyond the recommendation of the Board, and have the unions, despite that willingness of the employers, turned down the position of the employers?

Mr. MORSE. I am advised by the administration that the employers in the mediation conferences that have been held thus far, while the strike gun is being pointed at the head of the country, have been willing to increase the Board's amount by $2 million, and are willing to go to $78 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am quite sure the Senator will not agree with me in what I am about to say. Yesterday, I introduced a bill to provide for compulsory arbitration after all the means of mediation and conciliation have been exhausted and after recommendations as to how a dispute should be settled have been made by boards of the type on which the Senator from Oregon has served. I do not ask the Senator from Oregon to commit himself, but I would like to have his views.

Mr. MORSE. I expressed myself in the Senate last night in opposition to compulsory arbitration legislation.

My recollection may be inaccurate, but I believe a very small number of Senators voted against the compulsory arbitration bill that was passed within the last few years, at the time of the railroad dispute. I voted against that legislation and spoke against it, because this is my view, and honest and sincere men disagree with me. I refused to take the position that we cannot make our free economy work.

In my judgment, a compulsory arbitration law—I shall make some comment on it at the conclusion of this manuscript—would contain great potentials for danger to our economic system. It would contain the danger of turning over to third parties many rights of management and many rights of labor.

I know that the argument on the other side is that of balancing interests. But I believe that in the long run we would be better off to suffer the stings and tortures of the right of employers to lock out and of unions to strike, and to use the other means at our disposal to bring an end to a strike or a lockout, rather than resort to the legislative process.

While I am on this subject, I wish to say that I have no doubt that if the public should become familiar with the facts involved in this case, supported by a government which makes very clear that it will not support a resort to economic force in a situation that does not warrant it, it would not take American labor long to appreciate that it would lose more than it could possibly gain by continuing the strike. The best enforcement weapon that exists in this free society, which requires men to be fair and reasonable in disputes such as this, is the pressure of public opinion, and not the pressure of legislation. That happens to be my philosophy. I have held to this philosophy for years.

I had not thought about it for a long time, but I suppose that is the result of my absorbing the teachings of the two greatest labor economists who have taught and written in our time in the United States, both of whom were teachers of mine—the incomparable John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin, and that great pupil of his, who became in his own right a foremost labor economist, Prof. Selig Perlman.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I can thoroughly understand, with justification, the conclusion to which the Senator from Oregon has come. But in this instance the union has been awarded by an impartial arbitration board a grant which is liberal, in accordance with the statement made by the Senator from Oregon.

After the award has been made, the employer makes concessions in excess of those made by the Board or granted by the Board. Yet the union says we will strike against the economy of the Nation.

The Senator from Oregon states that we should rely on the pressure of public opinion. I believe that public opinion is a very powerful force. My view is that public opinion has failed to persuade the union leaders to accept the award of the Board, except the additional concessions made, and that, therefore, there should be some final authority by way of an arbitration board.

I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I agree that there is considerable strength in each of these arguments.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I recognize the merits of the opposing argument, but I do not think that public opinion has even started to work on the case yet. I do not think the public is fully aware of the facts involved.

I do not think the public realizes yet the great losses that are being suffered and the jeopardy in which I think the strike already is placing the welfare of the country, and will jeopardize it more and more as time goes by.

I also have the philosophical view that the cost of freedom comes high, but that it is worth the price. As free men and women, we have to be ready to make some sacrifices for freedom for a period of time in a situation such as this, rather than take the position that we are going to substitute the force of government by way of legislation for the rule of reason that parties to a dispute should come to of their own free will.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his fearlessness and great courage in coming to the floor of the Senate and pointing out the weaknesses of the position of the unions which have precipitated this strike against the public.

Fortitude is required in a pure devotion to public service to take the position the Senator from Oregon has exhibited on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Ohio is very gracious and generous in making that statement, but it takes no fortitude and no courage to do what I am doing. To the contrary, duty compels me to do it. It is my clear obligation to present to the American people in behalf of my board the position of the Board.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many members are on the Board?

Mr. MORSE. There were three of us on the Board. Before the Senator from Ohio entered the Chamber, I stated that there were three members of the Board.

Besides the Chairman, there was the assistant dean of the Graduate School of Harvard University, recognized as one of the outstanding economists of this country, and a very practical economist. In fact, it was a great education to me to sit with him as we analyzed the economic facets of this dispute. The other member of the Board was Mr. David Ginsburg, recognized as one of the outstanding leaders of the bar, not only in the District of Columbia, but of national repute. In his younger days he was one of the clerks of the U.S. Supreme Court. He is a man with a broad background of knowledge in the field of industrial relations.

One gets accustomed to nonsequitur approaches to a matter such as this. For example, I have heard since the Board rendered its decision that there were those who thought that because three members who have reputations of being so-called liberals were appointed to the Board they would not function as judicial officers.

When I was dean of the University of Oregon Law School for many years and my recommendation was requested time and time again in connection with appointments to the bench, I always dismissed any representation that Mr. X was a conservative or Mr. Y was a liberal, because I have observed—and I wish to stress this point—that when men are placed in a judicial position, no matter what label is attached to them, whether it be liberal or conservative, they have a common ethical responsibility, and that is to reach their judgment on the basis of the evidence submitted to them, applying, as I said in the beginning of this speech, the preponderance-of-the-evidence rule.

I have never been one of those who belong to the school of thought that in selecting judges there ought to be any preconceived notions that they will fail to carry out that judicial responsibility.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I subscribe to the thought just expressed by the Senator from Oregon that the placement of high responsibility on individuals very frequently lifts them to the maximum of efficient and devoted service.

I wish to conclude by expressing my gratitude to the Senator from Oregon for his presentation on the floor of the Senate tonight.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is kind. Before the Senator leaves the floor, I wish to make this comment on his last remark: There is a great difference between an individual as an advocate and an individual as a judge. One being in the position of an advocate can very well follow an economic or a political philosophy which he has no right to follow as a judge. As a judge, he has to divest himself of his views and what he would do as an advocate.

As I related earlier, had I been at the counsel table trying this case for the union or the carriers, I would have presented a good many of the issues in an entirely different way. But that was not my function. It was my job to judge the case on the basis of the evidence submitted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope that the words spoken by the Senator from Oregon will have some impact upon the interested parties and that the stoppage of airline service will come to an end, restoring to the people of the United States the convenience that they are entitled to.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

Returning to comments I wish to make on the merits of the case and the merits of the recommendations of the Emergency Board, during the past year, most key industrial labor agreements—in steel, rubber, coal, telephone, aluminum, cans—have been characterized by moderation. The pay of Federal workers has stayed in line with the administration's wage policy. The unions in these and other industries have recognized the fact that excessive wage increases raise unit costs, require higher prices, lead to a wage-price spiral, and thus generate an inflation that hurts everybody—and most of all the working people. They have recognized that the true basis for higher living standards for all Americans is increasing productivity. They have recognized that workers whose wages increase by more than the average advance in productivity can gain only by reducing the real income of someone else—usually of some other worker.

But now these union representatives of the very well-paid employees are trying to negotiate a settlement—in defiance of the recommendations of a public board—a settlement that will be clearly inflationary. If this union succeeds, its success may well wreck our hope for price stability, and our ability to maintain a healthy and expanding economy.

These union representatives are asking not only for extremely large pay increases but on top of it for a cost-of-living escalator clause.

The union wants protection against inflation, but it shows a total disregard of what happens to others. One union may inconvenience the public enough to get an excessive wage increase, and help to start an inflationary spiral, and then protect itself with escalator clauses. But we cannot all do that. Old people living on their pensions and savings cannot do it. Workers whose wages were set by last year's contracts cannot do it. Workers who get only the minimum wage cannot do it. In addition, the Board recommended and the airline accepted a wage reopener to protect these workers, as I explained earlier in this speech.

Airline workers are, in effect, in the public service. They have contributed to making the American airline industry the most progressive, the most efficient, the safest, and the most economical in the world. Now they are challenged to serve the public interest in another way. The American people expect them to end this crippling strike, and to withdraw the excessive demands that threaten the Nation's interest in a stable and healthy economy.

THE EMPLOYERS AND THEIR EARNINGS

In making its excessive demands, the union representatives stress the fact that the airlines are presently enjoying a very considerable prosperity. What it fails to recognize is that this prosperity is extremely recent; until the last 2 years, airline earnings have been entirely inadequate; that, as a regulated industry, the airlines are severely limited in their opportunity to earn high rates of return over a period of years, to balance their earlier low returns; and that the carriers face tremendous capital requirements in the years ahead.

These are the averages rates of return on investment of the domestic airline trunk carriers over the past decade:

	Percent
1956	9.6
1957	4.8
1958	6.5
1959	7.1
1960	2.8
1961	1.5
1962	4.1
1963	4.3
1964	10.0
1965	12.4

Mr. President, when we take into account over this 10-year period the profits of the airline industry and the expenses for reinvestment in new equipment—which I shall discuss in a moment—and compare them with other industries, it does not follow—as the union is seeking to represent to the people of the United States at the present time—that the airline industry has been an affluent industry. The last 2 years have been 2 years of good profits, but I want to discuss those profits for a moment from the standpoint of other considerations related to them.

The past 2 years have been excellent years for the airlines; no one can deny it. But over the preceding 8 years, 1956–63, their average return was a modest 5.1 percent. When we compare the risks of capital investment to which an industry such as this is constantly subjected with what you and I, Mr. President, can get for our money by investing even in a savings bank, an average of 5.1 percent over an 8-year period is anything but excessive. This compares with an average rate of return on investment in manufacturing companies of about 9.1 percent over that same 8-year period. And in each of the last two very good years for the airlines, their average return was roughly the same as in all manufacturing in the United States. Over the whole decade, 1956–65, manufacturing companies earned 4.5 percentage points more on investment than did the airlines.

And not all airlines have done as well as the average. Among the five struck carriers, one barely broke even in 1960 and had substantial losses in 1961, 1962, and 1963. Another lost money in 1956, 1961, and 1962. Still another lost money in 1960 and barely broke even in 1961.

Moreover, one must recognize that, as a regulated industry, the airlines cannot expect to maintain indefinitely their current rates of return. If their costs rise unnecessarily, it can in the long run only be at the expense of the consumer.

The workers—as I have pointed out from the statistics already included in the speech—during the periods of losses for the companies received good wages compared with wages received in comparable industry and in American industry as a whole. And they should have. In fact, in American labor law there is a rule, and I am proud to say that some 30 years ago, in my earlier decisions, I enunciated this rule, which became a precedent and has now been adopted as a very important part of labor law. I should say that, rather than enunciating it, I applied it, because it happens to be an economic principle which I learned under the teaching of two great scholars previously referred to; namely, Profs. John R. Commons and Selig Perlman, and deals with the issue of ability to pay in a labor dispute. The rule is that ability to pay is not a relevant factor in a case when it is alleged by the representative of the employer that he cannot pay a wage of "health and decency." Those are words of art in both labor law and labor economics.

Mr. President, when we say a wage of "health and decency," we mean a wage which permits the head of a family to maintain that family in health and decency by providing the necessities of life, including decent food, decent shelter, medical care, and educational opportunities; but any income of the employer over the level of an income that will support a wage of "health and decency" is one of the economic factors for a mediator or an arbitrator to take into consideration in determining to what extent, if any, the facts would seem to support the contention of workers that they are entitled to a part of the profits of the company over and above that amount of wages from the company which wil maintain them in "health and decency."

If that rule were not in effect today, labor would have had no opportunity to progress under our economic system. It would exist in a pool of economic and wage stagnation. But, Mr. President, that becomes a matter of judgment brought to bear upon all the evidence presented on the wage factors in a given case. It becomes a matter of judgment in connection with other criteria—some of which I shall mention shortly in this speech—that a wage board must take into account if it seeks to decide what, on the basis of all the facts, a fair wage adjustment should be.

When we grant the wage increase that we have recommended be granted in this case, we certainly have taken into account—in fact, have given substantial weight to the fact that the general economic condition of the airlines during the past 2 years has been good.

After their long lean years, the airlines need to earn decent profits to get ready for the tremendous investments that lie ahead. The current generation of jet planes now in use cost $3 to $6 million each. The newer jets that are around the corner may ultimately prove to be a profitable investment for the airlines and a boon to consumers. But before that profit can be earned and before consumers can receive the bonus of lower fares, a gigantic investment will be required.

I shall not take the time this afternoon to burden the RECORD with the detailed statistical cost information that was put in the transcript record as to what the airlines will have to pay out in the next decade to buy the new model planes that will have to replace the present jet planes. Their cost will be substantial—in fact, very much higher than the $3 to $6 million per jet plane they have to pay at the present time for the models now in use.

Under our system of free economy, management is entitled to have consideration given to their capital cost of developing an industry so that workers can be employed in it. These capital outlays are of vital concern to the employees in this union, because as the airline industry is kept well equipped to meet the demands of the transportation requirements of the country, it means not only additional work for the unions, but new members for the union as well.

The new "stretch" jets soon to be in use will cost not $3 to $6 million, but $9 million per plane. The great new 747 is estimated to cost $20 million. The evidence shows that within 10 years we undoubtedly will see that much of our transportation for long distances will be in the 747's.

And the American supersonic jet, expected to become available around 1972—only 6 years from now—may cost a fantastic $35 million a plane.

The billions of dollars of necessary capital to provide this new fleet for our carriers can never be provided by the profits of the airlines in the next few years. But their profitability in the next few years will have to be such as to induce investors to buy the shares and the bonds that will finance the tremendous investment that will be necessary.

What are being overlooked, I say most respectfully, by the union spokesmen in this case are just such facts as I have spread on the record. It is of vital concern to and in the best interest of the union that preparation be made for this kind of change in the equipment of the airlines.

I stress that this equipment cannot be bought by investments made in the airline industry by the stock purchasers and bond purchasers on Wall Street unless a reasonable profit will accrue to the benefit of the purchasers of the stocks and bonds. If there is no hope of the airlines getting into a position where they can make these equipment changes, it will therefore redound to the economic disadvantage of the unions themselves.

I know it is easy for union leaders to go before lodge meetings—and that has been happening in this country at lodge meetings—and merely tell the union members of the profits the companies have made in the last 2 years; but say not one word about some of the losses that many of the companies have suffered in the last 10 years; not one word about the fact that the total average earnings of the airline companies in the last 10 years have been substantially less than those for American industry as a whole; not one word to the members of the ranks about the efforts to keep the American airline industry on a sound financial basis. These are controlling facts which the members should know about. When the members of the unions come to understand these facts, they will not be so enthusiastic as they are at the present time about fighting the strike to a finish, so to speak, by trying to force a capitulation on the part of the managers.

Workers have the right to demand decent wages and to expect the continued progress in wage rates that our burgeoning economy can afford. But investors have some rights, too. When wage demands try to eat up all the profits of American industry, we face either continuous inflation of prices or a slowing down of the investment which forms the basis for our productivity gains, our jobs, and for the progress in real wages that is the hallmark of our unparalleled American achievement.

As we pointed out in our Board recommendations, as I have said in decision after decision in labor dispute cases over the years, the only wages that count are real wages, not money wages. The airline workers involved in this strike will be sold short by the leadership of this union if it should develop, as a result of the strike, that the union succeeded in getting an inflationary wage increase. Such increases are not real wages. Such increases will not result in a real wage increase, but in a cheapened dollar increase. No union labor leader can cancel the laws of economics, including the laws of monetary economics.

So the senior Senator from Oregon is making his plea this afternoon for the leaders of the union and for the members of the union to answer for themselves the question: "Do you want a real wage increase, or do you want an inflationary wage increase? If you want the latter, you are only cheating yourselves, but, more than that, you are doing irreparable damage to the millions of American people who will suffer as a result of the inflationary spiral that you will have caused."

So I ask again: Why are the representatives of the IAM continuing this destructive strike?

A settlement will be made sooner or later, and the IAM unions know it. I think they will be in a sounder position if they substitute the mediation table for the picket line. A strike gun held at the head of the public in this hour of crisis is not a justifiable means for settling a wage dispute.

Do they think that they can totally disregard the national interest and the traveling public, forcing a settlement on the airlines and this country? A settlement which commences and enlarges the inflationary march of wages and prices—that disregards the fair settlement recommended by the Emergency Board and recommended as a framework for settlement by the President cannot be justified. The Board did not think there could not be modification of the terms of settlement from the Board recommendation. However, it does believe that the report is a fair and just basis for a mediation settlement, and it is a report based upon the preponderance of the evidence submitted, issue by issue, by the parties.

Undoubtedly the union can now present evidence in mediation that it failed to present to the Emergency Board. The report of the Board shows the union, in respect to some issues, failed to sustain its burden of proof. That is one reason for the Railway Labor Act providing a 30-day period after the Board's report to present further evidence in mediation. The union should call off the strike and do just that. I am satisfied that with the new evidence that they may be able to submit, there are some recommendations of the Board that could be changed if the evidence justified it. It is only on that basis that the union should expect to receive additional benefits in the settlement of the dispute.

I urge the members of the IAM union to study the report and the present demands of their leadership. I urge the IAM union representatives to enter seriously into negotiation with the airlines under the able leadership of Secretary of Labor Wirtz and Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds.

The union and airline representatives requested that I, as a member of the Board, mediate this dispute following the filing of the report. I rejected this request. The Board has done its job. As a quasi-judicial board, neither the Board nor its members have any further role to play except to urge the union and airlines to settle this dispute immediately and in the national interest by submitting additional evidence to a mediation hearing.

The Board does have a responsibility—and we shall carry out that responsibility—to make whatever statements, from time to time, we think the development of this strike justifies, by way of explaining and clarifying the report that we made to the President.

But, Mr. President, in my judgment, the leaders of union and the management of the airlines are faced tonight with a great challenge of industrial statesmanship; and they can meet and carry out that challenge if they will agree to submit their dispute to 2 weeks of mediation, and during that period of 2 weeks, agree, on the part of the union, to disperse the picket lines and the strike, and let reason prevail over what has become, in my judgment, an attitude of too much feeling and too much emotion on the part of the leaders of this union. The exercise of feeling and emotion has very little relationship to calm judgment. What is needed is to have both sides sit down and reason together for a fair mediation settlement of this dispute, with the men back at work and carrying out the public interest.

RUSSIAN FISHING TRAWLERS OFF THE PACIFIC COAST—IV

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on a number of occasions previously I have discussed the grave situation resulting from the presence of Russian fishing vessels off the coast of Oregon. As I point out in the letter which I am sending today to the President, I continue to receive a large number of alarming reports from Oregon fishermen and other worried citizens about the extent and magnitude of the Russian fishing activities off the coast of my State.

It appears that certain stocks of fish are very likely to become virtually extinct in the near future if these activities are not halted. The Russians apparently are not using conservation measures in their fishing; on the contrary, the evidence points to exploitation of the worst type. Thus, the situation has become truly critical.

I am now urging the President to deal with this problem at the White House level because it is not the kind of problem which can await the long, laborious procedures of the State Department. It must be dealt with immediately and on the highest possible level. If this is not done, great and perhaps irreparable damage will result to the fishing interests of Oregon and to all Americans by depleting one of our valuable food resources.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of today addressed to the President and the communications I have recently received from the Oregon Otter Trawl Commission be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 12, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On April 11—more than three months ago—I sent you a wire regarding the serious problem of Russian fishing activities off the coast of Oregon. Since then I have sent several communications to various Federal officials, but to date no action has been taken on this matter which reflects any positive steps in the direction of solving this crucial problem.

Alarming reports continue to reach my office from Oregon fishermen and other concerned citizens regarding the magnitude of the Russian fishing activities off the coast of my State. Copies of recent reports are enclosed.

I am told that some stocks of fish will become severely depleted unless these practices are halted. As I have pointed out previously the Russians are not using conservation measures in their fishing; all of the evidence points to exploitation of the worst type. This is why the situation is so critical.

Most respectfully I suggest that this is a matter which must be resolved at the White House level. It is not the kind of problem which can await the long-drawn-out procedures of the State Department but requires direct and immediate attention. If this course of action is not followed, irreparable harm will result to the fishing interests of Oregon and to the nation through depletion of one of our valuable food resources.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

STATE OF OREGON,
OTTER TRAWL COMMISSION OF OREGON,
Astoria, Oreg., July 8, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just talked with your assistant, Mr. Berg, re. the expanding Russian invasion in our fisheries. The fleet now is composed of 118 vessels as of 7/7 with more in the distance which could not be counted because of weather conditions.

I believe this issue is most urgent and demands the attention of our federal government. The President and Secretary State Dean Rusk should act in fisheries behalf.

I have proposed that Governor Hatfield call a west coast Governors Conference on the issue. I further propose that the governors of Maine, Mass. and R.I. be requested to attend. Having talked with a friend yesterday in R.I. who concurs with our thinking "to establish an extended fishery conservation zone" I feel certain that our government will realize that action must be taken. Both coasts as well as Alaska know this confrontation. I would again urge that you do all within your power to alleviate the apparent extinction of some stocks of fish of the United States.

I enclose some pieces which will further enlighten you about our problems.

Sincerely,

E. W. HARVEY,
Administrator.

OTTER TRAWL COMMISSION OF OREGON,
Astoria, Oreg., June 15, 1966.

DEAR U.S. CITIZEN: For the past two months or more we in fisheries have been faced with a large fleet of large Russian vessels in our Pacific waters. This fleet, we believe, poses a serious threat to ALL of our fisheries.

In Oregon, for example, in the month of May, 1966 one of our processing plants had to cancel its U.S. government contracts because of the scarcity of fish to process, namely the depletion of our stocks. Another plant was similarly affected in not being able to fill all of its May orders for both Government and domestic channels. The above pertains to one species of fish only. The Oregon May, 1966 production of this species fell to 21% of that in May 1965.

These facts and depositions (see extra sheet) gathered from our fishing men show you what is happening today. It has been said that the entire silver salmon run could be harvested by the Russian fleet in a matter of two weeks if they so desired. It would take many years (8–20 to return some species of fish to their normal level or present populations.

The West Coast Fisheries are in peril! These fisheries are worth many millions of dollars. We cannot stand by and see our fisheries decimated or depleted. We are acting in various locations along the coast, and also through and by the joint Governors' Committee. We suggest the following courses of action:

1. Request the immediate withdrawal of the Russian fleet until such time as all parties involved can assay the stocks of the various species, and determine sustained yield recommendations. Establish a fishery conservation zone.

2. Immediate extension of a U.S. fishery zone to the twelve mile line, or the continental shelf.

3. Request a North Pacific Rim Council (U.S., Canada, Russia and Japan) be formed to conserve all stocks of seafoods of the area.

We urge your sympathetic action.

Sincerely,

E. W. HARVEY,
Administrator.

To the Honorable Governor EVANS and Governor HATFIELD:

The fisheries of the West Coast are of a very considerable monetary value to the states and to the U.S. economy.

The presence of Russian fishing vessels of various sizes, all larger than ours, off our shores in 1965 and the greatly increased numbers in 1966, has caused a growing concern among the several fisheries industries of the northwest. The producers and the processors consider the continued fishing of this foreign fleet a most serious threat to the future of the stocks of our historic fisheries.

The implementation of a basically sound U.S. fishery policy for this area and for all U.S. coastal areas is strongly urged. Such policy shall provide for an adequate conservation program for all stocks of the numerous fisheries so as to maintain their productivity on a sustained yield basis for the continued economic activity of U.S. citizens.

In a meeting on June 16, 1966, in Longview, Washington, the Oregon-Washington Governors' Joint Committee on Foreign Fishing concurred in the following recommendations to the Governors:

1. Increase and coordinate surveillance on a twenty-four hour basis immediately.

(a) Inshore as well as off-shore by U.S. Coast Guard and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and State agencies.

(b) By daily staggered flights over the Russian fleet.

(c) Telescopic photography and all other available means of gathering pertinent information.

(d) Deputize two skippers per state to work with their boats among the Russian fleet to gather information.

2. Urge support of all U.S. Government agencies to press for the proposed early meeting between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Progress of such is to be reported to the Governors and their respective committees.

3. Urge full and comprehensive collection of information and its speedy dissemination to all concerned—especially industry.

4. Declassify all information on Russian fleet activities for dissemination as above.

5. That the Governors urge the President, and other officers and agencies to expedite the proposed meeting with the Russians.

6. Urge implementation of the Principles of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas. (See Article 6).

7. Urge the formation of an International Commission or Council for the Study of the Fishery Resources of the North Pacific (long range program).

8. Advocate and urge the establishment of a wider conservation zone to protect our offshore fisheries stocks adequately.

Respectfully submitted.

E. W. HARVEY.

On June 24, 1966, in Warrenton, Oregon, representatives of the following organizations drew up a petition on the Russian fishery problem:

We, the undersigned, hereby petition the President of the United States of America to issue an immediate proclamation to establish an extended conservation zone of two-hundred (200) miles or the continental shelf, which ever is greater, predicated on the principles as set forth in the 1958 Geneva Convention, Article 6, No. 1.

We further petition that historic fishing rights in consecutive practice for a period not less than ten (10) years be given consideration based on the average production by specie during said period.

We further petition that the Abstention Principle, as embodied in the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention, be made a part of the United States fishery policy assuring protection and continuation of the anadromous fishery resources and existing treaties also be honored.

> West Coast Trollers Association; West Coast Trollers Association Auxiliary; Seafood Dealers Association of Oregon, Inc.; Columbia River Salmon and Tuna Packers Association; Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union; Alaska Fishermen's Union — Otter Trawl Division; Joint Committees on Fisheries Appointed by Governor Daniel Evans, of Washington; Governor Mark Hatfield, of Oregon; Otter Trawl Commission of Oregon; Oregon Charter Boat Association; National Fishermen & Wives Association, Halibut Fishermen's Association; Congress of American Fishermen; Division of Fisheries—U.S. State Department; Washington Gillnetters Association, United Packinghouse Food & Allied Workers, Local No. 554.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 13, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 12, 1966:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Audun L. Heaton, Adamsville, Ala., in place of Lela Tate, resigned.

ARIZONA

Gilbert V. Montanez, Tempe, Ariz., in place of F. H. Miller, retired.

ARKANSAS

Truett Leavell, Dover, Ark., in place of J. W. Page, retired.

Herald A. Sneed, Quitman, Ark., in place of W. E. Varvil, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Norman K. Kinsel, Bonita, Calif., in place of J. B. Loomis, retired.

Helen H. Krotozyner, Littleriver, Calif., in place of P. W. Holmes, resigned.

Inga M. Cagle, Lost Hills, Calif., in place of M. M. Bunyard, retired.

COLORADO

Walter B. Lovelace, Boulder, Colo., in place of J. D. White, retired.

Emil G. Johnson, Durango, Colo., in place of S. C. Parker, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Arthur J. Cardin, Baltic, Conn., in place of L. A. Legros, retired.

FLORIDA

Stella S. Wester, Grand Ridge, Fla., in place of G. E. Lawrence, retired.

GEORGIA

William T. Webb, Douglasville, Ga., in place of C. A. Barfield, Jr., transferred.

HAWAII

Toshie Nagata, Mountainview, Hawaii, in place of Anna Durbenuick, retired.

ILLINOIS

Ernest Bickhaus, Jr., Quincy, Ill., in place of K. A. Elmore, retired.

INDIANA

Meredith G. Walker, Kirklin, Ind., in place of J. T. Stevenson, retired.

Robert L. Wilson, Jr., Ladoga, Ind., in place of J. H. Nelson, transferred.

George W. Moore, Modoc, Ind., in place of B. J. Bales, retired.

Doyle E. Rich, Monroe, Ind., in place of Adolph Hannie, retired.

Joy C. Stahl, Rome City, Ind., in place of T. J. Conley, deceased.

IOWA

George V. McQueen, Modale, Iowa, in place of P. M. Nelson, deceased.

George D. Lindflott, Northwood, Iowa, in place of E. O. Bottolfson, retired.

Edwin D. Lemberger, Ottumwa, Iowa, in place of R. L. Blankinship, retired.

Arlin E. Miller, Riverton, Iowa, in place of E. F. Cupp, retired.

Dean W. Breach, Sharpsburg, Iowa, in place of B. L. Beach, transferred.

Mima J. Chaloupka, Yale, Iowa, in place of D. L. Rundberg, retired.

Loren E. Norman, Zearing, Iowa, in place of D. H. Grimm, retired.

KANSAS

Frankie C. Sauer, Brownell, Kans., in place of H. M. Brundage, retired.

L. Walter Friesen, Inman, Kans., in place of J. C. Gaeddert, retired.

KENTUCKY

James V. O'Nan, Corydon, Ky., in place of S. C. Veatch, retired.

Frank W. Edwards, Danville, Ky., in place of F. M. Powell, retired.

Pauline A. Clift, Fredonia, Ky., in place of L. B. Young, retired.

LOUISIANA

Edward J. Vinyard, Ponchatoula, La., in place of C. W. Lavigne, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John F. Zaleski, Jr., Nabnasset, Mass., in place of E. G. MacLeod, retired.

MICHIGAN

Mae F. Hammond, Dowling, Mich., in place of Myra Wright, retired.

Wilma F. DeCamp, Nashville, Mich., in place of H. W. Wilson, deceased.

George W. Hanley, Sawyer, Mich., in place of J. P. Grynwich, resigned.

MISSOURI

Dorothea C. Betebenner, Alba, Mo., in place of Stella Crutcher, retired.

Arthur L. Jones, Amoret, Mo., in place of E. M. Word, deceased.

Henry J. Graf, Arnold, Mo., in place of R. C. Baum, transferred.

Kenneth C. Hitt, Gordonville, Mo., in place of H. G. Crader, transferred.

NEBRASKA

Orville W. Cumming, Hastings, Nebr., in place of E. L. Pounds, retired.

Charles W. Brokaw, Hebron, Nebr., in place of A. J. Nacke, retired.

Charlotte L. Keller, Rogers, Nebr., in place of L. T. Sumner, deceased.

NEVADA

Madge W. Green, Empire, Nev., in place of S. G. Walker, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roland A. Thibault, Greenville, N.H., in place of J. A. Desrosiers, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Dora Barbarotto, Buena, N.J., in place of Josephine Valdisseri, retired.

Louis E. Di Laura, Haskell, N.J., in place of Anthony De Staffen, retired.

NEW MEXICO

John T. Hough, Deming, N. Mex., in place of Otto Klaudt, retired.

Ray O. Harrison, Encino, N. Mex., in place of R. L. Romero, resigned.

Salomon L. Gonzales, Jr., Glorieta, N. Mex., in place of A. A. Robinson, retired.

Charlie G. Montoya, Jemez Springs, N. Mex., in place of B. M. Mann, retired.

NEW YORK

Hazel D Smith, Bliss, N.Y., in place of H. J. Smith, deceased.

Frederick C. Hofbauer, Bloomington, N.Y., of Mr. L. Murray, resigned.

John J. Constance, Chittenango, N.Y., in place of E. L. Coon, retired.

Anna M Phillips, Ellington, N.Y., in place of M. L. Murray, resigned.

Helen M. Russell, Hamden, N.Y., in place of C. L. Pampalone, retired.

Eathel E. Cafferty, Harpursville, N.Y., in place of L. A. Cafferty, retired.

Laura E. Maben, Jewett, N.Y., is place of N. E. Morse, retired.

Virginia M. DeZalia, North Hudson, N.Y., in place of G. L. Greenough, deceased.

Frances E. Rosenfield, Roslyn Heights, N.Y., in place of F. L. Miller, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

N. Eugene Carson, Bethel, N.C., in place of F. L. Andrews, Jr., deceased.

Paul P. Hinkle, Salisbury, N.C., in place of J. H. McKenzie, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harry T. Waite, Fairmount, N. Dak., in place of R. S. McConn, deceased.

OHIO

Roger K. Kraft, Mentor, Ohio, in place of G. F. Carver, retired.

Bernice R. Biddinger, Nova, Ohio, in place of D. V. Biddinger, retired.

OREGON

Charles D. Beck, Shedd, Oreg., in place of Valera McDonald, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jeanette R. St. Clair, Blairs Mills, Pa., in place of E. B. Kling, deceased.

Patricia E. Chynoweth, Davidsville, Pa., in place of C. R. Kring, retired.

J. Vernon Dixon, Everett, Pa., in place of H. F. Foreman, retired.

Lloyd M. Rowe, Jr., Greencastle, Pa., in place of A. R. Brumbaugh, retired.

Lorraine R. Thompson, Landenberg, Pa., in place of H. F. Sheehan, retired.

Francis J. McIntyre, Oxford, Pa., in place of M. J. Brown, deceased.

Thomas V. Simonetti, Susquehanna, Pa., in place of D. J. Scales, Jr., deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Roberto Vega-Matienzo, Luquillo, P.R., in place of C. M. Vallas, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Thomas H. Mellow, Jr., West Barrington, R.I., in place of W. F. Harkins, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Frederick W. Gaskins, Chesterfield, S.C., in place of Kirby Melton, deceased.

Mary S. Keels, Ridgeville, S.C., in place of G. H. Fogle, retired.

Robert A. Limehouse, Jr., Sommerville, S.C., in place of L. M. Blanchett, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jerome D. Prisbe, Roscoe, S. Dak. in place of Bernard Mayer, retired.

TENNESSEE

Billy T. Cash, Bradford, Tenn., in place of N. D. Guy, retired.

Robert L. Becton, Dyer, Tenn., in place of G. R. Canada, retired.

Dorothy B. Smiley, Lynnville, Tenn., in place of E. W. Blackburn, retired.

TEXAS

George S. Downing, Colmesneil, Tex., in place of M. E. Boyett, retired.

Clyde V. Barrington, Liberty Hill, Tex., in place of C. A. Shipp, retired.

Robert J. L. Pratka, Schulenburg, Tex., in place of W. A. Farek, retired.

VIRGINIA

Herbert D. Jones, Coeburn, Va., in place of R. G. Boatright, retired.

E. Chaisty Garrett, King William, Va., in place of D. R. Puller, retired.

Hubert H. Price, Luray, Va., in place of C. E. Beach, retired.

John D. Ripley, Jr., Lynchburg, Va., in place of O. K. Blackburne, retired.

Thomas R. Taylor, Saltville, Va., in place of A. F. Bennett, retired.

Arthur S. Horney, Speedwell, Va., in place of G. L. Copenhaver, retired.

WASHINGTON

Charles A. Moulton, Cosmopolis, Wash., in place of H. H. Holmes, retired.

Robert H. Plumb, Redmond, Wash., in place of R. E. Olney, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Doris L. Waugh, McConnell, W. Va., in place of Nellie Robinette, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Kenneth K. Kisow, Lake Mills, Wis., in place of F. M. Griswold, retired.

Emil W. Plain, Oconto Falls, Wis., in place of G. C. Flatley, resigned.

WYOMING

Fern L. Foster, Little America, Wyo. Office established October 26, 1963.

Dolores M. Robbins, Sunrise, Wyo., in place of R. A. Arbogast, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 143: 10: *Teach me to do Thy will, for Thou art my God: Thy spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art ever pouring out Thy spirit upon Thy people, we thank Thee for all those in every age who have opened their hearts to Thee, for men and women who have dreamed great dreams, seen great visions and who possessed courage to stand firm for what is right and good for all. For those who trust in truth amid lies; who stand for justice amid injustice; who walk in good ways amid evil times; who quietly work for brotherhood even when men are unbrotherly; who possess a vision of life with Thee at the center even when men deny Thy presence—we thank Thee, O God. By Thy spirit help us to be in the number of these great and good men: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 309. An act creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials;

S. 1312. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 2060. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 2287. An act to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula;

S. 2574. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended;

S. 2610. An act to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property; and

S. 3035. An act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes.

AUTHORITY FOR BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 15890, THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency, both the majority and the minority, may have until midnight tomorrow night to file their reports on H.R. 15890, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF RICHARD P. NATHAN AS A MINORITY EMPLOYEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 911

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, Richard P. Nathan is hereby designated a minority employee effective July 1, 1966 (to fill an existing vacancy), until otherwise ordered by the House, and shall receive compensation at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSED JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY LIBRARY AT CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a House joint resolution to extend express congressional approval and authorize immediate acceptance by the Government of the proposed John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library to be located at Cambridge, Mass. Introduction of this resolution follows referral to the Government Activities Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the report of the Administrator of General Services recommending acceptance of the library as a presidential archival depository under provisions of section 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act.

At the time similar reports were referred to Congress recommending acceptance of the Eisenhower and Johnson libraries and their designation as presidential archival depositories, the subcommittee took affirmative action rather than permit congressional approval to rest solely upon the fact that no negative action was taken during a period of 60 consecutive days of session, as provisions of section 507(f) of the Property Act requires.

Aside from affording members an opportunity to resolve any questions they may have concerning the library, hearings on the report and the resolution I have introduced today will permit a broader dissemination of information about this vitally important project—of interest to the many millions of people throughout the world who admired and respected the late President. The papers and other historical material of our Presidents are of priceless value to this and future generations. Generous offers such as the Government has received from the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Inc., merit immediate consideration and acceptance, as would be provided by the resolution I have introduced.

Upon transmittal of this resolution to the Government Activities Subcommittee, prompt hearings will be scheduled.

REQUEST TO HAVE THE DAV SPECIAL ORDER REPRINTED

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am having reprinted all the remarks of the various Congressmen which were made in the tribute to the Disabled American Veterans on the 34th anniversary of the granting of the congressional charter to that organization. I plan to have reprinted remarks made not only on June 16, the day of the special order, but also those made before and after that date which pertain to the anniversary of the DAV.

If any Member has any objections to the reprint, it is requested that he contact either my office or Mr. Raymond Noyes, Congressional Record Clerk. This statement is being made in order to comply with the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing for the reprinting of extracts from the Congressional Record.

PRECEDENT IS ESTABLISHED FOR SAVINGS IN MILITARY EXPENSES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the claim of Secretary of Defense McNamara yesterday that he has saved this country $4½ billion, and with tongue in cheek, I want to read a publicity release that was prepared by a few newsmen who will remain unidentified. The release is dated July 1, 1871. It is headed "Large Savings Achieved by Field Commander in West." It reads as follows:

[A news release of the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., No. 571-71, July 1, 1871]

Large Savings Achieved by Field Commander in West

Defense officials have lauded Gen. George Custer, commander of the 7th Cavalry, for his decision to save money by not taking the new Gatling guns into the field during his annual campaign in the Dakota Territories against the Blackfeet and Sioux.

Custer's decision is expected to save $1,760 in feed for horses to pull the wheeled Gatlings as well as $48.50 in additional maintenance if the new and delicate weapons were to be exposed to dust and field conditions.

RESOLUTION REQUIRING REPAYMENT OF WAR DEBTS BY FRANCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting a concurrent resolution which provides that the President should take such steps as may be necessary in order to require the Republic of France to make full and prompt settlement of World War I and other debts, owed to the United States. France is obligated to the United States on these debts in the amount of $6,580,932,495.57. No payments have been made since 1932. U.S. loans and military and economic aid to France, since World War II, have amounted to well over $7,500 million. If the United States is to maintain her position as the economic leader and stabilizer of the world, we cannot afford to operate on such a nonbusinesslike basis.

Actions and policies of the Republic of France, which are set forth in the resolution, clearly point out that France does not currently intend to settle these debts. One such action is the order that military facilities constructed by the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be removed from French soil. These facilities can be duplicated elsewhere only at very high cost.

Another example is the apparent intention of France to undermine the dollar. Since January 1962, she has withdrawn $2,369 million in gold from the United States. This is predicated on her "legal right" to do so, under a 1932 law, which took our own people off the gold standard, but allowed nations and bankers outside the United States to continue to demand gold.

Our World War II "moratorium pro tempore" on France's repayment schedule of World War I debts, as a friendly ally was also a factor.

When a nation we have helped to defend and rebuild does not see fit to honor and resume her long-term obligations to us, even in times of economic growth and stability, it seems readily apparent that we should take necessary action to insure full and prompt settlement with respect to past due accounts.

SCREW-WORM ERADICATION IN MEXICO

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14888) to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the first section of the Act of February 28, 1947 (61 Stat. 7) is amended by striking out in the first sentence 'or rinderpest', and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'rinderpest, or screw-worm'."
>
> SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 5. In carrying out this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with other public and private organizations and individuals."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, will the gentleman from Texas please explain for the benefit of the House the changes that were made in the House version by the Senate?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, the Senate struck out the word "or" and inserted a comma in lieu. In the second place, the Senate struck out the word "Section" and used the abbreviation "SEC." In the third place, the Senate divided our section 2 into two sections, creating a new section. That is all there is to it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I correct in understanding that the ranking Member on the minority side has cleared these changes with the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further; yes, he has and has discussed it with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO ALLOW AN INCENTIVE TAX CREDIT FOR COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR THE CONTROL OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 I introduced a measure, H.R. 16078, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years.

Pollution of our air and water resources is continuing at an alarming rate. Through cooperation of Federal, State, and local government bodies with private business and industrial enterprise, air and water pollution control facilities can be constructed to prevent further pollution of these resources.

The money expended by private enterprise for the construction of these costly facilities is an investment in nonproductive facilities, primarily in the public interest, requiring high, nonproductive operating costs which will be continuing charges against future earnings.

The most efficient way to encourage this kind of investment would seem to be by means of tax credit, rather than Federal grant. The necessary legislation to require pollution abatement facilities to meet local, State, and Federal standards is already on the books, and many industries have indicated their eagerness to tackle this problem.

A tax credit arrangement would enable them to do so promptly without having to wait for the availability of funds from Government grants. Such an arrangement would also eliminate costly administrative redtape, implicit in any Federal grant program.

I feel there is a very definite need for legislation of this nature, and it is my hope that hearings can be held on H.R. 16078 before Congress adjourns.

ARMED FORCES AIR TRANSPORTATION SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I, like many other Members of the House, was caught by the airline strike last Saturday. I was in Colorado Springs. I called the Air Force to see if they might have a plane going back to Washington, which they said they did. But I was not eligible to ride on it. If I was an Active Reserve officer in any branch of the armed services, I could ride on it.

I am a former officer having spent 5 years in the navy in World War II, but I am not a member of the Active Reserve so I was not given permission to ride on that airplane. I had to bother my committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] at his home in Texas who, in turn, called some general in the Pentagon and they did get permission for me to get on this plane.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Members of Congress should have the right to travel on military air transports on a space available basis just as members of the Reserve in the various branches of our armed services. I know that there have been abuses of congressional junkets, but it seems to me that we, the 535 Members of the Congress should have the privilege of riding on military transport facilities on a space available basis if we have a legitimate need for transportation.

NATIONAL WONDER: PERMIT DESTRUCTION OF GRAND CANYON WHILE SPENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO PRESERVE ANCIENT RUINS IN EGYPT?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as more newspapermen become aware of the move to destroy the natural state of the Grand Canyon, protests are growing around the Nation.

As early as May 17, "The Daily Pantagraph," Bloomington, Ill., whose president and publisher is Mr. Loring Merwin, published a stirring editorial that promoters of Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams would find impossible to answer. It requires no further comment. I ask that it appear herewith in the RECORD for your assiduous perusal:

[From the Daily Pantagraph, May 17, 1966]

WHY RUIN NATIONAL WONDER?

The United States is spending millions of dollars on a project to preserve some of the ancient architecture and ruins which would otherwise be inundated with the completion of the Aswan Dam in Egypt.

It is a paradox that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and interested groups are pressing so hard to get a bill through Congress calling for construction of two dams on the Colorado River which would destroy much of the natural beauty of the Grand Canyon.

One of these, the Bridge Canyon Dam, would create a reservoir nearly 100 miles long flooding the full length of the Grand Canyon National Monument and 13 miles into the Grand Canyon.

The other, Marble Gorge Dam, upstream from the Grand Canyon National Park, would flood some of the most beautiful areas of the Grand Canyon. It also would make possible another project, the Kanab Diversion Project, which would leave the river through much of the park a dry ditch.

All this is proposed in the name of the Central Arizona Project devised to provide water for dry areas. Actually the dams are proposed primarily for the creation of electricity which, in turn, would be sold to justify other phases of the water project.

Richard C. Bradley of Colorado University and many other opponents of these dams contend that the proposed generating facilities at these dams would not be economically feasible for long because of rapid development of other sources of fuel for producing electricity.

They also are pressing for legislation to protect the Grand Canyon area from further encroachment. The Bureau of the Budget has recommended deferment of at least Bridge Canyon Dam pending additional study. This gives conservationists some time to act.

We urge citizens to protest this planned destruction of one of the world's natural wonders by writing their Congressmen.

Other means to provide water and to generate electricity must and can be found.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 158]

Abbitt
Bandstra
Baring
Bell
Callaway
Celler
Clark
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Delaney
Downing
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Farnum
Findley
Flynt
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Helstoski
Herlong
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Laird
Landrum
McCarthy
McFall
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Mink
Moore
Morris
Morse
Murray
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
St Germain
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Whitten
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—MILITARY PAY INCREASE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2950) "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk began the reading of the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1679)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: for the Army, $612,400,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,434,200,000, of which amount $12,000,000 is authorized only for additional aircraft and electronic equipment to be used for expanded airborne television transmission capabilities; for the Air Force, $4,041,300,000, of which amount $55,000,000 is authorized only for procurement of, or for maintaining a production capability for, the F-12 aircraft, and $25,000,000 is authoribed only for the procurement of CX-2 aircraft.

Missiles

For missiles: for the Army, $510,000,000, of which amount $153,500,000 is authorized only for preproduction activities for the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system; for the Navy, $367,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $17,700,000; for the Air Force, $1,189,500,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: for the Navy, $1,901,800,000, of which amount $130,500,000 is authorized only for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37; and $20,000,000 is authorized only for the procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear powered guided missile frigate. The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37, and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1967, shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest.

Tracked combat vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, $359,200,000; for the Marine Corps, $3,700,000.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1967 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $1,539,500,000, of which amount $431,400,000 is authorized only for continued research, development, test, and evaluation, and research, development, and tests related to preproduction activities on the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,801,100,000, of which amount $26,600,000 is authorized only for the research, development, test and evaluation of the medium-range guided missile CONDOR and $5,000,000 is authorized only for research, development, test and evaluation related to the Deep Submergence Program, giving due regard in all such research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American Merchant Marine;

For the Air Force, $3,118,600,000, of which amount $22,800,000 is authorized only for research and development related to the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft and $200,000,000 is authorized only for research and development related to the Manned Orbiting Laboratory; and

For Defense Agencies, $459,059,000.

SEC. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1967 for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto, $125,000,000.

TITLE III—PAY OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

SEC. 301. Section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10[1]	$1, 424. 10	$1, 474. 50	$1, 474. 50	$1, 474. 50	$1, 474. 50	$1, 530. 60	$1, 530. 60	$1, 648. 20	$1, 648. 20	$1, 766. 10	$1, 766. 10	$1, 883. 70	$1, 883. 70	$2, 001. 60	$2, 001. 60
O-9	1, 262. 10	1, 295. 10	1, 323. 30	1, 323. 30	1, 323. 30	1, 356. 60	1, 356. 60	1, 412. 70	1, 412. 70	1, 530. 60	1, 530. 60	1, 648. 20	1, 648. 20	1, 766. 10	1, 766. 10
O-8	1, 143. 30	1, 177. 50	1, 205. 40	1, 205. 40	1, 205. 40	1, 295. 10	1, 295. 10	1, 356. 60	1, 356. 60	1, 412. 70	1, 474. 50	1, 530. 60	1, 592. 40	1, 592. 40	1, 592. 40
O-7	949. 80	1, 014. 90	1, 014. 90	1, 014. 90	1, 059. 90	1, 059. 90	1, 121. 40	1, 121. 40	1, 177. 50	1, 295. 10	1, 384. 80	1, 384. 80	1, 384. 80	1, 384. 80	1, 384. 80
O-6	703. 80	773. 70	824. 10	824. 10	824. 10	824. 10	824. 10	824. 10	852. 30	986. 70	1, 037. 10	1, 059. 90	1, 121. 40	1, 216. 50	1, 216. 50
O-5	562. 80	661. 50	706. 50	706. 50	706. 50	706. 50	728. 70	767. 70	818. 70	880. 20	930. 60	958. 50	992. 40	992. 40	992. 40
O-4	474. 90	577. 80	616. 80	616. 80	627. 90	656. 10	700. 50	739. 80	773. 70	807. 30	829. 80	829. 80	829. 80	829. 80	829. 80
O-3[2]	441. 60	493. 20	526. 80	583. 20	611. 10	633. 30	667. 20	700. 50	717. 60	717. 60	717. 60	717. 60	717. 60	717. 60	717. 60
O-2[2]	353. 70	420. 30	504. 60	521. 40	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50	532. 50
O-1[2]	303. 90	336. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30	420. 30

Footnotes at end of tables.

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN CREDITED WITH OVER 4 YEARS' ACTIVE SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205											
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	$583.20	$611.10	$633.30	$667.20	$700.50	$728.70	$728.70	$728.70	$728.70	$728.70	$728.70	$728.70
O-2	521.40	532.50	549.30	577.80	600.00	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80	616.80
O-1	420.30	448.50	465.30	482.10	498.90	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40	521.40

"WARRANT OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$449.40	$482.10	$482.10	$493.20	$515.70	$538.20	$560.40	$600.00	$627.90	$650.40	$667.20	$689.40	$712.20	$767.70	$767.70
W-3	408.60	443.10	443.10	448.50	454.20	487.50	515.70	532.50	549.30	565.80	583.20	605.70	627.90	650.40	650.40
W-2	357.60	387.00	387.00	398.10	420.30	443.10	459.90	476.40	493.20	510.30	526.80	543.60	565.80	565.80	565.80
W-1	298.20	342.00	342.00	370.20	387.00	403.80	420.30	437.40	454.20	471.00	487.50	504.60	504.60	504.60	504.60

"ENLISTED MEMBERS

"Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$510.60	$522.30	$534.30	$546.00	$558.00	$569.40	$599.10	$657.30	$657.30
E-8	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$428.40	440.40	452.10	463.80	475.50	487.20	499.20	528.60	587.10	587.10
E-7	$269.40	$322.80	$334.80	$346.50	$358.20	369.60	381.30	393.60	411.00	422.70	434.40	440.40	469.80	528.60	528.60
E-6	232.20	281.70	293.40	305.40	317.40	328.80	340.50	358.20	369.60	381.30	387.60	387.60	387.60	387.60	387.60
E-5	200.40	246.90	258.60	270.00	287.70	299.40	311.10	322.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80	328.80
E-4	168.60	211.50	222.90	240.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60	252.60
E-3	121.80	170.10	182.10	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80	193.80
E-2	100.50	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00	141.00
E-1	96.90	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00	129.00
E-1 (under 4 months)	90.60	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

"[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $2,208.60 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

"[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member."

SEC. 302. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who was entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on the day before the effective date of this title, shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day plus an increase of 3.2 per centum in the total of his pay and allowances:

(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224). After the effective date of this title, no increase in the basic pay or any of the allowances of members of the uniformed services on active duty shall increase the basic pay or any of the allowances of a member covered by the preceding provisions of this section.

SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member or former member of a uniformed service who initially becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the effective date of this title shall be entitled to have that pay computed using the rates of basic pay prescribed by the first section of this title.

SEC. 304. This title becomes effective July 1, 1966, or the first day of the month in which increases in the rates of compensation under the General Schedule of pay provided in section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), become effective pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1966, whichever is later.

TITLE IV—WEAPONS SYSTEMS

SEC. 401. Section 125(c) of title 10, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "However, notwithstanding any other provision of this title or any other law, the Secretary of Defense shall not direct or approve a plan to initiate or effect a substantial reduction or elimination of a major weapons system until the Secretary of Defense has reported all the pertinent details of the proposed action to the Congress of the United States while the Congress is in session.

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Managers on the Part of the House.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

PROCUREMENT

Navy (aircraft)

The House modified the aircraft portion of the Navy program by adding $20,000,000 for additional aircraft and electronic equipment for expanded airborne broadcasting facilities.

The creation of airborne broadcasting capabilities through Project Jenny was initiated by the Department of Defense under conditions demanding operational readiness in minimum time. Presently this project makes possible a Vietnamese television network considered by military and political leaders of South Vietnam and the United States to be of great importance to the success of efforts to achieve a stable, unified, secure and free nation. The urgent nature of Project Jenny's origination necessitated the utilization of available resources. A vehicle was needed large enough to house television transmitting and programing devices for two channels, AM and FM broadcast facilities, equipment for single or multichannel teletypewriter operations and other capabilities of a classified nature. The aircraft located and selected was the C–121 Superconstellation.

However, although the two C–121 aircraft, which bear the designation "Blue Eagle," now on station have, on their own terms, performed satisfactorily, due in part to some ingenious makeshift modifications, other restrictions imposed by this airframe tend to downgrade the ability to exploit fully the potential of television in South Vietnam. What is required for optimum performance is an airframe that is not severely weight limited, that possesses the speed and altitude capabilities for flexibility in operation, and sufficient range to allow basing in an area of known security. The Vietcong mortar attack in April of this year on Tan Son Nhut Airbase, partly directed at the Blue Eagle aircraft, resulted in the near total destruction of one of them and required a curtailment in broadcasting from a 7- to a 5-day-a-week schedule for several weeks. Ground transmitting facilities, whenever they may be ready, will in all probability be faced with the same danger.

It is imperative that there should be no disruption in broadcasting schedules and that coverage and programing time be greatly extended. The psychological implications of a failure to maintain broadcasting schedules might well contribute to a demoralization of the support of efforts to defeat the Vietcong. To insure a minimum number of hours of broadcasting daily, P3A Orion aircraft are required. This airframe possesses the capability to operate from a remote area (for example, in the Philippines) and at the same time permits the aircraft to be on station in South Vietnam for a minimum of 7 hours. The turbojet engines of the P3A greatly reduce the vibration and noise which are concomitant with the C-121 reciprocating type, and which have necessitated special modifications to secure acceptable broadcast quality. The P3A can operate at altitudes in the neighborhood of 30,000 feet as opposed to the C-121 maximum of 16,000 feet. This increase in altitude would increase the effective area of broadcast by a factor of 3 or 4.

The conferees agreed that through the utilization of some P3A aircraft now in the inventory it would be possible to achieve the results desired by the authorization of a lesser sum. The conferees agreed that authorization in the amount of $12,000,000 should be granted.

The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Air Force (aircraft)

The House modified the aircraft portion of the Air Force program by the addition of $51,200,000 for 13 CX-2 aeromedical evacuation aircraft.

The subject of aeromedical evacuation of sick and injured members of the Armed Forces has long been one of special interest. It was a matter of disappointment, therefore, to find that no provision had been made in the budget request for fiscal year 1967 for the procurement of modern jet aircraft for the aeromedical evacuation mission.

It appears from the testimony before the House committee that the requirement to modernize the aeromedical evacuation fleet is fully recognized within the Department of Defense and that the failure to request fund authorization for this program was purely a budgetary consideration. With the brave men of our Armed Forces fighting and dying in southeast Asia, it is urgent that expeditious action be taken to insure that our aeromedical evacuation fleet is the best available.

Since the conferees agreed that through the utilization of the best of those aircraft now engaged in aeromedical evacuation and the procurement of modern jet aircraft the purposes of the House amendment could be appropriately achieved.

Accordingly, the conferees agreed that $25,000,000 be authorized to be applied toward the procurement of these aircraft.

The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Navy (naval vessels)

Both the House and the Senate modified the naval shipbuilding program. The Senate added one nuclear-powered guided missile frigate (DLGN) at a cost of $150,000,000. The Senate also deleted two conventionally powered guided missile detroyers (DDG's) at a cost of $145,100,000.

The House extended the authority for a guided missile frigate authorized last year in the amount of $150,500,000, against which authorization and appropriation in the amount of $20,000,000 was made. The extension of the authority, therefore, was in the amount of $130,500,000; the House also added a new nuclear-powered guided missile frigate in the amount of $127,800,000 for a total of $258,300,000. The House further permitted the two conventionally powered guided missile detroyers (DDG's) to remain in the program.

The conferees agreed to the House's extension of authority for last year's DLGN in the amount of $130,500,000 and to the retention in the program of the two DDG's in the amount of $145,100,000.

The conferees also agreed that authorization in the amount of $20,000,000 should be granted for long leadtime items for an additional nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

The conferees further agreed to a modification in the language relating to the order of priority of construction of the nuclear powered vessel and the conventionally powered vessels. The agreed language reads as follows:

"For Naval Vessels: for the Navy, $1,901,800,000, of which amount $130,500,000 is authorized only for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37; and $20,000,000 is authorized only for the procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear powered guided missile frigate. The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37 and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during Fiscal Year 1967 shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest."

The Senate recedes with an amendment.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

The bill passed by the Senate increased the Department of Defense R.D.T. & E. authorization by $9.8 million. An increase of $14.4 million in research and development for the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system was partially offset by a reduction of $4.6 million for a classified Army project for which the Congress has twice declined to grant necessary construction authorization.

The bill passed by the House increased the R.D.T. & E. authorization for the Department of Defense by $373.2 million. The bill as reported from the conference committee is $235.3 million less than the House bill, $128.1 million more than the Senate bill, and $137.9 million more than the budget request submitted by the Department of Defense.

The amount in the House bill reflected increases to some 48 research and development projects, ranging from $1 million to $80 million. The Senate bill reflected changes only to two projects, NIKE-X increased by $14.4 million, and the reduction of $4.6 million from a classified research project. The House recedes and accepts the Senate reduction of $4.6 million.

Army

The bill passed by the House contained restrictive language for the entire amount authorized for the NIKE-X, $431,400,000. The Senate bill contained restrictive language only for the increased amount authorized for NIKE-X research and development, $14.4 million.

The Senate recedes.

The House increased the Army R.D.T. & E. authorization for other projects by $48.4 million. The conference committee agreed on increases totaling $10.8 million, to be applied to the Heavy Lift Helicopter program and the Advanced Aerial Fire Support System (AAFSS). The amount authorized for Army R.D.T. & E. is $1,539,500,000.

The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Navy

The House increased the amount authorized for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation by $142.7 million and inserted language restricting $26.6 million to the medium-range guided missile CONDOR and $8.6 million for the deep submergence program. The conference committee agreed on a total increase of $52.5 million. The Senate agreed to accept the restrictive language and amount applicable to the CONDOR missile and $5 million of the $8.6 million earmarked for the deep submergence program. The amount authorized for Navy R.D.T. & E. is $1,801,100,000.

The Senate recedes with an amendment.

In addition, the House bill was amended to give due regard in Navy research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American merchant marine. The Senate agreed to accept the amendment.

Air Force

The House increased the Air Force R.D.T. & E. authorization by $167.7 million and restricted $22.8 million to be used only for research and development related to the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft and $230 million to be used only for research and development related to the Manned Orbiting Laboratory. The Senate agreed to the restrictive language and amount for the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft. The conference committee agreed on $200 million for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory. Thus the House recedes on $30 million authorized for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory. The conference committee agreed on a net increase of $64.8 million to the Air Force R.D.T. & E. budget, to be allocated $50 million for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, $3 million for V/STOL aircraft technology, and $11.8 million for the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA). The amount authorized for the Air Force R.D.T. & E. is $3,118,600,000.

The Senate recedes with an amendment.

PAY OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Title III of S. 2950 as amended by the House provided an increase in the basic pay of uniformed services personnel amounting to 3.2 percent effective July 1, 1966. The bill, as passed by the Senate, contained no provision relating to uniformed services pay.

The conferees unanimously endorsed the House amendment with the following modifications.

1. In each military pay act beginning in 1958, and thereafter, there has been included a provision that officers entitled to pay and allowances under certain specified acts would continue to receive the pay and allowances to which they were entitled before the new act became effective. In other words, these officers paid under special acts of Congress were excluded from any pay increase or pay adjustment since 1955. The officers affected are Gen. Omar Bradley, Gen. Carl Spaatz, Adm. Raymond Spruance, and Gen. Alexander Vandergrift, whose pay was authorized by one of the following acts:

1. The act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).
2. The act of June 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 1052).
3. The act of September 18, 1950 (Private Law 957, 81st Cong.).

The House amendment therefore, by omission, would have, if enacted into law, authorized these officers to recompute their pay and allowances on the basis of existing law as modified by the language in title III.

The Senate conferees acknowledged that these officers merited an adjustment in their authorized compensation but were of the opinion that it should be restricted to a 3.2 percent increase. The House conferees receded from their position and accepted this change in the language of the bill.

2. Title III, as included by the House in S. 2950, would have established an effective date of July 1, 1966. The Senate conferees believe that our uniformed services personnel should receive an adjustment in their compensation at the same time as one is provided classified Federal employees. Therefore, the Senate conferees insisted that the language of title III relating to its effective date be modified to provide that the effective date of the uniformed services pay adjustment would be July 1, 1966, or the first day of such month in which the compensation of Federal employees paid under the classification act is increased, whichever is the later.

The House conferees receded from their position and accepted the Senate amendment.

The House recedes with an amendment.

WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Title IV of S. 2950, as amended by the House, contained a recommended amendment to that portion of the National Security Act now codified as section 125(c) of title 10, United States Code. The amendment was designed to incorporate the objectives recommended by an Armed Services Subcommittee resulting from its exhaustive inquiry into the Department of Defense's decision to phase out certain types of manned bombers in the Strategic Air Command.

The House amendment would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress all the pertinent details regarding any substantial phaseout or elimination of a major weapons system before such action could be initiated or effected by the Department of Defense.

The House language also required that the Congress, through its respective Committees on Armed Services, would within 90 days thereafter advise the Secretary of Defense as to the recommendation, of those committees on the proposed departmental action. The bill, S. 2950 as passed by the Senate, contained no similar language.

The House and Senate conferees were unanimously in accord with the objectives of the language contained in title IV as included by the House. However, the Senate conferees were of the opinion that the proposed statutory requirement that the respective Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate advise the Secretary of Defense of their recommendations on the proposed departmental action was unnecessary. In view of the position of the Senate conferees on this portion of the language in title IV, the House conferees receded from their position and agreed to delete the last sentence from the language contained in title IV of S. 2950 as amended by the House.

The remaining language in title IV, as unanimously approved by the conferees, therefore, reads as follows:

> However, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, the Secretary of Defense shall not direct or approve a plan to initiate or effect a substantial reduction or elimination of a major weapons system until the Secretary of Defense has reported all the pertinent details of the proposed action to the Congress of the United States while the Congress is in session.

The House recedes with an amendment.

SUMMARY

The bill as presented to the Congress by the President totaled $16,926,959,000 (of which $6,905,359,000 was for research, development, test, and evaluation). The bill as it passed the House totaled $17,858,059,000 (of which $7,278,559,000 was R.D.T. & E.). The bill as it passed the Senate totaled $17,170,059,000 (of which $6,915,159,000 was for R.D.T. & E.).

The bill as agreed to in conference totals $17,480,759,000 (of which $7,043,259,000 is for R.D.T. & E.).

The agreement arrived at by the conferees is $377,300,000 less than the bill as it passed the House, $310,700,000 more than the bill as it passed the Senate, and is $553,800,000 more than the bill as it was presented to the Congress by the President.

L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
F. Edward Hébert,
Melvin Price,
William H. Bates,
Leslie C. Arends,
Alvin E. O'Konski,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the conference report has been printed, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the statement on the part of the managers of the House.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] 30 minutes and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I will give the Members of the House as accurately as I can exactly what happened in the conference on the bill, S. 2950.

We had $20 million for television and communications aircraft for Saigon. The conferees agreed on $12 million.

We had $51.2 million for aeromedical evacuation airplanes. The conferees agreed on $25 million.

We had two nuclear powered guided missile frigates—one at $130.5 million and the other at $127.8 million.

For the benefit of my colleagues who do not know what a frigate is, Mr. Speaker, it is something like a light cruiser of the type used in World War I and World War II.

The conferees agreed on the first of these DLGN's and also agreed on $20 million for long leadtime items for the second DLGN.

So we got what was in our opinion a very good compromise.

There has been a lot of discussion and a lot of misinformation circulating about the language in the bill which would insure the building of the DLGN. We arrived at an agreement with the Senate that is wholly satisfactory to the House conferees since it carries out the basic concept of indicating to the executive branch that we mean what we say about building a nuclear surface Navy. The language we agreed on is this:

> The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37, and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1967, shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest.

The Constitution does not mention the Secretary of Defense.

The Constitution mentions the Congress and the President of the United States. We have come to the conclusion that it is useless to mention anyone but those whom the Constitution mandates to create your military, and to be the Commander in Chief thereof. Therefore, we think we have arrived at a better, a more reasonable and positive constitutional understanding on this question. I shall have something further to say on that subject later.

At this point, I would like to draw particular attention to the fact that there is an error, Mr. Gross, in the statement of the managers. I shall ask that the Record be corrected in this regard. The error was made by our staff because we are under such pressures. It is understandable. But it appears in the statement of the managers, and not in the bill, as it was agreed to in the conference. It appears only in the statement of the managers.

I think the Record should show, and in any event I believe I owe to the House, an explanation both of the error itself and of the manner in which it came about.

As I have previously indicated, the principal matter in discussion after the first of the three conferences with the Senate was the matter of the language stressing to the executive branch that we do, indeed, insist on a nuclear surface navy. And I have the backing of the giants in this.

The staff at my direction prepared a number of versions of language to effectuate this purpose. Among these language variations was the one which now appears in the statement of the managers. At the time it was prepared, the Appropriations Committee had not come out with its report. In the belief that the Appropriations Committee would recommend money for the two conventionally powered destroyers, the staff prepared the language now appearing in the statement of the managers and had a confidential committee print of the conference report made.

During the period over which the conference with the Senate extended, however, the Appropriations Committee did come out with its report. It indicated that no money was being recommended for the conventionally powered destroyers. This, of course, made the language in the statement of the managers referring to a "contracting sequence" as between nuclear powered and conventionally powered ships no longer pertinent. As a matter of fact, from the moment that the Appropriations Committee report came out, the language now appearing in the statement of the managers had no real validity.

Another version of the language was drafted which was agreed to by the Senate—stronger language—in my opinion; that is the language which appears in the conference report—the reprinting of the whole bill.

The staff then inserted the agreed upon language in the conference report.

The two DDG's which I referred to a moment ago were in the program as submitted to the Congress. The Senate cut them out and we managed in conference to put them back in the bill.

I still feel that the authority for these two destroyers should remain in the program regardless of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has not seen fit to recommend funds for their construction. It is quite possible that an immediate and urgent need for these ships might arise in the reasonably near future and if there was at that time a supplemental appropriation, the authority for their construction would exist. They could go ahead in an orderly fashion and the construction could begin.

Now, on the research and development portion of the bill, the House in its action added $373.2 million to the budget submitted by the Department of Defense.

The Senate added $9.8 million, for a difference between the two bills of $363.4 million. The House receded on $225.5 million and the Senate receded on $137.9 million. I will break this down further by the military services.

For the Army, the House had added $62.8 million, including the $14.4 million for Nike-X. The conferees agreed on a net add-on of $20.6 million for the Army, including the $14.4 million for the Nike-X. The balance of the add-on would be applied to the advanced aerial fire support system and the heavy lift helicopter program of the Army.

For the Navy, the House added $142.7 million and earmarked $26.6 million of that for the Condor air-to-surface guided missile, and $8.6 million for the deep submergence program. The balance of the funds added were distributed among 27 other research and development projects. In conference, the amount was reduced to $52.5 million over the budget submitted by the Department of Defense. The deep submergence program was limited to a $5 million add-on, and the Condor missile received the full amount added by the House. For the Navy, the House receded on $90.2 million; the Senate receded on $52.5 million.

For the Air Force, the House added $167.7 million above the defense budget and the Senate made no change. The funds added by the House were to support the manned orbiting laboratory, with an additional $80 million requested by the Air Force; the advanced manned strategic aircraft, $11.8 million—that is the one which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] recently handled with such great distinction and great knowledge. In his interest to save money, the Secretary of Defense took this out. We think it is a serious mistake and it cuts at the heart of our defense system, and we will have no part of it. We put that in, and it stayed in. Additional funds were authorized for the F-111A, V/Stol aircraft technology—rapid response research and development for southeast Asia, and management and support. The conferees agreed on $50 million additional for the manned orbiting laboratory, $3 million for the V/Stol aircraft technology program, and the $11.8 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, which I just mentioned, is for the follow-on for the B-52. We not only think, we know that the F-111 is not the answer. The F-111 is not the follow-on for the B-52. We think as the Joint Chiefs of Staff think, that the F-111 is an interim plane. We want the follow-on, for the natural projection of the state of the art.

We do not believe that any man regardless of his capability can, through technical knowledge, clairvoyance, or in any other way project the true future of the airplane.

If such a man is living today, he is the first one who has ever lived. Anybody today who says we can have a jack-of-all-trades airplane, simply does not know what he is talking about. No man has ever lived, or is living today, can produce a jack-of-all-trades airplane.

Thus, the House receded on $102.9 million and the Senate receded on $64.8 million. The Senate also agreed to the restrictive language in the House bill relating to the advanced manned strategic aircraft and the manned orbiting laboratory.

In summary, the important and high priority projects for which funds were added by the House remained in the bill, some with no change and others with minor dollar changes. To identify those high priority projects, I will read them again.

They are the Nike-X antiballistic missile program for the Army, the deep submergence program and the Condor air to surface missile for the Navy, the advanced manned strategic aircraft, the manned orbiting laboratory, and the vertical and short takeoff and landing—V/STOL—aircraft technology program for the Air Force.

The research and development portion of the bill, as agreed to in the conference, is $137.9 million above the budget request submitted by the Department of Defense and is $235.3 million less than that previously authorized by the House.

Next is title IV, weapons systems.

One other relatively minor difference between the House and Senate bills was the section dealing with the Congress being informed by the Secretary of Defense before any major weapons system is eliminated or substantially reduced.

We simply do not believe it is wise for one of us to pick up a newspaper some morning and read that the Secretary of Defense has decided to abolish the Polaris program. We do not think that is good business. We are going to do something about it, with your help.

This requirement was completely agreed to by the conferees, and the only change—which, as I say, is a minor one—was the elimination of the 90-day period within which the House and Senate Armed Services Committees would advise the Secretary of Defense as to what they thought about the proposed action—90 days did not amount to anything at all. We were glad to knock it out. The time period did not lend anything substantial to the underlying idea, and Members can be sure that the House Armed Services Committee will most certainly tell the Secretary of Defense what it thinks of his plans to eliminate or to reduce any future major weapons system.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force did not have much knowledge of it, when it was decided the B-58 was to be eliminated. We do not believe that is good business. We believe that no man should exercise that kind of power. It is too much power for a good man to want and certainly more power than a bad man should have, if one there be.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am proud and happy, and the conferees are, that our pay raise for the armed services was agreed on in the conference. Believe me when I say that this is a matter of deep personal gratification to me and to the great committee which I have the honor to head. We are going to insure that pay raise of 3.2 percent, the effective date to be the same as the civil service and the annual postal raise which comes up just about every year.

We believe that the boys living and dying for America should have the same consideration.

Let me state, Mr. Speaker, how strong the insistence of the Armed Services Committee is as to a nuclear Navy.

The father of our Navy, the immortal Carl Vinson, wrote to me the other day. He said:

> Now Mendel, let me congratulate you on the splendid and superb manner you handled "412."

That is this bill.

> I hope the Senate will go along with you. You might have to make some compromise but, at least, go to conference with the determination that the House is behind you and that your position, and that of the committee, is to the best interest of national defense.

Carl Vinson is the father of this Navy. He says we need a nuclear navy. He ought to know what he is talking about.

Moreover, some time ago I went to see Mr. Vinson.

He said:

> Lay down a long-term program for your Navy. I did this in the 30's over the objection of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This is the only way you will get a nuclear Navy. The great work done by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] and his magnificent Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was of invaluable help to us. We are fortunate on our own committee to have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] as members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, we need a nuclear Navy. We need a nuclear Navy, and we had better get it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to get a well-rounded picture of just what we mean by a nuclear Navy, what its great advantages are, and what many of our outstanding naval officers say about the need for a nuclear Navy, I would like to insert in its entirety at this point an article from Navy magazine of July 1966. In actuality, this article is an important portion of our committee report on this bill:

> The issue before Congress is very simple—do we start now to have all-nuclear task forces?
>
> The attack carrier is our prime naval attack weapon. It provides a movable platform from which to launch airplanes wherever they may be needed. With the British decision not to defend east of Suez, the French decision to pull out of NATO and to have all foreign troops withdrawn from French soil, and with the increasing problems with rights of overflight, we must be able to operate attack carrier task forces anywhere.
>
> The nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier has proven so far more effective in battle that the Department of Defense has requested one new nuclear-powered carrier this year at a cost of $427.5 million and is planning for other new nuclear carriers. The nuclear carrier has a complement of

about 6,000 officers and men. With its air wing of about 100 planes, its initial total capital cost is about $1 billion.

At least four escort ships are assigned to each aircraft carrier to protect it against any air or submarine attack. The initial capital cost of the four escort ships is about $500 million if they are nuclear powered and $300 million if they are conventionally powered; however, the cost of the nuclear-powered ships includes the first cores which provide power for at least 10 years, and also extra armament. The cost of conventionally powered ships does not include the cost of fuel or fuel delivery. When all costs are considered the difference in building and operating a nuclear-powered task force over a conventionally powered task force with the same type ships is only about 6 percent over their entire lifetime.

SOVIET SUBMARINES

As reported in the newspapers, the Soviets now have about 45 nuclear submarines which have unlimited attack range and are building more. Only nuclear-powered escort ships can give unlimited chase to any nuclear-powered submarine without having to abandon the chase for refueling.

Substituting conventionally powered escorts for nuclear-powered escorts does not in any way meet the problem of protecting the attack aircraft carrier against the unlimited attack range of a nuclear-powered submarine. Nor do they provide the continuous screen for the carrier.

It is foolhardy not to provide the best protection for the 6,000 man crew and the initial $1 billion unit capital investment in a nuclear-powered carrier by not spending the additional 4 percent to make the entire task force nuclear powered.

A nuclear-powered task force that is free of the black oil logistics train can travel anywhere around the world on a moments notice without refueling and can arrive ready for immediate operations. This freedom from the logistics train for black oil can be followed by new methods of replenishing ammunition and food so that the task force is less and less dependent on any logistics train. This possibility can open up new tactics which are flexible to meet peculiarities of any individual situation. As the Chief of Naval Operations stated in his memorandum of April 14, 1966, to the Secretary of the Navy:

"The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security."

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee has authorized a new nuclear frigate and reauthorized the nuclear frigate of last year. It has retained the two conventional guided missile destroyers which can be used as escorts for the John F. Kennedy and the America. Following language of authorization laws for the Atomic Energy Commission, it has provided that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering and construction of the two nuclear frigates as soon as practicable.

Each conventional destroyer, DDG, would be 515 feet long and would displace 7,600 tons.

Each nuclear destroyer, DDGN, would be 545 feet long and would displace 8,600 tons.

Each nuclear-powered frigate, DLGN, would be 570 feet long and would displace 10,000 tons.

The estimated construction cost of a nuclear frigate (DLGN) in fiscal year 1967 would be $138.5 million plus $12 million for the initial nuclear fuel, making a total of $150.5 million. The estimated cost of a first-of-a-class conventional frigate (DLG) with the same military weapons and electronics is $98 million. The estimated construction cost of a follow DLGN is $115.8 million plus $12 million for initial nuclear fuel; a follow conventional DLG is estimated to cost $76.7 million.

A conventional DLG requires about 2.1 million barrels of Navy special fuel oil (NSFO) to perform the same operations that the DLGN will perform with its initial nuclear cores. This quantity of oil costs $5.2 million not including the cost of delivery of the oil to the ship which would cost an additional $11.6 million.

The average annual construction and operating cost for the DLGN is about 20 per cent higher than that of a conventional DLG.

When the overall cost of a conventional task group is considered, the differential annual cost to provide nuclear power in a frigate is found to be about 1 percent.

The committee agrees with Admiral McDonald's statement that: "The overall increase in task group effectiveness would be much greater than this."

LONG-TERM

The estimated construction cost of a nuclear destroyer (DDGN) in fiscal year 1967 would be $127.1 million plus $12 million for the initial nuclear fuel, making a total of $139.1 million. The estimated cost of a first-of-a-class conventional destroyer (DDG) with the same weapons and electronics is $84.1 million.

The estimated cost of a follow DDGN is $104 million plus $12 million for initial nuclear fuel; a follow DDG is estimated to cost $61 million. The DDG requires about 2.4 million barrels of NSFO to perform the same operations that the DDGN will perform with its initial nuclear cores. This amount of oil costs $6 million, not including the cost of delivery of the NSFO to the ship which would cost an additional $13 million.

The average annual construction and operating cost for the DDGN is about 25 percent higher than that of a conventional DDG. When the overall cost of a conventional task group is considered the differential annual cost to provide nuclear power in a destroyer is about 1 per cent.

RICKOVER TESTIFIES

Admiral Rickover testified that the figures given in Admiral McDonald's memorandum show that for the one-third increase in overall cost of a conventional destroyer necessary to buy a nuclear frigate you get:

(*a*) Twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines,

(*b*) Helicopter landing facilities which the destroyer does not have.

(*c*) Facilities and accommodations for a screen commander which the destroyer does not have,

(*d*) More complete naval tactical data system facilities.

(*e*) Twice as many torpedo tubes, and

(*f*) All the advantages of nuclear power.

These things are not pointed out to your committee by the proponents of *conventional* power. It is obvious to me that the nuclear frigate is a very good buy. Further, the increase in cost is small enough that it should not require us to reduce the number of ships in the Navy in order to get these needed capabilities.

BATTLE EFFECTIVENESS

Rear Admiral Henry L. Miller, while in command of Carrier Division 3 in January 1966 had these advantages for the nuclear task force under combat conditions:

During the past several months, we have had occasion to observe, in combat, the first nuclear task group, including the aircraft carrier USS Enterprise, CVAN-65, and the frigate U.S.S. Bainbridge, DGLN-25. A broad reference has just been made to the influence nuclear power could have on the waging of war. I would now like to draw attention to several advantages of the superiority of the all nuclear-powered task group. Then I want to give several specific examples that have been experienced during these past several months of combat and that point up and support the advantages I will now enumerate:

1. Increased tactical flexibility as a result of unlimited endurance at high speeds. This permits—

(*a*) Greater use of evasive tracks when approaching the objective area thereby reducing the probability of detection.

(*b*) Longer routes to avoid storms.

(*c*) Capability to operate in bad weather is improved by the elimination of the hazardous and, sometimes, infeasible refueling requirement under these circumstances.

(*d*) The high-speed endurance extends the ability to attack along a greater perimeter of coast line.

(*e*) The ability to maintain high sustained speed reduces the vulnerability to submarines and guided-missile attack. High speed is one of the most important measures to employ against submarines and guided missiles.

2. Reduction of replenishment frequency with a greatly reduced dependence upon all forms of mobile logistic support (not only fuel) as a result of increased storage space formerly required for fuel oil.

3. Air intakes for boiler operations are eliminated thereby greatly improving the capability to seal the ship against atomic, biological, and chemical attack—a quantum jump in ability to survive.

EXIT STACK GASES

4. Elimination of the undesirable stack gases and smoke which not only make it difficult for the pilots sitting in their planes prior to takeoff or during approaches to a landing but also adds considerably to the Navy's maintenance bill due to the corrosive effects of the stack gases on communication and radar antennas and on aircraft.

5. The concern for loss of fuel oil facilities is eliminated. This includes the loss of facilities at the source (in any foreign country) by political action. It also includes the loss of prepositioned fuel depots to the enemy or the loss of the replenishment oilers en route to refueling rendezvous as a result of enemy action.

6. There is the ability, under severe threat situations, to operate from distant bases completely free from mobile logistic dependency, with the capability of high-speed return to such bases for replenishment of aviation fuel and ammunition.

7. Increased maneuverability resulting from much more rapid acceleration and deceleration.

8. High standards of technical training set in the nuclear propulsion program.

9. A cleaner ship internally and externally saving hundreds of thousands of hours a year in cleaning ship and aircraft.

10. And finally, ships in the 1967 and 1968 programs will be with us until the turn of the century. We are buying time if we build nuclear-powered ships. We are buying reduced effectiveness if we purchase oil-burning warships.

ABOUT THE ESCORT

Most of the above comments apply to any nuclear combat ship, be it carrier, destroyer, or cruiser. I would like to emphasize a few pertinent points, however, with respect to the DLGN *Bainbridge*. Several specific examples of her performances on this deployment will be mentioned later. She, of course derives all the same benefits from nuclear power that the carriers do with the exception of those affecting air operations.

But some are particularly applicable to her specialties—air defense and antisubmarine warfare.

(*a*) With a nuclear ship, the screen commander has one always ready as a submarine search and attack unit. There is no need to worry about which ship is ready or how long the unit may be away from the screen. Nor is there a need to relieve her with a freshly refueled ship.

(*b*) Independence from an external fuel source enables her to provide uninterrupted screening of aircraft carriers or other large ships. This is especially applicable during replenishment operations while the force is at a vulnerable slow speed and steady course.

(*c*) There is no need for the carrier to interrupt air operations to refuel her nuclear-powered escort because the escort is freed from worries over fuel.

(*d*) She can more readily follow speed changes of the carrier, e.g., faster acceleration and deceleration.

(*e*) And finally, as a picket she can remain on station without oiler need or destroyer relief in order to retire to refuel.

GENERAL STATEMENT

For the authorization legislation proposed for this year, the Department of Defense finally accepted the position of the Congress that the next aircraft carrier should be nuclear powered. $427.5 million have been requested for the authorization for the nuclear carrier this year.

At the same time, the Department of the Navy requested that there be two conventionally powered destroyers to be used as part of the escort for the nuclear power carrier. The position of the Navy is that a nuclear-powered carrier with two nuclear-powered escorts and two conventionally powered escorts is a sound concept.

Although the Congress last year authorized a nuclear-powered, guided-missile frigate and appropriated $20 million for this frigate as one escort ship for one of the nuclear-powered carriers, and although the Navy requested permission to proceed with this ship, the Department of Defense has never released the funds for this frigate. Nor would the Department of Defense permit the Navy to request any new nuclear-powered frigate this year.

Responsibility for this loss of time and experience must rest solely with the Secretary of Defense. Even if the signal to proceed were given now, it would not be until the *Enterprise* had been at sea for 10 years that it would have its first all-nuclear task group. However, even though the Secretary of Defense has testified that he wants the *Enterprise* and the new nuclear carrier to have all-nuclear task groups, he still has not released the $20 million which was appropriated by the Congress last year.

It is clear to the Committee on Armed Services that the advantages of nuclear power for the aircraft carrier are not fully achieved if the entire task force is not nuclear powered.

FREER TO MANEUVER

The aircraft carrier has to be replenished for aviation fuel and for ammunition. To this is the added necessity of adding fuel oil when any of its escorts are not nuclear powered, since the escorts usually obtain their fuel oil from the carrier. When the carrier is able to have its own carrying tanks devoted solely to aviation fuel, this means that it can go longer without needing replenishment, than when some of its tank space is used for fuel oil. Without the necessity of supplying fuel oil, two-thirds of the logistics tonnage required for conventional task forces drops off, including replenishment ships, oil tankers, depots in foreign countries, and the protection of the logistic train across the oceans from any source of black oil.

Without the necessity of taking on black oil, the carrier is freer to continue its maneuvering and its normal operations, for it is not tied up to a replenishment ship for the black oil.

If the escorts are nuclear, then they never have to be tied up to the carrier to get fuel. They are always ready to perform their primary mission; namely, protecting the carrier. If submarines are spotted anywhere the nuclear escorts do not have to be topped off with fuel, but can proceed immediately to the area to search for the submarine.

With the increasing number of nuclear submarines of the Soviets, nuclear escorts can pursue the nuclear submarines wherever they can trail them without ever having to be called off of the hunt for lack of fuel.

If the target of the submarine is a half billion dollar carrier having a half billion dollars worth of aircraft, the protection given that investment by the small saving of a few million dollars, does not make sense. Having the task force nuclear means that it can respond at a moment's notice to any emergency in any part of the world and arrive on the scene without needing fuel oil replenishment on the way. It can, as has been demonstrated, arrive fully able to do more than conventionally powered task groups.

The greatest and wealthiest nation on earth has been denied an all-nuclear task group because of cost effectiveness. This may be our Archilles heel.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Congress almost single handedly is responsible for the present status of our nuclear-powered Navy. It was congressional action which led to the Nautilus and the Seawolf, whose reactors were funded through the Atomic Energy Commission, due to lack of interest on the part of the Department of Defense. After the Nautilus was commissioned, it still took congressional insistence to have a new submarine fleet nuclear.

It was the foresight and initiative of the Congress that made the Enterprise a nuclear-powered carrier in the 1958 program. The cruiser Long Beach and the frigate Bainbridge were authorized as nuclear ships in the 1957 and 1959 programs. The Department of Defense still did not construct any further nuclear-powered surface vessels until Congress changed the Truxtun from a conventionally powered frigate to nuclear power for the 1962 program.

For fiscal year 1966, the Congress authorized $150,500,000 for another nuclear-powered frigate and appropriated $20 million for the procurement of the long leadtime items.

After hearings and a strong report, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in 1963 raised serious questions as to why the carrier John F. Kennedy was not to be nuclear powered. After further congressional prodding the Department of Defense has finally decided that the next carrier to be built will be nuclear and that there will be others in later years.

However, the battle over nuclear power for major combat ships in the Navy still rages. The typical task force for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier is to consist of at least four escort ships. At the moment, Department of Defense has not approved any nuclear escorts for the new nuclear carrier and the Navy has requested that each nuclear-powered carrier be accompanied by two nuclear-powered escorts and two conventionally powered escorts, instead of four nuclear-powered escorts.

JOINT COMMITTEE STAND

After examining the overall situation with respect to nuclear power for surface warships, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in its latest report of January 26, 1966, stated:

"The Joint Committee recommends that the Congress change the fiscal year 1967 Department of Defense authorization to require the two new destroyers to be nuclear-powered ships. This change will be in consonance with the constitutional responsibility of Congress 'to provide and maintain a Navy * * *' and with the continuing role of leadership taken by Congress in the development and application of nuclear propulsion to the U.S. Navy—first for submarines, then for aircraft carriers, and now for major fleet escorts."

The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate removed the two conventionally powered destroyers from the bill and substituted an additional nuclear-powered frigate in addition to the nuclear-powered frigate authorized last year.

The present bill, as recommended by the Committee on Armed Services of the House, includes an authorization for a new nuclear-powered frigate, continues the authorization for the frigate from last year and also provides for the two conventionally powered destroyers.

In testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations stated that they wanted to have the two conventionally powered destroyers and one nuclear-powered frigate—either the one authorized last year or a newly authorized one. This position is a sudden reversal of the position of the Department of the Navy, going back over many years.

EARLIER NAVY POSITIONS

In 1963, the then Secretary of the Navy and the then Chief of Naval Operations established as policy of the Navy Department:

> Based on the considerations outlined above, the Chief of Naval Operations and I support the policy of nuclear propulsion in all new major combatant surface ships (larger than 8,000 tons displacement) and of research and development programs directed toward ultimate wider introduction of nuclear power in surface warships.
>
> In summary, the results of our most recent reviews of nuclear propulsion for surface ships have led to the following specific recommendations:
>
> (*a*) Construct all future attack aircraft carriers with nuclear power beginning with CVAN–67 and including the CVAN in fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967 currently in the OSD-approved program as conventionally powered ships.
>
> (*b*) Construct all future frigates with nuclear power, beginning with the lead Typhon ship in fiscal year 1965, now approved as nuclear, and continuing with two DLGN's in fiscal year 1966, three DLGN's in fiscal year 1967, and two DLGN's in fiscal year 1968 currently in the OSD-approved program as conventionally powered ships.
>
> (*c*) Develop specific proposals for a new nuclear-powered guided-missile destroyer to be funded in fiscal year 1966 and to be followed by annual building both for carrier task force support and programs. This DDGN will be suitable for independent types of operations. It is noted that there are questions, including those from OSD, yet to be resolved on this ship type, and that there are no new DDG's or DDGN's currently in the OSD-approved Navy ship construction program.
>
> (*d*) Continue to support AEC and Navy research and development programs to obtain reductions in cost and other improvements in naval nuclear propulsion plants to enable nuclear power to be introduced on an even wider scale in surface warships.

CNO STATEMENT

The policy statement of the then Chief of Naval Operations of March 28, 1963, stated:

> The building of nuclear-powered warships is essential and is justified for two basic reasons. First, nuclear power gives significant direct military advantages. The military ef-

fectiveness of nuclear warships in relation to cost exceeds that of their oil-fueled counterparts despite the fast that individual nuclear-powered surface ships cost more to build and to operate than their conventional counterparts with the same armament. Second, a scale of construction sufficient to promote healthy development of nuclear technology must be supported or the Navy will be deprived of the option to effect a general transition to nuclear propulsion eventually including selected noncombatant ships. Such a general transition to nuclear propulsion should permit some reduction in total numbers of ships required to meet the Navy's widespread, worldwide commitments.

In 1964, the Secretary of the Navy sent a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense in which he said:

"I have come to feel that we may not be doing justice to 'cold war' utility of nuclear power in its forerunner relationship to 'hot war' by concentrating on the response and strike phases of active warfare. The ability of our all-nuclear task group to react quickly at any distance from CONUS in developing cold war situations with no forward preparations is of rising interest and importance; it suggests that in rounding out the ENTERPRISE task group we may have an attractive possibility for a somewhat revised, more flexible U.S. military deployment strategy available.

"The trouble-free operations of Enterprise, Long Beach, and Bainbridge during their recent deployment in the Mediterranean and followed by the high-speed global voyage Sea Orbit, which was accomplished without logistic support, are evidence that our naval nuclear power program has produced the best, the most reliable propulsion system for warships in history. On two occasions during the Mediterranean deployment, operational demands called for high-speed transits that only the nuclear-powered ships could meet. The lesson of this operation is that nuclear propulsion in surface vessels significantly increases naval readiness and utility. The point is that a task group should be complete or this increase cannot be realized. We need, moreover, to have the complete group to test and develop a full capability."

The failure of operations analyses so far has been to place the correct effectiveness values on (1) being free operationally of the requirement for logistic fuel support—particularly in conflict; (2) the ability to operate warships reliably over long periods of time at high sustained speeds; and (3) the strategic and tactical gain of eliminating a major at-sea replenishment requirement, e.g., continuously used ship oil.

MEMO TO SECDEF

This position on the part of the Secretary of the Navy was further stated with force on November 18, 1964, in a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense:

"Additionally, I consider it essential that we complete our first nuclear task group by building a DLG(N) in fiscal year 1966.

"The Navy considers that the construction of a nuclear-powered frigate in fiscal year 1966 is one of the two most important items in its fiscal year 1966 budget. This ship is needed to provide an adequate number of nuclear-powered escorts in the Enterprise task group and thus to allow this group to achieve its full potential.

"In order to complete the funding for the DLGN authorized and partially appropriated in fiscal year 1966, the Secretary of the Navy sent a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense on October 26, 1965, stating:

"I hope the rationale presented in enclosure (1) will persuade you to change your recommendation relative to the DLGN already approved by Congress."

* * * * *

"I disagree with your recommendation that we not construct the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate, DLGN, authorized by Congress and your recommendation not to program DLGN's in future shipbuilding programs."

* * * * *

"ENCLOSURE 1

"The comparison of nuclear and conventional escorts given in the draft memorandum does not point out the advantages that nuclear propulsion in the escorts would give to the carrier task group as a whole * * * For example, the table does not point out that in the situations cited for four conventional escorts the carrier will have to retire for replenishment with less than half its aviation ammunition expended; whereas, with four nuclear escorts the carrier can stay on the line until all its ammunition is expended. Further, even when shorter transit distances are required than those shown in the table in the draft memorandum, such as would be the case for deployed carriers, nuclear propulsion in the escorts would significantly improve the time available in the combat zone for the carrier task group before withdrawal for ammunition or fuel. * * *

"Further, it should be recognized that nuclear power in escorts can simplify the logistic support for the entire task group. * * *

"As I have indicated before, there are several operational advantages of nuclear propulsion in our escort types when operating independently and without logistic support. These include the ability (1) to trail enemy submarines and surface units at any time, at all speeds, and over all conceivable distances; (2) to operate without support as barrier or picket ships; (3) to transit to and operate for prolonged periods where logistic support is lacking or is feasibly only at minimal levels. In summary, these provide the unique flexibility of assigning individual escorts to special missions requiring sustained steaming under conditions where the requirement to refuel would jeopardize the success of the mission or where logistic support is not available.

"Just as the current situation in southeast Asia has placed new emphasis on the importance of the flexibility inherent in the aircraft carrier, I am convinced that an escalation of conflicts of this type to bring our logistics supply lines under attack would demonstrate more clearly the inherent advantages of the flexibility nuclear propulsion provides surface warships."

NAVY STUDIES

After all of these firm positions on the desirability of having nuclear power in the major combatant ships, the committee was shocked to find that the Navy had shifted its position—especially with respect to the escorts for the nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. Therefore, it requested the Navy to send over all of the studies that had been made to show whether escort vessels of nuclear-powered carriers should also be nuclear powered.

In response to that request, the Navy sent the reports of three studies: (1) "Nuclear Power for Surface Warships"—both interim and final reports (commonly known as NAVWAG 33), dated September 26, 1964, and February 22, 1965, respectively; (2) "Fleet Anti-air-warfare Study II" of September 3, 1965 (commonly known as FAAWS II); and (3) "Tactical Air Warfare Study II" of 1966 (commonly known as TAWS II). These reports constitute close to 7 inches of bulk paper.

The amazing part of these studies is that both the FAAWS II and the TAWS II reports specifically refer back to NAVWAG 33 as being the authority for the makeup of the task force with a nuclear-powered carrier.

Thus, in the endorsement of December 23, 1965, of the Vice Chief of Naval Operations to the FAAWS II study, there is the provision:

7. The following additional comments are considered pertinent: (*a*) The study compares costs of nuclear and oil-fired frigates. It does not include cost analyses for nuclear-powered destroyers since design studies in progress for DLG(N) were not sufficiently advanced to provide reliable cost and design data. For frigates, the total annual cost of the DLG(N) is shown as being about 20 per cent greater than for the DLG. This comparison allowed costs of only one-tenth of an oiler for support of the DLG and assumed no costs for escort of this oiler. The increase in overall combat effectiveness attributable to nuclear propulsion is significant and has been reported previously in Naval Warfare Analysis Group Study No. 33, Nuclear Power for Surface Warships. Your memorandum 0037 of October 26, 1965, to SECDEF includes additional information on the advantages of nuclear power in carrier task group escorts.

SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE

Likewise, in the synopsis of the Tactical Air Warfare Study, on page 8 of that study, there is the statement:

Substitution of nuclear carriers for conventional carriers results in superior performance, despite the increased cost ($194 million over 21 years including $50 million for four A-7 aircraft) of the Navy increment. This improvement is a result of the increased time-on-line of the nuclear carrier. This study did not treat base vulnerability and hence does not cover additional advantages of nuclear power which were brought out in NAVWAG Study No. 33, "Nuclear Power for Surface Warships."

Yet examination of NAVWAG 33 indicates only a cursory examination of the subject. In an appendix, AA, apparently put together at the last minute, on page 11, this report said:

From an effectiveness point of view, without regard to costs, the nuclear-powered frigate is the most capable escort vessel which could be provided for any carrier. A task group which is all nuclear could be optimized for maximum possible offensive capability, unlimited high-speed response range, and unlimited cold war endurance.

This statement is also confirmed by the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, as given to this committee on March 10 of this year:

"* * * there is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for * * *. As I say, I believe we have. If we haven't, I'm quite prepared to change the programs.

* * * * *

"Yes, I think that is important, not just one, but I think each carrier that is nuclear powered ought to be part of a balanced task force. Since we are recommending a nuclear-powered carrier, in 1967, we want to have not just the *Enterprise* part of a balanced force, but also this 1967 carrier part of the balanced force."

THE MIX SUGGESTION

The NAVWAG 33 study, however, immediately after the material quoted above, states on page AA-12:

However, limitations on the endurance of the people involved, the ordnance capacity of the CVAN, and the aircraft maintenance cycle, may place a limit on the usable value of such endurance. It has not been possible to place a dollar value on the unique capability of one or two escorts to perform independently for long periods, even though the

operational advantages of this capability are recognized. It is, nonetheless, possible that the incremental value of providing all escorts with this capability may be less than for the first one or two.

ASW protection requires that some escorts operate in the vicinity of the carrier. These can be refueled as required, with a relatively small loss in screen integrity. Considering the much lower cost of a DDG, compared to a DLGN, the most cost effective four-ship screen for a nuclear carrier *may* consist of a mix of nuclear and conventional ships. For an existing conventional carrier, the most cost effective four-ship screen would be composed of ships having, as nearly as possible, the same endurance as the carrier.

While the study thereafter proceeds to examine various combinations of a conventionally powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts, and a nuclear-powered carrier and various mixes of escorts, at no time thereafter does the study go into the nuclear-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts. Appendix AA is only 25 pages in length.

Apparently this is the "elaborate study" as a result of which the Secretary of the Navy "came to the conclusion that with each nuclear carrier we would like to have two nuclear DLGN's."

These paragraphs are subject to severe criticism in the following respects:

They are not based on any analysis, and they are weasel-worded.

The conjecture with respect to the endurance has not been borne out by the war experience in Viet Nam; on the contrary; Admiral Miller testified that the *Enterprise* was on the line "for 44 straight days and nights," that they maintained the schedule and that "there was no strain as far as our maintenance and operation was concerned."

LEAVING ITS STATION

In order to be refueled the conventional escort does have to leave its station.

While the conventional escort is being refueled, the carrier is more vulnerable.

In order to carry fuel for the escort the carrier has to give up fuel that could otherwise be used for its airplanes.

The extra cost of a nuclear escort is only 1 per cent of the cost of a total all-nuclear task group.

Not only does NAVWAG 33 never address itself specifically to the battle effectiveness of a nuclear-powered carrier together with four nuclear-powered escorts, but the study has severe limitations in its assumptions. These limitations were first pointed out in the endorsement of the Chief of Naval Operations of October 28, 1964, to the interim report of NAVWAG 33:

3. Those aspects of tactical superiority that come strongly into effect in wartime and yet are difficult to quantify analytically are not in this study. I have in mind the military value of greater freedom to move far and fast on demand; in other words, the new order of capability to meet swiftly changing circumstances that nuclear power provides and that conventional power cannot match. We could make a more realistic comparison of the nuclear and conventional carriers if we could find a way to embrace a full appreciation of these most important assets.

* * * * *

5. The Navy's principal interest in nuclear power in carriers is based on the demonstrated capability of a nuclear carrier to oprate for long periods of time, and at high sustained speeds as required, with greatly reduced dependence on logistic support. The most serious limitation on study analysis to date is that it undervalues the advantages of reduced dependence on logistic support by its lack of consideration of a combat environment. The final report, which will include computer runs with the logistic vulnerability model, should correct this limitation.

CNO ENDORSEMENT

The benefits of nuclear power, which the final report of NAVWAG 33 failed to consider were also specifically set forth by the Chief of Naval Operations in his endorsement of May 6, 1965:

7. In summary, the analyses in both the interim and final reports show that nuclear power in aircraft carriers provides more effectiveness for less cost than does conventional power. The analyses, of course, do not consider many of the factors which lead to the greater effectiveness that nuclear propulsion provides surface warships—factors which are important aspects of tactical superiority in wartime, but difficult to quantify analytically, such as:

(*a*) Increased tactical flexibility and freedom for independent action.

(*b*) Enhanced opportunity to use evasive transit tracks.

(*c*) Improved capability to operate in bad weather or to take circuitous routes to avoid storms.

(*d*) Ability to extend attack along greater perimeter.

(*e*) Freedom from dependence upon replenishment in areas of high threat.

(*f*) Elimination of concern for loss of fuel oil facilities at source, prepositioned fuel depots, or en route to the refueling rendezvous.

(*g*) Capability, under very high threat and combat situations that have deteriorated seriously, to operate completely free of fuel logistic support and be able thereby to cycle in high speed transits to distant sources for ammunition and aviation fuel needed to continue in action.

8. By installing nuclear propulsion systems in the fiscal year 1967 and subsequent attack carriers, we will provide commanders of naval forces with the ability to meet circumstances where unsurpassed resilience, flexibility, and endurance are necessary and highly advantageous. Considering a declining inventory of U.S. bases overseas, political uncertainties of the future, an increasing number of foreign nuclear submarines and the increasing air strike capabilities of our potential enemies, freeing a portion of our striking forces from the limitations of reliance on worldwide ship fuel distribution system is clearly indicated. The attack aircraft carriers may be the heart of the Nation's mobile strike power for years to come. Provision of the most in reliable flexibility to meet unforeseen needs in the future is insurance.

MORE FROM CNO

In the endorsement of February 1, 1966, to the TAWS II, the Chief of Naval Operations again cited the benefits of nuclear propulsion:

"4. * * * This study assumption eliminated from consideration the most important effectiveness advantage of nuclear power. The compelling reason for the Navy's strong recommendation for nuclear power in surface warships is based on the increased survivability and tactical flexibility which derive from freedom of dependence on propulsion fuel oil logistic support."

The dependence of U.S. air power on the fuel distribution system in the western Pacific is well known. The vulnerability of the system to attack, particularly the overland and terminal fuel distributions required for land-based air operations, is a matter of concern. While the Navy's underway replenishment groups are considered to be less vulnerable, they can also be brought under attack. Current utilization of Enterprise and Bainbridge is reducing our dependence on fuel oil and thus strengthening our total tactical air position in southeast Asia. The introduction of CVAN–68 and other nuclear-powered warships could be of critical importance to the efficient projection of air power during the early 1970's. I plan to forward under separate cover a further discussion of the advantages of nuclear power for surface warships which describes in more detail the importance of these advantages in the current military situation.

Despite this limitation, the abstract of the study TAWS II states:

The relative effectiveness of five equal-cost U.S. tactical air mixes is measured. The five mixes have different proportions of land-based and sea-based tactical air forces. In three of the mixes new construction carriers are conventionally powered; in two mixes new carriers are nuclear powered. Analysis of costs leads to an approximate equal trade-off in numbers of aircraft between land- and sea-based forces. Substitution of sea-based for land-based tactical air is shown to result in increased kills, sorties, and ordnance delivered in large-scale, nonnuclear wars. The effectiveness increases when the substitution is made with nuclear carriers. A sensitivity analysis is made to demonstrate the range of validity of the findings.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDIES

The net effect of all of these studies is that up until this point, there is no study that analyzes the kinds of escorts that should make up a task force surrounding a nuclear-power carrier. Indeed the studies were so poor on this point that the Secretary of Defense in his letter of December 1, 1965, to the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

"I am having the final report of the study, 'Nuclear Power for Surface Warships' (NAVWAG study 33) that you requested, sent to you. However, as you will note, the study concerns itself primarily with nuclear propulsion for carriers and deals inadequately with escorts. The study frankly admits the inadequacy of the examination of escort-building programs. Early this year, I requested the Navy to introduce nuclear-propelled ships into their study of the comparison of land-based and sea-based tactical air forces. This study has not yet been forwarded to me. I have asked my staff to determine what other reports or studies may be available and will be in touch with you further on this mtater."

It wasn't until April 14, 1966, that the study made by the Chief of Naval Operations addressed itself at length to an all-nuclear task force for the first time since 1963.

THE COMBINATIONS

In an examination of the cost and the operations of the nuclear carrier with various kinds of escorts, the study concludes that:

When the CVAN 68 is substituted for the CVA 67, with either carrier accompanied by four conventional escorts:

(1) The high-speed response range without logistic support is increased 80 per cent. This results from the additional fuel available from the CVAN for the four escorts (two DLG 16 and two fiscal year 1967 DDG).

(2) At a distance of 250 miles to the replenishment area, the maximum time sustained on station is increased 5 per cent and the tonnage of combat consumables (JP–5, NSFO, and aviation ammunition) required in the logistic supply line per ton of aviation ammunition expended [deleted] is decreased 39 per cent.

(3) At a distance of 500 miles to the replenishment area, the maximum per cent time on station is increased 13 per cent and the logistic tonnage per ton of ammunition expended is decreased 43 per cent.

When the CVAN–68 escorted by two nuclear frigates and two conventional destroyers is compared to a CVA–67 carrier with four conventional escorts:

(1) The high-speed response range without logistic support is increased 200 per cent. This results from the additional fuel available from the CVAN, all of which is for the

two conventional escorts (fiscal year 1967 DDG).

(2) At a distance of 250 miles to the replenishment area, the maximum time on station is increased about 7 per cent and the tonnage of combat consumables required in the logistic supply line per ton of aviation ammunition expended is decreased 55 per cent.

(3) At a distance of 500 miles to the replenishment area, the maximum per cent time on station is increased 18 per cent and the logistic tonnage per ton of ammunition expended is decreased 58 per cent.

When the CVAN–68 escorted by two nuclear frigates and two nuclear destroyers is compared to a CVA–67 carrier with four conventional escorts:

(1) The high-speed response range without logistic support is essentially unlimited.

(2) At a distance of 250 miles to the replenishment area, the maximum per cent time on station is increased 7 per cent and the logistic tonnage per ton of ammunition expended is decreased 70 per cent.

(3) At a distance of 500 miles to the replenishment area, the maximum time on station is increased 19 per cent and the logistic tonnage per ton of ammunition expended is decreased 74 per cent.

ALL-NUCLEAR ADVANTAGES

Thus it is that even within limited ground rules the advantages of a nuclear-powered carrier with four nuclear escorts far outweigh the advantages of any of the other grouping.

One factor that is implicit in the situation does not seem to have received proper emphasis even yet. The Soviet Navy has an increase in number of nuclear submarines. If any of the escort vessels have to pursue a nuclear submarine, it seems only logical that that escort should itself be nuclear powered; otherwise, it will have to break off the chase in order to return for fuel. This matter is mentioned in the report in relation to the Cuban crisis of 1962:

"The reports of Commander, Anti-Submarine Forces, Atlantic Fleet, showed that on at least five occasions during that period, U.S. naval forces had to leave submarine contact areas in order to refuel . . ."

The lack of logistic need to supply the black oil to propel the carrier and its escorts can hardly be overvalued. With nuclear power, the ships in a task force will always be able to stay in any engagement until the ammunition or the aviation fuel get low and then have complete freedom to choose any route thought desirable to reach an area where they can be replenished. At no time in the engagement does the commander have to worry about any of the ships running out of fuel; at no time does he have to be worried by the extra complications of refueling with black oil.

Without nuclear power there is an increase in demand of the logistic train to support the flow of fuel:

The increase in complexity and difficulty of logistic support when supply lines, and underway replenishment groups are subject to attack and protective measures are required imposes costs which add to the cost of the ships, cargoes and lives lost. In addition to the cost of providing convoy escorts, more logistic ships are required in order to get the same quantity of supplies through, since the efficiency of each ship is reduced due to delays in assembling convoy ships and their escorts before departing, and to delays while waiting to unload in crowded ports and storage facilities. When the logistic supply lines are attacked, a decrease in the requirement for NSFO for the strike forces will have a compounding beneficial effect. The surviving fuel transportation and storage facilities can all be concentrated on getting fuel for aircraft and other military vehicles through to the forward areas. The escorts that would otherwise be required for tankers carrying NSFO can be assigned to assuring the safety of other supplies. Further, the ability of nuclear warships to steam long distances at high speeds to rendezvous with replenishment ships while still maintaining a high percentage of time on the line:

(*a*) Reduces the number of replenishment ships required in the pipeline due to the shorter distance required to carry the supplies, and

(*b*) Allows the selection of areas of lower threat for replenishment thus further reducing losses.

CHALLENGE OF CHINA

Hence, it is that from an overall point of view, the Chief of Naval Operations concluded:

It is becoming increasingly evident that for many years to come the free world will be faced with the problem of a militant Communist China ever-ready to exploit any weakness we may show, and that we may be faced with a continually changing political picture among the other Asian nations. Following the French withdrawal from Indochina, the United States is left as the only Western nation capable of exercising significant power in the Asian theater. Nuclear propulsion in our naval striking forces will greatly enhance our capability to operate throughout the Pacific and Indian Oceans in order to carry out our national commitments there. Further, the tenuous hold we have on African and European bases again emphasizes the importance of sea-based air power.

Because of these considerations, the Chief of Naval Operations had as his specific recommendation: "I believe we should proceed now with the Navy program to provide not less than two nuclear-powered escorts for each cvan."

In addition, Admiral Miller found specific instances in which nuclear power was a far greater advantage than conventionally powered escorts.

1. After a 16,000-mile trip, Enterprise commenced combat operations in the west Pacific shortly after arrival and on the second day set a new daily record for combat sorties.

2. The 16,000-mile trip was made without any pre-positioned oilers or replenishment vessel.

3. Enterprise carries one more squadron than any of the other big attack carriers due to the elimination of smokestacks, air intakes, and other items needed running through the decks for conventional boilers.

4. Where Bainbridge was able to go on an antisubmarine search 145 miles from the task force within 5 hours of request for aid, the two conventionally powered destroyers took 5 hours to top off with black oil alone and didn't arrive at the area until 10 to 20 hours had elapsed.

5. Increased maneuverability with conventionally powered destroyers dropping some 1,500 yards behind whenever the Enterprise made a routine acceleration from 15 to 25 knots.

6. Lack of stack gases and smoke eliminated the corrosive effect on the ship and on the planes of the Enterprise. It saved Bainbridge 440 man-hours a week that was spent in preventive maintenance or training rather than in cleaning the ship.

7. The lack of stack gases has led to greater safety in airplane landings on the Enterprise and has made it easier to refuel helicopters while hovering over the Bainbridge.

Most importantly of all is the freedom from the logistics needs for propulsion fuel. The study of the Chief of Naval Operations of April 14, 1966, devotes many pages to a historical study of World War II and the relation of fuel oil to the battle situation. Many times battles were lost or had to be called off or avoided for lack of the basic propulsion fuel.

Mr. Speaker, here is this great array of great men, Carl Vinson, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Secretary of the Navy. All of these people say that in the interest of national security and in the interest of national survival we need nuclear surface propulsion. I do not think it is wise for the Secretary of Defense to overrule these gentlemen. Now we have asked the President to assume the responsibility and if, in his opinion, it is not in the national interest, then let him advise the Congress and then we can take appropriate action. The Constitution gives us this authority, and we had better keep this authority. Too much of our authority has been eroded. We have given it away gratuitously under the two amendments I have mentioned before. We do not propose to sit idly by and see your Navy lapse into obsolescence in our lifetime. This is what we say in the report, and I say it is a good one and I urge you to accept this report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago we discussed this bill which is presently before us at great length. The distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has just indicated to the House the essential differences that existed between the House and the Senate and the way in which this agreement was reached.

Mr. Speaker, I just have two brief comments to make. There are those in this Chamber who believe that the language which we formerly had in our bill in respect to the authority of the Congress as compared to the Secretary of Defense has been considerably watered down in the bill from the conference report as presently presented to you. I think to a large degree this is true, but while we sat in conference hour after hour trying to reach agreement we found that the Senate were of a different mind. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it became necessary for your conferees to walk out of the conference when we had no resolution on the matter which was before us. We believed that stronger language was necessary if we were to assume the power that is rightfully ours under article I, section 8 of the Constitution. I think this House is familiar, and I am sure that the country is familiar, as well, with the power which has been exercised by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense was never mentioned when our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution of the United States. He is a creature of this Congress. Whatever power he has was given to him by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have reserved unto ourselves under the language as set forth in the Constitution, the power for us to provide and to raise the forces of the armed services.

How can we maintain, how can we provide the Army and the Navy, if some man in the Department of Defense, as he sees fit, can destroy these forces under his command? I am willing to say that the Secretary of Defense is a man of unusual ability and a prodigious worker, a man dedicated to his work. But, nevertheless, when we took the oath of office here, we raised our hand to carry out our responsibility as imposed upon us by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot give away that responsibility.

The other body, however, was of a different mind. I feel, considering the point of view which they hold, that the language of the conference report as presented to us, is as strong as we could possibly make it.

In any event, I am willing on this occasion to go along with the conference report. But, if the spirit of the conference report is not upheld by the action of the President and the action of the Secretary of Defense, it seems to me it will be necessary for us next year when the authorization bill comes before us to have a stronger section in it.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one other point that I desire to make. I believe the essence of this report indicates the importance of research and development in the world in which we live. This bill totals $17 billion. Of that $17 billion, $7 billion is for research and development.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, all the money that we spend this year on ships, on missiles, on tanks and on all forms of equipment comes to $10 billion.

But research and development alone almost equals that amount, totaling over $7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe your committee is aware that "second best" in this dangerous world in which we live is not good enough. We must advance our own frontiers of science in order to make sure that we have the latest implements of war.

Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations, but overall, I do agree with the conference report and I ask the House to adopt it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of this huge appropriation for the Military Establishment, I want to express deep concern over the pattern of official conduct that has developed in the past 3 or 4 years.

It is the type of conduct that ought to outrage every Member of the House and Senate. It is the type of conduct that might be expected in a police state, but should neither be found nor countenanced in the United States.

In recent times we have seen the highest levels in the executive branch use the most despicable and foul tactics to discredit and smear legitimate congressional investigations. No one is spared who engages in vigorous dissent—neither witnesses, committee members, or chairmen of committees.

The power of the Defense Department has been used to try to frighten and intimidate those who testify in opposition to the Johnson-McNamara establishment, or those who take the initiative in criticizing high officials of the administration.

In recent days we have seen information—obviously from Defense Department sources—used to try to discredit a carefully documented report of the House Armed Services Committee. This information from a Defense installation was used to try to smear the efforts of a committee that had the courage to stand up to the dictatorial and deceptive tactics of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Even assuming that any part of the information could be verified, it was irrelevant and immaterial to the devastatingly accurate report of the House Armed Services Committee on the bomber controversy.

That report demonstrates the Defense Secretary was careless with the facts, to say the least, in claiming support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for his decision to phase out the B-58 supersonic bombers. I hope this problem will call attention of many people to that most important report and the case it makes against a number of McNamara decisions.

The Defense Department's most recent smear effort would be bad enough if it stood alone. It is nothing less than outrageous when taken in combination with the brutal tactics that were used against those who earlier tried to expose McNamara and other high Johnson administration officials.

In 1963, during the TFX controversy, it was anonymous Defense Department spokesmen who tried to smear the chairman and members of the Senate committee that caught McNamara wasting $400 million by awarding the multibillion-dollar contract to the Texas-based General Dynamics Corp. which was adjudged to have the second best plane.

In the same TFX investigation the Defense Department made numerous efforts to smear the committee staff members who did the job of making the case against McNamara.

In the same TFX investigation the Defense Secretary used the most ruthless tactics in ending the military careers of Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff. Admiral Anderson and General LeMay had the courage to give accurate and forceful testimony that they regarded McNamara's decision as wrong in buying the second-best plane.

It was the Defense Department that collected the raw allegation from the personnel file of Don B. Reynolds, the Maryland insurance man and former colonel in the Air Force who was a key witness in the Bobby Baker case. That derogatory information was peddled around Washington until it was finally planted in a column in an effort to discredit and destroy Reynolds as a witness.

Reynolds had given important testimony of highly questionable and unethical activity by some of the mightiest officials in the executive branch, and he had also testified that Baker had been a party to a cash payoff in connection with some defense contracts.

The information collected by the Defense Department for use in the attempt to smear Reynolds was totally unrelated to the question of whether Reynolds had told an accurate story about an insurance deal, a stereophonic gift to the Johnson family, and certain transactions with Bobby Baker in 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Take all of this, add it to the efforts to smear Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware, because of his activity in pressing the Baker case, and you have a sordid picture of the tactics this administration will use to stop the critics and the dissenters. It is time that everyone in Congress and everyone in his Nation realize what unrestrained power has done to some of the highest officials in the executive branch.

Members of the House of Representatives spoke with an almost unanimous voice—356 to 2—on Tuesday, June 14, 1966, when the authorization bill for military procurement was before the House. For too many years had the House Armed Services Committee served as an appendage of the Defense Department. On that day the House left no doubt of its support for the committee and its chairman in the bitter struggle that has taken place to free the committee from its subservience.

Every Member of the House and Senate should understand that what has been taking place with respect to the Armed Services and other committees is an effort to destroy the independence of Congress and coerce the individual Members.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 2950, the 1967 defense procurement authorization bill.

The success of the managers of the House clearly testifies to the merit and importance of the amendments which the Armed Services Committee and the Members of this body attached to the Senate bill. While understandably dollar amounts have been compromised, we still have a bill which states that Congress is determined that we shall have a first-class Navy, not merely a cheap one; not second-rate aeromedical evacuation aircraft but the best; not a status quo but a forward-looking, broad-gaged research and development program to carry on the Nike-X anti-ballistic missile system; the Condor medium range missile; the manned orbiting laboratory; and the advanced manned strategic bomber. Nor is Congress as a result of this bill going to permit those charged with defending our country to become a forgotten class of Government employees when others are receiving cost-of-living salary adjustments.

Let me say further that I was particularly gratified by the action taken by the conferees with respect to the amendment providing for additional airborne television transmitting capabilities. While originally a figure of $20 million was authorized by the House I wish to point out that in principle the conferees did not, in agreeing to a figure of $12 million, decide upon only half a loaf. Their report specifically states:

> The conferees agreed that through the utilization of some P3-A aircraft now in the inventory it would be possible to achieve the result desired by the authorization of a lesser sum.

In other words, the conferees stated that the same job could be done for $12 million if the Defense Department really wants a first-class airborne telecasting facility ready for use in Vietnam or wherever else in the world the situation may reqiure it on a moment's notice.

The conference report devotes a full page, beginning on page 6, to explaining some of the reasons why more modern equipment is highly desirable to make our efforts in this field more effective. When it was before us a few weeks ago, the Members of this House became familiar with these views. It is not necessary to recite them again at this time. Let me merely underscore that in authorizing this item the Congress is committing itself to doing whatever it can to make it possible for the Defense Department to do a first-class job. We have no assurance that they will act on it but this in no way should deter us in our efforts whether in respect to providing for a modern nuclear Navy, a follow-on bomber for the B-52's or the best capability for answering Communist propaganda and for helping to build a reliable national communications network in South Vietnam. I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California, to whom I will yield my remaining time, I would like to advise the House exactly what the bill contains.

The $17,480,759,000 in the agreement arrived at by the conferees is $377,300,000 less than the bill which passed the House, and $310,700,000 more than the bill which passed the Senate, and $553,800,000 more than the bill as presented to the Congress by the President of the United States. We know this is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his kindness in yielding me this time. I compliment him and the members of the House committee for the leadership they have shown in bringing us toward a nuclear-powered Navy.

I rise in support of the conference report on the defense authorization bill which is before the House today.

I wish to take special note of the nuclear-propelled warships which are included in this bill. The bill authorizes five attack submarines and one nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier as requested by the Department of Defense. This bill also includes the reauthorization of a nuclear-powered frigate added by the Congress to last year's authorization. The initiative of the Congress in adding this nuclear frigate to the Department of Defense request is to be highly commended and is, in my opinion, consistent with the vision that the Congress has shown in the past when we fought for the creation of a nuclear submarine fleet.

Further this bill authorizes the procurement of the long-lead-time material and equipment for an additional nuclear-powered frigate. The Congress expects the Department of Defense to include a request for authorization of a second frigate in its next year's authorization request.

I would like to invite my colleagues' attention to a comprehensive statement I made yesterday outlining the factors which I believe make it mandatory that the Congress authorize the nuclear propelled surface warships in this bill. My statement is printed on pages 15045 through 15049 of yesterday's RECORD.

As I mentioned yesterday, the Congress has again taken another step of leadership toward providing our Nation with a modern Navy by adding the authorization of nuclear warships to this bill. The leadership displayed by Congress in providing funds for development and utilization of nuclear power in naval warships has become traditional. This leadership started when the Congress in the late 1940's and early 1950's provided all-out support for a research and development program on nuclear powerplants for submarines. It is difficult to find an example of a wiser investment.

With the guidance of Admiral Rickover, and the inititative of the Congress, our Nation has achieved primacy in the field of nuclear propulsion of submarines. The Congress may well be proud of its role in this splendid accomplishment.

With the mating of nuclear propulsion and the Polaris missile system, our Nation has received the benefit of a virtually impregnable first line of defense.

Now it is time to take another progressive step to further strengthen our military forces by developing a nuclear powered surface Navy. In this connection, let me review briefly work that has gone on in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As you know, the Joint Committee has strongly supported a nuclear powered surface fleet. In 1963 the committee held executive hearings on progress in this field. Our findings were published in the report entitled "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," dated December 1963. These findings clearly pointed out that no new aircraft carriers or any firstline naval warship should be built without nuclear propulsion. These findings are consistent with the position of the House Armed Services Committee.

I hope the Congress will support the policy of both committees and accept the conference report.

I want to take this opportunity to especially compliment the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee with the full support of his committee members for the leadership he has provided in striving toward a nuclear-powered Navy. As I have said before, I strongly endorse the policy of the Armed Services Committee that all future major surface warships be provided with nuclear propulsion. I sincerely hope that this, the final form of the authorization bill, will point the way to the use of nuclear propulsion in all future firstline warships. Our Nation and our Navy deserve and require nothing less.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the defense authorization bill presented to the Congress by the conferees is reasonable and fully justified. I want to indicate my unqualified support of the bill.

I believe that the authorization of nuclear warships contained in this bill warrants special comment. The bill as presented to us by the Defense Department included five nuclear attack submarines and one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. The Congress added two nuclear frigates to this bill. This was done by reauthorizing the nuclear-powered frigates added by the Congress last year and the authorization of the procurement of long-lead-time materials and equipment for another nuclear-powered frigate. We expect the Defense Department to request the complete authorization of the latter frigate next year.

I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to a comprehensive statement on nuclear propulsion for warships made by the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy yesterday which is printed on pages 15045–15049 of the July 11, 1966, RECORD. I sincerely believe that the statement warrants the attention of all of us responsible for acting on legislation affecting our national security.

The addition of the nuclear frigates to the authorization bill is especially important. It involves application of nuclear propulsion to another class of naval warships—the aircraft carrier escort warships. At first the Department of Defense shifted exclusively to nuclear propulsion for submarines. Now submarines fitted with polaris missiles provide us with our first line of defense. This year the Department of Defense finally requested the authorization of our second nuclear propelled aircraft carrier. It is most unfortunate that we had a hiatus which will result in a period of nearly 10 years between our first nuclear propelled carrier and the second one which is in this bill. I believe that the Congress deserves credit for bringing about this second nuclear propelled carrier by its intensive review of the factors involved in the utilization of nuclear propulsion in aircraft carriers. The major remaining application of nuclear propulsion in our Navy concerns the escort warships for our aircraft carriers.

Although the Congress, primarily through the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees has pointed out the importance of the application of nuclear propulsion in escort warships, for reasons which are not understandable the Department of Defense has not gone ahead with this vital application. Congress in its action on the bill before us by adding nuclear propelled escort warships to the authorization has again taken the lead in providing our military forces with the unequaled military advantages of nuclear power.

I can tell you from my firsthand participation that delving into all of the factors involved in the consideration of propulsion plants for nuclear escorts has been an arduous task. In carrying out my responsibilities as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have participated in the review of all the documents we could get concerning the question of building nuclear propelled escorts. We also did everything that we could to get the views of those in the Navy and Department of Defense who are knowledgeable in these matters. I can assure you that the documentation furnished by the Navy and the Department of Defense as well as the testimony we have received has been carefully reviewed. The studies and reports show that the increased military effectiveness of the nuclear-powered warships including aircraft carriers and their escorts far exceed the small increase in the overall lifetime costs of these weapons systems. Fortunately, the factors are well documented for anyone's review. The principal documents which have been developed by the Congress concerning these factors were listed in the statement of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which he made on the floor yesterday. The list of these documents is printed in his statement on page 15047 of yesterday's RECORD.

I would like to particularly invite your attention to the case presented for nuclear-powered escort ships by the Chief of Naval Operations. He did this in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated April 14, 1966. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, the memorandum is published in our Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture in hearing print No. 64 on pages 8034–8063. I especially commend this memorandum to anyone interested in the military factors involved in nuclear propulsion and the factors involved in the supply of fuel under wartime conditions in general.

The record we have developed shows that under actual wartime operating conditions off Vietnam, two-thirds of the fuel used for a conventional carrier task group which includes the carrier and its escorts is used just to keep the ships running. One-third is used for running the carrier, and the other third is used for escort propulsion. This leaves one-third of the task force fuel for the propulsion of aircraft. Therefore, if the need for fuel for the carrier and escorts is eliminated, which is simply done by building nuclear propelled ships, the task force fuel requirements are reduced to one-third.

The Chief of Naval Operations in the memorandum to which I have referred also summarizes World War II experience concerning the controlling significance of fuel supply logistics. He cited numerous examples where the shortage of fuel was the dominant factor in our military operations and the operations of the Japanese. Lest one conclude that we should not be concerned with World War II experiences in respect to evaluating or in considering our plans for the future, I would like to quote the following directly from the Chief of Naval Operations' memorandum:

> The vulnerability of our overseas logistic supply lines is greater today than at any time in the past and is continuing to increase for the following reasons:
>
> a. The increased threat of submarine attack because of the improvements in conventional submarines and the advent of nuclear powered submarines.
>
> b. The increased threat of air attack because of the increased range of aircraft and missiles and their improved means of detection.
>
> c. The amount of fuel which must be transported has increased because of the higher fuel consumption rate of post-World War II military units.
>
> d. Each tanker lost has a greater impact because of the substitution of a smaller fleet of larger tankers for the large fleet of small tankers used in World War II.

It is just such considerations that make the answer to the question of nuclear propulsion for escorts so clear. They must be nuclear propelled to free them from their dependence on the vulnerable conventional fuel pipeline. The authorization of the nuclear escorts in the present bill provides this step.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I note with interest the conference committee has agreed on the need for $200 million for the manned orbiting laboratory for 1967. In my view, this additional $50 million to the amount requested in the President's budget is most essential. The manned orbiting laboratory program has completed its definition of the work to be undertaken to meet the objectives specified by the President in August of last year. It is the only military space program involving man and his utilization as an integral and essential functioning part of military space systems.

The NASA has demonstrated with great success in its programs, man's ability to perform in this very hostile environment. Our astronauts in the NASA program have demonstrated their ability to perform with their spacecraft the difficult tasks associated with launching, orbiting, rendezvous with other spacecraft, various complex experiments, and even their ability to walk in space. These demonstrated capabilities are vital to the success of the manned orbiting laboratory program. It remains for the Air Force to integrate the abilities NASA has demonstrated that man is capable of into their systems in such a manner that this country can maintain its military superiority over their adversaries who contend this.

In order to permit early transition of the MOL program into the hardware phase, this additional $50 million is considered essential. I would like to go on record to voice my concurrence with the conference committee recommendations that the manned orbiting laboratory program be authorized a total of $200 million in new obligation authority for 1967.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this defense procurement bill that has been reported to us by the conference committee contains half a billion dollars over and above that recommended by the Department of Defense.

By any measure this is a significant amount of money. It is more than half of the total sum recommended by the administration for title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act for this fiscal year. It is double the increase recommended for the war on proverty program.

Of particular concern to me in this half a billion dollar figure is the authorization for preproduction of the Nike-X anti-ballistic-missile system.

The very able Secretary of Defense has said that the construction of an anti-ballistic-missile system would not "add measurably to our safety."

The Federation of American Scientists, a distinguished group of 2,500 scientists and engineers, has said that this is "an immensely complicated system which will remain of dubious efficiency."

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has joined the Secretary of Defense in agreeing that a ballistic missile defense system must be accompanied by a full fallout shelter program.

In brief, this military procurement decision would lead to substantial new costs perhaps totaling as much as $30 billion. It would spur the race between offensive and defensive weapons systems and it would make even more difficult the achievement of the nonproliferation treaty which is now pending at Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported and will continue to support a strong national defense that will make and keep this country second to none. My voting record during the 8 years I have served in Congress makes this clear.

I support the basic provisions of this bill, including the thoroughly warranted pay increases for members of the Armed Forces. My vote for this bill on June 14 demonstrates this.

I support continued research and development on an antimissile system, and this bill includes those funds.

But preproduction of the Nike-X system goes beyond our present requirements. It is not a priority item, and with the great demands facing us in education, poverty, health and housing, it is a misallocation of our resources.

When this bill was originally debated on June 14, I stated that I reserved the right to vote against the conference committee's bill if this uncalled-for increase in the defense budget was not eliminated.

I will vote against this bill today because I continue to believe that the preproduction of this particular weapons system is unwise and unnecessary at this time. The Senate concurred in this decision when it did not include these funds in its version of the bill. I hope that the Department of Defense will concur as well by not implementing this program, which can only add dangerous fuel to the arms race.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House conferees on the military procurement bill, I know that every effort was exerted by our able, distinguished chairman and other conferees to uphold the position of the House, and I believe we were significantly successful in accomplishing this end.

The conference report sets forth adequately, I think, the results of our deliberations and the various equitable and well-warranted concessions that were made by both sides in an effort to reach final agreement.

The progress made in the final bill regarding nuclear naval construction is to my mind very noteworthy and indicates, I believe, the trend toward the desirable goal of a U.S. Navy which in time will be implemented as to its larger ships by nuclear power. The days of conventional larger ships are numbered, and it seems clear from the attitude of the Congress and our respective committees that we are moving as vigorously as we can toward projected utilization of nuclear energy in basic operating ships of our great Navy.

It would be appropriate, I think, to mention at this time the great debt which the Congress and the Nation owes to Admiral Rickover, who with such high purpose, ability and dedication, and in the face at times of strong opposition and bitter criticism, laid the groundwork for nuclear propulsion and power, an epochal achievement which will continue in years ahead to bear rich fruits in terms of the maximum feasible potential, mobility and strength of our total naval forces.

What this great American has accomplished in a relatively short time is in the finest and best traditions of the American Navy and his effective contributions will long be gratefully noted and remembered by Congress and the people of this Nation as well as by potential enemies.

It is also reassuring to know that the conferees have moved to see to it that important prerogatives of the Congress in relation to the executive department and with reference to our constitutional mandate of responsibility in the area of national defense shall be recognized and reasserted by law. To be sure, as we have seen in recent history, it is one thing to have these constitutional prerogatives recognized by law, and quite another thing to see them effectuated and practiced.

Our experiences in this respect, unfortunately, have not been so happy in recent time. We have repeated instances where specific laws recommended strongly by the Defense Department, enacted by the Congress and signed by the President have not been implemented as intended by the Congress, by the Defense Department.

This is, of course, regrettable and it has hampered and to considerable extent, it has nullified, effectiveness of Congress in strengthening very important facets of the national defense.

Whether this situation suggests basic defects in our constitutional government, or whether it really indicates merely an unhappy and lamentable disagreement between the Congress and the executive is debatable.

In any event, I hope there can be some corrective action taken in the near future that will result in the executive department indicating its willingness not only to recognize the prerogatives of Congress, but to fully implement our valid prescriptions and directives relating to defense of the Nation.

After all, both the Congress and the executive department have vital and most important duties with respect to the security of the Nation, and if we are to have good results in our joint efforts to keep our defense potential at high levels, as is required in these days of crisis, we should and must work together wholeheartedly as a team, each branch of Government respecting the prerogatives of the other and unifying our efforts, so as to move without obstruction toward the goals which. I am sure we all have in mind of developing and maintaining our defense in such a way that it will be capable of meeting every contingency and all the needs for maximum necessary degree of defense, safety and security that may be required in this troubled world.

I think this end is not too much for the American people to expect of those they have chosen to represent them in the high seats of Government, whether in the legislative or executive branch.

We all respect the powers and the areas of responsibility laid down for the Congress and the President in the Constitution, and I think we must all be resolved to cooperate, wholeheartedly and completely, in entirely good faith, and in unison, in carrying out our respective responsibilities in setting up the best and most effective defense and powerful striking force that will serve, not only as a screen and deterrent to aggression and war but that will serve to protect this country in every way.

I especially want to thank my great chairman, the members of our outstanding committee, and all the Members of the House who have cooperated so spontaneously, notably and patriotically to provide this inspiring blueprint for peace. I want to commend and thank all the conferees, because their work on this bill has made history, has raised new hope for total collaboration in fending off aggression, and in achieving the peace and preserving it for ourselves, the free world and our posterity.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 2, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—360

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.

Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack

Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Vigorito

Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—2

Brown, Calif.
Cohelan

NOT VOTING—70

Abbitt
Bandstra
Baring
Bell
Callaway
Celler
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Delaney
Dow
Downing
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Farnum
Fisher
Flynt
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gilligan

Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Laird
Landrum
McFall
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Mink
Morris
Murray
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell

Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stephens
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Whitten
Willis

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Laird.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Farnum with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Bandstra with Robison.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Scheuer.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Dow.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mrs. Green.

Mr. Morris with Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Olsen of Montana with Mr. Schmidhauser.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Abbitt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

AN ACT TO ADJUST THE RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14122), an act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966'.

"TITLE I—EXECUTIVE BRANCH

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Act of 1966'.

"Employees subject to Classification Act of 1949

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (79 Stat. 1111; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

" 'Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,609	$3,731	$3,853	$3,975	$4,097	$4,219	$4,341	$4,463	$4,585	$4,707
GS-2	3,925	4,058	4,191	4,324	4,457	4,590	4,723	4,856	4,989	5,122
GS-3	4,269	4,413	4,557	4,701	4,845	4,989	5,133	5,277	5,421	5,565
GS-4	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,216
GS-5	5,331	5,507	5,683	5,859	6,035	6,211	6,387	6,563	6,739	6,915
GS-6	5,867	6,065	6,263	6,461	6,659	6,857	7,055	7,253	7,451	7,649
GS-7	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729	7,942	8,155	8,368
GS-8	7,068	7,303	7,538	7,773	8,008	8,243	8,478	8,713	8,948	9,183
GS-9	7,696	7,957	8,218	8,479	8,740	9,001	9,262	9,523	9,784	10,045
GS-10	8,421	8,709	8,997	9,285	9,573	9,861	10,149	10,437	10,725	11,013
GS-11	9,221	9,536	9,851	10,166	10,481	10,796	11,111	11,426	11,741	12,056
GS-12	10,927	11,306	11,685	12,064	12,443	12,822	13,201	13,580	13,959	14,338
GS-13	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
GS-14	15,106	15,629	16,152	16,675	17,198	17,721	18,244	18,767	19,290	19,813
GS-15	17,550	18,157	18,764	19,371	19,978	20,585	21,192	21,799	22,406	23,013
GS-16	20,075	20,745	21,415	22,085	22,755	23,425	24,095	24,765	25,435	--------
GS-17	22,760	23,520	24,280	25,040	25,800	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------,
GS-18	25,890	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

"(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b) (4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208 (b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

"(5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this Act) at the time of such promotion.

"New appointments under Classification Act of 1949

"Sec. 103. Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 401; 5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended by striking out 'grade 13' and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade 11'.

"Postal field service employees

"Sec. 104. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"'POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"'PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4, 204	$4, 343	$4, 482	$4, 621	$4, 760	$4, 899	$5, 038	$5, 177	$5, 316	$5, 455	$5, 594	$5, 733
2	4, 552	4, 701	4, 850	4, 999	5, 148	5, 297	5, 446	5, 595	5, 744	5, 893	6, 042	6, 191
3	4, 919	5, 085	5, 251	5, 417	5, 583	5, 749	5, 915	6, 081	6, 247	6, 413	6, 579	6, 745
4	5, 331	5, 507	5, 683	5, 859	6, 035	6, 211	6, 387	6, 563	6, 739	6, 915	7, 091	7, 267
5	5, 697	5, 888	6, 079	6, 270	6, 461	6, 652	6, 843	7, 034	7, 225	7, 416	7, 607	7, 798
6	6, 113	6, 316	6, 519	6, 722	6, 925	7, 128	7, 331	7, 534	7, 737	7, 940	8, 143	8, 346
7	6, 545	6, 763	6, 981	7, 199	7, 417	7, 635	7, 853	8, 071	8, 289	8, 507	8, 725	-------
8	7, 088	7, 323	7, 558	7, 793	8, 028	8, 263	8, 493	8, 733	8, 968	9, 203	-------	-------
9	7, 665	7, 920	8, 175	8, 430	8, 685	8, 940	9, 195	9, 450	9, 705	9, 960	-------	-------
10	8, 345	8, 628	8, 911	9, 194	9, 477	9, 760	10, 043	10, 326	10, 609	10, 892	-------	-------
11	9, 221	9, 526	9, 851	10, 166	10, 481	10, 796	11, 111	11, 426	11, 741	12, 056	-------	-------
12	10, 202	10, 549	10, 896	11, 243	11, 590	11, 937	12, 284	12, 631	12, 978	13, 325	-------	-------
13	11, 274	11, 663	12, 052	12, 441	12, 830	13, 219	13, 608	13, 997	14, 386	14, 775	-------	-------
14	12, 427	12, 859	13, 291	13, 723	14, 155	14, 587	15, 019	15, 451	15, 883	16, 315	-------	-------
15	13, 736	14, 210	14, 684	15, 158	15, 632	16, 106	16, 580	17, 054	17, 528	18, 002	-------	-------
16	15, 179	15, 707	16, 235	16, 763	17, 291	17, 819	18, 347	18, 875	19, 403	19, 931	-------	-------
17	16, 793	17, 380	17, 967	18, 554	19, 141	19, 728	20, 315	20, 902	21, 489	22, 076	-------	-------
18	18, 530	19, 145	19, 760	20, 375	20, 990	21, 605	22, 220	22, 835	23, 450	24, 065	-------	-------
19	20, 525	21, 210	21, 895	22, 580	23, 265	23, 950	24, 635	25, 320	-------	-------	-------	-------,
20	22, 760	23, 520	24, 280	25, 040	25, 800	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

"(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "RCS". Compensation shall be paid to rural carrier in accordance with this schedule.

"'RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"'Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2, 391	$2, 507	$2, 623	$2, 739	$2, 855	$2, 971	$3, 087	$3, 203	$3, 319	$3, 435	$3, 551	$3, 667
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25'

"(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule, which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "FOS", for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class, which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"'FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"'Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	$4, 019	$4, 152	$4, 285	$4, 418	$4, 551	$4, 684	$4, 817	$4, 950	$5, 083	$5, 216	$5, 349	$5, 482
24 but fewer than 30	3, 715	3, 837	3, 959	4, 081	4, 203	4, 325	4, 447	4, 569	4, 691	4, 813	4, 935	5, 057
18 but fewer than 24	3, 064	3, 168	3, 272	3, 376	3, 480	3, 584	3, 688	3, 792	3, 896	4, 000	4, 104	4, 208
12 but fewer than 18	2, 407	2, 485	2, 563	2, 641	2, 719	2, 797	2, 875	2, 953	3, 031	3, 109	3, 187	3, 265
6 but fewer than 12	1, 736	1, 791	1, 846	1, 901	1, 956	2, 011	2, 066	2, 121	2, 176	2, 231	2, 286	2, 341
Fewer than 6	1, 398	1, 443	1, 488	1, 533	1, 578	1, 623	1, 668	1, 713	1, 758	1, 803	1, 848	1, 893'

"(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

"(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

"Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration

"Sec. 105. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"'(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"'Section 4103 schedule

"'Assistant Chief Medical Director, $25,890.

"'Medical Director, $22,760 minimum to $25,800 maximum.

"'Director of Nursing Service, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"'Director of Chaplain Service, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"'Chief Pharmacist, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"'Chief Dietitian, $17,550, minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"'(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'Physician and dentist schedule

"'Director grade, $20,075 minimum to $25,435 maximum.

"'Executive grade, $18,730 minimum to $24,355 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $15,106 minimum to $19,813 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $12,873 minimum to $16,905 maximum.

"'Full grade, $10,927 minimum to $14,338 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $9,221 minimum to $12,056 maximum.

"'Nurse schedule

"'Assistant Director grade, $15,106 minimum to $19,813 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $12,873 minimum to $16,905 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $10,927 minimum to $14,338 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $9,221 minimum to $12,056 maximum.

"'Full grade, $7,696 minimum to $10,045 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $6,730 minimum to $8,749 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $5,867 minimum to $7,649 maximum.

"'(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.'

"Foreign service officers; staff officers and employees

"Sec. 106. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$23,935	$24,770	$25,890	----	----	----	----
Class 2	19,333	20,004	20,675	$21,347	$22,018	$22,689	$23,360
Class 3	15,841	16,391	16,941	17,491	18,041	18,591	19,141
Class 4	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561
Class 5	10,602	10,970	11,338	11,706	12,074	12,442	12,810
Class 6	8,843	9,147	9,451	9,755	10,059	10,363	10,667
Class 7	7,473	7,724	7,975	8,226	8,477	8,728	8,979
Class 8	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729"

"(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$15,841	$16,391	$16,941	$17,491	$18,041	$18,591	$19,141	$19,691	$20,241	$20,791
Class 2	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
Class 3	10,602	10,970	11,338	11,706	12,074	12,442	12,810	13,178	13,546	13,914
Class 4	8,843	9,147	9,451	9,755	10,059	10,363	10,667	10,971	11,275	11,579
Class 5	7,974	8,246	8,518	8,790	9,062	9,334	9,606	9,878	10,150	10,422
Class 6	7,201	7,441	7,681	7,921	8,161	8,401	8,641	8,881	9,121	9,361
Class 7	6,614	6,832	7,050	7,268	7,486	7,704	7,922	8,140	8,358	8,576
Class 8	5,853	6,051	6,249	6,447	6,645	6,843	7,041	7,239	7,437	7,635
Class 9	5,341	5,517	5,693	5,869	6,045	6,221	6,397	6,573	6,749	6,925
Class 10	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,216".

"(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

"Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

"SEC. 107. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this title for corresponding rates of compensation.

"Salary rates fixed by administrative action

"SEC. 108. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased, effective on the effective date of section 102 of this title, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this title for corresponding rates of compensation.

"(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the effective date of section 102 of this title, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be held or considered to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 109. This title shall become effective as follows:

"'(1) This section and sections 101, 103, and 108 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"'(2) Sections 102, 104, 105, 106, and 107 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.'

"TITLE II—JUDICIAL BRANCH

"Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1966'.

"Judicial branch employees

"SEC. 202. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 203. This title shall become effective as follows:

"(1) This section and section 201 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) Section 202 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

"TITLE III—LEGISLATION BRANCH

"Short title

"SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1966".

"Legislative branch employees

"SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 2.9 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

"(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by 2.9 per centum. Notwithstanding section 303 of this title or any other provision of this section, the total annual compensation of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be an amount which is equal to the total annual compensation of the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, respectively.

"(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079–1084; Public Law 88–652; 2 U.S.C. 291–303), including each employee subject to such Act whose compensation is fixed at a saved rate, are hereby increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and following).

"(e) This section shall not apply with respect to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by House Resolution 416, Eighty-ninth Congress, and the compensation of employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act.

"(f) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under the subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased, such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

"(g) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (h), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Chaplain of the Senate, and the Postmaster and Assistant Postmaster of the Senate are hereby increased by 2.9 per centum.

"(h) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568), is amended by striking out '$23,770' and inserting in lieu thereof '$24,460'.

"(i) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 2.9 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

"Salary increase limitation

"SEC. 303. No rate of compensation shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 304. This title shall become effective as follows:

"(1) This section and section 301 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) Sections 302 and 303 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Salary steps for certain employees transferred to postal field service

"SEC. 401. Section 3551 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Postmaster General may appoint or advance any Federal employee who, together with his function, is transferred, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection, to a post office or other postal installation at or to (1) the minimum rate for his position, or (2) any higher rate for his position which is less than one full step above the highest rate of compensation received by him immediately prior to such transfer.'.

"Postal seniority adjustments

"SEC. 402. (a) The Postmaster General shall advance any employee in the postal field service

"(1) who was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962;

"(2) who is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in the same post office promoted to the same level on or after October 13, 1962, and is on the effective date of this section in a step in the same level below the step of the junior employee; and

"(3) whom the Postmaster General determines is in the same craft and same branch of the Post Office Service as such junior employee.

Such advancement by the Postmaster General shall be to the highest step which is held by any such junior employee. Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained.

"(b) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting subsection (d).

"Special delivery messengers

"SEC. 403. Section 3542(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof '10 cents per mile or major fraction thereof'; and

"(2) by striking out '90 cents per hour' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1.25 per hour'.

"Overtime

"SEC. 404. (a) Section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 911), is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'or, with the exception of employees engaged in professional or technical engineering or scientific activities for whom the first forty hours of duty in an administrative workweek is the basic workweek and employees whose basic compensation exceeds the minimum rate of grade GS–10 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for whom the first forty hours of duty in an administrative workweek is the basic workweek, in excess of eight hours in a day' immediately following 'in excess of forty hours in any administrative workweek'; and

"(2) by striking out 'grade GS–9' wherever it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade GS–10'.

"(b) Section 202 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 912), is amended by striking out 'grade GS–9' and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade GS–10'.

"(c) Section 401 of such Act, as amended (5 U. S.C. 926), is amended by striking out 'grade GS–9' wherever it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade GS–10'.

"(d) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, are amended by striking out 'level PFS–7' and 'level PFS–8', wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof 'level PFS–10' and 'level PFS–11', respectively.

"Sunday premium pay

"SEC. 405. (a) The heading of title III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'TITLE III—COMPENSATION FOR NIGHT, SUNDAY, AND HOLIDAY WORK'

"(b)(1) Section 302 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 922), is redesignated as section 303 of such Act.

"(2) Any reference in any provision of law to section 302 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, which is redesignated as section 303 of such Act by paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall be held and considered to refer to section 303 of such Act, as so redesignated.

"(c) Title III of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 921 and following), is amended by inserting immediately following section 301 thereof the following:

"'Compensation for Sunday work

"'SEC. 302. Any regularly scheduled eight-hour period of service which is not overtime work as defined in section 201 of this Act any part of which is performed within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be compensated for the entire period of service at the rate of basic compensation of the officer or employee performing such work plus premium compensation at a rate equal to 25 per centum of his rate of basic compensation.'

"(d) Section 401(1) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(1)), is amended by inserting ', Sunday,' immediately following the word 'night'.

"(e) Section 401(2) of such Act as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(2)), is amended—

"(1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof ', on Sundays,' immediately following the words 'duty at night'; and

"(2) by inserting in the second sentence thereof 'Sunday,' immediately following 'night,'.

"(f) The first paragraph of section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935, as amended (5 U.S.C. 673c), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided further,* That employees subject to this section whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during that eight-hour period of service'.

"Health and insurance coverage for certain employees on leave without pay

"SEC. 406. (a) Section 6 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2095), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing, an officer or employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, elect to continue his insurance and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions from the beginning of leave without pay. If he does not so elect, his insurance will continue during nonpay status and terminate as provided in subsection (a) of this section. The employing agency shall forward the premium payments to the fund established by section 5 of this Act.'

"(b) Section 7(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3006(b)), is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(1)' immediately following '(b)'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) An employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, file with his employing agency an election to continue his health benefits coverage and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency from the beginning of leave without pay, both employee and agency contributions. If he does not so elect, his coverage will terminate as specified in paragraph (1) and implementing regulations. The employing agency shall forward the enrollment charges so paid to the fund.'

"(c) An officer or employee who is on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), or section 2 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001), as the case may be, may, within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, file with his employing agency an election (1) to continue any insurance status or health benefits enrollment, or both, that he has on the date of enactment of this Act, (2) to reacquire any insurance status or health benefits enrollment, or both, which he may have lost while on leave without pay, or (3 to acquire an insured status or enroll in a health benefits plan, or both, if he was never previously eligible to do so, by arranging to pay currently and continuously into the employees' life insurance fund and the employees' health benefits fund, as appropriate, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions. The employing agency shall forward such payments to the employees' life insurance fund and the employees' health benefits fund, as appropriate. If he does not so elect, his insurance status and health benefits enrollment will continue and terminate as for other employees in nonpay status, or he will remain ineligible for insurance and health benefits, as the case may be, as though this paragraph had not been enacted. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.

"Increase in uniform allowances

"Sec. 407. (a) Section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), is amended by inserting immediately following the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'In those instances where the agency makes reimbursement direct to the uniform vendor, the head of the agency may deduct a service charge not to exceed 4 per centum.'

"(b) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'Sec. 405. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, each of the respective maximum uniform allowances in effect on April 1, 1966, for the respective categories of employees to whom uniform allowances are paid under this title are hereby increased, subject to the maximum allowance authorized by this title, as follows:

" '(1) If the maximum uniform allowance is $100 or more, such allowance shall be increased by 25 per centum.

" '(2) If the maximum uniform allowance is $75 or more but less than $100, such allowance shall be increased by 30 per centum.

" '(3) If the maximum uniform allowance is $50 or more but less than $75, such allowance shall be increased by 35 per centum.

" '(4) If the maximum uniform allowance is less than $50, such allowance shall be increased by 40 per centum.

Such maximum uniform allowances, as in effect on April 1, 1966, and as increased by this section, shall not be reduced.'.

"Sec. 408. (a) Section 303(c) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 416; Public Law 88–426) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(47) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.'

"(b) Paragraph (30) of section 303(d) of such Act is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 409. Section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1959 (73 Stat. 698; Public Law 86–375), is amended by striking out the figure '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$15,000'.

"Effective dates

"Sec. 410. This title shall become effective as follows:

"(1) This section and sections 401, 406, and 407 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) Sections 402, 403, 404, 405, 408, and 409 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period after the enactment of this Act.

"TITLE V—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

"Short title

"Sec. 501. This title may be cited as the 'Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 19C3'.

"Definitions

"Sec. 502. Section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251(j)) is amended by inserting the letter '(d)' after the words 'for purposes of section 10'; by striking out the words 'received more than one-half of his support from and'; and by striking out the words 'twenty-one' and 'twenty-first' wherever they occur and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'twenty-two' and 'twenty-second', respectively.

"Retirement coverage for certain employees on leave without pay

"Sec. 503. Section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(k)(1) An employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 1(a) of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, file with his employing agency an election to receive full retirement credit for his periods of such leave without pay and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, amounts equal to the retirement deductions and agency contributions which would be applicable if he were in pay status. An employee who is on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of such an organization on the date of enactment of this subsection may similarly elect within sixty days after such date of enactment. If the election and all payments provided by this paragraph are not made, the employee shall receive no credit for such periods of leave without pay occurring on or after date of enactment of this subsection, notwithstanding the provisions of the second sentence of section 3(c) of this Act.

" '(2) An employee may deposit with interest an amount equal to retirement deductions representing any period or periods of approved leave without pay while serving, prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 1(a) of this Act, and may receive full retirement credit for such period or periods of leave without pay. In the event of his death, a survivor as defined in section 1(o) of this Act may make such deposit. If the deposit described in this paragraph is not made in full, retirement credit shall be allowed in accordance with the second sentence of section 3(c) of this Act.'

"Immediate retirement

"Sec. 504. (a) Section 6(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2256(a)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) Any employee who attains the age of fifty-five years and completes thirty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9.'

"(b) Section 6(b) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2256(b)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) Any employee who attains the age of sixty years and completes twenty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9.'

"Annuity computation

"Sec. 505. Section 9(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2259 (d)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(d) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee retiring under section 6(d), shall be reduced by one-sixth of 1 per centum for each full month such employee is under the age of fifty-five years at date of separation. The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for a Member retiring under the second or third sentence of section 6(f) or the third sentence of section 8(b), shall be reduced by one-twelfth of 1 per centum for each full month not in excess of sixty, and one-sixth of 1 per centum for each full month in excess of sixty, such Member is under the age of sixty years at date of separation.'

"Survivor annuities

"Sec. 506. (a) Section 10(a)(2) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2260 (a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(2) An annuity computed under this subsection shall commence on the day after the retired employee dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (A) in the case of the survivor of a retired employee, the survivor's remarriage prior to attaining age sixty, or death or (B) in the case of the survivor of a Member, the survivor's death or remarriage.'

"(b) The last sentence of section 10(c) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(c)) is amended to read as follows: " 'The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the day after the employee or Member dies, and an annuity under this subsection or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) the death of the widow or widower, (2) remarriage of the widow or widower of an employee prior to attaining age sixty, (3) remarriage of the widow or widower of a Member regardless of age, or (4) the widower's becoming capable of self-support.' "

"(c) Section 10(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(d)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(d) If an employee or a Member dies after completing at least five years of civilian service, or an employee or a Member dies after having retired under any provision of this Act, and is survived by a wife or by a husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 40 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $600, or (3) $1,800 divided by the number of children, subject to the provisions of section 18. If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $720, or (3) $2,160 divided by the number of children, subject to the provisions of section 18. The commencing date of a child's annuity under this Act or the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended from and after February 28, 1948, shall be deemed to be the day after the employee or Member dies, with payment beginning on that day or beginning or resuming on the first day of the month in which the child later becomes or again becomes a student as described in section 1(j), provided the lump-sum credit, if paid, is returned to the fund. Such annuity shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) the child's attaining age eighteen unless he is then a student as described or incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after attaining age eighteen unless he is then such a student, (3) his attaining age twenty-two if he is then such a student and not incapable of self-support, (4) his ceasing to be such a student after attaining age eighteen unless he is then incapable of self-support, (5) his marriage, or (6) his death, whichever first occurs. Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the child's annuity, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child had not survived the employee or Member.'

"(d) Section 10 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(f) In the case of a surviving spouse whose annuity under this section is hereafter terminated because of remarriage before attaining age sixty, annuity at the same rate shall be restored commencing on the day such remarriage is dissolved by death, annulment, or divorce: *Provided*, That (1) said surviving spouse elects to receive such annuity in lieu of any survivor benefit to which he or she may be entitled, under this or any other retirement system established for employees of the Government, by reason of the remarriage, and (2) any lump sum paid upon termination of the annuity is returned to the fund.'

"Increases in certain annuities

SEC. 507. Section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2268) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(g) Effective on (1) the first day of the second month after the enactment of this subsection, or (2) the commencing date of annuity, whichever is later, the annuity of each surviving spouse whose entitlement to annuity payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund resulted from the death of:

"'(A) an employee or Member prior to October 11, 1962, or

"'(B) a retired employee or Member whose retirement was based on a separation from service prior to October 11, 1962, shall be increased by 10 per centum.'

"Effective dates

"SEC. 508. (a) This section, section 509, and subsections 1(j), 3(k), 6(a), 6(b), 9(d), 10(a)(2), 10(c), 10(d), and 10(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as enacted or amended by this title, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) Except as provided in section 507 and in subsection (c) of this section, the amendments made by this title to the Civil Service Retirement Act shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to these respective effective dates, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if this title had not been enacted.

"(c) The amendments made by this title to section 1(j) and 10(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to payment, continuance, resumption, and termination of annuity to a child who is a student shall apply with respect to children of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this title, except that no child's annuity shall be paid by reason of these amendments for any period prior to such date of enactment.

"Miscellaneous

"SEC. 509. The provisions under the heading 'CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND' in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85–844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

"TITLE VI—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS

"SEC. 601. Section 2(d) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 709; 5 U.S.C. 3001(d)) is amended by striking out 'twenty-one' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-two'.

"SEC. 602. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7(a) of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the biweekly Government contributions for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this Act, in addition to the contributions required by paragraph (3), shall be $1.62 if the enrollment is for self alone or $3.94 if the enrollment is for self and family.

"'(2) For an employee or annuitant enrolled in a plan for which the biweekly subscription charge is less than twice the Government contribution established under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Government contribution shall be 50 per centum of the subscription charge.'

"SEC. 603. The amendments made by sections 601 and 602 of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 701. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f–61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment."

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman from Louisiana to take some time to explain the differences between the version passed by the other body and the version passed by this House? I believe if this is properly done, all of us will be the beneficiaries and we will probably agree with the Senate version, but I think it is most important that it be done by the gentleman from Louisiana, and also that opportunity be given to other Members to ask questions as to the changes in the House version.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do as the gentleman requests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection that the further reading be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Who reserves the right to object?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object..

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14122 as passed by the other body is more nearly in accordance with the bill as passed by the House than has been the case with any other major Federal employee measure which has been enacted by the House during my 24 years of congressional service.

Not a single one of the pay-raise provisions of the House bill was changed in the other body, except for the addition of the usual provisions to give Senate employees the same raises granted to House employees.

In fact, the only change in the first 21 pages of the House bill was a slight modification of our time-and-a-half overtime provision for classified employees, which excluded scientists and other professional employees from that provision.

The only major amendment of the other body was the omission of the House provision of section 505 of the House bill which would have allowed persons who retired before 1962 and elected survivorship protection to have their annuities recomputed under the survivor protection formula enacted in 1962.

The cost of such recomputations would be $112 million.

In place of that annuity recomputation privilege, the other body amended the bill to grant a 10-percent increase in survivor benefits for an estimated 330,000 widows and widowers of employees who retired before enactment of the 1962 retirement improvements.

The bill passed by the House would have granted the increase to only 273,000 of these survivors.

The Senate bill, with amendments, cuts down the overall cost $22 million. The salary increase amounts to $416.7 million. The total cost, as stated in Senate Report No. 1187, accompanying the bill, amounts to $505.8 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is that figure of $505.8 million a cost per year, over and above the current cost to the Treasury?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I was not certain that I understood the gentleman's explanation of the first change in the House version made by the other body. Would the gentleman explain again the time-and-a-half provision?

Mr. MORRISON. The House bill provided for those that premium pay for overtime worked by classified employees in grades GS–10 and above shall not exceed the rate for the first salary step of grade GS–10, instead of grade GS–9 as provided in present law. Classified employees also are given 25-percent differential pay for Sunday work—as was granted last year to postal employees. The Senate amendment excludes scientists and certain other professional personnel from the application of these House provisions.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. All below grade 10 are to be given time and a half; is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. Actually classified employees get overtime up to grade 15, but only at the first-step grade 10 rate if their regular salary rates are above that rate.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an across-the-board salary increase averaging 2.9 percent for postal workers and other Federal employees. This is a very modest pay boost considering the rise in the cost of living that has occurred since the last Federal salary increase in October 1965.

The Congress in 1962 pledged that Federal salary rates shall be comparable with those paid by private enterprise for the same levels of work. President Johnson strongly affirmed this principle of comparability when, in a message to Congress on May 12, 1965, he declared:

> We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is short-sighted. In the long run, it costs more.

Yet, despite the increases voted last year and in the bill we are considering today, the salaries paid to Federal employees continue to lag behind the rates paid for comparable work in private industry.

My colleagues will recall that last year the original House bill provided for a 4-percent first-step increase effective in 1965 and a second-step adjustment to become effective a year later. The amount of the second-step adjustment was to be determined according to a special formula designed to bring Federal employees' salaries into closer relationship with those paid in private industry. However, the Senate reduced the 1965 increase from 4 to 3.6 percent and eliminated the 1966 second-stage increase altogether.

The reason given last year for reducing the increase voted by the House is the same reason given this year for not making a greater effort to close the gap between the salaries of Government employees and their counterparts in private industry: the threat of a Presidential veto if the increase exceeds the administration wage-price guidelines.

The Consumer Price Index was 110.4 in October 1965. Within 6 months the index jumped 1.9 percent to 112.5. So the purchasing power of the 2.9-percent increase we are voting today is actually only about 1 percent, minus Federal, State, and local taxes, civil service retirement deductions, and life insurance premiums.

I do not intend to be critical of either our own Post Office and Civil Service Committee or the corresponding committee of the other body. They have both been as generous toward the Federal employee as could reasonably be expected of them in view of the wage guidelines which the administration appears to be applying more rigidly to Federal employees than to those who can bargain collectively with private employers.

The fringe benefit features of the final version of H.R. 14122—including more liberal retirement provisions, increased Government contribution to the cost of health insurance, overtime pay and increased annuities for certain overtime pay and certain annuity increases—bring the cost to slightly more than the administration's wage guidepost figure.

To do less, as the Senate committee's report so well concludes, "would be to do practically nothing at all."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that I have gone over the Senate bill and it is very similar to the bill we passed. The Senate passed it without a dissenting vote.

I cannot see any advantage to any delay, or in going to conference. I do not know what we could accomplish.

Therefore, because so many persons are vitally interested in getting this legislation to the White House, I should like to concur with the gentleman from Louisiana and urge the immediate passage of this particular Senate version as it comes to us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the retroactive date, in any event, would be July 1? Even if the bill went to conference, the date very likely would be July 1.

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] that the best thing to do is to pass this legislation now, rather than to go to conference.

The reason for prompt passage of the pay-raise legislation is that this is the best we can do in this Congress. While it is not enough, we had better get the best we can for our good U.S. Federal employees and postal workers. It is clearly apparent that this is the limit the present administration, and the Senate, will accept. Better pay would be spent for education and family necessities—and is not inflationary, and certainly is necessary to meet increased costs of living.

I strongly urge the U.S. Congress and the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House and the Senate to prepare needed legislation and sound and adequate bills to be introduced in January when the next—90th—Congress convenes, to provide real comparability for salaries and pay for U.S. Federal employees and postal workers.

Congress by legislation already on the statute books has solemnly promised comparability in pay to private industry, for Federal employees and postal workers. This promise of the U.S. Congress of comparability in pay must be met and fulfilled in all good faith.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be allowed to have until Friday, midnight, to file a report on the Department of Transportation bills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 906 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 906

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order with 5 hours of general debate the annual amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act. Of course, the Foreign Assistance Act is controversial. There are supplemental and minority views in the report, but nobody appeared against the rule. Nobody proposed that the bill not be given a rule and, as far as I know, there is no substantial opposition to the rule. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has stated, House Resolution 906 provides for the consideration of H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 under an open rule with 5 hours of debate. A waiver of points of order was requested, but was not granted. This action was taken because there does not appear to be any language in the bill which is subject to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15750 is to authorize the overall foreign aid program for the next 2 fiscal years, 1967 and 1968, and to authorize the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress for 5 years, through fiscal 1971.

For fiscal 1967 the bill carries an authorization of $4,109,119,000, and for fiscal 1968 the figure is $4,158,339,000.

This bill marks a major departure from past procedure in that the program is authorized for 2 years rather than 1. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Dr. MORGAN, testified that by freeing the committee from the necessity of an annual hearing on the subject, it could use the time to carry out meaningful studies and investigations into various phases of the program. This is an aim which we can all support. However, the point has been raised that this, being the 2d session of the 89th Congress, is the wrong year to begin a new 2-year program. We are somewhat binding the next Congress. It could more properly be undertaken next year, thus leaving the 2d session of the 90th Congress for in-depth studies of the program.

The method used to calculate the second year authorizations was to use the figures determined for this fiscal year. This seems to somewhat deny the Foreign Affairs Committee the chance next year to reevaluate individual situations in various countries, leaving the job to the Appropriations Committee.

The bill is divided into two traditional sections, military and economic assistance—$917 million is authorized for each of fiscal 1967 and 1968 in the field of military assistance. This money goes primarily to some 10 countries, currently with about 2 million men under arms. This figure does not include aid to Vietnam which is included in the DOD appropriations.

On the economic side of the bill, a number of programs are included. They include those already mentioned, the Development Loan Fund program authorized at $1 billion per year for 5 years, and the Alliance for Progress authorized at $850 million for the same period. The appropriations requested for these programs are substantially below these figures, $665,388,000 for the Development Loan Fund and $543 million for the Alliance for Progress. This is a substantial amount of flexibility, and reflects the problems of multiyear authorizations.

Funds for international organizations are included in the bill. The authorization is for $140,433,000 and includes all U.N. programs from peace keeping assistance to children's relief and the World Health Organization programs.

Supporting assistance is authorized at $750 million for each year, $550 million of which is programed for South Vietnam. The economic activity generated by such assistance is used to assist in maintaining the military preparedness of our allies, primarily South Korea, Thailand, Laos, and South Vietnam.

The contingency fund is authorized at $150 million for each of the 2 years. For this year the appropriation request is $70 million. The purpose of the fund is to meet emergency situations around the world.

Other programs included in the bill are the technical cooperation and development program, the old point 4 program and the investment guarantee program.

Amended language will be inserted into the act by this bill which will forbid any assistance under the act to any country who trades with North Vietnam. The amended language is: "no assistance shall be furnished." Testimony of the committee chairman indicates that he and his committee view this as an absolute prohibition of aid. Substantial progress has already been made in this field since the facts were made known to the Congress and the public last year.

The dollar value of counterpart funds held by the United States in various foreign currencies, primarily generated by Public Law 480 food shipments, continues to plague us. Nothing in this bill will lessen that problem; nor has the Agriculture Committee, which controls the food-for-freedom program, come to grips with the problem. Something should be done to utilize these funds; I would hope that the two committees primarily interested could look further into the question.

There are supplemental, separate, and minority views in the report. Mrs. BOLTON, Messrs. MAILLIARD, FRELINGHUYSEN, BROOMFIELD, and MORSE support the bill but strongly object to the 2-year authorization features. They believe that such continuing programs as the Alliance for Progress and the development loan program should be authorized for the longer periods, but oppose such procedure for the entire foreign aid program because of the rapidly changing situations in so many parts of the world.

This view is also separately supported by Mr. FULTON.

Messrs. ADAIR, GROSS, BERRY, DERWINSKI, and THOMSON have filed minority views. They oppose the bill, pointing to numerous instances of hostile acts by recipients of foreign aid over the years, citing particularly Egypt, Indonesia, Ghana, and India. They also point to the situation in Latin America where billions in aid have brought forth very little progress.

They cite foreign countries who have received our aid and are still shipping supplies to North Vietnam and point out that the law does not require cutting off aid to these countries. They join their colleagues in opposing a 2-year authorization for the entire bill.

Mr. Speaker, although I feel that a certain amount of foreign aid is advisable and necessary, I cannot bring myself to believe that this tremendously extensive program each year is necessary or sufficiently beneficial to the United States of America. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I personally intend to vote against this bill. But I know of no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker, urge its adoption, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman knows, and I think the House should be made aware of the fact, that this is one of the largest foreign handout bills ever brought to he floor of the House. I say that, in point of the time and money provided in the bill under the 2-year provision and the 5-year provision for the Alliance for Progress.

This bill calls for approximately $13,800 million.

I wonder if the gentleman from California agrees with me that this Congress, having only recently increased the debt ceiling, ought to be going the other way. It ought not to be increasing the foreign aid spending and extending it over a period of 2 years. We ought to be decreasing and phasing out this program. We ought to be reducing it so that the taxpayers of this country can see some daylight; so that we can stop this eternal going deeper and deeper into debt and increasing inflation. I wonder if the gentleman agrees in general with what I have said—that this is the largest bill we have had in many years—probably the second largest bill in the history of foreign aid; that ought to be drastically cutting this bill instead of increasing it?

Mr. SMITH of California. I find myself in complete agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] for his analysis of the bill we are about to take up.

I would like to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from California mentioned that some $4,158,339,000 is to be authorized for the fiscal year 1968. As a member of the committee, I should like to point out that no justification was made for any specific figure for the second fiscal year; namely, 1968. It was essentially an arbitrary decision by the committee that we should establish a ceiling for 1968 which would be roughly the equivalent of the amount which would be authorized for the next fiscal year.

Indeed, the committee report points out with pride the fact that this would constitute a ceiling of, and I quote:

> It is expected that the Executive will not develop plans for fiscal 1968 which contemplate any increase in foreign aid.

Then it goes on:

> Rather than expanding the programs already under way or seeking new areas in which to operate, those responsible for the administration of military and economic assistance should reexamine their priorities * * *.

In other words, what we are being asked to do is to establish a ceiling without having any indication of any kind as to what the actual needs would be in the second year of the program.

I raise this point simply to show that we are taking a major and definite course as the gentleman from California has already pointed out and one which may require different action when the time comes.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding and I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from California also mentioned that now is not a particularly appropriate time to consider the extension of the foreign aid program for a 2-year period because we are in the 2d session of the 89th Congress. The gentleman suggested that next year might be a more appropriate time. I would fully agree with that position. But I would point out that there would seem to be no overriding necessity for our committee not to have an annual responsibility to make a review of the foreign aid program. Our committee is not so preoccupied with other major legislation that it could not find the time to make the in-depth inquiries that the chairman of the committee indicates are necessary in addition to the overall comprehensive survey which would seem to be necessary at least every 2 years.

I say this to point out that even next year there would be no compelling necessity for us to feel so concerned about the way we occupy our time that we would feel we should authorize this program for longer than a 1-year period. I just wanted to call attention to the fact, because the gentleman seemed to me to suggest that it might be a reasonable course of action for the 90th Congress to take, that we should wait until next year to make that decision. I think we should not make the decision to change the present approach until a good case has been made to justify what is being recommended by the administration.

Mr. SMITH of California. If the gentleman understood me to recommend a 2-year period, I wish to correct that misunderstanding. I think we ought to handle the subject every year. But if the House is going to consider it, I think it should not be considered until the 1st session of the 90th Congress, when there might be a number of different individuals back here who might be interested in deciding that question, and we should not bind them. I hope that my statement will not be interpreted as favoring a 2-year program, and all the excessive waste there is in the program.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the argument that has been made about approving a 2-year authorization and use next year to send Members gallivanting over the world. That is a fallacious argument in behalf of a 2-year commitment. The Foreign Affairs Committee, if it has the will and the desire to do it, can get to work next January or, at the latest, the first of February, and conduct the investigation that is needed with respect to this program. We do not need to devote a year to congressional junketeers floating around over the world. We need to get down to work in the committee and hold exhaustive hearings. We can get to the bottom of this program if there is a will to do it.

Mr. SMITH of California. I assume that will all be covered in the 5 hours of debate. I simply wanted to bring to the attention of the body of the House the information that was presented to the Rules Committee when we heard the request for the rule. That is what I was attempting to do. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEATH OF ROBERT G. PERRY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Robert G. Perry at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Bethesda, Md., early this morning, the Members of Congress have lost a valuable friend and a wonderful associate.

Mr. Perry was born in Beckley, W. Va., on March 17, 1923, and has 20 years of distinguished service as a member of the Hospital Corps of the Navy Department.

In 1951 he was assigned to the Capitol Physician, at a time when he held the rank of chief petty officer.

In 1961, in February, he retired from the Navy, but continued to serve us here as a civilian.

Perry was notable for his uprightness, his affability, his dedication to duty, and his desire to be of service to the men and women in the Congress.

Earlier today I talked to some of his associates in the Capitol Physician's office as I went by to inquire as to the state of the late Bob Perry's health, and I was shocked to be told that he had passed away this morning.

One of the comments that was made by one of his longtime associates I wrote down, and I quote as follows:

> He was just loved by everyone up here. You just can't put your finger on each of his fine qualities.

He further told me that people had been calling in constantly at the Capitol Physician's office during the illness of our late friend who has left us at such a young age.

I extend to his wife and his four fine children my personal sympathy and assure them that in the loss of their distinguished and splendid husband and father, I feel a deep sense of personal loss.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I would like wholeheartedly to endorse what the gentleman from North Carolina has said about our wonderful friend, Chief Perry, who served us so capably for so long in Dr. Calver's medical clinic here in the Capitol Building.

Chief Perry has been here, as the gentleman has said, a long, long time. The fact of the matter is he has been here about as long as I have been a Member of Congress. I was sworn into this body on January 3, 1945, and never has there been a time that I have gone to Dr. Calver's office but that Chief Perry always met me—and everybody—with a smile, a warm handshake, and, a deep interest in your problem or your ailment. It is the only place that dispensed medicine where I actually felt I was welcome and where I really felt at ease and perfectly at home. This was the sort of personal treatment that just effervesced within him. He loved people and he dearly loved his work here. It was part of his nature to be a good listener to our troubles. He was a loyal, devoted, sincere, dedicated man. I admired him and I respected him, and I honor him today.

I, too, with the gentleman from North Carolina, extend to his loved ones my deepest sympathy.

The other day I heard he was ill. I anticipated writing him a letter, in order to try to cheer him up—but, dear Lord, I am shocked to know he has passed away. What I could not say in a letter—I now pour from my heart.

I say to the Members of this House and to our colleagues in the Senate quite frankly that his sudden passing is a personal loss to me, as I know it is to every Member of the House and the Senate.

> Making friends is a lot of fun—shaking hands with everyone—hearing what each has to say—as we meet them day by day—swapping smiles and trading cheer makes us happy while we're here cause all the joy of life depends just on the art of making friends.

This little verse, Mr. Speaker, must have been written especially for Chief Perry. God rest his sweet soul in peace.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to hear of the passing of my good friend and former constituent, Bob Perry. Over the years he endeared himself to every Member of the House, for he possessed attributes of character that every man can envy.

To his wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina has so well expressed, Bob Perry left an indelible mark of service for all of us. It was a service which was done in a friendly, efficient, and effective manner.

I learned a few weeks ago of his serious illness. I fortunately did have an opportunity to drop him a line and wish him the best just a week or so ago. Regrettably, I did not have an opportunity to see him personally in recent weeks.

His place will be hard to fill, because the work he did was done so well and in such a fine manner.

I join with the gentleman from North Carolina and the others in extending to his family our deepest sympathy and sincerest condolences.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to join with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] and the distinguished gentlemen who have made statements. Bob Perry was a friend of mine. I extend my sympathy to his family. Bob Perry was a very, very fine man.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join all the Members of the House who have spoken on the passing of our friend Bob Perry.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Bob Perry. He has been a dedicated part of the world in which we in the Congress live, and his gentleness, his solicitude for our welfare, his counsel, and his care will be sorely missed. He will live in affection in our memory as he dwelt vibrantly in our affections during his years of association with us. To his wife and children I extend my deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of the late Bob Perry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15750, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] will be recognized for 2½ hours and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] will be recognized for 2½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15750. Before detail discussion of the bill I would like to discuss foreign aid in general.

It looks as though the Communists may be losing the cold war, and they do not appear to be winning the "hot war" in Vietnam.

I do not mean to say that from now on everything will be all right. Any quick review of the world situation shows that the United States is confronted with serious problems in all areas, and it is not too difficult to find examples of waste and inefficiency in our foreign aid operations.

Nevertheless, there have been encouraging developments. In countries where free elections have been held, the extreme leftists have been defeated and governments friendly to the United States have been elected. Although in a number of countries governments have been overthrown and military dictatorships have taken over, the new governments appear to be anti-Communist, to be sincerely concerned with improving existing conditions, and to desire the friendship and cooperation of the United States.

Furthermore, if you look around, there is evidence that many people are better off as a result of U.S. assistance.

Nine countries in Latin American have adopted tax reform legislation. Critics of the foreign air program prefer to emphasize the fact that 10 countries of Latin American have not yet reformed their tax systems. We ought to recognize, however, that tax reform is a vital issue in nearly every Latin American country and that further progress appears to be inevitable.

Over half the people of Latin America are benefiting from U.S. aid: 100 million people have been protected from malaria; 1½ million people live in houses built under the sponsorship of the Alliance for Progress; 13 million people in Latin America are benefiting from water and sanitation projects to which the United States has contributed.

I cite these facts because there is a tendency to focus so much attention on the scrap pile that we overlook the skyscraper which is being built.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there are very many here who think that the idea of foreign aid is all wrong and that it is a mistake for the United States to have any kind of a foreign assistance program.

There are a good many here this afternoon, including many who will vote for this bill, who have sincere misgivings as to whether we have the right kind of foreign aid program. All of us question whether we are spending too much money on foreign aid, whether we are providing assistance to the wrong countries, and whether the money we spend is spent for the most useful projects.

I would like to take a few minutes to consider what kind of a foreign aid program we ought to have and some of the reforms that are being discussed at the present time.

The first thing to consider is the relation of foreign aid to our foreign policy. If we regard foreign aid as providing a kit of tools to assist in the conduct of our foreign policy, we will have a different type of program than if we give priority to foreign aid and make adjustments in our foreign policy in order to make the foreign aid program more efficient.

Let me make clear what I am talking about.

There is a good deal of discussion of whether or not we are giving assistance to too many countries.

Now, there is no doubt that if we limited foreign aid to those countries having the most capable and honest governments, and which are most willing to cooperate with us, our foreign aid operations would look a lot better and we could save some money.

Anyone who analyzes the operation of the foreign aid program recognizes that, in general, the best programs are in the countries with the best governments. Wherever you have a government that lacks understanding of major problems and where skilled, native administrative and technical personnel are lacking, you find waste and inefficiency in spite of all the United States can do.

The fundamental problem is that of the 120 or so independent nations in the world today, a large percentage do not have capable governments or a reasonable number of people qualified to deal with political and economic problems.

It is U.S. policy to try to develop and maintain friendly and cooperative relationships with these countries whether their governments are efficient or not.

We are confronted with comparable situations in deciding whether to give aid to governments whose officials criticize our policies or to governments which accept assistance from the Soviet Union or Red China.

Many such countries are important, either because of the number of their people, their geographic location, or the nature of their resources. It is not to our advantage to force them into the Communist camp.

We have to recognize, however, that most of these countries need outside help and that they will fall under Communist domination without our assistance. In most cases, we do not get the kind of cooperation and support for our foreign programs in such countries that produces maximum efficiency.

Consider the use of foreign currency to finance foreign aid. At present, the United States has on hand excess foreign currencies available for U.S. use equivalent to almost $1.5 billion in 10 countries.

By far the largest amount are in Indian rupees and Egyptian pounds.

If we changed our foreign policy so as to use up foreign currencies, we could reduce our holdings. On the other hand, if we try to use these excess foreign currencies to help in the conduct of our foreign policy, the outlook is not encouraging.

Unfortunately, there are not many places in the world where we can promote our foreign policy by spending Indian rupees or Egyptian pounds.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat misleading to refer to the foreign assistance program as though it were one program. This bill authorizes funds for nine programs. All of them involve assisting foreign countries, but each is different in its purpose and its operation. Each is designed to deal with different situations and problems.

We provide military assistance to governments which cannot afford to pay for the military forces necessary to carry out the functions assigned to them in a common defense strategy and to governments which are not able to provide an adequate defense against subversion.

We provide economic assistance under the heading of "supporting assistance" to 13 countries for military or political reasons, primarily for shortrun considerations. This assistance is necessary to countries like Korea and Laos, where their economies have been distorted by military developments, and to a number of countries where we have base rights.

We provide development loans to assist 10 of the bigger and more progressive undeveloped countries to deal with their long range problems.

We provide technical assistance and development grants to 47 smaller countries who have not progressed to the point where they can undertake comprehensive development programs.

We have a special program of dollar loans and grants to the countries of Latin America with which we have tried to develop a special relationship under the Alliance for Progress.

We make contributions under the authority of this bill to programs of 12 international organizations because it is in the interest of the United States to encourage the nations of the world to work together to attain common objectives.

We authorize in this bill a contingency fund to enable those administering our foreign policy to deal promptly with emergencies whenever and wherever they occur.

In addition, there are small authorizations for programs for American schools and hospitals abroad and for southeast Asia multilateral and regional programs.

The United States is confronted with crises and problems all over the world. There is not any part of the world which we can ignore, where we can say that it does not matter to us what happens there.

It is in our interest to try to cooperate with governments everywhere in their efforts to find solutions to their problems. We have to accept the world as it exists. We cannot overnight make governments more capable than they are, nor can we force them to agree with us on all issues.

The foreign assistance programs authorized in this bill provide a variety of means which our foreign policy makers can use in dealing with the situations which they are forced to meet.

We should be realistic and discriminating in the money we spend on foreign aid. We should not invest money in long-range projects in countries where the governments are not able and willing to make the commitments necessary for long-range projects to succeed. We should not provide assistance to countries which use their own resources for purposes contrary to our interests.

Nevertheless, we face the fact that we need foreign aid in order to carry on our foreign policy and a certain amount of our assistance should be available to countries that are not too effective in making use of it.

FUNDS AUTHORIZED

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something about the provisions of the bill before us.

H.R. 15750 authorizes $4,109,119,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $4,158,339,000 for fiscal 1968.

These totals do not include military assistance to Vietnam but do include economic assistance to Vietnam and military assistance to 55 other countries in fiscal 1967. The Executive has programed economic assistance to 70 countries in fiscal 1967.

In many ways, these figures are misleading.

The most important single figure to keep in mind is that the Executive is requesting foreign aid appropriations of $3,385,962,000 for fiscal 1967.

The opponents of the bill will probably point out that it authorizes a total of $13,817,458,000. This total is derived by adding the authorization of $1 billion a year for 5 years for the development loan fund and $850 million a year for 5 years for the Alliance for Progress, together with the 2-year authorizations for the rest of the program.

This $13 billion figure reminds me a little of seeing in the newspapers that the average workingman earns some such amount as $113,000 during his lifetime. This sounds like a lot of money, but in terms of weekly pay envelopes, it does not seem so big.

The important thing is to keep in mind the figure of $3,385,962,000 which is the amount the Executive is asking to be appropriated for fiscal 1967.

FIVE-YEAR AUTHORIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT LOANS AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The President requested 5-year authorizations for all of the programs included in this bill.

Apparently, the President had a number of reasons why he wanted a 5-year authorization. In all fairness, I do not think the President was trying to avoid or to limit the control of the Congress over foreign aid.

The President is fully aware that all foreign aid funds are subject to annual appropriation.

The Executive has a pretty good record for holding down its requests for appropriation below the amount authorized when they can get along without the full amount.

For fiscal 1966 the authorization for development loans was $1.5 billion, but the Executive requested an appropriation of $780,250,000—a little over half the amount authorized.

In fiscal 1965, the authorization was $1.5 billion and the Executive requested an appropriation of $922,200,000.

For fiscal year 1964 the authorization was $1.5 billion, and the appropriation request was $1,060,000,000.

In fiscal 1963, with an authorization of $1.5 billion, the Executive requested an appropriation of $1.25 billion.

The record of these 4 years indicates that the Executive did not regard the authorization figure as an invitation to ask for more money than was necessary.

The main argument for a 5-year authorization is its effect on the undeveloped countries.

It is very difficult to get these countries to take a long-range view of their problems, not just economic problems, but social and political problems as well.

It is in their interest and in the interest of world peace and prosperity to have them think ahead and not, in trying to deal with their current problems, get themselves into situations which they cannot cope with.

It is U.S. policy in dealing with the less-developed countries to assure them of our interest and our desire to work with them in finding solutions to their problems. A 5-year authorization for development loans and for the Alliance for Progress is interpreted by them as an indication of interest in their future and gives them encouragement to plan for the future.

The committee approved a 5-year authorization for the development loan fund but cut the amount from $1,250 million a year requested to $1 billion.

The Executive is requesting an appropriation of only $665,388,000 for fiscal year 1967 under this authorization for $1 billion.

This issue is fairly simple. It is whether it is in the interest of U.S. foreign policy for the Congress to authorize an amount as large as $1 billion a year for development loans even when the Executive knows it will not need that much money for the first year, and may not for any year.

The committee could have gotten credit in the press for cutting the development loan fund from $1,250 million to $665,388,000 without reducing the funds to be appropriated by one dime. This would have been a cut of $584,612,000, but as far as financing foreign aid for fiscal year 1967, it would not have saved the taxpayer a cent.

The committee decided to go along with the authorization of $1 billion a year for 5 years. AID will not ask for the full amount unless they believe they can defend it, and the Congress will review the program every year and appropriate whatever amount has, in its judgment, been justified.

TWO-YEAR AUTHORIZATION

The bill provides for a 2-year authorization for each of the programs included, except for development loans and the Alliance for Progress.

If the Congress goes along with this idea, there will be no foreign aid authorization bill next year.

There will, of course, be an appropriation bill, and Congress will have ample opportunity to work its will.

Two-year authorizations for foreign aid are not new, although this is the first time the committee has recommended an across-the-board authorization for 2 years.

In 1957, the Congress approved a 2-year authorization for the development loan fund.

In 1959, Congress voted a 3-year authorization for military assistance, and an additional 2-year authorization for the development loan fund.

In 1962, Congress approved a 4-year authorization for the Alliance for Progress.

The committee had two things in mind in recommending a 2-year authorization:

First. A belief that the committee and the Congress might make better use of its time than going over the authorization request in detail every year.

Second. A desire to set a ceiling for fiscal 1968 and tell the executive not to spend their time working up bigger and better programs for fiscal year 1968 but to devise ways of dealing with our foreign policy problems without using more money than this year.

With a 2-year authorization, the committee does not intend to do any less work on foreign aid than it does now, and we do not intend to assume less responsibility.

The request for the authorization of funds inevitably focuses on plans for the future and on the financial side of foreign aid.

The committee believes that it should give more attention to the accomplishments of foreign aid and to what actually is going on, and a little less emphasis to what the executive says it intends to do.

A 2-year authorization will give each Congress an opportunity to act on the foreign aid authorization, and the Congress can, of course, enact legislation on foreign aid any any time.

RESTRICTIONS AND GUIDANCE

The bill imposes certain restrictions on the use of foreign aid and contains guidance and encouragement with respect to special situations.

SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Section 301(e)(3) of the bill—page 19—prohibits furnishing assistance to any country failing to take appropriate steps to prevent their ships or aircraft from trading with North Vietnam.

The worst offender is the United Kingdom, and they receive no U.S. aid.

No Norwegian-flag ships have arrived in North Vietnam since November 1965.

The Greek Government has recently issued a decree prohibiting Greek-flag ships to call at North Vietnamese ports.

No Cypriot-flag ship not already under charter before the enactment of the relevant foreign aid legislation last year has arrived in North Vietnam since that time.

Although shipping from countries receiving U.S. aid has been pretty much stopped, the committee included this provision to indicate to the Executive that we wanted the foreign aid program used to put pressure on the recipients of our assistance to cooperate.

PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES OFFICIALLY PARTICIPATING IN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE PLANNING SUBVERSION (SECTION 301(E)(1))

Government officials from a number of countries receiving U.S. aid attended the Tricontinental Conference in Havana last January. The purpose of this conference was to plan subversion against the governments of Latin America.

We believe that any government desiring U.S. aid should keep its officials away from conferences of this kind and that we should put the recipients of our aid on notice to this effect.

DISCOURAGING RECIPIENTS OF U.S. AID FROM DIVERTING THEIR OWN ECONOMIC RESOURCES TO PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OR OTHER COUNTRIES RECEIVING U.S. AID

Last year we included in the bill an expression of the opposition of the Congress to providing aid to countries that spend a lot of money and effort on propaganda against us or countries with which we maintain friendly relations.

Section 101(a) of this bill indicates that reports should be sent to the Congress on propaganda activities of this kind.

If the State Department has to file reports, it may make them a little more alert and aggressive in dealing with this matter.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE OF U.S. PROPERTY BY MOB ACTION

Last year we included in the foreign aid bill an expression of the sense of the Congress that U.S. aid should be cut off from countries permitting damage or destruction of U.S. property by mob action.

There have been a few cases where governments have apologized and taken other action to make amends for the destruction of U.S. property but where the actual compensation for damage has been long delayed. We think the State Department should give a high priority to this matter.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in closing that the United States has to attain three basic objectives in the field of foreign policy:

First. We have to win the war in Vietnam.

Second. We have to maintain the military capability and the readiness of those countries which are willing to use force to resist Communist aggression.

Three. We have to encourage the people of the less developed countries in their efforts to better themselves.

We cannot do these things unless we make it possible for those responsible for the conduct of our foreign policy to make use of foreign assistance programs of the nature and magnitude authorized by this bill.

There are indications that our foreign policy may be beginning to pay off.

This is not the time either to curtail or to reorganize foreign aid.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman referred in his statement to the fact that there are 10 countries throughout the world where there are excess local currencies which the United States has the right to use. One of the things that has come to my attention recently from several American businessmen and American travelers is that in seeking to purchase some of these funds that are excess for American dollars, they have not been able to do so.

Am I correct in stating for the RECORD that in those countries where there are excess currencies available, that under the provisions of section 104(T) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1954, as amended, an American citizen or an American businessman who is either traveling or doing business in one of those countries has an absolute right to go to the American Embassy and purchase those local currencies for American dollars? Is that correct, sir?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. Most of these currencies have not been generated by foreign aid. They have been generated under Public Law 480.

Two of the largest are India, where we have Indian rupees, and Egypt, where we have Egyptian pounds. These currencies have been generated under Public Law 480. Under that legislation, much of this currency is restricted as to use by the sales agreements entered into when we sell our commodities.

The countries buying our wheat and cotton have to agree to the sale of these currencies to U.S. tourists and businessmen or it cannot be used for this purpose.

Mr. CAHILL. I know, but I wanted to get an expression from the gentleman that it is the intent of this committee and of the Congress, I hope, that American Ambassadors in these countries shall, wherever possible, make these funds available for the American tourist or the American businessman.

Mr. MORGAN. So far as I am concerned, the gentleman has a good point. I believe they should be made available.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I believe the chairman already has expressed the congressional intent, and this is already expressed in the law; that, in fact, they do just that and it is part of Public Law 480.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not also true that it depends on the terms of the agreement between any particular country and our country, as to whether such funds are available for purchase by the average businessman or the average tourist? In some cases there are restrictions which prevent such purchases by individual citizens.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. The use of these currencies is limited by the terms of the various sales agreements.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I wonder if we could find out if any businessman has been denied these convertible funds.

Mr. MORGAN. The operation of this provision is of primary concern to the Committee on Agriculture rather than the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. KELLY. But it would be worth while to know .

Mr. MORGAN. I believe that these questions should be raised when Public Law 480 is under debate on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman states that the 2-year commitment is for the purpose, at least in substantial part, of having members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I assume, start touring the world to look into the various projects which have been financed by this handout program.

I believe the gentleman will agree with me that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is one of the best traveled of the Members of Congress on the Foreign Affairs Committee and in the House itself.

During the course of the hearings the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said this:

> Mr. Secretary, I put this question before in reference to a successful project and I have never had an answer. Just tell me one, anywhere in the world outside of Western Europe, that AID has financed, and been a success. I would like to look at it.

I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee will agree that we ought to have some answers in the Foreign Affairs Committee to questions of this kind before we start spending the taxpayers' money ambling around all over the world looking for failures in this program.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, of course, I want to speak up in defense of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I will say that our members do not travel any more than those on any other committee of this body. In fact, I do not believe they travel as much as members of some committees of the Congress.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] should answer the question for himself.

As I said when this question was raised in the Rules Committee, the minority singled out a couple of quotes from the members of the committee which appeared in the hearings.

If the gentleman wants us to furnish a list of successful projects I would suggest he look at pages 407, 408, and 409 of the hearings which set forth an impressive list of successful projects in response to the request of Mr. HAYS.

We can cite a good many successful projects all over the world.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would do that.

Mr. MORGAN. Let us take the country of Taiwan. Has foreign aid not been successful there?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish the gentleman would pay attention to the successes in the program, instead of just looking at things that have not turned out as well as they should.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will we not add the Philippines to that list?

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I agree that it is mandatory to travel to get the facts on foreign aid. It cannot be done otherwise.

I believe the world knows I am not a big advocate of foreign aid because I feel too much of it misses the mark. In fact, I have always voted against it. I also believe in giving the devil his dues and believe the world needs to know that if there is a showcase on the face of this earth for foreign aid the island of Taiwan is that showcase. It has proved itself there. It has, in fact, been so successful the Nationalist Chinese have said they do not need our help any longer. They are our friends. With our help they have helped themselves.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], I would like to suggest that you examine page 407 in the hearings, and you will find some successful projects for Latin America that AID has financed. It takes about a little less than two pages. I think you would be interested in reading it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with less enthusiasm than usual to speak for H.R. 15750. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] displayed his usual patience and good humor during our lengthy hearings and markup sessions. All of us on this side are grateful that he possesses those qualities because they were needed more than ever this year. The Executive sent up two bills—one for economic aid and one for military aid. For many of the programs we were asked to authorize "infinity" for the next 5 years. Few of us took kindly to this request. Our hearings reflect the basis for our concern. Our irritation was conveyed to Executive witnesses in sharp questions and clear words.

I think that the friends of foreign aid, no less than the foes, want to keep a close watch on the program. We who support foreign aid are keenly aware that deficiencies constantly creep into it, that it gets off the track from time to time, and that Congress has a legislative responsibility to focus on both the means and the ends no less than the Executive. For these reasons, many of us were perplexed and shocked that the Executive this year should request a 5-year authorization with no dollar amounts specified for almost all portions of the program for the next 5 years.

In his foreign aid message to Congress the President explained the reason for this unusual request in these words:

> To signify the depth of our commitment to help those who help themselves, I am requesting 5-year authorizations for our military and economic aid programs.

The implication of that statement is that our usual practice of annual authorizations has somehow shaken the confidence of those who need our aid. No evidence was offered in support of this thesis. In my opinion none can be found to justify that assumption.

Mr. Bell followed this up in his testimony by telling us that multiyear authorizations will enable AID to "provide a basis of stability and continuity for planning and carrying out economic aid programs." My only comment is that the administration does not need a long-term authorization to engage in long-range thinking and that only an appropriation will enable it to carry out any programs it devises.

As a matter of fact, we are subject to strange limitations sometimes by the very things we set up ourselves. If we do not have this bill come back to us each year, the House will be abrogating some of its responsibility to the public, to the people to whom was given the power at the beginning of this Government.

As the hearings progressed and the matter was pursued with other executive branch witnesses, other explanations for the 5-year authorization were advanced. Secretary Rusk made this point:

> I must confess I am concerned about the four hearings, and the four separate legislative procedures that are involved each year in the aid program, as time consuming for everybody concerned, including those of us in the executive branch. We were hopeful that we could find a way in which to use that time perhaps to somewhat better advantage.

I am interested in this better use of our time. I would like to see quite a good deal of the time of the committee and of the executive used to forward such programs as are really influential and which are really important to the world.

I sympathize with the Secretary of State and his associates. I am certain that the succession of annual hearings is a heavy burden on their time. I appreciate his solicitude for conserving our time. But we in the Congress are paid to examine these measures not alone because of the sums involved but because of their far-reaching policy implications.

Secretary McNamara defended the request for a 5-year authorization on a different basis. He told the committee that he already has 5-year programs "for all the nations we now believe we will be dealing with during this period of time. We worked them out because we think we should be dealing with the current year in the context of a 5-year program. It insures that the action we take today will be consistent with the action we will take next year, assuming that world conditions next year are as we estimate they will be today."

That is interesting. How can we know this?

Are we to know it through the use of a crystal ball? It might possibly be that the Secretary has this crystal ball. I have no way of knowing. But I do know that from our standpoint in the committee on the minority side we do not feel that we have such a crystal ball and that we could be certain that nothing will happen in the second year that has not been happening in the first year.

I am delighted that Secretary McNamara is planning long-term programs. Apparently the absence of a 5-year authorization has been no barrier to his long-range projections. Certainly those administering the economic side of foreign aid would be derelict in their duties if they did not give thought and attention to the program's objectives. I have never found it necessary to have authority in order to think ahead.

From this jumble of explanations for a 5-year authorization I can only conclude that it is not only unnecessary but is an abdication of a vital congressional function. I am not impressed with the argument that other agencies of Government have permanent authorization for their programs. Probably none of them is as susceptible to as much public concern as is foreign aid. Every Member of this body knows that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has a responsibility to the House to hear the evidence, recommend the amounts, and set the groundrules for the conduct of the program. As for the reactions of foreign governments, I am unaware of any uneasiness arising from a failure to authorize for a long period.

The committee did not adopt the executive proposal for a 5-year authorization. Instead it accepted a compromise for a 2-year program. And in place of the open-end requests for money it inserted specific amounts for each of the 2 years. It should be noted that the amounts for the second year are almost identical with those for the first year. We had ample evidence to justify making a decision on the authorization for fiscal year 1967. But we had no testimony to help us make a judgment on the amounts recommended for fiscal year 1968. Nobody knows whether we are recommending too much or too little. Given all the uncertainties in the international situation, it is the considered opinion of a number of us that the committee is making a serious mistake in bringing out a bill for 2 years. That is why five of us signed supplemental views that appear on page 64 of the report.

There are many segments to this complicated program that will be discussed and debated here. I want to mention one particular portion that drew my attention during the hearings. Over the years I have urged that our priorities be reordered to give greater attention to what I call the basic areas of development, particularly in agriculture, health, and education. It was heartening to read in the executive presentation these words:

> U.S. assistance cannot be effective unless recipient nations undertake needed reforms and improvements, and concentrate their own resources and energies on development priorities.

And then, we were told, there will be increased emphasis in the fields of agriculture, education, and health. I welcome this belated recognition of the obvious.

Too long have we been financing status symbols such as steel mills and paved highways while neglecting the less dramatic but more durable elements upon which a nation can build. Many of the developing nations have gone heavily into debt in the naive belief that a few large projects scattered around the countryside constitute development. Yet their people go hungry, health and education are neglected. They have simply overlooked the human equation. And I fear that we who should know better too often have been partners to much of their folly.

Over the years we have provided small sums under the foreign assistance program for educational and medical institutions abroad that have American sponsorship. Most notable among these are the American University of Beirut, the American University in Cairo, and Robert College. Others are in Latin America and the Far East. One cannot measure but certainly can identify and recognize the impact that these schools have had. They bring the citizens into association with American standards and methods. They send out graduates who are better able to interpret the thought of the modern world to their own fellows than all the technicians we send out. I think we would do well if we spent some time exploring the greater use and development of institutions of this type.

I was particularly pleased this year with an amendment adopted by the committee to provide $1 million in local currency for the use of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem. This modern facility is engaged in a variety of programs in the medical field that have an impact well beyond the confines of Israel. It is an excellent example of combining local facilities and talent with a modest amount of U.S.-owned local currency to accomplish one of the major objectives of our foreign aid program. Is there any reason why we should not multiply this approach in other countries?

Let me cite one other example of a modest program that is bearing fruit. Through the foreign aid program we are financing the International Executive Service Corps. The objective of that organization is to improve the management of local enterprises in the less developed countries through making available the services of experienced American businessmen for 2 or 3 months. These Americans serve as volunteers and provide operating and financial counseling as well as guidance in production and marketing techniques. Many of them are retired executives who welcome the opportunity to make their services available abroad. To them we should be duly grateful. Americans with skills in electronics, textiles, and banking have won the praise of local citizens for the assistance given them in putting local business in the black. Here again is real basic grass-roots development.

When all the oratory is over about the wonders of foreign aid, we simply have to face the grim reality that man is more than an economic animal. An obsession with economic development only injects new problems in the total development process that inevitably take us into the political and social arena. And in those fields our money can perform few, if any, services to the emerging nations. We have to rely upon other resources and strategies—which we simply have brushed aside.

Twenty years of foreign aid should have taught us much about what we can do and how best we can do it. We are dealing with people—not alone nations—of infinte diversity and complexity. Instead of plunging ahead in the belief that the dismal science of economics holds all the answers, we ought to reflect more upon the environment in which foreign aid must be conducted in each country. It is not sufficient to enumerate the successes, although that would not take too long. We ought to examine carefully the reasons for failures. This may take us into areas that may not seem to be the proper concern of Congress or its committees. But unless we do something of that kind, I fear that we will continue the aimless arguments and ventures of the past. If the Congress should adopt a 2-year authorization, it may well be that we could profitably engage ourselves with such a study next year.

We could do that, anyway.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would just like to say this to my colleagues. It seems to me it is up to us as individuals, as American citizens, as Members of the House of Representatives to go very deeply into the reasons for every single program that we try to finance because the financing of it is, to me, the least part of it.

If we have not contributed to the uplifting of the people of these countries, if we have not contributed to the betterment of society in that area, in that country, on that whole continent, then we have failed. I do not think we have failed. I think we are doing a great job, but I think we have done so much of it terribly badly, and I hope to be on the committee until that time when we really do a good job from start to finish. It is going to take a lot of work; it is going to take a great deal of real respiritualizing of ourselves. But it can be done.

Let us be at the doing.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

There are many reasons why this legislation merits our support. Most of them were ably discussed by our chairman, Dr. MORGAN. I would like to compliment him at this time on his remarks, and urge all my colleagues to refer to them during the course of the debate on this bill. They are clear and definite. They are factual and most pertinent.

I also compliment my colleague from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], for discussing the importance of many special items in this bill, and particularly bringing out the importance of dealing with the basic human needs at this time, the dire needs of the peoples of the developing countries. These are most important factors.

I do not wish to duplicate their efforts. Instead, I should like to concentrate on one reason—the one that comes closest to my own area of responsibility as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe.

Mr. Chairman, for some time it has been apparent to most of us in Congress that all was not well with the great western alliance which kept freedom secure during the troubled years of the post-World War II period.

In recent years, cracks and strains of disunity began to mar the solid front presented by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The organization continued to serve its basic purpose—the containment of the westward expansion of communism—but the unity of purpose, that feeling of solidarity which kept all 15 of us working together for a common goal, that zeal and that drive, were beginning to disappear. The 15 nations to which I refer are those 13 free countries of Europe, plus Canada and the United States, which bound themselves to come to each other's assistance by signing the treaty of Paris.

Two years ago, Mr. Chairman, a study mission of the Subcommittee on Europe directed attention to this development, warning about the consequences of disarray in the North Atlantic Alliance.

Our study mission did not propose any readymade solutions or—as seems to be the fashion these days—lay the blame for what was happening to NATO at the doorstep of one of our traditional allies.

On the contrary, our mission pointed out that the United States had to bear some share of responsibility for those developments and urged that, instead of indulging in mutual recriminations, that all of us ought to get together and begin exploring new avenues, new approaches, which could help us revitalize the much-needed alliance.

As we know, not much happened during the intervening 2 years until this March, when General de Gaulle precipitated the current crisis by withdrawing France from the military structure of NATO. Then the fat was in the fire, and all concerned began to run back and forth, wringing their hands, and trying to find a way out of the dilemma which confronts us.

Mr. Chairman, during the past 3 months your Subcommittee on Europe held extensive hearings on "The Crisis in NATO." We examined not only the implications of the French withdrawal but also those underlying causes which appear to have brought it about. And while our subcommittee's recommendations have not been finalized, I would like to outline some of my own thoughts on this subject.

This brings me back to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, and I think it is important that we approve this legislation.

It seems to me, first of all, that any talk about NATO having outlived its usefulness is sheer nonsense. The Soviet military threat is as real today as it was 5 or 10 years ago.

There are more than 120 Communist divisions stationed in East and Central Europe, poised to strike whenever our guard becomes sufficiently lowered.

Those ground forces are bolstered by thousands of planes and a very large number of missiles targeted on Western Europe.

In addition, Soviet penetration of the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, and the surrounding bodies of water, has increased substantially in the last few years.

These statistics speak for themselves. The Soviet military threat has not receded. On the contrary, Communist military capability aimed at Western Europe—and, ultimately, at the rest of the free world—continues to grow. Must we recall Berlin, Hungary, Poland, Cuba? History does repeat.

The military alliance embodies in NATO is, therefore, relevant—and badly needed. The funds in the bill before us, intended for our contribution to the NATO alliance effort in Europe, are absolutely necessary. They may not be very large—but, nonetheless, they are vital.

Let me add a footnote here to underline the importance of this military authorization for NATO:

In recent years, as troubles developed in other areas, it has become our custom to cut back on military funds for the NATO area.

Time after time, the very modest programs proposed for the most vulnerable region of NATO—particularly for Greece and Turkey—have been cut back and the funds diverted to other regions.

These actions on our part, it seems to me, open up something of a "Credibility Gap" with regard to our own intentions toward NATO—and our estimate of the threat confronting the North Atlantic community.

You cannot cut back on minimum programs—and cut back more than once—without leaving some people with the impression that we attach less importance to the military requirements of NATO than we do to those of some other areas.

Now we all know that the military posture of NATO has been shaken severely by the recent French actions. Let us not compound our difficulties during this crucial period by cutting back, or voting down, the authorization in the bill before us. It is needed not only for what it will accomplish in military terms, but also because of its psychological impact in attesting to our continued support of the North Atlantic alliance.

Mr. Chairman, there is another reason why the passage of the bill before us is important from the standpoint of our stake in—and our relations with—the North Atlantic community of nations.

As I mentioned earlier, one of our big problems with NATO is that the zest has gone out of the alliance.

Years ago, we were bound closely together by our common dedication to the task of reconstructing Western Europe—by the inspiration of that tremendous drive for peace which characterized the postwar period—and by the movement for Western European integration. Those elements—that glue which held the alliance together—that spirit which inspired our efforts—are no longer present.

The task of European reconstruction is finished.

The drive for peace floundered on the rocks of Soviet intransigence.

And the movement for Western European integration came to a virtual standstill for reasons which are too complex to be discussed in the few minutes allowed me this afternoon.

Four basic reasons are: First, the French veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market; second, French oppositions to vesting authority in supranational European bodies; third, the agricultural problem; and fourth, concern that the rich, industrious, and expanding Germany could come to dominate any integrated arrangement in Europe.

What we need, therefore, is a cause—and a task—which would transcend the purely military aspect of NATO and provide all the nations of the North Atlantic community with the direction and the unity of purpose, which were once a part of the alliance.

We have such a task—such motive for unity—in the peaceful endeavors embodied in our war against the traditional enemies of mankind: want, hunger, disease, and ignorance.

This is the war which we wage with the economic aid authorizations of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I say, let us not give up the fight. Let us not cripple that program. Rather, let us continue it and embark upon a new offensive by trying to further broaden its scope from an American undertaking to that of a NATO-wide—or North Atlantic-wide—campaign for the eradication of the basic causes of human misery, disorder, and, ultimately, war.

Here is a challenge—and an opportunity—to marshal anew the energies and the resources of the North Atlantic community for a peaceful offensive which equals in opportunity and importance anything that we have undertaken jointly during the past 17 years.

NATO needs such a challenge. The free, prosperous, energetic countries of the European Continent must raise their sights above the immediate concern with their own material well-being and regional security. They should be brought in as full partners into a long-range, closely coordinated program for the economic and social development of the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and of other areas.

Mr. Chairman, in urging the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, I, therefore, ask that the President call for a conference of the leaders of the North Atlantic community to explore and initiate such a new joint drive for peace—a drive dedicated to the building of the only solid foundations on which lasting peace can exist between nations of the world.

I urge all to support H.R. 15750.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 160]

Abbitt
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Bell
Bolling
Buchanan
Callaway
Celler
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dickinson
Diggs
Downing
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Flynt
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hawkins
Herlong
Ichord
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Leggett
McFall
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Mink
Morris
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
St Germain
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Price, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15750, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 347 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, on behalf of those of us on the minority side, I must pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Ohio, who led us through the long and sometimes trying days of these hearings and the markup of the bill. We are appreciative of the leadership she gave us.

I must also echo the gentlewoman's words with respect to the patience of the chairman of the committee and the opportunity that he offered everyone to be heard.

Now I come, however, to a somewhat less pleasant point. In past years we in the minority had prepared our views to include certain sections in boldface type. No objection has been raised to this practice. This year, without our consent and without our knowledge when the report was in final form at the printers we were denied this privilege. Had we known we were not to be accorded this privilege, we would certainly have prepared our remarks in a somewhat different manner.

A second point, Mr. Chairman, that caused us some chagrin was the fact that it was not noted upon the front cover page of our report that there were minority views or supplemental views. In that connection it is worthy of note that the report prepared in the other body upon the foreign aid legislation this year did carry such a notation. I say that these were matters of some concern to those of us who filed minority views.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. Of course, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, I am responsible for the removal of this boldfaced type, but I am sure that the gentleman knows that this report was accompanied by supplemental views of five members and separate views by one member and minority views by five members. In the first draft, as the gentleman said, some boldface type was used in the committee report. The chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing has requested all committees to hold the line and help reduce printing costs. The use of boldface type is not approved by the joint committee's regulations as it involves substantial additional labor costs. Instructions were therefore issued to eliminate it from both the committee report and any views accompanying it.

This was a matter of economy, and I am sure the gentleman wants to save a few dollars for the country. That is why it was eliminated from the report.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it was most unfortunate that this was done as it was, because the previous reports in years back have all had boldface type, which made a great difference in the way it was presented. I join my colleague in his deep regret at this omission.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say in response to the gentlewoman from Ohio that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing just made the economy plea this year.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am sorry that he has that point of view about the few things that really matter. If he had it about things that did not matter, it would be all right.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, since the type was originally in bold face in the first prints, it is difficult for the gentleman from Indiana to see how an economy was effected by resetting the type in the normal type in the final edition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those who vote for this authorization bill this year will have the distinction of having voted for the largest single authorization bill in the history of foreign aid. This you may use in your press releases to your folks at home. This bill in total provides an authorization of approximately $13.8 billion. Admittedly that is not all for this year. Basically the bill is a 2-year authorization bill with 5-year provisions for development loans and the Alliance for Progress, but the amount authorized this year, I repeat, is the largest of any single foreign aid authorization in the history of this program.

Mr. Chairman, in many other ways this is a program of staggering proportions. In this year's bill there is provision for economic aid to 72 nations in the world, plus carryover assistance to 10 additional nations.

Mr. Chairman, there is also provision for military aid to 55 nations in the world contained in this year's bill.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, in this bill we propose to give assistance, either economic or military, or both, to 84 nations in the world, and to that figure must be added the 10 nations to which I referred a moment ago where there are still carryover funds to be expended.

So, Mr. Chairman, it all adds up to the fact that foreign assistance is being given to 94 nations in the coming fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a point is sometimes made that the AID program is shrinking and that countries are being removed from its purview. It is true that a few have been so removed, but based upon the figures that I have just presented to the Committee, it can be said that the process of shrinking this AID program is one which is proceeding very slowly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] in his remarks a little while ago pointed out that contained in this bill are really many programs. That is certainly true. However, that line of thought should be carried still farther.

Mr. Chairman, in the whole of our AID program to the countries of the world there are many other programs than are encompassed in the Foreign Assistance Act. On page 77 of the House report we have set forth a number of these programs which include the Peace Corps, the food-for-peace program, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the Asian Development Bank which, when taken together with this year's programs, total over $5.5 billion in the overall areas of foreign assistance of one kind or another that the citizens of this country are extending in this year.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made, as I just remarked, to the fact that we are shrinking the program by removing certain countries from it. However, it is interesting to observe that while a somewhat less number than the maximum in past years is receiving aid this year, the number of personnel employed by the AID agency is at a near alltime high.

Mr. Chairman, it seems a bit inconsistent for us to say that we are reducing the program and reducing the number of countries to which it applies, but yet find it necessary to employ several thousand additional people to administer the program.

We have spoken already in the course of this general debate about the fact that this is for the most part a 2-year extension of the program. Many of us object to that and feel that it should be only a 1-year extension.

Opportunity will be offered for a fuller discussion of this point when an amendment is offered to make the bill a 1-year rather than a 2-year proposal.

However, it ought to be pointed out now that among the reasons for desiring a 1-year bill are these—first of all, in a world of very rapidly changing conditions, certainly the authorizing legislation which is the policymaking legislation, deserves and needs to be reviewed at least once every year.

We are told that flexibility is needed in the program because of these rapidly changing world conditions. But if we are to give it maximum flexibility with congressional oversight and approval, we must then have a 1-year program instead of a multiyear program as here provided.

Second, and I think validly, there are those who say, if we were to have a 2-year program, then this is out of step this year and that a new 2-year program, if there were one, should be authorized in the first year of each new Congress so that Members would have the benefit of the debate on the program and would have the knowledge of the committee and would be better able to evaluate the program and the needs of the program.

I repeat, I think there is a considerable degree of validity to that argument.

The third point in favor of the 1-year program is the retention of congressional control. We cannot control the program as we need to do and ought to do if we do not have the annual legislative oversight functions.

So, I would urge Members when opportunity offers, as it will be offered, to restore this to the 1-year program.

It can be said when the measure first came before the committee for markup purposes that it was in the form of a 1-year program. And only after certain action was taken in the other body did it then become necessary through a series of amendments to increase it to a 2-year basis.

A few words now about Vietnam. In the first place, it is important to recall that there is no military money for Vietnam in this bill. Economic money—yes. Military money—no. That, as all Members know, is now being handled in the Department of Defense authorization and appropriation bills.

We have been told through the years in the past that aid through military assistance particularly is valuable to us because it permits us to have on the fighting fronts of the world, soldiers—not American soldiers—but soldiers of foreign countries at far less cost than is required to maintain American soldiers.

But as we find ourselves now fighting in Vietnam, one is bound to ask the question: Of what value is it to maintain soldiers at less cost than it takes to maintain American soldiers if those other soldiers are not present there to help us when we need help?

How many are giving us assistance in Vietnam now?

Of the countries that receive assistance from us—South Korea is there in force with her soldiers and is doing an excellent job.

The Philippines are preparing to send some troops.

Of the countries that are not receiving aid, but are giving us assistance in Vietnam—there is only Australia and New Zealand.

When you have said that—you have said it all.

So, Mr. Chairman, where are all these troops that we have been supporting and equipping and training through the years so that it would not be necessary to maintain such large American forces in time of need? Where are they now when we need them? It seems to me, if there is one point where criticism can legitimately be leveled at the military program, it is in that area.

Each year we have found it worth while and helpful to examine briefly the question of pipeline—the amount of funds provided in previous years and not expended. Members will note that in the minority views we have appended, as we have in past years, a detailed schedule showing the pipeline as it exists with respect to various countries.

To consider some of the figures in broad outline—and I am speaking now in round numbers and approximations—a year ago at this time, when we debated this bill, it was estimated that the pipeline was about $6.2 billion—notice, almost double the amount of the current appropriation. This year the estimated pipeline at the end of the fiscal year will be a half billion higher, about $6.7 billion, on the basis of AID's estimates. Thus in the last fiscal year the pipeline has increased by approximately one-half billion dollars.

Those who care to examine the schedules to which I have referred will find many interesting data there, but just to call attention to one or two, we have been critical for many years of the Government of the Congo at Brazzaville, which is largely dominated, as all here know, by the Communists, and inspired by the Chinese Communists. It is interesting to observe that there is still in the pipeline for that Communist-dominated country the sum of $466,000.

An even more striking figure, perhaps, is that with respect to Cambodia. We read day after day in the news accounts that the Government of Cambodia is giving sanctuary to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces. So it may surprise some here, as indeed it did me, to discover that there still appears in the pipeline for that country, for development grants the sum of $1,382,000. With respect to this amount AID officials advised me just this morning that they did not know at what rate it would go or what it was being used for.

In the light of that sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, it does not appear that it is not worthwhile to oppose the U.S. Government. Here, I repeat, is a country which gives sanctuary to our enemies, and yet we have money in the program, and still expect to spend it, for the benefit of that country.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that that is reprehensible and ill advised. On balance, having in the pipeline $6.7 billion, almost double the amount requested for the appropriations this year under this bill, it seems to me that we might well rest, and not appropriate additional money this year, and that we should take a long, hard, careful look at the program as person after person has recognized needs to be done, and I am sure, then, that those parts which are good and worthwhile could be preserved and written into new law and could provide us with the ability to assist our friends, the ability to strengthen our own international ties, and to enlarge our military effort, if need be, at a greatly lowered cost to the taxpayer.

I urge that this bill be defeated.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the present bill. The purpose of the U.S. foreign assistance program is to help realize the potential of the underdeveloped countries. Our aid is only to inject the initial capital, technical know-how, and men to get the development process underway. In other words, our aid is a catalyst to start the reaction, which, once underway, is no longer needed. And the reaction must be a total commitment on the part of the recipient countries to help themselves in every aspect of their own development.

As President Johnson said in his foreign aid message:

> Although we recognize the shortsightedness of isolation, we do not embrace the equally futile prospect of total and endless dependence. The United States can never do more than supplement the efforts of the developing countries themselves. They must supply most of the capital, the know-how—and the will to progress. If they do, we can and will help. If they do not, nothing we can supply will substitute.

The proposed foreign aid bill for fiscal year 1967 puts a justifiable emphasis on self-help. Our successes in Western Europe, Greece, Taiwan and elsewhere have been due to a combination of outside help with the determined self-improvement efforts of the countries themselves.

In Taiwan, for example, one can see clearly the results of self-help. It is one of 27 countries in which our economic assistance has been terminated, and though it is far from rich by our standards, its economy is now growing under its own impetus. A recent study of Taiwan concluded that without American assistance it would have taken Taiwan at least 40 years to achieve self-supporting growth, instead of the 15 years it actually did take. But the same study emphasized that the key element in Taiwan's success was what the country did for itself.

The 20 countries receiving major AID development assistance have an average gross national product of $120 per capita. Yet these nations contribute an average of $6 for every one AID dollar from a country where per capita GNP now stands at better than $3,000 per year.

Insistence on self-help means that the United States may require a country to make some economic reforms or commitments as a prerequisite to financial assistance. Self-help frequently goes beyond the scope of any individual project to include such things as the revision of a tax system to make it more effective and more equitable or the enactment of stringent fiscal measures to insure that inflation does not wipe out temporary gains.

The AID program for fiscal 1967 will continue to enforce strictly the Agency's requirements for self-help. Recently, one loan was held up and no new loans were authorized for a full year in a Latin American country that did not take the agreed steps to improve its balance-of-payments management and to end its budget deficit.

Another program loan, to an Asian country, was approved with the condition that the nation eliminate a licensing system that slowed the import of needed raw materials, stifled private sector growth and invited corruption. The country complied with these conditions, and the reform led to a sharp spurt in private industrial output and an end to black market dealings in the freed items.

The requirement of self-help fills several purposes. It hastens the recipient nation's progress toward self-sufficiency. It insures that American tax money goes only to those countries that are interested enough to shoulder the greater share of the cost. And it gives the developing nation a justifiable sense of pride in its own accomplishments.

The foreign aid program for fiscal 1967 is strengthened by its emphasis on self-help. America has the resources to assist those who are willing to make sacrifices in their own behalf.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 15750, although I have serious reservations about certain provisions in it.

To begin with, I should like to join in the compliments which have been paid both to the distinguished chairman of our committee for his usual understanding of all the members of our committee and their differences and for his levelhandedness in dealing with a complicated problem.

I should like to join also in paying tribute to the ranking Republican on our committee, the gentlewoman from Ohio, who has been an inspiration to us all.

Other members of the committee have already described in some detail the various provisions of the bill now before us. For that reason I shall confine my own remarks to a discussion of one of the major recommendations regarding the foreign aid program which the President made this year.

Let me simply say in passing that the Foreign Affairs Committee decided against one of Mr. Johnson's two major recommendations, that the military aid program and the economic assistance be considered separately. The bill we are now discussing authorizes both military and economic aid.

I should like to talk about the other major recommendation.

The President on February 1 in his special message to Congress on foreign aid made an urgent request for 5-year authorizations both for our military and economic aid programs. This has turned out to be his most noteworthy and controversial proposed change in the present program. Indeed, as the debate today indicates, the multiyear authorization promises to be a major bone of contention.

The administration requested a 5-year authorization for foreign aid for two basic reasons. One might be described as intense solicitude for the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These annual reviews by the two committees, the argument runs, are tedious, time consuming, and not always productive. If relieved of this annual burden of an overall review, these committees could spend their time to better advantage.

Indeed, the distinguished chairman of our committee only this afternoon has particularly stressed this argument with respect to long-term authorizations.

The other argument might be described as primarily psychological, seeking to bolster the confidence of the recipient countries. As the AID Administrator, David Bell, expressed it, a 5-year authorization will give the countries involved "a more solid basis for understanding what they can anticipate if they accomplish the kinds of self-help activities" which the United States considers desirable.

Well, what kind of a case was made during the hearings for these two arguments? Certainly the testimony was undramatic in spite, I might say, of the chairman's warning to Secretary Rusk that "your shop is going to have to make a good strong argument for a multiyear authorization. Some real ammunition," he continued, "will have to be developed during these hearings before we will be able to sell a multiyear authorization to the House."

Certainly the provision for a 2-year authorization which the committee is recommending and which is found in this bill indicates a partial response to the administration's argument that our committee works too hard and with too little effectiveness. But the response is far less than the President had requested.

As the committee report indicates, a comprehensive review of the foreign aid program is important at least every 2 years and can best be assured by a renewal of the basic authorization.

The testimony reveals little evidence of why recipient countries need more assurance than they now have as to the long-range plans and generosity of the United States.

Secretary of Defense McNamara contended that a 5-year authorization would represent, and I quote, "tentative congressional approval" of our willingness to provide financial support for long-range planning by the recipient countries. However, since appropriations for these programs will remain on an annual basis, it is hard to see just why recipient countries would act differently if our aid program were to be authorized over a period of years.

In any event the President's specific request for a 5-year authorization was rejected by the committee—indeed, I would hazard the guess that it was not even seriously considered by most members of the committee.

Whatever may be the value of "freeing" Congress from what Mr. Johnson described as "the burden of an annual review of basic legislation," there is little, if any, sentiment for an authorization for a period of as long as 5 years. If Congress were to provide such an authority this year, for example, there would be no overall review of foreign aid by either the 90th Congress, to be elected this November, or by the 91st Congress, to be elected in November 1968. It is difficult to imagine the House approving such a change in present procedures, no matter how strong the pressures from the White House.

The committee bill does, however, incorporate a provision authorizing a 2-year program. Strong dissents from that recommendation can be found in the committee report, on pages 64–65 and 75–76.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that the House conferees last year were deadlocked for weeks over this question of a multiyear authorization. As a conferee myself, last year I agreed to the following language:

> As conference discussions continued, it became apparent that although the House conferees could not agree to a blanket 2-year authorization under present conditions, they were not irrevocably opposed to authorizing foreign aid funds for longer than a year regardless of circumstances.
>
> 1. During consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, House members of the committee of the conference will urge their colleagues to examine with the greatest care such proposals as may be submitted authorizing foreign aid programs for 2 or more years. The House of Representatives has approved authorizations for various aspects of the programs for periods of 2 years or longer on a number of occasions in the past, and the House conferees are prepared to suggest the consideration of longer term authorizations, taking into account the demands on the U.S. budget and the nature of the world situation next year.
>
> If 2-year authorizations were made, the authorizing committees of the House and Senate might direct their attention in alternate years primarily to a review of aid policies and an evaluation of operations rather than focusing on the programs submitted by the Executive for the year to come.

This language was inserted, Mr. Chairman, in response to the reluctant decision of the conferees from the other body that they should recede from their provision for a 2-year authorization.

While I personally have reservations as to the wisdom of even a 2-year authorization, I could not say today that I would be "irrevocably opposed" to a longer authorization "regardless of circumstances." Nor, in the language of the conference report, could I argue against examining "with the greatest care" such proposals.

The problem is that the world today remains most unsettled.

The chairman of the committee himself says we must accept the world as it is today, and the circumstances have not improved since last summer.

The changes throughout the world within the next 12 months are almost sure to be of a character which will demand a thorough reappraisal of our entire aid program next year. Furthermore, the fact is that our aid program goes to so many countries and for so many different reasons that I cannot help but feel it will continue to need the kind of scrutiny which an annual authorization provides. That such an appraisal takes time, and occupies both congressional committees and important members of the executive branch is surely no reason for not exercising our legislative responsibilities each year.

Certainly the suggestion that a 2-year authorization be now approved is easy to criticize. If, as the administration contends, a 5-year authorization is essential to promote long-range planning and to provide stability and continuity, that objective will not be achieved by a niggardly 2-year program.

Furthermore, for this 2d session of the 89th Congress to attempt to bind a new 90th Congress when it convenes next year would seem an obvious mistake. Surely if a longer authorization has merit it should be considered next year, when the newly elected Representatives to the 90th Congress first meet. In short, the committee's suggestion that a 2-year authorization be approved now is neither fish nor fowl. It deserves no support from the executive branch, nor from Congress.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman not agree with me that long-range planning can, should, and does go forward in many instances when the authorization is not made for such a long period of time? This program—I have seen a number of cases where planning over a considerable period of years has gone forward, and I feel properly so, even though the authorization has not been determined.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe the argument that there must be the authorization in hand before planning proceeds fails.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. There is no necessity for a long-term authorization or a multiyear authorization of any kind in order to make possible and to encourage longtime planning.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary himself, in answer to questions put by me pointed out that they had long-range plans both for Greece and Turkey. I questioned the usefulness of such projects because of the fact that we had no idea of the relationship between those two countries and what such relationship will be over a 5-year period. But there is no reason that long-range planning can and is being done even though we are on an annual authorization basis.

Mr. Chairman, let us examine more closely the reasons for the request for "a multiyear authorization." If they are convincing, perhaps Congress should change its ways. If the reasons are not convincing, surely we should continue with the present method of annual authorizations of foreign aid programs.

Let us first consider the President's position. In his February message, Mr. Johnson made clear his determination to make "the basic changes the times demand, to carry forward the best of what we are now doing in the less developed world, and cut out the worst."

Times are changing, the President says, and we must respond to those changes. The foreign aid program, he declares, has had the "most sober and searching review," and as a result, he recommends various changes. After questioning the merit of each program, the President proposes to make "the basic changes which the times demand." At the same time, however, Congress is being asked to do considerably less. Rather than to look into the merits of programs and consider basic changes, Congress is asked to provide a long-term authorization. Why? A 5-year authorization is needed, the President asserted, "to signify the depth of our commitment to those who help themselves."

Apparently attempting to allay the fears of some in Congress, the President then specified that—

> Annual congressional consideration of both economic and military programs will be maintained through full annual presentations before the substantive committees, if they so desire, as well as through the annual appropriation process.

What then is the basic reason for this request that Congress abdicate, at least partially, its responsibility? We need, it is argued, a longer authorization to reassure those whom we plan to aid. Having only given some $120 billion since the foreign aid program began some 20 years ago, we now apparently must do more, "to signify the depth of our commitment."

However, in order to emphasize the importance of giving the recipients of our aid the assurance that they can continue to rely on our generosity, the President in his message cut the ground out from under the other major argument for a long-term authorization. During hearings on the bill, much was made of the point that the Foreign Affairs Committee was too busy with its annual review of foreign aid to help as much as it should. As Secretary of Defense McNamara put it:

> From a purely practical point of view, I think you and we can better spend our time than by constantly reviewing the total program in the rather stereotyped fashion which is required . . .

What does the President think of this argument of his Secretary of Defense? Not much. The President emphasized that full annual presentations before the substantive committees would provide Congress with an opportunity to consider the foreign aid program each year, in addition to the annual appropriation process. His only hint of a change in the present methods was his suggestion that these annual reviews would be maintained and I emphasize the point—only if desired by the substantive committees.

What the administration is seeking, in other words, is a way to get the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, "off the hook." If they want no annual review, they should be under no compulsion. Indeed, as David Ball, Director of AID, put it:

> A multiyear authorization would in fact permit the committee, in my humble opinion to do a better job of inspecting, investigating, reviewing and understanding the elements of this program than the annual authorization process permits.

To put it bluntly, a basic reason for a multiyear authorization is the contention that Congress now is doing a poor job in overseeing the aid program. Freed of the burden of an annual review, it is argued, the legislative branch might be more effective in overseeing what is being done. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk put it in his tactful way:

> These annual hearings, in general across the board, may not always bring to bear the accumulated experience of the committee in helping us dig into some of the details of the program in which the judgment and advice of the Committee could be very helpful.

This theme of congressional inefficiency and ineffectiveness was repeated constantly during the hearings. Though Secretary Rusk was frank enough to admit that he would be "somewhat presumptuous" to advocate a long-term authorization solely on the basis of "how Congress spends its time," the general argument was the Congress through annual reviews is simply spinning its wheels. To help out "the sapless branch," the administration is advocating a new approach.

To compound the confusion, I should like to refer to the problem which Congress faced last year before foreign aid received the necessary stamp of approval. Last year, it should be remembered, the President did not even request a long-term authorization. It was the other body, or the committee of the other body most directly concerned, which felt it was imposed upon because it had to review foreign aid every 12 months. Now we are led to understand that despite "the great temptation" of being relieved of the necessity for annual reviews, the committee of the other body now feels there should be "at least an annual review" of foreign aid by the policy committees of Congress, "at least until the world situation stabilizes somewhat."

What an awkard situation for our President. Last year the House successfully turned aside a bid by the other body for a multiyear authorization for foreign aid, in part because there had been no Presidential request. This year the President's request is flatly rejected by the other body, even with respect to the Alliance for Progress and the development loan program, where the principle of multiyear authorizations was apparently well established.

The administration may well find itself in an awkward position also if the proposed 2-year authorization should be written into the law. The President asked, as part of his 5-year authorization "package," for "open ended" authorizations for most of his programs. Instead of specific dollar ceilings, the administration asked for "such amounts as may be necessary."

The committee bill, on the other hand, authorizes specific amounts for the various programs, for both the fiscal year 1967 and 1968. Since no attempt was made to indicate what might actually be needed in the fiscal year 1968, the committee simply established the same ceiling for 1967 and 1968. This may give the administrators of the program some real headaches.

The committee is quite frank in its evaluation of the 1968 ceiling. Indeed, the chairman of the committee this afternoon went so far as to praise this financial ceiling.

The committee report asserts:

> It is expected that the executive will not develop plans for fiscal 1968 which contemplate any increase in foreign aid. Rather than expanding the programs already under way or seeking new ways in which to operate, those responsible for the administration of military and economic assistance should reexamine their priorities in an effort to accomplish more with less money.

If the administration seeks more flexibility, and an opportunity for more effective and long-range planning, it can hardly be overjoyed at the establishment of a rigid and completely arbitrary financial ceiling for the fiscal year 1968.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], has raised a question regarding aid funds in the pipeline earmarked for Cambodia. First let me say there are no such funds for Cambodia in this bill. The funds in the pipeline for Cambodia were obligated at the time we cut off aid to Cambodia. This money was used to pay the costs of maintaining certain Cambodian students studying in the United States.

If we had refused to continue their support it would not have been in our interest to have them go home disgruntled and disenchanted. There were some who could not go home because they opposed the anti-American views of their government.

This decision as to the students was made in consultation with the congressional committees.

In addition there is a small reserve to pay off any claims of U.S. contractors who were building highways and doing other work in Cambodia when the program was terminated.

None of the money involved goes to Cambodia. The funds earmarked for the students go to American universities and the living costs are spent in this country. Even the air fare transporting them home is spent on American carriers.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not have the time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I must say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the information which has been supplied him is at variance with the information which was supplied me also within the last few hours. I was told that the money was there, that it would be spent, and that no plans were then firm for its expenditure.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That basically is correct. There are no firm plans. But this money is in reserve to continue the maintenance costs of the students here and to get them back home; also to reimburse any American contractors for terminating the services that they were performing at the time aid was cut off. So, regardless of what happens, the money will not go to Cambodia. It will remain here in the United States to terminate and to pay the costs that were entailed as a result of the cutoff of aid to Cambodia.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will yield further, I will merely repeat that that information is somewhat at variance with that supplied to me.

Mr. GALLAGHER. This is the information as to what is happening as far as the administration is concerned. For better understanding of the facts, I thought perhaps it would be in point to bring this matter up.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN].

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid program for the next fiscal year proposed in H.R. 15750, before us today, is a sensible, a sound, a responsible approach to one of America's most vital opportunities—the opportunity to help the people of less-developed countries build a better life for themselves.

The program concentrates our effort and funds on the most urgent problems of these countries—their need for more food, for better health, for more widespread education.

But the program also demands self-help by each developing nation, as a precondition for our assistance.

It calls for full use not only of publc but also of private resources in helping achieve economic and social progress—both the private resources of the developing nations, and the private resources of our own, and other prosperous nations.

Each country's needs, each country's resources, each objective of our foreign aid program, each AID program, have been carefully studied, and the amount requested for each is believed a minimum to meet the anticipated requirements for the next fiscal year. The total amount requested is about $2.5 billion.

This proposed expenditure for economic aid represents only a very small part of our gross national product or of the Federal budget—less than three-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product, and only 1.9 percent of our national budget.

Now Mr. Chairman, each year a number of our Members, and of our citizens, decry with vehement oratory the cost of this program, which they allege—quite wrongly in my opinion—to be excessive, exorbitant, intolerable, and so forth.

Just today, I received a letter from a group which calls itself the Citizens' Foreign Aid Committee—a registered lobby devoted not to improving those foreign aid activities, as its title might suggest, but to demolishing the entire program.

Let me quote from the letter. The committee says:

> Since American taxpayers are more likely to resent foreign than domestic spending, foreign aid should become the major target for conservative candidates.

What a shortsighted perspective.

Mr. Chairman, when the people of developing nations can stand on their own feet, because we have helped them to help themselves, our own national interests are advanced. Our economic aid is an investment in their and our future—an investment in the well-being of many millions of people in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and thereby, an investment in our own future security and prosperity. Furthermore, as the more energetic of these nations become prosperous trading partners among the world's nations, they then too can bear part of the burden we now largely carry.

Since the start of the foreign aid program, 27 nations have reached the point where they no longer need our help. For example, our AID program to Taiwan ended a year ago. With this help, Taiwan, in 15 years, built a self-sustaining economy. Without our help, many tens of additional years would have been required.

Taiwan now has the second fastest annual economic growth rate of any nation in Asia, second only to Japan. Mutually beneficial commercial trade now has supplanted our earlier aid. Steady progress toward the same self-sufficiency is being made by many other nations still on our AID list. Mexico, Israel and Turkey are three examples.

Mr. Chairman, through foreign aid, we have accomplished a great deal for other people, and for our own. Last year, the Congress appropriated a total of about 2 percent of our national budget for our economic assistance program abroad. This year, despite even greater need for help in less-developed countries, to raise their food production, conquer disease, educate their people, and generally make economic and social progress—and despite the increased economic commitment to Vietnam alone—we are asked to authorize and appropriate an even smaller percentage than last year.

Mr. Chairman, there are still millions of people around the world who continue to look to us for help in ending the cycle of hunger, disease, and ignorance. The American people want to assist them. The foreign aid program proposed is a sound, effective and, in the long run, inexpensive means of doing so.

FOREIGN AID REDUCED $300 MILLION BY ROGERS AMENDMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to learn that the intent of the Rogers amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 has been carried out with favorable results.

I have been advised by Mr. David E. Bell of the Agency for International Development that the amendment has reduced grants and gifts to foreign countries in the amount of $300 million over the past 7 years. The report also points out that the number of foreign countries have been reduced from 41 to 13—a reduction of 28 countries.

It is satisfying to see such results, but I am hopeful that under strict enforcement of the amendment, the program will eventually be completely phased out.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the detailed letter from Mr. Bell:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1966.

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: I am pleased to respond to your inquiry regarding compliance with the Rogers Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Section 634 (e)).

This section, as you know, directs the Executive Branch, wherever practicable, progressively to reduce and eventually to terminate bilateral grant economic assistance. This directive has been in effect with reference to supporting-type assistance since Fiscal Year 1959, and with reference to technical cooperation-type assistance since Fiscal Year 1962.

Attached are two tables showing the progress that has been made in complying with the Rogers Amendment in these two appropriation categories.

With reference to supporting-type assistance, the total request made by the Executive Branch has declined from $1,047 million in Fiscal Year 1959 to $747 million in Fiscal Year 1967—a reduction of $300 million. As the figures on an attached chart show, this reduction would have been considerably larger were it not for the necessity of funding increased activities in Vietnam. Use of Supporting Assistance for countries other than Vietnam has declined significantly. For example, in Fiscal Year 1961, these programs totalled $653 million, and in Fiscal Year 1967, the amount programed is $211 million. The reduction in the number of countries for which such assistance is programed has been from 41 in Fiscal Year 1959 to only 13 in Fiscal Year 1967—an overall reduction of 28 countries.

With reference to technical cooperation-type assistance, the total reduction in the appropriation request from Fiscal Year 1962 to 1967 is $51 million. The slight increase in technical assistance programs for Fiscal Year 1967 results from expanded programs in the vital fields of agriculture, health and education. The reduction in the number of countries has been 10—from 77 in Fiscal Year 1962 to 67 in Fiscal Year 1967.

These figures show that there has been substantial compliance with the Congressional directive contained in the Rogers Amendment regarding the reduction in bilateral grant economic assistance.

I hope this infomation will be helpful to you, and if there is any way we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid bill before us will help to fill some vitally needed assistance to the less-developed nations. Emphasis on agricultural output to help grow the needed food for starving millions, improved health services to save lives and control disease, and increased educational assistance to combat illiteracy and create manpower for economic growth is a wise and worthwhile course for the aid program and one which will mean little sacrifice to the people of this prosperous Nation.

Today, in the less-developed countries, millions die or suffer from the debilitating effects of malnutrition and communicable disease which have long been under control in the developed nations. Literacy averages only 25 percent in the Near East and south Asia, and 16 percent in Africa while the demands of development call for advanced technical and professional skills.

There is little question in my mind that the need for increased U.S. assistance in these fields is urgent. I hope that each of my colleagues will review carefully the following excerpt from AID's summary presentation to Congress setting forth the Agency's proposed new initiatives in agriculture, health and education:

NEW INITIATIVES IN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

To meet President Johnson's call for a "massive attack on hunger and disease and ignorance" in the less-developed areas of the world, AID will place new emphasis on its programs involving agriculture, health, and education.

In fiscal year 1967, AID plans to:

Increase by one-third its fiscal year 1966 programs for agricultural development in the less-developed countries and closely link its economic assistance projects with the Food for Peace Program;

Expand by 55 percent its health programs and launch a major drive to eliminate malaria in 15 countries and smallpox in 19 countries during the next decade;

Nearly double its programs in the field of education with special emphasis on projects to provide more teachers, educational facilities, textbooks, and specialized training in the United States for foreign students.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

In his 1965 farm message to the Congress, President Johnson said:

"The disturbing downward trends in food output per person in both Asia and Latin America in recent years must be reversed. And these trends can be arrested and reversed only by a massive mobilization of resources in both the food-deficit countries and the advanced countries of the industrial West."

In fiscal year 1967, AID proposes to invest nearly $455 million directly in programs to speed agricultural growth in the less-developed world. This represents an increase of nearly one-third over fiscal year 1966 and more than half again as much as fiscal year 1965. It will permit a greater mobilization of U.S. technology and resources to meet the needs of many developing countries. AID will also contribute $57 million in voluntary contributions for agricultural development to the UN Development Program, FAO's World Food Program, and the development of the Indus Basin.

In addition, the weight of the entire AID program and of food aid available under the Food for Peace Program will be used as leverage to hasten the massive mobilization of resources needed in the food-deficit countries.

The need for action is clear. Food output in the less-developed countries has been rising—but not as the demand for food. With population increasing at a rate of 2½ percent to 3 percent a year, food output per person has barely been able to keep pace, and in some countries it has actually declined.

Food demand is rising

But population growth is just one side of the problem. Food demand is also rising because personal incomes are rising for many in the less-developed countries. People who have long lived on subsistance diets are spending their first added income on more and better quality food.

Even with extraordinary progress in the family planning efforts of the developing countries, the prospect is for a rapid rise in food demand that will continue through the next two decades at the very least—and a food gap of massive proportions unless output can be drastically raised.

The less-developed countries now have a food deficit of 16 million tons of grain annually, met by imports from the developed countries. This deficit can be expected to grow to 42 million tons by 1975, and 88 million tons by 1985, if food output continues to increase only at the present rate, population grows at the rate projected by the UN, and only a modest increase in food consumption occurs over present minimum levels.

The 42 million ton food gap expected by 1975 is larger than the entire current U.S. wheat crop. The 88 million ton gap by 1985 would exceed U.S. grain production capacity (even assuming return of all reserve acres to production) by nearly 13 million tons, or about the level of U.S. food aid grain shipments today.

It is plain that if a food shortage of disastrous size is to be averted there must be a rapid increase in the ability of the less-developed countries to produce their own food.

It is equally plain that a rapid increase in food output is possible, if food and rural development are given the attention and the priority they deserve.

Agriculture has made rapid strides in many developing countries over the past decade. Experience has demonstrated the kinds of assistance, the kinds of national investments, and the kinds of national policies that can produce a rapid growth in food production.

Food output has been growing

Agriculture in the less-developed countries is not stagnant. For the past ten years food output has been growing steadily.

At AID's request, U.S. Department of Agriculture experts studied farm progress from 1948 through 1963 in 26 developing countries—countries that receive three-fourths of AID assistance and account for 75 percent of the people in the AID-assisted countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The study showed that rates of increase in crop output failed to exceed population growth rates in only five of the 26 countries: Nigeria, Egypt, Pakistan, Tunisia, and Jordan. Twelve of the 26 countries sustained increases of more than four percent annually, an agricultural growth rate greater than that achieved by the developed countries over any comparable period of time. And in the most recent five-year period, Pakistan has also moved toward a much higher agricultural growth rate.

From this record, the study concluded that it was feasible for many more countries to achieve growth rates as high as the leading 12, and that it was both practical and possible for most developing countries to increase food output sufficiently over the next 10 to 20 years not only to meet their own consumption needs, but to achieve a surplus for export or investment.

Achievement of this goal involves more than simple increase in the volume of agricultural investment by the developing countries and in the volume of agricultural aid from the developed world. A rapid rise in food output depends on a whole complex of factors, from the quality of farm research and extension services and the availability of transport and fertilizer, to the impact of national policies on the incentive of farmers to produce more.

Factors in agricultural progress

Progress begins with people with the skills needed to carry out a development program. Since the beginning of AID assistance in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the training of local agricultural professionals has been a keystone of technical assistance activities.

All of the 1,300 AID-financed agricultural experts now at work in the less-developed countries give priority to the training of local counterparts. Whether the AID expert's specific task is to help establish farm research facilities, assist in the development of irrigation systems, work on farm marketing bottlenecks, or advise on the distribution and use of fertilizer, his primary mission is to help local counterparts learn to do the job themselves and to train local staffs to help them.

As part of this continuing program of manpower development, AID usually brings 1,500 foreign agricultural professionals to the United States each year for advanced or specialized training.

The AID agricultural training mission involves many facets. In fiscal year 1965, for instance, there were 200,000 students enrolled in agricultural schools and colleges which AID has helped to establish in 41 Asian, African, and Latin American countries. These institutions are providing much of the trained manpower on which the expansion of agricultural research and extension services depends in the less-developed countries.

The role of American land grant colleges

American land grant colleges and universities, under contract with AID, are playing a central role in the creation of agricultural training institutions and of centers for practical research in the less-developed countries.

These efforts, to cite two examples, have resulted in these accomplishments:

A hardy strain of corn originally developed in Guatemala by an Iowa State University team now provides one of Thailand's largest export crops;

In South Indian, University of Tennessee professors proved conclusively that fertilizer and a few simple changes in cultivation could produce ten times the existing yields of "ragi," a type of millet on which 10 to 15 million people depend for food.

It takes effective extension services to get research results translated into action on a country's farms. In the Mymensingh district of East Pakistan, the AID agricultural advisor and his Pakistani counterpart found that while model farms were useful for research, demonstrations worked best when conducted by farmers themselves on their own small scattered plots of land. To the farmers of Mymensingh, line-sowing, the use of fertilizer, small pump irrigation, and other innovations were worth copying only if they worked for a neighbor whose farm and whose means were on the same small scale as their own.

AID has helped multiply the reach of extension services through farmers associations in Taiwan, farm cooperatives in Iran, farmers' clubs in Thailand and Nigeria, and "4–H" type clubs in more than 40 of the less-developed countries.

Agricultural credit programs

Even know-how is not enough if farmers cannot afford new seeds, the cost of irrigation water, or the investment in a season's supply of fertilizer. Making credit available is difficult in countries where land titles are often clouded, and the potential borrowers are already in debt to village money-lenders.

In Taiwan, farmers' associations worked as the source of credit to the country's 700,000 farmer-owners, with 70 percent of the loan capital coming from member deposits, the 30 percent balance from a government revolving fund financed by AID. In Korea, Iran, Tunisia, and many other countries, farmer cooperatives are working to channel credit for farm improvements.

In Mexico, a major break-through has been made through a supervised agricultural credit program supported jointly by AID, the World Bank, and the Mexican Government, and operating through private banks throughout the country. To date, AID has provided $40 million in development loans; the World Bank, $25 million; and the Mexican Government, the balance for a portfolio expected to reach the peso equivalent of $100 million by the end of 1966.

Private banks—with 90 percent of their risk insured by government programs—have begun for the first time to loan money to farmers for productive purposes: land improvements, fertilizer, purchase of live-stock and the like. A total of 72 private banks in 28 Mexican states are now cooperating in the program, and the peso equivalent of $52 million has been loaned to 12,722 farmer-borrowers.

Transportation is a major need

Transportation is required to bring tools, seeds, and fertilizer to farmers, and carry harvests back to cash markets. In 1965, Thailand earned the equivalent of $70 million in foreign exchange from corn exports alone. A third of the country's corn crop now comes from a new agricultural area opened by the 90-mile, AID-financed Friendship Highway, which enables produce to reach Bangkok markets in a few hours by truck.

Primitive marketing systems can seriously hamper agricultural investment. In Bolivia, rice output lagged for years despite high demand in La Paz markets and an obvious potential for greater output in rice-growing areas connected by highway to the markets. An AID study showed that, although prices were high in La Paz markets, the truckers who brought rice in the producing areas provided irregular service and paid very low prices. The farmers had no alternative outlet, and little incentive to grow more than their own need. To meet this challenge, AID helped form a producer-marketing committee which rented warehouses, and offered to buy rice at a stated, higher price. The truckers promptly raised their offering prices too, and the farmers responded; rice production climbed from a yearly average of 18,000 tons in the early 1950's to over 40,000 tons by the early 1960's.

Increasing rice production in Pakistan

The remarkable growth in rice output in East Pakistan—the most impoverished wing of the country of one of the worlds' most crowded areas—demonstrates the complex of activities that can produce rapid farm progress even under severe handicaps.

Since 1962, AID has cooperated with Pakistan's Ministry of Agriculture to raise rice output in a crowded delta area with a history of shortages. AID helped finance imports of American fertilizer and pesticides and train 6,000 agricultural extension workers and the senior staff of the East Pakistan Agriculture Department, including training in the United States for most of the 35 Department directors and deputy directors.

In the ten years between 1955 and 1965, the average production of rice in East Pakistan rose from 7.4 million tons to 11.5 million tons. Average production per acre nearly doubled, from 787 pounds per acre to 1,340. The use of improved seed is credited with 12 percent of the increase, and regular spraying with pesticides with another five percent. Other major factors included: a tripling in the use of fertilizer (from 30,000 tons to 90,000); a six-fold increase in irrigation (30,000 to 185,000 acres), largely through use of low-level pumps shared by a few farmers; development of an effective extension service which gained the confidence of the farmers; government subsidy of fertilizer prices (roughly 50 percent of the purchase price, plus the cost of transport to inland depots); and a grass-roots public works program run by local union councils and financed by U.S.-granted local currency which built thousands of miles of farm-to-market roads.

The new AID emphasis on food and agriculture

AID's starting point in expanding assistance to agriculture is to make country performance in developing food resources a priority condition of self-help in agreements covering program loans or substantial AID country assistance agreements. This policy recognizes the fact that lagging food output and the drain of depressed rural economies in many countries threatens the gain of rapid progress in other sectors.

Self-help means investing an adequate share of the country's own national budget in food production; providing funds adequate to support better, larger research and extension services; and to build or create the external supports farmers need to produce more. Many things farmers need do not take foreign exchange—rural road systems, country warehouses, and storage centers, for example, can all be built with local labor, local materials, and local currency. Many countries have found it necessary to subsidize the initial inputs farmers need to begin producing more, such things as fertilizer, pesticides, and improved seed.

If these investments do not require foreign exchange, they do take local funds and the urgency of the problem suggests that a number of countries may have to increase their own investments in food output at the cost of other, sometimes more glamorous, projects.

New policies in the less developed countries

Self-help also means a willingness to adopt national policies that encourage food output and to abandon policies that are clearly depressing production on the farms. In some countries, controls on farm prices designed to hold food costs in line for city workers have removed any incentive for farmers to invest in growing more for cash sale.

Other countries have found that when fertilizer distribution was opened to private enterprise, customer-oriented salesmen did a better job of promoting its use in the countryside than was ever done by government monopolies or understaffed extension services. In many Latin American countries, the slow pace of land reform and the prevalence of absentee owners leaves thousands of acres still without farmer-owners to manage the development of the land's full potential.

The most hopeful side of the world food outlook is the developing countries' own belated, but serious, concern over the problem. This concern is demonstrated by important changes already occurring in national policies and investment patterns. For example:

India has in the past year reversed its prior policies by establishing a production-incentive price support program for grains, by radically increasing the share of agriculture in its Fourth Five-Year Plan, and by opening fertilizer distribution to competitive private enterprise.

In Latin America, 14 countries have now instituted land reform programs, and the pace at which farmers are actually getting land titles is increasing steadily.

Nigeria has increased the volume of agricultural credit available to its farmers by 20 percent a year for the last ten years.

In the newly independent African countries the number of students graduating from agricultural schools of all types has about trebled during the last five years as part of the establishment of basic farm extension and research services.

AID assistance in fiscal year 1967 will be provided in five major areas of concern common to most of the food-deficit countries: farm market policies, agricultural institutions, research, water, and fertilizer.

Farm Market Policies: Agriculture is the largest private sector in the less-developed world, where progress depends on the decisions of hundreds of millions of independent farmers. No farmer is going to decide to break with old traditions or invest in new tools and improvements unless it is clearly rational for him to do so. Credit must be available to make investment possible; he must be able to obtain things he needs when he needs them; he must have an opportunity to sell what he produces for a profit; and there must be consumer goods available to buy with his added income.

AID will finance the services of more American experts to help other countries with the complex job of creating the network of practical policies needed for farm progress. In providing this kind of assistance, the Agency will rely heavily on the resources of American land grant universities and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, financed by contracts and interagency agreements.

Agricultural Institutions: AID will increase the flow of assistance available to help less-developed countries create or expand extension systems, cooperative and farm credit associations, agricultural training schools, marketing outlets and rural transport systems. The major costs involved are nearly all local costs, but AID can provide important technical assistance, some capital help, and general support through local currencies generated through Food for Peace sales.

Increased assistance in this field will involve a substantial increase in the number of AID-financed technicians serving abroad in agricultural development. The Agency will seek the added technicians primarily through contracts with American land grant universities and colleges, cooperative and farm marketing associations, and by reimbursed cost agreements with other federal agencies such as the Department of Agriculture. By contracting with these other institutions, AID expects not only to get the best qualified experts for each job but also to make full use of the experience of the universities, the cooperative and farm associations, and other specialized federal agencies in planning and organizing the job to be done.

Research Programs: American agricultural abundance is based in large part on the improved seeds, fertilizer, pesticides, and production methods made available through basic and applied research carried on by the Department of Agriculture, the land grant universities, and private industries in the United States. Our farmers can plant, grow, and harvest their crops with confidence born of having dependable and authoritative guidance to avoid almost every hazard to production that can be controlled by man.

Experience has shown, however, that American farm methods do not necessarily work in the rice bowl of Asia or in the tropical and sub-tropical lands of Latin America and Africa. But methods that do work can plainly be developed if the research capability of the less-developed countries themselves is improved.

In fiscal year 1967, AID will expand its cooperative efforts to improve the effectiveness of agricultural research centers in the less-developed countries. In particular, the Agency will increase its support through the land grant universities and the Department of Agriculture, to strengthen their participation in the development of agricultural research in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Support will also be channeled through such regional and international centers as the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines.

Water Resources: The expansion of water resources for food production will require sizable AID capital as well as technical assistance. AID is now providing assistance for 50 water projects in Africa, Asia, and Latin America which will open new land for cropping through irrigation or permit multiple-cropping.

Based on current agricultural technology, little can be done to expand grain supplies by bringing virgin land under the plow in the less-developed countries. Except for a few tracts like the eastern slope of the Andes in Latin America, there is relatively little virgin land left to exploit.

But development of water resources can bring new acreage into production, and may permit growing three crops on land that now grows only one. AID projects are helping to irrigate more than a million acres in India, half a million each in Pakistan and Korea, and 100,000 or more in Tunisia, in Ecuador, in Morocco, in Taiwan, and in Afghanistan.

AID has helped bring water to parched land by financing American steel, cement, machinery, and engineering services for large dam-reservoir systems; by supplying American pumps and piping for tube wells; developing terrace and catchment systems for rainwater on riverless plateaus; and by providing simple, low-lift pumps for delta soils too light to sponge up water lying just a few feet below ground level.

The developing countries need agricultural water more—and know less about the potentials of their water resources—than any other part of the world. AID has helped 14 countries undertake the first surveys of their own resources, and the mapping and exploration of new resources will be a key part of future AID-assisted water development programs.

Fertilizer Use and Production: A million dollars worth of wheat shipped to a food-deficit country will feed 70,000 people for a year. But a million dollars worth of fertilizer, properly used, can grow enough wheat in the needy country itself to feed 200,000 people for a year.

A massive increase in the use of fertilizer is essential if the food-short countries are to produce enough from their own land. The provision of American fertilizer, and of plants to make it locally, will account for a major share of AID capital assistance in agricultural development.

It has been estimated that if the less-developed countries are to raise their own yields enough to meet their food demands, fertilizer use will have to be increased five times over the present level by 1975, a target that will require about 20 million nutrient tons a year.

American fertilizer exports, financed by AID loans, now provide much of the nutrients in use in the developing countries. For example, AID-financed American fertilizer shipments—and to a lesser degree the output of local plants built with AID assistance—constituted all of the fertilizer used in Laos and Korea in 1965, nearly 50 percent of Taiwan's, and 15 percent of India's.

AID expects to use roughly a third of its agricultural assistance funds in fiscal year 1967 to finance fertilizer exports to the less-developed countries and the American equipment and engineering skill to build plant capacity in the countries themselves.

Local currency generated under the Food for Peace program can be invested in country agricultural development—paying local labor to build farm-to-market roads, providing basic capital for farm credit programs or loans to encourage the growth of small rural industries. To cite only one example, 48 Cooley Loans to American subsidiaries in 15 developing countries have provided $48 million of local currency for new food producing and processing industries.

Under the Food for Peace Programs, food can be used as part wages or incentive in rural development programs operated by American voluntary relief agencies. Food aid will continue to play an important role in disaster relief, and in child-feeding programs.

The United States cannot, however, regard food aid as a substitute for a more rapid increase in the developing countries' own food output. In recommending that food aid be included as part of any country assistance program, AID will take into account the country's efforts to help itself. In the negotiation of food aid agreements greater emphasis will be given to each country's commitment to rapid agricultural progress.

In this way, the Food for Peace Program can make a more effective contribution to the war on hunger. AID will work closely with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to ensure that the availability of food supplies from the United States helps to encourage rather than delay the massive mobilization for farm progress clearly required in Asia, Africa and Latin America today.

Fortunately, private investors appear willing to undertake much of the investment needed to build the required production capacity in the developing countries. AID currently has before it applications for guaranties covering $200 million in planned American private investment in fertilizer production overseas. In 1965 AID guaranteed about $12 million in fertilizer plant investments in Korea, India and Nicaragua.

Improved food quality

The food shortage in the less-developed world is a problem of quality as well as quantity. A simple rise in the quantity of traditional starchy diets may assuage hunger—but it will not necessarily improve health. Dependence on increased meat consumption to provide added proteins will either delay improvement or aggravate existing shortages, since it is twice as costly to produce an ounce of animal protein as an ounce of cereal protein.

In its technical assistance programs, AID will emphasize the introduction of new crops for a more varied diet. Technical assistance will be made available to help local food processing industries develop methods for using proteins in domestic oil-seed crops and other sources that should be exploited.

A number of large American food processors are experimenting with inexpensive, protein-rich cereal products that could be popularized in the less-developed countries. As in the case of fertilizer production investment, AID will continue to give priority consideration to guaranty coverage for private American investment in food processing improvements overseas. AID guaranties for food processing, farm machinery, and other food related investment amounted to $22 million in 1965.

Nor is the land the only source of proteins. With AID assistance, thriving commercial fisheries have been developed to begin exploiting the off-shore wealth of India, Pakistan, Korea, the Somali Republic, and Nigeria, to name just a few countries. AID-assisted extension services are also showing farmers how to harvest fish from their own village ponds. With help from AID technicians and their own extension agents, villagers in East Pakistan have netted a ton of fish from each pond that produced as little as 70 pounds three years earlier.

The food-for-peace program

As the United States places the main emphasis in its aid program on helping other countries increase their own food production, increased food aid shipments may be required to fill the food gap while local output is being expanded.

However, direct food aid under the Food for Peace Program and the proposed Food for Freedom Act will be closely integrated with other U.S. assistance to insure that the less-developed countries do more to raise their own food themselves.

The President has sent to the Congress a special food aid message, calling for new and improved arrangements for using U.S. agricultural resources.

The Food for Freedom Act, proposed successor to Public Law 480 (Food for Peace), will retain the best provisions of the current legislation and will:

Make self-help an integral part of our food aid program;

Eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid;

Emphasize the development of markets for American farm products;

Authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate;

Emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of five years;

Continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC);

Increase emphasis on combating malnutrition (the Act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods);

Continue to involve voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs; and

Provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

HEALTH

Good health is visible evidence of economic and social progress in any country. AID plans substantial increases in its contributions to the public health programs of the less-developed countries with four long-range objectives in mind:

The eradication and control of killing and debilitating diseases that sap the human resources of these countries;

The progressive elimination of malnutrition among mothers and children;

Participation in world-wide efforts to reduce the pressures of relentless population growth; and

Development of training and research facilities in the developing nations to provide the manpower to run their health programs.

In fiscal year 1965, health programs drew $66 million in assistance from AID. In the current fiscal year and fiscal year 1967, the requirements are expected to increase to $91 million and then to $154 million. In addition, $24 million of the U.S. voluntary contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund, World Health Organization, the Pan-American Health Organization, the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees and the UN Development Program will be devoted to health activities.

Disease control and eradication

The United States has been battling communicable diseases around the world on an intensified scale since World War II, contributing millions of dollars in technical assistance to cooperative eradication campaigns by individual governments and international organizations. AID is now stepping up the time schedule in this continuing campaign by setting target dates for the total elimination or permanent control of some of the world's most widespread killing and crippling diseases. AID plans to spend $79 million in fiscal year 1967 for these purposes, compared to $36 million in fiscal year 1966

Malaria

AID's target is to eradicate malaria within ten years in Ethiopia, Jordan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Thailand, the Philippines, and Latin America. In fiscal year 1967, it expects to spend $28 million to carry out malaria eradication programs in 17 countries.

Hundreds of millions of persons have been rescued from the debilitating effects of malaria since the end of the second world war. In slightly more than 20 years, the annual incidence of new cases has been cut back from 350 million to less than 100 million. Of 1.6 billion people who lived in malarious areas before the post-war eradication campaigns began, 500 million have been freed from the dangers of transmission, and nearly 400 million more are coming under the protection of eradication programs.

The wide ranging war on malaria is releasing long wasted reserves of manpower and land to the broader war on poverty. In Nepal, Nicaragua, and Ecuador, agricultural resettlement programs are now possible in tropical regions heretofore considered uninhabitable. People have returned to the Santo Domingo-Quevado region of Ecuador, where malaria-carrying mosquitos had driven away practically the entire indigenous population. The region is now producing some of the richest crops in the country. And productivity is increasing in other ways: in the Philippines, a highway contractor was able to reduce his labor costs by $200,000 when he discovered that with malaria eliminated, two men could do the same work that used to require three.

Though the world-wide malaria eradication program will probably continue to require bilateral and international assistance, success in each country depends on the determination and capacity of the country itself to organize and implement the campaigns. This requires efficient local leadership and administration as well as the advisers and commodities supplied from abroad.

Measles and smallpox

AID's first target is to eliminate the threat of measles and smallpox in 19 countries comprising the western flank of Africa. It hopes to control measles by 1971 and eradicate smallpox by 1975.

While smallpox has already been eliminated from many of the world's land masses, there remains a high cost in quarantine measures against its reintroduction. The United States alone spends $15 to $20 million annually to keep smallpox out. In sub-Saharan Africa, the disease still kills 25 percent of those stricken, adults and children alike, and takes a tragic toll in blindness and disfigurement among those who survive. Even mortality rates from measles in West Africa run as high as 20 percent and also leave many surviving children blind or deaf for life.

The African campaign against measles was initiated two years ago following the spectacular success of an AID-assisted experimental campaign in which 730,000 children were immunized in Upper Volta. Public health workers are now being armed with automatic hypospray-injector guns utilizing newly developed live virus vaccines which probably confer lifelong protection. All 19 governments sought—and will receive—AID assistance. During the next five years, 32 million children will be immunized.

The smallpox program is being carried out by AID in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service and the World Health Organization, which is enlisting help from many nations in a global campaign to continue for ten years. AID will assist in vaccinating over 80 million people.

Other diseases

Cholera: This dread disease still constitutes a major menace to the health of those who inhabit the countries of Southeast Asia. AID has been actively supporting efforts to find an effective vaccine. In four years, it has provided $1.3 million to research and training programs at the SEATO Cholera Research Center in East Pakistan. It proposes to contribute another $500,000 in fiscal year 1967.

Schistosomiasis (snail fever), hookworm, trypanosomiasis (sleeping sickness): The highly debilitating effects of these widespread parasitic diseases are to be studied in an effort to set up an effective control program. Both schistosomiasis and trypanosomiasis limit the utilization of land in countries where they prevail, seriously impeding economic development.

Rabies and Foot and Mouth Disease: These animal diseases still play havoc with human health, as well as agricultural development in the Western Hemisphere. In fiscal year 1967, AID plans to provide support to the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) for the development of vaccines against both. It will also support programs aimed at curbing the spread of hoof and mouth disease among cattle in selected countries.

Diarrheal Disease: Enteric diseases caused by poor sanitation and polluted water supplies represent by far the biggest health problem facing developing nations around the world. From capital cities with elaborate underground supply systems to far off villages which draw their water from a single well or stream, there is a growing demand for technical and financial assistance to install safe systems of water supply. AID loans are going principally to cities installing or improving their own water distribution and sewerage systems. Saigon in Vietnam; Rangoon in Burma; Karachi, Pakistan; Monrovia, Liberia; Ibadan, Nigeria; Khartoum, Sudan; Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania; Tunis, Tunisia; Fort Archambault in Chad; Nairobi in Kenya; Taiz in Yemen; San Jose, Costa Rica; Panama City, Panama; Bogota, Colombia; Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo in Brazil; and Lima, Peru.

In rural areas, where technical know-how is most important, villagers are being trained in elementary methods of construction and maintenance. The villagers provide the manual labor and building materials in return for technical guidance in drilling the wells and installing the pumps.

The new installations in Taiz, the capital of Yemen, provide an interesting example of the health benefits which safe supplies of water are bringing to rural and urban populations alike. Taiz is a curious blend of village traditions and urban aspirations. For well over 1,000 years it had been drawing its entire water supply from masonry channels running in from the mountains. The total daily intake usually amounted to less than four gallons per capita. AID installed a modern urban system, raising intake to 40 gallons a day for every resident. As a result of this success, other towns and villages throughout Yemen are now contributing their own funds, materials, and labor to construct similar water systems.

In Latin American countries participating in the Alliance for Progress, assistance in constructing water and sewerage systems is tied to reforms in municipal administration, and most communities are also meeting one-third of the cost of construction. More than 100 cities are now preparing requests for loans in Brazil alone. They will draw the credits from a national revolving loan fund established by AID.

Combating malnutrition

In a special report to Congress in 1965, President Johnson committed the agricultural and technological resources of this country to a world-wide war on malnutrition. He referred to tragic evidence that vitamin and protein deficiencies are robbing many countries throughout the world of the productive capacities of their people.

Malnutrition takes its worst toll in the first five years of human growth, blunting the physical development of pre-school children, and very often retarding their mental growth as well. In countries where food shortages are both chronic and widespread, this irreversible process affects up to 50 percent of the infant population.

AID missions around the world are now beginning to explore ways of getting the necessary enriched food supplements to these pre-school children. AID has contracted with several American universities to train American and foreign professionals and technicians in nutritional health and to prepare handbooks for use in the campaign.

It is not an easy assignment. While the suckling infant is nourished by its mother and the school child can benefit from a school lunch program, facilities do not exist in most countries for reaching the preschool toddler. Experimental programs carried out by private groups or government agencies in the past have not been coordinated, scientifically planned, or organized to this end. Developing nations must be willing to devote their own energies and facilities to this problem.

The program requires education for physicians, health workers, and mothers. It calls for social services to reach families in their homes and through child care centers. Local customs and eating habits must be known, so that the texture, taste, and composition of the enriched foods will be attractive to the consumers. The right foods must be grown to supply the required nutrients. While children in one region may be suffering from a vitamin A deficiency, those in another section of the same country may require animal proteins instead. New or improved high protein commercial products must be developed which can be marketed commercially, yet remain within the price range of those who need them most.

AID is now beginning the first pilot projects in Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Central America, Morocco, Turkey, Thailand, and Korea. The plan is to blend, fortify, and enrich basic food commodities—starting with supplies from the Food for Peace Program—with locally grown proteins, vitamins, and minerals. Within five years, AID hopes to have projects underway in at least 25 of the 50 countries that need such help.

Preliminary costs of this new research and training program are expected to rise to $10 million in fiscal year 1967, from $4.5 million in fiscal year 1966. The investment will increase substantially as the pilot projects move progressively toward the goal of reaching 150 million children by the end of 1971.

Dealing with population problems

The United States Government shares the serious worldwide concern over the social and economic implications of rapid population growth rates in many countries.

Considerable AID technical assistance has already gone to improving maternal and child health, to demographic studies and surveys, census refinement, and research into population problems in the developing countries. Since President Johnson determined, early in 1965, to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion of world population and the growing scarcity of world resources," AID has begun to respond to requests from governments for direct assistance to family planning programs:

South Korea and the Republic of China on Taiwan are already drawing local currency funds to support health and family planning clinics.

Turkey is seeking a loan to purchase transport vehicles for family planning workers and their educational materials, in addition to continuing the services of a demographer.

Honduras seeks training, education materials, and help with the cost of establishing family planning services in rural health centers.

From Pakistan and Tunisia have come requests for a wide range of technical assistance, transport vehicles, education aids, and training in support of family planning programs. India is discussing similar assistance with AID officials.

To get AID's help, the developing nation must have its own family planning program. That program must allow freedom of choice to each family. AID will not provide contraceptives or equipment for their manufacture.

To evaluate the requests, individuals in every AID mission were designated to be responsible for population matters. The Population Branch of the Technical Cooperation Staff and the Population Division in AID's Latin American bureau follow program developments and work with international organizations, American public and private groups, universities, and other institutions engaged in population work.

Research and training programs

AID supports research and training programs at the following universities and institutions:

University of Pittsburgh—developing an economic model for estimating costs of family planning programs;

University of Notre Dame—studies on changes in traditional family patterns due to modernization and urbanization;

Bureau of the Census—population projections in selected countries;

Population Council—fertility studies and surveys;

Columbia Institute for Social Development—audiovisual techniques for public education programs;

International Federation of Institutes for Social and Socio-Religious Research—Latin American population studies.

AID has also signed contracts with the University of North Carolina and Johns Hopkins to develop training progams in family planning for doctors and public health workers. Related programs are being developed for nurses and midwives in the Children's Bureau; for statisticians in the National Center for Health Statistics; and for census and survey specialists in the Census Bureau. The Pan American Health Organization gets AID's help to establish and improve demographic training in Latin American medical and public health schools. So do the Latin American Center for Demography and Statistical Studies in Chile, the National Center for Studies of Population and Development in Peru, and the General American Demographic Studies Unit in Guatemala.

AID's investment to date: $2 million in fiscal year 1965, $5.5 million in fiscal year 1966, with prospects of expanding assistance levels to $10 million in fiscal year 1967. That figure can reasonably be expected to double again in the years immediately thereafter.

AID recognizes the growing seriousness of the imbalance between food and people. The problems impede social and economic development, threaten the health and well-being of many, and will jeopardize man's long search for peace. But these problems are not solved quickly or easily.

More research is required on the relationship between population growth and economic development, on changes in traditional family patterns, and on methods of evaluating the effectiveness of family planning programs.

Training facilities must be expanded here and abroad.

Finally, AID will need to put more advisors in the field to meet a rapid increase in requests for assistance to national family planning programs.

Meeting the manpower needs of national health programs

In every country where AID is engaged in raising health standards, local people are being trained to take over the job. There is a tremendous world-wide shortage of people with the required skills, not only doctors but nurses, sanitarians, laboratory technicians, public health workers, health educators, hospital administrators, and paramedics.

To meet these requirements, AID administers grants to overseas medical and health training institutions, assisting both individuals and the institutions themselves.

In Lebanon and Vietnam, universities receive support to expand teaching and laboratory facilities. A medical school and nursing schools in Pakistan have received advice, equipment, and local currency. In other countries, including Thailand and Iran, medical teams from American universities are helping to set up regional medical centers in outlying regions.

All of these institutions draw upon the wide range of health services AID offers to developing countries: exchange fellowships, consulting and advisory services, technical equipment, and local currency support. The costs of these and other health training programs have increased from about $5 million each in fiscal years 1965 and 1966, to an estimated $14 million in fiscal year 1967.

Rural health programs

In many countries, AID is providing extensive assistance to improve the quality of rural health services.

In Thailand, for instance, a wide range of preventive and curative health services are being established this year through an integrated network of health centers, midwifery centers, public health laboratories, and regional tuberculosis control centers. In Vietnam, some 250 American doctors and medical technicians are at work and 4,200 new health subcenters have been added in provincial districts and hamlets.

EDUCATION

Education is the foundation for development. Progress in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America depends on a rapid increase in the number of trained, educated people who can run effective governments, operate public health systems, credit unions, cooperatives and businesses, and use modern farm methods to raise more from the land.

Education is a key to social change: the peasant who learns to read and to calculate is in a position to question the traditional authority of the village headman or local official for the first time. For rural villagers, and for millions in the remote districts of every developing country, a local school is the door through which their children, too, can enter the country's colleges and universities and share in the new opportunities of a growing nation.

Education is also an end in itself: it is demeaning for millions to live in ignorance, unable to write their own names. In country after country, a major goal of economic growth is an increase in national wealth sufficient to finance schools for every child.

Since the beginning of U.S. assistance in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, aid to education has been a major field of technical assistance and has accounted for the largest share of AID-financed technicians at work overseas.

In fiscal year 1965, for example, one of every five AID-financed experts overseas was working in the field of education—both in the development of basic education systems in aided countries and on the development of specialized education to train more doctors, nurses and health workers, farm experts, engineers, public administrators, managers, skilled technicians, and the like.

Contracts with American universities

Four of every five AID-financed educators at work overseas today are staff members from American colleges and universities with whom the Agency contracts for technical assistance.

Through some $185 million in contracts with AID 126 American colleges and universities participate in technical assistance programs including the training of foreign participants in the United States. Teams from 71 of these universities are at work overseas on AID-financed technical assistance missions in 38 countries.

The cumulative impact of AID educational assistance can be shown in several ways:

Since the beginning of the Point IV program in 1949, 94,000 foreign technicians and professionals have been brought to the United States for advanced education or training, and another 19,000 have been trained in third countries under U.S. programs. (In fiscal year 1965, there were some 8,500 foreign trainees in the United States, and 1,900 in third countries, under AID auspices.)

More than 670,000 teachers have been graduated from colleges and schools established with AID assistance. These graduates today provide 70 percent of the teachers in Ethiopia, about 40 percent of Vietnam's, 28 percent of Korea's, 45 percent of Iran's, 34 percent of Costa Rica's, and nearly 33 percent of the teachers in Turkey.

During the past five years, 237,000 classrooms were constructed with AID help, including local currency for labor costs.

In fiscal year 1966, there were more than 675,000 students in colleges and universities established in the less-developed countries with AID assistance, and another 670,000 in AID-assisted vocational, technical, and normal schools.

Much of the impact of U.S. educational assistance does not lend itself to statistics—for example, the work of AID-financed American educators in helping other countries modernize educational systems, improve curricula, and relate what schools are teaching more closely to each country's requirements for trained manpower and economic growth.

Proposed increases in AID's educational programs

In fiscal year 1967, AID proposes a sharp increase in its educational assistance programs. In the new African countries, a rapid increase in the basic supply of trained manpower remains a clear priority. In Latin America, the Near East and South Asia, and the Far East, an expanded educational effort is required to speed the pace of development. In Southeast Asia, more schools in the villages and the training of able leadership for nation-building are central to every hope for stability.

In fiscal year 1965, AID committed $88 million for educational assistance. AID expects to provide about the same amount during the current fiscal year. In fiscal year 1967, however, the Agency proposes a $155 million program of education assistance—an increase of nearly 50 percent over current levels. In addition, some $21 million will be allocated as contributions under the Foreign Assistance Act to the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees and the UN Development Program for education projects.

Although earlier AID projects in education covered a wide variety of education problems, more recent programs are concentrated on education planning and its relationship to national manpower requirements, on overcoming the most critical education and training bottlenecks, particularly the preparation of teachers and textbooks, and on the expanson of education for health and agricultural personnel. These last two fields of specialized education will account for an additional $60 million in fiscal year 1967 for AID programs in food and agriculture, and in health.

Educational planning assistance

AID emphasis on providing more help in planning national educational programs is a direct result of the dilemma faced by nearly every less-developed country in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Most of their citizens still cannot read or write. Literacy averages about 60 percent in Latin America and the Far East, but just 25 percent in the Near East and South Asia, and only 16 percent in Africa.

The need for a drastic expansion in opportunities for basic, general education is urgent if the citizens of new nations are to participate effectively in either development progress or self-government. But there is an equally urgent need for more people with the advanced technical and professional skills needed to lead the struggle for a more productive, modern society.

Both needs require substantial educational investments. Both needs cannot be met fully, at once. Neither can be neglected. Without the specialists required for development, there is little hope that a country can afford the cost of education for all. But without an expansion of basic educational opportunity, whole groups and regions are effectively barred from participation in national progress.

Choices must be made, and a balance struck between the claims for each country's education budget and its supply of educational manpower. Educational planning begins with this dilemma and with the difficult questions that flow from it: how fast must teachers be trained to staff a given rate of primary and secondary school expansion? How many agronomists, veterinarians, midwives, engineers, managers, accountants, and the like will be required to maintain progress five, ten, fifteen years in the future? At what rate must primary and secondary education expand to feed an expansion in advanced specialized education? Where must schools be placed to distribute opportunity fairly among the different regions and groups in new countries struggling towards national unity?

Educational choices made today in the less-developed countries will determine in large part their character as self-governing nations tomorrow. With AID support, the experience of America's educational community is being made available to help other countries plan wisely for the future.

In Nigeria, AID is supporting an evaluation by Education and World Affairs of the scope and priority of education programs. A similar study is planned for Ethiopia in fiscal year 1967. In Thailand, a three-party contract among AID, Michigan State University, and the Thai National Economic Development Board provides for education planning assistance to the Ministry of Education.

With the assistance of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics, AID has made a survey of educational planning facilities in Chile, Peru, and Guatemala. During the past four years AID has made it possible for over 100 Latin Americans connected with planning for educational development to attend seminars on this subject under the auspices of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America.

The prospect of joint planning for Southeast Asia regional education programs was opened at a November 1965 meeting of Southeast Asian Education and Planning Ministers convened by the Government of Thailand. U.S. Presidential Adviser Eugene Black represented the United States at the meeting. AID funds are proposed for regional education activities in Southeast Asia in fiscal year 1967, as well as for a comprehensive educational development scheme for Laos.

Training educational manpower

A critical bottleneck in expanding educational opportunity is a shortage of teachers and of institutions to train them in the developing countries. AID will expand its assistance to teacher-training institutions and explore new ways to "stretch" existing teacher supplies through in-service training, television, radio, and other new teaching techniques during fiscal year 1967.

In fiscal year 1966, more than 210,000 students are enrolled in normal schools and teachers colleges established with AID assistance in 37 Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

In Nigeria, funds will be needed in fiscal year 1967 to continue the programs of 11 American universities working to improve teacher education and other vocational aspects of higher education. These AID-financed American university teams are assisting 148 Nigerian educational institutions including four of the country's five universities, three of its advanced teacher training colleges, and 50 colleges training elementary school teachers.

Internships for college administrators

Through a contract with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AID is conducting a special program of internships in the administration of teacher training colleges. The program provides for an exchange of presidents of American colleges with the presidents of colleges in the Philippines, Thailand, Nigeria, and Kenya, and it helps to develop school-to-school relationships. It will be extended in fiscal year 1967.

AID-financed educational programs also train the staff for new centers of excellence in higher education in the less-developed countries. In India, for example, the Indian Institute of Technology is being established as the dynamic center of national scientific training and research with the help of an AID-financed consortium of nine American universities—the California, Carnegie, Case, and Massachusetts Institutes of Technology, Ohio State, Princeton, and Purdue Universities, and the Universities of California and Michigan. Scientists from the American universities are teaching at the new Indian institution, while their Indian counterparts and successors complete advanced study in the United States.

Even with a massive attack on the teacher shortage, it will be years in many less-developed countries before there are enough to staff primary and secondary schools in every village. On the basis of trials in Nigeria and in Colombia, it appears that television can be a valuable tool to bring education to remote villages and understaffed urban classrooms while additional teachers are being trained.

In Colombia, more than 400,000 children in 1,000 schools are receiving a better education through an educational television network that now covers 80 percent of the country's most densely-populated areas. The network means hundreds of schools now have the advantage of special subject teachers, and of audio-visual teaching materials that would not otherwise be available. AID, the Peace Corps, and the Colombian Ministry of Education are cooperating on the program.

In Nigeria, AID-financed educational television professionals (from the Board of Education of Washington County, Maryland (recognized pioneers in the United States) are helping to improve and expand radio and television instruction, establish permanent broadcast sections in the department of education, and develop pilot lesson materials in science, English, and mathematics.

Over 50 of the developing nations now have one or more television transmitters but in many of the countries educational program material is lacking. AID is reviewing the possibilities of adapting American material and has contracted with the International Institute for Educational Planning to study the cost, probable results, and other factors in using this material in the less-developed countries.

Improving the quality of education

In addition to teacher training, AID will also expand emphasis on improving the quality of instruction through in-service training, development of improved curricula, and support for better, and more, teaching materials.

Primary reliance in providing this assistance will be placed on expertise of American universities and educational institutions working under contract with AID.

During the past five years, AID has helped provide in-service training for more than 160,000 teachers in Latin America, almost 82,000 in the Near East and South Asia, nearly 24,000 in the Far East, and 33,000 in Africa. Much of the in-service training was provided—and will continue to be provided—by American university teams at work overseas on contract with the Agency.

In-service training is particularly important in school systems which are attempting not only a rapid expansion, but a radical change from traditional "rote" teaching methods to methods that stress creative thinking and learning by doing.

The participation of American educators

Two recent experiments have shown how an even larger cross-section of the American educational community than is now represented by AID contractors can be involved in the improvement of teaching in the less-developed countries.

The first began in India three years ago, when four American educators were brought there during their summer vacation to introduce key faculty of Indian colleges and secondary schools to modern methods of teaching mathematics and science. The experiment was so successful that in 1965 AID brought 200 American educators to India to conduct six-week "summer science institutes" at 94 locations, with 3,500 Indian teachers participating. The scheme will be expanded in India and in other countries.

The second experiment is the "Teach Corps," operating in Africa and Latin America and conducted for AID by the Committee on International Relations of the National Education Association. Under this program, 47 skilled American elementary and secondary teachers conducted summer workshops for 1,280 teachers in five developing countries. The program, designed to improve the quality of instruction by existing teachers, will be expanded in Latin America and throughout English-speaking Africa.

In many countries, a shortage of teaching materials—beginning with texts—is a serious bottleneck. AID has provided experts to help train local education personnel to write and publish basic handbooks and lesson materials in their own language, and has helped establish regional centers to translate and help publish and distribute textbooks.

In the Philippines, AID financed the import of $4.2 million in paper so that local publishing and printing industries could meet 80 percent of the country's textbook shortage. To date, 27 million elementary and secondary school texts have been made available through the program. In Central America, more than eight million school textbooks have been published for use in the schools. An AID loan to Ecuador will provide nearly two million books for elementary school children, while counterpart funds in Brazil will be used in that country's effort to provide free textbooks for all children.

In Africa, AID financed a joint project under which African and American educators have developed a new series of texts in mathematics and science which include basic material on health, nutrition, and sanitation as it relates to the countries in which the students themselves live. Texts produced in this program are now in use on an experimental basis in Liberia, Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Kenya, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Zambia, Uganda, and Malawi.

A special problem in the educational systems of many developing countries is the need to improve the teaching of English—in some cases because this is the *lingua franca* in a nation with many local languages, and in every case because it is a major language of international communication.

Through a contract with English Language Services, Inc., AID has developed a self-teaching program that includes workbooks, films, soundtape, language master cards, and the like and is designed to cut the time needed to train English language teachers from two years or more to about four months.

After complete testing at several regional centers, the system will be made available for general use.

U.S. higher education for foreign students

The steady expansion, through U.S. assistance, of excellent centers of higher education in the Far East and the Near East and South Asia has reduced somewhat the need to bring students from these areas to the United States even for advanced work, except for highly specialized fields.

For example, the Graduate School of Public Administration of Thammasat University in Thailand, established with help from the University of Indiana on contract with AID, is now available not only to Thai students, but for students from nearby countries.

Grants to the American University of Beirut (AUB) under AID's program for American Schools and Hospitals Abroad, have helped AUB expand as the outstanding educational center in the Middle East and to become a major training center for African leaders as well. As part of its own technical assistance programs, AID now sends about 600 students from other African and Middle Eastern countries to AUB for advanced or specialized education.

Elsewhere, however, AID is increasing its support for cooperative programs to bring students to U.S. universities for study. The Latin American Scholarship Program will make it possible for students to receive university training in the United States and return to their home countries as faculty members in the basic studies programs of local universities.

The Latin American universities pay the costs of student travel and English language training, the cooperating American universities provide scholarships, and AID provides student maintenance costs. The first 150 students under the program will reach the United States in April or May for preliminary English language training.

Under the first such program of its kind—the U.S. African Scholarship Program of American Universities—1,200 African students have been brought to American universities for undergraduate education. Another 100 have been brought here for graduate study. As the capacity of African universities increases, the undergraduate component of this program will decrease. AID assistance to higher education in Africa itself includes a regional program to provide scholarships in selected African universities for students from other African countries.

Programs for youth leaders

Because students from the developing countries frequently return to positions of unusual responsibility for their age and bear a unique leadership role in the development of their own country, AID has begun a series of specially designed courses and activities for youth leaders studying in this country.

These programs make it possible to provide summer leadership experience and practical training for selected students, as well as fellowships to promising and needy foreign students who are not here on government grants but could complete their academic work more rapidly and effectively with a minimum of additional support.

In fiscal year 1965, AID organized 18 summer institutes for some 600 foreign students, designed to increase their understanding of social and economic development and their practical ability to take community leadership on their return. At one eight-week institute, organized for AID by the University of Pittsburgh for 18 students, the mornings were devoted to seminars on communications, social change and leadership responsibilities, the afternoons to observation and practical training in local industry, business, community organizations and government. These programs will be continued in this coming summer.

Encouraging non-governmental educational assistance

Some of the most imaginative programs of educational assistance, particularly in the fields of literacy and rural development, are being carried out by private American groups and organizations at work in the less-developed countries.

Registered American voluntary agencies, working with their counterparts in the less-developed countries, are placing increased emphasis on community self-help programs designed to make villagers literate and teach them basic skills needed to establish rural industries—small shops to make simple farm tools, and other equipment; to produce such things as lumber, shoes, and cooking utensils.

To encourage this, AID makes available a wide variety of excess government equipment at minimum cost, including shipment to the country where it is needed. Equipment can include jeeps for transportation, machinery for vocational training schools, printing equipment for texts and pamphlets, radio and television equipment for educational programs.

Food is available under the Food for Peace Program for use as an incentive or part wages in self-help school construction programs carried out under the leadership of private voluntary agencies.

In cooperation with the Peace Corps, voluntary agencies such as CARE, and citizen organizations in the less-developed countries, AID is encouraging "school-to-school" assistance, through which American PTA's and other private groups work directly with local communities overseas to help build new classrooms, and improve equipment and teaching materials.

Partners of the alliance program

"School-to-school" assistance to Latin America is channeled through the Partners of the Alliance program for which AID supplies staff services and a portion of the travel costs. These are examples of the cooperation that can be developed through direct school-to-school relationships:

15 public school district in Oregon are providing in-service training for Costa Rican public school administrators and teachers; during their Oregon training, the Costa Rican educators help the Oregon districts with language and social studies courses.

High school students in Texas and Virginia have collected funds to help equip Peruvian Indian village schools and supply vocational schools in Peru with school supplies, vocational training tools, cement mixers, and handtools for self-help school construction projects.

An important additional means of promoting educational development in several less-developed countries would be to use U.S. Government-owned currencies which are excess to the needs of the United States to establish bi-national education foundations. The foundations would be modeled on similar institutions in the United States and would draw upon the experience of their American counterparts. Through their programs of assistance to local education, the foundations would be uniquely equipped to stimulate new initiatives in educational techniques, stimulate private educational activities, and focus local attention on such critical areas as literacy and the education and training of local populations, particularly the training of farmers in agricultural techniques.

Self-help in educational development

As in every other field, the greatest effort in the development of educational resources must come from within the less-developed countries themselves. Even at the outset, most of the costs involved in an expanded educational system are local costs. Teachers' salaries are paid with local currency; labor, and most of the material for school construction, is available locally.

AID can provide an important margin of help—U.S. training for key educators, American educators to help with projects overseas, paper, school equipment, and other American goods that may not be available in the less-developed country itself.

The less-developed countries have been increasing their own budgets for education an average of 15 percent annually. They now spend about $7 billion from their own resources for the education of their 1.3 billion people—compared with $42 billion the United States spends for the formal education of 180 million people. Latin American countries together spent the equivalent of $2 billion on education in 1965, while AID was devoting $32 million to assist education in Latin America.

In most of the developing countries the resources of local communities can be better mobilized to build educational facilities themselves.

The results of AID pilot programs in Guatemala, Liberia, and a number of other countries, and of private agency programs for community development in Latin America have shown that if villagers are organized and provided basic plans and a few materials—cement, hardware, metal roofing—they will build their own schools with their own labor to speed the day when an education is available to their children.

In Afghanistan, local communities constructed 140 classrooms through a self-help program, and in addition raised the local funds to pay teachers' salaries and purchase the initial school equipment.

From 1963 to 1965, Vietnam villagers constructed over 3,000 hamlet school classrooms with AID-supplied materials.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. Fascell] having assumed the chair, Mr. Price, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 15750.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2950) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

"FEDERAL SUBSIDY OF COMMERCIAL BANKS MUST STOP," SAYS TEXAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Hunter Young, executive vice president of Texarkana Federal Savings & Loan Association, Texarkana, Ark., writes me that "the home mortgage market has suffered a severe setback in our area due to the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve Board."

Texarkana, Tex., is my hometown, just across the street from Texarkana, Ark. It disturbs me greatly to know that my own constituents and millions of others—homebuilders and consumers, particularly—are suffering because of the selfish action of a few willful Wall Street bankers raising interest rates to historic highs so they can line their own pockets at everyone else's expense.

In addition to the money squeeze, Mr. Young accurately describes Federal Government tax collections deposited in commercial banks as "free money." These deposits average $5 to $6 billion annually, but the Government receives no interest at all. This just does not make any sense. When the Federal Government borrows from these same banks, the taxpayers must pay up to 5 percent for the use of that money. When the commercial banks get the use of the taxpayers' money, the public receives not one thin dime in interest.

Mr. Young suggests that the $150 to $200 million the Government would receive in interest each year on these accounts should be applied against the national debt. With the national debt increasing each year due to ever-rising interest rates, it seems to me that Mr. Young has hit the nail on the head.

The combination of high interest and tight money is a double-barreled blow to the average American. His legitimate housing needs go unsatisfied and he is saddled with a greater and greater interest burden to keep the Government running.

With unanimous consent, I will insert Mr. Young's letter at this point in the Record:

Texarkana Federal Savings & Loan Association,
Texarkana, Ark., June 27, 1966.

Hon. Wright Patman,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Patman: May we take this opportunity to express our appreciation for your continued fight to save the savings and loan industry.

The home mortgage market has suffered a severe setback in our own area due to the "tight money" policy of the Federal Reserve Board.

We feel that our place in todays economy should be maintained. Home ownership made possible by our industry plays a major role in the American Way of Life. The salvation of our industry is certainly in the public interest.

It is our opinion that the Comptroller of the Currency, with his free wheeling policy of allowing Commercial Banks to engage themselves in almost any business, should be replaced by an individual with the public interest at heart.

Savings and Loan Associations should be allowed to act as a depository for Federal, State and Local funds, as we too can use free money. If not, the Banks should have to pay for this money and the income used to lower our National Debt. We should be allowed a precentage (we suggest 10% of legal requirement) investment in Federal Home Loan Bank securities, the highest yield government securities on todays market. If we must pay 5.75% for borrowed money, then we should be allowed to cover part of this expense with Federal Home Loan Bank securities as a part of required liquidity.

We in the First Congressional District of Texas are indeed fortunate and proud that you represent us.

Yours very truly,

J. Hunter Young,
Executive Vice President.

MR. PAT DuBOIS, NEW PRESIDENT OF INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION, WARNS THAT FREE ENTERPRISE AND HEALTHY COMPETITION IN BANKING CAN FLOURISH ONLY BY AVOIDING THE EVILS OF CONCENTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the fine young president of the 6,200 members of the Independent Bankers Association of America, Pat DuBois, writing in the July issue of the Independent Banker, sounded the alarm that in banking, as in every other important American industry, the threat of superconcentration is a threat to free enterprise itself.

Mr. DuBois states that unregulated expansion in banking, whether it be by branching, holding companies or mergers, begets monopolistic control of money and credit that is harmful to America.

All Members of Congress should be acutely aware of these sentiments expressed by this leader of grassroots banking. With unanimous consent, I insert the entire article at this point in the RECORD:

THE FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL—THE PRESIDENT OF THE IBAA PREDICTS THAT FREE ENTERPRISE AND HEALTHY COMPETITION WILL FLOURISH IN BANKING IF WE AVOID THE EVILS OF CONCENTRATION

(By Pat DuBois)

(Pat DuBois, president of the First State Bank of Sauk Centre, Minnesota, was elected president of the Independent Bankers Association of America at the association's recent convention in Las Vegas, Nevada. He is a member of the Minnesota legislature and has served as chairman of the Agriculture-Rural America Committee of the IBAA. This article is adapted from his address before the 76th annual convention of the Minnesota Bankers Association in Minneapolis.)

Often I'm asked, "What is an independent bank?" Or, "What does the Independent Bankers Association believe in and what is it trying to accomplish?" Sometimes, when these or similar questions are asked by someone who doesn't believe in our philosophy, there is a fine spray of gravel accompanying the query. This might be in the form of a follow-up question like "Why does the IBAA continue its 'obsession' on the subject of branch banking?"

A good test of whether a bank ranks as an independent can be supplied by the answers to three questions I would pose, namely: "Where are policy decisions made?" "How much attention is paid to even the smallest borrower by the top officers of the bank?" and "How far can the buck be passed before a decision is made?"

A bank ceases to be an independent when it has a large branch system covering a wide geographical area or when it becomes a part of a bank holding company network. In situtaions such as this, policy is dictated from a headquarters that is distantly unaware of the personal factors that can tip the balance in favor of a loan applicant. The rule book is applied by direction and closely adhered to for decision.

Basic to the beliefs and program of the Independent Bankers Association of America is the conviction that the independent bank of, by, and for the community must continue to be a vital instrument in the continued growth and prosperity of our nation.

If the independent banks of this great country cease to function in this role, then the America we know today will be a totally different and much less desirable place in which to live.

In considering what our association believes in and fosters, we are guided by strong convictions about the kind of banking system that is best for America. These convictions have their foundation in the policy for American banking that has been set by the Congress since the founding of our nation and by the legislatures of the various states. This policy has been affirmed by the courts in numerous decisions.

We believe this nation should continue to foster a diffused system of banking that disperses control of money and credit among many instead of concentrating this control in a few huge institutions.

Our association believes that the diffused system is best and we further believe that most Americans agree with our objectives. Even some of the people I know who are employed by bank holding companies or holding company banks have assured me, in moments of candor, that they could not quarrel with our philosophy, conceding there is more job satisfaction and other rewards in independent banking.

The Independent Bankers Association of America believes that unregulated expansion in banking, whether it be by branching, holding companies, or mergers, begets monopolistic control of money and credit that is harmful to America.

AVOID CONCENTRATION EVILS

Private enterprise and healthy competition should be permitted to flourish in American banking and will flourish if we avoid the evils of concentration. At the same time, I realize that we must continue to live with an overlay of sensible supervision by state and federal governments. The laudable purposes of this supervision are protection of our depositors' money and the preservation of meaningful competition in banking.

This brings me to our strong convictions on the subject of branch banking. The policy of our association is to oppose branching in those states where it is not permitted and to limit it in states where it is allowed. We also favor tight controls over bank holding companies.

This is our policy because it has been demonstrated repeatedly that when branching or holding company banking takes hold, the public is served less well, because there are fewer alternative sources of credit. When banking concentration exists in any form, there is less chance for independent banks to survive and prosper.

BASIC TO FREE ENTERPRISE

In a nation whose philosophy of government is based on the concept of dispersion of political power, the dispersion of economic power would seem to need no further elaboration. It is basic and fundamental.

The association of which I am president consists of thousands of progressive banks whose policies demonstrate their belief in our dynamic economy. Our association acting as spokesman for these banks knows that to curb branching and holding companies is a "must" to insure the best possible service for the banking needs of America. This is not an effort to preserve the "status quo." It is instead a dedication to a requirement that is basic to retention of free enterprise in banking.

When I say that branching and holding company banking increase concentration of money and credit, I don't ask that you take my word for it. The best single factual source I know to support this can be found in the FDIC reports. The 1964 report, latest available, has this information documented in table number 48 on page 141.

Without chancing the confusion that comes from extensive quoting of figures, let me highlight this table for you. The various states are listed in three categories—the 16 permitting statewide branch banking, the 16 with limited area branch banking prevalent and the 18 with unit banking prevalent.

For each state in each category, the table lists the percentage of deposits in the largest banks or holding company bank groups. Generally, concentration is shown to be greatest in states with statewide branching and least in the unit banking states. The limited area branching states fall into an intermediate category, so far as concentration is concerned.

NEW GROUND RULES

To preserve meaningful competition in banking, our association works at both state and national levels for ground rules that permit the independent bank to survive and prosper.

Recently we tried—and I regret to say we were unsuccessful—to strengthen the Bank Holding Company Act, which we were instrumental in passing in 1956. Our purpose was to close a loophole that is permitting holding company banks in various states to acquire banks in violation of the intent of the law. The loophole has been exploited for bank acquisitions in South Dakota, Montana and Nebraska.

We were successful in the first session of this Congress in preventing complete emasculation of the Bank Merger Act.

As you know, mergers provide another route for acquisitions that bring about concentration. Had it not been for the strenuous efforts of our association, I'm confident the Bank Merger Act would have been enacted in its original form. This would have ended application of antitrust laws to bank mergers.

As introduced, the merger bill was special privilege legislation for a number of big banks that wanted to terminate antitrust proceedings pending against them. As enacted, the bill did terminate some of the pending cases, but application of the antitrust laws to banking was retained. We believe this retention was of great and fundamental importance to our present system of banking.

At our recent convention in Las Vegas, we registered our opposition to the cease and desist bill you've read so much about. Most repugnant of this bill's provisions is one that would permit the federal government to toss you out of your bank, even without a hearing, for unspecified banking practices of which a federal supervisory agency disapproved.

We followed through on our convention resolution with a verbal presentation of testimony to the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Basically, our stand resists imposition of federal control at the expense of states' rights.

MORE COMPLICATED TODAY

I have been associated with the Independent Bankers Association of America, in one capacity or another, for a long time. Therefore, I am familiar with the issues this association has had to deal with over the years. Having this background and experience, it impresses me that the problems that confront banking today are more complicated and difficult than ever before.

What has become banking's most vexatious problem was triggered by the Federal Reserve Board action increasing the maximum interest rate on certificates of deposit to 5½ per cent. It's no secret that the Fed took this action to help large New York City banks retain many billions of dollars in CDs held by foreign investors.

While the Fed action helped the New York banks in their competition for investments from abroad, it also forced other banks throughout the nation to climb on the interest rate merry-go-round.

As the battle for savings heated up, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, introduced a bill to require that commercial banks cease to issue negotiable certificates of deposit. An obvious slap at the big New York banks, this proposal, too, would cause reverberations in just about every bank in the nation.

"BE DAMNED TO THE SMALL"

Subsequently, Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER of New York, a member of Mr. PATMAN's committee, proposed that commercial banks be prohibited from accepting certificates of deposit in amounts of less than $15,000. It requires no crystal ball to know what the Ottinger proposal would do to just about every bank, including the one with which I am associated.

Once again it appears that an effort is being made in Washington to cut the cloth for the big and be damned to the small. At the proper time, we'll be there to remind the lawmakers of the problems of the small.

As we all know so well, the deposit ratio in country banks is heavy with time money, ranging up to 80 per cent, and a substantial portion of time deposits in country banks consists of CDs. To eliminate this form of saving for small savers would cause grave damage to these banks.

The proposals I already have mentioned are among a number that have been tossed into the hopper of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Another proposal of interest is Joint Resolution 1148, which would put a ceiling of 4½% on all interest payments of banks insured by the FDIC, *other than mutual savings banks*.

Since being authorized to pay higher interest rates, banks have stepped up their efforts to lure more dollars from savers. Some banks now pay 5½ per cent on deposits as small as $25. Higher rates paid by banks are in a large part responsible for an outflow of cash from savings and loan associations. The tight situation in which some S&Ls find themselves has halted construction of many single and multiple unit dwellings.

SAVINGS AND LOANS EFFECTIVE LOBBYISTS

It's long been recognized that the savings and loans maintain an effective lobby in Washington. The National Association of Home Builders aren't amateurs in the lobbying business, either. Both groups were, I'm sure, influential in the introduction of Joint Resolution 1148 and other measures designed to improve the competitive position of S&Ls.

The tighter the competitive squeeze banks put on savings and loans and mutual savings banks, the louder will be the cries from those savings institutions for broader powers to make them more competitive with commercial banks. New York State recently granted such powers to mutual savings banks and S&Ls.

Perhaps the federal agencies are about to take a new look at the role of the S&Ls and mutual savings banks in our economy. Governor J. L. Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board, who has long been sympathetic with the philosophy of independent banking, had this to say in a recent address to the Illinois Bankers Association:

"... The problems of competition among commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loans call for unbiased, thoughtful consideration. Our need is for flexible uniformity rather than rigid specialization. Our responsibility is to accommodate our depository institutions to the expanding needs of our communities and our nation. This demands more than broadening of present institutional lending powers. It requires a significant revision of our philosophy of the organization and operation of the depository system."

Is Governor Robertson's statement perhaps an indication of things to come, a clue of what we may face in our continuing fight for survival? Time will supply the answer.

ASSURE MANAGEMENT SUCCESSION

In closing, I wish to make these points of importance to you and your bank:

I'm sure most of you share my desire to perpetuate independent banking. If you want your bank to remain independent, you should be looking ahead to the day when you no longer will be active in its management.

As a starting point, offer the second and third men in your bank the opportunity to make decisions. Increase their authority as they demonstrate they have earned the right for more. Inaugurate a profit-sharing plan so that those who work with you may accumulate money that can be used to "buy in" at some time before you bow out.

You've all heard the expression, "Good things don't happen; they must be planned for." Planning now for future objectives will be a key factor in continuing your bank as an "independent."

A WORD ABOUT PROFITS

Now a few words about bank profits, one of those vital, close-to-the-heart subjects.

Let me urge you to consider the quality and liquidity of bank assets above and beyond the desire to earn a profit.

Good bank management will earn profit, but how much is banking entitled to? Why the common belief that this year's profit must exceed last year's? Is it not the better part of wisdom for a bank to forego some profits in times of abnormal competition? Isn't the cause of prudence better served by more attention to soundness and quality of loans and reasonable liquidity?

The right answers to these questions will be key factors in whether you and I win "The Fight for Survival."

VIRTUAL MONOPOLY ON THE PRODUCTION AND SALE OF MOLYBDENUM

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while the House was out on a short recess an event took place which I believe is very important to the House of Representatives and to the Members thereof, as well as to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this Nation a virtual monopoly on the production and sale of molybdenum.

Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the specialty steel industry is located in the State of Pennsylvania. This industry, Mr. Speaker, depends upon molybdenum for its existence.

Mr. Speaker, as the condition has existed over the past few years the only reason by which we have been able to maintain any kind of productivity in specialty tool steels in particular is that we have been able from time to time to tap our stockpile. I have discussed this process of tapping the stockpile with the molybdenum producers; namely, Metal Climax and Molly Corporations which have been exporting from the United States a portion of the molybdenum resources that are needed here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fighting to try to have the tariff set aside for a period of 2 years, the same as this House of Representatives has done in the matter of nickel in order that Canadian Molly, which is in sufficient supply, can be brought into the United States in order to preserve our stockpile.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the increase in price in molybdenum at this time is made possible because the U.S. surplus or, rather, stockpile, has reached a stage where no more can be taken from it. They have the tariff protection, an exorbitant tariff, against a needed raw material for this Nation. They have that locked up so that Metal Climax can now increase the price, because of its virtual monopoly over this matter, and we have now terminated or curtailed all production of the tool steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, without the tool steel industry, this Nation cannot survive.

I say to you, Mr. President, that I ask at this time that the Committee on Ways and Means take up my piece of legislation which is now pending before that committee, in order to open up the tariff for 2 years, in order to allow the importations in competition with a monopoly supply in this country, and I call upon Gardner Ackley to do something about this increase, which represents an increase which is higher per pound for steel than if the minimum wage had gone to a $2 minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, frankly I was amazed to read in last Saturday's newspapers that Climax Molybdenum Co., a division of American Metal Climax, Inc., increased its molybdenum prices by 5 percent.

As I have said, these price increases were put into effect by a company that has a monopolistic position in the supply of this rare metal. This is a company that earned $60 million after taxes on $475 million on sales for a return of more than 17 percent on stockholder equity. Prices of molybdenum already have risen more than 20 percent since 1961 which would indicate that such increases were sufficient to cover any cost increases of the company.

I would like to point out that the cost to the tool and specialty steel industry could run as high as $4 million. Is it not conceivable that steel producers would then have to raise prices to cover this cost?

As you know, there was a severe molybdenum shortage in this country for the last year and molybdenum had been rationed by the molybdenum producers to the steel industry. I urged the President at that time to put export controls on molybdenum and to release molybdenum from the stockpile. The Government decided to release surplus molybdenum from the stockpile which I understand will be used up by the middle of next year.

I subsequently introduced H.R. 10362 which would suspend the duty on molybdenum coming into this country. This bill would guarantee a greater supply of molybdenum and would alleviate any further shortages. It would also have the benefit of giving American Metal Climax competition from the molybdenum producers in Canada. This could be a great equalizer on molybdenum prices. I therefore urge Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and other administrative officials to support this bill which could have the effect of reducing molybdenum prices. I hope it will be passed this session.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a news item covering this increase as well as recent correspondence on this subject:

MOLYBDENUM PRICE RAISED BY SECOND FIRM

(By Lee M. Cohn)

Price increases for molybdenum spread today despite outspoken opposition by the Johnson administration.

Molybdenum Corp. of America announced it was raising its prices an average 5 percent, effective immediately, in line with increases announced Friday by American Metal Climax, Inc.

Molybdenum, which has been in short supply, is an alloying agent used in production of high-grade steel. The two companies raising prices account for the bulk of molybdenum output in the non-Communist world.

Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, issued a statement Saturday denouncing the price boost by American Metal Climax as "totally unjustified and . . . inflationary," especially in view of the company's high profit rate.

"I certainly hope that other producers of molybdenum products will refrain from following this action by Climax," Ackley said then.

His statement opposing the price increases revived a dormant element of the administrations anti-inflation policies. The administration has avoided public showdowns over prices for many months, in favor of efforts at private persuasion.

There had not been a public fight over prices since the administrations battle with the steel industry last January, which resulted in a partial rollback of announced increases.

VASCO METALS CORP.,
LATROBE, PA., *July 6, 1966.*

Subject: Senate Resolution 149.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: As you may know, over 90% of the specialty steel industry in the United States is centered in our state of Pennsylvania. As described in the attached remarks by Dr. Roberts, as the representative of a specialty steel industry group, its very existence is being seriously threatened by the tremendous growth of imports, which can effect not only the jobs of many thousands of workers but, in fact, be vital to our national security. Without the highly alloyed tool materials and unique steels manufactured by this highly specialized segment of the steel industry, our defense program could grind to a halt in a time of national emergency. Its importance might be likened to the bearing industry, which it supplies, and other vital industries so essential to a country's defense.

Accordingly, for the welfare of both Pennsylvania and the United States, it is very important that Senate Resolution 149 be voted on favorably at this session. Your consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
VASCO METALS CORP.,
JOHN C. HAMAKER, Jr.,
Vice President, Technology.

JULY 5, 1966.

Subject: H.R. 10362.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: It is our understanding that the above Bill sponsored by Congressman JOHN H. DENT is to be considered by you as Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the near future.

We and other specialty steel producers use considerable quantities of molybdenum in the production of tool steel and other alloys of prime importance to our national effort. We believe this Bill which would exclude molybdenum from tariff control, at least until we are assured of a sufficient supply, would be to the national interest.

Molybdenum is one of our most important alloys for cutting tools and high temperature applications and currently we are suffering due to our inability to obtain sufficient quantities on the open market for our normal production work.

Yours very truly,
VANADIUM-ALLOYS STEEL CO.,
HENRY R. WIMMERSBERGER,
President.

Copy to: Hon. JOHN H. DENT, U. S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

LAT STEEL LOBE,
Latrobe, Pa., July 5, 1966.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman of the Ways and Mean Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Latrobe Steel Company urgently supports H R 10362 lifting import duty on molybdenum during the shortage period. Domestic shortages combined with large exportation of domestic production make it essential that supplies from all sources be available to domestic consumers at competitive prices. Latrobe Steel Company a large producer of cutting tool material and high temperature alloys requiring molybdenum urgently requires adequate supplies. Your assistance on passage of HR 10362 will be greatly appreciated.

MARCUS W. SAXMAN III.

CC: JOHN H. DENT.

H.R. 10362

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, Aug. 17, 1963; 77A Stat.; 19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting immediately preceding item 911.70 the following new items:

" 911.31	Molybdenum compounds (provided for in item 419.60, part 2C, schedule 4)	Free	50¢ per lb. on molybdenum content+15% ad val.	On or before 6/30/67
911.32	Mixtures of two or more inorganic compounds, in chief value of molybdenum (provided for in item 423.88, part 2C, schedule 4)	Free	50¢ per lb. on molybdenum content+15% ad val.	On or before 6/30/67
911.33	Molybdenum ore (provided for in item 601.33, part 1, schedule 6)	Free	35¢ per lb. on molybdenum content.	On or before 6/30/67
	Molybdenum (provided for in part 2J, schedule 6):			On or before 6/30/67
911.34	Waste and scrap (item 628.70)	Free	50% ad val.	
911.35	Unwrought (item 628.72)	Free	50¢ per lb. on molybdenum content+15% ad val.	
911.36	Wrought (item 628.74)	Free	60% ad val.	"

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Duty-free treatment with respect to any article provided for in item 419.60, 423.88, 601.33, 628.70, 628.72, or 628.74 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall not apply after June 30, 1967, except pursuant to a trade agreement which is entered into under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 before July 1, 1967. For purposes of section 201 (a) (2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1821 (a) (2)), in the case of such a trade agreement the duty-free treatment provided by item 911.31, 911.32, 911.33, 911.34, 911.35, or 911.36 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall be considered as existing duty-free treatment.

FOOD IRRADIATION PROGRAM

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I and other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy furnished to this body our views on the national food irradiation program. We have provided reports on progress in the program being made by both the Department of the Army in the sterilization of food by irradiation and by the AEC in its program which involves the pasteurization of food by the irradiation process.

In June of 1965 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation, of which I am chairman, held hearings on the radiation processing of foods. During these hearings there was clear evidence that significant progress was being made on many of the items under study. It was noted, however, that the Food and Drug Administration up to that time had approved for public consumption only irradiated bacon, irradiated wheat products, and irradiated potatoes. This is still the case.

I have been concerned that the review and approvals of petitions by the Food and Drug Administration has not kept pace with the development work. Please understand that I recognize the need for careful study to insure that the product that is being approved is highly nutritious, palatable, and will have no untoward side effects on any segment of our population. I was concerned that an apparent delay in the handling of petitions might have been in part attributable to a lack of appreciation of the work that has been done and of the potential benefits that can result from the adoption of this new technique for the preservation of certain food products. I expressed this concern in a letter dated June 2, 1966, to Chairman Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission. He has responded in a letter dated June 17, 1966. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make copies of these letters a part of the RECORD.

I am very much encouraged by Dr. Seaborg's response and I am hopeful that his enthusiasm will be reflected throughout both the developmental and the regulatory programs. I do not think we should delude ourselves by assuming that in this day and age a program can always succeed on the basis of its own merit. Programs that are small in terms of dollars or expenditure of scientific manpower run the risk of being overlooked. There is a continual struggle for the research dollar. There is the competition for the time and attention of top management. In the Army and in the AEC as well, items that directly affect the national security are given the highest priority. I believe that it is at times necessary to draw special attention to programs that, though they be relatively small in magnitude, are well conceived, well executed, and hold promise of widespread application. They can represent the dedicated efforts of competent scientists and may well hold the promise of great benefit to mankind. This food preservation program is, in my mind, such a program.

I have taken personal interest in both the AEC's and Army's food irradiation program because I believe they are worthwhile programs and should go forward. It is, of course, an ultimate goal that private industry will take over the main effort of this program when a commercial application can be identified and the necessary approvals have been received. During the aforementioned hearings by the Joint Committee a number of representatives of private industry told of their interest in the program and their hopes for commercial application in the future. The Department of Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Army have been holding discussions with private industry in an attempt to find the necessary support so that a cooperative Government-private industry food irradiation plant can be designed, constructed and operated. The Government would plan to make a significant contribution to the initial costs of this plant. In addition it would guarantee a certain throughput so that, in effect, during the early years of this first-of-a-kind plant the operating costs of the plant would be shared.

I have been informed that discussions with the principal meatpackers of this country have made it clear that the amount of meat products proposed to be purchased by the Government was not considered sufficient by industry representatives. They believe that in order for an agreement to be reached the Government should offer to take a larger portion of the plant's output. There is some indication that some of the Government participants are not yet convinced of the desirability of increasing the Government's commitments during initial years of operation for the purpose of assuring that the project will get underway.

I should say that the intent here is to get a plant into operation for the purpose of learning the problems and techniques associated with the operation of a food irradiation facility of this type. It is all very well to do research on food products where the volumes are low and each package of food is, in effect, handled by a technician in a very special way. We have proceeded beyond that stage, and we are now ready on a number of products to have trained but nontechnical personnel handle large volumes of meat products in a manner similar to that used in the meatpacking industry. The Army, I understand, is prepared to use fairly large quantities of irradiated meat products in order to get additional information on acceptability for inclusion in the diet of our fighting men.

A year or more will be required for the design and construction of this proposed plant. As I indicated earlier, the Food and Drug Administration has already approved public consumption of irradiated bacon, and I have been informed that the Army yesterday has fully documented and submitted to the Food and Drug Administration a petition for the approval of irradiated ham. I think it is important that the construction of facilities for the food irradiation program proceed on an orderly schedule so that when the facilities are needed they are available and can be put to use. I think it is equally important that at as early a stage as possible we bring private industry into this program, because it is clear that the know-how of industry is a necessary ingredient for a successful overall program.

Therefore, I would like to again say that I shall encourage the Army and other Government agencies involved to make every effort to reach an agreement with those representatives of private industry who recognize the potential of this program and are willing to commit some of their own funds for the building and operation of facilities because of the possible long-range benefits and profits which may accrue.

The letters mentioned before follow:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC
ENERGY, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED
STATES,
June 2, 1966.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: As you know, the Atomic Energy Commission's research and development program is exceedingly broad in scope and includes a wide range of projects extending from those vital to the common defense and security of this country, to those which might be described as incidental benefits deriving from peaceful uses of atomic energy. With such a broad program involving many scientific disciplines, it is understandably difficult for the Commissioners to find the time to give detailed attention to what might be described as major development projects; let alone time for close study and management of the smaller programs.

I am writing because of a continuing interest that I have had in the AEC's Food Irradiation Program, a program which is small in terms of funds and scientific manpower in relation to many other Commission efforts. I believe, however, that this program has far-reaching significance in terms of the benefits which it holds out for mankind. We are living in a time when world food supplies are inadequate to meet the demands of the present population. Predictions for the future envision even a more dismal picture than the present one. A large fraction of the world's food supplies is continuously being lost through bacterial spoilage as the result of improper or inadequate refrigeration. In addition, large quantities of vital grain products are ruined by insect infestation.

Radiation processing of food has demonstrated its capability to sterilize, pasteurize, and disinfect food products effectively. A great deal of scientific data concerning this program have been gathered, and for the most part they are favorable. As an example of a feasible application of radiation processing to a food product, it has been demonstrated that radiation treatment of poultry and poultry products is an effective means of preventing the spread of salmonella infection. The significance of preventing the spread of this infection was highlighted by President Johnson in the January 1966 Economic Report of the President as follows:

"Foodborne diseases are being increasingly recognized as a leading cause of acute sickness in this country and probably account for more illness than all other environmental elements combined. Salmonellosis—the most serious such disease—now is much more widespread than it was 15 years ago because of inadequate controls in new methods of food production and processing."

As you know, to date, the Food and Drug Administration has approved for general consumption only irradiated bacon, grain products, and potatoes. Other petitions for irradiated foods have been before the FDA for some time, and an increasing number are in preparation for submission in the near future.

As I have already indicated I have taken a personal interest in the Food Irradiation Program throughout the years, and a similar concern has been displayed by other members of the Joint Committee. I am disappointed that I have not seen evidence of an equally strong interest in this program on the part of the Commission. In my opinion, if you as Chairman of the AEC, were to display such an interest this would have a salutary impact, particularly with respect to encouraging the prompt, as well as thorough, review of petitions submitted for radiation processed foods.

I was very pleased—and I am sure that you were too—to see the invigorating effect on the Food Irradiation Program that resulted from the Food and Drug Administration's approval, in the spring of 1963, of irradiated bacon for consumption by the general public. I am growing concerned that we may have lost the momentum which resulted from this approval, and the subsequent favorable action on grain products and potatoes. Accordingly, I urge that you devote special attention to the needs of this program in order to help assure that the pace of progress, as measured by FDA clearance of specific petitions, be commensurate with the rate of accumulation of scientific data in this new and promising field.

I would appreciate receiving any comments you may have on the views which I have expressed.

Sincerely yours,
MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Research,
Development and Radiation.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1966.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Research, Development and Radiation, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MEL: I am sympathetic to the views you have expressed on the AEC's Radiation Preservation of Foods Program, and I know that the other Commissioners join me in assuring you of our enthusiasm for this promising new technology. We have every intention of continuing to support the program vigorously. In fact, I and my colleagues have stated publicly on several occasions that we look forward to the time when the benefits of this process will become available to the consumer throughout the world. Yet, we recognize the complexities our scientists face in proving beyond reasonable doubt that radiation processing of foods does not adversely effect their quality and wholesomeness.

Procedures for obtaining clearances to permit unlimited public consumption of radiation-processed foods are both laborious and expensive to carry out, particularly because each class of food product is considered independently of other classes. Thus each petition for clearance represents a new approach usually without precedent. Our concern over this protracted matter resulted in an intensive review of the status of the program about a year ago, prior to the hearings held on the same subject by the Joint Committee. Since that time we have had occasion to review the program specifically again as part of our general review of the AEC's budget submittal to Congress. For planning purposes, we have authorized extension of the program beyond FY 1967, subject to approval by the Bureau of the Budget and Congress. We fully appreciate the situation where the exhaustive detail required to assure process efficacy and wholesomeness could not have been anticipated in the earlier years, since no ground rules for the granting of clearances had been laid down at the inception of the program. In fact, the ground rules continue to change as we progress with the technology.

More recently—in fact, two weeks ago—the Commission began making arrangements to meet with Commissioner James Goddard of the Food and Drug Administration to discuss the objectives of the AEC program and then to explore with him any means by which the granting of clearances for irradiated foods could be expedited. This is not a matter of academic interest on our part. We know that many food processors are interested in one or more facets of the program and will not commit themselves further until the clearances are obtained. At this juncture, we are unable to anticipate the outcome of the meeting with Commissioner Goddard. I will be happy to advise you of the outcome.

From the operational side, several important advances have been made recently: (1) our large mobile irradiator has been delivered to California and will soon be in operation there, processing field crops in cooperation with the farming industry; (2) ground breaking for the large Hawaii Development Irradiator is planned for July 18; (3) a solicitation of proposals for a contract to operate our fourth portable food irradiator has been made, and upon completion of the irradiator in October, it will be put into service on a cooperative basis with several industrial firms in succession. One or more of these are particularly interested in the control of Salmonellae—a point mentioned in your letter; (4) the world's first grain irradiator will be put into operation this summer, at Savannah, Georgia, and will be made available to the grain and flour industry; (5) the petition to FDA for clearance of strawberries was submitted in April.

In still another direction, our study on the cost-benefit relationships of selected parts of the food program is progressing well, and we expect that our contractor will soon be able to begin the consumer attitude survey which is an integral part of the study.

In general, the program is progressing according to plan, and the granting of more clearances would be a most timely reward for the efforts that have been expended by you, the Joint Committee, the AEC, and its contractors.

Let me say in conclusion that your letter is a further stimulus to us to accomplish our objectives in the most expeditious manner possible and that your continued support of the Radiation Preservation of Foods Program will be welcomed wholeheartedly.

Cordially,

GLENN,
Chairman.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong endorsement of the statement made by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman PRICE. We on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have from the inception of the program followed closely the research and development progress on the use of ionizing radiation as a means of preserving food products.

A large portion of this program is carried out in my home State of Massachusetts. In Gloucester, at the Marine Products Development Irradiator, designed and constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is carrying out a program on the radiation preservation of marine products. There, at the Development Irradiator, large quantities of fresh fish fillets and similar marine products are packaged and irradiated in order that we may study at near commercial scale this new technique of food preservation. I am happy to say that the work is progressing satisfactorily and there is every indication that this new means of preservation will have widespread application for fishery products.

It has been shown that the use of irradiation as a pasteurization technique permits substantial increase in the shelf life of these products without undesirable side effects. It will be possible therefore to reach wider markets, including the Midwest and other portions of our Nation not accustomed to a plentiful supply of fresh seafood.

In another part of Massachusetts, at Natick, the principal portion of the Army's food irradiation program is being carried out. The emphasis in the Army's program is on the sterilization of food products. The research has shown that bacon—already approved by the Food and Drug Administration—ham, beef, and other products, respond favorably to the irradiation process and we are hopeful that in the near future a number of these products will be available for use in our Armed Forces. In addition, there is promise of commercial application for the process.

I have mentioned the work at Natick and at Gloucester. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission is supporting research at universities and research institutes in the preservation of fruits and vegetables by pasteurizing doses of irradiation. Certain of these products have been shown to respond favorably to radiation treatment.

The process also has application in disinfestation of fruits and may open up special markets. For example, fruits grown in Hawaii and treated by this process may some day be imported to the mainland in large quantities.

There are a number of experimental facilities that are in operation as a part of the national food irradiation program. We have reached the stage of development where larger facilities are needed, those which would more closely approximate the size which could be utilized in industry. Preliminary meetings have been held between Government representatives and representatives of the meatpacking industry. There has been tentative agreement on the size and scope of activities and a sharing of costs for a pilot plant meat irradiator.

As my colleague has said, it is very important that work of this sort go forward and I am very hopeful that agreement can soon be reached, that commitments can be met, and that the special knowledge and expertise of private industry can be brought to bear on this program.

Throughout the years I have spoken out on the merits of the food irradiation program. This is in part because of special interest I have taken in the program and in part because I share the view that programs small in terms of dollar amounts and technical manpower may be brushed aside in our rush to achieve progress in other fields such as national defense, space, high-energy physics, and so forth. I have on a number of occasions visited the research laboratories involved in the food irradiation program. I have talked to the scientists and engineers and I am convinced that the program is a good one with reasonable short-term and long-term objectives and having the merit of achieving goals which can be important both to our military program and ultimately for the benefit of mankind. We must find a way to deal with the tremendous spoilage that occurs in foodstuffs throughout the world. People are often concerned over the shortage of food which occurs in many nations. This is only in part caused by underproduction. We must not overlook the fact that a sizable fraction of what is produced is never available for distribution to the consumer.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not saying that irradiation of food is a panacea; it will not solve all of our problems. It must compete with the other techniques of food preservation already developed and it must be able to pay its own way in the marketplace. Again, however, I urge that this work be allowed to continue at an appropriate level so that the worth of this new technique can be properly assessed.

CERTIFICATE OF HUMANITARIAN SERVICE FOR DR. ALFRED B. SWANSON

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that one of my constituents, Dr. Alfred B. Swanson, orthopedic surgeon, of Grand Rapids, received a Certificate of Humanitarian

Service for his excellent and meritorious service in treating the injured and maimed civilians of war-torn Vietnam.

It is with great pleasure that I join his fellow doctors of medicine in extending my congratulations to Dr. Swanson for his humanitarian missions.

Dr. Swanson is no stranger to this war-torn country. He will soon be leaving on his fourth mission of mercy. This time to implement a massive polio immunization drive for 500,000 Vietnam children, which he envisioned in 1962 when he first went to Vietnam to teach and do orthopedic surgery. It was then he encountered the crippled children of the country, finding "literally hundreds of postpolio victims" in the clinics.

These trips have been made at great personal sacrifice and have extended over 2 months in duration, temporarily abandoning his family and practice in order to carry out these patriotic and humane ventures.

The inscription on the Certificate of Humanitarian Service presented to Dr. Swanson reads:

> In recognition of the meritorious service performed for the medical profession, the United States Government and the people of South Viet-Nam by treating the ill and injured during his voluntary medical mission in South Viet-Nam.

Signed by James Z. Appel, M.D., president, American Medical Association.

This award was made in Grand Rapids on a memorable occasion at which time the Kent County Medical Society was rechartered, after a hundred years' activity, by Luther Leader, M.D., president of the Michigan State Medical Society.

SALUTING THE WORLD PRESS INSTITUTE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, peace in this troubled world can only come through international understanding. International understanding can only come through improved world communications. The more that men of every land "talk" with each other and come to "know" each other, the sooner they will see each other truly and without prejudice.

It is therefore most appropriate that we now take time to salute a fine project in international understanding, the World Press Institute, which this summer completed its fifth year of operation. I would also like to pay tribute to the more than 70 outstanding members of the foreign press who have come to know America through the World Press Institute, its yearlong program of American studies, internship on a major American newspaper, and travel throughout the major sections of the country.

Americans long have known that their image among other peoples has often been but a caricature. What they may not have recognized sufficiently is that many foreign newsmen themselves have broad misconceptions about America which prevent them from seeing us as we are and picturing us accurately for their readers. Thus the distorted image is perpetuated and augmented.

Fortunately for Americans, these distortions gradually are being eliminated through the program of the World Press Institute. By bringing some 15 foreign newsmen to this country each year and letting them see America as it really is, the institute is rendering the people of this Nation and the world an invaluable service. I say it is a service to the world because it results in bringing the truth to other nations through the eyes of promising young journalists.

Mr. Speaker, the world owes a debt of gratitude to Harry W. Morgan, founder of the World Press Institute and now its executive director, to Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn., which initially offered Morgan its campus facilities to help set up the World Press Institute and has continued as the project's base, to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, which places the foreign journalists in newspapers throughout the country during part of their visit, to the Reader's Digest Association for selecting the journalists who come here, and to the company sponsors who finance the institute.

The foreign journalists who have lived and studied here for a year under the World Press Institute program are important people—perhaps more important than they realize. They are a pipeline to truth for the peoples of their lands. They have been called opinionmakers. It may be they also should be called peacemakers. I am sure every Member of the Congress wishes them well.

AMMUNITION BACKFIRE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been concerned with the management of the war in Vietnam were impressed with the report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS. In this connection an editorial in the Chicago Tribune for June 27 entitled "Ammunition Backfire" is worthy of our attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

AMMUNITION BACKFIRE

Last spring, while television cameras carried his appearance before the Senate foreign relations committee, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara bristled when confronted with reports that ammunition shortages were holding up the war in Viet Nam.

"Baloney," snapped the Pentagon chief in describing a New York Times-Chicago Tribune Press Service dispatch from Saigon. This story told of American pilots being forced to cut down on their bombing raids and attack with inferior weapons because of a shortage of 750 pound bombs. McNamara, prodded for an explanation, declared flatly "there is no bomb shortage" in Viet Nam.

This was the same line McNamara had taken a month earlier at a March 2 news conference he called to refute other reports of critical shortages, many emanating from an investigation by the Senate preparedness subcommittee. "It can be stated categorically," declaimed McNamara, "that no shortages have impeded our combat operations in southeast Asia."

Last Friday the same Senate preparedness subcommittee reported the secretary of defense was wrong again. Ammunition limitations in Viet Nam have forced United States units to hold back on some missions, said the Senate panel, basing its conclusion on the testimony of top army, air force, and navy officers at closed hearings in January and March.

One Pentagon air force chief, Lt. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, testified it was "literally true that we did not have sufficient 750-pound bombs to give them all they wanted . . . and support all the sorties in Viet Nam." One result, said Gerrity, is that missions were flown with 500 pounders as substitutes, just as the news stories reported.

Friday's report was not the first time that the Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS (D., Miss.), sawed off a McNamara "no shortage" limb. Last August McNamara told the panel that "all divisions are ready to go to combat," that all have everything they need "without qualification."

Not so, said the committee, after a field investigation. Even as late as this spring, the army's four active divisions in this country were understrength and underequipped. Before the committee could make this report, a McNamara spokesman reluctantly confessed that the four divisions were not combat ready.

The spokesman's task was not made any easier by the fact that McNamara had just finished boasting that the demands of the war in Viet Nam, far from overextending the nation militarily, had in fact made it stronger than ever to meet any crisis anywhere in the world.

NO TIME FOR COMPLACENCY

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I believe all my colleagues will be interested in the excellent editorial from the New York Times of July 10, 1966, which deals with the recent intensification of the Vietnam war:

NO TIME FOR COMPLACENCY

President Johnson's optimistic remarks at his Texas press conference about American military accomplishments in Vietnam would have been more persuasive had they been tempered by greater realism.

Americans share the President's pride in the leadership, courage and professionalism of United States forces and support his objective of meeting all legitimate military requirements "with maximum economy." But the same kind of glossy generalisms that have done so much to impair the credibility of the Administration in the past clouded the well-deserved tribute to General William C. Westmoreland and his men.

This is no time, when the Vietnamese war has reached a new crisis and a new intensity and when the United States build-up there is far from finished, to talk about cutting-back military production, to be boasting about "no shortages . . . which have adversely affected combat operations," to warn against piling up multi-billion dollar surpluses of "worthless material" such as that with which the United States concluded the Korean war.

Such remarks leave a completely misleading impression. Production lines of many items have not yet reached their peak; indeed, in some instances, output is not matching demand. Not until October, for instance, will the Navy's scheduled aircraft production rate meet the loss rate. Illuminating rounds are scarce, jungle boots and clothing in short supply.

Aircraft sorties may not have been canceled because of bomb shortages, but many planes have been flown into battle with a fraction of the load they could carry—or with substitute and less effective ordnance. The construction program in Vietnam, particularly for airfields, is far behind schedule. The very Korean War surplus which the President scorned has supplied some of the munitions American forces lacked in Vietnam because of the failure of the Administration to admit soon enough that a war was being fought there and to let the necessary contracts.

Shortages, scarcities and logistic problems of many types, and the personnel and material "turbulence" incident to any large-scale military operations, are to be expected in any war. The supply problems in Vietnam are not insoluble and are being overcome. But the Administration's lack of candor, the attempt to hide problems or to pretend they don't exist, is unfair to the military and self-defeating as well.

The services are still under strain; there are still scarcities of many different types. Inventories have been drawn down all over the world and have not yet been fully replenished. The Seventh Army in Europe has been milked of some 55,000 specialists who are being replaced, in part, by newly trained soldiers. Some companies are at two-thirds strength.

There is still a war going on in Vietnam, and the approach of the November elections should not be allowed to obscure its tough and grim nature.

AUTHORITY TO COMPEL UNIFORMITY IN PACKING

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that there is some merit in the so-called truth-in-packaging bill pending in the Congress. I believe that the housewife should not be deceived into buying something other than what she actually wants in quality and in quantity. I believe in honest labeling and in honest packaging.

But I certainly do not believe that the Secretary of Commerce should have the authority to compel uniformity in packaging. It is true that exactly the same item can presently be purchased in many different packages, and in many different sizes. We presently have the right to choose whether we want the item in a box, in a bag or in a can, and what size box, can or bag; be it peanuts, popcorn, potato chips or what not.

Something will pass that is truly American when we go so far as to resort to standardization, for it is diversity and variety, with the individual right to choose in all things, that has contributed to progress.

The following editorial which appeared in the Detroit Free Press on the truth-in-packaging bill that recently passed the Senate deserves thoughtful reading:

Truth-in-Packing Bill Is Half Good, Half Bad

Michigan's Phil Hart is halfway there in his chosen role of saving the American housewife from herself.

His so-called truth-in-packaging bill romped through the Senate by an overwhelming 79–9 tally, and in the process trampled almost every major effort to modify it.

Some of the proposed amendments, such as the one from Senator Thruston Morton of Kentucky for a price-fixing or "fair trade" clause, were intended to defeat the entire bill. But others made sense, and the determination of the majority Democrats to whip the Republicans has produced a bill which is half and half, good and bad.

Essentially the bill is in two parts. One demands that the net contents of a package be clearly labeled in ounces, except for products marketed in even pounds, pints or quarts. The labeling must be conspicuous, without any added confusion such as "jumbo quart."

To this section we have no objection. It is reasonable and simple, and imposes no undue demands upon the manufacturer, the retailer or the buyer. But we do doubt that it's going to be as effective as Senator Hart imagines. Net weight labeling has been standard practice for years, but it isn't how housewives buy, necessarily. What instincts motivate the housewife even her hair-dresser couldn't tell for sure.

The second part of the bill, though, does disturb us. It would impose the heavy hand of Washington on manufacturers not only to be truthful, but to conform to Washington dictates. It is a clear example of governmental meddling where it has no right to be.

This section gives the Secretary of Commerce the right to dictate the weights or quantities in which a product could be marketed if he decided there were so many different sized packages that comparative shopping was impaired, and the producers won't standardize voluntarily to his satisfaction.

True, there are a cumbersome variety of sizes and weights—in potato chips, Hart tells us, 50 variations—but this is hardly the business of the government. So long as the housewife can find out exactly how much she's getting for how much money, and that the contents are what they say they are, the sizes and weights should be a matter of supply and demand.

If housewives wouldn't buy 50 different varieties of potato chip sizes, there wouldn't be 50 on the market. If some housewives didn't want them in cans, others in sacks and still others in boxes, they wouldn't come that way.

Big Daddy has a duty to protect the health and safety and general welfare of the housewife, but not to dictate her diet or her buying habits. We hope that when the bill goes to the House that section will be stricken.

A knight in shining armor who goes forth to slay a dragon shouldn't skewer fair maiden in the process.

PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICARE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I include in the body of the Record two letters bearing on the status and problems of administration of the new medicare program. The first letter is directed to me from Mr. Schacht, administrator of the Henry County Hospital—my own county—and the other from Everett A. Johnson, chairman of the Medicare Committee of the Indiana Hospital Association and directed to Commissioner Ball of the social security agency:

Henry County Hospital,
New Castle, Ind., July 8, 1966.

Hon. Ralph Harvey,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ralph: In reference to our conversation the first part of this week pertaining to our experience with the influx of Medicare patients, I again mention that in the two previous months, which we called common, we found that as mentioned to you, about one-sixth of our patients admitted were over 65 years old utilizing one-third of the medicine and surgical patient days.

Now in keeping track of the first seven days of July, I find that in our 194 bed hospital on June 30 we had 158 patients and in seven days admitted 165 and released 161, showing an increase of 4, or 162 patients on hand today. Of this amount, we had 44 patients over 65 years old on hand June 30 and 28 admitted and 28 released with the same number of 44 today.

So, with this very short duration of time, we already find that it takes more in the amount of time to register, more time to bill, and also, more time to keep track of the utilization and medical record work. We already have employed three additional people to do the necessary or added paper work.

All in all, instead of costing us less to take care of Medicare patients, we believe that it will be more costly than the average patient in the hospital. We believe that instead of the intermediate paying us less for Medicare patients, the figures will have to be brought up on an even scale or we will have to penalize the other patients by added expense in the hospital.

We recently received a Medicare bulletin from the Indiana Hospital Association which states this more clearly than I could explain. If you have not received the same, I am copying it for your surveyance.

Best regards,

Herbert A. Schacht,
Administrator.

June 29, 1966.

Hon. Robert M. Ball,
Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The Indiana Hospital Association respectfully responds to your invitation for comments with respect to proposed regulations, known as "Principles of Reimbursement of Provider Costs"—Health Insurance for the Aged—which appeared in the Federal Register on June 2, 1966.

The hospitals of Indiana concur in general with both the concept of reasonable relationship of revenue to cost and the application of RCC as a means of apportioning costs between Medicare and non-Medicare patients.

The hospitals of Indiana contend, however, that the Principles should provide for the following reasons:

1. The present method will not promote efficient operations. A cost plus approach provides an economic benefit only by increasing the cost base. Other methods of reimbursement enable cost savings to accrue to the benefit of the provider.

2. The present principles fail to differentiate between the various types of hospitals—government, non-profit and proprietary—especially in terms of sources of capital funds.

3. The present principles do not provide for a discriminate provision of funds to adjust for abnormal needs, which may result in an over provision of funds for those institutions without demonstrated need and vice versa.

4. The present principles do not provide for recovery of stand-by social costs, bad debts, charity, etc., which are costs to society and should be borne by all paying segments thereof. It is recognized that with the expansion of Federal programs, charity costs will be lessened. Unfortunately, they do not exist today and relief is necessary.

5. The present principles do not recognize the impact of the hospital industry's growth pattern. Since 1950, the demand for expanded hospital facilities has been so great that hospitals have exceeded the financial capabilities of the community. Financing responsibility has been met by selling bonds, mortgaging property, construction loans and other means which now impose a fund requirement upon current revenue. Medicare requirements are likely to accentuate these demands without any provision for contributing to a solution, beyond the two percent allowance.

6. The present principles do not recognize that increases in costs—clerical and other—created only because of Medicare patients should be recovered only from them rather than also from private patients.

7. The present principles do not recognize the financial impact of the rapid obsolescence which is apparent in the hospital industry.

8. The present principles do not promote or encourage area-wide planning of facilities. Providing depreciation and limited growth funds to all hospitals can only perpetuate existing errors. A more discriminating provision of funds is required to improve the distribution of facilities.

9. The present principles do not provide for economic or "going concern" costs to assure the continuity of facilities as required to provide services to Medicare recipients.

10. The present principles identify a large segment of the population and establish a pricing structure different from the other segments which causes non-Medicare recipients to subsidize Medicare patients.

The hospitals of Indiana urge that the principles of reimbursement be extended and applied in accordance with a system that has been developed between the hospitals, the Indiana Hospital Association and the Indiana Blue Cross Plan. This system has removed many of the above-defined deficiencies. The elements of the system which provide this are as follows:

1. Hospitals establish their departmental charges with reasonable relationship to departmental costs. This is an application of the RCC method to each charge, the lowest unit of revenue.

2. The Blue Cross Plan has a rate review committee which acts as a control "checkpoint" on the above and provides for an individual hospital approach in the application of growth and other factors in each institution.

3. Depreciation funds provided are required to be funded and utilized for purposes for which they were reimbursed.

4. Capital funds for expansion and similar purposes are granted only in accordance with community-wide plans for health facilities needs.

5. Requests for increases for operational purposes are judged against norms, such as salary and other operational expense schedules.

The major accomplishments of the system of importance to all payors are as follows:

1. Expense control reverts to the hospitals because revenue is unaffected by increases or decreases in costs, an excess of income is created when expenses are lower and a shortage when expenses are higher.

2. Hospitals not needing capital funds can be denied even depreciation funds. Conversely, funds so preserved can be granted to others having excessive needs with no greater cost to the total program.

3. Since rates apply to all patients in accordance with the local communities needs, all payors assume proportionate and equitable share of the long-range economic and other social costs.

4. The establishment of rates at the local level, even with controls, protects some degree of the authority of the board. In addition, its autonomy is protected through a recognition of its long-range planning decisions.

5. The preservation and improvement of the voluntary system is in the best interests of those who wish to receive the services and those who are responsible for the payment therefore.

6. Better area-wide planning and more efficient operations in other regards create long-range cost savings to all payors.

In view of these demonstrated accomplishments, we urge that necessary modification be made to utilize the Indiana system.

Yours sincerely,

EVERETT A. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Medicare Committee.
ELTON TEKOLSTE,
Executive Director.

FEDERAL GRANTS AND THE DECLINE OF THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace of Stanford University, delivered an address at the 58th annual Conference on Taxation of the National Tax Association in New Orleans, La., on November 9 of last year on the subject "Federal Grants and the Decline of the Federal System." This seems a most timely subject when Congress is considering all of the new legislation providing for further grants to States. His address follows:

FEDERAL GRANTS AND THE DECLINE OF THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

(By Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, 58th Annual Conference on Taxation, National Tax Association, New Orleans, La.)

The growth rate of federal aid to state and local governments is virtually unparalleled in our fiscal history. From $7 million at the turn of the century it soared to about $1 billion in the mid-thirties to mid-forties, and to nearly $14 billion in the current year. On the average the amount tripled every ten years and almost quadrupled in the past ten. Even more startling is the multiplication of programs which now cover most major domestic public services, with the few remaining gaps being rapidly filled. Continued expansion was foreshadowed at the first session of the 89th Congress which wound up its work two weeks ago. For once, academic advice, presidential recommendations and congressional action appear to be in harmony and point in the same direction. When the Joint Economic Committee earlier this year gathered the views of 48 economists on "Fiscal Policy Issues of the Coming Decade" most of those who referred to federal-state relations suggested an expansion of federal grants in some form or other. None disagreed. The last time I heard a plea for greater financial self-reliance by local governments was in 1964 during a study trip through the Soviet Union when I read an article by two Russian economists who, writing in an economic journal, suggested that local units ought to try to depend less on support from the budgets of higher governments.

It is remarkable that the United States government was able to multiply its grants—and other domestic activities—without significantly changing the ratio between total federal spending and the gross national product over the past 14 years, as President Johnson pointed out sometime ago. It did so by a sharp relative cutback in defense outlays which meanwhile dropped from 66% of total federal spending to 42%. That retrenchment in national security provided the leeway for a dramatic expansion of civilian public services which seems to have far from run its course.

The steadily swelling flow of federal funds into local channels has enjoyed wide popularity but, as any rapid growth, has also caused some dislocations, friction, administrative or political problems or even unhappiness among less favored groups. General opposition focused particularly on the charge that the spectacular expansion of federal grants to state and local units is leading to a centralization of governmental power at the expense of home rule, local autonomy and individual freedom.

But federal grants thrive on opposition. A joint conference of representatives of Congress and the Governors' Conference in August 1948, concerned over the postwar growth of federal grants to over $1 billion, recommended that amounts for fiscal 1950 be cut by no less than 20 percent. As it turned out, grants in 1950 were not 20% smaller but 34% larger and kept on climbing. Two years later a new administration assumed office which was troubled by the apparent trend toward a power monopoly at the national level and set about to reverse it. Following suggestions by Senator Robert A. Taft, it prevailed on Congress to form a study commission "because the activity of the federal government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, may be the primary interest and obligation of the several states . . ." In his 1954 budget message the President said: "This budget marks the beginning of a movement to shift to state and local governments and to private enterprise federal activities which can be more appropriately and more efficiently carried on in that way."

The creation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was heralded by some of its friends as the Second Coming of the Constitutional Convention and expected to help stem the tide of federal power—or according to others try to turn back the clock of history. But when the commission rendered its report two years later it was obvious to friend and foe that the world would little note nor long remember what was said here. The New Yorker would have placed the "on one hand . . . but on the other hand . . ." report in its department of anti-climax if it had mentioned it at all, which like other media, it did not. As it was, the commission succeeded during its short life and in the thereafter in attaining a degree of anonymity which the Central Intelligence Agency envied and has ever since been trying to emulate.

Federal grants meanwhile soared to $7 billion in 1960 and totalled almost $14 million in the President's recommendations of January 1965. Back in 1960 I discussed in my book, Taxes for the Schools, the remarkable fact that federal grants tripled during the life of an administration which was committed to cutting them and wondered aloud "how fast federal aid and federal activities in general will expand in the future if an administration comes to power that favors them." The record of the past five years has answered my question.

THE FISCAL MISMATCH AND THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID

The classic and most frequently advanced justification for federal grants—and for far larger grants—is inadequate fiscal capacity of state and local governments or what Walter Heller recently called the "fiscal mismatch": state and local governments are responsible for most domestic public services whose needs are exploding while the national government has preempted the most lucrative revenue sources. U.S. Treasury tax receipts, the story goes, expand with the economy and at a faster rate while state and local revenues are sluggish and grow only slowly. The record proves this to be true during every shooting war, from 1916 to 1920, from 1941 to 1945. But during peace periods, before and after every war, the opposite has been true. In the past 20 years GNP grew 203%, federal revenues 135%, state and local revenues (from their own sources) 434%. This was of course due to the fact that federal tax rates were cut (ever so slightly) while state and local tax rates were raised. So, now the case for more federal aid has to be slightly modified: state and local governments, by quintupling their tax receipts have overexerted their fiscal powers and exhausted their capacity. This gives us two compelling reasons to prove the need for a sharp expansion of federal grants: state and local tax revenues rise a) too slowly, b) too fast. Some observes feel that this is a "heads I win, tails you lose" proposition.

Federal financial assistance is also needed, we are told, because state and local governments are hamstrung by obsolete constitutional limitations which prevent them from exercising adequate taxing and borrowing powers. Those tight and unreasonable restrictions do not seem to have stopped state and local governments from boosting receipts (from their own sources) from $13 billion to $71 billion in the past twenty years or from pushing their outstanding debt from $17 billion to $92 billion. So, again, the case for federal grants had to be slightly modified: state and local debt grew 428% in the past 20 years, federal debt only 16%, which apparently proves that state and local governments are dangerously over-expanded while the federal debt has shrunk in relative terms and federal borrowing capacity is underused.

Strangely enough it is never mentioned in that connection that federal debt soared 1283% in the the preceding dozen years while state-local debt declined 9% or that federal and state-local debt were of approximately equal size three decades ago while today federal debt is three times larger than state-local.

Now I am not quoting those figures in an attempt to prove that more federal aid is needed or that it is not needed. That may depend on other considerations. I only want to throw light on the statistical acrobatics which are being widely used to present a one-sided and distorted picture of the record of federal and state-local finance. Even the originators of new grant-in-aid programs do not seem to believe that state and local governments are at the end of their financial ropes: they almost always include matching formulas which call for sizeable state and local contributions and often provide incentives for boosts in the spending of local funds. Such stimulants would serve no purpose if state-local governments had no remaining fiscal capacity. Several students of the subject such as Dick Netzer and Arthur Smithies have indeed concluded in recent reports that state-local governments are far from having exhausted their fiscal potential.

The 1950's and first half of the 1960's were characterized by continuous rounds of tax boosts at state and local levels which, to the taxpayers' chagrin, refute the snide remark of the American Assembly in October 1955: "Zeal for new tax levies is not characteristic of state legislatures." More than half the states enacted substantial tax boosts in 1963 and about two-thirds did in 1965.

But to boost taxes is a political hazard for the governor, mayor, legislator or local functionary who must run for elective office while a new federal grant program only bestows credit and earns gratitude for the public officials, federal, state or local, who enact the program or distribute its benefits. In the common folklore federal money comes "for free," a very comfortable thought which parallels the reasoning of the patient who told his psychiatrist that he was making long-distance calls to himself. "Isn't that expensive?" inquired the doctor. "No, it doesn't cost a cent," said the patient, "I am reversing the charges."

There is eternal glory (and political profit) in being the author of something akin to the Morrill Act, Hill-Burton Act or George-Barden Act which initiated major federal grant programs. But whoever heard of a tax bill named after those or any other legislators at any level of government? Small wonder that elective officials increasingly find federal aid more conducive to political longevity and thus more attractive than boosting a local tax. Charles Conlon remarked at the 1952 Tax Conference in Toronto that "The taxes which somebody else levies and you spend are of course the most desirable kind."

But there is something more to the distinction between "desirable" and "undesirable" taxes. A major share of federal revenues comes from the progressive personal income tax while the bulk of state and local funds is derived from taxes which are either proportional or even regressive. To be sure, if we allocate all taxes and all public expenditures by income brackets and relate the two—a study which unfortunately has not been undertaken for several years—we may be driven to the conclusion that government is primarily a huge machine for the redistribution of income. But, maybe, it is not doing enough of it.

Though the difference in incidence of federal and state-local taxes may not be as great as is often imagined or asserted, there undoubtedly is a different impact upon various economic groups. Consequently those who feel that redistribution of income—from those who earn it to those who yearn it—is a major purpose and virtue of a tax system, or of government as such, favor financing through the national government and abhor the growth of state and local taxation. Moreover they are steadily at work—and were successful in the Revenue Acts of 1964 and 1965—in making the federal tax system more progressive. They are presently hard at work in preparing further revisions of the same type. Obviously, it is far easier to engender enthusiasm for a new program if the potential beneficiaries can be told (or at least made to believe) that somebody else will foot the bill. Small wonder then that federal grants possess a political charm for office holders and office seekers, for prospective recipients and for many local taxpayers which is overwhelming and decisive—as their spectacular record proves.

ALTERNATIVES TO PROGRAMMATIC GRANTS

The national government could, of course, financially aid state and local governments by means other than programmatic grants. Some of those devices have been drawing attention in recent years. One plan which according to recent newspaper stories is now under active consideration in the Treasury Department would grant credit on the federal income tax for a percentage of state personal income taxes. This would soon force the 14 states which levy no such tax to impose it and cause others to boost their rates. That may well be the plan's real aim.

Credits on the federal income tax could provide broader and more effective aid to state and local governments if they extended to *all* taxes rather than single out the state income tax. Or, the credit device could be tailored to favor priority programs such as education. At hearings of the Senate and House committees studying means of aiding the schools—and, according to announcements giving relief to the property taxpayer—earlier this year I suggested to grant an income tax credit for school property taxes. Another way of helping particularly higher education would be the granting of income tax credits for tuition, charges and gifts which I recommended to several congressional committees in 1963.

Other plans would allocate a small share of certain federally collected taxes to states. The House of Representatives in fact twice passed such programs but rescinded them soon after. Redistribution of federal taxes to states (or also to local governments) would make funds available for the financing of public services at local discretion. Such plans of general subvention or tax sharing are widely used to distribute state-collected taxes to local governments, and also in several countries of the British Commonwealth. The United Kingdom adopted a system of general grants to local authorities in 1958. The United States government however has so far extended its "cooperative federalism" only to spending programs and not to taxes.

General federal grants to the states attracted little attention in the United States until Walter Heller, while still chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the summer of 1964, advanced an idea which has since become known as the "Heller plan." A presidential task force was summoned which endorsed the proposal in a report which was never made public but whose essential features can be gathered from several speeches by the task force chairman Joseph Pechman in 1965.

Senators Jacob Javits and Vance Hartke introduced a bill (S. 2619) to implement the Heller plan on October 11, 1965. It would distribute 1% of the personal income tax base, or about $2.5 billion a year, among the states, 80% in proportion to population and the remaining 20% to the 12 or 15 states with the lowest per capita income. Companion bills are pending in the House.

The "Heller plan" found a friendly reception among state governors. Management and labor as represented by the NAM and the AFL–CIO agree on the Heller plan (and those groups are not very often on the same side of major policy proposals); they both are against it. The NAM believes that the pleasure of spending public money should be tied to the pain of raising it (as the state governors once expressed it) and that in any case priority should go to cutting taxes and restraining public spending. The AFL–CIO feels that it wields more power in Washington than in some of the state capitols and that it can advance its goals better by a centralization of program decisions.

The federal departments administering major federal grants—H.E.W., Labor, Commerce—and the Treasury Department also voiced vehement objections to the Heller plan and prevailed upon the President to keep it under wraps where it still rests and may well remain. Nationally organized functional interest groups in welfare, health, education, etc., the most effective driving force on Capitol Hill which are responsible for the enactment of most existing federal grants, are dead set against general grants. They are committed to advancing their own programs and do not want to dissipate decisions on the spending of the monies to 50 state capitols or thousands of communities. Their Washington staffs are less than eager to let control of their favored activities get away from under their watchful eyes.

If the states received nonearmarked federal funds they could substitute them for their own and slow down or discontinue their biennial rounds of tax boosts. They might apply the monies to purposes other than those pursued by nationally organized special interest groups. They might not observe the innumerable conditions which professional interest groups usually succeed in writing into federal statutes and regulations on programmatic grants. Last, but not least: states could not be threatened with the withholding of funds when federal administrators are displeased with local practices.

The case for earmarked and conditional grants is not just that the states lack the capacity to finance the needed services—which argument has lost much of its force by the record of the postwar period—but that they won't do on their own initiative what needs to be done. If public services in the United States are being starved while consumers luxuriate, the blame lies largely with state and local governments. They did boost spending from their own sources in the past twenty years from $9.5 billion to $70 billion. But this, we are told, is far short of minimum requirements.

The population of the United States expanded 18% in the past 10 years and prices climbed 15%, while state and local expenditures for public services increased only 110%. That seemingly left a vast gap of unmet needs which had to be filled (at least partially) by a 240% growth in federal grants to the states and a 175% increase in total federal spending for domestic purposes. Personal income and consumption meanwhile grew 66%. In other words, governmental civilian spending increased about 2½ times faster than personal spending, a ratio which is widely held to be insufficient.

This seems to be a case of greyhounds chasing a mechanical hare. The hare of "public needs" will always be ahead of whatever government does, no matter how fast it multiplies its spending. If a public program fails to produce promised or hoped-for results that simply goes to prove that the appropriation was too small. Nothing is ever wrong with a government program that could not be corrected by doubling or tripling its amount. And since the national government has shown a capacity and eagerness to boost its domestic outlays at a faster rate than state and local governments, major decisions on spending should be centralized at the national level.

The national government was able to almost triple its domestic spending in the past 10 years (while its revenues grew only 60%) by bearing down on defense requirements. Outlays for national security increased only 13% which is less than the intervening rise in prices. So, numerous major military programs and projects had to be scrapped, deferred or slowed down in order to provide more money for civilian purposes. In the battle for the budget dollar, the Armed Services almost always lost out to the politically Charmed Services—domestic welfare programs.

The groups committed to a faster growth of governmental services feel, not without reason, that to grant unconditional funds to the states would in the end mean a slower increase in total spending for the ends they mean to advance. So they keep pushing for programmatic grants.

The cities have at best mixed feelings about the Heller plan. Not because they do not need or do not want the money. But they fear that without ironclad safeguards in the federal statute state legislatures might not give them what they regard to be their fair share. Court-imposed reapportionment may lead to a strengthening of the suburbs more than of the central cities. So, mayors would rather put their hope in Congress to earmark funds for urban purposes. The two contenders who received the largest number of votes in last week's mayoralty election in New York City, based their promises and fiscal programs on almost identical demands for federal grants to cities.

We all know that many of our major cities are in financial straits and are looking desperately for added revenue which they believe can come only from the national government. Demands on city treasuries are skyrocketing while their tax base shrinks.

Some observers of the scene wonder why our big cities, the centers and very symbols of financial power, are in trouble. We are the world's richest nation and most of the country's wealth is of course not located in its open spaces but in the cities. Income, property and transactions are concentrated in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, not on the farms. If our cities cannot make ends meet, what hope is there for Calcutta, Rio or Hongkong, or for smaller towns?

But the cities may have a good case: The citizens who can (and historically used to) provide their economic and tax base and civic leadership are leaving in droves. They are being replaced by residents who have little to offer in support, contributions or leadership but need and demand vastly expanded public services. What's more, the mass exodus of the middle and upper income groups from the cities is likely to increase in intensity in the years to come and multiply urban problems.

The flight from the cities is not necessarily a natural phenomenon like the weather or earthquakes. It is of course due partly to rising affluence. But to a large extent it can be traced to perverse public policies. To be sure, city policies are not designed with the intent or for the purpose of driving out the higher and middle income families and attracting the poor—but they could not be much different if they were. Some of those policies are the result of federal influence or demands. But many are city-made. And as time goes on and voter composition changes, the heads of city governments can less and less politically afford to resist the pressure of the new masses for a course of action which will shrink their tax base further. We may have passed the point of no return. And as cities become increasingly dependent on outside support they clamor for earmarked federal grants, not tax rebates.

Proponents of general grants to the states draw comfort from the fact that the idea was advanced by liberals but has drawn much support from conservatives including the Republican candidate in the last presidential election. This, they feel, proves that the plan has merits regardless of ideological leanings or political affiliation. They tend to overlook a crucial distinction: liberals who favor general grants want them in addition to specific or programmatic grants (which should keep expanding) while conservatives who support the plan mean general grants to replace specific and conditional grants.

Conservatives are attracted by general grants or tax sharing—in lieu of programmatic grants—because they would help shift decisions over domestic public services back to states and communities and reestablish local autonomy. Moreover such a change would enable the President and Congress who are now preoccupied with domestic affairs free to devote most of their time and attention to the consideration of national security and foreign relations. Our unsatisfactory position in world affairs and the decline of American power as well as prestige and influence abroad may well be related to the little time given to their study by the leaders of our federal government. Concentration on national security and international affairs by the President and Congress would not necessarily bring about decisions of greater wisdom but at least make for decisions arrived at with greater knowledge and care.

Liberal support for general grants is based on an entirely different rationale, on a prediction that a surplus will develop in the federal budget which might exert a "fiscal drag" on the economy. Just how realistic that expectation is remains to be seen. Budgetary deficits in the past five years totalled $28 billion and the built-in increases of old and newly enacted and expanded programs (plus hoped-for-further tax relief and future new spending programs) do not suggest the likelihood that the budget will be anywhere near a balance for as far as we can see ahead.

FEDERAL GRANTS AND FEDERAL CONTROL

Ten years ago, at the National Tax Conference in Detroit, the chairman of this panel, Professor Alfred Buehler, remarked that "the real question may not be one of assuring the states adequate revenues but of maintaining federal supervision over state activity through grants-in-aid." This was certainly borne out in subsequent years when statutes and administrative practices steadily tightened.

When the United States government grants aid to foreign governments it often refrains from watching the spending too closely for fear of offending sensitive feelings. It also forbids the states to direct or influence welfare recipients on how they ought to spend their monthly benefits. But our state governments can apparently neither be trusted to expend United States funds with as much wisdom as foreign governments or public assistance recipients nor need they be treated with as much restraint or delicacy.

Until not so many years ago the drive for federal funds for education and other services advanced under the motto "Federal aid without federal control." Since then federal money for schools and colleges has multiplied to several billions of dollars annually but no program of general support for operations which the schools and colleges demanded was ever authorized—or has much chance of enactment. Dozens of programs are being piled on top of each other for individual projects or specified small segments of school and college operations, each with detailed conditions and controls. In a symposium volume published earlier this year Seymour Harris pondered: "A puzzling aspect of educational history is the success with specific programs and the failure to obtain general aid."

That aspect need no longer be puzzling. It is now obvious—and some of us stated so years ago—that the battle over federal aid to education was fought not so much over money but over power. Congress now determines which subjects in education are to be advanced and how. Since this still leaves much leeway, recent aid statutes require each university or state department or school district that wishes to get federal money to prepare an individual application to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, setting forth in great detail how those funds—and their own funds—are to be spent. This gives the commissioner all power necessary to rule the educational system, by granting or denying the money.

He may occasionally overstep his bounds—as he did a few weeks ago when he threatened to withhold funds from the Chicago schools, seemingly oblivious of the direct line which the present mayor of Chicago maintains to the White House. Mayor Daley was able to get the order quickly rescinded and the Commissioner's ears pinned back. But how many of the country's 26,000 school districts are in as fortunate a position as the Mayor of Chicago?

You know how jealous universities and colleges are of their academic freedom and autonomy, how they guard against intrusions by state officials or anybody else. In some states such as California, Michigan, etc., the autonomy of the university is constitutional and legislative appropriations for operations are made in a one line item to be spent at the discretion of the institution. But federal funds are parceled out in dribs for highly selected purposes and with minute specifications and controls.

It has now become too plain to require much proof or be subject to argument that the basic purpose of functional grants-in-aid is the transfer of control over domestic public services from state and local governments to federal authorities. One of the leaders in the movement for federal aid to education, Representative **Frank Thompson**, of New Jersey, said recently:

"I am no more afraid of the judgment of the federal government in the field of education—I am less afraid of it than I am of the judgment of some of the locally elected school boards with respect to the administration of education programs."

With the multiplication of specific grant programs it is becoming evident that the United States is in the midst of a process of changing from a federal system of government to a unitary or centralized system in which all major public activities are determined and controlled at the national level. There is a direct federal-state-local chain of command through a functionally organized bureaucracy in most domestic services. Some years ago we were told that a functional division among levels of government was outmoded and that we no longer had a "layer cake" government but a "marble cake" government. By now we have, as Joseph McLean so well called it a "vertical functional autocracy," an integration of major public services from Washington to every small town. And the means by which the disintegration of "horizontal" government was and is being accomplished is the functional grant-in-aid.

This is why no program of general aid to the states was ever adopted or is likely to be authorized. The number of grants has multiplied and a catalogue prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations in April 1964 counted 216 separate program authorizations, a supplement in January 1965 listed over 30 more and the first session of the 89th Congress which adjourned two weeks ago added a few dozen new ones. Remaining gaps—of state and local activities not yet under a federal program—are being rapidly closed. There is much duplication and overlapping of programs with similar objectives or clientele, particularly in education, welfare and the poverty drive, with several Washington and local bureaus seemingly engaged in fierce campaigns of violent non-coordination. The number and intricacy of grant programs has now reached a point where a continued multiplication will lead to increasing friction, confusion and eventual chaos.

To be sure, thought has been given on how to create order out of confusion in studies by the Senate and House Committees on Intergovernmental Relations and particularly by the Advisory Commission on Intergovermental Relations. That commission, created in 1959, was not intended to stem the flow of governmental centralization as was its predecessor, the (first) Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Its task is more limited and pragmatic—to help take the rough spots, the creaks and friction points out of federal-state-local relations and to aid smoother cooperation.

The commission's staff has produced a series of solid research reports but the commission has continued its predecessor's tradition of anonymity, if not by its own volition. A recent survey revealed that less than one-sixth of over 900 top-level state executives had ever heard of the commission and an article by Deil S. Wright in the September 1965 issue of the Public Administration Review disclosed that no direct references to the commission appeared in the annual indexes of the pertinent major professional journals, that no cabinet-level appointee has attended any of the quarterly meetings of the commission since the organization meetings late in 1959 and early 1960, and that no President ever turned to the commission for recommendations on matters of policy.

NO MORE "INTERGOVERNMENTAL" RELATIONS?

Its low rank in the councils of government is no fault of the commission. Rather it springs from the fact that intergovernmental considerations are no longer relevant to federal policy decisions on domestic programs. They are only the technical means by which decisions to initiate, expand or alter public services are being carried out. Programmatic federal grants are devices to establish new or modify old governmental activities which are constitutionally, and have traditionally been regarded to be, in the realm of the states. They do not aid the states, they use the states to carry out commands of the federal government. This reminds me of the story of the two boy scouts who came late to the troop meeting and when asked for an explanation said: "We helped an old lady to cross the street." "Did that take you a whole hour?" their leader inquired. "Yes, it did," they replied, "she did not want to go."

Besides offering certain conveniences, grants are also the cheapest way for the federal government to implement its decisions on domestic public services. Through a contribution which sometimes exceeds 75% but more often equals one-half, one-third or less of the cost, the central authorities acquire as definite a control as if they bore the full cost: they establish the conditions under which funds are made available and no state can afford to forego its allotment to which its residents must contribute a share through their federal taxes.

In Canada intergovernmental payments and tax allocations are negotiated and settled at periodic meetings of the Dominion Prime Minister with the provincial premiers because they are regarded to be matters between the Dominion and the provinces. In the United States general state authorities—governors, budget officers, legislatures—are not part of the process that leads to new or expanded federal grant programs. Federal grants, usually recommended by the President, are a matter between the pertinent federal cabinet department, the functional committees of Congress and the affected nationally organized interest groups.

State or local officials called in for consultation are the administrators of a particular program, never general state officials. Decisions by Congress, and later by the federal bureaus, are decisions on the substance of education, public welfare, roads or urban affairs in which the state legislatures have little choice. Pending proposals would further restrict the limited discretion state legislatures still enjoy. The protagonists of governmental centralization have "wisely refrained from tampering with the Ark of the Covenant" as Rowland Egger so well phrased it. The symbols have been preserved and the rituals carefully respected. Lip service to local autonomy and home rule is as lavish as ever. But the substance of authority has passed into the hands of the national government. The formality or facade of federal grants is only used in order to maintain the fiction that we still have a federal system of government.

At the General Assembly of the States in December 1948 Roscoe Drummond said, "The issue has been foreclosed by events. The federal system no longer exists. The trend toward centralized federal government is overwhelming, inevitable, irreversible, and to a degree, irresponsible. It is a part of American life." He added that the federal system can no more be restored than an apple pie can be put back on the apple tree. Some state officials felt at the time like replying with Mark Twain's famous telegram to a newspaper, "Notice of my death greatly exaggerated." But Mr. Drummond was at most slightly premature. In July 1965, David Brinkley, speaking to the assembled students of the University of Ohio said: "The decline and fall of the 50 state governments will be completed within our lifetime. The movement of political power from state capitols to Washington is inevitable and unstoppable whether we like it or not."

Mr. Brinkley, it seems, likes the trend while others may not. But his judgment of what is happening in our system of government, in my opinion, can hardly be questioned.

As the number of federal grants soars, from 100 a few years back to over 250 at the present time, and possibly 300 or 400 some years hence—considering innumerable proposals to fill remaining "gaps"—the system is turning so cumbersome as to become completely unworkable. A basic change is called for to prevent utter chaos.

What purpose is served by maintaining the fiction of a state program aided by the national government when the latter provides 100% or 90% or 75 to 80% of the cost as it does in unemployment administration, on interstate highways and in some segments of public welfare and education? As trends go, the national government will in all likelihood eventually take over many or most of those services as the complications of maintaining the pretense of "intergovernmental cooperation" become unbearable, too obviously wasteful and useless.

Why should the issue of the governance of public services not now be placed squarely on the table and before the American people? To pile dozens or hundreds of new "grants-in-aid" to states on over 250 current ones serves no purpose other than to confuse the public and make governmental authority and responsibility incomprehensible.

To be sure: I am not proposing that the national government now take over all or some of the various public services which are now provided in the name of state and local governments under federal direction and with federal financing. But I wonder whether we should continue to drift into the "end loesung" (final solution) or face the issue now of what kind of government Americans want to have: centralized power and chain-of-command or home rule. Grants-in-aid which were the lever of change may be as good a place as any to consider the alternative that faces us.

CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND CONTINUES FIGHT FOR GREATER MOTORING SAFETY

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, over the Fourth of July holiday weekend our Nation once again witnessed the senseless slaughter of over half a thousand Americans on its highways. More Americans were killed in highway accidents during that brief 3-day period than were killed in combat activities throughout all of South Vietnam during the past 3 weeks.

Over the Memorial Day weekend in May we witnessed a similar spectacle and we will most likely see a repeat performance of it over the forthcoming Labor Day weekend. It was over the Fourth of July weekend last year that our late colleague from Louisiana, Mr. Thompson, was killed in a highway accident near Gastonia, N.C. Some 49,000 Americans died last year in automobile accidents, and the toll rises with each and every passing year. As the Nashua Telegram editorial, which I am about to include in the Record, points out:

> Since 1900 more citizens of this nation have died from motor vehicle accidents than in all of the wars we have ever fought, including the American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, I have had the privilege of serving on the important Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program of the Committee on Public Works, one of the five congressional committees which has held extensive public hearings on highway and traffic safety proposals. During my years in the State Legislature of New Hampshire and especially during the past 4 years on the committee, I have been vitally concerned with all aspects of safety on our Nation's hundreds of thousands of miles of roads—highway safety, traffic safety, automobile safety, and so forth. The Granite State has a fine history in highway safety and we are ever increasing our highway safety activities to make the State one of the safest in America for the motoring public. As tens of thousands of people every year enjoy the seashore, lakes, and mountains of our State, we must provide them with safer highways.

The Committee on Public Works has ordered reported H.R. 13290, the Highway Safety Act of 1966, and the bill will soon be reported. On Wednesday, June 29, 1966, I gave a detailed explanation of the bill, as ordered reported, on pages 13647–13649 of the Record. I would like to reiterate that the bill is a highly significant piece of legislation; and, if enacted, the programs provided for in its provisions will greatly aid the development of nationwide safety programs. We have maintained the same close partnership between the various levels of government in this bill which has so characterized Federal-aid highway legislation in the past. The bill constitutes a significant step toward safer highways for America.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a most worthwhile editorial from the Nashua, N.H., Telegram of May 27, 1966, preceding the Memorial Day weekend. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress and all citizens of this Nation who are concerned about highway safety.

Auto Crashes Claim More Lives Than Death Toll of War Itself

Tonight marks the start of one of the major holiday weekends of the season and, outside of Labor Day when vacations are over and families return to get ready for the start of the school year, no holiday weekend will attract more motorists to our highways.

Most of our industry will close down this afternoon until Tuesday, as will our schools, so thousands will be taking advantage of the three days to visit our lakes, mountains and seashores. Out-of-staters also will pour into our state and, as usual, most of them will be using the highways around our city to get to vacation areas, starting tonight, and will be returning by the same routes all day Monday and early Tuesday.

A new state safety traffic council urges extra precaution on the part of N.H. motorists this weekend because the delay in the car inspection period, it says, "offers a special traffic hazard this year."

In other years this first long holiday weekend of the year comes at the end of the spring inspection period for cars owned by N. H. motorists. This year the inspection period was delayed a full month, the extended weekend comes right in the middle and it is doubtful if 60 percent of our registered cars have been checked for deficiencies.

Recalling that the basic goal of the inspection is to remove unsafe vehicles from our highways, the council urges drivers to consider each on-coming vehicle as, potentially, one of those cars which has not been inspected and may be unsafe. The council also warns us to make certain that, "the driver who is taking one last ride in a clunker, doesn't involve you in an accident."

This Memorial Day will bring renewal of our people's tributes to those who have died in the conflicts necessary to maintain national and individual liberty. This is most fitting and proper.

But even as we direct attention to the dead of past wars, another menace—the traffic accident—goes right on claiming American lives at a rate which dwarfs the death toll of war itself. Even on this Memorial Day weekend, the increase in travel will bring with it the usual tragic upswing in traffic deaths.

Since 1900—a short span of 66 years—more citizens of this nation have died from motor vehicle accidents than in all the wars we have ever fought, including the American Revolution.

We can be comforted in our sorrow at the death of those who fell in wars with the knowledge that they lived and died for the principles for which their country stood. The greater number who have died in motor vehicle accidents died for no such principle, and that makes their deaths far more tragic. The fact that their lives were snuffed out by carelessness and thoughtlessness in so many instances points up the purposeless, useless nature of these deaths.

While we are dedicating ourselves to noble causes, as we often do on national holidays, we might pause long enough to dedicate ourselves to eliminating the greatest cause of violent death of all—the traffic accident.

THE DRAFT: VALLEY NEWS PROBES BASIC ISSUE—CLEVELAND RECALLS GOP PROPOSALS OF 1964

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, questions concerning the operation of Selective Service are troubling thoughtful Americans throughout the country. One of the most thoughtful comments that I have seen on this problem was published May 25 in the Lebanon, N.H., Valley News. It was written by Mr. Walter C. Paine, one of the publishers, and I ask unanimous consent to have it reprinted following these remarks.

The current discussions of the draft recall a detailed review of military manpower policies which was conducted April 21, 1964, by a group of Republican Members under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] who is a longtime student of this problem. Participants included Messrs. Lindsay, Bray, Ostertag, Findley, Morse, Halpern, Quie, Taft, Ellsworth, Schwengel, Wilson of California, Del Clawson, Gerald R. Ford and myself.

At that time, more than 2 years ago, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] noted approvingly that just the weekend before, President Johnson had issued a statement calling for review of the Nation's draft policies. A top-level review has now been completed by the Pentagon, although not released, and it is with frustration that we learn there is to be yet another study by a newly created civilian panel. The problem has been studied sufficiently; we should be in a position to take action now.

Had action been taken on the Republican proposals in 1964, this situation would have been well advanced by now if not actually solved.

In my own paper delivered during the April 1964 review, I urged that the Congress itself undertake an immediate review of draft policy.

As we know, this was not done until this year when the Armed Services Committee of the House held hearings.

In my paper, I suggested several different policy lines which ought to be investigated. One of them was the plan subsequently taken up by the Secretary of Defense and enunciated earlier this year when he addressed the newspaper editors' convention in Montreal.

Under this plan, a Universal National Service would have been established. Men would be drafted but given numerous options besides military service by which to fulfill their commitment to the country. These could include service in the Peace Corps, Foreign Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey, teaching and the like.

How much better off we would be today, had these Republican proposals for urgent studies been heeded 2 years ago. All needed investigations, hearings, and study would be out of the way and we would have been in a position to adopt a policy and make judgments soundly long before this.

However, better late than never, and, as a contribution to the debate, I submit Mr. Paine's thoughtful editorial at this point in the Record.

[From the Valley News, May 25, 1966]

What UMT Offers

At long last there is admission at the highest governmental level of the inequities of Selective Service. More than that, Secretary McNamara's plan to replace the draft with two years' national service provides the framework for a highly significant debate, the outcome of which will touch the life of every American family, and may also mark a basic departure in the traditional American attitude toward military service.

Americans have always rejected universal military service as overly "militaristic" and contrary to the American tradition of civilian supremacy and freedom of choice. Yet four times in the last twenty-five years the country has been called upon to field and supply major forces for occupation or combat duty far from home—an ironic record for an avowedly peace-loving, unmilitary people! And having inherited the lion's share of peace-keeping responsibility throughout a greatly contracted globe, does anyone believe that our future national commitments will be any the less?

Little need to dwell on the failings of the present draft system. It is neither fair nor efficient; indeed the latest equivocal deferment "tests" insult the sensibilities of a democratic people. If UMT were to replace the present discriminatory system, what forms might it take?

We applaud McNamara's suggestion that there be civilian as well as military opportunities to satisfy the requirement. However, the different kinds of service suggested are obviously not equivalent in terms of duress or risk—for example, a year with the Peace Corps in Africa could hardly be equated with a year of combat in Vietnam. Therefore, we would favor some system of weighted service under which those who select the less hazardous opportunities would be required to serve for longer periods.

Overall, we feel the Secretary's proposal offers great advantage to the nation. Recognizing the responsibility of every American to serve the country in some fashion, it would make for more efficient use of the variety of aptitudes and talents that young people offer.

By providing some opportunity for almost everyone the plan would remove the stigma that now attaches to those found unfit for military service and to those who, for lack of opportunity, money or brains, inevitably get drafted. It would greatly ease the problems of educational, career and marital planning for individuals, male and female, while on the national level it would provide a more dependable reservoir of trained manpower. In the long run, this should lead to more efficient training methods and more effective use of America's greatest resource.

The immediate reaction of college students has been favorable. This augurs well for the Secretary's proposal and offers Congress an unprecedented opportunity to listen to the ideas and desires of the millions of young adults whose lives will be most vitally affected.

AID LOAN TO INDIA

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the State Department's Agency for International Development announced a loan of $150 million to India. The AID loan, to assist India's purchase of U.S. raw materials, spare parts and other commodities, is to be repaid in dollars by the Indian Government over 40 years, including a 10-year grace period at 1-percent annual interest, and 2½-percent annual interest thereafter.

Obviously the action has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Yet this same Bureau of the Budget has raised objection to my bill, H.R. 15288, which would authorize the Treasury Department to subscribe to an additional $110 million of preferred stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Since FNMA can borrow 10 times the amount of its capital and surplus, the additional FNMA preferred stock subscription which I propose would increase FNMA's borrowing authority by $1.1 billion which together with funds from the $110 million of preferred stock subscription would increase FNMA's secondary market mortgage purchase authority by $1.2 billion. The Bureau of the Budget objects to the budgetary impact of the $110 million preferred stock subscription proposed in my bill.

As a substitute for my bill the Bureau of the Budget proposes that the 10 to 1 borrowing ratio of FNMA be changed to a ratio of 15 to 1. Such a change in borrowing ratio when over $3 billion of FNMA debt is outstanding based on the statutory 10 to 1 borrowing ratio raises grave possibility of a suit to enjoin FNMA from financing at the more liberalized borrowing ratio. In this tight home mortgage market such action would be tragic.

The position of the Budget Bureau is completely incomprehensible to me. Here it approves a $150 million AID loan to India at submarket interest rates with a 10-year grace period and at the same time objects to Treasury subscription to another $110 million of preferred stock of FNMA to enable that agency to provide additional urgently needed assistance to our chaotic home-mortgage market. The policymakers in the Bureau of the Budget should go out in this market and try and borrow funds to buy a home. Maybe then they would wake up to the seriousness of the mortgage market squeeze, which in some areas of the country is bringing homebuilding to a grinding halt, causing the layoff of hundreds of thousands of workers engaged in this great industry.

The Congress without delay should increase the mortgage purchasing authority of FNMA and do it in the time-proven manner that will not jeopardize the usefulness of this fine agency in this critical home-mortgage market.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BONDS

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today the Federal Home Loan Bank System set a new alltime high in the interest cost of its borrowed funds. It is offering a quarter of a billion dollars of 5¾-percent bonds at a discount to yield approximately 5.8 percent to the investor. The bonds are due January 23, 1968.

That excessive interest cost dramatizes the misguided policies of this high interest cost administration. This administration is forcing interest rates ever higher through its failure to curtail nonessential Government expenditures. It refuses to employ fiscal restraint and instead places the entire burden of curtailing inflationary pressures on monetary policy.

Yesterday's yields on Treasury 13-week bills climbed to 4.876 percent, a high for the second week in a row. Yesterday U.S. Government bond prices fell sharply to the lowest level in more than 40 years. More than 2 dozen U.S. Treasury bonds and notes are now selling to yield in excess of 5 percent. Seventy-one of seventy-five Federal agency issues are selling to yield better than 5 percent with 14 of these issues providing a return in excess of 5½ percent. The top, of course, is the current offering of Home Loan Bank bonds to yield approximately 5.8 percent.

The high interest rates of this administration are wrecking the homebuilding industry. Home mortgage funds are drying up and construction workers are being thrown out of jobs. It is time this administration woke up to the havoc that its high-interest policies are causing.

JULIUS KLEIN AND THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I raised questions with the Department of Justice concerning the possibility that Julius Klein may be in violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by his failure to register his representation for Rheinmetall, a German corporation. The letters, which I ask to be made a part of the Record, show why I have raised these questions. The first letter, dated June 16, 1966, is addressed to the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach, the U.S. Attorney General. The response, also presented below, is by Assistant Attorney General Walter Yeagley. My second letter, dated July 5, was directed to Mr. Yeagley raising further questions with him concerning the failure of Mr. Klein to register his representation of Rheinmetall.

The text of the correpondence follows:

JUNE 16, 1966.

Hon. NICHOLAS KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL KATZENBACH: Several documents have come to my attention which suggest that a public relations firm headed by Major General Julius Klein (Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc., of Chicago) has represented the Rheinmetall munitions firm of Dusseldorf, West Germany, at intervals during the past few years and may be presently representing the firm. However, careful examination of documents filed with the Justice Department by Klein fails to show this relationship.

Therefore, I raise the question as to whether Klein and his firm are in violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. This question is especially timely because the Department of Defense is this very week conducting final negotiations for a controversial $73.3 million gun contract with Rheinmetall. I have discovered that in at least five instances long standing minimum test standards were either lowered or waived completely in order to classify the weapon Standard A and eligible for procurement.

Because of the unusual procurement procedure, lobbying efforts in behalf of the firm become especially important.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act requires that representation agreements be filed together with detailed semi-annual statements of compensation and reimbursement. Klein has a voluminous file at the Justice Department, but it contains no reference whatever to Rheinmetall. Neither do the Department files contain any listing of representation for Rheinmetall.

However, several documents elsewhere strongly suggest that Klein indeed is the agent for this foreign firm and therefore under the law should be registered and required to file details of his representation agreement and the semi-annual financial statements. Among them are the following:

1. A letter verified to me by the State Department, in which Klein wrote Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William Tyler, on April 5, 1965 as follows:

"I think it might be taken without question that I, as past National Commander of the Jewish War Veterans, a participant in the Restitution Treaty Negotiations; and a member of the founding of the first Jewish claims conference, would never have undertaken to represent Rheinmetall without certain knowledge of their complete innocence of such charges as have been alleged."

2. Part 13 of Hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 14, 1963 in regard to activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals in the United States.

In the hearings Klein claimed exemption from the application of the Act, insisting that his activities in behalf of German firms were purely nonpolitical and mercantile and therefore within the exemption set forth in Section 3D of the Act. On page 1955, however, Klein is quoted as saying "You can't separate business from politics." It was the expressed opinion of Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the committee, that Klein's activities did in fact constitute political activities and he should register as an agent of Mannesmann, a German client then under discussion. Klein disagreed, but it is interesting to note that he did subsequently register as an agent for Mannesmann.

To establish Klein's relation with Rheinmetall, I cite pages 1822, 1824, and 1825 and 1914 which reproduced records of Klein's firm on which Rheinmetall is listed as a client or account.

Documents on pages 1822 and 1914 also show Hispano-Suiza as a client or account. This firm is located in Switzerland and owned rights on the gun involved in the procurement now being consummated. The gun is identified as H.S. 820 20-millimeter machine gun, and the H.S. initials are taken from the firm name Hispano-Suiza.

3. Numerous recent newspaper, radio and television reports discuss Klein's activities in behalf of Rheinmetall.

The Rheinmetall gun contract is being negotiated between the governments of the United States and West Germany. If Klein has been active in behalf of the gun contract it is difficult for me to see how his relationship can accurately be described as purely private and nonpolitical. He has corresponded with officials of the United States government in regard to his representation of Rheinmetall.

It seems to me the Foreign Agents Registration Act was intended precisely for a situation such as this. The contract involves only public money and therefore it is very much the public's business to know the full details on lobbying activities undertaken by agents for Rheinmetall.

The taxpayers are entitled to know what was done, who got paid and how much.

The final contract may be consummated very soon and therefore a prompt investigation of Klein's relationship with Rheinmetall is in order.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Text of Assistant Attorney General Yeagley's letter to Representative FINDLEY dated June 23:

"DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of June 16, 1966, in which you raise a question as to the possible obligations of Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc. of Chicago under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as a result of its representation of the Rheinmetall munitions firm of Dusseldorf, West Germany, has been referred to me for consideration and reply.

"The only information which this Department has at this time with respect to the relationship between Rheinmetall and the public relations firm headed by Julius Klein and the nature of its activities on behalf of this firm is that which was contained in newspaper reports. As would be expected, however, an inquiry has been instituted to obtain more and complete information in regard to this matter.

"From a review of the information at hand it is not as readily apparent as you indicate in your letter that the activities of the public relations firm on behalf of its client fall within the definition of 'political activity' as contained in Rule 100(a)(11) promulgated by the Attorney General under the terms of the statute with which we are concerned. As you know, the Foreign Agents Registration Act is a criminal statute and therefore must be strictly construed before charges of wilful noncompliance may be brought.

"Basically, it would appear from the newspaper reports that Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc., succeeded in persuading our Government to purchase from Rheinmetall a substantial order of munitions. These reports, however, do not indicate that Klein was representing the foreign principal with respect to any matter pertaining to the political or public interests, policies or relations or any foreign government or foreign political party since he was representing a private munitions maker. Nor was he engaged in this respect in the dissemination of any political propaganda as that term is defined in Section 1(j) of the Act; nor would it appear he was engaged in any activity to influence the enactment or repeal of any legislation affecting the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign government or affecting the foreign policies or relations of the United States. I presume it was already a settled policy of the United States Government to buy munitions from sources outside this country, and if such were in fact the case, then it would not be political activity for Julius Klein to attempt to persuade our Government to buy such munitions from a private industrial firm which he represented. However, further inquiry along this line is also being made.

"With respect to the references made in your letter to the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of May 14, 1963, tending to establish Klein's relations with Rheinmetall these have been reviewed and, as you know, they disclose nothing more than the fact that this client is listed among many others of the public relations firm for whom certain expenditures were made. As you also are aware, these hearings do not disclose the nature of the activities which were performed by the firm within the United States on behalf of Rheinmetall.

"As to the statement contained in your letter with respect to Klein's representation of Mannesmann, you may be interested to know that registration for this firm was requested because it appeared that the activities of Julius Klein for this client were more in the nature of a public relations consultant and publicity agent rather than in connection with a specific commercial undertaking.

"As I have indicated, inquiries have been instituted in this matter and in the event these inquiries were to disclose information which would show that Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc. has incurred an obligation to register on account of its representation of Rheinmetall, you may rest assured that such registration will be duly solicited.

"Your interest in writing to this Department is appreciated and if we can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to communicate with me.

"Sincerely,

"J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
"Assistant Attorney General."

(See pages 12767, 13085, 13272 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the substance of Representative FINDLEY's original letter to the Attorney General dated June 16.)

Text of FINDLEY's letter dated July 5:

"DEAR MR. YEAGLEY: Thank you for your June 23, 1966, reply to my inquiry regarding the obligations of Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc., to register its representation of the Rheinmetall munitions firm of Dusseldorf, West Germany under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

"As you are well aware, the Foreign Agents Registration Act has recently been amended by the Congress and the amending Act (S. 693) was sent to the President on June 22, 1966. If it is not vetoed by the President it will become law not later than September 2, 1966.

"I am very anxious to know the position of the Department of Justice regarding the activities of Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc., with respect to the newly strengthened Foreign Agents Registration Act.

"I must assume from the assurances in your letter that the Department has instituted inquiries into this matter, and perhaps you are now in a position to give me more specific answers. Frankly, I was somewhat surprised to learn that the best information of the Internal Security Division on this vital matter was that contained in newspaper reports.

"Specifically, my questions are as follows:

"1. Assuming that Klein is still representing Rheinmetall when S. 693 becomes law (thus eliminating any ex post facto issue):

"a) Is not Rheinmetall a 'foreign principal', as defined by Sec. 1(b) of the amended law? The German Embassy has informed me that Rheinmetall is a German corporation. A 'foreign principal' is defined as corporations organized under the laws of or having their principal place of business in a foreign country.

"b) Is not Klein an 'agent of a foreign principal' as defined by Sec. 1(c) of the amended law? An 'agent of a foreign principal' is defined as any person who acts as an agent, representative, employe, or servant, or acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal, and engages in 'political activities' in the U.S. or represents the interest of a foreign principal before any agency or official of the U.S. government.

"c) Is not Klein engaged in 'political activities' as broadly defined by Sec. 1(o) and as developed in the legislative history of the amended law? 'Political activities' is defined to include any efforts by a foreign agent to influence a government agency or official with reference to formulating, adopting or changing the foreign or domestic policies of our government.

"d) Is not Klein denied all the exemptions under the amended law, specifically Sec. 3(d) which is limited to representatives of U.S. businesses or thus engaged substantially in business?

"Accordingly, will not Klein have to register with the Department of Justice and cannot the Department require under Sec. 2(a)(1)-(11) of the amended law that Klein disclose his activities for Rheinmetall, including any activities related to efforts to negotiate a Rheinmetall gun sale contract between the German government and the U.S. Department of Defense, even though those activities may have occurred prior to the effective date of the law, i.e., September, 1966? Specifically, do not the filing requirements include retrospective as well as prospective activities?

"2. With regard to your answer to my letter of June 16, 1966, I wish to inquire why the Klein firm was not required to register under the un-amended law on the theory that Klein is admittedly an 'agent of a foreign principal' under 22 U.S.C. 611, as evidenced by the numerous registration statements he has on file. This being true, why is Klein not required to list his representation of Rheinmetall under 22 U.S.C. 612(a)(3)&(4), which requires a foreign agent to submit the name of *every* foreign principal for whom he acts and a statement of those activities? Clearly Rheinmetall is such a foreign principal as defined by 22 U.S.C. 611(b)(3)&(4).

"I will appreciate having your answers to these questions at your earliest convenience. The questions have special urgency because the gun contract, I am informed, is in the final stage of negotiation.

"Thank you for your fine cooperation.

"Sincerely yours,

"PAUL FINDLEY,

"Representative in Congress".

NATIONAL STRIKES, CONCENTRATIONS OF POWER AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today Americans in all walks of life are suffering the acute but needless inconveniences of the nationwide airstrike. Recent reports indicate no hope of early settlement. Although such an atmosphere is not conducive to the necessary scholarly consideration which must be done, the public inconvenience will at least focus attention on the task before us and illuminate the need for protective labor legislation.

Again I am taking the floor of the House to express my feeling for the need for congressional study and initiative on a national problem. The function of study and deliberation on problems such as the one before us in the airlines industry should not be—and cannot adequately be—deferred to the executive branch. The Democratic administration was confronted with need for further legislation in the area of labor management disputes during the railroad's dispute over the employment of firemen. At that time, rather than attack the problem at its roots, President Kennedy chose to request ad hoc authority to submit the dispute to compulsory arbitration. A major crisis was averted by such tactics, but the symptoms were only treated—the disease was not cured. At that time my colleague, then Representative, now Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, and I introduced legislation for a joint House-Senate committee to study and report on problems of industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. This measure was reintroduced in this session of Congress. Congress saw fit to postpone action in this area and react only by giving ad hoc authority to the executive. We are now again faced with the same stormy problem and are guilty of not repairing our roof while the sun was shining.

The administration may be reluctant to explore this problem of nationwide strikes in a public forum for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that this current disagreement in the airlines industry can be traced to a considerable degree to the Johnson administration. The administration's monetary and fiscal policies are in a large degree responsible for the increased demands made upon the airlines by the striking International Association of Machinists. The unions demand are symptomatic of the inflationary psychology and hearings in depth would undoubtably uncover this. Labor leaders are approaching the bargaining table with blood in their eyes as they know full well that increases in taxes, social security payments, and the cost of living are the reason why the workingman's real disposable income has risen very little in the past year. As a matter of fact, average weekly earnings in real terms—1957-59 prices—actually declined from $99.93 in December 1965 to $98.88 in April 1966. These inflationary forces must be checked, for 1967 promises to be a year of intensive and perhaps heated collective bargaining, with contracts expiring in the trucking, communications, food products, automobile and machinery industries.

I would also like to call attention to the significance of the fact that unions are again demanding cost-of-living "escalator" clauses. Such demands have been absent from negotiations since the inflationary periods of the 1950's. The number of workers covered by such clauses had been halved, from 4 million in 1958 to 2 million in 1966. The reappearance of demands for these escalator clauses is indicative of the union's awareness of the dangers inherent in the administration's economic policies.

Furthermore the administration has been less than energetic in pursuing this disagreement to a speedy settlement. In the few days prior to the strike, while the public was waiting in anxious anticipation, the negotiations, surprisingly, did not go down to the wire but were stopped Thursday afternoon. The strike began the following morning at 6 a.m. Also meriting some explanation is the fact that negotiations at the Saturday and Sunday sessions were only halfhearted. Part of the delay was allegedly caused by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz' return to the country on Saturday. But why was not there anyone else in the administration capable of conducting around-the-clock negotiations? And why, after Secretary Wirtz did return was he not joined by Secretary of Commerce, John Connor? Is this entirely a labor matter, or is management also involved?

Should there be an open congressional study of this matter, which I would urge there must be, representatives of both labor and management and other interested parties should be allowed to state their positions in an open and full debate and be subject to examination and cross-examination. In this connection I have been puzzled by the silence of the national labor leaders; especially AFL-CIO President George Meany and UAW President Walter Reuther. These individuals have lectured the Government and Congress over the years about every conceivable subject, including recently foreign policy. I have always welcomed the fact that labor leaders have spoken up, but it is now quite strange that they are silent on this area directly affecting them just as they were during the serious New York transit strike last January. A national dialog on this subject is most necessary and labor leaders should play an important part. An open congressional study would be the most appropriate vehicle for this.

Mr. Speaker, the essential issue for a congressional inquiry is the relationship of concentrations of power to the national interest. The economic well-being of our country is threatened when centralization and concentrations of power, capable of paralyzing whole industries, are permitted which can flaunt the public interest without fear of legal culpability. Just as business concentrations of power were found to require certain legislative controls over their activities, so today should it be recognized that labor monopolies have long passed the point where legislative action should have been initiated. Certainly there are various courses of legislative action which should be explored.

One idea I would like to see examined by a study committee stems from the distinction between labor's right to strike against management as opposed to their striking against the public. Labor has a right to strike against management which I have defended and will continue to defend. This right is one of labor's major tools for achieving a satisfactory settlement. It is part of the economic discipline: management loses profits and labor loses wages until an agreement is reached.

However, there is no economic or other justification for labor to strike or otherwise bring pressure to bear on the public through secondary boycotts or other means, for their grievance is properly directed against management alone. The technique of the nationwide strike is inherently against the public as it is designed to cause public misery and inconvenience such as we are now experiencing in the airline transportation area. The public is made the conduit for pressure on management in a nationwide strike, and public inconvenience and misery is therefore an essential ingredient of such operations.

An immediate illustration of the unions' desire to use this "public misery-public pressure" technique is found in the current airline strike. The unions, I have been informed, have ordered their men not to work on equipment which might be loaned to airlines which were not struck. Certainly the purpose of this maneuver can only be to further aggravate the inconvenience of the public and thereby increase public pressure. This action is not directed against the struck airlines, in fact, ironically, it may work to its benefit as its operating competitors will then be unable to increase and perhaps maintain extra business even after the strike is settled.

A solution to the problem of nationwide strikes, while still protecting labor's right to strike against the specific management against whom it has a disagreement, may be reached by prohibiting any two contracts by the same union in the same industry from coming up for reconsideration at substantially the same time. This would of course be exactly contrary to Teamster President Hoffa's goal of coordinating the expiration date of all contracts in his industry in order to obtain considerably greater power to reach the settlement through the "public misery-public pressure" technique. Prohibiting simultaneous expiration will force the union to direct its strike efforts against management only, the management with which the disagreement exists, as it should be.

Inhibiting Congress' effectiveness to thoroughly study this area in the past has been due to the complexity of the problem which reaches into many aspects of American life and cuts across the jurisdictional lines of our standing congressional committees. Accordingly I would propose that my bill, or a similar measure, be enacted which will establish a joint House-Senate committee composed of members of several standing committees with jurisdiction in areas relative to the problem. I have suggested that membership be drawn from the House from the Committee on Education and labor, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Judiciary. Correspondingly members for the Senate should be selected from the Senate Committees on Commerce, Labor and Public Welfare, and the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent at this time to include in the RECORD for the interest of the Members my bill to establish a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industry-wide collective bargaining and industry-wide strikes and lockouts.

H.J. RES. 590

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the "Joint Committee on Industrywide Bargaining" (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of eight Members of the Senate to be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker. The members of the joint committee appointed from the Senate shall include four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party; and they shall be designated from among the members of the Committees on Labor and Public Welfare, Commerce, and the Judiciary. The members of the joint committee appointed from the House of Representatives shall include four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party; and they shall be designated from among the members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SEC. 2. The joint committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall be authorized to study and investigate the entire field of industrywide and regional collective bargaining procedures and practices between employers and labor organizations, and combinations of groups thereof, and problems relating thereto, including but not limited to—

(1) the ways and means by which the collective bargaining process might be improved, altered, revised, or supplemented so as to avoid or minimize strikes and lockouts which affect an entire industry or region, or a substanital part thereof;

(2) the concentration of economic and other power under the control of business organizations and labor organizations, and groups thereof, and such practices or policies, if any, which tend to concentrate or monopolize power affecting the collective bargaining process, and the relationship of such factors to strikes and lockouts affecting an entire industry or region, or a substantial portion thereof;

(3) the effectiveness and usefulness of various forms of mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and other possible procedures and methods for aiding or supplementing the collective bargaining process;

(4) the administration, operation, and possible need for revision of existing Federal laws which in any way concern collective bargaining, strikes, or lockouts affecting an entire industry or region, or substanital portion thereof;

(5) such other problems and subjects which relate in any way to collective bargaining, strikes, or lockouts as the joint committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House of Representatives, by bill or otherwise, the results of the joint committee's studies and investigations, together with their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 5. In carrying out its duties, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no bill, measure, or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 192 and 194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. the cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

SEC. 6. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman.

ALL THIS AND WITHOUT BIG BROTHER TOO

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the expansion of Federal-aid programs for urban areas a current fixture of national governmental policy, it is indeed refreshing to learn of a city which has refused such programs and has progressed over the last 20 years through the power of its own initiative.

Refusing Federal funds available through the poverty program, redevelopment, housing, and beautification programs, to name a few of the existing programs, San Leandro, Calif., can boast among its many achievements city schools among the best in the State, a locally financed urban renewal program, a smaller-than-average police force with a decreasing crime rate and a steady influx of new industry or the expansion of old ones. Disavowing the "let's get ours" philosophy so prevalent today among city planners, this city of nearly 75,000 rolled up its sleeves and made progress synonymous with local responsibility. Of course, it goes without saying that municipalities differ as to their natural assets, and consequently advancement will vary from case to case. However, one necessary ingredient in this Nation's many success stories has been the determination of its citizens to take care of themselves within the limits of their capabilities. San Leandro is certainly an encouraging example of a modern-day pioneering spirit which has turned a deaf ear to Washington's promise: "I can get it for you wholesale."

As a wholesome shot in the arm to those who still endeavor to pay their own way, I insert the article, "San Leandro, Calif., Cuts Taxes 18th Year in Row," by Sterling G. Slappey of the Los Angeles Times in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1966]

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF., CUTS TAXES 18TH YEAR IN ROW

(By Sterling G. Slappey, Los Angeles Times)

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.—While nearly every other American city has been raising taxes, this city on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay has been reducing them for 18 consecutive years.

It's tax-setting time again, and again the rate will drop.

How does San Leandro do it?

"We are able to bring down our tax rate," Mayor Jack Maltester said, "because of economical and efficient management, because San Leandro is growing, the tax base is increasing and state sales tax collections in which we share are increasing.

"Over the years, assessments of property have gone up here just as they have everywhere else. However, our citizens and the companies in town now pay less per capita for city services than they did in 1947."

That was the year San Leandro's tax rate per $100 of assessed property valuation was $1.98. Total valuation was $20,111,755 and the population was 26,442.

Today, the rate is down to $1.07, assessed valuation is up to $189,612,415 and the population is 74,400.

The highly favorable tax climate here has been one of the main factors in attracting more than 500 firms, factories and plants to the area. New companies have been moving in or old companies expanding at a rate of one every 10 days. They pay up to $50,000 an acre for industrial sites.

They also pay more than one-third of the cost of municipal government and 45 per cent of the property taxes.

These include such giants as Kaiser Aluminum, International Harvester, Simmons, Kellogg, Western Electric, General Electric, Lion Manufacturing.

Companies that were here before the tax-cutting began include Caterpillar, makers of earth moving machinery; Friden, office machine manufacturers, and California Packing, food handlers.

It was 20 years ago that San Leandro began wooing industry and making life for business a pleasure.

Several businessmen said their companies chose San Leandro over adjoining Oakland because of the tax climate, better race relations and better cooperation between city officials and business.

The city government gets a stream of advice and help from a cluster of citizens-government committees.

San Leandro is described by City Manager Wesley McClure as "a well adjusted community." Its 62-man police force is only two-thirds the size of comparable-size cities. The crime rate has been decreasing steadily—down 10 per cent in the past 12 months.

City schools are considered among the best in California.

A locally financed urban renewal project has lifted the face of the center of the city, an exceptionally large library has been completed, and improvements and additions have been made at city installations. A new civic center is being built.

Above all, San Leandro is practically free of debt. This has been a major factor in giving the city its tax-cutting capability.

The only bond issue in the past 15 years produced the $1,750,000 needed for the library. The city, with a triple-A credit rating, could have borrowed $28 million.

The only other large debt is $1 million owed to the state for part of the Civic Center costs.

San Leandro avoids what Mayor Maltester calls "enmeshment" in Federal projects.

"The people of the city do not want us running to Washington every time we need something," he said. "We go it alone, pay as we go, and try to split up the big bills so we can pay for one improvement before we take on another.

"Under the urban renewal program we could have gotten a great deal of money from Washington for our redevelopment project in the middle of San Leandro. But we would have then come under Federal control. We don't want this. We raised the $1 million we needed ourselves.

"I am not opposed to Federal money for urban development for other, more needy cities. We just want to avoid Federal enmeshment here."

The city has turned down all Federal funds available through the poverty program, redevelopment, housing, beautification, land and water conservation programs.

A 4½-mile bayfront recreation area is being created on filled land with money taken from current working funds.

In two to three years San Leandrans will have at no extra costs to themselves, a new 18-hole golf course, waterfront drive, scenic areas, picnic parks and tennis courts.

These improvements already have increased by four times the value of nearby private property.

Besides the annual tax cutting, McClure said discussions have often been held on the possibility of reducing taxes for people who improve their property rather than increasing taxes for those who improve their homes and property.

This would be a novel approach to taxing in the United States by a city which probably is the tax-cutting example of the Nation.

PART 1—UNUSUAL "ARMY" OF INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS ENGAGES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the diligent and inquiring efforts of two newspaper reporters, what on its face appears possibly to be another scandal in the administration of the war on poverty has been unearthed.

The reporters, Bette Orsini and Jack Nease, staff members of the St. Petersburg Times, have recently concluded a six-part series discussing the activities of one Thomas P. Hardeman, and a number of poverty programs he either heads up or in which he is involved in the St. Petersburg area. The articles have been published in the St. Petersburg Times.

In addition, credit should also be given to the Largo Sentinel, a weekly newspaper in Largo, Fla., which has also been in the forefront in uncovering wrongdoing in the poverty program in the St. Petersburg area.

The Times' articles reveal numerous activities of the Hardeman organization which raise many questions that need to be answered. Much of what is taking place within his organizations is shrouded in secrecy. The articles indicate loose bookkeeping methods and raise a serious question as to the good faith nature of the operations between the various corporations which Hardeman has formed.

Following these articles, I called upon the Comptroller General of the United States and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to investigate the activities of the numerous organizations in which Mr. Hardeman is involved. It was reported on Friday, July 8, that the OEO has made its "investigation" and found no wrongdoing. Apparently in order to present a more favorable public image, OEO has recommended changes which will make Hardeman's operations less "vulnerable to criticism."

Mr. Speaker, in light of the many questions raised in the Times' articles, the OEO report is nothing less than astonishing. Specifically, the articles make the following points:

First. It has been admitted that a lease entered into by the Hardeman organization violated its contract with the Federal Government by not obtaining prior written approval from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Second. The administration of the various corporations are shrouded in secrecy including the full amounts paid in rent to another corporation headed by a friend of Hardeman.

Third. Involved in the corporations with Hardeman is his wife; however, the amount of salary each draw is kept secret.

Fourth. Records have been removed.

Fifth. Interlocking poverty corporations have been formed although all are operated by the same personnel.

Sixth. The parties refuse to disclose the names of the true owners of certain of the poverty corporations.

Seventh. Twenty thousand to twenty-five thousand dollars of funds earmarked to aid migrant farmworkers is being used to rent automobiles.

Eighth. In one instance, a photographer hired to take pictures was listed as a $75-a-day consultant.

Ninth. A petty cash fund in the amount of $1,798 was being maintained.

Tenth. Conflicts exist between the various corporations.

Even if, as the OEO reports, there is no malfeasance on Hardeman's part, these irregularities certainly come below the level of good faith and sound administration that the taxpayers expect and deserve in the administration of their money.

In any event, the Government Accounting Office has assured me that they will make a thorough investigation which I believe is still very much warranted.

Following is the first of the above mentioned series of articles which appeared in the St. Petersburg Times. Tomorrow, and through the remainder of the week, I will insert the balance of the articles in this expositive series:

Unusual "Army" Engages in the War on Poverty—First of a Series

(By Bette Orsini and Jack Nease of the Times Staff)

The "war on poverty" has many armies, but perhaps nowhere in the country is there one quite like that commanded by Thomas P. Hardeman of Treasure Island.

Aided by a Tampa attorney and a professional anti-poverty fighter from North Carolina, Hardeman has put together a complex of interlocking organizations that look to the day they will some day be spending $8 million or more a year in federal funds.

So far expenditures have been far below that, and there is some evidence that several officials in the Office of Economic Opportunity are becoming disenchanted with the Hardeman group. Others give him warm support.

Hardeman himself assumes a belligerent attitude when people try to find out exactly what is going on fiscally in the federally-sponsored programs. "That's none of your business," he tells reporters who press him for financial details.

This secrecy, for example, is used to hide the exact amount Hardeman and his wife are receiving from the programs. Last fall they drew annual salaries totaling $29,000 plus occasional consultant fees from federal funds, but their present salaries are secret.

Also secret is the full amount paid in rent to a corporation headed by a Tampa attorney Hardeman describes as a friend and who also is paid consultant fees from one of the poverty programs.

The attorney, Howard Garrett, says the firm is owned by "friends and clients" who don't want to be identified. The firm is named the H.A.S. Corp. but Garrett says he doesn't know what the initials stand for.

Hardeman, a 40-year-old former minister and professor who used to live in Tampa, is able to keep such details secret because he contends some records through which anti-poverty funds flow are "private."

"You're invading things that are not your business," Hardeman told reporters last week. Access to some records was gained only after hours of arguing, and many of the records are still secret after two weeks of trying.

Some records were moved out of St. Petersburg Friday night. One woman in the office slammed the door on an inquiring photographer.

To understand the antipoverty complex Hardeman has established it is necessary to begin with the Community Service Foundation (CSF), a philanthropic organization founded more than 25 years ago by Willis T. Spivey. It is widely respected for its work with poor Negroes in the Ridgecrest slum area south of Clearwater.

Hardeman jointed the CSF staff four years ago and now runs it as "vice president and deputy director." Spivey, who suffered a stroke last fall, has become less active in CSF management and is out of the state for months at a time.

Until a few years ago CSF operated entirely with private funds, mostly Spivey's, but when the federal government began its war on poverty officials sought out CSF as a natural ally.

Working with the Florida Institute of Continuing University studies (FICUS), the foundation helped train the nation's first group of Volunteers in Service to America (usually called VISTAS) and shared the spotlight when Mrs. Lyndon Johnson came to St. Petersburg in March, 1965, for their graduation.

When FICUS ran into state political troubles CSF took over and moved VISTA training operations to Manatee County. Until last week, however, headquarters offices were in the 300 Building in St. Petersburg.

At first CFS trained VISTAS on a non-profit "cost reimbursable" basis, receiving $96,000 last July, August and September.

Then, on Oct. 1, CSF began training the volunteers under a new contract. It provides for payment of $1,000 per volunteer for a training course of six weeks and permits CSF to make a profit.

Since CSF is a non-profit corporation, this money could not be taken out of the organization as profit. It is available, however, for salaries, bonuses, and equipment purchases.

Hardeman estimates CSF has received about $220,000 under this new VISTA training contract, and under the contract it can be paid as much as $293,000 if it gets enough volunteers to train.

On at least one occasion CSF has awarded an employe a bonus from CSF funds, but it is impossible to tell if this is a usual practice. Hardeman allowed inspection of the "cost reimbursable" VISTA records but refused to allow inspection of accounts under the $1,000-per-trainee account.

CSF VISTA records under the current contract, he says, are private records not available to anyone outside the foundation. He allowed inspection of the other VISTA records only after five days' delay and after he and an aide went through them behind closed doors.

The available records show Hardeman was paying himself $15,000 a year under the VISTA training program and paying his wife—a former school teacher—$14,000 a year from the same program last fall.

Last week he said present salaries are "not more" than this but refused further comment on the subject. He also said he has not paid himself any consulting fees since an OEO bulletin came out last March forbidding this.

Another anti-poverty organization in the Hardeman complex has its roots in a grant awarded CSF last summer. This grant, for $626,410, was to finance work with migrant farm workers in Florida.

Since the migrant program would make use of the volunteers of the VISTA program after they were trained, the two programs appeared to fit together nicely. The contract was awarded in April and the program began in July.

A month later Hardeman asked the OEO to transfer the money to a new group, the Community Action Fund (CAF).

A more apt name would have been the "Hardeman Foundation" since it was composed entirely of Hardeman's employes and friends.

Hardeman was and is president. Jack Mansfield, a sometime $75-a-day consultant to OEO who works for Hardeman on the CSF payroll, is vice president.

Garrett, the Tampa attorney sometimes retained as a consultant to lecture VISTA volunteers on legal problems, is secretary-treasurer. Other trustees were Fran Sutcliff, who later became a $12,000 a year regional director for CAF, and Al Guskin, who received $15,000 a year as head of the migrant program until he and Hardeman became embroiled in heated disputes.

Later OEO policy forced Mrs. Sutcliff and Guskin to drop from the board, but Hardeman and Mansfield could remain since their salaries were paid from the CSF VISTA payroll. Neither Spivey nor his wife were made members of the new board.

Hardeman says CAF was formed because OEO director Sargent Shriver was opposed to "family" foundations such as CSF running anti-poverty programs.

Herbert J. Kramer, director of public affairs for OEO, denies that this is Shriver's policy.

According to correspondence furnished by the OEO, Hardeman requested the fund transfer from CSF in his capacity as vice president and deputy director. Spivey said he didn't request the transfer but was "told" about it.

The request from CAF to receive the CSF funds was made not by Hardeman, the CAF president, but by Garrett, acting as secretary treasurer.

Asked about the situation, Hardeman produced a letter he wrote Noel Klores, director of the OEO migrant and Indian division, saying Klores had suggested the switch.

Klores yesterday confirmed this, saying he felt a new organization would be "more representative" than a private foundation controlled by people who donated private funds.

He said Shriver had no policy against family foundations but said: "Private foundations are filled with all sorts of problems."

Klores also said he thought at least one member of the board was a migrant worker. The name he mentioned, Mrs. Myrtle Mae Walker, was not listed by Hardeman as a director last week and does not show up on the secretary of state's records of original directors.

Hardeman said he is busy expanding membership of the CAF board, and said three new members have been added within the past month. He listed these as Ray Houston, executive director of the Community Welfare Council; Jack Ross, assistant professor of sociology at the University of South Florida; and Ben Fraticelli, executive director of the Florida Christian Migrant Ministry.

But for nearly a year CAF was run entirely by Hardeman, Mansfield and Garrett.

Last month a new group, Migrant Legal Services, was formed to handle a $806,000 U.S. grant to provide legal help to migrants. Original officers were Garrett, president; Hardeman, vice president; and Mansfield, secretary-treasurer.

Since then the board has been expanded, with Garrett moving up to chairman of the board, Mansfield to president, and Hardeman becoming a regular board member.

Tabulation of grants, contracts to date in CAF–CFS operation

		1965–66	1966–67
Community action fund migrant program		$626,410.00	$610,708
Community action fund migrant legal services			806,099
Community action fund migrant VISTA conference		4,900.38	
Community service foundation VISTA training		[1] 316,635.50	(2)
Costs incurred in VISTA training through:			
July 27, 1965	$27,336.23		
July 28 to Aug. 24	15,919.55		
Aug. 25 to Sept. 30	36,320.31		
Oct. 1 to 24	17,069.41		
Total	96,635.50	947,945.88	1,416,807
Grand total		2,364,752.88	

[1] Estimated total, since records beyond Oct. 24, 1965 not open to inspection. Estimate made on basis of statements by Director Thomas P. Hardeman that some $220,000 beyond the $96,635.50 has been paid under the present fixed-fee contract of $1,000 per trainee. Training cycle for each volunteer is 6 weeks.

[2] Contracts not yet negotiated for this period.

REPORT ON TRIP TO SOUTHEAST ASIA BY SOME MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the approval of President Johnson and with your approval, the following Members of Congress journeyed to the Southeast Asia area to investigate the U.S. military, economic, and political commitments:

Representative JOHN M. MURPHY, Democrat, of New York.

Representative JOHN J. GILLIGAN, Democrat, of Ohio.

Representative TENO RONCALIO, Democrat, of Wyoming.

Representative THOMAS C. MCGRATH, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California.

Representative WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine.

Representative EDWARD J. GURNEY, Republican, of Florida.

Representative TIM L. CARTER, Republican, of Kentucky.

Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois.

Representative BASIL L. WHITENER, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Representative GALE SCHISLER, Democrat, of Illinois.

Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Democrat, of Oregon.

Representative HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON, Republican, of Illinois.

The Members represented virtually every section of our country, both political parties, and are decorated combat veterans of World War II and the Korean war. We departed Washington, D.C., on Saturday, July 2, and returned late last night, Monday, July 11; upon our return we went directly to the White House and reported to the President and to the Speaker of the House in the Cabinet Room. The U.S. Air Force provided our transportation and coordinated our itineraries at the different countries we visited. At this time I would like to express our appreciation for the very efficient and professional assistance rendered by Maj. Gen. Lawrence S. Lightner, U.S. Air Force, and Col. John M. Chapman, U.S. Air Force, throughout the entire tour.

Prior to our departure during the week June 27–July 2 we were briefed at separate times by the Defense Department, the State Department, and by our AID officials in Washington. We departed Andrews Air Force Base at 6 p.m. on Saturday, July 2, and arrived at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, shortly after midnight. We met with the acting commander in chief of our Pacific Forces, Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force—Admiral Sharp was in the Eastern Pacific at the time—Gen. John K. Waters, commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific; Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., commander in chief, U.S. Air Force, Pacific; and Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander in chief, U.S. Navy, Pacific, and their respective staffs. These senior U.S. commanders conferred with us for about 4 hours describing in detail the constitution, disposition, mission, and operations of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific.

The emphasis was placed on southeast Asia and concentrated on the activities in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. The interrelationship of all of these countries was stressed politically as they related to terrain, culture, and the political and economic factors. It was clearly pointed out at this conference that the control and direction of subversive forces acting not only in South Vietnam but in Laos and Thailand as well were centered in Hanoi.

There were no illusions that the South Vietnamese or the Laotians or their guerrilla activities were independent nationalist movements. It is clear that the subversion of this entire area is the working of the Communist-controlled government at Hanoi. After these briefings we toured the Pearl Harbor naval and port complex, and departed early on July 4 for Clark Air Force Base in the Philippine Islands.

At Clark we were met by Lt. Gen. James W. Wilson, commander of the 13th Air Force. After a tour of our supply and logistical areas, as well as the Air Force Material and Tactical Aircraft, we went to the Clark Air Force Base Hospital, which is the air evacuation hospital for all of our Asian forces.

This hospital is one of the most complete medical complexes I have ever inspected. Col. William Hernquist, a most qualified surgeon and administrator, personally conducted us through the operating and recovery areas and described in detail the operations of his air evacuation and treatment facilities. The ability to move a wounded soldier from the battlefield to this hospital in 5 hours was clearly an indicator of the top efficiency of our battlefront and medical concepts of today. In effect, instead of trying to bring the hospital to the front lines, we bring the frontline wounded to the hospital in a matter of hours. Never in our history have we provided such complete medical care and treatment to our soldiers. The attitude and morale of the men at Clark made me proud of our American fighting men.

Without exception, the men I spoke with were fully confident of our inevitable victory in Vietnam and more important, they were fully aware of the reason for fighting in this faraway country.

We departed Clark at about 6 p.m. and headed for Tan Son Nhut Airbase in Saigon and arrived on Tuesday evening, July 5. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge met us at the airport and welcomed us to South Vietnam. We had a very short Fourth of July having crossed the international date line shortly after we departed Hawaii.

Early Wednesday morning we met with Ambassador Lodge at the American Embassy and received a comprehensive detailed analysis of the situation from the Ambassador. He pointed out that we were beginning to achieve a military victory but that in this era of "modern" war, a total victory would have to be accompanied by an economic and political victory as well. The Ambassador stressed that the Ky regime had been the longest continuous government in the country since the Diem era. Ky was now in his second year as Premier and had stabilized the Vietnam Government.

The Vietnam Government with the advice and the assistance of the allied forces had instituted social, economic, political, and administrative reforms throughout the entire country.

Under the revolutionary development program, it was evident that the people were making impressive strides toward complete stability. Facts related by the Ambassador left no doubt as to the Hanoi direction and conduct of the main force Vietcong units and North Vietnamese units in the country. The South Vietnamese never were the least bit attracted to communism and have been resisting this aggression for 20 years.

According to the Ambassador's estimates the Vietcong have about 24 percent of the population under their domination while the Republic of Vietnam Government has secured about 54 percent of the population. Living in a sort of twilight zone are 22 percent of the South Vietnamese people. A cursory examination of Vietcong tactics reveals that more than 10,000 Vietnam civilians have been killed by the Vietcong in their wholesale terrorist tactics to intimidate the country into submission.

In May of 1966, the lives of 115 officials were added to this list, many of them schoolteachers and hamlet leaders who were valiantly trying to educate and lead their people in a democratic life. The fourth dimension of this war was clearly portrayed by the Ambassador when he remarked that we are not only fighting a war, but we are trying to build a people's confidence in themselves and to win an economic struggle as well.

> Our Army can catch the whales—

He said—

> but the terror fish requires a finer mesh to our net of tactics.

Proceeding to the political situation, the Ambassador stated, and later in the day Premier Ky confirmed, the intention of the Vietnam Government to have the September 11 elections to the constitutional convention. This election will be the second in Vietnam history and once the convention draws its constitution, the people will then have the opportunity of participating in the democratic way of life. It must be stated, however, that the Army in South Vietnam has been the nationbuilder in a land which was dedicated to people in a small family concept instead of a nation as we know it. The Buddhist Institute headed by Thich Tam Chow has agreed that their election law is a good election law and this action confirms the fact that the much publicized Buddhist uprising and demonstration represented only a small minority of Buddhist thought. Although there have been demonstrations against the government by different factions, at no time has any of these factions evidenced a pro-Communist line of philosophy. Further at no time has any minor or significant political figure or leader in South Vietnam defected to the Communist side.

Ambassador Porter charged with the economic development of Vietnam described his efforts in working with the Government of South Vietnam.

> At all times the junta shows cohesion and willingness to take advice from the U.S. to work in three areas simultaneously, namely to run the war against the Vietcong, to restructure the country, and to institute an electoral system.

He stated that more and more people are feeling that their Government is worthwhile and not just a tax collector. The pacification program which is now operating in areas already swept by the Army consists of political action teams which go into the hamlets and villages to create peoples action elements to structure and stabilize the local governments. This ambitious program envisions 25,000 men per year in 59-man teams per hamlet going to 40,000 men per year in 1967 with the express mission of restoring economic and political life to areas formerly terrorized by the Vietcong.

Charles Mann, the U.S. AID Director, described in detail the assistance rendered to the South Vietnam Government. This program is the most complex ever undertaken by the United States. This year alone, this amounts to $650 million—part of a total of $2½ billion since 1955. The 842 Americans in this AID program are dedicated to working with the Royal Vietnam Government on activities to support and strengthen their Government and to reestablish the fiber and fabric of government.

These activities are in the fields of police, public works, with the emphasis on port development, road construction, rural electrification, city powerplants, and provincial electrification. In field operations over 2,800 projects have been undertaken on the local level. In the field of public health the total of 1,000 indigenous medical doctors which must serve a population of 16 million people are augmented by 33 medical health teams in the country at present with 20 of these teams being U.S. military personnel. The Republic of China Government has sent medical teams to help. This area of public health needs greater emphasis.

Preventive health with a program to conquer malaria and other diseases as well as the communicable disease problem are also being attacked by medical teams. This is part of a worldwide medical assistance program titled "Project Vietnam."

Refugee coordination is most vital to insure proper disposition of 1 million refugees in the last year alone. One-half million are still in temporary shelters. Fifteen international voluntary agencies are helping this refugee program. The International Red Cross as well as West Germany and New Zealand are participating in this program to aid the 40,000 to 50,000 new refugees per month.

The agriculture program is aided by a 200-man American staff. Key problems they are solving are the land reform programs to insure land tenure contracts, proper land and crop pricing, and farmer services to foster cooperative developments and farm credits.

The police program has 5,000 men currently in training. The very simple operation of maintaining checkpoints to apprehend smugglers, Vietcong infiltration, and other subversives will be expanded.

Education is of course basic to the development of this country as pointed out earlier, teachers are a target of the Vietcong terrorist activities but nonetheless the hamlet school program has seen 6,000 classrooms completed with 2,000 having been constructed through a self-help program. Seven million textbooks have been printed and 14 million are programed by 1968. These texts were written by Vietnamese teachers. Secondary school education is being emphasized and teacher training is a necessary part of their program. Over 5,000 have been trained to participate. In the vocational education field, 20 rural trade schools have been programed with 7 already completed. Five technical institutions to teach 1,000 students are completed.

On Wednesday afternoon, Gen. William C. Westmoreland conducted a detailed briefing on the mission and operation of MACV—Military Assistance Command Vietnam. Our participating allies under his command are the Republic of Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Republic of China, Republic of the Philippines, and Thailand.

General Westmoreland traced the escalation of the war by the North Vietnamese. In 1961 they used battalion strength organizations. By 1963, six regiments of Vietcong were identified in the field. By 1965, 14 Vietcong regiments and 9 North Vietnam Army regiments were identified. Today 13 Vietcong and 14 North Vietnam Army regiments, coordinated by 5 division headquarters are operating against the South Vietnam Government and Allied forces.

The effects of allied military operations against the Vietcong and North Vietnam Armies was a source of pride to everyone. The cumulative effects of U.S. Air Force, naval carrier-based aircraft, B–52 bomber units, naval gunfire, and the U.S. combined Army operation in the field, completely reversed the course of the war.

The problem of winning the peace must, however, be carried on simultaneously. The Vietcong terrorists are operating in the 43 Provinces, 235 districts, 2,558 villages, and 13,211 hamlets of this country. To drive this subversive terrorist organization out of this grassroot area is going to take a long time and very strong effective action by the Republic of Vietnam Government. The answer is the revolutionary development program which I referred to earlier.

On Wednesday I departed Tan Son Nhut Airfield—the main airport at Saigon—which is busier than Washington National and Kennedy Airports combined, and flew to Cam Ranh Bay about 250 miles north of Saigon where the second largest port is located. We have enlarged the unloading capacity here from about 1,000 short tons daily to 8,000 short tons daily. We have also established a bulk oil terminal. The logistical problems appear to be solved although there is a wait for some dry cargo ships in unloading. Much lighterage is used for discharging ocean vessels, unloading in some cases is done on a selective basis. This port will be a $300 million facility when completed and will be a big asset to the economy of the country when the war is over.

In the bay were two power ships for electricity, an ammo storage ship, aircraft ordnance maintenance ship. Four dry cargo ships were being unloaded and four were waiting for berths. All in all this is a very huge but efficient port operation. The Cam Ranh Bay Airfield is an example of an "instant airfield"; 90 F–4 fighters and 90 large cargo transporters move in and out daily.

The runway is aluminum and they have the usual aviation facilities. Combat sorties were taking off and landing every few minutes. Pilots fly about 200 missions during their 11-month tour. They usually operate in the same area and consequently are experts on the terrain.

We flew to Que Nhon in an Army Caribou aircraft, a two-engine small cargo type, and visited the ROK Capital Division. We received an honor guard which was the best I have ever seen. The South Koreans are really a model unit. They have adapted to the country completely and have formed a personal bond with the South Vietnamese. They have been most effective in combat operations.

Twenty-four thousand troops are in Vietnam now and by November 1 they will add another division which will bring their force to 48,000-plus. They have been very effective in civil action programs. Many of their soldiers are farm boys and have greatly assisted the Vietnamese in improving productivity.

We flew to An Khe in the interior, to the 1st Cavalry Division. This is our air mobile assault division. We observed several air strikes which were in process along our route of travel. This division actually has units in combat over a 300-mile area and can still support itself because of its great mobility. The "Air Cav" were experiencing difficulty in trying to make contact with the Vietcong.

The Vietcong seemed reluctant to close with U.S. units and more interested in attacking Republic of Vietnam Army units.

From here we flew to the 1st Brigade of the 101st Airborne Division at Dakto, about 18 miles from the Cambodian border. This was the unit which was involved in the heavy action during which Capt. William Carpenter had called the air strikes in on top of his unit. Carpenter described this action as necessary because the Vietcong were 15 yards from his men hidden in the bamboo undergrowth. The 101st are astride a main infiltration route and consequently in action all the time. The area is inhabited by the Montagnard—mountain people. A very primitive people, the men were in loin cloths and the women are bare breasted. Obviously, the coastal areas are rich and the target of the Communist action. We returned to Saigon via the Pleiku Airfield, about a 400-mile trip. The strongest impression of the day was our base development and use of air and mobility of our units, These three dimensions of the war are going well. The fourth we are obviously going to have to concentrate on, and that is to restore confidence in the minds of the Vietnamese people—confidence in themselves and their Government.

Every day this is proceeding effectively and it is evidenced by more schools under construction, more commerce on the roads, and more importantly by defectors from the other side.

On Thursday we departed Tan Son Nhut Airbase. We boarded a Navy two-engine eight-seat plane, a C–1A "Trader" and headed for the U.S. Aircraft carrier *Intrepid* which is on duty in the South China Sea. The landing was a real thrill. We came in with the carrier doing about 30 knots, the tail hook caught the first arresting cable and we were stopped in about 100 feet. Capt. Vince Macri, the captain, briefed us as to his mission and then we proceeded to inspect this 23-year-old veteran of World War II, Pacific action. This carrier incidentally was the last one to be refitted at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The *Intrepid* has 32 A-4 jet fighter aircraft and 24 A–1 propeller fighter, dive-bomber-type aircraft. She launches and receives back 10 planes every hour. The launch is by steam catapult and one plane goes off every 30 seconds. I spoke with the returning pilots in the readyroom and they told me that their armament of rockets, machineguns, napalm, and 500 to 2,000 pound bombs are very effective against the Vietcong units. Pilots know the terrain intimately and they felt they were effectively supporting the ground combat elements.

The *Intrepid* launches 90 strikes per day, about the same as the 12th Fighter Wing at Cam Ranh Bay airfield that I described earlier. The carrier is in every respect a floating, mobile, airbase. We flew from the *Intrepid* to our II F FORCEV Headquarters at Long Binh and were briefed by Maj. Gen. Jonathan O. Seaman, the commander. He commands the southern U.S. Forces which includes the Saigon area and runs to the Cambodian border.

He has Vietnamese as well as United States, Australian, and New Zealand forces under his command. He is very confident of our efforts and showed graphically on his situation maps the definite turn to our side that the war has taken. We traveled to the III Corps Headquarters of the Royal Vietnamese Army and were briefed by the deputy commander, General Tinch, and then visited the 25th Royal Vietnamese Division. The Viet soldier impressed me with his toughness and firm purpose.

They have been fighting for 20 years and want to end this war as quickly as possible. They showed some very revealing tonnages of rice and other supplies captured from the Vietcong. They now control the rice-producing areas and it is obvious that the Vietcong are hard pressed in the productive areas of the country.

Traveling by helicopter now, we went to Cu Chi, headquarters of the U.S. 25th Infantry Division—a real operation, Maj. Gen. Fred Weyand, commander. His base camp is right on top of the town that was the main Vietcong headquarters. It took a tough fight to drive the Vietcong away, but he now controls and secures the entire north flank of the Saigon corridor.

Using B–52 strikes, armored artillery, and our vastly superior firepower, the Vietcong is forced to break contact when they engage U.S. forces. The problem, as usual in this area, is to restore confidence to the local village and hamlet people. Confidence in United States and the Republic of Vietnamese Armies to report the Vietcong terrorists in the villages so that action can be brought to bear against the terrorists. This is being done on an increasing basis.

On Saturday we traveled by Army Caribou aircraft to the 5th Special Forces Group Detachment at Phuoc Long Province. A very fertile valley due to the Song Be River which flows through the Province. The special forces work closely with the provincial police and the revolutionary force units to pacify the area of 68,000 population.

About one-half are under control of the Vietcong. No production has been forthcoming from a large rubber plantation in the Province. The provincial chief hopes to resume production in the near future. That afternoon we went to the 1st Logistical Command installation in Saigon and toured the port, pier, warehouse, and distribution facilities with Maj. Gen. Charles W. Eifler.

The port congestion of Saigon has been relieved both here and at Cam Ranh Bay. A port authority under the contract of the Vietnamese Army will coordinate all logistical movements both civilian and military in the near future. It was evident that our logistical base has been carefully and soundly completed and is efficiently supplying the needs of our military and economic operation. For example, of 97,296 items on requisition for 7 days, 83,539 had been filled; 95 percent of aircraft requisitions were filled.

We departed Vietnam and arrived in Dong Muang Airbase, Bangkok at 6 p.m. on Saturday night and were met by Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, commander, of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Thailand. We proceeded to the U.S. Embassy and were briefed by the Chargé d'Affaires and General Stilwell. The U.S. concern for the development of Thailand can be readily understood by analyzing the past development at Sattahip which in effect is the creation of a new port city to meet the increased economic development of this entire country of 31 million people. New highways, railroads, pipelines, and airfields are proceeding with increased American emphasis. There is a real threat in the northeastern areas of this country along the Laotian and Cambodian frontiers. Hanoi-trained terrorists are employing the same terror tactics of ruthless murder and intimidation of town people as in Vietnam. The Thai Government is meeting this threat with American assistance and advice.

We departed Bangkok Sunday afternoon for Taipei on Taiwan arriving at 7 p.m. We met with Ambassador Walter P. McConaughy and Vice Adm. William E. Gentner on Monday morning and were briefed on the military, economic, and political situations. Our AID program has been such a success here that we are phasing out our program and the Formosans will be completely on their own. The threat of Red China is always present. Numerous clashes at sea and in the air occur in the straits between the mainland and Formosa. At 10 a.m. we met with the Vice President, C. K. Yen and then had an hour conference with President Chiang Kai-shek.

Chiang Kai-shek expressed his admiration for the U.S. role in southeast Asia, stating we were there in the nick of time. He felt that a negotiation would have to take place in Vietnam before any powers would withdraw their armies. He further stated that the problems on the mainland would prevent any Chinese involvement at this time. His country is a model for the free enterprise system in Asia. Booming industry, agriculture, and educational systems were evident from observing the people on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I support President Johnson's policy in Vietnam and commend him for his continuance of the policy supported and enunciated by our last five Presidents. That we as a nation will honor our international agreements and that we will fight if necessary to prevent the totalitarian aggressors from overcoming our allies. The President has committed and I support his commitment of American troops in Vietnam on the frontier of freedom.

The American people should fully understand that we here in the citadel of freedom are secure only as long as the frontier of freedom is protected. Every patriotic American has an obligation to support our commitment and the voices of doom should be hushed lest they give aid and comfort to an enemy that may otherwise misgage our national purpose.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his splendid report on Vietnam. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him and the other Members who just returned from Vietnam on their factfinding tour.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], was one of the most outstanding soldiers ever to serve his country. He won a distinguished service cross in Korea among other decorations. He is now demonstrating as a Member of Congress a capacity to prove equally valuable to his country as a statesman. It is a rare combination for a man to be both an outstanding soldier and an outstanding statesman but these qualities JOHN MURPHY possesses.

I would like to compliment too my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman MCGRATH, who went to Vietnam, for his excellent service to our country. A graduate of Annapolis fully trained on the ways of war but who has dedicated himself to the search for peace and the security of our country.

To all the Members of this Vietnam study mission, Mr. Speaker, please allow me to extend my admiration and gratitude for a job well down.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] in this report on our visit to Vietnam and to the Far East.

I have not had an opportunity to prepare a detailed and formal report, but will do so within the next few days and I hope to bring to the attention of the Members of the House some of my views.

Mr. Speaker, were were gratified that we were given an opportunity by the President and the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives to make this important mission, which we feel has great significance for the Congress as well as for the people of the country.

As the gentleman from New York has said, while we must be cautious in our optimism, we have every reason to be proud of the efforts that are being made in Vietnam. We have many indicia of the progress that has been made as we look about that country. One of the indicia is the information which was given to us with reference to the defections under the Chu Hoy or open arms program that is now in effect in Vietnam.

In the entire year of 1965, we were told that there were only 11,124 Vietcong defectors whereas through June of this year 9,200 such defectors have shown up on our side.

May I say also, as the gentleman has said, every American should be proud of the young men we have sent to Vietnam for the courageous and patriotic attitude that they have.

Those of us who visited with the marines in the northern part of Vietnam and we were told when we visited with General Westmoreland in Saigon and with Ambassador Lodge and when we visited the II Corps area and visited with General Larsen—wherever we went, whether we talked to Marine, Navy, or Army commanders, we were told that never in their experience, either World War II or in the Korean war, had they seen America's young men perform with such zeal and devotion to duty as they had experienced in this military conflict.

I would like to quote briefly several statements that were made to us by General Larsen who has command of the U.S. forces in the II Corps area of Vietnam.

One of the things he said was this:

> Every month things look a little bit better.

Then with reference to the criticism that some have made with reference to the alleged shortage of ammunition, General Larsen had this to say and I quote:

> We have never been short of any type of ammunition at any time we needed it.

Then, in discussing the situation of our acquisition of intelligence data, General Larsen said:

> Vietnamese civilians are now making much valuable information available to our side.

This, as the gentleman from New York knows, is another indicia of the effectiveness of our effort.

Then I thought it was significant that General Larsen had this to say:

> I think President Johnson has fought the smartest war, psychologically and militarily, of any war that we have engaged in during my lifetime.

So when we hear this criticism from the beatniks and the peaceniks and, if you please, the so-called doves, I think that it is unfortunate that they cannot have the experience which the gentleman from New York and the other 12 who joined us on this mission have had in seeing firsthand what is happening. As I have thought about the matter from a firsthand look, I think we do have a very serious problem. Assuming that we could accomplish a total military victory today, I am afraid that we would not have gained much unless we had time to proceed with the civil action program which will mean so much in the preservation of this country, its freedom and its independence in the future, with the orientation of the Vietnamese mind toward the village and the province, and not toward the nation, which is a serious problem. I would urge the U.S. Information Agency and other bodies to give attention to some unsophisticated approaches to those problems.

I think, too, that we cannot delude the people of our own country by thinking that this is purely a military action. The people of that area have, I believe, a great potential if we cooperate with them in technological and particularly agricultural training programs.

So, while I do not want to transgress upon the gentleman's time unduly, I do think that this mission of which we were a part, having had the opportunity not only to talk to people, but to see our troops in combat, and actually almost to be a part of it, gave us a picture which we would hope in some way we could convey to more of our people, because America is not willing to turn down any people who are craving for freedom. I know that if the people had the facts, they would feel as the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Wyoming, the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Illinois, and the others of us felt—that we have an opportunity in Vietnam, not only to restore freedom to that country, but also to preserve freedom in all of southeast Asia and, in doing so, to strengthen freedom here at home.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I look forward to having an opportunity to develop some of my thoughts more fully after a few days.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I would like to point out at this time that in 1941, when the gentleman was a member of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, he resigned his seat so that he could enter the service of our country. During that critical period in World War II he became a gunnery officer, and finished the war as a lieutenant in the Navy. Having served overseas in the defense of our country, he is the voice of experience when he speaks about our armed services.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from North Carolina in thanking the President and the Speaker of this House for making it possible for 14 of us to make this trip to Vietnam and to see firsthand the situation there.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] who served as the chairman of this House task force. He certainly handled himself very well throughout the trip. It was a great pleasure to travel with him. He conveyed the wishes of this House to our troops and to the various leaders in a manner that would make every Member of this House proud that he is a Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very helpful, instructive, and informative trip. The Members of the House had the opportunity to see firsthand the deployment of U.S. troops and of South Vietnam troops, the deployment of the Australian troops and the New Zealand troops, totaling 1 million men.

It is quite obvious the question is no longer whether we are going to win the war; the question rather is, How soon can we win the war?

The gentleman in the well has quite properly stated that we view the progress with caution but with optimism. My own judgment, in watching the deployment of these troops, is that the enemy has been so thoroughly pinned down by our own troops and our allies that we have reason to believe the Communists are indeed ripe for a massive knockout blow.

I believe history will show that President Johnson's decision last year to slug it out with the Communists in Vietnam, rather than to abandon this very rich and important territory to the Communists, will constitute the turning point in our 20-year struggle with the Red menace. President Johnson's decision to bomb the oil depots in Hanoi and Haiphong last week was acclaimed very loudly by our troops as certainly a sign that we are moving in the direction of total victory in Vietnam.

It is my hope that these bombings are going to continue. It is my hope that there will be other targets of a military nature that will be bombed. It is my hope that Hanoi is going to realize the folly of continuing this war in Vietnam. It is my further hope that we are going to hit the powerplants in the area of Hanoi, to totally immobilze Hanoi as the great supply depot for the troops that are waging warfare against our own men and our allies in Vietnam.

It is quite obvious that the deployment that has been accomplished by our forces in the relatively short time is nothing short of spectacular. Our forces have denied the Communists all initiative in Vietnam. They have denied them mobility. It is indeed a source of great pride to all of us who were there to see the high degree of proficiency and efficiency with which our troops are engaging in their mission.

I am quite positive that if every American could have the opportunity we have had in viewing our troops in Vietnam, their hearts would swell with pride, as ours did, in watching our men meet the great challenge.

There is no question that the helicopter has seriously challenged the old axiom that one must never get one's self involved in a land war in Asia. This may have been true many years ago. Thank God, our Defense Department and our industries have developed the great team that has been able to meet the challenge in Asia. Otherwise this great territory would have fallen to the Communists. With the aid of the helicopters, we are making every part of Vietnam inaccessible to the enemy.

It is my judgment, from speaking to the PW's and those who have questioned the prisoners of war, that the prisoners of war are reporting their morale has never been lower. The supply of food is short. The supply of medicine is literally nonexistent. The problems of ammunition are certainly slowing down their activities.

I think the other war is equally important. I was very happy to hear the gentleman from New York mention the peace program there. Too often the daily headlines we see in the press tell us only about the military aspect of the great challenge that we have accepted in Vietnam.

In fact, a great portion of our forces is being deployed in the pacification program, to secure the hundreds of villages from the Vietcong terrorism and subversion. Through this pacification program, developed by our Armed Forces, we are able to restore local governments and to make it possible for Vietnam to be ready for self-government. In my judgment, this pacification program holds the key to our long-range success in Vietnam.

I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend our medical forces in Vietnam. It is a source of great hope, of great courage, and of great consolation to all of us to know that such teamwork has been developed among the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, the Marines, and the Coast Guard that we are able today to move a wounded soldier from the field of battle to a major hospital installation where he can get major medical attention in less time than it took during World War II to move a soldier from the place where he was wounded to a field hospital, for limited care, in an ambulance. Our casualty rate has been kept down because the medics have been doing a truly outstanding job of giving excellent and quick help to our soldiers.

Also, we ought to commend those gallant civilians who work in the Agency for International Development. They are as much soldiers as the boys who are carrying guns. These men in Vietnam are bringing new dimensions of hope to the people of Vietnam and giving new meaning to America's presence there.

We were very much impressed by our interview with General Ky, who assured us that the elections are coming off on September 11, and who assured us that he sees no difficulty in transferring the reins of government from a military government to a civilian government. More important, I place great credence and great hope in his statement that he hopes that within 6 months after the constitutional assembly has been elected on September 11 the people of Vietnam not only will have a constitution but also will have an elected constitutionally formed government, which will take over the reins of government in that country.

These are all things which point to a hopeful picture.

I join my colleagues in cautioning against too much optimism. Certainly it has been a long struggle. The fact remains that we are today unequivocally winning this war. Our forces have taken the initiative. We have denied the enemy all mobility and all initiative.

It may be that more troops will be needed in Vietnam. It may be that more bombings will be needed in Vietnam. President Johnson has properly stated that he intends to give General Westmoreland all he needs.

General Westmoreland will go down in history as one of the great generals of our Armed Forces. The President is ready to give to General Westmoreland whatever he needs to assure total victory.

For those whom I have heard question whether we have a plan for victory in Vietnam, I would recommend a visit to Vietnam. When they see the spirit of our American soldiers and when they see the deployment of our American troops and when they see the great teamwork, they will understand. There is only one goal, and that goal is victory for freedom.

I say there is a great tide of freedom sweeping through southeast Asia, in Vietnam, and the victory we are going to have in Vietnam is going to pace that tide of freedom.

I have every reason to believe that when victory is ours in Vietnam we shall have demonstrated to the enemy that big wars are too costly and small wars are too costly and indeed we can look forward to an era of prolonged peace in this world.

To that goal, I congratulate the men and women who are doing such an excellent job in Vietnam.

I am proud to have been a member of the delegation headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. This has been one of the greatest experiences of my life. Certainly I can appreciate the great effort today more than ever before. I congratulate the gentleman for his initiative and the effort in putting together this task force to visit Vietnam.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

I should like to point out to the House that the gentleman enlisted in World War II as a private and rose to the rank of captain. He also was selected to lead a B-29 bombing raid in one of the first raids over Tokyo, Japan. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and many air medals in that war. Because of his past career and experience, he made a great contribution to the conduct and understanding of the air war by the other members of the committee.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, much as we are aware that a 10-day stay in South Vietnam is hardly time to permit a candid appraisal of many of the key issues, it is nevertheless sufficient time to acquaint one with some of the difficult problems in this involvement.

First off I want to pay my respects, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who has the time for this special order and who was kind enough to yield some of his time to me for this partial report. I believe Mr. MURPHY was an excellent chairman of our delegation and was most gracious in sharing his time with all members of the group. We were at all times free to ask questions of Ambassador Lodge, General Westmoreland, and General Ky. Mr. MURPHY was gracious in his tribute to our leaders and to General Chal of the Republic of Korea. Of course, I was particularly proud and pleased to be a member of his committee, and I am proud to take the floor now to pay tribute to my colleague on the way he handled this delegation. I am also grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the President for having been included in this delegation.

I am pleased to have been able to report to the President last night at the White House on the results of our trip.

Many critics of the administration had questions often raised on particular matters. I am convinced a beginning toward an honest answer to these questions was made during the trip. If permissible by the gentleman from New York, I should like to take about 5 minutes to cover these questions and to indicate my answers to them.

Most critics of the administration limit General Ky's support to the military, merchants, and upper class, and ask "What is the U.S. interest in South Vietnam?"

At the present time, whether or not a majority of the citizens of South Vietnam would vote for a continuation of the Ky administration is begging a far more important question. There is no question at the present time but that a vast majority of the citizens of South Vietnam desire peace first and foremost. It is in the pursuit of this peace that General Ky's administration is doing the most commendable job. Therefore, I believe it follows, Mr. Speaker, most of the people of South Vietnam who are concerned with peace appreciate the fact that his leadership is making it all the more possible and all the more soon. He has every belief that there will be widespread participation in the September 11 election. Our talks with him, as well as was possible in our short time, convinced me, in any event, that General Ky established a framework of government upon which we can rely once peace is obtained. Peace must come first and then will come the planning, which will justify one particular administration's election as against another and the adoption of a democratic society by the free people of South Vietnam.

There are many disturbing factors, to be sure. I was disturbed to find French absentee landlords still owning rubber plantations in South Vietnam. A tax or levy is paid to Communists and the French managers still run the plantations.

What is the relationship between labor and the Government in South Vietnam? We do not know, but we know if this modus operandi permits the preservation of these plantations and trees until such time as peace can be restored, we presume there will be a reason to justify these arrangements at the present time.

Question No. 2 which was most frequently asked by our critics is, "How free will these elections be?"

We believe there is little question but what they will be open to all people except the very hard core Vietcong and those neutralists dedicated to insurgency. It is hoped that all groups of all religious denominations will participate in South Vietnam's election of a constituent assembly. If they do not, it will be of their own free will and not because of any coercion by the Government. The exclusion of dedicated Communists in an election in a free country was provided in Greece and other countries that had large Communist groups, and there is no reason why it should not prove as successful in bringing stability in Vietnam.

Question No. 3 is "What is the attitude encountered outside of the cities toward Ky in the war?" We were not long in getting an answer to this question. I believe the answer is to be found in the answer to question No. 1 above.

Question No. 4 is "What is the attitude of the Buddhists and the students?" It seems a few militant Buddhists hoped to be able to establish a theocracy, and in any event it is certain they sought to bring about a downfall of the Government. Having overplayed their hand and come to the inevitable result of any group who would take such means in time of war, it is doubtful if they will again attempt similar strategy, at least not against the same administration.

Fifth. "Do one-third of all U.S. supplies go to the black market?"

As in all military engagements at all times, a far too large percentage of supplies do find their way to the black market. What can be done about this is an extremely complicated and difficult matter; we must keep constant vigilance in the hope that the problem can be attacked, the harms remedied, and corrections placed into effect.

Sixth. "How effective and how widespread is nonmilitary aid?"

Perhaps more effective and more widespread than anyone really knows in America. If there has been a failure to give credit where credit is due, it is in the tremendous work of pacification and in the civil action programs now undertaken by the South Vietnamese Government and more and more by the military troops of the United States. Much will be said on this particular program, and it is hoped that much more will be done in this tremendous field of assistance in every facet of South Vietnamese life. Political action teams are at work now in the villages and hamlets in a part of their own revolutionary development. These teams are made up predominantly of South Vietnamese trained also by cadres of South Vietnam in cooperation with our own Government officials. Terrorism is being abated, and much stability is being brought to the country.

There must also be concurrent with the waging of this war the teaching of political structures, establishments of political stability, and the constructing of physical assets that are being ravaged by the enemy.

The training of civil police also continues.

Building of public works, railroads, airports, airways, ports, and waterways continues a vital part of our program there. Public health and medical facilities need more attention and are in need of immediate and marked improvement.

Seventh. "What is being done for refugees from bombing and battle areas?"

There is admittedly a crowded condition in the hospitals near those areas that have suffered war damage. This is not without full attention of all officials, however, and we do believe improvements in this regard will be made as fast as is possible.

Eighth. "How deep is the anti-American feeling?"

The burning and ransacking of U.S. consulates is undeniable proof of anti-Americanism particularly by the militant Buddhist groups in Saigon and the northern Provinces. The superficial conclusion is that anti-Americanism prevails in all South Vietnam, but, Mr. Speaker, the problem appeared much more complicated. Time, the place and circumstances should be considered.

As for the time factor, this is war and there is no need to explain that anti-Americanism is one aspect of this war which we will have to deal with. Other factors in this war include the internal politics and unfortunately matters of religion in South Vietnam. When politics and religion are involved in a war in a country which still claims freedom as the only reason for its existence, there are those who raise anti-Americanism in order to gain popular support for their private cause. We also found, Mr. Speaker, that in South Vietnam, it is easy for the "anti" group to cry "Americans go home" and to find ready publicity channels available; but it is not easy for the "pros" to shout "Americans please stay" and find headlines available to their expressions.

Concerning the place factor, we Americans are exposed to a people still reeling from a hundred years of French misrule and abuse and a good bit of what may be interpreted as anti-Americanism now is nothing more than the understandable resentment of foreigners in their midst, particularly of some whose marauding complexes far overshadowed any desire to share the bounties of Asian life with whose sweat made them possible.

About circumstances, it is a known fact that a few anti-American slogans on banners carried by children in a square in Saigon may be read by millions of Americans on TV screens. But repeated expressions of gratitude to allied troops may not even come to the attention of official U.S. circles. Anti-American is a catch phrase and is ready made for use in Vietnam. It is, however, a matter which begs definitions. The problem will remain involved because none of the South Vietnamese leaders wish to waste time to define words at this juncture. We firmly believe that both the American officials and the people of South Vietnam are now determined that there is only one decision at the present time and it is to forget the words and to go ahead with defeating the Communists. The peoples of both nations, South Vietnam and America, realize that they have a common responsibility with all of the nations of the free world in this regard.

Ninth. "To what extent are the South Vietnamese people participating in this war?"

More and more the South Vietnamese people are being drawn into the struggle to preserve peace, in the pacification of South Vietnamese villages and in returning the nation to the processes of order. A recent expression of the Armed Forces Council to include all segments of South Vietnamese society is an encouraging step.

PERSPECTIVE ON VIETNAM

Thus, Mr. Speaker, are the answers to specific questions often raised. What follows touches on the "big picture"—our ultimate role as a result of these crucial days.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of valid ways to view the current conflict in

Vietnam but some are more valid than others. One point of view comes from the reporting of day-to-day events, a picture which is often distorted by dramatic happenings such as bombings, demonstrations, and attempted coups. Of course, these events are of great importance but they are often exaggerated and their significance can be transitory.

Instead of emphasizing the isolated events, a broader perspective can be gained by analyzing the war effort in its entirety. It seems clear that there is no longer a threat of military defeat for South Vietnam, as opposed to the situation about 18 months ago. The Vietcong still control large parts of the countryside but they are extremely weak in the cities. United States and South Vietnamese forces are winning most of the big battles and the Ky regime seems to have found a few sources of hidden strength.

THE NLF

The National Liberation Front tactic has been an abject failure. The North Vietnamese commanders established the front in an attempt to gain the support of those South Vietnamese who would not support an avowed Communist organization. It is an old Communist tactic to establish the allegedly non-Communist front, which in reality is controlled by the central Communist organization. But not one prominent South Vietnamese citizen has joined the National Liberation Front. Its top executives include an architect and a lawyer, both of whom are considered "mavericks" by their professional colleagues.

Another indication of solid support behind the Saigon government came from the 1965 provincial elections, where over half the eligible voters cast ballots, despite a Vietcong order for a boycott of the elections. The Vietcong have called for several general strikes in South Vietnamese cities but their suggestions have gone almost totally unheeded. It appears the September 11 elections will not be boycotted to any substantial degree.

Another way of looking at the war is from the viewpoint of the international political system. The Vietnam war has damaged our understanding with the Soviet Union and France, while complicating our policy toward NATO.

THE ASIAN VIEW

But perhaps the most important perspective on the war is from the viewpoint of long-term trends in Asia. From this stance, it is clear that the rising power of China must be kept within certain limits, by military means if there is no other alternative, but more preferably by the same diplomatic processes of containment and communication. These processes led to a profound modification of the world outlook of the Soviet Union. Undue conciliatory advances on our part may not be wise at the present time, since they might run the risk of being interpreted as a sign of weakness in Vietnam. But we can look forward to and prepare for the day when the Chinese will conduct their policies on a basis of pragmatism, rather than on blind faith in a revolutionary ideology, and will join the responsible community of nations, as the Russians appear to have done.

We must keep in mind that there is a dichotomy between what the Chinese seem to be saying and what they seem to be doing. This is partly due to the immense cultural gap separating Chinese leaders from the outside world. The Chinese idea of world guerrilla counter-encirclement may be a compensation for the actual isolation and military weakness of China.

When viewing the Vietnam conflict from an Asian perspective, it is clear that the region faces a problem which is a recurring one in international affairs. This is the problem of how to handle a rising power in the midst of a number of weaker states. The experiences with Germany and Japan should provide lessons on how not to handle the situation, while our approach to the Soviet Union seems to have been more successful. China has much in common with these other three states—her troublemaking, though motivated partly by defensive intentions, could still develop into a serious danger if wrongly handled, mainly because the philosophy behind it is so vague and opportunistic. According to W. A. C. Adie, in International Affairs, April 1966:

> This vagueness is a function of the fact that Mao has not yet properly conquered China nor organized it as a coherent modern state within definitive borders; he estimates that it may take one or more centuries to consolidate his revolution. In the meanwhile the old confusion between China as a way of life and as a territorial state remains; is Mao Caesar, Pope—or Messiah?

It is significant that the message of a contemporary Chinese dance-drama is that Mao is the savior of mankind, as well as of China.

Chinese nationalism is motivated by the same revolutionary ideology that once spurred the Soviet Union; its aim may be the same as that of the Japanese militarists who wanted to establish the hegemony of a single state over southeast Asia; it also has certain affinities with Hitler's nazism, arising from similar conditions. As Adie states:

> Both countries suffered from humiliating defeat and fragmentation of a patriarchal society; this created the need for a mass-nationalist "cement" to turn the "sheet of sand" Sun Yat-sen complained of into a rock. Both idealize mass hysteria and berserk fury. In both it is the march that is important rather than the direction.

There is much to indicate that the leaders of other Asian states also see Vietnam from this broader Asian perspective. Although, with the exceptions of Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, and Formosa, the Asian states have not openly professed support for our efforts in Vietnam, there have been reports that their leaders privately back our commitment there. They are glad that someone is fighting the Communist insurgency to keep it away from their borders.

THE PROTECTIVE SHIELD

In many ways, the U.S. effort in Vietnam is providing a shield behind which the rest of southeast Asia can develop. The war in Vietnam is providing a diversion which keeps China and North Vietnam occupied and prevents them from interfering freely with peaceful change in the rest of the area. As an editorial in the Honolulu Sunday Advertiser of July 3, 1966, put it:

> To only buy time can sometimes be worth the price.

BUYING TIME

There are indications that buying time in Vietnam has been worth the price in shielding Thailand. In Eastern World, May-June 1966, Simon Head reports that one consequence of the escalation in South Vietnam has been a reduction of Communist pressure on the other two areas in Indochina most vulnerable to Communist subversion—Laos and northeast Thailand. With the increasing involvement in South Vietnam, the Communists are unwilling to risk U.S. retaliation on a second front.

This explains why, in northeast Thailand, Communist strategy has not yet progressed beyond preliminary stages. There has been infiltration only in a few isolated areas, directed toward establishing "liberated zones" which can be used later as bases for operations on a larger scale.

These activities have prompted the Thai Government to embark upon a program of rural development. Rural poverty in the northeast is accounted for by the fact that most families make their living from growing rice in areas totally unsuited for its cultivation. Yields are low because of inadequate rainfall and poor soil. A farmer can rarely increase his income by producing a surplus—even when he does, it may not be worthwhile to send it to market due to the bad roads.

There is no landlord problem in the area—almost 90 percent of the land is owned by the farmers. The fact that the benefits of increased production do not have to be shared with a landlord increases the impact of the reforms and deprives the Communists of their most powerful propaganda weapon.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

There is enormous scope for agricultural development. Even on the unfavorable northeast soil, it is possible to treble the annual production of rice by the application of fertilizers and insecticides and the use of higher quality seeds. But the effect of these discoveries has been limited by inadequate supplies of seeds and fertilizers and a shortage of trained agronomists. Authorities have enough resources to operate effectively in only one or two chosen villages. In some of these, extension services have worked well and spectacular increases in production have been recorded.

According to Head:

> But the fact remains that the majority of villages are hardly affected and their continuing poverty will always be a source of potential strength to the Communists.

The area in northeast Thailand where the Communists have been most active has been chosen for its suitability as a base area because of its proximity to Ho Chi Minh trail. In some places, it is only 20 miles away. This reduces the problems of supplying and reinforcing a guerrilla organization.

This demonstrates further that the war in Vietnam must be seen from the broader Asian perspective. It is encouraging that our leaders take this view.

PRESIDENT'S VIEW SUSTAINED

In President Johnson's 1965 address at Johns Hopkins, he spoke these wise words:

> Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next.

This makes it clear that the value of our commitment in Vietnam must be assessed in conjunction with the overall situation in Asia. This determination shows that we must continue to pursue our present difficult task of diplomacy in southeast Asia which requires a mixture of containment without isolation, firmness with restraint, and tenacity with flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, given these guides, it is not too much to hope that within the foreseeable future we may see peace and stability in southeast Asia. If so, the peace of the world will have been secured for the time of our lives and quite possibly for the time of several generations to follow.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that at the beginning of World War II the gentleman from Wyoming enlisted in the U.S. Army. The gentleman served with the 1st Division for 3 years and participated in the invasion in north Africa, Sicily, and Europe. The gentleman was decorated many times and is the wearer of the Silver Star.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues from this House, I have just returned from an inspection tour of Vietnam. I went on this tour to get a firsthand look at both our military and nonmilitary activities there.

I would like to make a few brief observations about our trip and what we saw.

First of all, I want to mention that we stopped in the Philippine Islands on our way to Vietnam. We visited our troops at the Clark Air Force Base Hospital. This is one of the most modern and up-to-date hospitals it is possible to have. Just about every day a planeload of wounded are brought in from Vietnam. These wounded troops receive better medical attention than we have managed to provide in any other war. I am sure the helicopter is one of the contributing factors because of the speed with which our wounded can be evacuated. Clark Air Force Base also sends a planeload of wounded just about every day back to hospitals based in the United States. This excellent followthrough on medical care for the wounded is an indication of the kind of treatment that our troops are receiving.

Once we arrived in Vietnam, I was immediately impressed by the esprit de corps of our troops. They know they have a job to do. They want to clean up this situation as soon as they can. They are determined to do the job.

I had an opportunity to visit with many troops in the field. I was especially pleased to be able to talk with many GI's from Illinois. The equipment they have is more than sufficient for the military tasks they are carrying out. I ate with troops in the field. Their food is as good as any I had during my 4 years in military service.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that our military supply situation will be even better when Saigon's port facilities are improved. We are also building port facilities at Cam Ranh Bay, and this additional unit will further improve the supply situation.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Vietcong have won no major battles recently. We have captured thousands of tons of rice that the enemy had stored and hidden away in secret supply area in South Vietnam. We have been capturing many, many North Vietnamese. Many of the enemy troops are defecting, which is a development that will improve the situation by demoralizing the North Vietnamese leaders and troops.

Our field commanders in Vietnam told me that our American troops there are superior to any we had in World War II or the Korean war. Our Air Force and Navy pilots are doing an outstanding job of air support for our ground troops.

I think that Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge is the right man for the job. I was very impressed by Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He has surrounded himself with the best generals and staff members available in our time.

I went to Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, to make a grassroots, personal inspection of the military and nonmilitary situation there. Having made this inspection, I am satisfied that our troops are doing an outstanding job, that our military and nonmilitary funds are being spent wisely and to the best advantage, and that we are well on the road to victory.

I would like to make mention of our nonmilitary efforts in South Vietnam. Because of my previous experience as a teacher, I was especially impressed by the progress being made in elementary and secondary education. Projects by the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture will do a great deal toward creating a society which will develop an immunity to the promises and false blandishments of communism. This is peaceful, constructive activity being carried on by our Government agencies, and I am delighted to know that alongside our military efforts, we are waging another war—the war against poverty, hunger, and disease.

I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that our efforts in Vietnam appear to have the support of the people there. The Vietnamese people seem to be more than glad that we are there.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say something about our own attitudes here at home toward this war in Vietnam. Our GI's are very conscious of what we are thinking here at home. They know that most of us are in full support of what they are doing, what they are trying to accomplish. But more than one of them remarked to me that they fail to understand the motives of the draft card burners and the demonstrators who parade in opposition to our policies in Vietnam.

I personally think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the draft card burners and the demonstrators go home, wash their feet, and take a new look at the world. Our servicemen in Vietnam are demonstrating with raw courage and weapons in combat, while others here at home are demonstrating with dirty feet, placards, and beards. Somebody has their sense of values turned around, and I can report without qualification that it is not our men in Vietnam.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in behalf of President Johnson's conduct of this war. Everything that President Johnson has done has been a calculated risk. But what he has done has been right. As long as we continue on this course he has charted, we will come out all right.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and point out to my colleagues that he is a veteran of service during the Korean war and that he served for 3 years overseas and is an expert in gunnery both on the B–29 and the B–26 aircraft.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the Members are aware that 9 days is all too short a period in which to absorb all that we are doing and all that we should do in southeast Asia. It is too short a period of observation in which to reach conclusions on the merits of what we are doing and what we should do to restore peace to that troubled part of the world.

And yet we are forced to reach such conclusions as we can, as we vote on measure after measure setting the policy of this country. Those of us who have made the trip to Vietnam are infinitely better equipped to make these decisions than we were before we went.

It is easy, sitting in this country and reading the self-anointed expert columnists' prophecies of gloom to become discouraged. It is easy to feel that this country is hopelessly divided and that we are floundering in a morass of indecision and doubt when we read the constant and sometimes virulent criticism of this country's Asian policy by certain present and would-be Members of the Congress of the United States, as well as others outside of Government. And I have no doubt but that is exactly the impression which the Communist leadership in Hanoi and Peiping have gained as they scan our papers for an indication of our future course of action.

But this is not the feeling in Vietnam. There is no indecision there. There is no doubt as to why we are there nor of the importance of what we are doing there. There is a feeling of dedication to duty, of guarded optimism as to our ability to succeed both militarily and in solving the political and social and economic problems of the region, and a spirit of cooperation between the branches of the service and between the military and civilian officials of Government from the CINCPAC headquarters in Hawaii to the private in the field in the central highlands of Vietnam and the AID official working in the hamlets of the delta region.

So much does this sense of mission and accomplishment pervade the air in southeast Asia that I find myself amazed, after only a 10-day absence, to return to a reading of the American newspapers and the reports of the differing viewpoints of all of our "statesmen," viewpoints which offer "doubts" and criticism but which do not offer constructive suggestions of courses of action not already tried.

The fact of the matter is that our problem is not with the hamlets of South Vietnam. The problem is with the Shakespearean-type "Hamlets" in the United States. This war will not be lost in South Vietnam, but it can be lost on the political battlefields of the United States. The Communists do not forget that the French lost their struggle, not at Dienbienphu, but in France. I believe that the Communists know that they cannot win militarily in South Vietnam, but they believe they can win if the United States loses its will to win.

Well, I say let them be disabused of any such hope. Let each of us, in both parties, take the message to the American people. This is a time of crisis for the United States and the free world. This is a time for political cooperation, not political dissension. This is not Johnson's war or McNamara's war. This is an important free world struggle in which America must take the lead and has taken the lead. It is just as important today that Communist tyranny not take over Asia as it was that in 1941 Japanese tyranny did not prevail.

The Governors of the United States recently met, and with the single exception of the Governor of my State, endorsed our policy in southeast Asia. In dissenting, our Oregon Governor follows again the lead set by the senior Senator from my State.

The significant thing about the vote of the Governors is not the Oregon Governor's dissent, but the unanimity of the other 49 Governors' support of our policy. And when I am critical of the dissension and the disagreement which I hear in the country today, I am not being critical of the right of free speech. My political record, both in the State legislature and in the Congress of the United States, has been one of unfailing support of the right of free speech. But I have always taken the position that this constitutional right of free speech carries with it a correlative obligation to speak responsibly, and to point out specifically the defects of our policy and to offer some constructive suggestions as an alternative. It is in this area that the critics are failing, and I have never yet seen one of them who has felt the slightest reluctance in criticizing my support of American policy in southeast Asia, without a thought for the right of free speech, which I am entitled to, and do claim for myself.

I think that all of us who went to southeast Asia are convinced that militarily things are going well. There are significant problems, the main one being to find and maintain contact with the elusive enemy. The strategy and tactics of General Westmoreland seem adequate to cope with this problem.

Most of us, I think, agree that the oil depots were a legitimate military target. I think there are others, particularly powerplants, which ought to be considered. I know that the President has problems, but they ought not to be considered as immune.

Logistically there have been problems, but considering the tremendous buildup of men in 1 year, the results have been amazing. Some shortages have been apparent, but never without acceptable substitutes being available.

All of our military people and all of the Vietnamese with whom we talked are well aware of the importance of the second war—the war on economic, social and political problems. The effort by the military, by AID, by the Vietnamese, needs more emphasis. Its success varies from Province to Province, according to the degree of pacification and according to the ability of the Vietnamese Government.

Colonel Diep in Vinh Long seems to be a good one, a good soldier who is clearing his Province with Provincial troops, a good civil servant who uses his elected Provincial council, and who works at developing schools, hospitals, powerplants, and water systems. Other Provinces are not so fortunate. It is their country and their war, but there are weaknesses in administration, in some of the Provincial capitals, which we must work with the administration in Saigon to clear up.

Our people ought to have more training in speaking the Vietnamese language. Not enough do. Where some of the Special Forces people speak the language, the contact is so much more valuable, and we should not forget that the Communists do speak their language.

We visited schools built by self-help, which are most appreciated. Far more kids are in school in South Vietnam now than there were 2 years ago. The big cry was for more cement, and we must get more cement to them.

The civilian hospitals we visited are deplorable. In one Province of a half million people, there was only one hospital which had only two doctors.

There is almost no sanitation. People are two and three to a bed. The Seabees are at work constructing a surgery, and we are making efforts here, but more must be done. The public health problem in Saigon is a tremendous one. With over 1 million refugees flowing into that city, the garbage and sewage disposal problems are tremendous. This is an area in which we must work harder.

I, too, am convinced there will be elections. I am convinced of this for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the independence of the Government of South Vietnam to achieve the status of legitimacy. They were born through a coup. Premier Ky is aware that Bao-Dai is still in existence and is now a French national. He still makes a claim to South Vietnam. They fear above all a return of De Gaulle to South Vietnam, after having suffered under French rule for over 100 years. Premier Ky is no George Washington, but he has achieved a certain unity and he has weathered several severe political crises. He is only one man on the Directorate which has brought stability to South Vietnam. But we do not suggest that Ky or any other one man in South Vietnam could bring peace, stability and freedom to this country.

It is significant that we saw not one single unfriendly face or heard one unfriendly voice in southeast Asia. If they want us to leave, it certainly was not apparent to us.

This war is not over. It may be long and arduous. If we are as determined as are the people in southeast Asia, it can be terminated and this immense area preserved to the free world and not lost to the Communists.

Morale in Vietnam is high. We must unite to raise morale in this country.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon for his activities and to remind the Members of the House that the gentleman in World War II served as an aviator overseas.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that President Johnson is carrying on a commitment that the last five American Presidents have made, and that is to stand by our treaty obligations, particularly in the defense of freedom. The United States is fighting on the soil of Vietnam so that we here in the citadel of freedom may enjoy it fully.

The President has attempted to open efforts for negotiation through the North Vietnamese, with other countries, and to try through his intermediaries to bring about settlement.

The bombings, as we have pointed out, we feel are necessary to bring a total military decision to this farflung battlefield. We are using an economy force in this area, but we are using enough force so that in the future Communist aggressors will know that it is just too costly to dare to try to transgress on freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD should show that I agree with the position of the Governor of Oregon, and I have listened here today without objection, simply out of courtesy due to my colleagues who requested this special order for time to discuss their observations with respect to their trip to Vietnam.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, early today, the House of Representatives voted on the conference report on the defense procurement bill. I would like to explain my absence at the time of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative. However, it was impossible for me to be present because of adverse flying weather conditions and flight scheduling difficulties.

REPORT ON TRIP TO SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honor of being permitted to take this trip to Vietnam over the Fourth of July recess. I am grateful to the President and to the Speaker for approving this trip.

I join in the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], the chairman of the delegation, and compliment him for his very comprehensive narrative of our trip.

I would like to touch upon a few of the incidents that impressed me during this trip. I was in Vietnam last December. It appears to me that both the military and the political situations in South Vietnam have improved tremendously since my visit there 7 months ago.

I might remind the House that the members of this delegation were permitted to go anywhere in Vietnam that we expressed a desire to visit.

We now have more troops in South Vietnam. The amount of supplies going into that country has doubled since December. Excellent progress is being made in readying new port facilities to improve the supply situation even further.

I believe it was the unanimous conclusion of our delegation of 10 Democrats and 4 Republicans that the U.S. presence in southeast Asia is in the national interest and that our policy in Vietnam is the correct one.

We also agree that the leadership being shown by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and Gen. William Westmoreland is excellent, and that the morale of our troops is at an alltime high.

About the most impressive indication that our conclusions are correct came from talking to a defector, a former North Vietnamese Army captain, who said that the North Vietnamese and Vietcong leaders now realize they cannot win a military victory. Other prisoners and defectors have verified that attitude.

On the political side, it is obvious that Premier Ky has consolidated his position and that the September elections will proceed as planned. The Buddhist and Catholic groups have withdrawn their opposition and announced they will participate in the September elections.

When we stopped at Clark Field in the Philippines we learned that there were about 55,000 people—Filipinos, American civilians and armed services personnel—in that area. The Air Force hospital at Clark Field services all these people. While touring the hospital I talked with a young helicopter pilot who had been shot with a machinegun bullet in the leg and arm. As a result of this wound his kidneys went into shock and stopped functioning. While I was talking to him, he was being serviced by an artificial kidney machine. The doctors in the hospital informed me that they had two artificial kidney machines in that hospital plus a portable unit that they could take out to the field. I doubt that any hospital in the United States in a city of 55,000 people has that kind of equipment, such as we found in the Air Force hospital at Clark Field.

In addition to the fine hospital treatment that our wounded servicemen are receiving in the hospital, I was impressed by a program of people-to-people assistance. Philippine doctors, nationals of the Philippine Islands, are serving residences in the Air Force hospital at Clark Field in various specialties. I believe this is very helpful to the relations between the United States and the Philippines.

While we were in Vietnam, of course we talked with Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland. I was happy that we had an opportunity to talk with Charles Mann, our AID Director there. After talking with Mr. Mann, I bumped into one of my constituents in Vietnam, Mr. Jim Habron, who resides in Pleasantville, N.J., in my district. Mr. Habron works for the AID program in Vietnam, and at that time was working on a bridge project at Nha Be, several miles south of Saigon. Since I have come back to the States I have read in the newspapers that South Vietnamese Army units are conducting operations to rid the Nha Be area of Vietcong.

We also went to Camranh Bay. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that when the facility at Camranh Bay is completed South Vietnam will have the best port between Singapore and Hong Kong. The installation at Cam Ranh Bay will greatly alleviate the shipping problem caused by congestion in Saigon.

We also had the privilege of visiting with the Republic of Korea Tiger Division at Qui Nhon.

Now, this is a crack infantry division of Koreans. The Korean troops put on a demonstration for us of taekwondo, which is a form of self-defense. I think it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that one of the creeds of taekwondo may be stated as follows:

> We will be the cornerstone of anticommunism by training ourselves with the Taekwondo art.

Later that same day we went to An Khe where the base camp of the 1st Cavalry Division, the famous Air Mobile Division, is located. We were briefed by the chief of staff there, Colonel Beatty, and I think it is an indication of the caliber of officers and troops in that division to point out that Colonel Beatty learned to fly a helicopter in his forties after serving practically 20 years as a ground Army officer. I had been at An Khe with the 1st Cavalry in December of last year. At that time most of the division was contained within the base camp. Last week I was informed that all six of their battalions were out in the field fighting the Vietcong and the North Vietnam regulars. I think it is a significant sign of the aggressive attitude of our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

I was also particularly impressed by my visit to the U.S.S. *Intrepid*, a great naval aircraft carrier. While we were on the *Intrepid* that ship was launching and recovering air strike missions which had been in air operations in support of ground troops in South Vietnam. In between the launching and recovering of these aircraft the U.S.S. *Intrepid* refueled and also rearmed underway at sea.

We went to a Special Forces camp at Song Be near the Cambodian border. This village was overrun about a year ago by the Vietcong. However, it is now built up and is being protected by our Army units. We crossed the Song Be River in dugout canoes, and I was very happy there to meet Capt. H. R. Taylor, Jr., of the U.S. Army Special Forces, the famous Green Berets, who was stationed there. He is from my district in New Jersey. He told me how important it was in his opinion that the United States stay in South Vietnam and defeat the Communist aggression there.

Following my visit to South Vietnam last December I was quite concerned about the congested nature of the Saigon Harbor. On this trip I went to the 1st Logistics Command at Saigon. We flew over the entire Saigon River port area in a helicopter. The Army there is building a new quay in the Saigon River which will be able to handle deep-draft vessels and is also building a new port on the Saigon River where they will have two LST landing ramps and various warehouses. The intention is to build a berth at the new port which will handle four deep-draft vessels. The cargo unloaded at the new port facility will be able to bypass the Saigon city traffic and be shipped immediately out into the field to support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I have consistently supported President Johnson and his policies in Vietnam and in southeast Asia, and on the basis of my experience in South Vietnam last week, I intend to follow that course, because I think the President has maintained and pursued a sound policy for the United States of America in the manner in which he has conducted our affairs in Vietnam.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] and to express my appreciation upon his report from the standpoint of one who is well versed in the field of naval affairs.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGrath] is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. The gentleman served in both our Atlantic and Pacific fleets and is an expert in the Pacific waters, particulary having won five battle stars in the Korean war where the gentleman served on the U.S. battleship *Missouri*.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGrath] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, no one, and certainly not I, can harbor pretentions about being a Far Eastern expert on the basis of a week's trip, but it is possible for me to report to the House certain personal impressions and observations about our activities in Vietnam, and our general involvement in the Far Eastern theater. With all deference to my distinguished colleagues on the committee that made this trip, I shall undertake very briefly to offer my comments.

When our committee left Washington on the evening of July 2 for the Far East, I had three basic questions in mind about our situation in Vietnam, and I hoped to be able to come back with some sort of answer for each of these questions because I believe them to be matters of the greatest concern to everyone in America. The questions were:

First. Do the people of South Vietnam really want the forces of the United States to remain in their country, despite the devastation and suffering that war inevitably brings?

Second. Do our men in Vietnam—serving both in the military and in civilian services—believe in the job that they have undertaken? Do they believe their task worth doing despite the sacrifice and suffering involved? Do they think that they can successfully achieve the goals that have been set for them?

Third. What is the possibility of a meaningful and reasonably free expression of the popular will of the people of South Vietnam in the election that the Government has announced for September 11? Is there enough of a social and political fabric left in the Republic of Vietnam, and will conditions permit what we would regard as a reasonable election?

In reverse order, I can offer some answers to all of these questions with some real confidence in my knowledge of the kind of factual information which necessarily forms a basis for answers to questions like these. I am satisfied, for instance, that there is a very good chance—barring some sort of violent civil tumult in the next 2 months—for an honest and orderly election in September. It should be understood, however, that the election is for the purpose of choosing, by popular vote, a Constituent Assembly of 117 Members who will write a new constitution for the Republic of Vietnam, while the country will continue to be governed by a directorate, which includes 10 generals and 10 civilians. Following the promulgation of the new constitution to be written this winter, it is then proposed that a national election be held sometime late next summer, 1967, to fill the various posts established by the terms of the constitution.

The members of our committee were privileged to attend a dinner given on the evening of July 6 by Lt. Gen. Phan-Xuan-Chieu, who is president of the Vietnam Veterans Legion, and Secretary-General of the Directorate, which presently is governing the country. During the evening I had the pleasure of spending a considerable period of time with Mr. Tran Van An, who was elected chairman by the members of the election law drafting committee, established on May 5, by the Government and empowered to draft the election laws to be employed on September 11.

The ELDC was composed of 32 members including all elements of the Vietnamese body politic—except the Vietcong—and specifically such groups as the Buddhists, both moderate and militant, Catholics, Cao Dai, and Hoa Hao, various political parties, northern, central, and southern regional groupings, provincial and municipal councils, ethnic minorities such as the Montagnards, and ethnic Cambodians, professional groups, and trade unions. Mr. Van An had been a respected publisher and national leader in South Vietnam for many years, and if anything, his stature was increased by the fact that he spent 9 years in prison during the Diem regime for criticizing editorially the authoritarian tendencies of that administration. My conversation with Mr. Van An, as well as with others, convinced me that a meaningful election is not only possible, but highly probable on September 11, and, as Mr. Van An wryly concluded, the Vietnamese hope for a voter participation in this election somewhat better than the Americans experience in the presidential years.

On the question of the attitude of our troops, and our civilian personnel in Vietnam, you have heard from some of my colleagues on the committee, and you will unquestionably hear from others. Our opinion, I think, is unanimous and categorical: the attitude and demeanor of our men and women in Vietnam is nothing short of magnificent.

I could—but will not—spend hours talking about the day that two of my colleagues and I spent with some of our AID people down in the Mekong Delta country, including a regional director of the AID program who is a lieutenant colonel on loan from the Defense Department who has extended twice his tour of duty in Vietnam to carry on his very dangerous but very rewarding work of rebuilding the social fabric of that tormented region.

I could tell you of the warrant officer helicopter pilot I talked with in the Clark Field Hospital outside of Manila, who was, during our interview, hooked up to a kidney machine because his kidneys had stopped functioning after his left leg and right arm were shattered by a 30-caliber bullet. This young man has won 10 Air Medals and two Distinguished Flying Crosses, and his only concern is how rapidly the medical people can get him patched up to the point that he can return to his duties in Vietnam.

I could tell you of the two American civilian nurses, who have just arrived in a civilian hospital in the provincial capital of Vinh Long, where they have volunteered for a tour of duty in an area which has been for years terrorized and dominated by the Vietcong.

Or I could comment about the young Special Forces captain who drove me in a jeep over a rough trail near the Special Forces camp at Phouoc Binh, who drove with an M–16 rifle across his knees, because he felt "more comfortable" that way, but who, at the same time, carried a pocketful of candy for the Montagnard kids.

Perhaps the best indication of the extraordinary attitude of our people in Vietnam can be conveyed by reading the nine rules issued by General Westmoreland for the conduct of our troops in Vietnam:

Nine Rules for Personnel of U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Viet Cong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people. Here are nine simple rules:

(Distribution—1 to each member of the United States Armed Forces in Vietnam.)

1. Remember we are guests here: We make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people! Understand their life, use phrases from their language and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right of way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude or unusual behavior.
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.
9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. Military Forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

All of us on this trip were combat veterans of World War II or Korea, and I think it is fair to say that none of us has ever experienced such an attitude on the part of American troops as is presently being displayed by our people in the Far East, who fully realize the complex and delicate nature of the job which confronts them, and of the fact that they have two wars to win: the military pacification of South Vietnam, and the rebuilding of the social and political fabric of the country. They are working with equal fervor and dedication on both fronts.

In all candor, I must admit that I did encounter two people who were highly skeptical about our national effort in Vietnam, about the motives underlying it, and about its chances for success. Both were newspaper correspondents stationed in Saigon, a fact which may help us to understand why the American people do not fully appreciate what we are doing in southeast Asia.

On the first, and possibly most important, question of the attitude of the South Vietnamese people toward our continued presence in their country, I can only report that in our very brief stay, I encountered no one who wanted us to leave the area and permit them to deal with their problems unaided. This was true of Premier Ky; it was said by Tran Van An, by Tran Van Do, by General Chieu and his legionnaires. Our continued presence was fervently urged by the two province chiefs we talked with, by the lone doctor in the civilian hospital at Vinh Long, by the hamlet chieftain of a primitive Montagnard tribe in a little village on the Cambodian border; in other words, by everyone we spoke to whether of low or high degree.

Even those we could not speak to indicated that the presence of Americans was more than welcome. One of the most eloquent expressions of that welcome was on the part of some local, provincial soldiers who were manning the pathetic little mud forts, established along the length of Route 4 in the Mekong Delta, south of Saigon. These brave men are fighting night after night a lonely and desperate struggle to keep the roads open and clear of the Vietcong, so that their fellow-villagers may move their rice into the market, and when we passed by they stood on the walls of their forts and waved to us and saluted. Down in that area of Vietnam, the war is an ugly, brutal, savage encounter fraught with stealth and terror, and the bravery and dedication of those humble people would move a heart of stone.

I hope, at a later time, to request the privilege of addressing the House under special orders to describe in more detail and in greater depth the nature of that desperate conflict, but at the moment, suffice it to say that I hope that our people at home have the courage to match the courage and dedication of our men in the field, both military and civilian, and to match the bravery and dedication of the men and women of Vietnam who are toiling and fighting for the chance to live in decency, security and peace.

I again thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for having yielded me this time to offer this report to the Members of the House.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of the House that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] served for 27 months during World War II as a lieutenant (jg) in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He acted as a destroyer gunnery officer in the Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Pacific Theaters. He was awarded three area campaign ribbons, five battle stars, and two naval unit citations. At Okinawa he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry when his destroyer was hit by a Japanese kamikaze.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, you can read about a country until your eyes water, you can listen to lectures about a foreign land until your ears ache, but you cannot get the all-important feel of the situation until you have been there. Contact with reality brings all of your senses into play and indelibly stamps in your makeup a gestalt—the place becomes a part of you. To be sure a 10-day trip to southeast Asia does not make you an expert on the area, but it does give you an awareness that you could never get from periodical readings and stateside briefings. This trip has given us an experience we shall never forget, an understanding that cannot adequately be conveyed by words, and opinions that deserve attention.

Our group made up of veterans with previous combat experience departed Andrews Air Force Base at 6 p.m., July 2, stopped at Travis Air Force Base, near San Francisco, for refueling, on to Honolulu for a briefing by CINCPAC, a tour of Pearl Harbor with its stinging memories, and a brief respite before going on to Saigon via the Philippines where we stopped briefly at Clark Field to tour the logistics base, and the general hospital. Saigon hits you like Washington, D.C.—hot and humid. We arrived in the rush hour; made our way to the hotel through streets that were jammed with small cars and bicycles built for one, but oftentimes carrying as many as four.

The next morning at 9 a.m. we received a thorough briefing from Ambassador Lodge and his staff on the military, political, and economic situation in the Republic of Vietnam. This was followed by an enjoyable luncheon at the Lodge homestead where we met General Westmoreland and had an opportunity to question both Mr. Lodge and the general at some length. After lunch we proceeded to MacVee Headquarters where General Westmoreland and his staff gave us a detailed briefing on the military situation. After this we visited with General Ky for half an hour or so and obtained his views. In the evening we attended a dinner hosted by Lt. Gen. Pham Xuan Chieu. The next morning we began intensive tours of military bases and installations in South Vietnam starting with the logistics base at Cam Ranh Bay. Then on to the 12th Tactical Fighter Wing, the Korean Qui Nhon Division, 1st Cavalry Division, the aircraft carrier *Intrepid*, a Vietnamese division in the field, 25th Infantry Division, and the 5th Special Forces. Some of our group visited the 1st Marine and 1st Infantry Divisions. In all of these areas, most of which were in close contact with the enemy, we were given intensive briefings and had an opportunity to talk to the troops. On the eve of our departure we had dinner with General Westmoreland which was also attended by Ambassador Lodge, and we again had an opportunity to question both of them about the observations we had made. Saturday, we went to Bangkok, Thailand, where we received a briefing on the situation there. On Sunday we flew to Taipei, Taiwan, and the following day we had the pleasure of talking at some length with the Vice President and President Chaing Kai-shek.

Although the time spent in Vietnam was only 4 days, they were 4 days crammed with activity, giving us an opportunity to observe just about every aspect of life in that country. I carried a tape recorder with me and taped most of the briefings and many of the interviews, but at this time, the day after my return, I have not as yet had a chance to play back the tapes and garner from them some of the detailed information I was able to obtain. Consequently this report I consider as only an initial report based on the outstanding recollections of the trip. I intend to supplement this report in more detail at a later date.

Based upon these first arrival recollections of the trip my evaluation of the total situation is that militarily, economically, and politically the situation is generally good.

With respect to the military situation, it would appear that our intelligence is excellent, that we are being constantly informed as to the whereabouts of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. This is borne out by the fact that in recent months there has been no successful ambush of our troops by the enemy. It is further borne out by the fact that our group was able to travel to various camps in the field located not far from the enemy without even the threat of a mishap. The overall administration of the war is excellent. No commander or individual complained about the lack of supplies. The supply lines from United States to the front line is running very smoothly. Our operation from a strategic point of view is geared very well to the type of war that is being fought there. This is entirely different from World War II and the Korean conflict. There is really no front line. The enemy is in various pockets throughout the Republic, but with the ingenious use of air power, in particular helicopters, we are able to ferret out and annihilate these hostile pockets.

It was heartwarming for a former Air Force man to hear infantry men highly commend the good close air support they have been receiving even from high altitude flying B–52's which have been pinpointing targets close to our troops and doing it successfully, something unheard of in World War II.

I would say that the military aspect of the war is well in hand. The part of the conflict that is going to take some time is the securing of the villages after the enemy has been driven out. This is being accomplished through pacification units composed entirely of Vietnamese who are trained to come into a village and make it secure against counterinfiltration by the Vietcong. The recruiting and training of these units will take some time. It is difficult to say at this time how long it will be before all the villages will be secured. This war is essentially one of fighting against gangsters and we will not be assured of peace in Vietnam until we have a large enough police force to protect the villages and hamlets from the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese terrorism.

The political situation appears to be fairly stable at the present time. I would predict that the elections scheduled for September 11 will come off without being boycotted to any great extent by any group. The presence of our soldiers in Vietnam has boosted the morale of the people. There are no "Yankee Go Home" signs. They have at least realized that, unlike the French, we are not there to stay. We do not intend to colonize the Vietnamese and our presence there fighting for a cause along side their troops has given the people a spirit of nationalism which heretofore they never had.

Economically the country is making great progress under our AID programs. There is the danger of inflation which will have to be watched and against which necessary steps will have to be taken from time to time. The Vietnamese people are not materially well off, but nearly all of them are employed at some task or other and no one is starving.

It is difficult to make a prognosis. I would venture to say that within a year the situation would be such that any reasonable enemy leader would quit. It is difficult to tell just exactly what Ho Chi Minh will do. I am sure he realizes that he is losing, but whether or not this will force him to negotiate is highly speculative, probably doubtful. He has to save face as well as his head, and he undoubtedly will make an effort to hold on as long as possible. It does not appear that our actions, even if escalated, would bring in either Russia or Red China.

I would recommend that we continue to hit more military targets in North Vietnam and that we send more troops. In advocating that we send more troops I do not mean we are going to increase our losses. I make the recommendation only to make it easier on our fighting forces over there. At the present time we do have a great ratio of firepower to the enemy firepower, and due to our flexibility and mobility we are able to cope with any situation; that is, we can move a battalion or regiment from one division to help another with very little difficulty. If we were to send more troops, such movements would be obviated and make the war considerably easier to conduct.

Let me conclude by saying that there is no question of Communist aggression from Peiping in southeast Asia, and that this aggression manifests itself in the form of well organized terrorism. The Communist plan being to begin at the remote villages and eventually move into the larger cities. There is no question in my mind that we have an obligation to stop this aggression, and it appears that our mission in this regard is presently meeting with great success.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY], comment on the use of our airpower in Vietnam. The gentleman from Maine served on active duty with the U.S. Army Air Force in World War II from 1942 to 1946. He entered the service as a private and was discharged as a captain. While serving as a navigator on a Liberator bomber he was shot down in an air attack on the Ploesti oilfields and finished World War II as a prisoner of war in a Rumanian prison-of-war camp. He was awarded the Air Medal and the Purple Heart.

TAX RELIEF FOR COMMUTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in the New York City transit fare underscores the mounting cost, in terms of both money and ordinary comfort, exacted each day from millions of Americans who struggle valiantly, against enormous odds, to get to work. I speak of the plight of the dashing commuter.

New York's fare increase is the latest offshoot of the persistent neglect and paralysis afflicting urban mass transportation, and it is invariably the commuter who must pay the price in terms of higher fares and steadily deteriorating service.

I have consistently taken the floor here to explore this crisis in urban transportation. It is still with us, and it is getting worse. Fare increases are only one indication of a situation which threatens the welfare and well-being of the cities.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve, recently approved a bill increasing authorizations under the Mass Transportation Act and providing for technological research grants for the development of new forms of commuter service. This measure should break new ground in attempting to modernize our means of public transport.

I shall continue to press for an amendment to the Mass Transportation Act which would correct the discriminatory State limitation on the amount of funds available to any one State. This now stands at 12½ percent of the total authorization. It is obvious that such an allocation cannot possibly begin to meet the problems with which the Nation's major cities are faced. And yet it is precisely these sprawling metropolitan areas where conditions of public transport are most acute; the premise and validity of the legislation is indeed discolored by the very fact that these large cities are not receiving the proportionate attention to which they are entitled.

Today, I am introducing a bill to grant the commuter a yearly Federal income tax deduction for expenses incurred in traveling to and from work. Together with other perfecting legislation I am sponsoring, this new tax approach will help to offset the growing financial burden of commuters who depend upon mass transit as a necessity. The legislation provides a deduction of up to $200 annually.

I believe the Congress should recognize, additionally, that transportation costs to and from work are in essence a legitimate business expense. I urge that this matter, and that the variety of other pending legislation on this question of mass transit, be given prompt and close attention in Congress.

CONCENTRATING FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned, as are all Americans, with the question of whether the money we spend for foreign aid is going where it will do the most good—for the people of developing countries and for our own.

The proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1967 calls for an intensified policy to direct most of our aid to the countries whose need is greatest, the countries which have clearly shown they will match our assistance with strong self-help efforts of their own.

Call it a policy of selectivity if you will, or good administration, or even a hard-boiled approach to foreign aid. But whatever the term, it makes good sense.

Before a country qualifies of assistance, AID takes a careful look at the type and purpose of the proposed development program, the availability of assistance to the country from other sources, the ability of the country to make effective use of U.S. aid, and above all, its determination to make maximum use of its own national resources to promote economic and social development.

Because of this realistic policy, the great bulk of the AID program next year, as last, will be directed to a relatively few countries—those where the need is greatest, or those that have proven, by outstanding self-help, that they can best use substantial U.S. aid.

More than 90 percent of AID's direct country assistance next year will go to just 20 major countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Eighty-four percent of all AID development loans will go to only eight—India, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Colombia, Korea, Chile, and Nigeria. These countries are engaged in strong, self-help, development programs.

Ninety-three percent of AID's supporting assistance—which is used to further our urgent foreign policy or national security objectives—is slated for five countries: Vietnam, Laos, Korea, Jordan, and the Dominican Republic. Vietnam alone will account for 72 percent of this support.

This, instead of a widely scattered approach as was true a few years ago, our foreign aid today is a purposeful program aimed at specific objectives.

Besides concentration of economic aid in a few selected countries, there are other encouraging new aspects of the aid program.

Ten years ago, about two-thirds of our aid was for military assistance, and much of our economic aid went to help threatened countries resist Communist pressures. Today, the situation is reversed. Two-thirds of our assistance is now economic, providing capital and technical assistance the developing countries need for long-term development and progress toward self-support.

And even where survival is still at issue, as in Vietnam, we are helping industrial and agricultural development go forward behind the defenses built up by our military assistance programs.

We are helping other nations of the free world guard their independence through military assistance, but at the same time we are making a concentrated and determined effort to build solid foundations for their future economic growth.

Those are two of the most significant changes in our foreign aid program—concentration on countries and concentration on their economic and social progress.

They are wise changes. They are promising changes. And they are two of the reasons why I believe that the foreign aid program we are now considering is the most practical and effective ever sent to us, and deserves our fullest support.

A BILL TO PROVIDE PAYMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIR TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war in Vietnam, and we are asking hundreds of thousands of our young men to travel many thousands of miles at their own expense in emergency situations or when they are coming home to convalesce from wounds received in battle.

It is my belief that one of the least things we can do for these men is to pay their commercial air transportation costs in these situations: emergency leave, convalescent leave, and leaves before going overseas or upon returning from overseas. I have therefore today introduced legislation to authorize the particular service Secretary concerned to pay such expenses pursuant to appropriate regulations.

I hope that the Armed Services Committee will take immediate action on my bill.

A PROPOSAL FOR IDENTICAL POWERS FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS AND MUTUAL SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Federal Reserve Governor James L. Robertson has recommended that Federal and State legislatures grant identical powers to both commercial and mutual savings banks subject to their jurisdiction.

The Council of Mutual Savings Institutions has endorsed Governor Robertson's proposal and has issued the following statement and resolution calling for the enactment of legislation to accomplish Governor Robertson's suggestions and urging that each type of institution be defined only as to its corporate structure.

The council's statement and resolution follows:

Council of Mutual Savings Institutions Supports Robertson Proposal of Identical Powers for Commercial Banks and Mutual Savings Institutions

New York, N.Y.—Termination of the constant strife between the two types of financial institutions (commercial banks and mutual savings institutions) would result if the legislative bodies at the state and federal levels would grant identical powers to the commercial banks and the mutual savings institutions subject to their jurisdiction, as recommended by Vice Chairman James L. Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board in a recent address, according to a resolution adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions held here during the past week and released yesterday by George L. Bliss, President of the Council.

"It must be recognized that the days are over when commercial banks largely limited their field of operation to demand deposits and their investments to short-term loans and highly marketable securities, while savings institutions and life insurance companies, whose deposits and policy reserves constituting long-term funds were the major source of mortgage and other long-term credits," said Bliss. "Although there may be some argument as to which group started it," he continued, "the fact is that it was the McFadden Act, passed by Congress in 1927, which first granted commercial banks at the federal level the authority to invest in mortgage loans. Since then, the commercial banks have been steadily increasing their volume of long-term credits. While at one time the commercial banks had little interest in savings accounts, and in some states were specifically prohibited from accepting them, the bars and inhibitions which held them back have been removed. This has led the mutual savings institutions to seek broader fields of service. The result has been a continuous hassle between the two groups, for the past couple of decades or more, and which the legislative bodies have been "called on to referee."

In endorsing Governor Robertson's proposal, the resolution of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions calls for commercial banks and mutual savings institutions to be "granted identical statutory authority with respect to the services they may provide," the only distinction to be as to the type of corporate structure. The Council's resolution provides that such institutions, "if organized on a privately-owned capital stock basis, shall be known as commercial banks; and, if organized on a mutual or cooperative basis, shall be known as savings institutions."

"The directors of our Council," Bliss said, "believe this course would be in the public interest, since the competitive element would relate to the type of organization, i.e., stock or mutual, and not as to the nature of the services available." He suggested that the bill to authorize federal chartering for mutual savings banks, now under study by the House Banking and Currency Committee and which the Council has endorsed, would be an appropriate legislative vehicle for the first step in such a program. "The directors of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions," Bliss concluded, "urge the commercial banking groups to withdraw their opposition to this bill, including any expansion of services now included or that may be added, whereupon the mutual savings groups should suspend their opposition to legislation which would enlarge the services authorized to be provided by the commercial banks."

Council of Mutual Savings Institutions

Whereas, for many years it was the traditional concept of sound banking operation in this country that commercial banks, as demand deposit institutions, should restrict the investment or lending of their funds to a short-term basis; and that deposits in savings institutions and policy reserves of insurance companies, which constitute long-term funds, in fact, should be the major source of long-term credits, and

Whereas, over a period of years the commercial banks have been steadily increasing their volume of long-term credits, which change in policy has been rationalized by aggressively seeking, and in numerous instances accomplishing, legislative amendments empowering them to accept savings deposits and to extend long-term credits in the mortgage loan and other fields, and

Whereas, this development has spurred the savings institutions, the great majority of which are chartered or organized on a mutual or cooperative basis, to act defensively by seeking an expansion of their powers into other fields of investment, and

Whereas, the public press has reported that the Honorable James L. Robertson, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in an address delivered at Peoria, Illinois, on May 17, 1966, proposed that "all depository institutions be permitted to become comprehensive lenders and borrowers, subject to uniform bank-style limitations on the exercise of their powers," now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions does hereby endorse in principle the proposal thus advanced by Governor Robertson, to wit, that the commercial banks and the savings institutions be granted identical statutory authority with respect to the services they may provide, subject to the distinction that such institutions, if organized on a privately-owned capital stock basis, shall be known as commercial banks; and, if organized on a mutual or co-operative basis, shall be known as saving institutions, and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and appropriate committees of this Council be, and they are hereby, authorized to so present the position of this Council and to sponsor legislation to that end at both the federal and state levels.

Attest.

George L. Bliss,
President and Managing Director.

PANAMANIAN STUDENT VIOLENCE IN PANAMA AND COLON

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the current diplomatic negotiations between the Governments of Panama and the United States, relatively little of consequence is being published in the major press of our country but much is printed in the papers of the isthmus. The result is that the people of the Nation and the Congress do not know what is taking place as regards the future well-being of the Panama Canal and the security of the Western Hemisphere.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1966, and of May 25, I commented at some length on the so-called Tri-Continental Conference held at Havana in Castro's Cuba on January 3 to 15 of this year, and made the prediction that it would accelerate the pace of terror and subversion in Latin America, with special reference to Panama and the Panama Canal. Was I right? Let the following sequence of events in Panama supply the answer.

MAY 20, 1966

Juana Castro, sister of the Red dictator of Cuba, at a press interview in Panama, R.P., warned that university students in Panama are following the orders of the Tri-Continental Conference.

MAY 20, 1966

Panamanian student demonstrators, in midday, stoned the Presidential Palace in Panama City.

JUNE 3, 1966

After a call in Panama City for student demonstrations, the Panamanian National Guard prepared to quell possible disturbances.

JUNE 6, 1966

Panamanian students rioted in Panama City and Colon, requiring the use of the National Guard of Panama to restore order and resulting in 3 deaths and 27 wounded with extensive property damage, which included the total destruction of a city hall, post office and lottery office in Colon and the partial burning of the office of the Governor of Colon Province.

JUNE 9, 1966

Student disorders in Panama City and Colon, again requiring the use of the Panamanian National Guard to maintain order.

Mr. Speaker, the above indicated violence caused the President of Panama to order secondary schools in Panama City and Colon closed indefinitely and his office to charge that the riots were led by local Communists trained in Cuba and that the disorders followed the pattern of directives of the January 1966 Tri-continental Conference in Havana.

In this connection, I would emphasize again to the Congress and the Nation the fact that the chief of the Panamanian treaty negotiating team, Dr. Diogenes de la Rosa, is "an acknowledged Marxist intellectual" with objectives as clearly set forth in my statement on June 22 to this body.

As has been previously stated by me on various occasions, Panama is a land of endemic revolution and endless political instability. Now, to these inherent features, there are the additional problems of communistic revolutionary infiltration and subversion by Cuban trained agents.

Ever since the sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone strip were acquired by the United States in 1904, our presence has operated as the only stable influence on the entire Isthmus of Panama. It is now proposed on behalf of our Government that this control be surrendered to Panama, with inevitable Panamanian chaos extending to and enveloping the canal and the Canal Zone.

This territory, it should be noted, has often served as a haven of refuge for Panamanians in danger of assassination or of mob actions. I can think of no greater disservice to Panama than for the United States to relinquish its indispensable sovereign control over the Canal Zone, for this territory would unquestionably become the site of never-ceasing turmoil. Moreover, such surrender would be in violation of our treaty obligations and long-range commitment to maintain, operate, sanitate and protect an isthmian canal for the benefit of world shipping with tolls that are just and equitable.

The recent disorders, which in nowise can be attributed to canal problems, give a glimpse of what will surely occur in event the United States should abdicate its responsibilities through policies of mistaken generosity or weakness. They emphasize again the gravity of the situation at Panama which we can ignore only at our peril.

In order that the documentation of the recent Panamanian disorders as provided by isthmian newspapers, may be available to all seeking facts that are hardly mentioned and seldom interpreted in the mass news media of the United States, I quote the following news stories from the Panamanian press:

[From the Panama, Republic of Panama, Star & Herald, May 21, 1966]

CASTRO'S SISTER SAYS PANAMA STUDENTS FOLLOW HAVANA'S ORDERS

Juana Castro, sister of the Cuban communist dictator, Fidel Castro, said yesterday university student groups in Panama are following orders issued by the recent tri-continental conference in Havana.

She backed up her charge with photos of the material displayed on the bulletin board in the office of the local University Students Union. The material consists of Cuban propaganda for the communist-sponsored tri-continental conference which brought together delegates from Latin America, Asia and Africa and the front pages of the newspaper Gramma which is edited in Havana.

Miss Castro, who went into exile in June, 1964, said she decided to fight her brother's regime when she became convinced that her brother had betrayed the Cuban revolution. She was permitted to leave the island and now lives in Miami, Fla. Another sister resides in Mexico, but two other sisters and a brother remain in Cuba.

She predicted that the Castro regime will be overthrown, but said this will require the help of all Latin American peoples. She asserted that not only the common people, but members of the Cuban armed forces are conspiring against Castro, despite the existing repression.

Asked about "Che" Guevara, Castro's Argentine-born comrade who has not been seen for months now, Miss Castro said Guevara's whereabouts are not important.

"The fact is," she said, "that while everybody worries about where Guevara is, no one seems to be aware that many Che Guevaras are being manufactured in Cuba, cut to communist specifications, and are spread in Latin America, working for international communism."

She pointed out that while the Castro regime demands non-intervention, it is intervening openly in other nations' affairs "to strangle democracy."

In connection with reports that local extremist groups might attempt to kidnap her, Miss Castro told newsmen that she has word that "my denunciation of the communist tyranny in Cuba and of the threat it poses for the rest of the American countries is hurting them." She added: "They'll do anything."

Throughout her press interview, Miss Castro spoke of the "Soviet occupation" of Cuba and of the desperate condition of the people.

Last night, she addressed the Workers Confederation at the union hall on Mexico Avenue, near Cinco de Mayo Plaza. She stressed the loss of benefits that Cuban workers have suffered under the communist regime.

Miss Castro plans to return today to Miami.

[From the Panama, Republic of Panama, Star & Herald, May 21, 1966]

STUDENTS STONE PRESIDENTIAL PALACE DURING DEMONSTRATION

Students stoned the Presidential Palace during a demonstration yesterday commemorating a student uprising in 1958 and later caused disorders along a downtown section of Central Avenue and side streets.

President Marco A. Robles was in the second-floor Yellow Room of the Palace, in the wing across from his office, where a barter agreement had just been signed with Costa Rica delegates.

The cap of an automobile gasoline tank smashed through a glass pane of a door of the air-conditioned reception hall and the Chief Executive and others with him then went into the presidential office.

Chunks of tile blocks hurled by the student demonstrators broke two other glass panes in the Yellow Room and one on a door of the air-conditioned presidential office. The chunk that hit the presidential office did not pentrate the door lining. A number of louvres were smashed in the ground floor quarters of the presidential guard.

Within minutes after the rock-throwing started, guardsmen wearing gas masks and with rifles at the ready rushed out of the Presidential Palace and the students fled. Other roving patrols kept the students on the move with tear-gas grenades.

The violence started at 11:30 a.m. and lasted about an hour.

About 1500 high school students—boys and girls—had paraded up Central Avenue to Santa Ana Plaza in what was billed as a commemorative ceremony of the bloody 1958 student uprising.

The parade was to end with a meeting at Santa Ana Plaza. But many of the students did not stay for the meeting.

Then a group of a few hundred resumed the march and headed for the Presidential Palace. There, amid shouts of "Marcos Rifle (a nickname for President Robles) to the firing wall" and "come down, bignose" the students milled on the street, demanding that the President come down and taunting the guards.

The presidential guard stood behind the Palace's iron gate and made no move to interfere with the demonstrators, even when some of them shook the gate violently.

Suddenly, chunks of tile blocks started crashing against the building. The students obtained the missiles from a building under repair across the street from the Presidencia.

Even while fleeing from the guardsmen, the demonstrators continued hurling rocks. A number of vehicles caught in the commotion were struck, including a National Guard radio patrol car which had its windshield smashed.

During the parade and the meeting, speakers denounced United States military bases in Panama. In addition to the usual chanted slogans against "imperialism" and the "oligarchy," the demonstrators came up with a new one yesterday: "Juana Castro, get out." Miss Juana Castro is the sister of Fidel Castro, whom she has denounced as a communist tyrant. She arrived in Panama City yesterday for a one-day visit at the invitation of the Workers Confederation.

The students came out again in the early afternoon, barely 100 strong, but this time headed for the office of Minister of Government J. D. Bazan. They asked for the release of the four students—all under 17—who were arrested during the morning incidents. Bazan told them the youths had been turned over to the Juvenile Court.

During the conversation with Bazan, the student delegates said the problem was that the President refused to see them. Bazan replied anyone would have second thoughts about receiving students who showed up with threats and insults.

There were no further incidents during the afternoon.

A high official said yesterday's student violence followed the pattern laid down at the communist tri-continental conference in Havana for using student demonstrations to spark subversive movements. This official said agitators are out to provoke a fatal incident in order to arouse public sentiment.

[From the Panama American, June 3, 1966]

RP GUARD READY FOR STUDENT VIOLENCE

The National Guard today was prepared to quell possible disturbances that could arise from tonight's announced student meeting at Santa Ana Park called to protest the mysterious death this week of Colon high school student Juan Navas.

Tonight's demonstration has been called by Luis Navas, a brother of the dead student and the secretary general of the powerful Panama Student Federation (FEP).

Luis Navas and other relatives of the late student headed a large group of mourners including hundreds of students from Panama City and Colon, who crowded Puerto Polon Cemetery on the Atlantic Side for the funeral of youth whose body was found early Wednesday morning along the roadside of the Colon Corridor.

An autopsy performed by Colon Coroner Dr. Generoso de Puy showed that Juan Navas died from a blow at the base of the skull.

The officials theory is that the 20-year-old youth, who only Sunday returned from an eight-month trip to Russia, was either victim of a rival student group or of a hit-and-run driver.

Extremist student groups charge that Navas' death was the result of a beating he took either from the National Guard or the National Department of Investigations (DENI). Authorities checked luggage after his arrival at Tocumen Airport Sunday, but have denied they have ever held Navas in custody since his return from Russia.

The youth had gone to Moscow late September reportedly for medical treatment for head injuries suffered in the January 1964 Panama-Canal Zone border disturbances.

His mother is reported to have said that buckshot wounds in the head had left her son partially blind and with injury to the brain. His trip behind the Iron Curtain had been arranged by the FEP.

The FEP decreed today a day of student mourning in Panama City and in Colon, where the funeral was to take place early this afternoon. Classes were dismissed by school authorities to allow students to attend the rites.

The National Guard was on the alert for possible disorders during or following tonight's meeting at Santa Ana following student disturbances which required their intervention last night and yesterday morning.

Last night a large group of marchers were prevented by the Presidential Guard from reaching the Presidencia where student leaders proposed to talk with President Robles on the death of their fellow student.

Blocked from carrying out their intention after they had reached Cathedral Plaza, angry students warned they would return when they bolstered their forces enough "to take on the Guard".

Then they retreated back to Santa Ana, overturning garbage cans along Central Avenue.

Meanwhile, Auxiliary District Attorney Humberto Fassano who with the National Guard and the DENI yesterday made an on-the-spot check of the site where the body was found, was reported to be following a definite lead which could result in the capture of the killer or killers.

It was learned that authorities are searching for six youths, who according to an aunt of the dead youth, had accompanied him Tuesday night in an automobile.

[From the Panama, Republic of Panama, Star & Herald, June 7, 1966]

STUDENT VIOLENCE SWEEPS CAPITAL, COLON—TWO KILLED IN CLASHES ON ATLANTIC SIDE—FOUR GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS BURNED IN COLON; ROBLES ORDERS SECONDARY SCHOOLS CLOSED

Student agitation over the unsolved slaying of a leader exploded into violence in Colon and Panama City yesterday.

In the Atlantic Side city, where it took eight hours to bring the situation under control, two students were killed by bullets in clashes with National Guard troops. The dead students were Carlos Matthews, 21, of the Abel Bravo School, and Elvira Miranda, 17, a student in a night school.

A two-year-old girl, Diana Damaris Camargo, was pronounced dead on arrival at Amador Guerrero Hospital, but doctors could not say, pending an autopsy, if her death was connected with the disorders.

There were 27 wounded or injured in Colon, but only five required hospitalization.

Three government buildings—the Municipal Palace (City Hall), the Post Office and the National Lottery—were totally destroyed by fires set by the demonstrators. A fourth, the Governor's Office, was partially burned. The four buildings are relatively close to each other.

Store windows were smashed. At least five vehicles were overturned and burned.

Property damage was widespread and looting was extensive.

Early estimates of material damages in Colon ran between half a million and one million balboas.

In Panama City, the first outbreaks of violence occurred in the early afternoon. The initial focus of trouble was the National Institute, where a few hundred students held an impromptu meeting and then moved out to the streets. Troops, firing tear gas grenades, forced most to flee, but a small group went back inside the school. For about two hours, the students tried repeatedly to break through. Each time the rock-throwing students were turned back by tear gas. Finally, the president of the Parent-Teacher Association of the school went inside and escorted about thirty students out of the building.

Even while National Guardsmen hurled tear gas grenades at the students inside the National Institute, traffic moved without interruption along Fourth of July Avenue. But when rocks began hitting the passing cars, traffic was rerouted off the avenue.

The tear gas became so dense in the Institute area that residents of surrounding houses had to flee, some carrying babies in their arms. The gas drifted into Ancon.

Bands of demonstrators went into action at various spots in the city, keeping National Guard patrols on the move. A number of government offices were stoned and a government liquor warehouse was set on fire. It took an hour to put it out. Between 4:30 p.m. and 8:30 p.m. 17 fire alarms were turned in, most of them false.

At least two government vehicles were overturned and set on fire.

Twenty-two persons were treated in Santo Tomas Hospital dispensary in Panama City, mostly for injuries from rocks.

President Marco A. Robles ordered secondary schools on Panama City and Colon closed indefinitely.

The decree closing schools does not affect the University of Panama, which then became the rallying point for students. A student meeting started there at 6 p.m. and the theme of speakers was insurrection. There was talk of storming schools, of fighting on the streets, of concerted action with student leaders and opposition parties.

National Guard troops kept the campus under watch and two attempt by students to march out were beaten back with tear gas.

By 9 p.m., the situation in the capital was quiet except for the activity around the campus.

Students have been agitating since last week over the death of Juan Navas Pajaro, a Colon student leader whose body was found by the roadside near the Atlantic side city last Wednesday. He died from a blow on the skull. The extremist student leadership blamed agents of the National Department of Investigation (DENI) for Navras' death. The government denied the charge and ordered a full investigation, which so far has produced no leads.

Yesterday's trouble started in Colon about 8 a.m. when an estimated 500 students marched to the DENI office in Colon and stoned it. National Guardsmen dispersed them. But they returned in stronger numbers, an official statement said, and this time some of the demonstrators disarmed two guardsmen and felled three others with rocks. That started the shooting.

A presidential press office broadcast said the Colon demonstration was led by local communists known to have been trained in Cuba. It said the disorders followed the pattern of directives from the recent tri-continental conference in Havana.

Authorities said it was a quick and well-planned operation, pointing out that a "second wave" of extremists and hoodlums took over from the students and led the mob action.

With thousands of students and others on the rampage on the streets in Colon, the National Guard was unable to stop the destruction, arson and looting. After the government buildings were set on fire, the Guardsmen regrouped and with the arrival of reinforcements from the crack Tocumen Airport garrison slowly regained control of the situation.

By 4 p.m. National Guard headquarters reported that violence had ceased in Colon. The city, however, was dead.

At that hour, trouble was at its peak in Panama City.

National Guard headquarters reported 42 persons under arrest by nightfall in the capital. It listed seven guardsmen and two officers injured.

Official sources confirmed that the arrested in Colon included Ismael Laguna, former lightweight champion, who was caught firing at the National Guard.

[From the Panama, Republic of Panama, Star & Herald, June 10, 1966]

New Student March Dispersed in Colon—Tear Gas Sends Hundreds Into Canal Zone—Incident Follows Burial of Victims of Monday's Violence; Disorders Occur Also in Panama City

National Guard troops dispersed some 200 students attempting to demonstrate in Colon last evening after the burial of the victims of Monday's violence.

The strong tear gas affected scores of persons and drove hundreds of residents into the Canal Zone looking for refuge. At 7 p.m., an estimated 2,000 refugees had been accommodated in Mount Hope Stadium. They began returning to their homes as soon as the situation in the city quieted down.

Two women among the refugees required medical attention—one for shotgun wounds and the other for tear gas effects.

National Guard headquarters reported one guardsman wounded by a bullet and approximately sixty civilians treated in Amador Guerrero Hospital for injuries and tear gas effects. Whether any of the civilians suffered shotgun wounds was not established last night, but there were unconfirmed reports of two such cases.

The disturbance in Colon started about 5:45 p.m. and lasted around two hours. The Guard used tear gas and shotguns to quell it.

In Panama City, disorders broke out about 8:30 p.m. They followed the harrassment tactics of the post few nights as small groups of demonstrators went in to action simultaneously of various spots in the city, but mainly in the Santa Ana Plaza area. They smashed street lights, littered the pavement with garbage, turned in false fire alarms and threw rocks at guardsmen who dispersed them with tear gas. The Guard was in action until about 11 p.m.

At the start of the disorders in the Capital seven false fire alarms were sounded in 25 minutes.

Between 1500 and 2000 persons—mostly students—marched in the funeral cortege in Colon after the services held in the Cathedral. Three coffins were borne on the shoulders of the crowd. In one, was the body of Carlos Matthews, 17, an honor student of the Abel Bravo High School; in another, that of Elvira Miranda, also 17 a night school student; and in the third, that of 2-year-old Dalis Camargo.

Matthews and Miss Miranda suffered fatal bullet wounds in Monday's clash between demonstrating students and the National Guard.

The Camargo baby was brought to the hospital the same day and was listed in the day's toll. An autopsy has shown, however, that she died of pneumonia.

The funeral cortege moved from the Cathedral on 5th Street where the services began at 2 pm, to 11th St. to pick up buses for the Puerto Pilon cemetery. Thousands of spectators lined the funeral route.

A brief but torrential rain failed to disrupt the procession.

Along the way, some of the students chanted slogans against the National Guard and the National Department of Investigation.

No incident marred the procession.

On the way back from Puerto Pilon cemetery, about 600 students started a march toward the city. The group was down to 200 when it reached Tenth Street where the National Guard's men were deployed.

After the bulk of the demonstrators scattered, guardsmen cleared small groups behind improvised barricades. Some demonstrators hurled molotov cocktails.

The situation was brought under control in about half an hour's time and by 7:30 pm the Atlantic Side city was reported quiet.

The week-old student agitation was sparked by the death of Juan Navas Pajaro, whose body was found by the roadside on the Transisthmian Highway near Colon last Wednesday. He died from a blow on the skull.

The student Federation leadership—the victim's brother is the Secretary General—immediately accused the National Department of Investigation. The government is pressing an investigation, but Navas' death still is surrounded by mystery.

The students held demonstrations in Panama City and Colon culminating with Monday's clash with the National Guard on the Atlantic Sides. During the violence that swept the city, property damages estimated at more than one million balboas were caused. Four government buildings were burned.

The government charged the student agitation was the work of communists.

Schools in Panama City and Colon were closed Monday by the government until normality was restored. National Guard troops have kept a cordon around the University of Panama campus, to prevent student concentration there.

CANAL ZONE LIFE: FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SPEAK OUT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, certain elements in the executive branch of our Government have been engaged in a campaign of piecemeal erosions of the rights, powers, and authority of our country over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone and Panama Canal. This long train of abuses and usurpations, invariably pursuing the some object, has long since evinced a design of ignominious surrender recognized by all informed observers.

Specifically, I refer to such ill-advised action as, first, the attempted liquidation in 1955 of the Panama Railroad, which was narrowly averted largely by my own efforts, second, a move to give to Panama some of the major piers at Cristobal, which was prevented by action of the Congress, third, the employment of alien Panamanians on the Canal Zone police and security forces, and fourth, most recently, reports of a plan to adversely affect the payment of tropical differential for service in the Canal Zone to U.S. citizen employees whose labors are of skilled character.

Not only must U.S. citizen employees in the Canal Zone be thus abased but, in addition, they are now informed by their Government that even their right to express themselves concerning these matters should be suppressed. Reference is made to the newly issued set of regulations governing the conduct of such employees, effective March 31, 1966. To illustrate, I quote section 255.735-1(b):

> (b) The nature of the Canal enterprise, its geograprical location, and the *political* status of the United States in the Canal Zone make it *necessary to impose certain restrictions* on personal conduct both on and off the job that are *not ordinarily applicable* to Federal employees. In particular, the *officially declared* interest and policy of the Government of the United States in strengthening the bonds of friendship with the Government and people of Panama, place a *direct responsibility on each employee for himself and his dependents,* to refrain from any action or conduct *that might in any manner obstruct accomplishment of this end* or of *any other declared national-policy objective* of the United States concerning relations between the United States and Panama. [Italic supplied.]

This regulation follows the pattern of what was done by Hitler and Mussolini during their ascendancy and is now being enforced by Castro in Cuba. It is contrary to every dictate and practice of freedom but is the inevitable practice of those in authority who desire to stamp any opposition to their arbitrary and unrealistic programs, and should be immediately withdrawn. It is appropriate to inquire whether or not the Panama Government has issued similar instructions to its own citizens. Evidently not, for the Panamanian press refers uniformly to U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone as gringoes and other highly derogatory terms. In this, as well as in all other matters proposed for new treaty provisions, it is all give for the United States and all take for Panama.

In a recent issue of a Florida newspaper, I read a most informative letter to the editor by a Federal employee, who is President of Navy Lodge No. 2178 of the American Federation of Government Employees, Rodman, Canal Zone.

The indicated letter follows:

[From the Miami Herald, June 8, 1966]

Letter to the Editor: Living Isn't Easy in Canal Zone

In Carlos Conde's last of three articles on Panama and the Panama Canal we find the familiar picture of the lush-living, colonialistic "Zonians" daring to live like Americans being presented to our people at home. Perhaps these few thoughts will help balance the report and portray us a little more realistically.

The ones who are second-generation Zonians or have lived here the better part of their lives—who are by no means a majority of those here—are rightfully proud of their part in building, efficiently operating and defending one of the world's largest public services and engineering achievements.

In recent years we have even been afforded modern, comfortable homes, electrical conveniences such as air conditioning and even the great American pastime, TV. Still, many live in a sub-standard pre-war and even a few pre-Canal wooden structures. The cost-of-living is comparable to Miami with the exception of a few rapidly disappearing items. We spend most of our savings on trips to the U.S. for they cannot be spent on homes or property in the area in which we live and work.

Criticism frequently leveled at the Zonian is that we oppose any and all change that would benefit Panama. After witnessing first-hand over a period of years the effects of politically motivated foreign aid policies in this area it is true we are apprehensive of the many unrealistic expedients proposed and are in favor of a coordinated and well planned long range policy that would have a firm foundation on which to build. It is also true that we are harsh judges of some of the proposals with which the three-day experts and four-year term officials wish to "save" Latin America.

The great restraint shown in maintaining our self-control and dignity through some horrible riot-torn days in 1959 and again in 1964 is seldom mentioned. Through it all, while poor, misled, politically activated mobs raped their own city and tried to rape ours, we did nothing but keep doing our jobs.

Why we are here and what we are doing are too often forgotten. Instead we read malicious and derogatory accounts of us as interlopers and trouble-makers. It is hard to say which experience was worse for the Zonian, the unthinking actions of socially deprived and demogogue-led mobs or the gross misrepresentation of us to our own people by the supposedly educated and responsible press of our own nation.

What is to be accomplished by such reporting is inconceivable. If we were to believe their thesis then we are left with two dubious solutions. First, lower our standards of living in order to "go native" and thereby become more palatable; or more ironic, remove the alleged sources of friction by removing all the Americans and see the wheels of interoceanic transport grind to a halt.

C. W. Hummer, Jr.,
Balboa, Canal Zone.

PUERTO RICO: GOAL FOR "WAR OF NATIONAL LIBERATION"

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for those who have followed the strategy and tactics of the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy, the waging of "wars of national liberation" is a well-known device. Its purpose is not liberation but enslavement under the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, which means under the Communist Party.

In a statement of mine on April 20, 1966, and again on May 25, I commented at length on the "First Conference of the Solidarity of Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America," called the Tri-Continental Conference, which was held at Havana in Castro's Cuba, January 3–15, 1966. Its purpose was to foster revolution in Latin America through the processes of infiltration, subversion, and terrorism. The results of its work have already been evidenced in Panama within sight of the Panama Canal in the form of student riots in Panama City and Colon, with destruction of millions of dollars worth of property and loss of life. All of this required the use of the Panamanian National Guard to restore order.

The latest information from the Caribbean, as now found by investigators of the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, is that Puerto Rico has become an objective of Castro-trained guerrillas for a "war of national liberation."

Mr. Speaker, this is another step in the program to transform the strategic Caribbean into a Red lake in which the Panama Canal is the key target.

An informative discussion of developments in Puerto Rico by Fulton Lewis, Jr., published in a recent issue of a Washington, D.C., weekly newspaper, follows:

[From Human Events, July 9, 1966]

Castro Guerrillas Busy in Puerto Rico

(By Fulton Lewis Jr.)

Investigators for the Senate Internal Security subcommittee report that Castro-trained guerrillas have fanned out across the U.S. commonwealth of Puerto Rico with "national liberation" as their goal.

The Communist threat, of which little has appeared in the mainland press, is real and represents "considerable cause for alarm," the probers warn in a report released recently. Included in the report are the revealing speeches made by Puerto Rican delegates to the Tri-Continental Solidarity Conference held in Havana earlier this year. A fiery young rebel named Narcisco Rabell Martinez, who has received guerrilla training not only in Cuba but China as well, told the conference:

"The independence movement is continuously being organized among the Puerto Rican people so that we may unflinchingly confront U.S. imperialism. It is a fight waged within the very heart of the monster. . . . The possibility of obtaining Puerto Rico's independence is clear and present. . . . With the burgeoning of the mass movement now surfacing, Puerto Rico will soon become a 'free territory of America.' "

Martinez was not engaging in empty rhetoric. Castro-trained saboteurs were plotting the assassination of John Bishop, the FBI chief in San Juan, and stashed arms throughout the Commonwealth. FBI agents and police have engaged in gun battles with Communist guerrillas and seized huge quantities of arms and ammunition, from time bombs to carbines.

Communist sabotage has been widespread, particularly in the sugar fields. Incendiary attacks have been made against "imperialist" outposts throughout the island. Revolutionary cells have been established in major schools and universities.

Puerto Rico has become an important way station for the transfer of drugs from Red China and Cuba to the U.S. mainland. Castro agents, posing as anti-Communist exiles, are active in Puerto Rico and the United States peddling illicit narcotics.

The sale of drugs, particularly cocaine and heroin, provides a considerable amount of foreign exchange by which Castro finances guerrilla activities, according to the subcommittee report.

It is not hard to understand why Fidel Castro seeks the "liberation" of Puerto Rico. Geographically, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico extend in that order in a straight line across the Caribbean from the tip of Florida to the Leeward Islands. Under Communist control, the latter three could effectively block sea and air approaches to the northern half of South America and the Panama Canal. Cuba alone virtually commands the access routes to the Gulf of Mexico and Central America.

A Puerto Rican nationalist named Norman Pietri visited Havana earlier this year to co-ordinate plans for "the total eradication of Yankee military installations" in the Commonwealth. He singled out as targets for potential sabotage "long-range missiles, super bombers loaded with atomic bombs, nuclear submarines and special U.S. anti-guerrilla troops."

The Castro government is frankly pledged to the independence of Puerto Rico via a Viet Nam-style "war of national liberation." On February 10, Puerto Rican Communists established a "Free Puerto Rican Embassy" in Havana. At the same time they signed a so-called "solidarity pact" with the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam in the latter's Havana headquarters.

Aping the tactics of the Viet Cong, the Puerto Ricans claimed that they were "recognized as the only legitimate representative of the Puerto Rican people." Following that announcement, and the establishment of the "embassy," Communist leaders from 26 Latin countries announced they would establish "national committees of solidarity with Free Puerto Rico."

The Viet Cong representatives pledged aid and comfort to the Puerto Ricans declaring that the "enemy of both our peoples, and of humanity, is North American imperialism."

The Soviet Union is actively supporting the Puerto Rican campaign. Radio Moscow regularly beams messages of encouragement to the rebels, assuring them of Soviet "support for your struggle to . . . end the North American colonial yoke on Puerto Rico."

Actually the people of Puerto Rico have repeatedly voiced their desire to remain affiliated with the United States. In November 1964, in a national election they voted by more than 30–1 against "independence," reaffirming their status as American citizens in a "Free State Associated with the United States."

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn of the Senate's speedy approval of the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate five experiment and demonstration plants for research of fish protein concentrate. I have long been extremely interested in this particular product, and I want to emphasize my support of the Senate's action by introducing similar legislation in this House today. I hope that my colleagues will give this bill its well-deserved consideration as it presents a progressive and feasible step forward toward a solution of the world's hunger problem.

I have previously pointed out to this body that hunger is the most pressing problem facing us today, but it can never be too strongly emphasized that hunger and the misery that accompanies it affect two-thirds of the world's people, that these people are dissatisfied, and that they are justified in resenting the gap between their lives and ours. The United States must help. We who have the potential technology to work on this critical problem should also carry the burden. Blindness, anemia, endemic goiter, low mental age and learning ability, as well as many other evils of social and political deterioration are the children of malnutrition. We in the United States cannot ignore the demands of world citizenship. And at the same time we cannot continue our former attempts to feed the world on our diminishing surpluses. We must therefore encourage the upgrading of the indigenous diets and agricultures of the underdeveloped nations.

This is where fish protein concentrate—FPC—comes in. FPC is an odorless, tasteless powder of high protein value that serves as an additive to staple diets. The value of its blandness lies in its versatility; it easily adapts any flavor desired and can be incorporated into the present food culture of any people. It is cheaply produced, easily transported and can be stored indefinitely. Its most important feature, for the war on hunger, is its potential for production in the very countries that need help. Once FPC has been perfected by the vigorous experimental effort authorized by this bill, it will serve a dual role: first, we will be able to export the product itself under our food for freedom program; and second, we will be able to export the know-how as a major step in the permanent solution to the problem. Establish FPC plants in India, educate the people to use it, set up an adequate distribution system and India will be on the way to helping herself from there on.

Mr. Speaker, our fishing industry in the United States currently operates at only about one-fifth its potential. Moreover, the product FPC makes efficient use of all parts of a fish. Just imagine the results of a fivefold increase in the American fisheries coupled with the efficiency increase of utilization of the whole fish. It means, Mr. Speaker, an immense expansion of the amount of nutritive human food extracted from the sea.

In addition to the humanitarian aspects of developing FPC, Mr. Speaker, consider the benefits that this measure implies for our fishing industries. Fish not now sought for commercial use will always have a market, a humanitarian market.

Fish protein concentrate is a must in the present and future fight against hunger. But the experimentation has only begun; the five plants proposed by this bill will greatly increase our knowledge. Our present facilities are too small and too inflexible to meet the ever-increasing demand for adequate utilization of the untapped food available in the seas. We cannot afford not to discover all there is to know about this solution to the problem we face with the protein-starved people of the world. I hope that my colleagues will recognize the urgency of this bill and pass it quickly. It demonstrates this Nation's concern with the world food crisis; but it does more—it authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to take the first concrete step in this vital area.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN DESERVES MUCH PRAISE FOR EFFORTS TO END INTEREST RATE WAR

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN, is as usual, the most active Member of the House of Representatives in the bitter struggle to prevent a rising tide of high interest rates from engulfing the American economy. We are all beneficiaries of his untiring efforts against the ravages of tight money and costly borrowing.

Your Banking Committee, Mr. Speaker, just concluded extensive hearings on Chairman PATMAN's bills, H.R. 14026 and House Joint Resolution 1148, to stop the rate war for savings which threatens to destroy the homebuilding industry and intensify our housing problems. The committee overwhelmingly approved a strong resolution demanding that the Federal Reserve Board take immediate measures to stop this disastrous rate war. The committee also favorably reported Mr. PATMAN's bill, H.R. 15639, which will give a much needed shot-in-the-arm to the mortgage market.

In addition, last November Chairman PATMAN, in a published letter to Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, pointed out that certain member banks were issuing unsecured promissory notes without setting up proper reserves against these liabilities. Chairman Martin agreed, and in January the Reserve Board published in the Federal Register a proposed rule which was adopted in final form in late June to apply reserve and interest rate rules to these notes as suggested by Chairman PATMAN.

Furthermore, I am hopeful that the Board of Governors responds to Chairman PATMAN's expression of concern over misleading advertising of consumer-type certificates of deposit by a few overly aggressive commercial banks. Such advertising is grossly unfair to the vast majority of banks whose ads are above reproach as well as to thrift institutions—and is certainly harmful to innocent investors. I might mention as an example a large midwestern bank which advertises a 6-percent return on savings, but upon investigation it turns out that the saver actually receives only 4¾ percent simple interest. This kind of deception must stop and, if the Federal Reserve Board fails to act, I am sure that the Securities and Exchange Commission will do its duty to enforce the Securities Act of 1933 in this regard.

So all along the line your Banking Committee chairman is working effectively to maintain a sound financial system within a framework of private enterprise, to protect the small saver and the homebuyer, and, last but not least, to protect the general public from the inroads of high, inflationary interest rates.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the week of June 26, over 2,000 of America's finest architects gathered in Denver for their annual convention. The American Institute of Architects recognized during this session that the demonstration cities program, proposed by President Johnson and included as a most vital part of the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, offers tremendous benefits to Americans in cities of all sizes. The institute saw fit to approve unanimously the following resolution, which I present below for the attention of this body:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM AS INCLUDED IN H.R. 15890

Whereas the Demonstration Cities Program as recommended by the Administration has been included as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966 (H.R. 15890); and

Whereas the Demonstration Cities Program is an imaginative approach which will enable cities to concentrate the complete array of all available resources on the rebuilding and resurrection of blighted urban areas; and

Whereas the Demonstration Cities Program recognizes the importance of local initiative and planning, the desirability of a high standard of design and the need for quality construction; and

Whereas the Congress, by approving the Demonstration Cities Program, will make an important contribution toward solving America's most pressing urban problem—improving the quality of urban life; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That The American Institute of Architects strongly endorses the Demonstration Cities Program and urges speedy enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966 (H.R. 15890).

WE CAN BE PROUD AMERICANS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, far too often we Americans are presented with the picture of what is wrong with America. In our newspapers, on the radio and television, we are treated to a continual report of unhappy events seemingly indicating that the United States is in trouble. Many of these events are blown up far out of all proportion. There is a war in South Vietnam in which American boys are being called upon to risk their lives. On the domestic front there is concern over civil rights, inflation, and a host of individuals and organizations formed to protect something which is wrong with American society.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that far too many of us tend to underrate our country and its significance in the world today as the leader of the free world. We tend to see the things which are wrong with our country largely because they oftentimes receive more publicity than those which are right. This perhaps is a human failing. Probably no other day during the year is a better time to take stock of our many blessings as Americans than the Fourth of July. The

Fourth of July is a good time to pause and reflect on what is right with America.

On the eve of this Fourth of July, a great newspaperman did just that in a sterling editorial entitled, "We Can Be Proud Americans." Mr. James A. Clendinen, the editor of the Tampa Tribune, has done all Americans a great favor by putting down in black and white a refreshing appraisal of what is good and right about the greatest nation in man's history, the United States of America. This editorial is typical of James A. Clendinen. Over the years, he has forcefully focused attention on the truly important issues facing our community, our State, and our Nation. Mr. Clendinen is president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, and has won many editorial and journalism honors. I believe his editorial on the eve of the Fourth of July is one of his finest efforts. I hope all Members of the Congress will take the time to read, "We Can Be Proud Americans." I was sincerely stirred by it, and I believe you will be too.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, July 3, 1966]

We Can Be Proud Americans

Should Thomas Jefferson return from a long sleep and spend a day reading the newspapers and listening to radio and television, he would be dismayed at what apparently had befallen the cause for which he and his fellows pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

He would find renowned editors, distinguished Members of Congress and revered clergymen lamenting the state of America.

It is, they say, a nation which is trying to kill God, destroy moral principles and encourage idleness; a nation torn by racial strife, a nation whose youth outdoes its elders in degeneracy, a nation without the fortitude to wage a successful war or the wisdom to conclude an honorable peace.

They compile a doomful catalogue of what's wrong with America.

As one who has voiced his own share of complaints about conditions, it occurs to me that this Fourth of July eve is a good time to pause and reflect on what's *right* with America.

I submit that there is an impressive checklist.

* * * * *

Consider the sound and fury over civil rights that has shaken our country. To hear the extremists on one side, you'd think the Southern Negro still toiled in peonage. To hear extremists on the other side, you'd think the whole structure of our society would be laid in ruins by the granting of equal rights.

It helps to draw away from the conflict and get a clearer perspective.

Among my family papers are bills of sale for slaves, written as impersonally as though the transaction involved a horse or cow. One such paper, executed at Eufala, Alabama, in 1855 reads: "Received of Ezekiel Alexander . . . one thousand dollars in full payment for a Negro man slave named Jonas . . . which I warrant to be sound in body and mind . . . and further warrant Jonas to be a slave for life . . ."

Now in this same Alabama area where my grandfather practiced law and planted cotton before the Civil War, descendants of those slaves are not only voting but are candidates for public office.

All this change in the space of three generations!

Here in Florida, where school integration was the flaming issue in the Governor's race six years ago, and the Civil Rights Bill was the overriding subject in the 1964 campaign, who would have thought that the race question would be a negligible factor in the recent primary election?

The Ku Kluxers who murder in the name of white supremacy and the Negroes who riot in revenge against "whitey" are a small minority of both races.

When we consider the restraint and the fair-mindedness with which the great majority of Americans have reacted to the revolution in racial relations,

We can be proud Americans.

* * * * *

A favorite exhibit of all the doom-criers is America's youth. You get the impression that he is a bearded bum who spends his days lying in front of troop trains and his nights on an LSD jag.

Well, let's not be too hasty in consigning our young people to Skid Row.

Consider two recent surveys on the subject.

The Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J., reported, after surveying 850 colleges and universities, that left-wing student groups account for *"less than 1 per cent of the total student population."*

Another report, by the respected pollster Samuel Lubbell, said the picture of radicalism and rebellion on the campus has been greatly overdrawn. He interviewed students at 36 colleges and found that *five out of six* hold the same basic political and economic views as their parents.

In contrast to the beatniks and acid-heads, there is the remarkable evidence of idealism and patriotism on the part of thousands of our youth.

Take the Peace Corps. It has about 12,000 volunteers in the field. Some 10,000 of these are young men and women between 19 and 25 years of age, who chose two-year assignments in remote countries, under primitive living conditions, for pay of $75 a month. An impelling idealism had to be the motivation.

An even more inspiring report card comes from Vietnam.

Every responsible correspondent has commented on the courage and resolution of American soldiers in what is a dirty, bloody and often confusing war.

At the Tribune we have received some very moving letters from soldiers in Vietnam; letters which glowed with patriotism. I do not recall that we have received a *single complaint from a man stationed over there.*

We've all read of the Negro soldier who threw himself on a grenade to protect his buddies; of Captain Bill Carpenter calling for the planes to drop napalm on his own position to stop the enemy advance; of the gallant 14 Army Special Forces men, who, with all but two wounded, fought off an enemy force of more than 200.

These are the spectacular exploits which make the headlines and win the medals. But for every one of these, there are a thousand other men who in solitary heroism go forward to face death in the flak-filled air and the Communist-infested jungles.

An incident which occurred at a Tampa social function recently is worth noting.

Some grown-ups were chatting with a young man just returned from combat duty in Vietnam. Against a background of cocktail conversation and dance music, one of the women made a thoughtless remark: "Oh," she said, "I'll be so glad when we stop playing that silly game over there in Vietnam."

Responded the young man, with great earnestness: "That's no game we're playing over there, ma'am. That's for keeps."

Didn't he show a much clearer understanding of our national obligation than do many of the adults who doubt and deprecate the moral strength of his generation?

When we appraise, with an unbiased eye, the abundant evidence of idealism and patriotism on the part of our youth—

We can be proud Americans.

Another matter which has spread despair among many of our good citizens is the supposed rejection of religion by a nation whose motto is "In God We Trust."

The "God is dead" argument, coming after the Supreme Court banned official prayers in schools, has led pessimists to fear that America is riding hell-bent down the road to atheism.

Not quite.

Look at another survey, this one by pollster Lou Harris. He found that 97 per cent of the Americans interviewed affirm a faith in God. Furthermore, church membership in 1964 (the last year for which we have statistics) increased by one half of 1 per cent more than did our population.

In truth, the "God is dead" argument has been a boon to believers. It has compelled them to reexamine the bases of their faith; and that reexamination has imparted new strength and vigor to belief.

For myself, I have never doubted the power and permanence of religious faith since I visited Russia a few years ago.

One Sunday other newspapermen and I attended services at the Baptist Church in Moscow—the only Protestant church permitted there. It was an unforgettable experience to witness the devotion of people whose faith had survived an incessant propaganda assault, the scorn of their neighbors and the indirect if not direct persecution of their government.

If, in half a century of trying, the Soviet government has been unable to kill God, how can a few confused theologians succeed in this country?

When we think of our freedom to worship as we please, and of the great majority of citizens who exercise this privilege—

We can be proud Americans.

Another problem often cited as a sign of decay in America is the rate of crime in the cities. It's bad and we must do more, through better policing and prosecution, to reduce it.

But even here there is encouragement.

This subject was discussed at a recent journalism seminar at Emory University in Atlanta. Dr. Richard Wade, a history professor who has made a specialty of studying the problems of cities, made the surprising statement that the American cities of 1966 are actually safer than those of 1926, the early 1900's or the 1880's. He quoted statistics to prove it. Living conditions, too, he said, are vastly better in today's cities.

I can't speak for New York or Chicago. But I can testify from personal knowledge that the Tampa of today is an unbelievably better community than the Tampa of 1935. When I came here as a reporter, gambling houses and houses of prostitution operated as openly as any licensed business; gang murders were a common occurrence; honest citizens hardly dared vote on election day because thugs in the service of corrupt politicians controlled the polls. There was a general public apathy toward these conditions because reform seemed hopeless.

The transformation, in community progress and civic pride, in 30 years is little short of a miracle.

When we recall the improvements which have been made in Tampa and other cities across the land and the civic awareness of the work yet to be done—

We can be proud Americans.

What about the most crucial area of all those in which America is engaged? The worldwide struggle against Communism?

Detractors say that we are hopelessly bogged down in Vietnam, that the Communists constantly outsmart us, that our foreign policies have made us Uncle Sucker to the world.

We have followed an erratic course in Vietnam but the more realistic policy now in effect is paying off. The enemy, there is every reason to believe, will suffer a major defeat there.

Communism already has experienced serious reverses elsewhere.

Indonesia revolted against Red Chinese shackles which Sukarno was preparing and decimated the native Communist Party.

Ghana booted out the pro-Communist Nkrumah.

The Dominican Republic, contrary to predictions of the handwringers, rejected the leftist Juan Bosch and elected the conservative, pro-American Joaquin Balaguer to the Presidency.

Cuba, which Castro and his fellow Communists planned to make a showcase for Marxism in Latin America, is an increasing embarrassment and burden to Russia.

Measured against its own timetable and its own goals of economic abundance for all at home and for extending its domination throughout the world, Communism, in fact, is a proven failure.

By contrast, count the remarkable achievements of this country.

We have, since World War II, provided 116 billion dollars in government aid to other countries. As private citizens we have given $800 million in assistance to the needy of 64 countries in CARE packages alone.

In the same time by a show of resoluteness we forced Russia to pull its armies from the Middle East, we helped Greece subdue a Communist revolt, we have fought a war to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam, we prevented a Communist take-over by landing Marines in Lebanon, we are fighting another war against Communist aggression in Vietnam, and we have raised the standard of living for the mass of our people to levels which the most visionary Russian or Chinese cannot even imagine.

When we weigh the achievements of this nation against its failures, when we compare our contributions to human progress with those of the rest of the world, when we reflect upon the blessings of freedom and material abundance which, with God's help, we enjoy—

We can be proud Americans.

—JAMES A. CLENDINEN.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, anything new is bound to receive a great deal of attention, both pro and con. The Johnson administration's war on poverty is probably the most dramatic and comprehensive attack on the social ills plaguing our country ever attempted. It is a dream becoming a reality. Because it is dynamic and new, it has its critics. But I have always been a firm believer in the theory that facts speak far louder than the shrill voices of defeat and despair.

One of the programs receiving the greatest attention in the war on poverty is the Job Corps. In the Job Corps underprivileged youths ranging in age from 16 to 21 are pulled out of the bottom of the Nation's economic barrel. These are American young people who are school dropouts who are unable to find or hold an adequate job in our society. They are the economical and cultural underprivileged who have grown up in the very worst surroundings. They need help and a change of environment. They get this in the Job Corps.

Much has been said and written about the cost of the Job Corps. Recently, two outstanding articles appeared in the Tampa Tribune written by that newspaper's Washington correspondent, Charles Stafford, dealing with this subject. I feel these articles represent the very finest traditions of American journalism because they deal with facts. The facts are that the investment this Nation is making in the war on poverty, and more specifically, in the Job Corps, will more than pay for itself many times over in years to come. I commend Mr. Stafford's articles to the Members of the Congress. The first, entitled "You Should Consider the Facts," appeared in the July 3 edition of the Tampa Tribune. The second, entitled "Director Disappointed at Public Misunderstanding of Job Corps," appeared in the Tampa Tribune of July 5, 1966.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, July 3, 1966]

YOU SHOULD CONSIDER THE FACTS—BUT BEWARE

(By Charles Stafford)

WASHINGTON.—Citizen, beware.

What a political man may tell you in an effort to influence the way you vote might not be as factual as he would have you believe.

Not that he is dishonest.

The fact might be only half a fact, or it might be applied to an inapplicable situation.

Not that he is dishonest.

He might sincerely believe his view is in the best interest of the country, and of you, and if he had to bend a fact a little to persuade you, well . . .

Let's consider a fact in point.

For more than a year, Republican members of Congress and some Democrats who consider the war on poverty ill-conceived, have bludgeoned the Job Corps with this statement:

"You can send a boy to Harvard for less, much less, than you can train him in the Job Corps."

The Job Corps reports that the average cost per trainee for fiscal year 1966 was $9,945. The tuition at Harvard is $1,750.

Scandalous, isn't it?

But let's examine this political fact.

If you have been to college, or have a child in college, you know that the tuition is just a part of the cost of attending college.

A resident student at Harvard pays $620 a year for board, and $550 for room.

A Harvard spokesman said, "We estimate the cost for the 1966–67 school year for a resident student who watches his spending with reasonable care at $3,440."

Tuition, room and board total $2,930, which leaves the student $510 for laundry, books, special fees, entertainment, toothpaste and other incidentals. A modest fee indeed, as the Harvard spokesman ackowledged. It does not include travel to and from school, he emphasized.

Let's say our student lives in Washington, D.C. the round trip air fare (Job Corps trainees travel by air) to Boston is $51.66. He will come home for the Christmas holidays (Job Corps trainees get to) so we have to double that: $103.32.

That raises the cost of sending a lad to Harvard to $3,543 a year.

That's $3,543 vs. $9,945. Still pretty scandalous.

But no college or university, not even Harvard, lives by tuition alone. The tuition does not represent the actual cost of providing a year's education to a student. The institution gets private endowments, and aid from the federal government.

The last time anyone at Harvard tried to figure out the actual cost, the spokesman said, was about ten years ago. They reckoned at that time that the tuition represented about 50 per cent of the actual cost.

So we add $1,750 more to the cost of sending a boy to Harvard and get: $5,293.

Well, that's still more than $4,000 below the Job Corps figure.

But just a moment there, old political friend.

The Job Corps figure is for a 12-month year. The Harvard figure is for a 9-month scholastic year.

Reducing the Job Corps figure to a 9-month year, you get $7,459.

It's still scandalous, you say. Well, consider this: The Job Corps arrived at its figure by taking the total cost of operating the Job Corps and dividing it by the number of trainees. Included in the cost was capital costs—the expense involved in construction of facilities and rehabilitation of buildings chosen as training sites.

No university includes the cost of new buildings in its operating budget. In other words, these costs would not be counted in the cost of educating a student.

Because most of its construction is behind it, Job Corps expects its cost per trainee for fiscal 1967 to drop to $8,120 (or $6,090 for a 9-month period).

So now we are down to this comparison: Harvard $5,293, Job Corps $6,090.

The argument is still valid. You can send a boy to Harvard for less than you can educate him in the Job Corps (unless he happens to live in Los Angeles, in which case the added travel expenses would make the Harvard figure about even with the Job Corps figure).

But at least we have taken some of the bend out of the fact.

Now let's look at its application.

Dr. Franklyn Johnson, the former Florida educator who heads Job Corps, says that when the question of what is facetiously called "Mr. Shriver's education vs. Mr. Pusey's" arises he likes to recall the point made by his predecessor, Dr. Otis A. Singletary, now chancellor of the University of North Carolina.

When he headed Job Corps, Singletary used to say that he would personally "foot the bill for the first year for every Job Corpsman that Harvard would accept."

He didn't lay out a penny.

The average Job Corpsman has had seven years of schooling before dropping out, and has a reading proficiency of less than a fifth grader.

Can you imagine a class in sixth grade reading at Harvard?

The student at Harvard goes to class with 25 to 40 other students, listens to a lecture, and either learns what he hears or busts out. The Job Corpsman must have individual attention. He is very nearly tutored in the things he needs.

The Harvard student is led to the well, but he doesn't have to drink.

The Job Corpsman is force fed.

Eighty per cent of the young men and women entering Job Corps have never seen a doctor or dentist. The Job Corps takes care of their medical expenses, which is figured in the cost of their training.

The papa of the Harvard undergrad has been paying a doctor back home to keep him in good health since he was an infant, and the cost isn't considered in his education.

In short, the comparison of Mr. Shriver's education vs. Mr. Pusey's is ridiculous because the two aren't comparable.

A critic of the Job Corps might be right when he says the program is too expensive and poorly managed. But don't let him convince you, citizen, by telling you that it costs less to send a boy to Harvard.

Challenge his facts, analyze them, consider only those that stand the test.

Do the same, if you will, with any fact concerning any subject that a political man gives you. Or a salesman, or a doctor, or a lawyer, or a horsetrader, or a panhandler, or a minister of the gospel.

Or a newsman who writes a column from Washington.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, July 5, 1966]

DIRECTOR DISAPPOINTED AT PUBLIC MISUNDERSTANDING OF JOB CORPS

(By Charles Stafford)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Franklyn A. Johnson, director of the Job Corps, tells the story with pride, for it tells the story of the Job Corps' goal. And it's true:

"A Job Corps graduate got his first pay check," says Johnson. "No one had explained to him about deductions. He told the paymaster, 'This isn't right. The boss told me I would make more than this.'

"The paymaster explained to him: 'This amount is for the medical thing, and this is for Social Security, and this is for taxes.'

"The young fellow threw his hands in the air and yelled to his buddies, 'Hey, fellows, I'm a taxpayer at last!'

"He had become," says Johnson, "a producing member of society.

"We are trying to get a kid like this off the dole," he says. "If we don't save him, he is going to be a burden or the public for the rest of his life."

It is discouraging to Johnson that people misunderstand this goal.

It was deeply disappointing to him that St. Petersburg civic leaders did not understand.

For Johnson is an adopted son of Florida.

True, he was born in Rochester, N.Y., but he moved with his family to Miami Beach at the age of 6. He left the state to get his higher education at Rutgers, Harvard and the London School of Economics—sandwiching some high adventure with the First Infantry Division in North Africa and Europe, in an Army hospital where he found and won his wife, and in the Central Intelligence Agency.

But in 1952, he was back in Florida, serving as professor of government at Rollins College in Winter Park. He left after four years to become president of Jacksonville University, then in its infancy. In five years of his leadership, it became an accredited, degree-granting institution.

In 1963, Johnson was named president of California State College at Los Angeles, the position he left last January to take over the reins of the Job Corps.

His father, Col. Robert B. Johnson, lives in DeLand.

Dr. Johnson has the look of a gentleman of distinction—handsome features, greying temples, dark horn rim glasses. But he is almost never in repose; restless energy keeps him moving.

As head of the Job Corps, his slightly-built frame is shouldering a heavy burden. The Office of Economic Opportunity is under fire, and the Job Corps is in the thick of it. No other facet of the poverty war has been so heavily criticized.

"It is something like the battles in academic life," says Johnson, "only so much more complex.

"When you do something this new, you have controversy," he says. "You expect battles to make progress. There has been nothing like this in history."

Tiny flags on a map of the nation hanging on a wall behind his desk mark the 85 conservation camps and 17 urban training centers that are the campuses of the Job Corps.

"It's costly," Johnson says.

The Job Corps reaches down into the bottom of the nation's barrel of youth 16 to 21 years old. To qualify, they must be school dropouts for three months or more, unable to find or hold an adequate job. Underprivileged from having grown up in impoverished surroundings, and in need of a change of environment.

The corps teaches them job skills and basic academic subjects.

The cost for the first year was $9,945 per youngster.

Cost is part of the controversy over the Job Corps, a large part, says Johnson.

Taking up a profile of a typical trainee, he shows you why it is costly.

The average trainee has had seven years of school, but reads at a 4.7 grade level.

Forty-seven per cent have flunked examinations for military service—17 per cent the physical and 30 percent the mental.

An amazing 80 per cent have never seen a doctor or a dentist. Some come to the Job Corps with two sets of teeth.

"This is a travesty on American affluence at the middle of the 20th century," Johnson says.

In the corps, the trainees get their teeth fixed, are fitted for glasses, treated for long-untreated medical problems, and some get psychiatric help. It's costly.

In the classroom, the trainees have a wide range of needs. Some read at the second grade level, some at the eighth. "You can't lecture these kids," Johnson says. "It's almost a tutorial situation." It's costly.

Since it was a pioneering program, instructional materials and equipment had to be developed from scratch. Sites chosen for the centers had to be rehabilitated and adapted to the program. It was costly. But these costs are behind the Job Corps now.

"It will still be costly," says Johnson, "but the costs are going down."

For the new fiscal year, the Job Corps is budgeting $8,120 per trainee, and for fiscal '68, $7,650.

There are now 29,000 youngsters in training. This will go up to 45,000 next year.

As of June 6—roughly one year after the program was begun—2,240 trainees had graduated. Of this number 616 went into service (they couldn't get in before), 270 went on to other schools, 10 of them to college, and the remainder found jobs.

"We are only scratching the surface," says Johnson. He estimates there are 500,000 youngsters in the country eligible for the Job Corps.

One of the problems the corps has faced is the wide gap of understanding between teacher and trainee. Johnson is excited about a new effort to solve this problem, an effort to get Job Corps graduates on the training center staffs. Thirty have been added, and 40 more are in training.

"They have been through the poverty mill," he says. "They are in a position to communicate with other trainees."

The corps, in its first year, has had some problems in community relations and learned some hard lessons. One of these was in St. Petersburg. Recently, OEO Director Sargent Shriver directed that the woman's center there be moved away because "hostility has replaced hospitality."

The city council had urged the Job Corps to leave.

"I was disappointed that people couldn't see the advantage that this program is going to bring," Johnson says. "I was particularly hurt that it occurred in my state."

But he says everyone now agrees that the center shouldn't have been located in St. Petersburg in the first place.

"The city is a place people go to retire, a place they go for peace and quiet," he says. "And, in that sense, there are some cities that are more suitable than others."

And finally there is the problem of bad publicity every time a Job Corps trainee gets into trouble. Johnson has little patience with this. He says Job Corps trainees have a good behavior record, and he cites FBI figures to prove it.

Of all young people in the United States in the 16–21 bracket, 6.5 per cent have arrest records. But the arrest record for corpsmen after entering training is only 3.4 per cent.

That, in itself, is a mark of progress to Johnson.

For each youngster that is saved from crime, he says, the public saves $2,448 a year in jail costs. And for each one it turns into a productive, taxpaying citizen, it saves $1,968 a year in welfare costs.

To Dr. Franklyn Arthur Johnson, the value of the victory more than outweighs the cost—and the battle—of the moment.

WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's war against poverty is being won. In the few short months since the Economic Opportunity Act has been in existence, dramatic progress has been made in extending the helping hand to the one in every five Americans who today lives in hopeless poverty amidst the greatest prosperity of any nation in history.

This Nation has a moral responsibility to see to it that all of our people have the opportunity to live as full and meaningful lives as their native talents and intelligence allow. Poverty saps at the very vitals of our society. I do not believe in the theory that we will always have the poor with us.

I have been pleased to note in the past several months an increasing amount of constructive journalism dealing with the war against poverty and what those of us dedicated to this battle are attempting to do. A good example of this is the article written by Hobart Rowen entitled "Shriver's Poverty Goal: Real or Pipe-Dream?" which appeared in the Sunday, July 10, edition of the Washington Post.

This article is one of the best I have read dealing with the war against poverty and the charge sometimes heard that we cannot afford this fight. Rowen accurately and dramatically points out that the United States can afford this effort. As he indicates, to shirk this responsibility means that "there's something wrong somewhere." I commend the article to all Members of the Congress. It should be "must reading":

SHRIVER'S POVERTY GOALS: REAL OR PIPE-DREAM?

(By Hobart Rowen)

One needs blinders to ignore the sharp contrast between affluence and poverty on almost every side in this country. The lush rewards of an economic boom, in part fueled by war in Vietnam, pour into the lives of the many, while the tragedy of poverty continues to dominate "The Other America."

Our society is replete, on the one hand, with two-car families enjoying color TV, good food, long vacations, heat in the winter and air conditioning in the summer—and on the other, the non-families, underfed and sickly, unemployed or scavenging for a few hours work, cold in winter and steamy in the summer, dying slowly in their garbage-laden hovels.

The more sensitive correspondents covering last week's Governors' Conference in Los Angeles cringed at the embarrassing lushness of a new hotel-city, a scant few minutes from the unbelievable excrescence that is Watts.

It is the same in every big city in the U.S.; the ghettos exist almost side-by-side with the fancy hotels and tower apartments with their roof-top pools and tennis courts.

Yet, when Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity proposed, that as a goal, poverty be wiped out by 1976, some scoffed. Shriver must be wearing "rose-tinted glasses," the *New York Times* harrumphed.

Well, regardless of the *New York Times'* editorial position, the only thing wrong with Shriver's goal is that 10 years may be too long to expect the poor to wait, docile and patient.

This big, rich country of ours can well afford to spare the resources necessary to meet Shriver's goal, and to do anything less would be immoral.

The economic basis for our ability to do the job lies in the expectation that we will have a one-trillion-dollar economy in 1976. That is the figure 1 with 12 zeroes after it: $1,000,000,000,000.

This is no wild guess. In recent weeks, Walter W. Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr, and the National Planning Association—among others—have all come up with estimates around the trillion mark for Gross National Product ten years hence.

Heller, for example, calculates with some precision that given a 3.5 per cent growth rate, GNP in 1976 will be $978,000,000,000. If a more desirable 4.5 per cent growth rate is achieved, the total will be $1,078,000,000,000.

These box-car numbers are a bit unwieldy for ordinary comprehension. A more simple way of putting it is that a trillion-dollar country in 1976 will be fully twice the size of the economy as recently as 1960.

If on that basis, then, enough can't be spared to eliminate poverty, there's something wrong somewhere. The National Planning Association warns that everything can't be done at once. True. But as Heller says, "nothing else should have a priority higher than eradicating poverty."

Heller's views on this whole question, detailed here for the first time, deserve close attention. It was his imagination, after all, that first inspired President Kennedy to launch the antipoverty planning and convinced President Johnson to carry it forward as his own program.

The Minnesota economist is certain that Shriver's 1976 goal is realistic. "We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, considering our affluence, if we plan on anything else," Heller told me.

He agrees readily that there is more to licking poverty than just providing the money. "It is a question of ingenuity and our institutional capacity to get at the real roots of poverty," he says.

But in terms of being able to finance the effort, Heller rightly insists that the resources are there. This country can do anything it commits itself to do.

Shriver did not pluck the 1976 date out of the air. His target was based, first, on an interim goal for 1972 that would cut the existing poverty population of 32,000,000 to 12,000,000.

To do his, Shriver has laid before the Budget Bureau a five-year projection of spending beginning with fiscal 1968 that may shock the dollar-watchers in this country. But would they be less shocked by bloody revolutions in the ghettos?

OEO officials are not giving out these confidential estimates, but some good guesses can be made. One starts with the President's proposal in the budgt for fiscal 1967 (the year which just began on July 1) for cash expenditures of about $24 billion to help the poor.

This includes not only OEO's own budget of $1¾ billion, but all the money to be spent for poor people through social security, veterans programs, public assistance and so on.

For fiscal 1968, this column learns, Shriver wants to add between $5 and 10 billion to the $24 billion figure, then boost the total by successive substantial (but lesser) increments each year through 1972.

That means a fiscal 1968 antipoverty budget in the vicinity of $30 billion or more, rising to $40 billion or more by fiscal 1972.

Does the number sound overwhelming? Can we afford it? Government sources indicate that by 1972, the Gross National Product will probably be around $850 billion, up $150 billion from the rate at the start of this year.

Thus, a $40 billion antipoverty program would mean allocating a slightly higher percentage of our wealth out of an $850 billion economy than we allowed when we spent $24 billion out of $700 billion.

But that is just the point: we must do better, or the antipoverty effort will be a mere holding operation, and actual eradication of poverty will be an unreachable hope.

Shriver says that if the poor can be reduced to 12,000,000 by 1972, the rest of the job can be completed in the four following years.

The war against poverty will need boldness of concept as well as money. Shriver and others talk of "income maintenance," a heavy phrase which means adding cash to the incomes of those who are not able to swing it despite all other forms of help.

One form of income maintenance is the controversial "negative income tax." Another, being investigated by the Council of Economic Advisers, is improved public assistance programs, which would involve minimum standards set by the Federal Government.

The form is less important than the final result, that is, boosting the income of the most unfortunate. Shriver calculates that to meet his first five-year goal, some seven million of the 20 million to be removed from poverty will need this kind of direct aid.

But how about the Vietnam War, some will ask. Can we afford all of this when the war costs so much?

If there is a major escalation of the war, other expenditures will have to suffer some. But unless Vietnam blows up into a total war, the huge American economy can still provide a better shake for its poor at home.

Top economists estimate, for example, that the war cost could increase by $2.5 billion each quarter without requiring additional taxes—the growth of the economy itself would cover that much of an escalation.

If the cost of the war should remain constant, there might actually be a sizable surplus in fiscal 1967.

And looking hopefully to the day the Vietnam conflict ends, vast outlays to whip poverty will be needed not only for the social and humanitarian purposes involved, but to replace in part the vast war budget.

On balance, Shriver's goal is reasonable and desirable, and deserves the support of all thinking people.

FEDERAL PAY BILL

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my colleagues a few of my personal feelings on the Federal pay bill before the House today.

I support the proposal, but I want the RECORD to show that I am somewhat disappointed over the action taken yesterday by the other body. I feel the Senate has done an injustice to the Federal retirees.

While the Senate version of the pay bill does make provision for widows' pensions, I am sorry to note that their version deleted what I consider to be one of the most important sections in this measure; namely, the recomputation of pension benefits. This action will have an adverse effect on close to 100,000 Federal retirees, who, under the House version, could have recomputed their annuities under the 1962 formula.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, spent many long hours studying and analyzing the impact of the recomputation provision. It seems a shame to see this labor washed away.

Mr. Speaker, by and large, the proposals before us today are well devised and well thought out. They cover the broad scope of Federal service from salary increases to improved fringe provisions. On each of these items I have long voiced my firm support. My objection today is not to the pay bill itself: my objection is to the actions taken yesterday in the Senate.

I support the pay bill and will continue to support any proposal to guarantee Federal employees their proper standing in the community.

SOMETHING TO SAY: OUR OLD HORSES NEED A RETIREMENT HOME

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the May issue of Horsemen's Journal, there appeared an article by my good friend, Mr. Daniel Martin, of Cambridge, Mass. It is my pleasure to call this article to the attention of the Congress, and to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

SOMETHING TO SAY: OUR OLD HORSES NEED A RETIREMENT HOME

(By Daniel Martin)

As an owner and trainer, many times I'm asked by horse racing fans, "What happens to these horses after they're through racing?" I tell them, somewhat evasively, "If they're fairly bred, and their racing record is any good, they can be used for breeding purposes." But that does not satisfy them. They want to know what happens when they can't be bred, such as is the case with geldings, barren mares, impotent studs and those with bad breeding and racing records. Informed that many are sold as hunters and/or jumpers, some as saddle horses or lead ponies, and some given away as pets, the curious fan seems satisfied.

I've raced at some of the finest circuits, but got most of my basic training at the half-milers and fair meets. Horsemen at the halfers are usually cutting costs in order to meet their ever-increasing expenses. Many own these animals on cuff deals, or train them on a percentage basis, especially when they are down to a two or three horse stable. These cheap horses wind up sold, resold, and resold again, depreciating in value each time until they are too old and/or too sore to race. When they have little or no value left, owners sometimes try to give them away as a pet.

Have you ever tried to give away a horse that is 9 or 10 years old, sore, can't be ridden or bred, has a big appetite and 10 or 15 more years to live? It's difficult, if not impossible.

A horseman is a horselover, but also a businessman. When his horses are running bad and he owes the feedman, blacksmith, and others, he can't afford to feed pets and couldn't get stalls for them anyway. A home on the farm is the proper place for them, but that costs about $50 per month, and if a man stayed in the business long enough, he'd soon accumulate more horses and more farm bills.

The only other alternatives now are to pay the vet $10 to destroy him, or sell him to the market house for $60 or $70 depending on his weight. Not much of a reward for a horse that has raced from two years old to old age, and may well have been someone's bread and butter. With all the winter racing nowadays, there is little chance the horse has had much in the way of winter vacations, especially if it is a cheap one.

Although there are many opportunities to make serious money in racing, I've yet to meet a horseman in the game for money alone. A man must love horses in order to spend seven days a week with them, year round. He develops an affection for an individual horse, and would rather see it graze a few years instead of ending up in a dog food can.

I've thought about a solution to this problem and have talked to many fans and horsemen about it. They sympathize, but what to do? I have some ideas which may interest racing associations and other racing bodies, as well as the public. They are as follows:

1. Farms maintained for the retirement of racehorses (owned publicly or privately).

2. Horses retired on a per year basis ($300–$400 per year), until deemed ill or feeble by a competent veterinarian, and then humanely disposed of.

3. The farms would be supported by the horses retired there, and they to be supported by a fund especially set up for this purpose.

A fund like this could be supported in various ways, such as withholdings based on a certain percentage of a horse's earnings from the time he is two years old until his date of retirement, regardless of transfer of ownership; an appeal to the governors and state legislatures for a small percentage of racing handles and horse sales such as the Keeneland, Saratoga and Belmont sales; a percentage of race track admissions, if only five cents of the price; donation boxes placed at the cashier windows to enable the public to contribute some of their dimes after cashing a ticket.

Millions of dollars are spent in medical research regarding the horse. Many now undergo surgery and return to race successfully. Only a few years ago, this was thought impossible. Race tracks and their personnel are improving in appearance. The HBPA and management get together to improve conditions and satisfy horsemen. Millions of dollars go into purse money each year. Racing is considered the nation's No. 1 spectator sport, meaning a lot of admission money. Such huge investments, and such huge returns. The Jockey's Guild sees to it that a percentage is taken out of each jock's mount for his retirement, besides his social security. Everyone is taken care of, but no arrangements are made for the "athletes" who make the sport possible.

If we consider ourselves mistreated, we squawk, but what does a horse do? Well, it's time somebody squawked for it, as it has a legitimate beef. Fans who understand the situation tell me they certainly wouldn't mind an additional nickel to their admittance fee. Also, when a fan cashes a ticket worth a few dollars and change, I don't think he'd mind giving the change toward the performer's retirement (this, of course, would be voluntary). Many wealthy owners having stake horses and winning big races would be glad to write a few tax deductible checks toward those animals not fortunate enough to be a member of their stable.

I've owned a few of these unfortunate athletes myself, and have carried them with me trying to find them a home. But as expenses rose, I finally had to face facts and dispose of them, instead of retiring them. Horsemen don't want to do it, but are forced to financially.

Are not these old campaigners entitled to some recognition for their past performances? It all amounts to a few years of grazing and the right to grow old peacefully, little enought to ask, after the entertainment they've provided for millions. They put money in our pockets, add to the economy of the nation, provide jobs for thousands, and are responsible for the "Sport of Kings."

TRUMAN CENTER IS BEGUN IN ISRAEL

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 11, an historic event took place of which this country can be justly proud. The valiant and great state of Israel paid tribute to a great American, President Harry S. Truman.

In May of 1948 the ancient and proud heritage of the Jewish people was brought to modern fruition. The state of Israel, traditional home of the children of Abraham, was declared to be an independent modern state. But that long-awaited day was not without some uncertainties, some fears. Surrounded on all sides by nations swearing to seek her destruction, Israel at the moment of independence did not know for sure who were her friends, who her enemies.

Israel did not have to wait long to discover that in the United States of America she had a true friend. Within 11 minutes, President Truman announced to Israel and to the world that the United States recognized the state of Israel and welcomed her as a sister state in the family of free democratic nations.

Israel has never forgotten Harry S. Truman for this deed. President Truman was the first head of a foreign state to recognize her existence, and he followed this recognition by offers of aid and assistance.

On Monday, the grateful people of Israel paid another tribute to President Truman. In Jerusalem, the spiritual heart of the nation, the people of Israel dedicated a center for the advancement of peace in honor of Harry S. Truman. In an article in this morning's New York Times, James Feron described the moving ceremony in which Israel honored her oldest and dearest friend.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the article by Mr. Feron in the RECORD; it is a fitting tribute to a great American and a great nation:

TRUMAN CENTER IS BEGUN IN ISRAEL—MESSAGE OF EX-PRESIDENT IS READ AT CORNERSTONE FETE

(By James Feron)

JERUSALEM, (ISRAELI SECTOR) July 11.—A cornerstone was laid today near Hebrew University for a peace center that former President Truman said might provide "a fresh start" in finding ways to prevent war.

The Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, a $4.1-million project financed by 41 equal donations, mostly from American Jewish leaders, will serve mainly as an international study center.

It will function as part of the university, covering such subjects as international relations, sociology, comparative religion and political theory. A $50,000 Truman Peace Prize also will be awarded annually.

Today's ceremony took place without the former President, who remained in Independence, Mo., on the advice of his doctors. Thurgood Marshall, the United States Solicitor General represented Mr. Truman.

TRUMAN'S REGRETS EXPRESSED

But the former President had prepared his own remarks and they were spoken by a longtime associate, David Noyes. Before conveying Mr. Truman's message, however, Mr. Noyes spoke of the former President's physical condition and his feelings about not being able to attend.

"He works, he reads and writes," Mr. Noyes said of the 82-year-old Mr. Truman. "His legs have given out a bit, but nobody was more disappointed in not being able to come than he was."

Mr. Noyes nodded his head toward Miss Rose Conway, who was sitting with 600 others in the university auditorium, and introduced her as Mr. Truman's personal secretary since the days of his Presidency. "This is her first time out of the country," Mr. Noyes said, "but Mr. Truman wanted her to come as an indication of his personal interest."

Referring to the recognition of Israel by Mr. Truman on the day she proclaimed her independence, Mr. Noyes said, "President Truman came here in 1948 and he has never left." The audience burst into applause.

"And he's never going to leave," Mr. Noyes added to more applause.

MESSAGE IS READ

The former President's message said, "I had hoped against hope that I would somehow manage to make the pilgrimage to this ancient city." But, he said that in deference

> to family and physicians "it becomes necessary for me to postpone my visit to Jerusalem until this fall."
>
> Mr. Truman spoke of the nuclear arms race, of his own unsuccessful efforts as President to turn over the process and the bomb to the United Nations for safekeeping and of the now-expanded "nuclear club."
>
> "Witness the paradox of a peace-indoctrinated nation, India, having to give serious thought to the production of its own bomb," he said. Although Mr. Truman did not refer to Israel, a similar problem has confronted many Israelis.
>
> ### A FRESH START
>
> "So we meet here to try to make a fresh start ," Mr. Truman said. "Here we will give serious consideration to any new practical approach that could help to advance the cause of peace."
>
> "All will be welcome," he added. "There are no restrictions as to national origin, ideological commitment or religious differences."
>
> He said that the annual peace award was now in effect and that he hoped to "greet the person" who in the judgment of the trustees will have been responsible for "significantly advancing the cause of peace in the year of 1966." Mr. Truman asserted that "the emphasis is on significantly advancing."
>
> Earlier Mr. Noyes had said Mr. Truman had received many telegrams of good wishes, including one from President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, whose call to his fellow Arabs to adopt a more realistic attitude toward Israel created a sensation.
>
> Mr. Bourguiba said he would be unable to attend the ceremonies, but he wished Mr. Truman "every success in your enterprise."
>
> ### A HOPE FOR SHARING
>
> Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem said he hoped that some day the center "will serve both sides of the city," which has been divided since 1948. Last week, a group of students urged that the old Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus, abandoned in a demilitarized enclave in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem, be reopened as a peace university concentrating on Mideastern studies and be open to both Jews and Arabs.
>
> Thurgood Marshall, who had been asked by Mr. Truman to attend the ceremonies, received prolonged applause when he rose to speak. He accepted the ovation on Mr. Truman's behalf although much of the warmth was obviously intended for the distinguished Negro leader, who has been associated with the struggle for civil rights.
>
> "Not only is the occasion unprecedented but the undertaking is audacious," Mr. Marshall said. "In a smoldering world, we here give physical embodiment to our faith in the capacity of reason and science to bank the fires of violence, to seek out the causes of war, to lay out paths to peace."
>
> The Solicitor General, said that the peace center would be well situated in the soil that first nourished the principles of a social order worthy of man.

JOHN STEINBECK SAYS STOP THE WHOLE WAR NOT JUST OUR HALF

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished American Pulitzer and Nobel Prize winning novelist has broken his silence on the war in Vietnam, with a thunder which will be heard "around the world" in less than 80 days.

In his reply to a plea from Soviet Poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko, urging him to protest American policy in Vietnam, the author of "The Grapes of Wrath" said:

> I am against this Chinese inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you ask me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

John Steinbeck, an outstanding American intellectual, whose 20-year-old son John is now fighting as a U.S. soldier in Vietnam, in his "Dear Genya" letter tells of his detest of all war and his particular and personal hatred for this war.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of John Steinbeck's "Dear Genya" letter contained in a press release from Newsday, Garden City, N.Y., is set forth at length because I share the sentiments of John Steinbeck that we must "stop the whole war—not just our half." I commend it for reading to my colleagues in the House:

> GARDEN CITY, N.Y.—John Steinbeck replied today to a plea by Soviet poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko that the Pulitzer and Nobel prize-winning American novelist speak out on the war in Vietnam.
>
> In a poem published July 7 in a Moscow literary newspaper, Yevtushenko had chided Steinbeck, among U.S. intellectuals, for his silence and urged him to protest against the bombing raids on North Vietnam. Today Steinbeck, a resident of Sag Harbor, replied to Yevtushenko in an open letter published in Newsday, the Long Island newspaper, for which he has been writing a nationally-syndicated weekly column.
>
> Steinbeck asked Harry F. Guggenheim, editor and publisher of Newsday, to make his copyrighted reply available simultaneously to all other news media. In releasing the letter, Guggenheim said that Steinbeck's own 20-year-old son, John (Catbird) Steinbeck, is now fighting as a U.S. soldier in Vietnam.
>
> Following is the full text of Steinbeck's open letter to Yevtushenko:
>
> MY DEAR FRIEND GENYA: I have just now read those parts of your poem printed in the New York Times. I have no way of knowing how good the translation is, but I am pleased and flattered by your devotion.
>
> In your poem, you ask me to speak out against the war in Vietnam. You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.
>
> Surely you don't believe that our "pilots fly to bomb children," that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.
>
> You know as well as I do, Genya, that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. They are marked in pictograph and Cyrilic characters.
>
> I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Vietnam at all. If this were a disagreement between Vietnamese people, we surely would not be there, but it is not, and since I have never found you to be naive you must be aware that it is not.
>
> This war is the work of Chairman Mao, designed and generaled by him in absentia, advised by Peking and cynically supplied with brutal weapons by foreigners who set it up. Let us denounce this also, my friend, but even more, let us together undertake a program more effective than denunciation.
>
> I beg you to use your very considerable influence on your people, your government, and on those who look to the Soviet Union for direction, to stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South.
>
> For my part, I will devote every resource I have to persuade my government to withdraw troops and weapons from the South, leaving only money and help for rebuilding. And, do you know, Genya, if you could accomplish your part, my part would follow immediately and automatically.
>
> But even this is not necessary to stop the war. If you could persuade North Vietnam to agree in good faith to negotiate, the bombing would stop instantly. The guns would fall silent and our dear sons could come home. It is as simple as that, my friend, as simple as that, I promise you. I hope to see you and your lovely wife Galya soon.
>
> With all respect and affection,
>
> JOHN STEINBECK.

Mr. Speaker, in a news article in the same newspaper under the byline of David R. George, after referring to John Steinbeck's reply he includes some references to Yevtushenko's poem as follows:

> In his poem published in Russia's Literaturnaya Gazeta, Yevtushenko, 33, recalled Steinbeck's visit to Moscow in 1963 and his advice to young writers then under attack for criticizing shortcomings in Soviet society. Steinbeck said, at that time: "Well, young wolves, show me your teeth."
>
> The time has come, the Soviet poet said, for the 64 year-old Steinbeck, "an old wolf," to "show his teeth" against the U.S. bombing raids on North Vietnam.
>
> Yevtushenko has been, intermittently, a daring critic of the Soviet scene, as Steinbeck was of his own country during the Depression. The young Russian poet has been officially censured for poems denouncing anti-Semitism and for attacking the traces of Stalinism which remain.
>
> ### *"Grapes of Wrath"*
>
> Referring to the foremost of Steinbeck's novels, "The Grapes of Wrath," which depicted the ordeal of Oklahoma farmers forced from their land during the Depression, the Soviet poet wrote to Steinbeck:
>
> "Some other writers' 'Grapes of Wrath' /Are still to come/But is it possible that yours/Are only in past?/You always were able to hear the voice of time./Do you hear /From far-off Vietnam?/Through the jungles to New York and Moscow/There flies/The cry for help/'Mama, Mama.' "
>
> ### *"Not to Be Silent"*
>
> Yevtushenko reminded Steinbeck that "you, yourself, taught us not to be silent" and asked why the American novelist did not speak out on Vietnam:
>
> "Is it not dreadful for you these nights, /When a pilot flies to bomb the children, /And perhaps/Is carrying with him your book about Charley?/The winter of our discontent/Is now,/It is impossible to live quietly/For if the politicians are lying/They /Lose their right to politics./You may say: /'Why get involved in politics?/Everyone knows that politics is a whore.'/No, John,/ /Politics also is bravery and honor,/When carried out in the name of conscience and ideals."
>
> Yevtushenko said in an introduction to his poem that many of his friends in America "are fulfilling their national and international duty by speaking out against war . . ." He cited poet Robert Lowell, who rejected a White House invitation to an arts festival a year ago in protest against the Vietnam war, and folk singer Joan Baez,

who has refused to pay taxes to be used for war. Yevtushenko wrote:

"Not a Warrior"

"Joan Baez, of course, is not a warrior, /But listen,/Joan Baez sings/In the name of: /'Mama, Mama' in Vietnam."

In concluding his poem, Yevtushenko said he hoped Steinbeck would not regard him merely as a strident propagandist. He wrote:

"These lines are not a provocative trick, /But I cannot remain silent and isolated. /Yes, we are little wolves./But John, you're an old wolf./So show your teeth,/The teeth of John."

Mr. Speaker, John Steinbeck's voice is raised at a most appropriate time, a time when there appears to be on the international scene a new peace offensive, Ambassador Goldberg's visit to the Vatican, Mrs. Indira Gandhi's call for a new Geneva conference, Prime Minister Wilson and Mrs. Gandhi's forthcoming visits to Moscow, all seem to indicate that there is developing a world recognition that peace cannot be unilateral. Let us hope and pray that all the forces who truly "seek peace and pursue it" will unite to "stop the whole war—not just our half."

ADMINISTRATION'S EFFORTS TO CUT COSTS AND INCREASE EFFICIENCY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it seems desirable to bring to the attention of the Congress and of the American people specific instances of the administration's efforts to cut costs and increase efficiency. Instances of supposed waste and inefficiency get publicity from sources that may not wish the administration well.

I therefore request that the accompanying letter from the President to the Honorable William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, be printed in the Record.

The letter does two things very clearly and very directly: It points out the excellent job being done by the FAA and its distinguished Administrator. Second, it illustrates the President's close watch over the details of the multitudinous agencies for which he is responsible.

The FAA is one of the agencies coming under the purview of the House committee on which I have the honor to serve. Naturally I am gratified to have the President's approval, in which I heartily concur. Further, I wish to note with satisfaction the President's invariable practice to commend good work wherever he finds it.

The White House,
Washington, July 6, 1966.

Hon. William F. McKee,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

Dear Bozo: I have noted with satisfaction the excellent work which you and your associates at the Federal Aviation Agency have been doing in reducing costs and manpower while absorbing additional workload and improving service to the public.

I have taken particular note of your cost reduction program under which you saved $47 million during the 1966 fiscal year. These savings have been accompanied by a reduction in Agency employment of more than 3,500 employees—eight percent, since 1963. The Agency has succeeded in combining economy in administration with a safety program which has helped the commercial air carriers of the United States achieve the best safety record in the world and the best record for any five-year period in the history of American aviation. You have clearly demonstrated that outstanding performance in a critical and complex program can be continually achieved while reducing costs.

I am pleased to observe that the House Appropriations Committee, after thoroughly reviewing your program and budget for the 1967 fiscal year, singled out the Federal Aviation Agency for special commendation for the efficiency and economies achieved in recent years.

As you know, in my budget message for the 1967 fiscal year, I stressed the importance of strengthening the coordination of Federal programs in the field and giving more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. The FAA has provided an example of what can be done to decentralize management to field officials who have the authority to act promptly and effectively in meeting the needs of the public. Your success in establishing regional and area centers of field supervision while simultaneously reducing employment in field offices has demonstrated that decentralization can mean better public service and more productive use of field personnel.

I shall count on you and the good people at the Federal Aviation Agency to continue to provide examples of public service at its best.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Conable (at the request of Mr. Arends), for the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. Matsunaga (at the request of Mr. Albert), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. King of New York (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through July 21, on account of illness.

Mr. Cunningham (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Albert), for Tuesday, July 12, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Staggers (at the request of Mr. Patten) for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Kupferman) for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Whitener (at the request of Mr. Roncalio), for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, July 13, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Horton and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bandstra.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kupferman) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bray.

Mr. Watkins.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Patten) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Multer.

Mr. Joelson in two instances.

Mr. Dyal.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Morrison.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 309. An act creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1312. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2060. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2287. An act to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula; to the Committee on Internal and Insular Affairs.

S. 2574. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2610. An act to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3035. An act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13651. An act to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 13, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2559. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 12, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion control study of St. Johns County, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted January 7, 1963, and House of Representatives, adopted June 19, 1963 (S. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2560. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the sufficiency of lands capable of sustained production under irrigation use in the North Portal, North Pavillion, and Cottonwood Bench areas of the third division of the Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11671. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 14548. A bill to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 16138. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 16139. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of exemplary rehabilitation certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16140. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act to permit the participation of interstate funds in retiring bonds on toll bridges, tunnels, or roads on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16141. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be disregarded for certain public assistance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 16142. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to the administration of certain federally operated schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 16143. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 16145. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 16146. A bill to amend section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to the order of priority in which certain eligible immigrants may be issued visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 16147. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Board-Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 16148. A bill to provide for the protection, conservation, and development of the natural coastal wetlands of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, for fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 16149. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of commercial air transportation expenses for certain members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16150. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to make certain provisions of that title relating to mutilation of the flag of the United States effective throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16151. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the centennial of Prospect Park, Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 16152. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the funeral expenses payable with respect to certain veterans from $250 to $500; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 16153. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Denton County, Tex., within the Fort Worth division of the Northern district for the U.S. district courts in Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 16154. A bill to revise the Federal elections law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 16155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 16156. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 16157. A bill to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16158. A bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the dollar ceiling on the amount of combat pay received by commissioned officers which may be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 16159. A bill to repeal section 7 of the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16160. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of Chinese gooseberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 16161. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 16162. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a segment of the Great Prairie Parkway in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 16163. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16164. A bill to amend section 47 of title 28, United States Code, to provide means for the disqualification of circuit judges for bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16165. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16166. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in a deed conveying certain lands to the University of Maine so as to permit such university, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16167. A bill to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 16168. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16169. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 16170. A bill to place deputy U.S. marshals under the competitive civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 16171. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 16172. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 16173. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 16174. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 16175. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16176. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1944, defining "nonfat dry milk," so as to include within the meaning of such term nonfat dry milk to which vitamin A or D has been added; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.J. Res. 1207. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to accept title to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 1208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 1209. Joint resolution to prohibit any change, other than restoration, in the location or design of the west front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 1210. Joint resolution to prohibit any change, other than restoration, in the location or design of the west front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 822. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H. Con. Res. 823. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of France to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Con. Res. 824. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 912. Resolution relating to the compensation of the Official Reporters of Debates of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 16177. A bill for the relief of Elias J. Sgouritsas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16178. A bill for the relief of Hascal Reizemberg; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 16179. A bill for the relief of Maria Esther Taboada Paz de Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16180. A bill for the relief of Yoshiaki Yoshihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 16181. A bill for the relief of George S. Exarchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16182. A bill for the relief of Athanasia Liakokos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16183. A bill for the relief of Lennox Mead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16184. A bill for the relief of Elsie Rhaburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 16185. A bill to provide for the free entry of a high resolution nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer for the use of Midwestern University at Wichita Falls, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16186. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zapponi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 16187. A bill for the relief of Leo England, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Support for Our Fighting Men in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 graduating class of George W. Wingate High School, in the finest spirit of our American tradition, has dedicated its yearbook in the following manner:

> In this world of conflicting ideas, may this book be a symbol of friendship to be cherished in the years to come.
>
> As we recall the events that shaped the world during our years at Wingate, we will remember those who fought for the ideals they believed in.
>
> We the graduating class of 1966 dedicate our yearbook to the troops in Vietnam, and hope that some day all people may be free and at peace.

I know that all of the Members of the Congress join with the graduating seniors of Wingate in their desire for a lasting peace.

The yearbook called Mosaic, 1966 is, indeed, a fine literary and artistic piece of work.

An interesting innovation is the insert in the back of the book containing the school songs in print and on a disc record.

The school principal and faculty and more especially the faculty adviser, Samuel B. Koltun, have every right to be proud. Their students reflect credit upon their teaching by this accomplishment. Congratulations to them and to the entire student body.

Ken Bruning, a Fine American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the death of Ken Bruning of Levittown, N.Y., long a leader in the Disabled American Veterans both in Long Island and nationally, is a sad loss for his community, for the organization he served so well, and for the Nation.

Ken Bruning lost his sight as a result of his service to the Nation during World War II. Yet, in spite of this greatest of physical handicaps, he fashioned a constructive career, raised a wonderful family, gave unsparingly of himself to the causes in which he believed, and was never heard to complain.

To me, Ken Bruning exemplified the quiet courage of the thousands of Americans who have given and are giving far more than the rest of us so that we all might live in freedom.

In a memorable press conference, President John F. Kennedy suggested that life is not always fair in its demands upon those who serve the Nation. Jack Kennedy's death was tragic testimony to the truth of his words.

It is sad but true that some give everything including their lives, the greatest gift of all, while others give little or nothing. We do not know why.

I know this: Ken Bruning can take a place of honor in the company of our Nation's heroes.

His quiet courage has won for him our deepest admiration and of him it can be truly said: here was a man.

Ben Cole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, July 10, was the 50th birthday of a fellow Hoosier, my good friend Ben Cole, a member of the Congressional Standing Committee of Correspondents.

Ben is chief of the Washington bureau of the Indianapolis Star, the Muncie Star, and the Arizona Republic. He has been with the Star since 1944, serving as statehouse reporter and city editor in Indianapolis and has been chief of the Washington bureau since 1949.

Ben is a well-known and respected figure on Capitol Hill, not only to the members of the Indiana congressional delegation and their staffs, but to a wide circle of colleagues and congressional friends on both sides of the aisle. It was men like Ben of whom the author of "The Newspaper Guy" was thinking when he wrote his famous lines:

> "Some day I'll pass by the Great Gates of Gold,
> And see a man pass through unquestioned and bold.
> 'A Saint?' I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:
> 'No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper guy.'"

Ben has always exemplified the best and finest in the field of journalism. His fellow Hoosiers and his many friends are proud of him, and I wish him many more happy and productive years in the profession he serves so well, for his papers, his State, and his country.

First Aid Squad—Pompton Lakes, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a demonstration program conducted by the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad in the congressional district which I represent. This demonstration program shows techniques which prevent paralysis resulting from swimming accidents and especially from diving injuries.

A "diving injury team" of the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad is performing a valuable public service, going around the New Jersey and Middle East area to demonstrate methods of preventing paralysis. Cervical spine injuries are often aggravated or even caused by persons attempting to help victims of diving accidents. By their demonstration programs, the Pompton Lakes First Aid Squad shows how simple it is to provide against such injuries.

The program has been presented in schools, to scout troops, at civic and community service clubs and to groups assembled at private pools who have requested the demonstration.

Each member of the diving-injury team devotes a great deal of time to program, particularly Al Snyder, chief narrator; Arthur Heimall, chief instructor; and Mrs. June Hepworth, its chairman, but all feel that if their efforts prevent even one serious injury the time invested is well spent.

Other members of the team are Casey Jones, Heinz Suhl, Ed Janowski, Hans Frese, Murray Goldberg, Jack Quinn, Bob Carroll, Joseph Hepworth, Jessie Snyder, Dot Reardon, Pat Rathburn, and Rose Rhinesmith.

Working with the group are four children who have been trained to act as victims in actual demonstrations and have also posed for the slides used in presentation of the program where a pool is not available. They are Debbie Jones, Karen Carroll, Ken Crane, Jr., John Quinn, Jr., and Ron Houser.

These public-spirited people give their service free of charge and are so dedicated that they are willing to go anywhere, even beyond the Midatlantic States area, to conduct demonstrations. I am proud to be the Congressman of such dedicated people.

Tight Money—Remedial Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, presently, the economy of the Nation is faced with the growing scarcity of bank credit. Commercial banks cannot supply the present credit demands. Today, credit at the Federal Reserve is available at the discount rate of 4½ percent but only on eligible assets and then only for 15 days. These eligible assets are Treasury securities and certain short-term paper. Other assets like customers' loans and other obligations are eligible, but at a penalty rate of an additional one-half of 1 percent and also for 15 days. This penalty and this limitation of time are the rub. In today's economy, these are costly burdens and are contributing to tigher money. These restraints and limitations should be removed if commercial banks are to serve adequately business and industry generally.

Banks are competing one with another for funds in all markets in all sections of the country. When banks thus compete with each other, no new credit is established to meet growing demands. They are hampered by their ineligibility to borrow readily and economically from the 12 Federal Reserve banks which comprise the country's central banking system.

The outmoded and obsolete borrowing restrictions are intensifying present difficulties. The Federal Reserve has recognized a need for change and has recommended legislation. There is a bill pending in the House, which has already passed the Senate last August. It is S. 1559. It is presently lodged in the House Banking and Currency Committee. The proposed bill would permit a member bank to borrow from a Federal Reserve bank on the security of any assets acceptable to the Reserve Bank without paying a penalty rate of interest. The 15-day limitation would be removed.

William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has stated:

> As long as member banks hold a large enough volume of Government securities, they need not, of course, be particularly concerned as to the eligibility for discount with the Reserve banks of customers' paper held by them. Since World War II, however, there has been a sharp net decline in the aggregate holdings of Government securities by member banks. If a continuing substantial increase in economic activity should cause banks further to reduce their holdings of Government securities in order to meet increased credit demands, many banks would be obliged to tender other kinds of collateral if they should seek to obtain Federal Reserve credit.

In order to avoid cumbersome administrative procedures and problems arising from the necessity of distinguishing between "eligible" and "ineligible" paper, the Reserve Board urged Congress to move in and revise and update the law so as to eliminate the existing restrictions with respect to "eligible" paper.

The administration approves of this new procedure.

This legislation would remove technical impediments to ready access to Federal Reserve credit without penalty. The Federal Reserve Board wants to make the discount window an effective means of supplying funds to commercial banks.

Enactment of this measure would benefit all banks—large and small—in all sections of the country. It would relieve the pressure and reduce destructive competition for funds among banks and between banks and nonbank financial institutions.

Jet Noise: A Plea for Bipartisan Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation and for other purposes. I am pleased to sponsor this legislation following its introduction by the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

The aircraft noise abatement bill comes to the Congress with the support of the White House and the Federal Aviation Agency. The bill is a direct result of the White House Conference on Aircraft Noise, held on October 29, 1965, in answer to my request to the President by letter of August 19, 1965, and the report of the President's Task Force on Noise Abatement, headed by the President's Science Adviser, Dr. Donald F. Hornig. While my present view is that the bill does not go far enough it is nevertheless a constructive step forward in the direction of an ultimate solution. It represents at least a recognition from the highest level of Government, that jet noise is a problem, national in scope, requiring action on the executive, congressional, and administrative levels.

The identification of jet noise as a national problem was the major objective of my efforts during 1965 to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the seriousness of the noise problem and its effect upon the daily lives of millions of Americans—men, women, and children—who reside near our Nation's airports. I have addressed myself to this problem on 12 separate occasions in the House and have introduced 2 bills, H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982, to help solve the problem of aircraft noise.

I am pleased that hearings on legislation to alleviate this problem will be scheduled shortly and that all bills on this subject will be reviewed and studied by the committee. I will make every effort to strengthen the legislation along the lines of my bill H.R. 7982 in an effort to bring the resources of the Federal Government to both local governments and to private industry, to share the cost of developing noise reduction techniques on airports as well as aircraft. I favor and will propose amendments to provide Federal funds to pay for part of the cost of implementing noise reduction techniques.

The bill which I have introduced today along with the distinguished committee chairman authorizes the FAA or the proposed Department of Transportation to set noise standards and regulations and to use these standards in connection with the issuance, amendment, or revocation of certificates authorized by title VI of the Federal Aviation Act. This is an important step in the direction of alleviating the noise problem and I am hopeful this effort will not be delayed, thwarted or frustrated by those who would make this issue a political one. Jet noise affects many millions of Americans—of both political parties—and the effort to attack this problem should be a bipartisan effort.

I have today written to the chairman of the New York State delegation steering committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, requesting that the entire delegation consider giving its endorsement to aircraft noise abatement legislation on a bipartisan basis and take the issue out of partisan politics.

I have also requested the chairman of the New York steering committee to consider appointing an ad hoc committee of New York Members to work with Members from other States in arriving at a united position on the legislation and on proposed amendments to strengthen the legislation. By coordinating the effort in this bipartisan manner, we can move forward in the battle against aircraft which pollutes our environment and disrupts the daily lives of millions of our citizens.

Thanks to a Marine in the Vietnamese Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman of the 33d District of California, embracing a Marine Corps installation at Twentynine Palms, I am indebted to Paul A. Toneman, Sr., of Washington, D.C., for calling my attention to one of those marines, his wife, their feelings about the Vietnamese conflict, and what is being done for them. It is a source of great pride to me to represent such constituents.

In sequence, I cite first an innocuous inquiry from S. Sgt. William R. Grayson, USMC, 152287, serving with the 3d 8-inch howitzer battery:

> JUDITH BARR WIG SALON,
> *712 H Street, NE.,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MISS BARR: I saw your ad in the April issue of a magazine, and my thoughts turned to my wife waiting at home until I return from this nasty war here in Viet Nam. I think she deserves a nice gift and I'm sure that one of your wigs would do perfectly. I'm not very well versed in these things so I would appreciate your help. If you would please send the information I need to purchase one of your wigs; I've heard of your company before, through my mother who is a beautician. She tells me that you are the best, and that's good enough for me.

Louis and Michael Taff, who operate the nationally known Judith Barr Salons, were quickly determined to go all out, at their expense, regardless of the cost of their cumulative plans. A short time later they heard from the sergeant again:

> I received your letter today and I must say that I am truly amazed at your concern. It is deeply appreciated. America is truly a wonderful place and you have made me very proud to be member of our Great Society. Being the wonderful person she is, my wife will reject my surprise as being too extravagant on my part. She tries very hard and works very hard to save so that we can have a nice time when we are together once more. This is my second time in this area in less than one year, so when I was home last I didn't get to see very much of her. But as soon as we put an end to this threat to peace, there will be time to relax and enjoy the comforts of home.
>
> I certainly shall not tell my wife that I have sent her address, maybe it's not too late to have a surprise within a surprise—which she so truly deserves. You see, it's not so rough on me, being so far from home and my loved ones because this is my chosen profession. It's the women who suffer in so many ways, but still, it's for a cause that every American believes in, and if suffer we must, then suffer we will.
>
> Again, I thank you for your time and concern. To be able to do something for Louise from so far away makes me a very happy husband. We have not celebrated our anniversary or birthdays together for 3 years because of my overseas commitments. She was born the very day before me. It's been very nice talking to some wonderful people.

Front-page articles were carried in both the Washington Informer and the Capital Spotlight. From these articles I learned Mrs. Grayson works as a waitress in the enlisted men's mess at the Marine Corps Base in Twentynine Palms, Calif., while the sergeant is engaged in combat with the enemy. I also discovered the Judith Barr Wig Salons had not answered Sergeant Grayson at once but had talked to the Marine Corps Headquarters first and found no insurmountable obstacles. They had the cooperation of the editor from the local California paper, who had Mrs. Grayson telephone Washington.

For the combat sergeant, who was not aware of what he had started, all details were worked out in behalf of his wife. The Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington provided accommodations for Mrs. Grayson at no charge to anyone. The local Sheraton management wanted to have a part in supporting the morale of a serviceman fighting overseas.

Mrs. Grayson arrived in Washington on July 8 via American Airlines as a guest of the Judith Barr Wig Salons. She was fitted with a wig of her own selection. The cost of the wig, the transcontinental air transportation, and all other expenses were borne by the famed Judith Barr establishments, in happy collaboration with the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Being a Legionnaire myself, I am particularly pleased to highlight what followed. The American Legion really responded—the James J. Reese-Europe Post No. 5 placed all of its facilities, resources, and personnel at the disposal of Mrs. Grayson to make her visit truly memorable. An honor guard of eight was immediately appointed, to meet the lady's plane on Friday, July 8. Comdr. William E. Bibbs, an employee of the Post Office, greeted her in person along with several aids, and an escort for the drive to the Sheraton-Park.

On Saturday morning, after being escorted to the Judith Barr Salon for the fitting and presentation, Mrs. Grayson was the honored guest at a grand luncheon arranged for her at the Two Caesars, with the DeEarl Barrie Beauty Salon as host. The District of Columbia commander of the American Legion, Richard Giasson, and his wife, Mrs. Dyal, and I were present with others. Immediately after lunch, with the assistance of the staff involved, the doors of the White House were opened to Mrs. Grayson and her entourage. The complete tour lasted about 90 minutes.

In the afternoon, Mrs. Grayson enjoyed the unique distinction and privilege of a private tea with His Excellency, Vu Van Thai, Ambassador of Vietnam, and his charming wife. Sergeant Grayson will be informed of this gracious act whereby this outstanding envoy indicates his country's feeling for the heroes we have sent to support liberty.

After a quick visit to the headquarters of the James J. Reese Legion Post, where many of the members had arranged to meet her, Mrs. Grayson enjoyed the delights of an informal dinner tendered in her honor on the Shoreham Terrace by the Honorable Stanley Barry, an executive of the Boy Scouts of America, who also has a marine son on active duty.

Mr. Toneman wrote Sergeant Grayson as follows:

> Your Congressman not only attended the luncheon, bringing Mrs. Dyal along to meet your wife, but he telephoned to this delighted constituent to offer his car and to do anything else she desired to make her stay in Washington something to be long remembered by the two of you.

In his latest letter Sergeant Grayson apologized for not responding promptly:

> Please forgive the delay in writing to you but we have been in an operation which ended yesterday. This is like something on

TV, all the officers and men in my outfit think that it's wonderful, too. This is like seeing a dream come true; Louise has never flown before, and that's just one of the many things you are doing that will give us something to remember for the rest of our lives. With everything I am reading about this program for my wife it is almost like being there with her.

Sergeant Grayson, you placed the shoe on the wrong foot; it is we who salute and thank you for your valiant efforts in our behalf.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago important changes began to take place in Eastern Europe. In the aftermath of de-Stalinization policies the Eastern European countries became more independent from the Soviet Union and won greater freedom to determine their own affairs. The dogma of a uniform international communism was gradually replaced by the recognition that different peoples and nations ought to choose policies which better suited their individual national situation and needs.

The forces of polycentrism have been steadily growing. Only a few months ago we saw Rumania's dramatic initiative in asserting her national sovereignty and political independence. During the first decade of the cold war there was no question that the nations of Eastern Europe were wholly Soviet satellites; countries dominated by the Soviet Union, subject to continuous Russian intervention and often outright repression of their people by physical force. This situation has changed noticeably, however, and the political and human rights of the Eastern Europeans are no longer wholly denied. Persuasion and negotiation now often take the place of coercion. We welcome this change wholeheartedly, as it can only serve the causes of freedom and peace. Moreover, polycentrism has not only had an impact on international relations in Eastern and Central Europe, it has at the same time contributed to greater internal liberalizing tendencies. The people of Eastern Europe are the beneficiaries of this change.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that the conditions in Eastern Europe will continue to improve, for we have only witnessed the beginning of a change so far. The countries of Eastern Europe must gain greater independence, and their people must have greater freedom. America is committed to the ideas of freedom and independence and the fate of the captive nations could not and will not be indifferent to us.

All people have a right to determine freely their own affairs, whether they are Armenians or Byelorussians, Czechs or Slovaks, Ukrainians or residents of the Baltic States. Americans give their support to these brave people and their aspirations for freedom and independence, and we look with hope to the day when it will no longer be possible to speak of "captive nations" or "captive peoples."

Senator Robert C. Byrd Writes in National Magazine of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area—A New West Virginia Vacation Center in the Midst of Beautiful West Virginia Scenery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under the caption, "West Virginia's Do-It-Yourself Forest," our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], authored an interesting, inviting, and informative article for the July 1966 issue of the American Automobile Association's widely circulated magazine, American Motorist.

It was my privilege to have cosponsored my colleague's legislation under which was authorized the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area of West Virginia, and I share in his recommendation of that facility only 2 to 3 hours away from Washington, D.C., and within 350 miles for some 65 million people—more than one-third of the Nation's total population.

Senator Robert C. Byrd has demonstrated commendable leadership and concern in making our scenic State—the Mountain State—attractive and available to our citizens and tourists. I am privileged to cosponsor his legislative proposal for an Allegheny Parkway which would facilitate access to the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks Recreation Area and other unique and historical locales which he describes briefly in his timely article.

And it is appropriate to note that my West Virginia colleague cosponsored the Appalachian Regional Development Act which I introduced and managed, and which will afford improved developmental roads through scenic West Virginia and especially one in proximity to the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the article by Senator Byrd of West Virginia, from the July 1966 issue of American Motorist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

West Virginia's Do-It-Yourself Forest

(By U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia)

You will enjoy this pastoral paradise—an island of serenity surrounded by the population explosion—for many reasons. There are the rolling green hillsides, the abundance of colorful wildflowers, a great variety of trees and other foliage, endless rivers to fish, swim, or canoe in, and a panorama of geological and historical wonders.

It is one of the country's newest year-round vacation centers. At a safe freeway-driving speed, it is only two or three hours away from Washington, D.C., and it has been estimated that it is within 350 miles for some 65 million people—more than one-third of the Nation's total population.

I recommend the new Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area of West Virginia.

Not only will you find your days filled with pleasurable activities, but you may enjoy the feeling that here is a real modern-day do-it-yourself forest all around you. In this day of population density and disappearing natural hillsides, Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks stands, for me, as an outstanding monument to man's ability to rehabilitate nature in its finest form.

There was a time—not too long ago—when these shaded hills were scarred and blackened. The trees that stood there for a thousand years or more fell before the woodman's ax and were carted away by railroads which crisscrossed the hills. The tree bark that was left behind quickly caught fire and the flames far outreached the primitive fire-fighting equipment which was used to hold it at bay.

The Monongahela Forest as we know it today, was then called the "Monongahela Burn."

And burn it did, many times, until the U.S. Forest Service stepped in to acquire the land, to plant new trees and to salvage the historical monuments.

I was happy to sponsor the legislation which created the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area and I was indeed pleased to have the full support and endorsement of American Automobile Association and its members for the project. It was approved by Congress and signed into law by President Johnson in September, 1965.

All of the natural attractions are there for visitors to see. However, the legislation will permit the expenditure of Federal funds to conserve the natural resources and to develop them wisely for greater public use. We will go to work on this program immediately.

But today, visitors can enjoy the same fishing streams that the Seneca and Shawnee Indians used for the family food baskets. There is also Spruce Knob, the highest point in the State, having an elevation of 4,860 feet. Soon to go up near that peak will be an observatory tower, standing about 25 feet tall, all of native stone, and affording visitors an unobstructed view of five surrounding peaks.

Some of the many attractions to see include:

Seneca Rocks: Rising almost 1,000 feet, above a branch of the Potomac River, they are considered one of the most spectacular and interesting natural wonders east of the Mississippi. They are sometimes compared in appearance to a ruined ancient castle, but they record the geological history of the country.

Smoke Hole Cave: A former Indian home, it is located on a mountaintop and is outstanding for its maze of corridors and side rooms, representing Indian efforts for multiroom dwellings.

Smoke Hole Country: A writer in the area recently described the valley this way: "The Smoke Hole country lies in almost untouched beauty, a haven of escape, a Shrangri-La of all things—trees, flowers, animal life, scenic vistas, and climate. It provides a retreat from the disturbing noises of expanding American industrialism."

Big Cave: Formed in solid rock at an altitude of 2,200 feet in Cave Mountain, it is the best known of the many caves in the Smoke

Hole Country. In it, early settlers and Confederate soldiers dug nitre which they boiled in iron kettles and used in manufacturing gunpowder.

Big Spring: Situated at the base of Cave Mountain, it is a famous fishing ground, as trout gather there where the water is always cool. The Shawnee Indians first used the area, but were driven out by the Seneca, who eventually ruled all of the region now contained in Pendleton County.

Seneca Caverns: A series of subterranean rooms, located only a few miles from the highest peak in the State, they are decorated with stalactites and stalagmites which have been fashioned by drops of water trickling through the roof of the caverns for thousands of years. The deepest room is 165 feet below the earth. Well-lighted for tourists, they contain Statue of Liberty, Niagara Falls, and Metropolitan Opera to name just a few of the interesting formations.

Hermit Island: An area of about 4.5 acres where one botanist in 1933 found 283 species of flora, indicating the abundance and variety of plants at Spruce Knob. Many nature-study groups made treks into the valley to collect rare plants. Game and fish are numerous and varied, but, strangely enough, there are a few insects.

Rivers: Two major tributaries of the Potomac River—the South Branch and the North Fork of the South Branch give life to the valley. Feeding into these are dozens of clear, cold, spring-fed streams flowing from forested watersheds, creating scenic attraction as they cascade out of the high mountains into the valley below. As it wends its way down between the rocky cliffs of the gorge, the South Fork creates some of the most spectacular fishing water and scenic beauty to be found in the eastern United States. The South Branch is noted for fishing and white water canoeing.

Timber: The high country around Spruce Knob is a bit of Canada transplanted into the West Virginia countryside, with native red spruce and other forest tree species being unique in the typically Appalachian hardwood area.

Cranberry Glades: Just outside the recreation area, the glades are a mass of color produced by the ground cover which abounds in the area. It is the site of a Visitor Information Center.

There is the story of a man who traveled through this area many years ago. He left behind his impression in a simple one-line statement: "Paradise Discovered, October 23, 1725."

Perhaps you can send a postcard from the same area reading, "Paradise Rediscovered, 1966." I hope you will come early and stay for a long time—the experience will be just what the doctor ordered.

Address by Vice President Humphrey Before the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a highly significant address was delivered last week by Vice President HUMPHREY at the national convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held in Los Angeles. Vice President HUMPHREY reviewed the long struggle for civil rights and the advances that have been achieved, and he also outlined problems which continue to confront the movement and the philosophy that can guide us in seeking to meet these problems.

In reading over this speech—and I have done so several times—several points that the Vice President made appealed to me as particularly impressive. These included:

We have the moral obligation to match our promises with performance and to reward faith with fulfillment.

We must understand that now the question is not whether all men shall have a full measure of freedom and justice but how it shall be provided.

There is no room in America for racism of any color. We must reject calls for racism, whether they come from a throat that is white or one that is black.

Programs financed by all of the people—black and white—shall not be operated to benefit only part of the people.

There is an urgent need for new initiatives and responsibility in civil rights matters by our States and local governments.

As may be noted from the few observations cited above, the Vice President, in his address before the NAACP, not only was offering wise counsels to the delegates assembled at this important convention, but was expressing principles of morality and justice which are equally applicable to all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, as delivered at the National Convention of the NAACP in Los Angeles, Calif., on July 7, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

America is marching on the road to freedom.

I am proud to be back among my friends of the NAACP who have led this march for 57 years.

From the shadows of a dark past toward the shining hope of a brighter tomorrow, this march has been difficult, uncertain, and often dangerous. But history shall surely record its glory.

For we marched . . . even when our band was small and our ranks thin and ragged . . . even when victory seemed a distant and unattainable goal.

There have been young marchers and old . . . Negro and white . . . rich and poor . . . but always marching with a common spirit—moved by a common hope—and striving for a common objective.

We marched and fought against separate and unequal education, and segregated lunch counters, and a seat in the back of the bus.

There have been defeats, but many more victories.

There have been many heroes, and some martyrs.

Yes, the road to freedom is stained with tears and the blood of many Americans—including men such as Medgar Evers—men already counted among authentic American heroes.

We have learned there is no single road to follow. . . no one program . . . no one slogan that will bring us to the end of our march.

There have been many things to do, and many roles to play. And through the years the NAACP has played a role second to none in terms of dedication and determination of sacrifice and courage.

We are here today because of millions of hours spent in the courthouse and on the courthouse steps—sitting down and standing up—in voter registration drives and in the halls of Congress.

Our triumphs have been impressive and numerous. Our progress has been unmistakable. Yet these triumphs and this progress must be judged from the perspective of the man who has borne the burden of oppression and prejudice.

A generation ago, it may have been enough for the Negro to ask for the right to enter a restaurant.

But today the Negro American asks:

Is my life better? Are my children attending better schools? Do I hold a better job—or any job? Do I have a voice in the life of my city and my neighborhood? Am I a first-class citizen—a man among men, in my own eyes and in the eyes of my family?

Until a man can truthfully answer "yes" to these questions, we should not expect him to consider the battle won or the struggle ended. And neither should we.

For what is left for such a man when the dust of the march has settled?

Where today the slogans of a better world spring from his lips, tomorrow there may be nothing but the taste of ashes.

So, precisely at a time when the civil rights movement has achieved its most stirring victories, the revolution of rising expectations demands that we turn now to confront the work which remains.

It is one thing to cry "freedom now" on a picket line. But it is another to achieve true freedom in the squalid world of the ghetto—where generations of exploitation have produced problems which no man can overcome in a day, week, or year—where we see and feel the devastating impact of that tragic equation which has too often decreed that poor shall beget poor and ignorance shall beget misery.

It is one thing to demand the federal government to meet its growing responsibilities in civil rights. But it is another to generate in our states and localities the commitment and urgency required to produce significant improvement in the lives of people.

And it is one thing to overcome flagrant examples of racial prejudice—segregated hotels, buses and parks. But it is another to eliminate the more subtle and sophisticated techniques which effectively restrict true freedom of choice in jobs, education and housing.

Now we must combine an acute sense of urgency with a heightened understanding of the complexity of the remaining civil rights problems. We must balance dedication to action with commitment to achievement.

We must understand there are no easy answers, no instant solutions, to problems generations in the making.

But there are certain problems demanding priority attention as we strive to translate legal promises of equality and freedom into reality.

First, the federal government accepts the job of meeting its growing responsibilities.

One of those responsibilities is to press for legislation to fulfill the promise of the Constitution. You know what this Administration is doing on Capitol Hill to discharge that responsibility—and we need your support urgently if the Civil Rights Act of 1966 is to become law.

There are other responsibilities as well. And one of these is to see that programs financed by all of the people—black and white—shall not be operated to benefit only part of the people.

Last Friday a new day of security and well-being dawned for the senior citizens of this country—the long-awaited program of medicare went into effect.

But another revolution took place simultaneously—a revolution in medical facilities available to Negro Americans and other minorities.

Acting with a clear mandate from Congress, the federal government directed that hospitals could only participate in the medicare program if they provided non-segregated facilities and medical service to persons of all ages.

More than 92 per cent of our hospitals met these standards on July 1—and many of these hospitals were previously segregated. I predict the large majority of those not in compliance will be in the near future.

One fact is certain: the funds for medicare and other federally-assisted facilities are collected without regard to race, color or creed—the benefits, therefore, must and will be available on the same basis.

Secondly, there exists an urgent need for new initiatives and responsibility in civil rights matters by our states and local governments.

The battle against slumism and poverty must be waged primarily in our local communities—with assistance from the states and federal government.

The struggle to provide quality education for all the children of America must go forward in our localities—again with assistance from the states and federal government.

The job of achieving meaningful choice for all persons in the sale and rental of housing must be accomplished in our cities.

The federal government is fully prepared to play a major role in this process. But the impact of this federal assistance is magnified a thousand-fold if a community is fully committed to the goal of decent, non-segregated housing for all its citizens—if a community is developing creative, bold new approaches to meet the housing crises of urban and rural America.

The vital task of building a system of justice which treats all men alike—black and white, rich and poor—must be carried out in our cities and towns.

"Equal justice under law" is more than slogan etched over the entrance of the Supreme Court. It is the foundation of our entire democratic system of government.

The Supreme Court has reiterated the need to inform all arrested persons of their right to counsel—of their right not to testify against themselves—and of their right to prompt arraignment before a magistrate.

These decisions—reaffirming some of our fundamental notions of justice in a free society—should be applauded by every American—and implemented by every community.

For in the final analysis, the responsibility for securing equality before the law is a shared responsibility. The judicial, as the legislative and executive branches, has thus posed a challenge to all Americans.

How do we replace the old argument over states' rights with the more meaningful development of states' responsibilities . . . and the responsibilities of communities, and organizations, and individuals?

There is difficult, unglamorous, backbreaking, heartbreaking, day-to-day work ahead in every ghetto . . . every election district . . . and every school district—for only there can our lofty goals and promises be redeemed.

We know the NAACP has been doing this work in countless cities and towns across America. Yes, long ago you made the decision to stay in your communities and do the work that had to be done.

We salute you for this decision.

Yes, I applaud those who left their everyday pursuits to be part of the new birth of freedom taking place in the South.

But I also applaud and honor those who will remain in those towns after the fever pitch of the moment has passed. Theirs is the long and arduous task of converting apathy to conviction—of translating ardor into achievement.

We should strive to do these things because they are proper and just . . . because we have the moral obligation to match our promises with performances and to reward faith with fulfillment.

But we should also do them because this nation will know little tranquility and peace until all Americans have an opportunity to share in her well-being.

We must understand that now the question is not whether all men shall have a full measure of freedom and justice, but how it shall be provided.

Thirdly, we must enlist new allies in our struggle against discrimination and derivation—from business, labor, religious and community groups.

We know that in recent years impressive strides have been made by both business and labor in rooting out blatant forms of job discrimination based on race or color.

The next phase of the battle will be less dramatic, and it will attract a smaller number of those interested in the simple issues and the easy victories. Yet this next phase—one of the nuts and bolts of the expansion of employment opportunities—is vital.

Outmoded training programs, biased testing and recruitment procedures, apprenticeship requirements and promotion patterns can deny equal employment opportunity as effectively as the old fashioned "white only" classified ads.

We must take vigorous affirmative action through skillfully designed training programs to help compensate persons who have been denied all opportunity to prepare themselves for today's job market.

We must give special attention to working out equitable procedures so that arrest records, juvenile offenses, and lack of a high school diploma are not permanent barriers to employment where a person has otherwise established his trustworthiness and ability.

Federal departments and agencies are now sponsoring a number of innovative programs so that equal employment opportunity will exist in fact, as well as in law. Private industry must be more willing to exeriment as we seek workable solutions to these knotty problems.

The time has come to broaden the base of the civil rights movement . . . to reach out into the community and enlist vital new sources of energy and strength.

Here the NAACP has an especially important role to play. You have traditionally sought close cooperation among churches, labor unions, business groups, and service clubs. We must now reach out even further with the message: "Brother, we need you for freedom."

This appeal cuts to the core of those questions of philosophy and of strategy which currently engaged the civil rights movement.

It seems to me fundamental that we cannot embrace the dogma of the oppressors—the notion that somehow a person's skin color determines his worthiness or unworthiness.

Yes, racism is racism—and there is no room in America for racism of any color.

And we must reject calls for racism, whether they come from a throat that is white or one that is black.

Legitimate pride in the achievements and contributions of one's forebears is, of course, another matter. One of the great tragedies of America has been that so few persons—white or black—appreciate the remarkable contributions of Negroes to this nation's history.

How many of us, for example, know that 26 of the 44 settlers who established this city of Los Angeles in 1781 were Negroes?

But pride in Negro history and achievement should establish a basis upon which to build a new climate of mutual respect among all elements of society—not false doctrines of racial superiority. We must strive to create a society in which the aims of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the civil rights movement can be achieved. And, always remember, we seek *advancement* . . . not *apartheid*.

Negroes have been a part of America since Jamestown. They suffered—and survived—the cruel yoke of slavery. They have experienced hardship and discrimination of a severity and duration that no group of Americans has known. And the basis for this brutality has been segregation and exclusion—on terms imposed by the white majority.

Today this system is being torn down through the concerted efforts of both white and Negroes. We must strive to perfect one citizenship, one destiny for all Americans.

Integration must be recognized as an essential *means* to the *ends* we are seeking—the ends of freedom, justice and equal opportunity for all Americans.

And if there are areas in this country where meaningful integration is not a realistic prospect—as there are, in both the South and the North—then the true remedy lies in creating these conditions as quickly as possible.

As President Johnson said in his historic address at Howard University, "In far too many ways American Negroes have been another nation: deprived of freedom, crippled by hatred, the doors of opportunity closed to hope."

Who, in similar circumstances, might not feel within him the responsive echo to the cries of power and hostile pride?

Who, in similar circumstances, might not finally lose faith and patience with statements of good intention which were seldom translated into action?

Our response to these cries of outrage and despair must be hard, visible evidence—evidence that a man can see and feel and measure in his city . . . his job . . . his home . . . his children . . . his own sense of dignity and self-respect.

Today, after far too long, we are beginning to see that evidence. The road to freedom has been obscured far too many years by hatred and habit, by anger and apathy. But it now lies clearly in view.

We march down that road not in separate columns to the sound of martial music heralding the approach of clashing armies.

We march, instead, together—to the sound of a song echoed by free people everywhere, of all colors, of all races, in every land:

> "Stony the road we trod . . .
> Bitter the chastening rod . . .
> Facing the rising sun of our new day begun . . .
> Let us, together, hand-in-hand, march on till victory is won . . ."

Budget Bureau Policy Threatens To Endanger Soil Conservation Service Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern over the Bureau of the Budget's recently adopted policy with regard to new projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program.

Since last December, the Soil Conservation Service has sent 51 new watershed work plans to the Budget Bureau for review. In the past, the Budget Bureau has checked watershed work plans and, if no objections to their economic feasibility were found, has transmitted the projects to the Congress for review and approval by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate. Under provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, projects with a single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet capacity are sent for review and approval to the House and Senate Public Works Committees, and projects with a single structure of less than 4,000 acre-feet capacity are sent to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. The provision for review and approval by congressional committees has been part of the law since it was enacted in 1954.

Within the last month or so, however, the Budget Bureau has changed its long-established policy and has refused to send any new watershed projects to the Congress for review and approval, regardless of the merits of any of the individual projects. As a result, all 51 new watershed work plans are still pending in the Budget Bureau and, even though there has been no change in the law, the appropriate committees of the House and Senate have not been given an opportunity to review and approve these new watershed projects. This new policy of the Budget Bureau threatens to endanger one of the most effective programs for soil and water conservation.

It is my understanding that the Budget Bureau has held up these watershed projects because of a contention that the provision for congressional review and approval of individual projects is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the executive branch. Very frankly, I do not think this matter involves any great constitutional crisis. The Soil Conservation Service watershed program has operated under the provision for congressional review and approval of individual projects for a dozen years. During this time, the House and Senate Agriculture Committees have approved 293 projects, and the House and Senate Public Works Committees have approved 153. In other words, 446 watershed projects have been approved under the present provisions of the law, and there have been no previous complaints that this law violated the Constitution. Only last year the Congress, with the approval of the executive branch, amended the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to permit Soil Conservation Service to provide assistance to watersheds with structures of up to 12,500 acre-feet flood detention capacity. Nothing was said at that time about the possible unconstitutionality of review and approval of these projects by congressional committees. In fact, it was not until late May of this year that Soil Conservation Service officials first learned of the Budget Bureau's objections to this procedure.

If the Budget Bureau's new policy is not reversed, and if the new watershed work plans are not sent to the Congress for review and approval, it will be extremely unfair to the local officials who have spent years preparing detailed plans for these projects. Among the projects now being held up by the Budget Bureau is the Three Mile Creek Watershed, which is of great importance to the Union County area in Iowa. This project was officially proposed in 1958 and it has been in the planning stage since January 1961, more than 5 years ago. After a great deal of hard work on the part of the local sponsors, plans for the Three Mile Creek project were sent to the Budget Bureau on April 25, 1966. This project, which I have been following closely for more than a year, would provide valuable soil conservation, flood control and recreation benefits to the Union County area. In addition, it would offer a source of municipal water supply to the town of Afton, which has been hampered by acute water shortages in the past. And, in the long run, the Three Mile Creek Watershed would provide the basis for future economic growth in the area. I feel it would be most unfortunate if this project, as well as the others pending with the Budget Bureau, were delayed by a dispute over abstract legalities.

In my opinion, the Soil Conservation Service watershed program is far too valuable to be endangered by arguments over the alleged unconstitutionality of a law which has been in operation without previous objections for a dozen years. Any question as to the constitutionality of the provision for congressional approval of projects can be resolved at a later date, when the Congress has the time to consider the matter with care. In any event, if there is anything certain about this dispute, it is that nothing in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act authorizes the Budget Bureau to deliberately hold up projects which merit approval. I therefore think the Budget Bureau should reverse its policy of holding up watershed work plans and allow this program to move forward, as it has in the past, under the procedures established by law.

Salute to Our Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ROBERT WATKINS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SALUTE TO OUR TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

(An address by the Honorable GERALD R. FORD before the American Heritage Foundation's Northeastern Regional Vote Workshop, Philadelphia, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, July 11, 1966)

When those who are deep in the political battle—like Mr. Bailey and me—are invited to give non-partisan talks, we are forced to make some major readjustments in the content of our remarks.

Mr. Bailey and I have to make such readjustments not only because of the nature of this audience but also because of the place selected for this conference. We are meeting in the City of Brotherly Love. We shouldn't forget that this evening.

Among other things, we have to write a new speech. That basic talk for partisan gatherings which we give over and over again has to be scrapped. Even the jokes have to go because partisan political humor just doesn't seem funny to those outside the ranks of party faithful.

Tonight we salute the two-party system, the political system that our Nation has had almost from its beginnings. As the representative of what is temporarily the minority party, I want to thank the American Heritage Foundation for the valuable work which it has done for many years to give life and meaning to that system. I congratulate the Foundation on the inauguration of these Regional Vote Workshops, and I wish you success in your 1966 Nonpartisan Register and Vote Campaign.

The work that the Foundation is doing looks to nurturing in the hearts of all citizens the ideals of democratic government. Unless these ideals flourish there, no constitution, no law, certainly no political party or its leadership can maintain the health of our political system.

In 1960 the Democrats alleged a "missile gap." Republicans from General Eisenhower on down denied the charge. In 1966 the Republicans contend there is a White House "credibility gap." John Bailey will protest vehemently. But both of us will likely agree there is a "commitment gap" on the part of too many Americans. What we need is a commitment to broad, staunch, and constructive support for the two-party system.

Several centuries ago, the Italian poet Dante put it this way: "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." My plea is that all Americans discard political neutrality and enlist in the battle to preserve the two-party system.

What is called for, I sincerely believe, is a decision by more and more Americans to renounce political neutrality during elections and to bring their entire individual effort to bear on behalf of candidates who meet their rigid specifications of honor and outlook.

As individuals, you have the responsibility and duty to become actively engaged in partisan politics. I am not here as a recruiter for the Republican Party although I will be glad to take applications at the door. What I am saying is that you cannot, as individuals, expect to achieve concrete political results if you are unwilling to join and work for the party of your choice. It is only within a party that you can help to determine party policy, help select candidates for party nomination and work for their eventual election. It is only within a political party that you can till and fertilize the soil which will produce the kind of legislators who will, for example, get some of our basic problems, state and national, out of petty politics. Many like myself in the political arena are disappointed that more of our highly motivated citizens are not working as actively as they should be in a political party.

What the Foundation is aiming at is the broadest type of citizen participation in the political process. It is a goal that deserves the unstinting support of both great American political parties.

The political party is the agency, and really the only agency, through which citizens can fully and effectively participate in the political process.

Where there is freedom, there will be more than a single political party, for free men will not all think alike.

It may seem strange that the founding fathers viewed the growth of parties with alarm. They made no provision for them in the Constitution. George Washington warned his countrymen against them in his Farewell Address. Our forefathers' apprehension was not without reason. Political wars in the England of their time were characterized by bitter party strife and divisive partisanship.

It was Thomas Jefferson who started our two-party system. You might say that as vice-president he was the first minority leader on Capitol Hill.

Jefferson thereby added to the constitutional checks and balances another safeguard in our experiment in democratic government. It has saved the nation from the oppression which so often characterizes those countries where a single political party dominates every aspect of political life and, unchecked, stifles all dissent. And it has saved the nation from the anarchy and chaos which so often characterizes those countries where every conceivable faction organizes itself into an independent political party.

Elihu Root called the two-party system a sign of political maturity. The two-party system guarantees a wide appeal to the electorate and it increases the chances for coherence and stability in government. It avoids the irresponsibility of factionalism which, at best, operates to allow popular control in a one-party state. More important than these theoretical considerations is the fact that the two-party system, in the context of America, her institutions and traditions, has met the test of history. It works. It is an important part of that complex set of balances and mechanisms that have made the American experiment in democratic government the world's greatest success story.

Under Jefferson's innovation, America has prospered, maintaining always her commitment to both majority rule and freedom of dissent. Many countries, particularly in Latin America, have copied our Constitution. And in many cases they have met with repeated failure. One of the keys to understanding why is their inability to develop a two-party system.

A goal of this Northeastern Regional Vote Workshop is to consider ways to sharpen the cutting edges of our two-party system. The problem was never stated better than it was some forty years ago by the prominent British writer, Mr. J. A. Spender. The problem, he said, "is to convince our fellow countrymen that to have political convictions, to join a party, to work for it, and to support it out of their purses, so far as means allow, are among duties of all citizens, and cannot be neglected without serious harm to the country." This is one of the great unsolved problems of democracy. Until we solve it, our two-party system and the very quality of our government will be defective.

The indices of citizen involvement in politics do not tell an encouraging story in the United States. The percentage of citizens of voting age who have voted in recent presidential elections has hovered about the level of 60 per cent. In off-year Congressional elections, it has been running between 45 and 49 per cent. In local elections a turnout of 30 to 40 per cent is common. These levels of voter participation do not compare favorably with those of advanced nations with a democratic form of government in other parts of the world.

With less than two-thirds of the potential electorate actually voting, how many less ever actively work for a political party or for candidates for office? And of those who work—performing the important role of informing their fellow citizens—how many less ever make a financial contribution? The number gets smaller and smaller, and diminishing with it is the effectiveness of our two-party system.

Particularly acute is the need for an adequate financial foundation, one consistent with democratic principles. Herbert Alexander, Staff Director of President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs, has put the costs of 1964 campaigns at 200 million dollars. Such expenditures are not unjustifiably large in campaigns directed toward a potential electorate of more than 100 million who are asked to vote for at least 200,000 offices of some significance.

Only about 10 per cent of adult Americans ever contribute to election campaigns. This figure is significantly higher than it was fifty or even twenty-five years ago, but it is still far too low. It is not healthy for the costs of democracy to be met by so few. The day when political parties can sit back and depend on large contributors must end. Our election costs must be covered without jeopardizing our public morals. Our goal should be securing ever more contributors to our political parties on a regular year-round basis. The wider the base of party funds, the less suspicion there can be of improper influence. There is a job to be done. Recent data from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center shows that less than half of those interviewed had ever heard of efforts to raise money for campaign expenses. Eighty-five had never been asked to contribute. Only one out of fifty had ever participated in a campaign fund-raising drive. When asked if they would contribute if approached, a fourth said yes, while 58 per cent replied no.

Our failure here is deplorable—and even more so because we raise annually throughout the country large sums for welfare and other community needs. Is the well-being of our political system any less important? With hard work and organization, and with the help of groups like the American Heritage Foundation, our political parties can meet this test. My own party has made strides in this direction. Since 1963 a substantial portion of the operating budget of the Republican National Committee has been met by annual ten-dollar sustaining memberships. In 1964, through the extensive use of direct mail and television appeals, 72 per cent of the contributions for the Republican presidential campaign came in sums less than 500 dollars. Only 30 per cent of the contributions to the Democrats came in these smaller sums. But establishing the measuring rod at 500 dollars is still setting it awfully high. There is much more that both parties can do and must do to interest the individual citizen of limited means in investing in our political process. Until we do—until the costs of democracy are apportioned democratically—our two-party system will not be doing the best job it can.

In the field of legislation there is also much that can be done. Efforts here are generally aimed at restraining abuses in raising and spending campaign funds.

I suggest that it is time to emphasize the need for adequate financing of parties and candidates through mass contributions of small amounts. The present methods of fund-raising too often shut out of elective office men and women who lack substantial personal funds or lack personal access to great wealth.

There are other steps that can be taken to lighten the burden of campaign costs—notably modifying the restrictions of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act—the equal time provision—which operates to prevent television and radio stations from providing free time to candidates for office.

Those who discuss the inadequate participation of citizens in the political process generally center their fire on the citizen. He is denounced by critics as apathetic, uninformed, and uninterested.

I feel that the indictment must be extended to cover politicians and perhaps others in our society. If the citizen is uninterested, is this lack of interest due to some degree to the failure of politicians to offer something that will arouse his interest? If he is uninformed, is it because much political oratory is not really informative? Some will contend—perhaps it's an alibi—that they just can't get the facts from any source.

There is need for drastic reform of campaign procedures that go back to the horse-and-buggy era. Something in this direction is being done by the Republican National Committee. On the suggestion of President Eisenhower, Chairman Bliss has a commission at work studying the quadrennial national convention with a view to streamlining this venerable but soporific institution.

This is a start, but much more is needed if campaigns are better to serve the purpose of spreading information and capturing public interest . . .

In 1968 I hope that televised debates between presidential candidates, so successful in attracting public interest in the 1960 campaign, will be conducted again. I see little merit in the argument that any incumbent president should not engage in debate with his opponent. I believe President Kennedy would have debated his Republican challenger in 1964 had he lived to run for reelection—and the voters would have been the beneficiaries.

If, however, the candidates themselves are unwilling to engage in debate, they could designate spokesmen to participate in joint televised appearances on their behalf.

Debate between the parties should be practiced far more widely than it is at present. Although I attach special importance to debate in presidential campaigns, there should be a running debate between party spokesmen at all political levels at all times. There are always important issues. There are always differences of opinion on some of them. The parties would be strengthened, the public would be better informed, and policy decisions would be made more wisely if we argued out things before the public.

To talk of the two-party system is to invite attention to the woes of the minority party. I shall refrain from inflicting on you any long list of complaints, but I do want to express one fear which, if justified, should be of concern to all regardless of party.

It is not easy for the minority to make its voice heard. In this age of mass communication, the Office of the President dominates the American political scene. The eyes of the nation and the world are fixed upon it. And rightly so. Its power is awesome, as is the responsibility which confronts the man who possesses it. It is power to do enormous good. But the great power to do good is, at its root, simply great power. Free men must be able to check it and challenge it, lest it consume them.

If free men cannot check and challenge it, then we do have one-party rule. If it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to do so, then we have begun a journey down a dangerous road.

We seek in our political life the attainment of justice and the containment of power. The two-party system plays a vital role in the struggle to achieve these goals. By providing debate and discussion it helps us travel a much surer course toward justice for all our citizens.

The minority must be able to get its views out to the people. I hope that the minority State of the Union Message, first delivered this year, will become a permanent institution—given time and prominence corresponding to that of the President.

Although I speak tonight for the minority, the Republicans, I do not believe that those in the minority can or should sit back and bide their time. There are some, a very few fortunately, who argue that the minority should await a national disaster at home or abroad and then move in, pick up the pieces and build from the shambles. This I contend is neither the tradition nor the heritage of the Republican Party in the 1960's. This was not the role of the Republican Party under Lincoln or Eisenhower. It was not the role of the Democrats in their dark days in the minority in the 1920's. We must by the competence of our candidates, by the record of legislators and administrators and by the philosophy that we espouse earn the respect of our fellow citizens.

My suggestions only touch the surface. In the final analysis the future of our two-party system depends on the courage and conviction of all Americans—of whatever political stripe—and their commitment to the values of majority rule and freedom of dissent.

These values are the heritage of all Americans. They are values that will be preserved only through strengthening the two-party system.

"South Louisiana Hayride," With Its Deep South Western Music of Ponchatoula, La., Threatens To Outdo Nashville, Tenn.—Home of "Grand Old Opry"—It Has Many Rabid Fans, Famous Stars, and Abounds With Colorful Entertainment Every Saturday Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it used to be that you would have to go to Nashville, Tenn., on a Saturday night to see and hear good old country western music played by famous artists who come from far and wide to join together each week for the famous "Grand Ole Opry" show.

But this Tennessee monopoly is about to be challenged by one of the best western Saturday night performances in the Deep South, and people come from miles around, from anywhere and almost everywhere to see Ponchatoula's pride and joy, the "South Louisiana Hayride."

Unlike the famous stage show—namely, "Louisiana Hayride," which many years ago was a Broadway hit, starring Carol Bruce and other celebrities, "South Louisiana Hayride" could almost be considered a distant cousin of a stage show musical comedy which ran for years on Broadway and across the Nation. "South Louisiana Hayride" is not a nightly production of the same show, but a brandnew one, every Saturday night, that packs them in with standing room only, to bring fame and widespread publicity to the colorful little city of Ponchatoula with its famous and even fabulous western music.

Ponchatoula used to boast it was the "Cypress Capital of the World" with two giant cypress sawmills, one owned by the husband of a famous yesteryear movie star, Marguerite Clark, which have long since disappeared. But, today some people call it the "Little Athletic Capital of the United States," with championship American Legion baseball teams and tournaments and championship semipro baseball teams. And in the spring of the year you can always get a big dish of the finest strawberries in the whole wide world.

When famous western music stars arrive in Ponchatoula for this 8 o'clock hayride every Saturday night, things really begin to happen. Mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, come from every direction, both near and far, and come early to try to get a seat.

This hayride western show happened, almost by coincidence, because Stanley Cowen wondered why our people of this area could not have a fine, clean show each week to entertain them after a week of hard work. His father, M. A. Cowen, affectionately known as "Dunk," said:

> Son, you are right—if you do it right with good western music and fix it so that any man would be as glad to see his daughter there, as in a church, you cannot miss, and I will back you all the way.

That is just what happened and even those few critics who said it might last 6 months have joined in applauding all the fame that the "South Louisiana Hayride" has been bringing to this countryside ever since it started in February of 1964.

Working with Stanley Cowen was a western music stalwart named Lloyd "Hank" Jones, who not only has a thriving insurance business, but carries on a little politics along the way, holding an important elected office as police juryman for the seventh ward of Tangipahoa Parish.

Every Saturday night, at about 8 o'clock as the crowds pull in, those who cannot get a prize seat just stay home and turn on the popular radio station, WFPR, that has a listening audience of well over 100,000 folks, and with the talented aid of "Rube" Rogers, known far and wide as the original "Country Boy," Terrel McCrory and George Holly, all of the neighboring city of Hammond, the show is brought by this radio station, to all the armchair fans who sit at home listening to Rube opening up:

> Get comfortable, just take off your shoes, you'll feel better, get the coffee poured around 'cause here comes the show you have been waiting for.

And with big time flare on comes one of the most unusual and entertaining western shows to the delight of thousands who take their hillbilly and western music so seriously. Many will drive miles to hear their favorite stars.

RCA Victor thought so much of this Ponchatoula Hayride talent that they sent in to Ponchatoula over a million dollars worth of recording equipment to make the Porter Wagoner album, entitled "Porter Wagoner on the Road," with other favorite stars Norma Jean and "Speck" Rhodes participating. Few, if any western music stars enjoy the popularity of Porter Wagoner. This very album made at the Ponchatoula Hayride is near top spot in the Nation's ratings of like albums. With Porter Wagoner and other stars, this show has attained worldwide publicity, while the loyal folks of Ponchatoula, with a twinkle in their eye, will usually say "whether it's western music with Porter Wagoner at our 'South Louisiana Hayride' or a championship American Legion baseball team, or a championship high school football team, Ponchatoula always brings home the 'bacon.'"

And on any Saturday night, it is not uncommon to see people from as far away as Florida or California or even see Louisiana's most successful and popular Gov. John J. McKeithen with his family sitting right there in the front row, or a U.S. Congressman, or a visiting U.S. Senator—they all come, and sometimes as many as 2,000 or 3,000 at a time to see their favorite, the "family fun show," with folks of all ages from 2 to 92. Some doubted it all could happen, but thanks to Stanley Cowen, his fine father, "Dunk," Hank Jones, Country Boy Rube Rogers, George Holly and others, it did happen. And the only thing that worries the people of Ponchatoula is that many might start calling their show, the "little grand ole opry" of the Deep South and that would be terrible, because they, are so proud, that they never want to change the name of the "South Louisiana Hayride" which they love so dearly.

Congressman Horton Commends Constituents' Help for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to certain of my constituents who are presently in Vietnam and to indicate the pride I feel for what they have been able to accomplish in support of our men and mission there.

Among the items to which I wish to call my colleagues' attention are a series of articles written by Mr. Ross Boyle, former president of the Rochester Junior Chamber of Commerce who resigned in February to go to South Vietnam as a consultant to the Agency for International Development. These articles published by the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union demonstrate clearly the service which Mr. Boyle has accomplished in informing the people of Rochester of the present situation in Vietnam as well as the contribution that his activities have made in bettering the economic and social conditions of the South Vietnamese people.

In support of Mr. Boyle's work, the Jaycees of Rochester have recorded a series of comments from people in our community and sent this tape to him. Mr. Boyle is playing this tape in various places as another example of the feelings his fellow Americans have for South Vietnam. I was pleased to record my comments for this purpose and would like to share them with my colleagues, as well:

> To Ross Boyle, past President of the Rochester Jaycees and now currently serving with the Agency for International Development in Viet Nam, I wish to thank you for informing Rochesterians of conditions in

Viet Nam by your articles which have appeared in our local newspapers. I hope you will play this tape in many places in Viet Nam so that Rochesterians and other servicemen will know of your country's gratitude for the important mission you are performing. As a member of the United States Congress, I can assure you that we in Washington are very much aware that full freedom for South Viet Nam means economic self-sufficiency as well as military security. In both of these areas, I am pledged to doing all in my power to insure the provision of whatever assistance is required for success. I join your fellow Americans in saluting you for helping to carry around the world our philosophy of freedom. Clearly our goal in Viet Nam is freedom—freedom for the individual, freedom in government, and freedom of a nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I would like to have inserted here in the RECORD one of Mr. Boyle's early columns. I think it demonstrates very clearly the insight of Mr. Boyle into the situation in Vietnam and our effort there. Also I think it demonstrates that the people of Rochester are being given an excellent perspective with which to view conditions in South Vietnam.

The column follows:

VIETNAMESE SELF-HELP "WELL PLANNED"

(By M. Ross Boyle)

U.S. EMBASSY, SAIGON.—It is, of course, impossible to be here in Viet Nam more than two or three days without developing opinions. Anyone who is here a week automatically is classified as an expert on Viet Nam and its problems. However, since I have now been here a month, I am beginning to realize how unexpert my ideas on how to win the war and the peace are. But there is one aspect of our U.S. involvement here which I would like to emphasize.

The war in Viet Nam is in the headlines every day—number of military actions, number dead, wounded, captured, number of missions flown. Now, following the Honolulu Conference, even the struggle for improving the lot of the Vietnamese people is getting some coverage because Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner have both come to review the situation with large parties of experts and have made many recommendations on returning to the U.S.

The day-to-day job that is being done and has been done for the last 10 years and more by the men and women of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) here in Viet Nam is generally ignored. These Americans, now numbering more than 800, along with several hundred assistants from other areas of the Far East and over 1,000 Vietnamese, work quietly but effectively with the government of Viet Nam to provide the people with improved education, better living facilities, adequate food, and a better understanding of a democratic way of life.

Contrary to popular opinion in the U.S., this task is not accomplished by merely giving away American dollars and commodities. Dedicated men work long hours, seven days a week, planning a well balanced program designed to help the people help themselves.

Some of the most successful programs run here are self-help projects in which the U.S. provides a hamlet with a few bags of cement and some aluminum roofing material and the people build themselves a school. They then identify themselves with that school and if the Viet Cong attempt to destroy it, they lose the support of even the portion of the hamlet population that had been VC sympathizers.

To implement projects of this kind we have province representatives who live and work in every one of the 43 provinces of South Viet Nam. They act as advisors to the Vietnamese province chief, construction engineers, truck drivers, friend, midwife, and whatever else is needed to show the people the good side of the American.

I have just returned from a two day trip during which I visited province representatives in Nha Trang, Cam Ranh City, Ban Me Thuot, and Bao Hoc. They were proud of the accomplishments which the people in their areas had made—schools, refugee centers, orphanages, new market places, agricultural experimental stations, and many others. They were also concerned about how much more needed to be done. They are dedicated and enthusiastic.

If we are able to achieve any real lasting success here in Viet Nam, it will be men like those in AID who will be responsible because they live with the problem every day.

Two of the people I have met here in the mission are ex-Rochesterians—Bob Klein is mission program officer, responsible for planning the projects to be implemented throughout the country. He lived in Brighton and worked at Kodak Park for six years from 1958 to 1964. Ray Gordon is head of the Food For Peace operation here. Several years ago he was employed by the Gannett Newspapers.

This is an operation which probably will play as big a part as the military operations under Gen. Westmoreland in any long range success which will be achieved here but the American people hear too much about the war effort and military buildup and not enough about the people-to-people civilian effort being undertaken.

It will do us no good to win battles unless we can follow them up with well planned and well implemented programs of social reform. That is what only 800 American civilians (not 225,000 troops) are undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to another of my constituents, Peter R. Liebschutz, who also is acting as a consultant to the Agency for International Development. I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Liebschutz on the steps of the Capitol just before his departure for Vietnam earlier this year and talked with him about his forthcoming work. Recognition also should be given to Mr. Kenneth Halaby, of Rochester, who had joined Mr. Boyle and Mr. Liebschutz in Saigon with AID. Realizing the sacrifices that these men have made to take leave of their regular jobs for a period of 6 to 8 months, it is a privilege to commend them publicly in the hopes that such actions and their mission will not be forgotten in the context of combat.

On March 12 I said in addressing the Rochester chapter of the American Institute of Banking:

> Economic assistance alone cannot continue as an effective diplomatic device. We need to encourage popular participation of the people in these foreign lands so that they are partners in the progress of their country.

It is in this area that the Agency for International Development performs a vital function and it is to men like Boyle, Liebschutz, and Halaby that credit can be given for the structure of such programs as they exist today in Vietnam. We must never overlook the fact that private individuals like these men are working daily in order to guarantee that a free South Vietnam will be able to survive and grow in the years following the cessation of hostilities in that land.

I also am pleased to take note of the efforts of the 31 students in the Twelve Corners School in Brighton, N.Y., who have sent gifts to be used in an orphanage in Saigon. The students are members of Mrs. Susan Davis' fourth grade class.

The schoolchildren have mailed boxes of clothing, soap, toothbrushes, toothpaste, bandages, towels, washcloths, and toys to Army Capt. Hilton Bicknell in Vietnam. Captain Bicknell in turn distributed the items to the children of one of Saigon's orphanages.

The idea originated with 9-year-old Lauren Crawford, who was acquainted with Captain Bicknell's family. Lauren interested her fourth grade classmates in the idea, and through their combined efforts immeasurable good was accomplished in Vietnam.

I salute these children and their elders who through their own abilities and initiative have done so much to help the Vietnamese people. I urge my colleagues and all who might take note of this speech to explore similar avenues of assistance to Vietnam. I firmly believe that the road to peace and prosperity in Vietnam will be paved with the contributions made by Americans and Vietnamese working together today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Benedetto Pascale, minister, Silver Lake Baptist Church, Belleville, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Cause me to know the way wherein I should walk.—Psalm 143: 8.

O God, our Father, we invoke Thy name at the opening of this House of Representatives of our Nation. We ask for Thy divine wisdom and guidance in all their deliberations. Give them vision and inspiration to see the end from the beginning. Endow them with patriotic motives and unselfish service, that at the end of the day they may hear Thy divine voice saying to them "well done."

In these pressing times, may Thy divine guidance point the way wherein we should walk. Turn our reproach into praise, and our fear into faith. Help us to measure our success by the unselfish service we render.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for men and women of deep devotion and dedication who have made this Nation great. Give us a new sense of duty, responsibility, and appreciation that we may add greater luster to this heritage. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3034. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals;

S. 3112. An act to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes; and

S. 3467. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee, on the part of the Senate, for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67-1.

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1967 FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, NAVAL VESSELS, AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, AND RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, July 12, 1966, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 2950. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND MEMORIALS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT MAKES CLEAR THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THIS GENERATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in a historic speech last night to the American Alumni Council the President made clear the role of the United States in this generation.

If any clarification of our policy was needed, that clarification was completely provided.

The President not only described our goals in Vietnam, but he placed those goals in their total perspective.

Mr. Speaker, the President's speech not only marked the end of isolation; it recognized the scope of the American commitment to peace and freedom throughout the world. It clearly declared that freedom cannot exist very long anywhere unless it exists everywhere; that there is no such thing as a white man's peace or a Western peace or an Atlantic peace.

Mr. Speaker, our commitment, in order to have meaning, must be total, and not partial, global, and not regional.

The Pacific, as well as the Atlantic, is a part of the world in which we live. America is not just involved in the Atlantic community—it is also involved in the Pacific community.

More important, 20th-century America is a vital part of the entire world community. The might and power of the United States are dedicated to one end and one end only—peace, freedom, and human decency throughout the world.

If there was ever any doubt about America's intentions, surely, the President last night made clear what those intentions are.

We seek no territory—no advantage—over any nation or any people—only freedom and decency.

Our resolve is complete.
Our aim is clear.
Our duty is certain.
We shall not fail.

Mr. Speaker, the President's speech is as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1966]

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON CHINA POLICY

(WASHINGTON, July 12.—Following is the text of President Johnson's speech delivered by telephone to the American Alumni Council meeting at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.)

As a former schoolteacher who turned to politics only to learn that all of life is a classroom, I have a very special respect for the work you do.

My own career, which began in a little school in south Texas, owes a great deal to men and women like you who labor that others may learn.

All my life, I have taken seriously the warning that the world is engaged in a race between education and chaos. For the last two and one-half years I have lived with the daily awareness that the fate of mankind depends on the outcome of that race.

I came here tonight because you are committed, in the name of education, to help decide that contest. It is the most important victory we can ever win.

EACH MAN'S OPPORTUNITY

We have set out in this country to improve the quality of American life. We are concerned with each man's opportunity to develop his talents. We are concerned with his environment—the cities and farms where he lives, the air he breathes, the water he drinks. We seek to enrich the schools that educate him and to improve the governments that serve him.

We are at war against the poverty that deprives him, the unemployment that degrades him and the prejudice that defies him.

As we look at other parts of the world, we see similar battles being fought in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America. On every hand we see thirst for independence, the struggle for progress and the frantic race between education and chaos.

In all these regions we, too, have a stake.

Now where are the stakes higher than in Asia. It is about Asia—and peace in Asia—that I wish to talk tonight.

I

Asia is now the crucial arena of man's striving for independence and order—and for life itself.

This is true because three out of every five people on this planet live in Asia.

This is true because hundreds of millions of them exist on less than 2 cents a day.

And this is true because Communists in Asia still believe in force to achieve their goals.

If enduring peace can come to Asia, all mankind will benefit. But if peace fails there, nowhere else will our achievements be secure.

By peace in Asia, I do not mean simply the absence of armed hostilities. For where men hunger and hate, there can be no peace.

I do not mean the peace of conquest. For humiliation can be the seedbed of war.

And I do not mean simply the peace of the conference table. For peace is not written merely in the words of treaties, but in the day-by-day works of builders.

The peace we seek in Asia is a peace of conciliation: between Communist states and their non-Communist neighbors; between rich nations and poor; between small nations and large; between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white; between Hindus and Moslems and Buddhists and Christians.

It is a peace that can only be sustained through the durable bonds of peace: through international trade; through the free flow of people and ideas; through full participation by all nations in an international community under law, and through a common dedication to the great tasks of human progress and economic development.

Is such a peace possible?

With all my heart I believe it is. We are not there yet. We have a long way to journey. But the foundations for such a peace in Asia are being laid today as never before. They must be built on these essentials:

II

First is the determination of the United States to meet our obligations in Asia as a Pacific power.

You have heard arguments the other way. They are built on the old belief that "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet."

They claim that we have no business but business interests in Asia; that Europe, not the Far East, is our proper "Sphere of interest"; that our commitments in Asia are not worth the resources they require; that the ocean is vast, the cultures alien, the languages strange and the races different.

These arguments have been tested and found wanting.

PARTNER OR PROBLEM

They do not stand the test of geography: We are bounded not by one but two oceans—and whether by aircraft or ship, satellite or missile, the Pacific is as crossable as the Atlantic.

They do not stand the test of common sense: The economic network of this shrinking globe is too intertwined, the basic hopes of men are too related and the possibility of common disaster is too real for us to ignore threats to peace in Asia.

They do not stand the test of human concern: The people of Asia matter—we share with them a common humanity.

And they do not stand the test of reality: Asia is no longer sitting outside the door of the 20th century. She is here, in the same world with us, to be either our partner or our problem.

Americans entered this century believing that our security had no foundation outside our own continent. Twice we mistook our sheltered position for safety. Twice we were wrong.

If we are wise now, we will not repeat our mistakes of the past. We will not retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia.

The second essential for peace in Asia is to prove to aggressive nations that the use of force to conquer others is a losing game.

There is no more difficult task in a world of revolutionary change—where the rewards of conquest tempt ambitious appetites.

As long as the leaders of North Vietnam believe they can take over the people of South Vietnam by force, we must not let them succeed.

We must stand across their path and say: "You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow."

Every American must know exactly what it is we are trying to do in Vietnam. Our greatest resource in this conflict—our greatest support for the men who are fighting there—is your understanding. It is your willingness to carry—perhaps for a long time—the burden of confusing and costly war.

We are not trying to wipe out North Vietnam.

We are not trying to change their Government.

We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Vietnam.

And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory.

WHY ARE WE THERE?

Then why are we there?

Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Vietnam stop shooting at their neighbors.

Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable.

Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede.

When will that day come? I cannot tell you; only the men in Hanoi can determine the answer.

We are fighting a war of determination. It may last a long time. But we must keep on until the Communists in North Vietnam realize the price of aggression is too high—and either agree to a peaceful settlement or to end the fighting.

However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.

First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Vietnam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist.

Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Vietnam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it.

III

The third essential is the building of political and economic strength among the nations of free Asia.

For years they have been working at the task. And the untold story of 1966 is the story of what free Asians have done for themselves, and with the help of others, while South Vietnam and her allies have held aggression at bay.

Many of you can recall our faith in the future of Europe at the end of World War II. We backed that faith with all the aid and compassion we could muster.

Our faith in Asia today is just as great. And it is faith backed by reason. For if we stand firm in Vietnam against military conquest, we believe the emerging order of hope and progress in Asia will continue to grow.

Secretary Rusk has just returned from a trip through the Far East. He told me yesterday of many heartening signs as the people of Asia work toward common goals.

GAINS OF THE LAST YEAR

In the last year:

Japan and Korea have settled long-standing disputes and established normal relations with promise for closer cooperation.

One country after another has achieved rates of economic growth beyond the most optimistic hopes of a few years ago.

Indonesia has pulled back from the brink of Communism and economic collapse.

India and Pakistan—600 million strong—have ended a tragic conflict and returned to the immense work of peace.

Japan has become a dramatic example of economic progress through political and social freedom and has begun to help others.

Communist China's policy of aggression by proxy is failing.

Nine Pacific nations—allies and neutrals, white and colored—came together on their own initiative to form an Asian and Pacific Council.

New and constructive groupings for political and economic cooperation are under discussion in Southeast Asia.

The multibillion-dollar Asian Development Bank is moving forward in Manila with the participation of 31 nations;

And the development of the lower Mekong River basin is going forward despite the war.

THE ECHO OF PROGRESS

Throughout free Asia you can hear the echo of progress. As one Malaysian leader said:

"Whatever our ethical, cultural or religious background, the nations and peoples of Southeast Asia must pull together in the same broad sweep of history. We must create with our own hands and minds a new perspective and a new framework. And we must do it ourselves."

This is the new Asia that is taking shape behind our defense of South Vietnam. Because we have been firm—because we have committed ourselves to the defense of one small country—others have taken new heart.

We do not intend to let them down. Our word will be good.

IV

There is a fourth essential for peace in Asia which may seem the most difficult of all: reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies.

A peaceful mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia.

A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation.

For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world.

We have learned in our relations with other such states that the weakness of neighbors is a temptation and only firmness backed by power can deter power backed by ambition. But we have also learned that the greatest force for opening closed minds and closed societies is the free flow of ideas and people and goods.

For many years the United States has attempted in vain to persuade the Chinese Communists to agree to an exchange of newsmen as a first step to increased understanding.

More recently, we have taken steps to permit American scholars, experts in medicine and public health, and other specialists to travel to Communist China.

RICH POSSIBILITIES IN WORLD

These initiatives have been rejected.

We persist because we know that hunger and disease, ignorance and poverty, recognize no boundaries of creed or class or country.

We persist because we believe that even the most rigid societies will one day awaken to the rich possibilities of a diverse world.

And we persist because we believe that cooperation, not hostility, is the way of the future.

That day is not yet here. It may be long in coming, but it is clearly on its way. And come it must.

Earlier this year the Foreign Minister of Singapore said that if the nations of the world could learn to build a truly world civilization in the Pacific through cooperation and peaceful competition, then—as Theodore Roosevelt remarked before him—this may be the greatest of all human eras—the Pacific era.

As a Pacific power we must help achieve that outcome.

It is a goal worthy of our dreams and of the deeds of brave men.

I pledge to all those counting on us: We will do our part.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] on the statement he has made.

I think the statement made last evening by the President has spelled out in words that anyone can understand the clear objectives of our country throughout the world and particularly in Asia.

Again I commend the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the West, I listened with great interest and high appreciation to the words of the President.

For over a year I have from time to time stood upon the floor of the House to call attention to the fact that we are a nation whose shores are washed not just by one great ocean but by two and that we are a member of the Pacific community of nations just as surely as we belong to the Atlantic community of nations.

In a speech before the House last October 12 I observed that the Pacific community must be looked upon not as separate and unrelated bits and pieces but as an integral whole, as a community of which we are very much a part. Looking at the Pacific in its entirety, I called attention to the revolutionary economic and social changes that are sweeping a dynamic new Asia into the 20th century.

I said that history had bequeathed us a role in the Pacific—a role of challenge and opportunity which we cannot and must not relinquish, "for we learned long ago that the Pacific is not a barrier but a highway—a highway that can bring us the horror of war as it once did and as it may do again, or a highway that can bring us the treasures of trade and cultural exchange as it does today and as we hope that it will always do. The Pacific does not separate us from Asia, Australia, and New Zealand; it binds us to them." I noted that our trade relations with our Pacific neighbors are growing dramatically and that, concomitantly, our Pacific ports are assuming ever increasing importance in the national economy. I noted too the painful lessons of 1941 and 1950 that our security "depends upon the security of the entire Pacific community, which in turn depends upon the security of each of its members—the smallest as well as the greatest."

In that speech, I observed that the time has come for us to look to the Pacific, to focus our attention there, to encourage in every way the development of the Pacific community, to build in earnest and thereby to take our part in a great adventure. I asked that we strive to give new energy to our Pacific diplomacy.

That we accord the Pacific the effort commensurate with its great importance to this Nation.

That we think "Pacifically" as we long ago learned to think "Atlantically."

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the President has answered my call to clarify our Nation's Pacific policy. He has done so with logic and skillful articulation.

He has called attention to the "new Asia."

He has put our actions in Vietnam into the perspective of the entire Pacific.

He has observed that the Pacific is as crucial to this Nation as is the Atlantic, that Asia is as critical to our peace and prosperity as is Europe, that we cannot and must not retreat from our destiny there.

He has associated himself with the remarks of Theodore Roosevelt and the distinguished Foreign Minister of Singapore, Mr. S. Rajaratanm, about the coming of the Pacific era.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the President for his remarks. He has done the Nation a great service. I hope that every citizen will read and reflect on this important address.

I certainly feel the distinglished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] should be commended for bringing the President's important remarks to the attention of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—FILING OF ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT ON H.R. 15890

Mr. PATMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file an accompanying document to the report on the bill H.R. 15890, in order to comply with the provisions of clause 3 of rule XIII—the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I do not believe I am going to object, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency whether this request has been cleared with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. PATMAN. I am informed by our staff that it has been and I do not think there is any doubt about it having been cleared.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR ROBERT G. PERRY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members of the House of the arrangements for the funeral services of our late friend, Robert G. Perry.

I have been advised that friends may call to view the body at the Simmons Funeral Parlor, 1661 Good Hope Road SE., on Thursday, July 14, 1966, from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m.

Services will be held on Friday, July 15, 1966, at 9 a.m.

Interment will take place on Friday, July 15, 1966, at 10 a.m. at the Arlington National Cemetery, Memorial Gate.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MACE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to remind my distinguished colleagues of a historic anniversary. The year 1966 marks 125 years of consecutive use of the present mace in the House of Representatives. The mace is used as an active symbol of authority by the Sergeant at Arms. Made in 1841 by William Adams, the mace is an exact reproduction of the original mace which was destroyed when the British Army burned the Capitol on August 24, 1814. It replaced a temporary wood mace that was used from 1814 to 1841.

Standing 46 inches high, the mace is an exceptional example of a 19th century silversmith's art. Its core is formed by 13 ebony rods, representing the Thirteen Original States of the Union, and its surface is covered with solid silver painstakingly engraved with the seven continents of the globe. An artisan's treasure, it cost the U.S. Government a nominal $400. Today, its value, both real and intrinsic, far exceeds that sum.

For centuries, the mace has been symbolic of power and influence. Originally employed as a potent weapon, gradually it has come to represent persons and institutions of authority. In England, the King began the practice of sending his sword or mace down to the House of Commons to signify his presence when he was physically absent from the House. This custom has continued in the Commons to this day, and our English cousins never meet without the reminder of this ancient ceremonial tradition.

The position of the mace signifies whether the House is in session or whether it has resolved itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Visitors in the galleries today will notice that the mace is now in position at the Speaker's right, meaning that we are now in regular session. When we begin our deliberations in the Committee of the Whole, the mace will be placed on the lower pedestal next to the desk of the Sergeant at Arms. Any Member or visitor entering the House can tell at a glance if the House is in session or in committee.

A resolution of the First Congress, adopted on April 14, 1789, required that an appropriate symbol of the office of the Sergeant at Arms be provided. As designated by the first Speaker, Frederick Muhlenberg of Pennsylvania, the mace has become the symbol of the Sergeant's authority, and it has occasionally been used to quell an unruly or turbulent Member, or to restore order on the floor of the House. So great is the respect for the mace that it need only be "presented" to a Member creating a disturbance, and he will quietly take his seat. In the 177-year history of the House of Representatives, there have been few instances when the mace was required—its symbol of legislative authority has never been violated.

The record of the mace should make all Americans proud, for during our history it has set a continuing example of the respect for law and order existing not only in the House of Representatives, but throughout our land. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride today in offering this salute to the mace in this, its 125th year.

LOAN TO MAINE SUGAR INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very distressed by a $2.5 million loan just made by the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce to the Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., of Easton, Maine.

The loan is a colossal waste of the taxpayer's money. It amounts to an investment in a beet sugar factory whose future is very uncertain indeed. Recently the largest beet sugar producers in the United States, after agreeing to construct a beet sugar plant in Maine, pulled out because they felt sugarbeets could not be grown properly in northern Maine. Also, it provides for the construction of a beet sugar factory hundreds of miles from a seaport, necessitating costly transportation expenditures.

The granting of this loan by the Department of Commerce amounts to paying for an untried operation. This loan strikes a damaging blow to the two sugarcane refineries in my congressional district, and will result in the displacement of many employees there. In short, the loan is not only misplaced, but misspent as well.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 161]

Baring
Bell
Blatnik
Brademas
Celler
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Cunningham
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Flynt
Fraser
Garmatz
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Holifield
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Long, La.
McFall
Mackie
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Morris
Morse
Multer
Murray
Ottinger
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rosenthal
Scott
Senner
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15750), with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] had 1 hour and 35 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] had 1 hour and 34 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, was the result of many weeks of hearings and meetings and hard work by the Foreign Affairs Committee under the very able guidance of our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN. As he has done so many times in the past, the chairman performed masterful stewardship on the Foreign Assistance Act. His knowledge, his skill, and his judicious temperament were continually demonstrated during our committee deliberations.

The New York Times editorially has commended Chairman MORGAN for "a high order of leadership." Mr. Chairman, this recognition is amply deserved.

Many times in the past I have risen to support America's programs of military and economic assistance abroad, but it is the future to which my remarks will be directed today.

For one need not be a prophet to see the next 10 years as a time of rapid change and eminent challenge.

The United States and the free world will be challenged as never before by the revolutionary forces at work on this planet.

I believe it should be recognized that many of these forces are of our own creation.

Is it not we in the United States who have largely been responsible for the technological and scientific revolutions which have made it possible for man to break the barrier of mere subsistence living and to progress to an affluent and comfortable society?

Is it not we who have created the media of mass communications which have carried the message of our progress and our prosperity to even the most remote corners of the earth?

Mr. Chairman in the final analysis, are we not the cause of the global revolution of rising expectations?

Within the past year I have traveled around the world and have visited some 15 countries in Asia, the Middle East and Europe. There is no place where I have been that the awareness of a new world has not penetrated.

Filipino children living in remote barrios may never have ridden in a motorized vehicle, but they can identify the aircraft that fly over from Clark Field.

Indian youths, with only rags to call clothing, crowd the sidewalks of Calcutta to hear a few strains of American popular music.

Afghan nomads with transistor radios can hear the Voice of America telling them about debates in the United Nations in New York, and about a power failure along our eastern seaboard.

Everywhere I went the story was the same: People expect things to be different, to be better.

They have found that independence by itself does not mean very much. Many of them are still as sick and poor and illiterate as they were in the days of colonialism.

They have freedom, but now they want the material progress that freedom has meant for the United States and the West. They expect a better life for themselves, and certainly a better life for their children.

These are, we must agree, legitimate aspirations. They are the same hopes and the same dreams which inspired the men and women who settled and built our own beloved Nation.

But these same aspirations can be easily twisted and distorted by the inflammatory propaganda of the Communists.

When people see the Old World dying and the New World not yet born, when their ambitions continue to outrun the prospects of fulfillment, it is little wonder that communism has an appeal.

If we were in the position of the emerging peoples we too might listen with fascination if men came to us and said: "We have the prescription for the future; we have all the answers; we know what to do because we have already done it, in the U.S.S.R., in China."

This simple claim to have the answers is one of communism's greatest weapons—and one which we must never for a moment underestimate. The Communist Chinese stand ready to use this and other tactics to harness the forces of discontent to their own purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my colleagues are familiar with the statement by Lin Piao, the Vice Premier of Communist China, in which he outlined a strategy of global guerrilla warfare in which the emerging nations of the world would surround, isolate, and ultimately annihilate the free world.

While this document must be viewed in the light of Chinese capabilities to carry out such a program, we should not underestimate the strength of Chinese intentions.

As instruments of their policy, the Chinese have sought to recruit not just Communists, but all those angry men and women, even entire nations, who seek to tear down the present world system.

Call them what you will—Jacobins or anarchists or ultras—they dream of a world turned upside down in which you and I must come to them to beg for bread. In other words, they are irreconcilable to peaceful change and progress.

In a very real sense, then, a central purpose of American foreign policy—and the policy of the West in the coming decade—must be to reconcile the unreconciled among men and nations to the continued validity and viability of the present world system.

This policy must be pursued in several ways.

First, we in the free world must maintain the military strength to contain aggressor nations, like Red China. We must be able to deny them their conquests and curb their ambitions, as the United States and our allies are doing even this moment in Vietnam.

In order to assist the free nations in this effort, the bill before us today authorizes an appropriation of $917 million for military assistance in both the current fiscal year and the coming one.

Three-fourths of the funds authorized will go to 10 countries, extending from Greece to Korea, which are adjacent to the borders of the Soviet Union or mainland China.

The importance of the military preparedness of these allies to our own defense was strongly emphasized by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their appearances before the committee.

But military aid alone will not suffice to solve the political and social problems created by the revolutionary crises of our times. In addition, we must be willing to give stake in the future of our system to those peoples and those countries which now stand outside the circle of prosperity.

It is to this end that our foreign economic assistance programs must be aimed.

It is generally agreed that our aid programs must be geared to building habits of economic and social responsibility in the recipient nations. They must provide emerging peoples with opportunities for self-help and self-achievement in an environment of cooperation.

Experience has shown that one effective way to accomplish these purposes is through regional, multilateral organizations and projects. It was for that reason that the committee approved a new section to the Foreign Assistance Act for southeast Asian multilateral and regional programs.

I need not belabor today the tremendous importance which southeast Asia has for the United States and its foreign policy. This region has become the battleground in the struggle between the forces of freedom and those of Communist aggression.

To this conflict the United States has committed the lives of hundreds of thousands of its young men and billions of dollars for the equipment and necessities of war.

But we know full well that progress in southeast Asia demands that economic advancement occur behind the shield we have raised in southeast Asia. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to assist in that developmental process, to help build the new world toward which the Asians are striving.

The new section 271 of the Foreign Assistance Act affirms the importance of social and economic progress to U.S. objectives of establishing peace and stability in southeast Asia.

It also expresses the sense of Congress that these objectives would be served by an expanded effort at self-help by nations of that area, as well as by assistance from other interested, developed nations through multilateral and bilateral programs.

Section 272 sets forth the criteria which the President must take into account in providing assistance under this new title.

They include consideration or questions of self-help, regional cooperation and cooperative endeavors which look toward the solution of pressing social and economic problems.

And, Mr. Chairman, I can advise my colleagues, on the basis of my experience and observation in my recent travels, that these emerging countries are willing, anxious, and determined to help themselves and to cooperate toward the solution of these problems.

Section 273 of the act authorizes the President to utilize any of the funds appropriated for economic assistance, with the exception of those under the Alliance for Progress, in order to provide aid under this title.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the administration had requested an open-ended authorization for foreign appropriations. The committee very wisely rejected this request in favor of the limitation adopted.

Such funds may be used upon terms and conditions determined by the President, subject to the general rules and limitations set forth in the act.

I firmly believe that the establishment of this regional program for southeast Asia is a major step forward, toward the solution of many of that area's regional problems.

There are three requirements for southeast Asia if it ever is to know peace and stability: First, the nations must achieve economic and social progress in order to give their peoples a better life. Second, the nations must forget their intraregional squabbles and learn to cooperate together on projects of mutual benefit. Third, the nations must be able to establish the necessary unity to counterbalance, in some measure, the power of China on the Asian scene.

Through this new title, a start is made toward all three of these objectives. Among the development programs which could be financed are technical studies dealing with the Mekong River Basin, projects funded through the Asian Development Bank, the expansion and development of the existing regional Graduate School of Engineering in Bangkok, the Asian Productivity Organization and the Asian Labor Education Center in Manila.

All of these projects are directed toward the economic development of the southeast Asian nations in a context which maximizes intergovernmental cooperation and coordination. They provide a hope that ultimately the nations of that area can stand on their own and can resist Chinese pressures toward domination of their region.

Complementing the regional approach to international development, the committee has added a new title IX to the Foreign Assistance Act which is designed to emphasize the grassroots kind of activity which is so necessary to political stability.

As the committee report says on page 27:

> Over the years in exercising legislative oversight with respect to the administration of U.S. development assistance, the committee has observed that there is a close relationship between popular participation in the process of development and the effectiveness of this process.

Because of this belief, the committee has, in the past, written a number of provisions into the Foreign Assistance Act. These provisions urged that emphasis be given to stimulation of local programs of self-help and mutual cooperation, including loans to small farmers, encouragement of cooperatives, labor unions and savings-and-loan-type institutions. In this grassroots approach to development both public and private organizations could be utilized for maximum participation and effort.

Unfortunately, in the past neither those officials responsible for dispensing U.S. aid nor the recipient governments were particularly interested in this aspect of development.

It gradually has become clear, however, that failure to engage all of the available human resources in the task of development not only hinders economic progress, but also does little to remedy basic social and political unrest and instability.

In recent months many AID officials apparently have realized the wisdom of the committee's longstanding insistence on the use of democratic institutions in development. A number of programs emphasizing this approach have been inaugurated.

Believing that this trend should be encouraged and spurred on, the committee has proposed the language embodied in the new title IX.

It points up that even more attention and emphasis be given in the administration of U.S. assistance programs to the goal of attaining a larger measure of popular participation in development.

"Community action, and community development" have become the watchwords of the President's war on poverty. Now we must take some of these same concepts and apply them abroad to help wipe out poverty, ignorance, and disease through the mobilization of all available human resources.

The committee intends to keep a close check on the manner in which AID carries out the congressional intent of title IX. We expect that the Agency will develop the criteria for determining how well programs in these areas are proceeding insofar as they enlist the energies and talents of the people.

Mr. Chairman, before closing, I should like to turn to the issue of a 2-year authorization.

I am moved to speak on this subject, since the minority report flattered me by quoting a statement which I made in the course of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a statement which expressed my reservations about the wisdom of a long-term authorization.

I must admit that I have some deep reservations on this point, but at the same time I believe it is best to set the record straight.

I would like to point out that the statement quoted in the minority report was made by me at the time when the executive branch was requesting that the entire foreign aid program be placed on a 5-year basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not grant that request. Basically, apart from the Alliance for Progress and the development loan programs which have been a long-term basis for years, the bill before us contains a 2-year authorization. And it is this 2-year authorization that is at issue today.

After restudying the issue, I am moved to support a 2-year authorization, and I would like to explain why.

As my colleagues know, I have never been and I do not ever intend to become a rubberstamp for the decisions or requests originating in the other branch of our Government.

But, Mr. Chairman, I try to keep an open mind, and when the reasons are valid and persuasive, I am not afraid to reconsider my position.

During the markup of the bill, I listened with great care to the arguments advanced by our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], arguments which set forth cogent reasons for a reexamination of my position on this issue.

Further, I was given assurances by our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] that the committee will follow through with an extensive examination of the different parts of this program next year, and that the committee staff may be enlarged. We do have an excellent staff but they are overworked.

Committee hearings and study will begin immediately upon the reconvening of the 90th Congress.

Further, we will have an opportunity to examine not a legislative proposal but the operation of the AID program on a country-by-country basis.

Furthermore, as I went back and reviewed the experience of the House and statements of some pretty knowledgeable people bearing on this issue, I recalled for example, that the House earlier this year passed several bills dealing with international matters—bills containing 2-year authorizations, the Asian Development Bank and the food-for-peace legislation and other measures in this category.

In each instance the 2-year authorization was overwhelmingly approved by the House.

I went further back in time and recalled the advice and admonitions of some of our former colleagues whose reputations for integrity, courage, and devotion to our Nation's cause require no elaboration on my part. Many of us served with our former colleagues, Dr. Walter Judd, and John Vorys, and with other colleagues who urged that our foreign undertakings be placed on a firm and sufficiently long-range basis.

I also recall the recommendations of our chief executives, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Truman, and President Johnson, who commended to the Congress the advisability of adopting this approach to foreign assistance.

Finally, I reread the recommendations of the supplemental views which favor a 2-year authorization, but would prefer to have it begin in the first year of each Congress.

Having weighed all those arguments and all of those recommendations, based on many, many years of experience in the field of foreign policy, I reconsidered my own reservations and came to the decision to support the 2-year authorization proposed in the bill now before us.

I believe that the 2-year authorization proposed in the bill before us—taken together with Chairman MORGAN's assurances that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will continue to work as hard as ever on this program next year—represents a sound approach.

It does not abdicate our responsibility for this program.

It does not burden a new Congress with a commitment which cannot be changed. This authorization can—and may be—revised next year.

But at the same time, it gives the executive branch an opportunity to plan ahead.

It gives the newly elected Congress an opportunity to look into the program before voting on it.

And it will give the Committee on Foreign Affairs greater opportunity to concentrate on an intensive examination of those parts of the program which may require such extra effort and study.

I urge, therefore, that the 2-year authorization be approved. And I appeal to my distinguished colleagues on the minority side—who have supported this program and who see the merits of a 2-year approach—to reconsider their position about embarking upon this approach next year rather than this year.

Let us give the new Congress an opportunity to study and examine this program thoroughly before it comes up for a decision.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the approval of this legislation including the 2-year authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this brief time to express my support for the bill that is now under consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

I was somewhat surprised to hear my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, extol the virtues of the 2-year authorization because I recall rather recently being on a radio program with him when I expressed my own views to the effect that there might be some merit in a 2-year authorization and he stoutly defended the 1-year position. However, I certainly would not criticize my distinguished friend for having seen the light, as he explained to us a few moments ago.

Mr. Chairman, my main reason for speaking is not to extol the virtues of the foreign aid program. That has been done very eloquently by several speakers, but to tell the Committee that at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment which will strike out all authorizations for the fiscal year 1968 except for the development loan fund and the Alliance for Progress.

I do this not in a conviction that a 2-year authorization is necessarily bad, but that if it is to be done, I very, very firmly believe that it should be at the beginning of a new Congress and that we should not be put in a position of deciding now on a very controversial and important issue in such a way that the new Congress, which will come in in January, will not consider the program until it has been in session for more than a year. It seems to me that if this is a good idea—and I concede that there are some arguments for it—this is the wrong time to do it, and I would hope that such an amendment would carry and that the new Congress will be able to make a determination as to whether it wishes to depart from the time-honored principle of annual authorizations and proceed to the 2-year authorization. But I believe that question should be decided by the new Congress and not by us on behalf of people who will be elected this fall.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, over a period of 20 years, Congress, with the approval of a succession of Presidents, has blithely picked the pockets of American taxpayers for at least $140 billion and dished it out around the world for what is euphemistically called foreign aid.

And today, if this bill is approved, the citizens of this country will be on the way to being victimized to the tune of approximately another $13.8 billion.

It was designed, we are told year after year, in season and out, to win friends and influence people around the world to the cause of peace and righteous living. As we have said in the minority report, the record is one of vast failures that have been paid for with our billions of dollars.

In a message to Congress on March 13, 1959, the then President Eisenhower said that as a result of foreign aid "our friends among free world nations make available to us for the use of our forces 250 strategic bases, 5 million ground forces, 30,000 aircraft, and 2,500 vessels.

Where are the imposing forces about which Eisenhower spoke so glowingly in 1959? The casualty figures from Vietnam provide the answer just as did the casualty figures during Harry Truman's "police action" in Korea when the United States sustained 150,000 casualties. When it comes to fighting and dying our so-called friends, upon whom we have lavished so much, are conspicuous by their absence.

It is significant that exclusive of Korea, the countries providing even token combat support in Vietnam—Australia and New Zealand—are not on the list of foreign aid panhandlers.

Yes, where are the 5 million ground forces, the 30,000 aircraft, and the 2,500 naval vessels that the lavish foreign handout program was supposed to make available? As a cold matter of fact, some of these "friends" have been and are still helping the enemy. In 1964 and 1965, several hundred free world ships, including those of Britain, Japan, Greece, Norway, Lebanon, Italy, West Germany, and Panama, landed thousands of tons of supplies at Haiphong in North Vietnam to help the Communists in their killing of Americans.

Leading the list in this Red trade were ships flying the British flag. This is the same British Government which owes American taxpayers billions of dollars and which is today being saved from collapse by virtue of hundreds of millions of American dollar credits to prop up the sagging pound sterling.

This is the same perfidious British Government which continues to trade with and support the economy of Cuba, thus keeping Fidel Castro in power and a Communist dictatorship in operation 90 miles off our shores, and spreading subversion throughout this hemisphere. This then becomes the excuse for dumping more millions of American dollars into Latin American countries to meet the threat of Communist infiltration spawned in Cuba.

Meanwhile, President Johnson has the effrontery to join with the perfidious British in their boycott of Rhodesia even though the same British Government thumbs its collective nose at our boycott of Castro's Cuba.

It is bad enough when these professed "friends" refuse to help us with the fighting and dying as in Vietnam where 4,000 Americans have been killed and another 25,000 wounded. But it is worse when they furnish those who are killing and wounding Americans with the supplies they need and are aiding and abetting Communists elsewhere.

It was only a few days ago that the British Government announced it would not send troops to Vietnam and would not provide arms for fighting the Communists. Under these circumstances, how can Lyndon Johnson keep a straight face before the American people and justify the use of American dollars to prop up the pound sterling or spend money from the foreign aid contingency fund to aid the British in their attempts to destroy the Rhodesian Government which seeks its independence from the leeching British as did our forefathers 190 years ago?

Incidentally, as the foreign handout program continues, our gold stocks dwindle. France, into which this country dumped some $9 billion in so-called foreign aid, has ordered us to pack up and get out, meanwhile, according to published reports, pulling out some $33 million per month of our gold. How long, I ask, will it be until the United States holds the worthless paper of the world and an assortment of foreign nations have taken over our gold?

Into India this country is now pouring hundreds of millions of dollars each year and yet we read only today that Prime Minister Gandhi and Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia have just issued a joint statement asserting that India and Yugoslavia will adhere to "nonalinement as an instrument of peace and peaceful coexistence."

Are memories so short that we have forgotten what happened when Communist Chinese troops were sent plunging across the Indian border? When it became a question of saving their hides, leaders of the Indian Government came crawling and begged the United States to come to their defense. This Government responded instantly, and when it became clear to the Red Chinese that U.S. military forces would be used to halt the invasion the fighting ended.

India, with communism on its threshold, refused to send combat troops to Korea when the Russians and Red Chinese made their first postwar military thrust in Asia. Then they said they were "neutral." They have steadfastly refused to send combat help to Vietnam because, they say, they are "nonalined."

But neither Mrs. Gandhi nor Dictator Tito is "nonalined" when it comes to picking the pockets of American taxpayers through the medium of the open-handed spenders both in and out of Congress.

India and Yugoslavia are but two examples of the "heads we win; tails you lose" foreign aid technique. What about Italy, Greece, and Turkey, to name only three more in addition to Britain and France? All of them have wallowed in the foreign aid trough but they are shedding none of their precious blood in Vietnam.

It was not so long ago that President Johnson sent Henry Cabot Lodge around the world to drum up help in the fighting-and-dying department in Vietnam. Lodge returned to Washington to report that our so-called friends around the world expressed their "deep gratification" that we were fighting the war.

Shortly thereafter, and probably in recognition of this stirring report, Lyndon Johnson appointed Lodge as Ambassador to Saigon.

But what should we expect when the Vice President, HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, takes to the public rostrum as he did at Huron, S. Dak., on May 31, this year, to proclaim that the United States must learn to accept abuse—not gratitude—in helping poorer nations?

In a speech at Huron College, in his former hometown, HUMPHREY asserted that leadership required patience and understanding. "In none of this," he said, "should we expect either friendship or gratitude."

I say that when the United States invests the blood of its youth in a sanguinary war 10,000 miles from home; when it invests more than a billion dollars a month in that war; when it has ladled out $140 billion to help the downtrodden from Ouagadougou to Timbuktu, it is entitled to something more than a kick in the teeth.

A writer in the Detroit Free Press summed it up fairly well recently when he wrote:

> It is a fact that some of those who have howled the loudest for American involvement in every nook and cranny on this troubled globe are now leading the wailing over our predicament in Vietnam.
>
> Go into Africa, Uncle Sam, these people insisted, and mix into the tribal affairs which have been confounding observers for centuries on end.
>
> Stick your oar into Latin America, Uncle Sam, they said, and don't fret over the fact that generations of highly intelligent natives have been unable to bring about land reform, which is the genesis of progress.
>
> Go here, go there, go everywhere, Uncle Sam, these people urged, for you are the new leader of the new world and the great unwashed yearn for your pearls of wisdom and pant for your solicitude. Take money; help make the world green; and go, go, go!
>
> Didn't they realize, these people, that some time, some place, Uncle Sam might get his foot caught in a bear trap? Apparently not. And now the shock of their reaction to the nasty impasse in Viet Nam has brought them to near hysteria and we hear soulful laments directed against the government which went, went, went.
>
> A few days ago a man came in for a chat and he was asked: "What do you want out of our involvement in Viet Nam?"
>
> "What I want," he replied, "is to be able to walk along the principal street of any city in the world and not be ashamed of my Americanism. I want to 'win' over there to the extent of a decent, negotiated peace, and then I want us to get out—the wiser for our experience—and leave those people alone."

Mr. Chairman, I have said before and I repeat that the foreign aid program, as it has been operated and is presently operated, is one of the worst swindles ever perpetrated upon the American people. It is not within the capacity of the citizens of this country to police and provide the bankroll for the rest of the world. It is a further swindle because it has not, as promised, produced dependable friends and allies throughout the world.

This Nation today is debt-ridden and plagued with inflation. It is faced with growing internal dissention. It is moving inexorably toward the day when citizens will be confronted with the grave question of whether this free government can be preserved.

In all conscience and reason, this bill ought to be drastically reduced and under no condition should the citizens of this country be committed to a foreign aid program of more than 1 year.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

First, I should like to join with my colleagues in expressing our high regard for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN. His stewardship of our committee has been marked by fairness, bipartisanship, and tremendous devotion in the discharge of his responsibilities to the House and to our Nation. His approach to the complex, frequently exasperating, problems of our foreign policy has been marked by all of those characteristics—and by a good deal of foresight.

It is in no small measure due to his personal interest and concern for the future course of our foreign policy that during the past 6 months our committee, and its various subcommittees, have spent many hours examining such diverse issues as the conduct of the war in Vietnam, the crisis in NATO, our policy toward Asia, the future of the United Nations, the problem of Communist subversion in Latin America, and many others.

In addition, the committee has devoted over 3 months to a careful survey of the programs required to carry out U.S. foreign policy, embodied in the legislation now before the House.

The result of these efforts, the information and the insights which they produced, and the collective judgments arrived at by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, are reflected in the provisions of H.R. 15750 and elaborated in the report accompanying this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as the author of the amendments in committee to authorize foreign aid for 2 years, except for 5-year authorization of the loan programs, I want to discuss why it is in the public interest in my opinion for the program to be authorized for more than 1 year. Let me begin by saying that the principle of long-term authorization is not a new principle in the foreign aid program. It is, in fact, an established principle which Congress has recognized on several occasions and which has been widely supported through the years by Presidents of the United States and a broad segment of leaders in business, government, and the professions.

Every President of the United States has urged long-term authorization beginning with President Truman who said:

> It is well known that one-year authorizations for development programs are wasteful and inadequate. Countries that are planning their development ahead . . . are kept in doubt and are unable to move ahead with confidence. The authorization clearly should be for 4 or 5 years, as in the case of the Marshall Plan.

When the Eisenhower administration took the lead in proposing that foreign aid be put on a long-term basis, Democrats joined Republicans in supporting the establishment of the Development Loan Fund in 1957.

As President Eisenhower said:

> I believe our common objective can best be accomplished through a long-term authorization of appropriations in reasonable amounts, together with the concurrent enactment in one appropriation bill of appropriations for each of the years for which the program is authorized.

It is important to remember that the Development Loan Fund was authorized for 2 years in 1957 and again in 1959, and for 5 years in 1961, following which the Alliance for Progress loan program was authorized for 4 years in 1962.

In making these long-term authorizations, Congress refused administration requests for borrowing authority, and required instead annual appropriations. This was a wise move in my opinion, and this system has worked quite well in the case of the development loan program.

I am particularly well qualified to speak on the subject of long-term authorization for the foreign aid program because I was one of the Democrats on the Foreign Affairs Committee who signed supplemental views in the House report on the mutual security bill in 1957. One of the points we made in this statement was that the Development Loan Fund as a new program should be given a trial period of a year, rather than being authorized for more than 1 year. Our misgivings were unfounded. It is clear that the long-term authorization of the development loan program has helped to stabilize the foreign aid program and to emphasize the continuing U.S. commitment to assist less-developed countries. It is also clear that there have been none of the problems in connection with the long-term authorization of the development loan program which opponents of the 2-year provisions are now claiming will result.

In 1961 and 1962, President Kennedy, continuing along the lines initiated by President Eisenhower, again emphasized the importance of a long-term authorization:

> Long-term authorization, planning and financing are the key to the continuity and efficiency of the entire program. If we are unwilling to make such a long-term commitment, we cannot expect an increased response from other potential donors or any realistic planning from the recipient nations . . . no other step would be such a clear cut signal of our intentions to all the world . . . No other step would do more to help obtain the services of top-flight personnel. And in no other way can we encourage the less-developed nations to make a substained national effort over a long-term period.

Again, Republicans joined Democrats to support the long-term authorization of the development loan program, and in 1962, the Alliance for Progress.

This year, President Johnson has recommended a 5-year authorization for the entire foreign aid program. What he has requested is not something new or different. He proposes an extension of a principle which already has been successfully applied to part of the foreign aid program, building on precedence established by the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

Our committee has met the President half way by recommending continuation of the long-term authorization for the development loan program and the Alliance for Progress, together with a 2-year authorization for other categories of assistance. I quote from the committee report, page 5:

> A 2-year authorization of specific sums assures an opportunity for each Congress to make a comprehensive review of the foreign aid authorization.
>
> There will not be any diminution of congressional scrutiny of the foreign assistance program as a consequence of the 2-year authorization. The Committee on Foreign Affairs does not regard a 2-year authorization as indicating that it intends to assume less responsibility for, take less interest in, or do less work on foreign aid.
>
> Annual appropriation of funds will still be necessary following a comprehensive and detailed review by the Committee on Appropriations.
>
> The committee believes that more attention should be given to the contribution which our various foreign assistance programs are making to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy and to reviewing in detail specific foreign aid operations rather than undertaking every year an all inclusive survey of what the Executive proposes to do in the year to come and the estimated financial requirements.
>
> The committee desires to explore and discuss policies, programs, and operations which are in need of attention. It is not anticipated that the responsible officials of the State and Defense Departments will spend less time in the preparation and presentation of material to the committee than they do at present.

COMMENTS ON SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Six minority members of our committee who support the foreign aid program have signed views opposing the 2-year authorization, despite the fact that at least five of these also indicated their support for the continuation of the 5-year loan programs. In doing so, they said that the case can be made for authorizing the loan programs for 5 years because this "is continuing a policy which Congress has already approved," and that "the foreign aid program as a whole is so complex and the international situation changes so unpredictably" that the other categories should not be authorized for 2 years.

Let us examine these arguments. The international situation is complex and it does change rapidly, but this has been the case ever since the end of World War II.

If the international situation should change so as to require legislative changes in the AID program, Congress can always revise the 2-year authorization by simply amending the act next year. This has been done from time to time with the Development Loan Fund, and there is no reason that the same procedure cannot be used again if the world situation requires such a step.

Furthermore, the logical conclusion of the argument that Congress should approve only those things which have been approved in the past is an absurb position, unworthy of discussion.

The supplemental statement also says that a multiyear authorization should not be passed this year, but should be considered at the beginning of a new Congress. The passage of a 2-year authorization this year would bring the program up for review in the second year of the new Congress, and I think you probably could argue that new Members would be in a position to cast an informed vote on the program at that time.

It is also worth pointing out that the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress were authorized for more than one Congress, skipping the 88th Congress altogether. But I have not heard anyone argue that this adversely affected congressional prerogatives.

The final argument made by the members who signed supplemental views is that a 2-year authorization would represent "the abdication of responsibility by the Foreign Affairs Committee."

CONGRESS CAN BETTER CONTROL FOREIGN AID WITH A 2-YEAR AUTHORIZATION

The fact is, as I said earlier, with a 2-year authorization there will be more, not less, congressional control over foreign aid.

As all Members know, there will be annual appropriations under these long-term authorization provisions. But annual appropriations do not mean that there will be sufficient congressional control over the program through the appropriations process. I do not believe this for a minute, nor do I accept the argument that the kinds of control insured through the appropriations process would give adequate policy direction to the program. A combination of policy and funding controls exercised by both the authorizing committees and the appropriations committees is vital.

Having said that, let me point out that there are very few Government programs which are not authorized for more than 1 year. Almost every major program of Government is authorized permanently. Those programs which are not authorized permanently are almost all authorized for more than 1 year. Has anyone ever claimed that the authorizing committees which oversee the other departments have abdicated their responsibility by having authorized these programs for more than 1 year? On the contrary, the less time a committee has to spend on annual general review of programs, and can instead devote itself to selective examinations of programs, the more control it will have over their operations.

We know how beneficial, for example, investigations of the foreign aid program have been, not in just correcting specific abuses, but in increasing the effectiveness of the entire program. Does anyone doubt that these investigations result in better control than the type of annual general hearings covering the waterfront which the Foreign Affairs Committee has had to conduct every year?

Some of the most productive work of the Foreign Affairs Committee has been the investigations of the foreign aid program which have been carried out in recent years and which could be greatly intensified if the committee and its staff were not so tied down each year will full committee hearings on the foreign aid bill.

A 2-year authorization would give the committee a chance to probe the foreign aid program in depth. I have not the slightest doubt that this will result in better control over the program.

Those who make the argument that the committee is abdicating its responsibility and that Congress will lose control over the program by authorizing it for 2 years would do well to look at the development loan program and the Alliance for Progress, both of which provide evidence to the contrary. There has been no indication of any loss of congressional control or any abdication of responsibility by the authorizing committee in authorizing the loan programs for more than 1 year.

Let me also point out that there has been substantial bipartisan support for long-term authorization for the loan programs. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] all voted for the long-term authorization for development loans and the Alliance for Progress; none of them signed the minority views in 1957 which attacked the 3-year authorization provided for the Development Loan Fund; nor did any of these Members who now say 2 years is an abdication of committee responsibility support the motion by Smith of Wisconsin in 1957 to delete the Development Loan Fund. They all also voted for the conference report which contained a 2-year authorization for the loan program. Their record is clear—they have never thought long-term authorization was an abdication of responsibility. As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said in 1961, when arguing for long-term authorization with annual appropriations:

> Most of us, as I have indicated, are in favor of long-term programming. We recognize there can be more efficiency and effectiveness, if we have long-term programming. Furthermore I certainly am in favor of long-term commitments over a specific period to an individual country. We might develop such a response on a basis of a long-term authorization for 3 or, perhaps, 4 years. We might couple that with a multiyear appropriation of part, but not all, of the total amount which the administration estimates it is going to need 3 or 4 years from now.

HOW THE 2-YEAR AUTHORIZATION WOULD AFFECT THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

It has also been argued that if the foreign aid program were authorized for more than 1 year the Foreign Affairs Committee would have to close shop on the off years. It is very difficult for me to see how anyone could make an argument of this kind knowing how much there is to be done in the foreign affairs field these days, and what a heavy responsibility falls upon the Foreign Affairs Committee. Members know how pressed for time the committee is, and it is apparent that as long as the Foreign Affairs Committee has to conduct a general review of the foreign aid program each year it will be substantially foreclosed from consideration of other major foreign policy questions.

The result is that the Foreign Affairs Committee is not able to play its full role in the making of foreign policy. If the committee is going to perform for the House and for the country functions which increase daily in importance, it must have the opportunity to operate more broadly in the foreign affairs field. This can be done if annual authorization hearings by the full committee are not mandatory.

WOULD A 2-YEAR AUTHORIZATION HURT THE PROGRAM BY PUTTING IT IN THE HANDS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES?

There is also the argument that to authorize the foreign aid program for more than 1 year while requiring an annual appropriation would leave the program in the hands of the appropriations committees.

As I indicated earlier, I think it is essential for the authorizing committees to play their full role with respect to the program. The appropriations committees cannot give adequate policy direction to the program; this must continue to come from the authorizing committees. But there is no reason that this kind of policy control cannot continue to be exercised by the Foreign Affairs Committee with an authorization of more than 1 year. Other authorizing committees have had no difficulty controlling programs which were permanently authorized or authorized for more than 1 year. There are many other forms of control than simply passing the authorization bill each year, and many of these are more effective than the generally superficial consideration given the program every year under the present system.

BENEFITS OF A 2-YEAR AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

The benefits of a long-term authorization for the foreign aid program are practical. A tree cannot grow if you pull it up every year to look at its roots.

Let me sum up the case this way: There is no single action which could be taken by Congress which would do more to stabilize and make the foreign aid program more effective than passing an authorization for more than 1 year. Not only would it be a sign of continuing American commitment to its international responsibilities, but it would also represent the acceptance by Congress of a fact long since accepted by the American people; namely, that foreign aid is a necessary part of our foreign policy.

Passage of a 2-year authorization by Congress would be a sign to the rest of the world that the United States is in this fight to win. As Dr. Walter Judd, one of our former distniguished Republican colleagues serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee said in 1961 in arguing for long-term authorization:

> If you have a long-range problem, you have to have a long-range solution. You can't do it otherwise.
>
> The best way I have been able to think of it is this: When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the Congress met and declared war. It did not declare war for 1 year and say, "We will spend the last 2 months of the year debating whether to fight the second year," and the same thing at the end of the next year.
>
> We declared war until we won. But at the same time we did not lose control of the conduct of the war. We did not commit outselves to fight it all with tanks because we perhaps started with tanks, or all with battleships, instead of shifting to carriers. We would modify our operations as experience developed.
>
> The main thing was to tell our allies, and our enemies and our own people that we are going to fight until we won. It is the same now. If we can get that kind of confidence in us abroad, and at the same time keep flexibility, rather than rigidity in our program, I feel strongly that will be best for the program and best for our country.

What Walter Judd said has been echoed by public groups which have studied the foreign aid program, by Presidential commissions, and by witnesses from a broad segment of American life. Let me quote just a few of the statements made by witnesses before our committee this year:

John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, said:

> Long-range economic planning and development must be emphasized in foreign assistance programs. To accomplish this goal, a 4-year authorization of foreign aid funds, subject to annual appropriations and review by appropriate congressional committees, is desirable. * * * We think this is consistent with what we in business would term good long-range planning.

John C. Lynn, legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation, testified this year before our committee as follows:

> Let's decide what is in the best interests of the United States. Make this a 10-year plan or a 5-year plan, if this is what is required. Then each year the administrative agencies of Government would come before this committee and demonstrate to you what progress they are making on the plan that you and, let us say, the AID administrators develop for India.
>
> We would be for a 5-year plan, but the authorization would be based on the progress being made toward carrying out the plan.
>
> This is the same procedure that the Congress follows with regard to domestic programs. We see no reason why it shouldn't be done with the AID program.

John T. Caldwell, president, North Carolina State University, speaking for the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, testified:

> The institutions of a society which develop, undergird, and replenish the individual and social competencies cannot be produced overnight. For this reason we applaud the proposal in H.R. 12449 for 5-year funding authorizations * * * but 5-year authorizations would add a measure of psychological stability to a foreign-aid program too often characterized in the past by year-to-year uncertainty. The 5-year authorization begins to recognize the desirability of choosing long-range goals and building programs toward their achievement.

Dr. Caldwell quoted presidents of other State universities and land-grant colleges as follows:

> Earl Rudder, Texas A & M University: "One of the most common fallacies in foreign assistance thinking is the assumption that host officials responsible for development in newly developing countries are already committed to the action required for progress with specific development projects. This fallacy, plus short-term aid commitments results in projects getting underway without sufficient commitment on the part of the host government to secure the minimum in local participation and support required for success."
>
> Elvis Stahr, Indiana University: "Renegotiations of contracts annually or biennially have been known to take as much as 8 months * * * with corresponding uncertainty and loss of time."
>
> John T. Fey, the University of Wyoming: "Lack of predictable funding is a major deterrent for any university-related program."
>
> F. L. Hovde, Purdue University: "The training of U.S. and foreign technicians and scientists is a continuing endeavor that cannot be mounted effectively with short-run fund authorization."

Similar testimony was received from many other organizations including the National Council of Catholic Women, the AFL–CIO, the National Council of Jewish Women, and others.

So it is apparent that the recommendation of the Foreign Affairs Committee for a 2-year authorization with 5 years for the loan programs is consistent with the actions of Congress in the past which were supported by Republicans and Democrats alike, with the best judgment of all of those who have been concerned with the administration of the program, and with the express views of leading Americans. Someone has said that the foreign-aid program is trying to do a 50-year job in 10 years with 5-year plans and a 1-year authorization. The least this House can do is to put the program on a sounder, more businesslike basis by providing a 2-year authorization, and by continuing the 5-year authorization for development loans and the Alliance for Progress.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the commentary of the gentleman from Florida, I am tempted to cease my remarks. But inasmuch as the logic of the gentleman from Florida was not as convincing as his delivery, I am constrained to go ahead and discuss the opposite position on this issue.

Before I point out the fallacies of a multiyear authorization, I should like to commend the chairman of our committee, Dr. MORGAN, for his very dedicated and persuasive manner in handling this bill in committee. Early in the committee deliberations I was proud to follow the chairman in supporting a 1-year authorization. Later on signals were crossed and people went in divergent directions, and the chairman heroically nurtured a multiyear authorization bill through the committee. But I do wish to commend the chairman for the original position which we share.

First, I should like to direct the attention of Members to the minority views, which commence on page 66. I point out, in the form of an apology, that even though these minority views were written as carefully as possible, events of the last month have made them slightly obsolete. Some of the observations we made as to problems in various parts of the world in relation to the foreign aid program have intensified. If we were to write the report today, we could give you more devastating, practical reasons for curtailing this program, for keeping it at a 1-year level, and for making needed tightening requirements in the law.

I should like to point out to Members the problem we have in the administration of this program. We have over 72 recipient nations, some of which are very grateful, some completely ungrateful, some who assume that foreign aid from the United States is a way of life for them. It imposes an impossible administrative assignment to operate in this many countries, with the billions of dollars involved, with any degree of efficiency. That is why we recommend in our minority views that we have a deliberately calculated practical policy of phasing out this program. We set no time limit. We are realistic enough to know that for the next 10 or 20 years this program may still be with us.

But certainly a practical phasing out of this vast and absolutely unmanageable program would be in order.

Then recognizing the tenor of debate in the House, and the fact that sometimes those of us who offer amendments are accused of trying to gut the bill, I wish to emphasize that all the amendments I know will be forthcoming will be progressive, practical, helpful amendments to improve this program. Certainly we hope that these progressive amendments which we shall offer later this afternoon and tomorrow will receive the support that they deserve on behalf of the taxpayers of this country.

We are especially interested in tightening up the administrative complications. We feel a bit of restraint on personnel, restraint on the number of countries who are aid recipients, and a tightening up of previous language that the Congress has placed in this law would be helpful.

For example, it is the intent of Congress, as expressed in a number of sections of the foreign aid law, that aid not be given any country carrying on aggressive action against another nation. Obviously, in the case of the United Arab Republic, this intent of Congress has not been followed.

I am not even speaking of the nominal thought that this raises the question of the belligerence of the United Arab Republic against the State of Israel. I am thinking of their involvement in Yemen. It is the intent of Congress that we not reward aggression with blind continuation of our aid program. I am hopeful we can make progressive suggestions that would tighten this loophole.

Then we find ourselves in the ironic situation of contributing aid to countries who continue to be at loggerheads with each other. India and Pakistan are classic examples. Certainly our aid is essential to both those countries, and certainly it ought to be used as a lever to bring about peaceful cooperation between them.

Then we have a country that is torn apart, Cyprus with both it's neighbors, Turkey and Greece, being aid recipients. Certainly our aid could be used as a lever—it has not been—to bring about a practical solution in that part of the world.

Then, we get into the Latin American situation, where we have been told since 1961 that the Alliance for Progress would produce utopia for countries south of the border. All their historic ailments and complications would be cured under the Alliance for Progress. We find it hard to explain why this program, with all its grandeur and expense, has not helped Argentina to reach a minimum of stability—or Ecuador, or the Dominican Republic, or Haiti. There are other nations in the Alliance for Progress who have not achieved minimum stability in their government.

Last fall a group of us in the Foreign Affairs Committee toured Africa. We want to see democracy flourish in that continent. We are also aware of the fact that it is the policy of our State Department not to provide aid to countries which are outright dictatorships. In recent months the Prime Minister in Uganda dissolved his parliament and tried to assassinate the leading opposition political leader and is now running that country in a fullblown personal dictatorship. Yet Uganda is an aid recipient. If we are to produce stability in government, if we are to produce democracy, we should not be rewarding a retrogression such as we have seen in Uganda and other lands.

I can go on, Mr. Chairman, and give many other examples of what I think are inconsistencies which seem to prevail here, but I am afraid my arguments may be falling on deaf ears.

So I wish to remind Members again of the fact that as we conclude this debate we will be offering what we consider to be very helpful, practical amendments, many which will make the administration of this program easier, many which our committee perhaps overlooked, but I am confident that the Members on the floor will support these constructive, practical amendments.

If, in the process, these amendments aid the American taxpayer, this will be wonderful, but our immediate aim is to help the administration of this well intended, but greatly misdirected program.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members to take time between their consideration of this debate and the amendments that will be forthcoming to quickly read the minority views, where we give the facts and figures and the reasoning that could be used to support the constructive propositions and constructive housecleaning that will be forthcoming.

In conclusion, I point out, Mr. Chairman, that we do have under the chairmanship of Dr. MORGAN a very fine committee, a committee that has been dedicated to its responsibility and dedicated to help produce a more effective foreign policy on behalf of the people of the United States. Certainly, this committee can be trusted to work with an annual foreign aid authorization. We need not strip the committee of any voice, thereby stripping the Congress of further voice, in the authorization processing of this legislation. I cannot conceive, especially in a campaign year, of any Member voluntarily liquidating the role of the Congress in the direction of the foreign aid program. That is exactly what we would do if we go to a multiyear authorization. So we do expect that there will be widespread bipartisan support of maintaining the 1-year authorization on behalf of the taxpayers and on behalf of the voice of Congress—a much-needed voice of Congress—in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Mr. Chairman, we who serve in the legislative branch of Government have become accustomed to interference from the executive branch in our deliberations and legislative decisions. To a limited degree, this is a natural result of the political relationship which does exist between a President and the legislators who are elected with him under the same party label.

Apart from the direct impact of this aid bill, I again remind the Members that many provisions of the law are being disregarded by the executive branch. I have given you the example of the United Arab Republic and wish to remind you there are loopholes through which aid can be given Communist countries.

The administration has been operating on the fallacy that it is possible to wean individual Communist nations away from the Soviet orbit. These attempts have proven to be complete failures. You cannot change the nature of Communist domination over any nation any more than you can expect a leopard to change its spots.

Aid to any Eastern European Communist country would serve to strengthen the Communist governments there. I do not object to U.S. aid in times of famine or natural catastrophes, since there exists in both tremendous good will toward the United States and its citizens. Aid to Red governments, however, perpetuates and expands the strength of the Communist system. These Eastern European nations are part of the Soviet economic sphere, channeling not only their own surplus products into Soviet-controlled economic programs, but depriving their own people of the necessities of life to meet the quotas imposed by the economic czars of the Red world.

As we supply aid to the Communist governments of Eastern Europe, some of it trickles down to the people. However, it is represented as coming from the efficiency and generosity of their rulers. Much of our aid, however, is diverted to the Soviet Union or reshipped to leftist or neutralist countries in the world's trouble spots as part of the economic infiltration and activity of the Soviet colonial empire.

The official line of many Communist governments in Eastern Europe is that by being included as recipients of U.S. foreign aid and favorable trade, they pursue "independent" action in foreign affairs despite their Communist political philosophy. The statements of our Ambassadors merely reveal the thoroughness with which those Communist governments have brainwashed our State Department officials. All of these governments in Eastern Europe are supporting the aggression by North Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 15750 as now written.

H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, represents a feeble attempt by the Congress to regain some control of a foreign assistance program which has gotten completely out of hand in recent years. In the initial postwar period, foreign aid was a noble and enlightened endeavor by this Nation to help a war-torn Europe and Asia toward recovery. This has long since been accomplished, yet the United States continues to foot the bill for scattered and diverse programs which bear little relationship to our fundamental national interests. I say that it is time for us to stop, take stock of our position, and put foreign aid on an economic diet as recommended by the Clay committee in 1963.

H.R. 15750 does not do this. It is only one of many bills which contain foreign aid. Foreign aid has actually increased since 1963 rather than decreased. As a matter of fact, total foreign aid has increased in excess of 30 percent over fiscal year 1961 if all foreign aid programs are added together. H.R. 15750 only attempts to soften some of the more glaring acts of defiance and ingratitude shown by some of the past recipients of foreign aid to insure that it will not happen again. It specifies, for instance, that benefactors are not to direct propaganda against the United States or its aid recipients; recipients are to pay "adequate compensation" for damage or destruction of American property by indigenous mobs; recipients are to refrain from transporting goods to or from North Vietnam; and recipients are not to plan activities involving insurrection or subversion against the United States or other aided countries.

To my way of thinking, the very need for such conditions—necessary as they may be—is a sad commentary on the way in which our assistance has been received in some countries. Not too long ago, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic told us to "jump in the lake," his mobs destroyed a USIA library, and he now threatens war on his Arab and Jewish neighbors. Ex-President Nkrumah of Ghana used American assistance to help plan subversion for his neighbors. President Sukarno of Indonesia once told us "to hell with your aid," permitted U.S. property to be attacked, and menaced the peace of Malaysia in spite of all our efforts. India and Pakistan used American military supplies to wage war on each other. And France, the greatest recipient of military assistance in Europe, has been a thorn in our side regarding the Western Alliance and our policy in Vietnam. Some apologists might point out that two of the less grateful—Nkrumah and Sukarno—are no longer in positions to insult this country and misuse our aid. But is it not also true that their wings were clipped after the largest part of American assistance was cut off; after the supposed moderating influence of American aid failed to achieve its purposes?

Mr. Chairman, consider these insults and the way in which our foreign aid has been misused. Bear in mind the disappointing results from the nearly $3 billion we have poured into the Alliance for Progress program. Consider, too, the disturbing balance-of-payment deficit which is aggravated by large-scale foreign aid expenditures. Look back on the domestic programs which the administration has attempted to pare down or eliminate in order to finance extensive foreign-aid commitments—such things as impacted school funds, school lunch and milk programs, and the like.

Consider all of these things, Mr. Chairman, and you have a thumbnail sketch of how much of our foreign aid money has been spent. You get an idea of how some of our friends have received our help. All that I can ask is that with such friends, who needs enemies?

How many times must our mistakes be compounded before our policymakers realize that friendship cannot be purchased? How many billions in American dollars must be poured down the open-ended funnel of foreign assistance before it occurs to us that common national interests, not joint bank accounts, are the ingredients for useful and productive international relationships?

From the beginning of our constitutional history, our Government has operated on the principle that appropriations shall be made by the Congress because its Members are closest to the people. That assumption is just as valid today as it was in the time of our Founding Fathers. Because of this conviction, I say that it is high time that the Congress regain control of our total foreign aid program. For too long, we have entrusted our responsibilities to the judgment of the executive bureaucracy, and we are the worse for it. We must restore some semblance of proportion to our overall foreign economic commitments. We must remind all potential recipients that foreign assistance is a favor, not a right. We must, in short, restore our self respect and implement our national interest by rejecting H.R. 15750 as it now is written.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I plan to offer an amendment which would establish as U.S. policy that no funds authorized in this bill could be used for any activity or program which is contrary to the policies of the United States.

I am pleased that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has included in this year's bill a policy statement that:

> The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the U.S. development program * * * shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

In recent years I have testified before the committee in support of my bill to provide that U.S. payments to the United Nations shall not be used for programs contrary to the policies of our country. I have also offered similar legislation as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. This year, on May 11, 1966, I testified in behalf of my bill, H.R. 53, calling for a halt to this misuse of funds to nations who have vowed to destroy us, or who are openly assisting our enemies.

The evidence in support of the need for my legislation has been clear. In January of this year, the United Nations Special Fund, now the U.N. Development Program, approved a project at the University of Havana to train engineers and other technical persons, costing, $2,096,500. Castro's Communist teachers, many of whom are Russians, were handed this money to carry out a program certain to undermine our efforts to keep the Western Hemisphere free from Castro and Russian totalitarianism. Our representatives at the United Nations objected to this, and voted against it, but it did no good. Just 2 years ago, the U.N. Special Fund also approved a grant to help Castro's ailing economy, which cost U.S. taxpayers $500,000.

The language in this year's bill would require the President to seek assurance that U.S. funds given to the United Nations will not go to Castro's Cuba. This is good and establishes a basic policy which our freedom-loving people demand. It is idiotic that our country, which contributes over 40 percent of all funds going to the U.N. Development Program annually, should thus support the totalitarian designs of Castro and his Communist government to the tune of millions of dollars. I congratulate the committee on providing the language it did about Cuba.

While the bill includes the provision to ban U.S. contributions to the U.N. Development Program which go to Cuba, the legislation needs to be further amended to cover all United Nations programs in which funds might be used contrary to our national interests; and it needs to cover all nations, not just Cuba.

The evidence for the need of this amendment, which would provide that no payment by the United States to the United Nations shall be used for any program contrary to the policies of the United States is readily available. There is no requirement by the U.N. Charter that we make these contributions.

The most flagrant and disheartening example outside of Cuba involves Cambodia and our fight for freedom for the Vietnamese people.

In the last 4 years, Cambodia has received almost $3 million from the U.N. Special Fund for various projects, which cost U.S. taxpayers $1.2 million. The most recent grant was for $611,900 in January 1965. This is the same country which is led by Prince Sihanouk, who said on March 23, 1966, in announcing that Cambodia had given the Vietcong a shipment of rice:

> We have given this aid to them by closing our eyes because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy, which is U.S. imperialism.

Foreign relations expert and columnist, C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times has recently reported that Cambodia is "a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Pnompenh government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality."

I will read here a recent news dispatch from Cambodia:

> PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA.—Prince Norodom Sihanouk has sent a message of solidarity to North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh on the U.S. bombings of oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong, the government reported.
>
> Sihanouk expressed profound indignation for the raids and pledged total support to (North) Viet Nam.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow the President to put a stop to the oftentimes wholesale support and taxpayer's dollars to people who have flatly stated: "We will bury you." It is a sickening thing to realize that our dollars are helping to aid a country which gives sanctuary to the Vietcong.

Once this amendment is passed the President will have a firmer base on which to demand that U.S. funds not be used by anti-American programs.

I urge that the House adopt this amendment.

A copy of the amendment follows:

> Page 11, immediately after line 11, insert the following:
>
> "(d) Section 301 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "'(d) The President shall seek to assure that no payment or contribution by the United States to the United Nations or to any agency or activity thereof shall be used for any program or activity which is contrary to the policies of the United States. If the President determines that any such payment or contribution (or any part thereof) is used in violation of this subsection, he shall thereafter withhold United States payments and contributions to the United Nations until the amount withheld equals the amount used in violation of this subsection.'"
>
> And redesignate the following subsection accordingly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, throughout the years I have favored the foreign aid bill, and I similarly favor the bill this year. I believe it is important for the pacification of the world and is necessary in the interests of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. And in doing so, I wish to recognize this debate as an opportunity for the various Members to face responsibly their constitutional role in the formulation of foreign policy.

The U.S. program of foreign assistance has been a prominent feature of American activity in the international community. It has, since World War II, striven for multiple objectives and its general outlook can be altered year to year by the sense of this Congress. Let us evaluate the present bill's provisions for the role of America in the world in the near future.

Basic to our foreign assistance program is the assumption that economically underdeveloped nations are woefully prone to underdevelopment in a political sense as well. For two centuries, this country has constantly recognized that a free and vibrant society, functioning through truly democratic institutions, was not the norm of national life throughout the world. From the era of this Nation's birth, when Europe contained outmoded autocratic governments and their radical inversions of revolutionary mob rule, this Nation has never taken its successful political life for granted. In our own time since World War I, we saw some countries choose between fanatical fascism and totalitarian communism as their political systems. Surely we have learned that constant effort by those committed to democracy is needed if that system is to take roots in more than a few isolated nations. In its foreign assistance program, this country asserts first that it wishes to help other nations attain stable political lives. And, second, if the poverty of nations threatens those leaders who seek stable and democratic systems, we will not allow that threat to go unimpeded. With a stake in democracy throughout the world, the United States is willing to mitigate the strains of economic underdevelopment abroad.

The bill before our consideration now is a significant demonstration of our will to spread political stability through economic development.

Provision is made in this bill for assistance to research and educational institutions in the United States to develop greater programs concerned with the economic and social development of less-developed countries. This will enable AID to continue to increase its use of private American skills and talents.

In the particular area of supporting assistance to Vietnam, this bill goes far in satisfying the needs of our foreign policy. Funds will be used for rural reconstruction directed toward village development, refugee relief, and other essentials. We are taking strong steps to enable the Vietnamese economy to withstand serious inflationary pressures which could endanger basic political stability.

We are also considering today a proposal for continued support of the valuable development assistance program of the United Nations. Through this agency, we are contributing immense benefits for peaceful development throughout the world. Know-how is transferred to the less-developed countries through the provision of experts and the granting of fellowships for training abroad. The U.N. also provides surveys of natural resources, economic feasibility studies, training institutions, and research institutes. These are some of the concrete steps toward economic development which are required by the aspirations of the countries we wish to help.

The value of another agency, UNICEF, is well known. It does substantial work in the field of disease control, health services, and nutrition. It further supports education and vocational training.

The world food program, supervised jointly by the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization, with our help can continue to supply foodstuffs on a multilateral basis to promote economic and social development of the developing countries.

U.N. and direct AID assistance programs are much more than simple donations of funds. They are sound steps toward a broader business interaction between all nations involved. As countries which we now assist grow stronger, they will provide new and growing markets for U.S. business. This, of course, will improve our balance-of-payments situation. What we are pursuing is a community endeavor on an international scale. Beyond altruism lies an approach which is based on a belief in common stakes and mutual desires for general development of both sides of the assistance transaction.

The American outlook on foreign aid also calls for determined efforts of self-help by the recipient nations. This bill recognizes that there is a close relationship between popular participation in the process of devlopment, and the effectiveness of this process. Accordingly, the bill calls for assurances that participation be maximized through the encouragement of democratic institutions—both private and governmental. The experience of aiding Japanese development immediately after the war, for example, has taught us that huge programs by governments can be successful if the citizens in all localities are involved in their nation's development. In particular, loans to small farmers, encouragement of savings and loan-type institutions, and so on, are called for.

A new section of the Foreign Assistance Act would strengthen the southeast Asia multilateral and regional programs. Among the most encouraging developments of this year is the dynamic display by non-Communist Asian nations of a willingness to combine their resources and plan toward the economic development of that entire region. With Japanese willingness to join our continuing efforts, southeast Asia can build a formidable and political independent area of progress.

A necessary complement to successful foreign assistance is our refusal to condone flagrant efforts to disturb peaceful development throughout the world. Several months ago the world was notified that some nations, joining in a tricontinental congress intend to overturn the governments of several nations in this hemisphere. The polite announcement does not make less threatening their determination to impede gradual political progress and economic development in the victim nations. With foreign assistance on one side, the United States extends its opposition to international upheaval, on the other. Accordingly, this bill denies assistance to those who plan military efforts against this country or any country receiving assistance from us.

In addition, I am most gratified that the bill calls for a restriction of funds to refugees serving in the Palestine Liberation Army. U.S. contributions to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees would no longer reach that disruptive military force.

In the Middle East, we also seek to divert excess foreign currency to the Hadassah—Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem. I welcome this provision as a significant constructive part of this program and a partial solution to our standing problem of excess foreign currency.

This bill is complex and many-faceted. Yet, its general outlook is unmistakable. In a world where some wish to overthrow and radically invert, those who wish to respond effectively and morally must do more than obstruct. Maintain the peace we must—but our policy toward others must seek to develop nations, to stimulate change, and thereby insure the peace.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Representative from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] for his vigorous support of the grant of $1 million in excess foreign currency to the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem. The authorization contained in this bill is designed to help that dynamic center to keep up with the latest developments in the medical field. To bring this about the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] responded to the appeal of the national president of the Hadassah Medical Relief Association, Mrs. Mortimer Jacobson, by proposing an amendment to this bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A unanimous vote registered our full agreement with Mr. FARBSTEIN's amendment.

The value of the organization thereby aided is well known. Hadassah projects in Israel include youth rescue work, land reclamation projects, a vocational training program, and a medical program. It is one of the foremost voluntary agencies working in close cooperation with the U.S. program of food for peace.

The medical center in Jerusalem is a splendid expression of American financial and technical aid to developing areas. Funds collected in this country provide American standards and know-how to the only center in Israel for all three vital functions of healing, teaching, and research. Part of its outstanding achievement is the training of medical students from various countries in Africa and Asia. In addition, personnel from the Hadassah Medical Center in Jerusalem have traveled to several African countries to help them start clinics for both treatment and preventive medicine.

While we in this Chamber are asserting our determination to extend American aid to developing nations, it is most fitting that we recognize the achievements of Hadassah in Israel. Mr. FARBSTEIN's amendment has directed us to a fruitful cooperative program which will benefit all nations involved. I was delighted to lend my support to this amendment in committee and to make the motion calling for its passage.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the history of the U.S. Government, there have been few governmental projects that have been debated, discussed, and criticized more than the U.S. foreign aid program. Critics of foreign aid are quick and even eager to find flaws in a program that is, at best, difficult to implement. They seek tangible proof that the U.S. dollar has achieved immediate results. Because of its very nature, however, foreign aid is not a program which produces spectacular, overnight successes. Instead, it is a long-range program which is not well-suited to a rigid, inflexible schedule. Our foreign aid program is designed to help people—people who suffer from malnutrition and disease—people who have never known the inside of a schoolroom, or even a secure roof over their heads. We cannot expect people who are hungry and starving to produce a thriving industrial society; just as we would not expect people who cannot read to be able to build airports for jet planes, or skyscrapers to house huge corporations.

I cannot tell you today of any sweeping, immediate changes created by the introduction of U.S. economic and technical aid, because change takes much time, and change is often not as evident as some people would prefer. For instance, how can you categorically list the changes which occur in the attitudes of a people, or of a government that opens new developmental opportunities because of the introduction of foreign aid? It is simply impossible to put attitudes into tangible, cut-and-dried statistics, but I can name some circumstances which form, I think, an impressive list of meaningful successes. In 1965 alone, as a result of the AID program, over 40,000 classrooms were built; more than 110 million people vaccinated against smallpox; more than 90 million people benefited from water supply facilities; over 1 million new acres were irrigated; and more than 2.5 million people received agricultural credit loans. I can remind you, also, of the 26 foreign nations, including Western Europe, Lebanon, Japan, and Free China, which have completed the transition from being recipients of U.S. economic aid to being self-supporting countries.

Of course, it is unnecessary to go into great detail about the dynamic growth of Western Europe and Japan. We are all well aware of their prosperity; but perhaps the lesser known story of Taiwan, or Free China, might be more pertinent to this discussion.

In December 1949, 1½ million impoverished, homeless refugees landed on the island of Formosa for a last-ditch stand against Communist China. Now, in 1966, 15 years later, Taiwan stands as a living testimonial to the success of U.S. economic aid. Illiteracy has almost been conquered. Over 95 percent of all primary age children attend school. The agricultural development of the island has been astounding. In 10 years rice production has increased 41 percent, and the average farmer is banking a record of 30 percent of his cash income. The island's textile, garment, and wood industries are booming. There is even a growing motion picture and television industry. All of these achievements were possible because of the wise programs of the Chinese, 14 years of U.S. technical advice, and $1.5 billion in grants and loans.

In 1949, V. K. Welling Koo, then Ambassador from Nationalist China, said:

> Help Free China retain a position that can be defended and we will demonstrate that any area of freedom can beat communism in production, education, welfare, happy living.

Mr. Koo proved to be a good prophet, for in 1965, Taiwan no longer required assistance, and the U.S. economic aid ceased on June 30 of that same year.

This is not to say that all the problems of Taiwan have been alleviated. They have not; but their problems have been reduced to such an extent that the island can now go about the task of becoming a productive member in the world family of nations.

The United States, from the very beginning, wisely invested in the future of Taiwan through technical aid, grants, and loans. Today that investment is paying handsome dividends. The success of Taiwan is proof to all countries of Asia, and for that matter, the entire world, that the U.S. foreign economic aid program can and will help any country who is willing to help itself.

Some people would say that Taiwan is an example of unparalleled success, but they would be wrong. Certainly, the amount of time it took for Taiwan to become an independent, self-supporting nation was extremely short, but other countries, in far worse condition than Taiwan, have also made remarkable progress. India, for example, has overcome many obstacles and is well on the road toward economic independence. Since 1953, India's national income has increased 42 percent. Life expectancy has risen from 27 years in 1947 to 42 years in 1965. Today 60 percent of the children under 12 attend school. Compare that to a literacy rate of 10 percent only 15 years ago.

Only recently, India, a country who always prided itself on a controlled and protective economy, was able to liberalize its import regulations, and open the gates to a steady flow of much-needed raw materials and mechanical equipment. Foreign aid was a major contributing factor to the new easing of import restrictions, for without foreign aid, India would not have had the confidence or the economic prosperity to permit the acceptance of new industrial responsibility.

We have seen here two examples of successful foreign aid. Taiwan, in terms of national development, had a rather fast and dynamic growth. India, on the other hand, shows a slower type of success—a type of success which requires slow changes in established tradition and thought before the actual developmental work can be effective. Both Taiwan and India, however, are in their own way successes.

Many critics of foreign aid center their arguments around the length of time it has taken to help these countries to their present stage of development. They say it has simply taken too long. When the facts are reviewed, however, it is apparent that our own country went through a long process of change and growth. It has only been since the turn of the century that the United States has truly begun to develop. The progressive income tax, lowering of interest rates, rural electric cooperatives and other forms of assistance to farmers are not old institutions in our country. Only 30 years ago, farmers in most places in our country were without electricity and plumbing. Yet we sometimes think that 10 years is too long to give foreign aid to a nation that has not yet shown evidence of overwhelmingly successful results. We have only to look in our own country for the answers to these critics. It has been said that it takes 8 full years for a program to move through Congress from the inception of the idea to the passage of legislation. Surely we are expecting too much to think an entire country can be modernized within the course of a few years.

But despite the time it takes for development to occur, there has been significant progress. Taiwan is certainly a completed success story at which Americans can point with pride, and India soon will be. We cannot, however, allow ourselves to bask in the light of our achievements for there is much yet to be done. Foreign aid success stories of today must provide our guidelines for tomorrow. We must accept the legacy of successful economic development of countries such as Taiwan, and continue pursuing a program whose goal is, and always will be, to maintain a healthy climate for continued self-development.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has granted me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the United States should immediately cancel existing cultural exchange and athletic competition agreements with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations which support North Vietnamese aggression in South Vietnam.

Russian and Polish cancellation of track and field events is clear proof—if any were needed—that there is no such diplomatic animal as a nonpolitical exchange program with Communist nations. It is now beyond dispute that by entering into such agreements our State Department has simply provided these

Communist nations with a propaganda tool to be used against the interests of this country and the free world.

Soviet groups are in this country at the present time under the United States-Russian cultural exchange program. They should be asked to leave forthwith.

American groups are currently in the Soviet Union and other Communist nations under the same agreement. They should return home immediately.

So long as American troops are engaged in combat in South Vietnam, there can be no basis for so-called cultural exchange relations with Communist aggressors.

To participate in such programs under present international conditions is a mockery of the sacrifices being made by our American troops fighting in South Vietnam.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 leaves me with mixed emotions.

On the one hand, I am gratified to note that the committee has again sought to write into law a clear prohibition of any aid to any country which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport goods to or from North Vietnam. On the other hand, I have strong reservations about the provision for a 2-year authorization.

Last year, it will be remembered, in conference on the 1965 foreign aid authorization, the other body insisted that this prohibition be weakened so that the President was required only to consider denying such aid to those countries involved in trade with the Hanoi regime. Admittedly in recent months there has been a healthy reduction in the level of this traffic. As the minority views on page 73 of the report accompanying this bill show, during 1965 free world ships called at North Vietnamese ports a total of 256 times. I would remind my colleagues that this is the first complete public report we have had from the administration. Up until now the American people have been told there were only 119. For the first half of 1966 the number, I am informed by the Department of Defense, is 54.

Free world ships arriving North Vietnam, 1966

Flag	January	February	March	April	May	June	Total
United Kingdom	13	11	5	4	4	1	38
Greece	3	1	----------	1	1	1	7
Cyprus	1	----------	1	1	1	2	6
Malta	----------	----------	----------	1	----------	1	2
Italy	1	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1
Total	18	12	6	7	6	5	54

So we have made some progress but just as surely something still remains to be done and we in the Congress must not relax our efforts to dry up entirely this source of supply to our enemies. One ship is one too many. Fifty-four ships is intolerable. It can never be explained to our constituents at home who are so deeply concerned about the war in Vietnam.

As the minority views to this bill pointedly suggest, it is indeed a sad commentary on our alleged friends and allies, and on the ineffective diplomatic efforts of the administration as well, to note the lack of concern in many of these countries until recently about trade that their flag vessels have engaged in with North Vietnam and the corresponding lack of assistance which they have given to the South Vietnamese in their struggle against the Vietcong.

During 1965, for example, ships flying the Greek flag entered North Vietnam 28 times and according to the State Department the total amount of Greek aid to South Vietnam to date has been some medical supplies. During 1965 there were 29 Norwegian-flag ship arrivals in the north but so far South Vietnam has received no aid at all from the Norwegian Government. During 1965, 37 trips by Japanese-flag vessels helped supply Ho Chi Minh but so far the Japanese have supplied South Vietnam with only some ambulances, medical supplies, transistor radios, and construction help on a power dam and bridge over the Mekong River. Furthermore, while Japanese-flag ships no longer enter Haiphong, Japanese trade still continues with North Vietnam. Finally and most incredibly there is the United Kingdom. During 1965 British-flag vessels called 136 times in the north but British aid in the south has amounted to only a token amount of educational equipment, some roadbuilding machinery and a few diesel fishing boat engines.

Let me quote to you from the State Department release entitled "Free World Assistance to Vietnam as of May 24, 1966," which indicates the total amount of British aid during the last year and a half:

> United Kingdom: The United Kingdom has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. With eight Vietnamese already in training in the United Kingdom, Britain has agreed to provide for 12 more this year.

It hardly needs saying how pathetic the aid our so-called friends are giving South Vietnam is when compared to our own efforts, both in men and material. It is downright appalling when compared to all we have done for these same nations in the past and are in some cases still being asked to do.

Mr. Chairman, there is another story involving free world shipping and the supply routes of the enemies of South Vietnam which this bill does not attempt to influence and which I feel I must speak about as well. This involves the matter of Cambodia's alleged neutrality and the reports that free world ships entering Cambodia by means of the Mekong River through South Vietnam carry goods which ultimately benefit the Vietcong.

I have on a number of occasions in recent months sought to bring to the attention of the House information which clearly reveals that Cambodia is a back-door source of supply of apparently growing importance to Vietcong and North Vietnamese units. I could not even attempt to summarize this information at this time. The most recent report appeared on the front page of the New York Times only this past Monday, July 11, under the headline "Four U.S. Battalions Lose Red Regiment at Cambodia Line." In the same paper on a different page was another story filed in Laos disclosing that Laotian fighter pilots have been in action against the Sihanouk Trail and that they were fired on from Cambodian soil.

As I have said before in this Chamber, when in South Vietnam on a Special Armed Services Committee assignment this past April I was shocked to learn that despite the existence of reports for many months of the flow of contraband from free world vessels using the Mekong River to Cambodia that we have no effective control over this traffic. During the first 6 months of 1966, ships flying the flags of six free world countries called 169 times at the Cambodian capital port city of Phnom Penh on the Mekong River.

Free world ship arrivals in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 1st half, 1966

Flag	January	February	March	April	May	June	Total
Panama	19	17	13	5	6	6	66
France	10	8	10	11	10	5	54
Japan	5	6	6	4	2	5	28
United Kingdom	4	3	3	2	1	2	15
Netherlands	1	2	----------	----------	2	----------	5
Italy	----------	1	----------	----------	----------	----------	1
Total	39	37	32	22	21	18	169

Because of the danger to its security the South Vietnamese Government closed the Mekong River to all Communist vessels bound for Cambodia in late 1964. Despite the growing evidence of the use of Cambodian soil by the enemies of South Vietnam no other effective steps have been taken with regard to the river traffic.

I have, therefore, called upon the President to urge the Government of South Vietnam to close the river to all Cambodian traffic—first of all to stop the flow of contraband and, second, to prod the Cambodian Government into making greater efforts to live up to their alleged policy of strict neutrality. So far this recommendation has been met with only the routine evasive responses from the State Department, with which we are all so familiar.

The question presents itself, therefore, if our Government is not going to take effective action in this area, should not Congress take the initiative as it has taken the initiative with respect to trade with Cuba and North Vietnam. The cases are similar if not identical. Congress has sought to stop the free world aid to the North Vietnamese war economy in order to directly and indirectly cut off a source of supply to the Vietcong. We know that the Vietcong does derive aid and comfort from Cambodia either officially or unofficially, either with or without the complete knowledge and consent of the Cambodian Government, and that free world trade to Cambodia is a factor in it.

While there have been a number of recent news stories which endeavor to suggest that Cambodia's Chief of State, Prince Sihanouk, has now decided that the Vietcong will not win in South Vietnam and that he will become more friendly with the West again, I, for one, have yet to see any firm evidence that such is yet the case.

The reports that Prince Sihanouk has accepted our Government's offer to finance an expanded program of border surveillance by the International Control Commission do not in themselves indicate a change in basic policy. Many times Sihanouk has called for better surveillance of Cambodia's borders and ports but he must always have done so in the full knowledge that the Communist member of the International Control Commission, Poland, has always rejected such a move and could be expected to reject like moves in the future. Obviously the Cambodian situation must be watched very carefully in the coming months.

No one wants the war to be enlarged whether into Cambodia or elsewhere. Neither does anyone want the war kept going by the virtue of the enemy's ability to use Cambodian soil as a sanctuary and as a logistical base of support. The Cambodian interpretation and implementation of neutralism, whatever its intentions, clearly is being exploited by the enemies of South Vietnam. Unless a change in the situation in Cambodia is soon discerned, I believe that efforts to bring economic pressure should be undertaken until Cambodia takes more effective action to eliminate the use of its territory by the enemies of its eastern neighbor. For my part I do not believe any aid should be provided any country which trades or permits ships under its registry to carry goods to or from Cambodia. While I recognize that there may be difficulties in bringing appropriate legislative action to bear on this elusive problem I would strongly recommend that the distinguished chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee give this whole problem a very hard look for if the administration does not take effective action soon with regard to Cambodia then, just as has been the case with free world trade with North Vietnam, the job will be left for Congress to do.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to return to the concern I expressed at the beginning of my remarks with respect to the 2-year authorization provided for in this bill. In recent years I have voted against foreign aid legislation to protest against this overextended and often poorly handled program, recognizing at the same time that it contained a number of worthwhile undertakings as well. The growing criticism of the foreign aid program from many sides in recent years has had the salutary effect of reducing the level of spending in this field. I continue to feel, however, that that level can be reduced further. That it has been reduced at all is in part due, I believe, to the opportunity that the Congress has each year, both under the authorization bill as well as the appropriation bill, to subject this whole program to the closest scrutiny.

I cannot think of a more appropriate time or place to express what I believe to be the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, than on this bill which undertakes to provide military assistance to 55 countries and economic assistance to 70 countries. They should be with us or they should not get a dime of our taxpayers' money. I would not dispute the level of support recommended for our friends in South Vietnam for even while I realize that our program there is in great need of more effective surveillance which could and should be provided forthwith, I want the record to show that I would support such aid if it were before us today as a separate item just as I supported the supplemental Vietnam aid authorization passed earlier in the session. However, I have grave reservations about the remainder of this bill. When we weigh the aid we have given to more than 100 nations over the years against the help we have received from these same countries in our efforts to defend freedom throughout the world I can only question the worth of much of our aid program. It is time we started to measure the quid pro quo and let the whole world know we are going to continue to measure the quid pro quo. In their hour of need the South Vietnamese people are scarcely getting sympathy from those who have been beneficiaries of our aid programs for decades. These countries should realize that if they accept our help we expect that they should be willing to render whatever assistance they can in return to defend freedom wherever it is threatened throughout the world. Until we have more tangible evidence of a return on our investment I cannot support this legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, in authorizing money for the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 we once again have the opportunity and the responsibility to review the role of the United States in world affairs.

Since my first term in Congress, I have been a firm supporter of foreign aid. I believe then, as I do now, that our foreign aid program can be an important ally to a dynamic American foreign policy devoted to the fulfillment of man's aspirations.

In my first speech on foreign aid in 1961, I said that for the first time in history it seems possible that the benefits of civilization may be distributed among all of the people everywhere. For the first time in history, it then seemed that the people of the emerging countries could see some reasonable hope and likelihood that the lot could be changed.

The foreign policy of the new administration that year for the first time recognized that for the people of the world the struggle for nationhood and the struggle for development are intertwined. It recognized that the United States could either seize the leadership in a changing world, or it would be left behind. Furthermore, it recognized the responsibility of the rich nations to give economic assistance to those nations which have less material abundance.

Mr. Chairman, our record during the past 5 years has seen a mixture of failures and successes. We have never done enough to help the hungry and the uneducated—nor is there ever enough which we can do. We have never fully sided with the people of the world and with democracy and against dictatorship and privilege. Our funds have sometimes been wasted, sometimes been stolen, sometimes been given to precisely those people who least needed help.

But the need for foreign aid remains, and I remain convinced that our Government should use its great resources to help the people of the world. In studying the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, I find that it makes many constructives advances and in some instances points to directions in which our foreign policy should certainly be directed.

In southeast Asia, for example, it emphasizes the need for multilateral and regional programs which, as I have often noted in this Chamber, offer the best chance for peace and progress in that region of the world. For the Alliance for Progress our authorization has been increased in recognition of the success of that program. A new section has been added to the technical cooperation and development grants title, which would help our universities "develop and carry out programs concerned with economic and social development of less developed countries." And for the program as a whole, by authorizing money on a multiyear basis, we have at last recognized that our commitment to foreign aid must be long range.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss each of these developments in a little more depth.

Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 adds a new dimension to the technical cooperation and development program of the Agency for International Development. Title II provides that up to $10 million may be given to "research and educational institutions in the United States for the purpose of strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries. In short, AID will now be able to encourage universities to prepare themselves, their faculties, and their students for a more direct role in economic development.

The contribution which trained Americans can make to the growth and well-being of the developing nations is virtually limitless. Occasionally we tend to think that all the United States has to offer the world is money, military weapons, and anticommunism. But the fact is that we can offer much more. For among our greatest resources are know-how and trained manpower.

The great scientific and technological advances which we have made in this country should not—and must not—be made for this country alone. The discoveries of science—like the poetry of Shakespeare—belong to the world. It is imperative that we discover how to translate our scientific know-how into terms which are directly relevant to the developing nations. And it is crucial that we find ways of providing the people to disseminate that information within the nations themselves.

In the July issue of Foreign Affairs, President James Perkins of Cornell makes clear how drastic this need really is. In an article entitled "Foreign Aid and the Brain Drain," he not only tells how vital trained manpower is for the world as a whole, but he points out that rather than being an exporter of trained men, we are a manpower importer.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, nearly 5,000 highly trained scientists and engineers come to this country every year. There are more South Koreans with Ph. D.'s in Cambridge, Mass., than there are in South Korea.

The new provisions of this bill—taken in conjunction with the International Education Act of 1966—will begin to help AID to explore ways in which our universities can begin to meet the responsibility and the challenge which is presented by the discrepancy between our own abundant skills and the need for skills in the rest of the world.

I think, however, that even more than an effort by our universities is needed. I believe that this country should create an exciting and dramatic new program to enlist scientific talent into the service of developing countries.

For that reason, I have proposed that the United States train a career corps of men and women to disseminate scientific and technological information throughout the developing world. I have proposed that it be called the International Development Corps.

The corps might draw, for example, on men and women who, after returning from the Peace Corps, want to continue to work in developing countries.

Upon returning to the United States, I have suggested that the Peace Corpsmen and others might participate in a graduate program to gain proficiency in a scientific subject which is relevant to the needs of a developing nation. There they would be joined by men and women from the nation for which the proposed project would be conducted.

The important role that this kind of a program could play is underlined by outgoing AID Administrator David Bell in another article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs:

> The process of foreign assistance—

He points out—

> is inherently dependent on research * * *. There can be no doubt of the importance of incorporating far stronger programs of research and evaluation into our aid administration.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that in giving the AID authority to spend $10 million to help universities "develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed areas," we have taken an important step. In voting for this measure, we can go a long way toward encouraging universities to develop the facilities and programs which an International Development Corps would require.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at Latin America. The pending bill contains an enlarged authorization for the Alliance for Progress. H.R. 15750 provides $850 million for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971, of which $150 million is authorized for outright grants. The dollar figure is significant and so are the dates, for in the present bill the Congress makes a clearly enlarged commitment to the Alliance for Progress. The total loan authorization has been raised to $700 million from the previous level of $600 million; the amount available for outright grants has been doubled from the previous level of $75 million; these increases will be for each of the coming 5 years.

Despite some initial stumbling blocks, this program is now succeeding. Over 50 percent of the people of Latin America are benefiting from U.S.-assisted Alliance programs. More than 1.5 million people are living in Alliance-sponsored housing. A million children are attending school for the first time because of new classrooms built with the help of the Alliance. Hundreds of thousands of people are receiving medical attention from new, Alliance-aided hospitals and health centers. More than 13 million people are benefiting from Alliance-financed water supply and sanitation projects.

One good indication of the support the Alliance has within our Nation has been the growth of the partners of the Alliance, a program through which organizations in 30 of these United States have entered into partnership arrangements with community groups in several Latin American countries. Chambers of commerce, Rotary and Lions Clubs, high schools, women's clubs, and other civic organizations and community groups have in the 2 years that the program has been operating supplied over $3.1 million of equipment and services to schools, hospitals, villages, and farmers' organizations in Latin America. What greater proof could there be of the support of the American people for assistance to our friends to the south?

The authorization for $150 million in technical cooperation grants in the present bill is especially significant. Of these funds, almost $50 million has already been programed to finance U.S. technicians serving on short-term projects in Latin America and over $10 million to pay the cost of training technicians from Latin America—most of whom are administrators—in the United States.

In all, the present commitment is well-deserved and necessary. It will assist our hemispheric neighbors in their struggle to solve their tremendous social, economic, and political problems. Good progress has been made so far; Congress must provide the funds to continue that progress.

Mr. Chairman, turning to the tense Near East, the pending bill provides for a number of significant actions. That area continues to be highly unstable, largely due to Arab aggression against Israel and Yemen. The volatile nature of the region's political situation requires us to give careful scrutiny to the measures provided for in H.R. 15750.

First, I would like to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting out a bill which includes a provision that further U.S. contributions shall not be made to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency unless the Agency takes all possible measures to assure that no part of the U.S. contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving training as a member of the Palestine Liberation Army. Over the last 17 years, the United States has contributed nearly 70 percent of UNRWA's budget, and it is entirely inappropriate for those funds, or any U.N. funds, to be used to aid an organization which has as a stated goal the destruction of a U.N. member state. This is especially so in the case of the Palestine Liberation Army, which is dedicated to the destruction of Israel, the bastion of democracy in the Near East. Since its establishment in 1964, the Palestine Liberation Army has trained approximately 8,000 recruits. It is time for the United States to do everything possible to stop this immoral assistance to the Palestine Liberation Army.

The bill provides for continued U.S. aid for the United Nations Emergency Force. For 10 years now this force has been stationed on the armistice line between Israel and the United Arab Republic, and serving the cause of peace in the Near East. The force sets an example for a larger U.N. peacekeeping force, which may someday be instrumental in meeting the crises of international politics. It deserves our complete support.

The U.N. Emergency Force, however, has not been able to stop all the threats to the peace in the Near East. The worst culprit—the United Arab Republic—has continually threatened Israel and has been waging war for some time against Yemen. Action must be taken to curb this aggressor.

The committee's report expresses the view that "economic assistance should be withheld from countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparation for their execution." This is certainly correct. But why not write langage into the bill itself and spell out the intent that it be directed at Egypt? Just over a month ago, the House adopted my amendment to H.R. 14909, the food-for-freedom bill, to help stop food sales to the United Arab Republic. Should not similar action be taken on this bill?

I urge the distinguished chairman of the committee to accept an amendment to the bill which will carry out the declaration of intent contained in the report.

On another question, Mr. Chairman, I also commend the committee for its action in making the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem the beneficiary of a grant of $3 million Israel pounds. The Hadassah Center houses a comprehensive program of teaching, healing, and research. It has trained doctors and nurses from all over the world, many from developing nations in Africa and Asia. The center clearly meets the highest goals of our foreign aid program.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the relationship of our foreign aid program to the conflict in southeast Asia.

As I have said repeatedly, I believe that the situation in Vietnam requires a political and not a military solution. If our involvement in that part of the world has any humane meaning, it is our belief that we have a responsibility to help the people of Vietnam create a better life for themselves. For that reason, while I have opposed escalation of armaments in Vietnam, I have supported efforts to escalate economic development in that country.

Certainly the money which we have given to Vietnam under supporting assistance has had some beneficial effects. Schools have been built; farm output has been increased; small factories have been constructed; malaria has virtually been eliminated; and rural communities have been encouraged to start development programs of their own.

However, we delude ourselves and the country if we pretend that the $550 million for supporting assistance included in this bill will help build a great society in Vietnam. For the fact is that virtually all of that money is needed to compensate for the crippling effects of the war. So long as the war continues at this intensity, it is a nonsequiter to speak of building a solid economy in Vietnam.

The precise expenditures for Vietnam in fiscal 1967 have been kept secret for security reasons. But it seems fair to note that by far the largest single expenditure will be for the commercial import program, which in fiscal 1966 cost about $370 million. This program does not offer any new assistance for the people of Vietnam—rather it is merely designed to keep them from sinking under the weight of inflation. The commercial import program has kept inflation down to 6 percent.

Other major expenditures include transport and logistics—$38 million in 1966—public safety and police improvement—$27 million in 1966—and programs to help the 2 million refugees displaced by the war—$12 million in 1966. Indeed, only a tiny fraction of the $550 million will be spent on the kinds of constructive programs which were so gloriously promised last February at Honolulu.

Mr. Chairman, title VIII of the bill would provide for southeast Asia multilateral and regional programs. The most exciting such program, to me, is the development of the Mekong Delta River Basin. For the moment, the Foreign Affairs Committee, as it says in the report, has simply authorized the President to utilize funds for various technical studies of the region, but I would very much hope that in the next year we would begin to prepare to join in the financing of a large-scale regional project of whatever size the war makes physically possible.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that no funds are specifically authorized for title VIII. Rather, "the President is authorized to utilize funds otherwise available to carry out the provisions of part I of this Act." I would have preferred to see money specifically authorized for regional programs. This cross-bookkeeping procedure merely once again underlines the fact that the emergency situation in southeast Asia has caused the abandonment of some highly important projects.

In summation, Mr. Chairman, while I have reservations about some aspects of our aid program, I continue to believe in the importance of America's efforts to help the nations and the people of the world to help themselves. We should do so partly because it is practical, but primarily because it is right. The new Foreign Assistance Act contains measures—for Latin America, for southeast Asia, and for aid to universities—which, I think, mark the creative and progressive direction in which our aid should be headed. In supporting the foreign aid bill today, I do so with the especial hope that measures like these will be pursued and expanded in the future.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, before focusing attention on one specific region where U.S. assistance has played a major role in foreign affairs, I would first like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Middle East subcommittee for their absolute fairness in handling the committee's consideration of this measure and in particular the fairness shown to those of us who disagree with their philosophy of this program. Both chairmen have leaned over backward to be fair and to recognize all of us and our feelings.

Obscured by the present war in Vietnam, a major threat to peace and stability is growing in the Middle East, nourished to a high degree by U.S. foreign aid. Since 1945, the United States has poured more than $23.5 billion in economic and military assistance into the Mideastern countries. Today, we are asked to appropriate $799 million, bringing our total assistance package to more than $24 billion in the past 21 years.

My chief purpose today is to urge important changes in our Middle East aid program which has failed to achieve its stated purposes. Specifically, three areas deserve special attention: first, the failure of our aid program to halt Soviet penetration in the Middle East; second, the escalation of the arms race in the Middle East due in great part to inconsistent U.S. policy; and third, the fraudulent abuse of U.S. funds in the refugee programs chiefly executed by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.

U.S. AID AND SOVIET PENETRATION

No one has failed to miss the growing friendship between many Middle Eastern countries and the Soviet Union. The recent visit of Soviet Premier Kosygin to the United Arab Republic and the Syrian reception of Vietcong and Red Chinese delegations both underscore the failure of U.S. aid to deter the advance of direct Soviet influence in the Middle East. The news headlines of the past year have carried repeated evidence of the Soviet's desire to organize an alliance of armed radical governments in the area. In the past year, also, evidence of Soviet military deliveries to Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and Yemen has been reported.

Our Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and Asia recently toured the Middle Eastern countries and was shocked by President Nassar's pro-Vietcong attitude and his repeated charges of "American aggression" in Vietnam.

Yet, the United Arab Republic has received more than $1 billion in assistance since 1945, and even last year received $55 million in food aid after telling the United States it could "drink the waters of the Red Sea." It is noteworthy that this assistance was approved by the State Department after Congress had adjourned.

This action was taken after Nasser had pledged to purchase $6 million worth of corn from the United States, paying for the food in dollars. Aid to Egypt was therefore reinstated despite the admission by Egyptian officials that several years ago corn was diverted from the people of the country and was sold, to obtain revenue for arms purchases. The action was also taken in face of a Government Accounting Office report that Egyptian officials had fraudulently represented their Government in the previous corn transactions. Yet, the United Arab Republic President has "demanded"—and I use his word "demanded" assistance totaling $150 million for the coming year.

But the effects of our failure to halt Soviet penetration do not simply mean a closer Egyptian-Russian friendship. Drawing strength from Soviet aid, President Nasser has established a beachhead in Yemen and has brazenly allied with a minority in Yemen against the favored majority of the small Arab nation which does not want Nasser's so-called Arab socialism, a fancy phrase which actually covers naked totalitarianism and hybrid variety of communism.

Despite the agreement between King Faisal and Nasser to withdraw Eygptian troops from Yemen; they remain. Ironically, the cost of maintaining Nasser's war machine in Yemen is approximately $150 million a year, the identical amount he has "demanded" from the U.S. foreign aid package.

It is not coincidence that the United Arab Republic attempts this blackmail at a time when we are focusing attention on South Vietnam. But the most astounding fact is that the United States through its Public Law 480 assistance is actually enabling Egypt to carry on its militant activities and hostile adventures throughout the Middle East.

But evidence for Soviet penetration in the United Arab Republic is not alone. The Moscow embrace has now extended to Syria which has become virulently anti-America and now boasts of a "war of national liberation" against Israel. Yet Syria has received $83 million since 1945, and received $1.1 million in economic help last year. Moscow, however, recently scored a coup in Syria, hopes the country will be the first Arab state to recognize East Germany, and has been able to have the Syrian Government legitimize the Communist Party. We are also aware of the recently purchased ultramodern jets by Syria from the Soviet Union. Jets were also sold to Iraq, a country which has received nearly $100 million since 1945, $6.5 million last year alone.

The Soviet influence has also taken indirect forms despite U.S. assistance efforts. In 1963, the United Arab Republic carried on a $149 million yearly trade with North Vietnam. In 1964, that trade had jumped to nearly $600 million per year.

But what does all this mean to the U.S. aid program which is before us today?

First, it means that a $23.5 billion effort has failed to block Soviet penetration and bolster U.S. influence in the Middle East which are the principles upon which the program is built.

Second, it means our aid enhances Nasser's strength and prestige at home and abroad, perpetuates his power and provides revenue for military purposes.

Third, it means we are aiding middle eastern countries who are pronouncedly anti-American, who attack our foreign policy in southeast Asia, and who actually carry on lucrative foreign trade with our enemies.

Last year during House debate on this measure, advocates of aid to nationalizing countries and countries trading with Communist bloc countries saw little wrong with continuing aid. I doubt that argument would sit well with our troops in Vietnam who see American fliers fight Soviet built Mig-21's in the Far East and yet see American taxpayers help Arab countries purchase Mig-21's in the Middle East.

Congress saw through this smokescreen last year. No one can miss the aims of the United Arab Republic, no one can miss the desire to move their troops into Aden once the British evacuate, no one can miss the growing Syrian-Russian alliance and general Soviet penetration. Why, I ask, Mr. Chairman, should the American taxpayer continue to subsidize this area in light of the recent evidence that our program has not met its objectives?

U.S. AID AND MIDDLE EAST ARMS ESCALATION

Another major objective of the U.S. AID program in the Middle East was spelled out by the Assistant Secretary before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He said, in part:

> It remains our policy to support the independence and integrity of all states in the area. We continue to work with them in helping bring about the conditions of stability in which an enduring Middle East peace can be achieved.

Unfortunately, the arms race aided by U.S. funds threatens regional stability and world security. The United States is contributing heavily to arms escalation.

The past few weeks' headlines carried the details of the President's decision to sell planes to Israel, a move which has grave military importance. For the first time, the United States has given Israel offensive weapons, not defensive ones. Once again, the American taxpayer is footing the bill for the costs of these shipments and once again the Middle Eastern tension is heightened.

The aid only increases the territorial desires of the neighboring states. What was originally designed as assistance to create a peaceful equilibrium in the Middle East has now become an arms race pitting the Soviet Union against the United States. Neither, certainly, desires a collision in the area, but the continuing aid may make such a confrontation unavoidable.

THE HIGH COST OF A FRAUDULENT REFUGEE PROGRAM

Since 1959, American taxpayers have contributed more than $288 million to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency which deals primarily with the problem of Palestinian refugees. This year $——— is being requested for the program. UNWRA has repeatedly failed to rectify the relief roles and this contribution, intended originally to aid war refugees is now aiding the third generation of the original recipients. Among the people now receiving rations are 10,000 members of the violently militant PLO—Palestinian Liberation Organization—which has the sole purpose of fomenting trouble in neighboring countries. Funds sent to the U.N. by the United States are actually supporting Arab refugees who are trained by Arab armies, and are providing rations for aggressive forces—not educating or feeding the majority of the citizens of the recipient countries.

The U.N. Organization has attempted to purge the relief rolls but the task is nearly impossible and little headway has been made. Meanwhile, we foot the bill as usual. Our contribution must be cut. There is absolutely no justification for using American taxpayer's money to support, feed, clothe, and shelter liberation armies in the Middle East.

THE 620(I) VIOLATIONS

Among the more important problems, Mr. Chairman, are the violations of clause 620(i) in the foreign assistance authorization which suspends assistance to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts against the United States or other countries receiving assistance under the AID program. Despite the detailed evidence of open hostilities in the Middle East against other recipient countries, U.S. aid continues. Insidiously searching for loopholes in the law, the State Department has funneled aid to nations which are obviously outlawed by the 620(i) provision. It is time Congress strengthened this clause and assumed more authority for determining when a nation cannot receive aid. What Congress and the American people clearly spot as open violations of this provision have been ignored by the administration.

We have seen the administration play politics with our money in the Middle East for too long. It has not stopped aggression, it has not kept the peace, it has not halted drives of liberation and hostilities between nations, it has not stopped Soviet penetration, it has not coped with the alarming problems of refugee fraud and arms escalation. In short, the program has failed to a very great extent and deserves complete reappraisal and reduction.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the debate over the 1966 Foreign Assistance Act comes at a time when the importance of such a program can be dramatically reinforced in the case of a new democratic nation in our own hemisphere. I speak of Guyana, formerly British Guiana.

On May 26, British Guiana became Guyana, the third British colony in the Western Hemisphere to achieve independence peaceably.

The birth of Guyana as a free and independent state can only be greeted sympathetically by the older nations of America. All the Latin American Republics as well as the United States have experienced colonial rule, and rebelled against it. Hence, we can understand the ardent desire of the Guyanese people to captain their own destiny.

At the same time, Great Britain deserves the commendation and appreciation of the entire American community for the responsible manner in which it has divested itself of its outposts of empire in the new world—Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago in 1962, and in May of this year, Guyana.

Guyana's future now rests, as it should, largely upon the decisions of its own citizens. Yet decades of experience have taught the American Republics that their individual fortunes are intricately entangled. The Organization of American States, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and the Alliance for Progress demonstrate this recognition that the peace and prosperity of each American republic affects the course of events in the others. Thus, the nations of the hemisphere necessarily share a friendly interest in developments in Guyana.

It is to be fervently hoped that the Guyanese people can overcome the racial antagonism which has split the country between warring East Indian and Negro factions. That lamentable situation, which erupted into violence in 1963 and necessitated the intervention of British troops, debilitates the country's efforts to achieve peaceful progress.

Forbes Burnham, the Prime Minister, has encouraged racial amity and political discussion free from racial overtones. Burnham, a Negro, has shown considerable fairness in sharing political appointments between Negroes and East Indians.

However, it is by no means certain that Burnham's principal political opponent, Cheddi Jagan, former Prime Minister and a Marxist, will cooperate in Burnham's attempt to end the deep-rooted fears each race feels for the other. Despite his avowed Marxism, Jagan's political support rests with the East Indians who in the main are independent farmers and shopkeepers—those least likely to be attracted by Communist doctrines. The Negro proletariat, on the other hand, which might be expected to be responsive to Jagan's political orientation, has supported Burnham who attacks Jagan for his espousal of Communist theories. Meanwhile, the East Indian portion of the population is growing faster than the Negro. If Jagan sees his chances for election in the future in maintaining the bloc support of the East Indians, he may continue to encourage the division of the Guyanese electorate on racial lines.

British troops, which have been instrumental in keeping order, will probably withdraw before the end of the year. Then the real test of the Guyanese ability at self-government will begin in earnest.

Even if racial fears and suspicions can be ameliorated, the job of economic development remains a difficult one. The name Guyana means "land of waters" in the local Indian language. The country, about the size of Idaho, is part of the watershed system of the Amazon and Orinoco Rivers. As such, Guyana is traversed by rivers carrying huge quantities of water to the ocean. Heavy rains result in extensive flooding all over the country. The maintenance of seawalls, canals, and sluices currently consumes half the national budget.

In an effort to help Guyanese development, Britain, Canada, the United Nations, and the United States provided about $24 million in aid in 1965. I understand that over the past 2 fiscal years the United States has contributed approximately $10 million each year to Guyana and its development. For fiscal year 1967, this sum will remain about the same. The Government of Guyana has now produced a 7-year development plan calling for the expenditure of $174 million, almost two-thirds of which will have to come from foreign sources. The plan is not as useful a guide as might be hoped, but the World Bank—IBRD—will provide assistance to improve it.

In the past year, Burnham's administration has done much to clean up the financial mess left in the wake of disastrous strikes and riots and Jagan's mismanagement. It is to be profoundly hoped that Jagan's mischief can be held in check so that the work of reconstruction and development can go forward.

In the meantime, the continued cooperation among Britain, Canada, the United States and the United Nations with Guyana provides the foundation from which the new nation can overcome its internal tensions and assume a progressive role in the hemisphere.

It is quite obvious that Cheddi Jagan is waiting in the wings, eagerly hoping that the present democratic government will be unable to solve the pressing economic and social problems which confront the impoverished little nation.

Mr. Chairman, in October of 1963, in the same Chamber, I pointed to the alarming situation in then British Guiana under the leadership of Marxist Jagan. I was sincerely heartened when the British Government decided to postpone the granting of full independence to the country until this year when a democratic government had been installed.

With passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, this Nation is provided with the opportunity to help a newly developing nation to correct the great social and economic ills which, left unsolved, could cause another Dominican crisis necessitating the dispatch of troops from Republics of the Western Hemisphere. The money this country is setting aside for use by the Government of Guyana is indeed a wise investment in freedom and democracy in Guyana and in continued peace in our part of the world. It can mean the difference between a peaceful, free Guyana and another Castro-type regime in the hemisphere. In the latter case, it would be the first beachhead of international communism on the mainland of Latin America. This, we cannot afford.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. **Wolff**].

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15750.

Mr. Chairman, in theory our foreign aid program is one of the finest expressions of traditional American concern with the well-being and progress of our less fortunate fellow men throughout the world.

In practice, it has often failed to live up to its glowing promise.

All of us in this body are aware of the recurring instances when ineptly conceived or administered foreign aid projects have made us a laughingstock and have given our Communist adversaries opportunity to poke fun at Uncle Sam.

I do not think the world's leading industrial nation, a nation that owes its wealth and power to the ingenuity and business acumen of its people, should fail as often as we have failed in our efforts to help bring other peoples to a standard of living closer to our own.

I believe that in many cases the effectiveness of the assistance we give other nations has been severely limited because of poorly conceived, poorly administered, even capricious projects that have helped no one, least of all our image abroad.

Further, I hesitate to consider an authorization for foreign aid or for any other expenditure of public funds unless I am satisfied that such assistance achieves the maximum return for the nation involved and for the vital interests of the United States.

I have long had grave doubts whether many of our foreign assistance projects have been based upon commonsense business principles. I have long felt that the many instances where projects have failed occurred because the abundant expertise of our private sector was not consulted.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I sponsored and the committee approved the inclusion in this foreign aid bill now under consideration provision for the establishment of a business advisory council, composed of American businessmen, to help pass judgment on assistance projects contemplated for a foreign nation under the AID program.

My proposal, which was incorporated in what is known as the Wolff-Morse amendment, is found at section 301(a)(3), International Private Investment Advisory Council, and I commend it to the close attention of my colleagues. For within it, I believe, lies the ultimate success or failure of one of the greatest of our national undertakings.

I am not without experience in the foreign aid field. I have seen AID missions in operation in dozens of countries and in many critical areas. Just last November I observed our AID programs in Vietnam, and it is my observation that the program needs assistance from people of the private sector who have achieved success in the practical survival school of experience from which every businessman must graduate if he is to survive.

This is a school I attended for 25 years before coming to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, our foreign aid program has been characterized by too many bureaucratic generals. What the program needs is the advice and counsel of a few hard-working sergeants. Their experience is invaluable, yes, indispensible, to our success abroad.

I am greatly pleased to note the enthusiastic expressions of support that my proposal for a business advisory council has evoked from my Republican colleagues as well as from those on my side of the aisle. I was happy to collaborate with my colleague **Bradford Morse**, of Massachusetts, in bringing this measure into its final form.

Yet the fact that this proposal has met with widespread approval should not obscure the possibility that it won't be effective unless it is closely monitored by the Congress to insure that it is being put into practice by the Adminstrator of the Agency for International Development.

Frankly, the working of the bill is not as strong as I would have liked. I would prefer that it be made mandatory that every foreign aid project be reviewed by a council of businessmen with actual experience in the field involved. However, I believe that frequent prodding of AID by the Congress can insure that the proposal becomes a reality under the legislation we are considering today.

Mr. Chairman, I believe American business and industry, which has brought this Nation to the position where it is able to help less favored areas throughout the world, will rise to this challenge and provide a cadre of business leaders to supply the judgment and experience necessary to make good, sound, loans and grants in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, my proposal would substitute expertise for innocence.

Let us apply the tough judgment of proven businessmen to our program of assistance to friendly nations.

Let us combine idealism with practicality.

Mr. Chairman, although H.R. 15750 does not satisfy every requirement we may have for a perfect program of foreign aid, on balance I do believe, if administered properly, it will help to provide the climate necessary to accomplish the desired objectives and I support the bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, when I vote, as I shall, in support of the recommendations of the Foreign Affairs Committee for a continuation of our foreign assistance programs, it will mark the 14th year I have given such support. But, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have requested an opportunity to discuss the legislation, because quite candidly, it is the first time I felt fully qualified to add substance to the dialog.

I also fully support the 2-year authorization contained in this bill because of my conviction that longer—not shorter range planning—will contribute greater efficiency. The responsibility of the Congress—and of all three committees in this body sharing that responsibility—should be one of continuous review of program management. The annual exercise in semantics that takes place on this floor does not resolve that solemn duty in any regard whatsoever. That is one reason why I stand before you in the well of this House today.

For the past 4 years I have been privileged to serve as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the House Committee on Government Operations. I followed in this chairmanship a distinguished predecessor and a valued and valuable colleague, my friend from Virginia, Congressman PORTER HARDY.

In undertaking the role of chairman, I proceeded with caution and care to assemble first a staff fully competent to meet the many and varied demands occasioned by the great diversity of assignments given the committee under the rules of the House. I am proud of the caliber of the staff. I take pride in the accomplishment of the committee to date.

Our first project—an examination of the staggering accumulation of so-called counterpart funds held by our Government around the world—resulted in a unanimous report which was in every sense constructive and worthwhile. Reviewing that report, no Member can charge either that it was partisan or that it failed to aid in improving administration of the accumulated funds.

Our second major undertaking in the field of foreign affairs related to the activities of NATO and the NATO infrastructure funding practices. That report is presently in preparation. Delay was necessary because of the intransigence of the French President necessitating most critical reevaluation of tentative conclusions by the subcommittee.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the more recent—more precisely—the current activities of the subcommittee; commencing in December. Initial inquiries were made regarding the U.S. foreign aid programs in Vietnam. Let me at this point emphasize, most emphatically, that I favor our aid program to the Government of Vietnam because the alternatives available are not attractive, nor do I find them in the interest in the continuing security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is really fighting three wars in Vietnam—a military war, a political war, and an economic war. It would be senseless to win one without a victory in the others. In fact, in my opinion, it would be impossible. I believe our economic aid effort is essential to help win the economic war in Vietnam and a viable economy is a must to political victory.

Because of this, I am supporting the foreign aid bill. I do so, despite the fact that I have misgivings over the adequacy of planning by those responsible for the programs now being funded by American dollars. I question the adequacy of controls and of end-use audits in the overwhelming number of instances of aid programs instituted in that unhappy country.

Mr. Chairman, when we made our inquiry in late December and in early January, we were shocked to find that the General Accounting Office had not physically been present in Vietnam for a period of more than 3 years and had no effective program of field audit underway in Vietnam—I am glad to say that situation was almost immediately corrected. A team was dispatched—progress has been made, but I am certain I bespeak the consensus of the committee that we will not be satisfied until the Comptroller General has ordered a continuous presence of the GAO in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, when we made our initial inquiry, we learned that the Inspector General's office of the Department of State, specifically created at the insistence of my predecessor chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, had not been present in Vietnam for more than 16 months. This situation was also immediately corrected and the AID mission in Vietnam has been favored with his presence or that of his staff on at least three occasions in the intervening months.

We were also surprised to learn of the inadequacy of management inspection personnel in Vietnam. This was called to the attention of AID officials in Vietnam and steps have been taken to improve the situation—but I emphasize that the steps are not adequate. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to infer that the program is in hands of incompetents or knaves—they are in fact able and dedicated in the main. Rather, I emphasize the nature of the joint responsibilities of the Congress through its committees and the Executive to act prudently to never accept the statement, "There is a war going on out there," as justification for failure to expend the public dollar in order to produce full benefits. The American taxpayer has the right to expect at least that.

I recognize the great difficulties involved in expanding a program from $110 million to almost $600 million in 4 years. No corporation, however large or competent, could do it with efficiency—most would be reluctant to undertake an expansion of that magnitude without first recruiting and training their management and operating personnel.

Unfortunately, and, unhappily, governments are faced with needs more pressing than needs which characterize our business enterprises—nevertheless, the impossible cannot be achieved, no matter how great the task of planning. However, there are serious defects in the premise upon which some of the planning is predicated.

The most serious, in my judgment, is that in operating the commodity import program. We allow the free economy of Vietnam to determine its scope. What free economy? Where in the Orient is the economy as free in the sense we Americans are accustomed to regarding? Or more appropriately, where does it meet our definition of a free economy?

The interrelationship of business in the Orient is perhaps more intricate—more difficult to unscramble—more bound in the nature of cartels and the urge to seek to exploit every speculative potential than business anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident I speak the consensus of the seven Members who accompanied me to Vietnam and who faithfully spent many hours in detailed hearings—that the program requires the use of experienced and highly competent commodity analysts if it is to respond to needs of the people of Vietnam—and if it is to aid in stabilizing their economy and creating, in part, the warmth of regard for the United States which we seek as we aid that country to freedom.

The commodity import program for Vietnam, which in the past fiscal year involved the expenditure of almost $400 million, represents almost two-thirds of the total U.S. economic aid program in Vietnam. Spending for the present fiscal year is projected at an even higher level. Yet these enormous quantities of U.S.-financed goods are being poured into Vietnam without proper determination of the real needs of the Vietnamese economy—and without adequate checks on the quantity and quality of the goods as they arrive in Vietnam—or on their ultimate end use. As recently as 1 year ago, only one officer was assigned to the Commodity Import Division of the AID mission in Saigon and at the time of the subcommittee's visit to Vietnam in early May the total staff of the Commodity Import Division—responsible for administering a program of $400 million—was 7 men out of a total of some 800 Americans employed by AID in Vietnam.

A high official of the mission informed the subcommittee in May that "the objective of U.S. policy in spending this money is—to control inflation." AID relies largely upon the applications of those importers whose names are on an approved list maintained by the Government of Vietnam to determine the quantities and types of goods that are to be imported. Checks on the reliability of the importers—either by the Government of Vietnam or by AID—are virtually nonexistent. The subcommittee was told, and I quote:

> This is the best system under the criteria which we have established in Vietnam as the basic purpose of the Commercial Import Program—that is, to meet the market demand for commodities to prevent inflation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the reliance of the U.S. Government on the unrestrained workings of a questionable free enterprise system—in order to determine the quantities of goods that are to be imported in Vietnam with U.S. financing—is naive to the point of being ludicrous under the circumstances that presently exist in that country. The much-publicized importation of excessive quantities of unicel 100—a chemical which is normally used as a blowing agent in the manufacture of rubber but which was subsequently discovered to have great explosive power—is just one example of the manner in which the commodity import program, with the present lack of adequate commodity analysis and end-use checks, can be used to subvert the goals of the Government of Vietnam and the United States.

The hoarding of imported goods for speculative purposes in a rising market, which has taken place due to a lack of proper surveillance over the program, is another example of this. Since 1955, we have pumped $17 billion worth of consumer goods and raw materials into Vietnam. This amounts to 80 percent of all the economic aid which we have sent to that country during the past decade.

As it now stands, we have no way of knowing whether we are sending 5 or 10 times the national requirement of Vietnam for any specific commodity. Although the program is designed to fight inflation, it may have even the opposite effect. The record shows the cost of living increased about 50 percent last year.

In effect, we are subsidizing a group of importers—not the Vietnamese people. Our commodity import program should be based on the real needs of the people, determined by proper study, rather than the orders submitted by local merchants, who often are more interested in making a fast dollar.

It appears also there was a general abdication of responsibility for the audit and review of the U.S. aid programs prior to the inquiry of the subcommittee.

The adequacy of the audit function of the AID mission in Vietnam had deteriorated in fiscal year 1966 to the point that it no longer served as an effective management tool to AID officials in Vietnam and Washington. I am pleased to report that in recent months since our inquiry began there has been a substantial increase in the audit and review activity in Vietnam by these agencies and other offices also having responsibility in this area. However, the audit function in the Vietnam AID mission still leaves much to be desired.

Despite an increase in the AID audit staff in fiscal year 1966, the accomplishments were astonishingly disappointing. The number of U.S. auditors went up from 9 to 17, but only 3 audit reports were issued. Sixteen other audits were completed in fiscal year 1966—some for as long as 10 months—but no reports were issued. That is an incredibly poor record and illustrates the pressing need for proper end-use checks of our assistance. If there are not enough AID auditors in Vietnam to do this job, then they should be sent there immediately. This is the largest single AID program that we have in the world, so it demands proper administration.

Subcommittee investigation disclosed that these reports were being unnecessarily delayed by meaningless updating, were not being reviewed in a timely manner by the director of the AID mission in Vietnam. In addition, the recommendations were not being acted on promptly and vigorously.

One example which demonstrates the case in point pertains to the AID audit of the $15 million loan accounts receivable of the National Agricultural Credit Office in Vietnam. This audit disclosed significant findings which were highly critical of the AID monitoring of the program. Only 33 percent of all of the outstanding amounts which were due in 1964 or prior years had been collected.

Although the audit was given top priority by the previous director of the AID mission and was completed in early November 1965, the draft report was not reviewed by the present director until February 1966. He did not issue a formal order implementing the recommendations until June.

AID management advised the subcommittee during its visit to Vietnam in May that the issuance of the final report had been delayed so that it could be updated to include more recent and more meaningful figures. But our review of the draft report and the final report showed no evidence of any such updating. There were only minor word changes and a slight alteration of the format.

Simply put, this report apparently was buried until we demanded something be done about it. As a result, the report was disinterred. Hopefully, the mission will now act to put at least one project in proper order.

Mr. Chairman, I have already stated that I will support the economic portion of the AID bill despite my serious misgivings over the administration of the commodity import program and other activities. I feel the alternatives at this time are much less attractive and not in the Nation's interest.

But I am putting the administrators on notice that if the commodity import program—in Vietnam—is not straightened out and improved in the next year, I will offer an amendment to the next foreign aid bill—or urge the Appropriations Committees—to prohibit any commodity import program that is not based upon detailed commodity analysis by qualified experts.

I promise this House that the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, in cooperation with the Committee on Foreign Affairs, will continue the closest surveillance over management practices. The Reorganization Act charges us with responsibility to follow programs to determine their economy and efficiency of operation. This is an important function of the Congress that is the particular responsibility of the Committee on Government Operations. I—so long as I remain chairman—will honor that duty with great care.

I want also, Mr. Chairman, to pay tribute to the minority Members who traveled with me and the staff to Vietnam, to Taiwan, and to Thailand. I am sure that if it is necessary to follow up our previous investigation with another inspection trip to Vietnam this fall or next spring, it will be undertaken with the same determination to improve this program, and thus in one way to contribute to the resolution of this war.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I will be most pleased to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and also as a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California, and as one who shared in the recent trip to Vietnam which the gentleman is describing, I should like to express my appreciation for the work that has been done by the Moss subcommittee, in the character and quality of the hearings that were held in Vietnam and also to express my gratitude for the attitude toward aid program administration that the chairman has taken, which has been a constructive one, and one which has not sought to make headlines, but primarily to achieve results and efficiency of operation. Some of these purposes, I am very happy to say, have already been achieved. I am confident that many more will be achieved and, as a result of the activities of the subcommittee, that the operation of this program will be greatly improved.

Mr. MOSS. I thank my friend for his very generous remarks.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support of the principles contained in H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. I do have reservations about certain aspects of the bill which I will mention in my observations today.

First, I want to emphasize my support of the concept of the foreign assistance program, now in its 18th year, represents the American response to the world challenge of the mid-20th century, the challenge to provide a better life for peace-loving people the world over. Our response has been thoughtful, generous, and effective—and this year's assistance act, carefully amended and adjusted by the Foreign Affairs Committee, is an improvement of an already outstanding program.

The bill authorizes $4.1 billion for each of fiscal years 1967 and 1968; $1 billion for development loan funds and $850 million for the Alliance for Progress for each of fiscal years 1969 through 1971.

These authorizations combine both economic and military assistance to further our dual aims of aiding the peaceful economic and social development of the poor nations, and bolstering the military posture of the non-Communist states.

We are helping the developing nations to take off into sustained economic growth, to provide a better life for their citizens. Military assistance strengthens this endeavor by giving these nations a sense of confidence, a climate of security from outside aggression, an ability to defend themselves, and freedom to devote their energies to constructive development of their own land and people.

This year's act makes several major revisions in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. One significant change is the authorization of funds for 2 years rather than for 1. I have some reservations regarding the advisability of this extended authorization. Our assistance program, commendable as its objectives may be, is admittedly very complex, and the international picture changes so unpredictably that I would have to give considerable evaluation and be fully convinced before I vote for the extension. Proponents for the 2-year authorization contend that each Congress is assured an opportunity to review the foreign aid program while the longer period of authorization allows for greater continuity in planning. It will permit the Congress, they point out, to explore more thoroughly, and to discuss at greater length specific operations of our aid program. Congress, however, will not relinquish its guiding and defining role in foreign assistance since annual appropriations of funds will still be necessary following a comprehensive review by the Committee on Appropriations.

There is much to be said, however, for the approval by the Foreign Affairs Committee of a 5-year authorization for the Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan Fund. Long-term authorizations demonstrate our sincere commitment and support of such worthwhile projects. Development loans are the heart of our foreign aid venture. They enable developing nations to help themselves, to utilize their dormant resources, to concentrate on basic reforms such as transportation, housing, sanitation, education, and hospitals. Under the Marshall plan, more than 90 percent of our aid was furnished in the form of outright grants. Today, however, over 65 percent takes the form of loans; and 92 percent of the commodities financed by AID in calendar year 1965 were procured in the United States. Our aid program therefore has been beneficial not only to the recipient but to the donor as well.

I also commend the committee for not placing a limit on the authorization of military assistance funds to finance our NATO commitment. Since we must shift our NATO facilities from France to a more hospitable region, and our national security requires prompt action, the President deserves free rein in this matter.

In another area of national security, mainly the war in Vietnam, I agree with the committee on the importance of social and economic progress in achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives of peace and stability in southeast Asia. I am in agreement with the expanded effort proposed by the committee for regional and multilateral cooperative approaches to the social and economic development of the region. I wholeheartedly approve section 103(c)(3) which grants $1 million in Israel pounds to the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem. In my statement to the Foreign Affairs Committee on this subject, I pointed out that this institution is administered by Americans, staffed by American physicians, and supported by charitable funds from the nonprofit Hadassah organization in the United States. The medical center houses a comprehensive program of teaching, healing, and research in medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacology. Many of its students come from outside of Israel, representing countries from Africa and south Asia. This worthwhile project truly deserves our support.

This year's act, as in previous years, authorizes U.S. contributions to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. However, it is fortunate that the committee qualified the authorization. The bill now states that no further U.S. contribution can be given to Palestine refugees unless the Agency takes all possible steps to prevent U.S. funds from aiding refugees who are training as members of the Palestine Liberation Army. I concur completely with the committee's denial of funds to this organization preparing to send Arab terrorists to join Communist forces in Vietnam.

I have pointed out sections of the bill which I have found to be particularly noteworthy and laudable. However, I believe that other parts of the bill need clarification, especially those concerning U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic. The present bill and the accompanying committee report allude to or mention in at least five different places qualifying conditions on aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic. Furthermore, these conditions are vague and therefore permit too much leeway for differing interpretations. The patchwork of restrictions is inadequate. We need a separate section of the bill to delineate precisely our policy toward the United Arab Republic.

Congress has tried for a number of years to limit U.S. aid to the United Arab Republic but has been largely unsuccessful. The State Department, although quite aware of congressional intent, has consistently construed, or should I say misconstrued, aid to the United Arab Republic as essential to the national interest. We passed the aggressor-nation clause in 1963, but the State Department somehow concluded that Nasser's military ventures into Israel, Yemen, and the Congo were not of an aggressive nature. Nasser has scorned the United States, spurned our aid and spat in our face. He instigated riots which burned the J.F.K. Library in Cairo; he misused our assistance; he fomented unrest in the Middle East. Furthermore, he supports the Palestine Liberation Army which is arming Arabs to fight against our men in Vietnam. In the light of these and other actions, I will later offer an amendment to the bill before us which will curb aid to the United Arab Republic. I urge my colleagues to support me in this endeavor.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I note in the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, now under discussion, a section entitled "Need for Replacement of Basic Equipment and Expediting Modernization." It appears on page 38. I have read this with particular interest and I commend the committee for its wisdom in calling attention to a very important matter. It does not appear to be generally known, but it is nonetheless true that an intense program of modernization on weapons and equipment has been carried out by Communist forces. In many areas their equipment is just as good as anything our forces possess. This decree of modernization is not always the case among the troops of our allies in the free world. Much of it is obsolescent or badly worn. Unfortunately, this situation is particularly true in the Pacific where our forces are engaged in a conflict extremely important to all of the free world. For it is there that the spread of communism must be stopped if it is to be stopped in our time.

The Communist forces in southeast Asia are increasingly well equipped with aircraft and weapons manufactured in Russia, in Czechoslovakia, or in Red China. In contrast, our stanchest friends in that area are using old equipment which certainly does not measure up to the newer Communist-built weapons.

There is every reason to seek to improve equipment all along the line in the hands of those friendly forces which on tomorrow may find themselves actively a part of the conflict. New and more modern aircraft, missiles, electronic equipment, even more modern rifles and tanks, should not be denied these countries. Obviously, there is a limit to what we can do. But we can do more, and I think the American people would have us do more toward improving the equipment of those countries already engaged, or most likely to be engaged, in the fighting on our side. By doing so now we may find in the future that we have saved lives, time, and money.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, as I rise once more in opposition to the continued wasteful misuse—constitutionally illegal misuse in my opinion—of taxpayers' dollars to finance the foreign aid program, I note that the confusion which has marked this program since its inception three decades ago is continuing unabated.

As debate on this foreign aid bill began yesterday, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman MORGAN, told us that we must accept the world as it is, and that it therefore is necessary that we must agree to a policy of aiding even unfriendly and inefficient countries if those who shape our foreign policy think this is in the national interest.

Using the thesis that foreign aid is a tool for carrying out foreign policy objectives, the able chairman of the committee tells us that it is necessary to spend some of these billions of tax dollars in some countries without regard to whether their governments are efficient or not. And he tells us also that we are confronted with comparable situations in deciding whether to aid governments hostile to our policies or governments which are on the payroll, if I may call it that, of the Soviet Union and Red China.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has provided us with an unusually candid statement of foreign aid policies—or at least what he believes to be foreign aid policies—and I am certain that he was perfectly sincere in his every word.

But hear this: Almost at the same time we were hearing the opening statement of the chairman of the committee, Mr. William S. Gaud, who is Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development and has been nominated to be the Administrator, was giving the committee of the other body, which was considering his nomination, a somewhat different view of what Mr. Gaud believes to be foreign aid policy.

Mr. Gaud told the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body, in answer to criticism of the farflung nature of the aid program, that he considered "performance" to be the primary factor in determining whether individual countries should continue to receive assistance.

If countries go off the water wagon, if they fail to make good use of their resources, if they are frivolous, or if they fail to make real efforts toward self-sufficiency, they should not receive aid, Mr. Gaud testified. He cited Brazil under the former Goulart regime as an example of a country denied aid because of such practices.

Now I ask you—does foreign aid policy as stated to us by the chairman of the committee seem to be the same as the foreign aid policy as stated by the man who will administer the program as we lay it down in this bill now before us? To me, they seem to be separate and distinct policies—and I submit that this is typical of the confusion and uncertainties which increase and multiply in this haphazard operation as the Congress continues, year after year, to reauthorize it. It is a program in which a vast host of right hands have no idea what an equally vast host of left hands are doing. This has led to misdirection and waste of both effort and money—it has, indeed, led to futility and even to chaos in some respects.

I must add—with all due respect to my earnest and diligent colleague from Pennsylvania—that of the two foreign aid policies which I have just outlined, my preference is for that espoused by Mr. Gaud. If it is essential to the national welfare, which I doubt, and if it is necessary to attaining and keeping a peaceful world, which I also doubt, that we continue this checkbook foreign policy, then I would prefer that at least some discretion be exercised in determining who will and who will not get the proceeds of the labors of our taxpayers.

But in saying that I prefer the foreign aid policy enunciated by Mr. Gaud rather than that given to us by the chairman of the committee, I do not want to be misunderstood by anyone as having indicated in any way that I favor continuation of the foreign aid program. I am categorically opposed to this bill, as I have been to its predecessors and as I will be to its successors. But as a realist, not given to wishful thinking, I know that we are going to continue foreign aid for years to come. In that light, I would hope, at least, that we would draft legislation which would effectively tighten up the loose pipes and joints in this foreign aid mechanism and put an end to the wasteful practice of throwing hundreds of millions of our dollars into the pocketbooks of nations which not only have no idea how to use the money, but which are outright hostile to us and on friendly terms with our mortal enemies, the world Communists.

Thus, I am particularly opposed to the provision in this bill which would provide a 2-year authorization for continuation of this program, for such an authorization would take away from the Congress its power to at least review, and try to stem, the reckless practices of which we all know—even the supporters of the program—exist in the foreign aid operation. I would remind you that next year, there will be a new Congress, a new House, and there will be many new faces on Capitol Hill. What we are asked to do here today is not to abdicate the responsibility of the 89th Congress in supervision of the foreign aid program, but to abdicate the responsibility of the 90th Congress to supervise it until it is in its last year.

I favor defeat of the bill. But if that cannot be achieved, I urge you to reduce to a single year the extension of the foreign program which it would authorize.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of H.R. 15750, and I would like to join with others of my colleagues in complimenting the Committee on Foreign Affairs and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for the bill they have brought before us.

In many respects, it seems to me that the bill as reported to us by the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House is a far superior measure to the two bills reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

For example, the bill before us provides for 2-year authorizations for most sections of the foreign aid program, with 5-year authorizations for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress. S. 3584, on the other hand, would provide only a 1-year authorization in all fields. This would make it necessary to continue the burdensome procedure of review of the aid program, every year, by both Houses of Congress, not only at the appropriations stage, but also at the authorization stage. Short-term authorizations of the program make it difficult for foreign nations to settle on decisions for long-term planning, which are needed if they are to make effective use of our foreign aid dollars. Long-term authorizations, on the other hand, represent a pledge of faith by the United States in the principle that, in our own self-interest, we should continue to help narrow the gap between the rich and poor nations of the world.

The amounts authorized by the Senate committee's bill fall consistently short of those in H.R. 15750, and indicate an unwillingness to join in full support for the program. For the Development Loan Fund, the House bill authorizes $1 billion; the Senate bill only $620 million. For technical cooperation and development grants, the House bill authorizes $231,310,000; the Senate bill $210 million. For the Alliance for Progress, the House bill authorizes $850 million; the Senate bill only $543 million. In all these cases, Mr. Chairman, the House bill is to be preferred. This is no time for us to be pennywise and pound-foolish in our foreign policy.

At several points in the Senate bills, attempts are made to set arbitrary limits on the number of nations which can receive particular kinds of aid—10 for the Development Loan Fund; 40 for technical cooperation and development grants; 10 for supporting assistance; 40 for military grants. Such arbitrary limits fail to take into consideration changing world conditions or changes in foreign nations' ability or willingness to participate in an effective development program. These limits would be likely to prevent us from demonstrating at least some interest, through token aid programs in small and impoverished states, especially in Africa. Far preferable is the flexible approach of H.R. 15750, which permits the number of recipient nations to depend on the number of nations where an aid program is needed and will serve our long-term interests.

Another novel provision in the bill as reported by the Senate committee is that the furnishing of aid to a country should not constitute a commitment for the use of U.S. forces. While I can understand the feelings which lay behind the adoption of that phrase, it seems to me it was an unnecessary addition, and I am glad that there is no such provision in H.R. 15750.

In several respects, the bill as reported out in the other body appears to reflect a trend toward a neoisolationist approach to the problems of the day, which may have been caused by unhappiness over the situation in Vietnam. This seems to me to be regrettable. The provisions of a bill of this kind should be considered on the merits and quite apart from the situation in Vietnam, except of course where aid to Vietnam is concerned.

The Senate committee was also concerned about the need to increase the use of multilateral agencies in the development process. Thus, it sought to impose requirements that 15 percent of Development Loan Fund operations must be through international organizations, and that Alliance for Progress loans must have the approval of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. The purposes of both these provisos are admirable, but they should be stated as objectives, rather than rigid requirements.

There are certain additions in the bill as reported by the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee which add greatly to it. I should like to commend particularly the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], for what I understand was his proposed amendment, which appears in the bill as title IX.

This new provision emphasizes the importance of encouraging the utilization of democratic institutions in determining the allocation of aid. The amendment does not contain any specific restrictions on the operations of the program, but it emphasizes our determination to support the growth of democratic institutions around the world. Such an emphasis is desirable, because it is not foreordained that aid to a country will result automatically in political progress toward the democratization of its institutions.

H.R. 15750 also includes a provision that would deny assistance from U.S. contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to Palestinian refugees engaged in the so-called Palestine Liberation Army. It is appropriate and necessary for us to emphasize that aid designed for refugees must not be diverted, especially for uses which would destroy peace in the Middle East.

On the other hand, I regret the provision in H.R. 15750 that no U.S. contribution to an international organization should be used for a project in Castro's Cuba. This amounts to an effort to earmark our U.N. contributions in certain respects and is in my opinion unwise. Even the Soviet Union has not attempted to tie such political strings on its contributions to the U.N. development programs. The whole purpose and spirit of the U.N. programs would be jeopardized if member states were to start trying to dictate where and how their contributions should be used.

Mr. Chairman, as we help struggling new nations achieve some measure of economic and social progress, it is well for us occasionally to think back to our own early days as a nation. Too often we are inclined to think that we made the grade alone.

The fact is that, beginning in 1776, we received crucial financial assistance from friendly European countries. By 1783, when the peace treaty was signed, our Nation had received loans from France, Holland, and Spain totaling $9 million plus gifts—or as we would say today, "grant aid"—from France in the amount of $2 million. These figures do not include the substantial value of military assistance received from France.

During the years following the peace treaty, our financial difficulties continued to mount, as our foreign obligations and arrears of interest increased. Additional loans of $16 million from Holland made it possible for us to meet some of our obligations of principal and interest, and France had generously remitted the interest on her loans up to the date of the peace treaty. Some of the aid we received from France was never repaid. Thus we cannot claim to have been an exemplary debtor.

By shortly after the turn of the century, our foreign obligations had grown beyond $75 million. Development loans from various European countries went primarily to State and local governments, providing help for essential transportation, agriculture, public utilities, and new industry. In addition to foreign loans, development was furthered through the introduction of new skills, ideas, and livestock from England, France, Spain, and others. Foreign assistance was eagerly sought by the early Americans, as an essential factor in liberating our energies and talents for self-help.

It has often been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the American people do not support the foreign aid program. In support of this, we have been shown polls where people answer "Yes" to the question "Do you favor a reduction in foreign aid?" just as they would to the question "Do you favor a reduction in taxes?" When I circulated a questionnaire to my constituents last year, I tried to see what the response would be to questions which differentiated between the types of aid given and the recipients, much as the aid agencies must differentiate in operating the aid program. I found that the people in my district, the 23d District of New York, showed a consistent general support for the program while showing a substantial understanding of the nuances involved in the various types of aid. I am sure this would be true in the Nation as a whole if the question were presented in terms other than all black or all white.

Thus, economic and technical assistance received the strongest support, especially when offered to Latin American countries, through the Alliance for Progress—87 percent in favor, 9 percent opposed, 4 percent undecided—and also when offered to important Asian democracies such as India—70 percent in favor, 21 percent opposed, 9 percent undecided—and the new nations of Africa—66 percent in favor, 21 percent opposed, 13 percent undecided. Military aid received substantial support when given to countries of military importance in defense against communism, such as Turkey—76 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed, 7 percent undecided—and countries threatened with aggression, such as Israel—75 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed, 8 percent undecided—but military aid to countries with no significant military strength was opposed in the district—42 percent in favor, 48 percent opposed, 10 percent undecided.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with others in complimenting the committee for including a specific provision for aid to the Hadassah Hospital near Jerusalem. I have visited this remarkable institution and it certainly deserves our support.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to pay tribute to the retiring director of the AID, Mr. David Bell. Our country, and the entire world, has been fortunate in having at the helm of this vital and difficult program one of the great public servants of our time. We wish him well in his new endeavors, where, fortunately, he will continue to devote his talents and energies to the achievement of a better life for our neighbors around the world.

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the foreign aid bill. I am not going to waste my time in debating whether or not we ought to make our commitments for 1 year or 2. I am simply against the program because we have seen its failures and waste repeated over and over again. We should have completely revamped and restructured this program a long time ago. But all we have done is to repeat the same mistakes and ignore all of the waste and the heavy cost to our American taxpayers.

Last year, when I first opposed foreign aid after 12 years of supporting it, I did so because I felt that foreign aid—which had worked in the late 1940's in Europe—could not do the same job in the underdeveloped, neutralist nations of Asia and Africa. My feelings in this respect have since been not only reaffirmed but aggravated as well.

Mr. Chairman, last year, I felt that our foreign aid programs in Asia and Africa were simply wasteful and ineffectual gestures of U.S. concern for the people of the nations involved. Now I am starting to feel that foreign aid, in all its many forms—and that includes much more money than we are voting on here today—is sort of a slush fund or Texas-size expense account to cover up the spiritual bankruptcy of this administration's foreign policy. This, in my opinion, is worse than waste.

Gone are the days when American policy had the dynamic thrust that probed for the future. Johnsonian foreign policy uses foreign aid as a slush fund to prop up petty dictators and other questionable regimes, the collapse of which would pinpoint the failure of administration policy. Such foreign aid will never get us anywhere but into trouble. It involves us in trouble by getting us committed to a regime we should not be committed to. Misused foreign aid sometimes eliminates our policy flexibility because we are bound to support a faltering regime in order to justify our foreign aid and pretend it was more than mere bribery.

Just take a look at Vietnam, Mr. Chairman. Since 1955 we have given Vietnam $2½ billion worth of aid. It does not seem to me that this money ever did the people of South Vietnam any good. Most of it was stolen by profiteers and corrupt officials. The peasants know this, and I think it has affected their attitude toward the United States. It does not make sense to feed millions to the profiteers while antagonizing the people.

We have thrown our foreign aid around in southeast Asia like a drunken fool. We have sloshed it into Vietnam so carelessly that most of it—far from helping the people—has gone into Swiss bank accounts of corrupt officials, or been shipped back to France by Indochina's French banks, or channeled to the Vietcong through the black market.

In Vietnam, thanks to American aid, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. I believe that our foreign aid program in Vietnam has, in some ways at least, undermined our war effort. I say this because our aid has fanned the fires of corruption and inflation, antagonizing the Vietnamese peasantry. Also, the way in which our aid funds have been diverted to profiteers and corrupt officials—and most importantly, to Vietcong pockets—has made us look stupid. It has made our Government look like a dumb, blundering Goliath. It has made people wonder if we are serious about our war effort in Vietnam.

Think about some figures for a few minutes. We have poured $2½ billion into South Vietnam in the last 10 years. That is more than $100 per South Vietnamese. Most South Vietnamese earn little more than $100 a year, so this is big money. But what has it done? Very little. Most of it has gone to France, private bank accounts, or to the Vietcong. I have written several times to Secretary of the Treasury Fowler concerning this problem, but the administration wants to try and pretend that the problem does not even exist.

In pouring money into Vietnam this way, the administration has served our cause badly. We have tainted our war. Our aid program has tied us to corrupt officialdom and profiteers, alienating the peasants, and playing into Vietcong hands. I am very sorry that the President of the United States had chosen as America's partner in Vietnamese redevelopment a man, Marshal Ky, who has declared that his hero in life is Adolf Hitler. We have become too involved with Ky. We have helped make Vietnamese government and finance into a "Terry and the Pirates" comic strip. By throwing vast quantities of money into that mess, fanning it into ever-mounting proportions, we have hurt our war effort by aggravating corruption and inflation in South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, listen to what Ne Win, Burma's Chief of State, had to say about huge U.S. spending programs in Asia:

> This kind of aid does not help. It cripples. The recipients never learn to do for themselves. They rely more and more on foreign experts and foreign money. In the end, they lose control of their country.

That is what the Burmese leader fears if Burma took U.S. aid. Burma does not take U.S. aid. Burma is poor, isolated, provincial, and secretive but, as the Washington Star said on June 27:

> There are a lot of things wrong with Burma, but there is no graft or corruption among the top officials. They are not becoming millionaires and they are not acquiring fancy mistresses or Swiss bank accounts.

In the long run, Burmese pride may be a better bastion against communism than South Vietnamese corruption. After all, is South Vietnam any richer than Burma if you strip away the dancehalls, black market stores, and the like?

Mr. Chairman, another problem of our present aid program is that we wastefully shovel money to different places without worrying where it is going. I think this administration is much more concerned with seeing that government X gets its yearly payoff than in seeing that the money is put to good long-term use. After all, if we insisted that the money be used well, we might alienate the two-bit air marshals and other pompous leaders our Government is playing games with.

My point is this. The reason our aid is wasted is that no precautions are taken to see that it is well used. All our Government cares about is "paying off" the foreign governments to buy short-term support. We are very reluctant to check further. Strict foreign aid criteria would antagonize our "friends" like Marshal Ky and the assorted anti-Semitic Arab potentates. We use aid to keep our foreign policy chickens from coming home to roost.

Eventually, these chickens must come home to roost. When a revolution topples a corrupt regime we were supporting, all our aid is wasted because it went to pay for mistresses and Swiss bank accounts instead of helping people.

Frankly, I do not like the idea of spending money abroad so long as there are poor people in America—and we will always have them, even after this poverty program stunt is dead and buried. Nevertheless, for the sake of politics at least, I think we are going to have to help the poorer nations of the world. But the Johnson administration aid program does not do this. Under the Johnson administration, foreign aid is used to bribe other countries to stick with our bankrupt policies. This type of aid does not help people. It just perpetuates inadequate policies, and wastes money.

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, one of the best examples of pouring money into a bottomless drain is our aid to India. The economic problem of India is so bad that very stern measures will have to be taken to get that country on its feet, but India just wants to bumble along. The United States does nothing to stop this. We just keep giving India money to postpone the day of reckoning. We do not insist that the money be used well. Insistence might antagonize the Indians. Frankly, if the money we spend gets no results, then I say, let us stop spending it.

I oppose aid to India because the money we spend is too inconsequential and wastefully administered to get any results against the backdrop of India's overwhelming economic problem. If India is friendly today—and they are only friendly by comparison with their prior attitude—this new attitude reflects their border dispute with Communist China. Communist China helped our relations with India a lot more than foreign aid ever did. When India turned against Communist China, we promptly gave India military aid. Secretary McNamara gave the Indians a munitions factory. What happened? India and Pakistan fought each other with U.S. military hardware and only Red China profited. On top of this, it turned out that we had an ammunition shortage, and could have used the factory ourselves, but that was typical McNamara military aid planning.

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to encourage India to go Communist. India and China could never get along. Who would give them food and aid? Perhaps we could get together with the Russians. I am not being wholly facetious here. If we got together with the Russians, we could cut foreign aid and cut our defense budget. Maybe the day is not too far off.

To return to India for a moment. We have poured almost $7 billion into India since World War II, with practically no results. India still refuses to pursue economic policies. Like many underdeveloped nations, she has embarked on much too ambitious industrial development programing, while refusing to pay sufficient attention to the agriculture necessary to feed her starving millions. India, while admitting her heavy-industry program has not worked, keeps trying to set up additional blundering socialized industries. India discourages private industry with a 65-percent corporate income tax. No wonder India is bogged down.

Meanwhile, Indian agriculture is so backward that America has to send $700 million worth of wheat just to keep India's head above water this year. The Indians want our money, but do not want our advice. I strongly believe our aid ought to go with sound technical planning or not at all. I do not want Americans telling Indians what to do, but I do want to see advanced, sensible planning required before U.S. aid is made available. Our State Department people—those foggy minds in Foggy Bottom—are afraid of setting terms because they are afraid to offend the people they are dealing with.

India is sinking into an economic quagmire, yet they have the money to fight a $125 million war with Pakistan, and they have the money to go bidding for modern submarines. As far as I am concerned, they should get no more foreign aid until they stop looking for submarines and start getting realistic about building up agriculture and private enterprise. Until that time, our aid program will be meaningless except as a wasteful, stopgap program designed to keep India from suffering the consequences of cutting her own economic throat.

I realize that it is hard for the United States to impose the necessary standards on our loan programs. Sometimes toughness would breed great resentment.

But I think that fairness to our hard-pressed taxpayers and long-range policy planning both demand a new degree of backbone in the State Department. I hope it will be forthcoming.

One step I think we ought to consider is channeling more U.S. aid programs through organizations like the World Bank and the several regional development banks. These organizations can insist on sound terms and sound planning without being vulnerable to charges of "dictation" and besides, aid money spent through the regional banks cannot be used for bribes or stringless grants to two-bit dictators. If we channel our aid through regional organizations, our Government will be forced to come up with a foreign policy that can stand on its own two feet. Right now our foreign policy balances precariously on an open checkbook and this is good for nobody—especially our American taxpayers.

Earlier this year, Mr. Chairman, I wrote to the President suggesting that he consider the idea of establishing a Middle East Development Bank. My suggestion was prompted by a belief that such a bank could do more for Middle Eastern development than our unilateral aid programs. Our own programs are extremely unimaginative. All we ever seem to do is send new weapons shipments to the different Arab nations. I cannot see the sense of this. The arms race is keeping the Middle East tense with the threat of war. Now I know the administration talks about the need to supply the different Arabs with new weapons so that they do not get these weapons from the Russians. Perhaps there is some sense to this, but I would rather see the money we put in the Middle East used constructively.

I think perhaps a Middle East Development Bank—similar to the Asian Development Bank—could underwrite some regional economic development projects which would aid both Israel and the Arab States. This would be a great shot in the arm for Arab-Israeli cooperation. This may be optimistic, but if Israel has made the desert bloom, why could not a Middle East Development Bank make even more of the desert bloom? And perhaps in the process help the Arabs and Israelis to bury the hatchet?

Such a program would, to my mind, be far more preferable to a policy of continually supplying assorted Arab States with the latest military hardware while neglecting regional economic development. Israel is getting too prosperous for direct aid, now that her per capita income is as high as that of Holland, but regional aid programs, designed to help both Arabs and Israelis, offer a chance to combine economic and political commonsense.

It is difficult for a nation like the United States to make regional development programs part of our own foreign aid program. But a regional development bank, which includes local nations as both contributors and members, can stimulate local cooperation. These banks are not thought of as foreign or imperialist. Nations getting bank international aid do not worry about political motives, and regional banks never approved aid which gives two-bit dictators money for Swiss bank accounts. These banks are the best ways to build up underdeveloped areas. If we had channeled our aid through a regional development bank in Vietnam, our aid might have gone for progress instead of graft, and we might not be trapped in a bad situation out of loyalty to the regimes we supported.

Mr. Chairman, I am again going to vote against foreign aid. It is wasteful. It is unsuited to the needs of the underdeveloped nations. We use it as a diplomatic slush fund, and let recipient countries waste or misappropriate it. Quite often, our aid programs alienate local peasants who see us propping up an unwanted, dictatorial regime. When our Government uses foreign aid as a checkbook to get our incompetent diplomacy off the hook, foreign aid works like a narcotic. So long as our policy can fall back on international bribery, it will continue to be unrealistic and complacent. If our policy has to stand on its own two feet, perhaps then we will see some long-range planning and commonsense.

But as long as foreign aid is used to buy support for shaky U.S. policy, then that aid will be used wastefully and never be conditioned on careful planning and administration necessary to make it work for the people. And so long as foreign aid is used to buy support our policies cannot win on their merits, our policies will not shape up.

It is a vicious cycle. Maybe the administration likes it. I do not. I am going to cast my vote against waste, fraud, corruption, maladministration, and incompetence. It is not worth supporting. Perhaps foreign aid can be redesigned to be effective. Until that time, it is not a program I want to support.

Let me raise one final thought. I urge the members of this Committee to take a good, long look at Vietnam. Where are our friends who have received $115 billion in foreign aid since World War II? Where are they?

Ask yourselves these questions:

First. Why are we fighting alone in Vietnam?

Second. Why are American lives and tax dollars the principle ones being sacrificed in this war?

Third. Where are all of our foreign aid recipient allies?

I believe that we can all answer these questions. And I think that the answers condemn our foreign and foreign aid policies in no uncertain terms.

We are fighting alone in Vietnam—or practically alone—because our so-called friends do not trust us. Because these "friends" do not think that our President knows what he is doing. Because these "friends" do not have any confidence in our ability to end the 20-year crisis in Vietnam by mere force. All the foreign dollars we have pumped into Europe since World War II have not swayed European opinion one bit. Our foreign aid has not bought us any support in Europe for policies which Europe would not otherwise support. So we are fighting almost alone in Vietnam.

We do have some token support from Australia and New Zealand. And then there is Korea. Korea is one foreign aid recipient which is happy to be fighting in Vietnam. They should be. They are getting paid off in spades. Back in February, I asked the President to disclose the terms of our "deal" with the Koreans to hire Korean mercenaries to fight in Vietnam. The administration tried to pretend there was no deal. But there is a deal and the Koreans admit it. Some people might say "Korea is grateful" and that she is one aid recipient fighting to pay us back. They would be wrong. Korea is fighting for more foreign aid. Korea is getting fat on that good old Democratic war prosperity.

I ask "Where are all the recipients of our foreign aid?" Are they in Vietnam with us? No. Spiritually, they are on the picket lines around the world. Now I do not altogether blame them. The foreign policy of this administration does not inspire confidence. The "credibility gap" is as big as the Grand Canyon. I am glad we are bombing the oil in the North. I am glad it is supposed to be so effective. Then why did not we bomb 4,000 American lives ago? When the administration says our policy is strictly kosher, the world disbelieves. So much for the support we bought with foreign aid.

Look at the record. No gratitude. No support. No real achievement. Three strikes. I think the time has come for foreign aid to leave the ball game. I urge the defeat of this wasteful piece of legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, mine has been a rare and precious experience.

Mr. Chairman, for 2 days I have been in this Chamber, privileged to listen to every word of this great debate, and it has been a great debate. It has been a scholarly debate. Most of the addresses were prepared ones. They went into the subject in all its aspects in depth and in most incidents with penetrating clarity.

But, Mr. Chairman, the interest in foreign affairs must be far greater in our country and in this body than would be indicated by the number of Members on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, at the last count there were 28 people on the floor of the House of Representatives listening to this great debate. I believe since then we may have lost one or two to the inroads of human fatigue.

Mr. Chairman, does it mean that there is scant interest in our country and on the part of the Members of this body in foreign affairs, or does it mean that the American people and their Representatives here are so well satisfied with the foreign aid program, the way it has worked, the way it has contributed to our security, and to the building of our future, that it is not necessary to show any participation here?

Mr. Chairman, I have a few humble observations to make. Since I have had no opportunity to jot down these observations, I must speak from the cuff, as it were. These are observations of 10 years of warm association with as fine a group of men and women as I have ever known, the membership of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

First, Mr. Chairman, I feel that at long last I have reached the end of the road of futility. Year after year we have held our hearings on the mutual aid bill—weeks of hearings—and have worked under handicaps, one in particular, the handicap of time, another the handicap of having reference books that we could not take from the committee room because they were so secret, and we had little time to look at them. Then, Mr. Chairman, after weeks and weeks of this we would complete our task, all of us with the feeling that we had very little knowledge of the subject, in depth. It had been an exercise in total futility and we knew it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we may vision the beginning of the end of that road of futility.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, every other year we now can look forward to giving our time and attention to examining this program. And, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, will have the opportunity to know what we are doing in Europe better than she has ever known before because she will have each alternate year to looking the product in the eye and learning at firsthand the weaknesses and the strengths of every program and when information is imparted to that great brain of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly], conclusions come that are intelligent and far-reaching.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I will know more about Africa when each alternate year I have the time and the means of familiarizing myself with each and every program in Africa and of determination of what programs are good and what programs are bad or wasteful. Now Africa is the zone of my interest. It is my responsibility. I have said many times, and I believe it, that as Africa goes so will go this world of ours.

The wealth that is in Africa and which is undeveloped is tremendous almost beyond belief. It will build a rich economy, covering an entire continent thrice the size of the United States and it will furnish a tremendous buying market for our goods. Every cent advanced to Africa in this period of her building will come back to us a thousandfold.

So a year ago I was committed to the annual review of the foreign aid authorization by our committee. I was one of the conferees, deadlocked with the Senate week after week, because we were insisting that the House committee shall look into this program each and every year. I do not think anyone in the world could have been more convinced that the House had to take a new authorizing book every year.

The trouble was that I, of all people, had been afraid of changing the status quo. I had been willing to go on endlessly trudging down the highway of futility rather than strike out on a new path with a year for finding out what was right and what was wrong and the next year for revising the authorizations to measure up with our findings.

Yes, there have been mistakes in our foreign aid administration. Yes, there have been extravagances.

When our committee was told this year of the new plan of AID to give the bankers more money so that they could travel around the world to find places and opportunities for investment, at first blush I was not sold on it. But neither I nor any other member of the committee could reach a wise determination unless there was the time and opportunity of direct checkup on the spot by the committee. That opportunity will be assured by the change from 1 to 2 years in the authorization.

I think that when we go over the actual operation of this program every other year and go over the authorization itself every other year, we can perform our task with far greater intelligence.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few other observations very humbly to make. But before doing so, I want to say that our committee has one of the greatest chairmen that this Congress has ever produced. I think that is the evaluation of every member of our committee on the Democratic side and on the Republican side. Our chairman has done a tremendous job. And he has had the loyal cooperation of as fine a professional staff as ever has been assembled in any legislative seat in the world.

Let me tell you—she may not be the First Lady of America, for that is the position of the gracious wife of the President of the United States, but she is one of the first ladies in the hearts of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—the ranking minority member of our great committee, the brilliant and genuinely beloved gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton], a statesman of dedication in the finest American pattern.

The other first lady in the hearts of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly], whose contribution to our country in its relation with foreign lands and in the crystallization of a firm foreign policy is second to that of no other Member of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, with this humble observation, I now make bold to express the hope that next year our regional subcommittees will be fully staffed.

I would like to have on my Subcommittee on Africa and on every other regional subcommittee a staff comparable to the staffs of the subcommittees of the great committee headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson]. I think that if each regional subcommittee had a staff of two or three people, we could save millions of dollars for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman with whom it was my great joy to serve on the delegation to the United Nations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I simply want to say, from the gentleman's remarks, one would think that the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs do not also have a soft spot in their hearts for the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly]. I just want to say that we have great admiration and affection both for Mrs. Bolton and for Mrs. Kelly. Your remarks seemed to indicate that the Democratic members of the committee had a particular interest in Mrs. Kelly and I wanted to correct that impression.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman most sincerely. The gentleman is a matchless exponent of gallantry. I am sure we all join in his appreciation of the qualities of womanhood in our associates both of whom we dearly adore. I do appreciate his contribution.

I have a few other observations to make, and they are very humble. They concern our association together as fellow members of a committee. One of the great privileges we have in this body is that of knowing our colleagues. Recently, when I was successful in a primary contest, someone told me that a Member on the other side wanted me to know that he felt pretty good about it, but he did not wish his constituents to know how he felt, because it might hurt him in his own district. I think that is a sort of index of the feeling we have for one another in this great association and companionship we have in the Congress of the United States. On that note, which I hope meets with universal accord, and is noncontroversial, I turn back the remainder of my time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, whether the problem of international balance of payments can be discussed in this short time is a question, but certainly we can bring it into focus here, hopefully. To me it is rather shocking that the committee report does not even mention it. At least, I cannot find it. There is something said, I am happy to say, in the minority views. It seems to me that it is almost the situation of our fiddling while Rome burns. Our aid program in its full compass, including not just the bill before us but also the one that was previously passed, Public Law 480—the food and tobacco for freedom, or whatever it is now—and all the other funds that exist totaling close to $6 billion, is the major cause of the deficit in our balance of payments. Because we have failed to move forward to correct that deficit, the United States is weakened in the world today economically, and therefore politically, and is unable to implement its foreign policy.

The Clay report of a few years ago, to which no attention was paid by our committee, the Congress, or the President—in fact, if anything, it was calmly forgotten—suggested that we had to get back to a level below $2 billion if we were going to be realistic in this problem of international balance of payments. I even thought the $2 billion was too much. I say this as one who for years has argued that there is a place for the foreign aid program. I believe in foreign aid, but I think we must relate it to our abilities and, above all, we had better start relating it to good expenditure policy. And that is the second point I want to talk about.

The first quarter of this year revealed that our balance of payments is going to run a deficit of over $2 billion. All the stopgap measures that we have been using in the past few years, which many of us suggested to the administration were stopgap, would actually put us in worse position if in the meantime we did not use the time we were buying with those stopgap measures to move in and correct the basic causes. So here we are talking in terms of $5 or $6 billion, in this particular bill, another $3.6 billion to be added to the previous amounts with no consideration being given to the impact of those expenditures on our international balance of payments.

I do not even see the wornout argument of the AID administration that, after all, this really does not affect the balance of payments because there are tied-in loans, or the AID expenditures are tied in with purchase in the United States.

Several years ago when AID first began developing this false syllogism, I tried to bring it into focus first by pointing out that they were not really talking about the programs themselves, the expenditures in the detailed programs which are listed in the given report and are listed elsewhere, that those expenditures were tied in with purchases in the United States, because the bulk of the program expenditures was for wages. If materials were bought, when roads and schools and houses were built—which are the main structures being built—those materials are procured locally.

The actual figures are that only 15 percent of the money spent by AID on the specific programs has anything to do with purchases in the United States.

For years AID and the administration have been getting by with the false presentation and fooling the Congress and the people by talking in terms of a tie-in of 80 percent. What are they talking about when they say tie-in with 80 percent? They are simply saying that if $1 billion is spent in India, then 80 percent of the foreign exchange in the country up to $1 billion must be used to purchase goods in the United States. But this is redundant, because there has been expenditure and trade between India and the United States, irrespective of AID and irrespective of the governments. All AID has done is to move in and try to count twice in the international balance of payments the export aspect of our private sector in trade.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In the course of hearings on this general subject before the committee, Mr. Chairman, the point was made and not refuted, that while these so-called tied loans were used, as the gentleman indicated, largely for purchases in the United States, a side effect was that it simply freed money otherwise available to the governments getting the loans, with which they could go anyplace in the world and make purchases. So that in fact it has not increased the purchases by the receiving government in the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. The more we zero in on it, the more we realize this is a complete phony. To hide behind this kind of concept, so that we do not move in on the serious problem of the balance of international payments, is the most dangerous course we can take. We should realize that trade existed between India and the United States and South America and the United States, or wherever it was, on a normal basis. Then, with that as a base, talk about what happens when we tie in the foreign aid programs in the use of total foreign exchange of that country, with purchases in the United States. Then we might be able to talk about something realistically.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if I might add to the dialog a point that was raised in the commodity discussion, the total purchased in the United States was $1,192 million in the fiscal year 1965, as compared with $408 million purchased in the United States in fiscal year 1958. Similarly, the offshore expenditures of AID in 1960 were over $1 billion. In fiscal year 1965, that was reduced to $411 million.

As it affects the gold flow, I might say the net balance-of-payments outflow of AID dollars is $253 million, when you take into consideration the fact loan repayments are now coming in to the tune of some $158 million. So it is not really as black as it might appear.

Mr. CURTIS. I would say to the gentleman, it is a great deal more black. There ought to be public hearings on this issue. Frankly, I would have hoped that the Foreign Affairs Committee would have conducted public hearings on this one aspect.

The Joint Economic Committee is failing in its responsibility, I might say, in conducting hearings on this aspect. There are all sorts of loose figures chasing around. The net result is we are diminishing our favorable balance of trade, our exports over our imports.

Let me relate this to one thing the gentleman interjected. That was offshore procurement, which theoretically is not an AID program. That is essentially related to the military.

We are paying through the nose in the military by our approach to the buy-American provision, and eliminating offshore procurement in our efforts to do something about the balance of payments and the gold flow. In the process we are paying $100 million more for a lot of military goods and services we could have been getting much cheaper.

At the same time we apply a 60-percent buy America formula to Defense Department procurements, a 20-percent formula in other agencies, and an 8-percent formula to those materials which GSA might be procuring.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I was merely trying to point out that this $253 million outflow is restricted to the AID program. I am not going to get into the other matters the gentleman mentioned. I would, however, consider that it would be very worthwhile for us to hold hearings on this point.

Mr. CURTIS. I would say that if we cut down this request, as we should, in my judgment, to about $1 billion instead of $3.6 billion, we could solve this balance-of-payments problem and we might go a long way toward balancing our Federal budget, and thus really moving in on the problem of domestic inflation. The increased inflation is going to further damage our balance-of-payments position.

We have two assets in the balance of international payments. The first is our balance of trade. That balance was $6.7 billion in 1964. It declined to $4.8 billion in 1965, which demonstrates, I might add, what is really happening. In the first quarter of 1966 it further declined to $4.4 billion. I can tell the House that it is going to continue to decline as this inflation begins to take further hold in our society.

Now I should like to talk about another matter. I have pointed out for a number of years the Curtis corollary to Gresham's law. Gresham's law says that bad money drives out good. I have pointed out that Government money drives out private money.

This is particularly true in the area of foreign aid. At the same time this Government is cutting back and curbing private investment abroad it is doing nothing about restraining the public investment, the AID program before us, Public Law 480, and others.

To me one of the great things that happened in the Foreign Aid Act of 1963 was the creation of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. That Committee issued a report in July 1965, which I hold in my hand. When we go back in the House, I am going to ask unanimous consent to put the whole report in the RECORD, because I find no reference in the committee report accompanying H.R. 15750 to this valuable report of an official Government committee reporting to the President and I hope to the Congress. This report contains many detailed recommendations where we could move private enterprise into the field of foreign aid. This report constructively criticizes the AID program one step after the other for its failure to bring the private sector into this national endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, I also hold in my hand another document, "Proposed Economic Assistance Programs, Fiscal Year 1967, Agency for International Development Summary Presentation to the Congress." On page 11—and in fact in other places—the presentation pays great lip-service to private initiative. One of the headlines is "Encouraging Private Initiative."

But look through this long document to find out what is said or has been done about the specific recommendations of this Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise. Yes, one terse paragraph can be found. You can find it on page 61, if you read the whole 239-page document, as I had to do to find it. One little paragraph, and I am going to read it in toto now.

> The report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid provides many suggestions which will help to shape the direction and the scope of AID's private enterprise programs. A number of the committee's recommendations have already been adopted and the Agency is developing appropriate action programs in response to the other suggestions of this committee.

Now, that is the extent of the reference to the hard work of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. Nowhere does the AID tell you what recommendations have been adopted. Nowhere does AID spell out what recommendations the Agency is developing appropriate action on. So this AID 1967 report might just as well not have been made as far as the Congress is concerned. It gives no knowledge of what AID is really doing to get private enterprise into foreign aid. Under these circumstances all I can say to my colleagues in the House, having read the Committee on Foreign Affairs report and these other documents to which I have referred, there is only one thing to do; namely, vote this bill down and send it back to committee. I know it will not happen, but hopefully the committee then would report the bill back with the amounts cut to about $1 billion, or $1.5 billion. We will correct our balance-of-payments problem in the process, and we will stop the domestic inflation we are facing. We will strengthen the United States abroad and at home.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to respond for the purpose of correcting the RECORD. The report to which the gentleman referred was widely discussed in the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Why is it not mentioned in the report? Will the gentleman yield to me? Why do you not mention it in your own report?

Mr. GALLAGHER. In the interest of economy we did not put it in the report, but it is in the hearings, and I may say many amendments——

Mr. CURTIS. I do not yield any further now because I want to comment on that observation. In the interest of economy you say you do not report what is in this report of the Advisory Committee. What a concept this is of economy.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point the material which I have referred to in my remarks:

FOREIGN AID THROUGH PRIVATE INITIATIVE

(Report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., July 1965)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN FOREIGN AID

Chairman, Arthur K. Watson, Chairman, IBM World Trade Corporation.

Ernest C. Arbuckle, Dean, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.

Joseph A. Beirne, President, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

William T. Golden, Corporate Director and Trustee.

Henry T. Heald, President, The Ford Foundation.

Kenneth D. Naden, Executive Vice President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Edith Sampson, Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.

Sydney Stein, Jr., Partner, Stein, Roe, and Farnham.

Murray A. Wilson, former President, National Society of Professional Engineers.

Subcommittee on Investment Guaranties

Chairman, Kenneth A. Lawder, Treasurer, W. R. Grace and Company.

Peter B. Langmuir, Vice President, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company.

Alfred H. VonKlemperer, Vice President, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company.

L. Stanton Williams, Vice President, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company.

Consultant to the committee

Raymond L. Vernon, Director, Development Advisory Services and Professor of International Trade and Investment, Harvard Business School.

Committee staff

Harriett S. Crowley.
Kenneth M. Rabin.
Boris Scherbak.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Hon. DAVID E. BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State.

DEAR MR. BELL: In submitting, herewith, the Report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, there is one principle I would especially like to emphasize. Over the past months, as we worked to relate foreign aid and private initiative, we came to believe that no matter how carefully our aid dollars are invested and no matter how wise and energetic AID's personnel may be, there is still not enough money nor people to accomplish the vast task the U.S. has undertaken.

To put this into perspective, our government is today putting over two billion dollars each year into the economies of 72 countries. Yet this considerable sum, divided among their populations, comes to but $1.44 per person. Even in Latin America, where the effect is most intense, the amount is only $2.73 per person each year. Clearly there are limits to what we can hope to achieve.

It is this realization, more than the original mandate of our Committee, which finally leads us to urge that the Agency for International Development put increasing stress on its role as catalyst and energizer for private effort. It is only through private resources, our own and those of the developing countries themselves, where the additional resources are potentially adequate to meet the challenge. That is the basis of our recommendations.

The Committee is grateful for the help of many people. Over the course of its life, more than a hundred witnesses testified before us, and many individuals and organizations submitted statements to us. We heard from representatives of business and labor, the religious organizations, foundations, educational institutions, agriculture and others. We are especially grateful to Dr. Raymond Vernon, who helped to draft this report, and to Mr. Kenneth A. Lawder, who headed our Subcommittee on Investment Guaranties.

The very willingness of so many to help persuaded me that Americans from every background believe in the moral and practical values of our foreign aid program. It is one of our country's noblest efforts and I submit this report with the earnest hope that it will further this great effort.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR K. WATSON,
Chairman.

JULY 30, 1965.

BACKGROUND

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid was authorized by an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, Section 601(c), introduced by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and co-sponsored by Senators ERNEST GRUENING, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and WAYNE A. MORSE.

The legislation called for the establishment of a nine-member group to "carry out studies and make recommendations for achieving the most effective utilization of the private enterprise provisions of this Act . . ." Its members shall represent the public interest . . . and be selected "from the business, labor and professional world, from the universities and foundations, and from among persons with extensive experience in government." The Committee was ordered to submit its report by June 30, 1965, to the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and to make it available to the President, to Congress, and to the public.

The members were appointed on May 26, 1964, and convened on June 17, 1964. Beginning in September, the Committee held monthly meetings at which it received the views and recommendations of well over a hundred persons and organizations concerned with international development. Contributors to the Committee's work are listed in the Appendix of the Report.

During the life of the Committee, several members visited one or more developing nations of the world to review the present and potential uses of private resources for international development.

Members received no compensation for their services but were entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act, for travel and other expenses incurred in attending meetings.

SECTION 1: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND FOREIGN AID

This report explores methods for harnessing the vast non-governmental sector of the United States to the task of accelerating economic growth in the less developed countries.

In broadest terms, the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid believes that non-government resources not only can do more, they must. Otherwise, foreign aid would be doomed to become a costly palliative of indefinite duration. The Committee concludes that business, labor organizations, agricultural groups, professional societies, educational institutions, foundations and many other resources, if encouraged, are ready and willing to assume a broader role in international development.

Twenty years have gone by since the United States launched its first post-war program of foreign aid. In that time, some $40 billion of economic aid has been appropriated by the United States Congress; first, to help our friends in Western Europe recover from the destruction of World War II; then, to help the lagging countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America in their long climb out of the depths of poverty.

By and large, foreign aid has achieved a great deal. Yet as one looks back on those twenty years, the programs seem to have presented an uninterrupted series of crises. In the annual Congressional reviews, the program's many remarkable accomplishments often have seemed swamped by accounts of its shortcomings and failures. It is hardly surprising that there is now a widespread desire to question what the United States has achieved for its time and money.

In the perspective of history, however, both the time and the money will seem modest. Twenty years is hardly long enough for a single generation to grow out of a deprived and ignorant childhood. The $40 billion is less than one-half of one percent of the wealth produced by the United States during the period.

The efforts of advanced countries to help less developed nations toward economic growth and political maturity will go on. From time to time, there will be doubts and misgivings about the wisdom or the effectiveness of the effort. Nevertheless, most Americans understand very well that the effort should continue and our political and economic interests are best served by building up the productive capabilities and democratic institutions of the less developed countries. What Americans do demand, and what they are entitled to have, is the assurance that their resources and support are applied with intelligence, skill and dedication.

The resource gap

If the less developed countries are to grow at tolerable rates, they will need a great infusion of capital and human skills from the advanced world.

As matters now stand, there is a huge gap between what the less developed countries need for a tolerable rate of growth, and what they are likely to get. As far as their capital needs are concerned, the gap has been measured by various United States and international agencies. Each of these measures is based on somewhat different assumptions and none can be entirely precise. Yet all of them suggest that the size of the gap is staggering—between $5 billion and $20 billion annually.

Part of the reason for this great gap lies in the underdeveloped areas themselves. They are simply unable to absorb large quantities of capital efficiently. For the most part, this is because of a second gap—the gap in human resources. This need is more subtle and, in many ways, more profoundly disturbing than the gap in capital. The less developed countries are critically short of the skills, traditions, and organizations that are part and parcel of a modern industrial society. These lacks run from skills in factory layout to skills in the conduct of management-labor relations; from knowledge about plant breeding and animal raising to knowledge about flood control and weather forecasting; from skills in the mobilization of savings to skills in the distribution of foodstuffs.

The less developed countries lack also the men and institutions to ensure that the fruits of their growth will be fairly distributed. They lack union officials who are capable of bargaining responsibly with management, and tax collectors who are capable of enforcing objectively the tax laws of their countries. In short, most of the complex social and cultural infrastructure which we in the advanced countries take for granted has to be put in place brick by brick. Money alone will not do the job.

In surveying the size and nature of the problem, this Committee has come to three basic conclusions:

First, added capital cannot be expected to come from government sources in quantities sufficient to fill the gap. The non-government resources of the United States and other advanced countries must, therefore, play a much greater part.

Second, the skills and other human resources which the less developed countries need must also come largely from non-government sources. Governments simply do not have command over most of the human resources that are needed.

Third, the role of the non-government groups—of business enterprises, labor unions, professional societies, and all the rest—must be greatly expanded. Otherwise the economic development we do achieve will not provide the pluralism, the democratic balance, and the diffusion of benefits which are its final purpose.

The means of assistance

In the course of nearly two centuries of national existence, we Americans have managed to develop a social system which is unique in human history. We have built the world's most powerful economy and, in the course of this growth, have developed institutions on a giant scale. We have the largest enterprises in the world, the biggest labor organizations, the biggest governments, the largest farm complexes, the greatest universities, the largest private charitable and benevolent organizations. At the same time, we have maintained an open society in which economic and political power is widely diffused, in which initiative and innovation can spring up from many levels, and in which barriers between social and economic groups are as insignificant as man has so far been able to devise.

Most Americans see this great diffusion of power and this unparalleled measure of social and economic mobility as prime sources of this country's strength. Yet, from time to time we feel a sense of impotence and inadequacy as we confront the monolithic discipline of the Communist societies, with their apparent capacity to mobilize all their men, all their technology and all their capital to some single purpose. From time to time, too, we feel at a disadvantage in the face of seemingly coordinated and disciplined actions of other adavnced nations in Europe and Japan, which appear to have found a way for the public and the private sectors to move in close harness. As we see other nations face up swiftly to some crisis or some opportunity in international affairs, we sometimes wonder if the United States has yet found the formula for effective operation in the international area.

In theory, the American constitutional system puts the conduct of foreign affairs firmly in the President's hands, yet the economic resources which give him strength are not easily mobilized. In contrast to the monolithic reach of totalitarian states, our own Federal government accounts for about 10 percent of the purchases of goods and services while state and local governments account for another 10 percent. The control of the rest is distributed among millions of farms, hundreds of thousands of business enterprises, and great numbers of non-profit organizations.

United States interests abroad are almost as greatly dispersed. An estimated 3,000 United States businesses have facilities abroad. More than 500 educational, labor, charitable and religious organizations have programs or facilities overseas. Each of these in its own special way represents a part of our American system; but few of them are responsive to any common purpose or common strategy.

As it turns out, some of the resources that are needed by the less developed countries lie within the ambit of the Federal Government; but a critical part of those resources lie beyond government's reach. The Federal Government may be able to provide some of the capital funds; but it needs the participation of other sectors of the American economy in providing the skills to design a plant, organize a market, train a work force, raise a crop, or distribute a commodity. The Federal Government has no command authority over the skills of a university, a foundation, or a labor union. Accordingly, a well-balanced strategy of assistance to less developed nations must contemplate that there will be a role for all sectors of the United States economy. If the environment is right, some of these sectors will move into such activities as a normal part of their own operations. Many already have. Others, however, will have to be encouraged, persuaded or assisted to extend their activities to the less developed countries.

In sorting out the respective roles of the private and the public sectors in providing the resources for the aid program, this Committee believes that there are a few basic guidelines to be followed, guidelines which are derived from the experience and the convictions of the American people.

In the first place, private organizations are generally capable of greater speed, flexibility and incisiveness than government agencies. Freed from government procedures, permitted to find their own ways of performing the tasks which are necessary for economic growth, private organizations can outperform official agencies. These comparative strengths are no reflection upon the men and women who man our government posts; on the contrary, our experience as members of the Committee has left strong, favorable impressions of the energy, dedication and good sense of the AID leadership.

In part, the limitations of AID are due to the fact that it represents simply one part of a complex government machine which has many objectives apart from development. In individual cases, therefore, the development objectives may be pitted against conflicting government aims. In part, too, the limitations of AID simply derive from the fact that, under the U.S. system of public checks and balances, the program is subject to continuous scrutiny from many directions: from the press, from Congress, from other government agencies. The result is sometimes deeply frustrating. It usually takes many months for AID to comply with the statutory requirements for employing technicians or consultants, or for processing contracts, loans or guaranties. There are exceptional cases. An emergency can generate faster action through extraordinary channels. But the use of extraordinary channels carries extraordinary risks for the government agency involved.

The Committee has been guided by *a second general point*, which also favors the more extended use of non-government channels in the aid program. There is always a risk that government-to-government aid may by mishandled. When this happens, both governments are exposed to special political risks. Such aid at times can generate a backwash of bitterness and resentment. Aid through private channels carries fewer risks of this sort.

A third general guideline by which this Committee has been influenced relates to the limitations of American private organizations. Though private entities may be free to react more quickly and flexibly, they operate with certain constraints of their own. Like all American institutions, they should be expected to make sacrifices to common national objectives. But there are limitations on the extent to which most private organizations can take on extraordinary financial risks. The existence of such organizations depends upon their ability to remain strong. This overriding fact cannot be disregarded by their managers.

There is still *a fourth guideline* which the Committee has found useful in its deliberations. Much of the work to be pursued under the foreign aid program, as we noted earlier, is intended to train people, to speed changes in institutions and values. Tasks of this sort take time, a great deal of time. They require prolonged, continuous contact from the aid-giving end. Yet without fixity of purpose and involvement of vital self-interest, such continuity is usually in constant peril. In its application, this fourth guideline can mean different things for different programs. In many cases, it argues for a transfer into private hands of activities now performed by government agencies. Pushed and hauled by the vagaries of public and Congressional sentiment, by the limitations of the annual appropriation process, and by the changing tactical concepts of successive administrations, government aid agencies cannot be expected to demonstrate constancy of purpose as their outstanding attribute. Accordingly, competent and stable private institutions may be far more effective instruments of national policy in some situations than government institutions.

A fifth guideline which has influenced the Committee's conclusions is the principle that public resources wisely used can attract private resources in even greater quantities. There are many illustrations in our national life in which public resources have been used as catalysts and energizers of the much greater sources available to the private sector. By providing such indispensably basic facilities as transportation and education, by clearing away obstructing bottlenecks, by reducing the risk and uncertainty of the political and economic environment, by providing some element in an undertaking which the private sector is unable by its own efforts to provide, a public foreign aid program can "leverage" its total impact many times.

The means of receiving

We in the United States see our nation as a symbol of the vitality and creativeness of a pluralistic society. We have not yet stamped out the last traces of poverty and prejudice in our economy. But what has been achieved so far gives Americans every reason to champion the role of private initiative and stress the importance of freedom of opportunity.

True to its history, the United States has urged the less developed countries to strengthen and extend their own private sectors and to build up many of the other institutions of a pluralistic society, such as trade associations, labor unions, family farms, cooperatives and foundations, as a critical step in the achievement of economic and political maturity. At the same time, we have come to learn that there are fundamental cultural and historical differences and important differences in priorities which distinguish the advanced countries from those in the less developed world.

The extent of some of the differences that have to be bridged is indicated by the reaction of some countries to the concept of private enterprise. To the countries of Asia and Africa which are just emerging from centuries of colonial rule, the words "private enterprise" conjure up a series of images and associations which are as different from the familiar United States connotation as night is from day. The outstanding examples of "private enterprise" in the colonial economies were usually enterprises controlled from the mother country, often with privileged status. In the heat and tension of the struggle for freedom, therefore, "private enterprise" is seen by many Asians and Africans as part and parcel of a system of domination from without; and the United States espousal of "private enterprise," especially foreign-owned private enterprise, is seen by many as a Trojan horse intended to impose a new form of political and economical bondage upon them. Although colonialism has long ceased to be a problem in most of Latin America, many nations in that area of the world tend to echo the reactions of the Asians and the Africans.

In addition, all underdeveloped countries express concern over other aspects of foreign private investment. Rightly or wrongly, they worry about the balance of payments impact of servicing a growing foreign interest. And they want to know how they can remain masters of their own house if foreigners control their principal means of production.

In most parts of the less developed world, therefore, local sentiment is torn between two conflicting views. On the one hand, they recognize that private enterprise can make great contributions to the development process. On the other hand, there is a fear of its bigness and of dominance by such enterprise. Of course, one would expect those local groups which are politically hostile to the private enterprise system to be hostile to foreign-owned business. But the same antagonistic reaction is also found among those who have a stake in the private system. In many countries, local businessmen see foreign-owned business as a giant "unfair" competitor, not as a helpful ideological ally.

The United States, therefore, confronts a less developed world in which private enterprise is often on the defensive. Indeed, it faces a world in which some nations profess to be evolving toward one form or another of socialism. Nevertheless, paradoxically, the future of the private sector in the less developed world is far from discouraging.

The experience of India is illustrative. In the execution of each of the three Indian Five Year Plans since 1951, the private sector has responded more dynamically and the public sector less dynamically than the Plan had projected. As a result, each successive Plan has assigned a larger role to the private sector than its predecessor Plan. In the process, doctrinaire Indian declarations on the subject of state socialism have given way to more balanced and more pragmatic evaluations of the respective roles of the private and public sectors.

The trend in other countries, such as Mexico and Pakistan, has been in a similar direction. In these countries, and in many others, a modern, dynamic private sector has evolved with unexpected speed. While the old cliches about "exploitation" continue to have great currency in these countries, there is at the same time a widespread recognition that many of the new entrepreneurs simply do not fit the old patterns. As a result, government servants are more disposed to accept the desirability of linking the freedom and flexibility of the private sector with the power and purpose of the public sector. At the same time, noting some of the unhappy consequences of state ownership in Egypt, Guinea, Ghana and other countries, various governments in Africa, Latin America and Asia have felt even more strongly the need to modify their doctrinaire socialist views.

In some ways, the experience of the less developed countries in the field of agriculture has also suggested a bigger role in the future for the private sector. The problems of agriculture have been more perplexing, and more threatening to the aspirations of the less developed countries than the problems of industry. In many cases, these countries have been unable to raise their farm output to match the increase in their population. The reasons have been complex and they have differed from country to country. Sometimes, the problems have been rooted in predatory forms of land tenancy, money lending and monopoly marketing which have deprived farmers of any incentive to increase output. Sometimes there has been a need for greater public investment in roads, drainage, water or power. Sometimes, the need has been for new seed and technology.

The first response of governments in the less developed countries, notably in India and Pakistan, had been to assume that the government itself would solve the problem through a combination of investment, coercion, and regulation. Today, however, it is rapidly beginning to be clear that the problem can only be met if it also engages the energies of many non-governmental institutions—of private producers and sellers of seed and insecticide, producing and marketing cooperatives, banks, credit unions, and research institutes and testing stations. We begin to see new hope that these countries, by drawing on all their energy and resources, may yet solve the stubborn problem of agriculture.

Nevertheless, as matters stand today, the question of the future roles of the public and the private sectors in less developed countries is uncertain and undecided. Thus far, private enterprise is the dominant form in most less developed countries, including many which profess to some form of socialism. Indeed, in most of these countries, the revenues and expenditures of the public sector are far less important in relation to the nation's income than the levels that typically prevail in Western Europe and North America.

In due course, the less developed nations will generate their own patterns of public-private relationships. When they do, these patterns will bear the stamp of their own history and aspirations. In most less developed countries, the role of national planning will be a good deal stronger than the role to which we in the United States are accustomed. Most of these countries will be less disposed than the United States to acknowledge the innate desirability of private over public enterprise. Mixed private-public enterprise will no doubt be much more common than in our own experience. In many of these countries, the public regulation of private enterprise will continue long traditions, so contrary to our own, of being pervasive, detailed, and of leaving large areas of discretion in the hands of government officials.

We Americans are not without influence in affecting these attitutes. In fact, our influence is often far greater than we suppose. True to our own convictions, we should use our influence as we can. At every opportunity, we ought to broaden and strengthen the private sector. But we must be prepared to accept the fact that the most effective pressures are often achieved through quiet diplomacy rather than through stentorian ultimatums. Indeed, the most effective pressure of all, in the end, is to help increase the resources and capabilities of the private sector so that it may provide its own justification for an expanded role.

One final point. Even a society in which private enterprise is dominant, in which economic power is diffused, and in which checks and balances are basic to the system will need a public sector which has foresight, rationality and planning capacity. In a nation trying to grow under forced draft, that need will be particularly great. To be sure, an economy based on diffused initiative cannot be either highly disciplined or readily predictable. In such a society, it is the function of many institutions to take on new initiatives that may not be according to plan, and to resist the efforts of others which may run counter to their interests. Economies of this sort, when they are successful, grow partly out of the foresight and planning and partly out of the competition and conciliation of the institutions that make them up.

In our efforts to achieve societies of this sort abroad, therefore, we must be prepared to accept the appearance of certain seeming contradictions in our efforts. We must be prepared not only to encourage the growth of private enterprise but also to encourage other institutions with which such enterprise will sometimes cooperate, sometimes clash, for example: an effective structure of government organizations, a creative and responsible structure for the conduct of labor relations, an efficient system of cooperative organizations where such organizations are appropriate, and a series of institutions devoted to educational, philanthropic, and other non-profit activities. It is out of such a ferment that economic growth and the democratic process may be expected to appear.

SECTION 2: THE FLOW OF DIRECT INVESTMENT

Of the many roles that United States private enterprise is equipped to play in the less developed countries of the world, that of investing in and managing branches, subsidiaries or affiliate companies is the most obvious. U.S. business already has large investments of this sort outstanding in the less developed countries. By early 1964, its direct investment in these areas was $13.3 billion; of this total, $2.5 billion was in

manufacturing, $7.5 billion in petroleum and mining, and $3.3 billion in other branches of business activity.

Compared with the needs and possibilities of the developing nations, however, the rate of increase in such investment has been insignificant. Here and there, to be sure, some special circumstances has generated a spurt of investment by United States enterprises. But the total increase of all direct investment by United States enterprises in the less developed areas was only $522 million for 1964. This contrasts sharply with the $5–$20 billion annual gap cited earlier. Most of this increase in direct investment was in the more advanced parts of the less developed world, especially in Latin America; and roughly 20 percent was financed by ploughing back profits previously generated in the less developed countries rather than by a fresh flow of resources from the United States.

The problem of climate

Why is so little private investment moving into the less developed countries? Businessmen would answer the question in different terms, but their answers would add to misgivings about "climate."

"Climate" seems a vague word. But it suggests the nature of the concern well enough. United States businessmen are accustomed to evaluating and accepting normal business risks. Not many of them are accustomed to evaluating and accepting political instability, threats and rumors of expropriation, systems of pervasive discretionary regulation, prospects of rapid inflation and devaluation, and other novel features of overseas investment.

Accordingly, the characteristic reaction of businessmen who have sensed the unfamiliar risks posed by the less developed world has been to turn elsewhere for opportunities. This is not to imply that once the climate were improved, all the conditions to attract foreign direct investment would be satisfied. A favorable climate must be thought of as being a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for attracting foreign investment. The improvement of climate therefore, is only a first step in persuading businessmen to investigate the many opportunities in the less developed world.

Just as the word climate itself is vague in this context, so the means for its improvement in any country are also ill defined. If the threats of inflation and devaluation could be reduced, if the uncertainties of political life could be contained, if the latent and active hostility against foreign owned enterprise could be held in check, climate would be improved. But these are symptoms of the basic problems of underdevelopment itself.

There are no simple nostrums for the improvement of a country's climate. Confidence cannot be guaranteed, for instance, simply by extracting a declaration in favor of private foreign investment from an aid-receiving country, if any duress is involved in the process. On the contrary, in some cases, commitments of this sort when extracted as a condition of foreign aid, may imperil a friendly government and expose foreign investment to needless risk.

Though the measures needed to improve a nation's climate may not be crystal clear, it is clear that in any such effort nothing succeeds quite like success. If a less developed country succeeds by its policies in attracting some capital, this in itself is the largest single step that the country can take to attract more capital. The stimulating effect of capital at work bolsters confidence and expectation.

There are countries, however, which are on dead center in this regard. With confidence impaired, the question is how to build back the climate to a point at which businessmen will be prepared to consider opportunities in such countries again. In a succeeding part of this section, we shall have various proposals to that end, including tax and guaranty proposals. But some general measures may be helpful.

AID has been supporting a number of programs aimed at increasing the degree of local understanding of a privately-oriented economy. In some cases, AID is using its influence to point out that existing legal and regulatory structures are unnecessarily discouraging to business, both local and foreign. In other cases, schools of business administration receive support; in others, systematic contacts between private organizations are being financed; and in still others, selected individuals visit the United States to see for themselves how a complex privately-oriented system such as the United States actually works.

As the Committee observed in Section 1, the climate for operations by foreign and local private organizations has improved recently in a number of major countries of the less developed world, such as India and Brazil. There remain many opportunities to link AID's work on the improvement of climate with the thoughtful and imaginative work which various business groups and foundations are undertaking on their own initiative. Recent programs sponsored by private groups in Turkey, Mexico, India and other countries afford businessmen and government officials unprecedented opportunities to explore their common interests and reconcile their conflicts. More effective coordination of AID and non-governmental efforts of this sort could increase their total effectiveness. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID select a number of key aid-receiving countries for intensive study of factors which may improve the investment climate; that such studies enlist the help and advice of the appropriate business communities concerned; that an explicit program be developed for the improvement of the climate in those countries studied; and that, wherever the foreign aid program offers some effective opportunity for the improvement of such climate, the opportunity be used to the full.

Even as it makes this recommendation, the Committee is aware that AID's capacity to use the foreign aid program as leverage is limited in many ways. International agencies, such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund can, at times, be much less inhibited in trying to induce constructive change. To be sure, the fact that the United States is ready to provide added resources to a country which has made its peace with the international agencies may be an important reason for the influence of those agencies; but the fact remains that such agencies are at times in a better position to induce change. Accordingly, the Committee is pleased to note that international organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank are developing various proposals which could improve the treatment of foreign private investors.

One such initiative is the development by the World Bank of an International Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, recently submitted to nations for ratification. The Convention sets up conciliation and arbitration machinery which foreign investors and contracting states are free to use in the settlement of investment disputes. The Committee regards this approach as highly desirable. Accordingly:

We recommend that the United States Government accept in principle the concept of international arbitration; that it ratify the proposed International Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes; and that it seek to secure its ratification by others.

Another international initiative of great potential interest to the United States would be an international code for the fair treatment of private foreign investors. Other efforts of this kind have floundered in the past, under the pressure of the representatives of the less developed countries, which have felt obliged to try to match the "obligations" of the host countries with the "obligations" of the investors themselves in any such treaty.

While some of the counter-proposals may be objectionable, others are perfectly appropriate. If the "obligations" proposed by the less developed countries are reasonable, we believe that United States subsidiaries will find them tolerable and will appreciate the opportunity to demonstrate what modern constructive private enterprise can achieve. Indeed, American owned businesses in the less developed countries typically lead in such matters as wages, working conditions, in-service training programs, and tax probity. A declared willingness to continue such standards can only bolster the position of United States enterprise and strengthen the general cause of the private sector abroad. Accordingly:

We recommend that the United States Government lend its full support to the principle of an investment code under international sponsorship; and that as part of such a code the United States be prepared to accept a reasonable statement of the obligations of investors, to accompany a statement of the obligations of host countries.

The Committee recognizes that international agreements alone offer no final guarantee for the hesitant investor. The purpose of such agreements is only to contribute toward meeting the profound need for a psychologically improved climate. The advantages to a less developed country in adhering to such codes have to be obvious and substantial. The elite status of the less developed countries which are signatory to the code has to be widely recognized.

The initiating investment force

It is a long tortuous path from the faint gleam of some investment opportunity in a far-off country to the consummation of the investment.

The first step on the path is to engage the attention of the investor sufficiently so that he is prepared to investigate the possibility. This is not easily achieved. It costs money to explore any proposal for an investment in a foreign enterprise; perhaps more important, it costs the time of key corporate officials whose attention could otherwise be engaged in larger and more familiar issues close to the heart of the enterprise's immediate interest.

Of course, a few enterprises are fully geared to deal with problems of this sort and the number of such companies is increasing. These companies systematically scan world markets and world raw material sources for opportunities to invest. They systematically compare costs, appraise the quality and temper of the labor market and of labor organizations, estimate the future policies of governments, and try to come to some net judgments concerning investment prospects. But the number of such companies is still fairly small. More typically, the interest of United States companies in overseas investments is sporadic or nonexistent; and where it exists, it is confined to a few of the more familiar, more developed areas of the world, notably Canada and Western Europe.

If the prospective investor is unfamiliar with the circumstances within a given country, the chances are slight that he will go very far out of his way to develop the necessary knowledge. If he does investigate, it is likely to be only in response to the strongest sort of stimulus. If no direct interest of the prospective investor is involved, an exceedingly persuasive well-documented case, presented under favorable auspices, may generate the necessary follow-up. But casual, run-of-the-mill contacts are unlikely to yield any response.

All this is familiar ground. The lessons are well known to the authorities of those few countries and areas that have successfully promoted private direct investment in the past, such as Israel and Puerto Rico. In both these cases, government agencies have set up an elaborate machinery to generate feasibility studies in detail, to "sell" the opportunities suggested by these studies to individual business organizations in the United States, and to guide the hesitant investor over the innumerable hurdles involved in setting up a new understanding.

An appreciation of the importance of this kind of effort has been evident for some time in the AID activities. In recognition of the problem, for instance, AID and the Department of Commerce have undertaken a number of different programs.

First, the United States Government, in certain cases, will finance up to 50 percent of the cost of pre-investment surveys undertaken by United States investors; by April 1965, it had in fact authorized 126 such studies. Second, AID has financed a certain amount of technical assistance to industrial banks in the less developed countries, in order to expand their capabilities in making feasibility studies.

Third, AID has financed the publication and distribution of a Catalogue of Investment Information and Opportunities. Finally, the Department of Commerce, in cooperation with AID has created an Office of International Investment to bring investment opportunities to the attention of the business community.

Our impression of these programs so far is that they are neither adequately designed nor staffed to create new investor interest. The assistance in financing feasibility studies to the United States investor has been relevant only when an active interest in a project already existed. It has not been especially helpful to the long process of creating investment interest where none previously existed. As for feasibility studies not involving a United States investor, these have more often been financed for the public sector than for the private sector. This does not reflect any conscious bias on the part of AID. It may be the result of a tendency to stress the large, individual, identifiable project at the expense of the smaller one and a tendency to finance the exploration of projects already half-conceived at the expense of more general surveys.

The studies required to stimulate private investment interests often differ markedly in emphasis from those required for the large individual project. National surveys of market potential, market distribution channels, or investment opportunities may be a first necessary step. Analyses of legal and institutional impediments to the creation of industries may also be required. The feasibility of specific individual projects might be considered only at a second stage. And the "sale" of such projects abroad might be a third important stage, separable from the other two. This suggests introducing a considerable degree of flexibility into the financing of investment-promoting studies in order to cover an area much wider than that ordinarily understood in a "feasibility" study program. Accordingly:

We recommend that both the United States Government and private organizations assist the less developed countries in undertaking large scale programs of market studies and feasibility studies, to be used as part of a campaign in engaging the interest of prospective local and foreign private investors. In view of the need for persistence and continuity in the promotion of any given project, the generating of such studies should be the prime responsibility of local entities, such as a development bank or well-equipped ministry, motivated and equipped to maintain a follow-up campaign from the stimulation of an initial interest by investors to the final act of establishment. If necesary, the contracting of foreign technical assistance should be included. AID financing should be predicated on significant contributions by the local institutions but might include the costs of a substantial effort to "sell" proposals in face-to-face contracts with enterprises in the United States.

The guaranty programs

Once the interest of a prospective investor has been engaged, a long process still remains in which the investor ordinarily looks for ways and means to overcome his hesitation and minimize his risks. At this point the various guaranty programs of AID come into play. These programs, the Committee is convinced, have had a significant impact upon the rate of United States direct investment in the less developed areas.

For nearly two decades, AID and its predecessor agencies have had the authority to guaranty United States individuals or business entities and their wholly-owned foreign subsidiaries against certain kinds of risk. By 1964, insurable risks were limited by law to situations in the less developed areas, including those commonly called specific risks: (1) inconvertibility of earnings or of repayment of principal; (2) losses due to expropriation or confiscation, (3) losses due to war or revolution; and those known as extended risk; (4) losses on loans made for housing mortgages, (5) up to 75 percent of the loss on an investment arising out of any such other kind of risk as the President might determine. Different statutory and administrative conditions apply with respect to the various kinds of guaranties; different ceilings control the total guaranties in the various categories. But, by and large, the United States had accumulated a considerable body of experience in guarantying against risk to overseas investment. By the end of 1964, nearly 1000 specific risk guaranty contracts were outstanding on investments in the less developed countries covering risks in the first three categories listed above; and the aggregate of the guaranties on such investments totalled nearly $2 billion.

In addition, there were various signs that the interest of American business in the guaranty program was accelerating. The number of applications for guaranties in the first three categories received by AID in Fiscal Years 1963 and 1964 amounted to 590 and 712, respectively; these figures were higher than those in previous years. The amount of these guaranties issued in FY 1964 was $524.5 million, far higher than in any earlier year and is approximately $800 million for FY 1965.

These three types of guaranty are therefore mature, well-established programs with a history of usefulness and success. For that reason, the Committee is of the view that the time has come to relax some of the statutory and administrative constraints originally applied to such guaranties, in order that they can be applied more widely and less equivocally. Among such measures:

We support the proposals under consideration by the Congress which would: (1) raise the $2.5 billion statutory ceiling on the guaranties against inconvertibility, expropriation and military hazards to a new level of $5.0 billion; (2) relax the statutory requirements for enterprises eligible for guaranty, to permit the coverage of foreign corporations jointly owned by more than one U.S. company; (3) relax the 20-year statutory limitation on the life of guaranties; and (4) permit AID to use income from the guaranty program not only for the management and custody of assets but also for certain other operational costs associated with the guaranty program.

We urge in addition (5) that enterprises be permitted to insure comprehensively for all three categories of risk, rather than for each risk separately, thereby reducing the total amount of insurance coverage required; and (6) that consideration be given to a reduction in the rates applicable to such insurance so that the coverage of two specific risks costs ¾% rather than 1%, and the coverage of three specific risks costs 1% rather than 1½%.

In the case of the housing and extended risk guaranty provisions, experience under the law is a good deal more limited. By June 1, 1965, housing guaranties totalled only $121.3 million and only three contracts had been signed under the extended risk guaranty.

The early caution exercised by AID in administering extended risk guaranty authority is understandable, especially in cases where the business commitment involves a direct investment (that is, an investment coupled with management and control). Businessmen managing the enterprises in which they invest cannot expect to be protected from all the hazards of their operation. Nevertheless, the Committee believes that a really significant potential may be in the extended risk idea. Through it we see a way to make investment in less developed economies attractive, or in many cases even legally possible, for many United States institutional lenders. The Committee recognizes that such insurance may one day result in large claims against the U.S. Treasury. It accepts this as preferable to alternative ways in which development can be stimulated. Accordingly:

We recommend an expansion of the extended risk guaranty. In undertakings in which businessmen are willing to risk as much as 25% of the total investment on a junior basis, an amount not to exceed 75% of the investment should be eligible, upon approval by AID, for a 100% extended risk guaranty. To permit adequate opportunity for the development of such programs, we recommend that the statutory authority to issue housing and extended risk guaranties be prolonged to June 30, 1969. We recommend also that the $25 million guaranty limit in connection with loans and the $10 million limit in connection with other investments be removed.

It is well to note that some of the more common risks of business investment in the less developed countries are not covered by existing guaranty programs. The most obvious of these is the possibility of a devaluation of the currency. Concern over devaluation has probably been the largest single source of worry to prospective and committed foreign investors.

There are various ways of reducing the devaluation threat. If an investment is in the form of debt, the debt can be denominated in dollars or other hard currency. Hedges of one sort or another are also possible. But none of these devices covers all the major forms of investment; and some of them are exceedingly costly to maintain.

The concern over the effects of devaluation is particularly important because the reaction of local and foreign investors to that fear can sometimes imperial the stability of the economy of a less developed country. From time to time, a wave of capital flight may seize a country, accompanied by money stringency within the economy and foreign exchange instability without.

This is a well known problem—so well known, in fact, that on the whole its effects are exaggerated rather than otherwise. The oft-repeated guess that capital flight from Latin America in recent years has approximated $10 billion, for instance, is patently without any statistical foundation and probably grossly wide of the mark. Yet the problem is real. The obvious "solutions" to the problem, such as governmental control over capital movements, usually suffer from major drawbacks of a practical kind.

One possibility which has been proposed, however, seems to the Committee to offer sufficient promise to warrant further development. This is the generation of a guaranty fund by the less developed countries, which would permit them to offer external guaranties of indemnity against the impairment of value resulting from devaluation. Obviously, such a guaranty could not be broadly extended in any economy. But it might be possible to conceive of a guaranty applicable to the working funds of key enterprises. Such a guaranty might conceivably reduce inventory hoarding, mitigate the drain on working capital funds, and dampen capital flight when devaluation threatened.

Many operating aspects of such a guaranty would be novel and difficult. In the first place, if the guaranty is to mitigate capital flights, it would have to apply not only to foreign-owned investments but to locally-owned investments as well. In the second place, if the guarantying institution is to offer a credible guaranty, it would probably have to be operated as an international one and maintain some reserves outside the less developed countries.

Finally, the question of the size of loss generated by a devaluation would need to be carefully defined. For instance, the normal net working capital of the enterprise and debt denominated in non-local currency would almost certainly be included in such losses, the undepreciated portion of fixed assets almost certainly would not. To carry these possibilities further:

We recommend that the United States Government urge the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank to explore further the feasibility of setting up a guaranty system which would selectively indemnify both locally-owned and foreign-owned enterprises in the less developed countries against the effect of a devaluation.

The conditions of entry

After a businessman is persuaded that opportunity exists and risks are tolerable, he has still to establish many remaining conditions of entry.

Most less developed countries have various laws aimed at either encouraging or regulating new investment. As a result, one major phase of the process of direct investment is detailed and protracted negotiation with officials of the host country over the terms of entry. Although businessmen often wish that this step could be avoided or compressed, the stimulus for negotiation usually comes from both sides rather than from the government alone.

In such negotiations, the prospective investor often seeks concessions such as: a guaranty on the right to withdraw profits or capital; a waiver of tariffs or import prohibitions on machinery and raw materials; a waiver of taxes on income; a promise of protection from competing foreign imports; a guaranty that work permits will be issued to foreign managers and technicians associated with the enterprises; or an understanding that the government will provide local transportation, power, land or capital at preferential rates. Governments for their part are likely to demand: employment of local managerial and technical personnel; purchase of local materials; sale of some of the equity in the enterprise to local interests.

One could hope that the less developed countries might move toward a system of law and a pattern of administration in which conditions of this sort were codified and applied on a non-discriminatory basis. On the whole, we believe that movement in this direction, by removing some of the initial uncertainties confronting the private investor, would tend to stimulate such investment. The Committee is content to note the point, and to express the hope that AID will bear it fully in mind in any subsequent efforts to improve the investment climate.

Of the various provisions which are negotiated at the time of entry of new investment, few create as much difficulty as the insistence of many less developed countries that local partners should be taken into the enterprise. There are a number of reasons why governments in the less developed countries often insist on local partners. One reason has been suggested already: the fear that the foreign-owned enterprise may exercise an undue measure of control over the economic life of the country. Even if a government has no real concern in an individual case, the fear of being vulnerable to domestic criticism may lead it to insist upon some degree of local ownership. A second reason for concern on the part of local governments is the fear of a future balance of payments drain in the servicing of a large foreign investment in the country. As local governments see it, foreign investments grow largely on the basis of reinvestment of local earnings and of local bank borrowings. But as they grow, the potential drain through dividend remission continues to swell. To be sure, the full balance of payments effects of any given foreign investment are difficult to measure. It is not surprising that local governments try to mitigate those effects by insisting on some measure of local ownership.

On the other hand, there are perfectly good reasons why some enterprises should find it necessary to resist demands of this sort. The partners in any joint venture do not always have parallel interests. Conflicts can arise over pricing the machinery and industrial materials expected to come from the United States parent, over the assignment of markets by the parent to its different subsidiaries, or over dividend policy and reinvestment policy.

It is no great wonder that many direct investments are abandoned over the thorny issue of joint ownership. Nor does the Committee see any easy way out of the dilemma. A few firms have been known to generate industrial projects in some less developed areas, with either the unilateral intention or the express commitment to sell out their equity interests to local owners within a limited period of time. Occasionally, foreign firms have undertaken to manage enterprises on a fee basis without equity commitments. Some firms have been persuaded to take on local partners, provided the local partners were either firm employees, small public stockholders or a reliable local investment banking institution; some of the recommendations proposed below may help to the extent that they contribute to broadening capital markets and financial intermediaries in the less developed countries.

These approaches, however, are likely to be quite unattractive to many, perhaps most, foreign business enterprises. And for many of these—for good reasons—the wholly-owned subsidiary may be the only acceptable approach. A realistic identification of an issue is sometimes a necessary prelude to its solution. The Committee hopes that this review will contribute to that end. Therefore:

We recommend that the United States Government support both wholly-owned and jointly-owned enterprises in the less developed countries, and that it avoid any doctrinaire position on the issue.

We recommend further that where the prospective investor has legitimate concerns regarding the nature of the arrangement proposed by the host government, and wishes to enlist the support of the United States Government in expressing these concerns to a host government, the United States Governments should consider sympathetically the possibility of lending such support.

The taxation of income

It is axiomatic that any measure which increases the prospective yield on an investment increases the investor's inclination to make the investment. As a result, there have been numerous proposals to stimulate investment in the less developed areas by reducing the tax burden on the income from such ventures.

To appreciate the import of some of these proposals, a brief description of the existing system is needed.

As a rule, United States taxpayers are not subject to taxation on profits earned by a foreign subsidiary until those profits are brought home to the United States. To be sure, there are some important limitations on this general rule. For instance, profits earned in overseas branches of a United States corporation, as distinguished from an overseas subsidiary, are ordinarily taxable from the moment they are earned. Certain profits paid as dividends by subsidiaries to foreign-based holding companies also may be subject to United States taxation before the profits are brought home. But the general principle remains that overseas profits are not taxable until brought back to the United States.

When the income does become taxable under United States law, the taxpayer is given a credit for income taxes that may have been paid to a foreign government on the same income. The calculation of the tax credit is a complicated business, but its intended effect is to ensure that the total of foreign and United States income taxes levied against a dollar of income will not exceed the regular United States corporate tax rate; unless, of course, a higher rate has already been levied in the foreign country, in which case that higher rate fixes the ceiling.

At various points in this complex procedure, United States law and regulations make important distinctions in the treatment of foreign income, depending on whether the income originates in the less developed countries or in other foreign countries. In general, these distinctions favor the less developed countries. For instance, the formula for calculating the United States tax credit discriminates in certain cases in favor of investments in less developed areas; in those cases, the total tax paid by the investor is less than he would pay on the same amount of income if it arose elsewhere, such as in the United Kingdom or even in the United States proper. Furthermore, United States tax rules about the taxability of income received by foreign holding companies are more lenient if the income is used for reinvestment in less developed countries than for other purposes.

In approaching the problem of tax concessions as a means for stimulating investment in the less developed areas, one has to recognize that tax considerations are only a part of the problem. An investor who considers a new undertaking in a less developed country ordinarily has only the most approximate notions about the size of the market, the costs of production, the prospects of competition, or the difficulties of operation.

Accordingly, there is a strong tendency to decide these investments on the basis of two kinds of questions. First, what is the chance that the investment, once made, may be lost? Second, what is the risk that failure to invest may undermine the investor's long-run position in an important market?

In examining the many proposals for tax relief to investments in less developed countries, therefore, the Committee has considered of great importance those tax measures which deal with the contingency of income loss. The Committee regards this problem as important for other reasons as well. When United States enterprises operate subsidiary undertakings in the United States, they can offset losses in such subsidiaries against gains in their other operations. When the subsidiary venture is located abroad, however, United States enterprise as a general rule are prevented by our tax laws from offsetting foreign losses against domestic gains. Accordingly:

We recommend that the United States tax laws and regulations be amended so that the United States taxpayer's right to offset losses in subsidiaries against taxable income from other sources would be the same for subsidiaries in less developed countries as it is for subsidiaries in the United States.

There are a number of other aspects of United States tax law which appear to operate to the relative disadvantage of investment in the less developed areas. In 1962, United States tax law was amended to grant United States firms a 7 percent income tax credit on added plant and machinery investments; but under the law, plant and machinery to be used outside the United States ordinarily does not qualify. Since then, an agreement has been signed with Thailand, to be submitted to the Senate, which provides among other things for application of a 7 percent credit to United States taxpayers' purchases of plant and equipment for use in Thailand. A similar agreement has been reached, in principle, with Israel; and the subject will be considered in current negotiations with India.

In principle, the Committee thinks it is desirable to remove any provision that penalizes investment in the less developed countries. Accordingly:

We recommend that the United States Senate accept the provisions of the United States-Thailand tax treaty which would apply a 7 percent investment credit to United States-owned investment in Thailand.

We recommend also that the United States Government take steps to apply the same treatment to investment in other selected less developed countries, either by legislation or by treaty.

Among the boldest of the tax proposals to stimulate United States investment in the less developed areas is one which would allow the United States taxpayer to reduce his total tax bill in the United States by an amount equal to 30 percent of certain investments made in a less developed country. (The credit would apply also to reinvestment of profits, to the extent that the reinvestment exceeded half of the profits.) In effect, so long as the United States taxpayer had taxable income, whatever the source of that income might be, he could arrange to be repaid for 30 percent of the investment in a less developed country out of credits granted against his United States tax bill.

The Committee is well aware that discriminatory tax devices must be employed only sparingly as a means to achieve national ends. In this case, however, we see a compelling need to increase the flow of private investment to the less developed countries. This need, in the Committee's view (with one member dissenting), justifies special measures such as the 30 percent tax credit. Accordingly:

We recommend the enactment of a proposal for a tax credit equal to 30 percent of the investment by United States investors in productive facilities in less developed areas, to be applied against the total United States tax liability of such investors.

The Committee also believes that the tax-sparing proposals which have been made from time to time in the past are worth further study. These are proposals which would allow the United States taxpayer, in the calculation of his U.S. liability, to receive a credit for taxes normally payable to a foreign government, but from which he has actually been "spared" by tax exemption or holidays under the laws of the foreign government. Accordingly:

We recommend that the encouragement to investment offered by such tax-sparing measures in less developed countries should not be negated by United States tax laws.

The application of antitrust law

United States antitrust laws are another uncertainty besetting overseas investors. By their terms, some of these statutes apply not only to the activities of businessmen inside the United States but also to activities outside the country.

Statutes of this sort pose a dilemma. On the one hand, it is easy to envisage an agreement, entered into outside the United States, which stifles competition in the import or export of goods or services and which does injury to the United States economy. On the other hand, it is also easy to picture a case in which the managers of United States owned subsidiaries in foreign countries may find themselves obliged by United States law to adhere to standards of conduct different from those of their local competitors, thereby weakening their position in these countries.

This is a real problem. Nevertheless, the proposal sometimes made that "antitrust should stop at the water's edge" is hardly defensible in the light of United States interests involved in imports or exports. Besides, such a policy on the part of the United States could be construed by the rest of the world as a tacit confession that a free enterprise system is not an exportable commodity. On the other hand, the application of United States statutes to transactions abroad, without regard to the difference between domestic and foreign settings, would be equally indefensible.

From time to time, it has been suggested that United States antitrust agencies might make greater use of a procedure for the advance clearance of doubtful arrangements. The Committee believes it is unrealistic to hope that the businessman's uncertainty about the legality of his international arrangements under the antitrust laws can be reduced very much by an extension of the advance clearance procedure. In the case of international antitrust problems, what the authorities would be asked to judge in advance is a complex system of relationships which are likely to evolve and alter continuously over the years. In circumstances of that sort, the authorities can be expected to offer a "clearance" with so many qualifications that the procedure would be of little practical help to business.

Nevertheless, there may be other ways to take the edge off some of the genuine uncertainty now existing in the international antitrust field. One approach which the Committee believes has merit represents an extension of the practices which the United States Government has already begun to follow in cases with international ramifications—practices of consultation and collaboration with other foreign governments where the interests of nationals of those governments are involved in an antitrust suit.

Intergovernmental collaboration on antitrust cases can achieve one important objective for the businessman: while it cannot serve to clarify the murky corners of United States antitrust law, it may be able to reduce his problem of being responsive to the disparate standards of a number of different jurisdictions all at the same time. Such a possibility would exist if, for example, the United States were prepared in practice to agree with other selected countries on the limits of application of their respective jurisdiction in antitrust matters.

Fifteen years ago, such an approach might have come very close to the proposal that United States antitrust philosophy should stop at the water's edge; for, at that time, one would have had difficulty in finding a nation abroad with much interest in the maintenance of a vigorous competitive system. Today, however, the situation is changing. The European Economic Community is on the threshold of an extensive period of enforcement of its antitrust regulations. The Scandinavian nations now have a fairly significant record of effective antitrust enforcement, using their own distincive standards and procedures The United Kingdom, after nearly two decades of experimentation with different approaches to the antitrust problem, now is contemplating some added steps in the application of the philosophy. Canada also has an antitrust statute with a record of enforcement. In other countries, as well, the antitrust concept is active.

Our concern here, of course, is with investments in the less developed countries. The complexity of corporate ownership patterns is such, however, that the jurisdictions of the advanced nations may well be involved in arrangements affecting the less developed areas. Besides, methods of consultation and jurisdictional division worked out with the advanced nations may serve as prototypes of what may eventually be possible in agreements with less developed countries. Accordingly:

We recommend that the United States Government, working through its bilateral treaties of establishment, through the mechanisms provided by the OECD, or through other appropriate means, widen and strenghthen its collaborative practices with other governments in the antitrust field. Wherever the activities of such governments seem likely to raise the problem of multiple standards and jurisdictional conflict in the application of antitrust policies, a major objective of the collaboration would be to reduce the uncertainty of the businessman concerning the jurisdictional authority and antitrust standards which would apply in his overseas activities.

SECTION 3: THE FLOW OF FINANCE CAPITAL

Capital is a scarce resource in the less developed countries and its scarcity impedes development both in the public sector and in the private sector. To deal with it, a number of capital sources have been created by agreement between governments. Some have been bilateral in character, such as the loans and grants to governments under the United States aid program; some have been multilateral, such as the loans of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

While public funds have been moving into the public sectors of the less developed countries, programs to direct capital toward the private sector have been slower in developing. This delay has been due in some countries to an ideological bias in favor of public investment. But more often, it has been due simply to the difficulties of mobilizing private capital and of channeling capital to the private sector. They are formidable in countries which are just beginning to modernize and grow.

Of course, not all types of capital are equally scarce in the private sectors of the less developed nations. Suppliers of equipment from many advanced countries, often acting with the help of their governments, are prepared to offer medium term credits to private enterprises in the less developed countries. The money market in New York readily absorbs the short-term dollar paper of a considerable number of well-known enterprises located in Latin America. But long-term capital or equity money is quite scarce, even for the well established venture. And, if the venture is small or untried, any kind of capital is scarce except at the most elevated rates of interest. This problem must be dealt with if a private sector is to flourish. And there is every reason to hope that the problem may be aided by appropriate action in which the private and public resources in the United States can play a part.

The balance of payments issue

The first question which the United States has to face in dealing with this issue is whether it is prepared to allow its own foreign exchange resources to contribute to the solution.

For the past five or six years, the United States has been deeply concerned over the country's steady loss of gold. Understandably, our government has taken a number of steps to check the flow. In making public loans and grants in the foreign aid program, for instance, the United States Government has "tied" the aid so that the money would be spent on United States goods and services. About 85 percent of United States bilateral aid is now tied in this way.

In the private investment field formal "tying" of this kind is not feasible or desirable. Accordingly, over the past year or two, the Administration has felt the need to apply a series of measures to constrain the export of United States private capital. The principal measures have been: a 15 percent tax on certain types of capital raised by foreigners in the United States markets; a voluntary program by which United States parent companies would try to improve the net balance of payments effect of their overseas subsidiaries' operations by 15 or 20 percent; and a voluntary program by which United States banks would hold down increases in their foreign lending to 5 percent per annum.

From the start, official policy has sought to make clear that these restrictive measures were not directed at the less developed countries. For those countries, the United States aim of stimulating economic growth was to take precedence over its aim of controlling the outflow of United States capital. Accordingly, the 15 percent interest equalization tax was made applicable only to capital exports destined for the advanced countries. For the same reason, the voluntary program for improving the balance of payments performance of United States companies with foreign interests was limited to transactions with the advance countries.

But the distinction was badly blurred in the Federal Reserve Board's voluntary program for curbing overseas bank lending. Here, the ceiling imposed on bank loan increases was global in nature. The only special recognition given to the less developed countries was a recommendation to banks that, within the global quota, priorties be given first to export loans and, second, to loans for the less developed countries.

The available figures suggest that this formula markedly curbed loans which otherwise would have gone to the less developed areas. The recent monthly rate of long-term lending to the less developed areas by U.S. banks has been only about three-quarters as high as the rate in 1964. Although total loans outstanding to these areas from United States banks have been increasing by several hundred million dollars yearly in past years, indications are that such loans will be lower at the end of 1965 than at the end of 1964.

A curtailment of this sort defeats the United States objective of encouraging the development of the less developed countries and, above all, of the private sectors in those countries. What is more, there is a real question whether the curtailment does much to help the balance of payments position of the United States. It is characteristic of the less developed countries that, unlike the advanced nations, they spend every dollar of foreign exchange that they acquire as fast as they acquire it. Therefore, when the less developed countries acquire dollars through bank loans, the United States runs less risk that these dollars will be converted directly into a demand for scarce United States gold.* Only when these dollars fall into the hands of other advanced countries does the risk become real. Some of that kind of risk, it appears to the Committee, is worth taking in light of the critical importance of aiding the less developed areas. Accordingly:

We recommend that the Federal Reserve Board amend its recommendations to United States banks so that the restrictive effects on loans to less developed countries are eliminated.

Legal and institutional reform

Seventy-odd countries in the world are generally regarded as "less developed." Each has its own law and institutional characteristics, and each presents its own special problems in the mobilization of long-term capital for productive enterprise. A few common problems, however, tend to be present in many of these countries.

One basic source of difficulty lies in long-standing provisions of the commercial and corporate law in many less developed countries, designed for another era and another kind of economy. There are numerous illustrations of this kind of difficulty.

In some countries, for instance, it is difficult or impossible to collect on defaulted debts unless some tangible security has been provided as collateral. This factor strengthens the tendency of banks and other lenders to provide loans only against collateral and to avoid extension of general lines of credit so common in advanced countries.

In other cases, the problem is of quite another kind. Under the corporate law of some countries, enterprises are prohibited from making additional stock offerings except through rights to stockholders. If a significant group of stockholders is unwilling to increase its cash investment in the company and if no market can be developed for the rights, the company, in practice, may be prevented from increasing its equity. At the same time, other useful corporate instruments, such as the convertible debenture or the convertible preferred stock are ruled out.

Still another kind of problem arises when the law simply does not provide for or does not permit certain kinds of institutions. Major legal blocks can sometimes be found to bar such useful institutions as the open-end investment trust, the cooperative bank or credit union, the organized stock exchange, the factoring house, the leasing of capital assets, or the conditional sale.

Often the problems of developing an adequate local capital market are not so much problems of law as those of habit and custom. For example, in some countries the idea of having public stockholders is abhorrent both to the owners of the enterprises and to prospective investors. The owners cannot reconcile themselves to a situation in which outsiders share the prerogatives of ownership; and the outside investors cannot picture a situation in which the controlling stockholders would feel any responsibility for minority interests. Partly as a result, information of the kind that any serious investor requires is rarely available, even for very large enterprises, in the less developed world.

There does not appear to be any overwhelming reason why the leasing of fixed assets, the use of convertible securities, or the development of credit unions could not be introduced more widely. Unhappily, however, it is not enough to know what worked in the United States and Western Europe, in order to know what should be prescribed for the less developed countries. While some of the institutions and legal provisions of the advanced nations may be exceedingly desirable and constructive, others may be meaningless or impractical. The habits, institutions, capabilities and legal structures of less developed countries are, in many cases, too far removed from those of the advanced countries to permit any easy bridging of the gap.

Fortunately, a few nations seem to be making the transition from situations of the sort just described to more modern and more efficient institutions. In such nations, the government has commonly helped to create and support institutions which worked in harness with the private sector in various pragmatic ways. Japan, which is well along toward acquiring the full panoply of modern credit institutions, is achieving its modern status by a curious mixture of state banking institutions, government-private banking partnerships, unorthodox industrial lending policies, and even more unorthodox stock flotation practices. Mexico also has begun to achieve some breadth of securities ownership, using methods which would be regarded as unorthodox elsewhere. Mexico has resorted to such practices as government-financed market stabilization of privately issued securities and government-sponsored investment trusts whose portfolios consist principally of privately issued securities. The laws, institutions and experiences of countries such as these may prove more relevant than those of the more advanced countries. Accordingly:

We recommended that a large-scale program of assistance be expanded for the development and improvement of local financial institutions in support of private and cooperative enterprises in the less developed countries; and that the program draw heavily not only on the expertise of the United States and other advanced countries, but also on expertise in countries whose institutions may be more relevant to those of the less developed countries. Presumably, such a program could be conducted not only through the auspices of public international agencies such as the Organization of American States and the United Nations specialized agencies, but also through private organizations such as those in the cooperative and labor fields which have the necessary experience and interest.

The encouragement of financial intermediaries

A number of steps for the mobilization of equity capital or long-term debt might generate results in a significant number of the less developed countries. One of these is the building up of intermediary institutions capable of mobilizing investor capital and of managing a portfolio of equity interests or long-term debt, such as development banks, savings institutions, or stock exchanges. In order for such institutions to succeed, they must command the confidence of both sides in the transaction. That is to say, such institutions must have the confidence of the principal owners and managers of the firms in which they take a significant interest, as well as the confidence of the investors who are providing the funds.

There are many encouraging examples of institutions which seem to have assumed this role with some degree of effectiveness in the less developed countries. In many countries, including Nigeria, Pakistan, Mexico and Turkey, official institutions such as the development banks have had outstanding successes. Elsewhere, locally-incorporated private or cooperative institutions seeded with foreign funds and analogous in form to United States investment trusts have produced excellent results. In addition, there have been promising foreign investing mechanisms purchasing for portfolio, such as ADELA. One successful institution, the International Finance Corporation, is a public international agency, wholly owned by the stockholders of the World Bank.

Still other institutions of this sort have been discussed. A proposed Peace-by-Investment Corporation, for instance, would channel equity funds into the less developed countries, using United States Government credits as its source of financing in the initial stages, and relying partly upon funds from private investors in later stages; this is one added approach which desires the most careful consideration as a way of helping to fill the capital gap with private resources.

---

* Private investment flows from the U.S. to less developed countries in 1964 were $1.8 billion, and of this only $522 million were direct investments. The total amount included some $481 million of long-term bank lending and sales of securities in the U.S., and $803 million of short-term bank loans and commercial financing—Department of Commerce.

Institutions of this sort have far more potential importance in the less developed countries than in the advanced nations because they are sometimes capable of satisfying a number of special needs. First, such institutions may be in a position to undertake the initial investigations and the subsequent surveillance of investment opportunities; in countries in which corporate information is closely held, this is a critical function. Second, such institutions may be able to provide some degree of liquidity to their investors; in economies in which organized securities markets are lacking or are underdeveloped, this too can be of critical importance.

One of the more immediate methods to provide long-term money for the less developed areas relates to the International Finance Corporation. A proposal now before the United States Government is to allow the IFC to borrow $400 million from the World Bank. At the same time, the proposal would suspend the existing requirement that IFC transactions with a private enterprise in any country must be guaranteed by the government of that country. The Committee strongly endorses both points. Accordingly:

We urge the United States Government to approve a proposal to permit the IFC to borrow up to $400 million from the World Bank for investment in private enterprise in the less developed areas; and we urge approval of the provision eliminating the need for the guaranty of such transactions by governments in the country of investment.

In its analysis of the problems of supporting non-governmental entities in the less developed countries, the Committee has come to believe that there is a real need to brush away some of the obstacles which are now impeding access to local currencies owned by the United States Government in those countries. The Committee is aware that the greater use of these currencies raises problems, such as the need to restrain money supplies when inflation threatens, and the need to avoid policies which discriminate against local businessmen in favor of their foreign competitors. Nevertheless, use of these currencies could be widened and one productive channel is the provision of seed money for financial intermediaries.

There have already been a few instances of this in connection with the establishment of industrial banks and home financing institutions. The Committee believes this could readily be extended to entities which perform other roles, such as cooperative banks, investment companies, and mutual funds. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID review its policies with a view to widening the use of United States-owned local currencies; and in that connection, that it give serious consideration to the greater use of those currencies for increasing the capital base of financial intermediaries of both the commercial and cooperative types.

While the United States can increase the capital resources of financial intermediaries through local currency loans, it can also increase their resources by tax incentives to investors which provide the funds. For some individual and institutional investors building up a diversified portfolio of investments, the impact of a tax advantage can be considerable. Such investors ("portfolio investors," so-called) are ordinarily in a position to weigh many more alternatives and to figure the yield and risk considerations much more closely than the direct investor concerned with the operation of an overseas subsidiary. Accordingly, any tax advantage extended to a portfolio investor will figure explicitly in the appraisal of alternatives. Hence:

We urge the Administration to consider the possibility that any United States tax credits extended by treaty or legislation to the direct investments of United States investors in less developed countries, such as the 7% and 30% credits proposed in Section 2, also should be extended to the portfolio investments of United States corporate or institutional investors, wherever such investments meet the eligibility criteria which would apply to direct investments.

The use of guaranties

For many institutional investors, however, neither tax incentives nor loans will have much effect in stepping up the flow of long-term capital from the United States to the less developed countries. Pension trusts, insurance companies and other institutional investors, for instance, are unlikely to examine any lending opportunity seriously, however lucrative its yield, if the opportunity involves any significant risk. Funds of this sort must be managed on a fiduciary or quasi-fiduciary basis. Hence, the standard of "the prudent man," conservatively interpreted, must generally be applied. The risk of criticism is always greater, therefore, when an institutional investor pursues a relatively untried course, such as investment in the less developed areas. Yet the funds of institutional investors may provide an indispensable element in financing productive investment in the less developed areas.

No great single step will sharply increase the receptivity of institutional investors toward commitments in the less developed areas. But a series of lesser measures, taken collectively, might change the prevailing state of mind. Some of these go back to the general "climate," discussed in Section 2. Others are more specific. For instance, where countries have laws or constitutional provisions which specifically guarantee a foreign investor against arbitrary governmental treatment, the United States would do well to consider whether such guaranties cover portfolio investment. If they do not, as is sometimes the case, any efforts to improve the investment climate of such countries ought to include the objective of extending the existing guaranties.

In addition, however, the United States itself should take steps to ease the grant of specific and extended risk guaranties for the portfolio investor. AID has already shown a willingness to experiment in adapting its guaranties to portfolio investments. We think this trend should be accelerated. Specifically:

We recommend that AID tailor its specific risk guaranties to permit their easier availability to United States buyers of selected issues of foreign private enterprises. Among the possibilities which AID should explore is: arranging for the application of such guaranties through negotiation and agreement with the underwriters rather than with the ultimate buyers, thereby sparing the buyers the cost and difficulty of direct negotiations and ensuring a wider United States market for the securities involved.

It is the extended risk guaranty, however, which the Committee thinks may be a real hope for increasing the flow of portfolio funds to the less developed areas. In Section 2, we recommended that a 100 percent extended risk guaranty be available for a part of the capital provided for certain projects in the less developed countries. This provision would, of course, be available for portfolio investors if they were the source of such capital. In addition, however, we believe that AID should be encouraged to experiment with less-than-100 percent coverages for portfolio investors, where these seem useful. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID offer portfolio investors extended risk guaranties, combining risk-yield features which make selected securities of private enterprises in the less developed countries competitive with the alternative opportunities of such investors.

The sectors to be supported

Every country which supports a program of foreign aid or which insures or subsidizes the foreign investment of its citizens is caught up from time to time in a tangle of conflicting considerations. On the one hand, the aid-giving country sees advantages in contributing to the growth and support of the less developed country; yet, on the other hand, occasionally fears the consequences of the increased competitive strength of the area receiving the aid.

This conflict is painfully sharp when an aid program in a less developed country is designed to build up additional production in an industry or branch of agriculture which is already in economic difficulty in the aid-giving country. If the project in the less developed country is a textile plant, for instance, the United States might understandably be worried about creating added spinning capacity at a time when United States textile mills were not fully employed; if the project was to increase cattle production, the United States might be concerned by the fact that meat appeared to be in surplus at home; and if the project was aimed at expanding rice production, the United States might well wonder about the United States rice surplus already being financed out of United States tax money.

Nevertheless, there is not the slightest doubt where United States interests lie. Our political and our economic interests are best served by building up the productive capabilities and democratic institutions of the less developed countries. It is important, of course, that these development programs should be sensibly conceived; but sensible programs sometimes include the expansion of output of products which are in surplus in the United States. The evidence is overwhelming that the best customers of the United States are also the countries which seem to be our strongest competitors. The competition, in the end, is sorted out through adjustments and shifts on the part of both parties. Overall demand for United States products, altered though it may be, survives the shifts.

As a general rule, United States officials in AID and United States representatives to international agencies try diligently not to be diverted from their principal development purposes while dealing with pressures of individual United States industries or agricultural groups. But considerations such as these inevitably tend to build up in the analysis of any given project. And unless there is a clear, strong line inside the complex United States Government establishment, the tendency on the part of government officials, when considerations of this sort exist, may be to hesitate, procrastinate and qualify.

There is irony in the fact that when the prospective recipient of United States or international aid is a private enterprise, the intrusion of extraneous considerations of the sort just described is even greater than when a public enterprise is involved. This is so partly because government enterprises tend to be concentrated in infrastructure and heavy industry while private enterprise tends to specialize in lighter manufacturing activities. Accordingly, loans to private enterprise are more likely to provoke questions of international competition. Besides, the governments of the less developed countries tend to defend their own governmental projects more effectively than the projects of their private businessmen. The result is lopsided in terms of United States long-run interests; government enterprise projects often have clearer sailing than those of the private sector.

In a society as complex and as pluralistic in nature as the United States, it is inevitable that pressures such as these will continually arise. But it is one of the obvious principles of effective administration that any program should confine itself to a limited number of major objectives; otherwise, the program may serve no objective at all. In this case, we must never lose sight of the fact that our prime objective is the economic growth of the aid-receiving countries. At times, that objective will lead United States officials to take a considerable interest in the avoidance of harmful policies in aid-receiving countries, such as policies relating to the existence of destructive monopolies, or harmful land tenure arrangements. United States aid officials also should be interested in situations in which the competitive advantage of a foreign country is based upon exploitative wages—wages which are excessively low in light of the productivity levels in the country concerned; for wages of this sort are hurtful not only to competitive United States industry but also to the growth of the developing country itself. Interests of this sort, specific though they may be, are still essential to support the general objectives of foreign aid. Accordingly:

We recommend that, in the administration of its aid programs in the less developed countries, United States representatives be instructed to subordinate other objectives to that of securing the economic and social development of the less developed nations. In this connection, it should be recognized that United States interests are usually best served by testing any project in these terms, rather than in terms of whether the project would affect the competitive position of particular branches of United States industry or United States agriculture.

SECTION 4: DEVELOPING HUMAN RESOURCES

Economic development depends above all upon the upgrading of human resources and the improvement of institutions through which development is achieved. Capital, though necessary, cannot achieve by itself these improvements. A critical question is how best to provide the necessary human and institutional changes.

The educational structure

Part of the answer—a very large part in most cases—lies in the improvement of education in the less developed nations. When we speak of education in this context, we mean education in its broadest sense. There is not only a need to spread literacy; there is also the need to spread explicit skills relevant to the tasks that confront every nation.

In almost all cases, agricultural skills rank very high in the priority needs of the less developed countries. Some of these are simple skills, such as cultivation and conservation practices. Some are far more complex skills requiring the establishment of agricultural colleges or institutes of engineering.

Nor dare we neglect the training of a skilled and semiskilled work force, intended for industry, construction, transport and the like. Such training has been much ignored in the past, too often on the easy assumption that labor of this sort is spontaneously available. Nothing could be further from the facts. When a vacuum exists in the middle ranks of the industrial labor force, the industrial economy is bound to be crippled.

Men skilled in the technical and managerial fields are in chronic short supply in the less developed countries. Filling these deficits is especially difficult because of the long lead time needed for training.

In developing an adequate educational strategy, the problem is not only one of assessing needs but also one of maintaining balance. There are well-defined pressing short-term needs, and less precisely defined long-term needs. The limited available resources cannot satisfy all needs. The challenge to sensible planning is to maintain a proper appreciation of both kinds of need.

AID programs in most countries place a certain amount of stress on education and educational planning. But our impression is that much more attention and resources are needed for planning and execution of educational programs. We see this as a key issue affecting every facet of the development process. Accordingly:

We strongly urge AID in reviewing and responding to a country's development strategy, to place major emphasis upon the planning, host country commitments to, and the execution of educational programs. In such programs, we urge AID to use every means to tap the rich resources in United States universities, labor unions, cooperatives, business enterprises, professional societies, and other non-governmental entities which have something to offer to the educational process.

In the pages that follow, the Committee will have more to say on specific steps that might be taken to further this objective.

Export of industrial skills

There are many channels through which to assist the less developed countries in their formidable job of education. Where management skills and technical skills are concerned, the foreign branches, subsidiaries and affiliates of United States firms can make a major educational contribution. Numerous other sources in the United States are prepared to provide managerial and technical help to industry on a commercial basis. These include many engineering and management firms with a wide range of specializations and considerable experience. Still, the Committee believes that the network of communication between the prospective sources of industrial assistance in the advanced countries and the prospective recipients in the less developed countries suffers from major gaps.

We begin with the fact that, except in the case of direct investment, ordinarily a great gulf exists between the prospective source of managerial or technical assistance in an advanced country and the prospective recipient of such assistance in the less developed world. In the typical case, the enterprise in the less developed countries that might benefit from the assistance does not even exist; it is no more than an amorphous idea in the mind of some individual or local industrial bank. Or if the enterprise does exist, its conception of how it might be helped and who might help it is vague and formless. Some source of initiative is needed to focus the problem, define the possibilities, and search out the necessary managerial or technical assistance; and it would be unrealistic to assume that such initiative will be generated spontaneously from either local or foreign sources. This is why the Committee recommended in Section 2 that there should be a greatly stepped-up effort to increase the flow of feasibility studies in the less developed areas, and a major strengthening of institutions with a stake in bringing some of those studies to fruition.

If the flow of feasibility studies is greatly increased, one can hope that foreign enterprises will be persuaded to make more investments in the less developed areas. But that possibility exists only for a limited range of opportunities. To be sure, in cases in which the scale of a proposed enterprise is relatively large and the technology is relatively advanced, there may be United States companies interested in the possibility of setting up a subsidiary or affiliate. If the scale is small and the process is simple, however, few United States companies are likely to have an interest in the operation. Measured against alternative possibilities in the United States, prospective profits in the less developed countries may seem small and risks may appear uncomfortably high. Accordingly, in the less developed countries, operations such as bakeries and dairies, paper box plants and rubber footwear plants, trucking depots and supermarkets, may be unable to secure the American managerial and technical skills needed.

If the United States firms are unwilling to invest in such enterprises, would they be willing to sell their managerial and technical skills on a fee basis to moderate-sized firms in the less developed world? On first blush, the picture is not encouraging. United States enterprises offering technical assistance to enterprises abroad use various formulas for compensation. If the agreement is broad in scope, the aided firm generally pays some percentage of the value of its sales for the services; percentage figures in the range of 4 to 8 percent are typical. The agreement may also provide for reimbursement of the out-of-pocket costs of the assisting firm.

As a rule, in arrangements of this sort, both the receivers and the givers of technical assistance are relatively large firms. Small firms that need technical assistance often have difficulty in paying for it; and small firms possessing the technology in the advanced countries often have difficulty in finding a way to export it. When a small firm is asked to provide assistance, the cost of detaching a key officer from his regular duties at home may seem especially high. The problem is to find a way of providing an adequate level of compensation which reflects the full cost incurred by the assisting firm in diverting its manpower from home-based activities.

The block to adequate payment does not arise simply from the inability of the receiving firm to pay for and the assisting firm to provide the required services. Even if both firms were willing, the governments in less developed areas are often unwilling to permit arrangements in which the compensation rate seems high, according to "local" standards. This reluctance is due partly to an unwillingness to permit the spending of scarce foreign exchange for services that may seem overpriced; but it also is due in part to the fact that foreign parent companies have sometimes been suspected of charging their subsidiaries very high fees in order to draw out profits in the form of expenses. As a result, yardsticks for licensing fees have been developed in some countries which at times impede the easy flow of technical assistance.

Even though the private recipients may be in no position to pay for technical assistance out of their own resources and even though governments may resist "abnormal" payment formulas, we believe that there are times when such assistance is well worth providing.

When technical assistance has an initial seeding effect which introduces new skills and sets new standards of performance, it can generate benefits to the receiving country exceeding anything that is reflected in the amount that the recipient firm could be expected to pay. The Committee believes, therefore, that wherever technology or managerial assistance may have a major seeding effect in an aid-receiving country, aid would be well justified in subsidizing the sale of such technology or assistance to the degree appropriate to reflect its full effects in the less developed country. Accordingly:

We recommend that, in selected cases, AID partially finance the sale of technical, professional or managerial assistance from United States organizations to entities in less developed countries, and that the subsidy contribute not only to the costs of the assisting enterprise but also to the costs of searching out and finding the appropriate source of such assistance.

The principle of AID subsidy for seeding managerial and industrial skills is not new. AID has supported numerous projects to train and educate local managers and the local labor force, through supporting such institutions as the Asian Productivity Organization, business schools and vocational education programs, the labor education center in the Philippines, and industrial technical assistance projects. AID has also vigorously supported the recruitment and training of management personnel to run cooperative housing, production and marketing ventures in the less developed countries.

The Committee has the impression, however, that there are still a significant number of rich, unexploited opportunities by which AID, acting in conjunction with foreign private groups already operating in some countries, might increase the total effectiveness of United States efforts. The Committee has been briefed on some of the unusual industrial training efforts sponsored by United States labor organizations in less developed areas. A tailoring school in Kenya, a motor vehicle maintenance school in Nigeria, and a steel workers' school in India illustrate the many industrial projects in which American labor organizations have participated. The Committee is also aware that American-owned subsidiaries and affiliates in the less developed countries already do a considerable amount of such training. Some do it simply as a normal part of their plant routine; a few pursue such training much more formally as a contribution to the development of the host country.

The use of existing industrial facilities of foreign subsidiaries for training local managers and the local labor force is desirable on many grounds. It can often be launched without much added capital investment. It can dramatize more effectively the modernizing influence of such foreign investment. And it can be used as part of an integrated program with other development efforts, such as the efforts of local industrial banks to make up a package to attract new industrial investors or the efforts of local productivity centers to enrich their industrial training programs. Where such a program involves significant amounts of added cost to the enterprise concerned, however, there is a case for AID assistance in financing such activities.

In sum, we see the possibility for a greatly expanded role for the United States aid program in building up the vocational, managerial and professional foundation of a society based on private enterprise, cooperative ventures, and other non-governmental enterprise activities. We see some of this role being achieved in cooperation with various private groups, including universities, labor unions, cooperatives, and enterprises operating abroad. Accordingly:

We urge AID to actively promote the development of management schools and vocational institutions in the less developed countries capable of generating the manpower needed for the management and operation of a society based on principles of private enterprises, cooperative ventures, and other non-centralized enterprise forms. We also recommend that AID survey the possibilities of more extensive use of facilities of American-owned subsidiaries and affiliates in the less developed countries for training purposes; and that it undertake to provide financial support, using local currency as available, for such added training activities as these enterprises or other organizations might be willing to undertake with the use of those facilities.

Export of professional skills

There are a profusion of person-to-person contacts between managers and technicians in the advanced countries and those in the less developed areas, arranged through governments, through private enterprises, through foundations, through labor unions, and through many other types of organizations.

Among the many productive contacts that have developed are those between members of the construction industry of the United States and their counterparts in the less developed nations. These contacts, for the most part, have been the result of joint work in the field. AID's major role in promoting such contacts is suggested by the fact that American engineering and construction firms have been working on AID-assisted projects amounting to about one billion dollars annually.

The creation of public works and private structures has always been an important training ground for managers, engineers, architects and craftsmen in the less developed areas. Its importance as a training ground has been enhanced by the fact that the United States and international agencies, when financing construction in the less developed areas, have ordinarily insisted upon appropriate standards of design and workmanship. This, in turn, has brought a steady flow of foreign consulting engineers, architects and construction specialists into the underdeveloped areas. In many cases, these specialists have broadened their impact by conducting formal training courses for local construction personnel. These training courses have been so useful, in fact, that we believe that AID should make provision for such courses as a normal part of any major contract for construction or design.

United States technical assistance from the private sector is not, of course, confined to engineering and construction skills. A considerable number of other professions have offered their services on a contract basis in the less developed countries. A number of management consulting and economic research firms, for instance, have acquired valuable experience in less developed countries.

For a time, it appeared that the United States private sector might be inadequately represented in the flow of technical assistance of this sort. Earlier versions of the Foreign Assistance Act had directed the President, as a matter of preference, to draw on governmental resources in the technical assistance field whenever such resources were available. The Committee is pleased to note that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 reversed the order of preference, so that technical assistance is first sought from private enterprise on a contract basis. In practice, this has come to mean that when the skills of government agencies are called upon, they usually are of a kind which cannot readily be found in the private sector. For example, the Committee notes with approval that government agencies skilled in public works, such as the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Public Roads, usually limit their interests to large general problems of national public works planning, while private firms are used to handle the more specific design, supervision, and construction problems.

The many contacts between the United States private firms and local counterpart professional groups have produced some exceedingly fruitful results. In Turkey and Iran, for instance, the recent appearance of a skilled and competent body of local private engineers can be credited partly to such contacts.

Effective private participation in these technical assistance activities could be widened, however, if the various financing and guaranty facilities which now are extended to exporters of goods from the United States private sector were as readily extended to "exporters" of personal services. In some cases, the firms involved cannot afford to finance their activities over an extended period of time, while awaiting payment from the private organization or government agency to which their services are being extended. In other cases, such firms are understandably unwilling to accept the special risks of inconvertibility or political change that may be involved while awaiting payment. This is a difficult and complex field, to which AID and the Export-Import Bank have been giving increasing attention; indeed, a number of steps have been taken of late which seem formally to expand the facilities available to firms rendering technical assistance abroad. But our strong impression is that more progress can be made to place "exporters" of services on a parity with exporters of goods. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID and the Export-Import Bank review their present policies for extending guaranties and export credits to exports of technical and professional services destined for the less developed areas, with the object of eliminating any remaining disparities of treatment between exports of service and exports of goods.

Export of agricultural skills

About two-thirds of the work force in the less developed countries earn their livelihood from the land. Practically all the people of such countries depend upon local food supplies for their existence. The desperate race between population growth and food production in the less developed countries is so well known and so widely documented that we need not labor it here. So critical is this problem that it justifies the greatest attention of AID. Where industrial feasibility studies are concerned, those which relate to expanding the supply of fertilizer or insecticides or which relate to the transport and processing of foods will merit an especially high priority. Where technical assistance programs are being considered, those which can draw more agricultural expertise out of United States colleges and extension services should merit the highest attention. Where persons skilled in cooperative practices can be tapped, their assignment to the development of cooperative organizations in the agriculture field should be given first consideration.

It is precisely because the promotion of agriculture rates so high in the list of development objectives and because that promotion involves so much of the economy of the less developed countries that the Committee finds it difficult to isolate any particular facet of the issue for special consideration. We can only urge that all the detailed recommendations contained in other parts of this report be read in the light of of our special concern for the future of agricultural production in the less developed world.

Generation and adaptation of new knowledge

It must not be assumed, however, that enough knowledge already exists in the United States to permit us to prescribe what needs to be taught in the less developed areas. One lesson which has been driven home to those who are familiar with technical assistance programs is the basic fact that techniques which work in Topeka, Kansas, may have little relevance in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. All the knowledge that is needed for efficient economic development simply does not yet exist.

It is in the field of agriculture, in fact, that our ignorance is most in evidence. The necessary programs in this sector cover such disparate subjects as: changing the structure of village cultures; altering the institutions of land tenure; developing an appropriate educational system; building a system of farm-to-market roads or irrigation works or drainage canals; creating the rural institutional base through which help can be channeled; generating an effective credit and marketing system; and developing an industrial complex capable of providing the machinery, chemicals and other processed materials that are needed by modern agriculture.

A greatly expanded program of agricultural research is needed. Among the lines of research activity that seem self-evident to the Committee are these: much more research on the physical impediments to agricultural productivity, country by country, region by region, crop by crop; much more research on the development of appropriate plant strains and production techniques, by areas and by crops; much greater understanding of the cultural and institutional barriers to increase output; greatly increased testing of rival approaches to agricultural organizations and education. These lines of agricultural research, however, should be thought of as illustrative, rather than exhaustive. A review of some of the on-going programs in some countries, such as the Comilla experiments in East Pakistan, the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines, and the Rockefeller Foundation's cooperative work in corn, wheat and potatoes at the National Institute of Agricultural Research in Mexico, will suggest added approaches capable of extension to other areas and other crops.

Our ignorance of what works and what does not is also evident in fields other than agriculture. For example, we are unsure about the kind of public administrative systems that might work in the varied circumstances of Latin America, Africa and Asia. We are uncertain about the type of educational techniques and educational curricula that might be most appropriate to the state of literacy and kind of society encountered in these areas. And, ironically enough, we are even unclear about the type of industrial technology which might be most appropriate to the little markets and underdeveloped industrial environments that are characteristic of the less developed world.

It is difficult to specify the research that is needed to cover all these areas. In the industrial sector, however, the problem is partly one of finding efficient production processes in a range of industries—"efficient" in the sense that they are capable of operating on a relatively small scale with a minimum of reliance upon expert maintenance. As a beginning, AID might well identify a number of industrial processes in which the problem commonly arises and might support research in these areas by qualified research institutes, wherever they may be. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID finance increased research imaginatively related to the agricultural, industrial, educational and adminministrative needs of the less developed countries. In some of these fields, such as agriculture, education, and administration, the research would no doubt have to draw heavily upon United States resources, of the sort that can be provided by universities, agricultural research institutions, and the like; but the experimentation itself would usually take place in the less developed areas themselves and should be directed towards strengthening research institutions and capabilities within these areas. Defining the problems to be studied and identifying qualified research capabilities requires of AID considerably more skill and more effort to involve the less developed countries than has heretofore been characteristic. Some of this activity might be financed by United States owned local currency where available.

The role of the non-profit institutions

As some of our earlier discussion has indicated, much of the significant work undertaken by Americans in helping to upgrade people and institutions in the less developed world has been done neither by public officials nor by private business; it has sprung spontaneously from the non-profit organizations of all types which are so prominent a feature of American life. Some of the accomplishments of these groups have been striking: the strengthening of educational systems; the formation of democratic trade union movements; the establishment of credit unions and housing cooperatives; and the planning of national economic and social progress. The initiative of so many groups in extending a hand to counterpart organizations, often without support or recognition from official sources, is a tribute to the strength of American pluralism.

In some cases, however, activities of this sort have required outside help. To fill this need, AID in some instances has provided assistance either in hard dollars, local currency, or surplus food and freight costs. But there have been times when groups such as these have felt frustrated by their seeming inability to draw swiftly and easily upon official support for productive local activities in the less developed countries.

In Section 5, we shall propose some general organizational measures which will have a bearing on the aid program's future role in this area. Whether or not these general organizational measures are adopted, we see certain substantive steps as being widely desirable. It seems clear that non-profit organizations which spring up in the less developed countries, such as incipient cooperatives, young labor unions, and new hospitals or schools, as a general rule are even more ignorant of the posible sources of outside help than a prospective entrepreneur would be. The job of fashioning a bridge between such groups and potential sources of technical assistance abroad is extremely difficult. The job will take more money and attention, much more of both than so far has been available. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID assist in financing the development of appropriate nonprofit institutions in the less developed countries and that it finance the development of links between such organizations and their counterparts in the United States through which technical assistance could be effectively provided. Assistance of this sort could take many forms, from such familiar activities as assisting educational institutions to supporting public forums and discussion groups. We see this activity, too, as a fruitful possibility for the expenditure of United States-owned local currencies.

SECTION 5: SOME ISSUES OF ORGANIZATION

AID is directly responsible for the commitment of about $2.1 billion annually for economic assistance. Through these funds, it administers a wide range of programs, from the sponsorship of research to the extension of guaranties. To perform these functions, AID has about 6,700 Americans on its payrolls, of whom 3,900 are abroad and 2,800 in the United States.

The Committee's task is not to appraise the operating efficiency of this complex, farflung operation. Such an appraisal is a highly specialized and difficult job, which bears only peripherally upon the Committee's concerns. The Committee has no doubt that, in an organization whose mission is as difficult and heterogeneous as that of AID, any such survey would inevitably turn up opportunities for improvement. The Committee is also clear that some of the seeming shortcomings in AID administration are unavoidable consequences of the legal and administrative structure of the Federal Government itself. The endless effort to remain above criticism—public, Congressional or Executive—imposes burdens on AID operations which are unmatched in the private sector. The need to coordinate all activity with the State Department and other branches of government also adds a dimension which gives the appearance of slowing and blurring the action of the agency.

The Committee's administrative proposals, therefore, are directed only to its main objective—the objective of releasing the energies and resources outside of government in the economic and social development of the less developed countries. These proposals stem far less from a critical view of AID's performance than from a sober recognition of the limitations under which it is obliged by circumstance to operate.

Programs versus projects

For many years, two different approaches to foreign aid have competed for resources within the foreign aid program. One is the concept that funds should finance specific projects—identified, engineered, blue-printed proposals for dams or roads or plants. The other is the idea that funds finance some of the resources needed to execute a general national plan.

AID has striven to have both—a sensible national plan for each major aid-receiving country and a well-developed set of specific projects. Frequently, however, AID has confronted the case of a country which seemed to have a perfectly justifiable case for receiving foreign aid but which did not have enough specific projects to which the aid might be attached; that is, a country which seemed to have a reasonable general plan, but a plan that did not include the kind of project activity which provided an easy focal point to which to affix the aid. In such cases, the needs to be financed have sometimes included heavy imports of spare parts or raw materials, in order to increase the rate of operation of existing plants; or large requirements for imports of light machinery, for use by a highly dispersed complex of light industry.

As between the two aid-giving patterns, Congressional committees have in the past usually expressed their strong preference for the project approach. The reasons for the preference are perfectly clear. When United States aid is identified with a specific project, there is a seeming basis for accountability, for determining whether the plan was well-drawn and the money was well-spent, which is far more obvious than in the case of the so-called program loan. The bricks and mortar are visible and tangible, a test of United States capabilities and a witness to United States willingness to provide aid.

Most sensible programs of economic development require a certain amount of large, visible installations and projects. But it is ironic that our desire for visibility and accountability frequently diverts our help from its most productive uses. Often the greatest need of a developing country is to infuse machinery, spare parts and materials into an economy that has been starved for these essentials. The sector which benefits most from such infusion, experience indicates, is the private sector. That sector's response to help of this sort has at time been spectacularly productive.

Fortunately, AID has resisted some of the pressures to concentrate upon large projects and frequently has financed large program loans in some of the aid-receiving countries, sometimes with striking results. Accordingly:

We urge the Congress to encourage not only well-conceived project loans but also well-conceived program loans in the administration of United States aid, especially when such program loans would stimulate the local private sector to a greater contribution in the process of social and economic development.

Tapping non-Government resources

Perhaps the most pervasive organizational difficulty which the Committee has encountered in its survey of United States aid administration is the underdeveloped state of liaison and coordination between official governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations, both in the United States and in the aid-receiving countries.

This is not a surprising state of affairs; indeed, it would be surprising if it were otherwise. Many of the tasks to which the business enterprise, the labor union, the university and the government agencies are gearing themselves in the field of economic development are new and unprecedented. The need for intimate and continuous communication between the public and the private sectors which the present situation requires, therefore, is almost without parallel.

It would be an overstatement to say that the machinery for effective communication and collaboration between AID and the private sector is wholly absent. Indeed, in the past few years AID has gone to great lengths to find ways to try to build that machinery. A staff concerned with the role of private enterprise in the aid program has been created in AID. In addition, AID officers have regularly engaged in conferences with labor unions, agricultural groups, universities, foundations, voluntary agencies, and others concerning various aspects of the AID program. But there are still major AID missions abroad which have no effective officers concerned with building up the non-governmental role in the aid program.

One measure which the Committee regards as indispensable is the strengthening and extending of the present private enterprise staff, both in Washington and in the field, so that it is effectively represented throughout the administration of the aid program. The difficulty in carrying out such recommendations in the past has principally been one of recruitment; with a few notable exceptions it has been extremely difficult for AID to secure men with the appropriate background from the non-governmental sector.

We believe that business organizations, labor unions, foundations, and other organizations would be prepared to assist in the recruitment of such personnel, in a framework in which the men involved were rotated back to their respective organizations after a period of time in the service of AID. Such tours of duty would be of value not to AID alone, but also to the organizations and individuals concerned. Further, we believe that this need is particularly urgent in relation to private enterprise development and that recruitment of seasoned business executives with broad international experience should be given particular emphasis. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID expand and improve its organization both in Washington and in the principal missions abroad so that it is appropriately staffed with persons who, by experience and competence, are capable of acting as an effective conduit between the private sector and the official aid organization. In this connection, we urge AID to take steps to establish a basis for co-opting men from the private sector for rotation back to their permanent organizations after a tour with AID.

The delegation of operating responsibilities

AID's activities form a spectrum which extends from the most general kind of national planning operations to the most specific sort of day-to-day lending and guarantying operations. Having in mind some of the operating advantages of private organizations over governmental bureaus, the Committee gave a good deal of thought to the possibility of AID's delegating some of its operating responsibilities to private organizations.

Even under existing patterns of operation, of course, a certain amount of delegation takes place. Every time that AID decides to contract out some of its work instead of using its own staff, the delegation of operating responsibilities is involved. While the direct hire of personnel sometimes seems less costly, there are numerous situations in which contracting makes good operating sense. It is easy to create a misleading appearance of economy by the use of the direct hire route; the appearance is especially misleading when it leaves a residue of specialized personnel in the AID agency who must be kept at work on a succession of jobs for which they are not well-qualified. Besides, nongovernmental organizations in the United States have specialists in many fields whose experience and skill often exceeds those which AID or any other organization could muster for their own needs. In the unceasing effort to mobilize the best United States talent to the aid task, therefore, the use of the contractor route can be an exceedingly efficient arrangement.

The Committee would emphasize, however, that simply contracting with an appropriate institution does not assure effective assistance. The skills of the individual nominated by that institution to direct the project are more important than the character of the institution itself. Accordingly:

We commend AID for its increasing use of contractors in the handling of specialized tasks and urge the Agency to extend this practice.

In the efforts of the United States Government to reach out beyond the government sector and to involve the best available expertise in the program of economic development, the establishment of effective contact with non-profit organizations has been in some ways more difficult than communication with the business community. When businessmen have services to offer to the government, a clear incentive for breaking through the barriers of government regulations and procedures usually exists. Non-profit organizations, whose technical assistance commitments, in fact, exceed the technical assistance funds administered by AID, ordinarily do not have these incentives; their programs may indeed suffer from too close an identity with the assistance programs of such a political instrument as AID. Accordingly, it is often difficult or impossible to bring the resources of government and of the non-profit organizations into an effective working relationship.

This is not an altogether new problem for the United States Government. In other contexts, the Government has tried to handle the problem in different ways. One pattern, for example, has been the creation of essentially private corporations for essentially public work. Another pattern has been the creation of public corporations or public agencies with exemption from many of the normal administrative requirements imposed by government. The form to be used depends in part on the particular function of the hybrid public-private agency involved.

The Committee has given a good deal of thought to the problem of generating one or more non-profit, quasi-private institutions which would link national or regional development programs with the resources of foundations, universities, labor unions, cooperatives, professional groups, and charitable and religious organizations. Such institutions, as the Committee sees it, could receive funds directly from the Congress, on contract from AID, from private resources such as foundations and other organizations, and from foreign governments. These institutions should be subject to as few of the restraining governmental regulations and statutory requirements as possible, consistent with the need to account for the expenditure of their funds. They should be free, for instance, to make much more flexible arrangements for the employment of academic personnel than AID itself is now able to do. Ideally, they would tend to reduce the sense of frustration and delay which non-profit organizations often feel in their dealings with government; they would tend to shorten the line of communications in technical assistance programs, so that policies agreed at the top between AID and the non-profit organizations were not subject to frustration in the field; and they would tend to remove from publicly-funded technical assistance programs the political constraints inherent in AID which reduce the effectiveness overseas of AID's technical assistance program and which discourage the coordination of private and public assistance efforts.

More explicitly, such institutions would have three specific functions at the outset: (1) the administration of technical assistance programs both in countries, such as Libya and Saudi Arabia, which do not receive foreign aid in the usual sense and those, where AID programs are being terminated but which need help in improving their human resources; (2) the exchange of plans and information among United States foundations, universities, professional societies, charitable and religious organizations, regarding their activities in the less developed countries; and (3) the maintaining of contacts with non-profit organizations in these countries.

In due course, it should be possible to enlarge these responsibilities so that the new organizations might take over some of AID's responsibilities for technical assistance programs in countries in which AID was providing program and other financial assistance; this step would presumably come later and then only in close conjunction with AID. What is needed now is an early beginning in the bridge-building process. Accordingly:

We recommend that the Administration formulate specific proposals aimed at creating one or more organizations which could increase the technical assistance commitments of private groups and in time more effectively administer publicly-funded technical assistance programs in coordination with those which are privately-funded. In view of the urgency of the problem, such proposals should be prepared in time for consideration and adoption in next year's AID program.

While stressing the need for communication between the public and the private sectors in the United States aid program, we dare not lose sight of the fact that there are some activities by private groups in less developed areas which are all the more effective for being independent of the official United States establishment. Their independence from government support represents a strength for which the Soviet Union and the Communist Chinese have no counterpart in their foreign aid programs. Besides, their independence imparts an added measure of strength to the local institutions which they support; these institutions are less vulnerable to indications of displeasure from their own governments, and more disposed to take some of the independent positions which a pluralistic society demands. In some countries, considerations of this sort are vital in connection with certain programs such as the training of community leaders and the education of business and professional groups—programs which are now being assisted by United States educational groups, business organizations, and private foundations. Activities of this sort, operating on the margin of the national sensitivities of the less developed countries, may find it desirable to avoid the drawbacks of official United States support.

There are some activities of this sort, however, which could be supported and stimulated by United States aid, provided that the aid was made available through the neutralizing filter of some local entity—some entity whose loyalty and commitment to the local culture and to the host government in the less developed country were beyond question. One approach to this need is suggested by the imaginative experiment which AID is exploring in India, where a binational non-profit foundation would be set up and financed to support a wide variety of educational and scientific programs. An entity of this sort could forge one more effective link in a chain which brought non-governmental groups in the United States in closer and more effective contact with their counterparts abroad. Accordingly:

We commend AID on its initiative in seeking the creation of a binational non-profit foundation in India; we urge AID to press forward with this experiment as a matter of high priority; and we urge that, if initial indications are encouraging, the experiment be repeated in other countries where local conditions are favorable.

The supplementing of functions

Many of the proposals suggested in this report have significant manpower and staffing implications, both in Washington and in the field. Some may lead to a reduction in AID personnel; some obviously call for an increase. The proper implementation of the recommendations proposed here may require AID to create new posts, to be filled either by additional hiring or by transfer from existing positions. The Committee would urge, however, that when a position cannot be properly filled that it remain unfilled and that AID undertake to provide those services through another instrument. Accordingly:

We recommend that AID draw up a plan for staffing the recommendations proposed in this report, and that the Congress and the Executive Branch give sympathetic consideration to the AID proposals.

The need for a continued dialogue

The Committee firmly believes that the dialogue between AID and the private sector which the Committee's operations have helped to develop should be institutionalized and continued in the future. Some of the administrative suggestions made earlier will contribute to that objective. But more is needed.

The problems clamoring for attention at the topmost echelon of AID are many and complex. In the present organizational structure, even under the most propitious circumstances, the task of broadening the role of the private sector has to compete for attention with many other issues. To maintain an effective dialogue between AID and the private sector, one element that is needed is a clear point of effective contact within the AID organization—a man and office of sufficient stature to command the respectful attention of both the non-governmental organizations outside of AID and of the hierarchy inside of the United States aid organization. It is clear that extensive international experience outside of government, as well as experience in government, would be an indispensable requirement for the incumbent.

Finally, the Committee believes that other groups which are charged with evaluating the foreign aid program ought to have a continuing concern for the role of the non-governmental organizations in that program. We have in mind, particularly, the future operations of the General Advisory Committee for Foreign Assistance Programs, appointed by President Johnson in May 1965. We commend this critical subject to their continuing attention.

Arthur K. Watson, Ernest Arbuckle, J. A. Beirne, William T. Golden, Henry T. Herold, Kenneth D. Naden, Edith S. Sampson, Sidney Stein, Jr., Murray A. Wilson.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan].

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to arise in support of H.R. 15750. I do not have the privilege of being a member of this great committee under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I do not pretend to be an expert on all of the details and the intricacies of the foreign aid program, but I have had the opportunity very recently, with 13 other Members of this House, of going to Vietnam and southeast Asia during the Fourth of July recess. We did have the opportunity of seeing at firsthand some of the effects of the AID program in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Therefore, I was astonished, not to say perplexed, by some of the remarks I heard just a few minutes ago on this floor by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino]. One week ago today three Members of the House, myself included, the others being the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Duncan] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], spent a day in the Mekong Delta area, in the Vinh Long area Province. We saw there the schools and hospitals being built in this area which contains 50 percent of the population of Vietnam, in which there are no sizable U.S. armed services units operating. This is a dirty, ugly, back-alley war being fought down there by very brave people with their popular forces, and there AID people are working with them side by side, night and day, to rebuild and restructure a society that has been torn apart for 20 years. I think any American citizen, and certainly any Member of this House who had the privilege that we did of being there, would be proud of what America is doing for those people.

Just to set the record straight, the school population of Vietnam in the last few years has more than doubled, and under this AID program we have developed in 1955 more new instructors in the past 3 years in the elementary and secondary school system at the hamlet level in Vietnam. We will graduate an additional 2,500 a year.

Mr. Chairman, we have underway a provision to train 1,700 elementary and secondary schoolteachers per year. By early 1968, 13,000 new hamlet classrooms will have been built, providing additional educational facilities for 780,000 children in Vietnam.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have poured as has been said $2.5 billion in aid into Vietnam, and we are pouring it into a country in which the Vietcong is doing everything in its power to tear up what we build faster than we can build it.

But to suggest, as the gentleman from New York has done, that these $2.5 billion have been wasted, or that foreign aid to Asian countries cannot for some reason or other be as successful as the Marshall plan was in Europe is extremely misleading.

Over the years this country extended economic aid to the Republic of China in amounts totaling $2.24 billion, and on our return trip from the Far East the members of the committee I have referred to had the chance to discuss the problems of Taiwan with both the Vice President, Mr. C. K. Yen, and with the President of the Republic, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Both men pointed out proudly that the economy of Taiwan has advanced to such a point that they are now self-sufficient, and no longer require economic aid from the United States. If the Communists had not been tearing Vietnam to pieces for the last several years, South Vietnam might by now be approaching self-sufficiency.

Upon our return to Washington, last Monday night, the 14 members of the committee went directly from Andrews Air Force Base to the White House where we met for an hour and a half with the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House. The President asked each of us in turn to comment upon, to criticize if necessary, what we had seen in Vietnam. No one at that table, including the four distinguished Republican members of the committee, had anything but praise for the foreign aid program in Vietnam and several said the only trouble was that we were not doing enough in the way of providing educators and doctors and public health people and more hospital facilities and more schools and textbooks.

I would therefore think that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino], before castigating so thoroughly this program of aid to Vietnam, would do well to consult with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have just returned from southeast Asia, and they might be able to provide him with the factual information which would provide the basis for him, and for the other Members of the House, to vote approval of H.R. 15750.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret that for the first time in the 4 years I have been in Congress I probably will cast my vote against the foreign aid authorization bill. I will do this not because of a groundswell of opposition from my constituents back home, but because I believe our AID effort in current proportions is, perhaps, the most ineffective program in the Congress in terms of the dollars spent.

It is not because of a deficit balance nor loss of gold, nor aid for Communist-trading nations that I oppose this bill, but because I think the AID program, as currently envisioned, is programed to start no place and end no place. It constitutes a mere temporary balm for the underdeveloped countries of the world and, moreover, is actually catastrophically confounding in the small country of Vietnam.

Make no mistake, I have recently returned from a visit there and I am extremely optimistic about our military effort in that country. When a $750 billion economy such as ours takes on a $1½ billion economy such as North Vietnam, which lacks an air force, a navy, a modern army, industry, substantial population or geography and when that effort is taken on at the $2 billion per month rate, and when enemy dead casualties are counted at the 60,000-plus annual rate, it is not in the cards that the encounter last indefinitely.

Success at the present time is being achieved, however, in spite of, and not because of, a large part of our AID effort.

It is true that in many areas of Vietnam our AID mission has achieved considerable success in training and assisting local personnel. The men working in this gallant effort I salute. This I have verified by many direct contacts. Unfortunately, of our $530 million appropriated during the last year for AID, three-fourths of the total, or $370 million, did not go into the technical assistance program at all, but was earmarked for commodity imports—CIP.

The commodity import program is not an AID program at all, but a scheme which has grown up through the years whereby 2,000 predominantly Chinese merchants unjustly enriched themselves.

It is ludicrous to have American men fighting and dying and relying on the assumption that American diplomats are making meaningful progress in the economic and political phases of the war, only to find that a large portion of our Vietnam AID program is going down the tubes.

As I explained in a recent letter to the President, the program is working like this:

Until 2 weeks ago, we were shipping one-half billion dollars of annual AID and food-for-peace goods to private importers in South Vietnam licensed by General Ky to buy U.S. gifts. They have been buying at 60 piasters to the dollar—70 piasters for food for peace—and have been selling at 118 piasters to $1 plus profit plus no wage or price control in a 50-percent expanding cost-of-living market. Two thousand licensed Chinese merchants, an exclusive group since 1959, pay at least $2,000 each per year to receive this booty, and in addition they pay a 33-percent tax to the government directly for the privilege of distributing AID. They say that not much of this aid gets out to rural areas. Of this major part of the AID program, I doubt if any of it goes to the rural areas. It creates profiteers and I am sure I could show the invoices and sales records to prove it. On our food-for-peace program, I attach at the end of my remarks the latest record of the 10,000-employee Department of Agriculture, Washington office, indicating what is happening to our $100 million in food for peace going annually to Vietnam. If you are amazed that it is dated September of 1965, you share my feelings. The answer is given that the Department of Agriculture has no one in Vietnam since the Foreign Agriculture Service is really strictly a marketing agency. Apparently we are not concerned with who gets our surplus or how it is paid for or which poor people are helped, or at all, as long as our warehouses are evacuated.

Restated then, if a Chinese merchant wants U.S. pharmaceuticals from San Francisco, he has to be one of the 2,000 licensees. He orders the goods and AID pays the wholesaler in cash, and the merchant pays into the U.S. Embassy account for the goods at 60 piasters to $1. He is free to resell the goods at any price to anyone. Really there is nothing to stop the Vietcong from driving a truck down from war zone C, loading up the drugs in Saigon, paying 10 percent less for volume or 10 percent more because the purchaser is a known Vietcong and then driving back up to war zone C and unloading. The point is we are losing our goods in the almost ordinary course of business. No wonder only 12 to 30 tons per day were coming down the Ho Chi Minh trail a few months ago. And I point up again, we are bombing the wrong trail.

The Government of Vietnam then draws 25 billion piasters annually from the Embassy account for general purposes and collects additionally a 33-percent direct tax on these goods. The Government of Vietnam collects 15 billion piasters additionally in general taxes and runs about 15 billion piasters deficit, like the U.S. image. The AID people have said that this system cannot really be changed, because the Chinese merchants run the economy and will assassinate those who urge reform.

In the standard AID analysis of the commodity import program dated June 19, 1966, it is stated that control of the program has been improved by the Audit Division of the AID Controllers' Office in Washington, the Special Projects Auditing Division, a four-man resident team of AID management inspection, and the Vietnamese National Police and Customs Inspectors, and the U.S. Inspector General and General Accounting Office.

I have verified the true state of affairs in Vietnam as late as yesterday. I talked to AID personnel who had just returned, and they verify that only 50 percent of the Vietnamese domestic intracountry commerce can be effectively monitored.

It is alleged that the CIP is a hedge against inflation. As a practical matter, when goods normally in short supply are provided, the tendency is to bring prices down. However, when goods are introduced and unlimited amounts of piasters put into a fully committed Embassy drawing account, the effect then is not to limit the money supply but to unreasonably expand it.

I have reviewed in detail the formal analysis of the CIP by the Agency for International Development dated June 19. The document attempts to justify, rationalize and defend an operating program that I personally view as against American interests. I do not believe that one-half dozen or 3 dozen American personnel in Saigon can possibly control the thousands of shipments and partial shipments of United States and underdeveloped nation materials that sift into Saigon on vessels belonging to 100 different nations, dispersing the goods through 2,000 importers.

I have talked with AID personnel at length about reform in the commodity import program. The reforms currently being effected to strengthen supervisory personnel, to increase audits and security, miss the point.

In a war without frontlines you just cannot put three-fourths of a billion dollars worth of goods into the private economy in a vain effort to control inflation and not have those goods wind up in the hands of the Vietcong.

I would suggest reforms as follows:

First. Allow South Vietnam foreign trade to resume its regular foreign exchange form. Merchants would then be forced to pay the going rate for commodities and if the goods are paid for in piasters, the money supply should dwindle.

Second. Provide American AID goods then not through the exclusive license group who are selling on a runaway market, but effect direct distribution of these goods all over Vietnam through controlled joint United States-Vietnam Government channels. In this way the goods could be sold at controlled prices or given away ratably over the provinces when required. We would be stopping the profiteering in our gifts, the South Vietnamese would get the idea that goods originated because of U.S. largess, and prices would be controlled since American goods constitute a considerable portion of the domestic economy.

U.S. military units now deployed all over Vietnam, working now to pacify villages would be used to assist in the supervision and distribution of the goods.

The South Vietnam Government could then be provided operating funds on a directly controlled monthly basis according to need, thus improving the control and direction needed in the current liaison between our two Governments.

To: Department of State.
Date: September 16, 1965.
From: Amembassy Saigon.
Subject: PL 480 Progress Report—Second Quarter CY 1965.
Reference:
CERP B-1221 (10 FASR-300).
Saigon's A-844, May 13, 1965—AID (US) 15-2 VIET S.
CA-4745, November 2, 1964—AID (US) 15.
CA-3472, September 29, 1964—E2 XR AID (OD) 15-2 XR AID (US) 15-6.
CA-2453, August 30, 1965—AID (US) 15-8.

FOR AGRICULTURE

Part I—Arrivals and unloadings (10 FASR-304.61)

The IBM Automatic Data processing sheets containing information on arrivals and unloadings are forwarded monthly.

No extensive damage to cargo reports were required during the reporting period.

In accordance with comments from FAS/S in future all listing of shipments will be completed prior to forwarding sheets to FAS/W.

Congestion at Da Nang has continued to cause late reporting from that Port. Solution of logistic problems is receiving priority attention from all elements of the U.S. Mission and an easing of the situation is anticipated through deployment of additional U.S. resources.

Part II—Compliance with requirement on resale, etc. (10 FASR-304.62)

The certificate set forth in the "Pattern Report" attached to CA-4745 has been made a part of the IBM page report.

Part III—Compliance with usual marketing (10 FASR-304.63)

GVN has not exported rice during the period and has observed export restrictions.

Part IV—Evaluation

No irregularities or unusual discrepancies were noted in the second quarter of 1965. It is believed information transmitted and GVN assurances are correct and adequate.

Mission continues to press for more timely reporting from Da Nang.

For the Ambassador:

LESLIE C. TINHANY,
First Secretary of Embassy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to the last speaker discussing the AID program in Vietnam. While the observations he makes of the difficulties of our AID program are important, I think to vote against the AID program is the wrong way to solve the problems which he so aptly identifies.

During the debates that have gone on in this country and in this Congress it has been pointed out that the problems of Vietnam not only involve military and economic difficulties, but involve political problems as well.

When we look to the resources here in Washington, D.C., to see what kind of assistance we can offer to that country, we find we have a Military Establishment, which we support at the rate of $50 billion a year, which is able to, and is coping with the difficulties of an insurgency effort in South Vietnam.

But when we look to the economic problems, we find that the AID agency, ordinarily operating in the various continents of the world under peacetime conditions, is suddenly asked to take on major new responsibilities in an insurgency war—a situation for which they have been given no long-term responsibility in terms of advance preparation, training or recruitment of personnel.

The Agency has not been given the long-term responsibility for this kind of contingency and has not been given the advance authority to build up the capabilities which would be required to enable it to do a better job.

This, it seems to me, is one of the drastic shortcomings in our ability to be effective in that very small country. The way to solve this problem is not to cut the AID program and to tell the AID personnel that they are all through and that they have to go home. The way to try to solve this problem is to try to devise long-term programs accompanied by the necessary funding and the development of more effective techniques so that in an insurgency situation, AID can bring in trained personnel and programs and techniques that are suitable for the occasion. We do precisely this kind of advance planning and preparation on the military side. Why do we not do the same for the problems of supporting the civilian economy under wartime conditions?

When we turn to the political side, we must ask, where are the facilities and where are the resources in this country to deal with the political problem? We find that there is no agency in Washington that is competent or has the responsibility for political problems in an insurgency war.

Now there is an agency which works in this field on a limited basis known as the Central Intelligence Agency. But the CIA is neither equipped nor is it a suitable agency to deal with the very acute political difficulties we find in a place like South Vietnam.

So this responsibility has fallen in large part again to the AID agency. If that agency is going to be able to accomplish anything, to make some progress and to meet these responsibilities, the answer is not to cut it back and to say that we are going to terminate the AID program. The answer is to give that agency new power and new authority and new opportunities to build up its capabilities in the economic field as well as in the political field in the context of insurgency wars.

Mr. Chairman, before I turn to my main points about foreign aid, I want to pay tribute to David Bell, retiring Director of the Agency for International Development. His wise and able leadership has been of the highest order. His willingness to do whatever was necessary not only to strengthen the program, but to help explain it and make it better understood, has been gratefully recognized by many Members of Congress. We are fortunate to have an able, experienced successor as director of AID.

I also want to acknowledge the able work of our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Morgan. His counsel and patience have contributed enormously to the successful work of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, in the AID bill that is before this Committee of the Whole, there is an amendment which I hope will substantially improve the ability of that agency to more effectively help the people in the developing world.

This amendment would add a new title IX to the law and it would direct the President in carrying out the economic development and technical assistance programs to place special emphasis on assuring maximum participation in economic development on the part of the people of the developing countries through the encouragement of democratic, private, and local governmental institutions.

This amendment conforms substantially to one of the recommendations made by a group of Republican Congressmen earlier this year. These recommendations were developed largely at the initiative of the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse]. For this reason, I am attaching at the end of my remarks an excellent statement on development prepared by Mr. Morse earlier this year.

It is my judgment, Mr. Chairman, that the new title IX in the bill before us will enable the Agency for International Development to accept a wider perspective and to take a broader look at the way in which the program is presently being administered around the world.

If our AID program is to be successful, we need to involve the people of the developing world in the process of development. It is not enough to work in the capitals of these countries. It is not enough to work with the central governments of these countries. We must focus on building the kind of community participation and on building the private and public institutions so essential to development.

Mr. Chairman, the other day, I read an article by Dr. Arlan L. Rosenbloom, who had 2 years of medical practice in southeast Asia with a Medico team. His team established and operated a clinic and a surgical unit in a small provincial town. The clinic employed modern American medical and surgical techniques, enjoyed tremendous popular success and was closed 3 years later after the Medico team left the country.

Reflecting on this experience, Dr. Rosenbloom concluded that his team's work in southeast Asia was "a personal success but a practical failure." He pointed out that he and his coworkers developed a self-sufficient institution that was "out of the mainstream of the host country's program," and he passed the following lesson to us. He wrote:

> Building our own self-sufficient facilities in other lands so that we can enrich our relationship to our fellow men is a noble, inspiring and ego-satisfying gesture, but it is an impractical device for today's medical needs and an intolerable anachronism in the post-colonial world. Institutions for social, economic, educational, agricultural and health development must be built from within a nation, with the motive force from the citizens of that country. This will provide realistic goals, temper the strangulation of corruption and above all insure permanence. Technical aid, especially teaching, can help build these institutions, but they cannot be molded or controlled by outsiders in the second half of the 20th century. Our best efforts must be directed to this form of aid, to help people "help themselves, for whatever period is required . . . because it is right."

These conclusions of a medical doctor who worked in southeast Asia support my own belief that the shortest, most direct road to economic and social development lies in the direction of assuring maximum participation in the development process by the people of the developing country.

This conviction is further reinforced by the cumulative experience of the foreign aid program with self-help and cooperative undertakings.

Over the years, the Congress—and particularly the Committee on Foreign Affairs—have urged that economic and technical assistance be used for programs of self-help and mutual cooperation. Loans to small farmers, encouragement of cooperative labor unions and savings and loan-type institutions, utilization of American voluntary agencies, and support of integrated programs of community development designed to promote stable and responsible governmental institutions at the local level have been among congressional recommendations. Unfortunately, in spite of these repeated expressions of congressional opinion, we find that popular participation in the development process has been increasing at a very slow rate. The bulk of activities financed with U.S. foreign assistance is directed at industrialization projects which, while necessary and helpful, appear to suffer frequently from two major drawbacks:

First, they tend to promote the development of one sector of an economy in advance of all others; and, second, they leave largely untapped the great potential for planning and implementation of development activities contained in the mass of the people of the developing countries.

This failure to engage the available human resources in the task of development not only acts as a brake on economic growth but also does little to cure the basic cause of social and political instability which poses a constant threat to the gains being achieved on the industrial and related fronts.

It is for this reason that, this year, the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided to take a step with a view to providing a new orientation—and a new emphasis—to our foreign assistance undertaking.

In section 106 of the bill before us, the committee included the amendment which I had offered adding a new title IX to the Foreign Assistance Act. Let us again call attention to the words of this amendment:

TITLE IX—UTILIZATION OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS IN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 281. In carrying out programs authorized in this chapter, emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of the people of the developing countries, through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental institutions.

The purpose of this amendment is clearly outlined on pages 27 and 28 of the committee report accompanying H.R. 15750. It reflects the committee's conviction that the goal of attaining more popular participation in development can best be achieved in the following ways:

Fostering of cooperatives, labor unions, trade and related associations.

Developing community action groups and other organizations that provide the training ground for leadership and democratic processes.

Making possible increased participation of such groups, and of individuals, in planning, executing, and evaluating development.

Strengthening local government to enable local groups to solve their own problems.

Utilizing more broadly and effectively the experience and resources of existing private and voluntary organizations.

Building in general of democratic private and public institutions on all levels—local, State, and National.

As mentioned in the report, the Committee on Foreign Affairs expects to keep close check on the manner in which this new title is carried out. Implementation of this title should lead us to recognize some of the criteria by which to measure progress.

First among the questions which AID will be required to answer is, What are the primary institutions and methods in democratic development? We need agreement on factors as specific, as identifiable, as the economists have devised for measuring the progress of economic development: GNP, per capita income, savings, trade balances, and so on. In our report, the committee has stressed certain rather well-recognized institutions through which the masses of people can participate actively in the development process: cooperatives, trade unions, trade and related associations, local government, and others. Along with these basic institutions, we need to identify other pertinent elements: public participation in the planning process; education of leaders and public on country problems; simple technical-economic measures dealing with priority needs which can be extended rapidly and widely; improvements in the dialog between governments and the people they are intended to serve; and other ways. Having carefully assessed the priority factors, appropriate designations for them are needed; headings as standard parts of our program presentations, and reporting systems.

Next, the types of assistance which can promote the development of democratic institutions must be identified along with the most appropriate and effective ways to channel such assistance.

Third, we will have to determine what percentage of a country's people are being involved, are being "reached" through these institutions and processes. Throughout the world, we have good working examples of most of the institutions and procedures we have in mind. But most of them are limited in scope. In country after country, perhaps only 10 or 15 percent of the potential members and beneficiaries of such institutions and methods are actually involved. We need simple, inexpensive techniques—within a country's present limitations of financial and human resources—to involve not just 10 or 15 percent, but 80 or 90 percent of populations; and reliable criteria for measuring the degree of involvement.

Fourth, we will also have to give thought to the quality of institutions and services. There are some countries, for example, which have a very large number of cooperatives—at least on paper. In reality, however, only a few of those cooperatives are actually viable and effective. A few "big" farmer members get loans; they, in turn, lend at high interest rates to the small farmers. Most of those cooperatives do not have a savings system; or, if they do, a farmer is forced to save without knowing why. Such situations are not helpful to the attainment of our objectives. We must devise relatively meaningful quality measurements to add to those which we use to measure quantity. It will not be easy, but we must develop such practical standards.

The interrelationships of economic, social, and political factors in development have been studied by increasing numbers of scholars in recent years. We are gaining new insights about the development process. But the operational implications from such understanding for our foreign aid program are only now being identified. Several excellent books and papers on this subject have recently been written. I have had the pleasure of reading a manuscript being worked on by Mr. Edgar L. Owens, of AID. It is a brilliant and convincing study of the relationship between democracy and development.

One excellent article in the January 1966 issue of World Politics discusses the social-political aspects of the foreign aid program and seeks to identify the extent to which such factors are acknowledged in the aid program. The author, Robert A. Packenham, examines attitudes in AID toward considerations of political development.

Because of the importance of this article, I am inserting at this point key excerpts from it:

POLITICAL-DEVELOPMENT DOCTRINES IN THE AMERICAN FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

(By Robert A. Packenham)

It is becoming increasingly evident, if it is not clear already, that one of the most critical problems in the overall modernization of the developing countries is political development. In South Vietnam, in the Congo, in Brazil, in Indonesia—all over the underdeveloped world, the capacity of countries to cope with their own problems, and consequently the stance of the United States toward these nations, turns in varying degrees on the successes or failures of the political systems.

* * * * *

Knowledge in this field, although far from adequate, is much greater than it was fifteen years ago, when large-scale aid programs began. It is known, to be specific, that political development usually depends not only upon changes in the economic system, but also upon alterations in social structure, administrative capacity, and that set of attitudes and expectations which has come to be called "political culture." Aware of these dimensions, one can better evaluate the adequacy of the doctrines of political development actually found in the foreign-aid program.

* * * * *

A major goal of U.S. foreign policy is to contribute to the creation of a "community of free nations cooperating on matters of mutual concern, basing their political systems on consent and progressing in economic welfare and social justice." All over the world inadequate performance by political systems is an impediment to the achievement of this goal. Therefore a strategy that could improve that performance would serve the national interest.

* * * * *

I. THE NOTION OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE ACADEMIC LITERATURE

* * * * *

In drawing from a substantial group of writers on the subject, it was found that they tended to stress five conditions as the prime correlates or determinants of political development. The five are these:

A legal-formal constitution prescribing such features as equal protection by the law, the rule of law, regular elections by secret ballot, federalism, and/or the separation of powers (Theodore Woolsey, Woodrow Wilson, John W. Burgess, most comparative government textbooks).

A level of economic development sufficient to serve the material needs of the members of the political system and to permit a reasonable harmony between economic aspirations and satisfactions (Marx, Beard, Milliken and Rostow, Lipset, Coleman, Wolf).

The administrative capacity efficiently and effectively to maintain law and order and to perform governmental output functions rationally and neutrally (Weber, Brzezinski, Pauker, Wriggins).

A social system that facilitates popular participation in governmental and political processes at all levels, and the bridging of regional religious, caste, linguistic, tribal, or other cleavages (Deutsch, Lipset, Scott, Weiner, Kornhauser, Almond).

A political culture—that is, fundamental attitudinal and personality characteristics—among the members of the political system such that they are able both to accept the privileges and to bear the responsibilities of a democratic political process (Almond, Beer, Leites, Inkeles, Lasswell, Parsons, Banfield, Lerner, Pye).

With the possible exception of the legal-formal approach, these determinants are not just hypotheses. There is a substantial body of literature supporting the importance of not only the economic approach but also the social-system and the political-culture approaches.

* * * * *

In fact, the validity of the economic, administrative, social-system and political-cultural approaches is sufficient to use them as a standard for evaluating aid political-development doctrines.

* * * * *

But "open-ended" does not mean "meaningless." We all know that some political systems are more developed than others, even if we have not yet specified the concept or concepts that satisfactorily formalize that intuitive knowledge. Pye points out that observers in both developed and developing societies are uncertain and ambiguous before the very notions of "underdeveloped," "advanced," or "backward," and that some of this uncertainty stems from lack of knowledge about the similarities and differences in the two kinds of societies. Yet, he concludes, "everyone seems to sense that some forms of differences are acceptable, while others are not." It is simply that concepts have not been found that identify clearly which differences are acceptable and which are not.

In the meantime, until political development may be defined more precisely, there is a considerable body of reliable knowledge about its conditions. It is this knowledge, then, that we shall use in formulating operational criteria for evaluating aid doctrines. The standard will be how aid might be used to help create the conditions of political development rather than political development itself. This standard, which embodies an indirect approach to political development, is in important respects less demanding than it would be if it incorporated a direct approach. An indirect approach is less politically sensitive in the recipient country, and it allows a political-development policy within the framework of economic and other aid programs, rather than requiring a separate program specifically for political development.

II. POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY: TOWARD A POLITICAL-DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Among all the attempts at defining the dependent variable reviewed in this article, the dynamic-relational approach—especially as formulated by Halpern—seems the most promising. Halpern's formulation provides a simple yet meaningful model that embraces all political systems without abandoning the contextual principle and without adopting a single-instrument (such as party) strategy that is bound to be inappropriate in some and perhaps in many cases. However, even Halpern's definition should not be relied upon too heavily. The emerging nations are evolving in many and perhaps unique ways. Their political systems may embody "mixes" and processes as yet unknown or at least unrecorded. To invert a felicitous phrase of Professor Huntington's, there is much to be lost (as well as something to be gained) in closing off alternative definitions at this stage. Open-ended political-development models, which specify continuity of development but not necessarily its end point, may well be the appropriate way to approach the problem given the current state of our knowledge.

* * * * *

In thinking about a political-development strategy, it will be useful constantly to bear in mind at least two fundamental considerations. The first is the level and nature of points of access to the process of political development. So far as the nonclandestine instruments of United States foreign policy are concerned, there are two points of access. One is at the level of the central government, through the medium of diplomacy.

The other is at the level of the total society—all the systems (economy, family, community, and so forth) of the society. Here the medium is primarily the economic, military, and technical-assistance and information programs. Of course, aid and information programs depend on the permission of central governments. But the distinction is valid in the sense that diplomats deal almost exclusively with other government elites, whereas aid and information officials often deal primarily with the society at large. We hold that a U.S. policy of political development should use both potential points of access.

The second basic consideration is time span. A policy of political development should consider not only immediate but also medium- and long-range time spans. It should ask, what are the immediate and long-range consequences for political development of the policies of the government in power? Of the diplomatic position of the United States toward that government? Of aid and information programs? What would these consequences be if another government were in power?

* * * * *

At the level of the total society, decisions about economic and military aid, technical assistance, and information programs might take into account not only economic or military but also political-development criteria. Here too the definition of political development as a dynamic relationship can be used. How can the aid and information instruments of foreign policy help political systems maintain and adapt themselves as they confront, generate, and absorb continuing transformation? Existing knowledge about the conditions of political development might also be used to derive some instrumental answers to this question. For example, the economic approach would mean rigorous economic criteria for aid projects, such as those currently employed: capital-output ratios, cost-benefit ratios, rate of marginal saving, rate of export expansion, foreign-exchange position, and the like. The administrative approach would suggest the whole range of technical-assistance activities in public administration and other fields that could improve the recipient governments' output capacities at all levels of government. The social-system approach would suggest use of technical-assistance programs to develop the organizational capacity of labor unions, local communities, private cooperatives, professional and trade associations, newspapers, and the whole range of civic, educational, economic, and other groups that constitute a differentiated social infrastructure. The political-culture approach would suggest political education institutes; political education handbooks; in-service training schools; and politicization of "people to people," participant-training, education, information, and other programs to inculcate democratic values, teach bargaining skills, and in general foster a democratic political culture.

The use of such instruments in specific instances would depend upon a wide variety of factors, such as other demands of foreign policy and—scarcely to be minimized—the experience and intuition of officials on the foreign scene and in Washington about the wisdom of the measures. But the scholars' findings seem sufficiently solid today to be used as guides to suggest policy alternatives. At the very minimum they indicate some crucial new *dimensions* of the conditions of political development—dimensions that are not just economic and administrative but profoundly social and psychological, and that cannot be ignored by the policy-maker.

III. POLITICAL-DEVELOPMENT DOCTRINES IN THE UNITED STATES AID PROGRAM

The remainder of this article describes, and frequently evaluates, political-development doctrines embodied in the United States economic and technical-assistance programs primarily during the period from the spring of 1962 to the spring of 1963. During that year we carried on fifty-four formal interviews with officials from the Agency for International Development (AID) in Washington and had dozens of conversations with other officials, in AID and elsewhere, involved in the aid policy process. In addition to the interviews a large body of published documentary material—laws, hearing testimony, speeches, administrative policy guidelines, manual orders and regulations, congressional reports, and various other kinds of agency memoranda—were surveyed for the study.

A. Political development: a purpose but not a policy

A dominant doctrine, especially among the highest officials, is that the overriding goal of of aid, as of all instruments of American foreign policy, is the creation of a "world community" of free and independent nations, "each free to work out its own institutions as it sees fit, but cooperating effectively in matters of common interest." This goal should not be obscured even by important short- and middle-ranged considerations, such as the cold war, which "we should keep . . . in perspective as only one element in our continuing effort to achieve a viable world order." To the objection that such a goal is beyond the capacity of the U.S. alone to achieve, the doctrine provides that "the United States must nonetheless play the leading role in shaping the history of our time in that direction. This is both the burden and opportunity of our generation in this country."

The political-development content of these statements of purpose is even clearer in other official declarations of basic purpose. In his 1961 Foreign Aid Message to Congress, President Kennedy spoke of the goals of "an enlarged community of free, stable, and self-reliant nations," and "an environment in which the energies of struggling peoples can be devoted to constructive purposes in the world community." In his 1962 Message he said, "Our new aid policy aims at strengthening the political and economic independence of developing countries," and that it reaffirms "our nation's basic interest in the development and freedom of other nations." The President also declared, in his second State of the Union address, that the main goal of foreign aid is to help create ". . . a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others." Finally, the AID Program Guidance Manual (PGM) for 1963 states explicitly that the goal of aid is to assist in the development "of a community of free nations cooperating on matters of mutual concern, basing their political systems on consent and progressing in economic welfare and social justice. Such a world offers the best prospect of security and peace for the United States."

The significance of this doctrine should not be minimized. Official U.S. aid statements do not have to stress such values as world community and independent, democratic (i.e., based on consent) states. This doctrine is a result of a conscious choice—some argue an altogether utopian choice. Nor has the government always argued the case for aid in these terms. During the period from the outbreak of the Korean War until 1960, under the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and its successors, there were few such statements. This doctrine is not meant to be mere rhetoric. It is a serious and constantly repeated goal of United States foreign policy.

Yet these declarations bear little clear relation to specific aid objectives and programs. The approach to political development that is most often relied upon to achieve these objectives is economic; and even it is only implicit.

* * * * *

The interview data reveal this gap still further. At least ten of the respondents spoke of the broad, overall objectives of aid, citing, in substance, the goal of a "world community of mutually independent and democratic nations." Six of these ten took the line that to achieve this goal the best course is "to pursue economic growth consistent with democratic institutions." But they had not a single criterion, other than economic measures, that could serve as an instrumental guide or intellectual tool with which to achieve this goal. Of the other four cases, two illustrate the fundamental ambiguity resulting from the statement of political-development goals at the abstract level and the absence of objectives, concepts, and instruments with which to implement them at the specific level. The chief planning officer in one of the AID regions said, "You know, one thing I've never been clear about is what our fundamental policy is on the question of whether we're trying to promote democracies or not."

The second statement is from an office director in the Latin American region: "We're somewhat schizophrenic here. We want governments that are free and independent but also non-Communist. I suppose this makes our posture that we like them to be free to choose any type of government that won't ally with the Communists—preferably a democratic one."

These two officials have put their finger on a widespread phenomenon in AID: the absence of a clear connection between the goal of the high-level policy statements—helping to achieve a world community of independent nations based upon government by consent—and the real goals that they themselves, as operators, pursue. These two respondents have articulated this gap more than have the others, but it is there, in some measure, in almost every instance.

b. Meanings of "political development"

Not surprisingly, AID officials understood the term "political development" in various ways. This had been anticipated, but even so the meanings attached to the term were different from those expected.

One of the most common responses was, in effect, that political development is anti-Communist, pro-American political stability. According to this interpretation, aid for political development is aid for short-term political purposes. Examples are aid to shore up a crumbling, pro-American government, or aid as a bribe for a military installation, or as a means of meeting a deficit in the country's balance of payments. These uses take little or no account of the economic development plans of the country, which are so dear to the hearts of many AID officials. In fact, they may hurt economic development.

Another meaning is, in effect, economic development. When asked for a reaction to the notion of political development, the respondents approve, and then talk as if we were asking about economic development. A striking example of this was an official who said the Soviet Union was politically developed. When I pursued the point, it turned out he meant that the Soviets have a high standard of living. "Political-development function" means, in these cases, long-term rather than short-term aid; but it also means political development only in the sense of a purely economic approach.

A variant of this theme is the frequently expressed idea that political development is the absence of political impediments to economic developments. Such impediments vary greatly and range from governments whose fixation on stability saps the vitality of economic growth to radical political forces that divert resources away from economically useful activities. In all instances, however, "political development" in this sense is a *means* to achieve the *end* of economic development. The ultimate goal is economic rather than political development.

Another, related, point is the real meaning for many officials of the term "development." AID stands for "Agency for International Development." The concept of "development," we would argue, should include but not be limited to economic development. Yet for a majority of respondents the real meaning of "development" is "economic development." For them, the two terms are interchangeable; AID is, in effect, "Agency for International Economic Development."

Thus "political development" usually means either "short-term political," or "economic development." Nearly all AID officials see the uses of aid primarily in terms of this dichotomy. As a result few officials even conceive of a third alternative, namely, *political development*. The debate between the extremes of short-term, "uneconomic," political uses of aid, on the one hand, and long-term, economic, "nonpolitical uses," on the other, seems to have hindered consideration of still other alternatives, such as (long-term) political development.

In addition, many AID administrators find it very difficult to think about society-wide political change systematically and analytically (as they often can about economic development). Those interviewed also found it almost impossible to deal conceptually with the question of how aid instruments might be used to effect "broad-scale political change." They had a strong tendency to limit the meaning of political development entirely to leadership elites in the existing central government or to those elites, immediately surrounding the existing government, who might succeed it. Elites in other levels of government (provinces, local areas), nongovernmental elites, and nonelites were usually not considered part of the process of political development. All of these tendencies continued even after it was indicated to the respondents that what was meant by political development was long-term broad-scale change in the political system.

C. Explicit attention to political development

The number of places and persons in the aid establishment that are explicitly concerned about political development is not very large. However, it was possible to identify three loci of such attention: research and planning units in the Department of State and AID; some very high-level elites; and a minority of the largely middle-level elites in AID interviewed for this study.

1. Research and Planning Units: At least three research and planning units in the Department of State and AID devoted attention specifically to the question of political development. The Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) of the Department of State had several papers prepared on the subject of political development and the relation of U.S. policy instruments toward it. Papers done for INR in 1962 by Richard Neustadt, Thomas McHale, Chester Bowles, and one unnamed author were circulated restrictedly in the executive branch in the fall of 1962; the paper done anonymously, "Creating Allies for Socioeconomic Progress with Political Stability in Latin America," was, by our standards, very good. It said that the military, the labor unions, and the universities and secondary schools are potential allies of the U.S. for "progress with political stability," and that therefore the U.S. might well try to strengthen them by channeling financial assistance through them.

The paper by Neustadt effectively argued the case for more attention to political development, but it did not do much else. The McHale paper restated the familiar notion that there are fundamental social and attitudinal differences between "folk" and "urban" cultures of which U.S. policy-makers must take cognizance. Bowles' piece fairly pointed out, with some implications for policy, that most of the developing countries are primarily agricultural. INR also commissioned at least two social scientists to do case studies of political development in individual countries. Professor Phillip Taylor of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, a political scientist, did one on Venezuela; and Dr. McHale, an economist with a private economic consulting firm, wrote another on the Philippines. To our knowledge neither report has been made public.

The Policy Planning Staff of the Department of State has also been interested in political development. One member of this staff has written on the subject and was perhaps the man most often identified by aid personnel as a responsible government official who was interested in and knowledgeable about political development. However, he himself was not sanguine about the amount of influence that aid can have on political development. Moreover, like most State Department personnel, he had a strong proclivity to view political development in terms of short-term rather than long-term political change, in terms of elites only rather than the political system at large, and to consider only specific political development activities rather than the maximization of the political-development implications accompanying all assistance activities.

In AID, a major point at which a political-development concern was in evidence was the Program Coordination Staff (PCS), especially its Policy Planning Staff. The Program Guidance Manual (1962) for FY 1964 has some general statements in the text to the effect that political development ought to be a consideration in planning the aid program for each country. Multiyear planning is encouraged. The Manuel sets out a framework for the development of "LAS's" (Long Range Assistance Strategies) for twelve countries, some elements of which are to be applied to all countries, in the "CAP's" (Country Assistance Programs) and "GP's" (Goals Plans). Attention to political development is considerably greater here than in other manual order material we saw. The Program Guidance Manual (PGM) asks that, when planning country programs, current U.S. objectives and policies be analyzed to see whether economic and political objectives are coincidental; whether these objectives are the same for the U.S. as for the countries' leaders; and if they differ, whether the U.S. should try to change them. It then asks that certain kinds of analyses be made of trends in the country—not only economic, but also social, political, and administrative analyses:

"Aid gains in effectiveness as it supports groups that seek the goal of development. The purposes of our aid programs include the encouragement of the forward-looking elements in and out of government, and of political, social and educational reforms which advance the growth of a free and open society. Moreover, progress toward the narrower goal of self-sustained economic growth depends upon the growth and change of attitudes and institutions which fall within the social, political, and administrative sphere. For these reasons, a thorough analysis of the social, political and administrative characteristics of the country and identification of priority U.S. goals in these areas is of fundamental importance for an effective long-range assistance strategy."

The text is supplemented on this point by an annex entitled "Political, Social, and Economic Appraisal," which suggests a number of specific questions this kind of analysis should consider. These questions deal with dimensions of political development that few official documents treat in such detail, namely, the social-system and political-culture dimensions. A partial outline of the annex, with selected excerpts, suggests how far in advance of other guidelines this framework is:

1. Survey of broad social, political, and administrative characteristics of the country.

(a) What are the broad social characteristics?

(1) attitudes towards change

(2) culture, education, and related factors affecting development

(3) stratification

(4) national unity

(b) What are the general political characteristics of the country?

(1) relationship between political leadersihp and important segments of the population

(a) Is the government responsive?

(b) Is a feeling of participation, of willingness to sacrifice, present?

(c) Key groups—how does their attitude toward government affect the ability of the government to implement policies?

(d) Does center-local relationship support initiative and coordination?

(2) political recruitment and competition

(3) articulation of popular demands

"What role do the following play? . . ."

(a) press

(b) military

(c) parties

(d) religious organizations

(e) labor, business, farmers' organizations

(f) aristocrats

(4) strength and stability of present government

(5) ideology, competence, and integrity

(c) What are the general administrative characteristics of the country?

(1) How adequate to development tasks is the basic administrative organization and procedural set-up?

(2) How adequate to development tasks are the caliber and attitudes of administrative personnel?

(3) What is the political climate of public administration?

(d) What are the country's major social and political goals within the next few years or decade?

2. Statement of LAS social and political goals and [their] relation to total country strategy.

(a) Within the context of [the survey outlined] above, what should U.S. strategy view as the most important social and political goals in the country?

"What social, political or administrative changes would be feasible within the next five or ten years in order to alleviate major problems identified above, or to start or accelerate desirable trends?"

(1) political and social goals

"Identification of desirable social and political goals for another country and culture inevitably requires making some value judgments. While particular U.S., British or Western European institutions or practices may not be either feasible or desirable models for other countries, the United States is not indifferent to the direction of social and political development in AID-assisted countries. Since judgments of some kind are essential, it is preferable that they be systematic, considered, and prior to events rather than ad hoc in response to events" (1022.2, B5).

(2) political and social impediments to economic growth

(3) relationship between U.S. and host country statements of goals.

(b) What is the optimal balance for the total country program between more immediately productive types of economic investment, and use of resources to promote social/political goals which may have only indirect and long-run economic impact?

(1) conflicting and complementary goals

(2) level of social investment where demand is intense

(3) level of social investment where demand is not intense

Another annex, "Analysis of Self-Help and Social Development," also displays concern for political development. It provides a list of "standard political and social items" that the country team might "consider . . . and either indicate the country's performance, or explain why the item is not particularly relevant to an analysis of self-help in the country." The items listed are land and income distribution, taxation system, elementary and general education, welfare programs, and political organization and popular participation. Each of these five items is elaborated in a paragraph. The paragraph attached to the last item asks the right questions, if somewhat repetitively:

"Whatever the nature of the present political system, is there a discernible trend toward bridging the gap between the local community and the national political superstructure? Are political participation and leadership becoming more broadly based? Are responsible opposition elements permitted to articulate their views of public needs and are there constitutional means by which they can gain office? Is there increasing willingness to accept electoral results as legitimate? If there is no responsible opposition, or if existing opposition is not permitted to operate freely, can different policy views be expressed and considered within the government? Are civil liberties (speech, press, assembly, worship, fair and speedy trial, freedom from arbitrary arrest and imprisonment) clearly defined and increasingly respected?"

Most of these questions in this guidelines manual are asked for the first time. Before this document was published nobody, either in the field or in Washington, had much guidance on questions they should be asking or concepts they could or should be using. Regarding his experience in Thailand, Neustadt wrote: "What of Washington? To judge from questions asked, reports requested, through the various channels to our Mission staffs, your town had not, as of December last, given much guidance on or voiced much interest in political analysis beyond the range of plots and personalities. As one official put it: 'We don't get many inquiries from any quarter: we pretty much have to guess what they want.' This certainly is not conclusive on the frames of reference held in Washington. But it is rather suggestive."

Because the PGM appeared in August 1962 (after "December last," i.e., 1961), one may hope that there has been some improvement in the situation Neustadt characterized. However, at the conclusion of this study there was considerable reason to believe that there is still not "much guidance" or "much interest" in political development from Washington. Even within the Program Coordination Staff, the office which produced the PGM, it is doubtful that the importance of political-development guidelines was fully accepted. The specific political-development concepts and lists of criteria elaborated at length in the full-length (several hundred pages) PGM (1962) are nowhere visible in a condensed (forty-nine pages) version of the Manual distributed for Agency and public use. The absence of these concepts is significant because the condensation is presented as a "summary statement . . . of the principles which guide U.S. economic assistance programs." Political-development concepts are almost totally absent from the factors that the Program Coordination Staff said in May 1963 determine official aid strategies and types of economic assistance.

* * * * *

2. Highest-Level Foreign Policy Elites: A second locus of explicit attention to political development is found in a few individuals at the highest level of the U.S. foreign-aid policy elite. Secretary of State Rusk, for example, urges that aid be used to help establish "free institutions . . . and . . . development of the individual and family status and dignity." Former Assistant Secretary Edwin Martin says that the U.S. should "support and work with groups who cherish democratic values and constitutional government." When he was the first Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Philip H. Coombs arranged to have as many as forty students from Angola and Mozambique brought to the U.S. to study at Lincoln University. He assumed that these countries would be independent before very long, although no one knew exactly when. After independence, they would need qualified people, including political leaders, if another Congo were to be avoided. In countries like these with small elite populations, an investment in the education and socialization to democratic values and practices of only forty students seemed likely to pay rich dividends for political development. The State Department watched with interest the activities of the Institute of Political Education in Costa Rica, a privately-financed school for young Latin American politicians. While avoiding any formal official commitment, the State Department lent moral support to the Institute and to the efforts of private American groups who helped finance it.

Chester Bowles, formerly the President's Special Representative and Adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American Affairs, and now Ambassador to India, is one of the few very high-level officials consciously and explicitly attentive to the problem of political development. "True development," Bowles has said, must be not only "economic and social," but "political as well . . . political in terms of domestic institutions which create an informed and constructively motivated citizenry." "Institution-building" is a goal of many, but few are those who see it as part of a strategy for political development. An exception is former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs Harlan Cleveland (now Ambassador to NATO). He has said, for example, "We know that the most useful measuring rods in development are those which measure the building of institutions, rather than those which measure only production, trade or national income. We know that technicians who leave institutions behind are good technicians, and technicians who just leave techniques are bad technicians—even if everybody loves them and they are fairly dripping with cultural empathy. We know that the vigorous effort by almost all technical specialists to exclude politics from their calculations is doomed to failure."

There are still others who could be mentioned. But they are a small minority. By and large the high-level officials do not give attention to the analysis of political development prior-to-events rather than *ad hoc* in response to events; nor do they recognize again prior-to-events, "the importance of political advancement as a central [or even a peripheral] aspect of foreign policy and operations."

3. Middle-Level Elites.—The Interview Sample: The third locus of attention to political development is found in the interview sample. Among these fifty-four officials, nearly all of whom are middle-level elites, a minority of seventeen—not quite one-third—may be said to display some attention to political development. These are officials who give some indication of having thought about political development sufficiently that it might influence some of their aid decisions. These seventeen display doctrines corresponding to approaches to political development in the following proportions: legal-formal, none; economic, six; administrative, nine; social-system, seventeen; political-culture, thirteen.

It is notable that the legal-formal approach is nowhere in evidence. Thus among not only the academicians but also these operators, legal-formal concepts of political development are not regarded as useful. It may be observed here that there is little evidence in this entire study that Banfield's charge, "Our faith that democracy can regenerate the world without coercion has led us to try one legal or institutional gadget after another," is accurate with respect to the attitudes of AID administrators. The vast majority of our evidence suggests little tendency to try to achieve political development by legal-formal means.

The administrative approach is expressed primarily in the stress on stability, or order for its own sake. This view is that aid should assist administrative apparatuses to cope with any disorder; there is less concern that it help them cope with and generate social transformation. This doctrine is found equally among generalists and public administration specialists—often more vehemently and with less sophistication among the former than the latter. Among the specialists, the administrative approach expresses itself specifically in references to the need for more public services, public-safety programs, and public administration in general.

It is frequently suggested that American foreign-aid doctrine and policy give a disproportionate amount of emphasis and resources to aid programs in administration as such. This is not quite correct. David S. Brown has pointed out that only about eight percent of U.S. technical-assistance funds from 1945 to 1963 went for public administration. Given the demands put on administrative apparatuses by social mobilization, it can well be argued, as Brown does, that the quantity of aid resources devoted to public administration in its various forms should be increased rather than decreased. First, however, other weaknesses of the administrative-approach doctrine should be corrected. One weakness is that programs of public administration are no more part of a strategy of political development than are most other technical-assistance programs. This should change. Moreover, the general stress on order and stability for their own sakes should give way to a more adequate political-development strategy, such as one that helps political systems to cope with and generate continuing transformation.

Expressions of the social-system and political-culture approaches are primarily at the level of (a) group life (e.g., development of alternatives to existing political power groups, land reform, institution-building, support of groups fostering democratic values and constitutional government), or (b) attitude change among adults (e.g., the Political Education Institute in Costa Rica, diplomatic pressure urging military juntas to hold elections, as in Peru in 1962 and Guatemala in 1963). A third possibility—childhood, especially schooltime, socialization—does not appear to have been tried. Perhaps it cannot be tried because this area is too sensitive and politically dangerous for U.S. foreign policy to become involved in it. Yet in light of the apparent importance of political socialization for political development, the mere existence of this lacuna is significant. For it means either that an important dimension of political development is inaccessible to influence by the instruments of foreign policy, or that an important opportunity for such influence is not being used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state that I favor the current U.S. foreign aid program authorization. I believe economies and cuts can be made in the amounts, but U.S. military and economic foreign aid is clearly necessary for our U.S. security, and the defense and progress of the free world. We in the United States, with our power and stability, must stand behind our friends and allies who are in the developing countries and who are in danger from infiltration and terrorism at home, and aggression from abroad.

Likewise the United States must help the people of emerging and new countries to develop if we are to maintain our position as the leaders of the world for freedom, peace, and progress, better living conditions, and education for all. We citizens of the United States have a world responsibility that we should not neglect, and cannot avoid, except at our peril and the increase of tyranny.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed 2-year U.S. foreign aid authorization provision. It is my firm belief that a 1-year authorization which coincides with the annual Federal budget, prepared for each Government fiscal year, should be continued. The Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress on my position would remain at 5-year authorizations but even on these, we must make sure that this does not develop loose handling, if so, we should return to 1-year basis.

The U.S. foreign aid program causes a fight and hot dispute in Congress each year. It should. The dangers are great, and the security of the American people is at stake.

The world in these days changes fast, and U.S. foreign policy must be hammered out constantly to meet these serious problems on an immediate basis.

To decide the exact amount needed to be authorized for U.S. foreign affairs programs throughout the world for 2 years, by multiplying the current year's authorization by the simple number of 2, is pure folly. No man, no Federal administration, and no Congress is that smart, and I am sure the world will not stand still to fit into such simple arithmetic calculations. It is pure nonsense to multiply the various authorizations by a doubling process as there are many categories and varieties of aid in many countries. The authorization process then becomes a formality, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee is put on the shelf for 2 years, while the House Appropriations Committee with annual legislation then takes over jurisdiction to set the foreign policy.

Is this basic change of U.S. foreign policy administration good? My answer is definitely "No." I oppose this weakening of the U.S. Congress. This bill will result in a real "heyday" for all bureaucrats. If this procedure of 2-year authorizations is good for such a serious field as foreign policy, why shouldn't the U.S. Congress adopt the same rule for all Federal Government departments, bureaus, and agencies? This would open the gates wide for bureaucracy and effectively remove the control of the U.S. Congress and the American people.

When the 2-year authorization bill is passed for U.S. foreign aid, it becomes an open promise and a red apple, held out to all comers for the next year. It plainly states that U.S. lavish generosity will be continued regardless of the progress of the Vietnam war, inflation, or problems at home. The die will be cast to give U.S. foreign affairs programs precedence over all other programs, war, progress or peace, by this prior commitment of the U.S. Congress. This procedure will be fair notice that the supervision and inspection of U.S. foreign aid policy by the U.S. Congress as an overall policy will be cut down 50 percent. It will also mean that the weight and policymaking power of the bureaucrats is being increased that much in determining U.S. policy abroad.

I should like to point out some other provisions of the foreign aid bill that I think should be specifically mentioned. I first refer to section 620(n) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. Last year the House Foreign Affairs Committee placed a provision in the act that I thought was better and stronger, but the conferees on the Senate-House conference committee, in adopting the conference report, changed the language so that (n) reads:

> In view of the aggression of North Vietnam, the President shall consider denying assistance.

And so forth. The managers on the part of the House accepted the argument that negotiations on this matter of recipient countries of U.S. aid, would be more effective if there was not a rigid requirement that aid be terminated. I favored the position last year, that U.S. aid by statute should be terminated for any recipient countries of U.S. aid, who trade, or assist North Vietnam.

The bill that we have now before us contains the following stronger language which I firmly favor:

> (n) In view of the aggression of North Vietnam, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965—
>
> (A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to North Vietnam—
>
> (i) any items of economic assistance.
>
> (ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or
>
> (iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and
>
> (B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from North Vietnam.

I want to point out further specific prohibitions against furnishing U.S. assistance in section 620 of the foreign aid bill:

> SEC. 620. PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.— * * *
>
> * * * * *
>
> (i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts, *or is participating officially in any international conference to plan activities involving insurrection or subversion,* directed against—
>
> (1) the United States,
>
> (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased, *or such participation has ceased*, and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed, *or that such participation will not be renewed or repeated*. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

* * * * *

[(1) No assistance shall be provided under this Act after December 31, 1966, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1).]

(l) The President shall consider denying assistance under this Act to the government of any less developed country which, after December 31, 1966, has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1).

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Todd].

Mr. **TODD**. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate on the foreign aid authorization bill, it has been clearly brought out that the purpose of the programs is to assist the development of other nations so that their citizens may lead fruitful, meaningful, and peaceful lives. It has become equally clear that this purpose bill will not be achieved without economic progress, which in turn provides increasing resources per person in the developing countries.

But one point must be made very clear: Neither the United States, nor any nation in this world, has the resources required to guarantee increasing per capita incomes in most developing nations as long as the present worldwide population explosion continues.

To suggest otherwise is to delude both ourselves and our friends. We must be careful to avoid an escalation of expectation—for to falsely increase the expectations ourselves and our friends will result in turning our hopes into disillusionment, and our friends into enemies.

We must be realistic. This Congress has been so. We have authorized the use of counterpart funds for meeting the population explosion. We have recognized that food for freedom will not prevent mass starvation 10 years from now unless steps are taken to bring population growth into line with growth of food supplies. And in our foreign aid, we have begun to recognize that assistance, upon request of the nation involved, in family planning programs is an integral and essential ingredient of a viable development program.

This is why I am pleased that AID has seen fit to utilize some of its dollar appropriations for family planning assistance. This was started in a timid way. Now it is time for AID to move more rapidly and to provide dollar assistance to all aspects of the program. The agency should fill every reasonable request for material assistance to family planning programs, which it receives. I trust it will do so, as there is nothing in this bill to prevent it and in the context and purpose of the legislation, it is clearly necessary.

I should like to explain briefly why I am so concerned that AID move more rapidly in the area of family planning. Let us assume per capita income in the less developed countries averages $100 per capita per year. In these countries, there are about 2.2 billion people. The population of these countries is increasing by about 50 million per year. Simply to maintain present per capita income, total income in these countries must increase by about $5 billion per year. At a return on capital of 15 percent per annum, it will require a capital investment of $33 billion to provide this increase of $5 billion in income. And the capital investment will have to grow at least as rapidly as the populations.

Clearly, these staggering sums are not available. Clearly, in the absence of a reduction in the rate of population growth, poverty will increase. Clearly, it is utterly unrealistic to promote the possibility of economic development, without slowing down these rates of population growth.

Now, do we have the resources to provide family planning services to those who want them? The answer is unequivocally, "Yes." The estimated cost of providing these services is between 10 and 30 cents per head of population per year, depending upon the other maternal and child health services which are provided at the same time. The total sum is between $220 and $660 million. So $1 on family planning is as effective as $50 to $100 without family planning. This should be taken into consideration in allocating our AID dollars, since they are limited, and they should go to those people whom they can help, and not where they will be wasted.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I insert remarks delivered, off the cuff by a noted economist, Dr. Stephen Enke, as his own opinions at a Partners for Progress conference held in Washington on May 5, 1966:

Economists have not contributed very much to the problem analysis of population growth and economic development, I am ashamed to say this, because what is badly needed here are more numbers, more numerical analysis.

This brings me to the point that most governments view economic development in terms of raising per capita income. Now, per capita income is a ratio. It is gross national product, the enumerator, and population the denominator.

If you want to raise the ratio one way is to make the numerator go up and have the denominator go down. Now, we obviously are not going to reduce population.

So the real issue is—

Should we spend our resources in economic development programs, in mostly accelerating the increase in output, in the numerator, or using resources to slow the rate of population growth.

Now, any superficial analysis would indicate that if I want to take, say a million dollars of resources to increase output, I can put them either into factories, dams or irrigation ditches, and so on, or I can put that money into family planning clinics—

The effect on per capita is just about a hundred times greater if you spend the million dollars worth of resources on slowing population growth rather than trying to increase the output. Work on the denominator and not on the numerator, that is part of the message.

This number of a unit of one hundred depends on about three parameters—any parameter could be wrong by a factor of two. If they are all wrong, it would still be about twelve times to one which is not bad.

If they are all in favor of my argument it would be eight hundred to one. I think one hundred to one is conservative. This is not an argument that one only spends economic development resources slowing population growth.

The argument is that one uses resources to slow population growth and to have dams, factories and all of the rest of it. You have to do both, and we will get to the balance question in a little while.

An economically operated planned parenthood campaign should cost roughly a dollar a year per acceptor, or per practitioner, depending on the mix of contraceptive methods used. This dollar estimate assumes it is the Coil they are using because this is most economical over a period of time, far more than the pill; with a well-decided economical mix of methods, about a dollar a year per acceptor, or per member of a clinic.

If you want an adequate program which will say cut the birth rate by about one-third, you are going to get about one person out of ten of the total practicing control effectively.

This is equivalent to saying that the cost of an effective, adequately sized program is about ten cents a year per head of population in the country.

So if you look at it—it is interesting then to take countries like Brazil, India and Egypt—what would happen if they did spend ten cents a head of population on family planning clinics and so on?

What would this represent in the economic development budget?

You look at the so-called developing countries and you will find that ten cents per head, if spent on planned parenthood, would represent about one percent of what is spent on all economic development programs.

This is true of Brazil, Egypt, or any where else.

One percent, if they would use it, would do the work of the other ninety-nine, would be as effective as the other ninety-nine.

First, it is worth remembering because few people understand it.

Now, a million dollars of resources will be at one time more effective in raising per capita income if spent in slowing population growth rather than increasing output growth. It takes about a dollar per practitioner of birth control per year.

You have to have about one out of ten people in the country practicing birth control to have some effective program. That is ten cents per head of population.

That is about one percent of what most backward countries are now spending altogether on all kinds of economic development.

This is kind of interesting.

Now, rather more subtle, which I should not attempt here, but I will, is that it is not just a question of saturation. We are always thinking of the Ganges Valley, the Nile Valley, for instance, of being saturated with people. We see a problem there.

But really the high birth rate is a matter of interest even in the Amazon which has a lot of the same sort of resources going on for miles—it is bad to have so high a birth rate.

The argument is sort of like this—

If the birth rate is sort of like forty per thousand a year and if the result of population increase is doubled about every twenty-five to thirty years, or so, you have to double your stock, so-called, or double your technological level to stay ahead.

It is the pace at which the population grows that matters.

Let's examine a country that is developing fairly rapidly. The death rate falls fast. The birth rate remains the same. Therefore, the rate of natural increase is high.

How long can they do it, is the question. For a while, yes.

Take India again—if they go on like they are at present, it would mean eight times, eight times as many people in a hundred years. That is just impossible.

One of two things has to happen. The birth rate has to come down and/or the death rate has to go up. That is just all there is to it.

How do they die? They are not going to die of high food consumption. They are not going to die out of going in swimming pools.

They are going to die of all the unpleasant things that happen to poor and starving people.

So anybody who argues against advancing as rapidly as possible planned parenthood is arguing for death by starvation. He may not realize that but he is.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15570, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

Since the time mankind first inhabited this planet by His divine will, there has been and ever will be a world of change, diversity, contrast, and contradiction. Common to all civilizations, past and present, is the fact that humanity has been confronted with three great and mortal forces—fever, famine, and war. History offers solid evidence that nations have from time to time diverted their national resources and their manpower from that side of life which contributes to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth and peaceful and physical well-being in order to pursue conquest and to maintain their armaments. The tapping of man's sources of strength for expanding the priceless benefits of education and for providing adequate and safe shelter, food, and protection from disease and natural disasters, has frequently given way to the reckless inflation and dissipation of energies toward the useless destruction of man, bird, and beast.

Throughout the vast areas of the world, an immense burden of poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease weighs heavily upon millions of people. These circumstances have contributed to unrest and chaos. They have spawned the acts of terror and violence and exploitation of men, women, and innocent children. It is not strange, then, that dissatisfaction with the world in which we live and the determination to realize one that shall be better characterizes the yearnings and the mood of mankind in the receding years of the 20th century.

Not too many years ago, the freedoms enjoyed and cherished by Americans, the British, and other free peoples were challenged by ruthless Nazi and Fascist dictators and aggressors. When World War II ended, victor and vanquished alike pondered in great sadness their mindless wisdom as their lands laid ravaged, their resources spent, and millions of their youth slain. It is paradoxical and pathetic that men, capable of exercising their intellect and reason and of practicing the religion of peace, still fail to recognize that those who pursue the religion of war and conquest breed only self-conceit, intolerance, and crimes upon humanity.

A little more than 18 years ago, Congress met in joint session to act on President Truman's urgent proposal to aid Greece which was appealing for American assistance in preserving her government and her freedoms from Soviet Russia's menacing and aggressive tendencies. President Truman told the Congress:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

President Truman's remarks to the 80th Congress are as timely as the news reports in our daily newspapers. In 1948, it was Greece, where Communist terrorists reinforced by infiltration from the north and abetted by Moscow, were attempting to disrupt the Greek nation. Today it is South Vietnam where an armed aggressor, the Vietcong controlled and supported by Hanoi and incited by Red China, is trying to forcefully impose its will on South Vietnam.

The free world's adversaries are those who preach and practice world communism—adversaries as treacherous as freemen have ever faced. Their aim, cloaked in every conceivable form of deception and brought to bear with skill and cunning, is to systematically harass, isolate, and crush the United States, her allies, and other struggling young nations where freedom flourishes. In southeast Asia, the Chinese Communists under Mao Tse-tung have created the strategy and the techniques of isolating Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which they have designated as "rural areas of the world," together with the industrialized West, which they describe as "cities," with the ultimate objective of complete subjection to their rule. The immediate and crucial test of this Communist offensive against freedom is, of course, in Vietnam.

THE EFFORTS OF OTHER AID-GIVING COUNTRIES

In total, the Western industrialized countries have been providing about $6 billion in official "aid"—official, bilateral flows of financial resources—to developing countries in each of the last 4 years—1960 to 1964. The United States in 1964 furnished about 60 percent of the total of the $6 billion—other countries, 40 percent—or about 0.56 percent of the U.S. gross national product for that year. Three other nations furnished an additional 30 percent; France 15 percent, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany 7 to 8 percent each. As a percentage of gross national product, French aid was almost twice as high as the United States, while the United Kingdom and Germany were slightly lower.

The United Kingdom and Canada give better loan terms than the United States. The former nations can make loans without interest, while the latter nation has adopted International Development Association terms for some of its lending; that is, 50-year maturity and a 10-year grace period and interest at three-fourths of 1 percent.

Of the $6 billion of 1964, $1.8 billion was in the form of loans. About $4.2 billion of the $6 billion was in the form of grants; and $1.2 billion of the $4.2 billion represented agricultural surplus commodities given by the United States. Another $1 billion represented grants for technical assistance and related purposes. These include large sums which were, in effect, subsidies to the government of countries recently independent which maintained the employment of former British, French, and Belgian civil servants who had been a part of the colonial administration.

Of the remaining $1.6 billion of the total grants of $4.2 billion, about $0.4 billion consisted of constributions to multilateral institutions. The most important of these are the European Development Fund of the European Economic Community—largely for the benefit of African countries formerly under French and Belgian administration associated with the European Economic Community—the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, and the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The Development Assistance Committee has 14 members; United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Canada, the three Scandinavian countries, Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, and Portugal. This indicates the international interest in foreign assistance.

There have been international arrangements made for 10 developing countries by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. There are two International Bank for Reconstruction and Development consortia for India and Pakistan; two Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consortia for Turkey and Greece; and six International Bank for Reconstruction and Development consultative groups for Colombia, Malaysia, Nigeria, Sudan, Thailand, and Tunisia.

Members of the India consortium make available about $1 billion per year of which the United States share is 42 percent—other countries, 58 percent; members of the Pakistan consortium make available over $400 million per year, of which the U.S. share is 49 percent—other countries, 51 percent; and pledges to the Turkey consortium total $300 million per year, of which the United States puts up 47 percent—other countries, 53 percent.

To summarize, foreign aid by other major countries shows the following breakdown:

French aid amounted to $840 million in 1964. This is a decline from a 1962 total of almost $1 billion. 1965 French aid was slightly less than 1 percent of the total French gross national product. Three-fourths of this aid was in the form of grants, almost all of these grants were to former colonies in Africa.

British aid amounted to $500 million in 1964. There has been a small, irregular increase during recent years. This total is about 0.5 percent of the total British gross national product for that year. Most of their aid is concerned with nations in the Commonwealth.

German aid amounted to $460 million in 1964. This was a decrease from the high point in 1961 of over $600 million—less than 0.5 percent of gross national product and 65 percent of this aid was in the form of loans.

Japanese aid amounted to $180 million in 1964. This was 0.25 percent of their total gross national product. Most of this aid is in the form of indemnification and reparations payments and loans.

Canadian aid amounted to $130 million in 1964. This represents 0.30 percent of the total gross national product for that year. There has been a marked increase in Canadian aid and commitments are rising as well.

There have always been and will continue to be those bitter critics of foreign aid, both within and outside the Congress, who have never favored giving any U.S. aid to foreign countries. Most of these critics have always proclaimed that American tax dollars should be used only for the benefit of the American people. And I suspect that another segment of the bitter critics of foreign aid have always opposed the program on the thesis that a dollar saved in any Government program would eventually mean reduced taxes and more dollars in the pockets of the American people.

But it is not alone the basic humanitarian interest of the people of the United States which has generated their support of foreign aid to many countries where the program has so successfully operated in the past years. It has also been the firm and necessary policy that foreign aid is in the basic interest of national security. Foreign aid has been and continues to be an important and effectual arm of American foreign policy.

Foreign aid in the form of military aid has provided the United States with the necessary oversea bases which have successfully enabled us to contain Communist expansionism and aggression around the globe since the end of World War II. In this regard our military bases in the Pacific and the Asian area are proving to be equally as important as those which we have maintained in the Atlantic and Mediterranean areas.

We cannot expect to promote the best interest of the United States in the future without a foreign aid program. Foreign aid will be with us for a long time. It can no more be abandoned than could the National Manufacturers Association or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Foreign aid as an instrument of foreign policy will continue to enable the United States to promote its basic interests in furthering the economic and peaceful development of the fastly growing populations of the emerging nations around the globe.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank most warmly the distinguished ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], for yielding me time.

I rise in support of H.R. 15750, and I am happy to note that this bill reflects a number of ideas advanced by 25 members of the minority—worked out largely at the intiative of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and released on March 15, 1966—calling for major new directions in foreign aid if we are "to guide the revolution of rising expectations in a peaceful course toward political stability and economic prosperity."

Specifically, this paper made a number of suggestions that are reflected in H.R. 15750 and which enjoyed bipartisan support in the Foreign Affairs Committee. For example, the Republican statement had as its third recommendation:

> The United States foreign aid program should place new emphasis on the need for growth of popular participation in the development programs of the developing countries and the increased capacity of recipient governments to perform effectively in the broad spectrum of development tasks.

Section 281 of H.R. 15750 creates a new title IX entitled "Utilization of Democratic Institutions in Development." This title provides:

> In carrying out programs authorized in this chapter, economic development on the part of the people of the developing countries, through the encouragement of democratic private and local government institutions.

Similarly, our statement incorporated a suggestion of the National Citizens' Commission to the White House Conference on International Cooperation that a Private Investment Development Board be established. Section 301(a)(3) of the instant bill provides for the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council "to make recommendations to the administrator of the foreign assistance program with respect to particular aspects of program and activities where private enterprise can play a contributing role."

Further, I am pleased to note that section 103(c)(3) of the bill provides a grant of 3 million Israel pounds for the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem, one of the important and great medical institutions in the world. This modern medical center—supported by thousands of American women of Hadassah throughout the United States—carries out a comprehensive program of treatment, teaching, and research in medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacology. Many of the nearly 1,500 enrolled students at the center come from the developing nations of Africa and Asia. In my judgment, this grant—the equivalent of $1 million American dollars—is a wise use of excess foreign currencies and will be well used in the construction of needed residence facilities for nurses.

Primarily, Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the question of Vietnam. I should like to raise some cautionary flags.

I support the general principle of what we are trying to do there in foreign aid, but I believe certain points should be carefully looked at by the committee and by the several departments of the Executive.

I am referring to the commercial or commodity import program—CIP—which to date has provided about $1.7 billion for balance of payments and budgetary support to the Government of South Vietnam. Under this bill the CIP will benefit very substantially from the $550 million authorized for supporting assistance in each of fiscal years 1967 and 1968. The CIP generates counterpart funds—the title of which rests with the Government of South Vietnam but which are used under joint agreement of the United States and South Vietnam.

The fact of the matter is that there is substantial indication which has been developed in testimony before the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee that the United States has lacked sufficient control over these counterpart funds.

It is clear that discussions are held between the Governments of South Vietnam and the United States and annual agreements worked out on the programs to be funded. However, it is unfortunately equally clear that we have lacked the flexibility to modify or shift the use of counterpart funds for these agreed-upon programs if they do not work out or if urgent needs develop elsewhere.

I believe it is very important that the Embassy in Saigon have the strongest backing from Washington on taking a fair but tough line to insure that these funds actually are used efficiently and for the purposes which the Congress and the Executive determine essential in the national interest.

What we are talking about here is some 25 billion piasters, or $250 million in the coming year. I might add in passing, it is important in these agreements that we take a very hard look at the pressures of inflation and make sure that the relationship of the piaster to the dollar, in spite of the recent devaluation, is not disadvantageous to the United States. In a word, I am hopeful that there will be serious discussions in Saigon looking to tightening up this program, which has not always been administratively run with the flexibility or the toughness which was required, in my judgment.

Secondly, for too long the operation of the port of Saigon has been inefficient at best. Until January of this year, there were some six South Vietnamese departments concerned with its operation.

More recently, it has been put under single management and some improvements have been effected, including a substantial improvement in the unloading of tonnage. However, civilian cargo is still unloaded in 8-hour-a-day shifts and serious steps are still required to insure truly effective and more honest management of the port.

It is estimated that up to 25 percent of some shipments have been improperly handled and in some cases have not reached their proper destinations. It is my hope that major steps will be taken to insure the sound operation of the port including warehousing, to deny opportunity to profiteers, and to see to it that supplies will move to their correct destinations in prompt support of our men in the field and civic and economic reconstruction programs of South Vietnam.

Lastly, I think that foreign aid programs in support of civic action and reconstruction in concert with political action teams will only be effective if they are backed by major reforms in South Vietnam itself. I have particular reference to the need for major—not token—land reform. Many in South Vietnam would have much great conviction if they owned their own land rather than farming it as tenants—often to absentee landlords.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio for her characteristically fine job of guiding the minority members of the committee in the preparation of this bill. Her constructive leadership did much to enable the committee to produce some important changes in our foreign aid program.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] for his reference to the work of 25 Republican Members of the House in making recommendations on the foreign aid bill this year. I particularly want to call the attention of the House to the importance of title IX of the bill, a new provision on the "Utilization of Democratic Institutions in Development." The new title was proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], and gives the Agency for International Development the opportunity—indeed it challenges the Agency—to take an entirely new approach toward the business of development. The proposal reflects the recommendations of the Republican paper of March 15.

It clearly implies a mandate to AID to take advantage of the importance of developing a human infra-structure as distinguished from the almost exclusively economic emphasis of previous programs.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee noted in its report that it plans to keep "close check on the manner in which the intent of this new title IX is going to be carried out."

I also would like to call the attention of the House to the inclusion in H.R. 15750 of a number of the other recommendations contained in the Republican paper. The paper urged that the recommendations of the Watson Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid be given careful attention. The committee was informed of a number of instances in which AID is moving in this direction. In addition, the committee adopted an amendment recommended by the Watson committee that will extend the maximum term of guaranties of equity investment from 20 to 30 years.

Still another Republican recommendation incorporated a suggestion of the National Citizens' Commission to the White House Conference on International Cooperation that a Private Investment Development Board be established. Section 301(a)(3) of the bill before us provides for the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council which will make recommendations to the administrator of the foreign aid program on areas and projects where private enterprise can make a positive contribution.

Similarly, the Republican paper stressed the need for a particular emphasis on development in Latin America. We are heartened to learn from the testimony of Administrator Bell that three of the eight countries for which development loans are planned are in Latin America—Brazil, Chile, and Colombia.

A significant portion of the paper was devoted to proposals for greater engagement of the people in the process of their own development. This is the theory behind the new title IX and I am pleased to note language in the committee report that encourages AID to make use of a variety of indigenous organizations "which provide the training ground for leadership and democratic processes."

We also called for AID support to private foundations here in the United States which are doing their best to facilitate competence in government and broaden the base of popular participation. One of those, which we specifically mentioned, is the International Development Foundation of New York. I hope that the language in the committee report indicating "increased reliance upon nongovernmental organizations with a demonstrated competence to enlist popular participation in the development process" will be taken very seriously by AID.

Consistent with the idea of broadening the base of popular participation in development in the emerging nations is the concept of enlarging the role for the private groups here in our own country. Sometimes, we forget the great number, variety and dedication of the groups working in the development field. The House Foreign Affairs Committee called attention to this last year with the publication of a catalog listing the oversea programs of U.S. nonprofit private organizations. We have not, however, had sufficient coordination of these private efforts in the Agency for International Development. The establishment of a coordinating mechanism was one of the points stressed in the Republican paper. I am happy to note in section 301(a)(1) of the bill before us a direction that there be established "an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this act, and in the coordination of such programs with ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernmental U.S. institutions."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that while these constructive recommendations were proposed by 25 Republican House Members, they received significant bipartisan support. I have already mentioned Mr. FRASER's contribution. He has long recognized the need for a new approach to foreign aid. He delivered an excellent paper on this subject at a private meeting a few months ago and I include the text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT: THE MISSING DIMENSION OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD DEVELOPING NATIONS

(By Congressman DONALD M. FRASER)

Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, and friends, it is my deep conviction that political development is, indeed, the missing dimension in American policy toward the developing nations. By political development I mean the fostering, stimulation, and guidance of fundamental social structures and behaviors that make effective self-government possible.

The U.S. Government for too long has been content to deal only formally with other nations, pushing and prodding through diplomatic channels, using the leverage which our aid gives us to influence decisions, and occasionally stimulating a coup.

We have inadequate communication with the various groups and forces in developing societies and are able to exert little influence upon the shape of new forces. This deficiency becomes acute when a nation comes under insurgency attack. We step up our assistance and our military involvement, but we lack competence to deal with the political aspects of insurgency wars.

We proclaim as basic public policy our intention to get new nations to stand on their own feet as stable and responsible members of the international community. Yet it seems to me that we usually treat those nations as though they already have the capacity to run their own affairs, if we only give them a substantial addition to their material resources.

I hesitate to use an anthropomorphic analogy because I fear that just such an unstated assumption may underlie some of our present neglect of political development effort.

A child matures to adulthood, at least physically, pretty much without human intervention, given a reasonable diet and protection against the harshest threats to his life. We don't really teach a child to stand or walk—we merely encourage him to follow our example when he is physiologically ready. Without our intervention doubtless he would stand and walk and run as soon and as well on his own as with our coaching.

Our present international policies have largely relied on economic and military aid—analogous to the food and security needed by a child. I suspect that we have assumed these measures would allow the recipient young nations to mature politically by some automatic inner-directed process toward stable, responsible nationhood.

But we know far too little about political development of societies to rest our hopes on such an assumption of automatic political maturation. I for one am convinced that we must take a far more deliberate and more comprehensive role toward developing nations. We should systematically try to trigger, to stimulate, and to guide the growth of fundamental social structures and behaviors among large numbers of people in other countries if we are to insure political development commensurate with the technological and defensive military prowess we are already striving for.

To return to the human analogy I warned against earlier, sophisticated parents know that the emotional and social maturation of their children requires far more conscious effort on their part than their physical development does. Surely we can alert ourselves to the need for encouraging political growth if we hope them to become well-rounded nations.

Although U.S. interest in political development includes a wide range of considerations, including a better understanding of the effect of what we are already doing, tonight I am taking a narrower, more specific approach. I shall stress the importance of working with people and ideas and attempting to exert influence from the bottom up instead of from the top down. It is our failure to become involved with the various elements in a developing society which is the focus of my concern.

Before I discuss the policies we should adopt in the political field, I need to anticipate several objections:

Some might ask whether I am proposing to transfer the sophisticated concepts of American political democracy to the developing nations. This is not what I am proposing. Political development doesn't mean a wholesale transfer of American values to other cultures, nor does it prescribe a competitive, two party system for societies which are barely holding together. I am proposing that the U.S. become involved with the people of the developing nations and work with them as they shape their own future. This future is bound up in political values and political action.

Some will object that I am proposing to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. It is true that nations are sensitive to interference, and when you reach in to touch their politics you may hit a sensitive nerve. Of course we need to be circumspect and avoid interfering directly in political decision-making.

But there are many ways to become involved in the political development of another nation. We are already working overseas with the consent of governments in areas related to political development:

The campesino leadership training program—run by the Farmers Union and funded by AID

Credit union and cooperative development—run by various cooperative organizations and funded by AID

Training of trade union leadership—through the AIFLD with joint labor-management support and AID funds

Community development projects under AID

Educational development abroad under public and private sponsorship

U.S. military training with its emphasis on democratic values given to military personnel of the developing nations

Sister relationships between institutions such as states, cities, universities, etc.

The Peace Corps

Training of citizen leadership by groups such as the League of Women Voters

Another reason why our activities are not felt to be interference is that our political aims are consistent with those of the developing nations. They hold self-determination as one of their highest principles. We seek to advance and protect that right.

Self-determination is closely linked to the idea of self-government. This is America's great heritage. By exploiting and promoting this principle, we can be more potent than the Communists in influencing political development. The Communists exploit grievances as a stepping stone to a rigid, doctrinaire regime. Democratically-oriented leadership in a developing country can be just as determined to alleviate grievances.

I hope these objections can then be laid aside.

The recommendations which I shall make about political development seek to answer two questions: Who should take the responsibility for an increased effort, and what direction should these efforts take?

The urgency of gaining competence in political work is underscored by Vietnam. When the President or the Secretary of State wish to intensify our efforts in Vietnam they can turn to our military establishment which is trained and ready to serve. They can call upon our AID people, already in place and operating. But, as we are reminded so frequently, the problem is primarily political. Where do our leaders turn for operating competence in the political development field? Where in Washington is responsibility centered? Whatever competence we may be developing under fire in Vietnam, such as the work of General Lansdale, the back-up responsibility in Washington is obscure and diffuse.

A country with the stresses of Vietnam requires a highly integrated effort in which the lead is taken by those charged with the political problem. A first class political effort in such a country requires the same careful planning, training, and organizing as our military efforts.

We must give some agency this operating responsibility. The State Department should not take this assignment. Its role is to deal with existing governments and provide reports and analysis. The State Department, of course, would continue to set over-all policies within which increased political development activities would operate.

The CIA should not be that agency, despite its current activities in the political field. Its covert nature inhibits the feedback from experience which is essential to learning. It is compelled to respond to current crises. Its name abroad unfortunately is so bad that its activities carry built-in hazards where we need to build bridges of respect and confidence.

If this responsibility is to be given to an existing agency, it should be AID which is an arm of the State Department. It should become a primary mission of AID.

Here are some suggestions for AID in assuming this major commitment. I hasten to add, these suggestions are tentatively made:

First, the agency should create a top-level political study and research staff.

Second, the agency should bring political development concepts to bear on the formulation of economic programs.

Third, it should develop an operating capability in general political development.

Fourth, it should undertake intensive preparation for accepting operational responsibility for U.S. political efforts in countries threatened with insurgency, where sensitivity to U.S. involvement is displaced by more urgent considerations.

Fifth, AID should sponsor a new institute to be termed a Center for Democratic Development to carry on those activities which the government finds difficult to do directly. This Center might have a small, full-time board which includes at least one representative from each of the two major political parties. Political party representation would contribute useful understanding of political dynamics and help insure within this country the acceptability of the Center's work.

This Center should also have a full time director and staff to research and develop operating programs for the Center. Both AID and the Center would continue to contract many activities to other groups such as universities and other non-federal public and private organizations. Satellite centers might be spawned for special purposes or activities either here or abroad.

I re-emphasize that these are tentative suggestions. If a major responsibility for political development is fixed somewhere, the possibilities will readily unfold.

What are some of these possibilities?

First, and perhaps most urgent we should provide an institutional framework to absorb and retain the knowledge, experience and personnel who are now engaged in political development efforts in the crisis areas of the world. What we learn in Vietnam must be preserved and expanded upon. At present we have no means of insuring that we build on the lessons of the past. One of the simplest lessons, for example, seems to be the value of language training. We should have many, many people in training now learning native languages and the skills which would add to our ability to be of help to a country.

I recognize that all countries must help themselves, and that there are limitations on what can be done from the outside. Too often these limitations are over-emphasized as reasons for doing nothing. The lessons of earlier years in Vietnam should teach us that at the very least we need civilians in the field who know first hand what is going on in addition to the other contributions they can make. This may be an expensive program, but the cost must be measured against the $5 million a day which we are now expending in Vietnam.

Second, we should do more to stimulate organizations based on economic or community interest. Whether the groups are cooperatives, credit unions, campesino organizations, labor unions, or based on some other self-help concept, they give experience in democratic power. In short, these groups can become the source for popularly based political movements.

A man heading our Peace Corps in a Latin American country told me of the Corps' experience in community organization. He said that traditionally Latins use a petition to remedy a community grievance. The only activity is a person carrying the petition around with the others looking to see who has signed. However, when the Corps stimulated community meetings, the participants experienced a political awakening. The initiative and organization demonstrated by these meetings were a revelation to the invited local officials in countries where the idea that government is the servant of the people is not widespread.

We often conceive of politics as an expression of individual persons' attitudes, but politics tend more to reflect attitudes shaped and expressed through organized groups and their leadership. The ideology of a group is tied to its experiences and to its leadership. The impact of leadership upon group ideology through inspiration, example, and commitment is enormous and needs to be fully understood and appreciated. And leadership can be influenced far more easily than is commonly believed.

Third, then, we need to encourage democratic leadership. Training opportunities for all levels of political leadership should be created, both in-country training and at U.S. or regional institutes.

Such training sometimes may be more effective without U.S. personnel participating. For example, in Latin America there are many democratic political leaders no longer in office. We should find ways through which these elder statesmen can inspire and teach promising young people.

I am acquainted with one talented American citizen who has been in political education work in Latin America. He has many useful ideas. Outside of the CIA there is no place for him to work. Every other agency disclaims responsibility for political development work. Yet there are many places around the world where his efforts are badly needed.

Fourth, we need to establish more ongoing, personal links between people and groups in this country, and political and economic groups in the developing countries. We need non-governmental links with political leaders and movements built on mutual respect and understanding. These survive the stresses of fluctuating government-to-government relationships. These links serve multiple purposes. They provide a two-way communication for better understanding and exchange of ideas. They can be a vehicle for recommending politically oriented youth who would benefit from outside training. They can be a conduit for aid which strengthens political work, such as help in research and communications. (An old mimeograph machine can be essential to political communication.) They can identify problems which are creating political stresses, and articulate the views of nonruling groups. This linkage should be with as many organized groups as possible. Every organized group has political potential.

A friend of mine who has done considerable lecturing in South Asia observed in a recent report that while the USIS personnel in India were quite familiar with university professors, none know the President of the All-India Depressed Classes Association who, he said, was a lawyer by profession and very influential among the Untouchables. He went on to point out that as a sociologist he was interested in more contact with locals, but he felt that in a subtle sense and quite unconsciously the USIS personnel tried to reduce his informal, personal contacts with locals. These tendencies would be minimized or reversed if communication at the political level were someone's primary responsibility.

In this same vein, I spoke recently with an executive director of a local party institute from a Latin American country. I asked him about his contacts with the political officers of the U.S. Embassy. He said that their tendency was not to communicate adequately with political activists, although he had a good word to say about the number 2 political officer. He pointed out that it would not be proper for an embassy official to sit through their political meetings, but that a non-governmental person from the U.S. would be quite welcome.

The means of accomplishing this linkage will vary. A nongovernment agency is needed, but it may have to be insulated even further, perhaps through a multi-national organization. For example, we might sponsor a Center for Democratic Development for the Western Hemisphere located in Latin America and run jointly by us and Latin Americans. We may need separate non-governmental groups to establish links with different political forces in the same country. We might, for example, want an organization here in the U.S.—non-government, of course—which works with the Christian Democrats throughout Latin America. At the same time, of course, we would expect other organizations to work with other political parties.

These links need some permanence even though individuals may come and go. To maintain these links would require money for travel, conferences, bulletins and periodicals and many other activities ordinarily typical of organization efforts.

Fifth, we should encourage the development of local government consistent with the local culture. Local control over matters of local concern helps build support for the idea of government. A pluralistic development in government can add stability to a society and encourages leadership to emerge and be tested.

Sixth, we need to greatly expand existing programs of rural and urban development. Literacy, agriculture know-how, public administration—all are skills needed for effective government. I would also add those skills needed for the management of private enterprises and simple public speaking, small group leadership, and large assembly management skills.

Much of this, of course, is already being done under the umbrella of economic aid. We need to do more.

Why should be do all this? Political development work would pay enormous dividends to us as a nation.

I have just suggested several political development activities that we could engage in. Each of these rests upon assumptions about how nations grow toward political stability. If every program were undertaken as a soundly researched experiment, we would rapidly advance our basic knowledge about how things happen in the emerging world.

Perhaps Congress could be brought in on the ground floor of this educational process.

This 89th Congress elected roughly 100 new members. Suppose that our Center for Democratic Development had a program for these new members. Each would take a single developing country, study it intensively and visit it. Over a period of years, we might well get a Congress with a greatly strengthened appreciation of the problems of the developing world, of U.S. policies toward them, and of their future needs.

One of the biggest problems we face on the Hill today is winning support for the AID program. A better understanding of an AID program would be a natural by-product of Congressmen's assignments to a developing country.

These educational advances will be welcome. But may I emphasize that I am suggesting that we go forward with a massive program of political development activities based on what we now can see is needed.

We cannot afford to rely on a mystical faith that political institutions underlying stable nations will come into existence automatically or by chance, everywhere in the world.

Our own country has produced able, trained people in vast numbers of civil action groups, labor unions, charitable organizations, political parties, trade associations, social groups, and local governments. With great care we can put this reservoir of political skill to use in other countries. These people can share themselves, and their ideas and skills abroad, as we have already used economic, educational, administrative, and military technicians. The dividends to us as a nation will be enormous.

Some may argue that people and ideas are not very tangible weapons in this modern world. I would counter they are the most effective weapons. I ask you to consider why the picture of Lafayette, a Frenchman, flanks the Speaker's dais in the House Chambers.

People and ideas have made this country the oldest democracy in the world. People and ideas can contribute greatly to the emergence of democratic institutions around the world.

Thank you.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, underlying the major criticisms of foreign aid lies, very often, a criticism of the concept of foreign aid itself. It is on this fundamental question—why we should have foreign aid at all—that I want to comment.

Foreign aid, as conceived these past years, is a unique feature of the 20th century. Its reason for being is the existence of a highly interdependent world. It is important to recognize this interdependence, for only then can we understand that isolation, especially for the United States as a world power, can no longer be a feasible alternative. Being a power requires being actively and constructively involved in world affairs. The most constructive means of involvement I can imagine is through the foreign aid program, because foreign aid allows us to maintain a global leadership through helping other peoples.

Foreign aid must be made an indispensable part of our overall foreign policy for two important reasons: for the national security and for the potential that exists in foreign aid as a peacemaking and peacekeeping instrument in our foreign policy.

We all know that communism plays on the instability that exists in underdeveloped countries. It attempts to topple existing governments and establish totalitarian regimes. We also know that communism takes advantage of poverty, and attempts to create a breach between the so-called have and have not nations. We also understand that political and economic havoc can come from within a nation itself. This form of internal agitation most often occurs if a country has not undertaken positive economic development. It occurs if a sterile status quo is adamantly and indiscriminately preserved, if no attempt is made in the direction of social change. As a result, these countries often pursue seemingly irrational policies in order to divert attention from internal conditions. More often than not, the scapegoat of these "hate campaigns" will be the United States, by virtue of our status as an industrialized power.

If we are to maintain any kind of leadership in international affairs, if we are to advance against the fronts of communism, then we must help the nations of the underdeveloped regions to embark on a program of accelerated growth. Foreign aid can help sustain the independence of countries such as Thailand and Laos, which are threatened by a Communist neighbor. It will also help meet the internal challenge—as in India, where the 5-year plans have had a positive value, not only for economic growth, but also in harnessing the energies of the people toward a common constructive effort. In such a perspective, foreign aid does more than react against the Communist challenge. It seeks the positive purpose of striving toward economic growth together with political stability, and change together with peace.

We often fail to recognize the tremendous potential that exists in a foreign aid program. This potential exists not only for the underdeveloped countries, but also for us, because foreign aid can be very effectively used, if flexible enough, as a tool in international diplomacy. It can be used as a peacemaking and peacekeeping force if we are prepared to use aid as an alternative to crisis management. By this I mean that foreign aid can be used as yet another channel of diplomatic communication, as yet another reason to sit down at a conference table. We could use it to prevent escalation of disputes. We could even help solve disputes by bringing this aspect of our foreign policy into focus. Such can be the silent success of foreign aid in international diplomacy. Just because it is silent does not mean we should overlook its importance.

At this time, foreign aid as an additional peacemaking and peacekeeping force in our foreign policy takes on increased importance in view of the fact that the nature of diplomacy is changing and that the nature of the world is changing. For not only must we realize that the world is becoming increasingly interdependent—a world in which we cannot stand apart should a crisis occur—but we must also understand that this is a nuclear age. This means that many of our traditional means of diplomacy are becoming obsolete. We can no longer rely solely on a military defense. We can no longer be concerned just with nations in the abstract, we have also to be concerned with the peoples of those nations. The situation in the underdeveloped countries is changing so fast, everything is so much in a flux, that if we do not concern ourselves with the welfare of other peoples, then we might just find ourselves becoming increasingly unpopular where it matters most. Our avenues of international communication will fast decrease unless we turn to new avenues—such as that of foreign aid.

In the years ahead, we must have the insight to see the significance of helping others help themselves. We must also, for our own interests, have the imagination and the wisdom to make our foreign aid program an integral part of our foreign policy.

There is great potential in a flexible, sound foreign aid program. It is a potential that we can afford in economic terms, and a potential that we cannot afford to lose in diplomatic terms.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to join with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have paid tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, the chairman of our committee, who is, I think in the opinion of all of us, one of the most and perhaps the most knowledgeable persons on either side of the Capitol on the question of foreign aid, and who has spent long hours on the committee studying this problem and presenting this bill to this committee today.

What I have said for Dr. MORGAN certainly goes for the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who also, as the ranking minority member, has spent long hours on this bill. The fruit of their efforts and the efforts of the entire committee is the bill which has been brought forth here today.

I certainly think that the New York Times summed up very well the feelings of the House with regard to Dr. MORGAN when it said:

> New leadership certainly has emerged, and all this adds up to a high order of leadership from Representative MORGAN, and the committee that brought forth this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are several points that I would like to correct for the RECORD. One was the statement that this committee paid no attention whatsoever to the Watson report. The fact of the matter is that it was discussed many times, and our hearings are dotted with comments referring to it. Secretary Rusk, Mr. Hoagland, and Dave Bell, and many others discussed this report. It did have a full measure of consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] referred to the question of the outflow of gold with regard to this program. For the record I would like to say that AID does not in any way contribute to the drain on the U.S. gold supply. In fact, over the years 1963, 1964, and 1965, gold transactions between the United States and aid recipients has resulted in a net inflow of gold to the United States of some $60 million.

Now, while much of our energy and most of our concern is focused on the war in Vietnam at the present time, because our problems there are immediate and young men are dying, nevertheless, in a larger sense we must set a long-range course for our energies and our concerns which will help to build a world of peace. This bill and this program are predicated on the hope that one of these days soon we will have a world at peace, and at that point mankind can join its efforts in battling the real enemies of man; poverty, disease, and ignorance.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the great paradox of our time is that while we are engaged in a far-off war, our hopes and our concerns are harnessed to the fundamental drive for peace. Perhaps this is one of the real frustrations of our age, that while we discuss a bill to help the unfortunate peoples in the world to break the bonds of ignorance, of poverty and disease, young men must still chase each other through the woods with rifles and other instruments of war. Yet while that war goes on, we here today must reaffirm our belief that peace is possible and, hopefully, probable.

Mr. Chairman, this bill that we are discussing here today is based upon the President's message which contains his belief that war will someday end, and when it does, we can go on toward building a world for peace.

This bill is a part of that continuing war on poverty, misery, and disease in which there will be no losers, unlike the specter of world war III where there will be no winners.

Now, Mr. Chairman, today there will be many amendments offered, to, perhaps, improve or detract from this bill. Most of them are certainly well intended. Most are designed to place limitations upon this bill. However, I believe we should keep in perspective that just as the aid bill cannot remake the entire world, similarly, there is no immediate solution to the problems of the world that can be arrived at by placing a limitation upon the President and upon the administration, and upon those concerned with the conduct of our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, we are only fooling ourselves that restrictions and prohibitions in the Foreign Assistance Act are going to change the facts of life.

The aid bill is now replete with restrictions of all kinds. What is essential is Presidential flexibility. I have confidence in our President that this flexibility will be used to good purpose.

In response to President Johnson's call for a "massive attack" on the root causes of hunger, disease, and ignorance in less-developed countries, the foreign aid legislation before the Congress places major emphasis upon three crucial human concerns: agriculture, health, and education. I would call to the attention of my colleagues that the increased commitments in these areas have been termed "new initiatives," implying not merely an expansion of the old, but a dedication to finding new means of combating centuries-old problems.

Today, more than ever before, it is apparent that a healthy, well-nourished, educated population is absolutely essential to a nation's economic development. Without this most fundamental resource—without a physically and educationally developed people—a country is handicapped from the first in undertaking the very difficult burdens of a development program.

As a result, AID plans to expand substantially its programs in these vital areas during the coming year. Its proposals will—

Increase programs for agricultural development by one-third over the previous year;

Expand health programs by 55 percent;

Increase programs in the field of education by almost two-thirds.

Let us examine why each of these areas is of such vital importance.

The first of the "new initiatives" in foreign aid is agriculture. In his foreign aid message, President Johnson stated:

> The problem of hunger is a continuing crisis. The solution is clear: an all out effort to enable the developing countries to supply their own food needs, through their own production or through improved capacity to buy in the world market.

The need for action in the agricultural area is very clear. Food output in the less-developed areas of the world has been rising, but not as rapidly as has the demand for food. Population growth has been between 2½ and 3 percent a year. Food production is hard pressed to keep pace; in some areas it has fallen behind.

This is not to say that agriculture in the less-developed countries has been stagnant. On the contrary, a recent Department of Agriculture survey has shown that many AID-assisted countries have been achieving agricultural growth rates of more than 4 percent a year.

Despite this growth, however, to feed their populations the less-developed countries must presently import 16 million tons of grain annually. It should be of grave concern to us that, if present conditions continue, this deficit will have grown to 88 million tons by 1985. Even if the United States were to utilize all its resources, it could not—and should not—bridge the gap alone. Too heavy a reliance on Public Law 480 food imports can become a crutch, discouraging necessary efforts within the less-developed countries themselves.

It is apparent, then, that only through a rapid increase in the ability of the developing countries to meet their own food needs can a shortage of disastrous proportions be averted. A sizable potential for food production does exist in the less-developed countries. It can and will be developed if it is given the priority attention which it in fact deserves.

I would like to impress upon my colleagues that it is precisely to achieve these ends that the new initiative in agriculture is designed. AID proposes to increase its contributions to agricultural programs to a level of $512 million during fiscal year 1967. About one-third of the total would be used for fertilizer projects—to finance increased imports of fertilizer from the United States, to construct plants abroad, and generally to expand fertilizer production and distribution in the less-developed countries. Dollar for dollar, increased supplies of fertilizer will work to provide food to almost three times as many people as would direct imports.

The remainder of the proposed funds would be devoted to the development of water resources, irrigation facilities, and transportation services; the distribution of pesticides and machinery; the establishment of farm credit systems; and the development of additional manpower.

With self-help reforms and sufficient outside assistance, most of the less-developed countries can be self-sufficient in food by 1985. Taiwan, Thailand, Israel, and Mexico are already examples of countries in which food production has been able to keep well ahead of population growth. Through concentrated effort, the example can become the rule.

The effort must not be just on our part, however. Under David Bell, AID has come to place strong emphasis upon self-help as a condition for assistance. A prime measure of self-help efforts is and should be country performance in the development of its food resources. The United States is making clear to less-developed countries that only through adequate investment of their own resources in agriculture can the goals of food production be realized. And today these goals are no longer a vision, but a pressing need.

The second "new initiative" strongly emphasized in the legislation before us is that of health. It is here, particularly that it is most apparent what it means to be among the two-thirds of the world living in abject poverty.

I would urge my colleagues to consider—

That the infant mortality rate of the less-developed countries is five times that of the developed countries;

That 60 percent of the people of Latin America, Asia and Africa and 70 percent of the preschool children are dangerously undernourished;

That almost half their children die before the age of 6;

That their life expectancy is only 47 years of age, while in the developed countries it is 70 years;

That they have 1 doctor for every 4,300 persons, compared with 1 for every 800 in the developed countries.

A population which is undernourished and ridden with disease is one whose creative energies are sapped and whose productivity is lowered. If a country is to break these bonds—if economic and social progress is ever to take place—the good health of its population must be assured.

The proposed foreign aid program plans to increase to a level of $178 million, the U.S. contributions to health and medical programs in the less-developed nations. Four areas would receive particular attention.

First, the eradication and control of communicable disease is to be stressed. Already more than half a billion people are protected from malaria, but as many more continue to be threatened by the disease. The target of the aid program is to eradicate malaria completely in more than 20 countries during the next 10 years. A full-scale attack will be launched against other major diseases as well—those whose victims, even if they survive, may be maimed or crippled for life.

Second, American assistance will attempt to combat the major problem of malnutrition. Insufficient calorie intake and unbalanced, improper diets reduce general resistance to illness and cause mental and physical retardation in 10 to 25 percent of the population of the less-developed countries. Increased aid funds would seek to develop and provide enriched food supplements for both mothers and children, to train additional personnel in social service and health activities, and to encourage the growth of foods which will provide a balanced diet.

Third, AID funds will contribute to increased effort to ease the pressure of population growth. It is staggering to consider that by 1975 the population of the less-developed countries will be close to 2 billion people and, at current growth rates, will double by the year 2000. It must be emphasized, however, that the AID program provides assistance with population problems only when requested, and only when it is assured that freedom of choice for each family will be allowed. The United States should not and cannot impose solutions to social problems upon the rest of the world.

Finally, the new AID program plans to increase its support of medical research programs and of facilities to train various health personnel: doctors, nurses, midwives, sanitation officers, and so forth. Manpower shortage in the health field has been a particularly crucial problem, and one with which there is still a great deal to be done.

As is readily apparent, however, and as my colleagues are well aware, much progress in the area of health has already been achieved. By continuing to work closely with the developing nations in this field, we will be able to increase the great strides already taken toward the relief of human suffering.

The third of the "new initiatives" which AID will emphasize during the coming year is education. Again, it is readily apparent that this is an area of critical need.

Basic educational skills are profoundly lacking in most of the underdeveloped world. In Latin America and the Far East, literacy averages close to 60 percent; but in the Near East and south Asia, where half of the population of the less-developed world is concentrated, it averages only 25 percent—and only 16 percent in Africa.

In his foreign aid message to the Congress, President Johnson said of educational development:

> Nothing is more critical to the future of liberty and the fate of mankind.

Without a drastic expansion in basic educational opportunities, the prospects for popular self-government are extremely limited and insecure. Democracy as we know it requires a degree of sophistication which can come only with a major rise in educational levels.

Increased educational opportunities are also needed to develop the skilled manpower necessary to operate public health systems, cooperatives, credit unions, businesses, and modernized farms. Only through education can outdated customs be broken down and the foundations for progress be laid.

Aid to education has always been a major field of U.S. technical assistance. During 1965 one of every five AID-financed experts abroad was working on an educational project. Much of the assistance, especially for projects in teacher training and institutional development, is carried out through contracts with private American institutions.

As we have seen, however, much remains to be done. The expanded AID programs for fiscal 1967 will concentrate on the improvement of popular participation in development and in government and the expansion of the technical and professional skills available to the developing societies. The additional funds are planned to support such varied projects as curriculum improvement, textbook production, exchange programs, and the utilization of radio and television in drastically understaffed classrooms. Manpower development, the improvement of English instruction, and the strengthening of research programs are other areas which are to receive high-priority attention.

At the present time, the less-developed countries are increasing their budgets for education at an annual rate of 15 percent, and they will continue to make serious efforts to improve their educational capacity. Their resources are limited, however, and the demands are immediate. Only with our assistance can the rapid progress which is needed be achieved.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we have before us legislation designed to help the developing countries help themselves, so that they will one day be able to provide the essentials of a better life to all their people. The "new initiatives" in agriculture, health, and education put the emphasis where it should be placed—on the areas most fundamental, most crucial, most necessary to development. It is in the best of American traditions to aid those throughout the world in freeing themselves from the bonds of hunger, disease, and ignorance. And it is in our long-term interest as well, Mr. Chairman, since only in a more prosperous world can the stability essential to peace be achieved. As nations continue to grow in freedom, progress, and security, we will truly be able to experience and enjoy the benefits of a better life.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think what is essential to keep in mind is that now that man has found a means of ending the human story on this planet, we must turn our energies and our talents to find the means for its continuance.

I firmly believe that the foreign aid bill is the best investment we can make in this, man's most vital quest on earth the search for meaningful life for all men in a world at peace. I urge its passage.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, even more than in the past, the foreign aid program we are considering has a basic objective of helping the people of the less-developed countries work toward a better life.

As the President has said, it is a program "to help give the people of the less-developed world the food, the health, the skills and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

I am sure that at times we all tend to think of foreign aid largely in terms of loans and assistance to governments, through which we channel much of our assistance, rather than in terms of directly helping the people of the developing countries who reap the benefit from the assistance we provide through the foreign aid program.

Much of our help influences the daily lives of these people as AID technicians work side by side with them—showing them better ways to build homes, schools and hospitals; better ways to work their farms; better ways to educate their children; better ways to improve their health; and, in general, better ways of living. In short, better ways to do things after the Americans have left.

Most AID assistance, however, is in the form of development loans to finance projects like factories and power facilities; to help carry out broad programs like agricultural research and extension services, and to help finance imports of American goods needed for industrial and agricultural growth.

But here again, it is the people of the developing nations who reap the benefit.

When a factory is built or enlarged through an AID loan, it means more jobs and earnings for the people, a chance to buy more of the things they need. When an agricultural credit program is started with AID assistance, it means that small farmers get the loans they need for seeds and fertilizer and equipment. When a new road is built, or an electric power facility or water system goes into service, it is the people who profit.

Let me cite a few examples of what our foreign aid has meant to the people of developing nations.

By the close of the last fiscal year, AID assistance through the Alliance for Progress had resulted in 300,000 homes for 1½ million people in Latin America; 25,000 new classrooms; nearly 1,000 water and sewage systems serving more than 13 million people; 10 million textbooks for schoolchildren; more than 300,000 loans for farmers; more and better food for 13 million schoolchildren, and protection of more than 100 million people against malaria.

In the Far East, more than 1.7 million children were attending school in classrooms provided with AID assistance; 116,000 students were enrolled in assisted colleges and universities; more than 100,000 teachers had been trained with AID help; 2 million additional acres of land had been brought under irrigation; 1.7 million farmers had obtained loans to raise food output, and 115 million people were protected from malaria.

In Africa, it was the same story of help to people through AID assistance: 800,000 pre-school children vaccinated against measles; a tripling of secondary school enrollment in East Africa to 75,000; training for 41,000 students underway in vocational and technical schools; demonstrations of successful farming techniques to over 300,000 Sudanese farmers, and so on.

These were all direct benefits the people of developing nations gained from AID assistance. Not mentioned were the benefits they gained from construction of new factories, new transportation facilities, new sources of food such as fishing industries, and new and better means of communication.

You will note that in each area where AID is at work, it is stressing greater education and better health for people. Both are essential if a nation is to develop the human resources for economic and social progress.

As a final point I remind you that the American taxpayer is not bearing most of the cost of progress in the developing nations. Indeed, the 20 countries receiving major development assistance today invest an average of six of their own dollars for every dollar of U.S. assistance.

And the dollars we do lend or spend go for a purpose that can hardly be questioned. They go to people who, like our early-day Americans, are willing to work long and hard to build a brighter future for themselves and their children.

This program deserves our continuing wholehearted support.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, the United States has a commendable record of providing assistance to nations in need. We recognized long ago that humanitarian efforts lay the groundwork for a world of peace and economic stability. Passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 will afford the opportunity to continue these efforts.

The foreign aid program under consideration today is similar in many ways to the programs of past years. There is, however, an important change in emphasis proposed in this year's legislation. Increased attention is to be given to education, health, and agriculture. Although the total authorization for fiscal 1967 is almost exactly what it was in the previous year, allocations for education, health, and agriculture will be increased by about 50 percent. Investment is being concentrated in these areas in order to speed developing countries to a level of self-sufficiency.

Economic development is still a new and uncharted field. There is no magic formula to tell us exactly how to transform an underdeveloped, slowly growing country into an economically viable one. But economists and political scientists do agree that education, health, and agriculture are each a vital precondition for self-sustained growth. Thus our emphasis on these areas in the proposed program.

Only an educated population can run the machines needed to compete in the markets of the modern world, cope successfully with the complexities of modern business and economics, or master the intricacies of modern science.

And without adequate health care and sufficient food, all other efforts come to naught. An ill, undernourished man cannot be expected to lead his country into an industrial revolution.

Another major change in the proposed bill is a greatly expanded program for economic aid to Vietnam. This program will provide refugee relief, seek to raise urban and rural living standards, and finance essential imports. The social and economic development of Vietnam will ultimately determine the future of that war-torn nation. Therefore, we must strengthen our efforts in these nonmilitary areas even as the war goes on.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 will also extend the life of many projects already of proven value. The Partners of the Alliance, or the Companeros de la Allianza, for example, give civic clubs, schools, professional groups, and similar organizations an opportunity to work directly with the people of Latin America.

I am proud to report that the citizens of Maryland have taken a very active part in this program, choosing as a sister state, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The Maryland Partners of the Alliance, a volunteer group headed by 40 of our State's leading citizens, has sponsored numerous projects throughout the State designed to help Rio de Janeiro. The University of Maryland student government has raised money for books for the University of Rio, and the St. Vincent de Paul Society, of Baltimore, has contributed money for school construction in Niteroi. Similar programs are being sponsored by local Kiwanis, Rotary, and other service clubs.

When a group from the Maryland Partners visited a fishing village in Rio de Janeiro they were greeted by a banner reading "The fishermen of Saquarema need you." The Saquarema problem was silt congestion in its major inlet, and the Maryland Partners helped the fishermen to develop a solution for removing it. The success of these Marylanders shows what foreign aid, in its more fundamental concept, can achieve.

The benefits of our foreign aid program come at a small cost to us; the program does not burden the American economy. The proposed program, for example, would devote less than one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product to aiding other nations, a percentage which has been steadily declining since 1963.

Furthermore, the adverse effect of foreign aid on our balance of payments is being steadily diminished. An ever-increasing percentage of aid expenditures is spent for equipment purchases here in the United States. By fiscal 1967 the Agency for International Development will spend 88 percent of its funds in this country, thus helping to boost the economy of every State. In the last year alone, over $20 million of AID money was spent in the State of Maryland.

In fact, over the long run foreign aid actually benefits our balance of payments. A developing country, as it grows, demands increasing amounts of U.S. exports. A 1-percent increase in the GNP of a developing nation leads to a 1.4-percent increase in its purchases of U.S. exports. For example, U.S. sales to Taiwan, where our economic aid is no longer needed, doubled in 2 years' time. And increases in exports resulting from our foreign aid program have a particularly beneficial impact on the city of Baltimore, the Nation's third largest foreign trade port.

Foreign aid will not miraculously end poverty and squalor and hunger in the developing nations around the world. But it will offer a beginning. We are often reminded that it is better to light a candle than curse the darkness. It might be added that it is also important to keep the candle burning. Let us do just that by passing the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the Agency for International Development supports programs in more than 70 developing countries around the globe, but nearly one-fourth of its total budget is spent in just one nation: South Vietnam from which several of us have just returned. We are all keenly aware of the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen over there. But not so well known is the activity of the nurses, teachers, farm experts, and others who are conducting a large and vital economic aid program in Vietnam. For fiscal year 1966, the bill is about $640 million. Let's take a closer look at what that money is accomplishing.

About a thousand Americans are working in the aid program there, side by side with more than 1,800 Vietnamese employed by AID. There are nearly as many AID employees in South Vietnam as there are in Washington directing our worldwide efforts. Our headquarters out there is in Saigon, but much of the work is in the provinces. We have a representative in every one of the 43 provinces. An AID provincial representative must know how to fill out an invoice for a bulk shipment of steel bars and cement or how to build a makeshift wheelchair for an invalid child. He must write good, clear reports to Washington or teach tribal women how to cook wheat. In the midst of a war with no front lines and no safe areas, he can live for days in a cave if he has to.

One such representative is Sanford (Sandy) Stone, of Cleveland, Ohio. As an illustration, his activity within the past year included helping the village of Song Be, which we visited, recover from a Vietcong attack. He obtained food from Saigon, enlisted volunteers to restring powerlines, recruited others to lay water pipe for the hospital and the provincial headquarters. Sandy has a philosophy, a reason for being there, and he puts it this way:

> In Vietnam we are faced with a new kind of war, where a purely military solution is impossible. Unless military action is combined with social, political and economic improvements, so the rural people are given a stake in their country worth defending, there can be no permanent victory here over communism.

Four-fifths of the Vietnamese are farmers and fishermen, and the counterinsurgency program assisted by our economic aid money directly supports the war effort in rural areas. American AID technicians and materials enable the farmers, fishermen, and refugees from the Vietcong to educate their children, improve their farming, and benefit from health facilities. In a self-help school construction program, 2,300 schools have been built, and in the next 2 years 13,000 new classrooms will be built for more than three-quarters of a million children. In the past 3 years, AID has trained more than 5,500 teachers. And AID helped the Government of Vietnam establish a national service that so far has printed more than 6 million new textbooks.

They are terribly short of medical care over there. The facilities are primitive and unsanitary and some provinces have no hospitals and no doctors. The ratio is 1 doctor for about every 29,000 people in South Vietnam. That compares with 1 for every 1,500 on Taiwan, for instance, and one for every 900 in Japan. But we are doing something about that too. And we must do more. A medical school is now being built in South Vietnam to graduate 200 doctors a year. Malaria is prevalent but of those exposed to the risk of getting it 83 percent are now protected against it. Village health stations have been set up and stocked with medicine at 12,500 rural locations, although we do not yet have the trained personnel to man them all properly. AID finances Project Vietnam, whose American doctors are volunteering for 60 days' service in the country. One of them, Dr. Martin Funk, of Park Ridge, Ill., established a clinic in Kontum, in the remote highlands of central Vietnam. "We started with a couple of bottles of pills and 20 patients," he reported. Two months later he was handling up to 121 patients in a single morning. Diseases include pneumonia, arthritis, tapeworm, diarrhea, and tuberculosis. Why did Dr. Funk go out there? Because, he said, "there was something to be done, and I wanted to help."

A gigantic problem in that unhappy land is refugees. More than 900,000 have been driven from their homes in the last year. AID has helped to resettle half of them and to shelter, feed, and clothe the rest in temporary centers. Frank Wisner, of Washington, D.C., is one of the AID men helping refugees, in a little camp about 50 miles from Saigon. He not only sees to it that the refugees get clothing, food, housing, and medical care; he makes sure they find a way to make a living—for example he helped one family establish its own little furniture-making business.

The farmers of Vietnam are encouraged by AID to use more fertilizer. Four years ago, only 100,000 tons of fertilizer a year was being added to the soil of South Vietnam. Last year that amount was almost tripled, to 276,000 tons. This is potentially an immensely wealthy country. In some areas 3 crops of rice a year can be produced instead of one, and each crop can be doubled in size. This is vital as we try to feed the expanding world population. Insects and rodents were destroying a third of the crops; then a half-million farmers started using insecticides—600 tons a year—and taking part in a program that exterminates 38 million rats a year. The annual saving in food is nearly 100,000 tons.

For fishermen, we have introduced nylon nets and motorized junks, and the catch has increased from 165,000 metric tons in 1959 to 368,000 last year. Seventy-nine fishing cooperatives have been established, with more than 17,000 members.

Besides our counterinsurgency program, we have the Commodity Import Program, and indeed that is where a lion's share of the money goes. Of the $640 million we are spending in Vietnam this fiscal year, including nearly $100 million in food for peace, the commodity import program accounts for $370 million. Commodity imports supply the cement to floor a pigsty in a rural hamlet; and we constantly heard requests for more cement and it should be used for people as well as the pigs, the paper for textbooks; bicycle tires; fertilizer; fishing nets. Most of the dollars stay in the United States, paying American producers and exporters. Licensed Vietnamese importers pay their government in local currency—piasters—for those goods which they import and sell. The Government turns around and uses that money to strengthen its economic development and its defense effort. This import program fights wartime inflation by providing nonluxury commodities that are in short supply. Some of the items that make up the $370 million are iron and steel mill products, $72 million; industrial machinery and parts, about $71 million; rice, more than $35 million; medicine and pharmaceuticals, $21 million; motor vehicles, tractors and parts, nearly $18 million; and fertilizer, $17 million.

The mission of AID in Vietnam must be carried on by trained and dedicated people. Their work toward a better tomorrow, in the midst of a war-torn country, is most difficult and frequently dangerous. Eight AID men have given their lives in this "shirtsleeves war." One of them, Joseph Grainger of West Hartford, Conn., before he died was paraded through villages by the Vietcong, who told the people, "Here is that imperialist American who was trying to exploit you." But their attempt at a propaganda stunt didn't work and they soon gave it up—because they were greeted with such statements as: "This is not a bad man." "He has been our friend." "He helped us build this well, so we don't have to go all the way to the river for our water."

Foreign aid is, I suppose, as unpopular a program as we have. All of us have whipped it from time to time in campaign speeches. Yet I think there is no program more vital to our search for world peace. You cannot have a world at peace if half that world goes to bed hungry every night. You cannot have a world at peace if millions are uneducated and living in filth and squalor, easy prey for the false promises of communism.

You can see in Thailand and Taiwan what can be accomplished by peace and judicious applications of credit. You can even see that famous road that "begins nowhere and ends nowhere"—the monument to foreign aid inefficiency. It is now an integral part of a system of roads reaching up into the northeast provinces, that are coming under Communist terror attacks—a vital cog in the defense of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, aid is essential to the success of our cause in Southeast Asia. I hope the bill will be supported.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, Americans are frequently being warned these days, "You cannot get tomorrow's jobs with today's skills."

That slogan is quite true of course. But it has another meaning that applies to conditions beyond our own shores. It is that no matter how many dollars we spend helping less developed countries build up industry and agriculture, without education for their people they can gain no real self-sufficiency, no political stability, no democracy, and no future.

That is why the President has called on the United States to nearly double its help to other nations in the field of education.

Since the beginning of U.S. assistance in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, such aid has accounted for a major share of the Agency for International Development's technical assistance and the largest number of AID technicians at work overseas. This emphasis will be sharpened in the coming year, with special effort given to building up basic educational systems tailored to the needs of individual countries.

Their need is urgent. Only about 16 percent of the people of developing African nations can read and write. In the Near East and South Asia, the average is 25 percent; in Latin America and the Far East, 60 percent. The underdeveloped countries must decide now how many teachers they will need in 5 years, how much of their budgets can be spent on basic education, how much they must commit to vocational training, and how much they can afford for advanced specialized education.

In the coming year, AID plans special emphasis on helping the developing nations review their overall educational programs and helping them decide what directions they must take. Most of this guidance will be given by American education experts under contract to AID. In Thailand, for example, educators from Michigan State University have helped develop a planning office under the Ministry of Education. In Turkey, another university group will help train the staff of a new Budget and Planning Department under the Turkish Ministry of Education.

Vital to any educational program, of course, are teachers. In fiscal 1967, AID will be looking for ways to "stretch" the effectiveness of existing teacher supplies through in-service training, television, radio, and other new teaching techniques. There are already more than 210,000 students enrolled in normal schools and teachers colleges established with AID assistance, and in 1967 the agency will increase its help to such institutions.

The critically short supply of textbooks in developing nations will also get increased attention by AID next year. AID assistance includes the training and supervision of textbook writing teams, purchase of special books from the United States, and studies to determine the specific book needs of each nation. In some countries, AID help will consist of supplying needed paper and printing supplies, and in others the agency will help establish cooperative textbook rental libraries.

AID is also planning programs to improve the quality of instruction, to train college administrators and youth leaders, to expand the training of foreign students in American universities, and to encourage greater support of education by private American organizations.

We already have accomplished much to increase education in the developing countries. Since the start of the point 4 program in 1949, nearly 100,000 foreign technicians and professionals have been brought to the United States for advanced education or training, and another 19,000 have been trained in other countries under U.S. programs. More than 670,000 teachers have been graduated from schools and colleges established with AID assistance. In the last 5 years alone, 237,000 classrooms have been built with AID help.

This fiscal year, more than 675,000 students are enrolled in colleges and universities started with AID assistance, and another 670,000 are attending AID-assisted vocational, technical, and normal schools.

Impressive though these figures are, they represent only a start. Much more can and must be done if the people of the developing nations are to be freed from the enslavement of ignorance, and if their countries are to have the human resources and skills need to become economically self-sufficient. America has the resources to help do the job. We can readily spare help; we cannot afford not to give it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the goal of advancing the free world through economic, political, and social development should be a continuing policy of the United States. This is the essence of a long-term authorization for the foreign aid program—a declaration that the United States supports and encourages long-term development, which it considers basic to the growth and security of the free world and to the security and progress of the United States.

Support for a multiyear authorization for the foreign aid bill has come from both sides of the aisle and from leaders of many segments of our society. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said only a year ago:

> Congress should cease its annual review of foreign aid and place the program under long-term authorization. The case for doing so is familiar and persuasive.

Former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said:

> We cannot afford to exhaust ourselves by spasmodic programs designed to meet ever recurring emergencies. We cannot operate on a day to day, hand to mouth basis. Instead we must think in terms of policies and programs we can afford to live with for what may be a long period of years.

J. F. Doherty, legal representative for the AFL–CIO, notes that a multiyear authorization "will allow more detailed congressional reviews of specific program operations in nonauthorization years, while retention of yearly appropriations will maintain congressional control of the program."

And a leader in the National Council of Jewish Women has pointed out that "long-term economic development based on 1 year planning seems contradictory."

Yet, with all this support, Mr. Chairman, two arguments persist against multiyear authorization. The first is the familiar objection that a multiyear authorization will lessen or destroy congressional control of the AID program. Let us examine this objection.

In the first place, the idea of a multiyear authorization is not a new concept. In fact, it has been the rule rather than the exception in national domestic programs, and internationally it has been highly successful in both the Alliance for Progress and the development loan program. These programs constitute approximately one-half of the total AID program—yet there has been neither evidence nor assertion that these long-term authorizations have undercut the influence or responsibilities of Congress.

Instead we have seen a clear recognition that if the AID program does not advance to the liking of Congress a strong measure of control may be instituted at any time by regulation of appropriations, resolutions or amendments. Multiyear authorization does not sacrifice congressional control; that is clear.

Second, I believe there is more than a mere lack of disadvantage in this proposal. I believe a multiyear authorization will benefit the Congress and the people by allowing a more flexible and selective examination of the AID program.

The Congress may be free from the burden of the annual legislative cycle of criticism of the idea of foreign aid per se, and may direct its energies instead to whatever part or parts of the program that we feel is necessary. In this way we can bring our judgment to bear on areas of particular concern. We can adopt an efficient, businesslike examination of the individual projects underway and discard the shotgun approach that has characterized past criticism of our aid program.

The second major objection to our aid program is tied to the old belief that foreign aid is a temporary thing—hesitantly entered, accidentally extended, and soon to end. This is the ideology which holds that this country has neither the responsibility, the resources, nor the will to carry out such an arduous program. In short, this is one of the old myths that must give way to reality. Foreign aid is not a temporary project; foreign aid is not an evil program. It is a basic and essential instrument of our foreign policy.

And we should recognize the plain fact that as other nations grow in freedom and independence, so the security of the United States is strengthened; and as others grow in economic strength, so will the United States continue to prosper.

It is time that we accept as a reality the great burden we have taken upon ourselves. We shall not lighten that burden by cursing it at every step but will carry it to its destination only by a careful long-range examination of our resources and planning for our abilities.

For surely if our age is to be remembered it will not be only for our medicine or our schools; it will not be only for our farms, or our abundance. Rather we shall take distinction as the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make all the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.

Once we accept the fact that foreign aid is and should be recognized as an integral part of our foreign policy, once we recognize that foreign aid is not just a mighty nation's contribution to the world, but also a very practical tool with which to resist our enemies and to encourage and persuade our friends, then surely we can recognize the obvious necessity for the sort of sound, long-range planning that is basic to an orderly policy. Then we can accept without further quibbling the wisdom of allowing a multiyear authorization for this program.

Congress' reluctance to make the aid program a long-range, continuing process flies in the face of recommendations by three Presidents, numerous presidential study commissions, at least several congressional committees, and testimony by citizens from all walks of life.

President Eisenhower said in 1957:

> I believe our common objective can best be accomplished through a long-term authorization of appropriations . . . obviously sound economic development is not a year to year undertaking but a continuing process.

In January 1957, in study No. 1, "The Objectives of U.S. Economic Assistance Programs," by the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, prepared for the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, U.S. Senate, January 1957, it was stated:

> Since economic growth is inherently a slow process, and since the economic and political results we seek from an economic development program will accrue only over a considerable number of years, the program must have continuity. As an instrument of short-term policy, development assistance is wasteful and ineffective. If we have any hope of achieving desirable results from a development-assistance program, we must be clear in our own minds and must make it clear to the rest of the world that this is a program which we propose to pursue consistently for at least 5 or 10 years and which we will not permit to be affected by changes in the international or domestic political climate. If we are not prepared to make this kind of long-term commitment, we should probably not support development assistance programs at all.

In March 1957, in study No. 3, "The Role of Foreign Aid in the Development of Other Countries," by the Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change of the University of Chicago, March 1957; prepared for the U.S. Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, it was stated:

> Economic aid program must be conceived as a long-run enterprise and some guaranty of its duration is as important as is the total magnitude of the program. For, as was pointed out repeatedly in this report, the process of economic development takes time, and the execution of an effective development plan requires a fairly high degree of assurance that sufficient funds will become available as the program unfolds in coming years.

Again in 1957 in "A New Emphasis on Economic Development Abroad," the report to the President by the International Development Advisory Board, we find this conclusion:

> We believe that an economic development program must have continuity—a long-term approach in planning, budgeting and review. A program with the life expectancy of one year—technically the current budgetary situation for economic development assistance—cannot begin to provide the comprehensive planning required.

Then in 1959 in "Economic Assistance Programs and Administration," third interim report, we find this statement:

> The effectiveness of economic aid can be greatly increased if the principal programs aimed at development—Development Loan Fund lending, Technical Assistance, and surplus agricultural commodity aid—are authorized and funded on a longer range basis than at present . . . The present annual authorization for technical assistance does not provide an adequate basis for a continuing program, and continuing legislative authorization is desirable.

And again in 1959, the Composite Report of the President's Committee To Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program states:

> The same reasons which lead this committee to recommend placing military assistance on a continuing basis apply with equal force to the closely related defense support . . . Accordingly, the Committee proposes that the Congress and the Executive Branch take the necesary legislative and administrative steps to put the Mutual Security Program on a continuing basis.

The result of all these strong recommendations was the establishment of the Agency for International Development in 1962. But for 4 years we have turned right around and ignored the basic reasons for creating that agency—continuity and unity of purpose.

In 1961, President Kennedy said:

> We are launching a Decade of Development on which will depend substantially the kind of world in which we and our children shall live.

We are now past the halfway point in this decade of development. For too many years we have been playing the reluctant bride. For too many years we have been pulling our perennials up by the roots to examine them. Surely, we can do better.

We have debated the principle of giving aid since aid first began with lend-lease in 1941. And surely making this choice has been a difficult decision. But certainly when we decided to create AID in 1962, we should have reached an end to our indecision and attacked our problem with a vigor and energy concomitant with our role as a world leader.

I believe that Congress should recognize aid as a fact—studied, questioned, debated and now firmly established. I believe that Congress should place aid on the sound business basis that will enable both us and the underdeveloped nations we are seeking to help to conduct the long-range planning that is absolutely essential if this program is to achieve its goals.

To accomplish this I believe that Congress is thoroughly justified in approving the 2-year authorization before us today and in continuing the 5-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note the prophetic statement made by Secretary of State Rusk before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on March 23, 1964:

> We often hear talk about what we are doing to future generations of Americans and about the legacy which we give to our grandchildren. I would certainly not want mine to grow up in a world where the richest nation—having nearly half of the world's wealth—ignored for decades the needs of two-thirds of the people, who lived in poverty, disease, and hunger. It would surely not be a very safe or stable world. And even more, it would not be a very great heritage or tradition to pass on.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members bear this message in mind as we vote on this bill today.

TOWARD A THEORY OF EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, the recommendations we have made today for the conduct of our foreign assistance effort go beyond changes in administration. They are designed to provide an entirely new dimension in our programs to assist the developing nations. Development on the scale necessary if these countries are to become proud and stable members of the international community is principally a job for government of these countries; only government can provide the legal and institutional framework that is essential for the efficient application of technological and other tools of development. We can, I believe, help these governments develop the capacity to direct and shape development.

We must give our attention to two separate spheres. For a society to achieve growth it must, on the one hand, have a government with a highly developed capacity to perform. The government must be able to plan efficiently, to administer effectively, to communicate with the people easily, and to engage the participation of the people in the development process.

Popular participation involves the ability to communicate with government, the capacity to organize, and the competency to initiate and follow through on projects through techniques and instruments the people have developed for themselves.

THE GOVERNMENTAL CAPACITY TO PERFORM

Many of the developing countries have only recently achieved self-government; many others have only recently become aware of the opportunities for advanced economic prosperity. It is understandable that they are still reaching for the capacity to effect change. They have experienced difficulties with various combinations of problems including a lack of a sufficient number of competent officials, inadequate knowledge of their own geography and resources, rudimentary transportation and communications systems, and traditional political viewpoints and institutions.

If the foreign aid program is to be successful, the United States must assist these nations in improving their performance. We should not seek to impose an institutional pattern, but rather to instill respect for a process of government that engages the people in decisionmaking. U.S. foreign aid must never be an instrument of uninvited interference in the domestic affairs of independent countries.

The United States has a number of opportunities to influence quite directly the establishment and growth of some of the most fundamental instruments of government. Our help is occasionally asked for in the drafting of national constitutions. Legislators in the developing countries can learn a great deal from U.S. experience in developing staff and research support for the legislative process. Our assistance in helping parliaments establish legislative reference services would be of important practical utility.

Decentralization of governmental functions and political power may also provide a constructive area for study. Formal federalism may not be appropriate for many developing countries, but our experience may be useful in emphasizing that decentralization will not bring benefits in governmental capacity or popular participation unless the people are involved in the Government that decentralization brings closer.

Although the administrators of our foreign aid program have recognized the importance of establishing effective, honest and competent civil service and public administration, the United States has not given this field sufficient attention in our aid effort. Technical assistance in the development of merit systems, examination programs, and in-service training could be extremely useful. This is the kind of thing the Republican Task Force on Latin America had in mind last November when it recommended the establishment of an Inter-American Civil Service Academy.

One of the most important tests of any government's performance is its ability to maintain law and order. Both the armed services and the police have a role here if the civilian government employs these powerful tools with restraint. The training of law enforcement officials in the use of power and restraint would be an appropriate use of foreign aid funds. Likewise in the military sphere, assistance in the form of hardware does not contribute directly to the development process, but assistance in the form of training can help transform the military of the developing countries from a feared vehicle of authoritarianism to a popular instrument of progress. Here again U.S. experience with the Army Corps of Engineers and the use of the military to enforce civil rights is relevant.

The performance of a government will also be reflected in the strength of its mechanisms for channeling popular support. The political party structure need not follow a two-party pattern. The experience of Mexico demonstrates that a single party coalition can be a major instrument of development; in a multiparty system competition between parties for popular support can provide impetus for reform, communication between people and government, and a popular voice in governmental decisions about development.

To be sure many political leaders need greater understanding of the concept that elections involve not only victory, but a mandate from the people for the conduct of policy in their interests. New techniques for the training of leaders and the organization of support must be brought to their attention; much can be done even with simple programs of instruction in how to run a meeting, how to operate a mimeograph machine, and how to raise funds for political action.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF THE PEOPLE

It is at the point of governmental mobilization of support and opinion that the problems of governmental capacity and popular participation merge. I think that our experience with development over the past 20 years has demonstrated that sound development depends on the participation of the people.

Alexis de Tocqueville commented more than once on the vitality of U.S. local government and private voluntary associations. Of local government he wrote:

> Local assemblies of citizens constitute the strength of free nations. Town meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within reach; they teach men how to use it and how to enjoy it. A nation may establish a system of free government, but without the spirit of municipal institutions, it cannot have the spirit of liberty.

For a variety of reasons, both historic and philosophic, many developing nations have extremely strong central governments. It is difficult for a government that is distant to win the allegiance of the people. Yet even a government that is close must involve the people in its decisions.

We cannot urge a drastic realinement of administrative and political power in the developing countries, but we can make available to them the benefits of U.S. experience with strong local government. We can suggest techniques of developing leadership in the villages and rural areas; we can assist in the development of recruitment programs that will provide the government with a source of personnel to be trained in the techniques of public administration and then set to work among their own people.

We should certainly improve our knowledge of the attitudes of people toward government. What steps should be taken to increase their belief in their own ability to effect change? How can government encourage and assist in the exercise of popular initiative? These questions may best be answered through the efforts of the private voluntary institutions and associations which contribute to the initiative, achievement, and accommodation of change. De Tocqueville commented on the range and effectiveness of such groups in the United States:

> As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or a feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they look out for mutual assistance; and as soon as they have found one another out, they combine. From that moment they are no longer isolated men, but a power seen from afar, whose actions serve for an example and whose language is listened to.

Such associations are practically unknown in the developing world. Too often the kinds of associations, such as trade unions, which we know as both supporting and opposing participants in the democratic process, may be, in some of the developing countries, an instrument by which the government controls workers.

Our foreign aid effort should recognize the significance of private groups in change and development and make an effort to bring to the developing countries the concepts of democratic participation, education, equality, and public service that have informed U.S. private groups.

The natural groups of society—labor, students, professional people, farmers, women, and so forth—must be encouraged to organize to serve their common purposes. They must be encouraged to recognize and analyze their common interests, and the advantages of joint action and self-discipline on behalf of the greater national development purpose. The sensitive teaching of these lessons and responsive understanding of them will contribute to the consciousness of group capacity to shape the future.

Aside from political parties, one of the most obvious areas for voluntary association is in labor—industrial labor in the cities and agricultural labor in the rural areas. The Communists know this lesson and have been busy. They have perceptively applied the Marxist doctrine that the source of revolution was to be found among industrial wage earners to a theory of agrarian revolt. Che Guevara has written that "in underdeveloped America the countryside must be fundamentally the locale of the armed struggle." This was also the burden of the Chinese Defense Minister's statement of last fall on the inevitability of conflict between "the cities of the world" in North America and Western Europe and "the rural areas of the world" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

We begin too late in this area, but we do know that in a very literal sense the modernizing of a society begins with the work of the labor force; those who work in the development process will be most attuned to its potential and its failure. Their participation can be enlisted for the national program, or for those who promise a brighter future.

Organization is particularly vital and far more difficult in the rural areas. The organization of agricultural workers to initiate, administer, and support agricultural reform and technological advance is imperative. Per capita agricultural production in most of Latin America has actually decreased in the past decade. Cooperatives and other voluntary associations should be encouraged, not only as desirable vehicles of civic action but as sources of technical education as well.

Rural development requires, as AID Administrator David Bell has said, not just better agricultural techniques, but "improvements in marketing and transportation arrangements, in education and health facilities, in better institutions of local government and of private cooperation." It requires housing, schools, libraries, hospitals, and savings and credit institutions. The development and channeling of initiative on the part of the rural population is a proper area for U.S. support.

ENGAGING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN FOREIGN AID

In light of the tremendous impetus that has been given to reform by various forms of citizen groups in the United States throughout our history, it is ironic that this should be a missing ingredient in our foreign assistance efforts.

The Watson committee recently recommended:

> The role of the nongovernment groups—of business enterprises, labor unions, professional societies, and all the rest—must be greatly expanded.

While the committee had words of praise for AID officials, it pointed out:

> Private organizations are generally capable of greater speed, flexibility and incisiveness than government agencies.

In fact, it continued, without restraints of bureaucracy, "private organizations can outperform official agencies."

Not only would a greater involvement of U.S. private groups increase the quality and volume of our foreign aid effort, it would help to create a larger constituency for the foreign aid program here in this country. Decentralization of the aid process would involve sustained enthusiasm from the White House and a constant determination at AID to utilize all the private sources of influence in the task of promoting and sustaining a network of voluntary associations in the developing countries.

If we believe that the development process will depend on the political effectiveness of those it seeks to serve, we must seek to engage the efforts of the people of the United States in its success.

BUSINESS

The extraordinary responsibility which American business has demonstrated in its participation in local community affairs has proven to be not only an important key to community improvement but of economic benefit to business. The 3,000 U.S. businesses which maintain facilities abroad have increasingly realized that their practices and policies abroad have a direct impact upon the success of American foreign policy.

Business can build upon this hopeful record of public service by playing a more active role in support of foreign aid. Business has, in three important spheres, an opportunity to become an active participant in development, while at the same time demonstrating to the developing world some of the gains that can result from efficient, economic, responsible private enterprise.

First, U.S. private investment abroad can be increased. It is here that the recommendations of the Watson committee are particularly important, and I am presently drafting amendments to foreign aid legislation that will reflect those recommendations. The magnitude of the need for additional capital is reflected in the committee's estimate that the gap between the amount of capital available to the developing countries and the amount which they need ranges from $5 to $20 billion annually.

Increased public attention should also be given to the work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—an association of United States and European government and business leaders who are attempting to encourage private foreign investment in Latin America. Just 2 weeks ago, Britain's Foreign Secretary, Michael Stewart, indicated that Britain was considering ways to increase its capital export to Latin America.

Second, U.S. business abroad can launch a program of management and vocational training in the underdeveloped countries, particularly in Latin America. This would have an enormous impact upon the capacity of modernizing societies to develop the skills necessary to accommodate growth. The International Executive Service Corps provides one creative channel for such assistance. There are others, such as greater use of U.S. plants for the conduct of AID sponsored vocational and technical education programs, and support for institutions, such as the School of Administration and Finance in Medellin, Colombia, which will provide an increasing supply of technical and middle-level management. The recent recommendations made to the White House Conference on International Cooperation Year are also worthy of study.

Third, as the Watson Committee recommended, U.S. business can make available to Government foreign air operations some of its own highly competent personnel on a short-term basis. This would not only be a significant business contribution to the foreign aid effort, but has potential for improving its administration as well. Such an arrangement worked satisfactorily during World War II and has been tried with outstanding results by Gov. James Rhodes, of Ohio.

LABOR

The American labor movement has no peer as a private institution devoted to participation in private international affairs. Its contribution through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has been substantial. While there have been criticisms that labor's overseas activities have not always been sensitive to internal political situations in the host countries, I think it is clear that the American labor movement has been unique in its willingness to contribute its services and resources in support of the purposes of American foreign aid.

American labor will not always be welcome. Particularly in Latin America where labor union development has followed the European pattern, there is some feeling that private European efforts are more appropriate.

Perhaps the most productive contribution that American free labor can make is to help instill the sense of national consciousness and the national responsibility that has made labor such an effective force in U.S. economic growth. Decentralization of the labor effort may be of value too. Locals might beneficially be allowed more freedom to cooperate in community-to-community and people-to-people projects organized for a variety of local organizations acting together.

FARM GROUPS

The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange and the National Farmers' Union fully recognize that the world's population explosion imposes on American agriculture not just the potential benefit of increased sales, but the responsibility of helping to feed the hungry of the world. It imposes on them also the responsibility to extend the knowledge of agricultural productivity and modernization to the developing countries. It is clear that not even the enormous productivity of American agriculture will be able to feed a world population that is growing at the current rate.

Through private programs, extending the technical knowledge of American agriculture to the rural areas of the southern half of the globe, American farmers can offer not only technical skills, but the means by which agricultural workers and farm owners can become an effective voice in public policy. Groups such as the 4-H clubs, with their youth and enthusiasm have a vital role to play and should be encouraged.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

American colleges and universities have an outstanding record of support for U.S. foreign aid. Largely on contract to AID or philanthropic foundations, they have undertaken valuable research projects that have served the foreign aid program well. Through exchange programs and the establishment of schools in the developing countries, they have brought skills and knowledge. Two of the most outstanding efforts are the schools for middle-management capabilities operated in Peru and Central America under contract with AID by Stanford University and the Harvard Business School respectively.

Management administration, technical skills and teacher training are all so desperately needed that there is no danger of doing too much. Equally important, however, is expanded teaching of political science. This is a new discipline to many developing countries, but there is growing evidence that the younger generations are eager for the tools of social science to help them shape their future.

American colleges and universities must be encouraged to accept every opportunity for bringing to the developing world a greater knowledge of political science and organization skills. Greater attention should be given to the law schools where the great U.S. tradition of the partnership between law and public policy can serve as a useful example to societies where the study of law is more narrowly conceived.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

The contributions of the Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie and other foundations to the development process know no equal. The opportunities for such foundations are immense. They are uniquely equipped to provide the kind of financial and technical assistance needed to expand the teaching of political science and to help reshape university curriculums to reflect modern needs.

The International Development Foundation has served as one kind of model for an experiment in creating independent private foundations. It is worth considering whether initial and supporting capital for such an operation could come directly from AID. Of course, it would have to be made clear that both the foundation's operations were consistent with the U.S. foreign aid program and that its policies and programs were established and implemented privately. National sensitivities in this field, as in efforts to increase popular participation may be aroused, but the ends of development are too important for the means of development to be limited merely by fear of controversy.

OTHER VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

There are a number of other groups in the United States that have given form and shape to our own development as a modern society. It is impossible to think of a single segment of American society that does not have its institutional representation. All of these groups, the League of Women Voters, the Knights of Columbus, the American Bar Association, and the National Council of Churches, to name just a few, represent the interests of their members. Independently these groups are effective; collectively they have undeniable strength in a democracy. They are a creative and vital force that must be engaged in the foreign aid program.

POLITICAL PARTIES

The most obvious voluntary public associations in the United States are, of course, the two major political parties. Their potential in support of foreign aid is immeasurable. It is important that whatever they do they try to do collectively.

Merely a greater facilitation of contact between U.S. politicians and their counterparts in the developing countries would be extremely beneficial in building an understanding of the developmental process. But more broad and specific programs could be designed. The short-lived Institute for Political Education established in Costa Rica to teach political skills and public policy knowledge to progressive Latin American political parties may have provided an important clue as to the most valuable contribution which the Republican and Democratic Parties collectively can make.

Proposals in this country have been made for a Latin American Institute for Democratic Development to aid Latin American political parties in the identification and training of new leaders in education in political science and organization skills. It would be an important and appropriate initiative taken collectively by the two great U.S. political parties to found such an institute, to finance it, and to sustain it.

A further important role could be served by both parties at the national and local levels if they would take it upon themselves to encourage other private voluntary associations to participate actively in the foreign aid program. The Republican and Democratic Parties now reach into every community in the United States. They have a responsibility to engage themselves and to seek to engage others in support of development in the developing countries.

A NEW ROLE FOR THE STATES

There are now 28 Partners of the Alliance programs which have enlisted American States, or portions of them, in mutual development efforts with nations or regions of Latin America. The purpose of the partners program is not to build roads and bridges, but to build the confidence of the private sector, in the United States and in Latin America, in the goals and purposes of the Alliance for Progress. My own State of Massachusetts has a partners program with the Department of Antioquia, Colombia. The goals are modest, but the dividends are great, not only for mutual understanding, but for a new faith in the development process.

This program, in my judgment, has been given too little attention and too little support. Its potential for increasing the foreign aid constituency here in this country and for providing the high impact support perhaps most needed in many parts of Latin America is enormous.

Another example of successful decentralization of responsibility for foreign aid is the Chile-California program of technical cooperation, by which the State of California, under contract with AID, has undertaken to assist the people of Chile in the planning and research of development projects. Since the program was undertaken in the spring of 1964, eight technical assistance projects studies calling for a U.S. contribution of $1,367,000, have been negotiated. The projects cover research, in Chile and at California universities, in transportation, agricultural development, education, budgeting, and regional planning.

When I visited Chile last fall, I was impressed by the enthusiasm and support the program was receiving. Historic ties and similar geographic conditions have increased the responsiveness of the Chileans to the California-administered program. Certainly, this pattern can be repeated successfully. One of the reasons for the Partners of the Alliance program between Massachusetts and Antioquia was the similarity of our mutual development patterns. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has the educational facilities, the business community, the labor movement, and the church, professional, youth, and political groups to undertake a broad collective effort to participate in the development of Colombia.

The States would not be in competition with AID, but would cooperate fully with AID guidelines and coordination. AID should welcome their initiative and the opportunity to engage the people in a direct and beneficial State-to-State program that can facilitate the popular participation in development we believe is so necessary to meaningful economic growth.

A CLEARINGHOUSE FOR PRIVATE AID EFFORTS

In 1955 the Technical Assistance Information Clearing House, a private center for the collection and dissemination of information on overseas private development programs, was established and supported under contract by the predecessor of AID. The clearinghouse has served as an information center on the programs and operations of U.S. voluntary agencies, missions, and foundations engaged in technical assistance abroad. It maintains comprehensive files on more than 400 organizations and their technical assistance programs, AID contract information, and related material. This information is available to government and private agencies for their use in planning programs and to individuals and groups seeking channels for using their special skills and resources.

This limited concept of a clearinghouse may have been adequate in 1955. It is inadequate today. And if the private sector of the American economic and political communities is to be engaged in support of development abroad in a more active way, as has been proposed here, the existing clearinghouse will prove to be obviously insufficient. It is necessary to have this information exist within AID itself, for the coordination—as opposed to direction—of the multitude of private aid efforts by a multitude of voluntary associations in the United States will require extraordinary emphasis and attention.

With over 400 agencies in the private aid field already, with over 3,000 private

U.S. business concerns operating with facilities abroad, and with an ever-increasing participation of local communities and other voluntary groups, it is essential to establish a clearinghouse and coordinating office that will be able to minimize the duplication of effort and maximize the information available on what efforts are being undertaken and what efforts need assistance. The program to engage the private sector in the development process in the support of foreign aid imposes a new obligation upon AID to provide the administrative framework within which such a vastly expanded program of personnel and communications can be effectively and orderly managed.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the recommendations we have made here today will contribute to the strength and effectiveness of our efforts to assist the developing countries. Insofar as they reflect a sharp break with the past, we recognize how little really we have learned about the development process. We have learned a good deal about programs and policies that will not work; we have learned a good deal less about those that will.

We really do not know to what extent the experience of U.S. voluntary agencies will be transferable to a situation which differs so sharply from our own. We really do not know just what it is that will give people in the rural backwaters of Latin America, Asia, and Africa a sense of their own political effectiveness.

But we do know that there is a revolution going on. Either we will use our resources in an effort to channel that revolution in a direction that promises freedom, or we will leave it to those for whom freedom has no value.

If we truly believe that the principles of freedom, liberty, equality, and self-government have relevance for all people in the modern world, we must, as a matter of national interest and moral conscience, move in the direction we have proposed today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 162]

Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Bell
Blatnik
Bolling
Celler
Clark
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Flynt
Garmatz
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Holland
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Landrum
McEwen
McFall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Moorhead
Morris
Murray
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Scott
Senner
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 371 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1966".

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, in addressing myself to the bill before us, I shall confine my remarks to two aspects of this legislation: to the need for it, and to the new dimension which it provides for our foreign aid effort.

The need for this legislation—for the various instruments which enable the President of the United States to carry out the foreign policy of our Nation—is as urgent today as it was 10 and 15 years ago.

The world in which we live is still a very troubled world. The ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, and ignorance—exercise their sway over the lives of millions of our fellow men. The clash of competing ideologies—the greed and perversity of some men and of some rulers—threaten the security and the lives of millions of peoples in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, and in other areas.

In times like these, we in the United States—the strongest and the most prosperous country on earth today—must take adequate measures to provide for our own security and to help others attain theirs.

The military assistance program embodied in the bill before us—and, to a large extent, the supporting assistance and the contingency fund authorizations—are required for this purpose.

In addition, and looking to the future, we must continue to aid in ameliorating conditions which give rise to instability and disorder in the world—conditions of economic dependence, of underdevelopment, and of want. Our own material well-being, and the future of peace in the world, are intimately connected to the success of our efforts in this field—and not only of our own efforts, but also those of millions of peoples, and dozens of governments, who are striving to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

The Alliance for Progress—the economic development loan program—and the technical assistance portion of the bill before us, are directed to the attainment of this objective. Without them, we would leave our Government, and our President, without the tools necessary to build for peace in the world.

THE NEW DIMENSION

In the remainder of my remarks, I shall speak about the new dimension of foreign aid embodied in this year's Foreign Assistance Act.

I believe that the bill before us contains some of the most important and exciting breakthroughs in our approach to the development process.

For years, the bulk of our foreign assistance effort was channeled into government-to-government transactions. The flow of our foreign assistance was predicated on the assumption that national governments were primarily, at times even exclusively, responsible for economic development of the territories under their jurisdiction.

To an extent, that assumption may have been correct when applied to the organization of society in many of the developing countries of the free world. However, it ignored one of the basic facts of life; namely, that economic development of the United States and Canada, of Western Europe and of Japan—the most industrialized and prosperous countries of the free world—was accomplished not by governments alone but through a combination of governmental action, private initiative, and free enterprise.

The experience of the developed countries suggests that the most direct path to economic development, and to progress in such fields as education, health, as well as to social and political development, lies in the direction of an effective, working partnership between private initiative and governmental enterprise.

It is only such a partnership that is able to harness the energies and the talents of the entire population of a country to the task of economic development—to harness them in a way which allows ample opportunity for innovation, for individual initiative, and for private cooperative undertakings.

Similarly, private enterprise and the experience and generosity of private individuals and organizations in the developed countries, can play an important part in stimulating economic development of the less developed areas.

We began to recognize these principles, and to apply them to our foreign aid effort, as early as a decade ago.

Through various amendments to our foreign aid legislation, enacted over a period of years, we called for the establishment of community action programs; for the encouragement of cooperatives, savings and loan associations, free labor unions and other private institutions; for the utilization of the experience and the facilities of U.S. voluntary agencies; and for the promotion of private investment capital abroad. All of these early congressional mandates were directed to the goal of assuring more comprehensive, diversified, and effective popular participation in the development process.

Over 2 years ago, we took another step. A survey conducted by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I have the honor to chair, focused attention on the extremely broad range of programs conducted abroad by private, nonprofit American organizations and emphasized the contribution of those activities to the development process.

Our report stressed the urgent need to collate more information of this type, and to bring it to bear on the programing and implementation of our foreign aid.

The directory which we published after the survey constitutes something of a milestone in the effort to collect, organize systematically, and disseminate information about the activities of such private groups.

NEW EMPHASIS ON PRIVATE PARTICIPATION

The bill before the House today takes another step—a giant step—along the path which we have marked in earlier years.

In a sequence of provisions written by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this legislation emphasizes the importance of private participation in the development process—and directs the President to make such participation a high-priority goal of our foreign aid undertaking.

The amendments embodying this new dimension of foreign aid are scattered throughout the bill. They were proposed by a number of Members—Democrats and Republicans alike—and they convey our committee's conviction that in the process of helping the developing countries realize their full potential, we must place substantially more emphasis on private-to-private, and government-to-private, channels of aid and communication.

I am certain that various members of the committee will elaborate on the specifics of these various amendments. I will, therefore, only briefly comment about their form and purpose.

CLEARINGHOUSE OF INFORMATION

One of the key amendments, contained in section 301 of the bill, directs the President to establish an effective system for obtaining adequate information about the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process.

The amendment further imposes upon the President the responsibility to use such information in the planning, direction, and execution of our foreign aid programs, and to coordinate such programs with the ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernment U.S. institutions.

This is the first clear, comprehensive, unequivocal expression of congressional sentiment on this subject. It is even more than that: it constitutes a legislative directive to the President to take specific steps in order to set up a clearinghouse of information about nongovernmental U.S. involvement in the development process—and to coordinate federally sponsored foreign aid programs with private effort.

We know that the Agency for International Development, working through its own staff as well as through contractural arrangements with the Technical Assistance Information Clearinghouse of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., in New York, has begun to collect and publish information about several segments of this private activity. What we need, however, is a concerted effort in this area—not only with respect to the programs conducted abroad by American organizations, but also with respect to the need and the opportunities for such private foreign aid. We trust that this new legislative provision will give the President both the necessary authority and the mandate to launch such a concerted effort.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Another key section of the bill—section 103(a)—authorizes the President to assist research and educational institutions in the United States in strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of the less developed countries.

During the next 2 fiscal years, the President may use up to $10 million of technical cooperation, development grants and Alliance for Progress funds for this purpose.

AID currently uses the services of universities in carrying out some overseas programs. Frequently, these activities place excessive demands on the limited specialized manpower resources of such institutions. The new authority will enable AID to assist a selected group of educational and research institutions in developing additional resources and greater competence on the campus in problems related to growth in the developing countries. In turn, AID will be able to draw upon this increased private capability in preparing and carrying out technical programs in the developing countries.

ENCOURAGING PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The bill before us extends for 5 years the requirement that not less than 50 percent of development loan funds must be used to encourage economic development through private enterprise. It also contains the following provisions designed to encourage the flow of private investment overseas—a flow which is an important factor in economic development:

First. Section 301 provides for the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council composed of leading American business specialists.

This Council will make recommendations to the Administrator of the foreign aid program with respect to activities where private enterprise can make a meaningful contribution. The Council will also serve as liaison for the Administrator with specific private enterprises which may be involved or interested in the foreign assistance program.

Second. Sections 102 and 105 of the bill direct the President, in carrying out the foreign assistance program, to encourage each recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development.

Third. Section 104 changes the investment guarantee program in the following respects:

First. It increases the ceiling on the total amount of specific risk guarantees which may be outstanding at any one time from $5 to $8 billion;

Second. It raises the ceiling on the extended risks guarantee program from $300 to $375 million, while earmarking $160 million of this amount for use on housing projects throughout the world.

Third. It increases from $400 to $500 million the amount of Latin American housing guarantees that may be outstanding at any one time, and earmarks $350 million of that total for use solely for pilot or demonstration private housing projects similar to those insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

And, finally, the bill adjusts the minimum rate of interest that the Administrator of AID can allow eligible U.S. investors to earn on loan investments for housing; raises from 20 to 30 years the maximum term of equity investment guaranties; and authorizes a number of lesser changes to make the program more serviceable to investors.

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

I mentioned previously, Mr. Chairman, our committee's conviction that in order to expedite economic development, the people of the developing countries—as well as the private sector in the developed countries—must be given the means and the opportunity to participate fully in the development process.

In section 106, the bill before us addresses itself to this issue: it directs that in carrying out programs of U.S. development assistance, much higher priority and emphasis shall be accorded to the goal of assuring maximum popular participation in the development process. The committee report points out that this goal can best be achieved through the fostering of democratic private and governmental institutions—cooperatives, labor organizations, trade and related associations, community action groups, and local governmental bodies. Such organizations provide the training ground for leadership and democratic processes. By making possible increased participation of such groups and of individuals in the planning, execution, and evaluation of development undertakings; by utilizing the experience and resources of existing private and voluntary organizations; and, generally, by building of democratic private and public institutions on all levels—we can foster maximum reliance on enlightened self-help, at the same time assuring maximum return on each dollar spent through the foreign aid program.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I stated at the outset that the bill before us—the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966—opens a new dimension of foreign aid. It is an exciting, and a promising, dimension. By placing new emphasis on private effort in the development process—by opening the doors wide and facilitating private participation in this process—I believe that we can greatly hasten the realization of our goals in this field.

Also, and perhaps even more importantly, by sharing with our friends in the developing countries the secret of our own economic growth; namely, that wise governmental policies must always be complemented by imaginative private initiatives, by voluntary cooperative efforts, and by reliance on local responsibility—we will enable them to advance toward a better tomorrow much faster than they could do it in any other way.

Even the Communists are beginning to realize that private, nongovernmental enterprise, which plays such a large part in our system, accomplishes more and pays larger dividends than total reliance on central government action—even when the latter is reinforced by coercion and terror.

What we propose today in the bill before us is a workable alternative to an unwarranted dependence on miracles wrought by governments alone. It is an alternative that has proved successful in each and every country which has managed to achieve economic progress while keeping secure its people's right to freedom. It is an alternative—a new dimension—which should meet with an enthusiastic response both in the United States and abroad.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAILLIARD

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MAILLIARD: On the first page, immediately after line 4, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 2. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after the first section thereof the following new section:
>
> " 'SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR AUTHORIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act (except sections 202 and 252) authorizes appropriations for furnishing assistance or for administrative expenses under this Act for fiscal year 1968.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I announced earlier in general debate that I was going to offer. It does one thing and one thing only.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce from 2 years to 1 year the authorizations contained in this bill, with the exception of the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress, which are not touched by the amendment.

I offer this for a number of reasons. Only on those two exceptions have we hitherto given multiyear authorizations. The remainder of the bill we have never before given more than a single year authorization. I am referring to economic not military aid. Also, if the Members will look on page 3 of the committee report, which has the table on the authorization requests, it becomes immediately apparent that no justifications for any fiscal year 1968 authorizations were given. We cannot find them in the hearings. We cannot find them in the report.

I am not one who is unalterably opposed to multiyear authorizations. I for one will oppose any attempt to reduce the multiyear authorizations for the Development Loan Fund or for the Alliance for Progress.

But, it seems to me, that if, even for administrative expenditures and these various other programs which do not have long leadtime factors, we are to decide to change the time-honored policy and proceed to a 2-year authorization, then it ought to be done at the beginning of a new Congress and not at the end of an old Congress. This will have the effect of having a new Congress, convening in January, which will not have the chance to examine this or which will not be compelled to examine this until the second session of that Congress. This certainly is very poor practice.

If we are going to have a 2-year program, it seems to me the administration ought to come in with a 2-year program, which it did not do. The administration request this year was for a 5-year program and open ended authorization, which would have abdicated virtually any responsibility of our committee to determine what should be authorized.

The committee wisely put dollar amounts on. The Members will notice that in some cases these amounts bear almost no resemblance to the budgeted amounts, even for 1967, but for 1968 we cannot find anything. I am not at all sure that we might not have granted much too much in some categories and too little in some other categories. But in any case we cannot find in the record any justification of what should be a proper amount.

I submit we should return to the honored tradition of the House for a single-year authorization. If there is to be a fundamental change in policy, I believe it should be considered by the new Congress in January.

I urge the passage of my amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding in opposition to the amendment, may I take just a moment to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for the great job it has done this year.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported a very good bill—the best in recent years. It will do the job, but at the same time it is a prudent piece of legislation which can be supported by every member. Again I congratulate the able chairman and his committee for their excellent work. It provides only a few million dollars more than last year's authorization bill, despite the fact that the needs have greatly increased during the past year. It provides aid for one less country than last year's bill. It also provides more aid for Vietnam than any other country.

This new legislation also includes increased funds for programs which Congress has always thought were basic, in agriculture, health, and education.

It is also worth noting that under this authorization bill we will still be spending less than three-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product.

I think Members of the House generally agree that the foreign aid program is now the best administered and most effective in the history of economic assistance. For this reason, Members can vote with confidence for the bill reported by the committee. I congratulate the able chairman and the members of the committee for their excellent work.

The pending amendment would eliminate the 2-year authorization for all parts of the program except for the Development and Alliance Loan sections which the committee has recommended again for 5 years. Every minority member of the committee who has expressed opposition to the 2-year authorization has done so despite the fact that a number of these same members have supported long-term authorizations in the past for the Development Loan program and the Alliance for Progress as well as for military assistance.

It is difficult to understand the position of our Republican friends who oppose the 2-year proposition. It was a Republican President who first requested long-term authorization for the foreign aid program for the less developed countries.

What President Johnson has requested and what the committee is recommending is merely an extension of Republican principles first written into law under a Republican President. But what President Eisenhower requested was much more radical than President Johnson's request. President Eisenhower's administration requested borrowing authority, which would have deprived Congress of all control over the foreign aid program. By comparison, the request of President Johnson is for multiyear authorization with annual appropriations.

Most of those on this side supported President Eisenhower's request for long-term authorization in 1957 and again in 1959 for 2-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund.

The Development Loan Fund was the first step in putting the foreign aid program on a sounder, more businesslike basis. All that President Johnson and the committee are now recommending is a minimum authorization of 2 years—which can hardly be called long-term, it is really a short-term authorization, for the remainder of the program.

The authorization for more than 1 year of the Development Loan and the Alliance Loan programs has worked quite well. The present request merely extends this system to the other parts of the program, which are as deserving of 2 years as are the loan programs of 5 years.

Surely supporting assistance for Vietnam is deserving of a 2-year authorization. Contributions to international organizations, which are a continuing commitment by the United States, are also deserving of 2 years. Technical assistance is certainly deserving of 2 years, having been in existence since the point 4 program. It makes no sense to authorize loan programs for 5 years and refuse a 2-year authorization to these vital parts of the foreign aid program.

It is also important to point out that Congress has voted long-term authorizations of 3 to 5 years for the international foreign aid work of the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank. There is no reason to penalize our own U.S. programs.

The advantages of a 2-year authorization are well known to Members of this House. Let me just point out the testimony of the chamber of commerce before the Foreign Affairs Committee in favor of a 4-year authorization, which is twice as much as the committee has recommended. One of the Nation's leading businessmen said in speaking for the chamber:

> We think this is consistent with what we in business would term good long-range planning.

Those in the minority opposing the 2-year provisions are not being consistent, nor are they applying the same standards which were applied in establishing the Development Loan Fund. Former Congressman John Vorys, who led the fight against the long-term authorization of the Marshall plan recognized as early as 1957 that the foreign aid program as a whole should be put on a long-term basis. As he said during hearings that year:

> This program, the mutual security program, is, I think, the only program on Capitol Hill that is both authorized and appropriated annually. I will take credit or blame for inventing that. I did that back in 1948. I think to some extent its usefulness has passed. But that is one of the things we face.
>
> In order to get away from that, the Gordon bill and the administration presentation this year suggests more in the way of continuing funds. That is one way to get away from it, as far as the authorization is concerned: More time for programing so that you don't have that Cinderella temptation the night of June 29 to plaster the walls with obligations.

In conclusion, let me point out that a 2-year authorization was recently passed for the food-for-freedom program by the House. Passage of the bill recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee would be consistent with this action, with previous congressional action on foreign aid, and with the bipartisan positions of every president and with the recommendation of a variety of American leaders. I urge the House to support the committee bill.

Under unanimous consent agreement, Mr. Chairman, I include a statement about the 2-year authorization together with statements of spokesmen of various organizations favoring it:

TWO-YEAR AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

The Foreign Affairs Committee, acting on a request from the President to authorize the foreign aid program for five years, has renewed the authorization for Development Loans and the Alliance for Progress for five years and has recommended a two-year authorization for the remainder of the program. This is only half as much as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has gone on record as supporting. The Vice President of Pfizer International, testifying for the Chamber, recommended a four-year authorization as being "consistent with what we in business would term good long-range planning."

Passage of the two-year program would be in keeping with Congressional action in the past and with the recommendations of a number of other persons and groups in addition to the Chamber.

1. In 1957 and in 1959 Congress approved two-year authorizations for the Development Loan Funds. This was made a five-year authorization in 1961.
2. In 1962 Congress approved a four-year authorization for the Alliance for Progress loan program.
3. At various times Congress has approved long-term authorizations ranging from three to five years for U.S. subscriptions to the World Bank, the International Development Association (a subsidiary of the World Bank), the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.
4. Congress has also approved long-term authorizations for the Food for Peace program. The House has recently approved a two-year authorization for the Food for Freedom program.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR LONG-TERM AUTHORIZATION

Every administration since the inception of foreign assistance has agreed on the need for long-term authorization of the program.

President Truman, under whose administration the Marshall Plan began and author of the Point 4 Program: "It is well known that one-year authorizations for development programs are wasteful and inadequate. Countries that are planning their development ahead . . . are kept in doubt and are unable to move ahead with confidence. The authorization clearly should be for 4 or 5 years, as in the case of the Marshall Plan."

President Eisenhower, who proposed the Mutual Security Program and under it the Development Loan Fund: "I believe our common objective can best be accomplished through a long-term authorization of appropriations in reasonable amounts, together with the concurrent enactment in one appropriation bill of appropriations for each of the years for which the program is authorized . . ."

President Kennedy, who proposed the present Foreign Assistance Act and with it the Alliance for Progress: "Long-term authorization, planning and financing are the key to the continuity and efficiency of the entire program. If we are unwilling to make such a long-term commitment, we cannot expect an increased response from other potential donors or any realistic planning from the recipient nations . . . No other step would be such a clear signal of our intentions to all the world . . . No other step would do more to help obtain the service of top-flight personnel. And in no other way can we encourage the less-developed nations to make a sustained national effort over a long-term period."

President Johnson, who has directed the program toward new initiatives: "To signify the depth of our commitment to help those who help themselves, I am requesting five-year authorizations for our military and economic aid programs. For development loans and loans under the Alliance for Progress, this is merely a reaffirmation of the principle adopted by the Congress in 1964 and 1962. It will not impair the ability or the duty of the Congress to review these programs. Indeed, it will free the Congress from the burden of an annual renewal of basic legislation, and provide greater opportunity for concentration on policy and program issues."

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

Congressional control has been maintained over both foreign and domestic programs with permanent or long-term authorizations, including Development Loans and Alliance for Progress loans which represent approximately half of the economic aid program.

A long-term authorization does not bypass the normal procedures of Congress. Rather, it applies the same form of control exercised over all agencies and programs which have been authorized for more than one year.

First, authorizing legislation is recommended by the committees and debated on the Floor of each House of Congress. The resulting statute will provide a clear guide for administration, programming and financing a stated number of years. Congress can, of course, amend this authorizing statute at any time before the expiration of the authorization.

Second, the authorizing committees will exercise continual scrutiny over the operation of the program, and require periodic auditing and reporting. Freed from the annual authorization process, much of which required repetitive presentation and review, the authorizing committees can examine the entire aid program or selected aspects in greater depth and detail than before. At the end of the authorization period, Congress would be in a better position to make a broad judgment of the program and to determine constructive changes in future legislation. The Executive Branch would benefit similarly from a longer period of time between presentations of the program.

To facilitate continuing review by the authorizing committees, the President has requested an amendment to Section 634(d) of the Act to provide for a full and detailed annual presentation of the program to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee if it is requested. This amendment was reported favorably from Committee.

Third, during the years when the program is already authorized, annual appropriations would continue to be required. These, together with continuing review by the authorizing committees, would insure Congressional control over the foreign aid program—control which because it can be more selective will be more effective.

STATEMENTS BY BUSINESS, FARM AND LABOR LEADERS

U.S. Chamber of Commerce (John O. Teeter, Vice President of Pfizer International, on behalf of the Chamber, April 27, 1966): "Long-range economic planning and development must be emphasized in foreign assistance programs. To accomplish this goal, a 4-year authorization of foreign aid funds, subject to annual appropriations and review by appropriate Congressional committees, is desirable. We think this is consistent with what we in business would term good long-range planning."

Farm Bureau (John C. Lynn, Legislative Director, May 3, 1966): "Let's decide what is in the best interests of the United States. . . Make this a 10-year plan or a 5-year plan, if this is what is required. Then each year the administrative agencies of Government would come before this committee and demonstrate to you what progress they are making on the plan that you and, let us say, the AID administrators develop for India.

"We would be for a 5-year plan, but the authorization would be based on the progress being made toward carrying out the plan.

"This is the same procedure that the Congress follows with regard to domestic programs. We see no reason why it shouldn't be done with the AID program."

AFL–CIO (James F. Doherty, Legislative Representative, May 4, 1966): "the AFL–CIO Executive Council has endorsed the President's move to separate the economic and military aid requests and to have aid authorized for a 5-year period." (Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council, February 25, 1966. For some time, it has been clear that the yearly foreign aid programs require better planning. The executive council calls upon Congress to enact into law the President's proposals to separate the economic and military aid programs and to have them authorized for a 5-year period in order to make possible their being planned more effectively.)

STATEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (by John T. Caldwell, President, North Carolina State University, May 10, 1966):

"The institutions of a society which develop, undergird and replenish the individual and social competencies cannot be produced overnight. For this reason we applaud the proposal in H.R. 12449 for five-year funding authorizations . . . But five-year authorizations would add a measure of psychological stability to a foreign aid program too often characterized in the past by year-to-year uncertainty. The five-year authorization begins to recognize the desirability of choosing long-range goals and building programs toward their achievement."

Earl Rudder, President, Texas A & M University: "One of the most common fallacies in foreign assistance thinking is the assumption that host officials responsible for development in newly developing countries are already committed to the action required for progress with specific development projects. This fallacy, plus short-term aid commitments results in projects getting underway without sufficient commitment on the part of the host government to secure the minimum in local participation and support required for success."

Elvis Stahr, President, Indiana University: "Renegotiations of contracts annually or biennially have been known to take as much as eight months . . . with corresponding uncertainty and loss of time."

John T. Fey, President, the University of Wyoming: "Lack of predictable funding is a major deterrent for any university-related program."

STATEMENTS BY RELIGIOUS LEADERS

National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., June 26, 1961: "Through the years the constituent denominations and the policy organs of the national council have formulated definitive recommendations with regard to the policies and operations of assistance programs. These have been presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on numerous occasions. They have included—(1) The authorization of programs over a period of several years so that plans, operations, and relationships with participating countries could be freed from impossible deadlines, crisis psychology, improvisation, and the waste which results from the 1-year programing cycle."

National Council of Catholic Women, April 28. 1966: "We fully support the President's request for a 5-year authorization of our economic assistance programs. The reason that we particularly are interested in a 4- or 5-year term on this particular bill is that we have found in many different areas that a project will be started, or it is ready to be started, but there is no point in starting it because in a couple of weeks, or a couple of months the committee has to look at it again, and decide whether we can do this or we can do that. This is a long-term project. You have to be educating men from primitive manhood and you can't do it in 12 months."

National Council of Jewish Women, May 4, 1966: "Five-year authorization: The National Council of Jewish Women favors a 5-year authorization, with yearly review of appropriations, for the economic aid program. We believe this is necessary to give validity and continuity to an assistance program emphasizing sustained long-term development in recipient countries.

"And long-term economic development based on 1-year planning does seem to us contradictory."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it requires some courage to take on the majority leader in his argument that Congress should change from a basic policy which we have maintained since the beginning of the foreign aid program to a new policy, by providing a 2-year authorization. Yet the majority leader himself made it quite plain that no justification has been made for us to support this 2-year suggestion, as that it is not even what the President has requested. The President requested a 5-year, long-term authorization and, as the majority leader himself said, this is a short-term authorization.

However, a 2-year authorization is twice as long as has been previously authorized and, for the life of me, I can see no justification, including the remarks just made, to make us change our present procedures.

The majority leader made much of the fact that Republicans only are now opposing this 2-year authorization. Well, the fact of the matter is that the conversion of a good many members on the majority side of our committee is very recent and quite inexplicable. Certainly there is no partisanship involved here. The chairman of the committee himself said yesterday that he was a long-term opponent of long-term authorizations, and yet he is now supporting a 2-year program.

There is no reason, so far as the alleged advantages to the program are concerned, why we should take this course and adopt a change in policy. The only justification advanced, and perhaps this is a problem that should concern the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs themselves and nobody else, is that we on the committee are so busy with other important business, or so incapable, that we cannot afford to take a good look at the foreign aid program every year. To my mind that is a reflection on the capacity of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is not an accurate reflection of how busy we are. Also, it ignores the fact that the foreign aid program is of such a character that it needs close supervision.

Indeed, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this year is leading the fight for a short authorization because he recognizes this is the only way in which Congress can keep it under close scrutiny. Granted, if the Foreign Affairs Committee wants to abdicate in favor of the Committee on Appropriations, that committee would exercise some control over these programs. However, the Appropriations Committee is concerned basically with money, whereas the basic policymaking committee should be the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is no justification for us to change our policy.

The majority leader has suggested that this multiyear authorization was merely an extension of Republican principles, and asserted that President Eisenhower asked for something which was much more radical. I should like simply to point out that Congress did not respond to that suggestion of President Eisenhower. I should like also to point out that the suggestion now made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not a response to what the President is suggesting. He asked for 5 years, and the committee recommends 2. The reason why the committee has not responded is because there is a basic recognition that Congress needs relatively close authority over and control over the foreign aid program. It is simply a question as to whether we should do it on a 1-year basis, or whether we can get by on a 2-year basis.

Nobody has answered the argument that, if we should accept the 2-year proposal, and make this radical departure from the way that Congress has handled its responsibilities in the past, we should act at the beginning of a new Congress. Surely we should not attempt to bind a subsequent Congress, as we would be doing if we should approve a 2-year authorization this year.

Why, the majority leader asked, should we refuse to approve an authorization for a 2-year program for vital programs? The implication of that question asked by the majority leader is those programs would not be able to be carried on unless we grant this authority. Yet vital programs will continue so long as they are authorized, and will not depend in any way on the length of the authorization.

We should continue with a 1-year authorization because this gives us an opportunity to scrutinize the program next year in the regular course of events. This would not mean that the long-range planning would not continue without interruption, and just as effectively and efficiently. The executive branch is already engaged in such planning. Secretary McNamara pointed out during the hearings that the executive branch is presently engaged in planning for military aid to a variety of countries. That is not going to be interrupted in any way, whether or not Congress authorizes this program for 1, 2, 5, or 10 years. So the argument that the chamber of commerce or anybody else may use, that the only way we can get good long-range planning is have multiyear authorizations, is entirely fallacious. We can get good long-range planning if we keep a close eye on what the executive branch is doing and how they attend to their business.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it may seem a little strange to some of my colleagues on the committee that I should take the well and, perhaps, it is strange. But, Mr. Chairman, I feel this is an issue which deserves careful discussion and support for a 2-year authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I am less than enthusiastic about this legislation but my colleagues know that I have never been a party, either in the committee or in this House in hampering and handicapping for the sake of doing so and because I opposed legislation. Neither have I been a party in supporting amendments to a bill, which I am not going to support. I have not done so in the committee, and I know my colleagues are aware of it.

Mr. Chairman, I have been for a longer authorization since the days of the Marshall plan.

I have served for a period of 16 years in this House on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The thing that is amazing to me is that this program has worked in its administrative process as well as it has.

Mr. Chairman, we have had some fine administrators. We have a new one coming in now who is an able man. We have just lost an able man. We have people dedicated to performing a job which we tell them they must perform.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is anyone who has been more enthusiastic about the technical assistance end of the program than have I.

The majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] will remember there was a great man, Dr. Bennett, from his State who came before this committee many years ago. He had just returned from India and he went to Ethiopia. He was killed in an airplane accident, which was a tragedy and which represented a great loss, not only as an individual but a loss in the terms of service to his country.

Dr. Bennett told the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

> Just give me a $2 steel-pointed plow that the Indian farmer can use in cultivating 18 acres of land rather than 4 acres; that is all I want.

Mr. Chairman, he said he did not want hundreds of millions of dollars to flow into this program.

My opposition to this program has been one of scope and not of administration and not of intent.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to do too much. But no administrator and no administration can properly plan on a year-to-year basis in such an immense free-flowing operation as this and do it efficiently. Some of the most prominent leaders in this country, as the distinguished majority leader said—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Farm Bureau, the AFL–CIO, and other organizations—have been insisting for years for us to do this job more efficiently, give these people time to plan, and we can look at it through the Committee on Appropriations year by year; give them a chance. However, we have never done this.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the remarkable thing is that it has worked as well as it has.

It just seems to me that if we would give them this opportunity it would be in our best interest.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], does the gentleman really think now, before he takes issue with me and says, "Well, how many hearing did you attend"?—I had a little business in my congressional district in the middle of these hearings to which I had to attend if I stayed here—but I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] or any other member of the committee if—and this is no reflection upon any of them—if we really went into depth into this program this year, or as to that matter in the last several years? I do not think so.

Mr. Chairman, I say that whatever changes might be made can be for the better, because I do not believe the gentleman can tell us that we went into this program in depth.

This responsibility is certainly the responsibility of the Congress and a responsibility of the gentleman's party and I do not believe it has been done and I do not believe anyone has done it in the past several years.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the committee has not gone into these questions in depth it is not because we have failed to give a long-term authorization. It is simply because we have failed in a basic part of our responsibility as members of a major legislative committee. It is not because of the lack of time. If we organized our time in such a way as to get the job done, we could do it on an annual authorization basis.

If we were to accept the line of argument that the gentleman is presenting, every major committee of this House would say—we can only afford to take a look at major problems falling within the responsibility of our committee every other year or once every 5 years.

I would suggest to the gentleman that that would be offensive to the members of most of the committees. I would hope it would be offensive to members of our own committee.

Mr. BURLESON. I think the gentleman is making a very good argument in favor of the 2-year authorization which would give us time to go into it. We have not been doing it and I think we should.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed an ironic moment, for we have on the minority side three Members speaking in favor of this amendment who, in the years that I have been a Member of this House, have traditionally and consistently supported the foreign aid bill, each speaking in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

On the other hand, we have just heard our distinguished and scholarly friend, the gentleman from Texas, speaking against the amendment, a gentleman who has traditionally opposed this bill.

I think for the majority to accuse the minority in this regard of being insensitive to the needs of the foreign aid program misses the mark.

In this House in 1961, I as a new Member supported the long-range authorization for the Development Loan Fund and for the Alliance for Progress. You have my pledge I will fight to maintain the full 5-year authorization if it is proposed that the term of authorization for the Alliance for Progress be cut. As a matter of fact, I do not have strong feelings about the 2-year authorization but I do have strong feelings about the responsibility of this House to do its job.

In the committee absolutely no evidence and no testimony was presented as to what the requirements for the several accounts which are the subject of the 2-year authorization under the committee bill would be for fiscal year 1968.

For example, the technical cooperation development grant authorization in the committee bill in 1967 is $231,310,000—the very same authorization for 1968. There was absolutely no study given to what the needs of the agency would be in 1968. That might require a different figure.

I could go down the line on this. You have the information before you on page 3 of the committee report.

Let us lay to rest one shibboleth right now—there is absolutely no need for a long-term authorization, to have the long-range planning that is so necessary to this program.

I was in the executive department for a couple of years during a previous administration. We planned long-range programs for 5 and 10 and 25 years without long-range authorizations. So I think the two are absolutely unrelated.

Gentlemen, I insist that this House would be irresponsible to accept the 2-year authorization of the accounts other than the DLF and the Alliance for Progress at this time. No. 1, we did not examine what the needs would be nor did the executive suggest what the needs would be in fiscal year 1968.

Furthermore, if there is a time to provide for a long-range authorization or a 2-year authorization, I think commonsense dictates that it should be at the beginning of a new Congress. I think if this bill comes before this Congress next year, there will be an opportunity for us to examine properly the question as to whether or not we should have a 2-year authorization for these other accounts.

I urge the House to recognize its responsibility, Mr. Chairman, and I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those of our colleagues who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will realize that it is very strange that this amendment should be so drawn as to be offered to this section of the bill.

This amendment is a limitation which has the effect of nullifying certain provisions of the bill which will be read later on and will be presumably, under consideration when they are read. All through the bill you are going to have conflicts between this amendment and the authorizations of funds which it contains. Such conflicts appear on page 3, page 11, page 12, page 13, page 14, and page 20.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I will yield in a moment. The right way to do what the gentleman seeks to do is to meet this issue head on every time there is a provision authorizing funds and to offer appropriate amendments so that we can determine whether we want a 1-year program or a 2-year program. Let us settle the issue as we go along. Let us consider the technical cooperation and development grant authorization on page 3 and determine the length of time for which funds are to be authorized for that program. Instead, the gentleman has come in with an across-the-board, meat-ax type of amendment which applies to programs as a group rather than giving them individual consideration. That is the wrong way to do it. There will be conflicting provisions which may be difficult to interpret.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I just want to explain—and I should have explained when I offered the amendment—that we did this in order not to have to offer 9 separate amendments.

Mr. MORGAN. You will have to offer separate amendments to take out the dates—the references to fiscal 1968.

Mr. MAILLIARD. No——

Mr. MORGAN. How are you going to correct those dates?

Mr. MAILLIARD. The Parliamentarian and everyone else agrees that the amendment would be effective. I admit it is unusual.

Mr. MORGAN. How are you going to correct these conflicting provisions on the pages in question? Your amendment would not correct the subsequent language in the bill.

Mr. MAILLIARD. If the gentleman would read the amendment again, he would see that it is automatically done.

Mr. MORGAN. You are going to have conflicting provisions all the way through the bill.

Mr. Chairman, my name has been tossed around here several times by my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] who has been saying that I have changed my mind on the question of multiple-year authorization. That is correct. If you will read the hearings, you will see that on the first day of our hearings, when the Secretary of State was present, I said to him that he would have to make a good case. I think the AID witnesses made a good case. So I became an advocate of the 2-year approach.

Now, the gentleman from New Jersey must have changed his mind because I have in my hand a quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1961. Here is what he said during that debate:

> Now, most of us, as I have indicated, are in favor of long-term programing. We recognize there can be more efficient and more effectiveness if we have long-term programs. Furthermore, I am certainly in favor of long-term commitments over a specific period to an individual country. We might develop such response on the basis of long-term authorizations for either three or four years. We might couple that with a multiple-year appropriation of part but not of all of the total amount.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee knows without my telling him that the so-called good case that the executive branch made could not have been very good if the committee rejected their recommendation. Their recommendation was for a 5-year authorization. The committee took action for a 2-year authorization. There was no testimony of any kind at any point, and I challenge the Chairman or anyone else to say so, with respect to a 2-year authorization. We have no idea whether the executive branch wants a 2-year authorization or not. There was no evidence presented that such an authorization would be of any benefit to them in dealing with the recipient countries, whether or not we should continue to be generous, and there was no indication that their long-range planning would be more efficient or more effective.

Mr. MORGAN. I disagree with the gentleman. I attended every one of the hearings except two. I listened to both the executive witnesses and the private witnesses and I have been convinced.

This House, on June 9 of this year, adopted a 2-year authorization for the food-for-freedom program without one single word of protest about a multiple-year authorization. That was a $3 billion program, and not one single word of protest was offered on the floor of the House to a multiple-year approach to the food-for-freedom program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. During the committee's deliberation on this particular bill the administration did justify its reason for wanting authorization for a 2-year program; is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman reads the hearings, he will find several convincing arguments in favor of a multiyear authorization.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to the able arguments made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], and other Members in opposition to this amendment, I would like to point out that the program will enable AID more effectively to do a bargaining job with developing countries. It will also enable the representatives of our country to negotiate with other countries and to urge that they should put more money into the development countries.

As well stressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman, it guarantees a more effective program.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I just want to say if we are going to face this issue, let us meet it. Let us meet it when we come to the authorization for technical assistance, and let us meet it when we come to the authorization for military assistance. We can consider each case on its own merit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I do not have to apologize to the members of the committee for being somewhat critical of the foreign aid program at this time and for my support of the Mailliard amendment, because over the years I have consistently supported the mutual security program or any part of the program by whatever name.

I served for 12 years on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Each year I analyzed the budget submissions of the mutual security program, on AID, or whatever the name of the organization was at that time which was handling the foreign aid program in the executive branch.

I believe the annual appropriation process for the foreign aid program is mandatory. On some occasions I have honestly doubted whether it was necessary to have annually both a foreign aid authorization and a foreign aid appropriation. But over the years I have gradually become convinced that it was more beneficial to do it twice than to do it once each year. Therefore I believe that we ought to have an authorization process every year, and we ought to have an appropriation process every year. The people who present the program should come up twice to the Congress, both the House and the Senate, to make their presentations and to jutsify the dollars, the programs and the projects that they are trying to get approved.

I have listened to members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for a number of years say repeatedly—and this is from Members on both sides—that they were never satisfied that they had had an opportunity to get into the program, into the details of the dollar submissions, and the individual projects and the programs that were submitted by the executive branch of the Government. These complaints came when we had an annual authorization.

Now the proposal is that instead of having an annual authorization presentation, they want to cut it in half. They want to make the committee's participation 50 percent less effective. I have heard many on the other side of the aisle, as well as on my own side of the aisle say that even when they did it every year, it was not sufficient. Now they want to cut it in half.

I do not see how we can get more congressional control when we reduce by 50 percent the time given to the consideration of it by the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Many of us are concerned—and that includes people on the other side of the aisle as well as people on our side of the aisle—that Congress is losing control over the programs, and over the dollars—and the dollars involved here are substantial. I just do not understand the rationale of those who say on one hand they want more congressional control, and on the other hand want to cut in half the consideration of the program by the House and by the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to point out to the Committee that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by a vote of 11 to 5, strongly supports the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan. I quote:

> A majority of the members of the committee feels that there should be at least an annual review by the policy committees of the Congress, at least until the world situation stabilizes somewhat.
>
> Aid as a factor in the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, the use of American arms by both sides in the recent India-Pakistan conflict, the persistent overselling of aid as a "cure-all" both to the American people and to foreigners, balance of payments problems—these and other factors have had the effect of merging the thinking of Members who previously held opposite points of view on the merits of long-term authorizations.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey. I do find myself in accord with the Senate recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the argument has been made that better planning would result if we had a multiyear authorization for some of these projects and in some of these accounts. I should like to point out that there are a number of programs and projects over the years which were 3-, 4-, or 5-year projects, and on which they have been able to achieve success on the basis of a 1-year authorization.

I believe I am correct in saying that in this bill itself we have a multiyear project, the Indus Basin project, for which in at least three and perhaps more years they have gotten a 1-year authorization. I understand that the agency and the committee itself point with pride to this project.

If this project is as good as they say it is—the Indus Basin project—and it is a multiyear project, and they have had to come up once every year and get an authorization, it seems to me this one illustration demonstrates we do not have to have a 2-year or 3-year or 4-year or 5-year authorization to get results from the vast expenditures that we make in this field.

Let me conclude with a final observation. I believe it is healthy for the executive branch of the Government to come up and to justify this program once a year to the committee ably chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I believe it is also wholesome for those in the executive branch to come up and justify their facts and their figures before the Committee on Appropriations. It is equally beneficial to the members of your committee, Mr. Chairman, and it is equally beneficial to the members of the Committee on Appropriations and to all of us who are not on these two committees to have an annual review, not once but twice. I urge approval of the Mailliard amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Among other things, I call attention to the technical services contracts entered into by the Agency for International Development—contracts which total almost a half billion dollars, incidentally.

This is something I believe we ought to go into next year, as well as many other foreign aid expenditures. We did not this year. I am going to cite a few contracts, and find out whether any of the Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs can provide answers as to how this money is being spent.

For instance, there is the Council for International Progress in Management, Inc. It provides for an adviser to encourage tourism in Colombia.

My question is: How many more of these have we got around the world, paid with American tax dollars to promote travel in foreign countries?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, to answer the question.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and he can have full access to all of the information he would require. He has as much information available to him as anyone.

Mr. GROSS. How would you like to answer the question? How many more of these are on the foreign aid payroll around the world?

Mr. GALLAGHER. You are a member of the committee, and you have the book in front of you.

Mr. GROSS. In Argentina, there are two contracts to do exactly the same thing: develop a model research center to provide a trained corps of professional economists. How many more of these contracts are there around the world? Do you not think we ought to know? I note that Robert R. Nathan & Associates, Inc., has a fat contract for almost $1 million for the purpose of advising as to general policies of economic development in El Salvador. What is this about? Does any member of the committee want to answer the question? The name Robert Nathan was once bandied around, I believe, as one of the brain trusters for the Democrats in Washington.

Then I see that the Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. holds a contract to assist Algeria to develop a capacity to operate and maintain a clinic.

Do you not think we ought to take a look at this and how many more Cooperatives For American Relief Everywhere there are?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. You did not answer my other question. Let me finish, and then I will give you the opportunity to answer.

Incidentally, I note that the American Institute for Free Labor Development holds contracts in almost every country covered in this book, and almost all countries are represented. The stated purpose is the developing trade union practices and policies. I wonder who constitutes this institute, and what it has accomplished. We did not go into this in the committee this year. We could have started in January or early February of this year, held consistent hearings in the committee, and found out what is going on under these contracts if the committee had been organized to that end.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Then there is the African-American Institute, which has a lush contract for more than $3 million to assist Guinea in selecting personnel for training. I do not know what for. I hope that the gentleman, who often is known as the spokesman for the State Department in the committee, Mr. GALLAGHER, can tell me what this is all about.

Mr. MORGAN. Would the gentleman yield so I can make a correction at this point? This must have been one of the days when the gentleman did not come to the Committee on Foreign Affairs because of his conflict with another committee.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. Does the gentleman know of any other member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who spent any more time in the hearings this year, or last year, or the year before, than I did?

Mr. MORGAN. I will tell the gentleman he was not present, because they did testify, on page 691.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute. You are operating on my time. How do you know I was not there?

Mr. MORGAN. Here is the testimony on page 691. The gentleman said that the American Free Labor Institute did not testify. I say they did testify, and here is the record, and here is the list.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MORGAN. I will let the gentleman proceed, but I am going to serve notice if there are any further requests for additional time I am going to be raising an objection.

Mr. GROSS. You just saved 2 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I want an answer to my question from the chairman if he will be so disposed as to give it. Do you know of any other member of the committee, with the possible exception of yourself, who spent any more time in the committee this year, last year, or the year before?

Mr. MORGAN. I admit that the gentleman from Iowa has been very good in his attendance at the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but the gentleman does have some conflicting obligations. I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania should not state that I said that they did not appear, because that is exactly what the gentleman said. They did appear.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, who appeared?

Mr. GROSS. The American Free Labor Institute.

I did not say they did not appear.

Mr. MORGAN. You said they did not testify in front of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. No, I did not say they did not testify before the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. That is exactly what you said.

Mr. GROSS. I said that we needed to find out what they are accomplishing throughout the world.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman had been present at the hearings I am sure he would know what information is contained in the hearings.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa made a remark which referred to an analysis report in cooperation with the American relief operations. That is CARE, the worldwide relief and charitable society. I believe everyone knows of the work that they perform. I believe the gentleman has made a precise case as to why we should have a multiyear authorization, so we can get into the most minute details of the program.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any reason why they should be in Algeria, which probably supports the Communists with as much enthusiasm as any other country in that area?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman is misinformed or is inaccurate on that. Certainly, the man who did support communism everywhere is no longer in office. I believe this is one of the reasons why this program is working.

Mr. GROSS. And in Nigeria there are two contracts for exactly the same purpose, a feasibility study of key links on the Nigerian highway system.

I have no doubt that this dual study will lead to the American taxpayers having the dubious pleasure of providing the money with which to construct the key links in the Nigerian road system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would expect, if this amendment is not adopted, that there will be a rush for membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee next year because it will be one of the most comfortable committees to which a Member of Congress can be attached. And from what I have heard the Air Force or some other system of transportation is going to be hard pressed to provide transportation for the Members who will be traveling around the world. This apparently is one of the reasons for a 2-year program—so the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House can be really comfortable and travel around the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Sure, I yield further.

Mr. MORGAN. All I want to tell the gentleman from Iowa is that as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have been pretty careful in signing authorizations for visits to go to various places throughout the world, and the gentleman knows it. The members of my committee do not travel very much.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is very good, is it not?

Mr. MORGAN. I plead guilty—I admit that during the last 3 or 4 years, since the gentleman from Iowa became a member of the committee, I have tried to airlift the gentleman out of Iowa or out of the United States but I have not been successful.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is your hard luck.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I do not consider it a meat-ax approach to this problem at all. I think if the Committee on Foreign Affairs made a deliberate and independent judgment, the bill before us this afternoon would be a bill for a 1-year authorization. I think the efforts of the executive branch of the Government were clearly shown in that they failed to convince the committee that there should be no more than a 1-year authorization.

When the committee sat down to mark up this bill, our very congenial and very able chairman asked the committee whether we should consider a bill for a 1-year authorization or a 2-year authorization, and the committee voted almost unanimously for a 1-year authorization. The chairman of our committee brought in a committee print for a 1-year authorization and the bill that we marked up in that committee was a bill for a 1-year authorization.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Not at this time. You have a great deal of time, Mr. FASCELL, and this is the first time I have spoken on this bill.

Mr. FASCELL. I just want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. The RECORD is being corrected right now—that is my purpose.

Mr. Chairman, we marked up a bill in that committee for a 1-year authorization and that was the basic bill, and the committee print that was brought in by the chairman. And much to the consternation and amazement of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after they brought in a committee print for a 1-year authorization, they learned that the other body had inexplicably voted for a 1-year authorization. Amazement prevailed in the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. What the gentleman is saying is not quite accurate, I had two bills drawn up—one was a bill providing for a 1-year authorization and the other was for a 2-year authorization.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. That is precisely what I said—that is what I said.

Mr. MORGAN. You said that we started with a 1-year authorization when the committee had a choice between a 1-year or a 2-year authorization. The committee voted to consider the draft bill providing for a 1-year authorization. As we came to each section of the bill, we amended it in the regular way, under the regular procedure. By a vote of the committee, we adopted the 2-year authorization.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Well, I am glad to have the gentleman confirm what I just said.

Mr. MORGAN. But there was a choice between two bills.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. There were two bills as I said—a 1-year bill and a 2-year bill—and the committee voted to have a committee print brought in on a 1-year basis.

Mr. MORGAN. I am agreeing with the gentleman.

The committee voted to take up a 1-year bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. That is correct. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. MORGAN. The committee did not vote for a 1-year bill. That is what you are saying.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have our genial chairman confirm what I am saying to this Committee. They did vote for a 1-year authorization until they found that the chairman and the Committee on Foreign Relations had voted for a 1-year authorization.

Mr. MORGAN. We voted to take up the bill which provided a 1-year authorization.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, the executive department had made no case for more than a 1-year authorization. The committee was working on a 1-year authorization and this conversion to more than a 1-year authorization has occurred after the record was made and after the bill was before the committee for the markup.

I do not think there has been any record made to justify a 2-year authorization and I do not like to be in a position of a checker on a board being pushed around by the committee in the other body. I think it is high time that this body make an independent judgment on whether we have a 1-year or a 2-year authorization. I certainly hope that this amendment will be supported and confirm the judgment that was made in the Committee on Foreign Affairs the first day to consider a 1-year bill. It is high time that we exercise our independence in this body and adopt this amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think most of the arguments for and against the amendment have been presented here this afternoon. However, there are two or three points that should be added. In the first place earlier in the debate on this amendment reference was made to the fact that certain representatives, for example, of the Chamber of Commerce came before the committee and urged a multiyear authorization. That is true. But if Members will read further in the hearings, they will find that under questioning these same witnesses stated that they do not intend by that that the matter should not be presented each year to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They thought it should be. It was perhaps a lack of understanding of the legislative process that led them to endorse the multiyear program as proposed by the Executive.

Mr. Chairman, it may be worthwhile to examine, in at least one instance, how this operation works. Take, for example, the authorization for military assistance contained in this bill. It is $917 million for fiscal year 1967. Incidentally, we have pointed out that that includes no military assistance for Vietnam, as that is now carried in another bill. But having in mind the uncertainty of our military requirements and the uncertainty of the world situation, what the majority of the committee did in this case and in others was in effect to say that $917 million is what we need for military assistance in fiscal year 1967. Therefore it follows that what we need for fiscal year 1968 is also $917 million.

The Secretary of Defense and others made a very careful and complete presentation upon this matter. They urged the committee to authorize the $917 million requested for fiscal year 1967, but there was no evidence of any kind as to what would be needed next year. So the committee is saying that if this is sufficient for this year, no matter what the world condition may be next year, the same amount of dollars will meet our military requirements. I say, Mr. Chairman, that that is not a responsible way to legislate.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I fail to understand why we should authorize, as the gentleman has said, our foreign military assistance program for 2 years when we authorize our own military program for the United States, for our own Department of Defense, every year. If we can do it for our own Department of Defense every year, why should we not do it for the foreign military assistance program every year? It just does not make sense.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure the gentleman knows the Department of Defense authorization for the purpose of conducting our military operations is a continuing authorization. We authorize military construction each year. But most of that $50 billion defense expenditure is under a continuing authorization.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Our own defense program is authorized for 1 year. We authorize the military construction every year.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct, but that is only part of the Defense appropriations. The rest is a continuing authorization. The same thing applies to the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments. They are all continuing authorizations.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If we can do it for our own Defense Department every year, why should we not do it for foreign assistance?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, that is not military construction——

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I feel the gentleman has misunderstood the chairman's position, and I would like to know on what authority the gentleman is basing his statement. It seems to me that for the past 4 years they have been before our committee urging a long-range authorization.

Mr. ADAIR. I said that, and I have added under questioning executive witnesses did go to the point. They said that their recommendation by no means was intended to imply that these programs should not be annually considered by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is exactly what this amendment would require.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to limit the U.S. foreign aid authorization to 1 fiscal year.

I fail to see why, when we have the Federal budget set on a fiscal-year basis, we should not then make our foreign policy conform to the Federal fiscal year policy. We have done this for years on U.S. foreign aid, ever since the Marshall plan was instituted. If we in Congress have been wrong all this time, Congress has been 50 percent wrong. Because Congress has held foreign aid hearings and authorized the U.S. foreign aid programs every year, obviously, according to the people who now advocate a 2-year authorization period, Congress should have only authorized the U.S. aid programs through hearings and debates every other year. So that 50 percent of the time of the Congress has been wasted—or has it really? I believe not.

Another point I would like to make is that the foreign policy of the United States is a continuing policy. The world is ever changing. The U.S. Congress cannot put off consideration of our important foreign policy, to every-other-year consideration. We on the House Foreign Affairs Committee should be examining the policy in major part all the time, week in and week out, and there should be annual justifications presented by the State Department, AID, and the various bureaus, agencies, ambassadors, ministers, and military advisers and administrators.

Why should we talk about major justifications? Several are saying we could get the opportunity in the House Foreign Affairs Committee to look into minor things. We should be looking at the major justifications and testing them, and not once every 2 years.

Certainly U.S. foreign affairs problems cause a fight on the floor of this Congress every year. I believe they ought to, and this is good. Our U.S. security is involved. This is an untidy, warlike world and we must watch supremely carefully. We should not put the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House of Representatives on the shelf for 2 years and then make U.S. foreign policy merely a dollar justification or a housekeeping project through the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. This is a minor part of their responsibility and jurisdiction and the major part of the House Foreign Affairs Committee jurisdiction.

These members on the House Foreign Affairs Committee are experienced for years in working on our basic U.S. foreign policies. These policies should be justified carefully annually and the dollar sign should not be put first. I feel if we put the dollar sign first, we are going simply to have the House Appropriations Committee look at the dollar amounts and say that is what the U.S. foreign policies in all their varied aspects should be.

One further point is this. If Congress sets up the U.S. foreign aid authorization for 2 years, we are simply by arithmetic doubling the amount for this year, because there have been no justifications for the succeeding fiscal year 1968, beyond the current fiscal year 1967 we are now talking about. How can anyone in sound mind, how can any Congressman, how can any congressional committee decide right now what the policy should be for 1968? It is complete futility.

That means if Congress put a dollar amount in the authorization legislation for foreign aid for 2 years, we in Congress are talking about futile approaches. We are talking about policies and problems unknown at present, and that makes no sense in dollars. Therefore, the authorization in dollars means nothing. This change in effect means simply an open-end authorization. How can this House for the fiscal year 1968, beyond the fiscal year 1967 coming up, have a dollar amount, judging what should be done all over the world 2 years from now for amount of authorization? It simply cannot be done.

What this 2-year authorization provision does, is to cut the power of this House of Representatives in this Congress to control and supervise our U.S. foreign aid programs. I am against this proposed change and oppose it strongly.

I want this Congress to control the power of the bureaucrats, and to continue to set the policies to which they must conform. This bill increases the power of the bureaucrats by 50 percent. The agencies will come to Congress and justify not what money they need based on the current year, but on basic policy set by Congress 2 years before.

I am sure the officials and people in AID and in the U.S. State Department look ahead with some little qualms and qualifications to coming up and getting a red-hot going over on U.S. foreign aid programs every year. They would love not to have to face this prospect every year. If they could, they want to cut down this necessary testing of current positions and mistakes while they are hot and fresh. I do not blame them in the least. I would feel that way too if I were in their shoes. Much better to account for 2 years old dusty history than a real live hot and boiling current controversy.

But let me tell you, those of us on the House Foreign Affairs Committee question these witnesses closely, and test policies, and try to see if our U.S. State Department, AID, and the various U.S. agencies, are keeping up with events, to see if these officials are watching diligently, to see if events really are moving, and policies carried out on behalf of the American people. I remember it was our House Foreign Affairs Committee that blocked the proposal of the military and the State Department when Sukarno of Indonesia was high in power, for sending for very advanced point-to-point tropospheric radio communications equipment. I am not permitted to explain too much about the equipment but current strong objections of some of us of the Foreign Affairs Committee blocked this proposal, would not let this equipment go. It was really across party lines that this objection was made, and it was certainly effective.

Will Congress get that kind of watching on a 2-year authorization of U.S. foreign aid? No, because for 2 years the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House will be set on the shelf. If I were a U.S. bureaucrat and could see that I could get a promise for my particular department or agency or bureau, a commitment of 2 years from this House of Representatives, and when Congress is always talking about economy—and we are doing much more about that economy than the Senate—if as a bureaucrat I could get that beautiful red apple for 2 years, I would be up here arguing for it just like they are.

But I oppose this proposal, as it is not a move for economy, but a guarantee of continued high spending which is causing inflation and high food prices, clothing prices, rents, and so forth. This is not good for the American people and the country.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAILLIARD, of California, and Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 86, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART I

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended as follows:

(a) At the end of the ninth paragraph, add the following new sentence: "It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should keep the Congress fully and currently informed with respect to those countries receiving such assistance which do divert their own economic resources for such propaganda purposes."

(b) In the last paragraph, immediately before the period at the end thereof, insert the following: "and to provide adequate compensation for such damage or destruction".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House has previously granted the Committee on Banking and Currency permission to have until midnight tonight to file a report and an accompanying document on the housing bill, H.R. 15890.

Some of the material which should be in this report is not yet available. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the committee now have until midnight Friday to file its report on H.R. 15890 and an accompanying document in compliance with clause 3, rule XIII.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ECONOMICS PROFESSOR REPUDIATES FALSE CLAIMS OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have risen on the floor to call attention to the false claims of independence by the Federal Reserve System. Of course, this so-called independence does not exist. It has not been granted by the Congress or by any Executive order. Whatever independence that the Federal Reserve claims has been seized and not granted.

I am pleased to see that the current issue of a highly respected economics journal, Challenge, carries an article which fully documents the absurdity of the Federal Reserve's claim to independence and autonomy. The article is written by Mr. Leo Fishman, who is a professor of economics and finance at West Virginia University. This is an excellent article by a recognized expert on monetary affairs. I hope my colleagues will read this carefully.

Professor Fishman says:

> Unquestioning acceptance of the Fed's authority to behave in a completely autonomous fashion is unjustified.

He goes on to note that the implications for public economic policy in the months and years ahead could be grave.

In calling attention to the dangers of the Federal Reserve's seized independence, Professor Fishman says:

> Thus, if the Fed had the power to act independently in matters of national economic policy, it is possible for monetary policy to be oriented towards one set of goals while fiscal policy is moving in a different—and incompatible—direction. It is also possible for monetary policy to be used in such a way that it will negate fiscal policy.

I place the complete article, "The White House and the Fed," in the RECORD at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE FED—DOES THE FEDERAL RESERVE REALLY HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY THAT RUNS COUNTER TO THAT OF THE ADMINISTRATION?

(By Leo Fishman)

Early in December, 1965 the Federal Reserve Board announced that it had "approved actions by the directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of New York and Chicago increasing the discount rates of those banks from four to four and one-half per cent" in order "to reinforce efforts to maintain price stability." It was no secret that although Fed Chairman William McChesney Martin had been urging such a move for some time, President Johnson felt that it was not warranted.

The Fed's action touched off numerous public and private discussions of the desirability of the increase in the discount rate. Very little attention, however, was devoted to the much more basic issue involved: Does the Board of Governors actually have the legal authority to act independently of the President in matters of national economic policy?

It is now rather widely recognized that the two most important sets of tools that can be used in determining and implementing public economic policy in the United States are fiscal policy (taxation, expenditures and budgetary deficits or surpluses) and monetary policy (the availability and cost of money and credit). Somewhat less well known is the fact that certain aspects of monetary policy are apt to be much faster and considerably more flexible than fiscal policy.

Monetary policy is most likely to be effective when used in restrictive fashion. If used for restrictive purposes, it cannot fail to counteract, at least to some extent, the effect of a stimulative fiscal policy.

Thus if the Fed has the power to act independently in matters of national economic policy, it is possible for monetary policy to be oriented toward one set of goals while fiscal policy is moving in a different—and incompatible—direction. It is also possible for monetary policy to be used in such a way that it will negate fiscal policy.

President Johnson, for any number of reasons, chose to say as little as possible about the December action of the Board of Governors and to play down his differences with Mr. Martin. Moreover, it is clear that the electorate now accepts without question Martin's repeated statements that the Board of Governors may act independently of the President in matters of national economic policy.

This unquestioning acceptance of the Fed's authority to behave in a completely autonomous fashion is unjustified. And the implications for public economic policy in the months and years ahead could be grave.

Martin and others who share his belief in the complete autonomy of the Fed have generally cited three different types of evidence in support of their position: Tradition and historical precedent, judicial decisions, and legislation enacted by Congress. In order to evaluate the validity of their contention, let us examine each one.

TRADITION AND HISTORICAL PRECEDENT

Supporters of an autonomous Fed hark back to the Madison Administration when Congressman John Randolph and Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Dallas supported efforts to minimize the influence of the President on the Second Bank of the United States. They also point out that Alexander Hamilton believed it would be unwise to put the credit of the First Bank of the U.S. at the disposal of the government.

But none of these men argued that either the First Bank or the Second Bank of the United States should have the power to act independently of the President in matters pertaining to national policy. Moreover, during those very same times other leading public officials were strongly opposed to the existence of both the First Bank and the Second Bank of the United States precisely because they felt that institutions of this type should not act (or have the power to act) independently of the Administration on questions of national economic policy.

Thomas Jefferson, who was President when the First Bank of the United States met its demise, and Andrew Jackson, who brought about the demise of the Second Bank, held substantially similar opinions in this matter. In a letter to Treasury Secretary Albert Gallatin dated December 12, 1803, Jefferson wrote: "What an obstruction could not this Bank of the United States, with all its branch banks, be in time of war! It might dictate to us the peace we should accept, or withdraw its aids." President Jackson commented on the Second Bank in a similar vein in his Farewell Address.

Proponents of the view that the Fed is completely independent of the President sometimes attempt to buttress their argument by referring to the Federal Reserve Act of 1913.

The 1913 Act, however, did not endow the newly created Federal Reserve Board with autonomy. On the contrary, the Federal Reserve Board, as originally conceived and created, was for all intents and purposes a bureau of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury served as ex-officio chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Board was assigned offices within the building occupied by the Treasury Department.

A careful reading of the Congressional debates that preceded passage of the Federal Reserve Act indicates that its proponents intended the Federal Reserve Board to act independently in the same sense that such government agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission act independently in carrying out the policy directives contained in the relevant legislation. And there is no evidence that Congress intended to endow the Federal Reserve Board with power transcending that of the President of the United States.

Congress did intend to keep the Federal Reserve Board out of politics. For this reason, Congress encouraged the President to appoint to the Board only men of high caliber with competence in the field of finance, rather than political hacks. But there is no evidence that Congress intended to preclude the possibility of Presidential influence or control in matters involving the national welfare.

The 1935 Amendment to the Federal Reserve Act terminated the ex-officio status of the Secretary of the Treasury as a member of the Board. Statements made by Senator Carter Glass and others during the debates preceding passage of this Amendment, however, indicate clearly that Congress wished to free the Board from subservience to the Treasury, but not to grant it complete independence from the President.

In explaining to the House of Representatives the final version of the bill approved by the Senate-House conference committee, Congressman Henry B. Steagall (who sponsored the bill with Senator Glass) observed:

"The President of the United States is clothed with the power to reorganize the Federal Reserve Board, so as to bring the [Federal Reserve] System, with its vast resources and powers, into full harmony with the advanced policies of the present Administration." [sic]

Marriner S. Eccles, first chairman of the newly constituted Board of Governors, regarded the Board as part of the Administration and himself as a member of the President's official family. At the same time, he regarded the Board as a nonpolitical agency in the sense that its members would not participate in party politics or in political campaigns.

By word and by deed, President Franklin D. Roosevelt lived up to this conception of the relationship between the Board of Governors and his Administration and the position of the chairman in his official family. This relationship was altered by President Harry S. Truman after John W. Snyder became Secretary of the Treasury in 1946. Eccles was told that in any appearances before Congress he must make it clear that he was speaking for the Board of Governors and not for the Administration. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder was to be the spokesman for the Administration in matters pertaining to economic policy.

Eccles did not relish his new status outside the fold of the President's official family, but neither he nor President Truman took the change to mean that the Board of Governors could thereafter act independently in making broad policy decisions affecting the national welfare. In fact, from 1942 until the early 1950s, it was not possible for the Federal Reserve to exercise autonomy in the determination of monetary policy. Since the Federal Reserve System was committed to pegging the price of government securities, its powers to determine monetary policy were necessarily limited.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

Two decisions by the Supreme Court have also been cited to support the view that the Board of Governors is completely independent of the President. Neither of these cases involved either the Board of Governors or its predecessor, the Federal Reserve Board. The more recent of the two cases, Humphrey's Executor v. United States [295 U.S. 602] involved the Federal Trade Commission. In its 1935 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the power of the President to remove a member of a Commission is restricted where its members are "an independent, nonpartisan body of experts charged with duties neither political nor executive, but predominantly quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative. . ."

The relevance of this decision to the present issue is subject to question, however. It is doubtful that the Board of Governors is completely analogous to the Federal Trade Commission. The latter has been judged to be a quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative body, which is not part of the executive branch of the government. On the contrary, there is strong presumptive evidence that Congress intended the Board of Governors to be part of the executive branch of the government. Moreover, the Supreme Court warned against interpreting its decision in the Humphrey case too broadly, stating that its decision applied specifically to the Federal Trade Commission and that "the power of the President to remove an officer . . . will depend on the character of the office."

The issue being considered here, however, is not whether the President has the power to remove a member of the Board of Governors, but rather whether he has the power to overrule the Board of Governors if it makes a decision involving national economic policy that he does not approve of. This distinction is real, not fanciful. The President does not have the power to remove either Senators or Congressmen from office, but he does have the power to veto legislation passed by Congress.

Actually, heavier reliance has been placed on a much earlier case, Kendall v. United States [12 Peters 210], decided by the Supreme Court in 1838. In that case the Supreme Court ruled that the branch of government is not the essential consideration in establishing the nature and extent of the independence of a government official but rather the statutory mandate of his office. In 1952, in oral testimony before the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management, Lucius Wilmerding, a consultant to the Fed, interpreted this decision to mean that the President has no power under the Constitution "to interfere with, set aside, correct or revise, the decision of the Board in any matter which has been committed by Congress to the Board's exclusive jurisdiction."

Granted the validity of this interpretation of Kendall v. United States, does it follow that the Board of Governors may use monetary policy to achieve broad national goals in opposition to the wishes of the President? To answer this question, it is necessary to consider the relevant legislation and to ascertain whether Congress has committed to the Board of Governors exclusive jurisdiction over the use of monetary policy to achieve broad national economic objectives.

PERTINENT LEGISLATION

Neither the Federal Reserve Act nor any other legislation that cites the Board of Governors by name specifically gives it such a mandate. This fact has been noted by reputable public officials and economists, but their comments have not attracted the attention they deserve. Among those who have pointed out that no such clear-cut mandate exists are George Leland Bach of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, who conducted the Hoover Commission study of the Federal Reserve System, and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS. There is evidence that the Board of Governors itself held a similar view for years.

Unable to cite an explicit mandate, Mr. Martin and others who share his opinion have sometimes declared that an implicit mandate exists. In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957 Martin conceded, "The Federal Reserve Act does not contain any provision specifically stating that the objective of the Federal Reserve System is to promote conditions that will foster sustained economic growth and stability in the value of the dollar." He went on to say, however, that "this objective is implicit in the title of the Act and . . . together with the declaration of policy contained in the Employment Act of 1946, it is clear that the promotion of credit conditions conducive to economic growth and the maintenance of the stability of the dollar is one of the most important objectives of the Federal Reserve."

But a careful reading of the legislation referred to by Chairman Martin does not reveal any valid basis for the claim that the Board has an implicit mandate to use monetary policy to achieve broad national goals independently of the President. The language used in the title of the Federal Reserve Act is straightforward. It states that the purposes of the Act are to establish Federal Reserve banks, furnish an elastic currency, and afford means of rediscounting commercial paper. The exercise of monetary policy for the purposes mentioned by Mr. Martin is not implicit in the title or in any other portion of the Federal Reserve Act, either as originally passed or as amended.

In fact, the possibility that monetary policy would or could be used to achieve broad national economic goals probably never occurred to those who initially conceived the Federal Reserve Act or to the members of Congress who passed it.

Moreover, the present-day use of the powers of the Federal Reserve System is completely at variance with the political philosophy and values espoused by Carter Glass and Woodrow Wilson, both of whom played key roles in framing the Federal Reserve Act. Enough is known about the beliefs and deeds of Glass and Wilson to make it apparent that if they had ever contemplated the possibility that the Federal Reserve would deliberately attempt to influence the general level of economic activity or the price level, they would have endeavored to modify the Act to forestall that possibility.

When the Federal Reserve Act was substantially amended in 1935, Congress considered the possibility of granting broader policy-making powers to the Board of Governors, including a specific mandate to the Board. But Congress decided against doing so. Since Senator Glass helped to influence this decision, there can be no doubt about what his attitude on this subject was.

The version of the 1935 bill initially approved by the House of Representatives contained an amendment to Section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act which stated, "It shall be the duty of the Board of Governors to exercise [its powers] in such a manner as to promote conditions conducive to business stability and to mitigate by its influence unstabilizing fluctuations in the general level of production, trade, prices and employment, so far as may be possible within the scope of monetary action and credit administration."

In the view of the Senate, however, this provision went too far and it was accordingly deleted from the version of the bill that the Senate passed. The House-Senate conference committee followed the lead of the Senate. This was not the result of oversight. Commenting to the House of Representatives on the proceedings of the conference committee, Representative T. Allan Goldsborough said, ". . . there was a mandate in the House bill. [It] would have given the Federal Reserve Board very broad powers. When we got into conference we found that if we insisted on any sort of mandate at all we would get no bill."

In the light of these facts, the contention that the Federal Reserve Act, as amended in 1935, gives the Board of Governors an implicit mandate to use its powers to achieve broad national economic goals is unwarranted. The true situation appears to have been clearly understood in the period immediately following enactment of the 1935 legislation.

On several occasions Congress considered legislation designed to accomplish, at least in part, the purposes of the deleted provision of the 1935 Act, but no such legislation was ever approved. Moreover, there are indications that even the Board of Governors was not entirely convinced that it should be given a statutory mandate to act independently of the President and other federal agencies with respect to monetary policy.

To judge the soundness of Chairman Martin's opinion in this matter, it is also necessary to consider whether the Employment Act of 1946 contains an implicit mandate to the Federal Reserve authorities to exercise their monetary powers to achieve broad national economic goals and to do so independently of the President. The declaration of policy of that Act does set forth certain broad goals of national economic policy. However, neither the declaration of policy nor any other portion of the Employment Act of 1946 includes any mention of the Federal Reserve System.

This was not the result of haste or oversight in drafting the final version of the bill.

During the preliminary hearings on this legislation, no member of the Board of Governors testified before any Congressional committee involved. No reference to the legislation was made either in the "Federal Reserve Bulletin" published monthly by the Board of Governors, or in the annual report of the Federal Reserve System for about a year after the Employment Act of 1946 came into effect. In fact, until a number of years had passed there was no indication whatsoever that the Board of Governors considered this statute to have any particular significance regarding the exercise of its own monetary powers.

The real issue, however, is not whether the Federal Reserve can or should use its monetary powers to influence the general level of economic activity and the price level. Few, if any, responsible public officials or reputable economists would seriously argue that the Federal Reserve authorities cannot or should not be allowed to use their powers in such a fashion.

The Federal Reserve Act as amended gives the central bank certain powers for the purpose of accommodating business and industry, and preventing various monetary and banking abuses that might hamper the smooth functioning of the economy. These include the power to regulate minimum reserve requirements for member banks, the power to regulate the discount rate, and the power to engage in open market operations; i.e., the power to buy and sell securities, commercial paper, and foreign exchange in the open market. If properly exercised, they can be very useful tools of public economic policy.

The crux of the question is not whether these tools should be consciously used to achieve certain broad goals of public economic policy, but rather whether the Board of Governors is justified on legal grounds in using them independently of the President.

The Employment Act of 1946, although it does not contain any mandate to the Federal Reserve System, does contain an explicit mandate to the President. It is his responsibility to coordinate the efforts of the various agencies of the federal government to achieve the goals of "maximum employment, production and purchasing power" set forth in the declaration of policy.

Other portions of the Act indicate more specifically that it is the President who is responsible for achieving the required coordination of all "plans, functions and resources" to achieve these ends.

It is impossible for the President to discharge these responsibilities unless he coordinates national monetary policy with national fiscal policy. Moreover, it is possible for the President to exercise this power without the passage of new legislation or a change in the composition of the Board of Governors. The basis for such exercise of power by the President already exists both in statute and in historical precedent.

One must conclude, then, that there is no legal basis for the Board of Governors' claim to complete autonomy in the determination of monetary policy designed to achieve broad national objectives. On the contrary, it appears that as matters now stand the President has a legal mandate to coordinate monetary policy with fiscal policy and other aspects of public economic policy for the purpose of achieving broad national goals. Indeed, it is impossible for the President to fulfill the mandate given him in the Employment Act of 1946 if he fails to coordinate monetary policy with other national economic policies.

It may be that a substantial portion of the voting public would prefer not to have the President exercise these powers and would prefer to have the Board of Governors act with complete autonomy. If so, this attitude should be expressed through a proper legislative mandate. But since such legislation would be inconsistent with the mandate to the President in the Employment Act, a change in that statute would be required as well.

Since this is a matter of great national importance, the voting public should be fully informed of the ramifications of such a change. Until such legislation is passed, however, the Board of Governors should be required to defer to the White House on matters of broad national economic policy.

NATIONAL USURY LEGISLATION NEEDED?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, rising interest rates and tight money are leading to practices designed to circumvent State usury laws. An article in the Wall Street Journal for Tuesday, July 12, 1966, points out that banks and other lenders are devising techniques for getting around these State laws by adding additional "finance charges" to the legally permitted lending rates. Rates illegal in States where the funds are received are being made from States where higher rates are permitted to avoid the impact of stricter usury provisions. It is clear that Federal regulation of such interstate practices is needed to control such abuses. The rights of the people to be protected from usurious debt merchants should not be denied by legal legerdemain and gimmickery.

I have unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD at this point for the consideration of my colleagues:

Interest in Ursury: Lenders Seek To Skirt Laws Setting Ceilings on Some Loan Rates—A Baltimore Brokerage Firm Adopts Financing Charges; Hidden Mortgage Expenses—Cost-Price Squeeze Is Cited

(By Richard E. Blodgett)

NEW YORK.—In this time of tight money and soaring interest rates, borrowers presumably can find some shelter under state anti-usury laws, which set ceilings on loan interest rates. But this legal umbrella is now springing a few copious leaks.

Banks and other lenders are finding ways to bypass the laws by adding new financing charges of one kind or another, thus jacking total lending charges above legal interest ceilings. In other cases, lenders have simply cut back granting certain types of loans to which the laws apply, contending that the restrictions prevent them from getting a fair return.

All this is happening mainly in a dozen Eastern and Southern states where anti-usury legislation sets a maximum 6% interest rate on many types of loans. Legal lending rates are higher in other parts of the country. In the affected areas, however, the moves by lenders have pushed the high cost of borrowing still higher for thousands of customers seeking mortgage money, large personal loans, credit for stock purchases, and other financing.

LOOKING FOR LOOPHOLES

Lenders complain they are caught in a classic cost-price squeeze between their own rising cost in obtaining money and the ceilings imposed on them in lending it. Some have been prodding state legislatures to raise these ceilings; in the meantime, they are passing their additional costs along to individual borrowers dealing with them, seeking "loopholes" in the laws in order to do so.

Brokerage firms, which regularly borrow large sums and re-lend part of the money to customers buying stock on credit, have been particularly imaginative in this respect. Generally, they charge their customers the same rate the bank charged them, plus an additional ½% or more to cover their re-lending costs; the stated object is not to make money on such transactions, but to break even.

However, prevailing interest rates on loans to brokers recently have risen to 5¾% to 6%; thus if a brokerage firm adds the customary ½% to the bank rate, it is breaking the law in those states where rates on broker loans to customers cannot exceed 6%. If the firm obeys the law, it loses money on re-lending.

Stein Bros. & Boyce, Inc., a Baltimore-based brokerage house, thinks semantics will provide a way out. The firm, which has been losing money on 6% re-lending, has decided to start adding a "financing charge" to this rate. This boosts the total charge to customers to 6½% and more in some cases, enough to break even, according to W. Wallace Lanahan, Jr., president. Maryland law, while barring brokers from charging "interest rates" in excess of 6%, says nothing about "financing charges." Other firms with Maryland offices plan to levy "financing charges" too.

NEW YORK FIRMS' PROBLEM

Many big New York-based brokerage houses, exempted by a 1959 law from a 6% interest ceiling imposed on other types of loans, have a different problem. Though they can charge New York customers enough to defray re-lending expenses, they also operate branches in states where the 6% ceiling is imposed.

Their solution: Ignore the laws of other states. They argue that since securities orders from outside New York are actually filled here, New York law applies. So they have been charging over 6% in states with this ceiling—and hoping they won't be challenged.

The brokerage firms believe their argument is valid, but they can't be absolutely sure. "Heaven help the guy who gets caught," says a worried official of one house.

Others apparently are taking a damn-the-torpedoes attitude. An officer of one big company says the penalty for usury is so light in most states that "its worth the risk" to ignore the law. Most often the penalty is either cancellation of the loan agreement, or repayment of the interest—sometimes double the amount—by the lender.

A major exception is Vermont, where conviction for usury can lead to a jail term. "We've been advised by our lawyers not to charge Vermont residents more than 6%," says one brokerage official.

PRESSURE FROM PRIME RATE

The pressure on lenders has developed with considerable force only recently, when the prime rate—the interest charged by banks on loans to their most credit-worthy corporate customers—rose to 5¾% from 5½%, the third increase since December, when the rate was 4½%.

This is still below the 6% limit imposed on many loans by the anti-usury laws (though some in the financial community expect the prime rate to go to 6% soon), and in any case loans to corporations are generally exempt from provisions of these laws. But all other bank loan rates are scaled upward from the prime rate—and some of these other loans are covered by laws setting interest limits of 6%.

The most recent prime rate increase was quickly followed by boosts in the rates some New York commercial lenders, notably savings and loan associations and savings banks, pay on depositors' savings. These increases normally would have been followed by matching boosts on interest the lenders charge for home mortgages. But mortgage rates were already at or near the 6% interest ceiling the state imposes on this type of loan.

Some New York savings banks are trying to boost their return on mortgages by switching some of their funds to investment in mortgages in states with higher interest rate ceilings. They have also found a way to get more than 6% out of a 6% loan.

It works this way. A mortgage applicant gets approval for a $20,000 loan at 6%, but with an important proviso. While his interest payments are calculated at 6% on a $20,000 loan, the principal the bank actually gives him is less than that agreed on, perhaps $19,500. So the borrower is paying more than 6% on the money he really got. New York law does not specifically permit such lending practices on mortgages, but the savings banks claim that this method has been supported by past court decisions. A few savings banks refuse to make such mortgage loans, however, insisting they may indeed be violations of the law.

The disparity between interest limits on mortgages in various states is hurting some lenders. Last year, for example, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Winston-Salem, N.C., placed large amounts of money for out-of-state investors into home mortgages in North Carolina. But in recent weeks mortgage rates out of state have exceeded the 6% maximum allowed by North Carolina anti-usury laws. As a result, investors are turning to mortgages in states with higher ceilings and this part of Wachovia's business has been "curtailed sharply," says Aubrey C. Doggett, Jr., vice president in charge of the bank's mortgage department.

The cost-price squeeze also affects other types of loans. In New York, for example, lenders are forbidden to charge more than 6% on loans of more than $5,000 to individuals, proprietorships and partnerships. Philip W. Smith, vice president of New York's big Chase Manhattan Bank, says "there's no great nourishment" in such a rate when the bank is paying "practically that much" to borrow the funds in the money market.

So Chase has cut back on such loans, generally making them only as an "accommodation" to existing customers. "We're just suffering with the times," says Mr. Smith.

Some other New York banks have been converting many of these loans to a type not covered by the interest ceiling of 6%. The ceiling does not apply if the loans are repayable on demand, instead of having definite maturities, and are backed by negotiable collateral.

Irving Trust Co., for one, has been informing some customers with the affected loans that when they mature and are up for renewal, collateral will have to be provided and the loans placed on a demand basis—and that the rate will then be more than 6%. With the prime rate for corporate customers with impeccable credit ratings at 5¾%, "it doesn't make any sense" to charge only 6% on riskier loans to individuals and other noncorporate entities, says an Irving official.

Many types of loans, of course, haven't yet been affected by cost-price squeeze arising from usury ceilings. Personal loan companies, for example, are regulated in most states by separate laws that set rate ceilings of between 18% and 36% on the small loans these firms make to individuals. Most finance companies already are charging the maximum, but there's no severe squeeze on their profits; they're paying 6% or a little less to borrow the funds they lend.

New York banks report no trouble yet with installment loans, either. State laws permits banks to charge up to $6 per $100 on most of these, and the current maximum rate charged by most banks here is only $5.25. Because on installment loans the borrower on the average has use of only half the money, the effective rate is double the stated rate.

Those loans that are affected, however, constitute a fairly large share of the business of many lenders. Consequently, renewed efforts to lift state-imposed ceilings can be expected.

In the recent past, these efforts have met with only mixed success. Kentucky this year raised its legal lending rate on home mortgages and other types of loans to 7% from 6%, and Illinois did so three years ago. But a move to raise the ceiling on home mortgage rates in New York died in the state legislature this year, and a bill to specifically permit brokers to add financing charges to their interest charges on re-lending to customers, was defeated in the Maryland legislature. Stein Bros., and others who have imposed the charges anyway, say they can do so because the existing law doesn't forbid them to.

Stein Bros. and other securities concerns in Maryland campaigned for passage of the bill, but often financial institutions steer clear of openly advocating higher interest limits. "If we campaigned for such a bill it would give it the kiss of death," say one banker. "People would say, 'Look at those greedy bankers trying to milk the public.' "

MILITARY HOUSING COST LIMITATIONS ARE UNREALISTIC

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the problems of attempting to build housing for military personnel under present unit-cost limitations. The limitations which now are applicable to the military construction programs in the area of housing include barracks, bachelor officer quarters and family housing. They are unrealistic in that they are too low to permit the construction of adequate living quarters in many areas.

All of the military services have made recommendations for increases in these unit-cost limitations. It is a well-known fact that proper housing must be provided for military personnel and their dependents if we are to interest qualified personnel in making careers of the military service. The small space allocations which result from these cost limitations are certainly not conducive to proper living facilities.

The present cost limitations also are resulting in reduced construction standards and specifications which will call for increased maintenance expenditures in the future. This means we may, in fact, be building military slums for the future. It is penny wise and pound foolish to provide facilities of this type. Not only are they far from satisfactory; they are simply substandard.

The importance of providing adequate troop housing facilities and family housing for our military personnel has been neglected too long. This neglect has an adverse effect on our efforts and our ability to build a professional defense force capable of doing today's military job in an efficient manner. It drives many qualified and trained personnel out of the Armed Forces. Although the President has expressed his interest in a review of programs in this field, nothing formal has come out of the executive branch. I feel therefore that it falls upon the Congress to take the lead in meeting this problem.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today which would increase the cost limitations on permanent barracks from $1,800 per man to $2,300 per man and on bachelor officer quarters from $8,500 per man to $10,500 per man.

Later I will introduce legislation which would increase the unit-cost limitations for family housing in amounts which it is felt would provide proper and adequate facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the men who wear the uniform of America's armed services are expected to assume whatever risk may be required of them. They can never enjoy a normal, happy homelife, such as that which is available to most of us. The career man simply cannot put down roots in the community of his choice. At the very least, we should attempt to help him to feel that he does have a home which is pleasant and attractive and comfortable. At too many military bases this is far from true. A good many servicemen live in World War II barracks which were inadequate even when they were built more than 20 years ago.

Let us correct this situation. It will have a profound effect upon morale and, I believe, a significant effect upon retention of desirable personnel in the armed services.

DEATH OF GEN. A. G. L. McNAUGHTON

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, this week death came to one of the outstanding men on this continent and in our age. He was Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, a retired general who had commanded Canadian Armies in both World Wars I and II.

General McNaughton was a remarkable human being who achieved renown as an engineer, a statesman, an inventor, and general. He was a man with whom I was honored to serve as my counterpart on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, for 2 years, 1961 and 1962, until his retirement.

An obituary published in the Washington Post on July 12 follows:

GENERAL McNAUGHTON DEAD; SHAPED CANADIAN ARMY

MONTEBELLO, QUEBEC, July 11.—Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, architect of the modern Canadian army who fought in two World Wars, died today at his summer home here. He was 79.

The man who commanded the 1st Canadian Army before the invasion of France had been in apparent good health recently. The cause of death was not made public.

A brigadier at 31 in World War I he was credited with inventing the box barrage—an artillery firing system boxing in the enemy. He was wounded in the battles of Ypes and Soissons. A month before the end of the war he was placed in command of all Canadian heavy artillery.

After the armistice, he returned to Canada and began forming the nucleus of the Canadian army he was to command for a time in World War II. The military forces were reorganized during his tenure as chief of staff.

M'GILL GRADUATE

An engineering graduate of McGill University, Gen. McNaughton became chairman of the National Research Council in 1935. He came with some credentials as a research physicist. He invented the cathode-ray compass, an aid to airplane pilots. The general was still with the Research Council when World War II broke out. He immediately was called back to the command of Canadian forces.

By now a major general, he took the 1st Canadian Division to England, by 1940 he was promoted to lieutenant general and placed in command of the 7th Corps of Canadian and English units. He devised a flexible defense system of tank traps, road barriers and entrenchments against a possible German invasion after the fall of France.

When the 1st Canadian Army was created, Gen. McNaughton was placed in command and in constant maneuvers over the countryside, whipped it into a finely drawn fighting force. He called his army "a dagger aimed at Berlin." But he was not destined to lead it into battle.

In December, 1943, he became ill and the year 1944 found him back in Canada relieved of duty. The relinquishment in command was believed due in part to disagreement with the National Defense Ministry, which detached a corps from his army and sent it off to the war in Sicily and Italy over his protest. The ministry said the men were eager and impatient for battle.

TERRIBLE MISTAKE

"I still think I was right," he said later. "It was a terrible mistake to break up the army."

The army was reunited in time for the Normandy invasion in June, 1944, but the command had passed to Gen. H.D.G. Crerar, who led it through the battles of France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany.

Back in Canada, Gen. McNaughton was named Minister of National Defense and later became chairman of the Canadian-American Joint Defense Board. After the war he served as Canadian representative to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, president of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada and Canadian chairman of the international joint commission that handles U.S. and Canadian affairs.

The general, whose full name was Andrew George Latta McNaughton, was born at Mossomin, Sask., Feb. 25, 1887. He married in 1914 to Mable Weir. They had three sons and two daughters. One son, squadron leader Ian McNaughton of the Royal Canadian Air Force, was killed in action in June, 1942. The widow and the other children survive.

REVOLUTION

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, we may well have passed the point of no return in the revolutionary violence in this Nation which masks itself under the name "civil rights." We may be beyond the hour of midnight; it may already be zero-zero-zero-one. If that is true, and I pray that it is not, every American will feel the hot breath of revolution on the nape of his neck, whether he be conservative, liberal, or radical, or any shade of philosophy in between.

There are few who have even a passing understanding of the accelerating demands of rights leaders who can deny that the Negro today is the deuteragonist of the Socialist and the Communist. This is not to say, of course, that all Negroes are Socialists or Communists, for they definitely are not. This is to say that in too many cases they are the pawns of the left; the radical group which will discard them as useless when their purpose has been served.

The Shreveport Times published on June 28 a masterful editorial on this situation under the title "Revolution?" If there were a way I could require every American to read it, I would. I must, at least, make the effort to give it the nationwide attention it deserves by including it here in the RECORD. I urge every Member to study it line by line.

REVOLUTION?

The civil rights movement in this country has taken a distinctly revolutionary turn. Doubters can look at the most recent demands of rights leaders: $50 *billion* for Negro welfare over the next 10 years; all local police power in federal hands; federal trials for civil rights cases; forced integration to compel "racial balance." The list is longer than we have space.

Much of the evidence of a new revolutionary outlook in the rights drive is visual—all too visual. At a critical juncture in its effort to maintain racial accord, Mississippi finds itself stormed by marchers shouting "black power" and flaunting slogans that could incite blacks or whites—or both—to bloodshed. What we have, in essence, is a remarkably cynical bid on the part of rights leaders for martyrs—martyrs that will transfuse their cause with somebody's real blood.

But the revolutionary bell tolls not only in Dixie. Far to the west of Mississippi, California has seen the flames, real flames, of open rebellion in Watts. Across the continent, New York City sits on a summer powderkeg of mob violence and so-called racial "moderates" like Martin Luther King are lighting the fuse with barely-concealed threats of "disorder" unless demands are met.

In between, revolutionary sparks have fallen on midland cities like Chicago and Cleveland where Negroes and other racial minorities have taken their troubles into the street, firing cars, smashing glass, and shooting at police. Other places are braced for trouble that Negro leaders and advocates have predicted—as a result of this or that "grievance."

Federal officials, now concerned over the violent character of the revolution, haven't helped to curb violence with their vague implications that the only way for "oppressed" people to get "something" is for them to go out into the streets on a hot night and heave a brickbat through somebody's store window.

Revolutionary attitudes, of course, have spread beyond the area of civil rights and into the minds and morals of some elements of our most important commodity—youth. There is a spirit of anarchy abroad, of "anything goes," that masks itself in democratic slogans but seems to glory in dope and dirty words. Defiance of law, of all authority, is the hallmark of revolution and we can see it not only in youthful campus rebels but in the rising tide of crime in this nation.

This has been a country of law and order—the founding fathers thought nothing more important—but the Supreme Court of this era has put itself in the vanguard of revolution and its rulings most often only mirror the demands of the militants. The Warren Court seems to be—at times—a revolutionary tribunal rather than a constitutional arbiter.

All federal office-holders take an oath to uphold the Constitution, but the "liberal" fashion of permissiveness and the raw, exposed power of minority voting blocs have packed more power than Bible-sworn promises. Congress has often yielded to the revolutionary tides in these circumstances.

But there are other reasons why radicalism has replaced common sense and realism in dealing with our problems, the most important of which is the fact that this racial revolution is given—as much as possible—camouflage trappings of legitimacy; of democracy; of doing what is right; of going with the flow of history. This illusion has been made almost perfect by three decades of liberal indoctrination.

It is not unusual for revolutionary ideas to sweep up so-called "liberals" or progressives. Short-cuts to some vague all-equal socialist paradise appeal to many people who honestly do not believe in authoritarian government. The shortest short-cut to this "paradise" is a social revolution in this country. So Martin Luther King says "we can't wait." Freedom now! As he professes "non-violence," he shouts that "we will make the white power structure say 'yes' when it wants to say 'no.' "

Why wait, indeed. The Russian revolutionaries said freedom was their goal, too. And maybe it was. The oppressed worker was the Russian Revolutionary cause just as the Negro is advanced as today's vehicle of total change. But Russia no longer is revolutionary; radically reactionary is the phrase for the Kremlin. What happened to those dreams of freedom? What happened to the worker?

The trouble is that revolutionists are all too human. Once in power they want to stay in power. The way to stay in power is to establish a dictatorship. Nothing is there to stop them because the wave of revolution has destroyed the checks and balances, the institutions and traditions that could have barred the way to totalitarianism. The Russian worker was just a pawn of power.

This nation has avoided such social revolutions and as a result freedom has endured on these shores. Some inequities prevail, but the best system of justice yet devised—together with freedoms no other nation enjoys—provide eventual outlets for most of our troubles. The American way of dealing with problems as they arise has been one of calm, lawful evolution—not the revolution we now are seeing.

What good will it do the Negro if, in compelling a revolutionary equality for him, the wider freedoms of *all* Americans—black or white—are lost? The Russian worker had a revolution made in his name, too, but in the end only a deeper slavery was his reward. It can happen here. It is happening here.

LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION TO THE "UNCONSCIONABLE" AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include several editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the words "unconscionable strike" are headlined in the editorials of the New York Times. The Washington Daily News, and Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, Chairman of the Presidential Emergency Board, express public concern in the pending controversy between the International Association of Machinists and United, Trans World, National, Eastern, and Northwest Airlines. Similar editorials have also appeared in other newspapers across the Nation including the Washington Evening Star, Washington Post, and the Wall Street Journal.

This crippling and unnecessary strike has again emphasized the sterility of the provisions of the Railway Labor Act as well as the efforts of emergency boards appointed under this act to resolve labor disputes in the transportation field.

To repeat what I said on July 11, the reports of the emergency boards have never in my recollection been totally accepted by the parties to the dispute; indeed these reports, as in the present airline-IAM dispute, have served only as a new basis to try to get substantially more concessions from management.

The President of the United States should promptly exercise his great powers in an effort to persuade the IAM to settle this strike within the reasonable perimeter of the Emergency Board report which L.B.J. described as "the framework for a just and prompt settlement." The President should also ask Congress for immediate legislation designed to forbid any future strike in the transportation industry under similar circumstances as exist in the present controversy which cause such a great inconvenience to the public, including Vietnam veterans trying to get a few frantic minutes' leave at home.

I am today introducing a bill, H.R. 16189, identical to S. 3587, introduced by Senator Frank Lausche, of Ohio, providing that whenever a labor dispute has occurred in the vital transportation industry and after the Conciliation Service and Mediation Board have exercised unsuccessfully its power to bring about a settlement, the President shall create a Presidential Board that has the power to make final decisions.

For the information of my colleagues I am attaching copies of the editorials from the New York Times, Washington Post, Washington Evening Star, Washington Daily News, and the Wall Street Journal to be included as a part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 9, 1966]

AIRLINE STRIKE

By any standard, the strike of the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines is unfortunate. As usual, it is the public that suffers most. On that ground alone the strike ought to be ended—and speedily.

The union wants a bigger share of the industry's recent substantial prosperity. It blames "short-sighted" management for the strike and declares its dissatisfied members "have a right to strike."

The employers, bargaining together for the first time, point out that they accepted—while the union rejected—as the basis for settlement the recent recommendations of a Presidential Emergency Board. President Johnson called the recommendations "the framework for a just and proper settlement, which is in the national interest." The companies say they have sweetened the pot "by an additional substantial offer above the Board's proposals" that would exceed the estimated $76 million cost of the recommendations.

These are the facts. What complicates this—and very nearly every labor-management relationship—are the intangible, the human, the political considerations. One of these is the union's announced determination to smash the Administration's 3.2 per cent wage guidelines even tho the Presidential Board's recommendations were in excess of that figure. They want to claim credit for it themselves rather than having the board do it for them.

Another factor is the union's internal political problem. The highly skilled mechanics, in a strong bargaining position because they are in short supply, object to being grouped in the same unit with porters, kitchen workers, ramp and store personnel. They say the unskilled depress their wage and working standards.

As a result, IAM leaders, faced with a revolt by militant mechanics and fearful of losing them, apparently feel the necessity for being more militant still.

But surely these political and intangible considerations are not sufficient reason for shutting down 60 per cent of the domestic trunk line industry, for depriving 150,000 daily passengers of air service at the start of the vacation season and for disregarding public opinion and the public interest.

Under Presidential prompting both sides have agreed to resume negotiations. They could do no less. We urge them to settle their differences realistically and speedily.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 11, 1966]

A Strike Against the Public

The International Association of Machinists seems determined to press its strike against five of the nation's major airlines to the point where restrictive labor legislation will become a matter of urgent national policy.

The latest manifestation of the union's "Public-be-damned" attitude was the announcement last night that IAM personnel would be forbidden to service any aircraft leased by the struck airlines to those still operating. The leasing plan could, under no stretch of the imagination, be considered a strike-breaking move. The legitimate economic pressure on the struck lines would have remained in full effect. The only result would have been to alleviate, in some small degree, the crisis in the nation's transportation system, war effort and economic life. Now, even that slender reed has been snatched away.

Even before this latest ill-considered action, the union put itself on shaky ground by spurning every attempt by disinterested parties to head off the strike. Every statutory means of avoiding the crisis was passed up. In addition, the union brushed aside the offer of the National Mediation Board for binding arbitration. A presidentially appointed emergency board headed by Senator Wayne Morse, probed the issues in dispute and came up with a recommendation for wage increases averaging 3.3 percent. The carriers accepted the package; the union rejected it. Despite the fact that the proposal exceeded the administration's economic guideposts, President Johnson hailed it as the basis for "a just and prompt settlement." The airlines' final offer was even more liberal than the proposals of the emergency board. But the union walked out.

The union's main contention is that the airlines are prosperous and that the workers should share in that prosperity. It is true that the airlines are prosperous. It is also true that the union membership already shares in that prosperity in the form of high wages and an ever-increasing number of jobs available. But the suggestion that wage dispute settlements should be based directly on profits could be taken seriously only if accompanied by a proposal for a lower wage package for the less prosperous of the carriers and a decreased scale in the event profits should slack off. The union has made no such suggestion.

The threat of a strike and the strike itself are legitimate weapons in collective bargaining. But the thoughtless, capricious use of that weapon to create havoc in the nation's economy can only increase the demand for congressional action to curb abuses of union power.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1966]

No Bargain

The stark reality of the strike against five major airlines by the International Association of Machinists is making an inconvenienced public all too aware of the frailty of bargaining under the Railway Labor Act. Though the Act is intended to encourage compromise, it actually works to postpone the need for meaningful discussion between the parties. As the President said on Thursday, he had done everything within his power to avert the strike. Now the responsibility is finally where it belongs.

This is not a classic strike; employes are not oppressed or exploited. Rather it is a product of our affluent society. Despite side concerns and local issues, the heart of the disagreement is money. The airlines, last year and so far this year, have been enjoying a boom. The union wants a much larger share of the resulting income. Rank and file members, working in an industry that historically has not been strong financially, want the gains achieved by other unions.

Are the proposals reasonable or is the union being greedy? By the only yardstick available, the recommendations made by a presidential emergency board a month ago, the union asks too much. The board's position is not sacrosanct. It does, however, represent a constructive estimate by a distinguished group on how management and labor might fruitfully and fairly agree.

The airlines have already accepted the board's recommendations. As the negotiations continue, it is incumbent upon the union to move toward a compromise or provide workable alternatives to what is already on the table.

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1966]

An "Unconscionable" Strike

The strike by the International Association of Machinists that has grounded 60 per cent of the nation's commercial airplanes has an atavistic flavor. The union, it seems, cannot be swayed by an objective offer of a fair settlement or by appeals to act in the national interest. It just wants more. And it is apparently counting on the disruption and inconvenience caused by the strike to get it.

There is no question that the airlines are now prosperous. They are benefiting from both a boom in air travel and the widespread use of jets, which have proved far more popular and profitable than they had expected. Their profit figures are not secret; they are in fact reflected in offers to the union.

The machinery of the Railway Labor Act, which applies to air carriers, was first employed to bring about an agreement. But the union refused to accept the National Mediation Board's offer of binding arbitration. Then President Johnson appointed an emergency board, headed by Senator Wayne Morse, which made proposals that would have provided what *Mr. Johnson described as "the framework for a just and prompt settlement." This, too, was rejected. Finally, the airlines made a new offer that reportedly exceeded the Morse proposals; but the union decided to strike rather than to bargain.*

At a time when the nation is at war and must be operating all of its air transport, the strike harms the entire union movement and its reputation for responsible and reasonable leadership. *The machinists, as Senator Morse has pointed out, are not being asked to make any sacrifice.* His board ignored the Administration's wage guideposts, recommending increases averaging 3.5 per cent; it also proposed a reopening of the contract by the union if living costs go up faster than the board anticipated. Given these concessions, Morse holds that the strike is "unconscionable."

Conceivably, the union's strategy will succeed in getting it more. But the machinists must recognize that excessive demands can provoke an excessive reaction. If they hold out for a settlement that is uneconomic for the airlines and inflationary for the country, they will surely provoke demands for action to curb union power.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 12, 1966]

Strike Against the Public

The nation's air transportation has been crippled by a new manifestation of a spreading mutation in traditional labor tactics. The walkout by the Machinists union is not ordinary economic warfare against the companies; it is a strike against the public.

The union's confidence in this tactic explains its refusal to budge in negotiations. The companies originally offered wage boosts of about 30 cents an hour, while the union demanded up to 53 cents over a three-year contract. A Presidential emergency board suggested 48 cents over a 42-month contract.

The airlines accepted this proposal as a basis for negotiation, but the union struck. Even so stout a friend of organized labor as Senator Wayne Morse, an emergency board member, denounces the union's position as "unconscionable."

But then, why should the union grant an inch when it has the power to create such great mischief at so little cost to itself? The strike has closed down about 60% of the nation's passenger volume, disrupting plans of some 150,000 travelers every day. Coming at the height of the public's traveling season, the result is tremendous inconvenience and no little grief.

Precisely this public burden is the union's immediate object. If there is any doubt, consider how the Machinists and their allies have thwarted Civil Aeronautics Board efforts to ease the crush on travelers. The CAB authorized airlines to exchange equipment to increase service, but the unions on nonstruck airlines have refused to service aditional planes. The Machinists said they "question" the use of leased equipment even if it does not come from the struck airlines.

The Machinists can easily see that creating a public crisis has been immensely profitable for other unions in the past. There was a time, for instance, when every emergency brought Government pressure on companies to give the union what it wanted.

Today the unions are so flushed with success that they often demand even more than the Government can stomach, but the upshot is usually the same. The union closes its ears to public cries for mercy. The companies, with greater consciences and greater contact with the public, are forced to listen. The result almost invariably will be a union victory.

To make everything even more unreasonable, the motivation behind today's typical strike is less the union member's economic needs than the political benefits their leaders find inherent in militancy.

Airline mechanics now make up to $3.53 an hour. It's hard to believe that a raise of 53¢ instead of 48¢ will be worth their own inconvenience in striking, not to mention the trouble they cause others. To offset organizing pressure from an independent union and the Teamsters, however, the Machinists' chiefs need to bring home a settlement certified as fat by the fact that it took a crisis to win it.

Bloated with political as well as economic power, numerous unions seem to feel they have nothing to lose in assaulting the public even for such cavalier reasons. In the long run such irresponsible behavior as the railroad firemen found out, invites drastic measures like compulsory arbitration. Yet in general, the solicitude unions receive on Capitol Hill and in the National Labor Relations Board makes outbreak of arrogance eminently predictable.

In short, the record of union-management-government relations quite naturally tempts many labor leaders to conclude that they can get away with almost anything. Strikes against the public will continue increasingly frequent and blatant, we suspect, until that record starts to show that even labor has a need for restraint.

A TAX CREDIT INCENTIVE FOR INDUSTRY TO STOP AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MIZE**. Mr. Speaker, in carrying out the Nation's program of water and air pollution abatement, it is necessary for business, industry and government to work together in partnership as the most effective method of accomplishing what needs to be done.

The immensity of program involves thousands of industrial plants and billions of dollars in construction and equipment. It is beyond the means of any one firm to add this burden to its capital investment. The only way we are going to get the job done is for everyone to work together, and make some incentives available along the way.

To implement the partnership which is so important, I have today introduced legislation which would provide an incentive tax credit of 20 percent to encourage the construction of pollution abatement facilities.

Under the terms of this bill, any industry which installed abatement facilities at its plants would be permitted to take a tax credit equal to 20 percent of all costs incurred for the facilities, including the cost of land, buildings, improvements, machinery and equipment used to control air pollution and/or water pollution, providing these measures have been aproved by the appropriate State agency.

Participating industries would also have another incentive. In lieu of the depreciation deduction now allowed, the firms could amortize the costs on a 1- to 5-year basis.

In consideration of the capital outlays for nonproductive facilities of this type and the continuing expense burden for operating such facilities, it appears imperative that incentives to business through modification of the Federal tax laws be adopted as the most reasonable and logical approach in meeting pollution abatement problems.

Encouragement of capital outlays by use of the tax law has precedence in the existing investment credit and in the depreciation guidelines instituted in 1962. The success of these devices would be ample evidence of the value of the incentive. As I see it, the incentive is neutral among different taxpayers faced with pollution problems. It favors neither the large nor the small, the efficient or the inefficient; it recognizes the burden of pollution abatement in relation to the need in each situation and it encourages the adoption of steps to solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the water crisis which America faces makes it necessary for us to explore every means of making the wisest use of our dwindling supplies. No longer can we afford the luxury of pollution. Every drop is precious because the available supply must serve more people in more ways. It must be free of contaminants and it must be as fresh and pure as possible.

Industry cannot go the job alone, but through the incentives offered by the Government the necessary steps can be taken, and we can be well on our way to an effective program of pollution abatement not only for our water resources but our air resources as well. It is something which we cannot delay. I respectfully propose this approach as one of the best means of getting started. I trust that hearings can be held and the legislation considered before we adjourn.

PART 2—UNUSUAL "ARMY" OF INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS ENGAGES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. **QUILLEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Speaker, what follows is the second and third in a series of six articles which appeared recently in the St. Petersburg Times dealing with irregularities in certain aspects of the war on poverty on the west coast of Florida. Part 1 appeared in yesterday's Record at pages 15362–15364.

Supported by Federal Funds: VISTA Camp's Profits, Owners Are Unknown

(Second of a series by Jack Nease and Bette Orsini, of the Times staff)

(Note.—Times staff writers Jack Nease and Bette Orsini look at the H.A.S. Corp. in the accompanying story in their continuing inquiry into the fiscal affairs of Suncoast anti-poverty programs supported by federal funds. The study tends to raise more questions than it answers. The reporters were denied access to records detailing expenditure of public funds. The true owners of the H.A.S. Corp., which apparently is wholly supported by public money, are still unknown. And there are conflicting stories on how the H.A.S. Corp. came to acquire the land for a VISTA training camp and rent it to the Suncoast foundation operating the program.)

The VISTA training camp in Florida lies midway between Bradenton and Sarasota, just off U.S. 301 in a little Negro community known as Tallevast.

The camp is owned by the H.A.S. Corp., which receives $3 per day per trainee from the Community Service Foundation (CSF). The CSF is paid, in turn, by the federal government.

On the surface the arrangement appears to be a profitable one for H.A.S. but who gets the profits, and how much, is a secret.

Howard Garrett, a Tampa attorney who twice ran unsuccessful campaigns for the state Legislature and is paid $50 a day in consulting fees from time to time by CSF, is listed as president of H.A.S.

But Garrett says he owns only a "nominal" interest in H.A.S. The real owners, he told reporters last week, are "friends and clients" who don't want their identity known.

Records concerning purchase of the one-acre camp are rather interesting.

In September 1965, CSF wrote checks totaling $10,677 to "Howard Garrett, Agent." All except $3,500 of this was billed to the federal government under a "cost reimburseable" VISTA training contract.

In October a deed dated October 11, 1965, was filed in Manatee County recording the sale of the training site by the Lake Region Packing Association to the H.A.S. Corp. for $18,000.

The $18,000 figure is listed in the deed, and is verified by attached state stamps.

Also recorded at the same time was a mortgage deed given by the H.A.S. Corp. to the Lake Region Packing Association. The mortgage was for $10,000, payable with 6 per cent interest in one year.

Together, the two documents appear to show that only $8,000 was needed to purchase the land, with the other $10,000 due within a year.

The mortgage includes the property and such items as a stove, pots, pans, trays, large coffee pots, 48 steel bunk beds and 48 mattresses.

Here are the amounts and the notations on checks (and in one case the check stub) of the CSF checks to Howard Garrett, agent.

Sept. 10—$2,000, rent.
Sept. 21—$1,200, bedding.
Sept. 21—$1,100, kitchen equipment.
Sept. 21—$2,877, balance of rent cycle 2.
Sept. 21—$3,500, advance on lease.

When the VISTA training costs were billed to the federal government the checks were listed a bit differently.

The first check, for example, was listed as $500 worth of housing and $1,500 was listed under food.

The kitchen equipment check for $1,100 was listed on the CSF ledger as "food" and billed to the OEO under a general category called "Housing and Subsistence."

Thomas P. Hardeman, CSF vice president, said OEO officials approved listing of the kitchen equipment as "food" to get the VISTA training camp started.

All the amounts, he said, had been audited by federal auditors and all invoices sent to the federal government had been paid.

The checks to Garrett as agent were marked on the back as deposited to the account of "Garrett and Garrett trust account."

Garrett said last week that this money had been turned over to the H.A.S. Corp.

Hardeman refused to say what arrangement CSF has now for rental of the camp, but Garrett displayed a lease providing for payment of $3 per day per trainee. It was dated Sept. 12, 1965.

Both men declined to say exactly how much had been paid for rental of the camp.

At the $3 a day rate, however, it would take only 200 VISTA trainees staying at the camp 30 days to pay the entire $18,000 for the camp.

The normal training period is for six weeks, but some of this time is spent in the field.

Hardeman said the lease is being renegotiated.

The general location of the camp appears to be good as far filling the needs of the program. It is fairly typical rural Florida, the type of area the VISTA program trainees work in after graduation.

But exactly how the camp was selected as a VISTA training site is unclear.

Both Hardeman and Garrett agree that the project needed to find a new home in September 1965. Garrett says Hardeman asked him to find a place. Hardeman says Garrett approached him, saying he had a client with a camp location.

The camp consists of a concrete dormitory building with a kitchen and dining room at one end, six small wooden cottages, two portable office buildings and an auditorium building. Only the concrete block building was there when the H.A.S. Corp purchased it.

Discussed at March Meeting: Hardeman Eyed VISTA Transfer to CAF Control

(Third of a series by Bette Orsini and Jack Nease, of the Times Staff)

(Editor's Note.—Times staff writers Jack Nease and Bette Orsini today continue their inquiry into the fiscal affairs of an interlocking complex of the Community Action Fund and the Community Service Foundation—which conduct poverty operations spending more than $2.36 million in federal funds. The reporters were denied access to records detailing expenditure of public funds. The true owners of the H.A.S. Corp.—which apparently is wholly supported by public money—are still unknown. And there are conflicting stories on how the H.A.S. Corp. came to acquire the land for a VISTA training camp and rent it to the complex as site for the largest training program of VISTA volunteers in the nation.)

There is evidence Thomas P. Hardeman planned to pull the VISTA training center out of the Community Service Foundation operation and put it under his own Community Action Fund jurisdiction, records of the $2.36-million poverty complex disclose.

Hardeman, who works for the Community Service Foundation, but heads the Community Action Fund, denies there was such a plan.

Dr. Willis T. Spivey, who heads the foundation which employs Hardeman to develop projects for it, said he is unaware of the move.

But a search of the records has turned up minutes of a March 8 CAF regional directors meeting which show reference to a suggestion that staff members from the VISTA training staff be used for training migrant aides for CAF between VISTA training cycles.

Hardeman's reply, according to the minutes, was that "this is a question that should be considered confidential, but there is a possibility that VISTA training will be run by CAF rather than CSF in the future.

There also are signs of deepening conflict between the poverty war complex headed by Hardeman and the VISTA volunteers he is training in the largest training center in the nation.

Apparently smarting from Washington VISTA observers' critical comments on handling of volunteers in the migrant program, Hardeman told his regional directors "entirely too much time" has been given the VISTA side of his program.

"It was not our intention," he said, "to let the tail wag the dog."

Hardeman's CAF migrant program has been the site of major upheaval the past weeks as upshot of a tug-of-war over the VISTAs.

In the internal strife that has marred the program almost from its inception Hardeman has fired a half-dozen key employes, including the director.

The fired director, Alan Guskin, an ex-Peace Corpsman who is now a VISTA official in Washington, came into conflict with Hardeman over the supervision of VISTAs assigned to the migrant program.

Hardeman wanted his migrant center regional directors to have full control over the volunteers. Guskin said the only way the VISTAs could work effectively was to have a coordinator in the central office with time to look to their needs specifically.

The wrangling extended over several months. In one exchange, recorded in the minutes, Hardeman asked the coordinator of volunteers, John Evans, to leave the room so he could discuss whether to continue the position the next year.

Evans said he preferred to remain since he knew more about the position than anyone and perhaps could contribute to the discussion.

Guskin and Evans based their case on the premise the volunteers were part of the VISTA national organization and should be handled differently than paid employees on the staffs of agencies where they're assigned.

One of Hardeman's migrant directors complained of the coordinators visiting the volunteers without obtaining "clearance" from the director in the region.

She protested she "suspects a spy operation" when "these people drop in unannounced simply to talk to the volunteers and see how they are doing."

Ultimate outgrowth of the differences was the firing of Guskin, Evans, the two assistant coordinators of volunteers and several other employes.

Asked about the dismissals Hardeman termed it "a sweeping reorganization of the migrant program." He defended it on the grounds "We have certain standards that we want people in the programs to measure up to."

"When you're dealing with the public money," he announced to a reporter, "you don't keep somebody who isn't performing."

Hardeman said three of the staffers, who worked in VISTA support roles, would not be replaced. He said the VISTAs "can stand on their own two feet. We will have a logistics person to handle" the work of the former coordinators of volunteers.

Hardeman hinted there may be more firings. He said the shakeup resulted from "a continuing evaluation of staff positions—and it isn't finished yet."

In April he firmed up the new get-tough policy with the VISTAs.

Records of an April 20 advisory committee meeting quote him as announcing "there will be a real change of policy regarding VISTA volunteers in this program."

"As of May 7," he said, "we have done away with the separation of VISTAs from the migrant program. There will be nobody going around from region to region to hold the volunteers' hands. There will be no expenditure of time dealing with volunteers' personal problems."

He said the policy would be such that "if anybody feels he cannot work with local staff, he can leave. We will not counsel anybody on their problems or try to persuade them to stay with the program when they are thinking of leaving."

Hardeman said he had "erred in the other direction in letting VISTA volunteers lead the program. We won't have the expense or the waste of time next year that we had this year."

THE 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SPEAKS

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a questionnaire to the fine constituents of my congressional district, to get to know their thinking on significant matters of national concern. I am pleased now to let my colleagues here in the Congress have the benefit of the opinions of the 10th Congressional District, and submit herewith the questions asked, with the tabulation of the answers received:

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor the present U.S. policy in Vietnam?	39.2	43.6	17.2
2. Do you believe the security of the United States would be jeopardized if we withdrew from South Vietnam?	47.6	39.2	13.2
3. Should we make any concessions to the Communists?	6.4	84.5	9.1
4. Do you favor the recognition of the Vietcong?	13.1	68.6	18.3
5. Should the Vietcong be admitted to a coalition government in South Vietnam?	14.4	68.3	17.3
6. Should the United States give foreign aid to countries which trade with North Vietnam?	4.3	85.2	10.5
7. Should the United States—			
(a) Increase the number of military personnel in South Vietnam?	35.3	37.4	27.3
(b) Increase air attacks and targets in North Vietnam?	67.7	13.9	18.4
(c) Impose a naval quarantine around the port of Haiphong?	63.3	11.4	25.3
8. Should the United States continue to supply wheat to Nasser?	18.2	61.8	20.0
9. Do you favor the expansion of international trade with the Soviet Union?	36.6	46.2	17.2
10. Do you favor a balanced budget?	86.0	5.4	8.6
11. Should the budget be balanced—			
Percent			
(a) Always? 63.9			
(b) Only in times of prosperity? 21.3			
(c) Never? 2.7			
(d) Undecided 12.1			
12. Should the Federal Government pursue a policy of—			
(a) Curtailing spending and keeping taxes low? 83.8			
(b) Increasing Government spending and raising taxes as necessary? 7.9			
(c) Undecided 8.3			
13. Do you believe that the Federal Government should set safety standards in the automotive industry?	66.1	24.8	9.1
14. Do you favor compulsory modification of automobile exhaust systems to reduce air pollution?	80.8	10.0	9.2
15. Do you favor a program to encourage the hiring of older workers by offering employers tax incentives?	57.3	24.9	17.8
16. Do you favor expansion of our food for peace program as a stimulus to the agricultural portion of the economy?	50.3	26.2	23.5
17. Do you favor the administration's proposal to cut the school lunch program by $21,000,000, and the school milk program by 80 percent?	17.8	72.9	9.3
18. Do you approve of the administration's proposal to spend $1,000,000,000 on health and education programs in underdeveloped countries?	30.3	57.6	12.1
19. Do you approve of a proposal to allow tax credits for business for programs to train unemployed and underskilled workers?	67.2	22.0	10.8
20. Do you favor the extension of the present treaty prohibiting nuclear testing in the atmosphere to include underground testing as well?	45.1	35.7	19.2
21. Do you favor more strict regulation of the sale or ownership of firearms?	67.1	29.7	3.2
22. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer or reading of the Bible in public schools?	90.2	8.1	1.7

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF PRESENT-DAY GREECE

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Greece is one of our historic allies, and has been an especially stanch associate since we shared in the effort against the Nazi and Fascist aggression which precipitated World War II. Therefore, it is most practical that we understand and appreciate the economic problems of present-day Greece. An extremely timely lecture on this subject was delivered by Prof. Stratis G. Andréadis on June 13 in Paris to the Academy of Ethical and Political Sciences, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF PRESENT-DAY GREECE

(Résumé of a lecture given to the Academy of Ethical and Political Sciences in Paris on June 13, 1966 by Prof. Stratis G. Andréadis)

This lecture deals with a number of problems of the Greek economy that are mostly linked to the process of the economic development of Greece and to its association with the European Economic Community.

Following the collapse of the national economy during the Occupation and civil war, great efforts were undertaken aimed at the reconstruction of the country and the recovery of its economy. By approximately 1954 the necessary conditions for getting the Greek economy moving were present and economic development had been normalized.

However, efforts aimed at economic development and structural changes brought about pronounced dislocation that was in danger of upsetting domestic equilibrium, with the appearance of strong inflationary pressures, as well as foreign equilibrium, as a result of the steady growth in the trade deficit.

The most difficult long-term problem that Greece must solve consists of maintaining domestic as well as foreign equilibrium. The deficit in the balance of trade, with respect to the export sector, results from shortcomings in the composition of these exports, whereas, with respect to the import sector, it is brought about by the process of development itself. The trend toward rising prices is primarily the result of pressures brought to bear by excessive demand on the means of production. These pressures could be relieved through a further increase in imports, whose financing, however, would imply an increase in invisible resources; or they could be relieved through an inflow of capital, of course, provided that the capital imported, whether due to its nature or its volume, would not entail the danger of later on creating problems with regard to the debt service or balance of payments liquidity crises.

In the sector of financing the economic development, the principal shortcoming lies in the institutional weaknesses that obstruct the normal flow of savings toward productive investment. A judicious policy of stimulation should therefore be applied in order to activate the capital market, especially the Stock Market, and encourage the establishment of specialized institutions forming an integral part of the country's financial structure.

Regarding the effects that might result from the association of Greece with the European Economic Community, the repercussions of the customs union, first, on foreign trade and, then, on economic expansion will be examined.

With respect to the new orientation of foreign trade following association, the results have so far been minimal. Comparing the average for 1961–1962 and the average age for 1964–1965 one finds no great difference either in the percentage of total imports made up of imports from the Community or the percentage of the total exports of Greece consisting of exports to the Community.

With regard to economic development, the progressive reduction in customs duties will no doubt result in reducing nonproductive activities that continue to exist under the protection of customs barriers. Furthermore, there has been no indication following association with the Community of any tendency toward and adjustment in transformation activities favorable to Greece. Neither the inflow of capital from countries of the Community nor the acceleration in the rate of development have been up to expectation.

In short, up to now the results of association have been rather slight and its effect on economic development has not been very pronounced. Neither the foreign trade of Greece nor its association with the European Economic Community have noticeably influenced its development, which has been truly remarkable and appears to be almost exclusively the result of intrinsic factors.

Finally, concerning the strategy to be used, it would consist, first of all, in eliminating as much as possible the two points of obstruction that impede development and, secondly, in bringing the national economy into line with the new conditions resulting from association in order to draw from the integration of Greece the maximum advantage offered.

Incidently, so that the Members will appreciate the fact that Professor Andréadis is an expert in his field, may I point out that he is a graduate of the University of Athens and Paris, and received his doctorate in law at the University of Paris. A member of the Athens bar, he is a professor of administrative law at the Athens Graduate School of Economic and Business Science, and has been on the board of directors of a number of leading Greek banks and industries. He is also the author of a great many works in the field of law and economics.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Thursday evening, June 30, our colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, addressed the Washington area commemoration of the Declaration of Ukrainian Independence. Representative DULSKI's address was the feature program held at the Statler Hilton. Because of its significance, and in recognition of the sound concept of foreign affairs evidenced in his remarks, and realizing the very timely nature of his comments, I insert Representative DULSKI's stirring address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THADDEUS J. DULSKI ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JUNE 30 DECLARATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Twenty-five years ago, across the entire Eastern Europe, between the Baltic and the Black Sea, a gigantic battle, raged between the two greatest tyrannies of modern times —Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia. In the midst of that tumult, the radio station in Lviv, the capital of Western Ukraine, was seized by Ukrainian nationalist insurgents, and on June 30, 1941, they broadcast a proclamation which began:

"By the will of the Ukrainian people, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, under the leadership of Stepan Bandera, proclaims the restoration of the Ukrainian State for which entire generations of the best sons of Ukraine have given their lives."

Thus opened a new chapter in the history of the Ukrainian nation's fight for freedom and independence. It is a chapter of unparalleled heroic struggle against the overwhelming forces of two most ruthless oppressor states in our time.

Ukrainians share a thousand-year-old national culture, history and state tradition, tied in its most vital elements of love for freedom and democratic process with the West.

Ukrainians naturally looked to the Western powers for support in their resistance against Russian, and Nazi subjugation alike. Unfortunately, the Western allies did not understand the Ukrainian people's fight for liberation then.

It is our task—our responsibility—that they understand it *now*.

Yet, even without Western support in 1941, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists decided to seize the slender opportunity provided by the confusion of war between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. They had been preparing the Ukrainian people for an armed uprising against Russian aggression for more than a decade. They were not going to miss this opportunity to try to win independence for the downtrodden Ukrainian nation.

Ukrainian political leaders of various parties assembled in Lviv. A Provisional Government of Ukraine, headed by Dr. Jaroslav Stetzko, was appointed.

This Government received widespread, enthusiastic support from the entire Ukrainian nation.

The two primates of the Ukrainian churches, the metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Andrei Sheptycky, and Bishop Policarp, of the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, issued pastoral letters imploring divine blessing on the restored Ukrainian State. They requested the Ukrainian people to be obedient, and to cooperate with the new government.

All over the Ukrainian territory, from which the Russian Bolshevik troops had escaped, local Ukrainian administration was set up, and the proclamation of the restoration of the Ukrainian Independent State was repeated at mass public rallies.

The joy of expected national revival was mixed, however, with deep sorrow of mourning for countless thousands of relatives and friends, political prisoners, beastly murdered by the Russian occupation authorities in Ukraine, headed by Khrushchev at the order of Stalin. The sight of huge mass graves, discovered in the prison yards in every town in Ukraine, evoked in every Ukrainian's heart a profound desire to avenge the death of one's dearest relatives and friends, and not to rest until the criminal Russian Communist imperialism would be abolished once and forever.

Yet, more disappointment was to come. The Russian oppression in Ukraine was replaced by the brutal Nazi German occupation, which refused to recognize any rights of Ukraine to liberty. Hitler's Gestapo arrested all the leaders of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and members of the Provisional Government, who did not manage to escape and go underground, and imprisoned them in the concentration camps in Germany. Many were shot without trial. Ukraine was dismembered, and its biggest part was put under the blood-thirsty rule of Reichskommissar Erich Koch.

A wave of resentment and protest against the German rule arose in Ukraine. From small partisan detachments, the large Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), under the command of General Taras Chuprynka, was formed late in 1942.

Later, after the return of the Russian Bolshevik Army, the UPA continued the fight against the Russian domination in Ukraine for several years after the war ended in the West.

Today, although Moscow has succeeded in suppressing large-scale open resistance in Ukraine, discontent with the Russian rule in Ukraine remains profound. This presents a favorable soil for the existence of an underground, aiming at the revolutionary overthrow of the Russian oppressive system, and the restoration of Ukrainian independence.

This great devotion to human freedom is not irrelevant to our time.

Listen as I read a description of MVD behavior at Kingir Concentration Camp on June 26, 1954—ten years after World War II, and more than a year after the death of Stalin. The account by an eyewitness of the massacre, Volfgang Strauss, is to be found in the Spring 1964 issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly.

Quote: "I saw about 500 Ukrainian women and girls step out of the second barracks. Clasping hands, they marched out into the yard, singing 'Ukraine is Not Dead . . .'. When the rows of Ukrainian women and girls were a few yards away from the tanks, which had surrounded the yard, something dreadful happened. The tanks began to move forward. Without halting, they moved down and crushed the bodies of the women and girls. In spite of the noise of the tanks, one could still hear them singing. There was human flesh sticking to the sides of the tanks, and the smell of blood in the air. When the tanks came to a halt, there were about 70 women still alive. They began singing a hymn. An officer shouted commands and thereupon a horde of soldiers, who had looked on during this dreadful spectacle, hurled themselves on the women who had survived, tore off their clothes and violated them . . . When the soldiers finally desisted, there was not a woman left alive." End quote.

Is it any wonder that the Ukrainian people now struggle toward the day when Russian oppression is ended? The reasons are abundantly clear. Only the methods of struggle are different.

The last few years are characteristic of the new methods: Strikes, street battles, and demonstrations. Although these are brutally suppressed, they cause losses in the ranks of the occupiers.

The big fights in Novocherkask and Donets Basin in 1962–63 marked the turning point, not only with regard to new tactics and strategy, but also with regard to morale. The people have lost their fear. They have found again the courage to fight.

One can see from the Soviet press that the population is endeavoring to arm itself, especially the young workers and students. People are providing themselves with weapons by stealing them from the state arsenals, by illegally purchasing them in the state depots, and by taking them from representatives of the Soviet authorities and from the military troops.

During the past two years, reports of insurgent activity have increased. Insurgents are mainly students, young workers, and collective farmers. These young people leave their families, go into the forests, and fight—leaving production in the lurch.

It is commonly known that such armed rebel groups operate in the forests around the famous Ukrainian medieval fortified towns. People call them "forest dwellers" or "children of the forest."

A novelty in the underground movement of the Ukrainian people is secret radio broadcasting, which is widespread. This has caused a great disturbance among the Soviet Russian occupiers of Ukraine.

The Soviet Press has named a few illegal transmitters in Dnipropetrovsk, Central Ukraine, in the Kyiv area, in the Donets Basin, in the Kazakhstan and in the Tartar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. It recently revealed a sensational fact: In one town alone—Bila-Tserkva—southwest of Kyiv, there are more than one hundred illegal transmitters in operation—right now!

The widespread ideological and cultural offensive on the part of the writers, artists, and intellectuals—especially of those of the younger generation—is another form of revolutionary activity.

The ideas they represent are mainly—love of country and God—justice—truth—human dignity—freedom.

The young artists flatly reject so-called socialist realism. They look for new forms of artistic expression. A cultural renaissance of traditional and historical principles is the dominant motive in which the younger generation is interested.

One finds no dialectical materialism, no internationalism, no Soviet patriotism. On the contrary, there is a fanatical love of one's country and God.

Owing to the limitation of the time at our disposal here tonight, I shall refer to one example only—the young Ukrainian poet, Vasyl Symonenko. His verses are charged with accusations against Russia. They demand resistance. We are glad that they have become the inspiration and battle-cry of the young.

Symonenko looked into the "tortured eyes" of Mother Ukraine, which seemed like wounds to him—yet wounds "flashed with blood-red lightning of upheavals and fights at the barricades." He pledged:

"Ukraine, you are my prayer,
My eternal desperation,
For you, holy name, I am ready
To pour forth my last drop of blood."

The voices of poets, like Vasyl Symonenko, are heard from Kamchatka to Rumania and Bulgaria, from Georgia to Estonia and Latvia.

At the same time, however, new developments have been taking place in the Soviet government. These developments are grave and dangerous for the entire world. With Khrushchev's fall, a whole class of leaders is being systemtically replaced.

An analysis of current events in the Soviet Union yields the conclusion that KGB (State Security Committee)—Cheka (First Soviet Russian Political Police)—is already monopolizing political power. Prominent members of the Cheka are being rehabilitated—Dzerzinski glorified. The Communist press features stories, depicting the heroism of Cheka members.

A new generation of fanatical Russian chauvinists, with KGB mentality, is preparing to take over in the empire. This new Russian elite is addressed to the Russian people, who alone can respond to the ideals of Russian chauvinism, vision of new conquests, and a new form of messianic nationalism. For the non-Russian nations, terror is to be the only way. The new Russian elite cannot justify its position internally by imposing the Russian rule and way on the enslaved nations.

We can expect, therefore, increased aggression outside the USSR. This aggression may manifest itself in various forms, such as peripheral wars, civil strifes, class struggles, as well as new methods yet untried. The declared policy of peaceful coexistence will be accompanied by an expansion of Russian influence abroad through multi-stage communist takeover of free countries.

The days to come will be ones of danger for all yet free peoples—days of increasing struggle on the part of freedom-loving people inside Ukraine and in other Captive Nations. Most of all—days of dedication and effort on our part.

Everyone in the West must understand the Ukrainian people's fight for freedom. The next opportunity—which may come soon—is one we must not miss.

In the words of the great national freedom fighter and poet laureate of Ukraine, whose magnificent statue stands in Washington just at the entrance to Embassy row—Taras Shevchenko:

"Struggle on—and be triumphant!
God himself will aid you;
At your side fight truth and glory,
Right and holy freedom."

Thank you.

ENGINEERS' REPORT ON PROPOSED GRAND CANYON DAMS: "POOR USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS"; "SUBSTANTIAL NET LOSS OF AVAILABLE WATER"

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a group of engineers at the W. M. Keck Laboratory of Hydraulics and Water Resources, California Institute of Technology, has volunteered an appraisal of the proposal to build the Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon Dams. The statement is required reading for Members of Congress. It follows:

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, Calif., June 17, 1966.

Re H.R. 4671, to authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of the lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We urge you not to approve the construction of either Marble or Bridge Canyon dams as part of the Lower Colorado River Basin Project. Although the Subcommittee has defeated Congressman REINECKE'S motions to delete these dams from H.R. 4671, we ask the Subcommittee to reconsider its actions, because we believe that building these dams is a poor use of federal money and an unnecessary desecration of the Grand Canyon.

Although we recognize and concur in the strong conservation arguments against these dams, we object to these dams and power plants on the basis of engineering economics. We are writing as individuals expressing our views, but by profession we are all civil engineers, specializing in hydraulic engineering and water resource development.

The remarks in this letter are concerned with the proposed Marble Canyon Dam, which we have studied in some detail.* We believe that similar arguments will also apply to the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam, and we concur with the Bureau of the Budget in recommending that it not be considered until a later time, if at all.

The sole purpose of Marble Canyon Dam is to generate electric power. There is no benefit accruing from water storage, because of ample other storage projects on the river; on the other hand there will actually be a substantial net loss of available water due to evaporation.

The power necessary for pumping in the Central Arizona Project could be better provided by a steam power plant at a point close to the aqueduct pumping stations. There is no need to produce peaking power for the Lower Colorado River Basin Project, other than to make the proposed Marble Canyon operation barely feasible in its own right, and to permit the acquisition of base power in exchange for peak power at a profit.

In our opinion the Bureau of Reclamation has not adequately advised Congress on possible alternatives to Marble Canyon Dam. Furthermore, the alternatives should be based on fulfilling the functions and needs of the Central Arizona Project, rather than on producing an equivalent amount of peaking power, which is not an objective of the water-supply project.

The economic evaluation of various alternatives must be made on the basis of comparable interest rates, pay-out periods, subsidies, and taxes. For example, if the costs of power generation of Marble Canyon Dam are based on the artificially low interest rate of 3.2%, then the same interest rate should be used in consideration of other projects. It is improper to compare publicly-financed Marble Canyon power with privately-financed alternatives which do not involve this hidden subsidy and tax exemption. The economic evaluation of alternative projects, whether public or private, should reflect as nearly as possible the true costs to society for given benefits.

There are trends in the power business which the Bureau of Reclamation has not fully taken into account, in our opinion. First, there has been a tremendous upsurge in nuclear power technology in the last few years so that it is now becoming highly competitive with both conventional steam and hydropower generation. The only streams on which hydropower generation still remains competitive today are probably those with very heavy flows of water, such as the Snake and Columbia, where huge amounts of power (in relation to the cost of a dam) may be generated. At a given site the amount of power which can be produced is directly proportional to the amount of water flow. The Colorado is a relatively dry river and if the flow were 5 to 10 times as much (were it not in an arid part of the country) then a dam and power plant at Marble Canyon might be highly beneficial. But since the huge costs of the dam, $239 million, must be amortized against a relatively small amount of power generation, the cost of the power goes up.

A second factor apparently not fully considered by the Bureau of Reclamation is the likelihood that the market value of peaking power will probably continue to drop in the future as power usage becomes more diversified (into things such as air conditioning), and the use of power throughout the day will tend to become more uniform. Furthermore, with massive regional inter-ties the variable power loads can be equalized over larger regions and there will simply not be so much need for large hydropower capabilities to meet sudden changes in power demand. In fact many regions of the country get along very well now without any hydropower plants, and the peak load is taken care of by older and already amortized steam generation units.

Insight into the cost of nuclear power alternatives is given by a recent Bechtel Corporation report prepared for the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Office of Saline Water.** From that, it may be deduced that it is possible to build a nuclear power plant of 600,000 kilowatt capacity (same as Marble Canyon Dam) for only about $95 million capital cost or only 40% of Marble Canyon Dam. Assuming 4.5% interest at 50 year amortization, power could be produced at about 3.1 mils per kilowatt hour (at a 90% load factor) compared to the corresponding cost of about 6.5 mils (at a 40% load factor) at Marble Canyon Dam.

One of the effects of superficially low interest rates used in evaluation of federal power projects is to artificially lower the annual cost of large capital cost projects. However, in the public interest at this time of inflation, when President Johnson is asking industry to defer capital expenditures wherever possible, it would seem to be wiser to choose plans which have lower initial cost.

In summary, we support the water delivery features of the Central Arizona Project but not the construction of Marble Canyon or Bridge Canyon Dam. It has not been demonstrated that these dams have any economic or engineering advantage over other possible sources of power for the Central Arizona Project, or of revenue for the Basin Development Fund. Existing reclamation policy and lack of precedent for federal steam power in the West should not be a block to the rational consideration of a steam power alternative; rather if this is the most feasible, as we suspect it is, then the existing policy and law should be changed appropriately.

Therefore, we urge you to insist on a proper engineering study of alternatives to Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams. In the meantime these projects should not be authorized, especially in view of their effects on the Grand Canyon.

Sincerely yours,
Norman H. Brooks,
Professor of Civil Engineering.
Vito A. Vanoni,
Professor of Hydraulics.
Fredric Raichlen,
Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering.
Jerry Yudelson,
B.S. '66.

Subcommittee members: Walter Rogers, chairman, Leo W. O'Brien, James A. Haley, Ed Edmondson, Walter S. Baring, Harold T. Johnson, Morris K. Udall, Compton I. White, Jr., Phillip Burton, John V. Tunney, Thomas S. Foley, Richard White, Teno Roncalio, John P. Saylor, Craig Hosmer, Joe Skubitz, Laurence J. Burton, Wendell Wyatt, George V. Hansen, Ed Reinecke, Wayne N. Aspinall, Santiago Polanco-Abreu.

cc: House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (other members): Ralph J. Rivers, Roy A. Taylor, Hugh Carey, David S. King, Walter H. Moeller, Jonathan B. Bingham, N. Neiman Craley, Jr., John A. Race, E. Y. Berry, Charlotte T. Reid, Rogers C. B. Morton, Henry P. Smith, III.

Staff: Sidney L. McFarland, T. Richard Witmer, Theodore Schad.

Speaker of the House John W. McCormack.

Senator Thomas Kuchel.

Senator George Murphy.

Hon. Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Dean Peterson, Office of Science and Technology.

Sierra Club, San Francisco.

BILL ON PACKAGING DECEPTIVELY LABELED

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington, D.C., Evening Star recently carried an item by Richard Wilson on the truth-in-packaging bill which has passed the Senate and will come before this body. Mr. Wilson presents several solid arguments against this legislation—arguments which should be heard before final judgment is made. Therefore, I insert Mr. Wilson's comments in the Record at this point:

Bill on Packaging Deceptively Labeled

(By Richard Wilson)

Mrs. America en route to the supermarket has gotten pretty canny about jumbo ounces and giant economy sizes. She knows that a giant half quart is still a pint and that a bottle shaped like an hour-glass may look bigger but actually holds less than the regular size.

Congress is rushing to her protection, nevertheless, with a bill that is as trickily labeled as a few of the packages on the supermarket shelves. This is called the "truth in packaging bill" and it directly affects more people than any other measure passed this year.

The bill brings under control of the federal regulators about 8,000 packaged food, drug, cosmetic and sundry items for which consumers pay $63 billion annually, or more than one-fourth of their income.

This particular package actually holds more than the label says. If it were confined to the label, truth in packaging, there would be little to quarrel with, although the power to enforce such truths already amply exists in state and federal law, as the regulators freely concede.

The Senate, not looking at the small print on the label, has passed the bill 72 to 9 and President Johnson has praised the Senate's action in passing "one of the most important pieces of legislation before Congress this year."

It is, indeed, one of the most important pieces of legislation passed in Congress any year, for it is the opening wedge for a series of actions in the name of consumer protection that could disorganize the most efficient system for the mass manufacture and distribution of goods the world has ever known. The House of Representatives now has its chance to review the Senate's action.

What's wrong with requiring manufacturers to state clearly the size and content of their packaged goods? Nothing. If the present laws were enforced there would be no need for a new federal law for this purpose.

---

*Yudelson, J. M., "The Marble Canyon Dam Controversy", Tech. Memo 66-1, W. M. Keck Laboratory of Hydraulics and Water Resources, California Institute of Technology, June, 1966.

**Bechtel Corp. (San Francisco), "Engineering and Economic Feasibility Study for a Combination Nuclear Power-Desalting Plant," 3 vol., Dec. 1965.

What is wrong with the bill is that it sets up a new system of federal regulation leaving the regulators wide discretion in controlling the business practices of the packaged goods industry and no one knows where they will stop. This is not consonant with the simple purposes stated by President Johnson when he proposed the legislation.

But it is consonant with the growing consumerism movement that wishes to substitute the regulations and judgment of federal bureaucrats over a wide field for the market-tested practices of a highly efficient industry.

What is done now will cast a long shadow in the future. The 8,000 items on supermarket shelves today, it is estimated, will swell to 20,000 in a few years. We are going to have even more a packaged economy than today and those who control it from Washington will have great power.

The system now proposed, however, is so loose, so subject to the whim of whatever regulator happens to be in office, and so generally complex and unenforceable that the regulators will be pushed in the direction they seem to wish to go. That direction is toward the government-issue standardization of major commodities in every day use, as to size, content, quality and, eventually, price. This is the road to ruin for great industries that play such an important part in the national prosperity.

There are two sure ways to plunge this nation into a colossal depression. One is to regulate the automobile industry, the other to hamstring the packaged goods industries with all their related activities, such as national advertising on radio-TV and in the newspapers and magazines, transportation for national distribution, manufacture of cartons and packages, local employment and investment in supermarkets.

The heart of the truth in the packaging bill is not the mandatory requirement protecting Mrs. America from being deceived by misleading packages. It is to be found in the discretionary powers in the bill that permit bureaucrats to fix by fiat precise specifications for packaging and labeling where there is no question of deception at all.

A housewife who had the time to read the hearings, reports and debates in Congress would readily recognize the morass this would lead to. The marketing practices are so delicately balanced and the technical details are so great that the odds favor the regulators making a frightful mess of it. We could end up with shelves full of GI-type packages that would cause the cost-conscious and discriminating housewife to turn up her nose, flounce out of the supermarket and write a hot letter to Johnson.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE HOWARD SMITH

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, if present returns from the elections in Virginia are certified, this body will lose the services of our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Howard Smith, one of our most able, dedicated and courageous leaders. His defeat will result in further suffering, not only for our beloved Southland, but for all Americans who love the Constitution.

I am not passing judgment on the voters of Virginia, but the results of this election provide ample evidence that the Democratic Party has fallen into the hands of the New Left. Even now we read where the liberal Democrats of the House are plotting to prevent the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman Bill Colmer, from succeeding Judge Smith.

These events further convince me that the hope for saving this Nation is to be found in the Republican Party.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 159 of July 12, 1966, I was not recorded as voting. I was unable to be present in the House because of official business.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks during the general debate today on H.R. 15750.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MISSION TO SOUTH VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Krebs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the mission to South Vietnam and southeast Asia in which I participated during the 4th of July recess was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. I express to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the President my appreciation for being included in this mission of 14 Members of the House of Representatives who were privileged to see at firsthand the activities of our Government in southeast Asia in such a vivid manner.

On yesterday I commented briefly upon this mission when the gentleman from New York [Mr. Murphy] gave his report to the Members of the House. Today I would like to give a more detailed statement of my observations and experiences while on this grueling, but exciting, inspection.

MISSION OF THE DELEGATION

Mr. Speaker, the mission assigned to our delegation by the President and by you was to make a study of the role of the United States in the Vietnamese conflict. This mission was not limited to military activity but was to include a look at the civic action efforts being carried on by both the military and civilian agencies of our Government. We were then to report to you and the President our findings and our recommendations.

We were under the favorable condition of having a direction from the President we were to that permitted to see anything that we desired at any place in South Vietnam. This resulted in the necessity of our group dividing itself in order that we might collectively bring back as thorough a report as practicable after a 9-day study of our southeast Asian involvement. This we did.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina knows, and as I believe many Members of the House know, all of the Members who composed this committee which went on the trip to Vietnam and to southeast Asia were combat veterans of World War II or Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House and our distinguished colleagues now present should recognize that the gentleman now occupying the well of the House [Mr. Whitener] is a distinguished naval officer of World War II and that he served as a gunnery officer and received a Navy commendation from Secretary Knox which cited him for his courageous initiative under fire.

Mr. Speaker, as one of many who have been decorated in the past and who were on this trip, the gentleman from North Carolina distinguished himself not only in his service during World War II and in his service to this House of Representatives, but in his service to the committee during our explorations of the problems in southeast Asia.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for his comments. I might say to our colleagues in the House since the gentleman from Ohio and I were both navy gunnery officers, we did have a community of interest as we worked together on this mission which we felt was important, and I can say to my colleagues there was no more valuable contributions made during the entire trip than the contributions made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan]. He and all of the others were dedicated to the task and I hope and I know that he shares the hope that the several reports we will make will indicate that we did view our mission as a serious one and as an important one for our country.

It was my privilege to go to the northernmost sector, the I Corps area, and the II Corps area, in addition to visiting in Saigon and surrounding territory, including much of the III Corps area. I regret that I was not able to participate in any inspection in the southerly IV Corps area. From the reports that we received at our briefings and discussions we were able to get much information as to our situation there which had not been available to us in the past. The IV Corps area being under the military area of authority primarily assigned to the forces of the Republic of Vietnam and other free world nations, we felt we could best spend our limited time in the areas of the primary responsibility of U.S. forces.

To accomplish the widespread personal observations that I and other members of our group were able to make required the cooperation of Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland and many others under their command. I feel that every effort was made by those gentlemen to assist us in accomplishing our desired purpose, bearing in mind always the limited amount of time available to our group.

While there may have been hesitancy at times in going along with our personal requests as to areas of visitation, I can assure everyone that the infrequent reluctance displayed by the military was in the interest of the safety of the individual Members of Congress. When we persisted, our requests were granted. This resulted in our being able to actually witness combat at first hand and to fly over areas where combat was occurring. We visited remote outposts which were manned by small numbers of Marine, Army, and Air Force personnel. It was only through this type of visits that we were able to really get the feel of the military action and an understanding of the morale and performance of our men under fire.

I believe that our delegation gave every effort to the cause of accomplishing the mission assigned to it. In spite of the long hours and the great physical fatigue involved, no member of any party in our delegation with whom I was associated at any time displayed any lack of energy or interest in fulfilling the role which was assigned to the delegation.

SECURITY LIMITATIONS

Since this report is being given in a public forum it is necessary that the recitation of many facts, figures, and data given to us under the classification of "top secret" not be divulged. Because of these necessary security limitations I apprehend that this public report may have the appearance of being fragmentary. I know that my colleagues in the Congress are fully aware of the essentiality of omitting classified material in this report.

Notwithstanding the security limitations under which I address the House, I am hopeful that the report will be of interest and aid to my colleagues.

OUR AMERICAN LEADERS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

In each of the areas visited by us I was deeply impressed by the ability and dedication to duty of our military and civilian leaders. This was true at CINCPAC's headquarters in Hawaii, where Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharpe serves as commander in chief of the Pacific with great ability and brilliance. Associated with him is Gen. Hunter Harris, chief of Pacific Air Command, a worthy associate of Admiral Sharpe.

During our visit to CINCPAC we were sorry that Admiral Sharpe's duties had called him to another area, but we were appreciative of the briefings arranged by Admiral Sharpe which were led by General Harris and Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force. On previous occasions I have had the privilege of participating in conversations and briefings with Admiral Sharpe and General Harris and have developed a keen admiration for the service they are rendering to our Nation. They and the officers under their command contributed much to giving us the broad picture of the entire Pacific military and political situation. This was a very worthwhile commencement to our mission.

At Clarke Air Force Base, where Gen. James Wilson, U.S. Air Force, is commanding, we were very hospitably received for a 3-hour visit to the base, and particularly to the base hospital. Many of our colleagues are acquainted with General Wilson from years past when he was associated with the Congress in liaison work for the Department of the Air Force. I can report to them that he is still rendering the same high type service in his present assignment to which the Congress became accustomed when he worked on Capitol Hill.

The Clarke Air Force Base Hospital is under the command of Colonel Tarrow, U.S. Air Force, one of the most inspiring medical men that it has been my privilege to meet. Colonel Tarrow and the other members of his fine medical and nursing staff are doing a wonderful work as they serve our military personnel injured in Vietnam, who are brought to them after being removed from that beleaguered little country. This is an important function in our military program in the Far East. They are fulfilling their role with a degree of excellence almost unimaginable. As we visited the injured patients and witnessed the high degree of excellence of the medical attention they were receiving at the hands of Colonel Tarrow and his staff we felt that America is fortunate to have such considerate and capable people to bind up the wounds of those who have given their blood and health in defense of freedom.

After our 3-hour visit at Clarke Air Force Base we proceeded to Saigon. There we met with Gen. William C. Westmoreland, our military commander in Vietnam, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, two of America's great citizens. It has been my privilege to be closely acquainted with "Westy" Westmoreland for many years and any evaluation of him by me could be suspect because of the partiality of friendship were it not for the fact that there is a unanimity of opinion on the part of the troops, as well as the leaders of our Government, that this South Carolina native is one of the great military men of all time in our Nation.

On the diplomatic front Ambassador Lodge is giving leadership of the highest order. His candor in discussing some of the problems confronting the people of South Vietnam, and the people of our own Nation, was enlightening and refreshing in its forthrightness. Truly, the United States can be proud of these two outstanding Americans.

We met and consulted with many other great military people of all ranks under General Westmoreland's command. In my case it was a privilege to be closely associated with Lt. Gen. Lew Walt, commanding general, III Marine Amphibious Forces, which has the responsibility for the area known as I Corps area of Vietnam. General Walt is a great military figure. As I spent many hours with him over a 2-day period I came to realize that he was an equally great humanitarian.

Maj. Gen. W. B. Kyles, U.S. Marine Corps, commanding general of the 3d Marine Division, is also doing a great service for our country in the I Corps area of Vietnam. It was my pleasure to share his quarters while in the Da Nang area. Out of that association I developed an appreciation for this fine military man.

Serving in the Da Nang area as the leader of our Naval Forces is Rear Adm. Jack Wechsler, U.S. Navy, who gave freely of his time and effort to assist the four of us who had gone to the I Corps area for an intensive visitation. Admiral Wechsler is ably commanding our Naval Forces in the area. All about us we could see the results of his performance of duty in an exemplary manner.

Associated with each of these gentlemen are other outstanding military men, whom we were privileged to meet and talk with in great detail. I will not undertake to make a detailed listing of each of these officers and enlisted men other than to say that, without exception, I was greatly impressed by their knowledge, devotion, and zeal in the performance of their duty.

As we moved from the I Corps area to the II Corps area with our party of four Members of the House, we were privileged to meet Maj. Gen. S. R. "Swede" Larsen, U.S. Army, who has the Army command in the II Corps area. General Larsen is a brilliant military commander with a scintillating military career through past years. It is my prediction that his service in the Vietnam conflict will add further luster to his already remarkable record.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all will understand that the opportunities that we had in Vietnam included those of meeting countless other officers and enlisted personnel serving under the direction of the gentlemen whom I have mentioned heretofore. This included civilian personnel under the direct control and supervision of Ambassador Lodge. The performance which they are giving in both military and civilian pursuits under the direction of the distinguished leaders I have mentioned is one which is impressive. My observation of them at work convinces me that the reports given by the various commanders and civilian leaders as to the high level of morale and performance of duty was entirely accurate. It seems unfair not to mention many of these by name. I am sure that all will know that my failure to do so is not an indication of any lack of appreciation for the contribution which they are making.

ITINERARY OF DELEGATION

On July 3, 1966, at Camp H. M. Smith, Hawaii, we were given a thorough briefing by Gen. Hunter Harris, U.S. Air

Force, commander of the Pacific Air Forces; Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force, chief of staff, CINCPAC; Gen. John K. Waters, commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific; and Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander in chief, U.S. Navy, Pacific, and several officers associated with them in that great headquarters for all of our activities in the Pacific. The briefings gave us the story on the role of CINCPAC, the situation in southeast Asia, operations, logistics, and other areas of interest relating to our military forces in the Pacific theater. These briefings, coupled with a tour of the military facilities in Hawaii, were very revealing and gave us a backdrop for our continuing mission as we moved further east.

After leaving CINCPAC we flew to Clarke Air Force Base, the Philippines, where Gen. James Wilson, U.S. Air Force, commanding general; Colonel Tarrow, commanding officer of the Clarke Air Force Base Hospital and other medical facilities in southeast Asia, and the officers associated with them gave us a complete briefing on the role of Clarke Air Force Base and the medical command in the southeast Asian situation.

While we spent only approximately 3 hours at Clarke Air Force Base, we were privileged to visit many of the injured young men hospitalized in this great medical facility and to have an opportunity to discuss with them their experiences on the battlefield which resulted in their sustaining injuries. This was a very worthwhile experience, though not pleasant to witness. We were impressed with the high quality of the medical care being given to our personnel as well as the quality of the individuals who were ministering unto their wounds and illnesses.

We were then taken to the flight line where we were privileged to interview some of the patients who were being evacuated by airlift from Clarke Air Force Base to hospitals in the United States where they could be nearer their families. This operation was carried out with efficiency and with full consideration of the physical conditions of the individual patients. The airlift procedures being utilized for handling ambulatory and nonambulatory casualties of war was impressive. As we compared this facility with our experiences in World War II and the Korean conflict each of the Members of Congress in the mission expressed pleasant surprise at the improvements that have been made in this important area by our military forces since the days of our service in time of war.

We then flew into Saigon, Vietnam, where we were welcomed by Ambassador Lodge and military personnel from the headquarters of our American forces in Vietnam.

Here we were given morning briefings by Ambassador Lodge and the key civilian personnel in the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. These briefings included backdrop information on the history of the Vietnam situation, its development, and current status. These briefings embraced discussions of the economic, military, political, and social conditions existing in the past and present and with suggestions as to the possible course in the future.

Briefly stated, we were told that our forces are now better organized militarily and that great gains are being made in social, political, and economic reform. Reconstruction in villages has moved along well under the joint guidance of civilian and military representatives of our Nation in that war-torn country.

We were also told of the terroristic tactics being used by the Vietcong and the forces of North Vietnam, particularly their active program of slaying officials of villages, hamlets, and Provinces for the purpose of terrorizing the average citizens of the community.

It was heartening to hear from the lips of these leaders that in their opinion the Congress has provided all that has been needed to do the job that is necessary to be done in Vietnam, and we were assured that our representatives there were doing their very best to utilize these resources effectively.

In the utilization of these resources we were given information as to construction projects, including building new seaports, marshaling the necessary logistics and materiel support for anticipated military requirements, the development of pacification programs and civil action efforts, all of which seemed to bear equal importance in the minds of our American leadership.

As a result of this proper and wise utilization of the resources provided for the Vietnamese conflict we were assured that the situation is looking up and becoming more favorable each day as far as military victory and civil action programs are concerned. Another effect of this utilization of resources provided by the Congress has been an increase in the manpower and materials of war. With these added resources we were told that there has been a heightening of confidence on the part of the South Vietnam friendly forces and a corresponding increase in the number of defections by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese fighting men to our side.

We were further assured that it is the opinion of our top personnel that the projected general election on September 11, 1966, will be held and that it is the present desire of Prime Minister Ky that his administration have these elections conducted fairly and honestly.

The evaluation placed upon Prime Minister Ky was that he was a dedicated advocate of freedom and an unflinching opponent of communism. While he is a young man with a limited political background and a predominantly military experience, he appears to be a strong leader and is dedicated to military victory and to a better life for the people of his nation. His cooperation has greatly advanced the pacification program in the various hamlets, villages, and Provinces, and his cooperation with our civic action programs has been a display of teamwork which deserves the plaudits of his people.

Ambassador William J. Porter, top assistant to Ambassador Lodge, expressed the view that the degree of cooperation between the administration of Prime Minister Ky and the allied civilian and military leaders has been of the highest order. It was his feeling that through the pacification programs which are carried on in a direct way by the Vietnamese Government, as well as efforts to train local police forces and the participation of many medical experts from the free world in a voluntary medical program is working very effectively in Vietnam. Their activity will bring many benefits as we jointly try to build a future for the people of Vietnam.

The AID director in Vietnam, Charles Mann, pointed out that the program of his Agency was the largest and most complete undertaking by AID in any country in the history of that program. Some of the goals sought by this program, according to Mr. Mann, are the building of a stable Vietnamese economy as soon as possible, to support and strengthen the Vietnamese Government and establish viability in that field, and to promote a program of building of institutions such as agricultural research, schools, public works, electric and water systems, ports, and many other needed facilities. He suggested that in his opinion the degree of cooperation between the military and civilian government had reached a point not heretofore seen in that country.

Another effort of the AID program is to assist in training of local and provincial leaders, including police and communications officials, as well as public officeholders. In this program our AID people are working with representatives of Australia and Great Britain in trying to bring about the organization of an effective police force.

The AID program is also concerning itself with the establishment of a major electric powerplant, as well as rural electric plants at several sites. This phase of the program also includes road and port facility construction which is essential to the future economic stability of the country.

AID also has a public health program, which involves the use of both civilian and medical teams. They seek to develop teams of 17 members; with 3 medical doctors and a corps of technicians. Twenty of these teams are capable of performing surgery and providing specialized medical treatment. In addition to the medical teams, this program involves large hospital renovation projects in 13 Provinces and a broad-based preventive medicine program which includes prenatal care, malaria control, and the elimination or reduction of communicable diseases.

We were further advised that under the refugee program of AID there are approximately 1 million refugees in South Vietnam today who have been provided with care under the auspices of the Vietnamese Government with the cooperation of our Government. The AID mission is providing buildings, supplies, food, and other commodities necessary to establish and operate refugee shelters.

We were given a detailed statement of the important agricultural extension services and research projects which have been instituted by AID and the

Vietnamese Government. It is felt that this will bring about an increased production of agricultural products. It will also aid in developing much-needed know-how in the future. This know-how is essential if the Vietnamese agricultural economy is to be adequate to provide the basic food and fiber needs of its people.

We were advised that under the AID program buildings for school purposes are being promoted with the cooperation of the Government of Vietnam. This additional venture involves the provision of classrooms, textbooks, and institutions of higher learning and vocational schools. These are essential as a part of the necessary civil action program if Vietnam is to subsist at the conclusion of hostilities at some future time. It has been noteworthy, we were told, that much of this educational program is being accomplished on a self-help basis with full cooperation on the part of many of the Provincial, village, and hamlet leaders under the encouragement of the Central Government of Vietnam.

During the afternoon we were transported to the headquarters MACV—Military Assistance Command, Vietnam—where General Westmoreland led a briefing. A full disclosure of the mission and activities of our military forces and those of the Government of Vietnam was made by General Westmoreland and the other briefing officers.

Logistics problems and their solution, combat methods and results, political and social conditions within Vietnam, civic action efforts and results, morale of our forces and the Vietnam military men and civilians, and numerous other subjects were fully explored at this 2-hour session.

One of the most solid benefits of this briefing and the ensuing question-and-answer period was that it gave to each of us the broad picture prior to our making local inspections. We were, therefore, enabled to more fully appreciate the importance of the role of the individual units and commands that we were to later visit in the mosaic of the total effort our forces are making for freedom in Vietnam.

This occasion also gave us an opportunity to meet and consult with the top staff people in General Westmoreland's headquarters. They made a most favorable impression as individual officers of the several U.S. military services working together as a team for the cause to which our Nation is committed.

Congressmen CORMAN, CARTER, GURNEY, and I then took leave of the other members of our mission and were flown to the headquarters of the III Marine Amphibious Forces near Da Nang. There we were briefed by Lt. Gen. Lew Walt, U.S. Marine Corps commanding general, III Marine Amphibious Forces, and several officers serving with him in that command.

General Walt and his officers expressed the view that more progress has been made in the past month in military and civic action efforts than they had experienced in any previous 3-month period since our troops were committed to Vietnam. They pointed out that cooperation with Province officials in the I Corps area had reached a new high and that in their opinion this resulted from a greater feeling of security on the part of the Province, village, and hamlet officials because of the presence of the American forces in their area. They gave us full information as to the background and location of enemy and friendly forces in the area, as well as detailed information as to military operations which they had experienced. In this outline we were shown the current deployment of enemy and friendly forces in their area of responsibility in a very vivid and impressive manner.

After this preliminary briefing we were taken by helicopter to the An Hoa area, where two Vietnamese engineers gave us a tour of a burgeoning industrial development. This project is being carried on by a corporation jointly financed by the Governments of Vietnam, West Germany, France, and the United States. The corporation contemplates the erection of an electric generating plant, a water control plant, a fertilizer manufacturing facility, and a small steel mill. Due to the presence of coal and a large iron ore deposit this area was selected for the proposed $52 million industrial development.

These gentlemen spoke very hopefully of the proposed project and expressed the view that its completion would be of inestimable value economically and psychologically since it would show the Communists what free people can do in the field of economic development. Already this project is providing employment for 900 Vietnamese citizens and will ultimately employ up to 5,000 persons.

In connection with this industrial development project there has been established a school for 300 children of employees, together with a technical school. A high school is contemplated for next school year and a much-needed hospital will be constructed to serve the company personnel, as well as residents of the Da Nang area.

It was very gratifying to hear these outstanding Vietnamese engineers express their appreciation for the presence of American troops in the Da Nang area, saying that the presence of these troops has greatly expedited the construction progress of this important industrial facility.

I thought it was significant that under the leadership of these two gentlemen all employees of the industrial complex are trained on the job, and many of these young men and women are learning such crafts as draftsmanship and extremely technical subjects.

We then left An Hoa for a visit to a Combined Action Company—CAC—east of Da Nang. Under the CAC program 12 marines and 36 Vietnamese local or Province force members make up a unit. Our marines train the Vietnamese who are in the service of their own Government and are paid from the treasury of the Government of Vietnam. They live and work in the same compound and will do so until the Vietnamese members of the company are ready to assume the full responsibility of their operations.

From this CAC unit we made a helicopter tour of the area of responsibility of the 3d Marine Division, accompanied by Maj. Gen. W. B. Kyles, commanding general, 3d Marine Division. This helicopter flight took us over many villages and hamlets, including areas in which hostile action was occurring as we flew over. The areas of previous military actions were pointed out to us, as were suspected locations of Vietcong units and units of our own military services.

This tour ended at Hoa Khanh Children's Hospital, which is operated on a volunteer basis by members of the 1st battalion, 3d Marines. This small unit was built by our marines on a voluntary basis. Corpsmen became carpenters and constructed cribs and storage space. Two young Vietnamese women were hired at the expense of the individual marines to do nursing, laundry, and minister to the children. This facility was opened on December 26, 1965, and has resulted in the treatment of hundreds of children of the area suffering a wide variety of diseases, such as scabies, bubonic plague, malnutrition, malaria, pneumonia, and other diseases. The hospital not only treats patients who are brought to it, but these humanitarian men of the Marine Corps hold a daily sick call for persons of all ages in the area in which the hospital is located. The opportunity to visit this primitive, but effective, hospital, manned by skilled Marine and Navy medical officers and volunteer military enlisted men, was another experience which increases one's pride in the military men of America.

After leaving the hospital we then made a helicopter flight to the command post of the 2d battalion, 3d Marines, at Dai Loc, where the battalion commander, Lieutenant Colonel Horns, U.S. Marine Corps, gave us a complete orientation as to the role of his battalion, which at the time, was engaged in contact with the enemy a short distance from the command post.

Upon leaving Dai Loc we then flew by helicopter to hill 55 where we visited an infantry unit of the 9th Marines under the command of Major Blaz, U.S. Marine Corps. We were given an orientation discussion, as well as a report of action by this unit during the past 24 hours. Here again the marines of this infantry unit were in contact with the enemy within a short distance of hill 55.

We then departed hill 55 and flew to Chu Lai, where Colonel Brown, U.S. Marine Corps, and Major Moore, U.S. Marine Corps, gave us an orientation discussion similar to that which we had had at the other Marine units that we had visited at hill 55, Dai Loc, and other places. It was in this village that we saw another Combined Action Company (CAC) and witnessed one of the classes being conducted by the Marine officers and enlisted personnel with a group of local Vietnamese men. We found the morale of this unit to be on the same high level as we had found with our own forces. As we departed a young American Marine lieutenant advised us that some of his Vietnamese men had located a unit of Vietcong approximately

2 miles from Chu Lai and that as soon as darkness came they planned to go out and launch an attack against this Vietcong group.

On the same evening Lieutenant General Walt, Rear Admiral Wechsler, Congressmen CORMAN, CARTER, GURNEY, and I visited the U.S. Naval Hospital at Da Nang. There we visited with the injured personnel hospitalized in this new and excellent facility under the command of Captain Spencer of the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy. We were given the privilege of presenting Purple Heart Medals to a number of men who been injured in action. This new hospital is serving a very great need and is offering to our wounded the highest quality of medical treatment.

Upon leaving the naval hospital Admiral Wechsler and AID representative Gordon and Burgess drove us to the U.S. AID hospital at Da Nang. This hospital facility was filled and overflowing with Vietnamese civilians of all ages who had suffered casualties as a result of the war activity. The variety of injuries was myriad in nature, and the horrors of the war to a civilian population were vividly illustrated to us as we walked through the wards and halls.

The AID representatives told us that in addition to local medical men this hospital has been the recipient of much assistance from volunteer medical doctors of the United States. They expressed commendation for the American Medical Association and the individual physicians who have made such a great contribution to the people of Vietnam through their voluntary and gratuitous services to the casualties who have been hospitalized in this facility since its opening.

At 6 a.m. the following morning our party again boarded a helicopter, landed at an airstrip, and then proceeded by airplane to An Khe, where we visited the command post of the 1st Cavalry Division. As we entered this command post, artillery fire was being executed by the men of the 1st Cavalry Division and continued for an appreciable period of time during our visit. Col. George S. Beatty, U.S. Army, chief of staff of the division, and other officers gave us a complete briefing as to the activities that had occurred with that division and in the area of its responsibility.

They pointed out that the enemy had a strength of approximately 16,000 men within the area of responsibility of the 1st Cavalry Division and that this division operates over a wide area from the China Sea a distance of approximately 200 kilometers and a similar area from north to south. The division has accounted for capturing 1,182 prisoners of war, captured great quantities of rice and medical supplies from the Vietcong, and have killed approximately 5,000 of the enemy during their operations.

Notwithstanding the fact that the enemy has shelled the camp on many occasions we found that the morale in the division was at a high level and that the new concepts of military action employed by this division has proven to be most effective in combating the enemy. We were told of the civic action program, the information approach of the Vietnamese, the amount of food dispensed by the division to the Vietnamese, and of the excellent joint operations between the 1st Cavalry Division and the Vietnamese military forces.

We then left the command post by helicopter and flew to Hong Kong Hill and to other small units of the 1st Cavalry Division where we witnessed the performance of the officers and men of the division. It was apparent to me that this division was highly skilled, zealous in the accomplishment of its mission, and contributing mightily to the military and civic action progress being made by our forces in Vietnam.

From An Khe we flew to Nha Trang, where we visited the headquarters of Maj. Gen. S. R. Larsen, U.S. Army, U.S. Army commander in the II Corps area. General Larsen and his associates provided us with a tour of the area and gave us an excellent discussion of the activity which has transpired in recent months in the II Corps area, including the effective work of the 1st Calvary Division.

He expressed the view that from a military and civic action standpoint things look a little bit better every month. He further suggested that the criticisms with reference to the supply of ammunition for our troops were not well founded as far as he had observed and stated that his units had never been short of any type of ammunition at any time that they needed it.

General Larsen further pointed out that due to the military progress that the allied forces have made in recent months the Vietnamese civilians are now providing much valuable information which was not obtainable prior to the buildup of our forces in Vietnam. He further expressed complete approval of the decisions made by higher authority and stated that we were fighting the smartest war psychologically and militarily that our country has engaged in during his lifetime.

Significantly, General Larsen stated that: "Our men are shaping up better than any men ever committed to military conflict by the United States."

After completing our assignment at Nha Trang we then returned by aircraft to Saigon, where we rejoined the remaining members of the delegation.

On the following morning at 8:00 a.m. we departed Saigon by U.S. Army aircraft for Song Be for a visit with a detachment of U.S. Army special forces in the Phouc Long Province. This unit was under the command of Lt. Col. Jay B. Durst, U.S. Army. The unit immediately impressed me with its readiness and ability even though situated in an area infested by the enemy. Colonel Durst then escorted us to the headquarters of the Province where the Province chief briefed us on the conditions in his area. He expressed the appreciation of his people for the assistance which our forces were giving in the battle against communism. His attitude for the future was one of optimism and hope for a brighter tomorrow for the people of his Province.

We were then taken by Colonel Durst and his men to visit a tribe of Montagnard people in a small tribal village in Song Be. After crossing the river in small boats we were greeted ceremoniously by a primitive musical band of the village and then guided to the center of the village for a further visit. The tribal chief extended greetings through an interpreter and expressed his appreciation for the presence of the men of the Army special forces. Here we were shown some of the tangible results of the special forces civic action efforts. Most significant, I felt, was the evidence of the effective work by these U.S. Army men in the form of the spirit of friendship directed toward them by the people of this particular primitive tribe.

We then left the Montagnard village for a tour of the limited secure area surrounding it. We then reboarded our aircraft for the return flight to Saigon.

That evening—Saturday—we had our final visit with General Westmoreland, Ambassador Lodge, and principal civilian officials and military commanders in the Saigon area at the residence of General Westmoreland. In an informal exchange of views we as individuals conveyed to Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland the impressions that we had derived from our several visitations and inspections.

The following morning we departed Saigon for Bangkok, Thailand, where we arrived at 4:45 p.m. In the absence of Ambassador Graham Martin, who is on home leave, a splendid briefing was conducted by Mr. Fluker, Chargé d'Affaires of the U.S. Embassy. The situation of Thailand, its economy, military status, and other material facts were conveyed to us by Mr. Fluker and several other members of his Embassy staff.

Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, U.S. Army, commanding general, MACTHAI, also gave us an excellent report on the status of U.S. military forces, as well as Thailand military forces deployed in Thailand. Included in his statement was a recitation of some of the plans for the future that our military forces have in Thailand and a portrayal of the importance of the splendid relations that we have consistently had with the Government of Thailand as we jointly undertake to preserve freedom in southeast Asia.

At midday on July 10 we departed Bangkok for Taipei, Taiwan, arriving there at approximately 6:00 p.m. At 7:45 a.m. on Monday morning we went to the United States-Thailand defense command headquarters, where we were briefed by Vice Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., commander, USTDC, and two other officers.

Admiral Gentner impresses me as a dedicated naval officer who is fulfilling in a commendable fashion a very important role of our Government.

The briefing at USTDC included a statement of the role of our forces at Taiwan, the cooperation we are receiving from the Republic of China, and data with reference to the military strength and capabilities of the Red Chinese Government. The briefing reemphasized in my mind the importance of our continued cooperation with the Government of the Republic of China and the magnificence of the cooperation that we have consistently had from that Government and its military forces.

Following the USTDC briefing our group departed for the Executive Yuan for a meeting with the Honorable C. K. Yen, Vice President of the Republic of China. Vice President Yen in a very forthright manner outlined his thoughts as to the future in the relationship between our Government and his Government, as well as the absolute necessity that we stand together in our opposition to further aggression by the Red Chinese.

We then proceeded from the Executive Yuan to the residence of the President of the Republic of China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President received us graciously. He was very forthright in his discussion of the mutual problems of our Nation and his nation. He expressed a keen desire to have our views on several matters of international relations and frequently addressed questions to members of our group. It was my feeling that this was a most productive audience. I believe that the members of our congressional mission clearly stated the position of our Government in its relationship with the Government of the Republic of China.

We then departed the residence of the President for the residence of Ambassador William Walter McConnaughy for a buffet luncheon and briefing. Ambassador McConnaughy and his associates in the U.S. Embassy in a concise and succinct manner conveyed to us many salient facts with reference to our situation as far as the Government of the Republic of China was concerned. We then departed Taipei at 1 p.m. for the return to Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

ARRIVAL IN WASHINGTON

Upon our arrival at Andrews Air Force Base we were advised that the President and Speaker McCORMACK were awaiting our arrival at the White House. They desired that we give a full report and expression of our individual views on the state of the war in Vietnam, as well as conditions in the Far East. Upon arrival at the White House President Johnson and Speaker McCORMACK greeted us in the Cabinet Room where the President asked each individual member of the delegation for a verbal report and any recommendations that he might have. Each of us made such report and recommendations as we felt proper.

Following an hour and thirty-five minute session with the President and Speaker, a press conference was held in the White House at which time each of the members of the delegation made a statement to the press and answered the questions propounded to them.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

First. It is beyond question that political problems in Vietnam have been burdensome in the overall picture of our aims for freedom for the Vietnamese people. These political problems, however, have not in my opinion, been overcoming to our position and to the prospects for the building of a strong and viable government in that country.

Second. I do not believe that it can be questioned that we are engaged in a venture which involves both military and civic action to an equal degree. Vietnam will not have a strong and effective government until a spirit of nationalism, as contrasted with the existing orientation to province, hamlet, or village has been developed. A complete military victory without a corresponding victory over the present handicaps of lack of civic and national consciousness will be unproductive in my opinion.

Third. The present Government of Vietnam under the leadership of Prime Minister Ky seems to be more stable and reliable than was true several months ago. It is my feeling that if the projected elections on September 11, 1966, retain strong leadership oriented toward the democratic way of life that the people of Vietnam will rally even more strongly to the side of freedom.

Fourth. The Vietnamese forces have been engaged in many years of war. The manifestations of fatigue are reported by all responsible military and civilian officials of the United States with whom we talked. This condition is one which is inescapable and apparently irremedial. It is my feeling that the increased number of U.S. troops in Vietnam will have the effect of relieving some of the pressure on the Vietnamese forces and that the fatigue which has been observed may be somewhat abated as pressure subsides.

Fifth. The civilian and military leadership now being provided by the United States in the personages of General Westmoreland and Ambasador Lodge and their associates is of the highest possible quality. It is my belief that this leadership has resulted in great measure in a much improved situation for the forces of freedom in Vietnam and will ultimately deal a mortal blow to the forces of North Vietnam and the Vietcong.

Sixth. The civic action programs of our military and civilian forces have made a favorable impact upon the people of Vietnam, including those who heretofore have seemed to be inclined toward the side of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. In my judgment this program has not attained the magnitude which it must attain if we are to win the ultimate goal of a strong and effective government of the people in the Republic of Vietnam after military hostilities have been concluded.

Seventh. It is apparent to me that one of the major problems today in Vietnam is the localized attitude of the citizens of the villages, hamlets, and Provinces. They seem to have no sense of loyalty to Vietnam as a nation. It is my opinion that immediate steps should be taken under the direction of the U.S. Information Agency and other appropriate Government agencies to promote an accelerated program toward developing a pride in their nation in the minds of the people of Vietnam. I believe that this can be accomplished through many unsophisticated approaches which will get through to the people of Vietnam without great difficulty, even though it may take an appreciable period of time.

Eighth. We are faced with a clear problem of difficulty in communicating the message of freedom directly to the rank and file of the people scattered throughout Vietnam. This presents a problem which seems acute. I am hopeful that members of the U.S. Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, and other appropriate Government agencies can develop a more widespread program of Government-to-people communication in order that the message of freedom might be indelibly carved in the minds of the rank and file of Vietnam.

Ninth. The voluntary medical and civic action programs now being carried on by charitable and religious organizations, by individual members of the military units, by volunteer physicians from the United States, and others have been most fruitful. It is my belief that this program should be encouraged by our Government since it seems to be the most direct way to tangibly evidence the desire of the United States and the Government of Vietnam to be of help and assistance to the people of that country.

Tenth. The war in Vietnam has definitely taken a turn in favor of the allied forces in a rather remarkable way in recent months. The destruction of the oil supplies in the vicinity of Haiphong and Hanoi in recent weeks has had a very salutary effect upon our own fighting men and the civilian population of Vietnam who support their Government. At the same time it has had a devastating effect upon the morale of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese who now combat us in South Vietnam. It is my belief that continued pressure upon the sources of supply, electric generating facilities, and transportation media will hasten the day of military victory.

Eleventh. The efforts of the U.S. Government to seek an honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam through more than 200 contacts through intermediaries have been commendable and praiseworthy efforts. It is my belief that the people of Vietnam and others in southeast Asia now know that our desire is for peace, and not for war. I believe that we should continue our efforts for such an honorable settlement. Pending such honorable settlement, we should not in any way diminish our military capacity or military efforts.

Twelfth. No one can predict the period of time that our forces will be engaged in the Vietnamese conflict. It is my belief that there is reason for optimism and that we will within a reasonable time attain a military victory. The prognosis at this time, however, based upon all intelligence given to our mission, would indicate that we cannot contemplate such a conclusion of hostilities in the near future. There is no doubt that the unfortunate conduct of many groups and individuals in the United States has contributed greatly to worsening of our situation in Vietnam. This conduct has not appeared to be harmful to the morale of our own military personnel, but it has given aid and comfort to our enemy. It is my belief that we should in some way intensify our efforts to convey to those who have engaged in such activities and public statements as may have encouraged the enemy and caused him to misjudge the will of the United States to desist from such conduct in the future. This plea should be made to persons in and out of Government.

Thirteenth. Our military personnel in Vietnam, ably supported by U.S. civilians, are generally fulfilling their mission in Vietnam in a manner which is a great credit to them and their country. It is my belief that we should at all times convey to them and to their families the appreciation of a grateful nation for the role they are playing in the preservation of freedom and in combating the ideology of communism.

SOUND AND LIGHT FOR THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to join our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] in cosponsoring his fine resolution to provide for a program of historical drama on the Capitol Grounds.

It seems to me that this would be a grand vehicle in re-creating the great historical events of American history. With powerful lights, paired with sound tracks of music, voices, and special effects; great spectacles dramatizing the history of the Capitol can be re-created for American patriots. "Son et lumiere" as named by a French architect, Paul Robert-Houdin, originated after World War I. Since then, this process of sound and light has been used successfully all over the world.

Frederick March staged an impressive show on the tale of "The American Bell" at Independence Hall in June of 1964. To the delight of the ear, band music swelled as sounds of builders labored and ropes and pulleys strained.

Such a program conducted on the Capitol Grounds will be the concern of a commission established to organize and manage these "son et lumiere" historical events. With the aid of historians, artists, writers, choral groups, military bands, and the National Council on the Arts, an outstanding presentation can be produced. Few technicians are needed to set up the loud speakers and lights in addition to only one technician needed to operate the control mechanism. A relatively low costing drama can be staged several times a week from late spring to early fall open free to the public.

The Capitol is ideal for such historical narration and re-creation. It is a building that symbolizes our Nation in which the history of our country is entwined in William Thornton's architectural achievements. Congress has met at the Capitol since 1800 therefore forming the perfect setting to present the convening of the first session in Washington or the first address to a joint session of Congress by President John Adams. Furthermore, the Supreme Court met at this famous site for 134 years. An effective program can reenact the Dred Scott decision and the great McCulloch against Maryland controversy.

The Capitol has seen most all of our Chief Executives inaugurated, creating an ideal spot for Lincoln's first inaugural address. The noisy gaslight celebration of the news of the fall of Richmond can be coupled with cannon fire followed by soft solemn music of Lincoln lying in state. Son et lumiere can also create sounds of claps of thunder, capturing the passion flying during the Clay-Calhoun-Webster debates of the 1850's. The clamor of the conversion of the Capitol into a barracks, hospital, bakery, and storehouse during the Civil War can stimulate minds.

Nineteen Presidents recall their terms in Congress at the Capitol before entering the Presidency, allowing narrators an opportunity to echo Woodrow Wilson's declaration to Congress that the "world must be made safe for democracy" or F.D.R.'s historic message to Congress on December 7, 1941.

As done at the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris and the Acropolis in Athens, son et lumiere can produce a spectacular array of entertainment for anxious spectators.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that the House Committee on Administration, where these resolutions have been referred, will act favorably to speed approval of this plan for the Nation's Capitol.

VIETCONG AID FROM INSIDE THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE STOPPED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of the war in Vietnam which both perplexes and enrages loyal American citizens: While American soldiers give their lives to help the people of South Vietnam in their fight for freedom against the Vietcong, other American citizens are actively assisting the same Vietcong in their program of terror. Each time an American soldier's death notice appears in the press, the incongruity and utter insanity of the situation is further emphasized. The question is asked over and over: "How can these traitors aid and abet the enemy with impunity?"

The explanation of course lies in the fact that a declaration of war has not been made by the United States against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. If we were formally at war with the enemy, these so-called Americans would be behind bars overnight. However, I am sure that the majority of our citizens believe that the absence of a technical declaration of war should not permit American citizens to assist the Vietcong in wounding and killing fellow Americans.

To correct this glaring oversight in our prosecution of the war against the Vietcong, I have introduced legislation which would punish those who give money, property, or things to any hostile foreign power acting in opposition to the Armed Forces of the United States. This legislation would also make the obstruction of the movement of military personnel or transportation a punishable offense.

A review of some recent incidents connected with the anti-Vietnam protestors in the past few months illustrates why there is a crying need for legislation of this type.

Attempts have been made to solicit donations of money and blood for the Vietcong, and actual remittances of money have been blocked by the Treasury Department because of Federal regulations prohibiting unlicensed remittances to the Vietcong and related organizations.

In October of last year efforts were made in Oakland, Calif., to prevent the passage of troop trains and railroad cars carrying military supplies to the docks for transshipment to southeast Asia.

Radio tapes made in the United States addressed to the American troops in South Vietnam have been forwarded indirectly to Hanoi for broadcasting to our troops. The theme of these messages stressed opposition to the U.S. military efforts on behalf of the Vietnamese people and encourage the American soldiers to lay down their arms and refuse to fight. An excerpt from one such tape, as reported in the press, stated:

> We're not asking you to shoot your commanding officer or sergeant in the back yet—not at this time.

These are but a few of the forms of protest which have outraged the sensibilities of loyal Americans. In September of last year I introduced H.R. 10818 to prohibit the making of certain threatening and abusive communications to members of the Armed Forces and their families. This proposal was made necessary by incidents in which wives and relatives of soldiers killed in Vietnam received abusive phone calls from callers opposing the war in Vietnam. A more vicious form of protest can hardly be imagined.

Another excess in which the Vietnam protestors participated involved the desecration of the flag. At Purdue University and in a New York City off-Broadway theater, the American flag was held up to ridicule and abused. These incidents called to the attention of Congress the absence of a Federal statute to cover this offense. Accordingly, along with other Members of Congress, I introduced legislation, H.R. 14476, to punish similar future offenses.

One thing is certain: In the minds of most Americans, a force which has killed and wounded thousands of American boys is rightfully classified as the enemy—whether a declaration of war has been promulgated or not. And those who owe allegiance to this Nation and still persist in aiding and abetting this enemy should be dealt with swiftly and forcefully.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS AT ST. MARY'S DOMINICAN COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to commend to you a very fine speech given by the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman John Brademas, on the occasion of the 57th commencement exercises of St. Mary's Dominican College on May 22, 1966, in my home city of New Orleans.

John Brademas very eloquently sets forth the vital role in public service at all levels of government which American women do play today—and will play more extensively in the future. He cites as examples the vast opportunities for public service in the Peace Corps, in the Volunteers in Service to America, and the National Teacher Corps, and urges the young ladies in the 1966 graduating class of Dominican College to enter public service as the most rewarding type of work they can do.

I am happy to recommend to my fellow colleagues this splendid address by Congressman Brademas. The speech follows:

Address by Congressman John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana, 57th Commencement Exercises of St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, La., May 22, 1966

I am honored to be with you at Saint Mary's Dominican College today just over a century since the Dominican nuns first settled in New Orleans in 1860 and over half a century now since the accreditation of this college.

As a former teacher at another Saint Mary's College, also for women, I feel at home here in New Orleans with you.

The only thing I miss is seeing the University of Notre Dame across the road but then I rather imagine you miss that even more than I do!

I am particularly pleased to be with you on a day when my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman Hale Boggs, is being awarded the Saint Mary's Dominican College Medal for Public Service.

You have chosen wisely for Hale Boggs is one of the most highly regarded leaders of our country.

You perhaps know him best in Louisiana because he is such an effective champion of the people of your State, both in time of trouble—witness his efforts to bring assistance following Hurricane Betsy—and in better times—I cite only his work to bring more trade to New Orleans.

As you know, he is, as Majority Whip, the number three leader of the House of Representatives.

In our Nation's Capital, Hale Boggs is respected both by the President and by his colleagues in Congress for his intelligence, his courage and his unfailing good humor.

The citizens of all of Louisiana should take great pride in having Hale Boggs as one of their Representatives in Congress.

CONGRESSMAN HALE BOGGS HONORED

The honor which Congressman Boggs receives today symbolizes public service and it is that theme that I wish to discuss with you today—public service and the opportunity such service offers to educated women in 20th Century America.

I said "educated women in 20th Century America" for you who are today receiving your degrees should know that not so long ago many of you might not have had the opportunity to go to college.

Where only 7 of every 100 girls 17 years old were high school graduates in 1900, the number in the early 1960s was 73 out of every 100. Only one of every 100 21-year-olds was a college graduate in 1900; in the early 1960s, the proportion was 14 out of every 100.

Even had you been among the lucky few to get an education, the chances were that few would go on to graduate school, as many do now, or find a decent place in the world of work.

Now, however, there are more than 26 million women working in America.

One of every three American workers is a woman, and almost three out of five of those are married.

Eight or nine out of ten girls today will be gainfully employed at some time during their lives.

The change in opportunities for women is nowhere more evident than in government. Women have come to assume important positions throughout the government. At the national level, women occupy some 130 jobs filled by executive or Presidential appointment; in state government, there are 394 women state legislators and 45 women in statewide elective offices. And I need go no further than my own Committee in the House of Representatives, Education and Labor, to see the outstanding contribution made by two of the seventeen Congresswomen now in Washington, Edith Green of Oregon and Patsy Mink of Hawaii.

In reciting the advances in education made by women and indicating just one sector of our society where women have made notable achievements, government, I do not at all mean to suggest that you will not encounter problems and limitations and obstacles which sometimes hamper you simply because you are women.

Betty Friedman, Simone de Beauvior, David Riesman and many others have given their views about these difficulties.

Yet a recent study by Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia University entitled, "Life Styles of Educated Women," reached a highly significant conclusion. After a survey of women who pursued graduate education, Dr. Ginzberg reported: "There is little in our analysis to support the widespread belief that most educated women are trapped in situations which create frustrations and disappointment and that it is the rare woman indeed who is able to fulfill her potentiality, the opposite is much closer to the truth", he asserts.

Dr. Ginzberg noted that nearly 80 percent of the women under study held full time jobs demanding 36 hours of work or more a week.

One out of three was earning $10,000 a year or more.

Yet over 70 percent were married and 60 percent had children.

While conceding that the women in the study were not typical of all women in similar educational categories, Dr. Ginzberg called them "pacesetters" for our society in the future.

He saw this as a future of far less conflict between career and family than had been thought inevitable in the past.

ROLE OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE

I want now to comment on the possible role of women in our future society with particular emphasis on public service.

For I submit that the teachings of your religious faith, the needs of people both here at home and abroad, and the humanizing instinct of women all combine to mean new opportunities for service for the American college women of today.

The social encyclicals of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI are powerful pleas not only to Roman Catholics but to all people everywhere to relate the teachings that afflict the social and economic problems that afflict mankind.

Pope John XXIII, in his great encyclical on Christianity and Social Progress, Mater and Magistra, called direct attention to the challenge of social action:

"It is no wonder then that the Catholic Church instructed by Christ and fulfilling his commands, has for two thousand years, from the ministry of the early deacons to the present time, tenaciously held aloft the torch of charity, not only by her teaching but also by her widespread example—that charity which, by combining in a fitting manner the precepts and practice of mutual love, puts into effect in a wonderful way this twofold commandment of *giving* wherein is contained the full social teaching and action of the Catholic Church."

Throughout the encyclical Pope John insists upon this basic theme: that every man and every woman, whether clergy or lay, should approach the problems of modern civilization—some of which are unique in man's history—with a truly Christian vision of the prime importance of charity, justice and human dignity.

To me one of the most striking characteristics of the encyclicals of both Pope John and Pope Paul is that they are not simply restatements of Christian principles unrelated to the immediate problems of contemporary life.

They are rather hard-hitting directives, setting forth in clear terms the responsibilities of the individual, the Church and the State, in interpreting Christ's message—in our family life, business relations, community activities, in our natonal life and in international relations.

I cite here only three areas wherein the teachings of religion and the needs of people should mean challenge to you, as women and as human beings.

THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

First, the quest for peace demands that we diminish the stark contrast between America's affluence and the terrible poverty of the new nations.

Earlier this month I attended a conference in England with a number of other Congressman and Senators and Members of the House of Commons for the purpose of discussing the policy of the United States and Britain in Africa and Latin America.

One of the participants in the conference was the distinguished author and economist, herself a Roman Catholic, Lady Jackson, perhaps better known to you as Barbara Ward.

Barbara Ward spoke eloquently of the growing gap between the rich nations of the West and the poor emerging countries of the world.

She said that the West, with 20 percent of the world's population, last year enjoyed 75 percent of the world's income.

In 1965, the West added $60 to $70 billion to its income, a single year increase that was larger than the Gross National Product of all Latin America, and twice the Gross National Product of India.

Yet our own foreign aid program here in the United States has been going down, for we give a smaller percentage of our national wealth today to the poor nations of the world than we did a decade ago.

Then hear the admonition of Barbara Ward: Surely if 0.3 percent of national income is all we can afford for those who starve, those without shelter, those whose children are dying and those who will certainly live at least 30 years less because we can do nothing, then we cannot say we are Christian or of the great Judaic tradition, we cannot say here is the true produce of a humane Western civilization, we cannot say we are the last best hope of mankind, we can say nothing that will not in fact be a mockery of our claims and a proof of our complacency.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Here in our own country, we have within our own midst a nation of have nots. For over 30 million of our fellow citizens live below the poverty lines, $1,500 a year for an individual and $3,000 annually for a family of four.

Last Friday night in Jackson, Mississippi, I visited classes where illiterate Negroes, men and women but mostly women, of all ages, were learning in a Roman Catholic schoolhouse how to read and write and do simple fractions, seeking, if you please, to reach a 6th grade level of education, and wanting desperately to be allowed to go on to a 9th grade level.

I do not now speak of Asia or Africa or Latin America, many miles away, I speak of Mississippi, just a short car ride from here.

THE STRUGGLE FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Finally, in both North and South, for the problem is ours as well as yours, we have come to realize that neither the mandate of our Constitution or the teachings of our religious faith will allow us any longer to deny to Negro Americans the rights and opportunities the rest of us enjoy.

Now young women, especially those who, like you, have had the good fortune of a fine education, need not sit on the sidelines watching these historic challenges march by.

Indeed, your education imposes a special responsibility on you.

And I here remember President Kennedy's remarks at another commencement, at American University in Washington, when he said:

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university, wrote John Masefield, and his words are equally true today. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens and ivied walls. He admired the spendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was 'a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see'."

THREE OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE

Let me then briefly, in the context of the challenges I have discussed, tell you just three opportunities for service for young college women today, opportunities that will enable you, hating ignorance, to strive to know, and you, perceiving truth, to strive to make others see.

I cite only three—the Peace Corps, the VISTA Volunteers and the National Teachers Corps.

In a world where large and impersonal organizations are the rule, all three can mean a direct, personal involvement in the struggle against poverty, ignorance and injustice.

The Peace Corps offers young people the opportunity to serve both their own country and the rest of the world by working with people and government in underdeveloped areas. The Volunteers build schools, educate the young, care for the sick and poor, develop sanitary systems, build roads and help carry out the multitude of tasks needed to draw the newer nations into the 20th century.

In the War on Poverty, the VISTA volunteers, the domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps, helps to bridge the widening gap between the haves and the have-nots in America by helping the poor in their neighborhoods and homes. There are already over 2,000 volunteers in training or in service side-by-side with the poor in crowded slums, in decaying mill and mine towns, in unpainted shacks on worn-out farms, in migrant work camps, and on Indian reservations.

A third, and the newest of the service organizations which will attract young women, particularly those who wish to enter teaching, is the National Teacher Corps. In its first year, the immediate goal is to enroll 3,750 young people in a bold new effort to improve education at its weakest point, the poorer school districts in the nation. In a combination with and under the tutelage of experienced teachers, they will serve two years in the poor rural and urban school districts where they are needed most. While they are teaching, these young people, called teacher-interns, will be paid and will have the opportunity to study for master's degrees at nearby cooperating universities.

These are only three areas of possible service; there are of course many more.

I realize that most of you will marry, have children and raise your families.

In fact, if you do this well and nothing more, you will be rendering an indispensable and noble service.

Indeed, I am here reminded of Mark Twain's reply when asked what men would be like without women.

He said, "Scarce."

I hope, however, that you will strongly consider giving at least some of your life to the kinds of service I have suggested for, to reiterate, the teachings of the Christian faith, the needs of people and the humanizing instinct of women combine to mean new opportunities for such service in our own days.

In closing, I should like to quote the words of my friend and distinguished constituent, the president of another great Roman Catholic center of learning, Father Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame, in an address last month to a group of highly successful young executives. Said Father Hesburgh:

"We all need a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment as we pass through life, some sense that the world is better for our passing through it. This satisfaction and fulfillment can come to each of you superficially by your being deeply involved in the exciting drama of a growing business—but man does not live by bread alone or by good balance sheets either. In the very heart of our humanity, we must, for real human satisfaction and fulfillment, touch life and hope on a deeper level, in serving God where He is perhaps best found and served today, in the pathetic lives of those who have none of our advantages but who desperately need our hand of help if hope is not to die in their souls."

Let us then, you and I, let us all, seek to serve.

FREE TRIAL AND FAIR PRESS: AN OUTSTANDING ANALYSIS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this distinguished body to a timely article by Robert M. Segal, entitled "Free Trial and Fair Press." This article appears in the June 1966 issue of the Massachusetts Law Quarterly.

Mr. Speaker, Robert M. Segal is one of this country's outstanding labor lawyers. A former chairman of the labor relations law section of the American Bar Association, Bob Segal currently practices law in Boston, Mass., where he also lectures on labor relations at the Harvard Business School and is chairman of the bar-press committee of Massachusetts.

At this point I insert in the RECORD Mr. Segal's outstanding analysis of the problems connected with the timely and important question of "Free Trial and Fair Press":

FAIR TRIAL AND FREE PRESS—AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

(By Robert M. Segal)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Warren Commission's Report on the assassination of President Kennedy states that Oswald's "opportunity for a trial by 12 jurors free of preconception as to his guilt or innocence would have been seriously jeopardized by the premature disclosure and weighing of the evidence against him." The Commission warned, "The experience in Dallas during November 22–24 is a dramatic affirmation of the need for steps to bring about a proper balance between the right of the public to be kept informed and the right of the individual to a fair and impartial trial." (Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (1964) pp. 239 and 242.)

These conclusions point up a basic problem affecting the administration of justice, especially in criminal cases, namely, "trial by press" or prejudicial publicity in pending cases. As Anthony Lewis has written, "The truth is that excessive pretrial publicity does flaw our generally civilized standards of criminal procedure." (Lewis, The Case of "Trial by Press," N.Y. Times Magazine (Oct. 18, 1964), p. 31.)

II. FAIR TRIAL

The fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution provide that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. This includes the concept of a fair trial guaranteed by the sixth amendment, which provides in part, "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury. . . ."

Due process of law is not only an integral part of our Constitution but is based upon a concept as old as the Magna Carta. The spirit in practice under the common law "dictates that the parties must have notice, an opportunity to appear and present their case, an impartial tribunal, and a trial before a court of competent jurisdiction." (Note, 4 Stan. L. Rev. 101 (1951).) As Justice Roberts pointed out,

"But where the conduct of a trial is involved, the guarantee of the fourteenth amendment is not that a just result shall have been obtained, but that the result, whatever it be, shall be reached in a fair way. Procedural due process has to do with the manner of the trial; dictates that in the conduct of judicial inquiry certain fundamental rules of fairness be observed; forbids the disregard of those rules, and is not satisfied, though the result is just, if the hearing was unfair." *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts,* 291 U.S. 97, 137 (1934) (dissenting opinion).

The idea of a fair trial (including the trial jury) is coincident with the origins of the law itself. Its development is described in detail by Blackstone who pointed out that in England trial by jury was established in the 14th century and has two fundamental elements: (1) final verdict of guilt or innocence in every criminal case was to be given by the twelve men in the jury-box and not by the judge, and (2) the trial was to be public and not secret. The trial jury is the foundation stone on which the whole of English and American freedom has been based. Indeed, our freedom is founded on its independence, impartiality and fair play

In furtherence of our sense of fair play and justice, we have established an elaborate system. We provide for a jury panel selected at random and representative of the population of the area. We allow examination of the jurors concerning conflicting interests or bias or prejudice. We grant the right of counsel to confront and cross-examine witnesses and we require testimony under oath. We protect the individual accused of crime by providing him counsel and presuming him innocent of the charge, and we require the state to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. We have developed elaborate rules of evidence excluding hearsay because there is no way of testing its truth. We exclude irrelevant and incompetent testimony and we guard against error. All of these safeguards have been established and are maintained to secure trial by reason. In brief, as Justice Holmes stated, "The theory of our system is that the conclusions to be reached in a case will be induced only by evidence and argument in open court, and not by any outside influence, whether of private talk or public print." (*Patterson* v. *Colorado,* 205 U.S. 454, 462 (1907).)

In essence, then, a fair trial is a system that removes the crime or dispute from the public arena into the quiet laboratory of justice, where the matter may be examined under the rules of law in an atmosphere unprejudiced by passion, unspoiled and unaffected by extraneous considerations. Indeed, it would be totally inconsistent with the basic notions which undergird our jurisprudence where the question of innocence or guilt of a person accused of crime to be decided by public opinion rather than by a jury pursuant to rules of law in a fair trial. In the words of Justice Frankfurter, "Proceedings for the determination of guilt or innocence in open court before a jury are not in competition with any other means for establishing the charge." *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show,* 338 U.S. 912, 920 (1950). Trials, as the Supreme Court has reminded us, "are not like elections, to be won through the use of the meeting-hall, the radio and the newspaper." (*Bridges* v. *California,* 314 U.S. 252, 271 (1941).)

III. FREE PRESS

Along with the constitutional right to a fair trial, there exist the rights of the press and speech guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. A vital aspect of our concept of constitutional government is "the maintenance of the opportunity for free political discussion to the end that government may be responsible to the will of the people and that changes may be obtained by lawful means." (*Stromberg* v. *Carlson,* 283 U.S. 359, 369 (1931).)

In the state and federal constitutions, there are explicit provisions guaranteeing the freedom of the press. Secret courts are abhorrent to our society and our way of life. The courts, therefore, are open and their proceedings critically, even disapprovingly, analyzed. In this area, the Supreme Court has held that no court has power to punish summarily for contempt of court, except for matters which happen within the courtroom itself, and which directly obstruct the actual conduct of the court. (*Craig* v. *Harney,* 331 U.S. 367 (1947); *Pennekamp* v. *Florida,* 328 U.S. 331 (1946); *Bridges* v. *California,* 314 U.S. 252 (1941); *Nye* v. *United States,* 313 U.S. 33 (1941).) Moreover, under the *Times* rule, newspapers have a qualified privilege in any civil action for libel if false statements about public officials have not been published with "actual malice," i.e., with knowledge that they are false or with reckless disregard for truth or falsity. (*New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan,* 376 U.S. 254 (1964); for further elaboration of this rule, see *Garrison* v. *Louisiana,* 379 U.S. 64 (1964) and *Rosenblatt* v. *Baer,* 383 U.S. 75 (1966).) The consequence of such decisions is that our papers believe they are subject to virtually no legal restraints with respect to what they print about pending criminal cases. The press claims the self-justification that it is not only exercising a constitutional right but also carrying out its responsibility in a democracy to inform the public fully, fairly and comprehensively.

The press argues that the public has a "right to know" what goes on in crime and law enforcement circles and how the government is handling a person's rights; it urges that publicity may keep the police and judges (who are elected in most states) in line. In addition, it is said that the announcement of the apprehension of a suspect may allay public fears, and publicity may help the police in finding witnesses and even act as a crime deterrent. Even the Warren Commission makes reference to "the right of the public to be kept informed."

Not long ago, Mr. Justice Goldberg (as he then was) told the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

"The first and primary responsibility of the press is therefore as protector and promoter of all the rights and liberties of Americans. The entire Bill of Rights is in the press' charge—not only the free speech clause of the First Amendment. A newspaper which fails to exercise its right of free expression in protest against the invasion by any branch of government—the executive, the legislative, *or the judicial*—of freedom of thought, of conscience, of assembly and of the person defaults in its most elementary duty and responsibility."

IV. PREJUDICIAL PUBLICITY

Inevitably, the constitutional right of freedom of the press sometimes comes into conflict with the safeguards for the fair administration of justice as enshrined in our Bill of Rights. By catering to sensationalism to increase the volume of sales, certain representatives of the mass media may be ignoring and actually destroying the constitutional rights of litigants and undermining the administration of justice. Under the guise of informing the public, the news media (sometimes with the cooperation of the police, prosecutors and/or defense attorneys) often try cases in the press, thereby prejudicing the jury, the witnesses or the public.

"[T]he conception of a fair and impartial trial, as it exists in the mind of the average citizen, is not what it was before the day of the substitution of trial by newspaper for trial by jury and the law of the land, but this conception is the product of what is taught by our newspapers and local courts, and is the source of wrong upon wrong in the administration of justice." (William Forrest, quoted in Phillips and McCoy, *Conduct of Judges and Lawyers* (1952) p. 185.)

Our standards of justice are lowered by any improper interference with the jury trial. Publicity in the mass media (based on releases or "leaks" from prosecutors, the police and/or defense attorneys) which interferes with the rights of litigants and improperly influences the trial jury is prejudicial publicity. It was Chief Justice Field of Massachusetts who recognized in 1899 that—

"It is an inevitable perversion of the proper administration of justice to attempt to influence the judge or jury in the determination of a cause pending before them by statements outside of the court room, and not in the presence of the parties, which may be false, and even if they are true are in law not admissible in evidence." (*Telegram Newspaper Co.* v. *Commonwealth,* 172 Mass. 294, 300, 52 N. E. 445, 447.)

In 1923, Justice Holmes wrote for the United States Supreme Court that a state criminal conviction could not stand if the courtroom had been dominated by a mob, so that the trial had been "a mask" and that "counsel, jury and judge were swept to the fatal end by an irresistible wave of public passion." *Moore* v. *Dempsey,* 261 U.S. 86, 91. In 1961, the Court in *Irvin* v. *Dowd,* 366 U.S. 717, extended this philosophy from mob control of the courtroom to the less tangible atmosphere of prejudice caused by publicity in newspapers and on radio and television. In the *Irvin* case the Court, setting aside an Indiana murder conviction, held that the defendant had been denied due process of law because adverse publicity had prejudiced the jury against him. To the reader of modern newspapers, the pattern would not seem unfamiliar; the defendant had been called a "mad-dog killer" by newspapers in the six months preceding his trial, and press releases from the Evansville police officials had revealed his confession to six local murders. In a sharp concurring opinion, Justice Frankfurter discussed the general problems of press coverage of criminal charges before trial and stated,

"Not a term passes without this court being importuned to review convictions, had in States throughout the country, in which substantial claims are made that a jury trial has been distorted because of inflammatory newspaper accounts—too often, as in this case, with the prosecutor's collaboration—exerting pressures upon potential jurors before trial and even during the course of trial, thereby making it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to secure a jury capable of taking in, free of prepossessions, evidence submitted in open court. Indeed such extraneous influences, in violation of the decencies guaranteed by our Constitution, are sometimes so powerful that an accused is forced, as a practical matter, to forego trial by jury." (366 U.S. at 730.)

In any pending criminal case, publication of the alleged confession or admission of fact bearing upon the guilt of the accused is prejudicial to the rights of the defendant unless and until these have been admitted as evidence in court. Mr. Justice Jackson has commented: "It is hard to imagine a more prejudicial influence than a press release by the officer of the court charged with defendants' custody stating that they had confessed, and here just such a statement, unsworn to, unseen, uncross-examined and uncontradicted, was conveyed by the press to the jury." (*Shepherd* v. *Florida,* 341 U.S. 50, 52 (1951).)

Modern communications media have exacerbated this difficulty. In 1963, the United States Supreme Court reviewed a Louisiana trial held after the defendant's alleged confession to the sheriff had been taped and shown to the community on television three times prior to the trial. Mr. Justice Stewart, characterizing the process as "kangaroo court proceedings," stated for the Court:

"For anyone who has ever watched television the conclusion cannot be avoided that this spectacle, to the tens of thousands of people who saw and heard it, in a very real sense *was* Rideau's trial—at which he pleaded guilty to murder. Any subsequent court proceedings in a community so pervasively exposed to such a spectacle could be but a hollow formality."

"Due process of law in this case required a trial before a jury drawn from a community of people who had not seen and heard Rideau's televised 'interview.'" (*Rideau* v. *Louisiana,* 373 U.S. 723, 726–7 (1963).)

A second prejudicial area is the publication of the criminal record of the accused pending trial. Not until the accused is convicted or takes the stand in his own defense is his criminal record properly taken into account and then only for limited purposes (and, where the jury is involved, under careful instructions from the court). Yet, by publishing the defendant's record, the news media tend to prejudice the minds of the jury against him and thus undermine his fundamental right to a fair trial.

In *Commonwealth* v. *Crehan,* 345 Mass. 609, 188 N.E. 2d 923 (1963), the presiding judge, in the lobby prior to the drawing of a jury, ordered reporters to make no mention in ensuing stories of the criminal records of the defendants. A newspaper published an article regarding the judge's statement. Said the Supreme Judicial Court, reversing the conviction:

"The articles * * * directly interfered with the judicial process. The violations * * * did precisely the harm which the instruction was designed to prevent; the articles which embodied them were a 'threat or menace to the integrity of the [jury] trial.' (*Craig* v. *Harney, Sheriff*, 331 U.S. 367, 377." 345 Mass. at 612.)

Opinions as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, published in the newspaper, whether self-generated or issued by the prosecuting authorities or defense counsel, may add up to prejudicial publicity. The use of labels—"killer," "hoodlum," "robber"—is widespread; noted above is the case of *Irvin* v. *Dowd* in which the press had tagged the accused as a "mad-dog killer." The well-known *Sheppard* case, now awaiting decision before the Supreme Court, involved (along with much else in the way of abuses) repeated newspaper, radio and television intimations of the defendant's guilt which, at least in the judgment of the federal district court, fatally infected the proceedings with unfairness. (See *Sheppard* v. *Maxwell*, 231 F. Supp. 37 (S.D.O. 1964), *reversed*, 346 F. 2d 707 (6th Cir. 1965), *cert. granted* 382 U.S. 916 (1965).) Examples such as these constrain one to agree with Mr. Justice Jackson that "trial by newspaper" can be "one of the worst menaces to American justice."

Similar conclusions apply to press statements as to expected testimony of witnesses in a pending case. This type of material may never be admitted in the courtroom, would be subject to cross-examination if admitted, and would be hemmed in by judicial safeguards which do not exist in the publications of what witnesses will testify. If the promised evidence fails to materialize or is rejected by the court, the presentation of it to the jury by the indirect methods of publicity can be prejudicial. It tends to make a mockery of the actual trial, and to cheapen the opinion of the public regarding the integrity and effectiveness of the courts. As one judge has stated, "Evidence is for the consideration of the court and jury and not for the public. In the first place the evidence may be inadmissible and, even though admissible, it may be wholly unconvincing or its effect may be entirely eliminated by proof which follows. If the public believes the proposed evidence to be true, when in fact it is not, it may view the ultimate decision of the case as unjust, especially when it does not learn that the proposed evidence either failed to materialize or fell flat." (Quoted in Phillips and McCoy, *op. cit. supra*, p. 170.)

During the trial itself, the same principles would be applicable to such other prejudicial publicity as comments upon evidence already introduced or any statement of matter which has been excluded from evidence by the court at the trial or any comment as to the credibility of any witness at the trial. The right of a newspaper to report the trial of a case in open court is not absolute, and it "gives neither to a newspaper nor to an individual the right ot prejudge a case, or to misstate it, or to hold up to scorn or ridicule, either directly or by natural implication from his language, a party who is pursuing his legal remedies in court." (*Brown* v. *Providence Telegram Pub. Co.*, 25 R.I. 117, 119, 54 Atl. 1061, 1062 (1903) (a case involving a post-trial suit for defamation and particularly the defendant-newspaper's claim of privilege to report court proceedings).)

How can an accused receive a fair trial before an impartial jury if the jurors' minds have been poisoned by one-sided, often erroneous, opinions published by news media or released by a party in the case? How can the accused be given a fair trial on the evidence before the court when the jurors have already been fully exposed to unsworn, uncontradicted opinions, confessions, prior records, and conclusions which are inadmissible in court? If a private person were to mail a letter to a juryman telling the juror that he knows that the defendant is guilty or has committed other crimes or has confessed, it is clear that there would not be a fair trial. But is there any distinction between such a letter and the printed letter in the newspaper or a radio or TV story over the airwaves?

All the above actions produce an unseemly battle of publicity in which the public takes the case from the jury and ignores the accepted rules of evidence which apply in court. If a judgment should be that which the law and the evidence demands and not what the public may demand, then publicity which is prejudicial to this result should be eliminated.

What about the right to a "public" trial guaranteed in the sixth amendment? This right has been held to be for the benefit of the accused. (*People* v. *Jelke*, 308 N.Y. 56, 123 N. E. 2d 769 (1954); see also Phillips and McCoy, *op. cit. supra*, p. 186.) "The public trial exists because of the aversion which liberty-loving people had toward secret trials and proceedings. That is the reason our courts are open to the public, not because the framers wanted to provide the public with recreation." Mr. Justice Douglas, quoted in Lewis, *op. cit. supra*. Of course, as was noted in the concurring opinion of the Chief Justice in *Estes* v. *Texas*, 381 U. S. 532 (1965), benefits may flow from a public trial beyond preventing the use of a court as an instrument to persecute a given accused. But—

"The guarantee of a public trial confers no special benefit on the press, the radio industry or the television industry. A public trial is a necessary component of an accused's right to a fair trial and the concept of public trial cannot be used to defend conditions which prevent the trial process from providing a fair and reliable determination of guilt." (381 U. S. at 583.)

The press claim of a public "right to know" stands on no better footing when it is urged as a consideration to which all else must be subordinated. Surely the *Estes* case demonstrates this. There, substantial portions of the proceedings against Estes were televised, including live coverage of a two-day hearing on defense motions, opening and closing arguments by the state and the return of the verdict, as well as soundless videotaping of other aspects of the trial. The Court met headon the contention that the question before it was resolved by the fact "that the public has a right to know what goes on in the courts." Acknowledging that the public has a right to be informed about court proceedings, the Court nonetheless found that the tendency toward unfairness inherent in such televised coverage (even, be it noted, in the absence of any showing of actual prejudice) was sufficient to tip the scales in favor of reversal, at least in a case of considerable notoriety. To assert a "right to know," then, is simply to articulate in a catch phrase one important interest to be considered; the countervailing interest in fair trial persists and may well prevail.

The words of Justice Frankfurter remain apt:

"This Court has not yet decided that the fair administration of criminal justice must be subordinated to another safeguard of our constitutional system—freedom of the press properly conceived. The Court has not yet decided that, while convictions must be reversed and miscarriages of justice result because the minds of jurors or potential jurors were poisoned, the poisoner is constitutionally protected in plying his trade." (*Irwin* v. *Dowd*, 366 U. S. at 730.)

V. REMEDIES

Various legal remedies to solve the problem of prejudicial publicity have been used in this country. The technique of setting aside past convictions because of the adverse influence of publicity has obvious and serious deficiencies, for it requires a costly new trial many years after the event with the likelihood that the rights of the defendant and of the state have been jeopardized by scattered witnesses and evidence. In addition, consider the accused who has been deprived of his liberty and put to a tremendous and avoidable ordeal and expense; if, in fact, he has been convicted as a result of unfair publicity, a later reversal is a moral victory only. Curative instructions by the judge are also open to question, for according to Justice Jackson, the notion that court instructions can be counted upon to cure prejudice is known by "all practicing lawyers . . . to be an unmitigated fiction." A change of venue or a delay in the trial also invove these same practical difficulties as well as the problem of whether an impartial tribunal can be obtained from a community where prejudicial pre-trial publicity has been disseminated on a widespread basis by mass media. Further, a change in venue is an exception to the defendant's right to be tried in the locality where the crime was committed, while delays interfere with a defendant's constitutional right to a speedy trial and may subject him to a prolonged period in jail without bail.

Questioning of prospective jurors about prejudicial publicity is also defective. It involves the same problems as found in instructions from the judge. Further, the attorney runs the risk of antagonizing the jury by questioning its impartiality and highlighting the publicity, while at the same time, he may be foreclosed by the prospective juror's answer to the inquiry whether he can render an impartial verdict according to the evidence in spite of the sensational publicity in the mass media. If the juror who has formed an impression which he states can be overcome by the evidence is, in fact, seated, the effect is to reverse the normal rules of evidence involving a presumption of innocence for the accused in criminal cases and the burden of proof for the plaintiff in civil cases. To waive a jury trial, as suggested by some persons, would be sacrificing another fundamental right to the problem of prejudicial publicity. In brief, then, the susceptibility of the mind to printed or "news" matter which adversely affects the rights of the defendants or litigants to a fair trial based on the rules of law cannot be overcome by the present legal remedies. For an excellent discussion of the inadequacies of the present legal remedies, see the unpublished speech by Justice Bernard S. Meyer of the Supreme Court of New York before the Bar-Press symposium at Boston, Mass. (May 5, 1964). (See also Goldfarb, *Ensuring Fair Trials*, The New Republic, Feb. 1964, p. 11.)

In England, the British, with no written constitution and no elected prosecutors, deal with the problem of all publicity in a criminal case in a clean-cut manner. They punish for contempt of court virtually any publication about the defendant in a criminal case before trial except the bare fact of his arrest, and they even punish criticisms of judges. Lurid news accounts of the arrest of the accused, statements by the police of confessions, a summary of the expected evidence against the defendant, his past record, and photographs of the accused before trial are regarded as unfairly prejudicial to the defendant's right to a fair trial and are effectively forbidden by action of the courts through their contempt power. (See Goodhart, *Newspapers and Contempt of Court in English Law*, 48 Harv. L. Rev. 885 (1935); Appendix to statement by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show*, 338 U.S. 912, 921 (1950).) In our country, however, where publicity has always been an essential part of our tradition, our written constitution guaranteeing the right of freedom of speech and press has restricted the power of the courts to punish as contempt, comments on pending cases unless the publication presents a "clear and present danger" of obstructing justice. (*Craig* v. *Harney*, supra; *Pennekamp* v. *Florida*, supra; *Bridges* v. *California*, supra.)

Legislative proposals to curb prejudicial publicity have recently been made. Justice Bernard S. Meyer has proposed a statute applicable to newspapermen, broadcasters, lawyers and others involved in criminal trials. (See Meyer, *Are Additional Remedies Needed*, Thirty-Ninth Report of the Judicial Council of Massachusetts, p. 47 (1963); and see speech noted supra.) It would flatly prohibit any disclosure as to the existence of a confession, of the defendant's prior record and of similar damaging matters (unless they were brought out at the trial), and any expression of opinion on the defendant's guilt or the credibility of evidence or witnesses. Other practices, which would be violations if the court found that they threatened substantial prejudice to justice, would include interviews with victims of a crime, appeals to racial bias and publications of the names and addresses of the jurors.

There have also been recent attempts to estabilsh self-imposed guidelines for the members of the bar and press. In Oregon, for example, the press and bar have agreed upon a statement of principles on the coverage of news in criminal cases. (See A.B.A. Coordinator (Nov. 1962 and March 1965).) In Massachusetts, a guide has been adopted by many daily and weekly newspapers, although not by the major Boston dailies. Much has been said and written, pro and con, about the efficacy of a generally applicable code of ethics setting "specific standards of crime reporting which, while preserving complete freedom for the press, will also adequately safeguard the rights of an accused." The description is that of the then Supreme Court Justice, Arthur Goldberg, in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Several other recent developments may lead to a workable solution to the difficult problem of prejudicial publicity in pending cases. Frank Stanton, President of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has recommended that Brookings Institution, an independent research and educational organibation, undertake the composition of a task force of leaders in law, journalism and government to study and report on a voluntary intermedia code of fair practice to guide coverage of legislative and judicial proceedings as well as the pretrial detention of persons. The American Newspaper Publishers Association has named a study group to probe the area of potential conflict between the first and sixth amendments. The American Bar Association, to implement the recommendations of the Warren Commission, has set up a panel of eleven nationally prominent lawyers and judges to serve as a Bar Advisory Committee on Fair Trial and Free Press; this committee, a part of the broad program to formulate minimum national standards for the administration of criminal justice, is considering the responsibilities of members of the bar, law enforcement officials, and mass media, as they relate to the preservation of fair trial and avoidance of prejudicial publicity. Its report is expected in the fall.

One further solution has been recommended which mitigates constitutional questions and conflicts relating to the free press. This includes control of attorneys and law enforcement agencies by bar associations and the courts. Dean Erwin Griswold, in recommending this solution, points to the fundamental responsibility of the legal profession and calls for revision of Canon 20 of the Canons of Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association to effect a complete prohibition on any statements on pending cases from the moment of the arrest until the ultimate completion of the trial; in addition, he suggests that the rule-making and contempt powers of the courts be used over the police and law-enforcement officers. (Dean Griswold's statement is printed in *Harvard Today*, Jan. 1965, pp. 9–13). The New Jersey Supreme Court has adopted a set of rules banning potentially prejudicial statements to the press by prosecutors, policemen and defense attorneys before and during criminal trial. (*State* v. *Van Duyne*, 43 N.J. 368, 204 A. 2d 841 (1964).) The Philadelphia Bar Association has adopted a statement of policy recommending that law enforcement officers and lawyers be restricted substantially in their statements concerning criminal investigations. A.B.A. *Coordinator* (Feb. 1965). The Standing Committee on Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association has been working on a revision of Canon 20 to help insure a fair and impartial trial. A.B.A. *News*, Dec. 15, 1964. Perhaps most significant is the 1965 Statement of Policy of the Attorney General of the United States concerning the release of information by Department of Justice personnel. (See 28 C.F.R. § 50.2 (1965).)

In brief, solutions to the conflict between a free press and a fair trial are necessary, and as Professor Goldfarb has suggested,

"Self-control by press and bar would go far to alleviate many of these problems. If the press does not control itself, it may find the courts doing so by extending the contempt power. Former Justice Frankfurter and others have recently suggested emulating the English contempt rule. If this is done, American courts should draw a careful distinction between editorials and criticisms, and the reporting of 'judicial' facts like confessions and criminal records, giving the former an absolute First Amendment protection. It is simpler for the bar to control its members than it is for the press. Lawyers are peculiarly susceptible to the disciplinary control of the bar and the courts. This power ought to be used to control lawyers' complicity in pre-trial publicity. In the case of the district attorney, standard regulations could be drawn to control precisely the public information practices in all prosecutor's offices. This, along with rigid control of the private lawyer by the courts and bars, would go far to soothe this sore spot in the trial system." *Op. cit. supra* at 14.

VI. CONCLUSION

The rights of a free press and a fair trial are neither incompatible nor independent of each other. They must be reconciled for the benefit of our democratic society. We must eliminate prejudicial publicity in pending cases not only to insure the capstone of our judicial system and our freedom but also to meet the test described by the late Justice Frankfurter:

"Not the least significant test of the quality of a civilization is its treatment of those charged with crime, particularly with offenses which arouse the passions of a community. One of the rightful boasts of Western civilization is that the State has the burden of establishing guilt solely on the basis of evidence produced in court and under circumstances assuring all the safeguards of a fair procedure." (*Irvin* v. *Dowd*, 366 U.S. at 729.)

INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I am eagerly awaiting the results and revisions of the exhausting study now being completed by the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce dealing with the establishment of guideposts for States and counties to follow in taxing multistate businesses.

There are more than 3,000 State and local taxing jurisdictions in these United States. In many instances each of these jurisdictions has its own separate rules, exemptions, and rates. For small- and medium-size multistate businesses, in particular, the cost of the paperwork alone to comply with the tax rules and regulations of these many jurisdictions is oppressive.

It sometimes happens that a small multistate business is not able to keep up with the constantly changing and increasingly complex tax rules of a distant taxing authority and it finds itself being held liable for many years of back taxes, plus penalties and interest, for which it may not really be liable and of which it was totally unaware until the State or local tax collector sent his notice. This liability for unknown back taxes can also arise under successful court action by a taxing authority to extend its jurisdiction. Because of the hodgepodge of jurisdictional rules governing State and local taxation of multistate businesses, the same transaction or the same income can be taxed by more than one taxing authority and thus be subject to double or even triple taxation.

Mr. Speaker, as we know this matter has been the subject of several years of careful study by the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce under the able chairmanship of our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Edwin E. Willis. This special subcommittee was established pursuant to the mandate of Public Law 86–272 and has been engaged for over 5 years in trying to bring some commonsense to this broad and complex legal maze. In 1961 and 1962 the special subcommittee held hearings at which businessmen and tax administrators from all parts of the country explained the problems resulting from the present variety of State and local income taxes and sales and use taxes. These hearings formed the basis of an extensive four volume report by the special subcommittee and was accompanied by H.R. 11798 introduced by Chairman Willis on October 22, 1965. From January to May of this year the special subcommittee has heard over 100 witnesses, representing both taxpayers and tax collectors, on the subject matter of H.R. 11798. The special subcommittee and its staff is now hard at work on revising H.R. 11798 and I know will come up with the kind of solutions which this problem deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to see this burdensome problem solved in a manner which will promote the common market of these United States and eliminate unnecessary barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce between our States. The degree to which we can keep unfettered the free flow of commerce throughout the United States determines the health of our economy at every level—local, regional, and national. What this legislation will do is in keeping with this fundamental and basic objective.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN HAWAII

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii's State government, although the youngest in the Nation, has been among this country's leaders in comprehensive planning for economic development and growth.

The results of this farsighted approach by the government led by Gov. John A. Burns have been most gratifying, and Hawaii presently is in a period of spectacular economic and commercial advancement.

Among the leaders in this wise and productive effort has been the State director of planning and economic development, Dr. Shelley M. Mark. Recently, Dr. Mark outlined Hawaii's achievements and goals of recent years at an address at the annual San Diego, Calif., Maritime Day-World Trade Week commemoration.

I am most proud and happy to lay this record of achievement and outline of plans for the future for my State before my colleagues and the Nation at this time:

Hawaii and the New Pacific Era

(Address at annual Maritime Day-World Trade Week celebration, San Diego, Calif., May 23, 1966, by Shelley M. Mark, director, Department of Planning and Economic Development, State of Hawaii)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, distinguished citizens of San Diego, it is certainly a high honor to the State of Hawaii and a great personal privilege to be invited to speak at your Annual Maritime Day-World Trade Week festivities. Your prowess and progress in all types of maritime activities are well known to us in Hawaii. Since my arrival here, I have also been impressed with your tremendous hospitality and feeling of Aloha for Hawaii. As I left the airport I spotted a large sign which said "Welcome to the Hanalei." I was taken by car to my very fine accommodations at the Kona Kai Club, passing the Kona Inn on the way. Those of you who have been to our islands know that Kona and Hanalei are two of our most sparkling jewels. In fact, I am wondering who has borrowed what from whom?

Speaking of our Islands, of course the most noteworthy event in recent weeks has been the winning of the Kentucky Derby and the Preakness by a race horse named Kauai King. Although this horse has never been to our islands and we do not have racing, he has given us world-wide publicity that money cannot buy.

At the risk of covering ground that may already be familiar to you, I would like to discuss some of the recent economic progress made in Hawaii, particularly since we attained statehood. As some of our key economic indicators show, we have made substantial progress in recent years. In 1965, our population was nearly three-quarters of a million people, representing a 17-percent growth since 1960. This compares with a national growth rate of 8 percent over the same period. Our employed work-force in 1965 was about one-third of our total population.

This represented an increase of 13 percent over 1960, as compared with the national growth of 8 percent. On the other hand, our unemployment in 1965 was less than the national rate, slightly over 3 percent as compared with the national average of 4½ percent in 1965. Our personal income in 1965 was approximately $2 billion, representing a 38-percent increase since 1960, as compared with a 32-percent increase for the nation as a whole. Per capita income in Hawaii was almost $3,000 in 1965 which places it above the national average. Most of our other indicators have displayed similar tendencies.

But more revealing than the figures alone are some of the factors underlying these recent growth rates. As is the case with San Diego, we rely very heavily on Federal expenditures for our basic economic support. In 1965, total Federal expenditures, both military and civilian, amounted to nearly $1½ billion or a 27-percent increase since 1960. Secondly, our tourist industry continues to grow at an exceedingly rapid rate. Visitor arrivals amounted to more than 600,000 in 1965 or a 100-percent increase since 1960. This is not hard to see in view of the unprecedented national prosperity that we have enjoyed, the increased leisure time at our disposal, the improvements in transportation technology and the reduction in the cost of coming to Hawaii, from the West Coast particularly. We fully expect a continuation of these trends.

Another encouraging feature of our recent economic development and one that tends to be under-rated, by the way, has been the increasing stability in our basic agricultural sectors, namely sugar and pineapple. This has been due to technological improvements, together with a continuing emphasis on research into new methods of production and new by-products, all of which has firmed up the staying power of these industries in the face of increasing market competition. The value of the production in these two sectors was about $300 million in 1965, and we expect this level to be at least maintained in the next several years.

Then, significant progress has been made in some of the newer growth sectors of our economy. The value of diversified manufacturing has amounted to nearly $200 million, while the total volume of our foreign trade is about $140 million. It is still too early to place a price tag on our research and development industry, but with the promising scientific developments at our University, the increasing number of contracts that have been awarded to Hawaii and the growing interest of private industrial firms, we feel that we are nearing the take-off stage in this area.

So basically, in recent years, our economy has proved adaptable to external changes while developing increasing internal strength and stability, at the same time. I am sure that you will detect considerable similarity with San Diego in experience if not in magnitude. Thus I believe our past performance has been entirely satisfactory. But what about the future?

Certainly we cannot take things for granted. While we fully expect our economy to continue to grow and prosper, we do realize that it can be disrupted by factors beyond our control. For example, the level of Federal expenditures is dependent upon changes in the international situation and on national policy decisions which may be made to counteract or adjust to such changes. These can lead to a continuation or acceleration of recent trends or, on the other hand, a wholesale disruption or dislocation of economic activity in the Islands. Our tourist industry has benefited from prosperity conditions on the Mainland and indeed throughout the world, from technological improvements in air transportation, and from increasing consumer preference for travel and recreation. We expect and hope that these favorable developments will continue, but there is no guarantee that this will be so. Political uncertainties, such as our share of the quota under the United States Sugar Act, can affect the well being of some of our basic industries in the future.

Thus, the task that lies ahead of us is we must continue to strengthen our existing economic bases and at the same time uncover new sources of income and employment for our growing population. We realize that the time to plan and act is now, when times are good, rather than to wait for disaster or calamity to fall upon us.

In our quest for new economic opportunities, we are seeking to capitalize on our position in the middle of the Pacific and are focusing our attention on three major areas—foreign trade; research and development, particularly in oceanography, and educational and cultural interchange.

Foreign trade is something familiar to all of you. Most of you are engaged in one or another aspect of it. While Hawaii's foreign trade has increased sharply in recent years, it is barely scratching the surface of the vastly increased trade crossing the Pacific, about $9 billion worth by last count. With the vigor of the present day economies of Japan, Taiwan, Australia and New Zealand, and the rising aspirations in other developing areas of Asia and the Pacific, we can hope for even greater growth in the future. Our problem is how to capitalize on our central Pacific location in order to participate more fully in this trade. Our approach has been to put new emphasis on Hawaii's position as an intermediate point from which trans-Pacific trade may be serviced or facilitated. Thus, we are working to establish a new foreign trade complex in Hawaii to provide facilities for the performance of distribution services from the State with the potential for appropriate processing and trans-shipment activities.

Next month, we will be opening our new Foreign Trade Zone which, as you know, is a secured area into which merchandise can be brought without being subject to the United States Customs Laws. Within the Zone, this merchandise may be stored, handled, displayed, used for processing or manufacturing, and subsequently, imported into the customs area or shipped abroad. It is only at that point that the applicable customs duties are levied and the result is usually a considerable saving to the user of the Zone. We are regarding our Foreign Trade Zone as a public facility, much like any other port facility, whose purpose is not to be profitable in itself, but to afford the opportunity for private firms to exercise their initiative and ingenuity in their search for profit. We also visualize our Foreign Trade Zone as an educational venture out of which a greater community-wide interest in all sorts of foreign trade activities will be generated.

Our Trade Zone, then, is but the first step toward a Foreign Trade Complex in Hawaii, which could ultimately embrace expanded display and exhibition facilities, conference facilities, trade mission offices, and all other types of services and facilities catering to the Pacific trade. We see Hawaii as playing a major role in bringing together buyers and sellers from East and West, assisting in their trading and financial arrangements, and providing them with display, exhibition, and test market facilities. We welcome the full participation of San Diego's business community in this effort.

Hawaii is also looking to the ocean in yet another attempt to assure its future economic growth. I refer to our efforts to stimulate research and development activities, with particular emphasis on oceanography and other endeavors that may be based on the findings of scientific research. Our University of Hawaii has made very substantial progress in these areas. It is attracting both an outstanding faculty of scientific specialists, as well as an increasing share of research contracts. The State Administration, under the dynamic leadership of Governor John A. Burns, has embarked on an intensified effort to call attention to Hawaii's advantages and capabilities for oceanic research and science-based industry. The Navy, as well as other Federal agencies, has cooperated very closely in bringing about many of these new programs in our State. Our own business and industrial community has realized the potentials for economic growth in these areas and has participated closely in the advanced planning phases. All this is, of course, nothing new to San Diego, which for many years has been a pre-eminent center for all types of research and development activities. This is mainly an indication of the close affinity between our two areas in still another area of economic activity.

I have mentioned educational and cultural interchange as a third area holding promise for the future growth of Hawaii. It may come as a surprise that such activities should be regarded as a basis for economic growth. However, I believe we do have a rather unique role to play. As some of you may know, there has been established a federally-supported institution located at the University of Hawaii, known as the East-West Center. This Center provides scholarships and fellowships for students from both the East and the West. It offers technical training facilities for the technicians and officials of the emerging countries of Asia and the Pacific. It offers a meeting ground, conference facilities, and a research library for senior specialists from these countries. But most of all, it provides an environment, in an area noted for its racial harmony, for people of different educational, cultural, and national backgrounds to come together, to work, study, train, and research, to develop an understanding and appreciation of different points of view and ultimately to provide the basis for the solution of mutually pressing problems.

However, the East-West Center can succeed in its mission only as the University of Hawaii progresses. With this in mind, both the State Administration and the State Legislature of Hawaii have wholeheartedly supported the University through generous capital and operating budget appropriations and in many other ways. The University has developed strength and capability not only in the physical sciences, but also in the social sciences, the arts and the humanities, thus providing the needed educational complement for the broader cultural and technical interchange purposes of the East-West Center. The University of Hawaii in its own right has supervised and conducted important international programs in conjunction with the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, the United Nations, and the Trust Territories. The Hawaiian community itself must be considered a prime resource in our nation's efforts to achieve mutual understanding with the peoples and countries of Asia and the Pacific.

There is no doubt in my mind that Hawaii can assure its future economic growth by full and ingenuous participation in the three programs that I have mentioned. However, in each of these, Hawaii, with its unique assets, its strategic central Pacific location, its multi-racial population, its appreciation of education and science, its worldwide business orientation, and its Aloha spirit, has an even greater mission to undertake. In carrying out this mission, which I have already alluded to and which I shall elaborate upon, we must exercise foresight and initiative and take imaginative action. But this is something that we cannot do alone or in large part.

There is much to be gained by cooperative and collaborative efforts with other areas, particularly those displaying interests and embarking on programs similar to ours. This I have already found in my very brief association with the city of San Diego.

Some of you may know of efforts previously launched to establish a sister-city relationship between our two areas. I believe such a concept to be valid. But without concrete and productive follow-through, it can very easily degenerate into a mere propaganda exercise or become meat for the political meat grinder. So rather than a mere waving of slogans or exchange of official courtesy calls, might I suggest this course of action—that all agencies, institutions, companies, and individuals in our respective areas, who have mutual interests and concerns, make preliminary contact, arrange periodic meetings, and agree on areas where cooperative endeavors can be worked out.

As a starting point, may I suggest that efforts be launched to increase the flow of trade between our two areas through the exchange of specific information on trading and investment opportunities. Secondly, those agencies and individuals who are already engaged in providing services to both areas, such as shipping, freight forwarding, financing, marketing and distribution, should consider further how they might assist in the expansion of this trade. I am sure that we in Hawaii have much to learn from the superior port development program that is being carried out in San Diego.

Third, as I mentioned at the beginning, I am pleased to see the Hawaiian atmosphere that has crept into your resort development and I think this promises a continued expansion in the flow of visitors between our two areas. For while we have high hopes for the growth of foreign trade and R&D activities, we are not unmindful of the present day significance of our tourist industry. Along these lines I would like to see an early institution of direct air service between San Diego and our Islands. This objective was nearly attained in previous years and I don't think we ought to let any possibilities die.

In the field of research and development activities, the pre-eminence of the Scripps Institution, your aircraft and electronics industries and your outstanding educational institutions has been long established. The University of Hawaii in its research program would certainly do well to engage in cooperative efforts with Scripps. For example, joint oceanic research projects could be devised, utilizing the vast continental shelf areas that are readily accessible to you and the deep water areas that are close to the Hawaiian Islands. Much fruitful scientific information, some of it with rather immediate economic application, can be produced through this collaborative approach.

Finally, along these lines, there is one great scientific project where we have an immediate mutuality of interest. I refer, of course to Project Mohole, a project of tremendous scientific significance, where it is intended that drillings be conducted on the floor of the ocean to extract samples from the inner core of the earth and obtain information as to the earth's origin, its movements, and relationships to its environment. As you may know, the drillings are to be carried out on the floor of the ocean just north of the Hawaiian Islands and as I'm sure you are aware, the tremendous platform, from which the oceanic experiments are to be carried out, is being constructed in your San Diego shipyards. However, this project is presently in great jeopardy because of the action of the House in cutting out the necessary funds from the budget of the National Science Foundation. We in Hawaii are making every possible effort to see that the necessary funds are restored by the United States Senate and that the Congress will see fit to go along with the restoration. We are pleased that President Johnson has made such a strong statement on behalf of the Mohole Project and that Governor Brown of California and Governor Burns of Hawaii are pressing so vigorously for its restoration. I am sure that many prominent San Diegans have exerted their influence on behalf of this project, and I am hopeful that many more will emphasize its importance to their Congressmen. For it is out of such pragmatic efforts that a true and lasting cooperative relationship between our two areas can be affirmed.

As I have said previously, there is a new challenge that areas such as ours must face realistically and cooperatively. This is the challenge of the new era of the Pacific. Make no mistake of it: the Pacific era has arrived, and it has exposed an amazing lack of knowledge and direction in coping with its attendant problems. For almost all of our history, our country has been oriented toward the East and toward the Atlantic community. But now, the Pacific era has emerged, bringing with it the disruption of Viet Nam, the enigma of Communist China, the uncertainties of Indonesia. We have found ourselves as a Nation, not quite prepared to cope with these new problems. There is much that needs to be learned and much that needs to be done.

But in facing up to these challenges, there is much that can be done. There is not only the vast potential for greatly expanded trade and investment, but also the opportunity to assist in the economic development of other nations without impeding necessary social changes and with full recognition of the dignity of the individual. Thus, it is up to us, the states and areas which face westward to the Pacific, to take the lead in reshaping our national outlook, in refocusing our national policies, in redirecting our national energies and in redefining our national educational purposes, so that as a nation we may be better equipped to meet the challenges of the new Pacific era.

The people of Hawaii are fully cognizant of the magnitude of this task. We shall do our part. We seek your assistance and guidance in meeting our mutual responsibilities in the days ahead.

PLAYGROUND LIGHT DRIVE A SUCCESS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the drive to provide temporary lighting at 47 Washington playgrounds has become a success.

The Washington Post had carried the story that the goal has been reached and, in fact, has gone over the top.

I am proud of the fact that a corporation from my congressional district has made, what is thought to be, one of the largest single contributions to this lighting program. This installation of lighting equipment will not be of the temporary nature advocated for the Washington playgrounds. Its equipment will be a permanent feature and will add greatly to the reduction of juvenile delinquency in the area served by the Rosedale Recreation Center, where these lights of the Duro-Test Corp., the country's fourth largest manufacturer of light bulbs, will be installed.

This North Bergen, N.J., corporation, with a long record of interest in combating juvenile delinquency, can be credited with a major assist in Vice President Hubert M. Humphrey's campaign to provide lighting for playgrounds in the District of Columbia.

The 60 fluomeric brand lamps represent the latest advance in outdoor floodlighting technology. By combining fluorescent, incandescent, and mercury-vapor elements in one unit, the lamps provide high intensity and very long life at long lower electrical cost. Duro-Test officials estimate that with average use the lamps will last at least 5 years. The fixtures for the lamps were formerly in use at Griffith Stadium, once home of baseball's Washington Senators and football's Redskins.

The fluomeric lamps are earmarked for use at the Rosedale Recreation Center, 17th and Gale Streets NE., Washington. With the installation of the lamps, the Rosedale ball field will have one of the most modern lighting systems available anywhere.

In order to insure efficient use of the new lamps, Duro-Test technicians worked closely with District officials in planning the layout of the Rosedale facility and in testing the lamps in the Griffith Stadium fixtures.

The Duro-Test Corp. has pioneered in the promotion of modern lighting for outdoor recreational facilities and the establishment of nighttime recreational programs for youth. A leader in this effort has been the company vice president, Herbert A. Anderson. Mr. Anderson is chairman of a committee composed of members of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association which is interested in promoting, on a nationwide basis, lighting campaigns for playgrounds, ball fields, and other amateur recreational facilities.

In 1963, Duro-Test and Mr. Anderson worked closely with the Sports Boosters Club of Leonia, N.J., in establishing a summer basketball league for teenagers in the northern New Jersey suburban area. The club was concerned about the lack of planned summer activities for the community's high school students.

The program was made possible with the cooperation of the fathers of Leonia and Duro-Test Corp. in establishing a lighted field for these basketball games. It is a prototype of a major trend—the turning to nighttime summer sports activities as an outlet for youth, in a growing campaign to combat juvenile delinquency and vandalism. Cities across the country are in the throes of similar efforts. Among the places where playground lighting projects are being carried forward are Philadelphia, Dallas, Staten Island, Albuquerque, East Liverpool, Ohio; Carbondale, Ill.; and Pine Grove, Pa. Cities in which new baseball park lighting for recreational leagues is in the works include Reading, Pa.; Long Beach, Calif.; Tacoma, Wash.; Franklin, Ind.; Linden, N.J; Chillicothe, Ohio; Fairmont, Ind.; Sonora, Calif.; Newton, Ill.; Mendota, Ill.; Payson, Utah; Lindsborg, Kans.; Freeburg, Ill.; and Moore, Okla.

To fulfill positive need of older teenagers, high school, and college youths for wholesome evening activities, the Leonia Sports Boosters together with the Leonia Recreation Commission, set up the Leonia, N.J., summer basketball league in 1963 .

As a first step, the Boosters installed additional lighting. A new type of bulb called fluomerics was obtained from the manufacturer, Duro-Test Corp., whose vice president, Herbert A. Anderson, was a resident of the area. These lights won immediate approval due to their self-ballasting characteristics. The new lights screw directly into the old fixtures, eliminating the problem of installing expensive ballasts and special wiring. The lamps carry a life rating of 16,000 hours. This means no lighting worries for many seasons to come.

AMERICAN LEGION PARADE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion will have its 48th annual convention here in Washington, D.C., this year. This will be the first time in 12 years that the Capital City was chosen for this convention. As an integral part of the ceremonies which attend the business of the convention, the Legionnaires will stage the largest parade in the history of our Nation.

A parade has a very significant place in building the spirit that is the essence of America. A parade exemplifies the spirit of life, the vigor, the cooperation, and the brotherhood that has made us a strong nation and will keep us this way. I have had a long and pleasant experience with the American Legion, and I admire the conscientiousness and drive of the Legionnaires in their efforts to preserve in civilian life the values they struggled for in the military. The parade which they will present on August 29 is a moving, living symbol of these efforts and worth watching. Consequently, upon my own responsibility, unsolicited by any group, and in support of my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Jimmy Morrison, I am introducing this House concurrent resolution calling for a half holiday on the afternoon of August 29. This resolution is not novel; a similar resolution was passed in 1954 when the Legion last held their convention here.

There are some who would say that this is a terrible waste of manpower, but since when is boosting morale and spirit and building the strength of a nation a waste of money? A man's wages should be continued—we are not punishing anybody because the convention is to be here, quite the contrary. We are thankful that the Legion brings this opportunity for us to join our old comrades and folks from back home in remembering the struggles of the past.

Small communities all over the country have made great efforts to send delegations to this convention. They had a purpose—to show the people of the Capital and other Legionnaires that they remembered what happened in the struggle of the past; that they joined them and are now in sympathy and common effort with the other veterans throughout the land. Surely the memory of the Congress, which has so much to do with the future, the present, and the past of our Nation, cannot have any shorter memory.

Nothing was too good for the boys that went off to war in 1914 and 1941 and 1945 and 1952; and we watched the parades then to give honor to the paraders, men going off to offer their lives on the field of battle for a nation which they knew would appreciate their sacrifice—for all time. The men that are marching for the American Legion now are those who returned. Surely, their offering was as acceptable as the life of the man who died next to me on a Navy cruiser. Surely their efforts now, their interest and concern with the welfare of our Nation, is worthy of similar honor.

We spend billions to put a man on the moon; we spend billions in aiding the poor, and the reasons for all this are going to be exemplified here in the Capital on August 29 as they have not been exemplified for some time. I think we should give a little of ourselves, balance the values, and realize that all these millions and billions are wasted unless we give to every American the chance to see the fruit of his labor—to observe a ceremony which embodies the spirit of all he works for.

Occasionally, we are told that Americans are degenerating, scorning patriotism and the flag, becoming egotistical, fearful, and discontent human beings who would rather be Red than dead. I feel this image is inaccurate. I think the Americans do appreciate what our fighting men have done in the past and the traditions which veterans continue to fight for now. I do not think the American people are unappreciative. To me it is a source of inspiration to know that the young people on my staff want to go see this parade. To me it is an answer to those iconoclastic critics of our society that American youth and American populace are stirred and reverent at the sight of a flag and the sight of a thousand marching men. I think this is a great patriotic occasion and a chance for the Government to show its employees, the veterans and the rest of the Nation that our memory is not short, that we care, and we respond to the activities and efforts of those in the Nation that gave and will yet be called upon to give so much.

HIGH COMMISSIONER NORWOOD REPORTS TO U.N. TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the last week of June, I and three of our colleagues, Representatives Burton of California, Bingham, and Morton, attended sessions of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, while our Ambassador to the Trusteeship Council, Eugenie Anderson; High Commissioner William R. Norwood; special adviser to the U.S. delegation, Francis Nuuan of Yap, a Member of the Congress of Micronesia, and others, reviewed the past year's progress in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I am happy to include in the Record the opening statement presented by High Commissioner Norwood.

The statement follows:

Opening Statement to the United Nations Trusteeship Council by the Honorable William R. Norwood, High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, June 27, 1966

Mr. President, this is the first time I have had the honor and the privilege of serving as the Special Representative of the Administering Authority. I look forward to receiving the comments and recommendations of the members of this body, many of whom have visited the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and know from first hand observation the magnitude and complexity of the problems that exist in our widely scattered island area.

My immediate connection with the administration of the Territory necessarily is limited since I became Deputy High Commissioner only some six weeks ago. At that time I also began to serve as Acting High Commissioner and I would like at this time to express my appreciation to my predecessor, the Honorable M. W. Goding, who had the privilege of appearing before this body on five previous occasions. Prior to my appointment, I had the opportunity of discussing with him the problems of the Trust Territory and I appreciate his friendly assistance during the brief period when our terms overlapped.

Our annual report which is before the Council provides detail on the period under review, July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965. Inasmuch as almost a year has elapsed since the latter date, I shall report on some of the significant events which have occurred since that time.

ADMINISTRATION

Our budget this past year, fiscal 1966, of 17.5 million dollars enabled us to continue program expansion in elementary and secondary education, in public health, in construction of facilities and in other major activities. Four years ago, increased appropriations were sought from the U.S. Congress. The former statutory limitation on appropriations of 7½ million dollars was raised to a new authorization level of 17½ million and for the past two years the U.S. Congress has granted our requests for appropriations up to this new level. But as our programs expanded so did the needs of the Territory. It soon became evident that a bold new approach was essential if the Territory were to achieve acceptable levels of development in the political, economic and social spheres. Accordingly, a few weeks ago, the Department of the Interior submitted to the U.S. Congress a legislative proposal to authorize a multi-million dollar, five-year accelerated capital investment program for the Trust Territory. This multi-million dollar investment would bolster health, education, water, power, and sewage services; provide better air, ground and water transportation; modernize and extend radio and telephone communications; and establish suitable buildings for executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Territorial Government. The U.S. Congress presently has this proposal under consideration.

Along with the request to provide a stepped-up construction program, the new legislation calls for removing the present ceiling of $17.5 million a year for civil government operations. Under the new proposal, Trust Territory operating budgets would increase proportionally with proven need and ability to carry out essential expanded programs.

Simultaneously with accelerated programs in various areas of development will be the infusion into the Territory within the next few months of some 400–500 Peace Corps Volunteers. Recruitment of volunteers for work in the Territory has been underway on over 60 college campuses throughout the United States for the past two months. An unprecedented response resulted in more than 2,700 applicants in the first month. Among these were over 100 volunteers who had previously served in the Peace Corps in various parts of the world.

The first phase of the Peace Corps proposal calls for 400 volunteers to go to work in the Territory by this coming October, 1966. The first and largest group will be elementary school teachers and community development workers. This division will consist of approximately 180 elementary school teachers and 18 secondary school teachers. There will also be at least three experienced former Peace Corps Community Development workers per district to assist with community development projects for the local communities.

The second largest group of volunteers will be assigned to the public health area and will consist of some 80 health aides, 11 nurses, 6 pharmacists, 6 lab technicians; 3 X-ray technicians. The health workers still make local surveys aimed at helping to control such diseases as tuberculosis and leprosy; they will teach health education in the schools and to adults and will work on various community health projects. The nurses, pharmacists, lab and X-ray technicians will be assigned to district and subdistrict hospital units to upgrade present Micronesian technicians.

Group Three will be in public works and will provide a mixed cadre of engineers, architects, surveyors and urban planners to supply planning and engineering support for a variety of construction projects from water catchments to docking facilities. It will be a relatively small group, starting with approximately 12 civil engineers, 18 surveyors, and 6 architects/planners.

The fourth group will be assigned to public administration and will include 6 lawyers and 6 small-business advisors to assist with business development in each district.

The second phase of the Peace Corps project provides for volunteers in such fields as agricultural extension, credit union and cooperative development; more secondary and elementary school teachers; additional volunteers in public health, especially for immunization teams serving remote outer island areas; and volunteers with experience in radio broadcasting and communications.

Paramount in the use of Peace Corps Volunteers will be the underlying principle of supplementing the activities of administrative employees—not replacing them. Areas for special focus will be in the outer islands and villages away from the district center. The volunteers, who are coming to the Territory at the express invitation of the Micronesian people, will provide "middle-level manpower". Their aid is expected to add thrust to all aspects of social, economic and political growth, especially in the areas away from the district centers.

Several important appointments were made in keeping with our policy of placing qualified Micronesians in senior administrative positions. Mr. Dwight Heine of the Marshalls, was named District Administrator of the Marshall Islands. He is the first Micronesian to be appointed head of a district administration.

Mr. Leo Falcam's appointment as acting district administrator for Ponape is the most recent example of this trend.

Mr. Kaleb Udui of Palau, formerly Assistant Attorney General at Trust Territory Headquarters, was chosen by the Congress of Micronesia to be Legislative Counsel for the Congress. Mr. Udui was the first Micronesian to receive a law degree and it is especially fitting that the important post of Legislative Counsel went to a leading Micronesian.

In the Marianas, Mr. Frank Ada, former Political Affairs Officer, was promoted to the post of Assistant District Administrator for Public Affairs. Four of our six districts now have Micronesians serving in the posts of Assistant District Administrators. At Headquarters, Mr. Eusebio Rechucher, former Economic Development Officer, became Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Resources and Development.

Mr. Koichi L. Wong, a graduate of the University of New Mexico in 1965 with a B.S. degree in Civil Engineering, was appointed to the staff of the Headquarters Civil Engineering Department. As has been noted at previous session, the head of our Headquarters Political Development Department is a Micronesian, as are the Assistant Director of Public Safety and the Assistant Public Information Officer. Two Micronesians serve as Assistant Treasurers in the Headquarters Department of Budget and Finance.

The Headquarters Community Development Department has a senior Micronesian Community Development Advisor and the Women's Interests Office is Micronesian.

Mrs. Tosiwo Makayama and Mrs. Nick Bossy became the first Trukese women to run for public office and the first to be elected to the Truk District Legislature.

In the public health field, Miss Ulai Trudy Otobed of Palau became the first Micronesian woman medical officer and at the same time won recognition for her outstanding performance at the Fiji School of Medicine in Suva.

There are many Micronesians holding other senior executive and professional positions throughout the Territory. Our Scholarship and special training programs are increasing and more and more Micronesians are returning to the Territory to fill responsible positions. We shall continue to implement the policy of placing qualified Micronesians in senior posts.

A Social Security Plan for Trust Territory citizens is being studied and in November, 1965, the Chief Actuary of the U.S. Social Security Administration, traveled throughout the Territory preparatory to making recommendations on possibilities for eventual establishment of a Social Security System.

The Micronesian Title and Pay Plan, which established position classification and pay rates for all positions occupied by Micronesian employees of the Trust Territory Government also has been restudied. This study includes the relationship between grade levels and the skill requirement of positions, the extent of pay distinctions between steps within a grade, and qualification standards in selecting employees for all categories of positions.

Further, in March of this year, a Task Force to develop proposals for Micronesian Civil Service Act was established in response to the Congress of Micronesia's Joint Resolution which requested the High Commissioner to develop proposals for Civil Service regulations for Micronesian employees of the Trust Territory Government.

EDUCATION

The accelerated program in education continued into its fourth year. Education development was marked chiefly by improvements in programming, planning, and in consolidating the gains made in the prior three years. It may be of interest to the Council, to note that Education Department operating expenditures, not including construction, rose from $963,272 in fiscal year 1963 to some $3,765,500 for the year we are concluding. For the year under review, FY 1965, some $3,500,000 was provided for Education programs, plus approximately $1,100,000 for elementary, high school and dormitory construction. Additionally in FY 1965, private schools, mainly mission schools, spent $425,000 for school operation.

During FY 1965, 213 elementary classrooms and 16 new high school classrooms were completed, and other new elementary school classrooms and additional high school classrooms were placed under construction. Some 142 American teachers were on local elementary school staffs as compared to the 123 of the previous years.

Reprogramming on the elementary school level resulted in the addition of the 7th and 8th grades in many of the public schools, thus affording educational opportunities for hundreds of pupils who otherwise would not have had an opportunity for schooling past the 6th grade. The addition of the 11th and 12th grades in some of the high schools afforded high school education for an additional 700 students throughout the six districts.

An event of considerable significance to the Territory's educational program was the inclusion of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the U.S. Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. Under this Act the Territory will add 40 additional elementary school teachers this fall to the local school staffs with all costs being supplied under the new law. The addition of these 40 additional elementary school teachers plus the Peace Corps Volunteer teachers should have a substantial impact on local elementary schools.

An orientation program for the 40 new elementary teachers mentioned above will be conducted in cooperation with the East-West Center and the university of Hawaii this summer for a period of six weeks.

For the year just concluding, FY 1966, there were 197 students on various government scholarships. For the school year which will open this autumn, there will be 264 official government scholars: 36 in public health, 128 in various other professional fields, and 100 partial government scholarships in general fields. During the past year over 200 Micronesians took short-term refresher courses and on-the-job training through the Institute for Technical Interchange of the East-West Center and under the Trust Territory administration.

The year saw also an expansion in number of U.N. fellowships with seven Trust Territory citizens studying and observing, or preparing to do so, in professional activities in various countries abroad on United Nations Technical Assistance grants, UNESCO fellowships or WHO fellowships.

It should be noted that forty (40) Trust Territory citizens have been awarded United Nations fellowships to date.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

The creation and establishment of the Territory-wide legislature, the Congress of Micronesia, loomed large in the political sphere this past year. Accredited to the United States delegation and seated here today is Mr. Francis Nuuan of Yap Islands. He is a member of the House of Delegates of the Congress. Some of you have met him and I hope all of you will come to know him during the course of these meetings. He can, I am sure, give you first-hand information, his own views and those of the people he represents, regarding their attitudes, desires, and hopes for the Congress and their political future.

The organization and rules of procedure of both houses of the Congress are basically those common to many legislative bodies throughout the democratic world. These rules are essentially similar for each house. They provide for the manner of opening and conducting the business of each session, the election of officers, and detail parliamentary procedures to provide for decorum and orderly deliberations. The rules also contain sections on appointment of various committees and definition of functions of each committee. These rules are set forth in the "Congress of Micronesia Manual," copies of which have been provided your respective delegations.

The First Session of the Congress of Micronesia closed August 12, 1965. During the 30-day session of the Congress, 45 bills, 15 resolutions and 43 joint resolutions were introduced in the General Assembly, while 32 bills, 40 resolutions and 21 joint resolutions were introduced in the House of Delegates. Thirteen bills and 20 joint resolutions were passed by the Congress and submitted to the High Commissioner. All 13 bills were signed into law.

The publication, "Laws and Resolutions, Congress of Micronesia," which has also been provided you, contains the full text of the measures adopted by the Congress.

Anticipating rapidly expanding legislative activities of the Congress of Micronesia and the need for related legislative services, the Legislative Counsel and five prospective legislative aides accepted an invitation by the Institute of Technical Interchange of the East-West Center, University of Hawaii, to observe the 1966 Budget Session of the State of Hawaii Legislature. This instructive visit to the Hawaiian Legislature was an outgrowth of one of the resolutions adopted by the first session of the Congress.

In preparation for the second regular session, the Interim Committee of the lower house recently met at the provisional headquarters to discuss various legislative matters.

Thus, through the Congress of Micronesia, the people of the Territory are making substantial progress toward self-government and are developing and strengthening a mutuality of interest and understanding among the widely scattered districts.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Territory has a two-year contract with Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., an internationally known consulting firm. Under terms of this agreement a team of economists is conducting a study in depth of the resources of the Territory and factors related to their potential development. The Nathan group has just submitted a detailed preliminary report identifying those areas with most promise. Later this summer they will submit specific recommendations for implementation of economic development.

Meantime, copra continued to be the largest export item with 13,718 tons valued at $2,525,000 exported for the year under review. Although the world market prices fell this past year, the Copra Stabilization Board was able to maintain a price of $132.50 per ton to the producer for grade one copra throughout the year.

Emphasis continued to be placed on the development of the marine resources of the Territory. A fisheries development program is underway on an experimental basis. This covers boat building, inshore and offshore fisheries development, conservation of marine resources, and we look forward to the establishment of biological and oceanographic research facilities.

Total export of fish by the Van Camp Seafood Company this past year was estimated at 4,000 tons. There were 19 tuna fishing vessels operating in Palau waters, and two additional tuna fishing boats are to be added within the next few months.

Exploration of commercial fisheries operation in other districts is underway by Star-Kist and Van Camp Seafood Companies who hold options on sites in the Truk District.

In Palau, the Government's Fisheries Development Program saw the completion of a 75-foot Hawaiian-style fishing boat and continued to improve the Palau shipyard and the Palau Fisheries Station. The Hawaii Skipjack Fisheries Training Program was reactivated; and 11 Micronesians from Palau, Truk, and Ponape were sent to Hawaii for advanced training on commercial skipjack boats.

The Palau Boat Yard expanded its operation and now has over 10,000 square feet of covered work area including a slipways capable of overhauling and maintaining the present tuna boats fishing in the area. This past year 61 boats were constructed in the yard for sale to government and private customers. On June 4, I had the honor of being present at the launching in Palau of the 75-foot Hawaiian-type fishing boat which, incidentally, was the largest vessel to be built within the Trust Territory. This vessel will be operated under an experienced fishing captain from Hawaii in an attempt to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Hawaiian method of skipjack fishing utilizing all Micronesian crew members. Those trainees returning from Hawaii with accumulated savings have indicated they intend to use these funds to invest in vessels of their own in order to carry on their profession on fishing boats they themselves own. Another 43-foot tuna vessel is under construction, and plans for larger fishing vessels of 50 and 65 feet are on the drawing boards.

The Economic Development Loan Fund is presently capitalized at $600,000, and it is planned to raise the capital level to $1,000,000. Since last July, 16 loans totaling $146,000 were granted to individuals or groups desiring to initiate new enterprise or to expand existing business. Additionally, the Loan Fund guaranteed 15 bank loans for a total of $127,600.

The Territory's infant but promising travel industry received added impetus with the acquisition by the Government of a second 60-passenger DC-4 airplane and increasing construction of hotel facilities. A new two-story, concrete hotel with 16 rooms, built by the government in Saipan, was leased to a Micronesian company. Ten motels also operate in Saipan, and four more are currently under construction. Private interests have leased a site for a 50-room $400,000 hotel on Saipan. A new hotel was built by the government in Yap and will be leased to local private operators.

Credit unions are proving an effective means of accumulating capital and at the same time are providing helpful credit to the local population. The 27 credit unions with nearly 4,000 members had assets amounting to $290,000—an increase of 51 percent in less than one year's time. Further, Micronesian members had accumulated $263,000 in savings, an increase of 59 percent over the previous year with an average per member of $72.00. Three additional credit unions were chartered last month.

Credit unions granted 1,670 loans amounting to $409,000. Since their inception, credit unions have made over 4,800 loans totaling $900,000. These loans were principally for such purposes as buying building materials for home improvement, for purchasing furniture and household appliances, for buying boats and outboard motors and for many other useful purposes. These credit unions are entirely controlled, managed and operated by Micronesians.

I might note that Mrs. Carmen Chigiy Dauei, who is with us today as an observer in our delegation, is treasurer of one of the most successful credit unions in the Territory, the Yap Islands Employees Credit union.

The past year also witnessed expansion in cooperative associations, with some 23 chartered cooperatives in operation as compared to 16 the previous year. Additionally, there were some 13 unchartered cooperatives in operation. By far the greater number of cooperatives were serving copra producers. Often on a remote island, they purchase copra at prevailing prices and make available needed merchandise.

In addition to the copra producers' cooperatives there are four serving fishermen; three for handicraft marketing, one for boatbuilding, and one for low-cost housing for Micronesians.

The cooperatives have assets of roughly $1,000,000, and it is estimated that they carried on more than three million dollars worth of business with their producer-consumer members during the past year.

AGRICULTURE

Coconut planting and rehabilitation continued with greatest emphasis this past year in the Marshall Islands. Cacao promotion in Ponape and Truk continued although somewhat hampered by disease and rat damage to cacao pods. Twenty-two tons of cacao will be exported this year. Pepper production was pushed in Ponape with ten new private pepper farms being started. Some 2,500 pounds of black and white pepper were processed from the government pepper demonstration plantings in Ponape.

Experimentation on the rice project in Ponape continued. 30,000 pounds of rice were harvested as compared with 5,000 pounds last year.

The Agriculture Department continued special training programs in cooperation with the East-West Center. Thirty-five participants took part in a Root Crops Interchange in Palau; 11 spent three months in Hawaii on Plant Quarantine and tropical crop production training projects; and one senior Micronesian agriculturist studied citriculture in Japan. The principal entomologist for the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association conducted a six-week rat abatement methods training program at the Trust Territory Farm Institute in Ponape with 30 participants in attendance.

The Plant Pathologist spent most of his time during the year investigating the causes of a serious breadfruit disease first reported from Pingelap Atoll in Ponape District in the early 1950s. The disease is spreading to other districts. Destruction has been very severe, destroying 60–80 percent of bearing trees where it has hit. The effect on the local subsistence economy of the atoll islands is serious, and concentrated attention is being given to the problem. Outside experts currently are in the Territory studying the disease in conjunction with the Territory's plant pathologist and under joint auspices of the Territory and the East-West Center.

The Oriental Fruit Fly eradication program on Tinian and Saipan is complete. A re-infestation of the Melon Fly occurred on Rota, and re-eradication is in progress in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture on that island.

The forestry-conservation program, started a year ago, devoted much time to preparing guidelines and policies in this field. Proposed legislation was drawn up for the establishment of territorial parks, forests and other types of conservation areas. The Forestry-Conservation Officer maintains headquarters in Palau, and methods of reforesting eroded and deteriorated lands of that district are being investigated and will receive first attention with similar reforestation projects being launched later in the other districts.

LAND MANAGEMENT

A new division of Land Management was established in our Resources and Development Department, and a new Director of Land Management joined our staff in February 1966. He came to us from our neighboring Trust Territory of New Guinea, and is a most welcome addition to our staff. A 12-day Land Management Conference with Land Title and Survey representatives from every district was held at Trust Territory Headquarters, Saipan, in April 1966. The Director also serves as Land Claims Administrator. The Division of Land Management during the year was involved with granting of homesteading deeds, surveying, master planning in various districts, lease inspections, and mapping and boundary surveys.

TRANSPORTATION

Considerable advances and improvements in air service were made since the last reporting period. Three years ago our small air fleet carried approximately 4,000 passengers annually. During FY 1965 our airline carried 24,500 passengers. Earlier this past year, an additional DC–4 aircraft was acquired, and scheduled DC–4 service is now being provided to all districts except Ponape where water landing still necessitates use of amphibious aircraft.

Recent indications of interest in possible commercial operation of airlines within the Territory have increased hopes of additional links with neighboring areas of the world. As our future development grows, there is no question that air service must be expanded and improved, and I am hopeful that such expansion can be carried out within the framework of a commercial airline operation.

A completely new arrangement for ship transportation was arranged during the year. Last August (1965) we entered into a new contractual arrangement by which a shipping corporation of New York operates our three large logistic vessels: the M/V *Gunners Knot,* M/V *Pacific Islander;* and the M/V *Palau Islander.* An important feature, both from an operational and economic standpoint is that the shipping company concerned, under the laws of the Trust Territory, has chartered a local organization called the Micronesian Line to operate the vessels. Seventeen Micronesians serve as licensed officers in addition to almost exclusive Micronesian crews on these vessels.

All district field trip vessels, formerly operated by outside contract, now are being run by local Micronesian shipping companies. To provide for the field trip service requirements to areas where there is limited revenue, the government supplies operating subsidies to defray portions of the operating costs.

INFORMATION AND RADIO BROADCASTING

With the return of 12 employees this past year from training in Hawaii, the Broadcast network has 35 full time employees, of which 25 have had professional training.

Plans have been made to send an additional group of 12 to the East-West Center for the final stages of our three-year training program.

It may be of special interest to the Council to know that each of the district stations receives weekly by airmail two United Nations programs, i.e., "This Week at the UN" and "Scope." All district stations have a program of educational broadcasting and special programs in adult education. Transcription services from major distribution sources have been required for distribution to all stations. Local programs in the vernacular presently take up about 25% of the broadcast day. Presentation of world news throughout the network has been organized and every district has news broadcasts in the vernacular and in English on a daily basis.

The Broadcast Center also records important conferences, duplicates broadcast materials for various departments and operates a tape duplication service for all activities. It is also responsible for coordinating all recording functions for the Congress of Micronesia. Full broadcast coverage of the second session of the Congress of Micronesia will be undertaken this year with all district broadcast station managers in attendance during the session to provide vernacular material for broadcasting daily sessions to all the districts.

Several noteworthy projects in the general communication area were accomplished during the year. At Headquarters in Saipan, the completion of the Territory-wide receiver station has resulted in a greatly improved message flow through elimination of the Guam relay. Formerly all messages had to pass through a circuit in Guam.

Four additional two-way radio stations were established on remote islands, making a total of 32 such out-island radio links with the district centers. Another 20 such two-way radio units have been purchased and will be installed within the next few months. We will then have furnished two-way radio communications to all remote islands having sizeable permanent populations.

We are closely watching the development and availability of new techniques in the communications world. New techniques, now in an experimental stage, may offer significant benefits to our area.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The field of Public Health is one of very special interest to the Council this year in relation to the Report of the World Health Organization.

The improvement of public health in the Territory has been, and continues to be, one of the basic goals of our Administration. We have struggled against many odds, not the least of which has been difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified medical personnel. It should be kept in mind that the goal of the Administering Authority as stated by the late President Kennedy, is to bring the health services in the Territory to at least the minimum acceptable standards of a community of the United States. The Administration long has stated that this goal is yet to be reached and I would be less than candid were I to imply that we expected to reach it in the immediate future.

I feel it is worthy of special attention that the W.H.O. Report opens on this theme and in its introduction notes that this objective could be achieved only by stages.

Let me say also that we have found the W.H.O. Report to be most helpful in aiding us to pinpoint problem areas. I assure the Council that each and every conclusion and recommendation has received and will continue to receive careful scrutiny.

The Headquarters Department of Health increased its staff during the year by the addition of a Director of Dental Services, a Chief Pharmacist, a Sanitary Engineer, and a Medical Equipment Technician.

A new Director for the Department has been tentatively selected and we hope to make a final decision within the next few weeks. With his employment, we expect orderly improvement in the health program to follow.

The Territory-wide immunization program is 95–100% completed except for the Marshalls out-islands where population is so widely scattered, and in all districts booster shots are being given. Influenza vaccination was included among the regular immunization this year. The out-island immunization program also now has been launched in the Marshalls, and immunization teams are accompanying the field trip vessels as they visit the outlying atolls. We are hopeful that we can complete the Marshalls District's basic immunization program this coming year.

Tuberculosis control is receiving special attention. In Palau, for example, since the W.H.O. team visited the Territory, a districtwide T.B. survey has been carried out, and some 6,700 persons were x-rayed. Of this number only 67 were suspected of having the disease, and follow-up on these persons is underway. Similar intensive surveys as yet have not been possible in all the other districts, but I assure the Council that these will be conducted as rapidly as our staff and resources permit. I expect the Peace Corps Health island workers to contribute greatly in this area as well as in the field of leprosy control.

At this time arrangements are underway for a team from Hawaii to survey the leprosy problem in the Territory and to make recommendations to strengthen our treatment program. Hawaii has had considerable experience with this disease.

An extensive dental survey is being made. Eight thousand children have already been examined in two of the districts, Palau and Truk.

During the past year the Trust Territory started a family planning program. Family planning services are made available to those who desire such services, according to their personal and religious beliefs. It is not offered as a mass program.

Since November 1965, we have installed new x-ray machines in the hospitals at Majuro, Ponape, and Saipan, with a fourth new x-ray machine to be placed in operation in a new x-ray room at the Yap Hospital next month.

These new x-ray machines are 200-milliamp units, the latest models. They can take suitable x-rays of all types, and can also be used for fluoroscopic work. Two hospitals, Truk and Palau, still are using 150-milliamp units, but these are in good working condition. A new 200-milliamp model is planned for the new x-ray department of the new Truk Hospital plant. A new x-ray machine also will replace the older unit in Palau Hospital so that within the next year or two there will be standardized and new x-ray equipment in all of the district hospitals.

A qualified medical equipment technician is now on our staff to keep x-ray units and all types of medical and dental equipment in working order. It is planned that this technician will conduct a formal training course for x-ray technicians and medical equipment repairmen in the near future. Twelve candidates, 6 in each category, are expected to commence this training. Plans also call for replacing or installing new x-ray units or a portable type in the sub-hospital units.

During the past year, the Trust Territory Government was in close contact with the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Delmar Ruthig of the Division of International Health spent six months in the Territory as a consultant, aiding in the reorganization of the Department of Public Health and in making improvements to our medical care and public health programs.

The United States Public Health Service provided a special consultant to make an intensive study of the mental health problems of the Territory, and the recommendations of this specialist are now in the process of being implemented. Construction of mental health facilities at Ponape and Truk is scheduled for the near future in advance of the construction of the new hospitals which are slated for these two districts. It is proposed to use these two new mental health facilities for patients from the other districts as well.

The University of Hawaii School of Public Health and the State Department of Health are furnishing continuing assistance to the Territory in the fields of epidemiology, medical care, public health and paramedical fields.

The new Sanitary Engineer is devoting special attention to the problems of environmental sanitation.

New hospital equipment was on order at the time of the W.H.O. team visit, and most of this has been installed. Additional equipment is on order, or will be ordered this coming year.

Three Micronesians graduated from the Fiji Medical School at Suva as Assistant Medical Officers and began their internship in Trust Territory hospitals last December. In the paramedical fields, three laboratory technicians graduated from the Suva Medical School, as did one x-ray technician. Twelve nurses graduated from the Trust Territory School of Nursing, and six special candidates with many years of practical nursing experience successfully passed the examination after one year of training in the Trust Territory School of Nursing. Refresher training for medical officers, nurses, and other support staff continued in Honolulu under the joint auspices of the Trust Territory and East-West Center. A senior medical officer completed a W.H.O. fellowship in Leprosy, and participants attended W.H.O. seminars in Manila on Leprosy, Filariasis, and Intestinal Parasitic diseases. Additional public health scholarships were awarded for this coming year making a total of 36 such scholarships in existence.

The Rehabilitation Center at Majuro is in operation. It has two physical therapists and one M.D. on the staff. A surgical team from Honolulu also visited the Center to perform rehabilitative surgery and will return periodically for follow-up and to treat other cases.

During this past year a six-month pilot project was planned for the Truk District under which the clinical supervisor, an M.D., using his own 35-foot motor sailing ketch will visit the islands of Western Truk and the Eastern Truk out-islands, following up on immunizations already given instituting a program for filariasis and treatment, as well as providing general medical care. He will be bringing modern medicine within the reach of hundreds of out-islanders who do not now regularly receive such benefits.

A great deal still remains to be done to improve public health at all levels in the Territory, but I feel we have made real progress this past year.

STATUS OF RONGELAPESE

The 12th annual medical survey of the people of Rongelap was carried out in March 1966 by a joint AEC-Trust Territory medical team. The general health of the Rongelap people appeared to be good. There had been no disease epidemic and no unusual illnesses had occurred. In view of previous findings, thyroid examinations were carried out on a large number of unexposed people at both Rongelap and Utirik to compare incidence of thyroid nodules in the exposed Rongelapese. It is felt that the slight increase in thyroid nodule cases in the Rongelap group may in part be related to inconsistent hormone therapy which had been instituted in September 1965. Two hypothyroid boys who had shown growth retardation showed considerable improvement and spurt in growth following hormone treatment. Five other cases were taken to Brookhaven National Laboratory in late May of this year for examination and surgery. All have responded favorably to treatment and have returned. Of six previous similar cases on which thyroidectomy or partial thyroidectomy had been performed in 1964 and 1965, no reoccurrence has been found.

I am pleased to report that U.S. Public Law 88–485 which granted $950,000 in compassionate payment to the Rongelapese was implemented with the distribution of the money to the beneficiaries. I might note that the attorney representing the beneficiaries was present on Rongelap during the final negotiations and payment. The Council will be interested to know that the great majority of the recipients elected to draw only a few hundred dollars in cash and deposited the rest of their funds in bank savings accounts and propose only to use the interest.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Our community development program, which formerly confined itself to a few selected rural communities, this past year expanded its scope of activities to include urban programs. There has been growing recognition of the need for community services in congested, socially chaotic urban areas, where over 40 per cent of the Territory's population now resides.

Significant community development projects in eight selected rural communities this past year included projects in environmental sanitation and rodent control, typhoon cleanup, procurement of community copra boats and copra-hauling trucks, procurement of diesel generators for village electricity supply and the like. In women's affairs, a two-week Women's Family Living Seminar was held in the Marshalls for 71 women leaders in joint collaboration with the East-West Center. Two women trainees, one from Yap and one from Palau, were sent to Fiji for a year's study at the South Pacific-sponsored Women's Community Education Training Center; arrangements were concluded for the services for two years of a Girl Scout leader to organize troops and train Micronesian Scout leaders. As a result of intensive work, four districts—Palau, Marshalls, Ponape and Yap—have very active women's interest programs.

Under the youth program, primarily concentrated in Palau, the Youth Corps participated in forestry conservation activities, brick-making for building low-cost pilot houses, and worked on village sanitation projects.

The Community Development Section also will be playing a key role in the use of Peace Corps Volunteers since much of the work of the volunteers will center around community development projects in isolated rural villages.

LEGAL

An event of considerable significance and one which previously has been debated in this Council occurred this past year when the Congress of Micronesia passed Public Law No. 1–7 which provided for jury trials in certain criminal cases and in certain civil actions at the option of the various district legislatures. Two districts, Marianas and Palau, have adopted enabling legislation to permit jury trials. Since the jury system is a completely new concept in Micronesia, mock or demonstration trials have been held in various districts with members of the High Court, District Courts and members of the Attorney General's staff participating. First jury trials in the Trust Territory are expected to take place at sittings in Marianas and Palau this forthcoming year.

Public Law 1–3 passed by the Congress of Micronesia at its first session provided for the compilation, codification and publication of public laws and regulations of the Territory and established a Committee on the Code to accomplish this task. This new committee replaced the former Code Committee which had been appointed by the High Commissioner and which has been at work reviewing the Code.

REHABILITATION OF EBEYE

At the 32nd Session, the Special Representative described in some detail the first phase of the rehabilitation of the island of Ebeye. The second phase of the Ebeye Improvement Project is underway, and work on demolition of all existing sub-standard housing is starting this week. Complete new apartment units, each having indoor salt-water flushing sanitary facilities, electricity and fresh water facilities will soon rise all over the island to join the units built in the first phase. There will be a new power plant, repairs to the dock, a fresh-water catchment, an island-wide salt-water pressure system and an island-wide sewer system. Along with this rehabilitation of basic housing facilities, the Administration will build new school classrooms, and plans call for the rehabilitation and expansion of the present sub-hospital unit.

It is recognized that even with these improvements Ebeye living conditions will pose many remaining problems which must have and will receive continuing attention.

From the foregoing report I believe we can say with some pride and confidence that we are making progress in the Trust Territory.

This is not to ignore or deny that many problems and needs remain. It is our responsibility to see that these needs are met within the financial and human resources available to us.

The population of the area is growing rapidly at a rate of about four per cent per year. It is a young population, eager to learn, hungering for education, and with rising aspiration and hope for enlarged opportunity.

So in all fields of education, health, community and political development, and economic development, there are growing and justified demands for further improvement in services and facilities.

We must be responsive to these demands and the patterns of growth and change which are inevitable.

We recognize the trust placed in our administration and are determined to fulfill our obligation to the People of Micronesia.

SPECIAL ADVISER NUUAN REPORTS TO U.N. TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I placed in the RECORD the opening statement presented by High Commissioner William R. Norwood, before the United Nations Trusteeship Council on June 27. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert herewith the remarks made by Mr. Francis Nuuan, of Yap, a Member of the Congress of Micronesia, who served as special adviser to the U.S. delegation. Mr. Nuuan's remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF MR. FRANCIS NUUAN, SPECIAL ADVISER TO THE U.S. DELEGATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL, JUNE 27, 1966

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Administering Authority and this much-honoured body for making it possible for me to appear before you. This is a moment which the Micronesians look forward to each year, the moment when we may be represented on a council which deals with and upholds the interests of the Trust Territory people.

In addressing you, I do not wish to take up the time of this Council by dwelling upon the physical and the cultural problems of the Territory which make development most difficult. Many members of this Council have visited the Territory and know from first-hand information the nature of the problems of our area.

I would like to share with you the views of my people, in a very general way, with regard to the over-all development of the Trust Territory. I do not wish to try to duplicate the report of the High Commissioner, Mr. Norwood, nor even to speak of the development of the Territory, with many aspects of which I am not intimately familiar.

I believe it is in order to make mention of the progress in the Trust Territory that has been made under this Administration, especially within the last four years, progress which I feel is most remarkable. Now, there may be many among my people, and even among members of this group, who may think otherwise. However, one looks at it, though, one must not be blind-folded and must keep in mind the point that "progress" is a very qualitative word. When the term "progress" is used to describe programmes of the Trust Territory, or of any area, for that matter, it must be evaluated in the light of the past experience of the area.

I am overwhelmingly intrigued by the developments that have taken place. Outstanding in the political sphere is to be noted the inauguration of the first Congress of Micronesia. This body has taken over the legislative power that was once the sole prerogative of the High Commissioner. The Congress of Micronesia, once only a dream, now stands as an embodiment of the wishes of the people. The formation of the Congress also pointed out very vividly the fact that the Micronesian people can work together for a common goal, one that is beneficial to the welfare of the entire area.

It must be noted that, in addition to the legislative power now held by the Congress of Micronesia, a great number of responsible, policy-making positions are now being held by Micronesians in the executive branch of our government.

When speaking of the economy and of the social development of the area, I would like to point out that my remarks will be limited in scope and vision since economic problems can be treated only by experts in such fields.

I should like to point out once again that the people of Micronesia have expressed their discontent many times with regard to the slow pace of economic development in the area. This is especially true in the development of transportation. New roads and improvement of existing roads, the opening of channels and docking facilities and additional airfields are all needed. There is a definite demand, indeed, for the extension of water and electrical power to the Micronesian communities. All of these have an important bearing on the economic and social development of the area. Most of you are well aware of these and of many other demands of the people, and this is not the first time that the people have expressed their concern over the need for these services.

The Congress of Micronesia in its inaugural session expressed keen interest in rapid economic development of the area. At the moment, we are looking forward to the findings of the economic development team, which we hope will serve as guidelines for the economic development of the Territory. It is hoped that this group will provide an objective report of the economic potentials and offer, at the same time, constructive recommendations that can be used as guidelines.

It is a known fact that economic development of the area is very limited. The natural and human resources that are basic to any development are very meagre. Nevertheless, there may be possibilities that commercial enterprises, now unprofitable or incapable of development by the Micronesians themselves, could be developed either by government sponsorship or by foreign investment. All such ventures, I feel, must provide opportunities for Micronesian participation.

As for the introduction of foreign firms and capital to develop the economy of the area, there is not much that I can say about it. I know one thing to be certain, and that is that the Micronesian people seem to contradict themselves to some extent. They want vast economic exploitation; yet, at the same time they want protection of their interests as well as of their cultural heritage.

In the social affairs of the area, interesting developments are taking place. One remarkable development is in the advancement of education for the Micronesian people. This is to be accredited largely to the programme widely known in the Territory as the accelerated elementary school programme, under which many modern school buildings have been built. American teachers as well as educational facilities have been provided to upgrade the elementary education programme.

It should be borne in mind, however, that these programmes have not solved all the problems facing educational development in the Territory. I believe it is in order to mention that in Yap the educational facilities and school buildings still are in need of development, especially in the outer islands. Outworn school buildings are still being used and few American teachers as yet have been able to be sent to the outer islands.

I can add little to what has been said about the existing health and sanitation problems in the Territory. We have found that only so much could be accomplished in the past by the Administration's limited funds. The report of a World Health Organization on the Territory points out many of the health problems that still need to be solved.

In conclusion, I should like to mention the fact that my people are aware of the problems encountered in the development of these far-flung and scattered islands. I give credit to the Administering Authorities for the progress which has been made under difficult conditions and limited budgets. I know that the Administering Authority has plans for a more rapid development, and the people of Micronesia look forward to the implementation of expanded as well as new programmes in all areas of development.

We know that these new projects, such as the Peace Corps Programme and the expansion of capital improvement requirements, will do much to speed development. The people of Micronesia welcome these new programmes and will give them their support.

Within a few weeks—actually on 11 July—I shall be sitting in the Second Session of the Congress of Micronesia. Among the many things which will be debated in that session will be the deliberations of this body. I shall be most pleased to convey to my colleagues the greetings of this body as well as to report on the deliberations of this session. Mr. President, I thank you for the privilege of appearing before the Trusteeship Council.

CULVER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION ON REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to exclude from taxable income reimbursements an individual receives for moving expenses when he is transferred by his company.

Personnel managers, company presidents, and individual employees of a number of firms with plants in northeast Iowa have brought to my attention the financial burden which thousands of talented people must bear when employers transfer them from one plant or office to another. The reimbursements these employees receive to cover their moving expenses are now held to be taxable as income, even though they have realized no real additional income, but are only being reimbursed for expenses incurred as part of their job.

We are all well aware of the high costs of moving a family and possessions from one part of the country to another, and it is very possible that a reimbursement for such expenses could place an individual in a higher income bracket. A constituent of mine who was "fortunate" enough to receive two promotions within a year, each of which required major moves at considerable expense, suddenly found himself faced with a bill for over $2,000 for back income taxes and interest on the reimbursements he received from his employer for those expenses.

This problem is particularly significant in Iowa since over one-fifth of the Nation's 500 largest manufacturers operate more than 260 plants in our State.

I realize that we must be extremely cautious about reducing tax revenues at this time, but I believe that it is unfair to penalize hard work, initiative, and ambition—which has been rewarded by a promotion and transfer—by taxing these reimbursements.

The legislation which I have introduced will exempt from taxable income only actual reimbursements paid by an employer for reasonable moving expenses, if the taxpayer has been employed for a minimum of 1 year and is moved more than 20 miles in the course of his job. The exemptions would include expenses for: First, moving of household goods and personal effects; second, traveling within the continental United States, including meals and lodging, to the new residence, and third, certain costs incurred in change of housing.

I urge my colleagues in the House to give their careful attention to this problem in the coming weeks, and I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken by the Congress this year.

THE ECONOMY OF AROOSTOOK COUNTY, MAINE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the economy of Aroostook County, in my State of Maine is based upon the agricultural industry, and the Maine potato has formed the base of that economy.

So important is the annual potato crop that it determines if the county prospers or wants. If the crop is abundant and prices good, the people of Aroostook are prosperous. If the crop is poor or prices drop, there is little money to buy the necessities of life.

It is accurate to say that Aroostook County has always had a one-crop economy. As a consequence, its destiny has been tied to the vagaries of weather and to the equally unpredictable price of a perishable commodity.

For a long time, we in Maine have sought a means to diversify our agricultural industry in order to stabilize our economy. Less than 2 years ago, Aroostook County realized this hope when the U.S. Department of Agriculture granted Maine an allotment of 33,000 acres for the production of sugarbeets.

As you can readily appreciate, this development was greeted with joy in Maine, and viewed as a long-awaited means for strengthening the economy of agricultural Aroostook County.

Today, the first commercial crop of sugarbeets is growing in Maine soil. At Easton, Maine, a vast sugarbeet processing plant is nearing completion, scheduled to be operational at harvesttime.

The plant is being built by Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., at a cost of $14,700,000. Loans of Federal ARA funds, as well as a loan from the Maine Industrial Building Authority have made possible the construction of this plant, and I can attest to the fact that much study of the feasibility and economic soundness of this project preceded the decision of the Federal and State agencies to invest in it. The soundness of this investment, as well as its importance to Maine and Aroostook County, have been established beyond question.

So convinced of the merits of Maine's new industry are these agencies that just 2 weeks ago, the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce awarded a new loan in the amount of $2,250,300 to Maine Sugar Industries, Inc. These funds will be used to help provide additional machinery and equipment for the processing of raw sugar cane.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this will greatly increase the economic potential of Maine's sugar industry. The additional loan will enable the refinery to create more thar 400 new permanent jobs.

Today, my respected colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], has challenged the wisdom of the new EDA loan. He bases his misgivings on the mistaken belief that sugarbeets cannot be commercially grown in Maine.

My honored colleague has been misinformed, for it has clearly been demonstrated that sugarbeets of excellent quality can be raised in Aroostook County. Many were grown there in test plots last year and millions more are growing in the vast and beautiful fields of northern Maine at this very moment.

Experimental plots of sugarbeets have been grown for the past 3 years. These experiments have provided the facts needed to help growers to raise sugarbeet crops successfully.

Last year, the University of Maine Cooperative Extension Service grew 466 acres of sugarbeets in 46 demonstration plots located in all areas of Aroostook County.

In the report on their findings they concluded as follows:

> The 1965 plots demonstrated that sugarbeets can be profitably produced in Aroostook County. In view of the yields in 1965, up to 19 tons per acre and sugar content of 17 percent average yields of up to 15 tons and sugar content of 16 percent for the area seem easily attainable. There is every reason to believe that sugarbeets will become a valuable crop in conjunction with potatoes and provide a stable second source of income for the economy of the county and State.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to share this information with my colleagues and to allay any fears which may have been aroused. Maine is in the sugar industry to stay, and I have every confidence that it will be a thriving industry.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on this eighth anniversary of Captive Nations Week I rise in this citadel of freedom, the U.S. House of Representatives, to plead for those whose freedom has been stolen by the masters of the Kremlin.

At this time when national attention is focused upon the Far East it is well for us to keep vivid in our minds those proud peoples, the Albanians, Bulgarians, the Czechs, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Poles, and Rumanians whose national identity has been submerged by Soviet imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this House and all American to remember that we must not rest until all the people of the world are allowed to achieve their own destiny in their own way. More than 40 years ago, President Woodrow Wilson said that self-determination was a cornerstone of our foreign policy, and we should not be deterred until every nation in the world is free to determine for itself what form of government it shall have.

ACTION NEEDED NOW TO ELIMINATE FEDERAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR MUNICIPAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when States, cities, and their dummy corporations issue tax-exempt securities to finance industrial development, they are merely serving as conduits for transmitting Federal tax-exemption privileges to private, profitmaking businesses. As a serious abuse of the traditional Federal tax-exemption privilege extended to States and their subdivisions for financing public capital expenditures, the practice has long been of concern. But its scale, breadth, and rapid growth in recent months make it imperative that action be taken now to eliminate the abuse.

The new factors are these: The flow of tax-exempt municipal industrial bonds has assumed floodlike proportions; the number of very large issues is more frequent, and some massive ones are planned; ingenious techniques are being used to maximize the gains and to eliminate the risks of this type of financing which could further swell the volume; large cities and entire States are about to participate on a major scale; and more businesses of different types are learning that they too had better get on the gravy train.

VOLUME NOW HUGE

From a volume of $12 million in 1955, municipal industrial development financing increased to $100 million in 1963, and to $200 million in 1965. But in 1966, this steadily increasing flow turned into a flood of $300 million during the first 4 months of the year alone, and estimates for the year as a whole range from a conservative $700 million up to $1 billion or more.

At $1 billion, State and local giveaway financing of private business is huge by any measure. It is more than 20 percent of the $4.7 billion of new corporate bonds issued by all manufacturing firms in 1965. It is about 10 percent of the $10 to $11 billion annual total of all State and local securities marketed in the past 2 years. It is more than 10 percent of the total new issues of the Federal Government in 1965.

The rate of increase as well as the expected total volume of new municipal industrial issues this year should be more than sufficient to warn us to act now. Already, their relatively high coupon rates have helped to drive up interest costs for ordinary tax-exempt municipals to the highest levels since 1934. With the booming demand for money, even at higher interest rates, the States and localities are finding it difficult to find buyers for their relatively small-scale water, sewer, and school issues as major investment underwriters naturally concentrate on attractive municipal industrials.

And there are omens of worse to come if we do not stem the flood.

LARGE ISSUES MORE FREQUENT AND MASSIVE NEW ONES PLANNED

Until 1961, when the little town of Cherokee, Ala., sold a $25 million issue to build a chemical plant for Armour & Co., large single issues were a rarity. They have since come thick and fast.

Here is the record on very large issues in the intervening period:

In 1962: $25 million by Opelika, Ala., for U.S. Rubber Co.

In 1963: $50 million by Lewisport, Ky., for an aluminum plant for Harvey Aluminum Co.

In 1964: $23 million by Helena, Ark., for Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Corp. to build fertilizer manufacturing facilities; $22,500,000 by Maricopa County, Ariz., for American Sugar Refining Co.; $20 million by Blytheville, Ark., to build an anhydrous ammonia plant for Continental Oil Co.; $45 million by Prattville, Ala., to build manufacturing facilities for Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp.

In 1965: $25,500,000 by Selma, Ala., for Hammermill Paper Corp.; $45 million by Phenix City, Ala., for Mead Corp. and Inland Container Corp.; $55 million by Scottsboro, Ala., for Revere Copper & Brass Co.

In 1966: $60 million by Clinton, Iowa, for a plastics and petrochemical plant for the Skelly Oil Co. and American Can Co.; $30 million by Lorain, Ohio, for shipbuilding facilities for Litton Industries of Los Angeles; $34,400,000 by Ashland, Ky., for a steel plant for Armco Steel Corp.; $35 million by Northern Delaware Industrial Corp. for the Phoenix Steel Corp.; $70 million by Camden, Ala., to build lumber, plywood, and paperboard facilities for United Fruit Co. and MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River Ltd. of Canada; announcement of $36 million issue by Winchester, Ky., to construct a heavy truck drive axle manufacturing facility for Rockwell-Standard Corp.; discussion of $50 million issue by Iowa for an anhydrous ammonia fertilizer plant for Sinclair Oil Co.

Even these huge issues will be overshadowed by two additional proposals now in the works.

The New York Port Authority proposes to issue $500 million in tax-exempts to construct a World Trade Center in Manhattan, consisting of two 110-story skyscrapers with 10 million square feet of space, 40 percent of which will be leased to private businesses and is intended to produce $10 million per year annual profit to the port authority.

The State of Ohio, through its Ohio Development Financing Commission, plans a series of tax-exempt issues, beginning with one of $100 million, designed to produce $10 million in arbitrage profits per $100 million issue, which will then be used for industrial development. This ingenious adaption of an old technique deserves a special look since its use, now pending Treasury approval, would encourage massive industrial development issues—the bigger the better—as well as issues for other State and local purposes.

ARBITRAGE PROFITS AND THEIR INCENTIVES FOR MASSIVE TAX-EXEMPT INDUSTRIAL ISSUES

For a number of years, States and localities have increasingly taken advantage of the spread in interest rates between tax-exempt municipals and commercial bank certificates of deposit or Treasury bills, by advanced refunding of maturing tax-exempt issues. For this purpose, a municipality sells notes or issues new tax-exempts before the maturity date of the outstanding issue and makes a profit for the intervening period on the difference between the lower interest it pays and what is paid on a bank certificate of deposit or on a Treasury bill.

The proposed State of Ohio industrial development tax-exempt bond plan is an adaptation of this scheme. The proceeds of the hundreds of millions of new tax-exempt industrials will be invested entirely in riskless Federal Government securities wih similar coupons and maturities. The difference in present capital values will be skimmed off the top and used to build plants for private industry.

Here is a description of how it works which appeared in the June 27, 1966, issue of U.S. News & World Report:

> Suppose [Ohio] sells 300 million dollars in bonds and puts 250 million of the proceeds into Treasury bonds maturing in 1990. It uses the remaining 50 million to help localities finance new industries.
>
> Here's how it can work out: Those Treasury bonds are selling on the market at about 83—or $830 for a $1,000 bond. The 250 millions, thus, will buy 300 millions in Treasury bonds.
>
> So, when the Treasury bonds mature in 1990, the commission will cash them and use the proceeds to pay off the 300 millions in bonds that it has issued.
>
> The planners have another angle. The Treasury bonds will be pledged to guarantee interest and principal on the bonds the commission sells. With a guarantee like that, the commission's tax-exempt bonds may well be sold at an interest cost as low as 3½ per cent.
>
> That 3½ per cent in annual interest is just what the commission will be collecting on its 300 million dollars in Treasury bonds—brought at 250 million.
>
> Result: The interest return on the Treasury bonds will pay the interest cost on the commission's bonds.

Obviously, what will work on $300 million for Ohio could work equally well for any other State, and if it works for hundreds of millions, why not for billions? While this technique may become attractive as a way of financing ordinary municipals, its success in Ohio cannot fail to tempt State treasurers from coast to coast, in the North as well as the South, to issue massive-sized tax-exempts for industrial financing.

MAJOR NEW AREAS EXPECTED TO ENTER COMPETITION

Until recently, tax-exempt municipals for industrial development were exploited vigorously mainly by certain States of the South, notably Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. This day is past. Ohio, Iowa, and Kansas have already entered actively in the competition. All together, some 38 States have prepared or are preparing legislation to use tax-exemption privileges for industrial purposes, and the stage is set for an escalation of unfair competition to nationwide industrial warfare.

As I reported in my remarks to the House on June 20, a portent of what is to come is the announcement that New York City will establish a quasi-public body, financed by tax-free municipal industrial bonds which will build manufacturing plants, warehouses, truck terminals, and other facilities for lease to private firms.

My own State of Wisconsin has authorized county development corporations, including one in Milwaukee, to undertake a form of tax-free industrial financing.

What is happening is that northern industrial cities and areas are getting fed up with the pirating of jobs and industries by those areas which have unscrupulously used the lure of cheaper tax-exempt financing. The inevitable is in course of happening as the North rushes to make good its losses. And, in this war as in others, all will emerge losers, including the Southern States whose advantage was in direct proportion to the restraint of other areas.

MORE COMPANIES AND A GREATER VARIETY OF ENTERPRISES SEEK BENEFITS OF TAX-EXEMPT FINANCING

The list which follows of well-known companies known to have received or are about to receive the advantages of tax-exempt municipal industrial financing reads like a "Blue Book" of American business:

Allied Paper Co.
American Can Co.
American Machine and Foundry.
American Sugar Refining Company.
Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.
Armco Steel Corp.
Armour & Co.
Arvin Industries.
Brunswick Corp.
Camp Paper Co.
Continental Oil Co.
Cooper Tire and Rubber Corp.
Crane Co.
Cutler-Hammer Corporation.
Cutter Laboratories.
Diamond Alkali.
Emerson Electric.
Flintkote.
General American Transportation.
General Tire and Rubber.
Georgia-Pacific.
Great Lakes Carbon.
Hammermill Paper Corporation.
Harvey Aluminum.
H. K. Parker.
Inland Container Corp.
Litton Industries.
MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River, Ltd.
Mead Corp.
Mohawk Tire & Rubber.
Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Co.
Olin-Mathieson Corp.
John Oster Manufacturing Co.
Phoenix Steel Corp.
Rand McNally Corp.
Revere Copper and Brass Co.
Rockwell-Standard Corp.
Rubberoid Corp.
Safeway Stores.
Sinclair Oil Co.
Skelly Oil Co.
Spreckles Sugar Co.
Sunbeam Corp.
Swift & Co.
True Temper Corp.
Union Bag Co.
United Fruit Co.
U.S. Rubber Corp.
U.S. Shoe Corp.

The great majority of the tax-exempt issues benefiting these companies have been used for the construction of new factories and manufacturing facilities. But the lure of cheaper financing is bound to be as great for modernizing or expanding old facilities as well as for building new ones, for retailers and shipbuilders as well as manufacturers, and, indeed, for banks and real estate interests as for any other sector of the economy.

And examples of each of these new uses of tax-exempt municipal financing are now to be found.

Delaware through its Northern Delaware Industrial Development Corp. raised $35 million to buy a defunct plant of the Phoenix Steel Corp. and, in addition, to pay for its modernization.

Kentucky used its $34,400,000 issue of 1966 to add to facilities for Armco Steel Corp., already located in Ashland, Ky.

Wichita, Kans., agreed to raise $6 million in tax-exempts for expansion at Cessna Aircraft, a leading firm in the city.

Topeka, Kans., in 1965 agreed to use the proceeds of a $3,700,000 issue to build a store and a large parking garage for the well-known New York retail store, R. H. Macy & Co.

Great Bend, Kans., has more recently agreed to raise $900,000 to build a store for J. C. Penney Co.

Lorain, Ohio, raised $30 million to enable Litton Industries to go into the shipbuilding business at that location.

Wichita, Kans., proposes to raise $1 million to build a bank and office building for the Stockyards National Bank of North Wichita.

The New York Port Authority's proposed $500 million issue to build a World Trade Center will put it massively into the real estate business.

Now that the potentialities of tax-exempt financing for private business have been demonstrated by the "pioneers" in a wide variety of business fields as well as in manufacturing, there is every evidence that many others will rush to seek the same advantage. Mr. James F. Reilly, partner in Goodbody & Co., a New York investment firm specializing in the underwriting of municipal industrial development issues, is quoted in the Wall Street Journal of April 1, 1966, as saying that businessmen are losing reservations they may once have had about municipal financing.

Said Mr. Reilly:

> They used to be skittish because critics called this type of financing socialistic—but industry is rapidly getting hard-headed because borrowing costs are going up so fast—

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

Mr. Speaker, if we do not act now to close the loophole in the Federal tax law which confers tax exemption privileges on private business, we shall soon be inundated by the pressure of forces which I have outlined. And in the process, some extremely unfortunate consequences will follow.

Plant pirating and uneconomic location and job shifts will accelerate. Not only will the Northern States battle the hitherto advantaged States of the South, but the struggle between the great industrial cities and, indeed, between a city and smaller communities in the same State will intensify. Interest rates on all kinds of State and local borrowing, already at the highest level in a generation, will climb still further. Federal credit restraints will be nullified as large corporate borrowers bypass the private credit market to do their borrowing through the conduit of municipal bonds. The Federal Government will suffer large revenue losses and so will States and cities, as more and more property moves into public ownership. For these public costs, there will be no public gain.

On March 1, 1965, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 5587 and H.R. 5599, which would close the tax loophole. These bills would remove the Federal tax exemption for interest on State or local government obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises. They would in no way encroach upon the right of State and local governments to issue tax-exempt bonds for public purposes.

I am most gratified that Treasury Secretary Fowler is now heading a drive to do away with the Federal income tax exemption on municipal industrial development bonds. In remarks to the House on June 20, I included the Secretary's recent forthright statement to State legislative leaders against this abuse of the tax-exemption privilege. Following his statement, the Wall Street Journal reported on June 20 that Treasury officials are giving the "highest priority" to bring this matter to the Congress during this session. I applaud this recognition by the Treasury of an extremely serious situation, and its determination to act now.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WELTNER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN), for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CRALEY.

Mr. CURTIS to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. **Fulton** of Pennsylvania during his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Todd** (at the request of Mr. **Rees**) to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Leggett** (at the request of Mr. **Rees**) to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Quillen**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Wydler**.

Mr. **Grover**.

Mr. **Pelly**.

Mr. **Bow**.

Mr. **Cahill**.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Rees**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Powell**.

Mr. **Nedzi**.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3112. An act to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3467. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2950. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vesels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13651. An act to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **REES**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2561. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2562. A letter from the Chairman, the Advisory Committee on the Arts, Department of State, transmitting the annual report of the cultural presentations program for the year July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 107, Public Law 87-256; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2822. An act to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 16188. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide limitations on building construction projects for defense purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 16189. A bill to provide for settlement of labor disputes in the transportation and other essential industries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16190. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 16191. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 16192. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16193. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 16194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16195. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 16196. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to undertake a study of landslides and flood control in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16197. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16198. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 16199. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16201. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16202. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 16203. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 16204. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act with respect to mallards three or more generations removed from the wild; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 16205. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 16206. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 16207. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 16208. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 16209. A bill to provide that certain television and radio receiving tubes be appraised under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 16210. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 16211. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 16212. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a special educational training and physical rehabilitation program for persons with educational or physical deficiencies to enable them to serve effectively in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 16213. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 16214. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the elimination of aircraft noise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16215. A bill to amend section 203(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to reduce or eliminate aircraft noise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 16216. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 16217. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 16218. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 16219. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 16220. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 16221. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 16222. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 16223. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16224. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 16225. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 16226. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 16227. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 16228. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 16229. A bill to provide that certain television and radio receiving tubes be appraised under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 16230. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 1211. Joint resolution relative to a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H. Con. Res. 825. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Con. Res. 826. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Con. Res. 827. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 828. Concurrent resolution providing for the parade of the National Convention of the American Legion to be held in the District of Columbia on August 29, 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16231. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Polizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16232. A bill for the relief of June Vernon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16233. A bill for the relief of Virgil Vernon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16234. A bill for the relief of Georgios Dimitrios Sevastelis and his wife, Efstahia Sevastelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16235. A bill for the relief of Hee Ngew Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 16236. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Coyne, Sr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 16237. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Kongas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16238. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Che Fee Lai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 16239. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Esteves Capela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 16240. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Turek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16241. A bill for the relief of Aurelio La Fata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16242. A bill for the relief of Pietro De Gaetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16243. A bill for the relief of Thomas Kaltsanas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 16244. A bill for the relief of Sedley Alleyne Greenidge Haugland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 16245. A bill for the relief of Armindo Santos-Ferreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

411. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Common Council of the City, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to urging enactment of H.R. 12341 relating to "Demonstration Cities" urban renewal program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

412. Also, petition of the Town Board, Town of Southampton, Southampton, N.Y., relative to opposing enactment of H.R. 11236 relating to wet lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of All Wisdom: We quiet our minds at the beginning of this session that we may have high communion with Thee. For we would listen rather than speak, would be still and know that Thou art God. Speak Thou, and our souls shall live.

Especially on this day, as we listen so intently to hear what the people are saying, may we be alert to hear what Thou art saying to the nations, to this Nation of our love and devotion, and to all who are in authority around us.

Give here, we pray, such poise and inner peace as will enable Thy servants in this Chamber to contemplate and comprehend the bewildering movements of our day. We know not what a day—this day—may bring forth. But we know that we are all bound together in the bundle of life. Something could happen this day—anywhere in the world—that would make life different for our Nation and all mankind.

And something might happen in this place that would put a new face on affairs.

So we turn to Thee with the ancient prayer: Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth. Forbid that we multiply and amplify words, and drown out the still, small voice that speaks within. Before any speaking, we pray that there may be sensitive listening and response, and that there may be spoken here this day words that, by Thy grace, may be for the healing of the nations.

In Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 12, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Tuesday, July 12, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives, on July 12, 1966, during the adjournment of the Senate:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination and withdrawing a nomination, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1967, FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 98)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1967, in the amount of $300,000, for the Department of Agriculture which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a protocol was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session. Protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962 (Ex. Rept. No. 6).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3610. A bill for the relief of John Theodore Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3611. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Chambers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York):

S. 3612. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of those who are dedicated to helping retarded children; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3613. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3614. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by, or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance pursuant to, such titles must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRIFFIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I inquire whether this request has been cleared with the minority?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, it has.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have cleared this request with the leadership on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education be authorized to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon for a continuation of the markup session on the elementary-secondary school bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR ROBERT G. PERRY, ASSISTANT TO THE PHYSICIAN OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the funeral services for Robert G. Perry, assistant to the Physician of the Capitol, who died on Tuesday morning, will be held at 9 a.m. on Friday, July 15, at the Simmons Brothers Funeral Home, 1661 Good Hope Road SE., Washington, D.C.

Interment will take place at 10 a.m. on Friday, July 15, in Arlington National Cemetery—Memorial Gate.

Those who wish to pay their respects before the funeral may do so at the funeral on Thursday, July 14, from 10 a.m. to 9 p.m.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP FOR THOSE WHO ARE DEDICATED TO HELPING RETARDED CHILDREN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the National Association for Retarded Children has as its national slogan, "Retarded Children Can Be Helped." It is a slogan worthy of national recognition of the devoted work of over 100,000 persons whose aim is to foster more understanding of these children.

It was not until 1961 that mental retardation got the attention it sorely needed and deserved. In that year, President John F. Kennedy appointed a "President's Panel on Mental Retardation." After a year-long study, the panel made recommendations which were to become the boldest program for remedial action ever envisioned. Two great laws were passed by Congress and signed just 1 month before the President's tragic death.

Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp commemorating those who are dedicated to helping the retarded. The request is supported by the National Association of Retarded Children, and the suggested slogan is their national motto, "Retarded Children Can Be Helped." The bill would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special commemorative postage stamp on October 15, 1967, the date of the NARC Convention to be held in Portland, Oreg.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3612) to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of those who are dedicated to helping retarded children, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger (for herself and Mr. Kennedy of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRYWIDE BARGAINING

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution calling for establishment of a bipartisan Joint Congressional Committee on Industrywide Bargaining to study and report to Congress on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts.

The history of this joint resolution dates back to July 24, 1963, when, at the height of the railroad work rules dispute, I took the floor of the House of Representatives to call upon the Congress to face up squarely to the problems that arise out of industrywide bargaining. At that time, the railroad featherbedding issue was the topic of the day. But I warned then:

> The matter immediately before us is symptomatic, only a sample of more problems to come.

Today, the Nation is faced with a most serious airline strike. The recent walkout by more than 35,000 members of the International Association of Machinists has crippled five of our major airlines and has inconvenienced the public to an intolerable degree. This strike has affected an estimated 150,000 daily air travelers and 4,100 daily flights in 231 cities and 23 foreign nations. Further, it has grounded approximately 70 percent of the Nation's airmail service.

This strike is a damaging blow at a time when our Nation is at war and the services of all of our transportation systems are vitally needed.

This strike demonstrates again that the Nation's labor-management laws—particularly the Railway Labor Act—which applies to airlines—are not adequate. Long ago, Congress should have undertaken, in an orderly fashion, a serious review of our labor laws and the broad policy problems associated with industrywide bargaining and strikes. Furthermore, the Johnson administration should have encouraged such action and should have advanced recommendations of its own.

It is regrettable that the committees of Congress, which are controlled by the President's party, have avoided this serious problem. An excuse, if not a justification, for the failure of Congress may be found in the fact that legislative jurisdiction over labor-management legislation is now scattered among a number of committees in both the Senate and House.

It is apparent that a congressional vehicle needed to cope with this broad problem does not now exist in the organization of the Congress.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am today introducing a joint resolution to set up a Joint Congressional Committee on Industrywide Bargaining. The committee would consist of 16 members, 8 from each House, with membership equally divided between the parties. The committee would include members of the Senate Committees on Labor and Public Welfare, Commerce, and the Judiciary and members of the House Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The committee would be authorized to study and investigate problems related to collective bargaining and strikes and lockouts which affect an entire industry or a substantial portion thereof.

It would be my hope that such a committee could operate in an atmosphere as free as possible from political pressures, that it could make an intensive and scholarly study, and that it would come up with sound legislative recommendations meriting the support of Congress and the Nation.

Mr. President, in 1963, and again in 1965, I introduced in the House of Representatives legislation similar to the joint resolution I introduce today. For a long time, we have needed better procedures and more effective tools to deal with crippling nationwide strikes. If my resolution had been adopted and implemented, it is likely that the Nation today would not be helpless and frustrated in the face of the current strike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 174) to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts, introduced by Mr. Griffin, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 174

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the "Joint Committee on Industrywide Bargaining" (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee") to be composed of eight Members of the Senate to be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker. The members of the joint committee appointed from the Senate shall include four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party; and they shall be designated from among the members of the Committees on Labor and Public Welfare, Commerce, and the Judiciary. The members of the joint committee appointed from the House of Representatives shall include four members of the majority party and four members of the minority party; and they shall be designated from among the members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sec. 2. The joint committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall be authorized to study and investigate the entire field of industrywide and regional collective bargaining procedures and practices between employers and labor organizations, and combinations or groups thereof, and problems relating thereto, including but not limited to—

(1) the ways and means by which the collective bargaining process might be improved, altered, revised, or supplemented so as to avoid or minimize strikes and lockouts which affect an entire industry or region, or a substantial part thereof;

(2) the concentration of economic and other power under the control of business organizations and labor organizations, and groups thereof, and such practices or policies, if any, which tend to concentrate or monopolize power affecting the collective bargaining process, and the relationship of such factors to strikes and lockouts affecting an entire industry or region, or a substantial portion thereof;

(3) the effectiveness and usefulness of various forms of mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and other possible procedures and methods for aiding or supplementing the collective bargaining process;

(4) the administration, operation, and possible need for revision of existing Federal laws which in any way concern collective bargaining, strikes, or lockouts affecting an entire industry or region, or substantial portion thereof;

(5) such other problems and subjects which relate in any way to collective bargaining, strikes, or lockouts as the joint committee deems appropriate.

Sec. 3. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

Sec. 4. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House of Representatives, by bill or otherwise, the results of the joint committee's studies and investigations, together with their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

Sec. 5. In carrying out its duties, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no bill, measure, or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 192 and 194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

Sec. 6. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Sec. 7. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 643

Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Lausche, and Mr. Williams of Delaware) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 644

Mr. MONTOYA submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 14596, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 645

Mr. HART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 14596, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 3328) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of certain medical materials and supplies whenever the remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies is too short to justify their retention, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to join in support of S. 3097 which will provide financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1949 to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures. This idea in itself is certainly a worthwhile plan. There are many structures that exist today in communities throughout the Nation that are of great historical import; however, many local communities do not have the funds that are needed to restore them. This measure would provide, on a limited scale for Federal assistance in the purchase and renovation of these sites so that they might be preserved for posterity.

The historical significance of this bill is noteworthy. However, there are also other features that should be noted. While preserving our national structures, we would at the same time be aiding the various communities in their urban renewal programs, as many of the great sites exist in areas of blight today.

By providing funds for their renovation, an example would be set for an area, and perhaps new industry would be attracted, as tourist attractions are created. The importance of this secondary feature certainly must not be underestimated.

Mr. President, there are certain sections of this bill that might be improved upon before final passage. I hope that the Members of the Senate will concur with me in supporting this measure as still another step in our venture of historical conservation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of this measure, at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Wednesday, July 20, 1966, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

John W. Peck, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

Joseph P. Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Ohio, vice Mel G. Underwood, retired.

Robert A. Ainsworth, Jr., of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

John C. Godbold, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Richard T. Rives, retired.

C. Clyde Atkins, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Florida, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

Donald P. Lay, of Nebraska, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit, vice Harvey M. Johnsen, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself as chairman.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Thursday, July 21, 1966, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Woodrow B. Seals, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Texas, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

Ernest Guinn, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge, western district of Texas, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

Irving L. Goldberg, of Texas, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

William M. Taylor, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Texas, vice T. Whitfield Davidson, retired.

Jack Roberts, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge, western district of Texas, vice Homer Thornberry, elevated.

John V. Singleton, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Texas, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372 approved March 18, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I announce the following seminars and hearings to be held by the subcommittee:

First. Executive session seminars on "Coordination of Federal Science Activities"—July 18 at 10 a.m. for nongovernmental participants and August 3 at 10 a.m. for governmental participants.

Second. Continuation of hearings on Federal support of social and behavioral science research—10 a.m., July 19 and 20.

Third. Hearings on Senate Resolution 231 at 10 a.m., July 25, 26, and 27.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SCHOOL PRAYER

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 148 and related resolutions concerning school prayer.

The hearings will be held on August 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 10, 1966, in room 318, Old Senate Office Building.

Any persons or organizations interested in presenting their views to the subcommittee should contact the subcommittee staff in room 419, Old Senate Office Building, extension 3018.

CANCELLATION OF HEARING ON STATE PROCEDURES RELATING TO UNFIT JUDGES, AND NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN OTHER BILLS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that, because of the airline strike and the lack of transportation, the July 14 hearing on State procedures for the removal, retirement, and disciplining of unfit judges will be canceled. The hearing on Friday, July 15, will be held, however. Scheduled for Friday is testimony on State procedures for the removal, retirement, and disciplining of unfit judges, and on S. 1356, H.R. 2653, S. 3404, and S. 3576.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on July 12, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Paul E. Trimble, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the rank of vice admiral, and withdrawing the nomination of Donald J. Willis to be postmaster at Minerva, Ohio, which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the U.S. Advisory Commission on International and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SCHOOL MILK APPROPRIATION RESTORED, BUT MAY NOT BE ADEQUATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I arise today to thank my colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee for making such a marvelous fight in support of the special milk program for schoolchildren. As I indicated yesterday, the committee included $105 million in the Agriculture appropriations bill—$5 million more than is being spent on the program this year and $2 million more than Congress appropriated for fiscal 1966.

I want to especially thank Senator Spessard Holland, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, for making such a magnificent effort against the administration's proposal to cut the milk program by 80 percent to $21 million. His astute questions in subcommittee probed to the heart of the weaknesses of this administration plan, and undoubtedly were a major factor in the decision of the Department of Agriculture to reverse itself.

However, I wish to add that, although I support the Agriculture appropriations bill today, I have very serious reservations about the adequacy of $105 million to do the job that should be done if our Nation's schoolchildren are to utilize the program to its maximum. I think that every Member of the Senate should keep a close eye on the school milk program, to see if additional funds for the program should be included in a supplemental appropriations bill later this year.

As I indicated on the floor yesterday, in my estimation an excellent case can be made for the appropriation of an additional $5 million so that school districts can be fully reimbursed for their participation in the program. I shall follow the progress of the program, and I shall make this case later in the year if I find, as I expect to, that these funds are inadequate.

VOLUNTARY PRAYER AN AMERICAN RIGHT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I would like to speak for a few minutes in support of Senate Joint Resolution 148, a proposed constitutional amendment which would allow voluntary participation in prayer in our public schools. We, in the Senate, open every session with a prayer. It seems that the least we could do would be to allow the children in the public schools to have the same privilege.

Last month, in the Senate, our Chaplain asked that we, as Senators, might be given "the courage of our convictions—the confidence to say yes to what is right, the courage to say no to what is wrong, and the wisdom and the insight to know the difference." It was a good prayer, but it somehow brought to my mind another less sophisticated prayer:

> God is great. God is good. And we thank Him for our food.

These 13 simple words, which can be said in less than 30 seconds of time and have been said by millions of American schoolchildren in the past, may no longer be said by kindergarten children in New York State as a result of the case of *Stein* v. *Oskinsky* (348 F. 2d 999, cert. denied, 382 U.S. 957 (1965)).

It might be considered ridiculous if the consequences were not so serious. It is difficult to believe that such a thing could happen in the United States, in the enlightened 20th century, when it is fashionable to laugh at the absurdities of the Middle Ages and their ruminations about how many angels could stand on the head of a pin.

In a more serious vein, let us consider some of the reasons why Senate Joint Resolution 148, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools, should be passed by the Senate if we have the courage of our convictions. In

March of this year, Senator DIRKSEN estimated that more than 81 percent of the people of this country disagree with the Supreme Court's decisions in *Engel* v. *Vitale* (370 U.S. 421 (1962)) and *Abington School District* v. *Schempp: Murray* v. *Curlett* (374 U.S. 201 (1963)). This estimate was based on polls that were taken. Certainly, if we as Senators are to estimate from the amount of mail that we have received on this subject, at least 81 percent of the people of the country want the question of the right to pray returned to the jurisdiction of their local school boards and their local school authorities, and this is what Senate Joint Resolution 148 proposes to do.

If we wish to live up to our convictions, it is time that we said "yes" to the people who wish to have an opportunity to vote on the question of returning to the right to pray in school. Congressmen and Senators are the elected representatives of the people of the country, and we, presumably, are in Congress to see that the wishes of the majority of the people are considered in making our laws.

More than 200 resolutions have been introduced in Congress to change the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment in these cases, but nothing has been done about the resolutions. Oh, yes, hearings have been held on them, but no proposed constitutional amendment has been passed by the Congress. It is time that Congress passed an amendment so that this passed amendment might then go to the States, so that the people of this country can have at long last a chance to vote on this question. Congress would not be deciding the issue of whether or not we should have prayers in the public schools. Congress would only be giving the people the chance to decide whether there should be prayers in the public schools.

And if we pass Senate Joint Resolution 148, a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary participation in prayer in the public schools, we would not necessarily be permitting prayers in the schools, but we would be prohibiting an interpretation of the U.S. Constitution which forbids prayer in the public school.

Senate Joint Resolution 148, in and of itself, changes nothing. It is merely the first step to allow the people to vote to bring about a change, and Senate Joint Resolution 148 does not even propose a positive change. It proposes only to set aside an unwanted prohibition and to allow each local area to proceed then to make its own decision on the subject. Are we afraid to let people vote on this matter? Have we the right to refuse to let people vote on this subject? If we have the courage of our convictions, we will propose this constitutional amendment, and allow the electors of this country to make the final decision of what is to be done about the right to pray in the public schools.

Justice Stewart in his dissenting opinion in Abington School District against Schempp said:

> What our Constitution indispensably protects is the freedom of each of us, be he Jew or Agnostic, Christian or Atheist, Buddhist or Freethinker, to believe or disbelieve, to worship or not to worship, to pray or keep silent, according to his own conscience, uncoerced and unrestrained by government. (*Abington*, cited *supra*, p. 320.)

Senate Joint Resolution 148 will restore this freedom to the people of each locality.

Justice Stewart quoted from the Everson case as follows:

> State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them. (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 18.)

There is another reason why Senate Joint Resolution 148 should be passed by the Senate. In June 1962, when the Supreme Court decided Engel against Vitale, Justice Douglas, in a concurring opinion, stated that any Government financing of religion is an unconstitutional undertaking. His words added to the alarm of those people who saw in the prayer decisions the beginning of a program which would eventually drive all vestiges of religion from our national life.

As Senator DIRKSEN predicted in March, "if the profound legalisms of the courts are carried to a logical conclusion," all references to God in our national life may yet be abolished. The theologists who proclaim that "God is dead" may yet be proved correct as far as all outward signs in the United States are concerned.

Justice Douglas' warning has resulted in a prolonged debate. Other Justices in the Engel and Abington decisions went to great lengths to point out that the prayer decisions showed no animosity to religion and that they applied only to the specific factual situations involved in each case.

However, in the March 31, 1966, "Litigation Docket of Pending Cases Affecting Freedom of Religion and Separation of Church and State," published by the Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress, there are listed at least a dozen cases, exclusive of school bus cases, brought by the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, or the Americans United for Separation of Church and State, to challenge practices in the public schools which do not conform to the ideas of these groups in regard to proper separation of church and state.

In addition, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, who was one of the successful plaintiffs in the Abington School District against Schempp: Murray against Curlett case, and several other people have brought a law suit in Maryland to abolish tax exemptions for church property. While the Maryland Court of Appeals has decided against the request, Mrs. Madalyn Murray—now O'Hare—has announced that the decision will be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Another recent opinion of the Maryland Court of Appeals, Horace Mann League against Tawes, has just resulted in a ruling that the State of Maryland may not make grants of State funds to sectarian colleges, and this decision is also going to be appealed to the Supreme Court.

It is obvious that the opponents of religious practices are not going to sit quietly by and allow present practices to continue without challenge, but these opponents will be slowed down if they know that Congress will clarify by constitutional amendment any interpretation of the Constitution which is not in accord with the will of the majority of people in this country.

The passage of Senate Joint Resolution 148 would serve as a warning that the will of the majority of the people cannot be thwarted by a few people for purely selfish or self-serving reasons or to satisfy their own interpretations of what the Constitution means. A manifestation of government hostility to religion or religious teachings "would be at war with our national tradition as embodied in the first amendment's guaranty of the free exercise of religion." These are the words of the Supreme Court in the case of *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, 211–212, which Justice Stewart quoted again in the Abington case.

The amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 148 states as follows:

> Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. Nothing contained in this article shall authorize any such authority to prescribe the form or content of any prayer.

This amendment would restore to the American people their "freedom of religion, not freedom from religion." It would extend freedom of religion even to the children in our public schools. It would let them pray voluntarily or of their own volition; and while the Supreme Court may have cast some doubt on how "voluntarily" children may choose their actions in the public schools, I prefer to look at this matter as Justice Stewart did in the Abington case.

> It may well be, as has been argued to us, that even the supposed benefits to be derived from noncoercive religious exercises in public schools are incommensurate with the administrative problems which they would create. The choice involved, however, is one for each local community and its school board, and not for this Court. . . . It is conceivable that these school boards, or even all school boards, might eventually find it impossible to administer a system of religious exercises during school hours in such a way as to meet this constitutional standard—in such a way as completely to free from any kind of official coercion those who do not affirmatively want to participate.
>
> But I think we must not assume that school boards so lack the qualities of inventiveness and good will as to make impossible the achievement of that goal. (*Abington*, cited *supra*, p. 319, 320.)

Recently, Ellis Katz of Temple University wrote an article on "Patterns of Compliance with the Schempp Decision"—3 Journal of Public Law 396—in which he attempted to trace the impact of the decision of Abington School District against Schempp: Murray against Curlett on the practice of Bible reading in the States. Professor Katz bemoaned the fact that so many writers have been concerned with the reaction of Congress to the decision and so few have been concerned with the reaction of local school districts in the States. He said:

> This is most unfortunate in that it gives one the impression that there is a one-to-one relation between what the Supreme Court says and what society does. This is by no means always true; and it is especially false in cases where the Supreme Court strikes down long established state practice. (Katz, cited *supra*, p. 397.)

Mr. Katz' conclusions were based on responses to questionnaires sent to the chief educational officers of the 50 States.

Forty-six questionnaires were returned and forty-one were used in the study.

> In summary, the questionnaires show that prior to the Schempp decision, nine states required Bible reading in the public schools. . . . Twenty-six states allowed Bible reading but did not require it. . . Finally six states prohibited Bible reading in the public schools . . . Of the twenty-nine states that reported Bible reading before Schempp, only five (about 17 percent) report that Bible reading has completely stopped in their school districts, fourteen (about 48 percent) report that it has almost completely stopped, and six (about 21 percent) report that Bible reading continues about as it did before the decision.
>
> It is fairly clear that opposition to the enforcement of the Schempp decision was essentially local rather than statewide. . . . First, this study, along with other studies of compliance with Supreme Court decisions in the church-state area, should serve to dispel the notion that society automatically responds to the will of the Supreme Court.
>
> Indeed, this study indicates that 60 percent of the states report continuing violations of the Court's Bible reading decision. (Katz, cited *supra*, p. 402, 407.)

I have considered Mr. Katz' conclusions in great detail to point out to you that the Supreme Court decision is not being recognized in many localities, and to submit to you that an unenforced ruling or law is bad, in that it results in a further lack of respect for law in general. The lack of respect for law in this country is already alarming. We can help the problem in this area by passing Senate Joint Resolution 148 and by returning the control of the prayer-in-school problem to local authorities, who presumably will decide it in each local area in accord with the will of the majority of that area.

Finally, although we are told often that children may pray on their own time other than during the school day, this argument overlooks one vital point made by Mr. Justice Stewart in Abington against Schempp. Justice Stewart said:

> For a compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage.
>
> Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at least, as government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private. (*Abington* v. *Schempp*, cited *supra*, p. 313.)

In 1947, Mr. Justice Jackson deplored the extension of the Supreme Court's authority to act as a "super board of education for every school district in the Nation." *McCollum*, cited supra, page 237. Harvard's Dean Griswold and many other leading constitutional lawyers were again critical when the Supreme Court extended its "super school board" powers in Engel against Vitale in 1962. However much regret may be expressed at the Supreme Court's school board role, it cannot be undone by the Court itself, and only we in Congress can now return the control of prayers in the public schools to local school boards. We can do it by passing Senate Joint Resolution 148.

We should do it because we do have the courage of our convictions, and we do have the wisdom and the insight to say "Yes," to what is right. The proposed constitutional amendment passed by us will give the people of the country the right to vote on this vital subject. The Founding Fathers provided a way to amend the Constitution, and they expected that the people would be given an opportunity to amend it whenever an amendment was needed. We should pass the proposed amendment to stop the trend toward the elimination of all signs of religion from our national life and to eliminate an area where law today is being disregarded.

In Kentucky, the attorney general advised the superintendent of public instruction that baccalaureate exercises were approved where attendance was voluntary, that grace before lunch by pupils could continue, and that the Christmas nativity scene can continue "so long as no religious significance is attached thereto." In Michigan, a Federal judge ruled that public school pupils who wish to say prayers or read the Bible may do so provided that they complete their exercises at least 5 minutes before school begins or begin them at least 5 minutes after school ends, and if a prayer is to be said at lunch time, it should be a silent prayer during moments of silence set aside for private meditation. (*Reed* v. *Van Hoven*, 237 F. Supp. 48—Mich. S.C. 1965.)

And in New York not only the "God is good" prayer was banned, but it was held that a school principal acted well within his authority when he prohibited the right to say:

> Thank you for the World so Sweet,
> Thank you for the food we eat,
> Thank you for the birds that sing,
> Thank you God for everything.

It would be ridiculous if it were not so disturbing. It is time—more than time—for the Senate to pass this resolution—to propose a constitutional amendment to return the right of voluntary participation in prayer in the public schools.

In Justice Douglas' own words in the case of Zorach against Clauson:

> We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. (343 U.S. 306, 313 (1952).)

We, as Senators, have the courage of our convictions and the wisdom and insight to know and to say "Yes" to Senate Joint Resolution 148 because it is right.

AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just finished reading in today's New York Times an article entitled "The American Prisoners in Hanoi," written by the distinguished American newspaperman, Mr. James Reston. The article reflects clearly, in my judgment, the views of the American people.

Mr. Reston describes the fact that in the last few days and weeks the government of Hanoi has paraded captured American flyers down the main streets of the city, and that now the regime of Ho Chi Minh is talking of "trying and executing" captured American prisoners.

As Mr. Reston points out:

> The rules of war specifically forbid the retribution now being discussed in the Communist world. Article XIII of the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the Hanoi Government on June 5, 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty.

Mr. Reston also states:

> We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides of this war, but none more ominous or dangerous than this.

Indeed, that is true. Let the Hanoi regime be fully warned in advance that any attempt to humiliate and execute captured American prisoners now in their hands will meet with a worldwide revulsion. It would unite the American people as no other act could unite them in the fight we are making for the respect and dignity of the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this splendid article written by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, July 13, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—In the last few days Hanoi and the Communist capitals of Eastern Europe have been talking about trying and executing the American fliers captured in North Vietnam. We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides in this war, but none more ominous or dangerous than this.

The Communist photographs of the American pilots being led helpless and handcuffed at gun point through the menacing crowds are bad enough. But if this is followed by another of those spectacular Communist "trials" and the execution of these men, the reaction of this country is likely to be precisely the opposing of what Hanoi imagines.

THE U.S. REACTION

This is a very critical moment in the long struggle to keep this war limited. The North Vietnamese leaders are no doubt furious about the bombings of the oil dumps in Hanoi and Haiphong. They have ordered the evacuation of the civilian population from those cities and no doubt this has encouraged a spirit of revenge. But nothing will add to the brutality and unpredictability of this war more than making these few fliers pay with their lives for carrying out the orders of their Government.

There has been much stupidity but very little jingoism in America's conduct of this war. The American people have been troubled but calm. With one or two exceptions, the President and his aides have avoided appeals to emotion and no effort has been made to arouse a spirit of hatred toward the political leaders or the soldiers of North Vietnam.

In fact—rightly or wrongly—U.S. officials here and in Saigon have pictured the enemy as brave but misguided men fighting for Peking or Moscow against their own national interests. But all this could easily be changed by howling mobs, drum-fire courts and firing squads in Hanoi.

The rules of war specifically forbid the retribution now being discussed in the Communist world. Article XIII of the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the Hanoi Government on June 5, 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty.

This, however, is not primarily a legal but a practical question involving the psychology of the American people and the President of the United States. Nobody who knows anything about Lyndon Johnson can have much doubt about the severity of his reaction if the fliers he sent into North Vietnam are executed against the standards of international law for carrying out his orders.

Argument in this country about whether the orders to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong were wise will be overwhelmed. The curiously impersonal attitude of America to the war will end, and public opinion will undoubtedly support him in any countermeasures he takes, no matter how severe.

THE DIPLOMATIC QUESTION

For the moment, then, the practical question is not whether the Prime Ministers of India and Great Britain can persuade the Soviet Government to help end the war, but whether they can persuade Kosygin and Brezhnev to intervene in Hanoi to stop this trend toward personal reprisals, which will only tend to make the war unmanageable.

Moscow and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe are obviously in no mood to propose a compromise settlement in Vietnam, but they may at least be willing to do something about keeping it from getting out of control.

HARRIMAN'S TASK

The President's special envoy, Averell Harriman, is now working almost full time on the diplomacy of avoiding this tragedy, but the indications from Hanoi are that officials there intend to go through with the trials.

Far from intimidating other Navy and Air Force fliers from attacking targets in North Vietnam, which apparently is the intention; far from restraining President Johnson, which is what they are believed to have in mind; far from encouraging opposition to the President's bombing policy, the conviction and execution of the American fliers will almost certainly escalate the bombing and unite this country behind a much more punitive and aggressive policy.

The present situation is bad enough. The American people and even the American Government are divided about using power to destroy the power centers of North Vietnam, but if these fliers are humiliated and executed, it will be difficult if not impossible to follow a policy of restraint, no matter what the consequences.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This young man Jones who was paraded down the streets, in total violation of the rules of war, and treated with the greatest indignity by the Communists of Ho Chi Minh was the son of one of my dearest friends, the late Major Louie Jones of Baton Rouge, La. I resent this bitterly.

I think it is time for the Hanoi regime to know that so far as we are concerned we have declared the war we are fighting. We declared a limited war. We did that at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

We are not war criminals. The Hanoi regime has the war criminals.

I am providing for the Record the brief of the American Bar Association which conclusively shows that our position is entirely legal before the world; and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the Record at the conclusion of this colloquy. It is lengthy but it should be printed in the Record for this purpose.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Communist regime in Hanoi does what they are threatening to do, they are even greater war criminals, and we should take those steps which we think appropriate and to punish them severely. We should also punish, by appropriate means, people in this country who have supported and given aid and comfort to the Hanoi regime and who have suggested in any respect that they are right.

If the Communist assassins should make the mistake of murdering these fine young American boys, it would unite the American people as nothing else could. We know the kind of brutality and bestial treatment of which the Communist regime of North Vietnam has been guilty.

The press of this Nation has failed to give adequate publicity to the bestial acts of the North Vietnamese. Newspapers publish a picture of some little child who has been hurt when Americans tried to hit an oil depot and missed the target; but they fail to show how the Communists went into towns and deliberately, purposely killed innocent men and women guilty of nothing more than trying to provide for their families and then killed the children as well. Some eastern newspapers ignore that and take the attitude that we are the ones to be criticized, rather than the criminals in Hanoi.

But even the New York Times would be forced to report the murder of American prisoners of war.

This criminal act if resorted to by Hanoi will unite the American people as nothing else has. While it is true that those young men would be martyrs, the outcome would serve the cause of freedom and honor even more than the lives of our boys who are fighting for liberty in South Vietnam at this moment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the distinguished Senator. When the Senator uses the words "murder," he is completely correct. The phrase "trial and execution" is a very cruel euphemism. What is suggested by the Communist regime in North Vietnam would be murder.

Exhibit 1

The Lawfulness of United States Assistance to the Republic of Vietnam**

(John Norton Moore and James L. Underwood in collaboration with Myres S. McDougal,* May, 1966)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.

I. The United States presence in Viet Nam is lawful under customary international law and the United Nations Charter.

A. The Republic of Viet Nam Is A Recognized State Under International Law.

B. The Republic Of Viet Nam Has Requested Assistance From The United States To Meet Armed Aggression.

C. United States Assistance To The Republic Of Viet Nam Is Lawful Under Customary International Law And The United Nations Charter.

II. The United States Activities in Viet Nam Are Lawful.

** This paper is presented as a brief for the lawfulness of the major outline of United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam—a policy which may share lawfulness in common with other alternatives—and is presented in the interest of obtaining a more complete exposition of the legal issues involved. It neither evaluates the alternatives available in the Viet Nam crisis nor argues for the present United States policy in Viet Nam, and is intended only to demonstrate that the United States policy in Viet Nam is a lawful policy alternative. This is not to divorce law from policy—any meaningful approach must do quite the opposite—but it is to recognize that in any given situation there may be a number of lawful alternatives. For a brief attacking the lawfulness of United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam see the *Memorandum of Law of Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam,* reprinted in Congressional Record, pp. 2665–2673 (Feb. 9, 1966). See also Friedmann, *United States Policy and the Crisis of International Law,* 59, Am. J. Int'l. L. 857 (1965), and Wright, *Principles of Foreign Policy,* Worldview (February 1965), reprinted in Raskin & Fall, The Vietnam Reader 7 (Vintage ed. 1965).

Since it is unnecessary for the conclusions reached, this paper does not consider whether the United States is legally *obligated* under international law to render assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam.

Fore general background documentation with respect to the Viet Nam conflict see Staff of Senate Comm. on Foreign Relations, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam (Rev. ed. Comm. Print 1965), hereinafter cited as *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965); *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834). See also *Hearings on S. 2793 Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,* 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. 1 (1966).

* Myers S. McDougal, B.A., M.A., LL.B., B.C.L., J.S.D., L.H.D., is Sterling Professor of Law at Yale Law School; John Norton Moore, B.A., LL.B., LL.M., is formerly Assistant Dean and Associate Professor of Law at the University of Florida College of Law, is currently a fellow at Yale Law School and beginning in September, 1966 will be Associate Professor of Law at the University of Virginia School of Law; James L. Underwood, B.A., LL.B., LL.M., is currently a fellow at Yale Law School and beginning in September, 1966 will be Assistant Professor of Law at the University of South Carolina College of Law.

A. The Defensive Use Of The Military Instrument By The United States And The Republic Of Viet Nam Was Necessary.

B. The Defensive Use Of The Military Instrument By The United States And The Republic Of Viet Nam Is Proportional.

III. The United States Has Met Its Obligations Under the United Nations Charter.

IV. The Geneva Accords Support the United States Position.

A. Nothing In The Geneva Accords Requires The United States To Abstain From Resisting Aggression Against The Republic Of Viet Nam.

B. Aggression By The D.R.V. Against The R.V.N. Violates The Geneva Accords And Fundamental Principles Of The United Nations Charter: This Material Breach Of Agreement Permits Suspension Of Any Corresponding Obligations Which May Be Binding On The United States Or The R.V.N.

C. D.R.V. Aggression Against the R.V.N. Is A Fundamental Change In Conditions, Constituting Grounds For Suspending Any Corresponding Obligation Which May Be Binding On The United States Or The R.V.N.

V. The Executive—Congressional Action Rendering Assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam Is in Accordance With United States Constitutional Processes.

A. Executive Action Rendering Assistance To The Republic of Viet Nam Has Been Authorized And Affirmed By Congress.

B. The Executive—Congressional Action Rendering Assistance To The R.V.N. Is Authorized Under United States Constitutional Processes.

1. There is ample constitutional authority for such executive—congressional action.

2. No formal declaration of war is required for such executive—congressional action to comply with United States constitutional processes.

Conclusion.

THE LAWFULNESS OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF VIET NAM

In recent months, critics of United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam have increasingly used legal arguments in their attacks on that assistance. They have asserted that the United States presence and activities in Viet Nam violate general principles of international law, the United Nations Charter, and the United States Constitution. In support of these assertions, they argue that the Republic of Viet Nam is not a state, that the United States is merely intervening in a civil war, that this intervention neither qualifies as self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter nor is otherwise legally justified, and that since Congress has not formally declared war the present United States military presence and activities in Viet Nam exceed the executive power. Although there is certainly room for choice and disagreement among the available policy alternatives, these legal arguments substantially misstate the case.

The present United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is lawful under the most widely accepted principles of customary international law, the United Nations Charter and the Constitution of the United States. Since the Republic of Viet nam has requested aid from the United States and other nations of the world to meet a situation with a significant component of outside armed aggression, there can be no question that the United States and the other nations responding with appropriate assistance are lawfully acting pursuant to the right of self-defence recognized under customary international law and the United Nations Charter.[1] Moreover, the executive-congressional action taken in rendering assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is in accordance with United States constitutional processes.

These conclusions are based not on mere legalistic exercises but on the genuine shared expectations of the international community as developed through a long history of practices and authoritative communications and reflected in principles designed to ensure minimum world public order. The principal thrust of many of the more important principles of contemporary international law, both customary and as incorporated into the United Nations Charter, is to secure genuine freedom of choice to the peoples of the world about their own form of government. Thus, under customary international law, states have not only been accorded a most comprehensive right of self-defense but have also been authorized to give aid to the established governments of other states, when such states are attacked by enemies from without or within.[2] Similarly, the self-determination of peoples is stated as a principal goal of the United Nations and few of its goals have been more insistently sought in the practice of the organization; the Charter contains many provisions designed to preclude attacks, by any means, upon the territorial and political integrity of states; and the sum total of provisions in the Charter would, in the absence of an effective centralized peacekeeping machinery, appear greatly to enhance the authorization of states reciprocally to assist each other when subjected to attack.[3] These widely accepted principles are consistent with declared United States goals of complete self-determination for the people of the Republic of Viet Nam and the maintenance of minimum world order through the rule of law.

The following discussion will show point by point that the United States presence in Viet Nam is lawful under customary international law and the United Nations Charter, that the particular United States activities in Viet Nam are lawful; that the United States has met its obligations under the United Nations Charter; that the Geneva Accords support the United States position in Viet Nam; and that the executive-congressional action rendering assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is in accordance with United States constitutional processes. In particular, the discussion will show in detail that the Republic of Viet Nam is a state under international law and that today there are substantial expectations that the Republic of Viet Nam (South Viet Nam—the R.V.N.) and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam (North Viet Nam—the D.R.V.) are separate and independent states under international law; that the Viet Nam conflict can not be fairly characterized as a "civil war"; that the R.V.N. has requested assistance from the United States to meet armed aggression; that the present United States assistance to the R.V.N. is in accordance with the right of self-defense recognized under customary international law and the United Nations Charter; that the United States seeks a solution through the machinery of the United Nations; that the United States assistance is supported by the Geneva Accords which have been fundamentally breached by the D.R.V. in its armed aggression against the R.V.N.; and that the executive-congressional action taken in rendering assistance to the R.V.N. is in accordance with United States constitutional processes, as authoritatively interpreted by successive presidents and congresses of the United States.

I. THE UNITED STATES PRESENCE IN VIET NAM IS LAWFUL UNDER CUSTOMARY INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

In examining the lawfulness of the United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam, it is important to distinguish between the lawfulness of the United States general presence in Viet Nam and the lawfulness of the particular United States activities in Viet Nam, and also to distinguish between the relevant international and constitutional law. When all relevant prescriptions are reviewed, it will appear evident both that the United States presence in the R.V.N. is lawful and that the use of the military instrument is well within the permissible limits of self-defense.

Under customary international law and the United Nations Charter, a recognized state such as the R.V.N. has the right to request and receive assistance from other states pursuant to its right of self-defence.[4] It is important to note, however, that even if the R.V.N. were not a recognized state under international law, and was instead a mere "temporary zone" not "qualifying politically as a state," there still would be no basis for suggesting that it would not be entitled to receive assistance pursuant to its right of self-defense when subject to armed aggression from another zone in violation of a major purpose of the international agreement establishing it. In fact, the United Nations action in Korea and the major thrust of contemporary international law and the United Nations Charter strongly indicate that even a temporary zone in an internationally divided country has the right to request and receive assistance in self-defense. One of the major purposes of the United Nations Charter is to authorize collective measures for the suppression of acts of armed aggression, whether by United Nations action as such, or by collective assistance from individual states, until the United Nations is able to act. Moreover, clearly one state does not have the right under customary international law and the United Nations Charter to armed aggression against another.[5] And since there are substantial ex-

---

[1] On February 21, 1966, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association passed a resolution affirming the lawfulness of the United States presence and activities in Viet Nam. The resolution stated in part: "[B]e [it] resolved by the American Bar Association that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty. . . ." N.Y. Times, Feb. 22, 1966, p. 1, col. 7 (city ed.). See also the brief by Leonard C. Meeker, Legal Adviser of the Department of State, *The Legality of U.S. Participation In The Defense of Viet-Nam* (March 4, 1966) reprinted in Dep't State Bull. (March 28, 1966); Deutsch, *The Legality of the United States Position in Vietnam*, 52 A.B.A.J. 436 (1966); the address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk 1965 Proceedings, Am. Soc. Int'l L. 247; and Comment, *The United States in Viet Nam: A Case Study In The Law of Intervention*, 50 Calif. L. Rev. 515 (1962). This 1962 study is somewhat out of date, particularly with respect to the increased armed aggression from the D.R.V., the increased United States response and United States submission to the United Nations, but provides a useful analysis of the 1962 situation in Viet Nam under customary international law.

For a short statement endorsed by 31 professors of international law that the United States policy in Viet Nam is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter see Congressional Record, p. 1409 (January 27, 1966).

With respect to Australian aims in assisting the Republic of Viet Nam see Paltridge, "Australia and the Defense of Southeast Asia," 44 *Foreign Affairs* 49 (October 1965).

[2] See the discussion and authorities collected in § 1 c *infra*.

[3] See generally McDougal & Feliciano, Law & Minimum World Public Order (1961).

[4] See the discussion and authorities collected in § 1 c *infra*.

[5] Article 2 §§ 3 & 4 of the United Nations Charter provide:

"3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such pectations today that the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. are separate and independent states under international law, any armed aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is in violation of a fundamental principle of customary international law and the United Nations Charter. But again, it is important to note that even if the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. did not qualify as separate states under international law, but were instead merely separate "temporary zones" not "qualifying politically" as states, it is still clear that armed aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. would violate the same fundamental principle of customary international law and the United Nations Charter in breaching by force the core of the international agreement that established them in a situation not authorized by self-defense. Aggression in these circumstances, whether against a state under international law or against a mere "temporary zone" not "qualifying politically as a state" is still violative of fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

A. The Republic of Viet Nam is a recognized state under international law

The classical definition of a state under international law points to four factors, a people, a territory, a government, and capacity to enter into relations with other states.[6] The Republic of Viet Nam meets all of these qualifications. It has a current population of approximately 15 million, administers a territory in Viet Nam south of the 17th parallel of approximately 66,000 square miles,[7] has a widely recognized government,[8] and has repeatedly been recognized as having capacity to enter into relations with other states.[9] Similarly, at least since the Geneva Accords of 1954 the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam also meets these qualifications for statehood, although to a lesser extent with regard to international recognition.[10] And although the R.V.N. and the D.R.V. qualify as states even under these restricted classical requirements, there have been instances in which political entities have been recognized as states in spite of difficulty in meeting one or more of these requirements as, for example, was the case with the State of Israel in 1948.[11] In the final analysis, then, it is the expectations of the international community as manifested by their conduct toward a particular political entity which establishes its statehood. In this regard, probably the most important indicators of the expectations of the international community as to statehood are recognition and United Nations determinations. Thus it is said in *Oppenheim*, one of the leading international law treatises:

"In recognizing a new State as a member of the international community the existing States declare that in their opinion the new state fulfills the conditions of statehood as required by International Law." [12]

In fact, this author asserts in unnecessary extreme that it is the act of recognition itself which creates statehood: "Recognition, while declaratory of an existing fact, is constitutive in its nature." [13] Similarly, Article 10 of the Charter of the Organization of American States which is declaratory of the general international law in this respect provides: "Recognition implies that the State granting it accepts the personality of the new State, with all the rights and duties that international law prescribes for the two States." [14]

In addition, as Professor O'Connell points out, United Nations determinations are also important indicators of statehood: ". . . the United Nations Charter allows membership only to States, and decision on membership would seem to be conclusive on the question of *de facto* Statehood," [15] Moreover, Professor Briggs has written that: "[A] determination [by the General Assembly of the United Nations] that . . . [a state has] the capacity to accept and perform the obligations of the Charter is a recognition of . . . statehood and international juridical capacity, whether or not . . . [it is] admitted to the United Nations.[16] It should also be pointed out that there are essentially no major differences in consequences under international law whether recognition is *de facto* or *de jure*.[17]

In the light of these general principles of international law the next sections will examine the international status of the Republic of Viet Nam and its predecessor governments and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. This examination will look at the international status of these communities prior to the Geneva Accords of 1954, will discuss the effect of the Geneva Accords on that status, and finally will examine their status today, nearly twelve years after the Geneva Accords.

Status Prior to the Geneva Accords of 1954

Historically, the territory comprising all of Viet Nam has been divided between rival political factions or separate government units during a substantial part of its history.[18] In the words of Anthony Eden: "Indo-China had no tradition of unity, and there was little in common between the rich

---

a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

There is substantial authority that this proscription binds nonmembers as well as members of the U.N., whether by its own force or as a rule of customary international law. See generally the authorities collected in § 1 c *infra*, and note 248 *infra*.

[6] See the statement of Philip C. Jessup in advocating the admission of Israel to the United Nations, reprinted in Briggs, The Law of Nations 69–71 (2d ed. 1952).

[7] Although no two sources agree perfectly on these population and area statistics, a recent Rand McNally Official Map of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia puts the population of South Viet Nam at 15,900,000 and the area at 66,280 square miles. A 1963 State Department fact sheet on Southeast Asia puts the population at 14,520,000 and the area at 63,000 square miles. See Dept. of State Publication 7473, Far Eastern Series 118, Released January 1963.

Although the Viet Cong exercise influence over a significant portion of this area, they do not remotely approach the status of the Saigon government with respect to international recognition of governmental authority to administer and speak for this territory. Similarly, in light of this long continued international recognition, temporary loss of control by the Saigon government over portions of this territory in the course of civil strife largely precipitated by the defensive conflict against the D.R.V.-Viet-Cong, can not be validly regarded as reducing the established statehood of the R.V.N.

[8] The Republic of Viet Nam is recognized by about 60 nations today and has de jure diplomatic relations with about 52 of these, including France, United Kingdom, West Germany, Brazil, Mexico, Switzerland and Ethiopia. A list of those nations may be obtained from the Embassy of Viet Nam, Washington, D.C. See also *Legal Status of South Viet-Nam* Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State (4/31b–865BT).

[9] This is discussed in more detail throughout this section but it might be noted briefly here that the Republic of Viet Nam is a member of at least 30 international organizations including 12 specialized agencies of the United Nations.

[10] The Rand McNally Official Map of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia puts the population of North Viet Nam at 17,500,000 and the area at 61,294 square miles.

The D.R.V. is recognized by about 24 nations. See Release 4/31b–865 BT, Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State.

[11] See authority cited note 6 *supra*. See also Briggs, *op. cit. supra* note 6, at 66.

[12] I Oppenheim, International Law 127 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955). And Brierly says: "The primary function of recognition is to acknowledge as a fact something which has hitherto been uncertain, namely, the independence of the body claiming to be a State, and to declare the recognizing State's readiness to accept the normal consequences of that fact . . ." Brierly, The Law of Nations 124 (4th ed. 1949).

[13] Oppenheim, *supra* note 12, at 128.

[14] See Briggs, *op. cit. supra* note 6, at 101.

[15] I O'Connell, International Law 169 (1965). "In order to be admitted to membership in the United Nations, the applicant must first of all fulfill the requisite conditions; one of them is that it be 'a State.'" Liang, *Who Are the Non-Members of the United Nations?* 45 Am. J. Int'l. L. 314, 316 n.11 (1951).

[16] Briggs, *Community Interest In the Emergence of New States: The Problem of Recognition*, 1950 Proceedings of the American Society of Int'l Law 169, 176.

[17] "Although for political purposes *de facto* recognition has sometimes been regarded as provisional or limited, the legal consequences of *de facto* and *de jure* recognition are essentially the same. The distinction is thus properly a poltical rather than a juridical distinction, and is so regarded by contemprary doctrine." Briggs, *op. cit. supra* note 6, at 129.

See also I O'Connell, International Law 176 (1965). "Since international law is indifferent to the form of recognition any practical distinction between recognition *de facto* and recognition *de jure* must be discovered, if anywhere, in municipal law." *Ibid.*

[18] See generally Do Vang Ly, Aggressions By China (2d ed. 1960); Nguyen-Van-Thai & Nguyen-Van-Mung, A Short History of Viet-Nam (1958); Jumper & Normand, *Vietnam: The Histrorical Background*, from Kahin, Government and Politics of South-East Asia 375–390 (2d ed. 1964), reprinted in Gettleman, Viet Nam: History, Documents, and Opinions on a Major World Crisis 10-28 (Fawcett ed. 1965).

Dr. B.S.N. Murti has written:

"As far back as 17th and 18th century, Vietnam was divided roughly along the 16th Parallel between Tonkin in the North and Cochin-China in the South. The Dong Hoi Wall, which was built in 1631 and was more than 100 kilometers long, 3 meters high and 6 meters broad at the bottom at certain places, was an impregnable thing located between the South and the North. . . . Thus geography, history and politics met for centuries somewhere near 16th Parallel in Vietnam."

Murti, Vietnam Divided 27–28 (1964).

For an official British view focusing on events since World War II see *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), at 5–17.

"Viet-Nam had been partitioned before. Apart from divisions which had occurred in earlier centuries, the country had been split into two zones by the Potsdam arrangements in 1945; indeed, the partition of 1954 repeated, except for the difference of one degree of latitude, the partition of 1945, and was in fact the consequence of that partition, for it was the occupation of northern Viet-Nam by Chinese forces that enabled the Viet Minh to consolidate their grip on that part of the country to such a degree that it proved impossible to dislodge them."

Id. at 17.

south and the overpopulated north."[19] In recent times, Viet Nam was composed of several French territories themselves in turn parts of the larger French Indo-China, which during the Second World War was largely controlled by the Japanese. Following World War II, pursuant to the Potsdam agreements of 1945, Viet Nam was divided at the 16th Parallel between the British and the Chinese commands for the purpose of accepting the surrender of the Japanese troops in Indo-China. During this brief period of occupation in 1945–46, the Chinese allowed the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam under Ho Chi Minh to become entrenched principally in North Viet Nam as the government of Viet Nam, while the British subsequently encouraged return of French colonial government beginning in South Viet Nam and moving North and which also claimed sovereignty to all of Viet Nam.[20] Although territory both North and South has changed hands since then, at least from that time until the present, there have essentially been two separate governments in Viet Nam controlling different territories, developing along different ideological lines and both at least until recently, claiming sovereignty over all of Viet Nam.

In June 1948, the French High Commissioner for Indo-China signed a declaration recognizing the independence of the State of Viet Nam as an associated state within the French Union,[21] and in 1949 and 1950 pursuant to the Elysee Agreement this status was achieved.[22] Although the agreement did not effectively provide complete independence to the French recognized Boa Dai government at that time, it and subsequent French actions did create a substantial international status for the Bao Dai government which was in the next few years recognized by at least thirty states,[23] a number which would grow to about thirty-five prior to the Geneva Accords.[24] Pursuant to this legal status, the State of Viet Nam was given legal authority over many internal matters and was able to enter into some treaties in its own name. In particular, on June 18, 1952 it ratified the Treaty of Peace with Japan.[25] And on November 5, 1952 it accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes arising under this Japanese Peace Treaty, again in the name of the State of Viet Nam.[26] Most importantly, however, in 1952 it was recognized as a state by the United Nations. Pursuant to a French draft resolution to admit the Bao Dai government of the State of Viet Nam to the United Nations, the Security Council on September 19, 1952 voted 10 to 1 in favor of admission.[27] The Soviet Union cast the only vote against the resolution, but this negative vote by a permanent member of the Council prevented the adoption of the resolution. In response to this Soviet "veto", on December 21, 1952 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution by a vote of 40 to 5 with 12 abstentions to the effect that the State of Viet Nam was a state qualified for membership in the United Nations, and calling on the Security Council to take note of this General Assembly determination.[28] The resolution said in part:

"[The General Assembly] *Determines* that Vietnam is, in its judgment, a peace-loving state within the meaning of Article 4 of the Charter, is able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter, and should therefore be admitted to membership in the United Nations . . ."[29]

By this resolution, the United Nations recognized the Bao Dai government of the State of Viet Nam as representative of a state under international law. It should be pointed out that this recognition of the Bao Dai government of Viet Nam was made by the United Nations despite arguments by the Soviet Union that Ho Chi Minh's Democratic Republic of Viet Nam was the only government of Viet Nam entitled to admission to the United Nations.[30] A Soviet draft resolution to this effect to admit the D.R.V. as the sole representative of the State of Viet Nam was rejected in the Security Council by vote of 10 to 1.[31]

---

[19] Eden, Full Circle 88 (1960).

[20] This is a greatly condensed version of a complex situation. For more detail see *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965*, 5–12, 47–52 (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), and Nguyen, *op. cit. supra* note 18 at 323–46.

Although in the short period prior to the arrival of British occupation forces in southern Viet Nam the D.R.V. had proclaimed independence and sovereignty over all of Viet Nam, its provisional government was proclaimed in Hanoi and apparently its principal control was in the North. According to the British Foreign Office: "The Democratic Republic claimed sovereignty over the south as well as the north, and in Saigon a Communist-controlled Provisional Executive Committee for South Viet-Nam was set up. In practice, however, there was no government in Saigon or anywhere else in southern Viet-Nam, and looting and attacks on French nationals were common occurrences." *Documents, supra* at 7.

B.S.N. Murti has written:

"The Democratic Republic of Vietnam was ruling in the area North of the 16th Parallel as a sovereign State between August 1945 and December 1946. It was in effective control of this area and there was no French interference during this period. . . .

"During this period, in the area South of the 16th Parallel, the French were brought back for civil administration and the revolutionary Government set up was dispersed within a few weeks and during the period from August 1945 to December 1946 the French were in effective control of that area. According to *de facto* doctrine, therefore, before the civil war there were in fact two sovereign authorities—the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as a sovereign State in the North and the French colonial rule in the South."

Murti, Vietnam Divided 171 (1964). But see Isaacs, *Independence for Vietnam?* in Gettleman, Viet Nam: History Documents and Opinions on a Major World Crisis 37, 40–45 (Fawcett ed. 1965).

[21] *1947–1948 Documents on International Affairs* 736–37 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1952).

[22] *1949–50 Documents on International Affairs* 596–609 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1953). Documents, *op. cit. supra* note 20 at 10–11.

For a discussion of these agreements and the Pau agreements of 1950 see Survey of International Affairs 1949–50 427–28, 432, 435–36, 437–38 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1953). "With the regulation of these common services France [in 1950] relinquished control over the internal affairs of the Associated States." *Id.* at 438.

[23] "Vietnam [the State of Viet Nam] now has a government freely appointed by the head of the State, national representation and its own administration and army. Its existence as an international entity has been recognized by more than thirty Powers. It participated in the San Francisco Conference on the Treaty of Peace with Japan; it belongs to many international bodies which are listed for members of the Security Council in document S/2756."

Statement of Mr. Hoppenot, of the French delegation to the United Nations, made in the Security Council on September 18, 1952. U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 7th year, 602nd meeting 16 (S/PV.602) (1952).

"[The State of Viet Nam] . . . has been recognized by more than thirty nations, and . . . has been admitted to membership of most of the United Nations specialized agencies. Furthermore, . . . [it is a member] of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, and . . . [has] participated in various important international conferences and . . . [is party] to several international conventions.

"On the basis of all these facts my Government is satisfied that Vietnam . . . [has] attained a full measure of sovereignty and independence. For these reasons the Netherlands recognized . . . [Viet Nam] in April 1950 as [a] freely associated . . . [State] of the French Union. By this act my country indicated more than two years ago, that it was satisfied that these three countries [Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia] were sovereign States."

Statement of Mr. Von Balluseck, of the Netherlands delegation to the United Nations, made in the Security Council on September 18, 1952. U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 7th year, 602nd meeting 19 (S/PV.602) (1952).

Also see I Oppenheim, International Law 174 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955).

"Some members of the Union, such as Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, seem to have acquired a certain degree of independent international status, including the power to make treaties. In recognising in 1948 the independence of Vietnam, France declared that the independence has no other limits than that implied in Vietnam's associate membership of the French Union. Vietnam undertook to respect the rights and interests of French nationals, to ensure respect for the principles of democracy and to give preference to French advisors and experts." *Ibid.*

"The declaration [of 1948] was confirmed by a French law of February 2, 1950, which also covered the similar cases of Laos and Cambodia . . . the Independence of these three States was recognized soon after by a number of other States, including the United States of America and the United Kingdom."

Id. at 174 n. 5.

And see generally Survey of International Affairs 1949–50 427–31 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1953).

[24] For the figure of thirty-five see the speeches by French Foreign Minister Bidault made at the Geneva Conference on May 8, 1954, and May 14, 1954. *Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 16 [1954], Command Paper 9186). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 109 & 133. For the possibility that 33 nations may have been the maximum number recognizing the State of Viet Nam prior to the Geneva Accords see American Foreign Policy—Current Documents 121 n.3 (1958).

[25] 136 U.N.T.S. 46–47 (1952); I Oppenheim, International Law 174 n.4 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955).

[26] 150 U.N.T.S. 147–149 (1952).

[27] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 7th year, 603rd meeting 11 (S/PV.603) (1952). For the Security Council debates on this resolution see *Id.* 602nd meeting 15–20; 603rd meeting 1–11.

[28] The Ad Hoc Political Committee of the General Assembly voted on December 19, 1952 by a vote of 38 to 5 with 16 abstentions to recommend admissions of Bao Dai's State of Viet Nam to the United Nations. U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 7th Sess., Ad Hoc Pol. Comm. 318 (A/AC.61/SR.50) (1952). A copy of this resolution appears in U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 7th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 19, at 10 (A/2341 & Corr. 1) (1952). The General Assembly voted for this resolution as discussed in text at U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 7th Sess., Plenary 410 (A/PV.410) (1952).

There is some authority that a vote for the admission of a state to the United Nations "implies recognition, at least for those members who vote for it." I O'Connell, International Law 169 (1965).

[29] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 7th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 19, at 10 (A/2341 & Corr. 1) (1952).

As further evidence of its international status at this time, the State of Viet Nam (the Bao Dai government) was a member of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the International Labour Organization, the Universal Postal Union, and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.[32]

This substantial recognition by other nations of the world, membership in international organizations, conclusion of treaties in its own name, and United Nations recognition indicate that as early as 1952 the State of Viet Nam had substantial recognition as a state under international law.

This international status was further reinforced when in June, 1954 France signed a treaty with the State of Viet Nam which by its terms granted the State of Viet Nam complete independence as of June 4, 1954.[33]

Subsequent to the signing of this treaty but prior to the Geneva Accords, the leadership of the State of Viet Nam substantially passed from Bao Dai to Ngo Dinh Diem, who Bao Dai had appointed as the new Premier of the State of Viet Nam.[34] Premier Diem formally organized his government on July 7, 1954.[35] Thus prior to the Geneva Accords, there were some expectations that the State of Viet Nam was an independent state under international law and by the conclusion of the Conference the State of Viet Nam was recognized by about thirty five states.[36]

Moreover, at the Geneva Conference itself, the French made it clear to all concerned that the State of Viet Nam was legally independent and that France lacked the capacity to negotiate on its behalf.[37]

---

[30] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 7th year, 603rd meeting 9 (S/PV.603) (1952).

[31] *Id.* at 19. Although the resolutions for the admission of Viet Nam, adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, did not on their face indicate which government of Viet Nam was being recommended for admission, this Soviet draft resolution calling for the admission of Ho Chi Minh's Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, which was defeated, and the debates themselves, made it evident that the Security Council and the General Assembly had voted to admit Bao Dai's State of Viet Nam. See particularly the remarks of Mr. Malik, the delegate of the U.S.S.R. *Id.* at 2, 7 & 8.

[32] *Id.* at 1–2.

[33] See 161 British & Foreign State Papers 649–51 (1954). See also the speeches by U.S.S.R. Foreign Affairs Minister Molotov on June 8, 1954 and of Chou En-Lai, Foreign Affairs Minister of the People's Republic of China on June 9, 1954, both made at the Geneva Conference and both apparently adverting to this independence agreement. Although Molotov's remarks on June 8, 1954 indicate that independence agreements were as yet "unsigned and therefore unpublished," and were not of a "nature to inspire confidence," Chou En-Lai's remarks on June 9, 1954 show full awareness of the treaties and indicate that they had been initialled by then. *Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 16 [1954], Command Paper 9186). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 147 & 164.

The Speech by French Foreign Minister Bidault on May 14, 1954, during the Fourth Plenary Session on Indo-China indicated that an independence agreement was actually concluded with Viet Nam sometime prior to May 12, 1954, and that the delegation of Viet Nam read it to the Conference on May 12th. *Id.* at 134. Although possibly not Bidault's reference, the State of Viet Nam's proposal on May 12 refers to "the joint Franco-Viet Nam Declaration of April 28, 1954, which provides for the signature of two fundamental treaties: the first of these treaties recognises the complete independence of the State of Viet Nam and its full and entire sovereignty: the second establishes a Franco-Viet Nam association within the French Union based on equality." *Id.* at 123. Although this independence declaration reinforced substantial expectations of independence, it seems likely that the treaty was not formally initialled until June, although this was still more than a month prior to the Accords. See note 36 *infra*. Also see the July 3, 1953 declaration by the French government of its intention to accord full independence to the State of Viet Nam, Documents on International Affairs 470–71 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1953), and the joint Franco-Vietnamese declaration to the same effect on April 28, 1954, 161 British & Foreign State Papers 648 (1954). See also former President Eisenhower's discussion of these French declarations in Eisenhower, Mandate For Change: The White House Years 1953–1956 218, 421 (Signet ed. 1963).

[34] See Scheer, How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam 12–13 (1965).

See also Do Vang Ly, Aggessions by China 104 (2d ed. 1960).

[T]he French under pressure from common friends were at last driven to negotiate with Ngo Dinh Diem, who agreed to head the government at Saigon on June 17, 1954, on condition that he was given full civil and military powers."

Ibid.

[35] Scheer, note 34 *supra* at 13.

[36] There is also evidence of some degree of factual French control and influence over Vietnamese affairs, rapidly decreasing but continuing to some extent until 1956, but the evidence including the fact that Diem was asserted to be anti-French and that Prime Minister Mendes-France feared Vietnamese disruption of the Geneva Conference points to some degree of factual independence in decision making prior to and during the Conference. For the proposition that Diem was committed to re-making Vietnamese society in an anti-French mold see Scheer, note 34 *supra* at 20. With respect to Mendes-France's fears of Vietnamese disruption of the Conference, former President Eisenhower wrote in his memoirs that:

"Mendes-France had only one request: [to U.S. representative Bedell Smith] that we use our influence with the Vietnamese Premier, Ngo Dinh Diem—newly appointed by Bao Dai—to prevent him from needlessly obstructing any honorable truce which the French might reach with the Vietminh."

Eisenhower, Mandate for Change: The White House Years 1953–1956 442 (Signet ed. 1963). Also see EDEN, FULL CIRCLE 146 (1960).

See also Survey of International Affairs 1954 44 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

"There was a delay of several days after the decision on the composition of the Indo-China conference, occasioned by the necessity of waiting for the arrival of representatives of the Vietnamese government and the Viet Minh, and by that of obtaining the consent of Bao Dai to Viet Minh representation. M. Marc Jacquet, Mr. Donald Heath, the American Ambassador in Saigon, and M. Bidault's personal secretary all flew to Cannes to exercise their persuasiveness to this end. Negotiations between France and the Vietnamese government had been under way since 8 March to draft the treaties which should accord independence to Viet Nam and define its relationship with the French Union, and it had been widely reported in the press that the treaties would be signed before the opening of the Geneva Conference. However, this plan collapsed at the last moment, apparently because of a decision by the French government to defer the signing of the main treaties until the accompanying detailed convention had been agreed upon. Bao Dai issued an indignant statement on 25 April saying that the failure to agree was no fault of the Vietnamese, and protesting against the idea of a 'Munich' in Indo-China. A 'joint declaration' that the two governments had agreed on the total independence of Viet Nam was signed on 28 April, though this did not change the juridical position of Viet Nam, which went to the conference with its sovereign status rather uncertain."

Id. at 44. "The treaties were initialed in June." *Id.* at 44 n. 7.

It should be noted that the Indo-China phase of the Geneva Conference began in early May, 1954, and the Geneva Accords were not signed—orally agreed to in the case of the Final Declaration—until July 21, 1954. (The Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities was back dated to July 20, 1954 apparently to meet Mendes-France's self-pronounced deadline.)

For the recognition figure see note 24 *supra*.

[37] Thus, French Foreign Minister Bidault said in a speech on May 8, 1954 at the opening of the Indo-China Phase of the Geneva Conference:

"[I]ndependence [for the State of Viet Nam] has already been completed. . . .

"In Viet Nam, and in spite of the war, France has been able to keep its promises and full independence has been recognised and has become effective. Thirty-five free countries, by recognising those three States, [Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos] and a number of international organizations by accepting them in their midst, have consecrated that independence. The national Government of Viet Nam has been able to set up an administration to organise its finance, to develop its economy, to establish diplomatic relations with the main free countries. It built up an army. All those elements means sovereignty. . . . The independence of those States is not at stake. . . .

"[The French Government has] . . . removed all reason for this conflict to exist by recognising fully and unreservedly the independence of Viet Nam. . . ."

Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference (Miscellaneous No. 16 [1954], Command Paper 9186). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 108–109.

And in a speech on May 14, 1954, at the Fourth Plenary Session of the Conference on Indo-China Bidault said:

"Independence is the final goal of a process of development which began immediately after the Second World War and which has already been achieved, a fact proclaimed in this very place and in the most precise and detailed manner by the representatives of the three states. [Viet Nam, Cambodia & Laos]. . . . The Vietminh proposals pay scant regard to facts and events. . . . [T]here does exist a Government of the State of Viet Nam. That Government is the

The Democratic Republic of Viet Nam on the other hand could, prior to the Accords, also claim some right to be regarded as a state under international law, for at one time the French had concluded a treaty with the D.R.V. at least factually recognizing its existence,[38] it had been recognized by the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and a number of East European nations,[39] and it had formal diplomatic relations at least with the People's Republic of China,[40] although arguably under the classic test the statehood of the D.R.V. was not as clear as that of the State of Viet Nam. Perhaps an indication of the true state of international expectations prior to the Geneva Accords is indicated by the fact that Professor Lauterpacht, at one time a judge of the International Court of Justice, in a list apparently made prior to the Accords, listed both Viet-minh and Viet Nam as separate states under international law.[41]

The Effect of the Geneva Accords of 1954

Nine states participated in some phase or another of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indo-China. They were Great Britain, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam (Viet-minh), France, Laos, the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the State of Viet Nam, and the United States.[42] It should be noted that both the D.R.V. and the State of Viet Nam were represented at the Conference, a factual recognition of the reality of two long separate and competing states in Viet Nam.[43] The final products of the Conference, reached on July 21, 1954, are widely known as the Geneva Accords of 1954.

The Geneva Accords with respect to Viet Nam consisted of an Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities, signed only by representatives of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the French Union Forces in Indo-China,[44] and an unsigned Final Declaration of the Conference.[45] The Agreement On Cessation of Hostilities which, as was indicated by the fact that it was signed, was the core of the Accords, provided principally for a military cease fire to be followed by a regroupment of opposing French Union and D.R.V. forces to the South and North respectively of a provisional military demarcation line, a limitation on the introduction of armaments and military personnel in order to prevent further conflict between the opposing forces,[46] and the creation of an International Control Commission to supervise the the execution of the agreement. Civil administration was to be in the hands of the party whose forces were regrouped in that zone pending general elections for the unification of Viet Nam. The Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities was dated July 20, 1954. The Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference made on July 21, 1954, which reiterated the spirit of the cease fire agreement and which dealt in slightly more detail with the provisions for elections was signed by no one. It was orally approved, however, by all of the nine states attending the Conference except the United States and the State of Viet Nam each of whom made unilateral declarations of their own.[47] The United States declared that it would refrain from the use of force to disturb the settlements, in accordance with its obligations under the United Nations Charter but would view any future aggression in violation of the agreements as seriously threatening peace and security. The United States also reiterated its position that "peoples are entitled to determine their own future, and that it will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this." [48] The State of Viet Nam, toward which, as has been seen, there existed expectations that it was an independent state under international law at this time and which was not a party to the Accords protested them.[49] In a final declaration which

---

government of His Majesty, Bao Dai, which is recognized by thirty-five states, is a member of various international organisations, and which is represented here in the eyes of all those who have recognised it. This Government is fully and solely competent to commit Viet Nam. With it the French Government has conducted a series of negotiations which, as I mentioned at the beginning of this statement, led to the joint declaration and to the conclusion of two treaties which the delegation of Viet Nam read to the Conference on the 12th of this month. The sovereignty and independence of Viet Nam are therefore recognised by France over the whole territory of Viet Nam. . . ."

Id. at 132–34. See also note 270 *infra.*

[38] See *Documents Relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965] Command Paper 2834), at 9.

"Negotiations led to an agreement of 6 March, 1946, by which the Viet Minh undertook not to oppose the entry of French forces [in northern Viet Nam] while the French Government recognised the Democratic Republic as a free State with its own government, legislature, army and finances, forming part of the Indo-Chinese Federation and the French Union; a referendum was to decide whether Cochin-China should be united with Annam and Tongking as one State. . . ."

Ibid.

[39] Murti, Vietnam Divided 171 (1964).

See also Survey of International Affairs 1949–50 429–30 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1953).

[40] "After the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam established formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China." Excerpt from a speech by Chou En-Lai, Head of the Delegation of the People's Republic of China, May 12, 1954. *Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 16 [1954], Command Paper 9186). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953–54), at 124.

[41] Under the heading "States At Present International Persons" Professor Lauterpacht listed among others "Viet-minh, Vietnam, North Korea and South Korea." I Oppenheim, International Law 255–258 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955). See also Murti, Vietnam Divided 171–172, 172 n.7 (1964).

[42] *Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 16 [1954] Command Paper 9186). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 106. With respect to an account of the Geneva Conference see generally Survey of International Affairs 1954 42–73 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

[43] This was not true of Cambodia and Laos where the governments of the Khmer and Pathet Lao were denied the right to participate.

[44] *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954], Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 27–38; 161 British & Foreign State Papers 818–837 (1954). The actual signatures appeared as:

"For the Commander-in-Chief of the French Union Forces in Indo-China:

"Deltiel,

"Brigadier-General.

"For the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army of Viet Nam:

"Ta-Quang-Buu,

"Vice-Minister of National Defence of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

Command Paper 9239 at 38; 161 British & Foreign State Papers at 835.

[45] *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954], Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 9–11; 161 British & Foreign State Papers 359–361 (1954).

[46] One of the puzzling aspects of the Accords is that by their terms they only prohibit the *introduction* into Viet Nam of military personnel and armaments and do not, at least by their language, prohibit buildup of indigenous military forces. If this interpretation is correct, and there is no indication in the Accords that it is not, it would seem to constitute one of the serious weaknesses in the Accords. It also makes the ban on *introduction* of armaments and military personnel seem somewhat onesided in view of the subsequent withdrawal of the substantial number of French troops constituting a major portion of the French Union forces in Viet Nam at the time of the Accords and it casts some doubt on the continuing efficacy of the ban on *introduction* of military personnel and armaments after that withdrawal, at least in a situation where elections could not be held and division continued for a substantial period. See Articles 16, 17 & 36 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities. Section 4 of the Final Declaration of the Conference strongly supports this interpretation that the ban is only on the *introduction* of military personnel and armaments and nothing in the Final Declaration would suggest any other interpretation. Section 4 provides:

"The Conference takes note of the clauses in the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet Nam prohibiting the *introduction* into Viet Nam of *foreign* troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions." (Emphasis added.)

Moreover, the Chairman of the International Control Commission took the position in a press conference on November 21, 1954 that the Accords were not concerned with increases in indigenous forces either in the North or the South. See Murti, Vietnam Divided 53 (1964). If this interpretation is correct, neither an increase in the size of the R.V.N. nor D.R.V. forces would per se be prohibited by the Accords as is apparently popularly supposed. See Scheer, How The United States Got Involved In Vietnam 62 (1965).

It should also be noted that by the terms of Articles 16 and 17 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities it was essentially the introduction of "troop *reinforcements*," "*additiona*l military personnel" and "*reinforcements*" of armaments and munitions that was prohibited. There was some latitude for replacement of existing forces and armaments written into the Agreement.

[47] See *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954]. Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXI (1953/54), at 5–9. For discussion see text at Section IV A *infra.*

[48] *Further Documents supra* note 47 at 7; 161 British & Foreign State Papers 365 (1954). For a full text of the United States unilateral declaration see text at Section IV A *infra.*

[49] See *Further Documents supra* note 47 at 7, 9. See also Fall, *How the French Got Out of Viet-Nam* in Raskin & Fall, The Viet-Nam Reader 81, at 86–87 (Vintage ed. 1965).

"At a restricted session of the Geneva Conference on 18 July, the Viet-Namese Delegate dissociated himself from discussion of the Conference took note of, however, the State of Viet Nam pledged itself not to use force to resist the cease fire arrangements in spite of its general objections to those agreements.[50]

Because the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam referred to a "provisional military demarcation line," and "regrouping zones" pending general elections for the unification of Viet Nam, and the Final Declaration said:

"The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the Agreement relating to Viet Nam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." [51] some have concluded that "under the Geneva Accords of 1954, South Viet Nam is merely a temporary zone not even qualifying politically as a state," [52] and that agression by North Viet Nam against South Viet Nam is merely a civil war, comparable even to the United States Civil War.[53]

These conclusions are based on erroneous interpretations of the Geneva Accords. As has been seen, at the Conference Viet Nam was represented by two states each claiming sovereignty to all of Viet Nam and each recognized as the only lawful government of Viet Nam by one or the other of the major opposing power blocs at the Conference. The Communist nations supported the credentials of the D.R.V., and the Western powers implicitly backed by the prior United Nations action supported those of the State of Viet Nam. Seen in context, then, this language as to provisional zones was intended to preserve the existing claims to sovereignty to all of a united Viet Nam by both the D.R.V. and the State of Viet Nam, and to indicate that the participants contemplated eventual unification of Viet Nam by free elections. This language was not intended to undercut the existing credentials of statehood of either of the contenders prior to unification. The participants at the Conference each wanted to avoid recognizing the government championed by the other side as a lawful government of any part of Viet Nam and each wanted to preserve the claims to sovereignty over all of Viet Nam of the government that they recognized. To say that the participants at the Conference intended to reduce the legal status of the particular government of Viet Nam that they recognized to that of a "temporary zone not qualifying politically as a state" is practically to state the opposite of what both sides intended. The declarations and actions of the parties before, during, and after the conference make this opposite interpretation evident.

Thus, the foreign ministers of the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, in a February 18, 1954 Berlin Resolution agreeing on the holding of the Geneva conference said:

"*It is understood* that neither the invitation to, nor the holding of, the above-mentioned Conference shall be deemed to imply diplomatic recognition in any case where it has not already been accorded." [54]

After consultations between the French and Soviet delegations at the Conference, the list of nine participating states, including both the D.R.V. and the State of Viet Nam was agreed to but again subject to this non-recognition provision of the Berlin Resolution.[55]

Similarly, French Foreign Minister Bidault made it clear in the opening address at the proceedings on Viet Nam that:

"For France, there is a Viet Nam State of which the unity, territorial integrity and independence must be respected. With the presence at this Conference of a party which, in order to fight against this state, has organized armed forces, has been admitted as a necessity with a view to bringing about a cessation of hostilities, this presence must not be interpreted as implying on our side any kind of recognition . . . The elements of this solution depend, first and foremost, in our opinion, upon the opinion which will be expressed by the Government of Viet Nam.[56]

and in a later address at the Conference he reiterated that:

"[T]here does exist a Government of the State of Viet Nam. That Government is the government of His Majesty, Bao Dai, which is recognized by thirty-five states, is a member of various international organizations, and which is represented here in the eyes of all those who have recognized it. This Government is fully and solely competent to commit Viet Nam. . . . The sovereignty and independence of Viet Nam are therefore recognized by France over the whole territory of Viet Nam," [57]

Proposals made by both the State of Viet Nam [58] and the D.R.V.[59] at the Geneva Conference called explicitly or implicitly for recognition of the sovereignty of their particular government. And there is no indication in the records of the Conference in the *British Command Papers* [60] or in the Accords themselves that the D.R.V. consented to relinquish its existing claims to statehood and sovereignty, at least over North Viet Nam,

---

draft documents embodying the principle of partition; and in the concluding session on the 21st of the month, he wanted the inclusion in the Final Declaration of terms indicating his Government's reservation, though the Chairman, Mr. Eden, rejected this suggestion. Thus the Government of Viet-Nam was not a party to the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities nor did it join in the Final Declaration of the Conference."

Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965 (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), at 17.

See also SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1954, 48, 64 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957). As to independence prior to the Accords see notes 36 & 37 *supra*.

[50] *Further Documents supra* note 47 at 7, 9. See also SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1954, 67 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

[51] Article 6 of the Final Declaration.

[52] *Memorandum of Law of Lawyers' Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam,* reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 9, 1966, pp. 2666–2673. Although the "Lawyers' Committee" makes the claim that their "memorandum" is "fully documented" (*Id.* at 2553) they cite no authority for their interpretation of the Accords to the effect that the Republic of Viet Nam does not qualify as a state unless it is an asserted article by Judge Edgerton in the *New Republic* for May 22, 1965. See *Id.* at 2669 n. 17. The communication by Judge Edgerton to the *New Republic* does not say that the Republic of Viet Nam is not a state and on this point does not advert to evidence beyond the language of the Accords set out above. See 152 *The New Republic* 28 (May 22, 1965).

[53] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 9, 1966, pp. 2668–2670. It should be pointed out that there may be substantial differences between categorization of a conflict as a "civil war" as used in everyday speech, and categorization of a conflict as a "civil war" for a particular legal purpose. The legal realists have long since demonstrated to the legal world that categorization may differ depending on the purpose for which the categorization is made. Here, some critics seek to label the Viet Nam conflict as a civil war for purposes of arguing that assistance to the South Vietnamese government is unlawful. Although the proposition that it is unlawful per se to render assistance to a recognized government such as the government of the R.V.N. is highly doubtful even in a civil war situation, as is shown in Section I C *infra*, there are substantial legal differences between the Viet Nam conflict and a "civil war" that make authorities concerned with "civil wars" not controlling. As is demonstrated by this section there are substantial expectations today that the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. are separate and independent states under international law and in any event they are separated by a military cease-fire line making aggression across that line unlawful. For the purpose of assessing the lawfulness of assistance to the R.V.N., then, the use of the military instrument by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. cannot be validly classified as a "civil war." Similarly, since the campaign to overthrow the government of the R.V.N. by armed attack receives at least significant assistance and direction from the D.R.V., the Viet Nam conflict within the R.V.N. cannot be validly classified as a "civil war" for purposes of prohibiting outside assistance to the recognized government under attack.

[54] *Resolution On The Holding Of A Far Eastern Conference Agreed By The Four Foreign Ministers*, February 18, 1954, in *Documents relating to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, Berlin, January 25–February 18, 1954*, (Miscellaneous No. 5 [1954], Command Paper 9080). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXI (1953/54), at 33. A major purpose of the resolution at this time, of course, was to avoid recognition of the Chinese People's Republic.

[55] French Foreign Minister Bidault said in the fifth plenary session of the Conference on June 8, 1954:

"As a result of exchanges of views between the French Delegation and the Soviet Delegation, the list [of members of the Conference] was finally settled with the agreement of the nine participants, subject to the reservation included in the Berlin communiqué that 'neither the invitation to, nor the holding of, the above-mentioned Conference shall be deemed to imply diplomatic recognition in any case where it has not already been accorded.' "

Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference (Miscellaneous No. 16 [1954], Command Paper 9186). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXI (1953/54), at 137.

[56] *Id.* at 110.

[57] *Id.* at 133–34.

[58] *Id.* at 123. It is a generally accepted proposition in international law that preparatory work at a Conference, (*travaux préparatoires*) included the records of negotiation and the minutes of the plenary meetings, may be a useful aid in interpretation. See I OPPENHEIM, INTERNATIONAL LAW 862–63 (7th ed. Lauterpacht 1948); *Harvard Research Draft Convention on The Law of Treaties,* 29 AM. J. INT'L. L. 652, 937, 953–966 (Supp. 1935).

[59] *Documents, supra* note 55 at 116–121. See particularly §§ 1 and 4 of the D.R.V. proposal. See French Foreign Minister Bidault's interpretation of the Viet-minh proposals *Documents, supra* note 55 at 133–34.

This insistence by both sides on recognition of the sovereignty of the government championed by their side was implicit in much of the discussion at the Conference. See *Documents, supra* note 55 at 105–168.

[60] *Documents, supra* note 55 at 105–168.

by signing the ceasefire agreement and acceding to the Final Declaration. Certainly the State of Viet Nam which expressly objected to the Final Declaration and which had not even signed the ceasefire agreement did not consent to have its status reduced from a recognized state under international law to that of a mere zone And the same is apparently true with respect to the interpretations by all of the other participants in the conference with respect to the accords on Viet Nam. There can be no better evidence of this intention than by the subsequent interpretations on this point by the participants in the conference itself. As the comments to the *Harvard Research Draft Convention on The Law of Treaties* indicate:

"In interpreting a treaty, the conduct or action of the parties thereto cannot be ignored. If all the parties to a treaty execute it, or permit its execution, in a particular manner, that fact may reasonably be taken into account as indicative of the real intention of the parties or of the purpose which the instrument was designed to serve."[61]

Similarly, Article 69 of the *International Law Commission 1964 Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties* provides:

"There shall also be taken into account, [in the interpretation of treaties] together with the context: . . .

"(b) Any subsequent practice in the application of the treaty which clearly establishes the understanding of all the parties regarding its interpretation.[62]

By way of subsequent conduct of the participants with respect to Viet Nam, the British government, one of the Co-Chairmen of the Conference, said sometime after the Conference was concluded:

"The references in the title and text of this message to the 'Democratic Republic of Viet Nam' do not involve any departure from the policy of Her Majesty's government in recognising, in accordance with their obligations under Article 12 of the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam as the only legal Government of Vietnam."[63]

And, by way of further indication of this, the British Joint Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said in the House of Lords on June 25, 1957:

"The present division of Viet-Nam into two parts on either side of the 17th Parallel dates from the agreements reached at the Geneva Conference of 1954. In the North authority is vested in the so-called Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam resident in Hanoi. The South is administered from Saigon by the Government of the Republic of Viet Nam of which Ngo Dinh Diem is President. Her Majesty's Government recognizes the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam as the sole Government entitled to represent the State of Viet-Nam in international affairs."[64]

Similarly, in a dispute with respect to the maintenance of a United States consulate in Hanoi shortly after the Accords, both the D.R.V. and the United States seemed to interpret the Accords as preserving the statehood of the governments of the D.R.V. and the Republic of Viet Nam respectively.[65] Later statements by the Soviet Union delegates to the United Nations are consistent with the retention of claims to statehood by the governments concerned.[66] In fact, although it is always difficult to prove the negative, a cursory but conscientious search indicates that none of the participants in the Geneva discussions on Viet Nam ever put forth the interpretation that under the Geneva Accords the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. were both merely "temporary zones not qualifying as states." In the face of the uncontradicted evidence of what the participants actually intended by the Geneva Accords such assertions of loss of statehood are untenable.

Certainly the participants in the Conference intended, at least by the language of the agreements, that Viet Nam be unified by free elections under one or the other of the competing governments variously recognized by the two sides. This, however, is quite a different intent from that of reducing the statehood of the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. to "temporary zones not qualifying as states." It is principally this intent that Viet Nam be unified by free election which is expressed by the "provisional zones" language in the accords. To suggest, however, from this intent that aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is merely a "civil war" even comparable to the United States Civil War is to ignore the crucial fact, among others, that the central purpose of the internationally drawn provisional demarcation line in Viet Nam was for a military cease fire making aggression across that line unlawful. If nothing else, the two zones were at least intended as separate international entities with respect to the lawfulness of the use of force by one zone against the other.[67] Consequently, *even if* the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. were not today two *separate* states, aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is a fundamental breach of the Geneva Accords entitling the R.V.N. to the appropriate corresponding right of self-defense. Since this point has often been ignored, it bears emphasizing that even if this were a "civil war" in Viet Nam in the sense that there were no current expectations that two independent and separate states exist today in Viet Nam, nevertheless, the fact that armed aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is in fundamental breach of an internationally drawn cease-fire line makes the legal consequences radically different from those attending a "civil war."[68] As Professor Quincy Wright pointed out in the 1959 Proceedings of the American Society of International Law:

"Another complication may result from the protracted functioning of a cease-fire or armistice line within the territory of a state. While hostilities across such a line by the government in control of one side, claiming title to rule the entire state, seems on its face to be civil strife, if such lines have been long continued and widely recognized, as have those in Germany, Palestine, Kashmir, Korea, Viet Nam and the Straits of Formosa, they assume the character of international boundaries. Hostilities across them immediately constitute breaches of *international* peace, and justify 'collective defense' measures by allies or friends of the attacked government, or 'collective security' measures by the United Nations. If this were not so, armistice and cease-fire lines would have no meaning at all."[69]

The United Nations action in Korea lends support to this distinction. Moreover, it cannot be validly maintained that the military demarcation line pursuant to the Geneva Accords no longer has validity in Viet Nam. For both the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. regard the Accords as having continuing legal validity and continue to make complaints to the International Control Commission.[70] Furthermore, the decisions and continued functioning of the International Control Commission long after the July 1956 failure to hold elections also indicates the continuing legal validity of the internationally set demarcation line in Viet Nam.[71] In addition, apparently all parties concerned regard the Accords at least as the beginning point of any current settlement, and the general international community attitude bears out this expectation that the demarcation line is of continuing validity today. This continuing legal validity of the demarcation line in Viet Nam is consistent with the stated United States policy not to attack the integrity of the D.R.V. as a territorial or political entity, but simply to induce the D.R.V. to halt its armed aggression against the R.V.N.

---

[61] 29 Am. J. Int'l. L. 966 (Supp. 1935).

[62] *Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its sixteenth session 11 May—24 July 1964,* U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 19th Sess., Supp. No. 9, at 25 (A/5809) (1964).

[63] *Vietnam and the Geneva Agreements* (Vietnam No. 2 [1956], Command Paper 9763). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XLV (1955/56), at 3 n.1.

[64] *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), at 126.

[65] See Murti, Vietnam Divided 173–74 (1964). Dr. Murti also points out:

"Both the Western bloc as well as the Soviet bloc of countries recognised the State of Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam Governments respectively, as the only legal Government over the whole of Vietnam. Even after the Geneva Agreement, the two blocs continued their recognition and their diplomatic missions in the two zones and claimed that the Government supported by them was the only legal Government for the whole of Vietnam."

Id., at 173.

See also as to continued French recognition of the Saigon government, Survey of International Affairs 1954 83 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

[66] See text at notes 91–94 *infra*.

[67] See in particular Articles 19, 24 and 42 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities and paragraph 5 of the Final Declaration.

[68] Violation of a cease-fire line in an international agreement by the use of force, unless in self-defense or pursuant to valid United Nations collective action, would also seem to be a patent violation of the fundamental principle against the use of force in international relations; a principle embodied in Article II, sections 3 & 4 of the United Nations Charter. Since there can be no doubt that the D.R.V. violations of the Accords by force are aimed at the political and territorial integrity of the R.V.N., and are neither justified by self-defense nor by valid collective United Nations action, they are undoubtedly also in violation of fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. Professor Quincy Wright has said:

"The Charter explicitly permits a state to use armed force in the territory of a foreign state or across an internationally recognized armistice or cease-fire line only in 'individual or collective self-defense' in response to an 'armed attack'; under authority of the United Nations itself; or on invitation by the government of the state in whose territory the force is used, in case that government is in fact in a position to speak for the state."

Wright, *International Law and Civil Strife,* 1959 Proceedings of the American Society of Int'l Law 145, 148 (1959).

[69] *Id.* at 151.

[70] For example on the commencement of United States bombing of military targets in the D.R.V. in February, 1965, the D.R.V. registered a formal complaint with the I.C.C. of violation of the Geneva Accords. See *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China of February 13, 1965* (Vietnam No. 1 [1965], Command Paper 2609), at 7–10. During the same period, the R.V.N. also registered a formal complaint with the I.C.C. of D.R.V. violations of the Accords by armed attack against the R.V.N. See *Id.* at 16–30.

That this is currently the official D.R.V. position is also indicated in a Report by D.R.V. Prime Minister Pham Van Dong made to the National Assembly of the D.R.V. on April 8, 1965 in which he said: "It is the unswerving policy of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to strictly respect the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Vietnam. . . ." Aptheker, Mission to Hanoi 113 (1966).

It should also be pointed out that Article 14 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities provided for administration of separate zones "pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Viet Nam," and regardless of the cause, such elections have not yet been held.

The nearly ten years of separate development of the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. along different ideological lines after the date set for elections had come and gone indicates that the cease fire line established by the Geneva Accords in fact created continuing expectations of an international boundary between the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. The actions of the D.R.V. in continuing attempts to conceal their military direction and assistance with respect to the N.L.F.,[72] rather than openly admitting that the attack on the R.V.N. includes elements of the PAVN army, also provides some indication that the D.R.V. regards the cease fire line as a valid international demarcation line with respect to the employment of forces across that line, and that they regard the use of force by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. as something other than "civil strife."

Although some have argued that assistance even to the recognized government in a "civil war" should be outlawed because of the danger of civil strife escalating to international war,[73] the same argument would appear to apply even more strongly with respect to the use of force by the D.R.V. across what is at least a factual international cease-fire line dividing the major contending ideological systems in the World today. And once significant outside armed aggression takes place across such a line against the established government, certainly the situation should give rise to appropriate rights of self-defense. It should also be pointed out that there is no indication in the Accords themselves that they would cease to function should elections not be held. In the light of the complete lack of evidence of such an intent in the Accords and of the continuing evidence of expectations to the contrary this interpretation would be unwarranted. And it should be remembered that any argument depending on the cessation of the effect of the Geneva Accords because elections were not held would cut both ways. Under such a theory presumably it would also be a "civil war" should the R.V.N. openly invade the North even in some hypothetical situation in which they had no provocation. It is doubtful that in these circumstances the nations supporting the D.R.V. would be inclined to accept the "civil war" label and in any event this also would be too disruptive of minimum world public order. Consequently, such a theory of the expiration of the Geneva Accords when elections were not held would seem neither realistic nor attractive.

Moreover, despite the language of the Accords there are some indications that at least some of the participants at the Geneva Conference were aware that the Accords might result in indefinitely partitioning Viet Nam until genuinely free elections could be held. Anthony Eden's memoirs indicate his feelings in 1954 that the partition of Viet Nam was the best solution.[74] In fact, in view of the German and Korean experiences partition seems a somewhat drastic way to arrange a cease fire and election if that was all that was contemplated by the parties.[75]

---

[71] Out of eleven Interim Reports and a number of Special Reports issued to date by the International Commission for Supervision and Control In Vietnam, six of the Interim Reports and all of the Special Reports have been issued after the July 1956 date for elections had passed. These also included the 1962 Special Report of the I.C.C., finding violations against the D.R.V. for its aggression against the R.V.N., and finding violations against the R.V.N. for receiving military assistance to meet that aggression.

It is also clear from these I.C.C. reports and the official messages of the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference that the failure to hold elections did not affect the continuing legal validity of the international cease-fire line in Viet Nam. Thus, in an official message from the British and Soviet Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on May 8, 1956 which adverted to the possibility of non-implementation of the election provisions, the Co-Chairmen said: "Pending the holding of free general elections for the reunification of Viet-Nam, the two Co-Chairmen attach great importance to the maintenance of the cease-fire under the continued supervision of the International Commission for Viet-Nam." *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), 96–99, at 97. In the Eighth Interim Report of the I.C.C. issued on June 5, 1958, the Commission indicated that its supervision was to continue until free elections were held, saying:

"The Commission notes that there has been no consultation between the two Parties with a view to holding free nationwide elections for the reunification of the country, and to resolving the political problems and thus facilitating an early termination of the activities of the Commission and the fulfillment of its tasks."

Eighth Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam (Vietnam No. 1 [1958], Command Paper 509), at 15. And in its Ninth Interim Report issued on March 10, 1959, the Commission said: "The Commission, as directed by the Co-Chairman, has persevered, and will continue to persevere in its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in Vietnam in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Agreement . . . ;" and

"There has been no progress in the field of political settlement as envisaged in the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference. There has been no consultation between the two Parties with a view to holding free nation-wide elections for the reunification of Vietnam. This has maintained the prospect of an indefinite continuance of the Commission and its activities."

Ninth Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam (Vietnam No. 1 [1959], Command Paper 726), at 17.

[72] D.R.V. Prime Minister Pham Van Dong said on January 8, 1966:

Question 3: "If the United States withdrew its troops, would the DRV withdraw its troops from South Vietnam?

Answer: "The so-called 'presence of forces of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in South Vietnam' is a sheer U.S. fabrication in order to justify their war of aggression in South Vietnam."

Aptheker, Mission to Hanoi 124 (1966). See also Viet Report 6, 7 (Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. 1966).

[73] See the discussion in Section I C *infra*.

[74] See Eden, Full Circle 97, 101, 102 (1960).

"It was clear to me that any negotiated settlement was bound to produce either a Communist share in the government of most of Indo-China, or complete Communist control of part of the country, and I thought that the latter alternative was preferable. . . . The were some indications of a greater willingness in Vietnam to face partition. There was no love lost between north and south. We felt that the distress at amputation might prove more apparent than real."

Id. at 101.

[75] Former President Eisenhower has written:

"In Vietnam . . . the French proposed military groupings in delimited zones—which means that all Red formations would move north of one established line, all those loyal to the French Union would pull south of that parallel. . . . To me these French proposals . . . implied nothing else but partition. We knew, from experience in Korea, that this would probably lead to Communist enslavement of millions in the northern partitioned area."

Eisenhower, Mandate for Change: The White House Years 1953–1956 432 (Signet ed. 1963). See also the seven point program jointly agreed to by the United States and the United Kingdom on June 29, 1954, which indicates that an armistice agreement on Indo-China would be respected which:

". . .

"2. Preserves at least the southern half of Vietnam. . . .

"3. Does not impose on . . . retained Vietnam any restrictions materially impairing . . . [its] capacity to maintain stable non-Communist regimes; and especially restrictions impairing . . . [its] right to maintain adequate forces for internal security, to import arms and to employ foreign advisers.

"4. Does not contain political provisions which would risk loss of the retained area to Communist control.

"5. Does not exclude the possibility of the ultimate reunification of Vietnam by peacefull means. . . ."

Eden, Full Circle 149 (1960). Apparently Mendés-France also supported these objectives. See *Id.* at 157.

See also Survey of International Affairs 1954 48, 58, 60 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

"On 25 May the Viet Minh Foreign Minister, Mr. Dong, put forward a detailed plan, which was clearly in the nature of a first approximation to the 'accepting price' of the insurgents. . . . This plan was, clearly, rather more than a proposal for a regroupment of forces; if put into effect it would in fact provide something like a *de facto* military partition of the country, and one that, with its provision that the two areas chosen should be economically viable, seemed to be envisaged. as lasting for some time."

Id. at 48. And see Do Vang Ly, Aggressions By China 151 (2d ed. 1960).

"Naivete is not known as a Communist weakness. The Vietminh must have known the true meaning of 'provisional' when they bargained at Geneva for division on the 17th Parallel. They could not have been unaware of the fact that the partitions in Germany and Korea were also 'provisional' in the beginning, and that with the years they had, to all appearances, become about as 'provisional' as the cold war."

Ibid.

The stress on civilian freedom to choose zones, which took the form of Article 14(d) of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities providing for free transfer only during the troop movement period, also seems to some extent an implicit recognition by the parties that the partition might last a substantial period of time, and that in the interim there would be two separate international entities in Viet Nam.

According to the *Fourth Interim Report* of the I.C.C., by July 20th, 1955, 892,876 had moved from the North to the South and only 4,269 had moved from the South to the North under Article 14(d). *Fourth Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam* (Vietnam No. 3 [1955], Command Paper 9654). Great

Moreover, the Accords are not notoriously heavy in election provisions, mentioning them only in a rather airy fashion.[76] It was clear that the Conference had not come to grips with the key election problem in any meaningful way in 1954.[77] With this background, it may well be that the participants at the Conference were not particularly surprised when elections were not held in 1956.

In summary, the proponents of the view that the use of the military instrument by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is a "civil war" must establish not only that factually the Accords did not establish an international demarcation line creating expectations of two separate international entities in Viet Nam today, but also that the military cease fire line of the Accords had ceased to have legal validity prior to the D.R.V. aggression against the R.V.N., a result which does not automatically follow from a mere recitation of the language in the Accords to the effect that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."[78] For even if the line was not originally intended as a political or territorial boundary this does not mean that the cease-fire line itself, a major purpose of the Accords, is of no validity today on the issue of military aggression across that line.

The use of the military instrument by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N., then, is clearly not analogous to "civil strife" either for the purpose of assessing the lawfulness of that use or for the purpose of assessing the lawfulness of the responding assistance to the R.V.N. This is so both because of the existence of substantial expectations today that the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. are separate and independent states under international law and in the existence of an international cease-fire line in Viet Nam violated by armed aggression of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. The "civil strife" label, then, ignores the essence of the Geneva Accords in preference to a facile verbalism. Also, of course, the United States Civil War analogy is non-comparable, among other reasons because the "Hanoi regime is anything but the legitimate government of a unified country in which the South is rebelling against lawful national authority."[79]

With respect to the effect of the 1954 Geneva Accords on the status as states of both the State of Viet Nam and the D.R.V., the Accords is no way lessened the established status of the State of Viet Nam or the existing claims of the D.R.V. Instead, they could only have strengthened the claims to statehood of the competing governments, particularly the seemingly weaker claims of the D.R.V., since the reality of the settlement was that the two governments had acquired, even if intended to be temporary, relatively fixed and separate territories and had participated in an important international conference even though that participation did not technically result in recognition of their asserted statehood by the countries of the opposing bloc.

In the nearly twelve years following the Geneva Accords, this reality of two separate and independent states in Viet Nam has become increasingly clear.

The Present Status of the D.R.V. and the Republic of Viet Nam

Although the settlements of an international conference are a means of effecting the status of statehood, in the final analysis they are only one means for effecting that status and may be superceded by later and contrary indications of the expectations of the World Community, or of the participants in the Conference. Moreover, treaties such as the Geneva Accords on Viet Nam cannot bind the international community as a whole with respect to recognition of statehood, but only those states agreeing to be bound.[80] The rest of the world community, including the United States, which expressly refused to be bound by the Accords, has always been free to recognize the reality of two independent international entities in Viet Nam and certainly this is true for purposes of rendering assistance for their self-defense. Today, nearly twelve years after the Geneva Conference of 1954, there can be no real doubt as to the statehood of the Republic of Viet Nam, a statehood which substantially existed even prior to the Geneva Accords and which was not adversely affected by them. It would appear, however, that despite language of the Geneva Accords there are now substantial expectations of two states existing in Viet Nam which qualify as separate and independent states under international law.[81]

On October 26, 1955, following a referendum in South Viet Nam, the Republic of Viet Nam was formed with Ngo Dinh Diem as President.[82] Since the Geneva Conference of 1954, the statehood of this Republic of Viet Nam, the successor government to the Bao Dai government of the State of Viet Nam, has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the international community.

On January 23, 1957, a draft resolution sponsored by 13 nations including two of the participants plus the Co-Chairman of the 1954 Geneva Conference, France, the United States and Great Britain, was introduced in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly seeking the admission of the Republic of Viet Nam to the United Nations.[83] The resolution in final form provided:

> *The General Assembly,*
>
> *Recalling* its resolution 620 C (VII) of 21 December 1952 finding Viet-Nam qualified for membership in the United Nations
>
> *Noting* that Viet-Nam [the Republic of Viet Nam] has been excluded from membership in the United Nations because of the opposition of one of the permanent members of the Security Council,
>
> 1. *Reaffirm its determination* that Viet-Nam is fully qualified for admission to membership in the United Nations;
>
> 2. *Requests* the Security Council to reconsider the application of Viet-Nam in the light of this determination and to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible.[84]

The co-sponsorship of this resolution by Britain, the United States, and France, with the approval of the Republic of Viet Nam is further evidence that the participants in the Geneva discussion on Viet Nam did not regard the Accords as affecting the recog-

---

Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XLV (1955/56), at 30, Appendix IV. In referring to these figures the SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1955–56 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1960), says: "The figures given seem to be incomplete, but not widely so." *Id.* at 18 n.1. According to Bernard Fall, ". . . perhaps as many as 80,000 local guerrillas and regulars and their dependents, including almost 10,000 mountain tribesmen, went northward." Fall, *How the French Got Out of Viet-Nam*, in RASKIN & FALL, THE VIET-NAM READER 81, at 88 (Vintage ed. 1965).

[76] The only reference to elections in the signed Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities appears in Article 14(a) and reads: "Pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of the Viet Nam. . . ."

The unsigned Final Declaration of the Conference adverts to the election problem in all three sentences of paragraph 7, but leaves most of the important problems to be solved by consultations between the zones to commence on July 20, 1955. The first two sentences of paragraph 7 are an experience in ambiguity.

[77] See discussion note 76 *supra*. Some questions which immediately come to mind are: What are the Vietnamese to vote on: unification, a chief executive, a constitution, a constituent assembly, etc.? If the question of unification is the issue, do "general elections" mean that a majority of the total of both zones is necessary for unification, or a majority of each zone, both agreeing? Can elections be "free general elections" if there is only one choice on the ballot? If not how many and what choices must there be? Is a simple majority all that is required or some other figure?

This cavalier treatment of the political settlement problems must be considered a major weakness of the Accords and suggest that the parties were aware of the possibility of an extended partition in Viet Nam unless, of course, they contemplated unification other than by elections. See generally, Fall, *How the French Got Out of Viet-Nam*, in RASKIN & FALL, THE VIET-NAM READER, 81, at 87–88 (Vintage ed. 1965).

[78] From paragraph 6 of the Final Declaration.

[79] *The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam* 4 (Reprint from the March 28, 1966 Department of State Bulletin—Department of State publication 8062, Far Eastern Series 147).

[80] See the discussion in text at Section IV A *infra*.

[81] This does not mean, of course, that if at some time both the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. should agree to unification that it would be barred by international law.

[82] See the Provisional Act constituting the Republic in South Vietnam in 162 BRITISH & FOREIGN STATE PAPERS 539–40 (1955). See also Fall, *How the French Got Out of Viet-Nam* in RASKIN & FALL, THE VIET-NAM READER 89 (Vintage ed. 1965); THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS 1955 113 (Council on Foreign Relations 1957).

For extracts from the Constitution of the Republic of Viet-Nam, promulgated on October 26, 1956, see UNITED NATIONS YEARBOOK ON HUMAN RIGHTS FOR 1956 259–62 (1958).

[83] U.N. GEN. ASS. OFF. REC. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 77 (A/SPC/SR. 17) (1957).

The question of the admission of the Republic of Viet Nam to the United Nations was also adverted to in December, 1955. Without a vote on the admission of Viet Nam as such, the General Assembly passed a "package deal" resolution to admit "all those eighteen countries about which no problem of unification arises." It was evident from this language and the discussions that the Republic of Viet Nam and the Republic of Korea were not included in the General Assembly "package deal." Since their non-inclusion at the time was apparently in the interest of breaking the serious admissions deadlock confronting the United Nations and since the issue of the inclusion of the R.V.N. was never pressed in the General Assembly this non-inclusion can not be taken as authority for General Assembly opposition to the admission of the R.V.N. In fact, when the issue was pressed in the Security Council the Council voted 9 to 1 with 1 abstention to admit the Republic of Viet-Nam. Again, the negative vote of the U.S.S.R., a permanent member of the Council, prevented the resolution from passing with respect to the R.V.N. See U.N. GEN. ASS. OFF. REC. 10th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 21, at 4–7 (1955); U.N. GEN. ASS. OFF. REC. 10th Sess., Plenary 552nd, 409–420, at 420 (A/PV. 552 (1955); U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL OFF. REC. 10th year, 704th meeting 1–10, at 10 (S/PV. 704 (1955).

[84] U.N. GEN. ASS. OFF. REC. 11th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 25, at 9 (A/RES/523) (1957).

nized status of the Republic of Viet Nam as a state under international law. This draft resolution was adopted by the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly by a vote of 44 to 8 with 23 abstentions.[85] The only 8 votes against the resolution were the 3 of the three Soviet Socialist Republics, joined by Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Romania.[86] The General Assembly adopted the resolution on February 28, 1957, by a vote of 40 to 8 with 18 abstentions.[87]

It was evident from some of the debates on this resolution that the General Assembly votes recognized the status of the Republic of Viet Nam as an independent state under international law. Mr. Matsudaira, the delegate from Japan said: "Viet-Nam had now become an independent State which maintained diplomatic relations with forty-seven countries and belonged to many international organizations."[88] Mr. Navia Varon, the delegate from Colombia stated: "The Republic of Korea and the Republic of Viet-Nam were sovereign States which fulfilled the requirements of the Charter. . . ."[89] In fact, significantly the Soviet delegation at this time did not oppose the admission of the Republic of Viet Nam on the grounds that it was not a state or that the Geneva Accords had deprived it of status as a state but instead argued that *both* the Republic of Viet Nam and the D.R.V. were separate and independent states which should be admitted to membership in the United Nations together. And in January, 1957, the Soviet delegation introduced a draft resolution to that effect seeking "the simultaneous admission of all these States," the D.R.V., South Viet Nam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea.[90]

During the debate on these resolutions, Mr. Sobolev, the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said in referring to the 13 power draft resolutions to admit the Republic of Korea and Viet Nam: "The two draft resolutions before the Committee served propaganda purposes: they suggested that South Korea and South Viet-Nam represented the whole of Korea and the whole of Viet Nam respectively. The real situation was quite different: both in Korea and in Viet-Nam two separate States existed, which differed from one another in political and economic structure."[91] And later he said: "The fact was that there were two States in Korea and two States in Viet-Nam."[92] And during the same debate, Mr. Kizya, the delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic said: "The realistic approach was to admit that there were two States with conflicting political systems in both Korea and Viet-Nam. In the circumstances, the only possible solution was the simultaneous admission of the four countries constituting Korea and Viet-Nam. That was the purpose of the USSR draft resolution."[93] And Mr. Pyzhkov, the delegate of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic said: "[T]wo completely separate and independent States had been established in each of those countries, [Korea and Viet Nam] with different political, social and economic systems."[94]

This Soviet draft resolution and the views of the Soviet delegation during the debates on the various resolutions indicate that the other Co-Chairman of the 1954 Geneva Convention, the Soviet Union clearly took the position that in 1957 despite the Geneva Convention or perhaps as a result of it there were now two sovereign and independent states in Viet Nam. It should be noted that apparently the 1954 Geneva Convention and the partition of Viet Nam had substantially changed the position of the USSR from its 1952 stand by the D.R.V. was the sole legitimate government of Viet Nam. It in effect admitted the legitimacy of the government of the Republic of Viet Nam as a state under international law and sought to establish the statehood of the D.R.V. as well. Again, this position indicates that the participants in the Geneva discussions on Viet Nam did not regard the Accords as limiting the statehood of the recognized governments of Viet Nam.

This General Assembly resolution for the admission of Viet Nam was debated on September 9, 1957 in the Security Council.[95] During the course of the debates it was reaffirmed that the Republic of Viet Nam was considered an independent sovereign nation. Thus Sir Pierson Dixon, the United Kingdom delegate, stated: "My Government played a leading part in the negotiations at the Geneva Conference in 1954 which brought an end to the tragic war in Indo-China and which thus enabled the State of Viet-Nam to establish itself in independence."[96] And Mr. Jarring, the Swedish delegate said: "[O]ur affirmative vote implies recognition by my Government of Viet-Nam, with the territory which it now possesses *de facto*."[97] From the context of the discussion as a whole it is evident that these remarks were in reference to the Republic of Viet Nam. The Security Council vote was 10 to 1 in favor of admission, but again this Soviet "veto" prevented the passage of the resolution.[98]

On October 25, 1957, the General Assembly again responded to this Soviet "veto" with a resolution substantially identical to that of February 28.[99] This time the resolution was passed by a vote of 49 to 9 with 23 abstentions.[100] On December 9, 1958, by a vote of 8 to 1 with 2 abstentions the Security Council again voted in favor of the admission of the Republic of Viet Nam.[101] Again, however, the Soviet "veto" prevented the resolution from passing. These votes were taken after full presentation of the arguments that the Republic of Viet Nam was not a state representative of the people of Viet Nam and that unification of Viet Nam should be required prior to admission to the United Nations.[102] This General Assembly resolution, then, was another decisive rejection of the arguments against the statehood of the Republic of Viet Nam by the most authoritative organ of the international community. And at the least these General Assembly resolutions that the R.V.N. is fully qualified for membership in the United Nations mean pursuant to Article 4 of the Charter that in the judgment of the General Assembly the R.V.N. is capable of fulfilling its obligations under the Charter.[103] This would seem to specifically affirm that the R.V.N. has the right of individual or collective self-defense expressly reserved under Article 51 of the Charter. Moreover, at the present time both the R.V.N. and the D.R.V. have pending applications for membership in the United Nations,[104] which again under Article 4 of the Charter expresses their willingness to be bound by the United Nations Charter and indicates their assessment of their own status as states able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter.

This history of United Nations resolutions and debates on the status of the two Viet Nams after the 1954 Geneva Accords leaves no doubt that the Republic of Viet Nam is recognized as an independent state under international law and some of the debates lend support to the proposition that there are now two independent states in Viet Nam.

The present status of the Republic of Viet Nam as a state under international law is confirmed by the recognition presently accorded that state by about 60 nations.[105] It is also presently a member of at least 30 international organizations[106] including 12 specialized agencies of the United Nations,[107] has a permanent observer to the United Nations,[108] and has participated in about 48 international conferences.[109] In fact, the R.V.N. is a member of as many specialized agencies of the U.N. as is the Republic of Korea and is a member of more than are Albania, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and the U.S.S.R., among others.[110] It should also be pointed out that since the United Nations determinations and the continuing international recognition of the Republic of Viet Nam have overwhelmingly recognized the Saigon government as the lawful government of the R.V.N. rather than the National Liberation Front, there can be no question but that the Saigon government and not the N.L.F. is regarded by the international community as the generally recognized government entitled to speak for the Republic of Viet Nam.[111]

---

[85] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 105 (A/SPC/SR.22) (1957).

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Plenary 663rd (A/PV.663) (1957).

[88] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 77 (A/SPC/SR.17) (1957).

[89] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 80 (A/SPC/SR.18) (1957).

[90] See U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 25, at 5–7 (A/SPC/L.9) (A/3519) (1957).

[91] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 79 (A/SPC/SR.18) (1957).

[92] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 101 (A/SPC/SR.22) (1957).

[93] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 81 (A/SPC/SR.18) (1957).

[94] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 11th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 87 (A/SPC/SR.19) (1957).

[95] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 12th year, 789–790th meetings (S/PV.789) (S/PV.790) (1957).

[96] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 12th year, 790th meeting 5 (S/PV.790) (1957).

[97] *Id.* at 8.

[98] *Id.* at 10.

[99] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 25, at 2–4 (A/3712) (1957). The vote on this resolution on October 17, 1957, in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly was 49 to 9, with 22 abstentions. U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 41 (A/SPC/SR.49) (1957). For debate on this resolution in the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly see U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm., 44–49th meetings (A/SPC/SR. 44–49) (1957). For debate and vote on this resolution in the General Assembly see U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Plenary 709 (A/PV.709) (1957).

[100] U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Plenary 709 (A/PV.709) (1957).

[101] U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 13th year, 843rd meeting 8–10 (S/PV.843) (1958).

[102] For example: "According to Article 14 of the Agreement on the Cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam, South Viet-Nam was merely a zone for the regrouping of French military units. Its administration was not a legal government which could be taken to represent Viet-Nam as a whole." Statement of Mr. Trhlik, the delegate from Czechoslovakia. U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 10 (A/SPC/SR.45) (1957);

"The draft resolution proposing that South Viet-Nam should be admitted to the United Nations . . . was contrary to the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indo-China, under which South Viet-Nam was merely an area for the re-grouping of the French armed forces and the régime established there could not be regarded as a legal government representing the interests of the Viet-Namese people. . . . The agreements had been signed on behalf of the people of Viet-Nam by the present Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam which had thus been given factual recognition as the only Government entitled to represent the entire Viet-Namese people."

Statement of Mr. Voutov, the delegate from Bulgaria. U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 12th Sess., Spec. Pol. Comm. 16–17 (A/SPC/SR.46) (1957).

[103] Article 4, section 1 of the United Nations Charter provides: "Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

[104] Information supplied by the Office of Public Affairs, the United States Mission to the United Nations, to J. N. Moore on February 22, 1966. According to the Office of Public Affairs, "South Vietnam submitted its application on December 17, 1951. North Vietnam submitted its application on November 22, 1948, but it was not circulated as a Security Council document until September 17, 1952."

When the United States agreed to render assistance to the Saigon government these United Nations determinations and international recognition indicate that there was no uncertainty as to which government was entitled to speak for the R.V.N.[112] There was in fact no realistic alternative to the Saigon government, for no other governmental entity in South Viet Nam, including the N.L.F.—which apparently was not even fromally created until 1960[113]—had any realistic claim to represent the people of the Republic of Viet Nam in international affairs. Moreover, as is discussed in the next section, the evidence indicates that the N.L.F. receives significant assistance and control from the D.R.V. and cannot validly claim to be representative only of indigenous sentiment within the R.V.N. itself. As such, the Saigon government and not the N.L.F. is the only government lawfully entitled to request defensive assistance for the Republic of Viet Nam.

With respect to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, its claims to statehood are strengthened by the recognition presently accorded to it by about 24 nations,[114] and its participation in a number of international conference.

It should be pointed out that the continuing full recognition accorded to the Republic of Viet Nam by the United States, Great Britain, France and Laos and the recognition of the D.R.V. by the Soviet Union and Communist China is again indicative that the participants in the Geneva Conference of 1954 did not contemplate that the Accords would adversely affect the existing statehood of the D.R.V. or the Republic of Viet Nam in the absence of elections to unify Viet Nam.

It should also be noted that in the 1962 Geneva Conference on Laos, the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. again participated separately.[115] In fact Laos apparently has diplomatic relations with both states, constituting additional recognition of the reality of the separateness of the D.R.V. and the R.V.N.[116]

As Dr. B. S. N. Murti, an Indian scholar who was actively associated with the International Commission For Supervision and Control in Viet Nam has written in 1964: "[Since the Geneva Agreement] Two independent sovereign States, claiming sovereignty over the whole country, came into existence in Viet Nam and the division of the country seems permanent. . . .[117] Both the States are completely independent with fullfledged Governments of their own owing no allegiance to the others."[118] Today, nearly twelve years after the Geneva Accords of 1954 it can be said that there are substantial expectations within the international community that the Republic of Viet Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam are separate and independent states under international law.[119]

---

[105] See note 8 *supra*.

[106] Nguyen-Van-Thai & Nguyen-Van-Mung, A Short History of Viet Nam 346 (1958).

[107] The Republic of Viet-Nam is a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Monetary Fund, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, the Universal Postal Union, and the World Meteorological Organization. *United Nations Press Services, Office of Public Information*, Note No. 2718/Rev. 3 (April 1964) (64–38338). The Republic of Viet Nam is also a member of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. See U.N. Ecosoc Council Off. Rec. 20th Sess., Supp. No. 5, at 1 (E/2712) (E/CN.11/407) (1955). The government of the Republic of Viet Nam has also "made or pledged contributions to the United Nations programmes in Korea and Palestine and to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance." See the remarks of United States Ambassador Lodge made in the Security Council on December 9, 1958. U.N. Security Council Off. Rec. 13th year, 843rd meeting 8 (S/PV.843 (1958).

[108] The office of the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Viet Nam to the United Nations is located at 866 United Nations Plaza, Suite 547–9 New York 17, New York.

[109] *Preliminary Report on the Achievements of the War Cabinet, from June 19, 1965 to September 29, 1965,* 52 (Republic of Vietnam 1965).

[110] Out of 16 specialized agencies listed in April 1964, the Republic of Viet Nam and the Republic of Korea were members of 12, Cambodia, Cuba and Czechoslovakia were members of 11, Bulgaria, Romania and the U.S.S.R. were members of 9, Albania, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine were members of 8, Yemen was a member of 6, Monaco and Mongolia were members of 5, Zanzibar was a member of 4, Liechtenstein was a member of 2, and San Marino and Western Samoa were members of 1. *United Nations Press Services, Office of Public Information,* Note No. 2718/Rev. 3 (April 1964) (64–38338).

[111] As late as 1965 apparently the few N.L.F. representatives abroad still did not claim diplomatic status. Fall, *Viet-Cong—The Unseen Enemy in Viet-Nam*, in Raskin & Fall, The Viet-Nam Reader 252, 260 (Vintage ed. 1965). It would seem that for purposes of assessing the lawfulness of assistance to a recognized government meaningful discussion as to when rebels become a generally recognized government must distinguish the situation in which they achieve that status by virtue of completely indigenous revolt from the situation in which the status is only achieved in the first instance by virtue of significant outside initiation, direction, or assistance.

[112] The United States was assisting the Republic of Viet Nam with limited economic and military aid beginning in 1955, and had rendered assistance to the State of Viet Nam even prior to that date. As Don and Arthur Larson have pointed out:

"Of total aid from 1953 to 1961, less than one-fourth was classified as military, and more than three-fourths economic. Some idea of the relatively small size of the military side may be seen from the announcement on May 5, 1960, that the Military Assistance and Advisory Group would be increased by the end of the year from 327 to 685."

Don R. and Arthur Larson, What Is Our "Commitment" In Viet-Nam? in Raskin & Fall, The Viet-Nam Reader 99, 101 (Vintage ed. 1965).

The National Liberation Front, however, was not formally created until December 20, 1960, and even then led what Bernard Fall describes as a "very shadowy life for almost two years." Fall, *Viet-Cong—The Unseen Enemy in Viet-Nam,* in Raskin & Fall, The Viet-Nam Reader 252, 257 (Vintage ed. 1965).

[113] See Fall, note 112 *supra* at 257.

[114] "North Viet-Nam has full diplomatic relations with 24 countries, 12 of whom belong to the Communist bloc." *Legal Status of South Viet-Nam,* Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Dept. of State (4/31b–865BT).

[115] See *Declaration and Protocol on the Neutrality of Laos,* (Treaty Series No. 27 [1963], Command Paper 2025). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXVII (1962/63), at 2, 22–23, 26.

[116] There may be several other states, as well, that have recognized both the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. In any event, the situation is comparable to that in Korea where South Korea has full relations with 64 nations while North Korea is recognized by 25, and apparently both Koreas are recognized by only about one nation. For the figures on North and South Korea, see *Legal Status of South Viet-Nam,* Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State (4/31b–865BT).

See also Survey of International Affairs 1955–56 16–17 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1960). "Mr. Nehru announced in the Lok Sabha on 16 March 1955 that, though India did not have formal diplomatic relations with them, it had for all practical purposes recognized Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam, and had a special mission in Cambodia and consulates-general in the other three states." *Ibid.*

[117] Murti, Vietnam Divided v. (1964).

[118] *Id.* at 176.

[119] Professor Friedmann, a critic of aspects of United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam, apparently agrees that North and South Vietnam may be regarded as *de facto* separate states.

"In Yemen, where Saudi Arabia supports the royalists and Egypt the Republicans, and in Viet-Nam, where North and South Viet-Nam may, since the agreement of 1954, be considered as *de facto* separate states, the civil war aspects of the conflict are purely political and to some extent religious, but not racial."

Friedmann, *Intervention, Civil War and the Role of International Law,* 1965 Proceedings of the American Society of International Law 67, at 70 (1965).

"It may be conceded that North and South Viet-Nam are today *de facto* separate states, even though the Geneva Agreement of 1954 spoke of 'two zones.' "

Friedmann, *United States Policy and the Crisis of International Law* 59 Am. J. Int'l. L. 857, at 866 (1965).

For Professor Friedmann's views see the above two articles.

See also Survey of International Affairs 1954 83 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

"For all practical purposes, there were from the middle of the year [1954] four states in Indo-China-North Viet-Nam, South Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos. Political developments took a separate course in each of them, although they had in common the problems of the armistice and of their relations with France."

Ibid.

At least with respect to the lawfulness of the use of force the Soviet Government

B. *The Republic of Viet Nam has requested assistance from the United States to meet armed aggression*

That the government of the Republic of Viet Nam has requested assistance from the United States and other nations currently rendering military and nonmilitary assistance has never seriously been questioned. In fact, the first government of the Republic of Viet Nam requested United States assistance and no successor government has asked the United States to leave. It is also clear that the present government has requested and approves of United States assistance in meeting continuing armed aggression of mounting intensity.

Among numerous indications of this request for assistance to meet armed aggression, and approval of that assistance, are a letter from President Ngo Dinh Diem to President Kennedy dated December 7, 1961 in which President Diem said:

"Mr. President, my people and I are mindful of the great assistance which the United States has given us. Your help has not been lightly received, for the Vietnamese are proud people, and we are determined to do our part in the defense of the free world . . . But Viet Nam is not a great power and the forces of International Communism now arrayed against us are more than we can meet with the resources at hand. We must have further assistance from the United States if we are to win the war now being waged against us."[120]

President Kennedy responded in a letter of December 14, 1961: "[I]n response to your request, we are prepared to help the Republic of Viet-Nam to protect its people and to preserve its independence."[121]

And in a letter of December 9, 1961 from the Republic of Viet Nam to the International Control Commission the R.V.N. said:

"In the face of the aggression, directed by the so-called 'Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam' against the Republic of Viet-Nam, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Agreement, the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam has requested the Government of the United States of America to intensify the aid in personnel and material which the latter was already granting to Viet-Nam. The right of 'self-defense' being a legitimate and inherent attribute of sovereignty, the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam found itself constrained to exercise this right and request for increased aid, since North Viet-Nam continues to violate the Geneva Agreement and to do injury to life and property of the free people of Viet-Nam.

"These measures can end as soon as the North Viet-Nam authorities will have ceased the acts of aggression and will have begun to respect the Geneva Agreement."[122]

And Nguyen Cao Ky, the current Prime Minister of the Republic of Viet Nam stated in a speech to the Vietnamese people on October 1, 1965:

"At the request of the Republic of Viet Nam, the governments of the U.S., the Republic of Korea, Australia and New Zealand have sent their military units to help us. Following a legitimate self-defense plan, and very moderately, the Viet Nam Air Force and the U.S. Air Force have successfully bombed enemy military bases, staging areas, army barracks and supply depots in North Viet Nam."[123]

Nor is this just an official United States and Vietnamese view of the nature of this request. Mr. Michael Stewart, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, stated in the House of Commons in April 1965:

"Faced with that situation [aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam from the D.R.V.] South Viet-Nam appealed to the United States for help, and the United States responded. But it is important to notice that in 1959, when this pressure from the North began, and even as late as 1961—nearly two years later—there were still only 700 members of the United States Armed Forces in South Viet-Nam. . . . [I]t cannot be claimed that the action taken by the North was the result of a considerable United States military presence in the South. The action from the North preceded the arrival of United States forces in any considerable degree in the South."[124]

And in an interview in April, 1966, Thich Tri Quang a South Vietnamese Buddhist monk with a wide popular following in the R.V.N. stated:

"Q. *Can you comment on rumors that the first thing a legislative assembly might do would be to ask the Americans to leave Viet Nam?*

"A. Rumors such as these are sheer libel. No proof or substantiation for them exists. One should not ask whether Americans should remain in Viet Nam. It is agreed by all that the struggle against Communism here must be made with the assistance of the Americans. So the problem is really how to enhance the value of that assistance. American assistance is not now fully supported in Viet Nam because there is no popular representation to give it such support. When an assembly is elected, it will, by giving its moral endorsement to such assistance, enhance its value and its acceptance."[125]

---

appears to agree that the R.V.N. and the D.R.V. are separate states.

"[W]ho has given the USA the right to deal out retribution for the actions of partisans in South Vietnam and for the defeats which the occupation forces and their accomplices are suffering by bombing raids on the territory of a third country—the VDR [D.R.V.]?"

Broadcast text of Soviet Government statement on Viet-Nam, February 8, 1965, in *Recent Exchanges Concerning Attempts to Promote a Negotiated Settlement of the Conflict in Viet-Nam* (Viet-Nam No. 3 [1965], Command Paper 2756), at 11.

[120] *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 85–86 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[121] *Id.* at 84.

[122] *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China,* (Viet-nam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXIX (1961/62), at 8.

[123] *Preliminary Report on the Achievements of the War Cabinet From June 19, 1965 to September 29, 1965* 3, 6 (Republic of Viet-nam).

[124] *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), at 250. With reference to this quoted figure of 700 members of the United States armed forces in Viet Nam as late as 1961, the exact figures vary from one account to another, possibly reflecting what month in 1961 one is referring to. There seems to be substantial agreement, however, that prior to 1961 the United States had only a very limited Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) in South Viet Nam—probably not more than about 800–900 with figures somewhat lower in earlier years. See LARSON in RASKIN & FALL, note 112 *supra* at 101. Some idea of the small military role of the United States during this period is indicated by the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the first United States military casualty in the R.V.N. occurred in December, 1961. THE VIETNAM HEARINGS 263 (Vintage ed. 1966). There is also substantial agreement that a moderate buildup of United States military advisory personnel began about mid-1961, going to roughly 12,000 by mid-1962 and about 23,000 by January 1965. See the address by William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, January 23, 1965, reprinted in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam* 137 at 143, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965). See also *Special Report to the Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China,* (Viet-nam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXIX (1961/62), at paragraph 16, page 9. See also on the level of United States forces in Viet Nam during this period the mesage from the President to Congress on May 4, 1965, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 219–20 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965). An indication of the relatively minor combat exposure of United States advisory personnel during much of this period is evidenced by the fact that as late as September 2, 1963, President Kennedy indicated that as few as forty-seven Americans had been killed in combat in Viet Nam. See *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 100 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

The more rapid build-up and the introduction of United States combat units as such apparently begin in the Spring of 1965, leading to the present level of about 260,000 United States military personnel in the R.V.N. N.Y. Times, May 13,1966, p. 1, col. 7 (city ed.), at p. 3, cols. 6 & 7. This defensive build-up is continuing.

Yet it seems to be accepted that a major escalation in the military attack on the government of the R.V.N.—said by some to really be the beginning of the conflict—took place about 1959–60, which is easily prior to the responding increases in United States forces. See, for example, Fall, *Viet-Cong—The Unseen Enemy in Viet-Nam* in RASKIN & FALL, THE VIET-NAM READER 252, at 256–57 (Vintage ed. 1965). It should also be noted that the D.R.V. issued a call in September, 1960, for the creation of a revolutionary front in the south to overthrow the Diem government. *Id.* at 257. Moreover, prior to the commencement of bombing of military targets in the D.R.V. in February, 1965, and the introduction of United States combat units as such in the Spring of 1965, ". . . in November, December, January, over the turn of the year 1964–65 . . . North Vietnam moved the 325th Division of the regular North Vietnamese Army from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to up the ante. . . ." Testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in THE VIETNAM HEARINGS 263 (Vintage ed. 1966). See also text at notes 313–16 *infra.*

[125] "A Talk With Thich Tri Quang," *Time* 27 (Vol. 87, No. 16, Apr. 22, 1966). Statements such as this perhaps take on added weight when it is remembered that Thich Tri Quang is highly critical of the present Ky-Thieu government and asserted United States support for that government.

See also "2 Top Buddhists Making Efforts To Mollify U.S.," N.Y. Times, June 10, 1966, p. 1, col. 1. (city ed.), at p 3, col 1; "New Buddhist Policy Raps Peace Talk As Cong Sellout," New Haven Register, June 9, 1966, p. 1, cols. 6–7 (city ed.).

"Buddhist foes of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime. . . . disavowed neutralism and said any peace talks now would mean surrender to the Viet Cong.

"The presence of American troops in the country is obviously needed temporarily, said a 15-point proclamation by the Unified Buddhist Church. . . .

Although there is certainly evidence that the conflict in the Republic of Viet Nam also has internal support, no impartial observer today can question that the campaign to overthrow the internationally recognized government of the Republic of Viet Nam by force and violence receives significant military assistance and direction from the D.R.V. As such, the conflict within the R.V.N. cannot validly be categorized as a "civil war" for purposes of assessing the lawfulness of the responding assistance to the recognized government. As President Kennedy put it in a letter to President Diem as long ago as 1961:

"Your letter underlines what our own information has convincingly shown—that the campaign of force and terror now being waged against your people and your Government is supported and directed from the outside by the authorities at Hanoi. They have thus violated the provisions of the Geneva Accords designed to ensure peace in Viet-Nam and to which they bound themselves in 1954." [126]

Evidence of this external military assistance and direction is well documented and is not just a United States view. On June 2, 1962, the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet Nam, composed of representatives from India, Canada and Poland and which was established pursuant to the 1954 Geneva Accords issued a Special Report which considered allegations of aggression and subversion on the part of the D.R.V. against the Republic of Viet Nam. In this Special Report, the first report so designated since the commencement of the I.C.C.'s reporting in 1954, the Commission adopted the following findings of the Legal Committee:

"(1) The Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet-Nam proceeds on the principle of the complete cessation of all hostilities in Viet-Nam, respect by either Party of the Zone assigned to the other, and the inescapable responsibility of the Parties for the fulfillment of the obligations resulting therefrom.

"It follows that the using of one Zone for the organization or the carrying out of any hostile activities in the other Zone, violations by members of the Armed Forces of one Party of the territory of the other Party, or the commission by any element under the control of one Party of any act directed against the other Party, would be contrary to the fundamental provisions of the Agreement which enjoin mutual respect for the territories assigned to the two Parties.

"(2) Having examined the complaints and the supporting material sent by the South Vietnamese Mission, the Committee has come to the conclusion that in specific instances there is evidence to show that armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions and other supplies have been sent from the Zone in North to the Zone in the South with the object of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the Armed Forces and Administration of the Zone in the South. These acts are in violation of Articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet-Nam.

"(3) In examining the complaints and the supporting material, in particular documentary material sent by the South Vietnamese Mission, the Committee has come to the further conclusion that there is evidence to show that the PAVN has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South, aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South. The use of the Zone in the North for such activities is in violation of Articles 19, 24 and 27 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet-Nam." [127]

In adopting these findings of the Legal Committee the Commission said: "The Commission accepts the conclusions reached by the Legal Committee that there is *sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt* that the PAVN has violated Articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 in specific instances." [128] Although the Polish representative dissented from these conclusions,[129] the Indian representative who signed the Commission report issued a special statement indicating disagreement with the statement of the Polish delegation and reiterating the stand and findings of the Indian and Canadian delegations as formulated in the Special Report.[130]

And in a dissenting report from the Canadian delegation to the Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference issued on February 13, 1965, the Canadian delegation made public what he indicated were conclusions of the Legal Committee of the I.C.C. to the effect that:

"The Legal Committee concludes (reference paragraphs 742 to 746 and paragraph 754 in Section VI) that it is the aim of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party (the ruling Party in the Zone in the North) to bring about the overthrow of the Administration in the South. In September 1960, the Third Congress of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party held in Hanoi (in the Zone in the North) passed a resolution calling for the organization of a 'Front' under the leadership of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party for the overthrow of the Administration in the South. Such a 'Front for Liberation of the South' was, in fact, constituted under the sponsorship of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party. There are present and functioning in the Zone in the South, branches of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party and the Front for Liberation of the South along with its armed branches, namely, the 'Forces for Liberation of the South,' and the 'People's Self-Defense Armed Forces.' The Vietnam Lao Dong Party and the Front for Liberation of the South have the identical aim of overthrowing the Administration in the South. The Vietnam Lao Dong Party, the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces have disseminated in the Zone in the South propaganda seeking to incite the people to oppose and overthrow the Administration in the South. There exists and functions a 'Voice' of the Front for Liberation of the South and a 'Liberation Press Agency' which assist in the above-mentioned activities. It is probable that Hanoi Radio also has assisted in the said activities. Propaganda literature of the Front for the Liberation of the South and in favour of the activities of the Front has been published in the Zone in the North and has been distributed above by the official representatives of the DRVN.

"The Legal Committee further concludes that:

"(1) the Vietnam Lao Dong Party in the Zone in the North, the various branches of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party in the Zone in the South, the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces have incited various sections of the people residing in the Zone in the South, including members of the Armed Forces of the South, to oppose the Administration in the South, to overthrow it by violent means and have indicated to them various means of doing so.

"(2) Those who ignored their exhortation and continued to support the Administration in the South have been threatened with punishment and in certain cases such punishment has been effected by the carrying out of death sentences.

"(3) The aim and function of the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces are to organize and to carry out under the leadership of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party, hostile activities against the Armed Forces and the Administration of the South by violent means aimed at the overthrow of the Administration of the South.

"The Legal Committee concludes also that the PAVN has allowed the Zone in the North to be used as a base for the organization of hostile activities in the Zone in the South, including armed attacks, aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South in violation of its obligations under the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam.[131]

In this same report, the Canadian representative to the I.C.C. said:

"It is the considered view of the Canadian Delegation that the events which have taken place in both North and South Vietnam since February 7 are the direct result of the intensification of the aggressive policy of the Government of North Vietnam. In the opinion of the Canadian Delegation, therefore, it should be the chief obligation of this Commission to focus all possible attention on the continuing fact that North Vietnam has increased its efforts to incite, encourage, and support hostile activities in South Vietnam, aimed at the overthrow of the South Vietnamese administration. These activities are in direct and grave violation of the Geneva Agreement and constitute the root cause of general instability in Vietnam, of which events since February 7 should be seen as dangerous manifestations. The cessation of hostile activities by North Vietnam is a prerequisite to the restoration of peace in Viet-

---

"The statement by the Unified Buddhist Church denied any neutralist tendencies among the estimated .5 million Buddhists it represents. It said the presence of American troops in the nation of 15 million 'is obviously needed, temporarily.' "

Id. at p. 1, col. 6, p. 2, col. 1.

[126] *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965), at 84.

[127] *Special Report to the Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China,* (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXIX (1961/62), at 6–7.

[128] *Id.* at 7. (Emphasis added.)

The Commission also found after discussing this armed aggression from the D.R.V. that the responding United States military assistance was a violation by the R.V.N. of Articles 16, 17 and 19 of the Geneva Agreements. *Id.* at 10.

In evaluating the legal import of these findings it should be kept in mind that the Commission's findings amount to findings of aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. in breach of the Geneva Accords. As a result of such aggression, the R.V.N. would be entitled to suspension of any corresponding obligations that may be binding on it as necessary to take appropriate defensive measures.

It should also be pointed out that even if all of the asserted political grievances of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. were legally justified, including the failure to hold elections, still they do not remotely constitute an "armed attack" within any accepted interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter. As such, an attack by the D.R.V. because of alleged breach of political provisions is still violative of a major principle of the U.N. Charter. See the discussions in sections 1B and IV *infra.*

[129] *Id.* at 21–22.

[130] *Id.* at 23.

[131] *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China, February 13, 1965* (Vietnam No. 1 [1965], Command Paper 2609, at 12–13).

nam as foreseen by the participants in the Geneva Conference of 1954."[132]

The majority report of the Indian and Polish delegations did not dispute these findings[133] but in a short separate statement on the Canadian statement the Polish representative indicated his disagreement with the Canadian statement and denied that the material disclosed by the Canadian representative had any sanction by the Commission.[134] And in another short separate statement the Indian representative denied that the information quoted in the Canadian statement was sanctioned by the Commission or any of its committees.[135]

To anyone familiar with the cautious wording of the I.C.C. Reports, these findings within the context of Special I.C.C. Reports indicate recognition of military assistance and direction from the D.R.V. aimed at the overthrow of the Republic of Viet Nam by armed aggression.

This conclusion is expressed even more strongly by the SEATO Council. In a communique issued on March 30, 1961, the SEATO Council declared:

"Having examined the situation in Laos and the Republic of Viet-Nam, the Council *unanimously* approved the following resolution: . . . the SEATO Council has noted with grave concern the continued offensive by rebel elements in Laos who are continuing to be supplied and assisted by Communist powers in flagrant disregard of the Geneva accords. . . .

"The Council also noted with concern the efforts of an armed minority, again supported from outside in violation of the Geneva accords, to destroy the Government of South Viet-Nam, and declared its firm resolve not to acquiesce in any such takeover of that country."[136]

And on April 15, 1964, with the French Council Member abstaining, the final communique of the SEATO Council Meeting declared:

"The Council expressed grave concern about the continuing Communist aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam, a Protocol State under the terms of the Manila Pact. Documentary and material evidence continues to show that this organized campaign is directed, supplied and supported by the Communist regime in North Viet-Nam, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962.

"The Council agreed that the defeat of the Communist Campaign is essential not only to the security of the Republic of Viet-Nam, but to that of South-East Asia."[137]

And in a communique issued by the SEATO Council on May 5, 1965, again with the French reserving commitment, the Council said:

"The Council considered at length the dangerous situation caused by the aggression against the Republic of Viet-Nam—an aggression organised, directed, supplied and supported by the Communist regime in North Viet-Nam in contravention of the basic obligations of international law and in flagrant violation of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962. The Council noted with grave concern the increasing infiltration of arms and combat personnel from North Viet-Nam into South Viet-Nam and the evidence that this infiltration includes members of the regular armed forces of North Viet-Nam. . . .

"The Council reaffirmed its conclusion at Manila a year ago that the defeat of this Communist campaign is essential not only to the security of the Republic of Viet-Nam but to that of South-East Asia.

"The Council agreed that Communist subversion continued to be a serious threat to the Asian member nations. It agreed that measures envisaged, namely, material and other aid at the request of the countries affected, should be continued."[138]

The SEATO Council is composed of representatives from Thailand, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, France, Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States, and the Philippines.

In a recent study of the political roots of the Viet Cong—the National Liberation Front (N.L.F.) and the People's Revolutionary Party (P.R.P.)—published in the April 1966 issue of *Foreign Affairs,* George A. Carver, Jr. writes:

"In short, not only does the P.R.P. control all aspects of the Viet Cong movement, including the N.L.F., and not only is it a subordinate echelon on the North Vietnamese Lao Dong Party, but the P.R.P.'s own leaders appear to be individuals who themselves occupy ranking positions within the Lao Dong Party hierarchy.[139]

"An understanding of the Viet Cong's organizational structure enables us to recognize the real significance and function of the more than 50,000 persons infiltrated into South Viet Nam since the Lao Dong Party's 1959 decision to pursue its objective of political conquest by waging insurgent war. Until mid- to late 1963 these infiltrators were virtually all ethnic southerners drawn from the pool of regrouped Viet Minh forces and supporters taken north in 1954. They were not foot soldiers or cannon fodder (at least not until Hanoi began sending in whole North Vietnamese units in late 1964 or early 1965). Instead they were disciplined, trained and indoctrinated cadres and technicians. They became the squad leaders, platoon leaders, political officers, staff officers, unit commanders, weapons and communications specialists who built the Viet Cong's military force into what it is today. They also became the village, district, provincial and regional committee chiefs and key committee members who built the Viet Cong's political apparatus. . . . Until the recent sharp rise in Viet Cong battlefield casualties, approximately a third of all the personnel in Viet Cong military units at and above the district company level were "returnees" trained in the North. At least half of the membership of most P.R.P. district committees, and an even larger proportion at higher echelons, also appear to be "returnees". Without this infiltration from the North, in short, the present Viet Cong organization could never have been developed,[140]

"There are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure for their native land. As an organization, however, the N.L.P. is a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots, subject to the ultimate control of the Lao Dong Party in Hanoi.[141]

"No Vietnamese of what could accurately be described as significant personal prestige or professional standing—not even one of known leftist persuasion—has even been willing to associate himself publicly with the N.L.F. or lend it the use of his name." [142]

---

[132] *Id.* at 14–15.

[133] *Id.* at 4–5. The majority report was concerned with the commencement of United States and R.V.N. bombing of the D.R.V. on February 7, 1965. After adverting to documents indicating that the bombing had taken place the Commission said:

"These documents point to the seriousness of the situation and indicate violations of the Geneva Agreement.

"The International Commission is examining and investigating these and connected complaints still being received by it concerning similar serious events and grave developments, and will transmit a report to the co-Chairmen as soon as possible."

Id. at 4. In evaluating the legal import of these findings see the statement of the Canadian Delegation *id.* at 12–15 and note 128 *supra.*

[134] *Id.* at 32.

[135] *Id.* at 31. Although inquiries have been made in letters sent on April 14, 1966 to both the Indian and Canadian delegations in an effort to clarify their apparently contradictory reports with respect to the additional findings of the Legal Committee, at this writing no reply has been received from the Indian delegation. In a letter of April 22, 1966 to J. N. Moore, Commissioner V. C. Moore of the Canadian Delegation indicated that the letter had been forwarded to the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa for future substantive reply.

[136] *Seventh Ministerial Meeting of the Council of SEATO, Bangkok, March 27–29, 1961: Communique Issued March 30, 1961,* American Foreign Policy 940, at 940–41 (Current Documents 1961) (Empasis added.)

[137] SEATO Record 18, at 19 (Vol. III No. 3 June 1964). The French declared in abstaining: "The French Council Member, while expressing the sympathy and friendship of France for the Vietnamese people, who for such a long time have been undergoing such severe trials and who aspire towards real independence, stated that under the present serious circumstances it was wise to abstain from any delaration." *Id.* at 19.

The SEATO Council also "expressed concern that the achievement of a neutral and independent Government of National Union in Laos is being jeopardized by repeated violations of the Geneva Agreement of 1962, particularly by North Vietnamese military assistance and intervention and by repeated Pathet Lao attacks . . ." *Id.* at 19–29.

See also the final communique of the thirteenth meeting of the ANZUS Council, July 18, 1964, in Seato, Record 14 (Vol. III No. 4 August 1964). "The Council gave particular attention to the aggression against South Viet Nam which the communist regime in Hanoi organized and is directing, supplying and supporting in flagrant violation of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962." (The ANZUS Council is composed of representatives from Australia, New Zealand and the United States.)

[138] *Extract from a Communique issued by the Council of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization, Bangkok, 5 May 1965,* in *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834) 257, at 258, 260; Seato Record 23, at 23–25 (Vol. IV No. 3 June 1965).

The Government of France, which was only represented by an observer at this tenth meeting of the SEATO Council, declared: "The French Observer indicated that, as he had not participated in preparing this communique, the French Government does not consider itself to be committed by it." *Id.* at 25.

The Council also "expressed concern that the Geneva Agreement of 1962 continues to be violated by the presence of North Vietnamese military forces and supplies in Laos, by the activities of the Pathet Lao, and by North Vietnamese use of the territory of Laos to send men and material to the Viet Cong in South Viet-Nam." *Id.* at 24. And the Council "noted with concern evidence of increasing Communist subversion from outside the country against Thailand notably in the north-eastern part of the country." *Id.* at 24–25.

[139] Carver, *The Faceless Viet Cong,* 44 Foreign Affairs 347, 364 (April 1966), reprinted in Congressional Record, p. 6452 (March 22, 1966). George A. Carver, Jr. holds degrees from Yale and Oxford, is a former officer in the U.S. Aid Mission in Saigon, and has been associated with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

[140] *Id.* at 369–70.

[141] *Id.* at 372.

This direction of the N.L.F. by the D.R.V. is also backed up by Professor Tai Sung An writing in the Summer 1965 issue of *Orbis*, the Journal of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania who wrote:

"The overall strategy of the Viet Cong insurrectionary movement in South Vietnam is directed by the Lao Dong Party (the North Vietnam Communist Party) under the overlordship of the Chinese Communists." [143]

And in April, 1966, following several weeks of political unrest in the R.V.N., Thich Tri Quang, one of the leaders of the protest movement said in discussing the nature of the Viet Cong in an interview:

"Q. *Do you believe there are non-Communist elements within the Viet Cong?*

"A. This is mostly a matter of semantics and led by the Communists, so we can have no hope for them. Even if they are only followers, they can be of no use to us. Being led or directed by Communists is the same as being a Communist.

"Q. *What do you think of the Viet Cong movement?*

"A. That is mostly a matter of semantics to me. People try to separate North Vietnamese Communists from South Vietnamese Communists. No such separation exists. They are both Communists. And as far as I am concerned, as a religious man, the ideology they possess is much more dangerous than the guns they possess." [144]

And *New York Times* correspondent Neil Sheehan in an article in the May 2, 1966 *New York Times*, provides an analysis of the evidence on which the above conclusions are based which substantially supports these findings as to the character of the National Liberation Front. He points out that:

"The available evidence strongly indicates that the war was actually initiated on orders from Hanoi after the regime of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem refused in 1956, with United States support, to hold the Vietnam-wide elections that were to decide the circumstances for a reunification of the country. . . . The instrument for the renewal of guerrilla warfare was the clandestine organization that had been deliberately left behind when the bulk of the Communist-led Vietminh troops, who fought the French and were the predecessors of the Vietcong, were withdrawn to the North in 1954.

"The existence of such a clandestine Communist party organization in the South has been documented. In this regard, analysts also point out a fact often little understood in the West, that there is only one Communist party in Vietnam and that its organizational tentacles extend throughout both the North and the South. At no time since the mid-nineteen-forties, when the struggle against the Japanese, and then the French began, has the politburo of the party lost control over its branch in the South.

"By 1960, the evidence indicates, Hanoi decided that some instrument was necessary to lend an aura of legitimacy and to disguise Communist control over the guerrilla warfare its cadres had fostered in the South. [leading to a call for the formation of the N.L.F.].

"Students of Vietnamese Communism view the character of the alleged non-Communist leadership within the Liberation Front as another indication that it is Communist controlled. Little is known about these men, but what is known indicates that they are, without exception, colorless figures with no significant political standing. All have histories of left-wing activities.

"[T]he Liberation Front does not control the Vietcong armed forces, despite its claims to the contrary. Documentary evidence, interrogation of prisoners and other intelligence data indicate that the guerrilla units are directed by an organization known as the Central Office for South Vietnam, or Cosvin as it is commonly called here.

"Cosvin is believed to be the senior Communist headquarters in the South, reporting directly to the reunification department of the Communist party in Hanoi and thus to the politburo. Through its military affairs department, Cosvin acts as a high command for the Vietcong guerrilla units.

"The Communists had hoped at the time of the Liberation Front's formation in 1960 to attract prominent South Vietnamese intellectuals, politician and religious leaders. . . . None have as yet joined the front. . . . Practically all prominent non-Communist Vietnamese politicians, including Thich Tri Quang, have repeatedly stated their belief that the front is controlled by the Communists." [145]

It should also be pointed out that even if all of the asserted political grievances of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. were legally justified, including the failure to hold elections, still they do not remotely constitute an "armed attack" under any accepted definition of "armed attack" within the meaning of Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, or otherwise present a self-defense situation justifying the use of the military instrument by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N.[146] As such, the evidence of significant initiation and military assistance and direction of the conflict from Hanoi constitutes evidence of outside aggression in violation of a major principle of the U.N. Charter and gives rise to appropriate rights of self-defense in the Republic of Viet Nam, whether or not the attack was in response to legally justified assertions of breach of political conditions in the Geneva Accords.[147]

Documentation by the United States and the Republic of Viet-Nam with respect to the aggression of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. may be found in *A Threat to the Peace, North Viet-Nam's Effort to Conquer South Viet-Nam* (1961), and *Aggression from the North, the Record of North Viet-Nam's Campaign to Conquer South Viet-Nam* (1965), two reports issued by the U.S. Dept. of State, and *Communist Aggression Against The Republic of Viet-Nam* (1964), and *The Bogus War of Liberation in South Vietnam* (1965), two reports issued by the Republic of Viet Nam.

In testifying publicly before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 20, 1966 Secretary of Defense McNamara said that his information indicated that there were aproximately 20,000 *regular D.R.V. troops* presently operating in the R.V.N. and receiving "day to day and hour to hour" direction from Hanoi, and that the infiltration rate from the D.R.V. was continuing at the current rate of approximately 4,500 per month. He also indicated that regular troops of the D.R.V. were operating in the R.V.N. as early as 1964 and prior to commitment of United States combat units as such.

---

[142] *Id.* at 365. For an article substantially backing up this analysis of the N.L.F. membership see Pike, "How Strong Is the N.L.F.?" reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 21, 1966, p. 3544.

[143] Tai Sung An, *The Sino-Soviet Dispute and Vietnam* IX ORBIS 426, at 429 (Summer 1965). Tai Sung An is an "Assistant Professor of Political Science, Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland, formerly, Research Associate, Foreign Policy Research Institute." *Id.* at 523.

[144] "A Talk with Thich Tri Quang," *Time* 27 (Vol. 87 No. 16, April 22, 1966).

[145] Neil Sheehan, "Hanoi's Troop Infiltration Said to Trouble Vietcong," N.Y. Times, May 2, 1966, p. 1, col. 2 (city ed.), at p. 4, cols. 1–6. See also the articles by R. W. Apple, Jr., "A Hanoi General May Be In The South," N.Y. Times, Feb. 17, 1966, p. C3, col. 1, (city ed.); and Jack Raymond, "Vietnam: The Facts Behind the War," N.Y. Times, Feb. 6, 1966, p. 4E, col. 1.

[146] See the discussion of "armed attack" within the meaning of Article 51 in Section Ib *infra* and in the authorities cited §§ Ib and Ic *infra*.

[147] The principle of the U.N. Charter violated is, of course, the prohibition against the use of force in international relations contained in Article 2, §§ 3 and 4.

With respect to the failure to hold elections in 1956 see generally Fall, *How the French Got Out of Viet-Nam* in RASKIN & FALL, THE VIET NAM READER 81, at 87–91 (Vintage ed. 1965); MURTI, VIETNAM DIVIDED 178–195 (1964); Young, *The Southeast Asia Crisis*, THE EIGHTH HAMMARSKJOLD FORUM 5, at 109–114 (The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Working Paper 525/65/2, October 18, 1965).

"The United States Government indeed did try to persuade President Diem and his colleagues in Saigon to conduct the discussions for as long as necessary and in elaborate detail with the communist authorities in a location which would have been provided for this purpose in the demilitarized zone. However, as a matter of policy, the government in Saigon decided that it should not and could not compromise its position by any such consultations. The governments of the United States, France and Great Britian agreed jointly to persuade the governments in Saigon otherwise, but, despite their efforts, they were not in any position to force what they considered to be a sovereign government, recognized by many nations, to undertake action which was considered detrimental, possibly leading to vital harm, to the national interest and integrity of that *independent* state. At the Summit Conference in July 1955 the Soviet delegation was apprised of this situation but did not show particular concern. In 1956 the Western governments were of much the same opinion. The British and Soviet Co-Chairman, anticipating that the elections under Paragraph 7 would not take place, advised the Vietnamese authorities in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam not to disturb the peace and to cooperate with the International Commission. Apparently the Soviet Government did not put any great pressure on its communist colleagues or on its Western adversaries to enforce these so-called election provisions of the Geneva Agreements."

Id. at 113. (Kenneth T. Young, Jr. is the former United States Ambassador to Thailand.); Tolischus, "Elections in Vietnam," *The New Leader* 9 (August 16, 1965).

"These elections were to be held in Vietnam in 1956. They were not, and the impression has been spread that President Diem, prodded by the U.S., refused to permit them for fear the Communists would win. That is not true. The United States committed itself at Geneva to national unification elections supervised by the United Nations for all partitioned countries, including Vietnam.

"The Diem regime, which did not sign the Geneva Accords and did not consider itself bound by them nevertheless agreed to the elections and in July 1955 declared itself ready to discuss election procedures with Ho Chi Minh. But it quite properly demanded that Ho first comply with the Geneva agreement by creating the necessary conditions for free elections in the North, ending Communist terror and totalitarian control and assuring liberties at least equal to those in the South. These demands were repeated in 1958 and 1960.

Ibid. (Otto D. Tolischus is a Pulitzer Prize winning former member of the editorial board of the New York Times.)

And according to the United States Department of State:

"In the three-year period from 1959–1961, North Viet Nam infiltrated an estimated 10,700 men into South Viet Nam. . . . The gradual build-up of United States military assistance which began in late 1961 was a direct and justifiable response; to the previous serious violations of the 1954 Geneva Agreements by North Viet Nam. The aggression by Hanoi became substantial in 1959 and had intensified to dangerous proportions by late 1961.

"It is now estimated that by the end of 1964 North Viet Nam had infiltrated over 40,000 men into South Viet Nam. Most of these men were infiltrated through the territory of Laos in plain violation of the 1962 Geneva Agreement on the Neutrality of Laos. Native North Vietnamese began to appear in South Viet Nam in large numbers in early 1964, and in December 1964 full units of the regular North Vietnamese army began to enter the South. The latest evidence indicates that elements of the 325th PAVN division began to prepare for the move south in April 1964. . . .

"The level of enemy activity increased sharply in 1965 and new efforts were required to protect South Viet Nam from being overrun. The number of incidents and large-scale enemy attacks reached new highs, and the level of infiltration rose dramatically over 1964. Final figures for 1965 are not yet available, but it is estimated that seven regiments of the army of North Viet Nam and thousands of other troops entered the South in 1965." [148]

Although the conclusions of the State Department "White Papers" have been challenged with respect to the degree of indigenous v. outside initiation, direction and assistance in the Viet Nam conflict,[149] the totality of evidence—whether or not all of the above evidence is accepted in its entirety—strongly indicates that the campaign to overthrow the recognized government of the Republic of Viet Nam by violence receives substantial military assistance and direction from the D.R.V. and suggests that prior to any significant increases in United States assistance, D.R.V. initiative was a critical element in the conflict. There can be no reasonable doubt from the evidence that this was so prior to the commencement of bombing of military targets in the D.R.V. in February, 1965 and the introduction of United States combat units as such in the spring of 1965. The statements and documents from representatives of third party states as well as from the states directly concerned indicate international recognition of this armed aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N.

This continuing aggression constitutes an "armed attack" within the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and general principles of international law, and is in violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Accords.

All of the frequently cited definitions of aggression from the most conservative to the broadest, apply to the D.R.V. activities. Many of these definitions so closely fit these activities that they might well serve as factual descriptions, especially written to describe the entire range of those activities. Even the most narrowly conceived definitions apply to a large portion of those activities and in their totality such activities certainly constitute an "armed attack" justifying use of the military instrument in self-defense.

The findings of the International Control Commission and the evidence discussed above indicate at least four categories of D.R.V. activities that constitute aggression under customary international law and the United Nations Charter. They are:

"1. '. . . The PAVN has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South.'

"2. Committing and encouraging acts of terrorism against the government of the Republic of Viet Nam.

"3. Violation of articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam.

"4. Armed attack against the Republic of Viet Nam." [150]

Each of these categories has the common characteristic of being directed against the territorial and political integrity of the Republic of Viet Nam and would seem to violate Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter. In other words, such activities constitute highly intense attacks of such impact as to create in the target state a reasonable expectation that it must resort to the military instrument to preserve its political and territorial integrity. This becomes evident when each of these categories is considered in the light of the definitions of aggression under the United Nations Charter and customary international law.

Fomenting Civil Strife and Aiding Rebellion In Another State Constitute Aggression Under International law

The United Nations has repeatedly condemned the creation of civil strife by external elites using internal agents. Thus the General Assembly said in Resolution 380–V.

"The General Assembly . . . condemning the intervention of a state in the internal affairs of another state for the purpose of changing its government by the threat or use of force,

"1. Solemnly reaffirms that whatever the weapons used, any *aggression*, whether committed openly or by *fomenting civil strife* in the interest of a foreign power, or otherwise is the gravest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world." [151]

The General Assembly also condemned aid given by Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania to Greek rebels in a manner significantly similar to the D.R.V. activities. In Resolution 193 the General Assembly stated:

"The Greek guerrillas have continued to receive aid and assistance on a large scale from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, with the knowledge of the Government of those countries and that the Greek guerrillas in the frontier have, as found by the Special Committee:

"(i) Been largely dependent on external supply. Great quantities of arms, ammunition and other military stores have come across the border, notably during the times of heavy fighting. . .

"(ii) Frequently moved at will in territory across the frontier for tactical reasons, and have thus been able to concentrate their forces without interference by the Greek army, and to return to Greece when they wished.

"(iii) Frequently retired safely into the territory of Albany, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia when the Greek army exerted great pressure.

"3. Having noted further the conclusions of the Special Committee that a continuation of this situation *constitutes a threat to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece and to peace in the Balkins and that the conduct of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia had been inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.* . . .

"5. Considers that the continued aid given by Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to the Greek guerrillas endangers peace in the Balkans, and is inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

"6. Calls upon Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia to cease forthwith rendering any assistance or support in any form to the guerrillas in fighting against the Greek Government including the use of their territories as a base for the preparation or launching of armed action.

* * * * *

"9. Recommends to all members of the United Nations and to all other states that their Governments refrain from any action designed to assist directly or through any other Government any armed group fighting against the Greek Government." [152]

In article 2, paragraph 4 of the International Law Commission's Draft of a Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind, the I.L.C. condemned:

"The organization, or encouragement of the organization, by the authorities of a state, of armed bands within its territory or any other territory for incursions into the territory of another state; or the toleration of the organization of such armed bands in its own territory, or the toleration of the use by such armed bands of its territory as a base of operations or as a point of departure for incursions into the territory of another state as well as direct participation in or support of such incursions." [153]

In article 2(5) the "undertaking or encouraging by the authorities of a state of activities calculated to foment civil strife in another state" [154] is condemned.

Such legal disapproval of a state's fomenting civil strife in another state by offering sanctuary, military aid and encouragement to rebels seeking to overthrow the government of the other state are not peculiarly Western points of view. Communist nations have long purported to condemn the same activity. Thus in a draft resolution presented to the General Assembly in 1954 the USSR labeled as aggression "Support of armed bands organized in its own territory which invade the territory of another state." [155]

---

[148] *The Basis for United States Actions in Viet Nam Under International Law* 5 (Mimeograph U.S. Dept. of State).

[149] See I. F. Stone, *A Reply to the White Paper* in Gettleman, Viet Nam: *History, Documents, and Opinions On a Major World Crisis* 317 (Fawcett ed. 1965), and in Raskin & Fall, The Viet-Nam Reader 155 (Vintage ed. 1965).

[150] ICC findings are quoted in part in *Documents Relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834) at 195, 198. See also *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China*, (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper, 1755), Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXIX (1961/62).

[151] Resolution No. 380 (v) U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 5th Sess., Supp. No. 20, p. 13 at p. 17 (Doc. A 1775) Nov. 17, 1950 (emphasis added).

[152] Resolution 193 (iii) U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 3d Sess., pt. 1, Resolutions pp. 18–20 (A/810) (1948) (emphasis added).

[153] Adopted by the I.L.C., 3 June–28 July 1954, U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 9th Sess., Supp. 9, p. 10 at 11 (A/2693).

[154] Prepared by I.L.C. 16 May–27 July 1951, U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 6th Sess., Supp. 9, p. 10 at 12 (A/1858).

[155] Article 1(f), USSR, Draft Resolution 18 Oct. 1954 U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec., 9th Sess., Annexes, Agenda Item No. 51, at 6 (A/C.6/L332) (Rev. 1).

In the same resolution the USSR labels as indirect aggression an act which creates "An internal upheaval in another state or a change of policy in favour of the aggressor."[156]

Such definitions of aggression have historical precedent for the Soviet Union. In 1933 the USSR concluded a treaty with Rumania, Poland, Afghanistan, Persia, Latvia, Estonia, Turkey, and Finland. Article 2(5) labelled as aggression the "Provision of support to armed bands formed in its territory that have invaded the territory of another state. . . ."[157]

Such practices and pronouncements, taken together, constitute strong authority that the International Control Commission's findings that the DRV "has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging, and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South, aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South"[158] amounts to a finding that the D.R.V. has committed aggression against the R.V.N.

Committing and Encouraging Acts of Terrorism in the Republic of Viet Nam Constitute Acts of Aggression Under International Law

The finding of the Legal Committee of the International Control Commission—according to the Canadian representative—that those who opposed the D.R.V.-Viet-Cong effort to overthrow the government of the Republic of Viet Nam were "threatened with punishment and in certain cases such punishment has been effected by the carrying out of death sentences" constitutes a finding of aggression under international law.

The seriousness of these acts of terrorism under international law can be appreciated only when the specific form they take is considered. The acts of terrorism are designed to have the greatest possible impact on what the United Nations Charter refers to in Article 2(4) as the "political independence of [*a*] state." The acts of terrorism are directed at school teachers and village chiefs and others whose effective performance of their duties is vital to the functioning of the recognized Government of the Republic of Viet Nam. Whether the persons attacked are popular or unpopular, such activities encouraged by the D.R.V. constitute aggression under international law.

The dangerous impact such acts of terrorism may have on the peace of the world is appreciated by customary international law as interpreted by the practice of states and the law of the United Nations as interpreted by the International Law Commission.

The International Law Commission condemns as endangering "the peace and security of mankind,"

". . . the undertaking or encouragement by the authorities of a state of terrorist activities in another state or the toleration by the authorities of a state of organized activities calculated to carry out terrorist acts in another state."[159]

Similarly the Soviet draft resolution labels as indirect aggression an act which "Encourages subversive activity against another State (acts of *terrorism*, diversionary acts, etc.)."[160]

Violation of the Military Cease-Fire Provisions of the 1954 Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam Constitutes Aggression Under International Law

The International Law Commission has stated that international peace and security is endangered by

"Acts by the Authorities of a State in violation of its obligation under a treaty which is designed to ensure international peace and security by means of restrictions or limitations on armaments, or on military training, or on fortifications, or of other restrictions of the same character."[161]

A fortiori this provision would certainly seem to condemn as an offense against peace and security the violation of a military cease-fire line in a non self-defense situation; a violation which creates in another state a well grounded apprehension that its territorial or political integrity is militarily threatened. The treaty violations by the D.R.V. meet these requirements.

The International Control Commission found that the D.R.V. had violated articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities. Each of these articles provides for the limitation of military activities.[162]

Article 10 provides for the complete cessation of armed hostilities in Viet Nam.[163]

Article 19 requires that the parties shall ensure that the zones assigned to them ". . . are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."[164]

Article 24 requires that "The armed forces of each party shall respect the demilitarized zone and the territory under the military control of the other party . . ."[165]

Article 27 places responsibility for insuring the performance of the agreement on the commanders of the respective parties.[166]

The cumulative effect of these findings of treaty violations is a finding by a competent international body of aggression against the Republic of Viet Nam by the D.R.V.

Armed Attack Is Universally Considered Aggression Under International Law

Even apart from violation of any specific treaty provisions armed attack is universally considered an act of aggression justifying the use of the military instrument in self-defense.[167]

The D.R.V.'s armed attack upon the Republic of Viet Nam, involving the use of significant numbers of regular troops of the D.R.V., is without legal justification. Their claims of violation of the election provisions of the Geneva accords would not, even if legally valid, justify such attacks. Such political questions pose no real threat to the operation of the governmental machinery or to the territorial integrity of the D.R.V. and cannot be considered an "armed attack" on the D.R.V. within the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. This principle of international law that political conditions in another state do not justify individual armed attack is widely accepted. In its draft resolution on aggression the USSR states in paragraph 6:

"The attacks referred to in paragraph 1 [armed attacks] and acts of economic, ideological and indirect aggression . . . may not be justified by any considerations of a *political*, economic or strategic nature. . . . In particular, the following may not be used as justification:

A. The internal situation of any state, as for example

". . . (b) Alleged shortcomings of its administration.

". . . (e) Establishment or maintenance in any State of any political, economic or social system."[168]

This principle would also seem to be applicable in the case of armed attack across an international cease-fire line.

Thus, the whole spectrum of acts of aggression, ranging from the direct and coarse to the indirect and subtle has been catalogued. Such aggression in its totality constitutes an armed attack within the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. This attack is directed at the territorial and political integrity of the Republic of Viet Nam reasonably creating expectations in that state that it must use the military instrument to protect itself.

Professor Kelsen supports this interpretation that such activities constitute armed attack within the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter:

"Since the Charter of the United Nations does not define the term 'armed attack' used in article 51, the members of the United Nations in exercising their right of 'individual or collective self-defense' may interpret 'armed' attack to mean not only an action in which a state uses its armed force but also a revolutionary movement which takes place in one state but which is *initiated or supported by another state.* In this case the members could come to the assistance of the legitimate government against which the revolutionary movement is directed."[169]

In any event, the infiltration of regular troops of the D.R.V. army would alone seem to satisfy anyone's definition of "armed attack" under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The evidence suggests that even this was taking place prior to the introduction of United States combat units as such and the bombing of the D.R.V.

C. United States Assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam Is Lawful Under Customary International Law and The United Nations Charter

The right of the Republic of Viet Nam to request military assistance and of the United States to grant such a request is well established in international law. This right is derived from three sources, any one of which would be sufficient alone to support the United States military aid to the Republic of Viet Nam. The sources are (1) customary international law, (2) the right of collective self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and (3) the right of regional self-defense, of which the collective assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam and the regional defense structure of the South East Asian Treaty Organization are examples. The cumulative effect of these mutually reinforcing strands of authority is to confer upon the United States military presence in Viet Nam strong legal credentials. This can be best appreciated by first considering each of the component parts of the legal authority and by then taking an overview of the complete structure.

---

[156] *Id.* at art 2(c).

[157] 147 L.N.T.S. 69, at 73. The treaty is also found in BRIGGS, LAW OF NATIONS 969, at 970 (1952).

[158] See *Documents Relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945-1965, op. cit. supra* note 150, at 195, 198.

[159] See article 2(6), *ILC Draft Code, supra* note 154, at 12.

[160] Par. 2(a) USSR, *Draft Resolution, supra* note 155, at 6 (emphasis added).

[161] See *I.L.C. Draft Code, supra* note 154, at 12.

[162] The Agreement on Cessation of Hostilities may be found in *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954], Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54) at 27.

[163] *Ibid.*

[164] *Ibid.*

[165] *Ibid.*

[166] *Ibid.*

[167] U.N. CHARTER art 51.

[168] *USSR Draft Resolution, supra* note 155, at 6–7. (Emphasis added.)

[169] KELSEN, COLLECTIVE SECURITY UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW 88 (1954), XLIX NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, INTERNATIONAL LAW STUDIES. Brownlie states:

"In the present connexion it might be argued that 'armed attack' in article 51 of the Charter refers to a trespass, a direct invasion, and not to activities described by some jurist as 'indirect aggression'. But providing there is control by the principal, the aggressor state, and an actual use of force by its agents, there is 'armed attack'."

See Brownlie, *The Use of Force in Self-Defense,* 37 BRITISH YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 260 (1961).

Customary International Law Authorizes the United States Military Assistance

The right of a state which is attacked (externally or internally) to invite other states to assist in its defense and the right of the invited state or states to render assistance is supported in both the ancient and contemporary practices of states. The invitation and response may result from the authority of a treaty or the necessity of the moment: Vattel noted that ". . . they who are not tied by any treaty may for their own conduct, take the merit of the cause into consideration, and assist the party which they shall judge to have right on its side, in case this party shall *request their assistance* or accept the offer of it. . . ."[170] That the right to request and render defensive assistance is not an occasionally permitted departure from a general rule is indicated by Woolsey who states ". . . there is nothing in the law of nations which forbids one nation to *render assistance to the established* government in such case of revolt, *if its assistance is invoked*. The aid is not interference . . ."[171]

Not only is the rendering of military assistance to a widely recognized government under attack a legal right; in some contexts it may become a necessity for the maintenance of world order and genuine self-determination. This is especially true where the attack is wholly or partly external and assistance is needed to protect the autonomy or self-determination of the requesting state.

One contemporary scholar, Professor Richard Falk, has written that in some situations the failure to render military assistance to the legitimate government might constitute intervention on behalf of the other side whether or not such was the intention.[172] The legal principle of non-interference is based on the need to promote internal autonomy, or self-determination; conversely when the situation is such that the failure to give military assistance would result in the defeat of a legitimate government with a consequent defeat of the principle of self-determination, then such a failure to give assistance on request may even be regarded as illegal intervention on the other side.

Falk applies this principle to the world community as it is currently composed by stating that "Furthermore it is evident that the existence of an important aggressor or 'expanding' state in the world community makes non-intervention impossible. A refusal to exert influence to balance the opposing exertion of influence does not protect the internal autonomy of the third state, it merely forfeits its destiny to the expanding state . . . Eventually such forbearance will produce the threat of interference to one's own public order autonomy. That is, to a large degree non-intervention must be a universally shared and practiced ideal if it is to be feasible for any state."[173] Lauterpacht indicates that military assistance upon request may not be properly termed intervention whether the attack is internal or external because intervention implies a "dictatorial interference."[174] Lauterpacht further indicates that customary international law permits defense agreements to preserve a form of government against coerced change. He says that "a state that has guaranteed by treaty the form of government of another state . . . has a right to intervene in case of a change in the form of government. . . ."[175]

The practice of states is replete with examples of the exercise of the right to request defensive assistance and the right of the invited state to render such assistance. One frequently cited example bears significant similarity in its context to the Viet Nam situation. In 1826, Spain was playing a role similar to that of the D.R.V. by rendering military assistance and sanctuary to insurgents who were supporting the pretender to the throne of Portugal in an effort to overthrow the regency.[176] Pursuant to request Great Britain dispatched a corps of troops to assist Portugal. This example which is cited by Wheaton, Lauterpacht and others as evidence of customary law is significantly relevant to the situation in Viet Nam.[177]

The right under customary international law of an attacked state to request, and the invited state to render, aid is plainly applicable to the cooperative effort of the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam.

The Viet Nam conflict cannot be fairly characterized as civil war with respect to choice of legal rules to be invoked, because there are, as has been pointed out, substantial expectations that the Republic of Viet Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam are separate states under international law, and in any event the D.R.V. has been providing significant armed assistance to the Viet-Cong in violation of the core of an international cease-fire line. However, there is substantial authority that the right of the Republic of Viet Nam to request and of the United States to render military assistance remains in full force even if the Viet Nam conflict could be appropriately characterized as a civil war. Lauterpacht notes that when those opposing the recognized government are mere insurgents or rebels that third states may assist the government but not the insurgents, and Garner seems to hold the view that international law permits third states to assist *only* the recognized government in a civil war situation.[178] Applied to the Viet Nam conflict this means that even if there were no contextual differences from a civil war the United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam would still be lawful but the aid of the D.R.V. to the Viet-Cong would be illegal. Lauterpacht further notes that if the rebels attain the status of belligerency then the conflict becomes an international war and it would seem that in a context of international conflict third states may assist the recognized government in defending itself against international attack.[179] There-

---

[170] VATTEL, LAW OF NATIONS 490 (1829) (emphasis added).

[171] WOOLSEY, INTERNATIONAL LAW 89 (1st ed. 1860) (emphasis added).

[172] 5 HOWARD L. J. 164, 168 (1959).

[173] *Id.* at 173.

[174] OPPENHEIM, INTERNATIONAL LAW 305 (8th ed. Lauterpacht, 1955).

[175] *Id.* at 309.

[176] WHEATON, LAW OF NATIONS 90 (1836).

The contemporary practice of states under the United Nations Charter provides ample support for military assistance to widely recognized governments even in civil conflict situations. Professor Sohn, in a recent letter to the authors, has called attention to several recent examples. He cites among other examples:

"4. . . . When military revolts tried to overthrow the Governments of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika in 1964, these Governments asked for British assistance and no objection was raised by anybody to it, though attempts were made later to replace the British troops with African troops.

"5. Similarly, when revolts started in Gabon and other French-speaking West African states in 1964, French troops were invited to restore peace.

"Consequently, there are ample precedents for United States action in Vietnam."

Letter from Louis B. Sohn, Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard, April 21, 1966.

[177] WHEATON, LAW OF NATIONS 90 (1836); I OPPENHEIM, INTERNATIONAL LAW 305 (8th ed. Lauterpacht 1955).

[178] II OPPENHEIM, INTERNATIONAL LAW 660 (7th ed. Lauterpacht 1952).

See the discussion of Garner's views in note 179 *infra*.

[179] *Ibid.*

The majority of commentators seem to support the view that even in a civil war situation military aid may be rendered to the widely recognized government. The majority also seems to support the view that aid may not be rendered to the rebels as such, at least prior to achieving belligerent status. See note 181 *infra* for a discussion demonstrating that the N.L.F.-Viet-Cong has not achieved belligerent status under international law. In a comment on the Spanish Civil War Garner notes that: "there is no rule of international law which forbids the government of one state from rendering assistance to the established government of another state with a view to enabling it to suppress an insurrection against its authority . . . . If assistance is rendered to the legitimate government it is not a case of unlawful intervention as is the giving of assistance to rebels who are arrayed against its authority."

Garner, *Question of International Law in the Spanish Civil War*, 31, AM. J. INT'L L. 66, 68 (1937). Professor Borchard has also taken the position that the recognized government and the rebels should not be treated alike. In his view international law permits military aid to the recognized government but it " . . . requires that revolutionists receive no aid or comfort . . . ." Borchard, *"Neutrality" and Civil Wars*, 31 AM. J. INT'L L. 304, 306 (1937). Writing of the Spanish Civil War, Professor O'Rourke states:

"Until an insurrection has achieved the status of belligerency, it would seem, therefore, that the established government may expect partial treatment from third powers. Non-intervention, which treats both Combatants impartially, amounts to neutrality. While one appreciates the diplomatic dilemma which gave birth to the policy, unless a recognition of belligerency was implicit in the move, *non-intervention* is legally incorrect."

O'Rourke, *Recognition of Belligerency and the Spanish War*, 31 AM. J. INT'L. L. 398, 410 (1937).

Garner further notes that the Institute of International Law determined that:

"Among the obligations of foreign Powers in respect to the legitimate government is the duty 'not to furnish to the insurgents either arms, munitions, military supplies or financial aid' or to 'allow a hostile military expedition against an estabilshed and recognized government to be organized within their domains."

Garner also points out that: ". . . among the jurists who supported the resolutions were Holland, Westlake, Rolin-Joequemyns, Pierantoni, Brusa, Renault and Von Bar. This also appears to be the view of all reputable text-writers who have discussed the subject, among whom may be mentioned Rougier, Hyde, Oppenheim, Weiose, Ferand-Giraud, Fiore and La Pradelle."

Garner, 31 AM. J. INT'L. L. 66, 68 (1937).

Professor Friedmann has indicated that this seems to be the prevailing view. He states: "What is probably still the prevailing view is that the incumbent government, but fore even if the Viet-Cong were purely indigenous to the R.V.N., received no outside assistance, and were considered to have attained the status of belligerency, there is still authority that the United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam would be lawful.

The Viet-Cong, however, not only receive outside assistance but do not meet the requirements of belligerency, which are said to include some stability of control over territory and people, the maintenance of an established government, and observance of the rules of war. Greenspan notes, for example, that to be considered belligerents the opponents of the recognized government must observe the rules of war.[180] The Viet-Cong, though, have repeatedly broken the laws of warfare. Many of these violations take the form of acts of terrorism directed against the civilian population, including village officials, school teachers and ordinary farm laborers.[181] The rising tempo of terrorism is indicated by this statement made by Bernard Fall:

"Statistics now began to pile up inexorably: 452 village chiefs were lost by South Viet Nam in 1957–58. By January, 1960 they were being lost at the rate of fifteen a week. On May 25, 1961, President Kennedy told Congress that minor officials were being killed in Viet Nam at the rate of 4,000 a year: eleven a day. In 1964, over 1,500 small officials were lost, and over 400 during the first four months of 1965." [182]

School teachers, whose job was to prepare the people for self-government, were among the most frequent victims.[183] A typical example of Viet-Cong activities directed against civilians engaged in such pursuits as growing food is the recent killing by a Viet-Cong mine of 54 farm workers riding in civilian buses.[184] It would seem that just with respect to this element alone, the Viet-Cong are far from having achieved a belligerent status. Moreover, the status of belligerency, as historically understood, grows out of internal revolt. Here, however, there is substantial evidence, noted above, that the Viet-Cong receive significant direction and control from the D.R.V., and that there was significant initiation of the conflict from the D.R.V.

In summary, customary international law affirms the right of the Republic of Viet Nam to request defensive aid and the right of the United States to grant such aid. The United States was invited in by the widely recognized government of the R.V.N. No successor government has asked us to leave. In fact, the present Chief of State, as well as civilian leaders opposed to the present government, have recently reaffirmed their desire for continued United States assistance.[185]

The Right of Collective Self-Defense Under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter Authorizes United States Military Assistance

The right under customary international law of one nation to assist another in defense against aggression is reaffirmed by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter which takes cognizance of the "inherent" right of individual and "collective self-defense". Several distinguished scholars believe that the phrase "collective self-defense" used in the Charter not only reaffirms the right of self-defense but in at least one sense expands it. Lauterpacht has stated the principle as follows:

"It will be noted that, in a sense art. 51 enlarges the right of self-defense as usually understood and the corresponding right of resort to force by authorizing both individual and collective self-defense. This means that a member of the United Nations is permitted to have recourse to action in self-defense not only when it is itself the object of armed attack, but also when such attack is directed against any other state or states whose safety and independence are deemed vital to the safety and independence of the state thus resisting or participating in forcible resistance to the aggressor." [186]

McNair is in substantial agreement when he says ". . . the phrase individual or collective self-defense leaves something to be desired, but its significance lies in the fact that it *enlarges* the right of self-defense by authorizing and legalizing collective action . . ." [187]

Collective Self-Defense May Be by Non-Contiguous States

The origins of Article 51 of the Charter as well as the practice of states under that article indicate that states which are not geographically contiguous may assist each other by collective self-defense. The origins of the article at the San Francisco conference creating the United Nations indicate that those who adopted it had in mind mutual defense acts by states which were not contiguous as well as those which were. In the debates concerning the term "collective self-defense" an exchange occurred between the representatives of the USSR and the United Kingdom. The two representatives indicated agreement on two significant points. First, they agreed that the term extended to "agreements such as the Anglo-Soviet and French-Soviet pacts".[188] Secondly, they agreed that such agreements were "clearly not regional pacts".[189] No dissent

---

not the insurgents, has the right to ask for assistance from foreign governments, at least as long as insurgents are not recognized as 'belligerents' or 'insurgents.'" Friedmann, *Intervention, Civil War and the Role of International Law*, 1965 Proceedings, Am. Soc. of Int'l. Law 67, 72.

Garner takes the position that even recognition of belligerency of the rebels does not permit states to render military aid to the rebels. 31 Am. J. Int'l. L. 66, 68–70 (1937).

As has already been noted, Vattel seems to have taken the position that either side can be lawfully aided in a civil war context, although it may be doubtful whether the rebels may be aided prior to belligerency. See note 170, *supra*.

A minority of commentators, which apparently consists principally of Quincy Wright and Sir William Hall, seem to espouse the view that the mere existence of a rebellion of which the outcome is uncertain is sufficient to make the recognized government incompetent to ask for military assistance from another state. See Wright, *United States Intervention in the Lebanon*, 53 Am. J. Int'l. L. 112, 121–122 (1959); Hall, A Treatise on International Law, § 94, p. 347 8th ed. 1924). Hall, however, would not seem to apply this doctrine to situations where the military opposition to the government is externally assisted or directed. He recognizes as legal, military assistance which is designed to check intervention in the affairs of the assisted state by a third state. He notes that: "Interventions which have for their object to check illegal intervention by another state are based upon the principle that a state is at liberty to oppose the commission of any act, which in the eye of the law is wrong . . .". He further states that: "It has already been seen that the existence of a right to oppose acts contrary to law, and to use force for the purpose when infractions are sufficiently serious, is a necessary condition of the existence of efficient international law." *Id.* § 92, at 341–42.

Therefore, in situations in which the rebels are unlawfully receiving external military assistance and direction the authorities are unanimous or nearly so in saying that the widely recognized government may receive defensive military assistance. Any meaningful concept of self-determination strongly supports this conclusion.

[180] Greenspan, The Modern Law of Land Warfare 18–19 (1959).

[181] See *Id.* at 170–171 for a discussion of Article 33, Geneva Convention IV, 1949 prohibiting reprisals against the civilian population. At 155–156 Greenspan indicates that such conventions are considered to embody customary law and are considered binding on non-signatories. The rules of the conventions, being declaratory of customary law, would thus be relevant in determining whether or not the insurgents have gained belligerent status.

With respect to the laws of war it might also be pointed out that the attempts of the International Red Cross to enforce the rights of American prisoners of war to send and receive mail have been rebuffed by the D.R.V. The D.R.V., though a signatory to the relevant convention, has characterized its American captives as "war criminals" and not POW's. Moreover, the N.L.F. does not consider itself bound by these conventions. See N.Y. Times, May 7, 1966, p. 3, col. 5. The explicit denials by the N.L.F. that the rules of customary law embodied in these conventions apply to it, are another indication that the N.L.F. can not be considered to have gained belligerent status. For a discussion and quotation of the relevent articles, articles 69–74 of Geneva Convention III, 1949 on POW's see Greenspan, *supra* note 180, at 126–128. See also the discussion in note 303 *infra*.

[182] Raskin & Fall, Viet-Nam Reader 257 (Vintage ed. 1965).

[183] In a recent article Senator Edward Kennedy stated that "school teachers have been the prime targets of terrorism" conducted by the Viet-Cong. See *Hearings on S. 2793 Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. 1, at 109–110 (1966). Senator Kennedy further noted that in 1965 alone over 11,000 civil servants—a high proportion of them teachers—were killed, abducted or wounded by the Vietcong. *Ibid.*

[184] *Time*, 32 (Feb. 25, 1966).

[185] See Joint Communique, Chiefs of State R.V.N. and U.S., part III, par. 9 and part IV, in N.Y. Times, Feb. 9, 1966, p. 14, col. 8. See also the statement by Thich Tri Quang at note 125 *supra*.

[186] II Oppenheim, International Law 155 (7th ed. Lauterpacht 1952).

[187] McNair, Law of Treaties 579 (1961) (emphasis added).

[188] 17 U.N.C.I.O. 396.

[189] *Ibid.* The mistaken belief that Art. 51 permits collective self-defence only by contiguous states may stem from the fact that for a time prior to the adoption of the U.N. Charter the San Francisco Conference labelled the article which eventually became Art. 51 as Art. 52. Article 52 finally became the number given to an entirely different article which deals with regional arrangements. See 17 U.N.C.I.O. 492, which records what finally became Art. 51 as being Art. 52 of the skeleton charter.

Not only is geographical proximity not a pre-requisite for membership in regional defense organizations under Article 51 of the Charter, but neither are cultural, historic, linguistic or spiritual ties necessary. At the San Francisco Conference, an Egyptian proposal to include such ties as necessary elements in the definition of regional arrange-from this view is recorded in a meeting that included representatives from countries widely varying in their ranks in the world's power spectrum.

The practice of states under Article 51 had indicated that geographical contiguity of the parties is not a requirement of collective self-defense. For example, Denmark and Greece, widely separated countries, are both parties of NATO.[190] This alliance has existed for 17 years without having been regarded as illegal for lack of contiguity and historical or ethnic ties of some party states. Another example of a defense pact concluded between non-contiguous countries is the Baghdad (now CENTO) Pact which at one time included Iraq and Great Britain who were hardly next door neighbors.[191]

Collective Self-Defense Does Not Require Prior Security Council Approval

Three factors combine to demonstrate that collective self-defense may be taken without prior authorization of the Security Council. They are: (1) the wording of Article 51 itself, (2) the origins of Article 51 as seen at the San Francisco conference, and (3) the practice of states subsequent to adoption of Article 51. This section will take up these factors one at a time.

1. The terms of Article 51. Article 51 states:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The use of the term *"inherent"* is significant. The inherent right of self-defense under customary international law was not limited by a requirement that prior approval be obtained from a central mechanism. The use of the term *"inherent"* can be taken to mean that the Charter reaffirms the lack of such prior restraint. It is also significant that the requirement for prior Security Council authorization appears in a different chapter (VIII) from the one (VII) in which Article 51 is found and that requirement does not refer to collective self-defense but rather to chapter VIII "enforcement" action. In addition, the use of the phrase "until the Security Council has taken measures" indicates that action may be taken before the Security Council acts.

2. The origins of Article 51. The diplomatic negotiations at the San Francisco conference which established the United Nations indicate that the very reason for the insertion of Article 51 was a desire to avoid the necessity of obtaining prior approval of the Security Council for collective self-defense. Several of the Latin American delegations were afraid that their ability to take collective defensive measures could be destroyed by a big-power veto in the Security Council.[192] Article 51 was therefore inserted in order to avoid the possibility that a major power could render other states legally defenseless without the ability to take action on their own or receive aid from the Council. It should be recalled at this point that the right of collective self-defense expressed by Article 51 applies to both non-regional and regional defensive action and is not limited to the right of the Latin American countries.[193]

The record of the debates in the Senate on the advice and consent to the ratification of the SEATO treaty indicate that the Senate was also acting pursuant to the understanding that Article 51 collective defense action did not require prior Security Council approval.[194]

3. The practice of states under Article 51. The practice of states as indicated by a succession of mutual defense pacts entered into subsequent to the adoption of the Charter indicates that in the opinion of the parties prior approval by the Security Council of defensive action is not required. Each of these agreements makes direct reference to Article 51 of the Charter and interprets that provision in the manner that its terms clearly demand *i.e.* that initial action may be taken by the aggrieved party and its allies and that such action may continue until it is effectively replaced by Security Council measures. In order that it may be seen that such an interpretation is widely shared even by non-Western nations, the first example quoted will be the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance of 1955 signed by the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, The Hungarian People's Republic, The German Democratic Republic, The Polish People's Republic, The Romanian People's Republic, and the Czechoslovak Republic. Article 4 of the Treaty provides:

"In the event of armed attack in Europe on one or more of the Parties to the Treaty by any state or group of states, each of the Parties in the Treaty, in the exercise of its right to individual or collective self-defense in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations Organization, shall immediately, either individually or in agreement with other Parties to the Treaty, come to the assistance of the state or states attacked with all such means as it deems necessary including armed force. The Parties to the Treaty shall immediately consult concerning the necessary measures to be taken by them jointly in order to restore and maintain international peace and security. Measures taken on the basis of this article shall be reported to the Security Council in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations Organization. These measures shall be discontinued immediately the Security Council adopts the necessary measures to restore and maintain peace and security."[195]

Moreover, such an interpretation of Article 51 is not confined to the principal capital exporting powers. A quotation from the Joint Defense and Economic Cooperation Treaty (1950) of the Arab League concluded between Syria, Transjordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the Lebanese Republic, Egypt, and Yemen demonstrates this. Article 2 of that Treaty provides that:

"The Contracting States consider any [act of] armed aggression made against any one or more of them or their armed forces, to be directed against them all. Therefore, in accordance with the right of self-defense individually and collectively they undertake to go without delay to the aid of the state or states against which such an act of aggression is made, and immediately to take, individually and collectively, all steps available, including the use of armed force, to repel aggression and restore security and peace. In conformity with Article 6 of the Arab League Pact and Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the Arab League Council and U.N. Security Council shall be notified of such an act of aggression and the means and procedure taken to check it."[196]

Ruth Lawson summarizes the relationship of collective defense organizations to the Security Council as follows:

"The relationship of contemporary regional and global organizations is worthy of special comment. The collective defense organizations based on the North Atlantic Treaty and the Rio, Manila, Baghdad, and Warsaw pacts are ultimately grounded in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which with notable prescience legitimized collective defense against armed attack without Security Council authorization."[197]

---

ments was defeated in Committee III/4 by a vote of 29 to 5 See 12 U.N.C.I.O. 701–02.

The defeated proposal stated:

"There shall be considered as regional arrangements organizations of a permanent nature grouping in a given geographical area several countries which, by reason of their proximity, community of interest or cultural ties, linguistic, historic or spiritual affinities, make themselves jointly responsible for the peaceful settlement of any disputes which may arise between them and for the maintenance of peace and security in their region as well as for the safeguarding of their interest and development of their economic and cultural relations."

12 U.N.C.I.O. 850. In the debates prior to the defeat of the Egyptian proposal the delegate of the United States stated:

"While the language submitted by the delegate of Egypt clearly defined obvious legitimate and eligible factors for a regional arrangement, it was probable that it failed to cover all the situations which might be embraced by regional arrangements."

12 U.N.C.I.O. 701.

Without taking note of these United Nations records or citing any authority for the proposition the *Memorandum of Law of Lawyers Committee on American Policy toward Vietnam* states that:

"The concept that the United States—a country separated by oceans and thousands of miles from southeast Asia and bereft of any historical or ethnic connection with the peoples of southeast Asia—could validly be considered a member of a regional system implanted in southeast Asia is utterly alien to the regional systems envisaged in the charter."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 9, 1966, pp. 2665, 2667–2668. The prevailing evidence clearly indicates that there are no such restrictions on regional defensive organizations under Article 51 of the Charter. In any event, it is generally accepted that any assistance to a state engaged in lawful self-defense is authorized pursuant to Article 51 whether or not such assistance is pursuant to action under a regional system.

[190] For the text of the NATO Treaty of April 4, 1949, see TIAS 1964, 63 Stat. 2241.

[191] *Accession of the U.K. to the Pact of Mutual Cooperation Between Turkey and Iraq Signed at Baghdad on Feb. 24, 1955* (Miscellaneous No. 5 [1955], Command Paper 9429).

[192] RUSSELL & MUTHER, A HISTORY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, 668–713 (1958).

[193] 17 U.N.C.I.O. 396.

[194] The Senate's concept of the relation between Article 51 self-defence action and the Security Council is discussed below in the section of this article dealing with SEATO. See note 202 *infra.*

[195] For complete text see *Disarmament and Security: A Collection of Documents 1919–1955*, 84th Cong., 2d sess., 551 (1956), hereinafter cited as *Disarmament and Security.*

[196] *Id.* at 622 ff.

[197] LAWSON, INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL ORGANIZATION VI (1962).

That collective defense action under Article 51 is entirely different from "enforcement action" which under article 52 can be taken only with prior Security Council approval is indicated by Kunz. He states:

"As in municipal law, self-defense under Art. 51 is not a procedure to enforce the law, is not designed to punish the aggressor

U.N. Members May Act in the Collective Self-Defense of Non-Members

The practice of states since the signing of the Charter has indicated that it is the genuine expectation of the World Community that United Nations member states may conclude collective defense arrangements with non-members. At the time of the conclusion of the NATO Treaty two of the parties, Italy and Portugal were not members.[198] Kelsen states: ". . . according to an almost generally accepted interpretation of Article 51 of the right of collective self-defense may also be exercised in case of an armed attack against a non-member state." [199] Apparently no international law scholar has ever seriously suggested that the United Nations Charter prohibits the right of self-defense of non-members or of the right of members to assist in the collective self-defense of non-members.

The various arrangements made between the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam amount to a collective self-defense request. These arrangements are composed of such acts as the exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and Premier Diem, and President Thieu's recent reaffirmation of the desire for United States assistance.[200] The close interaction between the two governments as demonstrated at the recent Honolulu conference is a further indication of this collective defense arrangement.

SEATO Regional Defense Agreement Is Based on Article 51 and Covers the R.V.N.

The institutional framework of the United States military assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is provided by the SEATO regional defense agreement [201] which is firmly rooted in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter which expanded the concept of self-defense to provide for such collective arrangements. Senator Mansfield, a member of the United States delegation to the conference which established SEATO, made clear the relation of SEATO to Article 51 when he told the Senate that:

"The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty is consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The treaty would come under the provisions of Article 51, providing that nothing contained in the United Nations Charter shall deprive one of the states from the individual or collective right of self-defense." [202]

Senator Mansfield further noted in the same speech that measures taken under Article 51 "do not need prior approval of the Security Council. . ."

The legal structure created by this agreement is composed of two strands: (a) the umbrella of protection extended by the treaty to the Republic of Viet Nam [203] and (b) repeated action on the part of the Republic of Viet Nam indicating acceptance of this protection.

The SEATO Treaty was concluded in September 1954 by Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, Pakistan, France, New Zealand, Great Britain and the United States.[204] The primary purpose of the treaty was to insure self-determination of the peoples of Southeast Asia by insuring the territorial and political integrity of the states into which they were organized.[205] While Viet Nam was not a party to the treaty the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Viet Nam was designated by the parties as a protocol state as to which the treaties' protection against aggression extended.[206] Such protection was not intended by the parties to the agreement to be forced on Viet Nam or any other protocol state. Article 4(3) states, "It is understood that no action on the territory of any state designated by unanimous agreement [as a protocol state] or on territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned." [207] The Republic of Viet Nam has consented to the over-all protection of the Treaty and has requested the particular defensive assistance currently being rendered by several parties to the Treaty. A treaty may confer a benefit, on a country not a party, if the parties to the treaty are clear and unequivocal as to their intention to confer such a benefit.[208] The parties to the SEATO Treaty made their intention to confer the benefit clear and the Republic of Viet Nam made clear its acceptance. In 1957 a joint declaration was issued by President Eisenhower and President Diem of the Republic of Viet Nam. In this statement specific recognition was given to the application of the SEATO Treaty to the Republic of Viet Nam. Because of the importance of this statement as an indication of the Republic of Viet Nam's approval of the SEATO shield of protection the two final paragraphs of the declaration will in large part be quoted:

"President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem noted . . . the large buildup of Vietnamese communist military forces in North Vietnam during the past 2½ years, the harsh suppression of the revolts of the people of North Vietnam in seeking liberty, and their increasing hardships. . . . In particular they agreed that the continued military buildup of the Chinese Communists, their refusal to renounce the use of force, and their unwillingness to subscribe to standards of conduct of civilized nations constitute a continuing threat to the safety of all free nations in Asia. To counter this threat, President Ngo Dinh Diem indicated his strong desire and his efforts to seek closer cooperation with the free countries of Asia.

"Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability. The just settlement of problems of the area by peaceful and legitimate means within the framework of the United Nations Charter will continue to be the mutual concern of both governments. Finally, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem expressed the desire and determination of the two governments to cooperate closely together for freedom and independence in the world." [209]

The SEATO treaty has proved to be more than an abstract framework within which to discuss the theory of collective self-defense. Since the SEATO Council contains several Southeast Asian nations among its members, it is one of the better suited deliberative bodies of the World Community to judge aggression and its effects on self-determination of the peoples of that area. As has been mentioned previously, the Council has on two occasions, 1964 and 1965,[210] adjudged that aggression was being committed by North Vietnam against the Republic of Viet Nam. This regional finding has been effectuated by military support on the part of a majority of the countries composing SEATO. Combat troops have been contributed by Australia and New Zealand. Thailand has given support by permitting its territory to be used as the site of air bases for supporting operations against aggression aimed at the R.V.N. The Philippines has indicated that it will dispatch some 2,000 support troops.[211] It should be noted that another Asian country, South Korea, though not a party to the SEATO Treaty has contributed some 20,000 combat and support troops for the collective defense effort and has recently indicated that it will double this amount.[212]

In summary, the SEATO treaty has at least the following bearing on the legality of mili-

---

or to obtain indemnities, is not an enforcement action by the United Nations, but serves primarily to repel an illegal armed attack."

See Kunz, *Individual and Collective Self-Defense in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations*, 41 Am. J. Int'l. L. 872, 876 (1947). From this it would seem that Article 52 "enforcement action" is action by the United Nations, through its own forces or those of a regional agency to which it has delegated authority to enforce international law concerning aggression or to take other action collectively authorized by the United Nations. Prior approval of the Security Council is required before a regional body can take such "enforcement action" on behalf of the world organization. Prior approval is not required, however, before a nation or group of nations can act in collective defense pursuant to Article 51, whether acting under a regional arrangement or not.

[198] Kelsen, *op. cit. supra* note 169, at 128.

[199] *Id.* at 88. Waldock, in speaking of the interpretation that Article 51 does not permit U.N. Members to act in defense of non-members states, ". . . we know this interpretation of the words was completely rejected by the United Nations with respect to the invasion of South Korea." See, Brierly, Law of Nations 305 (6th ed. Waldock 1963).

Without noting Kelsen and Waldock, in fact, without citing any authority, the *Memorandum of Law of Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam* implies that because Article 51 speaks of "an armed attack against a member of the United Nations," that "neither the right of individual . . . nor . . . collective self-defense can become operative" with respect to the R.V.N., a non-member of the United Nations. See Congressional Record, Feb. 9, 1966, pp. 2665, 2667. The authority is clearly against such an interpretation. And as a policy question such an interpretation makes even less sense. It would mean, for example, that the People's Republic of China would have no right to individual or collective self-defense.

[200] N.Y. Times, Feb. 7, 1966, p. 3, col. 2. See also note 185 *supra*.

[201] The text of the SEATO Treaty may be found in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam*, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 62 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[202] Congressional Record, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1055.

[203] See the Protocol to the SEATO treaty in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam*, Commitee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 66 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[204] *Id.* at 62, 65.

[205] See Preamble to the SEATO treaty, *Id.* at 62.

[206] See the Protocol to the SEATO treaty, *Id.* at 66.

[207] *Id.* at 63.

[208] Briggs. Law of Nations 871 (1952).

[209] *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam*, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 73–74 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[210] See notes 137–38 *supra*. The decision to render military asistance to the R.V.N. pursuant to SEATO can be validly made by individual members as well as by the SEATO Council as such. Ruth Lawson notes that under both the SEATO and NATO treaties "* * * the commitment to act in event of armed attack is a matter for unilateral decision * * * Lawson, International Regional Organization 276 (1962).

[211] New Haven Register, April 11, 1966, p. 1, col. 5.

[212] N.Y. Times, March 1, 1966, p. 7, col. 1.

tary assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam: It creates an international body to some extent capable of making a determination as to the existence of aggression against area countries; by extending its protection to the Republic of Viet Nam it recognized that that country was the potential object of aggression; the R.V.N. completed the institutional structure for its defense by explicitly acquiescing in the SEATO protection; the SEATO Council has explicitly determined on two occasions the existence of external aggression from North Viet Nam against the R.V.N.; the terms of the treaty (Art. IV) permit defensive assistance to protected countries upon request; and such request was made by the Republic of Viet Nam to which a majority of the SEATO states are rendering some assistance.

These determinations and actions indicate that in the opinion of the assisting SEATO parties the Republic of Viet Nam was competent to make a request for military assistance and that the request was proper.

The Fundamental Principle of Self-Determination

The principles of customary international law and Articles 51 collective self-defense are but separate manifestations of a larger principle: self-determination. Taken separately each of the principles discussed appears to furnish legal support for the United States presence in the R.V.N. Their cumulative effect is seen in the principle of self-determination. This principle would seem to require that if there are ambiguities in customary international law and the United Nations Charter, they should be interpreted in a way to promote the genuine freedom of choice of the Republic of Viet Nam to determine its own form of government and society.

The right of self-determination has frequently found expression in the practice of the United Nations. One example that is conspicuously relevant to the Viet Nam situation is the United Nation's treatment of the crisis confronting Greece immediately after the Second World War. In that crisis military assistance was rendered to the Greek government by the United States and Great Britain to oppose rebels who had been receiving arms, ammunition, other military assistance and sanctuary from the communist governments of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. Far from condemning the actions of the United States and Great Britain, the United Nations gave effect to the principle of self-determination by noting that a continuation of the action of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia "constitutes a threat to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece and to peace in the Balkans and that the conduct of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia had been inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the charter of the United Nations . . ." [213]

This principle of self-determination would also seem to require that the United States continue to examine its policies in Viet Nam to ensure that alternatives are effectuated which maximize the genuine freedom of choice of the people of the Republic of Viet Nam.

II. THE UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES IN VIET NAM ARE LAWFUL

A. The Defensive Use of the Military Instrument by the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam Was Necessary

Under international law there are two requirements for the use of the military instrument in lawful self-defense, necessity and proportionality.[214] The first of these requirements of lawful self-defense, necessity, has clearly been met; the factual basis has been discussed in the preceding sections.

Armed attack launched from and by the D.R.V., civil strife fomented by the D.R.V., acts of terrorism inspired by the D.R.V., and cease-fire violations committed by the D.R.V, are acts directed at the Republic of Viet Nam's territorial and political integrity. Such acts created a situation of overwhelming necessity under either traditional international law standards or the United Nations Charter for a limited military response in self-defense directed at interdicting the aggression from the D.R.V. Many of the International Control Commission findings and other evidence demonstrating the necessity for use of the military instrument against the D.R.V. indicate that an armed attack occurred as early as the period from 1959 to 1962 or even earlier and was accelerated thereafter. The bombing of the D.R.V. did not begin until February 1965. This time lag between attack and response indicates that according to still another criterion, time, the D.R.V. is an aggressor in its actions against the R.V.N.

The second requirement of lawful self-defense, proportionality of the response, has also been met.

B. The Defensive Use of the Military Instrument by the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam Is Proportional

The military response of the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam has been aimed at interdicting the D.R.V. aggression against the R.V.N. and has been carefully limited to those resources of the D.R.V. which contribute to that aggression.

This is most clearly demonstrated as to the bombing of the D.R.V. by Secretary of Defense McNamara's account of how the targets were selected with that objective in mind:

"The airstrikes have been carefully limited to military targets, primarily to infiltration targets, to transit points, to barracks, to supply depots, to ammunition depots, to route of communication, all feeding the infiltration line from North Viet Nam into Laos and then into South Viet Nam.

"More recently there have been added to this target system railroads, highways, and bridges which are the foundation of the infiltration routes.

"The primary emphasis has been placed upon the routes south of 20 degrees north. . . . Hanoi is at about the 21st parallel. . . . Our strikes are concentrated on the lines of communication running south and east and west, south of 20 degrees.

"The basic objective of the strikes has been to inhibit, to reduce, to deflect, the movement southward of men and material. We have sought to deny them the use of their primary lines of communication and to force dependence on an inadequate secondary road system and inadequate means of support.

"The strikes have been designed to increase the dependence on an already overburdened road transport system by denying the use of the rail lines in the South. In summary, our objectives have been to force them off the rails onto the highways and off the highways onto their feet.

"These carefully controlled rail strikes will continue as necessary to impede the infiltration and to persuade the North Vietnamese leadership that their aggression against the South will not succeed.

"Q. Mr. Secretary, what efforts are made to avoid killing civilians in our airstrikes?

"A. Each target is chosen after a very careful review of all reconnaissance photographs. We have carried out very complete reconnaissance of this entire area. Each target is chosen after careful review of reconnaissance photographs to insure that it is isolated and separate and apart from urban population or civilian population areas." [215]

The proportionality of the airstrikes is indicated not only by the limited nature of the targets but also by the manner in which the airstrikes have been used to serve the diplomatic objective: a negotiated settlement. The bombing has been stopped twice: once for approximately a week and again for 37 days.[216] Both pauses were to encourage the D.R.V. to negotiate. Both peace overtures were substantially disregarded by the D.R.V.[217]

The ground operations conducted by the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam also conform to the requirements of proportionality. This is true both as to the number of the troops involved and the nature of the operations.

In a recent address at Yale University, Bernard Fall noted that the optimum ratio of counter-guerrilla troops to guerrillas is 10 or 15 to 1.[218] Occasionally an even higher percentage is necessary. In Malaya the percentage was 55 to 1.[219] According to Fall, the recent figures indicate that the ratio of United States-R.V.N. troops to D.R.V.-Viet-Cong troops is approximately 3½ or 4 to 1.[220] Such figures indicate that far from being excessive, the United States-Republic of Viet Nam troop strength could be increased several fold above current levels and still remain easily within the bounds of proportionality.

The nature of the military operations conducted by the Republic of Viet Nam and the United States is appropriate to the exercise of the right of self-defense.[221] A large number of the military operations have been clearing operations designed to assert control over Viet-Cong influenced areas and thus make possible a return of normal governmental supervision over these areas.[222] Operations thus conceived are directly related to the territorial and political integrity of the Republic of Viet Nam.

Other operations which deliberately seek out D.R.V. and Viet-Cong troops in the R.V.N. and engage them in battle are also appropriate to the exercise of the right of self-defense. The legal Committee of the International Control Commission has found that a D.R.V.-Viet-Cong objective is the overthrow of the recognized Government of the Republic of Viet Nam. It would seem, then, that all operations within the R.V.N. against such troops, whether the troops are transient or hold particular territory, are appropriate measures to insure the territorial and political integrity of the Republic of Viet Nam.

---

[213] General Assembly Resolution 193 (111) para. 3, *supra* note 152.

[214] McDOUGAL & FELICIANO, LAW AND MINIMUM WORLD PUBLIC ORDER 217–218 (1961).

"There is * * * increasing recognition that the requirements of necessity and proportionality as ancillary prescriptions (in slightly lower-order geeralization) of the basic community policy prohibiting change by violence, can ultimately be subjected only to that most comprehensive and fundamental test of all law, reasonableness in particular context."

Id. at 218.

[215] *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 210–12 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[216] N.Y. Times, Jan. 31, 1966, p. 1, col. 8.

[217] See N.Y. Times, Jan. 31, 1966, p. 1, col. 7, for an announcement by Ho Chi Minh refusing offers from the U.S. for unconditional peace negotiations. See Secretary Rusk's news conference, N.Y. Times, Jan. 22, 1966, p. 2, cols. 3–8. See also President Johnson's news conference announcing the resumption of the bombing of the D.R.V., N.Y. Times, Feb. 1, 1966, p. 1, col. 1.

[218] Address by Bernard Fall, Yale University, March 3, 1966.

[219] *Ibid.*

[220] *Ibid.*

[221] See *Newsweek* 28 (April 18, 1966).

[222] *Ibid.*

III. THE UNITED STATES HAS MET ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

At the conclusion of his term in February 1966 as President of the United Nations Security Council, Akira Matsui of Japan said in a letter to the members of the Council that differences of view on the question of Viet Nam had "given rise to a general feeling that it would be inopportune for the Council to hold further debate at this time." [223] This was indicative of the unfortunate response to efforts on the part of the United States to utilize the machinery of the United Nations for seeking peace in Viet Nam. These efforts show full compliance by the United States with the requirement of Article 51 of the Charter that "Measures taken by members in self-defense shall immediately be reported to the Security Council." They further show full compliance by the United States with the requirements of Article 33 that settlement by peaceful diplomatic means be attempted of any dispute that is "likely to endanger international peace and security." The response by the Security Council and U.N. officials to these efforts indicates that the United Nations is presently reluctant to exercise its prerogative under Article 36 to "recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment." Furthermore, the response indicates that the Security Council did not deem it necessary to take any action which under Article 51 would require a cessation of defensive action by the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam. These efforts and the response will be examined in detail chronologically.

On August 2, 1964 and again on August 4, 1964 United States ships were attacked in international waters by torpedo boats from the D.R.V.[224] Between the first and second attacks the United States complied with [225] Article 33 by communicating its displeasure in a note to the Hanoi regime. These peaceful efforts resulted in the second attack by the D.R.V. vessels. The United States then conducted a limited and measured [226] response in the form of air strikes on the docking and supporting facilities of the torpedo boats.

The very next day this defensive action was reported to the Security Council by United States Ambassador Stevenson.[227] This desire of the United States to use the peace seeking facilities of the United Nations sharply contrasts with the attitude of the Hanoi regime. In a statement made on August 8, 1964 the Government of the D.R.V. made the following statement: "The Foreign Ministry of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam stresses that the United Nations Security Council has no right to examine this problem. . ." [228]

The next defensive action against the D.R.V. was also immediately reported to the Security Council.[229] On February 7, 1965 [230] Hanoi controlled Viet-Cong attacked the United States installation at Pleiku causing loss of American lives. The incident was a calculated escalation in a context of increasing armed attack from the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. and United States forces advising in their defense. The limited and measured response directed at this increasing armed attack was aimed at the staging areas in the D.R.V. from which guerrillas infiltrated into the Republic of Viet Nam,[231] and has continued to be aimed at interdicting this armed attack.

The Security Council, after having been clearly informed of the United States action, made no effort to replace United States action with action of its own as it had a right to do under Article 51. The inability of the United Nations to take such action was clearly demonstrated by Secretary-General U Thant at a news conference on February 24, 1965.

"Question: '. . . If no progress is made toward negotiations, might you feel compelled unilaterally to step into the breach and bring the matter to the Security Council?'

"The Secretary General: 'I do not think that is a practical proposition, for reasons that are obvious and well known to you. The government of North Viet-Nam has all along maintained that the United Nations is not competent to deal with the question of Viet-Nam since, in its view, there is already in existence an international machinery established in 1954 in Geneva. They have all along maintained that position and, as you all know, it is a position also maintained by the People's Republic of China. As far as the United Nations is concerned, I think the greatest impediment to the discussion of the question of Viet-Nam in one of the principal organs of the United Nations is the fact that more than two parties directly concerned in the question are not members of this organization. I therefore do not see any immediate prospect of useful discussion in the Security Council.' " [232]

The United States has made continuous efforts of the sort envisaged by Article 33, *i.e.* diplomatic attempts to bring about negotiations. Such attempts were made continuously but were most dramatically emphasized by the two pauses in the limited and measured bombing of the D.R.V. The first occurred in May 1965 after President Johnson's April speech at Johns Hopkins University calling for unconditional negotiations.[233] A further pause of 37 days took

---

[223] Quoted in United Nations Press Service Release WS/231, 4 March, 1966.

[224] Statement by U.S. Ambassador Stevenson to the Security Council August 5, 1964, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 124–25 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[225] *Id.* at 125.

[226] *Ibid.*

[227] *Id.* at 124.

[228] U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL OFF. REC., 19th year, Supp. July, August, September 1964 at 170 (S/5888). In contrast to this D.R.V. attitude, the R.V.N. communicated with the President of the Security Council on August 13th & 15th, 1964, offering its full cooperation in the investigation of the incident, calling attention to the overall problem of aggression from the D.R.V., submitting several R.V.N. "white papers" containing factual evidence of that aggression to be circulated as official Council documents, and offering to accredit a delegation to the Security Council to participate in debates on the incident. See *The Bogus War of Liberation In South Vietnam* 43–47 (The Republic of Vietnam, June 1965).

[229] Letter from Ambassador Stevenson to Security Council President, Feb. 7, 1965 in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 149–151 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[230] *Ibid.*

[231] *Id.* at 150.

[232] Press Conference, Feb. 24, 1965, quoted in RASKIN & FALL, THE VIET-NAM READER 263, at 267 (Vintage ed. 1965), and in *Recent Exchanges Concerning Attempts to Promote a Negotiated Settlement of the Conflict in Viet-Nam* (Viet-Nam No. 3 [1965], Command Paper 2756), at 21. See also the July 10: Report From "The Times": U Thant's Visit To London.

"U Thant declined to comment on the visit of Mr. Harold Davies to Hanoi, but on the suggestion that the United Nations should be involved in Vietnam he said that China and North Vietnam had always maintained that international machinery already existed to cope with the question of Vietnam.

" 'In their view,' he said, 'the United Nations should not, and must not, be involved in trying to find a peaceful solution to the problem.'

"U Thant said that he did not think, therefore, that there was any immediate prospect of United Nations' involvement. Primarily the question of Vietnam was, he said, linked more with the Geneva Agreement of 1954." *Id.* at 109.

[233] Speech of President Johnson, April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins University printed in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 197 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

The extensive efforts of the United States, Britain, Canada, and a number of nonaligned nations to achieve a peaceful solution pursuant to article 33 of the Charter through negotiation, the machinery of the Geneva Accords and the machinery of the United Nations have been consistently refused by the D.R.V., the U.S.S.R., and the People's Republic of China. See the documents contained in *Recent Exchanges Concerning Attempts to Promote a Negotiated Settlement of the Conflict in Viet-Nam* (Viet-Nam No. 3 [1965], Command Paper 2756). By way of indicative extracts:

"Preface *id.* at 7:

" 'As will be seen from document No. 12, Mr. Gromyko (who visisted London at the invitation of Her Majesty's Government from March 16 to 20) was unwilling to consider a joint message of an uncontroversial nature and said that in the prevailing circumstances it would be inappropriate even to discuss the possibility of convening an international conference. Much to the regret of Her Majesty's Government, therefore, and in spite of repeated efforts to induce the Soviet Government to reconsider their attitude, subsequent British efforts to promote negotiations on Viet-Nam have perforce been unilateral and their effectiveness has been greatly diminished by the absence of the traditional cooperation . . . .

" 'The story of these unilateral British efforts, together with those made by many other Governments and by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, is set out in the other documents now publishd. In spite of the discouraging responses from China, North Viet-Nam and the National Front for the Liberation of South Viet-Nam, Her Majesty's Government intends to persevere their efforts . . . .' "

February 11: Mr. Kosygin's Visit To North Viet-Nam: Joint Communique (Extract) *id.* at 18.

"The two sides unanimously declared that the only correct way to settle the South Vietnam problem is: The USA must correctly implement the Geneva Agreements, end at once the aggressive war, withdraw all its troops, military personnel and weapons from South Vietnam, stop all interference in South Vietnam's affairs and let the South Vietnamese people settle by themselves their internal affairs."

March 10: Statement by Huynh Tan Phat, the Leader of the Delegation of the South Viet-Namese Liberation Front to the Indo Chinese People's Conference at Phnom Penh *id.* at 24.

"When asked why the SVNLF supported the proposal for the convening of new Geneva conferences on Laos and Cambodia and did not consent to hold such a conference on the South Vietnam question, Huynh Tan Phat said that every country had its specific conditions. . . . [F]irst and foremost, the place beginning December 24, 1965.[234] During this period U.S. diplomatic missions to many of the world's states indicated the U.S. desire for negotiations.[235] This lengthy pause concluded on January 31, 1966 without having received a favorable response from Hanoi. On January 28, 1966, Hanoi, in letters to the heads of several states, reiterated its unwillingness to engage in unconditional negotiations.[236]

On January 31, 1966 the United States again sought the assistance of the United Nations in its peace keeping efforts.[237]

US imperialists should withdraw all their troops, military personnel, arms and war material from South Vietnam and leave the South Vietnamese people to settle their own affairs."

March 15: Declaration by the Seventeen Non-Aligned Countries *id.* at 25.

"We . . . make an urgent appeal to the parties concerned to start . . . negotiations, as soon as possible, without posing any precondition. . . ."

March 16: Note on Contacts Between the Co-Chairmen *id.* at 28.

"When Mr. Gromyko visited London from March 16–20 at the invitation of H.M. Government, the question of negotiations on Viet-Nam was discussed in detail with him by the Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister. During the course of these conversations, Mr. Gromyko rejected the idea put to him by the Foreign Secretary that the two co-Chairmen might agree on a message in terms sufficiently objective to be mutually acceptable to other members of the Conference. He also rejected the Prime Minister's proposal that the two co-Chairmen should actually reconvene the Geneva Conference on Indo-China and expressed the view that, until what he called American aggression in Viet-Nam had been terminated, it would be inappropriate even to discuss the possibility of calling a conference."

April 1: The Secretary's Speech to the House of Commons (Extracts) *id.* at 38–40.

"What we have had to struggle with during these last weeks is a situation where the repeated attitude of the Communist side was that it saw no need for negotiations or a conference at all. It has sometimes been suggested that this attitude of the Communist Powers can be blamed on us; that if we had been prepared to engage in phrases condemnatory of the United States, or to dissociate ourselves from its actions, we should have got a better response. But I think that we should notice what response others have been getting—France, India and Yugoslavia.

"The French approach glanced at, but no result from it; the Indian ignored and the *People's Daily,* in Peking, saying on March 22 of the Yugoslav initiative, 'The Tito clique serves America' and going on to say that President Tito had no right to express opinions about Vietnam. . . .

"It might be said that the United States Government should spell out more fully what was required as a satisfactory assurance by North Vietnam that it was prepared to cease attacks on the South, or that the United States should describe the exact process through which a cease-fire might be reached, or that it should describe more fully how it pictures the future of Vietnam, for all these things must at some time be part of the discussion.

"It is difficult for the United States to do this so long as there is no indication from the other side of its preparedness to consider a settlement on any terms. If and when there is a clear indication to that effect, when the other side communicates in any form that it desires a cessation of hostilities, or considers there is room for negotiation, then the door would be open and there would be something which could be regarded as a basis for negotiation; and then the thoroughly sound proposition that this whole problem must have a political and not merely a military solution could become alive and real."

April 8: Reply by the United States Government to the Declaration by the Seventeen Non-Aligned Countries *id.* at 49–50.

"We welcome the concern and interest of the governments participating in the declaration of March 15; just as we welcome any initiative aimed at bringing peace to any part of the world. The declaration is a constructive contribution to the effort for peace. . . .

"There may be many ways to this kind of peace. In discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned, in large groups or in small ones, in the reaffirmation of old agreements or their strengthening with new ones.

"We have stated this position over and over again, to friend and foe alike. And we remain ready—with this purpose—for unconditional discussions."

April 8: Speech by Mr. Pham Van Dong (The Four Points) in North Viet-Nam (Extracts) *id.* at 51.

"It is the unswerving policy of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to strictly respect the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Vietnam, and to correctly implement their basic provisions as embodied in the following points:

"I. . . . According to the Geneva Agreements, the U.S. Government must withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. troops, military personnel and weapons of all kinds, dismantle all U.S. military bases there, cancel its "military alliance" with South Vietnam. It must end its policy of intervention and aggression in South Vietnam. According to the Geneva Agreements, the U.S. Government must stop its acts of war against North Vietnam, completely cease all encroachments on the territory and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. . . .

"3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the programme of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, without any foreign interference. . . .

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is of the view that the above-expounded stand is the basis for the soundest political settlement of the Vietnam problem. If this basis is recognized, favourable conditions will be created for the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem and it will be possible to consider the reconvening of an international conference along the pattern of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam.

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam declares that any approach contrary to the above stand is inappropriate; any approach tending to secure a U.N. intervention in the Vietnam situation is also inappropriate because such approaches are basically at variance with the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Vietnam."

April 11: "Observer" Article in the Peking Peoples' Daily "Johnson's Big Swindle" (Extracts) *id.* at 52–53.

"As a matter of fact, the talk about 'unconditional discussions' is a swindle pure and simple. . . .

"The South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation solemnly declared some time ago that 'all negotiations with the U.S. imperialists at this moment are utterly useless if they still refuse to withdraw from South Viet Nam all their troops and all kinds of war materials and means and those of their satellite countries, if they still refuse to dismantle all their military bases in south Viet Nam, if the traitors still surrender the South Vietnamese people's sacred rights to independence and democracy to the U.S. imperialists and if the South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation—the only genuine representative of the 14 million South Vietnamese people—does not have its decisive voice.' . . .

"If the American aggressors refuse to quit South Viet Nam, the only road open to them is one of total defeat. . . . We would like to tell the Johnson Administration: whatever you have done or may possibly do, the Chinese people will staunchly side with the Vietnamese people and fight shoulder to shoulder with them to the end for the complete defeat of the American aggressors."

April 12: Article in the Peking Peoples' Daily "Serious Advice for U Thant" *id.* at 54–55.

"According to Western press reports, U.N. Secretary-General U Thant has on more than one occasion of late indicated his intention to visit China and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam to 'inquire about' what he calls 'the possibility of achieving a negotiated settlement in Viet Nam.' . . .

"If U Thant is undertaking this activity in the capacity of U.N. Secretary-General, then we should like to tell him in all seriousness to spare himself the trouble.

"The Viet Nam question has nothing to do with the United Nations. The 1954 Geneva agreements were reached outside the United Nations, and the latter has no right to interfere in the affairs of Viet Nam or of Indo-China as a whole. It is the responsibility of the Geneva Conference participant nations to uphold the Geneva Agreements, and no meddling by the United Nations is called for, nor will it be tolerated. This is the case; it was so in the past, and so will it remain in the future.. .

"The United Nations has never taken a just stand on the Viet Nam question. It has absolutely no say concerning a settlement of the south Viet Nam question. . . .

"In short, U.N. intervention in affairs of Indo-China cannot be tolerated. . . .

"We would like to advise U Thant: save yourself the trouble. There is nothing for the United Nations to do in Viet Nam, neither is it qualified to do anything there."

April 12: Reply by the Chinese Government to the British Co-Chairman's Message of April 2 *id.*, at 57–58.

". . . [T]he Chinese Government hereby states to the British Government that in the present circumstances it is not suitable for a special representative of the British Government to contact the Chinse Government on the problems of Viet Nam and Indo-China, and that he is not welcome."

April 14: Reply of the Canadian Government to the Declaration of Seventeen Non-Aligned Countries *id.* at 60.

"The Canadian Government welcomes the spirit in which the appeal has been launched and commends the sponsoring nations for their initiative which reflects the anxiety of all responsible nations of the world over the deepening crisis in Vietnam and their concern for a peaceful resolution of the conflict. . . .

"Discussions or negotiations, however, require a willingness of both sides to participate. The Canadian Government earnestly hopes therefore that all the other interested governments will respond affirmatively to the appeal as a demonstration of their concern for peace, and that they will not hesitate to take up the offer of unconditional discussions

See footnotes 234, 235, 236, 237, on page 15544.

Ambassador Goldberg placed formally before the Security Council a draft resolution calling for immediate negotiations without preconditions. The draft resolution provided that:

"The Security Council, Deeply concerned at the continuation of hostilities in Vietnam,

"Mindful of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security,

"Noting that the provisions of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 have not been implemented,

"Desirous of contributing to a peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam,

---

made by the President of the United States of America."

April 22: Editorial in the Peking Peoples' Daily on the Declaration of the Seventeen Non-Aligned Countries (Extract) *id.* at 66–67.

"The Viet-Namese people will never agree to negotiations 'without any preconditions.' They have on more than one occasion made clear their stand. . . .

"Frankly speaking, the 17-Nation 'appeal' completely caters to the interests of United States imperialism and has become a shield in the hands of the Johnson Administration to ward off worldwide condemnation of and opposition to the United States crimes of aggression.

"Why has the 17-nation 'appeal' catered so much to the needs of United States imperialism? Credit should be given to the Tito clique of Yugoslavia.

"It is common knowledge that from beginning to end the document was masterminded and created by the Tito clique. As early as March 2 this year, Tito wrote to Johnson urging 'negotiations' with 'neither party putting forward any preconditions,' and stressing that this would 'directly benefit' the United States. Johnson immediately replied. He bestowed high praise upon Tito and added that 'in your conversations and communications with the leaders of other countries, you will reflect this understanding.' These instructions from the United States boss sent the Titoites scurrying everywhere, and soon the 'appeal' was produced."

May 13: Statement to the House of Commons by the Foreign Secretary: Mr. Gordon Walker's Tour *id.* at 78–79.

"It was a disappointment that the Chinese and North Vietnamese refused to see Mr. Gordon Walker. It is also regrettable that even the Soviet Government are, so far, only willing to contemplate negotiations on Cambodia rather than on Vietnam."

May 15: Note on a Meeting Between Mr. Gromyko and the Foreign Secretary in Vienna *id.* at 80.

"The Foreign Secretary again raised with Mr. Gromyko the question of convening the Geneva Council on Indo-China, arguing that the sooner this took place the better, but Mr. Gromyko could not agree that the Soviet Union should take part in negotiations on this subject."

June 3: Statement in the House of Commons by the Foreign Secretary *id.* at 86–87.

". . . I must tell the House that at present a barrier is erected at the very beginning of the road. That barrier is the refusal of the Governments of North Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union to negotiate at all."

July 19: Prime Minister's Speech in the House of Commons (Extracts) *id.* at 111–116.

"On more than one occasion we have tried to use the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. His proposed peace tour secured the same result as the unofficial visit of Mr. Gordon Walker. The Indian representative was rebuffed, the seventeen non-aligned nations were rebuffed, and France was rebuffed. More recently we secured the almost unanimous Commonwealth support for a Commonwealth Mission on Vietnam, and again Peking and Hanoi refused to accept the Mission. . . .

". . . [T]o get a political solution means getting men round a table. Every effort to do this—whether through the co-Chairmen, whether through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, whether through the French initiative, whether through my right hon. Friend's message to the Heads of the Geneva Conference Governments, whether through the initiative of the 17 non-aligned countries, whether through the initiative of the Commonwealth Peace Mission and subsequent attempts to get acceptance of that Mission—has so far foundered on the willingness of Hanoi, and, to the extent to which China accepts responsibility for these matters, of Peking to agree to negotiations. I do not think that there will be any disagreement with that proposition.

". . . [A]ll these attempts have established the willingness of the United States, the Government of South Vietnam and of the majority of the Geneva parties to have negotiations. No further diplomatic approaches are necessary with them."

July 30: Text of a Letter on Viet-Nam Sent by Mr. Goldberg to the President of the Security Council of the United Nations *id.* at 124–25.

"Members of the Council also are aware of the prolonged and repeated efforts of the United States Government to open a path to peaceful solution of the disputes of South East Asia, beginning with our acceptance of the terms of the Geneva Accords of 1954. These efforts have included:

"Various approaches to Hanoi, Peking and Moscow;

"Support of peaceful overtures by the United Kingdom, Canada, and the British Commonwealth of Nations;

"Favorable reactions to proposals made by seventeen nonaligned nations, and later by the Government of India;

"Approval of efforts by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to initiate peace talks;

"Endorsement of a larger role for the United Nations in South East Asia, including a United Nations Mission of Observers along the frontier between Viet Nam and Cambodia, a United Nations Mission to investigate alleged suppression of minority rights in Viet Nam, and a United Nations invitation to Hanoi to participate in Security Council discussions of the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin;

"Major participation, directly and through the United Nations, in economic and social development projects in South East Asia;

"A direct appeal by the President of the United States to the members of the United Nations to use their influence in bringing all parties to the peace table;

"Repeated assertions on the highest authority that the United States is prepared to engage in negotiations or discussions of any character with no prior conditions whatever.

"On at least fifteen occasions in the past four-and-a-half years, the United States has initiated or supported efforts to resolve the issues in South East Asia by peaceful negotiations.

"I am sure that the other members of the Security Council share the deep regrets of my Government in the fact that none of these initiatives has met with any favorable response whatever. It is especially unfortunate that the regime in Hanoi, which, along with the Republic of Viet Nam, is most directly involved in the conflict, has denied the competence of the United Nations to concern itself with this dispute in any manner and has even refused to participate in the discussion in the Council."

See also the *Renmin Ribao* Observer editorials reprinted in SUPPORT THE PEOPLE OF VIET NAM, DEFEAT U.S. AGGRESSORS II (Foreign Languages Press Peking 1965).

". . . President Ho Chi Minh has solemnly declared to the world:

"'To settle the south Viet Nam question, the United States must, first of all, withdraw from south Viet Nam, let the south Vietnamese people decide for themselves their own affairs, and stop its provocative attacks against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

"The Chinese Government and people fully support President Ho Chi Minh's statement. They are resolved, together with the Vietnamese people, to carry to the end the joint struggle to oust the U.S. aggressors from Viet Nam.'

Renmin Ribao Editorial April 12, 1965, "Solemn Pledge of the Thirty Million Vietnamese People" *id.* at 7–8.

"Only the withdrawal of all U.S. armed forces from south Viet Nam can create the indispensable pre-condition for the peaceful settlement of the Viet Nam question in accordance with the Geneva agreements and provide a reliable guarantee for the Vietnamese people to settle their own affairs and to achieve the peaceful reunification of their motherland."

Renmin Ribao Editorial April 16, 1965, "People of the World, Act Now and Force the U.S. Aggressors to Get Out of Viet Nam!" *id.* at 29, 32.

[234] N.Y. Times, Jan. 31, 1966, p. 1, col. 8.

[235] N.Y. Times, Dec. 30, 1965, p. 1, col. 8; *id.* p. 7, col. 1; *id.* p. 6, col. 1; N.Y. Times, Dec. 31, 1965, p. 1, cols. 7–8.

For a recent indication of the continuing United States efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement see N.Y. Times, June 3, 1966, p. 1, col. 6 (city ed.).

"Through Peking and other diplomatic channels, the Administration . . . has sent a new message to Hanoi pledging willingness to cease bombing if North Vietnam, under some form of international verification, stops infiltrating troops into South Vietnam. . . .

"Thus far, according to highly placed officials, there has been no reaction from Peking or Hanoi to the two American initiatives."

Ibid.

[236] See the N.Y. Times, Jan. 31, 1966, p. 1, col. 7, for a statement by D.R.V. President Ho Chi Minh rejecting U.S. offers to negotiate. See also note 233 *supra.*

[237] N.Y. Times, Feb. 1, 1966, p. 1, col. 4, p. 12, cols. 2–6. Ambassador Goldberg's January 31, 1966, request that the Security Council consider the Vietnamese conflict and adopt the United States resolution calling for an international peace conference clearly complies with the requirements of Article 37 of the Charter. Article 37(1) states as follows:

"Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council."

Article 33 states:

"(1) The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice. . . ."

Thus the wording of Articles 37 and 33 would seem to require or at the least permit, the parties to a dispute to attempt a diplomatic settlement among themselves before

"Recognizing the right of all people, including those in Vietnam, to self-determination,

"1. Calls for immediate discussions without preconditions at ——— on ——— date among the appropriate interested governments to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia.

"2. Recommends that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for the cessation of hostilities under effective supervision.

"3. Offers to assist in achieving the purpose of this resolution by all appropriate means including the provision of arbitrators or mediators,

"4. Calls on all concerned to cooperate fully in the implementation of the resolution,

"5. Requests the Secretary-General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution." [238]

The draft resolution presented by the United States was not adopted. In fact, there was little interest in discussing the matter, beyond that displayed by the United States. On January 21, 1966, shortly prior to the introduction of the resolution and during the second United States bombing pause "the Secretary-General said he did not think that an open debate in the Security Council would be useful." [239] In another statement made on the same day the Secretary-General stated that the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force in Cyprus "were in danger of being curtailed in the near future because of a lack of funds." [240] The same lack of funds would seem to be a factor precluding any U.N. peace-keeping activities in Viet Nam.

Despite these inauspicious signs the United States presented its resolution. So reluctant were many of the Security Council members to even discuss this peace effort that the United States barely achieved the requisite 9 votes (of 15 members) to have the resolution set for discussion.[241] Russia and Bulgaria voted against discussing the matter and France, among others, abstained.[242] The result of the discussion was the statement by the Security Council President with which this section began: that no agreement could be reached.

It should also be pointed out that under Article 35 of the Charter any member or even non-member of the United Nations could have brought the Viet Nam situation to the attention of the Security Council. And under Article 99 "The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security."

The United States and all of the other nations of the world must, of course, continually work to strengthen and assist the United Nations in undertaking solutions to problems such as Viet Nam. It is particularly important that every feasible effort continue to be made to maximize the potential of the United Nations to seek a solution to the Viet Nam situation. As United Nations Ambassador Goldberg has repeatedly indicated, the search for a peaceful negotiated solution must continue. The facts, however, indicate that the United States has met its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

IV. THE GENEVA ACCORDS SUPPORT THE UNITED STATES' POSITION

A. Nothing in the Geneva Accords requires the United States to abstain from resisting aggression against the Republic of Viet Nam

As has been seen, the Geneva Accords of 1954 with respect to Viet Nam consisted of an Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities between the D.R.V. and the French Union forces, and a Final Declaration of the Conference.[243] The United States did not sign

---

they refer the matter to the Security Council. Prior to January 31, 1966, the U.S. was engaged in extensive diplomatic efforts to interest the D.R.V. in negotiations. See note 233 *supra*. Thus it can not be said that the U.S. unlawfully delayed formally presenting the Viet Nam controversy to the U.N. for it was acting in compliance with the spirit of Articles 33 and 37 that settlement among the parties be first attempted before the dispute is referred to the Security Council. Moreover, there was some feeling that premature referral to the United Nations might inhibit the possibility of a negotiated settlement by freezing the positions of the parties in the resulting debate.

The United States presented evidence of the nature of the Viet Nam conflict on February 27, 1965, in the form of a paper entitled "Aggression from the North (S/6206)." The presentation of evidence not only satisfies the reporting requirement of Article 51, it goes beyond that requirement.

A clearer understanding of United States compliance with the requirements of the Charter can be gained if U.S. approaches to the U.N. are considered in tabular form. Opposite the U.S. approaches are found the articles of the Charter with which the acts comply. This list of *Public U.S. Communications to the Security Council and Secretary-General* is printed in *Hearings on S. 2793 Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,* 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. 1 at 634–35. The listing of the Charter Articles with which the acts comply represents the conclusions of the authors of this paper and is not to be found in the committee print.

"PUBLIC U.S. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND SECRETARY-GENERAL

"51 & 37—1. August 5, 1964.—Letter from Ambassador Stevenson requesting a Security Council meeting on the Tonkin Gulf incidents (S/5849).

"2. September 9, 1964.—Ambassador Stevenson informed the Security Council President of U.S. views on the report of the Security Council Mission to Cambodia and Vietnam dated July 27, 1964. In particular, he commended the report's suggestions looking toward the establishment of a group of U.N. observers and the resumption of political relations between Cambodia and Vietnam. He concluded that implementation of the report's recommendations represented 'practical, although limited, steps by which the U.N. can exercise its peace-keeping responsibilities and contribute to a reduction of tension in southeast Asia' (S/5955).

"51—3. February 7, 1965.—Letter from Ambassador Stevenson informing the Council members, in accordance with article 51 of the U.N. Charter, of the air attacks against military installations in North Vietnam which were undertaken by the United States and Government of Vietnam in response to increasing infiltration from the north and expanded attacks by Vietcong forces in the south (S/6174).

"51—4. February 27, 1965.—Ambassador Stevenson's letter to the Security Council President forwarding for the information of all U.N. members the text of the Department's paper entitled 'Aggression from the North' (S/6206).

"5. April 2, 1965.—In a letter to the Security Council President, Ambassador Stevenson rejected a Soviet charge that U.S. forces were using 'poisonous gases' in Vietnam. The U.S. letter attached excerpts from Secretary Rusk's March 25, 1965, press conference on this subject (S/6270).

"33 & 51—6. April 9, 1965.—The text of President Johnson's April 7 address at Johns Hopkins University was transmitted to the Security Council President for the information of all U.N. members.

"33—possibly 37 7. July 28, 1965.—President Johnson wrote Secretary-General U Thant expressing the hope that all the resources of the United Nations could be used to bring about peace in Vietnam.

"33—possibly 37 8. July 30, 1965.—Ambassador Goldberg wrote the Security Council President informing U.N. members of U.S. efforts to find a peaceful solution in Vietnam and inviting the members of the Security Council to collaborate with the United States in the search for an acceptable formula to restore peace and security in southeast Asia (S/6575).

"33—9. January 4, 1966.—Ambassador Goldberg informed the Secretary General of the purposes and content of the U.S. 'peace offensive' and again urged members of the Security Council to give even more earnest thought to what they might do to achieve peace in Vietnam (S/7067).

"51 & 37—10. January 31, 1966.—Ambassador Goldberg requested the Security Council President to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in Vietnam (S/7105)."

The text of these messages may be found *id.* at 635–47.

Despite these efforts, opposition to U.N. action continues on the part of some members. Because of the opposition of France and the U.S.S.R., Secretary-General U Thant recently said "I have to say that at least for the moment the U.N. cannot and should not be effectively involved in peace-keeping operations or any operations of the nature of the maintenance of international peace and security or law and order, in Vietnam." N.Y. Times, May 13, 1966, p. 2, col. 1.

On June 2, 1966, Nguyen Duy Lien, the Permanent Observer of the R.V.N. to the United Nations requested Secretary-General U Thant to provide United Nations observers at the September elections for a constituent assembly in the R.V.N. The proposal was welcomed by the United States and Britain. See "Saigon Asks U.N. to Observe Vote," N.Y. Times, June 3, 1966, p. c3, col. 1 (city ed.). The proposal, however, met opposition elsewhere within the United Nations. See "Saigon Bid to U.N. Meets Opposition," N.Y. Times, June 4, 1966, p. c3, col. 1 (city ed.) N.Y. Times, June 11, 1966, p. c5, col. 1 (city ed.).

[238] N.Y. Times, Feb. 1, 1966, p. 12, cols. 2–6.

[239] United Nations Press Release WS/225, Jan. 21, 1966, at 2.

[240] *Ibid.*

[241] Wall Street Journal, Feb. 3, 1966, p. 1, col. 3.

[242] *Ibid.*

For an indication of U.N. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg's emphasis on the processes of international law and the United Nations as essentials in the search for world peace, see "Goldberg Rebuts Acheson View That Peace by Law Is 'Illusory'," N.Y. Times, May 19, 1966, p. 6c, col. 4 (city ed.). "'The way to peace in this turbulent age is to keep to that national vision, to work with all our might for the establishment of a structure of law that will be reliable and just to all nations,' he continued.

'For though law alone cannot assure world peace, there can be no peace without it.'" *Id.* at col. 5.

[243] *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954], Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXI (1953/54), at 9–11, 27–38.

or otherwise agree to be bound by either the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration and made this position clear at the Conference itself. It is a well accepted principle of international law that treaties ordinarily cannot impose obligations on states which are not parties to them. As Lord McNair, a former President of the International Court of Justice has written: "[N]o State can be bound by any treaty provision unless it has given its assent, and that principle is applicable equally to all types of treaty."[244] Similarly, Article 18 of the Harvard Research Draft Convention on the Law of Treaties provides: "A treaty may not impose obligations upon a State which is not a party thereto. . . ."[245] And Article 58 of *the International Law Commission 1964 Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties* provides:

"A treaty applies only between the parties and neither imposes any obligations nor confers any rights upon a State not party to it without its consent."[246]

The commentary to this article said:

"There appears to be almost universal agreement that the rule laid down in this article—that a treaty applies only between the parties—is the fundamental rule governing the effect of a treaty upon States not parties. . . .

"There was complete agreement amongst the members that there is no exception in the case of obligations; a treaty never by its own force alone creates obligations for non-parties. The division of opinion related to the question whether a treaty may of its own force confer rights upon a non-party."[247]

There is some authority that so-called "law-making" treaties such as the Hague Conventions on the rules of land warfare or the United Nations Charter which are accepted as customary law may create expectations that may bind non-party states.[248] The detailed provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or of the Final Declaration cannot be validly characterized as such, however, and in any event the proposition has less certainty in a context in which a state expressly refused to be bound at the time the so-called "law-making" treaty was entered into.[249]

The Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities was signed only by representatives of the D.R.V. and the French Union Forces[250] and it is clear that the United States, not being a party to it, was not bound by it. With respect to the Final Declaration of the Conference, as has been pointed out, it was not signed by any state, but was orally agreed to by France, Britain, Cambodia, the D.R.V., Laos, the People's Republic of China, and the U.S.S.R. It was, however, expressly rejected as a binding obligation by the United States and was not agreed to by the State of Viet Nam. This United States position, clearly enunciated at the conference, that it was not prepared to join in the Final Declaration of the Conference including the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam has so often been misstated that the pertinent extracts from the official verbatim record of the Final Plenary Session of the Conference are here set out in full.

"*The Chairman* (Mr. Eden): . . . Finally, gentlemen, there is the Draft Declaration by the Conference, which takes note of all these documents. [Including the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam] I think all of my colleagues have copies of this Draft Declaration before them. I will ask my colleagues in turn to express themselves upon this Declaration.

"The Representative of France.

M. Mendès-France (France): Mr. Chairman, the French Delegation approves the terms of this Declaration. . . .

"*The Chairman:* The Representative of the People's Republic of China.

"*Mr. Chou En-lai* (People's Republic of China): We agree.

"*The Chairman:* On behalf of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, I associate myself with the final Declaration of this Conference.

"The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"*Mr. Molotov* (U.S.S.R.): The Soviet Delegation agrees. . . .

"*The Chairman:* . . . The Representative of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam

"*Mr. Pham van Dong* (Democratic Republic of Viet Nam): Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the words pronounced by you. . . .

"*The Chairman:* . . . I will continue calling upon countries to speak on the subject of the Declaration. I call upon the United States of America.

"*Mr. Bedell Smith* (United States): Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates, as I stated to my colleagues during our meeting on July 18, my Government is not prepared to join in a Declaration by the Conference such as is submitted. However, the United States makes this unilateral declaration of its position in these matters:

"DECLARATION

"The Government of the United States being resolved to devote its efforts to the strengthening of peace in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

"*Takes Note*

of the Agreements concluded at Geneva on July 20 and 21, 1954, between (a) the Franco-Laotian Command and the Command of the People's Army of Viet Nam; (b) the Royal Khmer Army Command and the Command of the People's Army of Viet Nam; (c) Franco-Vietnamese Command and the Command of the People's Army of Viet Nam, and of paragraphs 1 to 12 of the Declaration presented to the Geneva Conference on 21st July, 1954.

"The Government of the United States of America

"*Declares* with regard to the aforesaid Agreements and paragraphs that (i) it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with Article 2 (Section 4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force; and (ii) it would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid Agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

"In connection with the statement in the Declaration concerning free elections in Viet Nam, my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a Declaration made in Washington on 29th June, 1954, as follows:—

"'In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the United Nations to ensure that they are conducted fairly.'

"With respect to the statement made by the Representative of the State of Viet Nam, the United States reiterates its traditional position that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that it will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this. Nothing in its declaration just made is intended to or does indicate any departure from this traditional position.

"We share the hope that the agreement will permit Cambodia, Laos and Viet Nam to play their part in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of that area to determine their own future.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

"*The Chairman:* The Conference will, I think, wish to take note of the statement of the Representative of the United States of America.[251]

In this unilateral declaration the United States refused even to take note of paragraph 13, the last paragraph of the Final Declaration of the Conference. Paragraph 13 provides:

"The members of the Conference agree to consult one another on any question which may be referred to them by the Interna-

---

[244] McNair, The Law of Treaties 162 (1961).

[245] 29 Am. J. Int'l L. 918 (Supp. 1935).

[246] *Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its sixteenth session 11 May–24 July 1964,* U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec., 19th Sess., Supp. No. 9, at 7 (A/5809) (1964).

[247] *Id* at 7–8.

[248] See generally McNair, The Law of Treaties 310, 255–71 (1961).

There is substantial authority for the proposition that even non-members of the U.N. are bound by the obligation to refrain from the use of force embodied in Article 2, section 4 of the Charter. See Comment, 50 Calif. L. Rev. 515, at 522 (1962). And see the address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk 1965 Proceedings, Am. Soc. Int'l L. 247.

". . . [L]ast year, a United Nations Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States met in Mexico City. All shades of United Nations opinion were represented. The Committee's purpose was to study and possibly to elaborate certain of those principles. The Committee debated much and agreed on little. But on one point, it reached swift and unanimous agreement: that all states, and not only all Members of the United Nations, are bound to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Non-recognition of the statehood of a political entity was held not to affect the international application of this cardinal rule of general international law."

Id. at 249–50.

Whether or not a non-member is bound by the force of the provision as such, this would seem to be a strong rule of general international law today. See generally McDougal & Feliciano, Law & Minimum World Public Order 129–31, 138–48 (1961). Moreover, Article 2, section 6 of the Charter certainly indicates an intention that even non-members be held to this standard. And since the D.R.V. has a pending application for United Nations membership; which under Article 4, section 1 of the Charter is an undertaking to accept the obligations of the Charter, it hardly seems harsh to judge its actions by the Charter. See notes 103 & 104 *supra.*

[249] This is not to suggest that the nations of the world not expressly agreeing to the Geneva Accords are free to assist either the D.R.V. or the R.V.N. in an aggressive attack aimed at the political and territorial integrity of the other state. Such an attack across an international cease-fire line, if not pursuant to the right of individual or collective self-defense or collective action expressly authorized by the United Nations, would clearly constitute a violation of the customary international law prohibition against the use of force in international relations embodied in Article 2, sections 3 & 4 of the United Nations Charter.

[250] See note 44 *supra.*

[251] *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954] Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXI (1953/54), at 5–7.

Mr. Bedell Smith's statements for the United States made it evident to all concerned that the United States would not consent to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference, a position with which all of the delegations were already aware. Before making the United States unilateral declaration Mr. Bedell Smith unequivocally stated that the United States was not prepared to join in the Final Declaration of the Conference. This statement is sometimes omitted by those adverting to whether the United States approved or consented to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference.[252] Moreover, the United States statement which followed was not inconsistent with this unequivocal statement but merely took note of a substantial part of the agreements reached at Geneva, made an express unilateral two point declaration, and ended with a statement of position. Nothing in this statement indicates United States consent to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference. Point one of the two point express declaration merely indicated that the United States would act in accordance with its existing obligations under the United Nations Charter with respect to refraining from disturbing the agreement by threats or use of force. This statement that the United States "will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with Article 2 (Section 4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force" is, even standing alone, clearly not an agreement to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference. For being bound not to disturb the agreements by force in accordance with preexisting United Nations obligations as to when force is and when it is not permissible is quite a different thing from subscribing to all of the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference, including provisions such as limitations on the introduction of military equipment into Viet Nam, etc.[253] And taken together with Mr. Bedell Smith's unequivocal statement that the United States would not join in the Final Declaration of the Conference, there can be no doubt that the United States did not consent to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference.

It should also be noted that there were only two points to the express declaration paragraph of the United States statement issued at Geneva. Point one of the declaration which declared that the United States would act in accordance with Article 2, section 4 of the United Nations Charter, and point two of the declaration which declared that the United States would view aggression in violation of the agreements as seriously threatening international peace and security. The statement of position which followed this express two point declaration does not seem a part of the formal declaration as such, since it was neither numbered (iii) nor a continuation of point (ii) in the same paragraph with the declaration. Regardless of the effect of this discussion of position in the statement,[254] which in any event does not affect the conclusions of this paper, it is clear that the heart of the United States unilateral declaration at Geneva was its two point formal declaration. Nothing in this formal declaration, or anything else in the United States statement at the final plenary session of the Conference indicated that the United States consented to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference.

As was pointed out in a Comment in the *California Law Review* in 1962:

"Since the United States was not obligated to become a party to the Accords and did not become a party, it hardly seems arguable that it is bound by them. . . . By restating adherence to the charter and by warning against renewal of aggression the United States cannot be said to have become a party to the Accords. The unilateral declaration of the United States does not constitute a binding obligation. Those who have stated or implied that the Accords and unilateral declaration bind the United States have offered no legal reasons to support their position. Their only possible support comes from the United States denunciations of Communist violations of the Accords. It might be argued that by relying on the Accords the United States has obligated itself to observe them. But it would be anomalous to say that a nonsignatory state must observe an agreement merely because it has protested against violations of the agreement by a signatory. There appear to be no rules of international law leading to such a result, and a contrary result is indicated by the rule that the violation of essential provisions of an agreement creates a right for the other party to cancel the agreement."[255]

The contemporaneous declarations of the then United States President and Secretary of State reinforce the clear indication to all concerned made at the Geneva Conference that the United States was not bound by the Final Declaration of the Conference. Thus, President Eisenhower indicated in a statement on July 21, 1954, the day of the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference, that the United States was not a party to or bound by the Geneva Accords:

"The United States has not been a belligerent in the war. The primary responsibility for the settlement in Indochina rested with those nations which participated in the fighting. Our role at Geneva has been at all times to try to be helpful where desired and to aid France and Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam to obtain a just and honorable settlement which will take into account the needs of the interested people. Accordingly, *the United States has not itself been party to or bound by the decisions taken by the Conference,* but it is our hope that it will lead to the establishment of peace consistent with the rights and the needs of the countries concerned. The agreement contains features which we do not like, but a great deal depends on how they work in practice.

"The United States is issuing at Geneva a statement to the effect that it is not prepared to join in the Conference declaration, but, as loyal members of the United Nations, we also say that, in compliance with the obligations and principles contained in article 2 of the United Nations Charter, the United States will not use force to disturb the settlement. We also say that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern. . . . .

"The United States is actively pursuing discussions with other free nations with a view to the rapid organization of a collective defense in Southeast Asia in order to prevent further direct or indirect Communist aggression in that general area."[256]

In his *Mandate for Change,* President Eisenhower again emphasized that the United States was not bound by the decisions taken

---

tional Supervisory Commission, in order to study such measures as may prove necessary to ensure that the Agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam are respected."

In refusing even to take note of this agreement to consult between members of the Conference, the United States was indicating in yet another way its separateness from the Conference decisions.

[252] See for example Aptheker, Mission to Hanoi 98 (1966). Scheer, How the United States Got Involved In Vietnam 18 (1965). Scheer asserts:

"The United States and the Diem government were later to claim that they were not bound by the agreement because they had not signed it. However, the United States, for its part, had implied approval when it returned Walter Bedell Smith to the conference, from which he had earlier been withdrawn, at the insistence of the English and the French. Eisenhower acknowledged in his *Mandate for Change:* 'Our direct interest in these negotiations arose out of the assumption that the United States would be expected to act as one of the guarantors of whatever agreement should be achieved,' He also worte: 'By and large, the settlement obtained by the French Union at Geneva in 1954 was the best it could get under the circumstances.' "

As to the United States feelings about the Conference and the reasons for Bedell Smith's return see Survey of International Affairs 1954 62–64 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957); The United States In World Affairs 1954 248–49 (Council on Foreign Relations 1956).

"There was no formal guarantee of the agreements. The Conference Powers, except for the U.S.A. and Viet Nam, issued a final Declaration taking note of the agreements. The U.S.A. issued a unilateral declaration that it would 'refrain from the use or threat of force to disturb' the agreements and 'would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern.' The Vietnamese government undertook not to use force to resist the carrying of the cease-fire into effect though it maintained its reservations on the settlement."

Survey of International Affairs 1954, *supra,* at 67.

With respect to Scheer's quotations from *Mandate for Change* see also pp. 447–48 where former President Eisenhower pointed out that the United States was refusing to participate in the resolution and that in a news conference on July 21, 1954—the day of the Final Declaration of the Conference—he had indicated that the United States was "not a party to or bound by the decisions taken at the conference. . . ." Eisenhower, Mandate for Change: The White House Years 1953–56 447–48 (Signet ed. 1963).

[253] See notes 46, 112 & 124 *supra.*

[254] The United States in reiterating that it "shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the United Nations to ensure that they are conducted fairly," was calling for a proposal which had been rejected by the Communist delegations.

"The communist delegations have also rejected United Nations supervision of an armistice, favored by a number of delegations. In a propsal for restablishing peace throughout the national territory of Vietnam, the Vietnam representative [the State of Viet Nam] asked that elections be held there under the auspices of the United Nations."

"The News In Review," *United Nations Review* 2 (Vol. 1, July 1954).

[255] Comment, 50 Calif. L. Rev. 515, at 519 (1962).

[256] *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965), at 60. (Emphasis added.).

at the Conference[257] and also pointed out that on July 20, 1954, the day before the final settlement:

'The Russians were pressing for a conference resolution and for us to join in adopting all the provisos. We, of course, were refusing to participate in the resolution but were authorizing Bedell to make a declaration which would note the conference decisions and state that we would not use force to disturb them.[258]

And at a news conference on July 23, 1954, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said:

"[S]ince the United States itself was neither a belligerent in Indochina nor subject to compulsions which applied to others, we did not become a party to the conference results. We merely noted them and said that, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, we would not seek by force to overthrow the settlement." [259]

These conference records and contemporaneous statements demonstrate unequivocally that the United States did not join in the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the 1954 Geneva Conference. Moreover, this conclusion does not rest on a mere technicality as to whether the United States did or did not sign the agreement at Geneva, as has been implied by some,[260] but reflects the fundamental proposition that the United States clearly never consented to be bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference, a position which was even at the time of the Conference made abundantly evident to all concerned. The only United States obligations stemming from the Conference itself, if a new obligation at all, was that expressed in the United States unilateral declaration. As has been seen, in its formal declaration at the Conference the United States declared:

"(i) it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them, [the Geneva Accords] in accordance with Article 2 (Section 4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligations of Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force; and

"(ii) it would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid Agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

The first point of this declaration was declaratory of the already existing obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter. For since the United States was a member of the United Nations it was, of course, already bound by Article 2 of the United Nations Charter. But as has been shown, collective defense action taken pursuant to Article 51 of the Charter is in accordance with Article 2, section 4 of the Charter. That is, Article 2 is subject to the self-defense exceptions also written into the Charter. Thus, the United States may assist the R.V.N. pursuant to the right of self-defense consistent with even its first point in its unilateral declaration at Geneva as well as consistent with the United Nations Charter and general principles of customary international law. Moreover, the second point of the declaration, to the effect that aggression in violation of the agreements would be viewed with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security indicates the United States interest in assisting the Republic of Viet Nam against future aggression. The present aggression of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. constitutes such future aggression, the threat of which was unmistakably adverted to by the United States in its Geneva declaration. Assistance to the R.V.N. in these circumstances is entirely consistent with the unilateral declaration of the United States.

The present United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is entirely consistent with the expectations created by the United States actions at the Geneva Conference of 1954. This assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam cannot violate the Geneva Accords because the United States was never legally bound by either the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration of the Conference. And similarly, this assistance is consistent with the unilateral declaration of the United States with respect to the Geneva Accords since the United States assistance is authorized under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and the declaration expressly indicated the United States interest in protecting the Republic of Viet Nam against aggression.

Although a separate issue, it should also be pointed out that there are some reasons for suggesting that the Republic of Viet Nam was never bound by the provisions of the final settlement of the Conference, including the election provisions, although its nearly twelve year acceptance of the cease fire and partition pending elections would suggest that today it is either obligated by *these* provisions or the *de facto* separation largely resulting from them.[261] For like the United States, the State of Viet Nam was not a signatory to the Geneva Accords and has consistently protested substantially all but the cease-fire provisions of the final settlement.[262]

Thus, prior to the Indo-China phase of the Conference, on April 25, 1954 the Government of the State of Viet Nam issued a communique that:

"With regard to Viet-Namese unity, it is known that various plans have been drawn up which would entail a partition of Viet-Nam. Such solutions may offer certain specious advantages of a diplomatic nature, but their adoption would present extremely grave disadvantages and dangers for the future. . . . Viet-Nam would never be prepared to consider the possibility of negotiations in which France, violating the basic principles of the French Union from which her authority is derived, were to negotiate with those who are in rebellion against the Viet-Namese nation or with hostile Powers, thereby disregarding or sacrificing her partner.

"Whatever may happen, neither the Head of the State nor the Viet-Namese Government will consider themselves bound by decisions which by running counter to national independence and unity would violate the rights of peoples and reward aggression, contrary to the ideals of the United Nations Charter and to democratic ideals." [263]

And on July 18, 1954, Dr. Tran Van Do, the Representative of the State of Viet Nam said at the Geneva Conference:

"The Viet-Namese Delegate said that he must categorically dissociate himself from any discussion on either the French or the Soviet draft of the proposed final conference resolution on the grounds that he could not accept the principle of partition on which the cease-fire in Viet-Nam was to be based. He reserved the right to make known the views of his Government at a subsequent session. The Viet-Namese Delegation formally protested against partition and therefore rejected both French and Soviet drafts." [264]

And at the final plenary session of the conference Dr. Tran Van Do did not agree to the Final Declaration of the conference but instead offered an amendment to it:

---

[257] EISENHOWER, MANDATE FOR CHANGE: THE WHITE HOUSE YEARS 1953–56 448 (Signet ed. 1963).

[258] *Id.* at 447.

[259] SCHEER, HOW THE UNITED STATES GOT INVOLVED IN VIETNAM 19 1965).

[260] See *Id.* at 18.

[261] Whether bound or not, an aggressive attack by the R.V.N. on the D.R.V. across the internationally set cease-fire line in Viet Nam would seem to be a violation of the rule of customary international law embodied in Article 2, sections 3 & 4 of the U.N. Charter against the use of force in international relations, unless the action was taken in lawful individual or collective defense or pursuant to collective action expressly authorized by the United Nations. The same principle would also apply to the D.R.V. See note 249 *supra*.

See also Comment, 50 CALIF. L. REV. 515, at 520 (1962).

"The agreement was signed by North Vietnam and France, but not by South Nietnam [sic]. It therefore can be argued that South Vietnam acquired no rights under the agreement. The question of Vietnam's rights under the agreement is really irrelevant since, whether the Vietminh obligation is owed to Vietnam or not, there is a Vietminh obligation owed at least to France. By sending troops into Vietnam the Vietminh have violated article 24 of the agreement."

Ibid.

Although Article 27 of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities says that: "The signatories of the present Agreement and their successors in their functions shall be responsible for ensuring and observance and enforcement of the terms and provisions thereof . . ." if the R.V.N. is not otherwise bound by the provisions of the agreement there is little reason to suggest that it is bound by this provision. Moreover, it is not clear from this provision that the parties adverted to the R.V.N. as a successor "in their functions"; for example, it is also open to the interpretation that they were referring to successive Commanders-in-Chief of the PAVN and French Union Forces.

[262] For an account of the Geneva Conference see SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1954 42–73 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957).

"Reactions to the agreement, and to the end of the marathon conference, ranged from that of Mr. Chou, who called it all 'a tremendous success' (which from his point of view it certainly was) to that of Mr. Tran Van Do, the Vietnamese Foreign Minister, [the State of Viet Nam] who resigned on the spot."

Id. at 67.

For objections raised during the Conference by the State of Viet Nam which did not participate in the drafting of the Final Declaration see *Id.* at 48 & 64.

See also DO VANG LY, AGGRESSIONS BY CHINA 104, 110–11, 114, 150 (2d ed. 1960).

"The Geneva agreement was arrived at on July 20. Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, who had assumed office by this time not only did not recognise the agreement but vehemently protested against it."

Id. at 104.

"But the armistice agreement, it may be mentioned, was a bilateral military accord between a French general and the Vietminh Commander-in-Chief. The French general did not have the legal sanction to negotiate an armistice—he had no delegation of powers from Mr. Diem's Government, from where alone he could have got it. In 1949, the French had returned Vietnam's sovereignty by a solemn treaty signed with Emperor Bao Dai; and Bao Dai had delegated full civil and military powers to Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem in 1954. Mr. Diem's representative alone could have negotiated for Vietnam."

Id. at 110–11.

[263] *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965], Command Paper 2834), at 87.

[264] *Ibid.*

"*The Chairman*: . . . I call on the Representative of the State of Viet Nam.

"*Mr. Tran van Do* (State of Viet Nam): Mr. Chairman, as regards the final Declaration of the Conference, the Vietnamese Delegation requests the Conference to incorporate in this Declaration after Article 10, the following text:

" 'The Conference takes note of the Declaration of the Government of the State of Viet Nam undertaking:

" 'to make and support every effort to re-establish a real and lasting peace in Viet Nam;

" 'not to use force to resist the procedures for carrying the cease-fire into effect, in spite of the objections and reservations that the State of Viet Nam has expressed, especially in its final statement.'

"*The Chairman*: I shall be glad to hear any views that my colleagues may wish to express. But, as I understand the position, the final Declaration has already been drafted and this additional paragraph has only just now been received; indeed, it has been amended since I received the text a few minutes ago. In all the circumstances, I suggest that the best course we can take is that the Conference should take note of the Declaration of the State of Viet Nam in this respect. If any of my colleagues has a contrary view, perhaps they would be good enough to say so. (None.) . . .[265]

"*Mr. Tran van Do* (State of Viet Nam): Mr. Chairman, I expressed the view of the Delegation of the State of Viet Nam in my statement and I would have this Conference take note of it in its final act.

"*The Chairman:* As I think I explained, we cannot now amend our final act, which is the statement of the Conference as a whole, but the Declaration of the Representative of the State of Viet Nam will be taken note of. . . .

"Any other observations? (None.)"[266]

Moreover, it is clear from this exchange that the Conference was aware of the reservations of the State of Viet Nam but made no objections to them.

In his final statement for the State of Viet Nam, made at the concluding Plenary Session of the Conference on July 21, Foreign Minister Tran Van Do proposed provisional control by the United Nations over the entire territory pending free elections and said:

"[T]he Government of the State of Vietnam requests that note be made of its solemn protest against the manner in which the armistice has been concluded and against the conditions of the armistice which take no account of the profound aspirations of the Vietnamese people, and of the fact that it reserves to itself complete freedom of action to guarantee the sacred right of the Vietnamese people to territorial unity, national independence and freedom."[267]

Nor can it be validly maintained that the French delegation agreed to the Final Declaration on behalf of the State of Viet Nam, for the French delegation responded in the name of France only, and there is no suggestion in their acceptance that they were also binding the State of Viet Nam. Both the separate presence and participation of the delegation from the State of Viet Nam and the statements of the French delegation at the Conference indicated that the French neither intended to nor were legally capable of binding the State of Viet Nam. Thus in the opening statement on the Indo-China phase of the Geneva Conference on May 8, 1954, M. Bidault, the then French Foreign Minister said:

"[I]ndependence has already been completed. . . .

"In Viet Nam, and in spite of the war, France has been able to keep its promises and full independence has been recognized and has become effective. Thirty-five free countries, by recognising those three states [Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos], and a number of international organisations by accepting them in their midst, have consecrated that independence. The national Government of Viet Nam has been able to set up an administration to organize its finance, to develop its economy, to establish diplomatic relations with the main free countries. It built up an army. All those elements mean sovereignty."[268]

And in this opening statement he also said that the French Government has recognized: "fully and unreservedly the independence of Viet Nam. . . ."[269] And on May 14, at the Fourth Plenary Session of the Conference Bidault said:

"[T]here does exist a Government of the State of Viet Nam. That Government is the Government of His Majesty, Bao Dai. . . . This Government [Bao Dai's State of Viet Nam] is fully and solely competent to commit Viet Nam."[270]

French Prime Minister Mendès-France's only request to the United States shortly after taking office on June 18th indicates that there was some truth politically in the independence of the State of Viet Nam at the Conference. As Eisenhower reported in his memoirs:

"Mendès-France had only one request: that we use our influence with the Vietnamese Premier, Ngo Dinh Diem—newly appointed by Bao Dai—to prevent him from needlessly obstructing any honorable truce which the French might reach with the Vietminh."[271]

---

[265] *Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference* (Miscellaneous No. 20 [1954] Command Paper 9239). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXI (1953/54), at 7–8.

[266] *Id.* at 9.

[267] Documents on American Foreign Relations 1954 315–316, 318 (Council on Foreign Relations). The statement provides in full:

"The delegation of the State of Vietnam has presented a proposal designed to obtain an armistice without division, even provisional, of the territory of Vietnam, through the disarmament of all the belligerent forces after their withdrawal to the smallest possible zones of regroupment and the institutions of a provisional control by the United Nations over the entire territory, pending the reestablishment of peace and arrangements permitting the Vietnamese people to determine its destiny through free elections. The delegation protests the summary rejection of this proposal, the only one which respects the aspirations of the Vietnamese people. It insists that, at least, the demilitarization and neutralization of the Catholic religious communities in the delta of Northern Vietnam be accepted by the Conference.

"It protests solemnly: (a) the hasty conclusion of the armistice agreement, contracted only by the high authority of France and the Vietminh notwithstanding the fact that many clauses of this agreement are of such a nature as gravely to compromise the political future of the Vietnamese people; (b) the fact that this armistice agreement abandons to the Vietminh territories, many of which are still in the possession of Vietnamese troops, and thus essential to the defense of Vietnam in opposing a larger expansion of Communism and virtually deprives Vietnam of the imprescriptible right to organize its defense otherwise than by the maintenance of a foreign army on its territory; (c) the fact that the French High Command has arrogated to itself without preliminary agreement with the delegation of the State of Vietnam the right to fix the date of future elections, notwithstanding that a matter of a clearly political character is concerned.

"Consequently, the Government of the State of Vietnam requests that note be made of its solemn protest against the manner in which the armistice has been concluded and against the conditions of the armistice which take no account of the profound aspirations of the Vietnamese people, and of the fact that it reserves to itself complete freedom of action to guarantee the sacred right of the Vietnamese people to territorial unity, national independence and freedom."

(Copy supplied by the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Viet Nam to the United Nations).

See also The United States In World Affairs 1954 252–53 (Council on Foreign Relations 1956).

"The agreement on Vietnam was signed by the Commander-in-Chief of the Vietminh ('People's Army of Vietnam') and the Commander-in-Chief of the French Union forces in Indochina, but lacked the signature of any representative of the state of Vietnam. In fact, the Vietnamese delegation not only refused to sign but entered a solemn protest against the 'hasty conclusion' of the armistice, the abandonment to the Vietminh of territories still in possession of Vietnamese troops, and the intrusion of the French High Command in political matters without preliminary Vietnamese agreement. In view of these facts, it stated, the Government of Vietnam reserved 'complete freedom of action to guarantee the sacred right of the Vietnamese people to territorial unity, national independence and freedom.' "

Ibid.

[268] See note 37 *supra.*

[269] See note 37 *supra.*

[270] See note 37 *supra.* See also notes 33 & 36 *supra.*

Since France had entered into a treaty with the State of Viet Nam granting it independence prior to French approval of the Accords, there is a strong case that France was not legally capable of binding the State of Viet Nam by its agreement to the Accords. Article 22(c) of the *Harvard Research Draft Convention on the Law of Treaties* provides:

"If a State assumes by a treaty with another State an obligation which is in conflict with an obligation which it has assumed by an earlier treaty with a third State, the obligation assumed by the earlier treaty takes priority over the obligation assumed by the later treaty."

The Comment to Article 22(c) says:

"What a State gives by treaty to another State it cannot take away by a treaty subsequently concluded with a third State, at least not without the consent of the first-mentioned State. Manifestly that would be in contravention of the rule *pacta sunt servanda*. . . .

"Writers on international law seem to be unanimous in opinion as to the general principle that the obligations assumed by a State in a treaty with another State should prevail over those assumed by the same State under a later treaty with a third State. . . .

"Apparently in no case in practice has the general principle of the priority of the obligations previously assumed by a State over those subsequently assumed by it with a third State, ever been seriously denied, and no decision of an international tribunal is known in which the contrary principle has been sustained."

29 Am. J. Int'l L. 1024, 1025, 1029 (Supp. 1935).

[271] Eisenhower, Mandate for Change: The White House Years 1953–1956 442 (Signet ed. 1963). See also note 36 *supra.*

Anthony Eden's memoirs bear out this fear of Prime Minister Mendès-France of Vietnamese opposition to the Accords.[272] As has been shown in the discussion on the statehood of the R.V.N., there were also significant expectations that the State of Viet Nam was independent under international law prior to the July 21st conclusion of the Accords.[273] There are some reasons for suggesting then, that since the Republic of Viet Nam never consented to be bound by the Geneva Accords, except not to use force to resist the carrying of the cease fire into effect,[274] it was never legally bound by the other provisions of the final settlement. This has, in fact, been the unequivocal position of the Republic of Viet Nam and their predecessor the State of Viet Nam from even prior to the Accords to the present. Both in their public statements[275] and in their relationship with the International Control Commission[276] this position has been consistently reasserted. Again, the point is that the position of the Republic of Viet Nam that it is not bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities or the Final Declaration is not merely a later asserted technicality based on an accident that they had not signed the Accords,[277] but stems from their continuing objections and refusal to be bound by the Geneva settlements prior to Geneva, at Geneva, and after Geneva, a position which was certainly clear to all of the participants at the Conference. These continuing objections to the Geneva Accords specifically lend credence to the R.V.N.'s position that it is not bound by the election provisions of the Accords.[278]

Both the United States and R.V.N. declarations at the Conference and their subsequent conduct do give rise, though, to expectations that neither state will attack the integrity of the D.R.V. as a sovereign entity, except in lawful self-defense. The present United States assistance to the R.V.N. with its narrowly defined aims of interdicting the D.R.V. aggression against the R.V.N. is consistent with those expectations.

It should be pointed out, however, that for the reasons discussed below, even if the United States and the R.V.N. were bound by all of the provisions of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities and the Final Declaration it would not detract from the lawfulness of the present United States assistance.

B. Aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. violates the Geneva accords and fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter: This material breach of agreement permits suspension of any corresponding obligations which may be binding on the United States or the R.V.N.

The D.R.V. was one of the two principal parties to the Geneva Accords on Viet Nam, having signed the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet Nam and having consented to the Final Declaration of the Conference. Since a major purpose of the Geneva Accords on Viet Nam, as indicated by the signed Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities, was a military cease fire and a withdrawal of the combatant forces to the North and South, any armed aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is a fundamental violation of the Geneva Accords. This serious violation of the Geneva Accords by the D.R.V. is, among other evidence, documented by the findings of the International Commission for Supervision and Control:

"The Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet-Nam proceeds on the principle of the complete cessation of all hostilities in Viet-Nam, respect by either Party of the Zone assigned to the other, and the inescapable responsibility of the Parties for the fulfillment of the obligations resulting therefrom.

"Article 10 of the Agreement states expressly the obligation of the two Parties to order and *enforce* the *complete* cessation of all hostilities in Viet-Nam.

"Article 19 of the Agreement casts the obligation on the two Parties to ensure that the Zones assigned to them are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy.

"Article 24 of the Agreement proceeds on the principle of the inviolability of the Demilitarized Zone and the territories assigned to the two Parties and states expressly that the armed forces of each Party shall respect the territory under the military control of the other Party and shall commit no act and undertake no operation against the other Party.

"Article 27 of the Agreement affirms expressly the responsibility of the Commanders of the Forces of the two Parties of ensuring full compliance with all the provisions of the Agreement by *all elements* and military personnel under their Command.

"It follows that the using of one Zone for the organisation or the carrying out of any hostile activities in the other Zone, violations by members of the Armed Forces of one Party of the territory of the other Party, or the commission by any element under the control of one Party, or the commission by any element under the control of one party of any act directed against the other Party, would be contrary to the fundamental provisions of the Agreement which enjoin mutual respect for the territories assigned to the two Parties.

"The Commission accepts the conclusions reached by the Legal Committee that there is sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt that the PAVN [the army of the D.R.V.] has violated Articles 10, 19, 24 and 27 in specific instances."[279]

Because this aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is a continuing violation of a major provision of the Geneva Accords, the situation under international law is not comparable to that of a civil war. And this is true even if the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. were to be regarded as merely separate "temporary zones" not qualifying as states. For the cease fire provisions violated by this aggression have been agreed to by the D.R.V. and have been set by an international conference. Moreover, as has been discussed in section I there are substantial expectations that the D.R.V. and the R.V.N. are separate states under international law.

---

[272] See EDEN, FULL CIRCLE 146 (1960).

[273] See notes 33, 36, 37 & 270 and accompanying text *supra*.

[274] See SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1954 67 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1957). "The Vietnamese government undertook not to use force to resist the carrying of the cease-fire into effect though it maintained its reservations on the settlement." *Ibid.*

See also the note delivered by the Government of Viet-Nam to H. M. Ambassador, Saigon, 3 April 1956 in *Documents Relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965] Command Paper 2834), at 95.

"[T]he Government of Republic of Viet-Nam will not have recourse to violence to resolve its problems and will uphold existing conditions of the present state of peace (Maintiendra les donnees de fait de l'etat actuel de paix). It will not seek to violate the demarcation line and the demilitarised zone, as they have resulted from the situation of facts existing at the present time in Viet-Nam."

Id. at 96.

[275] See text at notes 263 and 267 *supra*. "[N]ot being a signatory of these Agreements, the Government of Viet-Nam has declared on several occasions that it does not consider itself as bound by their provisions." Note delivered by the Government of Viet-Nam to H.M. Ambassador, Saigon, 3 April, 1956 in *Documents Relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965.* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965] Command Paper 2834), at 95. "We have not signed the Geneva Agreements. We are not bound in any way by these agreements, signed against the will of the Viet-Namese people." Declaration broadcast by M. Ngo Dinh Diem, Saigon, 16 July, 1955, *id.* at 107. "The Government [the State of Viet Nam] does not consider itself in any way bound by the Geneva Agreements, of which it was not a signatory." Statement by the Government of Viet-Nam, Saigon, 12 August, 1955 in *id.* at 109. See also "Vietnam in World Affairs" 73–84 (June 1956, Review published by the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Vietnam.)

[276] "As civil and military administration in the zone south of the provisional demarcation line has been passing into the hands of the Government of the State of Vietnam, which has not signed and is according to its repeated public declarations opposed to both the Geneva Agreement and the Final Declaration, further continuance of the Commission's activities and the effective discharge of its responsibilities are in serious jeopardy as the Commission, established under Article 44 of the Agreement, can only draw its authority from the Agreement itself and has no other sanction. We would like to add in this connexion that during our discussions with the Government of the State of Vietnam, we have been told that it will give full protection and practical co-operation to the Commission as an International Peace Commission but will not make a formal or public declaration to that effect in view of the position taken up by it with reference to the Geneva Agreement and the Final Declaration.

Fourth Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam (Vietnam No. 3 [1955] Command Paper 9654). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XLV (1955/56), at 17. "[T]he Government of the Republic of Vietnam had stated that it was prepared to offer effective cooperation to the Commission but that it was not prepared to assume responsibility for the implementation of the Geneva Agreements in Vietnam." *Seventh Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam* (Vietnam No. 2 [1957] Command Paper 335). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXX (1957/58), at 19.

[277] See the implication in SCHEER, HOW THE UNITED STATES GOT INVOLVED IN VIETNAM 18 (1965).

[278] For the position of the R.V.N. toward the I.C.C. and elections see SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1955–56, 18–19 (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1960).

Great Britain—a Co-Chairman of the Geneva Conference—agrees that the election provisions of the Accords are not legally binding on the R.V.N.

"Her Majesty's Government have always regarded it as desirable that these elections should be held and have advised the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to enter into consultations with the Viet Minh authorities in order to ensure that all the necessary conditions obtain for a free expression of the national will as a preliminary to holding free general elections by secret ballot. Nevertheless, Her Majesty's Government do not agree that the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam were legally obliged to follow this course. * * *"

Note delivered by H.M. Embassy, Moscow, to the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union, 9 April, 1956, in *Documents relating to British Involvement in the Indo-China Conflict 1945–1965* (Miscellaneous No. 25 [1965] Command Paper 2834), 124 at 125.

[279] *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China,* (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXIX (1961/62), at 6–7.

The major thrust of contemporary international law as reflected in the United Nations Charter is to outlaw the use of force by individual states unless required by self-defense. International grievances that fall short of self-defense, such as political grievances, no matter how serious must be settled without the use of force by individual states. Thus, Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, which is in this respect substantially reflective of a long series of major international understandings,[280] provides:

"§ 3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"§ 4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

This renunciation of the use of force to settle disputes is reflected in the well-recognized principle that even breach of treaty may not be remedied by unilateral resort to force, provided, of course, that the breach does not also present a self-defense situation.[281] Moreover, by its pending application for membership in the United Nations the D.R.V. is itself holding out, pursuant to Article 4 of the Charter which sets forth qualifications for membership, that it is a state and that it accepts the obligations contained in the Charter.[282]

There is no question but that the D.R.V. is not acting in self-defense in its armed aggression against the R.V.N.[283] For the explicit findings of the Legal Committee of the I.C.C. that the D.R.V. was in violation of the Geneva Accords in its armed aggression against the R.V.N. occurred several years prior to the United States and R.V.N. bombing of military targets in the D.R.V.[284] In addition, the United States and the Republic of Viet Nam have repeatedly made clear that the bombing of the D.R.V. will cease when the aggression of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is halted, and that their objective is not an attack on the political and territorial integrity of the D.R.V.

As a result, regardless of the validity of its political grievances against the R.V.N., the D.R.V. is not only violating the Geneva Accords in its aggression against the R.V.N. but in doing so is acting contra to one of the most fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter which is itself largely declaratory of customary international law. Such a resort to the use of force in a non self-defense situation is clearly unlawful even assuming that the principal allegations of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. were all legally justified. A study of the International Control Commission Reports with respect to the grievances asserted by the D.R.V. demonstrates that the D.R.V. has no legitimate claim to justify its aggression against the R.V.N. as self-defense. The principal D.R.V. allegations of R.V.N. breach of the Accords are failure to consult on the holding of elections in 1956, reprisals against resistance leaders, inadequate cooperation with I.C.C. controls, and entering into a military alliance with and receiving military assistance from the United States.[285] Since none of these principal asserted grievances of the D.R.V. constitute an "armed attack" on the D.R.V. within the meaning of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter,[286] or otherwise constitute a self-defense situation,[287] even if all of these grievances were legally justified and the R.V.N. were bound by the applicable provisions of the Geneva Accords, the D.R.V., in its aggression against the R.V.N. would still clearly be acting contra to a fundamental principle of the United Nations which is also part of customary international law and which is binding on the D.R.V. This fundamental principle is that disputes be settled by peaceful means and that political grievances do not justify resort to the use of force. The D.R.V. may not lawfully seek to remedy asserted breach of treaty by the use of force in this situation, which, even assuming all of the grievances of the D.R.V. to be legally justified, clearly falls short of permissible self-defense. Moreover, a characterization of self-defense broad enough to justify the present armed attack by the D.R.V. on the R.V.N. would probably sanction armed aggression by one or the other of the separate governments in Germany, China, and Korea against the other. Such a spurious characterization not only fails to come within the accepted meaning of self-defense in international law but is clearly too disruptive of minimum world public order.

The R.V.N., on the other hand, has made it clear that it has requested substantial United States military assistance to offset outside aggression and that when that aggression halts, the United States military presence will no longer be required.[288] It is a generally recognized principle of international law that a material breach of an international agreement by one of the parties entitles any other party to suspend the operation of corresponding obligations in the agreement in whole or in part. Article 42 of the *International Law Commission 1966 Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties* provides:

"Termination or suspension of the operation of a treaty as a consequence of its breach:

"1. A material breach of a bilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles the other to invoke the breach as a ground for terminating the treaty or suspending its operation in whole or in part.

"2. A material breach of a multilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles:

"(b) A party specially affected by the breach to invoke it as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty in whole or in part in the relations between itself and the defaulting State;

"(c) Any other party to suspend the operation of the treaty with respect to itself if the treaty is of such a character that a material breach of its provisions by one party radically changes the position of every party with respect to the further performance of its obligations under the treaty.

---

[280] See McDougal & Feliciano, Law & Minimum World Public Order 129–31, 138–48 (1961); Briggs, The Law of Nations 968–72, 980 (2nd ed. 1952).

[281] See McNair, Law of Treaties 576–78 (1961). "It need hardly be said that the breach of a treaty is not in itself an 'armed attack' within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter." *Id.* at 577 n.1.

[282] See notes 103 and 104 *supra*. For the proposition that even non-members of the U.N. are bound by the obligation to refrain from the use of force embodied in Article 2, section 4 of the Charter see note 248 *supra*.

[283] For the proposition that the Vietminh activities against the R.V.N. "unquestionably violate international law" see Comment, 50 Calif. L. Rev. 515, at 520 (1962).

[284] The Special Report making these findings was issued on June 2, 1962 and apparently reflected evidence of aggression accruing during the preceding years. See *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China*, (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers, XXXIX (1961/62), at paragraphs 5, 8 & 9.

[285] See the First through Eleventh *Interim Reports of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam* and the *1962 Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China. First and Second Reports* (Vietnam No. 1 [1955], Command Paper 9461). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XIX (1954/55); *Third Report* (Vietnam No. 2 [1955], Command Paper 9499). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XLV (1955/56); *Fourth Report* (Vietnam No. 3 [1955], Command Paper 9654). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XLV (1955/56); *Fifth Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1956], Command Paper 9706). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XLV (1955/56); *Sixth Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1957], Command Paper 31). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIII (1956/57); *Seventh Report* (Vietnam No. 2 [1957], Command Paper 335). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXX (1957/58; *Eighth Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1958], Command Paper 509). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXX (1957/58); *Ninth Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1959], Command Paper 726). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIV (1958/59); *Tenth Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1960], Command Paper 1040). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXVI (1959/60); *Eleventh Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1961], Command Paper 1551). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIX (1961/62); *1962 Special Report* (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIX (1961/62).

The principal grievances asserted by the R.V.N. against the D.R.V. are failure to properly implement provisions initially allowing refugees to freely transfer zones, inadequate cooperation with I.C.C. controls, and armed aggression against the R.V.N. *Ibid.*

It might be noted that in the *Eleventh Interim Report* the Commission said:

"The Indian and Canadian Delegations are convinced that there have been many instances of non-co-operation by both Parties which have impeded the work of the Commission and its Teams. These have not in all cases reached the stage of formal citations because of evasions and lack of cooperation on the part of the Party concerned. For this reason the two Delegations agree that, in the experience of the Commission, the number of formal citations in itself is no fair measure of the degree of co-operation received from either party."

Id. at 25.

[286] See Note 281 *supra*.

[287] See generally McDougal & Feliciano, Law & Minimum World Public Order 121–260 (1961).

Even today in Viet Nam there can be little question that the intense D.R.V.—Viet-Cong attack is aimed at the political and territorial integrity of the R.V.N. and that the R.V.N.-United States response is directed at interdicting that attack.

[288] See, *e.g.*, the communication from the Liaison Mission of the R.V.N. to the I.C.C. on December 9, 1961, in *Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China* (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIX (1961/62), at paragraph 13, set out in text at note 122 supra.

See also the Statement of Adiai E. Stevenson to the Security Council on August 5, 1964, in *Background Information Relating to Southease Asia and Vietnam*, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965), at 124–27.

"3. A material breach of a treaty, for the purposes of the present article, consists in:

"(a) A repudiation of the treaty not sanctioned by the present articles; or

"(b) the violation of a provision essential to the accomplishment of any of the objects or purposes of the treaty." [289]

It would be hard to posit a violation of a more essential treaty provision than the D.R.V.'s documented violation by armed aggression of the military cease-fire provisions of the Accords. Since this continuing aggression of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. is a material breach of the Accords, even if the United States and the R.V.N. were bound by the limitations on the introduction of military arms and personnel and other corresponding provisions contained in the Geneva Accords, this breach certainly justifies a suspension of the pertinent treaty terms consistent with the right of self-defense of the R.V.N. Finally, regardless of rules as to suspension of treaty as a consequence of breach, the right of self-defense is an inherent right of sovereignty and there is authority that it "is implicit in every treaty." [290]

To summarize, the documented armed aggression of the D.R.V. in violation of the Geneva Accords is clearly neither justified by alleged breach of treaty nor is otherwise lawful, even if the D.R.V.'s principal grievances against the R.V.N., including the failure to hold elections, were all legally justified grievances. This armed aggression by the D.R.V. is a fundamental violation of the agreements which presents a self-defense situation clearly permitting suspension of any corresponding obligation which may be binding on the United States or the R.V.N.

With respect to the United States, not only is the United States not bound by these provisions of the Geneva Accords, but it would seem that by rendering assistance to the R.V.N. to defend against aggression from the D.R.V., the United States is acting to preserve and guarantee a major provision of the Geneva Accords, as well as to uphold the principles of the United Nations; action which is certainly consistent with its 1954 Geneva declaration.

Furthermore, the I.C.C. has impliedly recognized the greater seriousness of D.R.V. aggression against the R.V.N. as compared with the responding military assistance from the United States. For in its 1962 Special Report it significantly discusses the D.R.V. aggression before it discusses the responding United States military assistance, an order of discussion which is considered important enough by the Polish Delegation to protest it in its dissenting statement to the report.[291]

In addition to D.R.V. violations of the 1954 Geneva Accords and fundamental principles of the United Nations, there is evidence that the D.R.V. has been infiltrating troops into the R.V.N. through Laos and has been using Laotian territory to conduct hostilities against the R.V.N.[292] Such actions are in clear violation of the fourteen power 1962 Geneva Agreements on the Neutrality of Laos which were signed by the D.R.V.[293] Articles 4 and 6 of the Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos provide:

"The introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations and foreign military personnel into Laos is prohibited.

"The introduction into Laos of armaments, munitions and war material generally, except such quantities of conventional armaments as the Royal Government of Laos may consider necessary for the national defence of Laos, is prohibited." [294]

And the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos makes it even more explicit:

"(g) They [the signatories] will not introduce into the Kingdom of Laos foreign troops or military personnel in any form whatsoever, nor will they in any way facilitate or connive at the introduction of any foreign troops or military personnel;

"(h) They will not establish nor will they in any way facilitate or connive at the establishment in the Kingdom of Laos of any foreign military base, foreign strong point or other foreign military installation of any kind;

"(i) They will not use the territory of the Kingdom of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries." [295]

Moreover, by her own statement of neutrality which explicitly became part of the international agreement on Laos,[296] not even the Government of Laos could authorize such D.R.V. actions on Laotian territory.[297] In any event, the government of Laos has given no such authorization.[298] Insofar as the D.R.V. forces make use of Laotian territory in their aggression against the R.V.N., then, they also violate the 1962 Geneva Agreements on Laos.

---

[289] *Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of the Second Part of its Seventeenth Session,* U.N. Doc. No. A/CN. 4/184 (Jan. 1966), at Annex, p. 5.

"The great majority of writers recognize that the violation of a treaty by one party may give rise to a right in the other party to abrogate the treaty or to suspend the performance of its own obligations under the treaty. A violation of a treaty obligation, as of any other obligation, may give rise to a right in the other party to take non-forcible reprisals and these reprisals may properly relate to the defaulting party's rights under the treaty . . ."

Commentary to Article 42 of the *International Law Commission 1963 Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties, Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of its Fifteenth Session,* U.N. GEN. ASS. OFF. REC. 18th Sess. Supp. No. 9, at 17 (A/5509) (1963).

See generally authorities cited in *The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam* 10 n. 22 (Reprint from the March 28, 1966 Department of State Bulletin—Department of State publication 8062, Far Eastern Series 147).

[290] See the statement of Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg during the negotiations in 1928 leading to the conclusion of the Briand-Kellogg Pact in BRIGGS, THE LAW OF NATIONS 977–78 (2nd ed. 1952). In any event, it is difficult to see how anything in the Geneva Accords could bind the R.V.N. or the United States to refrain from appropriate defensive measures in a context in which the R.V.N. is subjected to D.R.V. aggression in violation of those Accords.

[291] "The majority report wrongly admitted unfounded allegation of aggression and subversion brought by the Republic of Viet-Nam against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam in spite of the fact that they do not find any legal justification in the stipulation of the Geneva Agreement and furthermore are not substantial and based on any evidence. These artificial allegations have been advanced in the report as a most important item before a problem described in insignificant terms of receiving military aid from the United States of America."

Special Report to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China (Vietnam No. 1 [1962], Command Paper 1755). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIX (1961/62), at 21.

[292] See the findings of the SEATO COUNCIL to this effect in note 138 *supra*. See also the recent Laotian accusation against the D.R.V. to the effect that it is guilty of "repeated aggression" against Laos. "Hanoi Aggression is Charged By Laos," N.Y. Times, Feb. 24, 1966, p. 6C, col. 4 (city ed.), excerpts at note 298 *infra;* and President Johnson's Message to Congress, August 5, 1964, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965), at 122–24.

[293] For the complete text of the 1962 Declaration and Protocol on the Neutrality of Laos see *Declaration and Protocol on the Neutrality of Laos: Geneva, July 23, 1962,* (Treaty Series No. 27 [1963], Command Paper 2025). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXVII (1962/63).

For the Conference documents as well as the complete text of the 1962 Declaration and Protocol see *International Conference on the Settlement of the Laotian Question Geneva, May 12, 1961–July 23, 1962,* (Laos No. 1 [1962] Command Paper 1828). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXVII (1961/62). For the participation of the D.R.V. in the Conference and their signature of the Declaration and the Protocol see Command Paper 2025, *supra* at 2, 22, 26 & 60.

[294] Command Paper 2025, *supra* note 293, at 27; Command Paper 1828, *supra* note 293, at 20.

[295] Command Paper 2025, *supra* note 293, at 4; Command Paper 1828, *supra* note 293, at 17.

[296] Command Paper 2025, *supra* note 293, at 2, 4; Command Paper 1828, *supra* note 293, at 15, 17–18.

[297] The statement of neutrality by the Royal Government of Laos which became an integral part of the Conference Declaration provides:

"(3) It [Laos] will not resort to the use or threat of force in any way which might impair the peace of other countries, and will not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries;

"(4) It will not enter into any military alliance or into any agreement, whether military or otherwise, which is inconsistent with the neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos; it will not allow the establishment of any foreign military base on Laotian territory, nor allow any country to use Laotian territory for military purposes or for the purpose of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, nor recognize the protection of any alliance or military coalition, including SEATO. . . .

"(6) . . . [I]t will require the withdrawal from Laos of all foreign troops and military personnel, and will not allow any foreign troops or military personnel to be introduced in Laos . . . ."

Command Paper 2025, *supra* note 293, at 2; Command Paper 1828, *supra* note 293, at 16.

[298] This would seem fairly to be implied from the recent Laotian Government accusations against the D.R.V. to the effect that it is guilty of "repeated aggression" against Laos. See "Hanoi Aggression Is Charged by Laos," N.Y. Times, Feb. 24, 1966, p. 6c, col. 4 (city ed.).

"A spokesman for the Laotian Government, Phagna Bouasy, denounced the North Vietnamese government today, accusing it of 'repeated aggression' against Laos.

" 'We hold the Government of Hanoi responsible for all the aggression, all the dead, all the bad things that have happened to our Kingdom since that Govuernment [sic] took the decision to aid the Neo Lao Hak Sat [the pro-Communist parent grop [sic] of the Pathet Lao] in nourishing, adding to and spreading disorder in this country,' he said. . . .

"Mr. Bouasy said that 20,000 North Vietnamese were fighting in Laos, but reliable military sources here estimate the figure at 'not more than 10,000.' "

Ibid.

Senator Fulbright, the Chairman of the Senate **Foreign Relations** Committee, has indicated his understanding that the D.R.V. has engaged in hostilities against the R.V.N. in violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Accords and the United Nations Charter. In supporting the passage of the 1964 Tonkin Gulf Resolution Senator Fulbright said:

"Certainly supported and quite possibly incited by Communist China, North Vietnam has persistently engaged in subversion and more direct hostilities against the duly constituted governments of both Laos and South Vietnam. It has done these things in gross violation of the Geneva Agreement of 1954 and of the Geneva Agreement of 1962 pertaining to Laos. It has done these things in violation of international law, in contempt of the United Nations Charter, in malice toward its neighbors, and in reckless disregard of the requirements of peace in southeast Asia."[299]

An analysis of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and fundamental principles of general international law embodied in Article 2 of the United Nations Charter supports the lawfulness of the present United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam and unmistakably demonstrates the unlawfulness of the D.R.V. aggression against the R.V.N.

C. D.R.V. Aggression Against the R.V.N. Is a Fundamental Change In Conditions, Constituting Grounds for Suspending Any Corresponding Obligation Which May Be Binding on the United States or the R.V.N.

Even if the United States were bound by the provisions of the 1954 Geneva Accords, and even if the D.R.V. aggression was not a material breach of the Accords, the aggression against the R.V.N. is a fundamental change in conditions constituting grounds for suspending any treaty provisions with respect to prohibitions on military assistance and related conditions.

Article 44 of the *International Law Commission 1966 Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties*, which is essentially declaratory of general international law in this respect provides:

"A fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty and which was not foreseen by the parties, may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty unless:

"(a) The existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty; and

"(b) the effect of the change is radically to transform the scope of obligations still to be performed under the treaty."[300]

With respect to the Geneva Accords, few changes could be a more fundamental change in circumstances constituting an essential basis for consent and radically transforming the scope of any obligations undertaken, than the **D.R.V.'s** disregard of the cease-fire provisions of the Accords. For the military cease-fire was the very essence of the understanding of all the states participating in the Conference. Point two of the United States unilateral declaration, to the effect that the United States would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern, even makes this explicit as far as the United States is concerned. In fact, point two of the United States declaration greatly strengthens the case under this rule of general international law as it indicates that the possibility of future aggression was adverted to as important by the United States at the time of the 1954 Geneva Conference itself. In a situation of armed aggression of the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. in violation of a major principle of the agreements, any obligation to refrain from rendering military assistance to the R.V.N. in the absence of such aggression is inapplicable after the occurrence of such aggression. The present situation, involving aggression by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. in clear violation of the Geneva agreements, coupled with the continuing inability of the International Control Commission to deal with the problem,[301] constitutes beyond question a fundamental change in essential conditions contemplated by the participants at the Geneva Conference. As a result, even if the United States were bound by the provisions of the 1954 Accords, and was not justified in suspending obligations because of D.R.V. breach, aggression against the R.V.N. is a fundamental change in essential conditions existing at the time of agreement and constitutes grounds for suspending any corresponding treaty obligations in order to meet such aggression.

V. THE EXECUTIVE-CONGRESSIONAL ACTION RENDERING ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF VIET NAM IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

It has been asserted by some that the present assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is unlawful in that it constitutes warmaking by the Executive without a formal declaration of war by Congress.[302] This assertion raises claims under internal United States constitutional processes which should be kept separate from the claims made to international processes of authoritative decision discussed in the preceding sections. Such claims under internal constitutional processes do not relate to the lawfulness of United States action vis-a-vis the World Community.[303]

The claim that the present assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is unlawful in that it constitutes warmaking by the Executive without a formal declaration of war involves two somewhat separate but related arguments, usually mixed together. The first involves a characterization of the Viet Nam involvement as executive involvement or as the Lawyer's Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam has termed it: "President Johnson's warmaking,"[304] with the implication that such executive action violates the separation of powers principle and is thus unconstitutional. The second argument is based on an interpretation of the Constitution to the effect that military involvement such as that in Viet Nam is unconstitutional without a formal declaration of war by Congress.

The first of these arguments attempting to brand the military involvement in Viet-Nam purely executive action is factually indefensible in the face of congressional action authorizing and affirming United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam.

The second argument in the present context of executive-congressional action is not compelled by the language of the Constitution, runs contra to repeated authoritative interpretations of the Constitution by successive Presidents and Congresses of the United States, and is not supported by policy. In the face of the joint executive-congressional authorization for the present assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam there can be no doubt that this assistance is lawful under United States constitutional processes.

The next sections will first explore the factual background of congressional authorization and affirmance of assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam and will then examine the constitutional basis for the executive-congressional action rendering assistance in that context.

---

[299] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18400.

[300] *Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of the Second Part of its Seventeenth Session* U.N. Doc. No. A/CN.4/184 (Jan. 28, 1966), at Annex, p. 6.

For a general discussion of this principle see the *Commentary* to Article 44 of the *International Law Commission 1963 Draft Articles on the Law of Treaties. Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of its Fifteenth Session,* U.N. Gen. Ass. Off. Rec. 18th Sess., Supp. No. 9, at 20–23 (A/5509) (1963).

[301] Even when functioning at maximum potential, the Commission can not be rated as well suited to the task of policing the peace in Viet Nam. It is evident from the Reports of the Commission, however, that there has been an increasing breakdown in its effectiveness, particularly in its later years. In its Eleventh Interim Report, for example, the Commission invited the attention of the Co-Chairmen to its deteriorating financial position, *Eleventh Interim Report of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam* (Vietnam No. 1 [1961], Command Paper 1551). Great Britain Parliamentary Sessional Papers XXXIX (1961/62), at 27.

[302] See the *Memorandum of Law of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy To-Ward Vietnam,* reprinted in the Congressional Record, pp. 2666, 2671–2673, Feb. 9, 1966; Rockwell, "Presidential War" *Viet Report* 19 (Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. 1966).

See also Senator Morse's views on these constitutional claims at Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18428–18430, 18442–18447; Congressional Record, March 21, 1966, p. 6406. "The Senator from Oregon repeats that, under the Constitution, the President has no power to wage war until a declaration of war is passed by the Congress." Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18443.

[303] It is generally understood that the laws of war may apply without formal declaration of war. See for example Article 2 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12, 1949, which provides: "[T]he present Convention shall apply to all cases of declared war or of *any other armed conflict* which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, *even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them.*" In commenting on this provision McDougal & Feliciano say: "The article strongly indicates the irrelevance, for the purposes of regulation of combat situations, of an issuance or omission of a declaration of war, as well as of recognition or disclaimer of the existence of a 'state of war.'" See McDougal & Feliciano, Law & Minimum World Public Order *541* (1961).

Apparently there have been assertions from Hanoi that American pilots captured in the D.R.V. are "war criminals and subject to the death penalty." See N.Y. Times, June 2, 1966, p. c 3, col. 6 (city ed). As the above materials indicate and the Korean experience reinforces, whether or not there is a formal declaration of war, is not an acceptable basis under international law for reducing the status of captured belligerents to "war criminals." If such claims are also based on allegations of aggressive war, such allegations, as demonstrated in this paper, are completely unfounded. But even if such allegations were accepted, claims that clearly identified belligerents are "war criminals" simply because combatants in a military apparatus engaged in aggressive war, have not been accepted by the World Community, including the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, and are clearly contra to accepted "standards of human rights for contexts of violence." See McDougal & Feliciano, *supra* at 528, 531–34, 541–42, 530–61.

[304] *Memorandum of Law of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam,* reprinted in Congressional Record, Feb. 9, 1966, pp. 2666–2672.

A. *Executive Action Rendering Assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam Has Been Authorized And Affirmed by Congress.*

On February 1, 1955, the Senate of the United States voted 82 to 1 with 13 members not present to advise and consent to the ratification of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and Protocol thereto.[305] The 13 members not present all indicated that they would have voted yes if present.[306] This overwhelming sentiment in the Senate for approval of the ratification of SEATO and its Protocol extending protection to the "free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam,"[307] expressed the strong sense of the Senate that the Republic of Viet Nam be assisted against future Communist aggression. The record of the debates on this treaty[308] as well as the language of the treaty make this abundantly evident. Thus, Senator George said:

"The preservation of that freedom is a primary objective of the treaty. It is, moreover, of vital concern to the United States; for we have realized that any significant extension of the Communist world would generate the gravest danger for our own Nation.

"To the extent that we support the independent governments of Southeast Asia in maintaining their freedom, therefore, we also defend the highest interests of the United States. It is our purpose, Mr. President, to give advance notice to any Communist nation contemplating aggressive action in that area that they will have to reckon with the United States."[309]

And Senator Smith of New Jersey said:

"This treaty meets the problem by an approach perhaps best described as a kind of restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. Under this treaty, each party recognizes that an armed attack on any country within the treaty area would endanger its own peace and safety. Each party, therefore, agrees to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."[310]

The basic United States foreign policy decision to assist in defending the Republic of Viet Nam against future Communist aggression—certainly if by armed attack, then, was overwhelmingly supported by Senate action at least as long ago as 1955. This affirmative Senate vote in 1955, pursuant to the constitutional power to advise and consent to the ratification of treaties was in fact a crucial step in the adoption of this southeast Asian foreign policy.

The language of Article IV of the SEATO treaty and the Senate debates on it, however, indicated that the United States would in taking any future action pursuant to Article IV § 1 of the SEATO treaty "act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."[311] There is support in the Senate debates on SEATO that this and other language was designed to distinguish SEATO from the alleged NATO principle of automatic military response to an armed attack on a covered treaty nation, thus avoiding the NATO controversy relative to the powers of the Executive and the Congress in the use of the military instrument.[312] The language, however, would seem to permit whatever presidential use of force is authorized under the constitution and in any event this provision has been met by subsequent congressional action with respect to Viet Nam.

From 1954 until mid-1961, the United States' involvement in Viet Nam was limited to a relatively small number of military advisors, and to the rendering of military, economic and social aid.[313] Some idea of the relatively small military role played by the United States during this period is indicated by the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the first United States military casualty in the R.V.N. occurred in December, 1961.[314] Beginning in late 1961 and continuing over the next few years, in response to increased aggression from the D.R.V., President Kennedy substantially increased the numbers of United States advisory personnel and the amount of military, economic and social aid. By the end of 1962 President Kennedy had authorized approximately 11,000 men in the R.V.N.[315] The United States at that time, though, did not have combat units as such in Viet Nam and the involvement in Viet Nam in February, 1962, was termed by then Attorney General Robert Kennedy "a struggle short of war."[316]

On August 5, 1964, following separate attacks on August 2 and 4th by D.R.V. torpedo boats on United States destroyers in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin,[317]

---

[305] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1060. Senator Langer, who also voted against the U.N. Charter, said in opposing advise and consent to the SEATO treaty: "I am one who believes that the United States of America ought to mind its own business and to keep out of foreign entanglements all over Europe and Asia." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1057.

[306] *Id.* at 1060.

[307] *Protocol to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, September 8, 1954.* "The Parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty unanimously designate for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam. . . ." T.I.A.S. No. 3170 (Feb. 19, 1955).

[308] Article II of the SEATO treaty provides:

"In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-helps and mutual aid will maintain and develop this individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability."

Article IV provides:

"1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

"2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

"3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned."

Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, Sept. 8, 1954, T.I.A.S. No. 3170 (Feb. 19, 1955).

See also Pacific Charter, September 8, 1954, T.I.A.S. No. 3171.

As is evident from the language of article IV § 2 of the SEATO treaty, in the absence of an armed attack the parties were legally obligated only to "consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense." There is support in the Senate debates on SEATO for this interpretation. See the remarks of Senator George, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, pp. 1051–1052. This is not the case with respect to the obligation under article IV § 1 as to "aggression by means of armed attack."

These distinctions relate primarily to the question of whether the United States is legally obligated under international law to render assistance to the R.V.N., and do not dictate conclusions on the lawfulness of United States assistance under international law or the effect on internal constitutional processes with respect to authority to use the military instrument. See notes 398 and 439 *infra.*

Since it is unnecessary for the conclusions reached, this paper does not consider whether the United States is legally *obligated* under international law to render assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam.

[309] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1051.

[310] *Id.* at 1053.

[311] See text at note 308 *supra*. Senator George said that: "It [the SEATO treaty] has no effect whatsoever on the thorny question of whether, how, and under what circumstances the President might involve the United States in warfare without the approval of Congress." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1051. See also the remarks cited in note 312 *infra.*

[312] Senator Smith of New Jersey said:

"Each party, therefore, agrees to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. That means, by implication, that if any such emergency as is contemplated by the treaty should arise in that area it will be brought before the Congress by the President and the administration, and will be considered under our constitutional processes. We are not committed to the principle of NATO, namely, that an attack on one is an attack on all, calling for immediate military action without further consideration by Congress."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, p. 1053. And see the remarks of Senator George *id.* at 1051, and Senator MANSFIELD *id.* at 1055.

[313] See note 124 *supra.*

[314] THE VIETNAM HEARINGS 263 (Vintage ed. 1966). As late as September 2, 1963, President Kennedy indicated that as few as forty-seven Americans had been killed in combat in Viet Nam. See *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 100 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965.)

[315] THE VIETNAM HEARINGS 263 (Vintage ed. 1966). See also note 124 *supra.*

[316] See Comment, 50 CALIF. L. REV. 515, at 518 n.33 (1962).

[317] See the statement by U.N. Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson to the Security Council on August 5, 1964, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 124–127 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965). According to Senator FULBRIGHT:

"Our own naval vessels, such as the *Maddox* [one of the destroyers attacked] and other associated vessels, have never engaged in any attacks on those islands or anywhere else in North Vietnam. . . .

"It has been asserted by others that the *Maddox* was backing up or convoying the smaller vessels of the Vietnamese.

"The testimony I am familiar with shows that this is not a fact."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18402.

President Johnson delivered a mesage to Congress asking Congress "for a resolution expressing the unity and determination of the United States in supporting freedom and in protecting peace in southeast Asia * * * [and] affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.[318]

"I recommend a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO treaty." [319]

On August 7, 1964, Congress responded by passing the Southeast Asia Resolution, often called the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which is here set out in full:

"JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECUITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

"Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

"Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

"Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

"Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

"Sec. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress." [320]

It should be emphasized that under section 3 of this resolution Congress could reassess its policy at any time by a concurrent resolution which would not require presidential signature. The resolution was passed in the Senate by a record vote of 88 to 2, with 10 members not present and voting.[321] All 10 members not present, however, indicated that if present they would have voted for the resolution.[322] The sentiment of the Senators was really 98 to 2 for the resolution. The House approved the resolution by a vote of 416 to 0, with one representative simply answering "present" and with 14 members not voting.[323] The resolution was overwhelmingly passed by Congress, then, with only 2 votes cast against it in both houses combined.

This resolution, which was largely modeled on the 1955 Formosa and the 1957 Middle East resolutions giving the President authority to employ armed forces in resisting aggression in those areas,[324] expressed the clear congressional intent that "Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression," and "as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

This joint congressional resolution clearly indicates congressional authorization of the use of armed force, as the President determines, to assist the Republic of Viet Nam against aggression. This broad authority which is obvious on the face of the resolution, is strongly supported by the record of the congressional debates on the resolution and was evident in the remarks of both proponents and opponents. Moreover, the record of the debates also indicates that this resolution was intended to provide any congressional authority necessary for action under Article IV of the SEATO treaty.

Thus, Senator Fulbright, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who managed the resolution on the floor [325] said:

"Mr. President, I recommended the prompt and overwhelming endorsement of the resolution now before the Senate. . . . The resolution further expresses the approval and support of the Congress for the determination of the President to take such action as may be necessary, now and in the future, to restrain or repeal Communist aggression in southeast Asia." [326]

And it was said in a dialogue between Senators Brewster and Fulbright:

"Mr. Brewster. My question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize or recommend or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China.

"Mr. Fulbright. There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it, that contemplates it. I agree with the Senator that that is the last thing we would want to do. However, the language of the resolution would not prevent it. It would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary. It does not restrain the Executive from doing it. Whether or not that should ever be done is a matter of wisdom under the circumstances that exist at the particular time it is contemplated." [327]

And in a dialogue between Senators Scott and Fulbright:

"Mr. Scott. I support the resolution. I was glad to hear the chairman say that there is nothing in the resolution which limits the right of the President to repeal any attack or prevent further aggression within the areas described in the resolution.

"Mr. Fulbright. That is correct." [328]

And in a dialogue between Senators Cooper and Fulbright:

"Mr. Cooper. Does the Senator consider that in enacting this resolution we are satisfying that requirement [the constitutional processes requirement] of Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty? In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

"Mr. Fulbright. I think that is correct.

"Mr. Cooper. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?

"Mr. Fulbright. That is the way I would interpret it. If a situation later developed in which we thought the approval should be withdrawn, it could be withdrawn by concurrent resolution.

"Mr. Cooper. I ask these questions because it is well for the country and all of us to know what is being undertaken.

"Under section 2, are we now providing the President, if he determines it necessary, the authority to attack cities and ports in North Vietnam, not primarily to prevent an attack upon our forces but, as he might see fit, to prevent any further aggression against South Vietnam?

"Mr. Fulbright. One of the reasons for the procedure provided in this joint resolution, and also in the Formosa and Middle East instances, is in response, let us say, to the new developments in the field of warfare. In the old days, when war usually resulted from a formal declaration of war—and that is what the Founding Fathers contemplated when they included that provision in the Constitution—there was time in which to act. Things moved slowly, and things could be seen developing. Congress could participate in that way.

"Under modern conditions of warfare—and I have tried to describe them, including the way the Second World War developed—it is necessary to anticipate what may occur. Things move so rapidly that this is the way in which we must respond to the new developments. That is why this provision is necessary or important. Does the Senator agree with me that this is so?

"Mr. Cooper. Yes, warfare today is different. Time is of the essence. But the power provided the President in section 2 is great.

---

[318] President's Message to Congress, August 5, 1964, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 122, at 122–23 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[319] *Id.* at 124.

[320] 78 Stat. 384 (Approved Aug. 10, 1964).

[321] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18470–18471.

[322] *Ibid.*

[323] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18555. Representative Powell answered "Present." Presumably the 14 members did not vote because not present.

[324] The President in his message to Congress on August 5, 1964, said: "The resolution could well be based upon similar resolutions enacted by the Congress in the past—to meet the threat to Formosa in 1955, to meet the threat to the Middle East in 1957, and to meet the threat in Cuba in 1962." *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 124 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965). This interpretation of the Southeast Asia Resolution as based on the Formosa and Middle East resolutions is also supported by the congressional debates. See *e.g.,* the remarks of Senator Morse Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18428–18430.

For a comparison of the language of these resolutions with the Southeast Asia Resolution see *Background Information supra* at 129–30; Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18428–18429.

[325] N.Y. Times, March 2, 1966, p. 1, col. 8 (city ed.), at p. 7, col. 1.

[326] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18399.

[327] *Id.* at 18403.

[328] *Id.* at 18408.

"Mr. Fulbright. This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that." [329]

And Senator Kuchel said:

"I remember the Middle East resolution. I remember the Formosa resolution. Both came to Congress from President Eisenhower. Both were requested so that all might know that the people's representatives in this branch of the Government agreed with the Chief Executive of the United States with respect to the authority he possessed and the circumstances under which he would be compelled to utilize his power.

"That is the plain intent of the joint resolution now about to be passed by Congress." [330]

And Senator Cooper said:

"In response to my questions, the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and I believe, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], confirmed my viewpoint that in passing this joint resolution we would satisfy the conditions of the SEATO treaty, and would exercise our constitutional function to give the President of the United States authority to do what he determines may be proper and necessary with respect to any situation which affects our security in South Vietnam.

"I believe that is the essence of the second section. At least that was the meaning and interpretation given to it by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee." [331]

And Senator Thurmond said:

"The resolution which we are considering today does approve a new element which has not, prior to this week, been exercised, and that is the taking of all necessary measures to prevent further aggression. I sincerely hope that the President will take all necessary measures to prevent further aggression, not only against our own military forces, but also to prevent further aggression against our southeast Asian allies." [332]

And Senator Morse who opposed the resolution among other grounds on the ground that it was an unconstitutional "predated declaration of war" said:

"Another Senator thought, in the early part of the debate, that this course would not broaden the power of the President to engage in a land war if he decided that he wanted to apply the resolution in that way.

"That Senator was taking great consolation in the then held belief that, if he voted for the resolution, it would give no authority to the President to send many troops into Asia. I am sure he was quite disappointed to finally learn, because it took a little time to get the matter cleared, that the resolution places no restriction on the President in that respect. If he is still in doubt, let him read the language on page 2, lines 3 to 6, and page 2, lines 11 to 17. The first reads:

" 'The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.'

"It does not say he is limited in regard to the sending of ground forces. It does not limit that authority. That is why I have called it a predated declaration of war, in clear violation of Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which vests the power to declare war in the Congress, and not in the President.

"What is proposed is to authorize the President of the United States, without a declaration of war, to commit acts of war." [333]

And:

"No one can read the joint resolution and the authority proposed to be given the President in the joint resolution without recognizing that it would clearly authorize the President to proceed to follow whatever courses of action are necessary in his opinion; and such action would constitute authority to conduct war." [334]

And in a dialogue between Senators Gruening and Morse, both of whom opposed the resolution, it was said:

"Mr. Gruening. This resolution, in effect, is an authorization which would be the equivalent of a declaration of war by the Congress. Would it not be?

"Mr. Morse. I think so.

"Mr. Gruening. That is one thing I am very apprehensive about. If we should get into an all-out war, which I fear may happen, this resolution would be considered the authorization by the Congress to so proceed. Would it not?

"Mr. Morse. That is correct." [335]

And Senator Morse said:

"Under the resolution Congress would give to the President of the United States great authority, without coming to the Congress and obaining approval by way of a declaration of war, to carry on a land war in South Vietnam. The choice is left up to him." [336]

And Senator Gruening said:

"[T]his resolution not only endorses all our Government has done to date in southeast Asia, but also gives the President a blank check, not merely to do whatever he likes in South Vietnam, but, to quote the text of the resolution:

" 'To take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.'

"That is, in effect, a predated declaration of war, if and when the Executive chooses, and war not merely in South Vietnam but in all southeast Asia." [337]

And in a dialogue between Representatives Frelinghuysen and Adair it was said:

"Mr. Frelinghuysen. Do I correctly understand that section 2 of this resolution does constitute an implementation of Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty itself? This treaty says that in the event of danger there will be measures taken in each country in accordance with its constitutional basis? In other words, does this resolution give positive powers to the President to act with respect to our responsibilities as a member of SEATO?

"Mr. Adair. It does so. Within the framework the gentleman has described, and, of course, subject to the Constitution of the United States." [338]

Although some members of Congress indicated that they interpreted the Tonkin Gulf resolution more narrowly,[339] and some of the debates including other remarks of some of those quoted [340] was ambiguous, the express language of the resolution coupled with the record of the congressional debates as a whole strongly indicates that it was the congressional intent to authorize the use of armed force if necessary, as the President should determine, to assist the Republic of Viet Nam in combating aggression, subject to later reassessment by concurrent resolution. An Amendment introduced by Senator Gaylord Nelson seemingly to limit the authority of the Tonkin Gulf resolution and which provided in part that: "Our continuing policy is to limit our role to the provision of aid, training assistance, and military advice, and it is the sense of Congress that, except when provoked to a greater response, we should continue to attempt to avoid a direct military involvement in the southeast Asian conflict," [341] was not adopted.

In 1965, President Johnson determined that the defense of the R.V.N. in the face of mounting aggression from the D.R.V. would require a full combat role for United States troops as well as bombing of infiltration routes, transportation facilities, and other selected military targets in the D.R.V.[342] This action in response to increased aggression from the D.R.V., including the introduction of regular units of the PAVN army into the R.V.N.,[343] was within his authority as Commander in Chief pursuant to the Tonkin Gulf resolution of Congress.

---

[329] *Id.* at 18409–410.

[330] *Id.* at 18414.

[331] *Id.* at 18417.

[332] *Id.* at 18420.

[333] *Id.* at 18426–427.

[334] *Id.* at 18442.

[335] *Id.* at 18447–448.

[336] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, p. 18448.

[337] *Id.* at 18469.

[338] *Id.* at 18543. Representative Albert said: "Mr. Speaker, this resolution supports the determination of the President of the United States to take all necessary measures, including the use of armed force, to repel any armed attack on forces of the United States, to prevent further aggression, and to defend the peace and security of southeast Asia." *Id.* at 18542.

[339] See the remarks of Representative Adair *id.* at 18543 and of Representative Gross *id.* at 18546.

[340] Senator Fulbright said:

"In frankness, I do not believe the joint resolution would substantially alter the President's power to use whatever means seemed appropriate under the circumstances. Our recourse in Congress would be that if the action were too inappropriate, we could terminate the joint resolution, by a concurrent resolution, and that would precipitate a great controversy between the Executive and the Congress. As a practical question, that could be done."

Id. at 18407. And see the remarks of Senator Fulbright in discussing the amendment offered by Senator Gaylord Nelson, *id.* at 18459.

[341] *Id.* at 18459. The complete amendment provided:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "That" insert "(a)."

On page 2, between line 6 and 7, insert the following:

"(b) The Congress also approves and supports the efforts of the President to bring the problem of peace in Southeast Asia to the Security Council of the United Nations, and the President's declaration that the United States, seeking no extension of the present military conflict, will respond to provocation in a manner that is 'limited and fitting.' Our continuing policy is to limit our role to the provision of aid, training assistance, and military advice, and it is the sense of Congress that, except when provoked to a greater response, we should continue to attempt to avoid a direct military involvement in the southeast Asian conflict."

Ibid. See also the remarks of Senator Fulbright on this amendment *ibid.*

[342] See note 124 *supra.*

[343] In testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Secretary of State Dean Rusk said:

"At no stage have we ourselves wanted to escalate this war, as the expression goes. At no stage have we wanted a larger war. But it was in November, December, January, over the turn of the year 1964–65 that North Vietnam moved the 325th Division of the regular North Vietnamese Army from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to up the ante here. . . . That was before the bombing started. . . ."

The Vietnam Hearings 263 (Vintage ed. 1966).

To eliminate any doubt as to the congressional support for the increased measures taken in assisting in the defense of the R.V.N., however, on May 4, 1965, President Johnson sent a message to Congress in which he said:

"I ask the Congress to appropriate at the earliest possible moment an additional $700 million to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

"This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed." [344]

Although this request was presented in the form of an appropriation measure, it was also intended and was considered by Congress as an opportunity for debate on the merits of the increased Viet Nam military involvement. There was evidence, in fact, that the President had authority to fund the necessary expenditures for Viet Nam from other appropriation items in the Defense Department budget but chose, in the light of the intervening increase in United States military involvement in Viet Nam, to directly present the Viet Nam issue to Congress.[345] Moreover, the sum asked for, although large by everyday standards, was not a substantial measure in terms of the real cost of the continuing military action in Viet Nam.[346] In short, the request presented Congress with a relatively clearcut issue as to approval of the major outlines of the increased United States military involvement in Viet Nam, and was largely intended as such.

The 50 member House Committee on Appropriations unanimously reported the resolution. In reporting the resolution, the Committee pointed out:

"As the President stated in his message of May 4, 'This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam.' . . . Circumstances have arisen which have required an acceleration of our effort in Southeast Asia. The President has requested and the Secretary of Defense has testified in support of the recommended supplemental appropriation.

"The enactment of the accompanying resolution will provide the means for continuing the build-up of modern supplies, equipment, and facilities for our forces. It will also provide Congress an opportunity to again make known to our friends and foes alike that the people of the United States have every intention of standing firm in their opposition to Communist aggression." [347]

The record of the debate in the House indicates that with a few exceptions [348] the vote was intended by those voting for it as well as those voting against it as a vote on approval of the increased military involvement in Viet Nam. Thus, Representative Bow said:

"Mr. Chairman, let no man, whether he be in Moscow, Peiping, Hanoi, or Havana, have any illusions that the Congress of the United States, speaking for all the people, does not support the President's action in Vietnam. We do." [349]

And the House Minority Leader **Gerald Ford** said:

"Now, Mr. Chairman, the second reason why this resolution is before us is psychological. Some people thought that we ought to have another resolution on Vietnam and that we ought to have a resolution on the Caribbean. Such resolutions have been passed previously. Those resolutions we have passed heretofore and they are still in effect. There has been no change in congressional attitude. I do not believe a reiteration by us, a repeat of the words which we said before, would have near the impact as what we are doing here this afternoon. Republicans in the House stand unanimously behind the President on this matter." [350]

And Representative **Rivers** of South Carolina, the Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, said:

"The Armed Services Committee met on yesterday afternoon with the Secretary of Defense and I am happy to say that our participation in this action was agreed to by a committee vote of 37 to 0.

"This appropriation is a simple reaffirmation of the action taken on August 10, 1964, when 504 Members of this Congress—both sides—went on record as supporting the struggle for freedom in South Vietnam. It is as simple as that." [351]

And Representative **Lipscomb** of California said:

"This measure is more than just a supplemental appropriation resolution. It is a forceful expression of the Congress and the people of the United States to the world that we are prepared to take whatever steps necessary to halt Communist aggression." [352]

And Speaker of the House **McCormack** said:

"The action of the House today is a clear indication to the entire world that our people are united behind the President.

"So this resolution now before us involves more than merely an appropriation of $700 million" [353]

And Representative **Conyers** who voted against the resolution said:

"This resolution is not an emergency request for funds, but rather a method to secure a vote of confidence on our policy in Vietnam. As the President has stated, a "yes" vote means support of the Vietnam policy. I cannot vote "yes" because I do not support the present policy in Vietnam." [354]

And similarly, Representative **Ryan** who also voted against it said:

"It is clear from the committee report and from the debate that this appropriation is not necessary for the support of our Armed Forces.

"The basic issue is U.S. policy in Vietnam. The resolution in effect seeks congressional approval of the new policy which is a departure from the previous policy of aiding the South Vietnamese to fight their own war." [355]

The vote in the House on May 5, 1965, was 408 to 7 to approve the resolution.[356]

The **Record** of the debate in the Senate also indicates approval of the broad outlines of the United States policy in Viet Nam, although a number of senators expressed reservations as to particularities or as to future policies and indicated that their vote was not to be construed as a blank check for the future or otherwise qualified the meaning of their vote, and a few senators fundamentally opposed those policies.[357] Again, some senators indicated that the vote was a further congressional authorization of the use of armed force in the assistance of the R.V.N. along the lines of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, or stated that no such additional authorization was necessary, or otherwise more broadly interpreted the vote. Thus, Senator **Clark** said:

"We are dealing with a subject which is as a matter of fact, if not in law, a declaration of war." [358]

And Senator **Saltonstall** said:

"The President told us, when 150 of us gathered in the White House yesterday, the purpose for which he wanted the appropriation. He indicated that he needed the appropriation not only, as we all know, to carry out our efforts in southeast Asia, but also to show that Congress feels the same way today as it did last year when it passed the joint resolution urging the President of the United States to take whatever action he believes necessary in the interest of international peace in southeast Asia.

"The defeat of the appropriation bill would be tantamount to a repudiation of the earlier joint resolution adopted by Congress." [359]

---

[344] Message from the President of the United States, May 4, 1965, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 219 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[345] See remarks of Representative **Mahon** at **Congressional Record**, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 9518, and the remarks of Representative **Ryan** *id*. at 9535. Senator **Morse** said:

"The next point I wish to make is that the Senate need not pass this appropriation measure, for the President, from his own lips in the East Room of the White House yesterday, told the members of the committees that he had assembled there that he did not need to ask for an appropriation. From his own lips yesterday the President told Members of Congress assembled that he has the legal authority to transfer the necessary funds. The President then proceeded to tell those assembled why he was doing it in this way.

"The President wants to commit Senators again. He told those assembled in the East Room yesterday, in effect, that he wanted them to know that when they voted for this joint resolution, they would again be committing themselves to support the President's policy in southeast Asia. . . ."

Id. at 9504.

Representative **Ryan** pointed out that the committee report states:

"The authorities in existing law could have been utilized in lieu of the proposed appropriation."

Id. at 9535.

[346] Compare this $700 million request, for example, with the $13.1 billion appropriation bill approved by the Senate on March 22, largely for the Viet Nam Conflict. See N.Y. Times, March 23, 1966, p. c 13, col. 1 (city ed.).

[347] **Congressional Record**, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 9518.

[348] See the remarks of Representative **Kastenmeier**, *id*., at 9528, and the remarks of Representative Lindsay, *id*. at 9530.

[349] *Id*. at 9518.

[350] *Id*. at 9519–9521.

[351] *Id*. at 9521.

[352] *Id*. at 9522.

[353] *Id*. at 9525–9527.

[354] *Id*. at 9532.

[355] *Id*. at 9536.

[356] **Congressional Record**, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 9541. Representatives **Brown** of California, **Burton** of California, **Conyers**, **Dow**, **Edwards** of California, **Green** of Oregon and **Ryan** voted against the resolution. Eighteen representatives did not vote, presumably because they were not present.

[357] See generally as to qualifying remarks or opposition the remarks of Senator **Gore** *id*. at 9497, Senator **Javits** *id*. at 9498, Senator **Aiken** *id*. at 9499, Senator **Stennis** *id*. at 9501, Senator **Morse** *id*. at 9503, Senator **Gruening** *id*. at 9730, Senator **Prouty** *id*. at 9759, Senator **Nelson** *id*. at 9759, Senator **Kennedy** of New York *id*. at 9760, Senator **Pastore** *id*. at 9770, and Senator **Stennis** *id*. at 9771.

[358] **Congressional Record**, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 9482.

[359] *Id*. at 9495.

Senator Miller said:

"It seems to me that the joint resolution would merely be an implementation of a commitment which the Congress overwhelmingly made last fall. As I recall, a commitment was made, with only 2 dissenting voices out of the 535 Members of the House and the Senate, to support the President in his actions, including the use of armed force, to resist aggression in southeast Asia." [360]

And Senator Cooper said:

"When we voted in this body in 1964 for the joint resolution supporting the President, I said on the floor of the Senate at the time that we were granting to the President, prospectively, authority to take whatever action he thought necessary to repel aggression in Vietnam. I believe we provided to him then any authority that he needed for the action that he has taken in Vietnam." [361]

Senator Morse who opposed the resolution said:

"The first point I wish to make is that no matter what semantics Senators use and no matter how much they protest—and they doth protest too much—the fact is that they are abdicating their clear constitutional duties under the Constitution of the United States, for when they vote for this appropriation, they will again vote to give the President power to make an undeclared war.

"I say most respectfully that I believe the interpretation of the administration as to what the Congress voted last August [the Tonkin Gulf resolution] is absolutely correct. . . . The House even goes the President one better in respect to the invitation of the President to have unity on the part of Congress behind him.

"The House does not intend any verbal reservations to be considered as limiting." [362]

And Senator Gruening who also opposed the resolution said:

"President Johnson frankly stated that this request was being used not because moneys were needed to supply our Armed Forces in Vietnam, but rather as a vehicle to secure congressional approval of his carrying on the undeclared war to North Vietnam and anywhere else in southeast Asia that he sees fit.[363]

"This requested appropriation, coupled with the President's message, is in fact tantamount to giving the President a second blank check.

"The Congress last August gave him one blank check to wage war with only two dissents. To repeat, I feel strongly that this cannot be done under the Constitution." [364]

It might also be pointed out that according to Senator Mansfield:

"No one has suggested at any time during this debate, that any Member of this body has advocated withdrawal." [365]

The vote in the Senate on this resolution on May 6, 1965, was 88 in favor to 3 opposed.[366]

In summary, by the approval of this May, 1965, Viet Nam military appropriation measure Congress in fact indicated approval of the broad outlines of the assistance to the R.V.N. and the authority of the President acting under the Tonkin Gulf resolution to use armed force in that assistance.

In August and September, 1965, Congress debated and passed the Defense Department 1966 appropriation bill including approximately $1.7 billion for a southeast Asia emergency fund largely to meet Viet Nam expenses.[367] Again the vote was overwhelming, passing the House by a vote of 380 to 0,[368] and passing the Senate by a vote of 89 to 0.[369] This appropriation measure, however, was in sharp contrast to the May, 1965, supplemental appropriation measure for military expenditures in Vietnam, which presented a relatively clearcut issue of American policy in Viet Nam. Here, the Viet Nam appropriation was approximately $1.7 billion out of an overall appropriation measure for total Defense Department needs of about $47 billion.[370] Although this request provided Congress with an opportunity to check the appropriations available to the President for Viet Nam, the final vote did not provide a clearcut choice on Viet Nam to the individual congressman, as is indicated by the fact that Senator Morse voted for the appropriation measure despite his disagreement on Viet Nam policies.[371]

In January, February and March, 1966, however, Congress was faced with an appropriation authorization measure largely for Viet Nam, which again presented Congress with the Viet Nam issue and which together with foreign assistance requests for Viet Nam precipitated an unmistakable full congressional debate on the merits of the United States assistance to the R.V.N.[372]

On March 1, 1966, the Senate voted to approve the authorization bill by a vote of 93 to 2, with 5 members not present and voting.[373] All 5 members not voting indicated that if they had been present they would have voted for it.[374] On the same date, the House voted to approve the bill by a vote of 392 to 4 with 1 Representative answering "present" and 36 members not voting.[375] Although the record of the debates again indicated that some congressmen were opposed to United States policies in Viet Nam, and others did not wish their vote construed as a blank check approving in advance possible future expansion of the conflict, again the course of the debates indicated that Congress largely approved the broad outlines of assistance to the R.V.N. and the President's authority to use armed force.

One indication supporting this was the failure to adopt the amendment introduced by Senator Morse to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution.[376] The amendment was tabled in the Senate by a vote of 92 to 5.[377] During the debates on this amendment Senator Saltonstall said:

"We must be aware that the issue presented by the Senator from Oregon is not a matter of withholding from the President some new authority he has requested. It is a question of withdrawing from him authority which the Senate, with but two dissenting votes, freely gave to him in August of 1964." [378]

And Senator Javits said:

"It is a fact, whether we like it or not, that by virtue of having acted on the resolution of August 1964, we are a party to present policy." [379]

---

[360] *Id.* at 9496.

[361] *Id.* at 9499.

[362] *Id.* at 9502.

[363] Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 7, p. 9729.

[364] *Id.* at 9731.

[365] *Id.* at 9771.

[366] *Id.* at 9771. Senators Gruening, Morse and Nelson voted against the resolution. For an explanation of Senator Nelson's nay vote see *id.* at 9759. Nine Senators did not vote, presumably because they were not present.

[367] See Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 17, pp. 24251–24262. This $1.7 billion southeast Asia emergency fund was added in conference after the House had approved the Defense Department 1966 appropriation bill. See the remarks of Representative Mahon *id.* at 24252, and Representative Dow of New York *id.* at 24261. For the vote in the Senate see Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 21734.

[368] Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 18, p. 24262. This vote in the House was on the conference report.

[369] Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 21734.

[370] See Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 17, p. 24253.

[371] See Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 15, p. 21732. Senator Morse said: "I find myself in a very difficult position in determining my vote on this bill. The bill contains [so] many items with which I agree that I find it difficult to vote against it. But it provides $1,700 million to support what I consider to be an unconstitutional and illegal American war in southeast Asia, making it difficult for me to vote for it. . . ." *Id.* at 9516. And Representative Dow of New York said: "This Congressman is voting in favor of the entire appropriation, for the reason that the appropriation bill contains the major sums to serve the entire Defense Establishment. . . ." Congressional Record, vol. 111, pt. 17, p. 2461.

[372] See *Hearings on S. 2793 Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,* 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. 1 (1966). These hearings, much of which was nationally televised, were technically on S. 2793, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. See *id.* at 1.

In his message of January 19, 1966, President Johnson, requesting the supplementary appropriation, said:

"In the last 2 years, in repeated acts of authorization and appropriation, the Congress has provided continuing support for our national decision 'to prevent further aggression' in southeast Asia. The quoted words come from the joint resolution of the Congress—Public Law 88-408—approved on August 10, 1964. It is in the letter and the spirit of the resolution that I request this supplementary appropriation. While that resolution remains in force, and until its obligations are discharged, we must persevere. I believe the resolution is right, and I believe the course we follow is necessary. I intend that those who must face danger and death as we follow that course shall be supported. I am confident that the Congress will agree."

Congressional Record, p. 4409, Mar. 1, 1966.

[373] Congressional Record, pp. 4410–4411 (Mar. 1, 1966). Senators Gruening and Morse voted against the authorization.

[374] *Ibid.*

[375] *Id.* at 4475–4476. Representatives Brown of California, Burton of California, Conyers, and Ryan voted against the measure. Representative Powell answered "Present." Presumably the 36 members not voting did not vote because not present.

[376] Senator Morse's amendment provided:

"Sec. 402. The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia,' approved August 10, 1964 (78 Stat. 384), is hereby repealed."

Congressional Record, p. 4370 (Mar. 1, 1966).

[377] *Id.* at 4404. Three members were not present and voting. Of these, 2 members indicated that if present they would have voted to table it. Senators Fulbright, Gruening, McCarthy of Minnesota, Morse and Young of Ohio voted against the tabling motion. See "Congress Passes $4.8-Billion Fund for Vietnam War", N.Y. Times, March 2, 1966, p. 1, col. 8 (city ed.), at p. 7, col. 1. See also "Senate to Avoid A Vietnam Clash," N.Y. Times, March 1, 1966, p. 1, col. 7 (city ed.).

[378] Congressional Record, p. 4375 (Mar. 1, 1966).

[379] *Id.* at 4374. Senator Javits also said: "As I agree with his [President Johnson's] policies to date, I shall vote for this authorization. But if tomorrow I disagree with his policies the President leaves us no alternative but to vote against an authorization, and I shall do so." *Id.* at 4374. And in a dialogue between Senators Javits and Russell it was said:

Mr. Russell of Georgia. "The Senator knows that we were approving the use of the President's constitutional power.

And Senator Smathers said:

"Let us have no illusions about this particular vote. . . . No one can say that what we do will not in effect be a reaffirmation of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which was passed in August 1964. . . . By our vote to table the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, we shall be voting to reaffirm the decision we made when we passed the joint resolution of August 10, 1964. When I vote, I want to reaffirm it, and I believe the great majority of Senators have the same feeling." [380]

The *New York Times* pointed out that:

"As soon as debate opened today, it became apparent that the White House was not willing to let the President's critics 'off the hook' by the device of the tabling motion.

One after another, key supporters of the President rose to say that the vote on the tabling motion was a test of unquestioning endorsement of the President's policy. . . .

"Just before the vote on the motion, Bill D. Moyers, the White House press secretary told reporters that the President believed that if Senators wanted to 'reverse' the Tonkin declaration because of 'a change of heart,' then they should vote for Senator Morse's amendment.

"But, Mr. Moyers added, the President believed that if there was no change of heart and Senators wanted the original resolution to stand, 'they ought to vote to table.'

"Thus, it was clear, the President was throwing down the gauntlet to his critics." [381]

Although the record of the debate indicates that not all Senators would agree with one or another of the above interpretations,[382] the fact was that Congress overwhelmingly rejected an amendment to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution as it had reserved the right to do by concurrent resolution under Section 3 of that resolution. In fact, according to the *New York Times,* a resolution to reaffirm the Tonkin Gulf resolution would have easily passed.[383] It was just as clearly unnecessary.

During the debate on the authorization bill Senator Gruening introduced another amendment, this one designed to restrict the sending of draftees to southeast Asia during any period of hostilities without the renewed consent of Congress.[384] The amendment was tabled by a vote of 94 to 2.[385]

A statement signed by 78 members of the House of Representatives who voted for the appropriation authorization bill indicated an intention that their vote not be interpreted as a blank check for future "unrestrained or indiscriminate enlargement of the military effort" and indicated their continued endorsement of efforts at negotiation, but at the same time it contained nothing questioning the authority of the President acting pursuant to the Tonkin Gulf resolution. The statement read:

"Mr. Chairman, we will vote for this supplemental defense authorization. The support of the American and allied troops who are fighting in South Vietnam requires it.

"We agree with President Johnson's statement that 'We will strive to limit conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor increased danger.' We therefore reject any contention that approval of this legislation will constitute a mandate for unrestrained or indiscriminate enlargement of the military effort, and we strongly support continued efforts to initiate negotiations for a settlement of the conflict.

"We, in particular, wish to express our concurrence with the President's statement of last week in which he declared the Vietnamese conflict to be a limited war for limited objectives calling for the exercise of 'prudent firmness under careful control.' " [386]

Other Congressmen interpreted the vote on the appropriations authorization measure more broadly. Senator Gruening who opposed the bill stated:

"There are thus five policy decisions involved in . . . this appropriation authorization bill:

"First. A reaffirmation of the Bay of Tonkin resolution;

"Second. Delegation to the President of the power of unlimited military escalation in southeast Asia." [387]

And in an exchange between Representatives Randall and Ryan it was stated:

"Mr. Randall. It has been brought out crystal clear that the joint resolution unanimously agreed to by this House, 416 to 0 on August 7, 1964, is a sufficient declaration to authorize the President to conduct military operations in southeast Asia.

"Mr. Ryan. Does the gentleman construe that resolution to be a declaration of war?

"Mr. Randall. Not a formal declaration, but for my part the resolution provides ample authority and I think also, for the overwhelming majority of fellow Members, as will be shown by the vote on this bill today." [388]

And Representative Gallagher, of New Jersey said:

"Now the time has come for us to reaffirm the vote of the Tonkin resolution." [389]

And Representative Pike, of New York said:

"I hope that we will pass this bill. I hope that it will be construed as another brick in the arch of congressional support for our policy in Vietnam." [390]

A Supplemental Defense Appropriation Bill, largely for Viet Nam military expenditures, was passed by the House on March 15, 1966, by a vote of 389 to 3,[391] and by the Senate on March 22, 1966, by a vote of 87 to 2.[392] Again the record of the debates

---

Mr. Javits. "Exactly.

Mr. Russell of Georgia. "We put Congress behind the President. We put the imprimatur of congressional power on a power that he could have exercised anyway. . . ." *Id.* at 4377.

[380] *Id.* at 4390. By way of similar supporting statements, Senator Russell said: "I knew that the joint resolution conferred a vast grant of power upon the President. It is written [sic] in terms that are not capable of misinterpretation, and about which it is difficult to become confused. . . . The language could not have been drawn more clearly. . . . It is only one page in length; it is clear; it is explicit. It contains a very great grant of power. . . ." *Id.* at 4372. Senator McGee said: "I personally believed that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was very clear at the time it was passed. . . . I desperately hope than [sic] an overwhelming vote to table will mean exactly what it says, that there is no intention on the part of the Members of the Senate to in any way detract, by that vote, from the President's position in southeast Asia. . . ." *Id.* at 4379. Senator Dirksen said: "We gave the President the power with our eyes open. We knew what we were doing. . . ." *Id.* at 4388.

[381] "Congress Passes $4.8-Billion Fund For Vietnam War," N.Y. Times, March 2, 1966, p. 1, col. 8 (city ed.), at p. 7, col. 1. Senator Fulbright pointed out that: "I know we do not have the votes to change the existing resolution which has been under discussion. . . ." Congressional Record 4382 (March 1, 1966).

[382] For qualifying interpretations of the vote to table Senator Morse's amendment or the vote on the appropriations authorization bill see the remarks of Senator Javits Congressional Record 4374–4375 (March 1, 1966); Senator Fulbright *id.* at 4381, 4383; Senator Clark *id.* at 4383, 4389; Senator Case *id.* at 4404; and Senator McGovern *id.* at 4409.

[383] "Congress passes $4.8-Billion Fund For Vietnam War," N.Y. Times, March 2, 1966, p. 1, col. 8 (city ed.), at p. 7, col. 1. "Mr. Fulbright and others critical of the Administration policy realized that it would be impossible to get any votes but those of Senators Morse and Gruening for outright repeal of the Tonkin resolution, since this would be a repudiation of the President during a war.

On the other hand, they knew that there would probably not be more than 20 votes against the Russell amendment [to reaffirm the Tonkin Gulf resolution] after long, divisive debate." *Ibid.*

[384] The amendment provided:

"On page 3, after line 8, add the following new section:

"Sec. 302. During any period that any armed force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that armed force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such armed forces."

Congressional Record 4405 (March 1, 1966). For a discussion casting some doubt on the constitutionality of such an amendment see Jones, *The President, Congress, and Foreign Relations,* 29 Calif. L. Rev. 565, 583 (1941).

[385] Congressional Record 4406–4407 (March 1, 1966). Senators Gruening and Morse voted against tabling the amendment. Four Senators were not present and voting. Of these two indicated that if present they would have voted to table it.

[386] Congressional Record 4544 (March 2, 1966).

[387] Congressional Record 4410 (March 1, 1966). Similarly, Senator Cooper said: "But I am bound to say that the action we take here in approving this authorization bill, will in my view, at least, be a measure of approval. It is a way of saying to the President, 'To this point, at least, we do give a kind of approval to your course of action.' That is my understanding of it." . . . *Id.* at 4390. And Senator Morse said: "It [the appropriation authorization bill] contains new authority which makes it possible to escalate the war. . . .

A vote against the bill would constitute a check on the purse strings, in order to deny to the President the authority that the bill would give him to expand the war. . . ." *Id.* at 4395.

[388] *Id.* at 4462.

[389] *Id.* at 4464.

[390] *Id.* at 4464. By way of similar supporting statements or broader interpretation of the vote see *e.g.*, the remarks of Representative Fascell *id.* at 4449, Representative Bennett *id.* at 4450–4451, Representative Stratton *id.* at 4451, Representative Ichord *id.* at 4461, Representative Love *id.* at 4402, Representative Randall *id.* at 4462–4463, Representative Senner *id.* at 4406 (March 2, 1966), and Representative Burton of California who voted against the appropriation authorization bill ". . . to question, by that vote, the course and conduct of our policy in Vietnam. . . ." *Id.* at 4457 (March 1, 1966).

[391] Congressional Record 5823 (March 15, 1966). Representatives Burton of California, Conyers and Ryan voted against the bill. Thirty-nine Representatives did not vote, presumably because not present.

[392] Congressional Record 6462–6463 (March 22, 1966). Senators Gruening and Morse voted against the bill. Eleven Senators were not present and voting. Ten of these indicated that if present they would have voted

indicated that the bill was viewed by many as an opportunity to express congressional views on the merits of Viet Nam policy, although this time more of the debate was directed at the possibility of military shortages in Viet Nam and the adequacy of the appropriation. Senator Morse said:

"Mr. President, I rise to oppose the pending bill. My vote will be cast against this legislation because it provides the means of conducting a war that is unauthorized through our constitutional processes." [393]

In a dialogue between House Minority Leader Gerald Ford and Representative Mahon, the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, it was said:

"Mr. Ford. I gather, from what the gentleman from Texas is saying, that a Member of the House who votes for this Defense Department appropriation is giving to the Commander in Chief the day-to-day authority to carry on the execution and implementation of our Nation's position of strength in South Vietnam. An 'aye' vote on this bill today means that one supports adequate military strength to meet successfully the challenge of Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

"Mr. Mahon. This, I believe, would be a fair interpretation of a vote in favor of the pending legislation." [394]

And Representative Celler, of New York said:

"Joining 39 Governors, I support the President on Vietnam. The $13.1 billion fund is essential for the support of our troops and for carrying out our commitments in South Vietnam." [395]

And Representative Ryan who opposed the bill stated:

"It is not simply an appropriation to support the present effort in Vietnam. The funds are intended to escalate the war. The real issue is the policy question embedded in the authorization and now in the appropriation." [396]

Again, it was evident from the record of the debates that not all congressmen supported the particularities of the Viet Nam policy, that some fundamentally opposed it, and that many did not intend that their vote be interpreted as a blank check for unrestrained military efforts. It was also evident, however, that Congress as a whole strongly supported the broad outlines of the United States policy in Viet Nam and the authority of the President to use armed force pursuant to the Tonkin Gulf resolution.[397]

This survey of some of the principal congressional action with respect to the United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam indicates beyond doubt that executive action rendering military assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam has been authorized by Congress.

Even aside from the SEATO treaty,[398] the Tonkin Gulf resolution which Congress overwhelmingly approved and has not terminated despite recent reconsideration of the question provides congressional authorization for the use of armed force in assisting the R.V.N. against aggression.

The several appropriations measures which have been passed to fund that assistance unmistakably indicate congressional support for the major outlines of that policy. This does not mean that some Congressmen don't fundamentally disagree with United States policies in Viet Nam, and it does not mean that many Congressmen don't have different views on questions such as the wisdom of bombing or not bombing particular targets in the D.R.V., the best strategy for promoting negotiations, or the wisdom of further intensification of the military effort. It does mean, however, that the broad outlines of the United States policy in Viet Nam are unmistakably based on executive-congressional action and that it is fundamentally in error to assert that the authority for those policies, including the use of armed force, is solely executive authority. The President, of course, as Commander-in-Chief must bear the primary responsibility for the implementation of the particularities of that policy, as well as a share in the responsibility for the continuation of the major outlines of that policy. Moreover, the President as chief spokesmen for the nation in foreign affairs must always bear the heavy burden of leadership.

B. The Executive-Congressional Action Rendering Assistance to the R.V.N. Is Authorized Under United States Constitutional Processes.

1. There Is Ample Constitutional Authority for Such Executive-Congressional Action.

The Executive and Congress, acting together as they have in the manner discussed above, have ample constitutional authority to assist the Republic of Viet Nam against aggression or subversion, including assistance by the use of United States armed forces. Even apart from specific powers delegated under the Constitution, the President and Congress together unquestionably possess substantially all of the ultimate foreign relations authority of the United States.[399] This authority was vested in the federal government both pursuant to specifically enumerated powers and as a necessary concomitant of nationality. As Mr. Justice Sutherland said in the opinion of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*:

"The investment of the federal government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution would have vested in the federal government as necessary concomitants of nationality. . . . As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family." [400]

The specific powers delegated under the Constitution, however, leave no doubt that the executive-congressional action rendering assistance to the R.V.N. were pursuant to United States constitutional processes.

---

for it. See "War Funds Voted in Senate, 87 to 2," N.Y. Times, March 23, 1966, p. c 13, col. 1 (city ed.).

With respect to foreign economic aid to Viet Nam see "Senate Unit Votes Vietnam Aid Fund—Rejects Policy Riders After Rusk Says Enemy Might Misjudge U.S. Aims," N.Y. Times, March 8, 1966, p. 1, col. 2 (city ed.); Congressional Record 5541–5552, 5555–5563 (March 10, 1966). In reference to this amendment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 Senator Sparkman said:

"I do not consider a vote on this bill as a vote for or against our policies in Vietnam. Many people have regarded the bill as being a statement or restatement of policy. I do not feel that that is true, and I believe that is the feeling of most members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"Senators must decide for themselves whether they consider a vote on the bill as a vote on the administration's policies . . .

"Let me add here that I strongly support our policy in Vietnam, but I do not regard the bill as a reaffirmation of it, and I do not believe it should be considered in that light. . . ."

Id. at 5542.

[393] Congressional Record 6406 (March 21, 1966).

[394] Congressional Record 5804–5805 (March 15, 1966).

[395] *Id.* at 5807.

[396] *Id.* at 5821. For other statements supporting the Viet Nam policy or a broad interpretation of the vote see the remarks of Representative Ford *id.* at 5818, who said: "Mr. Chairman, the approval of this legislation today will back up the policy, the posture, and the position that I think our Government is taking in Vietnam today. . . .

It is crystal clear to me that anyone who votes for this legislation is endorsing the policy currently being executed by the Commander in Chief. . . ." And Representative Ryan said:

"The only opportunity the House has to express its views on foreign policy is when we are asked to authorize or appropriate funds. If we are to participate in this debate on Vietnam policy, we must do so this afternoon. An affirmative vote, no matter [sic] how individual Members of the House may regard it, will be interpreted by the administration and the public as a full endorsement of administration policy. A vote for this bill is a vote for the escalation rider as well. . . ."

Id. at 5821. For a narrower interpretation of the vote on the bill see the remarks of Representative Shriver *id.* at 5819, and Representative Edwards of California *id.* at 5820.

[397] Although certainly without constitutional authority, a recent poll of Congress, based on 272 total replies received, bears out this congressional support of the broad outlines of United States policy in Viet Nam. The reply was from 35 Senators and 237 Representatives. See Congressional Record, March 2, 1966, p. 4625. A sample question and reply is: "In your opinion, is it vital to the United States to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover? House: 206 yes, 20 no. Senate: 28 yes, 6 no." *Ibid.*

[398] See the argument under the SEATO treaty in *The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam,* 12 (Reprint from the March 28, 1966 Department of State Bulletin—Department of State publication 8062, Far Eastern Series 147).

It would seem that the SEATO treaty at least lays down an Executive-Senate policy that the R.V.N. be assisted against future Communist aggression and that aggression against the R.V.N. affects an interest of the United States. It would seem also that at least after the "constitutional processes" requirement of Article IV has been met, the SEATO treaty contributes as a source of authority for the use of the military instrument. Moreover, at least under the language of SEATO it would seem that the Executive can also act pursuant to the policy of SEATO in protecting that interest of the United States to the extent of any independent powers he may possess in the use of the military instrument.

It should be pointed out that the SEATO treaty many bear on a number of legal issues related to United States assistance to the R.V.N., such as the lawfulness of that assistance under international law, whether there is a legal obligation under international law to render such assistance, and the effects on internal constitutional processes with respect to the use of the military instrument. Although related, these issues should be focused on separately as conclusions on one do not necessarily dictate conclusions on another. This note is concerned with the issue of what effect SEATO has on internal constitutional processes with respect to authority for use of the military instrument.

See also note 308 *supra* and note 439 *infra.*

[399] See generally Corwin, The President-Office & Powers 1787–1957 (4th ed. 1957); Corwin, The President's Control of Foreign Relations (1917); Wright, The Control of American Foreign Relations (1922).

[400] 299 U.S. 304, 318 (1936).

The President has broad powers in foreign relations stemming overall from his position as the chief representative of the nation in foreign affairs,[401] his power as Commander-in-Chief[402] and his power to "take care that the laws [including treaties] be faithfully executed." [403] These powers carry substantial authority for the use of armed forces abroad even in the absence of congressional authorization. Former Assistant Secretary of State James Grafton Rogers concludes in his *World Policing and the Constitution* that:

"There is attached as an appendix to this book, a list and a fairly complete one, of the occasions on which the United States has used armed forces abroad from 1789 to 1945. In the few cases in which authority of Congress was found for the employment of guns and men in the occasion, that fact is noted. Such cases are those of the five declared wars and here and there others besides. These cases may not be all recorded because the research to find them would delay us unduly but the number of incidents in which the President sought or got Congressional authority is not far wrong. They are very few, only a dozen or two.

"In all the other affairs listed, running tc well over a hundred, the Executive alone has assumed responsibility. The President or his subordinates, usually admirals or ship commanders, seem not to have doubted their authority to fight in pursuance of national interests. Congress and the American public have accepted that view of executive responsibility, duty and scope. The Constitution has been interpreted by practice. This means of interpretation, even among lawyers, is almost conclusive." [404]

And Craig Mathews has written in an article in the *Yale Law Journal:*

"Constitutional history has shown that the President can take military action under his independent powers whenever the interests of the United States so require. In the modern world the scope of America's interest can be determined only by reference to the state of affairs in the international arena as a whole and to the over-all purposes of our foreign policy. Any rigid test of protectable interest would leave the nation dangerously unequipped for survival.

"On the other hand, the President may not take military action where the interests of the United States are not involved. In the absence of crisis he should defer to the legislature. He is limited here by his own good faith, by the impeachment power of Congress, and by numerous important political considerations, such as the necessity of retaining congressional cooperation and the advisability of permitting military policy to be guided to some extent by public opinion. If these safeguards seem insufficient, it must be remembered that there is no feasible alternative. The circumstances calling forth the exercise of the Commander in Chief power cannot by their nature be anticipated." [405]

The use of a quarter of a million American troops in large-scale hostilities in Korea [406] was apparently also authorized by executive action without either a joint resolution of Congress authorizing the use of armed forces or a formal declaration of war as such. With respect to this Korean action, Craig Mathews has written:

"The controversy evoked by American participation in the Korean conflict illustrates the confusion and the possible perils resulting from use of the outmoded concept of what is a direct effect on American interests. Although it was said that 'the constitutional powers of the President were exceeded and the constitutional powers of the Congress of the United States were bypassed' by our military action in Korea, the action of the President seems well within his independent authority." [407]

Consequently, even if the use of armed forces in Viet Nam were not expressedly authorized by Congress, some existing precedents suggest that in the absence of congressional indication of a contrary policy, such action would be constitutional.

But regardless of the proper limitations on the executive power to use armed forces abroad in the absence of congressional authorization, here the executive is authorized by congressional action, particularly by the combination of the SEATO treaty and the Tonkin Gulf resolution.[408] Professor Quincy Wright in his classic study *The Control of American Foreign Relations* concludes his Chapter on "War and the Use of Force" by saying:

Thus in practice the President has an exceedingly broad discretion to authorize the use of the forces. . . . For political intervention, authorization by special resolution of Congress seems proper and has been the usual practice." [409]

It is clear from the chapter and the context that Professor Wright was referring to action by the use of armed forces. Executive-congressional action since Professor Wright wrote this study bears this statement cut with respect to congressional authorization of executive use of armed force. In 1955 Congress passed a joint resolution with respect to the Formosa crisis which provides that:

"The President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack." [410]

And in 1957 Congress passed a somewhat similar joint resolution dealing with the Middle East indicating that "if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces" to aid Middle Eastern nations requesting assistance against armed Communist aggression.[411] President Eisenhower's use of United

---

[401] See Mathews, *The Constitutional Power of the President to Conclude International Amendments,* 64 Yale L. J. 345, 369–70 (1955).

[402] U.S. Const. art. II, § 2.

[403] U.S. Const. art. II, § 3. See Corwin, The Constitution and What It Means Today, 120–27 (12th ed. 1958). In speaking of the President's authority under the Atlantic Pact to protect the United States from the dangers of an armed attack against a party to the treaty Corwin writes:

"But from the very nature of things, the discharge of this obligation against overt force will ordinarily rest with the President in the first instance, just as has the discharge in the past of the like obligation in the protection of American rights abroad. Furthermore, in the discharge of this obligation the President will ordinarily be required to use force and perform acts of war. Such is the verdict of history, a verdict which has been currently confirmed by our intervention in Korea under the auspices of the United Nations."

Id. at 127. See also Durand v. Hollins, 4 Blatch. 451 (C.C.S.D. N.Y. 1860).

[404] Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution* in 11 America Looks Ahead (World Peace Foundation 1945), at 78–79. Corwin says of this list: "While inviting some pruning, the list demonstrates beyond peradventure the existence in the President, as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, of power to judge whether a situation requires the use of available forces to protect American rights of person and property outside the United States and to take action in harmony with his decision. . . ." Corwin, The Constitution and What it Means Today 126 (12th ed. 1958).

See also Foley, *Some Aspects of the Constitutional Powers of the President* 27 A.B.A.J. 485 (1941). "The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief are not contingent upon a declaration of war by the Congress." *Id.* at 486.

[405] Mathews, *The Constitutional Power of the President to Conclude International Agreements,* 64 Yale L. J. 345, 359–65, at 365 (1955). Also see Jones, *The President, Congress, and Foreign Relations,* 29 Calif. L. Rev. 565 (1941).

"However sound in constitutional theory, a limitation of presidential action in the exercise of military command to measures short of acts of war would seem of little practical significance, in view of the great difficulty of determining even the approximate content of the limiting concept."

Id. at 580. Professor Corwin points out: ". . . Presidents came very early to be recognized as having power to employ the armed forces in defense of the persons and property of Americans situated abroad against attack or imminent danger of it; and this recognition received judicial ratification even prior to the Civil War. And on the basis of these beginings later Presidents have come, as the scope of the interests, both public and private, seeking protection has expanded, to exercise independently of Congressional sanction a virtual *warmaking* power of uncertain dimensions. . . ."

Corwin, The Constitution and What It Means Today 60 (8th ed. 1946). For an opinion seemingly taking a narrow view of the scope of executive authority over the use of the military instrument in the absence of congressional authorization see Talbot v. Seeman, 5 U.S. (1 Cr.) 1 (1801).

[406] See *The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam,* 11–12 (Reprint from the March 28, 1966 Department of State Bulletin—Department of State publication 8062, Far Eastern Series 147).

[407] Mathews, note 405 *supra,* at 363. Also see Douglas, *The Constitutional and Legal Basis for the President's Action in using Armed Forces to Repel the Invasion of South Korea,* 96 Cong. Rec. 9647 (1950).

[408] See note 398 *supra.*

[409] Wright, The Control of American Foreign Relations, 309–310 (1922). Professor Wright also points out that: ". . . [I]f he considers such action essential for the enforcement of acts of Congress and treaties and for the protection of the citizens and territory of the United States, the President is obliged by the Constitution itself to use his power as commander-in-chief to direct the forces abroad, and this duty resting on the Constitution itself cannot be taken away by act of Congress." *Id.* at 307.

". . . Congress may authorize a broad use of force by acts or resolutions applying to particular incidents and by declarations of war.

"According to Justice Story in Martin v. Mott, it belongs to the President himself to interpret the exigencies in which a use of force is justifiable . . . This case aplied to the act of 1795 delegating the President power to call forth the militia, but the same principle would seem valid whatever the source of his authority, whether statute, treaty or the Constitution itself."

Id. at 309.

Professor Wright's conclusion indicates also that it is doubtful whether the executive acting alone has power to use force "for the purpose of bringing pressure upon foreign governments for political objects." *Id.* at 310.

[410] *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 129–30 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

[411] This Middle East resolution provides in pertinent part:

"The President is authorized to undertake in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nations or groups of nations of that area desiring such

States armed forces in Lebanon in 1958 was asserted to be within this resolution.[412]

Once Congress has authorized the use of the armed forces in situations requiring such authorization, and a fortiori in situations not requiring such authorization, the President as Commander-in-Chief has broad discretion in the particularities of the use of those forces. The day to day conduct of hostilities is almost universally said to be within the domain of the Presidency.[413]

Congress, of course, has a plethora of power over the use of armed forces abroad derived from its powers among others to declare war, raise and support armies, provide for defense, make rules for the government and regulations of these forces, and to appropriate funds.[414] When Congress authorizes or approves Presidential use of forces as it did in the Formosa, Middle East and Tonkin Gulf resolutions, then, there can be no question but that the combination of executive-congressional action provides ample constitutional authority. As Mr. Justice Jackson pointed out in a concurring opinion in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*:

> "When the President acts pursuant to an expression or implied authorization of Congress, his authority is at its maximum, for it includes all that he possesses in his own right plus all that Congress can delegate. . . . If his act is held unconstitutional under these circumstances, it usually means that the Federal Government as an undivided whole lacks power."[415]

It is simply not tenable to suggest that the federal government lacks constitutional power to render military assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam. Moreover, it is clear from the *Curtiss-Wright* case that Congress has a broad discretion to delegate authority to the President in foreign affairs pursuant to joint resolution.[416]

The history of executive and congressional action with respect to the use of armed forces abroad indicates that although the major constitutional outlines of the division of power between the executive and legislative branches are not characterized by "bright-line" distinctions, in practice the Executive has great authority and executive action taken pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress would seem to have unimpeachable constitutional authority.

2. No Formal Declaration of War Is Required for Such Executive Congressional Action To Comply With United States Constitutional Processes.

A related constitutional challenge which has been made with respect to the large scale use of armed forces in the assistance of the R.V.N. is that absent a formal declaration of war by Congress the military activities in Viet Nam are unconstitutional. Supporters of this view apparently urge that this conclusion follows even if the use of armed force is otherwise authorized by both Congress and the Executive.[417]

This interpretation is no more required by the language of the Constitution than by historic practice. The Constitution says: "The Congress shall have power . . . to declare war."[418] Certainly this language gives Congress power to declare war. But elementary logic tells us that this syntax does not answer the question whether Congress may choose to authorize the use of armed forces without a formal declaration of war and constitutional practice tells us that it can. From the history of the Constitutional Convention it is evident that most of the framers wished the war power to be largely controlled by Congress rather than reside exclusively in the Executive, although it is clear also that in changing the words "to make war" to "to declare war" it was intended that the President have power with respect to some defensive actions.[419] But again, this intent does not compel the conclusion that Congress may only authorize the use of force by formal declaration of war and that it may not authorize it by joint resolution or otherwise. Moreover, this broad language and intent does not solve the innumerable practical problems of just where executive authority under the Commander-in-Chief power ends and congressional authority begins nor conclusively answer the semantic problems of what was meant by "war", or "declare." As James Grafton Rogers has observed:

> "The question remains: 'What is "war"?' No dictionary or text helps us much. The word has many meanings. It is a contest at arms, a struggle of violence between nations, but clearly not every use of arms nor every contest.
>
> "What is 'declare'? Clearly there is here a distinction from 'making,' or 'waging' or 'conducting' war. There seems in experience

---

assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States."

Id. at 130.

Senator Morse opposed both the Formosa and Middle East resolutions as unconstitutional on grounds substantially identical to his constitutional opposition to the Tonkin Gulf resolution. It would seem that in passing the Formosa and Middle East resolutions the Congress twice previously rejected those arguments. See Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 14, pp. 18428–18430, 18443–18445 (remarks of Senator Morse).

Professor Corwin writes of this resolution:

"... President Eisenhower, with the hearty acclaim of his predecessor, proposed to Congress early in January 1957 that it authorize him to use American armed force as he deemed wise to resist "overt armed aggression" by "any nation controlled by international communism" in the "general area" of the Middle East, and in this connection he asked the right to undertake military aid programs with any nation or group of nations in the area. This is the so-called "Eisenhower Doctrine," first propounded by the President in 1953 in connection with the problem of defending Formosa against attack from the Chinese mainland. In both instances the President was perfectly aware that he could make without congressional approval the disposition of armed forces of the United States that he suggested. His motive for requesting such approval was his belief that it would add materially to the impressiveness of the action he contemplated. Many presidents have at various times requested and received advance assurances of this sort from Congress."

Corwin, The President—Office and Powers 1787–1957 223–24 (4th ed. 1957).

[412] See "Eisenhower Doctrine Defines Aid in Mideast" N.Y. Times, July 16, 1958, p. 3, col. 5. According to the New York Times: "There was no question from either Democrats or Republicans about the President's constitutional authority for sending troops into Lebanon under the justifications he cited." "Critics in Senate Deplore Landing," N.Y. Times, July 16, 1958, p. 1, col. 8, at p. 10, col. 8. See also Krock, "Law and Intervention," N.Y. Times, July 16, 1958, p. 8, cols. 4–5, for the proposition that President Eisenhower's constitutional power to send troops into Lebanon was not seriously questioned.

[413] See Corwin, The President—Office and Powers 1787–1957, 228 258–59 (4th ed. 1957); Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution* in 11 America Looks Ahead, 26–27, 28, 31, 88–89 (World Peace Foundation 1945). According to Rogers, "Congress cannot take over such matters as . . . the command, deployment and use of our army, navy or air corps. *Id.* at 88–89. He further says, however, that:

"(c) The Congress can limit the extent of the armed forces, ground, air and sea, which the President has at his disposal.

"(d) It can, in the form of regulations or appropriations, limit the use of our armed forces, in almost any way, such as to areas, for example.

"(e) It can by limiting appropriations or expanding them introduce great flexibility or great restrictions in the capacity of the Executive to act. . . ."

Id. at 89.

Mr. Justice Jackson said in concurring in *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952), "While Congress cannot deprive the President of the command of the army and navy, only Congress can provide him an army or navy to command. It is also empowered to make rules for the 'Government and Regulation of Land and naval forces,' by which it may to some unknown extent impinge upon even command functions." *Id.* at 644.

[414] U.S. Const. art. I, § 8.

[415] 343 U.S. 579, 635–37 (1952).

[416] Mr. Justice Sutherland pointed out:

"Practically every volume of the United States Statutes contains one or more acts or joint resolutions of Congress authorizing action by the President in respect of subjects, affecting foreign relations, which either leave the exercise of the power to his unrestricted judgment, or provide a standard far more general than that which has always been considered requisite with regard to domestic affairs."

United States v. Curtiss-Wright Corp., 299 U.S. 304, 324 (1936). Also see Jones, *The President, Congress, and Foreign Relations*, 29 Calif. L. Rev. 565 (1941).

"All of the factors which have contributed to the tendency toward congressional delegation of power to the executive department in matters of domestic regulation are present, in more compelling force, with respect to legislation affecting international relations."

Id. at 573. In discussing the *Curtiss-Wright* case Jones said:

"... [T]he language used by Justice Sutherland in his opinion for the Court would seem, in effect, to withdraw virtually all constitutional limitations upon the scope of congressional delegation of power to the President to act in the area of international relations."

Id. at 575. Professor Corwin says of the Lend Lease Act: "In brief, the act delegated to the President the power to fight wars by deputy; to all intents and purposes, it was a qualified declaration of war." Corwin, The President—Office and Powers 1787–1957 239 (4th rev. ed. 1957). See also note 426 *infra*.

[417] See the *Memorandum of Law of Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam*, reprinted in Congressional Record, Feb. 9, 1966, p. 2666, at pp. 2672–2673.

[418] U.S. Const. art. I, § 8.

[419] See Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution*, in 11 America Looks Ahead 27–35 (World Peace Foundation 1945); 5 Elliot's Debates 438–39 (1845).

to be a distinction between declaring and 'commencing' or 'precipitating' or 'provoking.' Declaring is a matter of words and words only."[420]

The Korean conflict, certainly involving large scale hostilities has been termed a "police action" rather than a "war", a distinction which Lauterpacht finds a basis for in international law.[421] Similarly, the objective of the United States military assistance to the R.V.N. is to pursue collective defense goals. As the Korean experience would suggest, this distinction may also have validity for constitutional purposes.[422]

Most importantly, regardless of these distinctions, the language of the Constitution and the policy evident behind it does not say that Congress may only authorize the use of the military instrument by a formal declaration of war and cannot do so by a joint congressional resolution or otherwise.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter said in a concurring opinion in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer:*

"It is an inadmissibly narrow conception of American constitutional law to confine it to the words of the Constitution and to disregard the gloss which life has written upon them."[423]

This is particularly true in an area such as this which is not easily amenable to judicial action.[424] In such an area, "the gloss which life has written upon them" is largely the history and practice of successive Presidents and Congresses, which in turn becomes perhaps the most important indicator of constitutional interpretation. The history and practice here, however, indicates that a formal declaration of war was not constitutionally required in many instances of the use of military force, some of which involved major uses of the military instrument even in the absence of congressional authorization. A fortiori, where Congress has otherwise authorized the use of the military instrument no formal declaration of war would seem to be required, for the means of authorization would seem to be within the discretion of Congress. Throughout the constitutional history of the United States there is apparently no court that has held and no recognized consitutional scholar who has written that collective defense measures authorized pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress are unconstitutional because of the absence of a formal declaration of war.[425] There is simply little if any significant authority for this proposition in the constitutional history of the United States.[426] The great bulk of the available evidence points to the opposite conclusion. As stated by Rogers in his *World Policing and the Constitution* in 1945:

"There can be war without a declaration of Congress. The President has great military authority. It is not all spelled out in the Constitution. Congress can add to it but never much restrict it in military matters.[427]

---

[420] ROGERS, note 419 *supra,* at 34.

[421] See II OPPENHEIM, INTERNATIONAL LAW 224–25 (7th ed. Lauterpacht (1952)).

Lauterpacht also indicates that the purpose of "war" is: "Such a defeat as compels the vanquished to comply with any demand the victor may choose to make. . . ." *Id.* at 208. He also points out that: "Apart from specific treaty obligations, no moral or legal duty exists for a belligerent to stop the war when his opponent is ready to concede the object for which war was made." *Id.* at 225.

It would seem that in both these respects the Viet Nam conflict differs from "war."

[422] According to the State Department:

"The fact that military hostilities have been taking place in Southeast Asia does not bring about the existence of a state of war, which is a legal characterization of a situation rather than a factual description. . . . South Viet-Nam and the United States are engaged in collective defense. . . ."

Statement, March 4, 1965, in *Background Information Relating to Southeast Asia and Vietnam,* Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate 191 (Rev. ed. Comm. Print June 16, 1965).

It should be kept in mind that: "The same exercise of coercion, which may 'legally constitute' 'war' in relation to one rule of law on war, obviously need not at the same stage 'constitute' 'war' in the sense of another rule. . . ." McDougal & Feliciano, *The Initiation of Coercion,* 52 AM. J. INT'L L. 241, 244 (1958).

The Korean conflict in particular gave rise to a series of conflicting cases and articles concerned with whether it was a "war" or not, but usually for insurance purposes. Needless to say, these conflicting determinations on other issues should not be confused as answers to the declaration of war problem. See generally Pye, *The Legal Status of the Korean Hostilities,* 45 GEO. L. J. 45 (1956).

[423] 343 U.S. 579, 593 at 610 (1952).

[424] See the study *prepared for the use of the joint committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate,* 82D CONG., 1ST SESS., POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND THE ARMED FORCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES 4 (Comm. Print Feb. 28, 1951).

"By the nature of things the courts have not been called upon to decide the major conflicts between the President and the Congress in this field. Such clashes seldom present justiciable issues. Where private rights have been involved, the courts have been very careful not to infringe upon the powers of either the President or the Congress. Where possible, they have side-stepped the issue. Where this has not been possible, they have acted almost without exception to affirm the views taken by the President as to the extent of his own authority."

[425] Although it is always difficult to convincingly prove such a negative without unduly prolonging research, at the least a study of the leading works in this area suggests that collective defense measures authorized pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress are not unconstitutional because of the absence of a formal declaration of war. The *Memorandum of Law of Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam,* note 417 *supra* at 2557–59 discusses no authority specifically contra to this proposition. The principal issue has clearly been the allocation of competence in the use of the military instrument between the Executive and the Congress *in the absence of congressional authorization.* Even this issue seems to have been resolved in favor of a broad and still somewhat undefined Executive power to use the military instrument. See generally, CORWIN, THE PRESIDENT'S CONTROL OF FOREIGN RELATIONS 126–167 (1917).

The parallel development of the treaty power lends support to this analysis of the war power. Although the Constitution provides that "[The President] * * * shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur * * *," it is clear today that the President has substantial authority to enter into executive agreements without explicit congressional authorization, and that the congressional-executive agreement pursuant to joint resolution is the functional equivalent of the treaty. See McDougal & Lans, *Treaties and Congressional-Executive or Presidential Agreements: Interchangeable Instruments of National Policy* in MCDOUGAL & ASSOCIATES, STUDIES IN WORLD PUBLIC ORDER 404 (1960).

As Senator FULBRIGHT has pointed out "* * * an executive agreement ratified by joint resolution differs from a treaty largely in name only." *Ibid.*

[426] There is some precedent, however, for individual congressmen questioning some congressional authorizations of Executive use of the military instrument as unconstitutional delegations of the war power. An objection was raised in Congress during the Buchanan administration to a request to confer authority on the President to protect the lives of American citizens in certain Central American countries. President Buchanan answered the objection, indicating that "a very brief examination * * * will place this objection at rest." He said:

"But can Congress only act after the fact, after the mischief has been done? Have they no power to confer upon the President the authority in advance to furnish instant redress should such a case afterwards occur? Must they wait until the mischief has been done, and can they apply the remedy only when it is too late? To confer this authority to meet future cases under circumstances strictly specified is as clearly within the war-declaring power as such an authority conferred upon the President by act of Congress after the deed had been done. In the progress of a great nation many exigencies must arise imperatively requiring that Congress should authorize the President to act promptly on certain conditions which may or may not afterwards arise. Our history has already presented a number of such cases."

See CORWIN, THE PRESIDENT'S CONTROL OF FOREIGN RELATIONS 146–150 at 149–50 (1917).

Another objection was raised on similar grounds by Senators opposed to President Wilson's request for congressional authority to take defensive measures in protection of American shipping. According to Corwin: "The measure passed the House with the usual expedition. In the Senate it met with opposition which eventually, because of the termination of Congress, proved fatal to it." President Wilson, however, who had already indicated that he possessed independent power to take such measures, went ahead and armed American merchant vessels anyway. Corwin comments that: "The President might undoubtedly, had he chosen, have detailed war vessels to escort American merchantmen through the barred areas." *Id.* at 152–56, at 153 and 156 n.28.

The lessons of history do not support a rigid rule as to what is and what is not a permissible delegation of authority to use the military instrument and it would seem that the judgment of Congress and the Executive would certainly be given wide latitude. In view of the Executive's unique position of leadership in foreign affairs, his substantial independent authority in the use of the military instrument, his power as Commander-in-Chief, and the need for flexibility in foreign affairs, rigid objection to delegation is unrealistic. In fact, because the President is Commander-in-Chief any declaration of war or other congressional authorization of the use of the military instrument in reality results in substantial executive decision of policy issues such as the locus of coercion, size and composition of forces employed, etc., many of which may be as important with respect to limitation of conflict as the original decision to use the military instrument. Moreover, when Congress expressly reserves the right to review executive action and withdraw its authority as it did in the Tonkin Gulf resolution, this delegation argument has even less weight. It should also be noted that the congressional authorization of the use of the military instrument in the Tonkin Gulf resolution occurred in a context of continuing aggression against the R.V.N. which is expressly adverted to in the preamble of the Tonkin Gulf resolution as a reason for the congressional action. The resolution, then, is not a blanket delegation by Congress of its war power without knowledge of the circumstances but is an exercise by Congress of that power in a particular context with which Congress was aware.

See also note 416 *supra.*

"A review of our history is a little surprising. Congress has never declared war except as a consequence of the President's acts or recommendation. It has never refused to authorize war when requested by him. Four of our nine serious and extended engagements with force against another nation were conducted without Congress 'declaring war' at all. In fact Congress has never in any case 'declared war' in a strict sense. It has merely recognized the prior existence of the fact."[428]

And the conclusions reached by Rogers in this article were:

"In the first years of the Republic it developed that a 'declaration' of war was not deemed essential to executive use of force against another nation. Hamilton himself said so. Three conflicts were waged with other governments, France, Tripoli and Algiers, within the first twenty-six years of the Republic without a declaration of war. As time has gone on, it has been generally recognized (a) that the initiative and responsibility for war is inevitably and prevailingly executive; (b) that even 'declarations' originate characteristically from the executive side; (c) that 'war' is considered a special category in the use of force, apparently confined to cases of great effort, to major contests designed to crush and conquer another nation. The President has been left free, by general public, political and judicial acquiescence to engage without Congressional authority not only in routine protection of our people and property abroad but in enforcing national aims like the establishment of routes of commerce and above all in prolonged and costly police operations, alone or in conjunction with other powers, intended to reduce foreign nations to orderly behavior by international standards.

"The use of armed force for international police measures does not involve a declaration of war. This country has joined other nations in extensive armed action against the Barbary States, Japan, Korea, Samoa and China to require them to meet civilized standards of international relations and has carried on alone similar large measures against Mexico, Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua to enforce conformity with obligations to the world, all without considering or declaring it 'war.'"[429]

Since James Grafton Rogers made his study, there have been additional important uses of armed forces abroad without a formal declaration of war, particularly in Lebanon and Korea. Although the authority of the President to assist the Republic of Korea in the absence of a formal declaration of war or other explicit congressional authorization was challenged by some as unconstitutional,[430] the consensus seems to be that the Korean action, even in the absence of congressional authorization comparable to that in the Viet Nam situation, was constitutional.[431] Senator DOUGLAS in fact presented a paper to Congress on the constitutional basis for the President's action in using armed forces to repel the aggression against South Korea in which he concluded that despite the absence of a formal declaration of war the President's action was "in thorough harmony with the legislative intent of the framers of the Constitution" and "in line with sound historical precedent."[432]

A pamphlet prepared in 1951 for the use of the joint Senate committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services and entitled *Powers of the President to Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States* explored the lawfulness of the President's action in Korea and concluded that it was constitutional. This study noted that:

"Since the Constitution was adopted there have been at least 125 incidents in which the President, without congressional authorization, and in the absence of a declaration of war, has ordered the Armed Forces to take action or maintain positions abroad. These incidents range from war against the Barbary pirates in Jefferson's time, to the occupation of Iceland under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In many instances of this character the President has acted in accordance with the general opinion of Congress or has sought congressional ratification later. Many such incidents, however, have not been referred to Congress at all."[433]

Since the Supreme Court has held that United States treaty obligations are nevertheless subject to the Constitution,[434] if the formal declaration of war were the only constitutionally permissible means of authorizing the use of the military instrument it would be required in the Korean case also. The Korean conflict, then, even though pursuant to express United Nations authority, would seem to be no stronger a case with respect to whether internal constitutional processes require a formal declaration of war than the Viet Nam conflict. In fact, the more obvious congressional authorization in the Viet Nam conflict makes it at least as strong a case in terms of the declaration of war issue as the Korean situation.

In any event, constitutional history and practice lends strong support to the proposition that no formal declaration of war is constitutionally required when Congress chooses to authorize the use of the armed forces pursuant to joint resolution.

Although these problems are not easily amenable to judicial settlement and usually arise only tangentially in the courts, in *The Prize Cases*,[435] growing out of the Civil War and one of the few pertinent judicial authorities, the Supreme Court indicated that at least in the defense of the United States the President is bound to resist without waiting for legislative authority and that such a use of armed forces is constitutional in the absence of a declaration of war.[436]

Article IV of the SEATO treaty provides that:

"Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would *endanger its own peace and safety*."[437]

And Section 2 of the Southeast Asia Resolution provides that:

"The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia."[438]

In view of this SEATO finding advised and consented to by the Senate, and this Southeast Asia finding approved by the Congress, the authority of the executive-congressional action in Viet Nam would seem to be reinforced to some extent by the reasoning of *The Prize Cases*.[439] As the lan-

---

[427] Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution* in 11 AMERICA LOOKS AHEAD 41 (World Peace Foundation 1945).

[428] *Id.* at 45. "Four prolonged and costly military struggles, three of which ended in treaties of peace, were carried on by the Executive usually with Congressional support in some form, but in every case without any declaration." *Id.* at 54.

[429] *Id.* at 86–88. Rogers also immediately points out: "If there is doubt on this point, Congress can delegate authority to the executive branch, by authorizing it to proceed in conformity with stated principles of policy." *Id.* at 88.

[430] See the statement of A. J. Schweppe, *Hearings before Subcommittee of Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S.J. Res. 1. In S.J. Res. 43,* 83d Cong., 1st Sess. 62 (1953).

[431] See Mathews, *The Constitutional Power of the President to Conclude International Agreements,* 64 YALE L. J. 345, 363 (1955); Douglas, *The Constitutional and Legal Basis for the President's Action in using Armed Forces to Repel the Invasion of South Korea,* 96 CONG. REC. 9647 (1950); POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND THE ARMED FORCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, note 424 *supra,* at 1.

[432] Douglas, note 431 *supra,* at 9649.

[433] POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND THE ARMED FORCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, note 424 *supra,* at 2.

[434] See, *e.g.,* Reid v. Covert, 354 U.S. 1 (1957). Mr. Justice Black wrote: "The United States is entirely a creature of the Constitution. Its power and authority have no other source. It can only act in accordance with all the limitations imposed by the Constitution." *Id.* at 5–6.

[435] 67 U.S. (2 Black) 635 (1862).

[436] The Court said: "He [the President] has no power to initiate or declare a war either against a foreign nation or a domestic state . . .

If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority.": *Id.* at 668.

[437] See note 308 *supra.* (Emphasis added).

[438] 78 Stat. 384 (Approved Aug. 10, 1964). See text at note 320 *supra.*

[439] Former Secretary of State Dulles testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1953 that:

". . . I believe that it is possible that one result of the North Atlantic Treaty is to enlarge somewhat the area within which the President can make war, as against the so-called declaration of war.

"In other words, when the Senate by overwhelming adoption of this treaty said that an attack upon another country would be the same as an attack upon the United States, then it is arguable at least that the proper area within which the President might make war was somewhat enlarged."

Hearings before Subcommittee of Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S.J. Res. 1 & S.J. Res. 43, 83d Cong., 1st Sess. 887 (1953).

Although the language of SEATO is intentionally weaker in this respect than that of NATO, the finding that an armed attack against the R.V.N. would endanger United States "peace and safety" raises the same issues. In any event, here we are concerned with the much stronger case of the permissibility of executive-congressional action not the permissibility of executive action alone.

For a fuller discussion of the President's power to use armed forces under NATO and the congressional history on this point see *Powers of the President to Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States* note 424 *supra,* at 25–27. According to this study, in rejecting a reservation to the treaty introduced by Senator Watkins: "the Senate . . . repudiated the idea that the President could not use the armed forces of the United States to carry out Article 5 without congressional authority." Interestingly, even this proposed reservation introduced by Senator Watkins to limit executive authority to use the military instrument in the absence of congressional authorization seems to contemplate that Congress may authorize the use of the military instrument other than by formal declaration of war. In pertinent part the proposed reservation provided: "That the United States assumes no obligation . . . unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the emguage of the SEATO treaty and the Southeast Asia Resolution are an indication, national defense in the present era may have ties extending beyond the immediate geographic boundaries of the United States. In any event, although not squarely on point, these cases at least provide another authoritative indication that a formal declaration of war is not always required in the use of armed forces.

Several early Supreme Court cases indicate that Congress may authorize hostilities amounting to "war" without formal declaration of war. In the case of *Bas* v. *Tingy*,[440] decided during the August term 1800, a four man Supreme Court agreed that Congress had authorized limited hostilities amounting to a state of war between the United States and France despite absence of a formal declaration of war. Several of the Justices pointed out that Congress need not declare a general war but could authorize lesser uses of the military instrument. Thus, Justice Chase said:

"Congress is empowered to declare a general war, or Congress may wage a limited war, limited in place, in objects, and in time. . . .

"What, then, is the nature of the contest subsisting between America and France? In my judgment, it is a limited, partial war. Congress has not declared war, in general terms; but Congress has authorized hostilities on the high seas, by certain persons, in certain cases.[441]

"If Congress had chosen to declare a general war, France would have been a general enemy; having chosen to wage a partial war, France was, at the time of the capture, only a partial enemy; but still she was an enemy.

"The acts of Congress have been analyzed, to show, that a war is not openly denounced against France, and that France is nowhere expressly called the enemy of America: but this only proves the circumspection and prudence of the legislature." [442]

Justice Washington spoke of a distinction between "solemn" wars "declared in form" [443] and lesser hostilities "more confined in . . . nature and extent" [444] and the implication was that Congress can authorize either type. In indicating that a formal declaration of war was not necessary to authorize limited hostilities amounting to a state of war between France and the United States Justice Washington said: "Such a declaration by congress, might have constituted a perfect [unlimited] state of war, which was not intended by the government." [445] And Justice Paterson said:

"The United States and the French republic are in a qualified state of hostility. An imperfect war, or a war, as to certain objects, and to a certain extent, exists between the two nations; and this modified warfare is authorized by the constitutional authority of our country. It is war *quoad hoc*. As far as congress tolerated and authorized the war on our part, so far may we proceed in hostile operations." [446]

In *Talbot* v. *Seeman*,[447] a similar case decided during the August term 1801, Chief Justice John Marshall, writing for the Court, indicated that Congress had authorized limited hostilities against France, which he referred to as a war, despite the absence of a formal declaration of war. He wrote:

"It is not denied, nor, in the course of the argument, has it been denied, that congress may authorize general hostilities, in which case the general laws of war apply to our situation; or partial hostilities, in which case the laws of war, so far as they actually apply to our situation, must be noticed." [448]

The clear implication of his discussion is that Congress can constitutionally authorize the use of the military instrument other than by formal declaration of war.

Although the ultimate issue in these cases was that of salvage, they reflect judicial cognizance of congressional power to authorize a range of hostilities other than by formal declaration of war.

That Congress, if it so chooses, may constitutionally authorize the use of the military instrument abroad other than by formal declaration of war is also supported by policy considerations. As has been discussed, the policy behind giving Congress power to declare war seems to be that largely of ensuring congressional approval for major uses of the military instrument at least in situations not required by defense of the United States. This purpose can be carried out just as effectively and in many circumstances with a great deal more justification in foreign affairs, by the use of a joint congressional resolution authorizing the use of the armed forces, rather than by a formal declaration of war as such. Such a resolution can in many situations provide Congress as clearcut an issue of the use of the military instrument as the realities of foreign policy allow. In fact, such a resolution may have the advantage of keeping the issue before Congress when Congress reserves the right as it did in the Tonkin Gulf resolution to terminate the resolution by a later concurrent congressional resolution not requiring presidential signature. The record of the debate on the Tonkin Gulf resolution suggests that Congress was quite conscious that it was authorizing the use of the military instrument. And no one reading the record of the debates in Congress or watching the national televised hearings on Viet Nam before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [449] can reasonably doubt that there had been a full-scale congressional debate on United States policy in Viet Nam by the time the Senate voted 92 to 5 on March 1, 1966, to table an amendment to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution.[450] Such a full-scale congressional debate is, of course, imperative on an issue of such crucial national importance. It can be achieved, though, without a formal declaration of war. [451] And regardless of what sophistry is employed to argue otherwise, in tabling this amendment and in not otherwise reexamining the Tonkin Gulf resolution Congress was at least acquiescing in the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief to commit combat units to Viet Nam pursuant to the authority of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Professor Corwin has pointed out that foreign policy depends heavily on congressional cooperation.[452] If Congress fundamentally disagreed with the President on a military involvement as large as Viet Nam, such a policy would be impossible. For as we have seen in relation to Viet Nam, Congress must advise and consent to ratification of treaties, raise and support armies, appropriate funds, and enact necessary tax measures to finance the operations, just to name some of its checks.[453] In addition, at least for constitutional purposes,[454] Congress has the power to repeal treaties or other national commitments,[455] and to repeal any joint resolutions providing increased presidential authority for the use of the military instrument, as it specifically reserved the right to do by concurrent resolution pursuant to section 3 of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

There may be serious disadvantages to requiring a formal declaration of war as the only method of congressional authorization. As Lauterpacht has pointed out there seem to be differences in international law between collective defense actions and "war," [456] and certainly a formal declaration of war would seem to undercut claims of limited defensive objectives. In addition, such a formality might inhibit the possibilities of negotiation in a situation where the country strongly wishes to maximize those possibilities. As has been pointed out:

"To declare war would add a new psychological element to the international situation, since in this century declarations of

---

ployment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide . . . . *Id*. at 26.

For some of the differences between NATO and SEATO see the text at note 312 *supra*.

See also *The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam* 12 (Reprint from the March 28, 1966 Department of State Bulletin—Department of State publication 8062, Far Eastern Series 147), and note 398 *supra*.

[440] (The Eliza) 4 U.S. (4 Dall.) 36 (1800).

[441] *Id*. at 43.

[442] *Id*. at 44.

[443] *Id*. at 39.

[444] *Id*. at 40.

[445] *Id*. at 40.

[446] *Id*. at 45.

[447] (The Amelia) 5 U.S. (1 Cr.) 1, 25 (1801).

[448] *Id*. at 27.

[449] Hearings were conducted on January 28, February 4, February 8, February 10, February 17, and February 18, 1966. THE VIETNAM HEARINGS vi (Vintage ed. 1966). The testimony of the principal witnesses was extensively televised. *Id*. at ix-x. See also note 372 *supra*.

[450] See note 377 *supra*.

[451] And even a formal declaration of war is no guarantee of a meaningful congressional debate. James Grafton Rogers writes that:

"Only once in our history was the wisdom of entering war debated or really submitted to the process characteristic of legislative action. This was in the War of 1812. In the other four cases, the war was decreed, in effect practically unanimously, very promptly and without more than formal debate."

Rogers *World Policing and the Constitution*, in 11 AMERICA LOOKS AHEAD 54 (World Peace Foundation 1945).

[452] "Presidential initiative in the formulation of our foreign policy is a familiar fact. . . . It is likewise a familiar fact that the ultimate viability of an executive policy in this field will depend upon the backing of public opinion as reflected in Congress, or in the Senate, and not a few Presidential programs have had to be abandoned outright or modified because of their failure to obtain this backing; as for instance, Adams and Clay's Pan-American policy, Pierce's Cuban Policy, Grant's Santo Domingo policy, Cleveland's Hawaiian policy. Finally, in one or two instances Congressional pressure has forced unwelcome policies upon a reluctant Executive, the principal examples being the War of 1812 and the intervention in Cuba in 1898."

CORWIN, THE PRESIDENT'S CONTROL OF FOREIGN RELATIONS 126–127 (1917).

"But whatever emphasis be given the President's role as 'sole organ of foreign relations' and the initiative thereby conferred on him in this field, the fact remains that no presidentially devised diplomatic policy can long survive without the support of Congress . . . CORWIN, THE PRESIDENT—OFFICE AND POWERS 1787–1957 184–85 (4th ed. 1957).

[453] See generally, CORWIN, THE PRESIDENT—OFFICE AND POWERS 1787–1957 170, 204 (4th ed. 1957); Rogers, *World Policing and the Constitution* in 11 AMERICA LOOKS AHEAD 85–91 (World Peace Foundation 1945).

[454] Otherwise valid international obligations would remain so. See CORWIN, note 453 *supra*, at 196.

[455] See CORWIN, note 453 *supra*, at 196.

[456] See note 421 *supra*.

war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy. It would increase the danger of misunderstanding of our true objectives in the conflict by the various Communist states, and increase the chances of their expanded involvement in it. Such a declaration would question the continued validity of the President's statements concerning his desire for a peaceful settlement allowing the various nations of the area, including North Viet Nam, to live together in economic cooperation, and his reiteration that we do not threaten the existence of North Viet Nam.

"On balance, a declaration of war—which would be the first since the signing of the United Nations Charter—would significantly reduce the flexibility of the United States to seek a solution among extremely complex factors and reduce the chances that our adversary will take a reasoned approach to a resolution, when US policy from the beginning has attempted to avoid closing off any possible avenue of resolution and to make the North Vietnamese more rather than less rational in the situation." [457]

As long as there is any possibility that a formal declaration of war might inhibit negotiations and a peaceful settlement, such a formality should be avoided.[458]

Particularly since the advent of the United Nations, after which generally speaking the use of force is only permissible in individual or collective defense or through authorized United Nations action, it would seem that in most instances the formal declaration of war is too rigid as a means of congressional authorization of the use of the military instrument. In these circumstances, policy does not support a rigid requirement that the formal declaration of war is the only method by which the United States can use the military instrument or by which Congress can authorize the use of armed force.

As Senator DOUGLAS pointed out in his paper on the constitutional basis for the President's military action in Korea:

"There is indeed a good reason, besides the need for speed, why the President should have been permitted to use force in these cases without a formal declaration of war by Congress. That is because international situations frequently call for the retail use of force in localized situations which are not sufficiently serious to justify the wholesale and widespread use of force which a formal declaration of war would require.

"In other words, it may be desirable to create a situation which is half-way between complete peace, or the absence of all force, and outright war marked by the exercise of tremendous force on a wholesale scale. This is most notably the case when big powers deal with small countries, and in situations where only a relatively temporary application of force is needed to restore order and to remove the threat of aggression.

"Such an intermediate method is also particularly useful when dealing with satellite or puppet states of another big power. Force can be used against a satellite without necessarily stirring up the opposing big power, as would almost certainly occur were war formally to be declared. It is made easier, therefore, for the other big power lurking in the background to save its face by pretending not to notice what is happening to its satellite, and therefore in effect to disavow it." [459]

Possibly also, a formal declaration of war might in some situations of what would otherwise be a limited defensive conflict trigger mutual defense treaties with third powers thus enlarging the conflict, or precipitate other undesirable consequences under international or domestic law.[460] Moreover, a study of *Hostilities Without Declaration of War* compiled as long ago as 1883 indicates that historically the nations of the world have frequently utilized the power to engage in hostilities without a formal declaration of war. In fact, the British author of this study found that:

"Circumstances have occurred in which 'declarations of war' have been issued prior to hostilities; but during the 171 years here given (from 1700 to 1870 inclusive), less than ten instances of the kind have occurred. . . .

"On the other hand, 107 cases are recorded in which hostilities have been commenced by the subjects of European Powers or of the United States of America against other powers without declaration of war." [461]

Historically, then, nations including the United States have frequently found it appropriate not to formally declare war when engaging in hostilities. This practice continues today as is evident from the hostilities in Korea, the hostilities in Indochina, from 1947 to 1954, the hostilities in the Suez Canal incident in 1956, and the hostilities in West New Guinea between the Dutch and Indonesians in 1962, all of which took place without a formal declaration of war.[462] In fact, it has been recently said that:

"There has not been a formal declaration of war—anywhere in the world—since World War II." [463] In the light of this history, to interpret the Constitution to require that Congress may only authorize the use of armed force by a formal declaration of war might unduly restrict the courses of action open to the United States vis-a-vis the other nations of the world as well as militate against limitation of conflict. The United States must be able to meet armed aggression flexibly, utilizing a whole range of strategies from the non-coercive ranging through varying degrees of coercion and always employing constitutional procedures facilitating preference for the least amount of coercion necessary.

In short, a formal declaration of war may in many cases of armed conflict for one reason or another be an overdeclaration with unfortunate consequences for foreign relations. Such a formal declaration is admitted by all to be clearly undesirable in the Viet Nam conflict.[464] Policy considerations suggest, then, that the Constitution be interpreted as not requiring the formal declaration of war as the only method of congressional authorization of the use of the military instrument.

The language of the Constitution and the intent of the framers, the history, practice, policy and available judicial precedent do not require a formal declaration of war to constitutionally authorize the United States action in Viet Nam in the present context of executive-congressional action, and together they strongly suggest that no such declaration of war is required. As a result, in the absence of any comparable precedent to the contrary, it seems clear that the executive-congressional action rendering assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is lawful under United States constitutional processes.

Whether executive-congressional authorization of the use of armed force is per se unconstitutional in the absence of a formal declaration of war is simply not a significant constitutional problem. The significant problems are what authority the Executive has to use armed forces in the absence of congressional authorization and what authority is granted to each of the executive and legislative branches in a situation of disagreement between the branches as to the use of armed force. In the light of the history of congressional action on Viet Nam these problems are certainly not presented with respect to the use of the armed forces in Viet Nam. Under our Constitution the President has broad and somewhat undefined powers as Commander-in-Chief to use the military instrument and particularly to control the military particularities in the use of that instrument. With regard to the power given to Congress, however, it would seem that in a situation of substantial use of the military instrument such as in Viet Nam, Congress should have a major role in terms of permissibility of the broad outlines of the continuing use of the military instrument. That is a role which Congress has significantly participated in with respect to Viet Nam, and is one in which Congress should continue to participate.

---

[457] *The Question of a Formal Declaration of War in Vietnam*, Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State (4/43—1265BT), at 1.

"The policy of the United States in Viet Nam is to assist the Government of the Republic of Viet Nam, at the latter's request, in thwarting an armed aggression from North Viet Nam and to achieve a workable settlement of the dispute among the principal parties involved. This policy is pursued with limited aims, seeking to end the aggression against South Viet Nam without threatening the destruction of North Viet Nam, allowing a miscalculation by the enemy as to our intentions, or unnecessarily enlarging the scope of the conflict. The United States believes that the struggle must be won primarily in South Viet Nam and is in that context a defensive military effort."

Ibid.

[458] Not surprisingly, the D.R.V. itself has stopped short of the drastic step of formally declaring war on the United States. Information supplied by the office of the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Viet Nam to the United Nations on May 27, 1966. For the address of the office of the Permanent Observer see note 108 *supra*.

[459] Douglas, *The Constitutional and Legal Basis for the President's Action in Using Armed Forces to Repel the Invasion of South Korea*, 96 CONG. REC. 9647, 9648 (1950).

[460] With respect to a formal declaration of war against the Viet Cong or the N.L.F., for example, such a declaration might amount to a premature recognition as a belligerency or government, thus artificially upgrading their status under international law and possibly weakening the legal position of the recognized government of the R.V.N. Moreover, since there is evidence that the N.L.F. does not control the Viet Cong military apparatus, query whether a declaration against the N.L.F. as such would be realistic. See text at note 145 *supra*.

With respect to domestic law, a formal declaration of war may trigger undersirable consequences better reserved for the "total war" situation. It might, for example, unnecessarily increase the executive "war power" thereby militating against congressional oversight of the use of the military instrument or its domestic consequences. It might also unncessarily inhibit maximization of the rights of free speech, travel and other civil liberties, whether through "positive law" or public opinion.

See also *The Question of a Formal Declaration of War in Vietnam*, note 457 *supra*, at 3. ". . . [T]here are only a few laws which can become operative only in time of war, and they have not been found necessary for the conduct of hostilities in Viet-Nam." *Ibid.*

[461] MAURICE, HOSTILITIES WITHOUT DECLARATION OF WAR 4 (1883).

This study is concerned with cases in which hostilities were commenced prior to formal declaration of war, and the number of cases in this study in which there was never a declaration of war would be substantially lower.

In the circumstances of the armed attack by the D.R.V. against the R.V.N. there is certainly no issue of surprise commencement of hostilities with respect to the responding United States actions directed at interdicting the armed attack from the D.R.V. See generally Eagleton, *The Form and Function of the Declaration of War*, 32 AM. J. INT'L. L. 19 (1938).

[462] See *The Question of a Formal Declaration of War in Vietnam*, note 457 *supra*, at 2.

[463] The statement is from an address by Secretary of Defense McNamara to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on May 18, 1966. N.Y. Times, May 19, 1966, p. c 11, col. 1 (city ed.), at col. 2.

[464] Senator MORSE has said: "I am not for a declaration of war in Vietnam. I do not believe there are sufficient grounds for it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 21, 1966, p. 6406.) The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam asserts that: "In pointing out that the President lacks constitutional power to make war, our committee does not imply that a declaration of war by the Congress is desirable." Letter from the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam to President Lyndon B. Johnson, January 25, 1966, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 9, 1966, p. 2666.

CONCLUSION

United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg recently said:

"Our nation derives its great influence in the world not only from great physical power, but also from the fact that our basic law and our national outlook are premised on the equality and dignity of all men.

"The way to peace in this turbulent age is to keep to that national vision, to work with all our might for the establishment of a structure of law that will be reliable and just to all nations.

"For though law alone cannot assure world peace, there can be no peace without it. Our national power and all our energies should operate in the light of that truth." [465]

The United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is a lawful policy alternative. That lawfulness means compliance within the spirit of Ambassador Goldberg's words with the basic structures of international law and the United Nations; structures designed to promote self-determination and world public order. In carrying out policies within these structures "our national power and all our energies" must continue to be used to maximize the prospects for peace and secure self-determination and economic and social progress to the people of the Republic of Viet Nam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS VIETNAM VICTORY POLICY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate have long recognized, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is an organization that has made critically important contributions to the strengthening of our national security.

This leadership, which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has provided, has been particularly helpful with respect to the war in which we are engaged in South Vietnam. The VFW has, as an organization, demonstrated a truly remarkable understanding of the strategy of the Pacific area, the importance of South Vietnam, and the need for a clear-cut U.S. victory in that conflict.

Consequently, I am confident that Members of this Senate will be pleased to know of an outstanding editorial tribute which has recently been accorded the Veterans of Foreign Wars and Mr. Andy Borg, of Superior, Wis., who is the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is a matter of satisfaction to me that such fine editorial comment with respect to the VFW appeared in the highly regarded editorial columns of the San Diego Evening Tribune on June 28, 1966.

The editorial quoted extensively from the remarks of the VFW national commander, Andy Borg, emphasizing the need to win in Vietnam and, also, why the United States must not be dissuaded, in fear of what the Kremlin or Red China might do, from taking all necessary steps to win the war.

I am also confident that the many Members of this Senate who have shared my admiration for the leadership which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has given our country in matters of national security will concur with the San Diego Evening Tribune editorial opinion that "the VFW chief and the national organization he heads are doing a public service in taking such a forceful stance."

Because of the importance of this editorial appearing in the San Diego Evening Tribune, which is one of the much respected Copley publications, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, June 28, 1966]

VFW'S VIET VICTORY POLICY PUTS BACKBONE INTO AMERICA

The United States must win the war in Viet Nam in the interest of America's vital national security.

This is a plain truth which the Veterans of Foreign Wars, now meeting in San Diego, has long espoused with vigor and conviction.

It is something which needs to be said and believed by the American people whose lives and prosperity, as well as the nation's honor, are bound up in this conflict.

And particularly it is something that needs to be said for the benefit and belief of the enemy we are fighting in Viet Nam and those who are supporting him.

Andy Borg, commander in chief of the VFW, here for the 40th annual meeting of the California department, put the issue this way:

"It is up to the United States to unite and convince the world. If the United States ever become convinced that it will go all the way, the war will go to the peace table with either a complete victory or a just and honorable peace."

Borg, an attorney from Superior, Wis., explained it this way: If a trial lawyer makes it clear from the very outset that he is prepared to go all the way up to a jury, a settlement is more likely.

Temporizing and shilly-shallying only make certain the loss of respect, not only of friends and allies, but also of our enemies. Our will and resolve are forever after cast in doubt. And that way lies destruction.

One of the most convincing ways the United States could show it means business, in the view of the VFW, is by cutting off shipping to North Viet Nam by blockade and, if necessary, by mining the port of Haiphong.

This would apply to ships of all nations—Russian, allies or otherwise—the primary consideration being our resolve that neither friends or enemies should be sending supplies to Viet Nam to kill Americans.

There have been timid and phony arguments against such forceful and convincing action.

One argument is that we cannot risk antagonizing friendly shipping nations because we are so short of ships under the American flag we must depend on them for help.

These nations who are now supplying the Communists are motivated by money, not ideology. When and as a blockade caused their risk insurance to rise astronomically, we should see a dramatic end to this trafficking with our enemy. Rather than boycotting American business, they might well look for more to replace that lost through blockade.

As for angering the Russians to the point that they would try to run the blockade, Borg has a good, straightforward American answer:

"Let them worry about that." If a Kennedy-type blockade worked around Cuba, why shouldn't one work off Viet Nam?

And as for Red China entering the war, the odds are long against it. Communist China is caught in a tight economic squeeze. It fears reprisal bombing by the United States and a Nationalist Chinese move to the mainland. It has no repair parts for war machinery formerly supplied by the Soviet Union. Moving men and material to South Viet Nam would be extremely difficult.

"The Red Chinese would not have anything to gain by entering the war because at the present time they are fighting the war with North Viet Nam soldiers without the loss of face and men and supplies," Borg pointed out in San Diego the other day.

The VFW chief and the national organization he heads are doing a public service in taking such a forceful stance.

The VFW is expressing the attitude of the American people, whose way always has been to win the war and an honorable peace.

AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE OVERSEAS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on June 8, I introduced an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 to strengthen our support of adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations. I have been deeply disturbed by the nearly unanimous opinion of experts that such research has been grossly neglected in our foreign aid programs, even though it has been indispensable to the unmatched progress of agriculture in our own land.

Since I introduced this amendment, cosponsored by my distinguished colleagues, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PELL, I have been gratified to receive letters of support from a number of experts in the field of agricultural assistance overseas, as well as organizations such as the National Council of Churches which have a deep moral concern over the threat of hunger and starvation in developing countries.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of these letters in support of my amendment be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

---

[465] N.Y. Times, May 19, 1966, p. 6, col. 4 (city ed.), at col. 5. (Typographical errors corrected).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONDALE. I am most gratified also that, in its report to the Senate on the foreign aid legislation, the Foreign Relations Committee saw fit to endorse the substance of my amendment. On page 11 of this report, there is a declaration that:

> The Committee believes that in countries where food production is not keeping pace with the demands of expanding populations, or where diets are seriously deficient, high priority should be given to promoting agricultural development, particularly programs to establish or expand research designed to adapt existing knowledge and techniques to new situations.

I continue to feel that this language should be contained in the law itself, together with a statement that:

> Such research programs, to the greatest extent possible, should be based on co-operative undertakings between universities and research institutions in the developing countries and United States universities and research institutions.

This objective would be accomplished by the adoption of my amendment.

Because of the urgent need to improve food production in developing countries, and the insufficient efforts made in this direction in past years, I feel that the Congress cannot be too firm in insisting that the highest priority be placed on this objective.

EXHIBIT 1

INTERNATIONAL MINERALS &
CHEMICAL CORP.,
July 7, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for the note advising me of your amendment to pending foreign aid legislation designed to encourage increased emphasis on supporting adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations.

Certainly adequate and properly conducted research is a requisite for the intelligent and most productive use under varying local conditions, of the various food production tools which can and must be made available to agriculture in developing countries.

You and your associates are to be commended for your efforts to increase the emphasis on research toward that end.

Communication to members of the Senate on behalf of the proposed amendment is now being prepared, and we will be pleased to make favorable reference to the amendment where possible in appropriate public utterances by representatives of the corporation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. WARE.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Davis, Calif., June 28, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter of June 13th and for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 8th as well as for the copy of your Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The Amendment is excellent. I concur in it wholeheartedly.

As you probably know, some thirty states were lately represented at a meeting of Directors of International Agricultural Programs sponsored by the University of Minnesota. The consensus at this meeting, I believe, was that our institutionalized agricultural science, with necessary adaptations of course, can serve as an instrument for economic development abroad far beyond any past uses. At the same time many of us feel that the potentialities of this projection of our agricultural research institutions abroad are very poorly understood in the United States even—and perhaps especially—in educational and scientific circles which are often most influential in shaping our policies of foreign technical assistance. I hope very much that the International Agricultural Program Directors in the several states will keep in close touch with each other as well as with senators like you and Senators BURDICK, MCGOVERN and PELL so that we may, as rapidly as possible, formulate programs of technical assistance abroad which make sense in terms of our own institutional framework, including our universities and also the fine research facilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and make sense also in terms of the needs of recipient countries. But beyond all this we need very much to put our formulation in terms that justify Congressional support. For myself, I am convinced that as rapidly as possible we should try to get such support through the authorization by Congress of annual federal appropriations upon the assurance of which long-term technical assistance programs can be planned and executed. All this I think is very much in keeping with your own reflections on the subject and with the Amendment you have proposed.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Professor John Blackmore at the University of Minnesota who is exercising considerable leadership in this field.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES M. HARDIN,
Director, International
Agricultural Center.

cc: Professor John Blackmore, Director, International Agricultural Programs, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF, INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 20, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for sharing with us a copy of your speech on the need to encourage increased emphasis on supporting adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations. We agree with you that expanded efforts in this area are vital to any long-term solution to the world food crisis.

We do have one reservation. Where your amendment says that "such research programs, to the greatest extent possible, should be based on cooperative undertakings between universities and research institutions in the developing countries and United States universities and research institutions", we would prefer that the wording be *to the extent practicable* rather than "to the greatest extent possible".

Because we agree with you on the importance of encouraging such research in developing countries, we are sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Very sincerely yours,

OVE R. NIELSEN,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

UNITED CHURCH BOARD
FOR HOMELAND MINISTRIES,
June 20, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: The Reverend Mr. McCanna has referred a copy of your Amendment to the Foreign Aid legislation regarding agricultural research in hungry nations to me. I am very much in favor of supporting this amendment and so state my position. I have two brothers working in Africa as deputy directors of the Peace Corps and the Foreign Aid program. I have seen at close range the results of this kind of assistance and am heartily in support of it. Your amendment would sharpen the focus of the aid in bringing the resources of the universities and research institutions to these development programs.

I have followed your leadership in the Senate with interest and heartily back you.

Sincerely yours,

SERGE F. HUMMON.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT
COLLEGES,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In reply to your recent letter to Dr. Elton Johnson of our International Rural Development Office concerning your proposed amendment No. 587 to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966:

There is no question but that increased emphasis needs to be placed on supporting adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations. By making this emphasis a matter of priority in legislative intent, your amendment would be most helpful. May I say, also that the authority requested by the administration to make grants to support the capacity of universities to conduct technical assistance work abroad, and to extend the authorization for technical assistance over a 5-year period, both are most relevant to the objective you seek, and I trust they will be included in some form in the final legislation.

Universities must be able both to involve highly competent people in their overseas programs, and at the same time maintain a high level of competence at home. Some assurance of continuity of program is also essential.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL I. THACKREY,
Executive Director.

Cc.: Chancellor John T. Caldwell.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Raleigh, July 5, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter relative to the amendment you have introduced to the pending foreign aid legislation. This is a most significant amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. We feel that a critical need exists for the establishment and expansion of adaptative agricultural research programs of Land-Grant colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture with foreign institutions.

We would like to second your view that we have had too much of a transfer of information bias in our foreign assistance programs. This same caution would apply to the concept of adaptative research unless it is clearly understood that adaptation of agricultural technological experiences will require creative, imaginative and experimental processes and not merely copying of work previously accomplished. It is not a simple process, but rather one that must be viewed in a long-run context and one requiring the development of an optimum number and size of research institutions.

Viewed in this context, it is important that two essential elements be included. First, that the programs be conducted with indigenous institutions and governments committed to the adaptative research philosophy and those that have demonstrated genuine concern by initiating actions to develop such educational and research capacity. Secondly, that the concept of grants rather than contracts with interested and capable United States universities be developed that will permit long-term commitments on the part of these institutions.

At North Carolina State University we have been engaged in adaptative agricultural research in Peru and are now programming expansions in this area. Enactment of your amendment would provide essential support for the objectives of this and other United States institutions.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Caldwell,
Chancellor.

Cc.: Dean H. B. James, School of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

Church World Service,
New York, N.Y., June 30, 1966.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: I appreciated very much your letter and the attached amendment to the pending foreign aid legislation designed to encourage increased emphasis on supporting adopted agricultural research overseas. As you are well aware, we also are deeply concerned with this problem of world hunger and the lifting of agricultural production in the developing countries. I see that your proposal would further these mutual desires.

While something along this line is apparently included in the intent of the new Food For Freedom legislation, I endorse its inclusion also in the foreign aid legislation. It seems to me that we cannot emphasize too strongly the need for this type of research which you have proposed.

I hope that you will take the liberty of sharing this letter with your colleagues.

For your information, I shall be out of the office until mid-August and in the interim, should you desire to keep us abreast of developments, I would suggest that you might want to communicate with James MacCracken, Executive Director of Church World Service.

In the meantime, thank you very much for sharing this information with me.

Sincerely yours,

Melvin B. Myers,
Director, Material Resources Program.

Cc.—Mr. James MacCracken, Mr. Henry McCanna.

New York, N.Y.,
June 15, 1966.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.:

Your proposed amendment "strengthening adaptive research" is most necessary and creative and we pledge our support. Also alerting all other town and country church leaders.

Dr. Henry A. McCanna,
Commission on the Church in Town and Country, National Council of Churches.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today, July 13, marks the first anniversary of the Environmental Science Services Administration. One year ago the three offices of the Department of Commerce which were dealing separately with research into the various aspects of the natural environment were merged into one unit within the Department. The previous three offices were the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory, the latter of which was formerly a part of the Bureau of Standards.

The reorganization has permitted the agency to extend and expand its scientific capability. The result in the past year alone has been an expanded research program into oceanography and sea-air interaction, an intensified and detailed study of the Gulf Stream, and research into changes engendered in both the air and the ocean when cold air masses move from the land over the sea.

Of immediate and direct benefit to the public has been the creation of a single source of warnings of environmental hazards by the creation of ESSA.

I am hopeful that appropriations will be forthcoming in this session so that we can take full advantage of this new capability for early warnings of natural disasters. The Environmental Science Services Administration has requested funds to establish a formal service for reporting and warning of weather conditions. The system called the natural disaster warning system, would provide for upgrading and expanding detection facilities, communications capability and community preparedness procedures, especially in those areas of the country which are plagued by tornadoes, hurricanes, cyclones, floods, and even blizzards and forest fires.

Natural disasters such as these claim 500 to 600 lives annually and cause losses of between $11 and $15 billion annually.

It is estimated that the number of deaths could be reduced by one-half, and about $100 million could be saved annually if the nadwarn system, as it is nicknamed, were put into operation.

I have spoken before, here in the Senate, and urged that the proposal receive favorable consideration in the appropriations committees.

I think the Environmental Science Services Administration has a bright future ahead of it. I congratulate it on the progress it has made in the space of 1 short year. I understand that today is open house day at the various ESSA offices around the country, to give the public a chance to become acquainted with ESSA's various functions. I wish that time permitted me to take such a tour, but I hope that many Americans have the time to take advantage of ESSA's invitation.

I hope also that actions can be taken to set up the nadwarn system this year. There is a great need for this program in my own State, as I am sure there is a similar need throughout the Nation.

THE VITAL ROLE OF OCEAN SHIPPING

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Rear Adm. John Harllee, U.S. Navy, retired, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, has excellent qualifications to speak on the full dimensions of sea power.

As a naval officer, he saw U.S. merchant ships deliver the goods to Korea, disproving the views of some persons who demeaned the importance of the Nation's merchant marine following World War II.

As Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, he has seen our merchant marine deliver the goods in Vietnam, again disproving the views of those persons who would let our merchant marine dwindle to extinction.

He knows that U.S. military and commercial ships carry more than 95 percent of U.S. aid and two out of three military personnel sent to Vietnam.

It was these experiences, these facts, that led Admiral Harllee, in a National Maritime Day speech in Seattle, to make the observation that "whether all-out peace or all-out war—or anywhere between—the role of ocean shipping is vital."

In that speech, Admiral Harllee also paid a well-deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] by describing him as the Pacific Northwest's "greatest maritime asset."

Because Admiral Harllee knows of what he speaks, I ask unanimous consent that his National Maritime Day speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Rear Adm. John Harllee, U.S. Navy, Retired, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Before a Joint Luncheon of the Propeller Club, Port of Seattle Chamber of Commerce, at Seattle, Wash., on May 20, 1966

Thirty three years ago, National Martime Day was proclaimed, for the first time, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The son of a former ship-owner and ship's master, FDR stated that May 22 was selected in recognition of the sailing of the first trans-Atlantic steamship, *SS Savannah* 114 years earlier. ". . . thus making a material contribution to the advancement of ocean transportation." These were the key words of President Roosevelt's proclamation.

There are now about one dozen "days" similarly celebrated nation-wide and supported with the dignity of a Presidential proclamation. In 1933, however, there were only two, Maritime Day, and Child Health Day. Thus, National Maritime Day is, in a sense, a pioneer holiday, and it has been honored by five Presidents.

In proclaiming this year's National Maritime Day, President Lyndon B. Johnson touched not only on the past, but also mentioned the merchant marine's importance to the present and future.

He said;

"Throughout our history, American ships have contributed to the development of our modern economy, as well as to the strength and unity of the country. As this Nation's economy continues to expand, we will continue to need ships. . . ."

The President said;

"Our merchant marine is also vital to our friends all over the world. The transportation of surplus commodities . . . is an important part of our foreign aid program.

"As long as the United States may be called upon to defend the Free World's interests anywhere on the globe, our ships are necessary to insure continuous supply of the military materiel that helps to prevent or defeat aggression by any country."

So says our President.

Now, it would certainly be remiss if we let World Trade Week and Maritime Day go by without saying a word about the wonderful Congressional team that the State of Washington has sent to the Congress.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Scoop Jackson and Congressman Tom Pelly have a splendid record of supporting American shipping and industry. The public welfare is deeply in the debt of these gentlemen for their work in assuring the existence of the fourth arm of defense, which our merchant marine constitutes.

To the credit of the other gentlemen of the State of Washington delegation they too, coming from a coastal state, know the value of shipping to our commerce and our defense. Their votes have been a supporting and sustaining influence in necessary maritime legislation.

Permit me to say a few special words about Senator Magnuson.

Senator Magnuson, on the Washington scene, is today regarded as one of our Nation's senior statesmen. In matters of commerce, trade, maritime affairs, air, sea and land transportation, he finds himself playing the role of the strong right arm of the President of the United States.

As a supporter of the Democratic party, Senator Magnuson turned out 7,000 persons to pay tribute to the Lyndon Johnson administration at $100 a head and, believe me, that took a lot of leadership.

Senator Magnuson is turning his energies to the Transportation Bill which seeks to prepare this Nation to enter the 21st century in the field of transport.

Senator Magnuson carries the burden in seeking adequate safety of life-at-sea standards to protect our Nation's growing cruise trade. As Chairman of the Commerce Committee of the United States Senate, he is doing an excellent job, and our splendid economic growth and progress has upon it Maggie's hallmark.

I can tell you first-hand that the greatest maritime asset this State and the Pacific Northwest has is its senior Senator.

No man knows more, or does more, to promote and protect our merchant marine.

The one thing I know for certain is this; whenever the Commission is considering a case involving this area, I will hear from the Senator on behalf of his constituents.

Now, unquestionably the two figures of greatest interest to the Port of Seattle are total imports and total exports. These are also figures of national significance—and our exports must be stressed. There is a dangerous trend here. Though our exports are greater than our imports and though both are increasing, the latter are gaining on the former.

To exports-imports must be added a third factor; our dollar expenditures overseas. These form a vast dollar output, comprised of such items are defense programs, direct business investments, AID programs, and the deficit in the tourism account. It is the stacking of this third factor on top of exports-imports that presents us the grim facts on our balance of trade.

I do not expect that our imports will go anywhere but up; nor do I foresee the time when our overseas dollar expenditures will slack off—not with the world situation being what it is. Therefore, it is to our overseas exports that we must look for the solution, for it is the overseas-export dollar that brings back home the dollar being spent overseas.

Turning the spotlight on your own fine port, we find—in the 1965 report—that exports here totaled 1.23 million tons—an excellent year for exports. For imports, however, it was an even more productive year; and the record shows that import cargo, moving through the Port of Seattle, amounted to 1.25 million tons—an increase of more than 20 percent over the previous year. In short, exports up; imports up even more.

The same pattern is apparent in all too many of our great ports. There are certainly no clear and easy answers to this problem. I do know, however, that when and if it does become resolved, our American merchant marine will have to play a major role in that solution.

Thinking about, and dealing with, the economic facts of ocean shipping takes up the greater part of my life these days, which is what you should expect from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

At this point I'd like to explain this Commission in reference to another government agency; the Maritime Administration. The latter is a component of the Department of Commerce. Under its administrator, the Honorable Nicholas Johnson, it promotes the American Merchant Marine through subsidies, administration of cargo preferences, research and development, training, and other means.

In contrast, the Federal Maritime Commission is an independent agency. We are charged with the regulation of common carriers by water, the regulation of ocean terminals, and of independent ocean freight forwarders in the foreign commerce of the United States. We regulate the domestic commerce between the continental U.S. and Alaska, Hawaii and the U.S. Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The one term heard in our offices far more often than any other is "ocean freight rates."

At the Commission, there are five commissioners; and here I want to take the opportunity to bring to you the personal good wishes of the other four; Vice Chairman John S. Patterson, Ashton C. Barrett, James V. Day, and George H. Hearn.

Ladies and Gentlemen, on this Maritime Day, I want you to know there is keen interest in your Nation's Capitol in the proposed Department of Transportation as a component of the government under a cabinet officer.

A few have taken a stand against such a department; most are for it. The five members of the Federal Maritime Commission, too, have taken their stand. Unanimously—and that also means bipartisanly—we support the proposed department.

We are convinced, along with the President, that such a department would provide the best instrument for solution of the myriad problems that now beset the transportation complex of the United States. Such a department would provide the means for developing a unified national transportation policy for all modes of transportation—a policy that would facilitate new technology and insure a strong, safe, efficient, and fully-integrated United States transportation system. Our rapidly growing economy cries for such a system.

The new Department of Transportation would deal mainly with the safety, promotional and policy functions of transportation. It would seek to develop in the Executive branch of your government the kind of efficient, integrated management approach that has brought American industry to world leadership.

Each year dozens of government departments and agencies spend billions of dollars in the transportation area. As businessmen you will, I am sure, agree that it is good management, and therefore good government, to bring transportation under one responsible department—a department that could, and would, do the job with maximum dispatch and with minimum cost.

It is my firm belief that unless we move to unify our transportation complex, and do it soon, and then take steps to find sound answers for the problems that beset the many segments of transportation . . . unless we do that, we will have chaos in the air, on land, and at sea. It is, further, my firm belief that a Department of Transportation would be the best—and perhaps the only—instrument for preventing that chaos.

The technological advances in the intermodal transportation call for the Department of Transportation and call for our attention this National Maritime Day. One advance of special interest for ocean shipping is containerization. This relatively new advance is no stranger to many of you present, I might add. However, for the benefit of those not familiar with this exciting new method of moving goods—for that is what it really amounts to—I would like to emphasize that containerization shows bright promise in several modes of transportation. Rapid and efficient transfer of uniform containers between rail, truck and ocean carriers will lead to direct through-intermodal transportation of cargo in our foreign commerce.

Additional commodities, even some of the traditional bulk types, will be adapted to containerization. Already such commodities as coffee, bananas, and pineapples are being loaded directly into specialized containers and moved from the point of production to the wholesale warehouse in the United States.

The importance of effective space utilization within ocean vessels cannot be overemphasized. This will require miniaturization of refrigeration equipment and the development of thinner and more efficient insulating material for refrigerated containers. For a vessel carrying hundreds of unitized containers, space savings from improvements of this type will be substantial.

These and many other improvements are now being developed. New and difficult questions will continue to be raised and solutions will have to be found. They are all part of the technological break-throughs now underway in the field of ocean transportation.

These revolutionary changes in ocean transportation have not come about by themselves; they have required and will continue to require vast amounts of work and a high degree of cooperation and coordination between private industry and various federal governmental agencies, and between the governments of the different sovereign nations involved in our foreign commerce.

These efforts are carried on under the philosophy of the Johnson Administration that the public interest is better served through cooperation of effort between government and industry, rather than through governmental direction and control. We in government who are concerned with improvement in our transportation facilities stand ready to assist in every way possible as new and revolutionary changes continue to develop in ocean transportation.

The Federal Maritime Commission evolved from an older body that traces its origin back 50 years to 1916. We were created—in our present form—just five years ago. Since that time we have seen patterns shape up. Inasmuch as one of these has to do with the whole spectrum of American shipping, I think it appropriate on this National Maritime Day to spell out five specific ways in which we at the Commission have contributed to the American Merchant Marine.

Number one. Enlightened regulation has fostered stability in the terminal and freight forwarding areas.

Number two. Our use of- and potential use of- Section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 has led to concellations by foreign governments of a number of decrees—decrees that had operated in a discriminatory manner against American flag vessels.

Number three. American flag lines have been enabled to compete on more equal terms with their foreign competitors—a development that came about from efforts by your Commission to eliminate such malpractices as illegal rebating in our foreign trades, not only through direct action by the Commission but also by the insistence by the Commission, in accordance with the law, or by self-policing systems.

Number four has to do with the successful efforts of your Commission to require an "open door" policy for admission of all carriers to conference membership. These efforts have permitted American flag operators to gain prompt admission to conferences when that type of operation suited their needs.

And finally, we believe that proper regulation of our oceanborne commerce, including removal of discriminations and encouragement to the free flow of trade, has played its role in the recent great and unprecedented increase in cargo carried to and from our shores and the resultant increase in business and the strengthening of our merchant marine.

Am I saying that the Federal Maritime Commission is in the business of promoting the merchant marine? No, that is emphatically the job of the Maritime Administration. But what I am saying is that the sum total of much of our work has contributed to the health and strength of the American merchant marine and free world oceanborne mercantile enterprise.

At this point, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to make an appeal. It is an appeal to each of you to help support the President's 1966 Youth Opportunity Campaign. About two million young Americans will, in a month from now, be looking for work.

Some will be looking for a summer job so that they can continue school; others will be looking for a job to start their careers. The youngsters I am talking about are those 16 to 21 years old, and we all recall how important those years were in our own lives.

To those of you in a position to do so, I urge you strongly to try to increase your work force by one percent—a one percent youth and opportunity factor. To others, I request your firm support of this worthy campaign.

Today, for the third time since President Roosevelt inaugurated National Maritime Day, American forces are engaged in a major test of strength against aggression. Once again the American Merchant Marine has been called upon to help provide that essential difference between victory and defeat.

Our merchant marine provided that margin in the various theaters of oceanic conflict against the Axis powers; provided it against Red imperialism in Korea; and now provides that essential difference against the combination of Red and Yellow imperialism—this time in Southeast Asia.

Following World War II there were some who demeaned the importance of the United States Merchant Marine in any future test of strength. Aircraft would handle most of the load, they said. But less than eight years after the end of that war, I saw their predictions put to the test. From the bridge of my cruiser I saw merchant ships deliver the goods—watched our cargoes-to-Korea supply our land forces and help them stem the Red Chinese tide.

Today we once again see the true picture. Again, those who foresaw only a minor role for the merchant marine, have to back down. I say; on this Maritime Day, 1966, "Whether all-out peace or all-out war—or anywhere between—the role of ocean shipping is vital!"

I wonder how many of us here fully realize the extent of American shipping's contribution to our commitment in Viet Nam. Our ships, military and commercial, carry 95 to 98 percent of the goods being used there. Two-out-of-three GI's are sea-lifted there, the other one-in-three being flown there.

Let us not overlook the fact that Viet Nam boiled up at a time when our nation's peacetime trade was at record heights. However, when the call came for sealift support of the Viet Nam conflict our merchant marine, as it had done before, assumed a dual role, serving the nation's civilian needs on the one hand and the military needs on the other.

This dual task and the carrying out of that task . . . these I believe demand the respect of every citizen and mark, in letters of fire, the true significance of National Maritime Day, 1966.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESSES BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND AT THE WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of this body to two highly provocative commencement addresses given recently by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. Far from the usual platitudinous remarks given on such occasions, these addresses turn boldly to the contemporary scene for their substance, justification and appeal.

To the graduating class of Michigan State University, Vice President HUMPHREY in characteristically pungent prose cites what he calls the "radicalism" of the older generation in making timely, resourceful and courageous responses to the great social and economic challenges that it faced: the great depression. World War II, the subsequent international struggle with communism, and the battle at home for a better society.

Appropriately and with great effectiveness, the Vice President points to these accomplishments as guides and inspiration for the new generation faced as it is by far more vast and exciting opportunities to carry on the world's work, so well begun.

To the West Point Military Academy graduates, Vice President HUMPHREY as a scholar and a historian places into broad social and political perspective this Nation's long established role, its goals, and its responsibilities in Asia.

At a time when this Nation must give its closest attention to the fashioning of guidelines for flexible yet realistic policies in Asia, it is urgent that we understand the varied cultures, the changing needs, and the complex of conflicting dogmas at play within the nationalistic ambitions of that part of the world's people.

This fascinating and statesmanlike analysis will serve a long standing need in this country for a clarification of our goals and objectives in Asia.

Together these speeches afford a comprehensive analysis of the challenges at home and abroad. I therefore ask that these speeches be included into the official record of this body.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH., JUNE 12, 1966

HUBERT HUMPHREY feel a kinship with college students.

I like to be where the action is.

I was raising Cain with the system before you were born, and as I am just beginning to get started, I don't doubt that I will be raising Cain when you are running things too.

In fact, I wish I were being graduated today. I might have a better idea where my next job is coming from.

Today I speak in a relatively new role. I speak for management.

As management's spokesman, I wish first to thank you for service to your nation.

In all these years of study, I am sure you thought you were improving your position to compete in the years ahead or to enter a profession. But you today are more than college graduates.

From management's viewpoint, you are valuable national resources.

More Americans are in college this year than all the Americans alive when our nation was founded. More Americans are in graduate schools today than all the Americans who bore arms during the Revolution. Those are lots of resources.

And we will need them all.

For by the time one of you is likely to stand in this place at some future Commencement, the American people will number more than 300 million—and the people in the world almost too many to even think about.

And I need not recite for you the future needs and the problems of those people.

You will be in charge. You will be responsible for our national security and my medicare.

You will be responsible for the education of my grandchildren and the freedom of my great-grandchildren.

So I propose to take a look at you and have a talk with you.

But first, about your parents . . .

It may be hard to believe but, in another century's history books, the very people who have been helping with your tuition may be ranked among the greatest radicals in modern history.

Some of your parents might flinch if you told them there were radicals in your family. But they have been nothing less.

Theirs is the first generation in all of history which, by its own hand, has surrendered the privilege of telling its offspring: This is how things are; this is how they always have been; this is the way the world goes.

Your fathers and mothers were born children of hills and valleys. Today they see the galaxy itself.

They have created amazing new systems of management, science and technology.

They have found new and better systems to care for people.

And I have been right in the midst of it with them, just as I am with you.

I am not going to bore you with tales of the Great Depression, or of World Wars, and of the hardships your parents faced.

Nor will I recount the struggles that took place in our country to achieve the measure of well-being and social justice we have reached today.

But I can tell you, it has been no picnic. It has been no improvised "happening."

It has taken involvement, and hard work, and study, and self-doubt, and passionate disagreement, and finally, understanding and motion.

Progress has ridden no fast express. It has been a local all the way.

Thus, as older generations welcome you aboard, I think you ought to know that they've not been cooling their heels waiting for you.

The generation of your parents has lived amid the floodwaters of history. Most of them have known genuine hardship. Many of them have lost loved ones on other continents. Their old horizons have gone far off in space, yet they have followed, cautious but willing. The world has come to their dinner table, and at times has seemed to stay a long while, yet they remain hospitable.

They have made history. Yet to many of you, I know, it seems "the heavy hand of history."

Remember this: The challenges they have faced didn't leave room for some of the niceties of today.

They have had to meet trouble in large sizes.

They have had to feed and clothe and house and transport and produce and educate and struggle in big portions, just to overcome the clear and present perils of their time.

Individualism has been the backbone and concern of their work. Yet to serve the individual, they have had to build on a scale which has seemed at times to dwarf the individual.

By and large they have been, I believe, a resourceful and courageous generation.

And now, to you, I know, it seems they have hidden their history.

Over the battlefield they have laid out the golf course.

For those of you who have grown up within putting distance of a country club or within walking distance of a second car, it is hard, I know, to recognize many vestiges of radicalism.

"Where's the action?" you ask.

And I reply: There's plenty of action. Roll up your sleeves and have some.

Your parents had to fight desperately, at your age, to stave off poverty at home and violence abroad—and they in large part succeeded.

Yet the challenges you face are far greater, and far more exciting, than those they faced. The scale of effort to be required of you will be far greater than that required of them.

For the fact of our time is this: The poverty our nation knew in the Great Depression . . . the peril that mankind knew in World War II—these are nothing compared to the poverty and peril that surround our strong, rich America in the world today.

There are desperate conditions of injustice and hunger and disease throughout most of the human family.

There are, in human society, conditions which not only bring a sense of shame and insufficiency to those of us who live in such a blessed land . . . but conditions which can lead to the eruption of the little disorder, which can grow to the small war, which can build to the cataclysm which could destroy rich and poor, black and white, believer and non-believer—all of us alike.

That is where the action is.

This is the environment in which you will be in charge.

This is the human adventure on which you embark.

I believe you sense the full measure of what you face.

I feel a sense of concern and of involvement among you.

I have seen you in the Peace Corps, helping strangers.

I have seen you marching down dusty roads on behalf of fellow Americans whose skin doesn't happen to be white.

I have seen you, in VISTA, lifting the forgotten to a place of self-respect in life.

I have seen you, standing calm, resisting the temptation of violence, for what you believe in.

I have seen you, wearing your nation's uniform, fighting bravely for a cause far more difficult to understand than any we have defended before.

I have seen you speaking out, from deep personal conscience, without thought of personal popularity.

You perform remarkably well in the system your parents built, yet I know that you are probing relentlessly to find your own personal relationship to it . . . desperately seeking identity in a society of bigness.

For your generation, the old labels seem to have little meaning.

Whether you are part of the "New Left" or the "New Right" or the "Out" or the "In," your concerns are far more for basic humanity than they are political.

And I think it is a mistake to see in either your protests, your reservations, or you dissent, much that can fit into the traditional political categories.

Indeed, if much of our political history seems to have escaped you, you are not too troubled by the loss. You are deeply and personally caught up in what matters today.

You set high standards for yourselves, and you judge yourselves harshly.

And you show a remarkable degree of serious introspection for the children of prosperity.

And I sometimes fear that, in your own introspection, you may come to believe you are alone.

I tell you now that when you stand alone, you are not alone.

When you speak out and act alone in America, you are more a part of this land and more a source of its strength than are all of the multitude who join in silence, no matter how vast they may seem.

"The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us," said Ibsen, "is the compact majority."

Oppose that compact majority, and you are sure to collect a few bruises. But I have found that the best remedy for a bruise is to collect a few more.

The more you speak out, and the more you act, the more you are going to discover that you are lending courage to a surprising number of people whose feelings will come to the surface in response to yours.

True freedom in any land is a relentless, never ending process of self-discovery among its people.

This you will preserve, for our own land, not because it is your inheritance; nor because some destiny says you must; but because your own free search for individual identity in the living present, demands it.

The strongest bulwark of liberty is man, free and in search of himself.

A good number of your generation have already learned this lesson, in search of themselves in places and causes far distant from East Lansing, Michigan.

It is your opportunity to carry that lesson into forgotten corners of our country—and of the world—where people have never had any reason to learn it, or believe it.

We face today the incomparable opportunity—in the red dust of South American villages, in the neon minefield that is Watts, California—to stimulate the will to seek identity and to discover one's course.

You will be tempted to chart your progress by Gross National Product or by trade indices, or by many other of the quantitative measures you so distrust today.

Keep your distrust of these things.

Measure your progress by whether those you help—those who have known in their lives nothing but despair and defeat—by whether they can begin to have faith, by whether they can begin to have hope, by whether they can begin to find themselves.

Yours is the opportunity to prove in the world what the generation of your parents has already begun to prove in America: That the course of history is not a mindless juggernaut we are powerless to control, but a fresh challenge susceptible to courageous action in each generation.

I hope you will be sensitive to that opportunity.

I hope you will waste no time in seizing it.

The story is told that Pericles of Ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply devoted to causes, who wished to change immediately what was wrong in the world.

Pericles chastised the young man for being too bold and brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men.

The older man patronizingly said: "Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved."

To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

Despite the fact that I represent management here today, I will tell you this: If you do not choose to follow, precisely the trails that others have blazed, then I do not think we ought to count the future unsafe in your hands.

In your search for identity and self-knowledge, you will have much to discover before you determine what is worthwhile, and what is worthless.

But in a land of individuals, better the mystery of the search than some counterfeit security. In a world society desperate for change, better your dedication to it than your fear of it.

It is the special blessing of this land, that each generation of Americans has called its own cadence, and written its own music—and our greatest songs are still unsung.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y., JUNE 8, 1966

Gentlemen, I salute you. You have completed four years of rigorous training—of mind, of body, and of spirit. You have done well.

But I congratulate you even more on what lies ahead—for the lives of service to your country and to your fellowmen which you begin here today.

The demands on you will be great—greater than on any previous generation of the "Long Gray Line" that has passed proudly through this great institution.

Never before has your country been so deeply linked with every part of a rapidly shrinking and changing world.

Never before has the power available to men been so awesome.

Yet never before have men everywhere been so aware that power alone cannot solve their most urgent problems nor satisfy their deepest needs.

You are soldiers. There will be times when your courage, your coolness, and your command of the military arts will be required in full measure.

But you will have to be more—much more—than fighting men.

You will have to be builders.

You will have to be diplomats and psychologists, engineers and politicians, advisers, educators, and friends.

For in the years ahead, the peace and security of the human family will be threatened by aggressions far more subtle than those of armed regiments moving across national frontiers.

World peace and security will be threatened by propaganda, subversion and agitation . . . by economic warfare . . . by assassination of honest and able leaders . . . as well as by the naked use of armed force.

World peace and security will be threatened, above all, by the very existence, for two-thirds of mankind, of conditions of hunger, disease and ignorance.

We must learn that the simple solutions of times past will not meet the present-day challenges, and new forms of aggression, we face.

Our "doves" must learn that there are times when power must be used. They must learn that there is no substitute for force in the face of a determined enemy who resorts to terror, subversion and aggression, whether concealed or open.

Our "hawks" must learn that military power is not enough. They must learn, indeed, that it can be wholly unavailing if not accompanied by political effort and by the credible promise to ordinary people of a better life.

And all of us must learn to adapt our military planning and actions to the new conditions of subversive warfare—the so-called wars of national liberation.

We must learn to meet and defeat our enemy on all, not just one, of the battlefields. We must use the techniques of politics, of economic development, of information and social advancement—and of coordinating all these efforts in a rational and effective total effort.

We are linked to all parts of a complex and changing world. I want to turn now to one part—but a most important part—of that world. It is a part of the world that I know is much on your minds. I speak of Asia, and of America's role there.

In this Spring of 1966, we urgently need perspective on Asia—on its history and the history of our relationship. That perspective can give us guidelines for wise choices—and a solid base for realistic hopes.

I believe the ingredients of perspective can be found in the answers to three questions: Who and what is Asia? How did we get involved in Asia? And, finally, can we achieve sensible goals in Asia?

* * * * *

Who and what is Asia?

Asia means people—more than half of mankind.

Asia means civilizations—venerable, inventive, artistic, and deeply rooted cultures.

Asia means religions—the great compassionate religious and ethical systems of Hinduism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity.

Asia means problems—the age-old afflictions of poverty, illiteracy, disease, exploitation, and oppression.

And in the modern era—the past hundred years or so—Asia means revolution.

It was a revolution that was long in coming but inevitable once West met East with full force.

Revolution is seldom peaceful, never easy. For Asia the period of Western impact—and the transformation it produced—has been often turbulent, bitter, and humiliating.

Take three major ingredients of modern Western history—the spectacular rise of nationalism, capitalism, and science. Bring them to bear on proud older cultures, either through direct colonial rule—as in India, in Indonesia, or Indo-China—or through enclaves and sphere of influence—as in China.

Little wonder the effect would be disruptive on Asian societies, as well as sometimes constructive. Little wonder that the results would engender resistance and resentment among Asian peoples toward the Westerner, as well as curiosity and sometimes friendship.

And little wonder that the history of Asia in the modern era is the history of Asia's response to the West, an unfolding revolutionary process of which the end is by no means in sight.

It is a process that seeks first to expel the foreign colonial master, and has largely succeeded in doing so.

But independence is only a fragile beginning, not an end.

With independence comes the struggle for nationhood in the full sense of the word—the struggle to create national unity out of religious and linguistic and even geographic fragmentation . . . the struggle to create national power, in order to maintain stability within and to deter and resist any would-be aggressors without . . . and the struggle to create both wealth and justice, to create a society of expanding opportunities and hope.

The revolutionary process is turbulent and fraught with dangers: It contains the danger of unbridled competing nationalisms; the lure of false prophets and demagogues; the temptation of illusory short-cuts that lead to new tyranny; the passions aroused by unfulfilled expectations.

Nearly fifty years ago a new specific danger was first added to this process: The doctrines of Marx and Lenin—offered as an explanation of Asia's past, a plan of action for Asia's present, and a blueprint for Asia's future.

Though always a tiny minority, the agents of Marxism-Leninism were able in parts of wartime and post-war Asia to ride the tide of nationalism and anti-colonialism.

With perseverance and discipline, they produced an impact far beyond their numbers.

Today we see in mainland China the tragic result of one Asian revolution that lost its way—a revolution captured by a disciplined Communist minority.

The high price of that tragedy is, for the people of China, a life of isolation in the world's most rigidly totalitarian state, and, for the people of Asia, a profoundly disturbing neighbor.

Today we see in the Indo-China peninsula the tragic result of another Asian revolution that lost its way. The people of Vietnam, who have lived with violence for a quarter of a century, not only find half their country ceded to a Communist minority regime in Hanoi. At the same time they also face a determined effort by that regime to force South Vietnam under Communist rule.

* * * * *

I come to my second question: How did we get involved with Asia?

The question may sound naive. Yet I frequently hear the statement from those who should know better that "America has no business in Asia."

In part this view stems from frustration in the face of Asia's complexity. How much easier to withdraw and let nature take its course.

But in part this view also stems from a misreading of history.

We are all in some degree both heirs and captives of history. And our involvement in Asia is no recent abberration but rather a rooted fact of history.

In one sense, of course, America is simply a something funny that happened to Columbus on his way to Asia.

In a deeper sense, we are and have been a Pacific power from the days of New England's clipper ships in the late 18th century.

Our traders and entrepreneurs soon were joined by our missionaries—not simply evangelists, but doctors and nurses, teachers, engineers and agricultural specialists. By the mid-19th century American ships had opened up Japan, and American citizens were leading participants in what became the greatest export of people and technology ever attempted from on civilization to another—much of it focused on China.

In the process, we became catalytic agents of transformation. In the process, too, we became unwitting participants in Asian history, and in revolution.

America's role in Asia today is a direct product of the century that preceded World War II and of the war itself.

For with the end of that war, the responsibilities of victory imposed on us a stabilizing role in Japan and Korea.

And with the beginning of the Cold War, the Communist victory in China, and the outbreak of the Korean War, American power was the only shield available to fragile and newly independent nations in non-Communist Asia.

This was not a role we had sought. This was not the peace for which we yearned.

Nor is it a role we seek to perpetuate today. But the peace still eludes us. For there are those in Asia who still pursue their objectives by aggression and subversion. And there are others who ask our help in meeting this threat.

* * * * *

I come to my final question: Can we achieve sensible goals in Asia?

What, in simplest form are those goals?

First, we seek to assist free nations, willing to help themselves, in their deterrence of and resistance to all forms of aggression.

Second, we seek to assist free nations, willing to help themselves, in the great tasks of nation-building. We must lead other rich nations in the war on poverty, ignorance and disease in Asia.

Third, we seek to strengthen the forces of regional cooperation on the basis of Asian initiatives.

And finally, we seek and will continue to seek to build bridges, to keep open the doors of communication, to the Communist states of Asia, and in particular Communist China—just as we have to the Soviet Union and the Communist states of Eastern Europe.

The isolation of the Asian Communist states—however caused—breeds unreality, delusion, and miscalculation.

Efforts to break that isolation may, for the time being, provoke denunciation and hostility. But we shall persevere and explore means of communication and exchange, looking to the day when the leaders of Asian communism—as their former colleagues in Europe—will come to recognize the self-destructiveness and wastefulness of their present bellicose policies.

Prudence and reason, not the slogans of the past, will guide us as we try to reduce the unacceptable risks of ignorance and misunderstanding in a thermonuclear age.

Let me underline what we do *not* seek:

We do not seek alignment, except from those who choose it. We do not seek economic privilege. We do not seek territory or military bases. We do not seek to dominate or to conquer.

Our objectives are best served by one result in Asia:

The emergence of nations dedicated to their own national independence, to the well-being of their people, and to the pursuit of peace.

* * * * *

I return now to my question: Can these objectives be achieved?

My answer is yes. But much depends on our actions as a nation, and on the understanding that prompts those actions.

In the struggle for a peaceful, strong, and developing free Asia, our assets in the region are great.

In Japan, at one end of Asia's arc, we have a staunch friend, a highly developed nation, our second trading partner, an immense potential force for the development of Asia.

On the South Asian subcontinent, at the other end, we have close friends in India, the world's largest democracy, and in Pakistan. Both nations are dedicated to independence and bravely embarked on programs of development.

And in the Southwest Pacific, completing the triangle, are our friends in Australia and New Zealand who share our commitment to the future of Asia.

Elsewhere—in Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia—we find nations committed in differing fashions to independence and development. We respect their commitment, and we respect their differences. We applaud their leadership.

But what of the states of former French Indo-China?

There, of course, is the present focal point of war and revolution in Asia. And there we are tested as never before. We face a situation of external aggression and subversion against a post-colonial nation that has never had the breathing space to develop its politics or its economy.

In South Vietnam, both defense and development—the war against the aggressor and the war against despair—are fused as never before. Vietnam challenges our courage, our ingenuity, and our ability to persevere.

If we can succeed there—if we can help sustain an independent South Vietnam, free to determine its own future—then our prospects, and the prospects for free men throughout Asia, will be bright indeed.

We know this. Our friends and allies know it. And our adversaries know it. That is why one small country looms so large today on everyone's map of Asia.

But Asia will not disappear with a Vietnam settlement.

Nor will our objectives and responsibilities in Asia disappear.

The peace and development of Asia will be high on our national agenda for the rest of this century.

So will our relations with the nations of Asia—including our relations with mainland China.

President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins University last year was an historic formulation of American purposes in Asia.

In that speech he said that our commitment to South Vietnam was firm, that our quest for peace would be unremitting, and that our continuing concern with the welfare of the peoples of Southeast Asia could be tested by Asians ready to initiate cooperative ventures of peaceful development. The President pledged 1 billion dollars to projects that might be developed.

In that speech, too, President Johnson envisaged participation by North Vietnam in constructive social and economic arrangements once Hanoi had decided to stop the shooting. And last February, he again appealed to the "men of the north" to stop aggression and to join in helping fulfill the unsatisfied wants of the people of the region.

Termination of war alone would be a major contribution to the process of accelerated social and economic development in Asia.

But there are other basic problems which face most of the countries in the area.

In Asia, incomes are low. Population growth is high. There is a shortage of capital. The need for investment is almost limitless. There is excessive dependence on a limited number of products for foreign exchange earnings.

These problems demand the attention of countries in the area as well as countries outside which are able to help.

But there is promising ferment in free Asia today—ferment that can lead to higher standards of performance on the part of individual countries and a greater sense of community among them.

War is always cruel. But the war in Vietnam should not obscure for us the fact that behind the smoke and uproar is the testing of an issue vital to all of Asia, and indeed the world.

Can independent, non-Communist states not only survive, but grow and flourish in face of Communist pressure?

In that confrontation, a review of free Asia's achievements should give us solid ground for hope.

Consider South Korea, where exports have increased by 500 per cent in the past three years. Consider Taiwan, which has been transformed from an aid-receiving to an aid-giving country and enjoys a rate of economic growth higher than even that of Japan. Consider Malaysia and Thailand, where ambitious development plans are being launched. Yes, consider Indonesia, where new leaders are determined to see that potentially rich country resume a responsible place in the world community.

All of these developments are striking evidence that, notwithstanding Communist boasts that they represent the wave of the future, the real achievements taking place within Asia have occurred in areas that rely upon independence, competition, and respect for national integrity as the bases for genuine and enduring social and economic progress.

As we Americans strive to deal with the immense problems—and the promise—of a vibrant, modernizing interdependent Asia in the years ahead, we will be called upon to show special qualities of mind and spirit and understanding as a nation.

We will have to learn far more about Asian history and Asian cultures than any of us now know. We need more than nodding acquaintance with the key critical issues that absorb the attention of Asians.

We will have to learn to speak and read Asian languages.

We will have to become more sensitive to the differences among Asian nations as well as their similarities.

We should also be sensitive to the pride, dignity and nationalism of Asian peoples and nations. Like most people, Asians prefer to rule themselves badly than to be well ruled by some foreigner. The same goes for advice and initiatives. Otherwise good ideas inevitably lose some of their appeal if carried through Asia in clearly foreign wrappings.

Asians prefer Asian initiatives, proposed by Asians. So do we.

Finally, we must learn to suppress our national enthusiasm for quick solutions.

Asia's problems are extraordinarily complex and intractable; they will be with us for a long time to come, and we should force ourselves to practice some traditional Asian patience.

It is patience—and perspective—that we will need in the years ahead.

For I have no doubt that we will meet, in Asia as in the rest of the world, time and again with disappointment, disillusionment, ingratitude and frustration.

Yet we must not be deterred.

It is our good fortune to be free citizens of the most prosperous and powerful nation in the history of the earth.

It is the prosperous who can most afford compassion and humility.

It is the powerful who can most afford patience and perspective.

Let us, then, not pursue policies—or judge ourselves—in consonance with the passion of the moment.

Let us pursue those courses of which, in the judgment of history, it can be said: "These were the paths taken by wise men."

USE OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS FOR MASS TRANSIT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on April 7, the Baltimore City Council adopted a resolution urging the Congress to enact S. 2339. This is a bill which I introduced as a companion to a bill introduced by Congressman JONATHAN B. BINGHAM in the House. These bills authorize moneys in the highway trust fund to be used, at the option of the Governor of each State, to construct rapid transit systems in urban areas.

The bill rests upon the philosophy that our urban areas desperately require improved transportation. In some cases a city's needs will best be met by new or improved highways; in other cases by new or improved bus or rapid rail transit systems. In most cases the optimal solution will be a balance between roads and rapid transit.

Everyone pays lipservice to the concept of balanced transit, but when we get down to cases, the Federal Government pays real cash only for roads. I recognize that there is an Urban Mass Transit Act. But in the 3-year period 1964–67 it provides our cities with about a third of a billion dollars compared to the highway trust fund which pumps $12 billion into road construction during the same period.

As a practical matter, our cities, already strapped for funds, have no real choice. They must use the 90–10 Federal money to build roads or do nothing. In short, the scales of balanced transit are heavily tipped in favor of highways.

The purpose of my bill is to redress the balance and permit elected local officials to make an effective choice between competing modes of transportation.

As one of America's great metropolitan areas, Baltimore is understandably concerned with the need for improved transportation. The city council states:

> The principal problem not only in Baltimore, but in every major metropolitan area in the United States, in the financing of adequate mass transit facilities.

The council's resolution goes on to say:

> The Tydings-Bingham bill provides a sensible form of subsidy out of existing revenues. . . . The bill commends itself, not only as help to solve the financial dilemma of mass transportation, but in effect also calls for the systematized planning of transportation needs as a whole.

I deeply appreciate the support and interest of the city council of Baltimore. I ask unanimous consent that its resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 1376

(City Council Resolution supporting the provisions of the Tydings-Bingham bill in the Congress of the United States)

The planning and development of Maryland's present interstate highway program, and the intrastate highway program has been developed independently and without regard to the other possible methods of transportation. In other words, whether a subway or rapid transit railway could better do the job than a freeway or expressway has never been jointly studied.

Following the conclusion of World War II, the return to the mass production of automobiles created a tremendous demand for the improvement of existing Maryland highways, as well as highways in other states, and the construction of many new roads to handle the rapidly-increasing volumes of traffic.

Highway planners in those days believed that highway construction could adequately satisfy transportation needs. The experience of every major city in the United States, including Baltimore, to date, conclusively proves that highway construction can never satisfy the transportation needs of large metropolitan areas. Only a well-developed system of mass transportation can accomplish this.

Unfortunately, when the interstate highway act was passed in 1956 providing for the financing of 90% of the interstate highways out of Federal gasoline taxes, the Congress was satisfied that this program would do the job of moving people efficiently from Point A to Point B. The experiences of the 1960's show that the interstate highway act will not only fall short of its goal, but in many cases, actually aggravates the transportation system. The construction of freeways and expressways not only fails in densely populated metropolitan areas to solve the problem of mobility of people, but also brings accompanying costs in loss of people's homes (mostly poor people), loss of jobs, loss of valuable tax land in cities, removed forever from tax rolls, loss of aesthetic assets of a City, such as parks and historical buildings and monuments, loss of manufacturing plants and their accompanying jobs, and the creation of eyesores which often blight surrounding areas.

Recently, the Metropolitan Transit Authority conducted a study to determine what transportation facilities, if any, are needed in the Baltimore metropolitan area by the year 1980. The consulting firm of Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas was instructed by the Authority to assume the completion of the entire State Roads Wilbur Smith study program for metropolitan Baltimore by 1980. In other words, the firm was told to assume the construction of a vast system of expressways and freeways, and then find out if there was any need for additional improvement for mass transportation in the metropolitan area.

The firm recommended the construction of a large subway system in inner Baltimore City to be connected with a rapid transit system in metropolitan Baltimore along with many improvements in existing bus service. The cost of construction of the mass transit system recommended by the M.T.A. is $300,000,000, almost all of which must be borne by the real estate tax rate of Baltimore City. Obviously, Baltimore City real estate tax payers are not going to pay $300,000,000 to carry out the recommendations of the M.T.A.

The principal problem not only in Baltimore, but in every major metropolitan area in the United States, is the financing of adequate mass transit facilities. The Congress of the United States in the 1940's and 1950's solved the problem of financing roads by the use of gasoline taxes at a time when mass transit facilities were not deemed critically necessary. Time has proved that the development of an efficient mass transit system is vitally necessary to every large metropolitan area and can only be accomplished by some form of government subsidy.

The Tydings-Bingham bill provides a sensible form of subsidy out of existing revenues. In effect, the bill says that the Governor of a state may elect to use Federal highway gasoline tax revenue for mass transit purposes with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. The bill commends itself not only as help to solve the financial dilemma of mass transportation, but in effect also calls for the systematized planning of transportation needs as a whole rather than determining how many highways are needed, and then deciding what mass transportation facilities can be used, as we are doing presently in Baltimore; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That this body recommends that the elected representatives in the Congress of the United States from Maryland are urged to vote for Senate Bill 2339, sometimes known as the Tydings-Bingham bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Council is instructed to send copies of this resolution to each member of the Maryland Congressional delegation, the two Senators from Maryland in the Senate of the United States, the Governor of Maryland, the Attorney General of Maryland, the Comptroller of the State of Maryland, the members of the Metropolitan Transit Authority, the members of the State Roads Commission, the Mayor of Baltimore City, and the Director of Public Works of Baltimore City.

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, over a period of years the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., has made it a practice of honoring at its annual meetings the memory of those whose vision, courage, and leadership resulted in the successful construction and subsequent efficient management and operation of one of the greatest works of men.

Among those so honored have been President Theodore Roosevelt and Secretary of War William Howard Taft; Rear Adm. John G. Walker, president of the Isthmian Canal Commission for Exploration, 1899–1902, and the first chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission for Construction, 1904–05; John F. Stevens, who, as Chief Engineer of the Commission, 1905–07, won great fame as the "basic architect of the Panama Canal"; Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals, who, as chairman and chief engineer, 1907–14, and as the first Governor of the Panama Canal, 1914–16, directed the completion of the project and launched it into the era of operations; Col. W. L. Sibert, the builder of Gatun Dam and locks, 1907–14; Col. David D. Gaillard, in charge of the excavation of Culebra Cut, 1907–13; Sydney B. Williamson and Harry O. Cole, in charge of the construction of the Pacific end of the Panama Canal; Maurice H. Thatcher, member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and civil Governor of the Canal Zone, 1910–13; Maj. Gen. William C. Gorgas, the great sanitarian of the isthmus, 1904–14, whose work was acclaimed by respected engineers as having made the canal possible. Of these thus honored, Stevens, Williamson, Cole, and Thatcher were civilians.

At the 31st annual luncheon meeting of the society held at the Lawyers Club in the Nation's Capital City on May 21, 1966, the organization honored the memory of Edward Schildhauer, the civilian electrical and mechanical engineer who designed the lock gate and other operating machinery, including the towing locomotives for hauling vessels through the locks. The lock operating machinery is still in use and the locomotives lasted for more than half a century, gaining for their designer a tremendous reputation as one of the most creative contributors to the success of the canal enterprise.

The program was, indeed, of historic character. Ben M. Williams, president of the society, presided. The assembly included a number of past presidents and members of the ladies auxiliary, with virtually all significant phases of Canal Zone activities and life represented.

Distinguished personages with Panama Canal associations present included:

Col. George S. Brady, engineer, author, and editor.

Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., historian of the Panama Canal and authority on interoceanic canal problems, formerly in charge of marine operations of the Pacific sector of the canal.

Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, former Governor of the Panama Canal, 1940–44.

Col. Pierre Gaillard, son of Col. David D. Gaillard, member of the Isthmian Canal Commission for whom the great cut through the mountains was named.

William R. McCann, consulting engineer, of Hopewell, Va.

George C. McCullough, business executive, of Birmingham, Ala.

Walter G. Ross, business executive.

Col. Ralph H. Sartor, consulting engineer, of St. Michaels, Md.

Frederick G. Swanson, civil lawyer, of Tyler, Tex.

Mrs. Ailene Gorgas Wrightson, daughter of General Gorgas.

At the conclusion of the luncheon President Williams expressed his appreciation of the large turnout of members and guests, some of whom had come from distant parts of the Nation. He presented the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, former Member of the Congress from the Louisville District of Kentucky, civil Governor of the Canal Zone, and the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, who had been selected to pay a tribute to his deceased friend, Edward Schildhauer, and to introduce the guest speaker, Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, a nephew of the celebrated canal engineer.

In a business session following the program, the society elected James L. Hatcher as president for 1966–67 to succeed Mr. Williams.

Captain Schildhauer's views are, of course, his own. Although I wish to insert his address in the Record today, by so doing I am not endorsing those views or passing judgment on them. In the future, the Senate will be called upon to consider a solution to the Panama Canal problem, and I believe it will be beneficial for us to have the views of Captain Schildhauer, a distinguished officer and American with a special knowledge of canal problems.

To make available to historians and scholars of the future as well as engineers, navigators, and other experts concerned with interoceanic canal problems, the Congress, and the Nation at large, I ask that there be printed in the Record at this point the remarks of Governor Thatcher and the address of Captain Schildhauer.

There being no objection, the remarks and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Governor Thatcher

Mr. President, Members of the Society, and Guests, in the past this Society has honored various leaders in the great work of building the Panama Canal. These honorees have been members of the U.S. Army Engineer Corps, the Army Medical Corps, a Naval officer, and certain U.S. civilians. The Society has also sought to give recognition to the various groups that joined in the work of the great Isthmian enterprise—the unmatched industrial undertaking of the ages. In addition we have given recognition to the fine, effective services of the forces which for more than a half century have been engaged in the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Canal—a work most efficiently wrought, and without destruction or sabotage of the Canal facilities.

In the construction era U.S. civilians, in the various categories, performed duties similar and comparable to those rendered by members of the Army and Navy; and in civil administration, electrical and mechanical divisions, and the like, U.S. citizens were predominant.

The Society has felt that all these, together with the alien workers (who performed the rougher toils, and assumed the greater hazards), were and are entitled to such consideration. There has never been, in all history a more dedicated, effective, and loyal collection of industrial toilers and builders than those of the great organization that built the marvelous channel connecting the two oceans at Panama. There was, there is, and there ever will be glory enough for all. And I would include the fine and effective cooperation of the Panamanian government during the construction years, which I recall with unfailing gratitude.

During the construction era, while the civil activities were not spectacular like those of engineering and sanitation, yet they were equally indispensable and praiseworthy, and were of prerequisite character.

Since the completion of the Canal the maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Canal, covering a period—I repeat—of more than a half century, have been carried out efficiently—both in peace and war. There has been nothing of destruction or sabotage of the Canal facilities. All honor to Gov. Edgerton—here with us today—and the non-military and military forces associated in these connections.

On this occasion the Society honors and pays tribute to the fine labors and contributions to the Canal effort of another great civilian of our nation, who, as the chief electrical and mechanical engineer, with genuine genius and skills invented and designed the electrical and mechanical machinery and equipment for the successful operation of the great lock systems of the Canal, and other features required. In the overall picture his services were of the highest order. For the benefit of our government his inventions were patented; and he won the admiration and esteem of the engineering world.

I speak, of course, of our old friend on the Isthmus, Edward Schildhauer, deceased, whose achievements and fine personality won the affectionate regard of all who knew him. Because of my own official connection with the building of the Canal, and my association and friendship with him on the Isthmus and afterwards in this city, I have been chosen to pay him this tribute and to introduce the guest speaker on this program.

Now for a brief run-down of Edward Schildhauer's career. He was a native of the great State of Wisconsin, born in 1873. In his teen years he gave considerable attention to music, played the cornet and other instruments, and organized and directed musical groups. Also, early in life he manifested aptitudes for electrical and mechanical engineering; and before his majority found congenial employments in these connections. Thus, he resolved upon a career in these fields, and in January 1894, he entered the University of Wisconsin, and in 1897, graduated with two degrees in electrical and mechanical engineering.

Thereupon, he held positions in his chosen fields in private enterprises such as J. G. White & Co., Chicago Edison Co., and other large business concerns, and grew and matured in electrical and mechanical engineering. Thus, in 1906 he was offered by the Isthmian Canal Commission the position of Chief Electrical and Mechanical Engineer of the Panama Canal organization; and stationed first in Washington, D.C., and later in the Canal Zone. He and his wife, Ruth, went to Europe, where he inspected various lock systems, from which—tho much smaller than those intended for the Panama Canal—he learned many things of interest and value. He thereupon designed the machinery and mechanisms for the moving of the great Canal lock gates, with central controls and unification, and for the electrical "mules" for the towing of ships thru the locks, all working together in faultless precision and with perfect effectiveness, noiselessly and in swiftness. His great and unique contributions to the success of the Canal enterprise made him famous, and won for him the acclaim of the engineering world. His true memorial is the collective labors he wrought in the Canal Zone, and in the systems he designed, which have stood the test of more than fifty years of constant and grilling usage.

In 1914 Edward Schildhauer resigned from his position with the Isthmian Canal Commission; and he also resigned as President or Chairman of the Canal Zone Red Cross and the A.I.E.E., the Union Club, and as President of the Strangers' Club in Colon.

On his return to the States he had his choice of employments with large and successful business enterprises, and accepted some of these offers and rendered highly capable service. Finally he retired from such employments and settled in Los Angeles, California. There, as a citizen, and as one deeply interested in civic affairs, he entered upon certain political activities and wrought beneficial service.

Ed Schildhauer possessed a pleasing personality, was big of brain and brawn, was of commanding presence, and was blest with a fine capacity for friendship. He easily made friends, and held them thenceforth. As his name would suggest, he was of German extraction, but always a high-class loyal and effective U.S. citizen. His bust has been placed in the Hall of Fame of the University of Wisconsin. His death occurred in 1953, at the age of 80. His grave is in his beloved Wisconsin soil. The death of his loyal helpmeet followed after, and she now sleeps beside him. Ruth Schildhauer shared his life on the Isthmus. She had literary talents, and wrote some lovely poems. She contributed much to her husband's success in life. They died without issue, but they had an adopted son and daughter.

Now, for the second feature of my pleasing task on this occasion. The nephew of Edward Schildhauer, Captain Clarence H. Schildhauer, U.S.N.R., retired, is our guest speaker today, and we welcome him. He, too, has had a brilliant career, and is yet active. I hasten to give a few of the high points of his life and activities, and then you may hear him.

He started his naval service as an enlisted man; and in 1915 he was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis; and graduated therefrom in 1918. He rendered distinguished naval service in World War I, followed by his assignment on missions to North Russia and Germany. Then came destroyer duty with the Pacific Fleet; and next, naval aviation studies at Pensacola, where he graduated in 1923, with test pilot activities involved. In 1925 he established the world's sea-plane record for endurance. In 1928 he organized the first Naval Experimental Squadron VI–I. Later, in 1930, he resigned from the Navy and joined General Motors Corporation's aviation interests, rendering in that connection highly important services. There followed his connection with the Pan American Airlines, Operating Division, and he became Manager of the Pan American Pacific Division, and was placed in charge of the first 100 trans-Pacific flights; and in 1937 he took charge of the Pan American Atlantic Operations. Then came his employment by the Glenn L. Martin Co. in 1939. He was called back to active naval duty in World War II, and served until 1947, when he retired with the rank of Captain. He has received the Legion of Merit award—in 1946. In 1951 he became the Vice President and General Manager of Civil Air Transport of General Chennault's Flying Tigers, with headquarters in Formosa. In 1953 he returned to the United States, and now lives at Owings Mill, Maryland, near Baltimore. He is now with the Bendix Radio Field Engineering, engaged in highly important work.

Captain Schildhauer is married, and Mrs. Schildhauer is with us today.

He is a member of the Naval Reserve; he is in the prime of life, with priceless experiences behind him, and many more years before him, we trust, for beneficial labors. He has membership in the Army and Navy Club, the Reserve Officers' Association, and is a commissioned officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

Captain Schildhauer has long been deeply interested in Isthmian Canal matters (and has navigated the Panama Canal), especially from the navigator's standpoint. His address will be on the subject of a future Isthmian Canal, chosen by himself. We shall be happy to have his views on the complex issues involved; and the Society will be glad, at any appropriate time, to receive any divergent representations and judgments. The Society maintains an open forum.

I have the honor and privilege of presenting Captain Schildhauer, who will now address you.

THE PROBLEM OF A NEW CANAL: THE BEST SOLUTION

(Address by Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, U.S.N.R., retired, before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., May 21, 1966)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: Meetings such as this one make me wonder what are the feelings of the family of the man commemorated. Now I know.

From the bottom of my heart, I am deeply grateful for the splendid tribute of Governor Thatcher to my late uncle. On behalf of all members of the Schildhauer family, I express their fullest appreciation for the signal honor accorded by this memorial program in the capital city of our country.

Naturally, the thoughts of all of us are directed to the question of a new Isthmian Canal, either at the present route or at some other location. Because of the grave importance of the subjects involved, I venture to give you my own views on the matter of the best solution trusting that they will be considered objectively. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been legislation providing for consideration of only one solution, the canal matter is of such vast consequence that any inquiry purporting to be comprehensive should consider other treatments. In so doing, the key issues are site and type; and I shall express views which, I believe, reflect the judgment of most of the survivors of the construction of the present canal, including engineers so engaged. All these can appraise the problem realistically because of their intimate experience with, and knowledge of, the extreme difficulties which accompanied the original construction. In this connection, I especially refer to the tremendous question of slides, which would be vastly enlarged in any effort to go deeper into the earth for a so-called "sea level" project if the present site should be recommended as now seems most likely or in any other area.

In recent years much has been published about inter-oceanic canal problems. Writers have vied with one another to make the subject appear new but, as experienced students of Isthmian history well know, the major questions involved are old. The only new feature in the equation is a new crop of advocates and diplomats who have ignored the lessons of experience and have proceeded purely on the theoretical considerations.

The Panama Canal was opened to traffic on August 15, 1914, yet, within ten years, the subject of the type of canal, despite a most careful evaluation of the matter, was still being agitated. In a letter on May 31, 1924, to former Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, who had designed the Panama Canal and brought the project to a point where its success was certain, Governor Jay J. Morrow, one of its ablest governors, made this incisive and prophetic statement:

> "The sea-level project is a hardy perennial, and apparently there will always be someone to argue for it, no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such scheme within practicable limits of time and cost may be demonstrated."

The years passed. With the approach of World War II, our authorities became concerned about the problems of the Panama Canal and sought legislation for increasing its capacity through the construction of what was described as the Third Locks Project. Authorized in 1939 at a cost of $277,000,000 after insufficient study and inadequate investigations, this proposal provided for one set of larger locks (140′ x 1200′ x 50′) near each of the existing locks but somewhat removed from them and for connecting the new locks with the existing channels by means of by-pass channels. (H. Doc. No. 210, 76th Cong., 1st Session.)

The proposed arrangement at the Atlantic end of the canal was logical because it duplicated a sound layout that has been tested by more than 50 years of successful operation at Gatun. At the Pacific end, however, the original third lock channel plan had three sharp bends that would have created operating problems and navigational hazards of the gravest character. This appraisal is based on navigational experience, study and observation, including many transits of the Panama Canal on naval vessels. Also, it should be especially noted that this project had undisclosed features for converting the canal to sea level according to a plan that had been neither comprehensively studied nor specifically authorized by the Congress!

Active construction started in 1940 and was placed on a rush basis until it was suspended in May 1942 after an expenditure of more than $75,000,000 mostly on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores. Fortunately, no excavation was undertaken on the Pacific side at Pedro Miguel, which left the way open for a re-examination of the project in the light of marine experience before it was too late.

The Panama Canal at that time was the scene of tremendous activities in connection with its military protection and the transit of our naval vessels to and from combat areas in the Pacific. These demands created keen interest among canal authorities, both operating and engineering, in the study of canal operational, navigational and engineering problems with regard to planning as derived from lessons learned under war conditions.

Eventually, these efforts inspired the development in the Panama Canal organization itself of what today is known as the Terminal Lake-Third Lock Plan, which proposal would consolidate all Pacific locks in one set south of Miraflores similar to the existing layout at Gatun and provide a summit-level lake anchorage in the Pacific sector to serve as a traffic reservoir.

Recognized immediately by respected canal engineers as the greatest single contribution in the way of canal planning since the removal of the Bohio Dam and Locks to Gatun to form Gatun Lake, the proposal attracted wide support from navigation interests that use the canal, including local naval authorities and, eventually, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King and Secretary of the Navy Knox.

In its study of the plan, the Navy Department sent the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and a member of the General Board to the Canal Zone to look it over in the field. The General Board recommended strong Naval support of the plan and, in its principal report, made this significant statement: "The General Board is much impressed by the great preponderance of evidence in favor of the lock type and considers that the opinions presented, supported as they are by experience, fully justify the abandonment of the idea of a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 5, pp. 6758–6759.)

Extensive studies at the time in the Canal Zone, and later in the Navy Department, showed the lake-lock design to be the best canal plan for the transit of vessels practicable of achievement, and at "comparatively low cost", estimated in 1943 at less than $300,000,000 and without the necessity for negotiating a new treaty with Panama. The last is a paramount consideration.

Eventually, the terminal lake proposal was submitted on September 7, 1943, by the Secretary of the Navy to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who indicated his approval of it as a post-war project. It was subsequently approved in principle by two Governors of the Panama Canal as the preferred form for the modification of the authorized Third Locks Project to meet future navigational needs.

Upset by the wide acceptance of the terminal lake idea for a new lake-lock type canal, advocates of the old and rejected "sea-level" plan, after the startling advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, seized upon that nuclear development as the psychological lever for obtaining legislation for a canal inquiry under a statute, the bill for which was drafted by themselves at the height of public hysteria.

The ensuing act of the Congress (Public Law 280, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945) directed the Governor of the Panama Canal to make a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing its capacity and "security" to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and "national defense"; and also for a restudy of the Third Locks Project, and a study of canals at other locations.

Taking advantage of the "security" factor inserted in the bill by advocates of the "sea-level" type, the 1946–7 investigators interpreted this factor as paramount and controlling, and money costs not a "governing consideration" and sympathetic propagandists urged it as a "mandate of the Congress!" According to informed members of the Congress at that time, this was a far more extreme interpretation of the statute than was intended by the Congress which enacted it.

The report of this inquiry was submitted in 1947. As expected, it recommended only the so-called Sea-Level Project in the Canal Zone on an alignment different from the existing channel for major canal construction, initially estimated to cost $2,483,000,000 primarily on the basis of its alleged greater "security". It ignored such matters as the vital treaty question involved, and what would be its costs for a huge indemnity to Panama, a greatly increased annuity, and the effect on tolls, all of which would have to be borne by maritime interests that use the canal or by our over burdened taxpayers. No wonder, such report failed to receive Presidential approval! When President Truman transmitted it on December 1, 1947, to the Congress, he did so without comment or recommendations, and the Congress took no action thereon, not even authorizing its printing. Three years later, in the Act of 1950, the Congress, on its own initiative, reorganized the Panama Canal enterprise, placing it on a self-sustaining basis.

As time passed, transits through the Panama Canal increased, and by 1964 its capacity was approaching saturation. On Executive recommendations, without adequate hearings, debate or information, the Congress enacted Public Law 88–609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964, under extraordinary circumstances for so gravely important a matter.

In the Senate, the bill for this law was passed by voice vote without debate; in the House, under a rule procedure that prevented adequate debate on the vital issue. Moreover, the House acted without the benefit of published hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that conducted them and those hearings to this day have never been printed!

The statute authorized the President to appoint a so-called "commission" of five men not subject to Senate confirmation to determine the feasibility of constructing only a "sea-level" canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. This action, unwisely restrictive and unprecedented in character, served to exclude from consideration the solution that many competent independent and experienced engineers and other experts considered to be the best and most economic solution when the problem is evaluated from all key angles.

This body is now functioning. It is not the independent and broadly-based commission that situation requires and as was employed in the building of the present canal. The sea-level interests because of the alleged vulnerability of the present high-level lake-lock type canal are using the 1964 enactment to advance the 1947 "sea-level" recommendations with utter disregard of costs or consequences as a "mandate from the Congress" for the second time since World War II.

Meanwhile, the proper handling of the overall inter-oceanic question has been complicated by a series of developments affecting the Isthmus that started when Alger Hiss of the State Department in 1946 listed the Canal Zone as an "occupied area", thereby classifying it as a non-United States possession. Then followed in 1953 the negotiation of the Eisenhower-Remon treaty of 1955, which was supposed to end Panamanian demands for years to come. But efforts to appease, as was foreseen by informed members of the Congress and others, only resulted in greater efforts to extort. Today we are in the process of negotiation with Panama for new treaties affecting the canal that would cede back to that country full sovereignty over the Canal Zone. As to that, I can think of no greater disaster for the continued efficient maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal or to Panama itself. It would be far better for Panama if the United States stayed on the Isthmus in perpetuity, for our presence there is the only guaranty for its continued independence.

It is pertinent to observe that the United States would never have undertaken to construct the Panama Canal except under conditions of complete and perpetual control. Moreover, long experience on the Isthmus shows that the present canal could not have been built nor subsequently maintained and operated with requisite efficiency with less authority than our government has exercised under the 1903 Treaty. This is in no sense imperialism but plain common sense, for our responsibilities require adequate authority.

As to the original decision of our government for the high-level lake-lock plan, the wisdom of it has been completely established. It was not a fly-by-night action by irresponsible and incompetent officials or a political compromise as claimed by some propagandists but a reasoned decision after the fullest consideration by some of the best engineers and ablest statesmen that our country ever produced, after extensive debates in the Congress.

The principal arguments used by "sea-level" advocates during United States control have always been of hypothetical military character, "security" and "national defense"; not the actual problems of navigation and operations.

During the 1904-06 "battle of the levels", it was the alleged "vulnerability" of the high-level plan to naval gunfire, which was an important factor in causing the division of the Pacific locks into two sets separated by the intermediate level Miraflores Lake—the major error in the design of the Panama Canal. Parenthetically, I may add that the consolidation of the two sets of Pacific locks were originally urged by Chief Engineer John F. Stevens in 1906 and later attempted by Colonel William L. Sibert but was not done because of public pressure in the United States for immediate action.

In 1939, it was the alleged danger of enemy bombing attacks that led to the hasty authorization of the Third Locks Project and its hazardous channel layout, and, as previously indicated, without adequate study of the crucial navigational and operational features involved.

In 1945, it was the alleged greater "security" of the "sea-level" type against destruction by nuclear attack, which fallacious premise has been extensively exposed in the Congress.

In 1964, it was the alleged greater "vulnerability" of the high level plan to destruction, even by "two sticks of dynamite".

Thus, it is abundantly evident that advocates of a "sea-level" canal adjust their terminology and justifications to their needs for advancing their predetermined objective. They never mention the obvious facts that nothing can be constructed of indestructible proportions, that the greatest dangers in any type of canal in the entire Canal Zone are massive slides, that the critical slide area is in the high central mass, and that any canal, regardless of design, can be destroyed by nuclear attack. Nor do these advocates ever give the costs and complications involved in negotiating a new treaty with Panama to determine the specific conditions for constructing a "sea-level" undertaking in the Canal Zone, which project is not covered by existing treaty and would require a new one.

It is to be noted also that "sea level" advocates ignore the fact that the design that they have in mind is not, in any sense, an open strait, such as the Strait of Magellan, but that tidal locks and many miles of lateral dams, diversion channels, and flood control structures on both sides of the ship channel, would be necessary. They also ignore these facts: (1) that a greatly deepened cut required by the so-called "sea-level" design would present a greater peril for nuclear attack than the existing canal and (2) that, as warned by the Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies, 1957–60, there would be "serious danger of a long interruption to traffic * * *" (Ho. Rept. No. 1960, 86th Cong. 2nd Sess., p 5, para. 16). Such lack of forthrightness in a matter so grave, is indeed, incomprehensible and, in fact, constitutes a betrayal of our own and Western Hemispheric interests, including those of Panama itself.

In following the canal subject closely over a period of years, I have read extensively in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many of the thoughtful objective addresses and statements of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania, as well as the writings and utterances of distinguished and informed authors. In the quality of their documentation, clarity of expression and force of arguments, Congressman FLOOD'S contributions on the canal question are unique in our history and should be studied by all who wish to understand the canal problem. As summarized by him in a statement to the House of Representatives on March 1, 1966, the key issues in the Isthmian question are obvious and simple.

First, the transcendent responsibility of our Government to safeguard the indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone territory as granted under the 1903 Treaty.

Second, the subject of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing high-level lake-lock canal through modifying the Third Locks Project to provide a summit lake and anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with the layout at Gatun, on which, as previously stated, some $75,000,000 of the taxpayer's money has been spent on lock site excavations only at Gatun and Miraflores. The major part of these excavations can be utilized under the proposed lake-lock plan.

Third, the matter of a new Panama Canal of so-called "sea-level" design to replace the present canal, which, in addition to other structures previously mentioned, requires tidal locks near the Pacific end of the canal where the tidal range has a maximum of 22 feet.

Fourth, the question of a new canal at another site in Panama or Colombia or Nicaragua.

Despite the enactment of the 1964 canal statute, three bills were introduced in the present Congress by Representatives ANDERSON of Tennessee, BOW of Ohio and FLOOD of Pennsylvania to create an independent and broadly-based Interoceanic Canals Commission. The Commission would be authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for:

An increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks Project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

The construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

The construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

You will note that these bills include consideration of the major improvement of the present Panama Canal through modification of the Third Lock Project. This is not included in the 1964 statute which only refers to a "sea-level" canal to meet future requirements. The enactment of these bills, to include consideration of increasing the capacity and efficiency of the present canal, should be included in the full and complete investigation and study of canal problems. The increase of capacity and operational improvement of the less expensive and functionally superior high-level lake-lock canal to meet the basic requirements mentioned in the statute cannot be overlooked in any inquiry that purports to be "full and complete." Moreover, it should be independent.

The high-level lake-lock type of modernization, when considered from all angles, offers the best solution. Besides it could pay its way while the necessary improvements are made. In contrast, a "sea-level" tidal lock canal must be completed to full dimensions at once and its enormous construction cost would be a substantial addition to the national debt for a very long time, to which must be added the diplomatic costs for a new treaty.

Indeed, meeting the canal problem by the major improvement of the existing lock-type canal would inure to the very great advantage of Panama by keeping the canal on the Isthmus, preventing the destruction of Panamanian economy, and insuring the continued independence of Panama itself.

My uncle and his top level associates in building the Panama Canal were not men moved by sentiment in making crucial decisions but tough-minded realists. They, like those who follow the sea, had a great respect for the powerful forces of nature, so often exhibited at Panama in the form of massive slides. Were they here today, they would not be influenced by any sentimental feeling evoked by saving their own work but only by the intrinsic realities of the situation that they so well understood. I have every reason to believe from many conversations with him that they would favor the lake-lock plan that I have discussed as the proper solution and would oppose the resurrected idea of a so-called "sea-level" canal, which would require an unprecedented expenditure of the taxpayer's money and open a veritable box of Pandora of difficulties of every character. I, therefore, believe that the wisest and best solution is to keep the present canal and enlarge its capacity and improve its operations to meet future needs of shipping by means of the indicated high-level lake-lock design.

THE CAMPAIGN FOR SAFETY ON THE HIGHWAYS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, most Americans feel only shame when they read of highway deaths and injuries.

And yet this guilt could turn to pride if we as a nation found ways to reduce accidents even as our traffic continues to increase.

Congress, by its careful consideration of new legislation to improve automobile construction, is fulfilling part of its responsibility in this area. I am sure that we will find it necessary to act in other ways, too.

But laws can go only so far. The big question is: How can each person behind the wheel of an automobile become an active participant in a campaign for safety on the highways?

Many State and municipal law enforcement officials have joined in worthwhile safety programs. I am happy to report that a major newspaper—the Record of Hackensack, N.J.—recently began its own campaign to reduce road hazards.

The Record is encouraging motorists to be on the watch for road conditions that cause accidents. The newspaper provides coupons which can be filled out and forwarded to State officials for engineering study. The Record is also planning a traffic conference for full discussion of the problems thus uncovered. Attorney General Arthur J. Sills has given full support to this campaign.

Mr. President, I ask that an article and an editorial, from the June 29 issue of the Record be reprinted in this RECORD. It seems to me that this newspaper is accomplishing two worthy objectives at once: It is reminding each driver that he has a personal stake in traffic safety, and it is also unearthing valuable information for traffic experts. The Record is providing a valuable example for similar action elsewhere.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, June 29, 1966]

SILLS SUPPORTS RECORD TRAFFIC-SAFETY DRIVE

(By William Schechner)

One of the State's leading campaigners for traffic safety, Attorney-General Arthur J. Sills, has given his full support to The Record's campaign to end the carnage on Bergen County highways.

The death toll on Bergen roads now stands at 52, and unless the current trend is reversed the total for the year will be near 120. Last year 90 died on Bergen roads.

Sills praised The Record's upcoming traffic conference as an excellent idea. The meeting between State, County, and local traffic experts is aimed at presenting information on area death traps and how they can be corrected.

Word from the Attorney-General was received at the same time as the mails brought more than 200 coupons from Record readers describing what they believe to be the worst danger spots in Bergen County.

Sills said the newspaper's coupon campaign was providing a valuable service by allowing drivers to tell officials about road conditions which can cause accidents.

"Too often they feel 'I ought to tell somebody' but they don't know who to tell," Sills said. Another coupon appears on Page 3 of today's editions.

Citizens often write him, Sills said, asking what they can do about automobile safety. He praised the coupon and conference because they give individuals a chance to make themselves heard. "The public can participate by bringing to our attention those areas they consider trouble spots," the Attorney-General said.

LARGE SUMS

The Attorney-General also said he will send The Record conference State Police reports detailing the location of danger spots noticed by troopers on highway patrol.

The reports are sent to the State Highway Department, which then reports back to Sill's Law and Public Safety Department on what can and has been done.

Some of the conditions are promptly corrected, Sills said, while others have to be put off because it would cost large sums of money to make the changes.

Sills also promised the full co-operation of his Department, which includes the Division of Motor Vehicles and its Traffic Safety Service as well as the State Police, in supplying information for the conference.

Sills has a long-record of interest in traffic safety, and he recalled that he himself has notified the Highway Department of a dangerous condition he noticed during his morning drives from his home in Metuchen to the State House.

Motorists driving at high speed on Route 1 in New Brunswick do not have enough warning of a traffic light at the intersection of Route 1 and Ryders Lane, Sills said. He has asked the Highway Department to put up warning signs.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, June 29, 1966]

DANGER SPOT

Do you know of a road condition in Bergen County that is the cause of accidents? If so, list it below and mail this coupon to Danger Spot Editor, The Record, 150 River Street, Hackensack. Record reporters will check accident statistics on the site, and if the danger is confirmed, information will be forwarded to the State for engineering study. If you wish, you may submit a sketch of the road, showing the danger, on a separate sheet of paper. Please make your recommendations as concise as possible.

Location________________________________
Why is it bad?___________________________
Suggestions_____________________________
Reader's Name___________________________
Address_________________________________
Phone Number___________________________

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, June 29, 1966]

LOOK AGAIN—IT'S MANSLAUGHTER!

As of the moment when this is being written—thus a total subject to change within any such minute as it takes a human being to bleed or burn to death in a crumpled car—some 52 persons had been killed in automobile accidents on Bergen County roads and streets since the bells of midnight rang in 1966. Statewide the massacre had reached a total of only—only!—501 Monday, as against 525 at that hour last year, but in Bergen County the killing appeared somehow to have slipped out of control. It was running 13 deaths and 97 days ahead of the record established in 1965, and, with two big summer holidays and the death-dealing dusks of autumn yet to be negotiated, the extrapolations indicate 120 killings for the year.

So what? One killing is dull routine. Four killings at a clip make eyewitnesses, ever toughened doctors and policemen, faint or sicken. Killings in batches of five or more can even make Page 1 of the New York Times if the circumstances, e.g. roasting to death, are colorful. But so what? What's The Record getting excited about? What's the big deal, asking people to nominate their own favorite danger spots?

Well, manslaughter at this rate—at a rate hurrying up to 50,000 a year nationwide—is something to get excited about, period. Something has to be done, and the fact that dangerous driving has its roots in the blackest subsoil of the human mind and spirit had better not be allowed to deter our trying to do it.

We can start, as was done by the Senate this week, to require that cars be made safer at the point of design and manufacture. We can impose on a national Administration safety standards sterner than it wanted. We can persuade a President to say for us, as this one did. "We can no longer tolerate such anarchy on wheels."

We can harden the laws against drunken driving, as the State of New Jersey has just done, and we can make it less difficult for the policeman to bring into court evidence incontrovertible by bland lawyers and obliging expert witnesses.

We can demand—as we shall do one of these days, as certainly as a computer can count off the people who have the accidents—that all drivers submit to periodic physical and psychological re-examination. We can rule off the road the senile incompetent and the juvenile irresponsible.

And, through the use of a device as relatively unsophisticated as a pool of plain people to identify the dangers that haunt them, we might find the time has come for a radical re-evaluation of the way we use the money governments appropriate for roads. Is it time to change priorites so that more money can be applied to wiping out such horror chambers as the Little Ferry traffic circle and such ridiculous antiques as the Anderson Street Bridge in Hackensack? Is it time to limit access to the downtown streets which have become commuter raceways? Is it time for the elimination of all major street crossings at grade? We're killing 16 people on the old roads for every one that dies on the limited-access highways. Is it time the automobile owner and driver be taxed heavily enough to eliminate death-trap roads and high-friction intersections?

Big Deal? Maybe.

It had better be.

A SENSIBLE SEA POLICY

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, Thomas Hardy, the English novelist, asked:

> Who can say of a particular sea that it is old? Distilled by the sun, kneaded by the moon, it is renewed in a year, in a day, or in an hour.

It is that ability to renew itself which gives the sea so vast a potential to serve a world faced with an ever-growing need for food and natural resources. A coal mine may run out, an oil well may dry up, but with proper use, the sea will continue to serve man indefinitely.

As is the case with any natural resource, proper use entails development as well as safeguards against harmful exploitation.

The Senate recently approved S. 2218, a bill to extend U.S. fishery jurisdiction from the present 3-mile limit of its territorial waters to 12 miles off its coasts. A few days later the Senate passed my bill to expand the fish protein concentrate research and development program. These measures represent both aspects of proper use of a natural resource.

Because some persons may consider such measures important only to a particular industry or to particular areas, I would like to discuss today the broader implications involved. These measures are of national and international import because they are involved in the development of a sensible sea policy—a policy that will put to work for man and for world peace the vast resources of the ever-renewing sea. This policy entails use of the oceans as a supply of food, water and minerals, as a medium of transportation and communication, as a factor in the complex pursuit of a stable peace.

Mr. President, there are a number of persuasive reasons why the United States should extend its territorial fishing zone to 12 miles. This Nation is one of the very few countries with coasts which still limits itself to a 3-mile fishing jurisdiction. The vast majority of fishing nations have set boundaries of 12 miles or more. This fact is supported by the Department of State and the Department of Navy, both of which in reversing longstanding opposition to S. 2218, noted that the trend in international law was establishment of 12-mile fishing zones. It must be pointed out that the measure in no way endorses extension of territorial seas, a step which could adversely affect freedom of the seas.

Certainly a wider territorial fishing zone will be of some assistance to our fishermen who are facing increasingly stiff competition from larger and more modern foreign fleets. Foreign vessels can be seen regularly off our coasts taking a resource which could be ours if we were equipped to compete. We are not equipped to compete because this Nation has been slow to recognize the great need for, the great stakes involved in developing a sensible sea policy.

There are some persons who would argue that the Government has no business aiding an industry that cannot meet foreign competition. Aside from an ample number of precedents showing that thinking incorrect, I firmly believe that we let our fishing and maritime industries dwindle to extinction at grave risk to the Nation.

I will return to the importance of these industries in a moment, but first I want to discuss what I consider the most persuasive reason for supporting the 12-mile-limit bill. Mr. President, I do not know of any supporter of S. 2218 who believes it is a panacea for our fishing problems. Enactment of this bill, however, will provide the United States with a most useful tool in working to bring about a world fishery convention, a convention desperately needed if the oceans are not to be stripped clean, if we are to have the international agreements necessary to insure that the seas will continue to renew and to serve man. In short, enactment of this bill must be coupled with strenuous efforts to bring about a world convention. The recent creation of a high-level fisheries post in the Department of State indicates the administration is beginning to appreciate the importance of the problem.

There is good reason why there appears to be insufficient worldwide pressure for this needed convention at this time, and that is human nature. As I noted earlier, the United States is one of the few fishing nations which permit foreign vessels within 12 miles of its coasts. Certainly nations which can fish close to our coasts while keeping foreign vessels well away from theirs are not anxious to give up their advantage. By extending our fishing zone to 12 miles, Congress will encourage other governments to see the wisdom of calling a world fishing convention.

Mr. President, the United States has a great interest in the establishment of world fishing regulations, not only because they will assist what once was and can be again one of our most important industries, but principally because they will help insure proper use of ocean resources.

Development of a desalination process would be one proper use. Development of fish protein concentrate as a source of cheap, high-quality protein for the world's hungry would be another. I have talked at length on numerous occasions about the value of fish protein concentrate as a food supplement, and will only say today that those persons opposing development of the product should put aside regional interests and personal prejudices and think of vast need for a protein concentrate.

I am confident that this Nation has the scientific ability to develop the resources of the ocean. I am not sure it has the will, not because it is tired, but because it does not appreciate what is at stake. At stake is whether or not this Nation, in the years ahead, will be able to compete on equal terms in the struggle to lead the world toward freedom. It was the late President Kennedy who said:

> If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

The competition will be waged in the poor, developing countries, but not, as we have heard so often, in the hearts and minds of people, at least not at first. The battle will be waged and, in large part, won, in the stomachs of the hungry of the world. There are countless studies indicating that the gap between the haves and have-nots is growing, that the gap between the amount of food the world can produce and what it needs is widening.

The ocean represents vast untilled acres of farmland which, properly cultivated, can help reverse that ominous drift. I believe that as the world's richest nation, we have a heavy responsibility to bear in the war against world hunger. I believe that as the target of nations who oppose freedom, we must take the lead in this war, for the hungry of the world will look for leadership to that nation which has fed them. Let us not enter this battle handicapped by failure to bring all our resources to the task. That is one reason why a viable fishing industry is in the national interest.

But it will do us no good to harvest and to mine the potential of the sea if we cannot carry the products of our labors to the people of the world. It will do us little good to feed the hungry if we are not prepared to help them develop strong economies through trade. Those are only two reasons why a viable maritime industry is in the national interest.

Too often, too many persons believe seapower is something to be cranked up in time of emergency. But seapower, the end result of a sensible sea policy, is more than carriers and deck guns, more than supplying troops in war. Seapower also is the good sense to explore and cultivate the great natural resources of the sea; and it is the ability to carry cargo and extend influence in peace.

The time has come for the United States to reclaim its place among the world fishing and maritime leaders. The time has come for this great country to turn its attention to exploring and cultivating the sea, the earth's last frontier. To those who contend the challenge of the ocean is passed, I ask, "Who can say of a particular sea that it is old?"

DENIAL OF EQUAL RIGHTS TO AMERICAN JEWS TRAVELING IN ARAB COUNTRIES DEPLORED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, many of us have been appalled over the indignities suffered by our Jewish fellow citizens in their travels or planned travels to the Middle East. Though bound to us by trade and treaty, some of these Arab nations violate the canons of international custom and usage by barring American travelers from visiting their countries solely on the grounds of religion.

It does not mitigate the offense to recognize that such arbitrary acts hurt none more than the countries which practice the discrimination. Business contacts are aborted, trade possibilities are reduced, and ill will abounds.

Most grievous of all, our citizens are being deprived of their rights of citizenship and we are unwilling or unable to redress this wrong. It is ironic that as we move closer to the achievement of equal rights for all our citizens at home, we silently suffer outrages against our citizens abroad.

Jerold C. Hoffberger, a leading citizen of Maryland and a close friend of mine, has written a very thoughtful letter to me on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of Mr. Hoffberger's letter at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: Once again I'm writing to you about a most distasteful subject. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency, on June 29th, reported that Syria and Jordan had barred three American Jews scheduled to visit there next month as members of a Trade Union group. The Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union (AFL-CIO) discloses that the Arab Governments had refused visas to the Jewish members of a Union-sponsored tour of Europe and the Middle East scheduled to leave New York on July 12th. The Union reported that the action of the Arab Governments had been in violation of earlier assurances that there would be no discrimination against the Jewish members of the group. Egypt and Lebanon, which are also on the itinerary, had not barred the three Jewish Union members.

We have raised our voices in concern when official representatives and military representatives of the United States are barred from these countries because of their religion. Now private citizens are being given the same treatment. I wonder what would happen throughout the world if the United States barred a citizen of Jordan or Syria for any reason whatsoever except that that person be a carrier of disease or a criminal. I recognize that there is not much we can do about this sort of thing but I do believe we should raise our voices in outrage.

Whatever you can do to put this matter on the record will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JERRY.

PRAYERS AND BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the text of a statement endorsed by the Protestant Ministers for School Prayers and Bible Reading has recently come to my attention. Certainly their views on this important matter should be considered, and I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT ENDORSED BY PROTESTANT MINISTERS FOR SCHOOL PRAYERS AND BIBLE READING

As a Protestant minister, I wish to state my firm conviction that, due to recent Supreme Court decisions, provision now needs to be made in the United States of America for individuals, on a voluntary basis, to be free to pray and to read the Holy Bible in our public schools and, in general, to recognize Almighty God in the public life of our Nation.

RECORDS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE U.S. SAVINGS BOND PAYROLL PLAN BY EMPLOYEES OF THE PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD AND THE PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, employees of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and the Pearl Harbor Naval Supply Center recently established remarkable records for participation in the current U.S. savings bond payroll plan.

Rear Adm. E. Alvey Wright, commander of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, was recently presented with a new minuteman flag bearing three gold stars and three white stars symbolizing 19 consecutive years during which more than 90 percent of the employees have been buying savings bonds regularly through the payroll savings plan.

As a matter of record, the actual participation in the program was 98.5 percent or 5,595 of the 5,676 employees.

Another minuteman flag was presented by Gov. John A. Burns to Capt. Elliott Bloxon, commanding officer of the Pearl Harbor Naval Supply Center.

Naval Supply Center employees established a record of 93 percent participation—the 15th consecutive year with more than 90 percent participation. A total of 918 of the center's 987 employees are enrolled in the payroll savings plan.

I know that President Johnson and Members of this body will be exceedingly pleased to learn of the widespread support given to the U.S. savings bond payroll plan by the employees of these two commands.

CENTENNIAL OF NEW ATHENS, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this July 15, 16, and 17 the town of New Athens, Ill., is celebrating its centennial. Situated in the southwest part of Illinois, this proud community has grown and prospered over the last 100 years. The area is noted for having some of the finest farmland in the State. And a traveler is immediately struck by the well-kept, flourishing farms of the district.

The history of New Athens is rich and varied and is marked by many exciting episodes. In 1813 a fierce Indian tribe massacred many of the early settlers. Floods often swept through the center of the town. And reports that New Athens was to become the center of steamboat traffic once boosted the population to 1,500 only to have it dwindle to 5 when the reports proved false.

But despite calamities and hardships the citizens of New Athens persevered. Today New Athens is an outstanding community boasting many fine churches and a progressive school system. I congratulate the people of New Athens on their achievements of the past, and I share with them the hope for their continued progress and prosperity.

REPORTED EXECUTION OF AMERICAN PRISONERS BY NORTH VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there have been very ominous reports in the newspapers about the North Vietnamese Government trying and executing certain of our prisoners who were taken as prisoners of war.

It is my profound hope that the Government of North Vietnam will not execute the prisoners they designate as war criminals. Clearly they were captured while carrying out the orders of their Government, orders which they had no part in formulating and orders to which the laws of this country require obedience. Such an execution would be a barbarous violation of the Geneva Convention of 1949, but I do not rest my appeal upon that basis alone.

The real, the substantial basis for my appeal to the government of Ho Chi Minh is that it would have the opposite effect to that which, I assume, they desire. Rather than deterring further attacks upon their oil installations or their cities, it would certainly inspire more intense attacks and a greater spread of devastation.

I recognize the natural desire of the Government of North Vietnam for revenge against the Americans for what they regard as a savage escalation of a war, which, in their view, results from aggression by the United States. Nevertheless, in view of the simple facts of life, further to incite the American Government to increased bombing will only make any kind of settlement short of complete and utter devastation and destruction all but impossible.

Mr. President, I have, as the record will show, opposed the escalation and broadening of the war in Vietnam. I still believe it is a serious mistake and that, instead of military victory, we should be seeking a compromise settlement of the war by negotiation. Sooner or later the war must end. As a purely practical matter, the ending of the war will be delayed and the suffering of all the people concerned will be increased if the prisoners of war are executed.

I believe that the prestige and influence of the government of Ho Chi Minh will be enhanced and the criticism of the American escalation will be stronger if the prisoners are treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention. In short, to show restraint and self-discipline under the stress of this severe provocation will enhance the reputation for maturity and wisdom of the North Vietnamese throughout the civilized world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "Washington: the American Prisoners in Hanoi," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times on July 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, JULY 12.—In the last few days Hanoi and the Communist capitals of Eastern Europe have been talking about trying and executing the American fliers captured in North Vietnam. We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides in this war, but none more ominous or dangerous than this.

The Communist photographs of the American pilots being led helpless and handcuffed at gun point through the menacing crowds are bad enough. But if this is followed by another of those spectacular Communist "trials" and the execution of these men, the reaction of this country is likely to be precisely the opposite of what Hanoi imagines.

THE U.S. REACTION

This is a very critical moment in the long struggle to keep this war limited. The North Vietnamese leaders are no doubt furious about the bombings of the oil dumps in Hanoi and Haiphong. They have ordered the evacuation of the civilian population from those cities and no doubt this has encouraged a spirit of revenge. But nothing will add to the brutality and unpredictability of this war more than making these few fliers pay with their lives for carrying out the orders of their Government.

There has been much stupidity but very little jingoism in America's conduct of this war. The American people have been troubled but calm. With one or two exceptions, the President and his aides have avoided appeals to emotion and no effort has been made to arouse a spirit of hatred toward the political leaders or the soldiers of North Vietnam.

In fact—rightly or wrongly—U.S. officials here and in Saigon have pictured the enemy as brave but misguided men fighting for Peiking or Moscow against their own national interests. But all this could easily be changed by howling mobs, drum-fire courts and firing squads in Hanoi.

The rules of war specifically forbid the retribution now being discussed in the Communist world. Article XIII of the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the Hanoi Government on June 5, 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty.

This however, is not primarily a legal but a practical question, involving the psychology of the American people and the President of the United States, Nobody who knows anything about Lyndon Johnson can have much doubt about the severity of his reaction if the fliers he sent into North Vietnam are executed against the standards of international law for carrying out his orders.

Argument in this country about whether the orders to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong were wise will be overwhelmed. The curiously impersonal attitude of America to the war will end, and public opinion will undoubtedly support him in any countermeasures he takes, no matter how severe.

THE DIPLOMATIC QUESTION

For the moment, then, the practical question is not whether the Prime Ministers of India and Great Britain can persuade the Soviet Government to help end the war, but whether they can persuade Kosygin and Brezhnev to intervene in Hanoi to stop this trend toward personal reprisals, which will only tend to make the war unmanageable.

Moscow and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe are obviously in no mood to propose a compromise settlement in Vietnam, but they may at least be willing to do something about keeping it from getting out of control.

HARRIMAN'S TASK

The President's special envoy, Averell Harriman, is now working almost full time on the diplomacy of avoiding this tragedy, but the indications from Hanoi are that officials there intend to go through with the trials.

Far from intimidating other Navy and Air Force fliers from attacking targets in North Vietnam which apparently is the intention; far from restraining President Johnson, which is what they are believed to have in mind; far from encouraging opposition to the President's bombing policy, the conviction and execution of the American fliers will almost certainly escalate the bombing and unite this country behind a much more punitive and aggressive policy.

The present situation is bad enough. The American people and even the American Government are divided about using power to destroy the power centers of North Vietnam, but if these fliers are humiliated and executed, it will be difficult if not impossible to follow a policy of restraint, no matter what the consequences.

THE POLITICS OF EXTREMISM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, extremism has contributed no bright pages to our country's history. Down the decades we have had our share of the ultra this and the ultra that, of lunatic fringes, but in the testing perspective of time their stories do not make inspiring reading. It has taken men of conscientious reasoning and considered judgment to bring the Nation to the eminence it now occupies.

It is a very salutary thing to have our young people reminded of these facts, to be reminded that catchy slogans and so-called "worthy causes" are often cloaks for premeditated deceit.

Not so long ago one of our citizens, who already has served this land well, made good use of an opportunity to talk to a group of college students on the "politics of extremism." His remarks were carefully documented and any doubting Thomases in his audience could turn to the stern facts in source material and learn for themselves that he spoke the truth without color or distortion.

That man is Robert H. Hinckley, of Eden, Utah, who began service in my State's government four decades ago and then placed his abilities at the country's disposal in the 1930's to combat the ravages of the great depression. That task ably discharged, he became a member and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and later an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air. After Pearl Harbor he accepted a key post in a war industry where his talents and experience would yield the maximum return in the national interest. Once victory was in sight, however, he willingly returned to Washington to assume the exacting work of Director of the Office of Contract Settlement.

When the thorny problem of contract settlements had lost its urgency in 1946, he became vice president and director of the American Broadcasting Co., which he still serves.

Several years ago Mr. Hinckley established a fund of $250,000 at Utah's Brigham Young University in memory of his father and mother, Edwin S. and Adeline Henry Hinckley, to provide scholarships for worthy students interested in the important problem of communications. This has now resulted in the development of a department of Brigham Young University for radio, television, and the general field of communications.

More recently, in May of 1965, Mr. Hinckley and the Edward John Noble Foundation, of which he is a trustee, provided $250,000 for the establishment at the University of Utah of the Hinckley Institute of Politics. Its mission: To create respect for politicians and politics, to inspire university students to participate actively in politics, to encourage them to stand for public office, and to convince them that politics is an honorable calling.

As the first of a series designed to further those goals by sharing with a large audience significant discussions and analysis of political issues, Mr. Hinckley delivered a lecture at the 18th annual Pi Sigma Alpha conference at the University of Utah on May 24 and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Politics of Extremism

(By Robert H. Hinckley)

Pi Sigma Alpha probably should have borrowed a sign for this speech from one of our downtown churches and placed it outside. It reads: "Come in and have your faith lifted."

For I undertake this analysis of modern-day fringe politics standing on an old American platform—that faith, not fear, has been the secret of this country's success and greatness. The politics of fear in contemporary America, which we are about to examine, is a departure from that mood and spirit, an aberration on the American scene which is as fascinating as it is repelling.

We begin with an appraisal of left-wing extremism in the form of communism, and shall then turn to the Far Right.

COMMUNISM

Starting with a theoretical framework resting heavily on economic and historical determinism and class conflict, Marxists laid down a program of action whereby Communists could speed up the overthrow of capitalism.[1] Stirring up class and racial conflict would be the starting point. Catching capitalism at a weak point, Communists would then foment a revolutionary outbreak, bringing the old order down by force and violence. The post-revolutionary government would be dictatorship—in theory, dictatorship of the proletariat, but in fact, dictatorship by the vanguard of the proletariat, which means the Communist Party elite.[2] The next step calls for the nationalization of property as socialism replaces capitalism. Then as all vestiges of selfishness and class spirit disappear, the socialist state evolves into the final stage of communism where the state will wither away and men will live by the rule, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."[3]

It is important that we understand Marx's objectives that we might thereby evaluate his means. He clearly intended to produce a society of self-governing individuals in which there would be an equalitarian division of the products of labor. Without any sense of ridicule, I do describe this as the search for a workers' utopia—that "green valley" of enough for all and the repression of none.[4]

But it is my firm conviction that Marx and his disciples left us a system filled with flaws and a blueprint not for freedom but for tyranny.

The first shortcoming in Marxism goes to the very foundation of the whole system, to the notion of economic determinism. I say to you that man is more—much more than what he eats, and much more than merely a captive adjunct of the economic system that provides his wants.

Marxists, therefore, have based their cure for the ills of man on the false diagnosis: That they can perfect economic man by putting him through dictatorship and socialism. Even if we were to grant that the socialistic experience might purge man of economic sin, he would still be subject to psychological disorders, the possibility of racial prejudice, and a wide assortment of other human frailties that would keep man from joining the angels that Marx contemplated in the final stage of communism.

The second error in Marxism is his analysis of capitalist development. Instead of there being any predestined course for capitalism which spelled increasing doom for the proletariat, capitalism, like socialism, has shown that it can go in almost any direction. In America, the depredations of monopolists and the exploiters of child labor of the 19th century have been brought under control in the mixed economy and capitalism has provided rapidly rising standards of living for essentially all of the American people.

The third objection that must be made to the Marxist scheme is its reliance on government by an elite. When the Mensheviks lost to the Bolsheviks at Brussels in 1903 on the issue of a workers' party open to all, Marxism-Leninism became dedicated to the proposition that some workers are created more equal than others. Subsequently, in Marxist states from Russia to Yugoslavia and Cuba, a new class of favored bureaucrats simply replaced the capitalists of the old regime. The proletariat is no more in power after the revolution than before!

Fourth, when Marxists talk about dictatorship of the proletariat they mean *dictatorship* by the party against everyone else. Press censorship, the imprisonment of writers, the campaign against religion in the USSR, the cancellation of elections in Castro Cuba, and the Berlin war are the mailed fist of dictators, not the kid gloves of a democratic system. I repeat, Marxist dictatorship means *dictatorship.*

Fifth, Marx's proposition that the state will wither away overlooks the lust men have for power and their unwillingness ever to relinquish it. As Lord Acton was to warn long ago: "Power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely." It would be interesting to hear Mr. Khrushchev on the subject today of "How do we dissolve the dictatorship?" for Marxists really have no formula to achieve the peaceful transition of power from dictatorship to democratic socialism and from socialism to the withering away of the state. Dictators do not wither away—they manage to get "elected" for life!

To me, the sixth criticism of Marxism is the most telling of all: It cannot possibly achieve its goal of producing self-governing individuals by first putting them through dictatorship. The authoritarian state is the breeding ground of serfs, not free men; and as Lord Macauley warned a century ago: "If men are to wait for freedom until they become wise and good in slavery, they may indeed wait forever."

What is the meaning of all this for the United States? I think the evidence is clear that Communists do intend to destroy the United States of America.[5] And they are committed to *any means* which will achieve that end. As you listen, therefore, to avowed Communists like Danny Rubin who appeared on this campus urging reform through the ballot box, don't overlook their underground training schools where Communists are taught the fine art of how to kill a man by jabbing a pencil into his neck,[6] how to sabotage a defense facility, and to gather data for their espionage network. Those may be reform tactics, but they are alien to American politics.

Moreover, Communists function as fifth columnists to weaken the country internally by intensifying conflicts and domestic disturbances of any sort. Thus Communists take advantage of civil rights controversies and make their presence felt in Harlem and in Watts. They have been known to stage protracted strikes for political rather than economic reasons, the classic case being the strike against Allis-Chalmers in 1940 to prevent the fulfillment of that company's defense contracts at a time when Hitler and Stalin were jointly dividing up eastern Europe.

In the face of such dangers, how should a free society based on faith, not fear, respond to a terrorist party in its midst that is committed to the country's downfall: Stifle their speech? Prohibit their meetings? Register them? Outlaw them?

The suggestions I would make are, first, to remove the conditions that the maggots of Marxism feed upon. I mean by that to work untiringly for an end to the deprivation of minority rights, unemployment, substandard working conditions, and slum housing. These things we can do by the progressive reforms we have tried in the economic field since the 1930's and in the race relations field since about 1954. In short, let us make democracy and capitalism in America examples at their very best of how this kind of political and economic system may minister to the needs of man.

---

[1] For a convenient collection, see Arthur P. Mendel, ed., *Essential Works of Marxism* (N.Y., Bantam Books, 1961), 592 pp.

[2] Lenin, *State and Revolution,* in *ibid.,* p. 120.

[3] *Communist Manifesto,* in Mendel, *op. cit.,* p. 33; Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific,* in Mendel, p. 78; and Lenin, *State and Revolution,* in Mendel, pp. 177–78.

[4] *Communist Manifesto,* in Mendel, p. 33.

[5] See the record summarized in Communist Party of the USA v. Subversive Activities Control Board, 367 U.S. 1 (1961).

[6] See Scales v. U.S., 367 U.S. 203, at 250–251 (1961).

The second part of our response to the Communist threat relies on an old American answer on how to cope with bad ideas—simply rebut them with better ideas. As Thomas Jefferson said so long ago: "We have nothing to fear from the demoralizing reasonings of some if others are left free to demonstrate their errors, and especially when the law stands ready to punish the first criminal act produced by the false reasonings: These are safer correctives than the conscience of the judge."[7]

But since the full Communist threat is not restricted to the area of ideas, we must be prepared to "punish the first criminal act" that they may undertake. Here I would urge a reliance on laws aimed at such acts as espionage and sabotage, and conspiracy to commit those acts, rather than placing reliance on statutes aimed at speech and advocacy. Moreover, there is a need for an effective FBI to keep tabs on the undercover world of communism and for the use of grand juries for indictments and our regular trial juries, not congressional committees, for determining the guilt or innocence of Communists accused of violating the laws of the land. These are the time-honored instruments which have always stood us in good stead against other enemies of the public good, and I refuse to submit to the proposition that the Cold War requires us to repeal the first, fourth, fifth, or sixth amendments of the Bill of Rights.

Internationally, where we also meet the threat of communism at many points around the world—Berlin, Korea, Viet Nam, Cuba, Africa, and South America—I offer much the same formula: That we do what we can to eliminate those conditions on which communism feeds and be prepared to resist overt acts of aggression. Such a policy calls for the intelligent use of foreign aid, military firmness where it is needed, and continued vigorous support of the United Nations.

But I hardly need tell you that these proposals for dealing with Communists at home and abroad are regarded by some of our countrymen as woefully inadequate. These are our countrymen who see Communists everywhere and who, in a fantastic double-take on logic, would have us copy Communist tactics to fight Communism. They are, of course, the followers of the Far Right on our political spectrum. To them we now turn.

RIGHT-WING EXTREMISTS

Across the stage of America's political history have marched a fascinating array of minor political parties: The Anti-Masonic Party, the Know-Nothings, Barn Burners, Soft Hunkers, Populists, Grangers the Bull Moosers, Progressives (of either the LaFollette or the Henry Wallace varieties), Socialists, Communists, Vegetarians, Prohibitionists, the Silver Shirts, the Minute Men, the Birchites, and the American Nazi Party.[8]

Although many of them are not around long enough for even a curtain call, they can, like John Wilkes Booth, be troublesome while they are on stage. Some of these minor parties have expressed what might be called the *Politics of Protest* in behalf of particular interest groups. As a case in point, one thinks of the Granger movement of the 1870's seeking to protect farmers from railroad and grain storage monopolies. But others have expressed the *Politics of Status* for the psychologically politically, and socially deprived among our people.

The meaning of the politics of status becomes clear as we contrast the true conservative with the right-wing reactionary. Both the conservative and the reactionary may be opposed to the federal income tax, but the reactionary right-winger sees it as a part of a gigantic plot to communize the country. While the right-wingers occasionally use the terminology of conservatives, as Professor Richard Hofstadter has said, "They have little in common with the temperate and compromising spirit of true conservatism in the classical sense of the word. . . . Their political reactions express, rather, a profound if largely unconscious hatred of our society and its ways. . . ."[9]

The *targets* of the right wing from 100 years ago to the present have included a fantastic list of human beings, government institutions, and even mythical characters: Catholics, immigrants, Jews and Zionism, England, bimetallism, the liquor trade and Wets, the League of Nations and the United Nations, the teaching of evoluation, psychiatrists and mental health clinics, government regulation of business, the income tax, Franklin D. Roosevelt, social security and medicare, fluoridation, the Supreme Court and Earl Warren, the State Department, peaceful co-existence, Negroes, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Martin Luther King, rock-and-roll music, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Eastern Establishment, even Mary Poppins (because in their spooky world, Birchites fear things that fly around in the air), and Santa Claus (for what could be worse than a give-away artist in a red suit!).

Many streams come together to form the river of right-wing extremism: Chauvinism, isolationism, and distrust of foreigners. Another is what would have to be called evangelical fundamentalism. It is no accident that in the leadership of the Right Wing we find today a Robert Welch from a Fundamentalist Baptist family in North Carolina; a Reverend Billy Hargis from the Ozark Bible College; Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, a former Australian Pentecostal preacher; and Mormon Apostle Ezra Taft Benson. Sprinkled across the organizations of the right wing are groups which speak with religious fervor, such as the Christian Crusade of the Reverend Hargis and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade of Dr. Schwarz.

Still another well-spring of extremism is that modern-day psychological sickness of being lost in a big impersonal world, the feeling of helplessness in coping with such constant disasters as the Cold War.[10] Or the disasters may be of a much more personal character—failure in one's profession, in marriage, or in one's role as a parent—until the underpinnings of a stable life have been shattered. Taken together, these factors have contributed to what Professor Hofstadter has called the paranoid style of right-wing American politics.

What are the manifestations of the paranoid style of the Right Wing? Some of them appear in the sick language which some extremists use in discussing public issues. Hardly a better example can be found than the theme of Robert Welch's address at an April dinner meeting in Salt Lake City this year: "Not only is the whole country now one vast insane asylum, but they are letting the worst patients run the place. And just about the only inmates they lock up anymore are those who come the nearest to being sane."[11]

Such sentiments bring to mind that classic observation of Al Capp, that "There must be some other branch of the federal government, some mental health set up, which keeps its eye on groups that start off being just ridiculous like the Nazi Party or the old Bolsheviks, which in time become dangerously lunatic as they did. People like that are ridiculous, it's true, and good for a laugh at a press conference, but once the nuts get organized, they can take over the asylum."

The most convincing paranoid symptom of all is the conspiracy which the right-winger sees everywhere threatening his country and his personal world. Typically, the paranoid sees himself as a very exalted person, surrounded by enemies who threaten his very existence. In this nightmarish world, the extremist sees Communists, Comsymps, fellow travelers, socialistic Democrats and moderate Republicans all linked in a gigantic conspiratorial apparatus to destroy the United States.

What can be done to exercise that nightmare? Senator FULBRIGHT's proposal makes a lot of sense: "These people don't need condemnation; they need help. They need, each one of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend, and then perhaps a good long rest." And I say, most of all, they need faith, not fear.

Let us turn now from right-wing moods in general to that prototype group of the Far Right, the John Birch Society. The Birchites have taken as their watchword: "Less government, more personal responsibility, and a better world."[12]

To achieve these goals Birchites seem to be committed to the following programs (although one must read a mountain of Birchite documents to come up with what would normally be found in a brief political party platform): Impeach Earl Warren; get the United Nations out of the United States and get the United States out of the United Nations; expose Communist infiltration in the civil rights movement, in government and the schools; stop foreign aid; repeal the income tax; resist fluoridation; pass the Liberty Amendment to get the government out of business; support local police, and proselyte police for Birch Society membership; censor schoolbooks to eliminate liberal influences; balance the federal budget; restore prayers to the public schools; and infiltrate PTA's and school boards.[13]

A close look at this Birch program immediately reveals some interesting things. All of the stated objectives are negative except perhaps for the proposal which all law-abiding citizens endorse, to support the local police. In the whole list, there is not really a positive suggestion on how to deal with the great problems that confront America—how to check Communist aggression in Viet Nam, how to restore the battered alliance in NATO, how to remove the conditions in underdeveloped countries which breed communism, how to lift a fifth of our people above the poverty level, how to achieve equal rights for all of our citizens, or how to rebuild the dilapidated core of our central cities—*not a single positive word on how to cope with those problems.*

And beyond the negativism, the list also reveals some sharply contradictory ideas. The Birchers would have us defeat Communists, but they would repeal the income tax which is critical for our national defense budget; and they would abolish foreign aid, a vital economic tool for checking the expansion of communism in the cold war. They would resist the encroachment of government on private lives, but they endorse the restoration of official prayers in the public schools and urge the censorship of school books. And the better world that they would build would be a world deprived of the one institution which tries to pull all nations together and provides a collective force for good and decency for all men, the United Nations.

---

[7] Letter to Elijah Boardman, July 3, 1801.

[8] See W. B. Hesseltine, *The Rise and Fall of Third Parties* (Washington, 1948).

[9] Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style of American Politics* (N.Y., Knopf, 1965), pp. 43–44.

[10] See Emile Durkheim's discussion of anomie in his book, *Suicide* (Glencoe, Free Press, 1951).

[11] *Salt Lake Tribune,* April 8, 1966.

[12] *Bulletin of the John Birch Society,* November, 1965, p. 2.

[13] See *ibid,* and *The Blue Book* (Belmont, Belmont Publishing Co., 1961) especially.

When it comes to tactics, Birch spokesmen take their cue from Machiavelli. Anything goes in the war against the conspiracy. Robert Welch openly justifies tactics which in his own words are "mean and dirty. But the Communists we are after are meaner and dirtier," Welch justifies, "and too slippery for you to judge for yourselves whether the tactics I am about to describe are legal and moral or mean and dirty." [14]

The conspiracy can be put down, Welch admonishes the Birchites, *"only by themselves becoming conspirators against established government."* [15] Conspiring against the conspirators can take many forms. One is the infiltration of political parties such as the Los Angeles County Young Republicans; another, a well accepted American practice of course, is to run Birchites for public office, such as the local school board or state text book commission.

Another device is collective slander, which now seems to have become standard operating procedure for some Birchites. All of us, for example, were slandered last July by the so-called Birch scoreboard on the Communist takeover which said that the United States was 60 to 80 percent under Communist influence and control. More recently, and as I have already mentioned, Welch came to Salt Lake City to slander us by calling our great and glorious land an insane asylum and us inmates. These people call themselves patriots. I ask you, "Who are the patriots and who are the inmates?" But that pales by comparison with the charge of treason which Welch leveled against President Dwight David Eisenhower.[16] Comparable abuse has been heaped upon Secretary Dulles, CIA Director Allen Dulles, President Kennedy and Earl Warren by Birch spokesmen.

In surveying this whole scene of Birch Society tactics one has to agree with the characterization by Bill Mauldin that it is "malice in wonderland."

How then shall we appraise the John Birch Society and their kindred fanatics of the extreme Right Wing? [17] We have Ezra Taft Benson's judgment that "The John Birch Society is the most effective non-church organization in our fight against creeping socialism and godless communism." [18] To use an expression of an old friend of mine and a great and important Republican, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, "That's hogwash!"

I fail to see how the country can be successfully defended against any aspect of a Communist threat by our putting on the Communist dress—and it is frightening how closely the Birchites have copied the Communist style. The spirit of elitism among Birchers, the semi-secret chapters that parallel Communist cells, the use of front groups,[19] the tactics of infiltration, the use of the big lie, and the total centralization of all policymaking at the Welch level of the society indicate a striking parallelism between the Birch Society and the very enemy they seek to defeat.

There are also a few fascistic aspects in the Birch Society style—in particular "Der Führer" principle, or the single-man theory of leadership. As Welch unblushingly states in the "Blue Book," "The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. . . . The Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels. . . . We are going to cut through the red tape and parliamentary briar patches and road blocks of confused purpose with direct authority at every turn. The men who join the John Birch Society during the next few months or few years are going to be doing so primarily because they believe in me and what I am doing and are willing to accept my leadership anyway." [20]

Is that dictatorship? I abhore dictatorship—Communistic, Fascistic, or Welchistic!

Beyond those shortcomings, the Birchite approach to the problem of communism is nonsensical. We cannot cope with communism abroad if we abolish the income tax and foreign aid, and we will hasten the triumph of communism at home if we follow Birch admonitions and turn our backs on the struggle for civil rights for all Americans.

Yet even if everything were right about the Birchites—and they ought to be right to be that far right—they would nevertheless merit my utter contempt for their hatred of democracy. By now, I am sure that we all know the epitaph which Robert Welch would put on the graves of John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson: "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud." [21] This contempt for democracy is further revealed in Welch's derogatory attack on politicians, beginning with Eisenhower. For Welch knows the truth of George Bernard Shaw's observation that you can't have democracy without politics and politicians. To anyone who has drunk of the wine of government by consent, majority rule and equal rights for all, the potion which Welch offers us is poison hemlock.

But it is not only Birchite contempt for democracy, but also their hatred of liberty that repels me so about these extremists. One need only note Birchite campaigns to prevent speakers they disagree with from appearing on college campuses, and their massive letter writing to the Xerox Corporation or the Saturday Evening Post to kill programs or publications they oppose, to know that these people do not believe in a free society. As that wise friend and great journalist, Elmer Davis, recognized a decade ago: "What they hate and fear is their own neighbors who try to think. In the name of anti-Communism they try to strike down the freedom of the mind, which above all things differentiates us from the Communists; in the name of Americanism they try to suppress the right to think what you like and say what you think, in the evident conviction—insofar as they have reasoned conviction at all—that the principles on which this republic was founded and has been operated will not bear examination. People like that are not merely un-American; they are anti-American." [22] Elmer Davis' first commandment was, "Don't let them scare you." And it was fitting that his biographer used that as the title of his biography.

CONCLUSION

To Americans who both understand and love their country, the appeals of both Right and Left are petitions in bankruptcy. We are a nation of middle-roaders—Republicans a bit right of center, Democrats a bit left of center—whose *two* party system has provided us over most of our history with choice, with change, and with stability.

I appeal to you to see that the center of the spectrum is vital, that politicians are crucial to democracy, and that our *major* parties are worthy of your support. Go into politics and make those parties dynamic instruments of self-government.

Above all, never forget that faith, not fear, built this country. I never knew the hour in our history when fear should have replaced reason and courage as the helmsman of our ship of state. Nor is this the hour.

To the politics of extremism we offer instead the love of life, faith in freedom and, with Thomas Jefferson, "Eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

A BUSINESSMEN'S PEACE CORPS A REALITY—THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 3½ years ago I proposed the establishment of a "businessmen's peace corps," which would send our executive talent and human know-how to needy areas around the world. My recommendation became a reality in June of 1964 under the formal name—International Executive Service Corps—IESC.

Since its establishment, IESC has amassed an enviable record. As of June 15, 1966, IESC has either completed or accepted nearly 200 projects in Central and South America, Africa, and the Middle and Far East. Thirty are now in operation, 63 completed, the rest in a stage of development.

Executive recruitment by IESC is accomplished through city representatives. In order to better acquaint these representatives with the organization and their role in it, 29 city representatives in the Central and Eastern States were invited to a 1-day conference in New York on July 12. They were greeted by David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of IESC, and by Frank Pace, Jr., president. They also met with key members of the staff and together reviewed their role in terms of community relations programs, liaison with Government agencies and private business groups, recruiting, and the screening of candidates.

A similar meeting for city representatives in the Western States wil' be held in San Francisco on August 9.

In the past, IESC executives in the field, while able to identify the problems confronting industry in the emerging countries, at times also required access to specific technical information. To obtain such information, IESC turned to Volunteers for International Technical Assistance—VITA. VITA was formed in 1960 by Dr. Robert Walker, a nuclear physicist with General Electric. It was created with the intention of using the spare time and talent of specialists in the United States to supplement international assistance projects.

Having in the past handled 15 problems submitted by IESC, VITA and IESC have just agreed to cooperate officially on a project in Taiwan that will employ the resources of both groups on a joint basis. While the two organizations carry on their joint project in Taiwan, they will continue to cooperate on an informal basis elsewhere to help build managerial and technical skills in the developing countries.

Mr. President, the International Executive Service Corps, its staff, and its distinguished Board of Directors are to be congratulated for the effective job they are doing in foreign assistance through private enterprise. The initial assistance of AID, which is being reduced as the organization becomes increasingly self-supporting, has been a wise use of our funds, in the development of this venture, which was inaugurated just two years ago in a White House Rose Garden ceremony. I am pleased at the sound and steady development from the time of my first proposal of such a plan here in the Senate.

---

[14] *Blue Book*, p. 96.

[15] *Ibid*, p. 29.

[16] Robert Welch, *The Politician* (Belmont, Belmont Publishing Co., 1964), pp. 278–79.

[17] The interested reader is referred to such critiques as Arnold Forster and Benjamin Epstein, *Report on the John Birch Society, 1966* (N.Y., Vintage Book #353, 1966), 112 pp.; and Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, *The Strange Tactics of Extremism* (N.Y., Norton, 1964), 315 pp.

[18] Ezra Taft Benson, *Stand Up for Freedom* (mimeo, 1966), p. 13.

[19] *Blue Book*, pp. 86–92.

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 158–61.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 159.

[22] Elmer Davis, *But We Were Born Free* (N.Y., Bobbs-Merrill, 1952), p. 226.

OPERATION COMBAT LEAVE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, three Texas Air Force Reserve troop carrier wings are rendering yeoman service in support of "Operation Combat Leave." I want to call the Senate's attention to this operation and to commend these units on their effective and professional participation.

The units are the 446th Troop Carrier Wing of Ellington Air Force Base, Houston; the 433d Troop Carrier Wing of Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio; and the 512th Troop Carrier Wing of Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth.

The dedicated men of these wings are taking part in the operation which is designed to provide travel assistance to military personnel on leave prior to and on leave returning from the southeast Asian combat zones. As you know, the current civil air transport difficulties have made travel a most difficult affair.

There are now seven transcontinental flights daily in "Operation Combat Leave." These are serviced either by Air Reserve or Air National Guard units. The Guard is now flying four and the Reserve three of the flights. Other Reserve and Guard units are providing aircraft for feeder trips on a nonscheduled basis. Major active Air Force commands are assisting, too, with maintenance of the feeder flights.

I believe this activity once again points up the value to this Nation of an active, ready Reserve force. I hope we will learn the lesson and do nothing to curtail the capabilities of these Air Reserve units. They can and do meet the tasks assigned to them.

THE LATE GEN. A. G. L. McNAUGHTON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Post carries the obituary of Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, who was one of Canada's great soldiers and leader in many fields.

I came to know General McNaughton in his later years through discussions that we had on the concept of transferring unused waters from Canada southward and eastward to the United States, and on to Mexico. Because of his service as Canadian chairman of the International Joint Commission, General McNaughton was well informed on water problems of his native land. He and I had sharp differences on the feasibility and desirability of transfer of water, but I recognized him as a man of integrity and competence and unfailing courtesy.

It was a privilege to meet him and to correspond with him. I feel deep regret at his passing. I extend my condolence to all of his family and to his neighbors and friends and to his Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Washington Post for July 12 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. MCNAUGHTON DEAD; SHAPED CANADIAN ARMY

OTTAWA, July 11.—Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, the controversial and versatile father of the Canadian army, died early today at his summer home in Montebello, Que.

He was 79 and was living in semiretirement and apparent good health.

He will be buried Wednesday with full military honors in Ottawa, the nation's capital that involved him in both great triumph and defeat during a distinguished career spanning more than 50 years.

Gen. McNaughton, born in Saskatchewan in 1887, built a career as a scientist, politician, soldier, and diplomat on outspoken honesty and bluntness.

As head of the army, he was involved personally in the two big Canadian military crises of World War II. He also became a world authority on atomic energy and spoke for the West in dealings with Russia in the 1940s.

And later as Canadian chairman of the International Joint Commission, he gained hard-won concessions for his country in negotiations with the United States for use of Columbia River power.

Andrew George Latta McNaughton began his career in the public service in 1912 when he entered the military.

When World War I broke out, he used scientific training as an engineer to build a solid reputation as a gunnery officer. By the end of the war, he was Canadian artillery commander.

He continued his way up the military ladder during the inter-war years and became Chief of General Staff in 1929 at the age of 42.

He trained Canadian troops for the first three years of World War II but retired before he could lead them into battle after a policy split with the government.

Gen. McNaughton vigorously opposed splitting Canadian troops to send a corps to Italy. He maintained they should be kept together as an army for the main push in Europe.

He stepped down in 1943 when the government didn't support his stand.

BACK IN SERVICE

But the conscription crisis led to his return to public life in November, 1944, as Defense Minister when he firmly supported Prime Minister Mackenzie King in opposing conscription for overseas service.

Appeals for volunteers failed and a month later conscription for home service was introduced.

His career then hit a snag when he failed twice in 1945 to win election as a member of parliament.

But the man who learned to fight back during his early life on the prairies refused to quit and plunged ahead into a new career in the public service.

He made his way back to the top in 1948 when he became permanent Canadian Delegate to the United Nations.

In 1950, he was appointed to the International Joint Commission handling boundary water disputes between Canada and the United States.

His hard-headed bargaining won for Canada unexpected concessions in the Columbia River controversy when the U.S. agreed to pay back both power and cash in return for downstream benefits.

He stepped down as Canadian chairman of the Joint Commission in 1962, claiming he was fired by then Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, and had lived in semiretirement since that time.

But he had written his name into Canadian, and world, history.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS AND CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2947).

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is no accident that the Senate is considering major pollution abatement and control legislation for the second day in a row.

Yesterday, we approved—by a vote of 80–0—amendments to the Clean Air Act. Today we are taking up amendments to the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the basic Federal Water Pollution Control Act. There are 48 sponsors on today's bill. It has the unanimous support of the members of the Committee on Public Works.

All of this is an indication of the importance the American people attach to the improvement of the quality of our environment. The President has called for action. Our contituents have called for action. And we have developed legislation designed to repair the damage of past and present waste and to upgrade the quality of our Nation's waters.

We can, as Members of this Congress, take pride in the legislation we have developed. It bears the fruit of many minds on both sides of this Chamber. I want to pay tribute to the late chairman of our committee, Senator Pat McNamara, who created the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution; to our distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has challenged us to greater efforts; and to my colleague, the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], who, as ranking minority member, has been a strong right arm in our efforts to eliminate harmful pollution from our air and waters. I want to express my thanks, also, to other members of the subcommittee and the full committee, to the committee staff and to the staffs of commitee members who have worked long and hard to perfect the legislation developed by our committee.

In the early days of our work, I sometimes despaired of progress in this field. But in the last year we have seen a remarkable shift in opinion and support.

Industries who once opposed us are now eager to get on with the job. State officials who viewed our proposals with alarm want to coordinate their pollution control programs more effectively with other States and with the Federal Government. Federal officials who were open in their skepticism now find our legislation useful and challenging.

And behind all these changes is the voice of the American people, demanding an end to the waste of our resources, insisting on an effective program, supported by the needed funds to do the job.

Mr. President, we have a mandate—from our constituents and from our posterity—to get on with the job of protecting our water resources. We do not have much time. We do not have all the answers. But we know enough about our needs and about the magnitude of our problems to make a substantial beginning toward ending the burdens of inadequate and poor quality water supplies.

As an example of the demand for action we are receiving from our constituents, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a series of articles and editorials from Maine newspapers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, these are but a sampling, from one State—a State which has an abundance of water resources. The problems of Maine can be multiplied a hundredfold for the Nation as a whole. The legislation we are offering today is designed to help answer these problems.

The bill pending before the Senate today, S. 2947, can be considered the first omnibus water pollution control act. It extends and broadens the existing program; it provides a new emphasis in the clean rivers concept; it strengthens other existing law, including the Oil Pollution Act of 1924; and it manifests the total commitment of the Federal Government to abatement of the pollution of one of the Nation's most vital resources.

Last year the Congress enacted the Water Quality Act, authorizing the establishment of water quality standards on all the Nation's interstate rivers. The Water Quality Act was a major step toward achieving the ultimate goal of control and abatement of water pollution. That act recognized the States' primary responsibility in this area, by providing an opportunity for the States to adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof, within each State. The water quality criteria, combined with a plan for implementation and enforcement of the criteria adopted, when approved by the Secretary, will be the water quality standards. It is important that this distinction be made. Water quality standards include both the criteria and the plan.

Following passage of the act, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution held extensive hearings throughout the Nation and in Washington on the financial needs to support an adequate water quality program. On the basis of that information, S. 2947, cosponsored by 48 Members of the Senate, was introduced. The bill you have before you today is a modified form of S. 2947. Several provisions are identical to those in the original bill, including authorization of $6 billion as the minimum Federal investment to provide adequate municipal secondary treatment for 80 percent of the population. This figure represents 30 percent of the committee's estimate of a $20 billion total cost of those facilities. That $20 billion does not include either treatment of industrial effluent or separation of storm and sanitary sewers, both of which will require multi-million-dollar investment. I want to emphasize the fact that $20 billion is a conservative estimate; $6 billion is the minimum Federal share of an adequate program for the next 6 years.

S. 2947 also includes elimination of dollar ceilings on grants to State, local, and interstate agencies for the construction of sewage treatment works.

S. 2947, as amended, provides for an intensified basic research program by authorizing funds for research on water quality requirements for all water uses, for research into the handling and disposal of radioactive wastes, and for other research, including the problems associated with waste discharge from boats and ships, household or small waste disposal systems, eutrophication, which is the special problem of Lake Erie—animal feedlot wastes, agricultural runoff, and numerous other specific pollution problems.

S. 2947, as amended, authorizes a research and demonstration program into advanced waste treatment and water purification and joint municipal-industrial treatment facilities.

S. 2947 provides for a vitally needed study of the pollution of the estuaries and estuarine zones and increases funds available for Federal program grants to State and interstate agencies from $5 million annually to $10 million annually.

The committee believes it is essential to accelerate our research and development effort, with special emphasis on contract research.

The bill also authorizes a loan program to aid communities in depressed areas where sewage treatment facilities are vitally necessary, but where the tax base is so eroded that the communities can neither levy taxes nor float bonds sufficient to meet the local share of the project's cost.

Other major provisions of the bill include a prefinancing provision whereby those States which are prepared to go ahead more rapidly to construct approved projects with State or local funds are authorized to use later Federal fund allocations to reimburse the State or local government for the Federal share of such projects. The reimbursement feature is limited to the life of the monetary authorization under S. 2947.

Metropolitan areas have special pollution control problems. The volume of sewage is great. Land costs are high. Multiple jurisdictions make coordinated planning and action difficult. To encourage such joint action, the committee offers an incentive of a 10-percent Federal grant bonus where the project is certified as consistent with metropolitanwide plans. This would improve programs and cut costs.

The committee also has applied to the problem of international pollution the authority provided in the act for abating pollution situations wholly within the United States; has expanded participation in the conference stage of the enforcement proceeding; has provided a method for the Secretary to obtain information necessary as to the character and extent of pollution; has provided for a study of the costs of an effective national pollution control program, presently estimated at approximately $100 billion; and has provided for a study of pollution from boats and vessels on the Nation's navigable waters.

S. 2947 amends the Refuse Act of 1899 to assure that its administration is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and has amended the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, extending the enforcement provisions of that act and transferring its administration to the Secretary of the Interior.

The Clean Rivers Restoration Act was proposed by the administration and is included as title I of S. 2947. It authorizes planning pollution control and abatement on a river basin basis and offers incentives for sewage treatment construction under such plans. In essence, the clean rivers program is an expansion of the concepts expressed in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 relative to water quality standards.

In my earlier remarks, I noted that water quality standards will more than simply set water quality criteria. In order to have standards, it is essential to have both the criteria and the plan for implementation of those criteria. The Water Quality Act was designed for application within the context of watersheds. But the committee did not specify either the organization of, or the formulation of, that plan of implementation in terms of construction plans and schedules.

The clean rivers restoration program, as provided in the committee version of S. 2947, carries the river basin oriented water quality program the next logical step.

Under the clean rivers program, the Secretary of the Interior, at the request of a Governor, or Governors, of a State, or States, will designate a planning agency with appropriate local, State, and Federal representation to develop necessary comprehensive plans for the control and abatement of pollution in a given river basin or portion thereof. This title provides that the designated planning agency will have 3 years in which to come up with an approved plan. The plan will include recommendations for the treatment works and related sewer facilities, joint municipal or municipal-industrial systems, where appropriate, and necessary steps to maintain and improve water quality standards, and an adequate financing program.

The planning agency has been deliberately given broad instructions by the committee so that it will not be forced to develop a plan which is inconsistent with a particular river basin or its existing political institution. The recommendations of the planning agency are subject to review by State, local and Federal interests and prior to acceptance of any plan. Approval by the Secretary is required if projects under the plan are to qualify for Federal assistance under this title.

As an incentive for the States to initiate planning on a river basin basis, title I provides that after designation of an appropriate planning agency, and if facilities proposed within the river basin involved meet the qualifications established under section 207 of title I of the act, the Secretary may make a grant in an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost of a project.

In order to receive this grant, the States are required to pay 30 percent of the cost of the project, and the Governor must provide satisfactory assurance that statewide water quality standards consistent with section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act are in effect or will be established.

In the original administration proposal, the clean rivers restoration plan included a "one shot" financing plan which was designed to shift the entire burden of financing pollution control to local bodies after an initial Federal investment. The committee rejected this approach as impractical and unwise.

In summary, then, the clean rivers restoration program approaches the pollution abatement problem on a river basin basis. It provides incentives to encourage the States to participate in river basin planning; and in keeping with the precept of the law that the States bear the primary responsibility, the States must agree to assume additional responsibilities. The Federal presence is available to insure the achievement of our national goals, but not to centralize control of the Nation's water resources.

Mr. President, yesterday during debate on air pollution, I referred to the philosophy of the subcommittee on air and water pollution regarding exploratory efforts on matters which affect the public health and welfare.

During the hearings on water pollution the subcommittee took the opportunity to enlighten itself and the public on potential hazards associated with exposed uranium mill tailings piles in the Colorado River basin. These piles—slag heaps resulting from the uranium milling process—are being eroded by the waters of the Colorado and other natural forces, thereby depositing quantities of radium 226 and thorium 230 in the river.

The Colorado is used for both agricultural and domestic use and any contamination of it can adversely affect the public health. Witnesses from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission disagreed as to the potential hazard from the tailings piles. The committee was inclined to accept the judgment of Mr. Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer of FWPCA, and his technical experts, who testified that a long-term hazard does exist from erosion of the pilings.

The committee feels that the Atomic Energy Commission has not satisfactorily discharged its responsibilities toward the prevention of radioactive pollution in the Colorado River basin. The AEC has a clear obligation to protect the public from radioactive hazards generated by activities it licenses, regardless of the traditional regulation of radium by the States. Further, through its licensing procedures and title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, part 20 regulations, the AEC has the authority necessary to control radioactive releases from tailings piles of operating and closed mills. In view of the concern of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Public Health Service, the committee believes the AEC has not fulfilled its regulatory function or exercised its authority to prevent radioactivity from the tailings piles in the Colorado River basin.

The counsel for the AEC testified that the AEC could require stabilization of the tailings piles if the pile represented a risk to the public health and safety. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration testified that the piles did represent such a risk. I suggested that the President's Executive Order 11258, dealing with prevention and control of water pollution from Federal activities, contained a section which provided the AEC with more general regulatory authority. This section 1, subsection (3) states:

> Pollution caused by all other operations of the Federal Government such as water resources projects and operations under Federal loans, grants, and contracts shall be reduced to the lowest level practicable.

This order was issued after the committee, and especially the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], urged prompt steps to abate pollution from Federal installations, and from facilities of recipients of Federal grants and contract funds.

Although the AEC's counsel offered a legal opinion to the contrary, the committee feels that this Executive order confers upon the AEC sufficient regulatory authority to control the pollution from the uranium mill tailings piles of operating mills under contract to the Government, and that the AEC can provide direction for those owners of nonoperating mills—which operated under Government contracts—to provide adequate control of the tailings piles.

The committee recommended that the FWPCA move expeditiously to establish responsibility for control of the tailings piles, and to provide the Congress with adequate assurance that any control measures applied would be sufficient to achieve long-term protection of the health of the people who live within the area, or depend upon the use, of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

The committee is also concerned with the more far-reaching problem of release of radioactivity associated with nuclear powerplants. We intend a much deeper examination of this problem in future hearings. The committee is concerned that standards promulgated with reference to a statistical average man and that an average dose concept may not be satisfactory to protect persons in the population who may have peculiar exposure situations or may adversely react to lower levels of exposure.

Mr. President, the legislation we present to the Senate today represents a substantial advance in the war against water pollution. More importantly, it opens wider the door to improved water quality—to the chance for adequate supplies of water for our citizens to drink, to use in their homes, to enjoy for recreation, and to use in industry and on the farms. It is imaginative, but sound. It represents a reasonable compromise with the administration on its proposals. The bill is meaningful, and one of which the Senate can be proud. I urge its passage.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Portland (Maine), Sunday Telegram, July 3, 1966]

COASTAL POLLUTION PROBLEMS—AND PROGRESS—IN MAINE

". . . From the rolling, sometimes choppy sea, we view a panorama of rugged coastline . . . gracious towns nestled here and there within sheltered bays; of dories, yachts and lobster buoys bobbing in the sun; of islands favoring us with views on all sides; of forested hills gently sloping to the sea . . . a granite mountain rising swiftly, majestically above it . . ."

Is this a come-on for the tourist dollar from Maine's Department of Economic Development? Is it a Chamber of Commerce salute to the glories of the Maine Coast?

Not exactly.

The mildly poetic paragraph above is found in a Maine Water Improvement Commission 1962 classification study of Maine tidal waters.

But none of the publicity puffs directed to potential tourists of the Maine Coast by the DED and every local chamber of commerce along this great granite threshold of the Atlantic would likely include other, less poetic observations from this WIC study in their pages.

For publicity pieces obviously don't mention the raw sewage and industrial wastes that those "gracious towns" are pouring into "the rolling, sometimes choppy sea."

Nor will they describe the resulting pollution of most of the harbor waters on which those "dories and yachts" are bobbing—or the numerous, tremendous clam flats and their multimillion dollar harvests closed down by health authorities for pollution—or the public bathing beaches where pollution has produced obvious but unadmitted swimming hazards.

Tourism, of course, is an economic mainstay of many Maine coastal towns and they must promote their attractions whether their waters have pollution problems or not.

A few ocean communities have taken impressive steps to clean up bays, beaches and estuaries as part of their recreational package. Several other similar town projects are in the advanced planning stage, though experience to date shows a wide gap, especially in money, between planning and execution.

But too many communities apparently still have their heads stuck in the sand or mudflats, hoping that the worst—a pollution crisis—won't happen to them, yet doing nothing to prevent one.

And in some cases, the Maine Legislature seems to have its head stuck in the same hole.

Pollution of Maine's great rivers, the bulk of its industrial pollution going back decades, has drawn tremendous attention in recent years, thanks to the Maine Water Improvement Commission's surveys and recommendations, and stories of the commission's gains and defeats in its classification legislation.

But the WIC, under its original mandate from the Legislature and in its subsequent studies and recommendations, has been equally concerned with Maine tidal waters and shores from Kittery Point to West Quoddy Head.

Its findings have shown the coast deserves all the concern it can get on pollution problems; problems that, for example, have closed down 106 clam flats, some of them very large and rich, and all of them totaling an estimated 20 per cent of the state's annual harvest potential for this shellfish.

TIDE TAKES CARE OF IT

Pollution almost closed down the State's biggest beach resort before construction of a sewage treatment plant rescued its reputation in the nick of time, and it has fouled the state's largest harbor and some of its smallest ones with bacteria-laden Class D water conditions, dangerous to all forms of water recreation.

Since the days that town and individual sewer lines replaced the farmhouse privy, Maine's ocean cities and towns have had a simple answer—pipe it overboard and let the tide take it out. After all, how can you pollute the Atlantic Ocean?

But, as WIC findings have vividly shown, it's not a question of polluting the Atlantic Ocean—it's a question of polluting one's doorstep to that ocean, tide or no tide.

Pollution sets in when the dumping of raw wastes becomes constant. Bacteria and materials in this waste may die and dissipate within a few hours after discharge, but they are being constantly replaced. So in a sense they are not dying and dissipating. And the greater the rate of discharge, the higher this pollution constant is.

The twice-daily tides with their dilution and current factors, and the high oxygen content of the ocean waters they bring in, undoubtedly are a big help in fighting this pollution constant, holding it lower than it otherwise would be. But they don't begin to lick it where a population of any size is involved.

As an incoming tide tremendously dilutes polluted harbor or shore waters, an outgoing tide tremendously concentrates the pollution of remaining waters. It strands much of the waste materials on exposed flats, where this concentration builds up while waiting for the tide's return.

Thus the neighboring cities of Portland, South Portland and Westbrook, daily dumping all their municipal sewage untreated into Casco Bay, augmenting it with the industrial wastes of a major paper mill and numerous waterfront fish and meat processing plants, produce Class D pollution conditions (the worst recognized by WIC classification) in Portland's great harbor and main anchorage, despite eight foot tides.

And a few other coast communities, with much smaller harbors to match their much smaller populations and untreated wastes, have also graduated to the Class D waterfront pollution big league. Bar Harbor is one. Belfast is another.

Class C town and resort waterfronts (unsafe for swimming) are legion along the coast.

POLLUTED SHELLFISH

The argument is also made that sewage discharge into tidal waters holds no comparison to discharge of such wastes into inland bodies of water. Because who drinks salt water? Besides, aren't the water volumes of estuaries and bays large enough to prevent the grave damage to aquatic biology found in polluted inland waters?

The trouble with this theory is that while communities don't drink the salt water along their shores, their residents and summer visitors delight in eating the shellfish and other marine delicacies that live in these waters.

And these tasty little animals, marine biologists find, have a proclivity for absorbing their environmental waters into their body tissues without making fine distinctions about bacteria content or its source. That, for example, is why 106 Maine clam flats have been closed to harvesting by the Dement of Sea and Shore Fisheries according to standards set by the U.S. Public Health Service.

The department does its own, constant testing and has sole responsibility for the opening or closing of clam flats.

Its tests are so thorough and regular that the public can rest assured that any clams offered for sale in Maine are a "clean and wholesome" product, says Dana E. Wallace, the department's marine resources scientist.

As for damage to the balance of aquatic life in coastal waters from pollution, this is still a largely unexplored question and for that reason alone should demand a cautious approach if coastal areas value the economics and attractions of their fish harvesting industries.

No doubt more pollution can be absorbed than in fresh water, but the organic matter in human and many industrial wastes is still food and there are plenty of customers for it in the teeming microscopic animal world of salt waters.

As has amply been demonstrated in polluted ponds and rivers, this unnatural food supply can upset nature's balance of water biology, allowing tremendous multiplication of some plant and animal species which may tax their other food sources and starve out life dependent on these sources in resulting competition. Theoretically, such an imbalance can work its way up to higher forms of animal life, including fish, forcing them to look elsewhere for food.

Pollution from the Los Angeles Valley, for example, has caused a huge multiplication in sea urchins. These spiny and very hungry little animals have virtually wiped out the giant ocean floor kelp beds off the Southern California coast.

BATTLEGROUNDS

A single drop of natural salt or fresh water under a microscope at a few hundred times magnification ceases to be just a drop of water, especially if it is favored with a trace of organic pollution.

It becomes instead a bright, quivering little world of hydrazoa, protozoa, and other subkingdoms, transparent little creatures of vast variety in form and movement.

Some of them are wormlike, endlessly writhing and coiling their bodies. There are sack-like little animals, seemingly motionless, who suddenly shoot out and retract their mouth to capture bypassing bits of food matter.

There are stick-like little animals which twitch to and fro. And there are shapeless little blobs of animals that just seem to sit, possibly contemplating a reproduction of themselves by simple division.

And for all this activity seen, there is much more beyond the eye's reach, descending to the amazing world of bacteria, nature's simplest and one of her most useful plant forms.

The analogy is perhaps inappropriate, but if Maine's pollution abatement efforts could be put under a microscope, its variety of activity in this field might seem somewhat similar.

The activity ranges from communities which have modernized their sewage systems and built sewage treatment plants to cure chronic and dangerous pollution conditions, down to communities apathetic about the need and angry about the cost of meeting WIC classification standards for their waters.

The WIC currently has in its files planning reports on 91 proposed sewage treatment plants and sewer projects. If all were undertaken as designed, they would cost an estimated $113.5 million. As it is, facilities totaling $18.9 million have approached to the construction stage or been completed.

Old Orchard Beach and Bar Harbor, two of Maine's greatest resort towns, are interesting contrasts in performance.

Back in August, 1959, at the height of its summer season, Old Orchard Beach faced perhaps the gravest economic crisis in its history. A Water Improvement Commission report announced that some of the waters at the beach were at D level, heavily polluted and quite unfit for swimming. (Even a B-2 or C rating is unfit for swimming.)

The crisis this presented the town was in three forms: the rapid spread of publicity that would keep summer visitors away; the real danger to public health from further continuance of the conditions; and the possibility of heavy WIC penalties for failure to correct the situation.

Exactly one year later, thanks to earlier plans, Old Orchard Beach held open house at its new $687,000 primary sewage treatment plant at Ocean Park. The town approved another $400,000 in sewer system interceptors to eliminate its ocean outfalls, bringing its bonding for these projects to half a million dollars, the federal and state governments funding the balance.

The town then lost no time advertising itself far and wide as "The Cleanest Beach in Maine," which has proved its best return on a painful but proud investment.

At about the same time the WIC put the fat in the fire for Old Orchard Beach, it discovered similar Class D pollution conditions at famed Bar Harbor. It recommended that waters along the town's shoreline, including a strip of beach, be brought up to a B-1 classification, suitable for swimming and other clean water uses.

After release of the Commission's Hancock County tidal waters survey in 1962, measures were inserted in the town warrant to begin appropriations for a capital improvement fund to finance eventual corrective measures. The voters turned it down, and every year since they have rejected such appropriations.

At Bar Harbor's town meeting this year a capital improvement fund was established to start accumulating money for a building to house town offices. If voters wish to transfer money from this fund for construction of sewage facilities they could do so, but no moneys have as yet been appropriated specifically for correction of water pollution.

In the meantime, the legislature was persuaded to lower the WIC's recommended B-1 classification for the shore area to a Class C requirement. This gives the town a lower goal to shoot for in pollution control.

There's just one little problem. Class C waters are still not suitable for swimming, only for boating and fishing, yet the beach concerned is still heavily used by residents and visitors every summer.

The Maine Water Improvement Commission has many responsibilities under law, and in trying to fulfill them it encounters many problems. Public attitude is a big one.

"A ruling majority of the people of Maine," observes the commission in its 1965 annual report, "are sufficiently concerned with cost (of pollution control) to cause them to resist really adequate programs.

"This would not be true if the program was accepted as a genuine public works activity for the benefit of all, instead of one to which it is politic to give lip service but which is otherwise placed on a low priority level." But for some towns, that "low priority" level may not be sufficient much longer.

ENFORCING THE LAW

The WIC has now virtually completed its classification of Maine coastal waters and river basins and will start to give more attention to enforcement of these classifications in coming months.

Its procedure in water classification begins with surveys of the existing conditions of a body of water. Along the coast these include harbors, estuaries, settled shores, bays and some islands.

After completing its survey of a coastal town's shores, the commission is required to call a public hearing of residents to determine what use these waters are receiving and the types of uses the people would like to see continued or added if possible.

The commissioners and their staff, after such hearings, make the final determination on what "reasonable" classifications should be recommended to the legislature, which has the final say. Thus the law does not try to eliminate all pollution, but merely aims to reduce it to acceptable levels for given uses.

In a good many instances, the Commission has found that a stretch of shore showed a Class B–2, C, or sometimes Class D pollution problem, but that the stretch of shore was popular for swimming and the residents wanted to continue to swim there.

Such a finding would lead the Commission to recommend an upgrading to a B–1 classification, a safe level for swimming. With the legislature's approval, the community would be under orders to bring the waters up to that classification, with or without a deadline, depending on the seriousness of the situation.

The process can be pretty frustrating, for all its logic.

Some coastal communities have not only failed to start corrective steps, but have disputed the WIC's classification recommendations where their voters' voices would be most effective—in Augusta.

Out of 27 coastal towns surveyed in Hancock and Lincoln Counties, the legislature voted lower classifications than recommended by the WIC in all but eight. The Commission's classifications remained intact only for Sedgwick, Sorrento, Sullivan, Surry, Wiscasset, Westport, Edgecomb and Alna.

Raeburn W. MacDonald, WIC chief engineer, recalls one of these appeals with a grin. "One bit of testimony before the legislature was to the effect that nobody ever bathed in the tidal waters of Hancock County as it was far too cold for that purpose. The only purpose they served was to enhance the view.

"In general, however, testimony dwelt upon the expense involved in providing sewage collection and treatment as compared to the 'negligible benefits' to be realized."

In one instance, a town health officer, a doctor of medicine, declared to the publisher of the local weekly paper that the water classification studies made there by the WIC engineers were without validity.

His influential observation just happened to precede a town meeting at which voters turned down a sewage treatment plant for which the town would have paid only 20 per cent of the cost, thanks to matching 30 per cent federal and state pollution control grants plus matching 10 per cent federal and state grants under an accelerated public works program qualification.

As a matter of fact, the WIC has had more than one doctor question its on-the-scene pollution testing techniques.

As much as it can, the commission uses its trailer laboratory for bacteria tests of water samples, particularly from salt water. The laboratory can be virtually backed down to the water's edge. While not able to make as exhaustive tests as Department of Health and Welfare laboratories, it has the important advantage of speed.

That's because coliform bacteria native to animal and human wastes doesn't live long in salt water. And it is the count or frequency of these bacteria in given water samples, together with dissolved oxygen and biochemical oxygen demand measurements, that accurately reflect the degree and danger of the water's pollution to humans from a disease standpoint and to fish from an oxygen standpoint.

Possibly consumed by the protozoa in salt water or killed off by its low temperature or salinity, at least 80 per cent of these coliform bacteria will disappear from a sample in three days. In fact, most disappear the first day, notes MacDonald, but they don't die off at a predictable time rate that would allow later laboratory testing to reflect source conditions.

"Therefore, if we want to know what the situation is at the water's edge, and that is what we need to know, we've got to do most of our testing on the spot rather than mail samples away to a laboratory," he explained.

This holds almost as true for fresh water tests, and the WIC trailer laboratory has been on Androscoggin River duty most of the past year.

When the WIC then turns up frequent Class C and not a few Class D pollution situations in most of the heavily, and even moderately populated sections of the coast, despite dilution by the ocean and its high kill ratio of coliform bacteria in salt water, such findings speak volumes on the potency and immensity of these discharged wastes.

Portland's great harbor, for example, generously fed by Portland, South Portland and Westbrook (whose pollution problems will be examined in depth next week) is a Class D and Class C tidal sewer, for all its continued beauty from a distance. But Portland's Back Bay, a giant tidal pond in the city's midst, can't even stagger up to its Class D classification.

Down the shore a piece, beautiful, yacht-dotted Falmouth Foreside's shore continues in violation of its B–2 classification and town fathers recently received another WIC visitation.

WINDOW ON THE BAY

Rockland's big harbor opens onto Penobscot Bay like a window and would seemingly have few problems. But 12 sewer outfalls along two miles of harbor front, half of them in Lermond's Cove, plus numerous private pipes discharging into brooks, followed up by the contributions of waterfront industries, produce Class C conditions bordering on D in sections.

Back in 1960, the city had an engineering survey made by Fay, Spoffard and Thorndike, Boston, which came up with a $1,365,000 plan for modernizing the sewerage system and construction of a sewage treatment plant.

The plans have lain dormant for the most part, however, because the WIC does not yet view the harbor condition as urgent.

The city has constructed several new storm drains to take some of this load off the old combined sewer system, and has sought federal funds for more storm drains, for bulkheading of Lermond Cove and for relocating its outfalls.

The city is also compiling a comprehensive map of all its own and private sewer lines and their tie-ins, no mean feat of detective work.

Neighboring Thomaston's St. George River is in serious trouble, sharing with its Mill Brook tributary at least 14 sewer outfalls, some from the town, the rest from Maine State Prison. The large clam flats in the river's big tidal bend, once among the finest in the state, are closed. Thomaston and state officials are studying a joint sewage treatment plant for the town and prison.

Camden has made a final $56,000 survey in preparation for an estimated $860,000 sewage treatment plant and sewerage improvement program to overcome its lovely harbor's long time pollution from the Megunticook River's woolen mill and tannery wastes and from river and harbor sewer outfalls.

Town officials say the WIC has provided a lot of help and they look for a start in construction of the treatment plant next year if full federal assistance is confirmed.

Belfast is digesting a heavy engineering report from Metcalf & Eddy, Boston civil engineers, recommending a sewage treatment plant and new sewers to pick industrial wastes to overcome the inner harbor's Class D condition. A city Water Improvement Committee has been organized to sponsor public information and support for the project.

Considering that most of their installations have been built within the past five years, the roster of Maine coastal communities with sewage treatment plants in operation today—13 plants in 11 towns—is worth taking a look at.

Most of the newer plants and their systems were planned and financed under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with federal and state matching grants splitting 60 to 80 per cent of the cost, with the community financing the balance, usually through bonding.

The basic matching rate is 30 per cent federal and 30 per cent state. But communities in "depressed" areas have qualified for an additional 10 per cent federal grant, also matched by the state. The plants:

Kittery—Admiralty Village treatment plant, built in 1940, which serves about 1,400 persons. Despite its age, and earlier Imhoff Tank design, this plant has an efficiency of 89 per cent suspended solids removal and 25 per cent biochemical oxygen demand reduction. Unfortunately it serves only about 10 per cent of Kittery's people. The town and Portsmouth Naval Shipyard are discussing additional facilities.

Ogunquit—This resort town's new treatment plant has been sized to handle part of Wells' sewage. The $385,000 plant, built last year, is part of a $1 million Ogunquit Sewerage District program including interceptors, force mains and pumping stations.

Kennebunk—This town has two sewage treatment plants built in 1960 to arrest pollution of the Mousam River. The Water Street plant serves 1,400, and the Boothbay Road plant serves 630 persons. Both use a primary treatment process and chlorination.

Biddeford—This city has a $750,000 treatment plant built in 1964 as part of a $1,518 million program to stem this city's pollution of the Saco River. The city floated a $400,000 bond issue to cover its share of the cost.

Saco—This small city has two treatment plants, an industrial plant built in 1962 and the Bear Brook Plant built in 1961. Together they serve about 2,900 persons. Additional facilities to handle the entire city are in final planning stages. Yet to be worked out, however, is a method to treat tannery wastes which contribute heavily to the Saco River's Class D condition.

Old Orchard Beach—A modern large treatment plant serving 6,600 persons built in 1960. Discussed earlier in this article.

Scarborough—A small treatment plant built in 1963 to serve a shopping center area and to arrest pollution of the Nonesuch River. It serves a population equivalent of 293.

Cape Elizabeth—A small treatment plant built two years ago at Pond Cove to serve a school complex, stores and a housing development to reduce pollution of the Spurwink River. It utilizes an advanced secondary process.

Freeport—A primary treatment plant utilizing two Imhoff tanks and chlorinaters. It was built in 1952 to arrest pollution of the Harraseeket River and serves most of the town. The town's coastal waters and harbor have a B–2 rating and classification, however, indicating some pollution, probably from South Freeport's development.

Wiscasset—Has completed a $300,000 treatment plant to stem the town's pollution of the Sheepscot River. The primary treatment facility is located on Sortwell Island and connected to the shore by a causeway.

Boothbay Harbor—Back in 1962 the waters of this famed harbor were rated "a low D" in pollution by the WIC—very poor. This sparked a $1 million sewage treatment plant and system improvement program. The harbor waters today meet their B–1 classification.

Two notable additions to coastal sewage treatment plants in the next year will be a $1,008,000 facility at Brunswick, greatly reducing the town's pollution of the Androscoggin River (albeit a drop in the bucket considering the total pollution of this river, still unclassified by the WIC) and a $345,000 treatment plant at Yarmouth, part of its $683,000 program to arrest historic pollution of the tidal Royal River. Both projects began in May.

THE MATTER OF MONEY

Effective sewage treatment costs money. Towns of 5,000 population and lower can easily hit half a million dollars in a sewage treatment plant program, including intercepters, pumps and force mains, not to mention planning costs.

As communities get bigger, the costs of hooking them up to a sewage treatment plant, together with increased plant capacities, boost initial costs tremendously. Thus Portland officials, looking over their city's engineering surveys for sewage treatment, find such a project nudging $20 million.

As the WIC points out in its 1965 report, limits on federal and therefore state grants have caused small communities with project costs within these limits to use them, while generating reluctance among cities.

The basic grant under the Water Pollution Control Act, passed several years ago by Congress to get things rolling, was 30 per cent of basic project costs up to a grant limit of $600,000, with the state matching another 30 per cent and the community the remaining 40 per cent.

In certain areas the federal government would add a 10 per cent grant for accelerated public works purposes, also matched by the state, leaving the community only 20 per cent of basic project costs.

Recently Congress upped the federal grant maximum to $1.2 million for any one project, also to be state matched.

Although the federal maximum grant for any single project has doubled, the federal authority has added little to its total allocation to the state for any one year. This has risen from $1,252,100 to only $1,412,060. The state's matching ceilings have been adjusted accordingly, and thus one single maximum grant could virtually use up the entire year's allocation.

This means just one large project could use up most of a whole year's federal allocation. Even these new limits, up to $2.4 million is combined federal and state grants, are "peanuts" to a project the size of Portland's.

In addition to the Water Pollution Control Act, considerable supplementary legislation has been passed in Congress recently, allowing aid, much of it in 50 per cents grants, to sewer system pipe installation not directly connected with treatment plants.

There is no direct federal aid to industries for sewage treatment facilities, a situation that is causing industries under cleanup orders to show more and more interest in purchasing sewage treatment services from community sewage treatment plants.

WHAT'S YOUR BRAND?

Maine's water improvement statutes provide five standards for tidal waters classification. They are SA, SB–1, SB–2, SC, and SD, the S used to distinguish them from freshwater standards which are similar but not the same. (When used in cases where tidal waters alone are discussed the S is generally dropped.)

Class SA—Suitable to all clean water uses, including swimming, shellfish harvesting, boating, fishing, etc. There must be no floating or settleable solids, oil or sludge deposits attributable to sewage or other wastes, no dumping or refuse, no discharge of sewage without primary treatment and disinfection, and no discharge or dumping of wastes of any kind in any quantity that would affect such waters' marine life or quality.

SB–1—The same uses and requirements as Class A but with a slightly higher allowable pollution count in shellfish growing areas.

SB–2—Suitable for boating and fisheries but not for swimming.

SC—Suitable for boating and fishing but not for swimming.

SD—The lowest classification, "shall be considered as primarily devoted to the disposal of sewage and industrial wastes without causing a public nuisance . . . by the creation of odor-producing sludge banks and deposits or other nuisance condition."

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, July 10, 1966]

COASTAL POLLUTION PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS IN MAINE: PART II—THE EFFLUENT SOCIETY

Sewage is decidedly a sore subject in polite conversation. It isn't even nice to think about, let alone discuss, the biological or industrial wastes of modern American civilization.

And the incredible water pollution problems which are today arousing the United States are only a measure of the previous lack of consideration given this very basic fact of life.

Unless a house pipe or street sewer plugs up, or until a septic tank starts decorating the back yard, household wastes are neither a subject nor a problem to ponder. They are just drained or flushed away.

But where is "away"?

In medieval towns, as schoolchildren read with amazement and disgust, "away" was generally the nearest street gutter by means of a well-aimed bucket. Rains did the flushing, if one was lucky enough to live on high ground.

Progress has been made. The engineering of modern gravity storm and sanitary sewer systems has reached tremendous development from its introduction just over a century ago. Perhaps its most notable achievement has been in the field of sewage treatment plants some of which, utilizing huge colonies of bacteria in normal but speeded up processes of nature, can virtually reduce raw sewage to drinking water.

Yet for the majority of Maine's cities and towns, progress has proved a relative thing. Their gutters are clean, but their rivers, harbors, or coastal shores are not. . .

The City of Portland's "away" for a dry weather (no storm water) average daily load of 13 million gallons of raw municipal sewage, without benefit of treatment, is Portland Harbor, the Upper Fore River and Back Cove, the cove alone handling 30 per cent.

The City of South Portland's solution for its daily four million gallons of raw municipal sewage is Portland Harbor and its Main Ship Channel shore.

The City of Westbrook, with only 65 per cent of its population served by municipal sewers (vs. 90 per cent or more in Portland and South Portland) quietly dumps a daily average 658,000 gallons of a raw sewage into the famous, or infamous, long-suffering Presumpscot River.

The Presumpscot's real claim to fame, however, is the 27 million gallons a day of industrial wastewater it receives from the giant S. D. Warren Co. paper plant in Westbrook, the region's largest industry by far.

The company now puts six million gallons a day of its wastewater through primary treatment to settle suspended solids, but discharges a further 21 million gallons untreated. And even in the treated six million gallons there's still the problem of lingering chemicals.

Cape Elizabeth, a pioneer of sorts, has built a small secondary sewage treatment plant at Pond Cove to handle schools, a housing area and a shopping center there, preventing pollution of the Spurwink River. But the town discharges enough sewage on its Main Ship Channel shores to bring advice from the Water Improvement Commission that another sewage treatment plant will be needed if the Fort Williams area is developed.

Falmouth Foreside's beautiful but thickly settled shore has been finding increasing problems with its convenient sewage discharge methods, a multitude of simple house and street pipes. And the town's rapidly growing shopping center area is taxing the limits of its ground disposal facilities.

Cumberland has a short mainland shore between Falmouth and Yarmouth, plus the shoreline of giant Chebeague, Casco Bay's largest island. Although the town's pollution problems are mostly minor and in places non-existent, its Wildwood Park area sewage has been violating the SB–2 classification of that ocean community's shore.

Yarmouth citizens voted last November to float a $450,000 bond issue as the town's share of the cost of a sewage treatment plant and interceptors to stop its heavy pollution of the tidal Royal River, a stream which has not looked very royal at close hand for many years.

On a bright, clear, windy day, the white-capped waters of Casco Bay, and even the murky waters of Portland Harbor, fairly sparkle and shine. They certainly don't seem polluted. Surely the tides and the ocean's nearness can take care of any pollution threat!

But if they can, why does the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries forbid, and why has it forbidden for years, any clam digging between Yarmouth and Portland Head Light because of polluted shores?

If Casco Bay and its fresh Atlantic waters can "take care of" its daily dose of Greater Portland's sewage and other wastes, why are the shores of several Casco Bay islands unfit for swimming by Maine Water Improvement Commission standards?

Why is the west shore of Long Island, for example, classified SB–2, unfit for swimming?

Why is the ocean shore of Cushing, another sparsely settled island, classified SB–2?

Why is the sparsely settled eastern or ocean shore of Peaks Island classified SB–2?

Why does the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries forbid clamming on all islands inside a line drawn from Waites Landing, Falmouth, to the most northerly point of Great Diamond, thence to the eastern shore of Peaks, thence to White Head on Cushing Island and from there to Portland Head Light, a line that takes in Little Diamond, Mackworth and House Islands as well, despite their proximity to deep ocean water?

Why are most of Falmouth's, Cumberland's and Freeport's shores fronting on Casco Bay classified B–2?

Actually, Casco Bay probably could dispose of this pollution—if it had the time. But as fast as the bay waters near Portland are dissipating their sewage load in deep water, it is being replaced.

Because the dissipation speed of Portland's smaller harbor waters is slower, because their volume is lower, their level of continuing pollution is much higher.

HOW TO ESTIMATE POLLUTION

Pollution in the case of sewage is measured by the Most Probable Number (MPN) of coliform bacteria in a 100-millimeter water sample (equivalent to six cubic inches).

Coliform bacteria are native to the intestines of humans and other warm blooded animals, and the degree of their presence in water is a reliable indicator of the presence and amount of sewage.

The coliform bacteria are not particularly troublesome themselves, but their presence in water indicates the real possibility of the presence of the disease bacteria which live in the intestines of human "carriers." The deadly typhoid bacillus and the Salmonella group of bacteria which cause dysentery are two examples.

In polluted waters, clams and oysters are possible collectors of these disease organisms because of the large quantities of water they "siphon" through their bodies.

Lobsters and other swimming fish are not affected this way because they do not ingest water as do clams and oysters.

The Maine Water Improvement Commission designates its Class A waters as those which have or must be brought up to 70 coliforms or less per 100 ml sample.

The B–1 classification is for waters with an MPN count of 240 or less, and B2—waters with an MPN count of 1,000 or less—is considered by the commission as unfit for swimming.

There are no MPN minimums for the C and D classifications, the latter being designated for water into which sewage may be discharged so long as it does not become a "nuisance." Portland Harbor and its adjacent waters are classified C and D.

The Water Improvement Commission found some interesting, not to say disturbing, MPN values when it surveyed Portland Harbor in 1957 and 1958, taking samples at 12 stations at varying stages of tide.

The readings, in order, generally represent high tide, half tide and low tide. The values are noted here because nothing has been done to reduce pollution conditions since they were taken.

Station 1, Congress Street Fore River crossing, 150 to 64,000 to 93,000 MPN coliform counts; Station 2, Thompson's Point, 93, 39,000, 110,000; Station 3, Veterans Memorial Bridge, 230, 23,000, 15,000; Station 4, Portland Bridge, 430, 23,000, 24,000; Station 5, inner harbor mouth near Portland side, 430, 43,000, 93,000; Station 6, Fish Point, off Fort Allen Park, 150, 2,300, 46,000; Station 7, off Cushing Point South Portland, 43, 93, 46,000; Station 8, Tukey's Bridge, 230, 43,000, 110,000; Station 9, mouth of inner harbor near South Portland shore, 390, 4,300, 110,000; Station 10, in cove near South Portland City Hall, 230, 3,900, 1,100,000; Station 11, off Turner Island, South Portland, 230, 2,300, 46,000; Station 12, Veterans Memorial Bridge, South Portland side, 230, 4,300, 460,000.

It is the continual input of these bacteria from a consistently large sewage flow that produces large counts, even though the disease organisms they warn of die in a matter of hours.

Receiving waters have quite a battle considering municipal sewage at outfall averages 50 to 300 million MPN per half pint sample.

RATS BY THE THOUSAND

Besides direct contact dangers and the travels of interested insects, Portland's gushing waterfront outfalls produce another continuing disease danger: Rats, thousands of them.

Battled but never quite conquered by rodent control campaigns, they are so well fed they just aren't too interested in the poisoned bait proffered by the Health Department.

The rats are thriving on two principal food sources, reports Health Department chief sanitarian Neal D. McDowell. One of them is as old as the waterfront and the other the result of modern household kitchens.

The historic and still generous food source is the droppings of fish and meat scraps from the Commercial Street waterfront food processing concerns. The new source is the garbage disgorged by the "electric pig" disposal units of kitchen sinks.

An August, 1965, survey of resident rodents by the Health Department turned up sightings and signs of large colonies at Portland Terminal Co. Wharves 1 and 3; Snodgrass, Brown's, Merchant's, Merrill's and Union Wharves, and small nests at Custom House and Widgery Wharves.

The same survey also found rats nesting near and patronizing several Back Cove outfalls, presumably for garbage scraps from many nearby homes. There was considerable infestation of the Baxter Boulevard shore between Dartmouth Street and Vannah Avenue, and smaller nests at other outfall areas.

Small rat colonies were also reported at East Deering's Presumpscot Estuary back shore and at points along the upper Fore River.

The growing pollution of the anchorage area near Portland's East End Bathing Beach, caught between the ebb and flow of currents from the City's inner harbor and Back Cove, caused the Health Department to urge closing of the beach to swimming two years ago. A freshwater pool has been built at the popular beach area as a substitute.

The controversial closing was voted by the City Council after beach tests showed the water bacteria count was not being reduced by chlorination of a nearby outfall thought to have caused the condition.

South Portland's small but pretty Willard Beach, a city park which fronts on the main harbor entrance just east of Fort Perble, is the only Portland Harbor area beach still open to public swimming.

The beach, which was given a "C" rating by the Water Improvement Commission in 1958 tests (two ratings below WIC safe swimming standards) continues open because of a staunch, consistent, and somewhat controversial stand, with City Council backing, taken by South Portland city health officer Dr. Philip P. Thompson Jr.

Dr. Thompson does not deny the presence of pollution conditions at the beach, though he feels and tests seem to show that ocean waters coming up the main harbor entrance keep the beach waters fairly clean compared to the inner harbor and anchorage.

The WIC station tests off the beach, for example, ranged from an amazing low MPN coliform bacteria count of 43 per sample up to a high count of 46,000 per sample. But he firmly rejects any parallel between the pollution danger to shellfish or to drinking water, and the pollution danger to swimming.

Rarely, if ever, "and in no case that I've been able to learn about," has an individual or group outbreak of pollution-caused disease, such as typhoid or dysentery, been traced to a swimming cause. Instead they are almost without fail traced to food handling "carriers," drinking water, or polluted clams or oysters, he says.

For this reason, declares Dr. Thompson, "I would be as strict as anyone where pollution of drinking water or shellfish is concerned."

Dr. Thompson feels that even with high coliform counts, a person would have to swallow large amounts of water to run the risk of ingesting a possible disease germ, and people swimming would not swallow anywhere near enough water to make this a possibility worth worrying about.

WORSE EVERY YEAR

Getting back to Portland Harbor itself, Capt. Linwood F. McLain, who until recently headed the board of harbor commissioners as chairman, agrees the sewage pollution problem is serious, "and it's getting worse every year.

"Our two cities (Portland and South Portland) have been taking the easy way out with their sewage for a long time, and the harbor shows it."

The harbor commissioners, two Portland and two South Portland men appointed by the Governor to oversee and control such activities as pier construction, dumping and landfill, and to investigate certain types of pollution such as oil spillage, are specifically prevented from having any say about municipal sewage disposal into the harbor, notes McLain.

Indeed, the commissioners' authority to fight other types of pollution is not specifically spelled out.

Because of steadily increasing pollution complaints from waterfront interests, and because of some recent cases of "lack of cooperation" by some industrial polluters, the harbor commissioners have sought and are awaiting clarification by the state attorney general of their power to compel cooperation.

But it's a pretty good bet that any individual polluters the harbor commissioners start clamping down on would ask in court why they are being prosecuted while the sewers of two cities, one the state's largest, are exempt from forced cleanup.

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram]

Coastal Pollution: Plans All Ready—It's Just Money That's Needed

Portland, South Portland and Westbrook have before them and are studying comprehensive civil engineering recommendations and plans for construction of modern sewage treatment plants and their interceptor systems. The big question is money, not need.

If built, they could reduce by approximately two-thirds these cities' daily sewage strength now going into the harbor waters, and even the remaining sewage effluent from these plants could have virtually all its bacteria killed by chlorination.

Because the three cities, as in the case of most cities, each have combined sewer systems which take care of storm drainage as well as sanitary sewage, there would still be the need to dump some raw sewage during storm flows too big for the treatment plants to handle.

This is a built-in handicap of combined sewer systems when it comes to sewage treatment, but the alternative of laying in a new separate sanitary sewage system entailing the ripping up of nearly every city street, would be incredibly costly.

Raeburn W. MacDonald, chief engineer of the Maine Water Improvement Commission, emphasizes that dumping of some raw sewage during a storm period, "still represents a big net gain over a situation where dumping is constant, day in and day out, not just occasionally."

It would be much more easily dissipated by the receiving waters, but the WIC would allow no more than a "C" rating for the receiving waters though they might be much cleaner than this between storm periods.

The following are summaries of plans and costs for cleanup, including those by the S.D. Warren Co. to further reduce its still tremendous wastewater loads on the Presumpscot River.

PORTLAND

When it comes to pollution abatement challenges among Maine cities, Portland bats in a league of its own. But the big town hasn't stepped into the batter's box yet. It's waiting to see if the federal government will pitch more pollution control money across the plate.

A year ago last April, the Boston civil engineering firm of Metcalf & Eddy laid before the city the most exhaustive pollution abatement study and plan Portland has ever had.

To make a 215-page report short, the plan recommends a $19,550,000 eight-year program to construct a $4.3 million primary sewage treatment plant of 16.5 million gallons per day capacity at the city's East End.

The balance would be $15,250,000 for construction of pump stations, interceptors, force mains and repairs to old mains for the first and last roundup of Portland's 45 principal sewer outfalls, bringing their daily 13 million gallon discharge to the plant.

Of the larger outfalls, 13 are in Back Cove, 27 in the harbor, and five at the Presumpscot estuary.

The city has accepted the study as its long range working plan but no major construction works have been authorized for it yet.

The program is expensive because of Portland's far-flung numerous sewer outfalls and many complexities of elevation for sewer construction of any kind, plus the large treatment plant needed.

It is also costly because federal water pollution control assistance to cities Portland's size has been quite limited.

A number of small Maine towns have received 60 to 80 per cent matching federal and state funds for their sewage treatment plant programs, but the basic federal grant has a $1.2 million ceiling (formerly $600,000) for any one project and only slightly more than that, a total of $1,412,060, in any one year allocated to Maine.

Recent federal legislation has come up with 50 per cent subsidies for certain types of sewer work indirectly as well as directly related to sewage treatment plant projects.

But Thomas F. Griffin Jr., Portland's public works director, is far from impressed with overall federal pollution control assistance to date.

All the assistance Portland can depend on at present would be about $6,714,000 in both federal and state aid, or 35 per cent of Portland's program cost.

Griffin notes that since 1956 federal assistance to communities for water pollution control has totaled about 14 per cent of the cost. A contributing factor to this, he charges, has been the "fragmentation" of federal pollution control programs into many agencies and categories, defying a really unified approach to the problem.

"I feel federal assistance in this field, as it is for highways, should be on a 90–10 per cent basis with the state and communities splitting the 10 per cent," declares Griffin. "I also think the ceiling on the total grant for a project should be removed."

He would further like to see the restriction of federal funds from combined sewer construction removed, arguing that separating sanitary sewers still leaves large pollution loads in storm drains.

"The total cost of such assistance would be huge," he admits, "but it would be small in comparison with our resources, and as a nation we can afford it. And the water pollution control programs we need in New England cannot be met by adding them to an already onerous property tax burden."

Griffin thinks that a bill from Sen. MUSKIE now under Senate study is "a step in the right direction." It calls for 50 per cent federal project subsidies if they are matched by 30 per cent state participation.

"Until the federal government starts showing pollution control programs the kind of support it has seen fit to give highways, airports and the like, my inclination and advice for large communities is to do nothing till we get some action."

Metcalf & Eddy recommend in their study that Portland consider paying off the unsubsidized balance of its project by a combination of general obligation and revenue bonds and that a sewage service charge be established to pay system operating costs and liquidate the revenue bonds, thus keeping any tax hike as low as possible.

SOUTH PORTLAND

South Portland this month will receive a comprehensive sewage treatment study and plan similar to Portland's from Boston civil engineers Fay, Spofford & Thorndike.

As outlined by Kenneth Neipert, superintendent of sewers for the city's Public Works Department, the South Portland program calls for a modern four million gallon a day primary treatment plant on filled land adjacent to Waterman Drive and across it from the foot of E Street.

The city will be working on target date of April, 1969, for completion of the plant and its interceptor lines, pump stations and force mains.

The cost of South Portland's pollution abatement program will be close to $4 million, including an estimated $1,125,000 for the treatment plant and the rest for rounding up the city's more than 20 principal outfalls, most of them along its harbor entrance and inner harbor shores below Portland Bridge.

Three major pump stations will be needed, plus eight smaller pump stations to drive sewage over high ground through a force main. Three existing pumping stations on Western Avenue will continue to handle that area.

South Portland is fortunate in that it is already well over 90 percent sewered, and in the fact that all the sewers in the city's western section are now tied into the Turner Island outfalls, making it fairly simple to run an interceptor the short distance from there along the shore to the treatment plant site.

If the cost of the overall project does come to $4 million and if all its phases are eligible for the basic 30 per cent federal and state matching subsidies, South Portland should get the full amount possible from these combined subsidies—$2.4 million.

WESTBROOK

The former Westbrook Sewerage District received a city plan for sewage treatment last November from the Boston firm of Camp, Dresser & McKee. A month later the Sewerage District was voted out of 10 years' existence in a city referendum and replaced by a city-operated Westbrook Sewerage Commission. But the plan still holds, though none of its projects have yet been scheduled for a start. Indeed, the City Council in June dropped plans for an initial $95,000 treatment plant reverse account allocation by the city.

The plan calls for a $1,130,000 primary sewage treatment plant on the Presumpscot River in the city's Halidon section about half a mile below S. D. Warren Co. on property the city purchased for this purpose several years ago.

The big settling tanks of this plant are to be supplied with city effluents by north and south bank interceptor lines picking up the city's 24 sewage outfalls in the Riverbank Park area, and with the help of a pumping station and force main at Cottage Place and an interceptor downriver to the plant.

Total project cost is estimated at $2,549,000, of which engineers estimate the city would have to pay about $1 million.

Camp, Dresser & McKee also recommended a Phase II project totaling $337,000 to connect Prides Corner section to the treatment by means of interceptors on East Bridge Street and Halidon Road and a pump station, but the firm advised that this phase would not become urgent until population of this section grew a lot more.

S. D. WARREN CO.

How do you handle the insatiable seas of waste-laden water that are the relentless byproduct of round the clock papermaking? And if you can sift out much of the solid waste, what do you do with it?

These are a couple of problems which S. D. Warren Co. of Westbrook, a major Maine paper mill and the Portland area's biggest industry, was content to let the Presumpscot River find answers for over a period of several decades. Then came the river's revolt.

In the sultry summer of 1959, the deep, barren mud flats in the Presumpscot's tidal section and estuary began giving off unprecedented quantities of hydrogen sulfide gas, quantities strong enough to blister and discolor the paint on many houses near the estuary.

Amidst the ensuing uproar, the Maine Water Improvement Commission commissioned a $25,000 survey of the Presumpscot's fragrant foulness. The resulting 1960 report from Camp, Dresser & McKee, Boston civil engineers, painted an awesome picture.

Below Westbrook, the report said, "the bed of the river was covered with a layer of slime and mud varying in depth from a few inches to five feet. No signs of aquatic plant growth or fish life were to be noted.

"Frequently the river is covered with a layer of foam which results in a rather unsightly appearance . . . Numerous gas bubbles are seen rising over the entire surface of the river and occasionally bottom deposits rise to float on the surface. . . .

"The nuisance conditions in the Presumpscot River and estuary are caused primarily by the presence of organic matter in the wastes and sewage discharged to the river which is fed upon by bacteria in the water and bottom muds. The bacterial feeding process depletes the dissolved oxygen . . . to such an extent that septic decomposition sets in with a liberation of gaseous byproducts, including sulphurous gases. . . ."

The river was tossing the tremendous waste disposal problems of a big industry and small city back into their laps.

In the six years since this report, things have started to improve for the lower Presumpscot, though perhaps not enough for the casual eye or nose to notice.

As George Bennett, S. D. Warren's candid engineer director of stream improvement aptly puts it: "We've come a long way since then, but we still have a long way to go."

S. D. Warren found that a major source of the organic matter in its mill wastes was in tiny wood fibers. This led to installation of filter screens which by 1964 were collecting 17 tons of fiber daily, and up to 37 tons of total fiber and clay particles.

Also since 1960 the company's papermaking methods have changed from the soda to the Kraft process, which with water reuse techniques has dropped the company's daily wastewater discharge from 42 million gallons per day to between 27 and 30 million.

The firm's first true waste treatment facility as such went into operation this year. It is a primary treatment plan based on a 280-foot diameter three million gallon capacity cylindrical concrete tank.

With the five largest of the company's 13 giant paper machines piping their wastewater into it, six million gallons a day, the huge clarifier works as a giant settling pond.

At its present rate, the clarifier is handling half the mill's process waste water (from actual papermaking) and it has a designed capacity for 20 million gallons a day.

Whether secondary treatment of this water to reclaim its dissolved and remaining undissolved solids may be needed in the future will probably be determined by the Water Improvement Commission's recommendations to the next Legislature for the lower Presumpscot's classification.

Yet the company's new primary treatment plant is a mixed blessing when it comes to operation.

First there is the trouble of picking up the plant's numerous waste outfalls by a system of interceptor pipes and pump stations. As this process proceeds, some wastes will have to be handled and treated separately from others if they are to be successfully reclaimed.

The other headache, an awesome one where such high volume, around-the-clock production is involved, is what do you do with reclaimed wastes for which no use is readily apparent? You can't continually buy land to dump or bury it on after the drying process.

Then there's the problem of the cost of such waste reclamation, $900,000 to date, an expense that must be met out of profits, not out of a surcharge on the product that would immediately lose sales to the competition.

The rebelling Presumpscot has tossed S. D. Warren some real problems—and challenges.

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, July 10, 1966]

Portland Studies Varied Disposal Complex Idea

(By David C. Langzettel)

Portland City Hall is working on a project for solving Portland's garbage, trash and sewage problems with a single disposal complex that would be largely self-sufficient.

It might even pay its own way some day, according to Public Works Director Thomas F. Griffin Jr., who came up with the idea as chairman of a waste disposal committee.

It's never been done before to Griffin's knowledge. For that reason he's trying—so far without success—to get federal aid to build the $6.5 million complex and a demonstration grant to help start its operation.

The complex would handle all wastes, produce power to run itself and also produce salt and slag byproducts worth more than $1 million a year.

The process also would turn out more than four million gallons of fresh water a day. For a city near Sebago Lake, making water is like shipping coals to Newcastle, Griffin concedes. But it has its use in the process.

If all this sounds like a Rube Goldberg perpetual motion scheme, a few minutes of explanation from Griffin put a new light on it.

Even if the complex as Griffin conceives it never has been built, all its parts have. And they all work.

"Putting this monster together—balancing the parts—isn't going to be simple," Griffin says. "But I've asked the Planning Board to start thinking about budgeting for it over the next few years. Perhaps we can get federal aid later on."

Basically, Griffin's "monster" has three elements: a sewage treatment plant and a big incinerator—as close together as possible—and a huge garbage grinder ("an oversized pig, if you will") installed in a sewage pumping station.

Theoretically, federal aid for each of these elements is available. And it seems obvious to City Hall that putting them together and gaining self-sufficiency will save money for Portland and the government.

Yet simply because the elements are integrated, Griffin says, individual federal departments apparently take a dim view of the project and "so far they refuse to get involved in each others' bailiwicks."

Briefly, elements of the process work together this way:

Garbage would be trucked to the pump station, ground and then injected into the sewer system with other wastes.

Raw sewage, with the garbage in suspension in it, would flow to the treatment plant, where floating solids would be skimmed off and settled wastes scraped together. This material would be conveyed by pipe to the incinerator to be dried and burned with trash and construction scrap.

Griffin would use walls containing circulating water to insulate the chamber. Heat from burning trash would turn some of this into steam to turn a turbine that would provide the small amount of power needed to run the entire complex.

Excess heat would be applied to salt water in stills, to produce the salt byproduct. Residue from burned materials (about 25 per cent) would be reduced to slag that would be useful in road construction.

The stills also would produce fresh water after removal of salt from the ocean water, which would go back to the treatment plant to dilute the effluent, or treated sewage, before pumping into Portland Harbor.

The only exhaust from the incinerator would be cleaned hot air.

Griffin estimates the plant would produce 50,000 to 100,000 tons of salt a year. The city uses about 4,000 tons a year on roads. So the remainder, at $14 a ton, could bring in $1 million or more every year, he suggests.

Griffin gives this cost breakdown on the complex: treatment plant, $3.5 million; incinerator, $2 million, and garbage grinding unit, $750,000.

Using a $6 million round figure and assuming 50 per cent federal aid and 30 per cent state, Griffin estimates Portland's share for the complex at $1.3 million. "Or you could call it the cost of two Bramhall Fire Stations."

Of course, this isn't the complete cost of an integrated pollution control system.

Portland has made a start on a treatment system by installing sewer interceptors along Marginal Way. And the city has built pump stations at Franklin and Riverside Streets. But another $16 million worth of interceptor sewerage would be needed to tie all city sewers into a plant.

Here the city is up against the federal government's chicken-or-the-egg proposition: you can't get federal aid for the interceptors until you have a treatment plant. Hence, Griffin's plan is being advanced now.

"We'd simply have to start the treatment end of the operation in a small way with what interceptors we have, then apply for federal aid for the rest," Griffin says.

Griffin has several ideas for cost cutting. One is to charge an incinerator fee to other area communities, which would find it cheaper and more convenient than the dumping system they're using now.

Private trash collectors also could use the burner on a monthly fee basis. And even individuals with a trash overflow between collection days might use it for a small fee.

Griffin also sees potential for similar operations in other cities, especially those lacking a good fresh water supply. Even the federal government might benefit directly, he says.

"For example, take Guantanamo Bay (the U.S. naval base in Cuba). They make their own water. I don't know what they do with their salt—perhaps they waste it—or whether they have an incinerator. But I think waste heat from burning trash could be used there."

Federal demonstration grants generally are approved for a project because it is unusual or unique and could serve as a model for other communities.

Griffin can't understand why Portland's plan wouldn't benefit others and save the federal government money to boot.

The idea originated more than a year ago when City Manager Graham W. Watt named Griffin to head the committee studying the garbage disposal problem. It's now collected and trucked to pig farms. The city has both wet and burning dumps for trash and pumps raw sewage into Portland Harbor.

A Metcalf & Eddy engineering study indicated in 1959 that a treatment plant alone would cost about $5.3 million. And the committee knew an incinerator would run at least $1.6 million.

Griffin knew ground garbage had been handled by treatment plants. But a treatment plant for sewage alone was too expensive, he felt.

His key cost-cutting idea was to combine processes so that sewage solids could be skimmed off and burned. This would reduce the treatment cost substantially and add only slightly to the incinerator bill.

The committee settled on a peninsula site for the complex, "somewhere between Commercial Street and Marginal Way, probably at the old dump area or on the harbor side near India Street."

To build at the former site of the East End dump would involve only the cost of digging out settled trash. But this would be an unpopular move in some circles because of recent recreation development on the Promenade, Griffin feels. On the other hand, the India Street site could be expensive to buy and develop.

The garbage grinder could be at the Franklin Street pumping station or at either of two proposed pumping stations, near Commerical and India Streets and near the dump.

With these matters decided, Griffin drew up some sketches and a written proposal which was forwarded last September to U.S. Sen. Edmund S. Muskie.

The committee also filled out a so-called preliminary inquiry form for federal aid, which in itself indicated the going might get rough.

The form originates with the Bureau of the Budget. But it also goes to each of the following departments for perusal: Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration, Health, Education and Welfare, Commerce, Interior, and Economic Development Administration.

The form was filed last December. So far city officials have had no reply.

"I'm not even sure what sort of reply we're supposed to get, one way or the other," Griffin says. "But I understand that Sen. Muskie is interested and doing what he can to stimulate some interest."

Even if the federal wheels do begin turning, the city isn't sure how much aid it could expect to get in view of Maine's very small allocation for anti-pollution measures.

The idea of issuing bonds to cover construction costs is intriguing to city officials, Griffin says, because the operation would be partly self-sufficient to begin with and could pay for itself after a time.

[From the Portland Evening Express, June 27, 1966]

Clean Water

Senator Edmund S. Muskie speaks on few subjects with more authority or conviction than on the matter of air and water pollution.

So the note of urgency in his message was not unusual when, in a recent speech in Maine, he expressed the hope that Maine would take advantage of a measure now making its way through the Senate. It is a $6 billion federal aid program. If approved, it would supply 50 per cent of the cost of a community pollution control program if the city would supply 20 per cent and the state the remaining 30 per cent.

The Senator cited impressive statistics on the water needs of the nation in the coming years and pointed out that Maine has a good supply of fresh water and that the state's economy has benefited from it.

"We must guard this resource. We must realize our potential. We must preserve our good water and clean up our soiled water," he said.

That has a good oratorical ring to it, to be sure. But it also has meat. Maine is deeply concerned about its economic development. The effort to attract industry deals with the complete need, quite properly, considering recreational, cultural, social and educational resources of a city or region. From the standpoint of employee contentment, that good supply of fresh water may also become increasingly important as well as for direct industrial use.

It may well be that in another 10 or 15 years, a good supply of fresh water may be more important than facilities for graduate study, a symphony orchestra or even the labor environment.

The long range view in economic development suggests that Senator Muskie is not overemphasizing if he sounds urgent in telling Maine to clean up its dirty streams and protect those water supplies still reasonably clean.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, July 1, 1966]

Senator Muskie Is Forcing Congress To Enact Antipollution Measures

There are times when it almost seems as if Democratic Senator Edmund S. Muskie is the only person who is pressing ahead powerfully on the anti-pollution front.

This is, of course, not true—the sheer economic loss sustained through the dirtying of the nation's water supplies is now well recognized, he is recruiting new allies daily, and the American people increasingly will see efforts made toward the Senator's goal of clean waters.

But the magnitude of the task is appalling—figures like $40 and $50 billions are being tossed about—and there is so much to be done that billions can be spent before water pollution can even be checked. And this excludes, of course, the air pollution that plagues all of America's larger cities.

Yet under Senator Muskie's guidance, the tools are being shaped at Washington for the role the federal government must play in pollution abatement. Last year Congress approved the Clean Waters Act establishing pollution abatement as a national policy. Recently the Senate Public Works Committee voted out, with powerful support in the Senate at large, a bill for a six-year program, and $6 billions in money, to help the states and municipalities build sewage systems and waste treatment facilities.

The bill combines some of the approach sought by the Johnson Administration, but chiefly this is the Senator's bill and is so recognized at Washington. There is a million dollars for the study of estuary pollution, bringing to mind the problem of Greater Portland's Presumpscot river. There is a larger program for demonstration projects in treating sewage. There is authority letting the government control oil discharges into the ocean from shore facilities as well as from ships. The former $1.2 million limit on federal grants for individual sewage-treatment projects is abolished, with Washington still contributing 30% of the total cost.

An important feature of the bill deals with entire river basins, an objective of the administration bill. Under Muskie's bill, planning agencies would be set up and given three years to develop a plan, for both intrastate and interstate rivers. When a full-fledged plan is approved by the Interior Department, the federal contribution will be 50%, with the state's share 30% and affected municipalities only 20%. This "sweetener" should hasten entire river-basin anti-pollution projects, under standards for cleanliness set forth in the bill.

If Congress acts favorably, as we hope it will, we can get the anti-pollution show on the road, and then a great burden will fall upon the people of Maine, their city governments and the legislature. The current predicament of the town of Falmouth, where pollution is a pressing problem, typifies the expensive measures that must be taken in the foreseeable future. With federal and state aid, and the good work being done by the Water Improvement Commission, Maine is in a position to show the way to the other states.

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel, July 2, 1966]

There'll Be No Clambake

Those shallow areas along the Maine coast that are known as clam flats have been plagued for some time by that residue of civilization, pollution.

Latest to suffer are the productive flats in the Searsport and Stockton Springs area which were closed yesterday because of the high bacteria count that has resulted from the pollution of the coastal waters in the vicinity.

An effort is now being made to see what can be done to restore the flats by eliminating the pollution or at least reducing it to acceptable levels.

It now appears that the best hope of accomplishing something is under a law passed by Congress at the behest of Senator Edmund S. Muskie. Senator Muskie has become the leading advocate in Congress of anti-pollution measures.

Those of us who reside inland are inclined to think of pollution as primarily a river problem.

It isn't. These polluted rivers empty into the sea and where they empty they deposit their filth in such quantity that even the mighty ocean can't cope with it. And there is an increasing amount of direct pollution along our coast line.

Certainly, one hopes that something can be done to correct the Searsport-Stockton Springs problem as quickly as possible. In the long range one hopes that something will be done to prevent other situations like it.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun, July 4, 1966]

Landmark Case in the Making

The closing of valuable clam flats in Belfast, Searsport and Stockton Springs may result in a landmark court case, under a new federal law. This is the first time since such areas have been closed due to pollution that a law is on the books which may offer redress to the clam diggers whose livelihood is affected.

Action to close the flats was taken after tests showed that the bacterial count was higher than allowed by the U.S. Public Health Service. As Sea and Shore Fisheries Commissioner Ronald W. Green explained at a public hearing, the state has no choice but to close areas where pollution surpasses the standards set by the agency. At the same public hearing, it was brought out that the offending pollution comes in part from communities along the Penobscot River and in part from poultry processing plants in Belfast.

At the request of the commissioner, Gov. John H. Reed has written Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, whose department is charged with enforcing the law relating to pollution of tidal flats and waters, to see how it can be applied in Maine.

The law, sponsored by Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, by the way, may allow the diggers to sue communities and corporations polluting the waters. Last year, the 65 diggers involved conducted a $200,000 business on the clam flats which have been closed.

In addition to possible redress in court, the federal law also may bring assistance in the way of federal technical studies and financing to restore the flats for commercial use.

If the Muskie law proves as effective as intended, pollution control will be given a big push, while those who are victimized by pollution will find needed assistance.

[From the Portland Evening Express, July 6, 1966]

Fouling Our Own Nest

The Sunday Telegram is delivering a two part Sunday punch in a pair of articles on our pollution of our coast.

This past Sunday the Telegram stated: "The neighboring cities of Portland, South Portland and Westbrook daily dump all their municipal sewage untreated into Casco Bay."

In odiferous addition to this filth disposal, says the Telegram feature, the cities add the industrial wastes of a major paper mill and the refuse from numerous fish and meat processing plants along the waterfront.

The result is that Casco Bay enjoys the worst possible water rating.

These waters are filthy.

So filthy that in the language of the Water Improvement Commission the waters of Casco Bay "shall be considered as primarily devoted to the disposal of sewage and industrial wastes. . ."

Beautiful Casco Bay gets the classification of D.

And "D" stands for Dirty.

"D" stands for Defilement.

"D" stands for Desecration.

"To dirty; to defile; to descrate" . . . this is how Webster's Dictionary defines "pollution."

Portland's polluted Back Bay is a giant open tidal sewer in the middle of the city.

The measuring stick for water filth doesn't go low enough to classify it. The Sunday Telegram states Back Bay can't even stagger up high enough to reach a class D rating.

These are remarks made in passing about Portland Harbor. The first of two Sunday Telegram articles reported on the whole coast.

But this coming Sunday, the Telegram takes a close-up look at Portland, exclusively. Its spotlight will glare on the way we are fouling our own nest.

Faced with these noisome facts, we hope the public outcry will be loud enough to trigger off a too long delayed cure.

Maine's Senator Muskie is the man leading the fight in Washington to combat pollution. What better springboard than Maine's biggest city?

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel, July 7, 1966]

The Tide Won't Clean It Up

It is generally conceded, in the newspaper business, that a good many news stories, regardless of their significance, go unread during a three-day Fourth of July holiday. Most people are on the move, occupying themselves with other matters.

But on Sunday our contemporary, the Sunday Telegram in Portland, published the first of two articles on maritime pollution, and we urge those who may have skipped lightly over it, or ignored it, to exhume the paper and read the article thoroughly.

The staff writers' research is thorough and well-documented, the story they reveal of the defilement of the Maine coast is shocking.

The impact is all the more devastating when one remembers that Maine has a coastline of more than 2,500 miles, and that a large proportion of the state's great throng of summer visitors spend their time at resorts and communities along the Atlantic shoreline. It is beautiful, it is largely uncrowded, but alas, much of it is badly polluted.

All of us here in Maine know why. Scores of Maine rivers and streams, emptying into the sea, have been used as sewers from time immemorial. It used to be assumed that since the ocean was so vast, and the twice daily tides so powerful, that the salt water absorbed this enormous mess of industrial and human sewage.

But with more than a hundred valuable clam flats closed to digging because of pollution, we now know that the tides leave a good deal to be desired as cleaning agents. This is an economic loss—the recent closing of clamming areas near Belfast recently shut down a $200,000 a year business—but the tourist industry will suffer far more if severe pollution reaches numerous beach resorts. Old Orchard Beach narrowly escaped disaster not long ago, and the lesson learned there has been profitable to others.

Yet there is much more to be done, with reference to the coast alone, and the state must be made ready to take advantage of increased federal aid, if Sen. Edmund S. Muskie can force his new "clean waters" bill to enactment. In relation to many other states, Maine is fortunate, but there is apathy and inertia to overcome, and the Telegram article will help mold public opinion in the right direction.

[From the Portland Press Herald, July 8, 1966]

TELEGRAM'S REVIEW OF POLLUTION OUTLINES PROBLEMS STATE FACES

The Sunday Telegram, in a manner of speaking, is in the process of delivering a one-two punch on the issue of coastal pollution.

Last Sunday its staff writers assembled a shocking exposure of pollution of the Maine coastline, naming the towns and cities that have recognized the problem, to do something about it. For those who have acted, it must be admitted, it was not so much a matter of conscience as one of economic necessity.

Next Sunday the Telegram will reveal "A Portrait of Portland", and residents of the area had better brace themselves for a disconcerting and disagreeable picture. This is the most heavily populated and industrialized part of the state, and every day its communities are pouring a vast amount of industrial and human sewage into Casco Bay.

The worst conditions are found in Back Cove and Portland Harbor, and only last week the Board of Harbor Commissioners publicly assailed the filthy conditions allowed to exist adjacent to this "beautiful city by the sea."

Very little has been done because of the cost of sewage lines, pumping stations and treatment plants. Yet if Sen. Edmund S. Muskie succeeds with his new bill aimed at more generous federal financial aid in pollution abatement, Greater Portland must prepare to take advantage of it. It is ironic to see civic leaders boasting that more than $20 millions will be spent on a new expressway, but ignore the befouling of Back Cove and the harbor. Perhaps the forthcoming Telegram article will change the present mood of apathy.

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, July 10, 1966]

GOD'S SEPTIC TANK

If the fish in Jake Day's cartoon would take off those gas masks and write this editorial, we'd get a horrifying first-hand story of what it feels like to be "polluted"—by sewage dumped into Maine's coastal waters.

Today the feature section of the Telegram focuses on the problems of pollution in the Portland area. Last week the Telegram spotlighted the problem along our entire coast.

The wholesale dumping of uncountable tons of human and industrial waste into the ocean clearly implies that Man treats the ocean as a septic tank provided by God.

Thanks in large degree to the arduous work done in Washington by our own Senator Muskie, Man is now belatedly trying to correct the situation.

Wholesale dumping is an expensive mistake to correct. Across the nation, in the rivers as well as along the coasts, it may cost billions of dollars to correct present pollution and to prevent future increased pollution.

The first steps—faltering sometimes, over strong opposition always—have been taken. New homes bordering on the ocean can no longer use the cheapest way of getting rid of their waste—a rusty pipe to the sea. But "grandfather clauses," with very long whiskers, permit high priced homes to act still in a pretty low-class way.

Doctors tell us that swimming in sewage polluted waters has not to their knowledge caused death, or even desperate illness.

We are inclined to attribute this good news more to the fact that swimmers get out of the way than to any kindly quality in the sewage.

Without deaths and disease, the penalties of pollution may lack the drama which triggers public action.

We all oppose pollution violently—right up to the point where its cure spells taxes. Right up to the point where preventing pollution before it starts leads to the threat of a loss of immediate jobs.

And so through positive nonaction the problems grow larger and the future cure grows more costly.

Speaking of cost, it is a fact that pollution in our rivers and along our coastline is costing and has been costing us millions of dollars in Maine.

Pollution has closed clam flats and thrown men out of work. It is still doing this.

Here we want to emphasize that every Maine clam which goes to market today is a fine, clean, pollution free clam. Sea and Shore Fisheries day after day check scientifically to ascertain there is no pollution in the beds being dug. Equally, Sea and Shore firmly closes beds where pollution threatens them. You can eat Maine clams and be wholly safe.

Senator Muskie's new Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Rivers Restoration Act provides up to 30 per cent Federal grants for sewage treatment plants. It removes the old dollar limitations which discriminated against cities such as Portland. His committee has approved a major expansion in research and development funds to work on problems of tidal estuaries, improved methods of waste treatment. Up to 50 per cent in Federal matching funds may soon be available for cleanup projects in river basins, where the state agrees to put up 30 per cent of the project cost.

Thus, a community in Maine would be able to upgrade its water quality and pay only 20 per cent of the cost. A fine investment!

The Muskie bill warrants the full support of Congress. Its cost—an estimated six billion dollars over the next six years—is small compared with the benefits it will bring. And among those benefits will be the opportunity for Maine to execute plans which Maine communities should get in readiness now.

Local cost can be further reduced by imaginative design of combined sewage and waste disposal plants. Already cities have installed these which get rid of their garbage, waste and pollution problems and then show the city a profit, through the sale of byproducts from such a plant.

A plant like this is envisaged by Thomas F. Griffin Jr., Portland's Director of Public Works, and is reported in the news columns of today's paper.

In summary, we hope that the facts revealed in the current series of Telegram articles will stimulate every Maine town and city bordering the coast or bordering a river to put pollution at the top of the list of Town Business. And keep it there until positive action is taken. For support, information and advice, write to your Senator Muskie of Maine, Washingon, D.C.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I would like to add a few thoughts to the analysis and explanation of S. 2947 which has just been presented by the able junior Senator from Maine.

My work with him on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has given me a deep appreciation of his dedication to the cause of pollution abatement. The fact that this important bill is before us today reflects his understanding of the nationwide urgency of the water pollution problem.

In general this bill expands the Federal Government's effort to attack water pollution. It would help clean up rivers by providing for a basinwide approach. It offers more funds for hard-pressed large urban areas and a revolving loan fund to help communities with sewage projects. It adds to the water pollution research programs.

Details of the bill have already been well explained by the junior Senator from Maine. I will not take time to repeat them.

What I would like to emphasize in our overall consideration of the water pollution problem is that effective action involves far more than money.

It involves a greater public awareness of the stake which individual citizens have in water pollution abatement. And it involves cooperation by these citizens, private businessess, and all levels of government.

To put it simply, water pollution is everyone's problem. If greater attention is focused on steps to control it, if civic organizations and other groups can increase their efforts to explore ways to meet local problems, I believe that great progress man be made through voluntary action based on understanding of the situation.

An example of spectacular achievement in this area, to the benefit of all concerned, is found in the successful project to clean up the North Platte River in Wyoming. It involved coordinated efforts by Federal, State, and local governments, plus private industry and private citizens.

In 1948 the U.S. Public Health Service reported that the 150-mile section from Casper, Wyo., to the Wyoming-Nebraska line was "so grossly polluted with human and refinery wastes that it is doubtful if recovery can ever be obtained."

Today this same stretch of water swarms with perch, sunfish, pike, and trout. Boy Scouts canoe on it and swim in it. Tourists camp by its side and water ski behind the big dams. Some towns tap it in dry spells. In short, the river has come back to life.

I want to point out to my colleagues that here in the Senate is one of the men responsible for the return to health of the North Platte River. Early in 1955, Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, then Governor of Wyoming, hired a sanitary engineer and told him he would back him to the fullest in a program to clear up the river.

As a result of this Governor's determination, and the cooperative support behind his determination, the people of Wyoming are now enjoying their river. Bottomland has risen in value from $240 an acre 10 years ago to $1,500 an acre now. Some of the companies which spent a great deal of money on pollution control are discovering long-range benefits, financial and otherwise, which they had not expected.

My point in mentioning this project is that is demonstrates what can be done when there is leadership, public understanding, and broad cooperation by everyone concerned.

It is the same combination which will produce results elsewhere in the country. The money we provide is important, but it is not the whole answer by any means.

Since the Federal Government is active in encouraging pollution control, I think it is well to emphasize again that in assuming leadership the Federal Government also assumes the responsibility for making sure that its own house is in order.

I am reminded of this responsibility because of a situation in my own State of Delaware at Dover Air Force Base. Water pollution from the base has been a problem for many years. Funds have been provided to correct one source of pollution from the base, but a serious pollution problem remains. Understandably there is not enough money to get everything done at once, but this matter of pollution is of such vital importance that we must be sure the Federal Government lives up to its responsibility.

Mr. President, I commend again the efforts of the junior Senator from Maine and the other Senators who have contributed to improvements in S. 2947. It is a significant piece of legislation dealing with an urgent problem. I hope that it will be quickly approved.

I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his committee work and for his excellent statement. The Senator has been a strong right arm and has help make this subcommittee and committee effort a cooperative one. This cooperative effort has produced some excellent legislation.

TRUTH IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I support in its entirely—I support strongly—the bill S. 2947 now before the Senate, which amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, strengthening, improving, and making it more effective.

The Senate has reason to be thankful for the dedicated and intelligent leadership which the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has provided. The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has held full and comprehensive hearings. It has received evidence from representatives of government, labor, and industry, and from public-spirited organizations. Twenty-seven Senators from both parties also presented statements to the subcommittee on the bill.

In his opening statement, the junior Senator from Maine outlined the provisions of the bill, the programs authorized, and the new authorities that would be granted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to insure truly effective water pollution control policies.

I have a particular interest in the bill, Mr. President. I have interest particularly in section 212, on page 30, starting at line 8. This section would authorize the Secretary of HEW, whenever he would have reason to believe that a person's activities are resulting in "discharges causing or contributing to water pollution or whose activities may affect the quality of the waters involved," to require that person to file a report giving full information on the extent of the pollution, its cause, and the steps needed to reduce it.

This section would be important to the Secretary in his struggle to reduce the pollution of our Nation's rivers and streams. All too often in the past it has been difficult, if not impossible, for the Secretary to obtain all the information he requires from private sources, as well as public. This section would give him the authority of law with which to acquire this information.

This section would be helpful to Congress—for Congress has had as much difficulty as many administrative agencies have had in obtaining the full facts on the pollution of our environment. Congress has had difficulty in this regard not only from private industry but from Federal agencies as well. To show the importance of this matter, I call the attention of the Senate to one instance:

As I pointed out in a speech on June 23 of this year, several of the tributaries of the Colorado River during the late 1950's and the early 1960's received substantial unwarranted amounts of radioactive contaminants from uranium mill pilings, the refuse of uranium mining processes. The uranium mills had been in operation since 1945. Reports of varying accuracy and detail of this contamination have been current for several years. And yet not until the report by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was released in March of 1966 did we have a comprehensive survey of the extent of the hazard, the efforts which have been made to bring about its abatement, and the further efforts which will be necessary.

Even with this report, it was not until this subcommittee began its hearings on the bill that we received the full appalling facts on the extent of the contamination in years past.

Only in these hearings did we learn that algae in the San Miguel River at one time contained levels of radiation 800 times the natural level. Only then did we find out that these rivers at one time contained fish 98 times more radioactive than they should have been. Only then did we learn of water so radioactive that persons drinking it would have received levels of radiation exceeding those considered acceptable by the Federal Radiation Council.

For 20 years, uranium mines and mills have been operating in the Colorado River basin.

We have no reason to doubt that uranium waste products have been contaminating the river all this time.

Geiger counters and the other radiation monitoring devices have been available all these 20 years.

Presumably, the privately owned mills have been equipped with these devices.

Presumably, the Atomic Energy Commission and its personnel have been likewise equipped.

Presumably, both have known of this contamination. They have known of the potential hazards they were causing. They have known of the hazard even as they were creating it.

And because of the complex and complicated terminology which must be used in discussing these matters, it has been possible to hoodwink Congress and the American people.

Because the Secretary of HEW and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration have lacked the authority to require the presentation of full information, it has been possible to deceive the people by giving them only half the facts and by presenting the facts in a manner calculated to confuse.

I do not level a blanket accusation of hoodwinkery and deception. I only say that there have been such cases of this in the past, and I am pleased to say that the chances of such cases happening in the future would be considerably reduced by passage of the proposed legislation and by section 212 of the bill in particular.

Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Maine and the other members of his subcommittee for an excellent and important piece of legislation.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who is one of the sponsors of the pending legislation, for his excellent statement.

The Senator from Alaska has been a longstanding supporter of legislation in this field. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with him, not only with respect to water pollution, but other conservation issues in which we have a mutual interest.

I particularly appreciate that portion of the Senator's statement dealing with uranium mill tailings piles on the Colorado River. I think it is important that we focus attention on this problem, which need not be a serious one, but one which we contend has been rather carelessly neglected by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful for these words from the Senator from Maine. I believe he is making a great contribution to the welfare of this Nation in bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment to the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is as follows:

> In page 27, line 10, after the word "finance" delete the word "its" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the local".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment which is designed to effectuate the intent of the committee. It pertains to section 209 of the bill which provides the loan program to assist those communities in depressed areas when the States do not contribute to the cost of municipal treatment works.

The language of the bill, as it appears before us, creates some confusion, or at least some ambiguity, as to whether such funds will be available to States to cover their portion of the cost of the project. It was the intent of the committee that the loan program be available only to cover the local share of the cost of the project. The proposed amendment would accomplish that result.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 642

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 642 and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 23, line 24, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 204."
>
> On page 24, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following new subsection:
>
> "(b) Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'including the training of personnel of public agencies.'."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, but thought I might make a brief explanation. It will be noted that my amendment would make funds available to States and interstate agencies for the training of personnel of public agencies in the prevention and control of water pollution and would include employees of municipalities. I believe it would be helpful to read section 7(a) of the present act:

> SEC. 7. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $3,000,000, [and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000] *for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $10,000,000* for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

Mr. President, if my amendment is adopted, it would add these words, "including the training of personnel of public agencies."

I would like to point out that section 5(a) of the act authorizes the Secretary to provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution in the conduct and coordination of research, investigations, experiments, and studies in this field.

It is my belief that there is an additional need to train individuals employed in water pollution control and abatement programs at the State, county, and municipal level. Thus, where funds are now authorized for the training of personnel in technical matters the thrust of my amendment is to authorize funds to State, county, and municipal agencies and interstate agencies so that these agencies may train the additional personnel required to operate the water pollution and control facilities to be financed under this bill.

From my talks with officials and publicly interested citizens in my own State of Kentucky and individuals of other States who have undertaken programs to provide for controls and abatement of water pollution, I know that there exists a great need for trained personnel. Congress will not achieve its purpose by authorizing increasingly large sums to the States, municipalities, and other agencies in the form of grants for the construction of treatment works where there are not adequately trained personnel to operate these facilities.

One of the projects of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States has been to assist in this great task of water pollution control, and the junior chamber of commerce has found that there is a need for the training of personnel to man these facilities.

I am happy to note that in my own State the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce has shown leadership in this field by embarking on a statewide program to bring to the attention of the public the need for new and more effective facilities to control and abate pollution and the necessity of securing skilled personnel to operate these facilities.

I would therefore appreciate it very much if the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill would comment on my amendment, and I hope would agree to its acceptance.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and have given his amendment by unqualified support. A number of witnesses, in the course of the hearings, testified to the need for the increased availability of engineering, scientific, and technical manpower to operate pollution control facilities. The general indication was that existing programs are suffering from a shortage of manpower and that an expanded program would be needed. This expanded program will require a greatly increased Federal commitment to training.

It might be useful to have printed in the RECORD some information received from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration which indicates a wholly insufficient training grant program especially when related to personnel demands as indicated in the testimony.

I ask unanimous consent to have this information from the Water Pollution Control Administration indicating the amount of money now devoted to training grant programs printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Appropriations for the training grant program for FY 1965, 1966 and 1967 are as follows: 1965, $2,617,000; 1966, $3,210,000; 1967, $3,543,000 (est.).
>
> There are three different training grant programs. The largest is the grants to institutions, $2 million in 1965. There are 57 grants for 42 institutions in 32 states ranging from $20 thousand to $50 thousand, and aiding approximately 291 students.
>
> The second training grant program is for fellowships to individuals, scientific and engineering students. Total allocation of this program in 1965 was $700 thousand to 51 institutions in 28 states resulting in 101 graduate level fellowships.
>
> The only other training grant program is for the Water and Sewage Operators Training School in Neosho, Missouri. The FWPCA provides partial support to the school which in 1965 amounted to $40 thousand. This is the only full time plant operator training school in the United States.
>
> The course covers a period of 32 weeks and in 1965 enrolled approximately 250 potential new plant operators.
>
> Finally, the FWPCA provides courses in water pollution control at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering School.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wholly endorse the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. Indeed, it may be necessary to do more in the years ahead in this field in order to give these facilities which would be built under the pending legislation effective maintenance and operation.

Mr. COOPER. I think so. I think it will be necessary to make more funds available in the future, but at least this is a start. I thank the Senator from

Maine for his endorsement of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

PROTECT OUR RESOURCES, COMBAT POLLUTION

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 2947, I urge passage of this bill to improve the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The bill would provide for more needed research, extended and improved planning, increased construction, and more effective enforcement in water pollution control.

The inspired efforts of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], have been outstanding and his leadership on this legislation is a step forward in the vital area of water pollution control.

Water pollution is one of the gravest threats to our national welfare. The problem of water pollution is now and will be in the future an important aspect in this Nation's health, welfare, and economic growth. We must take the necessary steps today to insure our country's rising needs for this precious product of nature. There is much water today but we must realize that the supply is not infinite and in order to serve all of our purposes, water pollution control must be properly managed.

The problem of water pollution is awesome. Expenditures for the treatment of industrial wastes are tremendous. To give some idea of the size of this problem, the industrial organic waste in 1970 is estimated to be equivalent to the raw sewage of a population of 210 million.

Another major problem in water pollution control is that of sewer runoff systems, not only for sanitation purposes but also for storm runoff control. This problem confronts 1,900 communities affecting nearly 40 million people with an estimated cost of $8 billion.

These figures on pollution of our fresh water supplies are appalling. Such insidious elements as chemical wastes, radioactive wastes, even recreational facilities such as motorboats with their fumes and oils contribute to the destruction of our fresh water areas.

Mr. President, I read an article recently that penguins captured in the Antarctic, which are nonmigratory and never leave their area, were found to have DDT in them. This DDT is washed down from the fresh water rivers and also through the ocean currents and contaminates the fish which are caught there.

Mr. President, this is a nationwide problem. I daresay that not a State or a community is free from the menace of water pollution. In my own State of Texas we are faced with many difficult cases.

The water in the Houston Ship Channel poses a danger to health and creates a fire hazard at the same time. A Texas newspaper notes:

> To fall into this oily mess is to court death, while its fumes endanger the health of those who live and work along its banks. Fire prevention authorities worry daily that carelessness may ignite some of the volatile chemicals, setting off a chain of fires and explosions that could cause astronomical losses.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the July 3, 1966, Dallas Morning News, entitled "Fabulous, But Filthy," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Houston Ship Channel carries two true descriptions. One is that of a "fabulous 50 miles." The other is "probably one of the worst problems in water pollution anywhere in the country." Still another, unfortunately, might be added: A fire hazard that could cause a worse explosion than that at Texas City.
>
> This mixture illustrates the dangers man can create as he builds. The great industries along Houston's waterway represent an investment of more than 2.5 billion dollars. Ships from all over the globe come and depart loaded with raw materials and finished products.
>
> Largely because of water traffic, Houston has become one of the great cities of the world, as well as Texas' largest.
>
> But the Texas Water Pollution Board, joined by the Harris County attorney's office, is battling to stop the nauseous contamination that tarnishes the economically golden hue of this channel.
>
> Houstonians say that to fall into this oily mess is to court death, while its fumes endanger the health of those who live and work along its banks.
>
> Fire prevention authorities worry daily that carelessness may ignite some of the volatile chemicals, setting off a chain of fires and explosions that could cause astronomical losses.
>
> It is encouraging to see more action being taken on the problem there Farther and faster steps are needed. Some system of intergovernmental cooperation will be necessary, probably, because too many units of government are working independently, if at all, to curtail these hazards.
>
> Neither those along the Houston Ship Channel nor Texans as a whole can afford not to eliminate the dangers. Furthermore, North Texas and other areas where the problem is not yet so critical must learn from South Texans' experience. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, in pollution and fire hazards as in other things.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, in Texas also, there are almost 30,000 people living in communities that are discharging untreated sewage. To correct this grave situation would incur an approximate cost of over $1 million.

Over 174 communities affecting more than 2 million people in Texas have inadequately treated sewage. And many other communities in Texas have no sewers at all and are potential health hazards.

Another major problem of pollution in my home State is pollution from oil wells. Through the work of such groups as the railroad commission, pollution control is being advanced. But much more is needed to be done, and this present legislation will assist in these water pollution control efforts.

Water pollution is expensive, not only for the individual and the businessman but for the community and the Nation. There is no escape from such an economic loss of our most valuable natural resource. The price of pollution is spread throughout the society by reduced availability of water and restricted growth of the economy.

Pollution control measures ease adverse conditions and produce innumerable benefits through improved waters. One cannot immediately measure these benefits in dollar-and-cents figures, for the gain from recreation, health, scenic improvements, and the future utility of water resources cannot possibly be tallied.

Water pollution is a national problem; therefore, action should be taken on all levels—local, State, and national.

Water is a precious national resource. Ever-increasing industrialization and population growth will make great demands for it in the future, pushing our supply to its limit. We must not remain blind to the problem until it is too late to do anything about it.

We must take action now to provide a plentiful supply of usable water for future generations.

This legislation will aid in the furtherance of water pollution control by improving and increasing the effectiveness of the programs of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It would raise the authorization for extended grant and contract authority for research purposes, and would also further support incentive pollution control programs.

S. 2947 proposes an expansion of construction grants, with a 5-year extension through 1972 along with increased appropriations. This bill calls for a 1,000 percent increase in the construction program set out by the Water Quality Act of 1965 in the next 5 years, from $150 million for fiscal 1967 to $1,500 million in 1972.

I hope that this valuable legislation will be favorably acted upon by my colleagues, for this bill contains the tools for benefits essential to the whole Nation.

More than anyone else, tribute should be paid to the Senator from Maine, who has worked so long to bring about this legislation.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I thank the Senator for his continued support in this field and for his kind comments about me. We could not have gone as far as we have without the support of the Senator from Texas, who, although he is not a member of the committee, has given us the benefit of his help.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to speak today in support of S. 2947, which I was pleased to cosponsor. This bill represents the work of many able hands. It unmistakably bears the imprint of the eminent junior Senator from Maine, Senator MUSKIE, who, as chairman of the Water Pollution Subcommittee, has ably led the Senate in the fight to clean our waters. It incorporates President Johnson's imaginative proposal for a clean river restoration program. And it reflects, as well, the efforts of the almost 30 Members of the Senate from both parties who have spoken out in this session in support of a broadened Federal commitment to water pollution control and abatement.

Finally, Mr. President, I consider it fitting to observe that this legislation marks the culmination of the leadership efforts over a period of many years of the former chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, the late Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, who created the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee over 3 years ago. It was Senator McNamara who recognized that this Nation can no longer afford the widespread illusion that our water supplies are drawn from a limitless source. And it was Senator McNamara who resolutely defined as our responsibilities to "take whatever steps are necessary to develop, conserve, and protect our water resources in order to meet the Nation's soaring needs for this precious product."

The legislation we are considering today marks a significant advance toward the fulfillment of those responsibilities. It is the most comprehensive piece of water control legislation ever to come before the Senate. It not only extends and broadens existing law and authorizes a commitment of Federal resources on a level of unparalleled but necessary magnitude, it also focuses on other aspects of pollution, such as those caused by the dischage of oil and the neglect of our estuaries, and it attempts to come to grips with the need for greater efforts in the area of research and experimentation, for greater knowledge about the impact and costs of pollution, and for more skilled personnel to carry out our expanded programs of water pollution control and abatement.

I would like to comment in detail about several aspects of this legislation.

As a Senator from a State where the problems of water pollution are immense and urgent, I am heartened by the realistic, no-nonsense approach which the committee has taken in authorizing funds to meet the existing backlog for the construction of waste treatment facilities.

Since 1957, Federal assistance of almost $700 million has been given to some 62,000 pollution control projects, but this level of assistance provides only a fraction of the resources which will be required to undo the damage which our past neglect has caused.

Consider the magnitude of need just in my own State of Massachusetts.

Twenty-eight Massachusetts towns are involved in the pollution of the Merrimack. It is estimated that it will cost $80 million for these towns to construct the treatment plants necessary to clean this river.

Twenty-six Massachusetts towns are involved in the pollution of the Connecticut River. It is estimated that it will cost $20 million for these towns to build the necessary projects.

Thirteen Massachusetts towns are involved in the pollution of the Blackstone River. It is estimated unofficially that it will cost $35 million for these towns to construct pollution abatement facilities.

And the estimated total cost of cleaning all of Massachusetts waters is placed at a minimum of $300 million. This enormous investment is required not to achieve some theoretical standard of water purity but merely to establish minimum standards for waters which are presently suitable only for the transportation of sewage and industrial waste.

The problem of water pollution in Massachusetts is perhaps more serious than in some States, but the national needs are of the same order of magnitude. One estimate places the costs of secondary waste treatment facilities for the Nation by 1975 at 20 billions of dollars and the committee observes that the total cost of pollution control could well exceed $100 billion.

It is clear that the local communities faced with these requirements lack the resources to construct the facilities solely by themselves. We must therefore greatly increase the scale of our Federal support and we must provide maximum incentives to the States and local communities to join together in a concerted effort to abate pollution.

That is why I am so delighted with the provisions of this bill which would authorize a total of $6 billion in appropriations through fiscal year 1972, eliminate the existing dollar-ceiling limitations on individual projects grants, and provide a 30-percent grant for every project regardless of cost. On the basis of the allocation formulas established under this legislation, Massachusetts could be eligible over the next 6 years for some $160 million in Federal assistance. When you compare this figure with the some $3 million in Federal assistance that Massachusetts received this past year, one can appreciate the difference that this greatly expanded program of Federal assistance can make to the waging and winning of our war on pollution.

At the same time, Mr. President, this bill recognizes that simply making more Federal money available and removing dollar ceilings will not be enough. When I testified before the Water Pollution Subcommittee on my bill, S. 2857, I pointed out that S. 2947 and my bill arrived at many of the same conclusions. I stressed, however, the need for mechanisms to insure maximum participation by the States in support of municipal pollution abatement projects. I also pointed out the necessity for making an effort to allocate Federal funds more on the basis of need rather than solely on the basis of traditional formula.

I am pleased that the committee bill incorporates the President's clean rivers restoration program in a form designed to encourage greater participation by the States under the bill, once a river basin planning agency is designated, water quality standards are established, and the State meets 30 percent of the project costs, the Federal Government may provide up to 50 percent of the project cost. The additional 20 percent Federal assistance is exactly the kind of incentive that I have urged we offer the States to encourage them to develop State assistance programs.

Considering the difficulties that communities such as Lowell and Haverhill on the Merrimack River in my own State of Massachusetts have in financing construction of treatment plants, this provision of the bill, which could cut the local burden to 20 percent of the project cost, could make a tremendous difference to communities which are anxious to combat pollution but lack the resources to translate intentions into action.

I remain convinced that we must continue to work toward allocating our Federal assistance more on the basis of need and I would like to ask the eminent Senator from Maine about the future in this regard. Under this legislation will the States who have the greatest needs and who are willing to do their share in matching Federal grants for pollution control receive adequate grants to meet these needs?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that, under the bill as it is now written, the Federal share would be increased to 30 percent of the total project cost, whether or not the States make a contribution to that cost. If the States make no effort—and 42 States do not now make an effort—local communities would have to bear 70 percent of the cost.

Under the clean rivers restoration title of the bill, if the States meet certain conditions and contribute 30 percent of the project cost, then the Federal share would go to 50 percent, leaving the local share at 20 percent. We think that would be a realistic sharing of the burden.

I do not know why the States have not responded to this challenge. The basic act under which our programs are now operating is based on the assumption that the primary responsibility rests with the States. The States have asserted their primary responsibility. And yet only eight of them, up to this point, make any financial contribution to the cost of sewage treatment projects.

In order to encourage necessary State participation in the grant program we have tried to provide additional incentives in this bill.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. Is the Senator from Maine satisfied that, if the States are willing to meet their responsibilities and the local communities theirs, the funds authorized in this bill are sufficient to meet the demands which would be placed upon them in those areas in which there is the greatest need?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. It is our estimate that the funds provided through 1972 will be adequate to provide primary and secondary treatment for 80 percent of the population of the country.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. And the Senator is satisfied that if the States and the local communities are responsive in working out programs to meet their critical needs, sufficient funds will be made available so that those communities and those States which have significant pollution control problems and are really in desperate need can meet their obligations?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Yes. Now, there are two areas of the problem that are not touched by this bill. One is the separation of storm and sanitary sewers for which Congress authorized a demonstration grant program last year. The second is the problem of industrial waste, for which Congress has not yet provided. Sufficient assistance for industry is not yet available.

With those two exceptions, my answer to the Senator is in the affirmative.

Mr. **NELSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts, while the

Senator from Maine is here, permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I have a brief amendment and a brief comment on it; then I shall be delighted to yield the floor. So with the Senator's indulgence, if we can proceed in that way I would appreciate it.

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, there are several provisions of this legislation which cover new ground and are vital to a comprehensive program of pollution abatement and control. The first of these amends the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 to make it unlawful to discharge oil from vessels, shore installations, or terminal facilities into inland or coastal waters.

My own State of Massachusetts has been constantly plagued by the problem of oil pollution. For example, in the spring of 1965 oil spilled off the Massachusetts coast in the area of Fall River covered the shoreline and the entire shellfish area. Only in recent months has the shellfish area started to clear.

During the same spring, oil spillage occurred in the Charles River, a river bordered by historic and cultural landmarks. The picturesque shoreline was coated with a layer of black sludge, all the way from Watertown to the ocean. Indeed there are waterways in our State such as the waters of the Mystic River and the wharf areas of Boston Harbor, that are continually polluted with oil. These are examples of what has become a national problem. I am hopeful that the stiff penalties for discharging oil provided for in the bill will do much to ameliorate this abuse of our Nation's waters.

I am also happy to see that S. 2947 provides that the Secretary of the Interior make a study of the costs of carrying out the provisions of this act, and a comprehensive survey of the costs and problems of national water pollution control. At the present moment, we cannot foresee the specific results of the passage of S. 2947. We know that the bill is a great step forward in pollution control and abatement. But to keep up with the advances that will be made as a result of this legislation, to expand our knowledge and our skill in coping with pollution, it is essential that a study be made of our progress in water pollution control.

Finally, I note the provision for a comprehensive study of the effects of pollution, including sedimentation, in the estuaries and estuarine zones of the United States.

The estuarine zones of our Nation are essential for the purposes of commercial and sport fishing, for recreation, and for camping and hunting. Yet until now, they have been virtually neglected. It was with this in mind that I recently proposed a bill to provide for a nationwide study by the Secretary of the Interior to identify the estuarine areas which should be protected from further deterioration caused by population pressures and water pollution.

Consequently, I consider this provision of S. 2947 a very important contribution to this legislation.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment to S. 2947.

On April 11, 1966, I received a letter from Dr. N. Bruce Hanes, director of environmental engineers, Tufts University. Dr. Hanes drew my attention to the severe shortage of trained personnel trained in the essential skills of water treatment and sewage control. He emphasized that fellowships are made to students on the graduate level, but not in sufficient number on the undergraduate level, where such fellowships or scholarships would offer incentives to students to begin studying techniques of water pollution and sewage control in the first years of college rather than later in graduate school.

He pointed out that unless action were taken, full implementation of our growing water pollution programs might be thwarted by a lack of skilled manpower.

I then wrote to the Secretaries of the Interior, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development inquiring into this problem and suggesting that consideration be given to convening a national manpower conference to explore the question. Their replies indicated that the problem of shortages of skilled personnel was manifest, but yet to be confronted.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of that correspondence be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING,
Medford, Mass., April 11, 1966.

Att.: Miss Barbard Souliotis.

The Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Senator of Massachusetts,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am writing this letter to express my grave concern of the success of the extensive Federal programs in the field of water pollution which were enlarged and initiated by Legislation in 1965, and the new programs that are being considered this year.

I feel that many funds have been channeled into this critical problem area without consideration of where the trained personnel will come from to carry these programs to a successful completion. I anticipate that the country will soon find itself in the position of New York State where 1.7 billion dollars have been made available through a bond issue and Federal funds to clean up the pollutional problems in the next seven years; however, they now find that they do not have the trained personnel to do the job nor can they find them. I am expressing this opinion as a young engineer who has been concerned with education in the field of water pollution for nine years and as the Director of Tufts University Environmental Engineering Program.

For example, last year the 89th Congress passed several laws which will make available millions of additional dollars to attack the broad problem of water pollution on several fronts. The major bill was the Water Quality Act of 1965 (P.L. 89–238) which provided an additional $50,000,000 a year of matching funds for the construction of sewage treatment plants. It also provided $20,000,000 per year of matching funds for the purpose of assisting in the development of new or improved methods of controlling storm sewage. In addition to the Water Quality Act of 1965, the following bills were enacted which contain provisions regarding water supply and pollution control:

P.L. 89–117: $200,000,000 per year of matching funds for the financing of basic public water facilities;

P.L. 89–136: $500,000,000 per year of matching funds for the construction, expansion or improvement of public works facilities in redevelopment areas;

P.L. 89–4: $6,000,000 per year of funds for the construction of sewage treatment works in communities in the Appalachian region;

P.L. 89–240: $50,000,000 per year of matching funds to finance, among other things, the treatment or disposal of waste in rural areas.

In addition, The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 is designed to "meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the nation * * *". This Act establishes a water resources council and river basin commissions and makes provision for financial assistance to the states to increase their participation in water resources planning. The Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965 provides for the consideration, in the planning of federal water projects, of the possibilities for outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. Provisions relating to water are also contained in the River and Harbor Act of 1965 and in Public Law 89–42 which authorizes $944 million for flood control and navigation improvement projects in thirteen river basins over the next two years.

According to the publication "Federal Water Resources Research Program for fiscal year 1966" the Federal Government budgeted a total of $1.8 billion dollars for water resources development for fiscal year 1966. Of these funds, only $9.7 million dollars were directly earmarked for manpower education. The Department of Interior administers $6.4 million dollars of these funds under P.L. 88–379 which authorizes the establishment of specific research studies at designated universities. It is questionable whether these funds should be strictly considered educational funds rather than research funds since they support faculty, research personnel, and graduate students who participate in research while pursuing course work at the same time. The balance of the educational funds ($3.2 million) are administrated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) and provide direct support for graduate students. These funds provide training grants to universities and individual fellowships on the basis of merit which permits students to pursue full time academic programs. The educational effort by the FWPCA was increased from $2.6 million in fiscal year 1965 to $3.2 million in fiscal year 1966. Even with this increase the educational output of trained men has lost ground this year in comparison to the number of jobs that are now available. As a result, of the greatly increased Federal funds that have been made available as outlined to combat pollution, hardly a day passes that requests for trained students in this area are received at Tufts from the Federal, State, and local level. We now find it possible to fill only a small fraction of these requests. This failure is a result of inadequate funds for graduate training combined with the necessity of many of our graduates to serve the country in the armed forces.

Next year this critical situation will become worse. President Johnson sent to Congress on February 23 a comprehensive message on pollution entitled "Preserving Our Heritage". In this message, he made eight badly needed specific proposals as follows:

1. A Clean River Demonstration Program which would "clean and preserve entire river basins from their source to their mouths." The four requirements included (a) adoption of appropirate water quality standards for entire basins, (b) development of long-range comprehensive and practical plans to achieve and preserve those standards by the states and local communities, (c) where not already

existing, the creation of permanent river basin organizations, and (d) willingness and ability of communities to obtain and contribute funds for construction of facilities.

2. Increase the federal contribution to the program for construction, planning, and administration. This includes the request to appropriate for clean river demonstration projects $50 million for fiscal 1967.

3. Reorganize and concentrate the water programs in the Department of the Interior. This includes the transfer of the newly created Water Pollution Control Administration from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to Interior. In the way this was done, the transfer automatically will be effected in 60 days unless Congress vetoes the proposal.

4. Increased financial support for state agencies. The specific request was to double the federal contribution.

5. Strengthen the federal enforcement powers. This includes proposals (a) to eliminate the two mandatory six-month delays now in the procedure, (b) to allow the federal government to bring suit to stop pollution when that pollution constitutes imminent danger to public health or welfare, (c) to give more weight in the courts to evidence produced in administrative enforcement hearings, (d) to allow the federal government the right to subpoena witnesses to appear at administrative hearings, (e) to allow the federal government the right to initiate enforcement proceedings when pollution occurs in navigable waters, intrastate or interstate, (f) to require registration of all existing or potential sources of major pollution and U.S. representatives be allowed to inspect such sources, and (g) to allow private citizens to bring suit in federal court to seek relief from pollution.

6. Strengthened research for new and improved concepts of water pollution control. The message states, "But if pollution control is to cope with increasing volumes of waste from our growing industry and population, new knowledge and technology are required. It is a challenge to research organizations, both private and public, to develop these technologies."

7. Expansion of training to meet the shortage of personnel. This includes the proposal to establish traineeships, fellowships, and an internship program in federal water pollution control activities.

8. Establishment of a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems—from methods to conserve and augment existing water supplies to the application of modern technology, such as desalting, to provide more usable water for cities, industries, and farms.

It is apparent from these proposals that a large number of funds are immediately needed in the field of education if the manpower needs are to be met from last year's legislation as well as the new bills that are being considered this year as outlined in the President's message.

A comparison of education funds available for full time study in fiscal year 1966 and proposed funds for full time study in fiscal year 1967 under the FWPCA Program is made below:

Fiscal year 1966:	
Training grants	$2,500,000
Fellowships	700,000
Total	3,200,000
Proposed fiscal year 1967:	
Training grants	2,910,000
Fellowships	633,000
Total	3,543,000

The total proposed increase in this program for next year (considerably less than last year) is $343,000 and will not provide the flood of additional trained engineers and scientists to meet our needs. The most important proposals in President Johnson's February 23rd message for the success of the overall water pollution program was item seven, calling for expansion of training in this area. The most effective way of accomplishing this is through a program that provides direct support for full time study similar to the current program at the FWPCA. This year's proposed budgetary increase of $343,000 is not adequate.

The following suggestions are made to attack the present manpower shortage:

1. Expand the present FWPCA Education Program.

This program is established and is currently doing an excellent job. Increased expenditures in this program will bring more rapid results than establishing new programs.

2. Establish support for undergraduate students in the field of Environmental Engineering and Environmental Sciences.

It is realized that this is an extreme step to take in education, however, it would attract good students rapidly to the field at the undergraduate level. If we wait until students realize the shortage of manpower in this area which coupled with good wages are often the moving forces for selecting a field of study we will be short of qualified B.S. students for jobs and graduate study. The direct federal support of undergraduate students is on the way. Why shouldn't the field of Water Pollution lead and be first.

3. Declare water pollution a critical area of national importance and make people working in this field exempt from the draft.

This is a radical recommendation, however, the situation is desperate and extreme measures need to be taken now. It is conservatively estimated that 50% of graduates at both the graduate and undergraduate level have been lost to the draft this year. This measure would provide the most immediate results for new manpower and encourage students participation on all levels.

Action needs to be taken now, if men and women are to be available to design, build, and operate treatment plants; clean our rivers, lakes, and streams; make new water standards; and to enforce the new legislation.

I would be willing to offer testimony on this matter if it would be of any assistance.

Similar letters have been sent to the following: Hon. BRADFORD MORSE, Representative of Massachusetts; Secretary Stewart Udall, Department of the Interior; Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, House Appropriations Committee; Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, House Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

N. BRUCE HANES, Ph. D.
Director, Environmental Engineering,
Tufts University.

APRIL 25, 1966.

The Honorable WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of an excellent letter I have received from Dr. N. Bruce Hanes, Director of Environmental Engineering, Tufts University. Dr. Hanes points out that we may not be able to achieve full implementation of our new and growing water pollution programs because of a lack of available manpower equipped with the necessary skills needed in this area. Since I share his concern, I would very much appreciate if you could determine what resources are available under existing legislation to train men for careers relating to pollution control.

Could you also advise me if the Bureau of Labor Statistics has formulated some projection of the manpower needs in this area over the next decade?

I would also like your judgment as to whether it would be desirable to convene a national conference to determine the need for skilled workers created by recent legislation designed to improve our natural environment, and whether our federal programs are adequately oriented to meet the need.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter in the near future.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, May 6, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you for bringing to my attention the very interesting letter from your constituent, Dr. N. Bruce Hanes, Director of Environmental Engineering, Tufts University. I, too, share your concern and that of Dr. Hanes that we will find our developing water pollution programs weakened by a severe shortage of personnel trained in the essential skills required.

Under the terms of the Manpower Development and Training Act, this Department has referred approximately 450 individuals from all over the country to the Water and Sewerage Technical School in Neosho, Missouri. Most of these men have been trained as water and sewage plant operators, which is a skilled occupation requiring from 36 to 52 weeks of instruction. The placement rate of course graduates has been quite good.

While this has been a successful program as far as it goes, we are not able, within the scope of this legislation, to provide training in the technical and professional occupations to which Dr. Hanes refers. He indicates in his letter that training for these highly skilled occupations should be conducted at the undergraduate and graduate levels, while our program emphasis is upon serving those with extremely limited educational, economic, and social backgrounds so as to make them employable.

Because of this, I believe that the programs conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the field of higher education are more promising for meeting professional needs of this type. I would suggest also that the question of a national conference dealing with manpower requirements for natural resource programs is dependent primarily on the results of findings to be made by the Department of Interior in its administration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Our Bureau of Labor Statistics has been informed that the Department of Interior is currently involved in a study of manpower needs in this occupational field which could conceivably serve as a basis for a conference such as you mention. We, of course, would be most willing to contribute to any effective solution to this problem.

Thank you again for bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am acknowledging your letter of April 25 with which you enclose a copy of your letter to Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz as well as a copy of a letter directed to you by Dr. N. Bruce Hanes regarding manpower requirements to solve the problems of water pollution.

This matter is, of course, a very serious one and we appreciate your bringing it to our attention. As Secretary of the Interior and as Chairman of the Water Resources Council, I shall want to have our experts study the matter carefully.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE UNDER SECRETARY
OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter addressed to Secretary Gardner dated April 26, 1966, enclosing a copy of a letter to the Secretary of Labor and a copy of a letter from Dr. N. Bruce Hanes concerning manpower needs and programs to deal with problems of water pollution.

Dr. Hanes' analysis of the manpower needs and programs to deal with water pollution control problems is a thoughtful and accurate appraisal of the situation. The need for engineers, scientists, and others trained in water pollution control and water resources management generally is a very significant one which is not being met by existing efforts.

As you know, the recently established Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is rapidly expanding. It is experiencing the kind of needs that concern Dr. Hanes. As the Federal agency involved with supporting water pollution control training programs, and providing research grants and fellowships to individuals and institutions, it has considerable interest in the points raised by Dr. Hanes.

In your letter to the Secretary of Labor, you raised the question of convening a national conference. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has recognized the need for much more information in the manpower training field. Information needed would include numbers of persons required by profession or specialty, level of training required by position, phasing of needs relative to the pollution problem, the geographic area where needs are greatest, and ways in which the field could be made more attractive as an occupation. It is essential, too, that administrative delays are not encountered by qualified personnel after they have indicated their availability for a position in water pollution control.

We believe much more attention needs to be given the water pollution manpower problem than has been given in the past. Your interest in this situation is greatly appreciated. If we may be of any assistance, or can provide additional information, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSNG AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Secretary Robert C. Weaver has asked me to reply to your recent query concerning the manpower needs and programs to deal with the problems of water pollution.

We are taking the liberty of referring this letter to Mr. James M. Quigley, Commissioner, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. I am sure Mr. Quigley will reply to you in detail.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL K. WALKER,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Department of the Interior has more recently informed me that although they are gradually compiling information on the shortage of trained personnel they have not made a special study of this shortage.

The committee in its report on this legislation recognizes the importance of the problem. It urges:

(1) That the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration report to the Congress on the question of skilled manpower for operation of pollution control programs;

(2) That such national conference as recommended by the Senator be called at the earliest date consistent with orderly procedure;

(3) That the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reexamine existing manpower development programs and other education programs to determine the extent to which those programs may be used for the training of needed skilled personnel.

It is impossible of course, to know exactly what the effects would be of an increased supply of trained personnel in water pollution control. But the prospects for greater efficiency and reduced cost are very encouraging. Water pollution experts from my own State of Massachusetts have estimated that with more skilled personnel they would be able to increase efficiency by 10 percent in 10 plants on the Merrimack River through the employment of more skilled personnel; they would save enough money to construct a multimillion-dollar treatment plant. The sad fact is that although Massachusetts officials realize the potential for increased savings, they find it very difficult to locate sufficient trained personnel to operate their plants.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that without a clear knowledge of how many men are needed to operate our water pollution control and abatement programs and without a positive training program oriented to meet those needs, we may find ourselves unable to achieve our pollution control objectives.

Consequently, to insure that this problem receives the consideration it deserves, I send to the desk a printed amendment, No. 640, and ask that it be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes amendment No. 640, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 640

On page 32, line 5, after "SEC. 17." insert "(a)".

On page 32, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"(b) The Secretary shall also make a complete investigation and study to determine (1) the need for additional trained State and local personnel to carry out programs assisted pursuant to this Act and other programs for the same purpose as this Act, and (2) means of using existing Federal training programs to train such personnel. He shall report the results of such investigation and study to the President and the Congress not later than July 1, 1967."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide for a comprehensive study of the need for skilled personnel trained in the techniques of water pollution control and abatement, and to determine how best we can utilize existing Federal training programs to train such personnel.

The Secretary of the Interior would report the results of such investigation and study to the President and the Congress no later than July 1, 1967.

Mr. President, passage of this legislation will give us many of the tools and much of the financial assistance that will be needed in the years ahead to restore and preserve the quality of our water resources. The distinguished junior Senator from Maine and his colleagues on the committee are to be commended for bringing this legislation before the Senate.

I urge its speedy passage.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and am happy to support his amendment. This subject was discussed earlier, Mr. President, in response to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The committee was impressed by the presentation, during its hearings, made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and devoted, indeed, several paragraphs in the report to the subject which he has raised. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1367) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts provided the committee with an extensive analysis of the personnel problem prepared by Dr. N. Bruce Hanes, Director of Environmental Engineering at Tufts University. Dr. Hanes pointed out that full implementation of new and growing water pollution programs may be impeded due to a lack of available manpower equipped with the necessary skills.

Senator KENNEDY also provided the committee with correspondence between himself and the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, in which the Senator, among other things, suggested the desirability of convening "a national conference to determine the needs of skilled workers created by recent legislation designed to improve our natural environment, and whether our Federal programs are adequately oriented to meet the needs."

The committee believes Senator KENNEDY's suggestion to be of the highest order of importance and urges that—

(1) The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration report to the Congress on the question of skilled manpower for operation of pollution control programs;

(2) That such national conference as recommended by the Senator be called at the earliest date consistent with orderly procedure; and

(3) That the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reexamine existing manpower development programs and other education programs to determine the extent to which those programs may be used for the training of needed skilled personnel.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think it is a splendid bill. The Senator from Maine has taken care of many of the problems concerning which so many of us have been deeply concerned. I know what a monumental labor it has been. I congratulate the Senator on his work.

I know that many of our colleagues are deeply interested in the economy and in the Federal expenditures. This is a $6 billion bill, but it is a $6 billion bill because the Senator from Maine has had the graciousness and the generosity to accept other people's ideas. Too many of us do not do that here very often. It is a very good precedent.

The pending bill has taken much of the steam out of the argument concerning the $6 billion bill. The Senator has pointed out very properly and nobly that it is a great deal of money but that the money does not have to be appropriated right away. The States will be encouraged by the passage of this bill to go ahead and spend the money on the theory that they will get it back ultimately.

In a State like New York, in which there is a $1.7 billion project, the idea of being able to get reimbursed for money being spent currently—which we can raise by credit and other means—makes us able to proceed. We will take our chances and the risk that ultimately the Federal Government will reimburse us. However, I point out the experience that we have had and why this is such a brilliant provision in the bill.

The New York Thruway—the first of the great trunk roads through the States—was followed by others in the country, and it has literally revolutionized our land.

There was no Federal road program at the time of its construction. We are still trying after all these years to get some Federal reimbursement for what is in effect an interstate highway—the New York Thruway.

New York would not have gone ahead with the great sewer construction program which our voters have authorized, by referendum incidentally, unless we had reassurance that we would be reimbursed for our expenditures.

I think the provisions incorporated in the bill by the Senator from Maine are very sound. The other provisions are splendid.

I am especially enthusiastic over what amounts to the advance approval of a river compact with respect to a river basin.

This is a fine example of Federal-State cooperation in a most elementary effort in our country toward the preservation of the water and its purity. I think that the Senator from Maine has every right to derive enormous satisfaction from his role in leading us into the enactment of this measure which I hope will soon be enacted.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the Senator from New York not only for his remarks this afternoon, but for the strong support and leadership he has provided in introducing legislation, some of the ideas of which are incorporated in the pending bill. I also thank him for prodding those of us on the committee to continue our efforts on this problem.

I do appreciate the comments of the Senator this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I point out that taking the ceiling off all these individual and collective projects is tremendously helpful to a big industrial State and is another major contribution in the bill. I thank the Senator.

AIRLINE CRISIS POINTS UP NEED FOR NEW EMERGENCY LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are now in the sixth day of a national airline strike which could very well drag on for weeks, endangering the economy of the country and stopping, or at the very least slowing, transportation facilities essential to the national security, health, and welfare. Yet there is now not a single statutory step left which the President can take to protect the public in this situation.

All the cooling-off periods have run out, but the dispute has not cooled off.

All the mediation and factfinding panels have made their recommendations, but there is no voluntary settlement.

All the top officials of the executive branch, from the President and Secretary of Labor on down, have sought to bring the parties to an agreement, but to no avail.

Surely it is high time we stopped pretending that existing laws are adequate, for the mechanisms provided by law—in this case the Railway Labor Act—have been used and exhausted, and the Federal Government is now completely devoid of statutory tools to protect the public.

Indeed, the President this time has not even asked for special legislation, as he did in the railroad firemen's strike, nor has he recommended, as he assured us he would in his state of the Union message last January, new emergency strike legislation. I urge the President to recommend his new emergency strike legislation now.

The Congress is not powerless, if we will only face the problem.

What is needed is a statutory method of insuring that essential services will be provided, even after all the cooling-off periods have been exhausted.

I have proposed one possible solution to the problem. My bill, S. 2797, would provide—in addition to factfinding with recommendations and a cooling-off period to permit bargaining on those recommendations—both of which have already been done under the Railway Labor Act in the airlines dispute—one last-resort weapon which the President could use when all else fails. The bill would authorize the President to seek appointment by a Federal court of a special receiver to take possession of and operate the struck facilities to the extent which, in the opinion of the court, is necessary to protect the public health and safety.

The procedure has the merits of, first, protecting the public; second, leaving the parties free to continue their bargaining as long as is necessary to reach a settlement; and third, avoiding compulsory arbitration or similar solutions such as the special arbitration law we reluctantly adopted to settle—if indeed it did finally settle—the 1963 rail work rules dispute. That is the last resort we had in the firemen's strike.

The need for such congressional action is amply demonstrated by a review of the chronology of the airlines labor dispute: I shall give the chronology in this case. The senior Senator from Oregon is present and no one is a greater expert on that subject than he.

In August 1965, the parties agreed to handle these negotiations on a joint multiemployer basis.

On October 1, 1965, the parties served notices of intention to renegotiate their labor agreements, pursuant to section 6 of the Railway Labor Act.

The labor agreements expired on December 31, 1965.

Negotiations failed, and on January 11, 1966, the parties made a joint application to the National Mediation Board for mediation. The case was docketed by the NMB on January 12, 1966, as case No. A-7655, and mediation commenced in Washington, D.C., and Florida.

On March 18, 1966, the NMB offered arbitration to the parties, on the statutory ground that mediation had failed to produce an agreement.

On March 21, 1966, the union rejected arbitration.

On March 22, 1966, the NMB wrote to both parties, announcing that arbitration had been refused and that the mediation board was therefore terminating its services. This letter triggered a 30-day cooling-off period under the Railway Labor Act.

On April 21, one day before the expiration of the cooling-off period, the President appointed an emergency board to find the facts and to make recommendations for a settlement.

After extensive hearings and consideration, the emergency board issued and made public its report and recommendations to the President and to the parties on June 7, 1966. This again triggered a 30-day cooling-off period.

On June 13, 1966, the carriers accepted the emergency board's recommendations, but the union rejected the recommendations.

On July 8, 1966, the last cooling-off period expired and the strike began.

We stand helpless now as far as legal remedies are concerned.

I hope we will not find it necessary now to adopt another special arbitration law as we did when the 1963 work rules dispute reached a similar impasse. If we use the 1963 rail work rules statute as a precedent, we will most assuredly be contributing to the establishment of compulsory arbitration as a precedent—and it is a precedent which neither labor nor management wants and which would very probably sound the death knell of free collective bargaining in basic or critical industries.

I have made my proposal. I think it is a sound one. Under my proposal, the parties are left free to bargain. If receivership becomes necessary, both parties operate under a disability, for the union forfeits the right to strike, but the employer forfeits possession and operation of his facilities. The Federal Government has suggested what a fair settlement would be, but the parties are free under this procedure—unlike compulsory arbitration—to reject the Government's suggestion and bargain for something else.

In short, this proposal produces the maximum protection of the public with the minimum of Government decisionmaking.

I have said time and again that the basic weaknesses of our existing emergency labor laws are bound to subject us to one crisis after another.

We must have gumption enough to face up to our responsibility.

I urged Congress to act last fall when a threatened steel strike imperiled the Nation's economy. But a last-minute settlement avoided catastrophe and no legislative action was taken. In January, when a subway strike paralyzed the entire New York metropolitan area, I again urged that Congress act, and the President also stated publicly that new laws were needed. But no legislative action was taken, nor were proposals forthcoming from the administration.

How long shall we wait? How complete a disaster must we have to justify new legislation?

I think we have already waited much too long, and endured far too many crises and "near misses." The time to act—and the time for Congress to enact—is now.

I think it is shocking that our Government is powerless under the statute to conduct the operation of the Government even as it pertains to mail. There is nothing we can do about it except to exhort and try to use brilliant talents like those of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and others to bring the parties together.

But if that fails, the President has no legal remedy whatever. This is a shocking state for a powerful Government with so many responsibilities to be in. I think it is the duty of the President to see that we repair it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to make a very brief comment on the statement that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made with regard to the pending airline strike.

As the RECORD will show, I talked at some length last night on the floor of the Senate, setting forth what the transcript of the record indicates in regard to the evidence pertaining to some of the major issues in the strike. The evidence submitted by the parties is quite different from the propaganda being issued by the spokesmen for the union.

It is important that the public understand the difference between the claims of the union and what the union showed in the trial of the case.

As I said last night, and repeat now, the emergency board appointed by the President, on which I had the honor to serve as chairman, was a quasi-judicial tribunal, not a mediation tribunal at all. Our jurisdiction and authority was limited to the hearing of the case on the basis of the evidence presented by the parties.

As the chairman of the board announced to the parties at the very beginning of the hearing, our recommendations would be based upon the application of the preponderance-of-evidence rule applied to the evidence submitted by the parties. The fact is that on issue after issue the union simply failed to sustain the burden of proof. The fact is that on issue after issue, the union is trying to substitute its economic power for evidence.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has pointed out that this is a regulated industry; that being a regulated industry, it is vested with the public interest; and that the public is a party to this dispute because it is a regulated industry.

The Senator from New York has made the observation that no procedures are available at this time, so far as the law is concerned, for the settlement of the dispute. The only procedure left, of course, is mediation between the parties, based upon the economic power of each—to strike or to lock out.

As the Senator from New York knows, ever since 1948 the senior Senator from Oregon has advocated a revision of the emergency dispute sections of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon have different proposals, but our objectives are exactly the same, for we feel that in regulated industries, when the dispute takes the form of creating a national emergency, the Government has an obligation, through Congress, to step in and to provide a fair legal procedure for the settlement of the dispute. Honest men and sincere men may differ as to what that procedure should be; but I certainly join with the Senator from New York this afternoon in saying that, in my judgment, the time has come when the administration must decide whether or not it wishes to recommend legislation for the settlement of this dispute. In my judgment, it should. To that degree, I completely agree with the Senator from New York.

I leave for future determination, on the basis of the arguments presented, what the form of that legislation should be. I have already made clear that I shall not support a compulsory arbitration bill limited to compulsory arbitration in a regulated industry when a national emergency takes place.

However, I have nothing but the highest respect for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who does not share my point of view in regard to this matter, but thinks that such an approach should be made.

The proposal having been made, I believe that it should be given careful consideration by the appropriate Senate and House committees, as we come to grips with the matter of procedures that should be followed to achieve an ultimate settlement of any dispute that reaches the stage of a national emergency.

A question of fact is raised as to whether or not the strike has reached a state of national emergency. It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that it has. One of the reasons I say that is that, as I pointed out in my speech yesterday, this strike now raises the issue as to whether or not the administration will stand by while a great union—which has a past agreement in a regulated industry that is vested with the public interest—uses its economic power to force a wage settlement that will blow off the lid as far as inflation control is concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish this thought; then I shall yield.

As I pointed out yesterday if this union succeeds in bludgeoning its way through to an inflationary wage increase, standing in the wings will be union after union ready to take up wage settlements. Of course, the leaders of those unions would have no course but to insist that they, too, ask for inflationary wage increases.

I say respectfully that Mr. Ramsey, the spokesman for this union, is substituting his adrenal glands for his cortex in this dispute, by making highly emotional appeals that have no relationship to the facts in the record. Mr. Ramsey tried the case, and Mr. Ramsey must assume the responsibility for the failure to establish even a prima facie case, on issue after issue, in support of certain unreasonable demands of the union. This failure caused the emergency board—sitting really as a labor court, as a quasi-judicial body—to say, as the report of the board shows, that on these issues the union failed to sustain its burden of proof.

This union apparently was so determined to go through to a strike unless its demands were granted by the board or by other agencies of the Government, that it did not even present its case through a labor lawyer or through the services of a labor economic service, which is customary in disputes of this type. So I said good naturedly and half jocularly, in a conversation with the parties, that I was a little surprised to find the union discriminating against the most outstanding closed shop in America—namely, my profession, the legal profession—by not having an able labor lawyer present its evidence.

I say most respectfully, and I hope the membership of the IAM will take note of it, that had they followed such an orderly procedure, in my judgment they would have made a better record in the case, and might have placed the board in a position where its recommendations might have been somewhat different on the basis of the evidence presented.

Be that as it may, I wish to stress this point this afternoon, as I did last night in my speech in the Senate. This union is bringing the American people to the brink of a great inflation. If this union succeeds in bludgeoning its way through to inflationary wage increases, may I say to my President, that you cannot stop the inflationary spiral without inflation control legislation. And what does that mean? As I said last night, it means wage control, it means price control, and it means the Government stepping in, in no small measure, to run the economy of this country.

A Government controlled economy cannot be reconciled with a free economy. Therefore, it is important that labor leaders in this country, not only in this union but in every other union, take a long, solemn look as to where the conduct of this union will lead them, because we are in an hour of national crisis.

As the record shows, I am opposed to the war in South Vietnam; but we are engaged in that war, and we must see to it that no one is allowed to take advantage of that war by leading the economy of this country into an inflationary spiral. If that should be done, let us face it: They will be attempting to make blood profits out of the war. All that any union or any employer is entitled to during this period are reasonable and noninflationary wages, and reasonable and noninflationary profits. That was the burden of my argument last night; it is the burden of my argument today.

So I agree with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] that Congress now has a responsibility, even if the President does not act. But I have reason to believe that since he fully comprehends the economic emergency that this strike is creating across the Republic, he will act. He cannot stand by, in my judgment, with the great record he has made in seeking to attack inflation, and let this union become the bellwether for leading the country over the brink and into the bottomless pit of economic inflation. So I join in the objectives stated by the Senator from New York this afternoon. I believe this dispute is causing us to confront a national emergency and will lead to similar disputes if it is not checked.

The workers in this union are entitled to a fair wage settlement. If they have any evidence that they did not present to the board, they should have the opportunity to bring that evidence forward. The President is giving them that opportunity by making available to them two great mediators, the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor.

But let me make clear that this administration, through mediation, cannot justify putting the stamp of approval upon a settlement in this case that cannot be reconciled with the right of the American people to a reasonable control of inflation. Any mediation settlement which will pave the way for an inflationary breakthrough with respect to wages cannot, in my judgment, be justified.

I shall yield to no one in insisting that these workers get a fair wage settlement. They were given a fair wage settlement on the basis of the evidence submitted by them. If they have any more evidence, evidence which they did not present, let them bring it forward. But, in my judgment, in this hour of national crisis we cannot let this union or any other union or any management group follow a course of action that will create a national emergency and threaten the soundness of the American dollar.

I also wish to say that this Senator will be misunderstood in making that statement, but I am perfectly willing to be misunderstood when I speak the truth.

We must face up to our responsibility as free people and recognize that while this war is on we will have to make some sacrifices here at home in seeing to it that we keep the greatest security weapon which we possess, a free economy and a sound economy.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the discussion which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and I had last night, it was revealed—and I assume that the Record today should show these figures—that the total demand of the union in this dispute originally was $130 million by way of fringe benefits, wage increases, and otherwise. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Record further shows that the three-member board of which the senior Senator from Oregon was the chairman, awarded the union $76 million in the aggregate.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The union refused to accept $76 million, but has reduced its demands of $130 million down to $114 million.

Mr. MORSE. It is claimed it is lowered to $114 million, but the parties are in dispute about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, but in any event this three-man board decided that $76 million was justified; that it would obviate the forces of inflation; and that was the settlement that should be made.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the Senator for his frankness in presenting this matter. The Senator has been just as vigorous in his description of the evils of this union leader as he has been in the past in the defense of the unions when he felt that they were in the right.

Last night the Senator said:

> I am advised by the administration that the employers in the mediation conferences that have been held thus far, while the strike gun is being pointed at the head of the country, have been willing to increase the board's amount by $2 million.

I concur with the Senator from Oregon that this is a strike against the people of the Nation and that something has to be done to effectively bring it to an end.

Mr. MORSE. I share the view of the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator knows that I introduced a bill which would provide for mandatory arbitration and final arbitration. I gather from what the Senator from Oregon has said that there should be fully explored what the instrumentality should be. Whether it is the recommendation of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], or my recommendation I am of the belief that something has to be done, and if it is not done through the recommendation of the President it should be done by the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to remind the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] that he asked consent for the Committee on Education to meet at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. We are late for the meeting but I do not mind because I think it is important that this record be made.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator spoke of the Emergency Board which he headed as being a quasi-judicial board. The fact is that it does not have plenary power, and no court can order its decisions into effect. Therefore, we must act. I believe the record should be complete. We must act on either the plan of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the plan of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], my plan, or some plan providing for definite action to protect the public interest. That is what we are all contending for and that is what must be done.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The Railway Labor Act provides for the emergency board to try the case as a quasi-judicial board, but demands only recommendations to the President and the parties for final disposition. Then, they have 30 days to seek to modify the recommendation of the board, and under the Railway Labor Act, they are free to strike. It is this strike that created the national emergency.

The sad thing is that every leader in this union and every member of this union knows that this strike is going to be settled, and they know it is going to be settled pretty much on the same basis as now, if they disperse the picket lines and get around the negotiating table and act in good faith to the American people.

Mr. JAVITS. The Federal Government must have the power to sustain itself, and this has to be done.

Mr. MORSE. They have to in so-called regulated industries, in accordance with the public interest.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS AND CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill [S. 2947] to amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to support S. 2947, the Clean Rivers Restoration Act. This bill is the result of extensive research and hearings by the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]. Senator Muskie and the other members of the subcommittee are to be commended for once again bringing to the floor of the Senate comprehensive and forward-looking legislation through which our energies and resources can be mobilized for the battle against water pollution.

The Clean Rivers Restoration Act extends and expands the Federal water pollution control program in several important respects. It is a significant and logical addition to the series of pollution control laws beginning with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the important amendments to that law, such as the Water Quality Act passed by the Congress last year.

One of the most important features of this bill is a provision which would organize water pollution control planning according to river basin. Water pollution does not, of course, respect State, municipal or agency boundary lines. The pollution of our major rivers does not mean that they are polluted only in the vicinity of major cities, but that they are polluted along their entire courses, from their sources to their mouths. In these circumstances, pollution control programs designed for particular cities or vicinities without regard to the situation throughout the drainage basin cannot be expected to do an effective job of cleaning up our rivers. Under the clean rivers restoration program proposed by this bill, comprehensive plans for the control and abatement of pollution throughout river basins would be prepared, and economic incentives would be provided to insure that waste treatment was adequate to meet water quality standards established by the plan. Only through the adoption of such a comprehensive plan in every river basin will we be able to eventually meet our national water pollution problem.

Another important feature of this bill is the provision for expanded research and development. Our methods of collecting and treating domestic wastes have not changed for half a century. Many industrial wastes are not amenable to conventional treatment, and new methods must be developed. We need extensive work on the problem of combined storm-sanitary sewers, on joint municipal-industrial systems, and on advanced waste handling and waste treatment methods. I feel that the expanded research programs and fund authorizations provided by this bill will go a long way toward bringing about the technological breakthroughs upon which much of the future progress in water pollution abatement and prevention will depend.

Although I will not discuss them in detail, there are many other outstanding features of this bill. The provisions for an estuary research program, the mandatory pollution report requirement, the regulation of oil pollution from vessels and terminals, to mention but a few of these provisions, will fill important needs in our overall national pollution control program.

Mr. President, I feel that the gravest immediate problem confronting us in the pollution battle is the vast requirements of our cities—large and small—for waste collection and treatment facilities. The Federal program for assisting municipalities to construct waste treatment works has resulted in a tremendous acceleration of construction work. S. 2947 makes a significant contribution to expanding this program. Under the clean rivers restoration program, the Federal Government may make grants up to 50 percent of the cost of treatment works provided that the State pays at least 30 percent of the cost. The Federal contribution under this program may be further increased by grants under the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

Amendments to the existing Federal cost-sharing program remove the dollar ceilings on grants and substantially increase the Federal proportion of construction costs if a treatment works is part of a comprehensive plan. Other amendments provide for retroactive reimbursement of money expended for qualified treatment works construction projects, and establish a loan program to help municipalities meet the costs of treatment works construction. These changes in and additions to the Federal program to encourage the construction of municipal treatment works are badly needed and will greatly strengthen that program.

Under this bill, it would be possible for a municipality to get a Federal grant of up to 40 percent of the cost of treatment plant construction under the amendments to the existing Federal grant program, and up to 50 percent under the clean rivers restoration program. The bill would authorize a total of $6 billion for the next 6 fiscal years to finance grants under both these provisions. I feel very strongly that both the proposed Federal grant levels and the authorization for funds to finance these grants are inadequate for the needs to be met.

I believe that meeting these rapidly mounting needs of our cities for adequate waste collection and treatment systems should be a national responsibility with a No. 1 priority. The pollution crisis around our cities is deepening so rapidly that the Federal Government cannot any longer sit back and insist that other units of government solve the problem. The fact is that the job is not being done and never will be done unless we make it an urgent responsibility of the Federal Government. If the building of interstate highways is a task so urgent as to require 90-percent Federal financing, certainly the saving of our lakes and rivers is equally urgent and equally national in its significance.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] is as follows:

On page 13, line 18, strike out "not exceed" and insert in lieu thereof "be".

On page 13, line 20, before the semicolon insert a comma and "except that such per centum shall be increased by the per centum (not in excess of 20) which is equal to the per centum of such costs which the State in which the project is located agrees to provide".

On page 14, line 21, after the semicolon, insert "and".

On page 14, beginning with line 22, strike out all through line 25.

On page 15, line 1, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

On page 24, line 16, beginning with "no grant" strike out all through "exceeding 30" in line 17, and insert in lieu thereof "the grant for any project shall amount to 50".

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my brief statement there be printed in the Record materials taken from the report "Disposal of Municipal Sewage—Water Pollution Control and Abatement," 12th report by the House Committee on Government Operations, prepared by the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee, March 24, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], for a period of 2 years. That committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] has been conducting hearings on air and water pollution for almost 4 years.

The pending bill is one of the fruitful results of these extensive and probing hearings into the question of water pollution in this country.

I believe that the Senator is to be commended for having brought to the floor of the Senate the most comprehensive, most forward-looking, and finest water pollution control bill that has ever been brought to the floor of the Senate to my knowledge, for active consideration by the Congress.

The bill would make an authorization of $6 billion, which is a substantial step in the right direction. The amendment I sent to the desk aims to change the formula in the bill. In the bill, there is a grant of up to 30 percent to the local municipalities, and up to 50 percent if the States are willing to match with 30 percent. The amendment I sent to the desk would make the grant 50 percent to local municipalities, and would match the State up to 20 percent, making a total amount of 90 percent. In other words, the Federal Government would make a grant of 50 percent to the local municipalities and another 20 percent if the State will match the 20 percent, making the Federal grant a total of 70 percent. The total grant to the municipalities, under those circumstances, would be 90 percent.

I think that ultimately—although this is the best grant feature that has been contained in any bill ever taken up in Congress for consideration—we will have to go into the position of "upping" the matching funds of the Federal Government to local municipalities far beyond what we have done in the past, and far beyond what it is contemplated to do in the pending legislation.

If we were to sit down, consider the most serious domestic problems confronting this country today, I believe that the problem of the status of the quality of our environment would rank as the most urgent one.

To one degree or another, we have polluted every river basin in America. We have polluted the shorelines of nearly every major city in America. We have almost destroyed the water in Lake Erie, we are well underway in the pollution of Lake Michigan, and are beginning the pollution of Lake Superior. We are well on our way to polluting that magnificent lake, high in the mountains, Lake Tahoe, and are beginning the pollution of the ocean. In fact, we now find that in the Antarctic, DDT has been found in the fatty tissues of the Adelie penguins and yet no DDT has been used within 1,000 miles of the Antarctic.

We are well on our way to a serious pollution of the air over this country. The whole issue of the quality and the status of our environment is, I think, the most significant and important domestic issue confronting this country today. When, finally, we get around to tackling the full force of the whole question of water pollution in this country, I think we will be facing a problem with a price tag on it somewhere in the neighborhood of $75 billion to $100 billion. Everyone says that is a lot of money, and of course it is a lot of money to spend in the next 15 or 20 years to clean up the water in America. However, it is only about the equivalent of 1⅓ years' defense budget. I think the question of maintaining and raising the quality of the environment in which we live in the next 15 to 20 years is worthy of the investment of money equivalent to a defense budget expenditure of a year and one-third.

EXHIBIT 1

OUR COUNTRY'S STREAMS CAN NO LONGER ASSIMILATE THE EVER-INCREASING WASTES DISCHARGED INTO THEM

(Materials taken from the report "Disposal of Municipal Sewage (Water Pollution Control and Abatement)," 12th report by the House Committee on Government Operations, prepared by the National Resources and Power Subcommittee, Mar. 24, 1965)

Satisfactory development of urban society depends on adequate disposal of the complex wastes resulting from community living. Water pollution, therefore, is both a symbol and affliction of the growth of modern civilization. It adversely affects the continued growth, health, and development of the United States.

The water-carriage system for the disposal of household and industrial wastes from our cities and towns developed because of its simplicity and apparent economy. The city sewer offered a relatively inexpensive means for removing offensive and potentially dangerous wastes from our immediate surroundings and discharging them to a watercourse for disposal beyond sight, smell, and conscience. This practice was tolerated by the America of a half-century ago, because the streams were often able to assimilate the discharge. As a result, stream pollution was minor and local in nature.

Today, however, our cities are no longer isolated from one another by long reaches of streams. In the increasingly urban America of today, our communities are growing closer and closer together. Water supply intakes and waste outlets are intermingled along our watercourses, and the assimilative capacities of our streams are no longer able to cope with the ever-increasing loads of pollutional materials discharged into them.

SINCE 1900, MUNICIPAL SEWAGE DISCHARGES HAVE QUINTUPLED, AND THEIR POLLUTIONAL EFFECT HAS TRIPLED

At the turn of the century, approximately 950 communities in the United States had sewers, serving about 24.5 million persons. A scant 60 communities provided partial treatment for the sewage of 1 million persons and the remainder discharged their wastes untreated. In 1900, the municipal wastes reaching streams had a pollutional effect equivalent to the raw, untreated sewage from a population of about 24 million.

The number of communities now served by sewers totals more than 11,400; and the number of persons served by those sewers totals over 118 million. Of these, about 9,300 municipalities now have either primary or secondary sewage treatment facilities, which serve about 102 million people.

Despite this progress, the total amount of municipal pollution has not decreased. On the contrary, municipal pollution has substantially increased as a result of growing population, obsolescence of older treatment plants, failure to construct needed sewage treatment plants, increased interception of industrial wastes by municipal sewers, and the ever-increasing number of water-using devices in the home (multiple baths, garbage grinders, automatic laundries, etc.) By 1960, the municipal sewage discharged into our streams, treated and untreated, was almost 5 times the amount discharged in 1900, and its pollutional effect was equal to the untreated sewage from more than 75 million people, or triple the amount in 1900.

The following table I shows the growth in the sewered population, the increase in municipal sewage pollution, and a projection, based on expected urban growth, estimating conditions which will exist in 1970 and 1980 under alternate assumptions—(*a*) if all communities provide secondary treatment by 1980, and (*b*) if construction of sewage treatment facilities continues at the present rate. These projections for 1970 and 1980 also assume that municipalities will continue to intercept acceptable industrial wastes.

The projections in table I show that even if the municipalities of this Nation provide secondary treatment with conventional methods by 1980 for all the sewered population, the amount of pollution reaching watercourses in 1970 and 1980 will be substantially the same as today. More importantly, these projections show that unless the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants is substantially accelerated, water pollution will continue to increase and will be intolerable in numerous places long before 1980.

TABLE I.—*Population served by sewers and sewage treatment, 1900–80* [1]

[In millions]

Year	Sewered population	Served by treatment	Discharging raw sewage	Population equivalent discharged
1900	24.5	1.0	23.5	24
1920	47.5	9.5	38.0	40
1935	69.5	28.4	41.0	51
1950	80.0	54.0	26.0	60
1960	105.0	80.0	25.0	75
1970	152.0	[2] 137.0	[2] 15.0	[2] 78
		[3] 124.0	[3] 28.0	[3] 85
1980	200.0	[4] 200.0	[4] None	[4] 70
		[5] 170.0	[5] 30.0	[5] 114

[1] Data taken or extrapolated from "Modern Sewage Disposal," Federation of Sewage Works Association, 1938; "1957 Inventory of Municipal and Industrial Waste Facilities," USPHS; and unpublished date from U.S. Public Health Service.

[2] Assumes that progress toward secondary treatment for all municipal wastes by 1980 will be made; a per capita population equivalent (PE) of 1.6; and 80 percent removal of PE by secondary treatment.

[3] Same as 2, except assumes present rate of sewage treatment construction will continue.

[4] Assumes that all sewered population will be served by secondary sewage treatment by 1980; a per capita population equivalent (PE) of 1.75; and 80 percent removal of PE by secondary treatment.

[5] Same as 4, except assumes present rate of sewage treatment construction will continue.

The metropolitan area of Chicago provides a classic example of profound difficulties resulting from the growing problems of municipal sewage disposal. Although Chicago has very efficient sewage treatment facilities, the city's waste discharges are equivalent to the untreated sewage of over 1 million persons and contain solid wastes suspended and in solution, amounting to 3,400 tons per day.

ALTHOUGH SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS HAS OCCURRED IN CONTROLLING POLLUTION FROM MUNICIPAL SEWAGE, THE TOTAL POLLUTION LOAD ON AMERICA'S WATERS IS STILL INCREASING

The construction of needed municipal and industrial waste treatment facilities is one of the most important elements of effective water quality management, and requires expenditure of substantial money. The inventory data now collected at 5-year intervals by the States and consolidated by the U.S. Public Health Service demonstrate both the steady improvement and the vast unfinished work still to be done in the control of pollution from municipal wastes. Table II summarizes these data for 1945, 1957, and 1962 (the most recent inventory of municipal waste facilities).

Table II shows (*a*) that in the 17-year period 1945–62, sewered communities increased from 8,917 to 11,420; (*b*) that the population served by sewers increased from 74,740,887 to 118,371,919, while those discharging raw sewage decreased from 27,867,783 to 14,686,941; and (*c*) that secondary treatment plants increased from 2,799 to 6,584, serving a population which increased from 21,659,504 to 61,191,352.

These figures are indeed important indicators of progress in controlling pollution from municipal wastes. Particularly significant is the great and rapid rate of progress made since 1957 when the Federal construction grants program began to operate.

However, table II also shows that in 1962 (*a*) there were 2,249 sewered communities, serving 14,686,941 people, still discharging raw sewage; (*b*) of those communities having sewage treatment plants, 2,794 plants serving 42,493,626 people provided less than secondary treatment; and (*c*) 1,923 of the sewered communities had combined sewers and storm drains through which raw sewage could overflow into watercourses at times of heavy rain.

TABLE II.—*Summary of municipal waste disposal for the United States*

General	1945 (number)	1957 (number)	1962	
			Number	Population
Number of communities—				
With sewer systems	8,917	11,131	11,420	
Discharging raw sewage only		3,065	2,139	11,060,516
Discharging treated sewage only		7,966	9,171	94,139,370
Discharging both raw and treated sewage		100	110	13,172,033
Type of sewers (number of communities):				
Separate	6,844	8,632	9,083	57,309,049
Combined	1,470	1,451	1,305	25,964,055
Multiple systems of both combined and separate	373	428	618	33,836,027
Not stated		620	414	1,262,788
Census population of sewered communities	82,012,692	102,047,712		123,406,458
Estimated population:				
Connected to sewers	[1] 74,740,887	98,361,396		118,371,919
Discharging raw	27,867,783	21,917,665		14,686,941
Discharging treated	46,865,114	76,443,731		103,684,978
TREATMENT				
Treatment plants, total	5,786	7,518	9,378	
Minor [2]	69	41	37	
Primary	2,829	2,730	2,672	
Intermediate [3]	98	100	85	
Secondary	2,799	4,647	6,584	
Estimated population served by—				
Minor treatment [2]	4,269,960	1,860,330		2,350,845
Primary treatment	17,172,560	25,666,745		32,733,831
Intermediate treatment [3]	3,763,090	5,590,952		7,408,950
Secondary treatment	21,659,504	43,325,704		61,191,352

[1] Includes population of 7,990 connected to semipublic, industrial, and institutional facilities not included in the "Discharging raw" or "Discharging treated" items.

[2] Less than sedimentation.

[3] More than sedimentation (primary treatment) but less than secondary treatment.

These ominous figures, demonstrating the large backlog of municipal wastes still requiring treatment, show only part of the job still remaining to be accomplished. The rapidly increasing population and urbanization of the United States, plus the enormous increase in complex chemicals and other products of our expanding industry, are constantly creating greater and greater quantities of municipal waste and resulting increases in pollution problems. An especially perceptive analysis of the present status of the struggle to control pollution from municipal waste discharges was made by Assistant Secretary of HEW James Quigley when he testified at the hearings as follows:

"Mr. McCLORY. Actually, Mr. Secretary, under existing law, and under existing programs of, primarily, States and municipalities, and private industries, we are making steady and substantial progress in solving pollution problems, are we not?

"Mr. QUIGLEY. We are making progress, relatively speaking.

"Maybe I am expressing it wrong. What I am saying is that we are doing something about the problems we are faced with. But whether we are just treading water, just breaking even, or perhaps even still losing ground, this is what bothers me. In other words, I think we can be rightfully proud and take credit for the efforts that are being made at the State levels in many States, by activities of interstate agencies in a number of instances, and by the impact of the Federal program. But I think the worst mistake we could make is to assume that because in the last 5 years we have done this much, the problem is well on its way to solution. It is not, and I think if you have an opportunity to review that technical paper that I submitted, it will be clearly demonstrated that things are going to get worse before they get better.

"* * * * *

"Mr. McCLORY. In other words, we are losing the battle of solving the pollution problem. We are not gaining on it.

"Mr. QUIGLEY. Let me put it this way: I think we have established a beachhead, but the battle is far from won. We can still be driven back into the sea. But I don't think we will. I think that the impetus and the support that the Congress has given to this program, the way it beefed up and expanded it and enlarged it in 1961, is pretty clear now; and it is becoming clearer every day in the minds of a lot of people at the State level, that the Federal Government is serious about this business of water pollution control. And I think just this fact alone makes the job of the water pollution control official at the State level a lot easier."

E. THE FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAM HAS SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED THE RATE OF CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS, BUT HAS NOT ENDED THE PROBLEM OF MUNICIPAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL

The Federal construction grants program was initiated by the 1956 Federal Water Pollution Control Act of July 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 498; 33 U.S.C. 466a et seq.) (Public Law 660, 84th Cong.). This program was initiated because Congress had found that the construction of sewage treatment plants has fallen below the level necessary to provide for the Nation's expanding population and to replace obsolescent and aging facilities, to say nothing of the backlog of needs which developed during the 1930's and became intensified during World War II. Unlike almost any other community facility, a waste treatment plant benefits largely those who live outside the community—the downstream water users. The people of a municipality will approve an increase in their public debt to build streets to drive on, water systems for essential water supply, and sewer systems to rid the premises of waste, with more enthusiasm than they will for effective waste treatment facilities at the point of disposal.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 stimulated local efforts to control pollution from municipal wastes by authorizing annual appropriations of $50 million for grants of up to 30 percent of the cost of sewage treatment works or $250,000 for each project, whichever was larger. Under this grant program, the construction of needed sewage treatment facilities markedly increased—but not enough. Because of the $250,000 limitation on a grant for any one project, the program offered little incentive to larger communities and did not encourage neighboring communities to join together to construct the more effective and less expensive multimunicipal waste treatment projects. Moreover, the statutory formula for allotting appropriated funds among the States did not consider the variation in water pollution problems of the States, and there was inadequate mechanisms for balancing funds with needs.

In 1961, Congress amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by enacting the act of July 20, 1961 (75 Stat. 204; 33 U.S.C. 466a et seq.) (Public Law 87-88). The 1961 act changed the Federal construction grants program to—

(1) Authorize increased annual appropriations of $80 million in fiscal year 1962, $90 million in fiscal year 1963, and $100 million for the fiscal years 1964 through 1967.

(2) Increase the 30-percent grant limitation from $250,000 to $600,000.

(3) Encourage communities to construct joint sewage treatment projects by applying the individual grant limitation to each community's share of the cost of such projects, up to a maximum grant of $2.4 million.

(4) Specified that State allotments which are not used in a fiscal year (*a*) may be used for additional grants to uncompleted projects where the need is due, in part, to any Federal institution or Federal construction activity, and (*b*) shall be reallocated to States having projects for which grant funds would otherwise be lacking.

Congress approved annual appropriations totaling $584 million for construction grants for the period 1957 through June 30, 1965, including the full authorized amounts of $80 million for fiscal year 1962 and $90 million for fiscal year 1963. Grants of an additional $109 million under the accelerated public works program resulted in construction of additional treatment facilities in 1963 and early 1964. Although appropriations for construction grants for fiscal year 1964 and for fiscal year 1965 were only $90 million each, the Congress specifically provided that allotments for such grants during the fiscal year "shall be made on the basis of $100 million." Under this provision, unallocated funds not used by several States were reallocated to provide full allocation of funds to projects in other States in fiscal years 1964 and 1964.

From the beginning of the program to February 28, 1965, there were 6,028 projects approved for grants of $640.6 million. This includes 783 projects aided in whole or in part by the $109 million made available under the accelerated public works program authorized under the act of September 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 541; Public Law 87-658). Local communities have supplied an additional $2,424 million to meet the total project cost of $3,064 million. This is a ratio of 4 local dollars to each Federal dollar in grants-in-aid. Approved projects will serve a population of 48 million and will improve the quality of water in about 52,000 miles of streams. However, the backlog of applications on February 28, 1965, totaled 1,470 seeking $181.3 million in grants to support projects costing $904.1 million.

The dramatic growth in the level of construction of municipal waste treatment plants resulting from the Federal construction grants program is shown in figure 3. In addition, the higher increased grant ceiling authorized under the 1961 act has resulted in construction of larger projects and a higher level of expenditure of local funds. The average project cost rose from $470,000 under the 1956 act to $600,000 in 1961, and the local share of project costs rose from $4.70 to $5.40 for each Federal dollar in grants. Moreover, with larger projects, the proportion of Federal grant aid going to cities of over 50,000 population increased from 13 percent under the 1956 act to 23 percent under the 1961 amendments. In 1963, the rate of construction and the grant percentages were further increased with the $170 million of construction aided by the supplemental grants under the accelerated public works program. The expiration of this supplemental aid resulted in the decrease of construction in 1964.

The initial Federal grants of $50 million per year increased construction sufficiently to balance population growth and obsolesence, but had little effect on the backlog of needed waste treatment facilities. Since 1961, there has been a steady reduction of that backlog with respect to sewered communities, but this progress has been largely offset by the growing increase in needs for waste treatment facilities to serve communities which still are without sewers.

The committee hearings clearly showed that the rate of decrease in the backlog is still too small to assure adequate control of the municipal sewage problem in the near future. Every effort must be made to expedite the full implementation of the Federal construction grants program at its maximum authorized level. The committee believes that it is imperative to maintain continuous scrutiny, review, and appraisal of the municipal sewage problems and to raise the level of the program sufficiently in advance to meet the developing needs and expedite reduction of the backlog of needed waste treatment facilities.

F. AN ENORMOUS BACKLOG OF NEEDED TREATMENT FACILITIES STILL EXISTS

The 1964 annual survey of municipal waste treatment needs, conducted by the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers in cooperation with the Public Health Service, reported that 1,533 communities presently discharging raw sewage urgently require new plants for the treatment of wastes generated from a population of 12 million. An additional 1,462 cities and towns with existing treatment plants require new or enlarged facilities because of obsolescence, insufficient treatment, or inadequate capacity. These communities presently discharge inadequately treated wastes from a population of 19 million. The Conference of State Sanitary Engineers also reported that 2,677 unsewered communities require sewer systems and sewage treatment plants to serve a population of 5.2 million. These unsewered towns frequently experience serious groundwater pollution and other public health problems because of individual disposal of sewage. The estimated cost, at current prices, of the present backlog of these 5,672 needed projects, to serve these 35.8 million people, is at least $1 billion for treatment plants and $0.9 billion for interceptor and outfall sewers and other ancillary works; i.e., a total cost of at least $1.9 billion.

(1) *Additional needs caused by population growth.*—The population served by sewer systems in the United States increased from 98.4 million in 1957 to 118.3 million in 1962—a 20-percent increase in 5 years. The urban population increased from 96.5 million in 1950 to 125.3 million in 1960—an increase of 30 percent for 10 years or 15 percent for a 5-year period. According to estimates by the Public Health Service the future population which must be served by sewer systems is as follows: 1965, 132 million; 1970, 152 million; 1975, 174 million; and 1980, 200 million.

(2) *Additional needs caused by obsolescence of present treatment facilities.*—The municipal waste treatment works currently in operation will eventually have to be replaced because of obsolescence, since the average effective life of treatment plants is 25 years and that of interceptor and outfall sewers is 50 years. The Public Health Service estimates that it will cost at least $3.3 billion to replace the existing treatment plants and at least $2.6 billion to replace their related ancillary works.

The above-mentioned costs of construction required to eliminate the backlog of needed municipal waste treatment works and to provide for continuing obsolescence and population growth within specified periods of time were estimated in terms of today's construction cost. The actual costs, however, will be higher because of the steady upward trend of construction costs. A projection based upon past experience indicates that an annual construction rate of approximately $698 million (in terms of 1963 construction costs) must be maintained through 1973 to substantially reduce the backlog and keep abreast of new needs arising from obsolescence and population growth. Actual costs will be about $100 million per year higher, assuming that construction costs increase an average of 3.5 percent per year.

POLLUTION FROM COMBINED SEWERS AND STORM DRAINS IS A SIGNIFICANT AND INADEQUATELY CONTROLLED ASPECT OF MUNICIPAL WASTE DISPOSAL

The discharge of mixed raw sewage and storm water into our streams by overflows from combined sewer and storm drain systems is one of the most difficult water pollution problems confronting us today.

The sewer systems in many of our older cities were developed in the 19th century before there was concern over pollution of the receiving streams and treatment of wastes. To the engineer of that day it seemed logical to collect both storm water and sanitary sewage in a single combined sewer system. A single sewer system was much less expensive than two separated systems; and the point of discharge was the same—the nearest stream. The future pollution effect of the combined system of sewers and storm drains was simply not recognized. Indeed, it would have taken exceptional vision to have foreseen the problems that now face our cities in the collection and treatment of wastes and the management of our water resources.

The problems result from the way in which the combined system operates. During periods of rainfall, the combined sewer system must carry mixed sewage and storm water which is many times its "dry weather flow." Because it was not considered economically feasible to build treatment plants to handle the entire flow of mixed rainwater and sewage, the sanitary engineer designed the sewer system with weirs (low dams) so that at some predetermined level—usually two to three times dry weather flow—the mixed flow of sewage and storm water would discharge directly into the watercourse without going through the treatment plant. As the municipalities grew and increased in population, the increasing flow of sewage left little or no reserve capacity in the combined system to handle storm water. Under these circumstances, sewage will overflow even during light rainfall. During heavy rainfall, a mixture of sewage and storm water virtually equal to the runoff will bypass the treatment plant and be spewed directly into the watercourse, along with large amounts of sewage sludge which have been deposited in the sewers. These overflows thus carry large amounts of pollution into the watercourses.

The intermittent nature of the sewage overflows is especially detrimental to the waters. Normal waste flows can be controlled to assure relatively constant levels of water quality for desirable uses. Storm overflows, however, introduce slugs of pollution which can upset an otherwise stable regime. Even with complete treatment of dry weather sewage, the pollution discharge intermittently from storm water overflows can seriously impair the usefulness of a stream.

As shown in table II above, in 1962 there were 1,305 communities whose sewer systems were entirely combined and 618 communities whose sewer systems were partially combined, making a total of 1,923 communities facing the problems which come from combined sanitary sewers and storm drains.

Up to now, few studies have been made to determine the composition of combined sewage and storm water overflows and to evaluate their influence on stream pollution. Even where detailed studies have been made, the information is often not applicable to other cities because their precipitation patterns, character of the runoff area, capacities and designs of their sewer systems, and the conditions in the receiving waters, are not comparable.

It is clear that the sewage overflow from combined sewer systems is an important source of water pollution. For example, according to a recent investigation by the Public Health Service, the total pollution load entering the streams from combined sewer overflows in Chicago in 1962 was equivalent to the untreated wastes from a population of 280,000. Chicago's problem is compounded by the multiplicity of its overflows (approximately 300 on the main channels and an undetermined number on tributary streams).

Some years ago the city of Buffalo, N.Y., made comprehensive studies of its combined sewer systems. Those studies showed that about one-third of the city's annual production of sewage solids overflowed without treatment, even though only 2 to 3 percent of the liquid sewage volume actually overflowed. This large overflow of sewage solids resulted from the settling of solids in the sewer systems during periods of dry weather flow and their subsequent flushing out and overflow with the first surge of storm water. There is no reason to suppose that this situation is not applicable, in greater or lesser degree,to all combined sewer systems. This important finding has not, however, received sufficient attention from the engineering profession, regulatory agencies, or public officials.

To correct the problem of pollution from combined sewer overflow by relocation and reconstruction of the sewer systems would require tremendous expenditures. According to the Public Health Service, the minimum cost for the separation of all combined systems in the United States would be between $25 to $30 billion.

Alternative and less costly solutions in many cases might be to provide storage basins, or treatment, for the overflows. In such systems, the excess flows would be taken off at the overflow structures and retained in storage basins for treatment at the municipal plant or at special treatment units designed for this purpose. However, in large and congested cities, the overflow outlets are generally located in areas which are too restricted or unavailable for storage or treatment installations, and it would be very costly to construct conduits to carry the overflow to available sites for storage or treatment. The feasibility of overflow treatment is, therefore, largely dependent on the cost and availability of sites for treatment facilities.

The director of the Bureau of Environmental Health, Pennsylvania Department of

Health (Mr. Karl M. Mason), testified as follows concerning this problem:

"Mr. INDRITZ. Do you have any suggestions for solving the combined sewer and storm drain problem, other than by separation?

"Mr. MASON. Yes; we feel, in some of the major cities, and the one that I mentioned in Pennsylvania, namely Philadelphia, Pa., that upon the basis of study it might come out that the actual treatment at various points in the systems of the combined wastes might be cheaper and better, more effective in the long run, than going into the central cities and tearing them up to separate the two.

"We don't know this. All that we feel is that there should be given flexibility, we believe, in that portion of the act for someone to look into the matter to see if that might not be the better way. This is a major problem.

"As you know, Washington has it right here. How are you going to take these 8-, 10-, 14-foot-diameter sewers and separate them? It might in some way be cheaper to take that combined waste at various points along the collection system and treat it.

"Mr. INDRITZ. Has your board conducted any specific research on the subject?

"Mr. MASON. No; we haven't."

The precise extent and solution of the problem of overflow from combined sewer systems are not accurately delineated at this time. There is, however, sufficient evidence to conclude that combined sewer and storm drain systems are a major source of pollution. They should be promptly and fully studied and remedial steps should be taken as early as possible.

The magnitude of the problem makes it unlikely that it can be solved solely by the cities themselves. Although the damage to water quality resulting from combined sewer systems is, like most water pollution, local in origin, its total impact has national effects. The committee therefore believes that the Federal Government should participate in seeking remedies for the problem, and recommends that Federal grants be provided to municipalities which establish demonstration projects approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to test the feasibility of new or improved methods of controlling the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage from combined sewer systems. The committee recommends that in making such grants the Department give preference to those demonstration projects whose results would be applicable to more than one community. To assure more comprehensive and wide spread research and development in these demonstration programs, the committee believes that the grant program should be at a level of at least $20 million per year for the next 5 years, and that, except in unusual instances, the grant for any single project should not exceed 5 percent of the total grant funds appropriated for the fiscal year.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCING MUNICIPAL CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS IS DIFFICULT

One of the greatest problems which a local community faces in building sewage treatment facilities is that of obtaining the necessary money at fair and equitable rates, with the requisite consent of property owners and citizens. Sewage treatment facilities are costly to build and operate, and usually have an inverse relationship to a municipality's ability to pay. For example, the Public Health Service estimates that the average cost of providing primary sewage treatment (considering amortization of capital cost, interest, and operation and maintenance costs) is $21.41 per million gallons in a treatment plant with a capacity of 100 million gallons per day as compared to $77.59 per million gallons in a plant with a capacity of 1 million gallons per day.

State laws provide the framework which controls local government financing. In many instances, bond sales are limited by both statutory and constitutional provisions. Many of these legal provisions were developed in periods of economic depression, and their stringency was intended to assure local fiscal responsibility. They have become unduly restrictive in recent years and have impeded the construction of public works which, because of postponed construction during the depression and war periods, are now urgently needed by many local communities.

These restrictions, in varying degree, take one or several of the following forms:

(1) Debt limitations which restrict the outstanding debt to a percentage of the assessed valuation of local real estate;

(2) Tax limitations which restrict the rate that can be levied to provide debt service payments;

(3) Interest rate limitations which restrict the percentage that can be paid for borrowed money; and

(4) Provisions permitting only real property owners to vote on a bond referendum, as well as provisions requiring more than the majority vote for approval.

The two methods generally used by municipalities to borrow money for construction of waste treatment plants are (1) general obligation bonds and (2) revenue bonds. General obligation bonds generally have the advantage of a lower interest rate because the full financial resources of the community are pledged to their repayment. However, revenue bonds have become increasingly popular in recent years, since they often are exempt from constitutional debt restrictions.

Several States have used a variety of grants and other assistance to ease these burdens. However, few changes have been made in the restrictions on municipal bond financing, and these restrictions still continue to retard ready access to the money market and thus unnecessarily increase the local government's cost of financing waste treatment plants.

These problems of municipal financing have been markedly alleviated by the grants made under the Federal construction grants program previously described in this report and by the loans available to municipalities under the public facility loan program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency under the Housing Amendments of August 11, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1491 et seq.). This program provides credit assistance to municipalities and other local public bodies for constructing essential public works where such credit financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and conditions. The program, when first initiated, had relatively limited funds available and its primary aim was to help small communities to secure needed public services. In recent years, the program has been greatly expanded to a point where loans are now made at a rate of $100 million a year.

However, the law has had a provision prohibiting public facility loans under this program to any municipality or political subdivision with a population of 50,000 or more.[1] This 50,000 population limitation hampers governmental responsibilities for water supply and sewage disposal in metropolitan areas.

First, it directly discriminates against communities of 50,000 population or more by not permitting them to receive public facility loans.

Second, it encouraged fragmentation duplication, and inadequate long-term facilities by prohibiting joint bond action by a number of communities within a metropolitan area to meet water and sewer needs. For example, several communities each having a population of less than 50,000 have been discouraged from joining together to provide a needed public utility such as a water or sewage disposal system, or connecting facility. Individually, each of the communities would be eligible for loan assistance under the public facility loans program. But when acting jointly (through the establishment of an instrumentality serving the entire area) they would be ineligible for Federal loan assistance if their aggregate population exceeded 50,000.

This population limitation operates directly counter to many existing program objectives for meeting metropolitan problems. For example, the Housing Act of 1961 stresses the desirability of cooperative action among municipalities and other political subdivisions in preparing comprehensive planning on a unified metropolitan basis (40 U.S.C. 458(c)). Also, the 1961 Federal Water Pollution Control Act encourages communities to construct joint sewage treatment works by joining each community's individual grant limitation (30 percent or $600,000) to a maximum grant of $2.4 million for a joint project.

Two partial steps to relieve the stringency of the 50,000 population limitation were taken in the Housing Act of September 2, 1964 (Public Law 88–560). Although the latter act did not repeal the 50,000 population restriction with respect to individual municipalities, section 601(b) of the act amended the law as follows: (1) It increased the limitation to 150,000 for any community in a redevelopment area designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2405) (i.e., irrespective of whether the area was so designated because it has substantial and persistent unemployment for the periods of time prescribed under section 5(a), or because it has many low-income families and substantial or persistent unemployment or underemployment as prescribed under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act);[2] and (2) it authorized making loans to a public agency or instrumentality serving several municipalities, political subdivisions, or unincorporated areas if each of them to be served by the public facility for which the loan is obtained meets the 50,000 population restriction. The committee believes these are steps in the right direction, and recommends to the appropriate committees that consideration be given to removing the 50,000 population limitation itself.

The committee further believes that there should be greater recognition of the needs of communities which will experience substantial population growth and where the sewage facility needed to meet such growth will contribute to economy, efficiency, and the comprehensively planned development of the area. The Executive Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (William G. Colman) pointed out in his testimony at the committee hearings that since construction of waste treatment facilities to provide for future needs is not easily accomplished under revenue bond financing, other financial aid is desirable. He said:

"You can construct normally with revenue bonds only the trunklines of the sizes and so on that are needed to fill the needs of the population today, the ones who are going to be paying the water bills, as soon as the construction is finished, whereas with the population continually growing in the metropolitan areas, particularly in the suburbs, economy in the long run would dictate a larger outlay in terms of physical facilities in order to meet the needs of tomorrow's population as well as today's. And that is a difficulty that you encounter on the revenue bond approach.

---

[1] Title 42, United States Code, sec. 1492(b) (4). However, this section permitted loans to a community of up to 150,000 population if it is in a redevelopment area designated under sec. 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2405(a) because of having substantial and persistent unemployment for the periods of time prescribed in that act or if it is near a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[2] This amendment would immediately qualify some 17 counties and 1 Indian tribe for public facility loans (S. Rept. 1265, 88th Cong., pp. 31–32).

Now, the recommendation that the Commission made in that regard is that where Federal aid is involved in loans for these types of operations, provision be made for a deferral of interest for x number of years, where a clear case can be made that through deferral of interest and the use of larger facilities to meet the needs of the future population, the whole thing will pay out eventually. Then it is a saving from the standpoint of the water users to have the larger facilities."

We believe this suggestion would be a useful means of encouraging construction of waste treatment plants sufficiently large to provide for future population within a growing community.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has a longstanding and distinguished record of concern and leadership in this field. I valued his membership on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, and regretted his decision to move to another committee assignment. He and I have had many discussions about this problem, its urgency, and the need for a massive increase in the Federal contribution toward its solution. I think we share equally that sense of urgency. Indeed, the pending legislation represents just that. In the sixth year of the program which the Senate is now considering, the Federal contribution will be 10 times its present level. More important is the fact that the pending bill would lift a number of limitations which inhibit the impact of Federal resources in those areas where the problem is the greatest.

I am speaking now of the heavily populated industrial areas of the country. The pending bill will increase the Federal contribution—if all conditions set out in the bill are met—to 50 percent of the total cost of municipal waste treatment projects under the clean rivers program. There is built into the bill an incentive for the States to make their contribution. As I said earlier, the basic assumption of current Federal law is, the primary responsibility of pollution control rests with the States and communities. Yet, the States have failed, with exception of eight States which provide some matching funds to make any financial contribution whatsoever.

The solution to the problem is the incentive built into the bill to try to stimulate State action, through allocation of State resources, to help the communities of this country deal with the problem. If the provisions of the pending bill are fully implemented in any given State, the division of financial responsibility would be 50 percent Federal contribution, 30 percent State contribution, and 20 percent local contribution.

In the judgment of the committee, after extensive hearings and discussion, this represents an appropriate division of the responsibilities that should rest on all three levels of the Federal system.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator mentioned that eight States have made a contribution. What is the maximum percentage contribution that any one of those eight States has made?

Mr. MUSKIE. The maximum provision is reflected in the bill. Maine and New York have contributed 30 percent of the cost. They make the largest contribution of any States to the cost of municipal sewage treatment projects. Six other States make contributions, some of which have a dollar limitation, and some of which have a smaller percentage limitation.

Mr. NELSON. But Maine and New York made a 30-percent contribution toward the total cost of sewage treatment plant installations?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. What kind of dollar figure has that been representing in those two States?

Mr. MUSKIE. The New York program would be financed by a bond issue which was approved last year, in a referendum, totaling $1 billion. The total cost for New York State is estimated at $1.7 billion. The Maine program has been financed out of current appropriations and a bond issue of $25 million last year.

Until last year, it was possible to finance the Maine program entirely out of current revenues. I do not know what the cumulative total of that contribution has been.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator from Maine know whether there will be any problem for some States respecting a constitutional prohibition against this kind of grant from general Treasury funds, or bonding to a local municipal treatment plant?

Mr. MUSKIE. I think there are some constitutional limitations on bonding. This bill does not require bonding.

Mr. NELSON. I refer to the authority of the State itself to take State general fund moneys and give it as a grant matching fund for local sewage treatment plants.

Mr. MUSKIE. I could not answer that question. There may be such. Does the Senator mean a constitutional limitation other than the bonding problem?

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. If there is, I do not know of any. We have no testimony to that effect. However, we do have information that some States have bonding limitations, which may be an inhibition if they need to raise money by that method.

Mr. NELSON. I certainly did not intend, by remarks, in any way to indicate that I did not think this was a massive increase in Federal participation, because it is a massive increase. I hope the bill will pass both Houses.

I think it is to the great credit of the chairman that we have been able to bring to the floor a bill providing for a $6 billion participation by the Federal Government. I am sure the Senator agrees with me that in future years Federal participation will have to be increased if we are to meet the problem.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do. I agree to such an extent that it would be easy to rationalize support of greater Federal participation in dealing with this problem than the pending bill envisages, or even than the Senator's amendment envisages, but we must deal with the art of the possible. We have in the bill, if Congress passes it, a means for helping meet the needs of the problem we are talking about.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this bill deals with what is undoubtedly one of the foremost problems confronting our Nation. I think it deals with it in a very rational and practical manner. In my judgment, the distinguished Senator from Maine merits the thanks of the entire country for the untiring energy, thought, and effort he gave in the preparation of the bill and in the presentation of it to the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank my distinguished friend from North Carolina, who helped immensely in his testimony before the subcommittee.

I think it is worth noting that Senators on both sides of the aisle, from all areas of the country, and of all philosophies, recognize the urgency of the problem, and are willing to support efforts to deal with it.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the members of the Public Works Committee, the distinguished chairman, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, and the distinguished Senator from Maine, Senator MUSKIE, for giving us S. 2947—a comprehensive approach for pollution abatement and water reclamation—in order to provide our Nation with usable clean water for the future.

S. 2947, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966, provides practical answers to industry, municipalities, and small towns in the complex and distressing campaign to protect the vital natural resource—water.

Civic leaders throughout the country have known for some time that their communities with nonexistence or inadequate facilities for waste treatment and disposal are contributing to a future catastrophe. However, they did not, in most instances, have the financial resources for the expensive sewage treatment plants. I know how hard it is; I was a mayor, and fully realize the difficulty of convincing the public of the necessity of $4 or $5 million for these facilities when so many other community projects are needed, especially in the field of education and transportation.

Unfortunately, a sewer system or a treatment plant is not a facility to which a mayor or city councilman can point with pride. No one really cares as long as it is working.

Frankly, the effect of putting such facilities in is soon forgotten. It is similar to a person who has a toothache, has it taken care of by the dentist, and then the ache is soon forgotten. Once the toothache is taken care of, the toothache and the dentist are soon forgotten. Once a sewer pipe is placed in the ground and dirt covers it, one forgets about it until he gets a bill and sees that his taxes have been increased.

If the Congress approves S. 2947, we, the Congress, can say to these civic leaders the Federal Government will provide more help, and we can encourage the States to do their share, because this is a big and an important job.

The $6 billion authorized by the bill is a great deal of money. It is small, however, when we compare this sum with the estimated cost of reclaiming the Great Lakes—$20 billion.

S. 2947 provides needed reforms in existing law by lifting the dollar ceiling on the 30-percent basic Federal grant projects; and by providing a 10-percent bonus, in addition to the basic 30-percent grant, for projects which conform with area wide planning. Provision of the 10-percent bonus encourages planning, but we do not require it for Federal assistance. The problem is too great and the need too present to require the detailed planning in which some Federal agencies are currently embroiled—confusing the local people instead of helping.

The bill provides more assistance for the local people in the form of a revolving fund to help authorities meet the local share of pollution abatement projects. Important, too, is the $25 million annual grants to promote research, development, and demonstration of new methods of pollution control and water reclamation to give us new ideas in this area of vital concern.

In my testimony before the committee I asked for a higher percentage of Federal participation. However, the clean rivers restoration program, which was added, fills a vital need with its river basin approach. Each river basin planning agency could qualify for 50-percent Federal grant, depending upon its own water quality standards, and a State program of 30-percent participation.

My own State of Indiana has plans to provide for State funds in pollution control projects. The river basin program means that we could make concentrated efforts of pollution control on the Wabash, the Ohio, the St. Joseph and the White Rivers.

The Public Works Committee has done an excellent job in providing the Interior Department, now the central authority for Federal pollution control, with an expanded program. I hope that the Department, in administering the program, will move to coordinate Federal funds available for sewer systems and treatment plants under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Urban Development Department, the Economic Development Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Interior Department's own central authority.

As another step in the campaign to insure an adequate safe water supply, I hope that we can work out a program to ease the desperate shortage of sanitary engineers. This can be done by shifting existing educational program and through the research grant funds provided by S. 2947 to educational and other institutions for new pollution abatement methods.

I am pleased that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] has accepted amendments proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], which will help to train personnel in this important field.

Again, now that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is present in the chamber, I wish to compliment him for the fine work he always does, not only in this field, but in every endeavor he undertakes.

I note that he is wearing a beautifully colored jacket, which is indicative of his youth and his interest in youth. He has an interest in young people and in seeing to it that we will have enough of our natural resources left so that the younger people will be able to enjoy in their lifetime the resources that we in our lifetime were able to enjoy.

I urge Senate approval of S. 2947, significant legislation, of which we, the Members of the 89th Congress can be proud. By approving this bill we will meet the requirements for the future and avert a national crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

[Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know that the Senate is anxious to vote shortly on this bill, and I shall not detain the Senate long. I should like to say, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, that the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], with the able assistance of the ranking Republican member on the committee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the entire committee, has done notable work in developing the bill before us.

This bill follows the Water Quality Act, and is a significant and purposeful proposal to try to meet the problem of water pollution.

It is now becoming more and more a matter of public consciousness that if our water resources are not developed—and more important—conserved our country will by 1980–85 enter a critical period of water supply, a period when clean water will not be sufficient for the needs of our people and expanding industry.

It will be necessary to store water in reservoirs in our river basins to prevent water pollution and to clean water so that it may be reused. This bill moves forward toward these goals.

I have raised a question, which does not question the need and purpose of the bill, but one which I think should be understood by the Senate and by the people. The bill provides a very large authorization, of some $6 billion over a period of 6 years. The bill does not appropriate any part of the $6 billion, but enacting the measure, Congress will give to the Appropriations Committee authority to recommend appropriations; and of course to Congress to approve appropriations.

The amount is awesomely large. But if one reads the report that studies indicate that to fully meet the problem of water pollution control, an expenditure of $100 billion may be required upon the part of local community, State, the Federal Government, and private industry.

This bill, while authorizing $6 billion, only authorizes grants for municipal sewage treatment. It leaves for future action the separation of storm sewers and ordinary sewers, which may total $40 billion, and also the treatment, prevention, and abatement of industrial wastes.

We are faced today with the cost of the war in Vietnam, and the attendant problems of inflation, shortages, evidences of control, and wartime and unhappy factors. Because of these, I have voted to hold down authorizations, to eliminate and defer unneeded expenditure, and I shall continue to do so. With respect to this bill, I think it necessary that the Committee on Appropriations, after these authorizations have been provided, take into consideration the cost of the war in Vietnam and will not appropriate large sums, until the burdens of the war in Vietnam are lifted. But in all fairness, it must be said that at some point, today or next week, or next year, this bill must be passed if the vital supply of water is to be preserved for the future life of our Nation.

I do not wish to burden the RECORD unduly, but I recall that yesterday, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and others, spoke of the necessity of moving in another direction to control water pollution—that is, with respect to industrial wastes. This bill deals with the provision of Federal assistance to municipalities, States, and interstate complexes. Something must be done to give incentives to industry to install the facilities to diminish or eliminate the waste which is a principal cause of water pollution. Many industries are assuming the responsibility. Their expenditures for pollution control facilities do not increase their profits, but are a type of social expenditure.

We should encourage them by some kind of tax incentive. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I have introduced a bill which would provide investment credit to industries installing pollution control facilities. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has pressed for such legislation for several years, and has a bill which would provide faster tax write-offs.

Because we are now discussing this tremendous problem of water pollution control, to conserve a basic resource, and because the pending bill represents a strong step in that direction as respects municipal sewage, I think it is proper, in this debate, to call attention again to the necessity of moving also in a parallel direction toward the control of industrial sewage. I hope very much that the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee will this year take action in that direction, by the recommendation of bills to provide tax incentives to industry.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **COOPER**. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky makes reference again to the subject of incentives for industries. I think it highly appropriate, because of his knowledge, and because of the leadership of the Senator from Kentucky and others, that the portion of the committee report dealing with incentives be printed in the Record at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1367) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INCENTIVE ASSISTANCE FOR INDUSTRIES

A number of witnesses testified on the need for tax incentives as a means of reducing the cost of noneconomic pollution control facilities. This is not a matter over which the Senate Public Works Committee has jurisdiction but it affects the overall effort to meet water pollution control and abatement needs. This committee strongly recommends that the appropriate congressional committees give consideration to tax relief proposals for industrial pollution control activities.

For the most part, pollution control does not provide a return on an investment to an industry. Installation of pollution control devices is costly and, in many cases, nonremunerative. The billion dollars of capital investment which will have to be made by the industrial sector for the benefit of the entire society will place a substantial burden on corporate resources, and ultimately on the general public. The committee suggests that there are several alternative methods of aiding industry in meeting its pollution control obligations.

Investment tax credits as proposed by Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, in legislation cosponsored by the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia is one method whereby industry could recoup the cost of control and abatement of pollution. Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, in legislation cosponsored by, among others, the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, provides for accelerated amortization of the cost of pollution control facilities. This may also provide a means of offsetting industry's cost of pollution control. However, both of these methods do not consider the problem confronting those industries with plants having great pollution problems and marginal economic efficiency.

The committee has recommended greater emphasis on joint municipal-industrial treatment systems operated by public agencies. Such systems are eligible for assistance under the sewage treatment grant program.

The proposal by the American Paper Institute for specific Federal grants to municipalities to construct industrial waste treatment facilities would provide an effective means of meeting the needs of both the marginal industries as well as the profitable industries. Such a Federal grant approach would not be inconsistent with public policy because the grant would, in effect, be made to a unit of government. This approach differs from that proposed by Senators Cooper and Ribicoff and is a matter which can and will be considered by this committee. However, realizing that there is no final answer to the problem of financing industrial pollution control, the committee reiterates its strong recommendation that the appropriate committees consider tax relief legislation.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I hope that this kind of documentation, which is appealing to the committee, will also make its impression upon the Committee on Finance.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], whose steady support of effective water pollution control legislation has been of immense help to me and to the other members of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, recently made a thought provoking speech, "Must We Pay the Piper," at the Summer Institute in Water Resources, Utah State University. I think that it is appropriate that this eloquent statement be presented to my colleagues on the day we enact the major bill designed to improve the quality of our water resources. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Moss' speech be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MUST WE PAY THE PIPER?

(Speech of Senator Frank E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah, at the Summer Institute in Water Resources, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, June 29, 1966)

If ever there was a classic example of carrying coals to Newcastle it is making a water speech at Utah State University. It is like spreading butter on the bacon—gilding the lily—painting vermillion into our Western skies at sunset.

There is no place in the country where there is more expertise on water than in this beautiful green bowl in the Wasatch Mountains. We have collected here in our water research laboratories some of the best brains and equipment in the country. We have added to them at this Summer Water Institute a number of visiting specialists in engineering and earth science.

I don't mind telling you that I feel I am in vast company. Although I have made water my major cause in the United States Senate, and I sit week after week in hearings on water legislation, I approach this assignment tonight with considerable humility.

The water story I am going to tell you in this June of 1966 is much more interesting than the tale I would have told had you invited me here in June of 1960—or even June of 1965. Today's story has a much broader sweep, much deeper implications, is more hopeful, and certainly more dramatic. In fact, the water story today is a cliff hanger.

Will America find ways to meet its growing water shortage?

Will we stop using and misusing and generally wasting our water resources as if there were no tomorrow?

Will we stop polluting our rivers and our lakes, creating health hazards for our people, killing off our fish, and desecrating our recreation areas?

Will we glut the beautiful Ohio with garbage, and smother the mighty Colorado in radio-chemical wastes?

Will we let the Great Lakes die?

Will we awaken some morning to find that we have run out of clean water in some sections of our country, and out of water of any kind in others?

Tune in, my friends, in 1980 and find out.

Find out whether the people in the most civilized and sensitive Nation in the world were sufficiently awakened in the sixties to do the things which must be done in the seventies to prevent the country from going through its water ceiling in the eighties.

Find out whether we made enough progress in discovering and employing revolutionary techniques in water resource development and conservation to forestall our faucets from running dry, our crops from turning brown, and the wheels of our industry from slowing down and stopping.

Learn whether we kept our water sources clean, our water wastage down, our water re-use cycle high—whether we found out how to control "water hogs," how to bridle unreasonable water use, how to impose disciplinary measures to control waste—whether we discovered how to desalt water cheaply and how to make rain fall where we want it—and, finally, whether we learned how to put to beneficial use every drop of water anywhere through interbasin and international water transfer, through recharging of aquifiers, and through multiple-use projects to increase supplies of municipal and irrigation water, to improve navigation, to control floods, to provide more power, to create new recreational areas and to protect our wildlife.

I predict that America will win this water fight. I say we will win it because of research centers such as Utah State University and summer institutes such as this one which fully diagnose and prescribe for all phases of our ailing resource, and from which knowledge flows out in many directions to be absorbed and used.

I say we will win because both the private sector and Government, from the county level up, are beginning to realize the immensity of our water problems and are moving to conquer them.

And, finally, I say we will win because the people themselves are awakening to the perils of our water pollution and the vulnerability of our water supply and they are beginning to insist that more be done, and to support financially the doing of it.

The breakthrough to the man on the street is the crucial one. For years, as this audience well knows, water has been discussed back and forth in the jargon of water experts, resource engineers and highly educated technicians, but today the pollution of our waters and the ebbing of our supplies is a growing subject for discussion in editorial columns, in magazine articles, in television specials, in civic clubs and over backyard barbecue pits.

Many forces have converged at this date and time in history to make water of such commanding interest. I like to think that the first impetus came from the report made in January, 1961, by the Senate Select Committee on Natural Water Resources, on which I served. This committee inventoried our water resources and projected our requirements through 1980; it supplied us with the hard facts on our water demand as balanced against our water supply.

But it took a whim of nature to really dramatize our water crisis—to make water breakfast-table conversation, a shift in wind patterns, causing rain to fall over the ocean rather than upon the coastal areas, greatly cut, for several years in a row, the normal amount of precipitation in a wide swath of country stretching from New Hampshire to West Virginia. This is an area of our densest population and our heaviest concentration of industry.

Now, we in the West know all too well what it is to have our cities and towns thirsty, and our fields dusty and dry. There has never been enough water here in Utah since the day Brigham Young led the pioneers down emigration canyon into the Salt Lake Valley. We have had to develop every source of water we could find, and to put every drop to beneficial use after we found it.

But the people of the large cities and towns of the East and Northeast seemingly have always had a bountiful supply of water—and they serenely assumed that they always would. Then they discovered that they, too, could be short of water—that it could happen to them.

In August 1965, the chief engineer of the city of New York warned the Delaware River Basin Commission that the largest city in the Nation could "run out of water by the middle of February." The President declared the Delaware Basin and New York a disaster area, and a drastic water saving program went into effect.

Well, as you all know, the East and Northeast did not run out of water. It *did* skimp through. But the interest of the people and their officials, and their newspapers, and their civic clubs was aroused as it never could have been aroused by a Senate national water resources committee report. A whole new and important area of the country became receptive to the water story.

As much as I regret the inconvenience and hardship the great drought of 1965 caused the people who suffered through it, it did serve to turn the national spotlight on water—and our water problems. Thus, it was a long-range plus for America.

Now, what is the water outlook in the years ahead in concrete terms? The statistics and facts compiled by the Senate Water Committee are still our bible on this.

If we in America are to sustain our expanding population and rising standard of living, we will have to double our useable water by 1980 and triple it by the year 2000. While we are using an average of 280 million gallons of water each day now for irrigation, industry and homes, we will be using daily about 600 million gallons in 1980 and a billion gallons a day in the year 2000.

We found out further that the 600 million gallons of water a day is getting close to the ceiling of the total supply of good quality water which our engineers have told us could be made available, as a practical matter, with *present* engineering knowledge and techniques.

We learned that in five of the Nation's twenty-two resource regions we stand on the edge of water disaster—we could well be out of water in any of them by 1980. Two of these water-short basins are the Colorado River Basin and the Great Basin. Utah stands astride of these two.

In most of the other water basins, where rainfall is generally adequate, the water has been so misused that pollution is rampant. In fact, almost every American river of any consequence is infested with water pollution from one source or another. Ten times as much municipal waste is being poured into our waters today as in 1900. Industrial waste has increased threefold from chemical plants, paper mills, tanneries, dye works, and municipal sewage.

The historic Merrimac, is filled with noxious wastes. Refuse from steel mills pour red rust into the Cuyahoga. Petro-chemical wastes from a huge oil company complex pollute the Ottawa; mine salts and chlorides contaminate the Grand River. The Arkansas is contaminated by mine, metal, processing, packing, and agricultural runoff wastes. The Columbia's pollution from paper mills poses more threat to the salmon than the river's dams. Canning wastes pollute the San Joaquin and the Sacramento in California. Oil refinery wastes taint the lower reaches of Yellowstone. Only last month we began in the Senate Public Works Committee to check into radio active wastes in the Colorado—and I do not need to mention to this audience the pollution problems of the Bear.

It will take $75 billion, spent over two or three decades, to clean up America's rivers.

Nor have our lakes been spared from pollution. The Great Lakes are a tragic example. Industry and communities around the lakes have used their waters for years as a dumping ground for municipal and industrial wastes. Pollution has been aggravated recently by the water shortage. Several of the Great Lakes are dying bodies of water. Erie, the northern border for much of industrial America, is the sickest. About one-fourth of Lake Erie is all but dead today. The huge expanse contains almost no oxygen, no fish swim about, and the surface and beaches are infested with scum.

We learned also from the water committee studies that we are proceeding far too slowly in harnessing and developing our rivers through multiple-purpose projects—that we must make the seventies the decade of advanced dam construction, just as we have made the sixties the decade of advanced highway construction.

We found that we have only begun to use our knowledge about depletion of water supplies through control of strip mining, timber removal, overgrazing and fire, and that we have a great deal more to learn about the mining of ground water and the recharging of aquifers.

We learned that we must step up activities in the field of water variability, which includes both floods and low water flow.

And finally, we discovered that we have only started to work on the great problem of water waste—on the ways in which water is being used inefficiently, on "water stealing" vegetation, on evaporation, and on allowing water to run off to the sea unharnessed and unused.

We found consistently that we had lagged on research in all of these fields—that a constant expansion of knowledge and technical capability in the water field is absolutely indispensable.

The Senate Water Committee estimated that the nation should invest a total of $228 billion in the period between 1958 (when the figures were gathered) and 1980 for all types of water resource facilities if we are to assure enough water to sustain our galloping population and our zooming standard of living. Since we have spent about $180 billion so far in our nation's history on water resource facilities—this means that we need to spend *more* in a twenty-year period than we have spent in almost two hundred years.

This alarming report unbuttoned a surge of both discussion and action in the water field. I think it is safe to say that the Congress has passed more constructive water legislation in the past five years than at any other time in history.

Congress established a water pollution control administration which will conduct and oversee a broad public and industrial pollution control program, and we greatly increased the federal funds available to communities for the construction of waste treatment and other pollution control facilities.

Congress launched a water research program which will invest nearly $100 million a year for ten years on basic water research. This is over and above the massive research program to bring desalting of water into economic balance both in North America and elsewhere in the world.

Congress enacted the Water Resources Planning Act, a landmark bill which places water resources planning on a river basin basis, and gives money to the states for planning. This bill recognized the fundamental fact that water does not stop at state or county or municipal boundaries, and that any planning which does not take this into consideration will be piecemeal planning—with piecemeal effect.

Congress passed a measure which established guidelines on what percentage of funds going into multiple-purpose water projects may be charged to recreation programs. This will equalize these costs between army engineer and reclamation projects.

We accelerated our efforts to authorize multiple purpose projects which would serve not primarily an agricultural society, but an industrialized society with mounting payrolls and increased leisure time.

All of this—and more—in five short years!

We have before us in this session of Congress legislation which will coordinate attacks on water pollution within each river basin. To make this program more effective we recently transferred the water pollution control administration from the department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of Interior, where other river basin planning is centered.

We have just passed in the Senate a bill which would establish a national water commission—an independent body of nongovernmental experts—to make an independent evaluation of policy questions in the water field. We will call on these distinguished citizens, outside the government, to consider all aspects of our incredibly complex and interrelated water problems, and to suggest remedies and solutions.

More imaginative solutions and better, bolder, planning is a mandate for America if we are to have enough water in the future. Water itself is an almost indestructible commodity, as you all know. To all practical purposes, the seas, rivers, ground, lakes, swamps and atmosphere of the earth hold as much water as they did when they were created. We are in trouble today simply because our civilization calls for the use of more water than any other civilization in history, and we are not only using this water, but flagrantly misusing it.

It is my opinion, however, that even if the United States does replace our hodge-podge of poorly coordinated water programs with a modern management system we may not be able to assure to our children and our grandchildren enough water to meet the needs of their way of living. Particularly will this be true if our children and grandchildren continue our present movement to the sun-drenched southwest quadrant of the United States where drought is almost perpetual.

We will have to find some way of redistributing water from river basins where water is surplus, to river basins where there is not enough to go around.

I feel that the best answer, not only for us who live in water short areas but for central and eastern America, is the North American Water and Power Alliance which proposes a continent-wide system to redistribute water from Alaska and the Canadian Northwest. It would transport huge supplies of water which now run unused into the Arctic Ocean to sections of Canada, the United States and Mexico which do not now have enough water within their own water basins. The Rocky Mountain area, and Utah, with its rich-but-dry-soil, would be among the areas to profit most greatly from this plan.

The NAWAPA concept—and I call it a concept because it is only that now—has been proposed by the Ralph M. Parsons Company, an architect-engineering firm of Los Angeles. It received little attention however, until a special subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, of which I was named chairman, undertook to analyze it and to compare it with an inventory of all water resource development projects anticipated for the next twenty years by principal Federal agencies.

It was the subcommittee's conclusion on the basis of a very general study that the Parson's concept, which is estimated to cost up to $100 billion and to take 30 years to build, would produce nearly twice as much water as the total of our other proposals for water projects for about one-fourth additional cost.

NAWAPA is a bold project which staggers the imagination. It is also most controversial. Some of our Canadian neighbors have strong reservations about exporting *any* of their water, others say, let's look at our need first to see if we have surplus, then see what we can get in return. The concept is only in the talking stage now but I predict you will be hearing a great deal more about NAWAPA in the future.

NAWAPA is one progressive step we must take. There are others of equal sophistication. One of these is reorganization of our Federal water resource management. It is now far too diffused to enable us to stretch our water supply as creatively and ingeniously as possible.

For example, we have five Federal Departments—Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Defense, and Housing and Urban Development—and two powerful independent agencies—the Federal Power Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority—and twenty-five subordinate agencies all with statutory responsibilities on water resources. It is very difficult to coordinate a program which is spread-eagled like this.

It is also most frustrating for an outside agency trying to work with the Federal Government with such a patchwork of authority. The Delaware River Commission, for example, must harmonize the work of nineteen Federal agencies, fourteen inter-state agencies and 43 State agencies. How the Commission move ahead with its work at all is a modern miracle.

Duplication is not the only caprice of our water management. Different agencies have conflicting programs. The Department of the Interior entreats North Dakota farmers to preserve wildlife while Agriculture pays them to drain the pot holes which sustain migratory birds.

The Park Service is trying to save the everglades in Florida while the Corps of Engineers drains them. The Federal Power Commission authorizes a run-of-the-river dam on a stretch of rushing water where the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation have under consideration multiple-purpose development.

There is little sound argument that coordination of our water resource programs is not desirable; many people simply feel that it is not possible. I do not agree. With water front and center in our national life, I believe that it *is* possible to do now what we have not been able to do in fifty years. To this end I have introduced legislation to convert the Department of the Interior into a full-fledged department of natural resources, bringing under it the diverse water activities of the Federal Government, and transferring out of it functions which can be done better by other departments.

Sparks have been flying ever since the bill went into the hopper. Bureaucrats don't want to be transferred, private interest groups don't want the agency which handles their pet projects changed in any way, powerful lobbies see loss of prestige and loss of control in any shift in authority.

If this is possible, my bill to establish a Department of Natural Resources is even *more* controversial than Nawapa. In fact, there are times when I read my morning mail that I believe I am sponsoring the two most controversial bills before the Congress.

But I feel that both of my proposals must eventually be adopted, and I intend to persevere on them.

My friends, man's inability to control water supplies caused ancient civilizations to crumble. We need not suffer the same fate. We are not less dependent upon water than we were a thousand years ago, but we know far more about our environment. We will learn more in the years ahead through creative research and the resolute application of the results.

We need not run out of water. We need not pay the piper.

If we can maintain our present momentum, I believe America can skimp through. We are far behind now in what must be done. But the public consciousness has been awakened—the people know that the days of writing blank checks on our water are gone.

It will not be easy to keep interest in our water problems high. The water picture can shift with the shift of a breeze. For example, the drought in the Northeast appears to be easing. Rainfall, so far this year, has been nearer normal, although it is too early to predict that the abnormally dry weather which has plagued this region since 1961 is over. But if it is—well, memories are short when the tap runs fast again, and the swimming pool is full, and the lawns are green.

Again some of the impetus that comes with sights and smells which cannot be borne dies down as polluted water becomes safe for drinking, as picnic beaches are opened, as rivers can be fished, and as wildlife has a new lease on life. If, and as, these days of wine and roses return we may lose some of our concern about water. America is a big country. It is hard to catch and hold attention on a problem which does not immediately—this morning—affect a person, or a community, or an area.

This apathy is something those of us who have made water a major occupation must be "suited up" to meet. For you and I know there is no choice on water. We know that we now have millions more people than we had when America was settled, and that we are compounding humanity at an unbelievable rate. Yet we have only the same amount of water on which we can count.

We know we have only begun the work which we must conclude by the 1980's—we have only glimpsed the far shores we must reach by the year 2,000.

Whether we make those shores—whether we get off that cliff on which we are now hanging so precariously as the water serial continues in reel after reel through the rest of the sixties and on through the seventies and into the eighties—depends on how well we plan now, and how courageously and surely we carry through those plans.

I predict that we will win the water battle. What do you experts say?

Mr. MUSKIE. One other point I should like to make, in response to the Senator's concern with the problem of incentives to industry, is that the bill is not entirely devoid of reference and application to the industrial waste problem. There is a provision in the bill for grants to demonstrate the feasibility of combined municipal-industrial waste treatment works. Municipal treatment works which treat industrial effluent, of course, would be eligible for assistance under the grants provisions of the pending bill. Smaller industries are interested in this. Combined facilities are being used to some extent, and when they are, they are of assistance to the industries involved.

The pending bill would undertake to stimulate expansion of this approach to include the industrial waste problem.

Mr. COOPER. I am aware of these provisions. I see the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] on the floor; I do not know whether he wishes to address himself to this matter but I hope that he will. I should just like to say, in closing, that I believe that this bill focuses the attention of the country upon the necessity of conserving the basic resources of water. It may eventually cost $100 billion, between the States, the municipalities, the Federal Government, and private industry, but we must make a start.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad that the Senator has again brought up the question of pollution by industrial wastes. We had a colloquy yesterday on the same subject.

I was interested to read this morning, in the New York Times, that Secretary of the Interior Udall, in testifying before a committee of the House of Representatives, mentioned that he felt the time had come when there should be some tax incentive program to help solve the problem of pollution. He recognized that he was not speaking completely for the administration, but personally, because of the conflict and the opposition of the Treasury.

Since our colloquy yesterday, I have done some additional research to determine whether there are other areas in related fields where economic incentives are given.

I was interested in finding the following sections of the Internal Revenue Code:

Section 174 permits research and experimental expenditures to be deducted currently. However, these expenditures do not include amounts paid for the acquisition or improvement of land or depreciable property.

Section 175 permits soil and water conservation expenditures and expenditures for the prevention of erosion of land used in farming to be deducted currently. However, the total deduction cannot exceed 25 percent of the gross income derived from farming. These expenditures are not deductible if they are incurred to purchase, construct, or improve structures or facilities which are depreciable.

Section 180 permits capital expenditures paid by farmers to be deducted currently where they are incurred to purchase or acquire fertilizer, lime, ground limestone, marl or other materials to enrich, fertilize, or condition land used in farming.

Section 182 permits capital expenditures for the clearing of farmland to be deducted currently. However, the amount deductible for any one year cannot exceed the lesser of, first, $5,000 or second, 25 percent of taxable income derived from farming, and such expenditures do not include those for the purchase, construction, or improvement of structures or facilities which are depreciable.

Section 615 permits exploration expenditures paid for ascertaining the existence of any deposit of ore or other mineral to be deducted currently to the extent that they do not exceed $100,000 in any taxable year with an overall limit of $400,000. However, expenditures for the acquisition of depreciable property do not qualify.

Section 616 permits development expenditures incurred for the development of a mine or other natural deposit—other than an oil or gas well—to be deducted currently but the section does not apply to the acquisition of depreciable property.

So, we see that there is precedent in the Internal Revenue Code for a faster than ordinary depreciation allowance which would be normally over a period of 20 years.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and I have discussed the matter many times. We must recognize the fact that if we are ever to solve the problem of pollution, we must look for complete cooperation from American industry.

Yesterday we authorized many millions of dollars for Government expenditures in air pollution control. Today we are considering a $6 billion bill for water pollution control. We all vote for the measure enthusiastically because we recognize the need for it. However, I think we are far from realistic when we are fearful of expending some additional $50 million to $150 million a year in fast tax writeoff incentives to encourage American industry to play a major role.

We must recognize that, unless we have the cooperation of American industry, we will not clean the streams or waterways of America. We will not be able to cleanse the air of America of pollutants.

It is only commonsense for us to recognize that the Government needs cooperation from American industry. The way in which we can achieve this cooperation with American industry is to grant fast tax writeoff incentives.

When we first introduced the bill that the Senate passed 2 years ago, the bill provided for a deduction or a tax credit or a fast tax writeoff in the first year. There was a demurrer on the part of the Treasury Department that this would cost too much money. The Treasury Department estimated that in the first year it would cost anywhere from $200 million to $500 million.

I recognized the fact that we were in stringent circumstances financially. I redrew the bill, to allow the depreciation deduction spread over 3 years. This would cost, instead of $200 million to $500 million, from $50 million to $150 million.

The formula can be changed depending on how far Congress wants to go in taking account of budgetary considerations. Once we determine what we want to deduct from our total revenue income, we can then work out the formula in any bill that is proposed. However, since we, as a Congress, are taking these huge steps toward water and air pollution control and authorizing such large sums of money, we ought to do the job by authorizing the deduction of a relatively small amount of money to clean up the streams and the air of America.

This can be done. I am not hopeful that the administration will come around to our way of thinking. I am convinced that the overwhelming sentiment in the Senate is that we give industry these tax incentives.

I believe that the Senate would vote overwhelmingly for such a program. Consequently, it is my feeling that we should not wait for the administration to take the lead. It is my feeling that we should take the lead and do the job, irrespective of the wishes of the administration. Therefore, before the session closes, and whenever an appropriate bill is reported by the Committee on Finance, it is my intention to offer from the floor of the Senate an amendment to achieve what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] have been talking about, and what I have been discussing and what the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] has been discussing.

I feel certain that we who are interested in this approach and have introduced various bills will be able to get together and agree upon what we believe should be a fair amount, taking into account the financial circumstances of the Nation at this time. At that time, I am sure, we can all agree upon, and all of us can join in cosponsoring, a measure that can be offered as an amendment to a bill reported by the Committee on Finance. I hope that at that time I might have the enthusiastic support of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, and the distinguished Senator from Kansas. We might have to fight the administration; we might have to fight the joint leadership; but I think there are times when that must be done in order to achieve desired results.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to associate myself with the Senator's remarks on this subject and on this point. It occurs to me, that to start to maintain a water pollution control program without providing some incentive to industry is exactly like building a bridge three-fourths of the way across a river, and then not adding the last span to reach the other shore.

The attitude of the senior Senator from New Hampshire is not colored in any way by the fact that the administration does not favor this step at the present time. During the adminisration of President Eisenhower, the Senator from New Hampshire was prepared, and on the floor of the Senate stated that he was prepared, to vote to override the President's veto of a water pollution control bill at that time. However, the House sustained the veto first, and the Senate never had an opportunity to vote. But most certainly the Senator from New Hampshire joins the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in supporting his tax incentive plan in some reasonable form.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe that together we can determine the reasonableness, because it is easy to calculate the relative costs of a tax deduction program or incentive program, depending on what the program will be.

Since the bill was introduced, I have found a lively, active interest on the part of various industries in America, industries that are the basic cause of pollution. There is a recognition by industry today, unlike their attitude a decade ago, that they do have a responsibility. They now have an active desire to eliminate pollution. Certain States have done it, and have done it well.

The distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who is standing in the aisle, as Governor of his State led the fight for tax incentives and tax credits, and for State taxing programs for the placing of pollution devices in Wisconsin.

Other States have followed the lead of Wisconsin. My own State of Connecticut recently followed this lead.

But State taxes are relatively small. The basic expenditures and the basic tax bite are by the Federal Government. So I firmly believe that once a tax incentive program were placed in effect, we would find an amazing acceleration on the part of all American industry—the coal industry, the oil industry, the steel industry, the mining industry—all of whom recognize their obligations, but find themselves in a fantastic bind with respect to expensive expenditures, and having to write them off over a period of 20 years.

It is economically unsound. But in this way they would be given the fast tax writeoffs. While the Treasury might suffer the loss in the first year or the first 3 years, it would pick it up later on. The deductions take 20 years, anyway, and the Federal Government would be able to recoup its immediate loss of tax revenues, because the continued deduction would not take place in the next 17 years.

It is a question of being practical; and since we are passing this landmark bill today for $6 billion, I believe it is very shortsighted not to implement it with a program that might cost anywhere from $50 million to $150 million.

Mr. COOPER. I am pleased with the statement that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has made.

For 3 years now, the Senator from Connecticut has been leading in the fight for legislation to secure these incentives to obtain the full cooperation of industry in this great task. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that the Senate will pass such legislation. I hope that he will use his influence with the administration to support such legislation.

Mr. President, on April 6 I spoke on the Senate floor concerning the public hearings scheduled by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution on the bill before us today and pointed out that I hoped that industry representatives in discussing various methods for controlling and abating pollution would also include a discussion of their views on the use of tax incentives as a method of accomplishing this purpose. I am happy to note that their testimony has been helpful to the committee in its strong recommendation for congressional consideration of proposals offering industry some form of tax relief.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement of April 6 be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TAX PROPOSALS FOR CONTROL OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I cannot predict which method the Congress may prefer in providing industry with some assistance in establishing pollution controls: that is, investment credit, accelerated depreciation, a combination of these two methods, or some other method. But I do believe that some form of incentive should be provided private industry and I urge the Finance Committee to give this matter their close consideration and I am hopeful that hearings may be held on these proposals in the near future.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the Senate that the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works has announced a 10-day hearing schedule on water pollution commencing April 19 and continuing through to May 5. I note that among the industry representatives scheduled to appear are the following: National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturing Chemists, the soap, and detergent industry, the iron, and steel industry, and the paper industry. I would hope that these industry representatives in discussing various methods for controlling and abating pollution would also include a discussion of their views on the use of tax incentives as a method of accomplishing this purpose.

In this connection, Mr. C. H. Gebhardt, manager of the tax department of the Mead Corp., has prepared a useful chart analyzing current tax proposals relative to water and air pollution controls so as to determine the measure of financial assistance that would actually be given to business if a particular proposal should be adopted. For each $100 outlay for pollution control facilities, Mr. Gebhardt concludes that the bill I introduced with Senator RANDOLPH would provide an incentive equal to 6.7 percent of the cost of pollution control facilities. Other methods provide for incentives of 1.1 percent, 6.1 percent, 7.8 percent, and 14.5 percent of the cost of these facilities. I ask unanimous consent that this table be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Comparison of various approaches to water and air pollution control incentives via changes in the Federal income tax law (using a $100 outlay for pollution control facilities as an example)

	Alternative approaches to incentives					
	Existing tax treatment [1] (for comparison purposes)	1-year writeoff and 7-percent investment credit	1-year writeoff and 14-percent investment credit	3-year writeoff and 7-percent investment credit	Existing writeoff [1] and 14-percent investment credit	1-year writeoff and no investment credit [2]
Cost of facility	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00	$100.00
Tax benefits:						
48 percent (present top rate on corporation)	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00	48.00
7-percent investment credit [3]	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	None
Additional 7-percent investment credit proposed [3]			7.00		7.00	
Total tax benefits	55.00	55.00	62.00	55.00	62.00	48.00
(a) Net cost of facility before considering the time value of money	45.00	45.00	38.00	45.00	38.00	52.00
(b) Net cost of facility considering the time value of money [4]	54.90	47.10	40.40	48.80	48.20	53.80
(c) Advantage of each alternative compared to existing tax treatment		7.80	14.50	6.10	6.70	1.10
(d) Amount of incentive as a percent of the cost of the facility [5]		7.8	14.5	6.1	6.7	1.1

"[1] Depreciation writeoff over 16 years using 1 of the accelerated methods permitted for tax purposes (sum-of-years-digits) has been used.

"[2] A 1-year writeoff with no investment credit is shown only for comparative purposes. It illustrates the importance of full investment credit, otherwise a quick write-off, whether in 1, 3, or 5 years is ineffective if this results in a loss of the investment credit.

"[3] Investment credit has been applied to the total outlay although under present law it applies only to equipment; not to land and buildings. It is hoped that any incentive legislation would extend the credit to all outlays, if it is to be an effective, even though modest, incentive.

"[4] It is obvious from line (a) above that there is no difference in net cost of a facility, after tax benefits, under the various alternatives other than for those which obviously allow an additional 7-percent investment credit. The timing of a company's recovery of tax benefits is most important, however, and this is reflected in lines (b), (c), and (d) where the dollars involved have all been stated in terms of present worth (i.e., their value today). (A 4-percent after-tax discount rate, with tax benefits realized commencing 1 year after the date of investment is the technique used.)

"[5] These incentives should be compared with the 30-percent Federal grants available (with certain qualifications) to municipalities for construction facilities. There have also been a number of recommendations to increase such grants as the full environmental improvement program is implemented. Note that in appropriate situations industrial plants will (and do) utilize such public facilities, thus deriving some benefit from Federal grants. The incentives outlined above would serve, in some degree, to treat equitably those industrial plants which for technical and other reasons must install and pay for their own facilities."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in the January issue of the monthly letter published by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, there is an interesting article on this subject entitled "Progress and Pollution—Can the Link Be Broken." In the body of that article the question of private industry purchasing equipment to control air and water pollution receives the following comment:

"If businesses and communities are to be expected to install control equipment on a massive scale to abate air and water pollution, more thought will have to be given to methods of inducing them to make the necessary investment. It needs to be frankly recognized that there is little motive in most cases for the individual business unit to assume unusual costs in order to reduce or prevent pollution, particularly if competitors aren't doing so. Control equipment is nonproductive so far as yielding any marketable product is concerned. In a competitive industry, it may represent the marginal item of cost that prices a company out of some market. Recognizing this, a community eager to attract new plants may be tempted to relax in enforcing pollution regulations."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the Morgan Guaranty Survey, January 1966]

"PROGRESS AND POLLUTION—CAN THE LINK BE BROKEN?

"The problem of pollution is currently being elevated to prominent national attention in much the same way as was the problem of poverty 2 years ago. Almost everyone, or so it seems, is suddenly talking about it, and scarcely a week goes by without an official at some level of government announcing a new initiative to curtail the flow of wastes into the country's atmosphere and waterways.

"Pollution, of course, is not a new thing in the United States, any more than is poverty; nor indeed are efforts at control. American municipalities have made heavy expenditures over the decades to eradicate or prevent water pollution, and some also have invested considerable sums in recent years to cleanse their skies. Similarly, many business firms have made significant outlays to abate the waste flow that is the inevitable accompaniment of industrial activity.

"Realization has emerged, however, that sizable though these efforts have been in total, they simply have not been adequate to keep up with the ever larger waste loads that growing cities, suburbs, and industries are discharging. Sight and smell alone have been sufficient to drive home this fact. Hundreds of bodies of water in the country are patently unfit for drinking, wildlife, or use in manufacturing processes, and the air in many communities often is laden with floating grime and offensive smells.

"Aroused by such conditions, the public appears primed to support vastly enlarged abatement endeavors. Concrete evidence of this came in New York State in last November's election, when voters gave approval to a $1 billion bond proposal for financing a clean-up of polluted waterways. The dramatic 4-to-1 vote far exceeded expectations and was rendered especially significant because the borrowing was the largest ever approved in the State's history.

"Since the public mood seems similar elsewhere, what happened in New York may well herald the beginning of a major new turn all across the country in the allocation and use of public funds. The ultimate cost of stepped-up pollution control programs defies meaningful estimate, but it is certain that many billions of dollars will be involved. Economic costs rivaling those for space exploration, for instance, are easy to visualize.

Underscoring this possibility is the fact that Federal participation in abatement endeavors is rapidly accelerating. Congress last year passed legislation that will require many States to quicken and enlarge antipollution efforts relating to interstate waters. It also provided for national standards limiting emission of automobile exhausts. Acting in accord with this law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has just set machinery in motion which will make such standards applicable to 1968 model automobiles and which will add an estimated $400 million to consumer spending on new automobiles that year assuming sales of 9 million cars.

"Basic to rational regulation of pollution is the question: How clean should water and air be? The answer isn't necessarily the one that most people presumably would give instinctively; namely, that both water and air should be as celan as possible. With regard to water, certainly, an attempt to achieve pristine purity in all instances regardless of intended end use would entail unnecessarily burdensome social costs. Water which is to be used for soil irrigation, for instance, obviously does not have to be purified to drinkable standards. This applies as well to much of the water that is used industrially. Significantly, agricultural and industrial uses account for roughly 90 percent of the country's total water consumption, and feeder systems for these uses often are separate from those running to the country's homes.

"Even if a particular stream serves as a source of drinking water, it doesn't necessarily follow that all pollutants must be prevented from entering it. Water taken from a stream, no matter how clean it may seem to be, often must undergo some purification treatment immediately before being routed to household taps. While flowing in the stream, moreover, water has a natural capacity to decompose and dilute many contaminants, thereby cleansing itself. Where there is assurance that this process will be adequate, it would be economic folly to undertake the expense of intercepting and filtering out all waste matter.

"But while water doesn't have to be maintained in all instances at a standard of absolute purity, it is clear that the country's expanding water needs demand that water quality in many rivers, streams, and lakes be raised above the levels that presently prevail. With the advance of technology and the wide application of fertilizers and pesticides, waters have been receiving heavy loads of inorganic and synthetic organic chemicals that do not respond to the normal process of decomposition and cleansing by bacteria and oxygen. In numerous other cases water bodies that could assimilate substantial quantities of organic wastes have been so overloaded with pollutants as to arrest the normal breaking-down process. This has occurred principally because the volume of organic wastes has been expanding rapidly with economic and population growth, while the quantity of rainfall and its subsequent flow through waterways remain relatively unchanged from year to year.

"The constancy of nature's precipitation bounty is the chief hurdle confronting officials who must plan for the country's future water needs. Projections of water demand point to the very real possibility that the supply that can be captured from rainfall runoff could prove seriously deficient within the next decade and a half. It is inescapable, therefore, that some way must eventually be found either to supplement or short-circuit nature's evaporation and precipitation cycle. The desalting of sea water is one possibility, although as a practical matter this as of now seems to have serious limitations both economically and geographically. A more promising possibility is that ways will be perfected to use fresh water more than once during the flow from watershed to estuary, as is already being done to some extent.

"UPGRADING WATER QUALITY

"To permit reuse, of course, water must be of suitable quality and this is why accelerated pollution control efforts are so important. The setting of quality standards thus becomes the first task in any coherent abatement program.

"More than half the States have taken at least some action along these lines. New York State, for example, has classified all of its 70,000 miles of streams and 3½ million acres of lakes as to proposed use. The classifications, which reflect to some degree the concept of stream specialization, are: A for drinking, B for bathing, C for fishing, D for drainage. Besides this classification program, sanitary engineers in the State have evaluated the sewage facilities that would be required in every community in order to raise water quality to the prescribed classification levels.

"While the State has only limited authority to force municipalities to construct such facilities, it has devised a program of financial aid that seems sufficiently generous to assure a good response. Whereas local governments have previously had to carry pretty much the full burden of construction costs for sewers and sewage treatment plants, their share would be only 40 percent under the new approach. New York State will finance the other 60 percent, using the proceeds of the $1-billion bond issue approved last November.

"Eventually Albany hopes to get Washington to go halves on the 60 percent, but that will have to await congressional action. The Federal Government now gives some assistance to municipalities, but a formula limiting the size of individual grants works to the disadvantage of communities undertaking large-scale projects. The most that can be granted under present Federal law for a single project is $1.2 million, a relatively small sum in comparison with the typical undertaking in major cities.

"Governor Rockefeller has campaigned actively for liberalization of Washington's financial aid to permit Federal payment of a full 30 percent of the cost of municipal sewage facilities. He also has proposed that the Federal Government should follow New York State's lead in providing industry with treatment incentives in the form of 1-year write-off against income taxes on investment in pollution control equipment.

"Hopefully the bold initiatives taken in New York will be emulated in other States. If they are not, the alternative is virtually certain to be a national cleanup directed from Washington. The Water Quality Act of 1965 specifically empowered the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enunciate standards of quality on interstate waters unless the States themselves do so to Washington's satisfaction by June 30, 1967. Should the Secretary do this, the results could be unfortunate. 'Any attempt to "standardize" water quality on a nationwide basis,' as Governor Bellmon of Oklahoma recently cautioned, 'would likely disregard regional differences in water quantity, flow, location, natural characteristics, and usage.'

"EXHAUSTIVE CONTROLS

"A disregard of regional differences is already evident in Federal action dealing with air pollution. The action just taken by Washington to require automotive exhaust controls on 1968 model cars applies unvaryingly to every State and every community in the Nation, making no allowance for differences in population concentration or in meteorological conditions. This inevitably means that some people are going to be making outlays of up to $50 on control devices that will bring no meaningful benefit either to themselves or their neighbors. This could be so, for example, for many residents of Maine—an irony since it is Senator **Muskie** of that State whose name is most closely associated with the enabling legislation.

"There are vast expanses of the continental United States where relatively sparse population or brisk air circulation, or a combination of the two, forestalls the formation of automotive smog. Either the wind blows the pollutants away, or temperature changes cause cold air to fall and force warm air, with its load of pollutants, into the higher atmosphere.

"The self-cleansing action of air is likely to be less effective, of course, in areas where population is heavily concentrated or where the topography is such as to produce frequent temperature inversion. As the term implies, this is the opposite of normal weather patterns. A layer of warm air moves in on top of cooler air, forming a blanket that prevents polluted air from rising and diluting itself in the higher atmosphere.

"In Los Angeles temperature inversions often combine with exhaust gases to produce the acrid haze that the city has been trying to banish for 18 years. It has been estimated that some 500,000 gallons of gasoline escape unburned from cars every day, mainly as a result of incomplete combustion, and get trapped by warm air in the "kettle" that is formed by the city's encircling mountains. The hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides contained in auto exhaust gases then "cook" in sunlight, reacting photochemically to form smog. The seriousness of this problem finally led to action by California's Legislature requiring that most new U.S.-made cars sold and registered in the State be equipped with exhaust-control devices beginning with the current model year. The standards recently promulgated by Washington relating to 1968 model automobiles essentially follow the California pattern. They apply as well, however, to imported cars.

"Although expert opinion is divided as to whether California-type exhaust-control devices actually are needed elsewhere, most car buyers in metropolitan areas probably will pay the extra charge uncomplainingly. Most large cities have so many air pollution problems that the layman tends to think that anything which may cut down the dirt in his air is to the good.

"The large industrial city can actually be viewed as a vast combustion chamber daily converting thousands of tons of fuel into the energy and heat that underpin modern life. Amenities and progress result, but so too do problems and pollution. Soot and fly ash are the housewife's constant bane, adding to her cleaning chores, blackening her wallpaper, and inflating her laundry bills. Gaseous emissions corrode metals, irritate eyes, offend noses, and reduce visibility. So far, fortunately, the soot and fumes have been more a nuisance than a proven health hazard, but in a few isolated episodes in this country and in Europe acute air pollution, associated with temperature inversions lasting for several days, has been accompanied by increases in the death rate. Unless the tempo of antipollution attack is quickened such episodes could become more common in the future, assuming a continuing trend in the direction of an ever more urbanized and industrialized society.

"WHAT TO DO?

"But while it is clear that something more must be done, it is far from clear precisely what that 'something' should be. A report issued last November by the President's Science Advisory Committee frankly acknowledged that 'there are many areas in which ignorance constrains our ability to deal effectively with pollution problems.'

"An orderly approach to air pollution control logically would involve the setting of standards by each community for the quality of its air, followed by efforts to curtail the most damaging emissions. There are real difficulties in the way of this procedure, however, because it entails not only an assessment of the technological feasibility of curtailment for specific emissions but also a weighing of the costs of control in relation to the costs of damage that occur in the absence of control. In the present state of the art, measurements of costs and benefits are in most instances too imprecise to yield a reliable guide to action.

"Given this situation, the excitement that characterizes much public discussion of what should be done is all too likely to lead to hasty or arbitrary proposals for curbing those sources of pollution that for one reason or another have aroused the most alarm. Highly questionable, for instance, is the recent recommendation of a committee of the New York City Council that exhaust-control devices be required by 1969 on all cars, old as well as new. Automotive engineers simply haven't been able to perfect a control device for installation on old cars that is economically feasible, and it is because of this that California, after considerable study, decided to limit its requirements to new vehicles.

"A variety of arbitrary proposals also have been made for curtailing sulfur dioxide emissions in New York City, including recommendations that the burning of coal be banned and that stringent limitations be placed on the sulfur content of fuel oil. Some proponents of these steps acknowledge that very difficult problems would be involved, ranging from costly furnace conversions to the limited market availability of low-sulfur oil that in part is the result of national policy limiting petroleum imports. Other advocates are either less candid or less informed. They would have it appear that the recommended shift in fuel-consumption patterns could be accomplished easily and quickly if fuel users were only more public spirited.

"PAYING THE BILL

"If businesses and communities are to be expected to install control equipment on a massive scale to abate air and water pollution, more thought will have to be given to methods of inducing them to make the necessary investment. It needs to be frankly recognized that there is little motive in most cases for the individual business unit to assume unusual costs in order to reduce or prevent pollution, particularly if competitors aren't doing so. Control equipment is nonproductive so far as yielding any marketable product is concerned. In a competitive industry, it may represent the marginal item of cost that prices a company out of some market. Recognizing this, a community eager to attract new plants may be tempted to relax in enforcing pollution regulations.

"The incentive for spending public funds on pollution abatement is also limited. Cities all over the country are pressed to provide services of all kinds to growing populations. Investment in modernized sewage treatment plants or incinerator stations can have less voter appeal than spending for police protection or schools.

"Still another deterrent to abatement is the fact that the unpleasant effects of pollution are often so widely diffused that they may not be troublesome to those immediately involved in creating them. Conversely, the benefits of control are usually enjoyed by people other than those who pay the bill. The community that treats its sewage before discharging it into the river, or the plant that catches fly ash in its smokestack, may not itself enjoy cleaner water or air. The beneficiary may be a neighborhood some distance downstream or downwind.

"The problem of pollution thus doesn't respond easily to commonsense maxims about 'getting what you pay for.' If the problem is to be corrected a way will have to be found to channel the general desire for a cleaner society into an acceptable method of getting up the money to pay for it.

"One promising suggestion, aimed at fostering greater activity in the antipollution field by industry, would have local, State, and Federal governments give tax inventive to business. Mr. W. G. Laffer, president of Clevite Corp., recently proposed a combination of investment credit, accelerated depreciation, and exemption from property taxes on pollution-control equipment. Certain States already provide some tax relief. New York, for instance, permits a 1-year writeoff on water-pollution controls, and Ohio exempts such equipment from property taxes.

"An alternative to incentives that is sometimes suggested would be a system of charges levied in proportion to the amount of harmful waste put into the water or the air. Effluent charges are used in the Ruhr region in West Germany, where they have helped to prevent deterioration of water quality in a heavily populated and industrialized area. This approach has been tentatively endorsed by the President's Science Advisory Committee. Such a system, however, would have the disadvantage of necessitating the creation of a large inspection and measurement apparatus. It could prove more costly in the long run, therefore, than tax incentives.

"To speed municipal efforts, State and local officials have been urging larger Federal grants to communities for abatement purposes, especially for investment in sewage treatment plants. With local funds widely inadequate to the task, construction of sewage facilities has not kept up with the growth of waste loads. Federal grants for construction of municipal sewage works have lightened local burdens somewhat, but the ceilings Congress has placed on the amount that can be granted for each project discriminate against the most populous States—whose pollution problems are the most severe. These ceilings should be liberalized, as Governor Rockefeller has recommended, and Congress should give high priority to raising grants to local authorities for sewage plants above the present total of $150 million a year.

"Actually, the problem which local communities face in providing adequate sewage facilities is merely one small part of what has been aptly termed 'the crisis of the cities'—of burgeoning urban needs in the context of limited financial resources. Urban problems in general probably aren't going to be solvable until tax revenues are more equitably shared between Federal and local governments. Some variant of the so-called Heller plan, which would substantially increase the amount of Federal tax collections channeled back to States and localities, may be the answer.

"Collaboration between Washington and State and local officials also is necessary to help define industry's role in pollution abatement and to calm down some of the shrillness that presently prevails. In too many instances, slogans—such as 'Let the polluters pay'—have substituted for analysis. The production of pollutants, it needs to be understood, is not the consequence of perverse business behavior but the 'inevitable concomitant,' as the President's Science Advisory Committee has noted, of technological activity.

"Businessmen, while they direct much of this activity, can neither be credited with all its benefits nor held uniquely accountable for all its unwanted byproducts. The dividends and debits alike are society's to share.

"If substantial pollution-control costs are to be built into the business process, it is society at large that is ultimately going to pay the price of those costs just as it now pays for other social objectives—such as factory safety, abolition of child labor, and minimum wages—that have become accepted costs of doing business. Clean water and clear air simply aren't free goods. Recognition of this is the vital prerequisite to the development of sensible abatement programs."

The bill (S. 2857) to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"S. 2857

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 46(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of qualified investment for purposes of determining the credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by adding after paragraph (4) thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(5) FACILITIES TO CONTROL WATER AND AIR POLLUTION.—

" '(A) In the case of section 38 property which consists of facilities or equipment to control water or air pollution, the amount of the qualified investment shall be twice the amount determined under paragraph (1).

" '(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term "facilities or equipment to control water pollution" means a facility or equipment used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing or mining process, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances.

" '(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term "facilities or equipment to control air pollution" means a facility or equipment used to control atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, or disposing of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants from any type of manufacturing or mining process.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.' "

Mr. RIBICOFF. My response is this: If the Senate persists in a good cause that has basic public support, the administration will not be far behind. Even if we fail this year, I am certain that very shortly we shall be able to turn a temporary defeat into a permanent victory.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. I concur in the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut and others.

I have introduced a bill which tackles the question of tax writeoffs and the question of giving consideration to matching funds to industry for the installation of treatment facilities.

I believe that the tax writeoff should be at the option of the industry, that the industry should be able to write off in 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years the cost of the pollution devices that are required to be installed—whatever is in the best economic interest of the company. It will be difficult to give enough inducement to achieve the job that needs to be done.

Also, I believe Congress should give consideration to whether a formula can be developed to give some matching grant funds to industry to do this job. The cost to the public is exactly the same.

Historically, the policy in this country has been to punish the polluter, but pollution laws have been passed and not enforced. If any State in the United States effectively enforced tough antipollution laws, it would have a serious tax effect, both upon the communities and the industries against which they are enforced. This matter is important enough to some industries so that they would actually move.

I am informed that if treatment facilities meeting the highest status of the art are installed in a paper mill, the cost involves 25 percent to one-third of the total investment in the plant.

If tough enforcement required every industry in America to reach the highest status of the art, all of the cost would ultimately be borne by the consumer, anyway. The cost of the automobile would go up to that extent, the cost of steel would go up to that extent, the cost of paper would go up to that extent.

Therefore, to give tax advantages, tax writeoffs, and matching funds or grants, if a reasonable formula can be figured out, would cost the taxpayer the same amount, whether it would come out of the Federal Treasury or would be built into the cost of the product ultimately bought by the consumer.

I am glad this question has been raised. I shall be glad to join with any group of Senators in sponsoring such legislation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in connection with our consideration of S. 2947, I call to the attention of the Senators the Water Resources Planning Act, which was enacted in the first session of this Congress. This act, which is Public Law 89–80, found in 79 Stat. 244, establishes a National Water Resources Council, composed of the officers of Cabinet level rank of the Federal Government who have responsibility for water resources in the United States, as an overall study, planning, and programing agency.

Title II of the act authorizes establishment of River Basin Commissions for comprehensive planning and coordination of Federal, State, and local water resource development activities in particular river basins or groups of river basins within a region.

Pollution control, of course, is but one aspect—although a very important aspect, to be sure—of the water problems facing our Nation. The relationship of pollution control and other water problems was clearly set forth by Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, in his testimony before the Interior Committee on February 5, 1965, expressing the support of the administration for S. 21, 89th Congress, the bill that became the Water Resources Planning Act.

Mr. Staats said:

> The problem areas that confront us in the water resources field are immense and varied. They include flood control, navigation, hydro-electric power, pollution abatement, and water quality control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation.
>
> In general, the overall national water supply is abundant, but it is not distributed equally. Shortages in some sections of the country are becoming critical and tend to restrict economic growth. At the same time, in areas with adequate quantities of water, problems arise because of floods and pollution.
>
> The pollution of our streams and rivers is of grave importance and of particularly deep concern because of the impact of water quality on all water uses. Studies reported in 1961 by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, based on data furnished by the Public Health Service, estimated the need for investment in sewage and industrial waste collection and treatment facilities alone would amount to over $42 billion between 1954 and 1980, and over $81 billion by the year 2000.
>
> Thus, our goal must be to develop, manage, and utilize our basic water supply to meet demands as they arise—both in quantity and quality. The development of these vital resources is a vast undertaking which is growing larger. Proper development will require the concerted and coordinated action of Federal, State and local agencies which this bill is designed to facilitate.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is the unit of the Senate that has general legislative responsibility for nationwide water resource matters, I wish to commend the very able Senator from Maine and his subcommittee, and the able chairman of the full committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for the exemplary standards that have been set in considering and working out the specialized provisions of S. 2947. I note that Secretary of the Interior Udall, in his testimony on April 20 of this year in support of the administration's clean rivers bill, S. 2987, the provisions of which have been amalgamated with the reported measure, S. 2947, before us today, stated:

> The bill provides for designation of a planning agency for a selected river basin. In most cases, that planning agency will be a river basin commission established pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act. In others, however, we may want to establish a commission such as the Delaware River Basin Commission . . . or to work with and through some other type of agency.

This statement is found on page 109 of the subcommittee hearings.

Mr. President, I am sure Senators will agree that the legislative history of the Water Resources Planning Act makes clear the overall jurisdiction of the Water Resources Council and the River Basin Commissions in comprehensive basinwide planning to insure high water-quality standards. Activities of State and local planning agencies authorized by S. 2947 must not supersede the water-quality responsibilities of the Council and Basin Commissions created by the Water Resources Planning Act. Rather, such agencies will supplement and complement the work of the Council and Commissions when S. 2947 cannot reasonably be implemented and carried out through the provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will follow closely the programs and activities of the Water Resources Council and the River Basin Commissions to be sure that they are fully aware of their congressional mandate to plan for the restoration and maintenance of high water-quality standards. My committee will also continue to be deeply interested in any legislative proposals relating to comprehensive river-basin planning against pollution of all kinds, and we will be happy to cooperate with the Committee on Public Works.

In this connection I wish to call attention to my announcement that appears in yesterday's RECORD setting July 20 as the date for the confirmation hearings on the nomination of Mr. Frank C. DiLuzio to be an Assistant Secretary of Interior under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966. One of Mr. DiLuzio's responsibilities in the new post will be the administration of the Federal water pollution control program, among other water and related programs.

I wish to cordially invite the members of the Committee on Public Works, particularly the able Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] to participate in those hearings, if they desire.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Public Works and a cosponsor of the bill, I wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished and able Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings and worked on the bill, the ranking minority member [Mr. BOGGS] on the subcommittee, and all other members of the Committee on Public Works for their splendid and diligent efforts in bringing to the floor of the Senate this very far-reaching and excellent bill which will mean so much to the health, welfare, and happiness of the American people.

The cleaning of our stream and rivers is a gigantic problem. At a conservative estimate it will cost over $100 billion to clean our rivers and streams and keep them clean up to the year 2000. I hope that the moneys which have been authorized in the pending bill will be a strong beginning to alleviate the very bad condition of our polluted rivers and point the way for us to having all our rivers and streams flowing with clear and clean unpolluted water.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] for accepting my suggestions that the definition of the term "river basin" include the word "streams" and also that the term "estuarine zones" include "bays" and "harbors" to take care of the peculiar conditions in the State of Hawaii. This will encompass Hawaii in the clean rivers restoration program and in the estuary study.

This is a good bill and I intend to support it.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, continued disruption of air service because of the airline mechanics strike is intolerable.

Every day compounds the inconvenience and hardship for millions of Americans and multiplies the economic loss to the Nation.

In my own State, Hawaii, our citizens and the tourist industry are almost totally dependent upon air transportation. Our fresh fruit and flower industries require air service to move their products to markets. Hawaii imports more than two-thirds of the food our people consume. Highly perishable items such as fresh fruits and vegetables are imported by air freight. Adequate air service is literally crucial to Hawaii's economy and the welfare of the more than 700,000 people living in the islands.

Next to agriculture, tourism is the second largest industry in Hawaii. Until the airline strike, which affects two of the three major U.S. carriers serving Hawaii from the mainland, it was estimated 700,000 visitors would journey to Hawaii this year. This would mean $302 million in income for our local economy. Mr. Robert Allen, managing director of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, has informed me the strike is causing more than $2,225,000 in losses per week in the visitor industry alone.

Mr. M. L. Randolph, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, has called the strike "a serious threat to Hawaii's tourist industry." He said the situation is "critical" and declared that continuation of the strike will be seriously detrimental to Hawaii's economy.

The Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce in Hilo, Hawaii, our largest island, which is rapidly enlarging its tourist facilities, cabled me stating that prolongation of the airlines strike will have extremely harmful effect on our tourist industry and agricultural export industries.

Mr. President, Hawaii is by no means the only State adversely affected, although I believe it is the hardest hit because of our mid-Pacific location and near-total dependence on air service for the traveling public.

According to an article in the Wall Street Journal today, the Greater Miami, Fla., area hotels are losing $400,000 a day in lost tourist business. The same article reports $500,000 a day is being lost in New York City by the tourist industry. This is the estimate of the city's visitors and convention center.

In San Francisco, it is reported 10,000 Shriners are still stranded from last week's convention because of the airline mechanics strike.

All over the Nation, people and business, including many small businesses dependent on the tourist trade and the air traveling public, are feeling the pinch. Economic losses are mounting and mounting fast.

Because of the critical situation, late yesterday afternoon I wired President Johnson urging him immediately to invite representatives of all parties involved in the air strike to the White House for around-the-clock negotiations to attain the earliest possible settlement. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

JULY 12, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge you immediately to invite representatives of all parties involved in airline mechanics strike to the White House for round-the-clock negotiations to attain earliest possible settlement, as you did in steel strike last year.

Every day compounds inconvenience and hardship for millions of Americans and multiplies economic loss to Nation.

Hawaii—so heavily dependent on air transport for its citizens and for its tourist and export-import industries—is particularly hard hit. Continued disruption of air service is intolerable.

HIRAM L. FONG,
U.S. Senator, Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I did this, fully minded of the President's direct and personal intervention when a steel strike threatened the Nation last September.

I shall refresh memories of those eventful days.

Last August 28, with the steel strike only 3 days off, the President dispatched a special mediation and factfinding commission consisting of our colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and Under Secretary of Commerce LeRoy Collins to meet with the union and steel industry representatives and report back to him.

Two days later, the two-man team flew back to Washington for a breakfast meeting with President Johnson. According to reports, within an hour the top committees of the union and the industry were called to the White House. The President personally spoke to them and urged settlement.

After that, negotiations continued on an around-the-clock basis. The Secretary of Labor and Secretary of Commerce were reported in attendance throughout the bargaining sessions. The Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers was said to have devoted full time to help narrow the disputed issues. The President and his aids were in constant touch and reiterated the need for a settlement without a strike.

One report stated the President had the union representatives and the industry representatives eating lunch and dinner in the Executive Office Building and kept in constant touch with them either through intermediaries or by direct appearance before the negotiators.

As a result of the President's intervention, the strike deadline was extended 8 days and agreement was reached September 3 and ratified by both sides within a few days following. There was no steel strike.

In the present airlines dispute, the strike has already gone into effect and the economic losses and the inconvenience to the American traveling public have already occurred and the situation is steadily worsening.

I therefore repeat my request of yesterday that the President call the parties to the White House for continuous bargaining until the airline mechanics strike is settled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point several cables I have received from Hawaii showing the urgent need for prompt settlement of the strike. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed the Wall Street Journal article entitled, "Airline Strike Plagues Many Firms as Mail Shipments, Travel Plans Are Thrown Off."

There being no objection, the cables and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOLULU,
July 12, 1966.

Senator HIRAM L. FONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Today sent following wire to CAB: "Urgently request your immediate consideration for temporary lifting of Cabotage regulations covering foreign-flag air carriers Honolulu-Mainland and Mainland-Honolulu. Action requested would enable additional forecast of 1700 seats being available per week. Present operating carriers insufficient equipment to handle traffic. Hawaii situation unique due to geographic location and almost total dependency of traveling public on air carriers." Would urge you lend weight of office and contact Civil Aeronautics Board re our wire requesting temporary lifting of Cabotage regulations covering foreign-flag carriers Honolulu-Mainland and Mainland-Honolulu. Forecasted strike losses exceed $2¼ million per week for visitor industry.

ROBERT ALLEN,
Hawaii Visitors Bureau.

HONOLULU,
July 12, 1966.

Senator HIRAM L. FONG,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This wire sent today to President: The current strike against five major airlines two of which serve Hawaii is a serious threat to Hawaii's tourist industry. Visitors constitute a major source of our income. Continuation of the strike will be vitally detrimental to our economy. We urge your personal influence in finding an immediate solution to this critical situation.

M. L. RANDOLPH,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu.

HILO, HAWAII,
July 11, 1966.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your efforts to bring all possible pressure to bear for prompt settlement of airline mechanics strike. Prolongation will have extremely harmful effect on our tourist industry and agricultural export indutries.

HAWAII ISLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 1966]

AIRLINE STRIKE PLAGUES MANY FIRMS AS MAIL, SHIPMENTS, TRAVEL PLANS ARE THROWN OFF

The five-day-old airline strike, a severe annoyance to vacation travelers over the weekend, has become a major workaday nuisance for many of the nation's businesses.

Consider the difficulty it has caused John L. Daly, manager of the speaker-training service of Smith Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia. Scheduled to address a seminar in Spokane, Wash., today, Mr. Daly was forced to trek by train and plane from Philadelphia to New York, Toronto and Calgary, Alberta, where he spent the night. This morning, if all goes well, he will arrive in Spokane.

With five of the nation's major airlines closed down, Mr. Daly's circuitous odyssey isn't particularly unusual. Other traveling executives must take similar time-consuming detours if they want to reach destinations, and many of them have decided it isn't worth the trouble.

WIDESPREAD IMPACT

The strike is hitting business in a multitude of ways. Hotels, resorts and travel agents are losing peak summer trade. Scattered lags in air freight have caused production delays at a few plants that receive parts by air. Lobsters are going unsold in Maine, flowers are wilting far from the florist shops they can't reach and thousands of marketable mice are stranded in Wilmington, Mass.

The walkout has been a boon, of course, to railroads, bus lines, "air taxis" and the airlines that weren't struck, but the blessing is mixed. These carriers, most of them already operating at peak levels when the strike began, are straining their capacity to take up the slack left by the strike, which affects more than 60% of the domestic trunk airline service.

The nation's hotel and resort operators were among the first to feel the impact of the strike. The Florida Hotel Association figures the walkout is costing the greater Miami area $400,000 a day in lost tourist business. New York City's Visitors and Convention Center puts the loss to the city at $500,000 a day and an official adds that by Wednesday the tourist business, New York City's second-largest industry, "will really be feeling the pinch."

The Grand Hotel on Mackinac Island, Mich., had vacancies in 25 of its 300 rooms Sunday night because guests failed to show up. The Sahara Hotel in Las Vegas says its occupancy is down 7%. "There have been numerous instances of guests being forced to extend their stays, but it hasn't offset the cancellations," an official says. Cancellations at the Pittsburgh Hilton are running to 27% of total reservations, compared with 5% normally, and the hotel is only half-full.

STRANDED SHRINERS

In San Francisco, some 10,000 Shriners still are stranded from last week's convention, but "no-shows" at the city's largest hotels are beginning to mount. Holdover guests offset the strike's impact in many places, but they also can cause problems, says Melvin Allison, executive assistant manager of the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles. He spent yesterday morning trying to get "a 185-pound, 84-year-old woman in ostrich feathers" back to her home in London. Pan American World Airways, which flew the woman to Los Angeles, can't get her a return flight until after July 22.

Despite delays in arrivals, however, most big conventions intend to go ahead as planned. The Chicago convention bureau is sticking to its initial estimate of 65,000 conventioneers this week; the National Housewares Manufacturers Association reports that 30,000 visitors registered for its convention Monday, and the remaining 20,000 that had been invited were expected to check in yesterday.

Travel agents are singing the blues. "We're losing at least 30% of our business each day," moans Marilyn Bogart, a partner in Chicago's VIP Travel Agency. "If the strike continues, it could mean a 50% reduction in the number of people handled through this agency," groans G. M. Balta, vice president of Adams Travel Bureau, Inc., in Philadelphia. A travel agent at Paul Browne Associates in San Francisco adds, "One of our biggest problems is getting in touch with airlines that are still operating. We were on the hold button on the telephone for two hours and twelve minutes at Western Airlines Monday, just trying to call in for reservations."

"This strike couldn't have come at a better time for us, since the first two weeks in July are normally the slowest of the year," says a Boston-based official of Flying Tiger Line, Inc., which specializes in air freight. In Los Angeles, the line's director of sales, Paul J. Finazzo, says its westbound freight backlog is about 500,000 pounds, up from the 50,000 to 100,000 pounds normal for this time of year. He says Flying Tiger is "running the pants off" its fleet, but adds, "Even if the strike were to be settled today, it would be a minimum of a week before air freight traffic movements would get back on schedule."

PROBLEMS IN AIR SHIPMENTS

American Airlines, a major nonstruck carrier, also is carrying freight, and in some parts of the country air freight haulers are sticking fairly close to schedules. But in others, manufacturers dependent on air shipments are running into problems. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif., says instrumentation-recorder parts being shipped from Tennessee were "bumped from the plane by mail" and held up for three days, delaying the company's production.

In Baltimore, the Martin Co. division of Martin Marietta Corp., which normally ships about 5% of its volume by mail, says delays are running a half-day to a day on both inbound and outbound shipments. Often freight has to be routed circuitously if it is to arrive at all. "Each day is a new problem," says a spokesman, "and the paperwork is building up tremendously because of extra bills of lading."

"We're using special delivery, air parcel post, railway express, as well as air freight to move our component parts, but were still experiencing delays," says a spokesman for Motorola, Inc., Chicago. "We haven't had to shut down any production lines yet, but another week of this and we might get really bogged down."

LOBSTER SHORTAGE

Sometimes firms will go to extraordinary lengths to get freight through. Says a spokesman for Electronic Specialty Co., a Los Angeles electronics maker: "To get a hot order to New York, we sent a shipment of electronic devices along as excess baggage with an executive who had space on a New York flight."

Another victim of the strike is the lobster industry. John Hines of Hines & Smart, a large Boston-area lobster dealer, says the airline walkout is costing the three largest lobster dealers a total of about $1,000 to $1,500 daily in lost shipments. The shortage of lobsters and other East Coast seafood already is beginning to be felt in restaurants as far away as San Francisco.

New York's big wholesale cut flower business also has been hit hard by the strike. Carl Sauter of A. Sauter & Co. says flowers are "lying in the sun" at California airports because there aren't any planes to carry them. He adds that prices on many California flowers already have risen 5% to 10%. A New Orleans florist says roses shipped by air from California Thursday didn't arrive until Sunday. After such a delay, "all you can do is throw them in the garbage can," he complains.

Charles River Mouse Farm, Wilmington, Mass., also is "crippled" by the strike, according to Henry Foster, president. The farm normally ships about 80,000 mice and rats a week to research laboratories. Currently about half the livestock is grounded, but a World War II bomber pilot was hired to fly a specially delicate shipment—20 crates of pregnant mice to a University of Pittsburgh lab.

ALTERNATE TRAVEL JAMMED

Most railroads, bus lines and air charter services report they are jammed to capacity. In New York's Pennsylvania Station, the Pennsylvania Railroad stationed a man yesterday with a bullhorn and a walkie-talkie to direct passengers to proper ticket windows. Company planes also were in heavy use; traffic control officials at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport report departures of company-owned aircraft were running three times higher than normal.

Company planes couldn't take up all the slack, however, and many trips had to be abandoned. Ford Motor Co., for example, had to postpone the shooting of publicity pictures of its 1967 cars because it couldn't get its photographers from Detroit to Los Angeles.

Instead of traveling, many businessmen apparently are deciding to use the telephone, and American Telephone & Telegraph Co. says on Friday and Monday, the first two working days of the strike, the volume of long distance calls was 10% to 15% above normal.

The strike also is hampering the collection of checks drawn on commercial banks, but the slowdown may be a blessing to the bankers. Because the banks are given credit for the uncollected checks in computing their reserve requirements, the increase in the "float"—or total of checks in the process of being collected—promised to boost at least temporarily the amount of cash they have available for lending.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the Senator from Hawaii for the statement which he has just made.

The strike that has been imposed against the airlines is, on the face, supposed to be a strike against the operators, when in truth it is a strike against the economy and the interest of the people of the United States.

I believe that the RECORD at this point should contain a statement of the facts dealing with the award made by the President's Board. That award shows that the unions asked for a $130 million aggregate increase in their annual wages, by way of direct wages and fringe benefits. The Morse board awarded a $76 million increase which, according to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], was liberal.

The union now asks 50 percent more than the Board awarded. It asks for practically every penny it originally demanded. It realizes, with its tremendous power in having paralyzed all airline transportation, that unless some action is taken by the President or by Congress, the union will succeed in its objective.

Mr. President, two bills have been offered in the Senate, one by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and one by me. My bill would provide that after all efforts at mediation and conciliation had been exhausted, the President shall appoint a five-man Board consisting of three representatives of the public, one from the labor union, and one from management, to arbitrate and render final decisions.

The bill which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] proposes would provide that U.S. courts be granted authority to declare that a receiver shall take charge and operate the airlines.

My proposal provides that the President should make a recommendation to bring the strike to an end. If the President does not do so, then the Senate and the House should pass legislation in a form which will bring the strike to an end.

Notice must be served upon the labor unions that Congress will not tolerate their paralyzing any segment of the economy, such as paralyzing the services rendered by this important branch of the national economy.

Again I commend the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] on his statement, and repeat that the time has come when the President should take effective means to recommend to us that we pass legislation which will stop forever the inordinate power of one labor leader to paralyze the economy of the Nation.

Mr. FONG. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his remarks. I know how difficult it is to pass legislation in the Senate and House on this subject. While we would be debating the bill which the Senator has introduced, much time would have elapsed and many businesses would suffer bankruptcy. Therefore, I have called upon the President to use his good offices, with his great power, to call the two parties together at the White House, as he did during the steel strike, so that the airline strike can be brought to a prompt end.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for what he has said and for the position he has taken. I invite his attention to the fact that as long ago as 1959, when there was a strike of other unions in the aviation services, I introduced legislation to apply compulsory arbitration to all contracts between the union and the industry in the aviation industry, and that, so far, I have been unable to get any hearings in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare upon the bill which I introduced with each succeeding Congress. I hope that, now, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii will assist me to get such hearings.

While I dislike to apply compulsory arbitration to any such disputes, it seems to me that here is one so clearly applicable to the protection of the public interest that it must be seriously considered and, I hope, passed by Congress.

The Federal Government has invested more than $3 billion in the building of airports in the few years since 1950. It has also put many hundreds of millions of dollars into the furnishing of security services, to make flights safe, for flight control machinery—all paid for by the Federal Government as to personnel, offices, and highly technical equipment—all a Government contribution.

Aside from that, as the Senator well knows, the subsidy given to airlines which do not operate successfully, as well as mail payments, are considerable additions to the economy of the various airlines.

In addition, I remind the Senator that the Federal Government controls the industry almost from top to bottom, not only as a matter of allocation of flights among the companies, but also in the matter of licensing personnel, supplying flight control equipment, which I have already mentioned. They are all Government activities, supplied at Government expense.

Furthermore, they are so supplied because of the direct connection between the great aviation industry and the defense of this Nation.

I hope that the President will heed the request of the Senator from Hawaii.

I ask the Senator if he will and can help bring about an early hearing, not only of the bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], which has already been mentioned, but also of the bill offered by me continuously since 1959, and other measures which have been offered by other Senators.

There has been no unwillingness to approach this problem. But there apparently has been an entire lack of willingness on the part of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold hearings to this matter. I am hopeful that the illumination of this matter which has been given by the Senator from Hawaii in such distinctive fashion will be helpful in obtaining early hearings and early action by Congress in support of protection of the public interest which is so heavily involved in this whole program.

I thank the Senator from Hawaii for yielding to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his statement on this matter.

In all of these disputes, there are three parties at interest. One, of course, is management, which represents stockholders and owners. The other are the labor unions. The third is the public.

For too long, such matters have been approached from the viewpoint of only what is in the interest of management or in the interest of labor.

Twice this year now, this country has been literally paralyzed by strikes. The strike of the tramway workers in New York—the people who run the public vehicles—earlier this year, not only paralyzed the entire metropolitan area of New York City, but by reason of the fact that it paralyzed that area, it also slowed down and to some extent paralyzed business processes all over this country.

Now we are in the middle of this airline strike. It is not as though the airline mechanics were working under conditions comparable to the Welsh miners in the coalpits in 1870, or anything like that. It is not as though they were not taking home a living wage to their families, because they are; but it seems to me peculiar that with the various bills which have now been offered, Congress cannot come up with an answer that will settle such disputes other than by a strike which paralyzes the Nation.

It is not that it is a mere inconvenience to the Senator from Hawaii or to his State, or to the Senator from Colorado or his State, or to the Senator from Ohio or his State, or to the Senator from Florida or his State. It is that it paralyzes our whole transit system. For example, two of the lines struck are the main lines to the State of Florida from the Washington area and the New York area. I can imagine what the economy of that State must be suffering at the present time.

As a matter of fact, there is not a State that is served by the struck airlines that is not suffering from the strike.

The only point I wish to make is that, with the complex economy in which we are involved, strikes in so many areas are bound to destroy and disrupt a great portion of our economy. For example, the strike of one union, the Longshoremen's, could disrupt the entire economy of the country. A strike of the railroads could do the same thing. Now we have a strike by the mechanics in the airline companies that is doing the same thing.

Mr. President, whose interests are the greatest? The interests of labor involved at a particular time? The interests of the employers, or the interests of the American public, which must pay for any loss of profits, which must pay for any loss in working hours; which must pay for any loss of convenience when a dispute exists in an industry or in a segment of an industry?

Mr. President, I do not like, and I have never liked, the words "compulsory arbitration."

I know it is objectionable to management. I know it is objectionable to labor. I can understand why it is from each viewpoint. Nevertheless, even though we have not resorted to compulsory arbitration—and I hope we do not—it seems to me this whole matter is something on which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should be working daily because of the effect of a strike like this on the complex economy we have in this country.

When we think in terms of the need to bolster our economy, the strike is costing possibly hundreds of millions of dollars to the people involved.

The distinguished Senator form Florida [Mr. Holland] spoke about the involvement of the Federal Government in this matter. It is quite true that the Federal Government subsidizes the local air carriers, but we should also bear in mind, in addition, the licensing of pilots and copilots and navigators, and the licensing of aircraft.

The Federal Government subsidizes the entire air industry. I wish I had the figures, but I do not have, showing the almost fantastic amount spent by the Government in the supplying of radio and navigational facilities, radar, and the people who operate them. Those number, if my memory serves me correctly, in the area of 45,000.

The remarks of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], it seems to me are well taken today. The Congress owes it to itself, it owes it to the laboring man who has associated himself with a union, to management, but, most of all, Congress owes it to the American public, the people who pay through the nose when these things happen, to try to find a solution to this proolem, so these strikes do not occur and upset our economy again and again.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Florida for their contributions to the discussion. I agree with them that the Senate should look into the matter, take into consideration the bills that have been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], study the whole question, and determine what solution might be reached.

I do not know whether compulsory arbitration is the answer. Probably there are other alternatives. But I believe that Congress should through its appropriate committees examine the question and receive the committee reports and recommendations. Even if a bill is not reported, I think that looking into the matter will be helpful in arriving at a solution.

I have asked the President to call the disputing parties to the White House and ask them to get together in round-the-clock session, so that they can reach a decision.

Again, I thank the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Florida for their kind remarks on my statement and for their contributions to the discussion.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS AND CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 47 Members of the Senate are joined with EDMUND MUSKIE, of Maine, in supporting the proposed legislation, not only in its purpose, but also by attaching their names to S. 2947, the bill itself. This is indicative of the general approval of the purposes of the legislation which the Senate is considering this afternoon, the amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

I desire to say, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works and of its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, that all of us, both on the Democratic and Republican sides of the committee, are joined in our commitment, which we feel is the commitment of the Senate, to move affirmatively in the field of pollution abatement and control, both of air and of water.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and all the other Senators who form the Republican component of the committee have worked diligently and with determination in the hearings and in executive sessions of the subcommittee and the full committee. This is testimony to the positive manner in which we are moving on this important, this vital, legislation.

Yesterday, on the amendments to the Air Pollution Act, the vote on passage was 80 to 0. Today it is our hope that a unanimity of opinion will again be expressed in the yea-and-nay vote which has already been granted.

Earlier this afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] made a reference of pleasantry to the coat that I am wearing today. A younger man would, of course, call it a blazer. It is ablaze with color. It displays the colors of West Virginia—blue and gold and was presented to me last year by the young men of the National Youth Science Camp. Because the Senator from Indiana made reference to this jacket, I invite attention to the fact that in Washington, D.C., today are 100 delegates to the National Youth Science Camp, which is held annually in West Virginia. They have been in Washington as a part of the 3-week program which is carried on largely in the State of West Virginia, in the historic section of Pocahontas County, at Green Bank, near the famous observatory. The group is comprised of two young scientists from each of the 50 States.

They were challenged today, at the luncheon meeting, by the words of the Vice President, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who pointed out that no matter how scientific an age we live in, we must realize that the ultimate in science is the heart of the scientist himself. I shall not attempt to speak of the eloquence with which the Vice President made this point—a very moving and telling one. But I shall, at a later appropriate time, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address of the Vice President of the United States to these 100 young men who are here in the city today.

Later this afternoon, the Science Camp delegates were privileged to meet the President of the United States and to be present as he commissioned a modern research vessel as a further development in the relatively new field of oceanography. At the navy yard they listened to the words of the President as he indicated that at the bottom of the sea are the substances with which life will increasingly be sustained and sweetened in the years ahead.

As these high school students were addressed by the Vice President during today's luncheon, so in previous years they have visited with other leaders of scientific thought and effort in the Federal Government. In 1963, the inaugural year of the Science Camp, and West Virginia's Centennial year, the speaker at the Washington luncheon was Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In 1964 our guest of honor was the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg. Both Dr. Seaborg and Mr. Webb were present at the gathering this afternoon.

Last year, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Commander of the Air Force Systems Development Command addressed the delegates, and discussed with them the rapid advances of our Nation in building airpower. Distinguished visitors at the camp itself have included Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong and M. Scott Carpenter, as well as Col. Charles E. Yeager, commander of the U.S. Air Force Aerospace Research Pilot School.

During the 3 weeks of the National Youth Science Camp the young delegates participate in a wide range of science-oriented activities. Included are field trips, panel discussions, lectures, guided tours and classroom sessions, all under the direction of a capable staff. Director of the camp is Prof. Charles N. Cochran, of the mathematics department of West Virginia University. He is ably assisted by Joseph M. Hutchison and Robert D. Slonneger, associate directors, and a staff of counsellors who are scientists in their own right.

I commend the delegates to the West Virginia National Youth Science Camp, and express appreciation to those dedicated individuals who give their time and energies to see that this event is well organized and smoothly administered each year. The State of West Virginia is gratified that so many Members of the U.S. Senate could be present at today's luncheon to greet the youthful scientists, and to hear the Vice President. These young men are aware that among the principal duties of every citizen is that of keeping informed on issues of national significance.

Mr. President, we are belatedly aware as a nation that the seemingly limitless resources of this rich land are indeed limited. We cannot and we must not, if we are to preserve the bounty of this land for future generations, continue to waste and despoil our water, our soil, and our other natural resources.

S. 2947, of which I am privileged to be a cosponsor, offers dramatic evidence of the concern throughout the United States and within the Senate for the problem of water pollution control. While this bill is not the final answer to the problem of water pollution, its passage will provide essential funds to combat the problem and to forestall even more serious water quality crises in the future.

I compliment the subcommittee members on this forward moving bill, and the work which produced it. Last year, the Congress took a great stride ahead in the enactment of the Water Quality Act of 1965. This authorized the promulgation of standards of water quality in interstate streams. Virtually all of the pollution abatement bills that have been heard before the committee have had their parentage in that act. This fact testifies to the years of labor and effort by the members of the committee which came to culmination in the Water Quality Act of 1965.

I further congratulate Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, the chairman of this subcommittee, for his tireless efforts on behalf of water pollution control legislation. This bill is a testament to his vision. The newspapers refer to him as "Mr. Water Pollution." Senator MUSKIE has won the admiration of his colleagues for his work as chairman of the subcommittee by developing a comprehensive and coherent program to attack the problems of water pollution.

The pending measure is the product of hearings and conferences conducted by the subcommittee last year and this, and the basic authorization figure of $6 billion proposed was not just drawn out of the air. It represents the best estimate of professional intelligence, that is, the Federal portion of one-third of the $20 billion estimated as the need for municipal sewage treatment work required by 1972.

Mr. President, even this amount, if authorized and appropriated, would not complete the job. It would provide treatment facilities for 80 percent of our population. But more important, it is my understanding that when we refer to secondary treatment process as withdrawing 90 percent of the biological oxygen demand, we are referring to only

90 percent of the 68 percent of the biological oxygen demand, which is processed in a 5-day treatment period.

It is for this reason, among others, that the research and demonstration funds that are proposed are of primary significance, for we need to find economical methods of removing 90 percent of the total biological oxygen demand, not just 90 percent of two-thirds of it.

The river basin planning approach, originally suggested by the administration, contains imaginative and constructive concepts. Pollution must be attacked at every point in the watershed, if true control is to result. The State and interstate planning agencies which this bill authorizes will be most helpful if the terrific water pollution problems we face in West Virginia are to be solved.

I speak with conviction not only as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, but also as a Senator from the State of West Virginia, a State which has often been referred to as the Mother of Rivers, because the origin of so many rivers occurs among our West Virginia hills. Yet, many of these streams, flowing from pure springs and freshets in the mountains, take on some characteristics of industrial and municipal sewers as they run to the sea.

Such a river is the Monongahela, formed by the confluence of the West Fork and Tygart Rivers at Fairmont, W. Va., the drainage basin including the southwest corridor or corner of Pennsylvania, the northeast portion of West Virginia, and a small section of western Maryland. The Monongahela and its tributaries are severely polluted by the discharge of untreated and inadequately treated municipal sewage and waste, and mine wastes.

I am told that the rudder of a river barge on the Monongahela River lasts from 6 to 8 months, due to the action of mine acids, as compared to an average lifetime on the Ohio River of approximately 18 months. I add that the Ohio River leaves much to be desired in the field of pollution abatement.

Another heavily polluted river in West Virginia is the Kanawha River, which originates in the south-central region of our State, in Fayette County. From there, it flows in a northwesterly direction for approximately 97 miles, before emptying into the Ohio River. Though the Kanawha is entirely within the boundaries of West Virginia, it is a major tributary to the Ohio River, and wastes discharged into the Kanawha affect the Ohio. The Kanawha Valley in the area of Charleston is frequently referred to as the little Ruhr, because of the heavy concentration of industries, largely petrochemical. There are approximately 30,000 employees and hundreds of millions of dollars of capital investment in the chemical industry in the Kanawha Valley.

These industries are a major segment of the economy, not only of that area, but of the State. And though they are a source of great economic benefit to our State, they are also a source of water pollution. It is my desire that Congress enter into a working partnership with private industry through government tax incentives in this effort for clean air and pure water.

Several years ago the State water pollution control commission directed the industries of the Kanawha Valley to reduce their pollution load by 50 percent over a 5-year period. I am informed that substantial progress is being made, but much remains to be done by both the industries and the municipalities that are located on the river.

Finally, there is the Ohio River, which is formed by the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers at Pittsburgh and flows into the Mississippi River at Cairo, Ill., some 900 miles below its point of origin. This great river includes in its drainage basin parts of the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. In each of the five areas of the basin, there are serious interstate pollution problems; and these come from industrial and municipal wastes.

I speak not only for West Virginia, but for the region in which critical problems of an interstate nature have developed, but also focus attention on a pressing national problem.

The need for Federal direction in legislation is clear. The funds which this bill would authorize are only a fraction of what will be required across the country to insure clean water for present and future generations. Increased Federal grants will serve to stimulate the necessary State, interstate, and local participation that must be provided if we are to eradicate pollution of the waters in this country. The research provisions of this legislation will provide the tools needed for further development of a cohesive water management program.

We must control pollution by every means at our disposal; we must actively seek new techniques to match the enormity of the problem. S. 2947 is a step—a step in the right direction—but it cannot be considered the final step.

The Federal commitment to water pollution is and must be a continuing one. Passage of S. 2947 will assure that this commitment is expanded and continued.

In the passage of S. 2947, we shall take another step forward. It is not the final step. It is certainly a very good beginning, and I compliment all the members of the subcommittee and of the committee who have worked with such effectiveness on this legislation. I assure the Senate that it has the full commitment of its Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution to go into these matters thoroughly because we realize that here there will be involved tremendous sums of money, and the necessary partnership with private industry must not be disregarded.

Incentives to private industry must be written into law, to make effective the partnership between Government and the segments and units of business and industry in this country. As we attack this problem, it must be a broad, strong, frontal attack. But also, we must move carefully and cautiously.

I say to the Senate that insofar as I am concerned, I will not lend my influence or assistance to bringing to the Senate floor proposed legislation which is not well reasoned. There will be differences of opinion, certainly; but I am not concerned when such differences exist. I am concerned when in the Senate of the United States or in the country we are indifferent to a problem of this magnitude. There is a great difference between differences of opinion as to how best to approach a problem and the tragedy of indifference among our people.

So if the Senate can express this afternoon, as it did yesterday, the aspirations of the American people for solutions to these great problems, I think we shall do well, and work our will in the public interest.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works. I agree with him that the bill which is before the Senate, if passed, will make and mark a significant step in the long and costly struggle to clean up our Nation's waters. For the first time, the Government of the United States will authorize realistic allocations of our natural resources to try to abate pollution. I am pleased and proud, Mr. President, to have been one of the 48 Senators who cosponsored this legislation with the distinguished Senator from Maine.

I believe that the Nation, and particularly those of our citizens who are concerned with conservation, with the preservation of our great natural resources of water and air, should recognize the debt that we owe to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the chairman of this subcommittee, who has been a leader in the forefront of this field for many years, and whose guidance, direction, and wisdom are really the prime motivating force behind the legislation upon which the Senate will vote this afternoon.

It has been my privilege to serve on his subcommittee. I have witnessed his leadership, his expertise, his ability to utilize the staff and the other members of his subcommittee for the public betterment; and I think that we are very fortunate in having a Senator of his caliber as chairman of such an important subcommittee, managing legislation in certainly one of the most vital fields in the entire domestic sphere of legislation for this country.

I think it unnecessary at this time to review the entire contents of S. 2947 but I do want to point out three aspects of the bill which deserve special mention. The first authorizes the Secretary of Interior to make a comprehensive study of pollution in the estuaries and estuarine zones of our country.

Tidal estuaries, Mr. President, are those areas where the fresh water meets the sea. It has been estimated by responsible scientific leaders that approximately 70 percent of all edible fish, sport fish, spend at least half of their lives in estuarine waters. Estuarine waters included the great bays, the inlets, and the sounds. There is no coastal area of the United States whose estuaries do not attract hundreds and thousands of people to fish, to swim, or to enjoy the benefits of the waters.

Yet we know very little about these estuaries. This bill will authorize the first comprehensive study of estuarine life and the estuarine zones in the United States which has ever been authorized. The study will consider sedimentation, fish and wildlife, recreation, water supply and power, demographic trends, mineral resources and fossil fuels, navigation, flood and erosion control, and land and industrial development. Only through such a complete study can we learn what we need to know about our estuaries. These bodies of water—the mixing area of fresh and salt water—are of great significance to the country and are now threatened by the destructiveness of man. We must act now to learn about our estuaries so that we may act soon to preserve, protect, and develop them.

A second aspect of the bill which deserves consideration is the calling for a study of boat and vessel pollution. The committee did not feel that it should propose sanctions or rigid regulations without first studying the effects of boat and vessel pollution. We shall have the benefits of that study. However, the legislation should serve notice to all those interested in marinas and boats, both pleasure and otherwise, that they have certain responsibilities to preserve the cleanliness of our rivers, streams, and waters.

The final section of the bill, which I feel deserves special attention, is that section which is concerned with the availability of trained personnel in the pollution and sewage maintenance and operation field.

As the report of the committee stated:

> Proper and efficient operation and maintenance of these plants is the key to the effectiveness of the water pollution control program.

Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient trained personnel.

Testimony before our committee, given by responsible leaders, was to the effect that we could increase the efficiency of most small sewage plants by as much as 50 percent if we had trained personnel operating the plants.

This bill makes a significant step forward.

The report also pointed out the useful work done in this area by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. His suggestions I think are well thought out and certainly have received the consideration of all his colleagues.

I myself am now preparing legislation to fill this manpower gap and hope to introduce it in a short while. In summary, I feel that we must not underestimate the importance of providing enough trained people in the field of water pollution control, and that we must act now to meet this manpower need.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony which I gave before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works on Wednesday, April 27, beginning on page 191 and going to the top of page 198 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK LAUSCHE, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Senator LAUSCHE. As a preliminary to my testimony, Senator, do understand that I at one time was mayor of Cleveland and subsequently Governor of Ohio. In those two capacities I had ample opportunity to learn of the problem confronting Ohio's metropolitan cities, especially, and also the rural areas dealing with the pollution of streams.

Ohio has 230 miles of shore on Lake Erie. Its metropolitan centers are in a substantial degree located on Lake Erie. This bill provides an authorization to expend $6 billion, as I understand, for the granting of help to local and State governments in their efforts to remove pollution from the streams and lakes and inland water bodies.

The contemplation is to make available $1 billion a year over a 6-year period and that that $1 billion a year will be used as an incentive system stimulating the local government authorities and people to develop programs that will purify the waters that are so essential to our living.

Last February 2 on the floor of the Senate I spoke at length on the subject of water pollution. At that time I pointed out some of the weaknesses in our program of attack. I said in part, making reference to a conference which I earlier had with officials of the division of water supply and pollution control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"It was generally agreed that the Federal grant programs and enforcement actions under existing laws are not adequate to combat the problem of water pollution. The program as it now exists needs to be reorganized. There is a need for a more realistic and fair distribution of funds provided by the Federal Government. Under the present law there is no provision for participation by larger metropolitan areas due to existing dollar ceilings, per capita income restrictions, and so forth, which make their participation unfeasible. They are the areas where the need is most urgent. In addition to the need for reorganization of the present program, more funds will have to be provided."

That is the end of the quote which I made on the floor of the Senate last February 2.

Senator MUSKIE, I am pleased to see that several of the important recommendations made generally and to which I subscribed are contained in the subcommittee's bill, S. 2947: One, increasing the amount of Federal grant money to municipalities.

Two, removal of serious and stifling limits or ceilings on individual project grants. These limitations have been serious and have only delayed progress and action where most needed.

Three, the bill would provide incentives for States to participate through a matching bonus. And, four, then it would provide for a long-term low-interest program to assist communities where local resources are not adequate to meet the local share.

In my opinion the most important problem facing our Nation today is our contest with the Communists of South Vietnam.

Four, and give priority to neither, I would put the subject of eliminating pollution in our streams and the fight against inflation. Unless we clean the waters that are so essential to our life, we can anticipate that there will be nothing but frustrations, agony, and despair in the future.

The need of solving this problem is long overdue and unless we attack on a mass basis now, its towering insolubility will grow worse. Six billion dollars I admit seems like a large sum of money. One billion dollars a year, especially having in mind the national debt of the present day, the responsibilities in connection with the Vietnam war, and the general program in which we are trying to improve the welfare and life of our people.

But if there is to be retrenchment in spending, I say to you respectfully that there are other fields which that retrenchment can be done in with far greater justification than in this field of fighting air pollution and water pollution.

If it were my way, I would put this program in the very top ranks of the time for solution.

If I may digress for just a moment, I travel from border to border of the State of Ohio by automobile and by small plane, and the subject of water supply is one of the keen ones. Rather tragically at a time when the land was covered with legumes and grasses and trees and when wildlife and bird life was abundant, our ancestors, with good intentions, did not recognize what the problem would be with those who followed them because of the indifference to the demands that water resources and natural resources be preserved.

I would like to leave this thought with you, Senator MUSKIE, that in Ohio we have considerable strip mining and that strip mining program has created toxic conditions. When the coal is exposed to the air the elements in the air coming in contact with the coal produce a poison and those poisons are moving down into the streams in many places.

I merely point that out in addition to the indifference frequently of industrialists of the past to take measures to keep the waters clear.

There is an urgent need for a crash program with the full support of the Federal Government and State and local governments. Water pollution is one of the greatest blights upon our Nation today. Too long we have closed our eyes to the seriousness of this all important problem and we have allowed it to grow until it now engulfs many areas and cities and threatens their economic existence.

Too long have cities and municipalities and industries rid themselves of their wastes only to damage those downstream. I cannot help but carry my mind back to the law school when we studied real property and discussed the right of riparian owners, and that is the riparian owner had the right to the water that passed by his property in the form of a creek or a river and that the upstream owner was not allowed to contaminate or to divert or to create conditions that would likely cause floods.

That law seemed to me sound. I remember clearly the Latin maxim, sic tuo utere aut alienum non laedas, you use yours not to injure that of others. That was the law applicable to the individual. Yet the Government paid no attention to it. We used our own to satisfy our whims, completely indifferent of the rights of those who were downstream, and completely indifferent to the rights of those who were to follow us in the habitation of our land.

Too long, Mr. Chairman, have we subscribed to the policy "out of sight, out of mind" and dumped wastes into rivers to get them out of our own backyards.

I point an accusing finger to no one. We as a nation however, have misused one of our natural heritages, our waterways and for more than a century and now we must face up to those wrongful acts and pay the price.

The very areas that are most responsible for this present condition are now the ones that are most plagued by their sins of the past and present. While some progress in pollution abatement is being made in the Nation as a whole, with Federal aid to the States and municipalities it is far too little and in highly developed industrial regions we are losing ground.

At the pace we are now moving it will take a century to clean up our rivers and lakes and manifestly that will be too late. In the meantime, some navigable lakes will have become dead and ports and cities will have suffered irreparable economic blight.

Industry, so dependent upon water, will have moved elsewhere. Ultimately, area economies will be so adversely affected that it will be reflected in marked reductions in Federal, State, and local taxes.

Senator Muskie, in the Union School of Theology at Cincinnati we have an archeologist by the name of Glick. He has won wide acclaim and fame in archeological research in Israel. He wrote a book after his research there. Standing out in that book is the theme that the great difficulties of the ancestors in Israel was in their quest for water.

Every little spring and stream was utilized. They fought for water. There was a lesson that should have caused us and other people everywhere to understand the significance of having an adequate water supply and of course a water supply means plenty of water. It does not mean poisoned and contaminated water.

Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate the importance and the immediacy of the problem, it should be pointed out that the entire population and industrial complex in the Great Lakes States is based upon their proximity to the largest source of fresh water in the world, the five Great Lakes.

The adverse effect which loss of our irreparable damage to this natural resource upon the continued economic growth and success of this complex is self-evident. It should be noted that already some 40 percent of our urban population and a higher portion of our industrial activity is located in only 4 of our 22 major river basins.

To repeat, 40 percent of our industrial complex is in 4 of the 22 river basins that we have. These basins frequently contain huge megalopolitan complexes and intensively developed watersheds where the gains for systematic approaches are likely to be large.

The Great Lakes Basin is one of the four that is relatively industrialized and with a rapidly growing population and the pollution situation is extremely acute. It is my belief that those basins similar to the Great Lakes Basin which are facing emergencies should be given distinct priority in Federal assistance, at least as to timing, if not in relationship to the ultimate proportion of allocation of money that will be made.

Time is essential in those areas. It has been estimated that the cost of reasonably complete abatement of pollution in this country in a crash program would be from $80 to $100 billion over a period of 10 years. This figure I think will be disputed by many. Although it is given to me, Senator Muskie, through the conference which I had with the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator Muskie. I don't think it is necessarily out of line, Senator Lausche. Our estimate of $6 billion for Federal contributions to sewage treatment grants for 6 years is based on the concept of $20 billion just for the current backlog in needed municipal plants.

That does not include the industrial problem. It does not include other aspects of the problem. So your figure is not necessarily out of line.

Senator Lausche. In my judgment substantial Federal assistance is definitely needed. Far more liberal in both amounts of money and formulas for allocating grants than is permissible under existing law. I have a thought that I have not set forth in my paper that I would like to leave with this committee.

The highway program financed by the Federal Government I think according to present figures will cost $40 billion. It is a self-sustaining program, the financing of which is made through excise taxes on gas and automobile accessories and tires.

I have tried to contrive some method of paralleling the fight against water pollution with the fight in eliminating the traffic hazards and congestion of the highways. I have been thinking of user taxes. But it is a rather difficult problem because we have no relationship of the intimate character in the water problem that we have in the using of the highways.

But I do suggest that this committee ought to give consideration of ways and methods of procuring additional funds to solve the problem. I further have the suggestion, which is not contained in my paper, that the committee should give consideration of working out a recommendation of some sort of accelerated depreciation writeoff of a capital investment so as to induce private industry to install pollution elimination devices.

I think now under the tax law if an industry does install a device to eliminate the pollution in its effluent it can depreciate that capital investment in a period of 19 years. We ought to study some incentive to urge them to expedite the installation and to accelerate the period during which they can depreciate. That is, instead of making them wait 19 years and full depreciation, if we allowed them to depreciate in 5 years, I think that type of inducement would go a long ways in helping some—in helping solve the problem.

This is my case, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania today will give me support, though I sorrow when I think how often he fails to give it to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to give my formal statement.

Senator Muskie. Please proceed, Senator Lausche.

Senator Lausche. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before your subcommittee today in support of S. 2947, of which I am a coauthor.

While this bill provides for a 6-year, $6 billion program of grants to municipalities for treatment construction with the Federal Government paying 30 percent of the total cost, it is only a "drop in the bucket" in relation to the ultimate needs. It is, however, a step forward toward a goal in a nationwide battle for pollution abatement. The bill might have provided for greater sums of money and for even more liberal Federal assistance. Perhaps as progress is made under S. 2947 and other pollution bills previously enacted into law, needs can be reevaluated and modifications can be made to expedite and make even more effective our war against pollution. The 6-year, $6 billion program for grants to municipalities, of course, places a heavy burden upon the Federal budget, which is already sorely taxed by military and foreign aid commitments. I say, however, that an adequate Federal pollution abatement program should have priority over most other domestic and public works programs, and, if there are to be any cutbacks or deletions because of budgetary problems, they should not affect our immediate attack against pollution. It needs and should be given the highest possible priority.

Last February 2, on the floor of the Senate, I spoke at length on the subject of water pollution and pointed out some of the weaknesses in our program of attack under Federal laws now existing. I said in part, making reference to a conference I had earlier with officials of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I quote:

"It was generally agreed that the Federal grant programs and enforcement actions under existing laws are not adequate to combat the problem of water pollution. The program as it now exists needs to be reorganized. There is a need for a more realistic and fair distribution of funds provided by the Federal Government. Under the present law, there is no provision for participation by larger metropolitan areas due to existing dollar ceilings per capita income restrictions, etc., which make their participation unfeasible. They are the areas where the need is most urgent. In addition to the need for reorganization of the present program, more funds will have to be provided."

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that several of the important recommendations I made at that conference are contained in this bill, S. 2947. They include:

(1) Increasing the amount of Federal grant money to municipalities;

(2) Removal of serious and stifling limits or ceilings on individual project grants—these limitations have been serious and have only delayed progress and action where most needed;

(3) Providing for more incentive for States to participate through a matching bonus; and

(4) Providing for a long-term, low interest program to assist communities where local resources are not adequate to meet the local share.

Mr. Chairman, the most important problem facing our Nation today is winning the battle against pollution of our rivers and lakes, especially in those regions where the situation is desperately acute, as in the Great Lakes Basin.

There is urgent need for a crash program with the full support of the Federal Government and State and local governments. Water pollution is the greatest blight upon our Nation today.

Too long have we as a nation closed our eyes to the seriousness of this all-important problem and let it grow and grow until it now engulfs many areas and cities and threatens their economic existence.

Too long have cities and municipalities and industries rid themselves of their wastes only to damage those downstream.

Too long have they subscribed to the policy "out of sight, out of mind" and dumped wastes into rivers to get them out of their own backyards.

I do not point an accusing finger at anyone. We as a nation, however, have misused one of our natural heritages, our waterways, for more than a century, and now we must face up to those wrongful acts and pay the price. In fact, the very areas that are most responsible for this present condition are now the ones that are most plagued by their sins of the past and present.

While some little progress in pollution abatement is being made in the Nation as a whole, the Federal aid to States and municipalities, it is far too little and in highly developed industrial regions we are losing ground. At the pace we are now moving, it will take a century to clean up our rivers and lakes, and that will be too late. In the meantime, some navigable lakes will have become "dead" and ports and cities will have suffered irreparable economic blight. Industry, so dependent upon water, will have moved elsewhere. Ultimately, area economies will be so adversely affected that it will be reflected in marked reductions in Federal, State, and local taxes.

Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate the importance and the immediacy of the problem, it should be pointed out that the entire population and industrial complex in the Great Lakes States is based upon their proximately to the largest source of fresh water in the world, the five Great Lakes. The adverse effect which loss of or irreparable damage to this natural resource upon the continued economic growth and success of this complex is self-evident.

It should be noted that already some 40 percent of our urban population and a higher portion of our industrial activity is located in only 4 of our 22 major river basins. These basins frequently contain huge megalopolitan complexes and intensively developed watersheds where the gains for systematic approaches are likely to be large. The Great Lakes Basin is one of the four that is relatively highly industrialized and with a rapidly growing population, and the pollution situation is extremely acute. It is my belief that those basins similar to the Great Lakes Basin, which are facing emergencies, should be given distinct priority in Federal assistance, at least as to timing, over those areas where the situation is not of an emergency nature.

It has been estimated that the cost of reasonably complete abatement of pollution in this country in a crash program would be from $80 to $100 billion over a period of 10 years. Obivously, to carry out such a program would be far beyond the financial abilities of State and local economies. Definitely, substantial Federal assistance is needed, far more liberal in both amounts of money and formulas for allocating grants than is permissible under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I recommend that your subcommittee act favorably on this bill. As a coauthor, I am pleased to give it my wholeheated support.

Senator Clark. May I say, Mr. Chairman, it is a rare privilege and a high honor, as Speaker Rayburn used to say, to find myself on the same side as the Senator from Ohio.

Senator Muskie. As a matter of fact, Senator Lausche, I particularly welcome your testimony. I know that you and I and Senator Clark disagree in several areas as to the responsibilities that the Federal Government carries.

To have your endorsement of this program and your expression of concern is a real boost to our efforts.

We appreciate it.

Senator Lausche. Senator Tydings, and Senator Moss and Senator Clark were not here when I said if there is to be any retrenchment let it not be in the fight against pollution. Let us retrench in other areas where the need is not so demanding and immediate as it is in this field.

Senator Clark. Ohio and Pennsylvania both border on Lake Erie.

Senator Muskie. Senator Clark, we are ready for you now. We welcome your presence. As I said before Senator Lausche's testimony we are delighted so many Senators are coming here to testify or to submit a statement on this important subject. I think now you are No. 23.

We might get a majority before this committee before we are through.

(At this point Mr. Harris assumed the chair.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am very happy to get the floor after waiting for an hour and a half and seeing other Senators come to the floor, be recognized, and leave after speaking.

It is indeed a privilege to speak to the Senate under these circumstances. I do want to address my remarks basically to the bill under consideration.

I am sorry that in the interim the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] has had to leave the floor. I wanted to compliment him for the work he has done and for his introduction of a bill, which I have cosponsored, to provide incentives to private firms and corporations who will be faced with the very onerous task of meeting antipollution standards and taking antipollution steps during the next few years.

I have personally felt that pollution was one of the greatest problems which face this country. I would place it above many of the other problems, because it affects the health of the Nation. When we have any problem which affects the health of the Nation, we then have something which ought to be one of the top priorities of the Senate.

I am therefore very happy to have supported, and will continue to support at the proper place in the proper bill, an amendment to provide an incentive, a tax credit or an increased tax deduction for moneys which are invested by firms or corporations in the diminishment of our pollution problems. There are many such companies in the United States, and some of them would be literally put into bankruptcy today if they had to take these steps under our present tax law.

I think the real solution is to provide them with the incentive and the opportunity to do this. I think that then we shall not have to worry so much about what will need to be done later.

I also compliment the distinguished Senator from Maine for his work upon the bill. As is quite often the case, the ranking minority member of the committee is overlooked. In this case, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] has done an outstanding job. He has worked on the bill all the way through. As the distinguished Senator from Maine has said, he is deserving of equal credit for the work that has been done on the bill.

This is a bill which requires an almost infinite amount of time and patience, as the transcripts of the hearings which lie on our desks will show. These two Senators have spent many hours in these hearings to try to come up with a workable bill to solve what to me is one of the most important problems facing this country. Their work is very praiseworthy, and I think it deserves the thanks of the Senate.

I rose to speak this afternoon upon this matter for one reason in particular. On page 15 of the report, and running thereafter to page 18, is a discussion of radioactive pollution.

On June 23 of this year, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and myself were involved in a colloquy in the Senate with respect to this matter.

I cannot say that I believe that the language of the report contains any direct misstatements. However, I believe that the wording of the language is such that it raises in my mind—as I am sure it will raise in the mind of any casual reader, as distinguished from a careful reader—the fact that a real problem of radioactive pollution exists in the Colorado River Basin.

I wish to call attention to 2 or 3 statements in the report.

On page 15 appears this statement:

> The report established that, in the past, at a period of peak release of contaminants from operating mills, there was a serious problem with regard to the presence of concentrations of radium 226 in the Animas and San Miguel Rivers.

These rivers arise in southwestern Colorado, as everyone knows; and the three words "in the past" are apt to be overlooked.

When this problem arose in 1956, 1957, and 1958, the senior Senator from Colorado was deeply involved in it, and he was deeply involved in the steps that were taken at that time—several changes in mill operations and other measures—to clean up the Colorado River. The important point, in my opinion, is to emphasize and to underscore that this job has been done.

I read from page 16 of the report:

> The Counsel for the AEC testified that the AEC could require stabilization of the tailings piles if the pile represented a risk to the public health and safety. The FWPCA testified that the piles did represent such a risk.

I do not find the facts in the hearings to be quite in accordance with that statement. For example, Mr. Murray Stein testified before the committee on May 6, and in part he said this:

> In 1960, a conference was held on all of the Colorado River Basin at the request of six of the seven States involved, and the Animas River pollution problems were incorporated into this enforcement conference. The Colorado River Basin water quality control enforcement project was then established and included in its work were studies of other sources of radioactive waste discharged to basin streams. The Colorado conference has met in five sessions, and recommendations have been made to abate radioactive and other sources of pollution.
>
> Uranium mill waste discharges have been substantially reduced. This was achieved through the joint efforts and cooperation of the States involved, the Federal water pollution control program, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the uranium milling industries themselves.

Then he continued:

> We believe the control and prevention of radioactive pollution in the Colorado River Basin has been one of the significant success stories in pollution abatement in this country. When we first began to deal with this problem in several areas, the radioactive levels were several times the maximum permissible concentration.

Mr. President, this year Colorado passed a water pollution bill which contains several elements. First, it creates a water pollution commission which gives it general supervision over administration and enforcement. Second, it adopts strict water quality standards in accordance with those satisfactory to Federal requirements where interstate streams are involved. Third, it is empowered to accept and allocate loans and grants. Fourth, it is capable of adopting, modifying, and enforcing rules and orders pertaining to water pollution control. Fifth, it may employ, and does employ, technical personnel and hearing officers and others of general responsibility.

Mr. President, I bring this matter up because I believe the Colorado act on water pollution control is one of the best and most forward looking acts in the United States. On several occasions I have paid tribute to the legislature—both Republicans and Democrats—that did such an outstanding job on this subject, under the leadership of Governor Love. I believe the Colorado act will constitute a model for good action upon water pollution control from this date forward.

In addition to the quotation of Mr. Stein which I read a few moments ago, I wish to read a few remarks from the statement of Mr. Klashman, who is the regional director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of HEW in Denver. Mr. Klashman said this:

> The cooperative industry-Government radioactive pollution abatement program has been eminently successful. Early studies had indicated that the tailings solids were the major source of stream contamination, and hence the industry instituted waste treatment practices that successfully captured and retained these settleable solids. Our surveillance network demonstrates clearly that for all practical purposes surface waters of the entire basin are now free of recent bottom deposits of mill tailings. In addition, where needed, the industry installed additional chemical treatment facilities to remove substantial quantities of radium dissolved in the liquid wastes before release of the latter to the surface streams.

I shall skip a bit and continue with his statement:

> In earlier years, also, the industry had been plagued by a series of accidents in which the occasional rupture of earthen tailings pond dikes released large quantities of radioactive wastes to the water environment. Better dike construction and maintenance has essentially solved this problem.
>
> Our surveillance program demonstrates that as a result of this abatement program, the surface waters of the Colorado Basin have for several years contained no more than one-third of the quantity of radium that is regarded as safe. This is a precedent-setting case in which an entire industry has cooperated in reducing pollution to a level sharply below that which has been regarded as acceptable.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to read an order which was issued by Dr. Roy L. Cleere, who is the director of public health, Colorado State Board of Health, pursuant to the act which has been enacted in Colorado.

> It is hereby declared to be the order of the Colorado State Board of Health that the owners, operators and other persons or corporations having or claiming to have a legal interest in the premises where tailing piles from uranium or thorium mills are situated, or persons having responsibility for the operation of the mill, submit to the State Department of Public Health within ninety (90) days after the effective date of this regulation a written report setting forth plans and measures employed by them to stabilize such tailing piles and what further plans and measures, if any, are proposed to accomplish the purposes of this regulation.

Then I shall read the actual order as it was put into effect, which was to the effect that these people do exactly this and report to the health department what they have done along these lines.

> It is hereby declared to be the order of the Colorado State Board of Health that the owners, operators and other persons or corporations having or claiming to have a legal interest in the premises where tailing piles from uranium or thorium mills are situated, or persons having responsibility for the operation of the mill, submit to the State Department of Public Health within ninety (90) days after the effective date of this regulation **a written report setting forth plans and measures employed by them to stabilize such tailing piles and what further** plans and measures, if any, are proposed to accomplish the purposes of this regulation.
>
> The effective date of this regulation will be thirty (30) days from and after the date of adoption hereinafter set forth.
>
> Adopted May 9, 1966.
>
> ROY L. CLEERE, M.D., M.P.H.,
> *Secretary, Colorado State Board of Health.*

I shall now take up one other aspect of this matter. I shall not detain the Senate for more than a few minutes, but I believe the record must be made clear.

Dr. Morris, who is the Director of the Division of Operating Safety of the Atomic Energy Commission, said this in the hearings:

> We felt that, simply as a matter of good housekeeping prudence in being a good neighbor, we should stabilize that pile and return the land to its natural state.

This refers not to any plant in Colorado but one in Monticello, Utah, and which was operated by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, along the same lines, after we had a coloquy on the floor the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] said this:

> Mr. BARTLETT. I did not intend to so imply. Obviously, the record is clear that no dangers are to be encountered by anyone at this time. One could go to the Arctic as a tourist, where there has been a peculiar situation in connection with radioactive fallout, and eat caribou meat and there would be no danger at all, or any dire consequences. We are not so sure, yet that the Eskimos, who subsist on caribou meat day in and day out, are not in some danger even now, although several years have passed since tests have been made in the outer atmosphere.
>
> I wish to assure my friend from Colorado that I am not talking today and shall not talk later as an alarmist. We have mined uranium in the past. We have processed uranium in the past. We are going to continue to do so.

On April 29, 1966, I wrote a letter to Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Seaborg's reply to my earlier letter can be found in full on page 14061 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23. I shall not insert it again but I do wish to quote a few paragraphs from his reply. He states as follows:

> The FWPCA report, which deals with potential effects of uranium mill tailings on rivers and streams in the Colorado River Basin, states, "there is currently no significant immediate hazard associated with uranium milling activities anywhere in the Colorado River Basin."

I continue with his letter:

> However, the report recommends that because of the long half-life of radium-266—the isotope of principal interest in the tailings from a water standpoint—and the uncertainties regarding changes that may occur over centuries in things such as river hydrology and the uses of water, measures should be taken to prevent the erosion, spread and distribution of tailings and that binding agreements should be reached as soon as possible regarding long term public and/or private responsibility for adequate maintenance of the tailing piles.

In concluding the letter he said:

> As you know, on May 9, 1966, the State of Colorado Board of Health adopted regulations concerning the handling and disposition of radioactivity-bearing ore materials. The regulations which become effective June 10, 1966, require mill owners to submit to the State of Colorado health authorities within ninety days from that date a written report on measures taken to stabilize tailings piles together with any further actions proposed. We think the approach adopted in the Colorado regulations is a good one.
>
> Please let me know if you would like any further information.

Mr. President, as I have said, I do disagree with one statement in the report, but nevertheless my reason for these remarks basically is to negative anything that the casual reader might get from the report that there is a present danger in the Colorado River Basin from radioactive water, because this is not the case based upon any standards which we have available to us today with regard to radioactive material.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am delighted that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] raised this question because it is not my desire or the desire of the subcommittee to create any undue alarm or suggest that there is any immediate problem related to uranium milling activities in the Colorado River.

It might be helpful if I cite two or three statements from the hearing record to put the matter into proper perspective.

For example, on page 3 of the hearing record, Mr. Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, made this statement:

> We believe the control and prevention of radioactive pollution in the Colorado River basin has been one of the significant success stories in pollution abatement in this country.

Mr. Stein made this statement on page 5 of the hearing record:

> I do not believe that the people in the area are now exposed to immediate health hazard. I think the radiation levels have been reduced materially. Certainly the water, as we will point out, is one-third of the Public Health Service suggested drinking water standards.

On page 37 of the record of the hearings, I made the following statement, raising some questions which I directed to Mr. Stein:

> Senator MUSKIE. Now, having listened to all of this, let me pose two or three questions which would seem to me need to be answered before we can develop some policy with respect to this problem.
>
> First of all, do the piles as they exist constitute any hazard to the health of anybody who might be exposed to them—as they stand?
>
> Secondly, is there enough radioactive material in the pile so that if concentrated in any way it would produce a hazard to health?
>
> Three, considering the physical characteristics of the pile, the environment in which it exists, and the erosion dangers which are present, are conditions such that they could lead to concentrations within any reasonable anticipation of what might happen that would be hazardous to health?

Mr. Stein's reply, which appears on page 38, was quite extensive. He concluded it with this sentence, which appears on page 39:

> I would answer yes to all three of the questions.

The subcommittee found itself in something of a dilemma. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration obviously was more concerned with the future problem or long-term hazard than were the Atomic Energy Administration representatives. We felt that on the basis of the facts disclosed, relative to the cost of stabilizing the piles in order to reduce any potential hazard, that the piles should have been stabilized.

We thought that the Atomic Energy Commission witnesses were a little careless in their attitude toward the solution of a potential long-term hazard.

But I should like to emphasize again to the Senator from Colorado that no witness before the committee suggested that these was an immediate hazard. The sole question involved was: What should be done in addition to what had been done or had not been done to minimize the possibility of future hazards? It was on that question that we felt it essential to invite the attention of the Senate and the public to the conflict in the attitude of the two agencies; to stimulate minimal action in dealing with the problem. I emphasize again that the committee was and is concerned with "long-term potential hazard."

Mr. ALLOTT. I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Maine. I think that even in this instance it might be reasonable to invite attention to the remarks of Dr. Morris, who in his opinion differed with Mr. Stein. His statement is on page 40, the page following the one from which the Senator from Maine was reading. Dr. Morris was asked by the Senator from Maine about the use of these piles as a child's sand pile. Dr. Morris replied:

> I think this allowable averaging applies directly. If the Boy Scouts camped on it for one night, there would be no danger whatsoever.
>
> Senator MUSKIE. How many nights could they camp on it safely?
>
> Dr. MORRIS. We could ask about the boy who slept there every night. My rough calculation shows if one was there 40 hours a week, he would get about four times the annual permissible dose.
>
> Again, this is close to levels for which there is no observable biological effect.

So there is a difference of opinion on this subject. I presume that the Senator from Maine has not seen the piles. As they come out finally, they are of very fine sand.

They can be stabilized—not without some difficulty, but stabilization is possible. At this point, I wish to make sure that the condition which the report might imply to a casual reader has been obviated by the steps taken some time since. Second, that any possibility of damage from these piles is now being diminished and done away with by action of the Pollution Control Board of the State of Colorado.

I am very much appreciative of the Senator's remarks but I thought it was important enough that we not leave the impression that the Colorado River Basin—most of which, incidentally, lies outside the State of Colorado, although Colorado supplies most of the water and which extends through all of the Southwestern States—was polluted from a radioactive standpoint.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, water, the vital resource, is much in our thoughts and much in our pronouncements today. But if we are to serve with fidelity the people whom we represent here, in the Senate of the United States, it is not enough that we think about water, or talk about water. We must act, now, to assure that there will be enough water, of adequate quality, to meet the present needs of the people, the growing requirements of the foreseeable future, and the staggering demands of the years to come.

My State of Connecticut, like so many States, owes much to the waters with which she is endowed. Three important river systems traverse Connecticut—the Housatonic, the Thames, and the Connecticut, New England's greatest stream. On the south the State is bounded by the waters of Long Island Sound, and the beneficiary of a beautiful shoreline.

Water turned the wheels of our earliest industry. Our tobacco crop grows in the fertile valley beside the long tidal river. Fish and shellfish are gifts of our waters. Swimming, boating, fishing for sport, and other water-oriented recreation for the people of nearby communities are the prospect—if not always the reality—which abundant water resources have to offer us. And the beauty of the State is enhanced by our streams and lakes and coastal waters.

Water is a gift of nature. It is our responsibility to protect it, to develop it wisely, and to use it well. New England learned long ago about the ravages of floods. We were reminded last year of the devastation of prolonged drought. And we are learning, painfully, about the terrible plunder of pollution. What is more we are doing something about it.

In Connecticut, Governor Dempsey's clean water task force—a panel of distinguished citizens appointed by the Governor last year—recently completed a study of the water pollution problem. Their recommendations—which have the strong endorsement of Governor Dempsey—will provide an even stronger and more vigorous State program to combat water pollution. In one major recommendation, the task force has proposed a $150 million bond issue to provide a program of State grants to municipalities for sewage treatment facilities. I am confident that this program will have the support of the Connecticut legislature next year.

The task force also urged the passage of the bill we are discussing today, and gave strong support to a program of tax incentives for the construction of pollution abatement facilities by industry. So we are moving forward. And S. 2947, the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966, offers sound solutions to the critical domestic problem of water pollution now, at last, faced squarely and met head on with the weapons of new knowledge, more money, and stronger authority.

The Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, under the leadership of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], has come forward again with sound legislation after a difficult assignment. I am proud to join in sponsoring S. 2947 and urge its speedy enactment into law

S. 2947 is a bold bill. It is bold in its call for an outlay of $6 billion in 6 years as the Federal contribution to the estimated $20 billion nationwide need for waste treatment works construction. It is bold in its call for the removal of restrictions on Federal assistance, which hamper the construction of some of the most critically needed projects. It is bold in its call for a special effort to develop advanced waste treatment for the joint treatment of municipal wastes and industrial wastes. It is bold in its call for new enforcement authorities to assure that the conference is armed with the information it needs on which to base a workable, fair program of remedial action. Enforcement is crucial to a successful water pollution control program.

Federal enforcement has laid the groundwork for the cleanup of difficult, longstanding problems on the Connecticut River, and I am convinced of its worth.

S. 2947 is a sound bill. It is the product of the exhaustive subcommittee hearings in Washington and around the Nation last year, of this year's thorough hearings on water pollution control legislation, and of conscientious bipartisan committee deliberations. It provides the mechanism for the river basins approach to water pollution control proposed by the President, while building on the solid foundation of present law so that no momentum will be lost in the great nationwide attack on the defilement of America's waters.

With the passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966, we will serve the people well.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to vote today for S. 2947, a bill amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

By providing for the first time Federal assistance on a scale necessary to meet present antipollution needs, and by eliminating dollar ceilings on sewage treatment plant construction grants, this bill is a major step in our drive to reduce and eliminate water pollution. I am glad to join Senator MUSKIE in cosponsoring this measure and urge my colleagues to support it today.

This bill authorizes Federal matching grants for sewage treatment plant construction that total $6 billion over the next 6 years. It raises the annual Federal contribution to $1½ billion a year by 1971 in contrast to the $150 million that would be authorized for the current year. Although this may seem to be a rapid growth, anything less would be inadequate for the job. It has been estimated that there is a backlog of sewage treatment construction needs of about $30 billion. The Federal share of this program, under the existing 30-percent to 50-percent matching formula, is somewhere between $10 and $15 billion. At the current level of Federal funding, $150 million a year, it would take 100 years to meet our current backlog alone. It is no wonder that cities and towns are impatient at the delay they currently face in attempting to get Federal assistance for their projects.

In addition, by the year 2000, our population is expected to grow by at least a third to a figure in excess of 300 million. This additional sewage treatment need not have been included in the estimated backlog and must be added to the total. Seen in this context, a Federal program of $1½ billion a year takes on a different cast.

This bill also corrects a major limitation in existing legislation by removing the restrictions on sewage treatment grants. The existing grant programs discriminated against cities because their construction costs far exceeded the limitations of $4.8 million per project. New York City, for example, is planning the North River treatment plant which is now estimated to cost $60 million. The cost of a new sewage treatment plant in Buffalo has been estimated to cost more than $30 million.

Inadequate sewage treatment by a major city can thoroughly pollute a river and ruin the pollution control efforts of smaller neighboring communities. Under this bill, our cities will qualify for Federal assistance and we will be able to make progress in restoring the quality of our waterways.

By providing Federal assistance to our cities for sewage treatment plant construction, Federal and State Governments can also urge that new construction meet water quality regulations. For example, New York City's North River treatment plant, now in the planning stage, is being designed as an intermediate quality plant that would remove only 55 percent to 60 percent of the active pollutants of the sewage it will handle. This plant is estimated to cost $60 million.

However, New York State and New Jersey have agreed with Secretary Gardner that new sewage treatment plants on the Hudson River should provide secondary treatment that would remove 85 percent to 90 percent of these pollutants. A North River plant designed in this fashion would cost about $100 million. The Federal Government would absorb almost all of the additional cost of additional treatment, if this bill is passed. This would make a major difference in the quality of the water in the Hudson. I urge New York City to design this plant so that it will provide secondary treatment—for with this legislation the Federal Government can help.

Another major feature of this legislation is a provision that permits States and communities to prefinance the Federal share of sewage treatment construction projects. This provision states that all projects meeting Federal standards that are started after July 1, 1966, will qualify for Federal grants when funds are available. This provision does not guarantee that the funds will be available. But it does guarantee that a community and a State will not lose Federal funds because they act now. This provision is of major importance to those States, such as New York, that have offered to assist local communities in financing their new construction.

The bill also establishes a Federal loan fund to assist local communities in meeting their share of new project costs. This eliminates major financial barriers to a successful municipal sewage treatment program.

I am also pleased that this legislation incorporates Senator TYDINGS' bill, S. 3240, requiring a study of the importance of our salt marshes and estuaries and the effects of water pollution on these areas.

I cosponsored Senator TYDINGS' original bill because of my concern over the continuing destruction of our marshland and the related effect on our fisheries and wildlife.

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission pointed out in its most recent report that at least 70,000 acres of coastal marshland along the Atlantic Coast has been destroyed in the last 10 years. The President's Science Advisory Commission has also pointed out that 60 percent of the seafood taken from water surrounding the United States is dependent on coastal estuaries and marshland for their existence. If we destroy our wetlands, we will destroy our fisheries so that oysters, flounder, and fluke either disappear or become rare.

I have introduced a bill in the Senate aimed at the preservation of 16,000 acres of marshland on Long Island's south shore. This bill, S. 3271, may well provide a pattern for cooperative local-State-Federal protection of marshland. But we also need to know what pollutants threaten these marshlands and estuaries. We need to know which areas are now in danger. The provision of the bill authorizing $1 million for a study of our estuaries and marshland is therefore an important provision.

This legislation also speeds up the Federal research program on water pollution problems. Imaginative research may provide new answers to our sewage disposal problems, answers that can save large amounts of money. Economical closed-system waste disposal units for individuals houses may make it possible to eliminate collecting sewers and treatment plants in new communities. New chemical processes may reduce the cost of municipal sewage treatment plants. And an emphasis on pollution-free industrial processes may make it possible materially to reduce industrial pollution.

Important as this legislation is, there are several problems that it does not answer. It does not meet our lateral sewer needs. We now provide some funds for this purpose under the community facilities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. But a single county growing in population may need lateral sewers costing $5 to $10 million. The largest grant for lateral sewers that HUD has given for this purpose is $1½ million. The Community Facilities Administrator reports that as of June 23, 1966 it has received 4,033 inquiries about grants that total $2,352,000,000. Their total authorization is $100 million. This is a gap that we need to close.

We also have not yet met the problem of industrial pollution. We can only enforce water quality standards if we can help industries absorb the costs of treatment. It is easier, for example, to require that a new plant be built so that it does not violate local water quality standards. But it is harder to require an existing plant to maintain standards at a cost which may drive it out of business.

The new river basin approach authorized in this bill makes it possible to provide tax credits to existing plants that install new treatment facilities, river basin by river basin. In those river basins where the local communities are providing effective municipal treatment and water quality standards are enforced, it might be possible to grant tax credits to those industries willing to install new treatment facilities on existing plants.

We also need thoroughly to explore the possibility of building pollution treatment plants to service a number of industries, with payments by the industry according to the amount of pollution it discharges. This approach will be studied with research funds provided in this bill. Both this approach and the one discussed earlier deserve careful study.

In closing, I wish to compliment Chairman MUSKIE and his colleagues on the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. They have reported a strong bill which I am glad to support.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, once again the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, on which I have the privilege to serve under the able leadership of Senator MUSKIE and Senator BOGGS, has brought before the Senate a most important and far-reaching bill designed to further this Nation's battle against water pollution.

Fighting pollution, whether it be air or water pollution, is not an easy task, but not to take action where action is so clearly called for would be a dereliction of duty by Congress and a disservice to all Americans. Pollution is one of the great domestic issues facing our Nation, and it is a problem that increasingly plagues more and more of our communities and endangers the Nation's health. Because of my interest in and concern with the water pollution problem in this country, I was pleased to cosponsor S. 2947, which is before the Senate today.

The scarcity of water has tormented man down through many centuries. Today our water needs are great and growing. Tomorrow the demands for adequate water to supply industry and agriculture for our exploding population will be even greater. The world demand is expected to double before the end of the 20th century. It has been estimated that by 1980 water supplies in the United States will be inadequate to meet the water requirements of our population.

Scientists tell us that the earth's original supply of water is still in use. Little has been lost or added. The centuries-old hydrologic cycles of water continue today. It is therefore not the total world supply that is of concern to man but its management and distribution that will determine whether adequate water will be available.

The history of my State, Mr. President, shows a strong link between the development of the State and the development of its water resources. So we in California have long appreciated this problem and the 240-mile-long aqueduct canal in Los Angeles is just one of many examples of California's effort to overcome the unequal distribution of water.

Last year, Congress enacted important legislation designed to alleviate the water pollution control and abatement problem. Important as this action was, evidence gathered from hearings held in California and across the country by the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee indicated that we are not doing enough and that greater effort is needed to deal with this most serious national problem.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee made recommendations to further attack the water problem, and many of these recommendations are incorporated in S. 2947. Our subcommittee found that greater Federal assistance was needed to meet the costs of municipal sewage treatment construction between now and 1972. S. 2947 would help to answer the dire need of the many communities across the Nation by authorizing a 6-year Federal program of sewage treatment construction grants. As costly as this program would be, I am convinced it is necessary for the health, welfare, and future growth of the country.

We in the West have always been keenly aware that water is a critically important resource. The shortage experienced by the northeast section of our country last year has served to underscore the fact that the water problem is national in scope, that it must be faced, and faced now.

That is why I feel that there is no more important subject than that of water. As the major substance of all living things, water is truly an extraordinary substance. It is essential for the transportation of man's commerce, for providing man with essential power for irrigation of his farms and, yes, for the sustaining of life itself.

The poet Byron once said:

> Til taught by pain, men really know not what good water is worth.

It is the duty of the Congress, the States, the local communities, and industry to see if the "pain" of inadequate water supplies can be avoided by proper and prudent planning.

The passage of S. 2947 today, Mr. President, will contribute to that end. Enactment of S. 2947 will again underscore the determination of the American people and of the Congress that the byproducts of modern society will not be permitted to despoil our natural resources, and that the genius and reasonableness of man will enable us to overcome the pollution problem, thus permitting our citizens to enjoy these precious natural resources.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], for the effective manner in which he has managed the bill now before the Senate.

This bill represents a further recognition by the Senate of the tremendous need for financial assistance to communities which are trying to clean up their own water pollution. The job of cleaning up our Nation's rivers must be accelerated; and this can be done only through additional Federal and State financial help. Our cities cannot be left to bear the full cost of these expensive treatment facilities which are of benefit to entire regions.

My State of New Hampshire contains the headwaters of six interstate river basins. We know firsthand the expense of installing municipal treatment plants. Under our Governor, John W. King, New Hampshire has played a leading role among the States in financial support to municipalities for controlling water pollution. Our New Hampshire communities are looking forward to the additional funds for which their State's efforts have qualified them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is detained on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Gruening
Hayden
McGee
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Smathers

So the bill (S. 2947) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, by unanimously agreeing to expand the Government's attack on water pollution, the Senate accorded the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] an outstanding tribute. I barely need add that the tribute was highly deserved. I join with the many Senators who commended Senator MUSKIE for the exceptional manner in which he brought this measure to its successful disposition. In committee and on the floor of the Senate today, his strong support, his clear, convincing advocacy, and his effective leadership assured the Senate's overwhelming approval.

Furthermore, with the passage of the clean air measure yesterday, followed by the antiwater pollution proposal today, Senator MUSKIE has indeed brought great distinction to his Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee. Clearly, all Americans are deeply grateful for his singular devotion to the solution of this grave and most significant problem.

So, too, has the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], devoted his great talent and energy to this problem. And of course he must share the credit for today's success. His vigorous support was essential to this outstanding victory.

The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], similarly is to be commended for his strong and articulate advocacy. Long a supporter of effective legislation in this vital area, his backing today served immensely to achieve an overwhelming endorsement. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] likewise contributed to the success both with outstanding support and gracious cooperation. The same may be said of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and other Senators who joined to assure unanimous passage.

Once again, I wish to praise Senator MUSKIE and his subcommittee for a job well done. Moreover, I praise the entire Senate. The achievement is surely a great tribute to this body.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I wanted the Senate to be perfectly clear as to the effect of the unanimous-consent request. Did I understand the Senator to say the Senate would convene at 11 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1335, H.R. 14596.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the committee on appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have had several inquiries from Senators as to whether I anticipate any votes on the agriculture appropriation bill tonight. I do not. I intend to deliver my explanatory statement on the bill and to make some procedural motions. I will also be happy to yield to any other Members who have statements or questions on this subject.

Mr. President, we now have under consideration H.R. 14596, the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for 1967. In summary, the amount of the bill, as recommended by the committee, totals $7,051,543,300, a net increase of $175,516,300 over the House bill, and is $28,905,300 over the budget estimates, and $670,094,800 over the appropriations for fiscal year 1966.

The increases over the House recommended by the committee result in a net increase of $159,207,300 for general activities of the Department. The House bill proposed the use of section 32 funds for amounts of $53 million for the special milk program, and $150 million for the food stamp program, as recommended in the budget estimates. Neither of these uses are in accordance with the purpose of section 32 authorization. The committee has stricken them from the bill and included adequate amounts by direct appropriation from general revenue funds.

There are several other increases and decreases involved in titles I and II of the bill to finance the general activities of the Department. The major increase in appropriations over 1966 is for the reimbursement of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for realized net losses. On this item the appropriation recommended is $3,555,855,000, the budget estimate, and an increase of $55,855,000 over the House. The appropriation of this amount for this purpose will fully restore the amounts of prior year losses except for a balance of $1,057 million for fiscal year 1961. It is expected that the budget estimate for next year will include a request for this amount as well as for the losses incurred during fiscal 1966.

I depart from my prepared text long enough to say we appreciate the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture in seeking to meet the requests of the Senate which have been to the effect that deficits in the Commodity Credit Corporation be caught up with as soon as possible. The action recommended by the committee, which is the same as recommended by the Budget Bureau, will see that all deficits are appropriated for except for 1961, which I have mentioned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I congratulate the manager of the bill on the action which his committee has taken to clear up the outstanding deficits. I think it should have been done before. We recognize that these deficits have been created, and this is a definite step toward the elimination of the deficits. I am glad to see it being done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. He has been one of the Senators who has been interested in seeing that these deficits be caught up with and that the Commodity Credit Corporation operate on a balanced budget, or at least have its deficit for the last year restored by each recurring appropriation bill.

The details of the increases and decreases made by the committee over and under the budget estimates and the comparative amounts recommended in the bill as passed by the other body are described in Committee Report No. 1370 accompanying the bill, and in my statement I will only deal with a few items.

The committee report contains 69 pages, and I realize it would take too much of the time of the Senate to go into details at this time.

The budget estimates transmitted to the Congress for fiscal 1967 recommended sharp decreases in traditional and vitally important agricultural and consumer benefit programs.

I refer specifically to the budget reductions affecting the Federal research program and cooperative control programs; the payments to States for research grants under the Hatch Act; the payments to States for cooperative extension under the Smith-Lever Act; the special milk program; the school lunch program; the advance authorization for the agricultural conservation program; and for loan authorizations of the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. President, in regard to these items, I request that a table showing the amounts of the 1966 appropriation; the budget estimate for 1967; the House bill appropriation; and the recommendations by the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of major items showing comparisons between appropriations for fiscal year 1966, estimates for 1967, House bill and Senate subcommittee recommendations

Item	Appropriations 1966	Estimate, 1967	House bill	Recommendation of Senate committee
Agricultural Research Service:				
Research funds	$144,059,000	$132,980,000	$145,673,000	$148,844,600
Plant and animal diseases and pest control programs	75,547,000	69,748,000	76,764,000	81,498,200
Cooperative State Research Service: Hatch Act payments	48,113,000	39,613,000	48,113,000	53,113,000
Extension Service:				
Smith-Lever for cooperative extension payments	75,536,000	75,917,500	75,917,500	78,917,500
Redirection from formula to nonformula of $9,600,000 was proposed in the budget and denied by the House and Senate subcommittee.				
Consumer and Marketing Service:				
Special milk program	103,000,000	21,000,000	103,000,000	105,000,000
School lunch program	202,000,000	183,000,000	202,000,000	212,000,000
Agricultural conservation authorization	(220,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)
REA authorizations:				
Electrification program	(365,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(365,000,000)	(375,000,000)
Telephone program	(97,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(97,000,000)	(117,000,000)
Farmers Home Administration (direct loan account): Farm operating loans	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(350,000,000)

today. It is therefore not the total world supply that is of concern to man but its management and distribution that will determine whether adequate water will be available.

The history of my State, Mr. President, shows a strong link between the development of the State and the development of its water resources. So we in California have long appreciated this problem and the 240-mile-long aqueduct canal in Los Angeles is just one of many examples of California's effort to overcome the unequal distribution of water.

Last year, Congress enacted important legislation designed to alleviate the water pollution control and abatement problem. Important as this action was, evidence gathered from hearings held in California and across the country by the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee indicated that we are not doing enough and that greater effort is needed to deal with this most serious national problem.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee made recommendations to further attack the water problem, and many of these recommendations are incorporated in S. 2947. Our subcommittee found that greater Federal assistance was needed to meet the costs of municipal sewage treatment construction between now and 1972. S. 2947 would help to answer the dire need of the many communities across the Nation by authorizing a 6-year Federal program of sewage treatment construction grants. As costly as this program would be, I am convinced it is necessary for the health, welfare, and future growth of the country.

We in the West have always been keenly aware that water is a critically important resource. The shortage experienced by the northeast section of our country last year has served to underscore the fact that the water problem is national in scope, that it must be faced, and faced now.

That is why I feel that there is no more important subject than that of water. As the major substance of all living things, water is truly an extraordinary substance. It is essential for the transportation of man's commerce, for providing man with essential power for irrigation of his farms and, yes, for the sustaining of life itself.

The poet Byron once said:

> Til taught by pain, men really know not what good water is worth.

It is the duty of the Congress, the States, the local communities, and industry to see if the "pain" of inadequate water supplies can be avoided by proper and prudent planning.

The passage of S. 2947 today, Mr. President, will contribute to that end. Enactment of S. 2947 will again underscore the determination of the American people and of the Congress that the byproducts of modern society will not be permitted to despoil our natural resources, and that the genius and reasonableness of man will enable us to overcome the pollution problem, thus permitting our citizens to enjoy these precious natural resources.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], for the effective manner in which he has managed the bill now before the Senate.

This bill represents a further recognition by the Senate of the tremendous need for financial assistance to communities which are trying to clean up their own water pollution. The job of cleaning up our Nation's rivers must be accelerated; and this can be done only through additional Federal and State financial help. Our cities cannot be left to bear the full cost of these expensive treatment facilities which are of benefit to entire regions.

My State of New Hampshire contains the headwaters of six interstate river basins. We know firsthand the expense of installing municipal treatment plants. Under our Governor, John W. King, New Hampshire has played a leading role among the States in financial support to municipalities for controlling water pollution. Our New Hampshire communities are looking forward to the additional funds for which their State's efforts have qualified them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is detained on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Gruening
Hayden
McGee
Robertson
Scott
Simpson
Smathers

So the bill (S. 2947) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, by unanimously agreeing to expand the Government's attack on water pollution, the Senate accorded the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] an outstanding tribute. I barely need add that the tribute was highly deserved. I join with the many Senators who commended Senator Muskie for the exceptional manner in which he brought this measure to its successful disposition. In committee and on the floor of the Senate today, his strong support, his clear, convincing advocacy, and his effective leadership assured the Senate's overwhelming approval.

Furthermore, with the passage of the clean air measure yesterday, followed by the antiwater pollution proposal today, Senator Muskie has indeed brought great distinction to his Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee. Clearly, all Americans are deeply grateful for his singular devotion to the solution of this grave and most significant problem.

So, too, has the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], devoted his great talent and energy to this problem. And of course he must share the credit for today's success. His vigorous support was essential to this outstanding victory.

The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], similarly is to be commended for his strong and articulate advocacy. Long a supporter of effective legislation in this vital area, his backing today served immensely to achieve an overwhelming endorsement. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] likewise contributed to the success both with outstanding support and gracious cooperation. The same may be said of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and other Senators who joined to assure unanimous passage.

Once again, I wish to praise Senator Muskie and his subcommittee for a job well done. Moreover, I praise the entire Senate. The achievement is surely a great tribute to this body.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I wanted the Senate to be perfectly clear as to the effect of the unanimous-consent request. Did I understand the Senator to say the Senate would convene at 11 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1335, H.R. 14596.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the committee on appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have had several inquiries from Senators as to whether I anticipate any votes on the agriculture appropriation bill tonight. I do not. I intend to deliver my explanatory statement on the bill and to make some procedural motions. I will also be happy to yield to any other Members who have statements or questions on this subject.

Mr. President, we now have under consideration H.R. 14596, the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for 1967. In summary, the amount of the bill, as recommended by the committee, totals $7,051,543,300, a net increase of $175,516,300 over the House bill, and is $28,905,300 over the budget estimates, and $670,094,800 over the appropriations for fiscal year 1966.

The increases over the House recommended by the committee result in a net increase of $159,207,300 for general activities of the Department. The House bill proposed the use of section 32 funds for amounts of $53 million for the special milk program, and $150 million for the food stamp program, as recommended in the budget estimates. Neither of these uses are in accordance with the purpose of section 32 authorization. The committee has stricken them from the bill and included adequate amounts by direct appropriation from general revenue funds.

There are several other increases and decreases involved in titles I and II of the bill to finance the general activities of the Department. The major increase in appropriations over 1966 is for the reimbursement of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for realized net losses. On this item the appropriation recommended is $3,555,855,000, the budget estimate, and an increase of $55,855,000 over the House. The appropriation of this amount for this purpose will fully restore the amounts of prior year losses except for a balance of $1,057 million for fiscal year 1961. It is expected that the budget estimate for next year will include a request for this amount as well as for the losses incurred during fiscal 1966.

I depart from my prepared text long enough to say we appreciate the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture in seeking to meet the requests of the Senate which have been to the effect that deficits in the Commodity Credit Corporation be caught up with as soon as possible. The action recommended by the committee, which is the same as recommended by the Budget Bureau, will see that all deficits are appropriated for except for 1961, which I have mentioned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I congratulate the manager of the bill on the action which his committee has taken to clear up the outstanding deficits. I think it should have been done before. We recognize that these deficits have been created, and this is a definite step toward the elimination of the deficits. I am glad to see it being done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. He has been one of the Senators who has been interested in seeing that these deficits be caught up with and that the Commodity Credit Corporation operate on a balanced budget, or at least have its deficit for the last year restored by each recurring appropriation bill.

The details of the increases and decreases made by the committee over and under the budget estimates and the comparative amounts recommended in the bill as passed by the other body are described in Committee Report No. 1370 accompanying the bill, and in my statement I will only deal with a few items.

The committee report contains 69 pages, and I realize it would take too much of the time of the Senate to go into details at this time.

The budget estimates transmitted to the Congress for fiscal 1967 recommended sharp decreases in traditional and vitally important agricultural and consumer benefit programs.

I refer specifically to the budget reductions affecting the Federal research program and cooperative control programs; the payments to States for research grants under the Hatch Act; the payments to States for cooperative extension under the Smith-Lever Act; the special milk program; the school lunch program; the advance authorization for the agricultural conservation program; and for loan authorizations of the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. President, in regard to these items, I request that a table showing the amounts of the 1966 appropriation; the budget estimate for 1967; the House bill appropriation; and the recommendations by the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of major items showing comparisons between appropriations for fiscal year 1966, estimates for 1967, House bill and Senate subcommittee recommendations

Item	Appropriations 1966	Estimate, 1967	House bill	Recommendation of Senate committee
Agricultural Research Service:				
Research funds	$144,059,000	$132,980,000	$145,673,000	$148,844,600
Plant and animal diseases and pest control programs	75,547,000	69,748,000	76,764,000	81,498,200
Cooperative State Research Service: Hatch Act payments	48,113,000	39,613,000	48,113,000	53,113,000
Extension Service:				
Smith-Lever for cooperative extension payments	75,536,000	75,917,500	75,917,500	78,917,500
Redirection from formula to nonformula of $9,600,000 was proposed in the budget and denied by the House and Senate subcommittee.				
Consumer and Marketing Service:				
Special milk program	103,000,000	21,000,000	103,000,000	105,000,000
School lunch program	202,000,000	183,000,000	202,000,000	212,000,000
Agricultural conservation authorization	(220,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)
REA authorizations:				
Electrification program	(365,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(365,000,000)	(375,000,000)
Telephone program	(97,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(97,000,000)	(117,000,000)
Farmers Home Administration (direct loan account): Farm operating loans	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(350,000,000)

POULTRY INSPECTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also request that a letter I received from the Secretary of Agriculture, dated May 18, 1966, dealing with administration of the meat and poultry inspection programs be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the statement in the committee report (No. 1370) on this subject taken from pages 33 and 34 of the report.

There being no objection, the letter and the excerpt from the committee report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: My attention has been called to the fact that a number of poultry processors have recently been contacting their congressional representatives regarding organizational actions we have taken affecting the poultry inspection service. In view of my earlier conversations with you on this matter, I believe it would be helpful to provide you with details of these actions in order to avoid any misunderstanding as to their purpose and impact.

At the time the meat inspection service was transferred from the Agricultural Research Service to the Consumer and Marketing Service it became apparent that certain functions of a highly technical nature were being conducted in both services with separate but similar technical staffs. For example, both services were maintaining separate laboratories for similar analytical work. Both had staffs reviewing and approving labels. Approval of plant facilities and sanitation requirements were being reviewed and approved by separate engineers, two separate kitchens for testing products were being maintained and both services maintained separate staffs for compliance and surveillance purposes in the field. The units responsible for these important technical functions supplemented the major inspection job and were not being coordinated under sufficiently strong and appropriate leadership.

After reviewing this situation, we determined that these services had a common objective, and could be combined as separate units with common facilities. Further, we felt they should be placed under competent and vigorous leadership to assure more adequate assistance to the inspection services as well as to improve and expand consumer protection. A Technical Services Division was established to carry out functions such as label approval, laboratory analysis, equipment, plant facilities and sanitation and standards for product ingredient. The Division acts as a service unit to both the poultry and meat inspection services. The Director of this Division reports to the Deputy Administrator for Consumer Protection in the Office of the Administrator, an arrangement which assures that these important areas will be given adequate attention and be made uniform for both poultry and meat inspection.

We also combined into one staff unit the compliance and surveillance force. This allows wider coverage in the field to prevent uninspected poultry and meat products from moving in interstate commerce to the detriment of the processing industry as well as to consumers.

Except for these two actions the poultry inspection service remains separate and intact in both Washington and the field. It continues under the direction of the Director of the Poultry Division. Similarly, the various other service programs performed by that Division, such as market news, grading, and surplus removal continue to operate as they have in the past. Let me emphasize that of the more than 1,600 full time staff required to carry out the poultry inspection service, only 27 technical and support personnel were transferred to the Technical Services Division. Similarly, only six field personnel engaged in compliance surveillance work were transferred from the Poultry Division.

We recognize the deep concern of many people in the poultry industry and we have emphasized that in establishing the Technical Services Division, the day-to-day poultry inspection functions would not be disturbed nor would the excellent line of communication between plant operators and the service be impaired in any manner. It is our judgment that in setting up the Technical Services Division, we can be more responsive to the ever-growing problems confronting the poultry industry in terms of residues, additives, disease and condemnations. In the overall, the entire inspection service can be improved to the benefit of the industry as well as to the consumer without increasing the cost to taxpayers.

Concise organizational charts showing the organizational structure of the Poultry Division and meat inspection service before and after organizational changes are attached.

I welcome the opportunity to comment on this matter, for I believe the actions taken are constructive and progressive. In no sense have these actions been taken as a means of subjugating poultry inspection to meat inspection. I fully appreciate the competitive nature of these products and the Department is and will remain sensitive to this fact. It is our desire to provide consumers with the protection intended by the mandatory legislation providing for both services and to do so efficiently, effectively and in cooperation with the two great industries involved.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Attachments.

An appropriation of $41,939,000 is recommended for administration of meat inspection. This is the amount of the budget estimate, an increase of $3,347,000 over 1966 and $347,000 over the amount carried in the House bill. The need for increased appropriations arises from the continued dispersion of packing plants away from major cities, together with the increase in numbers of packing and further processing plants under inspection.

For the administration of the Poultry Products Inspection Act, $19,330,800 is recommended. This is $1,344,000 over 1966, the amount of the estimates and $344,000 over the House bill.

The Committee had received a request to amend the bill to require that no activities in connection with the administration of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 could be merged with similar type activities in connection with the administration of the Meat Inspection Act.

The Committee has carefully considered this proposal, as well as a letter, received from the Secretary of Agriculture under date of May 18, 1966. The Secretary describes the organizational changes that he has approved since the transfer of meat inspection to the Consumer and Marketing Service and states that these changes were designed solely to improve common service activities of both inspection programs. The letter from the Secretary further asserts that day-to-day inspection functions of mandatory poultry inspection would not be changed by the realignment of common service activities announced last December 7.

The Committee expects the Secretary and the Department to abide by the statements contained in the letter and expects the Department to maintain independent supervisory inspection standards where required and separate working level inspection standards and services for these two important industries.

Mr. HOLLAND. In essence, the committee expects the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain independent supervisory and plant inspection standards and supervision for these two important program activities.

This concludes my brief statement on the bill. As previously stated, the committee report deals in detail with each appropriation item and major activity thereunder.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware. May I postpone yielding to him for a moment? The distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], is on the floor, and he may have something he wishes to add to my general statement before we get into colloquy, which is what I assume the Senator from Delaware had in mind at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments at this time.

Mr. President, the committee studied this bill very carefully, and I think exacted every possible economy. The bill is not nearly as large as some people seem to think, and much of it is not for agricultural purposes.

For example, Mr. President, $1,617 million of the total amount goes to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of programs carried on under Public Law 480. These programs include famine relief, the cost of giving wheat to India, for example, in return for their currencies which have little value and other portions of the food for peace or Public Law 480 program. This item alone makes up a large part of the bill.

The increases which we have made are, I think, well justified, and I think will meet with the approval of Congress. The special milk program, for example, was increased from the budget estimate of $21 million to $106 million, and the committee increased funds for the school lunch program from $183 million to $212 million.

The agricultural conservation program, a very fine soil conservation program, was increased from $100 million to $220 million. Then there is the rural electrification program, the budget estimate for which was $220 million—the Senate figure is $375 million. Loan funds for the rural telephone program were increased from the Bureau of the Budget request of $85 million to $117 million.

The authorization for operating loans to farmers through the Farmers Home Administration was increased from $300 million to $350 million.

These loan programs have done a great deal to strengthen and advance agriculture. In the case of REA and RTA loans, the repayment record has always been almost 100 percent. The repayment record on the FHA operating loans is over 95 percent despite the fact that these loans are only made to farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere.

Mr. President, these are some of the finest programs our Federal Government has—far better than most of the Great Society programs—and their cost is very little. The items which I have mentioned account for most of the increases in this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the comments made by my distinguished fellow Senator, and wish to say that his help, in the study and marking up of this important bill, was simply indispensable.

He has mentioned the amount of work done by the committee. I call attention to the fact, at this time, that the printed hearings, consisting of 2,018 pages of testimony, are now on the desk of each Senator. This is a good indication of the amount of work involved in considering a bill of this magnitude. I wish to express my very great appreciation to the Senator from North Dakota for his efforts.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for his gracious comments. The chairman was present at all of those hearings; I was not able to attend quite all of them. They were exhaustive hearings, and the chairman insisted on obtaining the fullest possible information from all of the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture, as well as the greatest possible amount of information from outside witnesses.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my understanding friend for his gracious comment.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who has been particularly interested, always, in the poultry business and everything affecting it, has a series of questions which he wishes to ask relative to the poultry inspection service. I am happy to yield to him for that purpose at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for yielding. I say to the Senator, I believe we understand these matters, but to make clear for the RECORD the legislative background, I would like to ask these questions.

First, I ask for clarification of the language in the committee report dealing with the reorganization of certain poultry inspection services and their consolidation with common services performed as respects the red meat inspection. It is my understanding that on December 7, 1965, the Department of Agriculture created a Technical Services Division which would serve as a supporting arm to perform various services for the Meat Inspection Division and the Poultry Division. Is this understanding correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, that understanding is correct. The Department sought only to combine in one division of the Consumer and Marketing Service those technical services common to both red meat and poultry, not to merge policymaking functions in the newly created agency. On the basis of this information, we appropriated funds for the Department's reorganization.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. Is it accurate, therefore, to conclude that the Technical Services Division will operate solely as a service unit to provide facilities and technology needed by the other Divisions and that it will not usurp any of the policymaking, supervisory or line functions performed by the Meat Inspection and Poultry Divisions prior to the December 7 reorganization?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For example, would those policy responsibilities relative to poultry inspection and grading criteria which were exercised by the Poultry Division prior to the December 7 announcement continue to be exercised by it?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, they would still be consulted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it therefore correct to assume that in approving plant blueprints and product labels, in conducting laboratory work, and in implementing its other responsibilities, the Technical Services Division will not only confer with but be governed by the policy standards established by the Meat Inspection and Poultry Divisions to the same degree as these divisions exercised such control prior to the reorganization?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Department's December 7 announcement also announced the creation of a Program Appraisal Staff. I have been informed that the responsibility of this group will primarily be to enhance vigilance regarding red meat and poultry products which have been shipped in interstate commerce in violation of the governing statutes. Is it correct to conclude, from this information that the Program Appraisal Staff will not be charged with inspecting or otherwise supervising the line inspection work performed now and prior to December 7 by the divisions charged with red meat and poultry inspection?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Delaware is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his cooperation in establishing the record.

I have a couple of questions in line with another subject contained in the bill.

I have received over the past 2 months numerous complaints from the poultry producers in my State and from other areas of the country regarding losses which they have suffered by using contaminated poultry vaccine. It was my understanding that this vaccine was supposed to be tested and approved by the Department of Agriculture before being released for general use. Has the committee taken any action in this bill which will improve the administration of the Virus Serum Toxin Act, and provide for more thorough testing of these poultry biologics?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. The committee recommended an increase of $500,000 for improving the administration of this program. This will provide for increased sampling and testing of these biologics, and also provide additional funds for stricter enforcement. In addition, we have requested the Department to review this program and report to the committee next year on needed improvements.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Have any funds been recommended for the eradication and control of the disease mycoplasma gallisepticum, which has been spread through previously clean flocks by the use of this contaminated vaccine?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. We included $150,000 in additional funds to step up the eradication of this particular disease. Before we did that, we received general complaints and petitions from the poultry producers all over the Nation that steps be taken along that line. We are very hopeful that these steps will prove to be effective.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the chairman for his cooperation, and I thank the committee for their consideration of these most important functions. I strongly support their decision.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware. I congratulate him on his always careful following of the problems of the poultry industry and other industries in his role as the safeguarder of the poultry producers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as amended, be considered as original text, and that no points of order shall be considered as having been waived by this action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 3, line 13, after "$100", to strike out "$120,673,000" and insert "$123,844,600"; in line 17, after the word "which", to strike out "$10,619,000" and insert "$11,869,000"; in line 20, after the word "and", to strike out "$5,401,300" and insert "$3,965,700"; and, on page 4, line 1, after "(21 U.S.C. 113a) :", to insert "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to formulate a budget estimate for fiscal 1968 of more than $15,000,000 for research to be financed by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, and pursuant to Public Law 88–25;".

On page 4, line 13, after "(21 U.S.C. 114b–c)", to strike out "$76,764,000" and insert "$81,498,200", and, in line 20, after the words "per centum", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That $100,000 of the amount appropriated by this paragraph shall remain available until expended for the planning of facilities without regard to limitations placed herein".

On page 6, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000".

On page 7, line 5, after the word "including", to strike out "$48,113,000" and insert "$53,113,000"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000"; in line 18, after the word "and", to strike out "$304,000" and insert "$317,000"; and, on page 8, line 4, after the word "all", to strike out "$55,227,000" and insert "$60,740,000".

On page 8, line 14, after the word "Act", to strike out "$74,347,500" and insert "$77,347,500 (except $2,800,000 which may be distributed under section 3(d) of the Act)", and, in line 18, after the word "all", to strike out "$75,917,500" and insert "$78,918,500".

On page 12, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "$67,020,000" and insert "$70,000,000".

On page 13, line 16, after "(16 U.S.C. 590p)", to strike out "$16,112,000" and insert "$18,500,000".

On page 14, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$4,347,000" and insert "$4,574,000".

On page 15, line 3, after the word "products", to strike out "$12,032,000" and insert "$12,182,000".

On page 15, line 25, after the word "laws" to strike out "$13,272,000" and insert "$13,575,000".

On page 16, line 24, after "1946", to strike out "$82,757,000" and insert "$83,581,000".

On page 17, line 9, after "(7 U.S.C. 1446, note)", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$105,000,000", and, in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and in addition $53,000,000 shall be transferred from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), and merged with this appropriation."

On page 17, line 16, after "(42 U.S.C. 1751–1760)", to strike out "$157,000,000" and insert "$167,000,000".

On page 18, line 5, after "1964", to strike out "$150,000,000, to be provided from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c)" and insert "$100,000,000, and in addition $25,000,000 appropriated under this head in Public Law 89–316, approved November 2, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided,* That no funds available in this Act shall be used to plan or formulate a food stamp program for fiscal 1968 to be financed in whole or in part from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c)".

On page 19, line 14, after "(7 U.S.C. 1766)", to strike out "$21,088,000" and insert "$21,349,000".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "$128,558,000" and insert "$130,424,500", and, in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,803,600" and insert "$77,545,000".

On page 24, line 23, after "1965", to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$3,000,000, and in addition $1,375,000 appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation".

On page 25, line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$10,000,000".

On page 25, line 13, after the word "Corporation", to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000".

On page 26, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$637,000" and insert "$2,500,000".

On page 27, line 8, after "(5 U.S.C. 574)," to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,604,000".

On page 27, line 19, after the word "Department", to strike out "$1,826,000" and insert "$1,851,000", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$537,000", and insert "$562,000".

On page 28, line 17, after the word "Library," to strike out "$2,147,000", and insert "$2,501,000:".

On page 30, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "$365,000,000", and insert "$375,000,000,"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which $72,500,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program;"; in line 18, after the word "programs," to strike out "$97,000,000", and insert "$117,000,000,"; and in line 19, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which $6,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and condtions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural telephone program.".

On page 31, line 7, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)," to strike out "$12,202,000", and insert "$12,302,000.".

On page 31, line 16, after the word "loans," to strike out "$300,000,000", and insert "$350,000,000," and in line 17, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which $50,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be used only to the extent required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly conduct of the loan program.".

On page 32, line 7, after the word "assistance", to strike out "to public nonprofit organizations".

On page 33, line 1, after "(40 U.S.C. 440–444);" to strike out "$51,057,000", and insert "$51,000,000,".

On page 34, line 5, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$8,342,000", and insert "$8,546,000.".

On page 34, line 8, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$4,150,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

On page 34, line 22, after "(15 U.S.C. 713a–11, 713a–12)," to strike out "$3,500,000,000", and insert "$3,555,855,000", and in line 23, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out ": *Provided,* That no funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or administer programs for the sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to titles I or IV of Public Law 480, 83rd Congress, as amended, to any nation which sells or furnishes or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to North Vietnam any equipment, materials or commodities, as long as North Vietnam is governed by a Communist regime" and insert ": *Provided,* That unless the President determines that the national interest requires otherwise, no funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or administer programs for the sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to titles I or IV of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, to any nation which sells or furnishes or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to North Vietnam any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as hostilities are in progress in Vietnam.".

At the top of page 37, to strike out:

"INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

"For expenses during fiscal year 1967 and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1641–1642), or commodity export authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, $40,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 37, line 20, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$600,000".

On page 38, line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "thirty-four".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, during the meeting of the full committee yesterday, a matter arose on which we were unable to act because the Bureau of the Budget had not submitted an estimate at the time, but I was authorized by the unanimous vote of the full committee to offer a certain amendment on the floor at this time provided a supplemental budget item was received in time for presentation. We understood the budget estimate was in the course of preparation.

On that basis I shall ask that the Senate agree to an amendment which would authorize $300,000 to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture to conduct a referendum which must be held before the recently passed bill can become operative. That is the bill by which a tax or contribution of $1 per bale is required on all cotton produced, with certain conditions laid down by that bill, for the purpose of promoting the sale and greater use of cotton.

The committee was unanimous in its authorization that the amendment be offered as a committee amendment if the supplemental item were received in time. That item has been received. I ask unanimous consent that the supplemental budget request be printed at this point in the Record as part of my statement.

There being no objection, the supplemental budget request was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President of the Senate.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal years 1967 in the amount of $300,000 for the Department of Agriculture.

The details of this amendment, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Estimate No. S. Doc. 98
89th Congress, Second Session

Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

The President,
The White House.

Sir: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $300,000 for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

Department of Agriculture

Consumer and Marketing Service

Budget appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
128	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory program..	$86,265,000	$300,000	$86,565,000

This proposed amendment provides funds to initiate work under the Cotton Research and Promotion Act of 1966 recently enacted by the Congress. This legislation authorizes a cotton research and promotion program with funds collected from cotton producers by assessing them $1 per bale of cotton produced and marketed. The necessary public hearings, producer referendum and establishment of regulations will take about 10 months. Therefore, in order to be ready to implement the Act at the start of the crop year next June, it is necessary to begin the preliminary steps as soon as possible.

I recommend that the foregoing amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1967 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated. I ask that the amendment be considered, and agreed to as a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 24, strike out "$83,581,000", and insert "$83,881,000".

Mr. HOLLAND. The addition of the $300,000 is for the purpose covered by the supplemental budget item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless someone has questions to propound at this time or has remarks of his own that he wishes to make on the bill, it is my purpose to suggest that the debate go over until tomorrow. At that time we will probably consider some controversial items which will require some discussion and perhaps some votes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to particularly commend the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has handled this bill with singular ability and competence. Senator HOLLAND not only distinguishes himself by his efficiency and initiative in his handling of these technical and complicated matters, but his tact and diplomacy enable him to handle even the most thorny issues with facility. I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to him and to the other members of this subcommittee for a job well done.

It is particularly gratifying to see several items included in this legislation which will be of particular value to the farmers in South Carolina, as well as in other parts of the country. Certain of our farmers have experienced long delays in getting harmful agricultural insects properly identified by the Department of Agriculture. In some instances, these delays resulted in a major portion of the crop being lost before corrective measures could be taken. This present bill includes an increase in the appropriation, which I requested, for this agricultural service that will accelerate and improve the identification process.

The Santee River basin is a most important economic area in the State of South Carolina, and, although we are blessed with water as an abundant natural resource, a planning survey has been needed for some time in this river basin to plan for the conservation and efficient use of this water resource in years to come. Under the appropriation increase authorized by this bill, it will now be possible to start this needed survey.

I have long supported soil conservation and watershed programs as a needed protection of our natural resources. It is pleasing to me that a regional soil conservation district, formed in the lower part of my State, will be able to proceed with its forward-looking plans in soil and water conservation because of this bill. This cooperative district has applied for matching funds for important soil conservation measures, which should now be available due to the increase in the resource conservation and development item contained in the bill. This type service will benefit future generations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Carolina, not only for his courtesy, but also for his more than gracious reference to the Senator from Florida and to his associates on the subcommittee and on the full committee. We are grateful for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STATEMENT ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT OF THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my vote was cast yesterday against the conference report on the military procurement bill because the bill represents another installment on foreign policy by military power. We have reached the stage where we vote billions for military force without attention to the uses to which it will be put.

And as our military power is increased, it becomes easier and more tempting to use it anywhere and everywhere a problem for the United States arises.

Through these vast military expenditures, we are substituting force for foreign policy. I think it is time we took a long pause and developed a foreign policy to which our military establishment would be oriented. We are proceeding the other way around. We profess to be aghast when the Chinese say that all power comes from the barrel of a gun, but we are the nation acting on that premise. It was of deep regret to me that this huge hardware procurement was tied in with compensation for members of the Armed Forces. The two should have been considered separately.

I favored the military pay raise. I have favored and supported extensive benefits not only for servicemen, but for veterans. With the exception of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I do not know of any member of this body who labored longer and harder than I to restore the benefits of the GI bill to men who served after 1955. On June 30, I cosponsored with Senator MONTOYA, of New Mexico, S. 3580, providing for additional readjustment assistance for Vietnam veterans.

This is not a question of providing the best in compensation and benefits for our military people.

Mr. President, I shall shortly introduce a bill that not only would expand the provisions of the GI bill, but also would provide better compensation by way of benefits to the survivors of American men who are being killed in an unconstitutional and unjustifiable war in Vietnam. For the men that survive and are wounded, my bill would provide additional benefits to those that now accrue to them, because in my judgment we owe a great debt to the men who are being sacrificed, either by loss of life or limb, to carry on the U.S. outlawry in southeast Asia in an undeclared war.

However, the issue in the bill that was passed by the Senate yesterday, and to which I was the sole dissenter, is in the nature and direction of our military power, in how it will be used.

In my opinion, we are leaning more and more upon the gun barrel and the bayonet in world affairs.

The Presidential semantics last night was fine. But they bear no relationship to his foreign policy toward Asia. By our actions, the United States has proved we do not believe in partnership with Asia. In practice, we believe that Asia must conform to the American view of how Asia's affairs should be arranged. We intend to do business with Asia on our terms, and our terms will be enforced with military power.

I am satisfied that history will record that all the talk of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense about seeking and negotiating peace in Asia really rests upon the major premise that our enemies in Asia must surrender first. We are in favor of negotiations if we can get a surrender, but this administration has not demonstrated that it is not insisting on a surrender before it reaches a negotiation.

Mr. President, let us face it: We cannot negotiate on a bilateral basis with any country in Asia with which we are now engaged in an undeclared war. That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has been pleading for more than 3 years that we face up to the fact that any settlement in Asia must be on a multilateral basis, with the United States and South Vietnam on one side of the negotiating table, North Vietnam and the Vietcong and probably Red China on the other side, and noncombatant nations sitting at the head of the table to direct the course of a peace settlement.

What a pity that the same President who talks of a lasting peace that can only come about through "full participation by all nations in an international community under law" continues to ignore the United Nations Charter with respect to American obligations under it.

Oh, yes, it can be said that the administration has submitted a resolution to the Security Council. But the ugly reality is, Mr. President, that this administration has conducted itself on a pro forma basis in the United Nations in respect to that resolution, for our President has not attempted to use the influence of his office to try to lead the United Nations to a consideration of that resolution.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon on several occasions, from this desk, has urged that the President go to New York City and make a speech to the world, to the Security Council, or to the General Assembly, calling upon the United Nations to lead the world to peace in Asia, by taking complete jurisdiction over the threat to the peace in Asia, which means taking jurisdiction over American participation in warmaking in Asia, as well as the participation of our enemy.

What a pity that the semantics of the White House are used to cover up the failure of the United States to abide by the Geneva agreement of 1954 for Indochina, for we did as much as any other nation in the world to destroy the solution for Indochina that was worked out at that Conference.

What the President said in his speech last night has no relationship to his actual policy in Asia. The possibility of "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies," which he termed vital to peace, is being pushed further and further into the dim future by the President's war policy in Asia. One can only conclude that this administration thinks the way to reconcile is to destroy first.

Surely, the possibility of any reconciliation with China will require the removal of American military power from her doorstep. Or do we believe that everyone but the United States will bargain and become reconciled with others under threat of destruction?

About one thing the President was right—the importance to the United States of a part of the world where live 3 out of every 5 of its human beings. The question is not its importance; the question is what kind of an Asia will prove most satisfactory to American interests?

The one that will be the most unsatisfactory, the most threatening, and the most unstable will be an Asia trying to free itself from American domination. That is where the President has gone wrong in his Asian policy. His administration is determined to dominate Asia by one means or another, to prevent any country there from ever becoming a threat to the United States. Some areas and countries can be dominated by financial means; others by military means.

But domination, and not partnership or cooperation, is the administration policy in Asia, despite the pious words of the President last night.

The President talks about not seeking any bases in Asia, but the sad fact is that we are building them, and the sad fact is that we are building substantial bases in Asia; and the fact is that we are building them in Thailand, we are building them in South Vietnam, we are expanding bases in the Philippines and Okinawa, and we have passed a bill in this session of Congress that authorizes the building of bases to the tune of a good many hundreds of millions of dollars at the discretion of the President and the Secretary of Defense.

Anyone who thinks that those bases will be built by the United States and then the United States will walk away from those bases, could not be more wrong.

I am satisfied that the United States is building permanent military bases in Asia, and that this will cause the occupation of large parts of Asia by tens upon tens of thousands of American troops for decades and decades to come.

I believe that this is a sorry foreign policy for this Republic, and it is a foreign policy that in my judgment must be changed, or we will start writing the first chapter of the decline of American civilization.

What a pity that the President, who told nations in Asia last night that "victory for your armies is impossible," continues to act in the belief that victory for American armies in Asia is possible. The war in Indochina ended in 1954. The United States revived it when we tried to undo that peace and began to arm South Vietnam. All the things the President told Asians last night about the futility of resort to arms apply equally to his own Asian policy. Sooner or later, the United States, too, will have to turn away from the use of force as a means of establishing a pro-Western base in South Vietnam.

The President's contention that Asia and Europe are the same insofar as American policy and interests are concerned, simply does not stand the test of current history. It does not stand the test of fact, for it relies on perpetuation of Western bases in Asia that are relics of the colonial past. An uphill and costly struggle will be necessary to maintain them. We can expect the price to get higher the longer we try to hang on.

It does not stand the test of reason, for contrary to the President's fine words, it is not the partnership of equals we are seeking in Asia, but the securing of American military interests in the Pacific.

The problem of this administration is that it cannot conceive of a peace or a condition of Asia that is not of its own making. Its overwhelming desire to have an American hand in every government of Asia and an American hand in every relationship between countries in Asia is the most basic ingredient of administration Asian policy. Overmanagement of Asian affairs is the greatest vulnerability of that policy, for it will cost the American people billions of dollars and thousands of lives and it still will never produce an American peace in Asia. The administration sees a threat to our military position in the Pacific wherever it does not control events. And the cost of controlling of three-fifths of the world's people is going to stagger even so rich a country as our own.

I have said nothing in this speech about my view of the lack of morality of our foreign policy in Asia. I have spoken on that subject many times in the last 3 years. In my judgment, our policy in Asia cannot be reconciled with morality.

Yesterday I voted against the military procurement bill of some $17 billion-plus because, in my judgment, I have a trust and a responsibility to carry out what I think is a very important check that the Constitutional Fathers wrote into the Constitution: check of the purse strings.

In my judgment, we cannot change the foreign policy of this administration, which is dominated by the military at the present time, until we start checking the expenditure of funds, which means the appropriation of funds. If we will use the check of the purse strings, this administration will be forced to change its foreign policy.

I voted against the military procurement bill yesterday.

I intend to continue to vote against appropriations for the military until there is a change in American foreign policy, for in my judgment American foreign policy is dominated by the Pentagon Building. In my judgment, the Secretary of Defense is the real Secretary of State in this country.

I voted against it because I greatly fear that this great country is on its way to control of our foreign policy by the military if we do not watch out. Therefore, it is important to bring the military under control, and I think it is important that the Johnson administration learn from the American people that they have cause for concern of moving in the direction of military control under a democratic label.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Senator WAYNE MORSE for his persistent and dedicated efforts to secure home rule for citizens of the District of Columbia.

In expressing his intention to offer the home rule bill as an amendment to the higher education bill, the Senator has indeed demonstrated his determination to leave no stone unturned to provide full citizenship for people in the Nation's Capital.

I suspect no one would deny that the District of Columbia represents an anomaly in our democracy. Its citizens are required to pay taxes and assume other responsibilities of citizenship, yet they are deprived of one of the basic privileges available to all other citizens, the right to participate in their own government.

The seat of our National Government should be the epitome of the principles upon which our system of government was founded, and thereby serve as a constant reminder of the merits of a truly democratic society.

In my opinion, Senator MORSE's amendment would substantially accomplish this desirable goal.

I wish to cite two features that would make the District of Columbia structure consistent with proclaimed national principles.

First, the nonpartisan election provision. This will make the principle of democratic representation a reality by encouraging and enabling the citizens of the District of Columbia to elect those who govern them. This provision would recognize one of our most cherished credos—that there should be no taxation without representation.

Second, the formula for a Federal payment to the District of Columbia. Especially commendable here that is it permits greater flexibility in such payments by varying them on the basis of modifications in the size of Federal establishments and local taxes. This approach to Federal payments will make it possible for the Federal Government to contribute its fair and equitable share to the District of Columbia.

Finally, I hope all Senators will join me in supporting Senator Morse's praiseworthy efforts to achieve home rule for citizens of the Nation's Capital and thereby make it an example of democratic government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am both honored and moved by the statement which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has just made with regard to the need of the adoption of a home rule amendment this year.

As the Senator knows, I have decided to offer the home rule amendment to the higher education bill when it reaches the floor of the Senate.

I believe that is a particularly appropriate bill on which to add it. If there is anything that we need to be educated about in this country it is the importance of giving to over 800,000 fellow Americans in the District of Columbia the right of self-government.

I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who goes to many parts of the world and finds himself from time to time in the capital cities of many of the so-called underdeveloped nations of the world, I have found a greater knowledge and a better understanding of the import of a home rule bill for the people of the District of Columbia than I find in the capital cities of most of the States of the Union.

The fact is that most people in our country are not aware of the significance and the symbolism of the denial of first-class citizenship to over 800,000 fellow Americans in the District of Columbia.

Therefore, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to say that if there were no other reason for home rule in the District of Columbia than to change the tarnished image that this country has in many underdeveloped areas of the world, that would be reason enough for the adoption of the amendment. Millions of the people in the world do not understand our boasts about democracy and freedom and our denial of it in the Capital City of the Republic to the people who reside here.

I am offering the amendment to the higher education bill after consultation with many advocates of home rule, in and out of Congress, and in both Houses of Congress, because it seems to offer the best hope of being reported out in this session of Congress. If it is adopted in the Senate, it will go to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. I am advised by leaders in the House of Representatives who are working with me on the matter that it stands its best chance of favorable consideration by that committee, and the best chance of getting to the floor of the House of Representatives for approval as a result of adopting a conference report, if it survives a conference.

No one knows better than the Senator from Oregon the parliamentary problems that lie ahead in the cause of home rule in this session of Congress. But I do wish to say on the floor of the Senate what I said on a television program yesterday. I shall paraphrase it: Let us face it. Across America in many of our great cities there is great turmoil, and there is great concern about giving to all Americans, irrespective of the color of their skin, full citizenship rights.

Mr. President, in the District of Columbia, a little bit more than 60 percent of the population—I believe it is 60.7 percent—is Negro. I have served on the District of Columbia Committee for a good many years. I shall spell out in greater detail, when debate on my amendment begins, the great concern among the Negro population of the District of Columbia over whether home rule is being denied by Congress because better than 60 percent of the District's inhabitants are Negro.

These are ugly realities from which we cannot run away.

Yesterday, I was asked on television:

> Mr. Senator, are you implying that a denial of home rule may create a race problem in the District of Columbia?

My answer was:

> It already has.

What I am seeking to do is to refute to the Negroes not only in the Capital City, but also across the country, their belief that there is no design on the part of Congress to grant to all citizens of the District of Columbia, white or black, the precious right of free men and free women to which they are entitled; namely, the right of self-government.

For there is no more reason to deny the right of self-government to the inhabitants of the Capital of the Nation than there is to deny that right to the inhabitants of the capital of any State in the Union.

Home rule does not in any way cause Congress to give up its constitutional residual power over the District of Columbia in connection with Federal questions. Certainly, the election of a mayor in the District of Columbia is not a Federal question. Certainly, the election of a school board is not a Federal question.

I heartily support the proposal of my colleague on the House side, Mrs. Edith Green, for an elected school board, but I believe that it should be made a part of the total package, where there will be elected not only a school board and an elected mayor but also a council.

But what will be told to us when we talk to them, as I have to many of them—as recently as yesterday, to one of the leaders of the Negro community of the District of Columbia: Many Negroes in the District are convinced that one of the reasons they cannot get home rule is that, with a 60-percent Negro population in the District, it might result in the election of a colored person as mayor.

Mr. President, I have stated as long ago as 1947, in the hearings and when I stood on the floor of the Senate and fought for the Neely-Morse bill, and for the principles of that bill after the great liberal from West Virginia had passed away and that bill became the Morse bill. We passed it in the Senate four times, and last year we passed the President's bill which I was proud to sponsor but which was 95 percent the Morse bill. When the charge was made that home rule is being blocked in part because it might lead to the election of a colored person as mayor of Washington, D.C., I declared that if the free men and women of the District of Columbia, given the right of self-government—to which they are entitled as American citizens, because they are entitled to first-class American citizenship—decide that the best qualified candidate in a race for mayor is a colored person, he should be elected and we should be proud to have him elected.

I hope that, at long last, we have learned in America that we cannot continue to have race play any factor in the election of representatives of a free people to any office in this country.

Tonight, I will say no more, but I did wish to say this much because I wanted the Senator from Michigan to know why we are following the parliamentary course of action that I am following.

To my President, let me say: "Mr. President, you have taken a great and noble stand on home rule for the District of Columbia. You have on several occasions made clear that you favor the type of home rule encompassed in the bill that you had introduced in your name last year and which was passed by Congress. I hope that when the amendment comes to the floor of the Senate, we can count upon the complete backing of the White House for a vote on that amendment this year and that it will be adopted in both Houses, so that we can settle, once and for all, this great issue that confronts us—home rule for the District of Columbia.

Let me say that until it is granted, the denial of home rule will continue to fan the flames of racial misunderstanding, not only in the District of Columbia, but from coast to coast within the Republic.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am glad that the senior Senator from Oregon has spoken as he has. As he indicated, at least by inference, this is not the time to debate in full his amendment. But I think that no time is too early to raise several of the points which he has now made a part of the Record.

I must confess that when I read in the press of his intention, I was somewhat disturbed. With him, many of us share a deep concern that we respond adequately to the needs of higher education. On first reading, I thought his proposal might serve us ill. I thought it might divide our efforts in the field of higher education and might deny us action on home rule, as well. It was for that reason that I took the time to study his proposal. I am convinced that the Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. This is the way to proceed, and it can be done if the will is here to achieve it.

Nor do I blink the fact that, certainly, one of the reasons for denial, over the decades, of home rule is the one that the Senator from Oregon cited. There is a Negro majority in the District of Columbia. There may be, as a result of free elections, the selection of a Negro mayor. Since when is the decision of other than a majority to be the concept that we shall insist be applied throughout the country?

In addition to the many reasons which the Senator from Oregon outlined, his proposal could have a very healthy consequence, one in which, as he said, he would take pride. So would I.

I marvel, week after week, listening to some of my colleagues talk about the undesirability of removing government decisions from the local and State levels and bringing everything to Washington. This is one time we can do something about that. We can permit local decisions to be made by local people and turn the attention of Congress to some Federal questions.

Again, I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon was in the Chamber when I made these remarks. I hope that his efforts will find overwhelming support in this Chamber. Let us remember, his home rule bill passed in this Congress by a vote of 63 to 29. The amendment, as I have read it, removes some of the more controversial aspects, so that the vote on it should be even more decisive when the roll is called.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 14122) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and was signed by the Vice President.

PRESCRIBING AND DISPENSING OF DRUGS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one of the biggest tasks facing the Government today is the implementation of the medicare program. I daresay that all of us who contributed to the passage of this important piece of legislation must sleep better at night. It is not often that we have the chance of serving the people in direct and concrete form. Sometimes I think we are so busy serving the interests of powerful pressure groups that there is little time to serve the voters who actually put us in office. It took a long time to pass this overdue legislation on behalf of our older citizens, but in the end the public interest triumphed.

Unfortunately, this is not the end of the matter. An important piece of legislation, if it is to work well, must be intelligently administered. And with a program as inherently costly as medicare, it must run as economically as possible or the bills will be so high as to constitute a heavy burden upon the whole population.

Today I am introducing a bill designed once and for all to close a major loophole which can send drug costs under medicare to astronomical heights.

My bill—and I am joined in the bill by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]—makes mandatory the prescribing and dispensing of all drugs under the medicare program in terms of the generic rather than the private brand name.

If this simple principle is adopted at the outset, it will eliminate a vast amount of unnecessary paperwork and cut down the complex body of bureaucratic rules and regulations which are coming into being. Indeed, my bill might be called the "drug of choice" for overworked and exhausted administrators who are trying to convert the medicare legislation into a working program.

This proposed legislation, however, goes beyond medicare. It extends to all drugs provided by or under programs where Federal financial assistance is involved. That is, any State in the Union which accepts Federal funds for the purchase of medicines must make these purchases in the most efficient and economical manner. It must require that such drugs be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis.

We are all familiar with the fact that prescribing by brand name is the formula for monopoly. Since no other brand of the drug can legally be substituted without the doctor's permission, competition can effectively be eliminated. In the absence of competition, there is no safeguard against outrageously high pricing practices. That exactly this situation exists should come as no surprise, since the whole system is designed to achieve just this result. And it is time that something is done about it.

In February of this year the Comptroller General of the United States gave the Congress some idea of the savings to the taxpayer if a generic program were used in providing drugs to welfare recipients under the programs of the 50 States. The State of Pennsylvania was selected for study because of the substantial Federal financial participation in that State's prescription drug program. Frankly, I was surprised to learn that, of the $5.3 million spent in fiscal 1964 for drugs for welfare recipients in Pennsylvania, roughly three-fifths, 60 percent—over $3.5 million—was contributed by the Federal Government. Obviously, this means that the total for all 50 States must represent a very significant contribution by the Federal Government—perhaps $100 million or more.

Now let us look at what the Comptroller General reported on the State of Pennsylvania. In the sample studied, 77 percent of the prescription invoices were for drugs prescribed and dispensed by their brand names. Had these prescriptions been written and filled under the generic names of the drugs, the expense incurred would have been about 40 percent of the actual bill paid.

In other words, if these drugs had been provided for the people of Pennsylvania by the generic name, such as aspirin, instead of the product costing $1, it would have cost 40 cents, and more than half would have been saved.

Let me give you some illustrative examples. Chlor-Trimeton, an antihistamine, one of the 200 most frequently prescribed drugs, is sold by Schering Corp. to druggists for $20.59—4 milligram tablets in bottles of 1,000.

Senators know that antihistamine is the type of drug that people take over a long period of time. They take it day after day if they have allergies.

The drug under its generic name is available to druggists in the same quantity and strength for as low as $1.40.

Laws have been passed in many States that once a doctor prescribes a brand-name drug, the druggist has to supply the drug on that basis.

On top of this, the druggist usually adds a 66⅔ percent markup as his charge for filling the prescription.

Here is something available for $1.40. The drug companies are happy to sell it for $1.40, and they make a profit on it. Yet some people are paying almost $40 for it by the time it finally gets to them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a comparison of trade name and generic name prices for about 15 drugs which appear in the list of the 200 most prescribed drugs. The reason for the startling difference in prices merit very careful investigation.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Price comparisons of some drugs in list of the 200 most prescribed drugs—Price to druggist

Trade name [1]	Price	Generic name [2]	Price
Achromycin (Lederle), 250-milligram capsules, 100's	$14.96	Tetracycline	$2.75
Pentids (Squibb), 400,000 unit, tablets, 100's	14.15	Penicillin G	1.50
Dexedrine (Smith Kline & French), 5-milligram tablet, 1,000's	22.60	Dextroamphenamine sulfate	.75
Meticorten (Schering), 5-milligram tablets, 100's	17.90	Prednisone	.69
Tedral (Warner Chilcott), 1,000's	24.00	Theophylline-ephedrine phenobarbital	3.50
Chlor-Trimeton (Schering), 4-milligram tablets, 1,000's	20.59	Chlorpheniramine	1.40
Gantrisin (Hoffman-La Roche), 5-gram tablets, 1,000's	25.30	Sulfisoxazole	10.90
Noctec (Squibb), 7½-grain, 100's	4.20	Chloral hydrate	1.20
Serpasil (Ciba), 0.25-milligram, 1,000's	39.50	Reserpine	.69
Miltown (Carter Products)	61.20	Meprobamate	20.80
Equanil (American Home), 400-milligram tablets, 1,000's	62.40		

See footnotes at end of table.

Price comparisons of some drugs in list of the 200 most prescribed drugs—Price to druggist—Continued

Trade name [1]	Price	Generic name [2]	Price
Butisol (McNeil), ½-grain tablets, 1,000's	$18.45	Butabarbital sodium	$1.63
Seconal Sodium (Lilly), 1½-grain tablets, 500's	18.30	Secobarbital sodium	4.70
Peritrate (Warner Chilcott), 10-milligram tablets, 1,000's	20.00	Pentaerythritol tetranitrate	.98
Dilantin (Parke-Davis), 1½-grain, 1,000's	10.08	Diphenylhydantoin sodium	4.25
Raudixin (Squibb), 50-milligram tablets, 1,000's	30.78	Rauwolfia serpentina	1.10

[1] 1966 Red Book.

[2] Drug catalogs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Peritrate is a vasodilator for heart patients. The people who use it must keep on using it for the rest of their lives. It is sold by Warner-Chilcott to druggists for $20—that is for 1,000 10-milligram tablets. Yet under the complicated—and I must say unpronounceable—generic name of pentaerythritol tetranitrate, it is available for 98 cents.

So here is a drug that a person, once it is prescribed, must use for the rest of his life; it can be bought, under its generic name for 98 cents, and at this price the manufacturer makes a nice profit. For the privilege of using the trade name, Peritrate, instead of the somewhat more difficult to pronounce generic name, pentaerythritol tetranitrate, the patient has to pay $20.

Perhaps it is too much to expect a physician to write a generic name of this kind on his prescription pad. For this reason my bill provides that if the Federal Government is to pay the cost of the medicine, even if the physician uses the shorthand trade name, the druggist is not only empowered, but is obliged to fill the prescription with the lower-priced generic product. Incidentally, under the Drug Amendments Act of 1962, the Secretary of HEW is required to have a review made of the official names by which drugs are identified to determine whether revisions are necessary "in the interest of usefulness and simplicity." If he finds revisions are necessary, he is empowered to act. So far as I know, up to the present the Secretary of HEW has taken no official action on this front.

The drug companies cannot be blamed for cooking up the unspellable and even unspeakable generic names to encourage doctors to write the simple, easy trade names of products on their prescription pads. This is the way the business game is played.

In other words, why is the generic word so complicated and unpronounceable? It is because the drug companies want to fix things so that the druggist will write merely "Peritrate" rather than the name I just mentioned—"pentaerythritol tetranitrate." The names are being made so complicated that it is impossible to write or pronounce them.

But when Congress has actually given a Government agency the power to do something about it, to correct the situation, for the life of me I cannot understand why a name like "pentaerythritol tetranitrate" should be allowed to remain on the books as the generic name for the product. Why not call it "PT"? That would be good enough.

The same thing can be said of the leading drug in the treatment of epilepsy. Dilantin, the trade name for the compound sold by Parke-Davis, is also on the list of the 200 most prescribed drugs in this country. Parke-Davis' price to the druggist is $10.08—1½ gram, 1,000's. But the drug under its generic name is beyond my powers of pronunciation; and my guess is that few doctors could spell it on the first try.

I cannot pronounce the name of the drug, so I am going to spell it. It is "d-i-p-h-e-n-y-l-h-y-d-a-n-t-o-i-n."

I hope the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], who is occupying the chair, has written that down, so that he may see if he can pronounce it when he goes home tonight. Diphenylhydantoin under that name is available at less than half of Parke-Davis' price, which is $4.25.

Several months ago I presented to the Senate some interesting facts on the domestic and international price conspiracy in tetracycline, the current most important antibiotic in this country and throughout the world. It costs about 1 cent to produce a tetracycline capsule, and for years it has been marketed to druggists for 30 cents a capsule, and consumers have had to pay 50 cents.

Incidentally, this was a worldwide conspiracy. They did not even exempt the hungry people in the poorest areas in the world. Everybody on earth had to pay 50 cents, no matter how poor he might be.

As a result of the Federal Trade Commission decision in 1963 which found American Cyanamid, Pfizer, and Bristol guilty of violating antitrust laws, a number of small companies began marketing tetracycline at much lower prices. I think they were perhaps charging 5 cents for a pill that cost a penny to produce. Most of these small companies have now been hounded out of the market by Pfizer, holder of the tetracycline patent, through patent infringement actions, on a patent that probably is not valid.

This case, which was on appeal in one of our Federal circuit courts for over 2 years, has recently been remanded to the Federal Trade Commission, and may ultimately reach the U.S. Supreme Court. Frankly, by the time this case is finally settled—if it ever will be—I am willing to give almost any odds that the tetracycline patent—which runs until 1972—will have expired.

Even if the case is decided for the public, the public is not likely to be the gainer.

The result is that these companies will succeed in milking the public by charging 50 cents for a pill that costs 1 penny to produce. They will do this for 17 years, and will keep the case in court by suing small people to keep them from producing the same pill until the patent runs out. Who would sue these companies to get his money back, if it is determined that the patent is not valid, and that the companies were guilty of conspiracy and ought to be in jail, after victimizing the public for 17 years, until the patent finally expired?

The ordinary prescription contains 16 pills—$8 is involved. Who would hire a lawyer to sue, in order to get his $7 back out of what it should have cost for the pills?

The strategy is for the companies to keep the case in court and proceed to victimize the public for 17 years, until the patent expires. Then, in the event the companies are held liable for damages, they will have the benefit of that fine decision which was made to benefit General Electric and the other nine electrical contractors who were found guilty of systematically victimizing the public for 10 years and overcharging on bids for Government work. The money they would spend in antitrust appeals would be deductible as an ordinary business expense, so they could take it off their taxes.

However, a few companies have managed, despite Pfizer's infringement suits, to continue to sell tetracycline. Before marketing, every batch of antibiotics must be checked and cleared by the Food and Drug Administration.

All these items, whether they come from large or small companies, must be checked by the Food and Drug Administration before they can be sold.

This material—completely satisfactory to FDA—is being sold for as low as 3½ cents a capsule to druggists, and patients pay anywhere from 6 to 10 cents.

As a result of this price competition, the tetracycline conspirators have had to come down in price. But they have a built-in insulation from the competitive forces of the market through physicians' practice of prescribing drugs through major brand names. It is an interesting fact that all three of the major companies' brand names are to be found in the list of the 200 most prescribed drugs. And what do these sell for? According to the 1966 Red Book, Achromycin—American Cyanamid—is sold to druggists for 17.6 cents a capsule; Tetracyn—Pfizer—is also sold for 17.6 cents a capsule; and Tetrex—Bristol—is sold for 17.7 cents.

So the price has been cut in half because a few small manufacturers were successful in offering some competition to the five conspirators in this field. But the public will not get the benefit of what the price should be, because in all probability these companies will succeed in filing lawsuits and keeping litigation—fraudulent, improper, frivolous litigation—continuing against these companies who are trying to sell the product at a lower price, until the patent expires.

(At this point Mr. MORSE assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This price situation poses a stark issue for the administration of medicare. Is the Government going to subsidize the exorbitant profits enjoyed by the major drug companies by buying their brand name products at such excessive markups?

We should keep in mind that some of these people already have been found guilty of conspiracy. Not too long ago, the Justice Department was talking about dropping its criminal conspiracy charge against these five companies who have been engaged in this conspiracy. I sent a letter to the Justice Department, and it landed like a bombshell in their midst, when they had just about cleared it with all the people necessary to drop this case against this worldwide international conspiracy.

Should the heavy cost burden for such products be thrust on the backs of the American people? Or should we encourage competitive free enterprise by making it possible for the small companies to participate in the medicare program and open the business to ordinary price competition? We talk a lot about the free and open market representing our national policy toward industry. We talk a lot about the necessity of keeping open the channels of trade; of the viability of small business enterprises; of the need for the kinds of price competition which small business affords. Our bill offers a specific opportunity for us to give that policy concrete support. For, frankly, unless this bill which requires generic prescribing and dispensing is passed, we face a twofold threat. One is that the costs, arising from the acceptance of brand name prices, will add a terrible financial burden in carrying out the medicare program. The other is that, for all practical purposes, we will turn our backs upon small business and reject their competitive participation in the vast drug procurement involved in this program.

Enormous efforts are being made by the major drug companies to persuade prescribing physicians and the public that highly advertised brand names are the only assurance of good quality in drugs. A recent issue of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association Bulletin, March 24, 1966, indicates that this is the chief job of the major companies' detailmen—a fancy name for salesmen. Ten large drug companies reported in a survey that, since the speaking program of the prescription industry was launched 6 years ago, over 20,000 speeches have been made by their detailmen.

Imagine. They have sent out people who now have made 20,000 speeches, to try to persuade someone that something that is wrong, is correct—in other words, to try to persuade folks that black is white and white is black.

It reminds me of an old song:

> White is black and black is white,
> For no good reason that I know,
> Only that my baby says it's so.

The most active firm, according to this memorandum, is Smith Kline & French. We can easily understand why this company is busily promoting the notion that major brand names are the index to quality.

Keep in mind that all these items are checked by the Food and Drug Administration. It is all the same thing, not a bit of difference in it. You could not tell one from the other, unless you had a program in your hand. Still, these people spend a fortune advertising that there is a difference.

The situation is similar to going to the doctor in the dispensary and asking him for aspirin. He will give it to you in a little box. I saw some today. It had no name on it. It just said "aspirin."

It is not marked Bayer, St. Joseph's, or anything else. It is only marked "aspirin." It will do the same thing as Bayer aspirin or St. Joseph's aspirin. That is what they give to Senators and Congressmen, and we have enough headaches up here to need some of it.

The difference is that one is 10 times more than the price of the other. The same thing is true of other drugs.

Smith Kline & French's Dexedrine, a widely used central nervous system stimulant, sells to druggists for $22.60—5 milligram tablets, 1,000's. This branded product is also on the list of the 200 most widely prescribed drugs. It is available under its generic name of "dextroamphetamine sulfate" from smaller companies for 75 cents.

Dexedrine for which the druggist pays $22.60 will cost the patient $40, if he is lucky. On the other hand, if the doctor wrote down "dextroamphetamine sulfate" it would sell for 75 cents and the patient would get it for $1.25 instead of paying $40.

It does not seem necessary to write down dextroamphetamine sulfate. Perhaps it would be possible to write down DX, and the druggist would know what it was, instead of the name that the drug company would give it to make it so unpronounceable that the patient and physician would have difficulty using it.

As a matter of fact, there are only two or three companies in the entire United States which manufacture this product, and all of the drug companies—big and little—which sell it, buy the finished bulk from the same sources.

All they do is buy the powder and make capsules out of it. It is all the same thing and it is made by the same manufacturer. All that these people do is to make tablets out of the powder. The difference is that if he wrote down DX the patient would pay $1.50.

You will be interested to know that Smith, Kline & French proudly reports that its speakers have put over the brand name message to some 400,000 persons in civic, professional, and student audiences; and that an estimated 17 million people have heard the firm's sales pitch on radio or TV to pay $40 rather than $1.50.

As a matter of fact, knowledgeable buyers of drugs have been purchasing under generic names for years in order to take advantage of the lower prices. The New York Hospital introduced its hospital formulary system as early as 1816; that is, the New York Hospital has been doing what I am advocating since 1816.

Under this system, hospitals buy drugs competitively under their generic names; and physicians using the facilities of the hospital signify their willingness to have these generic drugs administered to their patients even if their prescriptions actually specify brand names. Practically every large hospital in the country currently engages in this practice; if they did not, they could never make ends meet.

What I am advocating is that the Federal Government do what the hospitals do. They do not let the hospitals and the druggists shake them down the way someone would shake down the ordinary citizen.

Let us consider this a moment. If generic drugs are good enough for sick patients in hospitals, why are they not good enough for the rest of us not in hospitals. Even U.S. Senators and Congressmen—and for that matter, the President of the United States—are given generic drugs when they are patients at the Bethesda Naval Hospital or Walter Reed. The Defense Supply Agency, the largest procurement agency for drugs in the world, buys its medicines on a competitive basis under generic name; and a large number of these contracts are awarded to small companies who are the low bidders. These are the drugs that are stocked at Walter Reed and the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

I would ask this question of those who say we must buy Pfizer, Smith Klein & French, or Upjohn products by the brand name because we want to be sure of quality control. If these drugs which the Bethesda Naval Hospital and Walter Reed use are good enough for President Johnson when he goes there to have his gall bladder removed, or President Eisenhower when he went there because of a serious condition, if they were good enough for Harry Truman, if they were good enough for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, if they were good enough for John F. Kennedy, and if they are good enough for every Senator and Congressman, every admiral, general, and fighting man in our armed services, why are they not good enough for the rest of us?

As a matter of fact, in my lifetime I have been a Senator and I have been a member of the armed services. During those times I have had drugs administered to me by their generic names. As a private citizen I have had to buy them by the brand name. One cannot tell the difference because it is all the same thing.

If they are good enough for me as a Senator, and if they are good enough for the President, why are they not good enough for the citizens of the country? The answer is that they are.

It is a tremendous expenditure of money by a few major drug companies to victimize the public into paying 40 times what they should pay for a prescription. Our bill does not cover that situation. I would say, though, that the Federal Government is not going to pay for this hoax. We are going to pay what we ought to pay for it and it will be based upon competitive bids.

The bill which I am introducing has as cosponsors, in addition to the present Presiding Officer [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

The bill would save the people of this country billions of dollars and it would prevent the public from being victimized by a horrible hoax.

I think the purpose is clear. It is embodied in the bill which I now send to the desk for appropriate reference, and I request that the text thereof be published in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3614) to amend titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by, or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance pursuant to such titles must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3614

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(a)(11) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (D) thereof, (2) by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (E) thereof, and (3) by adding after subparagraph (E) thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) provide that all drugs provided under the State plan will be provided on a nonproprietary or generic basis, and, if a prescription is involved, will be prescribed on such a basis;".

(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (12) thereof, and (2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (13) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period the following: "; and (14) provide that all drugs provided under the State plan will be provided on a non-proprietary or generic basis, and if a prescription is involved, will be prescribed on such a basis.".

(c) Section 1002(a) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (12) thereof, and (2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (13) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period the following: "; and (14) provide that all drugs provided under the State plan will be provided on a non-proprietary or generic basis, and, if a prescription is involved, will be prescribed on such a basis.".

(d) Section 1402(a) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (11) thereof, and (2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (12) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period following: "; and (13) provide that all drugs provided under the State plan will be provided on a non-proprietary or generic basis, and, if a prescription is involved, will be prescribed on such a basis.".

(e) Section 1602(a)(15) is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C) thereof, (2) by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (D) thereof, and (3) by adding after subparagraph (D) thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) provide that all drugs provided under the State plan will be provided on a non-proprietary or generic basis, and, if a prescription is involved, will be prescribed on such a basis;".

(f) Section 1902(a) of such Act is amended by (1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (21) thereof, (2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (22) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon followed by "and", and (3) by adding after such paragraph (22) the following new paragraph:

"(23) provide that all drugs provided under the State plan will be provided on a non-proprietary or generic basis, and, if a prescription is involved, will be prescribed on such a basis.".

Sec. 2. (a) Subject to subsection (b), the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter (meaning a three-month period beginning January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1) which begins after the thirty-day period which commences on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act for any period before July 1, 1968, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of section 2(a)(11)(F), 402(a) 14), 1002(a)(14), 1402(a)(13), 1602(a)(15)(F), or 1902(a)(23).

Sec. 3. (a) Section 1861(t) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(t) The term 'drugs' and the term 'biologicals', except for purposes of subsection (m)(5) of this section, include only such drugs and biologicals, respectively, as are—

"(1)(A) included (or approved for inclusion) in the United States Pharmacopoeia, the National Formulary, or the United States Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia, or in New Drugs or Accepted Dental Remedies (except for any drugs and biologicals unfavorably evaluated therein), or (B approved by the pharmacy and drug therapeutics committee (or equivalent committee) of the medical staff of the hospital furnishing such drugs and biologicals for use in such hospital, and

"(2) provided on a non-proprietary or generic basis, and, if a prescription is involved, are prescribed on such a basis."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect January 1, 1967.

During the delivery of speech by Mr. Long of Louisiana,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Louisiana has forgotten that the senior Senator from Oregon wishes to be a cosponsor of the Senator's bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am delighted to have the Senator join me. I am happy to have him as a cosponsor of the bill. The Senator from Oregon has been a great battler against monopoly and for the public interest in holding the prices of drugs and other products at competitive levels. I am happy to have his support. In my judgment, no man has a better record on the monopoly issue than has the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. As I understand it, one of the arguments made by the drug companies for the necessity of charging or marking up the price so high is the great cost of research. If a drug can be sold as a generic drug for a dollar, and then a company puts a brand name on it, and sells it for $22, is the company producing the generic product losing money?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. Of course, as the Senator knows, he being chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, as long as these drug companies do not have a private patent, these drugs can be sold competitively. Those who compete to sell these drugs at, for example, $1.40 per 1,000 tablets, make a profit at that price. They are glad to get that price. The companies make money selling it at $1.40.

The Senator from Wisconsin has supported me in my effort to stop this means of getting a private patent, so that the companies can charge 100 or 1,000 times the cost of the product. The Senator has supported me in my effort to stop that kind of highway robbery. At the moment, I am not speaking of the problem of the patent laws. I am simply speaking of the practice of milking the public by using brand name drugs and making deals with doctors. How they are paid off, I do not know, but there must be something bad about it. I am talking about putting pressure on doctors to prescribe by brand name and having a patient pay about $40 rather than $1.40 for a drug.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, let me say I am glad the Senator is referring to the patent problem, because no one has made a more courageous fight than has the Senator from Louisiana to stop the shakedown of the American taxpayers, whereby they pay money for research, and then the companies doing the research get a patent as a result of the research paid for by the taxpayers, and charge exorbitant prices for the patented product. The Senator from Louisiana has been able to make progress against it. He has made remarkable progress. We have been able to go as far as we should——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been defeated as many times as I have won, but I am still in there fighting.

Mr. MORSE. It has been a source of pride for me to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Louisiana on his patent fight.

We have great distances to go yet to remedy the drug racket. Referring to the last point the Senator made; namely, that he does not know how these companies get some of the doctors to prescribe brand name drugs, rather than generic drugs, as the Senator knows, there is some controversy over efforts by the Food and Drug Administration to get support to prevent private doctors from being really part owners of drug companies that manufacture drugs, and then prescribing those drugs to their patients. That explains part of the answer to the Senator's question.

That racket on the part of the medical profession has to be stopped, too. I am a great supporter of private medicine. I am not a supporter of license on the part of doctors to exploit their patients and exploit the public. The sad, sordid record is that that is involved too much in the so-called private practice of medicine; and we shall have to continue to make the doctors understand that after the taxpayers pay for most of their medical education—they do not like to hear us say that—but if it was not for the taxpayers, these doctors would discover that they could not pay for their medical education. The taxpayer who provides the schools, the laboratories, the subsidies, makes it possible for them to become so-called private practitioners. They need to be brought under fair, just, and reasonable regulation; and here is one place.

I merely rise to commend the Senator from Louisiana that he has taken on just another phase of the general problem that he has been fighting for from the beginning, because this is hitched to the problem of monopoly. It is hitched also, may I say, to the problem of bringing a profession that needs to be brought under reasonable regulation to task. And the medical profession needs to be brought to task, in order to stop just the kind of exploiting that in his speech the Senator from Louisiana is demonstrating the medical profession is guilty of.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, to make the matter even clearer, suppose a man goes to a doctor and he says, "Now, here, I have an allergy."

The doctor says, "Well, fine, I'll give you a prescription."

So the doctor charges him perhaps around $5 for the visit, and he writes down the trade name, Chlor-Trimeton. If the patient has to take it for a long time, that is going to cost him $40 for a bottle of 1,000 4-milligram tablets. If he wrote down a somewhat more difficult name, chlorpheniramine, that would cost the patient $2 for the same number of tablets.

If I do say it, that is how people get rich, selling people something worth $1.40 for $40.

This bill is not directed to that practice. All I say is that we are not going to pay for that racket under the medicare program. Let these people call it whatever they want to; they can call it Chlor-Trimeton or chlorpheniramine or Ajax, I do not care; but it has got to be the kind of drug it is supposed to be, and they are going to sell it for $2, which would be the cost of $1.40 plus 60 cents profit.

In fact, the Government can buy it for less than $1.40, because they buy it on competitive bids.

This is a racket the big drug manufacturers are trying to foist on the Government. The small fellows are trying to compete. They are trying, with what little influence and money they have, to compete. They are trying to sell it for $1.40, while the other fellow is trying to get laws and government regulations to make us pay $40.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator will agree that someone who is able to pronounce that generic name ought to have $19 taken off the price, will he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The difficulty is, even if some sweet old person can pronounce the name, once the doctor writes down "Peritrate," these drug companies have been to the State legislatures, and they have persuaded 44 of the States to pass laws to put the druggist in jail if the person can pronounce the name and ask for it by the generic name, and the druggist supplies it.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator mean to say that if a druggist had a stock of a drug under the generic name, and had a stock of the drug under the brand name, that if a patient gets a prescription from the doctor under the brand name, and goes to the drugstore, and the druggist says, "That is going to cost you $20," and the patient says, "Well, I know the generic name, and that is a dollar; sell me the drug under the generic name," that the druggist cannot do that under the law?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. These people have gone to 44 State legislatures—and let me say here in behalf of the legislators, I know how these things happen. I was once a minute clerk in a State legislature. Those people vote on bills half the time without knowing what they are talking about. Some of these things happen very fast. They say, "The clerk will open the machine,"—there is a voting machine—they press a red button or a green button, and boom, it is all over with, and nobody knows what he is voting on. I have seen a State legislature pass 100 bills in a single day.

The minute clerk would write down that the bill was read in full. This is the way it worked: the fellow picked up the bill, his voice droned on for 30 seconds, and it was pronounced read in full. That is how those things get through. If State legislatures understood how these things are, they would not pass some of these bills.

But bills have been passed by 44 State legislatures to make it against the law for that druggist to sell you this drug, Peritrate, under the generic name, pentaerythritol tetranitrate, when the doctor wrote "Peritrate."

Mr. NELSON. Do I understand the Senator to say that 44 States have statutes which prohibit a druggist from selling to the patient the drug under the generic name, if the prescription he has from the doctor has it under the brand name?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is exactly correct. Forty-four States have been persuaded to engage in that hoax.

Mr. NELSON. Has any Senator ever entered the names of those States in the RECORD?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. However, I shall be glad to obtain them and make them available to the Senator if he wants them.

Mr. NELSON. I would imagine that most of the people, the legislatures, and the Governors of those 44 States had no notion of the effect of the statute which they passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What did Jesus say—"Forgive them, Lord, for they know not what they do."

He said that about the time they were nailing Him on the cross, if I recall my Scriptures correctly.

That is a rather apt description of the manner in which the legislatures engage in the passage of some legislation.

The State of Louisiana passed a measure that we called the millionaire's amendment. That amendment provided that the income tax could not exceed more than 25 percent. The State legislature agreed to that measure by a unanimous vote and forced Congress to call a constitutional convention to limit the income tax to 25 percent.

I wrote a letter to every State senator in every State legislature, explaining what an outrage such a law would be and how it would not benefit more than 1 percent of the people. It would be an outrage and would be unfair to the rest of the people in the country.

The next session of the legislature repealed that provision by a unanimous vote, the same way in which it had passed it before. That is about the manner in which someone goes about getting this kind of bill passed. The bill has been euchred through 44 legislatures to victimize the people of those States.

I am trying to provide that when we spend the money on the medicare program, we should be sure that we do not fall into the trap set by the drug companies which spend a lot of money on lobbying to victimize the people of this country.

Mr. NELSON. How would that work under the medicare program in the case of a beneficiary who receives a prescription for drugs?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator knows under the Constitution it is within the power of Congress to override State laws. Our law prevails over theirs. Is the Senator a lawyer?

Mr. NELSON. Not much of a lawyer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon is a law school professor. He no doubt recalls that clause in the Constitution that provides that the laws of Congress are the supreme law of the land, so that our law prevails over State law.

If we want to do so, we can prevail over the State laws in this field, particularly with regard to the medicare program passed by Congress.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is talking about the expenditure of Federal money.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. We do not have a States right problem involved here. This is Federal money that would be expended on a Federal program.

Mr. MORSE. Congress is supreme in regard to legislation that it wants to pass on any subject over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. I am a great States righter myself. I have heard very ridiculous arguments made here, but I have never heard any Senator rise on the floor and say that the State government has the right to administer a Federal program.

This is a Federal program, and we have a right to do what we want with it. The Federal law is supreme over State law.

Mr. NELSON. I want to clarify this matter for myself. This would mean then that a beneficiary under the health insurance program would be able to go to the drugstore with a doctor's prescription for a brand name drug and that the drugstore would give him that drug under the generic name.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what it amounts to. If a person under the medicare program is provided with a prescription by the doctor for a drug, he would take that prescription to the drugstore.

Suppose that the doctor writes Peritrate. The druggist can say: "I can give you that drug. It will cost you $40. On the other hand, I have exactly the same product. It is pentaerythritol tetranitrate. And it will cost you less than $2 instead of almost $40. Which do you want? Do you want the $40 product or the $2 product? It is all the same."

My dad used to say that people like to be fooled, and that if they like to do so, they have that privilege. He used to say that at one time he was a traveling salesman selling patent medicines. He had two patent medicines. One was high poplowrum and the other was low poplahighrum. They were both an extract of poplar oil. The bottles were both the same size. One product sold for $1 and the other sold for 50 cents. The only difference was that the high poplowrum was made from the bark of the poplar skinned down the tree, and the other was made from the bark of the poplar skinned up the tree.

If a person wanted to buy the high poplowrum, he could pay 50 cents for it, or he could buy the low poplahighrum and pay $1 for it. Both products were the extract of poplar oil and the bottles were the same size.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to add my full support to Senator LONG's bill requiring the prescribing and dispensing of drugs by generic name when the Federal Government foots all or a portion of the bill.

The major drug companies have enjoyed a singular immunity from the forces of competition. Their profits rank in the category of the fabulous. Even though inquiry into drug prices by the late Senator Kefauver had the result of strengthening the regulatory powers of the Food and Drug Administration it seems to have had little effect upon the shocking profiteering that goes on in the drug industry.

A few weeks ago when the Federal Trade Commission reported that the profits of the major drug companies ranked second to automobiles in size, it provided some interesting figures on individual companies. For example, Smith Kline & French enjoyed in 1964 a 33-percent rate of return on its investment, after taxes. The report of the investigation of the Kefauver committee showed that in 1958 it made 33.1 percent. There was practically no change.

Other major profitmakers in 1964 were American Home Products with a net return, after taxes, on investment of 27.4 percent; Sterling Drug, with 21.2 percent; Warner-Lambert, with 20.5 percent; Upjohn with 17 percent. Some of the major drug companies did even better in 1964 than they did in 1958. Lilly upped its profit rate, after taxes, from 13.2 percent in 1958 to 15.9 percent in 1964; Abbott went from 14.6 percent to 15.4 percent. When it is considered that the national average for the 500 largest manufacturing companies in the country is about 10 percent, this record is particularly surprising.

And what will it be unless this generic bill is passed by the Congress? In the past the major hospitals throughout the country—in the interests of economy—have purchased generically on a competitive bidding basis. With the Federal Government footing the bill under medicare, they no longer will have as direct an interest in keeping down hospital drug costs. The result will be that high-priced brand names will be expanded in the filling of doctors' prescriptions.

Officials of the Food and Drug Administration have stated that the quality of drugs sold under generic name are comparable to the highly advertised brand names sold at high prices. For years these generic drugs have been used in the country's leading hospitals. They are purchased by the Veterans' Administration and the Defense Supply Agency—both agencies of the Federal Government and substantial buyers and testers of drugs. Leading physicians of the country recommend them to their patients, and they are stocked by the most reputable and responsible pharmacists.

Unless this generic bill is passed by the Congress, the costs of medicare to the Federal Government will be substantially increased.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 14, 1966, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 13, 1966:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Paul E. Trimble, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 13, 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on June 15, 1966, of Donald J. Willis to be postmaster at Minerva, in the State of Ohio.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 13, 1966:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The following-named persons to the position indicated:

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for term expiring May 11, 1969, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, to be member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for term expiring May 11, 1969, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Pauline Tompkins, of Maine, to be member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for term expiring May 11, 1969, and until her successor is appointed and has qualified.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First Anniversary of Convening of Congress of Micronesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. N. NEIMAN CRALEY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the people of Micronesia on the first anniversary of the convening of their first territorywide Congress.

A year ago Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON and I observed and participated in the formal opening of that Congress for the people of the Marianas, Caroline, and Marshall Islands, islands which the United States has administered as a trust territory for the United Nations as a result of World War II.

On July 12, 1965, I had the honor and privilege to address the first Micronesian Congress in the territorial headquarters at Saipan. I was there to represent Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member.

Spread over 3 million square miles of the Western Pacific Ocean, the 2,141 islands with a population of some 90,000 people, are known to Americans for the battles fought there in World War II and as the testing grounds for the Atomic Energy Commission after the war.

As the islands' administrator the United States has worked for the political, economic and social progress of the people, fostering schools, teachers, immunization and hospital programs. The first Micronesian Congress is a symbol of the progress that has been made—a significant step in the development of self-government for these people. A vital tradition of American democracy has been entrusted to the Micronesians who occupy a strategic position in the Pacific area. They are anxious to prove themselves capable of such political maturity and I wish them well in this endeavor.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the right of self-determination and independence for all peoples is a principle firmly engraved in the American character; and it is in pursuit of these principles that the United States has guided her actions. Yet to more than 25 nations in the modern world, these principles of freedom and justice mean only memories and hope. These are the captive nations of Eastern Europe, Asia, and the Caribbean.

It is in sympathy with the unfulfilled aspirations of these gallant people that the President recently designated the week beginning July 17, 1966, as Captive Nations Week. The eighth annual response to a unanimous resolution of the 86th Congress, Captive Nations Week is dedicated to the exhibition of U.S. determination that the status quo of Communist domination should not be recognized as a permanent situation. It is appropriately centered on those nations now engulfed by communism. By strengthening the weapons of truth and fact throughout the United States, the ceremonies and activities of Captive Nations Week will thus contribute to overall American support of the gallant cause of freedom.

Many have recently pointed out the so-called process of "liberalization" that seems to be taking place in a number of Communist satellites; and being a realistic observer of world politics, one must be aware of certain movements in this direction.

However, though he may see some brief hints of progress, an astute observer will, beyond doubt, recognize that these people are not free, nor are they even close to true possession of the freedom with which we of this country are blessed. Witness the Berlin wall; witness the recent rise of religious tension in Poland; witness numerous other instances of totalitarian suppression of ideas and action. Communist oppression has sought, without success, to destroy the existence of national identity in these nations; and the all too gradual improvements have brought virtually no change in the actual status of personal liberty and national independence.

Therefore, in observing Captive Nations Week, we must recognize the plight of these people and pledge our support in their aspiration and struggle. Recognizing their undying spirit, we should extend our sympathy at all times and our aid to the people where it may be practicable in order to negate the unjust denial of their inalienable rights.

President Johnson, in his proclamation of July 8, 1966, has invited the people of the United States of America to observe Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and has urged them "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." In addition, it should be our duty and responsibility to put forth every effort enabling the family of captive nations to receive the opportunity to reenter the family of free nations; they should not be thwarted by lack of support and encouragement in their quest for renewed membership in this privileged group.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, this goes for the people of Russia as well, for those enslaved by communism in the Soviet Union will someday be freemen as they attain their inalienable rights.

Washington National Airport and the FAA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past month, I have brought to the attention of the House, and to the Federal Aviation Agency, the serious problems confronting the traveling public at Washington National Airport.

I have pointed out in my statements to the House, the tremendous increase in traffic at Washington National and the physical impossibility to accommodate the number of flights in and out of this airport. I have also suggested that stricter regulations by FAA be initiated and that other airports, particularly Dulles, be utilized for long-haul flights.

I was therefore pleased to note that the FAA, on July 1, 1966, announced the adoption of a new policy effective August 7, 1966, which should greatly improve conditions at Washington National.

Under the new regulations, it is anticipated that long-haul flights will be drastically curtailed at Washington National, that the number of scheduled air taxi and general aviation flights will be equitably controlled along with commercial air carrier flights to secure maximum safety and prompt scheduling at Washington National.

While the changes suggested may not correct all of the problems, I believe this is a step in the right direction, and I commend the FAA administration and its Administrator, Gen. William F. McKee for this effort to improve service and to end congestion at Washington National Airport.

I anticipate that various organizations will be critical of this effort, but in my judgment it will make flying safer and certainly more comfortable and reliable for the traveling public.

I do believe, however, that the FAA should continue its efforts toward the solution of this and other problems confronting aviation in the Washington area. Certainly Bolling Field and other airports in this general area should be examined and, if possible, utilized to make the city of Washington conveniently accessible to general aviation traffic as well as scheduled commercial flights.

For some time many have been urging the utilization of the Bolling-Anacostia facility for nonscheduled air traffic. It makes good sense to me, and I hope along with the regulations recently announced, further study and early action will result in even better service and safer air transportation for the citizens of this country.

Malawi: Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, while this body was in recess, the nation of Malawi observed the second anniversary of its independence and proclaimed itself a republic within the British Commonwealth. It is with extreme pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend warmest greetings to His Excellency Kamuzu Banda, first President of the Republic of Malawi; to His Excellency Vincent H. B. Gondwe, Malawi's Ambassador to the United States; and to all the people of Malawi.

Malawi, formerly known as Nyasaland, was years ago an important base of operations for the slave trade. The territory was relatively unknown until men such as the explorer-missionary David Livingstone ventured there in the latter half of the 19th century. Livingstone was a foe of the slave trade and his explorations led to the establishment of missions by the Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland in 1874–75 to carry on his work. In 1878, the African Lakes Co. was formed by Scottish businessmen to supply the missions and to combat slave trading through the establishment of commercial alternatives.

The task of eliminating the remaining slave trading groups fell to the British Government, which annexed the territory in 1891. The British Protectorate of Nyasaland continued until 1953, when it was joined with Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia in the Central African Federation. However, Nyasaland preferred an independent future and the Federation dissolved.

A smooth transition from colonial rule to responsible African government continued, and Nyasaland became an independent member of the British Commonwealth on July 6, 1964.

Rich in natural splendor, Malawi has been described as one of the most beautiful countries in Africa. Her striking mountain scenery and Lake Nyasa, third largest in all of Africa, make Malawi a highly attractive country for the development of tourism.

Malawi's agriculturally based economy is similar to those of many of the newly independent African States. She depends upon agriculture for the main source of her export earnings. The country is endowed with good land and imaginative management has resulted in increased production. A major effort in this direction is the young pioneer program which teaches young Malawians new agricultural methods. Other projects are a $1 million sugar factory, a textile mill, housing construction, and a transistor radio plant. A $9 million hydroelectric facility will provide enough power for any planned expansion through 1975.

I am sure that you will agree with me that the above facts indicate that Malawi is using its independence with skill and imagination. There are problems to be overcome, it is true, but the courage and determination demonstrated by the people of Malawi can lead one to conclude that they will overcome. I congratulate them on a job well done and urge them to continue in the tradition of unselfishness and achievement as the Republic of Malawi marches forward under a banner of cooperation and progress.

Congressman Grover Reports on New York Congressional District Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of my annual questionnaire.

This year's poll was prepared and analyzed by the political science students of C. W. Post College under the direction of Dean Alvin C. W. Bahnsen to whom I extend my thanks for a difficult job well done.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[In percent]

1. Should the United States withdraw from Santo Domingo?

Yes	31.9
No	53.5
No opinion	11.2
No answer	3.4

2. In Viet Nam, which of the following courses do you favor?

(a) Intensify U.S. Military action toward ending the war quickly;

Yes	59.5
No	13.9
No opinion	2.5
No answer	24.1

(b) Increase military aid without American troops; or

Yes	11.7
No	26.8
No opinion	4.2
No answer	57.3

(c) Negotiate best possible peace terms and withdraw?

Yes	35.2
No	20.7
No opinion	10.1
No answer	34.0

3. If the U.N. were to negotiate a compromise settlement in Viet Nam, would you favor United States' acceptance?

Yes	64.7
No	27.8
No opinion	6.6
No answer	.9

4. Should the United States seek an extension of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by the inclusion of Red China in negotiations?

Yes	54.8
No	37.3
No opinion	5.4
No answer	2.5

5. Do you favor our present policy of admitting Cuban refugees?

Yes	46.4
No	44.1
No opinion	7.9
No answer	1.6

6. Do you favor distributing foreign aid through the United Nations?

Yes	22.2
No	72.4
No opinion	3.8
No answer	1.6

7. Should foreign economic aid be continued and increased providing conditions are placed upon its use?

Yes	51.5
No	42.3
No opinion	3.8
No answer	2.4

8. Should organized groups be allowed to demonstrate for or against Government policies?

Yes	66.1
No	28.6
No opinion	3.3
No answer	2.0

9. Should the Federal Government remove all passport restrictions for citizen travel abroad?

Yes	27.3
No	66.9
No opinion	5.5
No answer	.3

BUDGET AND TAXES

[In percent]

10. Do you feel it is possible for the Federal Government to continue to spend large sums for:

(a) military uses?

Yes	63.3
No	26.3
No opinion	4.0
No answer	6.4

(b) space experimentation?

Yes	58.1
No	31.2
No opinion	4.8
No answer	5.9

(c) social improvements (housing, welfare, health)?

Yes	44.8
No	47.0
No opinion	3.5
No answer	4.7

11. Do you favor the increases in federal excise taxes as recommended by the President?

Yes	30.4
No	60.2
No opinion	7.3
No answer	2.1

12. Do you favor the President's recommendations to increase the withholding tax on income?

Yes	34.1
No	60.5
No opinion	4.1
No answer	1.3

13. Do you favor a national lottery?

Yes	73.1
No	21.6
No opinion	4.5
No answer	.8

LABOR AND BUSINESS

[In percent]

14. Do you favor placing greater federal restrictions on organized labor in public service and utility strikes?

Yes	77.8
No	19.4
No opinion	2.1
No answer	.7

15. Should labor disputes involving companies with national interests be mediated by the Federal Government?

Yes	72.2
No	23.0
No opinion	3.5
No answer	1.3

16. Do you favor a major review of organized labor as it affects our present society, toward the end of establishing a new Labor Relations Act?

Yes	78.9
No	11.1
No opinion	7.1
No answer	2.9

(a) Should federal legislation be passed to eliminate so-called right-to-work laws?

Yes	25.1
No	58.9
No opinion	12.2
No answer	3.8

17. Do you favor a guaranteed annual wage?

Yes	20.5
No	71.3
No opinion	6.5
No answer	1.7

18. Do you favor the establishment of federal standards for business ethics?

Yes	52.8
No	37.5
No opinion	7.3
No answer	2.4

19. Do you favor more strict Federal Government regulations of T.V. and radio advertising?

Yes	55.5
No	39.0
No opinion	4.6
No answer	.9

SPACE

[In percent]

20. Should the United States seek an international agreement on the use of space for military purposes?

Yes	63.7
No	26.5
No opinion	8.0
No answer	1.8

21. Do you believe that our crash program to land a man on the moon is worth the cost of it?

Yes	47.4
No	46.0
No opinion	5.7
No answer	.9

POVERTY

[In percent]

22. Do you think the President's anti-poverty program:

(a) should be expanded?

Yes	20.7
No	53.5
No opinion	5.8
No answer	20.0

(b) already goes too far?

Yes	52.7
No	17.4
No opinion	5.4
No answer	24.5

(c) should be withdrawn?

Yes	39.1
No	26.5
No opinion	7.4
No answer	27.0

23. Should the anti-poverty program be supervised and directed by:

(a) the Federal Government?

Yes	33.1
No	31.8
No opinion	6.1
No answer	29.0

(b) the State Governments?

Yes	23.0
No	35.2
No opinion	6.6
No answer	35.2

(c) the Local Governments?

Yes	33.1
No	33.0
No opinion	6.1
No answer	27.8

24. Should anti-poverty spending by the Federal Government be increased?

Yes	17.0
No	74.3
No opinion	4.2
No answer	4.5

(a) Do you favor Federal rent subsidies to individuals?

Yes	8.3
No	84.5
No opinion	5.2
No answer	1.0

SUBURBAN RENEWAL AND TRANSPORTATION

[In percent]

25. Do you favor Federal Government financial support of the Urban Renewal Program?

Yes	45.1
No	45.2
No opinion	6.8
No answer	2.9

26. Should federal funds be used to meet mass transportation problems:

(a) through loans?

Yes	57.0
No	17.8
No opinion	3.4
No answer	21.8

(b) through outright grants?

Yes	25.2
No	36.4
No opinion	4.5
No answer	33.9

(c) not at all?

Yes	15.9
No	35.2
No opinion	5.6
No answer	43.3

27. Should the Federal Government subsidize the building of inter-state bridges across Long Island Sound?

Yes	59.5
No	33.2
No opinion	6.0
No answer	1.3

FEDERAL POWERS

[In percent]

28. Should there be a Constitutional Amendment limiting the powers of the President in:

(a) domestic affairs?

Yes	28.1
No	38.8
No opinion	3.4
No answer	29.7

(b) foreign affairs?

Yes	29.7
No	35.8
No opinion	4.7
No answer	29.8

(c) both domestic and foreign affairs?

Yes	34.7
No	34.7
No opinion	4.2
No answer	26.4

(d) not at all?

Yes	26.4
No	23.1
No opinion	5.9
No answer	44.6

29. In view of the increased political power being exercised by the Supreme Court, would you favor constitutional changes limiting the term of office for these justices?

Yes	64.0
No	30.1
No opinion	3.6
No answer	2.3

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

[In percent]

30. Do you favor federal aid to private and parochial schools:

(a) for school construction?

Yes	37.1
No	57.8
No opinion	1.6
No answer	3.5

(b) for textbooks and teaching materials?

Yes	37.0
No	57.7
No opinion	1.6
No answer	3.7

(c) for teachers salaries?

Yes	29.0
No	63.5
No opinion	3.6
No answer	3.9

31. Do you favor the present federal Medicare program?

Yes	57.0
No	36.0
No opinion	6.1
No answer	.9

REAPPORTIONMENT

[In percent]

32. Do you believe that the apportionment of State Legislatures should be determined by:

(a) the Federal Government?

Yes	19.7
No	39.5
No opinion	5.5
No answer	35.3

(b) State Governments?

Yes	71.4
No	11.5
No opinion	5.6
No answer	11.5

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey to the U.S. Jaycees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and illuminating speeches of the entire year was made in Detroit on June 29 by the Vice President of the United States. Speaking before 10,000 members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce at their national convention at Cobo Hall, Vice President HUMPHREY emphasized, in striking manner, the thirst for individual freedom and opportunity which is surging throughout the world, the American passion for creativity and individualism which has helped write our Nation's success story, and the positive impact of American business activity overseas.

Because of the congressional recess, my colleagues may have missed this marvelous restatement of what America is all about, as well as the attendant report on the situation in Asia. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the Vice President's speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY BEFORE THE U.S. JAYCEES, DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 29, 1966

Eighteen years ago, a brilliant English author named Eric Blair unleashed a nightmare vision of life in the future.

Blair foresaw endless wars among three great super-powers. Every aspect of life would be totally controlled and man would be reduced to a robot-like existence—directed in his behavior and thought-processes by an all-seeing tyrannical government.

Blair's book was a warning to mankind: Unless the course of history changed, man would be doomed by what he had created.

And unless man himself changed, he was destined to lose every trace of personal freedom and every trace of his individuality.

If this book sounds familiar, it should.

Eric Blair wrote under the pen name of George Orwell. And his book was *1984*.

We are now halfway to the year 1984—halfway to Orwell's perpetual bad dream where apathy, cruelty, and ignorance were not only dominant characteristics of life, but the aims of the state itself.

In 1948, when Orwell wrote his novel, the reign of Josef Stalin had sealed off all of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in a bleak and brutal police state, where all movements were controlled, all individuality suppressed, all thoughts suspected. Stalin himself personified Orwell's fictional dictator, Big Brother.

The world knew, in Churchill's words, "that it is only America's possession of the atomic bomb that has kept bombs from falling on London again."

Today, 18 years later, no responsible government in the world believes that war between East and West is either imminent or inevitable.

During the past 10 years alone more than 60 new countries have been born—nations which previously had not existed, except as colonial enclaves, or as tribes or protectorates.

But none has turned to communism.

Nor have the voters of any nation yet freely elected a communist regime to power. Even in Eastern Europe, monolithic control has gradually eased in favor of a system of national regimes—each increasingly following its own course.

Indeed, self-determination and national independence have domiated the post-war period.

The last 18 years have brought us many troubles, but they should nevertheless give us hope that totalitarian regimentation is not the wave of the future.

Our time is not ruled by political dogma. The great moving force in the world today is humanity's restless craving for freedom . . . for opportunity . . . for a fuller share of the blessing of life . . . above all, for a chance for individual expression and fulfillment—in short, for the very things which lie at the heart of our own American Revolution.

It is, in fact, the precepts of the American Revolution—not those of Marxism—to which the bypassed people of the world are today stirring.

The marching feet in the world today are those of people seeking freedom.

Millions of people in the world—yes, in our own country—are restlessly seeking the same freedom and well-being that you and I enjoy.

It has been said that foreign policy is really domestic policy with its hat on. In a sense, this is true.

We know that rich nations cannot be secure amid the overwhelming misery of the poor nations.

We have learned, too, that no prosperous American neighborhood can really be secure amid other neighborhoods filled with poverty and pent-up anger.

We have learned that no business can operate at maximum efficiency until those who are unemployed find work . . . that no city can provide the best in life until the worst of its slums come open to the light . . . and that our own children cannot achieve the fullness of the future until the children of others can share in it.

Some say we seek to create in America a welfare state. I think this reflects a deep misunderstanding on the part of those who say it. What we seek to create is a state of opportunity.

We seek to increase the opportunity of the individual to achieve his full potential, unhampered by ignorance, poverty and discrimination. We seek to make it possible for the individual to identify and satisfy his own aspirations.

We seek not to paralyze initiative, but to revive it; not to build up the opportunity of those below at the expense of those above—but to broaden the horizons of both; not to dictate the terms of help, but to allow each community to find its own answers in its own way.

That is what our national investments in education, in health, in the war against poverty are all about. They are investments in self-help, in personal initiative, in opportunity.

All the new laws which go under the Great Society label were written to encourage and insure the full participation and partnership of state and local governments, private organizations and individual citizens.

And I hope that many of you will read those laws, examine them, understand them, and use them to help your own communities.

All of us know that the most effective action is action at the grassroots level—and that is where we all want it to come.

No, we are not avoiding Orwellian misery by constructing a welfare utopia that would diminish human choice and incentive. Instead, we seek a course that provides growth, purpose and direction to all who are willing to grasp the chance to use their talent and energy.

Our system does not guarantee individual success. But it can—and does—provide the climate and opportunity for the individual to be himself and to go as far as his abilities allow.

Yet, I think it would be inaccurate to say that there are no challenges—in the Orwellian sense—to our freedom or to our individuality in America today.

And, as young men who are also businessmen, your responsibility in meeting these challenges is great.

For you are leaders. You are successful. And your stake in our American success is great.

The great challenge which faces us is to assure that, in our society of bigness, we do not strangle the voice of creativity . . . that the rules of the game do not come to overshadow its purpose . . . that the grand orchestration of society leaves ample room for the man who marches to the music of another drummer.

It is the businessman who, of all citizens, most clearly knows what many others but dimly see: That much of our American progress has been the product of the individual who had an idea; pursued it; fashioned it; tenaciously clung to it against all odds; and then produced it, sold it, and profited from it.

It is the businessman who knows that a society which turns away from the man who has the courage to speak the unpopular, the unfashionable, the new and the untried—that society is dissipating one of its greatest potential sources of strength.

It is an unpleasant fact that many of our most talented young people are not choosing business careers because they feel business leaves no room for individual expression or higher goals.

The word must reach our young people that business *is* a place both for individual accomplishment and for public service.

Our national growth . . . our ability to carry our responsibilities at home and in the world—these things depend on the creative and dynamic force of private initiative in our economic system.

It is part of your responsibility, as businessmen, to get this story across.

Young Americans must know that individuality and initiative *are* a part of the daily environment of business . . . that new ideas are greeted with enthusiasm . . . and that business is not *just* profit and loss, but also the business of the community and of responsible citizenship.

Our young people must know that business is a place "where the action is" and that it is action which benefits people and which has a place for idealism.

The story of American business is the greatest story ever told.

I work each day with Plans for Progress, an organization of private businessmen which have helped tear down barriers of domination in America, which is helping provide new opportunity to hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

I work each day with businessmen who seek to keep young Americans in school, and on the path to responsible citizenship, through summer jobs. Last year they helped provide one million jobs to young people who otherwise would have been without them.

American businessmen are leaders in our efforts today to make our cities livable . . . to preserve the natural beauty and resources of our country . . . to bring education of quality to every American child . . . to make the arts, culture and recreation an every day part of American life.

American businessmen are at work on behalf of clean and honest government. They are at work on behalf of charity and philanthropy.

And the wages and benefits they extend voluntarily to those in their employe are better than those extended by many governments known for their welfare programs.

American business has been the advanced guard, too, in many countries, of enlightened social, economic and political policy.

The present change in Western policy toward Eastern Europe—a charge which is helping to hasten the movement toward independent policies there—has been aided in no small part by the economic bridge-building of American and Western European businessmen. Businessmen, with confidence in their economic system, have moved ahead on their own initiative to open Eastern Europe to ideas, to trade, to the winds of change. And all of us are the better for it.

It is a fact, too, that American private investment in the developing countries has, in many cases, triggered changes which have not only brought economic development, but political stability and social development as well. In many places, American private investment is making possible, for the first time, large-scale development of housing . . . the building of rural schools, roads and hospitals . . . construction of fertilizer plants—the things which not only develop an economy, but also give immediate and concrete evidence that democratic government can meet the needs and aspirations of simple, ordinary people.

The so-called Adela group—a consortium of American and European businessmen—is today taking equity shares in much-needed Latin American enterprise which could not otherwise find the capital to get off the ground.

In Latin America and in other parts of the world, hundreds of private American investors are today providing capital—to places starved for capital—for economic and social projects. And I might add that your government backs them up with guarantees.

And there is the personal commitment, too, of American businessmen who know that the labors of one man can make a difference.

There are the efforts of American small businessmen in Tunisia, teaching their counterparts there how to sell a better product, provide a better service, make a profit.

There are the efforts of the men and women of the International Executive Service Corps—retired American business executives—who are giving several months out of their lives to help enterprises get started in Latin America and in Southeast Asia.

All these things not only strengthen nations desperately in need of help . . . they strengthen the fabric of freedom. They show that there does not have to be a big brother to get things done. They show that free men, working together, can do far more than any totalitarian system giving orders.

Your own Project ACTT train and the Jaycees International Movement exemplify the spirit with which business has met the opportunities of international service.

And all of us are in debt to men who have, at personal sacrifice, left the world of business to enter the public service at local, state and national level.

American businessmen are indeed where the action is. And, for the good of men everywhere I hope they will remain there.

he received an honorary degree from Milliken University in Decatur.

This time he really had to work for his degree. Lincoln College assigned him no easy task. It called on Congressman SPRINGER to deliver the commencement address, on the college's 101st anniversary, as a substitute for the Senate minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, one of the great orators of our time. Senator DIRKSEN's recent hip injury forced him to cancel his scheduled commencement address at Lincoln College.

Congressman SPRINGER handled this difficult assignment with the same good-humored deftness we are accustomed to seeing him display as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His speech at Lincoln College shows wit and erudition. I include it here so that all of my colleagues can read and enjoy it:

I am here as your speaker today because Ev DIRKSEN fell out of bed.

I understand you were to be privileged to hear that great personality on this occasion had it not been for his accident. Please do not expect me to emulate his style or his appearance. Try as I will my hair will not stick out like that. It has been suggested that the Senator carries batteries in his pockets to keep that effect, but I think the insinuation is fallacious and shocking.

It is an honor to be considered worthy to fill in for the sage of the Senate, and I am sure that years hence when asked who delivered the commencement address at your college you will unhesitatingly reply, "Some congressman substituting for Senator DIRKSEN." Such is the price of popularity. You can be assured that the Senator would much rather be with you today, hip intact and bon mots at the ready.

Over the years I have had occasion to observe many commencement exercises—not too often as a participant, I hasten to explain, but as a speaker and as a proud parent eagerly awaiting the thrilling end to a four year financial disaster. Without doing any research in depth on the subject, I have observed that most commencement speakers tend to reminisce and bore you stiff with stories about the good old days. You should be very pleased to know that I shall be no exception to the rule. I would not want to break old traditions and have the ivy fall off the walls from surprise.

But I will keep in mind that the "hard times of today" are what we later on refer to as the "good old days." Having gone to college in the depths of the "Great Depression," which at the time was a description of an economic condition and not a psychiatrist's term, I recall meeting an old college crony in his cups who wistfully described those happy, carefree college days when we had no worry in the world—except the haunting fear that we might starve to death.

But as we old duffers recall the day of the five cent hamburger, I cannot help but ponder how it will sound in years to come when you, as the old crocks who make the speeches, turn on the nostalgia and tell about the days when—

A hamburger only cost thirty-five cents and the catsup was free.

You could buy a reasonably good suit for as little as ninety dollars.

Some working men were able to subsist on about one hundred fifty dollars a week.

There was a little coin called a dime that was made out of silver.

Young people were much better behaved.

When you are young, any kind of days are good days if you will just let them be so.

Another thing the commencement speaker is famous for, according to my little personal research project (which was turned down for a grant by NIH), is that invariably he has some pet philosophy which he has expounded ad nauseum to his children for the last quarter century. The general reception in that forum is always PHFFT. But now he has a whole new group to try it out on. Best of all, he has them in a position where they must listen politely and even applaud. What rapture. He can now hold up his head at home. And that is why it is not difficult to recruit commencement speakers.

So, in this instance also, I will do my best to live up to the commencement speaker's code. I have a philosophy which meets all the specifications, and I shall proceed to expound it, so brace yourself.

Let us talk for a moment about an old and overused word—Security. We can look at it from various points of view and in several of its ramifications to see whether or not it deserves the awe in which it seems to be held.

First, there is that elusive but apparently demanding thing called "national security." At times the country seems to be obsessed with it, whatever it may be. We find that nearly everything we do has some bearing on that nebulous thing—national security. We keep stockpiles of materials in its name. We probe space in its name. We spend over half of our staggering national budget for its most apparent aspect, military preparedness. We support other nations and international agreements and even international armed forces in its name.

At the same time we make it known privately and publicly that the United States is so strong and so resolute that all other nations really exist by our permission. We can, if necessary, says the gospel, annihilate any nation or group of nations which seriously threatens our existence. Probably so. But if so, what are we so worried about all the time?

Back in the beginning of our country, talk about national security must have been a kind of joke. We were a shaky little runt of a nation with practically no military might and economically always struggling to beat our checks to the bank. Perhaps, we didn't really win our independence so much as we fell into it by reason of bungling in Britain and big troubles on the continent. But one thing is for sure—while the struggle was on, the word security could have been taken out of the dictionary and not been missed. There was no such animal.

Where along the line then did we achieve this thing called national security? Not certainly by the War of 1812 when our disgruntled parent came over to teach us a lesson or two. Her troops roamed around and inflicted damage at will. The biggest mistake they made was to choose to burn up the most worthless piece of real property in the country at the time—the Capitol in Washington. Other problems brewing among stronger nations saved our bacon. We survived, but you could hardly describe the situation either before or after as national security.

When, then? By 1860? At that time we found out for sure that local squabbles are far more important to people than national security. There could be no swifter way to lay ourselves helpless before the world than to bleed the nation white by internal dissension and bloody fratricide. The War of the Roses had taught us nothing.

Again we were lucky. No one needed, or knew what to do with an unruly colony at the moment. It would have been like adopting Peck's Bad Boy. So they left us pretty much alone to bleed ourselves to death. And we tried hard enough. Did we then or soon thereafter have anything which might by any definition be called national security? I think not.

Once in our history we thought we had finally achieved national security. After World War I everyone was determined that we would never again be caught up in the wars of others. And we thought we knew how to accomplish it as well. It was simple—destroy everything needed to fight with and tell the remainder of the world we simply were not interested in their problems. If that was national security, I hope we don't have any again soon.

By 1941 we were wondering "What Happened". The Japanese were fixing to gobble up the Pacific including anything we had or might want out there. Europe was disappearing down the Nazi craw, and Hitler's disciples were making alarming inroads in South America. If security means being all alone in the world looking out at a ring of wolves, we had achieved it. Many a long year went by before we could breathe easier and see the tide turn. Fighting men on the bleak islands of the Pacific in 1944 saw no easy road home as they chanted "Golden Gate by '48."

Reminding you of the history since World War II with its cold war, its brinkmanship, the dark cloud of "the bomb," it should not surprise you to find that I think this thing known as national security is a myth. No one ever had it and no one ever will. What we like to think of as national security is a continuing gamble with history based on a series of hunches known as National Security Estimates.

There should be no expectation that we will win them all, but it might be nice to stop playing with the other guy's dice now and then. We should be as confident these days as we were smug before World War II and remember the story of the Russian school boy who was being interrogated by the visiting commissar.

"What do you know about the United States, Ivan?" asked his Honor. "Sir, Commissar," said Ivan, "the United States is a bloated, rich, evil, capitalist nation which wants to dominate the world. It feeds on its poor, downtrodden people who are illiterate and stupid."

"Fine, fine," said the pleased Commissar. "Now tell us what you know about the aims of the Glorious Peoples Republic."

"The aims of the Peoples Republic," recited Ivan, "are to catch up with the United States."

These are uncertain and perilous times in the history of man. That speech could also have been made when the sabre toothed tiger roamed these parts. All times are uncertain—uncertain for nations and uncertain for individuals. An observation on this point was well put by Admiral Radford when he said: "Freedom is not something we inherit by the accident of being born Americans. Each generation must earn it for itself."

So let us examine the idea of personal security for a bit, remembering that in this vale of tears we have no assurance from anywhere that we will get home for dinner tonight. Certain elements among our youth proclaim loudly that they cannot conform to ordinary standards because this generation left them with such tough problems to solve. So they choose to ignore them in the hope that they will go away. Even if their assumption were correct—that we did just purposely unload horrendous problems on them out of pure meanness—they spite only themselves and succeeding generations if they refuse to tackle what we bumblers may have messed up.

It is popular to look backwards at an idyllic age when life was more secure. There comes to mind an image of a rosy cheeked boy in knickers, wearing a cloth cap and rolling a hoop down a quiet, shady street. At the same time, father wore a high celluloid collar which would surely melt under the rigors of a Watusi. This generation, it could be argued, had that thing called security. The

It is part of the good news of the day that our free economic system—and the people who make it work—is not only providing profits, it is providing life and hope to the family of man.

Now, finally, it is my responsibility as your Vice President to give you a report, as of today, about where we stand in Asia and in Vietnam.

I say Asia and Vietnam, because we cannot see Vietnam as a vacuum, unconnected to its neighbors or the rest of the world.

When I returned from Asia and the Pacific earlier this year, I reported to the American people that I believed we had reason for measured optimism. I believe that this is more true today than it was then.

Last week, nine nations of Asia formed a new organization to be known as the Asian and Pacific Council. This organization was formed to strengthen these nations cooperation and peaceful development, but also—as the final communique put it—"To preserve their integrity and sovereignty in the face of external aggression."

This is but one of the things that can give us reason for encouragement.

Faced with communist pressure, the independent noncommunist states in Asia are working together to strengthen themselves and to inoculate themselves against aggression. Old quarrels and disagreements are being pushed aside and the nations of Asia and the Pacific are banding together—and among those banding together are nations which have traditionally taken go-it-alone positions.

Communist China still looms as a powerful force in Asia. But today Communist China is being torn by power struggle—a struggle with other communist nations, a struggle, too, from within. At the same time, her neighbors are achieving a unity of purpose and action that was missing before.

For, as the President of Singapore made clear a few days ago to the people of Europe—all the independent nations of Asia feel the pressure from the North—all of them feel they have a stake in what is happening in Vietnam.

On my Asian mission, I talked with no national leader who felt otherwise.

What of the immediate struggle in Vietnam.

That struggle is being waged on four fronts—the economic front . . . the political front . . . the diplomatic front . . . and the military front.

On each of these fronts we are gaining. And our efforts on these fronts are increasingly being coordinated, in proper balance.

On the economic front, the Vietnamese government, with our help, is taking the hard steps and decisions necessary not only to carry forward a program of economic development, but to defeat inflation—which can destroy economic progress.

The devaluation announced June 19 has not resulted in any sharp increase in prices. The price of retail items, including the critical price of rice, has steadied off. The prices of fish, chicken, charcoal and firewood—all critical to the economy—have fallen. Import prices are steady.

In the meantime, the hard day-to-day work of building a strong economy—the hard work that never makes the daily headlines—goes on in the Vietnamese cities and countryside.

Land is being redistributed. Wells are being dug. Schools are being built. Agricultural production steadily increases. Hospitals and roads are being completed.

These things are not dramatic. But every day the Vietnamese economy—and the life of the Vietnamese citizen—becomes a little better than it was the day before, despite calculated communist disruption and terror.

On the political front, work goes forward toward election this September for a constituent assembly. Representatives of all South Vietnamese political groups have been meeting to prepare the way for democratic government.

This is a nation which has undergone centuries of foreign rule and oppression. This is a nation with no comfortable, built-in republican and democratic parties. This is a nation trying to create stable, representative government in the midst of war and disorder. This is a nation with dozens of political, ethnic and religious groups—all seeking their own place in the future.

If this process should bring conflict and confusion, it should not surprise us.

The important fact is that the Vietnamese people are finding their way toward nationhood, and that they are doing it their own way and not under the direction of any communist commissar.

I think there is another thing to remember—in all the political ferment in South Vietnam there has been no call for a communist government.

The people of South Vietnam know the communists for what they are. And they know the so-called national liberation front for what it is—a front, for Ho Chi Minh and a communist takeover.

As on the economic front, the progress is slow and sometimes unnoticeable. But it is there, day-by-day. The time is near when the people of South Vietnam will show their commitment to democracy with their ballots. Many of them will be threatened with violence and even death, but they will vote. And I predict that the percentage of South Vietnamese who will vote—in face of these threats—will exceed the percentages in many of our American towns and cities.

On the diplomatic front, we continue our search for a just and peaceful solution to the conflict.

In these past weeks, we have repeated our message again and again—through diplomatic channels, through third parties, through public statement, through private and official sources—our willingness to come to the conference table to bring the violence to an end.

Although we have met with nothing but rebuff, we shall continue these efforts. And we shall maintain our offer to aid in the peaceful development of North as well as South Vietnam if only Hanoi will leave her neighbors alone.

At the same time, we have reaffirmed throughout Asia and the Pacific, our commitment to the security and economic growth of that part of the world. And we have reaffirmed our commitment to stand and see it through in Vietnam.

I believe that the depth of our commitment has been one of the major factors in the development of the regional cooperation and spirit of common cause we now see in Asia and the Pacific.

The purpose of our diplomacy has been, and will remain, the end of the fighting . . . the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam can freely choose their own future . . . and the gathering together of the resources of all nations to make life better for the by-passed millions who have waited for centuries in Asian village streets.

On the military front, we are gaining, too, each day.

The American troops in Vietnam are the finest men who have ever worn this nation's uniform. They are superbly led. They are superbly trained. They are superbly equipped. And their performance has been superb.

With our allies, they have inflicted in these past weeks a series of defeats on both Guerrilla and regular North Vietnamese units.

They have done nothing less than this—they have caused our adversary to re-examine all his old assumptions about "wars of national liberation."

The jungle or cave is no longer his sure refuge. His movement can no longer remain undetected. His supply can be cut off. The attacks he begins at great numerical advantage can become, in a matter of minutes, a disastrous defeat as he faces unexpected reinforcements and firepower. He can no longer choose his own time and place to fight.

And, perhaps most important, he can no longer count on the discipline of his own troops.

In the last six months of 1965, more than 8,000 communist defectors left his ranks. In the first five months of this year, he has lost more than 11,000 defectors—and more and more of them have been squad and platoon leaders and officers.

Today there must be some hard thinking taking place in Hanoi.

Today Ho Chi Minh is in Peking. Other officials of his government are in Moscow.

I think it must be clear to Hanoi that what President Johnson said more than a year ago remains true today.

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement . . ."

Our adversary must know that time is not on his side.

He must know that we will not sacrifice small nations for the sake of our own comfort.

He must know that we—and those who stand with us—count freedom no less sacred elsewhere than we do at home.

He must know, above all, that the American people have the resources, the vision, the courage, and the endurance to see it through for what we believe in.

Finally, may I say this.

The Alien fields of Vietnam will not be our final testing place between now and the year 1984.

There will be other tests . . . there will be other challenges on man's path toward a future of his own making.

Let us recognize, today, that the future lies in large part on our own American doorstep.

For our American wealth and power—our power to shape the course of events for good—is unparalleled in the history of the world.

More than any other people on earth, the American people have the means today to determine what kind of world it will be in 1984.

It is our opportunity—and our responsibility—to do whatever is within our power to see that 1984 does not bring stifling conformity and slavery. It must be our mission to see that 1984 will be a time when human freedom and human dignity may come to shining reality.

Honorary Degree for Bill Springer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln College in Illinois on Sunday, June 12, conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws on our good friend and colleague, BILL SPRINGER. This was the second time that the gentleman from Illinois has been so honored by an institution of higher learning in his district. In 1953 is quietly starting another major expansion of the Armed Forces. By the end of the year the 280,000-man force currently in South Vietnam will have increased to 375,000 by yearend and to 425,000 by next spring.

The Times itself in the same edition said supply problems in Vietnam are being overcome. But it added that lack of candor by the Johnson administration and the attempt to hide problems is unfair to the military.

CASE III

The Scripps-Howard roundup which appeared in the June 4 Washington Daily News said the Johnson administration has a hush-hush policy on prices. It said Cabinet members, economists, statisticians all have been told to soft-pedal prices and inflation which this newspaper pointed out are political dynamite.

CASE IV

According to a recent report of the Senate minority policy committee, the civil service retirement fund has $15 billion in investments. Income from this investment, plus Government contributions, keep the outgo current, but by 1970 the outflow will exceed cash receipts. On an accrual basis, there is an arrearage in the capital account of about $40 billion. Congress is obligated to vote funds to pay retirement benefits to civil employees.

CASE V

Under the title of "Politics in Poverty," the July 1 Washington Daily News described job security in a federally financed Kentucky coal area poverty program as conditioned on political kinships or economic interest to the county's Democratic courthouse machine.

CASE VI

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, according to a letter published in the Nation, berated a Washington, D.C., professor who in a broadcast pointed out that weekly figures on American deaths in Vietnam do not include casualties from disease, air accidents, and the like. In the past, when Sylvester did not approve of newsmen he threatened to go to their editors; in this case he carried his protest to the president of the university where the professor teaches.

CASE VII

The Department of Agriculture placed a rush order for 2,900 special typewriters which cost more than $500 each. Due to the rush, the Department was spending $1,500,000, or $500,000 more than the cost would have been if it had taken competitive bids.

According to the Agricultural Stabilization Service the rush was to meet a deadline of January 1, 1967, for reporting of farmers' payments. What the Department overlooked was that an amendment establishing the deadline had been defeated and was not in the law.

CASE VIII

Not long ago an article in U.S. News & World Report said antipoverty funds granted to Syracuse University were used, in part, to hire baby sitters and pay taxi fares to transfer people from heavy Democratic public housing areas to voter registration centers in the city.

CASE IX

A recent Gallup poll reported that 41 percent of the population lists crime as the greatest domestic problem in America. Some 51 percent of those polled believe that the problem had worsened in the last 5 years.

Statistics bear out this worry. In a report on June 20, 1966, the U.S. Department of Justice revealed that crime increased 6 percent in the first 3 months of 1966. The increase was led by a 14-percent rise in forcible rape, 11-percent rise in larceny, 9 percent in aggravated assault, 5 percent in auto theft, with murder, robbery, and burglary each chalking up 4-percent gains.

CASE X

An editorial in the June issue of a trade magazine, Welding Engineer, mentions a program of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity. It criticizes the program's cost of $16,000 to train four welders but especially is critical because the students only received training in one kind of welding. It points this up as an example of Government getting into some areas about which it knows little or nothing, and wonders why a welding school has to be set up in a city that already has two of the best privately operated welding schools with experienced teachers in the country.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, so teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto Thy children.

And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us: and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it.

For the Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident.

For in the time of trouble He shall hide me in His pavilion: in the secret of His tabernacle shall He hide me; He shall set me up upon a rock.

Teach me Thy way, O Lord, and lead me in a plain path.

For I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 13, 1966, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXCEPTION OF REAL PROPERTY OWNED BY NEW ZEALAND FROM PROVISIONS OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO LOCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to except real property owned by the Government of New Zealand from the provisions of certain laws regulating the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompaning paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on that Department's activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the third division of the Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNTS OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON RADIATION PROTECTION AND MEASUREMENTS

A letter from the General Counsel for the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the accounts of that Council, dated December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

country seemed to be entirely safe economically and diplomatically. So little Rollo could look forward to taking over father's business and living in quiet luxury and respectability to a ripe old age.

So Rollo went to Yale and lived with the Bulldog for four years, meeting some of the best people. From them he learned that the best way to make it go forever and ever was to get into stocks and bonds. So this Yale graduate went on to Wall Street and sold bonds. Such was the temper of the times that in due course he had acquired those trappings of security which we all recognize. He had a seat on the Exchange, a home on Long Island and a yacht on the Sound, to say nothing of shares and shares and shares of the best corporations. And then one day something impossible happened. The market went "Boom." He looked around at all his security and found that it had vanished. All he had in the world was a degree from Yale which had long since withered for lack of use. So he opened his window and went to the pavement clutching in his hands some pieces of paper called securities.

This story to you sounds strange, but it happened more times than you would like to know about. It happened in many different ways, in every generation, and it can only lead to a conclusion that security for the individual is also something of a myth. It is, at least, if we think of it in terms of safety from the buffeting of the world—if we think of it in terms of insulation from material worries. All of the high powered social programs designed to insure security, at least late in life—life insurance, social security benefits, medicare—are useful but no guarantee of anything.

If we must define security, I think we would have to compare it more with religion. It comes from within. It is there as long as you believe and know it is there and also do the things your intellect tells you must be done in its name. If you do not doubt it, you have it.

A friend of mine once told me that he had received his inheritance at age 18. He said that was when his father, a lawyer, told him never to expect any property or money to come to him from his, the father's death. "First of all," he said, "there would probably be none anyway because I would use it as I go along. And if I tried desperately to leave an estate for you, it could be wiped out overnight, and the effort would be wasted. One thing I can and will give you and now, so make the most of it. You can have any kind of an education you wish to work for. I will ask no questions as to how long or how expensive. This inheritance, properly managed, will bring you more security than any property I might be in a position to hand on down to you. It is a property which is not perishable or subject to the fluctuations of the market. It can adjust to any circumstances and be used to take care of you and all those you love. It can also be the source of the greatest satisfactions in life." And so it was. Now I doubt that the son was so overwhelmed with this magnanimity that he fell down and kissed his father's feet. I can imagine what his inner reactions might have been. But today he would agree with his father's thinking.

Now that you know my philosophy on the importance of education and the relative unimportance of more material attributes of society you can also understand why over the years I have been in Congress I have supported most of the measures which would make more educational facilities available and make it possible for more of our qualified youth to attend college. A combination of factors has dictated such a course for the government. The large population bulge in college age people has created an acute shortage of physical facilities in which education can take place. The recognition of the national need for scientists and all other advanced skills pointed to government participation.

It started with Sputnik. Suddenly there was a great urgency to train scientists. Great emphasis—probably too much—was concentrated on facilities and courses to produce graduates equipped to speed up our space age image. The concept was too narrow and motivated by misplaced concern, but it did point up a problem.

Trying to solve what at first appeared as a limited problem, the nation was brought face to face with the realization that the need for well educated citizens was far broader. We could not produce high powered scientists by suddenly making the field attractive if we did not build an educational base in the lower grades and secondary schools. To do this required a new breed of teacher and instructor. That in turn required new emphasis on educational courses for aspiring teachers and retreading for those already working at it. To launch a satellite into space and go on from there takes more than a new crop of Werner Von Brauns. Behind every countdown is an immense background of scientific work in many related fields from basic research on matter itself through medical research to engineering.

As these truths gradually dawned upon us we saw evidence of new dedication and new direction in all of education. The National Defense Education Act was expanded greatly to include what might look like extraneous curricula at first blush. That was proper.

My own activity in that regard has been concentrated somewhat in the field of health professions education because the main committee upon which I serve, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, deals directly with them, but the principles hold true throughout the higher education. In the last few years we have made funds available to build new schools and expand or update schools which will produce doctors, dentists, nurses and other health professionals. There are traineeships for graduates who will strive to qualify as teachers and supervisors in their respective professions. There are loans and now even scholarships to make these professions more available to qualified individuals. At the present time our committee is working on a bill to extend this same kind of help to the supporting professions in the health field such as medical technology and physical therapy. Many new subdivisions of these categories are appearing, and we need to encourage them in the same manner.

I am sure that I would be categorized as a "Progressive conservative" although these pigeon holes mean very little. I have felt for many years and so stated that the best way we could help other countries is to give them technical and educational assistance in such basic matters as health, education and food production. Huge sums sunk into foreign economies seldom pay off. But in the matter of increasing opportunities for our own youth to gain education and make use of its tremendous potential, I see no reason to spare the horses. I said previously security is an attitude, and I think further that it must be based on knowledge. Here is where we insure our national security.

Yes, problems you will have. Some we will leave you and some you will think up by yourselves. The pressures on your generation are terrific. But you also are better equipped to cope with them than any generation so far.

A laundry list of the problems we plan to leave for you would not be comforting either. They range from basic problems like "Is God dead?" to the franchise for a local CATV system. And all of them can give someone ulcers.

By all appearances foreign aid in its present form will still be with you for policy decisions. I have some misgivings about the course this program has taken over the years. How long shall we continue to build up and support countries which refuse political and economic freedom to their own people? It is argued that recipients of our aid must remain neutral in order to retain their self respect. I must confess that it bothers my self respect to have someone help himself to my picnic basket as though he had brought it, eat the best part of the chicken and throw the bones in my face. And when to you with failing hands we throw this hot torch, lots of luck.

And among you here today may be someone who will find himself faced with a duty to make decisions, or at least recommendations about military commitments to other countries. Perhaps you will come forth, as one of my staff assistants did recently when he said, "Congressman, here are four wrong answers—which one do you like?" Shall we help our friends all out? How far should this go? Should we supply only equipment? Should we train troops for other countries? Should we supply our own troops to fight for them? How do we tell who our friends are at any given moment without a scorecard?

I think my point is made. It's an uncertain old world and you are struck with it. So I can only suggest one antidote for the somber and threatening aspects of mankind's future. Don't worry too much about life because you are not going to live through it anyhow. Remember that the world is three-fourths water so the Lord must have intended that we do three times as much fishing as hoeing. About half of life is formalized nonsense which need not impede your progress if you recognize it for what it is and smile at it.

And if the clucking of the old fogies about the younger generation gets on your nerves at times, just remember that every one of them would gladly join you, taking on the burdens you must bear to enjoy the fun you will get out of life in these next few years of work and play. Not pretending to speak for anyone else, I am greatly comforted to realize that the heritage we leave to you is to be in the hands of a new group which is considerably brighter and better prepared for it than my own crowd was thirty-five years ago.

Disclosures of the Week—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, hereinafter is recent information that has come to my attention and which it seems to me should cause concern to the American public.

CASE I

Tax Foundation, Inc., in June 1966 reported to its members that estimated Federal civilian employment at the end of April was 2,644,244, an increase of 33,464 for that month alone. The U.S. Civil Service Commission was quoted as indicating Federal employment will further increase by 100,000 by 1969.

CASE II

According to an article by William Beecher in the July 10 New York Times, despite optimistic declarations about Vietnam war prospects by President Johnson and others, the administration

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the letter of Albert Archibald, of Martinsburg, W. Va., expressing condolences relating to the illness of Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, Sr.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3615. A bill for the relief of Desire V. Vanderhoeven; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3616. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning November 27, 1966, and ending December 1, 1966, as "National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. Pastore):

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

LOCATION OR TRANSFER OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. Lausche) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) to provide for use of a major factor of avoiding problems of heavy population concentrations in the location of Federal Government activities and in Federal Government purchasing and contracting, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Miller, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF A COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 283) creating a Committee on Intelligence Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and submitted a report (No. 1371) thereon.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Fulbright, which appears under a separate heading.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour on matters other than the announced business this morning, and with a time limitation of 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. That does not refer to any discussion that might occur on any point of order that might be made. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. Just routine morning business.

Is there morning business?

THE TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to permit those States now divided by two or more time zones to exercise some option in its application.

This bill would not detract in any major way from the basic principle of uniformity established by the recent Time Act. Its only purpose would be to eliminate the difficult and unfair circumstances which result from applying the act to States bisected by time zone lines.

There are 13 States which are cut into parts by time zone lines. For example, at the present time the boundary line between central time and eastern time runs almost through the center of the States of Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee; it also separates Michigan's Upper Peninsula from the rest of the State, and goes through the western tip of Florida.

Furthermore, the line between mountain and central time bisects South Dakota and Nebraska, and slices across the southwest corner of North Dakota and the western part of Kansas. The boundary line between Pacific time and mountain time separates portions of Idaho, Oregon, and Utah; even Salt Lake City and the Great Salt Lake are in different time zones. The most extreme case is that of Alaska which is in four time zones: Pacific, Yukon, Alaska, and Bering.

All of these time lines, which were established by the Interstate Commerce Commission after investigation, hearings and negotiations, have been designed to minimize the problems resulting from time differentials. The line through my own State of Indiana had to be drawn carefully to avoid splitting metropolitan areas.

The bill which I am introducing today will make it much more feasible for bisected States to operate under the new Time Act. Under present provisions of the Time Act of 1966, the decision to adopt daylight saving time or to remain on standard time must be made for entire State. This will in some cases result in great hardship and confusion, especially in those sections of a State which are part of a large metropolitan area centered in an adjoining State. Under my amendment, that decision could be made separately for each portion of a State bisected by a time line.

Let me emphasize that other States would not be affected and that bisected States would not be exempted from any other provision of the Time Act. It would require bisected States to commence and end daylight time on the same dates as all other States. It would not authorize any form of local political option for a city, a county, or any other such subdivision. To the contrary, the phrase "including all political subdivisions thereof," which makes the Time Act applicable to an entire State, would remain in the act.

The bill is not designed to exempt political or governmental subdivisions of any kind; rather, it would permit removal of the time zones as such from only one of the act's many requirements. Its scope is much narrower than those amendments which were presented to Congress during consideration of the Time Act. It will apply in only a few instances, and will not detract from national time uniformity.

The difficulties which will face Indiana and other States under the present provisions of the Time Act are not products of isolation. They will be caused by their unavoidable and significant economic and social ties to sister States. An amendment recognizing the indivisible relations between one part of a bisected State and its neighbors would allow choices which can only increase joint, interstate time coordination.

Mr. President, the diversity of our Nation often requires that we take different paths to reach common goals. A coordinated national time system is indeed a worthy goal, but to ignore the different ways in which time zones affect individual States could produce a stifling uniformity that might prevent further development of a coordinated national time system. Recognition of the specialized problems presented by that group of States divided by time zone lines is but one more recognition of the diversity of our States. It is also a recognition of the principle that true national policy comes best from coordinating the Nation's diversity, not stifling it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this bill be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3616) to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases, introduced by Mr. Bayh, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 is amended by inserting after "including all political subdivisions thereof" the following: "other than in the case of a State with parts thereof in different time zones which State may so exempt one or more such parts".

NATIONAL DAIRY FARMERS COOPERATIVES WEEK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation providing for a National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Milk Producers Federation.

The Nation's dairy farmers are the most efficient single group of agricultural producers in the Nation today. Much of this efficiency in production can be attributed to the giant strides made by dairy cooperatives in spreading technological know-how among farmer members.

Even more important, dairy cooperatives have done a magnificent job over the years of helping the dairy farmer to raise his income. Despite long hours of work and high capital investment, the Nation's dairy farmer gets a pitifully low return on his dollar. Without dairy cooperatives the return would be much lower.

The consumer has a particular reason for being grateful to the dairy cooperative movement. Dairy cooperatives have insured the consumer of a constant supply of "nature's perfect food" at reasonable cost. They have done this by fighting low dairy prices—prices that might cause many a dairy farmer to stop producing milk—while at the same time emphasizing greater efficiency on the dairy farm.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will express its appreciation of the job being done by the cooperative movement by passing this joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 175) to designate the period beginning November 27, 1966, and ending December 1, 1966, as "National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week," introduced by Mr. Proxmire, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT PROVIDENCE, R.I., AS THE "THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would designate the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital."

This joint resolution would be a most fitting tribute to my distinguished predecessor in this Chamber who died last month at the age of 99 after achieving a remarkable record as the oldest man ever to serve in the U.S. Congress.

Theodore Francis Green will long be remembered as a statesman and a patriot who understood the realities of international power and who knew at firsthand the perils and price of military service. It is therefore appropriate that we commemorate him by designating a veterans hospital in his name.

As a young man he raised his own company in the Spanish-American War, thus beginning his career in public affairs on a singularly patriotic note. Some years later, as a Member of the Senate, he was instrumental in establishing the Navy base at Quonset Point on the eastern shores of Narragansett Bay. He was also instrumental in establishing in Rhode Island the Veterans' Administration hospital which by the terms of this Senate joint resolution, would be designated by his name.

Mr. President, I am aware that it is the practice of the Veterans' Administration to defer to the wishes of Congress in giving such designations to hospitals, rather than to do so by administrative action. At least two VA hospitals have been so designated by specific legislative directives: the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital at Montrose, N.Y., and the Royal C. Johnson Veterans' Memorial Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. In addition, I am advised, there are the John J. Cochran Veterans Hospital in St. Louis, Mo., and the Edward Hines Veterans Memorial Hospital in Hines, Ill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the memory and record of Theodore Francis Green clearly merits this sort of commemoration and that the Providence hospital, designated by his name, should be added to this list. I hope the Senate will join me in honoring one of its great members and give early consideration to the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the Record at this point, along with a letter from Carmine V. Rivera, of Rhode Island, national vice president of the National Association of Government Employees, who first suggested the idea embodied in this joint resolution; and also a letter from W. J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 176) to provide for designation of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital," introduced by Mr. Pell (for himself and Mr. Pastore), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 176

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration hospital, located at Providence, Rhode Island, shall hereafter be known and designated on the public records as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital", and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such hospital is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such hospital under and by the name of "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital".

The letters, presented by Mr. Pell, are as follows:

June 6, 1966.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Thank you for the opportunity extended by your letter of May 27th, 1966, to comment on a suggestion by Mr. Carmine V. Rivera, National Vice President of the National Association of Government Employees, that the Veterans Administration Hospital in Providence, Rhode Island, be designated as the Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital.

Senator Green had a distinguished career of public service, most notably as a Senator from Rhode Island for many years. We fully appreciate the importance of paying due homage to this outstanding statesman. I must tell you, however, that the Veterans Administration has long followed a policy of naming its hospitals for the city or town in or near which they are located. That policy was adopted after considering suggestions that the hospitals be named for prominent doctors, Congressional Medal of Honor winners, and other individuals. It was realized that a fair basis of selection would be difficult, that controversy would result, and that persons or organizations whose candidates were not chosen would be disappointed.

Hospitals named by Congress, of course, are not subject to the mentioned administrative policy, and two have been named by legislative directives. They are the Royal C. Johnson Veterans Memorial Hospital and the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital, both of which were named by public laws enacted in 1945.

It has been our position in reporting on bills to name hospitals after individuals to point out our administrative policy and defer to the Congress on the propriety of legislative action.

We hope that this informaton will help you in your consideration of Mr. Rivera's suggestion.

Sincerely,

W. J. Driver,
Administrator.

May 19, 1966.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Pell: The passing away of the Honorable Theodore Francis Green was indeed a great loss to all those who loved him, not only in our state of Rhode Island but throughout the country.

We in Rhode Island will always be grateful to this dedicated man for his tremendous accomplishments during his tenure of office, particularly while he represented our state as a United States Senator.

We all know that the late distinguished gentleman was instrumental in bringing to Rhode Island the Veterans Administration Hospital, as well as naval establishments and other Federal agencies. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the entire Rhode Island Congressional Delegation immediately introduce legislation designating the Veterans Administration Hospital in Providence as the Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital.

With warm kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

Carmine V. Rivera.

LOCATION OR TRANSFER OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution by the senior Senator from Ohio and myself, ask to have it printed, and lie on the desk through the close of business on the 25th of July, and further, that a joint statement by Senator LAUSCHE and myself be placed in the RECORD as if read immediately following the printing of the concurrent resolution in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD and will lie at the desk as requested by the Senator from Iowa, and the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 101

Whereas heavy concentrations of population are causing a proliferation of social and economic problems which tend to deprive numerous citizens of an opportunity for wholesome living for themselves and their families; and

Whereas unrestrained commercial and population expansions will result in rapid increases and concentrations of municipal refuse, of agricultural solid waste, of smog-producing hydrocarbons, of nitrogen oxides, and in a rapidly increasing concentration of population; and

Whereas the location of sites for activities of the Federal Government and purchasing and contracting of the Federal Government, coupled with the mobility of our population, have caused and will continue to strongly influence regional and local concentration of population; and

Whereas the rate of population growth of certain regions of the United States has been substantially lower than the national rate of population growth; and

Whereas many such regions possess not only abundant resources for economic development but, equally important, unparalleled opportunity for wholesome living for people who wish to remain or move into them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that in the location or transfer of any Federal activity, or in the award of any Federal contract or subcontract (other than on a competitive bid basis), a major factor entering into the decision by the Federal Government shall be the promotion of a more orderly and equitable growth of the population of the various states and the areas within the several states to the end that problems of heavy concentrations of population will be avoided or minimized in order that more opportunities for wholesome living will be available to more people.

The statement, presented by Mr. MILLER and Mr. LAUSCHE is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS LAUSCHE AND MILLER

The Federal Government spends between $16 and $20 billion annually on research and development.

Billions more are poured into defense and space related activities and installations.

Yet, if one were to examine closely where these funds are being channelled, he would find that they are being concentrated in but a few states.

He would find that:

More than 34 per cent of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare research and development funds are being earmarked for universities in New York, California and Massachusetts.

More than 59 per cent of Atomic Energy Commission research and development funds are being sent to universities in California and New Mexico.

More than 69 per cent of National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development funds are going to universities in California.

More than 37 per cent of National Science Foundation grants are going to universities in California, New York and Massachusetts.

Anyone interested would further find that:

Five states—California, New York, Texas, Connecticut and Massachusetts—were awarded in fiscal year 1965 close to 50 per cent of the $23.3 billion in Department of Defense prime contracts. A closer scrutiny would reveal that two-thirds of the total prime contracts went to only 10 states.

An example of the inequities can be illustrated in the case of Texas. In fiscal year 1962, Texas was awarded military prime contracts in the amount of $1,006,000,000—four per cent of the national total. In fiscal year 1965, this had grown to $1.5 billion or 6.2 per cent of the national outlay.

One State—California—was awarded nearly 46 per cent of the $4.1 billion in National Aeronautics and Space Administration prime contracts. California, together with nine other states, accounted for close to 88 per cent of the total NASA prime contract awards.

This distribution of funds is being made without regard to the promotion of a more orderly and equitable growth of population. It has spawned such unrestrained commercial and population expansions as in the case of California where, according to estimates, within the next 30 years there will be increases in municipal refuse of from 12 to 40 million tons . . . of agricultural solid waste of from 13 to 18 million tons . . . of smog-producing hydrocarbons of from 7,345 to 9,095 tons per day . . . and of nitrogen oxides of from 2,215 to 3,975 tons per day. And at the present rate of growth, California will have a population of 1.5 billion.

These heavy concentrations of population are causing a proliferation of social and economic problems which tend to deprive numerous citizens of an opportunity for wholesome living for themselves and their families.

Another effect of the maldistribution of federal government funds is its serious impact on the distribution of scientific, professional and educational talents. Skills of many regions are being transferred to other areas.

It is estimated that the Midwest, for example, produces 40 per cent of the PhDs in science. Yet, because of the imbalance in federal fund distribution and the tendency to locate federal activities on each coast, the Midwest retains only about 25 per cent of them.

Needless to say, as the Waterloo, Iowa, Courier expressed it in an editorial last April 11, "In a day when competitive industry needs scientific research to survive, the uneven distribution of scientific brainpower must be a matter of concern."

It went on to comment that the Midwest "particularly is at a disadvantage because of the great cost of training PhDs whose talents are then transferred to other States."

When these talents are drained off from one area, expansion of businesses and industry is adversely affected.

If the trend is not reversed, we soon will have virtual "deserts" of scientific talent on the one hand and excessive concentrations of such talent on the other.

As a step in the direction of decentralization of government expenditures, we are introducing today a concurrent resolution making it the "sense of Congress" that there be a more equitable distribution of federal government contracts and activities.

The resolution sounds a warning on the "proliferation of social and economic problems" being caused by heavy concentrations of population.

And this is so because "unrestrained commercial and population expansions" do result in a proliferation of the problems we now face, such as air and water pollution.

It is also true that location of sites for activities of the federal government, coupled with the mobility of our population, strongly influences regional and local concentration of population. (Parenthetically, we might point out that employment in defense and space related industries in the State of Texas jumped from 65,300 in 1962 to 73,600 in 1964. And large increases were shown in 1965 and 1966.)

The resolution will provide our federal government agencies with a new guideline to follow in the location of federal government activities and in the placement of federal government contracts, and the result will be a reversal of the serious and dangerous trend towards undue population concentrations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 646

Mr. HART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MAILING PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 647

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have heard of many cases which constitute real hardship amongst many of my constituents who are sending parcels to their relatives serving in Vietnam. One mother, whose monthly income is less than $300 related to me that the cost of sending parcels to her son in Vietnam can reach $25 a month. I consider this a real economic hardship.

At this time I am sending to the table an amendment to H.R. 13448 which is presently pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The bill as it presently stands makes certain changes in the mailing privileges accorded to and for members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel serving in a combat zone. My amendment would further liberalize those privileges.

We all recognize the great morale factor which the receipt of mail and packages has to those who are serving their country in distant places. Mail is the only link with home and family. Most of us here can remember the anticipation and the joy of opening packages which we received while serving in the military. Servicemen in Vietnam can receive no less pleasure at the receipt of mail and packages from their loved ones at home. Moreover, our young men in Vietnam are fighting a tough, dangerous, and exceedingly disagreeable war and are fighting this war with bravery and in the finest possible tradition of American manhood. The best we can do is to help them as much as we can. Furthermore, any burden upon the families of our servicemen which hinders rather than encourages the sending of more packages and letters is also a burden upon the military effort of our country.

As I stated, I am greatly concerned about the cost of mailing packages to citizens serving in Vietnam. Many Rhode Islanders and I am sure all Americans, would like to increase the frequency of package mailing overseas. However, they find that due to cost, they cannot send as many packages as they desire. This obviously prevents the receipt of much desired mail from home by serving personnel.

To correct what I feel is an unnecessary and unwanted obstacle to the morale of our servicemen in Vietnam, I have drafted an amendment which provides that postage on parcels of 10 pounds or less, mailed to or from an overseas combat zone, shall be mailed at one half the postage rate which they would now require. I believe, Mr. President, that this proposed amendment to H.R. 13448 would have the effect of increasing the volume of packages to our servicemen. By accepting this amendment, the Senate would be doing a tremendous service to both our men overseas and their familes at home.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3475, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUT OF THE WILDERNESS OF VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 5 minutes in which to make a brief statement not on a CIA matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 29, 1966, units of the U.S. Air Force and Navy struck oil storage installations in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong in North Vietnam. This action was taken in support of 270,000 U.S. troops fighting in South Vietnam, and to deny necessary fuel supplies to aggressor forces. Most significantly, this action was taken to convince the Hanoi regime that its own best interests lie in abandoning war and choosing peace for Vietnam.

The decision of the Commander in Chief in consultation with his military and diplomatic advisers was no rash escalation of the tragic war in southeast Asia. It was, in my opinion, the logical consequence of events transpiring in that area in the past 6 months.

General Westmoreland has pointed out that the tide of battle is no longer running against the forces of the Republic of South Vietnam and those of her allies. With the substantial support of Amercan troops, who have shown amazing skill, resourcefulness, and superb courage, the forces of freedom have taken the heart out of the Vietcong effort; they have effectively diminished if not, indeed, destroyed the Red hopes of victory through subversion and wanton murder. In so doing, they have completely altered the political outlook in Vietnam. The ends for which we fight can be achieved by force of arms, if not by negotiation.

In the course of recent political disturbances, it remained clear that the large bulk of the Vietnamese in the South want nothing to do with the terror tactics or the attempted domination by the so-called National Liberation Front. This point is agreed upon by Buddhists and Catholics, by merchants, farmers, laborers, and by General Ky and Thich Tri Quang.

In the past 6 months there has been a continuing U.S. effort to find a formula for peace, to which there has been no forthright response from the Communists to U.S. offers of unconditional discussions, or of any mutual reduction of hostilities. The only response has been that South Vietnam and her allies must accept the program of the National Liberation Front—in effect, surrender.

I find no logic in the argument that these recent air strikes will further delay reaching the conference table. Openhanded efforts, "the pause," public announcements of willingness to meet, repeated appeals to the United Nations, indications of an acceptance of a reconvened Geneva Conference, global diplomatic efforts—all have failed to produce a significant response because the forces of North Vietnam have counted on a military victory.

The logic is much more persuasive, it seems to me, that our continuing military exertions in the South, and, on a carefully measured basis in the North—as part of a resolute policy of standing up to aggression—will actually expedite the chances for a political settlement. This is the logic of reality as against sophistry.

The North Vietnamese now have further evidence that they must seek solutions other than their assumed future "victory." It is more timely than ever to press for an honorable settlement—after the Communists have had an opportunity to assess the changed military situation, and to see, perhaps more clearly now, America's unyielding determination to set South Vietnam free.

I also disagree with those who argue that the considered use of American military power means an increased risk of global war. Their argument rests on the abstract premise that the free world must exclude war as an instrument of foreign policy, and that military action by the other side must be countered, on our part, only by some kind of splendid moral inaction. If adequate and worldwide peacekeeping machinery were available, if, indeed, the other great powers of the world were willing to concert with us for peace, if there were no aggressor nations, then perhaps a presently available alternative of war might be found. But I see no evidence of this when France and China explode their nuclear bombs, when other nations clamor to possess this dread weapon, when neither the United Nations nor any of the great powers of Europe dare come to grips with the problems of southeast Asia.

At this moment in the history of mankind, the strength of the peoples of the world who would be free rests fundamentally on the power of the United States of America and its determination to maintain her freedom. To argue that this power must not be used in defense of freedom is to give way to the fallacy, so assiduously practiced in Communist propaganda, that military action is morally wrong except when taken in the name of world revolution. The world is not perfect yet, but there is much good that needs defending, and it will not be improved without positive action.

Earlier this year, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, defined the objective of the war as "restoring the integrity and security of Vietnam and its people; so this means no attempt to overthrow the North Vietnamese Government, no wish to be involved in China, but that whatever is required in South Vietnam would be done."

While questions may remain regarding the history and constitutional sanction of our involvement, they have little relevance to the immediate problems of the United States in Vietnam. America has fought her campaign in the wilderness. The President has found his generals. As the Secretary of Defense pointed out only this week, a long road still lies ahead toward a successful conclusion of American military efforts. But let there be no doubt about American intention to see these efforts through. From this point on, the central issue is not solely the war, but the reconstruction as well.

American men have been sent to fight and to risk their lives in Vietnam. For many months, this commitment of our forces has been the subject of a great national dialog on our purposes in Vietnam. Because we possess such enormous power, it is relatively easier to solve the military problems than the more complex political ones. It has always been so. But at this point, as the possibility of a successful conclusion of the Allied military effort may loom dimly in the distance, America must not lose sight of its real purpose: the independence and integrity of the people of South Vietnam. Gen. Maxwell Taylor said earlier this year:

> If we are to leave the country after the end of the Viet Cong insurgency, it is essential that we make progress, even under the conditions of war, in stabilizing the government, the society and the economy.

Six months ago, at the University of California at Los Angeles, I said that, in Vietnam:

> We have shown our determination to accept the consequences of belief in the brotherhood of man and of our determination that communism can be defeated by the "good news" of democracy.

In traditional Vietnamese society there has been for centuries a tradition of village democracy. In modern times there have been several examples of successful elections by secret ballot. These practices were temporarily halted by the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem, who feared that they might be exploited by the Communists. More recently, efforts to achieve representative government through local elections have been resumed.

In my view, Diem's retreat from democracy played into the hands of the Vietcong. Free elections need to be put back in the hands of the people of South Vietnam. The time is right. The Vietcong have intimidated the people by exploiting the propaganda of "victory." Vietcong cadres have won adherents on the premise that the NLF is the way of the future—an argument which they have supported with terror.

I must say that I am greatly disturbed by reports from South Vietnam that the Ky government may seek to manipulate elections in order to exclude its opposition and to perpetuate itself. I devoutly hope that such reports are untrue, and are proved to be untrue. The United States must recognize that the processes of nation building and government building require time. There is no such thing as instant democracy. The United States must be assured that the elections in South Vietnam will be honest and fair, and that the trappings of democracy will not be substituted for the substance of popular government.

The right to vote ought not to be denied to any South Vietnamese citizen who believes in the freedom and integrity of his nation and who will accept the duties and obligations of citizenship. I mean by that, all citizens, who meet these qualifications, regardless of whether theirs is a history of association with the Communist Vietcong.

Furthermore, the restrictions on candidates should be applied only against those opposed to constitutional, self-government. The right to vote, to run for public office, to participate in the process of government, compose the foundation of orderly, democratic society. They are the strongest weapons available for the defense of freedom.

I should think that the immense contribution of the U.S. Government to the cause of a free, independent South Vietnam would allow us to exact the simple requirement that these rights be broadly given.

We seek no colony anywhere in the globe. We seek a secure South Vietnam, from which American forces can depart in peace and honor, with the assurance that man's capacity to flourish in freedom will once again be vindicated against totalitarianism in any form.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, request has been made by a member of the minority to object to such unanimous-consent request. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, is there any Member who now wishes to be heard in the morning hour?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 3-minute limitation on the morning hour be concluded not later than 11:30; that when it is concluded, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be recognized to make a general statement on the resolution which he will offer, and that he be followed by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once those general statements have been concluded, it is my intention to move that the Senate go into executive session, and I want to put the Senate on notice to that effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a great deal of difference between an executive and a closed session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be a closed session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be a closed session as provided for under rule XXXV.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is, a closed session.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 8 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I speak out this morning to express my commendation of the services of our Senate colleagues who are members of the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Mr. President, this Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct composed of Senators chosen by their colleagues deserves and has the support and confidence of all U.S. Senators.

Our colleagues on this important committee did not seek membership. In fact, a majority, if not all, reluctantly accepted this added responsibility and duty out of a sense of duty and of their pride in the Senate. We have read newspaper accounts of the proceedings of this committee in connection with hearings in executive session and also the recent public hearings.

There is every reason for Senators to be proud of the manner in which the proceedings have been conducted and to be proud of the dedication and high public service being rendered by our colleagues serving on this committee.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman, is one of the Nation's outstanding lawyers. In the past he has served as district prosecuting attorney of a judicial district in Mississippi and was a distingushed judge of the circuit court of his State. His name has frequently been mentioned in connection with a possible appointment as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Senators will agree he has eminent qualifications for the highest judicial position in our Government. No one could possibly challenge his judgment or question his integrity.

The committee vice chairman, WALLACE BENNETT, of Utah, is entitled to have, and does have the confidence, respect, and admiration of his Senate colleagues. His high intelligence and integrity are beyond question.

Likewise, the four other Senators of this committee are nationally known as Senators of the highest competence and excellent character and unquestioned integrity.

This committee is now engaged in sifting evidence regarding one of our colleagues. They neither asked nor wanted to have this additional public service. Very definitely, they did not seek to sit in this semijudicial and factfinding capacity. The senior Senator from Connecticut asked that they hold these hearings. It is certain they have done and will continue to do their duty thoroughly, fearlessly, and with the utmost fairness.

I wish to manifest my confidence and admiration toward each of these Senators.

Mr. President, more than 40 years ago I served as chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Following that time for many years I was a trial lawyer in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. I have been president of two bar associations. My purpose in speaking briefly today is to call attention to the attempted intimidation of Senate witnesses by attorneys for the senior Senator from Connecticut before the Senate Standards and Conduct Committee. I want to commend the chairman of the Ethics Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, for his forthright reminder that Senate witnesses are wards of the Senate. It would appear to me that some of the acts and actions of certain of the battery of attorneys representing the respondent have been improper. We should bear in mind that the Senate committee of which Senator STENNIS is chairman and Senator BENNETT is vice chairman were asked by the senior Senator from Connecticut to hold these hearings and they are doing an unpleasant duty not of their own volition.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to reports of intimidation of witnesses conducted by members of one of the largest law firms in the United States—Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl. Lawyers certainly should be familiar with the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association, if not the criminal laws of the United States.

I am informed that partners of the Cahill firm even sit on the grievance committee of the bar association. In view of this fact, if it is a fact, certainly none of these attorneys should flout the canons of ethics of the bar association.

There has already been published in the Washington Star an account of the manner in which Walter J. Kenny of this firm telephoned Michael B. O'Hare, a witness, stating:

> We just want you to know we have got a complete check on Terry Golden. It would be a shame for a lovely girl like her to have her reputation hurt in any way. Maybe after you hear the type of questions we throw at Jim Boyd you will get the flavor of it.

If such news report is a correct statement of fact this was a flagrant attempt to intimidate a witness, which incidentally Mr. O'Hare reported to the FBI. This incident was followed by the indefensible act of a combative young man, who told O'Hare, poking a finger in his chest:

> I just want to tell you one thing—when this is over I'm going to follow you to your * * * grave.

It was this latter incident which brought an admonition from the chairman and a subsequent apology. However, an apology is no substitute for the law and the rules of proper procedure at judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings. Intimidation, or attempted intimidation of a witness of the sort reported is highly reprehensible, in my judgment and would be prejudicial to the administration of justice from every standpoint.

Following the chairman's admonition on June 24, there was evidence of another incident which is said to have occurred on June 25 in the Sheraton Carlton Hotel, when the same Walter Kenny, Jr., summoned a former senatorial assistant, Glenn Cooper, to the hotel and endeavored to secure information from him derogatory to other witnesses. Kenny is quoted as saying:

> These four (referring to the four former employees) are finished. Do you want to be finished too?

I would consider that a threat.

There was still another case of intimidation when a private detective employed by this law firm called upon Judith Berling, another former Senate employee in company with her father, who is a member of the reportorial staff of the U.S. Senate. The detective is said to have suggested or threatened that Miss Berling's father might lose his job with the Senate if she did not cooperate in giving the right kind of testimony.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with the statement by Mr. Sonnett before the Standards and Conduct Committee that the threat of a muscular 27-year-old man was a "trivial incident." No violation of the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association is a trivial incident.

Equally serious has been the sinister type of interrogation conducted by Mr. Sonnett. He has attempted to attack the reputations of young women witnesses by innuendo, even indulging in the improper inquiry as to whether they intended to marry certain persons. Mr. Sonnett should know this is improper and irrelevant to the issue and is a course of conduct unbecoming a gentleman or a good trial lawyer.

Further still, it is said that employers of certain witnesses have been telephoned and asked that they discharge such employees. This is the equivalent of blacklisting, which under certain circumstances is a criminal offense.

The senior Senator from Connecticut asked for this investigation. It would seem it ill becomes his attorneys, therefore, to attack the integrity of the committee's counsel or for anyone to suggest that the committee may have arranged hammering to disturb the hearing. These are charges reflecting upon the entire U.S. Senate.

I should like to commend the members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct for their painstaking and patient efforts on behalf of this body. Each member of this special Senate committee—Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman; Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, vice chairman; and Senators EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, JAMES B. PEARSON. They have conducted the hearings in the highest tradition of the U.S. Senate. They are doing their duty with fairness, thoroughness, and impartiality. Without a doubt each one is distressed that he was selected by his colleagues to serve on this important committee. Chairman STENNIS and every member has the confidence of the Senate and of the public generally. Of this I feel certain. May I add that I hope the Senator involved in this inquiry has not been prejudiced by the actions of his counsel. I should like further to request that it be ascertained whether these cases constitute contempt of the Senate and whether the FBI has investigated these charges of intimidation, especially that which Mr. O'Hare referred to the FBI on May 23.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, the RECORD will show that I was the first in the Senate to speak out in favor of having the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct hold full and thorough hearings on the controversy involving Julius Klein and Senator DODD. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] associated himself with my position and made additional remarks on that occasion. We urged that the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the Senate take those steps necessary to give complete assurance to the Senator from Connecticut and to the Senate that fair, impartial, and thorough hearings would be held with respect to the problems raised in regard to the so-called Klein affair.

The senior Senator from Oregon has taken such a position in the Senate when other questions have been raised with regard to allegations of improper conduct by members of the Senate staff and Members. As the RECORD will show, I was one who spoke up in support of a special committee to be appointed to hear the allegations concerning the conduct of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

In my judgment, Senator DODD clearly is deserving of that type of hearing. He is getting that type of hearing. I am sure he appreciates that type of hearing.

In my opinion, the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] just made in the Senate are in no way a reflection on the Senator concerned. They are remarks calling attention to the conduct of certain lawyers and other representatives of the Senator from Connecticut, which conduct the Senator from Ohio believes has been improper and which, in fact, has not been fair and helpful to the Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct. I share his views and associate myself with his views.

On July 7, 1966, the senior Senator from Oregon received the following letter from the chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, Mr. JOHN C. STENNIS.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the excerpts included with the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
STANDARDS AND CONDUCT,
July 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed please find excerpts of testimony presented at a hearing beginning June 22, 1966, by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate investigating charges of misconduct against Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut.

Your attention is called to the portions of the enclosed excerpts in which your name appears.

In the event that you desire to comment upon these excerpts, it is requested that your comments be addressed to the Committee office, Room 222, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. Such comments will be made a part of the record of the Committee's proceedings. This by no means suggests that you make a statement.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Benjamin R. Fern, Chief Counsel, extension 6679.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,
John C. Stennis,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman.

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY

Mr. SONNETT. After you made the copies, what did you do with them?

Mr. BOYD. After the copies were made, they were brought to Mr. Anderson's office.

Mr. SONNETT. And did that include the Klein file?

Mr. BOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SONNETT. In the Klein file at the time you took it from the Senator's office, was there a collection of documents in plastic-covered envelopes which you had before you this morning?

Mr. Boyd. Yes, sir. I will say the entire—no, not the entire Klein folder, because you have shown me many documents in the deposition that I had never seen before. But in rough, the documents in the plastic sheet this, what we have called the instructions which have been identified in other terms by the counsel for the Committee were there, yes, sir.

Mr. Sonnett. Now, I show you a plastic envelope containing a variety of documents headed "Echo of the Fulbright hearings," with a memo reading as follows:

"Not a single U. S. Senator or Congressman criticized me after the Fulbright hearings. Somehow the people in Germany did not understand that this was not an attack against me but against the Federal Republic's strong stand on the Soviets by the appeasers. But I was pleased to get the attached letters from Senators and Congressmen since the Fulbright hearings, which include messages from leading Democrats and Republicans. As a matter of fact, I have suggested that a resolution be introduced and passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but I will take the advice of Senator Morse and forget about it."

Also in the envelope, Mr. Boyd, are the following documents:

A letter from Senator Albert Gore to General Julius Klein dated November 14, 1963, a letter from Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper to General Julius Klein dated December 31, 1963, a copy of a letter from Hubert H. Humphrey to General Julius Klein dated January 10, 1964, a letter dated February 6, 1964, from Senator Humphrey to General Klein, a letter from Senator Henry M. Jackson to Julius Klein dated November 23, 1963, a letter from Senator Jacob K. Javits to Mr. Julius Klein dated December 2d, 1963, a letter from Senator Kenneth B. Keating to General Julius Klein dated December 30, 1963, a letter from Senator Edward V. Long to General Julius Klein dated November 15, 1963, a letter from Senator Russell Long to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 21, 1963, a letter from Senator Thruston B. Morton to General Julius Klein dated December 5, 1963, a copy of a letter from Wayne Morse to Senator Symington dated November 19, 1963, a letter from Senator Wayne Morse to Mr. Julius Klein dated February 20, 1964, a letter from Senator Karl E. Mundt to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 21, 1963, a letter from Senator Karl E. Mundt to Major General Julius Klein dated February 6, 1964, a letter from Senator Abraham Ribicoff to Mr. Julius Klein dated January 3, 1964, a letter from Senator Hugh Scott to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 18, 1963, a letter from Senator John Sparkman to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 19, 1963, another letter from Senator John Sparkman to Mr. Julius Klein dated January 23, 1964, a letter from Senator Stuart Symington to General Julius Klein dated February 18, 1964, another letter from Senator Symington to General Klein dated November 14, 1963, a letter from Senator John J. Williams to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 21, 1963.

Senator Bennett. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to make a suggestion.

The Chairman. All right, Senator.

Senator Bennett. By reading merely the names of the Senators who wrote these letters, I think an erroneous, a completely erroneous impression will be left, so I would like to suggest that the text of these letters be printed in the transcription of today's record so that the public can know what these letters said, and I would also like to suggest that when Mr. Klein comes before us, he be asked to bring up all of the correspondence he has had with these Senators whose names have been mentioned a well as correspondence during this period with Senator Dodd.

The Chairman. Senator, I think your suggestion is certainly well taken. I will see what the counsel proposes to do with these letters.

Mr. Sonnett. I was about to ask Mr. Chairman, that the exhibit be marked as a Dodd exhibit and be made fully available either for incorporation in the record or released to the press as you wish. I must say, Senator Bennett, I hope you do not think that by my reading the names of some of these Senators I mean to imply that they did anything improper in writing these letters.

Senator Bennett. I don't think you are implying that they did anything improper, but since you have spent the first half of the afternoon, or since our counsel spent a good part of the time today going through the Dodd correspondence with General Klein, by inference the implication exists that these same Senators had the same kind of correspondence with General Klein, and having read the letters in that file, I think the inference is completely false, and I think in order to keep the facts straight in this hearing, that after the file has been accepted as an exhibit, the contents to which you have referred, the actual letters, should be printed in the transcript, so that the public can see the difference between these letters and the letters that the counsel for the committee has offered earlier.

Senator McCarthy. Mr. Chairman——

The Chairman. All right, Senator.

Senator McCarthy. Just as an additional comment there is variation among these letters, is that not true?

Mr. Sonnett. Senator McCarthy, these letters differ one from the other in general. There are letters here from leading members of the Senate on both sides of the House expressing their regret at any unfair treatment which General Klein had suffered by reason of the Fulbright hearings. Now I have confidence——

Mr. Fern. Mr. Chairman, I don't think we ought to characterize these letters exactly in that manner. I believe the letters speak for themselves and we should read the text.

The Chairman. I will make a statement here now. As I understand it, going back to this, I understand these letters were in the so-called Klein file?

Mr. Sonnett. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Taken from the Dodd office?

Mr. Sonnett. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. All right. That makes them pertinent here. They are part of the file. You certainly have a right to go into that and select anything there that you might wish to present. But the point is certainly well made. And I assumed you were going to offer them to go in evidence?

Mr. Sonnett. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. It will be admitted in evidence now, all of them will go into the record direct like other letters, Mr. Reporter.

(Dodd's exhibit No. 6 referred to follows:)

Echo of the Fulbright Hearings

Not a single U.S. Senator or Congressman criticized me after the Fulbright Hearings. Somehow the people in Germany did not understand that this was not an attack against me but against the Federal Republic's strong stand on the Soviets by the appeasers.

But I was pleased to get the attached letters from Senators and Congressmen since the Fulbright Hearings which include messages from leading Democrats and Republicans.

As a matter of fact, I suggest a resolution be introduced and passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but I will take the advice of Senator Morse and forget about it.

But it is time that the people in Germany not only forget about but also that they double their support for me.

(A few letters of tribute for JK from U.S. Senators and Congressmen.)

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
February 20, 1964.

Mr. Julius Klein,
United of America Building,
Chicago 1, Ill.

Dear Julius: I haven't had a chance to talk to Stu Symington as yet in regard to the contents of your letter of February 13 to me, your letter of February 12 to him, and your letter of February 5 to Karl Mundt.

However, my first reaction to your suggestion is to advise you not to press for a resolution or a letter signed by members of the Foreign Relations Committee. I don't think you will be able to get very many signatures on either one of such documents, because they are bound to be interpreted as critical of Fulbright.

Next, I would point out that such a resolution would run the grave danger that Fulbright would strike back, because he would interpret the move as a criticism of him. I think the record that has been made is fair to you and fair to Fulbright, and what you need to do is put it to effective use. The statements which Symington and I made on the record answer the criticisms that you are running into. There is certainly nothing that stops any other member of the Committee from writing a personal letter to you which you can put to effective use, also.

However, in my judgment you will do yourself much more harm than good if you seek to obtain some kind of resolution or general letter signed by members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

As you know, the Foreign Relations Committee has recommended a bill on the general subject of foreign lobbies, and with that in the offing, I think it would be unwise to press your suggestion. I think it would be better for you if during the course of the debate on the foreign lobby bill, those of us on the Foreign Relations Committee who care to could reinforce the comments we have already made.

I fully realize that I am not the party of interest in this matter, but on the other hand, I think maybe you should give some consideration to the possibility that because I am not the party of interest in the matter, I may very well be more objective than your subjective interest in the matter is inclined to make you.

I am sure that Stu would be glad to join us in a visit about this matter when you return to Washington.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
Wayne Morse.

November 19, 1963.

Hon. Stuart Symington,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Symington: It will be impossible for me to attend the Foreign Relations Committee meeting tomorrow morning, November 20, at which Major General Julius Klein is scheduled to testify on S. 2136.

In view of our conversation today, I would appreciate it very much if you would ask permission in my behalf to insert this letter in the record of the hearing tomorrow morning.

First, I wish to make some comments about Klein, himself, and then I want to make a statement in regard to the arguments he has advanced in his prepared statement in opposition to S. 2136.

I have known Julius Klein for the nineteen years that I have been in the Senate. I knew him all the time I was a Republican, as well as during the period I have been a Democrat. He has been a public relations man during that period of time, representing various clients on many matters. I have always found him to be completely non-partisan in any of the representations he has ever made to me in regard to any subject matter in which he was interested in his capacity as a public relations man.

I also have always found him to be honorable, and I have never known him to misrepresent facts about any issue or attempt to deceive me. On some matters involving his public representations, I have disagreed with his position and opposed his recommendations in carrying out my duties as a Senator. On other occasions, I have concluded that the facts have supported his position, and in those instances, I have favored his side of some given legislative issue.

I am very sorry that his work as an advisor to the West German Government which has been under investigation by our Committee apparently is receiving bad headlines in Germany as the German newspaper stories which you and I talked about today indicate. I am satisfied that in connection with any service Mr. Klein rendered the West German Government as a public relations agent in the United States, he performed that service with full disclosure to the German Government as to the representations he was making in behalf of that Government in the United States and did not knowingly or intentionally engage in any illegal action.

As he points out in his statement, the term foreign agent has a negative connotation in the minds of many newspaper readers and undoubtedly the newspaper stories concerning our Committee's investigation of the activities of foreign agents may have caused many people to assume incorrectly that services rendered the United States by American representatives of foreign governments who function in the capacity of public relations representatives necessarily carries with such work negative connotations. However, in my opinion, that is neither the fault of the Foreign Relations Committee nor of the law. It is one of those risks relative to public reaction that anyone working in this field must necessarily run.

I do not think that our Foreign Relations Committee is subject to any criticism because of the fact that representatives of foreign governments acting under the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 may have suffered some criticism or injury to their professional standing as a result of the Committee of the Senate carrying out its clear duty to try to find out what has been going on under the administration of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938. In one respect, it is somewhat similar to the risk that anyone runs as a result of a Grand Jury indictment.

There is no doubt about the fact that no matter how innocent one's conduct has been in regard to any matter, if it develops that the Grand Jury issues an indictment which later is either quashed or a petit jury acquits, there is no doubt about the fact that the person indicted has been injured. Sometimes, I refer to such situations as part of the price of being free men. Freedom comes high, but it is worth the cost.

I feel that so long as representatives of foreign governments conduct themselves honorably and properly within the law, the facts concerning their record will stand up against any investigation or inquiry into their course of conduct.

On the basis of any information I have received to date, I am sure that Mr. Klein's record in carrying out his public relations work will support the representations he has made in his appearance before the Committee.

I wish to repeat that on the basis of the friendship that has existed between us for nineteen years, it causes me to believe that he is a highly honorable man.

Now a word about Mr. Klein's prepared statement in opposition to S. 2136. I find myself in disagreement with a good many of his criticisms of the bill. It may be that before we finish the mark up of the bill, some of his criticisms and those of other witnesses should cause us to modify the bill. However, I do not think that his major criticisms are sound.

I refer particularly to the specific comments he makes on pages 5, 6, 7 and 8 of his prepared statement. As an introduction to the specifics he lists on those pages, he says, "Would legislation really control the bad ones?" In this reference, he is referring of course to agents representing foreign governments. I think most of his comments on this point constitute non sequitur arguments.

Murder laws, of course, do not stop murders, but all of us are a lot safer with the murder laws, and we have fewer murders than we would otherwise have. I know of no law that will control the bad ones, to use Mr. Klein's phrase, if any individual is determined to flaunt the law.

However, I do know that our hearings show that the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 is very much in need of amendment, and I think S. 2136 is a move in the right direction. I am perfectly willing to consider any proposal that will improve S. 2136, but I feel that Mr. Klein's prepared statement represents too much of an ignoring of the serious defects which have developed under the operation of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938.

Incidentally, I think some of those defects would never have developed if the Department of Justice had lived up to its clear responsibilities of effective administering of the law. Nevertheless, effective administering of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 will not resolve many of the defects which have been shown by the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee to exist. Therefore, I shall continue to support amendments of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 along the lines of S. 2136.

I think that the prepared statement which Mr. Klein will give at the hearing on November 20, deserves very careful analysis by the Committee in the mark up of the bill in order to doublecheck and make certain that the final bill will not be productive of some of the shortcomings that Mr. Klein fears. But I do think that we must see to it that the agents representing foreign governments are required to operate under full public disclosure of all their activities, because in a democracy there is no substitute for full public disclosure of any activity that affects the public interest.

I am sorry that I cannot be at the hearing, but I shall appreciate very much your making this letter a part of the record.

With warm personal regards,

Cordially,

Wayne Morse.

The Chairman. They are already exhibits now. They speak for themselves. Some of them ought to be read. You refer there to the Fulbright hearing. To make that clear, the Fulbright hearings were held by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate some time in 1963?

Mr. Fern. That is correct.

The Chairman. Some time during the year 1963, at which time it was claimed by Mr. Klein, as the Chair understands it, that great work had been done. That it had caused him to lose some of his business in Germany. Now, these letters came in then from the different Senators some time later, these are all after the hearings, aren't they?

Mr. Sonnett. Not all I think, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Not all?

Mr. Sonnett. But most.

The Chairman. The ones to which I refer came in after these so-called Fulbright hearings, and found their way into Senator Dodd's files and were in these papers that were collected here as testified.

Mr. Fern. Mr. Chairman, all of these letters were written after the Fulbright hearings.

The Chairman. They all were written after the Fulbright hearings? All right. I think, Senator Bennett, both members here have made a good point. I think Mr. Sonnett was going to offer them in evidence of course. They speak for themselves. I really think some of them ought to be read here that are typical of all of them, so that the erroneous impression that the Senator referred to will be avoided. Would you read——

Mr. Sonnett. I would be happy, Senator, to try and pick if I might one——

Senator Cooper. Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Senator Cooper.

Senator Cooper. Were these letters included in the so-called packet that at least Mr. Klein wanted the Senator to take to Germany?

Mr. Sonnett. Yes, Senator, and I have a very specific point of examination for this witness with respect to this collection of letters. I am not dragging them in merely to show or try to show that there was any impropriety whatsoever in anything that any Senator did in writing these letters, any more so than I think there was any impropriety in any of Senator Dodd's relations with General Klein.

Senator Pearson. Is that counsel's line of questioning? Is that the purpose of his line?

Mr. Sonnett. No, sir, I have a very specific question about this particular plastic envelope and these particular pieces of paper for this witness.

Senator McCarthy. Did I understand counsel said he didn't wish to attempt to make a selection as to a typical letter?

Mr. Sonnett. I think that might be unfair just as I think the fact that Senator Dodd has been singled out for such connections as he had with Klein is unfair.

The Chairman. Just pass them over here and let it be identified. Then the Chair will make a ruling on what will be done, please.

Mr. Fern. Mr. Chairman, may I propose that Mr. Sonnett and I confer and select what we think are representative examples here?

The Chairman. We want to keep the rest of the testimony moving. I have in mind referring this to a member of the committee to look at and we go on with the rest of the proof here and will come back in a few minutes. We have got to keep this matter going or we will be here a month.

Senator McCarthy. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that we might have the letters read tomorrow?

Senator Bennett. Mr. Chairman, hasn't the Chairman already ruled that the letters will be in the transcript?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Sonnett. May I show this to the witness?

The Chairman. You need it for further examination?

Mr. Sonnett. Yes, I do.

Senator Bennett. I have no use for them at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. All right, continue your examination then.

Mr. Sonnett. Mr. Boyd, was that plastic envelope with those letters in the Klein file in Senator Dodd's office which you surreptitiously removed in June, 1964?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I responded to the letter of the chairman of the committee, my response being under date of July 11, 1966:

Thank you very much for sending to me your letter of July 7. It encloses excerpts of testimony presented at a hearing beginning June 22, 1966, by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate investigating charges of misconduct against Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut.

Your letter called to my attention two portions of the excerpts in which my name appears. Those portions consist of two letters which I wrote, one to Mr. Julius Klein under date of February 20, 1964, and the other to Senator Symington under date of November 19, 1963. My major comment in regard to them is that they speak for themselves and on the basis of the facts which I had at my command on the dates that they were written, I am pleased to stand on the record which I have made in the letters.

However, these are not the only letters that I have written to Mr. Julius Klein, or written about him, or written in regard to his activities during my years in the Senate. I shall be pleased to make available to the Committee, if it so desires, any and all correspondence that I have in my office files concerning Mr. Julius Klein. If, at any time, the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate would like to have me appear before the Committee to answer any questions in connection with any of the correspondence in my office files to Mr. Klein or concerning Mr. Klein, I shall be glad to place myself at the service of the Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter in full be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 11, 1966.

Hon. John C. Stennis,
Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, Room 222 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Thank you very much for sending to me your letter of July 7. It encloses excerpts of testimony presented at a hearing beginning June 22, 1966 by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate investigating charges of misconduct against Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut.

Your letter called to my attention two portions of the excerpts in which my name appears. Those portions consist of two letters which I wrote, one to Mr. Julius Klein under date of February 20, 1964, and the other to Senator Symington under date of November 19, 1963. My major comment in regard to them is that they speak for themselves and on the basis of the facts which I had at my command on the dates that they were written, I am pleased to stand on the record which I have made in the letters.

However, these are not the only letters that I have written to Mr. Julius Klein, or written about him, or written in regard to his activities during my years in the Senate. I shall be pleased to make available to the Committee, if it so desires, any and all correspondence that I have in my office files concerning Mr. Julius Klein. If, at any time, the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate would like to have me appear before the Committee to answer any questions in connection with any of the correspondence in my office files to Mr. Klein or concerning Mr. Klein, I shall be glad to place myself at the service of the Committee.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in closing my comments on this matter, that I think that Senator Young of Ohio and some other Senators who I understand have inserted material in the Record today have performed a service to the Senate in making it perfectly clear that the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is entitled to the full support of the Senate in carrying out a thorough, no-stone-remaining-unturned investigation and hearing in respect to the issues that has been raised by these hearings. I repeat, that is the fairest thing that can be done for the Senator from Connecticut. I know of no evidence on the basis of any record made by the committee to date, that justifies any conclusion that Senator Dodd has committed any illegal act.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut has not completed, as yet, his presentation of his case in chief. There is no doubt about the fact that the record that has been made to date raises questions concerning the activities of General Klein that the committee will find it necessary to evaluate when it comes to analyze the full record of the hearings. I do not know what the full record made to date shows, because I know only what has appeared in the papers. But I wish to say, I think the committee is to be highly commended for following the course of action that the Senate in fact directed it to follow. I think that the American people and the Senate are entitled to have every confidence in the committee. I am sure that the final report of the committee will be based upon the evidence that is submitted to it.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, the current investigation of one of my colleagues by the Senate Ethics Committee has already caused considerable cynical comment by some journalists which tends to reflect on the character of members of the committee.

While it is true that a majority of the Senate has, for reasons best known to itself, failed to take positive action in passing a disclosure bill which would satisfy the public's right to know about the outside income of Members of Congress and their families—an opportunity, incidentally, which I provided by an amendment offered on July 2, 1964—Congressional Record, volume 110, part 12, pages 15849–15851—it by no means follows that the present members of the Senate Ethics Committee will fail to do a conscientious job. Suggestions of a whitewash are unjustified and premature. Only a very small amount of the evidence is in, and, until it is all in, no one should make a judgment on this case. Moreover, until all of the evidence is in and the committee has made its decision, no one should prejudge the committee.

Members of the Senate Ethics Committee are serving unselfishly in a most sensitive and thankless undertaking. How would some of the cynical commentators like to serve, themselves, on a committee to probe into the ethical practices of members of the journalism profession? Instead of being destructive in their comments, they ought to be constructive—or, at least, neutral until after this matter is over.

All of this is not to be interpreted as any condonation on my part of the way the Bobby Baker investigation was handled. Nor do I condone the investigation committee's superficial proposal relating to disclosure. We need a meaningful rule relating to disclosure of all sources of income by Members of Congress and their families, including all of those in such a close position of relationship that the public, by having them covered by disclosure, will be reassured that it has all the information needed. We need a body of canons of ethics for Members of Congress carrying with it the same high standards that prevail in the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, and other professional groups. The very existence of such standards carries with it a salutary influence on those covered by them.

I hope there will be no further instances of reckless criticism of the Senate Ethics Committee and any of its members. Each of them has my confidence that they will perform their duties in a manner befitting Members of the Senate. But it will require a majority of the Members of the Senate itself to fulfill the public's right to know by appropriate legislative action—a duty which, I regret to say, was sadly neglected here on the Senate floor on July 2, 1964.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to add my commendation to that of my colleagues for the outstanding work that Senator Stennis, the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and his fellow committee members have been doing in their current hearings. There can hardly be a more difficult and important area of congressional work than to hear and adjudicate the difficult issues that that committee now faces.

The Senate and the Nation are indeed fortunate to be favored with the extraordinary ability, perception, and wisdom which Senator Stennis brings to these proceedings. He and his colleagues deserve the appreciation of the Senate and the Nation for the forthrightness, thoroughness, fairness, and decorum with which they have conducted these hearings.

I have the greatest confidence in the distinguished chairman and his colleagues. I know that the conclusions they reach, after all the evidence has been presented, will be fair, accurate, and responsible.

Senator Stennis and his fellow committee members deserve the highest respect and support from all the citizens of our Nation, in this difficult undertaking.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, comment has been made earlier today by Senators with respect to the Select Committee on Ethics. Surely the responsibilities that those six men—three from my side of the aisle and three from the Presiding Officer's—have to discharge is of transcendent importance, of great and grave difficulty, and the Members of the Senate place their faith in the ability of the six to discharge their duties.

When the senior Senator from Kentucky introduced his proposal many months ago to create such a committee, I saw fit to vote for it. Speaking as a Senator, I have great faith in the three Republicans who were chosen, and I say to my friend, the Senator from Maryland, I have great faith in the three majority members of that committee who were appointed. I am glad to spread my own faith on the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, I also rise to commend the conduct of the Ethics Committee in this most difficult and painful responsibility.

Under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi, JOHN STENNIS, the committee has made an excellent start.

Cynics in and out of the Senate contended that this would be a hear-no-evil, see-no-evil, speak-no-evil committee. Any fairminded person who has had a chance to review the transcript of the record must be impressed by the obvious sincerity of committee members—Republican as well as Democratic—in trying to get at the full truth of this complex, delicate, and difficult matter.

This U.S. Senate has a proud tradition. People throughout America look to the Senate as the leading American source of debate and discussion of the problems that face the Nation. Together with the House, this body has the massive responsibility of making the laws under which all Americans must live.

With this vast power, a high standard of ethics can and should be demanded from this body. The current hearings by the committee obviously recognize this ethical requirement.

When Senators were appointed to this committee, all of us in this body recognized what a painful and unwelcome burden such an assignment necessarily represented. In spite of this the six Senators appointed to the committee seemed at the time of their appointment to represent excellent selections.

Certainly their conduct in these difficult hearings has corroborated this view. As one Senator I formally and publicly express my thanks to these six men for a conscientious and impressive job.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the strike which has canceled 60 percent of the commercial airline flights in the Nation is beginning to have unfortunate effects, both on the parties to the dispute and on the Nation as a whole.

Today I received copies of two wires sent to the President encouraging him to use his best judgment to bring about an equitable and immediate solution to the strike. I am sure that all Members of the Senate join with me in the hope that current negotiations will successfully end this serious work stoppage. I ask unanimous consent that these two messages be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 8, 1966.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The current strike against major airlines has a serious effect on the economy of our city. Being one of the Nation's significant industrial centers, it is in the national and public interest to use your good office to bring about an early equitable settlement.

Respectfully yours,
ROY C. ECHOLS,
President,
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Indianapolis and Indiana is suffering economic loss at the inconvenience and traffic delay occasioned by the present airline strike. I urge that all resources available to the Office of the President be used to settle this dispute as equitably and expeditiously as possible.

JOHN J. BARTON,
Mayor of Indianapolis.

BUILDING COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for 17 years the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association has been observing a special event during which period of time more than 5 million free beauty treatments have been given to women and girls in various institutions, such as homes for the aged, hospitals, penal institutions, and homes for special care.

During the observance of National Beauty Salon Week last February, thousands of people across this land, including ministers speaking from their pulpits, publicly complimented the professional cosmetologists on the institutional welfare program of their organization of more than 70,000 members. These "angels of mercy" have done a tremendous job in giving a lift to unfortunate women.

During the last 5 years the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association also has done much to build good citizenship and community leadership in its annual community leadership award program.

Outstanding judges, representing nationally known organizations, serve on the panel of judges, which makes the award. For example, the judges for the 1966 Community Leadership Award are the following:

The Honorable John M. Bailey, chairman, Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Sterling W. Brown, president, National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Wendell A. Falsgraf, chairman, American Citizenship Committee, American Bar Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. T. F. Haynes, executive secretary, Quota, International, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Dorothy M. Ford, immediate past president, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Mrs. Hans-Arnold Fraenkel, national treasurer, League of Women Voters of the United States, Hartsdale, N.Y.

Mrs. Ruth S. Knight, president, Zonta International, Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Allen H. Seed, Jr., executive vice president, Keep America Beautiful, Inc., New York, N.Y.

The Honorable BOB WILSON, Member of Congress, chairman, Republican Congressional Committee, San Diego, Calif.

Nominees are selected from various States entering the contest and the panel of judges makes the selection of the annual Charles Award for community leadership on the basis of their activity in their professional cosmetologist association, educational programs, religious programs, civic and social welfare programs, and political programs.

Those who have been honored with the Charles Award to date are:

Miss Edna Emme, St. Louis, Mo.

Miss Miriam Cordwell, New York City, N.Y.

Mr. Gaines Pressley, Marietta, Ga.

Mrs. Nelda Lewis, Kilgore, Tex.

I wish to express my congratulations, and I believe those of all Members of the U.S. Senate, to Mr. Leonard Benner, of Bellevue, Wash., national president of the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association, and to members of the board of directors: Mr. Louis A. Freiberg, of New York City, executive secretary; Mr. Nathan E. Jacobs, of Omaha, Nebr., public relations counselor, and all the cosmetologists who participated in these notable programs that have helped to build better citizens and a greater America.

I offer this salute to the hairdressers and cosmetologists in connection with the calling of their 46th national convention in Houston, Tex., July 24. May they ever continue their good work in the voluntary welfare field to brighten the lives of unfortunate people.

TAX HELP TO LATIN AMERICA STRENGTHENS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which deals with Latin American Republics, I would like to call attention to a gratifying development in our relations with the countries of this hemisphere.

When the Alliance for Progress was forged in 1961, tax reform was one of its major goals. To assist in this effort, the Agency for International Development, in cooperation with the Internal Revenue Service made teams of experts available to 15 Latin American countries.

Since then, 11 of these countries have established permanent tax training sections, 10 have inaugurated a public education and taxpayer assistance program, 10 now have return examination programs in operation.

The results have been remarkable. As noted in the July 4 issue of the International Commerce magazine, more than half of these countries have experienced increases in their tax collections over the past 2 years ranging from 25 to 45 percent.

These new revenues have helped in the fight against inflation, have supplied funds for local economic progress, and have improved the climate for all businesses in these countries—whether they are small or large, domestic or foreign. What is also significant, these developments will undoubtedly bolster confidence in the democratic process throughout Latin America.

This is an excellent example of how countries of the Americas can cooperate. I would like to commend the personnel in AID and IRS who have been making this program work, and ask unanimous consent that the descriptive article to which I have referred to be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOVERNMENT ACTIONS: TAX TEAMS FROM THE UNITED STATES ASSISTING LATIN LANDS TO BOLSTER SYSTEMS—BETTER COLLECTIONS WILL HELP NATIONS WITH LOCAL FUNDS NEEDED TO COMPLEMENT OUTSIDE GRANTS OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM

Modernization of tax laws and particularly establishment of more effective enforcement measures throughout Latin America have radically improved the economic outlook in a number of countries there. Specialists from the U.S. have assisted in this process.

The procedures have served to curb inflation and better the climate for domestic and foreign private enterprise. They have made it possible to raise the level of tax revenue and enable Latin American governments to provide the local funds needed to go along with the outside assistance provided under the Alliance for Progress program.

The vital contribution that sound administration makes to a nation's tax system was emphasized by U.S. Secretary of Treasury Henry H. Fowler in a recent talk to Latin American tax officials.

"The wisest tax laws, as we all know, mean very little unless they are administered effectively," he said. "In absence of good administration, a tax law represents very little more than a high-sounding, hollow expression of economic or political policy."

ALLIANCE SPURRED REFORMS

The improvements made by Central and South American countries in their tax system stem from the Alliance for Progress launched in 1961. The 10-year development plan for Latin America drawn up at that time set tax reform as one of its major goals.

The Agency for International Development in cooperation with the Internal Revenue Service has supplied technical assistance in the form of tax administration teams in 15 countries.

With AID providing the funds and IRS the tax experts, the U.S. teams give advice and assistance a particular nation might require to make its tax administration more efficient, productive and equitable.

While results are not achieved overnight, considerable progress has been made. The following table shows the tax revenue increase for those countries where the currency has remained stable.

Total tax revenue collections

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	1963	1964	1965
Guatemala	91.1	102.7	118.8
Costa Rica	50.5	56.7	65.2
El Salvador	66.2	79.8	84.9
Nicaragua	19.0	26.9	32.9
Panama	55.0	59.6	70.0
Paraguay	30.0	31.9	42.2
Ecuador	132.9	158.9	[1] 191.3
Peru	351.8	[2] 432.8	[1] 507.4

[1] Estimated.

[2] Preliminary.

The 1965 increase in El Salvador is significant because it was achieved in spite of the severe 1965 earthquake which disrupted the economy.

In countries where inflation has been a factor, part of the rise in tax collections is due to improved tax administration. In Chile, for example, tax receipts rose in two years from 13.8% of gross national product to 16.5%. And it is in Chile that the first successful prosecutions for tax fraud have taken place. Audits of returns have raised additional assessments 600% in three years.

Tax help is offered only to those countries specifically requesting it. When such a call comes in—generally through the AID mission—IRS conducts a survey to identify the nature and scope of tax administration problems involved, the objectives for overcoming them, and the advisability of rendering a tax advisory team.

When a tax team enters a country, IRS experts act strictly in an advisory capacity. The responsibility and authority to make decisions remain with the host country.

VARYING SIZES

The size of a tax team varies from one man to seven or eight, depending on the goals of the program. The overall objective could be to improve every aspect of tax administration or only such phases as returns, collection, enforcement, training, public information or taxpayer education.

IRS also aids foreign tax officials in training and orientation—either on an individual or group basis. Individual programs are tailored to a special need, while group sessions involve representatives from eight to ten countries in a six to ten week course.

A new development is the IRS mobile audit training team. The goal is to provide intensive on-site training to revenue agents in such areas as accounting principles and the examination of tax returns. The teams also train local agents who in turn teach others.

EXAMPLES CITED

In addition to statistics previously listed, the following are cited as examples of tax reform in Latin America resulting from IRS-AID cooperation.

Panama increased delinquent tax collections 130% in 1965; additional assessments from enforcement rose from $1.7 million in 1964 to $2.5 million in 1965 and over $6 million of the $10.5 million tax revenue increase in 1965 was directly attributable to tax reform and improved tax administration.

In Ecuador, a widespread publicity and taxpayer assistance program upped the number of returns filed from 27,000 in 1964 to 60,000 in 1965.

In Peru, a pilot delinquent-return program produced 1,400 returns involving nearly $500,000. The six people assigned to this program will be joined by 23 more this year.

Uruguay seized the assets of three businessmen to satisfy long-overdue tax obligations. As a result of publicity given to this action, others who owe back taxes are declaring their debts and paying them.

Colombia netted over three million pesos in a delinquent tax program that cost only 138,000 pesos to administer.

PERMANENT CENTERS

Of the 15 Latin nations participating in the program, permanent training sections have been established in 11; public education and taxpayer assistance is being carried on by 10; return examination programs are in operation in 10; delinquent tax programs have been adopted by nine, and failure to file are being investigated in eight countries.

While Latin America is receiving primary attention from the U.S. tax assistance staff, aid is being offered to other countries as manpower permits. The Philippines, Korea and India are presently receiving such help.

For IRS, Harold Moss is in charge of the Foreign Tax Assistance Staff. He worked with Japanese officials in the rebuilding of that nation's tax system after World War II, and half of his 32 years with the IRS have been spent overseas.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM MUST NOT BE SHORTCHANGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I announced my intention to fight for funds for the school milk program in addition to the $105 million provided in the agriculture appropriations bill as reported to the floor of the Senate if such an increase seems essential to the continued progress of the program.

Past history would seem to indicate that this amount simply is not enough. Although the agency administering the program within the Department of Agriculture asked for only $105 million when the fiscal 1967 budget was prepared, the Department itself requested $106 million for the program as long ago as fiscal 1965—2 years ago. In fact I asked the program's administrator, Howard Davis, back in 1964 how much would have to be appropriated if the reimbursement rate to the States was to be continued at the fiscal 1964 level. His answer? $108 million.

This, mind you, was before the Headstart programs, which use school milk, had fully gotten underway; before the current baby boom had further accelerated the numbers in our school-age population; and before the school milk program reached its current high participation level.

Yet we find now, 2 years later, that only $105 million will be made available.

I will continue to keep a close eye on this program to see if $105 million is indeed adequate. If it is not I will do my best to get additional funds in a supplemental appropriations bill.

PROPOSED BRIDGE DAM AND MARBLE CANYON DAM ON THE COLORADO RIVER IN ARIZONA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the lead editorial in the Washington Post this morning goes a long way toward putting into proper perspective the controversial proposal to build the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams on the Colorado River in Arizona. The editorial is one of the most sensible and low-keyed discussion of this inflammable subject which I have yet seen.

As a proponent of the dams, I welcome at long last the recognition of the fact that we do not want to "ruin" forever the spectacular Grand Canyon Gorge, or to change completely the character of the river which runs through it. I want to minimize the impact on both, and I think the bill as now drawn will do this. But all should recognize, as the editorial points out, the need for fully utilizing the waters of the Colorado River in the parched Southwest area of the country.

I appreciate editorial emphasis of the fact that Lake Powell, the reservoir behind Glen Canyon Dam upstream on the Colorado, has indeed proved to be a beauty spot rather than the desecration of the river which nature lovers predicted. Americans are now coming by the thousands to see Glen Canyon and the Rainbow Bridge where before only a hardy few could float down the muddy river on rubber rafts. The scenery is not identical with what it was in the pre-Lake Powell period, but most people say it is now enhanced and even more beautiful than it was in its original state.

I commend to my colleagues the thoughtful and reasonable discussion of the "Colorado River Issue" which appeared in the Washington Post on July 14, and ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Colorado River Issue

Debate began yesterday in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one of the most important bills before Congress this year—the measure to authorize the Central Arizona Project. It is vital to the 30 million people of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin. Indeed, the entire country will be affected by the outcome because of the great national interest in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The Committee will have to weigh two major objectives. The Colorado Basin states are clamoring for this final step in harnessing the great river as an essential element of their continued growth. Indeed, they insist that they cannot survive without additional water. With rare unanimity, they are asking Congress to authorize a project that will divert 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year to the parched and thirsty areas around Phoenix and Tucson.

The Upper Basin states are supporting this undertaking only because the bill would also authorize five new water projects in Colorado at a cost of $361 million and a study of 13 other Upper Basin projects. In the picture is the further hope of importing water for the semi-arid Southwest, to be financed at least in part by power revenues to be derived from the proposed dams at Bridge and Marble Canyons. Representative Morris K. Udall of Arizona recently held out hope that about $3 billion will be left in the basin fund "to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin states."

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress, not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

To our way of thinking, the answer must necessarily lie somewhere between the two extremes. The inescapable fact is that harnessing of the Colorado has been essential to the burgeoning of the Southwest. It could not support its present population without the impoundments of water behind immense dams (Hoover, Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and others). There is no doubt a compelling logic to completion of the system with due regard for scenic and recreational values as well as economic advantages.

We think that Congress will recognize this logic and pass some measure authorizing the Central Arizona Project. At the same time it is under obligation to this and future generations to minimize the impact upon the natural beauty of the Colorado River. Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable, and even the change of the river into a lake for 13 miles at the western end of the park by the Bridge Canyon Dam ought to be avoided if possible.

While earnestly seeking an alternative, however, is is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see. The 175-mile Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam has demonstrated, moreover, that stored water in the desolate Southwest can in some cases add greatly to recreational values.

We hope that Congress, in moving to utilize the full potential of the Colorado for the people, will give due weight to scenic and recreational values. Numerous suggestions for a compromise between the demands for water and the demands for preservation of natural beauty have been made. One is elimination of the proposed Marble Canyon Dam and the addition of this gorge to Grand Canyon National Park. Another is reduction of the height of Bridge Canyon Dam so as to avoid any water storage in the park and reduction of the flooding in the Grand Canyon National Monument.

There are various other proposals for enlargement of Grand Canyon National Park by the inclusion of sections of the Kaibab Game Reserve, the Kaibab National Forest and the National Monument. Congress could soften the impact of whatever it finds necessary to do to meet the water problem of the Southwest by adding to the remarkable complex of scenic and recreational preserves in the area.

THE 179TH ANNIVERSARY OF BASTILLE DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, the 14th of July, is a great national holiday in one of the oldest nations of the Western World. This date holds a hallowed place in the national heritage of France. To the people of that nation the 14th of July is symbolic of the striving for human freedom, a striving for which the French are well noted. And to Americans of French extraction, this day is also one of great pride.

This year France will celebrate the 179th anniversary of the day in 1789 when the people of Paris took control of the fortress called the Bastille. This fortress, which dominated the city, had become in the minds of the populace a symbol of tyranny and arbitrary government. It had long been used by successive regimes as a prison for political dissenters, who were spirited away from normal life and locked in the fortress, often never to be heard from again. It was also possible in those days for high officials of the land and court favorites to have someone they disliked put secretly in the Bastille, with no record available as to what had happened to the unfortunate person.

It is no wonder that the people hated this prison, this Bastille, and all for which it stood. A great and widening gulf existed between the old order, the status quo, and the new popular movement for liberty. During a demonstration, when it became apparent that the people would have to protect themselves, the governor of the Bastille refused to issue arms when he was requested to do so. It was then that the hatred of oppression, represented by this building, caused the people to storm the fortress.

The attack on this symbol of all the cruel and despotic aspects of the then traditional order in Europe, helped to open the floodgates of revolution which in time spread to almost all the nations of the continent. The struggle for liberty and justice before the law was given a great impetus by the event which the people of France so proudly commemorate today.

It was our forefathers who fired the "shot heard around the world" which in a sense began the revolution for human rights and the dignity of man. The citizens who took the Bastille were surely following in the same path. We can thus sincerely extend to the French nation our deepest congratulations and best wishes on this holiday which is so significant for not only their great nation, but for all of mankind as well.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of editorials appeared today supporting the statement I made in the Senate yesterday concerning the need for new legislation to protect the public interest in strikes which imperil the public health or safety.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 14, 1966]

Impotence on Strikes

In rejecting the flexible and generous terms recommended by a Presidential emergency board and all attempts at arbitration of the airline strike, the leadership of the International Association of Machinists is taking an unreasonable and irresponsible stand, deliberately flouting the public interest.

The powers of the Federal Government to end this dispute that has paralyzed a large part of the nation's air freight and passenger traffic are severely limited. Because the Government is powerless, the union is under no compulsion to yield to reason. It is free to cripple air transportation, causing inconvenience and frustration and increasing costs, in defiance of the President and in disregard of the public.

The machinists are acting within the law. But there is something wrong with a law that permits either labor or management thus to ignore the public interest and disrupt the nation's transportation services. Mr. Johnson pledged himself to correct this glaring weakness in his last state of the Union message. He stated then that he would "ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us to effectively deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

But the President has never since then advanced any such proposals. In Congress, Senators Frank J. Lausche and Jacob K. Javits are moving to make up for the Administration's lapse by calling for a form of binding arbitration to strengthen the Government's hand to deal with disputes that threaten essential national services. The machinists' strike is the latest evidence of the need for stronger powers in such areas.

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, July 14, 1966]

An Emerging Pattern

In its strike against nearly two thirds of the airline industry, the International Association of Machinists has further extended a pattern that is becoming all too familiar in American labor relations.

The sequence of events goes like this: Labor and management are at their usual loggerheads in a transport or transport-related industry the Government considers to be essential. As a strike deadline is reached, or nearly reached, the Taft-Hartley or Railway Labor acts are invoked or, as in the case of New York last Winter, the Condon-Wadlin Act. If industry and labor cannot agree, the reasoning goes, impartial arbitrators should delve into the facts and come up with a solution fair to both sides.

So far so good. But what happens then? If both sides are asked to accept binding arbitration, industry generally agrees, though often with reluctance. Labor just as frequently refuses. Very well, there would be no binding arbitration. But when the fact-finding reports and recommendations are presented the same thing happens. The employers accept with reluctance and the unions refuse.

This pattern, as we noted earlier, is getting too general for comfort. There are many examples of it, but a few recent instances are worth citing. It was the case with the International Longshoremen's Association's most recent strikes along the Atlantic-Gulf waterfronts. It was the case with the strike of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association against shipping lines last year, and with the strike of the Transport Workers' Union against the New York City transit system last January. It is also the case with IAM's current strike against five major airlines.

Negotiations for a new contract between IAM and the airlines have been in progress for nearly a year. Formal mediation under auspices of the National Mediation Board began in February and ended in failure in March. The NMB then suggested binding arbitration under the Railway Labor Act, which also governs labor disputes in the airline industry.

Within two days of this offer the carriers had accepted and the unions rejected binding arbitration. A month later President Johnson created an emergency board, which reported back to him a compromise solution on June 5, one day before the strike deadline. A 30-day no-strike period was then decreed and on June 7 the President endorsed the emergency board's recommendations on the grounds that they "form the framework for a just and prompt settlement, which is in the national interest." Once again the carriers accepted and the unions rejected the whole package.

It is, of course, conceivable that at one time or another a panel of outside experts will produce recommendations not entirely fair to the unions—even one consisting (as did the panel in this case) of Senator Wayne Morse, Richard E. Neustadt, associate dean of Harvard's School of Public Administration, and Washington attorney David Ginsburg. It is just as conceivable that a given panel might unwittingly be unfair to management.

But what is one to make of the impression that in case after case the transport unions are victimized by the impartial arbitrators and Presidential fact-finding boards—no matter how distinguished their rosters may be or how highly endorsed the recommendations may be outside the councils of the unions themselves?

This is what one must keep in mind in assessing the very costly and disruptive recent strikes along the waterfront, against the shipping industry, against the New York City transit system and now against five major airlines. These strikes were called not because management refused to give way to union demands, but because in each case the union involved refused to accept what impartial arbitrators found to be a fair settlement.

From this one might deduce that only the unions themselves are the proper judges of what can be considered a fair settlement, or, to put it another way, no Government body and no consideration of public interest or public inconvenience should be allowed in any circumstances to come between the unions and what they may be able to wrest by exerting the maximum pressure on the employers and on the public.

Senator Javits was absolutely right in saying yesterday that the President does not have "a single statutory step left" to protect the public in this instance and in adding "surely it is high time we stopped pretending that existing laws are adequate." The mechanisms provided by law, in this case the Railway Labor Act, have been entirely exhausted.

But the fact that in a statutory sense the President is left without weapons is not an excuse for accepting this sorry state of affairs as necessarily permanent. Where is that new emergency strike legislation Mr. Johnson has indicated is in the works? The time to produce it and the time for Congress to get down to business on it is now.

National Labor Front

Two U.S. Senators spoke out vigorously yesterday in favor of national legislation to ward off crushing nationwide strikes, such as the current airlines walkout.

Sen. Jacob Javits (R–N.Y.) proposes that a special Congressional committee whip together some corrective legislation.

PUBLIC IS HELPLESS

The President, Javits points out, promised such a move to protect the innocent public in his January state of the Union message. "Surely it is high time we stopped pretending that existing laws are adequate," he adds.

Sen. Robert P. Griffin (R–Mich.) on this past hot Tuesday had to struggle back to Washington from Detroit via a plane to Boston. He arrived convinced firsthand that the Railway Labor Act is woefully inadequate when it comes to handling modern airline strikes. He, like Javits, demands Congressional action. And what's been the big delay?

[From Newsday, July 13, 1966]

State of Affairs

(By Clayton Fritchey)

STUPID STRIKES

Washington.—In his state of the union message on January 20, President Johnson, in the wake of New York's crippling subway strike, said:

"I intend to ask Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading state and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

That's the last we've heard about that. Six months have gone by and, as the shutdown of the airlines painfully shows, nothing has been done. There has been no White House followup, and none appears on the horizon. In fairness to Johnson, it should be noted that he finds himself in the same dilemma that has frustrated many other White House incumbents: It's easy to talk about doing something; it is not at all easy to do it; for the plain fact is that no President has been able to find a wholly acceptable and effective remedy for strikes which imperil the public interests.

It is also a notable fact that both George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Walter Reuther, the No. 2 labor leader, joined the President in denouncing the subway strike, but they have not come forward with any new remedies either. Meany, in his usual constructive fashion, merely said he would oppose any presidential effort to obtain federal legislation covering city and state employees. Reuther, in his more responsive way, said, "Society can't tolerate stoppages which endanger the very existence of society."

Reuther is wrong. Society not only can, but does tolerate such stoppages. In the last few years there have been big strikes which shut down shipping, building, public schools, newspapers, taxis, buses, and the airlines.

In each instance everybody, including the lawmakers, agreed "there ought to be a law." But it takes time to prepare legislation, and by that time the emergency is over and the pressure is off. It is also then discovered that while strikes are damaging, they seldom prove fatal to the national interest. They just seem to at the time.

At the moment, the country is indignant about the airline shutdown, and there is renewed talk of "doing something" but in the wake of settlement, the passion for reform will, as usual, soon spend itself. The politicians are wise to this. Six months ago everyone thought this session of Congress would certainly pass new strike legislation, but there is little or nothing left of that innocent hope.

Perhaps, after all these years, it is time for us to stop kidding ourselves that there is some miraculous answer to these exasperating, and often stupid strikes, which hurt the innocent bystander—namely the public. After the Manhattan subway strike, New York State was urged to emulate the National Railway Labor Act, which provides for a national mediation board to handle disputes between rail or air carriers and labor unions. It also permits a presidential emergency board to make nonbinding recommendations if mediation fails, and provides for a 30-day cooling-off period before a strike can be called.

Arbitration demanded

Yet in the airline dispute, every step of this procedure was followed, and still there was a strike. That's what prompts recurring demands for compulsory arbitration. For years this radical but seemingly simple solution has tempted Americans. A recent Gallup poll showed the public 2–1 in favor of it, a large increase over last year. Unfortunately, it has two serious drawbacks.

First, various state experiments with compulsory arbitration have not been too encouraging, nor has experience of other countries where it has been tried nationally. Second, both labor and management shrink from such critical government intervention, and as long as they feel that way it is unlikely that Congress will go against them.

Still, even if forced arbitration is not the instant answer, Congress has an obligation to develop better strike machinery than we have now. It could do worse than consider the formula sponsored by Senator Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.).

If, under his proposal, a labor dispute did not yield to fact-finding or a compulsory 30-day bargaining period, federal courts, at the President's request, could appoint receivers to operate struck facilities to the extent necessary for health or safety. If the administration feels this is not a good answer, it would be helpful to know why—and also what its own promised answer is.

[From Newsday]

The Public Be Damned

The airline strike is now in its sixth day, with both sides refusing to budge, and both apparently happy not to bargain. Five major lines are closed, inconveniencing about 150,000 passengers per day seeking to reach 231 U.S. cities and 23 foreign countries. Travelers who really have to go have engaged in some fantastic expedients to reach their destinations. One man flew from California to London and then back to New York on a non-struck carrier. Others have gone to California by way of Mexico, or to Chicago by way of Montreal.

Both the economic loss and the inconvenience have been incalculable, not to mention the problem involved in moving members of the armed forces bound for Vietnam. Non-striking employes of the struck airlines are beginning to feel the pinch too. Eastern Airlines, for example, has laid off 12,000 workers who do not belong to the striking International Association of Machinists. American industry in the long run is also bound to suffer, since important shipments so often travel by air.

This is another of those "public be damned" strikes in which neither side shows any conscience. Without discussing the merits of the union's demands and management's counteroffer, both contending forces have been standing pat, and no amount of government mediation has budged them.

Congress, under the lash of this latest strike, has begun to rouse from its torpor. Senators Lausche (D-Ohio) and Javits (R-N.Y.) are sponsoring bills that recognize the problem of strikes against the public interest but these do not go far enough.

The only answer, and Congress is ducking it, is to create an independent, non-politically appointed board representing labor, management and the consumer in equal numbers. That board must have the power to step in and to enforce settlements that are in the public interest. An outraged public must eventually make its feelings known so that crippling strikes such as the present one can be prevented through compulsory arbitration when normal bargaining fails.

Since, at this moment, Teamster boss Jimmy Hoffa is preparing to demand nationwide contracts with grocery store chains and regional contracts with big dairy companies, the threat of a national trucking tieup is menacingly near. Action is needed, and this session of Congress must provide it.

CONTAINERIZATION AND THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Norman Scott, executive vice president of Matson Lines, presented an excellent statement to the Maritime Administration Transportation Industry Symposium in Washington, D.C. on May 26. This is a factual statement indicating the direction that technology will lead in the next 20 years as our merchant fleet continues to modernize. It is recognized that Matson Navigation Co. has played a leadership role in the development in marine transportation that has so substantially increased the efficiency of our domestic merchant marine and substantially reduced freight rates to our offshore areas such as Hawaii and Alaska. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Scott entitled "Containerization—1986" be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Containerization—1986

That title sounds a bit Orwellian—but this brief look into one aspect of the transportation industry 20 years hence is not designed along such lines.

I will sketch a picture of our industry in the 1980's, pointing out a major problem area that must be met head-on now if we are to progress at the rate we should.

We all know the transportation industry—on the sea, on the land and in the air—has made tremendous strides in the past 20 years. And within the industry it has been a period of progress for ocean shipping after years of doldrums as far as new developments were concerned.

Those big "boxes" are still revolutionizing transportation. More and more steamship, airline and rail and truck carriers all over the world are going into containerized operations. It has reached a point where a shipping company carrying general cargo almost has to provide a container service to stay even with its competitors. For ocean transportation, containerization represents as dramatic a change as did the advent of steam 150 years ago.

So it is safe to predict that progress in the next 20 years will be even more impressive and exciting than the past 20 years with containerization developments going full ahead on many fronts at the same time—in trucking, the railroads and airlines, as well as the ocean carriers.

It takes no crystal-gazer to see what lies ahead. Many of the tools and most of the know-how exist today waiting to be assembled and put to work for a new era of transportation.

Containerization, 1986, will go hand in glove with "6th or 7th generation computers". It will be an era of faster ships, possibly nuclear-powered, much more automated than at present and probably larger. Terminals, too, will be modernized, with cranes and other cargo handling machinery moving containers swiftly and easily from shore to ship to shore controlled by computers. Shipyards will have to be highly automated.

Also in prospect are such exotic items as large hydro-foil vessels, submarine tankers, "winged-hull" or hover craft and ground-effect machines, which skim over the water on a cushion of air at 200 knots with hundreds of tons of cargo or hundreds of passengers. Perhaps there will be cargo-laden missiles. Nobody views any of these things as pipe dreams any longer, not after what has happened in space and on sea and land since World War II.

Put all this glamourous hardware into operation and it looks as though we have it made. But to complete the picture and make it all work for maximum benefit to the ultimate consumer will require the creation and application of comprehensive systems concepts to develop maximum effectiveness of total distribution.

Consider the world demand for consumer goods by 1986 in light of population growth and standard of living increases in progress today. More people need more things and will be demanding more all the time. That means more and, hopefully, better transportation geared to the jet and atomic age, rather than the era of the "Model T" and the 5-cent streetcar fare.

What will be needed is a fully coordinated physical systems concept designed to provide total distribution of the lowest over-all cost consistent with service requirements to the ultimate consumer.

Containerization has great potential, but to yield its greatest benefits, it requires an integrated system. Such a system from a shipper's point of view would comprehend production scheduling, inventory control, insurance, storage, damage prevention and customer service and marketing. The tie-in, of course, must be complete between ocean carriers and rail, truck and air carriers to provide a system with this capability.

Unless containerization 20 years from now is part of a fully-integrated system, bottlenecks, red tape and inefficiency will inhibit much of the economic progress of the nation's and, for that matter, the world's transportation systems.

Achievement will be difficult but not impossible—provided that we start now to exercise "management technology" in a statesman-like way to solve such problems as competition between modes, standardization, the sociological questions of the impact of new techniques on the labor force, regulatory rigidity, the complications of tariffs, more realistic rate making, the political implications inherent in each phase, and each regional requirement.

By pointing out some of the more critical problems we can start to solve some of them to pave the way for the shiny, new concept of "Containerization—1986"—and realize its potential.

I have identified "management technology" as the key to these problems. And by management, I mean the management of government and labor as well as industry—it is everyone's concern. The challenge will be to achieve an environment by 1986 which will permit full realization of the remarkable "hardware technology" that is already on the drawing boards and in the memory banks of the computers. The hardware development potential, or the physical systems capability, already exceeds our management ability to utilize it fully.

My thesis and, if you will, my "message", is that to an even greater extent, we face a need to match "management technology" with the "hardware technology" capability we will possess by 1986.

Among the specific areas demanding attention today to be where we should be 20 years hence are the legal, regulatory, sociological and political ramifications, each a vital part of the complete transportation picture.

Most of our present laws affecting transportation were written when physical systems capabilities were either not thought of or in the early stages of development. They were not designed to encourage or even cope with the creation of systems that can now be physically established and operated. I refer, of course, to a much broader spectrum of transportation than ocean cargo container systems. And this points up the critical nature of the legal aspects confronting the industry in the years ahead. We must have laws that are based on today's, and tomorrow's, physical systems potentials.

For example, the container system as we know it today basically uses a single mode of transportation. Inter-modal use is still in its infancy. To accelerate the growth of maximum efficiency systems, legislation is required to encourage efficient inter-modal operations by permitting single ownership of inter-modal facilities by development or acquisition. As a minimum, the law should encourage streamlining physical operations by simplifying the development and administration of single factor rates. The legislation should provide for a single, independent regulatory agency having jurisdiction over all modes of integrated transportation. And finally, some deregulation is essential if multimodal transportation is to keep pace with the international demands of our industrial society where rapid change is the order of the day.

Our regulatory processes, some of which date back to the 19th century, need a thorough overhaul. We simply can't continue to be hamstrung by them in the 1980's. As mentioned, reaction time must be reduced. Present regulatory practices are too slow and cumbersome and more critically, they are increasingly usurping management functions.

Besides carrier regulation and tariff administration, there are customs regulations, documentation procedures and operational safety administration to be considered.

These activities should be brought into step with the times to foster the development and to meet the future requirements of the most efficient physical systems that can be assembled.

It is equally vital that rates and tariffs be simplified. The volume and complexities of today's rail and truck, and even ocean, tariffs are unnecessary road-blocks to the development of inter-modal and multi-modal cargo movements. The trend toward per-container rates should be encouraged. It is an economically logical process, which will materially simplify development of inter-modal systems. In the same regard, rate-making procedures should be based on costs rather than the value of service or other bases.

Here again, the evolution of a management technology in the field of regulatory affairs is needed. It seems obvious that if changes are not made, the growth of containerization will be retarded by red tape before the 1980's. "Management technology" must be a moving force in developing new ideas and shaping the future form of regulations that will foster maximum efficiency systems.

Now let's consider the sociological implications of our transportation preview of 1986. There are, I submit, three major categories that urgently require application of new management technology.

First is the all-important field of labor-management relations. Labor and management share a mutual responsibility to develop an equitable method or program to handle personnel adjustments resulting from automation and other applications of new technologies and equipment. In transportation, management and labor should be able to evolve satisfactory solutions through collective bargaining, even though they have had their troubles down through the years. Both have been criticized for tie-ups and public inconvenience. The maritime industry, in particular, has been through some rugged times in the mid-30's and postwar period. But there are definite signs of better understanding by both labor and management of the myriad problems that lie ahead, and of the need to work together to solve them. Ideally, new systems, new hardware and new ideas will create new jobs but there are bound to be dislocations and changes as they evolve. Part of the "management technology" we need is the ability for employee and employer groups to anticipate these problems before they become critical.

Next, for our second sociological consideration, we come to "people problems" within the management process of corporations. In the context of our 20-year look ahead, one of the primary internal management challenges will be the development of people able to use computer hardware more effectively and with more imaginative applications than is commonly demonstrated today. As I mentioned previously by 1986 we will be into more sophisticated computers, which will offer infinitely greater capacity, speed and flexibility for analysis and distribution of management information. However, regardless of the equipment capability achieved by then, its usefulness will be no greater than the accuracy of the input information and the selectivity of functions which the computers are called upon to perform. People must perform these functions. And people must create the intellectual awareness of system capabilities which transcend the short view perspectives of individual persons, departments, companies or even modes of transportation. We must have people who can visualize, plan and implement operations which do not yet exist but which are capable of development.

Third in my list of sociological considerations is the relationship with the customer community. Industrial management in our country, indeed, throughout the world, is becoming increasingly aware of the economic importance, in its broadest sense, of distribution. Gone are the days when top management relegated traffic and distribution management to a secondary role, with accountability well down the organizational line. This, of course, is no guarantee that broader systems development will find ready acceptance in the business society of 1986, but it does indicate that industry will become increasingly demanding in appraising and buying its distribution services. The management technology called for here is that of developing sufficiently broad managerial perspectives to establish true systems concepts of distribution in terms of customer requirements.

Now that we have had a look at the legal, regulatory and sociological questions, we come to the political element—probably the most difficult to classify or predict, but certainly one that will always be with us. In this category falls the development of broad public policy determinations covering basic legislation and regulation. Such matters as governmental financing of advanced research and financial aid or subsidy to new applications all fall initially within the political sphere. Equally important is the antitrust treatment of multi-modal systems, how they are created and regulated. The importance of this transcends politics as usual but we obviously must recognize the reality of things as they are, not as we might dream. So an educational and selling effort is required to restate national transport policy in the political arena in terms of multi-modal objectives.

I have tried to be realistic by pointing out a problem area that is easy to overlook, and have served up one version of a general approach to solving it. But speech is no problem-solver. As always, it boils down to a need for coordinated action, not just talk, under enlightened and hardworking leadership.

With what our researchers, scientists and engineers will come up with in the next 20 years we know we will have to do our best to be ready to manage what they make possible.

It is fitting when thinking about 20 years into the future to sum up the management challenge by recalling the words of the late "Boss" Kettering, the inventive genius of General Motors, speaking to a group at the dedication of the G. M. Technical Center in Detroit. ". . . the future will be greater than the most fantastic story you can write. You will always underrate it."

Thank you.

THE RISING TOLL OF MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENTS

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that we in the Commerce Committee, and the Senate in turn, have so significantly pushed forward the cause of safety on our highways as we did in the passage of S. 3005 and S. 3052 just before the recess. These bills are receiving the concerned attention of the House of Representatives, and it is my hope that the results may be the fulfillment of the goals which I envisioned when I introduced the Hartke-Mackay National Traffic Safety Agency bill a month before the administration measure was presented to us.

But there is an area of highway safety which has escaped attention during our considerations, although it is a great and rapidly growing segment of the highway safety problem. I refer to the rapid increase in popularity and numbers of what is probably the most dangerous vehicle on our roads, the two-wheeled motorbike and scooter.

Mr. President, in 1964, 1,100 people in the United States were killed in motorcycle, motor scooter, and motorbike accidents.[1] This was an increase of almost 25 percent over 1963.[2] For 1965, it is estimated that another increase of 25 percent caused the number of deaths involving motorcycles to soar to over 1,500.[3] One hundred and thirty thousand people were injured in motorcycle accidents in 1963 alone,[4] almost 1 person for every 13 motorcycles in the United States.[5] In the 4-year period 1961–64, cycle fatalities in the United States increased 83 percent.[6] Both Wisconsin and New York recorded over twice as many motorcycle accidents in 1965 as in 1964.[7]

The burgeoning popularity of motorcycling indicates that the number of motorcycle deaths and injuries will continue to rise. Motorcycle sales in the United States have mushroomed in the past 5 years. In 1961, there were only 600,000 motorcycles, motorscooters, and motorbikes in this country. As of January 1966.[8] There were over 1,300,000 and the number is expected to reach 1,500,000 by the end of the year.

Mr. President, the tragic killings and traumatic injuries resulting from motorcycle accidents are arousing concern throughout the Nation. The Committee on Trauma of the American College of Surgeons has begun to call parental, professional, and public attention to the dangers connected with these lightweight, two-wheeled vehicles.[9] The Journal of American Insurance recently noted "growing concern among insurance writers and safety officials regarding poor accident records of cyclists."[10] And the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, at its 1966 convention in Portland, Oreg., will consider recommendations for dealing with the growing motorcycle problem. But the epidemic of motorcycle mishaps continues to spread.

CAUSES OF MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENTS

A major factor in motorcycle accidents is the vehicle itself. The motorcycle is basically an unstable vehicle, often difficult to handle at slow speeds.[11] Performance studies by the Road Research Laboratory of England have concluded that considerable skill and practice are required to achieve maximum braking.[12] Dr. W. R. Felix, M.D., an experienced cyclist, has observed that shifting gears on a cycle is often complex.[13] The instability of the vehicles increases the possibility of losing control when they hit grease spots, ice, water, sand, or gravel on a street or highway. Dr. Edwin E. Carter of the St. Louis University School of Medicine warns that "people don't realize how unstable motorcycles are on a slippery pavement, or how quickly they go out of control when they hit a rock or a stretch of gravel."[14] Problems of handling are even more acute for drivers of motor scooters and motor bikes, where size and weight distribution contribute to control difficulties.

---

[1] *Medical Tribune,* November 20, 1965, page 17.

[2] Public Health Service, National Vital Statistics Division, 1963 statistics.

[3] *Traffic Safety,* April 1966, page 22.

[4] National Safety Council, *Accident Facts,* 1964 edition.

[5] Ibid.

[6] *Traffic Safety,* op. cit., at page 22.

[7] The New York statistics may be found in an article of the *New York Times,* June 8, 1966. The Wisconsin statistics were found in a May 3, 1966, publication of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, "Driver License Opinion Survey."

[8] *Press Release,* National Safety Council, Statistics Division, Jan. 1, 1966.

[9] *Medical Tribune,* November 22, 1965, page 15.

[10] "Two-Wheeled Trouble," *Journal of American Insurance,* September, 1964, page 22.

[11] *Medical Tribune,* April 16, 1966, page 18.

[12] Road Research Laboratory of England, *Research on Road Safety,* (1963), page 397.

A recent article in the New England Journal of Medicine found that scooters are "uniquely dangerous because of the small wheel that fits easily into invisible road depressions, the acute turning axis of the front wheel, and the light weight."[15]

These inherent dangers in the operation and control of motorcycles clearly imply that drivers should be required to demonstrate abilities to handle cycles with skill and care before being allowed to drive on our streets and highways. A recent study of motorcycle accidents by a team of Minneapolis physicians concluded that "it would be prudent to insist that drivers of motorcycles receive special instruction and demonstrate proficiency in the use of these machines before venturing onto our highways and city streets."[16] Yet today only four States—Hawaii, New York, Oregon, and Maine—require motorcycle drivers to obtain a special motorcycle operator's license and to pass a special motorcycle road test.[17] Throughout the rest of the country, possession of a valid automobile driver's license gives any person the authority to drive a motorcycle.

A second major cause of serious injury in motorcycle accidents is the exposure of the driver. Motorcyclists who hit other vehicles or pedestrians, or lose control of their cycles, go flying through the air to hit hard, rough surfaces or objects. Studies by the Road Research Laboratory, and by the Minneapolis physicians reveal that because of this exposure a majority of motorcycle accidents involve injuries to the head and lower extremities.[18] Protective coverings for the head and legs could thus significantly reduce the number of serious injuries suffered in motorcycle accidents. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. William H. Stewart, noted recently that of the 1,100 people killed in motorcycle accidents in 1964, "many died only because they failed to wear safety helmets."[19] While motorcycle trade organizations and safety groups urge cyclists to wear safety helmets and leather coverings, only Georgia requires motorcycle operators and riders to wear crash helmets approved by the State.[20]

A third primary cause of rising motorcycle injuries and deaths is deficiency in motorcycle equipment. Motorcycles are often hard to see in traffic or at night. Several States thus require them to be equipped with lights, brakes, reflectors and horns.[21] But only New York and Pennsylvania provide specifically for periodic inspections of motorcycles.[22] Defective brakes, or tires, may go unobserved in almost any part of the country, until they result in serious injury, or even death.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

These causes of motorcycle accidents and injuries reveal what can be done to prevent further increases in deaths and injuries.

First, under the forthcoming Traffic Safety Act of 1966 the Federal Government should promptly establish adequate safety standards for the design and construction of motorcycles, motorscooters and motorbikes. The definition of "motor vehicle" under the bill is broad enough to include them.

Second, special licenses should be required for all those who wish to operate a motorcycle, motorscooter or motorbike. The applicant should have to pass a physical examination, a written examination, and a road test. The State and local governments could perhaps provide for special off-street testing areas in which these examinations would be given by trained motorcycle examiners. New York, Hawaii, Oregon, New Jersey and Maine have been pioneers in developing these tests to protect not only the public, but the motorcycle operator himself.

Third, safety goggles and crash helmets should be required equipment for every motorcycle operator. Motorcycle racing drivers have recognized the protective capacities of helmets and goggles for years. The British Road Research Laboratory tests demonstrated that wearing a helmet reduces by 30 to 40 percent the risk of injury to the covered part of the head. New York State Commissioner of Motor Vehicles William S. Hults has urged his State to approve legislation which would require that all motorcycle drivers and passengers wear protective helmets and goggles meeting standards set by the Commissioner.[23]

The Road Research Laboratory has developed rigorous tests to determine the most suitable types of crash helmets. Shock-absorbing properties of helmet materials and padding materials have been investigated in order to produce the safest, most protective head covering. These tests, or similar ones, could be used by State or Federal motor vehicle officials to approve crash helmets for motorcycle operators. We learned years ago that requiring seat belts for automobiles reduced significantly the possibility of serious injury in automobile accidents. It is time for us to recognize that crash helmets perform the same function for motorcyclists. A massive educational campaign should be launched to inform the public of the protective advantages of crash helmets. In England such a campaign has succeeded so well that today 80 percent of all motorcycle operators wear crash helmets despite the fact that they are not required equipment. We must destroy the myth that only hoodlums and gangs wear safety helmets. We must persuade every cyclist that a simple $10 investment in an approved helmet may save a life—his own.

Fourth, an appropriate public agency, such as the local police department, for instance, must provide highly supervised motorcycle driver education similar to that traditionally provided for automobile driver training. Motorscooters and bikes are becoming increasingly popular with teenagers. An investment in preventive education now could save hundreds of young lives for tomorrow. The Bureau of Traffic of the Louisville, Ky., Police Department recognized this need for motorcycle driver education in August of 1965, when it established public driving schools for inexperienced motorcycle, scooter and bike operators.[24] Other cities should follow this example.

Fifth, periodic inspections of motorcycles should take place in every State, not just New York and Pennsylvania. The most careful motorcycle enthusiast may be unaware of equipment deficiencies in his vehicle, and many initiates probably do not have the technical knowledge to inspect their own cycles carefully and efficiently. The Pennsylvania motorcycle inspection is a good example of the kind of examination every cycle should be required to pass. Pennsylvania inspectors check steering, alignment and suspension, tires, wheels and rims, exhaust and fuel systems, brakes, lighting and electrical systems—including horns—vehicle glazing, registration and body items, road handling. If any of this equipment is not working properly, the vehicle is rejected and cannot be driven on Pennsylvania roads. In addition, any other equipment which has been mounted on the cycle must pass the inspection.

Sixth, it would improve the situation if no passenger were allowed to ride with the driver on any motor bike or scooter not equipped with a sidecar. These vehicles, because of their small size and light weight, are difficult enough to handle without a passenger. Riders only complicate the driver's problems of control, and increase the likelihood that an accident will occur.

Finally, at all levels of State, local and Federal Government we must begin a campaign to inform the American people of the need for prompt action to prevent the senseless injuries which occur in motorcycle accidents. Dr. James C. Drye, professor of surgery at the University of

---

[13] *Medical Tribune*, April 16, 1966, page 19.

[14] *Medical Tribune*, December 1, 1965, page 29.

[15] New England Journal of Medicine, October 15, 1964, p. 836.

[16] *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965, page 17.

[17] The Hawaii requirement is found in Act 29, 1965, Maine at chapter 303, Public Laws of 1965; New York, Article 9, section 503 (1965); Oregon, chapter 547, Laws of 1965.

[18] The Minneapolis study is discussed in *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965. The Road Research Laboratory results are at Road Research Laboratory, op. cit. at page 462.

[19] *Medical Tribune*, December 27, 1965.

[20] Georgia laws, 68–1673 (1962).

[21] Including New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Indiana.

[22] New York Article 9, section 390. Pennsylvania Purdon's Laws 75–834.

[23] *New York Times*, June 8, 1966.

[24] *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965, page 17.

Louisville School of Medicine, has called the motorcycle "the most lethal weapon on our highways and streets."[35] Sensible regulation must be used to put an end to the mayhem, death, and economic waste resulting from motorcycle accidents.

THE UGLIFICATION OF AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the press of urgent business there is a tendency to neglect responsibility which all of us bear to future generations in preserving the beauty of our land.

Recent proof of this was the appalling disclosure, in connection with the publication this year of the report of a "Special Committee on Historic Preservation," that half of the landmarks listed by the committee had already been torn down. This report entitled "With Heritage So Rich," was compiled under the auspices of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, financed by the Ford Foundation, and prepared under the guidance of former Representative Albert Rains. It observes:

> A nation can be the victim of amnesia. It can lose the memories of what it was and thereby lose the sense of what it wants to be. It can say it is being "progressive" when it rips up the tissues which visibly bind one strand of its history to the next. What it often does is to break the perpetual partnership that makes for orderly growth in the life of a society.

This year alone we have witnessed plans to destroy such irreplaceable treasures of the Nation as part of the California Redwood Forest, the Metropolitan Opera House of New York, National Presbyterian Church in Washington, and the west front of the Capitol Building itself. Although efforts are underway to save these landmarks, they may not be successful unless the citizens of this country rally to their support.

It is apparent that the quest for beauty must be concerned with manmade as well as natural scenes. An article in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 26 by Mr. Wolf Von Eckardt describes another aspect of uglification—the urge to lay down large ribbons of concrete which have the effect of overshadowing some of the most charming and historic areas of our cities. Examples are proposed expressways through the heart of the Vieux Carre in New Orleans, Society Hill in Philadelphia, and several sections of the Capital City of Washington.

Mr. Von Eckardt summarizes this process and comments that "our children will not thank us for it." His article deserves to be widely read and I would like to request unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the finest ways a citizen can express his patriotism is to join the fight to save as much as possible of America the beautiful. During the past several years leadership has come from the White House by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and from this body by such men as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE and Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. As a result of this concern, the Senate, on July 11, passed S. 3035, which provides for a survey of national historic properties, and for matching funds to acquire and preserve them.

In my judgment it is timely for our people, groups, and Members of the Congress to take a fresh look at the battle between beauty and the blight and to take a stand against the uglification of our cities and our countryside.

Let us do more than hope that when our children and grandchildren sing "America the Beautiful" they will have something more than pictures in the schoolbooks for which they will be able to thank us.

EXHIBIT 1

CITYSCAPE FINDS HOPE—FREEWAYS RUN INTO A BLOCKADE

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

The highway builders won another important battle a few days ago in New Orleans with the approval of an elevated freeway. But even so, there is cause for hope that the monstrous concrete ribbon that will recklessly slash through the city's picturesque Vieux Carre might be the last of its kind.

There is a revolt against the senseless indignity of urban freeways ruining cities and parks, and on the Federal level, at least, the highway builders are beginning to take it seriously. The revolt started in San Francisco and spread to other cities, notably Washington, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Baltimore and New York. But what troubles the Bureau of Public Roads is that the revolt is beginning to reach Capitol Hill—the most important place of all to a Federal agency.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, told the Senate recently: "It is time that Congress took a look at the highway program because it is presently being operated by barbarians, and we ought to have some civilized understanding of just what we do to spots of historic interest and great beauty by the building of eight-lane highways through the middle of our cities."

New Orleans' Vieux Carre, or French Quarter, is, of course, just such a spot of historic beauty. For years, the Louisiana State Highway Department planned an elevated expressway along the length of this charming tourist attraction, cutting it and, even more disastrously, its charming Jackson Square, from the Mississippi River.

As elsewhere, study after highway department-sponsored study "proved" the infallibility of the highway department's decision. As elsewhere, the city planners failed to do any planning and therefore could not propose any alternatives.

It was a long and bitter battle that attracted national interest because of the Vieux Carre's significance as the legacy of French culture in America.

Those concerned with our cultural heritage felt badly betrayed last winter when the Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton, approved the destructive expressway. He had just returned from a tour through Europe where, at the invitation of a private foundation, he and other Government officials studied means of historic preservation. But he seemed more impressed by political pressure from the Louisiana Highway Department and Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, the majority Whip, than by any lessons he learned in faraway Paris or Amsterdam.

The pressures won out when the New Orleans City Council voted five to two to go ahead with the freeway. No alternatives were considered; no reprieve for further study was granted.

Whitton however, has said that he is "still open to any consideration to enhance the area." Just what that means nobody knows, but it seems to hold some faint chance that the Vieux Carre can be saved. The Louisiana highway builders have rejected the idea of tunneling the expressway as infeasible and too expensive. As presently conceived, a 20 foot high structure filled with trucks and cars will blight Jackson Square much as the Embarcadero Freeway blights downtown San Francisco or the Whitehurst Freeway blights Georgetown's waterfront. Our children will not thank us for it.

But Whitton and the Bureau of Roads seem to realize that the battle of New Orleans may be their last victory. They agree with Senator CLARK that "we must find new and more imaginative ways to design urban highways and the necessary dollars to finance them."

A test of the Bureau's true willingness to find such ways is now imminent in Philadelphia. There, too, an elevated freeway was to cut a historic area—Society Hill and nearby Independence Hall—from the waterfront. Whitton seemed to feel that the highway builders had made all the concessions they could to beauty and sentiment when they agreed to some rerouting to save historic buildings and to depressing the freeway. The Philadelphia Planning Commission agreed.

But a committee of Philadelphia architects supported by some 80 organizations and no less than 10,000 individuals felt otherwise. The committee has drawn up a well-studied and documented plan whereby the ten-lane Delaware Expressway would be completely covered for six blocks along Society Hill. Thus city and waterfront would be united and the expressway cover would be turned into a handsome 15-acre park with room for playgrounds and other amenities.

Although he feels that urban freeways should enhance areas through which they run, Whitton is opposed to this much enhancement. He fears the expense and is worried about drivers who might feel unsafe in the tunnel and miss the view.

The committee retorts that on the basis of land acquisition cost, increased land values and tourist spending, the long-range economic advantages of the tunnel far exceed the added $25 million construction cost. As to motorists, the committee asserts that an imaginative tunnel design with improved lighting could be both safe and attractive. It points out that a view from a trench is no prettier than from a tunnel. This is an interstate and commuter freeway and not a scenic recreation facility for motorists.

The question, in short, is whether the highway builders will seriously consider and accept urban freeway design when it is offered. The American Institute of Architects is discouraged on this point. Citing the New Orleans elevated expressway as an example, AIA's president, Morris Ketchum Jr., charged that Federal policies on the design of highways within cities are producing disastrous results.

He resigned from the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification because AIA could not be placed in "a position of tolerating, or even approving, policies of which it disapproves—policies which are also in direct opposition to those of President Lyndon B. Johnson."

Besides the official beautification committee, Whitton has informally asked eight leading city planners, architects and engineers to advise him on route location and urban freeway design. The group includes outstanding landscape architects Michael Rapuano, Lawrence Halprin and John O. Simonds and architect Kevin Roche, an associate of the late Eero Saarinen.

---

[35] Ibid.

The group is now working on a sort of white paper which will set forth design standards and ideas for a new kind of limited access roads in a city.

The group may also recommend a National Design Review board to assist state highway departments with a more creative approach. This thinking coincides with that of the AIA, which may, at its forthcoming convention, urge creation of an advisory task force on urban freeways. It also coincides with recent proposals in Congress, notably those of Senator CLARK and Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey.

The Bureau of the Roads, meanwhile, is doing some hard new thinking of its own. A part of its $20 million annual investment in highway research is devoted to urban transportation and design problems. Among the emerging new ideas is use of air rights over freeways and the phrased redevelopment of entire city blocks in a combination of highway construction and urban renewal to provide housing for those who are displaced.

It is too early to tell, however, just how far and how soon more creative and constructive highway design will come about. Up to now, the state highway departments have largely ignored various missives from Washington urging them to be more responsive to their social and esthetic responsibilities and "to be more considerate of all human values."

Lately, however, the Federal highway builders have been using plainer language. Thomas G. McGarry, Whitton's special assistant, recently told a meeting of public works officials: "We can respond to our responsibilities out of our own initiative and our sincere concern for the public interest, or we can be dragged kicking and screaming to them by legislation."

MOLYBDENUM PRICE ROLLBACK ANOTHER L.B.J. ANTI-INFLATION VICTORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again the administration has demonstrated that it is fighting inflation hard and well.

This morning's newspapers announced that the Johnson administration has succeeeded in forcing the cancellation of a 5-percent increase in the price of molybdenum that had been announced 6 days ago.

Such a price increase could have been a crucial factor in shoving prices up generally, across the board. For some kinds of high quality steel the molybdenum increase could have added up to $18 per ton.

Other types of steel also would have been pushed up in price and of course with the bellwether steel price increases, the whole structure of our industrial pricing would move up. The administration stopped that cold.

The management of American Metals Climax—by far the largest molybdenum producer made that clear in the announcement that the administration had persuaded them not to raise prices after all.

And Mr. President, this price increase should have been rescinded. Economic council chairman Gardner Ackley called the proposed price increase unconscionable. Profits of American Metals Climax related to stockholders equity have been well above the average of industry in the country.

Profits of the molybdenum division of American Metal Climax are more than twice as high as American industry—and this of course is without any price increase.

Mr. President, this tough, fast, effective action of the administration will not make big industry throw their hats in the air. Of course the administration's vigor in holding down prices will be unpopular with much of industry.

But it should be mighty popular with the rest of the country—if only the consumers in the country would take notice of what the administration has done and recognize its significance.

Mr. President, the leveling off of production growth, the reduced volume of new orders, the increase in unemployment since it hit its low several months ago at 3.7 percent and since has risen to 4 percent, the enormous increase in plant capacity in the past 3 years and the huge influx into the labor force, plus the immense upgrading of the skills of that labor force, all suggest that excessive demand is unlikely to cause prices to rise from now on.

But, Mr. President, this doesn't mean that the inflation threat is over. Far from it. What happened in molybdenum—or threatened to happen before the administration stepped in could very easily happen in the rest of industry without a vigorous, alert administration willing to take action, powerful interests don't like.

And there is every possible danger that the wage price guidelines may be so generally and substantially breached—that wage increases might shove prices up.

To enforce—or to try to persuade labor to continue to live by those guidelines—is a hard, unpopular business.

But this is just what the administration is trying to do in precisely such cases as the molybdenum story that the newspapers reported today.

Prices may rise sharply this year as they did from 1957 to 1960 in the face of rising unemployment and falling demand. How can this happen? It can and without tough administration action certainly will happen because of the ability of both labor unions and big business to shove prices or wages or both up simply through superior bargaining power.

And finally, Mr. President—and I might say most important—we should recognize that this molybdenum story is just part of a long fight that started in the Kennedy administration in 1961. When President Kennedy persuaded the United Steel workers to hold down their wage demands. When big steel later broke the agreement and proposed a $6 a ton increase in steel prices, the President made his historic and winning fight to keep prices down.

Several times subsequently steel prices were held down. The auto agreements a few years later in the Johnson administration were held close to the guidelines and auto prices were kept down. Copper and aluminum companies agreed to rescind announced price increases after Johnson administration warnings and the announcement of stockpile sales.

Just this week we acted on a government pay raise—within the guidelines—as a noninflationary example to the country.

Mr. President, this fight by the Johnson administration against inflation is far too little noted. For the last 5 years—for the first time in American history, we have a national administration that is effectively fighting to keep prices down.

The good news on molybdenum today is a fine example of that struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT WINS A PRICE ROLLBACK FOR MOLYBDENUM—TOP PRODUCER ANNOUNCES RESCISSION OF A 5-PERCENT RISE MADE 6 DAYS BEFORE—LABOR PACTS A FACTOR—EXPIRING UNION ACCORDS AND STRONG CORPORATE PROFITS ARE CONSIDERED BY UNITED STATES

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—The Administration succeeded today in forcing the cancellation of a 5 per cent price increase on molybdenum announced six days ago.

As the price recission was announced in New York by American Metal Climax, Inc., the largest producer of molybdenum, Government officials here disclosed their basic motive for applying pressure on the company for the rollback.

They wanted to demonstrate to unions, as much as to management, that the Administration's anti-inflationary wage-price guidelines are not a dead letter.

The announcement came after the close of trading on the New York Stock Exchange and therefore had no impact on the market.

In deciding to make the attempt to force the first outright price rollback since January, the Government had its eye on the airlines mechanics' strike and on the many major labor contracts that expire next year, officials said.

The direct inflationary impact of the molybdenum price increase was also a major factor, officials stressed. They said the price rise, announced on Friday, could add as much as $18 a ton to certain high-quality steels used in tool-making, which require the use of considerable molybdenum.

STAINLESS STEEL IMPACT

For stainless steel, in which relatively small quantities of molybdenum are used, the direct additional cost would be around 50 cents a ton, they said.

In addition, officials were motivated to make an issue of the molybdenum increase because of the unusually high profits of American Metal Climax, they said. The company's earnings amounted to 17 per cent of stockholder's equity last year, and in its molybdenum division have exceeded 30 per cent, officials said. These figures compared with an average of 13 per cent for all manufacturing corporations.

Even the Administration's consideration of the company's profits was focused in the context of future union demands for big wage increases, however, officials indicated.

They foresee large union demands over the next 12 months or so, partly because industry profits generally are high. The striking airline mechanics, for example, have repeatedly emphasized the "unprecedented prosperity" of the airlines.

Among the major labor contracts that will have to be negotiated in the next 12 months are those in the electrical equipment, trucking and rubber industries. Auto industry labor contracts expire next fall. There have been almost no major union contracts that have expired this year.

The Government's pressure on American Metal Climax to rescind the price increase began, so far as the public knew, on Saturday, when Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, issued a statement denouncing the increase.

The statement was received with considerable surprise in industry circles, because it had appeared that the Administration had abandoned all attempts to force businesses to lower prices once they had been raised.

Rollbacks were forced on the aluminum and copper industries last fall and a partial rollback on the price of structural steel in January.

Thereafter, while Administration figures publicly criticized certain price increases—on cigarettes, for example, there appeared to be no real attempts to force reversals of price increases that had already been announced.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor said flatly at a press conference in May that there would be no more "public confrontations" between the Government and business over price increases, although the Administration would continue to exert quiet pressure to prevent or moderate price increases.

Some increases were, in fact, held to less than the manufacturer originally planned, on newsprint, for example, and shoes, after conference with Administration officials.

CIA FOREIGN RELATIONS RESOLUTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a resolution aimed at replacing the present review operations of Congress over the CIA and other intelligence agencies with a formal Committee on Intelligence Operations.

Congressional oversight of the Central Intelligence Agency and other agencies of similar purpose—such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and others—would rest with a formal nine-member Commission, composed of three members each of the Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Appropriations Committees. At the present time, oversight of such operations rests with several Members appointed by the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, such oversight has rested with the Armed Services Committee since the creation of the CIA. There has been no challenge to the functions of the Armed Services Committee in this regard, and I might say that I know of no reason to suppose that the arrangement is not proving viable and effective, as, indeed, it seems to be.

It is obvious that in sensitive and secret matters of this kind, with human lives involved in some aspects of intelligence operations, there is every reason to confine critical information to as few ears as possible.

While it is perhaps true that decisions made by these agencies do have some ultimate bearing on foreign policy, it is also a fact that almost every bill which comes before Congress has ramifications beyond the scope of the particular committee to which it is referred. There is certainly a great deal of correlation in these matters.

I do not think that the present instance is significantly different. If joint jurisdiction and oversight should be accorded both the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, then there is no reason why joint jurisdiction should not be accorded committees on any of the many bills which affect more than one legislative area.

As I understand it, the members of the Armed Services Committee who oversee operations of the CIA and other similar agencies have been quite cooperative in providing information to the Foreign Relations Committee on such subjects as the intelligence estimates for various countries, without divulging aspects of their operations.

The reasoning behind the proposal is, in my opinion, rather tenuous; and the justifications for maintaining the present methods of oversight and supervision are strong. There is much to be said for keeping the apparatus of supervision small and select, and I urge that my colleagues vote accordingly. I intend to vote to support the present, quite workable methods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I report to the Senate a resolution creating a Committee on Intelligence Operations approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 14 to 5 on May 17, 1966. On June 27, I sent to all Members of the Senate a copy of this resolution and report for their information. I did so in anticipation of the subject being taken up under the circumstances as they have developed this morning.

Therefore, I report the resolution to the Senate and ask that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created, effective at the beginning of the Ninetieth Congress, a committee to be known as the Committee on Intelligence Operations to consist of nine Senators, of whom three shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations from among the members of that committee, three shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services from among the members of that committee, and three shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations from among the members of that committee. No more than two of the members appointed from each such standing committee shall be from the same political party. The chairman of the committee shall be elected by the members.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the Committee on Intelligence Operations to keep itself fully and currently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and other agencies of the Government insofar as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence. The committee's duties shall include, but not be limited to, review of intelligence and counterintelligence activities and legislative oversight of the coordination of such activities among the various agencies concerned.

Sec. 3. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

Sec. 6. The committee shall take special care to safeguard information affecting the national security.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent that it now be in order to proceed to the consideration of the resolution just reported, on the investigation of the CIA, for the limited purpose of determining any procedural problems relating thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the resolution is not to "investigate" the CIA; it is to create a committee. The original McCarthy resolution was to investigate the CIA. This resolution was reported in place of that one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the change be inserted in the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to address a few remarks to the substance of, the necessity for, and the justification for the resolution which has just been stated. It is reported in place of the original resolution proposed in January by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy].

Mr. President, the resolution which I bring before the Senate this morning would authorize the creation of a Select

Committee on Intelligence Operations. It would consist of a total of nine members, three each from the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations. Its mandate would be "to keep itself fully and currrently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and other agencies of the Government insofar as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence."

Our sponsorship of this resolution proceeds from the belief that the CIA plays a major role in the foreign policy decisionmaking process and that by its activities it is capable of exerting—and has exerted—a very substantial influence on our relations with other nations. The resolution which we bring before you is an assertion of the duty of the Foreign Relations Committee to be aware of all the developments and activities of our Government as they relate to foreign affairs.

When the CIA was created, the extent and nature of its present role could not be foreseen. From a modest beginning in an entirely different context of world politics, the operations of the CIA have grown today to exceed the Department of State in both number of personnel and budget. The CIA is an efficient organization and I compliment it because in many countries its representatives stay longer and in many ways are better prepared—certainly they are better financed and, in many cases, have more influence—than our ambassadors.

The CIA has certain unique characteristics which set it apart from other institutions involved in the foreign policy process of the Government. These characteristics give the Agency unusual advantages and influence and suggest the desirability of the Foreign Relations Committee being more aware of its activities.

As is natural with any organization—particularly one staffed by intelligent and dedicated individuals—the CIA becomes a factor in the decisionmaking process as an advocate for its own recommendations. Its ability to provide the facts on which decisions are made gives it a great advantage over the Department of State in this respect. The Agency is not under the same compulsion to subject its data or analyses to the bureaucratic clearance procedures which affect and often retard the efficiency and imagination of the Department of State. Insofar as the collection of basic intelligence data is concerned, this immunity is proper. The desirability of scrutiny becomes more obvious in the case of conclusions which the Agency draws from its own data—conclusions which may be virtually unchallengeable given the Agency's freedom in its choice and presentation of supporting evidence.

There are certain other advantages, seldom mentioned, which the CIA enjoys. It is not required to expend any significant portion of its energy in dealings with either the public at large or the Congress. It is not expected, for example, to play host and guide to visiting Members of Congress, and we do not refer to it a regular flow of constituent mail and problems. Furthermore, its officers are relatively free from the social and ceremonial requirements which so greatly distract their State Department counterparts.

These aspects of the CIA's nature and functions were well stated in the recent series of very thorough articles on the CIA appearing in the New York Times. One passage reads:

> It is the CIA, unlike the Defense Department with its service rivalries, budget concerns and political involvements, and unlike the State Department with its international diplomatic responsibilities and its vulnerability to criticism, that is freest of all agencies to advocate its projects and press home its views; the CIA can promise action, if not success.
>
> And both the Agency and those who must pass upon its plans are shielded by security from the outside oversight and review under which virtually all other officials operate, at home and abroad.[1]

And in another of the articles, the Times pointed out:

> Nevertheless, the CIA enjoys an inherent advantage in any conflict with the State or Defense Departments because of its undeniable expertise—especially in economics and science—and because it is free from such political entanglements as trying to build up a missile budget (as in the case of the Air Force) or of having to justify the recognition of a foreign leader (as in the case of State).[2]

In urging the creation of a select committee or a Committee on Intelligence Operations, I am not suggesting that the Congress can or should assume control of the CIA or the other intelligence gathering activities of our Government. This is clearly a function of executive responsibility directly related to the conduct of our foreign relations and the maintenance of national security.

It has been asserted that the CIA functions under the National Security Council and initiates no activity which has not been ordered by the NSC. This seeks to imply close, continuous supervision by an organized mechanism. In this connection, I noted with great interest a recent report that the National Security Council met on May 9 of this year, for the first time since July 1965. Furthermore, the formal NSC machinery in existence in earlier years has atrophied to the point of nonexistence.

It seems to me, therefore, that if there is a chance that the executive branch may not adequately assure the proper relation of the CIA to overall national interests—particularly those in the field of foreign policy—it is imperative that the Senate know enough about the CIA's activities to be able to offer its own suggestions in this respect. As my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], has said, this is "not a question of passing judgment on any activities, but of proper procedures of the Government of the United States * * * it is a concern for the proper function of government, for the maintenance of proper relationships, and it is a desire to provide procedures by which the Senate, in this case through the Committee on Foreign Relations, can exercise its basic constitutional responsibility."—Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Congressional Record, May 16, 1966, page 10627.

The general public and congressional concern and uncertainty over the nature of the CIA's role in foreign affairs have found expression over the years in some 200 different resolutions which have come before the Senate on this subject. Of these, the proposal before us today is probably the most moderate. I believe that its adoption would contribute to the quieting of criticism, the allaying of public fears, and the restoring of confidence in the Agency.

The Senate has in the past created new mechanisms to meet new responsibilities. This precedent is at least as compelling in the situation before us today as that which vests legislative oversight in the committee which reports creating legislation. In instances where there are legitimate questions of jurisdiction and clearly intertwined responsibilities, I believe the Senate is far better served by the creation of a specially tailored select committee. As my respected colleague from Georgia has already acknowledged:

> The Central Intelligence Agency occupies a very peculiar position in our scheme of things.[3]

I believe that it is time for the Senate to take formal action which recognizes the true and evolved nature of this "peculiar institution."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. While I recognize the limitations of institutional forms of control, I believe that the creation of the select committee called for in this resolution will strengthen our position in dealing with executive branch officials who must ultimately exercise the control which is so essential if we are to be assured that our most honorable national principles and aspirations are not sacrificed to the immediate requirements of intelligence operations.

Another advantage which would result from the creation of a Select Committee on Intelligence Operations would be a more efficient coordination of the various intelligence activities of the Government. This aspect of the resolution has not received the attention which I believe it deserves. The overlapping and confusion of activities among the CIA, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the State Department, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency are a matter of common knowledge to those in the intelligence field. Last year's lamentable Camelot affair, resulting from an ill-advised project of the Department of Defense, was an excellent example of this situation.

The size of our overall intelligence effort is difficult to establish. However, an idea of its extent can be gained from the New York Times' estimate that its annual cost exceeds $3 billion a year. According to the same source, this amount is more than six times that specifically allotted to the CIA. The Times estimated that the National Security Agency alone spends about $1 billion of this total figure.

---

[1] The New York Times, Monday, Apr. 25, 1966.

[2] The New York Times, Thursday, Apr. 28, 1966.

[3] Senator Richard B. Russell, Congressional Record, May 16, 1966, p. 10618.

There is little doubt in my mind that a careful study of the entire intelligence community would result in a more efficient distribution of functions and, in turn, a reduction in its size and expense.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that the failure of the Senate to take this small step in formal recognition of its duty to exercise a more comprehensive oversight of U.S. intelligence activities will evidence an abdication of our clear duty in an area where the activities of the executive branch can spell the difference between national honor and national discredit or, conceivably, between war and peace.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I believe that with the responsibility, for good or bad that this committee has, it is entitled to access to the kind of information which would be available from the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, at this moment I shall not digress to discuss the merits of the proposal as was done by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because I wish to raise a procedural question, based, Mr. President, on rule XXV, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

This has been a most extraordinary procedure since its very inception. For example, Mr. President, this resolution has not been introduced. It did not follow the ordinary course of a Senator's sending it to the desk for appropriate reference; if that had been done, the resolution would not have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It would have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. But we have it here before us now, under this very unusual legal, though extraordinary, procedure of having a committee meet and write within itself a self-serving resolution that affects other committees of the Senate, without the rules of the Senate governing reference of legislation having been applied.

I raise a point of order, Mr. President, that before this resolution goes to the calendar, it must be referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Under paragraph (p) (1) (A) of section 1 of rule XXV matters pertaining to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same are referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I missed the citation of the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Paragraph (p) (1) (A) of section 1 of rule XXV prescribing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The provision then continues:

> except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

Mr. President, this resolution, as originally introduced, provided, as the Senator has stated, for an investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and for the appropriation of $150,000 for the purpose of providing a staff and the facilities for conducting that investigation. Of course, such provisions immediately placed it within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules. So that part of the resolution was rewritten. It was redrafted as a Senate resolution creating a committee.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has referred to the fact that this is a select committee. It is only called a select committee in his statement to the Senate. It does not anywhere else appear so in the proceedings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is not a select committee. Despite the fact that the Senator has called it that, it is a standing committee of the Senate that would be created. The resolution reads: "is hereby created a committee to be known as the Committee on Intelligence Operations." This is not a select committee in the ordinary sense of the word. It is a standing committee of the Senate of the United States that is proposed to be created, without reference to the Committee on Rules—which usually handles the creation of standing committees—or to the Committee on Armed Services—whose jurisdiction it invades in a number of instances.

I wish to point out further, Mr. President, that this is proposed to be done without hearing a single witness by the committee, in this self-serving, self-seeking resolution. It is presented here in this novel fashion to change the procedures of the Senate as they have existed since its creation, without a single witness appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, so far as I am advised, to support the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency on two occasions before the committee. His testimony, which was restricted to the very superficial aspects of their activity, was the most persuasive witness with respect to the necessity of this resolution. I do not know of any further witness. In effect, this resolution is the outgrowth of the failure of the committee to receive what it believed to be significant intelligence from the Director of the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I intend to discuss that. But when the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, wrote a letter to the members of that committee, pointing out that the Foreign Relations Committee was proposing to create a Subcommittee on Appropriations to deal with the appropriations for the Central Intelligence Agency and all of the other agencies that are listed in the resolution, the Committee on Foreign Relations, to avoid that criticism, changed the resolution again, and struck out the asserted authority to deal with the appropriations and budgetary affairs of all these various investigative and intelligence agencies.

I use that illustration to show the unusual length to which the committee went in seeking to avoid the normal procedures of the Senate, in reporting the resolution without its having been introduced and without having been introduced at any hearings except that the distinguished chairman of the committee may have been dissatisfied with the refusal of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to divulge his methods and sources of obtaining information when he appeared before the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to impose on the Senator's time, but he has said that the Central Intelligence Agency occupies a very peculiar position. I do not think it is fair to say that the Foreign Relations Committee is trying to be self-seeking, self-serving, or trying to monopolize anything when it seeks participation. It is not trying to take this over.

All the resolution provides is that the Foreign Relations Committee be allowed to be a part. It does not seem to me to be a very extreme move. We are not trying to oust anybody from jurisdiction.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Why does not the Senator from Arkansas introduce a resolution from the floor for appropriate reference? Why does he bring it in from the committee in this form?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has said it is a very peculiar situation.

In consultation with the Parliamentarian about the point of order the Senator is about to make, the Parliamentarian said the Senate has no precedent for this kind of situation.

Actually, there is no precedent in the history of the Senate that I know of, for dealing with a body like the Central Intelligence Agency. This is a most peculiar agency, as the Senator said.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I decline to yield further.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well; but the Senator himself has said that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not deny it at all. It is a peculiar agency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The formal supervision which we are seeking has never been acted on. The Senate has never taken any specific action with regard to one of the largest agencies, one of the most expensive agencies in the entire Government. It is all done very informally. I think that is very unusual.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I challenge the Senator from Arkansas to bring forth a single other precedent since the Senate was first created in 1789 where a committee brought forward a resolution to create a new committee of which it would be a part that was not referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration or to another appropriate committee.

If this is not a case which is self-serving, I do not know what self-serving means.

This proposal is presented in an unusual and unprecedented fashion. I realize we are living in a new day; but I know of no other instance in which a committee has been created on which the members were selected by the chairman of a standing committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that the committee is reporting a resolution of which it does not have jurisdiction?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is true. They avoided jurisdiction by reporting it out and not introducing it for reference to the appropriate committee.

The proposal departs from the general practice of having the chair appoint the membership of a committee or having it done by a caucus of the two parties and ratified by the Senate. I have never heard of another instance like this and I do not believe that the Senator from Arkansas has.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the Senator does now with the committee that functions in connection with the CIA, and this committee is following his precedent.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services designates members without the authority of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations designates members—also without authority from the Senate. That is the way they presently operate. This is a peculiar situation of which there is no precedent.

The committee is asking the Senate, in its wisdom, to make up its mind whether it wants a committee such as this to be formal or not. That is all that it is asking. It is not asking to oust anybody.

This procedure is the procedure that is now being followed. The present informal committee, with no formal recognition, is selected by the respective chairmen.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am utterly surprised that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has graced this Senate for so many years, does not know the difference between a subcommittee and a committee. The Senator is talking about the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services that now has responsibility for the Central Intelligence Agency, but he is proposing to create a standing committee, not a subcommittee, and he proposes to do it by having the selections made by the members of three other standing committees of the Senate.

I know of no instance where that has been done. Of course, a subcommittee can be extinguished at the end of a session of the Senate—it is extinguished—unless it is renewed by the full committee. This resolution proposes what would be a permanent committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Georgia saying that if the resolution now before us and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations in its present form had been sponsored from the floor, the resolution would have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It would have been referred either to the Committee on Rules and Administration or to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have a parliamentary ruling?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am confident it would have gone to one of those two committees. In my judgment, it would have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PASTORE. May we ask for an official ruling?

At the same time, in connection with that, may I ask if the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] introduced was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That was because he asked to have the Committee on Foreign Relations conduct the investigation. He spelled that out in the resolution. He was not letting anyone else in on that.

Mr. President, there are some other unusual features about this.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As to selection, I would be disposed to accept an amendment to have the members selected in the same way as any other committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not taking an unusual privilege. It should be the same as any other committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is not essential to the resolution at all. If the Senator wishes to have members selected in the other fashion, it is perfectly all right with me, and I am sure that it is with the other members of the committee.

The simple proposition is whether or not the Senate, in its wisdom, wishes to take action on a matter of this kind or continue this vague situation.

There have been 200 resolutions showing discontent about it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That would be revision 10 or 12 in the effort to get this resolution approved in some form. It has been rewritten, rewritten, and rewritten to avoid the jurisdiction of the appropriate committee, or committees, which should handle it.

Let me point out another novel thing. On every other standing committee of the Senate, the chairman is selected by the Senate. What does this resolution provide? It provides that the chairman be elected by members of the standing committee.

It deviates from the practice that has obtained since the inception of the Senate. The Senate has elected the chairmen of committees. Here it is proposed that this is a special case, that owing to the peculiar nature of this agency, we should let the new committee take away jurisdiction from the Senate itself to elect the chairman.. That is a most unusual provision. It is one that the Committee on Rules should examine after the Committee on Armed Services has examined into the functions of the subcommittee.

Now, Mr. President, as I say, this resolution has been rewritten and rewritten and rewritten time and again in an effort to avoid the ordinary parliamentary processes of this body. Under rule XXV, there is no doubt in my mind that this resolution should be considered by the Armed Services Committee. I do not know what the Parliamentarian would say, but I do know what the rules provide.

I am therefore glad to submit this parliamentary inquiry. If this resolution were introduced for appropriate reference, to what committee would this resolution be referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to ask the Senator from Georgia, is he referring now to the resolution as it was reported——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT (continuing). By the clerk from the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a cursory examination of this resolution, there is a feeling on the part of the Chair that in light of the——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I ask the Chair if he would examine into the resolution as to the agencies covered, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the others which are involved, and the jurisdiction that is now fixed, before he makes a ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is posing a hypothetical case. I want to make that clear at this point, because the resolution before the Senate comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator poses the question, if this resolution had been introduced from the floor of the Senate, and asked for appropriate referral, where would it have gone to? On a cursory examination, it appears to deal with matters of national security, which is the subject matter covered by the Committee on Armed Services and that is the committee to which the resolution would be referred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would not wish to yield right now, although I am glad to——

The VICE PRESIDENT. This ruling does not relate to the proposition that is presently before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I understand that. I am not complaining. I am not saying this is an illegal procedure. I say it is an extraordinary procedure that is resorted to only for special purposes by committees when they write bills within the committee and do not introduce them from the floor. That is the objection I am making. I say, for that reason, that a point of order should be sustained by the Chair, and this resolution should not go to the calendar but should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, so that we would at least have an opportunity to have some kind of hearing from the agencies affected as to what effect they think this resolution might have upon them and their operations.

Mr. President, I want to clear up a misconception which has arisen here, particularly in the distinguished newspaper published in New York, which the Senator quoted with authority about a dozen times in the course of his remarks, as to what legislative oversight means.

That particular paper seems to have the idea that legislative oversight means that a legislative committee which is oversighting has some control over the administration of that agency.

That is not true. Nothing could be further from the facts. All that we can do by oversighting is to keep ourselves informed as to what an agency is doing, with the exception of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to make that exception. They have the power of the purse. If they feel disposed, they can reduce the appropriation. But the other standing committees, when they are exercising legislative oversight, cannot control the operations of the agency.

I would say, Mr. President, that the most illuminating example of that of which I have any knowledge is the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations has legislative oversight over the Department of State.

Anyone who has read the newspapers for the last 8 months knows just how far the Foreign Relations Committee has missed in controlling or directing the activities of the Department of State. That shows just how much this legislative oversight function gives a committee control over an agency. All that it does is to enable committees to keep themselves informed about what an agency is doing and undertake to measure up to our legislative responsibilities in that light.

The State Department itself has an intelligence operation apart from the CIA. Each of the military departments has intelligence activities. The CIA is somewhat of a coordinating institution for other intelligence gatherers.

Mr. President, I want to say also that the Foreign Relations Committee has available to it practically all the information which is available to the Subcommittee on the CIA of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, with one or two minor exceptions.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee can get any intelligence estimate that has been arrived at in this Government on a particular situation in any country that bears upon our international relations.

One of the incidents that gave rise to this matter was when the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency declined to testify as to his sources of information and his methods of acquiring information. That matter is so sensitive, Mr. President, that only in the most extraordinary circumstances has the Armed Services Subcommittee, as careful as it has been, gone into the sources of information and the methods which the CIA has used in gathering information.

Why, Mr. President, if there were evidence of the slightest disclosure of the sources of information to the CIA from any source, if the report got out tomorrow—and I use this purely as a hypothetical illustration—that the Secretary of the Soviet Legation in Tasmania was revealing information to the CIA, our intelligence sources throughout the world would dry up. It would frighten them all to death. We could not get one iota of information. The act creating the CIA particularly charged that the Director of that Agency protect and maintain the highest classification of secrecy on the methods and sources of his information. That is properly so. If he does not do this, the CIA is not worth a plugged nickel so far as getting any clandestine information is concerned, because the slightest indication that a source of information is likely to be revealed would discourage the flow of information immediately and instantly.

Mr. President, at times an effort is made by committees to exercise an influence over executive agencies by the process of publicity. They publicize certain things. They leak information to the press in an effort to build up public sentiment, to control the editorial policy of great newspapers, thereby to influence national policy. I am not going to debate the merits of such tactics in ordinary circumstances, but I am going to say that they do not work where the CIA is concerned. The first time such methods were tried, we will have destroyed the usefulness of the CIA and we might as well abolish it.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee can call the Director of the CIA before his committee any time he wishes and he can get from him any information available to the Committee on Armed Services except as to sources and methods, and as to budgetary matters and how much money is spent for certain things.

Let me emphasize that when I refer to all these cloak and dagger operations, that they constitute a very small part of the total operations. They are vital. We must have them. Much of the rest might be of little value without those operations. However, the relative cost of the secret operations is not large.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator. When he says that the Foreign Relations Committee can get whatever information it seeks on intelligence matters from the CIA except information with respect to sources and methods used in connection with the collection of that information and the expenditure of money, is the Armed Services Commitee able to get that information?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We can get information as to sources and methods, but I want to be very frank with the Senator. I do not want the information except in the very rarest of cases. And the other members of the committee do not want that information except in unusual circumstances.

I want to say further that I do not think it is wise for the legislative branch of the Government to know all the sources from which the CIA gets its information. We should be interested in the validity of it and the importance to be attached to it. All of that is weighed in what they call the intelligence community, which consists of representatives of several agencies and departments of the executive branch.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for one additional question to seek information?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the argument of the Senator from Georgia that if this select committee——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is not a select committee. It is a standing committee.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the argument of the Senator from Georgia that if the Subcommittee of the Armed Services, in connection with receiving the CIA report, had added to it three members of the Foreign Relations Committee, which would be bound by the procedures of the committee in regard to the CIA, that that would increase the danger that information as to the sources and the methods of collection and financing would be made public?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Without the least intention of giving offense to the Senator or to his committee, I want to say that every time we add one person from any committee to the subcommittee, we increase the chances that there will be some leak.

Mr. MORSE. But there would be no danger if it were limited to Members of the U.S. Senate who are members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No. There is also a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and by a strange coincidence of parliamentary life, the membership of the two committees happen to contain some duplications. The members of the Appropriations Committee, of course, have the last word because they can cut off the means of existence of the Central Intelligence Agency or any other agency.

Mr. MORSE. Does it not follow that the Senator is arguing, when he makes the statement in regard to the protection of the source and the method of collecting and financing of the material of the CIA, that there is no question about its protection if the committee is limited to its present members in the availability to such material, but that if three members of the Foreign Relations Committee are added who will be bound by the same rules as those by which the Armed Services Committee is bound, we would then run into some danger of disclosing matters of secrecy?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have been here for some time. I want to say that there is a great deal of difference in the application that some Senators give to their responsibilities for maintaining matters that they get in executive session and the application that some other Senators give to such responsibilities.

Sometimes I have seen classified matters, given in executive session, printed in the newspapers before the committee adjourned.

Any Senator who has been here for any time knows that there is a difference between the approach of some Senators to matters of classification and the approach of other Senators to such matters.

I say that without any invidious comparison. It is true on the Armed Services Committee. It is true on every other committee, and it is true in the Senate as a whole.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield first to the Senator from North Carolina. I will have to stop yielding. I want to complete this argument.

Mr. ERVIN. My question is very simple. This does not reflect on any member of any committee. However, is it not a self-evident fact that every time an additional person is given secret information there is danger of it being disclosed? The more people who know a secret, the more apt it is to be disclosed, no matter who those people are?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. As I say, if we increase the membership of the committee by one, we increase the danger of material being disclosed. I do not care who it is. It is a fact of life.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member on both committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. If we were to add Foreign Relations Committee members to the subcommittee of the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services, why should we not add members of the Committee on Government Operations and members of other committees?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think there is some merit in the statement of the Senator. However, I will not debate all the merits of it today.

I am taking the position that the Senate should not agree to this unusual parliamentary procedure under which a committee sits in its own committee room and writes a resolution concerning somethink that belongs in the jurisdiction of some other committee. They then report it here and seek to deny jurisdiction to the other committee as a result of their procedure.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for a point of order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like it to be quiet so that we can all hear this colloquy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I am doing my best to bring the matter to a conclusion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I did not interrupt him in the course of his remarks, but it is all right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The remark of the Senator from Massachusetts seems to leave the impression that we should prevent action on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee because it has no concern with the subject matter.

I tried to make it clear that the Committee on Foreign Relations is charged by the Senate and by the rules with responsibility on foreign relations and is in a very peculiar relationship to this activity.

The activity that we are interested in is the foreign relations activity. Our interest has nothing to do with the domestic activities. If the CIA should seek to intervene in a domestic matter, we would not be interested. We have never asked for that information. If they were participating in an election on domestic matters, that would be something beyond our interest.

It is well known that this country is in great difficulty and is involved in a most dreadful and tragic war in which activity this country is the least unified of any country that I know of. It involves a grave responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We think we ought to know what part the CIA plays in situations such as we are involved in in Vietnam, and such as we have been involved in in Guatemala, in Iran, and in other parts of the world. When they refute reports by reputable organizations and reports written by well-established journalists, we cannot have the information that would prove or disprove the refutation. But, when he insinuates that the Foreign Relations Committee has no more interest in this than does any other committee, he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not think he said any other committee; he said the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have a more direct responsibility for foreign relations than does the Armed Services Committee, to be frank about it. I do not know why the Senator monopolizes the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not trying to muscle in on the Senator's committee. I am trying to keep the Senator from muscling in on my committee. That is what I am doing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing in the legislation that gives the Armed Services Committee exclusive jurisdiction on this subject. This is a power that his committee has assumed simply because the National Security Act came out of that committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not yield further, and I do not accept that statement. There is nothing here that would justify the statement that the Central Intelligence Agency will not give the Foreign Relations Committee any information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. "Significant," I said.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not believe that is correct. It would be far from the purposes of the Central Intelligence Agency. In my opinion, the President of the United States was correct in not authorizing the CIA to give details on the methods and sources of obtaining information.

Mr. President, the sponsors of this resolution emphasize that the CIA affects foreign policy. But it seems to me that affecting the subject is insufficient, under our practice, to confer legislative jurisdiction. If every committee that had some small degree of interest in a subject insisted upon the creation of special committees like this to deal with it we would have such a proliferation of committees around here that the Members of the Senate could not possibly name them all. They could not bear their names in mind. If we are going to create a special committee every time there is apparently any overlapping or conflict of jurisdiction, we would have such proliferation that it would destroy the present and existing committee system of the Senate of the United States.

I submit to the Senate, Mr. President, that this point of order is valid, and that the Committee on Armed Services, to which this resolution would ordinarily be referred if normal procedures were followed, should have an apportunity to consider this resolution before it goes to the Senate calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Georgia please restate his point of order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. My point of order is that under rule XXV, the provision of which I have read, the subsection of the rule dealing with the Committee on Rules and Administration, this resolution relates to a substantive matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, and therefore should be first referred to such committee, before it goes to the calendar. That is the point of order I made.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to ask a question.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Does not the President of the United States have sole jurisdiction over the operations of the CIA and as to what information it can disclose?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. He has complete control of it, through the National Security Council.

The Senator from Arkansas referred to the fact that there had been only one full meeting of the National Security Council for many months, but there are constant meetings of subcommittees of the National Security Council.

I do not believe the President has failed so signally in his duty that he has bypassed and neglected and disowned as important an agency of the Government as the National Security Council.

CLOSED SESSION

ORDER TO PUBLISH

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: I now ask unanimous consent that there be a sanitized version of these proceedings prepared, that it be under the authority of the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee; that they will take out anything which might be detrimental and that the record be made public, and that any Senator who participated shall have the right to correct his own remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE). Is there objection?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into closed session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I second the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make a statement.

The motion having been made and seconded that the Senate go into closed session, the Chair, pursuant to Rule XXXV, now directs the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries, close the doors of this Chamber, and that all officials of the Senate not cleared for secrecy be excluded.

(At 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m. the doors of the Chamber were closed.)

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in addition to the demand or the request or the suggestion of the Presiding Officer that the Senate Chamber and the galleries be cleared of all persons except the Senators, I move that the following staff members be allowed to remain:

The Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Frazier;

The Parliamentarian, Mr. Riddick;

The Legislative Clerk, Mr. Mansur;

The Journal Clerk, Mr. Somers;

The Official Reporters, Messrs. Drescher, Attig, Cinciotta, and Perry;

The Secretary to the Majority and Minority, Messrs. Valeo and Trice;

The Assistant Secretaries to the Majority and the Minority, Messrs. Graves and Brownrigg;

The General Counsel to Majority Policy Committee, Mr. Ferris;

The Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Dunphy;

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Wannall;

The Administrative Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Lacovara;

The Staff Director of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Marcy;

The Chief of Staff of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Darden.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, was the name of Mr. Woodruff, of the Committee on Appropriations, called?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. He has just taken the oath. Does the majority leader wish to have Mr. Woodruff remain?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would include also the name of Mr. Woodruff, who, I understand, has been sworn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Mr. Woodruff will remain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Official Reporters be authorized to take proceedings of the closed session in shorthand but that the notes not be transcribed; and that, when the session is concluded, they be placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Senate and kept secret by him along with other minutes and matters of such nature already in his custody.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does this proposal include a vote which may be taken on this matter? If so, I think that should be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Going back to the only previous closed session of which I have knowledge, a vote was taken at that time, and I believe the result was announced.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I ask that the distinguished majority leader withhold that for the time being. I do not know that I shall have any objection. I really did not see any necessity for going into a closed session. But I do not oppose the leadership, because I am sure their combined wisdom is greater than mine. Certainly any vote that has been taken in a closed session that I have ever attended has been made a matter of public record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it should be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senators indulge the Chair for a moment? The precedent in the rules is that any action taken now in the closed session is closed, and that means that it is in secret. It can be divulged only by specific affirmative action by the Members of the Senate or by a majority of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any vote that is taken be made public.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may make one more request, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the hour of 1 o'clock arrives, if the matter now before the Senate has not been concluded—and I feel certain that it will not be—the time be ignored and we continue on the present subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Has the Senator from Montana now placed before the Senate his requests on all the matters to be presented?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My question goes to this action: I merely wonder how anyone hereafter who wants to announce his vote or wants to say anything about his vote in public can do so if the action we take here is secret with the exception of the vote. How are we going to do that if the vote is to be announced?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, the votes have been announced.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that the unanimous-consent agreement is a part of the secrecy of the meeting. How do we get around that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The subject, of course, and the vote would both be made public; and before we went into closed session, everyone was aware of the question that was raised by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection to making the result of the vote public.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an unusual procedure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am disappointed we are now going into a closed session. There has been some criticism of the Senate being a club, that the Members do not like to have facts discussed released when it is not to their convenience. I would therefore ask this question, and premise it by the statement that there has been, in my opinion, many assertions which are unfounded, with respect to the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency. I say that after having made extensive trips to the Far East, Middle East and Europe, and during those trips doing my best to find out whether this basic question was true or not: Does the CIA make policy?

As a result of these trips I am convinced that the CIA does not make policy. That conviction does not come from reading newspapers. It comes from asking our State, CIA, and other representatives all over the world what are the facts?

Now what I should like to know is based on this development, the first in my experience as a Senator, closing the doors. What are my obligations as a Senator with respect to what I can or cannot say after this meeting is over?

The reason I ask that is because those who have been attacking the CIA over a period of months and years have had a field day in that the CIA cannot reply to the accusations made against it. A good place for those accusations to be replied to is on the floor here of the United States Senate. But now that opportunity is denied by the secret aspect of this session, which I consider unfortunate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Missouri was a Member of the Senate at the time of a previous closed meeting of this body, and he will recall that when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] asked that the doors be closed to consider the question of the Nike-Zeus, that was done. That was about 3 years ago.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I stand corrected. Perhaps I was not here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If this is a closed session, then I think the information which is given out under these circumstances should remain secret. There is nothing whatever to stop any Senator, at any time, outside the closed session from saying what his feelings are about the CIA and making statements with reference thereto. But the purpose of a closed session is to speak with the greatest freedom possible; and one of the reasons why the distinguished minority leader and I were interested that a closed session be held was for the purpose of protecting the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

I think we are doing this really to protect the CIA and to bring about as much freedom of expression as possible within this body. If we cannot trust one another, I do not know whom we can trust.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I regret this action was taken, but have no criticism.

Again I ask: What are my obligations as a Senator from Missouri with respect to what I can or cannot say as to what transpires here in this secret session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should say that the obligation of a Senator is up to each individual Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, I should like to know what the parliamentary procedure is based on, with respect to what we have been asked to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make an observation in regard to the question posed. I understand that the Senator from Missouri posed a question to the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Chair is correct.

The Chair indicated earlier that under rule XXXV, the proceedings, under that rule, in closed session are secret. That means they are secret for all Senators.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If Senators wish at a later date to make any comment as to their views on the subject matter, from their point of view, that is their privilege. But they are under an obligation not to divulge the proceedings of this session, who speaks, what was said, and all the argument pertaining thereto.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is exactly what I meant when I said that each Senator has his own obligation and will face up to it, and observe the secrecy of this session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, then, it is the position of the Chair that anything said about this meeting after the meeting is over is against the rules of the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the position of the Chair that it is in violation of rule XXXV, which makes a closed session a secret meeting to reveal any substantive arguments or proceedings of this meeting, including those who speak or those who make motions. The word "secret" is understood by Senators, unless on motion the Senate relieves itself of that injunction.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one further question. If the rule is not acceded to as it is now interpreted by the Chair, what is the penalty to the person or persons if there is an infraction?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is the judge of its own membership.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not hear the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is the judge of its own conduct and its own Members and membership.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Chair.

[Omission.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Paragraph 4 of rule XXXVI provides:

> Any Senator or officers of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is reading from rule XXXVI, which deals with executive sessions. A closed session is not necessarily an executive session. This session is a legislative session, and the doors are closed.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. JACKSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think that the ruling of the Chair is absolutely unanswerable. I think it is perfectly obvious to all of us that we may very well in this executive session involve ourselves in a discussion of policy matters. That makes it clear that the majority leader and the minority leader were perfectly correct in suggesting an executive session. I think it is perfectly clear that we are as much in executive session here as we are, I may say to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Arkansas, in the two committees that handle substantive matters in regard to secrecy problems of this Government.

The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations meet in executive session. I think that so far as secrecy is concerned, we are under the same obligation in this closed session of the Senate as we are in executive sessions of the committees.

It has been pointed out that our protection is that if there is any part of the closed session that we want to make public, that can be done by motion. But I think we ought to face up to the fact that we are dealing, in the very nature of things, with a matter that is pregnant with secrecy.

I join in supporting the majority leader and the minority leader in calling the executive session. So far as the public is concerned, we are protected by the request of the majority leader that if we get to the matter of rollcall votes in this closed session, undoubtedly a rollcall vote ought to be made public. But that too ought to be reserved for final judgment until we see what the situation is in regard to the subject matter of the rollcall vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be my hope, and I would hope the Senate would concur, that if there would be a rollcall vote, it would be in open session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May we take action on the request of the Senator from Montana; namely that the proceedings be taken in shorthand and that they be kept in secret in the files of the Secretary of the Senate, and not transcribed?

Is that the full request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That leaves open the question as to whether a later motion can cause the proceedings to be transcribed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], it was made possible, with the concurrence of the Senate, for the chairmen of the two committees most immediately concerned to make statements in open session before we went into closed session.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that if we are in closed session, we would discuss only matters that should be closed. But, after all, a man must have a reason for casting a vote; and the explanation given by the Senator from Missouri a short while ago, when he said he made investigations, worldwide, as to whether the CIA was influencing our foreign policy decisions, would be very important as to whether I voted yes or no. I think that that statement ought to be made in public. The idea that we are going to discuss every matter, whether of a secret nature or not, in a closed session, and then announce our votes without explanation, is, I think, all wrong, because I would be liable under the rule if I gave the reasons for my vote predicated on what some other Senator said in closed session.

If we are in secret session, only secret matters should be discussed. After that, we ought to go into public session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able Senator from Rhode Island is making my point. For days, weeks, and months this Agency has been attacked. It has been attacked directly; it has been attacked indirectly; and especially by a certain group of newspapers. Many of the accusations made against it, I have taken the time and trouble to get answers to. I think the point made by the Senator from Rhode Island is very well taken. Everybody in the United States knows about the attacks; very few people know about the defense.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], when he rose, said he wanted to talk on a point of order, and only on a point of order, with respect to two questions that were asked; and he was led into other fields. But the way this situation is operating—and I say this with great respect for the majority leader and the minority leader—where is the defense of the people of the United States, if all the accusations and the answers to the accusations are made in secret?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think there is a state of confusion among us. Rule XXXV is entitled "Session with Closed Doors." I understand that that may be a legislative or any other kind of session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. The President of the Senate announced a short while ago that the Senate is the judge of its own Members. It will be noted that rule XXXVI—and I think this might become important later—contains five sections. That rule is entitled "Executive Sessions." It was under that rule that paragraph 4 was read by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Now I should like to propound this inquiry, to be certain that we know what we are doing:

Is paragraph 4 applicable to the present situation, in which the Senate is in legislative session, behind closed doors, under rule XXXV?

The VICE PRESIDENT. After consultation with the Parliamentarian, and after an examination of the precedents available to the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian, since the subject matter that is referred to is secret, and the word "secret" or "secrecy" is involved in both rule XXXV and rule XXXVI, paragraph 4 of rule XXXVI would apply to the closed session provided for in rule XXXV.

Mr. ALLOTT. And any violation or disclosure that was made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I would appreciate a comment from the Chair amplifying an earlier comment from the Chair. This relates to the colloquy between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Missouri.

My interpretation of the admonition from the Chair would be this: that if we have a rollcall vote subsequent to the closed session, and someone asks me, "Why did you vote the way you did?" I could give him the reason why I voted. That reason might have been discussed here. But I would be giving the reason why I voted, regardless of what was said here.

Now if the person should ask, "Was that reason discussed during the debate?" I would have to say, "No comment."

I should like to ask the Chair if that would be a correct interpretation; if that would be a way to reconcile the problem discussed by the two Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's interpretation; and as the Chair has indicated and as Senators have indicated, a number of speeches will be made as to their views on the CIA, and those views undoubtedly will be reflected in the Senator's vote.

Mr. PASTORE. If I voted "yea," on the question because of what Stuart Symington said, and I were asked outside, "Why did you vote 'yea,'?" and I replied, "Because of what Stuart Symington said," I would be in violation of the rule. But that would be the reason why I voted as I did, and that is why I said that it is wrong.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's interpretation is correct, whatever his views may be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this is the time to clear up, to avoid any misunderstanding that may develop after the closed session. I completely agree with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Rhode Island, but I want to point out that after the closed session is ended, the two Senators and all the rest of us can say whatever we want to say on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere in the country on the subject matter of the CIA, so long as we do not disclose any matter of secrecy vis-a-vis the CIA that was brought out in the closed session.

We certainly, by going into closed session, have not estopped ourselves from discussing the pros and cons of the CIA in public, even though some of those pros and cons were discussed in closed session.

We would be in violation of the rules if we attributed to any Senator who spoke in the closed session any statement he made in the closed session. We certainly are not estopped so long as we do not involve ourselves in a discussion of any secrecy matter.

It seems to me that any other interpretation is stretching beyond reason the rule on closed sessions and the rule on executive sessions.

We all recall that we have been in executive sessions of committees, and sometimes joint sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services, where the transcript has been edited afterwards, and part of the transcript has been made public. That is a bridge we still have to cross. We may wish, after the record is made here this afternoon, to agree to a motion to edit the record made, so that only the secrecy matters are not made public, and the rest of the discussion is made public. But I thought that our only reasons for going into the closed session—and I support our doing so, and I think the majority and the minority leaders were correct in moving to do it—is to protect matters of secrecy that involve the security of this country, that ought to be protected; and we ought to be bound to secrecy on such matters.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree completely with the Senator's interpretation of the rule. I would suggest, however, that one other matter should be added. Obviously, if there is a matter of national security discussed which, if made public, would be a breach under the law of national security, even though it was in this overall secret session in connection with discussion of other matters that are not of a national security nature, that, of course, could not be brought out.

Mr. MORSE. If I have not made that clear, that is what I am trying to say.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What worries me, may I say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, is this for example. There have been all kinds of criticisms against the CIA prior to the proposal about this committee. When the Defense Department is attacked, they all, including its head, are able to defend themselves immediately. [Deletion.]

As one who has had some experience in this field, and also with the military, I would hope that our intelligence does not go back to in effect, only the military. The military gets hundreds of millions of dollars more for its intelligence operations than the Central Intelligence Agency receives for its operations. That is something that should be known, because I do not think any Member of the Senate would want to see intelligence exclusively in the military.

Now there have been statements that information is given to the Armed Services Committee which is not given to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee brought out the fact that no information is denied to the Foreign Relations Committee except information with respect to methods and sources.

Based on experience, when we get into methods and sources, if a man is caught, immediately hundreds of friends of the United States are in possible trouble all over the world; and every man carries with him the danger of that problem when he talks about methods and sources.

By coincidence, I am the only Member of the Senate of either party who is a member of both these committees, and in recent years have received more information about the Central Intelligence Agency in the Foreign Relations Committee than in the Armed Services Committee.

[Omission.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator surely does not know much about the CIA if that is the extent of his information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think I know as much as the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know very little. That is the point I am making.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What worries me is that when the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency came before the Foreign Relations Committee, he came prepared to give exactly the same briefing that is given to the Armed Services Committee. But after long interrogation, he had not arrived at the matters he thought he would like to present to the Foreign Relations Committee. The idea of the able Senator from Oregon strikes me as being fair. He asked a question. The suggestion that information given the Armed Services Committee is not given to the Foreign Relations Committee is not right. There has never been a question asked, since the days of Mr. Dulles, in the Armed Services Committee with respect to methods and sources. One of the wisest decisions made in this field was made by the late President Kennedy, when he said from here on the Ambassador in every country is the boss; and anybody who does not go along or get along with him is out, off the team. As a result, to my knowledge there has not been since that directive a single justification for saying the Central Intelligence Agency has set policy.

Now if these matters are not brought up in open hearing, following the thoughts of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, how are the people going to know about them? After this secret hearing are we going to be accused of perpetuating some form of secrecy? If that happens it would be an unfortunate development, because we should decide the issues along with the people and based on the record and the facts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am going to limit myself to procedural matters. I do not think there is anything under the procedure that we have adopted that would stop the Senator from Missouri from saying anything he wants to say about the CIA from a public platform or from an open session of the Senate later.

The only limitation we have imposed on ourselves is in the discussion of any matter of secrecy involved in this hearing.

I intend, after this session, not to be restricted in any way in my further discussions, as I have in the past, about what I consider to be the inexcusable intervention of the CIA in various places. [Omission.] We are not stopped, and it will not stop me—this is my understanding, unless the Chair corrects me—from a public discussion of the CIA, save and except as to any matter of secrecy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels he must respond to the Senator from Oregon. It is the judgment of the Chair, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, that the entire proceedings of the closed session is a secret proceeding. It is, of course, right, that any Senator at any time may make any comment he would like about the subject matter of the CIA, its operations, and so forth.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am saying.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But it is not proper, under the closed session rule, for any Senator to make any comment about the subject matter discussed here or which Senator said what, or what proceeding took place, a proceeding in the closed session or under the injunction of secrecy, unless there is specific affirmative action to remove that injunction in reference to that or any other item.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask respectfully for a clarification of what the Presiding Officer meant——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Presiding Officer has used the language "subject matter." I think it should be made perfectly clear that that does not mean a Senator, after this closed session, cannot discuss the subject matter of the CIA; but that the Presiding Officer means we cannot discuss or quote what was said in this body by any Member of this body on that particular matter. He himself is perfectly free to say whatever he thinks, representing the people of his sovereign State, he should say about the CIA or any other subject matter, so long as he does not disclose any secret information of what took place in this session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I would like to yield the floor. I think the Senator from Arkansas has a right to reply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon's interpretation is correct, as he sees it. In other words, the Senator does not in any way lose the right, at a later date, to discuss whatever he wishes about the CIA. However, he does lose the right, under rule XXXV, which applies to a discussion of the proceedings of this session, and to comment upon statements made by another Senator in this session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think this particular discussion has gotten off the track. This resolution does not attack the CIA. I am not attacking the CIA. I am simply proposing a simple change in the present method of appointment and any oversight and proposing to place three men on the committee.

The Senator from Missouri has led us off into a highway which I think is not really involved.

I do not think we are attacking the CIA. I have no intention of attacking the CIA. [Deletion.] However, the Director of the CIA told us that under the regulations, he could not tell certain significant foreign policy information to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think that the Committee on Foreign Relations is entitled to know whether these allegations we have read in the press are true. This is no attack on the CIA at all, and I do not think it ought to be presented that we are out to get the CIA. All we are seeking is to try to understand what it is doing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has been waiting. He is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, am I recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have, after some brief reference to procedure, I want to reason with my colleagues on the substance of the issue, not as a critic, but as a champion of the CIA. I should like to say about the procedure, that I have sat under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] many a day in executive session in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, dealing with stockpile, design, and technology of topmost secrecy. He lives with the secrets of nuclear weapons of the topmost secrecy. With reference to the rules of executive session, this is a closed session, and we are more or less meeting in the nature of the Committee of the Whole of the Senate to discuss matters critical and secret in nature. I have not heard one statement made, however, that was secret.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is on intelligence.

Mr. GORE. Even that has not been said. Please understand I am not critical. I think it is a contribution to the debate. We have many things said in executive session in our committees on which we base our judgment which are not revealed to the public.

Mr. PASTORE. I find no fault with what the Senator has said. I was not finding fault with the closed session. I only say that if we are going to refer to our votes here, let us have a reason why we voted a certain way. I only suggest that we sanitize this record as we have records in executive sessions, so that those matters which are secret are kept secret, and those matters which are public be made public, so that we can justify what action we take in a closed session.

Mr. GORE. Here again I shall draw a comparison with executive sessions. Sometimes we sanitize the released record. Sometimes it is within the judgment of this body. But I am going to say things that I will feel free to say here, but that I would not feel free to say if the press representatives were in the galleries. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would not have felt free to use the figure except in closed session. They have contributed to reasoning together on a matter that is vital to the Senate and the policymaking functions of the country in which the legislative branch ought to have a part. We are dealing here with an issue that goes to the full equal status of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, I have discussed the possibility of sanitizing the record with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and with the ranking members of the committee. I have not been able to see the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I am sure he would not object. I think we can trust these four men, outstanding Members of the Senate, to consider the possibility of sanitizing the record so that all suspect matters are taken out of the record.

I have discussed this matter with the minority leader also, and it has his approval.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I assume the Senator would include the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; we would be glad to have them. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and we would be delighted to have him included.

[Omission.]

Mr. SYMINGTON. The five stories that were written about the Central Intelligence Agency in the New York Times, which the CIA tells us did grave damage to the security of the United States, referred to these amounts. As against what the military receives for intelligence the CIA receives a relatively small amount. [Deletion.]

What I would suggest—is that this entire discussion held today be sent either to the Department of Defense or the Central Intelligence Agency, or both, and be sanitized, that information considered against the best interests of the United States be taken out of the record, and it then be published like any executive hearing of a Senate committee.

With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that this record be sanitized and released after the proceedings are over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the majority leader said the leaders.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Sanitized also by the Members of the Senate who participated, it could then be sent to the appropriate agencies, who could look it over. Then it could be published.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator made a unanimous-consent request. I was reserving the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is not comparable. There is no reason to send the transcript to the CIA and others. I had just understood the majority leader to say it had been cleared with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Cleared what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The sanitization of the record. I see no reason to send it down to any executive agency. If it is going to be done at all, I approve the majority leader's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator had made a request.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I hope the Senator will not press his request in the course of my time on the pending question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a statement concerning something the Senator from Arkansas has said?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator has referred to the articles in the New York Times. In my opinion, there were some breaches of security there.

There were also some grievous errors. [Omission.]

The New York Times articles were completely in error in this instance, as well as in other respects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator indulge the Chair for a moment in order to get the question before the Senate for the Senate's consideration?

May the Chair ask the Senator from Georgia, does the Senator from Georgia contend that the resolution now before the Senate is invalidly before the Senate because it should have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; I do not challenge the right of the Committee on Foreign Relations to report the resolution. I said the procedure was unusual, but the committee had the right to follow it. I have only seen it happen a few times in the almost 34 years I have been here. I say, however, before it goes to the calendar, under rule XXV it should be referred by the Chair to the Committee on Armed Services. That is the point of order I have made against the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In other words, the Senator contests the procedure that is being followed?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct. This resolution came forth from the Committee on Foreign Relations, it was generated there and was brought here. It was not introduced. This is the first opportunity we have had to request that, under our unquestioned jurisdiction in this field, we have an opportunity at least to have a hearing on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I think, in order to expedite the appropriate consideration of this point of order, the Chair should make his ruling, so the Senate will be at liberty to appeal from the ruling of the Chair or debate it, as it sees fit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I understand that on page 39 of the Senate Manual—this is the section the Senator from Georgia first read—that he is basing his point on section (p)(1)(A)?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct, the second part.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to clarify what that means, because I am somewhat confused, it deals, as I understand, with the Committee on Rules and Administration, and it says:

> Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other Standing Committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

This resolution does not require any payment of money, or create a charge, and I am quite unable to understand how it is applicable to this resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, there is no question of what it does. For example, it gives the subpena power, and it is implicit in the subpena power that a man cannot be subpenaed under such power and not be paid his expenses and his per diem as a witness. The resolution involves expenditures of funds, and we cannot escape it.

In the first instance, I did not insist that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I do ask that the Armed Services Committee, before it be deprived of its jurisdiction, have the right to consider this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that it would be helpful to have a ruling from the Chair, and then the Senators may proceed to debate it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly yield to the Chair in that regard, but I should like to be heard momentarily on this point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will entertain the views of the Senator.

Mr. GORE. This is by no means the first time that a resolution or a bill has been altered by a committee to which it has been duly referred, and which has considered it. During my service in the House and the Senate, I have known of many instances in which the nature and the content of a resolution have been changed. This is the procedure here. I see nothing particularly unusual about it. There is certainly nothing disreputable about it. The resolution is before the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia earlier asked the Chair to indulge in what appeared to me to be a most unusual undertaking—to render a hypothetical ruling. I am not critical; I am merely saying that that, to me, is unusual. The Chair was asked to rule to what committee it would have been referred if it had been introduced in its present form. That is all right; I have no criticism of that. But it was not introduced in its present form; it was introduced and duly referred to the committee, and the committee reported it back, and it is before the Senate, and is on the Calendar of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is not stating the facts correctly. This is not any substitute for the original resolution. It bears no number whatsoever. The Senator said it was equivalent to the original resolution which was introduced from the floor; but that was not reported out by the committee, because it would of necessity have had to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration when it was reported, because it authorized expenditures for an investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the ruling of the Chair. The Senator from Georgia said earlier that this resolution has been handled in a legal manner. I assume by that he means under the rules of the Senate. No Member of the Senate has had more to do with either the writing of the rules of this body or the interpretation of them than has the senior Senator from Georgia.

We did change the resolution and introduced it in a somewhat different manner, in part because we wanted to get it before the Senate on the substance of the resolution. We also changed it because of some objections which were made to the original proposals. The decision to take out any reference to money, for example, was made largely because it was charged that we were going to set up a staff, have an investigation, to subpena people, and do many other things no one had in mind.

It is difficult to drain of us a resolution to create a standing committee to conform to what is a confused, merged, double subcommittee, consisting of members of the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services.

I think the Senator from Georgia will admit that the proceedings of that joint subcommittee are somewhat irregular. I do not think there is any clear precedent for it. Some of his own remarks were to the effect that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee informally agreed to let the chairman of the Armed Services Committee preside. There is nothing in the rules that mentions how to proceed in this kind of joint committee, which is not a subcommittee. The committee does not deal with substantive matters, it does not recommend money for the CIA, it just asks the CIA to sit down and talk.

So what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the members of the committee decided, by a vote of 14 to 5, was to try to set up a procedure something like those informal arrangements. In effect, we said, "As long as you are so informal, why not let us come in and sit with you?"

They said, "We cannot do that, because of the acts of 1947 and 1949."

They interpret those acts as though they were the Atomic Energy Act. The acts of 1947 and 1949 say nothing about reporting secretly to anybody.

But they said, "No; we can't do that." Even the Director of the CIA came up. We said, "Let us have a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and you come up and answer questions which, if they were asked in this other informal joint, merged subcommittee, you could answer them here."

His defense was that the acts of 1947 and 1949 did not allow him to do that. That is an utterly ridiculous interpretation of the act.

Senator RUSSELL said that if the President decides what can be told to his subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee on this matter, it can be told. But Admiral Raborn said, "No; it is the acts of 1947 and 1949 that determine whether I can talk to the Foreign Relations Committee or not."

Everybody knows that is not the case.

We are dealing here with a strange agency, so we use unusual practices. The Senator from Georgia was using unusual practices in setting up this kind of joint subcommittee. All we are trying to do in this procedure here, is to assure that the Foreign Relations Committee can have the kind of information it needs in order to make recommendations to the Senate, so that it may pass judgment on the foreign policy of the United States. That is what is before the Senate, nothing else.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would point out to the Senator that as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, we sit together jointly on matters of procurement, and on matters of authorization of weapons, for the simple reason that it saves time. In this instance, on the CIA, these are both formal subcommittees. We sit together to save time. That is all there is to it. They are not informal; they are formal subcommittees sitting together to save time.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are willing to set up a formal subcommittee, and offer to have that sit with your two formal subcommittees. But as far as we were able to learn from what Admiral Raborn said, as to our formal subcommittee on the CIA, he would not answer questions asked by one of us, which he would answer if asked by one of you.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator's point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry. However, before yielding, let me say to my colleagues that I have a few serious views I wish to express. I do not wish to prolong this hassle about the point of order and the parliamentary procedure, so I will yield the floor, and seek recognition when the Chair has made his ruling.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wanted to raise a parliamentary inquiry rather than a point of order. I speak, as the Chair knows, I am sure, most respectfully.

As I understand the parliamentary situation, what is really pending is the point of order of the Senator from Georgia. The Chair seems to be anxious to rule on that point of order.

After the ruling, there is a probability that there may be an appeal. It is customary practice of the Senate, before the Chair rules on a point of order, that those who have views on the point of order can be heard before the Chair's ruling. There are many reasons for that. One of them is that after the— if the arguments that are submitted subsequently indicate that he is wrong. In all due respect, I am not anxious for the Chair to rule at the present time until there is a discussion of the pending business by those who want to discuss it. There are other views than those of the Senator from Georgia as to whether or not his point of order is well taken. I think that the Chair is entitled to have those views before he rules. He has not had those views. The opportunity has not been given for the presentation of the views, and therefore I am urging that the Chair withhold his ruling until other Senators have an opportunity to present their points of view on the point of order of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refers to rule XX, clause 1, section 8:

> A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate.

The Chair, under that precedent, may indulge whatever debate he feels may be necessary before making a ruling.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I did not raise the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels it would be helpful for the procedure of this body, to get the point of order clearly before us, to have the Chair make his ruling, and then whatever debate may be desired will, of course, be permissible.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair can follow that procedure. I only wish to say, the precedents are as long as my arm that when points of order have been raised, Presiding Officers have always been willing to hear, for reasonable lengths of time, those who have a different point of view on the point of order, for the purpose of presenting to the Chair their views on the point of order. They might be right, you know, and that is why we have followed that practice.

The Chair can rule now if he wishes to rule, but I think it most unfortunate if he does, because I think those who do not share the position of the Senator from Georgia on the point of order ought to be heard before the Chair rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to be very indulgent, and he believes he is. But the Chair believes it will expedite the proceedings to have the Chair make his ruling.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Chair would permit, I would like to make my point of order clear.

I have not made any point of order that this matter should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I stated that, in my opinion, by its very nature, it would create a charge on the Senate and, therefore, was within the jurisdiction of that committee; but I did not make that point of order.

I made the point of order that this should be referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, as a result of the legislative jurisdiction that is spelled out in rule XXV, for the Committee on Armed Services. The rule provides:

> to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects: (1) common defense generally. (2) The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

That involves all of your national security agencies and other agencies set forth in this resolution. The rule goes on to set forth the remainder of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. My contention is buttressed by the fact that, in rule XXV, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, to show the clear intent of the rules to protect the jurisdiction of the committees, it is provided that any resolution relating to a substantive matter shall first be referred to the committee having jurisdiction over the substantive matter.

I am making the point of order that you cannot bypass the jurisdiction of a duly established committee by any such procedure as this.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule, and will not, of course, foreclose debate, because appeal from the ruling is always possible.

The situation before the Senate is a resolution reported from the Foreign Relations Committee, not a resolution that has been introduced for appropriate reference. The situation for appropriate reference is different from that of a resolution reported from a committee.

Under rule XXV, the standing committees of the Senate are created and the subject matter within the jurisdiction of each committee is enumerated, but there are no stipulations limiting what the committee might report in an original bill or resolution, in a substitute for a bill or resolution, or what the committee may include in an amended-reported version of a bill or resolution, even if such reported bills should include subject matter the predominance of which would likely belong to another committee.

There is no rule or established precedent of the Senate to sustain a point of order to commit such a reported bill to another committee which properly has jurisdiction thereof; there is only an enumeration of the subject matter belonging to each committee.

Obviously, a point of order can be made that such a bill or resolution, in this instance, under rule XXV, should have been referred to another committee which had jurisdiction of the predominance of the subject matter, when such a measure is pending before the Senate; but, in the absence of an exact Senate precedent thereon, the Chair feels compelled to submit this question to the Senate, as authorized in rule XX, for its decision, so that the Senate may have a guideline in the future, should such a question be raised again.

The Chair makes note of the fact that had this resolution been introduced de novo by a Senator today for appropriate reference, that because the CIA had been created under the National Security Act, which was reported from the Armed Services Committee, and that was in Public Law 80-253, in 1947—that, on cursory examination of this resolution, it would have been referred to the Armed Services Committee.

But the situation is entirely different. This resolution originated in the Foreign Relations Committee, and it was reported to the Senate, and by unanimous consent is before the Senate; and there is no precedent, under rule XXV or any other rule, which gives the Chair any guidelines or any direction for referring this particular resolution to another committee, even though the predominance of the substance of the resolution rightly belongs in the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Chair's ruling—and I question the Chair most respectfully—is carried out to the extreme point, that would mean that any committee of the Senate could report a resolution on any subject that might concern another committee and get it to the Senate Calendar without reference to the proper committee. It would seem to me that that would violate the whole question of procedure within committees and for committee consideration if that rule—and I say it most respectfully—is carried out to the extreme situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair fully understands the thoughts expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. There is no precedent in this matter. We have examined it very carefully with the able assistance of the Parliamentarian of the Senate. There is always the possibility of averting the situation to which the Senator refers to by raising the point of order, which is exactly what was done today.

What the Chair seeks from the Senate now, in light of this situation, is to have the Senate express itself and to make its own precedent or its own rule, if it so desires.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the substance of what the Vice President has said at this time is that this question is not only a question referring to this resolution, but really the whole precedent of reporting a resolution by any committee which has no jurisdiction, we assume, over the subject, and having it get onto the calendar without proper consideration by the committee with jurisdiction. So it is a very broad ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the view of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Does the senior Senator from Tennessee correctly understand that the Chair has ruled that a point of order does not stand and is not amenable under the precedence of the Senate, and would desire the Senate to express itself? If that be true, the Senate can do so either by an appeal from the ruling of the Chair or by an affirmative motion to proceed with the consideration of the question before the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator permit the Chair to consult with the Parliamentarian?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the ruling of the Presiding Officer is to submit this question to the Senate.

The Chair does not rule that the point of order is out of order. The Chair rules that because there is no precedent to guide the Chair on this point of order, and because it is a matter that relates fundamentally to the jurisdictional integrity of the committees of the Senate, that the Chair refers to the Senate the decision as to whether or not the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia is well taken; namely, that the Foreign Relations Committee has encroached upon the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, and, therefore, that the resolution before us should be referred, because of the predominance of its subject matter, to the Armed Services Committee, before it is placed on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. Then, Mr. President, under those circumstances, I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the resolution before us.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that is out of order under the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are operating.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The observation of the Senator from Georgia is well taken.

Mr. MILLER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand that the ruling of the Chair includes a determination by the Chair that the subject matter is preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, or is that particular point also left open for the determination of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is that the Senator from Georgia maintains that under rule XXV, this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services before the Senate considers the resolution for definitive action.

The Chair says that because there is no precedent on this exact point that the Senate must express its will on the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may I inquire further? I think this may be important, because the question of whether or not the ruling of the Chair includes a determination that the Senator's point may be perfectly valid. There may be a preponderance of interest on the part of his committee, that would be one thing; but it could be another thing if the Chair is ruling that this is completely beside the point. It may be and it may not be preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Or it may be just the mere fact of the point of order being made that it is going to be referred to the Senate. We can vote on two things here, that is, our vote could be guided by two points; one, by the mere point of order itself, and another by consideration of whether in fact that point is factually sound, in that this is preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

I might, for example, decide that this is not preponderantly with the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, therefore I will not uphold the point. On the other hand—I hope I am getting across to the Chair my point—I think it would be helpful to the Senate to know whether or not we are voting on both these concepts, one, the point of order itself, or two, the determination of whether or not, for the sake of discussion, the Senator from Georgia is correct in his position that this is within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. This is a simple matter. Is it not the question that if we vote "yea," it sustains the point of order, if we vote "nay," it is in opposition to the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. The point of order is debatable, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is before the Senate, and the Chair has ruled that the point of order is debatable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has a point of order been made against the motion of the Senator from Tennessee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

The point of order is that the resolution appropriately belongs, under rule XXV, before the Armed Services Committee, it can be placed on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is debatable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I inquire about obtaining a vote on the merits of the resolution. Could that be done?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not until the point of order has been disposed of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Suppose a motion should be made to table the resolution, and that motion carried. Would it then be in order to vote on the merits of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would respond to the Senator from Arkansas by saying that under the unanimous-consent agreement, if a motion to table the point of order were successful, or carried, it would not be possible to complete action on the resolution today, because only procedural matters were included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

However, at a later time, or tomorrow, if the point of order fails, the resolution could be brought before the Senate for consideration, and would be subject to action by the Senate on the substance of the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In other words, the resolution would be placed on the calendar once again, and be subject to being called up on motion, for conclusive action by the Senate.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. If the Senate today establishes a precedent and requires that this resolution be sent to the Armed Services Committee, may I inquire whether or not the Armed Services Committee will hold hearings on the resolution? Hearings should be held.

Mr. McCARTHY. Since 1948, there have been 13 Senate resolutions dealing with the investigation of intelligence activities. Four were referred to the Armed Services Committee, and none were reported. Six were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and none were reported. Three were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and one was reported, I think in 1956. I think all of us know what the substance of this resolution is, and that nothing would be gained by referring it to the Armed Services Committee. If the Senate wishes to reject this on the procedural question, I suppose there is nothing to prevent them from doing it. But I hope, in view of the fact that this matter has been before the Senate on and off since 1946, and in 1956—when the present majority leader made a great fight to establish a joint committee of the House and Senate, which would supervise intelligence activities, there has been enough preparation, it seems to me, for us to act on the substance of the matter.

If hearings before the Armed Services Committee would add anything to this factual record, or if that committee had shown any interest in doing something to expand the jurisdiction of the Central Intelligence Agency, I would say let it go to the committee.

But I think under the circumstances we ought to face up to the subject which is before the committee.

If we do act on this procedural basis, it would be easy for the Foreign Relations Committee to report a resolution to set up a kind of standing committee which leaves out the Armed Services Committee and concentrates only on foreign policy aspects of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Senate might approve such a resolution, with the proviso that the President ought to instruct the Central Intelligence Agency to come up and answer questions put to it by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee.

But since joint jurisdiction is involved, we proposed the resolution in the form we did. I think the issue is before the Senate. Are we to evade our responsibility and slide off with this kind of very limited, specialized interpretation of the rules?

I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I know that although this may be considered a procedural question, we will be voting on a more fundamental question—on the merits of the resolution.

It will not be considered a mere procedural question. Representatives of the Foreign Relations Committee are asking to be included by the establishment of the new committee. We should decide the issue on the merits.

May I ask if the Foreign Relations Committee has, in hearings, made such an examination of the operations of the CIA as it is possible for it to conduct, and can it give to Members who are not on the Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee, any substantial information which would support the establishment of the committee? Or is it only a matter of speculation about the activities of the CIA?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is asking me, we have had hearings twice this year, we have had Admiral Raborn before the committee; we have had them in the past. But this year in particular, because of the various articles, the articles I have referred to, raising questions about CIA activity, the book, which was a bestseller, called "The Invisible Government," all these things have developed recently and because of certain well-publicized activities the question arises again. The Senator knows about publicity in the case of the Michigan State University, that has been in the newspapers, and also press reports of the case of the Estonian refugees. All these have raised questions about the activities of the CIA.

So we had hearings and asked the CIA about certain of its activities. The Director was willing to give us certain reports about armed strength of certain nations and various things, most of which I had heard in other briefings on other occasions. None of this was particularly new or especially relevant to the aspects of foreign relations in which I am interested and in which most of my committee are interested.

Under the rules of the Senate, for example, the Committee on Foreign Relations is given jurisdiction, under section 8, on page 33 of the Senate Manual, "Intervention Abroad and Declarations of War." [Omission.]

When asking questions in this field, we were told—and I have the executive record—"We cannot answer such questions."

As the Senator says, with respect to methods and sources, methods particularly, of course, are a most important aspect. [Omission.] I think many of the CIA activities tend to discredit the integrity of our country, and these activities raise a number of questions with respect to the influence on our foreign policy.

Mr. COOPER. Is it an implicit conclusion, the resolution that the present subcommittee is not performing its duties?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think that is implicit in it at all.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, under the resolution, is essentially military. That committee is interested in Vietnam, in bombing, in the conduct of the war itself, as evidenced by many public statements. The members of the Armed Services Committee are inclined to feel that their particular mission is to carry on the war and to win it; whereas I think the orientation of the Committee on Foreign Relations is that it is more interested in finding a way to negotiate peace. There is a slight difference in their interests and approach.

We are not trying to oust the Committee on Armed Services or any other committee from their legitimate interest. I would not for a moment say that they have no interest in this business. We are only asking them to allow us to participate because we believe this subject involves a very important aspect of our foreign relations—much more important today than when the CIA was created. It was created in a period when the Cold War was just getting underway. It was a small operation at that time. Now it has become worldwide.

As I have already mentioned, certain aspects of this operation have been widely publicized and are not secret at all.

They brag about their success. That involves some serious question of policy. I personally question and have grave reservations whether it was wise for the CIA to intervene in certain countries. I think we are riding for much trouble.

I know I read in the newspapers today very optimistic statements in articles, reportedly emanating from the CIA. These are matters of very serious national interest to this country.

I think the Committee on Foreign Relations is not only entitled to know, but I think it has the duty to know, about these activities.

But if we ask the CIA if they use means such as these to intervene in a country, in the interest of those countries, they say, "It is not possible for us to answer such questions."

Mr. COOPER. Is it a matter of record, if it is not confidential, that this has been done, or is it speculation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am always under the inhibition to say that I cannot say that the CIA told me, but I have innumerable cases and have before my committee.

I did sit personally in a hearing with the President and Mr. Dulles, and about 15 others, and heard him make the case for intervention in the Bay of Pigs. This is public information. I heard this with my own ears, with Allen Dulles promoting it. I was there for 2 hours. This has been publicized. What has been written about it, by and large, absolutely accurate.

Mr. COOPER. I read the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Bay of Pigs, and I must say that when I finished, I had not learned much of what had occurred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was talking about a meeting in the State Department with President Kennedy. This was before the Bay of Pigs. Allen Dulles was making a case for it and was urging the President at that time to make a final decision. This matter had been underway for a year. He wanted a final decision that would be a green light to proceed. I was there. I heard it, if we want to go into detail. That is the record.

Mr. COOPER. If we ever get to the point of voting on the merits of the resolution, and we should, how would we vote with knowledge—unless in a session like this—actual information based upon fact is provided us?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not seem to be necessary that we produce proof of them in each of these two instances, although I think we could in each instance. The general proposition seems to be that the CIA operates very deeply and broadly in the field of foreign relations.

[Omission.]

Mr. COOPER. I have personal knowledge on that point because of my experience in India.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was a long time ago.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; about 10 years ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator know?

Mr. COOPER. Because I was given information by the State Department.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How did the State Department know—it is widely rumored—that many people are agents in the CIA? They do not know.

Mr. COOPER. That is possible, but I think it is a little farfetched. [Deletion.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not trying to downgrade them. Many of them have been there longer and have had more experience than the Ambassador, in some cases dominating the whole team. In many cases, they are better trained and better paid.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I must insist, even though this record is being made in executive session, that the CIA officer is not paid as much as an Ambassador. There is not a single chancery in the world where the Ambassador does not receive higher pay than the CIA representative. The Senator has repeatedly stated that a CIA agent is paid more than an Ambassador. My information is that this is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has the great advantage that anything one says about the CIA cannot be challenged. The New York Times said——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is the Senator's Bible. But it is not the Bible always. I do not challenge the Senator's statement. I did not hear all the statement about it, but the Senator did not offer any proof that the CIA was supporting him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One can never offer proof.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If they are, it is at the direction of the President, and the criticism ought to be launched at the President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not offer criticism. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], asked a question about the interest that we have. I was not talking in this case about the President. [Deletion.] This was years ago. It was widely reported not only in the New York Times. It was widely reported that this was an interest of the CIA. This is a matter of foreign relations. It is certainly more of prime interest to the Foreign Relations Committee than it is to the Armed Services Committee.

The Senator from Georgia has stated that he has no interest in knowing about many of these things.

That is not so with the Committee on Foreign Relations, because we have a different interest. We are not interested only in prosecuting a war or building a big Military Establishment, which is a legitimate interest of the Senator's committee. We are not trying to infringe on that at all. We are interested in foreign relations, and that comes under section 8 "Interventions Abroad" of the jurisdiction of the committee. There is express and exclusive jurisdiction over the matter of intervention, under section 8, in the Committee on Foreign Relations. This is much more explicit than the Senator's committee with respect to jurisdiction over the CIA. There is nothing in the rules that specifically mentions the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. What about the other agencies? What about the Department of Defense Intelligence Agencies, which are much larger than the CIA? They are covered by the resolution. The Senator continues to refer to the Committee on Armed Services as if we were a warlike group. We are not acting as a group of people who are trying to get this country engaged in a war. I do not believe the Committee on Armed Services is interested in getting the country engaged in a war. The Armed Services Committee is interested to see that the country is prepared to fight a war wherever it is. I have no apologies to make for that. That is where my interest it.

I am frightened by people who want to disarm this country. They scare me to death. There are many of them in high positions. I, for my part, want to maintain the security of the United States at all costs. If that means that I am a hawk, I am a hawk. I was not in favor of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that the Senator was.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I was not in favor of getting there; but we are there, and I am in favor of winning the war there, and bringing our people home.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This has nothing to do with the resolution. That is a diversion; it is a red herring.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator attached a string to the red herring when he said we were interested in war. The Senator is the one who is drawing the red herring. We are not interested in war; we are interested in peace as much as anybody else.

I want to strengthen our national defense system as a backing for peace.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nobody is questioning that. I do not think we are worried about disarmament. I think the present budget is $60 billion for armament. The only agency that got more money out of Congress than the Executive has even asked for. I did not say the Senator is a warmonger, but that the main interest of the Senator's committee is to supply the armed services with weapons to prosecute the war and win it. Is that not so?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Our main interest is to have a Military Establishment to preserve the lives of American men all over the world. The Senator makes me think I might have more votes than I thought I had. I am encouraged.

I hope that the Senator does not have many on his side who are going on the theory that our committee has warmongers, and that it is necessary to put members of his committee on a committee to hold us down and to keep away from the Third World War.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator has to go off on the war issue, then we are stronger than I thought we were. I really thought the Senator had his point won.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I have great faith in the commonsense of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to put two questions to the Senator: One that puzzles me, and one for the information of the Senate.

First, all these agencies are under the jurisdiction of the President, are they not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That goes for foreign policy and for our intelligence. The question, therefore, which I ask the Senator is: Are we not, by introducing any oversight whatever in this matter, over and above what we have, challenging the President? We are getting another avenue of review of what he is doing about intelligence, in this case, of the Nation. In other cases, we look into other matters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The short answer is that this procedure has been in effect ever since the creation of the CIA. The merged subcommittee has been operating. There is nothing new about it. The simple, narrow question is, should three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations share the opportunity to know about the CIA. That is all there is to it. We are not challenging anybody. There is nothing that seems to me to be unusual. It arises out of the legitimate jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, one might say, and the interest of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JAVITS. One other question of elucidation for Senators who are members of neither of these committees. Will the Senator tell us how he understands how any of the rest of us can get any information about the CIA now, and whether that opportunity will be enhanced by the passage of the resolution which the Committee on Foreign Relations has brought before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, it would depend on the nature of the Committee. This present committee is under the inhibition not to reveal classified information. There is certain information they can tell us that is not classified. It is similar to what happens on other committees, such as the Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which have hearings. If one is not a member of the committee, there are certain things that they will not tell you, and certain things that they will. I think we cannot be so categorical that it will be complete.

I think that the judgment of the Foreign Relations Committee will be greatly improved if they have some knowledge of the activities of the CIA. I think they might even exercise some influence on the CIA if the CIA does some of the things it is reported to do. I cannot say for sure that they do them. I do not know whether they use [Deletion] at least it has been stated—that they use Michigan State University. I suppose it could be reasoned from that that they use others. My knowledge is very limited in responding on the merits, but this being in a field that is very important to foreign relations—and assuming that the Committee on Foreign Relations has the same competence as do the other committees—it ought to be of great advantage to them to know what is going on, and possibly it might produce some good ideas as to how the operations of the CIA could be improved.

Mr. JAVITS. If three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are assigned to this committee, will they consider it their obligation to brief the other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, or will they have to keep a wall between those three and the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should think there would be a reasonable exchange, particularly with reference to questions that have to do with policy. If the Senator wants to take a hypothetical question, I think it would be very important that they know.

We have had some cases [Deletion] in which, without getting into the merits, allegations about the degree of communism were involved. This is a matter of great importance in arriving at sound judgment. [Deletion.]

If we perform any function of value, it is advice and consent under the Constitution. How can we give any advice that is worth anything if we are not informed as to what is going on, and if we do not have information on which to base a judgment? Our advice would be very superficial if we did not have some information from the best available sources.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would like to be indulged.

[Omission.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from New York, as one member who has sat on that subcommittee, now, for a number of years, I may say that when any Member of the Senate asks me a question regarding the CIA, I try in private conversation to give him an answer to the best of my ability. Occasionally something may come up, and I say, "I can't tell you at length about it"; but I try to give him an answer. That came up with Senator Dworshak, of Idaho, a number of years ago. I had a number of conversations with him. He was not a member of the subcommittee, but he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I tried to handle it satisfactorily with him in that way. I hope it satisfied him.

Mr. JAVITS. Can we assume, Senator RUSSELL, that that is generally so?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. There were some subjects that I felt that I could not disclose. For example, we were told about the construction of the first U-2. I would not have been in conversation with any Member of the Senate on that subject. I know I would not have revealed it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That is a commonsense rule.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. But as a rule, I have been very free to disclose to Members of the Senate any information I had available as a member of the subcommittee. There were three or four instances such as that that I would not have disclosed, and would not in the future. They were so vital and could have had such a catastrophic effect if they did get out. I was using that as an illustration of one of the few that I would not have discussed.

But generally speaking, as to matters that pertain to information, and how reliable it is, dealing with questions about other countries, I feel free to discuss them with Members of the Senate. I have great confidence in the Senate. Some Senators have different ideas of the value of information; but generally speaking, I should say that 95 percent, 97 percent, or 98 percent of the information, I would feel free to give to the Senator from New York or any other Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much for this elucidation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Some few days ago, someone spoke of a fairly extensive research and intelligence office in the Department of State. I checked with the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee and asked if we had had any hearings or had called any witness concerning the Research and Intelligence Office in State, where operations are more akin to foreign policy than CIA operation, which are relatively closer to questions of national defense.

I ask in all sincerity: Would it not be well, before we continue worrying so much about the lack of information the Foreign Relations Committee is obtaining from the Central Intelligence Agency, we give consideration to the importance of the intelligence operations in the State Department. That surely comes within the operations of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have had a number of conversations in my office and Mr. Tom Hughes, of that agency; and if at any time the Members of the committee wished to see him, they could have met him. But it is no news to the Senator that this is a modest operation compared with the CIA. They are under all the inhibitions that the State Department functions under.

I have never had any meetings that embraced defense intelligence operations. The CIA, I submit, is not essentially, solely, or even predominantely engaged in military intelligence. It has a great deal to do with civilian affairs. In fact, it has more to do with civilian subjects than military, because military operations are so large, unless there is a high degree of duplication.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations for some years, I did not realize until recently that the Department of State also had a Research and Intelligence Division, regardless of its size.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very small operation compared with this and involves a very small amount of money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would hope that if we looked more into the Central Intelligence Agency, we would take a look at the intelligence operations of the Department of State, because State is closer to foreign policy than the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not think they have nearly the influence anywhere that the CIA has.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement and to raise a point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think I have the floor, but yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to raise a point, but not on the merits of the resolution. As the Senator from Mississippi understands the position of the Chair—not the ruling of the Chair, because the Chair did not make a ruling—the Chair has submitted to the Senate what is, in effect, the question whether the Senate should write a new rule. I invite attention to rule XXV, which covers 15 pages of the Senate Manual. Rule XXV carefully sets forth the names of all the committees and what their jurisdiction shall be, and expressly providing that bills introduced shall be referred to those committees, and that when the committees have considered the measures, they shall report them to the Senate..

Now it is proposed to say that a bill or resolution introduced by some committee does not have to go this route; that all these 15 pages of the rule are not controlling, are not guidelines, unless the Senate so finds that they are. That is why this is such an important ruling.

Unless we vote to sustain the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], we shall be setting a precedent whereby, I respectfully submit, the Committee on Public Works may write a bill on agriculture, report it to the Senate as such, and thereby abrogate a rule which covers 15 pages of the Senate Manual.

Do we want to set a precedent like that, merely to get at this problem? I do not think we do. If we are to launch out on a plan of such a kind as that, how shall we meet situations like this? Should not the question itself of how the rule shall be applied, be referred to a committee that is expert in the particular field for study and consideration, and then be reported to the Senate?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I finish my thought? We are confronted with one of the most far-reaching, serious matters, as I see it, that could possibly come up under the rules. It is clear to me that we will be violating the spirit of rule XXV if we voted for the resolution even though it was reported by a committee. Ninety-five Senators may introduce a bill jointly and pledge to support it; but under the rules, it would have to be referred to a committee for a study of the particular subject matter.

We shall be creating a precedent in haste in our vote, unless we vote to sustain the Senator from Georgia. If we do not vote to sustain his point of order, any committee could come in on a divided vote, and regardless of the subject matter, the Senate could start it far on its way toward passage, regardless of the nature of the committee or whether the proposal was submitted to the committee which was essentially charged with responsibility.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I tried to make the same point with the Vice President. Is it not true that if the Senate sustains the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia, we should try to write a new rule or should amend the rules so that they would cover this subject and not leave it open?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. If we are going to follow the general purpose and intent of the standing rules, that is one thing. I say that if we want to change the rule, it should be done only after study.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada, for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if we do not sustain the point of order, it will raise the question that any legislation could be brought up in committee without any hearing and reported to the Senate such as is involved in the resolution now pending. This would present a most serious question as to the handling of any legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. That is one of the main purposes for which rule XXV was written in its delineation.

Now I yield to the Senator from Nevada. I did not realize that he wished to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I make this parliamentary inquiry. If the point of order is not sustained, would the action of the Senate constitute a precedent for the proposition that any committee of the Senate could report and call up for action by the Senate resolutions or bills involving substantive matters not within the legislative jurisdiction of the reporting committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is essentially correct in that statement and question. In other words, a committee could—I doubt whether it would—report a resolution that is not within the substantive area of that committee.

Mr. CANNON. Would such action here today constitute a precedent of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the point of order is not sustained, the precedent would be established that a committee could originate a resolution on its own, and send it to the calendar, even though the substance of the resolution fell within the jurisdiction of another committee.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Chair, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a very fine question that presents the point of the whole subject.

I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is an interesting point to the Senator from Louisiana. For some years, I have been trying to get a select committee to study what was happening to the $15 billion we were spending for research which was relevant to the question of patents on Government research, but I could not get to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which would have primary jurisdiction, or to the appropriate subcommittee, to conduct hearings to look into it.

But now I find that the Parliamentarian failed to advise me that all I had to do was to get my own Committee on Finance to report a resolution from the subcommittee. I never knew that that could be done, even though we had no jurisdiction. But I am frank to say that it is interesting to know, if that is the case, that every committee would be able to report bills on any subject under the jurisdiction of their committees. The Committee on Finance could report bills relating to public works or agriculture. Any other committee could do the same thing.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me and permit me to make an observation, without his losing the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I was intrigued by the argument of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that it is advisable to pass this resolution so that he might be in a position to give advice when he is asked to advise or consent to something.

I do not want to disillusion the good Senator from Arkansas by saying that even if the resolution were passed, he might find himself in the same unhappy position in which I found myself on one occasion when I was practicing law.

An old woman came into my office. She laid a problem before me. I did as the Senator from Arkansas wishes to do. I got fully advised. I took down my lawbooks and read the cases dealing with the subject of her problem. I studied that problem; I looked into the statutes. I was fully in a position, as the Senator from Arkansas desires to be, to give her my advice. I gave her my advice.

She got up and started out of my office.

I said, "Wait a minute. You owe me five dollars."

She said, "What for?" I said, "For my advice."

She said, "I ain't gwine to take it."

The Senator from Arkansas may get the resolution passed and is in a position to give advice, but he may have the same unhappy misfortune that I once had, and not have his advice taken.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Nevada, for his inquiry, and I thank the Vice President for his very frank, candid, and correct response which has pointed up this question exactly as it should be.

I hope that if we are to establish a rule to cover situations such as this, it will be done after study, deliberation, and care, rather than as a procedural matter on this pending matter.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As a countermatter for consideration, counter to that suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I suggest that many questions involved in legislation have overlapping jurisdiction.

If this point of order is strictly and literally interpreted, there would be, if sustained, many instances in which resolutions or bills are reported by committees that infringe upon or deal with subject matter that has dual or multiple jurisdiction, and will be subject to such a point of order.

We are dealing with a serious matter of procedure, dealing with an issue that is before the Senate, reported by a committee, and on the calendar. There are many instances in which the Senate acts on a question reported by a committee, and which deals with a subject matter that could be dealt with, and indeed in other parts is dealt with properly, under the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make brief remarks in regard to what the Senator from Tennessee has said concerning the parliamentary question raised by the Senator from Nevada. But I shall yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall respond to the Senator from Tennessee by saying that no committee has been more diligent in exercising jurisdiction than the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not blame them for that. They should.

The other day a resolution was reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy dealing with a declaration against nuclear warfare. No one was opposed to it, but the Senator's Joint Committee on Atomic Energy insisted that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations because the resolution dealt with international relations.

I can recall a number of other occasions when a measure might perhaps have been within the jurisdiction of one committee or two committees, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations after they had been reported.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A few days ago, the Senator from Tennessee did a magnificent job of upholding the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, when a bill was passed which would have had a revenue impact. After the bill had been reported by the Judiciary Committee, the bill was referred to the Finance Committee and the bill stayed there for a year before we finally reported it back. The Judiciary Committee did not like our version and they took it back to their bosom. They reported it again their way. But there was no objection to the appropriate committee which had a prior claim to it looking at the bill and having the bill in committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I do not think that what the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana have said in any way invalidates the point I made; they buttress it. Indeed, they point out instances of overlapping jurisdiction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to a matter which I think at least ought to be made a matter of record, in relation to what the Senator from Mississippi said in regard to the inquiry made by the Senator from Nevada, as to whether some committee, such as the Public Works Committee, could not bring to the Senate a resolution dealing with agriculture.

There is a question of fact here that I think we are overlooking in the debate, and that is the claim of the Foreign Relations Committee that the CIA involves itself in foreign policy as well as in armed services matters and other matters involving the field of intelligence. It is the position of most of us on the Foreign Relations Committee that that is true, that the CIA does involve itself in foreign policy.

Mr. President, it was not the desire of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, or Mr. McCarthy or anyone else on the Foreign Relations Committee, that this matter initially be handled by this procedure. Quite to the contrary, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee sought to work out an understanding with the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee for an agreement whereby three members of the Foreign Relations Committee would be added to the subcommittee that is given jurisdiction over conferring with the CIA.

I do not know of anyone on the Foreign Relations Committee who has ever taken the position that the full Foreign Relations Committee should have that information. I do not know of anyone on the Foreign Relations Committee who did not recognize that whoever was selected from the Foreign Relations Committee, the three people selected would be present just as the Senator from Georgia and every other member of the present seven-man subcommittee is present, but to protect secrecy, as the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts have stated, they have made a policy of saying what could be said in their conferences with other Senators, within the limits of their own responsibilities not to disclose this secrecy to the Senators.

I do not know how we can object to that. But every attempt was made, Mr. President, to try to work out an agreement whereby three members of the Foreign Relations Committee could be added to this subcommittee, because of the belief of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I happen to think it is an undeniable fact—that the CIA involves itself in questions of foreign policy. And, speaking respectfully, the door in effect was closed to us. The only procedure made available was that the issue be submitted to the Armed Services Committee.

We took judicial notice that we knew what the decision of the Armed Services Committee would be, that they were not going to be for it. And after all, we feel that the Foreign Relations Committee has a jurisdictional interest, and that the Senate, through the Foreign Relations Committee, has an interest in the Foreign Relations Committee having made available to it the information on foreign policy that it needs to serve the Senate as an agent of the Senate.

Mr. President, if we sustain the point of order of the Senator from Georgia, we are saying to the Foreign Relations Committee that this issue will have to be submitted to a committee that really would be set up as prosecutor and jury and judge, because at least in the first decision, which would be at the lower court level, to continue my analogy, the Supreme Court would be the court of final appeal. The Senate should be our court of final appeal after the appropriate committee finishes with its report.

I do not have to tell my fellow Senators that it is pretty difficult to overrule on the floor of the Senate the judgment of the Armed Services Committee or the Appropriations Committee. I happen to think they are the two most powerful committees in the Senate as far as having all the presumptions with them, as far as being sustained by the Senate.

Therefore I wish to say—and I commend my chairman—that Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator McCARTHY, I think, were offered no other procedural course if they were going to carry out their responsibilities in their positions on the Foreign Relations Committee, than to follow the course of action that we have followed.

It falls within the prerogative of the Senate, in a situation such as this, where we have a conflict over jurisdiction, to really function, in effect, as a Committee of the Whole, which the Senate is doing now.

To argue again by analogy, if the Senate can discharge a committee, if it can take an item away from a committee and bring it to the floor of the Senate it can act now. In fact, Mr. President, there have been times in the experience of those of us who have served any period of time in the Senate at which we have taken matters directly up on the floor of the Senate, without their ever going to a committee.

So the Foreign Relations Committee really was put in a position, Mr. President, where this was the only feasible procedure available to it, to try to get the Senate, acting "as a committee of the whole" to pass judgment as to whether or not the committee ought to have some voice, by way of three representatives, by way of information about the operations of the CIA in the field of foreign policy.

I think it is regrettable that we were not able to work that out. I criticize no one for the fact that we did not work it out, because each person involved was sincere and perfectly honest, to himself, in the judgment that he followed.

But it is not a good situation, Mr. President; because after all, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee ought to act as two fingers in the same mitten—not in the same glove, but in the same mitten. We should be working hand to hand. Mr. President, there should never have been raised, in my judgment, this question of whether or not we are going to deny to three members of the Foreign Relations Committee an opportunity to be better able to serve the Senate as agents of the Senate in the field of foreign policy, by giving them the same access to information that three members of the Armed Services and three members of the Appropriations Committee have. I think that is the question of fact that is involved. And, of course, you can color it or discolor it all you want to; the parliamentary inquiries about a hypothetical case as to what would happen if some committee did something, that is not the issue before us. What is before us, when all is said and done, is whether it is in the best interest of the Senate, whether it is in the best interest of the country, to have three members of the Foreign Relations Committee joined with three members of the Armed Services Committee and three members of the Appropriations Committee in having access to the information of the CIA and to be represented by three members as each of the other two committees are?

If you want to put your Foreign Relations Committee in the position where it cannot give the Senate all the service that it should be able to give, as its agent in the field of foreign policy, then sustain the point of order of the Senator from Georgia. I say to the Senator from Kentucky, because of a remark that he made in regard to the issue involved—it is the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee to keep the Senate advised on foreign policy. If you slam this door in the face of the Foreign Relations Committee, you are denying it entrance into one aspect of American foreign policy that it should be allowed to enter, just as much as the Armed Services Committee is entering into that aspect of foreign policy as well as military policy, and that three members of the Appropriations Committee have access to.

So I close, Mr. President, by saying the real issue here today is whether or not the Senate wishes to support its Foreign Relations Committee in giving it equal treatment, along with the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, in accessibility to information now denied it, in connection with the CIA.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Section 2 of this proposed new standing committee reads:

> It shall be the duty of the Committee on Intelligence Operations to keep itself fully and currently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and other agencies of the government in so far as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence.

Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has an extensive intelligence and counterintelligence operation. Am I correct in stating that if this standing committee was formed in accordance with section 2 of the resolution, the counterintelligence and intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation would be taken away from the Senate Judiciary Committee and put under this joint committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That could be the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I say respectfully that I did not ask for my interpretation. I asked the Chair's interpretation, based on what the resolution says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not the prerogative of the Chair to give an interpretation of legislation or of a resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask that the Parliamentarian give a decision?

Let me state it again. "This agency would control other agencies of the Government insofar as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence."

I would like a ruling from the Parliamentarian as to whether that means the extensive operations in this field of the Federal Bureau of Investigation would thereupon leave the Judiciary Committee and go to this new joint committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling the Senator seeks is not within the prerogatives of the Chair or the Parliamentarian.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if I may make one more statement—

Originally, this resolution had the words in it "the Federal Bureau of Investigation." Later those words were taken out. But it seems to me we should have a determination on this.

I have been told by people in the Department of Justice that taking these words out would not take the prerogatives of this new committee out over the intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must say to the Senator from Missouri that whatever the Chair's personal views may be, that it is not the prerogative of the Presiding Officer of the Senate to interpret a resolution or a bill presented by a committee or a Member of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Chair. A Member of this body who knows the rules as well as anybody said it would be appropriate for me to make this parliamentary inquiry. He felt it was in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may make the inquiry, but may I suggest that the Senator refer to the processor of the resolution; the Chair has no power to interpret legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia is sustained, the effect of it will be to refer a resolution which is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to the Armed Services Committee. That is what the effect of it will be, and I ask the Chair, is that not correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the point of order is sustained, the effect of the action of the Senate will be to refer this resolution to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Exactly. Now, Mr. President, this relates to the colloquy that I had with the Senator from Tennessee. A committee that did not have jurisdiction of a resolution reported the resolution; the committee that does have jurisdiction of it makes the point of order that this is in their jurisdiction, and they want it referred to them.

I have never seen it happen in this entire Congress that a committee which had jurisdiction of a bill was denied the bill.

Many times, the Finance Committee, has requested reference to our committee of some measure that had only an incidental revenue impact.

Recently the Committee on the Judiciary thought that a bankruptcy matter was their jurisdiction. The Finance Committee did not agree with that entirely because it had a revenue impact. We took one position; they took another. So we voted on it here in the Senate. But both committees were afforded an opportunity to act on it. And the committee, as it turned out, that had the greatest jurisdictional interest, prevailed on that occasion.

It would seem appropriate that if the Committee on Finance wishes to report out a bill that has only incidental revenue involvement, but that regulates interstate and foreign commerce, the bill should be referred to the Commerce Committee, if there is anybody on the Commerce Committee that would like to have a look at that bill.

I have in my office a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the request that when the Finance Committee was through looking at a matter that involves taxation and also involves foreign operations, we should make it available to them.

I have told the chairman that I do not know that we will report the bill at all, but in the event we did, I would be glad to discuss the matter, and we would work it out.

That is how these matters usually happen. I have never known of an occasion where the committee that had jurisdiction was denied the right to even see a bill, except on one occasion with regard to a civil rights matter, where the Senate thought it just had to keep it on the calendar, because the Judiciary Committee was certain not to report it. But when a bill is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, and is reported here, and a point of order is made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the matter should be put in the Armed Services Committee, which has jurisdiction over it, and see what they will do with it.

If the committee does not wish to report the measure, we can come in with a discharge petition, if we cannot get it out of the committee, or wait until some other measure comes along, and offer it on that. There are all kinds of ways to bring a matter to a vote. But I would certainly hope that the Senate will not repeal rule XXV. That is what it means.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the able Senator has pointed out some more instances of overlapping jurisdiction. I could suggest to him that a matter affecting the investment tax credit for U.S. taxpayers investing abroad is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is where it belongs. It came in here as a treaty, and it belongs in that committee.

Mr. GORE. Well, Mr. President, that raises an interesting point. Its purpose and its principal effect is on the internal revenue of the United States, which is a subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee. I know of nothing in the Constitution that requires that treaties go before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask the Senator to look at rule XXV, and he will see it right there.

Mr. GORE. But that is a rule of the Senate, not in the Constitution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I said.

Mr. GORE. Well, I could cite some other things. Is Food for Peace a foreign policy measure, or a domestic agricultural measure? I could name dozens of instances of subject matter——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I simply wish to protect my rights. Yes, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I certainly do not wish to trespass on the Senator's rights.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. GORE. I am pleading with the Senate not to adopt, precedentially, a hard-and-fast rule which would plague us. The Senator has cited instances of comity between committees.

That is the only way that the Senate of the United States and its committee structure can operate. I would that it had prevailed in this instance.

The CIA gathers information, interprets information, reaching conclusions upon which decisions of our Government are based. If that is not a vital part in the decisionmaking process of foreign policy, I would not know how to describe it.

The Foreign Relations Committee sought, in conformity with the practice of comity, to reach some understanding, some modus operandi, of its senior members having access to this vital information. That was denied the committee. So the committee has come into the Senate, its parent, asking for the right to have access to information on which to base its conclusions, which it can use in rendering its responsibilities to the Senate.

Many of these questions are of overlapping jurisdiction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will be brief.

Mr. GORE. I will. I have sought the opportunity to make some brief remarks all afternoon. If the Senator will bear with me momentarily, I will close.

[Omission.]

But was that within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee. I say to the Senate, it was a dual jurisdiction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Just one second. I do not know which committee should have priority. I do not think we need to assign priority. If we abide by the rule of comity, then we will make both committees, along with the Appropriations Committee, fingers in the mitten in this operation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point I make is that the Foreign Relations Committee has had this resolution. They reported it. They did not have jurisdiction of it, but they had it. They reported it. That is why it is here. If we are going to deny the committee that had primary jurisdiction of this resolution an opportunity to have that resolution in committee and do what the committee wants to do with that resolution, it will be the only time that this Congress has denied a committee having jurisdiction that right to look at the resolution.

If this point of order is sustained, that will not be the end of the matter. The Senator from Georgia has some ideas about how the matter might be worked out amicably between those involved. But we are going to have to decide whether to respect the jurisdiction and faithful record of the Senator from Georgia, who, in my opinion, has done a magnificent job in my 17 years here—he has never leaked a national secret, as well as that of the Armed Services Committee.

I call attention to a story in the New York Times of June 20, 1952. The Senator who leaked the information is not here any longer. The Senator was sincere, but, inadvertently he leaked some of our vital secrets.

[Omission.]

Then here is a story that appeared in Drew Pearson's column about something that happened at the White House the other day. The story is substantially correct. It occurred between two Senators. I was one of them. I don't think I am the leak. That was a completely secret meeting. It was fully agreed that this matter should be the kind of thing that should all be secret. What leaked, actually, was not a security secret. At the same time, it was agreed that everything that was said would be secret.

Then here is a story of a fellow Senator who came to me and in a personal conversation asked me why I could not help him. I told him why I could not.

I said, "This is confidential. It would be embarrassing to a fellow Senator, but here is the situation."

We read it in Drew Pearson's column. The other fellow said that he didn't leak it. I know that I didn't leak it. Somebody did. But there it is, Mr. President. Senators are not always good security risks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So if we are going to talk about how we can protect national secrets and help the Committee on Foreign Relations to do the job it wants to do, I certainly think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his fine committee, who have never leaked a secret in 17 years, should be in a position to study this matter, before we act on it.

[Omission.]

It seems to me that anybody who is involved on a committee of this sort should be picked by those who are best at keeping secrets after they have had several years to observe him as one of those who keeps secrets best.

Certainly the Armed Services Committee has jurisdiction. They ought to be permitted to have the measure. If we do not sustain the point of order, this will be the first time we have permitted one committee to usurp the jurisdiction of another committee, and when the point was made, the request was made here on the floor to deny the committee with primary jurisdiction the right to look at that bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, earlier the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] asked the Chair for a ruling on this question. In a parliamentary inquiry, he said: "If the point of order is not sustained, will the action of the Senate constitute a precedent for a proposition that any committee of the Senate could report and call up for actions bills and resolutions on substantive matters not within the legislative jurisdiction of the reporting committee?"

The answer to that question was: "Yes."

I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry that I think ties in with what the Senator from Louisiana has just been talking about. Look at it the other way. Suppose the point of order is sustained. Since this is a precedent we are establishing here, would the action in sustaining the point of order constitute a precedent for the proposition that no committee of the Senate can report and call up for action by the Senate a resolution or a bill involving substantive matters, partly but not preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the reporting committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. First of all, the Chair would say that while a precedent is established—or at least the beginning of one—a committee would not be prohibited from reporting to the Senate a resolution or a bill. A point of order could be raised, if such committee did report a resolution or a bill where the predominance of the subject matter was not within the jurisdiction of that committee.

The Chair wishes to make it clear that there is, of course, a relevancy of the subject matter of this resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the history of the Central Intelligence Agency as one of the intelligence groups referred to in the resolution is one of having been reported from the House Committee on Armed Services, from the Senate Committee on Armed Services, under the terms of the National Security Act.

So the Chair earlier responded that under cursory examination of the resolution, had it been introduced on the floor of the Senate for the purpose of referral, on the advice of the Parliamentarian the Chair would most likely have referred it to the Committee on Armed Services. This is not to say that there is not a difference of opinion over where that referral should go. But the precedents would have indicated Committee on Armed Services.

To answer, now, the Senator's inquiry——

Mr. MILLER. May I repeat it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. If the point of order is sustained, would the action constitute a precedent for the proposition that no committee of the Senate could report or call up for action by the Senate substantive matters partly but not preponderantly within the legislative jurisdiction of the reporting committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's question leads the Chair to make this observation: The sustaining of the point of order would be a precedent, but it would not necessarily be a prohibition upon a committee in this case. If a point of order were made, the precedent that has been established could be used in the future to sustain the point of order, and this concerns measures predominantly within the jurisdiction of another committee. Likewise, a decision of the Chair is always subject to an appeal.

Mr. MILLER. That ruling is precisely what I want, Mr. President, because the Chair had previously given the Senator from Nevada a ruling on a precedent, that if the point of order were not sustained, the action of the Senate would constitute a precedent for the proposition that any committee of the Senate could report out and call up for action by the Senate resolutions or bills involving substantive matters not within the jurisdiction of the reporting committee.

That is clear to me, but I think the request I have made of the Chair is more responsive, at least, to what I intend to do when I vote on this proposition. I understand the Chair to make clear that this does not prohibit it, but that if the point of order is sustained, there would be a precedent for the position that no committee of the Senate can report out and call up for action by the Senate resolutions or bills involving substantive matters only partly but not predominantly within the jurisdiction of the reporting committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The word is "predominance" of the subject matter, not just "involving."

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make it crystal clear that a precedent is not a rule; a precedent establishes a guideline for the Senate and for the Presiding Officer when he makes rulings upon a point of order.

Mr. MILLER. I so understand the Chair. But I also wish to make clear that I understand the Chair to say this would be a precedent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on the question that is before us.

The issue, as I understand it, on which the Senate must vote, is whether this resolution offered by the Foreign Relations Committee should be referred to the Armed Services Committee, or whether, if the point of order is not sustained—or if the appeal is not sustained—then it will go on the calendar tomorrow.

In other words, it is a very simple issue, as to whether the resolution should go to the Armed Services Committee or on the calendar tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the question of procedure, I should like to speak briefly. Ordinarily, if this was introduced by an individual Member of the Senate, it would go to the Armed Services Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee has brought out this resolution, and is asking the Senate to consider it without having it referred to what we believe is the proper committee, the Armed Services Committee.

The fact that I wish to bring out is that the Appropriations Subcommittee and the Armed Services Subcommittee sit together on the subject of the CIA in order to simplify the hearings, get the information that they need, not only for the jurisdiction and the work of the CIA, and to find out what it is doing, but also for the amount of money that it needs.

On the merits of the situation——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The interest of the committee stems from its established jurisdiction under Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. In order to fulfill our responsibility to the Senate we must consider the amounts requested for the Central Intelligence Agency the existing procedure has proven to be a good one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. That is why the Appropriations Committee has joined with the Armed Services Committee for these hearings, and to save time and to carry out our objectives of following the work of the CIA to the best of our ability.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator knows, I had an exchange of correspondence and conversations with Senator RUSSELL of Georgia on this matter, and this goes back to March.

I started to put this in the RECORD when the Senator from Oregon, a moment ago, was talking about this matter. For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and his reply, relating to the subject.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 1966.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: As you probably know, there have recently been a number of new proposals in the Senate to create a special watchdog committee on the CIA, to study the effects of CIA's activities on foreign relations, or otherwise to involve the Congress to a greater degree in legislative oversight of intelligence activities.

Several members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have become particularly interested in relationships between the CIA and the Department of State and in procedures for coordinating the work of the CIA with foreign policy. In this connection, it has been suggested that a select committee of the Senate be created, with membership drawn from the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations, to provide legislative oversight of the whole intelligence community. A draft of a resolution to accomplish this is being privately circulated. I do not know whether it will be introduced.

It occurs to me, however, that selected members of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees now meet together from time to time for substantially this same purpose. I wonder what you would think of informally adding members of the Foreign Relations Committee to that group. This would, I think, do a good deal to allay the concern which several Senators feel, without the disadvantage of attracting as much notice as a formal resolution of the Senate. In addition, I should, in candor, express my own view that the Foreign Relations Committee has a valid interest in intelligence activities—just as has the Department of State in the Executive Branch.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Handwritten note by JWF: I would like to discuss this with you within the next few days at your convenience. I have in mind three members.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 30, 1966.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: As you know from the several conversations we have had on the subject matter of your letter suggesting a new committee or a revision of the present Committee for Oversight of the CIA, I have delayed answering your letter until I had an opportunity to talk to all of the Senators on the present oversight subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services.

After discussing it individually with several members of the committee, I called a meeting, and the matter was thoroughly covered at length and in detail. The unanimous conclusion was that it would be unwise to increase the size of the groups that meet jointly for convenience. Without any reflection whatever on the Committee on Foreign Relations, for which we all have the greatest respect, the responsibility for legislative oversight under the Legislative Reorganization

Act of 1946 is clearly that of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, which originated the legislation creating the CIA as well as the National Security Council, and all legislation coordinating the work of each unit of the intelligence community.

As you know, the Subcommittees are composed of the ranking members in seniority on the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations. Inasmuch as there was considerable duplication (for illustration, Senators Saltonstall, Smith, Stennis and I all are on both Committees), purely for the purposes of convenience the two Subcommittees have met jointly and Senator Hayden requested me to act as Chairman.

We are, of course, not able to pass judgment on the effectiveness of our oversight, but I think I can state with assurance that throughout the course of a year no agency of the Government spends as much time before its oversight and appropriations committees as does the CIA. The work of the CIA is, of course, related to international and foreign relations, but no more so than the work of the Armed Services Committee. The size and nature of our military establishment, of course, is largely determined by the status of our international relations. Indeed, there is a great deal of connection on down the line between the various committees and the subject of their oversight, but under the rules and practices of the Senate, the Senate Committee on Armed Services undoubtedly has jurisdiction in this case on matters other than budgetary.

With assurances of personal esteem and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The question, though, that I was leading up to—I make the point that this does not come as any surprise to the members of the Armed Services Committee; this has been under discussion since March—what does the Senate think about this being sent to the Armed Services Committee, with instructions to report back in 2 weeks?

I have no objection to their looking at it. They know all about it. We have discussed it ad infinitum. It seems to me the subject should be considered on the merits; if the Senate does not wish to have the Foreign Relations Committee look at the matter, then it ought to vote not to. If it thinks we have a legitimate interest, we ought to vote for it. If this question of procedure is important, that the Armed Services Committee look at it, I have no objection at all to an agreement that it go over to the committee for 2 weeks, is no problem at all.

The same thing is true about these details as to how you appoint a chairman. We were trying to make it in accord with what we believed to be the wishes of the Senator from Georgia. If he wishes to change those provisions, we will be more than willing to consider his amendments, also. It was in an effort to try to make this resolution as consistent with present practices as possible, in the same way that I informally asked the chairman of the subcommittee if he would be willing for us informally to be members of that subcommittee. That was the simple way. I originally tried to solve this matter.

But it did not work out. The idea that the Armed Services Committee ought to look at it does not offend me in the least. I am very agreeable that they look for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have a very short statement that I wish to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator think about that proposal?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am just one member of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would be happy to talk it over with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield momentarily here?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, a few moments ago, referred to the bills on bankruptcy, which involved dual and overlapping jurisdiction. The matter was referred to the Judiciary Committee. That committee made its recommendation, and it was then referred to the Finance Committee, with the understanding—I think with the instructions—that the committee report the bill back with its recommendations within, I believe, 2 or 3 weeks, or some such time.

That is a procedure that is frequently resorted to with overlapping jurisdictions. I think it is quite generous that the chairman of the committee has made this suggestion, and I hope the Senate will accept it, including the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Now, Mr. President, I shall briefly discuss the merits and the work of our committee on the CIA. I believe everyone here understands the issue today, which, I repeat, is a very simple one, as to whether this matter should go to the Armed Services Committee or whether it should go on the calendar tomorrow. That is the only issue before us.

On the merits of the work of the CIA Subcommittee of the Armed Services and the Appropriations Committee, let me say first that the chairman of our Armed Services Committee, who has assumed the chairmanship of the joint hearings at the request of the Senator from Arizona, has called meetings constantly, and especially when there is any subject that we believed was of importance that we should discuss at the time. He has been a hard working, able chairman, who has been a Member of the Senate for a great many years, and who has taken a tremendous interest in this subject of the CIA and the armed services generally; and I think he has a greater memory and understanding of the precedents of the Senate than any other Senator that I know.

As a member of that committee, I have never been refused an answer to any question that I have asked. I have always received all the answers to all the questions, from whomever may be the Director of the CIA. I believe that we get the information that we think is helpful, and that we should know, in connection with legislation.

One point that I do not think has been made especially complete or clear this afternoon is that the CIA is essentially under the National Security Council. The National Security Council is headed by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, and has as members the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the CIA Director, and a number of other important Cabinet officials.

The CIA is essentially different from an ordinary department like the Department of State or the Department of Defense, where Congress has a very important relationship, because of the personnel involved, because of the duties involved, and because of the legislative questions involved.

The CIA is under the jurisdiction of the National Security Council, and I would like to make it essentially, as it is in my mind essentially, a part of the executive establishment, the White House establishment.

The President calls upon the CIA for information, factfinding information that he needs, just as he asks his secretary, or just as he asks men like Mr. Rostow and other people in his office for facts on situations in which he, and he alone, at the end, has to make a decision.

In that way, the CIA is different from the ordinary departments. As such, it comes under a different category, if you will, in our legislative work here. Essentially it is a factfinding body. With all the questions that arise about the making of foreign policy, it only makes foreign policy when it finds facts for the Chief Executive, on which to act; and if it carries out any policy in any part of the world, as brought out this afternoon, it is doing so essentially under the orders of or with the approval of the President of the United States and the National Security Council.

So I say that I believe the CIA, so far as the legislative processes are concerned, is adequately handled in the manner that it has been handled. Perhaps I am prejudiced, because I have been on that committee now for a good many years; but essentially we could work problems out. And as I said before to the Senator from New York, I have never refused to tell any Member of the Senate an answer to a question regarding the CIA and its activities, to the best of my knowledge and to the best of my ability.

Naturally there are one or two aspects of the subject that perhaps we could not answer in detail. But the fundamental policies involved we could.

I wish to make one more statement. Assume we establish this committee that is requested by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as a formal committee. What is its jurisdiction? I am a member of the Small Business Committee. We cannot pass legislation to the Senate. We have to send any legislation that we want to the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Commerce.

If this committee is established as a formal committee, what will be its jurisdiction? Will it pass on appropriations, and say to the Appropriations Committee, "This is it; you appropriate this sum of money"?

If it is going to act on defense matters, is it going to say to the Armed Services

Committee, "This is it"? Or is it going to leave the matter to the Armed Services Committee for final action?

It seems to me that if we adopt this committee as a formal committee, we shall create a new situation, in which it will be very difficult to resolve the jurisdictions of the committee.

So, Mr. President, while there are other matters that we can discuss, I believe this situation is well known to the Members of the Senate today. I have a number of references here where I would argue very strenuously with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas on his prepared statement, but I will not take the time of the Senate to do it now.

I hope that the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia will be answered affirmatively by a majority of the Senate this afternoon. I believe it is in the interest of orderly procedure, and I believe it is in the best interests of administering the CIA.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I would like to touch on two points. A great deal has been made about the danger of having more people informed about the Central Intelligence Agency.

Under the resolution, there would be nine Members of the Senate on the committee, more or less privy to the Agency's reports.

Under existing practice, there is really no limit on the number of members that may be included, except the total number of the members who may be put on the committee of the Armed Services and of the Appropriations Committees. There is some overlapping between the two committees. The chairman of the Armed Service Committee could put his whole committee on the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, we have not made any changes recently. When Senator Byrd retired from the committee, we put another man on. There are five on the Armed Services Subcommittee; the Senator from Maine has not been mentioned earlier. She is a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know she is. All I said, the Senator could put his whole committee on that subcommittee, there is nothing to prevent him from doing it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, but I have no intention of doing it.

Mr. McCARTHY. And the chairman of the Appropriations Committee could put every member of that committee on the subcommittee.

So in effect the resolution we offer sets a limit on the number of persons who might be informed with reference to Central Intelligence activities.

In the House, there are 11 members on the Committee on Armed Services, who are on the CIA subcommittee, headed by Chairman RIVERS. Eleven members of the House Appropriations Committee evidently can be trusted. They may have two different kinds of intelligence committees. They have not told me about the inside one; they tell me about the public one. I do not know whether it is 11 or 4. This is the kind of information we should have. The record question is this, Is the CIA is a policymaking agency?

I am not going to argue this. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has given his opinion. I should like to quote a former President of the United States, Harry Truman, who said in a column in the Washington Post of December 22, 1963:

> "For some time I have been disturbed by the way the CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and, at times, a policymaking arm of the government. This has led to trouble, and may have compounded our difficulties in several explosive areas."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator identify who said that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Harry Truman, President of the United States, said it after he had served as President.

To move this along, the Senator from Georgia has made a point of order. If he is prepared to withdraw the point of order temporarily, I am prepared to move that the resolution be referred to the Armed Services Committee, with the understanding that it be reported favorably or unfavorably, with amendment or without amendment, in 21 days. Would the Senator from Georgia be prepared to withdraw his point or order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No. This matter is of such great importance and has been discussed at such great length that it should be decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is all right with me. I have heard the argument made that the Armed Services Committee should have a look at the resolution. But if the Senator is prepared to withdraw his point of order temporarily, I will move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Armed Services with the understanding that it be reported either adversely or favorably, with or without amendment, within 21 days.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, why does not the Senator make his proposal without a time limit? After all, if the point of order is withdrawn, the resolution originated in the committee itself. If the Armed Services Committee does nothing now, the resolution can be brought forth.

I do not think we ought to drag anybody around. We should not put on a time limitation. We are reasonable people, respectable people, and responsible people. We are interested in the security of our country. If the proposal is made to refer the resolution to the Armed Services Committee without any restriction or equivocation, we can then sit back as reasonable people and know that justice will be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. We tried to take it up with them.

Mr. PASTORE. But today the way has been cleared. We have never had such a discussion with respect to the CIA before.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator from Georgia does not withdraw his point of order, the situation will be what the Senator from Rhode Island says it will be. The facts can be presented. This is one occasion where I would suggest a limitation of time. But I think what is involved here is known to the Senate, and whatever changes the Armed Services Committee might wish to make in the resolution could be made by tomorrow night, if they wanted to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on the merits. It is an issue important enough to have a vote on the merits. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that we should not put a time limit on the committee; but would the Senator amend his motion to provide that the resolution should be reported to the Senate during this session of Congress?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether that would be any more acceptable. I would be glad to have it back within this session.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, this issue as to the matter of time has not been discussed. The question has revolved around jurisdiction and proper handling by standing committees of the Senate. I think that question should be settled. I have had no personal objections from my standpoint, as an individual, about the Foreign Relations Committee being invited in to sit on this committee.

I so informed the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] when he first discussed the matter with me. But now here we have had raised this question and have labored it for more than 4 hours as to whether a committee ought to have the right to report to the Senate, to be placed on the calendar, a bill or a resolution that unquestionably invades the jurisdiction of another committee. I think that question ought to be decided. If it is decided against the contention I have made, the matter might well go to the calendar. If it is decided in favor of the contention I have made, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and I shall give it the same consideration in that committee as I give other matters. I endeavor to see that all matters are considered. We have not always acted favorably on all pending measures, but we have tried to consider them all. Sometimes business reaches us very late in the session.

But I do not propose at this stage of the proceedings to let this suggestion be used as a way to hold a gun at the head of the Armed Services Committee and to say, "You have to report it within this period." I do not care what the period is.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not conceive it in terms of holding a gun at the head of anybody.

Mr. GORE. I had a situation recently in which exactly such a procedure was followed. I cited an example with reference to the question of bankruptcy.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask whether the Senator from Georgia means by what he has said to make this a vote, in effect, on the defeat of the resolution. It sounded as though that were his intention. I think we should know it, if it is.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mean what?

Mr. CASE. Whether the vote for his motion means a vote to defeat the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. CASE. The Senator did not state it, but is that his intention?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not know how the Senator drew any such inference from anything I said. He must have been imagining things.

I said the question had been raised and discussed here at great length as to the fundamental jurisdiction of committees and that that question ought to be decided by the vote on this point of order.

Mr. CASE. Does not the Senator mean by that that if the point of order is sustained, the resolution is defeated for this session?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not make that statement.

Mr. CASE. The Senator did not say it. Does he mean it?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not promise that I will bring this resolution out; but I am not going to consider this as a deathblow to the resolution.

Mr. CASE. When the Senator said we have been debating this for 4 hours and that we ought to decide it, what did he mean?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I was talking about the procedural question whether the committee had a right to report the resolution without any bill having been introduced, on its own volition, and to have it considered that invades the jurisdiction of another committee without its having been referred to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will permit me, with all respect——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not going to make a promise that I will report this bill in a week or 10 days or any other length of time.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from New Jersey is only trying to ascertain the meaning of the action the Senate is about to be asked to take. The Senator from New Jersey cannot escape the inference that if he should vote to sustain the point of order, he will be voting to kill the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator already voted to report the resolution three times.

Mr. CASE. What the Senator from Georgia has said confirms the Senator from New Jersey in his understanding of the matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point has been made that we have reported by dates certain. Without exception, in this Congress, every time we have done that, to the best of my knowledge, it has been a case where a committee had secondary jurisdiction, did not have primary jurisdiction, and wanted to look at a bill that came from another committee.

But all these thousands of bills that have been introduced did not go to our standing committees with instructions to report by a date certain. They were referred to the proper committees—period.

It is only where a committee has an interest in passing a bill that it reports a bill, and some other committee wants to look at the bill, that the committee having primary jurisdiction would say, "Fine. We will let you have the bill. But please report back by a certain date"; and that has worked out amicably.

What we are talking about here would be a reflection on the Armed Services Committee, to insist that if we pass a resolution over which we have complete jurisdiction, that that resolution should not be referred to the committee to do what they want to do with it.

That would not be the end of it, so far as I am concerned, and I do not think it would be as far as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are concerned. That we understand. If this committee does have jurisdiction, it ought to be permitted to have the resolution over which it has jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARTHY. My feeling is that the Armed Services Committee has had ample opportunity to look at the substance of the resolution. It could have asked earlier to study it. It took no action. A number of bills of this kind have been referred to that committee over the last 20 years. Consequently, I am prepared to have the Senate vote on the substance of this matter today. The Senate regularly does not insist on applying the rules of the Senate. If we did, we would be immobilized. Any kind of amendment could be offered. It seems to me all of a sudden the Senator from Louisiana becomes a purist over the rules of the Senate. It should be remembered that we offered the great civil rights bill on the Stella school bill. That was the most comprehensive legislation ever introduced.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Stella school bill, as I recall, had been reported by the appropriate committee. It came out of the Judiciary Committee.

If the Senator wants to change the rules of the Senate, I certainly think——

Mr. McCARTHY. We are not changing the rules.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should think that if the Senator wanted to change the rules, and if he wanted to establish a new standing committee, it would be necessary to amend the rules of the Senate, not the general statutes of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not what the Vice President said, acting under the one constitutional responsibility he has as Presiding Officer of the Senate. He said there was no rule or precedent. He said this would establish a precedent. This is properly before the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana said it was not legally before us.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I said I know of no law that has been violated by this, but that it is an unusual procedure. I stand on that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota consider the possibility of amending his motion; or, if it has not yet been proposed, if he will propose that the pending matter be referred to the Committee on Armed Services with no time limitation? I make that proposal on this basis. I have a great deal of confidence in the integrity of the committees of the Senate. If a bill is referred to the appropriate committee, I would assume, without question, that that committee would hold hearings and would either report the bill favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator proposing that we do this without a vote, that this be by agreement, and that we bypass a vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator wishes a vote, that would be fine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has been under consideration for 3 or 4 months. The Senate should vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say a rollcall vote on the proposal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That, is the effect of the motion now made, would be that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand the motion now made has a time limitation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we vote on the point of order, and that point of order is sustained, the resolution will go to the committee for an unlimited time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So it has the same effect. I would rather have it that way.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We could proceed that way.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in the form of a plea.

We have debated this matter for a long time this afternoon. I think we recognize the differences in the points of view that have developed between the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

I think the record is clear that the two chairmen were not able to reach an understanding as to how this matter should be resolved. That left the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in a position where he felt that, carrying out his duties as chairman of the committee, he should offer this resolution. A large number of us agreed with him.

I know that at this point in the debate, when there is a tendency on the part of Senators to reach fixed attitudes, there may not be a disposition to agree to what I think is a very reasonable solution of the problem.

I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] knows the high regard in which I hold him, and that his word will always be his bond so far as I am concerned.

However, a practical situation has developed which we must face up to. The reason why there has been this hesitancy on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee to this matter is that we felt, rightly or wrongly—but we felt that way, and I think we still do—that unless we can have some gentlemen's understanding that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the merits of this matter. The merits go to the question of fact as to whether or not, because the CIA involves itself to some degree in foreign policy, members of the Foreign Relations Committee should sit in with the committee now composed of members of the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee.

I think it is perfectly all right to send the resolution to the Armed Services Committee, but that will not remove certain feelings and attitudes about it.

Therefore, all I wish to say is that if the Senator from Georgia will simply say to the Senate that the matter will be heard before the Armed Services Committee, without any time limitation being put on it—and I agree that we should not put a time limitation on it—and that the committee will bring back a report before this session closes, for it or against it, or without recommendation—we have followed all those three procedures by committees in the past—I remember the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] brought back a report from the Commerce Committee in the last couple of years with no recommendation—or if the Armed Services Committee comes back with a report against the resolution, we would have the benefit of their judgment and why they are against it in their report. The same would be true if they were for it.

However, I do not think the Senate would be dealing fairly with the Foreign Relations Committee if we were to refer this resolution to the Armed Services Committee today with no gentlemen's understanding that we will have a chance to vote on its merits before we adjourn.

Perhaps there is no justification for the feeling, but the feeling exists, because attitudes have been expressed in opposition to any members of the Foreign Relations Committee sitting on this committee.

I think if we are not willing to have an understanding that we shall be assured of a vote on the merits, what we will be doing, in effect, without justification, is discriminating against the Foreign Relations Committee, without an opportunity to vote on the merits.

I think that the Foreign Relations Committee, on the merits, is entitled to have three members on that committee. But we are not arguing the merits of that issue now. We are arguing only the question as to whether we ought to have an opportunity to vote on the merits before we adjourn.

All that would be necessary, insofar as I am concerned, would be for the Senator from Georgia to say that the Armed Services Committee, in due course of time, but before this session closes, will vote to send the resolution back, with its recommendation or without its recommendation. But I think the Foreign Relations Committee is entitled to that consideration from the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement on this, because I do not like to be left in the position of appearing to be an unreasonable man. I understand the wishes of the Foreign Relations Committee in respect to this subject.

Back in 1953 or 1954, I offered to invite the two ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee into the sessions of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee—that was before the Appropriations Committee started meeting with us—and extend to them the privilege of examination. The offer was not accepted. They wanted to have a special joint committee at that time.

Since that time I have invited the distinguished majority leader also. He has attended some of the hearings.

When the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] came to see me about this matter this year and discussed it with me, I tried to be reasonable. I said, "Well, I will be glad to see what I can do about it, Senator FULBRIGHT, but, of course, if we invite members of your committee, you will have to adhere to the seniority rule, because we have followed it strictly in the Armed Services Committee and in the Appropriations Committee."

The Senator from Arkansas said that under the circumstances he could not agree to follow the seniority rule.

For that reason that proposal fell through.

I have not been unreasonable on this matter. I have gone out of my way to try to reconcile this matter and to recognize the desires of the Committee on Foreign Relations to have representation on this subcommittee.

I think I have gone the last mile. But I am not going to say, with a pistol pointed at my head, that I will do this or that, when I have already gone farther than the facts justify in some respects in yielding the legislative jurisdiction of my committee. That is the reason why I think we should vote on it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I had a very interesting conversation with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He, in very brief and forceful terms, stated that the initial purpose in giving jurisdiction to a committee over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency was to confine it within the smallest circle of Members. He further stated that it was subsequently decided that, inasmuch as the Appropriations Committee had to provide the money, it was only reasonable that it ought to be included within that small circle.

Today it is proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee that the circle of six be expanded to nine. That means an enlargement of the number of members through whom leaks can occur.

The primary objective has always been to avoid leaks.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I have been discussing the matter, and he agreed with what I shall now say. He is against, and I am against, the expansion of the number of members of that committee. He believes the membership should be kept at six, and that number of six might include two members of the Foreign Relations Committee. In that way there would be on that subcommittee two members of the Appropriations Committee, two members of the Armed Services Committee, and two members of the Foreign Relations Committee, with the membership to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States.

If that is done, the Vice President, in the faithful performance of his duties, would avoid the pitfalls described by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] earlier this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on sustaining or rejecting the point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to take a moment or two. I do not have much to say. I wish to clarify one point made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] when he asked me about adhering strictly to seniority in the assignment of Members.

There is another customary rule in the Senate that when a Senator sponsors a bill or resolution, or takes a special interest in it, we often vary seniority in his favor. In this case, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been active in this matter and had sponsored the resolution out of which this particular move has developed. I mean the original one has been changed, but it developed from his initiative. I said to the Senator from Georgia that under the circumstances I was not willing to agree to exclude him. I believe the Senator will confirm that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Was not this before the resolution was prepared? I thought the Senator had come to me before the resolution was prepared and we were trying to come to some understanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This was shortly after the original resolution was submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Does the Senator mean the resolution to investigate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Of course, that is a horse of an entirely different color.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the beginning of this whole interest in this session. There have been some 200 resolutions in the past dealing with CIA, none of which has come to fruition, largely because of the great respect and influence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arizona. At any rate, we have not come to any result. However, when this resolution was introduced, many objections were raised to an investigation, public or otherwise, of the CIA. I also realized that if it did not choose to be investigated, we had no effective way to investigate it. We began to explore what the alternatives were.

My objective, although perhaps not of the Senator from Minnesota—I do not know—but all along I had the idea—and I believe we discussed it informally with the Senator from Georgia—that it would be appropriate for the Foreign Relations Committee to participate. This need has become much more acute, in my view, because of the recent developments in the last 2 or 3 years.

During that time the operations of the CIA have been much in the news. Reference has been made to a best-selling book, published about a year ago, written by Ross and Wise, I believe, two journalists representing two of the most important newspapers in the country, and in a series of articles in the New York Times, and rumors and accounts of various kinds. * * * [Deletion.] We know these sad stories which I do not have the time to relate. But this has been published both in books and in articles. It was a succession of this type of thing that led me to believe that if we were to understand and to have any real important influence in this field of foreign relations, we ought to know about the activities of the CIA. I have already related one, about the Bay of Pigs, from my personal experience, and that of many others here secondhand.

That operation was essentially a CIA operation. I have heard in the committee, in the old days, about other operations, * * *. [Deletion.]

The CIA is a much more important and much bigger agency today, and has more influence in the course of events in our foreign relations; and that is why I think the Foreign Relations Committee should be a participant in the CIA subcommittee.

Much of the debate here seems to be under the false impression that we are trying to oust the existing committee. We are not doing any such thing. It is merely participation in their deliberations and access to knowledge which we hope will be mutually beneficial.

That is about the sum and substance of it. I think it is a very reasonable resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall not again undertake to reply to the arguments of the Senator from Arkansas, based on rumors, New York Times articles, and a book by two journalists.

I do, however, wish to absolve myself of any personal feeling insofar as service on the subcommittee by the Senator from Minnesota is concerned. I told the Senator that we had always strictly followed seniority rules, and it would be necessary to continue to do so. One reason was that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who has been a member of the Armed Services Committee for 14 years, started talking to me about getting on the CIA committee shortly after he came on.

I said, "I am sorry, Stuart, but we have followed seniority rules since the beginning, down to the letter."

The Senator from Missouri talked to me several times, before the time of the retirement of Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., when the Senator was appointed to the subcommittee, as a result of his seniority.

For that reason, and because the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees had strictly followed the seniority rules, I told the Senator from Arkansas that I thought Foreign Relations should do the same. He said he could not do so.

Therefore, the suggestion collapsed. I have no apologies for that, there is nothing personal. I have the highest regard for the Senator from Minnesota, but I thought that inasmuch as the other two subcommittees had followed the seniority rule strictly all the way through, that it was not asking too much of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was entering the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, should do the same thing. I still do not think it was an unreasonable request. I do not believe I have had an unreasonable position in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me that that is the very thing that could be acted on or covered by the report that would be brought back to the Senate. I have the feeling that during the hearings, such difficulties as that could be ironed out.

But it does not seem to me that this has very much bearing. The real problem which confronts us now is whether we can resolve this problem this afternoon and come out working together, as a united Senate team again, when all we need is some assurance that those of us who hold the point of view that those on the Foreign Relations Committee hold will get the chance to vote on the merits before we go home at the end of this session. What is so unreasonable about that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I had not challenged the Senator from Oregon. I must say that I am delighted to hear him say that he hopes the Senate can work as a team.

Mr. MORSE. I am proud of the way we work as a team when it comes to a matter involving the work of the Senate itself. But I think we have a procedural matter here that we ought to resolve as teammates, and not as opponents. We differ only on substantive matters.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Since the Senator from Georgia mentioned my name, all this has been difficult for me because of my great respect and admiration for the chairmen of both these committees, on both of which I serve.

The facts are that after I had served on the Armed Services Committee 10 years, I went to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and said, "I have been on this committee for 10 years, and now would hope to be a member of the Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency."

The chairman said, "Well, let's talk about it." He said, "You can go over and get any information you want from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I have arranged that for you before. But these are the reasons why I do not think this committee should be enlarged." I listened to his reasons, and then said—and he will verify it—"I think you are right. I do not think the committee should be enlarged."

What runs through my mind as we continue this discussion: On yesterday's front page, there was an article about a retired Army colonel who is apparently in trouble, being accused of espionage. There were also two stories of Czechs who have been asked to leave the country because, with a double agent, they thought they were monitoring the office of the Under Secretary of State.

Whether or not we like it, gentlemen, this is the world in which we live today; and we have no right, in my opinion, to send our sons and neighbors out to wage battle for this country in open war, and not do our best to protect them in the war in which we are relative neophytes, and the Communists are the masters and experts, in the hidden war that goes along with intelligence and counterintelligence.

It was for those reasons, after it was explained to me why the committee should be held small, that I agreed with the chairman. It is for that reason that, although I have the greatest respect for the Foreign Relations Committee, and above all for its chairman, in this particular case I disagree. Having been on both sides of it, with some experience in the Pentagon, I bring up just one more point for the Senate's consideration: There have been some figures used about money. I shall not use them again, even in this secret session.

But it is a fact that a small percentage of the money that goes into intelligence goes to the Central Intelligence Agency and a relatively large percentage of that money goes into the Pentagon. I would be the first to agree, not only because the KBG is dominant in the civilian intelligence activities of Russia, more authority than GRU, the military intelligence, but also because it is the right way to run our Government, that we should have an intelligence agency independent of the military. Intelligence recommendations to highest authority should not be decided only by generals and admirals. But if, for whatever reason, these consistent attacks against the CIA continue, some of which have been referred to on the floor today, what it will do is denigrate the Central Intelligence Agency to the point where it will all go back in the Pentagon and the people who decide what is to be recommended—intelligencewise—to the President of the United States, will be military men. Although I have the greatest respect for the military academies and their graduates, I cannot think of anything worse, from the standpoint of the future of my children and their children, than to have only the military advise the President as to whether, say, we should or should not declare war, based on their presentation alone of intelligence information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not believe there is any marrow left in this bone. I suggest we vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was absent from the floor the last 5 minutes or so. I understand that my name was mentioned in connection with possible appointment to the committee.

I want the record to show that I never asked that I be put on the committee. I would be glad to have the question of the possibility of my being put on the committee settled by a test vote. But I would rather not have the vote on the point of order.

The question of seniority as a requirement for appointment as a member of the committee is one which causes me some concern. There is nothing in the rules which says that when you move down subcommittees below chairman you take the senior top members. But I have no objection at all to having the practice followed by the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees in appointing their senior members followed by the Foreign Relations Committee, if its members are to be included on this committee. But I have never made it a condition that I be included on the committee.

There is something to be said for seniority. Chesterton explained the case best when he said that no rational case could be made for the practice of having the eldest son of the king succeed his father, but that it saved a lot of trouble.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not hear what the Senator said. If he had heard what I said, I do not think he would have taken any offense whatsoever, nor would any other member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not take offense.

Mr. President, if we are ready to vote, I should like to move the question, but if other Senators wish to speak, I shall wait.

Mr. RANDOLPH. First, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hope it is an appropriate inquiry to make at this time. Perhaps it has been anticipated by the majority leader. I wondered whether the vote was to be taken in secrecy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; in public. That is one of the things I was going to mention.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but since I have, along with the Senator from Missouri and one or two other Senators, the unenviable position of being on two of the committees involved in this controversy, I would like to point out just two things.

It seems to me we are all over emphasizing the fact that the vote we are about to take is an alternative vote. Both the Senator from Louisiana and our respective majority leader suggested a possible compromise, to the effect that this legislation should be referred to the Armed Services Committee without a date certain or any mandate on reporting it.

I submit that by sustaining the point of order, Mr. President, we effectuate exactly that. We will bring about precisely the condition that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Montana propose we do by a vote. In fact, our vote is, in effect, a vote to send this to the Armed Services Committee without any instructions whatsoever, depending upon their good judgment and depending upon their own responsibility to make a report.

The only other point I wish to make is this: So many Senators talk as if this were a final approach to this problem. Let us suppose that all the bad suspicions that have been ventilated this afternoon are true, and that sending this, by sustaining the point of order, to the Armed Services Committee means that it is buried there. I do not think it would be, but let us assume that. May I point out that the Senate is not without a great family of legislative tools by which we can reactivate this discussion. There is no way, by sustaining the point of order, that we bury this issue in the Armed Services Committee, in limbo and in perpetuity. If a majority of the Senate decide they want to bring it back for decision and for amendment to protect seniority rights if we so desire, we can do it through a series of approaches. We can do it by an amendment to an appropriations bill dealing with the appropriations for the CIA, because we can put it on as a restrictive rider. That has been done before. We can do it by an amendment to some other piece of legislation. The Senate can force its will, and I think that the proper thing to do, under these circumstances, is to sustain the point of order, see what happens for a given period of time in the Armed Services Committee, and then, if a majority of the Senate is dissatisfied with what they have done, reactivate it by any one of a whole series of legislative tools we have available. We are not deciding the issue forever and a day as of now.

Mr. PASTORE. But does not the Senator feel that since we have been behind closed doors now for about 3 or 4 hours, the eyes of the country are upon us?

Mr. MUNDT. And they are not seeing anything.

Mr. PASTORE. They are not seeing anything, but they are wondering what is transpiring here. Would it not be more comforting and reassuring to the people of the United States of America, when we go out of here, if they learn that as gentlemen we agreed to do something, not that we had to split our lines and be recorded as being pro or con on the proposition.

As the Senator has pointed out, this is not a final vote. It will decide nothing. This is merely a vote on jurisdiction; and many of us feel—I, for one—that possibly there ought to be some participation on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee on some sort of committee, whether a standing committee, a select committee, or some group of the Senate.

I am one of those who feel that the Armed Services Committee has primary jurisdiction, and they should be given an opportunity to look at this. If we can do it by agreement, I think it would look a lot better.

Mr. MUNDT. That would suit me perfectly.

Mr. PASTORE. And it would look as if, after all, we sat here as reasonable people and decided that on an amicable basis. If we did that, the country would be refreshed, and reassured.

Mr. MUNDT. If that could be done.

Mr. PASTORE. But this insistence that "I will prove that I am right and you are wrong" is not going to decide anything, because this is going to brew and brew until one day we decide whether it is right or wrong to have members of the Foreign Relations Committee participate.

Mr. MUNDT. It would make me very happy if we could do it by an amicable process. I simply wish to point out, that however we do it, we arrive at the same legislative home, with the same results and the same opportunities to reactivate it at any time a majority of the Senate desires.

Several Senators. Vote. Vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am quite certain in my own mind, at least, that the distinguished Senator from Georgia and his committee will not be too unreasonable in seeking a solution to the question which is before us at the moment.

But, having said that, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a sanitized version of these proceedings prepared, that it be under the authority of the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee; that they will take out anything which might be detrimental, and that the record be made public and that any Senator who participated shall have the right to correct his own remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now go out of closed session and return to regular legislative session, for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Senate returned to open legislative session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Chair state the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the point of order of the Senator from Georgia, that under rule XXV the original resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations consists of subject matter predominately under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services and therefore is improperly before the Senate and must be referred to that committee before it can properly be placed on the Senate Calendar.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I just bring this to the attention of the Senate. Immediately following this vote, there will be a vote on the International Wheat Agreement Treaty, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which I understand is up against a time limitation tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The vote "yea" sustains the point of order; the vote "nay" is to overrule the point of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. When is it the intention of the majority leader that the Senate again take up the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. At what hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twelve o'clock tomorrow, Mr. President.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow; and, furthermore, I ask unanimous consent that after a 15-minute morning hour the unfinished business, the agriculture appropriation bill, be laid before the Senate and debate begun.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The Senate has heard the question. The yeas and nays have been orderd, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McIntyre
Miller
Montoya
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—28

Aiken
Boggs
Burdick
Case
Church
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hart
Hartke
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McCarthy
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pell
Proxmire
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Dodd
Gruening
Mansfield
McGee
Nelson
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman

So the point of order of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] was sustained.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for the purpose of considering Executive F—89th Congress, 2d session—a protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

PROTOCOL FOR THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session, the protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, which was read the second time.

EXECUTIVE F—PROTOCOL FOR THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1962

The Governments signatory to this Protocol,

Considering that the International Wheat Agreement, 1962 which was extended by Protocol in 1965, expires on 31 July 1966, and

Desiring to extend the Agreement, in accordance with the recommendations of the International Wheat Council under paragraph (2) of Article 36 of the Agreement, for a further period,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962

The International Wheat Agreement, 1962 as extended by the 1965 Protocol (hereinafter called "the Agreement") shall continue in force between the parties to this Protocol until 31 July 1967.

ARTICLE 2

Signature, acceptance, approval and accession

(1) This Protocol shall be open for signature in Washington from 4 April 1966 until and including 29 April 1966 by the Government parties to the Agreement, or which are provisionally regarded as parties to the Agreement, on 4 April 1966.

(2) This Protocol shall be subject to acceptance or approval by the signatory Governments in accordance with their constitutional procedures. Instruments of acceptance or approval shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America not later than 15 July 1966.

(3) This Protocol shall be open for accession:

(a) until 15 July 1966 by the Government of any country listed in Annex B or C to the Agreement as of that date, in accordance with the conditions specified in the Agreement or prescribed by the Council before its accession to the Agreement, or

(b) as provided in paragraph (4) of Article 35 of the Agreement.

(4) Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America.

(5) Any Government which has not accepted, approved or acceded to this Protocol by 15 July 1966 in accordance with paragraph (2) or (3)(a) of this Article may be granted by the Council an extension of time for depositing its instrument of acceptance, approval or accession.

ARTICLE 3

Entry into force

(1) This Protocol shall enter into force among those Governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance, approval or accession in accordance with Article 2 of this Protocol by 15 July 1966, as follows:

(a) on 16 July 1966, with respect to Part I and Parts III to VII of the Agreement, and

(b) on 1 August 1966, with respect to Part II of the Agreement, Provided, that such Governments and the Governments which have deposited notifications in accordance with paragraph (3) of this Article by 15 July 1966 are Governments which held not less than two-thirds of the votes of exporting countries and not less than two-thirds of the votes of importing countries under the Agreement on that date, or would have held such votes if they had been parties to the Agreement on that date.

(2) This Protocol shall enter into force for any Government which deposits an instrument of acceptance, approval or accession after 15 July 1966 on the date of such deposit except that the Protocol shall not enter into force with respect to Part II of the Agreement earlier than 1 August 1966.

(3) For the purposes of entry into force of this Protocol in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article, any signatory Government or any Government entitled to accede in accordance with paragraph (3)(a) of Article 2 of this Protocol or any Government whose application for accession has been approved by the Council on conditions established under paragraph (3)(b) of Article 2 of this Protocol may deposit a notification with the Government of the United States of America not later than 15 July 1966 containing an undertaking to seek acceptance, approval or accession to this Protocol as rapidly as possible in accordance with its constitutional

procedures. It is understood that a Government which gives such a notification will provisionally apply the Protocol and be provisionally regarded as a party thereto for a period to be determined by the Council.

(4) If by 15 July 1966 the conditions laid down in the preceding paragraphs of this Article for entry into force of this Protocol are not fulfilled, the Governments of those countries which by that date have accepted, approved or acceded in accordance with Article 2 of this Protocol may decide by mutual consent that it shall enter into force among them or they may take whatever other action they consider the situation requires.

ARTICLE 4

Final provisions

(1) For the purposes of the operation of the Agreement and this Protocol, any reference to countries the respective Governments of which have acceded to the Agreement on conditions prescribed by the Council in accordance with paragraph (4) of Article 35 of the Agreement shall include a country which has acceded to this Protocol in accordance with paragraph (3)(b) of Article 2 of this Protocol.

(2) The Government of the United States of America shall promptly inform each Government which is a party or is provisionally regarded as a party to this Protocol, or which on 4 April 1966 is a party or is provisionally regarded as a party to the Agreement, of each signature, acceptance or approval of, or accession to this Protocol, of each notification made in accordance with paragraph (3) of Article 3 of this Protocol, and of the date of entry into force of this Protocol.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Protocol on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

The texts of this Protocol in the English, French, Russian and Spanish languages shall be equally authentic. The originals shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall transmit certified copies thereof to each signatory and acceding Government.

DONE at Washington this fourth day of April nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

For Argentina:
For Australia:
For Austria:
For Belgium and Luxembourg:
For Brazil:
For Canada:
For Costa Rica:
For Cuba:
For the Dominican Republic:
For Ecuador:
For El Salvador:
For Finland:
For France:
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
For Iceland:
For India:
For Ireland:
For Israel:
For Italy:
For Japan:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For Mexico:
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
For New Zealand:
For Nigeria:
For the Kingdom of Norway:
For Peru:
For the Republic of the Philippines:
For Portugal:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Sierra Leone:
For the Republic of South Africa:
For Southern Rhodesia:
For Spain:
For Sweden:
For Switzerland:

F. SCHNYDER,
April 4, 1966.

For Tunisia:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Arab Republic:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
For the United States of America:

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
April 4, 1966.

For the Vatican City State:
For Venezuela:
For Western Samoa:

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, although I know we are in executive session, I should like to ask the Chair as to the disposition of the resolution just voted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is automatically referred, under the point of order, to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this protocol, the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee. It is merely a 1-year extension of the wheat agreement which just came in force in 1949 and has since been revised and extended.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] who is an authority on this agreement, is a member of the committee. There is no controversy about it. I do not believe there is any point in delaying the Senate with any further explanation of the protocol. The report has been filed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that I do not feel that the extension of this agreement is in the interests of the U.S. wheat grower; but, in view of the actions now being taken in Geneva and the Kennedy round, I feel that it should be extended for another year.

For that reason, I supported it in committee, and I support it now on the floor of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by John A. Schnittker, Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to Mr. J. M. Stuurman, Chairman of the International Wheat Council, in London, England, on February 11, 1966.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Mr. J. M. STUURMAN,
Chairman,
International Wheat Council,
Haymarket House, Haymarket,
London S.W. 1, England

Attention: Mr. R. E. Moore, Executive Secretary.

DEAR MR. STUURMAN: This is to inform you that the United States of America will not request further consideration by the International Wheat Council of the recommendation to extend the International Wheat Agreement until July 31, 1967.

Acceptance of the recommendation to prolong the current Agreement for one more year does not mean, however, that the United States is satisfied with the IWA as it presently functions. The present Agreement concerns itself essentially with wheat pricing.

The United States is actively striving to achieve a meaningful and effective international arrangement for grains, including wheat. The principal objectives of this arrangement should be:

(a) To provide for acceptable conditions of access in major world markets in furtherance of a significant development and expansion of world trade in cereals.

(b) To establish an equitable arrangement whereby importers and exporters would share the responsibilities of adjusting world cereals supplies to demand, including food aid.

The United States would insist that any international grains agreement must contain provisions to accomplish these objectives. Without such provisions the agreement would not serve the long-term interests of either exporters or importers, including the developing nations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the report pertinent to this legislation now before the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from April 4 until and including April 29, 1966 (Ex. F. 89th Cong., 2d sess.), having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the Senate gives its advice and consent to ratification.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the protocol is to extend the International Wheat Agreement for one year beyond July 31, 1966, and thereby preserve the status quo pending negotiations for a new and broader agreement as well as a grains arrangement with the European Common Market. The protocol makes no other change in the agreement.

BACKGROUND AND COMMITTEE ACTION

The International Wheat Agreement first came into force in 1949. It was revised and extended in 1953, 1956, 1959, 1962, and 1965.

The agreement establishes a basic price range of \$1.62½ to \$2.02½ for No. 1 Manitoba northern wheat in bulk in store Fort William/Port Arthur. Importing countries agreed to buy specified quantities of wheat at not less than the minimum price, and exporting countries agree to sell specified quantities at not more than the maximum price.

The agreement has generally worked well, but has become outdated. The provisions of a new agreement, however, must obviously be related to the outcome of the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations and to the agricultural policies of the European Common Market.

The pending protocol to extend the agreement for one year was sent to the Senate by the President May 23. The Foreign Relations Committee held a public hearing on the matter June 12 and subsequently in executive session ordered the protocol favorably reported to the Senate. The transcript of this hearing, at which Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker appeared on behalf of the administration, is appended to this report.

The committee urges the Senate to act promptly, because the U.S. instrument of ratification of the protocol must be deposited no later than June 15 if it is to be effective.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. If there be no objection, the Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session, will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the respective resolutions of ratification.

The resolution of ratification of Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session, the protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, will now be read.

The resolution of ratification to Executive F was read by Hon. Emery L. Frazier, Secretary of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol for the Further Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from April 4 until and including April 29, 1966 (Ex. F, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted: yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 138 Exec.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Dodd
Gruening
Javits
McGee
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Harris in the chair). Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this resolution of ratification.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8337) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15860) to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States;

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia, in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Incorporated, on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the majority leader?

We are waiting for a report from the minority side, but the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is here. I seek unanimous consent for a meeting of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. I assure the Senator that the Republicans on the subcommittee thought that we ought to meet to get it out of the way.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I wonder if my able friend will withhold making that request? I shall see if it is possible for the minority to agree to the request.

Mr. **KUCHEL** subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks a most informative article appearing in the July 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "What's 'CIA'?"

This interview with Adm. William F. Raborn, retiring head of CIA, is most informative, especially as to the scope of CIA's operations and how it is directed, supervised, and controlled by the President of the United States, various agencies of the executive department of the

Government, as well as the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 18, 1966]

WHAT'S "CIA"?—INTERVIEW WITH ADM. WILLIAM F. RABORN, RETIRING HEAD OF AMERICA'S MOST SECRET AGENCY

(NOTE.—Once more, the Central Intelligence Agency—CIA—finds itself a center of controversy.

(Congress is studying a proposal to broaden its control and surveillance of the wide-ranging intelligence organizations.

(Now questions are raised. Just what is CIA? What does it really do—and not do? Does anybody know all its secrets, control its activities?

(In this exclusive interview, the man who headed Central Intelligence this past year takes readers of "U.S. News & World Report" behind the scenes of CIA, describes its workings in detail.)

Question. Admiral Raborn, what is the specific charter of the Central Intelligence Agency within the intelligence community?

Answer. The National Security Act assigned five functions to the Agency:

To advise the National Security Council—and of course the President—on intelligence matters relating to national security;

To co-ordinate all foreign-intelligence activities of our Government;

To produce and disseminate finished national intelligence within the Government;

To undertake what we call "services of common concern"—that is, functions which serve all the components of the intelligence community and can best be undertaken centrally;

And finally, to perform such other services as the National Security Council may direct.

That is as specific as the Congress wanted to be. That fifth assignment is the Agency's charter for clandestine activities, and you will notice it puts CIA directly under the control of the President's National Security Council.

Question. The emphasis appears to be on information gathering. Wouldn't it be more palatable and just as accurate to call it the "Central Information Agency"?

Answer. Our principal responsibility is to gather, specifically, that information which relates directly to national-security problems and objectives. The United States Information Agency deals with information in the broader sense of the term, and distributes it outside the Government. It is useful both to their operations and to ours to preserve this distinction.

There is a further point in our professional terminology: "Intelligence," as we use the term, refers to information which has been carefully evaluated as to its accuracy and significance. The difference between "information" and "intelligence" is the important process of evaluating the accuracy and assessing the significance in terms of national security.

Question. You just referred to "finished national intelligence." What is that in your terminology?

Answer. When a raw report has been checked for accuracy, and analyzed and integrated with all other available information on the same subject by competent experts in that particular field, we call it "finished intelligence." When, in addition, it represents the conclusions of the entire intelligence community, then it is "national intelligence." In short, we find that we need a terminology which can be more precise and more limiting than the broad concept of "information."

Question. People seem to have the impression that the CIA is a big spying organization—that it is staffed almost entirely by spies. Is there anything to that impression?

Answer. This, of course, is the popular view of any intelligence organization, but it is highly distorted. Our job is to keep the top officials of the U.S. Government informed of what is happening around the world that may affect the national security of the United States.

Of course, much of the world's area and population is under a closed society, run by governments that seek to conceal their activities and their objectives. They may be hostile to us, and some classical espionage is required to give timely warning of when and how these activities and objectives might threaten us. But, to maintain proper perspective, let me point out that a great deal of the raw information is public, or available with a certain amount of digging.

The principal role of an intelligence organization is to take what is overt and what is secret and bring expert knowledge, background information, and scholarly analysis to bear in a way which has nothing in common with the heroes of modern spy fiction.

Question. Could you give us the proportions between the analysts at home and the men in the field overseas who are collecting this information?

Answer. We don't publish these figures, or even rough proportions, because the information would be of great use to the opposition, but I can tell you this much: The man who joins CIA has far less chance, in the course of his career, of identifying with James Bond or "The Spy Who Came in From the Cold" than he does of serving as an academic researcher, economist, scientist, statistician, administrator, accountant, or supply officer.

Question. Another idea is that the CIA is stirring up insurrections, or starting and maybe running little wars—

Answer. This again is a misconception. Our major business is national intelligence, and so-called covert operations are a relatively minor part of our over-all activities. The Government, after all, is organized on a pretty logical basis: The Department of State is in charge of foreign policy and foreign relations; running wars would be the business of the Defense Department; CIA has enough to do getting, coordinating, and disseminating intelligence without running any wars.

Question. The National Security Act of 1947 envisages a field of clandestine activities, however, where the CIA will play a role which cannot be undertaken by State, or Defense, or other overt agencies of the United States Government. Do you have a free hand there?

Answer. Absolutely not. Any such activities are by direction of the National Security Council. To be precise, they must have the prior approval—in detail—of a committee of the NSC on which top-ranking representatives of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense meet with the Director of Central Intelligence for this purpose. These gentlemen see to it not only that every activity of the CIA is completely in consonance with the established policies and objectives of the United States, but that it is also advantageous to the United States.

Question. With that approval, are you free to operate as you wish in the field? Would the U.S. ambassador in the country concerned know about your activities there?

Answer. Like other U.S. officials abroad, CIA's overseas personnel are subordinate to the U.S. ambassadors. We are certainly not in competition with other U.S. representation abroad—we complement and supplement the "country team" approach of the embassy to official U.S. activities. We operate with the foreknowledge and approval of the ambassador.

Question. But some of our ambassadors have denied any prior knowledge of activities which are known to be, or at least suspected of being, CIA operations—

Answer. Conceivably there might be an instance where the Department of State in Washington would have reasons for not informing the ambassador. Normal policy is to have him informed.

Question. Does the ambassador receive your intelligence in the field, or does he have to get it from Washington?

Answer. It is made available in the field to the ambassador and designated members of his staff. If the ambassador wishes, he also gets the ultimate finished evaluation from headquarters, along with intelligence on other countries which may be of interest to him. The Department of State may also send to its embassies and legations the finished intelligence reports prepared by CIA.

Question. You and your predecessors have stated, as have the President and Secretary Rusk, that CIA does not make policy, but the accusation persists. Could this be because your information contributes to policy decisions?

Answer. To maintain that record, let me say again flatly that CIA does not make policy, and does not operate outside or contrary to established policy. Now, certainly nobody would expect the top officials of a government to make their decisions without considering all available information. It is the mission of CIA to provide the most accurate, the most comprehensive, and the most objective information available about matters which interest our Government, together with whatever we can learn or project about possible impending developments. In specific answer to your question, put the emphasis on "objective" information.

Question. But this information does play a part in the decisions of Government—

Answer. The top officials of the Administration, and for that matter, the legislators, obviously find it useful, because there is a constant increase in the demand for our current intelligence and our projective estimates. Let me point out that there is one unique contribution the CIA makes to Government officials facing a choice between alternative possible courses of action. Precisely because the CIA does not commit itself to any one choice among the alternatives, our intelligence input is free from partisanship or advocacy, and recognized by the recipients as objective.

Question. Isn't it true that much of the information you gather isn't really secret at all, but would be available to anybody in the right spot at the right time?

Answer. Yes. In fact, a considerable part of the information used by the Agency in preparing its finished intelligence reports is derived from the foreign press and radio, from technical journals of foreign countries, and from official publications of these countries. We don't disregard information simply because it is not secret. Finished intelligence, however, consists of the expert correlation and interpretation of all the information we can obtain, by both overt and clandestine means.

CIA'S BROAD INTERESTS

Question. Do you gather information about domestic events in foreign countries, as well as the operations of foreign governments?

Answer. Our interests and responsibilities may vary from country to country, but they are pretty comprehensive. It is obviously impossible to confine yourself to a nation's foreign affairs if you are responsible, for instance, for assessing the stability of the regime, the health of the economy, or the prospects for subversion in the boondocks.

Question. Do you collect information of a business nature?

Answer. We collect economic information which may be useful to the security interests of the U.S. Government—and we collect it exclusively for that purpose.

Question. Do you have to cover every corner of the whole world?

Answer. Of course we have priorities, but our intelligence requirements are worldwide. Our top Administration officials need factual and unbiased intelligence on a timely basis as one of the many elements which go into the decisions they have to make. At a minimum, we have to have certain basic information on hand about virtually every country in the world. Country X—you name it—might appear remote and totally unrelated to our national security, but it is nevertheless impossible to state with certainty that detailed information about country X will not become necessary to our Government on a crash basis some day.

Question. How detailed?

Answer. The basic information on foreign countries which is compiled in what we call the National Intelligence Surveys already adds up to more than 10 times the size of "The Encyclopaedia Britannica." Much of this information, of course, is hardly secret. It has to cover such prosaic matters as economic statistics, legal codes, sociological conditions and transport facilities, but it comes in handy when our customers start playing "20 Questions."

Question. At what point do you feel that this type of information—the basic data, the information which is open to the public—should be reported back on a running basis to our Government—as fast as you get it?

Answer. This goes back to the distinction between information and intelligence—and the needs of our Government. If everything is quiet, there may be an occasional situation report based largely on open information. If the situation has a direct relation to U.S. national-security interests, particularly in a crisis, we will be trying to get as close to "real time" reporting as modern communications permit.

Question. Is the information which you collect interpreted by somebody on the scene, or does it reach you in raw form so that you can sort out the facts from the opinions?

Answer. We require the original report, or the original statement of the primary source, whenever we can get it. When this "raw material" reaches us, it may be accompanied by the opinions and interpretations of intermediaries through whom the information has passed, and by the informed comment and preliminary evaluation of our own collectors in the field, but these additions are clearly labeled as such.

Question. How do you co-operate in the field with the other elements of your intelligence community? Aren't CIA and State and the military-intelligence people all looking for much the same information?

Answer. Our finished national intelligence derives from the work of all of the elements of the intelligence community. Foreign Service officers provide the Department of State with political intelligence, commercial attachés are responsible for economic information, the military attachés send military intelligence to their respective services, and, for that matter, there are agricultural attachés and labor attachés. All of them provide departmental intelligence for the specific needs of specific departments. All of these reports are also available to CIA.

The Agency has been added to supplement and expand the collection and fill any gaps. It has a broader charter for all types of intelligence necessary in the national interest, and—as I mentioned at the outset—the added statutory responsibility to "correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for . . . appropriate dissemination."

For example, a piece of political intelligence from one country and the Army attaché's report from another country may add up to a conclusion of major significance to the National Security Council, or specifically to the Atomic Energy Commission. It is CIA's responsibility to see to it that the two halves do get added up in Washington to make the whole, and furthermore that the finished evaluation reaches the department which needs it.

CONTROLS ON INTELLIGENCE

Question. But how do you avoid duplication of effort in the field?

Answer. The United States Intelligence Board, which represents the entire intelligence community, establishes guidelines and priorities for the intelligence-collection effort. This machinery can control unnecessary duplication, but when you are after the closely guarded information that affects our national interest, duplication of effort is often desirable rather than unnecessary.

Question. Are the State and military-intelligence people operating under handicaps, in comparison to CIA, in obtaining information?

Answer. You have to take into consideration, firstly, that the collection of intelligence is not the primary responsibility of the Department of State and the Department of Defense, and, secondly, that the representatives they send abroad must operate in the open as recognized officials of the U.S. Government. In effect, CIA often is in better postion to obtain necessary intelligence because CIA is specifically organized for this kind of collection and can give it first priority.

If, by handicaps, you mean the obstacles which foreign governments place in the way of intelligence collection, foreign governments make every effort to preserve their essential secrets, just as we do. Year by year, security procedures become more sophisticated and harder to circumvent, so that skill and specialization are even more necessary. On the other side of the coin, there are few, if any, countries in the world today which are as much of an "open society" as the United States.

Question. What about co-operation with the intelligence services of friendly countries? If we collect information which is important to one of our allies, is it passed to them?

Answer. I am not at liberty to go into detail, but wherever it is of mutual interest and advantage, there is substantial co-operation among the intelligence services of friendly countries.

Question. Does machinery exist to correlate all of the information that flows into Washington, and refine it into firm and useful conclusions?

Answer. Yes—specifically, the United States Intelligence Board, or USIB, which advises and assists the Director of Central Intelligence and is under his chairmanship. This Board meets every week, or more often if necessary, to co-ordinate the work of all of the intelligence components of the U.S. Government. It consists of the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, who represents CIA so that the Director, as USIB chairman, will be uncommitted; the Director of Intelligence and Research, Department of State; the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency; the Director of the National Security Agency; an Assistant Director of the FBI; and the Assistant General Manager for Administration of the Atomic Energy Commission. The heads of Army, Navy and Air Force intelligence meet with the Board as observers.

USIB assigns intelligence priorities to see to it that there are no gaps in our coverage, and insures that the judgments which go forward to the President are finished national intelligence.

This job of correlation and co-ordination, however, starts long before the product reaches USIB for final review. More and more, as we develop and refine the concept of an intelligence community, the analysts and the specialists in one component are in constant touch and interchange with their opposite numbers in the other departments and agencies, so that the national-intelligence process begins as soon as the raw information reaches Washington, if not before.

As for moving from the raw information to a firm and agreed conclusion, in many instances this can be done by the expert analysts available, backed up by our storehouse of background knowledge. There will always, of course, be the "unknowables"—questions which have no definitive answers, possibly because the future is open to the effects of many variables, or because the future depends on decisions which certain foreign statesmen may not even have made yet. Who will succeed the Premier of country X? When and by whom will there be a coup in country Y?

Our Government leaders need and request our best answers on the "unknowables." This we do in our National Intelligence Estimates. From what we do know, the best thinking available in the entire intelligence community makes rational inferences about the unknown—with varying but specified degrees of confidence, and an occasional footnote reflecting an individual dissent from the agreed opinion.

Question. How many of these estimates do you produce?

Answer. It varies with the need. The Estimate is not a global periodical, on a weekly or daily basis; it addresses itself to the probable course of one development, or one country. Many of the Estimates come out with a scheduled frequency—annually, for instance, if necessary. Some are produced in times of crisis in a matter of hours. All are geared to the intelligence needs of the top Government officials. All reflect the greatest possible professional skill and dispassionate objectivity we can bring to bear. CIA has no ax to grind, and does not permit itself to become advocate of a specific policy in preparing an Estimate.

All aspects of every Estimate get the fullest consideration, by the interagency working groups which begin the drafting, by the Board of National Estimates—a group of distinguished senior officers of long experience and proven competence in diverse fields of Government—and by the United States Intelligence Board. In the end, the National Intelligence Estimate is the report of the Director of Central Intelligence to the President and the National Security Council.

Question. Can this machinery operate fast enough to permit quick action when the flow of information suggests impending danger or trouble?

Answer. The process is extremely flexible. Conceivably, when the schedule permits, the draft of an annual Estimate might start two or three months before the target date, to permit comprehensive and deliberate consultation, reference to the field, and so forth.

On the other hand, the Board of National Estimates when required can complete what we call a "SNIE"—a Special National Intelligence Estimate—in a matter of hours, as I said.

As for immediate intelligence on current developments, we are geared to receive information, evaluate it, produce intelligence and react 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Nobody in the Agency, from the analysts to the Director, is guaranteed a night's uninterrupted sleep, or an unbroken week-end.

WORKING WITH THE FBI

Question. As we understand it, the Central Intelligence Agency does not run clandestine operations of any kind within the United States. Is that left entirely to the FBI?

Answer. The CIA has the responsibility for conducting operations outside the country; the FBI has as its principal mission the internal security of the United States and its possessions.

There is, of course, close co-operation and considerable interplay between our organizations, because we are combatting an international conspiracy whose operations and agents move back and forth between this country and foreign nations. The FBI and CIA therefore work very closely together and keep each other intimately informed on items of potential interest or concern to each other. This allows us to combat international conspiracy in the most effective possible manner.

The division of responsibility for clandestine operations, of course, should not be confused with the perfectly overt contacts CIA has domestically—for example, with experts in the profesional world to discuss international situations and exchange analyses.

Question. Do you work largely in a vacuum, with little or no contact with the rest of the Government outside the intelligence community?

Answer. By no means. It is inherent in the concept of a Central Intelligence Agency that any branch of the Government which has a legitimate need for information can call on us for it. By the same token, when we need expertise to help us in evaluation, or in the accomplishment of any of our missions, we will not hesitate to go anywhere in the Government or outside it, within the limitations of security, where we might expect to find the necessary help. But our closest ties, of course, are within the intelligence community, and to the top officials of the executive branch.

Question. What form do your intelligence reports take?

Answer. We disseminate finished intelligence in an infinite variety of formats, tailored to specific purposes. I reported frequently in person, of course, to the President and to the National Security Council. I have mentioned the Estimates, and our "55-foot shelf" of basic background information.

In addition, we have daily, weekly and monthly publications, some global in scope, some for a specific country or crisis. When the situation is truly critical, I have on occasion ordered situation reports as often as every hour on the hour, around the clock. Then there are individual memoranda which give us great flexibility in scope, format, deadlines and distribution. And we also turn out studies in depth which are the equivalent of a scholarly book or a doctoral dissertation. Various publications have dissemination lists, depending on their sensitivity and purpose, which range from less than half a dozen copies to hundreds.

Question. What is the "ancestry" of the CIA in U.S. intelligence activities? Does it operate differently from its predecessors?

Answer. The Agency grew from the need to establish a centralized and objective intelligence organization in peacetime. A primary impetus, of course, was the experience of Pearl Harbor, and the determination to insure against such surprises in the future.

The requirement for a centralized organization stemmed from the successful experience during World War II of the Office of Strategic Services under General Donovan. The requirement was made all the more real by the threat posed by an evangelistic international Communism which became readily apparent shortly after the close of World War II. There was general agreement within the Government that there was need for a nonpartisan co-ordinating agency in the intelligence field. As a result, the CIA was created in 1947.

In some respects the Office of Strategic Services of World War II was our ancestor, but it did not have CIA's responsibility for co-ordinating the work of the entire intelligence community, or our requirement for across-the-board coverage.

Question. Does CIA have anything that might be called regulations to govern its activities? Who prescribes them?

Answer. Is there a Government agency nearly 20 years old that doesn't have a rule book? Start with the original legislation, which spells out the mission of CIA and provides that we function at the behest and under the control of the President and the NSC. Under that charter, CIA is governed by several layers of regulations known as the "Nonskids," or National Security Council Intelligence Directives; the DCID's, or Director of Central Intelligence Directives, issued by the Director in his capacity as chairman of USIB, and head of the intelligence community; and finally, as in the case of any other governmental component, CIA's own Agency regulations.

HELP FROM "BEST BRAINS"

Question. Do you have any counsel or advisers outside the Government?

Answer. We have several panels of technical experts, both inside and outside the Government, to keep us informed on new developments and techniques which could be of us to us. On these panels are the best brains in this country, on virtually the entire range of human endeavor. We contract for studies and research projects, wherever in the United States these can best be performed.

CIA has long made it a practice to discuss its evaluations of the international situation with top men in the civilian world. We have done a great deal of this, but we must do still more. One of my last acts with the Agency, for instance, was to order even greater interchange with the nongovernmental experts on China.

Question. Have you found that the sporadic criticism, along the lines that spying is a devious business and that CIA operates without any control, has made people reluctant to work with you?

Answer. I have found no measurable reluctance on these grounds, although there is always the more general concern of the academic world that governmental funds and governmental projects must not be accompanied by unwelcome controls or commitments. On the whole, patriotic citizens in all walks of life are glad to work with us in serving the national-security interest. The intelligence community finds this very gratifying, because it helps us give the President, the executive branch, and the legislative branch the very best judgments that the best minds in this country can arrive at.

"UNDER FULL SCRUTINY"

Question. Is there any other Administration control of your operations besides the special National Security Council committee you mentioned?

Answer. The CIA and its activities have been reviewed in detail in the past by Hoover Commission task forces, the Doolittle Committee, the Clark Committee, and several special investigating bodies for specific purposes. On a permanent basis, the entire intelligence community is under continuing and full scrutiny by a most knowledgeable and distinguished board of private citizens appointed by the President. This is the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, first established in January of 1956 as the Killian Committee, and now under the chairmanship of Mr. Clark Clifford. The present membership includes Dr. William O. Baker of Bell Telephone Laboratories; Mr. Gordon Gray, former Special Assistant to President Eisenhower and onetime president of North Carolina University; Prof. William Langer of Harvard; Gen. Maxwell Taylor; Ambassador Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State; Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., former Secretary of the Army and former Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Dr. Edwin Land, head of the Polaroid Corporation; Adm. John Sides, USN (ret.); and Mr. Augustus Long, formerly the top executive of the Texas Company.

This Board meets in full session about every six weeks, to examine in depth and detail the work and the progress of the entire U.S. intelligence program. The meetings last two or three days and include comprehensive discussions with the Director and his senior officers, heads of other intelligence components, and senior officials of the Government who are our "customers."

Upon completion of each such session, the Board reports to the President and makes recommendations for the improvement of the intelligence effort. In addition, the Board has a number of two-man or three-man panels and subcommittees to delve more deeply and on a full-time basis into specific aspects and categories of intelligence work.

Question. What about control of your funds?

Answer. The Central Intelligence Agency budget is reviewed fully by the Bureau of the Budget, which requires the same assurances and justifications for expenditures by intelligence agencies that it requires from any other part of our Government. We are not immune from detailed examination of our requests by the Bureau, nor are we exempt from its skillful pruning knife.

We have to go to Congress for our funds, just like other agencies. The only difference is that, after our requests have been approved by certain special congressional subcommittees, the specific appropriations are then lumped in for passage with other appropriations, to deny hostile intelligence services information about our activities which would be very useful to them. We have meticulous auditing procedures to insure the tightest possible control over the expenditure of funds entrusted to the CIA.

Question. In light of the recurring arguments about a so-called "watchdog committee" for CIA, how much information does Congress actually get—not your intelligence reports, that is, but information about your activities, your budget, and so on?

Answer. Ever since CIA was first established, the Director has been authorized and in fact directed to make complete disclosure of CIA activities to special subcommittees in both the Senate and House.

In the House, the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee each have a special subcommittee for this purpose.

In the Senate, there are corresponding subcommittees which usually meet jointly.

In addition, the Director reports regularly to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on intelligence matters in that field.

Now, when I say "complete disclosure," I mean complete—and frequent. The CIA is completely responsive to their questions, no matter how sensitive. I have discussed matters with these special subcommittees which are so sensitive that only a small percentage of the personnel in CIA have access to them. And in case there is any suggestion that these meetings are sporadic and casual: In my first 12 weeks as Director I found that I was called to 17 meetings with these congressional committees. Our legislative log for the year 1965 shows that the Director or his senior aides met a total of 34 times with the four special subcommittees.

Question. Are they the only Congressmen who receive information from CIA? Intelligence, that is, as opposed to operational matters?

Answer. No, there were also 19 other committee hearings in 1965, for instance, to obtain substantive intelligence from CIA—and some of these hearings ran as long as three full days to cover the intelligence appreciation of the global situation. We also frequently brief individual members of Congress.

Let me make this distinction clear: I had authority to brief any congressional committee having a jurisdictional interest on substantive global intelligence. But discussion of CIA activities, methods, and sources is another matter. Public Law 80–253 of 1947—that's the National Security Act—makes the Director of Central Intelligence exclusively responsible for protecting the security of the sources and methods of the entire intelligence community. I was authorized by the President and by National Security Council directives to discuss such matters only with the special subcommittees designated for this purpose, not with any others.

PROTECTING CIA AGENTS

Question. What is the reason for this limitation?

Answer. It is not arbitrary or bureaucratic—we are safeguarding the lives of trusted agents and our own staff people all over the world who contribute to our Government's intelligence objectives.

We owe it to them to take every precaution to protect them—and we owe it to our Government to deny hostile intelligence services even indirect hints or the slightest clues which might enable them to take steps to blunt our intelligence operations, methods and sources.

Question. Do you mean it is a question of security leaks?

Answer. I prefer to say inadvertent disclosure. Even a professional intelligence officer has to be alert to draw the line between information which helps to evaluate or authenticate a piece of raw intelligence, and information which might point to the source or the method we used to obtain it. The more people who have both types of information, the more you multiply the chance that somebody will overstep that line by accident.

Question. How damaging can such disclosures be?

Answer. Well, the minute you even hint that you have information the other fellow has been trying to keep secret, it is one of the first principles of the art that he will do everything possible to locate and destroy your source, or disrupt your method of operation. If the opposition is given any clues to help pinpoint the source, the counterintelligence job is that much easier.

INFORMATION FOR CONGRESS

Question. Have the special CIA subcommittees in Congress expressed any dissatisfaction over the years that they were not getting enough information?

Answer. We have never withheld any information, substantive or operational, from the four special subcommittees. On some occasions, in fact, they have asked us not to give them the identities of very sensitive sources, because they did not wish to know, and we have complied. If you refer to dissatisfaction with the amount of information which we have—rather than the amount we give them—no professional intelligence operation anywhere in the world is ever satisfied with the extent of its knowledge, and these gentlemen have been working with us long enough so that they have probably acquired this same professional dissatisfaction.

Question. What about the effect of the criticism on your own personnel?

Answer. I think it is an eloquent testimonial to the dedication of the people in CIA that the criticism has not affected their morale. Bear in mind that, by our rules, they cannot answer, deny, or refute the adverse comment, even when it is patently and sometimes viciously false. Add to that the grave responsibilities for the nation's security, the pressure, the anonymity of achievement, and the constant need for security alertness—it is a source of pride, and nothing short of amazement, that we keep our people, and keep getting more good ones.

I asked recently for some statistics on how long our personnel had been with us. The answers showed that more than a quarter of our professional personnel—as differentiated from the clerical—had been with CIA more than 15 years, and that an astounding 77 per cent had 10 years or more of intelligence experience. About 15 per cent have graduate degrees; 5 per cent have the doctorate.

When you consider only the analysts who have the direct responsibility in headquarters for analysis of a foreign area, six out of 10 of them had lived, worked or traveled abroad even before they came to CIA. When you combine all the years required for graduate study, foreign experience, and then 10 to 15 years of intelligence work, it adds up to an impressive depth of knowledge, competence and expertise at the service of the nation.

I have been careful to stick to percentages, but in actual numbers, we could easily and adequately staff the faculty of a university with our experts. In a way, we do. Many of those who leave us join the faculties of universities and colleges. Some of our personnel take leaves of absence to teach, and renew their contacts with the academic world. I suppose this is only fair; our energetic recruiting effort not only looks for the best young graduate students we can find, but also picks up a few professors from time to time.

Question. What about the criticism that the CIA uses "dishonorable" methods? Do you operate on the principle that the CIA, as a participant in the cold war, is justified in adopting any measures that may be used by the opposing governments—"fighting fire with fire"?

Answer. Let's be quite clear in our minds that an adversary does not go by the Marquis of Queensberry rules. It is a rough fight, and the CIA may have to be clandestine from time to time, but I emphatically reject the word "dishonorable."

The men and women in CIA are, after all, Americans with the same ideals, the same ethics, the same moral codes as the rest of the nation. I have with me a copy of a remark Secretary Rusk made to a press conference last winter, which I would like to read into your record if I may:

"I would emphasize to you that CIA is not engaged in activities not known to the senior policy officers of the Government. But you should also bear in mind that beneath the level of public discussion, there is a tough struggle going on in the back alleys all over the world. It's a tough one, it's unpleasant, and no one likes it, but that is not a field which can be left entirely to the other side. And so, once in a while, some disagreeable things happen, and I can tell you that there is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom."

And President Johnson, when he swore me in as Director of Central Intelligence on April 28, 1965, put it this way:

"We have committed our lives, our property, our resources and our sacred honor to the freedom and peace of other men, indeed, to the freedom and peace of all mankind. We would dishonor that commitment, we would disgrace all the sacrifices Americans have made, if we were not every hour of every day vigilant against every threat to peace and freedom. That is why we have the Central Intelligence Agency."

Question. Just what are the duties of the Director of CIA?

Answer. The National Security Act of 1947 created the position of Director of Central Intelligence, or DCI, for short. The DCI is not only the Director of CIA—he is also first and foremost the principal adviser on foreign intelligence to the President and the National Security Council. And he is also chairman of the United States Intelligence Board, or USIB, which brings together the entire intelligence community.

Question. Now that you have just left the Central Intelligence Agency after more than 14 months as Director, what is your opinion of the Agency?

Answer. Excellent. It is the finest organization I have ever been associated with. The people at CIA are dedicated, loyal and highly capable. I found the Agency well up to its exacting requirements as our first line of national defense.

AFTER DOMINICAN CRISIS

Question. Why are you leaving now?

Answer. When President Johnson called me out of retirement from Government service, I asked him first how long I would be needed. He told me I could serve six months, or a year, or as long as he was in office, or until I was satisfied with certain administrative tasks, including, in particular, long-range planning.

I'm taking the fourth option, but I also came close to the one-year hitch. Actually, the President had had my resignation in hand for about three weeks when he announced it. I came in with the Dominican crisis; and you might say it behooved me to stay until peaceful elections brought a duly constituted Government into being.

Question. Admiral Raborn, what are you going to do now?

Answer. I plan to take a short rest and then return to American industry with the Aerojet-General Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request which has been cleared with the other side and with the chairman and with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12:15 tomorrow afternoon, when the agriculture appropriation bill becomes the pending business under order of the Senate, there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment, 30 minutes to be allotted to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Florida, and the other 30 minutes to be allotted to the proponent of the amendment, and that there be 1 hour allotted on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, July 15, 1966, at the hour of 12:15 p.m., during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

If any man walks in the day, he does not stumble because he sees the light of this world.—John 11: 9.

O God, our Father, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting and whose truth endureth forever, in all humility and reverence we bow in Thy presence offering unto Thee once again the devotion of our hearts. Amid all the traffic of our ways, turmoils without, within, make in our hearts a quiet place and come and dwell therein. Sure of Thy presence may we face the tasks of this day with a dauntless courage, a quiet faith and with a never failing good will.

In the struggle between light and darkness in our time may we walk in the light and live in the light that we and our Nation may continue to be the light of the world: in the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act.

THE 53D BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to notify the House of a very important occasion that takes place in our country today. In France they may be celebrating Bastille Day, but here we are celebrating GERRY FORD's birthday.

Born on July 14, 1913—the year, I do not need to remind you that the 16th amendment empowering Congress to levy and collect income taxes became law—GERRY is 53 years old today.

He is young and vigorous, and I am sure many of you recall the home run he hit a few years back at the annual congressional baseball game. And the responsibilities he has carried in the 89th Congress have not aged him so much that he could not do the same thing today.

GERRY is talented. He is respected. He is dedicated to good government. My only regret is that we do not have more troops on the Republican side of the aisle to help him celebrate his birthday this year. But the way he has conducted himself as minority leader during the past year and a half may very well correct the situation.

In fact, GERRY, I can think of nothing better to wish you as a birthday greeting than for you to have a whole battalion of new Republicans under your guidance in the 90th Congress.

Our friends on the other side understandably cannot join me in this hope. However, I am certain they will join all Republicans in wishing you a most happy birthday and a successful 53d year.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I certainly could not let this occasion pass without extending my own greetings and felicitations to the distinguished, beloved, and able minority leader on the occasion of his birthday. I desire also to say to the House that while GERRY has not always been in agreement with political policy on this side of the House, he has always been most cooperative with the majority leadership in processing the business of the House. I do not think that there has been one single disagreement during this entire session on any important procedural matter. This is as it should be. We are all interested in processing the business of the House. Of course, we differ on political issues.

Now, GERRY has done such a good job and has cooperated so well and has earned the accolades of his colleagues on the other side of the House so well that I think it would be in keeping with his performance that he should keep the same number of troops next year that he has had this year. Happy birthday, GERRY.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, all of us join in wishing you, GERRY, a very happy birthday.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, America lost Adlai Stevenson 1 year ago today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CURRENT STRIKE BY THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the current strike by the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines underscores the urgent need for the establishment of procedures to settle such disputes which paralyze our Nation's transportation and damage the economy.

It no longer suffices for Congressmen to wring their hands and extend their sympathies to the hundreds of thousands of people who have been seriously inconvenienced by this strike. It accomplishes little to assign culpability to the union or the airline companies. This will not reclaim the profits lost by the airlines or put lost paychecks back into the pockets of airline employees.

Trans World Airlines, one of the affected companies, is headquartered in my congressional district and has been forced to furlough 5,700 employees in the Kansas City area, a disastrous blow to the economy of that area. This involves the dilution of TWA's $3,600,000 payroll in the Kansas City area.

I have received a telegram from Mayor Ilus W. Davis of Kansas City, who states:

> The National Association of Machinists' strike against the five major airlines is substantially affecting the business and economy of the Greater Kansas City area. I know that you are concerned about this national emergency and I hope that you, in your legislative role and collectively with your colleagues, will take every possible action to bring this national crisis to an early and successful conclusion.
>
> In a separate communication, I have advised the President of the United States of my interest in this matter for I am convinced that this should be a concern of all levels and divisions of government. I want you to know that this office stands willing to be of assistance in resolving this serious labor dispute.

What is needed immediately is an end to the strike, followed by establishment of procedures to guarantee that such strikes, so injurious to the national interest, do not recur.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] concerning this uncalled for and unwarranted airline strike.

This is one of the most classic examples of irresponsibility I have ever witnessed in my 26 years in this Congress. The excuse that the papers write for calling this strike is that the leaders of this walkout do not like the profit that is made by the airlines. The President's panel recommended a 3.2 percent raise for these employees, but this was of no avail. Now the employees do not even want to go to the conference table.

This strike is costly to the military and it is costing us untold millions of dollars at a time when air service is critical, to say nothing of the millions of people who are cut off in their respective towns and hamlets across this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit on our hands much longer and fail to respond to the demands of the American people that this farce be called off so that this really tragic situation will cease to exist. Let the interested parties get together around the bargaining table, especially at this time when we are in the midst of a terrible war. If not, then the Congress—in the national interest—must act.

SOLDIER IS BEATEN AND ROBBED WHILE ONLOOKERS CHEER

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in last night's issue of the Evening Star, I read a very disturbing story, under a Chicago AP dateline, as follows:

> SOLDIER IS BEATEN AND ROBBED WHILE ONLOOKERS CHEER
>
> CHICAGO.—A soldier stationed in Chicago was beaten and robbed aboard a subway train yesterday while detectives said, 25 passengers cheered his assailant.
>
> The victim is Richard Bloomfield, 25, an Army specialist fourth class assigned to a nike base on the South Side. His home is in Portsmouth, Ohio.
>
> He was treated in a hospital where stitches were taken in a cut above his right eye.
>
> Two Chicago Transit Authority detectives, Charles Berglund and Joseph Ezerski, came into the subway car while Bloomfield was being assaulted.
>
> "We had to draw our guns on the whole crowd," Berglund said. "We had no choice. They were all chanting—cheering on the assailant."
>
> The detectives seizes James Person, 18, who was charged with robbery and battery.
>
> The soldier is white; Person is a Negro.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to make it a Federal offense to assault a man in uniform without justification. If we can have such a law applicable to those who assault civil rights workers, certainly we ought to have it available to men who wear the uniform of their country.

NEAT TIMING OF TWO RELEASES

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on two stories which appeared in our morning newspapers. I refer to the statement by the Solicitor General that the Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, was responsible for the illegal bugging of a hotel room in the city of Washington, and the release by the State Department of an attempt by two Czechoslovak diplomats to plant a listening device in the State Department.

Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the appearance of these two stories at the same time is totally coincidental. But I think it is more than passing strange that the two releases were so neatly timed. Indeed, I wonder whether the spy story would have appeared at this time if it had not been for the image-damaging aspects of the statement by the Solicitor General. It is common knowledge that Mr. Hoover is a master of the art of public relations. This is a valuable asset to any public figure. But I most seriously question the release of information, of potential consequence to our own intelligence and security operations, for the purpose of "blanketing" a negative story about Mr. Hoover.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the current airline strike has seriously affected individual plans and economic and other activity in the Nation and in my congressional district in Kansas City, Mo. One of the affected carriers, TWA, has headquarters there. Indeed, its payroll is one of the largest in the Fifth Missouri District. Consequently, I am eager to see the strike settled. As always in such a situation the emotions which are high on both sides bring more fog than light to the issues in dispute. The basic ingredient in the formula for industrial peace is determined good-faith bargaining on both sides. As a private citizen and public servant I urge this upon both parties.

A 12-MILE FISHING ZONE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I received a long distance telephone call from representatives of Pacific Northwest fishermen; they informed me that a Russian fishing fleet consisting of 119 vessels is now fishing around the Columbia River Lightship, which is 4½ miles off the mouth of the Columbia River.

Mr. Speaker, our fishermen have made great sacrifices and limited their fishing in order to try and conserve fishery resources. But, when a foreign fishing fleet comes in close to our shore all this sacrifice is in vain.

I am joining other Representatives in Congress from the Pacific Northwest and urging the President and our State Department to request the Soviet Union to withdraw this fishing fleet. Meanwhile, it becomes more and more evident that a 12-mile fishing zone such as would be established by legislation now before Congress is absolutely essential.

GREAT SOCIETY CATALOG OF CATALOGS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has become so fat with layers of confusing, conflicting bureaucracy, so entwined in repetitive red tape, and so involved in cross-purpose planning and programing between the Departments that the Congress has found it necessary to publish a "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments." Now, apparently, this congressional publication is inadequate in the omnipotent eyes of the Great Society planners and we find the Departments coming up with their individual versions of what the Federal "wish book" should be. So far I have discovered two and feel confident that if others are not already in existence they are now being conceived.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has published a "Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement." It covers all of the department and agency programs offered by the Federal Government. The Department of Commerce's pride was dented because OEO chose to advertise programs outside of its bailiwick and has countered with their own "Handbook of Federal Aid to Communities" including a section in their catalog on Sergent Shriver's poverty war.

Mr. Speaker, at this rate it will not be long before we will all need a Federal catalog to catalog the catalogs.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 15111.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business may sit during general debate during the week of July 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this request for an entire week been cleared with the minority Members?

Mr. ALBERT. The memorandum which was sent to me indicates it was cleared with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 163]

Baring
Bell
Blatnik
Casey
Celler
Clark
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
de la Garza
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Flynt
Fraser
Grider
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hathaway
Hays
Herlong
King, N.Y.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Morris
Murray
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Scott
Senner
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Trimble
Van Deerlin
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMEND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRACTICAL NURSES' LICENSING ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8337) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Virginia" insert ", and shall include those areas adjacent to the District of Columbia within a radius of thirty miles from the United States Capitol Building".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act—Public Law 86-708, effective as of July 29, 1961—so as to permit the licensing without any written examination of an applicant otherwise qualified to be a licensed practical nurse, who, for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this act, has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington Metropolitan area.

The bill as passed by the House defines the "Washington Metropolitan area" as "that area comprising the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md., the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, Va., and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Va."

The Senate amended this definition by adding the words "and shall include those areas adjacent to the District of Columbia within a radius of 30 miles from the U.S. Capitol Building."

The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia stated in its report that certain portions of nearby counties in Maryland and Virginia would not qualify under the House definition even though they are located geographically much closer than some portions of the immediately adjacent counties now included in the definition.

For this reason the committee was of the view that a radius mileage definition should be included as part of the definition in order to establish a more uniform geographical definition of "metropolitan area" for the purposes of this act.

This bill passed the House without objection, and the House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISH THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL AGENCY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15860) to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out "3(a)(1)" and insert "3(1)."

Page 7, line 5, after "necessary" insert ", but not to exceed $130,000 in any one fiscal year,".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15860 as amended is to create a fact-gathering-and-reporting agency to provide to any judicial officer as defined in the bill, in the District of Columbia reports containing verified information concerning any person about whom the judicial officer is to make a bail determination.

The Senate added two amendments. One is a technical amendment. The other would limit the sums authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill to "not to exceed $130,000 in any one fiscal year."

This limitation amply covers the estimated annual costs of operating the District of Columbia Bail Agency created by the act, as established by the testimony before the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

This bill passed the House without objection, and the Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 13290.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman indicate what the bill is.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. This is the highway safety bill, Mr. CRAMER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE SHOCKING, HEINOUS CRIME IN CHICAGO

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, this heinous crime that occurred in Chicago shocks all of us. Above all it highlights the fact that we do not know enough about the root causes for these horrible crimes to prevent their occurrence or apprehend the perpetrators.

Mr. Speaker, this crime highlights the desperate inadequacy of present Federal efforts to assist State and local law enforcement agencies to meet the problem of crimes of violence, a problem which, qualitatively and quantitatively defies our existing laws, the present state of our knowledge, and the resources we are applying to the problem of crime on our streets and in our homes.

The Federal Government is now spending about $23 billion a year in research. We are spending a billion dollars a year to support the National Institute of Health, alone. We are spending more in the National Institutes of Health program to study dental decay than the entire Federal effort in the study of the moral decay which produces these appalling and horrifying crimes.

Instead of spending somewhere between $13 million and $15 million a year in studying the causes and nature of crime on the streets of this country, and developing more effective measures of crime prevention and criminal law enforcement, we should be spending at least $100 million a year on this problem.

We must galvanize our efforts—our scientific knowledge—our best brains in the field of criminology, sociology, and the communications sciences, and bring these resources and talents to bear upon the problem of crime in our neighborhoods.

The cities and States cannot go it alone; none of them have the resources to make a meaningful attack on the problem. The effort that the Federal Government is making toward helping States and municipalities across the country is shockingly and shamefully inadequate, and this horrifying episode highlights that fact.

Mr. Speaker this is why I introduced a measure, H.R. 14416 to establish a National Institute of Crime Prevention and Detection, with an initial annual budget of $100 million. Such a definitive program would finally place the Federal Government forcefully and effectively behind the effort to harness existing scientific knowledge to crime prevention and law enforcement, and to direct major professional and research skills, organized on an interdisciplinary basis, to developing the knowledge we need to devise new tools, new methods and procedures, and new laws to bring tranquility and security to every American street and every American home.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 15750, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 101, ending on line 7, page 2 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 201(b), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this title, the President shall seek to encourage each recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development."

(b) Section 202(a), which relates to authorization for the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "$1,200,000,000" and all that follows down through "succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971".

(2) In the second proviso, strike out "June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, through June 30, 1971".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PURCELL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PURCELL: On page 2, immediately after line 12, insert the following:

"(a) Strike out the first sentence of section 201(b), which relates to general authority, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" '(b) The President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars upon such terms and conditions as the President may determine except that the length of such loans shall not exceed twenty-five years nor shall the grace period of such loans exceed five years. Such loans shall be utilized to promote economic development of less developed, friendly countries, and areas, with emphasis upon assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities.' "

And redesignate the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment deals with section 201(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act dealing with general authority under the Development Loan Fund. Specifically, it would limit the maximum terms for development loans to 25 years and the maximum grace period to 5 years. At the proper time I will offer a similar amendment to section 251(a) which would have the same effect on Alliance for Progress loans.

The existing law permits the President to make loans "payable as to principal and interest in U.S. dollars on such terms and conditions as he may determine." In actual practice, the Agency for International Development has extended loans on terms generally of 40 years' duration, with a 10-year grace period. The interest charged is 1 percent during the grace period and 2½ percent thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in this matter has greatly increased with the passage by the House of the food-for-freedom bill. This bill, as I explained in a letter to all Members of the House yesterday, ties the terms of dollar credit sales under Public Law 480 to section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Under title IV of Public Law 480, the terms since 1960 have been 20 years with a 2-year grace period. Over $1 billion in title IV sales have been made, often on terms harder than this. During the markup of the food-for-freedom bill, the Committee on Agriculture voted 21 to 12 to limit dollar-credit sales to this 20-year term with a 2-year grace period.

It was argued that this would discriminate against the farmer to require that his products be sold on a 20-year term while U.S. manufacturers are selling their products on 40-year terms under the current foreign aid program. So, on June 9, the House voted 193 to 165 to put Public Law 480 dollar-credit sales on the same terms as foreign aid.

I favor, and I think a number of my colleagues in the Agriculture Committee favor, a revision of all foreign aid terms—Public Law 480 and dollar foreign economic assistance—to a maximum of 25 years with a 5-year grace period.

This shorter grace period will be of real benefit to the U.S. balance of payments. I think this is a most important consideration in view of our many long-term commitments abroad, including Vietnam. At the same time, when we look at what other nations are doing in their economic assistance programs, these terms I propose are still very liberal. They provide a sufficient repayment period if there is any realistic prospect for repayment.

The argument most often used against more realistic repayment policies such as I am proposing is that of the growing debt burdens of the less developed countries. We should not, in our efforts to help other countries, forget our own debt burden. Our balance-of-payments problem is serious. We have had a deficit in every year since 1950 with the single exception of 1957. And this problem is showing little, if any, improvement.

As I explained in my letter of yesterday in some detail, what we are now doing is making it possible for the less developed countries to use the foreign exchange it earns to repay their existing hard-term debts, both public and private, to the European countries, Canada, Japan, and the World Bank. I believe it is not good policy for us to supply large amounts of extended credits while the other industrialized, capital-exporting countries are repaid on their hard credits.

This Nation is virtually alone in extending such long-term credits as 40 years with a 10-year grace period. In 1964, the United States made 98 percent of all loans of 40 years or more.

The weighted average maturity of loan commitments of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries, exclusive of the United States, in 1964 was about 17 years. The U.S. weighted average maturity was 33 years.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude that a 25-year term with a 5-year grace period is substantially more liberal than what the other developed nations of the world are presently extending. They are liberal enough if aid funds are being used efficiently and economically. The shorter grace period would assist our very serious balance-of-payments situation. Hopefully, these sounder terms would foster a greater sense of responsibility and urgency in the governments of the less developed countries concerning the utilization of foreign assistance. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman has presented an amendment or has indicated that he will do so. Would the gentleman clarify what the terms of the amendment are or would be? I understand there would be a 5-year grace period. What would be the interest rate beyond the 5-year period?

Mr. PURCELL. Three percent.

Mr. FINDLEY. Three percent interest. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I was about to make a reservation of objection, but I am not going to object to the present request. Time will be short today, and I think the House should proceed in regular order. If there are any further requests for time, I am going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman. As the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to say that we have carefully considered Public Law 480 since its inception, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for his amendment and express the hope that it will be adopted. It is a timely amendment, and one that is sorely needed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for indicating that he will offer an amendment as he indicated at the proper time. As the gentleman knows, the subject was a very important controversy when we considered the food-for-freedom program. I think it is a worthwhile and needed amendment.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank my colleague. In order that the House Members may understand, I have now offered an amendment. If it is necessary to do this totally, it will take another amendment. But I have now before the House an amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. While I certainly cannot but stand against the gentleman's amendment, the question nevertheless is not on the real interest yields themselves. The question is whether or not we want to help these people, whether or not we want to make these loans. The programs we had for many years were primarily on a grant basis. We have shifted from the grant basis onto dollar repayable loans.

The issue is whether or not we can make realistic repayment loans, as the gentleman said. The fact of the matter is that if realistic bankable loans could be made, and those loans could be applied for at the Export-Import Bank. There are financial institutions structured to make realistic loans where repayment capability is not the significant factor.

The problem is, why should we make a loan so difficult that it cannot be repaid? At that point, then we either have to extend the terms or move toward a position where the countries themselves cannot pay at all and they go into default.

The whole purpose of this is whether or not we can make loans that are loans that these countries can handle. While the gentleman's amendment is certainly worthwhile and motivated in the right direction, the fact of the matter is that we have a choice either to make these loans or to get back onto a grant basis.

The will of the House down through the years has been to get away from grants and to get onto loans. These loans are sufficiently flexible so that they can be tailored to a nations ability to repay. The question is whether the United States will try to make loans and adjust those terms to the future abilities of the countries to pay. For these reasons, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal of this amendment points out some of the difficulties which some people may want to approve of—the diversification of foreign policy among committees. I do not see any particular virtue of fixing a foreign policy by the Agricultural Committee, but it is their prerogative since that law happens to come under their jurisdiction. But it does point up the fact that the action of that committee puts it into competition with a good program operating under the foreign aid program. There is no logic in this, that because they seek to change that program, that a good program working under the foreign aid program ought to be changed. That logic is not necessarily correct.

As a matter of fact, all Development Loan Funds are repayable in dollars, and AID makes most of its loans on minimum terms set by Congress in 1964—1 percent during a 10-year grace period, and 2½ percent for the remaining 30 years. AID makes loans on harder terms to countries which are able to pay the costs. For example, to Israel we lent $4 million for development of its telephone system, with loan terms of 3½ percent for 20 years, with a 5-year grace period.

I do not see any virtue in removing the flexibility which exists under this program. Furthermore, last year at the request of this Congress, we made a study of the relation of loan-terms and debt burden on the development of countries. That was called the "Loan-Term, Debt Burden and Development" study. It documented the mounting foreign debt burden of many underdeveloped countries and concluded that hard term credit made it not only difficult for the United States to attain its objectives, but in the long run would be of greater cost to the United States in attaining the objectives and furthering programs for growth.

Further, by hardening the credit terms, it would be self-defeating, particularly in the case where we have had, since 1946, $32.8 billion in loans and have repayable on those loans $12.5 billion.

So, having shifted the emphasis from grants and putting it on terms which, yes, are soft, but on which repayment has been good, and having achieved our objectives at the best net cost to the United States, I see no logic in saying that just because some members of the Agriculture Committee thinks this is good for the food for peace program, it ought to be good for the Development Loan Fund.

I submit, under the evidence we have, the amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. I believe the gentleman misunderstood what my statement at least intended.

The Committee on Agriculture became interested in this problem because of its connection—and I believe perfectly logically—with the Public Law 480 program. At one time the Committee on Agriculture did vote to put in a 20-year limitation for the Public Law 480 program. That action was reversed by the House, and the present language in the food-for-freedom program or bill sets the terms for that program to be exactly whatever the foreign aid terms are.

I realize it is not always a compliment to be on the House Committee on Agriculture, but I do not believe it prohibits me from a license to come before this body and to ask that this body consider the ideas of those of us who have gone into some detail in regard to our foreign aid program as it is connected with food.

Mr. FASCELL. I certainly meant not to cast any reflection either on the gentleman or on the committee. I know he and they are sincere, dedicated, and knowledgeable.

Certainly we have a right to consider the proposal, as was done in the original food-for-peace program. We do have, from a practical standpoint, some division with respect to the setting of foreign policy in the two programs; one, Public Law 480, in the Committee on Agriculture, and the other in our committee.

I believe the House wisely settled that policy by trying to put the two together and leaving the policy questions fundamentally with the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PURCELL. I have no argument with that in any way. I merely wish to convince those who are on the Foreign Affairs Committee that we on the Committee on Agriculture are not arguing about jurisdiction.

I am for the bill. I have been for every foreign aid bill which has come up since I have been in the Congress. I intend to vote for this bill, whether it does or does not include this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to his purpose.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do so reluctantly, because I know the gentleman from Texas has been a supporter of this bill over a period of years.

I should like to repeat what the gentleman from New Jersey said. The basic reason for having an economic aid bill is to enable the United States to assist countries to improve the condition of their people. Those countries cannot do that with their own resources. We must have some flexibility in adjusting terms of repayment on these loans so that the conditions which confront the borrowing country 5 or 10 years from now can be considered.

When Public Law 480 first came before the Congress there was a jurisdictional question as to whether the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs or whether it should go to the Committee on Agriculture. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Many of us may lose sight of the fact that 50 percent of our foreign economic aid program involves agriculture and agricultural surpluses. So the Committee on Agriculture has a lot to say about the direction of foreign policy by virtue of its control over Public Law 480 and the food-for-peace program.

During our hearings the American Farm Bureau Federation appeared. The Farm Bureau is one of the most outstanding farm organizations in the country, Mr. John Lynn, legislative director, said this:

> Last year—

And again this year—

> we recommended that the authorization and appropriation for Food-for-Peace (P.L. 480) be transferred from the Department of Agriculture to AID.
>
> It is clear that the so-called Food-for-Peace program is for all practical purposes a foreign aid program. It has become an important tool of foreign policy and has become less and less a surplus disposal operation. Agricultural commodity aid provided through P.L. 480 represented nearly 50 percent of total net U.S. economic aid supplies to underdeveloped countries in the last few years.

We see the Committee on Agriculture has an important influence over the making of the foreign policy.

I say if we put the gentleman's amendment in the bill we take away an important element of flexibility in this regard. The program has worked very well, as the gentleman from Florida has pointed out, over a period of years. These loans are working very well—it would be a mistake to interfere with it.

This has been a successful program. It has been a program that was recommended by President Eisenhower first in 1957 on a soft loan basis to be financed in part with local currencies. Then in 1961 we made them hard dollar loans. Not all of the loans are for a 40-year period. Some of them are for 20 years, and some of them are 5- and 10-year loans, but this flexibility must remain if we are going to be successful in helping the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is spending his time discussing a jurisdictional fight, but the issue here is whether the House will reduce the grace period to 5 years and the total loan period to 25 years.

Mr. MORGAN. I wanted to tell the House that the Committee of Agriculture now controls about 50 percent of the foreign aid program. Therefore, I think that the jurisdiction over the food-for-peace program should be moved back into the Committee on Foreign Affairs where it belongs.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for making that statement which many of us have been arguing for years. This is exactly what should be the case. It was ridiculous in those past debates on foreign aid that we did not relate them to Public Law 480. Hopefully, the Congress will get around to this much-needed coordination.

However, I took the floor today because yesterday I was pointing up what I felt was the failure of the committee, that is, our House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to give appropriate attention to the report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid dated July 1965. I was calling attention to the fact that we, in the present debate, were not giving it proper attention. Second, I was calling attention to the fact that the AID organization had not given it proper attention. This morning, completely out of the blue as far as I am concerned, I received two letters, one from the Catholic Charities, Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, signed by Father Lawrence J. McNamara, enclosing a letter to him of June 29, 1966, from Bishop Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., pointing up in a much more forceful way what I have been trying to point out and thought was accurate. However, of course, I am limited in my ability to dig into these matters. I am going to put both letters into the RECORD at this point. They read as follows:

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: There is one other legislative matter which is of tremendous personal interest to me.

I am not thinking at the moment of any one particular bill as much as I am of the relationship between the Agency for International Development (AID) and the voluntary agencies cooperating with the Government in the Food for Peace program.

There are some serious problems that seem to be arising for the voluntary agencies—in fact, for the total effort on the part of the United States to confront the problem of world hunger and to develop deep friendships with the governments and peoples of undeveloped nations. I am enclosing some excerpts from a letter recently received from Bishop Edward Swanstrom, the Executive Director of Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference.

In the excerpt from Bishop Swanstrom's letter, mention is made of the report submitted by a special Task Force to the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of AID. Bishop Swanstrom seems to feel strongly that this Task Force report has received very limited circulation in the Government. He is "on top of" the situation on a day by day basis and is one of the best advised people in the world in terms of the problems of undeveloped nations and the American effort to participate in solving those problems. I have unquestioned confidence in his observation that AID has given little or no indication of the fact that this report even exists.

I have read the report in detail and would very much like to see it put into effect by AID. An expression of interest from yourself along similar lines would be a really big help to the hungry people of the world, to the voluntary agencies—and to the United States. I earnestly ask you for whatever word of encouragement or support you can give in the right places to the effect that you would like to see the recommendation of this report put into effect.

Copies of the report probably are available from AID. They are surely available from the Most Reverend Edward E. Swanstrom, Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10001.

Very truly yours,
Father LAWRENCE J. MCNAMARA.

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES,
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
New York, N.Y., June 29, 1966.

Rev. LAWRENCE J. MCNAMARA,
Catholic Charities,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR FATHER MCNAMARA: First of all I want to express to you the very deep appreciation of my associates and myself for your invaluable help and cooperation in the promotion of this year's Bishops' Fund for Overseas Relief campaign. I have been told that it is already evident that the proceeds this year will surpass anything in the past. We will not know the full result until the Bishops' meeting in the fall when all the reports will be in, but it will not surprise me if the total reaches over $8,000,000 this year. I say it won't surprise me—first of all because of the tremendous help you offered us, and secondly because of the concern I know there was at the time for the situation in Viet Nam and India and other sorely tried areas around the globe. May God bless you for your generosity and kindness.

During the meetings to promote the campaign, those Directors who were there will

> recall that I indicated that there may be times when you can be very helpful to us by bringing some of our concerns to the attention of your representatives in Congress.
>
> If you have an opportunity to review the enclosed report, it will point out to you a problem which now faces all of the voluntary agencies in the foreign relief field who participate in the Food for Peace program by distributing American commodities to the needy overseas. It is a report prepared by a special task force appointed by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Agency for International Development, Washington, to study the problems relating to our partnership with the United States Government. The report would seem to indicate that we have not been too successful recently in interpreting some of our problems to those who administer our governmental agencies. It is our feeling that unless some of the procedures, policies and regulations under which voluntary agencies accept governmental support are drastically revised, it will become more and more difficult for us to continue to participate adequately in the Food for Peace program.
>
> The Advisory Committee's task force seems to recognize this when it points out that the voluntary agencies find themselves over-audited, required to conform with unenforceable and unrealistic regulations, embarrassed by intermittent food availabilities and harassed for the payment of claims for "misuses" or program irregularities beyond their control. Perhaps, most unfortunately, voluntary agencies, like our own, are beginning to reap a back-swell of resentment from the leaders of the private sector overseas, harmful not only to their own interests and objectives, but to those of the American people as a whole.
>
> Volagencies must be accorded a radically different type of relationship if they are to preserve their integrity. Pyramiding governmental regulations, which almost completely becloud voluntary agency philosophy, have strained the partnership between government and the volagency to the point of almost total collapse.
>
> Frankly, we need your help to bring this matter to the attention of those who represent you in Congress. The task force report has received but limited circulation in government. Only a few days ago I took it upon myself to send copies of it to all the members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. So far as volagencies are concerned, AID has given little or no indication of the fact that this report even exists.
>
> You can help us to put the recommendations of this report into action. Since you believe in people-to-people programs instituted and conducted on the basis of human need as contrasted with government-to-government programs necessarily intertwined with politics and other pressures, we urge that you make known your support of the task force report.
>
> With every kindest personal wish,
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
> *Executive Director.*

So far as both agencies are concerned, the AID has given little or no indication of the fact that this report of the advisory committee even exists. The bishop points out in this letter that he, on his own initiative, sent copies of this report to all the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Committee on Agriculture, because he felt that these recommendations were so important.

And, Mr. Chairman, I can personally testify that it took my office over 2 weeks to obtain a copy of this report. And, certainly, I know AID in its own report which I read into the RECORD, devotes only one little paragraph, in a document of some 267 pages long, one little paragraph, telling that there is this committee; that it did make a report, that it has made recommendations, and that AID adopted some, and was proceeding to adopt others, but does not spell out anything about the recommendations beyond these meaningless generalities.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see AID is doing very little, really, to counteract the "Curtis corollary" that Government money will drive out private money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want with the name of "Gallagher" to oppose "Monsignor McNamara," or Bishop Swanson. But the fact of the matter is that Bishop Swanson did testify before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and we did listen to his views and we did take them into consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the Watson report about which he testified was mentioned several times.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman means in the hearings, but we established the fact that your committee——

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Did not even think enough of it to even mention it in your report. Am I not correct? You did not even think enough of it to mention it in your report?

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is not mentioned in the committee report, but I want to assure the gentleman from Missouri that we did give it full consideration, and Secretary of State Rusk did, as well as the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, may I state to the gentleman from New Jersey, and you can defend it, but obviously the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not think these recommendations were of very much significance.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to put in perspective the position of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to this amendment and with respect to the Food for Freedom program.

No. 1, Mr. Chairman, there were many of us on the committee who did oppose this limitation on the loans that are included in the food for freedom.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to whether or not the Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on Foreign Affairs should handle this program, I would like to point out that the commodity programs in this country are going from time to time to have to be adjusted, as this program moves forward.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this year we look toward increasing wheat production to the extent of about 15 million acres.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if you are going to take this program away from the Committee on Agriculture, then somehow, somewhere there is going to have to be some coordination between the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in respect to this production.

Mr. Chairman, this is true, because as of now our wheat surpluses are gone. This means increased wheat production.

Mr. Chairman, we have no soybean surplus and we have no butter surplus. Also, Mr. Chairman, the feed grains surpluses are about gone.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this House give every consideration to this problem before we start talking about adjusting the program and changing the program from Agriculture to Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the statement which has been made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CALLAN] and also add the fact that I am very concerned that the specter of jurisdiction of committees which has been brought into this debate.

Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, it seems to me that this represents a kind of a "ghost" that has been raised here, and very suddenly.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture, through the years, has been diligent in its efforts and we are at this point making the crest with respect to foreign agricultural programs insofar as food is concerned.

During the preceding years, 1 year was not very important, in terms of total dollars and no one raised the question.

And they did not argue whether we had jurisdiction or not. It is only when this particular program has assumed its present proportions that the argument has been raised.

I want to compliment the gentleman on his argument, and I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. CALLAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Indiana was not around here during the Marshall plan days, but I just want to tell the gentleman that we used some millions of dollars worth of farm surpluses in the Marshall plan days under the old section 402 of the Mutual Security Act and it worked very well.

I am not trying to make a jurisdictional fight here today. All I am doing is trying to point out that the Committee on Agriculture has a stake in our foreign policy because of their jurisdiction of the food for peace program. I cannot see why we should try now to model our development loan program to fit the conditions that apply to loans relating to sales of agricultural commodities and thus destroy the flexibility of the loan program. That is the only argument I am making. I am not trying to get in any jurisdictional fight here. I am arguing against the Purcell amendment because it will destroy the flexibility of the development loan program.

Mr. CALLAN. I agree with the gentleman, and I am opposing the amendment also.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think it might be worth while to note that if the Purcell amendment is adopted it would add approximately $850 million to the debt burden of developing nations. Certainly this in itself is a burden, I think the gentleman will admit. The food-for freedom program is now switching over to dollars instead of local currencies. So I think we are moving in the right direction, but to move too rapidly I think would result in the opposite of what we are trying to do through the aid program.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the Purcell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we went over this matter of the length of time of loans in the Committee on Agriculture. I would have liked to see a 20-year limitation placed on Public Law 480 loans, but an agreement or decision was made by the majority that an effort would be made here on the foreign aid bill to make them all similar, and for that reason I am supporting this amendment.

I did not see any sense whatsoever in lending money to a country for the purchase of food and then not have them to pay anything for 10 years. In other words, to have a 10-year grace period and then paying the total amount after 40 years. Not only will they have eaten up the food long before then, but it is very doubtful if many of these developing nations will actually be the same nation at the end of 40 years, what with the rapid changes in governments, anyway. We cannot expect anything to be very similar to what it is right now. In fact, a 40-year loan with a 10-year grace period for food or tobacco is about the same as a grant.

With all of the loans that are given for nondurable commodities, both for AID and Public Law 480, which is affected by this language, we will find that the expropriation of property will not be the main problem any more because there will not even be that property to be expropriated in these consumer loans.

You can imagine yourself paying your grocery bill 40 years from now. If there ever was a temptation not to pay what you owe to a rich relative, I would say that this surely would be such a temptation. In order to give some direction to those who are administering this program I believe we at least need the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] because these new and developing countries are like a young person who is growing up in the family. They need to learn responsibility. If they know they must meet their first payment within 5 years, if that were the longest grace period, they will have a greater sense of responsibility toward this loan than they would have with the 10-year grace period. Also if they know they must be repaying this debt in 25 years—25 years is a generation. Any of us here can think of 25 years from now, but to think 40 years from now, there may not be any of us, or at least very, very few of us who will be in this Chamber who will be in a position of leadership any place whatsoever. And this is also the case with the leadership of those countries as well.

Twenty-five years is about all that one can conceive of in the future, so far as having responsibility for anything, or that we provide assistance for. Therefore, I certainly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. In addition to supporting the gentleman's views, I also would like to add the fact that the argument that has been made that this would increase the responsibility of foreign nations, that is, their currency responsibility, I believe is a factor that is sorely needed. Therefore I certainly believe that that would be a good argument in favor of the amendment.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. During his remarks the gentleman from Texas said that this amendment was voted on in the House by a vote of 191 to 165.

The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I wonder if he would explain to the House whether this was a motion to recommit or whether this was a separate vote on this amendment.

Mr. QUIE. This was a separate vote on this amendment, because at the time a committee amendment was proposed to go to the 40-year provision in Public Law 480, the motion to recommit did not include this language because we had already had a separate vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Then did not the House have a rollcall vote on this very amendment?

Mr. QUIE. If the point of view of the Members of the House is the same as the point of view of the majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, then they have not taken a position. The majority point of view of the Committee on Agriculture was that we ought to make these two programs the same, that the same language should prevail in both AID and Public Law 480. Therefore, the decision was made on their part that they would come before the House when this bill was up and try to change both of them down to some lower period. The only thing that the House decided was that the majority wanted Public Law 480 to conform to this bill. So now we must make our decision, whether we want both of them to be for 25 years or both of them to be for 40 years.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, concern has been expressed here about the matter of flexibility and the ability of our agencies to extend assistance to developing countries. In that context we are frequently told that other developed nations of the world are extending extensive assistance to these newly developing nations. But the point that is noteworthy is that the assistance being extended by other nations, such as West Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom is almost invariably on terms much more strict, much more severe than even the terms included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. Therefore, I say we should adopt the gentleman's amendment. We would still be in a position to extend assistance to many developing countries on a far more generous basis than almost any other nation, if not any other nation in the world.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Could the gentleman provide us with the name of any country which has ever given credit beyond 25 years for goods of a noncapital or consumable type?

Mr. ADAIR. I am not able to give the gentleman such information. I do not think such assistance has ever been given.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. One of the grounds upon which the administration opposes this kind of an amendment is that we are bringing pressure on other developed countries to make softer loans. I think the gentleman will recall that, for example, in the committee there was mention that Great Britain was giving some interest-free loans. So we are making headway. We are urging the developed countries to make loans on more reasonable terms, and for this reason I think we should not now be raising our own terms when they are at the stage at which they are reducing their terms.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is quite correct in saying that there is testimony before the committee to the effect that we are urging other lending nations to make their terms more liberal. There was some testimony to the effect that this was being done. But even in the light of these allegedly more liberal terms, such terms are still far from being as liberal as the terms permitted under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think we have lost sight of the fact that one title in Public Law 480 provides that outright gifts in the form of great amounts of food have gone abroad on that basis, so when you start to compare our activities in this area with those of other nations, I do not think that you will find any nation in the world that is comparable with regard to the actual nutritional help we have given freely to these underdeveloped nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is a hope, and I say an unfounded hope, that those countries will liberalize the terms of their loans, both as to amounts of money lent and as to the terms of the loans.

It is strictly a hope. That is all.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct. In the effort being made, there is very little definite indication that it is fruitful.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the British loan, to which the gentleman from New Jersey referred, included an interest-free period as long as 5 years with a length of repayment in total extending 25 years? My guess is that our terms, as proposed in this amendment offered by the gentleman, are still a mile ahead in the sense of liberality as compared with the terms of the British proposal.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The British are now negotiating for some interest-free loans. I think this should be taken into consideration also, that there are only 10 countries involved in all this.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of pursuing this colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey and asking if the terms of the loan that the British are undertaking does include an interest-free period as long as 5 years, or with total terms beyond the 25 years?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, it would. If the loan is interest free, that would extend beyond the 25 years. That is the kind of loan the British are discussing with India. These loans are with countries like India, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Chile, and Nigeria. It is only the large countries which are involved in these loans.

Britain is negotiating for some interest-free loans rather than grants, and this is at our urging.

Mr. ADAIR. Are they repayable in hard currencies of the lending countries?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, they are repayable, although I am not quite sure what the terms are. They are flexible, such as ours are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the British are so well heeled that they can get into this racket of making practically interest-free loans, what are they doing asking us to extend credits to them to prop up the pound sterling? We have had millions of dollars dedicated backing up the pound sterling.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think the gentleman makes a good point.

Mr. GROSS. It just does not make good sense.

Mr. FINDLEY. I doubt whether we need fear the British outcompeting us for interest-free loans.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would invite the attention of the members of the Committee, and particularly the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey to the table printed at page 72 of the hearings, which is entitled, "Average financial terms of official bilateral commitments by DAC"—that is the Development Assistance Committee—"countries, 1962 to 1964." These are weighted figures. It is very clear that the majority of the loans as to the interest rates by other nations are by no means as favorable as those we have given traditionally. After the gentleman's amendment is adopted, there is still plenty of room for them to meet our loan terms.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if we refer back to the year 1941—25 years ago—and think of the vast changes that have occurred in the composition of nations on the face of the earth, I think we will have to admit to ourselves that loan terms which extend to 1991—which is 25 years from right now—are indeed generous and adequate and certainly realistic.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman has the table, which states the case since 1964. I think the gentleman should read the footnote under that table, which reads that Great Britain since 1965 has started to lend long-term loans interest-free.

Mr. ADAIR. I think that is the point we made earlier in our discussion. We both agreed that Britain was moving in that direction, although she had a very long way to go.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is the record clear that as of today no other nation has extended more favorable credit terms than are proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. The table sent around by the author of the amendment I believe gives the figures for the United Kingdom. In 1963 they made $9.1 million of 40-year loans, and in 1964 they made $7.3 million of 40-year loans.

Mr. FINDLEY. Are those figures for the AID agency?

Mr. MORGAN. No. I am talking about the 40-year loans of Great Britain, of the United Kingdom. They did make 40-year loans starting in 1963, in the small amounts I have just mentioned.

Mr. FINDLEY. Do they still continue this practice?

Mr. MORGAN. This table includes only figures for 1964. There is no figure for 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Quie) there were—ayes 32, noes 62.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Purcell and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 84, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 2, immediately after line 18, insert the following:

"(b) Section 201(d), which relates to interest rates applicable to development loans, is amended by striking out '2½ per centum per annum commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than 1 per centum per annum, nor higher than the applicable legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made' and insert in lieu thereof 'the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States having comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum'."

And redesignate the following subsection accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this amendment. It simply provides for the wiping out of the 10-year grace period that presently carries an alleged 1-percent interest rate. Of course, everyone knows that it costs approximately three-quarters of 1 percent to service these loans.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no interest charge, actually, during the first 10 years. I say again that my amendment would repeal the 10-year grace period, and provide that those foreigners who obtain money from this Government through these alleged loans pay the cost to the Federal Government of obtaining the money which today is at the rate of approximately 4⅝ percent.

Mr. Chairman, by what logic and by what standard of justice and decency do we demand that an American citizen and taxpayer who wants to build a home must pay 6 percent or 7 percent interest, while chiseling foreigners are permitted to obtain the same money at the rate of 2½ percent to be paid only after a grace period of 10 years?

Mr. Chairman, can the elderly of this country—beyond the prime of earning capacity, but who need housing, obtain interest-free financing for 10 years and then only 2½ percent for the remaining 30 years? The answer is self-evident, and it takes an inordinate amount of gall for the foreign "do-gooders" to deliberately create such an injustice and inequity.

Mr. Chairman, a short time ago the "foreign aiders," operating out of Foggy Bottom, made a 40-year loan to Turkey, with a 10-year grace period, and at 2½ percent interest for the remaining 30 years. That $3.6 million loan is for the purpose of providing 1,400 jeeps to haul family planners around Turkey.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, if it requires 1,400 jeeps to haul foreign aid family planners over Turkey, what will it take in terms of jeeps and planners when it is decided to "family plan" in India, for instance?

But, Mr. Chairman, back to Turkey—what is the collateral for this loan of $3.6 million on the terms that I have just stated? It will take a jeep, built on the lines of a Rolls Royce, to last for 40 years, or any part of 40 years, and everyone in this Chamber knows it.

The fact is that there is no collateral for this 40-year loan, and the members of this committee know it.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time and place to stop this financial double dealing. No Member of Congress can face his constituents, and with a straight face explain why there is one standard of financing for them and another for foreigners.

And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, those of the committee who believe they are doing so well with this foreign loan program might take time to look at the March 1966 report from the General Accounting Office, which shows that some sizable cracks are beginning to show up irrespective of the softness of it.

As of June 30, 1964, according to the General Accounting Office, "AID loans show that the net aggregate exchange rate loss incurred by the loan program, after AID was established in 1961, amounted to the dollar equivalent of $351.2 million."

This report by the General Accounting Office goes on to state that loans already are being converted to grants. In other words, it has been found that these foreigners cannot or will not pay out on them, and this Government has converted them to grants, which means, of course, a gift.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Does the gentleman think that the interest, regardless of what the rate is, is going to be repaid? Or does the gentleman think that any of these loans, whether they are for 25 years or 40 years, are going to be repaid?

Mr. GROSS. Of course these so-called loans will never be paid, but the point is, as the gentleman from South Dakota is well aware, that this program is going to be continued. What I hope to do is to make foreigners do what our American citizens and taxpayers have to do, and that is to start paying the going rate of interest when they get Government money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have just been up and down the same path on the previous amendment, except that this amendment goes a little beyond the point that the last amendment went as to the restriction of loan terms and the hardening of loan terms.

The main question—the key question again is whether or not we want to assist people. If we do not want to assist these developing countries, then we should vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. On the other hand, if we do want to assist them, then of course we should oppose it.

The fact of the matter is we are getting out of the grant business and into loans. We cannot immediately get into loans as bankable as we would like to see them. Nevertheless, these are hard-dollar, repayable loans. The British terms are less than what the gentleman asks. The British are now giving interest-free loans with a 7-year grace period, and the repayment in 30 years.

Canada is giving loans at three-fourths of 1 percent, with a 10-year grace period and repayment in 50 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicated a few moments ago that the British have put out a grand total of about $16 million on the terms that the gentleman is talking about—$16 million.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Whatever the terms are, the fact is that we have come a long way, and we are now converting from the grant business to hard-dollar loans. That is what this program is about. If you want to get back to the grant business, then we should adopt your amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true also if this amendment is adopted the net effect of it would be to increase the cost to the taxpayer because, as the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out, we have changed from the grant program to a loan program, and at least we get some interest that is repayable in American dollars, and the loans are tied to procurement in the United States.

If we should go back to the grant business we will have wiped out the repayment of any interest which we received on loans to date, which is $555,500,000. So if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa we will in effect say that what we want to do is to pass on to the American taxpayers the amount of interest that has been repaid under the loan program.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman has made a very profound point, and that is something that we should keep in mind in voting on this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, if the amendment is adopted, we will be moving back to the grant business again. If we make grants we will have no chance of getting any of this money back because, if a nation could pay normal interest rates it would go to the World Bank or to the commercial banks to borrow. We would not need a development loan program if we accept the philosophy of the gentleman's amendment. We would be back in the grant business again.

We have been moving away from the grant business since 1957. We are making progress. These loans are being repaid as they come due. If we are going to stay in this foreign aid business and be successful in our efforts we must have a development loan program which provides for a grace period and a low rate of interest.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I agree with my distinguished chairman. If we want to get back in the grant business, then we should vote for this amendment, and if not, we should defeat it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 2, beginning in line 23, strike out "$1,000,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$750,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1969".

On page 3, line 3, strike out "June 30, 1971" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and clear. It would reduce the authorization period of the Development Loan Fund from 5 to 3 years. It would reduce the annual authorization for each of the 3 fiscal years from $1 billion to $750 million. If the amendment is adopted, it would have the limiting effect of reducing the authorization by $2,750 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is again worthwhile to look at the pipeline for the development loan program. This year it is estimated to be at almost the same figure that it was a year ago; that is, $1,900 million. There is that much money unexpended in the development loan pipeline at this time.

When this bill was first presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the request for development loan authorization for each of the 5 years was $1,250 million. The committee reduced that amount by $250 million each year to an even $1 billion.

Let us compare that figure with the appropriation request. The appropriation request for this year is, in round figures, $665 million. If my amendment is adopted there is still a margin of $85 million between the authorization ceiling and the appropriation request. Look at it another way. What was appropriated last year for this item? Speaking again in round numbers, $618 million

Let us take still another perspective. What has the committee in the other body done with respect to this item? It has recommended an authorization ceiling of about $620 million. If my amendment is adopted, we will still be approximately $130 million above the authorization ceiling presently imposed by the other body.

In addition, the other body has put a 1-year limitation on development loans. So in all respect, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would be far more liberal than that recommended by the other side of the Capitol.

Finally, it ought to be pointed out, because Members are concerned about this, that there is no money for Vietnam in this section of the bill. It cannot be said, if you vote for this reduction, you are in anywise affecting our program in Vietnam. The money for Vietnam is in the section on supporting assistance. So you can support this amendment reducing the development loan program, knowing that there are almost $2 billion in the pipeline, knowing that we have acted more generously than the other body, and knowing that we have provided more money than was appropriated and used last year. In short, you can effect an economy; you can continue closer congressional control without in any way impairing the program.

If this 5-year program continues, what we are doing in effect is removing from the next two Congresses any real policy consideration with respect to development loans. Certainly there will still be the matter of annual appropriations of dollars, but the policy will be fixed for the next 5 years.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. As I understand the proposal of the gentleman, it reduces this program to 3 years. The present 5-year period has just expired, and the bill would authorize it for 5 years, and the gentleman would reduce it to 3?

Mr. ADAIR. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. The committee reduced the amounts requested by——

Mr. ADAIR. By $250 million for each year.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman's amendment would reduce it to what amount and by how much?

Mr. ADAIR. To $750 million—a reduction of $250 million each year.

Mr. FASCELL. Did the gentleman offer this amendment in committee?

Mr. ADAIR. I spoke about the amendment and said that it would probably be offered on the floor.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentlemen's amendment would shorten the time period covered by the Development Loan Fund authorization in the bill by 2 years and cut the amount by $250 million each year.

The original Executive request was for a 5-year program with $1,250 million for the 5 years. In an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] within the committee, the 5-year period was retained and the amount agreed to was reduced from the requested $1,250 million to $1 billion for the 5 years.

Those of us who believe in the Development Loan Fund believe this is a necessary amount that should remain in the authorization bill.

The Executive has a very good record of holding down the requests for development loans. Those of us who were around here in 1961, when this House adopted the 5-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund, know we have operated with an authorization of $1,500 million over a 5-year period. The Executive at no time from 1961 until the 5 years expired on June 30 of this year has requested the full amount of the authorization of $1,500 million for the Development Loan Fund.

In 1966, the last year of the Development Loan Fund, as the gentleman from Indiana stated, even though there was an authorization of $1,500 million in the 1961 act, the Executive requested only $618,225,000. This year, even though they are requesting an authorization of $1 billion, they are only making an appropriation request of $665 million.

So this is a just a paper cut. This is not going to save one single dollar. This authorizes more than the Executive wants for fiscal 1967. Those of us who have worked with this bill since the Development Loan Fund began in 1961 know that the authorization request for the Development Loan money has always been greater than the appropriation request. These figures ought to be flexible. There are only 10 countries now scheduled to share in this program. The executive came in with a request for an appropriation of $665 million and programed this amount of money. The executive has in the past been strict in holding down the authorization.

I believe the amendment is nothing but a paper cut and ask for a defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the statements made by the gentleman support in part the position I have taken. I see no reason why we should authorize, particularly for a number of years ahead, so large an amount as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just pointed out, when the appropriation requests are invariably much smaller. It seems to me that that is not a responsible way to legislate. I tried to make that point.

Mr. MORGAN. If that is not responsible, then this House has not been responsible since 1957.

Mr. ADAIR. Some of us have tried to make that point since 1957.

Mr. MORGAN. We have always had a higher authorization than the appropriation requested by the executive branch, so, according to the gentleman, this House has not been responsible since 1957.

Mr. ADAIR. Would not the gentleman admit if my amendment is adopted it would still leave a margin of $85 million between the request for appropriations and the ceiling to be imposed by the amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman's amendment exceeds the amount which the Executive has put in the appropriation request, and therefore allows some flexibility.

The damage done by the gentleman's amendment is that it would reduce the loan program from a 5-year request to a 3-year request. This would impair the long-range principle of the development loan program.

I have confidence that the Executive will hold down the requests, because for 5 years the Executive has never come in for the full amount previously authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 35, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 2, immediately after line 12, insert the following:

"(a) Strike out the first sentence of Section 201(b), which relates to general authority, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" '(b) The President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars upon such terms and conditions as the President may determine except that the length of such loans shall not exceed 25 years nor shall the grace period of such loans exceed five years for other than capital developments. Such loans shall be utilized to promote eonomic development of less developed, friendly countries and areas, with emphasis upon assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities.' "

And redesignate the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, Members will recognize that this amendment is very similar to the one which was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL]. If Members have copies of that amendment before them, it would be changed to the extent that at the end of the first sentence it would strike the period and add the words "for other than capital developments."

What this amendment would do is permit authority to remain for loans to be made up to 40 years for capital developments but, for consumer goods, like the food available under Public Law 480, to limit it to 25-year loans and 5-year grace period. There is a tremendous amount of aid, as the chairman of the committee indicated, under Public Law 480. Public Law 480 is about equal with this program. There is just no sense in providing 40-year loans for food.

One of the examples used in the Committee on Agriculture why the Public Law 480 loans should be the same as AID was that under AID you could make 40-year loans for fertilizer, which is a consumable commodity. If my amendment is adopted, it would mean that you could make the loan for a fertilizer plant in another country for 40 years but not for fertilizer, which they buy from the United States. I can see that there are reasons for long-term loans for a fertilizer plant or a bauxite plant or for highways or waterworks in some countries, because no matter what the government would be, the project is durable and would still be there for the next government and the people to use. However, when it comes to loans for countries to buy food, then I think we do need a limitation of this nature. To me this is very reasonable. We need this kind of a guideline. We could not make this kind of an amendment to the Public Law 480 bill. We wanted some uniformity between the consumable items that could be procured under Public Law 480 and the consumable items that could be procured under this program. Therefore, I believe that this would be the type of language which would give a direction that this House would want to give to the administration that they make their loans differently between the capital development and the kind of loans for which they would buy food or fertilizer or some item that would be immediately consumed and have really nothing to show for it in the years ahead.

However, if it is some kind of development where there is capital available for them for years beyond the length of the loan or for a good long period of time during the loan, then this would be permitted for a full 40 years as the bill now provides.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief explanation of my amendment, and I believe you can all understand it. Therefore, I ask you to support this amendment in order to make this program and Public Law 480 operate in a way that we could feel is a responsible fashion.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I have had any complaint from my businessmen who deal with foreign governments or foreign businesses, it is the fact that they find it is extremely difficult to compete on the market in providing competitive terms and interest rates. I cannot see where it makes sense to put our businessmen in a noncompetitive position with foreign businessmen. I just do not understand that kind of logic.

Therefore, I think, if I understand this amendment correctly, it would do two things: It would make one policy for capital goods and one policy for consumable items and, in a sense and in a very real sense, it would make it very difficult for our businessmen to be competitive in sales of consumable and agricultural goods in the world market.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 34, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 103. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 211, which relates to general authority, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Not to exceed $10,000,000 of funds made available under section 212, or under section 252 (other than loan funds), may be used for assistance, on such terms and conditions as the President may specify, to research and educational institutions in the United States for the purpose of strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries."

(b) Section 212, which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out all after "President for" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 to carry out the purposes of section 211 not to exceed $231,310,000. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

(c) Section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "to hospitals outside the United States founded or sponsored by United States citizens and serving as centers for medical education and research" and insert in lieu thereof "to institutions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, and to hospital centers for medical education and research outside the United States, founded or sponsored by United States citizens".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out all after "this section, for" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $10,989,000. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

(3) At the end thereof, add the following new subsection:

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of section 214(b), in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1967, $1,000,000 in foreign currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States."

Mr. GROSS (during reading of the title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this title?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no amendments.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to an application for assistance filed by the Ludhiana Christian Medical College in India. The sum of $450,000 is needed for the construction of an additional 72-bed wing at this college for the treatment of patients.

Bishop J. Waskom Pickett, counselor for the college here in the United States, and the Reverend Charles Reynolds were in Washington recently to discuss the project with AID officials and I am informed that AID is very favorably inclined, having conducted an inspection of the facility. However, it was also reported that all of the funds anticipated for the next fiscal year already have been assigned to other projects.

I would like to urge AID to reconsider this application carefully and to make every effort to fund this project. This is an excellent way to make use of foreign currencies and we can make no better contribution to international understanding than by the expansion of American health and educational facilities serving the people of other lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 104. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 221(b), which relates to general authority for investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (1), strike out "$5,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000,000,000".

(2) In the third proviso of paragraph (2), strike out "$300,000,000" and "$175,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$375,000,000" and "$215,000,000", respectively, and strike out "Federal Housing Administration" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(3) In the fourth proviso of paragraph (2), strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

(b) Section 221(c), which relates to limitations on investment guaranties, is amended by striking out "twenty years" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty years".

(c) Section 222, which relates to general provisions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In the case of any loan investment for housing guaranteed under section 221(b) (2) or section 224, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall prescribe the rate of interest allowable to the eligible United States investor, which rate shall not be less than one-half of 1 per centum above the then current rate of interest applicable to housing mortgages insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In no event shall the Administrator prescribe an allowable rate of interest which exceeds by more than 1 per centum the then current rate of interest applicable to housing mortgages insured by such Department."

(d) Section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)(1), strike out "Federal Housing Administration" and insert in lieu there of "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out $400,000,000" and insert in lieu there of "$500,000,000: *Provided,* That $350,000,000 be used for the purposes of section 224(b)(1)".

(3) In the last proviso of subsection (c), strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

Mr. FASCELL (during the reading of title III). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a question with respect to investment guarantees.

I understand from testimony on page 516, or 616, of the hearings—I am not sure—that the Export-Import Bank is endeavoring to compel U.S. investors in less-developed countries either to assign that portion of the aid investment guarantee giving coverage for retained earnings and the like over to the Export-Import Bank, or to prohibit them from securing special coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this type of protection is specifically provided for under our act.

What is the chairman's view with respect to the actions of the Bank, as alleged?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the legislative history of the investment guarantee program is clear, that the program is intended to encourage U.S. investors and not for the benefit of the Export-Import Bank or any other Government agency.

Mr. Chairman, if we encourage investors to go to the less-developed countries through the investment guarantee program, then I do not think that any agency of the U.S. Government should either try to benefit itself from that program or to prohibit U.S. investors from participating to the full extent in that program.

Mr. Chairman, the Export-Import Bank makes its loans to foreign corporations or groups. The AID guarantee program is for the U.S. investor.

Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that this would have been crystal-clear to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for that very clear explanation, and I believe it is a very important one, Mr. Chairman, because one of the most successful programs we have had has been the investment guarantee program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be unfortunate if in another program, which is also very good, the investment guarantee under AID would be sought as a collateral or means of collateral to insure, either directly or indirectly, transactions involving the Export-Import Bank. If there are some additional needs for collateral or security, or for other measures on the part of that institution, I believe they should be developed independently by the Bank or through the medium of additional legislation.

I think it would be unfortunate to mix up these two programs by having the investment guarantees issued under aid as security under another program.

Mr. Chairman, section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act provides the authority for the guarantee of investments by U.S. citizens in pilot or demonstration housing projects in Latin America. I supported this legislation in the original Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It was evident to me then that one of the major problems in Latin America which was causing social unrest was the lack of housing. I felt that one way to help provide the greatest impact on this housing deficiency was through American technological know-how and financial support. The authority provided by section 224 made possible the demonstration by American homebuilders and financial institutions, proven U.S. techniques for building, financing, and marketing privately developed housing.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have pushed for the continuation of this authority. Over the last several years, I have offered and had accepted in committee important amendments which have facilitated the operation of the housing program and made it a more attractive source for the supply of homes in many Latin American countries today.

In the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, I sponsored the amendment in committee that raised from 75 percent to 100 percent the amount of the loan investment that could be guaranteed under this program. This was necessary at that time because the program was hampered by the inability to obtain long-term investment funds with only a 75-percent guarantee, when the FHA, in this country, could offer a 100-percent guarantee.

In 1962, 1963, and 1964, successively, I cosponsored and supported amendments which raised the total face amount of the guarantees available to build housing projects from $10 million to $250 million. These increased amounts were essential in keeping the program moving ahead as more and more American firms became aware of the guarantee availability and the importance of the program to the Alliance for Progress increased.

In 1965, I sponsored in committee the amendment that retained in the law the authority to continue guarantees for pilot and demonstration housing projects. At that time, the Agency for International Development did not propose to continue support for projects of this sort beyond the $250 million which was then provided for in the act. It was my feeling, however, and the majority of the committee agreed, that housing projects of this nature make a substantial contribution to economic development and have immediate impact upon social conditions by alleviating housing shortages. Also, I actively worked for and supported the amendment in 1965 that increased the authorized amount for guarantees from $250 million to $400 million.

During the committee markup of the Foreign Assistance Act for this year, I proposed and the committee accepted an additional amendment to the Latin American housing section which will further facilitate the use of this authority. The amendment prescribed a minimum rate of interest that the Administrator of AID could allow eligible U.S. investors to earn on loan investment for housing not only in Latin America but worldwide as well. The housing guarantee program was being adversely affected by the low-interest-yield rate of 5½ percent fixed by the Treasury Department for investments in these oversea housing projects. The Department had fixed a rate of 5½ percent which unfortunately not only was below the current money market but below the FHA rate which currently is 5¾ percent. This made it extremely difficult to obtain commitments of funds from investors for oversea housing projects when a higher yield was available domestically. It therefore represented a major handicap to the housing guarantee program.

Under my amendment the Administrator was required to allow a rate of interest for investments of not less than one-half of 1 percent above the current FHA rate. This increased yield will make investments in these housing projects more attractive and enhance further the program's success. The amendment also permits the Administrator, if he finds it necessary in order to obtain adequate financing, to allow an interest return rate up to 1 percent above current FHA rates.

I also supported in committee an amendment which increased from $400 million to $500 million the amount authorized for the overall Latin American housing program including these pilot and demonstration housing projects. Further, I offered in committee the amendment that earmarked $350 million of the $500 million authorized to be used solely for these pilot and demonstration private housing projects. I wanted to be assured that the guarantee program would continue to support private housing projects which were so successfully demonstrating U.S. techniques of building, financing and marketing. The success of the program was unquestionable. Nearly $250 million of the total amount that had been provided was already being used to construct houses or was in process of development. Through February of this year, 14 housing projects had been completed or were under construction. They involved a total investment of $82.2 million and covered the construction of 16,000 dwelling units. Another 36 projects involving $157.2 million in investments and 28,000 dwelling units had been authorized and final plans were in process of development.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Latin American housing program is additional evidence of the immense contribution that private American know-how and investment can make toward national progress in these countries. I fully support the program and urge its continued support by the Congress.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word about the Latin American housing program.

I have supported this program from its inception. I believe that this undertaking, particularly the private pilot projects, has served a dual purpose. On the one hand it has helped to alleviate at least in some small measure the critical housing shortage in Latin America. On the other hand it has also demonstrated how through the use of private enterprise and individual initiative this great problem can be ultimately advanced toward solution.

Last year the administration requested an increase of $100 million in the ceiling on the amount of guarantees that may be outstanding for Latin American housing. At the same time, however, the administration proposed to terminate the self-liquidating pilot or demonstration housing program which had been such a success in the past.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs did not go along with the later proposal. Instead the committee adopted an amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and myself which reinstated the pilot housing program and and increased the amount of guarantees available for this purpose by $50 million.

During the hearings this year, the administration again expressed its desire not to continue the pilot housing program in Latin America and to use the available funds for other, but related, undertakings.

Again, the Committee on Foreign Affairs rejected this approach. In strong language the committee expressed its belief that this endeavor is one of the most successful ones in the Alliance for Progress. And we went a step further by increasing to $350 million the total amount of guarantees that may be used solely for pilot or demonstration private housing projects of types similar to those insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my strong support for this program. It is a tool for demonstrating U.S. techniques for the building, financing, and marketing of privately developed housing. It is a program which has demonstrated its merits. I trust that the executive branch, spurred by these repeated expressions of congressional intent, will apply itself to the administration of this program with the energy and the resources which it deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 105. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 251(b), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting immediately after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this title, the President shall seek to encourage each recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development."

(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "use beginning" the first place it appears and all that follows down through "year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971, $850,000,000, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended and which, except for $150,000,000 in each such fiscal year".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out "1964 through 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1968 through 1971".

(3) In the last sentence, strike out "June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, through June 30, 1971".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 7, line 16, strike out "$850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "750,000,000."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a practical, constructive amendment. It merely seeks to save $100 million from the expenditures of this act, and it is aimed at the Alliance for Progress where we have been more than generous over the years.

I would like to point out to the Members that we had fond hopes—I should not say that we had fond hopes—but the proponents of the Alliance for Progress program had fond hopes 5 years ago when this program was developed with great fanfare, that one of the products that would be immediately visible from our new investments in Latin America would be stability in Latin American governments. Yet less than a month ago Argentina, supposedly one of the three great powers of Latin America, went through another upheaval in government despite all the funds that have been poured in under this program.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is a very judicious, very mild and a very constructive amendment. I do not believe it would endanger the program. I think it would impose necessary restraint on the administrator of the program. I think that at least at some point this afternoon we ought to give the taxpayers of America some relief, and I think a $100 million cut in the authorization for the Alliance for Progress is the place to start.

I suspect that there might be some opposition to my amendment. I am not so optimistic as to think it will be accepted quickly. I did have the good fortune in committee to have a number of amendments accepted by the chairman and the majority, and this, of course, inspired me to try to develop other constructive amendments, one of which is this amendment that I offer at the present time.

But I think a $100 million cut is small. I think it at the same time shows a constructive effort on the part of the House to put a minimum of restraint on the spending under this program. I think as long as we are not going to touch the 5-year phase, which is so sacred to many of the Members, that this amendment has great merit, and I am hopeful that it will receive substantial support, more so, perhaps, than the other amendments which have been turned down this afternoon.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I know that the distinguished gentleman, who is a member of the committee, attempts to be constructive. I think he has pushed his batting average a little bit too far. I do not recall that he offered this amendment in committee. Of course, he has a right to offer it on the floor of the House for Members to consider. But I must agree with him that it is probably asking a little bit too much that he could get it accepted here without opposition, because notwithstanding the sincerity of his attempt, all he would do would be to gut the Alliance for Progress. That can hardly be called constructive.

At the same time the amendment is most unfortunate in its interpretations. Notwithstanding the fact that the Alliance for Progress has been and is understood to be a long-term program, it has moved along surprisingly well. Governments in Latin America are taking actions which we thought just a few years ago were not even possible—for example, tax reforms and land reforms, among others.

But in the middle of this program, when we are beginning to see some daylight and when we are gaining some momentum, and when we are attempting, from both an administrative standpoint and from a legislative standpoint, to make what amounts to a clear commitment to a program that should be extended, we should not suddenly substantially cut it without reason or explanation. That does not seem to me to be logical, particularly when it would have the interpretation placed upon it which it would have within our own Western Hemisphere.

Notwithstanding the trouble we have all over the world, I think all of us here are very cognizant of the fact that tremendous strides have been made in Latin America in recent years. This is no time to be taking any kind of a step backward in the question of funding those programs which are giving these people some encouragement to do for themselves what needs to be done. I think it is very, very important that the Alliance for Progress continue to be authorized at the funding level which has been set forth by the administration in view of the progress that has been shown.

U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere has been truly bipartisan almost since the founding of the Republic. This spirit was reflected most recently when the leadership on both sides of the aisle joined with the President on his visit to Mexico.

In recent years we have forged ahead in promoting and strengthening relationships in the hemisphere. In the spirit of foreign policy bipartisanship it is only proper that we should note the contribution to our present hemispheric policy by President Eisenhower, his brother, Milton Eisenhower, Douglas Dillon, the former Secretary of the Treasury, and Robert Anderson, also a former Secretary of the Treasury. The first three made significant contributions to building the policy now known as the Alliance for Progress. Robert Anderson is leading the negotiations with Panama.

With the help of the Alliance for Progress, Latin American overall economic growth is now going forward at a healthy rate—about 6 percent annually. And even if one discounts the population growth rate, the per capita growth rate is still over 2.5 percent. While we would all like to see more, this is hardly stagnation.

Latin American exports are growing at the rate of 3 percent per year and imports at the rate of 3.5 percent.

U.S. financial assistance to Latin America is now running at the rate of over $1 billion annually. In Latin America the annual volume of national savings has increased by $1.5 billion.

In the words of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—CIAP:

> The basic factors of Latin American economic development during the last 2 years and the prospects for the coming year are encouraging.

On the social side, this committee noted with satisfaction the widespread effort going forward to create institutions which finance social projects and private external assistance of at least $160 million devoted almost entirely to social programs. Nevertheless, the committee added that the solution to social problems in Latin America—as indeed it does in the United States—depends fundamentally on the adoption of suitable tax and tax collection policies.

The committee's points on expanded educational efforts and cultural exchanges are exactly in line with the administration's policies and action.

The record shows that one of the most significant overall results in Latin America over the past 18 months from the Alliance for Progress has been the strengthening of democracy. For in this year and a half there has been only a single case in which a democratically elected government has departed from office by other than constitutional means. Eleven countries have held elections at the local or national level during the period and the results have been respected, even where opposition candidates have won by narrow margins. Four of these elections occurred within the last 2 months and three others are scheduled in the next several months. In the Dominican Republic, where a few months ago some were saying an election was impossible, the free elections were held on June 1, 1966, and prospects for continued expansion of democratic institutions will proceed.

U.S. policy is in strong support for private enterprise, and realistic in its awareness of communism.

As pointed out by David Rockefeller, in an excellent article appearing in the April 1966 issue of Foreign Affairs, recent performance on the private enterprise side has been relatively good. He notes that private foreign direct investment is increasing. If reinvested earnings of U.S. companies are counted together with direct investment flows from the United States, the target of $300 million annually for such investment set in 1961 has been exceeded. Capital flight from Latin America is not now a serious problem.

The issue of communism has to be placed in its proper perspective. Certainly it is a problem. As the President pointed out in his speech in Mexico City on April 15:

> We believe the struggle for social justice and more efficient and equitable use of natural resources must be led by each country in its own behalf. My administration will not be deterred by those who tenaciously or selfishly cling to special privileges from the past. We will not be deterred by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism.
>
> We do not wish to see communism spread in this hemisphere, but we believe that the threat to the liberty and independence of the Latin American peoples from communism cannot be met merely by force. We will continue to concentrate our assistance mainly in economic and social fields and to encourage our Latin American neighbors, where possible, to limit their outlays for military purposes. We are encouraged that democracy flourishes in countries such as Mexico where expenditures for education and development are high.

We do not underestimate for a moment the significance of the Tri-Continental Conference that was held in Havana in January 1966. Cuba, the Soviet Union and Communist China clearly put the world on notice that Latin America is a prime target for subversive aggression. Democratic Latin America responded immediately and with vigor. The threat posed by the Tri-Continental Conference was immediately discussed within the Organization of American States and the American Republics put Communist countries on notice that they would not tolerate Communist subversion in this hemisphere. The Latin American Republics also discussed the issue in the United Nations. In a letter to the Secretary General they brought out sharply the inconsistency between the pious approval by the Soviet Union and Cuba of a resolution on nonintervention and the openly interventionist activities of the Soviet and Cuba representatives at the Tri-Continental Conference. In sum, none of the free countries in this hemisphere have ignored the threat which the Tri-Continental Conference posed to freedom. At the same time, none of them intend to be deterred by this threat from the equally important work of the hemisphere which is economic and social progress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], would not agree with me that if we cut 15 cents out of this bill the proponents would say we were gutting it. I have heard that expression used time after time in this debate and, of course, time after time in previous years. It seems if we take anything at all out of this bill, it is being gutted. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. May I make one observation? The gentleman from Iowa and I have listened while the gentleman from Florida delivered a scorching attack on this amendment. We have heard the argument that the Alliance for Progress has supposedly brought countries in Latin America into the 20th century. If we would study history we would find that, in proportion, there were fewer revolutions in Latin America prior to the social unrest generated by the Alliance for Progress program than there have been since. Where is the progress from the spending?

Mr. GROSS. I seem to recall that everything was supposed to be lovely and the goose was hanging high down in Argentina. We have turned loose substantial Alliance for Progress and other giveaway funds in Argentina. But the other day, out of thin air—at least the State Department had no prior knowledge of it—there was another military takeover in Argentina.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] talks about this hemisphere and the need to keep out communism. Why, bless his heart and soul, we had a Communist government planted in the Western Hemisphere for the first time under the Democrats.

The Alliance for Progress has not stopped communism in the Western Hemisphere. We got it here after the Alliance for Progress was put in motion.

I would think somewhere along the line the gentlemen who are the proponents and sponsors of this giveaway program would begin to have some regard for the taxpayers of this country and the burdens that they are going to have to carry, and the burdens upon their children. I would think that some day that would give them a little pause.

This bill started out at $3.4 billion for 1 year. It is now a 2-year program providing $4.1 billion in the first year, and $4.2 billion in the second year. Those are the approximate figures. This is not even the bill that the administration asked for originally. We moved in—not "we," but you moved in and added hundreds of millions of dollars to it.

In all conscience I ask when are we going to give the taxpayers of this country a break?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we are going to give them a break right now, because we are setting up a program which is independent, which meets the requirements of the administration's request in a great measure, but which is not a rubber stamp. I think the gentleman should be pleased on that point.

Since the gentleman used my name, I may say I did not talk about communism. I talked about freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. GROSS. Can there be communism and freedom at one and the same time?

Mr. FASCELL. I would not want to quibble with the gentleman on sematics. The Alliance for Progress came about after that to prevent any more Cuba's, and we have not had any more Communist invasion since that time.

Mr. GROSS. Who engineered the fiasco of the invasion of Cuba? Who was around at that time? Communism could have been stopped in its tracks at that time in the Western Hemisphere and stopped in its ability to spawn communism all over the rest of the Western Hemisphere. What happened on that fateful day in April 1961?

Mr. FASCELL. First of all, we did not have any Alliance for Progress. Secondly, we had to have a bad situation in order to have a fiasco.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The question was taken: and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 36, noes 42.

Mr. **DERWINSKI.** Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DERWINSKI and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VIII—Southeast Asia multilateral and regional programs

SEC. 106. Chapter 2 of part I the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE VIII—SOUTHEAST ASIA MULTILATERAL AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 271. GENERAL PROVISIONS.—The acceleration of social and economic progress in southeast Asia is important to the achievement of the United States foreign policy objectives of peace and stability in that area. It is the sense of Congress that this objective would be served by an expanded effort by the countries of solutheast Asia and other interested countries in cooperative programs for social and economic development of the region, employing both multilateral and bilateral channels of assistance.

"SEC. 272. SPECIAL PROVISIONS.—In providing assistance to further the purposes of this title the President shall take into account—

"(1) initiatives in the field of social and economic development by Asian peoples and institutions;

"(2) regional economic cooperation and integration in southeast Asia;

"(3) the extent of participation by other potential donor countries;

"(4) the degree of peaceful cooperation among the countries of southeast Asia toward the solution of common problems; and

"(5) the ability of multilateral institutions or other administering authorities to carry out projects and programs effectively, efficiently, and economically.

"SEC. 273. AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to utilize funds otherwise available to carry out the provisions of part I of this Act (other than title VI of this chapter) to furnish assistance under this title on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in order to promote social and economic development and stability in southeast Asia.

"TITLE IX—UTILIZATION OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS IN DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 281. In carrying out programs authorized in this chapter, emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of the people of the developing countries, through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental institutions."

Mr. **MORGAN** (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would that be over to line 18, page 9?

Mr. **MORGAN.** I think it would be over to page 10, line 2.

The **CHAIRMAN.** In the opinion of the Chair, that takes us to page 10, line 2.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 8, beginning in line 17, strike out ", employing both multilateral and bilateral channels of assistance".

Page 9, line 8, strike out "multilateral institutions or other".

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to change the language of the new title VIII, sections 271 and 272, to eliminate any authority granted to the President to channel bilateral aid funds through multilateral agencies.

We had testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that such channeling had a serious adverse effect upon the balance of payments because it did not retain the restrictions placed in this act to protect the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

Second, Mr. Chairman, if this provision remains in the law, it negates section 620(e)(1), which protects U.S. foreign investment by providing for the cessation of U.S. bilateral aid to countries expropriating U.S. property without making prompt and full value compensation.

Third, if this remains in, there will be no effect to congressional policy directives regarding foreign aid contained in section 620(e) through 620(m), which include restrictions on aid to Cuba among other things.

Another objection to this language remaining in the bill would be that it would negate the congressional directives in sections 202 and 252 requiring the use of not less than 50 percent of development loan funds for economic development through private enterprise.

Another objection if this language remains is that the regular authorization and appropriation procedure for our U.S. contributions to multilateral financial institutions which provide the important opportunity for congressional review and public discussion would be nonexistent.

Lastly, the policy of minimum interest rates on development loan and cargo preference requirements on AID-financed ships would no longer be effective.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in existing law, in section 205, as follows:

The President, after consideration of the extent of additional participation by other countries, may make available, in addition to any other funds available for such purposes, on such terms and conditions as he determines, not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available for this title to the International Development Association, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or the International Finance Corporation for use pursuant to the laws governing United States participation in such institution.

However, in recent years the Committee on Appropriations has written language into the appropriation bill which removed the effectiveness of that section.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope, based upon last year's Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, since it contains substantially the same language that has been in the appropriations act for several years, that this amendment would be adopted. That language provides that no part of this appropriation may be used to carry out the provisions of section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as mended.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of what I have been saying is this: that section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act says, in effect, that you can use 15 percent of development loans through specified, multilateral agencies, but the Congress in the appropriation law said this could not be done.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment if adopted would carry on the same policy in the new section of the law.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of our prime objectives in the foreign aid bill and in related legislation which we have considered in the past, has been to encourage self-help and to encourage other countries to cooperate with each other on a regional basis.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most dramatic results of our efforts in this regard, occurred in southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment should prevail, it would disrupt some of the most progressive steps that have been taken on the part of the various countries in southeast Asia. It would certainly cause havoc with the Asian Development Bank and the Mekong River Valley project and the southeast Asia highway program.

The very purpose of the proposed title VIII is to further encourage those countries to cooperate with each other and to undertake other multilateral self-help programs.

This title reaffirms the very policy of the United States by promoting progress through cooperative, self-help efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana would cause great damage.

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ZABLOCKI.** I am delighted to yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree—and perhaps I did not have the time to develop this as fully as it should have been developed—to the extent that we channel money under this new section VIII through multilateral agencies, we are depriving those funds of many of the safeguards and many of the guidelines that we have laboriously written into this legislation through the years for bilateral assistance?

Mr. **ZABLOCKI.** As the gentleman knows, there are no funds authorized or requested under this title for this year. However, it is our committee's intent, expressed in the report, that such funds as may be used pursuant to this title, be used subject to the safeguards and basic conditions which are in the law. I can assure the gentleman we will have an opportunity to review the implementation of this title next year and to pursue the issues that the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is not the gentleman then making an argument for a 1-year rather than a 2-year extension of this program if the gentleman says that in another year we will have, and we ought to have, the opportunity to review these deficiencies which I allege exist, because of the failure of protections which we have written into the law, and if we do not have the bill before us next year we will not have that opportunity?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As I said, we will have the opportunity to check on this matter further next year. Also, if the President should use development loan funds for the purposes of this title, the committee expects that he will use such funds in accordance with the provisions of title I governing development loans.

I do want to point out, and I am sure that the gentleman will not disagree, that if his amendment prevails, the programs that are now underway, such fine cooperative programs in southeast Asia as the Mekong River Valley project, would be placed in jeopardy.

I wish the gentleman had seen, and I am not sure whether he did or not, the documentary film which showed the kind of cooperation that every country in the area has given to this project, and how they helped each other in order to make the project work.

The gentleman's amendment would defeat this type of cooperative effort. I therefore hope the amendment will be defeated.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. Chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 301(a), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting immediately after "by such organizations" the following: ", and in the case of the Indus Basin Development Fund administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to make grants and loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars and subject to the provisions of section 201(d),".

(b) Section 301(b), which relates to general authority, is amended by striking out "United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the United Nations Special Fund" and inserting in lieu thereof "United Nations Development Program" and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United Nations Development Program authorized by this Act shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

(c) Section 301(c), which relates to assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Contributions by the United States for the fiscal year 1967 shall not exceed $13,300,000. No contributions under this subsection shall be made except on the condition that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency take all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization."

(d) Section 302, which relates to authorization, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for grants to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds available under any other Act for such purposes, for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $140,433,000.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for loans for Indus Basin Development to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds available under this or any other Act for such purposes, for use beginning in the fiscal year 1968, $51,220,000.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1967, $1,000,000 for contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund during the calendar year 1967. Funds made available under this subsection shall be in addition to funds available under this or any other Act for such contributions and shall not be taken into account in computing the aggregate amount of United States contributions to such fund for the calendar year 1967.

"(d) None of the funds available to carry out this chapter shall be contributed to any international organization or to any foreign government or agency thereof to pay the costs of developing or operating any volunteer program of such organization, government, or agency relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower."

Mr. GROSS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of this title be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 12, following line 12, insert the following:

"(e) None of the funds provided in this act shall be made available to any international organization, located within the United States, a member of which employs directly or indirectly, or otherwise gives sanctuary to any foreign national who has been determined to have been a spy or espionage agent, or who has sought by other clandestine means to violate the security of the United States Government."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is one amendment that will not and does not seek to cut the funds, and therefore will not gut the bill.

As a matter of fact, it just might save some money.

I am prompted to offer this amendment by the story which appeared in the paper this morning about the two Czechoslovakian spies who have been discovered in this country. Our Government has asked that one of them be deported, and he probably will be deported, but the other, the prime mover, a Czech by the name of Pisk, is located in the United Nations. He is the individual who originated this espionage effort in the State Department. He is the one who, apparently, first made contact with a State Department employee and exchanged ideas on how to steal the secrets of this Government by planting a listening device in the State Department.

It is incredible that this spy, the originator of this business, should be able to remain overnight in the United States.

Let me read what a spokesman for the U.S. delegation in the United Nations is quoted in this morning's newspaper as saying:

> In New York, U.S. delegates to the U.N. indicated that Pisk would not be expelled from the United States. "Mr. Pisk has done nothing to violate the U.N. headquarters agreement," the sources said. "Therefore, no action is contemplated on him here at this time."

I want to see this spy kicked out of the United States. I want to see some kind of showdown here and now as to whether Congress is going to tolerate the United Nations as a sanctuary for spies in this country. The purpose of my amendment is to see that no international organization gets any funds through the Congress of the United States and from American taxpayers if it provides a sanctuary for any foreign agent who has sought by clandestine means to violate the security of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. I certainly wish to join in the sentiments expressed here and to lend my wholehearted support of this amendment. I fail to see how anyone could refuse to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. This is a great and free country, and because of that freedom and the unlimited opportunities and lack of restrictions here, it is very easy for any citizen to engage in espionage. But I think it is unconscionable that this country should help pay the bill of any organization which engages in espionage activities, as this particular Czechoslovakian has done.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, while I am speaking in favor of this amendment, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of my objections to the passage of this entire measure.

First, I fail to see the propriety for the United States to continue to pour millions of dollars into the United Nations and its satellite organizations while we find some of these funds being used directly against our best interests. I am speaking specifically of the $37.5 million which is 40 percent of the total funds for the operation of the U.N. Special Fund. This fund is being used to help finance the teaching of technology at the University of Havana, and it is unbelievable that American taxpayers should be required to help finance the teaching of Cuban soldiers in advance technology.

Second. I do not believe that we are getting full benefit from the military assistance which has amounted to over $37 billion since World War II. The $917 million for military assistance included in this bill does not include at least another billion dollars for paying and supplying the South Vietnamese Army.

What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that of the 55 nations designated for military aid this year, only 1, Korea, has sent troops to Vietnam.

Third, we are grateful to Australia and New Zealand for assisting us in Vietnam, but neither of these countries is listed for military assistance in this bill.

Fourth. I oppose this foreign aid bill because this year we will be virtually abdicating our congressional review through the 2-year authorization proposed. Constantly, the Congress is under pressure to relinquish more and more of its constitutional prerogatives of controlling our Nation's purse strings, and I, for one, am not willing to acquiesce further in this regard. We have a responsibility to the American people to keep some sort of lid on our foreign aid expenditures.

Fifth. The amount included in this bill is greatly excessive and without justification. The President requested, in his words, a "barebones" appropriation for foreign assistance. The facts are that we presently have over $6.7 billion available from prior years' funds for expenditure in the foreign assistance field. When you couple this amount with the approximately $5.6 billion being authorized through the various organizations for foreign assistance, we find that the appropriations will be about four times the amount of the so-called barebones request made by the administration.

Sixth. Mr. Chairman, the terms and interest rates on the loans being made under our foreign aid program are totally unrealistic, and, in my judgment, adverse to our best interests in many areas. While we are granting 40-year loans at 2½ percent with a 10-year grace period, we find the Communist countries presently granting loans on a 10- to 12-year term at much higher rates. Actually, Mr. Chairman, some of the loans made by this country are being used by other countries to repay obligations or debts to Communist countries.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, instead of continuing unabatedly this foreign giveaway program, we should limit our foreign assistance to those nations, and only those nations, which have bona fide strategic value to the U.S. interests. We should terminate assistance to those countries aiding the Communists in any manner or form, or to those countries which play one side against the other in accepting handouts from both the United States and the Communist nations. Additionally, the report of the committee shows that we could substantially reduce the personnel complement of the Agency for International Development bureaucracy without adversely affecting its responsibilities.

I believe further, Mr. Chairman, that our economic aid programs should be changed from a line of credit to a real resource basis providing U.S. goods and technical services for specific projects. If this were done, program loans should be phased out as quickly as possible because of the adverse effects this type of aid is having on the U.S. balance of payments.

In my judgment, this foreign assistance bill is just another step toward the great international society, which will be financed by the American taxpayers. After all, we represent them, not the people of the world, and it is high time that we considered the financial problems of our overburdened taxpayers here at home, instead of trying to buy friends throughout the world.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I believe the gentleman has a good point. In fact, this particular individual did violate his employment under the United Nations organization, the United Nations Charter. No employee is to act as an agent of any particular country, but must act only on behalf of the United Nations, and this fellow completely broke his agreement and broke the United Nations Charter in that regard. I agree with you.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not understand that the individual to whom the gentleman referred was in the employ of the United Nations at the time of the alleged acts. Was he?

Mr. GROSS. He is in the employ of the Czechoslovakian Government's delegation to the United Nations. He is in the United Nations at the present time, if the reports in the newspapers are accurate.

Mr. FASCELL. I know, but in response to the point raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the issue is whether he violated the terms of the agreement with respect to the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. I am not concerned with whether he violated a United Nations agreement. I am concerned with Congress tolerating and the American taxpayers putting up money for any international organization within the United States to give sanctuary to a spy.

Mr. FASCELL. So am I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think there is no one here on either side of the aisle who would want to tolerate spies in the United States. Certainly the State Department does not want to tolerate spies. They are the ones that broke up the operation to which the gentleman has referred.

This is a very simple amendment. All it really does is to prohibit the United States from giving any money to the United Nations. If we want to break up the United Nations, then I say let us vote for this amendment. On the other hand, let those authorities entrusted with the security of the United States pursue, prosecute, and take whatever measures are necessary against spies who operate in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not do anything of the kind. If the United Nations—located on the soil of the United States—gets rid of this spy, it gets its money. If it does not, there would be no contribution by the United States. It is just that simple.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Who is to judge who is the spy—you, or the State Department, or our Government?

Mr. GROSS. Who usually determines who is the spy?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The courts do.

Mr. GROSS. The courts could not prosecute this individual because of diplomatic inmunity.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They still have that prerogative. We are still pursuing them. The FBI is still tracking them down.

Mr. GROSS. We cannot get this individual out of the country.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is not true. We have had over 700 of this type of people deported, who were operating through the United Nations or in the embassies.

I agree with the gentleman. The problem is that I do not believe this is the area where we should adopt this kind of action. What in effect the gentleman will do is to throw the United Nations into a turmoil at the very time when we are trying to find ways to peace.

Let us get rid of the spies. I am all for it.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman propose to get rid of these spies?

Mr. GALLAGHER. In the same way as we always do. We root them out, as the State Department did.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman propose to get rid of them?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We try them and convict them.

Mr. GROSS. We are not going to try this man. We are not going to deport him unless his government wants him to go.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would say to the gentleman that this is presently under investigation.

This is not the day to gut the United Nations. That is what this does.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that my good friend from Iowa—and I regard him as one of my close dear friends—has seen fit to bring into this discussion the name of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, it was my great honor and my great privilege to serve as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. It was an experience that has enriched my life. Before I went there, I had always supported the United Nations. I believed in it. But I have never fully appreciated the vastness of the work of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, it is truly our only bridge to peace and to world understanding. It may be a frail bridge, but it is our only bridge. Serving there, Mr. Chairman, with the great statesman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], my fellow delegate, and serving with the delegates from 117 other nations of the world, all seeking to find planes of common agreement on which could be rested the conscience of the universe, has convinced me of the depth and worth of the United Nations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that my beloved friend from Iowa—whom I salute as a great statesman, and who is doing a great job, even though he is not always in agreement with me, and is one of the most industrious Members of this body—I do regret that he has brought into this discussion the United Nations. Respectfully but firmly I now ask him to withdraw his amendment. Will he do it?

Mr. **GROSS**. Not the longest day I have ever lived would I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois. Then, much as I admire and love my friend, I am sorry I cannot shed my blood with him and, perforce, must leave him to die alone.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 52, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

Mr. **BENNETT**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 11, immediately after line 11, insert the following:

"(d) Section 301 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The President shall seek to assure that no payment or contribution by the United States to the United Nations or to any agency or activity thereof shall be used for any program or activity which is contrary to the policies of the United States.'"

And redesignate the following subsection accordingly.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this matter yesterday, as shown on page 15412 of the RECORD and I have altered the amendment today to exclude the last sentence and to make it conform thereby with the "Cuba section" of the pending bill.

I am pleased that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has included in this year's bill a policy statement that:

> The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United States Development Program . . . shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

In recent years I have testified before the committee in support of my bill to provide that U.S. payments to the United Nations shall not be used for programs contrary to the policies of our country. I have also offered similar legislation as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. This year, on May 11, 1966, I testified in behalf of my bill, H.R. 53, calling for a halt to this misuse of funds to nations who have vowed to destroy us, or who are openly assisting our enemies.

The evidence in support of the need for my legislation has been clear. In January of this year, the United Nations Special Fund, now the U.N. development program, approved a project at the University of Havana to train engineers and other technical persons, costing, $2,096,500. Castro's Communist teachers, many of whom are Russians, were handed this money to carry out a program certain to undermine our efforts to keep the Western Hemisphere free from Castro and Russian totalitarianism. Our representatives at the United Nations objected to this, and voted against it, but it did no good. Just 2 years ago, the U.N. Special Fund also approved a grant to help Castro's ailing economy, which cost U.S. taxpayers $500,000.

The language in this year's bill would require the President to seek assurance that U.S. funds given to the United Nations will not go to Castro's Cuba. This is good and establishes a basic policy which our freedom-loving people demand. It is idiotic that our country, which contributes over 40 percent of all funds going to the U.N. development program annually, should thus support the totalitarian designs of Castro and his Communist government to the tune of millions of dollars. I congratulate the committee on providing the language it did about Cuba.

While the bill includes the provision to ban U.S. contributions to the U.N. development program which go to Cuba, the legislation needs to be further amended to cover all United Nations programs in which funds might be used contrary to our national interests, and it needs to cover all nations not just Cuba.

The evidence for the need of this amendment, which would provide that no payment by the United States to the United Nations shall be used for any program contrary to the policies of the United States is readily available. There is no requirement by the U.N. Charter that we make these contributions.

The most flagrant and disheartening example outside of Cuba involves Cambodia and our fight for freedom for the Vietnamese people.

In the last 4 years, Cambodia has received almost $3 million from the U.N. Special Fund for various projects, which cost U.S. taxpayers $1.2 million. The most recent grant was for $611,900 in January 1965. This is the same country which is led by Prince Sihanouk, who said on March 23, 1966, in announcing that Cambodia had given the Vietcong a shipment of rice:

> We have given this aid to them by closing our eyes because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy, which is U.S. imperialism.

Foreign relations expert and columnist C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times has recently reported that Cambodia is "a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Pnom-Penh government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality."

I will read here a recent news dispatch from Cambodia:

> PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA.—Prince Norodom Sihanouk has sent a message of solidarity to North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh on the U.S. bombings of oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong, the government reported.
>
> Sihanouk expressed "profound indignation" for the raids and pledged "total support to (North) Viet Nam."

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow the President to put a stop to the often times wholesale support and taxpayer's dollars to people who have flatly stated: "We will bury you." It is a sickening thing to realize that our dollars are helping to aid a country which gives sanctuary to the Vietcong.

Once this amendment is passed the President will have a firmer base on which to demand that U.S. funds not be used by anti-American programs.

I urge that the House adopt this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always believed in the basic idea of using U.S. dollars as a tool for world peace and our own security. When I felt our foreign aid program was excessive and mismanaged I have recorded my vote against it as a protest against day-to-day imperfections rather than against the basic idea of foreign aid, substituting dollars for lives. Too often we have seen vast amounts of taxpayers' dollars go down the drain through extravagance or bad guessing on political motives of various countries or through other misconduct of the aid program; but no one can seriously quarrel with the objectives.

I am certain that the foreign aid program as now constituted is not the only answer to world peace and the uplifting of underdeveloped nations. I believe our State Department should have a U.S. Agency for World Peace, which would do intensive research into finding ways of achieving peace. I have introduced legislation on this, H.R. 16038, and have asked for departmental reports and hearings on the bill. I am hopeful for early action on this measure, which I believe would be a great move toward peace.

Concerning the foreign aid legislation before the House today, it comes to us significantly when we are engaged in an all-out war in Vietnam. One-fourth of the total budget administered by the Agency for International Development is for Vietnam. These funds in the past have been used to construct 2,300 schools and in the next 2 years 13,000 new classrooms will be built for more than three-quarters of a million children. These funds will also go to medical facilities, resettlement of the 900,000 Vietnamese people who have been driven from their homes because of the war, and for development of farming and fishing opportunities, in which four-fifths of the Vietnamese people are engaged. The bill, moreover, provides weapons of war to our allies in South Vietnam. We are fighting a military war; then, a political war and thirdly an economic war. We must win each to eliminate the military war.

Today, with our Nation's energies and manpower devoted to securing peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia, we must act favorably on the legislation before us; and I expect to cast my vote for the bill on final passage even though I realize that the things that will be done under the bill will not always be perfect.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I understand the gentleman has consulted the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] on the minority side.

Mr. BENNETT. I did.

Mr. MORGAN. The amendment has been modified. It now brings the amendment into conformity to the Cuban amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORGAN. The majority has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am the author of the amendment which appears in section 107(b) of the bill which seeks to prohibit the use of voluntary contributions made by the United States to the United Nations development program for technical assistance projects to Cuba, while that country is governed by the Castro regime.

This amendment is fully consistent with the policy which the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress have endorsed in years past.

I should like to say, for background purposes, that I initiated efforts to prohibit the use of U.S. funds donated to the United Nations for technical assistance to Cuba as far back as 1963 when the first project of this nature was approved by the United Nations Special Fund.

That particular project, as the membership of the House will recall, proposed technical assistance for an agricultural research station in Cuba.

That year the Committee on Foreign Affairs and then the House of Representatives adopted my amendment which proscribed the use of the U.S. funds donated to the United Nations Special Fund for that project in Cuba.

Unfortunately, the other body of the Congress did not go along with our proposal and the provision was deleted in conference.

This did not dissuade us from continuing in the effort to deny the Castro regime any type of American assistance.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I made representations to our Department of State and to our representatives in the United Nations. We were happy to receive assurances at that time that administrative arrangements would be worked out to prevent the use of any U.S. funds for the Cuban project.

Early this year when the governing council of the United Nations development program approved a technical assistance project for the University of Havana, I immediately objected to the Department of State and to our representation at the United Nations.

I am pleased to say that our representative in the Governing Council lodged a strong protest against the approval of this project. Further, we were again instrumental in receiving assurances that no U.S. funds would be used to provide aid to the Castro regime. These assurances are spelled out in the record of hearings held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 19, 1966. On that date Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco said the following:

> With respect to the project that I mentioned for the University of Havana, the U.N. has also stated that no U.S. dollar contributions would be used for its financing.
>
> The question is asked, Are not all contributions to the United Nations development program merged? If so, how can we be sure that no U.S. contributions are being used for Cuban projects?
>
> The answer is this: It is true that 40 percent of the total financial resources of the Special Fund are supplied by the United States. But, over 100 other countries also contribute to the Fund. Most of these contributions, making up the remaining 60 percent, are in currencies other than dollars. These contributions are held in separate accounts outside of the United States; they are not integrated with U.S. dollar contributions and their end uses are clearly identifiable. It is these nondollar currencies which will be used for the Cuban projects.

Nevertheless I have felt, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs concurs, that we ought to have a clear and unequivocal expression on this point in the legislation before us. It was for that reason that I offered my amendment embodied in section 107(b) of H.R. 15750. It was for that same reason that the Committee on Foreign Affairs overwhelmingly adopted the amendment.

At another point in this debate, I shall detail all of the efforts which I exerted in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the floor of this body and in other committees, to deny any type of economic aid or trade to Cuba while that country is governed by the Castro regime. At this point I wish to conclude with just this observation:

The amendment in section 107(b) is a needed and an effective amendment. It accomplishes the purpose on which we are all agreed. It provides further reenforcement to the administrative arrangements which have been put into effect to deny Castro any portion of the funds that the United States is contributing to the U.N. development program. I believe it is an amendment which merits our wholehearted support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment Offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 11, beginning in line 17, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal year 1967".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion yesterday the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee characterized the amendment offered by the gentleman from California with respect to a cutback in the authorizations from 2 years to 1 year as a meat ax approach to the problem. Of course it was no such thing. It was merely an attempt to strike all references to a 2-year authorization from this bill at one time, to avoid the necessity for the submission of separate amendments to strike the 2-year authorizations from various titles of the bill.

Since that particular amendment offered by the gentleman from California yesterday failed, I am offering a separate amendment with respect to the voluntary contributions to be provided to international organizations under this title.

I would like to begin my remarks with a quotation from the distinguished gentleman from Florida when he discussed the 2-year authorization yesterday. The gentleman from Florida said he did not accept the argument that the kinds of control insured through the appropriations process would give adequate policy guidance to the foreign aid program. A combination of policy and funding controls, in his opinion, exercised by both the authorizing committees and the appropriation committees, is vital.

In my opinion, this argument certainly applies to the voluntary contributions which this country makes to a wide variety of international organizations. I myself have been a strong supporter of such contributions by the United States, but I should like to point out that the sums involved are very considerable, running to some $140 million for the next fiscal year, together with some $4 million in carryover funds.

If we should keep the language presently in the bill, $140 million would be provided in 1968. I would suggest that this is an arbitrary ceiling. There is no indication now as to just how much money will be needed in that year for a wide variety of programs. The United Nations development program, for example, will need $70 million in fiscal year 1967 as compared to $65 million in the current fiscal year and $60 million in the fiscal year 1965. We do not know at all how much this kind of program will need in 1968.

Furthermore, as a reference to the bill before us indicates, the Committee on Foreign Affairs quite legitimately expressed policy considerations in proposed new language to be added to the act. I refer specifically to the language on page 10, beginning at line 21, which says, and I quote:

> The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United Nations Development Program authorized by this Act shall be used for projects for economic or technical

> assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

I refer also to the language on page 11, starting at line 4 and running through line 11, which reads as follows:

> Contributions by the United States for the fiscal year 1967 shall not exceed $13,300,000. No contributions under this subsection shall be made except on the condition that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency take all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

It is, of course, no secret that the United States has been providing over a period of years the lion's share of the funds to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. In the fiscal year 1965 the United States supplied a total of $24.7 million; in 1966 $22.9 million, including $8.9 million in food, was made available.

When I was a delegate to the 20th Assembly of the United Nations last September I was very much involved with the Relief and Works Agency. I know for a fact that there is a serious problem with respect to the provision of assistance to Arab refugees who are being trained by the Palestine Liberation Organization. As the representative of the United States, I protested against using United Nations funds for the sustenance of such trainees. A reflection of that same concern is found in the language of the bill before us, starting on page 11, line 5. It is entirely appropriate, indeed it is important, for the Foreign Affairs Committee to take this kind of policy position with respect to the variety of international organizations represented in this $140 million. There is no way in which the Committee on Appropriations could legally do the job that the Committee on Foreign Affairs does as a matter of course. There is no way in which that committee could write in a policy recommendation, or limitation, or restriction in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is essential that the Foreign Affairs Committee undertake the simple job every year of examining the request for funds for these international organizations, to set ceilings and establish policy restrictions, if they should be considered necessary.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] has already pointed out, by prior vote today we have made a decision on the principal issue involved here with respect to whether this should be a 2-year authorization or a 1-year authorization and decided on 2 years. I see very little change in the basic argument.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has fixed the ceiling for fiscal 1968 at the same rate as it has fixed it for fiscal 1967, and has presented that issue to the House of Representatives for a multiyear authorization. We trust that the flexibilities built into this program are such that we would not have to ask for any additional increases, however, we would not hesitate to authorize an increase in 1968 if necessary and advisable.

However, Mr. Chairman, the balance of the program has been placed upon a 2-year basis, and we urge the Members to defeat this amendment and keep all of the bill on a 2-year basis, except for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is there any reason that the gentleman can say why this authorization may not be decreased annually?

Mr. FASCELL. Well, it could be.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] has been the author of amendments with respect to the Palestine refugee relief program which reflects a decrease in the contributions made, and for 2 years now, as I recall it, these decreases have been made. If the committee follows the procedure, there would be a decrease next year. There might be decreases in other programs but, generally, we fix the overall limitation as is the rate for fiscal 1967 for fiscal 1968.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida seems to be agreeing with me that the 1968 ceiling which is established by this recommendation of the committee is essentially arbitrary. The gentleman himself said it might well be increased or it might possibly be decreased; they have no idea, and no projection was made as to the need for international organizations in 1968.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not believe I am agreeing with the gentleman from New Jersey. I believe the gentleman is agreeing with me, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has fixed the limitation for 1968, and we have done it on a sound basis, because we projected it on the basis of fiscal 1967 authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, the only point I am making is that some increases will be requested and, if so, they can be handled through supplemental requests or the committee can make its determination on an amended authorization.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I see no reason why an arbitrary ceiling is a sound one, as the gentleman from Florida seems to be favoring.

However, Mr. Chairman, we have no idea what the needs will be. I do not know what makes it sound, if we pass a ceiling.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not say that it was arbitrary at all. I said it was a reasonable figure and that the committee had a sound basis for it. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] said it was arbitrary and the gentleman from Florida has never agreed to that interpretation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Florida would touch upon the point of the advisability of annual consideration of policy questions with respect to these international organizations?

Mr. FASCELL. I have always indicated that this is good policy for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We need not only to review authorization figures but should spend more time studying, investigating, and acting on policy questions.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that our subcommittee undertook a recent study in depth with respect to U.S. policy and the operations of the United Nations. But, that was in the subcommittee. I would have much liked to have seen that entire study conducted by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, because that is a fundamental policy question which has very little to do with the authorization limitation for funding but is extremely important for the future foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday in discussing this question, while I believe funding limitations are vital and important, they are really very secondary to policy considerations.

I would hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs would give increased time to major policy questions.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I believe a 2-year authorization is so vital.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I fail to understand the point. How would our committee express its concern about policy with respect to international organizations except in such a form as an authorization for contributions to those organizations?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman presumes, in asking that question, that the only way you can effect policy is through funding. I do not agree to that at all.

I think our committee and the gentleman's own studies on the United Nations have made a valuable contribution in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself here in the well of the House again speaking on what I think is the critical issue on this entire bill, and put in focus particularly well by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

As I said yesterday, the concept of the multiyear authorization is not one which offends me. But I am offended when the Committee on Foreign Affairs and this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is ready to approve an authorization for the fiscal year 1968 when absolutely no justification and absolutely no testimony as to the propriety of the amount authorized in the committee bill has been presented.

I challenge the gentleman from Florida, who I see is on his feet, to tell me exactly what the dollars that we have authorized in fiscal year 1968 will be used for and, more important, to cite in the record of the committee, in the committee hearings, any testimony offered by any witness as to the amounts of money needed for the particular account for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to refer the gentleman to the very detailed presentation contained in these books which have been before the committee during the entire consideration of this over a period of several months with respect to the detailed program for the fiscal year 1967.

I refer the gentleman to my testimony in which I said in my judgment what we should do with respect to this program for the fiscal year 1968 is to fund it on the same basis as fiscal year 1967 because this to me makes sense, when you analyze the individual programs as presented for fiscal year 1967.

The gentleman can disagree with that basis but he cannot say that there was no basis for the decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman's integrity and for the gentleman's intelligence; but I have no respect for his clairvoyance. I do not think this House should authorize a figure for the fiscal year 1968 simply on the conjecture of a single Member.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Most of these amounts have been clearly stated over the years, and there is no act of clairvoyance involved on this issue.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman will recall, there have been some very critical issues that have affected this particular account. He will recall the article 19 dispute, and the U.N. bond issue, both of which have relevance to this account.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

I just want to say that this would put a ceiling on the bill. I am not one of those people who is worried about not spending the money. I believe if we fix this ceiling next year on the international organizations we are going to discourage the Executive from making increased commitments to the international organizations to which we belong during the next year. I hope they will regard this as a ceiling of $140 million.

This will have to run the gauntlet of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, and I am sure he will be watching this mighty close next year so far as the funds are concerned.

So I think the fact that we establish a ceiling for 1968 is important, and I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the record of the many foreign aid programs that have been functioning since the end of World War II is not one that would inspire confidence. Nearly $150 billion, all of it borrowed money on which we have been paying interest and on which we will continue to pay interest for generations, has been scattered abroad—in Europe, Asia, Africa, and North and South America.

Ostensibly, the purpose of this tremendous outpouring of America's wealth has been to combat communism, to gain allies to make it easier for us to prevent war from breaking out or to help us fight wars once they start, and to help undeveloped infant nations to establish sound economies.

What has been the result?

Since foreign aid first became institutionalized, the United States has become engaged in two wars in Asia against Communist aggression. We fought in Korea for 3 years and the only nation that gave us substantial assistance was Turkey.

We are now fighting in Vietnam and are suffering heavy casualties. We are getting only token help from our numerous allies and many of them are trading with our Communist enemies. The bulk of the cargo entering the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong is being carried in the ships of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Speaking of NATO in connection with the war in Vietnam, I am reminded that we bailed out France in southeast Asia soon after NATO's establishment with headquarters in Paris and with France as the keystone. General de Gaulle has disapproved of the "ever widening war in Asia" and has expressed his desire for the neutralization of Vietnam. He has ordered us to get out of France and to move the military installations which were built there by the United States.

Our policy of buying friends has been a colossal failure all over the world, as our diplomats have been insulted, our embassies stoned, and our libraries burned. Canada sells wheat to the Soviet Union, Argentina sells it to both the Soviet Union and Communist China, and Chile sells nitrate to Red China, but it does not lie in our mouths to complain, because the Kennedy-Johnson administration insisted over almost unanimous Republican opposition that the United States send wheat to the Soviet Union.

Some of the countries that we have aided are also receiving help from Communist Russia. Many of the new nations, as well as some of the older ones, have turned out to be liabilities rather than assets, due to frequent changes of government that are often brought about by military coups accompanied by assassinations and followed by wholesale executions and massacres. Chaotic conditions are too often followed by one-man rule, banning of political opposition, suspension of constitutional rights, nationalization of industry, and expropriations of foreign investments.

In many instances our economic help has been short lived, as runaway inflation has dissipated the gains and left the masses of the people worse off economically than before. At the same time, inflation in the United States has been accelerated by the expenditure of vast sums for foreign aid year after year.

What does the present administration propose to do about the situation? It proposes a continuation of foreign aid spending, with the authorization of more and more billions. The bill now before us authorizes $4,109,119,000 for fiscal 1967 and $4,158,339,000 for fiscal 1968. Altogether the bill authorizes approximately $13,800,000,000, some of it to be spent over a 5-year period.

The administration wants us to authorize money for a 2-year period, part of which would run during the Congress that will follow the current one. I am going to vote against the foreign aid authorization bill on final passage, as well as against the scheme for a 2-year authorization period. We must not surrender the opportunity for an annual review of the foreign aid program.

At present it appears very likely that there will be many new faces in the Congress as a result of the summer primaries and the November election. A House of Representatives that is 2-to-1 Democratic may be foolish enough to yield some of its power by agreeing to a 2-year authorization period, but if the Republicans make substantial gains this fall, I doubt if the 90th Congress would seriously consider such a proposal, should the 89th Congress fail to agree to it. In any event, I do not believe the present Congress should place unnecessary obstacles in the path of its successor.

During the past few weeks my office has been flooded with replies to my recent questionnaire, as thousands of my constituents have taken the time to reply to seven questions on Vietnam and inflation.

While there was no question about foreign aid on the questionnaire, a great number of the respondents added strongly worded statements in which they expressed vigorous opposition to various phases and the administrative policies of the foreign aid program.

If a nationwide poll were taken on the continuation of the present foreign aid program, I am sure the vast majority of the people—who, incidentally, pay the cost—would reflect an attitude entirely different than that which the Congress and the executive branch of the Government have taken in recent years.

The bill before us provides for economic or military aid or both to 84 nations plus carryover aid to 10 other nations. Aid of one kind or another is going to 94 different countries throughout the world.

Economic aid is going to 72 nations plus carryover aid to 10 others. Economic aid is therefore going to 82 different countries all over the world.

Military aid will go to 55 different nations at a time when we are talking about peace. It seems inconsistent to me that we should be advocating peace throughout the world at the same time that we are supplying armaments of all kinds to countries large and small around the globe.

Many of these nations have used American-manufactured weapons against each other, while a number of others are on the verge of fighting. At the same time we are getting almost negligible help from our so-called allies as our men fight in Vietnam.

Since the close of World War II, the United States has provided arms for half the nations of the world at a cost of $37 billion. In the present measure we are being asked to authorize an additional $917 million for military assistance. This does not include at least a billion more for paying and supplying the South Vietnamese Army.

France, one of the largest recipients of military aid, has turned its back on us in Vietnam, has demanded the evacuation of Americans from France, and wants to close our bases on French soil.

The United Kingdom, which we have given a tremendous amount of military assistance, continues to send her ships into Vietnam and Communist Cuba.

Latin American countries have received large amounts of military aid, but not one soldier has been volunteered from them for the Vietnamese forces.

It is interesting to note that in Africa, where we have sent considerable military aid, seven governments have been overthrown by military coups since June of last year.

Two of the largest current recipients of military aid, Greece and Turkey, are at swords' points over Cyprus.

India and Pakistan are also looking threateningly at each other. Both have benefited from our military assistance.

Mr. Chairman, while I have through the years opposed foreign aid authorizations and appropriations, this does not mean that I would never support the concept of foreign aid. If there were only some way of voting for responsible, well-considered programs, I might be induced to lend my support to them.

It seems to me that we should be considering three separate bills for authorizations, as well as three separate measures for appropriations. Military aid should be in one authorization, economic aid in another, and technical assistance in a third. Similarly, there should be an appropriation bill for each of these three items. In that way we would be able to consider each phase of foreign aid intelligently.

Channeling the money of American taxpayers and bond purchasers through the United Nations organization and other international instrumentalities would be dangerous, especially when we are fighting a war and there are many potential trouble spots throughout the world. While Secretary of State Dean Rusk believes that "foreign aid is basic to our security," I fail to see how such aid will help us to maintain our security if it is to be disbursed by international organizations to our enemies. This proposal should be dismissed without serious consideration.

Unless the administration presents us with foreign aid proposals in separate packages for military, economic, and technical aid and without such booby-traps as 2-year authorizations and the funneling of money through international organizations, I shall continue to vote against foreign aid authorization measures and appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) there were—ayes 43, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 18, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule for next week and our program for the remainder of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, upon disposition of the pending legislation, we will have finished the business for this week and it will be our purpose, after going back into the House, to make the usual unanimous-consent requests with respect to going over and dispensing with Calendar Wednesday.

In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are 14 suspensions:

H.R. 7315, relating to the National Museum of Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 13783, authorizing the furnishing of books and other materials to other handicapped persons under books for blind program;

H.R. 14838, amending the National Science Foundation Act of 1950;

H.R. 2623, creating the San Juan Island National Historical Park, Wash.;

H.R. 13419, authorizing feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals;

H.R. 2450, providing retirement in highest grade held in any Armed Force;

H.R. 3313, providing career incentives for certain officers of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 5297, limiting revocation of retired pay of members of Armed Forces;

H.R. 9916, respecting selection of candidates for appointment to service academies;

H.R. 15712, authorizing transportation of motor vehicles of certain members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 14875, improving the uniformed services savings deposit program;

H.J. Res. 421, providing appropriate flag ceremonies at Washington Monument;

S. 2822, simplifying laws administered by Farm Credit Administration; and

H.R. 14548, extending the leasing authority of the Postmaster General.

These bills will not necessarily be called up in the order listed.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday H.R. 15941, the Defense Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1967, will be considered.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 15111, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, under an open rule, with 8 hours of general debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for his inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to authorization for supporting assistance, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $200,000,000. In addition, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam in each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed $550,000,000. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask that chapter 4 be considered as read from page 12, line 13, down to the bottom of that page, and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to chapter 4?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOSS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: On page 12, line 23, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That where commodities are furnished on a grant basis under chapter 4 of part I under arrangements which will result in the accrual of proceeds to the Government of Vietnam from the sale thereof, such proceeds shall not be budgeted by the Government of Vietnam for economic assistance projects or programs unless the President or his representative has given his prior written approval."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment as a result of the findings of the Subcommittee on Government Operations during its trip to Vietnam in May of this year. This is a very simple amendment. Its purpose is to give our diplomatic representatives in Vietnam greater control over the budgeting of U.S. AID funds by the Government of Vietnam for economic assistance projects and programs. I am offering this amendment in response to an undesirable situation called to the attention of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information by some of our diplomatic representatives during the subcommittee's recent inspection trip to Vietnam.

I wish to emphasize that this amendment does not affect the U.S. military effort in that unfortunate country in any way whatsoever. It does not pertain to or interfere with commodity import funds used to support the military budget in Vietnam.

It does not tie the hands of the President or the Agency for International Development. On the contrary, it gives the United States greater control over our own AID funds. The urgent need for this expanded control was demonstrated to us in many ways during our hearings in Vietnam.

At present, our control is limited almost entirely to a simple approval of economic assistance projects and programs already drawn up in the budget of the Government of Vietnam. U.S. participation in economic projects and programs of the Vietnamese Government in recent years has been on a very limited basis. With the great increase in funds generated under the expanded commodity import program for Vietnam, it is necessary for the United States to play its proper role in decisions on the use of these funds. This amendment would require stronger control. Simply put, it will make it clear to all that this control is not a subject for negotiation. Any ally of ours must understand that such huge amounts of money represent a considerable sacrifice on the part of our people. We must insist that these tax dollars are used only for economic projects and programs under conditions which guarantee full and proper U.S. participation.

Our Ambassador in Vietnam should be given this mandate by the U.S. Congress. This will give him the necessary leverage to make certain that our contributions to economic progress in Vietnam are strictly in line with U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply states that where commodities are furnished on a grant basis by United States supporting assistance under arrangements where the Government of Vietnam receives proceeds from their sale, they shall not be budgeted substantially reallocated without prior written approval by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we need this control of our own funds. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

As a member of his subcommittee I traveled to Vietnam last May and I there became aware of the difficulties which had developed in the administration of the commodity import program there.

This amendment would give our administrators in that country greater control over this program—a control which is badly needed.

In fact, it would give us a control over our own funds—which inexplicably seems to have been lost or surrendered over the years.

The size of the amounts now generated and the fact that they are generated through commodities provided by U.S. taxpayers together with the questionable use of these proceeds requires that we exercise a greater control than we have hitherto.

This amendment will permit us to reassert the oversight to which our contribution entitles us, will allow the Vietnamese adequate freedom of operation and will contribute markedly to the overall efficiency of this vital aid program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in substantial agreement with what the gentleman seeks to accomplish by this amendment. I understand he has consulted the minority side and he has consulted the members of my committee. I will accept it with the understanding that certain technical perfections, taking into account Vietnamese budgetary practices, may have to be made when the bill goes to conference. With the understanding that we will thoroughly examine such technical requirements before the conference, I urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Also, I want to say to the gentleman that over the years the Committee on Foreign Affairs has worked very closely with the committee he now heads. When the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], headed the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs worked very closely with his committee. Our staffs have always cooperated. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is willing to work with the gentleman's subcommittee. I believe we are both trying to perfect our foreign aid operations, and it is a pleasure to accept this amendment.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, in responding to the remarks of the distinguished chairman, I want to express my gratitude for the cooperation we have always received. I assure him that it is my desire, as I know it is the consensus of every member of the subcommittee, to continue to work closely, cooperatively, and constructively with his committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the minority side is ready to accept the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague and most cooperative coworker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly support this amendment. As the gentleman indicated, it came about as the result of our subcommittee's visit to Vietnam and the discussions in the Subcommittee on Government Operations as a result of that trip.

Is it the intention of the gentleman that this amendment would deal with the reallocations of a major or significant nature, but, on the other hand, that it is certainly not intended to create problems within AID down the line as to very minor reallocations? Is this basically the gentleman's feeling?

Mr. MOSS. In accordance with our discussion, we are not attempting to deal with trivia, but instead with the very substantial items of reallocation which can occur. Attempts have been made in the past to effect such reallocations.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I believe the amendment is a most important improvement to the bill. There is no question that the relationship which existed when the United States had but a handful of advisers in South Vietnam is out of date at a time when there are 300,000 Americans in that country. I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for approval of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 12, line 20, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$175,000,000".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I offered an amendment with respect to the Alliance for Progress, to cut the amount $100 million. That seemed to be too substantial a cut for the Members to swallow, so I am back with a very small cut of $25 million in supporting assistance.

I wish to point out to the Members, as we covered in our minority views, that as of June 30 there was $547 million in the pipeline for supporting assistance. Furthermore, this amendment would not touch the $550 million which is exclusively for Vietnam, so it would not in any way endanger activity in Vietnam.

What we are trying to do is to achieve a very small and practical cut of $25 million in the supporting assistance section, where there is more than a half billion dollars in the pipeline, for which we have made substantial authorizations over the years.

I point out to the Members that the authorization in the bill, $200 million, is in excess of the appropriation request. We certainly do not want to further upset the very precarious budget which the President submitted earlier in the year, and I might even go so far as to say that on the President's behalf I am offering this amendment to try to get these figures within a reasonable budget provision.

I do not believe that a $25 million cut in supporting assistance, when there is more than a half billion dollars in the pipeline, could be called gutting the bill. I believe it is a necessary thing for us this afternoon to show some restraint on the part of the House over what appears to the public to be a complete runaway spending program.

I cannot conceive, interested as the Members are in the stability of the U.S. Treasury and in the stability of our dollar abroad, that the House would say, as to a bill before us, that every dollar of spending here authorized is sacred. I do not believe this $25 million of supporting assistance is sacred.

My amendment is a very practical and proper one. Certainly, considering the money in the pipeline and the fact that we are speaking of the portion of the funds not segregated for Vietnam, I am hopeful the amendment will meet with a minimum of opposition and might be accepted.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

With a maximum of affection for my friend, I hope the gentleman will not consider it personal for us not to support his amendment, as some of his amendments did have our support in the committee.

I hope, since he has enriched the bill, the gentleman will now support the bill.

I believe this amendment must be opposed. One of the problems is that on the question of supporting assistance, this involves one of the highly concentrated areas of the bill. There are four countries which get 75 percent of the funds under this. I am not quite sure where the gentleman would like to cut, since he has not specified.

However, countries that would be affected seriously are Korea, Jordan, the Dominican Republic, and Laos. Any cut in these areas would substantially weaken world security. While it is true that Vietnam is not going to be affected by this, nevertheless this money is needed to back up the security requirements of the United States which exist in these areas throughout the world. Bases which are maintained, for example, in Korea certainly add additional burdens to that government. Therefore, this money is used to take up the necessary slack which exists in their budget as a result of our activities in those areas.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman explain to the Members what his concern is with over $500 million in the pipeline?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman knows the pipeline has nothing to do with forward projects. That is an old argument. I know the gentleman is forward looking and he certainly cannot rest on taking a glance backward as to what the pipeline now carries in it. It is necessary that this funding the projected into the future. Certainly 75 percent of the countries I have outlined are finding it necessary. Korea is sending additional troops to Vietnam, and we do not want to undermine them at this point. The Dominican Republic action terminated quite favorably, and the troops are being withdrawn from there. I may say that there are 20 countries that have been terminated already, and successfully so, under the supporting assistance program. It is a tightly run program, and I hope this cut will not prevail.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. During the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois in support of his amendment he mentioned the fact that the executive was not requesting the full amount of $200 million, but he did not mention the figure they were requesting. They are requesting in appropriations $197.2 million, but they are requesting that the full amount of $550 million for South Vietnam be appropriated. So the difference between the authorization and appropriation requests for the whole supporting assistance package is only about $2.8 million. However, as the gentleman stated in his remarks, this is a very important part of the program. This was what was known under the Mutual Security Act as defense support. Supporting assistance is very important to the seven countries named by the gentleman. This is used to build military strength to compensate for our base rights and otherwise assist in our general foreign policy.

I hope that the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a), strike out "the fiscal year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968" and strike out the last sentence.

(b) In subsection (b), strike out "the first sentence of".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERRY

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERRY: On page 13, line 7, immediately before "and" insert the following: "; strike out '$150,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$70,000,000';".

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to bring this authorization in line with the authorization as provided by the other body. They are authorizing in their bill $70 million. I do not believe that we should be authorizing $150 million while they are authorizing $70 million, because we will give way to them and it will just simply make this body look a little bit foolish.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the Congress, I have understood that the "other body" is known as the "upper body" because it "ups" everything that the House of Representatives passes.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is not true in this instance and I believe that we should prove that it is not true.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the best argument I could make would be to read from the report of the other body on this $70 million authorization, and they say this:

> This provision authorizes an appropriation of $70 million for the contingency fund for the 1967 fiscal year. This is the amount of the appropriation request, though the administration had asked for an authorization of $150 million for each of the next 5 fiscal years. The Congress authorized $50 million for the regular contingency fund and $89 million for use in southeast Asia in the 1966 foreign aid authorization bill. An additional $100 million for the contingency fund was authorized by supplemental legislation.
>
> The committee understands that little of this additional $100 million will be used before the end of the fiscal year. In view of this, the committee's recommended authorization is actually an increase over the amount required this fiscal year for non-Vietnam operations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I join with my distinguished colleague in his remarks and I trust that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. I did not say "wish"; I just said "I knew."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Oh, with that certain knowledge, I do not believe we ought to make a longer argument but, nevertheless, while I certainly join the gentleman in wanting to make this program as tight as possible, I cannot agree with the gentleman that this body could ever look foolish by following the example of the other body. I feel that we should certainly follow our own example, in the hope that that might happen over there.

Mr. Chairman, the request this year is a minimum request, based upon the experience of recent years and, in fact, is the second lowest request for such funds.

Mr. Chairman, the contingency fund is maintained in order to meet urgent needs. It is tight.

Mr. Chairman, we had a long discussion on this and it is the feeling of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that this represents a tight request, second tightest in the history of the contingency fund.

Mr. Chairman, as such, I would urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], that I have had the honor to head the House conferees on the foreign aid bill for the last 7 years and we do not give on anything on which it is not absolutely necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have served as conferees on the foreign aid bill can testify that the House conferees are pretty rigid.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the conference lasted over 6 weeks and the position of the House was defended very effectively.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is proud of its record. I would say that last year 90 percent of the foreign aid bill, as finally agreed to represented the provisions of the House bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the argument about the contingency fund.

We were here just last February to act on a supplemental authorization and appropriation for $100 million for the contingency fund.

Now, the executive this past year has requested in this year's authorization $150 million. The request for appropriation is only $70 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs over a period of years has looked very carefully at this contingency fund and the executive has made a good record of returning to the Treasury of the United States funds unspent from the contingency fund.

If I remember correctly, it was back in 1962 when the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under some prodding by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], began to take a stronger and harder look at the contingency fund. He saw that funds from the contingency fund were being spent for projects that he did not think could be regarded as involving unforeseen emergencies. As a result of some strong language in our report, the executive had done a very good job in limiting the use of these funds to real contingencies and in returning unused funds to the Treasury.

For instance, in 1963 we authorized $250 million and appropriated $250 million. Only $149 million was spent, and the balance was returned to the Treasury. There need be no fear here that by authorizing $150 million in this bill today we are going to have contingency fund dollars wasted. The executive branch has a very good record over a period of years in its use of this fund.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I join with my distinguished chairman. This is a matter of judgment, and they have exercised good judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II

Chapter 2—Military assistance

SEC. 201. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 504(a), which relates to authorization, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In addition to such amounts as may be otherwise authorized to support Vietnamese forces and other free world forces in Vietnam, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this part (excluding the support of Vietnamese forces and other free world forces in Vietnam) not to exceed $917,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

(b) Section 508, which relates to reimbursements, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such amounts of the appropriations made available under this part (including unliquidated balances of funds heretofore obligated for financing sales and guarantees) as may be determined by the President shall be transferred to, and merged with, the separate fund account."

(c) Section 510(a), which relates to special authority, is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "the fiscal year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out "the fiscal year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each fiscal year".

(d) Section 512, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Africa, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal year."

(e) At the end of such chapter 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 514. ADMINISTRATION OF SALES AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS INVOLVING DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Programs for the sale or exchange of defense articles or defense services under this chapter shall be administered so as to encourage regional arms control and disarmament agreements and so as to discourage arms races."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that part II of the bill, page 13, line 9 through and including line 25 on page 14, be considered as read, and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONAGAN

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONAGAN: on page 13, immediately after line 24, insert the following:

"(b) Section 506, which relates to conditions of eligibility, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to any country to which sales are made under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 until such country has entered into an agreement to permit the use of foreign currencies accruing to the United States under such title I to procure equipment, materials, facilities, and services for the common defense including internal security, in accordance with the provisions of section 104(c) of such title I.'"

And redesignate the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is quite obvious, from a reading of the text itself. It is to require that where we have large stocks of foreign currencies, these currencies be used—in this case, for the purpose of military equipment—prior to and in preference to the use of newly appropriated dollars.

In some countries the legal situation is such that that is required to be done. The contracts between the United States and the foreign country contain authorizing provisions. However, there are other countries in which there are hundreds of millions of dollars of excess currencies which are really owned by the United States. But under the agreements that have been made up to this time it has not been required that these currencies be used for the common defense, including internal security.

This amendment would simply limit the granting of military assistance until such time as these provisions were put in the normal agreement which is negotiated regularly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. I am familiar with the gentleman's amendment. I believe that if we had had more time and if we had had more information on the amendment the amendment would have been incorporated in the bill during the marking up of the bill in committee.

Mr. MONAGAN. It is my fault that it was not submitted in time to be considered by the committee during the markup.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the amendment is good. I have consulted with my colleagues on the majority side, and the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we also agree that it is an excellent amendment and we accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, during Senate consideration of this legislation, an amendment was adopted to extend the present $55 million ceiling on grant of military equipment to Latin America to cover sales as well. The result would be to cut the existing program by more than half.

Proponents of the Senate amendment claimed that it will discourage military forces in Latin America from meddling in the political life of their nations. They further claimed that such a limitation will reduce the likelihood of an arms race among the Latin American countries. In addition, they averred that the cutback in U.S. military assistance will cause the Latin American countries to devote a larger portion of their resources to constructive purposes.

It is easy to sympathize with the motivations which insipired the Senate provision. The American people have historically felt an affinity for other democratic nations. Temperamentally and traditionally, we have abhorred militarism, at home as well as abroad. We have consistently rushed to disarm after each unsought and unwelcome military engagement. We have assiduously maintained civilian control over our own military forces. As the United States assumed far-flung responsibilities for the defense of the free world against Communist onslaughts, President Eisenhower—himself a product of our Military Establishment—warned of the dangers of a developing military-industrial complex in the United States.

But the Senate amendment, however well-intentioned, will not achieve the desirable purposes attributed to it. On the contrary.

Consider the problem of military coups in Latin America. In those countries where the military appear to play a dominant role, there has not yet developed a workable and popularly accepted basis among civilian political groups for the orderly transfer of power. In this kind of situation, the role played by the military is less cause than result. With or without U.S. military assistance, where violence is the accepted alternative to peaceful resolution of political issues, the military—frequently prevailed upon by civilian factions—will step in.

Furthermore, it is imperative to make a distinction between the use of the military to protect the status quo—a role apparently imputed to them by the authors of the current amendment—and their role to protect the state against Communist-inspired or other totalitarian revolutionary movements. In countries where viable political systems do not exist, where contending forces are unable to achieve peaceful accommodations, the Armed Forces may perform a vital moderating function. Much as we may deplore military intervention, we cannot be blind to realities. Above all, we must learn to judge each Latin American country according to its own circumstances and to avoid making blanket indictments of countries in which situations differ markedly.

Until some of the basic social reforms called for by the Alliance for Progress are achieved, Latin America will remain a region in ferment. But without internal peace, the goals of the Alliance will be rendered impossible. In these circumstances, U.S. military assistance—directed as it currently is largely toward internal security, counterinsurgency, and civic action—can play a meaningful role in helping the Latin American nations maintain the domestic peace vital to economic and social progress.

In fact, U.S. military assistance in these areas can be crucial to shoring up democratically elected governments. Drastically reducing military assistance is hardly the way to assist such countries as Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, and the new Guatemalan Government, which face active—and undemocratic—insurgent movements.

As for the charge that U.S. military assistance induces an arms race in Latin America, the contrary prevails. By virtually cutting out the military sales program—which would be the effect of the Senate amendment—we cut the Latin American nations loose to purchase military equipment from every persuasive dealer in the world. The effect would be to undermine inter-American efforts to adjust defense measures to real exigencies. Those Latin American military forces that exercise dominant roles in their own countries would then have free reign to satisfy their temptations to acquire unnecessary, but prestigious, sophisticated equipment. And it is unlikely that the United States could bring much influence to bear upon foreign arms dealers, eager for sales and indifferent to their impact upon the Latin American scene. In this case, we would shortly find a miniature arms race on among those countries in Latin America which have old boundary disputes and rivalries. The unhappy result would also mean the expenditure of scarce resources for unnecessary, costly, sophisticated weaponry.

In short, the Senate amendment will not reduce the penchant of some Latin American military forces to intervene in domestic politics. It will weaken the hemisphere's efforts to cope with the wars of terrorism and insurgency promised by the Tri-Continental Congress, held in Cuba last December. It will free those Latin American military establishments who wish to enhance their prestige by acquiring sophisticated equipment to shop around. And it will start the arms race which the amendment's proponents seek to avoid.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important to note that no amendment of this nature was adopted or even offered in the House of Representatives, and I urge the House conferees when they meet with their Senate counterparts to strongly oppose this particular Senate provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 601, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), immediately after paragraph (1), insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) establish an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this Act, and in the coordination of such programs with the ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernmental United States institutions;".

(2) In subsection (b), redesignate paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

(3) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) There is hereby established an International Private Investment Advisory Council on Foreign Aid to be composed of such members of leading American business specialists as may be selected, from time to time, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection. The members of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Administrator, who shall designate one member to serve as Chairman.

"(2) It shall be the duty of the Council, at the request of the Administrator, to make recommendations to the Administrator with respect to particular aspects of programs and activities under this Act where private enterprise can play a contributing role and to act as liaison for the Administrator to involve specific private enterprises in such programs and activities.

"(3) The members of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for travel and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their functions under this subsection.

"(4) The expenses of the Advisory Council shall be paid by the Administrator from funds otherwise available under this Act."

(b) Section 608(a), which relates to advance acquisition of property, is amended by inserting "(including personnel costs)" immediately after "costs" the first place it appears in the first sentence.

(c) Section 610(b), which relates to transfer between accounts, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated under section 402 of this Act for any fiscal year for use in Vietnam may be transferred to and consolidated with appropriations made under section 637(a) of this Act for the same fiscal year, subject to the further limitation that funds so transferred shall be available solely for additional administrative expenses incurred in connection with programs in Vietnam."

(d) Section 614(a), which relates to special authorities, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The limitation contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to any country which is a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression."

(e) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of subsection (i) is amended to read as follows: "No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts, or is participating officially in any international conference to plan activities involving insurrection or subversion, directed against—

"(1) the United States,

"(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased, or such participation has ceased, and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed, or that such participation will not be renewed or repeated."

(2) Subsection (l) is amended to read as follows:

"(l) The President shall consider denying assistance under this Act to the government of any less developed country which, after December 31, 1966, has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1)."

(3) Subsection (n) is amended by striking out "the President shall consider denying assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "no assistance shall be furnished".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the bill starting on page 15, line 1, part III, chapter 1—General Provisions—and going over to line 3 on page 19 be considered as read and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEIN

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: On page 19, immediately after line 3, insert the following: (4) At the end of such section 620, add the following new subsection:
>
> "(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds and reports to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has already declared its feelings about the troublemaker of the Middle East, Mr. Nasser, in barring any renewal of aid to his country under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program. I believe the bill before us today would be deficient if a similar provision were not included. I, therefore, introduce an amendment to prevent any assistance to the United Arab Republic under this legislation. Admittedly, there is no provision for aid to the United Arab Republic in the current foreign aid bill. However, the door is not closed—particularly to development loans. I believe we must close it as decisively as we can. That is the intent of this amendment.

I need not dwell unduly on the proof that President Nasser pursues a policy diametrically opposed to ours in the Middle East. Our intention is to promote peace. His is to promote tension, instability and war. He keeps 70,000 soldiers in Yemen for aggressive purposes. He has sent arms to the Congo and elsewhere in the volatile lands to his south. He has sought to deprive us of the use of Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya. He has discriminated against our citizens. He has burned our libraries. Perhaps most outrageous, he uses the aid we give him to free his own funds so that he can buy arms from Communist countries with which to make war.

Many of my colleagues have joined me in pointing out this country's mistake in aiding the United Arab Republic. Congress has consistently, over the years, expressed its opposition to our encouraging the Nasser rampage, which is how our continued assistance must be interpreted. My amendment would end this unwise policy once and for all. I call upon my colleagues to join me in barring American assistance to an aggressor, once and for all.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALPERN

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

> Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN to the amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: Immediately after the word "reports" on line 3 of the amendment add the following: "within 30 days of such findings", and immediately after the last word in the amendment, strike the period, add a comma, and add the following: "and further that such assistance will neither directly or indirectly assist in aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, for myself, I am satisfied in the interests of bipartisanship to accept this amendment to show the Arab countries that we in this United States are united in our disgust with the activities of Mr. Nasser.

However, I must submit to the wishes of the chairman, and, if he will agree to accept this amendment, I will be pleased on my part to do so.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not as vital as the argument would indicate. I have no strong opposition to either the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], or to the amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. The amendment prohibits assistance to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. There is very little assistance in this bill for the United Arab Republic, only a limited technical assistance program, that runs around $2,200,000.

What this program consists of, is a technical assistance program to provide a couple of university teams over there to show those people how to grow more food and to improve their production. All of this $2,200,000 is spent for services of Americans. The United Arab Republic does not get a dime under this act.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman believes this amendment is helpful and effective, the chairman of the committee is willing to accept both amendments.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed I rise to offer an amendment to the one now before us. I am in agreement with the intent of the amendment presented by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], who has done so much effective work in this field. I have a similar but broader, amendment at the desk, and the language I now offer would conform the amendments into one. In adopting my amendment, I believe the bill will thereby be perfected and strengthened. I could not be more pleased than with the acceptance of my amendment by the gentleman from New York.

I want to make clear that this language reflects the collective views of many of my colleagues. I want to particularly commend another able gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] for his efforts in helping to develop meaningful and unequivocal legislation which we trust will be included today in the Foreign Assistance Act. Likewise, much credit must go to the gentlemen from New York [Mr. RYAN and Mr. WOLFF] as well as to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], a member of the committee, all of whom have been most helpful. I would be remiss if I did not mention the superb cooperation and assistance given by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], the ranking minority members of the committee, who have contributed so much toward this bipartisan effort to cut off aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic.

It is significant and gratifying to know that the amendment has the full support of the minority leadership. I hail this unanimity.

Mr. Chairman, I feel my amendment is necessary in order to be more specific and to preclude any misinterpretation of the intent of this House.

Despite this overwhelming and enthusiastic expression of support, I feel it important to the legislative history of this legislation that I explain the amendment and its objectives in further detail. The amendment I offer adds the following language to the amendment previously read:

First. To the clause in the gentleman's amendment which asks the President to report to the Congress that assistance to the United Arab Republic is "essential to the national interests," my amendment specifies that the report be submitted within 30 days of such findings.

And, secondly, I would add a new provision in the presidential proviso by adding after the words "essential to the national interest," such phrase being in the gentleman's amendment, the following new language: "that such assistance will neither directly nor indirectly assist aggressive action by the United Arab Republic."

I have added a definite time limit of 30 days because I believe that the word "report" in the gentleman's amendment is vague and open to misinterpretation. The Congress must be informed of the reasons for and the amount of any assistance which the President determines essential to our national interest. So, if we are going to have a Presidential report, let us at least be specific and tell him both where and when to submit it.

And, most importantly, in order to indicate that we do not wish at any time, either directly or indirectly, to contribute to Nasser's aggression, I have added a further condition that the President must prove that any waiving of our no-aid provision will not in any way assist, directly or indirectly, aggressive actions by Nasser. Further, this provision should close the door once and for all for any possible assistance to Nasser under this act. By his own avowed aggressive policy, and his offensive actions in Yemen alone, he would be eliminated from any Presidential waiving of this amendment. That is why I recommend writing it into the bill as my amendment does.

Why is this new condition needed? I will tell you why. There is already a very broad antiaggressive clause as part of the existing act, section 620(i). But I must point out that this is a general clause and does not pinpoint specific countries, such as my amendment does in the case of the United Arab Republic. This is important, I believe, because the clause in the general sense has, to my knowledge, never been implemented by the State Department. Despite Nasser's repeated aggressive actions, the State Department has failed to label Nasser an aggressor and refused to suspend aid to his country. That is because, I believe the present all-inclusive, general clause is just that—all too inclusive and too general.

Now, by naming Nasser's United Arab Republic individually, and by inserting this specific antiaggressor section—my amendment, as it amends the gentleman's—will place the burden upon the State Department to prove that Nasser is not an aggressor nation. They must prove that the United Arab Republic is not fomenting strife in the Middle East, or elsewhere if he wishes to earn any aid from us.

Mr. Chairman, it is not unique for Congress to single out nations in the Foreign Assistance Act. No less than 19 nations are mentioned specifically by Congress which are not permitted to receive U.S. aid.

In fact, we have in the past singled out the United Arab Republic itself. I refer you to the amendment this House adopted by voice vote on June 9, on the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], restricting title I sales of food to the United Arab Republic under the Food for Freedom Act. I also refer you to last year's Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, expired as of June 30, which in a fashion very similar to the gentleman's amendment, imposed restrictions on aid to the United Arab Republic.

Secondly, Presidential reports and determinations submitted to the Congress are an accepted procedure to the Foreign Assistance Act. I refer you to sections 512, 620 (l) and (j) among many others.

Mr. Chairman, the phrase "essential to the national interest" is the language accepted in existing limiting legislation. It is used in the restriction on aid to certain other countries. It is used also in both the Food for Freedom Act and the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act to which I just referred.

But that phrase in itself is much too broad, and leaves too many loopholes, which have in some instances been taken advantage of.

That is why I am trying through the language of my amendment to close escape hatches and require the President to submit specific findings to Congress. My amendment will include additional restrictions and closely defined areas for exemptions.

For the reasons cited by the gentleman from New York and by many of us during the general debate on the bill, I would not take the time now to list the numerous indictments against Nasser and why, if we have any self-respect as a nation, we should eliminate the United Arab Republic from our assistance programs.

No one is less entitled to our aid, and no one has made more of a mockery of our program than the Egyptian dictator.

In view of these continuing transgressions on the part of this "Castro of the Nile," I can see no possible justification for the United States furnishing a single dime to the United Arab Republic.

With the adoption of the amendment before the House, and with the inclusion of my amendment, we can finally serve notice on Nasser, and to the State Department, that we no longer tolerate flagrant misuse of our funds—nor do we plan to underwrite aggression in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support this long overdue but crucial suspension of aid to an aggressor nation and to vote for my amendment and then for the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], which prohibits assistance under this act to the United Arab Republic except under clearly defined circumstances. Under the proposed amendments any aid to the United Arab Republic would be prohibited unless the President finds not only that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States but he must also find that such assistance will not encourage aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic. In addition under the proposed amendment the President must report within 30 days after such findings to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Last year I supported and voted for an amendment to the 1965 agriculture appropriations supplemental bill which prohibited the financing of shipments of agricultural products to the United Arab Republic. The other Chamber, in its wisdom, added to this amendment the language which allowed the President to authorize such sales where he determined such sales to be in the national interest of the United States. When the conference report reached the House floor, the Senate version of the ban was approved by the House, by overwhelming voice vote. I supported the Senate version of the ban.

As I stated in the House at that time, February 9, 1965:

> Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to aid to Egypt and other countries dedicated to a course of world aggression remains one of strong opposition. I joined my colleagues when we expressed this feeling as the sense of the Congress last week by voting to cut off shipments of surplus food to the United Arab Republic.
>
> The question before the House yesterday, Monday, February 8, 1965, was not one of reaffirming this position or changing it. Rather, the question was whether the sense of the Congress should be expressed in a manner contrary to the traditional separation of power and responsibility in the sphere of foreign affairs. The amendments added by the other body is one acceptable to me as it was acceptable to a majority of the Members of the House.
>
> I would not want to see the hands of the President tied because of our expression of opposition. It is more fitting to convey our feeling to the Chief Executive without impairing the flexible position required to negotiate with other countries. The other question before the House was whether to tie the hands of our committee going into conference on the bill.
>
> Our feelings have been conveyed in a responsible manner. Let us hope that the United Arab Republic will understand its full meaning and significance.

I have actively participated with my colleague, Congressman FARBSTEIN, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and my colleague, Congressman HALPERN, in the preparation of three amendments.

The language in the proposed amendments before the House today goes even further and strengthens the ban on aid to the United Arab Republic by requiring the President to report his findings within 30 days, and that any such aid to the United Arab Republic is in the national interest and will not be used for aggressive purposes.

The burden will be on the President to justify his action to the Congress while the constitutional power of the President to manage the foreign affairs of the Nation will not be violated.

On the broader question of aid to the United Arab Republic and our military assistance program in general, I would like to express my disappointment in the continuing arms races in various areas of the world. We must not permit our aid to be diverted so as to encourage aggression or subversion. We must continue to support those who represent the hope for peace in the world.

I have supported our economic aid programs in the Near East and in other areas of the world in order to assist the economic development of areas which are unstable and in order to achieve peace and stability throughout the world. I continue to believe that you cannot change the politics of a hungry man.

While we have made strides in assisting the economic development in the Near East through our economic aid program, the people of that area continue to suffer as a result of the arms race, and the aggressive attitudes of the United Arab Republic. Massive shipments of arms by the Soviet Union to the United Arab Republic and to other Arab States have escalated the arms race and as a result of increasing the defense requirements of the nations in the area, further economic progress has been and is being hampered.

Because of the belligerent attitudes and aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic, the proposed amendments now before this Committee are necessary and also because of the increased activities of the Palestine Liberation Front the amendments are timely. By passing these amendments, Congress will have spoken out in clear terms and the executive branch will retain the constitutional responsibility for conducting foreign affairs, while at the same time meeting its obligation to report to Congress the findings we must have to justify further assistance to the United Arab Republic.

I believe the amendments are sound and I am pleased to join with my colleagues from New York in urging their adoption by the Committee of the Whole House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, my able colleague from the Borough of Queens [Mr. Addabbo].

Mr. ADDABBO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of the principles contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, my colleague, Mr. Leonard Farbstein, and for the substitute amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Seymour Halpern, to H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

At this time, I wish to express my opposition to further extension of aid to those countries which have been damaging our Nation's policy interests and materially have been disrupting peace throughout the world. In whatever form it might be, assistance abroad becomes definitely an arm of American foreign policy. We do not wish that newly free states, who are weak and insecure at the present time, to lean too heavily upon enemy forces, as we are a civilized nation and one of our foremost endeavors at this time is to extend our knowledge and surplus commodities to meet human wants. However, on the other hand we do not wish those countries presently receiving our aid to abuse such by diverting its resources to war engagement and making it possible to avoid the cruel internal demands which arise. In this sense, the soundness of American aid, I feel, has already been damaged by countries such as the United Arab Republic.

As an illustration, a few weeks ago, a visitor to this country, Saudi Arabia's King Faisal made a derogatory statement in answer to a question asked of him as to what country he regarded as his worse enemy—the United Arab Republic or Israel when he replied that Egyptians remained the brethren of the Saudis. Jews from outside Israel, he was quoted as saying, had taken over the home of the Palestine Arabs and were therefore guilty of aggression. Is this not a hostile attitude to take after receiving aid from us? I cannot refrain from mentioning here that I believe all of us admire the contributions those of the Jewish faith have given to us here in the United States, as well as throughout the world.

I feel because of the specific section of this bill concerning U.S. aid to the United Arab Republic, a need is necessary for this amendment to delineate precisely our policy toward the United Arab Republic. Therefore, I support wholeheartedly the stand taken by these two distinguished gentlemen from New York, in their respective amendments on this subject.

I wish to commend at this time the outstanding work the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee here in the House of Representatives, has done, as well as the members of said committee, in presenting this important bill to us today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I should like to a short statement in connection with the remarks made by my distinguished and beloved friend. I know that this bill contains only a very small sum of money for the United Arab Republic, but a contract may be, and probably will be, signed with Mr. Nasser, insofar as the sale of surplus foods under Public Law 480 is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I take exception to remarks of our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I have been pleased to cosponsor the amendment offered by our able colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Farbstein. I believe that this amendment is fully consistent with the policy embodied in the legislation before us. It is a part of the American tradition that our Government has consciously endeavored to eliminate discrimination and to promote respect for the rights of all our citizens.

We have followed this policy in our domestic affairs and we have made it an integral part of our approach to other nations.

We have advocated and supported all the peoples' right to self-determination.

We have come out openly against policies of discrimination, whether such discrimination is based on race, color, or creed.

And we have included an expression on this point in the statement of policy which is contained in section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York simply carries out the principle which has been firmly established in our foreign policy for many years. It is a sound principle and one which gives outward expression to our respect for the dignity of all men.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to pursue further the statement I started to make earlier.

I started to say, when the time expired, that consideration is being given now to a renewal of a contract with the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480.

The language of the amendment, and as contained in the other amendments referring to Public Law 480 suggests that no assistance be given unless the President determines that it is essential in the national interest of the United States.

That is all right with me. There is nothing in this bill, however, even if this amendment is adopted—and I understand it has been accepted on both sides—to prevent any development loans from being made to the United Arab Republic if the President finds it is in the national interest.

I want to put all of those who have the authority to make any agreements, insofar as development loans are concerned, with the United Arab Republic and the sale of surplus foods under Public Law 480, that we in this Congress, on both sides, as I said earlier, look with disgust upon the activities of the United Arab Republic.

The statement of the chairman to the effect that we are flag waving is not correct. I believe this is serious business and that mature consideration be given before we make any contract or agreement to aid the United Arab Republic, keeping in mind the feelings of the Congress as expressed in the amendment I just offered which was accepted unanimously as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern]. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Tenzer] for the assistance he has rendered in this and also the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly] for her support and the numerous others in the House who echo my sentiments.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein].

Before the United States enters into commitments to supply additional food to Nasser, the officials of the Department of Agriculture and of the State Department should take a long, hard look at the record.

It is probably fair to say that during the last several months Nasser's words and acts have been somewhat less objectionable than in previous years.

Nevertheless, the United Arab Republic continues to draw on its very limited resources to build up its military establishment. All of the resources of Egypt are needed to improve the living conditions of the poverty stricken people of that country. They should not be used to accelerate an arms race to the detriment not only of the people of the United Arab Republic but to all of the people of the Near East.

Nasser continues to cultivate the U.S.S.R. His policy apparently continues to be to put pressure on the United States to assist him by threatening to throw in his lot with the Russians.

The Egyptian Army is still in Yemen, and there is no evidence that the withdrawal of these forces is being accelerated.

It seems to me that the United States should be firm with the Government of the United Arab Republic rather than follow a policy of appeasement. If Nasser wants to be friendly and cooperative, let us reciprocate. If he wants to give aid and comfort to our enemies and publicize unfriendly statements about the United States and our policies, let him make his own way without our help.

There have been numerous reports of private conversations with officials of the United Arab Republic, who said that beginning last fall Nasser was turning over a new leaf, that he wanted to cooperate with the United States.

In my judgment, the United States should pay more attention to what Nasser does than to what he or his emissaries say. Let us wait until his performance justifies such action before we resume food shipments.

The situation in the Middle East is always in considerable turmoil—the Arab-Israeli conflict; the division in the Arab world; and the constant probing of the Soviets to take advantage of every opening requires constant awareness on the part of our diplomats for shifts in emphasis, programs, and diplomacy while adhering to fundamental principles of U.S. policies in the Middle East.

An interesting discussion on some of the complexities, background, and actions which are continually shifting in the Middle East are set forth in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal by Philip Geyelin, which I commend to my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1966]

ARAB-WORLD PERIL—FAISAL VISIT POINTS UP WIDENING MIDEAST RIFT ALONG COLD-WAR LINES—SAUDI ARABIAN LEADER SEEKS FIRM U.S. STAND ON UAR; SOVIET ROLE IN AREA GROWS—A NEW RUSSIAN NAVAL BASE?

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The Russians are on the prowl again in the Middle East, and in a manner which raises sharp questions about just how fundamentally the character of the Cold War may have changed.

The popular notions currently have it that Vietnam is the really crucial conflict; that infiltration and subversion and guerrilla wars of liberation are the great danger, with outright Communist take-over as their aim; and that the Russians pose less and less of a threat to Western interests while the Chinese loom more and more as Public Enemy No. 1. Most top U.S. policy-makers find something to be said for all this.

But King Faisal ibn Abdul Aziz al Saud is here in Washington this week to tell President Johnson that his own oil-soaked kingdom of Saudi Arabia and a clutch of other Mideast monarchies are now menaced, actively if indirectly, by a growing Communist threat of Russian origin. As King Faisal sees it, the Soviets are rapidly expanding their bid for influence over the Arab "socialists" running Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Algeria, and actively wooing non-Arab but Moslem Iran. From all the evidence, the king wants more resolute U.S. support for the Arab "conservatives"—notably Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Kuwait—as a counterpoise.

INCREASED ALARM

Without accepting all of this assessment, many U.S. Government experts and private authorities are likewise expressing increased alarm over the latest turn of Mideast events. To some, the current scene is all too reminiscent of the situation a little more than a decade ago when the Russians were lining up their arms deal with Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, nailing down grandiose aid deals such as the one for building Egypt's Aswan Dam, and otherwise plunging deeply into the struggle for influence in the Arab world.

The scale of Soviet activity is more modest now, and the approach is somewhat subtler. "Last time the Russians openly challenged the West, stirred up Cold War tensions, scared the Syrians into union with Egypt, wound up alienating Mr. Nasser and almost wrecked their own cause," recalls one U.S. veteran diplomat. "This time they're moving on little cat's feet instead of bear's paws."

But intelligence reports and other gleanings leave no doubt of quickening Russian interest and activity. In part, the evidence shows a steady increase in the Russian Mideast effort in recent years, including the striking-up of trade relations with even such staunchly anti-Communist nations as Kuwait; the beginnings of a major economic collaboration with traditionally pro-Western Iran (featuring $260 million in Soviet credit to build a steel mill, in exchange for Russian access to Iranian natural gas); a general increase in Russian diplomatic, economic and military missions (at last count, some two-thirds of all Soviet military and technical personnel overseas were in the Mideast); and, according to some analysts, an abnormally high proportion of former intelligence specialists in key positions in Russian embassies in the Arab world (by one count, 5 of the 11 Soviet ambassadors to Arab states are onetime intelligence operatives).

NEW RED ACTIVITY

But there are also signs of a recent spurt in the Russians' activity, timed with Soviet Premier Kosygin's visit to Cairo last month.

Item: Though few results of that visit were revealed, many experts are convinced the Soviet chief nailed down arrangements for Egyptian repair-and-maintenance facilities for Russian warships and some, reportedly including King Faisal, fear that actual naval bases for Russia may ultimately be involved. At the least, this could mean warm-water ports for Soviet naval vessels in a part of the world where the U.S. Sixth Fleet now operates without challenge.

Item: Mr. Kosygin almost certainly used the influence of Russia, as the principal underwriter of Egyptian economic development to encourage Mr. Nasser to carry on with his fruitless, stalemated "war" on behalf of Yemen's republican government. Mr. Nasser's United Arab Republic (the UAR is no longer "united" with anybody since the rupture with Syria) has as many as 70,000 soldiers committed to stamp out the stubborn resistance of the royal Yemeni royalist forces. Russia's real motive, many onlookers believe, is to keep Mr. Nasser actively engaged on the tip of the Arabian Peninsula until the British pull out of Aden, next door to Yemen, leaving that British stronghold and the affiliated South Arabian Federation vulnerable to possible Nasserite inroads a few years from now.

Item: Soviet propaganda lately has been trumpeting, and Soviet diplomacy has been busily promoting, the cause of "Arab socialism" with mixed success. Iraq and Algeria, for example, have so far stood aloof from any tight "Arab socialist" cabal. But Russian efforts to promote improved relations between the UAR and Syria's new, arch-leftist government, which boasts at least one avowed Communist in the cabinet, show more signs of progress. Despite mutual suspicions and hard feelings growing out of the collapse of their short-lived union, both sides have been obediently trying to patch things up, since being urged publicly to do so by the Soviets last month.

By way of increasing the Russian "presence" in Syria, as well as Russian leverage, Moscow has just promised the new Syrian government up to $100 million in credits to finance a start on a new dam on the Euphrates which Soviet propagandists are promoting as "another Aswan."

The aim in all this, as most U.S. experts see it, is not the classic Communist take-over. Only in Syria are local Communists much in evidence. Instead, the immediate objective is to stir dissension in general, and, in particular, to provoke an open, violent quarrel between the so-called Arab nationalists, with their Marxist economic doctrines, and the monarchies, whose allegiance is largely with the Western "imperialists." By sharpening this struggle, the Russians could hope, first, to force the U.S. to take sides openly and decisively with the ancient, "conservative" kingdoms and shiekdoms while the Soviets ride the socialist "wave of the future." The theory, of course, is that the latter would in time turn out to be the winning side.

Ultimately, as this strategy is projected by analysts here, the hope would be to expand Russian influence over the entire Mideast. This could enhance Soviet military power (as with naval bases). More important, it could give Russia heavy influence, if not outright control, over the production and marketing of Mideast oil to consumers in the West. "The Russians don't need Arab oil for its own sake," says one U.S. authority. "But they'd dearly love to dictate the terms under which we get it."

Something else the Soviets might or might not welcome is the effect all this could have on the basic Arab-Israeli dispute which cuts across all other Mideast conflicts. Getting tied inextricably to the Mideast kings and sheiks would be awkward enough for the U.S. But if the Arab "revolutionaries" should wind up as the wave of the future, and sweep over the remaining "conservative" strongholds, the U.S. could wind up in the Mideast as the champion of Israel and little else, with the Soviets in the corner of those pledged to "Palestine liberation" by force. The upshot could be a U.S.-Soviet confrontation on an issue neither wants to fight about.

DREAD OF "POLARIZATION"

Nobody is saying that things actually will turn out this way. But dread of the very "polarization" the Soviets now seem to be promoting, with visible success, has been the major motivation of U.S. policy in the Mideast in recent years. The whole purpose has been to treat each country case-by-case and try to get along with all of them, rather than invite formal anti-Communist alliance only with friendly, staunchly pro-Western Mideast states, as was done in the Eisenhower days.

Against this backdrop the Faisal visit here takes on added significance, for its timing could scarcely have been less opportune. Quite by accident (the visit originally was planned for a year and a half ago), the Saudi leader is arriving at a moment when most of the nasty things that Mr. Nasser and the Soviets are saying about him have at least a ring of truth.

He has just received a batch of U.S. ground-to-air Hawk missiles and British Lightning jets and shortly will have some 1,500 U.S. and British technicians on hand to help him handle this new weaponry. He is loudly propounding a new approach to "Islamic solidarity" which Mr. Nasser is as loudly denouncing as an "imperialist" effort to construct a new kind of anti-Communist Baghdad Pact.

And now, here is King Faisal in Washington, asking for more specific assurances of U.S. support. By some accounts, the king wants the U.S. to cut further aid to the UAR until President Nasser takes his troops out of Yemen. A six-month, $55 million surplus food agreement with the UAR expires at the end of this month, though food shipments under its terms will stretch into the fall. Mr. Nasser urgently needs the food. He is heavily in debt to Russia for arms and is critically short of foreign exchange to buy foodstuffs elsewhere. What he would really like is another long-term food deal similar to a three-year arrangement which the Johnson Administration refused to renew a year ago; the intent was to pressure Mr. Nasser into settling the Yemen conflict and adopting a generally less hostile attitude toward the U.S.

The word is that the king also wants this country to define more precisely the circumstances under which it would come to Saudi Arabia's aid in the event of a UAR attack.

PROMISES COULD BE DANGEROUS

U.S. officials are disinclined to meet either of these demands. For one thing, the Kennedy Administration committed the U.S. in 1963 to help defend the Saudis against aggression. More precise promises could be dangerous simply because the Saudis themselves are involved in helping the Yemeni royalists and the fighting could be carried all too easily across the Saudi-Yemen frontier under circumstances that might make it difficult to tell just who was at fault.

But Mideast "polarization" is the major argument for caution, the policymakers contend. Too close U.S. alignment with Saudi Arabia would only advance the process, as, of course, would an abrupt cut-off of aid to the UAR. Yet President Johnson is in a box. King Faisal's pitch is bound to have powerful appeal in Congress, where sentiment is already strong for cutting off foreign aid to all but the most worthy, pro-Western, anti-Communist recipients.

The upshot is likely to be a compromise when the Saudi king and the U.S. President wind up their conversations today. The U.S. commitment to Saudi defense will probably be reaffirmed, privately if not publicly. The knotty question of aid to Mr. Nasser will be left in limbo. It has no place in any public resume of the Johnson-Faisal huddling. Privately, the king may be given some assurances that U.S. food aid to Mr. Nasser will be doled out on a month-to-month basis, if at all, after the present agreement runs out in an effort to continue the pressure on Mr. Nasser to adopt a more conciliatory tack.

But King Faisal may well be asked to pledge that the Saudis also will be a bit more concilatory in a fresh effort to solve the Yemen mess. Most officials here contend that King Faisal was as responsible as Mr. Nasser for the collapse of an agreement between the two men last November which was supposed to lead to a settlement in the Yemen. One possible first step: An arrangement by which Saudi Arabia might cooperate in a new plan to provide surplus U.S. food to both sides in the Yemen war. The hope is that such a move might not only help ease famine conditions in the Yemen but perhaps improve the atmosphere for a renewed try at a political settlement.

None of this, however, offers any guarantee of healing the Faisal-Nasser breach or of easing the wider "polarization" threat in the Mideast. The Soviet hold on Mr. Nasser is strong. King Faisal, according to some who know him, may well believe that economic distress within the UAR, coupled with the strains of the Yemen campaign, may well bring Nasser down—and that this is a compelling argument for a continuing hard line.

Meantime, the Soviets can be counted on to use their influence to fuel the wider internecine Arab strife. Whether this effort will match in scope the first big, postwar Russian drive in the Mideast, begun in 1954, is still impossible to say. "But I wouldn't sneer at a man who argued it was 'another 1954'," says one knowledgeable U.S. diplomat. "I'd listen intently."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] for rendering a fine public service and especially so our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who have accepted this amendment. I would like to point out that this amendment has been agreed to by both sides, and I urge that in the interest of time we move along and vote on it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently urged that this House make perfectly clear our intent that there be no economic assistance or agricultural aid under the Public Law 480 program and now the new food-for-freedom program to the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke in favor of the pending bill, stressing the importance of foreign aid as an ally in a dynamic foreign policy and its role in assisting the developing nations to achieve economic independence and self-sustaining growth. I feel strongly that the United States has an obligation to help relieve the economic and social problems of the developing world. At the same time, our economic assistance should not be abused, and the program must be administered in the interest of world peace and stability. Certainly our aid must not be allowed to subsidize aggression.

I have repeatedly urged on the floor of this House that economic aid and Public Law 480 assistance not be granted to the United Arab Republic as long as she continues to threaten Israel and carry on aggression in the Middle East. Congress has written language into the foreign aid bill expressing this as the intent of Congress.

The United Arab Republic, formerly Egypt, has been threatening Israel ever since that democracy gained its independence. The United Arab Republic has invaded Yemen and is currently carrying on aggressive action against that nation. More recently, Nasser has threatened invasion of Saudi Arabia.

In 1963 the Foreign Assistance Act was amended to include section 620 which provided that no assistance was to be provided to any country which the President finds is engaging in, or preparing for, aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act or any other act.

It is clear from the report, the debate in 1963, and debates in later years on the floor that this so-called aggressor nation clause was directed against the United Arab Republic.

In addition, in 1964, Public Law 480 was amended to provide that no sales shall be made to any country if the President finds such country is "an aggressor in a military sense against any country having diplomatic relations with the United States." Again the clear intent of the Congress was to deny aid to the United Arab Republic.

When the State Department failed to implement that intent, we again amended Public Law 480 in 1965 to make the prohibition even more specific. It read:

> No sale under title I of this act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Only last month, on June 9, the House adopted my amendment to the new food-for-freedom bill to prevent food sales to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines such sales to be in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, in the face of the expressed will of the Congress, the United Arab Republic has continued to receive economic assistance and agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. Time and again, the State Department has flaunted congressional intent.

Under the pending Foreign Assistance Act Amendments economic assistance will be continued for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968.

Nevertheless, the committee's report expresses the view that:

> Economic assistance should be withheld from countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparation for their execution.

This is certainly correct. This language is aimed at Egypt, but the bill itself does not mention that country. This must be spelled out. Therefore, I support the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is ludicrous for this Nation to allow itself to pay for both sides of an armed conflict. We should rather use our aid in an effort to end these conflicts. The most direct way of doing this is to keep American aid from those nations which maintain aggressive policies.

The pending bill also includes a provision which prohibits aid to nations which officially participate in international conferences called to plan activities involving insurrection or subversion against the United States or against countries receiving United States assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the President and the Department of State to heed the will of Congress on this issue.

The past intent of Congress is unequivocal, but it has been frustrated by the administration. Despite the obvious fact that the United Arab Republic has carried on, is carrying on, and plans to continue to carry on aggression against her neighbors, especially the State of Israel, the State Department has continued to send aid to that nation. The State Department is not unaware of what is happening in the Middle East. It has deliberately ignored the Congress in its decisions on Egyptian aid.

Mr. Chairman, we all remember Nasser's statement that the United States could take its aid and go "jump in a lake." One would think the message was clear enough.

Here is a breakdown of the aid that has gone to Egypt through fiscal year 1965:

Grants	$68, 100, 000
Loans	103, 200, 000
Surplus foods	850, 700, 000
Eximbank loans	47, 800, 000
Other	11, 100, 000
Total	1, 080, 900, 000

Mr. Chairman, it is time to end aid to the United Arab Republic. In the past, our assistance has permitted that nation to divert its economy to the production of cotton which has been bartered to Soviet Russia in return for arms—which have then been used for armed attacks in the Near East. This cycle must be halted.

Last month we did begin to halt the process. The House on June 9 voted to adopt my amendment to curb food sales to the United Arab Republic as a part of the new food-for-freedom program. At that time I said that neither our surplus food program nor our economic aid program "should be used to subsidize aggression by nations which receive our aid." The House concurred, and started to close the ring on Nasser. Let us tighten it today with adoption of the pending amendments.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am hapy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of the amendments proposed by my colleagues which would cut off all aid to the United Arab Republic unless the President determined that it was in the interest of our national security to do otherwise.

There should be little doubt in anyone's mind that the United Arab Republic is the greatest threat to peace in the Middle East. In his quest to become the leader of the entire Arab world, Nasser has taken up arms against several of his peace-loving neighbors. Because of Nasser's ambitions, little Israel has had to constantly be on the alert against attack. He has placed 60,000 of his troops in Yemen, a small nation in which a civil war only exists because of Nasser. Nasser supported the Communist inspired "Stanleyville" rebels in the Congo. Also, there are indications that Nasser is training troops to fight with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

I can think of no reason at all for aiding Nasser: He is a merciless dictator. He has proven himself over the years to be a vile opportunist who has no love for America or what we stand for. He has consistently taken our aid especially food intended for his hungry people and resold it for arms with which to attack his neighbors. He has employed West German scientists in an attempt to develop even more deadly weapons than those which the Russians have so graciously provided him. He has instigated revolutions in many of the nations surrounding him—fortunately with little success. He is hated by most; loved by few—certainly he is not any sort of ally of the United States.

It is difficult to conceive by any stretch of the imagination how aid to such a man will be in the national interest of the United States. By his past performance we all know that all further aid will get us is more denunciations, more burned libraries, and more agression. Therefore, I enthusiastically back the amendments offered by my colleagues to amend this year's Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment, and to compliment both the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] for presenting them to this body.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. I have never voted for any amendment to tie the hands of the President in the conduct of foreign policy, and I believe this amendment will not tie his hands but in effect will strengthen his hands in dealing with the UAR, because the UAR will know that we will insist upon their refraining from aggression.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

I support the measures to eliminate the provision in the foreign aid bill providing several million dollars in aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic.

I voted against this aid because history shows that any aid of any kind, no matter how benificent the project, to a state bent on military aggression strengthens the warmaking power of that state. It releases, for military use, resources which would otherwise have been spent for peaceful purposes.

The facts amply demonstrate that Nasser's present policy is generating throughout the Near East armed conflict, a wastage of manpower and material resources desperately needed in domestic development of all the Mideastern nations, and threatens general conflagration in the entire region.

Nasser's record of aggression is clear and unmistakable.

He has been involved militarily in the internal struggles for control of Yemen.

He is promoting the United Arab Military Command which results in channeling our aid and Arab internal resources into a destructive and ever-escalating Middle East arms race.

He is forcing nations like Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon to add to their weapons stockpiles, and forgo urgently needed internal development programs.

He entered into extensive new commitments with the Soviet Union during his recent visit to Moscow, to purchase ultramodern Soviet arms, jet bombers, tanks, and SAM missiles, which will further escalate the Near East arms race.

He stated four times in 1965, and again this year, that war with Israel is inevitable.

He has attacked our policies in Vietnam.

He encourages Arab refugees to believe that they will destroy Israel and he arms them.

He harasses our British allies in Aden.

He still bars Israeli shipping from the Suez Canal.

I do not believe we should vote funds to nations which, like the United Arab Republic, are engaged or threatening to engage in armed aggression.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. I support both the amendment and the addition.

The minority views to the report—House Report No. 1651—of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, at page 66 states as follows:

> In December 1964, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic told the United States to "jump in the lake" because U.S. Officials expressed irritation over the burning of the U.S. Embassy library in Cairo. *The United Arab Republic has been the recipient of $1,080,700,000 of economic assistance, most of it since 1960.*

It is shocking to me that the aggressive actions of the United Arab Republic against its neighbors, such as Israel, that great bastion of democracy in the Middle East, and against the United States itself, should bring forth largesse.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

I firmly believe that economic assistance should be withheld from countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparation for their execution.

The proposed amendment to the foreign aid bill will make the policy of Congress clear concerning the bellicose attitude of General Nasser and the United Arab Republic toward the establishment of peace and stability in the Middle East.

The intent of the amendment proposed by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] is clear to all of us:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds and reports within 30 days of such findings to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and further that such assistance will neither directly or indirectly assist in aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic.

Our foreign aid program should be for those countries believing in peace—those which are concerned with the peaceful development of their economies.

Unfortunately the more than $1 billion of aid we have given the United Arab Republic since the commencement of our aid program has done little to promote the peaceful intentions of this country.

Today the United Arab Republic has over 60,000 troops in the country of Yemen actually engaging in a civil war, while refusing to deal with the situation in a peaceful manner. The United Arab Republic has continually goaded the Arab extremists to war against the State of Israel and has led the escalation of the Middle East arms race. The United Arab Republic has for 18 years done everything possible to prevent a reasonable solution to the sad plight of the Arab refugees.

I am afraid that much of the impact of our aid these past years has been to free United Arab Republic funds for the purchase of more and more Soviet arms.

Mr. Chairman, only last month the House adopted an amendment to the food-for-freedom bill to prevent food sales to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sales are in the national interest. The amendment to the foreign aid bill now before us will be consistent with the House's previous action.

In conclusion, may I say that our policy should not only affect the aggressive actions of Nasser and the United Arab Republic, but all nations receiving aid who would use this aid in perpetrating militant acts against their neighbors.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation and my enthusiasm for the support which has come from both sides of the aisle for my amendment. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, since I did not have the opportunity to finish my comments and some further observations based on today's colloquy, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my additional remarks.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Thank you for yielding.

Some years ago I assured my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], that I had enlisted in this war for the duration. I am still in the thick of the battle. I am for the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we might overkill this amendment, and I suggest we vote.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment as amended offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On Page 17, line 24, strike out "the President determines".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the debate and the comments over the amendment and the amendment to the amendment we have just adopted, and I would like to point out to the Members of the House very early in that discussion the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], pointed out he did not feel the amendment should produce as much energy as the Members were putting into it since it was not being applied to the necessary part of the problem, which was the sale of foodstuffs to the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment applies to that section, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which is the area about which the chairman was concerned.

Now, secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that I am not trying to cut anything from the bill. This is not a dollar-cutting amendment. This is a progressive amendment, to block a loophole that exists in the present law.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the Committee will commence reading at page 17, all I do is delete the phrase, "the President determines," and then the language goes on to apply to nations preparing for aggressive military efforts, or participating in activities involving insurrection or subversion, etc., directed against the United States, any country receiving assistance under this act, or any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

However, Mr. Chairman, I leave in the act the next line which states: "until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased."

Mr. Chairman, under the language contained in the bill the problem that will develop, unless my amendment is adopted, is that you will force the President to pick up this hot potato with reference to any nation—for example the United Arab Republic—which is carrying on an aggression.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose, then, of my amendment is to remove the President from the immediate "hotbox" of having to determine that these military efforts are being directed against the United States or countries specified under this section of the act.

Mr. Chairman, what we should do is put the burden on the aggressor country, the country causing the problem in any particular case.

Mr. Chairman, again, I emphasize that my amendment is aimed at the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the President, through the State Department, could turn to them and say, "The law that the Congress passed requires me to suspend this aid." Therefore, it is not the President who has this problem. The Congress has made the decision. The President can say that the Congress has given him the flexibility to determine that such military efforts or preparations have ceased, and "your money can then be restored to coverage under this program."

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment is perfectly compatible with that idea and with that I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we adopt the gentleman's amendment and take out the words, "the President determines," who is going to make that determination?

I believe, Mr. Chairman, through this process we would make the amendment meaningless. I know that this amendment was presented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] who is the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee and I know the gentleman gave it a great deal of thought and very careful consideration. I am concerned that we may be making the amendment meaningless by removing the words "the President determines."

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the chairman will continue to read the language of the bill, in line 10, page 18, there is another Presidential determination, but that is on the basis of the President determining that the military effort and preparations have ceased.

What I envision is rather than the President having to turn to any aggressor country saying, "I have determined that you are an aggressor, and therefore I am terminating the aid you are receiving under this program," we create the situation where they must convince the President that they have ceased their preparations and their efforts.

This would help the President, since it does not put the immediate and direct burden upon him. It makes the cutoff automatic, and then they must prove lack of aggression to the President.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman certainly is trying to make a meaningful contribution to this dialog and to this bill, he states that he is removing a loophole but at the same time he is creating a crater.

One of the problems is that if you remove this determination then who shall make the determination? Who shall set the guidelines? This Presidential determination is a very tricky area. I think the Congress has considered this many times when it included the language that presently exists in section 620(i) of the bill as enacted.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and so that we do not undermine the amendment that has just been adopted as offered by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN], and in view of other prohibitions that exist, I urge that the Committee vote this down.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment of the gentleman of Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] refers to a section of the bill that is the result of an amendment offered by me and adopted by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, perhaps it will be of value to the Members to point out the purpose of this particular section.

Section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act as presently constituted, prohibits assistance under this or any other act, including sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any countries which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or against any countries receiving assistance from the United States. The addition to this section, included in the legislation now before the House, extends that prohibition to include countries officially participating in any international conference planning activities involving insurrection or subversion directed against the United States or any nation receiving U.S. assistance.

This addition to section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act evolved from concern which I felt regarding the composition of the delegations attending the Tri-Continental Conference hosted by Castro in Havana in January. The Tri-Continental Conference blatantly outlined the new Communist concept of "simultaneous wars" to be waged by several armed "national liberation forces" at the same time.

The Conference established a Solidarity Organization of African, Asian, and Latin American Peoples, which in turn established a Committee on Assistance and Aid to Movements for National Liberation—to be located in Havana—and a Permanent Executive Secretariat of the Solidarity Organization to coordinate armed insurgencies on the three continents, also to be established in Cuba. The second Tri-Continental Conference is scheduled for Cairo in 1968.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have been particularly concerned with the serious implications these developments have for the peace and security of the hemisphere. The Organization of American States expressed its alarm regarding the aggressive intentions of the Tri-Continental Conference in a resolution of condemnation approved February 2 by a vote of 18–0 with only Mexico and Chile abstaining.

The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs held hearings last February on the Havana Conference, and it was learned that delegates from some 82 countries participated in it. During these hearings it was brought out that some of the delegates attending the Conference, while techniaclly not official representatives of their governments, in a number of cases were there with the official approval of those governments. In several instances, the delegates were even members of the cabinet or of the foreign service of countries receiving foreign aid from the United States.

It seemed to me deeply ironic that the United States should be providing assistance to countries whose officials engage in plotting the kind of subversion and insurgency which would render impotent the long-range economic and social progress that are the goals of U.S. foreign assistance.

During the hearings on the Foreign Assistance Act, officials of the Department of State indicated that it was doubtful that present legislation would apply to such conferences. My amendment is designed to extend the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act to cover such circumstances; in short, to discourage such nefarious activities on the part of officials of supposedly friendly nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 18, immediately after line 15, insert the following:

"(2) Subsection (k) is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) Without the express approval of Congress, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise, or for carrying out any program, with respect to which the aggregate value of assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No provision of this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.'"

And renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to reenact in this law a provision which was first made a part of the law in 1963.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will remember, and probably this Committee will remember, that the aid program was intending in those days to erect a steel mill in India at a cost of about $500 million. After considerable study in the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was determined that some limitation should be placed on the administrative agency as to the amount that they could spend without the prior approval of the Congress.

This provision was in the 1963 act, and in the 1964 act. It expired in September of 1965. But I think it is more essential than ever, although there is no Bokaro Steel Mill on the horizon. The bill we are now considering is a 2-year authorization bill. The committee will not have an opportunity for 2 years to review the proposals that are being made by the administrative agency, and it is conceivable that they have some dreams about some expensive projects which should be the subject of congressional review and approval before a vast amount of money, such as was the case in the Bokaro Steel Mill proposal, is made available, or a commitment is made which might even to a degree be felt to bind the Congress.

I think this bill should have this provision reenacted so that we retain some degree of congressional control over sums of money in excess of $100 million.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Can the gentleman give the House the assurance that this is the same language which was in the 1963 and 1964 act?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Yes; this was drafted by the staff, with the help, I believe, of others who advise me it is the identical language which was in the 1963 and 1964 acts.

Mr. MORGAN. I remember that that language was sponsored at that time by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and was particularly intended to apply to the construction of the steel mill in India. If this is just an additional section having the same effect as the provision of the 1964 and 1965 acts, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I can give the chairman the assurance of the staff who drafted this amendment that this is identical with the language that was contained in the 1963 and 1964 acts, and I believe it would be a fine addition to this proposal that is to run for a period of 2 years. It would retain in the Congress some control over these sums of money.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. It is my understanding that similar language is in the bill reported out in the other body, and we on this side would be delighted to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUMSFELD

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUMSFELD: On page 15, immediately after line 21, insert the following:

"(3) In subsection (b), strike out "and" at the end of paragraph (6), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection; strike out the period at the end of paragraph (7), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon; and at the end thereof add the following new paragraph:

"'(8) utilize the services of United States private enterprise on a cost plus incentive fee contract basis to provide the necessary skills to develop and operate a specific project or program of assistance in a less developed friendly country or area in any case in which direct private investment is not readily encouraged, and provide for the transfer of equity ownership in such project or program to private investors at the earliest feasible time.'"

And renumber the following paragraph accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to section 601(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act. This entire section deals with the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation in our overall aid effort and contains various recommendations of specific tools to do the job.

My amendment would add to these tools the utilization of cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts with U.S. private firms to develop and operate specific programs of development in emerging nations. Personally, I would prefer tax advantages to organizations undertaking such activities, but such a proposal would not be germane to this bill. However, under such contracts, provision would specifically be made for a transfer of ownership to private investors at the earliest feasible time, as well as transfer of management to citizens of the host nation.

The advantages of this approach are clear. Existing programs of encouragement for private enterprise are not adequate. The investment guarantee program, it has been argued by many, helps only in marginal situations where the business firm already has an interest in making an investment, but is concerned about the risk of the venture. In some situations, the investment would undoubtedly be made even without the benefit of the guarantee.

Often, programs of assistance have been vulnerable to criticism because of mismanagement or inefficiency. This is to be expected when governments try to run business enterprises in areas where they have no knowledge or experience. Jose de Cubas, president of the Westinghouse Electric International Co., has advocated such Government-business partnerships as those authorized in this amendment because "the element of risk could be held to a minimum while the efficiency of individual corporate efforts—and the competitiveness of group efforts—could be maximized."

Through the use of a cost-plus-incentive fee contract system, AID could identify projects of merit, for example a fertilizer plant or food processing business activity, and bring them to the attention of business firms with competence in the area, offer to help finance the venture and get the job done even though under normal criteria investment would not be warranted, due to risk or the difficulty of access. Once the plant or project became operable, early transfer of the equity interest could be planned. The training of local personnel who would be trained to run the business should be structured into the program at an early date.

Mr. Chairman, this concept has received the endorsement of the National Citizens Commission Committee on Technical Cooperation and Investment, which reported to the White House Conference on International Cooperation last December. Its recommendation No. 28 appears in the June 1966, report of Congressman Fascell to the House on page 43. This approach has also been recommended by the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, in their report of July 1965, appearing in the Congressional Record of July 13, 1966, page 15430. Some representatives of AID contend that AID may now have the authority to make this kind of a contractual arrangement. Others seem to disagree. The fact of the matter is that AID is not now making use of this potentially valuable tool of development, as I believe it should.

It is the purpose of my amendment to provide congressional support for the use of the incentive contract as one method of bringing the enormous resources of U.S. private technology and management to bear on the problems of development.

This is what the United States has to offer—management skills, technical knowledge, and the private market system. And this capability exists in private enterprise—not in the U.S. AID Agency. Let us work from our strength.

I hope that the distinguished chairman and the able ranking minority member of the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Illinois, and he has assured me that this is not compulsory. As long as there is flexibility in it for the Agency, it is acceptable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the Chairman. Indeed, it is my intention that it be permissive and not mandatory, and that it simply be one of the tools available for AID to use, which they are not now using and which I would like to see them use.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I have also had an opportunity to read and study this amendment. I have discussed it with the members on this side. I am quite willing to accept it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Illinois' amendment and also to commend him for introducing this amendment.

The content of the amendment and his remarks are in keeping with comments I have made since my arrival in Congress whenever legislation relating to foreign aid is presented or being discussed. With consistency, I have stressed the overwhelming need for more involvement and commitment on the part of the private sector and a lesser emphasis in the public sector in the economic assistance categories of our foreign assistance programs.

I am pleased to observe the many improvements in the bill that recognize this concept—the trend toward loans and away from grants—the firm restriction against providing aid to Communist countries such as Cuba—the investment guarantee as provided in title III—the section admonishing the President to encourage the recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development and the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council on Foreign Aid.

These are all tremendous improvements and make it very tempting for me to want to vote for the bill. However, with the rapidly changing international situation, I cannot go along with the 2-year authorization proposed removing the annual review by the Congress.

Many of my friends in the Congress and some of my constituents who have visited Vietnam have advised me of the improper administration and mismanagement of the AID programs. Senator Griffin of Michigan gave a very revealing report of the problems on his return from Vietnam. There are many similar reports from other sections of the world. Too often, we have been propping up corrupt governments in countries with the people for whom the aid was intended actually turning against Americans because they feel we are in cahoots with these corrupt leaders. Indonesia and Sukarno has been the most glaring example. When we got tough and cut off aid, the people in the country took the initiative and deposed this political leader in what has proven to be one of the greatest victories over communism of our time. The climate for private investment, I am told, is improving daily.

With the amount of money available in the pipeline, I am convinced the acceptable parts of the program can continue without being jeopardized, thereby permitting a substantial decrease in the required monetary authorization.

The heavy drain on our gold reserves caused by this program is very evident to anyone familiar with the problem. This situation becomes more serious with each passing day. As many of the Members know I have always been an advocate of the "more trade—less aid" philosophy. Careful review of private investment internationally will reveal a favorable impact on our balance of payments where the public sector commitments represent the major drain or deficit factor on our gold reserves. This must be checked and reversed if we are to maintain our competitive position in the field of international trade. That is the principal reason for my raising these objections today calling for a more frugal commitment of funds, hopefully to establish a foreign assistance program that will be mutually beneficial to the people of the recipient country and to the people of the United States. As I said before, we are moving in the right direction but we have not gone far enough, fast enough. Therefore, I will vote for the motion to recommit the bill with the purpose of cutting the authorization from 2 years to 1 year, thus permitting an annual congressional review. We cannot abdicate our responsibility. We, as representatives of our people, owe this review and reporting to our constituents—the American taxpayer. It is their money we are spending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note with interest the mellowness of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think hereafter I shall wait until the end of the day to offer my amendments in the hope that they will be accepted.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the Castro regime seized power in Cuba, I have endeavored with every means at my disposal to bring to bear increasing economic pressure on that regime.

Over the years, we in the Congress have enacted numerous measures to withhold assistance to Cuba, to restrict the availability of free world shipping to the island and to limit the categories of goods that may be available to the Castro regime.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have sponsored and supported various initiatives within the Congress of the United States, designed to achieve these objectives.

In 1961, for example, we enacted the basic provision of section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, denying aid to the present Government of Cuba.

In 1962, we extended section 620(a) to prohibit assistance to countries aiding the Castro regime. We also authorized the imposition of an embargo on trade between the United States and Cuba—a very effective and far-reaching move which I was happy to cosponsor in the House.

In 1963, we went a step further. We placed a prohibition on the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States. We also extended the policy of economic denial by enacting far-reaching provisions designed to inhibit the availability of free world shipping to Cuba.

That same year I offered an amendment which was approved by the House of Representatives to forbid the use of our contributions to international organizations for the provision of technical assistance to the Castro regime.

In 1964, we incorporated the shipping provisions in the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act.

In 1965, together with a number of my colleagues I initiated efforts to have the U.S. Delegation to the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization oppose Cuba's attempts to gain admission to that organization.

This year we continued our efforts with a two-pronged attack.

First, I offered an amendment embodied in section 107(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, calling on the President to assure that no part of our contribution to the United Nations development program may be used for projects of technical assistance to Cuba while Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and secondly, I offered a second amendment, embodied in section 301(e)(3), prohibiting assistance to certain countries—including Cuba—which fail to take appropriate steps to prevent ships or aircraft under their registry from transporting equipment, materials or commodities to or from North Vietnam.

Each of the steps which I have just described, together with efforts which we have exerted in other areas, was designed:

To isolate the Communist pariah of the Western Hemisphere from normal economic intercourse with the nations of the free world;

To demonstrate to the peoples of the American Republics that communism has no future in this hemisphere;

To make clear to the people of Cuba, including those who are a part of Castro's present power structure, that the Cuban Castro regime cannot serve their interests;

To reduce the will and the capability of the Castro clique to export subversion and violence to other American states; and,

To increase the cost to the Soviet Union of maintaining a Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere.

This progressive application of economic pressure, combined with our other activities, has been effective. It has contributed to the increasing disorganization and bankruptcy of the Communist system imposed on that island.

Mr. Chairman, we must continue in these efforts. I urge that the House overwhelmingly adopt the two amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 which I have just described, adding another brick to the wall of economic isolation and pressure which must in time bring down the Castro regime.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the bill to amend further the foreign assistance act of 1961 pending action by the other body contains a chapter which provides assistance for population control.

These amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 pending in the other body set a dangerous precedent since they authorize specifically birth control action programs under foreign aid without setting out very necessary safeguards.

At present the Agency for International Development is financing programs of family planning abroad through section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Nowhere in the legislative history of the foreign assistance act is birth control mentioned or provided for.

I have, therefore, branded the present AID programs of birth control as "illegal," and have protested their continued operation.

Apparently because my arguments are well founded, certain Members of the other body who favor birth control introduced two amendments providing for programs during Foreign Relations Committee consideration of the bill. They were adopted and are part of the bill which will be presented to the other body.

While the amendments would have the effect of giving congressional authority to the present birth control programs under AID, it would make the problem worse by not providing the necessary congressional safeguards.

They would in effect give the executive branch a blank check to doing anything it pleased in this area with foreign aid money.

It could finance programs of sterilization and abortion—which would be repugnant to the moral beliefs of the great majority of the American people.

This is not a remote possibility. Right now in India that Government is paying men to be sterilized—about $10 to $20. Further the Indian Health Minister is on record as having said that only abortion would solve India's population problems.

The provisions would allow U.S. funds to be used to bribe men to have themselves sterilized. It would permit our aid money to pay for the murder of children yet unborn.

Can we in Congress, in conscience, give this power to the executive branch? Should not so delicate and sensitive a subject be left in the hands of the elected representatives of the people?

I am not saying that the executive branch will begin widespread support of abortion clinics. In fact, current departmental regulations would not allow it.

But such rules can be changed—without Congress or the public being aware that they have been changed.

Further, there are powerful lobbies at work right now in our country seeking to have abortion and sterilization accepted in Federal programs as legitimate ways of limiting population growth.

The American people will not accept such a socially destructive solution to population growth. But we must not discount the possibility that some public officials—under pressures from Malthusian groups—might without fanfare put the United States firmly behind abortion and sterilization abroad.

For example, the Washington Post of Sunday, March 13, carried a news item about a scientist who proposes a search for two chemicals, the first to sterilize the entire population of a country and a second to reverse the process and allow a couple which had Government permission to have a baby.

The news story quoted Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood-World Population as saying that he had a gloomy foreboding that such a plan might be necessary for some emerging nations which have growing populations.

Clearly U.S. support for such a program would be possible, without congressional approval, under the proposed Senate amendments.

No such provisions were offered or considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee or this committee. I urge, therefore, that the House conferees, when they meet with the conferees of the other body to strongly oppose the Senate provisions.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, section 301(e)(3) of this bill amends section 620(n) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended. Section 620(n) relates to the prohibition against furnishing assistance to countries which permit ships under its registry to carry cargo to North Vietnam.

I offered the original amendment in committee in 1965 which placed this prohibition in the Foreign Assistance Act. The original language of my amendment as accepted by the committee and finally by the House required that aid be cut off to those countries which had failed to take appropriate steps within 60 days to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting equipment, materials or commodities to or from North Vietnam. I felt at that time that the 60 days was a sufficient time in which to warn these free world countries that they must comply with the law or have further aid terminated.

The Senate had no comparable provision but accepted the House language with a modification. The modification provided that the President "shall consider denying assistance" instead of the inflexible requirement that assistance must be terminated to countries whose ships and aircraft under its registry call on North Vietnam.

The Senate argued that the language of the House bill afforded little negotiating leverage because most of the countries whose ships are still in the North Vietnam trade receive little or no assistance from the United States. The major nation with ships in this trade—the United Kingdom—no longer receives either economic or military assistance from the United States. The United States is making high-level diplomatic representations to obtain free world cooperation in getting ships and planes out of the North Vietnam trade, and a number of vessels have already left the trade because of commercial and safety considerations.

The House accepted the argument that negotiations on this matter would be more effective it there was not a rigid requirement that aid be terminated.

The amendment contained in this bill, Mr. Chairman, removes that flexibility which the House accepted during the conference on the Foreign Assistanct Act of 1965. I offered this amendment in committee because I believed that the full impact of our foreign aid program should be brought to bear wherever and whenever such action could contribute to bringing the war in Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. It was my firm belief that the period of over 1 year which has expired since the amendment was originally adopted is more than sufficient time to have prepared for the termination of aid to the remaining free world countries who still allow their aircraft and ships to carry cargo to North Vietnam.

There has been a very definite improvement in this situation. In calendar year 1965, 256 free world flagships from countries, not all of which received our aid, visited North Vietnamese ports. During the first 3 months of this year, only 36 such vessels have visited North Vietnam. Although there has been a sharp decrease in shipping by free world countries to North Vietnam, I still do not believe that the United States should continue to furnish assistance in any form to any country actively assisting North Vietnam by permitting their ships to transport supplies and materials. It was for this reason that I offered the amendment which removed the discretionary power of the President to terminate assistance to countries trading with North Vietnam.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 624(d), which relates to the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) Whenever the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, deems it appropriate in carrying out his duties under this Act, he may from time to time notify the head of any agency primarily responsible for administering any program with respect to which the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, has responsibilities under paragraph (2) of this subsection that all internal audit, end-use inspection, and management inspection reports submitted to the head of such agency or mission in the field in connection with such program from any geographic areas designated by the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall be submitted simultaneously to the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance. The head of each such agency shall cooperate with the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph."

(b) Section 635(h), which relates to general authorities, is amended by inserting "(except development loans)" immediately after "II, V, and VI".

(c) Section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, is amended by striking out "the fiscal year 1966 not to exceed $54,240,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $57,387,000".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 20, line 7, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal year 1967".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am about to test the validity of the argument that perhaps it is best to offer amendments late in a debate on a bill of this character. I would trust and even have some expectation this amendment may be accepted. It simply would make necessary an annual authorization for administrative expenses of the foreign aid program.

I recognize this may require a half day of the time of the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1967, but I would assume that this would not be putting an undue burden on that committee.

The Deputy Administrator of AID, William S. Gaud, came to the committee at the end of April and testified with respect to administrative expenses.

He requested some $57,387,000 for the year 1967. He pointed out that there were a variety of reasons why these administrative expenses increased from year to year. He said, for example, that inflation abroad, Federal personnel procedures, and Federal pay raises had resulted in an increase from 1966.

He pointed out further the importance with a 5-year program of having an open-ended authorization for administrative expenses, because, as he put it, it would be impossible to be specific with respect to future years.

I would like to quote what he said on that point:

> Mr. GAUD. Ordinarily it is easy for us to predict for the year ahead what we are going to need for administrative expenses or for other programs. For some of these programs, however, it is very difficult for us to predict, and it is true of administrative expenses, precisely what we are going to need 2, 3, 4, 5 years ahead.

I refer to the testimony on page 628 of the hearings.

He mentioned also, in answer to a question by the chairman of our committee, that it would be best to have an open-ended authorization. This testimony is on page 625 of the hearings:

> But it is pretty hard to sit here today and calculate with any degree of accuracy what our administrative expenses will be over the next 5 years. That is why it seems to us reasonable to ask you to authorize such funds as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, we did not follow the suggestion of Mr. Gaud. We authorized a specific sum, a sum for fiscal 1968 which is completely arbitrary. No case was made for any amount for 1968.

I would suggest it would be far better, and certainly no violation of anybody's time or responsibility, for our committee to consider next year just what the AID program will need to handle its administrative responsibilities for the fiscal year 1968.

For that reason, I urge consideration of a 1-year authorization for this aspect of the foreign aid program.

If there are no questions, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have been through this now a couple of times—once specifically and once in general.

I believe it was made abundantly clear yesterday the reasons why we have this program on a 2-year basis, and especially the administrative end of it.

Again, it seems to me that the gentleman from New Jersey rather clearly makes a case for a 2-year authorization. I have not seen anything about any of these programs getting any cheaper. We are in inflation. It would seem to me it would be a pretty good thing, if for no other reason, to settle, for the year after next, on the same basis as to administrative cost as is to be provided for the coming fiscal year.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, there is a question of morale. In many instances it is a favorite theme for some of us to give the bureaucrats or the administrators of these programs a bad time. To criticize government personnel seemingly reminds us of our own actions in supporting certain legislation and this may be the classic example.

As I said yesterday, on this same principle, we have some able people. We will have people who will be able to do a better job if they can plan over a 2-year period. When they do not know whether they are going to be in this setup for more than 1 year, it seems to me it constitutes a very awkward situation and contributes to a feeling of uneasiness. That does create a lack of high morale in the administration of the program.

It seems to me for many practical reasons, and especially in this regard, it is necessary, and certainly highly desirable, to permit this section to remain intact, along with the other sections.

I would favor retaining the 2-year authorization for this section than any other in the bill. I think the reasons for doing so are practical and substantial.

What would we do? If we are not to have a 2-year authorization for administrative purposes would we have to come in with a part of a foreign aid bill next year, just for personnel or for some other section of the bill? If we are to have a foreign aid bill, we had better come in with a bill such as we are considering now, rather than to fragment this and come in to make a case on a particular section. If there is to be a program I want to see the best one which can be produced. In my opinion it will not be good enough but it certainly should not be worse.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, over the years I have opposed this legislation because I conscientiously do not believe that the military assistance should be handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I believe that is under the jurisdiction of our committee. But that is a fact of life and it has gone on. I believe it should be separated, but it is not and there is nothing to be gained at this point.

Since I have become chairman of the Committee on Armed Services I have had to travel a lot. Last year I traveled to the Far East, and to Korea. I saw our allies who are the direct beneficiaries of this bill under the military assistance program.

The 19 divisions of Koreans are dependent upon this legislation for their assistance. They have 23,000 men fighting side by side with our boys and they committed another division. The F-5 airplane was built under this program. It is the only new airplane we have in our inventories. There is no other new airplane. Under the McNamara program we are forced to use the F-5 airplane in our armed services, and this military assistance program built that plane.

Mr. Chairman, I also visited Taiwan and saw the need and the dependence which the Nationalist Chinese have for this legislation in order to keep their army, navy, and air force going.

Everybody knows what we are doing in Vietnam. When we had the supplemental appropriation bill before our committee Secretary McNamara told us that he could not separate the MAP money from his own appropriated funds for Vietnam.

I have also visited Thailand and I know the great logistical help that they are giving our military as a result of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I have searched my conscience and knowing this and what these allies are doing for us and knowing that this is the only place I can help them and also being your representative on the Committee on Armed Services, I feel that I must reappraise my position. Therefore, this year, despite the features which may not be pleasing to me, I feel in good conscience I must support this legislation, and this is what I am going to do.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 20, line 8, strike out "$57,387,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$51,648,300".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is another constructive amendment. It cuts less from the bill than any other amendment I have introduced when I have been accused of trying to gut this sacred piece of legislation. All we are trying to do with this amendment is to reduce approximately $5.7 million from the administrative expenses. I would like to remind you that 10 years ago this AID Agency, under whatever name it carried at the time, had approximately 11,500 employees. Now, with the direct employees and contract personnel, the figure is approximately 18,000 employees. This is a runaway administrative setup. Since we have rejected the attempt to limit administrative expenses just to 1 year, I think it would be prudent at least to put a limit on the dollar amount of administrative expenses. I do not think $5¾ million would be an amendment that could be described as gutting the bill. I think it is a very healthy restraint on the runaway administrators of this program. The top Administrator, who comes and goes year after year, people like Mr. David Bell, who arrived with great fanfare and who we hope will master their assignments. Just about at the time that we on the committee think he may be able to make some administrative improvements in the program, these people throw up their hands in frustration and take off for institutions such as the Ford Foundation. So, unless we have some practical administrative restraint, I do not know how we will accomplish any savings. The only administrative restraint that I know that bureaucrats acknowledge is a dollar restraint. I think it would be perfectly consistent with the efficiency everyone wants for this program to delete $5¾ million from the administrative expenses of the program. Mr. Chairman, we are at the conclusion of the bill, the only other thing that follows will be a sound motion to recommit. I think we can close on a very diplomatic and progressive note by accepting my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the adoption of my amendment would represent a wonderful conclusion to the very fascinating, although to some of us, frustrating day here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. For a question, but not for a statement.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many of these employees are now working either as Government employees or as contract employees in South Vietnam?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Too many, for the very simple reason that we are fighting a war in Vietnam and at the very same time we are trying to follow a completely unrealistic aid program where we have not even subjugated the military infiltrators from North Vietnam.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the figures available are with respect to May 30, 1966, and they reveal that there are 2,018 employees in Vietnam.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] that the AID agency has been advertising for civilian employees for employment in Vietnam. They have a number of people who would like to go to Algeria, Cairo, and other glamorous spots, but few for Vietnam.

Mr. JOELSON. Casablanca.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It is a little difficult to administer this program under war conditions, and as the gentleman knows, we are at war in Vietnam.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman knows and I would say that there is no picnic in Vietnam and those 2,000 people are rendering a dedicated work which will do more to bring about peace than anything else about which I can think.

Mr. DERWINSKI. That is not at all the point. The point is that you are dispensing aid under this program to over 80 nations, without any real administrative control.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment would represent a practical dollar restraint or administrative restraint.

Mr. Chairman, this certainly would be a good way of controlling the runaway bureaucracy.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it always pains me to rise in opposition to an amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI]. His amendments always drip with compassion.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is adopted I would like to point out that it will be gutting the program in driblets of "compassion."

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

However, I believe, while it is a nice little amendment, as the gentleman says, it really in effect does go to the heart of the program. On the one hand all of us here today have been urging that we have greater efficiency in Vietnam.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] had an amendment adopted which will bring about this efficiency. It adds more people. At the same time, the very people who are interested in this economy are now asking us to go ahead and fire a lot of people indiscriminately.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have a more efficient program and at the same time we do not have the personnel with which to carry out the efficiency that we are requiring of them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should keep in mind that this 2-year program that we are adopting really has a built-in cutting device, because this does not take into consideration the fact that there will be things which will come up over which AID has no control such as the small, bit-by-bit pay increase increments and overseas wages and compensation, and the like.

So, I believe that the amount of money about which the gentleman from Illinois is worried is going to be taken care of by extending this program to a 2-year program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I urge the rejection of this amendment. But, nevertheless, if we want efficiency, and that is what all of us want, we should vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1967 authorization request is one of the lowest requests ever presented by the President to carry out the foreign aid program. The minimum request is lower than that of any of the requests in recent years. In fact the request is over $1 billion less than was requested only 3 years ago.

There is other evidence that the program is being tightly administered. Supporting assistance programs have been sharply reduced. Outside of Vietnam these funds have been reduced by more than two-thirds since fiscal year 1961. Programs have been terminated in 20 countries. Furthermore, the number of AID country programs has been reduced from 83 in fiscal year 1963 to a proposed 72 in fiscal year 1967.

This year's request, therefore, clearly indicates that the President intends to maintain an efficient aid program—one that is consistent with U.S. interests, but one that will be a minimum burden on U.S. taxpayers.

A large portion of the economic aid program is for Vietnam. Twenty percent of the economic assistance funds are planned for Vietnam, where they will be used to support vital U.S. objectives. This indicates clearly that programs for all the other countries are being held to a minimal level.

In considering the fiscal year 1967 request, the Foreign Affairs Committee has taken into consideration the executive branch's internal review of its proposal. Last fall, AID's internal review resulted in a reduction of two-thirds of a billion dollars—$660 million—from the original proposals. This indicates that there was a tight review of the program even before the Foreign Affairs Committee examined the request in detail.

Furthermore, in approving the program for 2 years, the Foreign Affairs Committee has provided that there will be almost no increase in the amount of funds authorized. The committee has clearly expressed its position that "those responsible for the administration of economic and military assistance should reexamine their priorities in an effort to accomplish more with less money." This means the program will have to continue to be tightly and efficiently administered.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the foreign aid program—economic and military aid—continues to be a relatively small portion of this country's immense wealth. Our national wealth continues to grow. Our GNP is estimated to be greater than $700 billion. In fiscal year 1967, the expenditures for the economic and military programs are estimated to be no more than one-half of 1 percent of the GNP—the same level as for the last 2 years. Relatively, therefore, the aid program is becoming a smaller portion of our total resources. It is becoming a smaller burden on the economy and the taxpayer.

The United States today is faced with many crises all over the world. I believe that in some ways the foreign aid program can help us to protect our interests in these turbulent times.

In my campaign, I indicated that the foreign aid program should be closely reviewed by the Congress and all unnecessary funds cut out. I believe the program has been carefully reviewed this year. In approving the request, the Foreign Affairs Committee stressed that the program must be focused on priorities. I believe that approval of this bill, which maintains a minimum program for the next 2 years, will assure us that the program will be focused on priorities, and that it will be, because it must be, administered very tightly.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with considerable interest and attention the pace and content of these 3 days of debate on the proposed foreign assistance authorization which is now before us. Of particular significance is the fact that so many Members have taken an active role in the debate on this bill. Clearly foreign assistance is a subject touching everyone in the United States, just as every branch of foreign policy has national significance. I can hear in the words of my colleagues the views and concerns of their constituents around the Nation.

There can be no doubt about the wisdom of debating important facets of policy as thoroughly as we are now debating foreign aid. Because foreign aid is a crucial instrument of our foreign policy, I think it is essential that we in Congress have the opportunity to study the program thoroughly every year, so we can insure that the program will be responsive to the thoughts of our constituents and to changes in the international climate. There has been considerable talk around the country of the diminishing role of the Congress in matters of foreign policy. If there is one area where we have assumed a leading role in foreign policy, however, it is foreign aid.

Of course, there is something to be said for eliminating some of the uncertainty that is inherent in an aid program which must be reviewed yearly. But when we offer assistance to an underdeveloped country, we are doing more than just entering into an economic transaction. Based on certain conclusions about the internal policies and problems of the recipient country, we are helping its people to help themselves to attain a better standard of living. At the same time, however, we are seeking to communicate to aided countries the value of the American way of life. This fact is recognized in a wise amendment added to this bill by our Foreign Affairs Committee, and it brings our aid program clearly within the scope of current foreign policy—it leaves something more than a purely economic decision to be made when the question of aiding a particular nation arises. It is this question, involving basic foreign policy, which we in the Congress must answer. Because of the volatile world climate, the answer will not necessarily be the same for a given country every year.

I think we should retain the single-year authorization, whereby Congress can make minor as well as drastic adjustments in foreign aid policy when such changes are justified.

As an example of how foreign aid serves as an instrument of foreign policy, the committee has added an amendment prohibiting assistance to nations which actively assist the North Vietnamese. Thus, we have clearly tied our foreign assistance efforts to our aims in southeast Asia, and rightly so. While we are chided for handling some of our foreign aid on a "strings attached" basis, we must remember that the United States cannot act as an impartial international agency in dispensing money and goods. While the development of all peoples toward a decent level of life falls within the scope of American national interest, there are some instances where our national interest is not served, and we must not hesitate to prohibit the distribution of aid in those instances, particularly where American lives hang in the balance.

Again, I want to commend my colleagues on the thorough and active review we have had of U.S. foreign assistance programs in the past few days. It is my hope that we can continue to review foreign aid in such detail on a yearly basis, so that we can insure that these programs will serve effectively to aid less fortunate peoples of the world and to promote the basic precept of American foreign policy.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, in past years the issue before us has been whether or not each of us supports foreign aid programs, and by how much. But this year we have added an element that disturbs me. We are asked to authorize a program for 2 years instead of 1.

This is not the first time we have been under pressure to further relinquish our constitutional prerogative of controlling expenditures, and I am sure it will not be the last. But by voting for a 2-year program we will allow a big foot in the door that will eventually lead to the 5-year authorization requested by the administration. In the process, this Congress will further lose its control over the operations of a program that has long been suspect by the American people, and rightfully so, as wasteful in many respects.

It has been argued that the Appropriations Committee will still have to fund these programs on an annual basis, which is true. However, the work of the Appropriations Committee would be hampered in any year when the proper authorizing committee failed to properly review the foreign aid expenditures of the past.

I will be interested in the reaction to this authorization when action is taken by our Committee on Appropriations, since the cost of this package is greatly in excess of even the "bare-bones" amount requested by the administration. I have never seen a foreign aid package yet, "bare-bones" or otherwise, that could not be prudently cut without affecting the purpose or efficiency of the programs. There have been enough failures and instances of wasteful expenditures in the past to indicate that the pruning of appropriations can have a healthy effect on these programs by forcing some degree of planning and efficiency.

It is good to note that this bill includes a provision that prohibits assistance to countries that permit their ships or aircraft to transport equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam. It is hoped that this provision will be vigorously enforced and policed.

However, I feel the provision to express the intent of Congress against providing funds for United Nations programs that assist Communist countries such as Cuba does not go far enough. The United States provides 40 percent of those funds, and such moneys should be absolutely prohibited from reaching the Castro regime. One such project was approved for the University of Havana this year in the amount of $2.1 million. To argue that our money is not used for such a project is pure fiction. We are contributing 40 percent of the money used 90 miles off our shores to promote subversion in our hemisphere no matter how you look at it. It should be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, instead of issuing a 2-year blank check with which to continue the foreign aid programs, it would be better if this Congress stepped back and took a long, cold look at the record of these programs. We are currently helping, in one form or another, almost every nation in the world. We continue to hear of further programs that will be submitted to aid foreign countries. Before we commit American tax dollars to the education, health, and welfare of the entire world, we should reexamine the programs already on the books and put them in efficient working order.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, last year, I introduced H.R. 5255, which I recommended either be passed as a separate bill or included in the foreign aid bill. One of the reasons I introduced this bill is because one of the leading universities in the country, Iowa State University, is in the district I represent and conversations that I have had with the president of the university and professors at the university have convinced me that performance and accomplishment at the present time are less than they would be under longer term institutional arrangements. I appreciate the opportunity given me to appear before the committee and the provision added in title II which embodies the provisions of H.R. 5255.

This bill authorized the creation and maintenance of foreign development centers at universities which are engaged in foreign technical assistance projects. At the present time contracts with universities for advice, counsel, and help concerning development projects in a particular country, are usually for a period of not to exceed 3 years. Quite often the university accepting the contract finds it difficult to find competent professional personnel to carry out the contract on such a short-term basis. Therefore, they often recruit a substantial part of their personnel for the contract and since the personnel recruited cannot be offered tenure, it is often difficult to attract the most competent individuals away from some other position which would include tenure and security.

If a university could plan to specialize in the problems for a certain country or area for a period of 10 years, it could not only attract more competent people but could also utilize the experience gained to a much better advantage for the Government. When someone finishes a short-term contract and then moves on to some other area of responsibility without even leaving associates in a continuing program fully exposed to the knowledge and experience he gained, it cannot help but reduce the effectiveness of the program in the less developed countries involved.

At the present time, many university staff members have to secure a leave of absence from their university to take on a foreign assignment; their advancement at the university is retarded; and their experience gained is not utilized after their short-term contract had expired. Under this provision, a university could mobilize a more competent staff for a long-range program and even though some of the personnel left from time to time, there would be continuity and good use made of the experience they gained. The university would also be able to develop longer term programs in the countries involved.

I believe everyone will agree that short-term projects will not do the best job in many of these countries. In most cases the greatest need is for longer term plans involving education and other programs which produce greater results for a dollar spent, but which results are not apparent for several years. These longer term plans could fit in with other university activities and schedules in such a way that the most competent staff members at the university would be willing to take foreign technical assistance assignments within their field of interest. Many such professors who have already attained a high standing in the professional field are not willing to take a part-time assignment concerning the problems of a particular country if they have no reason to believe that the result of their research and study will be used over a period of years.

By directly involving the university and the most competent members of their professional staff in the technical assistance program in a way which is now practically impossible, it would greatly increase the number of professional people engaged in the development activities and broaden the base so that a better balanced program of economic assistance would be recommended.

Mr. Chairman, this provision does not propose a new program in the technical assistance field but merely proposes a way to carry out the existing technical assistance programs so that we could secure better results. This kind of an approach has proven highly successful in the field of agricultural research.

Agricultural universities, including Iowa State University, have performed research work on a continuing basis under existing Federal-State programs. Under this approach they were able to recruit competent staff and have gleaned benefits from all of the research performed through the years. Under this proposal, that successful formula be applied to planning economic assistance programs and I urge that this provision be retained in title II.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the thing for each of us to ask ourselves before we vote on this bill on final passage is just how much longer can this country endure a foreign aid program? Year after year the American people are assured that our aid contributes toward changing an emerging and backward nation to a self-supporting country with prosperity and freedom.

How can we forget that near the end of the year of 1964, Nasser told the United States to "jump in the lake" because we expressed some rightful irritation over the burning of our Embassy in Cairo? How can we forget that after a comment like Nasser's, his nation since 1960 has received over $1 billion in economic assistance. Remember, that is $1,000 million. Then, recall the spring of 1964 when Sukarno, then President of Indonesia, had the effrontery to tell our Ambassador, face to face, "to hell with your aid." The facts were that Sukarno maintained himself in power largely because of a little less than a billion dollars he had received from us in economic aid. And yet this ingrate who now, thank goodness, has received his comeuppance had the consummate gall to insult our Ambassador.

Much less than a year ago the now deposed President Nkrumah of Ghana had the audacity to write and release a book blasting our foreign policy and bitterly critical of our assistance program. Yet, this same treacherous chameleon was at the very moment accepting $165 million of our aid to perpetuate himself in office. He nonetheless carried on up to the day of his downfall as the principal organizer of a Red Chinese spy network on the African Continent.

There have been so many insults leveled against us by foreign leaders that if you sat down to tabulate a list for the last 15 years, the total would be over 125.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason I ask the question, How much longer can our country stand to engage in a foreign aid program?

The record is clear. There has been failure after failure that has been paid for with our billions of dollars over the past years. If our aid has been so successful, what happened in Uganda, which has received about $20 million in aid, for it to become a dictatorship?

Year after year we have listened to the glowing predictions of what will happen in the future, but again and again we have had to listen to the pitiful excuses for the failures of the preceding year. Each year I have hoped there would be improvement in the administration of the program. But nothing seems to happen in the way of improvement.

Mr. Chairman, although the long record of failures is the one of the best reasons why we should stop the foreign aid program, there are other reasons that should be enumerated, including such things as the drain on our U.S. gold stocks which are a direct result of the aid program.

An additional reason is the fact it is generally recognized that economic assistance never reaches down sufficiently to the people of the aid recipient countries but always seems to benefit only the rich and well-to-do in those countries.

Yet another reason the bill should not be enacted this year is because of the huge unexpended balances in the program which have been referred to as the "pipeline" which now amounts to as much as $9 billion. This large figure is several times the amount authorized this year yet accountability over these pipeline funds has already been lost by the Congress. Why not cut through this bureaucratic redtape to finish the lagging foreign projects already commenced before any new starts? Along the way it might be discovered the projects were no good to begin with and have actually been abandoned.

A telling objection to the further authorization of foreign aid programs is the fact that many of the aid-receiving countries have in the past years taken our aid and proceeded to spend much of this assistance with other countries. This fact can be established by a comparison of the amounts of direct dollar economic aid we have granted these countries along side our trade balance with these countries. In other words compare for each country the amount of aid accorded the list of foreign recipients and compare this with the amount of our exports to each of these nations. From a list of about 25 nations in the Middle East, Africa, and the Far East it can be demonstrated that our dollar aid for these countries exceeds by about 3 to 1 the value of the products we sell to these countries. To state the matter very simply they have taken our money and bought their goods in other countries. These figures should refute conclusively the argument we hear so often that foreign aid money is, after all, spent in this country.

One of the strongest reasons of all why there should be no foreign aid program until there has been a thorough review of the entire operation is the fact that we are furnishing millions of dollars to nations which have accepted our aid and at the same time take aid from the Communist bloc nations.

The very worst offense is by these recipients of our aid who have acted against a peaceful solution in Vietnam. The Agency for International Development has tried to say many times in the past that our assistance to pro-Communist countries prevents them from slipping into the Communist orbit. The old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating" should pretty well establish the fact that what has happened in these countries is that they have taken our money but are nonetheless today in the Communist orbit.

But the worst evil of all about foreign assistance is that we have furnished aid to some countries who are now actively assisting North Vietnam by permitting their ships to transfer materiel and supplies into North Vietnam ports. It is true that the President of the United States has discretionary power to deny assistance to such countries but they are still shipping and we are still shoveling out money to such countries as the United Kingdom, Japan, Greece, Norway, and the Netherlands.

Since World War II we have spent about $37 billion on military assistance. For a long time we thought this was a small price to pay for keeping our boys off battlefields but within the very recent past we have found that France which has been the largest recipient has turned its back on us in Vietnam. It even supports Peking's admittance into the U.N. and in the last month demanded the closing of all our bases on French soil. Another of our supposedly great friends, the United Kingdom, which has received over $1 billion in military assistance sends her ships into Cuba every week. But worse still, British flagships are hauling supplies into the North Vietnam ports every day. Why is it the jungle-trained British troops in Malaysia cannot be used in Vietnam? Foreign military forces whether French, British, Turkish, or Greek have been equipped with materiel paid for by the American taxpayers. The question which hits us squarely in the face is what value is all this military assistance to us when our American boys are now fighting alone in Vietnam? Over 50 nations have been designated for military aid this year. Only one, South Korea, has sent troops to Vietnam. Australia and New Zealand who have sent troops to Vietnam are receiving no U.S. aid.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the Congress in 1959, although I supported the foreign aid bill that year on final passage I raised for the first time the question of congressional control over the aid program. Before that time I had been an elected official in local government where we had a careful accounting and a review by the authority making the expenditure. But I was astonished to find there was little or no congressional review of the foreign aid expenditure. After finding this to be a fact, I have since opposed this authorization and appropriation year after year because of the maladministration of these programs. Each year many of us have looked in vain for some improvement in the administration of foreign aid programs.

Maybe there is just no way that the foreign aid program can be made to work successfully. The objective apparently had been to make recipient countries our grateful allies and friends. It is argued that once commenced we must continue foreign aid in order to keep these countries as our allies and friends. Look as much as you will, but there is no convincing evidence that any of our aid recipients which have not gone Communist would have done so if they had not received our economic aid. France and Italy have received large amounts of our aid, yet Communist Party membership in these countries has not fallen off. On the other hand, Cuba went communistic in 1959 in spite of 12 prior years of foreign aid from the United States, and in spite of the fact that she had been favored beyond all other countries in sugar imports. Look back at the $11 billion of lend lease to Russia in World War II. Did this endear us to the Russian leaders? Has our aid to Poland, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, or Egypt turned Gomulka, Tito, Sukarno, or Nasser into dependable allies? No. Scores of other nations have received our aid and instead of being our grateful friend, there is good reason to suspect that our aid has often had the very opposite effect.

Some of these countries have even developed the technique of a veiled threat as the recognized and effective way to extort more aid. They make it appear they are in danger of going Communist, in order to receive larger amounts of American aid. But these very same applicants for our aid seem always to find it convenient and even necessary to insult and denounce the United States in order to prove to their own followers that they are independent and not the puppets of American imperialism. It seems to me that the fact that nearly always it is the U.S. Embassies and U.S. information offices that have rocks thrown through their windows and not the embassies of other countries that have never offered aid, should prove conclusively you cannot buy friends.

No, Mr. Chairman, our country cannot much longer stand or afford a foreign program. The time to stop the program is now. Right now.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to explain to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union what the proposed motion to recommit will contain. It will be of two parts. The first part will represent the essence of the so-called Mailliard amendment that we debated yesterday. The amendment would reduce the program from a 2-year authorization to a 1-year authorization, except for development loans and the Alliance for Progress program, which programs would remain at 5-year authorizations.

The second part of the proposed motion to recommit would reduce the authorization for development loans annually from $1 billion to $750 million.

The period of authorization for development loans would remain the same as in the bill before the committee; that is, 5 years.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as has been made evident by the explanation of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the motion to recommit contains the essential elements of two amendments already discussed by this body, both of which have been defeated.

The principal one would be to change the program from the present 2-year program, which it now is, back to a 1-year program.

The other would be to make cuts in the Development Loan Fund, which the gentleman has explained.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I would point out that what the gentleman from Florida has said is correct. The motion is essentially the elements of the two amendments. But there is a difference from the development loan program as offered in the amendment that we debated on the floor.

The amendment debated on the floor reduced the amount from $1 billion to $750 million, and reduced the years from 5 years to 3 years. The motion to recommit does not touch the number of years.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for the further clarification, and I now yield to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to point out to the Members of the House, that the first part of the motion to recommit was debated fully on the floor when the Mailliard amendment was considered yesterday. On a teller vote it lost by a vote of 122 to 86.

The second part of the motion to recommit, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] said, is somewhat changed because his original amendment was to reduce the development loan figure from $1 billion to $750 million, and it had a 3-year limitation in it. The 3-year limitation is taken out, but the figure for the Development Loan Fund would be reduced $250 million over a 5-year period by the motion to recommit.

I ask the Members on my side, and all those who realize the importance of the foreign aid program to the security of this country, to vote against this motion to recommit.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately preceding the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] at page 17, line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in order to help clarify the question so that Members understand as we vote on the motion to recommit, we are voting to take a 2-year authorization and reduce it to 1 year, or return to the present language.

In other words, if you vote against the motion to recommit you are voting to double the foreign aid program.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, historically I have not supported an authorization bill for foreign aid. I feel, however, on this occasion, because of the situation and because of our commitments in Vietnam I must reverse my position.

I was very much impressed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services when he gave his reasons for supporting this legislation. I too must say at this time while I intend to support the motion to recommit, if the motion to recommit does not prevail then I shall support the legislation.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington. I too have consistently not supported the foreign aid bill. But for the reasons that he has so eloquently outlined I intend to support the bill this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 15750) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On the first page, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after the first section thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON FISCAL YEAR AUTHORIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act (except sections 202 and 252) authorizes appropriations for furnishing assistance or for administrative expenses under this Act for fiscal year 1968.' "

On page 2, line 23, strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$750,000,000".

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 193, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—191

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Everett
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy

Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—193

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Price
Purcell
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vivian
Waldie
Watts
Weltner
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—48

Ashley
Baring
Bell
Blatnik
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Carey
Celler
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Curtis
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Farnsley
Fino
Flynt
Hall
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hays
Herlong
King, N.Y.
Landrum
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Morris
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Roush
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Stephens
Toll
Trimble
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis
Wright

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Scott for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Matsunaga against.

Mr. Roush for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Farnsley against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.

Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Senner against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Schisler against.

Mr. Conable for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mills with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. CLANCY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 146, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—237

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Selden
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Watts
Weltner
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—146

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Everett
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Mosher
O'Konski
Passman
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Secrest

Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stanton
Talcott
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NOT VOTING—49

Ashley
Baring
Bell
Blatnik
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Carey
Celler
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Curtis
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Farnsley
Fino
Flynt
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hays
Herlong
King, N.Y.
Landrum
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Morris
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Roush
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Stephens
Toll
Trimble
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Roush against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Hall against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Conable for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. O'Brien.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OUR NATION'S NEW MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE OPENING OF THE WEST AFTER THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE, THE GATEWAY ARCH

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of our great country dreams of new and bold ventures have become realities when undertaken by an industrious, imaginative, and enlightened people. Such is the story of our Nation's new monument commemorating the opening of the West after the Louisiana Purchase, the Gateway Arch.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the Mexico Evening Ledger on June 30, 1966, and written by Mr. Robert M. White, editor. Mr. White's comments pay just tribute to a feat of which all Americans everywhere can be justifiably proud.

THE MARK OF ST. LOUIS

The Eiffel Tower means Paris.

The Brandenburg Gate means Berlin.

Red Square means Moscow.

Times Square, New York.

The Golden Gate Bridge is San Francisco.

And now the Gateway Arch will mean St. Louis.

The arch is unique, bold, graceful and impressive.

It already is becoming the pride of St. Louis. In time, it will be known throughout the world.

The arch is officially The Gateway Arch commemorating the opening of the west after the Louisiana Purchase.

It is the tallest monument in America—630 feet. As a matter of fact, there are only 16 buildings in the country taller.

It is 75 feet taller than the Washington Monument.

It is 180 feet taller than the Great Pyramid of Cheops.

The foundations of the arch are 60 feet below ground level, the lower 30 feet being in bed rock.

At the ground level each leg is a double steel-walled equilateral triangle with each side measuring 54 feet at the base and 17 feet at the top.

There are 1,076 steps from the visitor center below the ground level to the top; however, a 40-passenger train will ride inside the core of each leg.

The engineering had to be so precise that surveying during erection of the steel sides was done at night when the temperature of each side of the three walls was equal.

There are many other facts and figures about the arch.

But the most interesting facts about it is this:

It's there.

It's there to become the pride of St. Louis. It's there to commemorate the vision of community leaders who said St. Louis needed a symbol. It's there to honor the talent and imagination of its architect Eero Saarinen. It's there proudly proclaiming the courage of the citizen's committee who selected Saarinen's daring proposal * * *.

* * * It's there, like all really great monuments, in towering tribute to man, himself, who always can, if only he will, do the seemingly impossible.

CITIZENS SHOULD BE CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE MONEY MARKETS OF THIS COUNTRY

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, every citizen should be vitally concerned about what is happening in the money markets of this country. The economic and social gains of the past 6 years are in serious jeopardy today because of skyrocketing interest rates and the critical imbalance in the national money supply.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a firm supporter of the new economics, I must hold this administration responsible for the interest rate crisis. Without a cohesive program, this administration is floundering in monetary policy. In effect, the administration is abdicating to William McChesney Martin the responsibilities for economic policy. This is the same Martin who, as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, led us up and down the boom and bust cycles of the fifties.

Today there is a major slump in residential construction and in all the related building industries. Builders predict that by the year's end new starts in housing will drop to 73 percent of the 1965 volume. We are on the verge of a lumber and building industries recession. The savings and loan institutions are badly hurt. The effect can only spread through other segments of the economy.

Only immediate attention and decisive action by the President can avert disastrous economic consequences. Today I am calling on the President to convene an emergency conference with the leaders of the Congress, members of the Federal Reserve Board, and housing and financial leaders to formulate an effective program to bring interest rates back into line, and to reestablish a healthy balance among financial institutions in the money market.

The Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted actions of last December have been completely unsuccessful as brakes on the economy and, as I suggested at that time, have served instead to throw the whole economy out of balance. The 4½-percent discount rate which the Federal Reserve Board is currently charging for loans to member banks is the highest discount rate since 1929. Economists throughout the country are alarmed that the Board has ignored the lesson of the fifties—that peaks of high interest rates are invariably followed by recessions. Almost without exception, the Federal Reserve has not decreased discount rates except as reaction to declining gross national product. Even today, I read with alarm that another hike in the discount rate and further increases in the basic lending rate to commercial banks are anticipated. In the light of our economic history, such an outrageous increase can only lead to complete economic disaster.

The money market today is in chaos. Federal securities are currently trading at an effective rate of 5¼ percent. Commercial banks are responding to the Federal Reserve's lead by continuing their interest rate escalation. On Friday, the

Chase Manhattan Bank of New York moved up its rate on dealer loans backed by Government securities to 6½ percent from 6¼ percent. Loans to brokers backed with non-Government collateral are now commanding a 6-percent rate.

The fierce competition between certificates of deposit of the commercial banks and the commercial paper issues of finance companies quickened when Walter E. Heller & Co. announced a rate jump from 5½ to 5⅝ percent on the short-term commercial paper it sells directly to investors. This action will obviously restrict the ability of commercial bankers to obtain funds for lending.

The tightening money situation is threatening to pressure the commercial banks to raise the "prime" rate even higher than the current 5¾ percent that the banks charge to their most gilt-edged customers. The competition for cash is now intensified by rising yields of sales participation offerings up to 5.75 percent by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Tax-exempt securities are experiencing corresponding interest cost rises.

The Federal Reserve Board worsened the money situation in December by permitting a 5½-percent interest rate on certificates of deposit issued by commercial banks—a rate which by now is commonplace in the banks. Investors are withdrawing their funds from savings and loan institutions to cash in on the attractive interest rates elsewhere.

The net inflow of funds to savings and loans—new savings less withdrawals—for the first 5 months of this year were the smallest since 1951. The May figures, the most recent available, show that withdrawals increased by 38 percent from a year ago. The quarter ending in April showed a loss of $744 million in savings. The Idaho Savings & Loan Association was forced to close its four offices on July 7, even though it was offering 5 percent on regular savings accounts and 5.5 percent on 48-month certificates. A savings and loan association in Oregon, in the district which I represent, reports that it has not made a single new loan commitment since April 20. A year ago this same association was averaging $400,000 a month in loans.

The only remedy that the Federal Reserve Board has offered to correct the maldistribution of money is to raise the reserves that banks must hold against time deposits from 4 percent to 5 percent. The action was quicky denounced as too little, too late by spokesmen for the savings and loans, many of our colleagues in the Congress, and Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon.

The housing industry is dramatically affected by the removal of funds from sources which traditionally lend money for the purchase of homes. The number of new mortgages granted fell 5 percent in April from March, and 9 percent from April 1965.

The Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, John E. Horne, reports that the interest rate on older homes—conventional home mortgages—was up to 6.09 percent in April 1966, compared with 5.89 percent in April 1965. For new homes the rate rise for the corresponding period was from 5.74 percent to 5.99 percent. Such fractional increases are of major significance on a 30-year mortgage. In my Congressional District, FHA mortgages require up to 7 points discount. Conventional mortgages are being limited in many areas to one-third down and 6¾ percent interest.

In May, new housing starts dropped 13 percent from the preceding month to the lowest level in 3½ years. Industry spokesmen are now unanimous in predicting a drop in new housing starts from a 1.5 million-unit level in 1965 to 1.1-million units in 1966, based on decreasing volumes in the first 4 months of this year. Contrast these totals with the 2 million homes a year outlined by the recent White House Commission on Civil Rights as a minimum requirement if we are to make any impact on solving the problem of the urban ghettoes of the Nation.

The decline in the real estate market is immediately affecting the lumber and building trades industries. The economic difficulties which will result if the housing situation continues to deteriorate are readily apparent. On the estimated basis of 2 man-years of labor for the construction of a single house, a decrease of 400,000 in new homes will mean the loss of 800,000 jobs in the labor market. A home construction decrease of this magnitude will cut the lumber market by close to 5 billion board feet.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I represent a State which leads the Nation in lumber production. The interest rate escalation vitally affects the livelihood of many of my constituents. But the impact on the homebuilding and lumber industries will be reflected nationally when home prices soar and financing becomes increasingly difficult. A building industry recession will reach into every congressional district in this country. What good is it for this Congress to pass landmark legislation in the housing area when nothing is done about an economy which is drastically impairing the availability of housing?

Moreover, when the developments described above are considered with other economic factors, the plight of the home building industry and the savings and loan associations becomes the catalyst in a chain reaction. In spite of recent increases in the interest charges on installment loans for consumer goods by leading New York banks, and the much publicized failure in automobile sales, consumer installment credit has continued to escalate to 175.3 percent of its 1957–59 average—compared with 159.2 percent in the first quarter of 1965. The high installment loan rates of the big banks have been obviously ineffectual in stemming the tide of consumer spending. At the same time, manufacturer's inventories continued to rise throughout the spring while orders for goods remained stagnant. Economists are watching with concern corporate expenditures on new plants and equipment which are now 17 percent higher than in 1965's record year.

My increasing anxiety over these economic bellwethers is reflected not only by my prompt response to the Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted action in December, but in correspondence I have directed to President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY. I call the attention of the distinguished Members of this body to the content of these letters as included at the end of my remarks today.

Many of my colleagues in the Congress are discussing the possibility of a tax increase as a method of cooling down the economy. An across-the-board tax hike is neither economically justified nor politically practical at this time. Although the tax cut was a key aspect of the new economics which gave an unprecedented 6 years of economic growth and stability, juggling of our income tax structure will, in my judgment, never be acceptable or desirable as an economic regulatory device. The Members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1962 were almost unanimous in that opinion.

There is no one action that can restore the balance in our economy. An effective program would include actions by the administration, by the Federal Reserve Board, by the Congress, by Government agencies, and by financial institutions. Lowering of discount rates, increasing reserve requirements, and Open Market Committee bond purchases would come under Federal Reserve Board jurisdiction. Stoppage of all "Fannie May" and sales participation offerings should be considered by the Treasury. Immediate repeal of the investment tax credit should be examined. Passage of an excess profits tax, especially in war industries, should be considered, as should restrictions on installment buying and restraint in Federal appropriations. From a wide variety of tools, a concise program of action should be recommended to the President and Congress.

Mark Twain would likely say, "Everybody worries about the economy, but nobody does anything about it." That is my concern. Who is going to take the leadership in restoring sanity to our national monetary policies? Obviously, only the President commands the respect and authority to marshal the forces needed to correct the situation.

I urge the President to take this opportunity to call a conference at which the leaders of the Congress, the members of the Federal Reserve Board, the officials of the Treasury, and other interested Government agencies, and experts from all segments of the housing and financial communities may face up to the money crisis that threatens our Nation and develop a program for its improvement. In his state of the Union message to the Congress last January, the President spoke of "creative federalism" in dealing with the problems of the Nation. What more appropriate time to give substance to these words than now.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a member of the Ways and Means Committee I have strongly supported the "new economics" of your administration, and in my public statements have been an outspoken advocate of policies to promote sustained growth in the economy. I regret very deeply that I now must strongly differ with the Administration on what I consider to be an abandonment of the principles we have been following.

In my judgment, unless corrective action is taken soon, the tight money policies imposed by the Federal Reserve Board and supported by recent actions of your Administration will destroy the economic gains we have made.

Within the past week, I had an extended conference with Secretary Fowler and Gardner Ackley on this matter. Although they were most cordial and helpful, they did not offer any satisfactory hope that actions would be taken to bring interest rates back into line. Mr. President, the near panic rush throughout the financial community in recent months to hike interest rates has raised a warning of impending consequences that cannot be disregarded. Only a direct action by your office can reverse this disastrous trend.

I submit, Mr. President, that this Administration cannot afford either politically or economically to be swept along, compounding the initial folly of the Federal Reserve Board, by engaging in such high interest policies as 5¾ per cent sales participation offerings and increased Federal loan rates. Every instrument of government should be marshaled to restore the healthy balance of monetary and fiscal policy required for continued prosperity. Through the successes of the past five years, we are on the verge of proving to ourselves and to the world that by enlightened government policies, a private enterprise economy can avoid the boom-and-bust cycles and can accelerate growth to meet the challenges of unemployment, expanding population, and economic opportunity for all. The lack of restraint in the use of monetary policy will surely bring this successful era to an end.

Just as a mixed monetary and fiscal policy has proved successful in generating growth, the same mixture is essential in restraining on overheating economy. High interest rates will not do the job. They are inflationary in themselves. They have not succeeded in slowing investment in plant capacity, not—with the single exception of housing—have they slowed the rising level of personal debt. They have instead contributed significantly to higher costs that are certain to be reflected in the consumer price index.

In the area of fiscal restraints, I recognize that the Administration has made a concerted effort to hold down expenditures and to reduce operating costs to a minimum. In addition, however, I hope that consideration will be given to other fiscal tools that will go directly to the danger points in the economy. Revisions in the Investment Tax Credit may be in order, to make its provisions applicable only to businesses and industries where expansion is vital to national defense or to encourage continued growth in other selective areas that are important to the national interest. Because of the sacrifices in lives and resources being made to fulfill our commitment in Vietnam, it may also be appropriate to consider means of curbing excess profits, particularly among defense-oriented industries. A request for standby authority in these and other areas of taxation might well provide the psychological restraint necessary to bring inflationary pressures under control without hindering a desirable rate of growth.

You, Mr. President, are the only one who can effectively express and implement the basic policies and programs to meet this crisis in our economy. I urge you to do so.

Sincerely,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1966.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since my letter to you of June 27, the nation's monetary and financial crisis has worsened. Daily reports of rising interest costs, the drastic decline in housing starts, and other indications of weak spots in the economy give me cause for serious concern about continued economic growth and the attainment of other objectives of your Administration.

The problem is of such magnitude that in my judgment only your personal leadership and influence can bring about a reversal of the interest rate spiral. I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that a conference should be convened among appropriate members of your Cabinet, Congressional leaders, members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, leaders of the housing industry, representatives of private and public financial institutions and other affected interests for the purpose of formulating a concerted program to bring interest rates back into line and to reestablish a balance in the money markets of the nation.

I am enclosing a copy of a statement, prepared for delivery in the House of Representatives, which outlines in greater detail the reasons for my growing concern.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 5, 1966.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The Vice President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am writing to you about this matter only because of my grave concern for the political and economic consequences if action is not taken soon to alter the present course of policy.

My apprehension over runaway interest rates and the apparent impotency of the Administration to cope with the current crisis in monetary policy cannot be overemphasized. A recent meeting with Secretary Fowler and Gardner Ackley served to sharpen my concern because it was apparent that the Administration has no positive policy to counter these damaging trends. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I wrote to President Johnson following that meeting.

Mr. Vice President, a continuation of present policies can lead to only one result—a serious recession in the home building industry, the effects of which will be felt first and hardest in the nation's lumber producing areas. The people affected will not be satisfied with a finger of blame put on the Federal Reserve Board. The President and his Administration will be held responsible.

Throughout our public careers, we have both worked to encourage and facilitate home ownership among a larger segment of the American population. To me this personifies one of the most worthy objectives of our free society. Yet, the monetary policies of this Administration threaten to deprive millions of Americans of the privilege of owning their own homes. At the same time, those policies will adversely affect those working in construction, lumber and related industries. To single out this one segment to take the dose of anti-inflationary medicine for the entire economy is inexcusable.

Spokesmen for the Administration are quick to denounce any increase in prices which reflect in the cost of living index—and I am not belittling their cause for concern—but where are the voices of indignation and concern over the 25 per cent hike in prime interest rates in recent months? Where are the positive policies necessary to prevent a disastrous decline in one of the most basic industries in America? Where is the concern over the very real impact that high interest rates, themselves, have on inflated prices?

Because of the high interest rate policies instituted by the Federal Reserve Board and concurred in by this Administration we are on our way to a recession in the lumber industry. There is no reason why such a thing should or must happen, but it will happen unless this Administration moves immediately and forcefully to bring interest rates back to acceptable levels and to institute monetary policies that reflect the real needs of our economy.

Because of the seriousness of this problem, and its broad implications, I hope this matter will receive your personal and urgent attention.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

A STEADFAST ALLY

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Australia is a stanch ally in the battle for liberty in southeast Asia. Australian troops are fighting alongside our men in South Vietnam.

Thus it was hardly unexpected, but certainly welcome, to hear Prime Minister Holt of Australia reaffirm his country's support when he visited President Johnson in Washington last month.

The Dallas Morning News recalls that the Prime Minister promised Australia would stand with us as long as seems necessary to win in Vietnam. The newspaper also notes that strong backing was pledged during the recent SEATO conference in Sydney.

We have fought together in both World Wars, in Korea, and now in Vietnam, the News states in an editorial. And neither should ever lose sight of the other's friendship.

This editorial on a partnership that will surely be preserved is one I would like to see in the RECORD.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
July 1, 1966]

A STEADFAST ALLY

Australians have reaffirmed their friendship for Americans. In Washington, Prime Minister Harold Holt promised to stand with our nation "as long as seems necessary to win in Viet Nam." Similar strong backing was pledged during the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization conference in Sydney.

Contrasting sharply with the attitude of such longtime allies as Great Britain, and to an even greater extent France, Australians' support is deeply appreciated. But all of us should recall that this is nothing new.

Aussies and Americans fought together almost half a century ago on World War I battlefields in France. They battled crack Nazi troops across North Africa in the Second World War. In Korea, there were the tough, husky and courageous men from Down Under to withstand communism along with Americans.

In Viet Nam, the U.S.-sized continent with a population only 1 million more than that of

Texas, is supply fighting men in significant numbers, as well as supporting forces.

Dedication to freedom and democracy, as well as clear vision of self-interest, inspires Australians as it does Americans. Australia has seen Oriental foes on her doorstep and knows the need of self-protection. But the descendants of those pioneers who conquered that continent, while our forebearers were pushing westward here, also fight for ideals.

As Australians have not forgotten our aid in the 1940s, Americans, we trust, will never lose sight of their friendship.

THE MILITARY SHOULD LIVE UP TO THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT AND EMPLOY QUALIFIED WOMEN

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to congratulate Secretary McNamara and the President on the savings that the Secretary has made in military procurement. As a member of Senator DOUGLAS' Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, which has followed these efforts, I have been quite conversant with the method in which savings have been achieved, and now I would like to point out one other great opportunity for the Secretary of Defense to save money. I would like to suggest that he promote qualified women within the Defense Department in place of bringing at great cost unqualified men to fill positions. Today, I am in receipt of a letter from a woman working at a military base, who points out with names and dates the published requirements for a position. She is now working unassigned as a supervisor, but when she asked for the title and the money that went with it, the military master sergeant in charge of her section said:

> I will not have any * * * feather-merchant women supervisors. We have plenty of qualified 7-level military who will do the supervision.

On one job which she asked for the qualifications were—4 years college; 2 years teaching experience; and 2 years Air Force supply experience. She was told that she was unqualified, although she had two degrees, years of teaching experience, and years as a civil servant. The military brought a man and his family from an area more than a thousand miles away. He had no college, no degree, and no teaching experience. At the end of 1 year he left. They again refused the position to the woman and selected a man with no college, no degree, no teaching, and no Air Force experience. He also was brought with his family—all expenses paid from an area thousands of miles away. The Air Force spent several thousands of dollars hiring and moving these two men and waived all public job requirements.

My correspondent further pointed out:

> I am tired of training my supervisors and tired of not having credit for devotion to duty. Since April 26 of this year I have had four different military supervisors and am forced to cajole them and abide by their whims lest I be classified as uncooperative and they begin to document me for insubordination. I grit my teeth to keep my mouth shut when our master sergeant struts down the office aisle and bellows "these * * * civilians are just like the Air Force missiles—they won't work and you can't fire them."

My correspondent also makes the statement:

> I have nothing in my files to indicate I am an unsatisfactory employee and I feel that part of the Air Force belongs to me and that all of the Communists aren't in foreign countries.

I direct Secretary McNamara's attention to this incredible waste of money, time, and talent, and I further suggest that he reread the Equal Employment Opportunity Act and advise the military that if civil servants can put up with them, they can put up with civilians.

SECURITY AND SECRECY

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major continuing problems we face is balancing the need for secrecy required by our national security with the traditions of public information in a free society.

The problem shows itself in many forms from time to time. During the present fighting in Vietnam, it becomes increasingly critical.

I would like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Post on July 7, 1966, which was copied from the Los Angeles Times. This story outlines the measures being taken by our forces to minimize the effectiveness of surface-to-air missiles used against our aircraft in Vietnam.

It may well be that much of this information was known to the enemy, yet this article seems to reveal much more information than is wise. My own military experience did not involve the Air Force, but I have talked with a number of officers in the Air Force who share my belief that the facts in this article go beyond what discretion would reveal.

This is not meant to criticize the reporter who wrote the story nor the newspaper which printed it. Obviously it was based on material which was given by military officials. It is they who should have exercised more caution.

It has often seemed to me that the Defense Department goes to excessive lengths to stamp as confidential information which is widely disseminated in the press. Here is an instance in which the Defense Department apparently allowed its interest in publicity to overcome proper caution about a vital security matter.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1966]

HOW U.S. PLANES EVADE MISSILES

Aerial teamwork, highly secret electronic devices and split-second evasive tactics have combined to virtually nullify the threat of Russian-built surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) against U.S. planes attacking North Vietnam.

Early this year, U.S. officials reported that the Soviet-built SAMs, thanks to new American tactics, had only about 5 per cent effectiveness. That is, only about 1 of every 20 SAMs launched hit a U.S. target. The percentage has dropped even further since then.

Although details of SAM-thwarting equipment and tactics are a closely held secret, they are based on the fact that the SAM-2 missiles provided to North Vietnam are radar-guided beam riders.

Planes specially equipped with electronics countermeasures accompany strike aircraft. Their equipment seeks to detect the beams from ground radar guidance stations when North Vietnamese crews begin to track targets.

Using electronics equipment aboard the planes, the countermeasures' operators seek to confuse the radar beam through transmitting beams of their own.

After the missile is launched, it can make major adjustments in its flight path only during the time that the rocket engine is still burning. After second stage burnout, the SAM travels at about twice the speed of sound along the course set by the burning rocket motor.

In the evasive action, U.S. planes attempt, in effect, to duck under the line-of-sight invisible beam and make such drastic changes in flight course as to make it difficult for radar to remain "locked on."

ADMINISTRATION ANTICS GIVE FARMERS NIGHTMARES

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, an article in this Monday's New York Times was brought to my attention which certainly makes me wonder just what this administration is using for commonsense these days. The article, which I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, tells of a New York investor who is going to set up a company in Rumania to breed and process more than 300,000 hogs a year with the products to be sold in the United States. Seventy-two percent of his financing will come from the American taxpayer through the Export-Import Bank.

Lately those of us from rural areas—Democrats and Republicans alike—have been concerned about the anti-farm attitude of this administration with its hide export controls, cheese import increases and the cutbacks of domestic meat purchases for the military, reductions in school lunch and school milk funds—all designed to push down farm prices.

We are all agreed that we have to do what we can to help underdeveloped countries build a viable agriculture so they may feed their people, but this is an entirely different operation.

This plan to use Export-Import Bank funds to set up a hog feeding and processing operation in a foreign country—and a Communist one at that—to sell pork products to the American consumer goes even further than anyone could imagine in his wildest nightmare.

It seems strange that at the very same time President Johnson was in Iowa 2 weeks ago telling the farmers that he did not really mean what he was doing to them, his people back in Washington were finalizing this deal to finance the production of 60 million pounds of Communist pork to be sold in U.S. markets in competition with American farmers.

Mr. President, I submit that if the taxpayers' money is going to be used to establish agricultural processing plants, let us do it in this country where our farmers help pay the taxes that support this Nation.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1966]

U.S. INVESTOR MAKES RUMANIA PORK DEAL

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia, July 10.—Milton A. Gordon, a New York investor, has announced here that he has signed an agreement with a Bucharest company for processing Rumanian pork products and selling them in the United States.

Mr. Gordon said last week the arrangement between his company, International Markets, Inc., and Prodexport, the Rumanian trade company, will call for breeding and processing of more than 300,000 pigs a year.

Intercontinental will design a packing plant, probably to be situated near the Danube, and will supply about $8-million worth of modern American-made equipment for the process.

Mr. Gordon added that the output would be worth about $10-million a year for the next decade. He said he would get credits from the Export-Import bank for 72 per cent of the project and financing from American banks for another 12 per cent. The remaining funds are to be provided by Prodexport.

DROPPING OF ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST ANHEUSER-BUSCH

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, On January 31, 1962, the Department of Justice filed a civil antitrust complaint against the Anheuser-Busch Corp.'s acquisition of a portion of the Rahr Malting Co. Describing Anheuser-Busch as "the largest beer producer in the country," the complaint said:

> Rahr will be substantially curtailed as a vital source of supply for independent breweries in competition with Anheuser-Busch; Anheuser will be eliminated as a customer for other malting companies; and Anheuser's advantage over smaller competing breweries may lessen competition.

On May 24, 1966, $10,000 was contributed to the President's Club by eight individuals associated with Anheuser-Busch.

On June 17, 1966, the antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch was dropped on the grounds that "further prosecution of the case was not warranted."

The eight contributors, en bloc, to the President's Club in May 1966 were as follows:

Mr. August A. Busch, Jr. (President)	$2,000
Mrs. August A. Busch, Jr.	2,000
Mr. August A. Busch, III (Vice Pres.)	1,000
Mrs. August A. Busch, III	1,000
Mr. Richard Meyer (Exec. Vice Pres.)	1,000
Mrs. Richard Meyer	1,000
Mr. Alfred Fleishman (Public Relations)	1,000
Mrs. Alfred Fleishman	1,000

The reports made by the President's Club to the Clerk of the House of Representatives reveal no contributions by any of these individuals in prior years.

Mr. Speaker, several disquieting reports on the President's Club have been given to the public by reliable journalists. Walter Pincus, writing in the Washington Star of September 24, 1964, said that, in soliciting members for this club, officials of the Democratic National Committee planted the idea "that contributors to the party in power would be able to gain an advantage in their dealings with the Government if they were members of the President's Club."

The columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott made the following report on the President's Club on May 17, 1966:

> "The President's Club is still very exclusive although it has been in existence since 1961," says Clifton Carter, Democratic National Committee executive director, in soliciting new members. "Its members are assured of direct relationship with President Johnson."
>
> Carter explains that in addition to being asked to White House social functions, "members who want to talk to the President, the Vice President, or one of their assistants, have only to contact my office. Members will immediately be put in contact with whomever they want to reach."
>
> In his sales pitch, Carter stresses that President Johnson uses the Club's membership list to solicit advice in making appointments and "in developing a consensus on important domestic and foreign issues."

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this information about the President's Club, the sequence of events which I have outlined raises serious ethical questions in the mind of any reasonable person.

Top Justice Department representatives met with me this morning and assured me that the decision in this case was based on the merits alone. I have great respect for the personal integrity of both the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, and the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Donald Turner. I would not believe they would participate in any wrongdoing.

Assuming competent career Justice Department attorneys determined independently that the case against Anheuser-Busch should be dropped, questions outside the Department remain unanswered. What contacts, if any, during this critical period were made by Democratic National Committee personnel with Anheuser-Busch officials? Was reference made in such conversations to the pending antitrust suit? What representations were made to Anheuser-Busch about the antitrust case? Why did top executives of Anheuser-Busch, and their families, suddenly and simultaneously, as manna from above, drop $10,000 into the President's Club? These questions should be speedily and fully answered.

THE ANHEUSER-BUSCH ANTITRUST CASE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell from the news story in the Washington Post this morning on the minority leader's press conference yesterday whether the Anheuser-Busch antitrust case was specifically mentioned by the minority leader in his remarks, or whether, by some fermentation of the news, the reporters just assumed this might be the sort of thing Mr. FORD was referring to. The news story refers only to Anheuser-Busch, however, and so I imagine the finger must have been pointed rather directly at that company.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be inserted at this point in the RECORD, because I feel that it documents the facts fairly as to the Anheuser-Busch people and destroys the charges implied or rumored or hinted at by the minority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

GIFTS QUASHED TRUST SUITS, GOP IMPLIES

(By George Lardner, Jr., Washington Post staff writer)

House Republican leaders yesterday dropped loud hints of Administration favors for members of the high-priced President's Club.

At a press conference on Capitol Hill, House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD (Mich.) said "some very disturbing rumors (were) floating around Washington about the dismisal of certain anti-trust actions * * * and contributions to the President's Club."

FORD made no charges of wrong-doing. He named no names.

A check of official records showed that three executives of the Anheuser-Busch Co. and their wives paid out $8000 for membership in the President's Club less than a month before the Justice Department dropped an anti-trust suit against the company.

The Justice Department quickly issued a statement saying the antitrust suit was dropped on its merits alone.

The head of the brewery's public relations firm and his wife joined up, too, with contributions of $1000 each, the minimum price of a year's membership.

Records filed with the Clerk of the House showed all $10,000 in contributions came on May 24.

The Justice Department dropped the antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch in Federal District Court in St. Louis on June 17.

"We understand Republican Congressmen are making hay on it," said Alfred Fleishman, board chairman of Fleishman-Hillard Inc., the St. Louis public relations firm that handles Anheuser-Busch's account.

He scoffed at the idea that the dismissal had anything to do with the memberships in the President's Club.

"There's one word for it—preposterous," he said. "You win 'em and you lose 'em with antitrust."

Contributing $1000 each to the Club along Fleishman and his wife were A. A. Busch III, the brewery firm's general manager, and his wife, and Richard A. Meyer, executive vice president, and his wife.

A. A. Busch Jr., president and chairman of the board at Anheuser-Busch, and his wife, each contributed $2000.

In a late afternoon statement prompted by Ford's remarks, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach said only two antitrust suits were voluntarily dropped by the Justice Department this year (two other dismissals were forced by bank merger legislation).

"I have no idea whether executives of any of these companies contribute to the Democratic, Republican or any other party," Katzenbach said. "Reviews of the cases after all the evidence had been accumulated indicated that further prosecution was not warranted."

The case dismissed against Anheuser-Busch was a civil suit filed in 1962 over the brewery's acquisition of a malting company plant. It charged that the acquisition of a source of malt for making beer was unlawful under the Clayton Antitrust Act.

The only other case the Justice Department decided to drop was dismissed yesterday. It involved another four-year-old civil suit charging six leading paper manufacturers with conspiring to hold down the prices they paid for pulpwood.

Fleishman said Anheuser-Busch has been on the losing end of antitrust suits, too, despite a long record of contributions to the Democratic Party.

"The Busches as brewers have been Democrats ever since the repeal of Prohibition," he said in a telephone interview. "Johnson's a friend of 30 years' standing. Mr. Busch (Jr.) raised $100,000 at a hundred-dollar-a-plate dinner for Kennedy in 1960."

Yet, Fleishman said, Anheuser-Busch was forced to sell a Miami brewery it "bought five or six years ago" as the result of an antitrust suit by the Justice Department.

"Nobody thought there was any cause and effect then," he said. "This company is too big for any of that type of activity. The courts decide the cases on their merits."

At the White House, Deputy Press Secretary Robert H. Fleming had nothing to say other than that "Ford himself says there are only rumors which he hasn't verified."

At the GOP press conference, Representative Melvin R. Laird (R-Wis.) said the results of a Republican "investigation" of the rumors would be aired on the House floor today by Representative Charles E. Goodell (R-N.Y.).

The session was called to bolster the Republicans' version of an election reform bill calling for candid disclosures of campaign spending and candidates' sources of income.

"We Republicans are serious about campaign reforms," Ford declared. "In this Congress we're only Number Two. But we try harder."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., who is the chairman of Anheuser-Busch and has been an active supporter of the Democratic Party for many, many years, is not the kind of businessman who comes running to Members of Congress for special favors on legislation, or for help in dealing with Government agencies. I told him about a provision of the administration bill on wheat and feed grains last year which would have cost his company millions of dollars in higher rice costs and he then followed up by taking his story to the House Committee on Agriculture in open hearings, where he proved his case. This is not the kind of businessman who is trying to bribe his way into governmental favor. I resent any implications of underhandedness, just as I resent an attempt to connect a contribution to the Democratic Party as automatically being something tainted.

Considering the size and visibility of the Anheuser-Busch firm as the leader of its field in this country, I am sure it operates under the constant scrutiny and surveillance of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and would be about as secure from antitrust action as General Motors or any other giant firm in a particular industry—no more and no less.

If $1,000 or $10,000, or any amount contributed to the Democratic Party could buy immunity for any firm from antitrust action, we would have on our hands a monumental scandal deserving of a congressional investigation. Perhaps, what we should do is to require a report on every business executive who has contributed as much as $1,000 to either party in the past 14 years—through the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations—and to list every governmental action in which his firm has been involved where the contribution could conceivably be regarded as a possible bribe. If the gentleman is suggesting we do it that way, I would be inclined to support him. But if he is basing this whole thing on the Anheuser-Busch case, then I think it is an instance of using honest reporting of political contributions in order to smear a Democrat who has made an aboveboard, fully reported, out-in-the-open contribution. Such tactics do not encourage the aboveboard reporting of political contributions, which is presumably what the minority claims to be calling for.

I understand there are also rumors about the Anheuser-Busch airplane being used to fly Vice President Humphrey to the All-Star baseball game. I have the facts on that, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The material referred to is as follows:

The facts are that Mr. Busch is Chairman of the St. Louis Bi-Centennial Corporation celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of St. Louis. The Bi-Centennial was inaugurated by a personal visit from President Lyndon Johnson in St. Louis on February 14, 1964 at the invitation of Mr. Busch. Vice President Humphrey was invited to close the St. Louis Bi-Centennial which came to its conclusion upon the tossing out of the first ball of the All-Star game played at the Busch Memorial Stadium in St. Louis on July 12. The Vice President was invited and he accepted the invitation. When the airplane strike took place Mr. Busch offered the use of the Anheuser-Busch plane to transport the Vice President and his party from Washington to St. Louis and return so that he might be sure to be there for the All-Star Game appearance to officially mark the close of the St. Louis Bi-Centennial. Mr. Busch did not know until a day before, when he was informed by the Secret Service, who would accompany the Vice President nor did he recommend or suggest anyone who should make up the Vice Presidential Party. Those are the facts surrounding the visit to St. Louis by the Vice President and his Party.

THE ANHEUSER-BUSCH ANTITRUST CASE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious matter. I hope at this time the House of Representatives and indeed the Senate will make a thorough investigation into these charges. I must join my colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] in saying that I have a high regard for the officials of Anheuser-Busch and particularly Mr. Busch. However, there are circumstances here that require for their sake, as well as for the sake of this administration, a real investigation and not one of these perfunctory investigations.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one other thing. I have received calls from people in St. Louis on this. It appears to me that the real problem here is an antitrust suit that was over 4 years old was continued before the courts without the Government prosecuting it and finally the Federal court ordered the Federal Government to come in peremptorily and try this in September. So, as far as the merits of the antitrust suit are concerned, it apparently appears that the Government had a very poor if not a weak case. So it is possibly not a question of bribery as much as sandbagging. I hope that this investigation will look at it from that angle as well in clearing this up.

MURDER OF EIGHT NURSES IN CHICAGO SHOCKS ENTIRE NATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation is shocked today at the heinous crime that occurred on the South Side of Chiago when eight nurses were murdered in their dormitory at the Southtown Hospital.

Every resource is being used by Chicago police with the full help of the county police, the State police, and the FBI, to track down this monstrous killer.

I am reasonably sure that when he is caught, he will prove to be a man with a previous criminal record; a man who has been released from some mental institution or some prison.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this country, in seeing this horrible tragedy which occurred in Chicago today, should give urgent thought to the whole problem of law enforcement. This country desperately needs help, serious help, and I do not think that the Supreme Court, in lowering the rules on the questioning of suspects and apprehending of criminals, is helping us any in this great problem. All of Chicago is shocked by this crime, and I am sure the whole Nation is shocked. I hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress will give immediate consideration to this growing problem of crime in America. It certainly has shocked the conscience of the whole Nation, and I do not think we should wait any longer in formulating national standards for apprehension and prosecution of those who commit crimes of violence. Too many of our State laws fail to adequately deal with violent crime.

I am certain that the man responsible for the atrocity is one who most probably migrated from some other State into Illinois. But even if he is a native of Illinois, we should realize that with the present mobility of our population, crimes of violence are a national problem which can be effectively attacked with uniform, national standards.

This Nation can no longer turn its other cheek to these mounting crimes of violence. I urge the Congress to take immediate action against this most serious of our national problems.

I should like to include in my remarks today an editorial which appeared this morning in the Chicago Tribune. This editorial was obviously written before the horrible crime occurred, but it is as timely as if it were written after the shocking murder was discovered.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

HANDCUFFED POLICE

Police Supt. O. W. Wilson says that the trend of Supreme court decisions may force law-abiding citizens to live in walled communities while criminals roam the land unmolested. Mr. Wilson related that at the governers' conference in Los Angeles last week he met a home builder who is developing a housing project which will be enclosed by a wall with a locked gate.

"Good people have to lock themselves in homes behind barred doors to protect themselves from assault," the superintendent said. "How much is a citizen willing to give up in life and property for the greater freedom of suspects?"

The court's tendency to load the law and police procedure in favor of the criminal is not new. In 1957 the court gave Andrew Mallory of Washington, D.C., a pass after he had been sentenced to death for rape, holding that the police had interrogated him for an unreasonable period of time before booking him. Mallory was convicted later of the same crime in Philadelphia and was sentenced to a term of up to 23 years.

In 1964 the court ruled that Danny Escobedo of Chicago had been improperly convicted of murder because the police refused his request for a lawyer before he confessed. In the term ending last month, the court extended this doctrine by holding that a suspect is entitled to counsel from the moment he is taken into custody or "otherwise deprived of his freedom in any significant way."

Police, the court said, must warn the suspect from the start that he need not talk. They must tell him that he is entitled to a lawyer before questioning begins. They must warn him that anything he says may be used in evidence against him. Even if he waives a lawyer at the beginning, he may demand one at any time during the interrogation. If he signifies that he does not want counsel, it must be established that he does so "voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently."

Such rules, Supt. Wilson said, "did not apply for the first 175 years of the Constitution." The Supreme court has acknowledged as much. It has held that its new rules will not apply to persons convicted "in conformity with previously announced constitutional standards." That is, it has changed the law overnight.

Mr. Wilson does not exaggerate the plight of the law-abiding citizen. A few hours after he spoke, there was a riot on the near west side in which a policeman was wounded, squad cars were pelted with rocks, store windows were smashed, and looting occurred. The ubiquitous Rev. Martin Luther King promptly showed up and persuaded district and station commanders to release half a dozen prisoners in the interest of abating tension.

The night before a burly hoodlum beat a soldier on an elevated train, repeatedly hammering his head against a window frame, after demanding that the victim hand over his money. A dozen or more passengers cheered the assault, which was brought to an end by a pair of detectives who ran up from another car.

If the Supreme court is trying to reduce urban life to the level of the jungle, it could not have been more successful. The police, not the criminals, are placed under restraint. Phony cries of "police brutality" and the creation of police "review boards" of civilians in New York and other cities compel the most tender concern for the criminal.

The former police commissioner of New York, Michael Murphy, has put the policeman's dilemma in a capsule: "The rank-and-file patrolman is now apprehensive of doing anything because of always being second-guessed. If I were on a beat today, I would share his apprehension."

MULTIPLE SLAYINGS IN CHICAGO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked. The tragedy referred to by my esteemed and distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] occurred in my district. It occurred in the dormitory of one of the better hospitals in Chicago, a hospital with which I am well and most favorably acquainted.

Among the victims was a young woman who had been the classmate and the close friend of the daughter of Mrs. Borrowdale, in charge of my Chicago congressional office.

I have been in constant communication by long-distance telephone. Our entire community is crushed and is still in a daze trying to realize how a homicide of such cruel and brutal dimensions could have come to pass.

Our first reaction is one of deep sympathy with the members of the bereaved families, some of them here and some in the faraway Philippines, from which a number of the slain nurses had come for training here.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] in saying that this should stir the entire Nation to renewed efforts to combat crime, including that which unquestionably comes from the malfunctioning of deranged brains.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive, as I gather the details and try to construct the tragedy in my mind, how this could have happened. The orgy of blood, I understand, went on from midnight until perhaps 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, it is a crime of mass murder that has stirred the conscience of our Nation. On every front must the effort be made to remove the likelihood of its repetition anywhere in our beloved country. We must not permit, Mr. Speaker, these young women to have died in vain.

ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICARE PROGRAM IN THE SOUTH IS UNFAIR

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, national attention has finally been focused on the outrageous manner in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has discriminated against the South in administering the medicare program. The disgraceful situation was brought to light when a Philadelphia, Miss., hospital announced it was being forced to discharge 28 elderly patients because indecisive, procrastinating Washington bureaucrats have failed to act on an application to participate in the medicare program.

Indeed, this case is one of the most glaring examples of bureaucratic bungling that it has been my experience to encounter in 20 years as a Member of this body. But, it is typical of what is happening throughout the South as thousands of elderly persons are being deprived of their rightful benefits as American citizens.

The background of the Philadelphia case illustrates the irresponsible manner in which HEW is handling the medicare program.

On June 16, 1966, an inspection team from the U.S. Public Health Service visited the Neshoba County Hospital. Hospital officials were told that approval would be recommended to Washington. Later, the hospital was told it was not in compliance.

No reasons were given for disapproval nor particulars cited. No recommendations were made as to how the hospital could amend its practices in order to receive approval.

On July 6, another team from PHS inspected the hospital. Again, the inspection team stated that approval would be recommended to Washington.

On July 9, an official of HEW here in Washington assured the hospital administrator on the telephone that approval would be given by 11 a.m. Monday, July 11.

When this promise was not fulfilled, Administrator Lamar G. Salter, called me for help. That afternoon and again the next day I attempted to talk with the Office of Equal Health Opportunities officer at HEW, Mr. Robert Nash. However, Mr. Nash was "on the other line" or in "conference" and I had to be satisfied with talking to his assistant, who passed the buck to another official who told me that the Neshoba County Hospital file would be located and that I would be called first thing Wednesday morning July 13. Mr. Speaker, it is now Thursday afternoon, and I am still awaiting that call.

In the meantime, the PHS dispatched another inspection team to Philadelphia in an apparent effort to pacify an aroused American public which is becoming more and more indignant over these inexcusable bureaucratic delays. No one knows just what this team hopes to discover, since the last inspection was conducted less than a week ago and favorably recommended the hospital for medicare participation.

Secretary Gardner is not confining his discrimination to Neshoba County Hospital. Just this morning I was informed that the Coahoma County Hospital at Clarksdale, Miss., and the North Sunflower County Hospital at Ruleville, Miss., have been victims of the same inexcusable, dilatory tactics of the Washington bureaucrats. In each case, the hospital administrators were informed in June that they had met the qualifications for medicare participation, but approval from Washington is still being withheld. Scores of similar situations exist in the South.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the medicare program are not being made available to eligible recipients on an equal basis throughout the country as Congress, in its enactment, intended. The actions—or inactions, as the case may be—of Federal bureaucracy in administering the program are frustrating the intent of the Congress, and denying needed treatment to great numbers of elderly, indigent citizens.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, and with the hope that Congress may be able to untangle the bureaucratic maze of arbitrary and capricious misadministration that threatens to cripple this program in its infancy, I am introducing a resolution this afternoon to create a select committee of the House to investigate HEW's criteria and methods used in approving hospitals for medicare patients.

Mr. Speaker, I think this a most important matter, and I hope the Committee on Rules will give prompt consideration to this proposal in the interest of the health and welfare of numerous aged American citizens.

USE OF FEDERAL AID FUNDS TO BRING ABOUT FEDERAL CONTROL OF LOCAL PROGRAMS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission at this time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Bradenton Herald, one of the leading daily newspapers of my State. The author, John T. Hamner, is one of the ablest newspapermen I have ever known. His editorial, "The Obvious Is Admitted," is the finest presentation I have ever read on the subject of the use of Federal aid funds to bring about Federal control of local programs.

I have often reminded my constituents of the fact that Federal control is inherent in Federal aid. Mr. Hamner sets forth very clearly the degree to which this control has developed. He also makes equally clear the fact that these Federal aid dollars come from the same pocketbook the local dollar comes from. I hope that all of my colleagues and all who subscribe to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will read Mr. Hammer's excellent editorial.

For those who are concerned about Federal control in local programs, they can consider Mr. Hamner's conclusion that a "community can decide for itself if the dance is really worth the piper's price."

The editorial follows:

THE OBVIOUS IS ADMITTED

If anyone had any lingering doubts that aim of federal "aid" programs has all along been control of local affairs, that doubt should be removed by the recent declaration of a high federal official with a lot of "aid" money to dispense.

Dr. Tinsley L. Spraggins of the U.S. Office of Education Opportunities put it bluntly: "Money is power, and the government intends to use this power as a lever to pressure school systems both North and South, to eliminate the last vestiges of segregation."

Dr. Tinsley was only admitting what has been obvious for some time, and was speaking only of one particular aspect of federal aid-force intentions. What he says applies generally to the federal programs, and for more purposes than elimination of all traces of segregation—enforced, de facto or volunteer.

The Government gives a community money to help it build a hospital. Then it tells the hospital whom it must admit, where they must be bedded down, what sort of services it may or must offer, what sort of construction it can use.

Then the government gives the hospitals money, via paying patient bills, and begins to tell it what it can charge.

The government gives the schools money, and tells them whom they may and must teach, how the teaching is to be handled, how the program must be run. This swells the programs and the employment rolls and the activities, but does nothing for the real purpose of a school system, which is teaching the regular courses to all students. So the government dangles the bait of still more money to systems hard put for cash, and creates pressures for the schools to invite the government still further into financing—and running—the schools.

The same thing has been going on for years in other areas. The central government gives "matching funds" to states to build highways, and then demands the right to approve or disapprove everything about those highways from where they go to what sort of signs may be placed on private property within sight of them.

It gives "aid" programs to farmers to "guarantee" them equal shares of the proceeds of the market place, and then tells them what they can plant, where they can plant it, and what they must do with it when harvested.

The government has been well pleased with the success of its projects. It has slipped the controls in so smoothly behind the checks that many people didn't suspect they were there. And the politicians have succeeded in having these programs come at the "demand" of the public, which now sees growing proposals to solve problems for people that the people didn't even know they had.

Still, many persist in seeking "federal aid" to pay for projects they sometimes need, more often just think would be nice to have. And thus they give new support to the fallacy that the central government can help states and communities do things.

The federal dollar for building hospitals and expanding school activities comes from the same pocketbook the local dollar comes from. The federal road-building dollar comes from the same gas pump the state dollar comes from.

One community can't stop the trend by passing up the temptations of the Potomac Loreleis. One community can't push the camel back out of the tent.

But one community can decide for itself if the dance is really worth the piper's price. And this one, beginning to show signs of addiction to the federal dollar, needs to be deciding.

CONTROLLING FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the other body is considering legislation to establish a Senate Committee on Intelligence Operations, a watchdog committee to oversee the far-reaching activities of the American intelligence community, and especially those of the Central Intelligence Agency. It is a debate that we should watch carefully, for the problems involved in the oversight of foreign intelligence have often been the subject of our great concern.

I have made my position on the subject quite clear in the past. In each of the Congresses in which I have served, I have introduced legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence to provide meaningful oversight. I have stood in the well of the House on many occasions to stress the need for such congressional supervision. On two occasions, I have testified before the House Rules Committee, urging it to recognize Congress' responsibility to supervise closely our intelligence apparatus.

The legislation which the Senate is considering would establish a permanent standing committee, which would act in this area instead of the present subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and add three members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Functioning only in the Senate, it would not provide the unified oversight that a joint committee could, but it is a very important step in the right direction because of its recognition of the role the intelligence community plays in American foreign affairs.

The current debate marks only the second time that the problem of controlling foreign intelligence has been debated on the floor of either body since the establishment of the CIA in the National Security Act of 1947. The other time was in 1956, when Senator Mansfield's resolution to create a joint committee was defeated.

It is regrettable that the current debate comes at a time when a new Director of Central Intelligence has just been appointed, for it is argued that it would be inappropriate to place checks on a man before he can prove himself. To say this is to miss the point, however, for the idea of congressional control of intelligence is a basic one which transcends whoever fills any of the offices involved. The Founding Fathers believed in the abstract ideal of checks-and-balances, regardless of personalities, as a necessity for democratic government. It is that concept which is now at stake.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of controlling intelligence are great, but the dangers are even greater. This point is emphasized in a study recently done by a member of my staff, Mr. Gary Sperling, entitled "Central Intelligence and Its Control." The essay examines the history and current workings of the intelligence community and attempts to evaluate the arguments for and against congressional control. I know that many Members of the House will find it of interest.

The study follows:

Central Intelligence and Its Control: Curbing Secret Power in a Democratic Society

(By Gary Sperling, May 1966)

I

This essay is founded upon two assumptions: that the government of the United States must continue to rest upon that most basic principle of the Declaration of Independence, "consent of the governed," and that such consent cannot be meaningful unless the governed are allowed to know to what they are consenting. With the advent of the Cold War, these two assumptions have ceased to characterize properly our American government. Our nation's leaders, motivated by seeming requirements of national security, have increasingly placed large sectors of American policy out of the range of public surveillance. Important information about the workings of our government have been withheld from the people on the theory that potential enemies would also receive the information and use it to advantage. "We have cloaked the operations of the Executive Branch of Government in veils of secrecy unknown to any previous epoch of our history."[1] As a result, the most basic principle of American democracy has become eroded. James Madison, over a century and a half ago, remarked, "It is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to the provisions against dangers, real or pretended, from abroad."[2] Today, his prediction has come true, and in no field more so than in the shadowy, spectacular, and romantic area of foreign intelligence.

At the same time, that governmental secrecy has increased at home, the need for information from abroad has also increased. Almost any area of the world contains either a potential American enemy or a potential crisis spot—and most parts harbor both. The Cold War requires that we monitor all of these, lest the United States be caught unaware of possible danger to it. A missile may strike the United States from a launching site thousands of miles away; every point on the globe is now "strategic". Complex and costly modern weapons systems take years to construct; unknowable future political situations must often be predicted with a high degree of reliability. In addition, there is the difficulty of penetrating the large portion of today's world that lies behind the Iron Curtain; a considerable bureacracy is required to ferret information out of totalitarian states. For these reasons, the tasks of intelligence have been immense, complex, world-wide, and ever-present. Intelligence has become a way of life to every major governmental leader, who must regard it as a necessary tool in national decision-making. The American intelligence community is well aware of its important role; a former Director of Central Intelligence has said, "There has never been a time in history . . . when Intelligence has had as clear an opportunity to get its views over as it has had in this country in recent years. The National Security Act of 1947 . . . has given Intelligence a more influential position in our government than Intelligence enjoys in any other in the world."[3] Certainly, with no immediate easing of the Cold War in sight, with military technology ever developing bigger and better weapons, and especially with America currently involved in a long and costly struggle in Southeast Asia, the prospect is that national security will require even more of our intelligence agencies in the years to come.

Yet this important part of our government remains wrapped, as Senator Eugene McCarthy has put it, "in its cloak of secrecy."[4] The American public and even its elected representatives hear little of intelligence operations—such as the U–2 flights—until after they have either been completed successfully or failed miserably. The most basic information on our intelligence community, such as its total annual budget or approximate figures on the number of people in its employ, are kept strictly "top secret", lest the enemy find and use the data. Often this reaches the height of absurdity; information which is readily available to the rest of the world is kept from the average American citizen. For instance, the National Security Agency, widely known in both the foreign and domestic press as America's "communications intelligence" arm (making and breaking codes, intercepting secret messages, developing techniques for transmitting secret information, etc.), is officially described only as performing "highly specialized technical and coordinating functions relating to the national security."[5] Americans were shocked to learn last year of a CIA agent's offer of a three million dollar bribe to Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore; they were startled to hear recently of the use of Michigan State University as a "cover" for intelligence activities in South Viet Nam. Yet this national outrage does not compare with the international disgrace brought upon the United States by the disclosure of such shady maneuvers as the Bay of Pigs operation.

Its self-imposed ultra-secrecy poses great problems for the intelligence community. Because the public cannot be sure what is and what isn't an American intelligence operation, it tends to suspect shadiness everywhere. "Anywhere in the world, when a minister resigns or a military junta takes over, the handwriting on the wall immediately spells CIA."[6] The frequent unfairness of these charges once caused Allen Dulles, then Director of Central Intelligence, to remark, "I only wish we had accomplished all that the Soviets attribute to us."[7] But Dulles realized the difficulty of his situation: "I am the head of the silent service and cannot advertise my wares . . . public relations must be sacrificed to the security of our operations."[8] John F. Kennedy also stressed this point in commenting to a group of intelligence administrators at the opening of the CIA Headquarters at Langley, Virginia, "Your successes are unheralded; your failures are trumpeted."[9] The present secrecy arrangements do not allow intelligence officials to boast of actions that go well and those that go poorly generally speak for themselves.

If it is risky for the intelligence administrator to present the truth, it is all but impossible for the scholar to obtain it. There is always a body of legitimately secret information about any intelligence operation, and beyond that is the general governmental fear of discussion epitomized by Senator Henry Jackson's statement that "details with respect to intelligence should not be discussed" during the 1962 debate over the nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence because it "may be unwittingly giving aid and comfort to the enemy."[10] Only those in charge of any given intelligence action can speak authoritatively of its nature, and these are the very people who would not do so. Harry Howe Ransom, author of a number of books and articles on U.S. intelligence, confesses, "One simply cannot apply the usual rigorous standards of data gathering and documentation to this subject."[11] Yet a certain amount of material is available on this subject and within its restrictions one can analyze some of the dilemmas presented by the existence of a secret intelligence apparatus in a democratic society.

---

[1] Walter Millis, *Arms and Man: A Study in American Military History* (New York: Putnam, 1956), p. 360.

[2] Letter to Thomas Jefferson, May 17, 1798, *The Complete Madison*, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 258.

[3] Allen Dulles, Address before the Yale Conference on Human Resources, New Haven, Connecticut, February 3, 1958.

[4] "The CIA Is Getting Out of Hand," *Saturday Evening Post*, January 4, 1964, p. 6.

[5] Office of the Federal Register, *United States Government Organization Manual: 1965–6* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 207. For a lengthy account of the NSA's activities and organization, provided by two former employees who defected to the press and Moscow, see *New York Times*, September 7, 1960, pp. 1 ff.

[6] Sanche de Gramont, *The Secret War* (New York: Putnam, 1962), p. 28.

[7] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 63.

[8] Address before the Advertising Council of San Francisco, California, September 19, 1957.

[9] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 5.

[10] Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 1, p. 1066. This and other Congressional Record references are to the permanent edition, unless otherwise noted.

[11] *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), p. 167.

It is clear that today's international situation requires some adaptation of the Founding Fathers' principles. In 1822, Madison wrote, "A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both."[12] Today most citizens would agree that the wide dissemination of information on intelligence methods and results is impractical for them and infeasible for the nation. The subject is both too complex and too fraught with danger for the entire populace to be so informed. However, it must never be considered so sensitive as to be withheld from the people's chosen representatives. Americans must look to a system of careful oversight if the tenuous compromise between defense and democracy is to be reached.

II

While it is common to refer to our intelligence functionaries as *the* CIA, this is only partly true. The Central Intelligence Agency is but one of a large number of executive officers which deal in the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of intelligence. Flanking it are the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, Army Intelligence, the Office of Naval Intelligence, Air Force Intelligence, the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a handful of more minor government agencies. Two aspects, however, set the CIA apart. On the one hand, it is the overall coordinating body, with final responsibility for the evaluation and dissemination of intelligence data through all parts of our federal government. On the other hand, though, it is the only one of the agencies listed that is not directly subject to the type of executive oversight Americans have come to expect of their Congress, oversight born of the basic principle of governmental checks and balances. We shall examine this unusual position later on, but for now let us consider the broad organizational outline of the intelligence community.

Perhaps the most closely guarded secret in Washington is the intelligence community's budget. Tucked into Defense Department contingency funds and costly weapons expenditures, its exact amount is known only to a handful of intelligence and Bureau of the Budget officials, as well as the President. In the absence of clear fact, a good deal of speculation has arisen: Hanson Baldwin estimated in 1954 that the total is approximately $2 billion; David Wise and Thomas B. Ross claim it is about $4 billion.[13] Allen Dulles has called figures such as these "several times exaggerated."[14] Yet Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who was one of President Kennedy's chief national security aides, says that the CIA's budget exceeds the State Department's by more than 50 per cent and that *this* amount is but half that of the intelligence expenses of the Defense Department.[15] If we assume that his information is correct (and no better source has as yet become available), the CIA's budget must exceed $600 million and the total allowance for the entire intelligence community must easily top $2 billion, or more than, for instance, the cost of the entire War on Poverty for this year. Similar academic detective work reveals that the intelligence community employs about 25,000 persons, approximately 15,000 of whom work directly for the CIA.[16]

Currently atop this vast bureaucracy is Rear Admiral William F. Raborn (USN retired), the Director of Central Intelligence; his job has been called "second in importance only to the President" by Senator RUSSELL, who as Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services is in a unique position to know.[17] He wears two "hats", serving as both chief coordinator of the intelligence community as a whole and as the everyday administrator of its major component. He sits in on National Security Council meetings as chief intelligence advisor. He has the responsibility, under the National Security Act of 1947, to inspect and evaluate the intelligence product of all government security agencies. He has virtually free rein to hire and fire CIA personnel without regard for Civil Service regulations. Perhaps most important, the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 allows him to spend any and all of the CIA's multimillion dollar annual appropriation purely on his personal voucher. As one author has commented, "This is truly an extraordinary power for the head of an Executive agency with thousands of employees and annual expenditures in the hundreds of millions of dollars."[18]

The role of the CIA may be seen by merely noting the names of its four subdivisions: Intelligence, Research, Plans, and Support. The CIA is charged with collecting *intelligence* (80 per cent of this material is gained through *research* among such "open sources" as technical magazines and foreign broadcast monitorings), using this data to draw up reports on the economic, political, social, and military situation in all crisis and potential crisis areas (this includes both long-range projections and daily summaries); providing this information to policy-makers to aid in the formation of *plans* for the national security; and providing such *support* for these operations as many prove necessary.[19]

The National Security Agency, a part of the Defense Department, has primary responsibility for "communications intelligence": the making and breaking of codes, the interception of secret messages of foreign governments, the development of techniques for the secret transmission of information, and the use of electronics for acquiring, communicating, and protecting all forms of information. The NSA Headquarters at Fort Meade, Maryland, contains 1,400,000 square feet of office space and is reputed to have more electric wiring than any other building in the world.[20] Its "domestic" budget is well over $100 million a year.[21]

The Defense Intelligence Agency was established by President Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs fiasco; its goal is to unify the intelligence efforts of the Department of Defense by combining many of the formerly separate activities of each of the armed services. These smaller staffs—Army Intelligence (G-2), the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), and Air Force Intelligence (A-2)—still exist and continue to supply particular service intelligence requirements. The DIA is charged with furnishing all Defense Department current operations intelligence, determining all Defense intelligence requirements, and producing all military intelligence estimates for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, United States military commands throughout the world, and the Secretary of Defense. It is, in a sense, a holding company within a higher holding company; the Director both coordinates all military intelligence within the Department of Defense and represents the DIA on the United States Intelligence Board (USIB), the overall coordinating committee of the intelligence community, on which the Director of Central Intelligence serves as Chairman.

The State Department is the oldest American hand in the intelligence field: it has supplied political, economic, and social information on foreign countries to national policy-makers since its establishment in 1789. Since 1947 it has had only the task of collecting this information from nations in the free world; the extra difficulties of extracting similar information from totalitarian nations has made it necessary to shift this chore to the better-equipped CIA.[22] Over the years, there has been considerable conflict between State and the CIA, and today State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research regards itself as *the* research and analysis arm of the Secretary of State's office.[23] Given the central role of State in the formation of foreign policy, this bureau has great potential importance, but the fact that its budget is dwarfed by the other major intelligence producers hinders it as a vital day-to-day factor.

The Atomic Energy Commission has primary responsibility for intelligence relating to atomic energy, including periodic estimates of the atomic-weapons capabilities of the nuclear powers, while the Federal Bureau of Investigation plays a central role in the important task of *counter*espionage. Other government departments and agencies who supply intelligence data in selected areas include the Department of Commerce, the Post Office Department, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, and certain government-affiliated research organizations, such as the Rand Corporation.

In sum, the intelligence community is a loose confederation of agencies from throughout the federal government, bound together on a continuing basis only by the fact that all coordinate their work with the CIA and the USIB and are officially under the President. In a segmented field, where it is the rule that details of operations are divulged only to those with a "need to know" and where it is therefore common to find a man at one desk totally unaware of what the man at the next desk is doing, it may safely be said that only the Director of Central Intelligence (and perhaps his highest-ranking assistants) can be aware of all the activities of the intelligence community. Yet it is this very man who differs from the other agency directors in that he is not responsible to the Congress for his budget, his employee policies, or the specific details of the operations he heads. The man to whom the system gives the most power is also the man who needs deal with the least checks upon him.

---

[12] Letter to W. T. Barry, August 4, 1822, *The Complete Madison*, p. 267.

[13] "Myopia on Intelligence," *New York Times*, June 3, 1954, p. 13. *The Invisible Government* (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 277–8.

[14] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 67.

[15] *A Thousand Days* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), p. 427.

[16] See Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story* (New York: Morrow, 1962), pp. 17–27; Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. vi, 82; and David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, p. 232.

[17] U.S. Senate Committee on the Armed Services, *Hearings*, "Nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence," 87th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, 1962, p. 9.

[18] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, pp. 80–83.

[19] I have simplified somewhat here. It is actually the Plans Division that conducts covert operations; the Support Division is merely an administrative arm in charge of such bureaucratic needs as equipment, logistics, etc.

[20] David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, p. 221. See note 5.

[21] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, p. 136.

[22] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 48–50.

[23] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, pp. 121–3. Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, p. 137.

III

That the intelligence community should have attained such a far-reaching and secure position within our government is in one sense surprising, for the American people came only lately to an appreciation of the value of a coordinated intelligence apparatus. According to its own official history, the United States Army was "slow to recognize the importance of military intelligence and backward in its use in the solution of military problems."[24] Until after World War II, there was little or no official government intelligence activity except in time of combat. For example, when the United States entered World War I in 1917, Army Intelligence consisted of a tiny section buried within a division of the General Staff—with only two officers and two clerks.[25] This was rapidly expanded during the year's involvement in the war, but almost as rapidly dismantled afterwards; symptomatic of official feeling about intelligence is the comment of Henry L. Stimson who, on becoming Secretary of State in 1929, closed down the nation's only cryptographic agency, saying, "Gentlemen do not read each other's mail."[26] During the inter-war years, according to George C. Marshall, our foreign intelligence was "little more than what a military attaché could learn at a dinner, more or less, over the coffee cups."[27] Intelligence at this time rarely attracted the most promising officers and usually received meager Congressional appropriations. Many Congressman looked upon a military attaché as an officer being sent upon a luxurious vacation at the expense of, and with no benefit to, the American taxpayer. Yet the neglect of intelligence cannot fully be blamed on such parochialism. More important was the lack of recognition within the State, War, and Navy Departments of the importance, even in peacetime, of coordinated foreign intelligence, and perhaps the most fundamental cause of intelligence neglect was the temper of the times—a period of isolation from world affairs, of America's viewing itself as a moral bastion, and of a military policy of passive defense. For all these reasons, Congress in the 1920's normally appropriated less than $200,000 annually for Army Intelligence and similarly small amounts for other agencies involved in intelligence.[28]

Pearl Harbor ended the apathy. The attack came as an almost complete surprise to American officials; when Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox received the news of the Japanese attack, he exclaimed, "My God, this can't be true. This [message] must mean the Philippines!"[29] Later investigation of the events leading up to the "day of infamy" proved that the information necessary to anticipate the attack was actually available to the Government, but that a lack of proper evaluation and dissemination apparatus had prevented the information from reaching the President and his chief advisors.[30] As in World War I, the response to the recognition of American intelligence inadequacy was a proliferation of temporary agencies; this time, though, there was one improvement: the formation of a Joint Intelligence Committee, a coordinating agency under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was of little help; General William J. Donovan, head of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, has admitted that President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference, lacking accurate intelligence reports, failed to realize that the Japanese were almost defeated and "traded important postwar concessions for Stalin's guarantee of entry into the Pacific war."[31]

The lessons of Pearl and Yalta were not lost upon America's leaders. General Eisenhower called the lack of centralized intelligence "a shocking deficiency that impeded all constructive planning," and President Truman commented, "The war taught us this lesson—that we had to collect intelligence in a manner that would make the information available where it was needed and when it was wanted, in an intelligent and understandable form."[32] Early in 1946, Truman took the first step toward the creation of a coordinated intelligence apparatus, issuing an Executive Order that established the Central Intelligence Group.

The Group operated under an Executive Council—the National Intelligence Authority—composed of the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, as well as a representative of the President. It was primarily a holding company, designed to coordinate the work of existing departments, but it was also authorized to perform services which the NIA determined could best be performed centrally.[33]

A year later, the 80th Congress legitimized the President's creation of centralized intelligence apparatus. The National Security Act—best remembered now for its unification of the military establishment—has been called a "basic charter of civil-military relations and of security policy formation."[34] Its most important creation was the National Security Council, a group of the highest civilian officials responsible for diplomatic and military planning (in 1966, the NSC is composed of President Johnson, Vice-President HUMPHREY, Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Office of Emergency Planning Director Bryant), to generate the basic policy recommendations in all matters affecting the national security. To inform these top-level administrators, the Central Intelligence Agency was formed. Its purposes, as defined by the Act are:

1. *To advise the National Security Council in matters concerning* such intelligence activities of the government departments and agencies as relate to *the national security.*

2. To make recommendations to the National Security Council for the *coordination of* such *intelligence activities.*

3. To *correlate and evaluate* intelligence relating to the national security, *and provide for the* appropriate *dissemination of* such *intelligence* within the government.

4. To perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence activities, such *additional services* of common concern *as* the National Security Council determines *can be more efficiently accomplished centrally.*

5. To perform such *other functions* and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

(Italic supplied)

This was an "organic" act, in that the functions of the CIA are defined only generally, with more precise direction left to the President and the NSC, but the Congress did make some attempt to limit the new agency. To insure that the CIA could never be converted into a *Gestapo*, the law provided that "the Agency shall have no police, subpoena, law enforcement powers, or internal security functions;" in another section of the measure, the power granted to the Director to inspect the intelligence product of all government security agencies for the purpose of "correlation, evaluation, and dissemination" was restricted in that FBI information may be examined only upon "written request". Furthermore, to emphasize that the CIA was not to supersede most of the existing intelligence bureaus, these departments were directed to continue to "collect, evaluate, correlate and disseminate departmental intelligence."[35]

The clear thrust of the National Security Act was to establish a confederated, and not a centralized, national intelligence appartus. However, this goal was undermined by the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, a measure designed to strengthen CIA administration by giving the Director of Central Intelligence unprecedented powers. Under the new statute, the CIA was exempted from all federal laws that require the disclosure of the "functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency"; the agency was exempted from almost all the major Civil Service regulations; the Bureau of the Budget was directed to make no reports to the Congress on these matters. The Director was given the power to bring one hundred aliens a year into the United States without regard to normal immigration laws. Above all, he was given the staggering power of spending all CIA appropriations "without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of government funds . . . the certificate of the Director shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified."[36] These provisions constitute voluntary cession by the Congress of all the traditional controls over the Executive, especially the important control over the expenditure of funds. They are an invitation to unchecked secret power.

Since 1949 the Central Intelligence Agency has grown phenomenally; a conservative guess would be that it now has almost three times as many employees as it had then. For this, five major explanations may be advanced. First of course is the increasing requirement of intelligence. A-bombs have given way to H-bombs, IRBM's to ICBM's, in the Cold War race for bigger and better weapons; the complexities of the latest weapons systems require ever more notice of the need for them. Second, one must cite an increasing feeling that certain aspects of national security are best handled centrally; specific intelligence operations are now so closely coordinated by the CIA as to make the other agencies involved almost subservient. Such close coordination often raises the general level of efficiency, but there is always the danger implied in Prof. Ransom's comment that "one man's coordination is another man's dictatorship." [37] A third source of growing CIA power over the years has been the policy of rotation within the military services and, to a lesser extent, among the other departments. It has resulted in the CIA's tending to have greater continuity than other agencies in personnel skilled in intelligence evaluation and analysis. "As the experience and competence of CIA personnel increase, so do its power and the relative importance of its role." [38] Despite the fact that Harry Truman said in 1963, "I never had any thought when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peacetime cloak-and-dagger operations," a fourth cause—one of the most important—of CIA growth must be laid at his feet. The ambitious objective of the 1947 Truman Doctrine ("to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures"), combined with an early lack of precision about the agency's purpose and organization, has caused the CIA to become a secret arm of foreign policy implementation—an arm nobody originally intended and one that has led the United States into disgrace on more than one occasion.[39] That this arm should have ever attained such power is largely the fault of the State Department; its inertia must be cited as a fifth cause of the growth of an agency that has all but replaced State in certain areas of foreign policy. Theodore Sorenson reports that President Kennedy felt that State's tendency to excessive delay obscured determination.[40] Part of the problem is the paucity of State's resources when compared to the CIA's, but even more important is the cession of work from State to the CIA during the Eisenhower years when the Dulles brothers headed these offices. The Hoover Commission found Allen Dulles too much of a work-grabber; Andrew Tully has noted that John Foster relied much more heavily on brother Allen's estimates than he did on the reports from his own ambassadors.[41] Without question, the "CIA problem" is, to a large degree, a "State Department problem."

---

[24] Department of the Army, *American Military History, 1607–1953* (Washington, 1956), p. 491.

[25] Peyton C. Marsh, *The Nation At War* (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, 1932), p. 226.

[26] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence,* p. 71.

[27] U.S. Senate Committee on Military Affairs, *Hearings,* "Department of Armed Forces," 79th Congress, 1st Session, Washington, 1945, p. 61.

[28] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security,* pp. 51–3.

[29] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security,* p. 54.

[30] Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission), *Intelligence Activities,* June, 1955, pp. 29–30.

[31] "Intelligence: Key to Defense," *Life,* September 30, 1946, p. 117.

[32] *Crusade in Europe* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1948), p. 32. *Memoirs* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1955), vol. II, p. 56.

[33] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security,* pp. 74–6.

[34] Walter Millis, Harvey C. Mansfield, and Harold Stein, *Arms and the State* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1958), p. 178.

[35] Public Law 80–253. A further provision of the Act, under which the CIA explains its extreme secrecy, provides that "the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure."

[36] Public Law 81–110.

Perhaps the most noteworthy—and the most frightening—fact is that these explanations seem likely to remain true for some years to come. The demand for intelligence is ever on the rise. The system of military rotation has not been reversed. The present war in Viet Nam illustrates our continuing commitment to the principles of the Truman Doctrine. Unless some outside action is taken, the CIA's secret power is likely to increase even further than it already has.

IV

Americans are presently unable to ascertain whether the CIA is doing a creditable job for two reasons: we are not united in one idea of what "a creditable job" is and, even if we were, we cannot obtain the information necessary to make a sound judgment. The National Security Act defines the duties of the CIA so broadly that there can be many conceptions of what is and isn't within the agency's responsibilities. Paramilitary operations, such as the Bay of Pigs maneuver, provide the best example of this imprecision. During the 1947 hearings, Congressman Fred Busbey of Illinois asked James V. Forrestal, the Secretary of the Navy, about rumors then prevalent that operational activities were being contemplated for the proposed intelligence agency; Forrestal denied them.[42] Sherman Kent's *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy*, which had a generally large influence on early CIA officials, makes a strong case against the CIA's entering into such activities.[43] Yet, as has been amply proven, the CIA has entered and continues to enter the field of international conspiracy. Such efforts are officially justified under clause 5 of the National Security Act, the "other functions" clause, but many people feel that this is stretching the point somewhat; to these people (this writer confesses that he is among them), the thrust of the Act is clearly for intelligence only, and not for military activities of any sort. Some Americans feel that the government ought to refrain from all clandestine and especially illegal operations overseas; they feel that such activities contradict the high moral principles to which this nation has traditionally dedicated itself. On the other hand, other Americans believe—and the government has consistently concurred—that "new times demand new conduct." As one member of this school of thought has forcefully put its case:

"While diplomacy is preferable, and usually more reliable and effective than subversion, the United States cannot realistically abstain from espionage or follow an absolute principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other nations. Cold War is by definition a stage in international politics that is neither war nor peace. In this situation, and short of a reign of international law based upon the consent of the governed, the United States may sometimes have to engage in clandestine activities to protect the national interest. The nation cannot accept the claim, in every situation, that the existing government or regime in every foreign country is the legitimate one. The national interest and the common defense may require intervention, even though this confronts us with legal and moral problems. The United States rarely faces comfortable alternative choices in support of foreign regimes. Often we must accept the lesser evil because circumstances fail to provide an ideal option." [44]

No public referendum can ever be conducted on this question, but it is one well worth more discussion than it has heretofore received. The proposition that our government should not indulge in covert operations includes the notion that the CIA should not do so, but the reverse is not true; Americans must distinguish the question of whether we are to undertake such activities from the question of whether the CIA shall be the leading force in this field. Until we do, there will always be objections to the CIA's work.

Even if we assume the government's position on the morality issue, we may question the CIA on grounds of efficiency: does the agency perform its functions in the best possible manner? Governmental secrecy prevents the layman, and even the scholar and the Congressman, from answering this vital question. There is no way to ascertain just how good the CIA's intelligence reports are or to what extent top officials may rely upon the agency's national estimates, for these are never made public. Most of what is known of these documents is based upon pure speculation, though the few facts available suggest that, like government in general, the CIA is sometimes right and sometimes wrong. It is generally accepted that the agency was over five years off in its estimate of the date the Soviet Union would detonate its first atomic bomb, but, on the other hand, the CIA precisely predicted the date on which the Chinese Communists were to explode their first nuclear device.[45] The agency's failure to predict the Red Chinese invasion of Korea in 1950 or the sudden erection of the Berlin wall in 1961 are balanced by its successes in obtaining a copy of Chairman Khrushchev's "secret speech" in 1961 and the now-famous Berlin wire-tapping incident.[46] Even in covert operations, the CIA has a generally mixed record; it succeeded in overthrowing Iran's Premier Mohammed Mossadegh in 1953 and Guatemala's President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in 1954, but failed miserably in its attempt to dislodge Fidel Castro.[47] Perhaps even more common than these clear cases are those which are partial successes, partial failures. Here the outstanding case is the U-2 incident: reconnaissance flights that, according to Allen Dulles, marked new heights in the scientific collection of intelligence, but the discovery of which torpedoed a summit conference.[48]

For all of the cases mentioned above, there is adequate documentation, but of how many instances are we ignorant? Just since last year, the CIA has been accused of provoking war between India and Pakistan, kidnapping Moroccan agents in Paris, and plotting the overthrow of former Ghanaian President Kwame Nkrumah, among other nefarious acts. While most of these charges are probably unfounded, fostered either by sheer ignorance or Soviet propaganda (one is reminded of the joke, which ran through Washington last summer and has appeared in many forms, about the two Yugoslavs surveying the wreckage after the Skoplje earthquake: one tells the other, "The CIA did it. Pass the word."), yet there is the possibility of their truth. Certainly they have been officially denied, but then so were the U-2 flights and the Guatemalan and Cuban sorties—at the time.

About all the scholar can conclude is that the CIA is neither perfect nor valueless. The official information which has been disclosed presents entries for both sides of the ledger, and it is sure that these facts barely scratch the surface. There is no way for us to tally up a final score for the CIA's efficiency.

All the while, there is a very distinct threat that the CIA, in performing its functions as best it can, may lead the United States into new and unwanted foreign policy situations. The CIA may at times make its own foreign policy; though this has been hotly denied by every CIA Director, the 1963 disclosure that the agency had been secretly aiding South Vietnamese Special Forces in their raids of Buddhist pagodas—raids that the U.S. Government officially condemned—seemingly presents such a case.[49] Even if it carries out only official State Department and National Security Council policy, though, the CIA's tactics may lead the nation into trouble.

---

[37] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, p. 84.

[38] *Central Intelligence and National Security*, p. 84.

[39] Harry Howe Ransom, "Containing Central Intelligence," *New Republic*, December 11, 1965, p. 12.

[40] Harry Howe Ransom, "Containing Central Intelligence," p. 14.

[41] *Intelligence Activities*, p. 14. *CIA: The Inside Story*, p. 259.

[42] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, *Hearings*, "National Security Act of 1947," 80th Congress, 1st Session, Washington, 1947, pp. 120–1.

[43] (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949), pp. 94ff.

[44] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, pp. 194–5.

[45] Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story*, p. 267. *New York Times*, April 25, 1966, p. 20.

[46] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, pp. 140–58. Millis, Mansfield, & Stein, *Arms and the State*, p. 284. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, pp. 128–30. Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story*, pp. 1–7.

[47] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 224. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, pp. 6–96.

[48] Allen Dulles, The Craft of Intelligence, p. 67.

[49] *Washington Post*, September 10, 1963, p. 16.

The U-2 flights provide an example of how the United States may be forced to make hurried and contradictory statements because of the CIA's efforts; the bumbling hypocrisy which American presented to the world in the spring of 1960 left us in international disgrace. Perhaps the best example of how the U.S. may be forced to undo itself is provided by the New York Times' recent account of the 1962 plot to doctor Cuban sugar:

"On Aug. 22, 1962, the S.S. *Streatham Hill,* a British freighter under Soviet lease, crept into the harbor of San Juan, Puerto Rico, for repairs. Bound for a Soviet port with 80,000 bags of Cuban sugar, she had damaged her propeller on a reef.

"The ship was put in drydock, and 14,135 sacks were off-loaded to facilitate repairs. Because of the United States embargo on Cuban imports, the sugar was put under bond in a customs warehouse. Sometime during the lay-up, agents of the Central Intelligence Agency entered the customs shed and contaminated the off-loaded sugar with a harmless but unpalatable substance.

"Later, a White House official, running through some intelligence reports, came upon a paper indicating the sabotage. He investigated, had his suspicions confirmed and informed President Kennedy, much to the annoyance of the CIA command.

"The President was not merely annoyed; he was furious, because the operation had taken place on American territory, because it would, if discovered, provide the Soviet Union with a propaganda field day, and because it could set a terrible precedent for chemical sabotage in the undeclared "back-alley" struggle that rages constantly between the West and the Communist countries.

"Mr. Kennedy directed that the doctored sugar not leave Puerto Rico. This was more easily ordered than done, and it finally required the combined efforts of the CIA the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Department, customs agents and harbor authorities to dis-intrigue the intrigue.

"The Soviet Union never got its 14,135 sacks of sugar; whether it was compensated for them has not been disclosed.

"It would be unfair to conclude that this was a typical CIA operation. On the other hand, it cannot be dismissed as merely the unwise invention of some agent who let his anti-Communist fervor get out of control.

"There is good reason to believe that a high-level political decision had been taken to sabotage, where feasible, the Cuban economy. The sugar project, harum-scarum as it was, developed from a general policy determination in the Plans Division of the CIA, and the general policy, if not the specific plot, presumably had the approval of the interagency, sub-Cabinet group responsible for reviewing all operations that have political consequences." [50]

Here, then, is an example of the CIA's carrying out an approved plan which could easily have disgraced this nation and opened up a whole new field of war. It would not have been a blunder or a mishap, as in the Powers flight, that brought the United States to this unhappy position, but the efficient tactical maneuvering of the CIA. This is not divergent foreign policy, but poor implementation, implementation that required the combined forces of many dissimilar government agencies for its correction. Still this incident presents as great a danger as the CIA's setting its own foreign policy would.

V

The general argument is now clear: left to itself, the CIA is the most dangerous agency in the United States Government. It may determine foreign policy, either knowingly or (if we accept disclaimers such as Congressman BRAY's statement on the floor of the House last month: "The CIA does what the President tells it to do. It is not autonomous; it does not chart its own course.") accidentally, through its capacity to develop and pursue an operation free from everyday guidance or restriction from the more political parts of the government.[51] It is, in one sense, its own ruler, for the only information the National Security Council or other high-level administrators have regarding the CIA's efficiency comes from the CIA itself. Its resources, both in number of employees and funds available, give it a strong advantage over competing departments, such as State, in displaying and selling its wares in the governmental market-place. Finally, its necessary secrecy—and secrecy often beyond what is necessary—shield it from many of the traditional American forms of governmental control.

Extraordinary measures are needed to check this powerful agency, but in the past these measures have not been forthcoming. Despite the fact that the CIA has been surveyed by no less than six *ad hoc* bodies, five different parts of the Executive Branch, and four Congressional subcommittees, little that is meaningful has been accomplished. The *ad hoc* investigations have been too sporadic, the Executive groups too limited, the Congressional subcommittees too eager to be discreet.

None of the first three *ad hoc* investigations was very thorough. The first of them, a task force of the First Hoover Commission headed by Ferdinand Eberstadt, reported in 1949 on national security organization in general and gave only passing mention to the still-new CIA. It did, however, find the agency "sound in principle, but . . . not now properly organized," and recommended that "vigorous efforts be made to improve the internal structure of the Central Intelligence Agency and the quality of its product." [52] Another special survey, conducted by a three-man panel headed by Allen Dulles (then a lawyer in private practice), reported to the President and the National Security Council in 1951; its findings were never opened to the public. It may be presumed that the alleged CIA failure to predict the Communist Chinese invasion of Korea was a central point of consideration for the group; their report is said to have found "much cause for dissatisfaction." [53] That their recommendations were probably accepted in large degree is evidenced by the fact that, shortly after the report was circulated, Dulles was made Deputy Director of the CIA. A third survey—this time of general CIA organization and performance—was made in 1954 by a four-man group, chaired by Lieutenant General James H. Doolittle; it came at a time when Senator Joseph McCarthy was threatening to investigate the "Communists'" in the intelligence community and probably was meant to head off what would have been a disastrous fishing expedition (the hearings were never held). Like the Dulles panel, Doolittle's group made only a private report, but it simultaneously issued, through the White House, a very brief public statement praising the CIA for "a creditable job" (though it also felt that there were "important areas in which the CIA organization, administration, and operations can and should be improved.").[54]

Far more detailed than any of these investigations, indeed the most thorough governmental study of the intelligence community yet produced, was the work of the five-man task force of the Second Hoover Commission, led by General Mark W. Clark. Originally only instructed to study and make recommendations about the CIA, it enlarged its subject to a comprehensive review of all foreign intelligence activities. It submitted two reports: one for the public; the other—including recommendations covering many overseas operations—for the President only (even the full Commission was not allowed to pass upon it).[55] Among its findings: that Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence by this time, had "in his enthusiasm . . . taken upon himself too many . . . duties and responsibilities on the operational side of the CIA's activities;" that "certain administrative flaws have developed in the CIA, which must be corrected to give proper emphasis and direction to its basic responsibilities;" that "the American people can and should give their full confidence and support to the intelligence program," though this presents "a corollary demand for clarification of misunderstandings which have arisen in the public mind, largely as a result of the misapplication of secrecy." To correct these conditions, the task force recommended "a small, permanent, bipartisan commission, composed of members of both Houses of the Congress and other public-spirited citizens commanding the utmost national respect and confidence . . .;" modeled after the Hoover Commission itself, this new body would make periodic reports on the "organization, functions, policies, and results" of the intelligence community to the President and Congress; it would "be empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use." [56] The full Commission did not fully accept this recommendation, feeling, no doubt from its own experience, that "while mixed Congressional and citizens committees for temporary service are useful and helpful to undertake specific problems and to investigate and make recommendations, such committees, if permanent, present difficulties." It did, however, accept the need for a CIA "watchdog" by suggesting that "the President appoint a committee of experienced private citizens, who shall have the responsibility to examine and report to him periodically on the work of Government foreign intelligence activities," as well as that "the Congress consider creating a joint congressional committee on foreign intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy." The Commission believed "the two committees, one Presidential and the other Congressional, could collaborate on matters of special importance to the national security." [57]

Following the Bay of Pigs fiasco, President Kennedy asked a former Army Chief of Staff, General Maxwell D. Taylor, to make a special study of the Cuban failure and of America's capabilities for paramilitary operations. Assisting Taylor were ROBERT KENNEDY, Dulles, and Chief of Naval Operations Arleigh Burke.[58] Their report was never published, but it was no doubt directed to the President's feeling that the CIA was one of the "soft spots" in his administration; following their study, Kennedy tightened up Executive review procedures over the CIA and transferred primary responsibility for any future paramilitary operations from the CIA to the Pentagon.[59] It may also be assumed that the shake-up in the CIA administration in the late months of 1961 resulted in large part from the Bay of Pigs failure and the Taylor recommendations. A further study of the CIA was made in 1964 by a special Presidential task force composed of Federick E. Nolting, former Ambassador to South Viet Nam, Major General John M. Reynolds, a vice-director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and John A. Bross, a deputy to the CIA Director. It may also have been a response to an alleged intelligence abuse—the Buddhist pagoda incident—and could well have been the most enlightened study of the six, since all three members of the investigating panel were directly involved in the compilation and use of foreign intelligence, but its findings have never been released by President Johnson.[60]

---

[50] *New York Times,* April 28, 1966, pp. 1, 28.

[51] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 23, 1966, p. 6587.

[52] Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570,* "Joint Committee on Central Intelligence Agency," 84th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, February 23, 1956, pp. 6–7.

[53] Warren Unna, "CIA: Who Watches the Watchman?" *Harper's,* April, 1959, p. 51.

[54] *New York Times,* October 20, 1954, p. 1.

[55] Hoover Commission, *Intelligence Activities,* pp. 17–20.

[56] Hoover Commission, *Intelligence Activities,* p. 14.

[57] Hoover Commission, *Intelligence Activities,* pp. 1–2.

[58] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?,* pp. 184–5.

The major faults of the six *ad hoc* groups are clear: they have been too sporadic, occurring only once every three years or so, and lacking continuous information; and they have been far too secretive to settle the strong fears of many Americans. Their recommendations have been all too often ignored, and thus have had only small impact upon the CIA. Furthermore, they are almost totally useless as a check on the everyday activities of the intelligence community. The offices of the Executive Branch which oversee the CIA offer far more hope of effective control than these periodic studies. They are regularized and better funded. Yet these have not been fully effective either.

Though the CIA was established to inform the National Security Council, the Council is not a prime check upon it. Many CIA activities are considered so mundane (even though they may have disastrous consequences) that the NSC may never learn about them. Basic oversight comes rather through the Special Group, also known as the 54–12 Group (from the number of President Eisenhower's directive establishing the panel).[61] General guidelines set down by the NSC theoretically control CIA operations, but it is the 54–12 Group that controls the rules' everyday application. The Group's current membership includes Admiral Raborn, U. Alexis Johnson (Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs), Cyrus R. Vance (Deputy Secretary of Defense), and William D. Moyers and Walter W. Rostow (Presidential assistants with special responsibilities for national security). Meeting once a week, they concentrate almost exclusively on operations, attempting to head off actions that might prove politically embarrassing to the United States.[62] But it does not clear most of the routine intelligence-gathering activities of the CIA, nor does it maintain continuing supervision over those operations it does approve. It is confined to basic decisions, leaving everyday affairs to the agents "in the field". As the Cuban sugar sabotage plot almost proved, this is not close enough surveillance to insure against national disgrace. Moreover, the Group is currently especially handicapped by the fact that a majority of its members are still relatively inexperienced in national security intelligence affairs.

Another controlling body, more aimed at improving general CIA efficiency than approving specific operations, is the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. This group succeeded the Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities in 1961. Its predecessor, which had been set up by President Eisenhower in 1956 to implement the Hoover Commission's first recommendation, had never gained the President's close attention and had lapsed well before 1961; one explanation was that President Eisenhower was "too busy to be bothered by it."[63] The FIAB has been more successful, no doubt due to the fact that its present Chairman, Clark Clifford, is one of President Johnson's closest confidants. But the FIAB has a basic problem (which was even worse for the Board of Consultants): meeting only once a month or so, it often finds itself exercising only *ex post facto* control. And, like the Special Group, it does nothing to inform the Congress and the people of its findings with regard to the CIA's general competence.

A third check is the Bureau of the Budget, which considers the CIA's budget in some detail before it is hidden in the Defense Department appropriation request that is finally sent to the Congress. Allen Dulles has stressed that the CIA always stands ready to account for every dollar it spends.[64] But this control is merely budgetary, which is to say that it makes no substantive judgments. The Bureau of the Budget, sworn not to interpose policy judgments in its decisions, can merely weigh a proposed operation against the total amount of funds available for this and other projects; it cannot make crucial political judgments.

The State Department and United States Ambassadors also exercise some control. The *New York Times* reports that the Ambassadors are now kept well-informed of CIA activities in their area, quoting Thomas Mann, Under Secretary of State: "I am sure that the policy is made here [at State] and that nothing is done without our consent;" it notes that Secretary Rusk feels "quite certain the CIA is doing nothing affecting national policy that he does not know about." But Rusk goes on to contradict Mann in adding that he is sure he is "the only one in the State Department informed about some of the things being done."[65] Such control is obviously not nearly as thorough as is needed; it is still quite conceivable that a CIA agent in some foreign land and the U.S. Ambassador to that nation are working in directly opposite directions.

A new hope in the area of executive oversight is the recently-formed Senior Interdepartmental Group. Charged with "responsibility to the full extent permitted by law for the overall direction, coordination, and supervision of interdepartmental activities of the United States Government overseas (less exempted military activities)," SIG includes Under Secretary of State George Ball (who will serve as "executive chairman"), Cyrus Vance, Admiral Raborn, USIA chief Leonard Marks, JCS Chairman Earle Wheeler, AID administrator David Bell, and Bill Moyers—an unusually powerful and qualified contingent. While it is clear that this panel will have far more to do than control the CIA, it is just as obvious that SIG will enhance the State Department's ability to perform that task. As one high-ranking Foreign Service officer observed, "If State really gets hold of this thing, it could be the biggest shift in years."[66] Given the traditional State Department inertia, though (see page 20), only time will disclose the true significance of the Senior Interdepartmental Group.

If executive oversight has not been complete enough, congressional oversight has been far, far worse. As one political commentator puts it, "The CIA has always had near sacred-cow-status on Capitol Hill."[67] The most shocking aspect of the situation is that it is the Congress' own fault; the wall between it and the CIA is self-imposed. By defining the CIA's duties in the National Security Act in the broadest possible terms, it left the actual limitation of the new agency not in its own hands, but in those of the NSC. The CIA Act of 1949 went even further, as we have seen; all the standard procedures inherent in Congress' traditional "power of the purse" were voluntarily waived. The conclusion that a majority of the Congress then felt many aspects of intelligence to be "too hot to handle" is obvious, but worse than this is the fact that this extraordinary sense of discretion (accorded to no other governmental area) still persists.

Congressional control is vested in four subcommittees on the Central Intelligence Agency—one each from the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations. These groups meet infrequently and do not accomplish much at those meetings they do hold. In 1963 the House Armed Services Subcommittee on the CIA met five times, with the other subcommittees holding about the same number of sessions; this, sparse as it is, is a sharp rise over the years just before the Bay of Pigs fiasco, of which Congressman Walter Norblad of Oregon once noted, "We met annually—one time a year, for a period of two hours in which we accomplished nothing."[68] The basic fault is not a lack of meetings, though, but a reluctance to act; were the latter not the case, the former would not be either. Senator SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, who serves on two of the subcommittees (he is the senior minority member of both Senate bodies), provides the best example of this problem. He has repeatedly asserted that the CIA is willing to produce information for his groups: "Whenever a suggestion was made as to whether there was anything more we should be told, or any information we might need, we always received it. . . . We could do more than we have done if we felt it were necessary to do so."[69] Yet, he has just as consistently voiced strong feeling that the subcommittee should not do too much: "The difficulty in connection with asking questions and obtaining information is that we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have . . . it is not a question of reluctance on the part of the CIA to speak to us. Instead it is a question of our reluctance. . . ."[70]

The sessions these subcommittees hold are all closed, but there is sufficient evidence that the groups function less for investigation than for shielding the CIA from its critics. After the U–2 disclosures, WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, one of the most influential members of the Senate, complained, "I had been hearing testimony presented before the Committee on Appropriations by the Central Intelligence Agency for 13 years. Never during that time were we told what the money was to be used for. It was a deep, dark secret. . . . I asked a number of members of our Defense [Appropriations] Subcommittee if they knew that the Central Intelligence Agency owned and operated planes, and they said they did not . . . it embarrassed me to know that the CIA had planes. . . ."[71] Senator Henry C.

---

[59] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days*, p. 290. Harry Howe Ransom,"Containing Central Intelligence," p. 13. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, pp. 202–4.

[60] Paul W. Blackstock, *The Strategy of Subversion* (Chicago, Quadrangle, 1964), p. 275.

[61] David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisibile Government*, p. 278.

[62] *New York Times*, April 28, 1966, p. 28.

[63] Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story*, p. 13.

[64] *The Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 259, 261.

[65] *New York Times*, April 28, 1966, p. 28.

[66] *Newsweek*, March 14, 1966, p. 27.

[67] Mary McGrory, "The CIA Chief," *New York Post*, March 25, 1966, p. 46.

[68] Paul W. Blackstock, *The Strategy of Subversion*, p. 274.

[69] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 1, pp. 1067, 1070.

[70] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 5924. For convenience and efficiency, the two Senate subcommittees often meet as one.

[71] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 8, p. 9780.

Dworshak's account of his experiences with congressional control of the CIA is more sarcastic:

"A year ago I was assigned to membership on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. For a long time I had had certain misgivings and uncertainty with respect to the operations of the CIA. I was very eager to find out something about the CIA, because it is a very vital and important agency in the executive department of the Government.

"When the director of the CIA appeared before the Senate appropriations subcommittee, I was so naive as to think that, as a member of the committee, and as a member of the Senate, I might be entitled to some information.

"I ventured to ask certain questions of the director. I was told very emphatically, 'This information is classified.' Information as to the number of personnel is classified, whether there are 1,000, 10,000, or 20,000 employees and officials working for CIA. Oh, Mr. President, that is highly classified information!

"Then when I directed questions to the director about the amount of money required to operate the CIA. I was again told, quite forthrightly, 'This is classified information.' Hush hush! Members of the Appropriations Committee must be willing to assume that the CIA, as a part of our Defense Establishment, is operating efficiently. We are told that it should not be our concern to inquire whether we are obtaining full value for the several millions of dollars which are appropriated annually for the CIA." [72]

Their excessive discretion, and the plain fact that they are often completely ignorant of important covert operations—before and after—keep the present subcommittees from functioning as effective curbs upon the CIA.

It was the recognition of these faults that led MIKE MANSFIELD, now the majority leader but then a Senate freshman, to introduce legislation in the 83rd Congress to set up a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. The bill did not get out of committee in that Congress, but in 1956, the Committee on Rules and Administration (prompted by both the reasoned recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the wild charges of Senator McCarthy) favorably reported the bill by an 8-1 vote to the full Senate. The ensuing discussion was the only time either House, as a whole, has considered the possibility of stronger methods of congressional control over the intelligence community.

The measure was not merely MANSFIELD's idea; he had, by this time, been joined by 34 cosponsors. The bill provided for a twelve-man joint committee, six from each House. Initial membership was limited to those Senators and Representatives already serving on one of the existing four subcommittees dealing with the Central Intelligence Agency. These members would select their own chairman and staff and have full cognizance and supervision over matters relating to the CIA, with power to advise, inquire, and report. Staff and other committee expenses for its first year were set at $250,000 by the Rules Committee.[73]

The general points made in floor debate on the bill will be considered in the next section of this essay, a discussion of the proposal's merits and demerits; it will suffice here to say that MANSFIELD, then just breaking into "The Club", soon found himself up against almost all the notables in what Senator CLARK has since referred to as "the Senate Establishment".[74] Just before the final vote, MANSFIELD commented, "I am beginning to feel a little like David facing Goliath, although I fear the results will not be the same"; in retrospect, he summed up the political situation by saying, "What you had was a brash freshman going up against the high brass. I got a good education." [75] Among "the high brass", all both politically influential and deeply committed to the existing system of control, were Senator Barkley (a former Vice-President and NSC member), HAYDEN, RUSSELL, SYMINGTON, and SALTONSTALL. To these men the two most crucial objections to the resolution were its "fully informed" clause and its provision for a committee staff.[76] Allen Dulles had been especially vehement about the latter point, feeling he would be making "unauthorized disclosures" by discussing CIA matters before such a staff; selected legislators were all right, for they carry the mandate of the electorate, but, to Dulles, professional staff members were quite another matter.[77] The final vote on the bill, 27-59, reflects the pressure of the Establishment; every member of the two Senate CIA Subcommittees (with the exception of Senator Chavez of New Mexico, who was absent), the only Senators eligible to serve on the proposed joint committee, voted against it.[78] Even ten cosponsors of the resolution switched.[79] Perhaps it is worth noting that Senator John F. Kennedy voted for the bill; Senator Lyndon B. Johnson voted against it.[80]

Since 1956, every Congress has seen at least a score of similar resolutions, but none have emerged from committee. The House Rules Committee held two days of hearings on CIA oversight on March 1 and 2, 1960, but later voted to shelve all seventeen resolutions on the subject.[81] Periodic reports of CIA abuses have aroused cries for renewed consideration of such measures, but no committee has as yet responded. In the present Congress, there are over two dozen resolutions on the subject, but none should be accorded more than a very slight chance of ever passing either House.

VI

Its one complete airing in the Senate, plus a large number of articles in the press, have provided a considerable background of debate for the proposal to establish some kind of strong Joint Committee on Intelligence. The major points in this heated discussion may be briefly summarized.

The major argument of those who see a need for such a committee is based upon Lord Acton's statement that "power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." While a certain need for secrecy is recognized, it is held that excessive secrecy invites abuse. There is no way at present for the Congress meaningfully to determine whether the CIA is doing a creditable job. "It is difficult to legislate intelligently if there is a dearth of the information upon which Congress must rely. . . ." [82] Free from the reins of Congress, the CIA is able to mount operations, such as the Bay of Pigs effort, which would face very difficult chances of ever being approved by the Congress. As Congressman ROGERS of Florida has put it, ". . . we have trusted a Government agency to make all but war without the consent of Congress." [83] There are those who would argue that even limited wars are not impossible for the CIA under present arrangements.

A second important argument in favor of a strong "watchdog" committee is that the half-dozen investigations of the CIA, which functioned largely in a manner similar to that of a weak Congressional Special Committee, have not provided adequate investigation, even in combination with the other existing control bodies. Each of the six surveys has found inadequacies in the CIA, but their recommendations for correction have usually been kept secret; the inadequacies were usually still there when the next investigation took place. Perhaps, it is argued, this is because the Congress didn't have a chance to exert some prodding political pressure. "It is not enough that CIA be responsible alone to the White House or the National Security Council," the Senate Rules Committee concluded. "Such responsibility should be shared with Congress in a more complete manned." [84]

Another argument, first put forth by Senator MANSFIELD in the Senate floor debate, is that the development of the CIA under essentially only Executive control, if that represented an "arrogation of power on the part of the Executive and a diminution to that extent of the equality between the executive and the legislative." Both MANSFIELD, and Senator MORSE of Oregon expressed strong fears that, through its control of secret information vital to foreign policymaking, the CIA abetted the Executive's increasing domination over this field, to the exclusion of Congress.[85]

To illustrate their feeling that a "watchdog" committee would be a proper and efficient control over the CIA, many propose the analogy to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Regular Congressional supervision in the field of atomic energy has existed through this committee since 1946.[86] It acts upon matters just as sensitive as foreign intelligence and has had no major difficulties in ironing out jurisdictional lines with the other standing committees. Above all, it has functioned well:

"The work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been of benefit to the country at large. It has maintained congressional liaison with, and congressional control of, much of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. It has provided a forum where information can be solicited and exchanged to the mutual satisfaction of all parties. It has given to Congress, for its guidance and assistance, a trained staff especially concerned with atomic energy matters. It has, at the same time, provided the Atomic Energy Commission with a legislative group familiar with its problems and alert to its particular needs and objectives.

"The members of the Atomic Energy Committee have the full confidence of the other Members of Congress. Their legislative actions are based on the knowledge that trusted Members of both Houses are fully cognizant of developments in atomic energy. They do not have to depend upon the unilateral judgment of the executive branch as to what Members of Congress ought or ought not to know." [87]

The Senate Rules Committee not only praised JCAE, but concluded, "What is true of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy can be true of a new joint committee organized to oversee the Central Intelligence Agency.[88]

---

[72] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6056.

[73] S. Con. Res. 2, 84th Congress.

[74] *The Senate Establishment* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1963).

[75] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6051.

[76] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, pp. 5922–5939, 6047–6063, 6065–6068.

[77] Warren Unna, "CIA: Who Watches the Watchman," pp. 52–3.

[78] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6068.

[79] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence,* p. 261.

[80] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6068.

[81] *Congressional Quarterly,* March 10, 1961, p. 389. Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive the Cold War?* p. 179.

[82] Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570,* 84th Congress, p. 20.

[83] Cited in Fred J. Cook, "The CIA," *The Nation,* June 24, 1961, p. 569.

[84] *Report No. 1570,* p. 19.

[85] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 5927.

[86] Harold P. Green and Alan Rosenthal, *Government of the Atom* (New York: Atherton, 1963), pp. 2–5.

[87] Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570,* p. 18.

A fifth argument is that a strong "watchdog" committee would provide new public and Congressional confidence in the now much-maligned agency. It could prove useful in denying the various unfounded international rumors of nefarious CIA activities, denials that mean little from the present clearly-biased subcommittees; it could also assist in safeguarding the agency from such domestic demagogues as former Senator McCarthy. In addition, it could help to safely publicize, without disclosure of vital information, the strength of our intelligence agencies, publicity which Allen Dulles has conceded would be one of the most effective deterrents to a potential enemy's appetite for attack.[89]

Sixth, it is argued that a "watchdog" committee might prove of definite value in exposing and counteracting possible prejudice that may slip in to the CIA's factual judgments, prejudice that Dulles has called the intelligence field's "most serious occupational hazard." [90]

In sum, the proponents of a strong joint committee argue that, in an era of increasing reliance upon foreign intelligence, there is a wide area in which the Congress could help to improve the intelligence product and safeguard American democracy. Congressional avoidance of this area is considered to be nothing less than an evasion of constitutional responsibility.

Opponents of a strong joint committee are, by and large, more vehement than those in favor of such a committee, for while the latter generally see the proposal as necessary to halt an indirect threat to American democracy, many of the former see the idea as an immediate surrender of American security. To these men, the extent of present CIA secrecy is vital, lest important national secrets be disclosed to America's enemies. They quote from George Washington: "The necessity of procuring good Intelligence is apparent and need not be further urged. All that remains for me to add, is, that . . . the whole matter [be kept]as secret as possible. For upon Secrecy, Success depends in most Enterprises of this kind, and for want of it, they are generally defeated, however well planned and promising a favorable issue;" and from James Forrestal: "There is, of course, the Central Intelligence Agency, on which, I am sure you will agree, if one is to secure improvements, one must undertake to secure them without fanfare." [91] There are clearly solid reasons for their position. Sources of certain types of data would immediately "dry up" if disclosed. Underground actions must by definition be kept secret if they are to succeed. Referring again to Allen Dulles: "Any investigation, whether by a congressional committee or any other body, which results in a disclosure of our secret activities and operations or uncovers our personnel would help a potential enemy just as if the enemy were able to infiltrate their agents right into our shop." [92] This is a problem not merely for the United States, but also for our allies, many of whom contribute to and make use of our intelligence services.

Most of those who hold the present secrecy arrangements vital also feel that the existing control apparatus is adequate. They point out that the public is represented by a small group of its most experienced Congressmen and that the entire intelligence system functions, in theory at least, under responsible Presidential leadership. The willingness of the CIA to cooperate with the present subcommittees is cited; "no information has been denied and all desired information has been candidly supplied." [93] The large number of *ad hoc* investigations is held to be equivalent to what any joint committee could safely do without impinging on the efficiency of the CIA. As Senator HAYDEN said in his lone dissent to the Senate Rules Committee report, "The greatest service we can do . . . is to facilitate the important work of the Agency and to let it get its job done without being watchdogged to death." [94]

Third, it is argued that the functions of the CIA are essentially executive in character, since the agency serves the President, the National Security Council, and other departments in a staff capacity. Senator JACKSON has said that, given this relationship, he cannot understand the contention that there is no constitutional control.[95] If we are to have a joint committee for the CIA, must we have a similar joint committee for the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and other executive agencies? Should the FBI be overseen by a new joint committee? Furthermore, a Joint Committee on Intelligence might raise a constitutional issue on the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches. Senator HAYDEN felt that, since the CIA officially undertakes activities only in accordance with National Security Council directives, any Congressional action which seeks to interfere with or pry into this relationship "would tend to impinge upon the constitutional authority and responsibility of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs." [96]

Those who oppose a "watchdog" committee do not accept the analogy to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. During the Senate debate, Senator SALTONSTALL especially emphasized the motion that the JCAE deals with a much larger operation, having possible effect on the domestic economy. The JCAE overlooks a field in which the Government is basically involved in manufacturing; it is closely involved in detailed legislative considerations. Intelligence, however, is vastly different from the field of atomic energy; a Joint Committee on Intelligence would have little or no legislation to consider.[97] Also, there is disagreement over whether the JCAE is doing an appropriate job. There is strong feeling, both in the Congress and among scholars, that it has, in some respects, taken over many tasks which should be performed by the AEC. "The JCAE," it is said, "is . . . not merely a legislative mechanism, but also a coparticipant in executive decision-making." [98] Such extension of power might not only raise serious constitutional questions, but prove disastrous to the intelligence apparatus.

A fifth argument is that the proposed committee might someday give an overly powerful forum to an irresponsible demagogue or even a mere ideologue, of which there are many in the Congress. Such a person could not only endanger the intelligence system with actual or threatened disclosures, but might also prove a potent behind-the-scenes roadblock to vital operations. Intelligence is held to be far too important to be hindered by politicians searching for political capital.

Finally, it is said, somewhat threateningly, that the present committee chairmen would oppose such a committee on the grounds that it might impede them in their own jurisdictions. The loss of control over military intelligence would hardly sit well with RICHARD RUSSELL.

Summing up for the opposition, then, one might cite Senator HAYDEN's comment, "How it would be possible to keep the American people fully informed and at the same time keep our Communist enemies in the dark, it is difficult to imagine. There must be secrets. There are men all over the world who are engaged in the service of the CIA. Are we to tell the dictators in Moscow how much money we are spending in employing these men and where they are empolyed?" [99] Certainly not; indeed, says Senator RUSSELL, rather than disclose vital secrets of the CIA, "It would be better to abolish it out of hand." [100]

VII

Once again the Central Intelligence Agency is prominently in the news. The recent disclosure that Michigan State University served as the "cover" for CIA agents in South Viet Nam during a multimillion dollar technical assistance program the university conducted for Ngo Dinh Diem's regime has spread fear among many Americans that the CIA is far more pervasive than had been previously suspected. All of those universities now receiving some CIA aid are currently suspect. At almost the same time, it has become known that an Estonian refugee, Juri Raus, who is being sued for slander in a Federal District Court in Baltimore, is basing his defense on the fact that the alleged slander was committed in the course of his duties as a CIA agent. Raus is claiming immunity from the suit on the ground that he had acted as an official agent of the Federal Government. Here again, the CIA appears in an unusually dim light.

Partially as a response to these incidents, the *New York Times* has published a 25,000-word study of the Central Intelligence Agency, compiled by a staff of writers and researchers, and based not only upon much of the data cited here, but as reports from foreign correspondents and interviews with high government officials as well.[101] It concludes that "while the institutional *forms* of political control appear effective and sufficient, it is really the *will* of the political officials who must exert control that is important and that has most often been lacking . . . the control question, while real and of the utmost importance, is one of 'not measures but men'. The forms of control mean nothing if there is no will to control, and if there is a will to control, then the form of it is more or less irrelevant." [102] This conclusion seems reasonable: certainly the Congressional subcommittees could be stronger bodies if their members chose to make them so, and both the 54–12 Group and the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board could do more by meeting more often and demanding greater information from the CIA. But it is easy to misinterpret this fact. The *Times'* survey finds little to criticize in the Executive Branch control bodies, proposes that the Director of Central Intelligence be the key figure in any system of control, and suggests that control can be attained only peripherally through congressional supervision—in short, the basic control structure should be within the Executive Branch. These recommendations echo Allen Dulles' comment that in the field of intelligence "you have to take certain things on faith. You have to look to the man who is directing the organization and the results he achieves. If you haven't someone who can be trusted, or who doesn't get results, you'd better throw him out and get somebody else."[103] It is this reliance upon the executive—to the almost complete exclusion of the legislative—that must be examined.

---

[88] *Report No. 1570*, p. 18.

[89] *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 51.

[90] *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 51.

[91] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 7–8. Letter to Hanson Baldwin, *The Forrestal Diaries*, ed. Walter Millis (New York: Viking, 1951), p. 449.

[92] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 67.

[93] Individual views of Senator HAYDEN, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570*, p. 24.

[94] *Report No. 1570*, p. 25.

[95] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 1, p. 1066.

[96] *Report No. 1570*, p. 27.

[97] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 5936.

[98] Harold P. Green and Alan Rosenthal, *Government of the Atom*, p. 268.

[99] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6058.

[100] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6049.

[101] *New York Times*, April 25–9, 1966, pp. 1ff each day.

[102] *New York Times*, April 25, 1966, p. 20; April 28, 1966, p. 28.

A good deal of secrecy cannot be denied the CIA, for it is certainly true that some secrecy is indispensable to much of its work. None of the responsible proponents of a "watchdog" committee has suggested, for instance, that the agency divulge the names of all its employees. What is being sought is not a completely open intelligence apparatus, but merely one that will be prevented from entering the Alice-in-Wonderland world that excessive secrecy can cause. Complete oversight may be impossible, but strong liaison is not, and this liaison does not now exist. The shock in Congress following the U–2 and Bay of Pigs disclosures indicates that many of the most important CIA operations are completely hidden from Capitol Hill. Yet the executive cannot be merely self-controlled; the Founding Fathers recognized this over 175 years ago and deliberately set up a governmental system filled with checks and balances.

To say that the CIA's activities are essentially executive in character is to say little; the Departments of State, Commerce, Interior, etc.—all clearly executive—are closely checked by Congressional committees. Even the FBI, a favorite example of "watchdog" opponents, is supervised; as a part of the Justice Department, it is monitored by the two Committees on the Judiciary. All that those who stress the CIA's executive nature are really saying is that, since it is executive, the CIA should be singled out for *separate* treatment by a *joint* committee. Look at the JCAE, it is said; it has abrogated executive power. But arguing against a "watchdog" committee in this way misses the point of the analogy. The JCAE was set up by the Congress because of a widespread feeling that the particular problems of the field of atomic energy could best be handled in this manner. Most proponents of strong Congressional supervision of the CIA feel that intelligence too could best be handled jointly, but would be almost as happy to have separate "watchdog" committees in each House. Unity is proposed only to save the CIA from redundant testimony and to help prevent harmful security disclosures. When the analogy to the JCAE is made, it is done so merely to prove that a "watchdog" apparatus *can keep a secret,* and resist being overrun by cheap politicians in search of demogogic fodder, while effectively curbing hidden power.

The joint committee format has its weaknesses. No matter how it is constituted, it will not be able to conduct wide-ranging *public* investigation of the CIA; some discretion will always be necessary. Furthermore, if the Mansfield method of starting such a committee with present CIA subcommittee members is used, the new committee will suffer from the same biases as the old ones. These are relatively unimportant, though, when balanced against the prospect of Congress effectively fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities. Let us put an end to arguments that the joint committee proposal is unsafe. It is certainly no more unsafe than the present subcommittees and, more generally, it must always be remembered that democratic government will always involve personnel risks. On the other hand, a joint committee has the added advantage of easily lending itself to the addition of Congressmen and Senators from the Foreign Affairs (Relations) and Government Operations Committees, many of whom would bring useful insights to Congressional surveillance of the intelligence community. Far more than the present segmented system of four subcommittees, a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence presents the possibility of intelligent oversight with the fewest possible security leaks.

A "watchdog" committee would not be a panacea though, and this writer believes further action is needed. The Senior Interdepartmental Group offers new hope of greater executive surveillance of the field of intelligence, but its wide range of duties will probably prevent it from realizing this hope. A stronger possibility for better oversight would be presented by reconstituting the 54–12 Group in such a way as to include Congressional representation; this panel might then serve as an additional "watchdog". Even more crucial is the need for an informal national discussion of what we should expect from our intelligence apparatus. "Those who believe that the United States Government on occasion resorts to force when it shouldn't," Richard Bissell, former CIA Deputy Director, once correctly noted, "should . . . direct their views to the question of national policy. . . .[104] Many of the abuses attributed to the CIA might never have occurred had the United States not let its intelligence apparatus develop so haphazardly. Intelligence is an ugly business, but today it must be accepted, and the sooner we do so—and decide how we are going to carry it out—the better. If the American people are against covert operations, for instance, let them rise up and say so—and not let the Government assume their feelings on the matter.

There is no easy solution to the problems of controlling central intelligence, but some delicate compromise must be sought. No issue is more basic than whether we can preserve rule by "consent of the governed" in today's troubled world. No challenge is greater than the combination of adequate intelligence machinery with the principles of popular government. It is imperative that we meet the challenge, or American democracy will either be rapidly destroyed or slowly whittled away.

PROGRESS REPORT ON NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SAVE THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago I announced the formation of a National Committee To Save the U.S. Capitol. The purpose of the committee was to mobilize public opposition to the proposals of the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. George Stewart, to extend the historic west front of the Capitol. Mr. Stewart's project would not only cost $34 million at a time when we are being asked to forego every possible unnecessary expenditure, but it would also destroy and cover up for all time the last remaining face of the historic original U.S. Capitol Building.

Since that time the response to this appeal has been most encouraging. Some 10 Members of the Senate and 20 Members of the House have accepted honorary cochairmenships on this committee. Legislation has been introduced in both Houses of Congress to block the Architect's move, at least until the whole matter can be more fully and publicly discussed and the best possible engineering and architectural advice can be submitted to the Congress.

In addition, the response from the people back home, the grassroots sentiment, has been tremendous. These are not just the architectural purists. These are the people who do not believe Congress ought to spend $34 million when we are faced with overwhelming military expenditures in Vietnam.

These are the people who do not believe Congress needs 119 "hideaway" offices in the U.S. Capitol only a couple of years after we spent $125 million to build a new House office building, including a modern electric subway to speed Members back and forth between the Capitol and their offices.

These are the people back home who believe our most treasured national shrine should be preserved, not defaced and destroyed, especially on the basis of a plan that was put forward by a man who is not an architect, and a plan that was developed in secrecy without any public review or debate.

I am confident the views of the people back home will be heard in this Congress and will block the unnecessary and most deplorable extension project.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include thoughtful editorial comments from three outstanding upstate New York newspapers, the Syracuse Herald-Journal of June 29, 1966, the Binghamton Evening Press of June 28, 1966, and the Freeman's Journal of Cooperstown, N.Y., of June 29, 1966, one of the oldest and most distinguished weekly newspapers in the Nation:

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, June 29, 1966]

THE CAPITOL PROFANERS

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON is issuing a call to join him in "fighting city hall". He wants our support in the form of protest letters to our Washington representatives to halt a proposed $34 million extension of the U.S. Capitol.

After thinking it over, we are angry enough to back up STRATTON's call with one of our own.

Our Capitol at Washington, in the words of Allen Nevins, is the "best loved and most revered building" of our nation, and no one yet has publicly attempted to justify the idea of this extension on a basis of need or of money.

---

[103] *U.S. News and World Report,* March 19, 1954, p. 67.

[104] *New York Times,* April 29, 1966, p. 18.

This grandiose proposal by a handful of men (J. George Stewart, the congressional architect, and the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol) would destroy the western front of the building with its handsome classic walls and cascading staircases. In their place would be another restaurant, two movie theaters and 109 new "hideaway" congressional offices, STRATTON reports.

Whether the exterior walls are or are not safe is a matter for competent engineers. If they are unsafe, they can be rebuilt and replaced without alteration of the original design. The British restored their House of Commons after Nazi bombing, and they insisted that it be restored, not modernized or modified.

Let's not let a few men in Washington tell us that our Capitol building (and it certainly belongs to all of us) must be defaced . . . This is our shrine of democracy . . . We want it to remain as it is.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, June 28, 1966]

THE NOISY WESTERN FRONT

The humble but honest Virginia sandstone of the West Front of the U.S. Capitol is crumbling after 166 years. A face of the nation, so to speak, needs repair.

Something called the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has decided on a major face-lifting—replacement of the sandstone with marble and extensions of the West Front 88 feet to accommodate another Capitol restaurant, two theaters, some offices, some conference rooms and a tourist center.

The estimated cost is $34,000,000, but in the light of experience with Congressional construction of recent years, the figure cannot be taken seriously. The hideous Rayburn Building, for example, started out with a $20,000,000 estimate and ended up at somewhere around five times that.

The Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has five members, Capitol "architect" J. George Stewart, House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Vice-President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. Stewart's title has quotes around it because he is not really an architect. The commission has the power to alter the Capitol without asking further Congressional approval and the decision on the West Front was made at a meeting which neither Mr. FORD nor Mr. HUMPHREY attended.

Since then the cries of outrage have risen. Some of the most outspoken comment has come from Democratic Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON of Amsterdam. Mr. STRATTON attacks the project as too costly, and a needless defacement of the "last remaining section of the original building." He also argues that most of the things that would be provided in the expanded building are not needed.

Mr. STRATTON is in good company. The National Capital Fine Arts Commission and the American Institute of Architects take about the same view. Such varied editorial voices as those of the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Times and the Washington Post have thundered in protest.

At the risk of being a copycat, we'd like to get on the bandwagon.

There is something essentially wrong with a five-man commission having the complete say about what is to be done with a national monument of a democracy. There also is something wrong about the office of Architect of the Capitol not being headed by an architect. There also is something wrong about Congressional buildings being the only public structures in the capital that do not have to be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission for approval.

Representative STRATTON is organizing a National Committee of One Million to Save the U.S. Capitol. That's all right, but we'd suggest that he might look into sponsoring a bill to recognize the Capitol architect's office to make sure that Congressional minions no longer can build unsupervised, unchecked and unreviewed.

[From the Freeman's Journal, June 29, 1966]

ARCHITECTURAL CAUTION

Swirling controversy once again surrounds proposed changes in the architecture of the United States Capitol. Reconstruction of the East Front of the imposing structure was completed in 1961, despite a storm of architectural controversy. Now the Vice-President and the distinguished legislators who serve on the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol have approved a proposal to enlarge, resurface, and redesign the West Front.

That the West Front is in a state of structural deterioration and even in danger of collapse is a fact. Something must be done and without delay. The question, however, is what?

William Walton, chairman of the Federal Fine Arts Commission, leveled a heavy barrage of criticism at the proposal for extending the West Front. He charged that the plan would be "a national tragedy" and that it would "vandalize" and "vulgarize" a great historic monument.

Some senators and congressmen have added their criticism. Our own Rep. SAMUEL S. STRATTON announced formation of a National Committee of One Million to Save the United States Capitol.

Few will contest the charm, grace, and inspirational quality of the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, or the Supreme Court, to cite but a few of the structures which help to make Washington one of the strikingly beautiful cities of the world.

Some recent additions to Washington architecture, however, have been, in the judgment of many critics, ponderous, dull, monotonous, vulgar. A not-so-shining example is the new Sam Rayburn House Office Building, for which the present Capitol architect bears responsibility.

We assume that Congress will want to withhold its approval for changes in one of the world's most prominent and historic buildings until it has given careful consideration to the views of distinguished members of the architectural profession.

U.S. LAWN TENNIS ASSOCIATION UNFAIR TO PERTH AMBOY TENNIS TOURNAMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Lawn Tennis Association has monopolistically ruled that the people of Perth Amboy, N.J., will not be able to hold their annual tournament at the regular time this year. The association's new 100-mile rule will not sanction a tournament within 100 miles of a USLTA at Forest Hills, Long Island. I intend to discuss this with the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce because I do not believe that any group in New York should have the power to prevent a tournament in New Jersey.

I resent their new rule, Mr. Speaker, because I resent the association telling us in New Jersey that we cannot hold our small tournament because it will conflict with their Forest Hills championship. From my personal experience, I know that the attendance at our tournament is almost entirely local, and that it does not hurt the Forest Hills attendance at all. Some people from Perth Amboy do go to Forest Hills and I know, in fact, that our small tournament helps to increase interest in the larger championship.

Moreover, in making this arbitrary 100 mile decree, the USLTA is acting like a monopoly and a trust. For, even though the antitrust laws do not apply to tennis, the association here is certainly violating the spirit of the antitrust laws and is acting truly small and provincial.

For nearly 30 years, Mr. Speaker, the people of Perth Amboy have been holding a small local tennis tournament in the beginning of September. The tournament, though small and drawing at most 1,000 people for its 2 days of matches, has several important purposes. All the receipts from the tournament go to worthwhile charities in the area, the Deborah Fund, the Elks Crippled Kids Fund, and the Mount Carmel Nurses Fund. In addition, the tournament enhances community spirit, while at the same time it builds up a local interest in tennis itself.

For nearly 30 years, this small tournament for the people of Perth Amboy ran along smoothly and was allowed to proceed in its own small way. Occasionally, since the more famous Forest Hills tournament was drawing to a close at the same time that our tournament was being played, we were fortunate enough to get a big-name star.

This year, however, there will be no big-name star at our tournament. There will, in fact, be no tournament at all.

We, who are so angry over Russia's canceling our annual track meet for her own selfish political reasons, should not allow a big organization like the USLTA to refuse to sanction Perth Amboy's annual tournament for its own selfish purposes. At the height of the tennis season, during the Labor Day Week, the association, at the expense of all nearby local tournaments, is attempting to secure for itself a monopoly of all the big-name players. The association fails to see, Mr. Speaker, that they will lose no revenue if they sanction Perth Amboy's tournament. They will only allow, if they do sanction it, a small tournament—held for charity—to continue for its 29th year. However, if it should not sanction the tournament, it will lose a great many friends, a good deal of respect, and a large amount of good will.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to put the distinguished majority leader on notice that next week, or very soon thereafter, I am going to be inquiring about when this session of the Congress may be expected to adjourn, because I have things to do as a few other Members have.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's last campaign proves conclusively that he does not need to spend any time campaigning in his district.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID HAS FAILED

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is being asked by the Democrat administration to authorize the Federal Government to take billions of the hard-earned dollars of American taxpayers to finance many questionable projects under a hodgepodge program known as mutual assistance. Despite the lofty purposes of foreign aid I am afraid the net result over the past 17 years has been to finance the mutual efforts of foreign countries in ganging up on the United States, abusing the American people, and in collaborating with our enemies. Foreign aid has failed in its objectives. It has not weakened or stopped communism. It has bought no friendship or loyalty for the United States in its efforts to prevent any country from going Communist when the Communists wanted to take over. It has depleted our gold reserve to the point where this Nation could face actual bankruptcy. It has helped to strengthen the economies of Communist countries so that Red dictators have been able to tighten their control over enslaved populations. It has made it possible for countries receiving our aid to carry on a profitable trade with North Vietnam at the very time Americans are being slaughtered by this Communist enemy.

The continued drain on our gold supply caused by the reckless use of foreign aid could well bankrupt the United States and force the devaluation of the dollar to make our money worthless. This is certainly of paramount importance to the American people. At the rate gold is being withdrawn from this country, the dollar will soon be without support. We have already replaced our silver coins with copper. Our paper dollar may soon be worth little more than the cost of the paper it is printed on.

Last year the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was $1.3 billion. U.S. gold reserves at this time amount to $13.8 billion and foreign countries hold dollars, which are claims against our gold, of at least twice that amount. By law approximately $9 billion is required to back up the paper money which is in circulation today. So it is plain to see how dangerous the situation is and yet the administration takes no steps to halt the pressure on our gold reserves by cutting back on the greatest source of the pressure, foreign aid.

In short, what little good has ever been accomplished by foreign aid has been completely overcome by the harm it has done and is continuing to do to this country.

I am opposed to the present bill, H.R. 15750, for the reasons I have just outlined. My opposition is further increased by the provisions of this foreign aid bill by which Congress gives up more of its constitutional responsibility to the executive branch. We are asked to give the President extended authority to spend the peoples' money on these overseas programs without checking with Congress. It is a betrayal of our oath of office to relinquish a responsibility demanded of us under the Constitution, to manage the spending of Federal funds. We have no authority to give the President the power to spend these funds without an annual accounting to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is enough money in the pipeline to finance existing foreign aid programs for at least a year. I do not think we should authorize any more money for foreign aid until we have been able to make a thorough restudy of where and how the money is being spent, with the view of eliminating those programs which are not accomplishing the purposes for which Congress authorized the money and to eliminate entirely all funds going to Communist countries or to programs of the United Nations which in turn channel them to Communist countries.

The American people, with good reason, do not trust the Johnson administration to be truthful about the foreign aid program any more than it has been honest about the Vietnam war and the Great Society programs at home. It is therefore our responsibility to the people we represent to be honest with them in matters in which they have a vital concern. We can best be honest by calling a halt to new foreign aid programs until we have uncovered the whole truth about what has been accomplished up to this time. I will vote against this bill.

DR. PAUL A. MILLER

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's nomination of Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, as Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare drew mixed emotions from my fellow West Virginians.

Most West Virginians, I feel, are proud that the President has seen fit to name a man who was educated in West Virginia and who has been devoted to the future of the State of West Virginia, to one of the most vital and important Federal positions in the Nation. At the same time, there was a feeling of disappointment that Dr. Miller is leaving his job at West Virginia University.

The Weirton Daily Times sums this feeling up better than I. Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD together with my foregoing remarks the editorial of the distinguished editor of the Times, Paul Glover:

[From the Weirton (W. Va.) Daily Times, July 9, 1966]

WE HATE TO LOSE DR. MILLER

Hancock County residents are elated that Dr. Paul A. Miller has been appointed to a high post in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, but are sorry to lose him as head of West Virginia University.

Dr. Miller has been recognized as one of the most able and distinguished men in higher education in the country.

We all in Hancock County have a close attachment to him because this is his native county. Although born in East Liverpool, his family moved to a home near Chester when he was still a boy. He attended Wells High School in Newell and was graduated at the top of his class there in 1935.

His mother, Mrs. Harry A. Miller, still resides in Chester. A brother, Bernie, lives across the river in East Liverpool.

Dr. Miller attended Bethany College for one year, then transferred to West Virginia University where he received an AB degree in 1939. He received his master's degree at Michigan State. He taught at Michigan State University for a number of years before returning to his WVU alma mater four years ago.

In accepting the government position, Dr. Miller succeeds Francis Keppel who resigned. The post pays $27,000 a year.

Dr. Miller has been receiving an annual salary of $30,000, plus an estimated $10,000 in fringe benefits at WVU. He has been the highest paid public official in the state.

Dr. Miller has been well liked throughout the state for his aggressive administration. He also was popular with the student body and the faculty.

When the City of Weirton held an appreciation dinner for Thomas E. Millsop earlier in the year, it was Dr. Miller who was invited to make the principal address. Dr. Miller is known personally by scores of residents of Hancock and Brooke counties and his departure from the West Virginia scene will be a great personal loss to them.

However, the whole state wishes Dr. Miller success in his new and more responsible field on the national level. In his new position he will have an opportunity to use his talents and energies in the whole field of education and in a most strategic and important situation and also at an important time in American educational history.

BRIDGEPORT, W. VA., 150 YEARS OLD

Mr. **DAVIS** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MOORE**. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege this evening of joining the residents of Bridgeport, W. Va., in the celebration of its 150th birthday.

Bridgeport is unique and rare in that one of its native sons, the late-famed wildcatter Michael L. Benedum gave proof to the community that he had never forgotten his West Virginia birthplace. Today, thanks to the philanthropy of Mr. Benedum, Bridgeport proudly boasts a civic and recreation center and swimming pool and a beautiful church as lasting remembrances of a man for his hometown. I might add that Mr. Benedum, a multimillionaire who lived in Pittsburgh, Pa., at the time of his death contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to colleges and universities in West Virginia through the Claude W. Benedum Foundation.

The Clarksburg, W. Va., Sunday Exponent-Telegram has an interesting account on the history of Bridgeport and its plans for the week-long sesquicentenial celebration in its July 10 edition.

Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks in the Record:

Bridgeport Plans Sesquicentennial Events This Week

Bridgeport is 150 years old, first chartered in 1816, and to celebrate this event, the week of July 11 through July 16, has been set aside.

Bridgeport was first settled before the war between Great Britain and the American Colonies, when a fort was built on the waters of Simpson Creek and was then known as Bridgefort.

Some of the first settlers at that time were Andrew Davidson, Joseph Wilkinson, James Anderson, John Powers, and Joseph Johnson. Bridgeport, rich in heritage as part of a new developing nation, has grown into one of West Virginia's finest residential and business towns.

A full week of events have been planned to entertain the many visitors expected.

The annual Fireman's Fair will be in progress nightly throughout the week starting at 7 p.m. The fair this year is to be bigger and better, providing fun and thrills for young and old alike.

At 6 p.m. July 14 at the Bridgeport Civic Center, the Sesquicentennial opening ceremonies will be held presided over by Mayor Walter Hathaway, who will welcome all visitors and introduce guests of national and local importance.

At this time the new addition to Bridgeport's water system will be dedicated with addresses by government officials of national prominence. Music for this program will be furnished by the Bridgeport High School Band.

Immediately following this ceremony at 7:30 p.m. will be the official Sesquicentennial Parade, which will follow a route east on Philadelphia Avenue to Center Street, then south on Center Street to Main Street, then West on Main Street to Virginia Avenue.

The parade will be made up of many exciting floats, bands, marching units, fire department vehicles from throughout north central West Virginia, clowns, old automobiles and the candidates vieing for Sesquecentennial Queen. This parade promises to be one of the most elaborate seen in this area.

Following the parade the public is invited to attend a reception to be held in the dining room of the Civic Center to greet the many honored guests. Refreshments will be served.

During the days of July 14, 15 and 16 there will be an industrial exhibit, open for all to view, in the main auditorium of the Civic Center. On display will be exhibits and products of all the local industries. At the same time, the public is invited to tour the Civic Center building and grounds and view the library, West Virginia Room and the Benedum Room.

On the Civic Center grounds will be found mobile trailers housing displays of West Virginia wildlife from the Department of Natural Resources and the "Telmobile" presented by the C. & P. Telephone Company of West Virginia.

All of these displays and exhibits will be open to the public during the hours of 1 p.m. to 8 p.m. each of these days.

At 7 p.m. July 15 a band concert will be presented on the lawn of the Civic Center. Following this event, at 10 p.m. on the stage at the fair grounds, the crowning of the Sesquicentennial Queen will take place. At 10 a.m. July 16 a tribute to "The Great Wildcatter," Michael Late Benedum, in the form of a Birthday Memorial will be held at the Chapel Building at the Bridgeport Cemetery.

Paul G. Benedum, of Pittsburgh, nephew and business associate of the late Michael L. Benedum, will be present to relate some of his memories of this great man. In the early evening of this day, it is hoped there will be a "Fly-Over" of several C–119 transports of the Air National Guard.

To bring the Sesquicentennial Celebration to a close, members of the Company E, 7th West Virginia Infantry (Civil War) of Morgantown, will visit the Bridgeport Civic Center, where at 8 p.m. the 38-star Union Flag will be raised, while an authentic Civil War cannon and muskets will be fired. These men will be dressed in uniforms of the Civil War period and will provide a fitting close to this wonderous event.

In conjunction with Bridgeport's Sesquicentennial Celebration, guided bus tours will be provided by local real estate and building firms.

It was announced by James W. Frush, that at 1 p.m. Saturday, July 16 and continuing through until 5 p.m. free bus tours will depart from in front of the Bridgeport Civic Center. These tours will be available to all visitors and will follow routes that will allow the passengers to view both the old and the new expanding Bridgeport.

Guides provided from the membership of the Bridgeport Women's Club will be aboard each bus to explain the community and its development as this tour continues.

Frush stated, "All Bridgeport citizens are justly proud of their town and hopes that all visitors to the Sesquicentennial Celebration will take advantage of this opportunity to see first hand all that Bridgeport has to offer."

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER'S 1966 OPINION POLL REPORT

Mr. **WYDLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WYDLER**. Mr. Speaker, it has become my tradition in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District to send a questionnaire to each registered voter to test the prevailing opinion on great national issues.

In March, I mailed my third annual questionnaire to over 100,000 constituents. The questionnaires sent in the previous 2 years brought complimentary responses and requests for more of the same. The enthusiastic response this year proves that people do care about their government.

As in the past, there was no politics in the questionnaire. It was sent to all registered voters regardless of party. The results were independently compiled and verified.

Our "Fabulous Fourth" District is progressive, successful, and well educated. Its opinion is important.

My reaction to the answers is that the American people are angry and frustrated. Never has opinion been so clearly set forth and been so one-sided on many issues.

There is a general determination to stop communism in southeast Asia and to back the President's commitments there.

The answers to questions Nos. 6, 7, and 8 show the low public opinion of typical so-called Great Society programs.

These results show the temper of the people. They are particularly significant because they represent the combined thinking of a cross-section of the Fourth Congressional District of New York—the "Fabulous Fourth"—a leading part of the New America, the suburbs.

I am still in the process of individually answering the thousands of comments I received but, the results having been tabulated, I am setting them forth in the Congressional Record for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress.

Once again my thanks and congratulations to those who participated and made this questionnaire a success. I am addressing these results to "Postal Patron" to reach each home in the hope of encouraging all citizens to register and vote this year.

If I am reelected, the large participation has assured that there will be a fourth annual questionnaire in the "Fabulous Fourth" District next year.

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	Undecided
FOREIGN POLICY			
In your opinion—			
1. Is it vital to the United States to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover?	70.6	19.2	10.2
2. If the Communists will not talk truce, should North Vietnam be hit harder?	76.0	14.2	9.8
3. Should the Congress support the President's decision to fight in southeast Asia?	70.4	17.8	11.8
4. Do you favor participation of Red China in the United Nations?	29.7	59.1	11.2
HOMEFRONT POLICY			
5. Do you favor my proposal to allow parents a tax credit for tuition payments?	81.1	14.8	4.1
6. If the war in Vietnam continues, should taxes be raised to finance an expansion of Great Society programs?	12.8	80.7	6.5
7. Do you think the war on poverty has been successful in improving the conditions of poor people?	7.6	71.7	20.7
8. Do you favor Federal rent subsidies to pay one-fourth of the rent for lower income families?	10.0	83.2	6.8
9. Do you favor a reduction in spending to produce a balanced Federal budget?	80.7	12.4	6.9
GENERAL			
10. Do you believe that the Government gives the people enough reliable information on what it is doing?	22.5	67.3	10.2
11. Have you felt the effects of an increase in the cost of living over the course of the past year?	91.2	6.7	2.1
12. Is the Congress dominated too much by the President?	60.4	25.6	14.0
13. Do you favor Federal legislation regulating packaging to protect consumers? (See Consumers Lobby)	75.5	7.8	16.7

CANCELLATION OF HEARINGS ON ELECTION REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgent need for reform in the field of political finance, I am deeply disappointed at the sudden and unexplained cancellation of hearings on this subject which were scheduled to begin before the Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee. Less than an hour and a half before the time set for the opening of hearings today, committee members and witnesses were notified of the cancellation.

It is hard to understand this show of reluctance to come to grips with issues so important to the institutions of popular government. Several bills have been introduced looking toward reforms which leaders of both parties have stated are long overdue. The problems to which these bills address themselves require early attention by the Congress. Recent revelations of the activities of the President's club give added reason for speedy action.

Mr. Speaker, all who are interested in the integrity of the election process will be grieved that Congress is dragging its feet on the matter of election reform. I trust that the canceled hearings will be rescheduled as soon as possible and that a serious and penetrating study of the subject will be undertaken without further delay.

REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER ADDRESSES OHIO ASSOCIATIONS ON FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 8, 1966, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Works and probably the most knowledgeable Member of this distinguished body on Federal water pollution control legislation, addressed a joint conference on water quality in Columbus, Ohio.

The conference was held jointly by seven major statewide associations concerned with water pollution control in the Buckeye State. These groups are highly interested in developing a comprehensive water pollution abatement program in the State which will become the one to be put into effect under the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965. The seven organizations which held the conference are the Ohio Manufacturers' Association, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, the Ohio Municipal League, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, the Ohio Reclamation Association, the Ohio Petroleum Council, and the Ohio Coal Conference, Inc. The conference was attended by over 500 concerned citizens of the State representing State and local governments, private industry, farmers associations, nonprofit and civic organizations, and just concerned Ohioans.

Mr. CRAMER's remarks are highly perceptive of and indeed relevant to the Federal water pollution control programs.

Mr. Speaker, Ohio has been one of the leading States of the Union in controlling water pollution through State and local government cooperation with specially created water pollution control entities. The Ohio River Water Sanitation Commission—ORSANCO—has long been regarded as an outstanding example of a river commission being able to clean up a major river without reliance upon the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include Mr. CRAMER's remarks before the water quality conference, and I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress and all Americans who are concerned about water pollution control legislation:

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS IN WATER QUALITY CONTROL

(Remarks of the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Member of Congress, before the Water Quality Conference jointly sponsored by the Ohio Manufacturers' Association, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, the Ohio Municipal League, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, the Ohio Reclamation Association, the Ohio Petroleum Council, and the Ohio Coal Conference, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, July 8, 1966.)

Ladies and gentlemen, during the past decade, our Nation has become increasingly aware of the many water supply and water purity problems confronting it.

Wide rivers have dwindled to streams, and lakes have been reduced to ponds. Streams and lakes which were once the pride of fishermen, swimmers, and other recreation and sports enthusiasts, in many instances, have now become open sewers. Some municipalities are without sufficient pure water to even meet the consumption demands of their residents. Some industries are without enough water to produce their products and to use in the operation of their machinery. Ships barely have enough channel depth to make it through some of the Nation's most important waterways.

Our Nation has an acute water resources problem. It has been characterized by some as a "water famine." There is just not enough water of adequate quality at all the places where it is needed for municipal, industrial, commercial, and irrigation purposes. It is so polluted, in many cases, that taxpayers and industries must pay ever-increasing taxes and spend ever-increasing sums of money to meet the needs of purification.

In my opinion, there are few problems confronting this Nation today with the magnitude and seriousness of maintaining sufficient pure water. The need for adequate, good quality water for all the Nation's uses is paramount, for water pollution menaces public health, destroys fish and wildlife, adversely affects manufacturing processes, reduces property values, raises taxes, and destroys natural beauty.

The increase in the amount and nature of pollution can be best illustrated by citing a few statistics. At the turn of the century, the total of municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses of water in the United States was about 40 billion gallons per day. By midcentury total water use had risen to about 203 billion gallons per day; and by 1965, it had risen to about 367 billion gallons per day. By 1980, only 14 years from now, the average daily use of water is estimated to be an astounding 597 billion gallons.

Municipal wastes increased from an equivalent of the sewage discharge of 24 million persons in 1900 to a total equivalent of the sewage discharge of 75 million persons in 1960. The comparable increase in industrial waste discharged was the equivalent of 15 million persons in 1900 to 150 million persons in 1960. The increase of the two combined is roughly sixfold in sixty years. Municipal wastes increased threefold between 1900 to 1960, but industrial wastes increased tenfold.

As recently as 1960, 25 percent of municipal wastes were being dumped into waterways as raw sewage. Another 31 percent was receiving only primary treatment, that is, the removal of only those solids which would settle. The very nature of the control problem has also changed, for water is being polluted today by materials unknown a few decades ago.

THE WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM

Ladies and gentlemen, the problem of water pollution is indeed a substantial one. Congress has proclaimed that it cannot be ignored. It must not be ignored. But just because it is a national problem, we need not rely completely upon the Federal government to correct it.

I think that it has been amply demonstrated over the past decade that only by concerted action on Federal, State, and local levels of government to claim the water which falls on our land, and to implement effective water pollution control abatement, can we guarantee the citizens of this Nation that there wil be an adequate supply of water of needed quality in the future. The answer lies in the effective use and reuse of water, and that cannot be achieved without sincere cooperation between government and industry, from the Nation's Capital to every County Courthouse, and from monstrously large industries to small plants.

When one realizes that by the year 2000 we will have a water supply need of 1,000 billion gallons daily, I repeat—1,000 billion gallons daily, and that there are only 650 billion gallons now available daily, then it becomes strikingly apparent that this will necessitate water reuse. Ohioans must be fully aware of the necessity for water reuse, inasmuch as water from the Ohio River is used 3.7 times as the river winds its 1,000 mile course. A program to provide sufficient clean water is the only way to meet these demands.

One of the most essential elements in water pollution control is the maintenance of water quality. Its many intricacies have been the subject of heated debate both in and out of the Congress for many years. It will continue to be the one overriding issue in water pollution control legislation for some years to come.

What are the current laws regarding water quality criteria, regulations, standards, and control? What about enforcement of such standards? How will the States and local governments be affected? What can concerned citizens and industries do? These are but a few of the questions with which I wish to concern myself today as I discuss water quality control and enforcement with you. Before we examine the details of the Water Quality Act of 1965, a desire for an understanding of some provisions of which has prompted this meeting today, it might be wise to first briefly examine the historical development of the Federal water pollution control program in general and water quality in particular.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1948

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, sponsored by Senators Robert Taft and Alben Barkley, represented a significant breakthrough in terms of national recognition of the problem. The theme of the legislation was that pollution was primarily a health problem best dealt with at a local level.

THE 1956 CONTROL ACT—FIRST GRANTS

Congress took a longer legislative step in 1956 with the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, better known as Public Law 660. The major innovation of the 1956 legislation was the provision for grants-in-aid to help local communities build sewage treatment works. Although the enforcement provisions of the 1956 Act allowed the Federal government to pursue with more authority the pollutors of interstate waters, they were regarded by most as being modest. However, this section did mark the entering wedge of what some considered to be the most vital part of an effective water pollution control program, namely, Federal sanctions.

I know that all of you probably recall the provisions of the 1956 Act respective to water quality control, but let me refresh your memories briefly. Under the provisions of the 1956 Act, when the Surgeon General had "reason to believe" pollution of interstate waters was occurring, he could call a conference of officials either in the State or States of origin or in the State or States being affected. After the conference, the Surgeon General could recommend remedial action; and if no such action occurred within six months after the Surgeon General's recommendations were made, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could call a public hearing in the State or States of pollution origin. Remedial action could be called for by the Secretary after the hearings and the pollutor given six months to effect such action. At the end of that time, if no action had been taken, the Secretary, upon request from the offending State could request the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit against the offender.

FEDERAL VERSUS LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In hearings before the House Committee on Public Works in 1959, the Secretary of HEW, Arthur S. Flemming, appearing as the principal Administration witness, took the position that the Federal government should pursue the enforcement provisions of the 1956 Act and should engage in the research and other activities embodied in the program. As you know, legislation in the 86th Congress, 1959–60, was vetoed by President Eisenhower because of his objections to the substantial expansion of the Federal grants-in-aid program of the 1956 Act which was called for in the legislation. In his veto message, President Eisenhower stressed that water pollution was primarily a local responsibility and that the budget could not be balanced by continually expanding Federal programs, i.e., the grant provisions of the Act. The veto was sustained, despite the substantial Democratic majority in the Congress that year.

THE 1961 AMENDMENTS

In 1961 Congress enacted legislation which amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase authorizations for appropriations for construction of waste treatment works, to encourage joint projects, to raise the dollar ceiling limitation for a single project, and to set a dollar ceiling limitation on joint projects. The Secretary of HEW, rather than the Surgeon General, was given responsibility for the program.

Ten Republican Members of the House Committee on Public Works filed a strong minority report on the reported bill registering our approval of many of its provisions.

The main discord between the House version and the Senate version of the legislation which resulted in the 1961 Act lay in the enforcement provisions. What happened, of course, is well known. The Senate conferees rejected the House provision giving the Secretary of HEW the power to issue orders for abatement, and the Conference substitute provided that if pollution were not abated within the specified time in the notice following the public hearing, the Secretary of HEW could ask the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit to secure abatement in cases of interstate pollution. In the case of intrastate pollution, he could ask for a suit only with the written consent of the State involved.

The 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act were the culmination of the developments toward amending the 1956 Act which had begun as early as 1958.

The Congress realized, however, that it would take a greater effort at all levels of government, and on the part of industry, agriculture, conservationists, civic and voluntary organizations, and individual citizens to come to grips with the monumental problems of water pollution. It is imperative, however, that the State and local governments and non-governmental entities take the lead in abating water pollution. This is the only effective means by which we can prevent encroachments by the Federal government into the prerogatives of the State and local governments in controlling water pollution.

With the thought in mind that additional water pollution control legislation was needed on a national level, many bills were introduced last year to strengthen the Federal water pollution control program.

The bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution control Act which was eventually acted upon by both Houses of Congress was S. 4, introduced by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine, and known as the "Water Quality Act of 1965." This bill passed the Senate in an extremely strong form, and, as a matter of fact, Republicans and Democrats alike expressed similar views, especially with regard to the section on water quality standards applicable to interstate waters and portions thereof.

Let me say from the outset, I do believe that the Water Quality Act of 1965 as finally drafted on a bipartisan basis is, by and large, a constructive and effective piece of legislation. Briefly, it provided for the creation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, through which the Secretary of HEW was to administer the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. It created the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of HEW to assist the Secretary in supervising and directing the head of the new Administration as well as the administration of all other departmental functions involving water pollution. It authorized research and development grants to demonstrate new or improved methods to eradicate the problems of water pollution caused by overflow of storm sewers or combined storm and sanitary sewers. The 1965 Act provided for a substantial enlargement of the grant program for construction of sewage treatment works, and it doubled the dollar ceiling limitation on grants for construction of waste treatment works for an individual project or a joint project.

Under the 1965 Act, authorizations for appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 were increased from $100 to $150 million, of which $100 million is to be allocated to the States under the formula of the existing law, based on population and income, and all amounts appropriated in excess of $100 million are to be allocated on the basis of population alone. Project grants above the dollar ceiling limitations may be made from the latter allotment if the State matches the full Federal contribution made to all projects from this increase in annual allotment. The law further permits the Secretary of the Interior to increase the basic grant by an additional ten percent of the amount of the grant if the project conforms to the comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area. But when the Senate passed bill lay before the House Committee on Public Works for consideration, all was not so well.

REORGANIZATION INTO INTERIOR

Although last year's Act, as all other legislation pertaining to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, continued the program through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President's Reorganization Plan Number Two of 1966, which transferred the program to the Secretary of the Interior, effective as of May 10, 1966, necessitates our discussion today on the basis of the Federal water pollution control program being administered by the Secretary of the Interior. I will make all references to last year's Act and the law, as amended, in that context.

WATER STANDARDS

The provisions of last year's Act which were the most controversial when the legislation was before the Congress was the section which would have given the Secretary authority to prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to all interstate waters and portions thereof and to promulgate standards pursuant thereto. It is the requirements of the language which finally evolved from this section which has prompted this meeting today. The provision, as passed by the Senate, would have given the Secretary complete power to control the use of waters of practically every stream in the Nation from the Ohio River to your neighborhood creek, which to a very large and realistic extent would, in fact, have given the Secretary control over the use of the lands adjacent to all such streams. The effect of this provision would have been to establish the Secretary as a nationwide "zoning Czar" over waters and adjacent lands.

Members of the House Committee on Public Works were strongly opposed to such a far-reaching provision. The Committee voted to strike this controversial and unwise provision. The Committee inserted in lieu of the Senate version a provision that each State in order to receive funds under the Act must have filed within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act (October 2, 1965) a letter of intent with the Secretary that the State would establish water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters on or before June 30, 1967. I think that all of you would agree that the House version was a much more reasonable one than either the Senate's or the one which eventually became law. The legislation, as reported by the House Committee, was sent to the Floor of the House where it was passed without a single "nay" vote.

Obviously, as I have pointed out, standards of water quality are desirable, but efforts should be made first to obtain the establishment of such standards or criteria by the State and local governments which are most familiar with all aspects of the matter in a given locality, including the economic impact of the standards to be established and enforced. Authorizing the Secretary to promulgate and enforce standards, to the exclusion of the States, would obviously discourage the State and local governments from developing their own plans and standards for water quality. It was the desire and the need to bring the States into the field of water pollution control that other provisions were included in the bill.

This desire to have the States adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof within such States and a plan to implement and enforce such criteria is the very reason that you are gathered here today.

Inasmuch as there was disagreement between the House and the Senate, the bill was submitted to a Conference to have the disagreements worked out. What came out of this Conference was the legislative language which became public law. The water quality standard provision reported by the Conference was the best compromise that could be obtained.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

I want to discuss the 1965 Act as it pertains to water quality standards in more detail, inasmuch as it is the principal purpose of your meeting and because it is complex legislation.

The new law provides that if the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency files within one year after the date of enactment of the Act a letter of intent that such a State, after public hearings, will before June 30, 1967, adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters and portions thereof within such State and a plan to implement and enforce such criteria and if the Secretary determines that such criteria and plan are consistent with the provisions of the Act, then such criteria and plan will thereafter be the water quality standards applicable to those interstate waters and portions thereof. If State control is to be preserved here in the Buckeye State, the criteria and a plan must be submitted by Ohio by June 30, 1967, and to be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

The 1965 Act provides further, however, that if a State does not file a letter of intent to establish water quality standards under the provisions which I have just discussed, or if the Secretary or Governor of any affected State wants a revision of the standards, then the Secretary may, after having had a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities, and affected industries, prepare and publish regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. The Secretary may promulgate standards six months after the date he publishes his regulations, unless within that period the State has adopted water quality standards which the Secretary finds to be consistent with the protection of the public health and welfare, the enhancement of water quality, and the general purposes of the Act or unless a petition for a public hearing had been filed under other provisions of the Act.

If the Governor of any State affected by the standards, petitions the Secretary for a hearing at any time after the regulations have been published and prior to thirty days after standards have been promulgated, the Secretary is required to call a public hearing. This public hearing is to be held in or near one or more of the places where the standards will take effect and is to be before a hearing board consisting of at least five persons. The members of the hearing board are to be appointed by the Secretary; however, each affected State may select one member and the Department of Commerce and other affected agencies may each select one member. There is a further restriction that at least a majority of the hearing board must be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of the Interior. House Conferees in their committee report stated that they expected the Secretary to appoint at least one public member of each hearing board who will be from the area to be directly affected by the standards. The House Conferees also intend that the Secretary in appointing hearing boards will insure a proper balance between all effected parties.

HOUSE CONFEREES INSIST ON STATES RIGHTS

Notice of the public hearing is to be published in the Federal Register and is to be given to the State water pollution agencies, interstate agencies, and municipalities involved at least 30 days before the hearing. After the evidence has been presented and on the basis thereof the hearing board is required to make findings as to whether the Secretary's standards should be approved or modified, and to transmit its findings to the Secretary. If the hearing board approves the standards as published or promulgated, they take effect when the Secretary receives the hearing board's recommendations. If modifications are recommended, the Secretary is required to promulgate revised regulations setting forth standards in accordance with the recommendations, and these revised regulations will take effect immediately upon their promulgation.

The Act provides that the discharge of matter into interstate waters or portions thereof which reduce their quality below the applicable standard, whether the matter is discharged directly into the waters or reaches the waters after discharging into tributaries thereof, is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of the Act. However, before abatement is initiated, the Secretary is required to notify the violators and other interested parties of the violation of the standards and at least 180 days must elapse so that there may be voluntary compliance. The House Conferees stated in the Conference Report on the legislation that during such period the Secretary should afford an opportunity for an informal hearing before himself or such hearing officer or board as he may appoint relative to the alleged violation of standards, upon the request of any affected State, alleged violator, or other interested party, so that if possible there can be voluntary agreement reached during this period, thus eliminating the necessity for suit.

In any suit brought to secure abatement of pollution the court is required to receive in evidence a transcript of the conference and hearing, the recommendations of the conference and the hearing board, the recommendation and standards promulgated by the Secretary, and such additional evidence including that related to the alleged violation of the standards as the court deems necessary to a complete review of the standards as well as a determination of all other issues relating to the alleged violation. The court is given jurisdiction to enter whatever judgment and orders the public interest and equities of the case may require after having given due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of complying with the applicable standards. The existing enforcement procedures in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act consisting of three stages, conference, public hearings, and court action, will continue to be applicable for enforcing the abatement of pollution which endangers the health or welfare of persons.

The Act requires standards of water quality established pursuant to the Act to be such as to protect the public health or welfare, enhance water quality and generally to serve the purpose of the Act. In establishing such standards the Secretary, hearing board, or State, as the case may be, is required to take into consideration their use and value for water supply, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreation, agriculture, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

In connection with such procedures the Act prohibits any witnesses or other person from being required to divulge in connection with any hearing any trade secrets or secret processes. This was insisted upon by the Minority.

As you can readily see, the 1965 Act is the most far-reaching proposal concerning water quality standards which has ever been enacted by the Congress of the United States.

HOW 1965 ACT IS WORKING

How is the program working? I have been informed by the new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, now under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, that some 36 States, including the District of Columbia, have already filed with the Secretary a letter stating their intent to adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters and portions thereof within their respective State and to adopt a plan to implement and enforce such criteria. This is an encouraging number of States, indeed, inasmuch as the remaining 15 States still have until October 2 of this year to file such a letter of intent. I understand that your State of Ohio was one of the first five States in the Nation to submit such a letter of intent, which is indeed commendable.

It is further my understanding that the majority of the responses received from the various States have been from the Governors themselves, rather than the State water pollution control agency, which may be an encouraging indication of the concern of the States over developing their own criteria and programs to control water pollution. Strong, but realistic, State programs will invalidate any claims by the Federal government that the States are not doing their share in controlling water pollution.

In May of this year, the Secretary of the Interior issued guidelines for establishing water quality standards for interstate waters under the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965. The guidelines were issued to assist the States in the development of the required water quality criteria and the plan for the implementation and enforcement thereof,and to delineate factors which will be considered in the Secretary's determination of whether the criteria and plan are consistent with the purposes of the Act. In addition to the guidelines in the Act, some twelve policy guidelines are given in the Secretary's release.

Unfortunately, there is not time here today to discuss the policy guidelines issued by the Secretary, but I am sure that they will be covered in other sessions of your conference.

Obviously, the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965 must be complied with. What we all must do is to make sure that the interests of all affected individuals, governing bodies, and industries are accurately represented and given a fair airing. If we enact satisfactory programs on State levels, there will be no need to resort to Federal regulations and standards.

NEW PROPOSALS FOR LEGISLATION

There are proposals before the Congress which, if enacted, would contribute more substantially to the abatement of water pollution from industrial sources than the present or proposed procedures of the Executive Branch. The application of Federal regulations is a negative response to a positive need. Proposals to encourage industry to prevent water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes are preferable, in my opinion, to continuing escalation of Federal expenditure and Federal regulation.

On March 15th of this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 13616, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide such a tax incentive to industry for the construction of waste treatment works. Under the provisions of my bill, every person, at his election, would be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis of any treatment work over a period of five years. In this context, treatment work means any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing process, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances. I understand that the concept embodied in my bill of accelerated depreciation of capital assets would probably be much more palatable to the Committee on Ways and Means than to consider such expenditures, which in fact are capital expenditures, as ordinary expenses that could be fully deducted in the year incurred or spread over a number of years at the option of the taxpayer, as many bills before that Committee would do.

I think proposals, like mine, are a much more constructive way to prevent industrial pollution of our waters without being detrimental to the industries themselves than any, if not most, of the proposals which have come from the Administration.

One thing remains abundantly clear. The Johnson Administration and the Secretary of the Interior are striving to exercise complete control over the waters of the Nation. What we must do is to see that the States adopt satisfactory programs and implement and enforce those programs to prevent further encroachments by the Federal government.

Already, there are many bills before the Congress to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to set up new Federal water pollution control programs. Many of these bills call for even stronger standards and Federal authority to control pollution. I feel that it is unwise at this time to change the existing law as it pertains to water quality standards, if such changes would result in more Federal control. I suggest that it is very unwise for anyone to suggest amending the existing water quality standard provisions of the Act when the regulation under present law will not go into effect until June 30, 1967.

Next week, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House Committee on Public Works begins public hearings on pending legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to establish other Federal water pollution control programs. There are no less than forty bills on water pollution control pending before the Committee for consideration this Session. I sincerely hope that any legislation enacted this year will be realistic, and I for one will work for palatable legislation.

Your meeting here today is indeed praiseworthy. It is encouraging to see representatives of various interests meeting to learn about the water pollution control program and how it affects them, directly and indirectly. I hope your efforts are successful, and I hope that the State of Ohio is permitted to establish its own water quality standards and to carry out its own clean water program.

FOREIGN AID REASSESSMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote "No on H.R. 15750 unless it is amended to limit its extension to 1 year and the amount authorized is also reduced. We have continued this program of foreign aid over a period of years in an inefficient manner. It has not won friends for us nor have the funds been effectively utilized. Last year there was much sentiment in the other body to eliminate the present program and not reinaugurate another until a complete reassessment of its value had been made. It is my judgment that this should be done.

A DOCTOR WRITES HIS PATIENTS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a letter which two fine doctors wrote to their patients regarding the advent of medicare and its coverage. They very succinctly pointed out what it would do and what it would not do. There is a great misunderstanding regarding medicare and many liberal spokesmen make it appear that the new and costly program will wipe disease off the face of the map by virtual push button control.

Dr. James Joseph Hughes and Thomas Michael Hughes very ably put the whole matter in its proper perspective in the following letter:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *July 1, 1966.*

To all our patients:

Now that medicare is law we feel that you should know exactly where we stand. We are not sure as to what kind of law it is—lawyers tell us that it is 1,000 pages long; we do know that the government has issued two books of instructions and these are frightening. We need to remember that the law was supposedly enacted to subsidize those over 65 (at present) and not to control the professional service.

Our policy has always been to provide the best medical service possible to all our patients. This policy will not be changed by medicare.

What does this mean to you if you are over 65 or have someone in your family who is?

1. You will need no "medicare card" to see either doctor; you have not needed this in the past. Your only "eligibility requirement" is that you need our service; this has been the only "eligibility requirement" in the past and the only limits on our practice have been the limits of time and space.

2. We will continue to bill you as we have in the past. We will look to you for payment of fees, as we have done in the past; we will not use nor accept assignments under "Part B" because then our obligation would no longer be to you but to a third party, the government or the insurance carrier.

3. We will furnish you, and you alone, with the necessary medical information so that you can seek reimbursement from whatever source you choose; this is lawful. This information will be on our own forms, rather than on any government or insurance company forms; the forms we plan to use are furnished by the Ohio State Medical Association. This is done to limit the paper work, "the red tape"; it is done in order to prevent the paper work from taking over the physician's time. We feel that the physician's time should be devoted to patient service rather than to paper service.

4. If you are eligible for medicare and need hospitalization we will continue the current practice of signing your hospital chart, thus indicating that you need to be in the hospital.

In summary, we will continue to provide professional medical service rather than political medical service—we are not trained in the latter. And it is for that reason that we will continue to provide medical service, as we can, to you; and that we will continue to look to you for our fees. You can then look to anyone you choose for reimbursement—the law provides for this!

We need to remember that the only compulsory feature of medicare is the obligation to pay the taxes—an obligation on all taxpayers!

JAMES JOSEPH HUGHES, M.D.
THOMAS MICHAEL HUGHES, M.D.

UNUSUAL "ARMY" OF INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS ENGAGES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing in the RECORD the fourth and fifth in a series of six articles which have been published in recent editions of the St. Petersburg Times. These articles bring to light further irregularities in the administration of the war on poverty on the west coast of Florida. Part 1 appeared in the RECORD of July 12 at page 15362 and part 2 appeared in the RECORD of July 13 at page 15484.

SOME MIGRANT MONEY USED FOR UNEXPECTED BILLS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Times staff writers Jack Nease and Bette Orsini today continue their inquiry into the way war-on-poverty funds are being spent by organizations commanded by Dr. Thomas P. Hardeman. So far they have been denied inspection of records of programs supported wholly by public funds and denied knowledge of the true ownership of land leased by these organizations with public funds. Today they write about some curious expenditures in the VISTA program.)

(Fourth of a series by Bette Orsini and Jack Nease)

Some of the more than $600,000 in federal funds spent by the Community Action Fund (CAF) to help migrant farm workers in the past 12 months has been used for unexpected purposes.

Some $20,000 to $25,000 of the money was used, for example, to rent automobiles for Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) assigned to work with the migrants.

Thomas P. Hardeman, CAF president, says he was told last year that the money would be reimbursed by the VISTA office in Washington.

Now, he says, VISTA officials will not repay CAF for the expense and it will have to be absorbed by the migrant program.

The VISTA car rentals are included in the $51,956 in travel expenses reported by CAF in a recent tabulation. Nowhere in CAF records made available to The Times are the volunteer car rentals listed separately.

The $20,000 to $25,000 estimate was made by a bookkeeper for CAF.

Some volunteers apparently traveled quite a bit during ther work with Florida farm workers.

One rental car assigned to a VISTA was driven 9,126 miles between Aug. 9 and Dec. 1, 1965. The bill came to $1,392.

Another volunteer's rental car was driven 6,664 miles during the same period, and another volunteer drove a rental car 2,148 miles in a 16-day period.

CAF paid both daily fees and mileage charges for the cars. The practice was stopped this month, one official said.

Hardeman refused to name the official in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) who approved the car rentals.

Several other expense items in the migrant program, and a related Community Service Foundation (CSF) VISTA training program, aren't what they seem at first glance.

CSF records, for example show payments to Bob Fellows, a former Tampa newsman, as a $75-a-day "consultant."

Hardeman said Fellows was really paid for taking pictures.

Fellows was paid $300 on Aug. 10, 1965, for four days of "consulting" and $375 Aug. 31, for five days.

Hardeman and a Tampa attorney affiliated with the migrant program have been paid as consultants to the program also, although total amounts received by them are relatively small.

CSF records show Hardeman received a $50 check Sept. 16 as a consulting fee for work done June 13, 1965.

Howard Garrett, a Tampa attorney who is secretary-treasurer of CAF and chairman of the board of the newly-formed Migrant Legal Services Inc. (MLS), has received at least $660 from the Hardeman groups.

Early in the program Garrett was paid $100 for two days consultation and $32 for two days per diem from CSF migrant funds. Both checks are dated July 2, 1965. Another $25 was paid to prepare a lease.

Later, when the migrant program was shifted to CAF, Garrett's law firm was paid a $175 consulting fee Nov. 3, 1965, and $281.25 for "consultant service" April 21, 1965.

Garrett has also been paid as a $50-a-day lecturer in the CSF VISTA training program, but records for this program past Oct. 1, 1965, are secret.

So are records showing the full amount of rent paid the H.A.S. Corporation, which lists Garrett as president, for rent of the VISTA training camp south of Bradenton. Garrett has said the real owners of the camp don't want their identity known.

Jack Mansfield, who later joined the CSF staff and is president of MLS, also received consulting fees early in the program. He was paid $200 for two days consultation and $129.44 for plane fare and per diem July 6.

Mansfield also was paid $242.66 from migrant funds March 10. There was no explanation of the payment on the check.

Mansfield's current salary comes from the CSF payroll, which handles the VISTA program, but he received a check for $462 on March 18, 1966, from the CAF payroll account.

The migrant funds, which totaled $623,568 from June 1965, through mid-May 1966, was checked by a federal auditor for the first time last week. His findings have not been made public.

Periodic auditing of the CAF funds has been done by Clearwater CPA Mildred C. DeJane, who received varying amounts for this service. She also received $100 a week to audit the CSF VISTA books.

CAF also employes a bookkeeper, Walt Neiger, to post accounts but Neiger appears to have little to do with actual accounting of the funds.

Real control of the federal funds handled by CSF and CAF is in the hands of Mrs. Hazel Ramsey, a long-time employe of CSF.

Only Mrs. Ramsey signs payroll checks for the two programs. Checks for other expenditures in the migrant program require both her signature and that of Hardeman, but in many cases Hardeman's signature is put on with a rubber stamp.

According to available records, Mrs. Ramsey was being paid $137.50 a week last July, received a $300 bonus early in August, and in late August began receiving $187.50 a week.

When reporters first asked to see the VISTA training fiscal records, Hardeman said Mrs. Ramsey had taken them home to work on during her vacation.

Five days later, but before Mrs. Ramsey returned to work, Hardeman and Mansfield produced the records after having gone through them in another section of the CAF office suite.

Reporters discovered the record-sifting process when they went to ask questions about another subject.

Many purchases for the migrant program were made from rather large petty cash funds maintained in each of the five regions.

One regional director received $1,798 in petty cash funds during a five-month period. Some regions attempted to keep petty cash balances of $250 and $300.

The OEO has since ordered CAF to reduce petty cash balances to $50.

SOME CAF-CSF FUNDS AMAZINGLY GYMNASTIC

(Fifth of a series by Bette Orsini and Jack Nease)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Times Staff writer Jack Nease and Bette Orsini today continue their inquiry into the fiscal affairs of a $2.36-million complex of anti-poverty operations run by Thomas P. Hardeman. So far the reporters have been denied access to records of programs supported wholly by public funds and denied knowledge of the true ownership of land leased by three organizations with public funds. Today they write about some interesting gymnastics with poverty funds.)

Poverty funds sometimes go through some interesting gymnastics in the $2.36-million Community Action Fund-Community Service Foundation complex operated by Thomas P. Hardeman.

Reporters asking to see fiscal records of a $626,410 CAF migrant Program arm of the complex were given some—but not all—of the accounts to examine.

Tracing one transaction to its source turned up a separate CAF "administrative account." It contained some interesting notations.

The migrant program accountant is not permitted access to the account and says he "doesn't ask questions."

"They don't tell me—and I don't want to know," he volunteered.

The account was just getting started when reporters began looking at the records.

It appeared to have been set up primarily to handle an expense not permitted by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Walt Neiger, the accountant, said some of the money went for down payment on a mobile home in a transaction "under no condition allowable by OEO."

The account was opened March 24 with a $200 deposit. The first check was for $200 a week later to George Coble and John Adonis. The records contain an April 15 note signed by Coble and William H. Johnson promising to pay the CAF administrative account $438 "in replacement of a loan."

Another prime purpose for the account according to Neiger's information was to have a depository to receive a $514.91 "profit" the Community Action Fund realized on a separate $4,900.38 contract with the federal government to run a VISTA training conference in St. Petersburgh last December.

The OEO paid poverty funds to CAF at the rate of $15.41 per day per volunteer for three days for 106 VISTA volunteers.

Conference records indicate a consistent total of 95 volunteers attending each of the three days' series of workshops. Some drew an attendance as low as half a dozen VISTA's. Newspaper accounts in the conference file list an attendance of 101.

At any rate the federal government paid for 106 and the $514.91 leaped from the CAF account to the closely guarded CAF "administrative account."

It was deposited by Hardeman and provided the capital for a series of loans, advances and other expenses.

In another interesting gymnastic, payments to one employe who had been receiving his checks from the CAF migrant account suddenly switched to the CAF administrative account.

Asked about the switchup Neiger said it involved a personnel problem he couldn't talk about and referred questioners to Hardeman. A Hardeman spokesman said the employe "did some work" for the administrative section.

The payment was for $137.50 to Billy Weeks, a former migrant center regional director taken off the payroll.

The check notation said the money was for "mileage."

Administrative account records showed "mileage" for 1,375 miles of travel by Weeks in 20 days "building community good-will and understanding." A notation said "trip authorized by Thomas P. Hardeman."

Seven weeks later Weeks was paid $200 from the account with a check marked "con. fees."

The files contain a May 19 letter from Weeks saying he received "the check for VISTA instruction" but didn't get paid for his last week's work.

The contents of the letter are interesting.

Weeks wrote, "I have never received a check for my last weeks (sic) work. This was the week you asked me to go to the state office on Friday. I understand you were to pay me with the $230.00 I raised from friends for that week. This was put in the Community Service Foundation (Migrant Program) Special Fund."

Among the first deposits in the account were one for $200 and one for $30. It was these funds though that went to cover the disallowable OEO expense on buying the trailer.

It is impossible to determine the amount of one loan made out of the account. A mixup of deposit and payment computations leaves the loan amount in question.

None of the CAF officials asked could supply figures to put the account back into balance—and hadn't noticed it was out of balance.

The VISTA conference payments produced more puzzlers.

The only record of how the $4,900 in poverty funds was spent was a nearly illegible handwritten report on a torn half piece of note paper. It listed printing and stationery figures, $200 for consultants, $300 for mileage, left a blank for per diem and noted a hotel bill of $3,904.77.

Another notation gave a breakdown of the consultant fees and noted expenditure of $514.91 marked "CAF." This amount later was deposited by Hardeman to his CAF administrative account.

The files contained no statement supporting the $3,904.77 hotel bill to the Princess Martha when first checked by reporters and CAF officials.

The next day CAF officials told reporters they found the bill "right after you left" and produced it from the files which had not contained it the day before.

There was a breakdown on all but three "miscellaneous" items for about $100 each. There is still no information available on the miscellaneous $300.

Next: 21 Attorneys.

THE PLAN TO DEFILE ONE OF NATURE'S GREAT MASTERPIECES

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in order that every Member of Congress may know the complete implications of H.R. 4671, the central Arizona project which includes provisions for intruding upon the monumental beauty of the Grand Canyon through construction of two unnecessary hydroelectric dams, I shall continue to place in the RECORD various statements, news articles and editorials, and other pertinent material.

Today I ask unanimous consent for inclusion of an analysis by Luther Carter from the June 17 issue of Science, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The article is accompanied by a set of photographs which of course cannot appear in the RECORD. Two of the photos are described by the following caption:

Bridge Canyon dam, a 736-foot high concrete-arch structure shown by an artist on the photograph above, would nearly fill the Grand Canyon's inner gorge. Marble Canyon dam, as indicated by the line in the photograph at upper left, would stand 310 feet high—its top nearly 400 feet below the rim of the inner gorge.

Mr. Speaker, for anyone who may wish to study these photos showing the deleterious effects of the proposed dams on majestic Grand Canyon, I shall be happy to obtain copies.

In addition to the destruction of a natural birthright, the dams would cost U.S. taxpayers only a million dollars short of three-quarters of a billion dollars, an expenditure defying sound economic reasoning particularly in a time when the Nation can least afford extravagance. Since the only reason for the dams would be to produce electricity and since the power could be generated more economically in steamplants, the proposal is all the more distasteful.

The Science article follows:

GRAND CANYON: COLORADO DAMS DEBATED

The Grand Canyon, carved by the Colorado River over a leisurely 9 million years, is indisputably one of nature's great masterpieces. The politicians of the Pacific Southwest, in something of a hurry, have been at work on a masterpiece of their own—a multibillion-dollar water project which, while offensive to some tastes, is drawn to a scale impressive by human standards.

Besides two dams in the Grand Canyon, which are the project's most celebrated feature to date, it would include the Central Arizona Project, consisting principally of a large aqueduct running hundreds of miles across Arizona, from Lake Havasu on the Colorado to Phoenix and Tucson; a number of reclamation and water supply projects in other Colorado basin states; and—ultimately the project's keystone—an aqueduct system to bring to the Colorado millions of acre-feet of water from some other river basin, probably the Columbia. The project's initial cost is estimated at $1.6 billion; its ultimate cost is not known, but it would run into additional billions.

Legislation to initiate the project is now before the Interior Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. The bill, H.R. 4671, will, if ever enacted, be a remarkable achievement of basin diplomacy to which Representative MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona, the Metternich of the Colorado, will have contributed much.

The proposal represents an intricate, delicate meshing and balancing of the interests of the Upper Colorado Basin states—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico—with those of the Lower Basin states—Arizona, Nevada, and California. Moreover, it harmonizes the interests of Arizona and California, whose relations with respect to use of the Colorado have been marked by much disharmony. It retains certain elements, such as the canyon dams and the concept of water importation, of the Pacific Southwest Water Plan submitted to Congress in 1964 by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, the congressman's brother.

The feeling of honest compromise inspired by H.R. 4671 within the Colorado basin is not the feeling the bill has always produced outside the basin. Its provisions for a water importation study have generated fears in the Northwest that the Columbia's now abundant waters may be seriously diminished by demands from the Southwest, a region whose political power has been growing as rapidly as its thirst.

Nationally, conservationist groups have become alarmed by the proposal to build the canyon dams. The conservationists, led chiefly by the Sierra Club, have had some success in contributing to the atmosphere of doubt and criticism that seems to have enveloped H.R. 4671. Indeed, the opposition appears strong enough to make passage of the bill without major alterations doubtful—yet any important change in the measure could cause the compromise among the basin states to fall apart.

The intricacies of Southwest water politics, fully revealed in H.R. 4671, are best explained by the history of the region's policies regarding use of the Colorado. The "Law of the River," as developed through two interstate compacts, several acts of Congress, a treaty with Mexico, and court decisions, apportions the Colorado's water among the various basin states and Mexico. The apportionments are based on an assumed annual flow of 17.5 million acre-feet a year—7.5 million for the Upper Basin, 7.5 million for the Lower Basin, and 1.5 million for Mexico.

However, from 1906 to 1965 the rivers total yearly flow averaged only 15 million acre-feet, with annual flows ranging from the record high of 24 million in 1917 to the record low of 5.6 million in 1934. Thus far, the deficit has existed solely on paper because only California has in fact been withdrawing its legal quota. California, entitled to 4.4 million acre-feet, has been withdrawing 5.1 million by dipping into the unused share of other states.

As other basin states begin withdrawing their full allowances, through future reclamation and water supply projects, the need to conserve and augment the Colorado's flow will become critical. Estimates as to when the critical movement will arrive vary, but it is believed to be not more than a generation away.

The purpose of H.R. 4671 is to "make the river whole" by increasing total water available as well as to authorize for immediate construction, the Central Arizona Project (CAP) and five reclamation projects in Colorado and New Mexico. The canyon dams and the importation of water from outside the basin are both viewed by the bill's sponsors as essential to their long-range objectives. The dams would serve no water storage function, but, once having paid for themselves from the sale of the electricity that they would generate, they would be expected to contribute to a new Lower Basin Development Fund. This fund, which would also receive the proceeds from water sales and part of the power revenues from Hoover dam and other existing dams on the Lower Colorado, would be used to reimburse the federal treasury for about 90 percent of the $525 million to be spent on CAP and for part of the much larger sums to be spent on the aqueducts, pumping stations, and other works needed to import water to the Lower Colorado.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to study various possibilities for augmenting the Colorado basin's water supply. These include water salvage and conservation, weather modification, and desalinization of sea water; but, in the sponsors' judgment, the most promising possibility is water importation.

The study would contemplate importing, initially, up to 6.5 million acre-feet of water a year (including 2 million acre-feet to the Upper Basin), which would make up the deficit under present quotas and provide for additional needs that arise. Another 2 million acre-feet might be withdrawn from the exporting basin (or basins), but diverted to water users along the route to the Colorado. The bill was amended last week to have the study cover west Texas, which is not part of the Colorado basin but is potently represented in Congress. The deadline for completion of the importation plan, together with the supporting feasibility studies and cost estimates, would be 31 December 1970.

Arizona's need for CAP, deemed urgent because of the steady loss of existing farm land as ground-water supplies decline and pumping becomes uneconomic, is the great driving force behind H.R. 4671. Representative UDALL concedes that CAP might be financed without the canyon dams, but he contends that the dams, dubbed "cash registers" for the Development Fund, are needed to help finance the importation system and other Lower Basin projects of the future.

In any event, if either the provision for the dams or that for the importation study were struck from the bill, the Arizona delegation might find that its basin allies, who were expected to support the provision for CAP, had vanished, like Indians into the wilderness. In fact, even with the revenue-producing dams and the importation study provided for in the bill, Arizona has had to make a major concession in order to obtain California's support for CAP. Arizona has agreed to give California's quota of 4.4 million acre-feet priority over its own quota of 2.8 million acre-feet, which the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed in 1963 after 12 years of litigation.

The five Upper Basin reclamation projects—three of them too marginal to get Bureau of the Budget approval—have been included in H.R. 4671 as part of the price Representative UDALL has had to pay for the state of Colorado's support for CAP. UDALL is not hostile to reclamation in the Upper Basin, but inclusion of the five projects, which would be built at a total cost of $361.4 million, does not make his bill more attractive politically. Colorado can speak softly on such matters and still be heard. One of her citizens, Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, is chairman of the House Interior Committee.

The foregoing sketch of basin politics does not do full justice to the complexities of the subject but is to be taken as a primer from which one may safely conclude that Colorado water policy is not arrived at by pure reason. Plans made for one part of the basin must take into account the desires and interests, legitimate and otherwise, of every other part of the basin.

Moreover, water project development in the West is characterized by a high degree of institutional rigidity. The policies of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, and the laws which govern those policies, are such that decisions on water projects are made within a rather narrow range of choice. The Bureau's contribution to the development of the West, as in the Salt River Project which has made modern Phoenix possible, cannot be gainsaid. But the Bureau cannot be expected to render objective judgments when faced, say, with a choice between recommending the construction of power dams in the Grand Canyon and recommending the construction of steam plants fired by the Southwest's abundant coal or by nuclear fuel.

The Bureau never has built thermal plants. It is not eager to start a fight with the private utility industry by proposing to build some. In fact, Secretary Udall has been making peace with the utilities by finally reaching agreements, after long controversy, for the sharing of cost-saving interregional transmission networks.

Traditionally, the Bureau has looked, with the blessing of Congress, to hydroelectric plants as the revenue-producing units for its "basin account," a device sometimes used to encourage acceptance of water projects which would have trouble standing on their own. Representative ASPINALL and many of his colleagues on the Interior Committee, which is dominated by Westerners, have, or think they have, a vested interest in continuing to have things done in the traditional manner.

To no one's surprise, when the Pacific Southwest Water Plan was proposed in 1964, the Bureau of Reclamation recommended the construction of the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams.

Although H.R. 4671 would authorize both dam projects, the Johnson administration has recommended the construction now of only one—the $238.6-million Marble Canyon dam. This dam is planned for a site 12.5 miles north of Grand Canyon National Park but still within the area known to geologists as the Grand Canyon.

The Bureau of the Budget, speaking for the administration, has said that a decision on Bridge Canyon dam, which would cost an estimated $511.3 million, should be deferred. The Bureau has recommended the establishment of a national water commission and indicated that this commission should study the dam's effect on Grand Canyon National Monument and National Park, along with the dam's relation to regional water needs and the various alternatives for meeting those needs.

Bridge Canyon dam would be in the Grand Canyon's lower reaches, well below the monument and the park, but its 93-mile-long reservoir would extend through the entire length of the monument and through 13 miles of that part of the canyon's inner gorge which forms the park's northwest boundary. Rising to a height of 736 feet, the dam would have a generating capacity of 1.5 million kilowatts, compared to the 600,000-kilowatt capacity of the 310-foot Marble Canyon dam. Having better than twice the other dam's potential for production of power and revenue, the Bridge Canyon dam is the one the Bureau of Reclamation and the sponsors of H.R. 4671 really want.

The Bureau is, to say the least, doing nothing to discourage an idea, which has been circulating among the bill's sponsors, that a deal should be struck with the conservationists. The proposition would be (i) to abandon the proposal to build Marble Canyon dam and to have the National Park's boundaries extended northward to take in Marble Canyon, and (ii) to build Bridge Canyon dam with the agreement that this dam would be the last Grand Canyon dam ever to be built. But there is virtually no chance that the conservation groups—certainly not the Sierra Club—will concede that Bridge Canyon dam should be built. They can be expected to continue denouncing the Bridge Canyon proposal as contrary to the Grand Canyon National Park Act. The act would permit dams and reservoirs necessary for reclamation projects to be built in the park, but only when such construction is consistent with the park's primary purpose of preserving the canyon's scenery, wildlife, and "natural and historic objects."

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, the Interior Committee's ranking Republican member and a caustic critic of the Bureau of Reclamation, has introduced a bill drafted by the Sierra Club that would enlarge the part to take in the entire Grand Canyon from Lee Ferry at the beginning of Marble Canyon to Grand Wash Cliffs at the head of Lake Mead. The bill would prohibit construction of any dams in the park.

Ironically, the Sierra Club and the Bureau of Reclamation both revere, as a spiritual antecedent, John Wesley Powell, the one-armed Union Army veteran and geologist whose Grand Canyon expedition of 1869, by small boat, was one of history's great adventures.

"We are three-quarters of a mile in the depths of the earth," wrote Powell in his journal, "and the great river shrinks into insignificance, as it dashes its angry waves against the walls and cliffs, that rise to the world above; they are but puny ripples, and we are but pigmies, running up and down the sands, or lost among the boulders. We have an unknown distance yet to run; an unknown river to explore. What falls there are, we know not; what rocks beset the channel, we know not; what walls rise over the river, we know not. Ah, well! we may conjecture many things. The men talk as cheerfully as ever; jests are bandied about freely this morning; but to me the cheer is somber and the jests are ghastly."

Powell's journal provides a classic account of a journey down a "wild river"—a term much used by conservationists, including the Secretary of the Interior. According to Georgie White, a white-water adventurer who has gone down rivers in Alaska, Canada, and Central America as well as in the Southwest, the Colorado, on its 280-mile course through the Grand Canyon, is the wildest river of them all. The only point of contact with the outside world is at Phantom Ranch, the Park Service camp on Bright Angel Creek for hikers and mule riders who take the Kaibab or Bright Angel trail to descend into the canyon from the South Rim.

The Sierra Club wants to preserve the free-flowing river—all of it, not just the 116 miles that would be left between the foot of Marble Canyon dam and the upper end of the reservoir behind Bridge Canyon dam. The club wants the inner gorge left undisturbed, preserving a unique geological record and the river which helped to write it. The club is outraged that spots such as Vasey's Paradise, a place of mosses, ferns, and flowering plants below a fountain that gushes from the side of Marble Canyon, would be drowned by the water rising behind Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon dams.

The National Park Service, in a 1963 report, also criticized the Bridge Canyon dam proposal. Edwin D. McKee, now with the U.S. Geological Survey, was quoted as saying, in a paper prepared in 1942 when he was a Park Service naturalist, that the Bridge Canyon project, which was already being considered, would obscure important geologic features. The greatest losses, McKee said, would be in and to the west of Toroweap Valley, in the National Monument, where the rising waters would conceal features illustrating local volcanism and the early stages of canyon cutting, as well as remnants of lavas that flowed down the river channel and sediments showing that, in two places, lakes had formed behind lava dams.

The Park Service observed that the upper reaches of the reservoir would lie between Havasu Creek and Kanab Creek, an area deemed by some to be among the most scenic in the National Park. Silt and debris would accumulate in this section of the park, the report predicted.

A DIPLOMATIC SILENCE

Strangely, however, the report said the Marble Canyon dam would have little effect on the National Park. This judgment conflicts with the view held by Park Service men now serving at Grand Canyon. It is fair to say that for the National Park Service, an Interior Department agency, to give no quarter in criticizing proposals favored, or likely to be favored, by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the House Interior Committee would not be playing the game in the most prudent bureaucratic manner.

Bureau of Reclamation officials insist that the objections to construction of the two dams that have been raised by the Sierra Club and its allies in the Park Service and elsewhere have been wildly pessimistic. For example, the Bureau discounts predictions that construction of Marble Canyon dam and of Coconino dam, which would be built on the Little Colorado River to keep Bridge Canyon reservoir from silting up, would leave the Colorado a tame river—too tame, even during spring runoffs, to flush out the boulders and other debris that wash into the river from side canyons to form natural dams and rapids.

The Bureau also contends that releases of water for power generation during hours of peak demand would keep the channel scoured and the river flowing freely. Siltation below Kanab Creek, where the Bridge Canyon reservoir would begin, would be minimal because the Coconino dam, together with Marble Canyon dam and the de-silting dam on the Paria River, would turn the now silt-laden Colorado into trout water, the Bureau says.

The Bureau regards conservationists of the Sierra Club type as people who are possibly sincere, but impractical and not a little selfish. Why, otherwise, would they oppose dam projects which, besides serving as "cash registers," would open up the inner canyon to tens of thousands of sightseers who would take boat trips on the reservoirs? Many of the conservationists, for their part, look on the reclamationists as Philistines who would gladly count in "fishermen man-days" to improve a project's cost-benefit ratio but who sneer whenever anyone mentioned natural beauty.

The Sierra Club says that the dams, besides being a desecration, would not be the best means of producing revenues for the Lower Basin Development Fund. One club study uses the Bureau of Reclamation's own figures as a basis for concluding that the Central Arizona Project could be paid for without any new revenue-earning facilities at all—just by using the future earnings of Hoover and other existing dams.

One expert witness to testify for the Sierra Club at recent House hearings on H.R. 4671 was Alan P. Carlin, a Rand Corporation economist. He said that neither Marble Canyon nor Bridge Canyon dam, despite the admitted flexibility of hydroelectric power in serving peak demands, would be as efficient as a nuclear plant, or a nuclear plant combined with a pumped storage plant, which would use the same water repeatedly by pumping it from a lower to an upper storage basin and running it through the turbines at hours of peak demand. Not only would these plants be cheaper to build than the power dams but transmission costs would be lower, Carlin said. They would be built, not in the bowels of the earth, but in or near urban areas of high power demand.

Representative UDALL and the Bureau of Reclamation have, of course, contested Carlin's findings. But UDALL himself has said that the most significant problem raised by proposals to build nuclear or coal-fired generating plants as an alternative to the dams is not economic but political.

UDALL has contended, moreover, that, if the federal government doesn't build the dams, they will be built by non-federal interests. License applications by the Arizona Power Authority and the City of Los Angeles are now pending before the Federal Power Commission, which 2 years ago was directed by Congress not to grant licenses for the two sites before 31 December 1966. Even with the expiration of the licensing moratorium, however, the commission may find itself under restraints. Last December a U.S. Court of Appeals told FPC it would have to reconsider its decision to permit construction of a pumped storage plant at Storm King Mountain on the Hudson River. The preservation of natural beauty should be a basic concern in comparing the desirability of the proposed plant with possible alternatives, the court indicated.

Because the water importation study is essential to the compromise on H.R. 4671, resistance by the Northwest to the bill's provision for such a study may prove as great an obstacle to passage as the conservationists' opposition to the Grand Canyon dams. This study is not easily reconciled with the study which the proposed National Water Commission would undertake. A bill to create the commission, submitted by the administration and sponsored by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, and 48 other senators, was passed by the Senate on 9 June.

The commission, to be made up of seven private citizens, would have 5 years to study water resource policy problems in a national perspective. Its mandate, as defined in the Interior Committee's report, would be to consider alternative solutions to water problems "without prior commitment to any interest group, region, or agency of government."

COOLNESS IN THE COMMITTEE

The commission bill has struck few sparks of enthusiasm in the House Interior Committee, where its fate now rests. Supporters of H.R. 4671 are understandably reluctant to trust such a commission to come up with a water importation plan for the Colorado basin. Yet, unless they can agree to do so, the reclamation states will be seriously divided on the bill, for there is little chance that Senator Jackson and the Northwest ever will agree to the importation study. It is now proposed that the study be placed under the aegis of the new interagency Water Resources Council, which Secretary Udall chairs, but this supposedly mollifying gesture isn't likely to soften the opposition. Indeed, JACKSON has rejected even a proposal to have the national commission give priority consideration to the Southwest's water needs.

For Secretary Udall, who must feel some anguish at the criticism he has received from his friends in the conservation movement over the dam proposals, the National Water Commission might well prove a blessing. The commission, if it ever receives House approval and is set up, could search for ways to loosen the regional and institutional rigidities that now bind water resource development planning. It is a large task, but the commission might even discover a solution to the Southwest's water problems that would keep dams out of the Grand Canyon and allow Colorado basin politicians to keep their heads above water.—LUTHER J. CARTER

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on the final rollcall vote, No. 165, on H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, I was in the Chamber and did not hear my name. Had I heard my name called, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER. The statement will be in the RECORD.

ATLANTIC STUDIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I invited the attention of this body to a program of studies on the Atlantic Community being conducted by the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community. The committee consists of:

Representative E. Ross ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana.

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Republican, of Michigan.

Representative DON CLAUSEN, Republican, of California.

Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire.

Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas.

Representative HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Representative JAMES D. MARTIN, Republican, of Alabama.

Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON, Republican, of Maryland.

Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota.

Representative OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, chairman.

In this program, essays on Atlantic Community topics have been prepared by foreign policy experts and referred to Congressmen for comment.

Today I wish to draw your attention to a statement prepared for our committee by Dr. Hendrik Brugmans, rector of the College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium. In the midfifties, Dr. Brugmans collaborated with Dr. Strausz-Hupe of the University of Pennsylvania to lay the groundwork for what is now the Atlantic Institute, a private international research organization directed by a group of prominent persons from many of the Atlantic nations. Dr. Brugman's statement is of particular interest at this time in view of the recent visit of the President of France to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Brugmans believes that President de Gaulle has brought home to the Europeans generally that they can now stand on their own feet and should now be more independent of the United States. Noting that real life is springing up again in east-central Europe, Mr. Brugmans further recommends that East-West relations be examined afresh, perhaps with an economic and cultural Marshall plan for Eastern Europe.

The full text of Dr. Brugman's statement follows:

ATLANTIC POLICY IN PERSPECTIVE

I

Less than ten years ago, there was much talk about an "Atlantic Community" to be established. Today, this phrase has lost a great deal of its significance, and is used with considerable care.

This has two reasons.

On the one hand, the rise of the European Common Market has given a new, specific meaning to the word "Community", which stands now, in practice, for a group of nations in a process of supranational integration.

On the other hand, President de Gaulle (whatever his style and wording) has brought home to the Europeans at large, that they can stand now on their own feet and should therefore be more independent of the United States. In fact, he has given them a sense of dignity, which is not going to disappear when he will have left the political scene. Whatever the future holds in stock, there will be no "restoration" in that respect.

Henceforward, we can talk about "partnership", but not of "community" in the strict sense which the term has acquired recently. Consequently, we should give some thought to the future structure of our Western world, so much the more so as N.A.T.O. has to be renewed three years from here. Structures are always the reflection of a balance of forces, of aspirations, hopes and interests, convergent or conflicting. Let us therefore ask ourselves how the situation is now, what our aims and targets are, and how we are to achieve them. Two main factors have changed international relations since 1949: first, *the Russian threat has substantially diminished*. On the one hand, Khrushchev's successors have hardly been able to consolidate their power, and inner opposition is a force to reckon with. On the other, the U.S.S.R. is at loggerheads with Red China, which means that it has a huge Eastern frontier to protect; consequently, it is unlikely that it will embark in military (or even political) adventures in the West; although the future remains unpredictable per definition, it seems probable that the two "crises" which Russia opened around Berlin, will not be followed by a third one; even the infamous "wall" might work here as an element of international stability. In any case, we have moved far away from the days when Monsieur Spaak voiced the feelings of most Europeans, in his unforgotten U.N. speech: "Nous avons peur". Today, Europeans are no longer "afraid" and this deprives us of an integrating force.

Secondly, as already indicated, the "economic miracle" they see around them, gives the Europeans a feeling of self-confidence which is new. True, this "miracle" was made possible by the Marshall-plan, but this was twenty years ago. Today, Europe no longer automatically looks to Washington for help, guidance and advice; only some smaller countries are still willing to leave world-politics to the U.S., but that is part of their neutralist past rather than of their Atlantic conviction. Although not yet powerful enough to match American economic dynamism, Europe already asks itself how it might achieve a position of equal partnership with America, not only in words but in reality. It has come to resent the constant flow of its scientists to the U.S. and the growing American "infiltration" on our industrial market, especially in its technologically most progressive sectors.

These facts will remain overwhelmingly important, with or without President de Gaulle. The "status quo ante" will not return, and in these circumstances, America should not take it for granted that Europe should "normally" be an unconditional ally. The alliance, desirable though it still is, should be redefined, both in political and frontier-guards, with the whole weight of N.A.T.O. is no longer axiomatic: it has become a matter of debate. New arguments are required.

Finally, we have to state that the feeling of greater self-confidence and the longing for greater independence of the U.S. cannot simply be described as "Europeans," as we did earlier. It is to a large extent more "national" than consciously continental. Here too de Gaulle is a symbol and a symptom rather than an accident.

If we are to counter the threat of resurgent Nationalism in Europe—and Nationalism is today a factor of Western disintegration—we should do so with intellectual and emotional weapons, different from those we could use 12 years ago. If the Atlantic world is to be organized, it should be done through concrete proposals and inspiring concepts, which correspond to our present needs.

II

In the military field, the great new fact is of course the apparition of two national "striking forces" in Europe, one of which at least, the French, can hardly be expected to be neatly integrated into any Atlantic whole. What should our policy be there, in a field which has to be considered as more and more "hot"? The "bomb" is becoming an obsession in people's minds and, as disarmament negotiations seem to become a senseless routine-business for experts, public opinion looks out for a statesmanlike perspective.

Is it enough to protest against "proliferation?" Certainly not. As things develop now, it seems reasonable to foresee that, in about ten or fifteen years, a certain number of medium-sized nations will have built up their nuclear defence. This may well seem deplorable to a country like the U.S., which enjoyed atomic monopoly until 1949, but there is every probability that super-weapons will become less expensive and therefore move into the range of national aspirations everywhere, be it for real military reasons or simply for prestige. Moreover, a moral condemnation of such a desire, when it comes from a nation which has thrown the bombs on Japan, does hardly sound convincing to newcomers, to "have-not's" and "have recently's". In other words, if the claim for non-proliferation is to have any appeal at all, American proposals should not only suggest that others stop building atom-bombs. They should also show what America intends to do with her own, short of which she will be accused of hypocrisy. In this respect, let us remember the action made to discredit the test-ban treaty of Moscow. Making the atomic club a closed shop will not do.

Before coming to our suggestions, let us make one remark first.

It seems wrong to be entirely hypnotized by the problem of who is going to pull the atomic "trigger." Of course, the final decision will always be taken by a very small team, if not by one man alone. This is true, whatever our Atlantic structures. But those who will have the fateful responsibility of "pushing the button or not," are not or should not be isolated from the community in the name of which and for the protection of which they act. They should know what their people or peoples would be prepared to consider as an acceptable "casus belli." In other words, the problem does not really lie with the "moment supreme", but with the political, popular consensus to be achieved beforehand. All concerned must be convinced that, whatever happens, they have been able to raise their voices and participate effectively in the decision-making process. When President Kennedy made his historic speech during the Cuba-crisis, he of course did not consult his 50 States. But the 50 States recognized him as their legitimate President.

Unfortunately, the Europeans have no reason as yet to consider the man in the White House as "their" President. They may like or dislike him, but he is not their elected chief, however much his decisions bind them in actual fact. This dichotomy now creates feelings of frustration, as one never knows whether the American leader who speaks and acts, does so as a national or an Atlantic Statesman. Many Europeans remarked with great concern that the Cuba-speech contained several mentions of "this hemisphere", but no reference to the defense of the free world. None the less, the final decision might have meant atomic war—also for Europe.

Here lies an institutional problem of paramount importance, the issue being between hegemony and partnership. How can the latter be organised?

In our opinion, only by the creation of an Atlantic body, with both military and political competences, fully equipped to prepare and finally make the fundamental decisions in the field of world-politics, including the decision to apply force, even nuclear force. In other words: I would propose an *Atlantic Council for World-Affairs,* to which the U.S. and the States of Europe should surrender part of their political and military sovereignty. In fact, it seems useless to complain that the allies are lukewarm in their support of American actions, for example in Vietnam. How could they be more enthusiastic, as they have never been consulted beforehand, even less participated in the debate that prepared the intervention? The Vietnam-war is not theirs and they cannot be expected to act as a "claque", applauding what they never were able to discuss. In practice, the Americans see themselves today in the same position as the French twelve years ago: they ask for support, but did not offer a share in the policy-making process.

The first and most important function of such an Atlantic Council would be to preserve peace in freedom, and set up a machinery for arbitration and peaceful change. As it would have the whole nuclear potential of the Western world at its disposal, it would take up the basic idea of the Baruch plan: supranational government "with teeth", its competence being however strictly limited to the function of a "world-police". For the time being, its geographic area would of course be limited to the States around the Atlantic, but it is no longer entirely utopian to envisage that maybe one day the Soviet Union would join the institution. No doubt that such proposals are radical, even revolutionary ones. But two factors should not be forgotten:

First, the present "balance of terror" (however preferable to no balance at all) can hardly be expected to remain the last word of international relations; sooner or later, fresh thinking should be done and new proposals made, in order to promote less provisional solutions;

Secondly, it seems difficult to underestimate the widespread pacifist feeling all over the world, including the U.S. itself. In the "battle of minds" which is going on, we should not be afraid of being "utopian" for a while; plans which seem utterly unpracticable when they are launched, may well be considered wise sooner than foreseen.

III

Of course, such an "Atlantic Council" (whatever its institutional form and competences: Federal or Confederal) will be extremely difficult to be set up—even if the U.S. would be willing—as long as Europe is weak and disrupted by Nationalism. If there is to be a real "partnership on equal footing," this cannot be achieved between one organised Continent on the side and a loose group of quarreling States on the other. In a certain sense, President de Gaulle was right when he suggested in 1958 that N.A.T.O. should be reorganised and ruled henceforward by a "condominium" of the "Big Three." Of course, President Eisenhower was also right when he declined the offer, answering that this would reduce the other allies to a state of second class mutes. None the less, it is only too obvious that no international organisation can work when composed by a multiplicity of countries, each of them being very different from the others, in size, power and political orientation. In fact, the situation today is, that there is no political leadership in N.A.T.O. at all, whereas the emergency-bonds of 1949 become weaker and weaker.

In this situation of deadlock and sterility, which was the cause of Monsieur Spaak's resignation as Secretary General, the suggestion of an Atlantic Council as mentioned above would have the notable advantage to make things move again. In fact, it would kill two birds with one stone and function as a sort of *"political Marshall-plan."* Real participation in world-politics, i.e., real participation in decision-making, should be made conditional of European integration. In fact this would not mean an offer "with strings," but the sober statement that the proposed Council could only work in practice insofar as Europe would be prepared to speak with one voice and act with one will. Moreover, there is nothing against "strings," provided they are woven intelligently.

So far, European Federalism is the only new political idea put forward on the Eastbanks of the Atlantic Ocean. But it has been shown continuously that the old self-conscious nations of Europe are not willing to give up part of their political sovereignty and independence. Everybody pays lip-service to the desirability of coming closer together, but each time the basic question arose, the governments backed out. That was the case in 1949 with the Council of Europe, in 1954 with the Defence Community (which included political integration) and recently, when the problem of majority-rule was put forward. Probably, the European States will not have the courage of setting up a workable Federation, as long as there is no "bait." The "political Marshall-plan" mentioned above, would provide such a "bait."

Do the Europeans accept to be prosperous but non-existent in world-affairs? Do they wish to unite economically and become a sort of "greater Holland", or a neutral Switzerland? If so, there is no problem and consequently no solution. But if we are right in thinking that the relatively great success of Gaullism, also outside France, is due to a feeling of political frustration to which the Europeans are subject—then, an offer of this kind would have an explosive effect, and be of lasting historic value. It would mean that the American Administration would be ready to open its world-political dossiers and share the responsibility for their handling with the Europeans . . ., provided they care to unite politically. In still other words, European unity would be the precondition of Atlantic integration, and, at the same time, the perspective of real Atlantic partnership would give an indispensible new impetus to European union.

Maybe such an Atlantic co-operation in nuclear and political world-affairs should be complemented by a new edition of the European Defense Community as far as "classical" weapons are concerned. In fact, why should not the Europeans rather than the Americans be responsible for the defense of their own sector, now that it probably will not be "hot", at least for the time being? "Partnership" also means that each partner is strong enough to meet the other without inferiority-complexes: it therefore seems advisable to let the Europeans be their own frontier-guards, while the whole weight of Atlantic nuclear defense behind them.

IV

Finally, it would be wrong to leave the East-Central European peoples out of consideration here. The times of Stalinism are over, in spite of occasional setbacks. True, the Communist governments in power beyond the Iron Curtain would probably prefer to be at the same time more independent of Moscow and less dependent on their own resurgent public opinion. In any case, real life is springing up again in these countries, which so many men of little faith deemed already lost for ever. In his latest book, "Europa Grossmacht oder Schlachtfeld", Dr. Otto Habsburg (as he calls himself now) makes this point strongly and rightly. In fact, "Mitteleuropa", the community of nations described by Professor Oscar Halecki in his "Borderlands of Western Civilization", is becoming a world-political factor again. It has already ceased to be a group of passive "satellites".

This means that we can no longer be content with shedding some tears on the graves of their freedom. New opportunities arise, but this forces us to do some new thinking. Things are on the move, whatever we do, but we should have a line of action of our own. Violent revolution seems to be out of the question: the non-intervention from the West in 1956 (and, earlier, in the German rising of 1953) has brought home to the peoples of the European East that they have to count only on themselves ("farà da se"). However, we can try to help and support them in a political non-warlike way.

Up to now, the re-orientation of those nations has mainly been directed to gaullist France. Striving for greater national independence (if not for inner liberalization), Rumania contacted Paris. In Poland, where the movement against totalitarian rule is more powerful, the government tried to win the backing of President de Gaulle, and profit by the traditional friendship between the two countries. This seems only too normal. Of course, the peoples East of the Curtain know that America is by far the strongest partner in the West, and that was the political meaning of the triumphal welcome they gave to men like Richard Nixon and Robert Kennedy. But at the same time, they consider natural to renew their bonds with their fellow-Europeans in the West, rather than expect everything from the far-away American "imperialists".

Consequently, it seems desirable that the whole problem of East-West relations should be examined afresh, first of all in the economic sphere. Here too, there should be a "bait" for opening up the doors: *an economic and cultural "Marshall-plan" for Eastern Europe,* of the type suggested by Professor Brzezinski in his book, "Alternative to Partition". A plan, financed by Americans and West-Europeans together, but administered by them and the Eastern governments concerned.

Here too, "conditions" should be put forward.

On the one hand, "liberalization" should be "rewarded", and political backwardness "penalized": in fact, there is no reason to believe that Western help would automatically result in greater freedom. But the "strings" imposed in order to promote it would no doubt be popular in Eastern public opinion.

On the other hand, multilateral co-operation between the beneficiaries should be made conditional, like in 1947 for the West. We are well aware of the fact that this second condition seems to contradict the ideas which have sometimes been predominant so far. In fact, it was thought in the recent past, that any kind of Nationalism in the Curtain-countries served our purposes, as it meant disintegration of the Eastern bloc.

Such a policy, however, seems to be shortsighted. The days of Nationalism are over, and it would be all too easy for the Kremlin to argue that the West, again, is "reactionary", as it tries to foster out-dated "sovereign rights". And this would be right!

We therefore should stress that, although national identity of all peoples should be maintained, the modern world is looking out for larger, plurinational concentrations, not for chauvinistic separatism. Here the example of the Common Market can be used as a possible model, as well as the attempts to create an Economic Community in Latin America. Thus, East-Central Europe could give another version of the universal trend towards Regionalism, and America should give it her full support. It was good to promote the independence of the former satellites vis-a-vis Soviet imperialism, but it will be better to support a lasting co-operation between the Sates concerned. A "buffer-region" beween Western Europe and the U.S.S.R. would be a factor of détente, as it would give Russia the certitude that her Western borders are safe.

How are political perspectives likely to develop? It is difficult to say, but probably the East-Central countries will discover a concrete similarity in their situation, so that it is not utopian to foresee that a kind of more collectivist edition of E.E.C. might be created, probably in co-operation with, but not subservient to the U.S.S.R.

Will the Soviet Union participate herself in such a program? That is perhaps not impossible. But even if she stays out, she would have the greatest difficulties in stopping her former "satellites" who want to take the risk. In any case, even if such an offer from the West would be rejected, both by the U.S.S.R. and the "Borderland"-countries, it would have an impact on public opinion and give a shock. Inside and outside the Communist Parties, there would be lively discussion on the subject. How in fact could they refuse altogether, confronted as they are with huge economic problems?

A new American-European plan of help and co-operation would mean that we would again be an active factor there. But much will depend on the outcome of the war in Vietnam.

Finally, any policy towards the East should give an answer to *the German question.* Those Germans are wrong who think that their problem of national "re-unification" can be solved apart from the European problem as a whole. For the moment, the Soviet-controlled part of Germany is still the key of the situation, and the U.S.S.R. will certainly not give it up before a reasonable alternative will be offered. On the other hand, any form of national re-unification of Germany would be highly impopular in countries like Poland and Czechoslovakia—for understandable reasons.

It therefore should be made crystal-clear to all East-European powers, including the U.S.S.R., and to public opinion, that any German "revisionist" move as concerns the Oder-Neisse frontier or the Sudetenland, would strongly be opposed and drastically checked by Washington. The Germans have to choose: either a "New Deal" East of the Iron Curtain, including re-unification of the Federal Republic with the present "German Democratic Republic", or a continued strife over Eastern frontiers. They cannot count on Western support both for a re-unification-policy *and* a "revision" as envisaged in the agitation of the "Landsmannschaften".

In other words: pacification and democratization, should include the formal recognition of the Oder-Neisse borderline, by Bonn. It is wrong to keep as a "trump-card", what in reality is a pre-condition for the game to be started. Presently, the influence of the U.S. in the Federal Republic is very considerable. The U.S. should use it to make our German friends understand that the Eastern borderlines of Germany as a whole, are there to stay.

H. BRUGMANS,
Rector College of Europe.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, our committee is indebted to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] for making a study of Dr. Brugmans' statement. The gentleman is a member of the Joint Economic Committee and an expert in international monetary matters.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly an important paper, and a clear and carefully thought out statement.

It is true, as Brugmans said, that the Europeans can now stand on their own feet and should therefore be more independent of the United States. It is also true that Europeans have an enhanced sense of dignity; but I seriously doubt that it is President de Gaulle who has "given" this to the Europeans.

Undoubtedly, as Brugmans suggested, the time is ripening for the reopening of dialog between East and West over the question of the division of Europe and the division of Germany. Certainly it is true that the immediacy of a military threat from Russia toward Western Europe has diminished; certainly it is true that the days of Stalinism and even of Khrushchev are gone. Certainly it is true that Europe has a new sense of dignity and a surging sense of strength.

If, however, these impulses are to be maintained and not destroyed, then it is most inappropriate to speak or think in terms of following De Gaulle, who would fragment Western Europe, or of emphasizing European unity at the expense of Atlantic community. An East-West dialog can lead to peace, opportunity, and security, only when the West is unified, not fragmented.

I hope that nothing in Brugmans' paper would be taken in any other way.

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I see where our British friends are continuing to allow their ships to supply North Vietnam and Prime Minister Wilson piously has said England will not sell arms to the United States because England disapproves of the U.S. bombing of North Vietnamese petroleum dumps and other military targets.

That is England's privilege. I do not want America to purchase arms from Great Britain anyway. The United States should have its own munitions industry. Our national security demands that we do not depend on anyone for arms.

I do object, however, to the holier-than-thou attitude of John Bull. What is the difference between arms and naval vessels? Why is not the United Kingdom consistent? After all, England's Ministry of Defense on behalf of a British shipyard has just underbid our American yards on some naval survey ships.

If the low-wage foreigners want to stand on principle, let them say, which is true, naval vessels even noncombatant ones, are a form of munitions. These new ships will have a role, indirectly at least, in resisting Communist aggression. Therefore, in all conscience, the British should abstain and not contract to build American naval vessels in British shipyards.

Meanwhile, I hope the House Committee on Armed Services will hold hearings on my bill to require all naval vessels to be constructed in American shipyards.

Mr. Speaker, no great world power with any sense would ever depend upon foreign nations to supply it with weapons or facilities or ships of war. Two naval survey ships might not seem important and not too serious were it not for a precedent. Once the United States establishes a new policy, the damage will have been done.

Congress should kill this Trojan horse program now—once and for all. Congress should insist that the Defense Department place its order in American yards.

Thereby, our pious foreign friends will be made to feel truly righteous. Let us help our English cousins abide in the paths of the righteous.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Food for Freedom Act of 1966 came up for discussion a number of times today during the debate on the foreign aid bill. While it is not a subject of direct concern in the foreign aid bill, an amendment adopted to the food-for-freedom bill should be of concern to all of us. On June 9, 1966, the House adopted an amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. Pike] which would permit fish concentrate to be exported under Public Law 480 without prior approval from the Food and Drug Administration.

Public Law 480 presently provides that fish concentrate may be moved under the authority of that act only upon approval from the Food and Drug Administration. I objected to the amendment and the concern I expressed at that time has only increased. Let me quote what I said on this matter during the floor debate on the Pike amendment:

> Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. When fishery products were included, they did not include fish concentrate because that had not been approved by the Food and Drug Administration.
>
> I do not believe it would be wise for us to pawn off on people of other countries food we do not permit to be sold to the people in our country. I do not believe we ought to sell fish concentrate to people of other countries until the Food and Drug Administration determines it is acceptable for human use.
>
> What the amendment would do is, by legislative intent, to say that fish concentrate, which includes all parts of the fish, could be sold under the Public Law 480 program. What would happen if it should be found that these fish products for some people in other countries caused some diseases or even death, and the Food and Drug Administration had not approved it? That would surely redound to the discredit of the United States.
>
> We in the United States demand that every food product which is sold for human consumption have the approval of the Food and Drug Administration. Until fish concentrate can get that approval, I believe the language ought to remain in the Act. For that reason I am opposed to the amendment. I believe it would be terribly unwise for the Congress to remove the language. This is not insignificant; it is extremely important. An interest in the fishing industry is not enough. We have the same problems with respect to other industries. Other commodities are subjected to certain economic difficulties because they cannot sell their product for a period of time. Cranberries had that difficulty a little while ago.
>
> Unless we are certain the product is healthful, that it will not create harm, we have denied to the industry the opportunity to sell it in this country. I rise in opposition to the amendment which would permit the dumping of fish concentrate on unsuspecting people in developing countries when the Food and Drug Administration still feels it is unfit for human consumption.

The significant part of my objection was based on the unknown effects of fish concentrate on other peoples of the world. I have recently come across an article appearing in a recent issue of the New Zealand Dairy Exporter containing some sobering implications in the drive to produce new fish protein concentrates and ship them to developing nations.

The author of the article is Sir Ernest Marsden, fellow of the Royal Society, Britain's oldest scientific society, and elder statesman of science in New Zealand. I believe his observations command more than passing note. Before I read the pertinent sections of the article, however, let me point out that early in the article Sir Marsden reports that Japanese studies of stomach cancer conducted by the National Cancer Center at Tokyo under Dr. T. Hirayama find:

> A positive correlation, of borderline significance, was indicated between the endemicity of stomach cancer in Japan and the local custom of taking certain highly salted foods, such as certain fish products, and possibly salted beans.

In the article Sir Ernest Marsden goes on to explain:

> In regard to the indication that certain salted fish products were conducive to higher incidence of stomach cancer, that is, apart from the larger influence of milk consumption habits, it is to be noted that small plankton scavenge radioactive substances from sea water and become very radioactive, chiefly from acquired polonium. I have found this to be a world-wide phenomenon. Plankton in turn pass on the polonium activity to bivalve shell fish such as mussels, cockles, pipis, etc. and also to certain small fish and thence to larger predatory fish where it moves mainly to the offal with little to the white flesh.

This indicates to me that the assumption that anything from the sea is pure for human consumption is surely false. Fish concentrate contains all the fish including the entrails and this, of course, means the offal as well.

The effect of this fish diet on certain people was included in Sir Ernest Marsden's article of which again I quote:

> The effect of this on the Maoris and Polynesians who consume large quantities of shell fish, etc., has already been pointed out by the author and incidentally also it is to be noted that the Maori incidence of stomach cancer, etc., is very high compared with that of Europeans.
>
> It would be of great interest to examine the radioactivity of the salted fish product referred to by Dr. Hirayama, as a significant portion of the diet of Japanese. Previous to my suggestions, Dr. Hirayama was inclined to ascribe the stomach cancer effect to the excess salt, which is perhaps not unreasonable. However, it may well be that a correlation may be found with the radio-

activity of the fish product in question, rather than with the quantity of salt consumed.

Similar reasoning may be applied to the case of Baltic fishermen who have an incidence of gastro-intestinal cancer four times that of the inland population who do not eat large quantities of smoked fish products; likewise there is a high incidence of gastric cancer in Iceland. Hitherto, these effects have generally been considered as due to possible carcinogenic compounds in the smoke, etc., but may it not be that it is the particular kind of fish product which is more important and the amount consumed?

It would appear to me that approval by this Congress of fish protein concentrate without Food and Drug Administration approval is a hazardous move. Untold damage could be done to our international relations should we be found guilty of pushing off on unfortunate peoples a food which possibly has a cancerous cloud over it. The little help that amendment might give to the fishing industry is nothing compared to the propaganda opportunities for people unfriendly to the United States, unless we make food available to other nations only when it is safe enough for our own peoples to eat.

SPIRIT OF VALLEY FORGE LIVES ON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Valley Forge lives on. It is a rare thing in this day and age to find people who are committed to the principles which make this Republic what it is. A front-page story carried in the New Concord, Ohio, Enterprise indicated a spirit that should be heart-warming to those who become cynical and think that our youth are beatniks carrying placards of protest and throwing beer cans at Fort Lauderdale. The truth of the matter is that most of our youth are doing a good job of living up to the American heritage in finding work in the summer, participating in scouting, 4-H activities and, yes, serving their country in its military commitments.

Lance Cpl. Harold Edward Boetcher, New Concord marine, lost his life in Vietnam in the service of his country. No eloquence could possibly assuage for the loss to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harold A. Boetcher of Route 1, New Concord. Words cannot fill the void which must be in their lives.

Yet all Americans can gain inspiration for these troubled times in the statement of Corporal Boetcher's father at this time of tragic loss of life. He explained that his son "was most proud to be a marine and fought for what he believed. That was, according to Harold, he would rather fight Communists over there than he would over here."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the Boetchers but they must be great Americans. Their son would be just as proud of them as they must be of his convictions and the honor he was true to in the Nation's hour of need.

The article follows:

[From the New Concord (Ohio) Enterprise, June 23, 1966]

NEW CONCORD MARINE PAYS HIGHEST SACRIFICE IN VIETNAM AREA

Mr. and Mrs. Harold A. Boetcher of New Concord, Route 1, have been notified of the death of their son Lance Corporal Harold Edward Boetcher. His death, according to authorities, occurred Monday June 20, at Chui Lai, South Viet Nam. The Boetchers reside one half mile west of New Concord and just north of U.S. 40. They are formerly from California where their son enlisted in the Marine Corps. The body will be brought to the Mock Funeral Home in New Concord for services and burial.

Two Marine Corps members from Columbus delivered the first message of their son's death to the Boetchers. Then a telegram was delivered, which had been sent to Cambridge

Cpl. Boetcher, who was a member of D battery, Second Battalion, 11th Marine Division, was sent to South Viet Nam in mid-February. He had been in the Marine Corps since enlisting July 6, 1962, after six months in the National Guard.

Born in Mitpitas, Calif., July 26, 1946, he attended elementary school in Muskingum County but was graduated from high school in the California community before entering the service. The family returned to Muskingum County two years ago.

Surviving Cpl. Boetcher in addition to his parents are two brothers, James Boetcher of Mount Sterling and Norris Boetcher of New Concord Route 1 and a sister, Nancy Boetcher of the home.

Corporal Boetcher's father explained that his son "was most proud to be a marine and he fought for what he believed. That was, according to Harold, he would rather fight Communism over there than he would over here."

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY CASH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide a substantial increase in social security cash benefits and other needed improvements in the social security program.

Today over 88 percent of the people age 65 and over are getting social security benefits or—for a relatively small proportion—benefits provided by some other governmental retirement program. Yet the great majority of our old people are poor. In fact, they constitute between one-fifth and one-fourth of all the poor in the Nation.

The reason why old people are generally poverty-striken is that they must depend largely on social security benefits to meet their needs and these benefits are inadequate. Even at the upper levels, the benefits are barely sufficient to provide subsistence in most parts of the country. The average social security benefit at the close of 1965 was $82—$984 a year—for a retired worker who has no wife entitled to wife's benefits and $142—$1,704 a year—for a retired couple. According to a recent survey of social security beneficiaries about half of the aged social security beneficiaries—46 percent of the beneficiary couples and 60 percent of the nonmarried beneficiaries—had less than $12.50 a month in regular retirement income over and beyond their social security benefits.

Poverty and its attendant social evils can be eliminated for those able to work by improving job opportunities, by providing opportunities for them to obtain training in skills that will fit them for available jobs, and by providing a prosperous and expanding economic climate. But improving job opportunities cannot eliminate poverty for the great majority of people who are on the social security rolls. Work is not a practical possibility for them. The economic well-being of the old people, disabled workers, and widows and orphans that constitute this large group—more than one out of every 10 Americans—depends largely on the extent to which their social security benefits are adequate.

Thus it seems to me evident that a very substantial increase in social security benefits is needed if the program is to play a truly effective role in relieving and preventing poverty. Under my bill, all social security beneficiaries will be provided a substantial increase—50 percent on the average—in cash benefits beginning for January 1967. For aged workers, benefits will increase from a minimum of $44 to a minimum of $55, and the maximum eventually payable under the law, now $168, will increase to $407. The maximum monthly amount payable to a family will be increased from the present $368 to $610. A retired worker now getting the average benefit of $82 a month will get $118 a month, and the average benefit for an elderly couple will be increased from $142 a month to $231 a month. Thus the increase in benefits provided by my bill will represent a really significant step forward in our efforts to alleviate the problem of poverty among the retired aged.

But this is only one aspect of what my bill will do. Social security today is not just a mechanism for preventing poverty. With the broad coverage the program now has, practically everybody who works for a living—the average earner and the above-average earner, the urban businessman, the farmer, the professional self-employed, and the supervisor and manager—counts on social security benefits as a source of income for himself and his family in retirement, in the case of disability, or when death occurs. More than 9 out of 10 Americans look to the social security program to replace their usual work income if that income is cut off by one of these occurrences. And, in my bill to improve the overall protection afforded under social security, I have not overlooked the above-average earner.

There has been a substantial deterioration in social security protection, in relation to earnings levels, over the years. This deterioration is due to the failure to keep up to date the amount of earnings that is subject to social security taxes and that counts toward benefits—the contribution and benefit base. There have been several increases in the base since 1935, but all of them have consistently lagged behind the rise in earnings levels. For example, the increase in the base to $6,600 under the 1965 amendments will, by 1967, only restore the situation that existed in 1951 with respect to the proportion of workers with all their earnings counted; it does not come anywhere near restoring the situation that existed in the early years of the program, under the $3,000 base. The result is that more and more workers have earnings above the creditable amount and therefore have insurance protection related to only a part of their earnings.

The $3,000 earnings base established by the 1935 Social Security Act had the effect of covering the total earnings of all but the most highly paid people. In 1938, about 97 percent of all workers and 94 percent of regularly employed men had all of their earnings covered by the $3,000 base. By providing an increase in the earnings base in two steps, to $12,000 beginning in 1967 and to $15,000 beginning in 1969, we will recapture all of the ground that has been lost since the beginning of the program. Setting the earnings base at these higher levels will, together with the average 50-percent increase in benefits, enable the program to offer, for workers at average and above-average earnings levels as well as for low-paid workers, social security benefits that compare reasonably with their accustomed levels of living.

In addition to improving the adequacy of social security benefits now, my bill also makes provision for keeping these benefits up to date once people start getting their benefits. Perhaps one of the most difficult problems facing people who are forced to live on a fixed pension is that economic conditions several years after the benefit is first paid are almost certain to be very much different from those prevailing when they retired. Even when benefits are reasonably adequate at the time they are awarded, they are likely to be nowhere nearly adequate some years later.

Thus far, this problem as it applies to our social security system has been attacked by making ad hoc changes in the system. In contrast, there are important advantages to having the adjustments made automatically as economic conditions warrant. One of the most important advantages is the feeling of security and the resultant peace of mind that will be afforded beneficiaries; they will know that their benefits will not fall behind as price levels change. By providing for the automatic adjustment of benefits to changes in the Consumer Price Index, my bill guarantees a beneficiary that his benefit will buy as much 10, 20, or 30 years after he came on the rolls as it bought at the time when he first came on the rolls. Both the civil service retirement and the military retirement systems now have provisions to automatically adjust benefits to increases in the cost of living. Such a provision for the social security system is overdue.

My bill also provides for automatic adjustments of the contribution and benefit base to increases in earnings levels. This continuing adjustment, in conjunction with the two-step increase in the base to $12,000 and to $15,000 that is provided in my bill, will assure that the social security program will continue to provide benefits that are reasonably related to the standards of living of the working population as a whole.

My bill includes still another provision that will have a significant effect on the amount of benefits payable. Under the present program a worker's retirement benefit is based on his average monthly earnings over a period of years measured up to the year he reaches age 65, if a man, and up to age 62, if a woman. Shortening by 3 years the period over which a man's average monthly earnings are figured, thereby making it the same as for women, will have a significant effect on the amount of the benefits payable to male earners and their families. For example, a man whose earnings were first covered in 1956, who had maximum creditable earnings in each year from then through 1966, and who attains age 62 and applies for reduced benefits in January 1967 would have his average monthly earnings computed over 14 years; his average monthly earnings—including 3 years of no earnings—would be $314 and his reduced old-age benefit, according to the benefit table in present law, would be $92.50; if all that my bill provided was an average 50 percent increase, his benefit would be increased to $146.60. Under my bill, his benefits will be computed over his 11 best years; his average monthly earnings will be $400 and his reduced old-age benefit, after taking account of the 50 percent increase, will be $168.70.

My bill also will provide important and urgently needed improvements in the protection afforded disabled people under the social security program. A major improvement in the protection of the disabled that will be made by my bill is the extension of health insurance protection under social security to people who are getting disability benefits. People who suffer severe disability are exposed to the same sharp drop in income and at least as great an increase in the cost of health care as retired workers, and the disabled worker may be less well prepared for the financial shock than is the retired worker. In addition, he often has great difficulty in getting health insurance coverage—perhaps even more difficulty than the aged person has. Thus the considerations that prompted us to provide health insurance for the aged under social security last year apply with equal force to the disabled.

The other improvements in the social security protection for the disabled which my bill will meet have to do with the conditions for payment of disability benefits.

Under present law, the older worker who incurs a physical handicap that prevents him from continuing in his usual occupation must, unless he is blind, be denied social security benefits, unless he is disabled to the extent that he cannot perform any substantial gainful work. My bill will fill this serious gap in the disability protection of many older workers by extending to all disabled workers age 60 through 64 a modified definition of disability similar to the definition that is now applicable to older blind workers. Benefits will be payable under this provision to older workers aged 60 through 64 who are unable because of their disabilities to perform work requiring skills and abilities comparable to those required in their previous usual occupations, but no benefits will be paid for any month in which an older worker meeting this special definition actually performs substantial gainful work.

My bill will also extend to all young workers who become totally disabled the same protection that is available under present law only to young workers who are disabled by blindness. Under present law, a disabled worker must, unless he is blind, have about 5 years of covered work during the 10-year period before he becomes disabled. This requirement is difficult, if not impossible, to meet if the worker has been in the labor force for a relatively short time. Under my bill, a worker who becomes totally disabled before age 31 will, regardless of the nature of his disability, be insured for disability benefits if he has covered work in half the period elapsing after age 21 and up to the time of his disability, with a minimum of about 1½ years of covered work.

My bill will also provide benefits for totally disabled widows, in cases where the widow became disabled before her husband's death or, in the case of a young widow, before her entitlement to benefits on the basis of having a child in her care ends, or within 7 years after either of these events. This is a period during which the widow may not have had sufficient opportunity to work so that she could become insured for disability protection on the basis of her own earnings. And, I want to point out that since these widows would be paid disability benefits, they would qualify for health insurance protection under the provision in the bill for extending health insurance protection to all people getting disability benefits. I think that disabled widows need to have this protection.

Finally, my bill will fill serious gaps in the survivor, disability, and retirement protection of large numbers of Federal employees and their families. In the many cases where workers have Federal service under the civil service or foreign service retirement systems but are not protected under one of those systems at the time they retire, become disabled, or die, my bill will provide social security protection by transferring credit for Federal employment to social security. The transfer-of-credit provisions in my bill are similar to a recommendation of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security, to a plan which was supported in a 1965 joint report of the Social Security Administration and the Civil Service Commission to the House Committee on Ways and Means, and to one of the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal staff retirement systems. It is a less expensive approach than one involving direct social security coverage because, unlike a coverage plan, which would generally involve payment of benefits under both social security and the staff retirement system, it will not go beyond the objective of filling gaps in protection. Also, the transfer-of-credits approach requires no reduction of benefit amounts payable under the staff-retirement systems, and thus avoids an important objection that has been raised by organizations of Federal employees against coverage under social security.

To finance these major improvements in the social security program, I am proposing, in addition to the 2-step increase in the contribution and benefit base to $15,000, a provision for a payment from the general revenues of the Treasury to the social security trust funds and some adjustment in the contribution rates for the program.

The payment from general revenues, which will begin at one-half of 1 percent of taxable earnings in 1967 and increase gradually thereafter, until it reaches 5 percent of taxable payrolls is, I believe, a most important and most necessary step. Under the present method of financing social security, people who start working today are going to pay more than they otherwise would have to in order to make up for the fact that in the early years of social security full benefits were paid to people who worked only a short time under the program and who contributed relatively little toward the cost of their benefits. Only about two-thirds of the employer and employee contributions paid with respect to young workers entering the labor force now and in the future will be used for benefits for those workers; the remaining third will go toward meeting the cost of paying reasonably adequate benefits in the early years of social security.

Under my bill, the payment from general revenues will be graded in so that eventually the general funds will bear about a third of the cost of the program—the cost of establishing, in the early years of social security, a reasonably adequate program for those who were at that time already approaching retirement. The whole of our population has benefited, directly or indirectly, from the fact that social security did pay full-rate benefits to those who were already nearing retirement when the program began or when their jobs were first covered by social security. And it is time, I believe, that we recognize the obligation of the Nation as a whole to help finance these benefits. It is therefore most appropriate to introduce into our social security system a provision for meeting a substantial part of the cost of the program from the general revenues of the Treasury.

Under my bill, it will be possible to make a very small downward adjustment in the contribution rates for hospital insurance program and still keep that program on a sound financial basis. My bill provides for this downward adjustment. On the other hand, the tax rates to finance the cash benefits part of the social security program for employees and employers will rise from the ultimate 4.85 rate now scheduled in the law to 5 percent each, beginning 1968. No change is needed, and none is made, in the rates paid by self-employed people under the cash benefits part of the program.

My bill thus provides important and urgently needed benefit improvements for the 21 million people now on the social security rolls and improves the benefit protection for those who will come on the rolls in the future, and provision is made for adequate financing of all of these improvements.

POCKETS OF POVERTY WITHIN OUR LARGE CITIES DEMAND EMERGENCY ACTION

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 16252, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1963. The purpose of my bill is to remove the arbitrary distinction between needy cities and needy areas, or pockets of poverty within our cities.

My own city of Cleveland provides a case in point for the need of such an amendment. Of the estimated 10 million people who inhabit the poverty areas in 34 major cities in the United States, 234,000 reside in Cleveland. Many of the people living in these pockets of poverty are in the lowest income brackets, lack the education and skills needed to qualify for gainful employment in today's highly competitive labor market. Others, while employed, lack either the education or technical training to improve their economic conditions. The poor of our large cities are at a particular disadvantage in their quest for a decent life. Our large cities are beset with a multitude of human problems while the local sources of public revenues to meet those problems are inadequate. In these circumstances the Federal Government must act.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 provides for assistance to cities in severe economic distress. It does not provide for neighborhoods or areas within cities which are in severe economic distress. The result is that the great urban slums, where such assistance is most desperately needed, present conditions which call for immediate remedy.

My bill is consistent with the basic intent of the law. It will make the pockets of poverty within our large cities eligible for Federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of the City of Cleveland adopted an emergency resolution calling upon Congress to take action to meet this problem. I include in my remarks a copy of the resolution:

RESOLUTION No. 1511–66

(By Mayor Locher and Messrs. Armstrong, Banko, Bell, Bilinski, Blaha, Brooks, Carr, Carter, Cimperman, Dacek, Duggan, Forbes, Garofoli, Gilliam, Harmody, Leo Jackson, Morris Jackson, Katalinas, Kellogg, Kruczyk, Latkovic, Matt, Mrs. McCaffery, Messrs. Pilch, Russell, Sanislo, Sinkiewicz, Smith, Stanton, Stringer, Turk, White, Zone)

An emergency resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Economic Development Administration Act to provide assistance to areas of poverty within central cities

Whereas, it has been clearly established that although employment may be high in a metropolitan area as a whole, persistent pockets of poverty exist at the same time within the central cities of this Nation; and

Whereas, the population of these poverty areas in thirty-four major cities totals nearly ten million, of which 234,000 are in the City of Cleveland; and

Whereas, technological change and the movement of industry out of the central cities has greatly diminished job availability in these areas; and

Whereas, the people living in these pockets of poverty are in the lowest income bracket and lack the education and skills needed to qualify for gainful employment in today's labor market; and

Whereas, this lack of economic opportunity and the resultant undesirable living conditions are causes of severe social unrest; and

Whereas, the economic stability of the entire area requires that these pockets of poverty be eliminated and that it is in the interest of the United States that meaningful employment be found for this poverty stricken segment of our society; and

Whereas, it is clear that massive measures requiring Federal assistance must be taken if these areas of poverty are to be eliminated; and

Whereas, this resolution constitutes an emergency measure providing for the usual daily operation of a municipal department; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland:

Section 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to provide assistance from the Economic Development Administration Act in areas where it is determined that low family income due to persistent high unemployment cause pockets of poverty within the central cities.

Section 2. That such legislation should include provisions for both loans and grants to increase jobs and also to increase job potential for the citizens in these areas of poverty.

Section 3. That the Clerk of Council be and she hereby is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG and Representatives MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, CHARLES A. VANIK, FRANCES P. BOLTON, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, and ROBERT E. SWEENEY.

Section 4. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and, provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to Council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted June 20, 1966

JAMES V. STANTON,
President of Council.
MERCEDES COTNER,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by Mayor Ralph S. Locher, June 23, 1966.

Effective June 23, 1966

I, Mercedes Cotner, Clerk of Council of the City of Cleveland, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 1511–66, adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland, June 20, 1966.

Witness my hand and seal at Cleveland, Ohio, this First day of July, 1966.

MERCEDES COTNER,
Clerk of Council of the City of Cleveland.

FINANCIAL POSITION REVEALED

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that officials occupying posts of trust and candidates for these posts should reveal their financial positions, I hereby make public my assets, liabilities, and income.

My investments consist of a 112-acre farm with two houses in Maryland, west of Aberdeen, which I acquired in 1965 for $118,000, and the purchase of which I announced at that time; my home in Ruxton, worth about $45,000, which I have owned for 20 years; eight shares of IBM stock worth about $2,800; paid-up annuities worth $32,345.79, accumulated during a 25-year tenure as a professor; and $6,736.83 credit in my congressional retirement plan.

My liabilities are an $80,000 mortgage on the farm and a $25,500 mortgage on my home.

In 1965, my personal income was $29,463.67 and $360 from articles and speeches. The gross rental income from my farm during 7 months of ownership in 1965 was $2,445.

Mr. Speaker, if I buy or sell any substantial item of property in the future, I shall follow the policy of announcing the transaction immediately.

VIETNAM: THE CONSTRUCTION WAR

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with all of the news of the war in Vietnam we rarely hear of the constructive actions being taken by Americans in that country. It is a pleasure, therefore, to commend to the attention of our colleagues the June 1966 edition of a publication called Construction Equipment and Materials.

This edition is devoted to the story of the building of harbors, airfields and other modern facilities which, when we leave, will be permanent assets for the Vietnamese people.

The people of the construction industry are to be commended for their bravery and patriotism in conducting "The Construction War" under the most difficult conditions of warfare.

The article follows:

VIETNAM: THE CONSTRUCTION WAR

(The war in Vietnam is like the closed-canopy jungle which covers this land. From afar, you see a profusion of greenery, but not the trunks and limbs that support it. So too, newspapers and TV dramatically portray the role of the jet bomber and the helicopter. But they neglect the building of new harbors, airfields, cantonments, and POL facilities—which are the backbone of the U.S. military. To obtain for CEM readers a definite blueprint of the role of construction in this conflict, we visited many military bases, photographed scores of construction projects, and interviewed admirals, catskinners, and project managers. The salient facts are these: The United States armed forces are the most powerful, technologically advanced combat units in the world. But the dispersion of enemy forces, adverse terrain and climate, and total lack of modern facilities makes Vietnam a poor place in which to wage a mechanized war. Therefore, the U.S. must first build the elements vital to modern warfare. We must reconstruct the environment, so that we can assist the Republic of Vietnam in winning its battle against the terrorist activities of Viet Cong. It is within this frame of reference, that we describe for you "The Construction War".—MIKE SPRONCK, publisher.)

WHAT YOU NEED TO RUN A $1-MILLION-A-DAY JOB

Putting a private contractor to work in a war zone is unique. So are the size and scope of construction in Vietnam. Contracts cover dredging, pile driving, excavating and grading, paving, erection of thousands of buildings, pipelining—you name it—on hundreds of projects at some 40 different locations.

The volume of the work is enormous. Current plans call for completion of over $1 million worth of work every day!

The problems of logistics are tremendous. In Vietnam you start with nothing, so you ship in everything: Like 100,000,000 board feet of lumber from U.S. West Coast mills; some 10,000 prefab buildings (most from mobilization reserve stock in the U.S.); about 50,000 tons of cement a month from Taiwan.

WORK ESCALATES WITH WAR

Construction in South Vietnam started out rather placidly. In 1962, Raymond International and Morrison-Knudsen accepted a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract for some airfield work under our military assistance program. The total program was about $15,000,000.

In fiscal '63 and '64 there were modest increases. Then, as the war escalated, construction did, too. By the spring of '65 the contract volume had grown to $100,000,000. Current funding is over $400,000,000. And RMK became RMK-BRJ as Brown and Root and J. A. Jones Construction Co. were brought into the joint venture.

Of course, this meant a complete reevaluation of the program through '65 to accelerate the rate of work in place. The $1.7 million WIP per month in December 1964 was now unsatisfactory. The contracting authority (U.S. Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks for all military construction in the Pacific Theater) decided to step up the pace to a $4.5 million WIP per month by July 1965. But by May '65 BuDocks realized that they needed $7.5 million WIP per month by September. And so it kept rocketing up: in July '65, $13 million for December; in August, $25 million for March '66; and in December '65, a $40 million rate for work-in-place per month to be achieved by October '66.

To reach this goal, RMK-BRJ and BuDocks would have to crank out a mammoth work force.

TRAIN VIETNAMESE ON JOB

The manpower target is 67,000. Of these, there will be 4,500 U.S. personnel (mostly supers and foremen), 7,500 third country nationals (most from the Philippines and Korea), and 55,000 Vietnamese.

By early spring, the contractor had more than half of his requirement on the payroll. And it looks like he'll have no trouble getting the rest.

Despite the dangers inherent in the Vietnam operations (attacks by V.C., tropical diseases, unskilled equipment operators), very few men have resigned.

WORKERS CHICKEN OUT, VOTED TO NO. 10 HALL OF FAME

Construction crews are a tough breed. You don't hang on the side of a cliff socking a jackhammer into a rock outcrop unless you've got a lot of guts. And it takes almost as much muscle and nerve to boss a gang of 'em.

If the construction stiffs in Vietnam are any exception, it's that they are tougher than most.

Dodging some green Vietnamese operator who's having trouble downshifting a 10-speed transmission is just one of the hazards. There's also the annoyance of tropical monsoons (11 inches of rain in one day), a variety of bizarre diseases (like the plague), and an occasional V.C. sniper popping up out of his spider hole. But over 2000 American construction men are sticking it out, giving our GI's the construction backbone they need to win the war.

The few that quit usually give hometown reporters exaggerated descriptions of the dangers. Like the one who complained in his local newspaper of "fear and filth." He claimed he and his roommate stood alternate guard in their room at night. (Kind of foolish within a fortified camp of 20,000 U.S. soldiers). He couldn't seem to get used to the lizards (the 4-inch kind that eat insects) that were all over the place, either.

RMK–BRJ voted him charter member of their newly formed "No. 10 Hall of Fame." (The Vietnamese kudo for everyone they like is No. 1).

A fundamental part of the personnel program is training. For all practical purposes the Vietnamese have no technical community—equipment operators, truck drivers, survey crews, draftsmen, and the like. There is even an extreme shortage of competent carpenters, bricklayers, pipefitters, etc. So the contractor is directing a technical training program—with dual benefits. The Vietnamese learn fast and soon become proficient at simple skills—carpentry, masonry, cement finishing—and adequate for the immediate needs in equipment operations. Over a period of time this training *and experience* will help South Vietnam achieve industrial capability.

MILLION-DOLLAR SPREAD

The huge volume of work and tight time schedules call for maximum mechanization. To get it, the contractor will use over $100 million worth of American-made construction machinery. About $40 million is currently at work; and $67 million is already on order. One Navy officer quipped: "This is the world's largest job being performed with equipment *on order*."

At the beginning of the construction build-up it was easy to draw rigs from mobilization reserves. Now the timelag is five to eight months—even with priorities.

If you're finding it hard to get the equipment you want—when you want it—the reason is obvious. We've got a booming civilian economy. On top of that we need over $100,000,000 worth of equipment for military construction in Vietnam. The drastically abbreviated roster that follows gives a fairly good idea of what that involves: 142 motorized scrapers; 306 crawler tractors; 56 wheel tractors; 12 soil stabilizers; 117 motor graders; 158 air compressors; 11 asphalt plants; 9 concrete plants; 125 power shovels; 14 dredges; 550 dump trucks; 14 pile driver-hammers; 30 asphalt pavers; 118 transit-mix trucks.

PARTS WEAR FAST

Parts purchase and distribution to the sites that need them are a serious problem.

Wear rates on machinery are ravenous in Vietnam. RMK-BRJ equipment specialists face: green operators; weather that alternates between 11-in. per day tropical downpours and 110-deg dry spells; fine sand and dust everywhere; a high-gear 20-hr-per-day 7-days-per-week schedule.

As a result, tracks last less than 1000 hr on many jobs. Radiator cores at Cam Ranh last 250 hr. They are then pulled off, repaired, and turned around once. But at the end of 500 hr they are completely "sand-blasted" out. Brake seals during the monsoon season require replacement as often as every other day.

To meet the need for a greater-than-normal supply of repair parts, the contractor orders extras right with his new machine purchases. Another complication arises when stevedores on the West Coast fail to send along bills of lading with parts shipments. Sorting $150,000 worth of parts on the wharves of Saigon proves an added burden for busy equipment specialists.

CONTRACTOR TAPS WORLD MARKET

The construction programs in Vietnam demands vast quantities of materials—$12½ million worth each month.

A major need is cement. (Vietnam has only a few mills and these are heavily overtaxed meeting the needs of the local economy. As a result, the local price has inflated 400% in just a few months.) Current shipments, bought by low bid from Taiwan, are running 50,000 metric tons per month. Price is below West Coast figures; with further saving in shipping cost.

For timber, U.S. lumber mills quoted prices below those of Asian firms, including the Philippines. Right now RMK-BRJ has over 100 million bd-ft on order.

The need for structural steel is limited; mostly pre-engineered buildings. Reinforced steel, sheet piles, and other steel items have been bought in the Asian market—mainly Japan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.

VC CLOSES RAIL AND ROADS

Distributing the equipment and materials in-country is as difficult a problem as getting it there.

There is only one major port—Saigon. (Cam Ranh and DaNang are now being developed as secondary ports.) There is *no* overland transportation. Most roads are inadequate for U.S.-size loads. The V.C. can ambush any convoy. The single railroad is already interdicted at some 80 points. Result: a logistical logjam. All shipping must be by air (expensive) or by water (slow).

But despite the obstacles, a dedicated group of men—military and civilian—are getting the job done. More than this, they are performing remarkably well. With few exceptions; the hundreds of projects that springboard our military effort are on or ahead of schedule.

HOW TO CONTROL A CONTRACT THAT HAS NO BLUEPRINT—SO YOU THINK YOU HAVE PROBLEMS

There isn't a contractor who has had more than one job, who hasn't asked himself how he ever got into his crazy business.

It takes guts, imagination, and money. The work is hard, the days are long, and the profit low. And if you read the failure records, you know it's as easy to get out of as in.

But next time you (or your men) feel the going getting tough, read over this description of the RMK-BRJ project in Vietnam.

Total volume: nearly $½ billion.

Rate of completion required: over $1 million a day.

Design: half have blueprints and specs—which naturally change with the scope and direction of the war—and the remainder is "eyeballed" in under oral directions of the resident engineers for the military commanders.

Location: forty or more separate sites, all 10,000 mi from home.

Transportation: no usable roads or rail lines between headquarters and the projects.

Weather: tropical heat all year long, with monsoon rains half the time.

Terrain: swampy river deltas in the South, barren sand-dune wastelands along the coast, 10,000-ft mountains in the North, and tropical jungles in between.

Special problems: sniper and mortar fire by V.C. terrorists.

Put any yardstick you want on the contract construction in Vietnam. You'll agree it's the biggest, most difficult project ever undertaken by private contractors.

The joint venture of Raymond International and Morrison-Knudsen easily met the $3-to-$5-million-a-year demands of MAC-V (Military Assistance Command-Vietnam) in the early 1960's.

But by 1965 the job was too big ($500 million a year), even for these giants, so they added the capabilities of Brown & Root and J. A. Jones, a pair of equally famous international contractors. As Project Manager Bert Perkins explains it, "We needed tremendous resources in proven management capability to undertake a project of this scope in the short time span required."

To extend its organizational skills even further, RMK-BRJ is subcontracting some 20 items of work.

DOUBLE KEY-MAN OUTPUT

The main difficulty in undertaking a project so urgent is that you must move ahead without blueprints.

This is where experience pays. The Vietnam Builders, as the joint-venturers call themselves, have it. Most of their supervisors have a generation's job know-how to draw on.

Bert Perkins has developed a novel way to multiply the output of his key men.

"Stole the idea from the Navy," he says. "Works like this. Each key man has a smart young engineering aide. (The Navy calls 'em Blue Darts.) I have a couple of them and a Special Assistant with no fixed assignment. This gives all top managers an extra set of eyes and hands and feet. The aide goes with the key man all the time, gets to know the jobs, the background, how the boss thinks, and what he's interested in. When something comes along where the boss can't be two places at once, the aide goes instead."

Even so, most of the RMK-BRJ top men work 12 to 15 hr a day, 7 days a week. Bert himself spends five days in the field, trouble-shooting problems on his 40 or so projects.

EVERYONE NEEDS EVERYTHING NOW

Adding to the management problems is the fact that there are many "customers" for the contractor's services. This is a military program in a war zone. Vietnam Builders are at the disposal of scores of "customers." Each corps and base commander, each branch of service, both U.S. and Vietnamese, has *separate* and *immediate* needs. (And these change—with the fortunes of war and shifts in military strategy.)

It's the job of RMK-BRJ management to see that all these needs are met—and through proper channels.

This creates the second major problem: time. Between the request for construction by a specific CO and the actual crank up of project forces must come the approval, clearance, and OK for funding by a host of military staffs and committees. (And occasionally congressional approval.)

Of course, the CO always needs the facilities "yesterday." Since the time-lag due to distance is six months, Bert Perkins and his staff often have to use some top-level diplomacy in explaining why they can't go right to work or meet everyone's needs.

MANAGEMENT THINKS AHEAD

To counter the adverse affects of shipping delay, the Viet Builders management staff has improvised a system of "advance thinking." It works like this.

A CO at one of the military bases tells OICC (Officer in Charge of Construction, U.S. Navy BuDocks, the military contracting authority for all of Vietnam) that he needs a particular facility. While the request is flowing through normal military and civilian channels, OICC talks to RMK-BRJ. They sit down right there and then and mentally build the project. Materials, equipment, labor, shipping time, cost. They develop rough layouts; get U.S.-based procurement officers busy on searching sources, availability, price. Like master chess players, they are thinking six, ten, twenty moves ahead.

This reduces the reaction time considerably. When Viet Builders get the official OK, its staff can pick up phones, assign job numbers, and go. (Of course, they just tear up the work sheets on the 3 out of 5 jobs that are finally authorized.)

Bert Perkins compliments U.S. suppliers. "They've leaned over backwards for us. They know the job we've got to do here, so they help. Even though we don't have priorities as such, they rush our stuff. It keeps the time span to six months—otherwise it would be years."

Some kudos are also due the contractors. The job syphons off their top management, men they could use in the booming U.S. economy to make profits they'll never earn on a complex, overseas operation like this. M-K president Jack Bonny, though, considers Vietnam a moral commitment.

WHERE TO GET MANAGERS FOR TOMORROW'S JOBS

Contractors are constantly searching for good managers—men to run their jobs and to help run their business. Yesterday, they got them from the crafts. Today, they draw them from engineering schools. Tomorrow's manager may be pulled from the ranks of professional business-school graduates. (Naturally, all are green to start and need on-the-job development.)

Bert Perkins, Project Manager for Vietnam Builders, shows the quality man you can get when you reach out into new fields for executive development. His college specialty was time-and-motion studies and management methods. After he had selected construction as a career, he picked up his civil engineering at night school and from correspondence courses. Like most of today's construction bosses, Perkins worked up through the ranks: timekeeper, expediter, equipment operator, foreman, superintendent.

"Contractors are learning to value scientific management methods," Bert declares. "Contractors today use PERT, computers, and enlightened personnel practices. They draw ideas from the many industries they serve: petroleum, chemistry, railroading, metalworking.

"The managers of tomorrow get their field experience on the job during the day; we expect them to do their home work at night reading articles or studying the administration of a business.

"No manager is going to be successful without both—job-site know-how and modern business administration."

WHY ONE CONTRACTOR?

Laymen often ask why the U.S. government doesn't put a hundred contractors on the Vietnam work. They don't understand the absolute need for tight, coordinated construction control.

The problem in Vietnam is one of logistics. There's a critical shortage of equipment, materials, transportation and communications.

More contractors would only increase the pressure on supply sources (not increase the number of machines or pounds of nails). And prices would be bound to rise. Nor would more contractors increase the available shipping tonnage—or dock space. And dozens of contractors would only complicate the problem of establishing and using radio networks and air lines.

Of course, the Vietnam Builders draw on the professional services of other American contractors, as key men are released from current jobs. RMK–BRJ provides some two-thirds of the management and supervisory staffs from its own personnel (many finishing up contracts in the States) and expands from this core.

Since there is no national phone system the contractor has had to establish a radio network. (Even Saigon is served by eight *separate* phone companies. "It's easier and quicker to drive across town," says Lt. Pickart, OICC Project Coordinator.)

Cable communications to the U.S. is almost as bad. So, routinely, a key man will hop in a plane to Manila or Tokyo and phone in a pocketful of messages, instructions, and requests.

RMK–BRJ also has its own air transport network, under a lease arrangement with Continental Airlines and Air Viet-Nam. They have a fleet of four DC–3s, three Dorniers, and eight Beech Barons with more planes to come.

A WAY OF LIFE

Mr. CEM asked Bert Perkins about the incentives for supers and foremen on overseas jobs like this. "Not much," Bert replied. "The pay rate is the same for many top jobs like mine. The main financial break is that up to $20,000 is tax free.

"There is just a certain breed of men geared to overseas work. They know it, and they like it. It's a way of life for them.

"Of course, some men figure it's a chance to move up. Maybe a good equipment operator gets to be a grading foreman, or a skilled carpenter gets a crack at forming super."

SUCCESS IS HARD WORK

The ability of the Vietnam Builders to successfully direct and control a project of this scope is based on not one, but many things. Long days and hard work, for sure. But also scientific management. They've built a transportation net and communications system from scratch. They preplan every job—including proposals. They have a computerized PERT system for management control in effect.

As a result, the U.S. Armed Forces will get the launch pad they need to fight and win a mechanized war as fast as it can be built.

VIET CREWS BUILD HARDSTANDS

One of the oldest quarries in Vietnam—and about the busiest (two 11-hr shifts, 7 days a week)—is at Bien Hoa. A battery of new wagon drills and compressors sinks holes on a 5x5-grid 22-ft deep. The nearby crushing set-up converts shot basaltic rock to four finished sizes (1½, ¾, No. 4, and fines) at about 300-tph rate. The trio of 15-kw generators provide power for belts and lights. All-Vietnamese crew turns out good looking concrete hardstand at Bien Hoa Airfield, using a 34–E paver and three-roll power screed. Don't worry about that big labor force. Pay is 25 piasters (18 cents) per hour. Built-up 14-in. forms move by fork lift. The four-compartment dry-batch trucks get agg and cement from drive-thru batchers near the crushing plant.

TERRAIN AND TACTICS DICTATE NEW METHODS

The kind of war you wage determines your construction requirements. That is why construction in Vietnam is unlike that of World War II or the Korean War.

There are sharp distinctions. There's no blackout of military sites at night. Quite the contrary, you brightly light the perimeter and much of the camp to prevent infiltration. You don't disperse your facilities, you concentrate them. (The problem is not aerial or artillery attack, it's the dollar cost of buying land in an allied country.)

Even latrine construction has changed. With concentrations of men in camp areas and up to 10 in. of monsoon rain in a single day, you don't dig a big hole in the ground and set some prairie schooners over it. You use above-ground 55-gal steel drums as removable containers and burn the waste outside the camp.

The Vietnam conflict is unique in another way. Private U.S. contractors are doing most of the military construction.

When you are fighting a war, nobody wastes a lot of time keeping track of who does what. So it is a little difficult to sort out the exact roles of the various construction forces in Vietnam.

CEM estimates that the private contractor is doing about 60% of the work. Military construction battalions—Corps of Engineers, Seabees, and the new Air Force Prime Beef and Red Horses teams—are doing the rest.

On some jobs, nearly everybody pitches in. Like the POL depot at Phan Rang. The Navy supplied all materials for the foundations—forming lumber, rebars, and the concrete. The Air Force shipped in the plates for the steel tanks and all hardware for assembly. Army work forces constructed the foundation and erected the tanks.

Usually, the who does what depends on the hazards and the urgency involved. Military forces take on the dangerous and immediate tasks. Or as one GI expressed it: "the quick and the dirty." The contractor is given responsibility for the bigger tasks and those of a more permanent nature (like building a permanent wharf for ocean-going ships).

Corps of Engineers troops in Vietnam number some 10,000 men. They perform a wide variety of tasks: Small but important jobs, like filling in bomb craters on roads; big jobs, like installing the twin prefabricated DeLong piers at Cam Ranh Bay.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS CREATES GI LIFELINE

To provide combat support: U.S. frontline forces need roads and bridges built, cleared, or repaired. The Army, Air Force, and Marines need helipads and runways. There's demolition work to be done and fire-streams to be cleared around camps.

To insure logistical support: Troops need a constant supply of ammunition, food and petroleum products to keep fighting. It's the Corps job to restore or create the facilities for these—deep harbors, docks, airports, POL tanks, roads, warehouses, storage areas, munition dumps and depots.

To improve the environment: To increase the U.S. soldier's fighting efficiency and morale, the Corps eliminates or reduces the hazards of climate, geography, and pests. This means building barracks, mess halls, hospitals, latrines; developing water supply (and maybe refrigeration) facilities; destroying breeding areas of mosquitos, rats, snakes, and other pests.

Now waging a war in an underdeveloped, rugged, tropical land, the U.S. Army places an even greater reliance upon the lifeline which the Corps provides for its combat forces.

The Corps construction battalions must therefore have tremendous flexibility. The equipment roster of each is standardized to fit average situations: enough machines in as wide a variety as possible to permit all types of construction, but no one type of equipment in any great supply.

This presents problems when special needs arise. Case in point: the tremendous demand for rock in Vietnam. Corps battalions had to put in an order for a dozen more crushers.

Troopers experienced in World War II note some other differences in construction procedures. Military strategy in Vietnam calls for concentration of forces rather than dispersion.

One soldier said: "It's kind of like the old Wild West days here. The 'Indians' are liable to come storming out of the hills at any time so you keep your wagons in tight."

This simplifies some problems of construction. The distribution system for water, power, telecommunications, etc. is easier to install. Lines are shorter.

But it aggravates other problems. Drainage (of monsoon downpours) is more difficult in a confined area. There's a greater than average demand for power, too. With temperatures running over 100 deg during the day, refrigerators require huge quantities of electric power. At night, extensive floodlighting is required—for round-the-clock construction work and for perimeter security protection against sneak attack by the VC.

An unusual aspect of the War in Vietnam is the large amount of civic work performed by U.S. servicemen during their off-duty hours. Corps of Engineers and Seabee troops, particularly, are helping Vietnamese citizens in the construction of local public works. They build schools, repair and strengthen bridges, dig fresh water wells, repair electric generator sets, undertake a wide variety of tasks that help the Vietnamese upgrade and improve their public services.

This work is perhaps as vital to our winning the war, as are our military operations. Through the civic action programs the Vietnamese people see our sincere desire to assist them in creating a richer, better life. It is in sharp contrast to the terroristic and destructive activities of the Viet Cong.

The Vietnamese also recognize the economic value to their country of much U.S. military construction. An outstanding example is Cam Ranh Bay. The piers, docks, warehouses, roads, cantonments, POL facilities, and two airfields will constitute the finest, most modern air and seaport in all of South Vietnam; perhaps the best in all of Southeast Asia. This is the legacy of the construction war.

STABILIZING "THE WORLD'S LARGEST SAND TRAP"

Bob Hope called Cam Ranh the world's largest sand trap. He's right. But that's only half of it. The sand is the world's worst for building: the particles are *all* fine, round, and of equal size. They flow and move like billions of ball bearings. But Cam Ranh is also site of the world's largest natural harbor. So the U.S. Armed Forces selected it for one of our principal bases in Vietnam. On a strip of beach facing the South China Sea the joint venture contractor is building revetments for an ammunition dump. In this first-stage construction, they build up the 12-ft-high walls with motorized scrapers, then shape and back slope them with a dozer. The sand must be thoroughly wet to hold even a shallow slope. Slopes are then sprayed with a MC No. 0 asphalt and the interior "floor" is given a 4-to-6-in. double bituminous surface treatment. (As you can see some of the blow sand has already moved in on the "finished" work.) Nearby, a big fleet of 24-yd twin-engine pans are carving a deep cut through a 250-ft-high sand hill. (Heavily-laden ammo trucks need shallow grades: 4% max.). No mass diagrams or grade stakes here. RMK–BRJ excavating super just cuts, fills, wastes, and borrows, as seasoned judgment tells him.

SEABEES HARD-SURFACE SMALL BOAT LANDING

Northernmost link in a chain of new harbors for South Vietnam is this one at Da Nang. Here Seabee forces are putting the finishing touches on a small boat landing. The twin LST ramps, pair of double LCU/LCM ramps, and truck-loading bays between, are hard-surfaced by a double bituminous paving. As the hydraulic dredge completes backfilling each sheet piled bay, trucks haul in ¾-minus top stone. A grader levels the lift to about 6 in. A crawler-drawn road mixer, borrowed from the 7th Marine Engineer Battalion, then applies and mixes bituminous coating. After the mixer makes a second (transverse) pass, a 35-ton rubber-tired roller finishes the surface.

TRIM FORCES FOR FAST, SMALL-SCALE WORK

The commanding officer or exec of a military construction battalion faces most of the problems of a contractor. He looks at the Army, Navy, and Air Force as his customers. They set the specifications and, indirectly, pay for the men, machines, and materials he needs to do the job.

Of course, there's no profit involved. Nonetheless, the military officers are held accountable for their construction services. Because of the unusual nature of building in a war zone, money can't be the criterion of organization, efficiency, and economy; power usage is.

Here's how is works. Each project, or part of one, is assigned a certain number of man-days. For example: erecting a 40x100-ft. preengineered steel building, 550 man-days. This is based on careful record-keeping on scores of jobs, stateside and overseas.

So an officer of a construction battalion records the time his group takes. Say they complete the job in 475 man-days. Their efficiency rating would be 116% (550 × 100 ÷ 475). If they required 600 man-days, it would be only 91%

These military construction managers also rate themselves on percentage of *active* labor or the number of men they actually have available for work. Unlike most of their civilian counterparts, they must provide their own quarters, mess, transportation, materiel, etc. That's all overhead which, though vital, doesn't produce.

The job-site force of a typical Seabee battalion today, runs only 45% of the total complement of officers and men. This is a big drop from the rating for MCB's during World War II. There are many reasons (some of which will probably be reviewed in light of our Vietnam experiences) why this is so.

The basic problem is that Seabee forces were sharply cut back after WWII. This left a hard core designed only for short-term, small-scale tasks. Current MCB complement is about 400 men—half that of WWII.

The equipment allowance, too, is half that of 25 years ago—230 machines compared with more than 500.

Besides, the young, eager, hardworking Seabee in today's conflict just doesn't have the job know-how of the WWII pros. For the most part, those men were craftsmen, operators, and mechanics who traded a hard hat for a helmet. They needed no on-the-job training.

The picture is getting brighter, though. For one thing, BuDocks is increasing the number and size of Seabee battalions. To reach an active labor ratio of 65 to 70% considered desirable, battalion size will have to almost double, since "overhead" tends to be fixed. (From the standpoint of U.S. contractors, this will build up a pool of skilled labor, as was the case in WWII.) In addition, troop commanders can hire Vietnamese laborers for some work—which helps the local economy.

Perhaps just as important, is the fact that the private U.S. joint venture can expand and contract work forces far more easily—and economically—to meet the requirements of the war. (Pay of a Vietnamese laborer is about 6000 piastres a month—$50 at the official rate of exchange—and, of course, he is completely self-supporting. By contrast, a Seabee gets a basic pay of $100 on the average, not including the direct costs of food, quarters, clothing, health and recreative facilities etc.)

Under these most adverse conditions then, we find a skillful blending of military and civilian forces to win the construction war.

CONVEYOR AGG PLANT FOR CONCRETE

Seabees in Vietnam are living up to their tradition of being a can do organization. At Chu Lai, MCB-4 needed a dry-batch concrete plant. None was available, so Seabees put two double-hopper aggregate batches together to do the job. The one on the left conveys 1½-in. crushed stone and sand to a ready-mix truck. The one on the right adds cement. The saw-tooth knife edge tears open cement bags; the canvas cover prevents wind-blown losses. With one man using a clamshell to load sand and stone and four men feeding bagged cement, the plant turns out 120 yards a day.

INSTANT BUILDING—GOOD AND NOT SO GOOD

In a land that offers both torrential rains and choking dust storms "instant buildings" are a haven for parts storage and work crews. The single-wall nylon units go up fast. You spread the canopy over level ground, erect the air lock, and turn on the blower. The only drawback: the lock limits vehicle entry. The double-wall structure—a series of sausage-shaped arches are laced together—is designed to be self-supporting. One problem: water leaks in. Others: columns at each end restrict entry; tie down stakes extend beyond the base; and a fan is still needed. But as one G.I. said: "It's better than working under a bush."

PM MEANS PRIMITIVE MAINTENANCE

"Over here you don't have the niceties you get used to in the States," said the Seabee equipment specialist, in what may be the understatement of the year. He's got one of the toughest maintenance jobs anywhere, keeping some 300 machines—everything from 1-yd power shovels to pickup trucks—working in defiance of conditions that would wear down many a stateside master mechanic.

In the first place, the fleet takes a constant pounding. It's running 20 hours a day, 7 days a week (all work is on a crash schedule). Most of the operators are young and inexperienced. Terrain and weather are absolutely rotten—hot, bone-dry dust half the year; heat, mud, and rain the other half. Sand chewing away at the metal all the time, rain seeping into seals at least half the time.

It's no wonder that rigs are virtually driven into the ground; they don't get sidelined for repairs until they practically drop in their tracks.

Repair facilities include one 30x75 ft. frame structure with a tin roof. That's the automotive repair "shop." Heavy rigs get parked outside a big circus-style tent.

Don't dirt and water get into the machines when they're torn down? You bet; and you find them there still when the rigs are buttoned up.

Then there's the problem of parts. Every equipment super faces slow delivery. Over here, though, the wait can be as long as 6 months; so Seabee machinists make as many parts as they can.

In the face of these problems, it's a tribute to American skill and ingenuity that equipment availability is as high as it has been. Right now, with 50 machines sidelined, availability is running about 85%.

ENGINEER TROOPS LAY INSTANT RUNWAYS

Air mobile warfare depends upon the ability of an army to launch division size attacks by air *and to support them by air*. In an underdeveloped country you must first build the airfields. Corps of Engineer and Seabee) troops are doing just that—at amazing speeds. The secret: AM-2 aluminum landing mats—a space-age improvement over the pierced steel blanks of WW II vintage.

Aluminum alloy sheets top and bottom are stiffened by a honeycomb of aluminum foil between. A simple interlock and their light weight (150 lb. per 2x2 ft. panel) make placement quick and easy. A standard motor grader dresses the subgrade and a 6-in. sand base. Soldiers, with some Viet workers, unfurl rolls of reinforced plastic membrane over the base. It extends 5 ft. into the runway shoulder to carry away runoff. An 8- to 14-man crew will place over 5000 sq. ft. per hour. Troops have thereby created operational fields (3500-ft. runways with Jato take-off and arrestor-gear landings) in 27 days, and "completed" bases (10,000-ft. runways and support facilities) in 90 days.

PEACE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there should no longer be a scintilla of doubt in anyone's mind that every American wants peace. First and foremost in the quest for peace is the President of the United States.

The President speaks for us in firm and unmistakable terms when he says we never wanted this war in Vietnam, We want no war there or anywhere else and that we will leave no stone unturned to attain peace there and everywhere else for all time.

He has made it abundantly clear that we are ready to negotiate for peace at anytime, at any place, with anyone and without any conditions. That means we will negotiate for peace with combatants, with non-combatants, with Communists and with non-Communists. As a matter of fact, any and every avenue, heretofore used or not, will be taken advantage of even if there is only a glimmer of hope that it will lead to peace.

At the same time this must not be taken as any wavering on our part to keep our commitments to the world and to continue to fight for freedom and liberty everywhere.

President Johnson's most recent statement cannot be misunderstood. He said:

> We want an honorable peace . . . In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it.

Those who are demanding dialog should understand that dialog means conversation between two or more people, not talking to oneself. Unfortunately, Hanoi and Peking and Moscow have refused to participate in any dialog that may lead to peace.

The very able and distinguished John Steinbeck, American Pulitzer and Nobel Prize winner and great contemporary author, sums up the entire situation beautifully in his recent letter, as follows:

> MY DEAR FRIEND GENYA: I have just now read those parts of your poem printed in the New York Times. I have no way of knowing how good the translation is, but I am pleased and flattered by your devotion.
>
> In your poem, you ask me to speak out against the war in Vietnam. You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have

a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

Surely you don't believe that our "pilots fly to bomb children," that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.

You know as well as I do, Genya, that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. They are marked in pictograph and Cyrilic characters.

I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Vietnam at all. If this were a disagreement between Vietnamese people, we surely would not be there, but it is not, and since I have never found you to be naive you must be aware that it is not.

This war is the work of Chairman Mao, designed and generaled by him in absentia, advised by Peking and cynically supplied with brutal weapons by foreigners who set it up. Let us denounce this also, my friend, but even more, let us together undertake a program more effective than denunciation.

I beg you to use your very considerable influence on your people, your government, and on those who look to the Soviet Union for direction, to stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South.

For my part, I will devote every resource I have to persuade my government to withdraw troops and weapons from the South, leaving only money and help for rebuilding. And, do you know, Genya, if you could accomplish your part, my part would follow immediately and automatically.

But even this is not necessary to stop the war. If you could persuade North Vietnam to agree in good faith to negotiate, the bombing would stop instantly. The guns would fall silent and our dear sons could come home. It is as simple as that, my friend, as simple as that, I promise you. I hope to see you and your lovely wife Galya soon.

With all respect and affection,

JOHN STEINBECK.

All of this means in the simplest language that we will stop fighting when the aggressor stops fighting. We will negotiate for peace while he is fighting or will deescalate and negotiate for peace during the course of the deescalation, or we will stop altogether and negotiate for peace during the cessation of hostilities.

We will bring this war to an end at the earliest possible moment but we will not bring it to an end by leaving the South Vietnamese to be slaughtered by the Communist aggressors.

We cannot, we must not, we will not permit the enslavement of people by aggressors anywhere.

CULVER PROPOSES DIRECT RETURN OF FEDERAL REVENUES TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, as I have met with local officials in the Second District of Iowa, I have become increasingly convinced that new and more effective means must be found to assist State and local governments in meeting their rapidly expanding financial obligations without necessitating further increases in already burdensome property taxes.

I am therefore introducing legislation today to provide States and their subdivisions a share of Federal tax revenues without establishing a specific purpose for which the funds may be used.

If we are to maintain a viable, creative federal system, it is essential that the tasks of government be performed at that level—local, State, or National—where needs can most effectively and economically be met. But I am concerned that unless we do establish a meaningful revenue-sharing plan, the Federal Government will have to assume more and more functions which could be better performed at the local level, simply because the States will not have the necessary resources.

My proposal would return a percentage of the gross national product directly to the States, divided according to population, who in turn would distribute the funds within the State to all levels of government in proportion to the taxes levied by State and local government units. In 1968, the States would receive a share of one-half of 1 percent of the GNP, with the amount increasing each year until it reaches a level of 2 percent of the GNP by 1978, where it would level off for annual distribution.

On the basis of most recent GNP and population figures, this means that a total of nearly $3,400 million would be distributed to the States in 1968, with Iowa receiving $38,948,000 on the basis of 1965 population figures.

All levels of government would receive advance word on the amount they would receive each year so that they could plan how to spend the money most effectively. There would be no Federal control over the funds appropriated.

In such a way, State and local governments can be encouraged to develop their own unique solutions to problems in a way that will insure the greatest possible freedom of action at the local level.

Oftentimes Federal grant-in-aid programs for specific purposes result in States instituting or expanding programs not always needed by the States, simply because they do not want to pass up any Federal funds that are available to them.

Implementation of my proposal would help eliminate such waste, would minimize the Federal requirements and administrative details presently involved in obtaining financial assistance, and would reduce the vast confusion of dealing with a multiplicity of Federal agencies.

In returning these funds to the States to meet their ever-increasing revenue problems, we will simultaneously be returning power to the States to meet the responsibilities which best fall to them and to their subdivisions. And in so doing, we will be promoting the type of creative and cooperative federalism which is crucial to the continued growth and development of our Nation.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO EMPOWER THE CONGRESS TO REGULATE THE DISTRIBUTION OF PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the world in which we live requires ever-increased consciousness if man is to progress as he should. It means the utmost development of our mental capabilities thus the best possible educational development of our citizens.

As we all known, the educational process is not confined to the walls of our educational institutions. Much of our education is acquired outside the halls of our schools and a good portion of this is in the form of the various reading matter that we come in contact with.

In view of this, it is greatly disturbing to see any pornographic literature reach our citizens let alone the sea of filth that is cast before their eyes today. This pornography can only serve to distract and mislead them and deprive them of those intellectual and moral pursuits that enrich all of society as well as themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as the chosen representatives of the people we have an obligation to do whatever we can to foster the educational and moral development of our citizens and protect them as best we can from those things that can only hinder this development.

Therefore, I am introducing today a joint resolution proposing that the U.S. Constitution be amended to permit Congress to regulate and control the distribution of pornographic material.

There must be a stop put to this deluge of filth that our citizens are subjected to. Drastic measures are needed and they are needed now.

Our citizens are contributing $1 billion a year toward the further development of this atrocious business. Yes, this business grosses $1 billion a year and every dollar that it receives serves to further its growth. Unless we take legislative action to control and curtail the distribution of pornographic literature, this destructive business will continue to grow and further contribute toward the moral decay of our society.

What is most disturbing about this business is that its attention is largely directed toward our youth; toward those who are most impressionable and those who will one day be the leaders of our society—for better or worse.

And what most provokes me is the fact that our mail system is being used as a means of reaching these youths—in their homes. It has been estimated that 1 million children a year are receiving pornographic literature in the family mailbox, and a study conducted in 1958 revealed that the traffic in mail-order pornography is doubling every 5 years.

Why must we allow this to happen? Why must we stand still in dazed appall while the distributors and publishers of pornographic literature gnaw away at the moral fibers of our society?

I am told that the Post Office receives some 70,000 complaints a year about obscenity in the mails and I wonder just how many more thousands of citizens receive obscene literature in the mail and fail to register a complaint?

What is to become of our society if we allow this obscenity to continue unchecked?

Action is needed. It is needed now and it is for this reason that I rise, Mr. Speaker, and ask the assistance of my colleagues in rectifying this deplorable and destructive situation by enacting effectual legislation now.

BOBBY STEPHENS DAY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Longview Morning Journal on June 18, 1966 concerning a longtime close friend of mine, Col. Robert L. Stephens. Also I include an article about Bobby Stephens Day.

I have known this very outstanding young man from the time he was a small boy. He always has been religious and a man of he highest character in all respects. His many talents and attainments warrant the signal honor he has received. Certainly he deserves the recognition he has been given.

The material follows:

BOBBY STEPHENS DAY

(By Carl L. Estes)

Any community is at its best when recognizing and honoring its citizens who have served their country faithfully and with distinction to themselves and the nation. So it is with Gilmer which places itself in the public spotlight Saturday by officially celebrating Bobby Stephens Day.

All East Texas is proud of Col. Robert L. Stephens, the celebrated and highly decorated "Silver Fox" of the U.S. Air Force who on May Day last year piloted a YF–12A jet interceptor at more than three times the speed of sound and brought the world's air speed record back to the United States from Russia.

For setting two new world flight records—a straight course speed record of 2,070.101 miles per hour, and an absolute sustained altitude record of 80,257.86 feet—Colonel Stephens and four of his test flight crew officers were decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross, awarded by Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. John P. McConnell in a Pentagon ceremony in Washington.

Gilmer is literally booming with pride, for Colonel Stephens is a native of the Upshur County capital. He is the son of Mrs. Manie Stephens of Gilmer and the late Vernon J. Stephens. A veteran Air Force test pilot at 44, he is prematurely gray—the basis for his honored unofficial title of "Silver Fox" by which he is recognized among his Air Force friends and admirers.

Colonel Stephens and his co-pilot also were awarded the Flying Tiger Pilot Award for the world record-breaking flight, and received the 1965 Thompson Trophy Award. The MacKay Trophy for 1965, awarded by the National Aeronautic Association for the most meritorious flight of the year, will be presented to Colonel Stephens and his flight crew at Edwards Air Base on July 23 by General McConnell, Air Force chief of staff.

Gilmer and East Texas people are proud that Colonel Stephens' picture hangs in the Air Force Hall of Fame at Edwards Air Base, Calif., where he is officially known as Director of the Air Force Flight Test Center YF–12 test force.

The intrepid Gilmer colonel has been a test pilot longer than any other man in the Air Force today. He was the first military man to be elected a "fellow" in the international Society of Experimental Test Pilots.

He is a Legion of Merit Medal winner for his work a few years ago as director of testing of the famed F–104 fighter plane. As a test pilot and aeronautical engineer for 17 of his 22 years in uniform, he has been at Edwards Air Base a number of times over the past 12 years and now heads a group of more than 100 military and civilian test pilots, engineers, technicians and others engaged in flight testing the Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) aircraft.

Colonel Stephens is a graduate of Gilmer High School, a graduate of Texas A&M University with an aeronautical degree, and holds a master's degree in aeronautics from Princeton University. He and his wife Joy have three lovely daughters, Lila, Linda and Lisa. His family will be with him for this happy occasion.

We here in Longview and throughout East Texas join in spirit with the proud people of Gilmer in honoring Colonel Stephens this Saturday. In all the activities of the day, we all shall be happy to have back home again, a distinguished citizen and one of the Air Force's finest, Col. Robert L. Stephens.

SPECIAL DAY IN HOMETOWN HONORS PILOT

GILMER.—As his home city put finishing touches on plans for Bobby Stephens Day scheduled today, the National Aeronautics Association revealed that Air Force Col. Robert L. Stephens and his record-setting pilots are to receive still further honors.

The MacKay Trophy, given for the most meritorious flight of the year, will go to the pilots and crew of the YF–12A jet interceptor in July 23 ceremonies at Edwards Air Force Base in California. It will be presented by Gen. John P. McConnell, U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, Washington, D.C.

Veteran test pilot Stephens, known as "Bobby" to his hundreds of friends and admirers throughout East Texas, broke world speed and altitude records on May 1, 1965, when he and his co-pilot, Lt. Col. Daniel Andre, flew the YF–12A to 80,257.8 feet at a world speed of 2,070.1 miles per hour. This broke the previous record held by Russia—and on the Soviet Union's May Day at that.

On the same day, four other test pilots under Colonel Stephens' command, set nine world speed and altitude records in the same aircraft.

The MacKay Trophy will be awarded in the name of all the men who flew and set the nine world speed and altitude records.

Because of his distinguished career, the colonel and his family are being paid special honors all day Saturday in the town of his birth.

Festivities, under direction of Jack (Spot) Baird of Gilmer and Longview, and the Upshur County Chamber of Commerce, get under way at 9 a.m. Saturday at Kinel's Cafe where friends are invited to drop by for coffee and visit the colonel before he goes to the Strand Theater at 10 a.m. to show actual films of the record-breaking flight. He will narrate the film, and answer questions from his audience. Primarily an event for school children of Gilmer and all East Texas, the film will be shown again if interest warrants, Baird said.

At noon, an all-service club luncheon at Gilmer Country Club will spotlight Colonel Stephens and his family. This includes his mother, Mrs. Marie Stephens of Gilmer, his wife, Joy, and three daughters, Lila Lee, Linda Lou and Lisa; his mother-in-law, Mrs. Jewel Fuller of Baytown; and his two sisters, Verna Helen and Lila Blanche.

Gilmer Rotary, Lions and Kiwanis Clubs will combine their meetings for the luncheon, which will see such special guests as State Reps. George Hinson and John Allen, State Sen. Jack Strong, Cong. Lindley Beckworth and Ray Roberts.

Texas A&M University will send a representative from its engineering school, from which Colonel Stephens was graduated, and a San Antonio member of the famed Flying Tigers, also is expected.

The 745th Air Force Band from Barksdale Air Force Base will play at the luncheon as well as in concert from a bandstand on the city square beginning around 2 p.m.

Colonel Stephens will be presented from the bandstand at 2:30 p.m. and will speak briefly.

On display on the city square will be survival equipment from the 2nd Combat Support Group from Barksdale.

Colonel Stephens and his family also will be paid tribute by the Gilmer High School Class of 1946 which is holding its 20th class reunion Friday through Sunday.

"AN INSPIRED TRADITION," ADDRESS TO HARVARD UNIVERSITY ALUMNI BY W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, U.S. AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, JUNE 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the Foreign Assistance Act today, I think it appropriate to call attention to the excellent address delivered by a distinguished American and outstanding public servant, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador at Large, on the subject of economic aid to other countries.

Ambassador Harriman's address was delivered to alumni of Harvard University during commencement exercises there last month.

On this occasion Ambassador Harriman was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Ambassador Harriman's address and a list of the degrees follows:

AN INSPIRED TRADITION

(Address to the alumni by W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador at Large)

In one way or another this University seems to have taught its graduates that there are more important things in life than purely personal gain. It has held out and ideal of public service and established a record of public achievement. Its graduates work for the community, the nation, and now the world—who knows how many governments, beside our own, are infiltrated, dominated, influenced by Harvard men?

FDR AND JFK EXEMPLIFY HARVARD TRADITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE

No men in our time have better exemplified this tradition of public service than Franklin D. Roosevelt, Class of 1904, and John F. Kennedy, Class of 1940. It has been my good fortune to have served them both.

Both these Harvard Presidents were distinguished, among other things by their precise and vivid understanding of history. They understood that change in the world was inexorable, that the velocity of history has never been greater, and that our nation can keep abreast of history only as it presses ever forward to new deals and new frontiers.

They knew also that the changes were not only in man's machines and his institutions but, even more, in his aspirations, in his faith, and values. They understood that the towering fact of the 20th century has been the awakening around the planet of the masses of humanity, so long the victims of misery, exploitation, and oblivion.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

President Roosevelt used to speak of "the forgotten man." It is time, in our own country, we have begun to remember the forgotten man: the unemployed and the impoverished; the sick and the aged; the man whose color consigned him to second-class citizenship; and the man whose lack of education denied him opportunity.

As President Kennedy said: "For one true measure of a nation is its success in fulfilling the promise of a better life for each of its members. Let this be the measure of our nation."

In the more than thirty years since I first went to work for Franklin Roosevelt in the National Recovery Administration—the old NRA—our country has made steady progress in widening the promise of American life. Today we see President Johnson's determination to make all American citizens full members of the national community—to strike down the barriers which hold men and women back for reasons beyond their own control—is carrying this effort to its fulfillment in the goals of the Great Society.

In so acting in our own country today, we are recovering the sense of public purpose—we are reclaiming our moral heritage.

OUR TASK IS TO BUILD A WORLD SOCIETY

Yet, even as we make progress at home, we find ourselves confronted by the same problems on a vastly larger scale in the world outside.

In the thirties Franklin Roosevelt told us that the nation as a whole could not move ahead so long as one of its parts lagged behind in poverty and underdevelopment. In the sixties John F. Kennedy told us that the world could not move ahead safely and successfully if one part lived in affluence and the rest in squalor.

The great task—the overriding challenge—for mankind in the rest of the 20th century is to do in the world what we began to do a generation ago here in the United States: to help build a world society where everyone can start to hope for a better life, if not for himself at least for his children, or their children.

We cannot survive as an island of safety and prosperity, aloof from poverty, wretchedness and strife elsewhere on this small planet. We must offer a helping hand to those who ask our aid to fulfill their hopes for a better life, in freedom from outside interference.

At this same gathering nineteen years ago, General Marshall pointed to the needs of a war-torn Europe, and proposed a great coöperative plan for European recovery. This, combined with the North Atlantic Treaty, made possible the revival of the genius and vitality of Western Europe. Now Western Europe is more vigorous and dynamic than ever. Some of us may feel sometimes there is a man who is too dynamic—but let us not forget that diversity was what we wanted to achieve.

NATO TODAY

Today we are reviewing the relationship within the North Atlantic Community and the role of NATO which has served us so well in the past. In looking ahead, we find a wide measure of unity of purpose among fourteen of the fifteen allies. It is agreed that our integrated strength continues not only to give essential security but greater opportunity for progress. In the political field this unity can contribute to breaking down the unnatural barriers of the Iron Curtain—to fulfill the strong urge of the peoples of both East and West. It can provide, as well, combined economic resources needed to assist the developing countries of the world in attacking the fundamental problems confronting them.

THE PLIGHT OF THE UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

Nineteen years ago the acute problem compelling our concern was a stricken Europe. Today it is the plight of the underdeveloped countries. Many of these countries have only recently attained their independence.

I vividly recall on more than one occasion President Roosevelt pressing Prime Minister Churchill during the war to grant India independence. This advice, I might add, was not at the time fully appreciated. Roosevelt's influence and the example of our country's actions in the Philippines have contributed to the rapid emergence of fifty-seven new nations from colonial status. Fifty-seven in all obtained their independence since the end of the war.

President Kennedy stated our position in the United Nations in unequivocal words: "My country intends to be a participant, not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals."

These fifty-seven newly independent nations are now facing the staggering problems of self-government combined with the need for rapid economic development which their peoples are demanding. These are formidable tasks and outside help is needed to deal with them.

In recent years we have undertaken to give a helping hand both through our support of international organizations as well as through bilateral assistance. Much constructive work has been accomplished, but the dimensions of the problem are greater than the means provided to meet it.

THE INCREASING GAP BETWEEN RICHER AND POORER NATIONS

Unhappily the gap between the poorer countries and the richer is increasing, and we don't need a computer to realize that appalling fact. Countries which have about half the population of the free world have an average per capita gross national product of $100 or less, compared to ours of over $3,000.

The president of the World Bank, George Woods—a product of Boston—recently pointed out that by the turn of the century at present growth rates the poorer countries will increase their per capita annual income by no more than $50 while we will add $1,500. Similar comparisons are applicable to the other industrialized nations. Mr. Woods, therefore, calls for a sharp increase in the flow of capital to the developing nations—at least those who ask for it—and on better terms, together with greater consideration for the acute problems created by the instability in terms of trade.

A former World Bank president, Eugene Black, is taking the lead in formulating plans for the coöperative developments of Southeast Asia and the new Asian Development Bank.

It may be reassuring to some to realize that these two men are not academic braintrusters but hardheaded, successful bankers with whom I used to work during the years I was involved in international banking.

Clearly, both moral obligation and political necessity require us to do our share to help the awakening peoples to move as rationally and quickly as they can into the 20th century. Unfortunately, I detect a new mood in some quarters today . . . a retreat from the idea of larger responsibility, a desire to return to our own concerns, almost a neo-isolationism. One can understand the causes of this mood because the burdens have been heavy, the problems intractable, the results slow. Yet we cannot let frustration become the ruler of our judgment, or fatigue the arbiter of our policy.

FOREIGN AID IS ESSENTIAL

I feel that something like this is happening today when men who have previously fought for foreign aid programs now regard them with indifference or reject them with indignation. For foreign assistance is one essential way in which we can meet our responsibilities to the developing world and thereby protect our national interest.

No doubt these aid programs have had their defects and failures though they have never been better directed than they are by a Harvard man today. Certainly they have not wrought magic or passed miracles, although as we look back at it the Marshall Plan in fact came very close to being a miracle. Yet they are the means by which we can join in partnership with brave and patriotic men in other lands, working for the modernization of their countries. To cast off this hope of a constructive relationship would be a blow not only against our national security, but against our moral identity.

Economic aid, I have said, is one indisputable way by which we can associate ourselves with those seeking national and social fulfillment.

THE INFLUENCE OF OUR DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

There is one other way, even more profound, and that is the influence of our own democratic ideals. Our leadership in the world does not rest ultimately on our material wealth or on our military power. It rests—in any enduring or significant way—on the extent to which our society and our policies embody aspirations which touch the minds and hearts of the rest of mankind.

I was in Moscow when Franklin Roosevelt died—and I will never forget the shock and sorrow of the Russian people, women weeping in the streets, the sense of desolation. Roosevelt represented a hope of peace and friendship with the United States, even in Stalin's Russia.

And no member of the Class of 1966 will ever forget when and where he heard about the death of John F. Kennedy.

Yet yours was not a private grief. Shock and grief encircled the world. Today, in the hovels and shanties in Latin America, Africa, Asia, I am told, photographs of President Kennedy, torn from newspapers still hang, recalling the faith forgotten men everywhere had in his purpose and his leadership. Even behind the Iron Curtain, I still hear people feeling and speaking of his loss.

THE CALL TO ACTION

This, I would like to think, is the Harvard heritage, the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. It is a challenge to self-satisfaction and complacency. It is a summons to generosity and magnanimity. It is a call to action—bold action, gallant action. It carries us beyond the narrow confines of our personal lives and private concerns, into a realm of higher and deeper fulfillment. It reminds us that we live in the most extraordinary century in history—and that, as another Harvard man, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said: "As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

This is the meaning of the lives of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. They shared the actions and passions of their times. They knew there was nothing to fear but fear itself. They asked not what humanity could do for them, but what they could do for humanity. As Harvard men, you inherit an inspiring tradition.

Let us recall the words of John F. Kennedy . . . The last public message he ever wrote, on the morning of his death, closed with these words to the American people: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Honorary Degrees, 1966

William Averell Harriman, Doctor of Laws: Quick and generous to serve the public good, he has bountifully expended his high talents in his country's cause. (Mr. Harriman, dipolmat and former Governor of New York, is currently United States Ambassador at Large.)

John William Gardner, Doctor of Laws: An informed and articulate champion of education, a concerned and perceptive agent of the social ends of government. (Mr. Gardner is the United States Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and President on leave from the Carnegie Corporation and Foundation.)

Charles Allerton Coolidge, Doctor of Laws: An upright and discerning servant of college, community and country; for thirty years this institution has relied on his courage and strength. (Mr. Coolidge, a Boston lawyer, was for thirty years a member of the Corporation and for eleven Senior Fellow.)

Howard Wesley Johnson, Doctor of Laws: We welcome to our company a vigorous new champion of education on the Charles. (Mr. Johnson is the President-elect of Massachusetts Institute of Techonology.)

Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, Doctor of Laws: A brave and gracious international officer who ably furthers world order by monetary means. (Mr. Schweitzer is Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund.)

Robert Lowell, Doctor of Letters: With anguished heart this powerful poet compassionately confronts the tragic complexities of human existence. (Mr. Lowell is often Visiting Professor of English at Harvard.)

Manfred Eigen, Doctor of Science: This marvelously innovative chemist has learned to time with accuracy the nearly instantaneous reactions of the molecular world. (Dr. Eigen is the Director of the Max Planck Institute at Göttingen.)

David Washburn Bailey, Doctor of Humane Letters: Scholar-scribe devoted to precision, preceding and propriety; long-time generous and helpful officer of this university. (Mr. Bailey is the former Secretary to the Corporation and the Overseers.)

Martha Graham, Doctor of Arts: She speaks to us of grandeur, tragedy and beauty through transient movements of the human form. (Miss Graham is a dancer, choreographer and teacher.)

Alexander Calder, Doctor of Arts: Earthbound, ethereal, standing or moving, the fresh forms of this joyous artist enhance our visual environment. (Mr. Calder, an artist of varied talent, is the creator of mobiles and stabiles.)

John Hasbrouck Van Vleck, Doctor of Science: Harvard honors a brilliant expositor of the electrical behavior of matter, her servant as beloved teacher and creative dean. (Mr. Van Vleck is Hollis Professor and former Dean of Engineering and Applied Physics at Harvard.)

Mark Van Doren, Doctor of Letters: Poet, critic, humane and admired teacher, he interprets with wit and understanding the best in literature and life. (Mr. Van Doren is Professor Emeritus of English at Columbia University.)

John Rock, Doctor of Laws: To thousands of grateful patients he has given the joy of children; to millions of families the potentialities of a happier life. (Dr. Rock is Clinical Professor of Gynecology, Emeritus, at Harvard and head of the Rock Reproductive Clinic.)

Saul Lieberman, Doctor of Letters: A rabbi modest, quiet, strong, whose patient learning illumines treasured ancient texts for modern man. (Rabbi Lieberman is Professor of Palestinian Literature and Institutions and Dean of the Graduate Department and of the Rabbinical School of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.)

Paul Codman Cabot, Doctor of Laws: A business leader astute, direct, high-principled; few of her sons have so well served this university. (Mr. Cabot was Treasurer of Harvard.)

MORE EFFORT NEEDED ON HARNESSING H-POWER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I note with great interest a small article in today's Washington Post entitled "AEC Asks More Effort To Harness H-Power." I am including the article with these remarks and hope that all of my colleagues will read it.

Most Members of Congress, by reason of their position, have had a greater opportunity to appreciate the impact of nuclear science on all phases of our society than have most citizens. Outstanding congressional leaders, such as our highly respected colleague from California [Mr. Holifield], have played a key role in bringing this country to the position of eminence in the nuclear field which it now enjoys. However, the accomplishments made to date are but a shadow of what lies ahead if we are successful in making a scientific breakthrough in harnessing the power of the hydrogen fusion reaction.

It is this reaction—the combining of elemental hydrogen atoms into more complex molecules—which is truly one of the fundamental sources of energy in the universe. This is the reaction which produces a major part of the energy of the sun and other stars—the source fundamentally responsible for life itself, as it exists on earth today.

A generation ago the taming of this reaction was inconceivable. Today it is conceivable, but its accomplishment is considered to lie in some remote future. A glance at the history of nuclear science, however, shows how fast these projections can change. Fifty years ago an atomic fission reaction was inconceivable. In 1939—just 27 years ago—as a student of physics at the University of California at Los Angeles, I listened to the great Dr. Fermi describe his first simple experiments with uranium fission, still far from the stage of a sustained chain reaction.

The war telescoped development in this field, as we all know, leading to the atomic bomb. In 1947 I was able to take graduate work in the design of nuclear piles for atomic powerplants—still then visualized as a more or less remote possibility for power production because of economic factors. Today, however, we see that possibly 50 percent of the newly planned electrical powerplant capacity of this Nation will be nuclear power. Such is the speed of scientific progress.

It is safe to predict that progress in controlling the hydrogen fusion reaction will, similarly, exceed our expectations. The results of that progress will represent a quantum jump in man's ability to cope with his environment. Energy, the use of which is the measuring rod of technological advance, will be available on an unlimited basis and at costs which may approximate zero, except for local distribution to the consumer.

So, I commend the Atomic Energy Commission for making the step described by this news article which follows. I have confidence that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will act favorably and quickly, and that the Members of the Congress will respond with vision and leadership to support the programs requested.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1966]

AEC Asks More Effort To Harness H-Power

The Atomic Energy Commission asked Congress yesterday to okay a "significant strengthening" of the Nation's effort to harness the hydrogen bomb reaction to produce electricity.

The AEC did so in reporting to the Senate-House Atomic Committee that the U.S. effort—once the world's most vigorous—is "losing its momentum" while the Soviet Union and certain other countries are forging forward vigorously.

Saying this is largely due to an essentially static budget, now runing at about $21 million annually—the AEC called for:

A 15 percent annual increase in normal operating funds over the next five years.

Construction of several large new devices—to carry out a "new generation" of experiments in the field—at a cost of up to $4 million a year at least three years.

The recommendations fell somewhat short of those recommended by a private panel of non-AEC scientists which had called for an up to three-fold increase in the range and pace of the program over the next five years.

SOVIET OCCUPATION OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago today the armed forces of the Soviet Union began the occupation of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, thus ending the existence of these countries as free and independent nations.

That invasion and occupation and the imposition of the Soviet regime was a flagrant act of aggression and continues as such today.

The Soviets have deported to their country more than a half million people from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, regardless of the fact that the U.S.S.R. joined the Genocide Convention.

In addition to these deportations the Soviet Union is forcibly resettling young people from these countries in Soviet Russia, thus obliterating their national identity by Russification, atheism, and Communist indoctrination.

The U.S.S.R. does not have any legal basis for the occupation of these countries but is trying to justify its domination by fraud and usurpation of the will of the people. The United States has never recognized the seizure and occupation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and has upheld and restated this position in a recent official publication of the Department of State—"Treaties in Force."

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the oppressed people of these once-independent nations will be able once again to gain their freedom—a freedom they so richly deserve.

NEED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCEDURES TO SETTLE DISPUTES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hull] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the current strike by the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines underscores the urgent need for the establishment of procedures to settle such disputes which paralyze our Nation's transportation and damage the economy.

It no longer suffices for Congressmen to wring their hands and extend their sympathies to the hundreds of thousands of people who have been seriously inconvenienced by this strike. It accomplishes little to assign culpability to the union or the airline companies. This will not reclaim the profits lost by the airlines or put lost paychecks back into the pockets of airline employees.

Trans World Airlines, one of the affected companies, is headquartered in my congressional district and has been forced to furlough 5,700 employees in the Kansas City area, a disastrous blow to the economy of that area. This involves the dilution of TWA's $3,600,000 monthly payroll in the Kansas City area.

I have received a telegram from Mayor Ilus W. Davis of Kansas City, who states:

> The International Association of Machinists strike against the five major airlines is substantially affecting the business and economy of the Greater Kansas City area. I know that you are concerned about this national emergency and I hope that you, in your legislative role and collectively with your colleagues, will take every possible action to bring this national crisis to an early and successful conclusion. In a separate communication, I have advised the President of the United States of my interest in this matter for I am convinced that this should be a concern of all levels and divisions of government. I want you to know that this office stands willing to be of assistance in resolving this serious labor dispute.

What is needed immediately is an end to the strike, followed by establishment of procedures to guarantee that such strikes, so injurious to the national interest, do not reoccur.

INFLATIONARY PRESSURES CONSIDERABLY EASED—HOMEBUILDING INDUSTRY THREATENED

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all cautiously pleased by recent economic reports, particularly those which indicate that the inflationary pressures which we were experiencing earlier this year have been considerably eased.

The economy of the Nation appears to remain very sound while the Nation's standard of living continues to increase.

However, in the effort to curb inflationary pressures there has emerged a clear and dangerous situation threatening one of the most important industries in our economy, homebuilding, and ultimately endangering the physical and financial well-being of millions of Americans.

This is a most important industry. It contributes 1 of every 18 dollars which make up our annual gross national product. It employs directly hundreds of thousands of persons and indirectly provided jobs for millions more.

But if current expectations of the homebuilders themselves are realized, this Nation faces a serious cutback in our efforts to provide homes for a rapidly growing population.

The situation is so serious that Mr. Larry Blackmon, president of the National Association of Home Builders, has termed it a potential "disaster."

The source of the problem is, of course, the "tight money" market created by those who shape our national monetary policies which has resulted in the current interest rate war and threatens to reduce the availability of mortgage financing to a point where only the higher income group can afford the expense of homebuying.

The effort to curb inflation through monetary practices affecting interest rates has set off strong and unhealthy currents in our money market. The immediate result has been a shortage of loan funds available for the financing of new home construction.

The thrift institutions, such as the savings and loan firms, have been caught in the middle of the current rate war. As a result, the thrift institutions, a primary source of the Nation's home financing, are now at a great disadvantage in securing funds at reasonable cost.

Thus, those buyers who can afford mortgage money in the current market are going to pay more for it while prospective buyers of a few months ago find they have been squeezed out of the market.

The cost of money rises and as it does the cost of housing rises, pricing additional prospective buyers out of the market, decreasing demand, forcing construction layoffs and cutbacks in construction.

This is not a hypothetical chain of events. It is underway at this very moment. In a recent survey of its members, the National Association of Home Builders indicated that 80 percent responding builders plan to cut back their operations by some 35 percent. A projection of this throughout the entire homebuilding industry would indicate a reduction in starts over the next year to 1,250,000. The association states that at least 1,600,000 new units are needed annually just to keep abreast of current requirements.

Admittedly, these are industry figures based on projection. However, the need for adequate and proper housing, a need which has been long recognized by the Federal Government, cannot be met or even approached if this situation is permitted to continue.

The money market in the country today is badly out of balance in some areas. Unfortunately, it appears that only congressional action will alleviate the situation and prevent a possible serious recession in the homebuilding industry.

We all wish to prevent inflation and ease inflationary pressures. But it is neither fair nor wise to permit one industry to bear the major portion of the load in carrying out anti-inflationary programs and policies.

There are several recommendations currently before the Banking and Currency Committee which could provide relief. These include proposals to authorize and instruct the Federal Reserve Board to purchase obligations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal National Mortgage Association. In addition, the committee has reported bills to increase the present authority of FNMA to borrow money to finance its secondary market operations, operations which have been seriously curtailed in recent weeks.

And finally, it would be my suggestion that the committee give consideration to a bold new program for providing adequate private sector financing through existing or additional Federal agencies over the next 10 to 20 years to insure that the situation which the home buying public and homebuilding industry faces today does not recur in the future.

Our population is growing at too great a rate, our current demands too large, our future responsibilities to formidable to risk major setbacks in homebuilding. In fact, today anything less than expansion in this field is detrimental to our national goal of better and more adequate housing for the American people.

But this is for the future. Immediate action is needed now to remedy an existing situation. There is legislation of controversy before the House regarding occupancy. However, if we do not act because others will not, the question of housing occupancy will become irrelevant in the face of lack of housing availability.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter which needs immediate attention. The health of an industry which is one of the economic mainstays of this Nation and interests of millions of present and prospective homeowners is at stake.

PROPOSED REIMBURSEMENT OF MEDICARE PATIENTS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would permit reimbursement of medicare patients for their transportation to a hospital to receive treatment from a therapist.

The present law permits a therapist to be reimbursed for his travel to extended care facilities or into a patient's home, but does not permit reimbursement to the individual patient. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this provision in the law prevents medicare recipients from receiving all the care they might otherwise get. A great deal of time is spent by therapists in traveling from place to place which might otherwise be spent treating patients.

I am very happy to join with my very good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], in correcting this provision in the law. I know that a great many senior citizens in the State of New Jersey would receive better treatment resulting from the more efficient use of the time of therapists.

I urge all Members to join with us in support of this corrective legislation.

ROBERT L. BENNETT, COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, TO BE HONORED AS "INDIAN OF THE YEAR"

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, July 16, special ceremonies will be held at the annual Indian Exposition at Anadarko, Okla., honoring Robert L. Bennett, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, as "Indian of the Year."

This award was begun 15 years ago by the 15 western Oklahoma tribes which sponsor the exposition. Its first recipient, in 1951, was the great All-American athlete, Jim Thorpe.

In recent years, the award has gone to such outstanding Indians as famed Ballerina Maria Tallchief, Evangelist Oral Roberts, and, last year, to Mrs. LaDonna Harris, wife of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the long-neglected needs of the American Indian are finally beginning to gain wide recognition, we are indeed fortunate to have a man such as Commissioner Bennett to oversee the progress which is being made in improving the living standards of this great segment of American citizens.

As the first Indian to serve as Commissioner in almost a century, Bob Bennett has, in the short span of 2½ months in office, brought new life to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. He has established lofty, but realistic, goals to move Indians now living on Government reservations into the mainstream of American life.

As he stated in his recent report to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

> As long as the Bureau has the responsibility for Indian people on or near reservations, it will do everything possible to see that disadvantaged Indian people benefit from this commitment. The application of the various government programs to Indian reservations should hasten the day when Indian people will become self-sufficient citizens of our American society.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Commissioner Bennett on this fine honor to be accorded him, and to express my hope, and belief, that his remarkable achievements—past, present, and future—will serve as a great source of inspiration not only to his fellow Indians, but to all the citizens of this Nation.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, there is today a mounting problem in the elective process. Because of the rising costs of campaign financing, many candidates for offices high and low, find it difficult to avoid encumbrances and obligations. The solution lies in the participation of more Americans in the political process. Elections should be financed primarily by people whose only interest is in good government. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to provide a tax deduction of up to $100 for political contributions to all political campaigns. This bill will broaden the base of political participation by encouraging men and women of meager and moderate resources to support candidates of their choice. It will encourage truly democratic government—of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this measure will be beneficial to the American political process, and I join with other Members who have submitted similar proposals.

CHANGES NEEDED IN TARIFF LAW TO BRING VALUATION PROVISIONS ON ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS INTO LINE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Customs Simplification Act of 1956 to permit valuation of receiving tubes under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

This is emergency legislation for the benefit of American manufacturers of television, radio, and other consumer electronic products. It is also for the benefit of the American consumer because it will prevent exorbitant increases in the cost of imported components and will forestall price increases for consumer electronic products.

There is today a great demand for radio and television tubes, caused primarily by the sudden acceptance of color television. This color boom already is straining the capacity of the U.S. firms which which produce these products. The firms are turning to foreign sources, particularly Japan, to help meet the demand.

However, a recent Customs Court decision has raised the threat of a drastic increase in the cost of importing receiving tubes. The problem stems from an archaic method of import valuation under section 402a of the Tariff Act of 1930. It establishes foreign value as the basis of appraisement of imported goods.

The appraised value of imported receiving tubes under this valuation method ranges from 200 to 600 percent of the actual price to the importer in some instances.

The present tariff, if not corrected, will result in a sharp increase in the cost of receiving tubes, which must eventually be reflected in the price of many finished products.

This problem gets out of the nickel-and-dime category when one reflects that the sales of consumer electronic products in the United States will reach $3.7 million this year.

The Customs Simplification Act of 1956 has established a more reasonable valuation provision, making export value the primary basis of dutiable value. However, receiving tubes are one of the items still subject to the old method of valuation under section 402a.

It appears that legislation is the only effective solution to the problem, so I am proposing the removal of receiving tubes from appraisment under section 402a and bringing them under section 402.

The legislation I propose is emergency legislation, designed specifically to include only receiving tubes and to be in force for only 3 years, the predicted peak years of the demand for such products.

Such legislation, I believe, will prevent an exorbitant increase in the cost of imported components. It will have no harmful effect on domestic manufacture since the domestic receiving tube business is so strong that manufacturers are selling all the tubes they can make.

SHIELD IN ASIA

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Mackay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, there is no equivocation in the Atlanta Constitution's support of the decision to bomb the oil depots in North Vietnam.

I have in hand three editorials from the Constitution which appraise various aspects of extending the air war.

Communist infiltration of the South was bound to force strikes against the petroleum supplies, the newspaper says. It finds a demonstration of President Johnson's praiseworthy restraint in the fact he held off the attacks until now. And it says that to have moved earlier would have disproved our contention that we wish no higher level of conflict than we are compelled to take.

The Constitution enumerates successes achieved by the President's foreign policy and it quotes Australian Prime Minister Holt's backing of our stand in southeast Asia.

The Prime Minister said while in Washington:

> But for the power and resolution of the United States, no country in Asia could feel itself secure from the threat of Communist aggression.

Hanoi could stop the fighting, if only it were willing to talk peace.

Under unanimous consent I place each of these editorials at this point in the Record.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, June 30, 1966]

Escalation by Whom?

For more than a year American warplanes carefully flew around the oil dumps at Hanoi and Haiphong while urging the Hanoi government to negotiate an end to the war, not force its continuance.

The Communist government declined to join in stopping the war. American planes still skirted the oil dumps in hopes the Communists would hold down their invasion of South Viet Nam to levels that would not necessitate strikes on their oil supply.

Instead the North Vietnamese scaled their invasion upward. Secretary of Defense McNamara reports that their greatly increased infiltration is relying more and more on trucks and power junks to haul in much heavier arms and equipment for use against U.S. and South Vietnamese troops.

That Communist escalation was bound to force a U.S. strike eventually against the oil supply at Hanoi and Haiphong. It was a demonstration of President Johnson's restraint and patience that he waited so long.

For the Soviet Union then to attribute "criminal escalation" to the United States is not so much outrageous as it is silly.

British Prime Minister Harold Wilson could afford to disassociate his government from the U.S. "extension of bombing to such areas" since British soldiers are not the ones being hurt by the Communist escalation, and he has his troubles with a noisy left wing.

But in reiterating stout British support for the American assistance to South Viet Nam, Wilson stated the case very well: "The opportunity for bringing all the fighting in Viet Nam to an end is open to Hanoi and the onus for continuing it rests there also."

By not only continuing but escalating the war, Hanoi required the American counterblow that it has now received. President Johnson's restraint is praiseworthy. But so is his determination not to falter in giving American and South Vietnamese troops that support which they so clearly require to offset the North Vietnamese escalation.

The United States has offered North Viet Nam peace. The North Vietnamese have chosen instead to test American power. They have no grounds for claiming mistreatment when they feel it.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 1, 1966]

The Only Shield in Asia

While many in Washington regretted and damned the President's decision to bomb around Hanoi and Haiphong, the Australian prime minister visited the American capital and had a blunt word on the subject.

Prime Minister Harold Holt said he was "nauseated" by the readiness of some people to attribute imperialism to the United States, and benevolence and humanitarianism to her Communist adversaries.

"But for the power and resolution of the United States," said Holt, "no country in Asia could feel itself secure from the threat of Communist aggression."

That is quite simply the fact. Japan is the only Asian nation that has the potential of power to counterweigh Chinese Communist aggression, direct or by proxy. And Japan has no appreciable armed force. Rather she has rested secure under the protective wing of American power while rebuilding her booming economy, as Europe did.

The day may hopefully come when reconstructed Asian nations can cease to fear and start to treat with a tamer Communist neighbor from a base of strength of their own. This is now happening in a Europe which 20 years ago was under immediate threat of Soviet seizure.

Until that day comes in Asia, though, Prime Minister Holt is right. No Asian country can be secure if the United States withdraws its shield now. There is no other.

So, just as the United States stood at Berlin, she stood in Korea and the Formosa Straits. Bush communism was resisted in the Philippines and Malaya, as it had been in Turkey and Greece. All the while the work of development, from Pakistan and India to Taiwan and Korea, has absorbed the unstinting effort of the United States.

To wish for a more perfect U.S. legal position in South Viet Nam (and it is considerably less embarrassing than the position of Hanoi, which has invaded South Viet Nam with three divisions, not vice versa) cannot, alter the fact of U.S. policy which has kept world peace for two decades.

That policy is in Asia what it was in Europe—to shield the weak from Communist seizure while helping them develop, and then be free to shape their own destiny. Wherever communism has pressed outward, it has struck the unbending American shield. It has met it now in Viet Nam and President Johnson is explaining patiently to Hanoi and home-folks alike that it simply is not going to bend there either.

Since the U.S. determination became clear in Viet Nam, Pakistan has quietly replaced her pro-Chinese foreign minister; Chinese violation of India's border has quieted; India and Pakistan have stopped fighting, with Russia as the peacemaker; Russia's coexistence exponents have been further repelled by Red China's warlike wing; war no longer threatens between Malaysia and Indonesia; Indonesia has withdrawn from the Chinese orbit; dissension within China itself points to purges, and the South Vietnamese are now and will remain free to choose their own destiny.

Incidental reverberations have set back Chinese intrusions in Africa and Latin America. In the briefly busy cockpit of the Caribbean, the Dominican Republic has chosen its own way and the Soviets have learned nuclear prudence in Cuba.

President Johnson's policy has been harshly debated. But it has had its successes.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 2, 1966]

The Ingredients for Peace

A room. A table. People willing to talk.

That combination is the way to peace in Viet Nam, President Johnson has told the world. The alternative is an even higher price for North Viet Nam.

The President has delivered the same message, again and again: America has no desire to impose military solutions. But it has the might and the obligation as the free world's greatest power to guarantee that aggression will be more expensive for the aggressors than value of any gains they seek.

American involvement in Viet Nam was originally minor. It has grown, rationally, step by step, because Hanoi and the Viet Cong kept believing there would be a stopping point, a weakening of will, a weariness.

Because they guessed wrong, they have now paid an awesome price. The Communist war machine has been dealt a stunning blow in the loss of a great portion of North Viet Nam's petroleum reserves. The deputy commander of the U.S. 7th Air Force calls it the "most significant, most important strike of the war."

The carefully ordered escalation has been widely misunderstood at home, too. There are many who have counseled for two or three years the action taken only last week. Have they been proven right?

No. For to have made an all-out military drive then would have given lie to a basic American policy. It would have disproved our contention that we wish no higher level of conflict than we are forced to take.

And such abrupt action, taken without careful warning and gradual escalation, could so have confused Russia and China about our intentions that they might have panicked into general war. Both nations are denouncing us now, but there is little sign either will do anything new in the face of the Hanoi-Haiphong bombings. They know the new action was predictable.

Hanoi must realize it too, by now. And the North Vietnamese must know we hold even more punch in reserve. They can end the bombings now, without the loss of an inch of their own territory.

All it takes is "a room and a table and people willing to talk respectfully."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA-U.S.S.R. TRACK MEET CANCELLATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGrath] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McGRATH**. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has announced that it will not send its national track and field team to the United States this month to participate in the scheduled Los Angeles meet which was to have been a continuation of the cultural exchange athletic program began in Moscow in 1958. The reason given for this decision, a mere 2 weeks before the meet was to have taken place, was that members of the Soviet track, squad chose not to come to Los Angeles to show their displeasure over the recent bombings of North Vietnamese military targets.

However, a study of past performances of both the Russian track squads and Russian propaganda use of those cultural exchange athletic meets indicates to me that it was not the activities of American airplanes which precipitated this decision, but rather the activities of American track and field stars, such as young Jim Ryun and Bob Seagren, and our squad of women athletes, considered the most promising in years.

I have always deplored the use of athletics as a propaganda weapon, but despite the manner in which the Soviets have made use of these dual track meets since 1958, we have—and rightly, I feel—continued to participate in good faith. We have done so despite a wide disparity in the conceptions of amateur athletics held by the U.S.S.R. and ourselves, and have held our own in these meets.

It has been well documented that in the Soviet Union, top athletes in every sport are carefully screened and those chosen to represent that nation plucked from the national crop and carefully tended in special training camps where their sole "employment" is to train and practice their specialties. It is likewise well known that in our country, an amateur athlete must train for his specialty while earning his living, and many of our top athletes have withdrawn from Olympic and other national competitions due to their inability to maintain their employment while preparing for competition.

Despite this, we have traditionally fielded excellent teams in every sport popular in this country and some sports which are not generally popular here.

When the first United States of America-U.S.S.R. track meet was held in Moscow in 1958 it was agreed that the competition would consist of two separate meets—a men's and a women's competition. They were to be scored separately, by pre-meet mutual agreement. When the dust had cleared in Lenin Stadium, the scoreboard showed that the American men had outscored the Soviet men by 126 to 109 and the Russian women had won their meet by a 63 to 44 tally. As far as we were concerned, that was it—the American men and the Russian women had won their respective meets.

But this did not satisfy the propaganda-minded Soviets, and their reports of the weekend's activities proclaimed that the Russians had won the international competition by a 172 to 170 triumph through the simple expedient of adding the men's and women's scores together.

Despite this violation of the cultural exchange agreement, we fielded a squad on Philadelphia's Franklin Field in 1959. There the U.S. men's team again outscored the Soviets by 127 to 108 and the U.S.S.R. women outdistanced the American women by 67 to 40. This time, not content with merely repeating their 1958 claim to have won the combined men's and women's meet, the Soviet propaganda mills claimed that the overall 175 to 167 score indicated they were widening their "superiority gap" and told their Radio Moscow audiences in Asia and Africa that this "victory" was symbolic of their increasing mastery of all facets of the competition between East and West.

And they went a step further. America's men had excelled in the field events and short running races while the Soviet long-distance runners left no doubt of their superiority. Russian women outshone America's female athletes in nearly all phases of the competitions. This, the Russians claimed, was proof that Americans may excel where speed over a short haul is essential, but when it comes to "stick-to-it-iveness," the Soviets have the stamina and determination to win out. The symbolism was obvious. Moreover, they said, American women, pampered and idealized, were no match for their Russian counterparts, who forsake frills in favor of hard work and physical discomfort, they declared.

In no uncertain terms, Russia has served notice on the world for two decades that she will catch up with and overtake the United States in production of industrial and agricultural items, cultural activities, and athletic prowess. In no uncertain terms, the Soviet leaders announced their convictions that communism would overtake capitalism all over the globe. The way they have gone about it in the field of athletics gives Americans who will take the trouble to examine it, a good example of how their determination is implemented.

Mr. Speaker, Russia entered the postwar era without any formalized national athletic program. Individual Soviet athletes scored occasional victories in distance running. Russian soccer teams advanced in semifinal rounds in Olympic competitions. U.S.S.R.'s skaters ranked among the best in winter Olympic games. After Stalin's death, however, the new Soviet leaders attacked their physical fitness problem with two thoughts in mind—the obvious need for a healthy, strong, spirited citizenry to accomplish the tremendous tasks the Government set for them and, second, the propaganda value of athletic superiority.

So the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a program called "Guidance of the Sports Movement in the Country," the motto of which was "Sports for All."

Today, Russia has nearly 200,000 sports organizations with a total membership of more than 20 million. New stadia, such as Moscow's 110,000-seat Lenin Stadium, have been built and athletic grounds have been established at factories, industrial settlements, parks and even in hotels, apartment houses and collective farms. The emphasis on physical fitness and competitive athletics in Russian schools has been noted by Americans during their travels in the Soviet Union for the past 8 years.

An example of the manner in which the Russians operate in athletics can be found in the sport of basketball, virtually unknown in the Soviet Union until 1948. As the sport gained in international favor and was added to the roster of Olympic events the Russians determined to become tops in this American-originated sport. Their observers came here, studied the game, and returned to Russia where they evolved a program for development of basketball players. They recruited a team and practiced without fanfare until they felt they were ready. Then, with a 7 foot 3 inch tall center, they showed up at the 1956 Olympic Games at Melbourne, boasting that they would defeat the United States at its own game. They have not yet made good their boast, but they are still trying.

Ice hockey was approached by the Soviets with the same determination, and they developed a world's championship team in 5 years. And on a tour of Canada in 1959, their "amateur" national team lost their first game in an unaccustomed indoor rink, but then they gained a tie and won the next six straight games over the best of Canada's amateur hockey teams.

Statistically, it would seem more probable to find 50 top competitors from among 225 million Russians than from among 190 million Americans. It is easier still when each of the 225 million is forced to keep his body in tip-top shape. And it is ridiculously easy when the Government need only tap the outstanding prospects and assign them "jobs" which consist exclusively of developing their athletic talents.

Last summer, in Russia, the Soviet's male athletes registered some excellent performances and defeated the American men's team for the first time, and, as usual, the Soviet women outscored the American girls. The Russians were unrestrained in their glee as they trumpeted this victory to the world.

But this year, things promised to be different. The performances registered during the qualifying meets for places on the 1966 American squad, both men's and women's, were outstanding, and apparently these performances were not lost on the Russians. Their track coach, Gabriel Korobov, had been preparing the ground for a massive Soviet defeat for several weeks prior to the announcement of the meet's cancellation. He told Russians of the smog in Los Angeles, carefully noting that Americans were "smog insulated." It seems that he eventually found the ultimate "out"—cancellation of the meet.

Mr. Speaker, this seems an even more probable explanation when one realizes that, while the Russian track team will not compete against the Americans because of our involvement in the Vietnamese fighting, the Soviet chess team—which will have no problems with either smog, Ryun, Seagren, or other American stars—will go through with its scheduled cultural exchange "meet" against an American chess team.

The cancellation of this track and field meet is deplorable, no matter what its reasons, Mr. Speaker. Americans have always felt that healthy athletic competition should be completely divorced from political considerations. I feel, however, that as long as the Soviets feel otherwise, it is far preferable that they show their displeasure over the North Vietnamese bombings by canceling a track meet than by following the pattern they favored a few years ago—creating an incident in Berlin.

CONGRESSMAN MORRISON REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following communication is a report which I am sending to some of my constituents entitled, "Your Congressman Jimmy Morrison Reports From Washintgon."

Dear Friend: I am writing this letter to give you a report on my accomplishments in your behalf during the last 24 years that I have had—thanks to you—the wonderful privilege and honor of representing the 6th District in the Congress of the United States.

I am also writing you this letter to ask your vote and support on Saturday, August 13th for my re-election to Congress for my 13th term.

A mayor of one of our cities put it this way when asked of his opinion of Jimmy Morrison:

"In the first place you can't argue with success, and no man has been more successful in Louisiana politics than Jimmy Morrison. There is, of course, a reason for this success, and I believe it is his hard work and dedication. No man tries harder or works harder to please his constituents. He is kind, good hearted, and generous, but overshadowing all of this the greatest attribute of all is the fact that Jimmy is the same fellow on all occasions and at all times. Unlike some politicians, he is the same after election as he is before, the same between elections, and just about the same year in and year out. I can say one thing, I never called on him but that he didn't put forth a great and extra effort to help me. He doesn't just help elected officials like myself, but he helps everyone of his constituents who calls on him regardless of their walk in life."

Quite naturally, I take the mayor's remarks as a compliment and I assure you that I shall continue to work for you, and do the best possible job for you as your Congressman.

As your representative, I have always devoted my full time to the countless problems of our District. The many decisions that I have made over the years have been uniformly based on what you people wished me to do for our District, State and Nation.

Without trying to be boastful, I think you will agree with me that the following projects and actions were tremendous aid and benefit to our District and State.

1. I was co-author of the Bill providing for $357,000 to dredge a 40 foot channel in the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to New Orleans. This has greatly contributed to the great industrial expansion in Baton Rouge and surrounding areas which has added additional wealth and thousands of jobs. This 40 foot channel provides the Port of Baton Rouge with deep enough water for any type of ocean-going vessel. Some of our industries required that this be done before expanding, and some of our new industries required this before building a plant in the Baton Rouge area.

2. The Indian Village-Port Allen cutoff project which I helped start in 1943 and which was completed a few years ago at a cost of $26,869,000 gave Baton Rouge and Port Allen the opportunity of obtaining the wonderful port facility which has meant so much to the area. With this new lock and intercoastal waterway large barges save 126 miles going and coming from the Mississippi River to Texas ports.

3. I worked hard to prevent the capital gains formula from being changed on pulpwood and timberland—greatly aiding this important industry. After Hurricane Betsy left over $10,000,000 worth of timber on the ground, I got the Interstate Commerce Commission to give special low freight rates so that this timber could be hauled by rail to larger mills in neighboring states, thus keeping it from rotting.

4. I have been successful in getting millions of dollars in Federal Funds for the construction of post offices throughout the District. I worked hard for the allocation of $5,000,000 in funds to build the beautiful, new Post Office and Federal building now under construction in Baton Rouge. When the approval of this building was announced, it gave a tremendous boost to the economic redevelopment of downtown Baton Rouge. This is just one example of the effect which new Federal buildings can have on the development and pride of a community.

In addition to this the following communities have received approval for new or expanded postal facilities in the past four years alone: Bogalusa, $324,923.24; Hammond, $393,378.03; Madisonville, $12,000; Slidell, $115,000; Baton Rouge (Istrouma Station), $79,000; Tangipahoa, $12,000; White Castle, $77,000; Baton Rouge (Foster Drive Station), $34,000; Baton Rouge (University Station), $104,000; Abita Springs, $14,000; New Roads, $88,000; St. Francisville, $66,000; Livingston, $20,000; Pearl River, $40,000; Springfield, $17,000; St. Gabriel, $90,000; Mount Hermon, $17,000; Covington, $156,000. Port Allen has a beautiful post office and a new one at Holden is to be constructed. Pearl River's post office has been completed and bids will be taken in a few weeks for Plaquemine's post office.

5. Below is a list of some of the Federal funds I have worked so hard to get for these local projects:

Sewer Facilities, Gonzales	$132, 000
Sewer Facilities, New Roads	165, 000
Sewer Facilities, etc., Hammond	970, 000
Sewer Facilities, Ponchatoula	410, 000
Sewer Facilities, Darrow	132, 000
Gas System, Varnado	120, 000
Water System, Tangipahoa	78, 000
Dredging Bayou Bonfuca, Slidell (this helped the Southern Shipbuilding Co., which has one of the largest payrolls in Slidell)	138, 000
Sewer Facilities, water, etc., Denham Springs	980, 000
Drainage, Amite-Comite Rivers, Baton Rouge	4, 000, 000
Interceptor Sewer, Port Allen	15, 870
Water System, Sun	86, 600
Two Water Systems, Amite	92, 700
Do	83, 570
Drainage for Ward Creek Project, Baton Rouge	1, 600, 000

These are but a few of the projects, as I have been successful in obtaining additional Federal fund allotments for various towns and cities in the Sixth District. When you classify these Federal dollars in jobs, thousands of new jobs were created.

6. I have always been a strong supporter of the Federal highway system, and have worked hard to see that the Sixth District gets even more than its share of funds allocated for the new interstate highway system. In 1965 alone, $26,224,470 was authorized for construction of the system in the 6th District, and 4,150 jobs were created to date; $176,581,633 have been authorized in the District covering work on 132.5 miles of interstate highway and 156 bridges. When the entire system is completed, more than 237 miles of interstate highways will be located in the 6th District at a cost of $342,281,000. This is 40 percent, or almost half, of the entire interstate highway system of the whole State which is located in our Sixth District. I am proud of the fact that I was instrumental in securing approval of the construction of Interstate Highway No. 12 from Slidell, through Hammond to Baton Rouge—the so-called Military Highway—which had at one time been eliminated from the plans by the Bureau of Public Roads.

7. For hospitals at Baton Rouge, Hammond, Ponchatoula, Mandeville, Slidell, Covington, Franklinton, Livingston Parish, Independence, Jackson, Zachary, St. Helena Parish, Bogalusa, Ascension Parish, Pointe Coupee Parish and others, I have secured over $26,000,000. I am doing my best to get more Federal funds. Just recently, I obtained $475,000 for Slidell and $475,000 for Covington hospitals.

8. Devil Swamp Barge Canal in Baton Rouge received over $3,000,000 in Federal funds which will prove to be a great asset in the future.

9. I have worked hard to get over $30,000,000 in Federal funds for L.S.U., Southeastern, and Southern University. Recently L.S.U. received a $3,700,000 grant from the National Science Foundation to use in expanding its excellent science program. Southeastern College in Hammond also recently received $400,000 for construction on its Hammond campus. Southern University at Scotlandville has received several million dollars in the past years.

10. To give you an idea of how hard I have worked to get more federal funds for my district, I might point out the difference in what the people of Louisiana paid out in federal taxes a year or so ago and what Louisiana received in federal funds:

Recent amounts *paid* in all federal taxes by all citizens of Louisiana in one year amounted to $827,640,000.

Recent amount *received* in federal funds in that year, given to Louisiana and its people—$1,741,722,000.

Therefore, Louisiana received almost a billion dollars more in federal funds than Louisiana paid in federal taxes. Think of what a billion dollars a year does for Louisiana's economy in the way of thousands of jobs and added prosperity.

11. I have always worked hard to bring new industry into the Sixth District, and few districts in the United States have had as many new industries located in their respective borders, as has the Sixth District of Louisiana. But I have also done everything possible to cooperate with existing industries by offering my full cooperation at all times. For example, the following have received federal loans with my assistance during the past 2 years alone: Kentwood Brick Co., $531,312; Vulcan Foundry of Denham Springs, $98,000; T. K. Valve, $273,999 for its plant at Hammond; Wilson Steel of Denham Springs, $100,000; Grant-Lehr Corp. of Denham Springs, $125,000; East Ascension Telephone Co., $1,400,000 and many others.

Again all of these federal funds mean new payrolls, with more people put to work.

12. Recently, through my efforts in cooperation with the rest of Louisiana's Congressional Delegation, $2,500,000 was given by the Federal government to L.S.U., Tulane, Loyola and three other South Universities to locate a research center at Covington, Louisiana, which in all probability will develop into a 10 to 20 million dollar institution.

13. Fourteen states made a terrific bid to have the Saturn Project located in their area. I can point with pride that I played a major part in locating this project at Michoud and Slidell, and the operation promises to become the largest industry in the state.

14. I have at all times offered my full cooperation to all civic and governmental agencies in the Sixth District and the state to provide for old age and welfare cases, unfortunate people, sick people, and people who were unable to take care of themselves. During my 24 years in Congress, the Federal Government has assisted Louisiana and citizens of the 6th District with well over $1 billion in welfare and old age pension funds which have been matched by the state.

Think of what this has done for our economy, like our crossroad country stores, small merchants and business in general.

15. I have handled the personal problems of thousands of constituents who called on me concerning matters affecting veterans, farmers, working men and women, day laborers, elderly people, businessmen, and all those with problems who had occasion to call on me in the last 24 years. On each and every one of them, over 50,000 in number, I have done my best and put forth my best effort to assist them.

16. I have done everything possible in the last 24 years to cooperate with and assist the oil and gas industry in the Sixth District and the State of Louisiana. This important segment of our industry has added much wealth to our economy.

17. I have been a staunch backer and have put forth all possible assistance to aid the strawberry farmers, vegetable and truck farmers, tung oil growers, dairy farmers, cotton farmers, small truck farmers, chicken and egg producers, rice farmers, sugar cane farmers, beef cattle producers, and all the other farmers in our Congressional District. That is why my membership on the powerful House Agriculture Committee is so important. I am a high ranking member on this Committee and am Chairman of the Family Farms Subcommittee.

18. I have devoted an enormous amount of time to veterans' problems and have supported all beneficial veterans' legislation in the past 24 years. I was a co-sponsor of the Cold War G.I. Bill, which recently became law and will help thousands of our deserving veterans. I was the author of legislation providing free air mail privileges to soldiers in Vietnam as well as air transportation at surface rates of letters and small packages to and from our soldiers in Vietnam. I was also co-sponsor of a Bill providing for mail airlift of regular mail to and from servicemen all over the world.

19. I am sure you recall the many times I took the Floor of the House to denounce Communism and urge my fellow Members to do everything possible to make this nation strong both within and without. I have worked for and supported all of our defense appropriations, and I feel that our only salvation to continue to be a free and great nation is to keep our country strong, both economically and militarily.

20. I have always voted independently on all bills coming before Congress, always trying to vote as the majority of my constituents wished or wanted me to vote.

My friends, it is difficult to impress upon you how important *seniority* and *experience* are in Congress. No truer words were ever spoken than, "there is no substitute for experience." As far as seniority is concerned, there is no greater valuable asset on Capitol Hill. I rank 31st in seniority out of the 435 Member House of Representatives. In other words, 404 Members stand *behind* me in seniority and only 30 Members stand ahead of me. For any of my opponents to even match this record of 24 years of seniority and experience, they would have to run, not in this August 13th election, but in the year 1990.

With this seniority you have given me and the experience I have gained, I can continue to do the job you want done. When you look at this record, I certainly hope that you will go to the polls on Saturday, August 13th and cast your vote for my *re-election*. Remember, please *vote No. 8*, and if you can, try to get some of your relatives and friends to do likewise.

I will be most grateful.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES H. "JIMMY" MORRISON,
Incumbent.

EYE RESEARCH NEEDED

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the great and growing responsibilities of the Congress to take appropriate action in matters concerning the Nation's health and to support the continuous pursuit of scientific efforts to control diseases which deprive our citizens of a useful existence. The evidence that we are carrying out this function effectively is all around us. The advance of medical science is so rapid, however, that we must be constantly alert that we do not neglect new challenges and new opportunities in health research as they are presented to us by the scientific community. Nor should we neglect glaring needs that are called to our attention.

In recent months it has been brought sharply to our attention that the field of eye research is suffering acutely from such neglect. We have evidence also that, largely as a result of the support given to our medical institutions by the Federal Government, this field of eye research today is our major hope for the conquest of blinding eye diseases. We know that more than half of our citizens suffer from some visual malfunctions. We have been made aware that 3½ million Americans have serious, permanent, noncorrectable eye defects and that blindness is perhaps the major disabling condition in our country. Yet I am told by experts in the field of ophthalmology that more than 80 percent of all blindness is the result of diseases whose causes are unknown to science.

Many of us in both the House and the Senate have become aware, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative to the future of ophthalmic research in the United States , and it is imperative to the health of our people, that there be created within the National Institutes of Health a separate and autonomous National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of eye research. On January 27, 1966, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, introduced a bill—H.R. 12373—to create such an institute and identical legislation has since been introduced by numerous other Members of this legislative body. In the other Chamber, similar legislation has been introduced by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, and, most recently, by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama. The bill introduced by Senator HILL enjoys the cosponsorship of 50 Senators.

The significance of this legislation was stated eloquently by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in a recent address before a group of eminent ophthalmic scientists and I think the substance of Congressman ROONEY's speech is worthy of the attention of the House.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of Congressman FRED B. ROONEY's address before the National Committee for Research in Ophthalmology and Blindness, of Chicago, Ill., on June 25, 1966.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN FRED B. ROONEY, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH IN OPHTHALMOLOGY AND BLINDNESS IN CHICAGO, ILL., ON JUNE 25, 1966

I am very grateful for the opportunity to speak before you today. I welcome the opportunity to share with you, as a layman, some of my personal thoughts regarding a health problem in which I have an intense interest.

And I hope to be able to discuss with you also, as a Representative in the U.S. Congress, what I feel are important elements in the movement to create a National Eye Institute, and to inform you as to the present status of legislation to establish such an autonomous unit within the National Institutes of Health.

It is important, I believe, that we who are representatives of the people in the Congress keep in close contact with you who are the leaders in the eternal search for better health. Government's involvement in health research depends almost totally upon the experience, the knowledge and the advice which is brought to it by the scientific community. When government does become involved, it is essential that we communicate frankly and cooperatively in seeking objectives which will best serve the American people.

It is not possible for us in the Congress to act upon needs and opportunities in medical research unless our attention is drawn to these problems by the nation's physicians and scientists—or by a knowledgeable segment of the public.

Congress today is taking increasing interest in the problems of vision and visual research. The beginning of this interest dates back ten years to the founding of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, under the National Institutes of Health.

Since that time we have seen an intensification of the eye research effort in the nation's medical schools. New work has been started. New ideas have germinated. New enthusiasm has developed among young ophthalmic scientists. And we, your representatives in Congress, have been congratulating ourselves that things were moving along at a lively rate toward the conquest of blinding diseases.

Then, last year, a report was published which provided us with a totally new insight into what was happening, and was not happening, in eye research. The report, "Ophthalmic Research: U.S.A.," was the result of an intensive survey. It was initiated and financed by Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc. and conducted by Dr. Thomas D. Duane, my good friend and neighbor in Pennsylvania.

Dr. Duane's report opened the eyes of many legislators to the fact that the government's investment in eye research had created a rebirth of interest and activity in the search for knowledge of the eye and the problems of visual loss. As Dr. Duane put it, we had created an infant of great vitality and with magnificent potential, but we were neglecting to provide that infant with proper nourishment. At the time of the survey less than $9 million per year was being invested in eye research by all sources of support, both government and private.

The interest of the Congress was further awakened last year by the results of a public opinion survey, sponsored jointly by the Gallup Organization and Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., which indicated that the American people feared blindness more than all other physical afflictions with the single exception of cancer.

These surveys, and the additional insight provided by expert scientific testimony before our House and Senate committees, have highlighted some facts which were never before brought to the attention of your legislators. I am sure the public was not aware of them either.

In the first place, we have been impressed by the opportunities that are present today in ophthalmic research. Many of us have no idea of the enormity of the problem. We do not know the scope of modern eye research and the many pathways that offer hope for the alleviation of visual disabilities that have been tolerated since the beginning of time. I am sure most of us did not realize that the advance of science in a whole host of disciplines has made it possible to attack the conditions which cause blindness from many newly-discovered fronts. We began to see for the first time that a full-scale research effort held hope for success in the eventual eradication of the causes of blinding diseases.

The second area of impact on us—and I must tell you that it has come as a shock to most of us—is the way we are neglecting these opportunities. I am sure that the Congress and the public have believed that eye research was moving along at the same velocity at which other scientific research is progressing.

We have found to our surprise that eye research has been proceeding traditionally as a part-time calling. For years it has existed in our medical institutes under the wing of departments of surgery. We were happy to learn that since Dr. Duane's report there has been a massive movement in our medical schools to give ophthalmology the departmental status it deserves. We are less happy with the realization that in the National Institutes of Health ophthalmology continues to play a minor role among a vast assortment of neurological interests. To my knowledge, ophthalmology does not exist as a division of a department of neurology in any of the nation's medical schools.

When we compare the need with the opportunity, the support we are presently giving to eye research seems inadequate. As legislators entrusted with the judicious use of public funds, we have become keenly aware that blindness is costing the nation tremendous sums of money each year. It is poor economy to provide for anything less than a total research effort in the field of vision, therefore. Dr. Jules C. Stein, Chairman of Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., recently said in testimony before a House Committee, and I quote: "It is time we stopped being content to pat ourselves on the back for all the good things we do for people after they are blind, and start moving vigorously into research that will wipe out blinding diseases at their source."

I assure you that many members of Congress now share this view. We have come to realize that eye research has not kept the pace in a period of magnificent progress toward better health. It is not my intent to place the blame for this situation. It is a universal attitude that visual loss is a fact of life. From physicians themselves we have often heard that loss of sight is an inevitable part of the aging process, that loss of visual acuity is unimportant if it is correctable through the use of glasses, and that we have done enough when we have encouraged frequent eye examinations so that conditions may be diagnosed and treated. They cite improvements in surgical techniques as ultimate advances. Yet I doubt that there are any here who are convinced that surgery and treatment are the ultimate goals to be sought in research, or that the eradication of conditions such as glaucoma and retinal diseases should stand in the wings, awaiting the advance of neurological science.

It seems to me that the public, including the Congress, has been preoccupied with "ultimate" blindness and care of the blind in the mistaken belief that such activity is contributing to the prevention of blinding disease. This emphasis on the plight of the totally or legally blind has tended to minimize the true and terrible extent of the problems of vision that exist among the American people today.

The Congress has become acutely conscious of the need to assess accurately the extent of these problems. It has acted quickly and positively on the recommendation of the RPB survey that the objectives of those engaged in gathering statistics be fully supported, and funds have been appropriated for these purposes.

However, we are aware also that there is deepening professional concern as to whether the statistics that are now being gathered have any application to the problems of today, other than to enumerate some segment of the population which is almost totally blind. There is growing concern as to whether or not these statistics are truly meaningful, or if they are indeed relevant to the problem of visual afflictions which affect our population.

If we are to deal realistically with the problems of vision that plague millions of our people, we must know to what extent disabling conditions such as glaucoma, cataract and retinal diseases have reached into our population. We have need for an assessment of typical segments of our population in terms of their visual acuity, whether or not they are totally blind. These questions cannot be answered through our present system of fact-finding, nor does it seem that a sufficient effort is being made to find the answers. It is said that one and one-half million Americans are blind in one eye—and I am at a loss to find any source to authenticate that figure. To be blind in one eye imposes a tremendous burden on an individual and in many cases would indicate serious jeopardy to vision. Yet, if the other eye is healthy, not one of these people would be reported under our present system of gathering information. It is as though we had decided to measure the extent of crippling in the nation by counting only the number of quadriplegics.

We are well aware of the difficulties involved in gathering detailed statistics on diseases and conditions that are not reportable to departments of health. Yet the Congress is becoming increasingly convinced that the problem of visual loss is far greater in its impact on the American people than is presently being represented to them today.

If you gentlemen are to be provided with adequate resources from both governmental and private sources of research support, then you and I and all of us who are interested in moving vigorously forward in eye research must lose no occasion to change these outmoded public concepts. The public is not aware that important research projects in eye research are being postponed or abandoned because approved applications for N.I.H. grants have not been funded. Nor is the public aware of the impact on the entire field of investigative ophthalmology when valid grant applications cannot be financed. The effect is not only to inhibit the activities of established investigators, but to discourage promising young people from embarking on careers in eye research. It is totally unrealistic, economically naive and scientifically unsound to train people, and then deny them the opportunities for research support that exist in most other areas of medical research.

I think you will understand then why an increasing number of Representatives and Senators are beginning to see the vital need for a separate Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health. I have been impressed by the many scientific reasons for the creation of such an Institute advanced by the many eminent researchers whose advice has been sought on the subject. I will leave it to you gentlemen to discuss the scientific arguments that have been presented. I have heard it said that all the arguments in favor of the separate institute are largely economic and political, while the arguments against it are primarily scientific. This does not coincide with the persuasive case for a separate institute developed by numerous ophthalmic scientists who have had my ear.

Speaking as a layman, it is only necessary to look at the record to be convinced that the only way to move ophthalmic research into the stream of scientific progress, the only way to get the answers to ophthalmic questions, the only way to gather information, to set realistic goals, and to carry out realistic action in ophthalmic research, is to put the vast and complex field of ophthalmology under the leadership and direction of ophthalmologists.

To the statement that the arguments for a separate institute are economic and political, I would answer as a layman that we have only to observe the extent of the blindness problem and to examine the effect of neglect on eye research, to conclude that the present status of ophthalmic research and training in the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is and will continue to be totally inadequate to the scientific needs of our time and of the future.

I am personally convinced, as are many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate, that the NINDB is carrying out its commitment to visual research with the greatest integrity and the best of good will. However, we cannot expect that those oriented to the broad field of neurology will look upon the problems of ophthalmology with the same intensity of interest and enthusiasm that we find among you who have been trained, have practiced and are continuously involved in investigation of every facet of the visual process. It is a matter of great significance to me that in its presentation of testimony before Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY's subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, that the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness outlined its present and projected activities in what amounted to 72 pages of fine type in the printed record of those hearings. In all this material, that which related specifically to programs in visual research amounted to approximtely three pages—some three percent of the text—and none of it indicated the scope of planning, the intensity of activity or the depth of scientific interest that we believe are now essential if the progress of eye research is to move off dead center.

If solid ophthalmic research projects are being held up, if the development of new ideas is being discouraged, if we are failing to take full advantage of promising opportunities, and if scientific research is suffering because the present Institute is oriented in other directions, then I submit that these are indeed *scientific* arguments for a separate Eye Institute.

It is for such reasons that on January 27 of this year I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to create within the National Institutes of Health a separate National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders. Since the introduction of that bill, 27 of my colleagues in the House have indicated their enthusiastic support by introducing identical legislation on the floor.

As for the other chamber, Senator FRANK E. MOSS of Utah was the first to introduce the Eye Institute bill in the Senate on April 15. I think you will be delighted to learn that we now have the full support of Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama who, as you are well aware, is the key figure in the Senate in matters related to the nation's health and welfare. Senator HILL himself introduced a similar bill on the Senate floor just ten day ago.

Senator HILL's proposal includes provisions for specific clinical research. Such research was merely implied in the wording of the bill I introduced in the House.

It is, however, completely in keeping with the intent and purpose of my bill and I see no reason, whatever, why the two versions could not be combined for a stronger drive in the fight against blindness.

We are confronted by one major problem in both the House and the Senate, however, and this is the sheer volume of health legislation proposed during the present session of the Congress.

There have been nearly 400 separate bills directed to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee relating to matters touching on public health. You can readily see that such a volume presents problems for Committee members and for the staffs of the Sub-committees.

As a member of the Commerce Committee, I am pleased with the fact that the Eye Institute bill has been introduced by four of my colleagues. I have had indications of support from other members of the committee as well.

The situation is only slightly less complex in the Senate. A large number of public health proposals are now pending before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, as one would expect.

The fact that Senator HILL has sponsored the measure will insure its fullest consideration, of course. But the Senator has always been scrupulously fairminded in his approach to priorities for legislation, I believe. The prospect for early hearings in either house in this session is not as bright as we might hope, therefore.

It is interesting to note, however, that in the two days immediately following Senator HILL's introduction of the bill, he was joined by 34 co-sponsors. This indicates wide interest in the Senate, also.

In seeking passage of this legislation, you must bear in mind that we must depend upon you who are recognized authorities in ophthalmology and those sciences which are closely associated with ophthalmology. You should by this time be active in convincing influential people, including your own Representatives and Senators, that the creation of a separate Eye Institute is essential to the progress of ophthalmic research, just as I have been convinced by the forthright statements of the Association for Research in Ophthalmology, the Association of University Professors of Ophthalmology, and the American Association of Ophthalmology. As members of such professional groups, and as individual physicians and scientists, you must be ready to present your arguments fully and clearly before the appropriate Congressional committees at such time as hearings are called.

I ask you not to be discouraged by what may seem to you to be excessive caution and deliberation in proceeding toward such a necessary and logical objective as a National Eye Institute. The voice of ophthalmology is unfamiliar, even in this health-conscious nation. The responsibilities of the Congress are enormous and diverse. But I can assure you that it will move in response to the will of the people. It is your job—and I accept it now as my own—to demonstrate continuously and enthusiastically that this step must be taken if we are to move intelligently and vigorously in our efforts to cope with increasing problems of visual disorders and blindness. I can assure you of my personal dedication to this effort. And I am confident of your own.

Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIDER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for July 14, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, on July 18.

Mr. PELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material during consideration of the bill H.R. 15750.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOB WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DINGELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. GIAIMO in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States;

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screwworm eradication in Mexico; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2563. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1965–May 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2565. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the valor of American youth as demonstrated by the award of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service for 1964, pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, Stat. 397–398; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. Additional and minority views on H.R. 14765. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1678, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 390. An act to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; with amendments (Rept. No. 1696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 16114. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 913. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15111. A bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty (Rept. No. 1698). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 16246. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates of pension payable to widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16247. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows and to liberalize and make more equitable the provisions of that title relating to the payment of pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 16248. A bill to make certain expenditures by the city of Tulsa, Okla., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 16250. A bill to provide that certain television and radio receiving tubes be appraised under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 16251. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 16252. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 16253. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to authorize contributions from the general fund of the Treasury to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to the Federal disability insurance trust fund, and otherwise improve the social security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 16254. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of brigadier general for an officer of the Air Force while serving as Assistant Surgeon General for Veterinary Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16255. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 16256. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 16257. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 16258. A bill to abolish the office of U.S. commissioner, to establish in place thereof within the judicial branch of the Government the offices of U.S. magistrate and deputy U.S. magistrate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16259. A bill to amend title XVIII of the social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 16260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities with a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 16261. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 16262. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 16263. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 16264. A bill to revise the Federal elections law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 16265. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 16266. A bill to provide that certain television and radio receiving tubes be appraised under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 16267. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 16268. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 16269. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to State and local governments in an annual amount equal to a specified percentage of the gross national product; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16270. A bill to designate the Blanchard Dam on Bald Creek, Pa., as the Foster Joseph Sayers Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 16271. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 16272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow for deduction for contributions to candidates in Federal, State, or local elections to broaden participation in political activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1212. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower the Congress to regulate the distribution of pornographic literature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 829. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 914. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate certain matters within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 915. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the administration and enforcement of Federal laws; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 16273. A bill for the relief of Mr. George Zaharias, also known as Georgios D. Zaharis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 16274. A bill for the relief of Pablo De Ungria, M.D., and his wife Estrellita Gensoli Ungria, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 16275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William C. Jones (nee Librada Guevara); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 16276. A bill for the relief of Nick Karagianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 16277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara K. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16278. A bill for the relief of World Mart, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 16279. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sabina Riggi Farina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hoffman-La Roche Indigent Patient Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people the indigent patient program conducted by the Roche Laboratories of Hoffman-LaRoche Inc., Nutley, N.J., a pharmaceutical house in my district. This pharmaceutical company has pioneered in the institution of this program in the drug industry, for they have long considered it their obligation to make available a selection of their drugs without cost to indigent sick and handicapped patients in the care of private practicing physicians.

It is in the highest tradition of American medicine for physicians in private practice to care for indigent patients whenever possible, and Roche assists the medical profession in this endeavor by making its products available free of charge.

This splendid example of humanitarianism was introduced during May of 1962. All of the drugs are obtained by the treating physician who informs Roche of the circumstances of each case, the medication needed, and the dosage strength. Hoffman-La Roche does not require the doctor to reveal the patient's name and should the indigent require additional medication, the physician may write to the company and request additional supplies for as long as the patient requires it.

I want to commend one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies for the inauguration of such a program of merit. Once again, we see that it is possible for self-sacrifice and the desire to aid our fellowman to overshadow the profit motive. Even though we enjoy today a most progressive and rich society, there still remain many unfortunate people who are suffering from the effects of ill health and poverty.

The Roche indigent patient program is indicative of the manner in which private industry can work to insure a more secure and comfortable life for our citizens.

Effects of Revision of Residual Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised in a letter from Charles W. Colsen, counsel to the New England Council for Economic Research and Development, dated May 31, 1966, that due to revision in the residual oil import quotas announced by the Secretary of the Interior, March 25, 1966, quotations on residual oil in New England were down 35 cents a barrel from the period immediately before the quotas were removed.

It is estimated by the council that this will result in a saving of more than $30 million to the New England consumer. This, I believe, is sufficient evidence of the wisdom of the strong efforts made by all 25 New England Congressmen in bringing to the attention of the OEP and the Secretary of the Interior, the inequities of the system of import quotas. The old system benefited no one and burdened the consumers of New England as well as placing unnecessary strain upon relations with those countries which are principal exporters of residual oil.

We should be aware that under GATT, the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, subscribed to by some 75 nations, import quotas are regarded as highly inimical to the best interests of world trade. The removal of the import quota on residual oil is in line with GATT policies and I am sure will be so recognized by other signatories in future tariff negotiations.

I am pleased to have had a part in bringing about a decision beneficial to my constituents as well as to our announced policy of liberalized world trade.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication asserted:

> No nation is any greater than its agriculture permits it to be.

There is a great deal of truth in this statement. I believe that many of my fellow Congressmen have become aware of this fact in recent months. Those of us who represent this Nation's highly efficient and productive agricultural States have been aware of this truth throughout our lifetimes. The only change of mind we have experienced relative to our knowledge of the essential role agriculture plays in this Nation's economic well-being is one of increased devotion to the cause of the American farmer and heightened respect for his productivity.

As our Nation has shifted to an era of migration from the farm to the city, many of our citizens have all too often forgotten the farmer. When drought has stricken large sections of our food-producing lands, the city dweller in nonagricultural areas has given it only passing notice. For the city dweller has become so accustomed to the shelves of plenty supplied by the American farmer, that he knows despite the loss of millions of bushels of food, he shall not want for his next meal.

We in America have been truly blessed with an abundant food supply. That blessing has been so extensive that too many have been willing to take it for granted. In failing to respectfully recognize the farmer for the vital role he plays in keeping American stomachs filled and American bodies nourished the general public has all too often done him a great disservice.

When the price of food has gone up many have been too ready and too willing to caustically assail the farmer. They have chided him for his complaints of not receiving a fair price. They felt sure they were correct in doing so because they considered it obvious that he was receiving substanitial income from the additional money they were spending for food.

Some doubted our contentions that though the consumer was paying 33 percent more for food in 1965 than in 1947–49, the farmer was receiving 10 percent less for his product than in 1947–49. I, and several of my fellow Congressmen from agricultural States have done our best to tell the farmer's story throughout the land this year. Our story has been a simple one—the American farmer, rather than being the principal cause, is in reality the victim of inflation. I feel the farmer's story told in recent months has been communicated well. I think the American public has learned a lesson in agriculture and I sincerely hope that lesson can be cast indelibly in the minds of all consumers.

Steadfast in his purpose, undaunted in his willingness to nourish the soul of our countrymen, and determined to blanket this country's fertile lands with abundance, the American farmer has met the challenge of hunger that has throughout history plagued man with sorrow and death. Not only has he met the challenge of this Nation, but he has contributed substantially to meeting the challenge of hunger throughout the world. I know, you know, and the American people know that the farmer will continue to meet this challenge.

Let us now resolve in this period of history when the eyes of the Nation have focused on the American farmer, to pay him his due respect, to assure him of our support and confidence and to pledge him the heartfelt thankfulness he so justly deserves.

Rogers Lauds President's Enthusiasm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have been keenly interested in the future of oceanography were pleased by the enthusiasm shown yesterday by the President at the commissioning of the *Oceanographer*.

The President's call for redoubled efforts in marine science and technology should be a rallying point for our future efforts in ocean research.

As the President pointed out, we have started on this trip into our last frontier, but we still have a long journey. The President's endorsement of oceanography will help speed the journey.

Community Development Districts—Another Layer of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the action of the House Appropriations Committee when, in April 1966, the administration's agricultural budget was trimmed by $113,611,000 less than the original request. This restored funds for proven programs while cutting back where reductions were needed.

One saving I favored, which was made at that time, was a $2,431,000 reduction in the request by the Rural Community Development Service. I agreed with the statement of the committee that existing Department of Agriculture personnel could handle the workload more effectively without an additional layer of supervision. But now we are faced with the revival of a similar request, under the guise of a new bill, S. 2934, despite the fact that the House already this year opposed expansion of the Rural Community Development Service. In addition, S. 2934 would duplicate existing governmental and private programs and would aggravate the problem of inflation.

Thus far, the bill has been railroaded through Congress. Public hearings in the House Committee on Agriculture consumed only 2 days, time which had previously been scheduled for the more vital school milk and child nutrition programs.

A committee minority report expressed disappointment with the limited scope of the hearings, as the committee failed to hear representatives from numerous agencies which conduct programs which would only be duplicated by this legislation. As the bill has been reported favorably by the committee, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the House should take a close look at this bill and vote it down when it is presented for our consideration.

The proponents of this bill allege that it will make available to rural communities the same type of development planning assistance as is now available to urban areas. A regional "community," usually embracing several counties, would be organized through State action and a planning board established in the district with members elected by the governing bodies of the various political subdivisions represented. Then the planning board could receive a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in drawing up development plans.

UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION

The main trouble with the bill is that it may create an administrative boondoggle which will prevent officials at any level of government from solving rural problems. Existing planning programs already are available to rural communities on an individual or multicounty basis. Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 permits Federal planning grants to nine different types of State, local, and regional planning units. Of the grants made under this program through fiscal 1965, $43 million have gone to 4,500 small communities and counties, $23 million to 130 metropolitan and regional planning areas, and $15 million to 30 States for statewide and interstate planning.

In addition to this HUD authority, planning activities are authorized through the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and HEW, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year, the Appropriations Committee noted that rural problems had been handled effectively through the regular established agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which have been working successfully with rural people for many years. These agencies can function more effectively if additional layers of supervision are not added between Washington and the rural areas.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ACTION

In addition, most States and localities have planning agencies of their own, both governmental and private. Local chambers of commerce are deeply involved in community planning. Communities in my State of Wyoming are participating in total community development programs as outlined by the National Chamber of Commerce.

Another rationalization for this bill has been the argument that local communities are not aware of their opportunities under present programs and that this bill is needed to acquaint them with the various Federal programs available. But the Department of Agriculture publishes an Agriculture Handbook which covers every program in existence. The National Chamber of Commerce has a clearinghouse service providing information on Federal programs applicable to local communities. Finally, myself and my colleagues in Congress are only too glad to help any State or local unit of government which is interested in utilizing a Federal program. I, personally, have processed hundreds of such requests.

INFLATIONARY PROBLEMS

With this country involved in a war and with the current problems of inflation, this bill provides for an open-end authorization, so that no one is sure how much money will be spent. Estimates have ranged from $5 million to $230 million.

The House should adhere to its previous policy of supporting the well established and useful agricultural programs, such as the school milk and school lunch programs, while cutting back on the unnecessary spending represented by bills like S. 2934.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The proponents of this bill argue that it would cure the ills of our cities by making the countryside more attractive. I have long been an advocate of helping the people in rural areas in order to discourage them from moving to the cities. It is quite true that many urban problems are the result of rural maladjustments that have been neglected. But these problems will not be solved by more plans. We have plans to implement today, only if we had the funds to do so. The money that will be spent for planning under this bill could be better put to use on current projects. It does no good to spend money on plans if you are afterward too broke to implement them. I represent a State which is largely rural and no one is more eager to develop this area than I am, but more planning boards are not the way to go about it.

There is absolutely no need for this legislation. There has been no evidence presented which shows that there is a deficiency of rural community planning or that there is not sufficient information available concerning Federal programs. This bill would only confuse the situation by creating another administrative unit, duplicating present efforts, and continuing to aggravate inflationary problems.

This session of Congress has compiled an admirable record of safeguarding the economy by reducing inflationary administrative requests. The House should continue to perform this vital role by defeating this unjustified and redundant legislation.

Long Wharf Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Council of the Arts awarded the Long Wharf Theater in New Haven, Conn., a $50,000 grant. I would like to tell you about some of the unique innovations which the theater has instituted.

The Long Wharf Theater is a year-round, professional repertory company. It could be called an experimental theater. The distance between the play and the audience has been eliminated, not only by abolishing the proscenium arch, but also by conducting seminars after the performances, by discussions between the actors and the audience, and by free workshop productions.

In addition to the regular performances, Long Wharf has several special programs. These special programs enable people who ordinarily would have no contact with the theater, to acquire an appreciation and an understanding of the theater.

Young people have benefited especially from the programs at Long Wharf. The high school program brings the theater to the students and the students to the theater. Since October, the touring company has visited 33 schools. During the same time, 17,000 students from 110 schools and 75 towns in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York have taken advantage of reduced student rates to preview regular performances. The Children's Theater presents plays which have been written especially for children. Disadvantaged students in all grades are able to attend productions by means of grants.

The experimental programs also reach two adult groups which have limited incomes. Grants have been established so that the elderly and the members of the adult literacy classes might attend theater performances.

The grant from the National Council of the Arts has helped make these innovations possible. It has enabled the theater to develop independently its unique cultural services and it has enabled Americans from all walks of life to understand and to enjoy the performing arts.

Many of the successes of the Long Wharf project and the recognition given it by the National Council prove the validity of the establishment of this council. Such work as Long Wharf's should clearly be supported, and I am proud to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

Remarks of the President at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Barnaby Keeney as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the 88th Congress I introduced legislation to establish a National Foundation to promote progress in the arts and the humanities.

This idea became a reality in the 89th Congress when the bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

Today, Dr. Barnaby Keeney, former president of Brown University, was sworn in as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities in an impressive ceremony at the White House.

For the benefit of all of my colleagues, but especially for those who cosponsored the legislation, I insert the eloquent remarks of President Johnson on this occasion.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SWEARING-IN CEREMONY FOR BARNABY KEENEY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Carl Sandburg, our great poet and good friend, speaks in one of his poems of our endless search for things beyond mere wealth. Americans, he writes, always come—

"To the time for thinking things over;
To the dance, the song, the story—
Or the hours given over to dreaming."

Today we gather not only to honor Barnaby Keeney as he begins a new chapter in his distinguished career. We are here to help our best minds find "the time for thinking things over"; to encourage our singers and story-tellers; to assist our scholars and thinkers whose hours of dreaming assure our years of greatness.

It has been less than a year since I signed legislation establishing the National Endowment for the Humanities—only a few months since the members of the Humanities Council took their oath in this room.

But in a short time, they have raised large hopes. Under the wise and spirited leadership of Dr. Henry Allen Moe, the Council has underwritten 200 summer fellowships for young scholars and teachers; 50 grants to established scholars in the humanities; awards totaling $300,000 to museums and historical societies for their education projects.

The council's grants are making our American classics more widely available; assisting historical researchers; distributing recorded classics to the blind; and improving the quality of educational television and radio.

The new chairman of the Council and the Endowment, Dr. Keeney, is a product of a great public university—the University of North Carolina—and a great private one, Harvard. He served in World War II and has distinguished himself as a professor of history, dean, and president of Brown University.

But I know he agrees that his new responsibilities will be the most demanding of his career.

For Dr. Keeney and the Council will be dealing with far deeper questions than how to distribute dollars. They will be probing deep into the heart of our people and our society for answers to the ancient mysteries: What meaning has life? What purpose has man?

That is the veil mankind has always sought to part; it is the mystery that has challenged and shaped us as a Nation from the first.

Our first soldiers and politicians were also our first scholars and philosophers. The Nation they brought forth excited all men—because it promised answers to the ancient mysteries, new meaning and fulfillment for man.

Ours was the only Nation ever based on an idea—that all men are created equal—that every man is entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But today, we still ponder the questions of the meaning of life and the purpose of man.

We know the answers are not wealth, or weapons, or wise government. These can help make life possible—but they can never make it meaningful.

So we turn for our answers to those whose profession is ideas; our scholars and writers, our historians and philosophers; our men and women, boys and girls of the Arts and Humanities.

They have contributed as much to our national life as our soldiers and politicians. They have lighted our path for almost two centuries—and the centuries ahead ask even more of their mind and heart.

That is why I have such great hopes for the Humanities Council—greater, perhaps, than the Endowment's budget—but I know that small budgets can spur large imagination.

And if the council has only a small membership and staff, I know that small budgets can spur large imagination.

And if the council has only a small membership and staff, I know that accomplishment does not depend on size.

I think of the Council as a small spark which can give the Nation—and the world—great light.

All of us, Carl Sandburg has written, are reaching out "for lights beyond . . . for keepsakes lasting beyond any hunger or death."

These keepsakes are not the products of industry, or spoils of war, or luxuries of wealth. They are the old ideas, the old words. The older they are, the more their meaning excites all men.

Freedom is one of them. Truth is another.

How well we preserve these priceless keepsakes, Dr. Keeney will depend a great deal on the work which you and your colleagues do.

So I wish you well. I welcome you—and I am happy to be your witness as you take the oath of office.

Thank you.

Noted Americans Honor Washington Correspondent Ben Cole on His 50th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to get prominent people to write perfunctory laudatory letters about someone on his 50th birthday.

But it is impossible to get people to write letters of the warmth of those which follow, unless the person praised has actually earned a warm spot in the hearts of those who do the writing.

To paraphrase Will Rogers, I never met a man who didn't like Ben Cole.

The letters follow:

State of Indiana,
Office of the Governor,
Indianapolis, July 7, 1966.

Benjamin R. Cole, Esq.,
Washington Correspondent,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: Somehow it seems appropriate that you are marking your 50th birthday exactly ten days after the inauguration of Medicare. Fifty years are not the same as sixty five years, but they do demonstrate your determination to reach that golden age when Geritol calls.

Your long tenure as a scribe on the Washington scene probably means you have a book up your sleeve. Louis Ludlow wrote *From Cornfield to Press Gallery.* Your rural beginnings, your service as a political reporter, and your career at the Nation's Capitol match the record of Ludlow remarkably. But your record is Ben Cole's record and you have covered the news of your era well.

Happy birthday, Ben!

Sincerely,
Roger D. Branigin,
Governor of Indiana.

Congressional Staff Directory,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
Washington Correspondent, The Indianapolis Star, National Press Club Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: When we first met during the Indianapolis mayorality campaign in 1947, neither of us were thinking much about fiftieth birthdays or Washington.

This note is to tell you how much I appreciate the full measure of yourself you have given your friends during the short, short nineteen years that have, someway, passed all to suddenly.

During those years I have usually agreed with what you wrote and have always agreed with your sense of justice, your kindness and your sincerity as you wrote.

Together you and I went through an interesting period when, for all to short a time, we had a President in the White House who was younger than we. I expect we, and all those in our general age group, aged more in those days than is possible on any one birthday since.

Congratulations. Happy Birthday. You're only one day older than you were yesterday.

Sincerely,
Charles B. Brownson,
(Former 11th District Representative, State of Indiana.)

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star and Arizona Republic,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cole: I join your many friends in offering warmest congratulations as you celebrate your fiftieth birthday. You have my good wishes for continued good health and happiness and a long career of covering activities in behalf of the people of Indianapolis by Congressmen Jacobs—first the father, now the son, and—who knows—maybe one day the grandson.

Sincerely yours,
John T. Connor,
Secretary of Commerce.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

Mr. Ben Cole,
McLean, Va.

Dear Ben: My warmest congratulations to you upon the anniversary observance of your 50th birthday. I hope in the years to come you will celebrate many more bearing witness to years of health, activity and usefulness.

When I arrived in Washington, of course we were friends already and had worked together when I was in the Legislature and you were working in Indianapolis. I was delighted when you were assigned to Washington shortly after I was elected to Congress. Both in Indianapolis and in Washington it has been extremely gratifying to work with you. You have respected my confidence and I think your reporting has been objective and of the nature that a reporter should strive to achieve. I have always found when I needed information or advice from a trustworthy source I could call on you. This policy has stood the test of years and I have designated you a journalist of the highest integrity.

Because of your pleasant bearing and optimistic attitude, you are always a welcome visitor and I know you will see through the window-dressing to the core of any matter we are discussing.

Just let me say, Happy Birthday from one good friend to another.

Sincerely yours,
Winfield K. Denton,
Member of Congress.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Labor and
Public Welfare,
July 6, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
Correspondent,
The Arizona Republic,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: This is not the first congratulatory letter I've had the pleasure of writing to you and I trust it will not be the last.

Your tenure in Washington goes back much further than mine, of course, but in my limited time here I have come to recognize why you are held in such high professional regard by your colleagues in the press corps, your editors and publisher, and by those members of the Congress whose offices you cover.

Citizens in Arizona as well as Indiana are indeed fortunate to have a man like you reporting in the capital. Your work has always been distinguished for accuracy and fairness, and no public servant could ask for more.

On the occasion of your 50th birthday, it is a privilege to join with your many other friends in Washington in expressing the hope that you will be covering the Arizona-Indiana beat for many more years.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,
Paul Fannin,
U.S. Senator.

Department of Agriculture,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Jacobs: Secretary Freeman is in the Far East and will be out of the country on July 12, when the reception honoring Ben Cole is to be held.

I know the Secretary will be disappointed at being unable to attend this event. Please extend to Mr. Cole birthday greetings and wishes for success and happiness.

Sincerely,
John C. McDonald,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Gates, Gates & McNagny,
Attorneys at Law,
Columbia City, Ind., July 8, 1966.

Mr. Benjamin R. Cole,
c/o Hon. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: I have been advised of your 50th birthday which occurs on Sunday, July 10th.

I am indeed sorry that I cannot attend the reception which is to be held for you on July 12th.

I want to congratulate you upon reaching the ripe old age of 50 years.

It has been my privilege to have known you personally during one-half of that half a century and as you know, I have always had a deep affection for you and have appreciated the fine friendship that we have enjoyed through that span of years.

I trust that you have continuous success, happiness and good health in the years ahead.

I shall always remember you best during those years when you were covering the State House. I recall particularly the time that I sent for you to offer you a position in the State Government and you were under the impression that I had sent for you to be critical on some of the articles that you had written. You were greatly relieved when you found out that I wanted you to take a position in the State Government and that I was not critical of you. You, of course, made a great decision when you stayed with the Indianapolis Star and you have made great progress since that time and your friends are proud of the great success that you have had in the newspaper field.

Again I congratulate you and I am sorry that I cannot be present at your reception. I do trust that before too long a time I will have the privilege of seeing you and enjoying a good visit.

I am grateful to Congressman Jacobs in advising me of this occasion and giving me this opportunity to write you.

With kindest personal regards to yourself and family, I am

Sincerely,

RALPH F. GATES,

(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
July 12, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply regret my inability to be with you tonight for reception honoring Ben Cole. He is an excellent correspondent, one in whom I have the highest esteem, and I only wish I could be there with you in marking his 50th birthday. The Arizona Republic is as proud of him as am I.

BARRY GOLDWATER.

(Former United States Senator, State of Arizona.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: It's a pleasure for me to offer birthday congratulations.

And it's doubly pleasant to join in a tribute to you and your service to your newspaper and to the people of Indiana.

Since words are your stock and trade, I couldn't hope to impress you with my Congressional rhetoric.

I'll say only that I appreciate your interest in the Ninth District. I appreciate your accuracy and honesty in writing about me and my work. And, on behalf of all Hoosiers, I appreciate your fine sense of humor.

Your friendships on both sides of the aisle attest to your integrity and fair play.

Many happy returns of the day.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

HANDLEY & MILLER, INC.,
July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
National Press Club,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I couldn't pass this opportunity to extend birthday greetings from both Barbara and myself, and to wish you continued health, happiness and success in the years ahead.

As one who is already past the 50th meridian of life, I do want to reassure you that life really does begin at 50—that is if you just care anymore.

I am only sorry that I can't attend Andy's birthday reception for you Sunday but, unfortunately, HARTKE still has my plane ticket in his pocket, and has had since '58.

Best wishes.

Your old friend,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY.

(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: It gives me great pleasure to add my good wishes for continued success upon this most fitting observance of the 50th birthday of one of Washington's most outstanding correspondents, Ben Cole.

My acquaintance with Ben dates back many years. I am proud to say that my esteem and appreciation for his fine talents as an excellent journalist and a truly fine person have grown over the years and have become deeply rooted into a lasting friendship.

Congratulations, Ben, for the splendid record you have made for yourself not only on the Washington scene, but also with your readers throughout the years.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I am indeed pleased to congratulate you as you celebrate your fiftieth birthday. Speaking from experience, I can assure you that the second half-century can be even more enjoyable than the first. All of us who have come to know you and appreciate your keen insight into the Washington world and to value your opinions and advice are indeed grateful for the service you have rendered, not only to those of us in the Congress, but to the public as well. I am sure that we can continue to enjoy the warmth and wisdom of your friendship and understanding for many years to come.

You are an honest newsman—indeed a credit to your profession—and, above all, a good and dear friend. I am proud to be among those who honor you on this auspicious occasion. Many, many happy returns.

With best personal wishes,

Your friend,

CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senator.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLE: Recently I heard a journalistic anecdote which may be an old one to you, but it was a new one to me. It goes like this.

A new copy boy, working nights on a large metropolitan paper, stopped the night managing editor and announced that he had been a copy boy long enough, he now wanted to be a reporter. When the editor asked him why he felt he was qualified to be a reporter, the boy replied, "I've been watching them. It's easy!"

I suspect that the readers of your newspaper columns may be somewhat like the copy boy: your excellence and journalistic ability make it seem so easy. On the contrary, I know that it has taken dedication to duty and painstaking effort to interpret correctly for the enlightenment of your readers the many facets of the Washington scene.

I send heartiest congratulations to you on this day, your mid-century birthday. I hope that all the readers you serve will continue to benefit for many years to come from your insight and uncanny ability to analyze and report the complex national and political problems that face our nation and affect us as individuals. Without reporters of your great interpretative ability, we citizens would be hopelessly entangled in shrouds of ignorance and misunderstanding.

With many happy returns of the day, I am,

Yours most cordially,

FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANDY: Thank you for your kind invitation to the Vice President to attend a reception celebrating the birthday of Benjamin Cole to be held July 12.

The Vice President would like to be able to accept. Unfortunately, he will be in St. Louis at that time. However, the Vice President has asked me to pass along his regrets and to thank you for thinking of him.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM CONNELL,
Administrative Assistant.

JACOBS AND JACOBS,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 10, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SON: Ben Cole is a kind, generous and just man. His discourse is stimulating and always seasoned with good humor. He would never willingly hurt anyone.

You are good to honor him on his 50th birth anniversary. He was your friend when you were a boy. He comforted me while you were away at war. He is my friend and I consider him one of God's noblemen.

You recall that through the years I have told you that he was one of the few I missed when my constituency came to miss me so deeply it voted overwhelming for me to come home.

May Ben have as many more birth anniversaries. The world will be richer for every one.

Love,

ANDREW JACOBS, Sr.,

(Former 11th District Representatives,
State of Indiana.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been asked to respond further to your invitation to the President to attend the reception you are planning for Mr. Benjamin R. Cole on July twelfth.

Although it will not be possible for the President to attend or send a personal message, he is certainly appreciative of your thoughtfulness of him and sends his warm, good wishes for the occasion.

Sincerely,

W. MARVIN WATSON,
Special Assistant to the President.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, July 11, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COLE: It is a pleasure to join in paying tribute to a talented journalist.

Although the term "public service" is generally used to describe government work, it is most certainly applicable to your career as a seeker and reporter of truth.

Best wishes for continued success.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH.

MCHALE, COOK & WELCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Providence has given to America riches, strength, and power, and may I paraphrase Bill Herschell who wrote "Ain't God Good to Indiana" by saying "Ain't God good to The Indianapolis Star and its reader for He has given us Benjamin R. Cole, Indiana's greatest Washington correspondent". I regret that I cannot be present to celebrate the deserving recognition you will be accorded on your 50th Anniversary by your many friends in recognition of your great ability to accurately and fairly report the doings and happenings in Washington without slanting the facts. In so doing, you have ingratiated yourself into the hearts of us all and when the legislative history of Washington during these years is written, the historians will have to get the facts from Ben Cole's files.

I am proud of you and of your great work and of the fact that I went through high school in Logansport with your beloved mother and your uncle, and therefore, I could expect nothing else from you.

As the Irish would say, "May the good Lord hold you in the palm of His hand and may the wind be ever at your back" for many more years.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. MCHALE.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
Rochester, N.Y., July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: Many thanks for the invitation to join the birthday party for Benjamin R. Cole.

As one who regards Washington as the news capital of the world, and who never ceases to recall with pleasure five years on the Washington scene, I would like nothing better than to meet with you, Ben Cole and the others—I never miss a Washington press corps rally if I can help it.

I have a trip to the mid-West on Tuesday, however, so all I can do is say thanks again for counting me in and congratulations on the idea of honoring Ben Cole, one of the tops in the Washington press corps.

With very best wishes to you both,

Cordially,

PAUL MILLER, *President.*

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star and Arizona Republic.

DEAR MR. COLE: I want to join with your many friends in extending heartiest congratulations to you on your birthday.

May you enjoy good health and happiness today and for many years to come.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Central Newspapers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Happy Birthday! It is a real pleasure to express my good wishes to you on your "half-century" mark—and it would take another half-century to say thank you for your friendship and many kindnesses to me. Arizona, as Indiana, is proud to claim you, and fortunate to have a newspaperman of your integrity, dedication and talent on whom to depend and call. Working with you over the past years has been a very gratifying and happy experience, and I look forward to many more years of this pleasant association.

May you have many more happy birthdays, each bringing you only the best and happiest years.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Bureau, The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: One of the real pleasures of being a Member of the Indiana delegation in Congress is the constant working acquaintance and friendship I have with you.

Not only are you a competent and careful craftsman of the journalistic trade, but you are a true friend and adviser to those of us who represent the people of Indiana.

In my three terms in the House, I have come to regard you not only as a fine correspondent and talented writer, but actually as another Member of the Hoosier delegation in Congress.

We have all benefitted many times from your great store of governmental information and experience, and your wealth of Indiana and national political knowledge.

I consider you, Ben, as one of the finest newsmen on the Washington scene, and wish to offer my sincere congratulations for your past years of service to your employer and the citizens of Indiana.

My warmest wishes, too, on your 50th birthday. May it be the beginning of a very happy and successful year for you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: Thank you for your letter of July 5 inviting Secretary Rusk to attend a reception in honor of your friend Mr. Benjamin R. Cole and to send a message of congratulations on the occasion of his 50th birthday.

Secretary Rusk has not yet returned from his trip to the Far East, but in view of his very full schedule following his return I regret that he will not be able to accept your kind invitation to the reception or to send a message. I know, however, that he would want me to send best wishes on his behalf to Mr. Cole.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

KNOX, IND.,
July 9, 1966.

DEAR FRIEND BEN: I am proud and happy to extend my warmest congratulations on your 50th birthday, and regret very much that I cannot attend Representative JACOBS' party in your honor on the 12th. I well recall our fine relations during your tour of duty at the State House and I still enjoy your column in the Star.

Best wishes to you and your loved ones.

Sincerely,

HENRY F. SCHRICKER.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana).

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Arizona Republic,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: It occurs to me that July 10, 1916, was a rather significant date in history. For example, on that day the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Omnibus Revenue Bill by a vote of 240–140, Pancho Villa issued a proclamation declaring his intention to recapture parts of Arizona for Mexico, the French advanced to within one mile of Perrone in their drive to remove the Kaiser from France, and President Wilson told a World Salesmanship Congress in Detroit that the Democratic Party was a friend of business.

Yet one must confess to a certain disinterest in the aforementioned when they are compared to an even more momentous event of overriding importance—the birth of Benjamin R. Cole.

Ben, we are indebted to your mother and father for their foresight. Without your fine, journalistic hand, life here in Washington might occasionally grow tedious.

My very best wishes to you on this birthday. The entire staff joins with me in the hope that the next 50 years will be just as you want them to be.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

As always,

GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 9, 1966.

DEAR BEN: Andy's much appreciated letter announcing your 50th birthday on Sunday, July 10th, and inviting me to the reception in your honor on Tuesday, reached me during my absence from Court while on vacation. I am grateful to him for the announcement and invitation so that I too can be among those of your host of friends to give you birthday greetings and best wishes on this happy occasion.

I need not tell you of the high esteem in which I have always held you, both as a man and as a writer—my warm regard and respect for you, I am sure, have spoken that message many times. So it is with real joy that I—and Vitallas joins me—wish many, many more happy birthdays, and may you and your family be blessed with an abundance of good health in the years to come.

Except for the distance that separates us, I would certainly be present on Tuesday.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,

Cordially,

BILL STECKLER.

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL,
New York, N.Y., July 6, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
c/o Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
234 Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN COLE: I regret very much that I cannot attend the reception that Congressman JACOBS is giving in your honor on Sunday, July 10. I am compelled to be in Chicago this weekend and will not be able to get back in time.

Although I have not had the privilege of meeting you personally I know your name and your reputation quite well and I salute you on the fine work that you have done for your newspapers in Washington over the years.

I'm glad that Congressman JACOBS is celebrating your birthday and not your retirement. Carry on!

Cordially,

MIMS THOMASON,
President.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN COLE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Not only do I want to congratulate you for the singular achievement of reaching the age of 50 with your imagination, professional integrity, and zest for the job undiminished, but I also want to congratulate ANDY JACOBS for having the foresight to honor you on this occasion.

As ANDY noted, the first Congressman from Indiana you were assigned to cover was his father. In a similar vein, when I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman you were the first reporter that it was my pleasure to become acquainted with. The constructive and understanding way you have covered not only Arizona news but my own personal part in it has earned you my greatest respect. I am happy to count you among my best friends and hope we are both around to mark the successful conclusion of your second 50 years.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Indianapolis, July 7, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: As you reach the ripe, young age of 50, I want to join your host of other friends in expressing appreciation for the fine job you have done and are doing to keep us Hoosiers informed about the Washington scene.

With your background of reporting governmental and political affairs in Indiana, you continually bring to us news and comments tailored to Hoosier readers. The fact that you occasionally deal with the antics as well as the actions of legislative and administrative leaders in Washington, and particularly of those from Indiana, adds flavor to the newsy reports and columns.

John Barnett tells me the members of the State Chamber staff rely heavily on your informative weekly reports outlining the votes of Indiana members of Congress on issues.

I wish you many more happy and successful years of reporting from Washington about Hoosiers and for Hoosiers. If our paths do not cross before then, I hope in any event to have the opportunity to visit with you again at the Chamber of Commerce Congressional Reception next spring.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. WALB,
President.

JULY 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
℅ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
234 Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Congratulations on your many years of faithful interpretation of Washington to Hoosiers.

Knowing the characters involved as I do, I have a real appreciation of the quality of the job you have done and sincerely feel that all of us have a much better understanding of the problems of our national government.

May we have many more years of your wisdom!

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. WELSH.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

How Long Will the War on Poverty Last?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the innovator of the war against poverty in modern times was the Emperor Napoleon III. After his exile, he continued to write about this favorite subject in London. But even Napoleon III had the intent of ending poverty in his country, France.

We had understood this was the intent here too—to end poverty yesterday if not tomorrow in the United States of America, to wipe it out, to eliminate it. Alas, this does not seem to be the true intent of this administration.

For Lyndon B. Johnson has allowed the Office of Economic Opportunity to buy a vast array of new office equipment. Included are such items as electric typewriters, file cabinets, film cameras, and a host of others. This monumental acquisition of shiny new supplies for the sumptuous offices of those directing the war on poverty can only mean, I submit, that the President and his aids expect our poverty war to go on a long, long time. I only hope that the purchase of adding machines does not mean that in the back of the high command's mind is the thought of adding to the number of poor.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Post Office, all agencies which have proved they can, given the chance, produce, have been ordered to cut new equipment to the minimum. The Army in Vietnam may have 29 items in short supply in the Vietnam war area as reported by a Senate committee.

But Sargent Shriver's chair-borne home command is now adding to its record of having stamp lickers getting $50-a-day record salaries, the best and newest machines for their war in which the poor are often the chief sufferers.

I would suggest that if the President does not intend the war on poverty to go on forever, he might at least order the new machines for the permanent agencies and let Sargent Shriver's circus employ their used equipment. Or maybe the money could even go to help the poor.

Pioneer Spirit—1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the pioneers first started filtering into the south Florida area, the only contact they had with their friends and relatives in the North was by mail.

The mailman of the last 1800's and early 1900's did not have to worry about a 70-pound limit or a ZIP code. He had only to worry about Indians, alligators, hurricanes, bandits, and sore feet.

For you see, the mailman, aptly titled the Barefoot Mailman, serviced the hamlets and towns between Baker's Haulover in Miami and Jupiter Inlet by foot, walking the distance of nearly 70 miles on the beach.

As we grew sophisticated and the methods of transportation improved, the route of the Barefoot Mailman was abandoned and assumed by more modern methods.

But each year Boy Scout and Explorer units undertake the trip. They made the same trek under existing conditions as the Barefoot Mailman did some 80 years ago. They sleep on the beach at night and walk by day.

I would like to commend their incentive and sense of history. I only wish that other youths might be inflicted with such a pioneer spirit.

Address of Vice President Humphrey at Michigan State University Commencement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point in the RECORD to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the remarks made by Vice President HUMPHREY at the recent commencement at Michigan State University. He congratulated American youth, our greatest natural resource, and encouraged them, while being mindful of the lessons of history and past traditions, to have the will to do and the soul to dare for the future challenges and responsibilities of this great country.

The text of the address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH., JUNE 12, 1966

HUBERT HUMPHREY feels a kinship with college students.

I like to be where the action is.

I was raising Cain with the system before you were born, and as I am just beginning to get started, I don't doubt that I will be raising Cain when you are running things too.

In fact, I wish I were being graduated today. I might have a better idea where my next job is coming from.

Today I speak in a relatively new role. I speak for management.

As management's spokesman, I wish first to thank you for service to your nation.

In all these years of study, I am sure you thought you were improving your position to compete in the years ahead or to enter a profession. But you today are more than college graduates.

From management's viewpoint, you are valuable national resources.

More Americans are in college this year than all the Americans alive when our nation was founded. More Americans are in graduate schools today than all the Americans who bore arms during the Revolution. Those are lots of resources.

And we will need them all.

For by the time one of you is likely to stand in this place at some future Commencement, the American people will number more than 300 million—and the people in the world almost too many to even think about.

And I need not recite for you the future needs and problems of those people.

You will be in charge. You will be responsible for our national security and my medicare.

You will be responsible for the education of my grandchildren and the freedom of my great-grandchildren.

So I propose to take a look at you and have a talk with you.

But first, about your parents—it may be hard to believe but, in another century's history books, the very people who have been helping with your tuition may be ranked among the greatest radicals in modern history.

Some of your parents might flinch if you told them there were radicals in your family. But they have been nothing less.

Theirs is the first generation in all of history which, by its own hand, has surrendered the privilege of telling its offspring: This is how things are; this is how they always have been; this is the way the world goes.

Your fathers and mothers were born children of hills and valleys. Today they see the galaxy itself.

They have created amazing new systems of management, science and technology. They have found new and better systems to care for people. And I have been right in the midst of it with them, just as I am with you.

I am not going to bore you with tales of the Great Depression, or of World Wars, and of the hardships your parents faced. Nor will I recount the struggles that took place in our country to achieve the measure of well-being and social justice we have reached today.

But I can tell you, it has been no picnic. It has been no improvised "happening." It has taken involvement, and hard work, and study, and self-doubt, and passionate disagreement, and finally, understanding and motion.

Progress has ridden no fast express. It has been a local all the way. Thus, as older generations welcome you aboard, I think you ought to know that they've not been cooling their heels waiting for you.

The generation of your parents has lived amid the floodwaters of history. Most of them have known genuine hardship. Many of them have lost loved ones on other continents. Their old horizons have gone far off in space, yet they have followed, cautious but willing. The world has come to their dinner table, and at times has seemed to stay a long while, yet they remain hospitable.

They have made history. Yet to many of you, I know, it seems "the heavy hand of history." Remember this: The challenges they have faced didn't leave room for some of the niceties of today.

They have had to meet trouble in large sizes. They have had to feed and clothe and house and transport and produce and educate and struggle in big portions, just to overcome the clear and present perils of their time.

Individualism has been the backbone and concern of their work. Yet to serve the individual, they have had to build on a scale which has seemed at times to dwarf the individual. By and large they have been, I believe, a resourceful and courageous generation. And now, to you, I know, it seems they have hidden their history. Over the battlefield they have laid out the golf course.

For those of you who have grown up within putting distance of a country club or within walking distance of a second car, it is hard, I know, to recognize many vestiges of radicalism. "Where's the action?" you ask. And I reply: There's plenty of action. Roll up your sleeves and have some.

Your parents had to fight desperately, at your age, to stave off poverty at home and violence abroad—and they in large part succeeded.

Yet the challenges you face are far greater, and far more exciting, than those they faced. The scale of effort to be required of you will be far greater than that required of them.

For the fact of our time is this: The poverty our nation knew in the Great Depression . . . the peril that mankind knew in World War II—these are nothing compared to the poverty and peril that surround our strong, rich America in the world today.

There are desperate conditions of injustice and hunger and disease throughout most of the human family.

There are, in human society, conditions which not only bring a sense of shame and insufficiency to those of us who live in such a blessed land . . . but conditions which can lead to the eruption of the little disorder, which can grow to the small war, which can build to the cataclysm which could destroy rich and poor, black and white, believer and non-believer—all of us alike.

That is where the action is.

This is the environment in which you will be in charge. This is the human adventure on which you embark. I believe you sense the full measure of what you face. I feel a sense of concern and of involvement among you. I have seen you in the Peace Corps, helping strangers. I have seen you marching down dusty roads on behalf of fellow Americans whose skin doesn't happen to be white. I have seen you, in VISTA, lifting the forgotten to a place of self-respect in life. I have seen you, standing calm, resisting the temptation of violence, for what you believe in.

I have seen you, wearing your nation's uniform, fighting bravely for a cause far more difficult to understand than any we have defended before. I have seen you speaking out, from deep personal conscience, without thought of personal popularity. You perform remarkably well in the system your parents built, yet I know that you are probing relentlessly to find your own personal relationship to it . . . desperately seeking identity in a society of bigness.

For your generation, the old labels seem to have little meaning. Whether you are part of the "New Left" or the "New Right" or the "Out" or the "In," your concerns are far more for basic humanity than they are political. And I think it is a mistake to see in either your protests, your reservations, or your dissent, much than can fit into the traditional political categories.

Indeed, if much of our political history seems to have escaped you, you are not too troubled by the loss. You are deeply and personally caught up in what matters today. You set high standards for yourselves, and you judge yourselves harshly. And you show a remarkable degree of serious introspection for the children of prosperity. And I sometimes fear that, in your introspection, you may come to believe you are alone.

I tell you now that when you stand alone, you are not alone. When you speak out and act alone in America, you are more a part of this land and more a source of its strength than are all of the multitude who join in silence, no matter how vast they may seem. "The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us," said Ibsen, "is the compact majority." Oppose that compact majority, and you are sure to collect a few bruises. But I have found that the best remedy for a bruise is to collect a few more.

The more you speak out, and the more you act, the more you are going to discover that you are lending courage to a surprising number of people whose feelings will come to the surface in response to yours.

True freedom in any land is a relentless, never ending process of self-discovery among its people. This you will preserve, for our own land, not because it is your inheritance; nor because some destiny says you must; but because your own free search for individual identity in the living present, demands it.

The strongest bulwark of liberty is man, free and in search of himself. A good number of your generation have already learned this lesson, in search of themselves in places and causes far distant from East Lansing, Michigan.

It is your opportunity to carry that lesson into forgotten corners of our country—and of the world—where people have never had any reason to learn it, or believe it.

We face today the incomparable opportunity—in the red dust of South American villages, in the neon minefield that is Watts, California—to stimulate the will to seek identity and to discover one's course.

You will be tempted to chart your progress by Gross National Product or by trade indices, or by many other of the quantitative measures you so distrust today.

Keep your distrust of these things. Measure your progress by whether those you help—those who have known in their lives nothing but despair and defeat—by whether they can begin to have faith, by whether they can begin to have hope, by whether they can begin to find themselves.

Yours is the opportunity to prove in the world what the generation of your parents has already begun to prove in America: That the course of history is not a mindless juggernaut we are powerless to control, but a fresh challenge susceptible to courageous action in each generation. I hope you will be sensitive to that opportunity. I hope you will waste no time in seizing it.

The story is told that Pericles of Ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply devoted to causes, who wished to change immediately what was wrong in the world. Pericles chastized the young man for being too bold and brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men. The older man patronizingly said: "Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved." To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

Despite the fact that I represent management here today, I will tell you this: If you do not choose to follow, precisely the trails that others have blazed, then I do not think we ought to count the future unsafe in your hands.

In your search for identity and self-knowledge, you will have much to discover before you determine what is worthwhile, and what is worthless. But in a land of individuals, better the mystery of the search than some counterfeit security. In a world society desperate for change, better your dedication to it than your fear of it.

It is the special blessing of this land, that each generation of Americans has called its own cadence, and written its own music—and our greatest songs are still unsung.

Peter Schoemann Honored by Wisconsin State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wisconsin delegation to Congress participated in a luncheon meeting at the Congressional Hotel at which the Wisconsin State Society presented its first annual Distinguished Citizenship

Award to Peter Schoemann, president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, a distinguished son of the State of Wisconsin.

I am happy to insert in the Record at this point, a report of the proceedings on that occasion:

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS FOR AWARD PRESENTATION OF THE WISCONSIN STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C., TO MR. PETER T. SCHOEMANN, GENERAL PRESIDENT, UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPE FITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 13, 1966

(Mr. Jerome O. Hendrickson, President, Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., presiding)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The invocation will be delivered by Bishop Tanner.

Bishop TANNER. For the invocation today I have chosen the Blessing of St. Benedict: O Thou who clothest the lilies and feedest the birds of the sky, who leadest the lambs to the pasture and the hart to the waterside, who has multiplied loaves and fishes and converted water into wine, do Thou come to our table as Guest and Giver to dine.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We are happy to see you today. I want to read some communications: John Cosgrove, Assistant Director in the Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning wrote as follows:

"Dear Mr. Hendrickson: I deeply appreciate the invitation of the Wisconsin State Society to honor Mr. Peter T. Schoemann on the occasion of the presentation of the Distinguished Citizenship Award to him on July 13, 1966.

"I regret that I cannot be with you. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than joining in so deserved a recognition. I worked with Mr. Schoemann in his capacity of Chairman of the Standing Constitutional Committee on Education of the AFL–CIO, and know of his contributions to education in general and the National Defense Education Act in particular. His dedication, integrity and qualities of leadership continue to be an inspiration to all of us who have the privilege of associating with him in whatever capacity.

"Please extend my regrets and cordial best wishes to Mr. Schoemann on this important occasion."

I also would like to read a telegram from the Staff of the Milwaukee Labor Press:

"Our best wishes on being designated Wisconsin's most outstanding national labor leader. May God continue to bless your future endeavors as he has in the past."

I would like to make some introductions:

Mr. James P. Schoemann, the son of the man we are honoring this afternoon. Jim Schoemann is the Administrator of the International Training Fund, a joint labor management trust which extends financial and technical assistance for the apprentice and journeyman training of the plumbers and pipefitters;

Congressman ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Representative of the 2nd District of Wisconsin;

Andrew J. Biemiller of Milwaukee, former member of our Wisconsin Congressional Delegation and currently Legislative Director of the AFL–CIO;

John Loomis, a Vice President of the Wisconsin State Society and former General Counsel of the Agency for International Development;

William F. Schnitzler, Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL–CIO and a colleague of our honored guest on the AFL–CIO Executive Council;

The Treasurer of the Wisconsin State Society, Charlotte Norris;

Casey Ireland, Secretary of the Wisconsin State Society;

Congressman LYNN E. STALBAUM, from the 1st District of Wisconsin;

Charles Donahue, Solicitor of the Department of Labor and former Research Director of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters;

Congressman JOHN A. RACE from the 6th District of Wisconsin;

The Most Reverend Bishop Paul F. Tanner, native son of Milwaukee and the General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference;

The Honorable John F. Henning, Undersecretary of Labor;

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, past President of the Wisconsin State Society and Representative of the 5th District.

We had expected to have with us today at the head table Mr. Martin J. Ward, General Secretary-Treasurer of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, who was regrettably called away to Chicago yesterday by the untimely death of his father.

My Executive Committee directed that this presentation ceremony be bipartisan, and we are very fortunate to have received acceptances from the two Wisconsin Members of the House of Representatives who have the longest term of service for their respective parties.

Our Democratic Representative is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is my distinct pleasure to present Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Representative from the 4th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Hendrickson.

Your Excellency, Bishop Tanner, our Honored Guest, my Colleagues, distinguished guests, this is truly a great privilege for me to be able to say a few words today as the Wisconsin State Society honors one of America's outstanding labor leaders and a fine son of Wisconsin, Peter T. Schoemann.

Knowing you as I do—your vast energies, your broad range of interests and your searching intellect—it is not easy to select one or two topics to dwell on in the few minutes alloted to me.

Since this week in Congress we are considering the Foreign Aid Bill, I think it appropriate to dwell briefly on the contributions which Pete Schoemann and the American labor movement are making to American policies and programs abroad.

As you all know, the AFL–CIO has supported the President 100 percent on Vietnam and our efforts to block communist aggression there and everywhere.

Pete Schoemann has been one of the most outspoken of our labor leaders on this subject. He has frequently stated his support for President Meany's vigorous anticommunist stance on the part of American labor in international labor circles. Among labor leaders from other nations he has been a constant, effective proponent of U.S. policies.

To me, Pete Schoemann represents the dedication to the American way of life of the labor movement in this country.

Communism, as you know, has classically aimed its appeals at the workers of the world, promising them a paramount place in their "new society."

American labor has rejected these blandishments and, for the most part, has refused even to toy with the suggestion that there might be something to gain under communism.

At the same time, our trade unions have been in the forefront of the free labor movement of the world. They have tried to impress upon the workers in other countries the benefits which can be obtained through participation in a democratic system.

In short, Pete Schoemann and other American labor leaders have not been content to be merely anti-communist. Rather, they have made, and are making, vigorous efforts to promote free institutions abroad which can act as a bulwark against Marxist philosophies, and rarely has any effort had such success as that undertaken by the labor movement.

For example, the Foreign Aid Bill now before the House contains a provision for assisting labor's efforts at providing low-cost housing for workers in Latin America.

American labor has invested millions of dollars and much time and effort in demonstrating U.S. techniques for building, financing and marketing privately developed housing. In doing so our trade unions have helped alleviate a crying need for decent housing for Latin American workers.

But Pete Schoemann can tell you much more about this labor program than I can. He has been in the forefront of these efforts, as he has been in the forefront of other progressive projects of American labor.

Because of his leadership, Pete has gained tremendous respect here on Capitol Hill and in the Executive agencies downtown. He has become well known in the past few years as one of the most vocal and effective spokesmen for the labor movement.

His fellow plumbers and pipefitters are all indeed fortunate to have such an able leader, and a man who is unafraid to speak out courageously on those public issues which touch the welfare of his own membership and the entire labor movement.

It is our hope that this Citizenship Award from your fellow Wisconsinites will—in some measure—express the general recognition which exists in Washington for the fine contribution which you, Pete Schoemann, are making to the labor movement and the progress of our nation.

Congratulations!

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Now, we are privileged to call upon Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of the 10th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and my colleagues in the House: After the very appropriate remarks made by Clem, I think that any words will merely be supplementary to the wonderful thoughts that he has expressed.

It is a great privilege for me, Pete, to be here and to take part in the ceremonies honoring your great service and your great contribution.

Just because we are honoring and awarding you today doesn't mean we are asking you to quit and to give up. You are still young in spirit, you are still young in heart, and you still look young.

Pete, people of America, people of Wisconsin, and people of the world I think have good memories of your dedicated services to mankind.

You know it is an accomplishment to be singled out in your life for a single accomplishment. It is an honor to be designated as a great labor leader and to be designated so in one field. That in itself is honor enough. But when you have a man who is singled out not only for his contribution to labor but for his contribution to another field of activity, then I think that is a real achievement and real accomplishment.

Peter is known in the field of education for his accomplishment in that field just as he is known for his accomplishment and achievement in the field of labor.

There are hundreds of thousands of young people in America today who are enjoying the privilege of education because Pete was a forerunner in that field. Because Pete felt what good does it do to bring all these emoluments to labor if they don't have the privileges and benefits of getting the fruits of that labor, namely, getting their children adequate education.

One of the reasons the United States of America ranks as high as it does in the field of vocational education is because of the pioneering spirit and the tenacity of Pete Schoemann over here the man we are honoring today. He started in the State of Wisconsin where he is not only known as a labor leader but as a leader in education as well.

Incidentally, I first heard about Pete Schoemann not about the labor movement, I heard about his work in the field of education in Wisconsin. He was on the school board of Milwaukee. I believe he is the only living—or dead—citizen of Wisconsin who has been honored by three governors of three different parties. Ordinarily most states have only two parties. We have three. Wisconsin always offers more.

But here was a man singly honored not by one governor of one party but honored by three governors of the State of Wisconsin that needed his consultation and work and his effort in the field of education.

I just want to say to be recognized in the world for just one achievement is a good thing but when a man is recognized for the things you have done in the field of education, besides the things you have done in the field of the labor movement, it is a double honor.

I am privilege indeed to stand before these people and pay tribute to you and pay you honor. You deserve it. No man deserves it more.

Apart from his direct activities within the labor movement, Pete Schoemann's favorite extracurricular activity—if I may call it that—has certainly been his interest in education; and this is of particular interest to me as a former teacher.

Many years ago, when he chose to become active in politics in Milwaukee, his interest in education led him to choose membership on the school board as a target of his efforts. He was a member of the Milwaukee Board of School Directors for 21 years and was twice president of the Board.

His involvement has included all kinds of education, both academic and vocational, and at all levels.

For 18 years, he was a member of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education, serving under Wisconsin governors of three different political parties. He was also president of the Board for seven years.

Long before he came to Washington, then, in order to take over as president of his own international union, Pete Schoemann had captured the spirit of organized labor's traditional stand of as much education as possible, and for as many people as possible, in the United States.

President Meany of the AFL–CIO made an excellent choice in selecting Pete Schoemann to be the Chairman of the AFL–CIO Committee on Education, in which capacity he often appears before committees of both Houses of Congress to present the AFL–CIO's position on various education bills.

Once upon a time, it seemed that the barriers to eventual passage of federal aid to primary and secondary education were practically insuperable. Those barriers have finally been broken down, and for this achievement, the school community—the school boards, the supervisors, and the teachers—owe a lasting debt of gratitude to their friends in the American trade union movement who kept up the fight year after year and never gave up in the face of what amounted at times to very discouraging odds. This persevering and very effective assistance is personified in labor leaders like Pete Schoemann who long ago recognized that it would profit little to achieve better wages and shorter hours and improved working conditions for themselves, if they could not help their children prepare for a richer and fuller life than they themselves had known.

Peter Schoemann's dedication to improvement of the educational system has always been reflected in his constant efforts to improve the quality of apprenticeship training for members of his own union. The high value he has placed on continuous training for skilled craftsmen has resulted directly in new and improved programs of training for journeyman members of his union as well.

Today, the apprentice and journeyman training system of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters in conjunction with employers at both the national and local level is rightfully considered one of the very best, if not the best, in this country.

Two characteristics of Pete Schoemann's fight for bigger and better apprenticeship programs deserve mention. One is his resistance to substitute methods of training in the form of spot training in some few skills of the trade for a shorter period of time than the full five years which his craft requires. Secondly, there has been his insistence that apprenticeship and journeyman training are primarily matters for joint labor-management determination and control; and that while government assistance is welcome and profitable and even deserved, the nation's various systems of apprenticeship training must never become comprehended into, and consumed by, an overall governmental manpower program.

By way of proving this latter point, his international union under his direction has established in conjunction with large interstate or national construction firms a very interesting trust arrangement known as the International Training Fund. Although, in the construction industry, apprenticeship is locally directed and locally financed in the first instance, it is the role of this Fund to assist local training programs through direct financial grants, and also by maintaining a corps of five full-time technical experts in the field whose job is to help local apprentice committees improve the quality of their training. I understand that this International Training Fund has made grants totalling more than $8 million in the ten years it has been in existence, and that all of this money was contributed in the first place by employers of union plumbers and pipefitters.

This emphasis on the rightful place of private enterprise in the total American scheme of things is an example of Pete Schoemann's political and social philosophy. The American trade union movement today is distinguished from labor organizations in many foreign countries by the fact that it believes in the fundamentals of the capitalistic or private enterprise system. Pete Schoemann, however, is one of those American labor leaders who stands out by being unafraid to say just that; that is, he is not content to give lip service to such things as private ownership of the means of production, competition in the market place, and the right of business owners to a fair profit, while relying largely on government initiative to solve our big social problems. He frequently speaks out on the rightful role of business and labor in solving some of these problems, not merely as following the leadership of public officials, but sometimes as taking the initiative.

Lastly, any tribute to Pete Schoemann at this time from a Republican would be incomplete without mentioning his outspoken insistence just within this past year upon greater political independence for the labor movement. Labor has always maintained a formal or technical kind of political neutrality, and every now and then supports a Republican. I myself am very proud of the constant and loyal support I have received from union members and their chosen leaders in my own congressional district. Sometimes though, we are led to believe that it is almost futile for a Republican member of Congress to vote for what he conscientiously believes is the real welfare of the working men and women of this country, because his Democratic opponent in the next general election is sure to take what is sometimes called a more "liberal" stand on certain issues, and this alone will be sufficient to win him the endorsement of the labor movement.

Pete Schoemann has lately pointed out, in connection with the fate of the 14(b) repeal and the situs picketing bill, that "liberal" and "pro-labor" do not always mean the same thing. I believe this point is very, very well taken and heartily recommend this consideration to other leaders in the trade union movement. I believe we are beginning to see the signs of an awakening to this political truth. I believe we saw that during the AFL–CIO Executive Council meeting this past winter down in Miami. I believe we saw that also during the National Legislative Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department held here in Washington this past March. Most assuredly, liberal and pro-labor are not the same thing, and they who are mostly intent upon securing enactment of a long list of welfare programs are not necessarily they who recognize the need for legislation that will stimulate organizing initiative on the part of labor and enable labor to better serve the welfare of its membership at the bargaining table.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call upon Congressman HENRY REUSS of the 5th District to make a special presentation to our distinguished guest.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you very much.

Reverend Clergy, colleagues, brothers and sisters: Wisconsin is illustrious for its cheese, renowned throughout the world for its beer, but there is nothing of which it is prouder than its great, clean, progressive labor movement. And no man has brought more luster to that movement than that peerless plumber, that sterling steamfitter, that genial journeyman, Pete Schoemann.

A lot of us in Milwaukee, when Pete left for bigger things in Washington a dozen years ago, were fearful that this might go to Pete's head, that he would forget his old friends in Wisconsin and the problems of Wisconsin. But as the history of the last dozen years demonstrates, he has not forgotten us. And we have not forgotten you, Peter.

I have the privilege of presenting on behalf of the Wisconsin State Society to you, Peter, a flag of the United States which has flown over the United States Capitol. If anyone doubts that fact, I have in this packet a letter duly signed and subscribed to by J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, saying it has flown over the West Wing of the Capitol. It may be the last flag ever to fly over it. [Laughter.]

I know, because the love of your country has been your great philosophical characteristic all your life, that this flag will ripple proudly over the Schoemann home and illuminate your love for your country—and I hope, sir, remind you that Wisconsin loves you.

On behalf of the Wisconsin State Society I proudly present this flag to you.

Mr. Schoemann. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hendrickson. Some months ago the Wisconsin State Society thought it would be an excellent idea to have a suitable award or citation to confer deserved public recognition on distinguished citizens of our State. We felt that since we were the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., that our recipient should be a person who has distinguished himself in some way, both in our home State and also here in the Greater Washington Area.

The man we selected to receive our Distinguished Citizenship Award certainly fills the bill on both counts. He was a leading citizen of the City of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin, not only in his chosen field of labor union leadership, but in a number of other civic activities as well. He left all that behind to come here to Washington to become a top executive official of his own international union. His union, The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of The Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, has been known for many years as an organization which was willing to try bold new experiments in labor management relations. It is a union which in the past has been in the habit of producing national leaders. Among its members have been numbered the late Senator Patrick V. McNamara from our neighboring State of Michigan, who passed away just this year; also, the late Martin P. Durkin from another of our neighboring states, Illinois, who was Mr. Schoemann's predecessor as president of the union and the first Secretary of Labor under President Eisenhower. Another outstanding member of the same union is Mr. George Meany, the first and until now the only president of America's merged labor federation, the AFL–CIO.

I would like to mention also that we are most happy to have with us today still another of Mr. Schoemann's fellow union members, Mr. James A. Brownlow, who until his retirement was president of the Metal Trades Department, AFL–CIO.

For the rest, I think I will let this scroll tell its own story.

The scroll says: "The Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C. Presents to Peter T. Schoemann its Distinguished Citizenship Award.

"Whereas Peter T. Schoemann is a native son of the State of Wisconsin, having been born in the City of Milwaukee, where he received his formal education and his apprenticeship training in his chosen calling, the plumbing trade; and

"Whereas he labored faithfully at that trade in Milwaukee for many years; and

"Whereas he answered the call of his brother journeyman plumbers to serve their interests as an officer of Plumbers Local Union 75 of Milwaukee for eighteen years; and

"Whereas he occupied an influential role in building up the city of Milwaukee by serving as President of the Milwaukee Building and Construction Trades Council for some twenty years; and

"Whereas he was not content to confine his abilities and influence to his home town alone, but played an active role also in his international union, serving as an elected official of that body from 1928 continuously to date; and

"Whereas dearly as he loved the labor movement, he was unwilling to allow it to become the sole focus of his attention, but instead devoted himself to the general welfare of his fellow Wisconsinites by serving on, and sometimes chairing, such bodies as the Milwaukee Board of School Directors, the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education, and the Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee; and

"Whereas in 1955, he was chosen General President of one of America's largest and most influential trade unions, the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, a position to which he has been twice re-elected unanimously by conventions of that body; and

"Whereas in the exercise of his high office, he has given the American trade union movement a constant and faithful example of wisdom, courage and administrative excellence; and

"Whereas he has never allowed his necessary involvement in large national and international issues to cause him to forget that the welfare of his brothers is grounded upon protection of his union's work jurisdiction and continuous training; and

"Whereas he was most instrumental in preserving and reshaping the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes in the Building and Construction Industry, for the purpose of keeping intra-industry disputes in private hands where they belong; and

"Whereas he has encouraged and promoted the extension and improvement of apprenticeship training, the only adequate form of training for preparing a journeyman to work at his trade; and

"Whereas under his guidance, the United Association cooperated with national construction firms to establish the International Training Fund, an altogether unique institution for the purpose of providing financial and technical assistance to training programs for apprentices and journeymen; and

"Whereas by establishing the International Training Fund, both the United Association, under his leadership, and the national construction firms have provided a model which other skilled crafts may well follow in training the craftsmen needed by American industry, thereby saving American taxpayers millions of dollars annually; and

"Whereas as a Vice President of the AFL–CIO, he has fought a vigorous campaign for an American labor movement, whose affiliates are unified in purpose and free to pursue their individual members' needs; and

"Whereas his ability and interest in international labor affairs have led to his twice being appointed as a labor advisor to International Labor Organization conferences, and as an AFL–CIO delegate to a Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; and

"Whereas his knowledge, skill and authority within the labor movement have caused him to be named to such bodies as the Atomic Energy Commission Labor Management Advisory Commitee, the National Manpower Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, and the Missile Sites Labor Commission; and

"Whereas in all of his service to various private and public interests, he has kept steadfastly before him the truth that labor is not the same thing as government, while business is different from both; so that while he has shown a capacity for tempering private demands in the light of public necessity, he has refused to equate labor statesmanship with a forgetfulness of the needs of those who elected him to union office; and

"Whereas especially by this means, he has provided an example of leadership that is a bulwark of American democracy, wherein the state is not the whole of Society; and

"Whereas he has, for all the causes above recited, reflected glory and honor upon his native State of Wisconsin, and endeared himself to his fellow Wisconsinites who now reside in Washington, D.C.: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That on this thirteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord the nineteen hundred and sixty-sixth, and of the statehood of Wisconsin the one hundred and eighteenth, the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C. hereby confers its Distinguished Citizenship Award upon Peter T. Schoemann, with all the rights and privileges consequent thereto."

Mr. Schoemann. Most Reverend Bishop Tanner, Honorable Congressmen, Mr. Toastmaster, Members of the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D. C., my Colleagues and Friends:

I am deeply grateful for this honor you have paid me, and I cannot tell you how much pleasure it gives me to accept this award here in the company of so many friends from the labor movement and from the State of Wisconsin, with whom I have been associated for many years.

It is a special honor to accept this award from my two good friends of many years standing, the distinguished Congressmen who have the highest seniority rank among members of their respective parties in our Wisconsin congressional delegation, Clem Zablocki and Al O'Konski. Both of them are friends of the working people of this country, and both have stood up time and time again to be counted on issues where the welfare of all our citizens was at stake.

Incidentally, the same goes for the man who earlier made the presentation of the flag that flew over the Capitol, that dedicated and very able Representative from Milwaukee, Henry Reuss.

Thank you too for all the good wishes for a successful convention which so many of you have expressed to me here today.

I am especially pleased by those words in the scroll which say that labor statesmanship is not the same thing as forgetfulness of those who elect you to office. When you say statesmanship, you immediately suggest the relation of the individual citizen to the state and government at various levels, and you also suggest the relation of the individual to his community at various levels. There are situations where the overriding concerns of the larger community require us to curb our own particular aims and ambitions, but we do not always arrive at the goal by forgetting our own special interests from the very beginning. I wonder whether we have not become so cynical in our view of certain things which go on here on Capitol Hill, for example that we miss the deeper meaning in a complex process that makes our American democracy work.

Thus, labor unions, business interests, farm interests, the school lobby and all the rest are often described as pressure groups for special pleaders. Statesmanship for their representatives is supposed to consist in forgetting their own special aims to take the broader, general welfare viewpoint.

In the field of economics, we once had the unseen hand of Adam Smith. The theory was that, if everyone sought his own maximum gain most selfishly, then by the operation of an unseen hand the selfishness of all would produce the greatest good for all. During the years of the Great Depression, if not before that, we finally learned that the hand was not only not seen, it simply wasn't there.

Could it be that the pendulum has now swung too far in the opposite direction? Could we be missing the important lesson that the general welfare is sometimes very well served by those seeking their own private interest, that sometimes it cannot be well served in any other way?

The better job one makes of his own talents and his own possibilities, the more he has to contribute to the general welfare.

Furthermore, proposals made in the name of public interest are not always what they claim to be, and unless they are subjected to the criticism which springs from private interest, what we could end up with is a great collection of foolishness enacted in the name of the general welfare. Special pleaders then serve as devil's advocates to make our public-spirited servants prove their case.

Perhaps our great public policy debates are somewhat similar to the situation we have in a courtroom. The judge is there to serve the administration of justice, but so are the lawyers for the plaintiff and the defendant. The judge does it by being an impartial judge; the lawyers do it by being the most persuasive advocates they can be for their own respective clients. To get the whole job done, we need the impartial judicial decision of the judge, and we also need the special pleading of the attorneys for both sides. For one thing, justice cannot be served unless the litigating parties get everything that is coming to them, and to get that they have to fight for it. For another, on a given question it can happen that the judge is wrong while one of the special pleaders might be right.

And so it happens that our private groups can serve the general welfare by making out the best case they can for their own special interest. Since the start of this year, a number of such issues have come up involving my own and other unions.

One such issue is that of the wage guidelines. We are supposed to be acting in the public interest if we keep negotiated wage gains within the guidelines, and contrary to the public interest if we exceed them. But is it in the public interest, given our free enterprise economic system, for labor organizations to bow their heads meekly to a decision in which they had no opportunity to participate, and which is dictated unilaterally by an agency of the government? No, not of the whole government, but only of its administrative branch. Much the same can be said of business firms on the question of price decisions that are made.

Another such issue would be the relation of federal manpower policy to the institution of craft apprenticeship. It is alleged that apprenticeship, in its present state, cannot provide the skilled craftsmen needed by American industry, and that therefore those who sponsor apprenticeship should permit and even encourage the establishment of every sort of less-than-apprenticeship training program. To do so is said to be in the public interest, and to obstruct the new development, so it is argued, can proceed only from motives of selfishness.

Our argument with this position is that its wisdom does not equal its sincerity. It overlooks the truth that even now many gain entrance to the skilled crafts without apprenticeship preparation, and that some of them do not survive very long; that many of those who leave the skilled trades were not totally without training, but rather did have some kind of vocational school or technical institute training, approximately the equivalent of what they would receive under many of these manpower training proposals.

To take another example, the racial issue is indeed a serious national issue, and the achievement of full racial equality and racial justice would be a precious national asset. But have we not other precious national assets which need not be torn up and consigned to the rubbish heap for the sake of solving this one problem in social justice? The school system which does not discriminate on racial grounds would be a precious national asset, but so—I would argue—is the neighborhood school, provided it is not used as a cover-up for discrimination. It is good and right that our society provide everyone a full and fair opportunity to work at the occupation of his choice, but so is the requirement that a person make some effort on his own part to obtain the occupation that he chooses to follow.

While there is a selfishness and a self-centeredness that is disruptive of the community, so is there a well-regulated love of one's own self and one's own group, and a socially necessary campaign for self-interest, both personal and collective.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the officers and members of the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., and to everyone here present who has played a part, large or small, in these various activities that are recorded in this handsome scroll you have presented to me, and that was made possible by my activity in my labor organization that I love so dearly.

This scroll will occupy a place of honor in my office and be a constant reminder in my remaining years of the inspiration and encouragement I have received over these many years from my fellow Wisconsinites.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call on Honorable John F. Henning, Undersecretary of Labor.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. Chairman, Friends: I am honored to be here in joining in this tribute to Pete Schoemann.

The mere mention of the name Wisconsin recalls some of the great progressive traditions of American political life. In fact, I think we can agree that in the years between the turn of the century and the First World War, Wisconsin was perhaps the most enlightened, the most active of all the states in terms of social legislation.

Wisconsin was the first state in the union to acknowledge the coming of the Industrial Revolution and establish those industrial laws which would protect the worker against the abuses of the factory system. And it is only proper that a state with such traditions should honor Pete Schoemann.

Pete is President of one of the greatest trade unions of America. In fact, by family tradition I am compelled to say he is President of the greatest labor union in this nation.

Pete, I would meet another loyalty test. I must say that you head the second most skilled craft in America. The first, of course, being the lathers. The lathers of Los Angeles and Boston where Neil Haggerty worked his trade.

It is a great tribute that Wisconsin provides to Pete Schoemann today. It is a magnificent thing. Pete has given the great years of his adult life, the great productive years of his life, and he gives them still, to the national interest and the cause of the American worker. He has achieved wonders for the people he represents but above that he represents the independence and the integrity of the American trade union movement. Pete Schoemann and men like him have made the AFL–CIO the greatest trade union organization in the history of the free world.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call upon Congressman JOHN A. RACE for a presentation to our distinguished guest.

Mr. RACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Honorable Bishop, Our Honorable Guest today, My Colleagues, Members of the Wisconsin State Society and Officers and Members of the different union organizations present.

Pete, it is a distinct honor to be with you today and I want to personally congratulate you. I feel very akin to you. I happen to have been a member of the Machinists for the past 25 years. I have served on the State Board of Adult Education of Wisconsin recently, and I see our background is similar. I don't think I will ever be a president of an international, but being a Member of Congress is another honor. I hope to stay here awhile.

I have a letter here, Pete, from the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation, which I would like to read:

"Mr. PETER T. SCHOEMANN,
"General President, United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, Washington, D.C.

"DEAR PETER: The Wisconsin Congressional Delegation wishes to take this occasion to thank you for the honor you have brought to our State, the Labor Movement, and the Nation.

"We know that you are one of the great leaders of the Labor Movement. We also know of your contribution in the field of education, both academic and vocational. For eighteen years you were a member of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education serving under Wisconsin Governors of three different political parties.

"You believe that democracy demands wisdom of the average man. Without the exercise of wisdom, free institutions and personal liberty are inevitably imperiled. For this, we thank you.

"In the exercise of your high office, you have given the American Trade Union Movement a constant and faithful example of wisdom, courage, and foresight. You have imparted to the familiar language—what too many have come to treat as the cliches of Christianity—a new poignancy and vibrance. You did not do so by reciting them, but by proving that it is possible to live them.

"Because much work remains to be done, we hope that you will be with us a long time. The people of the Labor Movement need your services, the young people of America need your example of selfless dedication, and we need your friendship and counsel. We not only wish you success in your approaching Convention, we predict it.

"With kindest personal regards, we are
"Sincerely yours,
"Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Congressman LYNN E. STALBAUM, Congressman ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Congressman VERNON W. THOMSON, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Congressman JOHN A. RACE, Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, Congressman JOHN W. BYRNES, Congressman GLENN R. DAVIS."

And also last but not least, the dean of our Congressional Delegation, "Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI."

Mr. SCHOEMANN. Well, this is a very pleasant surprise. I am deeply moved and sincerely grateful to both Senators and all of the Congressmen from my home State for the kind sentiments and good wishes expressed in this letter.

And I am deeply pleased to accept it from such a fine, outstanding young Congressman as JOHN RACE. JOHN may your performance during this 89th Congress mark the beginning of a long and successful career here in Washington. Thank you again.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We have men from all walks of life and the labor movement with us. I would like to introduce a Federal Judge who is a member of the Wisconsin State Society, Jim Durfee.

I want to thank Bob Shafer, Charlotte Norris, Bob McMillen of the United Association who is on Pete Schoemann's staff, Larry Gilbertson, Past President and Awards Committee Chairman of the Society, Dick Nelson and John Loomis of the committee, as well as Carm Dye and Sukey Wray.

At this time I would like to close by calling on Bishop Tanner before he gives his benediction to tell us of a little sidelight on our honored guest.

Bishop TANNER. This will only take about a minute but it is a story that I think is important to illustrate Pete's character.

There aren't many people in this room who were adults in 1932, the black, desperate days of the depression. At that time I was in youth work in Milwaukee and we were graduating a class of about 75 young men from law school who could probably earn $75 a month any place in town. Pete gave them a talk and an opportunity which I regret to say they didn't take. It amounted to this: He wanted them to get jobs in a shop and not to mention they ever went to high school, and above all that they were graduated lawyers, but to work themselves up to be shop stewards and after that Pete would pull them up in the labor movement.

I have never forgotten it because in those days a union wasn't very popular and unions needed intelligent leadership. And Pete had the intelligence to offer it.

(Benediction).

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 15, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of mercy and love, we are deeply disturbed this morning as we come before Thee in prayer. Life many times shocks us because of the actions of man's inhumanity. In this U.S. Senate, we are grateful that the individual citizen is remembered in his needs. The importance of the one person, the one opinion, the one conviction, the one vote, the one tragedy that affects all of us makes this government of the people, for the people, and by the people lasting and strong.

Today, this Nation, O God, is shocked by the murder, by a deranged person, of eight lovely girls training to be nurses in Chicago. It is for our own needed discernment that we recognize the evil facing mankind on every hand. We are a part of this evil because we do not sincerely seek a spiritual, moral, and mental development of our people to help in these days of tensions, despair, anxiety, and unrealistic evaluations of life. Forgive us and help us, O God.

We pray Thy strengthening and comforting presence upon the families who are numb at this moment. Only the Most High can bring them from the depths of despair and mourning.

Be with our President, this governing body, the Nation, and the individual citizen that all may contribute to the solution and prevention of personal and world tragedy. Shape us into a better nation, a peaceful people, and a world with a future. Mold us and make us after Thy will, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 13, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3498. A bill to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1374); and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor (Rept. No. 1373).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 1375).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

Winthrop Knowlton, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to measures of control, and the protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to the entry into force of proposals adopted by the Commission (Ex. Rept. No. 7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 3617. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3618. A bill to make certain expenditures for public facilities by States, municipalities, or other local public bodies more fully allowable as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3619. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on certain steel cylindrical tanks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3620. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expedite and facilitate adjustments of payments under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address delivered by Vice President HUMPHREY to participants in the Fourth Annual National Youth Camp, and the address of the President at the commissioning of the new research ship, the *Oceanographer*.

Program, leadership seminar initiating Citizen Workshops on Clean Water for America, welcoming remarks by Reynolds T.

Harnsberger, president of Izaak Walton League of America; explanation of workshops by J. W. Penfold conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America; and keynote address by self.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes during the morning hour, which I understand will be concluded at 12:15.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let the record show that an objection has been lodged with the minority leadership by a member of the minority. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is noted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, of the same committee, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF NAME OF ROLLA JEWEL BEARING PLANT, AT ROLLA, N. DAK., TO THE WILLIAM LANGER JEWEL BEARING PLANT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1372)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Government Operations without amendment, S. 3466, a bill to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

This legislation was introduced by my good friend and colleague, Senator Young of North Dakota. I am partiularly happy to be able to submit the report to the Senate because I feel that what this bill proposes is only just tribute to the memory of a famous North Dakotan who used his skills, persuasion, and untiring efforts to transform an area of North Dakota, located near an Indian reservation, from a relatively poverty stricken area to one where people have employment.

Those of us who watched the project develop remember vividly the many months of work that went into it. Senator Langer was in the forefront, working with his congressional colleagues, in arousing interest, clearing plans, smoothing out details which resulted in the establishment of this jewel bearing plant.

The people of Rolla, N. Dak., and the Indian people on the Turtle Mountain Reservation are to be congratulated on the success they have made of this venture. Their work and management also serve as a monument to Senator Bill Langer, who made a dream come true in his home State.

It is especially appropriate that Bill Langer's longtime senatorial colleague should have introduced this highly appropriate resolution since Senator Milton Young was most helpful, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, in securing support for this highly useful project at Rolla, N. Dak.

The Rolla project was one of the first designed especially to utilize the unique and specific talents and aptitudes of our American Indians in industrial production. It has been a great success. Since its inception many other Indian reservations have become the host to industrial activities designed to utilize the talents and abilities of our Indian friends. Almost invariably the results have far exceeded expectations. The Indians have proved to be faithful, energetic, loyal workers, happy for the opportunity to earn respectable wages close to home and gratified over the sharp increase in personal income provided by these commercial jobs.

In South Dakota, we have a rapidly growing increase of interest being expressed by various manufacturing enterprises in America over the possibility of utilizing Indian laborers—both men and women—in fabricating plants located on or near the reservation. Among the enterprises already operating in areas where they have access to a dependable and ample supply of Indian labor which is available near the plant, undisrupted by labor strife or strikes, happy and proud to find at long last steady employment at respectable wages are producers of fishing tackle, laminated wood, automobile and truck mufflers, bed blankets, Indian souvenirs, sandals, and American built toys. Others are sure to follow as they learn of this unique and mutually profitable arrangement for locating fabricating plants in low-cost-of-operation areas where taxes and living costs are low, where recreational opportunities are vast, where there is always a supply of dependable labor, where the sky is blue, and where living is worthwhile.

Yes, Mr. President, Bill Langer set in motion quite a movement in America which is designed to expand and to grow. It is indeed a pleasure to ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the report and a copy of the bill, S. 3466, be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the excerpts from the report, and the bill will be printed in the Record.

The excerpts from the report are as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, North Dakota, in memory of the late Senator William Langer of North Dakota.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The following letter from Senator Milton R. Young of North Dakota gives the background information of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, North Dakota and explains the part played by Senator William Langer of North Dakota in having this plant established:

Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Government Operations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McClellan: As you know, I have pending in your Committee on Government Operations Senate Bill 3466 which would honor our late colleague Senator William Langer by naming the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant, located at Rolla, North Dakota, the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

This is recognition which the late Senator Langer richly deserves. This Jewel Bearing Plant, which is our only domestic source of jewel bearings for our defense and space programs, had its inception in the late 1940's when Mr. John Hart, then Executive Director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, came to Washington to enlist the late Senator Langer's help in getting some industry to locate in or near the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation to provide badly-needed work for the Indians. Senator Langer's first thought was one of some industry to assemble watches or other similar intricate instruments widely used by our Defense Establishment. He had in mind utilizing the Indians' particular aptitude for native handicraft skills in the delicate work involved in this type of an industry.

Senator Langer very effectively sought help from every level of government from the White House on down. Securing this facility involved meetings with many important cabinet officers and executive agencies, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Bureau of the Budget, and the National Security Council. Senator Langer very effectively coordinated activities of all of these departments and agencies in an effort to establish this important industry. To him must go the credit for the establishment of this industry. Had it not been for his determined, effective, and untiring efforts there never would have been a Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla and, very likely, there would not have been one in this country.

I sincerely hope that you may see fit to approve this bill at the next meeting of the Government Operations Committee.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely,

Milton R. Young.

The bill is as follows:

S. 3466

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Jewel Bearing Plant operated and maintained by the General Services Administration at Rolla, North Dakota shall hereafter be known as the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such plant is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such plant under and by the name of the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I am today introducing a bill incorporating the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed omnibus legislation for 1966. Since I have not had time to study the proposal as closely as I would like, I am introducing the bill by request. However, the Joint Committee will go into the provisions of the bill in detail when hearings are held on the bill.

The proposed legislation is intended to effect two substantive changes in atomic energy legislation. First, it is proposed to delete the requirement in section 41b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 that the President make an annual determination of the quantities of special nuclear material to be produced by the AEC and the amounts to be available for distribution domestically and abroad pursuant to sections 53 and 54 of the act.

In recommending this change, the AEC states that because special nuclear materials and the source material from which they are produced are no longer scarce, it is not considered necessary or desirable to continue to burden the Chief Executive with the annual duty of making these determinations. The Commission also notes in this connection that with the repeal of these determinations the amount of special nuclear material to be produced by the Commission would continue to be controlled by the Congress and the executive branch through the normal budgetary process.

The other substantive change recommended by the AEC would amend section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958 to permit implementation with respect to EURATOM of the Commission's authority, provided in the Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act of 1964, to contract for toll enrichment services. Presently the EURATOM Cooperation Act provides for the sale or lease of specified quantities of special nuclear materials to the Community, and it is thought that these terms do not encompass performance of toll enrichment services. The AEC contemplates that toll enrichment will be sought by EURATOM when such services become available after December 31, 1968.

The AEC proposal also calls for technical amendments to section 223 and 161n of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to correct what now are erroneous references in these sections to other sections of the act. Previous amendments to the referenced sections necessitate these technical amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3617) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, introduced by Mr. PASTORE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO EXPEDITE ADJUSTMENTS OF PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3620) to amend the Social Security Act to expedite and facilitate adjustments of payments under certain conditions, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3620

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever the Secretary finds that more or less than the correct amount of payment has been made to any person under this title, proper adjustment or recovery shall be made, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, as follows:

"(1) With respect to payment to a person of more than the correct amount the Secretary shall decrease any payment under this title to which such overpaid person is entitled, or shall require such overpaid person or his estate to refund the amount in excess of the correct amount, or shall decrease any payment under this title payable to his estate or to any other person on the basis of the wages and self-employment income which were the basis of the payments to such overpaid person, or shall apply any combination of the foregoing.

"(2) With respect to payment to a person of less than the correct amount, the Secretary shall make payment of the balance of the amount due such underpaid person, or, if such person dies before payments are completed or before negotiating one or more checks representing correct payments, disposition of the amount due shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary in such order of priority as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) In any case in which more than the correct amount of payment has been made, there shall be no adjustment of payments to, or recovery by the United States from, any person who is without fault if such adjustment or recovery would defeat the purpose of this title or would be against equity and good conscience.

"(c) No certifying or disbursing officer shall be held liable for any amount certified or paid by him to any person where the adjustment or recovery of such amount is waived under subsection (b), or where adjustment under subsection (a) is not completed prior to the death of all persons against whose benefits deductions are authorized."

AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN AID BILL

AMENDMENTS NOS. 648 AND 649

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the foreign aid bill, S. 3584. The present foreign aid bill has two separate chapters, one dealing with development loans and the other with technical assistance. These two chapters limit the number of countries to which development loans can be made to the number of 10 and the countries to which technical aid can be made to the number of 40.

My amendments would allow, whenever the President so determines that it is in the national interest, extending the number from 10 to a number above in the case of development loans, and to a number above 40 in the case of technical aid assistance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SENATE SECTION, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to give notice that a hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 19, 1966, at 4 p.m. in the Joint Committee's open hearing room S-407 of the Capitol, to consider the nomination of Samuel M. Nabrit, of Texas, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainer of the term expiring June 30, 1970. The Senate section of the Joint Committee will also consider the nomination of Wilfrid E. Johnson, of Washington, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1967, of John G. Palfrey. Mr. Palfrey resigned from the Atomic Energy Commission effective June 30, 1966.

Without objection I will submit for the RECORD the biographical summaries of Dr. Nabrit and Mr. Johnson that accompanied their nominations.

There being no objection, the biographical summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHIC DATA OF SAMUEL M. NABRIT

Age 61 (Born February 21, 1905 in Macon, Georgia).

Home: 3806 Tierwester Street, Houston, Texas.

PRESENT POSITION

President, Texas Southern University.

EDUCATION

In 1925, B.S., Morehouse College.

In 1927, M.S., Brown University.

In 1932, Ph. D., Brown University.

In 1944, Post-doctoral study, Columbia University.

In 1950, Post-doctoral study, University of Brussels.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

From 1925 to 1931, Professor of Biology, Morehouse College.

From 1932 to 1955, Professor and Chairman, Department of Biology, Atlanta University.

From 1947 to 1955, Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Atlanta University.

In 1955, President, Texas Southern University.

Also Ten summers at Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

In 1945, Science Work Shop, Columbia University.

In 1945, President, National Institute of Science.

From 1948 to 1955, Coordinator, Grants-in-Aid Program for Research, Atlanta University Center, Carnegie Foundation.

From 1951 to 1955, Member, Screening Committee, Ford Foundation Fellowship Program.

In 1954, Consultant to National Science Foundation.

From 1956 to 1962, Member, National Science Board.

From 1960 to 1961, President, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

In 1961, Member, Fellowship Council, Danforth Foundation.

In 1961, Member, Board of Directors, American Council on Education.

In 1962, Member, Board of Directors, Southern Education Foundation. Author, numerous articles.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA ON WILFRID E. JOHNSON

Born: May 24, 1905, England.

Present Postion: Recently retired as General Manager of General Electric Company's Hanford Atomic Products Operation at Richland, Washington.

Education: 1930, B. S. in Mechanical Engineering, Oregon State College; 1939, M. E. Professional Degree, Oregon State College; 1959, SCD, Honorary, Oregon State College.

Previous Experience: 1930–36, Design Engineer—Household Refrigerator, General Electric Company; 1936–40, Design Engineer—Commercial Refrigeration, General Electric Company; 1940–44, Section Engineer—Aircraft Supercharger, General Electric Company; 1944–45, Engineer—Aircraft Gas Turbine Department, General Electric Company; 1945–48, Manager—Engineering Air Conditioning, Department, General Electric Company; 1948–51, Manager—Design & Construction, Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company; 1951–52, Assistant General Manager, Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company; 1952, General Manager, Hanford Atomic Products Operation, General Electric Company.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 12, 1966, the name of Mr. McGOVERN was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3602) to prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH on July 12, 1966.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor to S. 3181, relating to moving expenses, and that his name be included in the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the names of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as cosponsors of S. 3602, a bill to prohibit construction which would modify the Capitol Building without the consent of Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3514, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID E. BELL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a devoted and highly able public servant will leave the Government very shortly. I refer to David E. Bell, who has been outstanding as the Administrator of the AID program. This position involved directing one of the most difficult and challenging organizations within the Government. But Mr. Bell met the challenges, performed his duties with great effectiveness, and I wish to extend to him sincere gratitude for a job well done.

David Bell has been a credit to the various positions in which he has served. Yet, I can well understand his desire to leave. For his future will now be secured by a position which perhaps will be more lucrative and in which there undoubtedly will be some peace and surcease. All of this he has earned and richly deserves.

We shall miss him. But he goes with our congratulations and best wishes—and even more, with our sincere thanks.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly join with the majority leader.

David Bell is a great American. He is dedicated to his country and to the cause of peace with justice. His tenure has lasted longer than that of any of his predecessors. In a preeminently important governmental activity he has been able to demonstrate to a majority of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, with patience and painstaking devotion to the public trust, why assistance by this Government is necessary to nations of the world which are free, which wish to remain free, and which need the help and the assistance of the people and the Government of the United States.

Dave Bell now goes into a great private responsibility. He will be associated with an eleemosynary institution which bears a great American name, and will have the responsibility of helping to guide the decisions of that institution for the betterment of mankind. As he leaves Government and as he enters what I know will be a splendid career in the private sector of our economy, all I can say is that the distinguished majority leader voices the feelings of all of us. I wish particularly to add my hopes that this fine man, this fellow Californian, will someday reenter the Federal service, where he has so distinguished himself in the past.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with my colleagues in their praise of David Bell.

As manager of the foreign aid bill in the Senate, and having been in charge of the hearings connected with this bill, it has been my happy opportunity to have had extensive contact with David Bell.

I daresay that I have never met a man who is more compassionate, more talented, and more devoted to his public trust than this fine gentleman.

I wish him well, and I join my colleagues in expressing our regrets that we have lost him as a trusted member of the executive department. But we know that his devotion and his dedication and his talents will continue to be used for the benefit and the grandeur of America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues for their remarks, and agree with them wholeheartedly.

The acting minority leader has said that he hopes Mr. Bell will return to Government. Others have similar sentiments. It has been said that one of the newsmen, on learning of David Bell's resignation, expressed the same hope, in these words:

> Dave Bell is my candidate for the next Secretary of State.

Perhaps someday he will come back. We all can hope so. And if he does, he will be welcomed; not only because he is an outstanding administrator, but because he has already been through his ordeal of fire. And his initiation was with one of the most controversial agencies. Nevertheless, he has done a good job and he has performed it under the most difficult of circumstances.

As a further accolade to this able administrator, Mr. Bell, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Exit Bell: 'Bushed, Broke, but Not Mad,'" published in the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, July 1, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABLE ADMINISTRATOR—EXIT BELL: "BUSHED, BROKE, BUT NOT MAD"

WASHINGTON.—With a laugh, he told a personal friend, "I'm bushed, I'm broke, but I'm not mad at anyone." To the last, David E. Bell was the rarest character in the high echelons of the national government: an able administrator who was always—so far as one could see—poised and disarming, candid, persuasive, and friendly.

The day before his resignation was announced, one of the best-informed newsmen in Washington said, "Dave Bell is my candidate for the next secretary of state."

But he is leaving the federal government at the end of July.

His quip to a friend explained the very serious reasons why.

First, as to being "bushed": The top administrators all have man-breaking responsibilities nowadays. More, Mr. Bell headed one of the most controversial agencies in Washington, the Foreign Aid Administration. It takes a brutal hammering from opponents in Congress steadily, all during the year.

But on top of that, President Johnson is a peculiarly unrelenting taskmaster. He doesn't have the humorous, sporting touch of John F. Kennedy, tossing off a bad break or a slip or mistake with a quip, or with quick but short-lived irritation and anger.

He is a far more effective politician than Mr. Kennedy because he rides administrators and politicians hard, and doesn't forget or easily forgive.

He also stays mostly on the job, where Mr. Kennedy often took off for his country houses and rested, and let the whole government relax.

Second, as to being "broke": Washington salaries look quite good these days, particularly on the higher levels, provided the standard of comparison is that of the campus and not the top business administrator. The citizen with modest income would think an administrator like Mr. Bell could live comfortably.

But in Washington the top men cannot avoid a certain show of status. This is a government, after all. The standard of house and entertaining required of a man like Mr. Bell does not leave enough for his personal and family needs.

This is the reality for most of the best men here who do not come from wealthy backgrounds—the fact that lies behind the remark that Mr. Bell is "broke."

Many of them have to leave, not just for fancy salaries but to rescue their unbalanced personal budgets.

As for Mr. Bell's remarks that he was "not mad at anyone," this is the measure of how greatly the federal government needs this sort of man. There are not many of them around. Politicians and presidents lean on them.

But they still leave because they have to. Conditions are not yet right to induce them to stay.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest that there is no better place he can come, if he returns to public service, than the Senate of the United States, where I believe we need him sorely.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let us not get into politics. I wish to say that since my friend Dave Bell has become acclimatized to the East, he may very well look with favor on becoming a citizen of Providence, so that the hopes for him of the Senator from Rhode Island might blossom.

Mr. PASTORE. Surely. And there is nothing wrong with that—15 or 20 years from now.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made about our very distinguished citizen and friend, David Bell.

When I first learned of his resignation I wrote him a letter expressing sincere regret that he had left Government service. As our distinguished majority leader said, he has gone through a baptism of fire. I can assure anyone who goes through the hearings which we conduct on the foreign aid program in the Committee on Foreign Relations that that is a proper expression.

Dave Bell not only conducted himself in a gentlemanly and able manner but he was one of the finest administrators of the foreign aid program that we ever had. I wish him well in his new work.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as each day passes the impact of the current strike against five of our major airlines becomes greater. Not only is it causing serious disruption in the transportation of people and products but the economic impact is of a tremendous magnitude. In my own area TWA employs some 8,600 people. Of this number 5,700 are now off the payroll because of the strike. These employees represent a monthly payroll of over $3.6 million. The problem is equally serious in many other localities.

It should also be pointed out that many small businessmen are being seriously affected by lack of transportation for their products. If this strike is permitted to continue much longer it will truly be a major national catastrophe. Not only are we depriving 150,000 passengers daily air service but the strike is in complete disregard for the public interest. The airlines have accepted the recommendations of a Presidential Emergency Board which was headed by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. It is most unfortunate that the recommendations of that Emergency Board are being ignored as a framework for prompt and equitable settlement.

The time has come for the President to use the persuasive powers of his office to bring an end to this disastrous strike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Joseph H. McDowell, mayor of Kansas City, Kans.; a telegram from Louis P. Abrams, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City, Mo.; an article from the Wall Street Journal of July 12, 1966, entitled "Strike Against the Public"; an article from the Wall Street Journal of July 13, 1966, entitled "Airline Strike Plagues Many Firms as Mail, Shipments, Travel Plans Are Thrown Off"; and an article from the Daily News of Tuesday, July 12, 1966, under the heading "Capitol Stuff," by Jerry Greene, which deals with legislation introduced by our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in regard to the present airline strike.

There being no objection, the telegrams and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
July 12, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please contact Joseph Ramsey, vice president of International Association of Machinists and the five airlines urging them to meet and bargain in effort to stop the strike.

JOSEPH H. MCDOWELL,
Mayor.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 12, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senator, State of Kansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Greater Kansas City business community deeply concerned about deleterious impact on area economy resulting from continuation of airlines strike.

Urge your influence and assistance in whatever manner possible to bring about a speedy termination to this increasingly grave situation.

LOUIS P. ABRAMS,
Executive Vice President, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City, Mo.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 12, 1966]

STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC

The nation's air transportation has been crippled by a new manifestation of a spreading mutation in traditional labor tactics. The walkout by the Machinists union is not ordinary economic warfare against the companies; it is a strike against the public.

The union's confidence in this tactic explains its refusal to budge in negotiations. The companies originally offered wage boosts of about 30 cents an hour, while the union demanded up to 53 cents over a three-year contract. A Presidential emergency board suggested 48 cents over a 42-month contract.

The airlines accepted this proposal as a basis for negotiation, but the union struck. Even so stout a friend of organized labor as Senator WAYNE MORSE, an emergency board member, denounces the union's position as "unconscionable."

But then, why should the union grant an inch when it has the power to create such great mischief at so little cost to itself? The strike has closed down about 60% of the nation's passenger volume, disrupting plans of some 150,000 travelers every day. Coming at the height of the public's traveling season, the result is tremendous inconvenience and no little grief.

Precisely this public burden is the union's immediate object. If there is any doubt, consider how the Machinists and their allies have thwarted Civil Aeronautics Board efforts to ease the crush on travelers. The CAB authorized airlines to exchange equipment to increase service, but the unions on non-struck airlines have refused to service additional planes. The Machinists said they "question" the use of leased equipment even if it does not come from the struck airlines.

The Machinists can easily see that creating a public crisis has been immensely profitable for other unions in the past. There was a time, for instance, when every emergency brought Government pressure on companies to give the union what it wanted.

Today the unions are so flushed with success that they often demand even more than the Government can stomach, but the upshot is usually the same. The union closes its ears to public cries for mercy. The companies, with greater consciences and greater contact with the public, are forced to listen. The result almost invariably will be a union victory.

To make everything even more unreasonable, the motivation behind today's typical strike is less the union members' economic needs than the political benefits their leaders find inherent in militancy.

Airline mechanics now make up to $3.53 an hour. It's hard to believe that a raise of 53 cents instead of 48 cents will be worth their own inconvenience in striking, not to mention the trouble they cause others. To offset organizing pressure from an independent union and the Teamsters, however, the Machinists chiefs need to bring home a settlement certified as fat by the fact that it took a crisis to win it.

Bloated with political as well as economic power, numerous unions seem to feel they have nothing to lose in assaulting the public even for such cavalier reasons. In the long run such irresponsible behavior, as the railroad firemen found out, invites drastic measures like compulsory arbitration. Yet, in general, the solicitude unions receive on Capitol Hill and in the National Labor Relations Board makes outbreak of arrogance eminently predictable.

In short, the record of union-management-government relations quite naturally tempts many labor leaders to conclude that they can get away with almost anything. Strikes against the public will continue increasingly frequent and blatant, we suspect, until that record starts to show that even labor has a need for restraint.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 1966]

Airline Strike Plagues Many Firms as Mail, Shipments, Travel Plans Are Thrown Off

The five-day-old airline strike, a severe annoyance to vacation travelers over the weekend, has become a major workaday nuisance for many of the nation's businesses.

Consider the difficulty it has caused John L. Daly, manager of the speaker-training service of Smith Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia. Scheduled to address a seminar in Spokane, Wash., today, Mr. Daly was forced to trek by train and plane from Philadelphia to New York, Toronto and Calgary, Alberta, where he spent the night. This morning, if all goes well, he will arrive in Spokane.

With five of the nation's major airlines closed down, Mr. Daly's circuitous odyssey isn't particularly unusual. Other traveling executives must take similar time-consuming detours if they want to reach distant destinations, and many of them have decided it isn't worth the trouble.

WIDESPREAD IMPACT

The strike is hitting business in a multitude of ways. Hotels, resorts and travel agents are losing peak summer trade. Scattered lags in air freight have caused production delays at a few plants that receive parts by air. Lobsters are going unsold in Maine, flowers are wilting far from the florist shops they can't reach and thousands of marketable mice are stranded in Wilmington, Mass.

The walkout has been a boon, of course, to railroads, bus lines, "air taxis" and the airlines that weren't struck, but the blessing is mixed. These carriers, most of them already operating at peak levels when the strike began, are straining their capacity to take up the slack left by the strike, which affects more than 60% of the domestic trunk airline service.

The nation's hotel and resort operators were among the first to feel the impact of the strike. The Florida Hotel Association figures the walkout is costing the greater Miami area $400,000 a day in lost tourist business. New York City's Visitors and Convention Center puts the loss to the city at $500,000 a day and an official adds that by Wednesday the tourist business, New York City's second-largest industry, "will really be feeling the pinch."

The Grand Hotel on Mackinac Island, Mich., had vacancies in 25 of its 300 rooms Sunday night because guests failed to show up. The Sahara Hotel in Las Vegas says its occupancy is down 7 percent. "There have been numerous instances of guests being forced to extend their stays, but it hasn't offset the cancellations," an official says. Cancellations at the Pittsburgh Hilton are running to 27% of total reservations, compared with 5% normally, and the hotel is only half-full.

STRANDED SHRINERS

In San Francisco, some 10,000 Shriners still are stranded from last week's convention, but "no-shows" at the city's largest hotels are beginning to mount. Holdover guests offset the strike's impact in many places, but they also can cause problems, says Melvin Allison, executive assistant manager of the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles. He spent yesterday morning trying to get "a 185-pound, 84-year-old woman in ostrich feathers" back to her home in London. Pan American World Airways, which flew the woman to Los Angeles, can't get her a return flight until after July 22.

Despite delays in arrivals, however, most big conventions intend to go ahead as planned. The Chicago convention bureau is sticking to its initial estimate of 65,000 conventioneers this week; the National Housewares Manufacturers Association reports that 30,000 visitors registered for its convention Monday, and the remaining 20,000 that had been invited were expected to check in yesterday.

Travel agents are singing the blues. "We're losing at least 30 percent of our business each day," moans Marilyn Bogart, a partner in Chicago's VIP Travel Agency. "If the strike continues, it could mean a 50 percent reduction in the number of people handled through this agency," groans G. M. Balta, vice preisdent of Adams Travel Bureau, Inc., in Philadelphia. A travel agent at Paul Browne Associates in San Francisco adds, "One of our biggest problems is getting in touch with airlines that are still operating. We were on the hold button on the telephone for two hours and twelve minutes at Western Airlines Monday, just trying to call in for reservations."

"This strike couldn't have come at a better time for us, since the first two weeks in July are normally the slowest of the year," says a Boston-based official of Flying Tiger Line, Inc., which specializes in air freight. In Los Angeles, the line's director of sales, Paul J. Finazzo, says its westbound freight backlog is about 500,000 pounds, up from the 50,000 to 100,000 pounds normal for this time of year. He says Flying Tiger is "running the pants off" its fleet, but adds, "Even if the strike were to be settled today, it would be a minimum of a week before air freight traffic movements would get back on schedule."

PROBLEMS IN AIR SHIPMENTS

American Airlines, a major nonstruck carrier, also is carrying freight, and in some parts of the country air freight haulers are sticking fairly close to schedules. But in others, manufacturers dependent on air shipments are running into problems. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif., says instrumentation-recorder parts being shipped from Tennessee were "bumped from the plane by mail" and held up for three days, delaying the company's production.

In Baltimore, the Martin Co. division of Martin Marietta Corp., which normally ships about 5 percent of its volume by mail, says delays are running a half-day to a day on both inbound and outbound shipments. Often freight has to be routed circuitously if it is to arrive at all. "Each day is a new problem," says a spokesman, "and the paperwork is building up tremendously because of extra bills of lading."

"We're using special delivery, air parcel post, railway express, as well as air freight to move our component parts, but were still experiencing delays," says a spokesman for Motorola, Inc., Chicago. "We haven't had to shut down any production lines yet, but another week of this and we might get really bogged down."

LOBSTER SHORTAGE

Sometimes firms will go to extraordinary lengths to get freight through. Says a spokesman for Electronic Specialty Co., a Los Angeles electronics maker: "To get a hot order to New York, we sent a shipment of electronic devices along as excess baggage with an executive who had space on a New York flight."

Another victim of the strike is the lobster industry. John Hines of Hines & Smart, a large Boston-area lobster dealer, says the airline walkout is costing the three largest lobster dealers a total of about $1,000 to $1,500 daily in lost shipments. The shortage of lobsters and other East Coast seafood already is beginning to be felt in restaurants as far away as San Francisco.

New York's big wholesale cut flower business also has been hit hard by the strike. Carl Sauter of A. Sauter & Co. says flowers are "lying in the sun" at California airports because there aren't any planes to carry them. He adds that prices on many California flowers already have risen 5 to 10 percent. A New Orleans florist says roses shipped by air from California Thursday didn't arrive until Sunday. After such a delay, "all you can do is throw them in the garbage can," he complains.

Charles River Mouse Farm, Wilmington, Mass., also is "crippled" by the strike, according to Henry Foster, president. The farm normally ships about 80,000 mice and rats a week to research laboratories. Currently about half the livestock is grounded, but a World War II bomber pilot was hired to fly a specially delicate shipment—20 crates of pregnant mice to a University of Pittsburgh lab.

ALTERNATE TRAVEL JAMMED

Most railroads, bus lines and air charter services report they are jammed to capacity. In New York's Pennsylvania Station, the Pennsylvania Railroad stationed a man yesterday with a bullhorn and a walkie-talkie to direct passengers to proper ticket windows. Company planes also were in heavy use, traffic control officials at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport report departures of company-owned aircraft were running three times higher than normal.

Company planes couldn't take up all the slack, however, and many trips had to be abandoned. Ford Motor Co., for example, had to postpone the shooting of publicity pictures of its 1967 cars because it couldn't get its photographers from Detroit to Los Angeles.

Instead of traveling, many businessmen apparently are deciding to use the telephone, and American Telephone & Telegraph Co. says on Friday and Monday, the first two working days of the strike, the volume of long distance calls was 10 to 15 percent above normal.

The strike also is hampering the collection of checks drawn on commercial banks, but the slowdown may be a blessing to the bankers. Because the banks are given credit for the uncollected checks in computing their reserve requirements, the increase in the "float"—or total of checks in the process of being collected—promised to boost at least temporarily the amount of cash they have available for lending.

[From the Daily News, July 12, 1966]

How About Those National Strike Curbs Now?

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, July 11.—President Johnson arrived back in the capital this afternoon from his Texas vacation to learn that Sen. FRANK LAUSCHE (D-Ohio) had just relieved him of an onerous burden.

LAUSCHE introduced a bill in the Senate which kept the promise Johnson made six months ago to do something about solving the problem of crippling nationwide strikes.

No doubt the President had intended to take such steps when he figured the timing was right, or the polls indicated that such a move was in order.

In his state of the Union message last January, Johnson declared: "I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us to deal effectively with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

The New York City transit paralysis obviously prompted that pledge, which seems to have been shelved after the subways began to run again. But LAUSCHE hadn't forgotten the New York debacle, as he reminded the Senate today. And now with the nation facing serious economic impairment from the airlines strike, the Ohio Senator felt the time had come for action.

LAUSCHE said the nation "cannot suffer any longer the stoppage of the transportation industry" and offered a bill to create a Presidential board with authority to make "A final ruling" in all transportation strikes.

Significantly, the Senator moved only a few days after the Teamsters' Union national convention voted Jimmy Hoffa full authority to call nationwide strikes against the trucking industry.

Any pretense that the airlines strike does not involve the national interest would be ridiculous. Apart from all other considerations, the movement of troops in the Viet Nam war planning is directly affected.

The Continental Air Command has had to institute an emergency airlift to carry soldiers returning from or en route to South Viet Nam and to facilitate other military operations.

The Lausche bill, of course, stands no chance of getting even perfunctory consideration by a committee unless it is given a strong push by the Democratic leadership. This isn't likely without a call for action from the White House.

But with this bill already introduced, right in line with his state of the Union pledge, Johnson has a ready made opportunity, to step in, embrace the measure as his own and throw his full weight behind it. The urgencies brought forward by the airlines strike would thus serve as an excellent springboard. Most of the promised Great Society legislation of this year is still pending in Congress and transportation could easily be given a priority position. And the implied Hoffa threat could be disposed of before it became a crisis.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the mounting economic losses and hardship suffered by American travelers, workers, and businesses, as a result of the prolonged airline mechanics strike, compels me once again to renew my plea to the President to intervene personally.

The President did not hesitate to move in last fall to avert a threatened steel strike. After calling the union and industry representatives to talks in the Executive Office of the President, Mr. Johnson registered his determination that a strike must be avoided by personally looking in on the negotiations from time to time.

In this case, instead of moving in to prevent a strike, the President permitted the strike to go into effect and he has so far failed to intervene personally.

So the strike has continued day after day until now the airline shutdown is more than 1 week old.

The press has reported the mounting toll of economic losses not only to airline mechanics and the airlines but also to other employees and other industries. The ripple of economic damage and personal hardship is ever widening—and still the White House maintains its hands-off policy.

I should like to remind the people of America that this administration has just moved in to roll back the price of molybdenum. Previously, this administration has intervened at the very highest level—the White House—to roll back aluminum prices and steel prices, when increases had been announced.

There were many reasons for such high-level intervention—including the desire to hold prices within the administration's wage-price guidelines and so help to hold down the mounting cost of living. Another reason was to prevent a setback in the Nation's economic progress and to prevent unemployment.

All of these objectives are present in the current airline strike dispute.

Why, then, I ask has the White House failed to exert every effort to settle the strike.

With each passing day the adverse impact of the airline strike becomes more heavily felt in Hawaii, where tourism is our second major industry and where the vast majority of tourists come by air.

Pan American Airlines, the only domestic scheduled airline still operating to serve Hawaii and the U.S. mainland, is striving valiantly to accommodate stranded tourists and persons who must travel on business or family matters. But obviously Pan American cannot overnight take care of the thousands of passengers formerly carried by the other two major airlines serving Hawaii and the mainland, who are now grounded.

Two days ago I reported in the Senate the Hawaii Visitors Bureau estimate that the tourist industry in Hawaii loses $2,225,000 each week the strike continues. Based on this, the State of Hawaii could lose about $2 million in secondary earnings and about $200,000 in taxes, according to estimates of informed observers.

The Hawaii Visitors Bureau estimates that my State is losing between 1,200 and 1,400 visitors a day because of the airline strike. The average visitor stays about 2 weeks and spends about $450 in the Islands.

Occupancy rates in hotels on one of our neighbor islands, Kauai, have dropped anywhere from 7 to 20 percent. Continuation of the strike impedes Kauai's strenuous efforts to build up its tourist industry, so desperately needed to create jobs for the people of Kauai and the economy of the Island.

All our major neighbor islands are suffering the backlash of this strike, which is curtailing tourism in Hawaii at the very peak of our tourist season. Many people depend on income from the peak periods to tide them over during slack periods.

The chairman of the county of Hawaii, Mr. Shunichi Kimura, has advised me that the removal of some 34 scheduled flights daily to Hawaii will have a progressively deteriorating effect on our economy which is so closely geared to the visitor industry.

Furthermore, he says:

> Our particular Island of Hawaii suffers in the matter of air agricultural export as well. Prolongation of the strike therefore hurts us badly in our two principal industries.

Mr. Sidney Kusumoto, President of the Japanese Chamber of Commerce wired me asking immediate solution to the airline strike "to avoid hampering of economy."

Some shops in Waikiki report a "drastic decrease" in business. One of Hawaii's leading department stores, Liberty House, advised me the strike "is affecting our tourist business movement of fashion merchandise from the mainland to the islands" and is also "affecting our Hawaii customers ability to mail merchandise to the mainland and movement of our personnel to mainland markets."

One of our inter-island airlines, Aloha Airlines, informed me the impact of the strike has been "already felt" and if the strike continues it "will seriously affect tourist industry and island economy."

The Royal Hawaiian Division of Castle & Cooke reports the airline strike is "causing great distress."

One tour service advised me it had just canceled reservations for 115 people who are unable to come to Hawaii because of the strike.

Another tour group asked for help in expediting a settlement, stating the administration has been "lax in allowing the situation to last this long." I certainly agree.

Mr. President, I could continue the sad recital of adversities occasioned by the airline strike, but I will instead ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the wires and correspondence I have received on the strike, together with pertinent news stories on Hawaii's plight.

There being no objection, the telegrams and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 13, 1966.

The Honorable HIRAM FONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Present airline strike causing great distress to Royal Hawaiian Division of Castle & Cooke. Respectfully urge your good efforts be directed toward rapid settlement.

FRED SIMPICH.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
July 14, 1966.

Senator HIRAM H. FONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Hawaii economy please assist in expediting settlement of airline strike.

Feel administration lax in allowing situation to last this long.

E. Preston Chapin, Jr.,
President, Adventure Tour Travel Service.

Hilo, Hawaii, *July 14, 1966.*

Senator Hiram Fong,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Japanese Chamber of Commerce requests immediate solution to airline strike to avoid hampering of economy.

Sidney H. Kusumoto,
President.

Senator Hiram Fong,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This agency has just cancelled reservations for 115 people unable to come to Hawaii due to current airline strike. Urgently request your intervention in order to avoid continued loss of revenue to Hawaiian economy.

Pageant Tours,
Gerry Jordan.

Honolulu, Hawaii, *July 15, 1966.*

Senator Hiram Fong,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Existing airline strike is having damaging effect on tourist business large and small operators. If allowed to continue will create a disastrous economic hardship on all. Your continued efforts are imperative.

National Car Rental,
Duane T. Probst,
Executive Vice President.

Honolulu, Hawaii,
July 14, 1966.

Senator Hiram Fong,
New Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your efforts in connection with current airline strike. Urge your continued efforts to bring immediate settlement. If strike continues will seriously affect tourist industry and island economy. Adverse impact already felt by Aloha.

Char Alohawaii.

Honolulu, Hawaii,
July 14, 1966.

Hiram Fong ,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Surely there is something you can do to expedite an early settlement of airlines strike. We find it affecting our tourist business; movement of fashion merchandise from the mainland to the islands; also affecting our Hawaii customers ability to mail merchandise to the mainland and movement of our personnel to mainland markets has been curtailed. Will appreciate anything you can do.

E. A. Atterbury,
General Manager, Liberty House.

County of Hawaii,
Hilo, Hawaii, July 11, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senator,
New U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Hiram: I am well aware of your interest and concern in the matter of the airline mechanics strike now in progress. This strike has removed some 34 scheduled flights daily to Hawaii and will have a progressively deteriorating effect on our economy which is so closely geared to the visitor industry.

Our particular Island of Hawaii suffers in the matter of air agricultural export as well. Prolongation of the strike therefore hurts us badly in our two principal industries.

I know that you will do everything in your power to assist in bringing about an early strike settlement. Please use this message as you see fit to convey our expression of concern and dismay to all interested parties.

Yours very truly,
Shunichi Kimura,
Chairman and Executive Officer.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 12, 1966]

Tourist Arrivals Slowed by Strike

The Hawaii Visitors Bureau estimated today that the State is losing between 1,200 and 1,400 visitors a day because of the airline strike.

The average visitor stays two weeks and spends about $450 in the Islands.

"We're beginning to feel this effect right now," said Robert C. Allen, H.V.B. executive vice-president.

Hawaii has not yet lost a sizable number of convention groups, other H.V.B. sources said.

About 1,100 Shriners in five post-convention tour groups came here from California. About 1,500 were expected.

But only 40 of an expected 150 visitors in a United States Conference of Glaziers and Glassblowers Tour Group arrived.

Millions in losses to Hawaii could come from the strike, economists indicated.

The State could lose about $2 million in secondary earnings and about $200,000 in taxes, if the H.V.B.'s estimate of a $2¼ million weekly loss of visitor industry earnings is correct.

Nora Kirkpatrick economist for the First National Bank, said that secondary dollar turnover from visitor money would nearly equal the amount visitors spend in the Islands.

She said that the state normally would derive taxes of about 10 percent on the money.

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, July 12, 1966]

Stores Feel Strike Pinch

Island shops and inter-Island tour services reported the first ill effects yesterday of the airline strike, but most hotels remained nearly filled and businessmen generally said that it was too early to determine any strike effects.

Doyle C. Alexander, of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, said Waikiki store owners reported conditions ranging from a "drastic decrease" to "not too bad."

"The shops are being hurt because the visitors that are here already have done their shopping," Alexander said.

Inter-Island Tours and Island Holidays tours services both reported cancellations, but said that they would not feel the full effect of the strike until the end of the week.

Meanwhile, Pan American Airways' standby space decreased, but a spokesman said the real pinch would not be felt until the weekend.

"If this strike goes on through the week, we're really going to have a problem," he said.

"United Air Lines flights for this weekend were booked full, and so basically were ours."

Pan American announced this morning that all regular flights to the West Coast are booked solidly but that an extra plane would be added to today's schedule.

Leaving at 5 p.m., the plane will carry 161 passengers. The Pan American spokesman said that about 200 persons were on standby this morning at the airport.

Pan American planes arriving from the West Coast have as many as 10 empty seats, an unusually large number for this time of year.

Airline-related businesses reported reduced volume yesterday because of the strike.

Spencecliff Corporation, which caters meals for some airlines, reported that it is preparing about 1,800 fewer meals each week.

Air New Zealand has stopped flying beyond Hawaii to Los Angeles because of the strike.

Flower lei sellers at Honolulu Airport also have felt the pinch of the strike as passengers worried more about getting aboard a plane than about flowers.

Martina Makalino, past president of the Hawaii Flower Lei Sellers Association, said vendors have cut back on the number of flowers they buy.

She said some of the airport lei stands are having difficulty earning enough to pay for their flowers.

Northwest Airlines has laid off 11 reservation and transportation agents, according to the airline's Hawaii sales manager Herbert H. Churchill.

But United has not laid off anyone yet, and Quantas, which handles maintenance for Northwest, has not trimmed its staff.

"It has not affected us at all, and unless it goes on indefinitely, we wouldn't expect it to," said Hartley E. Shannon, engineering manager for Quantas.

TICKET SALES

Even the struck airlines continued to do some business. A United spokesman said the airline's downtown ticket office sales had decreased only 23 percent, though Waikiki ticket sales were off 62.5 percent. The company sold $7,000 in tickets Friday, the day the strike began.

Northwest also has kept its ticket office open. Churchill said the airline's real problem is in dealing with week-end tour groups.

The board has been flooded with calls from worried travelers. A reservation agent reported that some 5,000 calls came in on Friday. Calls have continued at twice the normal rate since the strike began.

Pan American has urged would-be passengers to check at a special standby desk at the airport.

Both the strike-grounded airlines have been shifting freight to Pan American and other carriers. United said its freight load for the week preceding the strike totaled 42,000 pounds.

Northwest Airlines shifted 10,000 pounds of freight to Pan American.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, July 12, 1966]

Kauai Hotels Beginning To Feel Strike Pinch

Lihue.—The airline strike is beginning to affect Kauai hotels, with occupancy drops ranging between 7 and 20 per cent.

Canceled tour groups appear to be the major cause of the empty hotel rooms.

Glenn Lovejoy, manager of the Kauai Surf, the Neighbor Islands' largest hotel, said, "We're beginning to show space, which normally is rare at this time of year.

"Instead of the expected 97 per cent, we're running about 90 per cent, and it will get worse as the strike gets longer.

"The first class rooms appear to be the most seriously affected."

A more marked drop was reported by the Prince Kuhio Hotel at Poipu. Manager Bob Lloyd estimated the resort is running about 20 per cent below normal.

Hardest hit were tour groups that came in over the weekend. Because of the strike, they had to be split into two groups, with some arriving Saturday and the remainder Sunday.

"As a result, we had plenty of empty rooms Saturday night," Lloyd said. "And we've had one entire tour cancel next weekend."

> Most of the small hotels and motels were not hit as hard because they generally cater to Honolulu businessmen and visitors rather than Mainlanders.
>
> Hanalei Plantation manager Barry Yap said, "It hasn't hit us yet, because we usually don't feel things until a week or ten days after Honolulu."
>
> Lloyd was about the only one who saw a bright spot in the strike.
>
> "We use a lot of college students as workers in the hotel, and as a rule they all quit right after the fourth of July.
>
> "Their leaving this year coincided with the strike, so we've got a little breathing space to find new employes."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, so that President Johnson may learn of the situation in Hawaii, I am sending him copies of these documents by special messenger today.

I conclude by once again urging President Johnson to forgo his hands-off policy and instead take a direct hand immediately in settling the airline mechanics strike. Negotiations should be held under White House auspices in around-the-clock sessions, as was done in last year's impending steel strike, so that strike will be quickly settled.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 39, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 508. No part of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for price support loans or payments in connection with the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, in excess of $50,000 to any one person, firm, partnership, or corporation, but not including any payments made to a producer under title III of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Maryland yield himself?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. President, over the past 7 years, on many occasions, I have opposed our present agricultural policy. In all truth, I should like to see this country return to more of a free agricultural market. This, of course, is not entirely possible because of the policies we have pursued over the past 20 years and more; but I believe it is time to stop and take stock.

Therefore, I propose this very simple amendment which the clerk has already reported. It would impose a limitation that no one single producer, individual or corporate, could get direct payments or loans of more than $50,000.

The Senate voted on this proposal last year and, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe it was defeated by some 49 to 42 votes. The vote was very close. But, each year I have served in Congress, we have heard reports that through high subsidies and price supports ultimately we will cut down the cost of the agriculture program. The truth is, and I read from the first page of the committee report on this measure, that last year we paid $6,381,488,500 to support our entire agricultural program, and now the Appropriations Committee reports a proposal this year that we pay $7,022,638,000—an increase of nearly $700 million for a program that the President said should be reevaluated.

I quote from the state of the Union message of the President 2 years ago:

> A major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our efforts to our small farmer who needs help.

I therefore suggest that if we are sincere and are trying to help the small farmer, this limitation on the big producer is entirely appropriate.

Less than 2 percent of the farmers of America gross more than $100,000 a year, yet they take home 20 percent of the subsidy program.

I admit that the amendment I offer today will not amount to a tremendous saving—somewhere short of $25 million—but it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I have the facts on what was paid to American farmers in 1964, a complete list of all farmers who received over $25,000 a year in either direct purchases or loans and the amounts that they repaid on loans that they did not fully redeem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this list by State, by commodity, and by name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*

(NOTE.—The lists below include only those producers who received individual loans of $25,000 or more on one commodity. It is possible that other producers received $25,000 or more from CCC loans by obtaining several loans on the same or different commodities, each for less than $25,000. It is also possible that the producers named on the attached lists obtained additional amounts on other loans, each for less than $25,000. CCC carries out its loan operations on a decentralized basis at many locations throughout the country and maintains all records on a commodity basis; therefore, preparation of lists showing the total amount received from CCC loans by a producer who obtained more than one loan would not be administratively feasible.)

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
BARLEY			
Arizona:	*Bushels*		
Youngker Farms Co., Buckeye	218, 205	$200, 748. 60	$200, 748. 60
Gila River Ranches, Inc., Gila Bend	71, 530	65, 807. 60	65, 807. 60
Enterprise Ranch, Inc., and Arizona Land & Cattle Co., Buckeye	30, 057	27, 652. 44	27, 652. 44
California:			
Westlake Farms, Stratford	971, 333	937, 336. 20	937, 336. 20
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points	296, 374	284, 519. 04	284, 519. 04
E. L. Wallace, Woodland	58, 258	56, 801. 62	56, 801. 62
J. H. Austin, Fresno	26, 257	25, 731. 86	25, 731. 86
Idaho:			
Robert W. Hubbard, Soda Springs	59, 750	50, 280. 41	50, 280. 41
W. S. Shufeldt & Sons, Soda Springs	56, 741	47, 946. 31	47, 946. 31
Gaylen Christensen, Tremonton, Utah	36, 180	30, 753. 00	9, 238. 39
Minnesota: Keith Driscoll and Raymond Driscoll, East Grand Forks	31, 590	25, 272. 00	16, 128. 00
Oregon: Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls	182, 292	157, 682. 29	157, 682. 29
Washington: S. T. S. Farms, Inc., Prescott	19, 764	25, 693. 20	25, 693. 20
BEANS, DRY EDIBLE	*Hundred-weight*		
California: Gnesa Bros., Patterson	6, 324	52, 671. 94	52, 671. 94
Idaho: William Hepworth and Jack Duncan, Rupert	5, 300	38, 531. 00	7, 270. 00
Michigan:			
Michigan Cooperative Bean Marketing Association, Lansing	15, 993	114, 190. 02	34, 272. 00
Mable Graham, Breckenridge	3, 985	28, 451. 11	------------
Frank Kulhanek, St. Charles	3, 507	25, 039. 19	------------
GRAIN SORGHUM	*Hundred-weight*		
Arizona:			
Jack Robison & Sons, Willcox	49, 903	$98, 308. 91	------------
Kinard & Greer, Willcox	33, 702	78, 820. 18	------------
Floyd H. Robbs, Willcox	25, 561	62, 075. 56	$1, 634. 41
Gilmore & Riggs, Willcox	12, 436	30, 468. 43	1, 057. 07
Kansas:			
Glen C. Gaskill, Moscow	16, 718	29, 256. 01	------------
J. David Sullivan, Ulysses	15, 886	26, 052. 87	26, 052. 87
J. R. Kapp, Moscow	14, 473	25, 327. 22	------------
Nebraska:			
F. Lucile Hammond and Tad D. Hammond, Nebraska City	31, 683	58, 296. 72	------------
Guy J. Barr, York	22, 176	39, 473. 28	------------
A. L. Rosener & Sons, Daykin	20, 868	37, 979. 76	------------
Dale Lovegrove, Geneva	20, 966	37, 948. 46	------------
Wayne Lyon, Merna	22, 261	37, 621. 09	------------
Kreutz Bros., Inc., Giltner	18, 850	33, 176. 00	------------
Frank Higgins, Schuyler	18, 954	32, 411. 56	------------
Sheridan Bros., Sutton	17, 735	31, 745. 65	------------
Robert D. Lovegrove, Fairmont	17, 136	31, 022. 16	6. 00
Forrest Binder, Table Rock	16, 330	30, 047. 20	------------
Lamonte Sahling, Kenesaw	17, 136	29, 816. 64	29, 816. 64
John E. Halloran, Hastings	16, 378	29, 152. 84	------------
John Kroger, Jr., Rosalie	15, 271	27, 335. 09	------------
Schurigar Bros., Inc., and Shurigar Farms, Inc., Kenesaw	14, 816	26, 372. 48	------------
Marion Johnson, Loomis	16, 127	26, 341. 36	26, 341. 36
Fred Schwindt, Jr., Clay Center	14, 144	25, 317. 76	------------

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued			
	Hundredweight		
New Mexico:			
Delbert Holloway, Clovis	25,892	$49,052.07	
Jewel Castor, Clovis	22,152	42,753.17	
Texas:			
Tyline N. Perry, Kress	67,422	135,814.15	
Charles Heck, Jr., Nazareth	53,730	107,104.75	
J. Meredith Tatton, Refugio	46,111	96,832.90	
Lloyd M. Bentsen, Mission	41,625	90,040.91	
J. C. Mills, Abernathy	37,568	82,929.81	
Taft McGee, Hereford	44,853	78,044.31	
Carl Easterwood, Dimmitt	43,663	75,973.44	$75,973.44
T. A. and K. G. McKamey, Taft	25,456	75,813.17	
Warner Reid, Tulia	41,375	72,689.11	
Miller Farms Co., Tulia	38,858	67,612.55	
John A. Raymond Smith, Hereford	30,770	65,034.05	
Martin & Marion, Hereford	33,120	63,965.65	
G. L. Willis, Dimmitt	31,378	63,294.95	
Simmonds & Perry, Robstown	29,493	62,230.86	
W. J. Giles, Dimmitt	29,956	60,991.90	
Don Williams, Farwell	34,853	60,644.92	
Stiles Farm Foundation, Thrall	26,602	60,531.34	
Miller Farms, Fort Worth	29,589	60,480.56	
Corliss H. Currie, Happy	28,262	58,552.82	
S. A. McCathern, Hereford	33,504	58,297.13	28,910.10
Nelson D. Durst, Eleanor Chance Couch, and Patience Chance Thomason, trustees under the wills of George G. Chance, deceased, and Georgia Chance, deceased, Bryan	28,839	58,254.78	
O. A. and C. E. Webb, and Charles Saigling, Abernathy	33,451	58,205.43	
J. L. Massey, Robstown	27,556	58,142.67	
Gerald McCathern, Hereford	32,340	58,094.90	
Autry & Baldridge, partnership, Dimmitt	28,690	55,945.89	
Ware Farms Co., Dimmitt	30,435	55,375.37	
John H. Goodwin, Sunray	31,740	55,227.25	
J. C. Mills, Abernathy	25,056	54,883.26	
Elmo Stevens, O'Brien	31,394	54,625.71	
John Trimmier, Jr., Hale Center	31,249	54,373.97	
J. D. Kirkpatrick, Bovina	30,580	54,232.34	
L. G. Mahagan, Kress	28,920	52,620.89	
David Nelson, Hart	30,075	52,330.50	
Mrs. Anna Blake Head, Ind. executrix, estate of Rand Morgan, deceased, Clarkwood	23,731	51,733.19	
Hosea Foster, Canyon	26,128	51,730.76	
Aubrey Harper, Robstown	24,380	51,440.93	
George E. Bennett, Hart	24,396	50,662.54	
Tom Miller, Dimmitt	26,767	50,335.03	
Floyd Webb and Smith Webb Burruss, Mathis	22,254	49,848.82	
Frank Wise, Dimmitt	22,717	49,522.86	
Jack Miller, Dimmitt	25,739	49,402.44	
Amko Farming, Inc., Corpus Christi	22,458	48,958.75	
C. B. Brittain, Sinton	23,027	48,586.33	
Aubrey Harper, Jr., Robstown Mrs. Ollie Knight Jackson, Corpus Christi	22,808	48,125.24	
Monroe Bros., Sunray	27,633	48,081.54	
Tommy Stanton, Dimmitt	22,296	48,013.36	
L. T. Wood, South Plains	26,121	47,721.82	
R. J. Cluck, Dimmitt	24,308	47,457.23	
Raymond Blodgett, White Deer	23,449	47,133.19	
F. J. Mears, Jr., Dimmitt	22,302	47,012.02	
Roy Montague, Silverton	26,646	46,364.03	
Harvey Brock, Hereford	25,239	45,934.17	
Marble Bros. and Paul Kropp, South Plains	23,109	45,647.74	
Brorman Bros., Hereford	21,115	45,400.78	
Wade E. Clark, Kress	23,454	45,265.63	
W. W. Walton, Corpus Christi	20,430	44,458.29	
L. D. Griffin, Silverton	23,966	44,216.53	
Allan Webb, Dimmitt	22,532	43,487.14	
C. H. Mayo, Taft	20,461	43,173.35	
J. M. Dellinger, Jr., Alice	20,373	42,927.01	
Bennett Bros., Pearsall	19,756	42,865.52	
B. L. Moore, Dimmitt	20,067	42,668.28	
W. H. Gentry, Hereford	24,135	41,995.25	
Una C. Dowd, Chapman Ranch	19,244	41,951.98	
J. H. Burkett, Sunray	23,998	41,756.45	
Travis Dyer, Bovina	22,151	41,564.82	
Glenn Merritt, Hart	19,172	41,356.11	
Don Dimball, Wildorado	21,227	40,967.41	
Fred Dunn, Dimmitt	20,259	40,914.17	
John Cole, Waka	23,420	40,750.80	
Dan Heard, Dimmitt	18,718	40,640.21	
Palo Alto Farms, Bishop	18,956	40,636.93	
Tide Products, Inc., Edinburg	18,511	39,880.29	
Merrill Dryden, Sunray	18,818	39,767.89	
Dulaney Bros., Dimmitt	20,109	39,763.79	
J. H. Kirby & Sons, Hale Center	20,383	39,338.82	
H. N. Keisling, Sunray	22,393	38,964.64	
Roy M. Lamb, Amarillo	21,443	39,919.27	
Harlan L. Barber, Hereford	19,745	38,503.04	
Ralph W. Shelton, Friona	22,118	38,485.32	
Epperson & Downing, Inc., Hereford	19,726	38,465.67	
Lloyd Glenn, Tulia	21,585	38,007.55	
Ocker Bros., Corpus Christi	17,388	37,905.84	
John Renner, Friona	21,705	37,766.70	
Joseph F. Green Heirs, Taft	17,882	37,730.98	
Lester Cole, Friona	21,660	37,689.10	
Berta Cunningham Estate, Chapman Ranch	17,238	37,644.58	
Texas—Continued			
Meyer Bros., Wildorado	19,463	$37,563.58	
James Fangman, Hereford	17,695	37,474.07	
V. H. Kellison, Lockney	18,523	37,230.44	
Ivan Block, Hereford	18,648	37,109.52	
J. C. Mills, Abernathy	16,976	37,007.03	
Calvin Petty, Dimmitt	16,958	36,968.43	
Donald J. Meyer, Hereford	21,199	36,886.73	
Bill Bourlon, Farwell	19,178	36,576.34	
Houston Lust, Dimmitt	16,744	36,501.93	
Roy Strasburger, Temple	16,119	36,490.57	
Clinton Glenn, Canyon	20,882	36,454.49	
Jackson & Hoepfner & Driscoll Foundation, Corpus Christi	16,764	36,416.36	
Wilbur Wilson, Plainview	17,383	36,330.47	
Tom Priestly, Corpus Christi Charles and Mabel Elliff, Agua Dulce	17,085	36,049.63	
Higgins & London, Hereford	20,712	36,039.23	
Jack R. C. Vincent, Amarillo	19,000	35,881.24	
Adkins & Son, Amarillo	18,660	35,828.04	
Jim Sam Howze, Robstown	17,024	35,792.99	
H. L. Wilson, Refugio	17,171	35,724.07	$30,360.68
E. D. Chitwood, Jr., Muleshoe	17,968	35,641.10	13,958.77
Marble Bros, South Plains	17,985	35,583.99	
Gordon Taylor, Sunray	16,906	35,512.08	
Lyons Bros., Hereford	18,348	35,499.83	
Charles Norfleet, Hale Center	18,231	35,186.60	
T. L. Abernathy, Jr., Tulia	16,808	35,004.56	
Don Motheral, Kress	20,117	35,004.45	
Clayton Bros., Springlake	20,115	35,000.10	
John Range, Farwell	17,991	34,903.31	
T. C. Garner, White Deer	17,000	34,849.99	
Bob Anthony, Dimmitt	15,818	34,483.46	
R. D. and Billy McClellan, Sunray	19,791	34,436.69	33,436.69
Robert E. Hooper, Plainview	17,739	34,414.82	
Oscar Mayfield & Sons, Taft	16,291	34,373.50	
Harvey and W. A. Spurlock, Sunray	19,717	34,308.34	
Chester Clark, Hereford	19,627	34,151.75	
Jack Smith, Lazbuddie	16,924	33,101.83	
H. H. Parker, Hart	17,984	34,050.00	
D. C. Dilley, Borger	19,517	33,960.42	
Calvan Robertson, Plainview	18,051	33,950.63	
Akin & Tunnel, Plainview	19,489	33,910.16	
Morgan Sturgess, Tulia	19,459	33,858.20	
Mildred Lowman, Bishop G. A. Parr, Alice	16,019	33,799.20	
Wallace Corse, Sunray	19,299	33,580.66	
W. G. Sanderson, Dimmitt	15,388	33,544.93	
Billy John Thorn, Friona	19,250	33,495.00	
Bill Brown, Laxbuddie	19,250	33,495.00	
Gordon H. Branham, Plainview	19,211	33,426.33	
Dalton Caffey, Friona	19,000	33,060.00	
C. B. Womble and R. R. Strain, Hereford	18,977	33,020.71	9,952.80
Rayphard Smithson, Dimmitt	15,135	32,993.64	
L. D. Ballard and Howard Hurt, Plainview	17,814	32,870.62	
Buford Carter, Vega	15,000	32,549.69	
Garner Bros., Bovina	18,661	32,469.44	
J. T. Holcomb and W. E. Uselton, Springlake	14,870	32,417.48	
James Cannon, Lockney	18,563	32,300.31	
S. A. Fangman, Hereford	18,535	32,250.81	
Jack Middleton, Tulia	16,868	32,196.97	
Jack Robertson, Plainview	18,471	32,140.33	
R. R. Rule, Friona	16,649	32,046.54	
Roy Browder, Sunray	18,404	32,022.41	
L. M. Britten, Groom	15,239	32,020.67	
O. D. Jackson, Vega	14,738	31,891.73	
C. Ralph Blodgett, Spearman	15,247	31,866.02	
W. M. Sherley, Lazbuddie	18,295	31,833.30	
A. L. Hartzog, Farwell	18,124	31,536.11	
Wallace Cannon, Plainview	14,652	31,500.94	
Leroy Robison, Sunray	18,006	31,330.44	
W. E. Burnett and Neal Burnett, Plainview	17,980	31,285.72	
Dennis L. Allison, Happy	14,281	31,275.39	
Andrew Price, Kress	17,010	31,060.60	
H. C. Davis, Hart	15,339	30,991.80	
Taylor and Fortenberry, Lockney	17,787	30,950.06	
H. W. Sisemore and J. W. Treadwell, Hale Center	15,366	30,885.27	
Jimmy Cluck, Hart	17,649	30,709.78	
Silvas Bros. and Alex Boyd, Port Lavaca	14,011	30,603.10	
Robert Huseman, Nazareth	14,988	30,557.88	
Edwin Adams, Plainview	15,796	30,443.46	
J. E. McCathern, Jr., Hereford	16,795	30,406.07	
Joe P. Hart, Hart	15,702	30,305.62	
Jim Bob Curry, Hale Center	16,363	30,224.64	12,768.00
Herbert Friemel & Sons, Hereford	13,955	30,003.26	
Luther Browder, Sunray	17,240	29,997.72	
Jack George, Hart	17,226	29,973.46	
O. V. Wilson, Kress	17,208	29,941.75	
B. R. Bennett, Hart	14,158	29,872.87	
J. M. Kendrick, Nazareth	15,383	29,843.20	
Dryden Farms, Robstown	14,526	29,788.90	
Wright Bros., Robstown	14,114	29,781.18	5,727.18
Don Sudderth, Bovina	17,057	29,678.48	
M. N. Smith, Tulia	15,287	29,657.56	
Richard Lupton, Nazareth	15,543	29,615.04	
Gilbert Wenner, Friona	16,943	29,480.48	
Alton Morris, Muleshoe	13,992	29,459.24	
Victor Harman, Happy	16,930	29,457.67	29,457.67

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued			
Texas—Continued	*Hundred-weight*		
W. C. McDaniel, Sinton	13,932	$29,396.67	------------
Brooks & Brooks, Hart	15,125	29,342.49	------------
R. W. Barton, Kress	16,862	29,340.23	------------
Melvin Jennings and O. Sheppard Thomas, Tulia	14,787	29,339.38	------------
Phillip Haberer, Earth	13,910	29,329.12	------------
L. A. Lance & Sons, Bovina	16,705	29,066.70	------------
T. G. and R. L. Jackson, Austwell	13,814	29,008.99	------------
Fred Bruegel, Jr., Dimmitt	16,669	29,003.37	------------
J. S. Hays, Tulia	14,128	28,902.65	------------
R. W. Shelton, Friona	16,596	28,877.57	------------
Walter E. Stone, Robstown	13,622	28,741.66	------------
Ray Groce, Petersburg	13,179	28,729.36	------------
Robert W. Kinkaid, Plainview	14,844	28,648.15	------------
Lee Renner, Friona	16,413	28,557.92	------------
Max Rarick, Bushland	14,799	28,413.90	------------
Dick Geries, Farwell	15,693	28,389.30	------------
Mike Allen, Friona	14,059	28,328.06	------------
Daniel P. Moore, Portland	13,417	28,309.12	------------
Horne Bros., Plainview	16,255	28,283.79	------------
S. R. Hutto, Hart	13,078	28,232.44	------------
G. O. King, Plainview	13,960	28,129.90	------------
Walter Mattiza, Robstown	13,525	28,128.78	------------
J. F. Whitsett, Tulia	14,249	28,096.19	------------
P. P. Stubblefield, Kress	14,408	28,095.43	------------
Dehnisch Bros., Mathis	13,304	28,072.33	------------
Earl Hillman, Kress	15,346	28,036.13	------------
A. T. Frye and Steve Barousett, Dawn	16,072	27,964.55	------------
Walterschied Bros., Hereford	16,070	27,962.03	------------
Ernest Sluder, Bushland	14,525	27,887.54	------------
M. A. Snyder, Jr., Farwell	14,429	27,848.75	------------
Milburn Haydon, Hart	16,000	27,840.00	------------
Alban Farms, Hereford	15,984	27,812.51	------------
C. C. Ellis, Hereford	15,984	27,811.81	------------
Iris Touchstone, Dimmitt	13,938	27,693.47	------------
Odell Jennings, Tulia	14,137	27,666.64	------------
A. E. Lewellen, Plainview	15,895	27,657.53	------------
Vernon Garrison, Silverton	14,199	27,609.18	------------
R. K. Brooks, Tulia	15,836	27,554.22	------------
Paul Kropp and Mae Bryant, Lockney	14,169	27,538.25	------------
J. W. Setliff, Robstown	13,037	27,508.54	------------
J. M. Wright, Dimmitt	15,806	27,502.44	$19,517.58
J. F. Clark, Nazareth	14,156	27,406.48	------------
Melvin Barton, Hereford	14,362	27,363.50	------------
C. R. Kay, Plainview	14,103	27,336.35	------------
Howard Sharp, Tulia	12,682	27,266.75	------------
Deta Blodgett, Spearman	13,011	27,193.20	------------
C. N. Cooke, Corpus Christi	12,473	27,190.61	------------
W. H. Long, Friona	15,625	27,186.92	------------
J. M. Young, Dimmitt	12,877	27,183.76	------------
Jack W. White, Summerfield	14,120	27,110.39	------------
Bob Kay, Dimmitt	12,428	27,093.92	------------
James D. Doan, Tulia	13,016	27,085.58	------------
Walter Taack, Lockney	14,318	27,014.02	------------
Harold Ray Caraway, Tulia	13,472	26,977.40	------------
J. W. Taylor Estate, Lockney	15,466	26,909.97	------------
A. L. Hollingsworth, Hereford	15,464	26,906.66	------------
O. W. Machen, Banguete	12,740	26,882.25	------------
Ray Copeland & Son, Olton	13,903	26,832.42	------------
Dennis Kotara, Panhandle	13,237	26,831.87	------------
Mrs. Mary A. Sanders, Corpus Christi Mrs. Gertrude Luby, Corpus Christi	12,307	26,829.39	------------
John A. Williams, Canyon	13,538	26,827.07	------------
Charles H. Friemel, Canyon	14,914	26,790 93	------------
George Heard, Hereford	12,286	26,783.49	------------
A. J. Givens, Plainview	13,507	26,743.07	------------
Carl Pate, Kress	15,361	26,728.49	------------
T. G. McKinney, Dimmitt	12,235	26,671.23	------------
E. M. Gossett, Jr., Dumas	15,859	26,600.84	26,600.84
Everett Wiseman, Vega	15,991	26,545.06	26,545.06
Roman Friemel, Hereford	12,219	26,515.23	------------
W. D. Howard, Jr., Farwell	15,210	26,465.40	------------
Lorenza Lee, Hart	13,785	26,426.46	------------
Fred Mercer, Silverton	15,180	26,413.90	------------
Virgil Marsh, Hereford	15,172	26,399.72	------------
Jimmy McLaughlin and Pete McLaughlin, Plainview	12,102	26,382.35	------------
Robert E. and Eugene O. Heath, Hale Center	13,107	26,345.46	------------
Doyld Davis, Hart	13,612	26,310.97	------------
Alice B. Simmonds estate and L.S.T. Farms, Robstown	12,442	26,251.96	------------
Mercer T. Ivey, Taft	12,437	26,241.03	------------
J. E. Howard, Plainview	15,077	26,233.63	------------
Harvey Milner, Tulia	15,075	26,229.74	18,381.14
John C. Carter, Plainview	13,485	26,161.28	------------
H. D. Moore and Vinita McClain, Wildorado	15,027	26,147.61	------------
Forrest Vise, Happy	12,788	26,086.21	------------
Lewis Sharp, Tulia	14,550	26,064.18	------------
Roma Boggs, Kress	13,553	26,022.35	------------
Felix Mote, Tulia	12,984	26,007.05	------------
Kenneth Heard, Littlefield	11,922	25,990.18	------------
Donal Akin, Floydada	12,638	25,974.64	------------
A. C. Glenn, Kress	13,441	25,940.95	------------
Young Bros. and R. E. Young, Floydada	13,290	25,914.73	------------
Melvin May, Hereford	14,859	25,854.97	25,854.97
George Heck, Tulia	13,175	25,847.07	------------
Bob Hammonds, Farwell	14,847	25,833.43	------------
Clyde Bradford, Happy	12,177	25,808.63	------------
Nelson Burton, Sunray	14,820	25,786.88	------------
Claude Higley, Stinnett	12,211	25,764.64	------------
GRAIN SORGHUM—continued			
Texas—Continued	*Hundred-weight*		
Edgar Rathkamp, Tivoli	12,268	$25,762.80	------------
C. F. Harris, Plainview	13,378	25,724.87	------------
Sam Rundell, Farwell	13,595	25,722.76	------------
Floyd Tomlinson, Canyon	14,769	25,697.36	------------
Ralph Britten, Groom	12,596	25,646.36	$7,113.27
Jerry Young, Plainview	12,921	25,615.68	------------
Jack Jackson, Abernathy	12,148	25,534.18	------------
Everett Heller, Kress	11,634	25,496.45	------------
Roy Roberts, Olton	12,869	25,477.59	------------
Leo Szydloski, Happy	11,628	25,466.20	------------
Paul Schniederjan, Bushland	13,217	25,376,56	------------
A. T. Kleman, Dimmitt	12,538	25,367.27	------------
Mrs. Jessie Herring, Johnson Estate, Vernon	14,554	25,324.48	------------
John A. Abbott, Harlingen	12,919	25,321.44	25,321.44
Ted Richardson, Hereford	14,552	25,319.78	------------
Homer Bartram & O. C. Harris, Lockney	11,313	25,228.88	------------
E. L. Howard, Friona	13,100	25,209.65	------------
Bobby McCormick & Paul Cooper, Lockney	13,103	25,158.33	------------
Wayne Foster, Farwell	12,479	25,144.56	------------
Carl Bruegel, Dimmitt	14,477	25,138,48	------------
Melvin Brock, Lockney	12,807	25,102.29	------------
F. L. Eicke, Hereford	11,532	25,025.30	------------
Paul Toliver, Plainview	11,963	25,001.84	------------
OATS			
	Bushels		
Georgia: C. T. Kersey, Sr., Elko	45,900	34,884.00	34,884.00
Idaho: Robert Myers, Bonners Ferry	62,100	39,744.00	------------
Mississippi: Loyce Makamson, Sidon	69,636	47,842.76	27,655.38
North Dakota: Ballantyne Bros., West Hope	57,150	29,718.00	------------
Oregon:			
Tulana Farms, Klamath Falls	953,125	691,015.62	555,078.13
Murel A. Long, Merrill	61,875	43,312.50	393.75
South Carolina:			
Kirkland & Best, Ulmers	51,030	37,432.80	18,262.80
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	44,959	34,168.84	34,168.84
J. C. Oswald, Allendale	39,478	29,791.95	29,791.95
South Dakota:			
Elkhorn, Martin	57,600	33,408.00	------------
J. E. Cheek Estate, Pierre	49,435	28,177.95	28,177.95
RICE			
Arkansas:			
Arkansas Rice Growers Cooperative Association, Stuttgart	1,975,974	10,192,868.95	10,192,868.95
Producers Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart	729,000	3,717,900.00	3,717,900.00
McAlister Seed Service Co., Walnut Ridge	29,676	146,163.14	146,163.14
Alice Sidney Farms, Lake Village	26,142	135,440.55	135,440.55
W. B. Bynum, Dermott	26,928	129,505.56	129,505.56
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson	23,007	110,560.13	110,560.13
Charles J. Peacock, Jr., McCrory	16,793	89,832.61	83,810.99
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro W. C. Bradley, Walnut Ridge	17,817	86,621.09	86,621.09
Kehi Plantation, Marion	16,042	81,631.71	------------
F. K. Bradshaw & Son, Hamburg	14,700	77,929.98	77,929.98
W. A. Baker, George Birmingham, and Aubrey E. Birmingham, Grady	12,422	68,227.86	------------
W. H. Hanna, Montrose	12,895	67,377.46	67,377.46
Charles H. Smith and Charles Bullock, Boydell	12,958	66,557.45	66,557.45
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro	11,432	61,564.45	60,759.45
Tucker Blankenship, Corning	12,592	60,854.50	60,854.50
R. D. Williams, Jr., Diaz	12,633	57,879.95	57,879.95
David N. and James D. Ford, Sherrill	10,570	57,872.64	57,872.64
Taggart & Taggart, Inc., Augusta	10,470	56,474.64	56,474.64
Hildebrand Farms, Inc., Stuttgart Raymond Hildebrand, Moscow	11,051	55,288.12	55,288.12
Doyle & Wilmans, Diaz	12,186	53,876.35	53,876.35
Elmer Ferguson, DeWitt	10,526	53,487.70	53,487.70
Leon J. Garot, DeWitt	10,671	52,604.25	52,604.25
Robert P. Lewis and Carl Price, England	10,225	50,305.77	------------
C. E. Newman, Fair Oaks	9,921	48,323.36	32,743.55
Powell Bros., Eudora	9,178	48,161.44	48,161.44
Pinchback Planting Co., Grady	8,856	44,645.40	44,645.40
Lester Fetzer, Hickory Ridge	8,297	43,295.45	43,295.45
R. C. Gilbrech, Holly Grove	8,740	43,021.50	43,021.50
Lawrence Digman and Hines Digman, Walnut Ridge	7,652	42,561.74	42,561.74
Lovett Farms, Grady	8,185	42,065.99	28,589.75
J. T. Carothers, Lake Village	7,868	41,543.04	41,543.04
John Schenk, Monticello	8,260	41,064.77	41,064.77
E. R. Coleman, Dowdy	8,145	40,684.95	40,684.95
J. P. Duncan, Dermott W. R. Smith, Lake Village E. F. Smith & Sons, Readland	7,983	40,665.35	7,938.00
Ralph Wimpy, Harrisburg	8,295	40,277.51	40,277.51
Truman Loftis, Bob Carllee, and Louis Carllee, England	8,819	40,213.63	------------
Nehon Hagler, Cherry Valley	7,841	40,000.07	40,000.07
A. L. Marsh, Ruth Marsh, and Kathleen M. Barber, McCrory	8,403	38,396.97	38,396.97
Tommy Hillman, Stuttgart Southern Rice Farms, Carlisle	7,160	38,023.30	38,023.30
Ralph R. Watkins, Stuttgart Geeridge Farm, Inc., Stuttgart Big Ditch Irrigation Co., Stuttgart	6,729	37,844.04	37,844.04
Robert Johnson, Cash	6,859	37,667.20	35,810.10

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued			
Arkansas—Continued	*Bushels*		
H. B. Chambliss, Pine Bluff	6,894	$37,046.70	----------
Chester Rutledge, Leon Rutledge, and C. S. Castleberry, Newport	7,737	36,209.16	$36,209.16
Clinton and Harold Anderson, Sherrill	6,716	35,766.27	----------
B. O. Geunther, Sherrill	6,716	35,766.22	----------
McAlister Seed Service Co., and Clifford Micklish, Cash	6,281	34,929.29	34,929.29
Raymond Barrett, Jonesboro	6,802	32,873.18	32,873.18
Guy M. Beene, Wynne	6,718	32,649.48	32,649.48
Ray Weaver, Cash	5,750	32,568.10	32,568.10
Noble Lake Planting Co., M. D. Morgan, and M. N. Rush, Pine Bluff	6,446	32,399.49	3,916.60
Erskine Harriman and Harry Lauhon, Hamburg	5,994	31,807.89	31,807.89
Sam Abowitz & Son, Arkansas City	6,723	31,655.61	31,655.61
David Knoll, Stuttgart	6,075	30,946.05	30,946.05
Ray and Don Daugherty, Stuttgart			
R. G. Holden Land Co. and John L. Conner, Newport	6,388	30,941.50	30,941.50
R. A. Greer, Weldon	7,038	30,753.00	30,753.00
Otmar Hageman and Joe Freeman, Gould	5,629	30,446.43	30,446.43
Mary O. McGregor, Sherrill	5,521	30,035.87	----------
Paul Young, Sherrill			
Leland Jones, Alicia	5,265	29,694.60	29,694.60
Eldon Simmons, Harvey Simmons, and Rudy Jones, Minturn	6,073	29,447.99	29,447.99
Paul Gaines, I. N. Arnof, and G. L. Morris, McCrory	6,276	28,430.28	28,430.28
H.S. Bramlett, McCrory	6,109	27,694.39	14,102.07
Burns Bros., Palestine	4,770	27,027.90	27,027.90
R. B. Oliver, Stuttgart	5,221	26,874.81	26,874.81
Albert Bullard, Minturn	5,702	26,713.84	26,713.84
Earl Simms, Hoxie			
Keiser Supply Co., Keiser	5,527	26,495.77	26,495.77
David Knoll, Stuttgart	5,062	26,477.87	26,477.87
Ralph and Anna Wood, Cherry Valley	4.860	25,952.40	25,952.40
Lamar and Willie L. Miles, Monticello	4,859	25,825.53	25,825.53
Robert Johnson and Joy Ledbetter, Jonesboro	4,657	25,816.02	25,816.02
J. C. Emenhiser, Eudora	5,670	25,636.50	25,636.50
E. W. Hahn, Hazen	4,737	25,554.01	25,554.01
Raymond Hahn, Stuttgart			
Ethan Dodd, Minturn	5,262	25,546.54	25,546.54
California: Thomas Mezger, Woodland	9,983	43,925.20	43,925.20
Louisiana:			
Mayo Romero, New Iberia	25,380	114,509.70	114,509.70
Zaunbrecher Bros., Jones	16,799	80,654.19	45,933.54
W. P. Tomlinson, Lake Providence	15,307	76,433.63	76,433.63
Rheinoldt J. Leonards, Lake Charles	14,027	64,799.55	64,799.55
Open Al Ranch, Inc., Lake Charles			
Brady Oswalt, Lake Providence	12,028	62,034.56	62,034.56
James B. Lingo, Oak Grove	10,934	56,934.30	56,934.30
Larry Guidry, Oberlin	11,916	52,978.21	52,978.21
Byron L. Rye, Pioneer	10,170	50,737.14	50,737.14
Arthur Loewer, Branch	8,298	38,813.33	38,813.33
Orin Andrepont, Kinder	7,971	36,532.49	36,532.49
Ashton S. Petitjean, Rayne	7,944	35,459.38	35,459.38
Eve Fontenot, Oberlin	7,364	33,442.87	33,442.87
Weston Monceaux, Oberlin	6,412	31,781.17	31,781.17
Clarence LaPoint, Reeves	6,531	29,648.32	29,648.32
Louis Fuselier, Mittie	5,393	26,826.62	26,826.62
Earl K. Oswalt, Lake Providence	4,859	26,813.58	----------
Elmo J. Bollick, Jones	5,882	26,156.52	26,156.52
John R. Denison, Iowa	4,952	25,150.93	25,150.93
Sagrera Bros., Bonita	8,100	34,720.65	34,720.65
Mississippi:			
Albert Prevot, Dwight McCollum, Frank Orlicek, and Thounissen, Hollandale	32,649	172,872.07	39,332.82
Nott Wheeler, Cleveland	25,054	130,965.82	130,965.82
J. A. Howarth, Jr., Cleveland	24,473	130,349.73	130,349.73
Allen Gray Estate, Benoit	24,600	122,516.13	122,516.13
Laudig & Cole Farms, Boyle	23,057	122,298.32	122,298.32
Dominic P. Rizzo, Cleveland	22,030	112,191.51	112,191.51
J. and V. Aguzzi, Cleveland	19,504	108,565.57	108,575.57
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	21,056	103,205.64	103,205.64
Mills Bros., Benoit	18,855	102,856.62	17,471.05
J. C. O'Neal, Jr., Cleveland	18,726	96,112.86	96,112.86
W. P. Skelton, Rosedale	15,636	83,012.98	----------
Richard Bros., Doddsville	16,121	76,467.32	76,467.32
Edward A. Lyons, Cleveland	15,530	73,920.94	73,920.94
Maryland Planting Co., Clarksdale	12,423	67,005.50	67,005.50
Hall & Hawkins, Merigold	12,311	65,444.87	17,151.95
W. J. Chudy, Cleveland	11,576	64,308.04	----------
Barbour & Parker, Cleveland	12,376	63,290.09	63,290.09
Wilton Richard, Greenville	12,812	60,492.08	60,429.08
Dan Seligman, Shaw	11,235	60,130.52	21,196.02
Raymond Murrell, Avon	10,910	59,284.88	59,284.88
Kenneth Frey, Hollandale	10,044	54,257.16	54,257.16
A. R. Mann, Jr., Skene	9,247	48,824.16	48,824.16
David E. Greer, Hollandale	9,362	47,818.16	47,818.16
Harden Farms, Cleveland	9,169	47,788.46	1,719.62
Cone & Richard, Greenville	10,419	47,456.28	47,456.28
Patterson Bros., Merigold	8,465	46,652.47	----------
Isabell S. Welshan & W. A. Welshan, Jr., Rosedale	9,241	46,339.29	46,339.29
Heinsz & Heinsz, Shelby	8,495	45,582.30	45,582.30
McGarrh & McGarrh, Merigold	8,481	45,461.91	----------
Ewing & Son, Inc., Robinsonville	8,856	43,690.59	42,903.09
Verl Fullen, Shaw	7,754	42,702.66	9,934.80
Eifling Farms, Hollandale	7,983	42,179.64	42,179.64
George F. Stock, Hollandale	7,766	41,553.18	2,395.50
L. E. Grant, Isola	8,434	41,486.09	41,486.09
RICE—continued			
Mississippi—Continued	*Bushels*		
J. L. Wilson, Jr., Rosedale	8,617	$39,772.43	$39,772.43
L. F. Foreman, Clarksdale	7,293	39,127.69	12,698.98
Robert E. Smith, Cleveland	7,135	38,660.18	38,660.18
Glenn E. McCoy, Clarksdale	7,329	38,417.17	----------
Joseph H. Theunissen, Hollandale	7,458	38,177.10	38,117.10
H. D. and T. A. Tharp, Isola	7,123	37,503.75	----------
E. D. Strain, Jr., Morgan City	6,989	36,802.72	36,802.72
Homewood Farms, Inc., Greenville	7,269	36,566.46	33,078.96
W. B. Tackett, Belzoni	7,119	35,858.70	35,858.70
Gerald and Henry Frey, Hollandale	6,582	35,819.48	35,819.48
A. and N. Fioranelli, Cleveland	6,753	35,538.97	----------
F. P. Unkel, Shaw	6,822	34,502.04	1,940.33
Charles Berry, Memphis, Tenn	6,057	33,439.95	----------
Harris & Wilson, Inc., Hollandale	5,953	32,830.16	32,830.16
L. A. Peeples, Merigold	6,526	32,644.33	----------
S. R. Phebus, Banks	6,480	31,112.10	31,112.10
Eckward N. McKnight, Cleveland	6,099	30,638.18	----------
Wade, McCollum, Hollandale	5,606	27,908.50	27,908.50
F. H. Nance, Cleveland	4,932	26,879.40	26,879.40
H. B. Mullins, Merigold	5,273	26,692.26	----------
Joe B. Dakin, Skene	4,924	26,638.84	22,814.92
L. B. Wilkinson & Purvis Richardson, Shaw	5,182	26,635.48	26,635.48
Sunrise Dairy, Cleveland	4,891	26,365.59	12,365.53
Josephine Plantation & Charles Lawrence, Merigold	4,990	25,919.40	25,919.40
J. C. Willis, Jr., Hollandale	4,762	25,655.25	----------
M. D. Dossett, Beulah	4,957	25,558.14	25,558.14
M. B. Litton, Shaw	4,786	25,411.61	----------
Turner Arant, Blaine	4,653	25,172.73	----------
L. B. Pate & Sons, Cleveland	4,693	25,093.69	----------
Texas:			
Anderson Farming Co., Lissie	45,419	217,422.39	171,935.02
Chocolate Bayou Rice & Canal Co., Alvin	36,261	162,066.47	162,006.47
J. A. Jenkins, B. M. Jenkins, and W. E. Jenkins, Jr., Hankamer	29,932	146,707.21	146,707.21
E. J. Stoesser, Dayton	25,837	135,318.09	135,318.09
Texas West Indies Co. Farm, El Campo	23,825	126,776.96	126,776.96
J. O. and G. F. Dennison, Liberty	24,105	118,435.45	118,435.45
T. F. Jenkins, Glen M. Kolemay, and Jeffrey Jenkins, Winnie	24,268	117,526.71	117,526.71
Pfeffer & Son Farms, Houston	22,876	115,106.88	74,701.45
A. J. and J. R. Carter, Victoria	23,781	114,153.04	114,153.04
J. H. Clipson, Sr., Eagle Lake	19,663	107,755.82	107,755.82
Harry Hafesnick and T. J. Babb, Edna	21,808	107,317.20	107,317.20
Henderson Farms, El Campo	20,825	103,911.28	103,911.28
R. M. Middleton Estate and Ed, Roy, George, Shirley, and L. E. Turner & Son, Anahuac	18,583	94,573.58	95,573.58
Floyd & Kenneth Henderson, El Campo	19,785	93,608.27	93,608.27
Martin Bros. & Son, Houston	19,591	92,253.42	92,253.42
Jess Mathews and Katherine Vance, Beaumont	18,694	90,315.03	90,315.03
Eddie Blackman, Sr., and Hornbeck Bros., DeKalb	18,023	85,871.06	85,871.06
Henry Huff, Edna	19,170	84,903.48	84,903.48
Francis Koop, Edna	16,719	82,209.12	59,301.63
J. R. Reed, El Campo	16,979	80,982.04	56,619.23
J. R. Thomas, Eagle Lake	15,365	80,765.10	80,765.10
Marvin Wiede and John Koop, Edna	16,689	80,751.53	41,526.53
E. P. Duke, Elmo Duke, Jr., and Anthony Duke, Rosharon	15,870	80,554.08	80,554.08
N. & M. Farms, Linke Nolte, and Rupert Myzell, Anahuac	14,578	78,461.48	78,461.48
R. L. Clipson, Eagle Lake	14,714	76,802.20	----------
Joe R. Anderson and T. L. Davidson, East Bernard	14,005	74,226.50	74,226.50
W. C. McBride and J. C. Emenhiser, Stowell	12,968	73,095.80	73,095.80
Harold Koop, Edna	15,394	72,837.90	72,837.90
Clinco Ranch, Clodine	14,915	70,798.35	57,409.05
Blue Creek Rice Farms & Kountz & Couch, El Campo	13,394	68,576.00	68,576.00
Blue Creek Rice Farms, by Frank L. Ramsey, agent, El Campo	14,105	66,915.21	66,915.21
Euel Dugat & E. J. Dugat, Winnie	13,058	64,888.70	64,888.70
E. P. Duke & Sons, Rosharson	12,575	63,057.58	63,057.58
Curtis A. Seaberg & Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	12,095	62,117.14	62,117.14
Henderson Farms, El Campo	13,173	61,849.40	61,849.40
Floyd & Kenneth Henderson & Clyde DeFoor, El Campo	13,003	61,447.79	61,447.79
Roger C. Brown, Dayton	12,633	60,817.17	60,817.17
Walter A. Virnau & Sons, Sealy	11,808	60,122.40	60,122.40
T. E. Reidland & Son, Crosby	12,575	60,106.63	60,106.63
A. G. & M. T. Simons, Jr., Edna	12,167	59,972.14	47,991.26
Robert Rasmussen & D. W. Beck, Louise	12,442	59,536.86	69,536.86
Harry and Everett Anderson, East Bernard	11,569	58,847.28	23,519.82
Ed H. Helwig, Fulshear	12,090	58,206.39	45,509.78
Cinco Ranch, Clodine			
John Clipson, Eagle Lake	11,993	57,732.22	57,732.22
Marsalia Bros., Eagle Lake	10,755	57,580.05	17,723.85
P. D. Gertson, Sr., Lissie			
John Pearson and T. J. Babb, Edna	11,897	56,990.15	56,990.15
J. H. Taylor, Hamshire	11,750	56,323.26	56,323.26
Frank R. Duke, Liberty	13,181	55,051.68	55,051.68
Joe R. Anderson, East Bernard	10,598	54,960.11	10,937.08
Ike, Morriss and Woodrow Prejean, Winnie	11,201	54,893.67	54,893.67

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued			
Texas—Continued	*Bushels*		
Jack Stoesser, Dayton	11,781	$54,623.76	$54,623.76
L. D. Ware, Fulshear	11,585	53,589.73	46,061.38
B. D. Fussell, Eagle Lake	9,774	52,779.60	-----------
Blue Ribbon Mills, Inc., Houston	10,682	52,550.02	52,550.02
Johnson & Johnson, West Columbia	11,237	51,813.78	51,813.78
Marsalia Bros., C. C. Brasher & T. L. Davidson, Eagle Lake	10,370	51,331.50	51,331.50
L. G. Raun & Sandy Creek Ranch, El Campo	10,578	50,034.65	50,034.65
Mitchell Bros., Beaumont	10,645	49,433.25	49,433.25
Jarrell E. Brown, Edna	9,757	48,942.88	48,942.88
K. Saibara & Son, Webster	10,260	48,619.63	48,619.63
Jack C. McBride, J. F. Guidry & W. S. Edwards, Winnie	9,868	48,435.66	48,435.66
Billy Halfen, Collegeport	9,495	47,911.32	47,911.32
Lowell G. Raun & Stockton Estate, El Campo	9,153	47,318.68	47,318.68
H. E. Moor & J. T. White Estate, Anahuac	10,295	46,863.70	46,863.70
Adolph S. Hankamer, Hankamer	9,774	46,812.50	46,812.50
Jack B. Willis, Eagle Lake	9,040	46,498.29	46,498.29
Paul McGown, Winnie	9,470	46,071.14	46,071.14
Clark Farms, S. J. Clark, Sr., and Gerald M. Clark, Edna	9,249	45,818.94	45,818.94
George Way and J. T. White Estate, Stowell	9,053	45,749.48	45,749.48
Frank A. Higgins, Eagle Lake	9,285	45,699.45	17,665.45
Maurice Willis and T. L. Davidson, Eagle Lake	9,320	45,667.56	45,667.56
Ferdinand J. Leonards and John Oscar Devillier, Winnie	9,099	45,657.41	45,657.41
R. M. Middleton Estate and I. Jett Hankamer, Hankamer	8,635	45,579.56	45,579.56
E. B. Kirkham and H. B. Haynes, Anahuac	8,770	45,166.64	45,166.64
Emmett Herbert, Stowell	9,371	45,014.49	45,014.49
Noel Clark, Edna	10,934	44,799.35	44,799.35
J. B. Wyatt, Clodis H. Cox, and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	10,129	44,457.90	40,809.75
Joe F. Terry, Victoria	9,182	43,971.67	43,971.67
Wilfred LeBlanc, Doris LeBlanc, and S. D. Fontenot, Winnie	9,730	43,365.33	43,365.33
N. S. Bean, Raymond	9,225	42,385.95	42,385.95
Naomi L. Kole, Winnie	8,118	42,166.32	42,166.32
J. S. and W. W. Winzer, Winnie	8,392	42,156.63	42,156.63
Donald Henderson, El Campo	8,579	42,139.84	42,139.84
Alfred J. Ash, Dayton	9,094	41,857.30	41,857.30
Howard Watson, Angleton	7,690	41,310.46	41,310.46
C. A. Kiker, Beaumont	7,573	41,059.56	27,404.04
C. W. Sisk; George, William D., and H. E. Dishman, Beaumont	8,159	40,401.44	40,401.44
Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	8,129	40,252.34	40,252.34
A. W. Peveto, Flurry Joe Peveto, and Lutcher & Moore Lumber Co., Orange	8,492	40,122.02	40,122.02
Carlton W. Trant and W. H. Keenan, Liberty	8,490	39,994.56	39,994.56
William H. Whetstein Farms, Alvin	8,383	39,477.30	39,477.30
Daniel J. Hankamer and R. M. Middleton Estate, Wallisville	7,574	38,930.36	38,930.36
Louie L. W. Lunday, Alvin	7,554	38,831.78	38,831.78
Arthur Lemke, Jack Daigle, Loranzo Daigle, and W. E. Bogan, China	6,866	38,728.35	38,728.35
Bobby Shellhammer and M. L. Shellhammer, Hamshire	7,897	38,685.26	28,685.26
Albert, Jewell, and Albert Dutcher, Jr., Wells Farm, and Frank C. Gordon, Lissie	8,022	38,522.59	38,522.59
Mrs. P. H. Sherer and Phil Baker, Anahuac	8,051	38,504.00	38,504.00
E. A. Turner and W. M. McBride and Son, Winnie	7,808	38,486.43	38,486.43
Ivan Hebert and E. L. Chaney, Beaumont	7,485	38,398.05	38,398.05
James Weaver, Hankamer	7,811	38,125.00	38,125.00
C. W. Smith, Louise Sample Germer and W. F. Germer, Ganado	7,947	37,800.35	37,800.35
Lester J. Cranek, Garwood	7,826	37,773.25	37,773.25
F. W. Fontenot, Broussard and Hebert, Anahuac	7,626	37,469.94	37,469.94
J. W. and John Isaacs, Alvin	8,308	37,381.67	37,381.67
J. H. Sandlin, Anahuac	6,994	37,340.55	37,340.55
Schiurring Bros., Garwood	7,793	37,331.65	37,331.65
W. W. McBride, Winnie	7,131	37,133.10	37,133.10
L. L. Fontenot, Winnie	7,413	37,079.20	37,079.20
Jack C. and Eloise McBride, Winnie	7,043	36,812.75	36,812.75
E. J. and Euell Dugat and E. C. Devillier, Winnie	7,352	36,647.02	36,647.02
Bert Harbour and Mrs. Lucille Harbour, Hankamer	7,835	36,416.87	36,416.87
J. T. Herin, Edna	8,712	36,329.46	36,329.46
Louis Watson, Angleton	7,193	35,836.82	35,836.82
N. S. and Jesse Wittman, Hamshire	6,928	35,709.26	35,679.63
Jay and Dexter Anderson, Lissie	6,936	35,457.46	33,287.43
B. D. Hart and Frank Galloway, Devers	7,581	35,428.55	35,428.55
William Zboril, Garwood	7,232	34,203.88	34,203.88
M. A. Ellis & Son and Mitchell D. Ellis, Collegeport H. A. Norris & Son, Bay City	6,008	34,020.84	25,767.38
Guy Myrick and Otto Truksa, Alvin	7,040	34,013.44	34,013.44
Lowell, George, and Norris Raun, El Campo	6,420	33,962.59	33,962.59
RICE—continued			
Texas—Continued	*Bushels*		
Denver Poland and Doornbos Bros., Winnie	7,495	$33,803.55	$33,803.55
Ivo Phend, Sr., Russell Phend, and Marie Weir et al., Hamshire	6,734	33,772.94	33,772.94
J. W. Gober, Nome	6,659	33,496,98	33,496.98
W. J. Winzer, Winnie	6,407	33,472,36	33,472.36
P. W. Douglas, Sour Lake	6,939	33,374.81	33,374.81
P. D. Kinser and R. M. Middleton Estate, Anahuac	6,802	33,126.72	33,126.72
Charles and Quintin Shult, and Frank L. Ramsey, El Campo	6,398	32,895.26	32,895.26
Mrs. Maggie Wisegerber, Lester Ray Wisegerber, and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	6,672	32,834.52	32,834.52
Chester Hicks and Frank S. Bulher, Edna	7,211	32,789.01	32,789.01
M. D. Shillings, Port Lavaca	7,508	32,738.40	32,738.40
Jesse Copeland and M. L. Shellhammer, Hamshire	6,186	32,723.94	32,723.94
James R. and Henry J. Hlavinka and Boettcher & Wasicek, East Bernard	5,955	32,690.75	-----------
E. E. and H. L. Adams, Alvin	6,981	32,690.50	32,690.50
Norris Raun, El Campo	6,371	32,681.43	32,681.43
Ben McCormick, Alvin	6,876	32,549.99	32,549.99
Jay and Dexter Anderson, Lissie	6,572	32,282.53	24,710.65
W. W. and J. S. Winzer and Edward C. Devillier, Winnie	6,611	32,133.46	32,133.46
Alvin E. Johnson, Louise	6,744	32,129.52	32,129.52
Billy Ray Smith, Ganado	6,854	32,048.84	32,048.84
J. C. Lewis, E. L. McDonald, and G. R. McKelvy, Bay City	6,570	31,829.76	-----------
Joe F. and Raymond Terry and George Musselman, Victoria	6,774	31,758.84	31,758.84
Wilfred Le Blanc, Winnie	6,091	31,423.29	31,423.29
J. B. Miller, Jr., Beaumont	6,575	31,186.31	28,632.92
J. K. and R. G. Allen, El Campo	6,275	31,141.93	31,141.93
Pete Eaton and B. D. Anderson, Rock Island	6,563	31,107.38	-----------
Richard Hahn, Ganado	6,797	30,518.53	30,518.53
C. D. Fenner, Paul Slatter, O. B. Fenner, A. J. Carter, and Floyd Slatter, Edna	5,574	30,376.66	-----------
A. J. Hungerford, Midfield	5,915	30,315.81	28,145.78
Adolph Jr., and Calvin E. Ebner, Orange	5,830	30,097.67	30,097.67
Pat H. Flowers and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	5,637	30,092.30	30,092.30
Elroy J. Ortego, Alta Loma	6,399	29,971.23	29,971.23
B. G. and F. M. Elkins, Devers	5,847	29,629.34	29,629.34
Alfred J. Ash and Sophie Graves Estate, Dayton	6,606	29,580.72	29,580.72
Warren Craigen, Beaumont	6,353	29,544.33	13,256.77
B. F. Metzger, Katy Ethel M. Campbell, Welsh, La.	6,053	29,517.05	20,474.75
F. J. Merta, Louise	6,274	29,331.46	29,331.46
Schiurring Bros., Garwood	6,710	29,322.70	29,322.70
J. T. Hare, Crosby	6,143	28,958.30	28,958.30
Keith Flournoy, Liberty	6,289	28,866.51	28,866.51
Eugene Bourque, Rosharon	6,557	28,315.37	28,315.37
J. W. Parker, Arnold Wolf, Jr., and B. F. Troxell, Dayton	5,759	28,275.21	28,275.21
George V. Miller, China	6,152	28,106.58	28,106.58
N. T. Stansbury, Beaumont	6,068	28,094.84	28,094.84
C. S. Brown, Devers	5,639	28,079.06	13,460.82
Jack Duke, Rosharon	6,049	28,056.59	28,056.59
Duward Harper, Alvin	5,970	27,843.06	27,843.06
O. C. Devillier, Jr., Winnie	6,000	27,779.12	27,779.12
Curtis S. Penick, Anahuac	5,398	27,771.75	25,211.01
R. B. Christ, Sr., Hamshire	5,237	27,608.80	27,608.80
J. C. Wall, Beaumont	5,708	27,398.40	27,398.40
Raymond Randel, Liberty	5,475	27,375.00	27,375.00
C. T. Wiese, Eagle Lake	5,590	27,245.70	22,048.95
Louie Mollnar, El Campo	6,282	27,236.16	27,236.16
A. E. Elliott, Bay City	5,606	27,020.92	27,020.92
B. E. Wilber and D. L. Heckaman, Hamshire	5,079	26,545.85	26,545.85
Frank Smaistria, Martha Losack, and Wm. Lee Frederickson, East Bernard	5,671	26,479.07	20,762.46
Lynn and Donald Herbert, Waller	5,586	26,421.78	26,421.78
Johnnie Garrett, Garrett Bros., and Walter L. Roome, Louise	5,714	26,421.49	26,421.49
Rudolph Skalicky, Ganado	5,598	26,311.41	26,311.41
W. C. Jenkins, Hankamer	5,385	26,132.42	26,132.42
Lester R. Wisegerber and Seaberg Farms, Inc., Dayton	5,701	25,882.54	25,882.54
Wanda S. and Wayne Bunton, Edna	5,217	25,877.81	25,877.81
J. Harland Bell, Rock Island	4,925	25,823.41	4,771.20
Buren J. Kallina, Garwood	5,260	25,601.90	25,601.90
George W. Stansbury, Raywood	4,864	25,536.00	25,536.00
Harvey E. Johnson, Port Lavaca	5,888	25,495.86	25,495.86
R. L. Poskey and Roy Dawson, Anahuac	4,871	25,475.33	25,475.33
Johnnie Garrett, Guy Stovall, Jr., and S. C. Cappell, Louise	5,265	25,444.90	21,466.90
James L. Adkins, Lissie	4,729	25,442.02	25,442.02
W. H. Huseman and Mrs. Annie Carmichael Estate, Louise	5,420	25,394.49	25,394.49
R. B. Christ, Sr., R. B. Christ, Jr., Ed Lohmann, and Elvan Bourque, Hamshire	5,480	25,373.28	25,373.28
W. H. Oetken, Anahuac	5,003	25,140.50	17,581.24
J. W. Murrell, Winnie	4,710	25,072.90	25,072.90

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
RICE—continued			
Texas—Continued			
M. I. Janes and Remie Fontenot, Beaumont	*Bushels* 5,310	$25,010.10	$25,010.10
SOYBEANS			
Arkansas:			
Arkansas Grain Corp., Stuttgart	7,103,230	16,353,580.93	10,454,477.76
McAlister Seed Service Co., Walnut Ridge	42,120	94,888.80	32,316.30
Hugh E. Richardson, H. B. Richardson and Richland Plantation, Inc., Hughes	34,344	77,960.88	77,960.88
Ralph Wimpy, Harrisburg	15,585	35,997.26	35,997.66
J. W. Prescott, Hughes	15,390	34,935.30	34,935.30
Pirani Bros., Marion	15,000	34,050.00	34,050.00
James E. McDaniel, Jonesboro	13,500	30,645.00	30,645.00
David N. Ford, Sherrill James D. Ford, Pine Bluff	13,500	30,510.00	30,510.00
J. B. Davis, Ogden	12,375	27,225.00	21,780.00
W. B. Bynum, Dermott	11,713	26,998.47	26,998.47
Phinn Reynolds & Son, Harrisburg	11,700	26,559.00	26,559.00
Illinois: A. E. Deal, Morrisonville	11,070	25,571.70	25,571.70
Indiana:			
Donald Kolb, Evansville	13,500	30,375.00	30,375.00
Donald E. Stewart, Robert Revell, and Harold Revell, Lebanon	11,115	25,119.90	25,119.90
Iowa:			
Herbert P. Turin, Odebolt	18,784	40,484.04	40,484.04
Kenneth Johnson, Callender	12,690	28,171.80	
Louisiana:			
W. P. Tomlinson, Lake Providence	15,840	35,640.00	35,640.00
Orville A. Coody, Lake Providence	11,681	26,581.36	12,406.36
Mississippi:			
Joe Priddy & Sons, Rolling Fork	32,168	72,802.88	72,802.88
Greer Bros. & Son, Hollandale	29,250	66,397.50	66,397.50
J. R. Flautt & Sons, Swan Lake	27,180	61,426.80	61,426.80
Evanna Plantation, Inc., Cary	23,130	52,273.80	52,273.80
F. B. Swearengen, Philipp	18,289	40,510.66	
W. P. Skelton, Rosedale	16,392	37,209.84	37,209.84
Dominic P. Rizzo, Cleveland	15,961	36,231.47	36,231.47
Annapeg, Inc., Minter City	13,265	29,382.41	
L. L. Walker, Minter City	13,050	28,904.22	28,904.22
Ray Roberson Farms, Inc., Philipp	13,009	28,815.44	28,815.44
Missouri:			
A. C. Riley, New Madrid	22,500	51,075.00	
W. V. Riley, New Madrid	22,500	51,075.00	
The Albert Painton Co., Inc., Painton	17,280	39,052.80	39,052.80
Wallace Farms, Gideon	17,100	38,304.00	38,304.00
North Carolina:			
A. D. Swindell, Pantego	41,580	93,325.50	63,220.50
McNair Investment Co., Laurinberg	19,814	44,185.22	44,185.22
South Carolina:			
W. R. Mayes, Mayesville	41,043	91,525.89	
J. A. Harvin, Sumter	26,774	59,623.65	6,021.00
J. T. Duncan, Martin	11,430	25,488.90	25,488.90
Wisconsin: Charles H. Kuiper, Union Grove	15,030	34,268.40	34,268.40
WHEAT			
Arkansas: Lake Plantation, Hughes	19,244	27,807.09	
California:			
E. L. Wallace, Woodland	59,345	83,858.11	
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles	50,806	69,096.16	69,096.16
Colorado:			
Sprague Bros., Holyoke	31,915	34,302.11	34,302.11
Harold Kuckartz, Arriba	27,000	31,860.00	15,525.00
Kalcevic Farms, Inc., Aurora	27,000	31,050.00	
Ralph and Jack Bowman, Wray	24,300	29,889.00	
Idaho:			
Wagner Bros., Lewiston	81,892	101,546.08	101,546.08
Ira McIntosh & Sons, Lewiston	63,102	78,246.48	78,246.48
Meacham Land & Cattle Co., Lapwai	59,997	73,738.23	18,411.00
Heglar Ranch, Inc., Burley	46,882	51,335.65	51,335.65
Drechsel Bros., Worley	41,196	49,187.57	19,298.57
Herndon Farms, Inc., Culdesac	34,162	41,408.25	31,248.00
Gaffney & Howe, Plummer	35,615	41,197.22	
Wittman Farms, Inc., Lapwai	34,839	40,111.90	
Sam Alm & Sons, Inc., Grangeville	31,497	38,111.37	
W. W. Riggers & Sons, Craigmont	33,828	37,979.34	37,979.34
Stanton Becker, Genesee	31,587	36,049.07	36,049.07
Harold Heaton & Son, Tekoa, Wash	24,266	35,598.47	
Pfaff Bros., Inc., Garfield, Wash	27,900	34,596.00	34,596.00
Arthur P. Meier, Peck	30,084	34,192.19	28,699.68
Matsuura Bros., Blackfoot	29,700	33,264.00	33,264.00
Herb Millhorn, Worley	27,610	31,496.63	31,496.63
Alvin Barker & Sons, Soda Springs	27,000	30,510.00	30,510.00
Shayne Linderman, Newdale	27,200	29,376.00	
George and Otto Brammer, Lewiston	23,220	28,792.80	28,792.80
Leland Woodbury, Burley	27,000	28,755.40	28,755.40
John Campbell, Idaho Falls	22,214	26,529.21	26,529.21
J. J. Driscoll & Son, Troy	22,604	25,881.69	25,881.69
Hilding, Frick, Plummer	22,248	25,814.76	25,814.76
Anderson Bros., Troy	22,145	25,305.11	21,396.35
McLeod Bros., Nezperce	22,377	25,174.82	25,174.82
Iowa: Payne Valley Farms, Inc., Hamburg	21,032	26,057.06	26,057.06
Kansas:			
Earl, Elsie S., and Frank Weisenberger, Scott City	45,608	62,482.96	
Albert Frahm et al., Colby	38,844	49,331.88	
B. A. Hutton, Brewster	37,260	47,320.20	
Robert W. Thierolf, Beloit	34,574	45,211.48	45,211.48
Neil Fuller & Sons, Beloit	31,673	44,885.63	
WHEAT—continued			
Kansas—Continued	*Bushels*		
S. Everett Dennis, Scottsbluff, Nebr	31,495	$43,153.57	
Harold N. Hobart, Sr., Harold N. Hobart, Jr., and Gano H. Tschudy, Hutchinson	28,244	40,510.93	
C. Wilber White, Goodland	27,702	36,008.19	$1,931.67
Herman Bott, Palmer	24,984	34,129.44	
R. T. McCreight, Ness City	23,220	33,156.00	
Adrian Schweitzer, Osborne	22,626	32,019.58	
Vestring Bros., Burns	22,807	31,124.21	6,172.20
W. T. Rooney, Jr., Garden City	23,580	30,720.60	
John Kriss Farms, Colby	23,850	30,289.50	
Benton Jones, Glasco	21,173	29,819.66	6,010.29
Ferguson Bros., Kensington	20,250	29,767.50	
E. A. Baalman & Sons, Menlo	20,754	26,504.82	3,682.80
Hattendorf Bros., Scott City	21,884	26,466.62	19,795.87
John D. Deforest, Peabody	20,608	25,739.63	
Richard L. and Jack Spiegel, Formoso	18,900	25,515.00	
C. H. Moore Trust Estate, Dodge City	20,453	25,390.49	
Minnesota:			
Keith Driscoll, East Grand Forks	30,780	46,146.60	16,310.25
John Bogestad, Karlstad	22,500	31,050.00	
Vernon Hagen, East Grand Forks	18,879	26,767.36	
Montana:			
Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin	200,212	206,218.36	73,233.00
Nash Bros., Redstone	49,320	57,704.40	
Onstad Grain Co., Carter	51,480	56,113.20	
Kraft & Martin, Havre	44,460	55,859.40	
J. G. Robertson, Inc., Great Falls	49,905	54,396.45	54,396.45
Juedeman Grain Co., Geraldine	48,285	52,630.65	
Warren Swenson, Cut Bank	46,660	50,859.40	6,714.40
Otis Waters, Richey	37,170	47,949.30	1,161.00
Pryor Land Co., Billings	43,625	47,551.25	47,551.25
Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin	44,100	45,423.00	45,423.00
Oscar A. Kalgaard, Big Sandy	40,526	43,746.68	43,746.68
Westermark Bros., Levon	38,610	42,084.90	42,084.90
Francis Maurer, Dutton	37,800	41,202.00	
Bill McCarter, Galata	34,570	36,591.30	36,591.30
Roy Killenbeck, Scobey	32,040	36,525.60	
Birkeland & Son, Inc., Fort Benton	32,850	35,806.50	
Gaylen Vernon, Ray Stoner, and Richard McCarty, Outlook	28,440	35,661.60	
Lazy K. T. Ranch, Billings	32,193	35,090.37	35,090.37
Clair Schillinger and Schillinger Farms, Inc., Wolf Point	29,430	35,021.70	1,392.30
Kenneth Schillinger, Vida	26,091	34,566.57	
Adolph Fix, Ekalaka	25,524	34,148.88	1,206.00
Royce Applegate, Square Butte	30,240	32,961.60	
Sikorski & Sons, Inc., Willard	24,641	31,749.21	5,945.04
John H. Leuthold, Molt	28,800	31,392.00	
D. K. Hereford Ranch, Ballantine	27,810	30,312.90	
F. E. Davison & Sons, Highwood	27,812	30,181.23	2,713.23
John Keil & Sons, Ledger	27,000	29,430.00	
Kenneth G. Axvig, Kremlin	22,500	28,632.60	
A. C. Kammerzell, Chester	25,920	28,252.80	28,252.80
Donald Norman and Arnold Dees, Kremlin	24,660	28,225.80	
Allan and Leo Schillinger, Vida	21,240	28,170.00	
Roland and Burton Wright, Moore	25,200	27,468.00	27,468.00
Leo M. Kraft, Havre	22,320	27,342.00	
Ralph Lee, Buffalo	24,930	27,173.70	27,173.70
Conover Ranch Co., Broadview	24,500	26,705.00	
Ivan Dahlman, Forsyth	23,220	26,470.80	26,470.80
Herbert G. Bitz and Selma McClintock, Box Elder	21,150	26,464.50	
Ole Jensen, Chester	24,102	26,271.18	
Swank & Son, Poplar	21,960	25,912.80	
Elmer and Mary P. Dostal, Geraldine	23,400	25,506.00	
Frank Kukla, Blue Creek	23,130	25,211.70	
Nebraska:			
Grace Land & Cattle Co., Lewellen	52,200	64,728.00	
Raymond, Ronald, Pamela, Michael, Leo, Morris, and Ilse Jessen, Lodgepole	39,600	48,312.00	
Knipp Land Co., Big Springs	33,300	41,958.00	
Ruth Hunt, Hastings	31,178	40,227.67	10,067.40
A. L. Rosener & Sons, Daykin	26,809	37,179.88	
Bailey Partnership, Big Springs	29,700	36,828.00	
Glen F. Burns, Chappell	28,342	34,317.52	10,918.72
Svoboda & Hannah, Ogallala	26,100	32,886.00	
Eugene Schefcek, Alliance	25,038	32,048.64	32,048.64
Leo Jessen, Oshkosh	23,400	29,250.00	
Robert R. Elliott, Solvang, Calif	22,410	28,012.50	
Ed and Beulah Jelinek, Alliance	20,002	26,807.64	
Nevada: Rio King Land & Investment Co., San Francisco, Calif	20,327	25,205.48	25,205.48
New Mexico:			
Archie Baker, Clovis	24,337	31,227.94	31,227.94
W. L. Lockmiller, Clovis	25,360	31,065.58	
Virgle Harrison, Texico	22,018	28,954.11	220.19
Albert and Monte Matlock, Clovis	20,510	26,765.55	26,765.55
North Dakota:			
Arvel Glinz, Eldridge	38,904	57,073.29	2,260.59
Ballantyne Bros., Westhope	36,000	50,760.00	
Benjamin Schaible, Mott	34,650	49,999.50	
The Witteman Co., Mohall	36,900	46,125.00	
L. J. Johnson, Plaza	34,200	42,408.00	
Polries Bros., Sykeston	28,512	40,487.04	
Roscoe W. Kelly, Niagara	27,900	39,078.00	
August C. Kirschemann, Mott John D. Kirschmann, Bismarck	25,200	35,932.50	
Henry Grain & Stock Farm, Westhope	28,440	35,550.00	4,725.00

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued			
North Dakota—Continued	*Bushels*		
T. A. Dilse, Scranton	27,720	$35,481.60	----------
Norman Glinz, Bottineau	26,370	35,406.00	----------
Alvin Kenner, Leeds	25,200	35,280.00	----------
Edwin Netzer, Regent }	35,525	34,197.08	----------
Dan Netzer, Bismarck }			
W. J. Thoreson, York	25,000	34,125.00	----------
Ernest P. Jensen, Williston	24,300	33,777.00	----------
Stair Bros., Newburg	24,930	33,655.50	----------
Willis Glinz, Newburg	25,429	33,496.25	----------
Carl M. Hodenfield & Sons, Ray	27.000	33,210.00	$1,451.40
Helen, Wayne, Cecil, and Dennis Zahnow, Roseglen	25,650	32,832.00	32,832.00
Alfred Johnson, Plaza	26,100	32,364.00	----------
Jack Follman, York	23,808	31,546.49	----------
Reginald and Kenneth Henry, Westhope	24,300	30,375.00	----------
August and Ronald Wagner, Englevale	20,367	29,403.00	2,268.00
Earl Schwartz Co., Kenmare	23,400	29,250.00	----------
Walter E. Johnson, Courtenay	18,990	27,830.70	----------
Roger Redel, Fressenden	18,211	25,859.62	----------
Leo and Anthony Muggli, Vincent Muggli, Jr., and Vincent Muggli, Sr., Carson }	17,280	25,423.20	----------
Rose Weinhandl, Shields }			
Carlton Larson, Sykeston	18,203	25,309.46	----------
Harold Hosfstrand, Leeds	18,251	25,198.74	1,192.00
Raymond Foerster, Conway	16,420	25,048.20	----------
Ohio:			
Ward Walton & Associates, Inc., Upper Sandusky	25,576	33,375.96	33,375.96
Orleton Farms, Inc., London	21,039	26,825.27	26,825.27
Oklahoma:			
John A. Francis, Kingfisher	20,250	27,315.00	----------
Joe Steichen, Ponca City	22,000	27,170.00	----------
James W. Sharrock, Ponca City	20,483	26,934.71	----------
Oregon:			
McCormmach Bros., Pendleton	69,570	83,622.36	83,622.36
Glenn Thorne, Pendleton	54,265	65,308.85	65,308.85
John Proudfoot and Leo Gorger, Ione	47,025	61,602.75	61,602.75
Raymond & Son, Inc., Helix	50,138	60,903.45	----------
Ralph S. Crum, Ione	43,647	57,177.57	----------
R. & T. Ranches, Athena	42,301	51,270.80	51,270.80
King Ranches, Pendleton	38,365	49,874.50	----------
Robert Kilkenny, Heppner	39,344	49,476.72	40,044.72
Les King, Inc., Helix	38,846	46,809.44	46,809.44
F. L. Watkins, Wasco	34,816	45,791.02	42,713.66
4 R Ranches, Wasco	38,840	45,254.20	45,254.20
Mud Springs Ranches, Pendleton Ranches, Cunningham Sheep Co., and Hoke Ranches, Pendleton	34,650	45,045.00	45,045.00
Adolph, Jr., or Georgia Shaffer, Condon	36,309	44,722.66	44,722.66
Key Bros., Inc., Milton, Freewater	33,705	43,816.50	----------
Richard W. Hampton, Pendleton	33,735	42,774.35	13,758.34
V. R. Ranch, Helix	35,059	42,246.48	42,246.48
Weber, Inc., and Vernita Adams, Athena	30,360	39,354.24	37,908.00
R. A. Brogoitti, LaGrande	31,444	39,305.00	39,305.00
Foster, Wernsing & Coffman, Athena	32,548	39,090.96	7,969.77
Charles Carlson, Ione	29,160	38,199.60	----------
M. Smith, Condon	26,608	36,950.64	36,950.64
H. H. McIntyre, Pendleton	30,348	36,633.42	36,633.42
Alvin Bunch, Heppner	29,577	36,372.70	36,372.20
Holdman Ranches, Pendleton	30,078	36,352.84	36,352.84
Hill Ranches, Inc., Helix	30,000	36,150.00	----------
Larry E. Kaseberg, Wasco	26,100	34,713.00	34,713.00
Marion T. Weatherford, Arlington	27,756	34,567.92	----------
W. D. Hardie & Sons, Condon	25,043	34,259.79	4,835.75
Merton S. Wade, Lostine	28,088	33,520.74	9,180.52
E. Earl or S. Bernice Pryor, Condon	27,148	33,517.83	33,517.83
Storie Ranches, Pendleton	27,384	33,271.86	33,271.86
Coppinger & Son Ranches, Echo }	24,750	32,175.00	32,175.00
A. C. and R. C. Moll, Pendleton }			
H. T. Rea, Inc., Walla Walla, Wash	26,211	31,444.60	----------
F. N. Johns, Athena	24,075	31,298.79	31,298.79
McElligott Bros., Ione	23,827	31,213.37	31,213.37
H. M. Zell, Wasco	24,260	30,806.42	30,806.42
Johns Smith and Beamer, Athena	23,418	30.443.52	30,443.52
C. O. Burnet or Althea Burnet, Moro	24,496	30,378.38	----------
Tad O. McCoy, The Dalles	23,524	30,236.64	30,236.64
W. L. Hulse, Dufur	22,050	29,988.00	----------
R. M. and Delta Johnson, Wasco	23.926	29,844.28	29,844.28
A. C. Warren, Ione	22,063	28,902.53	----------
Bill Wolfe, Wallowa	24,183	28,740.44	10,184.24
G. W. Temple, Pendleton }	22,060	28,679.04	28,679.04
Albert L. McCormmach, Walla Walla, Wash }			
T. M. Campbell, Helix	23,444	28,303.49	28,303.49
Sieg & Sieg, Baker	23,484	27,486.05	----------
David Horne, Pendleton	22,732	27,392.27	27,392.27
Glen Brogoitti, Helix	22,597	27,229.18	----------
Powell Goodin Farms, Moro	21,841	27,192.41	16,741.76
R. & H. Farms and Archie Harris, Milton-Freewater	20,821	27,067.30	27,067.30
Sandhollow Ranches, Helix	22,163	26,928.54	12,005.71
C. N. Jones & Sons, Heppner	21,857	26,714.38	26,714.38
J. Smith, Inc., Condon	19,270	26,689.41	26,689.41
Verne W. Dale, Helix	22,025	26,540.51	26,540.51
Robert Rothrock, Adams	20,798	26,457.27	20,475.00
Rosco E. Moore, Moro	21,226	26,365.03	----------
Campbell Ranch, Inc., Echo	20,984	26,349.95	26,349.95
Walker Whitacre Ranch, Athena	21,500	26,122.96	26,122.96
Harvey Smith, Ione	19,593	25,862.76	25,862.76
WHEAT—continued			
Oregon—Continued	*Bushels*		
Earl Mecker, The Dalles	18,900	$25,704.00	----------
Stirrup Ranch, North Powder	21,664	25,248.44	----------
G. L. Pratt, Visalia, Calif	21,664	25,248.48	----------
Harry Proudfoot, Echo	20,854	25,069.17	$7,177.17
South Dakota:			
William J. Stanley and William D. Asmussen, Agar	117,387	168,397.20	1,297.80
J. E. Check Estate, Pierre	50,797	70,326.89	----------
Elkhorn Farm, Martin	42,570	54,242.10	----------
Alfred and Johanna Ehlers, Presho	36,000	52,560.09	----------
Dennis L. Anderson, Rapid City	37,291	51,625.11	8,199.76
Leo J. Terca, Presho	31,500	46,076.40	----------
John Hippen, Martin }	32,760	41,767.20	----------
Raymond Jessen, Lodge Pole, Nebr }			
Louie E. Bartels, Gerrysburg	25,110	37,776.60	----------
Bartley Mills, Winner	28,800	37,440.00	----------
Kenneth Kinkler, Blunt }	24,840	35,272.80	----------
Hugo Kinkler, Littlefield, Tex }			
Krier Bros., Presho	23,580	33,069.60	----------
James S. Brown, Chamberlain	23,130	31,784.40	31,784.40
Arvid Ambur, Presho	24,030	31,719.60	----------
Bruno Wieczorek, Chamberlain	23,580	31,131.60	31,131.60
G. K. Hutchison, Presho	21,600	29,331.00	----------
Robert E. Duncan, Pierre	20,430	29,316.60	----------
Roy Norman, Hayes	21,852	29,063.16	----------
Earl E. Kinder, Onida	21,600	28,728.00	1,915.20
Verdun Stanley, Presho	21,600	28,512.00	19,483.20
Orville Schwarting, Gordon Nebr	22,950	28,458.00	----------
K. R. Rhiley Creighton	22,500	28,350.00	24,080.60
Myron D. and Mildred A. Johnson, Rapid City	21,780	27,952.20	----------
H. G. Ehlers Sons, Presho	20,890	27,943.80	6,878.10
Jerry Geeringer, Castle Rock	21,330	26,875.80	26,828.10
Leonel M. Jensen, Wall	21,150	26,818.20	21,319.20
Robert Bartels, Fort Pierre	19,440	25,660.80	25,660.80
Jetter Bros., Milesville	19,880	25,542.00	----------
Wm. G. and Lyle Schoulte, Presho	19,000	25,080.00	----------
Texas:			
Hill Farms, Hart	38,760	68,379.05	----------
Taft McGee, Hereford	43,528	55,933.48	55,933.48
Homer Hill, Hart	32,520	55,303.86	----------
Buddy Hill, Hart	35,342	55,231.81	----------
Gerald L. Lasley, Dalhart	40,582	53,419.06	53,291.86
Frank Robinson, Panhandle	35,204	51,573.38	----------
Berkley Stringer, Dumas	38,561	50,520.24	50,520.24
D. G. Cluck, Gruver	36,797	48,755.59	48,755.59
Sam R. Cluck, Gruver	36,297	47,730.99	47,730.99
Harold H. Hogue, Dalhart	36,011	46,274.56	46,274.56
A & O Farms, Dumas	34,496	46,028.39	46,028.39
Mrs. M. W. McCloy & Sons, Morse	34,349	43,451.70	----------
Monroe Bros., Sunray	31,825	40,895.13	----------
Gordon Taylor, Sunray	29,697	40,536.18	----------
Dale Schuman, Dumas	29,944	39,076.47	8,173.64
Dale Coleman, Dumas	28,661	37,633.20	22,386.42
Rose C. or R. C. Porter, Spearman	30,000	36,450.00	36,450.00
Merrill Dryden, Sunray	26,069	35,844.65	35,844.65
Lyons Bros., Hereford	23,242	35,225.77	14,572.87
Glen Scribner, Sunray	25,860	35,040.07	----------
Weatherford Bros., Sunray	25,405	34,169.06	----------
Marshall Cator, Sunray	23,871	32,455.26	----------
Don Williams, Farwell	24,630	32,388.45	----------
A. R. Bort, Gruver	24,377	32,164.26	32,164.26
Gene Cluck, Gruver	23,471	30,394.52	----------
Joe Schuman, Dumas	22,260	28,826.96	----------
Everett Bros., Stratford	21,064	28,541.76	210.64
Fred W. Mercer, Silverton }	19,068	26,849.14	26,849.14
Velma W. McGraw Estate, Fort Worth }			
John Cole, Waka	19,235	26,832.83	----------
Claude Higley, Stinnett	19,379	26,453.01	26,453.01
George Farms, Charlene and G. George, Perryton	18,000	25,740.00	25,740.00
J. H. Burkett, Sunray	20,268	25,638.38	----------
Claude Johnson & Son, Dalhart	18,909	25,621.70	----------
John A. and Raymond Smith, Hereford	14,447	25,302.90	----------
Washington:			
Glen Miller & Sons, Amber	133,542	166,927.50	41,927.50
D. Everett Phillips, Lind	110,500	139,482.99	----------
Leonard and Henry Franz, Lind	86,038	106,541.33	101,626.13
Kenneth Smith, Waitsburg	63,653	79,249.74	79,249.74
George D. Brown & Sons, Pomeroy	58,563	73,360.03	13,352.53
Staley & Boyd, Pullman	58,500	73,125.00	73,125.00
Robert V. Phillips, Lind	49,995	63,204.86	----------
Lehn Bros., Farmington	45,180	56,475.00	----------
Curtis Cattle Co., Garfield	41,427	50,694.20	50,694.20
Roy Peringer, Pullman	43,753	50,683.36	50,683.36
W. M. Boyd & Sons, Moscow, Idaho	39,195	48,993.76	48,993.76
Osborne Belsby, Amber	39,150	48,549.00	48,549.00
Baumann Farm, Washtucna	37,710	48,268.80	48,268.80
DeZellen & Son, Bridgeport	37,548	47,871.96	1,517.45
Richard E. DeSpain, Winona	41,081	47,773.02	47,773.02
Urgel Bell, Lacrosse	41,578	47,708.87	47,708.77
Robert J. and Lewis Patton, Waitsburg	36,073	46,534.17	46,534.17
O. H. Woodward, Inc., Dayton	38,535	46,492.58	7,099.85
Donovan Farms, Prescott	34,747	45,171.10	45,171.10
Ford Gumm & Sons, Tekoa	38,309	44,630.16	----------
Thomas J. Byers & Sons, Pomeroy	34,756	44,558.61	19,580.68
J. R. Damon, Lind	35,693	44,071.22	23,140.00
Pearl Gwinn, Pomeroy	31,626	43,275.89	2,674.62
S. T. S. Farms, Inc., Prescott	33,273	43,254.90	6,049.90
Ferrell & Luvaas, Pomeroy	35,902	42,902.29	42,902.29

TABLE B.—*1964 crop price-support loans made of $25,000 or more and amount repaid, by producer*—Continued

State, producer, and address	Quantity pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
WHEAT—continued			
Washington—Continued			
Joe McCown and Charles E. Neace Estate, Waitsburg	*Bushels* 34,433	$41,146.96	$41,146.96
J. L. Williams, Lind	32,040	41,011.20	39,168.00
Fred and Cecil Rommel, Pomeroy	32,832	40,453.25	40,453.25
Godfrey Meilke, Lind	33,747	40,267.60	40,267.60
Higginbotham Bros., Hartline	33,163	39,629.45	39,629.45
C. C. Wolf & Sons, Pomeroy	32,671	38,214.08	
Laura C. Gilliland Estates, Lafayette, Ind	32,211	38,170.21	18,206.13
Casey Farms, Inc., Eureka	31,297	37,970.98	
Lester Camp, Lacrosse	32,793	37,876.03	37,876.03
Nelson Bros., Waterville	28,530	36,518.40	
Lasater Farms, Inc., Walla Walla	30,004	36,455.06	36,455.06
Dippel Bros., Garfield	29,070	36,337.50	
Wayne Beale, Pomeroy	29,013	35,787.62	35,787.62
John E. Hair, Walla Walla	27,276	35,458.80	35,458.80
Allen Struthers, Eureka	28,460	35,307.53	
Ralph Cooley, Connell	27,000	35,100.00	4,680.00
The Sheffels Co., Govan	27,627	35,086.66	19,108.67
John W. Smith, Lancaster	28,264	34,543.40	10,018.40
Marvin Carstens, Espanola	29,518	34,403.11	19,298.47
Franklin D. Rockwell, Endicott	29,596	34,382.45	34,382.45
Jack Clodius, Waitsburg	28,408	34,343.43	34,343.43
Rockdale Farms, Edwall	28,997	34,338.89	
Harp Bros., Farmington	29,437	34,122.45	21,227.66
Heglar Bros., St. John	28,837	33,594.84	33,594.84
Wilbur Morgan, Pomeroy	26,400	33,528.00	
Calvin Raugust, Farmington	25,640	33,300.00	33,300.00
Ed Faure, Jr., Ritzville	27,500	33,109.64	33,109.64
Ellsworth Conover, Waitsburg	27,447	33,073.78	33,073.78
Howard Jorgensen, Coulee City	25,695	32,889.60	32,889.60
R. F. Young, Starbuck	27,486	32,845.89	32,845.89
Earl M. Pierson, Colfax	26,100	32,624.98	
Phillips Farms, Inc., and Merlin Phillips, Walla Walla	25,020	32,526.00	
E. E. Watkins, Spokane	27,356	32,416.33	32,416.33
Bennett Land Co., Farmington	25,830	32,287.50	32,287.50
Dick Edwards, Hartline	26,359	32,097.64	32,097.64
Virgil Feezell, Mabton	23,985	31,900.05	
Ferrell & Luvass, Pomeroy	27,095	31,836.12	31,836.12
Eugene Valaer, Walla Walla	24,300	31,590.00	
Morris Ganguet, Waitsburg	25,829	31,254.73	31,254.73
Yoshino Bros., Quincy	23,116	31,109.07	31,109.07
Nick Seivers, Jr., Lind	24,300	31,104.00	31,104.00
Orval Painter, Waterville	24,120	30,873.60	
George H. Ellis, Reardan	25,912	30,657.22	
Lawrence Timm, Harrington	25,760	30,525.37	
Kenny Foulkes, Lind	24,281	30,296.37	30,296.37
Dwelley Jones, Walla Walla	25,164	30,159.39	
Elmer Schoesler & Sons, Ritzville	25,354	30,159.34	
Heitstuman Bros., Clarkston Robert Heitstuman, Pomeroy	25,413	30,028.50	16,171.20
Cornwall Farms, Fairfield	24,347	30,018.39	11,604.39
Matthew Lyons, Waitsburg	*Bushels* 24,875	$29,974.38	
Klicker Bros. & Sons, Walla Walla	23,006	29,907.80	$29,907.80
Blacklaw Bros., Eureka	24,408	29,771.91	
C. B. Stonecipher, Waitsburg	24,706	29,675.43	
J. I. Kupers, Harrington	24,995	29,618.72	29,618.72
Neihenke & Pavlik, Colfax	25,360	29,543.81	29,543.81
Erwin Bros., Prescott	24,384	29,306.83	29,306.83
Mary Hanger, Dayton	24,258	29,058.29	29,058.29
Felgenhauer Bros., Fairfield	23,400	29,016.00	
Hofer Bros., Waitsburg	23,998	28,917.10	28,917.10
John Stephenson, Elda Stephenson, and Ella Stephenson Estate, Benge	22,500	28,800.00	
Willard C. Hennings, Ritzville	22,500	28,800.00	28,800.00
Dave Repp & Son, St. John	24,850	28,796.07	28,796.07
Walter A. Zellmer, Davenport	24,061	28,765.28	
Carl Boyd, Pullman	22,950	28,687.50	28,687.50
Gale O. Gfeller, Lind	22,410	28,684.80	
Frank J. or Frank Wolf, Pomeroy	20,866	28,199.21	4,875.52
Herbert Sackmann, Odessa	23,702	28,087.18	28,087.18
Robison Land & Livestock Co., Walla Walla	21,600	28,080.00	
Chester Powers & Son, Starbuck	23,202	27,726.64	27,726.64
C. L. Nelson & Sons, Thornton	23,496	27,372.75	27,372.75
Byron G. Dague, Walla Walla	21,052	27,367.60	27,367.60
David V. Adams, Coulee City	22,071	27,323.10	27,323.10
Roy M. Auvil, Farmington	23,601	27,259.05	
Earl T. Sherry, Prescott	22,513	27,127.89	14,451.77
C. C. King and J. C. Kinzer, Pullman	21,600	27,000.00	27,000.00
WeishaarFarms, Marlin	21,175	26,892.25	
Ray L. Small, Jr., Lowden	22,238	26,757.66	
A. S. Miller & Son, Colfax	21,330	26,662.48	26,662.48
James F. Ferrel, Walla Walla	21,998	26,288.09	
Clarence Strohmaier, Lind	20,520	26,265.60	
Paul Webb, Jr., Walla Walla	21,833	26,212.74	26,212.74
I. A. Zakarison Estate, Pullman	20,855	26,068.50	26,068.50
Clyde Davis, Pullman	22,488	26,043.19	26,043.19
Lowell Baker, Pomeroy	22,312	26,033.78	26,033.78
Paul E. and Glenn D. Hofer, Prescott Paul S. Hofer, Waitsburg Waneita Heilman, Los Angeles, Calif	20,025	26,032.50	
Harris Bros., Dayton	21,690	25,823.19	25,823.19
Edgar L. Smith, St. John	20,610	25,762.50	25,762.50
Myklebust Bros., Lacrosse	22,271	25,709.73	25,709.73
Fred Mader, Palouse	22,237	25,636.88	25,636.88
Pioneer Stock & Grain Farm, Inc., Colfax	22,043	25,443.46	25,443.46
Virgil Stevens, Wilson Creek	21,044	25,366.72	12,115.52
Norman Hansen, Tekoa	21,990	25,365.38	23,123.78
R. C. Walker, Hartline	21,028	25,339.19	25,339.19
Raymond B. Williams, Almira	21,423	25,110.00	25,110.00
Scheele Bros. and Theodore F. Scheele, Fairfield	20,250	25,110.00	25,110.00

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I want to preface my remarks by saying that for a long, long time I have been very much interested and concerned with the whole price support program, in many instances I have taken a position contrary to the recommendations made by several previous administrations—and with the present administration, which is Democratic.

I should like to propound this question to my distinguished colleague: Will this affect the one-price cotton system which we have today and which we hammered out after years and years of frustration?

Mr. BREWSTER. My answer to my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island is that, in my judgment, this amendment will have no effect on the present cotton price structure.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator say that? It is my understanding this amendment excludes everyone who would get over $50,000. As I understand the situation—and I will ask for time from the opposition to the amendment, because I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Maryland, unless he will indulge me; but, if he does not wish to yield me time, I wish to ask time from the opposition——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield such time to the Senator from Rhode Island as he may need.

Mr. PASTORE. I will take only 5 minutes.

I would like the Senate of the United States to understand that in order for this Government to unload its surpluses in cotton, we have been selling and exporting cotton to foreign manufacturers at 8 cents a pound cheaper than the American manufacturers must pay for it. There is not a Senator in the Chamber who does not understand that there is a differential in the standard of living between our country and countries like Japan, Italy, France, Great Britain, Hong Kong, and many others in the world, that are manufacturing cotton cloth, making shirts, and sending them back to be sold on the American market.

I realize that to a certain extent America must use her ingenuity, her marketing ability, her styling skills, to make up the differential. This is because the American millworker makes from $1.80 to $2 an hour, while the Japanese worker may make 35 cents an hour.

In order to unload the cotton on the world marketplace, we sell to Japan our raw cotton at 8 cents cheaper than the man manufacturing a shirt in Rhode Island must pay for it.

The argument is made that unless we do it, we cannot sell the raw cotton. If we cannot sell the the raw cotton, we cannot dispose of it. In the process we are closing down mills in the United States of America.

In the last 10 years we have experienced an astronomical increase in our gross national product. As a matter of fact, last year it was $675 billion. This year it will be $750 billion. In the last 10 years it has increased 100 percent.

In this prosperous period we have shut down 1,000 mills in the United States of America, and have thrown 350,000 millworkers out of jobs. Why? Because we cannot compete with countries that are buying American raw cotton 8 cents cheaper than the American people are able to buy it in America. To me that represents not only an inequity, but an iniquity.

In order to arrive at a solution of the problem, I suggested to the late President Kennedy that we ought to sell cotton at 8 cents a pounds cheaper to Japan, for example, in order to unload our surplus cotton, but we ought to add 8 cents a pound when it comes back at the port of entry. The administration said we could not do that. I asked why. We were told that the minute we did that, Japan would cut back on her imports of our raw cotton. We wrestled with that problem day in and day out, month in and month out.

The only solution considered feasible was to pay the mill 8 cents a pound, which was criticized because it was alleged to be a payoff, or pay it to the cotton producer. We inaugurated that program.

I should like to know if the amendment of the Senator from Maryland is intended to take away the benefit of 8 cents a pound to the American cotton producer so we can maintain and preserve American jobs.

I wish to have a clear, definite answer, because I have been told by people who are knowledgeable in this field that the amendment will destroy the one price cotton system.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in answer to my distinguished colleague, this amendment is to pay for yesterday's laundry. In other words, the $3.5 billion that goes for commodity support prices in this bill of $7 billion does not appropriate one single cent for tomorrow of the $3.5 billion. What it does is replace past expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, money that has already been spent, and it does not in any way, in my judgment, affect the issue the Senator from Rhode Island addresses himself to.

I know he, like myself, time and again in the past has supported the consumer position in the argument over agricultural support prices.

Mr. PASTORE. Indeed, I have, and I am interested in American jobs. One cannot buy anything unless he has money to buy it with. That is the reason why we are running around in circles.

Mr. BREWSTER. There comes a time to reevaluate our position on our agricultural policy. I have already placed in the RECORD a list of the many hundreds of people that have accumulated in excess of $25,000 per year per crop from the U.S. Government.

Let me give some examples.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that we may get an answer to the question of the Senator from Rhode Island? The question involves what the farmer shall get for his product.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am willing to yield, but on the Senator's time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not want to get the time period confused. I yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island; has he concluded?

Mr. PASTORE. I think I used four and a half minutes. Did I not, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island used 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield more time to the Senator from Rhode Island, if he desires it.

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield such time as he may need to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I said I was happy to yield, but on the Senator's time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], how much money is appropriated in this bill to finance the program described by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] a moment ago, that is, the recompensing of the cotton processors? How much is involved?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on whose time are we operating now?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is Senator BREWSTER's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland yielded to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no specific sum appropriated for that purpose. The sum appropriated is to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for losses incurred in 1964 and 1965, in carrying out the various commodity programs financed by the Corporation revolving fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, my question is, what is the estimated cost of the subsidy to the processors of cotton goods?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot state that. I can state that the loans made in calendar 1965 to all cotton producers were $886,697,959. The Senator will find that on page 59 of our report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not answer my question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot answer the question, if I may say, Mr. President, because this question was not involved in the hearings of the committee and is not involved in this particular bill. Therefore, I am unable to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In previous discussions on this subject, statements have been made in the Senate that the subsidization of the processors of cotton amounted to about $350 million to $400 million a year. How close is that to being correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. We do not deal with that particular subject under this bill. As I have tried to explain to my distinguished friend, this bill has no relation at all to the provisions of the farm legislation enacted last year. This bill reimburses the Commodity Credit Corporation for previous years' losses under the previous legislation, and restores it to a sound fiscal condition to continue its operations. But we do not compute for each commodity, in preparing this bill, what the Commodity Credit Corporation is limited to spending for that particular commodity in the next year. It is not done that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is the provision dealing with the subsidies to the processors of cotton?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was in the previous legislation and was amended by the legislative act passed in 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the authorization act?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, the legislative act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much are we expending to subsidize the processors? Can no one connected with this subject give an anwser?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to answer it. Maybe someone else is able to tell us.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. On page 58 of the committee report, there is a table showing all of these payments. On cotton for calendar 1965, the estimated number of payments was 509,000 totaling $69,551,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That still does not answer the question. It tells the cost of the cotton program, but it does not tell the cost of subsidizing the processors of cotton goods.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, Mr. President, I should like to continue my presentation. I am somewhat surprised, though, that the proponents of this appropriation measure are not quite sure where all this $7 billion is going.

My proposition is very simple: No one person should get more than $50,000. That seems to me to be eminently fair.

Let me give some examples. I put in the RECORD, the record for 1964. I have pulled out of that some seven or eight people who really got a windfall at the expense of the taxpayers.

Jack Robison & Sons, Arizona, a sorghum producer, received a loan of $98,000 which he never repaid.

Perry, Texas, sorghum, $135,000.

Kehi Plantation, Arkansas, rice, $81,000, never repaid.

Tulana Farms, Oregon, oats, $140,000. Straight out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Mills Bros., Mississippi, rice, $85,000.

Now listen to this one: Arkansas Grain Corp., soybeans, $6 million.

Wallace, California, wheat, $83,000.

Stanley, South Dakota, wheat, $167,000.

Phillips, Washington, wheat, $139,000.

In fact, some of the loans advanced were in amounts such as this: $3.7 million to Producers Rice Mill, Inc., in Arkansas. And the Arkansas Grain Corp. was loaned a staggering $16.4 million in 1964, of which they repaid a portion, but the tapayers paid $6 million.

I ask the Senate, what sense does this make? What sense does it make to the housewife, to subsidize large corporate operations to this extent?

I argue that it results in higher prices for the consumer, higher taxes for the taxpayers of the country, and serves no useful purpose.

The original purpose of the farm program was to save the family farmer. I am fully prepared to do that. But I am not prepared to subsidize, at great cost, the big producer. I do not see that this is in accordance with the original philosophy of the measure that was passed.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support this amendment, but I think we should clear up some of the points that have been raised here.

First, the Senator from Ohio asked the question as to what effect this would have on the subsidy that is being paid to the textile mills today.

The subsidy is not being paid to the textile mills now. A subsidy was paid under a previous law, but it is not affected by this amendment as of today. In previous years the subsidy was paid direct to the mills and amounted to, I think it was about 8 or 9 cents per pound. Then later the law was amended to provide that we sell to the American mills at the world price, and in order to do that the subsidy is now paid to the farmer. That subsidy amounts roughly to about 9 cents per pound, which means about $45 a bale, and if Senators wish to get what the cost of that is to the taxpayers they can multiply that figure by the number of pounds used domestically.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. While the Senator is figuring up the amount, I wonder if there is not an error in the calculations made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and whether, when he talks about the astronomical losses, he is not somewhat inaccurate, inasmuch as, when a large producer or a small producer gets a loan from the Government, the Government, in turn, receives either the grain or commodity or the money; so there would not be a loss as large as the one speculatively suggested by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is a loss, but the Senator from Maryland was pointing out in his report the amount of loans made to these individual units under the price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. And the Government then gets either the grain or the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, and the loss sustained is on the sale of this commodity in the open market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has yielded to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But there is a loss sustained if the Government, after obtaining the grain, has to sell it at a loss; and it is that loss we are reimbursing in the Commodity Credit Corporation appropriations here this year, which amounts to $2 or $3 billion a year. Technically, that is the way we approach it.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would be appropriate, however, that this amendment be adopted. It has been close to adoption before, and I am very much in favor of it.

There is no reason in my mind why they should use taxpayers' money to support these multimillion-dollar operations of the corporate type of farms. It involves less than 2 percent of our farmers. I have nothing against bigness in Amercia if it is not done with Government money. From the standpoint of protecting the taxpayers, consumers, or farmers, I do not think it should be the policy of our Government to promote a farm program for crops and subsidize it for the large corporate farmers to the extent that they can take over and gobble up the small farmers with taxpayers' money.

That is exactly what is happening in America. I do not think this should be done with Government money. That is the reason that I am strongly in support of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland which would put a limit of $50,000 upon the amount which any one individual could get from the Federal Government.

The Senator from Rhode Island raised the question concerning whether the amendment of the Senator would affect or nullify the two-price system; in my opinion, it would not. In all fairness, however, I should say that if we are successful in having this amendment agreed to, I am reasonably confident that it would have an effect on the program as administered. Those supporting the present program would see a revision. No doubt they would try to go back to the two-price system. That is the reason the textile mills are fearful. The amendment in itself, if agreed to, would not bring back the two-price system. I think we should look at this realistically.

I realize the concern of the Senator from Rhode Island. However, at the same time I think the Senator from Maryland is correct in his analysis. We would not automatically go over to the two-price system. It might lead to it, but this in itself would not.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if there is any justice in what I have said, and if there is any justice in the program itself, rather than laboring under promises to be made here and possibly never kept in the future, why would it not be better to modify the amendment now and obviate any injustice that might be done? Why should we repose our faith in assurances given on the floor, assurances which are so uncertain?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not say that.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator said it might not lead to it or it might. We cannot keep jobs in existence with terms such as "might" or "might not."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was trying to get the question straight. I was trying to be fair with the Senator from Rhode Island. Let it be clear that if an effort were made to go back to subsidizing the mills I would oppose it. I do not think we should be subsidizing the textile mills either directly or indirectly as is now being done.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. The mills do not want it. They were absolutely against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They do not want the subsidy in their own name, but let us be realistic. They are getting a subsidy today, only it is being paid in the name of the farmer. It is the same amount.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. However, if we stop selling it abroad cheaper than it is sold for in America, the American mills would have no complaint.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they would stop paying artificial support prices to produce more in America we would not have this problem.

Mr. PASTORE. Provided, they do not sell it cheaper abroad.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, who has charge of the time on the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have charge of the time for those who support the committee bill. I cannot yield to the Senator in view of the position he is taking.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, who has charge of the time for the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting minority leader has charge of the time for the opposition.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to get clear one statement that the Senator made. I am one of those who look with great concern on the growing tendency to have corporate farming in this country. I do not think it is wholesome. I do not think it is good. I do not think it is in the public interest to have our little family farms constantly merged into corporate farming operations.

I want to get it clear in the RECORD. In the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, who has studied this issue very carefully, would the continuation of these large payments beyond the $50,000 amount incorporated in the bill go to the level of encouraging new corporation operations as against family operated farms?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my opinion, it would not only encourage it, but would subsidize such expansion at the expense of the American taxpayers. That is the reason why I think the time is long overdue when we should put a limit on the amount that can be paid to any one operator.

I have no objection to a man having all the acreage that he can afford to buy and pay for. There is nothing in here to control that, and I would object to any legislation which would restrict the amount of land that any one farmer could plant or control provided he uses his own money.

I do think there should be a limit as to the amount that he could expect to receive under the price-support program from the Federal Government and a limit to his subsidy payments.

When the amount exceeds the $50,000 limitation he should certainly use his own money and take his own loss or gain. If he cannot do that he should get out of the business, and the small farmers can take over.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. **FONG**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes for a clarification of the Senator's amendment? Sugar was exempted last year, and I would like to propose a clarification to the amendment.

Mr. **BREWSTER**. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. **FONG**. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland last year accepted an amendment which exempted the sugar compliance payment. I ask if the Senator will accept this modification to his amendment:

On next to the last line I would strike out the words "under title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended," and insert in lieu thereof "of sugar, as defined in section 101(k) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, under title 3 of such Act."

Mr. **BREWSTER**. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment is so modified.

Who yields time?

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President the time is long overdue for a study and reappraisal of the various subsidy payment programs. Perhaps the most lush of all subsidy payments is that made to the merchant marine, with which the Senator from Maryland is so familiar.

Under the Public Law 480 program appropriations contained in the pending bill, there are large amounts for subsidies to pay freight rates to the American merchant marine over and above the cost for which we could ship grain to foreign countries under foreign flags. This is all right, but the Senator should recognize that over the years, under the Public Law 480 program, the merchant marine has been subsidized to the extent of $1,187 million. This amount was paid them for handling Public Law 480 commodities to needy foreign nations.

I suggest that this should be a subject of concern by the Senator from Maryland.

The Senator has also indicated a loss of some $6 million on a single loan on soybeans. This is not correct. Soybean prices have been constantly above the price-support level. There has been a shortage of supply.

Mr. President, if this provision were to provide only for payments to farmers and not loans, I would support it. However, loans to farmers to make possible more orderly marketing are just as much in the interest of the small farmers as they are in the interest of the big farmers.

A high percentage of these loans, particularly on wheat and many other crops are repaid. Why should we want to disrupt orderly marketing by placing a limit on the amount of loans that could be made to any one farmer?

Mr. President, I am amazed that the Senator from Maryland would state that the cost of these subsidies to farmers is about $7 billion. Under the bill that is being considered today, about $1.6 billion is to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation for the Public Law 480 program, the best foreign aid program we have. Yet, this is charged to the farmer.

The special milk program, from which the dairy farmers of Maryland derive great benefit, is under this bill, too. Also included are all the loans made through REA and RTA and the Farmers Home Administration which have a repayment record of almost 100 percent yet the Senator from Maryland considers these as subsidies to farmers.

We should have a better understanding of what this bill is about.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. President, the proposed amendment strikes at the heart of the price support and the cropland diversion programs now underway under existing law. The bitter truth about this matter is that the proposed amendment has a much broader objective. Before proceeding further Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I wish to reply to the Senator from North Dakota.

The Senator from North Dakota pointed out that under this agriculture bill many items are charged to the American farmer which in reality should be charged to other departments. As one who has criticized our present farm program and as a strong supporter of the proposed amendment I wish to say that the Senator from North Dakota is correct in his analysis. As he has just said and as I have said many times, many items here need clarification as to what this farm program is costing from the standpoint of the farmers. I say that as one of the critics of the program and as one of the supporters of the proposed amendment.

As the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, Public Law 480 should be charged to the foreign aid program. The school lunch program should certainly not be charged to the American farmers. In many instances such as these I believe it would be better for the country and the Senate if the bills were broken down so that when we criticize one of these programs—and I say this as one of the critics of this program—we would at least be specific on what the program itself is costing in each instance.

I believe it is too expensive a program, and I would like to see the amendment adopted and a limitation placed on payments; but we want our arguments to be fair.

I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Florida in yielding to me in order that I might concur in what the Senator from North Dakota has said. The Senator from North Dakota and I have discussed this point many times. In fact, we have spoken of getting together and attempting to get a true analysis of what the farm program, the maritime program, and many of these subsidy programs are actually costing the American taxpayers. Unfortunately they are included in different appropriation bills, and the different categories are mixed together so that very few people know what each program is costing.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for pointing that out; in all fairness to the American farmers that should have been pointed out.

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. I would like to add that the Senator from Delaware has, for a long while, been seeking to accomplish this and to obtain a better system of budgeting.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, the proposed amendment, while it is well intended and is made by honest men who want to impose reasonable limitations on the price support program, would be a very serious and vital blow to the whole price support structure, the whole program loan structure, and the whole cropland diversion structure under existing law.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] called attention to the fact that not all of the facts that he desired were available in the report of this committee and in the record That is the truth, Mr. President, because this committee was endeavoring to do its duty, to bring out a bill to supply the cost of operation of the Agriculture Department and its related agencies under existing law for fiscal 1967. This bill is not rewriting the law that is on the books. This bill is not a legislative bill, but is an appropriation bill, and provides for the restoration of the Commodity Credit Corporation's capital losses incurred for fiscal year 1964 and 1965.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I cannot yield at this time. I have limited time. I shall yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio later.

Mr. President, this bill is an appropriations bill. It has been carefully drawn. More than 2,000 pages of hearings are on the desk of every Senator. In the report are 69 pages showing every conceivable item that might have been desired, but not showing some of the things requested by the Senator from Ohio, because they do not pertain to the subject matter of this particular bill.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Well, it is in the report.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, the proposed amendment would very seriously hurt the operation of the cotton program, which was mentioned by the Senator from Rhode Island, the wheat program, which is of great importance to the wheat producing industry—particularly the States of North Dakota and Kansas—and to the feed grain producing industry. The proposed amendment would be of very great and devastating importance to all of them, because it covers not just payments but also loans, even though many of those loans are repaid—every cent—with interest. Nevertheless, loans are also limited by the terms of the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, nobody can tell how many producers will be affected by that, because that was not one of the pertinent facts before the committee. We can tell, however, from looking at the report of this committee, how big this subject matter is.

For instance, on page 58 of the committee report is a listing of the number and amount of payments for calendar year 1965. I ask unanimous consent that that tabulation be included in the RECORD at this time as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number and amount of payments, calendar year 1965

Program	All payments		Payments below $5,000		Payments $5,000 to $24,999		Payments $25,000 to $49,999		Payments $50,000 and over	
	Estimated number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Emergency conservation measures	30,700	$11,968,000	30,696	$11,945,774	4	$22,226	----------	----------	----------	----------
Conservation reserve	163,000	152,932,000	162,664	151,251,200	336	1,680,800	----------	----------	----------	----------
Cropland conversion	5,800	7,512,000	5,575	5,846,913	225	1,665,087	----------	----------	----------	----------
Feed grain diversion	1,893,800	956,340,000	1,885,145	882,410,712	8,509	66,854,504	113	$3,734,749	33	$3,340,005
Feed grain price support	1,387,000	434,866,000	1,385,445	422,304,877	1,538	11,402,966	10	343,671	7	814,486
Wheat diversion	1,047,500	37,823,000	1,047,361	36,772,818	139	1,050,182	----------	----------	----------	----------
Wheat certificates	942,000	487,234,000	934,259	423,859,871	7,652	60,211,153	80	2,456,421	9	706,555
Cotton price support	509,000	69,551,000	508,485	64,165,765	487	4,329,286	23	734,260	5	321,689
Sugar	75,000	77,195,000	72,370	32,729,445	2,438	23,099,588	114	3,731,162	78	17,634,805
Wool-mohair	263,000	17,926,000	262,747	15,886,181	250	1,963,781	3	76,038	----------	----------
Total, all program payments	6,316,800	2,253,347,000	6,294,747	2,047,173,556	21,578	172,279,573	343	11,076,331	132	22,817,540

Mr. HOLLAND. From that report alone, it appears that in the feed grain diversion program the amount of all payments for that year was $956,340,000. Those diversion payments were made because Congress had determined, in its judgment, that this was the best way to approach the problems which were facing agriculture. The amount of feed grain price support paid in that year was $434,866,000.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the item of wheat diversion, $37,823,000 was paid for the year 1965, and $487,234,000 was expended for wheat certificates during the same year.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Will the Senator yield additional time?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes at this time.

Under the item of cotton price support, the figure shown is $69,551,000, in that particular compilation.

If we go to the next page in the report of the committee, on page 59, we see a tabulation of the number and amount of loans for calendar year 1965. I ask unanimous consent that that tabulation appear in the RECORD at this time, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number and amount of loans, calendar year 1965

Commodity	All loans		Loans below $5,000		Loans $5,000 to $24,999		Loans $25,000 to $49,999		Loans $50,000 and over	
	Estimated number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Corn	73,685	$217,972,425	65,183	$139,020,206	8,274	$70,245,352	194	$6,230,723	34	$2,476,144
Grain sorghums	22,869	93,416,117	17,781	24,081,393	4,533	47,616,405	462	15,310,698	93	6,407,621
Wheat	78,830	223,585,023	68,425	118,905,259	9,991	88,926,659	361	11,774,308	53	3,978,797
Barley	6,436	12,876,952	6,079	8,521,245	344	2,892,910	7	244,824	6	1,217,973
Oats	16,025	22,938,520	15,522	17,995,469	494	3,992,460	6	176,435	3	774,156
Rye	5,554	6,365,210	5,478	5,799,157	76	566,053	----------	----------	----------	----------
Flaxseed	15,922	24,798,137	15,170	19,261,663	750	5,483,656	2	52,818	----------	----------
Cotton, form A and G loans	(1)	886,697,959	----------	229,784,421	----------	349,615,237	----------	138,345,523	----------	168,952,778
Soybeans	62,152	172,101,052	56,991	86,115,109	4,979	39,863,738	133	4,584,588	49	41,537,617
Peanuts	[2] 26	55,873,948	----------	27,746,539	----------	23,193,761	----------	3,861,408	----------	1,072,240
Rice	1,109	48,630,141	410	985,421	395	5,475,823	204	7,167,131	100	35,001,766
Honey	530	2,095,960	419	590,421	99	1,047,427	10	322,024	2	136,088
Tung oil	883	5,506,482	814	3,659,751	51	545,501	11	349,484	7	951,746
Beans, dry edible	1,385	4,583,377	1,139	2,402,623	242	2,023,449	3	103,531	1	53,774
Naval stores	[2] 1	9,193,051	----------	3,186,564	----------	2,900,269	----------	1,178,821	----------	1,927,397
Tobacco	[2] 15	101,018,714	----------	98,586,236	----------	2,335,611	----------	30,199	----------	66,668
Dryer equipment	1,406	2,508,019	1,405	2,502,591	1	5,428	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, commodity loans	----------	1,890,161,087	----------	789,144,068	----------	646,729,739	----------	189,732,515	----------	264,554,765

[1] Comparable number data not available because CCC makes loans to cooperative associations (form G) as well as loans to individual producers (form A) and the data on advances by cooperatives to individual producers is not available. Amounts shown represent total form G loans to cooperatives and form A loans to individual producers classified by size.

[2] Represents number of loans to cooperative associations, not individual producers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without attempting to quote all of the loan figures—and they apply to all the commodities separately—I shall mention some figures briefly.

As to wheat, the total loan figure was $223,585,023. As to cotton, the total loan figure was $886,697,959.

Mr. President, we are asked to take a blind approach—the case of the blind leading the blind—in which it is proposed to ban loans of over $50,000, regardless of whether they were repaid. Many of them, of course, were repaid. We are asked to ban them in all three of these commodity fields which I have mentioned, and in other fields which I will not mention because they do not happen to be that important.

The fact is that we are asked to take this leap into the dark, to outlaw the making of loans and the making of payments over $50,000 to every individual or corporation throughout the country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Florida knows well that under the present cotton program as well as the wheat program, the wheat certificate payments and the payments to the cotton farmers are supposed to be a part of the price the farmer gets for his wheat or cotton. The loan price was greatly reduced so as to better compete with foreign countries and to provide cheaper materials here at home.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is so right, they are not only supposed to be, but they are a very important part of the price the producer gets for his labor and the use of his land.

Mr. President, since the law changed, effective in 1965, I call attention to the tabulation on page 293 of the record of hearings for two purposes: First, to show that the cotton equalization payments of fiscal year 1965 under the previous legislation were $409,604,844.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. **HOLLAND.** I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio as soon as I finish this statement.

I call attention to that because those equalization payments were made separately to the processors in that year. They were made as a part of the price support system in effect under that legislation, and for which the costs are reimbursed in this bill.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** I wish to point out that the information which I sought earlier and could not get is now clearly provided by a reading of what is contained on page 293 of the hearings. That is, the cotton program helping producers, or whomever it was said it helps, the cotton grower, cost $409 million in 1965. We are seeking to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for that cost.

Mr. **HOLLAND.** The Senator is correct in one part and incorrect in another part.

In fiscal 1965 that was the amount paid to the cotton processors; but that amount would not necessarily be paid to them in fiscal 1966, or 1967. The situation is entirely different under existing law enacted last year. This change in payments procedures is not due to the action of the committee, but rather to the action of the Congress in passing legislation which deals with this subject matter differently.

I plead with my learned friend that he not tamper with existing law in an appropriations bill without knowing what the outcome will be, and no man here can determine what the result would be by the application of this $50,000 limitation on all loans and payments.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield a half minute to me?

Mr. **HOLLAND.** I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] knows that I was vigorously opposed to subsidizing processors of cotton. I am glad to know that the Senator from Florida opposed that initial measure.

Mr. **HOLLAND.** The Senator is correct, and that points up the fact that the Senator from Florida is not trying to write legislation on an appropriations measure, as this amendment proposes to do. The Senator from Florida is trying to carry out his duty as a member of the committee to help carry out the laws which are on the books, because we put them there, even though the Senator from Florida did not vote for it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The 10 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. **HOLLAND.** Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

From this tabulation on page 293 there appears another figure which I mention because it appears in the total payments for fiscal 1965, although it was in a different category last year. The payment on wheat certificates was $106,652,864. I call attention to that fact because the Congress, in its wisdom, placed this in a different category last year in the legislation approved for the 1965 crop year.

I say again, and without reflection on my learned friends, that this is a case of the blind leading the blind, in asking that we apply a limitation of $50,000 on all loans, whether repaid or not, and all payments made under the laws which we have passed. It is the farmer who risks his land, and his own toil, and investments in the production of a crop, and the Congress should not attempt to change a law just passed last year in this manner, and with no knowledge of its impact.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] placed his finger on the specific point involved when he said that we are not now considering legislation or the amendment of legislation. We should be considering the problem of financing of the Department of Agriculture to carry out laws that we have placed on the books.

I know something about the matter, and I wish to point out what was done. This committee acted over a long period of time to gather the facts and report them to the Senate. This bill was reported out of the full committee of members by unanimous vote.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. **HOLLAND.** I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on the bill for 2 minutes.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL.** As one who voted for the Brewster amendment last year, I must oppose it this year if it is to be added on to the agriculture appropriation bill, because of the ruling by the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture on how such a limitation would affect the cotton program.

Last year Congress provided a one-price system for cotton. I strongly supported this program because our domestic cotton textile industry needs to be able to buy cotton at a competitive price with foreign manufacturers. We now find, however, that under the so-called snapback provision in the farm bill, if the Secretary of Agriculture is not able to make available to all cotton producers cooperating in the cotton program the amounts of loans and payments they would be entitled to under the cotton provisions, cotton would again go back on a two-price system.

Mr. John Bagwell, General Counsel of the Agriculture Department, in a letter to Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee, dated June 2, 1966, advised that a payment limitation to any one producer cooperating in the cotton program would trigger the snapback provision for the whole program. This opinion was rendered in connection with a payment limitation which the Senate included in the natural disaster planting legislation last month, but it is my understanding that it would apply also to the Brewster limitation in this bill.

Whether this ruling is right or wrong, Mr. President, this is the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture which must administer the cotton program. It is vital that we continue cotton on a one-price system. If we are forced back onto a two-price system, New England textile mills, for example, will be required to pay 29 cents a pound for their cotton, while their foreign competitors could get our U.S. cotton for about 22 cents. Congress clearly declared their intent that this not happen in the cotton provisions of last year's bill. In addition, just a few weeks ago, we passed legislation to encourage cotton research and promotion. I believe we must maintain these efforts to stimulate our domestic cotton industry, both for producers and manufacturers, and therefore I must oppose this measure which threatens to place our cotton program back on the two-price system.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me in order that I might make my statement.

Mr. **HOLLAND.** I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts mentioned one fact of three I will mention at this time to show what other steps are being taken to try to bring the market into some degree of order.

The fact that he mentioned was that the bill we passed and which is now being set in operation by the Department of Agriculture, imposed a $1 per bale tax upon all cotton produced to step up improving the cotton situation. That does not look like the cotton producers are trying to evade their responsibility.

Another fact is that the cotton producers supported the bill last year, not just under the proposals of last year, but also proposals to favor the small producer because everybody knew the strain was on them, by giving them 4 or 5 cents more a pound. This was an attempt to enable them to stay in business.

Mr. **FANNIN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point? I would like to make a statement.

Mr. **HOLLAND.** I shall be glad to yield to the Senator, but I wish to make two more points in connection with wheat.

Everybody who knows anything about the situation knows that the Secretary is trying to carry out the wishes of the administration, and I think that they are in most cases the wishes of the Congress; trying to increase the production of wheat because the greatest need of the world is for more food. The Secretary, because of his desire to help in that situation, gave a 15-percent additional allotment to step up the production of wheat.

Now, are we going to say that we are going to bring under this bill not only those who made $50,000 to finance the crop last year, but those who yield to the request of the President and the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture to produce more wheat this year to meet our international needs?

Mr. President, I shall not labor the point further. I am glad now to yield such time on the bill as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] may need.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Arizona is recognized for such time as he desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that the Senator from Arizona will take not more than 5 minutes, as I have so many other requests from Senators to speak.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I should like to support the points which have been made so capably by the Senator from Florida as to the advantages which will accrue as a result of the provisions of this bill and the damaging effect the pending amendment would have on it.

The whole country stands to benefit if the cost of producing cotton can be reduced and if cotton products can be further improved. Scientists say these things can be done.

The question is whether the necessary investments will be made in research, promotion, machinery, land improvement, et cetera, and whether modern management and engineering skills can be attracted to cotton farming.

Efficiency is the key word in cotton's future. The drive for greater efficiency will be killed off if the Government deliberately discriminates against the larger cotton farmers. In most areas of business, the advantages of large-scale operation are clearly recognized. Only if firms become monopolistic are they considered to run counter to public policy. But the largest cotton growers in the country are not 1 percent as large as the biggest manmade fiber producer.

In manmade fiber manufacture, new discoveries are normally patented or carefully guarded as business secrets. Among the larger cotton farmers, the situation is exactly opposite to this. The larger farmers are usually best set up to try out new techniques of operation. They are usually the only growers with the financing, the management, and the scale of operation to put new scientific discoveries promptly into trial use. Their successes or failures are immediately known to all other farmers in surrounding areas and are communicated to all parts of the cotton belt. The larger farmers are thus the spearhead of progress in a great deal of cotton's struggle to compete with synthetics.

Cotton can be a great source of strength to this country if public policy does not cripple its drive toward efficiency. Right now the requirements of military procurement are forcing textile mills to shift back to cotton from synthetic fiber. New scientific discoveries are bringing all-cotton fabrics back into strong competition for manufacture of the new "durable press" garments. Research aimed at complete elimination of the boll weevil and other insects is now well advanced. Scientists predict that the cost of cotton production can be lowered 11 cents per pound through weed and insect control, mechanization, and so forth.

Farmers will soon vote in a referendum on whether they should be assessed $1 per bale to finance the kind of research and promotion that can help solve cotton's basic problems—and the distinguished Senator from Florida covered that very capably. It would be tragic for the Government to step in and penalize the larger producers, who are counted upon to bear a substantial part of this burden.

The payments being made to cottongrowers under the Agricultural Act of 1965—excepting only the payments to "small farms"—are designed to do no more than maintain farm income at tolerable levels in the face of sharp acreage reductions combined with an 8-cent reduction in support levels. This is not largess but a sound investment in the future of cotton. The investment and the leadership which has to come from larger farmers in cotton's drive for efficiency will surely turn to other fields if the Government adopts a policy of discrimination against them.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for yielding to me to make this statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill, who is in opposition to it—if there is any such opposition—grant me 5 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I am glad to yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize fully the argument made by the Senator from Florida that this is an appropriation bill to finance the ordinary problems incurred in the past under laws of authorization. However, I would feel delinquent if I did not use all available time in my possession to express my vigorous opposition to a U.S. Government program which, under the guise of helping the little farmer to survive, would proceed to make payments of over $50,000 in subsidies and loans aggregating $264 million.

Now what I have just stated may not sound completely understandable, but $22,817,540, according to the report, has been paid out to farmers in the way of subsidies in amounts of over $50,000.

Therefore, how could it be said that a farmer who receives $50,000 in subsidies comes within the category and the principle of the farmer who has to be helped to survive?

Such an argument cannot be maintained.

The second point is, I did not know that this was a fact, but page 59 of the report shows that loans of $50,000 and more, as distinguished from payments, have been made aggregating $264 million.

Again, I put the question: How can it be claimed that the farmer who is able to borrow $50,000 and more from the Government is in the category of needing Federal help in order to survive?

Mr. President, such an argument cannot be maintained.

I have just discussed $264 million loaned to farmers in amounts of $50,000 and more, and now we come to another one, in the amounts of $25,000 to $49,000 where the loans have totaled $189 million.

I cannot support the pending bill as it is written. I can support the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER].

I concur fully with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Senators who allege that large charges in the agricultural program have been made against farmers that should not be charged against them.

I repeat most emphatically that every time I get the opportunity, I shall rise on the floor of the Senate to argue against this misnomer of a farm program contemplated to help the little farmer stay on the land.

The amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], if it is adopted, will not disturb at all the little farmer. In my opinion, it will not disturb the farm industry.

In conclusion, I come to the subject of subsidizing the processor. It has been argued in this Chamber today that there is no subsidy of the processor of cotton—and let me bring this point to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. When we initially passed the bill, the subsidy went to the processor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

But the argument was made in this Chamber, since that time, that we have now initiated a new program of subsidization of the processor. Thus, that was removed and instead of paying the processor we are now supposedly paying the farm grower.

By whatever name one calls it, it is the same thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to go into the many arguments that could be advanced against the pending amendment. For the past 15 or 20 years we have been dealing with this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be placed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the National Grange addressed to me, dated July 14, 1966, which covers the subject very well.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1966.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Grange would like to reiterate its position on Limitation of Payments for you and your distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

Support payments are made to assure farmers, who have expanded their productive capacity and increased their capital investment in times of national need, relief from hardship during times of a decline in market demand. Support payments on all commodities have been substantially reduced since the end of World War II. In some cases, these payments are not sufficient for the producer to receive a return even equal to his cost production. Although these payments have not contributed to a prosperous agriculture, they have prevented the economic distress in agriculture such as resulted after World War I.

Diversion payments are not a gift, but a legitimate return for a desirable action in the national interest. In the late 1950's, the United States was faced with the vast accumulation of agricultural stocks with enormous storage costs to the government. The use of diversion payments, coupled with voluntary programs, have dramatically reduced the stocks of wheat and feed grains; the low support prices in milk have continually reduced surplus milk production; and the planting of cotton during the present year indicates the smallest cotton acreage in many decades. This program is working to reduce the price depressing and tax consuming effects of surplus stocks.

The payments for limiting production are proportionately higher for the larger farmer, and so, also, is his contribution to reduced production. It seems only just that the producers with the greatest capital investment should earn the largest payments since they are making the largest reductions. In addition, there seems to be some doubt about the constitutionality of an action limiting payments in such a manner to discriminate against large producers.

Since most of the reduction programs are on a voluntary basis, the effectiveness of these programs would be reduced seriously by a limitation of payments to the larger producers. This action would force them to replant acreage for unneeded agricultural commodities. Consequently, the ultimate effect would be borne equally by the small farmers, through a decrease in farm prices, or by the Government, through an increase in surplus stocks.

With the present program, we have transferred our surplus of stocks to a surplus of capacity, and, at the same time, our capacity for production remains the highest in the world. Yet, our surplus capacity does not depress farm prices as surplus stocks have done in the past. A much smaller percentage of production goes into Government storage now, and a smaller percentage yet is unredeemed after the loan period.

In our judgment, the public has received a proper return on its investment, including—

A reduction in surplus stocks;

The steady supply of an adequate amount of basic stocks at reasonable prices;

The availability of agricultural products for export, making our agricultural exports the largest earner of dollars of all our exportable commodities; and

The strategic value of our productive capacity kept intact.

Not the least of all the results has been a stabilized and improved farm income. Although it is still far too low, this program has fostered an increased equality for farmers in the domestic economic system.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we would appreciate your conveying to the Senate the opposition of the National Grange to acreage limitation payments on any part of our agricultural program.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY L. GRAHAM.

Cc: Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agreed to yield next to the Senator from Mississippi, to whom I yield 4 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I take a small part of this time to highly commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for the laborious work they have done on this bill. I commend them for the fairness of their presentation with respect to this amendment.

The question reduces itself into the simplest terms. Congress passed a basic agricultural act. The President signed it. Among other things, in effect, it sets the world market price of cotton as being the price of cotton in the United States. In other words, both thought it was necessary, in order to grow cotton, to provide some profit by the farmers receiving a subsidy.

Now, at the first chance in an appropriation bill, there is an attempt to repudiate the principles adopted in basic legislation—not as to everyone. It is not intended to repudiate it as to all, but only as to a few.

The basic unfairness of that proposal is so apparent that I do not think we need any further argument. But if there is to be a change in that basic principle, then let us adopt basic legislation, measuring the merits of all groups, rather than go out with a meat ax and chop down one group, and say we are going to apply this proposition to one group, but not the others.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield briefly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the Mississippi State Penitentiary received over $175,000?

Mr. STENNIS. That is incidental. It has a cotton farm, is one of the best managed penitentiaries in the United States, and provides its inmates with fresh air, and so on. It has no relation to the basic argument.

We talk about the little farmer. I represent the little farmer. I come from the area of the State where there are little farmers. I know their problems.

That is not the issue at all. There is a basic issue involved here, of a promise being made, and now there is an attempt to repudiate that promise in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the acting minority leader in charge of the time on this side, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the distinguished acting minority leader for his graciousness.

Mr. President, under the bill as presently presented there would be no limitation whatsoever on the amount of loans and subsidies paid to any one farmer.

The Senator from Maryland is quite correct in saying that 20 percent of the total $2.5 billion will go to the approximately 20,000 farmers with gross incomes of over $100,000 a year.

The Senator from Maryland has limited loans and subsidies to $50,000 for any one farm. The average net income per farm is approximately $5,000. What the Senator from Maryland is proposing is that no one should receive from the taxpayers more than 10 times the average net farm income. Who can object to that?

The minimum income established under the poverty classification is $3,000. The Senator from Maryland has proposed that no one should receive more than 17 times the poverty scale. That is certainly most moderate.

It seems to that it is a fundamentally sound argument that the farm subsidy program has become a program for many farmers who do not need help, and that it gives only a small proportion of its aid to the small farmer.

Many Senators would like to make cuts in the poverty program, but want to give 20,000 landlord farmers over $50,000 each in loans and subsidies. They would take it out of the poor while pouring wealth into the pockets of the few.

The Brewster proposal will save tens of millions of dollars and possibly even more. It is my belief that we should support it.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] as he may desire.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. I have the privilege of being the most junior member of that subcommittee, with some 13 Senators on it. On no subcommittee or committee on which I have served have I seen a chairman sit there and go through each individual item, whether there was opposition to it or not, with more care than does the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He examines every item carefully, whether there is opposition to it or not. Many times the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] helps him.

I have a communication from the Texas Farmers Union. Nearly every one of its members is a small farmer. They tell me, first of all, that these limitations cannot be made effective when participation in various farm programs is voluntary. What will happen is that the big corporate farms, at which payment limitations are aimed, will simply pull out of the programs. Without them you have no program. Large corporate farms will pull out and still survive, but the little farmer will not survive, because the program will be wrecked.

In the second place, in the case of cotton specifically, if the limitation is adopted, there is a "snapback" provision in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 that will automatically put cotton back under the 1958 act, which all backers of the 1965 act opposed.

I ask unanimous consent that the section from the act to which I have referred, subparagraph (12), which appears on page 10 of Public Law 89–321, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(12) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, as a result of limitations hereafter enacted with respect to price support under this subsection, the Secretary is unable to make available to all cooperators the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection for any crop of upland cotton, (A) price support to cooperators shall be made available for such crop (if marketing quotas have not been disapproved) through loans or purchases at such level not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate; (B) in order to keep upland cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, such price support may be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor and resale at a lower price or through loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of a price therefor lower than the amount of the

> loan thereon; and (C) such resale or redemption price shall be such as the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of cotton during the harvest season and will retain an adequate share of the world market for cotton produced in the United States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I would point out that the figure the distinguished Senator has earlier referred to, of $264 million for all characters of loans, for grain, for sorghums, for everything, represented only 14 percent of all loans. That represented 14 percent of the total of over $1,890 million.

Although the amount is large, when one considers the overall agricultural program, it is the tail wagging the dog.

Out of 3.5 million farmers in the United States, we have learned in the Education and Labor Committee in the hearings on the minimum wage bills, over 2 million of those farmers do not hire one single hired hand on their farms.

These are voluntary programs. Are we going to weaken the program for those more than 2 million family farmers on small farms?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the main purposes of the price-support program is to protect the small farmer. We have always recognized the important role of these small farmers in American life.

But in the past we have given the most money to the largest farms—to the men who need the money least. Seven barley producers receive in price support loans more than the 1,753 small barley farmers. One-ninth of the rice producers get two-thirds of the Federal money for this crop. The Government loaned one company—the Arkansas Grain Corp.—over $16 million.

Because of the world's needs and the changing picture of U.S. agriculture, we can no longer rely on our surpluses. American agriculture should produce enough food to provide for domestic needs, consumer exports, and food aid to certain developing countries.

President Johnson has said that we must have "a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most."

Without this amendment, 2 percent of the farmers—those grossing over $100,000 a year—will take in about one-fifth of the subsidy money. With this amendment, we will spend less money, and a proportionally larger amount on small farmers. I feel this amendment may best lead to an efficient and rational approach to the problems of agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maryland for his leadership in this field. After all, the purpose of his amendment is to help the small farmer. The second purpose of his amendment is to help the consumer.

I certainly do not know why, under any theory of any thinking person, we should not be interested in helping the small farmer and the consumer to a better way of life. Certainly, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, we will save about $25 million. That will help in cutting down the expenses of the Government, to say nothing of the other items.

I might point out again, as President Johnson stated in his state of the Union message last year:

> Our economy owes much to the efficiency of our farmers. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward. I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs the help the most.

That is exactly what the Senator's amendment would do. I hope the Senate will approve this amendment, and I hope that we will consider this as a first step—and a serious step—toward economy in Government, and the realization that we are going to have to help the people who need it most.

I might point out that $50,000 a year is certainly a little bit more than the average farmer makes—I was about to say during his entire life, but certainly 10 times what he makes in any one year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on this proposition I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I understand I have 1 minute remaining, so therefore, I say in summation: This is just one step in calling a halt to a program which has gone far beyond what was originally intended. This program was set up to help the family farmer, the small operator with small acreage, without much machinery.

That we support. We think it is important to American society. What we do not think is right is for one corporation, in Arkansas, to get loans of $16 million a year, and repay $10 million.

The distinguished Senator from Florida, the proponent of the appropriation measure, said most of the loans had been repaid. Then why are we asking the taxpayers to put up $3,500 million to make loans to millionaires? That is the question. My amendment would be one way of stopping it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the acting minority leader in charge of the opposition, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Do I understand, Mr. President, we have 16 minutes left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support this amendment and wish to say that I am as much interested in the welfare of the small farmers as has anyone else. In fact, there has been so much interest expressed for the small farmer that I sometimes wonder if it were possible to save all the tears that have been shed in the name of the small farmer it would not go a long way toward eliminating the drought with which we are now confronted in many areas of the country.

Let us get down to the facts of the matter. The adoption of this amendment would not in one single degree or by one penny affect the small farmer in America. It would not affect any farmer in America who is receiving total payments of less than $50,000 from the Federal Government. So let us keep that point clearly in mind.

Much has been said about the cotton farmers. Based on the report by the committee, on page 58, there are exactly five cotton farmers in the United States who would be affected by the adoption of this amendment as respects the amount of subsidy payments received only five.

As we use the statistics for 1965 I think I should be fair and say there would be more affected by the adoption of this amendment than the number reported by the committee, because in 1966 we shall be making the subsidy payments to the farmers rather than the textile mills; but, nevertheless, there are very few farmers who would be affected. As to wheat farmers, there are 14 farmers whose subsidy would be affected by the adoption of this amendment. Based on the reports, 132 wheat farmers in the entire United States received payments in 1965 in excess of $50,000. So let us get straight what we are talking about. This does not affect the small farmers.

Now, as to price support loans there were about 300-and-some-odd—the figures are not totaled, but roughly 300 farmers that would be affected, not including cotton. This is based on the committee report. Cotton payments under price support loans are not included in the report. We are dealing with a relatively small number of large operators, and even those are not affected except to this extent: They could still receive up to $50,000 from the Federal Government in subsidies or price supports. After that they would be on their own. And why should they not be on their own?

Much of American agriculture as we know it today has grown and flourished without any support prices whatsoever, without any subsidy payments. I am proud to say that the poultry industry of my State is one of them, and they have made out better by not being under Government operations and Government controls.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator mentioned a moment ago that only 14 wheat farmers in the United States would be affected. This would be true if a farmer raised only wheat. But I do not know of a single farmer in my State or the surrounding States who raises wheat alone. Most of the farmers are involved in raising of several commodities, including wheat, corn, oats, rye, soybeans, and perhaps wool or sugarbeets.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why it is proposed we exempt sugar under this amendment and include wool payments. These programs are almost exactly the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It has been called to my attention that under the present law there are instances where there is an overlapping, and some are drawing $50,000 under two or three different crops. In other words, it could well be they get over $50,000 from two or more crops.

But the point is, why should we not limit to $50,000 the amount to be paid under any one price-support program? I ask that question from the taxpayers' standpoint and for the benefit of the small farmer. Because if we stop subsidizing corporate type operations, the small farmer can better compete, and he can stay in business and keep and maintain his small farm.

There is a second point. A few years ago, we administered the cotton program by subsidizing the textile mills to the amount of about $300 to $400 million a year. We are still subsidizing them today; the only difference is we are doing it by making the payments to the farmer. But indirectly the subsidy goes to the mills because they can buy the cotton about 8 to 9 cents per pound below the prevailing domestic price; therefore it is a subsidy, even though it is paid in the name of the American farmer.

During the hearings the textile industry and the various departments—the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, all others that offered testimony in behalf of that subsidy—said, "If you would reduce the price of cotton to the textile mills you would reduce the price of cotton cloth to the consumers and it would average out that the consumers as taxpayers would save the money."

Statistics put out by the Department of Commerce show that cotton cloth is selling at a higher price today than it was selling before we started subsidizing the price of cotton for the textile mills, before we started giving them cotton at world prices. So the consumers did not receive the benefit of the subsidy, but the American taxpayers are paying this $300 to $400 million a year.

Certainly there is merit to the Senator's amendment that we should confine the agricultural program to the American farmer and not give it to big business, and the best argument that I know of in behalf of the Brewster amendment is made by those who tried to argue against it when they called attention to what it would do to the textile mills.

That is the secret to the whole problem. The textile mills are more interested in this program than the American cotton farmer because it is the mills that are getting the subsidies, not the American farmer. I think it is time that we confine our agricultural program to the farmers and not try to take care of the textile mills. If we are to subsidize the textile mills and other industries let us do it as a subsidy to the industries and not charge it up to the American farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have two more brief requests, and I am glad to grant them.

First, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear that I do not think this would benefit the consumer. It certainly would not benefit the small farmer, as the evidence already put into the Record by my colleague indicates. However, with regard to the argument of my friend, the Senator from Delaware, who is an expert on taxes, he knows very well that, even though large payments are made to individuals, the income tax—of which he is a great master—does much to bring the situation back into relationship, one with the other. Most of the payment will be recaptured in any case, and that is one of the functions of that tax.

I am sure that the principle that is sought to be applied here would not be applicable or acceptable by the Senator from Delaware or the other sponsors for many of the companies in their own States, which companies benefit to a great extent from Government contracts. I am sure that the Senator from Delaware would not want to apply a $50,000 limitation on the DuPont Co. I am not suggesting it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have opposed subsidies being paid to companies in any State in any amount. I only wish I had more support.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The principle that it is being sought to establish here arose last year. It has a saving factor. Its main objective is that if we take away this benefit for the larger companies, we negative the whole program. We might as well get started on a program to make it impossible for the big producers to comply.

I wanted to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland. He mentioned two companies in Arkansas.

Is it not a fact that the Arkansas Grain Corp., which the Senator mentioned, is a large cooperative with several thousand members, and that this money does not accrue to some big individual producers, but on the contrary accrues to several thousand small producers?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas knows more about the situation in his State than I do. All I know is that $16 million was advanced as a loan to a corporation in Arkansas and only $10 million was repaid. The taxpayers lost $6 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is probably the largest co-op in the State, and it has been very successful on the whole. I do not know about that loss. I had no notice of the loss aspect. However, the corporations which the Senator mentioned are two of the largest co-ops in the State. They have been quite successful in rice and soybeans, and I am sure that the full amount of the loan will be repaid when the crop has been fully marketed.

To leave the impression that some big corporate enterprise, such as DuPont Co., is taking a vast sum of money, I think is a misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 1 minute will be sufficient.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I merely wanted a minute to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware, that ordinarily I would be able to support the amendment.

The Senator from New Hampshire is not happy about the subsidy method that we had to resort to after a long, hard, and desperate fight in order to allow American textile mills to buy their cotton at the same price that their competitors abroad buy it.

It was the only way in which this could be done, and it was imperative that it should be done. However, after a long, hard fight, we have at last placed the American textile industry in a competitive position as far as buying cotton is concerned.

I could not vote for an amendment which might undo all we have accomplished and might possibly place our American textile mills back in a position of paying more for their raw materials.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Maryland raises an issue which has been raised over and over again. I have listened carefully to the arguments pro and con. I have obtained an analysis of the issue from the Department of Agriculture which I find persuasive. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS

Salient points

Payments are an integral part of farm programs carefully tailored to specific commodity situations. For diversion they are partial compensation for adjustments made in the national interest. For price support they are economy, because in their absence expenditures would be higher. Payments are *not* "something for nothing," they are *not* welfare, and they do *not* represent handouts. They are a "quid pro quo" adopted as the least costly method of achieving program objectives. Their limitation could well be the beginning of the end of farm programs as we know them.

Discussion

A limitation on Government payments to producers of agricultural commodities would strike at the heart of our farm policy and probably result in the breakdown or death of the entire structure of farm programs in their present form. This conclusion inevitably evolves from consideration of a payments limitation in relation to our basic agricultural policy, and the nature and purpose of our farm programs, and the role of payments in those programs.

Our basic agricultural policy is designed to provide a continuously adequate supply—but not a burdensome excess—of food and fiber products at stable prices which are fair to both producers and consumers without undue costs to the Government. This policy deals with agriculture as a whole, and the demand for farm products as a whole. Our agricultural policy is not a relief policy. It is not aimed at the plight of individuals or groups of individuals although it helps them by strengthening the economy of which they are individual parts.

FARM PROGRAMS

Farm programs are designed to achieve a reasonable balance between what farmers produce and what can be used—either domestically or through export channels. Present technology is so advanced and resources are so great that it is essential for these farm programs to be tailored to the prevailing commodity situation. Commodity programs are designed to affect the total economy of a commodity—the entire supply and the price for that entire supply.

Payments, like commodity programs, are geared to the circumstances of particular commodity situation. Payments under ASCS programs can be grouped in two categories: (1) diversion and price support, and (2) conservation.

1. *Diversion payments* are used to achieve a balance between production quantities that can be utilized, or, more literally, to induce a producer to hold down his acreage and production. (Such payments are made under acreage diversion programs for cotton, feed grains, and wheat, as well as cropland adjustment, cropland conversion, and conservation reserve programs. Other provisions of the commodity diversion programs—such as price support payments and certificates—also play a major role in reducing production to desirable levels.) Underlying diversion payments is the assumption that it is in the national interest to adjust production and supply. Such adjustments in the interest of the total economy or society should be apportioned. But a reduction in acreage is contrary to the individual farmer's interest—it reduces his income. Thus, there is a choice between two approaches: (1) give the farmer a quid pro quo—a diversion payment, or (2) maintain a mandatory program. The job is to adjust supply. The size of the payment only reflects the degree of participation or contribution to the total adjustment. Excluding large acreages from participation would be contrary to the purpose of the payment and the objective of the program. If large operators could not participate, total production would increase.

Loan operations, by their nature, would embrace the quantity that could not be marketed at the loan level. Denying or limiting the loan program to large operators would mean only that their production would be marketed largely through regular commercial channels, putting pressure on prices. Small operators would suffer from lower prices.

Thus, in the absence of higher payments to smaller farmers to withhold much more acreage, the production of smaller farmers would go under loan and total price support operations would increase. Either way, costs to the Government would go up.

Price support or equivalent payments are made to eligible producers of cotton, feed grains, wheat, wool, mohair, and sugar. The payments in the case of cotton and grains are offsets to reductions which have been made in returns which farmers heretofore could get for their crops by placing them under loan and turning them over to the Government in settlement of the loans. Payments on wool and mohair were described in the authorizing legislation as being intended to provide an incentive to increased production. In the case of sugar, the economy of which is more highly and rigidly structured, payments are generally referred to as "conditional" because of the various requirements imposed requisite to their issuance. Further, sugar payments are more than offset by taxes imposed on sugar processed, both domestic and imported.

2. *Conservation payments* are made under various programs. A common characteristic of all such payments is that they share the costs incurred by owners in carrying out needed and approved conservation practices. Such payments have been appropriately described as reflecting the benefits to the total economy, or people collectively, from needed soil and water conservation.

PAYMENTS—SUBSIDY OR SACRIFICE?

There is substantial misunderstanding that Government payments to farmers are "something for nothing"—and nothing could be more incorrect. Moreover, in neither of the categories cited can payments be appropriately described as subsidies or net profit. In each case there is a consideration—a quid pro quo on the part of the producer.

Payments are *not* welfare. They are part of a stabilizing mechanism in the interest of the national economy. They have been adopted as the least costly method of achieving an objective. To limit the size of the payment would jeopardize the achievement of the objective. And, clearly, the supply adjustment is just as effective whether 10 producers divert 100 acres each or 100 farmers divert 10 acres each—so long as the unit rate of inducement is the same.

Payments are *not* handouts. Payments are made, for example, to farmers to take land out of production. It is their land; they have the capital, equipment, know how and the right to produce a commodity on it; and they forego the return from this output.

Payments are *not* net profit or subsidy. Payments are in lieu of income the producer would have received from raising crops on acreage held out of production, or to prevent losses which would occur to our endowment of soil and water resources for future generations in the absence of needed conservation measures.

In all cases, payments are in direct proportion to the farmer's contribution. Clearly, a payments limitation would prevent participation in programs by the larger producers. No useful purpose would be served and supply adjustment could not be accomplished by forcing such producers out of our programs. Their nonparticipation would, instead, result in increased costs to the Government, less effective programs, and perhaps a complete collapse of our present programs in a few years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the prepared remarks of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who is necessarily absent, concerning the amendment offered today by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL POLICY AGAINST BIGNESS?

(Statement by Senator TALMADGE)

If we proposed to place limitations upon government payments to farmers because of the size of the individual operation, we should clearly recognize the nature of the issue. It is not whether subsidies are good or bad. It is whether subsidies should be used as a means of discrimination against the larger individual farmers, who produce the bulk of our crops.

This would be an extremely dangerous move, not simply for agriculture but for the nation. It is not in keeping with American tradition to oppose bigness as such, in business, industry and agriculture. We oppose bigness only where it restrains progress or otherwise harms public interest. But there is no contention that the large farms do any such thing. Much of our progress in agriculture, as in any other field, has been the result of bigness and the efficiency that normally goes with it.

In awarding Defense contracts—which necessarily contain various forms of subsidy— does our government avoid our giant corporations? Of course not. We are delighted to award billions in contracts to such outstanding firms as General Dynamics, General Electric, Boeing, North American Aviation, Lockheed, General Motors and Westinghouse. We are grateful that we have these big corporations with their enormous potential for equipping our defense establishments.

In this country we have a long history of subsidization in the national interest. It began with the very first Congress, in 1789, when subsidies were established to encourage American shipping. Today the subsidies for American shipping are heavier than ever. For example, subsidies on ship operations averaged almost $180 million a year from 1960 through 1964. Subsidies on ship construction average almost $100 million a year in the same period.

And is there any discrimination, based on size, in the subsidy the various shipping companies may receive? Of course not. There is no discrimination because of the size of the contract or the size of the company with whom the contract is made.

And what about the billions that have been spent on mail subsidies? Have we had limitations here based on size? Of course not. A big magazine like *Life*—which is constantly taking aim at the "farm subsidies"—gets the same benefits of the mail subsidies as the small publications. On the basis of a post office estimate made a number of years ago, the mail subsidy for *Life* (in 1956) was about $9½ million, compared with only about $800 thousand for *Coronet*.

What I am saying is that the question of price support limitation for farmers goes far beyond agriculture itself. If we should arbitrarily set a limitation on a farmer's size and opportunity, we should be opening the door to the same kind of penalty on bigness and efficiency throughout the rest of our economy.

Today the government has massive powers to influence our economy for better or for worse. There are so many different subsidies that it takes eight pages simply to list them in a recent Joint Economic Committee report entitled "Subsidy and Subsidy-Effect Program of the U.S. Government."

There is no way to set up a total amount of the subsidies paid. The Federal Government estimates its current subsidy expenditure at something over $7 billion a year but this does not even begin to take into account the many hidden subsidy benefits that are associated with such things as tariffs, depletion allowances, accelerated amortization of facilities, investment credit, etc.

The Federal Government, of course, has virtually unlimited powers over every form of economic activity. And if we now decide to use this power to penalize bigness and efficiency in a basic industry such as agriculture, how long will it be before this same principle is applied in the rest of our economy?

Price support limitation based on size of a farm is unsound and dangerous. It flies in the teeth of our American tradition. It should be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Maryland. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 139 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Allott
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Dominick
Douglas
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
McIntyre
Morton
Nelson
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—53

Aiken
Bartlett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Magnuson
McGee
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tower

So Mr. BREWSTER's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

AMENDMENT NO. 644

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 7, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$125,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered seeks to increase the appropriation for the food stamp plan, or program, by $25 million.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total appropriation of $125 million to operate the food stamp program in fiscal year 1967.

Participation at the beginning of fiscal year 1967 totaled between 1.2 and 1.3 million people—325 project areas are now in operation, and 14 areas are scheduled to open shortly. It is now estimated that $120 million would be required to finance the program in these areas for the full fiscal year. The $125 million approved by the Appropriations Committee would obviously permit only a minimal expansion.

In enacting the Food Stamp Act in 1964, Congress contemplated a gradual, orderly expansion until the program reached all States and all communities that wanted the program. In line with this approach, the program was expanded during fiscal year 1966 from an initial total of 110 areas, at the beginning of the fiscal year, to the present 325. The number of people participating almost doubled—from just over 600,000 to more than 1.2 million.

The States are geared to this gradual expansion. They have filed requests on behalf of more than 400 areas. The low-income families in these areas need food assistance. Although our general level of prosperity is high, many families are not participating fully. Even the $150 million requested will mean that some counties will remain on the waiting list at the end of this fiscal year.

The $150 million I am requesting is within the budget request recommended by the President.

We have an odd situation here today in this appropriation bill. I thoroughly approve the committee's action with reference to the school lunch and special milk programs but I cannot agree with their action in reducing the recommended level of funding for the food stamp program. My amendment restores the full $150 million requested for this program. I will support a move to provide the full $150 million requested for this program.

I said we have an odd situation and it is. There has not been a single question raised as to the effectiveness and the efficiency with which this program is operated. I have heard no one question its purpose or doubt its results in improving diets for low-income families.

I have heard no one say that we should slow down its momentum because there are indications of sloppy administration in the Department of Agriculture or in the States or in the communities that have the program. We have heard this type of charge against programs administered by other agencies.

We passed the Food Stamp Act in 1964. That act contained an authorization of $200 million for this fiscal year. The Department of Agriculture has not asked us to go that far. They are fulfilling the intent of Congress by providing an orderly, equitable expansion of the program to areas of the country that want and need the program. The $125 million proposed by the committee cut things too fine. It will require $120 million to operate the program in just those 325 areas now participating and the 14 areas scheduled to begin shortly. We are going to be in the position of disappointing a number of counties that, on the basis of the action taken in the other body with respect to this appropriation, had good reason to expect extension of the program to their people this year.

Many States have geared their finances in anticipation of the passage of the full budgeted amount which the President recommended of $150 million, the amount I propose in my amendment.

The country is prosperous, no doubt of that. There is also no doubt that thousands of families need food assistance despite the general prosperity. The food stamp program is a sound, accepted dignified way of getting food assistance to these families. We are not dealing here with an overnight nationwide expansion of the program. We are proposing a moderate expansion to maintain the momentum that has developed and to assure the States and communities that we meant what we said when we passed the act—the program will be made available in an orderly manner to every State and community that wants and needs the program.

I wish to say without reservation that I have a very high regard for the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], with whom I serve on the Committee on Agriculture. I know that he is sincere in the recommendations that have been made by his committee to the Senate.

But, Mr. President, food for hungry people should be the most important item on the agenda of the Senate. If we go through without increasing this appropriation to the level recommended by the President and the Department of Agriculture we are going to foreclose 300 additional areas throughout the country who are waiting for this bill to pass in order to program themselves into a food program which will feed hungry families throughout the vast expanse of the United States. That is what is at stake today and that is why I appeal to every Member of the Senate, because many Members have counties in their respective areas where hungry families are living and eking out an existence from day to day and going to bed hungry at night.

That is why it is of vast importance that we enact this program. The original intention of the program was to increase it gradually and that is what we are requesting by this amendment: to attempt to bring it up to the level recommended by the Department of Agriculture and the level that has been worked out by the States in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

Unless we do this many communities will be disappointed. But more importantly, many families who are going hungry will be deprived of this opportunity to feed their families and nourish their families properly so they can compete in American society with dignity and respect.

That is what is at stake. That is why I urge the adoption of the amendment today.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have tremendous sympathy for the amendment. It is meritorious, so far as I am concerned, in every respect.

However, I wish to say this: In my 16 years in the Senate I have never met a man who is more considerate, more compassionate or understanding, than the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He, least of all men, would want any man, woman or child to go hungry. I know whatever he does, he does conscientiously, seriously, sincerely and he feels that what the committee has done is adequate in every respect.

But there are two sides to the story. I have been told that there are some communities in my own beloved State of Rhode Island that will have to go without this help, unless the amount is increased.

I have every confidence, after informal discussions with the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that before the time expires on this amendment a proper adjustment will be made which will be satisfactory to carry out the intent and the desire of the Senate where human needs are involved.

I am told that there are several communities in my State that will face hardship if this help is not increased. That information comes from the Department of Agriculture.

It predicates a measure of suffering that need not be—and must not be.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] for offering the amendment, and I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who has listened today with compassion. I know he will act with justice and equity on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for 5 minutes.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS NEEDED FOR FEDERAL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my wholehearted support for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] to increase the appropriations in fiscal year 1967 for the Federal food stamp program. The fiscal year 1967 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture provides $100 million for the program with another $25 to $30 million expected in carryover funds from fiscal year 1966. I am reliably informed that the Department of Agriculture has contributed toward the operation of this program in 324 counties in the country. Another 300 counties have requested approval in the program in fiscal year 1967. I am told that it has been estimated that $150 million is needed to operate the program in the 624 counties for fiscal year 1967, so it appears that the funds approved will not equal the needs in the counties already approved.

Mr. President, the State of West Virginia has long realized the benefits of this highly worthwhile program. It was begun as a pilot operation in May 1961, in McDowell County of West Virginia and has since been extended to 17 other counties in my State.

Although West Virginia has seen some improvement in its unemployment situation—due to the Appalachian regional development program—we are still faced with the unsolved problem of assisting our people with severe needs of survival in the small rural communities which have not benefited from the major developmental projects.

For this reason, we have requested that the food stamp program be extended to another 14 counties—many of which are the so-called pockets of unemployment. These counties all have small out-of-the-way communities where elderly persons reside by themselves and where men who have the skills of coal miners, have not been able to find other jobs in other areas.

It is estimated that some 7,000 households and 25,000 persons in these counties could benefit from the program.

However, if the appropriations for fiscal year 1967 are not sufficient to maintain the program in the counties already approved, it is difficult to see how it may be extended to still more counties, not yet approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in those counties where food stamps have been offered, there has been ample testimony of the program's value. School officials readily testify that children are more alert when they are properly fed; employment offices note that men, as the heads of households, are more ambitious and physically fit to accept employment when it becomes available; doctors report less chronic illnesses among the elderly citizens of the communities.

May I also state here, that employment in West Virginia has not yet seen the same improvement as it has elsewhere. The latest figures for the State, available from the U.S. Department of Labor, indicate that unemployment is still in the 6-percent category.

May I quote one passage from the President's Appalachian Regional Commission which made its report in 1964. It said:

> The nutritional problems of the region persist despite the dedicated efforts of State and Federal officials who administer the Federal school lunch and commodity distribution programs. Increased funds will be needed to permit the extension of the school lunch program to those schools not now participating. The commodity distribution program cannot, however, be corrected by simply adding additional funds. The very nature of the program restricts the variety of the foods distributed; as a result many suffer from a lack of certain essential nutrients. The food stamp program—which has operated in selected pilot counties in Appalachia—has demonstrated its basic merit in overcoming these deficiencies and should be expanded.

The report is still correct today as it applies to the rural areas of West Virginia. They need the program.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Mexico on his vision in offering this amendment and thank him for the time he has yielded to me to make these remarks.

I hope that the Senate will adopt the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of those counties in West Virginia which would participate in the food stamp program during fiscal year 1967, if the pending amendment is adopted.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Counties in West Virginia which would participate in the food stamp program during fiscal year 1967 if the amendment is adopted:

OTHER AREAS THAT HAVE REQUESTED THE PROGRAM

Cabell County, Mr. Hechler.
Calhoun County, Mr. Moore.
Gilmer County, Mr. Moore.
Jackson County, Mr. Hechler.
Lewis County, Mr. Moore.
Pendleton County, Mr. Staggers.
Pocahontas County, Mr. Staggers.
Putnam County, Mr. Hechler.
Randolph County, Mr. Staggers.
Roane County, Mr. Hechler.
Upshur County, Mr. Staggers.
Wirt County, Mr. Hechler.
Wood County, Mr. Hechler.
Mason County, Mr. Hechler.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. MONTOYA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have heard reference made to some 324 areas now receiving benefits from this program. By areas, does the Senator mean counties within the United States?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. Governmental units, either municipalities or counties.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I see. Then, according to the information I have, there are some 20 counties in Arkansas which have made application for participation in the program. Do I correctly understand that if only $125 million is appropriated, which is the amount in the Senate bill, that possibly none of these counties would be able to participate because there would not be ample funds to include them in the program?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I further correctly understand that if the amount of the budget is appropriated, as I understand it, the Senator seeks to go no further in the budget recommended to the President and the Department of Agriculture up to $150 million?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the budget. My understanding is that if that amount is appropriated, then some 5 or 6, possibly, of the 20 counties in Arkansas which have applied would be able to participate, but if we do not go to the budget, then there could be no new counties added in my State; is that substantially correct?

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is correct. I stated in my remarks that there would be only minimal expansion. That is hardly any expansion at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the $125 million appropriation?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct. But if we get the full funding, then most of the counties in the Senator's State which have applied would be programed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether most of those 20 counties have applied.

Mr. MONTOYA. I do not know how many have been certified pending this appropriation. The Senator has that information.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In my State, it may be five or six which possibly would be included in the program. Unless this is granted, they would not be included.

I heard something said on the floor a moment ago, possibly in the course of debate on the Senator's amendment, that some effort is being made to work out something which will be agreeable and satisfactory.

Mr. MONTOYA. I am hopeful that such an agreement can be made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not in the confidence of those who are undertaking to bring about an agreement on this question, but I hope that such an agreement can be made and worked out satisfactorily so that a number of counties which are anxious to participate, and are eligible to participate, counties in which families reside that the Senator has described, should be receiving benefits the same as other families in a comparable position. I hope that such an arrangement will be worked out. If not, I shall enthusiastically support the Senator's amendment because I believe that the program, where it can be extended, should be extended at least up to the budget recommendations.

If we are going to bring about some reduction in the budget and try to hold down expenditures, I believe I would rather reduce it in some other area where a program is just getting underway, where there is not much experience, and we are not certain they are operating on behalf of those for whom the benefits are intended.

We know that those who are in need of assistance are being reached. As the Senator knows, there has been no criticism of the administration of the program up to now. We can have full confidence and assurance that whatever we appropriate will go toward providing the benefits we seek to bring about.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the Senator for his valuable contribution.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. MONTOYA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and commend him for his leadership on this important issue.

I am proud to serve with him on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. His leadership on this issue is typical of his creativity, the dedication he gives to American agriculture, and to the proper application of the abundance of American agriculture in the American society, and in shipping food overseas.

At present, in Minnesota, as I understand it, there are 12 counties which are in operation. Since June 1 of this year, three more counties have been added to the list. Hennepin County will be added on August 1, making a total of 16 counties presently or which will be in operation during the current year.

In addition, there are 16 additional counties—Renville, Lyon, Dakota, Benton, Clearwater, Otter Tail, Washington, Pipestone, Wright, Polk, Roseau, Chisago, Aitkin, Pine, Chippewa—which have requested participation in the program but which, under present circumstances, must be denied when the last full funding requested by the President is appropriated by Congress.

Is that the understanding of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. I am so informed by the Department of Agriculture. In fact, I supplied the list to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I am most pleased to join with the Senator from New Mexico in what is a needed improvement in the program.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. I do not think the problem is whether or not we feed the hungry—we are going to do it—but how we feed them. I think this is the best way to do it, rather than have somebody drive up to a warehouse and take a big basket of groceries, which is obviously against our economic system and our distribution of food, wholesale and retail. This certainly is the best plan to throw out of balance, to a lesser extent, the American economic system. I think it is so much better than providing gratuities at the warehouse, because the retailer and wholesaler are taxpayers and they furnish some of the funds that go into this program.

Mr. MONTOYA. May I interject to say that, according to a study made by the Department of Agriculture, in the small communities where the Department has started to have the same program, grocery stores have noticed and experienced an 8-percent increase of intake at the retail level.

Mr. MORTON. Yes; and that means a tax paid at the local, statewide, and Federal level.

I merely say to the Senator that we obviously are not going to shirk our duty to feed the hungry. The best way to do it is through the plan the Senator has offered.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for the valuable contribution he has made.

I yield now to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to associate myself with the amendment sponsored by the able Senator from New Mexico. I think it is well for us to realize that, in reality, this is not a handout; it is a helping hand. There is a very real difference between the two.

As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] so well said, this is a program for aiding needy families to which the Senate and the American people will subscribe.

The food stamp program benefits those families who are receiving some type of welfare assistance—including the unemployables, the aged, blind persons, the handicapped, and mothers with dependent children. There is also food stamp authorization to assist other families with incomes as low as or lower than those of families receiving welfare assistance, but who, for a variety of reasons, are not eligible for welfare grants. These may include persons living on small pensions, the unemployed, the underemployed, and those whose training limits them to unskilled low-paying employment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under the program, families must invest the money they would normally spend for food in the purchase of food stamps. In return, they receive additional stamps without charge. The normal food budget continues to be spent for food. But, as we know, the normal food budget for low-income families cannot meet financially the nutritional requirements for a sound diet. Thus, one of the principal objectives of the food stamp program which has been very successful in West Virginia is to stimulate the use of more nutritious food for low-income families.

I am told that during fiscal 1966 the food stamp program was expanded to about 1.3 million eligible persons in approved areas throughout the country. The budget request of $150 million—the figure in the House bill which our Appropriations Committee would reduce to $125 million—would permit further expansion to thousands of needy people located in approximately 300 more areas. With the continuing improvement in employment in larger and more industrialized areas, States have placed a priority on making the program operative in smaller and more rural areas. This is indicated and vital in West Virginia.

Hence, enlargement of the food stamp program is important to our State. There are 18 counties in West Virginia currently participating in the program, embracing approximately 72,000 eligible persons. But, Mr. President, there are 14 priority counties with pending applications certified by the State welfare agency. The number of counties across the Nation awaiting approval is approximately 400. It is my understanding that to enable participation by any substantial number of these additional counties it is necessary that the budget request of $150 million be approved. The pending applications may affect as many as 28,000 needy persons.

Mr. President, Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of West Virginia, has telephoned to express his concern that the food stamp program funding recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee is inadequate. Governor Smith, through the responsible State agencies, has directed successful and effective food stamp projects. He indicated the pressing need for programs in the 14 additional priority counties in West Virginia.

I support the amendment of the capable and distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya]. He is to be commended for his alertness in moving forward with this worthy effort. I am hopeful that the Members of the Senate will restore the food stamp appropriation to the $150 million budget level, thus providing the means through which food stamps may be extended to thousands of needy citizens on a realistic basis—not by a handout but by a helping hand from Government.

I support the amendment. I trust that the Senate will not so much override the Committee on Appropriations on this matter, but will realize the validity of the proposal which is advanced.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank my good friend from West Virginia for his contribution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not without sympathy for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico and supported by other Senators. The Record should clearly show what has happened in this matter.

First, the Senator from Florida was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the legislative committee which studied, reported, and supported to passage the Food Stamp Act. The Senator from Florida has been and is in sympathy with the purpose of that bill.

Second, last year the agency asked us for $100 million. We provided the full amount. We were assured that it would be spent in fiscal year 1966. To the contrary, only $70 million of that amount was spent; $30 million remains unexpended.

When the agency requested $150 million this year, they later told us that they would have a carryover of $25 million, meaning that they were asking for twice the amount they had expended in fiscal 1966.

The committee thought that that was a little big for a step-up, so we suggested an appropriation in the amount which is provided in the bill, in addition we provided for the reappropriation of the unexpended $25 million.

Now we find that the agency has made a larger mistake and has a $30 million carryover.

I have told the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that it seems to me we are being very generous toward this objective if we double the appropriation that was actually spent last year, from $70 to $140 million. So far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to be ungenerous with this program but the subject was heard by the full committee.

I am disposed to step up the amount to $140 million, which is $70 million more than was spent last year, in spite of the fact that we are at the highest period of employment we have had. This would be accomplished by a step-up of the direct appropriation from $100 to $110 million, and by stepping up the reappropriated amount, as is found in the bill, from $25 to $30 million. It seems to me that that is about as generous as our distinguished friends could expect us to be. That will still leave in conference with the House the difference between $140 and $150 million.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment accordingly, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). The yeas and nays have not been ordered on the amendment, so the Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would mean that the Senator would step up the first amount from $100 million to $110 million, and the second from $25 million to $30 million?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. MONTOYA. I sincerely thank the Senator from Florida for making this concession. I want it clearly understood that my remarks were not intended to cast any reflection upon the Senator's integrity or his feeling for hungry people. He is doing the job as he sees it in the Committee on Appropriations. I know that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he has always exhibited a compassionate heart for the hungry, poor people of the country. I thank him for accepting this compromise on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from New Mexico has modified his amendment as indicated by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I read for the Record the modified amendment—at least as I understand it?

> On page 18, line 7, strike out "$100 million" and insert "$110 million"; and on page 18, line 8, strike out "$25 million" and insert "$30 million."

That is the latest estimate on the amount of the carryover.

Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. MONTOYA. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes; except I wish to say this, to conclude my remarks: I commend the two Senators from West Virginia, who have manifested great interest in this amendment, and have lent me considerable advice. In fact, West Virginia was the first food stamp area certified by the late President Kennedy in 1961.

Because of their interest, and because of the interest manifested by other distinguished Senators here, I have offered the amendment, and I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Florida, as well as to the Senator from Rhode Island, who has been greatly interested and has contributed to the solution of this problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to have been able to work the matter out with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

I now yield such time on the bill as he wishes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as modified was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his dedicated efforts in bringing the Agriculture Appropriations bill to the Senate floor.

He has been sympathetically understanding and cooperative. I know of his knowledgeability and interest in the problems of Appalachia. I know him to be a dedicated Senator with an abiding concern for people.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in yielding to me.

I wish to discuss with him briefly the amounts of money involved and the language written into the bill regarding one of the appropriations in which I am grealy interested—the watershed projects.

A very excellent article by John B. Reubens, managing editor, was recently carried in the Central States Construction magazine, from which I quote as follows:

> Watershed projects are initiated by local groups and directed by a local board. Under Public Law 566, the Hope-Aiken Act of 1956, federal funds are available to pay for costs of construction but the local people must provide right-of-way, water rights, land rights and maintain the completed project. If structures cost less than $250,000, they can be approved at the state level; otherwise, the watershed plan must go to the appropriate committee of the U.S. Senate and House for approval.
>
> Congress itself makes a yearly identified appropriation to finance Soil Conservation Service work on watershed protection. After salaries, in fiscal 1966, there was $54 million available for construction and another $5.9 million marked for watershed planning. According to experts, this was adequate because the SCS engineering staff cannot handle much more work than these funds will permit. For fiscal 1967, about $55 million was available for construction and $6.1 million set aside for planning.
>
> At this point, executive interference with Congressional decision intervened. The Bureau of the Budget managed to get a directive written into the appropriation act, reducing the long-standing annual allowance of 100 projects planned and 80 under construction to 50 under planning and 35 under construction. This, for the entire United States.
>
> When we consider that there are 469 watershed districts, completed or under construction in the United States, and that there were 2400 applications for districts on file as of January 1966, this limitation is unbelievable. At the rate fixed by the Budget boys, it would take 48 years to dispose of the planning backlog alone. Worse yet, since a large watershed may require as much as 8 years to complete its structures, time to construct even projects already approved would extend infinitely. This is not what the Congress wanted or wrote into the law.

As I understand it, from reading the report, there has been a reduction in the number of projects that can be completed under the President's proposal, and also certain limitations on the fund. I would appreciate any comments the chairman of the committee could make on that matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the request, and also the interest the distinguished Senator from Kansas has shown in this matter. It is a matter which has caused a great deal of concern to the committee.

The committee is in favor of the small watershed program. We have found through the years, however, that we have been making disproportionate appropriations for planning of new projects, in comparison with the money we have made available to carry out the advanced plans and perform the construction work. We have complained of this in earlier years. This year, we decided the best way was to take this dilemma by the horns and step up the appropriation for construction, which we did by $2 million, we also reduced the number of new projects which can be worked on this year to 60, because the backlog of planned projects has grown steadily year by year until we are several years behind.

That obviously is not an unreasonable way to approach the program, and I hope the distinguished Senator will feel that our giving $2 million more for construction is proof positive of our interest in the program and of our desire to see it go ahead more rapidly than heretofore.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], because I know of no one who has had greater interest in this field than he. Therefore, I fully accept his response, and appreciate it greatly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I may say that several members of our committee were greatly interested in this subject, some of whom I see on the floor. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado, who was one of those so interested.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much. I was one of those who were very much interested in this matter. On firsthand, cursory examination, it did appear that the committee was doing an injustice. The explanation the Senator from Florida has given here is the one that was given in the committee.

There is one other thing which he mentioned in the committee, which I think should be brought out for the record here. Is it not a fact that in some instances the planning had proceeded so rapidly ahead of the construction that they had actually had to do some replanning on projects which had already been completely planned at one time?

Mr. HOLLAND. That statement was made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority member, who has several times told me that was the case. I am very sure that it is the case, and it would logically have to be. When you have plans developed years in advance, by the time you reach the construction stage, there are different developments in the area on the local lands and farms, and it naturally requires certain replanning.

I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota will recall having made that statement.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; the Senator is correct. Our planning of these projects is ahead of the construction program.

If you are planning 4 or 5 years ahead of the time that construction of a project is undertaken, much of the planning is out of date and has to be done again. I agree with the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, that we should step up the funds for construction, and ease up a bit on the planning.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Florida. I think it is a fact that when you plan 4 or 5 years ahead, it is almost a certainty that you will have to replan before you can construct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. In the meantime, that involves additional money, and it disappoints many people, who think that when you have the plans drawn, that means construction is imminent. In many instances, that has not been the case.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield at this time so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to yielding for that purpose.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, each year I have served in the Senate, I have supported the agriculture appropriations bill, without which there would be no farm programs. I intend to continue this policy with respect to the bill now before the Senate.

Even though I have disagreed with some of these programs and have voted against them, I nevertheless recognize that a failure to appropriate the money to continue farm programs would be disastrous to the agriculture sector of our economy.

I might point out that a good many farmers have recently become acutely aware of the seriousness of the defects contained in some of these programs—defects in the form of undue authority in the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise powers which depress market prices of agricultural products. These powers should be far more carefully regulated by laws passed by the Congress than has hereofore been the case.

The action by the Senate Appropriations Committee has, in good measure, restored some short-sighted reductions proposed by the President and his Budget Bureau.

The cooperative research service program for the State experimental stations would have been seriously impaired in Iowa and in other States by the proposed reduction of over $7 million, which reduction has been restored along with $5 million needed for maintenance of personnel at increased salary levels needed to meet the cost-of-living increase caused by inflation and also needed to strengthen the program.

The proposed reduction of $9,600,000 for distribution to the States under the extension service program has been rejected; a reduction of $20,200 for agricultural engineering research at Iowa State University has been restored; elimination of $10,000 for cooperative beef cattle breeding research at Iowa State University was rejected, as was a proposed elimination of $10,900 for research in corn genetics and breeding.

Perhaps the most significant action taken by the bill is the complete rejection of the administration's proposed cut from $103 to $21 million for the special school milk program; and not only is the adminstration's proposed reduction in the school lunch program from $157 to $138 million rejected, but the program will receive an additional $10 million to meet the normal growth requirements. I might point out that I cosponsored a bill to maintain our school milk program at current levels, and this was covered by the recently passed Child Nutrition Act which I also supported. Action by the Senate in these matters indicates a consensus that the administration proposals to cut these programs while at the same time expanding less essential programs were not well founded.

I might note that the committee report at pages 47 and 48 contains language designed to avoid unnecessary and time-consuming action by REA-financed cooperatives, and this should make more acceptable the guidelines spelled out in the fiscal 1964 committee report.

I believe the Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job, Mr. President, and I wish to commend it for placing before us a money bill which is as reasonable as one could expect, taking into consideration the programs that need to be funded.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I know of one further amendment, of which I have received notice that it might be presented, by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I do not see him in the Chamber. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Florida indulge the Chair for an inquiry? Is the time to be charged against his side?

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that the time be charged to neither side, Mr. President, unless there is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 646

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 646 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 16, strike out "$167,000,000" and insert "$171,500,000".

Page 17, lines 16–17, strike "$2,000,000" and insert "$6,500,000".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I modify my amendment at this time to make it read:

Page 17, line 16, strike out "$167,000,000" and insert "$169,500,000".

Page 17, lines 16–17, strike $2,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this amendment would provide additional Federal funds to implement section 11 of the National School Lunch Act.

The committee recommended $2 million, the same amount provided for fiscal year 1966. Last year $2 million resulted from action taken on an amendment which I offered on the floor and which the able Senator from Florida graciously accepted. This year the Department of Agriculture requested, and the budget proposed, an increase to $6.5 million for fiscal year 1967. My amendment, prior to modification, would have increased spending under section 11 of the National School Lunch Act to that recommended figure.

It was in 1962 that the Congress added section 11 to the National School Lunch Act. This section, carrying its own provisions for the apportionment of funds among the States, is intended to provide an extra level of support for a lunch program in schools drawing attendance from particularly needy areas.

We have had 20 years of highly successful experience with the national school lunch program. It is available to three-fourths of the children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. Eighteen million children participated in the program during the last fiscal year—about half of all children enrolled in schools that are in the national school lunch program.

One of the requirements made of schools under the National School Lunch Act is that children who cannot afford to pay the full price of the meal must be served a lunch at reduced price or free. For most of the schools in the program, fulfilling this requirement is not an undue burden. But many schools either did not come into the program at all because they knew they could not finance the lunch service or, if they were in the program, could underwrite the cost of the lunch for only their very neediest students. In both instances, the children suffer—they are the ones deprived of a program intended to help them. Section 11 was aimed at helping schools in this situation.

The $2 million we appropriated for this purpose last year was used to develop a series of demonstration projects—at least one in every State and the District of Columbia—to show what could be done with a higher rate of Federal cash reimbursement per lunch and a great deal of effort and initiative on the part of the State educational agencies and the local communities.

The level of Federal support including surplus foods provided for each lunch was still less than half the cost of putting that lunch on the table. The balance had to come from State and local sources and whatever the child could pay.

The States had very little time to get the demonstration projects rolling and they did a commendable job. Since the Federal cash assistance can be used only for food, local school officials and civic groups had to meet other program costs as best they could.

A total of 831 schools participated in the demonstration projects. The enrollment in these schools was 325,000 children. Nearly 137,000 children, or more than 60 percent of the total enrollment, participated on a daily basis. A total of 82 schools operated lunch programs for the first time. The average daily participation was approximately two-thirds of the total enrollment in these 82 schools. I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation showing the number of projects by State and the number of children participating be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Special school lunch demonstration projects under sec. 11 of the National School Lunch Act—Increases in participation resulting from special assistance payments [1]

	Projects	Average daily participation			Lunch price	
		Before sec. 11	After sec. 11	Additional children	Before sec. 11	After sec. 11
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Alabama	16	720	2,546	1,826	[2] 23	[2] 23
Arizona	4	676	1,523	847	27	15
Arkansas	10	561	1,876	1,315	20	15
California	20	3,604	5,971	2,367	31	21
Colorado	3	276	453	177	30	15
Connecticut	1	311	491	180	35	25
Delaware	1	58	113	55	25	15
District of Columbia	1	295	547	252	30	20
Florida	12	3,800	5,500	1,700	31	15
Georgia	20	5,560	7,356	1,796	25	19
Hawaii	2	224	247	23	25	17
Illinois	7	1,200	1,800	600	24	16
Indiana	5	353	697	344	33	19
Kentucky	61	11,401	13,800	2,399	26	18
Louisiana	13	6,384	8,912	2,528	17	8
Maine	4	120	250	130	27	15
Maryland	5	413	686	273	26	19
Massachusetts	15	1,382	2,517	1,135	20	15
Michigan	19	3,407	4,147	740	22	14
Minnesota	5	2,203	2,404	201	21	16
Mississippi	8	1,834	3,448	1,614	19	14
Missouri	2	1,017	1,151	134	22	10
New Jersey	3	311	362	51	30	20
New Mexico	18	1,974	2,163	189	[2] 19	[2] 19
New York	106	25,809	29,017	3,208	25	22
North Carolina	6	2,060	4,991	2,931	23	12
Ohio	5	2,336	2,766	430	27	17
Oklahoma	3	1,009	1,394	385	23	18
Oregon	1	222	314	92	25	15
Pennsylvania	25	3,995	5,169	1,174	32	15
Rhode Island	1	225	776	551	30	10
South Carolina	14	2,365	3,663	1,298	17	15
South Dakota	11	744	874	130	26	20
Tennessee	78	7,088	8,106	1,018	24	16
Texas	31	4,401	8,072	3,671	(3)	(3)
Utah	2	369	584	215	20	10
Virginia	13	1,459	2,761	1,302	26	13
Washington	2	362	469	107	28	15
West Virginia	23	2,776	3,195	419	24	21
Wisconsin	5	865	1,000	135	23	13
Total	581	104,169	142,111	37,942		

[1] Data not shown for several States because incomplete.

[2] Lunch prices not reduced. Special payments used to finance additional free meals.

[3] Not available.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, while complete data are not available on the level of participation in each of the projects prior to the pilot program, it is estimated that more than 50,000 needy children received lunches for the first time at school.

I would like to give a few examples as to how the program worked and what some of the people most deeply involved with the education of these children feel:

In Michigan, typical of immediate results achieved was the record in the Pelham School in Detroit which supplied lunches for the first time to 437 of its 959 attending children. In Les Cheneaux School in Mackinac County with 526 attending children participation rose from 256 to 308, a 20-percent increase. Similar participation increases were noted in other Michigan schools selected for the project.

In North Carolina, six schools participated in the demonstration project. Prior to the new program, less than one-third of the total enrollment of 6,400 children were participating in the lunch program. As a result of the additional assistance provided the student participation increased from 2,060 to nearly 5,000.

In California, 20 schools were approved for special assistance with an average daily attendance of 13,840 children. Here, the increase in participation as a result of reducing the lunch price from 30 cents to 20 cents, was 65 percent. In addition, there was a decrease in the number of lunches previously served free because more children could afford to pay the lower price for the lunch.

In Pennsylvania, 25 urban and rural schools with an enrollment of 9,000 children were approved as demonstration projects. Lunch prices were reduced from an average of 31.7 cents to 15.7 cents in these schools. As a result, the level of program participation increased by one-third and the number of free lunches provided more than doubled.

Here is what a few teachers and principals had to say as to the effects of the program:

Joseph C. Carroll, Principal, Washington Elementary School, Kenner, Louisiana: "I have seen a tremendous result since participation in the lunchroom has been increased due to lowering the lunch price from 20 cents to 12 cents per child. This improvement has been physically and scholastically noticed."

Sister M. Florence, OSB, teacher, Our Lady of Guadalupe School, La Junta, Colorado: " . . . there has been a definite increase in alertness and attention in school. Several children who habitually fell asleep during lessons no longer do so. One child used to faint periodically from lack of food. This also has stopped."

L. S. Mosely, Principal, Cumberry High School, Cumberry, North Carolina: "Since the initiation of the new program on December 1, 1965, the ADP (average daily participation) has more than doubled. Teachers have reported better attendance and improvement in the academic work of the students. The morale of the whole school is much higher."

Mrs. Wise—School Nurse, Shaw Jr. High School, Washington, D.C. Said she was "very pleased with the program" and stated "there was a remarkable change in the students now eating in the cafeteria for the first time." She "reported a decreasing number of students complaining of stomach cramps (from lack of food) and the children seemed to be happier."

R. P. Martin, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Herford County, North Carolina, Re: Robert L. Vann School, Abeskie, North Carolina: "The Special Assistance Program has enabled the school to feed in excess of 1,200 students daily since December 1, 1965, and the effect has been gratifying. Pupil morale is up. They take more pride in their lunchroom and in their school. Large numbers eating in organized groups in assigned areas of the room with the lunch period being used as a teaching and learning period in good eating habits, proper use of eating utensils, and good health practices is having a noticeable effect on the children. Teachers report that children who were formerly inattentive in class due to lack of proper nourishment have shown improvement in their class work and seem more interested in achieving the educational goals set for them. Many of the children who formerly were absent much of the time have improved attendance records resulting in better school work."

In the light of these results and these endorsements, I believe this program has demonstrated its effectiveness and has justified the congressional action in adopting this special approach in 1962.

I believe we can now do no less than continue this effort at the present level for the coming school year by providing $4.5 million.

There is uniform agreement that the program has been exceptionally wisely undertaken. The experience with the program, as indeed is reflected in the report filed a few days ago by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the child nutrition law, makes clear that the program deserves the fullest support based on this very satisfactory experience.

I would hope that 1 year's additional experience at the present level will persuade us substantially to increase it in the years ahead.

The distinguished and able manager of the bill and chairman, the senior Senator from Florida, and the ranking minority member, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and I have reviewed the objective that is sought to be attained by the amendment. I believe they concur in the $4.5 million figure. The amendment, I hope, will be supported.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the purpose of the committee in including the $2 million was to fulfill the effort that had been started last year. We thought and had been given reason to believe that this amount would permit carrying the program on through the next year, as started.

It now appears that is not true. The amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has been modified to cover the inclusion of $4.5 million

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

rather than $2 million as provided by the committee. This will finance expenses for the full year on the trial program.

Mr. HART. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding, the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Florida, without endeavoring to speak for all members of the committee—because we have not had a chance to confer with them—are willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am very grateful, as I was a year ago, to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from North Dakota for their recognition of the value of the program and for their willingness to attempt to maintain it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is a very good salesman and has done an excellent job of presenting his case. This program is a very fine one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. During the course of the last year, I had an opportunity to visit with Father Charles Woodrich of the Annunciation Grade School in Denver, Colo. This parish is in the center of the city of Denver and is made up largely of low income, Spanish and Negro families. Father Woodrich's school was invited to participate by USDA under the pilot program which was funded by the $2 million implement to section 11, offered by Senator Hart last year. The parish inaugurated a special assistance lunch program. It produced remarkable effects.

Father Woodrich has summarized the results of the program in the attached statement. I ask unanimous consent that his statement entitled "Special Assistance Lunch Programs for Elementary and Secondary Poor Schools" be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Special Assistance Lunch Programs for Elementary and Secondary Poor Schools

When the War on Poverty of this administration started, we were invited to take part in what USDA called a Special Assistance Lunch Program.

There had been no food program in poor schools because the schools would have to charge 30 or 35¢ for a lunch and the administrators knew the children could not afford it. Consequently the whole program would be a failure. So we began 10¢ hot lunch for grade school kids and 15¢ for high school students.

How does the Special Assistance Lunch Program work?

USDA gives double allotments of surplus foods and every month pays each school in cash for all the food they buy to give a balanced diet. (This cannot exceed 15¢ per day per child.) This gives a child milk, meat, vegetables, freshly baked rolls, fruit and dessert. The child comes back for seconds, or thirds, free of cost. Also extra milk is free. The children are so hungry that it is necessary to cook twice as many meals as there are children in order to satisfy their hunger. For most of them it is the only balanced meal they get all day.

The 10 and 15¢ pays the cooks and other incidentals in running the kitchen. Now this is possible because there is volume, all the kids are eating. Not a few children, as in 30 or 35¢ lunch programs in the poor schools at the present time.

Results from the Program: 1 and ½ years as pilot study in Denver, Colorado

(1) All the kids eat every day.

(2) Absenteeism is down 36%.

(3) Their marks have gone up, because they have energy to study.

(4) Stealing and other Juvenile crimes dropped. There are one out of 300 children per year compared to 1 out of twenty in the other schools where they do not eat.

(5) The kids take part in extra curricular activities, sports, etc. Before they did not have enough energy to do this. Their interest is up. And they stop hanging around with those that are out of school after school hours.

(6) Health and knowledge of new foods and eating habits is much better. They cannot be measured by yardstick you have to see it and then you just know this to be true.

(7) This program positively stopped drop outs in many cases. I know because I have seen the cases.

A poor child cannot pay 30 or 35¢ for a Hot Lunch, so he goes hungry. (This is all the National School Lunch Program provides now).

SUMMARY

USDA needs about $24,000,000 to be allocated to the Section 11 of the National School Lunch Program of 1963 and the *poor* children in *all* the poor schools of this great country can be fed a decent meal.

$2,000,000 was allocated by Congress last year to study this, but we don't need to study on empty stomachs to find out it needs food. We need the program now.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to Father Woodrich's summary in which he states that USDA needs $24 million under section 11 of the national school lunch program in order to take care of all poor children in all poor schools. In view of this great need, let me say that the amendment of the senior Senator from Michigan in the amount of $4.5 million is a modest one indeed. Permit me to urge the Senate to adopt his amendment and to instruct the conferees on the part of the Senate to insist on this amendment being sustained in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the senior Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there may be some Senator who has an amendment to offer, but I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I again express my thanks, admiration, and appreciation to the chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. He has put in a tremendous amount of work on this bill. His great knowledge of agriculture has been gained from many years of work on both the Agriculture Committee and on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. While no one is ever completely satisfied with an appropriations bill, we must recognize that the job of a chairman is a demanding one. The Senator from Florida shows unfailing patience and courtesy.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, the committee report contains language which should enable the rural electrification program to go forward in a prudent, sound manner to meet the increased needs of the future.

The directions of the committee report accompanying the fiscal year 1964 Agriculture Department appropriations bill require that, before approving loans for generation and major transmission, the REA Administrator take certain steps to evaluate existing or proposed contracts by which private companies supply or offer to supply wholesale service to REA-financed cooperatives.

I ask unanimous consent that those directions of the 1964 report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES

Rural Electrification Administration

Electrification Loan Program

The success of the rural electrification program in bringing electricity to the farms and rural areas has been an outstanding development in the past quarter century. It has benefited both the rural and urban segments of the national economy. The electrification of rural areas brought to rural residents the advantages of modern living which city people had long enjoyed. Power-type equipment operated on farms has opened a vast market in manufacturing and commerce. Nonfarm employment opportunities have expanded. The rapid growth in the economy has in large part developed from the contribution that REA-financed electrification loans has brought to the rural areas.

During the course of the hearings this year, the committee has presented to it, as it has in the past, widely divergent views with respect to REA loans for generation and transmission facilities.

As previously stated, this committee believes that both the rural electric cooperatives and the private power companies who furnish most of the supply of energy needed to serve the electric cooperatives are here to stay and they should make every effort to enter into earnest negotiations in reaching power supply contracts because it is to the mutual advantage of the cooperatives and the private companies to enter into satisfactory power supply arrangements.

The committee recognizes that the House recommended a new procedure for REA after hearing the differing points of view surrounding the loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration for generation and transmission purposes.

This committee concurs with the recommendations set forth in the House committee report, to wit:

Before public funds are loaned for power generation or transmission, the Rural Electrification Administrator, in connection with any such loan, should:

(1) Make a survey and determine wherein the existing contract for power or the proposed contract is unreasonable;

(2) Advise the supplier wherein such contract is unreasonable; and

(3) Attempt to get such contract modified to make it reasonable.

Loans should be made only when reasonable contracts cannot be obtained.

With regard to any further generation and major transmission loan approved in excess of $2 million, the Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Comptroller General, and the Congress, that each of these steps has been taken and that the private supplier had been given an opportunity to make the contract reasonable, specifying the details, and had refused or failed to do so.

The Administrator also shall furnish the Comptroller General and the Congress on the date of approval of each such loan application, the following information:

(1) The name and address of the applicant borrower and the date of the application.

(2) Description and estimated cost of the proposed generation facilities. Indicate if the proposed facilities are the initial or additional unit or units of a plant comprised of one or more units.

(3) Description and estimated cost of proposed transmission facilities, including any immediate or future plans to interconnect with other transmission systems.

(4) Description of any long-range plans the applicant may have for construction of additional generation and transmission facilities and the estimated cost of the planned facilities.

(5) Comparison of the estimated costs of generation by the applicant borrower with the cost of power available from existing suppliers, including the final offer by the private supplier including terms and conditions he offered to meet applicant's long-term energy needs.

(6) Summary of the efforts made by the applicant and by REA to obtain the applicant's power and energy requirements from existing power suppliers and the reasons why such efforts have not been successful.

(7) Explanation of the applicant's reasons for seeking an REA loan.

(8) The amount of electric energy which the applicant will cease to purchase from present power suppliers upon construction of the generating plant for which REA financing is being sought.

(9) Explanation of the extent to which the feasibility of the requested loan for generation and transmission facilities depends upon the use of a portion of the facilities by others (including Federal power marketing agencies).

(10) Details of the applicant's plans to sell or otherwise make available any of the power and energy from the proposed generation facilities to others (including Federal power marketing agencies).

(11) Names of State agencies and commissions having jurisdiction over the applicant borrowers.

With respect to each generation and transmission loan application, processed by REA in accordance with the foregoing procedures, the Administrator should, in order to avoid dilatory tactics or protracted delays on the part of either party in such negotiations, establish a publicly announced period of time during which the survey, determinations, and negotiations will be carried on prior to a definite cutoff date set by the Administrator.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, due to a report by the General Accounting Office on a loan to the Brazos Electric Cooperative in Waco, Tex., some controversy has arisen over what types of loans Congress intended should be covered by the instructions. I consider the GAO report to be thoroughly inaccurate in its interpretation of congressional intent. The GAO report gave an unreasonable interpretation to the language of the directions.

In an effort to make clear the intent of Congress, the committee has included language in this year's report to clarify the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the language of the agriculture appropriation report filed with the Senate July 12, 1966, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The directions of the Committee Report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1964 Agriculture Department Appropriations Bill (No. 497) require that, before approving loans for generation and major transmission, the REA Administrator take certain steps to evaluate existing or proposed contracts by which private companies supply or offer to supply wholesale service to REA-financed cooperatives.

The directions were intended to apply only to applications for initial loans for generation and major transmission to cooperatives where the facilities to be constructed would displace existing contractual arrangements with private power companies. The Committee did not intend the directions to require solicitation of offers from private power companies in the case of subsequent loans to federated G & T cooperatives.

Further, the directions were not intended to apply to any loan application which had been approved by the Administrator prior to the adoption of the directions, or to any reasonable addition to such loan. The Committee affirms this position and directs the Administrator to proceed without considering the directions as applicable as to any such loan and reasonable additions thereto.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this bill reported from the Senate Appropriations Committee is a great improvement over the administration request and a further improvement over the House bill, which restored many of the cuts in the budget request.

The budget called for cutting many of the most worthwhile programs of the Agriculture Department. All have been either partially or fully restored.

The special milk program has been restored to $105 million, an increase of $84 million over the budget request, and an increase of $2 million over the House-passed bill. I would have preferred $108 million, to allow for growth in the number of children being served under the program, but I am happy that we were able to get as close to that figure as we did.

The school lunch program has been restored to $167 million, $29 million over the budget request and $10 million over the House.

The committee recommends $2,500,000 for the Rural Community Development Service, which will offer new hope to rural areas. The House had recommended only $637,000.

The budget called for cutting the appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service to $204,728,000 a cut of over $20 million from the 1966 figure. The House restored this to $227,437,000 and the Senate has provided further restorations to bring this figure to $238,342,800.

The committee has recommended additional amounts above the budget request for construction and modernization of research facilities which were authorized by Congress last year. I am happy that among these is an appropriation of $325,000 for a much needed soil and water research facility at Bushland, Tex.

The committee also recommended, very wisely, I feel, that certain research which the Department had slated for extinction, be continued. Among these is a facility for research on sandy soils at Big Springs, Tex. The work being done there is very important for the Great Plains. I strongly urge its continuation. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a letter from Jack Buchanan, chairman of the board of supervisors, Martin-Howard Soil Conservation District, dated March 14, 1966, telling of the need for more research on sandy soils.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Martin-Howard Soil
Conservation District,
Stanton, Tex., March 14, 1966.

Hon. Ralph Yarborough,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: I am writing you concerning a very important problem. As you know, there is a proposal to close the USDA Big Spring Experiment Station on July 1, 1966. We feel this should not be done and hope you will support our efforts.

If this station is closed, within the next five years there will be a desperate need for additional research on sandy soils. Why close this station only to open another in the near future at considerable expense? We feel that the station should be continued, and should be enlarged to the status of a Regional Research Center.

The enclosed "Needs for Conservation Research for Sandylands in the Southern Plains", briefly states the problem and the estimated minimum funds required to carry out present and future research.

We are very concerned that there will not be any further research done on farming land under dryland conditions on sandy soils in the Great Plains States. This is the only USDA Station on sandy soils where they own the land in the Southern Plains States. You can get a clearer picture of the area in question from the enclosed map. This map is also located on page 3 of the brochure sent you in 1962 entitled "Conservation Research for the Edwards Plateau and the Sandy Lands of the Southern Plains" published by the Research Advisory Committee.

The water experts on the High Plains have estimated that irrigation water for that area will be depleted in about 60 years. We feel there will be a continuing need for further conservation research in this area. Why not go ahead and do the research needed now, because if we wait until research is needed, we will be behind. Wind erosion and limited rainfall are serious problems and will require a long range program.

Would you please ask the Secretary of Agriculture this question, "If we are to continue the research at the Big Spring Experiment Station, at what level should this research

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

be funded for an adequate program to meet the needs of this area"? We would like to know why research on moisture conservation is being closed out at Big Spring when this is the only hope we have of improving the stability of agriculture in this area? Other agriculture regions are receiving new research help on their problems and we need help on wind erosion and moisture conservation.

We appreciate your concern for the future of agriculture in this area and will be looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

JACK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors.

Enclosure.

Conservation Research for Sandylands in the Southern Plains, Big Spring Field Station, Big Spring, Tex.

Sandylands represent the hard core of conservation problems in the Southern Plains. These sandy soils are subject to severe blowing and wind erosion and every now and then give rise to tremendous red dust clouds that move across the United States and "fall out" on cities of the East with resulting cries of pollution from the dust and pesticides from farms in West Texas.

The Great Plains Conservation Program and other programs that the USDA use in assisting Soil and Water Conservation Districts have direct bearing on problems of sandylands. It is believed that better technology and conservation practices are needed to make these programs more effective, and that conservation research should be strengthened on these sandylands. This research should be on three broad conservation problems: Wind erosion, moisture conservation, and grassland management.

There are approximately 40 million acres of sandy soils in the Southern Plains, representing some of the most productive land in the Great Plains. Moisture conservation and wind erosion control are major problems in managing and conserving these soils. This is the only field station in the Southern Plains that SWC–ARS–USDA has for soil and water conservation research on sandy soils. Also, it is strategically located for research on conservation problems in 4 land resource areas: Southern High Plains; Rolling Red Plains, Southern Desertic Basins, Plains and Mountains; and Edwards Plateau.

Objectives of the research are to: (1) Develop basic knowledge and understanding of physical processes involved in moisture conservation and efficient use by plants growing on sandy soils; (2) develop improved practices for minimizing soil blowing through tillage, soil amendments, and cropping systems; and (3) develop better techniques and procedures for growing grass and maintaining cover on permanent grasslands.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the committee recommends $234,105,000 for the Soil Conservation Service, an increase of $5,789,000 over the budget estimate. The budget called for a reduction of $3.6 million in soil surveys. The House restored $2 million and the Senate concurred with the House. I feel it would have been wise to restore the full amount.

Also under SCS, the House cut $1 billion from the budget request for river basin surveys. The Senate concurred. I feel that a restoration of the House cut would have been justified.

All in all, Mr. President, in view of the budgetary restrictions under which we operate this year, this is a good bill. The onerous Budget Bureau cuts have been restored. I hope that next year we shall be in a position in which we can do a much better job and provide more needed funds for the various activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which so greatly aid the American farmer in making agriculture the most efficient sector of production in all the American economy. The leadership of the Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee under the guidance of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has done yeomen's work in restoring unwise cuts made in very vital agricultural programs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, agriculture has always been an important concern to Americans. From the apple orchards of New England to the wheat fields of Iowa, farmers have contributed to the American way of life.

But just because farmers always have been and always will be a vital part of America's life and economy, we do not have to have a farm program based more on tradition than on present realities and necessities. Today we need an agriculture program suited to the needs of the growing, dynamic economy of modern America.

The bill before us today is centered around an approach geared to the farm problems of the depression years—the needs of the thirties, not the sixties. Instead of anticipating the future directions and requirements of American agriculture, this bill continues the expensive dike-plugging operation which has characterized recent Federal agricultural programs.

Each year the cost of the stabilization programs has risen. Since 1955, the cost has multiplied almost 10 times. This bill asks for $670 million more than last year's appropriation.

I recognize the problems of agriculture. But I feel that we must begin to fight our way out of the morass the Federal agricultural program has become. We must take a more rational and longsighted approach than that embodied in the proposed bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in January of this year, when the 1967 fiscal year budget message was submitted to Congress, Alaskans were faced with the elimination of agricultural research in their State. The Department of Agriculture which operates the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station at Palmer, Alaska, had cut all funds for its continuation from the budget. The Palmer Experiment Station is the only agricultural experiment station in any of the 50 States operated directly by the Department. Assumption of responsibility for the Palmer Experiment Station had originated with the Department in the late 1940's over the vigorous protests of Alaskans. Because Alaska was then a territory and not a State, Alaskans were unable to prevent this taking of administrative authority by the Department of Agriculture. And it was without warning that in January we learned that the Department of Agriculture had decided to abandon its responsibilties.

Alaska is not a great agricultural State. Alaskans make no such claims. There is, however, considerable agricultural potential which should and must be developed, and it can only be developed by an orderly and sustained research program as its foundation.

Fortunately, first the House of Representatives and now the Senate committee have agreed that research in Alaska must be continued. Funds for the Palmer Experiment Station have been restored.

I am deeply appreciative of this, as are all Alaskans concerned with the development of our State's agricultural potential. I am especially appreciative of the cooperation and understanding given us by my good friend, Senator HOLLAND. This year, as in the years past, he has shown a rare understanding of Alaska's problems and the work which must be done to overcome them.

It is our hope that this year will see the return of responsibility for operation of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station to Alaska, so that it can be operated in the same way as are experiment stations in all of the other States. The Alaska State Legislature during its 1966 session adopted a resolution requesting transfer of the station to the University of Alaska. I have introduced S. 3421 to accomplish this purpose and it is my hope that action can be taken on the bill this year so that an orderly transfer of authority and responsibility can be had.

In the meantime, the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station will be able to continue its valuable work.

Alaskans are grateful and I take this opportunity to offer their thanks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the $7 billion agricultural appropriations bill before us has my unqualified support.

It is in the first instance a tribute to the leadership and foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the capable chairman of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. I consider it a special privilege to serve under his direction.

It is also a privilege to work with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking Republican member.

These two leaders work closely as a team serving the best interests of the farmer and the entire Nation. A true spirit of bipartisanship prevails at all times.

The subcommittee's printed hearings reveal the thoroughgoing manner in which it approaches its task. In some subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee, testimony is confined to departmental appeals on House actions. Not so with the Agricultural Subcommittee. Program justifications are carefully examined in each instance and a solid foundation is consistently laid for subcommittee decisions.

Another outstanding feature of this subcommittee is the competence of its professional staff. The chief clerk, Raymond L. Schafer, performs his duties with efficiency and dispatch. He has more than a decade of experience in his present position and a lifelong background in agriculture. His tenure speaks well of the confidence and trust placed in him.

The chief clerk is ably assisted by Joseph Stewart and the minority professional staff member, Mr. Edmund T. King. Again, at the staff level, there is full cooperation which is built on not only a congenial relationship but mutual confidence and respect.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today contains a near unanimous bipartisan effort—a victory if you will—to overturn a determined attempt by the Johnson administration and its Secretary of Agriculture to make deep cuts in popular and proven farm programs so as to free funds for other activities. Many of the activities which were assigned higher priority are new and experimental innovations of the Great Society.

In his budget estimates sent to the Congress last January, the President requested a wide variety of drastic slashes in the agricultural budget. Included was an $82 million cut for the special milk program—which the Senate has just extended and authorized to be expanded this week—a $19 million cut for the school lunch program; a $120 million cut for advance authorizations for the agricultural conservation program; a $20 million cut for agricultural research; a $145 million cut for REA electrification loans and many others.

Some of these reductions were instigated by the Secretary of Agriculture such as the $82 million cut for special milk; others came from the Bureau of the Budget.

The following table gives a detailed accounting of the proposed cuts and reflects the House and Senate committee action in response.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was orderd to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table of major items showing comparisons between appropriations for fiscal year 1966, estimates for 1967, House action and Senate committee recommendations

Agency or item	Appropriations and loan authorizations, 1966	Johnson administration budget proposal, 1967	House bill, 1967	Amounts recommended by Senate committee
Agricultural Research Service:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Research	$125,959,000	$107,980,000	$120,673,000	$123,844,600
Total funds available, research	146,059,000	134,980,000	147,673,000	150,844,600
Plant and animal disease and pest control	75,547,000	69,748,000	76,764,000	81,498,200
Total funds available, Agricultural Research Service [1]	224,606,000	204,728,000	227,437,000	238,342,800
Cooperative State Research Service:				
Payments and expenses:				
Payments to agricultural experiment stations	48,113,000	39,613,000	48,113,000	53,113,000
Total, Cooperative State Research Service [1]	54,827,000	47,740,000	55,227,000	60,740,000
Extension Service:				
Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses:				
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	75,536,000	75,917,500	75,917,500	78,917,500
(Note.—A redirection from formula to nonformula funds of $9,600,000 proposed in the budget was denied by the House and the Senate committee.)				
Total, Extension Service [1]	89,135,000	90,224,000	89,824,000	92,824,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations	108,802,000	109,020,000	109,235,000	109,235,000
Watershed planning	5,853,000	6,397,000	6,142,000	6,142,000
Watershed protection	66,331,000	66,559,000	67,020,000	70,000,000
Great Plains conservation program	16,082,000	16,112,000	16,112,000	18,500,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service [1]	226,986,000	228,316,000	228,510,000	234,105,000
Consumer and Marketing Service:				
Total available, school lunch program	202,000,000	183,000,000	202,000,000	212,000,000
Total available, special milk program	103,000,000	21,000,000	103,000,000	105,000,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Advance program authorization	(220,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)
Rural Electrification Administration:				
Electrification loans	(365,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(365,000,000)	(375,000,000)
Telephone loans	(97,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(97,000,000)	(117,000,000)
Total appropriations in bill [2]	6,381,448,500	7,022,638,000	6,876,027,000	7,051,543,300

[1] Agency totals also include other items not listed.

[2] Total appropriations bill includes other items not listed.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, this Senator does not wish to belabor the point. It is sufficient to state—as the table fully indicates—that the administration has suffered a stinging rebuke for its ill-advised attempts to cut back on proven agricultural programs.

Mr. President, I strongly urge adoption of H.R. 14596 as reported from the committee.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. **MORTON**. Mr. President, owing to a longstanding engagement in Lexington, Ky., where he is the principal speaker at the annual meeting of the Tobacco Farmers Advisory Council, my colleague from Kentucky, Senator Cooper, could not be here today. Because of the airline strike he had to leave last night to meet this commitment.

Senator Cooper, who has been a member of the Agriculture Committee for 6 years, has supported the farmer during his entire service in the Senate. He had prepared a statement in support of H.R. 14596, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Cooper

The bill to provide appropriations for the farm programs is one which affects every farmer in the nation, as well as consumers, school children and others who benefit from the programs of the Department of Agriculture. We are grateful to Senator Holland, Sentaor Young and the members of the subcommittee for their constructive consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill every year.

First, I want to say that I am glad the Committee has recommended $105 million for the special milk program. The Committee has also recommended $167 million for the National School Lunch Act, a very important program which the Administration's budget greatly reduced.

Two days ago, the Senate passed S. 3467, to amend the school lunch act, which I supported. During the debate, I pointed out the importance of Section 11 of that Act, funded for the first time last year although authorization was provided in 1962. So I want to support Senator Hart's amendment to appropriate $6.5 million for special assistance.

During the hearings of the Senate Agriculture Committee on S. 3467, Secretary Freeman pointed out that a Federal appropriation of $26 million would provide lunches to the 1½ million school children who do not now receive them. It seems to me that meeting this gap is a clear priority.

I support also the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] to

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

provide $150 million for the food stamp program, which the Senate Committee has reduced by $25 million in section 32 funds. I understand that Kentucky plans to extend the program to the remaining Appalachian counties this fiscal year with its allocation under the $150 million budget request.

When I presented my statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee earlier this year, I urged funds for the Soil Conservation Service, particularly to restore to last year's level funds for soil surveys. Although under last year's level, I am glad to see that the Committee has concurred in restoration of at least $2 million. The Committee has approved, as passed by the House, $750,000 for technical assistance in Appalachia. Mr. Sam McElroy, President of the Kentucky Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, tells me that an additional $667,000, as requested in the budget, will be needed to provide technical assistance in the land stabilization and conservation projects, and to provide additional technical assistance to soil conservation districts that do not have these projects. I am concerned also that the Committee has limited to 60 the number of watershed planning starts, which the House had increased to 100.

For the Appalachian Region Conservation Program, the Committee recommended $3 million, with a reappropriation of $1,375,000 in unused funds. I am glad that the Committee has recommended an increase of $227,000 over the House amount for Resource Conservation and Development, as Kentucky is just beginning to get its Tradewater River Resource Conservation and Development Project underway.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the principal Senate cosponsor of the REA supplemental financing bill, and one who has supported the REA during my entire service in the Senate, I am glad to note that the Committee has stricken from the bill the provision setting aside in a contingency reserve a portion of the funds approved for the rural electric and rural telephone programs. Funding the programs at last year's level is a great improvement over the drastic reduction ordered this year by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am glad that the Committee has recommended $2.5 million for the Rural Community Development Service, noting the importance of its coordinating function. Rural community development has been the most hopeful approach to the problems of rural America for at least ten years. I remember, under the Eisenhower Administration, when the first pilot counties were designated in Kentucky as Rural Development counties, and that one of the first acts of the Kennedy Administration was to expand the concept to the entire country. It has been clear for some time that better program coordination is needed, and nearly all who are concerned about the future of rural America urge that counties and communities join in planning for the better utilization of all programs. More recently, the Department of Agriculture established the Rural Community Development Service, but it was poorly funded last year. I think it is time, after all this talk, that a reasonable amount of funds be provided to give this approach a chance to work.

I had been concerned about the budget reduction of $8 million under the Hatch Act which would affect every land grant institution in the country, and result in a $229,140 reduction in Kentucky, and am glad that the Senate Committee has increased these funds even above the House figure. The land-grant colleges train the scientists who solve our agricultural problems and do the research which has made the American farmer the most productive in the world. I am glad also that the Committee has increased by $3 million over the House amount funds for the Extension Service, for I have supported the educational programs of county agents, and home demonstration agents during my entire service in the Senate.

I commend the Committee for its attention to the farm programs which are of true value to the county, and am glad to support the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr Bass], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cotton
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Brewster
Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson
Bass
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tower

So the bill (H.R. 14596) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Holland, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Mundt conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with his typically competent diligence and effective advocacy, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] has again led the Agriculture appropriation measure to swift and overwhelming Senate approval. We are always grateful for the highly efficient and able manner applied to all legislation which he handles.

But such an outstanding victory could not have been obtained without the equally capable cooperative leadership of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. To Senator Young goes our sincere thanks for his splendid joint support.

This great success may also be attributed to the outstanding support of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], whose articulate advocacy assured prompt Senate action. And to the

Senators from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] and Michigan [Mr. HART] goes further commendation for joining with their characteristic highly cooperative efforts to make orderly disposition a certainty. The same may be said of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], who urged his own strong and sincere views on this measure but who nevertheless did not seek to impede its disposition.

And to the many other Senators who joined in supporting this measure today we extend our sincere gratitude for the assistance which was so indispensable to its passage.

AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI—A PLEA FOR SANITY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have been gravely disturbed at persistent reports that the government in Hanoi has threatened to execute, as common criminals, American airmen who are now prisoners of war.

Accordingly, I have prepared a statement, "A Plea for Sanity," in which I am joined by 18 other Members of the Senate.

This declaration has been just released to the press, and I shall, at this time, read it into the RECORD.

A PLEA FOR SANITY

We, the undersigned, have previously protested the relentless escalation of the war in Vietnam. We have deplored those decisions, taken on both sides, which have steadily extended the dimensions of the war and intensified its fury.

The struggle in Vietnam now approaches a peril point of no return. Violence begets more violence; the fever of reprisal rises, feeding upon itself; reason is in danger of falling prisoner to blind passion. Then the war becomes a raging inferno, burning away the last barriers of restraint.

We apprehend that the execution of American prisoners, as threatened by the government of North Vietnam, would provoke the gravest reprisals, and further blacken the hope for peace.

In the past, we have worked for an honorable settlement of this tragic war. We have publicly criticized the mounting involvement of our own country, and have sought to keep open the path of moderation that could lead to a negotiated peace.

So, before the last remnants of reason are irrevocably abandoned, we call upon the Hanoi government to refrain from any act of vengeance against the American airmen. They are prisoners of war, fully entitled to the protection extended to men in uniform when captured in the performance of their duty. Their execution would drastically reduce the influence of all those in the United States who have tried to curtail the fighting. It would incite a public demand for retaliation swift and sure, inflicting new levels of suffering and sorrow, and fixing more firmly still the seal of an implacable war.

FRANK CHURCH, GEORGE MCGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, E. L. BARTLETT, LEE METCALF, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, QUENTIN N. BURDICK, FRANK E. MOSS, ERNEST GRUENING, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, VANCE HARTKE, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, JOSEPH S. CLARK, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Senators.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As the Senator is probably aware, yesterday morning the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, which is conducting a series of hearings on the various refugee programs, heard testimony by the Secretary of State.

In the course of that hearing I asked the Secretary of State directly what the attitude of the U.S. Government would be if these trials scheduled for the end of next week took place. The Secretary made an extremely forthright, strong, and vigorous policy statement. He indicated, first of all, that if these trials took place, that we, as a nation, would look upon such behavior by the North Vietnamese with the greatest degree of horror and revulsion. The Secretary stated that every effort was being made by the United States, by third countries, as well as by prominent individuals, to bring our very strong position on this matter to the attention of those in responsible positions in the Hanoi government. I was very much heartened by the Secretary's statement. I am sure that he is aware that we are all relying upon the administration's activities on this problem and hopeful that they will spare no effort to assist the prisoners.

Mr. President, the war in Vietnam is perhaps one of the most impersonal of conflicts undertaken by nations. I have had serious questions in the past concerning our activities in Vietnam and its effects upon the civilian population. On the other hand I have been appalled by the incidents of terror and assassination that the Vietcong have used to achieve their ends in this struggle. The possibility that prisoners of war will now be used to satisfy the frustrations of the north or in a vain attempt to effect our future military decisions is only a further reflection of the absence of considerations for the innocent and those now removed from this conflict. But this prospect of violence against helpless men, in violation of all traditional international agreements, is uppermost in the minds of all Americans today, regardless of their views of the overall conflict. I know of two American fighting men from my own State, Comdr. James Mulligan and Lt. Edward Brudno who, having faced and met their military obligations now find themselves the victims of retaliation in the larger political and ideological struggle of our day.

So I wish to join the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in his very strong declaration and statement of concern for the welfare and the well-being of the American servicemen who are being held as prisoners.

During the testimony by the Secretary of State we asked him about the South Vietnamese Government's observing the Geneva agreements on prisoners of war. He indicated that the names of prisoners in the hands of the South Vietnamese are now being turned over to the International Red Cross, that the Red Cross has access to all prisoners, and that the South Vietnamese Government is now in full cooperation with the International Red Cross.

I recall that on two occasions when I was in Geneva talking with the International Red Cross, they were, as of December of last year, expressing criticism of the South Vietnamese Government for their reluctance in turning over the names of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese prisoners that the South Vietnamese had taken. These lists were not available and the Red Cross indicated to me and the other members of the delegation who were at Geneva at that time their strong feeling that the United States should utilize its good offices with the South Vietnamese to have the South Vietnamese observe to the fullest extent the Geneva Convention.

The Secretary indicated on yesterday that he was firmly convinced that we are now observing these conventions in the fullest. This development, though late in coming is a source of satisfaction to those of us who have been concerned with prisoner indignities.

I also feel that the people of the free world have recognized the very strong effort recently made by the United States in attempting to insure that all in the south were respecting these Geneva agreements. On his basis, we have every right to expect the north to act in accordance with the norms of civilized men. So little of human dignity survives war that we are justified in abhoring such regressive actions as contemplated by the north and to remind them that the beginnings of peace are found in civilized behavior toward their fellow man. I therefore want to say to the Senator from Idaho that he has performed a very useful service today, one for which he deserves great commendation.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this afternoon, in this Chamber, let me attest to my admiration for the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for the real public service he has rendered in presenting his statement today before the country and the world.

Earlier today, I was glad to be associated with him when he and I talked over the statement he was going to make.

Surely, the heads of state of the nations of the world, including those in Hanoi, Red China, and all other Asiatic countries, whether they be somewhat neutral in this matter or extremely hostile toward the United States because of its involvement in Vietnam, must know—and they should know—that all Americans regard the lives of their airmen who are now prisoners of war as precious lives. All Americans hold to the view that these airmen are prisoners of war. As fighting men in our Armed Forces, they were flying over the areas where they were shot down in North Vietnam pursuant to orders given them. They must, therefore, be treated as prisoners of war.

If the horrible act which is being threatened by the Hanoi regime against our airmen is carried out, let the rulers of the world know that all Americans

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

will be united, because we regard those lives as so precious.

Let me repeat, I was glad to join with other colleagues in the statement of the Senator from Idaho. We want the rulers of the world over—friendly or unfriendly—to know our views and our determination.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Ohio, and fully share his sentiments. I appreciate the fact that he has joined in signing the statement which I have just read into the Record this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Idaho for the initiative he has just shown, and the initiative the other Senators have shown in signing the plea for sanity.

I would say that the sentiments expressed in the statement which has just been read would apply not only to the 18 signatories but also to the 100 Members of this body.

The Senator from Idaho as once more performed a public service on the question of Vietnam. I would express the hope that this plea for sanity would be a plea for sanity on all sides.

As Senators know, the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, is just completing an official state visit to the Soviet Union. She will be leaving shortly, but during the course of this meeting she has placed before Messrs. Kosygin and Brezhnev the possibility of a seven-point peace program which could possibly lead to the negotiation table.

Mr. President, in connection with her seven-point program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Mrs. Gandhi May Stir Viet Peace Drive," written by David Van Praagh, and published in the Evening Star of July 14, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MRS. GANDHI MAY STIR VIET PEACE DRIVE

(By David Van Praagh)

New Delhi.—If Prime Minister Indira Gandhi stays on in Moscow for a few days after the scheduled arrival of British Prime Minister Harold Wilson on Saturday, her plan for peace in Viet Nam may be a basis for a wider peace offensive.

This is the feeling in diplomatic circles here following Mrs. Gandhi's outline of what amounted to a seven-point peace plan a few minutes before she left for the Soviet Union via the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia July 7.

She is due to leave Moscow for home Saturday, a few hours before Wilson's arrival. But if the three-power talks on Viet Nam take place instead, it will mean that the cochairmen of the Geneva conference—the Soviet Union and Britain—and the chairman of the International Control Commissions in Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia—India—are putting their heads together.

SEVEN POINTS GIVEN

There is nothing particularly new about Mrs. Gandhi's almost casually expressed plan. But diplomats here reason that its timing and the order of its points—and India's reiteration after one year of its willingness to take part in stronger peacekeeping arrangements in Indochina—give it potential in the wake of extension of U.S. bombings to the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Mrs. Gandhi's seven points are:

1. Britain and the Soviet Union should convene the 14-power Geneva conference immediately.

2. Bombing of North Viet Nam should stop immediately.

3. "This should be closely followed by a cessation of hostilities as well as of hostile movements and actions on all sides throughout Viet Nam, in full observance of the (1954) Geneva agreement.

4. While a peaceful settlement is being hammered out in what might be "weeks of tortuous negotiations," the ICC in Viet Nam should safeguard "standstill arrangements," with India accepting added responsibility in this task if necessary.

5. Withdrawal of all foreign forces from Viet Nam and insulation of the country from foreign interference so the Vietnamese people can determine their own future.

6. Guarantee by the Geneva powers of the territorial integrity and independence of not only a neutral Viet Nam but also neighboring Laos and Cambodia.

7. The Geneva powers also should undertake a rehabilitation and development plan for all three countries.

FIRST SINCE SHASTRI

Mrs. Gandhi's statement was the first major utterance by an Indian leader on the Viet Nam war since the late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri called for an end to U.S. bombings of North Viet Nam soon after they started in February, 1965. Shastri's reward, many believe, was the suspension of an invitation to visit the United States.

At least the first three points of Mrs. Gandhi's plan appear to observers here as acceptable to the United States, but Hanoi and Peking have insisted on the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops, something that would come later under the Gandhi proposal.

Before withdrawal, under Mrs. Gandhi's plan, would come possibly stronger peacekeeping measures than the ICC is presently empowered to take.

This appears to be a reiteration, in a wider context, of Indian President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's proposal of more than a year ago for an international peacekeeping force in Viet Nam. It also appears to be an extension of talks on the same subject between Shastri and Prime Minister Lester Pearson of Canada in Ottawa in June 1965.

HINTS AT REUNIFICATION

The next two points of Mrs. Gandhi's plan appear here to be potentially unattractive to the United States.

This is partly because there is reason to believe that the Indian prime minister has in mind a reunified Viet Nam, after cessation of hostilities, under President Ho Chi Minh of North Viet Nam. She hinted at this in a recent birthday message to him. Nowhere in her peace plan does she mention South Viet Nam.

But if the Russians back this plan, it is reasoned here, there is no reason it would lead to a Chinese-dominated Viet Nam. Mrs. Gandhi specifies that the entire country would be "insulated" and "neutral" and its borders and independence "guaranteed" during and after self-determination, presumably by free elections.

Moreover, the last point, calling for coordinated economic aid to Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia—all to be protected by the Geneva powers—accords with an earlier proposal by President Johnson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know that there are those who find fault with anyone who uses the word "peace," or repeats the word "negotiations " However, somehow, some way, some time, the situation in Vietnam will be settled at the conference table through negotiations. It is just not going to peter out. I would hope that in view of the proposal made by the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, and tied in with the fact that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, will, next week, be visiting the Soviet Union, when Mr. Wilson and Messrs. Kosygin and Brezhnev meet, they will recognize their responsibilities as cochairmen of the Geneva Conventions of 1954 and 1962, and that they will exercise their authority and assume their responsibilities, and on their own initiative reconvene the Geneva Conference for the purpose of getting the situation in Vietnam to the negotiation table.

I think it is imperative. I know that so far as the President of the United States is concerned, no man is more eager to reach that table, to sit down with whoever may be there, and to arrive at a reasonable and an honorable settlement—a settlement which will give some degree of assurance to all of southeast Asia—not just Vietnam—a settlement which will be guaranteed by all the great powers, a settlement which will allow us to get out of Vietnam, not to withdraw hastily, and a settlement which will make it very apparent that we have no desire for bases such as Cam Ranh and others by means of which we could maintain a foothold for years and decades to come.

Every word I have stated, I am sure, fits in with what the President has been trying to do over this past year or more to bring this matter to a conclusion.

Accordingly, I hope that Mr. Wilson and Messrs. Brezhnev and Kosygin will take up the proposals laid down by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, and that out of this meeting in Moscow next week will come some small ray of hope which will bring this matter to a conclusion and bring back to the world—especially to the Far East, and most especially to southeast Asia—a degree of stability and peace which it has not had for more than two decades.

So, again, I commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho and his colleagues for taking this initiative and express the hope that his efforts, which have been persistent, and accomplished under difficulties—because he has received his share of criticism—will continue.

I am delighted that this statement has been made, and again extend my commendation and thanks to him.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the able Senator very much. I would only mention that nearly all of the Senators who have joined in the signing of this plea previously joined in a letter to the President last January, expressing the hope that the suspension of the bombing, then in effect, would be continued, and that the new round of bombing would not be renewed.

Some Senators who joined in the signing of this plea were not parties to that letter, but are nonetheless identified as Senators who have resisted the acceleration of the war, who have sought to further the efforts for peace, and who have worked to keep open the path of moderation which might lead to negotiations.

As to the threatened execution of these American prisoners of war, we hope to make it unmistakably clear that the consequences of such an atrocity will be very grave. By adding our voices in timely warning, we seek to contribute to the saving of these lives, and to prevent further escalation of the war in southeast Asia, with all the dire results that could follow.

I yield now to the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. First, Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator for his efforts, and that of his fellow Senators.

Mr. President, regardless of one's opinion of the war, or of the bombings of North Vietnam, there is no justification and no excuse for the personal reprisals now threatened by Hanoi against individual American pilots. These men, in the oldest tradition of war, were following the orders of superior officers to attack targets which to the best of their knowledge were military involving no loss or damage to civilian life. They were doing their duty for their country—just as the soldiers of North Vietnam are acting according to their duty as defined by their leaders.

I have dissented at many points from this war and its conduct. But I am at one with all Americans in regarding any reprisals against these young men and indirectly against their families, as an intolerable act—contrary to the laws of war, contrary to all past practices in this war, a plunge into barbarism which could serve the interest of no man and no nation.

Moreover, such reprisals would do terrible damage to the possibilities of reasoned discussions between our two countries—which is the only way to a peaceful solution of this conflict. Within our own countries, in international bodies, and in the world at large, the new bitterness and meanness which such reprisals represent would inevitably stifle debate and discussion and, perhaps, place our countries on a course of even-greater escalation, a course from which there is no return.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the eloquent statement made by the distinguished Senator from New York and the general support he has given to the effort by this group of Senators for whom I have spoken. We hope the message will be very clear that the threatened execution of American prisoners of war may well carry this cruel conflict beyond the point of no return.

As one who has constantly sought to find an honorable settlement, who can speak with some measure of independence and objectivity, as one who has frequently disagreed with our own Vietnamese policy, I hope this message will get through.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the majority leader pointed out that the sentiments expressed in the resolution which was referred to are shared by all 100 Members of the Senate.

In the President's address which came over television and radio last Tuesday night, these sentiments were expressed. I think the sentiments he expressed ought to be repeated here on the floor of the Senate. I am reading from an article written by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, which appeared in the July 14 issue of the Washington Star, and I quote from what the President said:

> As long as the leaders of North Viet Nam believe they can take over the people of South Viet Nam by force, we must not let them succeed.
>
> We must stand across their path and say: "You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow." * * * We are not trying to wipe out North Viet Nam. We are not trying to change their government. We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Viet Nam. And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory. Then why are we there?
>
> Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Viet Nam stop shooting at their neighbors. Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable. Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede. * * * However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.
>
> First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Viet Nam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist.
>
> Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Viet Nam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it.

I would suggest those sentiments are also shared by all 100 Members of the Senate.

The matter of the treatment of American prisoners of war by North Vietnam is, of course, a new matter which has been brought to our attention, but I am sure its possibility was considered by everyone in the White House, including the President, as well as many Members of the Senate.

As Mr. Lawrence pointed out in the article, the President's address was conciliatory. It was not belligerent. It was thoughtful. I hope it will be persuasive.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

President's Address Memorable

(By David Lawrence)

A memorable address delivered by President Johnson over television and radio on Tuesday night could change the course of human history. For the first time, the head of a nation talked directly to another people in the midst of a war. He earnestly pleaded the cause of peace and emphasized that "co-operation, not hostility, is the way of the future."

Mr. Johnson's speech was neither belligerent in tone nor blustering. The President tried the art of persuasion. He pointed out that, since "humiliation can be the seedbed of war," America is not seeking in Viet Nam "the peace of conquest."

Stressing what could lie beyond a peace conference, Mr. Johnson spoke of the need to strengthen the economic and social development of countries in Asia with their enormous populations which suffer from poverty, hunger and disease.

The President may have been thinking of Red China's detachment from the world community as he tactfully argued that isolationism is not good for China any more than it has been for the United States. He said on this point:

"Americans entered this century believing that our security had no foundation outside our own continent. Twice we mistook our sheltered position for safety. Twice we were wrong. If we are wise now, we will not repeat our mistakes of the past. We will not retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia."

The President's frank and outspoken words might have been uttered in the privacy of a "summit" meeting with the heads of other governments. But they take on added significance because of their directness and the willingness to make such statements in the open. Here are the significant passages:

"As long as the leaders of North Viet Nam believe they can take over the people of South Viet Nam by force, we must not let them succeed.

"We must stand across their path and say: 'You will not prevail. Turn from the use of force—and peace will follow.' . . . "We are not trying to wipe out North Viet Nam. We are not trying to change their government. We are not trying to establish permanent bases in South Viet Nam. And we are not trying to gain one inch of new territory. Then why are we there?

"Because we are trying to make the Communists of North Viet Nam stop shooting at their neighbors. Because we are trying to make their aggression unprofitable. Because we are trying to demonstrate that guerrilla warfare, inspired by one nation against another, cannot succeed. Once that lesson is learned, a shadow that hangs over all of Asia will begin to recede . . . "However long it takes, I want the Communists in Hanoi to know where we stand.

"First, victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Viet Nam by force. Do not mistake our firm stand for false optimism—as long as you persist in aggression, we will resist.

"Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home. We want an honorable peace in Viet Nam. In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it."

Rarely in the relations between two adversaries during a war has such frankness been displayed, at least on the part of the nation which has the more powerful military force and weapons. The strategy behind the kind of speech that President Johnson delivered may not be apparent to the naked eye, but it doubtless was based on the advice of those experts here and abroad who know what's happening inside Red China and who recognize that this is the time to present to the people on the mainland a formula that could lead to peace. The President said:

"A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful co-operation. For lasting peace can never come to Asia as long as the 700 million people of mainland China are isolated by their rulers from the outside world."

The text of the President's address doubtless will be relayed by radio throughout the world. At least the diplomats will read it in

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

full text, and those who have contact with Red China's government are in a position to point out that never has there been a more sincere or constructive declaration made to an enemy during a war than that which has just been proclaimed by the President of the United States in a conscientious effort to bring peace in Viet Nam.

THE COLORADO RIVER ISSUE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the State of California is undergoing a truly fantastic population explosion. There are 20 million people in California today and the California State Department of Health estimates that the State will have 50 million residents by the year 2000. California gains nearly 1,500 new residents each and every day.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives is now considering H.R. 4671, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower California River Basin project. This bill represents years of work by the water statesmen of California, Arizona, and the other Colorado River Basin States. The Lower Colorado River Basin project is crucial to the continued growth and prosperity of the semiarid portions of my State and of the entire Southwest. The 50 million people who will live in California less than 40 years from today must have water, and the Colorado River Basin project is the most important single measure contemplated to assure that water will be available for future generations.

Opposition to two dams on the Colorado River in Arizona has caused the project to be the subject of one of the largest letterwriting campaigns which I have seen in my tenure in the U.S. Senate, and I agree with the editorial published yesterday morning in the Washington Post which says:

> The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress, not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

I am saddened that some good conservation organizations with which I have worked for years, and for which I have the highest regard, have, in this case, used misleading, erroneous, and exaggerated emotional appeals to stimulate opposition to a project which is going to be vital as we care for the millions of Californians, Arizonans, and others who will live in the semiarid Pacific Southwest in the next quarter of a century.

In the words of the Washington Post editorial:

> It is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change—

Minor change is what the Post calls it—

> in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see.

Yet, unfortunately, that is the kind of nonsense emanating from some conservation groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial of July 14, 1966, entitled "Colorado River Issue" be printed in the RECORD, and I call upon responsible conservationists, and proponents of the Colorado River Basin project alike to heed the invitation of the Washington Post for an objective and dispassionate review of the project, with a view to achieving the greatest good for the millions of people who now live in the arid southwestern section of our country, and the many more millions who will live there 50 years from now.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1966]

COLORADO RIVER ISSUE

Debate began yesterday in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one of the most important bills before Congress this year—the measure to authorize the Central Arizona Project. It is vital to the 30 million people of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin. Indeed, the entire country will be affected by the outcome because of the great national interest in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The Committee will have to weigh two major objectives. The Colorado Basin states are clamoring for this final step in harnessing the great river as an essential element of their continued growth. Indeed, they insist that they cannot survive without additional water. With rare unanimity, they are asking Congress to authorize a project that will divert 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year to the parched and thirsty areas around Phoenix and Tucson.

The Upper Basin states are supporting this undertaking only because the bill would also authorize five new water projects in Colorado at a cost of $361 million and a study of 13 other Upper Basin projects. In the picture is the further hope of importing water for the semi-arid Southwest, to be financed at least in part by power revenues to be derived from the proposed dams at Bridge and Marble Canyons. Representative MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona recently held out hope that about $3 billion will be left in the basin fund "to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin states."

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

To our way of thinking, the answer must necessarily lie somewhere between the two extremes. The inescapable fact is that harnessing of the Colorado has been essential to the burgeoning of the Southwest. It could not support its present population without the impoundments of water behind immense dams (Hoover, Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and others). There is no doubt a compelling logic to completion of the system with due regard for scenic and recreational values as well as economic advantages.

We think that Congress will recognize this logic and pass some measure authorizing the Central Arizona Project. At the same time it is under obligation to this and future generations to minimize the impact upon the natural beauty of the Colorado River. Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable, and even the change of the river into a lake for 13 miles at the western end of the park by the Bridge Canyon Dam ought to be avoided if possible.

While earnestly seeking an alternative, however, it is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see. The 175-mile Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam has demonstrated, moreover, that stored water in the desolate Southwest can in some cases add greatly to recreational values.

We hope that Congress, in moving to utilize the full potential of the Colorado for the people, will give due weight to scenic and recreational values. Numerous suggestions for a compromise between the demands for water and the demands for preservation of natural beauty have been made. One is elimination of the proposed Marble Canyon Dam and the addition of this gorge to Grand Canyon National Park. Another is reduction of the height of Bridge Canyon Dam so as to avoid any water storage in the park and reduction of the flooding in the Grand Canyon National Monument.

There are various other proposals for enlargement of Grand Canyon National Park by the inclusion of sections of the Kaibab Game Reserve, the Kaibab National Forest and the National Monument. Congress could soften the impact of whatever it finds necessary to do to meet the water problem of the Southwest by adding to the remarkable complex of scenic and recreational preserves in the area.

RECLAMATION IS CONSERVATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 28, 1966, Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, delivered an address to the Los Angeles, Calif., townhall meeting entitled "Reclamation is Conservation." Commissioner Dominy has remained silent for many months in the face of bitter and emotional criticism against him by some Americans who erroneously allege that he wishes to destroy the Grand Canyon. In this address, Commissioner Dominy answers his critics.

I am proud of my record as a conservationist in the Senate of the United States for example. I have authored or cosponsored the Wilderness Act and legislation to create a Redwood National Park, the Point Reyes National Seashore, the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge, the Whiskeytown-Trinity-Shasta National Recreation Area, and many other conservation measures. I have consistently supported conservation legislation. As an American, I object to an exaggerated and emotional attack being focused on a single public servant, the Commissioner of Reclamation, simply because he tries to determine how best to prevent the semiarid West from blowing away.

So that both sides of the story might be known, I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Dominy's address be printed in the RECORD, and I express the hope that when legislation to create the Colorado River Basin project reaches the Senate it will receive thorough and searching, and fair and objective, consideration. I hope that the consideration will not be carried on in the aura of emo-

tionalism which has surrounded the great Grand Canyon controversy up to this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION IS CONSERVATION

(Address by Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, before the Los Angeles, Calif., town hall meeting on June 28, 1966)

It was a timely invitation which brought me before this Town Hall audience today. A great debate is building up on the manner of preservation, conservation and use of our publicly owned natural resources and the Pacific Southwest is sitting squarely in the center of the argument.

Consequently, it is appropriate that I select this opportunity to offer some remarks that I have been contemplating for some time.

I don't need to tell anyone here that neither Los Angeles nor any other metropolitan area of the Pacific Southwest would be in existence today at their present size and scale if man had not taken some positive steps to correct nature's imbalance of natural resources.

Some people question whether or not this is a good thing. I have read some letters to the editors criticizing your State's and our federally developed cooperative plans on the lower Colorado, which infer it would have been much better if Los Angeles and Phoenix and all the vast sun country in between had been allowed to be just that, sun country and nothing more. But from the fact that you seem to be happy and pleased to be living here, I would judge that you disagree, as I do.

Consequently, I am very proud that our Bureau of Reclamation, placed in business by the Congress back in 1902 under a great conservation President, Theodore Roosevelt, has been a major cooperator with the States of the Pacific Southwest in the development of essential water supplies.

Our role in the early Reclamation development in Arizona, through the Yuma and Salt River projects, is well known. What is not so well known is that when your predecessors here in Los Angeles were scratching around seeking an additional water supply in those same early years of this century, it was the Bureau of Reclamation which found a suitable reservoir site from whence developed the Owens Valley Project. That project was developed by your own local government, which is as it should be, wherever possible. I am a hearty believer in the philosophy that the Federal Government should undertake only those things which local people and local governments cannot undertake for themselves.

I also take some vicarious pleasure in the fact that one of the best Reclamationists we have today worked as a day laborer and roustabout in the construction of the Mulholland tunnel. He is MIKE KIRWAN, now a Congressman from Ohio and Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works.

He is one of the most solid friends and supporters Reclamation has, because he knows what the Bureau of Reclamation has accomplished and how important its mission here in the Western States is to our national economy. He knows, as well as anyone, that Reclamation *is* conservation.

I emphasize that little word, *is*, because I believe it to be true. Reclamation *is* conservation. It is the kind of conservation that helped lay the groundwork for the historic Conference of Governors on Conservation of Natural Resources in 1908. It is entirely in keeping with the declaration that came out of that conference and which inspired the past half century of unparalleled advancement in conservation.

"We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil-wash shall cease," formally declared the assembled Governors; "that there should be reclamation of arid and semi-arid regions by means of irrigation, and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation, and to develop power in the interests of the People; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the People and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated."

The Bureau of Reclamation has lived up to this credo within the framework of its responsibilities and the West and the Nation are richer for the work we have been able to accomplish in a cooperative effort with the Western States and their people. Nevertheless, today we are being branded as "destroyers" in critical $25 books and expensive full-page newspaper advertisements. The Congress is receiving a flow of emotional letters, canned postcards, and prepared coupons, most of which clearly stem from the unprincipled and erroneous allegation that we are "flooding out" the Grand Canyon and ruining the National Park System.

Let's take a look first at what Reclamation has accomplished. It may help in determining whether we are destroyers.

Your own growing metropolis outstripped the Owens Valley water supply and started looking for new sources in the 1920's. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California was organized in 1928 and authorized to build another great water lifeline, turning this time to the Colorado River. This project, the Colorado River Aqueduct, was made possible by the Bureau of Reclamation's construction of Hoover Dam, a massive concrete plug which harnessed the Nation's most erratic river. Moving quickly against the threat of new water shortages, the Metropolitan Water District advanced funds to the Bureau of Reclamation to build Parker Dam, an after bay dam below Hoover, and in the mid-1930's started construction of the giant pumping plant and aqueduct to bring Colorado River water across mountains and desert to Los Angeles and San Diego. The American Society of Civil Engineers designated this aqueduct and Hoover Dam as two of the seven engineering wonders of America. But I suppose we and you both are destroyers because these great engineering works were built in the natural serenity of the desert.

And while we were all busy on the Colorado River, the Bureau of Reclamation also was working elsewhere in the West, so much so that a new productive area, equivalent in size to Connecticut and Delaware, has been added to the assets of the Nation. Of course we have altered a lot of desert land, but there are nine million acres of a lush irrigated greenbelt where before there was only desert land or drought threatened cropland. You who prize your irrigated suburban greenery be the judge as to whether we are destroyers.

In addition to water for irrigation, Reclamation projects deliver in excess of 500 billion gallons of water annually to municipalities and industrial areas—serving a population of more than 10 million. Hydroelectric power, produced as a by-product of the stored agricultural and municipal water, is now being generated at a level of 33 billion kilowatt-hours annually—enough to supply the residential needs of a city of 6 million. This hydroelectric production, incidentally, does not pollute the air and it conserves valuable fossil fuels.

The Bureau of Reclamation has completed nearly 200 storage dams in the West. These impoundments have a storage capacity for 127 million acre-feet (more than 41 trillion gallons) of water. This stored water is cool, clear, and sparkling after the sediment settles out, in stark contrast to its muddy, roily state when it is impounded as it flowed to the sea in the natural rivers during and after the spring snowmelt. In addition to a major flood prevention and flood control role, these man-made lakes provide water-oriented recreation to millions—more than 35 million days of visitor use last year by fishermen, boating enthusiasts, campers, and others.

But of course, we are destroyers because we regulate the rivers and streams, clean them up and keep them flowing the year around, without ruinous seasonal floods or the slim trickles of the dry months.

Construction is now at the half-way point on a third—500-mile-long—water supply line for this area. This is the California State Water Project. The Bureau of Reclamation is proud to be associated with the State of California in one of the key reservoir and canal sections of this great water system, the jointly constructed San Luis Dam and Canal on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

The Feather River water will take care of the needs of Southern California until about 1990. But the far-sighted officials of the Metropolitan Water District and the State of California and the Bureau of Reclamation are already actively seeking to assure the additional water for continued growth and development for the 21st Century.

The vehicle for this new future water supply for southern California along with Arizona and Nevada, is one of the most far-reaching resource developments ever proposed. This is the Colorado River Basin Plan, a seven-State proposal that has evolved during the past three years out of the long-planned Central Arizona Project.

Much credit for broadening the Central Arizona Project legislation into a regional water plan goes to Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. In 1962, Chairman ASPINALL wrote to the Secretary seeking his views on a coordinated comprehensive pattern for development of the water and power needs of the entire Pacific Southwest. Secretary Udall reponded in January 1963 with an announcement of the start of a new study for the Lower Colorado River Basin Plan, aimed at solving the growing water and power problems of the Pacific Southwest.

This proposed plan, wrote Secretary Udall, "erases the outmoded concept limited by State lines, and concentrates on meeting the total water needs of the region. In the parched Pacific Southwest, we can prosper together or slowly shrivel separately."

As a result, a massive assault had been launched against threatening water shortages for the driest and fastest-growing region in the United States. And, parenthetically, a simultaneous attack has been mounted against the Bureau of Reclamation as the "great destroyer."

By August of 1962, a planning report had been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the proposed Pacific Southwest Water Plan. It was submitted to the States and interested Federal agencies for review, and legislation subsequently was introduced in the Congress. Sponsors of this regional legislation were members of the Arizona and California Congressional delegations—for the first time in history united behind a water resource development proposal affecting the Colorado River and all the States that look to it for their water lifeline.

Subsequently, the proposal became known as the Lower Colorado River Basin Project and it won qualified approval by the Administration prior to House hearings in the fall of 1965.

But there was still room for further regional expansion in a heartening display of water statesmanship. At the 1965 House hearings, members of the Congress from the Upper Colorado River Basin States had expressed concern about the effect of this downriver project upon future developments contemplated upstream, and they had pointed to the need for additional water in the upper basin by 1990. Accordingly, agreements were hammered out in a series of meetings last winter involving Congressional representatives and water officials of the seven States. Out of these eventful meetings emerged a basinwide project, supported, also for the first time in history, by all seven States of the Colorado River Basin.

This expanded legislation now proposes immediate authorization and construction of the Central Arizona Project. Other water supply projects in the Basin would be authorized also. In addition, it would establish a regional development fund to finance future projects to augment the inadequate water supply of the Colorado River. These future projects—desalination, weather modification, and/or importation from water surplus areas—would be determined in a feasibility study to be completed within three years, according to the proposed legislation. The general objective of the feasibility studies would be to augment the Colorado River water supply by some 2½ to 6½ million acre-feet—the latter amount being equivalent of another river nearly half the size of the present Colorado, which today is totally committed to consumptive uses or long-term storage.

Simultaneously, there is before the Congress a proposal for a national water supply study commission. While detailed research is pressed in desalination and a practical effort is being made to put known principles of weather modification to use in developing an additional water supply, there must be a complete array of facts and figures on water needs, supplies and potential surpluses in the various river basins. Only when these data are in and comparative costs are available, can Congress be expected to act on far-reaching proposals to augment the water supplies in areas of shortage.

Perhaps even more significant than the agreement on the terms of the Lower Colorado River legislation is the fact that the seven States of the Colorado River Basin are now working collectively, with the Federal Government, to solve the most pressing, largest, and most complex water supply challenge of our times. This unity of purpose is vital if the most arid part of the Nation is to enter the 21st Century without facing a water supply ceiling, limiting further economic and population expansion.

Associated with this Colorado River development during the past six decades in the seven basin States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, have been other noteworthy resource activities under Federal-State auspices. These include such major undertakings as the development of the Salt and Gila rivers in Arizona, the $2 billion Central Valley Project in California, major transmountain diversions to the Rio Grande, Arkansas, North Platte rivers and to the Great Basin in Utah, and headwater development in the Missouri River Basin in Wyoming. Collectively, the Federal-State water resource development in this seven-State area is the largest and most successful water use effort in the world. The existing projects are now a world-renowned demonstration area for arid zone resource conservation and utilization—and will be for many generations to come. Yet we are accused of being destroyers.

This sketchy resume of water resource development in the Colorado River Basin States is intended to remind you of this area's stake in this program. I again suggest to you that Reclamation *is* Conservation.

In spite of this background, those of us who have given our careers to water resource conservation and development have been attacked in recent months by massive propaganda and lobbying campaigns, in the name of conservation, which appear directed at discrediting and undermining the Reclamation program.

Consider these sweeping charges and glittering propagandistic generalities used by sincere but misguided preservationists against Reclamation during consideration of the Lower Colorado Project Bill:

Blind planning; faulty arithmetic; threatening the National Park System; wasting water; stretch facts beyond the breaking point; selling a bill of goods; a boondoggle; shaky economic underpinnings; obsolete precepts; hydroelectric power outmoded; reclamation laws no longer appropriate.

These people, carried away by their single-purpose zeal, have failed to recognize the great grey area between total preservation and total development, neither of which is contemplated.

As an example of the scare tactics used to achieve their emotional purpose, the following statement is made in an article in a conservation magazine, later digested in a mass circulation magazine:

"Much of the Grand Canyon habitat of the desert bighorn sheep would be destroyed by Bridge Canyon Dam."

Since my agency had originally proposed this structure, I sought information from the Federal agency which has jurisdiction over such wildlife, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

This is an excerpt from that Bureau's reply:

"Bighorns known to be in Bridge Canyon Reservoir area, but extent of population little known because of inaccessibility. If bighorns are in fact in Marble Canyon, population would be very limited. There are known populations above Bridge Canyon Reservoir in Grand Canyon National Park and in Lake Mead area (Black Mountains) below damsite. Bighorns have no particular affinity to river bottom except possibly for watering purposes. They normally range above the valley floor. At Havasu Lake (behind Reclamation's Parker Dam) bighorn populations adjacent to lake have increased in the years since impoundment, and they are commonly seen by boaters on the lake. At this year's Bighorn Council meeting, a Utah game department biologist gave a paper concerning apparent recent increase in bighorn populations adjacent to Lake Powell (Glen Canyon) reservoir."

Hence, the facts appear to be that Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs have actually increased the population of desert bighorns. But propagandists have deliberately distorted or misrepresented the facts and the vaunted editorial review of one of the world's largest circulation magazines apparently accepted this false statement on its face.

A principal impression the preservation propagandists seek to foster in generating their emotional appeal, is that the reservoirs proposed in the original Southwest Water Plan would "flood out" the Grand Canyon and thereby ruin the National Park System.

The Marble Canyon damsite is located 12½ miles above and outside the upstream boundary of the Park and dam and reservoir would be totally outside of either Park or Monument. The proposed Bridge Canyon Dam, which is in the area-sponsored legislation, but which the Administration has recommended be deferred for further study, is downstream on the Colorado River from both the Grand Canyon National Park and Monument. It would, however, back water in the inner gorge of the Grand Canyon through the National Monument and for 13 miles alongside the boundary of Grand Canyon National Park.

The preservationists have failed to point out that in our efforts to "flood out and destroy the Grand Canyon"—and those are their quotes, not mine—that the same vista from any viewpoint along the rim within the National Park will be visible without change when either or both reservoirs are created.

There are accusations that Marble Canyon Dam will affect the regimen of the river through the canyon. But the regimen was changed when Glen Cayon Dam was built and as a result, there is much clearer and colder water flowing downstream. There is now an excellent trout fishery below the dam where none existed before. It is true that there are power fluctuations but the minimum flow is greater than the natural flow in years of low runoff and the power discharges can help get the river runners through the rapids.

In sum total, the river running season has been extended from a single uncertain month in periods of high runoff, to several months as the result of construction of Glen Canyon Dam. The situation will be improved even more in future years when Lake Powell is higher.

We and the Congress have been bombarded with accusations that the dams are unnecessary to the project, that hydropower is outmoded and will soon be replaced by great thermal generating plants. We have analyzed all of these counterproposals thoroughly and in good faith. Yet, we find them wanting.

For example, the low-cost kilowatts which would come from these new thermal plants are predicated upon high load factor operation which is economically feasible only with a supplementary source of peaking energy such as hydro can supply. We also are aware that the utitlity industry still contemplates investment of many millions of dollars in hydro facilities, something that would be highly unlikely if hydro is going out of style.

Or their arguments have been that there are alternative means of financing Reclamation development. But such ideas have found a singular lack of practical support in Congress. Thermal or nuclear power alternatives to either or both of these dams are not options open to consideration under present Congressional thinking or experience.

Nevertheless, because we operate within a framework which has been laid down by the Congress in carrying out our water development responsibilities, we are not conservationists but destroyers, in the image these groups are seeking to build up. I say the contrary is true, that Reclamation development which gives full consideration of all existing values and all benefits which will be created, is the real conservation as Teddy Roosevelt and the other broad conservationists who have followed him have repeatedly endorsed.

Our critics have even sought to usurp the image of this great conservationist when they quote President Theodore Roosevelt, as he stood on the south rim of the Grand Canyon in 1903:

"Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it and man can only mar it."

Congress took him at his word and incorporated all of the Grand Canyon, as far as the eye could see from his viewpoint and much farther in each direction, in Grand Canyon National Park. And you today, and your children, and your children's children, will be able to see the magnificent vistas Theodore Roosevelt viewed, unchanged, even when Reclamation's task is completed.

Who is to say what Theodore Roosevelt was thinking when he stood on the rim of the Grand Canyon. What was he thinking of when he wrote:

"It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. . . . The time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. . . . It is not possible to properly frame so large a plan . . . without taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources."

This has been a guiding policy of the Bureau of Reclamation through the years and more so now than ever before. The competitive demands of a growing population, a growing economy and vastly greater leisure time and travel convenience, make the careful planning and use of our natural resources of greatest importance.

I am a veteran of 33 years experience in the Federal career service, all of it in natural resources administration and am familiar with the President's record in conservation since his days as a young Congressman, back in the 1930's when my own career was just getting underway.

He and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall are down in my book as solid conservationists. I am convinced that both have at heart the definition Gifford Pinchot and his aides used so much, that conservation is "the use of the natural resources for the greatest good for the greatest number."

President Johnson is beset with international problems, but nevertheless, he keeps a firm hand on the resources picture, with Secretary Udall as his able and forceful lieutenant. Indicative is the recent transfer of the pollution control administration to the Department of the Interior. It reflects the President's sane judgment and confidence in Secretary Udall that we all share who work with him.

Such belittling and ill-advised references as have recently been made about him are in poorest taste and judgment when balanced against his overwhelming record of accomplishment in the public interest. They reflect the panic of those critics who refuse to recognize that Reclamation *is* Conservation.

TRIBUTE TO WORTH BINGHAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, as many Senators read recently, the oldest son of the great publisher of a Louisville newspaper, Harry Bingham, died in a most unfortunate accident in Nantucket the other day. An excellent story has been written by Norman E. Isaacs, the managing editor of the newspaper; and because Harry was a friend of many Senators and was a great political reporter, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD. I think it will be of interest to all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTH BINGHAM, 1932–66: A PROMISING CAREER CUT SHORT

(By Norman E. Isaacs)

It was the summer of '52, I think. He was on the news staff as a trainee. That morning he'd come to work in tennis shoes, dungarees and an old shirt. One look and he was on "the carpet."

"Worth," he was told, "nobody works for these newspapers looking like that. You go home and get some decent clothes on. Either be back in an hour—or don't bother to report."

Worth Bingham made it back in 40 minutes.

Fourteen years later he was a hard-working, well-dressed assistant to the publisher. Thursday night he stayed down at the office to have dinner with the copy desk staff. There was good-humored jesting, some of it about himself, and serious newspaper talk. He enjoyed both. Friday morning he flew off for vacation in Nantucket.

WELL BACKGROUNDED

Then on Monday afternoon he phoned from Nantucket to report on a negotiation dealing with some future planning. He added happily, "The weather here is gorgeous."

Less than 24 hours later, Worth Bingham was dead, victim of a freak accident, just as was his younger brother, Jonathan, only two years before.

The potential for Worth was a career as one of America's great editor-publishers. He'd prepared well. After Harvard and the Navy, he'd broken in on the Minneapolis papers, writing obits, covering police, doing rewrite. He got his first big break when he was sent to Wisconsin on a lurid murder story. The old pros of the Chicago and Detroit papers were busy making sure the police officials were "tied up" for their purposes. Worth went off on his own and got the big story.

Later, in San Francisco, he worked on two papers there, editing copy and writing headlines. It was out there that he met a pretty art student and it was there that they were married.

SERVED IN WASHINGTON

His years of Minneapolis and West Coast experience complete, he returned to the Louisville newspapers, first to work on the desks and in political reporting, and then to the Washington Bureau where he worked long and hard mastering the intricacies of coverage in the nation's capital.

His series, "Our Costly Congress," which was reprinted all across the country and in Reader's Digest, took endless hours of research. And he wrote, and rewrote, and rewrote himself.

Returning once again to Louisville, he went out on the circulation trucks and knocked on doors, trying to sell subscriptions. Later he sold ads. Once a merchant didn't quite get his name and proceeded to denounce "the Binghams" up one side and down the other. Worth listened to it all with a wry grin on his face.

The training complete, he joined the executive staff. As a member of the editorial conference, he showed he had ideas, he expressed them, and he fought for them. And if it took a 12- or 14-hour day that was all right with him. In short he had a passion for newspapering—and there just wasn't any reason to doubt that he was going to wind up as one of the top figures in journalism.

He was a big, ruggedly handsome man, who had a little of many things mixed up in him—aggressiveness and shyness, pride and humility, reticence and forthrightness. He had great poise, and the indefinable gift of charm.

There were three things that stood out about Worth. One was his dedication to newspapering. The second was his fascination with politics. The third was his addiction to keeping fit. In all of these things, he played to win. At bridge, he could be the picture of elation and dejection within the space of minutes. He would groan loudly over his own misplays—and complain bitterly about losing a dollar.

DISDAINED APPEARANCES

It wasn't the dollar because he came very close to being unconscious about money generally. He just hated to lose.

Appearances meant nothing to him. He drove what others around the office looked on as an old wreck. It was a big station wagon that had a distinct air of semi-decrepitude. For a long time, the back portion contained a crib.

The fitness kick was quite something. Often he'd spend a lunch hour playing squash. He played tennis, golf, loved to ski, surfboarded. It was a surfboard that snapped forward yesterday, killing him instantly.

Of all his newspaper work away from Louisville, he loved Washington most. Part of this was because of the political atmosphere. Part, too, was that he worked there during the Kennedy era and Worth and Joan fitted perfectly into the setting. And he made deep and close friends all through the place.

As the friend on the phone said yesterday from The Washington Post, his office probably was just like our own: "Numb."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The young man to whom the Senator referred was a classmate of mine in college, and I knew him very well. I share with the Senator from Kentucky the very high regard for the young man and the tragedy of his loss, as well as the sorrow of his family. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, the family has distinguished itself in the journalistic field for many years, and has been deeply concerned with problems of the State and of the Nation.

I join with the Senator from Kentucky in expressing condolences to the family.

THE SALE OF ARMAMENTS ABROAD

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a recent issue of Saturday Review, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], has written an article on the sales of armaments abroad which deserves our serious attention.

In describing the scope and value of these armaments exports, he points out several factors of this growing business which tends to increase international tension. First is the growing competition among the world powers to supply military weapons to underdeveloped countries which have neither the need nor the capacity to use them. Second is the tendency of recipient countries to compete with their neighbors even to the point of open conflict. Third is the impact of a prestigious military establishment on internal political developments of these poor nations.

There is reason for a growing concern about the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Recent events in Kashmir and southeast Asia show clearly that the threat of conventional war is no less serious. Just 2 days ago Israel pilots flying French planes had an aerial duel with Syrian pilots flying Russian planes. These incidents do not contribute to international peace, as we do not yet have the ability to control the use of these weapons.

We know that what begins as a small military aid program can result in the involvement of a large scale military commitment of a world power. Therefore, I agree wholeheartedly with the senior Senator from Minnesota that a means must be found to strictly limit the distribution of these arms throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "The United States: Supplier of Weapons to the World" be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Saturday Review, July 9, 1966]

THE UNITED STATES: SUPPLIER OF WEAPONS TO THE WORLD

(Note.—How our foreign policy is being undermined by $35 billion worth of armaments exports—while industry and the Pentagon lobby for even larger shipments.)

(By Eugene J. McCarthy, U.S. Senator from Minnesota)

"In the Thirties, companies that sold weapons to foreign nations were called 'Merchants of Death.' Politicians reviled them. They were the subject of a sensational Senate investigation headed by former Republican Senator Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota.

"Times have changed. The U.S. Government is now encouraging defense manufacturers to sell arms overseas."

—*Forbes magazine*

Over the past fifteen years, the United States has given or sold to other countries some $35 billion worth of military assistance as part of our foreign aid. The major share of Defense Department arms supplied under our military assistance program has gone to industrialized countries in Europe and the Far East.

We have provided arms, equipment, and training to countries who are allied or associated with us through treaties—NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS—which are the legacy of the early years of the containment policy and of the John Foster Dulles era. In addition, we have provided military aid to a wide range of countries in such categories as: "forward defense" areas, including the Republic of China (Taiwan), Iran, Philippines, South Korea, Greece, and Turkey (the last two countries are also allied to us through NATO); countries that have given us military base rights such as Ethiopia, Libya, Spain and our NATO ally Portugal: "Alliance for Progress Security" countries—virtually every country in Latin America; and some twenty-three countries in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East that are regarded as having "free world orientation."

Our interest and concern over the threat of nuclear proliferation should not distract us from giving careful attention to what may be an even more serious threat to peace—the proliferation and distribution of non-nuclear weapons. Supplying non-nuclear arms has become a major activity—not only for the modern merchants of death or for illegal gunrunners, but for the governments of the major industrial countries.

France, long a major supplier of arms to the Middle East, is reported to be exporting nearly 40 per cent of its total aerospace production. The Soviet Union is also a major supplier of arms. Great Britain is actively engaged in the arms competition. But today the United States is the world's leading producer and supplier of arms.

In recent years, sales of arms have been taking the place of grants and gifts in U.S. military assistance programs. In 1950, the fourteen countries that obtained U.S. arms and military training all received these on a grant basis. In 1966, of the seventy countries that received any combination of grant aid, direct sales or credit assistance for arms, sixty-two were receiving grant aid, thirty-four were buying arms directly, and eighteen were the beneficiaries of credit assistance.

The principal purpose of most military aid, whether it be in the form of grants or sales, is, of course, to strengthen recipient countries against Communist aggression and subversion.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 20, 1966, stated:

"The governing principle of our military assistance program has been and is that the vital interests of the United States and the defense of the Free World are dependent upon the strength of the entire Free World and not merely upon the strength of the United States."

Over the past decade, however, intergovernmental trade in arms with the developing countries has involved more complex motivations and considerations. Several pressures have combined to increase the arms supply.

First, newly independent countries are frequently anxious to acquire arms for prestige purposes. Lions on golden chains no longer satisfy. To many nations, these arms are status symbols—the tangible manifestation of their nationhood and newly acquired sovereignty.

Second, supplying arms opens the way to influence on the military and also on the political policies of the recipient countries. Experience has demonstrated that when an arms deal is concluded, the military hardware is only the first step. Almost invariably, a training mission is needed and the recipient country becomes dependent on the supplier for spare parts and other ordnance.

Since the Cuban missile crisis, there has been an increasing inclination on the part of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. to compete in supplying military assistance in areas adjacent to the sphere of influence of the other power. Thus, we tend to concentrate our military assistance to developing areas in those countries, such as Iran and Pakistan, which are on the "forward-defense arc" that borders the Communist heartland. Almost three-fourths of the program proposed for 1967 is for countries adjacent to the borders of the U.S.S.R. and Communist China.

The importance of influence on the military can be seen in Africa. Of the five nations of sub-Saharan Africa where military governments have come to power in recent months, only one, apparently, the Central African Republic, has *not* been the recipient of U.S. military assistance. The other four—Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Nigeria, and Upper Volta—have all received at least minimal amounts of military aid. Indonesia, where military elements appear to have taken *de facto* control of the government in the wake of the recent turmoil, received, in addition to Soviet military assistance, nearly $64,000,000 in military-grant aid from the United States between 1959 and 1965. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, tries to increase its influence by assistance to, for example, Cuba, close to our shores.

The third reason for increasing arms sales, and a relatively new one for the United States, is financial and budgetary. Our balance of payments deficit is, in large measure, the result of military expenditures overseas—money that leaves the United States to support our military forces abroad, in Europe, and, particularly now, in Vietnam. The Vietnam war effort is costing the United States some $16 billion this year. By encouraging other countries to buy arms from us, we can offset to some extent the outflow resulting from these programs. Now, for instance, the Pentagon reportedly is "encouraging" additional purchases of U.S. arms by Germany by threatening transfer of U.S. troops from Europe to Vietnam.

Secretary of Defense McNamara proudly describes the efforts of his department in the arms sales field. In May 1965 he presented the Meritorious Civilian Service Medal to Henry J. Kuss, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Logistics Negotiations, the Pentagon's top arms salesman. The record of Mr. Kuss and his salesmen—"negotiators," the Pentagon calls them—is impressive. Military export sales since mid-1961 total more than $9 billion, from which U.S. industry will realize a profit of nearly $1 billion. For this achievement, the Pentagon credits "the intensive sales effort undertaken . . . in cooperation with U.S. industry."

Forbes magazine recently stated:

"Arms and military equipment are one of the U.S. major export items. Without them, few defense companies would be earning the kind of money they do."

Secretary McNamara cites the "obvious balance of payments benefits" of the arms sales program, noting that the U.S. defense expenditures and receipts entering the balance of payments in fiscal 1961 left a net adverse balance of nearly $2.8 billion. By 1965, the net deficit had been reduced to just over $1.4 billion, in spite of rising defense expenditures in Southeast Asia. Arms sales by the Pentagon increased from about $300 million in 1961 to more than $1.3 billion in 1965; 1967 receipts are expected to exceed $1.5 billion.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has stated that his department is in "very close touch with the Defense Department on the sale of arms." The State Department's Office of Munitions Control coordinates arms sales by issuing or denying applications for the export or import of all articles on the United States Munitions List. Export licenses for Munitions List items are denied for areas under Communist control. But the State Department approves the shipment of arms to other states to meet what are considered to be legitimate defense needs and the requirements of internal security.

Secretary McNamara appears to believe that there is no reasonable alternative to intensified sales of U.S. weapons and, with the traditional rationalization of arms salesmen through history, states that if nations cannot buy them from us they will buy them elsewhere—from Britain, France or the Soviet Union, at higher prices.

But what is the effect of this policy?

The outbreak of war between India and Pakistan is a prime example which was of great concern to this country. Pakistan, which has recently been receiving military assistance from Communist China, is formally allied to us through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and is reported to have received from $1.5 to $2 billion in military assistance in the last decade. India, the largest democratic nation in the world, refused United States military aid until its borders were attacked, but it had been receiving arms from England. When it became clear that United States-supplied weapons were being used in the Indo-Pakistani war, many Americans must have wondered how our government could have allowed itself to become caught in such a contradiction. Nor was it any comfort when John Kenneth Galbraith, former Ambassador to India, stated before the Foreign Relations Committee on April 25, 1966:

"The arms we supplied . . . caused the war between India and Pakistan . . . If we had not supplied arms, Pakistan would not have sought a military solution [to the Kashmir dispute]."

Also of growing concern in the past several months has been the spiraling arms build-up in the Middle East, where tensions among the Arab states and between the Arab states and Israel have long threatened to explode.

Between 1950 and 1965, we supplied relatively small amounts of grant military assistance to the area: to Iraq $46,500,000, to Jordan $33,000,000, to Saudi Arabia $31,000,000. Now, however, Saudi Arabia is buying $400,000,000 worth of British supersonic jet fighters and U.S. Hawk missiles. Jordan has received U.S. tanks, and on April 2 the

State Department announced that the United States had agreed to sell Jordan "a limited number" of supersonic fighter-bombers, reportedly Lockheed F-104s. It is not clear how Jordan, which has an annual per capita G.N.P. of $233 and which has been dependent on U.S. military grants and economic aid, will pay for these planes, which cost some $2,000,000 apiece. The availability of U.S. credit for arms purchases is undoubtedly an important factor.

(The State Department has been under special pressure in the case of Jordan because of our sale to Israel of weapons that had previously been promised by Germany under an arms deal cancelled last year.)

Secretary Rusk on January 28, 1966, stated, "We have tried over the years . . . not to stimulate and promote the arms race in the Near East and not to encourage it by our direct participation." But it is difficult to reconcile the State Department's policy of refraining from becoming a major supplier of arms with the aggressive arms sales program conducted by the Pentagon.

The United States appears to be abandoning its traditional policy of non-involvement in the Middle East arms competitions in favor of trying to maintain arms "balance" in the interest of political and military stability. But it is difficult to believe that the increasing supplies of sophisticated weapons in the area will contribute to the maintenance of peace or the reduction of tensions.

Tensions between Latin American states are not high at present, but our military assistance through grant aid or sales to some countries appears to be increasing, with Argentina agreeing several months ago to buy fifty jet attack planes from the Douglas Aircraft Company. At the same time, the Chileans are attempting to buy planes from us for defense against Argentina.

One may well question the desirability of strengthening military elements in countries that are, to a greater or lesser extent, trying to move away from a tradition of dominant influence of the military on political affairs, and endeavoring to develop democratic societies dedicated to freedom and social progress.

Among President Johnson's recent proposals to the Disarmament Conference meeting in Geneva is a suggestion that "countries, on a regional basis, explore ways to limit competition among themselves for costly weapons often sought for reasons of illusory prestige." On April 19, 1966, the U.S. delegate to the Disarmament Conference elaborated further the principles by which nations might undertake, on a regional basis, to limit conventional arms. If such regional arrangements could be concluded, potential suppliers should pledge to respect them and not deliver arms to the area.

But the Defense Department's guidelines for its arms salesmen give little encouragement to those who would favor restraint. Its pamphlet, *Information and Guidance on Military Assistance*, states:

"The Department of Defense has embarked on an intensified military assistance sales program.

"Achievement of . . . objectives calls for a very substantial increase over past sales levels. Success in this endeavor will be dependent in large measure upon effective sales promotion. The DOD has taken several steps to assist in the successful conclusion of military sales. . . . Foreign customer preference for U.S. material is being generated by developing an appreciation of its technical superiority, price, availability, and the offer of follow-on support through U.S. logistics systems.

"In many cases, credit arrangements may be made to facilitate military sales, on short or long term basis as needed."

It seems to be a case of the left hand of the government trying to control what the right hand is busily promoting.

Former Ambassador Galbraith has stated: "The policy of arming the indigent . . . has long since acquired a momentum of its own. It owes its existence partly to habit, partly to vested bureaucratic interest, partly to the natural desire to avoid thought and partly because to stop doing what is wrong is to confess past error."

He suggests limiting arms aid to countries that have an annual per capita income of more than $200, except by specific Presidential determination.

At a minimum, one would hope for some rationalization of the United States policy on arms sales. There is evidence that the Soviet Union might welcome an opportunity to disengage from arms competitions, at least in the Middle East. The United States should pursue any such possibility and, at the same time, use its influence to persuade other major suppliers to agree to some form of conventional arms moratorium. Such a moratorium would be a further step in the direction of the general disarmament and nuclear weapons control which most of mankind so earnestly desires.

[From Forbes magazine]

Weapons sales abroad, 1962–65

[Defense Department estimates, in the thousands of dollars]

Company	*Sales*
General Dynamics:	
F–111A aircraft	1,072,000
Tartar missiles	34,400
Total	1,106,400
Lockheed:	
P–3A aircraft	23,500
F–104 aircraft	527,100
C–130 aircraft	409,300
Total	959,000
McDonnell Aircraft: F–4 aircraft	703,000
Lockheed-General Dynamics: (joint venture), Polaris missile system	427,600
Both Iron Works-Defoe Shipbuilding: (joint venture), guided missile destroyer (DDG)	277,600
Martin Marietta: Pershing missile system	253,100
Raytheon: Hawk missile system	231,800
FMC: Armored personnel carrier, M–113	166,800
Chrysler: Tank, 105 mm. gun, M60A1	154,200
Sperry Rand: Sergeant missile system	149,700
Ling-Temco-Vought: F–8E aircraft	66,000
General Motors: Howitzer, 155 mm., M–109	56,500
Boeing: C–135F aircraft	53,000
Pacific Car & Foundry: Gun, 175 mm., M–107	38,600
Grumman: S–2E aircraft	23,300

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT COMMISSIONING OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY SHIP "OCEANOGRAPHER"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke at the commissioning ceremonies of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Oceanographer*, the most modern oceanographic survey ship in the world, and the first research ship to be commissioned since the enactment of S. 944, the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966.

It is fitting that this new ship will be operated by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, our Nation's oldest scientific agency—established by another visionary President, Thomas Jefferson, to make a "survey of the coast" of the brand-new Nation.

July 13 was actually a double ceremony, for it marked the first birthday of ESSA, the Environmental Science Services Administration, created from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Weather Bureau, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards by Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965 in order to, in the President's words, "provide a single national focus for our efforts to describe, understand, and predict the state of the oceans, the state of the lower and upper atmosphere, and the size and shape of the earth."

The President's words were most encouraging to those of us who long have viewed the oceans and their abundant resources as vital to the future of our Nation and the world. They were particularly meaningful to me as they bring a promise of fulfillment to two important pieces of legislation I cosponsored: S. 944, the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, and S. 2720, to authorize the construction of pilot plants to produce fish protein concentrate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the President's comments printed in their entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE NEW RESEARCH SHIP, THE "OCEANOGRAPHER," NAVY YARD, PIER 2, 2:10 P.M.

Secretary and Mrs. Connor, Reverend Harris, Captain Wardwell, my beloved friend Senator MAGNUSON, Governor Burns of Hawaii, distinguished Members of Congress, guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet here today at the beginning of a new age of exploration.

To some, this might mean our adventures in outer space. But I am speaking of exploring an unknown world at our doorstep. It is really our last frontier here on earth. I am speaking of mountain chains that are yet to be discovered, of natural resources that are yet to be tapped, of a vast wilderness that is yet to be chartered.

This is the sea around us.

While our knowledge of the sea is quite primitive, we do know something of its great potential for the betterment of the human race and all mankind.

We know that we can, for instance, greatly improve our weather predictions. We can save thousands of lives and millions of dollars in property each year. We just must start learning more about the sea.

We know that the sea holds a great promise of transforming arid regions of the earth into new, rich and productive farmlands.

We know that beneath the sea are countless minerals and fuels which can be found and exploited. We know—most important of all—that the sea holds the ultimate answer to food for the exploding population in the world. Nearly four-fifths of all life, of all life on earth, actually exists in salt water.

Using science and technology, we must develop improved ways of taking food from the ocean.

But catching fish is just not enough. It has been said that throughout history we have been simple hunters of the sea. Men must now learn how to farm the sea.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

Our scientists are developing a process for turning whole fish into a tasteless but highly nutritious protein concentrate which can be used as a supplement to our daily diet.

In addition, the United States Senate has recently passed a bill for the construction of several pilot plants to begin the commercial development of this fish protein food. The daily output of one of these plants would provide enough high protein supplement for well over half a million people each day.

It is toward a goal of understanding all aspects of the sea that we have commissioned the *Oceanographer* today.

Oceanographer is one of the Coast and Geodetic Survey's 14 research ships which will begin to help us explore the environment around us. Her sister ship, *Discoverer*, is under construction and also will be commissioned shortly.

In the past decade, our support of marine science and technology has grown from some $21 million to more than $320 million.

The Federal research fleet today totals 115 vessels.

Our progress has been the handiwork, of course, of many men. These men are in and out of Government. But the Nation owes a very particular debt to those particular members of the Congress, men such as our distinguished Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, who is here today and whose efforts have accomplished so much for oceanography over the last decade.

I want to pay tribute to the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, all the employees of the Department of Commerce and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other Government officials.

But I also want to say that today we must redouble our efforts. In the months ahead, we shall establish our priorities, we shall then set our timetables—and we shall follow them, just as we have followed an orderly and relentless program for the exploration of space. And the distinguished Scientific Adviser to the President, Dr. Hornig, is going to keep seeing that we do this. The frontier of our deep challenges our spirit and we want to see that that challenge from the deep is fully met.

My Science Advisory Committee has recently completed a report on "The Effective Use of the Sea." Through Dr. Hornig I am releasing that report today. I should like to commend it to the attention of all Americans.

I commend it, in particular, to the 100 outstanding high school students who have joined us here today and who have come to the Capital from the States of this Union. I hope that there are among you some of the great oceanographers of tomorrow. You could not choose, in my judgment, a more important or a more challenging career.

I am referring this report from my Science Advisory Committee to the new National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering set up by statute under the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON. This Council will be headed by our distinguished Vice President; distinguished members of the Cabinet and others will serve on it.

This Council will survey all marine science activities to provide for this Nation a comprehensive program in this field. I will ask them to complete their initial recommendations by the time the new Congress convenes next January.

Truly great accomplishments in oceanography will require the cooperation of all the maritime nations of the world. Today I send our voice out from this platform calling for such cooperation, requesting it, and urging it.

To the Soviet Union—a major maritime power—I today extend our earnest wish that you may join with us in this great endeavor.

In accordance with these desires I am happy to announce that one of the first long voyages of *Oceanographer* will be a six-month global expedition in which the scientists from a number of our great nations will participate. It is our intention to invite Great Britain, West Germany, France, the U.S.S.R., India, Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand, Chile, and Peru to participate in the first round-the-world voyage of *Oceanographer*.

We greatly welcome this type of international participation. Under no circumstances, we believe, must we ever allow the prospects of rich harvest and mineral wealth create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

The sea, in the words of Longfellow, "divides and yet unites mankind."

So to Captain Wardwell and his distinguished officers and men of *Oceanographer*, we say today: Yours is a most worthwhile mission. May you bring back much for the benefit of all humanity.

We congratulate you on the commissioning of your marvelous new ship. We wish you the best of results, fair winds, and smooth sailing.

And now I look forward with a great deal of personal pleasure to the opportunity to view the ship and some of the developments at first hand.

Thank you very much.

FEEDING 100 SENATORS?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we have all enjoyed and benefited from the expert management of Mr. Robert Parker, chef of the Senate Restaurant in the Capitol.

I am pleased to see that Mr. Parker's finesse in operating the restaurant is becoming well known elsewhere as well as on Capitol Hill. An article in the Star-Ledger of Newark, N.J., on July 10, 1966, noted that a 14-hour day is often spent by Mr. Parker in doing his work. It says that he delights in the "unexpected."

As chairman of the Senate Rules Subcommittee on Senate Restaurants, I am pleased to have the work of Robert Parker made public. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FEEDING 100 SENATORS? NO TREAT FOR THE CHEF

(By Vera Glaser)

The care and feeding of 100 U.S. Senators is enough to give any man a nervous stomach and Robert Parker, maitre d'hotel at the famous Senate restaurant in the Capitol, has one.

But the handsome, conservatively dressed Negro is too busy keeping track of the food foibles of the famous to worry about his own. From apple butter to zucchini, Robert knows what the lawmakers love to eat and loves nothing better than to produce it.

"They're all kings as far as I'm concerned," he said of his Senatorial bosses.

Sometimes Robert puts in 14 hours a day greeting, seating, and master-minding menus. He delights in the unexpected. A Senator may turn up for the breakfast, lunch or dinner with a princess, an astronaut, an ambassador, a lobbyist, or a plain old constituent.

"Is my credit still good, Robert?" Arkansas Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN often teases as he enters.

Once seated, he calls for a "McClellan hamburger" which means a ball of chopped steak cooked slowly on top of the stove, never flattened with a spatula, and brought to the table at medium doneness.

When Mississippi's courtly JOHN STENNIS appears for breakfast, everyone knows he wants his eggs over hard on a plate so hot it has to be carried in another.

And when Florida's SPESSARD HOLLAND requests his "Holland sandwich" the chef combines chicken and lettuce on whole wheat bread, seasoning slightly but using no butter or mayonnaise.

"Bring me what the big shots eat!" quips youthful GALE MCGEE of Wyoming, pointing to the mounds of toasted corn bread, a restaurant specialty automatically placed on the tables of West Virginia's ROBERT BYRD and RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas.

Vermont's GEORGE AIKEN has a standard lunch—soup, ice cream and coffee—and Oregon's WAYNE MORSE loves fried eggs and link sausage. Missouri's STUART SYMINGTON and Idaho's FRANK CHURCH are rare-roast-beef men. Robert personally selects their cuts in the kitchen.

The "Lausche salad," favorite of Ohio's FRANK LAUSCHE, is grapefruit and orange slices topped with a double scoop of raspberry sherbet.

LAUSCHE's fellow Ohioan, ROBERT YOUNG, is almost indifferent to food, but Virginia's WILLIS ROBERTSON delights in it. He often brings rabbit, ducks or fish from his hunting and fishing trips. The restaurant prepares these for him and his guests, adding plenty of hot spoon bread or biscuits which ROBERTSON douses in bacon grease and syrup.

Tucked away in a sideboard Robert keeps a jug of "Mountain Sourwood Honey" from Ribbon Gap, Georgia for Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, and a container of non-caloric sugar for GALE MCGEE to sprinkle over fresh strawberries.

As he hustles about, Robert listens for the bell signals denoting roll call votes or quorum calls. If a Senator is too absorbed in talk to hear them, Robert touches his shoulder to remind him he is needed on the floor to vote.

The Senator's dining room is tucked away behind the public eating area in the Capitol's north wing. It seats 130 and stays open as long as the Senators, wives, and administrative assistants are admitted.

Even more exclusive is the "inner sanctum" across the hall. There, in two chandeliered chambers known as the "Republican Room" and the "Democratic Room," each seating about a dozen, the lawmakers can escape and take nourishment in the company of only fellow Senators.

Staffers with urgent messages simply have to pass notes to their bosses via Robert.

Inner sanctum regulars are Tennessee's Ross BASS and Illinois' EVERETT DIRKSEN. Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD usually eats at his desk.

"I doubt if three Senators know my last name," said the maitre d modestly. "Most of them call me Robert or Chief."

But at least two former Senators—President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY—know Robert well.

Almost 20 years ago, Parker, a native of Houston, Texas, returned from service in World War II, took a job as postman and began delivering mail to the Johnson residence. Sometimes he helped little Lynda Bird and Luci Baines cross the street.

He knew the family cook, Mrs. Zephyr Wright, with whom he had gone to Bishop College in Marshall Texas.

When the Senate Majority Leader had a heart attack in the mid-fifties, Robert made a special after-hours trip to deliver a letter to him at Walter Reed hospital, a thoughtfulness LBJ never forgot.

Recently the President popped in at a luncheon given by Maine's Margaret Chase Smith, spotted Robert, and greeted him warmly.

"Hold the soup until I finish my speech," he said.

Robert's friendship with the Vice President who was instrumental in getting him his present job dates back to his days as maitre de at Twining Court Stables, a favorite Humphrey haunt.

He cherishes a photograph autographed by Humphrey, "To Robert Parker, a gentleman and a friend."

* * *

With the backing of restaurant manager Joseph Diamond, Robert has improved the service and atmosphere in the Senators dining room, rearranging tables, keeping fresh flowers on each one.

Recently Senator Russell Long complained that the food in the restaurant was not up to Louisiana's gourmet standards and asked Robert to draw up a list of items needed to perk up the menu.

During adjournment the room will be redecorated in off-white. There will be new draperies and new china, crystal and silver bearing the seal of the United States.

* * *

There is some question whether the other 99 Senators want anything fancier than they have now. Currently the most popular items are beef on bun (80 cents), bean soup (25 cents) and toasted corn bread (10 cents).

In four years on the job Robert has never said no to a Senator, but he admits the pressure can get a little rough at times.

"You've got 24 tables. You've got 100 Senators. When they call for a table and you don't have it, you've got to produce somehow. I don't know how I do it some days. You've got to be on the ball."

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION COMMITTED TO IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Bernard Boutin, the able new Administrator of the Small Business Administration, testified before the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking Committee this morning.

Mr. Boutin testified on the small business investment program which has been under severe attack.

The small business investment company program has been criticized because substantial Government and private money has been lost in the program. There have been a number of allegations of illegal and unethical conduct by those who have borrowed Federal money under this program.

Now, Mr. President. Mr. Boutin came into the Small Business Administration only 2 months ago. He has acted with speed and decisiveness to get the small business investment company program back on the track.

His statement spells out concisely just what Mr. Boutin has done and what he intends to do.

This Boutin statement also makes it clear that the SBA will do its best to give the American small businessman an increasing opportunity to secure equity and long-term capital. That is the prime purpose of the program.

Mr. Boutin recommended legislation as well as described administrative improvements he is instituting.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Boutin be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Before the Senate Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I very much appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you the current condition of the Small Business Administration's small business investment company program. My statement will be brief and my associates and I will be happy to answer any questions.

I would first like to discuss the legislative background of this program, our present overview of the program today, actions that we have taken in the last 60 days and will be taking in the days immediately ahead to improve the program, and, finally, our longer range views for the future. It is, of course, our basic intention to bring this program to the point where the objectives of the Congress at the time the act was passed are fully realized. The objective of the program is to "stimulate and supplement the flow of private equity capital and long term loan funds which small business concerns need for the sound financing of their business operations and for their growth, expansion and modernization."

From the time the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was passed until the present, there have been a number of amendments which have been enacted to strengthen the program in the light of operating experience.

The current status and the present legislation may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. A small business investment company is incorporated under the laws of the State in which it is to operate.

2. A license is issued to a group of individuals who meet certain standards. A list of these standards is attached to the statement as appendix I.

3. An SBIC may obtain funds from the Government in two ways:

A. From 5 percent, 20 year debentures, in an amount equal to the privately invested capital but not to exceed $700,000.

B. From 5½ percent, 15 year loans, in an amount not greater than 50 percent of the amount of the privately invested capital plus the amount of government funds supplied in (A) above but not to exceed $4 million.

4. An SBIC may not borrow funds in excess of 4 times its statutory capital without prior approval. This amount must include all government borrowings under section 303.

5. SBIC's may invest their funds in small business concerns by straight loans and equity type investments with the following major provisions:

A. The amount of funds invested in real estate must not exceed one-third of their portfolio.

B. A 20 percent line limit of their statutory capital to any one concern.

C. Restrictions on affiliated transactions involving the principals of the SBIC.

D. All financing must be for at least five years.

6. SBIC's are given certain types of tax benefits which are shown in appendix II, attached.

SBIC's are subject to certain regulatory requirements:

1. Certain detailed financial reports must be submitted twice a year to SBA. The year end report requires certification of an independent accountant or CPA.

2. SBIC's must obtain SBA approval for certain kinds of transactions or changes in control.

3. SBIC's are subject to regular examinations by SBA Staff for which they are charged a fee.

Our activities under the SBIÇ program to June 30, 1966, may be summarized as follows:

1. There were 686 licensees remaining in the program, of which approximately 600 were licensed during the period from 1961 to 1963.

2. SBIC's have made in excess of 20,000 financings during the life of the program.

3. From the best information available, indications are that there are approximately 250 companies operating unsatisfactorily for any number of reasons including violation of our regulations. Most of these should not, and will not, remain in the program.

Involved in these companies is about $125 million of private funds and about $75 million of Government funds. While we do not have precise information, the former Deputy Administrator for the investment division has estimated that the Government might suffer losses from $18 to $20 million on these companies.

4. The total Government investment in SBIC's as of May 31, 1966, was $270,588,000 as compared to approximately $462,310,000 of privately invested capital as of September 30, 1965.

I am submitting for the record as appendix III a review of the legislative history of the Small Business Investment Act, as amended, and information concerning the formation and operation of the program under this legislation.

In the roughly 60 days that I have been Administrator, I have devoted much of my time to an evaluation of this program and based on the best information available I have reached conclusions which have been translated into actions to improve the program's performance. My primary intention, which I am sure members of the committee share, is to reinforce the original intent of the Congress when it enacted the Small Business Investment Act and which guided it when it made subsequent amendments. The Congress determined, and we agree, that small business concerns needed an additional source of equity and loan financing. There is nothing in my review which leads me to conclude that the legislation Congress passed in 1958 was in any way unsound. I am convinced that the small business community currently needs and will continue to need long term loans and equity financing from SBIC's.

Since it is my belief that the program was and is based on sound premises, I sought to determine whether it was meeting the goals that Congress had set and, if not, what could be done about it. I do not believe that the SBIC program to date has fulfilled the high hopes which its sponsors held for it. I have, however, seen much evidence that many SBIC's are operating clearly within the framework of congressional intent. We have evidence indicating that many SBIC's are making imaginative, needed contributions to sound, progressive small business concerns in all parts of the country and in many diversified fields.

We know of investments in small business which are playing important roles in the defense effort and I call your attention to attachment No. 1.

They have made investments in very small retail concerns and I refer you to attachment No. 2 which provides some interesting information. Investments have been made in small businesses in large cities, in the suburbs, in rural communities, in growth areas, and in distressed areas. Attachments Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 are examples.

New products are being marketed because of the timely financial assistance of SBIC's.

Investments in firms such as those developing processes for the desalinization of sea water, for example, are clearly serving national goals. I refer you to attachments Nos. 7 and 8.

While I recognize the many benefits to the small business community which have resulted from the participation of SBIC's, I nevertheless strongly feel that the SBIC program has hardly begun to reach its full potential. There are many possible explanations and rationales for the problems which have developed. The simple fact that making sound, long term investments in growing small businesses is an extremely difficult and complex undertaking is but an example. There are limited numbers of people with the background and experience that qualifies them to operate SBIC's successfully.

Some of the difficulties experienced in the program can undoubtedly be laid to the door of SBA itself. There are those who feel that earlier in the program there was undue emphasis on the rapid licensing of new SBIC's. There are others who feel that there may have been a tendency in the later stages of the program to concentrate on encouraging profitability of SBIC's. I believe, however, that no real useful purpose is served by looking to the past except that the errors of the past assist us now in developing a more successful program.

I commit myself and my associates in the months ahead to making SBA a strongly administered, well managed, financially responsible organization in conducting the affairs of the SBIC program.

Since one of the basic obligations of the program is to assist the small businessman, greater emphasis must be placed on this premise. I wholeheartedly concur with your excellent statement, Mr. Chairman, "that there has been too little concern for small businessmen who should be the main beneficiary of this program." The prime measure for success or failure of the SBIC program must indeed be the extent it will help the small businessman.

On the other side of the coin, I also support the profit motive as an important part of this program. We must design our administration of the program so as to attract private capital and competent management. The program must, by our rules and regulations, establish clear and certain operating limitations. These rules and regulations, however, must not be so arbitrary and inflexible as to be either unreasonable or unworkable from the standpoint of the SBIC operator.

Therefore, I intend to make it a cardinal rule that we must strike a balance between the interest of the small business community and the SBIC industry for the mutual benefit of both. This will assure the accomplishment of the national policy and make the most efficient use of the public funds which have been entrusted to our administration. I have begun a program to meet these objectives.

I have ordered a review of all current licensing standards to be completed within 60 days to make certain that applicants for licenses are highly qualified, of unquestioned integrity and are adequately financed.

I have instructed Mr. Greenberg and his staff to develop loan guidelines to be followed by the SBIC's and to provide a system of surveillance to see that this industry serves small business as intended.

I have instructed Mr. Greenberg to begin a study to determine whether existing licensees who entered the program under previous standards should be required to upgrade their operations to meet current or future higher standards and, if so, how much time they should be allowed to comply.

I have given instructions that no new licenses will be issued or transfer of control allowed unless the investment division is fully satisfied from meetings with the applicants that they are fully qualified under our regulations.

I have also established a firm policy that each SBIC will be thoroughly examined at least once each year. Each new licensee will be examined within six months after licensing or whenever it first requests Government funds, whichever date is earlier.

I have taken action to improve administrative control by transferring the examination and investigation function of SBIC's from the investment division to a newly created office of audits and investigations under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Administrator for Administration. This will give the Administrator an independent reading on SBIC operations as well as a tool for determining the adequacy of the management of the program.

Because I am fully satisfied that we have a great lack of current information and because it is essential that we have accurate information as soon as possible on every single SBIC licensed by SBA, I have instructed that all SBIC's currently licensed be fully examined within the next 120 days. I doubt that this can be done with our present staff but we will attempt to borrow qualified persons from other agencies to help us meet this requirement.

In the meantime we are moving as quickly as possible to eliminate from the program those SBIC's which show no promise of satisfactory or productive performance. We further are moving ahead at an accelerated pace to eliminate any undesirable elements from the program. We do not want them in the program. The industry does not need them in the program and I intend to get rid of them.

Looking to the future we also are examining very carefully additional actions we might take administratively. We have begun a review of our regulations, procedures and reporting requirements. This review will be completed in 60 days. Our initial review clearly indicates to me that they are deficient in some respects and unclear in others. We will move rapidly to clarify those needing clarification and to correct any deficiencies which exist.

We are giving serious consideration to lifting the present administrative restrictions on full borrowing under section 302 for debentures.

As I am sure this committee recognizes, one of the interesting aspects of the program is that SBIC's are not alike. Some are small companies in small towns while others are large and operate in major financial centers. Some borrow government funds while others do not. Some are profitable and some are not. It is impossible to generalize about SBIC's in terms of size, length of experience, geographical location or portfolio content. Our rules and regulations must be broad enough for general application but precise enough for individual situations.

The first protection of government funds is the private capital invested in SBIC's. To the extent that private capital becomes impaired, government risk increases. I am, therefore, studying the possibility of lowering the present 50 percent definition of impairment.

There are also ways in which SBA and the Congress can work together to further strengthen the program and we are currently studying all possibilities.

While I personally have no doubt of my authority and responsibility in the SBIC program, I understand there have been some doubts in the past. I, therefore, am strongly of the opinion that the language of section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 should be amended to assure that the investment program is subject to the same principles of management, control, and supervision as all other activities of SBA. I believe that the Administrator of SBA should clearly have full authority to organize and assign responsibilities within the agency for maximum management control and efficiency of operation. I believe, therefore, that specific reference to a deputy administrator for investment and to an investment division should be deleted from the statute.

We are also considering the possibility of recommending to the Congress legislation which would allow the SBA Administrator to oust undesirable operatives from the SBIC program.

Experience has shown that SBIC's affiliated with banks and other financial institutions have been generally better managed and have been more successful. (I might add, this also applies generally to publicly-owned SBIC's.) To encourage this type we are giving consideration to recommending to the Congress that the limit of permissible bank investments in SBIC's be increased from the present 2 percent.

Present law places two main limits on government fund availability to SBIC's—$700,000 under section 302 and $4,000,000 under section 303. These limitations place larger SBIC's at a disadvantage. We are giving serious thought to the possibility of requesting that these limits be either raised or eliminated in order to equalize leverage between small and large SBIC's and to allow both large and small to receive government funds at a ratio of 2 to 1. Presently, of course, only the smaller companies have this advantage.

We, further, are giving our attention to the need for better tools to enable SBA to act promptly and with authority whenever we find our regulations being violated. We may recommend to the Congress that SBA be given the authority to revoke licenses in administrative proceedings. Court action is now required to accomplish this.

We are also carefully evaluating various legislative proposals now pending before the Congress. An example is the legislation which has been introduced to establish an SBIC bank financed with Government funds. We believe that one way to measure the success of a program is the extent to which the Government's financial commitment can be reduced. We will also study the possibility of a privately financed capital bank. Such a bank might obtain part of its initial investment from the Government but would derive its main capital from SBIC's and other private financial sources wishing to become members. Such a bank could function as a secondary market for small business paper much as FNMA operates in the mortgage market. With a privately financed capital bank, SBA participation would likely be limited to licensing and regulation.

I am attempting, Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate to you and the members of your committee the fact that we are taking a comprehensive new look at the program. In some cases we have already drawn firm conclusions and have moved ahead rapidly to take corrective action. In other areas we are studying all of the alternatives and hope to have some sound proposals to discuss with the Bureau of the Budget and, if approved by them, with the Congress.

Undoubtedly, there have been abuses as well as violations of SBA's regulations. Also, undoubtedly SBA has not been as firm a manager as it should have been but it is my firm belief that this industry is capable of performing an important function in the national interest and that it is incumbent upon SBA to do everything possible to get the program on the right track and keep it there.

It has been suggested that the industry be given the authority to police itself. I believe it is too early in our history to place total reliance on self-policing. I will continue to explore this possibility and will work with the industry in developing an appropriate approach. We still have much to do to assure protection to Government funds in the SBIC program.

As I have stated earlier, one of our most pressing needs is accurate and current information. From steps already taken we will shortly have this need fulfilled.

We are anxious to work closely with this committee to find solutions that will assure on a long-term basis that this program fulfills the mandate of the Congress by helping to meet the needs of the small business community.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS CONCERNING REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, recent Supreme Court decisions have virtually nullified major provisions of the law concerning the registration of both individual Communists and officers of the Communist Party. As a direct result, the Communist Party of the United States held the first national convention of their party in many years in June of this year.

Mr. Lee Bandy, the noted Washington correspondent of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., covered this national convention and has written a series of articles on the Communist Party. These articles appeared beginning on Monday, July 11, through Thursday, July 14, and they are a model of journalistic excellence. They are written with complete objectivity and are interspersed with quotes from and observations about the leaders of the Communist Party and other groups who either had observers at the convention or were noted in the proceedings of the convention. In my judgment, these articles provide an invaluable insight into the thinking of the leaders of the Communist Party in the United States and should prove of inestimable worth to all the Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that these four articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, July 11, 1966]

THE BATTLE CRY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY: "OUR GOAL IS SOCIALISM FOR THE U.S.A."

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—"Our goal is socialism for the United States."

That's the battle cry of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as it breaks ground for its first "open" political year in the history of this country.

Party members claim their task is to win adherents to this goal among the American working people whom they consider the key crowd in crushing the government—big business "conspiracy."

CPUSA faithful, who just wrapped up a four-day 18th national convention in New York City, believe circumstances for accomplishing the goal are in their favor.

They cite successes in socialistic countries abroad and the conviction among growing numbers in this country that radical solutions are required for our economic and social problems.

The party members contend that questions of capitalism have created a soaring interest in the idea of socialism and a rise in socialist consciousness.

Suggesting CPUSA expand the propagation of the idea, American Communist officials urge comrades explain far more widely the nature and necessity of socialism, its accomplishments in the lands where it already exists, and its enormous potential for the American people.

Members admit socialism in this country is to serve as the basis for building to new heights the size and strength of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

They recognize the battle will not be easily won and that it will require scars, deaths and hardships along the way. However, they declare the fight will be waged come what may.

The starting point will be the American working class which, CPUSA leaders say, must be organized into a "people's party" to break the government-big business "conspiracy" against the poor man.

They also call for the election of an administration and Congress "representative of the anti-monopoly forces."

"The key to the direction of this country lies in the advancement to the center of the stage of the working class and its organized sector," they assert.

"DECISIVE FOR FUTURE"

"Overcoming the present weakness in labor's role is decisive for the future of our country, and it is to this that the progressive forces, and the communists in particular, must address themselves as the central task of the day."

In their struggle, CPUSA officials see encouragement on the horizon. They note:

"Prolonged, hard-fought strikes have become more numerous recently. The war on poverty has stimulated a wave of community organizations throughout the country for a real attack on poverty. And in the Negro people's struggle for full political, economic and social equality, emphasis is shifting more and more to basic economic demands.

"The need for a concerted attack on unemployment and poverty is becoming ever more pressing. At the heart of such an attack lies the fight for jobs, for massive public works programs and other government actions to provide employment, for a 30-hour week, for abolition of overtime for some while others go idle."

Moreover party leaders list as "musts" destruction of slum ghettos, aid to small farmers, rehabilitation of Appalachia, a comprehensive social insurance system, vastly-increased old-age pensions and unemployment benefits, a much higher minimum wage, and the application of such benefits to all workers.

To accomplish such goals, members say:

"We must mobilize the broadest possible coalition against the most reactionary, prowar and pro-fascist sections of monopoly capital, and by defeating these to create the base for mass pressure on those in power to shift their policies in the direction of peace and democracy."

They realize this will mean "a socialist reconstruction of society" through a "government of the working class."

The struggle, they add, will include combining "the most diverse forms of mass action and public agitation with the electoral and legislative process."

The Red officials point out that socialism in this country will bear the marks of the womb from which it springs. It will not be modeled after that in any other country.

"FEATURES OF AMERICA"

"It will reflect the distinct features of American historical development, tradition and environment.

"Socialism here will represent extension of democracy to its fullest, taking as its starting point the democratic traditions and institutions of the American people.

"We believe and advocate that American socialism will guarantee all the liberties contained in the Bill of Rights, including the right of the people to express themselves freely through organizations of their choice, through different parties and competing candidates.

"Indeed, the freedoms in the Bill of Rights will take on far greater substantive meaning because private ownership of corporate wealth . . . will have been eliminated. Economic democracy is the foundation for a new birth of freedom,

"Once man in the collective becomes master of the economy, man as an individual is freed from its oppressive weight. Making a living ceases to be the desperate struggle it now is; labor loses its onerous qualities and becomes a means of self-fulfillment. Man can at last rise above the animal, jungle level of struggle for existence."

CPUSA officials promise socialism will free this country "of a fountainhead of moral corruption, hypocrisy and degradation that has plagued it from birth."

They praise socialism as the "philosophy of optimism, the affirmation of human progress, of the human potential, of man's capacity to create a rational human society. It is the promise of singing tomorrows."

NEXT: The Communist Party and Civil Rights.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 12, 1966]

U.S. REDS HAVE BEEN CALLING FOR "BLACK POWER" SINCE 1959

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—The cry for "black power" is not new to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

It has been calling for it ever since 1959 when CPUSA adopted a resolution at the party's 17th national convention, recommending "Negro political power" today.

The official position, akin to "black power" demands in some Negro quarters now, stated six years ago that:

"Negro people in the U. S. must secure their full rightful share of government power. In those urban and rural communities where they are the larger part of the population generally, and in the Deep South area of the historic American cradleland of the Negro people particularly, they must constitute the majority power in government.

"POLITICAL STRUGGLE"

"In its essence, therefore, the struggle for Negro rights is not a mere 'civil rights' fight, it is a political struggle . . ."

Gus Hall, national secretary of the U. S. Communist party, referred to the resolution in his three-hour keynote address to the 18th national convention which just concluded in New York City.

Saying that the party had taken a "black power" stand some years ago, the top American Communists urged those "who say we are tailing events" to read the resolution.

The communist leader criticized persons who become alarmed when the question of "Negro political power" is raised and who looked upon such authority as a "woeful dilemma."

"Where Negro citizens are in the majority they must have the right to exercise political power. This means the transference of that power from the present minority (Whites) to them (Negroes) as the majority," he asserted.

Hall suggested as one avenue of approach the formation of Negro political groups like the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The election and candidacy of colored is another, he added.

James E. Jackson, identified as one of the party's Negro leaders, issued a statement during the convention expressing "deep appreciation for the important and continuing contribution of SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) and the Black Panther movement (in Alabama) to the cause of Negro representation—for majority Negro power in the areas of Negro majority, as well as for maximum representation where Negroes are in minority situations."

Stokely Carmichael, SNCC national director, started the "black power" cry while on the recent freedom march in Mississippi. He was joined later by members of the Black Panther crowd and Congress for Racial Equality (Core).

NAACP NOT CONNECTED

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has disassociated itself from the term.

Jackson told the Communist convention:

"We consider the fulfillment of the right of the majority to the power in local areas as an important task in the total program for full integration of Negroes in the nation on the basis of the reconstruction of full freedom and equality."

Turning its guns on other civil rights problems, the party adopted a resolution calling for an end to "grinding" poverty, mass unemployment, substandard wages, the "abominable" ghetto housing, and "above all the unbridled police brutality."

It praised the rioters in Watts for focusing the attention upon those problems, and thanked Dr. Martin Luther King and "large sections of organized labor" for carrying the same "banner."

The party members contend Negroes "are intimately associated with the struggles for shorter hours, higher pay, longer vacations, early retirement, public works programs, and all other measures to increase and raise living standards for all workers.

"To build such working-class solidarity calls for a much greater fight to break down the barriers of White chauvinism in the ranks of labor and to secure labor's full involvement in the economic and other struggles of the Negro people as part of their own, and not least to develop an all-out campaign to organize the South."

One aim of the U.S. Communist party, they say, is to destroy "the power of the Dixiecrats" and increase "election of Negroes to state legislatures and local offices" throughout the South.

VICTORY NOT WON

Party officials concede the basic victory is yet to be won, and major battles lie ahead which demand the commitment and concentrated efforts of all the forces of progress in the country.

Claude Lightfoot, identified as chairman of the Communist party's Negro Commission, declared his party is going to move openly into the civil rights fray whether other groups like it or not.

"We will allow no one in the civil rights movement or the White power structure to block us," he asserted. "Lily white America has not been disturbed too much. In some respects, the situation has deteriorated, especially in the area of economics."

He warned that unless forthcoming programs raise the level of incomes for Negroes there will be further outbursts like Watts and Chicago—the home of Lightfoot.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 13, 1966]

U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY—REDS TAKE CREDIT FOR YOUTH GROUPS

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—The Communist party, U.S.A., takes credit for the newly emergent left among college youth.

It claims the "radical" trend is "an outgrowth of the seeds we and others helped to sow."

In its youth report to the party's 18th national convention in New York City recently, the U. S. Communist party listed four student groups as by-products of its efforts:

The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which assertedly has "moved rapidly to the left" since its start in the civil rights fight.

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), called a "first link to left student activity."

W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, held to have "begun to show the relevance of a socialist approach."

National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Viet Nam.

ONE TAKES ISSUE

Clark Kissinger, national secretary of SDS, takes issue with U. S. Communist claims that his organization and other student left groups are a result of Red party activity.

The SDS leader, an observer at the convention, notes his group was in existence long before the U. S. Communist party was ever organized in this country.

Kissinger adds, however, "we will be glad to work with the Communist party on specific programs." He didn't elaborate.

The U. S. Communist party decries what it calls "ultra-left" youth organizations, citing Youth Against War and Fascism, Young Socialist Alliance, Progressive Labor Party and the May 2nd Movement.

It says these groups have siphoned off talent "into hopelessly narrow and sectarian positions" that "view as a 'sellout'" any struggle that doesn't demand "socialism now."

The U. S. Communist party complains that such groups split coalitions seeking "limited goals."

It urges the "ultra-left" to participate in "united front struggles with the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy or other predominantly middle class peace organizations."

Kissinger doubts the American Communists will be successful in their efforts to unite all left groups under the CP banner.

"Too many of the organizations want to run their own show," he points out. "Also, many of the groups have differing ideologies."

The U. S. Communist party believes the "ultra-left" is not aware that refusal to unite is "destructive."

Consequently, the party says its purpose should be to show the "fringe" groups "that revolutionary militance is not in contradiction with the fight for democratic unity.

"We Communists do not see the newly emerged left as a force separate and antagonistic to our party or from the long radical tradition of America, but rather as an outgrowth of the seeds we and others helped to sow."

For some new left groups, the Communist party says, "a radical reorganization of society has become at least a vague socialism. For others, socialism is already taking on a scientific meaning and is leading them to study Marxism and to consider joining the Communist party."

It notes "direction of the new left has been to move closer to Marxism," but at the same time various problem areas exist.

One is that "the majority of the youth movement has not picked out the socialist alternative and become committed to it." However, the party observes "there is a willingness to study these alternatives."

It points out that objections are raised in questions such as:

"Socialism is fine but will it work?"

"Socialism is fine but is it possible to achieve?"

The U.S. Communist party contends "there is a new seriousness to these questions that reflect the leftward trend of the Democratic movement."

Gus Hall, national secretary of the American Communist party, told the convention delegates the "youth are now the spirit and the pace-setters of our party.

"They have stood up against the most inhuman brutalities. Their voices have made 'We Shall Overcome' the song of bravery and heroism throughout the world."

The party's youth commission asserts the nation has 100,000 or more young people in a "conscious left component." About 2,000 of them are members of the U.S. Communist party, it reports.

The panel estimated that "at least two million students" had taken part in teach-ins against the Viet Nam War, and "at least one million youth in some other action against the war."

The party leaders admit one of the problems facing the organization is the current age gap between the older officials and the younger sect.

Both discuss the same basic political themes—imperialism, monopoly capitalism, working class struggle.

But they represent two generations, two sets of attitudes so diverse that they find it increasingly hard to get along together under the same red flag.

Robert Duggan, 27, a Los Angeles plasterer's son, says:

"The youth are sharper, more willing to take stands. Anything that's been done in the party during the last four years is the work of young Communists."

Arnold Johnson, 61, public relations director for the party and a member since the 1930's replies:

"What you have here is the impatience of youth. There are, admittedly, some problems of rapport."

There are growing indications the under-30 group is finding its elders more narrow than they expected.

The first clear suggestion of a clash came at the convention when Bettina Aptheker, a founder of the Free Speech Movement, criticized party leadership for underplaying the role of youth.

The effect of the age * * * suggested, was to turn youth leftists away from the party toward such organizations as Students for Democratic Society.

Duggan, who heads a group of Communist-oriented youth clubs in Los Angeles, admits to being troubled by dark interludes in the party's past and questions "the ugly aspect of the old ways."

Older leaders answer that Duggan's generation fails to appreciate the need for discipline and solidarity.

"You've got to understand," Johnson said, "that we'd like to get them into positions of leadership. But we've got to loosen up first."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 14, 1966]

TO GUN FOR OPPONENTS OF COMMUNISM—AMERICAN REDS PREDICTING VICTORY IN POLITICAL ARENA WITHIN 2 YEARS

(By Lee Bandy)

WASHINGTON.—The Communist Party, U.S.A., launches a new political year with an air of confidence never before exhibited in CPUSA history.

The members are predicting "victory" in the political arena with the next two years and destruction of capitalism in the "distant future."

Gus Hall, national secretary of the party, says a chief aim is to organize a "people's party" for the purpose of dislodging opponents of communism from their "dominant political position."

He declines making any forecast, adding:

"Only the naive would now either try to set it up or predict when and how it will make the scene. It will be a reflection of a qualitative shift in the relationship of political forces.

"However, it is also not enough to say it is inevitable. It is necessary for the more advanced forces constantly to project the idea into the political dialogue."

The CPUSA leader cites as encouragement a movement for "independent political action" across the country. Such, he contends, must be organized into a political force to destroy "the two old parties of capitalism."

Hall sees independent movements within the Democratic Party—such as the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, California Democratic Council and New York Insurgents—as an indication of growing dissatisfaction with party machine politics.

He recognizes "these forces" need a political home but that they're not ready for it at this stage of the game; that they still prefer an attachment to a political party.

But the Red official predicts the independents will eventually break the two-party orbit and join a united front.

Hall considers political independence "a very important step." He says "it is a necessary political development before there can be organizational independence—before there can be a people's party."

The party leader takes delight in polls showing a drop in popularity of President Johnson, contending it reflects a growing independent mood among Americans.

He asserts that "grass-roots movements" for an alternative to the chief executive are already in progress across the country.

The idea, Hall adds, "is an undercurrent in the entire civil rights field. It is discussed in relation to the economic needs of the people, the war on poverty, and the problems arising out of automation."

He notes that in some areas "the discussion is already around personalities and the form for advancing an alternative." He declines to disclose any names.

However, the American Red suggests independents "gather their forces now" and "set in motion the movement that will present to our people an independent candidate for President in 1968."

He says "the way to prepare for such a campaign is to build and stimulate the forces of independence in the 1966 elections."

That, he adds, will include the election of peace, Negro, labor and left candidates Nov. 8.

"The concept of defeating the candidates of the ultra-right in 1966 is a necessary preparation for 1968," Hall declares. "Insofar as it depends on us, there are going to be Communist candidates from now on.

"We want to declare: we have put our very best foot forward," the party leader says.

He recognizes CPUSA has never talked this bravely before—at least out in the open. But he notes:

NEW UPSURGE

"The past several years have witnessed a pronounced rise in the strength and prestige of the Communist Party. This has taken place within the framework of the new upsurge of the left, marked by the formation of a number of new youth organizations, the appearance of new publications, and the greatly increased stature of Marxist theory in the country."

Halls boasts the party "has succeeded in stabilizing itself and is once again on the upgrade." He says:

"There is a growing interest in the ideas of Communists among the American people, and there is an unprecedented opening of doors in all communication media. There is a mounting influx of young people into our ranks. The party has broken out of its isolation and today truly speaks to millions."

The CPUSA official credits that to a "series of important victories in the party's fight for legality."

He thanks the Supreme Court for upholding the rights of Reds to hold union office, obtain passports and to work in industry.

"The decision of the Supreme Court nullifying the McCarran Act provision requiring members of the Communist Party to register opens the door to greater freedom of action for the Party, Hall declares.

FIGHT NOT ENDED

He points out, however, the fight for legality is far from ended. "Prosecution under the McCarran Act, tax harrassments, HUAC (House Un-American Activities Committee) witchhunts and other persecutions continue." But he contends:

"The fight against these takes place in a period of mounting democratic struggles; hence, possibilities exist for further democratic victories and for the further strengthening of the party."

Hall warns CPUSA members to remain on the alert for "we are not on a path free of problems . . . The Department of Justice is still publicly proclaiming that it will seek new indictments. We have illusions about the dangers of continuing attacks.

"But we also have a sense of confidence that in their defense of the democratic rights of all Americans, the masses will demand the assurance of our party's right to place its position in the market place of ideas."

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] performed a singular service yesterday when he introduced a bill to establish a joint committee to make a continuing study of the programs and operations of the Federal Government relating to science and technology.

This is an excellent proposal. It has my 100-percent support. I urge Senators and Congressmen to give it their close attention and strong support.

In 1954 the Federal Government spent approximately $3 billion for research and development. In 1967 it will spend over $16 billion.

This is the age of technological explosion. The development of computers, the computerization of technology, the technological development of the results of scientific study and the great burst of scientific research mean that our economy, our thinking, and our way of life are being radically changed. The Congress if it is to maintain some intelligent control and guidance over Federal expenditures for research and development must expand its scientific competence and understanding.

I have seen this need with ever greater clarity since I came to the Senate 8 years ago. I have spoken numerous times to the Senate on this subject.

I believe the growth of science presents the Congress with a major challenge. If the Congress does not meet this challenge the very principle of representative government will be endangered.

As I said on July 30, 1963:

> Increasingly, policy decisions made on programs and funds for science and technology affect in their full relevancy not only the security of the country but the liberty and privacy of every human being everywhere. If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions and that it have a role in the making of them. At the present time Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions and as a result they are made, not in the halls of Congress but elsewhere, not by the elected representatives but by unknown administrative officials.
>
> In this world of cataclysm, change, and of almost impossible complexity representative democracy is put to severe test. How is a popularly elected government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they cannot understand with implications they do not comprehend?

The President has shown that he is quite aware of the importance of coordinating and comprehending the Federal scientific effort. His small but expert Office of Science and Technology serves him well in this capacity.

The Library of Congress in its new Science Policy Research Division under the direction of Edward Wink does an excellent job of assisting the Congress as it struggles to participate intelligently in the making of scientific and technological decisions.

More help is needed. The Congress needs competent advisers within its own house. And that is what the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] proposes to establish with his bill which proposes a joint committee modeled after the Joint Economic Committee. He proposes that the President furnish the Congress each year with a report on the Federal Government's scientific programs. This report would be similar in kind to the President's annual economic report. The joint committee would have no legislative authority because it would need none. By means of hearings and studies it would review the President's report and the Government's programs, and it would make such recommendations to the Congress as it felt necessary. I support this measure, and I intend to provide whatever assistance I can to obtain favorable congressional action upon it.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of meeting and chatting with the distinguished jurist and scholar, Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in my office yesterday.

It was a most enjoyable and fruitful meeting, as I have for many years been most impressed by his able and determined defense in the famed Sacco-Vanzetti case, and rank myself amongst the admirers of his laudatory and distinguished career. So that my colleagues may share his profound testimony before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights regarding the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO BEFORE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, CONSIDERING CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS, ROOM 2228, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, JULY 13, 1966, 10:30 A.M.

I respectfully urge the enactment into law of Senate Bill S. 3296. Some of the opponents of this measure, and its companion bill H.R. 14765 in the House, have argued that this proposed legislation would invade fields exclusively belonging to the States. I do not agree with this contention and would say, to the contrary, that I doubt the Federal Government, when the need is apparent, the situation crucial, and the threatened harm irremediable, may ever exceed its authority in intervening to safeguard the constitutional rights of a United States citizen.

Not long ago a man convicted of murder in Pennslyvania sought a new trial because one of the jurors was related to the victim of the homicide, and another juror was kinsman to the chief prosecuting officer. Our court refused a new trial. I dissented. The defendant filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court and won a new trial on the very ground which had been ruled out by the highest court of Pennsylvania. I felt very happy about this Federal "Samaritanism", not because my position had been vindicated, but because the United States Government, through its judiciary, had prevented a denial of due process.

I rejoice that Senate Bill 3296 empowers the United States courts to intervene when the State courts deny to a United States citizen his right to serve on a grand or petit jury on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin or economic status. The cause of justice in America will also be advanced by section 501 which makes it a federal offense for anyone to injure or interfere with any person "because of his race, color, religion, or national origin while he is . . . participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege . . . or activity provided or administered by the United States or by any State or subdivision thereof."

If this provision had been law in 1927, one of the most appalling miscarriages of justice in the history of the United States courts would have been prevented. It was my privilege to have been associated with United States Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, then professor at Harvard Law School, in the defense of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti in the latter phase of that tragic case. It was proved that the foreman of the Jury, Harry H. Ripley, entertained hostility to Sacco and Vanzetti because of their Italian origin, and stated that if he had his way, Italians would not be allowed to enter the country. Before he even heard a word of testimony Ripley remarked to a friend: "Damn them [Sacco and Vanzetti] they ought to hang anyway."

Sacco and Vanzetti were participating in a privilege, the right of trial by jury guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and the State of Massachusetts. Ripley's declared hostility interfered with that right and contributed to the execution of two innocent men.

To prevent any misunderstanding at this point, let me state at once that, as much as I applaud the efficacy of the provisions of this proposed legislation, I do not want you to think that I am claiming for it retroactive jurisdiction or resurrectional powers. Sacco and Vanzetti are dead, and nothing will recall them to the land of the living, but this bill, when enacted into law, would impel state officials into doing their duty and not neglecting, as certain Massachusetts officials did, their bounden and sacred obligation to the law and elementary justice, to say nothing of fundamental humanity, decency and American fair play.

If the provisions of this bill had been in effect two months ago, I doubt that James Meredith would have been shot down while he was walking on a public highway, armed only with a walking stick and the Holy Bible under his arm. James Meredith was participating in a program provided and administered by the State because he was seeking to have Negro American citizens register under the voting laws of the State. I am absolutely certain that any person or persons charged with having wounded James Meredith will be properly tried in accordance with law, and I do not mean by my reference to that case to suggest anything to the contrary.

The colloquialism "Don't make a Federal case out of it," is intended to indicate the gravity, solemnity, and importance that attach to a Federal prosecution, and properly so. Had this present bill been law in early June, James Meredith would have walked the highways in a continuing protective aura of United States law, and it is probable that the great fear that any intending assailant would have felt in becoming involved with the sovereignty and austerity of United States law might have been enough to stay aggression. Indeed, had this bill been law prior to June 5, 1966, it may well be that James Meredith would not have started on his fateful journey.

No one can question the majesty and the greatness of the United States. Whether we see the words "United States" on a spaceship orbiting the earth, on a document of history, or stamped on the haversack of an infantryman, we thrill to the image it evokes of unsurmountable power, superb dignity and undeviating impartiality in the administration of justice. The United States Government is the greatest government in the world, as the country for which it speaks is indubitably the most wonderful of nations that ever existed, flourished and progressed in the tide of times.

The right to appeal to an authority beyond local sovereignty has basis in biblical history. When Saint Paul was hailed before Festus, Governor of Caesaria, to give answer for alleged transgressions of the law, and he feared justice might not come from the provincial judgment seat, he asked to be judged by the central authority in Rome, he asked to be sent to Augustus. And as a Roman citizen, he was accorded that right.

Senate Bill 3296 would assure to every American citizen the right to appeal to the central authority of the land. The Constitution of the United States, to which we turn not only for inspiration, encouragement and strength, but also for authority and power to transform into reality the dreams and the aspirations of America, declares in its preamble: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure Domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The people, and not the individual States, ordained the Constitution and so the first responsibility is to the people. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, for this reference to the obvious, and apparent emphasis on the patent, but so much has been said about the alleged unconstitutionality of this proposed legislation that I allow myself simply to point to a mountain range when so many see only marshes and a desert. One need go no further than the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States to find not only justification for this legislation, but indeed a mandate for it. More than that, these three amendments were forged in the fires of the Civil War, sanctified by the blood of those who were wounded and killed in that conflict, and adopted by the people when the emancipation of the Negro population was the immediate subject of consideration and not simply an academic topic for discussion or governmental experimentation. It could well be that the laws already on the statute books and the decisions of the highest Court of the land already embossed on the pages of our books of jurisprudence are adequate for the authoritative projection of the principles enunciated in this legislation and that all that is required now is the detailed planning for effectuating in practice the constitutional ends to be accomplished. In 1866, after the adoption of the 13th amendment but before the 14th amendment was attached to the organic instrument of the land, Congress enacted the first Civil Rights Act which provided that: "Citizens of every race and color shall have the same right to purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property as is enjoyed by white citizens."

The Civil Rights Act of 1875 provided that: "No citizen, possessing all other qualifications which are or may be prescribed by law, shall be disqualified for service as grand or petit juror in any court of the United States, or of any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

One of the magnificent virtues of Senate Bill 3296 is that it is primarily preventive rather than retaliatory in operation. It places in the hands of government a weapon, wholly painless in performance and yet far more effective than the punitive provisions of the past. Criminal sanctions step in after the constitutional right has been denied. Equity locks the stable door before the horse is stolen.

Section 202 declares that when it appears that a citizen of the United States is about to be deprived of his right to serve as a juror, the Attorney General may institute equity proceedings to prevent the threatened deprivation.

Had Senate Bill 3296 been law in 1925, the tragedy of the Sweet case in Detroit would never have stained the social fabric of our nation. In June of that year, Dr. Ossian Sweet, a young, talented, Negro physician in Detroit purchased a house in a foreign-born workingman's section of Detroit. An organization which became known as the Waterworks Park Improvement Association formed to keep Dr. Sweet out of his home. The first night that Dr. Sweet and his wife, with friends, stayed in the house, a mob formed and pelted it with stones and its occupants with threats. No serious disturbance occurred but the conduct, cries and agitation of the restless throng was as prophetic of what was to follow as the rumble of thunder, a high wind carrying dust into the air and an occasional flash of lightning proclaims the coming of a storm. The next night the storm broke. Five hundred mobsters rushed the house calling out, with opprobrious terms: "Get them! Get them!" In the ensuing tumult a shot was fired and one of the invaders, Leon Breiner, was killed. The eleven occupants of the house were charged with murder. Two trials followed. I heard Clarence Darrow deliver his masterful oration in the second trial.

I say that had this bill been law in 1925, Leon Breiner would not have lost his life and this sorrowful chapter in the social history of our nation would not have been written. Section 405 of the bill provides:

"No person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or interfere with any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his having aided or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of any right granted by section 403 or 404."

On the first or second day of Dr. Sweet's occupancy of the house he had purchased, the Department of Justice would have filed an action in the United States District Court to enjoin the Waterworks Park Improvement Association from gathering to accomplish its diabolic deed, and any mob which might have followed would have found itself attacking not poor Dr. Sweet, but confronting the might and the power of the indomitable United States.

It is not enough to have a right: there must be a way to have it respected. Thus it is that while civil rights are guaranteed by the Constitution, by statute and court decisions, their enjoyment is often curtailed and even made impossible by harassment, subterfuge, subtle threat and outright defiance. Hence the necessity for the supervision, the control and the machinery so well described in this excellent bill.

Mr. Chairman, I may say here that in 1955 our Pennsylvania Legislature established a Human Relations Commission to carry into effect the legislatively declared policy of our Commonwealth "to foster the employment of all individuals in accordance with their fullest capacities . . . and to secure commercial housing regardless of race, color, religious creed, ancestry or national origin."

Mr. Chairman, I would not abuse your kindness in honoring me with the opportunity to appear here to speak on this vital legislation, by repeating arguments, reasons and statistics with which you are already familiar. Our President, in urging enactment of this legislation, already has delivered an informative, stirring and eloquent appeal to the mind, heart and conscience of the nation. The Attorney General presented you with a masterful analysis of this bill in all its particulars, leaving hardly anything to doubt or surmise.

And now it is in the hands of Congress. It is a matter of infinite comfort to me that the Congress of the United States, in this new era of American history, has here on Capitol Hill been transforming legislative Sermons on the Mount for the poor, the sick, hungry, aged, economically disabled, oppressed, overburdened and underprivileged into bread, medicine, hospital beds, school houses, jobs, pensions, suffrage, human dignity, and all the rest. Government is no longer cold and aloof. It is warm, it throbs with understanding and compassion. This particular legislation calls for physical security, for peaceful participation in the administration of justice, for unhampered education and for freedom of the home for all people.

I have no fear that the enactment of this legislation will undermine, as opponents say, our dual form of government and make the federal authority too powerful. Federal sovereignty cannot be too powerful in advancing the interests, the freedoms, and the destiny of American citizens. Each time I look at this transcendentally beautiful Capitol I see in it the Declaration of Independence in imperishable stone, the Constitution of the United States in perpetual marble, and, in its graceful dome soaring in the skies, I see the assurance that the representatives of the people assembled thereunder are dedicated to obtaining for them the rights, to which, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "the laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them."

THE RIGHT OF DISSENT: FROM THE CAMPUS TO THE CAPITOL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on July 6, 1966, Senator Gale McGee gave an address before the student body at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg., concerning "The Right of Dissent: From the Campus to the Capitol."

I believe Senator McGee's speech is worthy of being placed in the Congressional Record. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his remarks be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Right of Dissent: From the Campus to the Capitol

(Address by Hon. Gale McGee, Oregon State University, July 6, 1966, Corvallis, Oreg.)

Until recent years, it was a sacred axiom of American politics that academic life and political life did not mix. Professors in the political arena were few and far between. For a budding candidate for public office to be suspected of professorial traits was tantamount to political suicide. Yet when I arrived on the political scene in 1958, straight from 23 years in the classroom, the event was heralded by some observers as the beginnings of a new transition that would some day enmesh the Halls of Ivy with the Halls of Government. That day is now upon us.

The Russians are suspect for having aided and abetted this new trend with the launching of Sputnik in October of 1957. For since that event, academics in public office have continued to multiply; and their acceptability at the ballot box has risen steadily. In a sense, the electorate was probably frightened into the necessities of the new political integration by the stark discovery that even the Communists in Moscow were capable of great scientific feats. But the fact that it continues to happen is important to the new profile of the politics of responsible, free government.

What was an orderly transition for nearly a decade has suddenly been thrust stage center by a single issue—Vietnam. Both in campus teach-ins and in Senate hearings, the dominant force has been dissent. The form and implications of that dissent have sometimes obscured the main focus of the war itself. Therefore, in a university forum setting such as this one at Oregon State University, it is doubly significant that students, scholars, and public officials have a hard look at the "Anatomy of Protest." In the few minutes at my disposal, I propose to examine the impact of Vietnam on the Right of Dissent—first, in the university forum and, second, in the Senate hearing room. Thus, the title of these remarks—The Right of Dissent: From the Campus to the Capitol.

For too long after World War II the college campus seemed altogether too quiet on public questions. Whether this was due to lethargy, or indifference, or a sense of making up for the time lost in the war is irrelevant to our purposes at the moment. The point is that the arrival of the late John F. Kennedy on the national, political horizon triggered a new and more acute sense of public interest among the new student generation.

In its initial resurgence, it was epitomized in the Peace Corps. But more to the point now, it has bloomed during the nationwide great debate on Vietnam. Because the preponderance of the publicity from the campus teach-ins has been critical of our Asian policy, the university has rightly or wrongly become a symbol of the attack on the Administration position. Perhaps I am especially entitled to defend the voices speaking out from the Halls of Ivy, not because of my own professorial days, but rather because I strongly believe in the present position of the United States in its firm stand in Vietnam. But equally, I believe in the traditional academic right—in fact, the obligation, of the campus to provoke dissent.

This is not to suggest that the dialogues on campus have always been conducted with circumspection. In too many instances they have lapsed into monologues, with the more extreme participants resorting to tactics beneath the dignity of honorable disagreement. Public policies have been described as reflecting the new imperialists, "power-mad" militarists, and warmongers out to conquer the world. Some of the critics may be professional revolutionaries, and some few even lack the credentials of campus residents. Some of them, too, might like to think they take orders from Moscow or Peking. But none of these should be used as an excuse to extinguish the obligation to inspire ferment on the campus.

In all fairness, the voices from the campus haven't been as one-sided as the headlines suggest. Protest always claims more attention than support. Willfully or otherwise, there has indeed been a distortion of the complete state of mind in the academic world. But more germane to our subject here tonight, the image that these vociferous protests and demonstrations from both students and faculty have projected has sometimes panicked those groups in the land who have solemnly assumed their self-appointed roles as keepers of patriotism and Americanism.

What concerns me is that we are about to be caught up in a series of witchhunts and new predatory raids on academic freedom—usually, of course, in the name of the Constitution but aimed at stifling the other point of view. Already it threatens to shut the doors on free inquiry and to inhibit free expression. In recent years this trend has made worrisome headway, aided and abetted by the resurgence of numerous extremist groups who have promoted a lucrative trade in suspicion, fear, hate, and smear.

The classroom, long a handy object of suspicion in the lexicon of the extremists, has suddenly become even more so because of the rising anxieties over Vietnam. That the current attacks on academic freedom may get out of hand is a serious prospect. The record is already replete with warning signals.

On one state university campus in the West, a Professor of English—identified at one time with SNCC—has come under attack from certain self-appointed censors of his conduct. His job remains in jeopardy. On another campus, a law against leftists speakers has been revived. This statute enacted by the North Carolina Legislature in 1963 prohibited Communists and pleaders of the Fifth Amendment from speaking at any state education institution.

Dr. Frank Graham, speaking about the Carolina law has said, "The free market of ideas in the historic American view is a basic part of the American tradition of free enterprise. 'Gag laws' repressing the freedom of assembly and speech are expressions of the totalitarian way and are contrary to the American way."

The North Carolina case is by no means the end of the line. Just across the border in neighboring Virginia the Virginia Department of one of the larger veterans' organizations adopted a resolution urging the State Assembly to ban Communist speakers on the campus. There are similar proposals pending in other states. It brings squarely into focus the right of a faculty and of student representatives to invite and to hear speakers of all persuasions, including the extremes of the right as well as of the left. Once leftist speakers have been banned, there is little defense left even for the extreme right-wingers.

With both of the extremes out of the way, what remains of the rights of the center? As John Donne put it so well, ". . . and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

A teach-in on the campus of the University of Miami in Florida prompted the use of one of the newer weapons of the extremists—the recorded telephone message. Invented by a Florida physician, W. C. Douglas of Sarasota, this device plays back messages previously recorded under the patriotic name "Let Freedom Ring." It can be connected into any telephone exchange around the country. Over 100 are now known to be in existence. It's a convenient tool for extremists coast to coast because of its particular advantage that it has not been the subject of regulation by the Federal Communications Commission, and the voices and sponsors of its often extreme accusatory messages remain strangely anonymous.

After the Miami teach-in, residents in the area were telephoned by unidentified callers and asked if they knew what was taking place on the campus of their very own university. If they wanted to know, they were told to dial 221-6767. In response to that number a woman's voice said in part, "This is 'Let Freedom Ring.' Last Tuesday night at Miami's own little, red schoolhouse, there was a strange assortment of pinks, punks, beatniks, and left-wing educators assembled for the purpose of pleading for a Soviet line against the Communists." An extended diatribe then proceeded to link anyone who had attended the teach-in with individuals who were accused of being Socialists, Communists, Pacifists, and oddballs. A United States Senator who participated was described as being "shoulder to shoulder with a Marxist who advocates selective assassination."

That such irresponsible and reckless assaults on character and on people in general excited the fears of otherwise well-meaning citizens was not surprising. The storm which threatened to engulf the campus jeopardized much more than the rights of the participants themselves.

It would be inaccurate, however, to leave with you the impression that such outbursts and assaults are the private property of extremist groups or of self-designated patriotic societies. The quest for "conspirators" and "plotters" behind our many complex public problems has readily found sponsors in the halls of Congress itself. A current member of the United States Senate has gone "Let Freedom Ring" one better. From a western campus, he sought to warn the world that "the little, red schoolhouse is redder than you think." He asserted that on the modern campus Communistic beatniks and foreign-born, fuzzy professors are destroying true Americanism.

Equally alarming was the outburst of a Member of the House of Representatives who has questioned whether a professor who had participated in a teach-in and was critical of Vietnam policy should be allowed to receive funds from the Federal Government. Mr. Congressman charged that for the professor to be granted those funds was a "shocking inconsistency."

What is even more "shocking" is that a Member of the Congress should raise such a question in the first place. Colleges and universities have always had to contend with those who wish to proscribe teaching and research with limits reflecting the political and cultural convictions of the time. But I agree with the thought embodied in a decision of the Supreme Court of this Nation which declares, "if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can order what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

It must remain a fundamental of Federal participation in education that such assistance never command conformity, nor limit the direction of inquiry, nor warp the substance of thought. To those who are upset with what one editorial writer described as "the cockeyed professors and pacifists and anarchists" on the campus, I would remind them that to enforce thought control upon our institutions of higher learning would do far more damage to our civilization and our Nation than can the fulminations of the most radical of students and the most irresponsible of professors.

Nor dare we take comfort in the lame hope that the current attacks are mere nitpicking assaults that will soon fade away. As our past history long since should remind us, such small beginnings can readily explode into dangerous attacks on everyone's freedom. It's not a very long step from the Vietnam critics to other critics. From Vietnam to the suspension of all unpopular dissent, it is but a short hop, skip, and a jump. Let us remember the warning of the venerable Tom Paine when he said, "He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression."

Even now the issue of academic freedom is assuming major proportions on the national, political scene. It reared its head a few months ago in the New Jersey gubernatorial contest where the question at issue was retaining a professor who embraced the Viet Cong on the payroll of a state school. More recently, it has popped up in the Governor's race in California. There the issue is a demand by one candidate for Governor to investigate affairs on the campus at Berkeley. The temptations for politicians to plunge into predatory missions on the campuses of our state universities are great, but they must also be discouraged. Mr. Justice Frankfurter of the Supreme Court, who had academic experience at Harvard, once noted the importance of defending the four essential freedoms of a university—to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study.

To this note should be added a statement of Chief Justice Earl Warren who cautioned, "to impose any straightjacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation . . . Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die."

Freedom is a precious possession. And we should periodically inventory its blessings and its ramifications. To destroy freedom in the name of protecting it betrays—not preserves—our national traditions. Yet, there have always been those among us who would in the name of liberty seek to deny it to their opponents.

To pass laws against ideas is utter folly. No matter how unpopular and unwanted, ideas cannot be legislated out of existence. Neither can they be silenced by a resolution from a veterans' convention.

The only way to defeat an idea is with a better one.

Neither patriotism nor loyalty, moreover, can be invoked by legislative edict, nor decreed by administrative order, nor achieved by loyalty oaths. To endure true patriotism must be inspired, not commanded.

In sum, it is imperative that we not sacrifice freedom of dissent on the altars of censorship, bigotry, or intolerance. To the professors, this is the heartbeat of academic freedom. It is also one of the sustaining pillars of all human freedom.

But even as it is essential that we guard against restrictions on academic freedom, the academic community itself must remember that this is a two-way street. Academic freedom must be balanced with academic responsibility. How best to strike that wise balance must ever remain within the province of good judgment. It cannot be legislated through formula.

This concept is clearly enunciated in the 1940 Statement of Principles of the American Association of University Professors—a portion of which reads:

"The professor as a man of learning and an educational officer should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others."

Even as that Principle may be honored by most, we are realistic enough to know, however, that all freedoms are abused by some; that in moments of excitement and crisis men of every station and occupation tend to say things with greater recklessness and impetuosity than with impartiality and dispassion. But this gives no one license to suspend liberty. Intolerance—be it of the left or the right—is still intolerable. And just as discipline and restraint are the hallmarks of the effective advocate, and indeed of civilized man, so the deviation from them reflects human frailties. And as there have been abuses until now, there will surely be more. But we can survive these as long as the constant pursuit of truth remains the high standard to which we repair, without regard for risks, without concern for costs.

As we pick our way along the tortuous and troubled pathways into the future, let us remember a bit of the eternal wisdom which flowed so generously from the pen of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in his First Inaugural Address: "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

The controversy which Vietnam has unleashed on the campuses of the land has intertwined campus dissent with political dissent in the Capitol so thoroughly as to make it difficult to separate the two. Perhaps more than ever before the Halls of Ivy and the Halls of Congress resound with the din of many of the same voices. But there is a difference. On campus the right at stake is the right to think otherwise, or even the right to be wrong. But on Capitol Hill, what is under attack is the right to be right.

The right of dissent is not equal at all levels. On the campus, criticism is accompanied by the luxury of irresponsibility—that is, the professor can afford less concern over the consequences of being wrong than can the Member of Congress. Or to put it in personal terms, Professor McGee had many more solutions to the problems of the world than has Senator McGee. And even Senator McGee, in yet a more restrained sense of responsibility, is not as much on the spot as the Chairman of a Committee on Foreign Relations, or on Armed Services, or of Appropriations. Or none of them are faced with the anguish of measuring the consequences of the decision as is the President of the United States. If the rest of us make a mistake, we may be given yet another chance to correct it. But the President has to be right the first time.

More than ever before in our country's history, criticism from the Capitol ought to be attended by an acute sense of great responsibility. It was not always so. For most of our national history, our role has been largely national in scope and the impact of our decisions rarely reverberated beyond the three-mile limit of our shore line. It was possible to survive demagogues and prima donnas and flamboyant orators in the United States Senate. They could say in very public ways one thing for home consumption and quite another for the Capitol. No longer is this true.

Particularly since World War II the United States has been thrust by the force of history into a role of frightening responsibility for the direction of world events. Not only what the President says or the Secretary of State, but even what a United States Senator may say makes a difference in Katmandu or Cape Town. Whether the issue be civil rights, nuclear disarmament, or Vietnam, the whole world is tuned in on our wave length. The day has long since passed when a United States Senator can carelessly expound his views on the great questions of our time without first pausing to measure the consequences of its impact on the rest of the human race.

Prime Minister Nehru put it vividly when he likened the United States to a modern Atlas with the world on his shoulders. "If you stumble," he said, "the world falls with you."

Demagoguery in the Senate Chamber today can shake the very foundations of international structures around the globe. No issue has made it more difficult to rise to the higher levels demanded by modern leadership than that of Vietnam. This is due in part to the kind of war it is. For the first time the man in the street is watching war on TV. All of the ugliness and the terrible brutalities of all wars have just now been compressed on to a 21-inch screen in the family den. This in itself has tempted the orators to exploit the heart rather than appeal to the head.

But complicating it even more has been the advent of televised Senate hearings. Great as this medium has been in educating the vast public audience to the facts of international life, it has not been an unmixed blessing. In my brief experiences on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have noted a distinct difference between the manner in which witnesses are interrogated in the privacy of the Committee on the one hand and under the glare of TV lights on the other. In the Senate hearing room it has sometimes been an irresistible temptation to the showman to replace the statesman. Instead of a quest for facts and truth, the TV hearing has on occasion become a thrust for higher Neilsen ratings. Unfortunately, personal invective, anger, harsh epithets, and political vengeance have intruded on the screen. Techniques and tactics better described on the pages of Variety rather than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have too often prevailed. In that atmosphere, it is perhaps understandable that showmanship displaces statesmanship. Understandable, but still unforgivable.

Both Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara are cases in point. Each has a thankless responsibility in making decisions of the greatest importance. They also have the responsibility of suffering the consequences for what they decide. At times under Committee bombardment, however, they were abused, harried, and insulted in the extreme. A stranger dropping in from another planet might have thought them to be enemy agents or worse. The respectability of the high trust which is theirs was demeaned—even their personal integrity was impugned.

The price paid for this kind of conduct in Committee was more than the personal injury to the men involved. It had the effect of downgrading government. It reflected a curious reversal of an American tradition of being innocent until proved guilty. The impression was very strong at times that the questioners of the two Secretaries started with the assumption of their guilt of some heinous crime unless they could come up with a good alibi.

During the dialogues on Vietnam, some have expressed their fear of the "arrogance of power."

The kind of abuse or criticism that is running rampant in the Congress is a form of arrogance in itself—an arrogance of dissent. It seems to assume a monopoly of truth and wisdom, leaving room for not the slightest doubt that there might be another truth. Even as some of the critics have been guilty of ascribing mostly good motives to Hanoi and the National Liberation Front while reserving all of the conspiratorial machinations and infamous plotting for our side, so they have pre-empted to themselves all of the virtues of being right. It never seems to enter their thoughts that just maybe the American position might be right.

In our current concern over the right to dissent, over the right to think otherwise, or even the right to be wrong, we seem to have forgotten that there is also a responsibility to respect the right to be right. As the late Adlai Stevenson once pointed out: "I do not impugn the good faith of those who hold different views than mine. I would only ask them in the name of the courtesies and decencies of a free society that they should equally refrain from impugning mine."

Surely there are no differences of opinion so wide that they cannot be explored in the context of responsible debate. The times require of us a much higher level of public dialogue if we are to arrive at the wisest possible decisions. If we indulge ourselves in discursive arguments, in bitter and vitriolic accusations, or in pique and impetulance, it is only at the peril of failing to reach constructive solutions.

In another time of crisis, Abraham Lincoln once advised "in times like the present men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity." I am sure it's not too much to ask that we exercise self-restraint and self-discipline and that we honor the heritage of free institutions and of men seeking to work in those institutions to the best of their abilities and with the intentions of an honest and honorable public servant. To disagree without being disagreeable ought to become the hallmark of a responsible democratic society. Only in this pursuit can we thus hope to meet problems which carry with them not only threats to the freedom of man but also to the hopes for achieving peace for all mankind.

SOCIETY'S RIGHTS VERSUS INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial entitled "Society's Rights Versus Individual Rights" which appeared in the Buckhannon, W. Va., Record of July 13, 1966. The editorial has reference to the recent Supreme Court decision relative to police questioning of suspects, and I feel that the question posed by the editorial to be a pertinent one: How will the new rules affect the rights of the individual, the morale and effectiveness of police officers, the orderliness of community life and the safety and security of every law-abiding citizen?

I ask unanimous consent that its editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY'S RIGHTS VERSUS INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

The individual's right to fair play versus society's right to maintain law and order has been brought into sharp focus by a recent Supreme Court decision. Newsweek magazine states in a feature article that the court's ruling, ". . . imposed sharp new limits on the public power to question suspects—a power lawmen claim is vital to convictions in four out of five criminal cases." The new rules provide, among other things, that after arrest police may not question a suspect until they have told him that he has a right to remain silent, that what he says may be held against him and that he is entitled to have his lawyer with him in the interrogation room. It is almost certain that according to ethical practice and "good professional judgment" the lawyers will advise their clients not to answer. It appears to many law enforcement officers, and with some justification, that under these conditions it will be almost impossible to ever get a confession.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, expressing for the court the bitterly contested five to four majority opinion, state's that, ". . . The . . . practice of incommunicado interrogation is at odds with one of our nation's most cherished principles—the individual may not be compelled to incriminate himself." In his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan stated that, "This doctrine . . . has no sanction, no sanction . . . It's obviously going to mean a gradual disappearance of confessions as a legitimate tool of law enforcement." Although, in general, law enforcement agencies across the country were apprehensive and critical of the court's decision, opinions are sharply divided even among police offices and their closest allies, prosecuting attorneys.

Despite the Supreme Court's legal rhetoric and the debate which follows it, certain facts stand out. The rights if the accused have been further protected, but the problems of law enforcement have been vastly increased. This comes at a time when crime is increasing at a sharp rate—six times faster than population since 1958 and still growing. Last year, more than 2,600,000 serious crimes were reported in the United States. In our great cities, minority population ghettos are becoming more and more of a law enforcement problem and in many cases riot spawners and potential battlegrounds as demonstrated in the Watts district of Los Angeles. Patrolling such areas, day or night, a police officer puts his life on the line every step of the way.

But, as Newsweek observes, we are in a time of transition. There is developing a new approach, a renaissance in law enforcement procedures. Law enforcement has become a subject of major study for philanthropic and government research agencies. The Ford Foundation alone, ". . . has poured more than $5 million into police studies and education projects." There are such proposals as one for a "two-platoon police force" in which, "One group would handle matters requiring the sophisticated approach: social problems—like juvenile delinquency—and major investigations. The other group would do the manual labor. directing traffic, investigating accidents . . ." New ideas are being discussed relative to handling narcotics problems, alcoholics and homosexuals.

However, in the light of such developments as the Supreme Court's present ruling, some authorities feel that we may be moving too fast. Such laws may be too sophisticated to be applicable until our society has evolved to a little higher level than it has yet reached. C. D. DeLeach, assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has put it this way: ". . . to all those who continually clamour for more restrictions on law enforcement, I pose this question—where will you turn for protection of your individual rights when you have totally destroyed the effectiveness of law enforcement?" This is a question that concerns every person in the nation. How will the new rules affect the rights of the individual, the morale and effectiveness of police officers, the orderliness of community life and the safety and security of every law-abiding citizen.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Congressional Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has recently approved a $34 million plan providing for a 4½-acre addition to the west front of the Capitol. This group of five men reported, without public hearings, that the implementation of its recommendations would prevent the deterioration of the west front and would make available additional office, restaurant, auditorium, and conference-room space.

I recognize the need for structural support for the west front. And increased office space is always a welcome idea to one who ranks 95th in Senate seniority. But what concerns me is the distinct possibility that what has been recommended is not the wisest way to meet these needs. Indeed, it appears that 150 years of history embodied in the architectural masterpiece that is our Nation's Capitol will be unnecessarily buried under the proposed plan.

It does appear that a shoring up is necessary. If that is correct, an exhaustive study should be made of the alternatives open to us which, while securing an effective restructuring, would at the same time preserve the grace and beauty of the Nation's most revered building.

Unfortunately, the Commission has apparently not given adequate consideration to the esthetic or historic factors involved in the major rebuilding which it has proposed. For example, the Commission's proposal would, in one thrust, destroy the magnificent architectural accomplishments of some of our most renowned architects and engineers. William Thornton, Charles Bulfinch, Benjamin Latrobe, and Frederick Law Olmsted contributed their special talents in helping to erect the Capitol. To eradicate their efforts, agreed generally to have resulted in a building that epitomizes the excellent in American architecture, is a drastic step. To do so without public hearings as to possible alternatives is even more unfortunate. Proper weight must be given to the significance of tradition and esthetics.

The opposition to the Commission's proposal has been formidable. Professionals and laymen alike have demanded the preservation of the west front. They have emphasized that the needed shoring up can and should be accomplished by a limited restoration intead of by a massive demolition and expansion.

The American Institute of Architects stated the historical consideration succinctly:

> If the West Front of the Capitol is extended, we will have buried the last of those walls that date from the early years of the Republic and will have obscured a part of our history that can never be restored.

Francis Lethbridge, Chairman of the Joint Commission on Landmarks for the National Capital, put it this way:

> If the old stones of the Capitol are crumbling, let them be restored, or replaced if need be, but let us refrain from padding its bones with layers of rooms until it becomes a shapeless mass signifying nothing but its own bulk. Congress deserves a mid-20th century answer to its space needs, not a misguided mid-19th century alteration to a venerable building deserving of respectful preservation.

In a letter to Vice President HUMPHREY, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, William Walton, expressed "grave concern" over the project to alter the west front, and said that the Commission had concluded "that to erase this great historic facade would be a national tragedy."

Studies have already been completed which demonstrate the feasibility of limited restoration as a preferred alternative to massive expansion. The civil engineering firm of Bernard F. Locraft made a detailed study for the Commission of Fine Arts. It concluded that plans for repairs and limited restoration are sound and sensible. As such, the report is in direct contradiction to the Capitol Extension Commission's assertion that a shoring up of the west front is infeasible and costly.

What is now needed is a full and open hearing. When such eminent professional authorities as the American Institute of Architects, the Joint Commission on Landmarks for the National Capital, and the Commission of Fine Arts, as well as the Washington Post, the New York Times, and numerous Senators and Congressmen unanimously condemn architectural recommendations, a searching reexamination of the plans is mandated. In my judgment, a scheme of limited restoration can be developed which would preserve the present proportions of the classic Bulfinch-Latrobe front.

Let us resolve the disputes over the considerations of cost, feasibility, architectural excellence and tradition through public hearings. I believe this is the only acceptable course now that the Capitol Extension Commission has recommended alterations without seeking the advice of impartial experts. Too much is at stake to do any less.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, as an individual grows up in our American society, the many things he does are recorded in many ways on various forms. Records are kept by Federal, State, and local governments as well as private institutions. An article by Helen B. Shaffer, "Editorial Research Reports," published in the Winston-Salem Sentinel of April 23, 1966, points out:

> Over a life span, the dossier piles up; data on parents, medical records, school reports, intelligence and psychological test scores, job histories, credit facts, and so on.

Some of this information is voluntarily given by the individual; some of this information is obtained without the knowledge of the individual.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the article which appeared in the Winston-Salem Sentinel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENCROACHMENT INESCAPABLE: PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

(By Helen B. Shaffer)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is looking for new ways to protect the privacy of the American citizen without creating more problems than it solves. The right to privacy is now—thanks to two Supreme Court decisions of the past year—backed by constitutional guarantees. Nevertheless actual encroachment on the privacy of the individual appears to be less escapable than ever.

The trouble is that, in the modern world, a large measure of privacy is necessarily sacrificed and the loss can be mitigated only slightly by new laws. Our society requires extensive record-keeping on every individual. This is a cradle-to-grave process that begins with footprinting the newborn infant and ends only with the cause-of-death notation on the death certificate.

Over a life span, the dossier piles up: data on parents, medical records, school reports, intelligence and psychological test scores, job histories, credit facts, and so on. Some of this information the individual gives up himself, often through filling out the innumerable questionnaires that come his way. The remainder is obtained without his knowledge from sources not known to him.

PERSONAL DATA

The result is that more personal data on the average mid-20th century American can be picked up by a routine check in a few days than scholars have been able to uncover about William Shakespeare—a well-known actor in his day—after four centuries of digging. And most Americans are so inured to living in the fishbowl age, they willingly disclose information about themselves which their forebears would have considered nobody's business but their own.

But there are limits, even for the privacy-stripped American of today. A few weeks ago, for instance, the State Department put a stop to the practice of asking U.S. embassies to keep watch on American travelers "considered controversial." In a highly publicized case of a different sort, the president of General Motors Corp. apologized on March 22 before a Senate subcommittee for hiring a detective agency to pry into the private life of a subcommittee witness. Ralph Nader had written a book and had given testimony critical of the industry for neglect of safety in automobile design.

No less than a half-dozen congressional subcommittees have investigated some phase of the privacy invasion question over the past year or so. Some of their revelations led to corrective action. The Post Office Department closed down the peepholes through which its agents spied on employees in locker rooms and toilets. Of more general application, the Department curtailed a long-standing practice of placing mail covers—that is, recording information on the envelopes of letters delivered to particular addresses—for use by an investigative agency.

EAVESDROPPING DEVICES

Another area where limits on privacy invasion are being sought involves the use of hidden eavesdropping devices. Practically everyone is agreed that private snooping through wiretapping or the secret placement of miniature microphones and transmitters should have no place in American life. The big argument is under what conditions the police should be allowed to use them in the war on crime.

Telephone tapping was presumably outlawed by Congress in 1934, yet the practice still goes on. Evidence gained from wiretapping is permitted in some state (though no federal) courts. The Justice Department has long sought legislation to permit law enforcers to tap phones in crime investigations. However, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach told a Senate subcommittee on March 22 it would be better for Congress to ban all wiretapping outright than to leave the situation in its present ambiguous state.

The new miniature eavesdropping devices present an even more difficult control problem. The Federal Communications Commission adopted a rule, effective April 8, forbidding private citizens to use radio devices to eavesdrop, but left it up to the states to decide whether their police should use them. In New York State, a court held on March 1 that court orders permitting police eavesdropping by such a device were invalid because contrary to the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution governing search and seizure.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM VITAL TO DAIRY FARMERS' INCOME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a great week for the dairy farmer. Earlier this week the Senate passed the Ellender child nutrition bill authorizing the extension of the school milk program for an additional 4 years. Today we will approve a bill appropriating $105 million for the school milk program for fiscal 1967.

These actions will mean a great deal to the millions of schoolchildren across the land, for they will continue to receive the benefits of "nature's perfect food." Just as important, the dairy farmer will benefit substantially from the Senate's decision to give the program the green light. For the school milk program accounts for 2.5 percent of the Nation's milk consumption. This is an all-important market to the Nation's dairy farmers—not only because it helps him to maintain a barely adequate income, but also because it introduces millions of young Americans to the milk habit.

At a time when thousands of dairy farmers are calling it quits because of low income it is essential to press hard for final congressional action on these two bills. By stimulating the consumption of milk they will keep many dairy farmers in business. In the long run this will assure a continuing adequate supply of milk at prices that are fair to the consumer.

For these reasons I am very hopeful that the House of Representatives will act quickly to pass the Ellender child nutrition bill and to agree with the Senate that $105 million, at a minimum, is needed for the school milk program for fiscal 1967.

THE CANADIAN-AMERICAN WATER POLICY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a lively contribution to the dialog on a Canadian-American intercontinental water policy was carried in the Vancouver, British Columbia, Sun of June 11.

It is a very perceptive and well-written account of the debate which took place between Canada's Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, who opposed export of surplus water to the United States, and myself, as an advocate of the North American Water and Power Alliance—or NAWAPA concept—or some other similar plan of collecting waters now running off unused to the seas in Alaska and northern Canada, and distributing them to water-short areas of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Vancouver Sun be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Vancouver Sun, June 11, 1966]

NAWAPA: A THREAT TO OUR SOVEREIGNTY

We've Got Water.
The U.S. Needs It.
It's Canada's Lifeblood.
Without It We Perish.

(By Ian Macdonald)

SHERBROOKE, QUEBEC.—Prince George—gone forever beneath the waves like another Atlantis.

Or Prince George—bigger, busier, the centre of a waterworks complex unrivalled anywhere in the world?

B.C.—a reservoir for the United States, many of its people displaced, its resources irreparably damaged.

Or B.C.—A giant powerhouse of North America, scene of one of the world's great tourist attractions, rich, master of its destiny?

Canada—Victim of the fast-talking Yankee trader, its sovereignty foundered.

Or Canada—swimming shoulder-to-shoulder with the U.S. into a great tomorrow, not a drop of its water spilling into the U.S. that isn't superfluous?

NAWAPA—North American Water and Power Alliance—a money-making scheme dreamed up by a Los Angeles engineering firm, an exercise in sophomore civil engineering, a monstrous threat to Canada's independence.

Or NAWAPA—a continent-wide plan for collection, redistribution, and efficient utilization of waters now running off to the seas totally unused or only partially used—the answer for a thirstier U.S., a boon to its northern neighbor?

General A. G. L. McNaughton, crusty old defender of Canada's rights, and Senator FRANK E. MOSS, a vocal U.S. water worrier from Utah, don't see it the same way.

They were guest speakers at the Royal Society of Canada June meeting on Wednesday at the University of Sherbrooke.

They couldn't agree on whether the U.S. hasn't enough water or Canada has too much.

The Democratic senator maintained the U.S. is starting to feel the pinch and Canada is the obvious source.

IS IT THERE?

The general, who was chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission from 1950 to 1962 and who battled loud and long over St. Lawrence and Columbia Rivers, argued Canada probably hasn't all the water everyone thinks it has, and probably will have uses of its own for all of it in the future.

One thing is clear.

The U.S. is in the position of the buyer and has to come to the potential seller, although an increasing number of Canadians recoil from the suggestion we would sell our fresh-water heritage.

But, as Sen. Moss pointed out in a friendly but forthright way, we used to say the same about natural gas.

He outlined his position: "After you in Canada have measured your water and projected your own ultimate requirements, it is my hope that you will find that you have water for export . . ."

The senator said if properly handled, water is not a depleting resource and that if Canada and the U.S. want to continue to live in constructive peace "on this richly-endowed continent of North America, and to grow, as St. Luke said, 'in wisdom and stature,' then we must co-operate in taking care of it."

He agreed the U.S. hasn't an unblemished record in water handling, and that it is fighting an expensive battle against years of pollution.

The senator's case seemed to ship water when he turned to the project, but he was honest in his admissions.

Moss said the concept was developed by the Ralph M. Parsons Company of Los Angeles, and its central theme came from one of the outstanding water planning engineers of the west.

But he admitted, "the resulting proposal or concept is based entirely on maps and analysis of published topographical, climeographical and hydrological data. In many areas there have been no on site investigations."

He said the plan calls for collection of about 15 to 18 per cent of the excess runoff from the high precipitation, medium elevation areas of Alaska and western and northern Canada.

GOOD FOR ALL

The result—from a system of tunnels, canals, and improved natural channels linking chains of reservoirs—along with other waters, would benefit "one territory and seven provinces of Canada, 35 states of the U.S. and three states of Mexico."

Moss said Parsons engineers estimate the cost to be an enormous $100 billion for a 25 to 30-year construction program.

It is estimated by Parsons that about 48 per cent of the investment would be in Canada, about five per cent in Mexico, and the rest in the U.S.

Estimated revenue was $4 billion a year, with operating expenses of less than $1 billion.

"This makes the scheme quite practical for amortization within the usual time for water projects in my country," the senator added.

Moss said most of the water revenues would come from the U.S., while more than half of the power available would be generated in Canada with the U.S. providing a market for large amounts.

"B.C. would be the site also of what might be the single most controversial feature of the initial NAWAPA concept," he said, with the understatement of a man who doesn't know B.C. too well.

"This is the proposal to make a huge lake out of the natural defile known as the Rocky Mountain Trench, along the west side of the Canadian Rockies.

He also said: "B.C. would have the greatest NAWAPA investment, in storage, power and navigation facilities. The town of Prince George would be the centre of a complex of waterworks unrivalled anywhere in the world."

"The people of the U.S. cannot expect the people of Canada to consider entering any arrangement such as this unless it is demonstrably and unquestionably for Canada's long-term best interest—and so found by Canadians," he stated.

"We are not devising a scheme to trick Canada. We are not even trying to arrive at a minimum price at which we might cajole and persuade you into selling us some of your water. As a matter of fact, we are working with dedication to avoid the prospect of U.S. dependence on imported water," Moss said.

"Common sense and prudence dictate that both countries keep an eye on a possible continental system as each of us design national water resource projects. Let's make sure that while we are making up our minds about the value of a continental approach, we do not do anything to make it unworkable," he added.

After the senator sat down, the general came winging in on NAWAPA like a dambuster.

The general said Canada's two resources of land and water are closely related and "we alienate or squander either only at our peril."

Not given to mincing words, he turned to propositions being "touted under the somewhat pretentious name of NAWAPA."

He added: "Of course this proposal is not an alliance at all. It is nothing more than an attempt by the Ralph M. Parsons Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., a private engineering firm, to drum up business for themselves."

The general said he felt obliged to say the proposals "are quite unacceptable."

He added that despite some temporizing pronouncements issued by distracted politicians, he felt his stand is backed up by the best Canadian engineers and informed technical and administrative officers.

JUST EXERCISE

Gen. McNaughton said with one exception the rivers in the schemes are national rivers of Canada.

"Over national waters, there can be no question but that the jurisdiction of the nation in which they are situated is supreme," he stated.

He said B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan have made the clearest declarations against sale of Canadian waters, and Quebec was too well informed to be drawn into export.

The general said it should be noted that no government or government agency on the continent has commissioned any technical study on NAWAPA, and that the U.S. government had not seen fit to act on a congressional resolution to refer the study to the International Joint Commission for study.

He quoted Trevor Lloyd, professor of geography at McGill University, as saying of NAWAPA: "Clearly we have here an exercise in sophomore civil engineering which has received far greater attention than it deserves. It underlines the danger, all too familiar to geographers, of allowing the drawing office to replace acquaintance with the land and the people as they really are."

The general said the amount of Canada's fresh water seems to him frequently overstated, and we are suffering from allowing overstatements to go uncorrected.

"In Canada, we have much less habitable and arable land (than in the U.S.). It may be that in the future, we will have to conserve this for ourselves and this in turn means that we do have to look with care before we put any more of it under water," Gen. McNaughton added.

He pointed to recent advice by H. A. New of the National Research Council, who urged formation of a Canadian committee on water, weather and vegetation to carry out certain studies before any water diversion is brought under consideration.

Gen. McNaughton said even the slightest changes in water can have far-reaching effects on vegetation and biological life. A region could become hotter in summer and colder in winter. Plants could die.

He stressed that many of the rivers talked about by NAWAPA are those "which provide a great series of prime power sites, rivers which form the basis of one of the world's great concentrations of the forest product industry, rivers which provide some of the finest salmon runs in the world."

The general said great projects are under way to harness all the resources in these areas and "the NAWAPA promoters would move all this out of Canada, the people, the industry, the water.

"It can only be described as madness to believe that Canada has surplus water in an area that is so obviously earmarked for major resource development, and where so much is already taking place," he added.

The general said NAWAPA is not interested in this but in flooding the valleys of Canada and draining off water for U.S. benefit.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FLOODED

"But the valleys themselves are of vital importance to B.C., because they contain the level land which is so vitally needed for roads and railways, for industries, for people and for agriculture," he said.

"Whitehorse and Prince George would be submerged, and their land with them, as would countless miles of railway and highways. These irreplacable assets would be destroyed in the name of trans-mountain navigation, Gen. McNaughton added.

He maintained NAWAPA would put under water an area stretching from the Montana border to northern B.C.

The general argued the scheme ignores all the plans in Canada for the use of the waters and lands of the trench—the Peace project, plans for the Fraser and Thompson; the Columbia development.

He said if there is any water left over, the Canadian west, not the U.S. northwest, southwest or midwest, is the logical beneficiary.

Gen. McNaughton said the Parsons engineers had not come up with anything new.

"The capture of Columbia and Kootenay waters in the trench, and their diversion over the Rockies, is the logical first step in development of additional water supplies for the Canadian Prairies," he stated.

He repeated earlier statements of his that the NAWAPA scheme was monstrous not only in physical magnitude, but in that the promoters would displace Canadian sovereignty over the national waters of Canada "and substitute a diabolic thesis that all waters of North America become a shared resource of which most will be drawn off for the benefit of the U.S. midwest and southwest regions where existing desert areas will be made to bloom at the expense of development in Canada."

He stated Canada should not expose herself over water.

"To me it is obvious that if we made a bargain to divert water to the U.S. we cannot ever discontinue or we will face force to compel compliance," said Gen. McNaughton.

NOT LIKE A TAP

"There is nothing in our experience to date which indicates any change in the vigor with which our American friends pursue objectives which they deem in their national interests, however much this may hurt a neighbor who had unwittingly made a careless bargain in other circumstances," he added.

Gen. McNaughton urged Canada be very careful to ensure the rights it thinks it has are admitted and confirmed beforehand.

"We have everything to lose by hasty and ill-considered action, and we have everything to gain by waiting until the essential information is available upon which we can make our own assessment of the subject of sharing resources and our own plans as to the course of action we will adopt."

Sen. Moss came back smiling gamely.

He said he thought he and the general agreed on one thing—that the study should be made, and quickly, before any decision was made by Canada.

But the senator emphasized that once water is diverted, and people and industry thrive around it, it can't be turned on and off like a tap.

THE BUSING DISTINCTION

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, an editorial in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on July 14, 1966, takes note of a proposal to bus children to schools in certain areas of the District of Columbia.

The editorial concluded that Supt. Carl Hansen should ask the School Board to affirm his determination to operate a temporary busing program only to eliminate overcrowding in some schools and to make use of vacant space in other schools.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I am in total agreement with the editorial statement that "the proper permanent solution is to build adequate schools where they are needed."

I am also in agreement with the Superintendent's main concern that the busing, if done at all, should be only temporary and that it should be confined to the purpose of relieving overcrowding, and not, as has been suggested by some, as a way of promoting artificial integration. The busing of students to promote integration has no basis in any U.S. Supreme Court decision or in any Federal statute, and I join with the Star in hoping that Dr. Hansen never relinquishes the position taken. This is not to say that I shall, if such is presented, support any proposal for congressional appropriation of moneys for the purpose of temporary busing to alleviate crowded schoolrooms, as I shall reserve any judgment on this point until such time as my subcommittee conducts hearings on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967. If the Commissioners and Dr. Hansen wish to present justifications at that time, I shall be glad to consider them. I have grave reservations as to the advisability of such a busing program, for once it is put into operation, the pressures will build for its permanent retention. There are those who would use the taxpayers' moneys to promote artificial integration in a school system that is less than 10 percent white, but I do not believe that the taxpayers' moneys can justifiably be spent for the busing of students to promote school integration or to deal with racial imbalance in the school population, the U.S. Supreme Court never having ruled, and the Congress never having acted, to date, against de facto segregation.

The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Brown against Board of Education on May 17, 1954, ruled, quite properly, in my judgment, that children in public schools could not be segregated on the basis of race, as this would contravene the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. The same Court ruled the same day in the case of Bolling against Sharpe, that racially segregated public schools could not be maintained in the District of Columbia by virtue of the due process clause of the fifth amendment. But the Supreme Court has never ruled against de facto segregation nor against racial imbalance in the public schools. The Court only ruled that race shall not be a factor in the assignment of children to schools in the public school system.

Additionally, it is my understanding that many prominent educators are of the belief that money spent for busing could be better spent for teachers' salaries, new teaching positions, and school equipment.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSING DISTINCTION

Superintendent Hansen's decision to recommend busing children from severely overcrowded public schools to those with vacant space will surprise a lot of Washingtonians. It is important, however, to consider the qualifications which Dr. Hansen attaches to this decision.

The facts of the situation are that about 1,700 children now are attending half-day classes because of congested neighborhood schools, while space for some 1,500 pupils is available in other city schools outside the overcrowded neighborhoods. To use these unused facilities during a period of crisis seems only common sense.

The trouble is that several dangers are inherent in the project.

First, of course, is the danger that this temporary emergency measure might become permanent, and that must not be allowed to occur. The proper permanent solution is to build adequate schools where they are needed. This must remain the goal. Dr. Hanson says he believes that once in the "busing business," the city will "get out as quickly as possible." He should urge the school board to affirm this determination as a flat policy—and to make it crystal clear to the congressional committees which appropriate money for new schools.

The superintendent's main concern, however, is that temporary busing should be confined to the purpose of relieving overcrowding, not, as has been suggested, as a way of promoting "artificial" integration.

We hope Dr. Hansen never relinquishes that position. As a practical matter, no degree of meaningful citywide integration is possible in a school system less than 10 percent white. In trying to reach an unattainable goal, however, irreparable harm could be done to the sound basic concept of neighborhood schools.

THE ROAD TO SAFETY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, further support of the automobile safety bill passed by the Senate is offered by the Louisville Times.

The Times considers the bill a fair one. It takes editorial note of the fact that Government activity in the field already has induced the auto industry to do many of the things the bill would require.

The Times also supports legislation to improve standards of driving and of highway construction.

As a matter of public interest, this editorial presents a balanced and reasoned viewpoint on auto safety. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Times, June 27, 1966]

DOWN THE ROAD TOWARD SAFETY

In the first four months of this year, 15,110 persons were killed in automobile accidents in the United States, compared with 13,650 in the same period last year. In April, the increase in traffic fatalities was 20 per cent greater than in the preceding April.

Perhaps statistics like these had something to do with the Senate's unanimous approval of a more demanding auto safety bill than the original proposals of the administration. Perhaps it was because of an awareness that an increasing number of Americans—though no one knows how many—are becoming genuinely concerned about slaughter on the highways. Possibly the Senate members reminded themselves that the life they save by demanding a safer car might be their own or that of a member of their family.

Whatever the motive or combination of motives, the Senate Commerce Committee is to be congratulated for strengthening the bill before sending it to the floor. Instead of bowing to industry pressure, it has stiffened its back. The bill as approved seems to us a fair one, at least to start with. Not all committee members were happy with it because a provision for criminal penalties was removed. But the bill's schedule of fines for violations, $1,000 per car to a maximum of $400,000, ought to be stiff enough to enforce compliance. If experience proves it is not, the law could be amended.

The same could be said for all its provisions. As it stands, it is in a rather experimental stage. It requires the secretary of commerce to set up minimum safety standards for new cars. These "interim" standards would be published by Jan. 31 and put into effect from six to 12 months later. They are not really radical. In effect, they are those established by the federal government for cars it buys, covering such things as seat belts, windshield wipers, collapsible steering columns, padded dashes and visors, outside mirrors, and so on.

The secretary of commerce also would be required to undertake a testing and research program on the basis of which he would publish revised standards by Jan. 31, 1968. He also would have to review the standards at least once every two years, and would be authorized to modify them.

The significant difference between this bill and the administration's first proposal is that the secretary of commerce is required to do all this. Under the other plan, he was given discretionary authority, which he might have chosen not to use.

The spotlight now shifts to the House, where committee approval of a companion bill is forecast within a week or two. We hope these cheerful predictions are realized. The fact is that because of governmental pressure the automobile industry already is doing a good many of the things this bill would require. We do not see how it could hurt the industry to go the rest of the way.

And now, with a federal auto safety law seemingly so close, if anyone wants to bring up the argument that the same government ought to pay some attention to the kind of people who drive these cars, we will gladly say amen. It never has been our contention that auto design is the sole factor in auto deaths and injuries. Both the motorist and the car he drives should be made as safe as possible, as well as the road on which both travel.

This seems to be the thought behind another bill passed by the Senate authorizing expenditure of $465 million over a three-year period to help states and cities expand their traffic safety efforts.

PROBLEMS OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a recent conference of the maritime industry, joined by representatives of both labor and management, dramatized the critical situation of our maritime industry. Aptly titled SOS, standing for "Save Our Ships" and "Save Our Shipyards," this conference showed again the willingness of all segments of this vital industry to work together to revive our maritime service and the moribund shipbuilding industry.

The crisis of our maritime industry must be seen in the context of our strength as a world power. Russia has clearly seen the long range importance of the merchant marine as a weapon of economic warfare. We must remember that peaceful coexistence to the Russians does not mean the abandonment of Russia's expansionist economic goals. It is significant that while the United States has allowed her merchant marine to decline to the point where less than 12 percent of our huge foreign trade is carried in American-flag ships, the Russians will add 464 vessels to their merchant fleet. In addition to the powerful thrust this merchant fleet gives to Russia's expansion, it has an obviously harmful effect on our balance of payments.

Two recent articles describe this problem clearly and well. One is a recent column by James Kilpatrick, entitled "Grappling With the Merchant Marine Problem," which appeared in the Washington Star on May 31, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Another article, "The Future Role of Soviet Sea Power," by Comdr. H. G. Dudley, Sr., USN, was published in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for May 1966. Commander Dudley emphasizes that the Russians consider their merchant marine to be an integral instrument of their naval power, and use it as such. Commander Dudley states:

> The growing Soviet merchant fleet will also serve definite political purposes. It will, of course, further the prestige of the Soviet Union as a creditable major power and, more importantly, it will lend itself to the Soviet design to create a "Socialist commercial bloc" on a global scale, resembling Soviet-Satellite economic ties. The Soviets undoubtedly feel that they have been successful in orienting the economy of Cuba and Egypt toward Moscow and now have confidence that other developing nations will follow at a progressive pace. To accomplish this progress in proper Communist style, all commerce would move in Communist ships; this would permit the Kremlin more positive control over the victims' economy. The ultimate goal of Moscow in this scheme would be twofold: to isolate the United States from the world markets and from the raw materials abroad; and to consolidate control of the economies of the rising nations. This would be in effect the revival of mercantilism, Communist style.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this extremely interesting article be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. These articles make quite clear the serious penalty we may pay in the years ahead for allowing our merchant marine to decline. Not only the short-term economic effect in terms of payrolls, jobs, and the balance of payments must be considered, but the danger of growing economic dominance of our chief rival, the Soviet Union. It is not too late to reverse the trend, but we must act vigorously and imaginatively to do so. I look forward to the recommendations of the SOS conference for positive ways by which we may restore our merchant marine to its rightful place in our economy and to its role in our overall naval policy.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 31, 1966]

GRAPPLING WITH THE MERCHANT MARINE PROBLEM

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

For the last five months, committees of the House and Senate have been grappling futilely with problems of the American merchant marine. They are no closer to an answer than they were when the second session of this Congress began. Meanwhile, the industry is dying.

In 1965, less than 12 percent of U.S. foreign trade was transported under the U.S. flag; this was the lowest percentage on record, and compares with 52 percent as recently as 1951. In terms of a merchant fleet in being, the United States ranks a poor sixth among the nations of the world, but even this rank is deceptive. Most of this fleet consists of vessels built more than 20 years ago. In terms of ships under construction, the U.S. ranks in 14th place, just barely ahead of tiny Finland.

The several reasons for this decline are not obscure. Part of the responsibility lies with the ship operators, who have been unwilling or unable to make the bold and imaginative changes that would permit them to compete for world markets. Part of the responsibility lies with the 32 separate unions that make up the AFL–CIO's Maritime Trades Department; their suicidal in-fighting, manifested in a series of maddening strikes, has reduced the industry to chaos.

Still another part of the responsibility lies with domestic shipyards and with the politicians representing them; they have clung tenaciously to protective and restrictive laws that have had a suffocating effect upon American operators both in foreign trade and on domestic coastal routes.

Yet the greatest responsibility, by far, lies upon the Congress and the executive agencies of the federal government. The Congress has been content to drift along with the basic Merchant Marine Act of 1936, though the law hasn't worked for 30 years. The defense establishment, enchanted by fly-boy visions of airlifted troops and cargoes, has woefully neglected the necessity for a healthy merchant fleet. The Maritime Administration, plagued by weaknesses, has frittered away its research funds on such glamorous ventures as the nuclear Savannah. Nowhere—in labor, in management, in government, in politics—has there been the leadership needed to unite the industry and to find some cures for its wasting disease.

Two major reports on the merchant marine have attempted to diagnose the sickness. Characteristically, neither of them has satisfied everyone.

Last October, an "Interagency Maritime Task Force," composed of government administrators headed by Alan S. Boyd, undersecretary of commerce, brought forth a 20-year plan for restoring the patient to health. To the outside observer—and to a few spokesmen within the industry—the Boyd Report is sound in principle. It would reduce federal subsidies for operations and construction, phase out the subsidies to passenger liners altogether, put an end to certain cargo preferences, and permit fleet owners greater freedom in their operations.

Two months after the Boyd Report, the President's Maritime Advisory Committee brought in a series of recommendations that contradicted almost everything the Boyd group had proposed. Yet the committee itself was sorely divided. One member, H. Lee White, filed a blistering 75-page dissent in which three other members joined in part.

To the concerned outsider, White's blunt prescriptions make considerable sense. A lawyer with long experience in maritime law and operations, White is president of Marine Transport Lines. In his view, a simple increase in subsidies is no answer at all. He doubts that Congress and the taxpayers would stand for handouts and loan guarantees that might reach a billion dollars a year under the Advisory Committee's plan. At some point, he says, it must be explained why other American industries with high labor costs are able to compete on world markets, while America's merchant ships cannot compete profitably even in our own coastal trade.

The first step, in White's view, is to abolish the restriction that limits operating subsidies solely to vessels built in high-cost American yards.

The Boyd Report makes the same recommendation.

Until this is done, American fleet operators cannot obtain the modern bulk carriers and tankers needed to compete with foreign operators. White makes the point that even the Soviet Union, which is adding 464 vessels to its merchant fleet this year, does not insist that all of them be built in Russian yards. The Soviet Union buys its ships wherever it pleases.

Thus far, the hard line advocated by White and by the Boyd Report has picked up little support within the sick industry or on the Hill.

EXHIBIT 2

THE FUTURE ROLE OF SOVIET SEA POWER

(NOTE.—*With such modern men-of-war as the Kynda-class missile frigate* Varlag *and the world's largest underseas fleet, the Soviet Navy would seem prepared to wage the hottest of wars. Yet, for the forseeable future, we can expect their Navy's role to be offensive in Cold War and defensive in hot.*)

(By Commander H. G. Dudley, Sr., U.S. Navy)

The Russians have been politically interested in sea power since the 17th and 18th century campaigns of Peter the Great. Since Stalin's death, however, Soviet maritime strategy has appeared in a different political concept. It now reflects the Soviet scenario of a struggle best defined by George Kennan who pointed out that the Soviet Union's "main concern is to make sure that it has filled every nook and cranny available to it in the basin of world power." Despite repeated threatening language in speeches and diplomatic exchanges, however, the theme of Soviet strategy is victory by Cold War and diplomacy.

Nikita Khrushchev made it clear that the Soviet Union did not desire to engage in war when he spoke to workers at Novosibirsk on 10 October 1959; and Marshal Vasily D. Sokolovskiy has more recently considered this theme important enough to repeat: "Peaceful coexistence . . . must be correctly understood. Coexistence is a continuation of the conflict between social systems, but by peaceful means, without war . . . We consider this an economic political and ideological struggle, not a military one." Then the Soviets, via the voice of the Twentieth Party Congress, clarified the main target of their "cold" struggle by stating: "In short, the world has moved out of the stage of the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union and during the current phase of coexistence is moving into the stage of the socialist encirclement of the United States as a prelude to final victory of Communism." The essence of this declaration supposes that the Soviets will capture the economic and political vitals of the developing nations and, thereby, isolate the United States. This is what Sokolovskiy had in mind when he stressed ". . . politics has available in addition to war, a large arsenal of various non-forcible means which it can use for achieving goals, without resorting to war."

Economic warfare, the co-element of Soviet political and psychological warfare, actually equates to trade-war. It seeks to dominate the economy of the rising nation and is nothing more than "merchantilism." Khrushchev set the Soviet course in this direction when, in 1955, he forecasted intentions to increase foreign trade by 70 per cent. It will be recalled that Khrushchev made this announcement when he introduced the Seven Year Plan shortly after replacing Giorgi Malenkov, and thereby used the opportunity to broadcast the Soviet policy of invoking the political instrument of trade and aid as the new tactic in pursuing Kremlin goals.

The unique advantage to the Soviets is their ability to prosecute a trade-war by decision, that is, when the political stakes are high enough, they decide, and manage to afford, the economic policies that help to win them.

Another facet of recent Soviet politico-maritime strategy involves designs to neutralize Western sea power by creating political and military obstacles to free movement of ocean commerce. In this regard, the Kremlin continues to work dilgently to fester the political environment around the four strategic, commercial bottlenecks of world trade routes: the Panama and Suez Canals and the Straits of Malacca and Gibraltar.

Efforts have been made by the Kremlin to extend Soviet sea power by proxy to these vital areas by building up the naval power of Cuba, Algeria, Egypt, and Indonesia. Further indications of these tactics are reflected in Soviet construction of seaports such as Hodeida in Yemen. This port, as well as others which may be offered for Soviet naval "blackmail" operations, constitutes a potential fleet-in-being type of haven which could accommodate both submarines and surface ships. Support ships for naval and fishing units could well find strategic ports and coves similar to the facilities which the Soviets enjoyed briefly in Albania for submarine operations. These projections of Soviet sea power are not myths. Indeed, current Soviet political maneuvering and planning lends new significance to them.

The naval—and air—forces which the Soviet Union has provided the developing nations have minelaying capabilities and, though neither first rate nor operational in all cases, these forces pose an additional potential threat in very strategic areas.

Closely associated with neutralizing Western sea power is the Soviet Union's effort to increase the three-mile limit of territorial waters. The political motive is obviously to nibble away the freedom which has always been a hallmark of the high seas and, accordingly, diminish Western sea power's mobility. If, for example, the 12-mile rule were to become international law, vast areas would no longer be free seas and many passages now classed as international would be subject to political wrangling. The Soviet Union's desire for coastal concealment of Communist insurgency activities around the world is another, more covert, motive.

Other political motives which shape Soviet maritime strategy could be cited; they, however, would merely reaffirm Soviet designs to further the Kremlin goal of world domination through maximum use of sea power.

There are important fixed factors affecting Soviet sea power. Professor Nicholas J. Spykman (1893–1943) emphasized that geography was fundamental to the formation of foreign policy, and so it is with Soviet foreign policy. Spykman highlighted the dependence of relative power of states not only on military forces but also on such factors as size of territory, nature of frontiers, size of population, absence or presence of raw materials, economic and technical development, financial strength, ethnic homogeneity, effective social integration, political stability, and national spirit. Credence is added to Spykman's concepts by Alfred Thayer Mahan and Sir Halford Mackinder, both of whom arrived at the same deductions. The former oriented his philosophy toward maritime strategy and the latter more toward the potential power inherently possessed by the Eurasian land mass. It is the wisdom of these three men which provides the tools with which one may analyze Soviet national power and, indeed, sea power, with reliability. The relatively new third dimension of Communism does introduce insidious tactics which challenge old theories. Nevertheless, as Mahan pointed out, his principles "belong to the unchangeable, or unchanging order of things, remaining the same, in cause and effect, from age to age," and that flexibility of application, occasioned by unforeseen developments, is necessary.

Land Mass Orientation. The vast size northern location, and orientation toward the Arctic have significantly influenced everything that is Russian. The high mountains in the east and south, the proximity of the Arctic, and the continental climate combine to produce extremely hot and cold regions, large unproductive areas, and difficult interior transportation. As a result, the bulk of Soviet industry, population and transportation is concentrated in Western Russia in a triangular area consisting significantly of only about 11 per cent of the country, the apex of which is near Lake Baikal.

Another region of less than 2 per cent of the entire land has been developed as the Far East Maritime Province. Geographically isolated, this rear area—1,000 rugged miles east of the apex—has been forced into military and economic seclusion. Both areas, consisting of about 80 per cent of the population, are joined by an excellent, but by itself inadequate, east-west Trans-Siberian railroad.

In reality, then, the vast land of the Soviet Union is literally reduced to a comparatively small, productive portion which is oriented like a tipped table in the direction of Europe. This feature explains why the Russians have always considered the defense of their western front the key to their survival. It follows, of course, that the isolated nature of the Maritime Province contributes little, if any, to the major power complex which is centered in western Russia.

Peter the Great was one of the first to appreciate the western orientation of Russia; this was symbolized by his moving the capital from Moscow to St. Petersburg. He clearly understood that the wealth and greatness of his country lay in its association with Europe and understood the importance of the Baltic and Black Sea to this greatness.

Geographic Vulnerability. From a defensive point of view, the high perimeter of the "tipped table" is bound by excellent obstacles; frozen seas, wide deserts, and high mountains protect three sides. Only from the west is the Soviet heartland approachable across terrain suitable for any large-scale ground movement, while the remaining large portions of its western frontier are coastal in nature.

Imagine yourself standing in Moscow, the geographic center of the Black, Baltic, and White Seas, and facing west; the vulnerability of Russia from the Muscovites' perspective can thus be more clearly appreciated. Not only do you gain a better understanding of the purpose of the Red Army, but you also recognize more fully the importance of sea power to the vast water-washed shores of western Russia—both from the point of view of defense and of contact with the world, the latter being the source of Soviet progress. Also from this vantage point, one may visualize the industrial triangle of Russia with its base facing quite vulnerably to the west; Eastern Europe and the Baltic directly threaten the center, whereas the Black Sea and the White Sea weaken the extremities. This is to say, the Soviet heartland is vulnerable from four distinct sectors, three of which must rely upon naval power for defense.

In a similar vein, the Soviet Union is militarily weakest where the seas literally penetrate deeply into the base of its industrial triangle. This makes the Soviets sensitive to any threat from the seas and increasingly conscious of the need for sea power. Furthermore, the Soviets become justifiably fearful of the sea-threat when they remember that within the last 115 years, while successfully resisting repeated invasions over land, they have been defeated twice by sea power—in the Crimean War (1853–1856) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905).

Internal Mobility. From the Soviet interior to its seaports, water transportation is seemingly difficult. The combination of waterways enables the interior movement of smaller merchant vessels and naval ships between the Arctic, Baltic, and Black Sea areas. Even though the internal water system is elaborate, it moves one-fifth as many ton-miles by water as the United States which has one-fourth of the mileage. Moreover, Soviet water ways transport only five per cent of the nation's freight turnover. Better use, however, can be expected of the rivers, locks, and canals as the current extension and improvement programs progress. Actually, river transit by ocean ships is now in effect and increasing. However, there is no river which provides free access to the ocean. The large Siberian rivers all empty into the Arctic Sea which is frozen for nine to ten months of the year. The Amur in the Far East deviates to a shallow estuary which is icebound for many months. The Volga, the most important river, carrying over half of the inland waterborne commerce, flows south into the landlocked Caspian; and both the Don and Dnieper rivers reach the Black Sea which, in turn, must exit through the Turkish Straits.

Thus, nature has forced the Soviets to the limits of man's ingenuity in efforts to overcome natural obstacles. In general, the inland waterways can be considered marginal, being susceptible to improvement but not substantial change.

Although all but one of Russia's major seaports lie in proximity to a river mouth—the exception being Vladivostok—they are relatively unimportant. In fact, the most important, Leningrad, does not rate among the 50 leading seaports of the world. Another point—the remoteness of many consuming and producing centers from the ports—makes international commerce very expensive after the heavy freight from river or rail is added to the ocean freight.

Peripheral Limitations. Access from the Soviet Union, that is the tipped table portion, lies either across the northern plain of Europe or through the Black, Baltic and White-Barents Seas. Not one of these seas has free access to the world inasmuch as each one is severely restricted in at least one of several ways. Exits from the Black and Baltic Seas require passing through narrow waters controlled by Turkey and Denmark respectively. Egress from the White Sea area is through relatively narrow and channeled waters of the Barents and Norwegian Seas. To further the restrictive effects, all three exits are under close surveillance of the North Atlantic Powers.

Likewise, the heartland of the Far East, the Maritime Province, is hemmed in by the Sea of Japan with only three accesses to the Pacific Ocean, all of which are easily dominated by Western-oriented Japan.

In effect, Soviet naval capabilities beyond their contiguous "lakes" depend primarily on the two port areas, Petropavlovsk, in Kamchatka, and Murmansk. And, the Soviets have been forced to make maximum use of these areas irrespective of their relatively remote and isolated locations. Although Petropavlovsk fronts on the Pacific Ocean, it is icebound three months of the year and hampered by extreme climatic conditions. With icebreaker operations, it is usable the year round, and a small portion of the Far East Fleet is based there. Even the major port of Vladivostok is icebound part of the year, requiring icebreakers for year-round use. Murmansk is more useful inasmuch as it is ice-free; in fact, Murmansk is the only Soviet port in European Russia that is unimpeded in its outlet to the high seas by ice or extreme narrows. Nevertheless, it is plagued by inhibiting climatic conditions—and severely so.

Thus, the Northern Fleet and the Petropavlovsk forces represent the major Soviet sea power threat in their respective ocean areas. For the Soviets to project their threat into the Atlantic, however, it would be essential for the forces—surface, sub-surface, and probably air—to funnel via the relatively narrow Norwegian Sea. In addition, channeling through the Greenland-Iceland-Faeroes Gap would increase their vulnerability. Submarine use of the Arctic ice cap would be probable but not without inconvenience and undesirable sacrifices.

A glance at a North Polar Map reveals three salient features which diminish the power position of the Northern Fleet. First, the Barents-White Sea area lies deeply in the Arctic, which extends even into the depths of Russia's Northwest; second, the circuitous route and distance to the North Atlantic is extremely long and vulnerable; third—and this relates to the second—the route to the Atlantic is relatively narrow.

Sokolovskiy has summarized Russia's dilemma from the experience of World War II: ". . . two of our fleets were based in inland seas [Baltic and Black Seas] and it was difficult to bring out the Northern and Pacific Fleets onto the high seas."

Unfavorable Climate. Although adversities of climate have been mentioned, it is proper to emphasize their limitations on both commercial and naval activities. Cold and dismal climatic environments seriously affect three of the coastal complexes—only the Black Sea enjoys the milder weather. The White Sea and Far East areas are plagued much of the year by fierce inclement conditions. Only the Satellite countries have Baltic ports with year-round weather conditions that are suitable for reasonably efficient commercial and reasonably effective naval operations.

As a general deduction, the areas from which Soviet naval operations could project into the distant oceans experience climatic conditions which not only discourage, but also preclude operational flexibility. This same limitation applies to ocean commerce. Where the Black Sea has more favorable weather, its accessibility to the open seas is more restrictive including periodic weather limitations on navigating the Bosphorus/Dardanelles.

The Northern Sea Route, some 6,000 miles long, is only open from about mid-July to the end of September; and the use of icebreakers extends this season by about two weeks. Although the Soviet Union has progressively made greater and greater use of this strategic route, it is inconceivable that, within the foreseeable future, they will be able to enhance the route's military and economic contributions to any significant extent.

The magnitude of the modern Soviet Navy was placed in clear focus by Admiral Arleigh Burke on 26 August 1957, when as Chief of Naval Operations he told the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "They have a large, well-rounded navy with the largest submarine force in history, and they are building subs at the rate of about 100 a year." He also pointed out that "In twelve years the Soviet Union has replaced Great Britain as the second ranking sea power." Subsequently, it became recognized that "the Soviet Union . . . has surpassed in some respects the military technology of the West and it also maintains far larger conventional forces." Although these statements were made six to eight years ago, they realistically portray a Soviet Navy today which was commenced in 1928 as part of Stalin's first Five Year Plan.

Stalin, although a "big ship" advocate, emphasized sub-surface warfare and, in 1941, produced the largest submarine force in the world. A naval reorientation during 1956–58 under Khrushchev further stressed the submarine but with a commensurate degradation of the surface navy. "Cruisers," said Khrushchev, "are fit only for diplomatic missions to foreign countries." In 1956, he stopped cruiser construction and replaced the "big-ship" sailor Admiral Kusnetsov with Admiral Gorshkov, a proponent of submarines, missiles, and smaller ships. Since then, missilery has dominated the naval scene (and has even been honored on land as a separate branch of the military). And now, the earlier concept of balanced fleets has given way to an emphasis on missile firing submarines and missile ships in the Northern and Far East Fleet.

The Soviet surface naval force today is the second largest in the world when measured in terms of tonnage. It includes a significant number of relatively modern cruisers, frigates, and destroyers, many equipped with surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles. These units are augmented by numerous coastal types which also brandish missiles. In addition, more than 100 oceanographic research ships emphasize the magnitude of Soviet interest in both the military and economic applications of the world's oceans.

The Soviets have a substantial naval air arm which has been dramatizing increased capabilities with long-range reconnaissance flights over the Atlantic and Pacific. Some of these aircraft have been TU–95 turboprops, the longest range type in the Soviet air inventory useable for oceanic patrol and anti-submarine-surface shipping.

The Red submarine fleet continues to be the world's largest; it includes numerous nuclear and about 400 conventionally-powered types. At least one-third are long-range, while the remainder are medium-range or costal types; and increasingly large portions of the long-range submarines are being equipped with missiles.

The majority of all Soviet surface and submarine vessels are capable of minelaying, giving the Soviet Navy an unusually extensive mining potential. Smaller units, including trawlers, further increase this capability to significant proportions. Equally important are the continued efforts by the Soviet Union to maintain a highly effective minesweeping force. At present this force is also acknowledged to be the world's largest.

The Soviet merchant fleet has expanded alarmingly fast since World War II, and now has an estimated annual increase approximating 1.2 million deadweight tons and a 1970 projected strength of about 13.5 million tons.* The probable goal for 1980 is 20 million gross tons. Current Soviet shipbuilding programs call for about 332 dry cargo ships, 131 tankers, and notably, 38 passenger vessels. Meanwhile, at least 1,124 Soviet merchant ships—totaling 7.03 million deadweight tons—are using the high seas today.

The Soviet fishing fleet will soon be the largest in the world. It is already considered to be the most modern. The trawlers are impressively large and capable of distant and extended operations through the organic support of modern salvage ships, tankers, refrigeration ships, and dry-storage vessels. Estimates indicate that the Soviet fishing force has increased from about 36,404 vessels of all types in 1940 to about 75,000 in 1962, and has a program for an additional 14,000. Fishing operations are global.

It must be concluded that the Soviet Union has, or will have, a numerical preponderance of the components essential to sea power; and Soviet efforts to develop a balance of naval, merchant, and fishing fleets are increasing.

The Soviets remain very much convinced that past efforts toward achieving global Communism have been successful, and that their ideology will reap progress under clever and determined leadership, through aggressive policies, and within the framework of Peaceful Coexistence. Hypnotized by their belief in the "inevitable world revolutionary movement," they will continue to seek every possible action short of war to hasten what they feel to be the ultimate crumbling of the world into their lap. Their strategy is shaped by the nuclear stalemate and the predominating influence which economic development has, and will continue to have, in the foreseeable future, both in Russia and throughout the world. In this environment they plan a significant role for sea power as the instrument for implementing Soviet political goals.

The Soviets will experience during the next decade their most serious challenge in the economic sector; and it is apparent that through directing a greater share of their national effort toward agriculture and consumer industry they intend ultimately to realize greater economic viability to meet the consumer needs. In addition, a necessary extension of the Soviet industrial base and greater participation in world trade are to be pursued by the Soviet leaders in an effort to stimulate their economy and enhance their power image. As a consequence, the military posture will feel the pinch and will find it necessary to restrain expansion desires. Thus the Soviets will probably maintain a military posture, including large naval forces, adequate to preserve the condition of stabilized deterrence and provide territorial security.

Reflection upon the world scene as an image of economic and military power will continue as a paramount Soviet aim. Through this image, the Soviets indeed hope to take full advantage of the high seas more than ever before to gain international prestige and impose blackmail. At the same time they will act to neutralize the effectiveness of Western sea power where possible by choking off the strategic crossroads of ocean commerce and extending their sea power by proxy.

The Soviets are bent on attaining world "socialism" through "economic diplomacy" and without direct involvement in military conflict. They envisage cultural and political co-operation with developing nations as sequel to economic penetration. The eventual aim of course is the development of pro-Communist attitudes and governments. This means that all efforts of aid and assistance will continue to be channeled to ensure profitable political goals irrespective of the resulting hardships to the Russian people.

This political strategic concept frames the future of Soviet sea power; it minimizes the limitations while making maximum use of Soviet sea power capabilities. It provides for the continued modernization of the Navy but will restrict in all probability further expansion; it will promote a progressive and larger commercial fleet; it will foster further growth of the already extensive fishing fleet; and will use these elements of sea power primarily for Cold War objectives while, at the same time, always being prepared to defend the homeland by offensive-defensive naval strategy.

The key to Soviet tactics within this strategy will be to avoid Western positions of strength which is tantamount to avoiding war at practically all cost. Meanwhile, there is no doubt that the strategic missile submarines in the Northern and Far East Fleets will be maintained to reflect creditability of a nuclear deterrent and, in Kremlin diplomacy, as nuclear blackmail.

Increased deployment of surface units primarily into the Mediterranean Sea and the North Atlantic can be expected as part of an effort to enhance the Soviet sea power image and to employ more fully sea power's potential as a diplomatic instrument. Large-scale deployments would seem to be around the corner as the Soviets overcome their logistic limitations, gain experience, and find "friendly" ports. In this regard, close co-operation of Soviet naval units with those of Algeria, Egypt, and Cuba, to mention a few, could well be high on the Soviet priority list. It is more likely, however, that Soviet out-of-area activity will emphasize show-of-strength in furtherance of political goals, inasmuch as the Soviet Navy is not the international "mixer" that other navies have been.

The Soviets will proceed rather cautiously in projecting their naval power into new areas in order to minimize Western reaction; they still recall the Cuban missile incident. A careful "approach" is also necessary to avoid alarming the nations of the Afro-Asian Bloc with their insidious and sophisticated penetration techniques.

The Soviet Navy is a Cold War Navy and highly capable of generating two desired ingredients for Soviet foreign policy—prestige and blackmail. To this end, the Navy will continue to be glossed in secrecy, deceit, and exaggeration.

Meanwhile, the Soviet fishing fleet has given evidence that it will make its presence felt throughout the world and in such fashion as to provide global prestige for the Soviet Union. The vessels, aside from providing economic assistance and intelligence services, serve to augment the Soviet image of sea power. Eventually, it can be expected that Soviet fishing units will associate themselves rather closely to selected ports as some have done in Cuba. The Soviets will use this technique to improve their opportunities to penetrate a multitude of nations and to expand Communist insurgency activity.

The growing Soviet merchant fleet will also serve definite political purposes. It will, of course, further the prestige of the Soviet Union as a creditable major power and, more importantly, it will lend itself to the Soviet design to create a "Socialist commercial bloc" on a global scale, resembling Soviet-Satellite economic ties. The Soviets undoubtedly feel that they have been successful in orienting the economy of Cuba and Egypt toward Moscow and now have confidence that other developing nations will follow at a progressive pace. To accomplish this progress in proper Communist style, all commerce would move in Communist ships; this would permit the Kremlin more positive control over the victims' economy. The ultimate goal of Moscow in this scheme would be two-fold: to isolate the United States from the world markets and from the raw materials abroad; and to consolidate control of the economies of the rising nations. This would be in effect the revival of mercantilism, Communist style.

The primary mission of Soviet naval forces in wartime is most likely the defense of the water approaches to the Soviet Union. The various fleets would conceivably be confined to their respective "lakes," as in the past. The strategy would be the usual offensive-defensive scenario with fringe benefits from submarine long-range operations.

The Northern Fleet would be the most active inasmuch as it would be the only European Fleet, including submarines, capable of projecting beyond the "lakes" of the Soviet coast. The surface units would probably penetrate as far as possible into the Norwegian Sea without undue exposure to Western opposition. The effort would be to provide defense in depth of the industrial Northwest and its associated bases and, in effect, to neutralize the Scandinavian Peninsula. This projection of naval power would be preceded by submarines of the attack and missile types to blunt the approach of any Western naval forces and to maintain control of the Norwegian-Barents Sea area. The primary mission of the submarines would be to destroy Western surface forces while the modern surface-to-air missile ships, with the assistance of naval air power, would hope to blunt an air strike against the Soviet Northwest. The limited number of Soviet ballistic-missile-type submarines (nuclear or not) could be used against the mainland of the United States; however, this would be out of context with the defensive orientation of the Russians and would probably not be prosecuted energetically after the initial stages, if then.

Assorted missions by submarines against the sea lines of communications would be a definite probability although on a much less efficient scale than the Germans in World War II. In this regard, the maximum effort by the Soviet boats would be expected in the Eastern Atlantic where it would be directed toward isolating Western Europe and supporting the Soviet Ground Forces. As the land battle disfavored the Red Army, or Soviet naval superiority became questionable, retreat of all Soviet naval forces to the proximity of their home bases for operation Fleet-in-being would be most likely.

In the Far East, the operating area for surface forces in defense of the Maritime Province would be confined to the Sea of Japan. Offensive-defensive submarine and aircraft operations could project outside the Japanese-Kurile Island chain to blunt approaching hostile forces to an extent dependent upon Japanese involvement. Full Japanese participation in favor of the Western powers would lead to a general withdrawal of Soviet naval forces to the vicinity of their bases with subsequent limited air and submarine operations. The Fleet-in-being concept would be implemented in the interest of retaining an adequate defensive posture to stave off direct attacks against the vital industrial heart of the Maritime Province.

---

* *See* Frank A. Nemec, "The Soviet Maritime Establishment," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, December 1964, p. 26.

Baltic and Black Sea operations could serve a three-fold purpose: protect the coastal shipping; provide defense in depth against air, surface, and submarine threats; and support ground forces as usual. Naval infantry in moderate amphibious operations would be used to support ground forces. Likewise, an important role of naval air would be to support the respective fleets.

In all four fleets, extensive mining could be anticipated whenever and wherever defensive action so favored. This would include efforts to exclude opposing forces from entrances to the home waters of the fleets.

The merchant and fishing fleets would, of course, be forcibly withdrawn to Soviet controlled waters. There is no conceivable sophisticated plan apparent at this time which the Soviets would be likely to apply in an effort to make military use of these components of sea power except insofar as they do provide a broad base for seafaring manpower. The merchant fleet would not be able to ply the oceans in war since the Soviet Navy does not have the antisubmarine capabilities with which to protect it; in fact, the antisubmarine forces have very limited range in regard to both tactical and logistic support.

The more one analyzes the Soviet Navy, its composition, its history, its disposition, and the Soviet propaganda concerning it, the more one becomes convinced that it serves primarily a Cold War purpose. And the Soviets undoubtedly find it prudent to emphasize Dwight D. Eisenhower's view: "War in our times has become an anachronism. Whatever the case in the past, war in the future can serve no useful purpose." In consonance with political objectives, the Kremlin will avoid direct involvement in war at practically all cost. This is evident by their political efforts and sea power strategy both of which are oriented toward a Cold War environment. If a Hot War should occur accidentally, Soviet maritime strategy would most likely be basically defensive, as history and current behavior tend to indicate.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN CONTAINERIZED TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Commerce, and as a representative from a remote State of the Union, I would like to call attention to current developments in the field of containerization, which are related to the activities of these committees, and are of great importance to my State and to the Nation.

It is apparent in Alaska that efficiency in transportation is vital to the prosperity of business and the welfare of our economy and our people. It is equally true that the lessons learned in carrying goods between our overseas States, and associated States, such as Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, can be directly applied for the benefit of U.S. businessmen who wish to export into foreign markets.

Ultimately, of course, any such improvements directly assist all consumers, who desire to use the goods for the satisfaction of basic human needs, such as food, warmth, clothing, and shelter.

Because of these interests, it has been gratifying to me to participate in the current inquiry on the potentials and problems of livestock exports, being conducted by the Small Business Committee under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Our committee, about 2 years ago, began a systematic exploration of this area, with specific reference to transportation costs and barriers. The committee was encouraged by the announcement at the opening of our hearings in February 1965 that steamship companies would lower their freight rates on beef by an average of 25 percent in order to stimulate the exports of this commodity. Shortly thereafter, the air lines announced similar reductions of 25 to 30 percent.

Testimony at the hearings indicated further savings could be accomplished through the development and use of refrigerated containers. Mr. John Eyre, of the Arthur D. Little Co., stated that containerization would, in the case of beef and beef products,: cut the gross transportation cost in half—in some cases by as much as 75 percent.

Our committee's interim report of October 22, 1965, recommended that the data on containerization "be utilized by departments, agencies, and industry associations concerned" in an effort to identify and eliminate transportation bottlenecks—"Expansion of Beef Exports," Interim Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Senate Report No. 939, 89th Congress, 1st session.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report that, with this information before them, American-flag steamship lines initiated the first integrated container service on the North Atlantic trade routes in April 1966. Our Small Business Committee hearings in May brought out that the investment and pioneer technology worked out by our steamship companies made this accomplishment possible. I feel that it should be commended.

Further, these developments are having tangible results. Recent articles in the press confirmed that the breakthrough in meat and livestock exports sought by the Senate Small Business Committee has been achieved by means of shipment in these containers. It is estimated that, if this trade is fully developed, it could yield an additional $250 million a year in sales for the American beef industry and a like amount in balance-of-payments credits for the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I referred be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 1, 1966]

BEEF EXPORT BY CONTAINER A REALITY

WASHINGTON, June 30.—Federal Maritime Commission Chairman John Harllee said today he believed a "breakthrough" had been achieved in shipping U.S. beef to Europe in containers.

An experimental shipment has already been made by United States Lines Co. and word on the movement received at FMC here from the Texas Farm Bureau was that the container shipments passed "all barriers" and the meat was being sold by one of West Germany's largest retail food chains.

TEXAS SHIPMENTS

More such shipments—in line with efforts of the past two years to increase U.S. beef exports to Europe—were planned from Texas, Mr. Harllee said, and further growth was expected.

Sea-Land Service Inc. was also engaged in similar experimental movements of containerized beef, he added.

Mr. Harllee credited the success he found in the beef export situation to cooperation between the steamship industry, beef raisers and processors and the government.

Mr. Harllee said the U.S. "entry into this market shows the value of teamwork and perseverance in overcoming both inertia and complex sets of barriers to this kind of export trade."

"Credit should certainly be given to Sen. JOHN J. SPARKMAN (Dem., Ala.) for his leadership and foresight and to . . . John Griffith and A. T. Desmedt of the American Steamship Traffic Executive Committee."

He said that "their initiative and imagination reflects credit upon the entire American-flag steamship industry."

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1966]

EXPORTS OF MEAT EXPECTED TO RISE: NEW SHIPPING DEVELOPMENTS CREATE FAVORABLE CLIMATE

Cooperation among business, industry and government has brought about overseas transportation conditions that may mean $250-million more a year in American beef and livestock exports, it was reported yesterday by John Harllee, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Mr. Harllee said that reports to the Senate Small Business Committee indicated that a potential market for $250-million of these products existed in Western Europe alone.

Mr. Harllee recalled that late in 1964 the Senate committee, under the leadership of Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, started to study the prospects for exporting high-quality American livestock products to Europe.

American steamship companies soon thereafter told Senator SPARKMAN that ocean freight rates on chilled beef to Europe would be reduced an average of 25 per cent.

Since then, Mr. Harllee noted, three technological developments in ocean shipping have taken place—integrated container service on the North Atlantic; perfection of refrigerated containers for perishables and the development of specialized preservative methods to facilitate shipping of meat.

Mr. Harllee also noted that as a result of these technical advances an experimental shipment of containerized American beef had been marketed competitively in West Germany. Additional shipments, he added, are being planned by the carrier, United States Lines, in cooperation with the Texas Farm Bureau.

Another trans-Atlantic container shipping line, Sea-Land Service, Inc., Mr. Harllee said, has also been involved in beef export movements under another experimental program.

"It is indeed a tribute to the American industry that its responsible officials responded so meaningfully and effectively to the leadership in this area by Congress and such agencies as the Department of Agriculture and our commission," Mr. Harllee said.

Mr. Harllee added that credit should also to be given to John Griffith, general freight manager of United States Lines and to A.

Theodore DeSmedt, president of American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, who is an official of the American Steamship Traffic Executive Committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this success, which has been described by Admiral Harllee of the Maritime Commission as an example of cooperation between business, industry, and Government, has much promise for the future of American transportation and American exports.

It is realized, of course, that containerization is in its infancy, and many problems must be resolved. Examples of these problems are contained in two articles which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on July 7, which describe consideration of an international agreement on ocean containerization, and the difficulties being experienced in planning for the inauguration of air containerization service this year. These matters will be coming before congressional committees, executive departments, independent agencies, and industry groups.

It is my belief that it would be useful to have these articles available to those concerned and I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, July 7, 1966]

DESPITE PROBLEMS: DOMESTIC AIRLINES' CONTAINER PROGRAM LIKELY TO START SEPTEMBER 1

(By Harold Gold)

The domestic airlines are likely to inaugurate their container program on September 1 despite some problems arising from a Civil Aeronautics Board order authorizing the plan.

The CAB in approving the program restricted one aspect of the plan that is causing some concern in airlines circles. The board specifically said that the airlines could not offer an incentive discount for greater density goods moving under specific commodity rates.

While noting that this could hurt the effectiveness of the plan, most airlines report that they are going ahead with the program "as is" in order to get the program "on the road." Trans World, United and the Flying Tiger Line are in this category. All three airlines told The Journal of Commerce that they are taking the steps needed to implement the program on Sept. 1.

STUDYING SITUATION

American Airlines, reported it is studying the situation. The airline has asked the CAB to authorize further industry discussions so that the airlines can deal with the problems arising from the Board's order. The Board has not yet replied to American's request.

The airline program involves a family of modular containers with most of the rates tied to the density of the shipment.

The containers have been designated A, B, C, D. The A container is, in effect, a pallet with the minimum capacity ranging from 370 to 500 cubic feet. The airlines will offer a rate reduction of $1 per 100 pounds for shipments moving in the A container.

In order to qualify for the B, C, and D container programs, the cargo must have a minimum density of 10 lbs. per cubic feet. This is slightly in excess of what the airlines are experiencing—the average running to about nine lbs. per cubic feet.

In order to get shippers to use these containers the airlines are offering discounts ranging from 75c per 100 lbs. for the B container to 35c for the D container.

One of the main purposes of the plan is to increase the density of air cargo shipments. In order to accomplish this the airlines will be offering a further discount of 33⅓ per cent of cargo having a density of more than 10 lbs. per cubic foot.

The airlines had originally planned to also offer a 15 per cent added discount for goods moving under specific commodity tariffs having a density of more than 10 lbs. per cubic foot.

The Board in refusing to allow the carriers to introduce this aspect of the program, indicated that the lines had not justified such an incentive.

It said "the record is clear that many specific commodity rates, such as those on magazines and phonograph records, are heavily weighed in favor of the density of such products and any additional discount on such rates might easily put such rates well below economic levels.

QUALIFICATIONS CITED

"In these circumstances, we are not prepared to approve an across-the-board 15 percent reduction of existing commodity rates provided only that an approved container is used and a minimal density requirement is met.

"This is not to say that the board would not approve specific commodity rates and density incentive discounts applied thereto on containerized shipments, providing such proposals were adequately supported with the required economic justification and tariff data."

The Board also did not allow the carriers to exclude perishables as proposed on the grounds that "containerization incentives should be afforded all products, and that the exclusion of any product should be accompanied by forceful reasons therefore.

"In the absence of a contrary showing, it would appear that the carriers should realize cost savings from containerization of these items equivalent to the savings on other commodities."

The problems over the elimination of the specific commodity discount is twofold; it could result in a situation where, depending on the weight of the shipment, it would be cheaper to send cargo outside a container than in one. Also, it could result in a traffic imbalance.

Almost all specific commodity rates are directional from California eastward. It is estimated that about 25 per cent of the current traffic would be eliminated from the container program under the CAB order.

These areas involve inclusion of all traffic under 10 lbs. per cubic foot within unitization incentive discounts; multi-lateral agreement for the interchange of pallets and containers; third party lessor or container pool; and additional containers of less than 60 cubic feet.

The airlines are hopeful that the program will permit them to get greater density freight, thereby improving load capabilities, and reduce ground handling costs.

While the program involves four basic containers, the airlines note that shippers can use their own containers.

As long as the shipper's container meets the criteria and its specifications are no larger than the corresponding container in the plan, the shipper will be eligible to receive a discount.

American, in a letter to the CAB said, "Disapproval of the 15 per cent density incentive for specific commodity rates in types B, C and D containers focused our attention on an anomalous rating situation which was not contemplated by the carriers party to the agreement.

For example, if carriers publish container rates on specific commodities to the extent authorized by the Board, it would cost less to ship 1,250 pounds of freight in a type C container (125 cubic feet) than in a type D container (62 cubic feet), because a lower rate is discounted (1,000 pound minimum weight vs. 100 pounds).

Obviously, we do not want to encourage a shipper to use twice as much space as necessary, so we do not plan to offer these rates in the tariff.

"At the same time, the Board has indicated that it believes containerization incentives should be afforded all products. If we were to file only general commodity rates on types B, C and D containers, the traffic moving under specific commodity rates would in fact be excluded. This appears to violate the intent of the board order."

In addition, discussions are needed between the carriers on container A concerning; 1-Application extended to sectors of less than 1,000 miles and to all commodities, as ordered by the CAB; 2-Reduction of minimum density from 10 pounds per cubic foot to seven pounds per cubic foot as requested in the Board order and 3-Inclusion of detention times and charges for carrier-owned containers as required by the board.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, July 7, 1966]

RATIFICATION OF CONTAINER PACTS LIKELY

(By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—The United States may soon become an active member of a group of international conventions encouraging the use of container shipments and helping U.S. companies promote their products abroad.

The Administration is seeking Senate consent to U.S. ratification of the conventions, to each of which more than 20 countries are party.

Chances appear to be good that the Senate will approve. The conventions are relatively non-controversial and offer benefits to U.S. exporters and shippers.

TWO CONTAINER PACTS

Under two container conventions, the United States would allow temporary tariff-free imports of shipping containers, such as movable tanks and lift vans, as well as permit goods moved in containers to pass through U.S. customs territory without payment or inspection.

The unhindered in-transit passage of the containers would be expedited under a system of so-called TIR (Transport Internationale Routier) carnets, issued by internationally approved organizations.

The two conventions are roundly supported by U.S shipping interests who believe that U.S. adherence will help stimulate world container traffic.

U.S. exporters may in turn be helped through the greater use of this relatively new transportation method which promises faster service at cut-rate prices.

Most West European countries now adhere to the two container conventions and U.S. participation would guarantee American exporters and shippers of favorable European treatment.

The other conventions now before the Senate set forth international carnet systems to permit the temporary free entry of professional equipment and commercial samples. The equipment may run from office machines to scientific articles.

These conventions are intended to make it easier for scientists and international businessmen to take their own equipment with them in visiting other countries. There would be less "red tape," too, in bringing in commercial samples or advertising material.

Under the carnet system, the posting of bonds with customs officials would be eliminated.

Instead, a businessman posts bond with a local internationally approved organization, which issues him a carnet. The same carnet may be used for as many countries as participate in the convention.

The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce in New York is expected to act as the carnet issuer, if the United States ratifies the professional equipment and commercial sample conventions.

Over 30 countries are party to the professional equipment convention and more than 20 are said to be active in the commercial samples carnet system.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is my intention to continue to do everything that I can to support the activities of the Senate Business Committees in order to advance the development of containerization in our domestic and international commerce.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, our hopes that the airline mechanics strike was on the verge of settlement were dashed with the announcements of last night and this morning. All of us feel a sense of frustration when there appears to be no settlement in sight. Thousands of innocent people and companies suffer because of the unwillingness of the airline companies and the union to give a little in order to achieve agreement. This is intolerable.

Unless there is quick agreement and resumption of flights, this Congress must address itself to the problem of protecting the public interest in assuring continued essential services to our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two wires typical of many now coming in.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
July 14, 1966.

Senator FRANK MOSS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The airline mechanics strike is a direct assault on innocent bystanders. Our company can phrase its complaint directly in terms of airport limousine, air freight, rent cars, taxicabs, and tour buses. Since the Federal Government accepted responsibility in the beginning its responsibility is paramount now; this is no cat and mouse political game.

CHARLES A. BOYNTON, Jr.,
President, Salt Lake Transportation Co.

DENVER, COLO.,
July 14, 1966.

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Present air strike is seriously disrupting our business and unless stopped this week will result in serious business losses. Please do everything you can personally or through Congress to correct this national emergency.

THE FRONTIER REFINING CO.,
M. H. ROBINEAU.

ALASKA: A BLUE-CHIP MILITARY INVESTMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Alaska operations of the Department of Defense costs almost $300 million a year. By appropriating those funds, Congress recognizes the strategic location of Alaska.

In a recent speech to the Alaska Bankers Association in Fairbanks, Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, commander in chief of the Alaskan Command, discussed the growing strategic importance of Alaska in light of Red China's development of nuclear weapons and of the large military force the Soviet Union keeps in Siberia. He also discussed the value of Alaska as a training ground for combat troops and as a refueling center on the fastest route from the Nation's east coast to the Far East.

However, General Reeves went further than to outline Alaska's strategic position in the Nation's defense. He also pointed out that the Nation is getting an extremely good financial deal in the State, and that the good deal has been good for the development of Alaska as well. For example, General Reeves reported that by June 1967, the Department of Defense will be saving $3.5 million a month by flying the polar route and refueling in Alaska as compared to sending its planes over the mid-Pacific route. This increase in military air traffic, and the adaptation of military designs to commercial aircraft will help cut passenger fares and freight rates to Alaska, the air crossroads of the world.

The general pointed out:

> Alaska is a blue chip military investment. Land was acquired at a low cost—2 cents per acre—developed by the military and now provides a large, economical cold-weather training ground. As technology and science increase the range of weapon systems, the location of Alaska increases in importance, thereby increasing the value of our military investment * * *.
>
> The U.S. military investment here could be as important as the British investment at Gibraltar. The importance of the military location of Alaska can only increase in the aerospace age and Alaska, and all Alaskans, will share in the resulting growth. "North to the future" is not an empty phrase—the 49th State truly is the land of the future.

Mr. President, so that other persons may learn of the Nation's blue-chip investment in Alaska, I ask unanimous consent that General Reeves' speech to the Alaska Bankers Association be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also, General Reeves presented a thought-provoking talk to the Alaska Carriers Association Convention in which he tied development of Alaska to development of the State's roads of the future. I ask unanimous consent that the general's task entitled "Alaska's Road to the Future" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY INVESTMENT IN ALASKA

(Speech by Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, commander in chief, Alaskan Command, to the Alaska Bankers Association, Fairbanks, June 2, 1966)

Ladies and gentlemen, the word "invest" is usually defined as putting money into business, real estate, stocks, bonds, etc., for the purpose of obtaining an income or profit, but in military use, "invest means to hem in or besiege an enemy installation.

Both definitions are accurate for the Department of Defense's investment in Alaska, for not only is Alaska a key position in America's effort to hem in or contain our most dangerous potential enemy, but because an investment in Alaska's military force can reduce the overall military expenditure.

To analyze the Alaska investment, let's examine its military significance from the standpoint of the Department of Defense. To do so, requires a look at three points:

(1) The present investment—that is, what does the military own in Alaska, and how was the real estate acquired.

(2) The present cost of defending Alaska.

(3) Most important—the strategic location of Alaska.

The cash outlay for the military real estate in Alaska was small—about two cents per acre—because the military land now in use is government land that we have retained. In most cases, the land was originally in undesirable locations. Often the growth of nearby civilian communities has given the post and the town common borders, thereby increasing the value of the military real estate. In fact, the entire development of Alaska can be characterized by cooperation and mutual growth of the civilian and military communities. Our expansion has kept pace with Alaska until we now have more than two billion dollars in property in Alaska, excluding the value of the military land and 78,000 military personnel and dependents. The military population represents one-third of the total state population. The military, other federal agencies and dependents exceed one-half of the total state population. We can also attribute a sizable percent of the population to military people who have either retired or completed their required military service here in Alaska and elected this as their new home.

Obviously, the Armed Forces in Alaska have a major effect on the present Alaskan economy. This has been true throughout the history of Alaska. The early explorations, carving out the first roads, the construction of the Alaska Highway, and the building of the Alaska Communications complex have all increased the military importance of Alaska. Each of the actions have had a comparable effect on the state's economy.

A classic example is the Alaska Communications complex. This is one of the most important military contributions to Alaska because it opened up Alaska's frontiers, while simultaneously tying the state together by providing rapid, dependable communications.

The communications complex has five parts. The first is the former Army Signal Corps System now known as the Alaska Communications Systems, or ACS. Sale of this long-line system to a civilian company is currently being considered in Congressional hearings.

The other four portions are:

(1) The White Alice System, a network of large tropospheric scatter stations;

(2) The Ballistic Missile Early Warning Communications System, an addition to the White Alice system that extends long-line routes from the Ballistic Missile Early Warning site at Clear to the Alaskan borders;

(3) The Aleutian System, a series of communication facilities collocated with the Air Force radar installations on the Aleutian Island chain;

(4) The Federal Aviation Agency long-line system, a network of twelve very high frequency radio links.

All five systems provide circuits for commercial use. Collectively, they form the Alaska Communications complex and blanket the state with dependable, rapid communications. The complex was constructed to meet a defense requirement, but has additionally served the general public as a commercial system. It would be uneconomical for a private company to develop the same coverage. The Alaskan Command doesn't want to build any communications systems, to the exclusion of private firms—we simply must have reliable command control. Communications were and are necessary to the security of North America. The residual effect has helped to develop Alaska.

What does it cost to defend Alaska and maintain the base for strategic action? In round figures, it costs the Department of Defense about two hundred-ninety million dollars annually. This figure is a total of one hundred twenty-six (point five) million dollars for military pay and subsistence allowances; one hundred thirty-seven (point five) million dollars for operation and maintenance (including the civilian payroll) and an average of twenty-six million dollars annually for military construction.

Is it worth two hundred-ninety million dollars a year to maintain the Alaska military contingent? Yes! For two reasons—

First—some of the funds, such as the twenty-six million dollars for construction, improve the value of the military establishment.

But, most important—the cost is justified because of the geographical location of Alaska.

Alaska's location becomes more important each day due to the increasing nuclear threat of Red China, and the increasing range and speed of modern weapon delivery systems.

Red China's development of a nuclear weapon and the Soviet Union's large military force in Siberia make Alaska a strategic location for early detection and interception.

The threat to North America from the Siberian Peninsula stems primarily from air, naval, and missile forces. Airfields located in this area are nearly one thousand miles closer to the Chicago-Detroit industrial complex than are airfields located in other Soviet Arctic areas. The importance of this area in any manned bomber attack on North America is readily evident—it is the shortest route to the Midwestern or Western states. Missiles or aircraft launched from this area toward the United States would pass over or near Alaska. Thus, we are very much involved in an early warning and forward defensive effort should the Soviet Union launch an attack on the United States.

Alaska was one of the three locations deemed most desirable for locating the giant Ballistic Missile Early Warning Sites. These three giant electronic facilities, designed to detect the launch of ballistic missiles are located at Fylingdale, England; Thule, Greenland; and, Clear, Alaska. Each one is an investment of over one-half billion dollars. To Alaska, the Clear facility means an eleven to twelve million dollar yearly contract.

Another aspect to the location of Alaska that we have long realized is its importance as a cold-weather training area. We too vividly recall from World War II and Korea, the rigors of fighting in cold weather. Only through personnel training, in actual cold-weather environment, can we overcome many of the problems encountered in cold weather warfare. Alaska affords us both the environment and the area for large-scale winter exercises with a climate and terrain similar to Russia. Arranging for a similar area in the Lower 48 or a foreign country is more time consuming, and more expensive.

The growth of hostilities in Southeast Asia and the resulting attempts to prepare personnel and test equipment has pointed up the suitability of the present exercise area as a summer training area. The present maneuver site extends southeast from here along the highway to just south of Tok, and affords an excellent environment for summer jungle warfare training. The tractability in summer is similar to Vietnam and Alaska mosquitoes can hold their own against any nation's insects!

The two infantry battalions recently transferred from United States Army, Alaska, to Southeast Asia have demonstrated their high degree of combat training received in Alaska. During a short period of acclimation in Hawaii, they were re-equipped and integrated with the 25th Infantry Division. Early last month they encountered their first combat mission—about ninety days following their departure from Alaska. This attests to the quality of Alaska as a summer training ground for jungle warfare.

We are experiencing difficulty in the established maneuver area due to the civilian expansion of Alaska. Each year we are required to build new access roads for the joint, combined winter exercise because homestead claims are filed along the roads as soon as the maneuvers are terminated. As a result, each year's training area is moved slightly, to alleviate property rights disputes.

We have considered moving the exercise to a new location—either north or west of Fairbanks—but the cost of developing necessary access roads, bridges, communications, base facilities, petroleum storage and additional airfields to allow necessary air mobility is prohibitive—especially since restrictions have been placed on all construction which is not directly related to Southeast Asia.

Since it is against Department of Defense policy to permanently withdraw this land from public domain, we could not consider the expense of developing a new exercise location as an investment. Facilities in the present maneuver area are adequate and the cost of relocating cannot be justified at this time.

Another Alaska advantage that is currently developing into a major military effort is our location on the great circle polar route. With today's long-range transport aircraft, Alaska serves as the mid-way station on the fastest route to the Orient. Thus, Alaska is playing a vital role in the war in Southeast Asia as a maintenance and refueling stop for the Military Airlift Command's new C–141 Starlifter cargo aircraft.

The C–141's are operating mainly out of Dover, Delaware and Charleston, South Carolina, for a direct flight to Elmendorf Air Force Base where approximately fifteen thousand gallons of fuel are on-loaded while a new aircrew inspects the airplane; then flies direct to Yakota Air Force Base, Japan, near Tokyo or Clark Air Force Base in the Philippine Islands, refuels, changes crew, and departs for Vietnam. The total elapsed time from Dover, Delaware to Saigon is twenty-two and one-half hours. Using Alaska as a refueling point for the long-range C–141 results in savings of approximately ten flying hours per round trip as versus the mid-Pacific route. At an estimated operating cost of one thousand dollars per flying hour for the C–141, this is a ten thousand dollar savings per trip. It is planned that by June of next year, the Starlifters will fly over three hundred-fifty round trips per month via Alaska, yielding a total savings of three and one-half million dollars per month.

Since modern jet transports such as the C–141 require less maintenance than propeller-driven transports and have greater range and larger load capacity, they permit increased aircraft utilization and greater flexibility of operation.

Future aircraft like the C–5 offer even greater growth potential of air traffic through Alaska. The Military Airlift Command estimates that the giant C–5A jet transport, currently being developed by Lockheed Aircraft, can carry a two hundred-fifty thousand pound payload at five and one-half cents per ton-mile—this is one cent less than the current rail freight rate.

Aircraft comparable to the C–5A are being studied and planned for commercial aviation. These aircraft will give further impetus to Alaska as the "Air Crossroads of the World" by lowering the passenger fare and freight rate.

The examples I have mentioned illustrate that by all banking standards, Alaska is a "blue chip" military investment. Land was acquired at a low cost—two cents per acre—developed by the military and now provides a large, economical cold-weather training ground. As technology and science increase the range of weapon systems, the location of Alaska increases in importance, thereby increasing the value of our military investment. Because we have acquired sufficiently large areas, we can, if required, expand our military forces in Alaska at little additional expense.

Due to the efforts of a few far-sighted leaders, the U.S. Armed Forces are strategically located at the future air crossroads of the world. We have built a citadel at the Polar Gateway.

The U.S. military investment here could be as important as the British investment at Gibraltar. The importance of the military location of Alaska can only increase in the aerospace age and Alaska, and all Alaskans, will share in the resulting growth. "North to the Future" is not an empty phrase—the 49th State truly is the land of the future.

Alaska's Road to the Future

(Address by Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, Commander in Chief, Alaskan Command, at Alaska Carriers Association Convention, Fairbanks, Alaska, Friday, April 22, 1966)

Gentlemen, as an Air Force General Officer and as the only Air Force Commander in the seven Unified Commands, it would be natural for me to echo the usual arguments for faith in the future of aviation. In Alaska, I would be doubly justified in emphasizing aviation because it has certainly played a major role in Alaska's development and it has particularly accelerated the growth in many isolated areas of the State.

Instead of aviation's future, however, I want to talk about the roads and the commerce that they carry. When Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India visited the White House, President Johnson told her that, "The journey to our future is over a very long and a very winding road. Every mile will be challenged by doubt." The President was speaking of international accord, but if he had been speaking to you, or perhaps to Governor Egan, he could have been referring to Alaskan highways. Although I marvel at the difficulties that have been overcome in building some of Alaska's roads, I am equally impressed with the need for unrelenting effort in building more. The journey to Alaska's future, . . . that is, a full realization of Alaskan potential . . . depends in large part upon an efficient road network and a healthy trucking industry.

Reverting to aviation's future in Alaska for a moment, I think it is excellent, and I think that the trucking industry in Alaska cannot help but share in some of the benefits of the growth of aviation. As more airports are built or improved, and as bigger and better airplanes are developed, it is inevitable that Alaska's population will spread and will increase. As this happens, there will be a growing justification for a better highway network. This is the pattern which has already been established in Alaska. Helicopters and short take-off and landing aircraft will become increasingly important. As aircraft become larger, faster and more efficient, there is a constantly declining in cost per ton-mile. The air freight traffic will increase, and will supplement rather than replace surface trucking. Even with a highly competitive rail and air freight network, trucking in the south 48 has grown and prospered. But, and this . . . I think . . . is important, they prospered only where good roads and population centers created a demand.

Alaska's strategic location insures a continuing increase in population. Alaska sits directly astride the Polar Great Circle route from North America to the Orient. It is then the aerial cross roads of the North. Alaska, as an aerial crossroad, can develop just as Hawaii did as a major intersection of sea lanes in an age of ocean shipping. There is also a growing recognition of Alaska's strategic importance as the state closest to Russia and Red China. We in the military have long recognized Alaska's valuable geographical position, and I think it is significant that commercial air carriers are now displaying a growing awareness of its valuable location. The military interest and research in cold weather operations has been a healthy influence on the growth of Alaska. I believe we in the military, along with the civilian populace in Alaska, have dispelled some of the misconceptions that have existed about the problem of working and living in Alaska. Each year we rotate more than 30,000 military personnel and dependents to the South 48. This is good for you, our friends in the trucking business, who move their household goods, but I think there is another and perhaps more important benefit. And that is that these people become ambassadors for Alaska and have the opportunity to tell many people that living and working in Alaska is far better than they had expected. I believe there are some worthwhile long range benefits to be derived from this.

There are some other elements in the growth of Alaska which I think are very healthy and worth mentioning. Alaska can be proud of the improvements in surface travel brought about by the State Ferry System. This "Marine Highway" certainly offers some of the world's most picturesque travel and at the same time is rapidly bringing economic and social development to an area rich in timber, fish and history. The ferry system is literally pushing back the frontiers of southeast Alaska.

Northwest Alaska needs the same sort of stimulus. If the entire state is to realize its potential, it cannot wait for major population centers to develop before building a road. More cities and more areas of homesteading will develop when more roads are built. Alaskan cities, even in outlying areas, will insist upon reliable access to existing economic, medical, and cultural facilities. Rapid development can only come when a vast network of year-round roads are built to permit Alaskan carriers and private vehicles to ply highways and bring the hallmarks of civilization to every Alaskan.

You are to be commended that in spite of the limitations imposed on you by the few highways, the great distances between population centers and the severity of weather, the number of pieces of trucking equipment per capita is greater in Alaska than in any other state, and is increasing each year by more than thirty-five hundred pieces. I doubt that many Alaskans realize that you furnish direct employment to more than seventeen hundred people, pay almost seven million dollars a year in state and federal taxes, that you are capable of handling any type of trucking activity, and that the trucking capacity of Alaska commercial carriers exceeds thirty-five hundred ton/days.

At the present, the members of this association move almost thirty million pounds each year for the military within the State of Alaska. I am referring only to shipments that originate and terminate in Alaska. Three Air Force Stations—Wildwood, Pedro Dome, and Murphy Dome—and all of the White Alice sites on the Alaska and Richardson Highways depend on your trucks for resupply.

Increasing the number of places served by highways will bring increased trucking demand. As easier access is permitted to isolated areas, the Alaskan Command can substantially reduce the cost of construction and resupply. With more highways, we can perform our mission of defending Alaska more effectively and more economically.

For example, look at the present method of maintaining the Alaskan Air Command's Early Warning Network. Each summer, the Air Force ships more than one-hundred fifteen thousand tons during the annual summer resupply program known as Project MONA LISA. After the ice pack closes the northeast shipping lanes, most of the sites are forced to depend on aerial resupply. Two of the radar installations, Sparrevohn and Indian Mountain, depend entirely on aerial delivery year-around. Certainly the cost of maintaining this vital link in the North American Air Defense System will be reduced as the highway network is expanded to reach some of these installations.

In closing, I again refer to a remark made by President Johnson—this time after the signing of the Alaska Purchase Centennial Bill on the 26th of March, this year. The Chief Executive said, ". . . the permanent projects which are planned as a part of that celebration will contribute to the long-range development of this great and important state."

I am sure that each of us will wholeheartedly agree with the President on the lasting value of the Alaska Purchase Centennial celebration. Some three-hundred thousand people are expected to view the exhibition site here at Fairbanks during 1967.

No doubt, each one of this number will find something in Alaska for them, for Alaska is a vast and varied land that offers something for everyone. I want each one of the 1967 visitors to go away with the same warm feeling that I have for Alaska. I want to see Alaska grow and develop its vast potential.

Transportation is the key that will unlock Alaska's treasure chest, and dependable year-around surface transportation is the essential element of that key.

I submit to all Alaskans that—wherever the trucker goes, there goes progress!

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the airlines strike has continued now for a week.

I will make no attempt to comment on the merits of either side to the dispute, but would like to point out the effect on the welfare of all concerned in Missouri, and to observe that in addition to those immediately involved there are many others being hurt by prolongation of the strike.

Telegrams from Missouri businessmen, urging every effort toward resolving the dispute, indicate how vital air service is today. These include not only businessmen who depend on airlines for fast business trips, but shippers whose products range from valuable parent stock poultry being exported worldwide, to florists and manufacturers.

Hotel operators and retail businessmen also report they are being affected adversely.

One airline, TWA, employs 9,014 persons in Missouri. Today, 5,977 of those employees are off the payroll. This adds up to a monthly payroll loss of $3,740,000.

There is no question of the harmful effect on the disputants and business generally. It is my hope that both sides will make every effort toward a settlement soon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a selection of the many telegrams I have received.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator EDWARD LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our firm depends on air freight service into Kansas City for 85 percent of our shipping. Please do what you can to help in this air strike.

EARL G. LACEY,
Wholesale Florist.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator EDWARD LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectively request your utmost effort to promote agreement in strike of five major airlines permitting settlement satisfactory to union, management, and our country. Each passing day multiplies hardships seriously affecting business and the national economy.

A. C. SWANSON,
President,
Western Auto Supply Co.

PLEASANT HILL, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator EDWARD LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strike on Trans World and other major airlines is seriously affecting our business of exporting valuable parent stock poultry to other nations around the world. Will appreciate your help in pressing for an early settlement of strike.

MR. IRWIN,
President,
Colonial Poultry Farms, Inc.

JULY 14, 1966.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The pending airline strike is seriously affecting the economy of the Kansas City region and your efforts to bring about rapid settlement will be greatly appreciated by citizens and businesses of this area.

Sincerely,
PLEASANT V. MILLER, Jr.,
President, Commerce Trust Co.

NABRIT TO AEC

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit's list of credits is much too lengthy to recite here. And I do not believe it necessary to itemize the list to strengthen my endorsement of President Johnson's nomination of Dr. Nabrit to the Atomic Energy Commission.

He has had, as the Houston Post states, a long and distinguished career in education and government service.

The Post regrets, in an editorial, the fact that Dr. Nabrit must leave Houston and his post as president of Texas Southern University. But it adds that his contributions as a member of the AEC will be of great value to the Nation.

Dr. Nabrit needs no further recommendation, but I still would like to place this tribute to him in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, June 23, 1966]

DR. NABRIT TO AEC

The nomination of Dr. S. M. Nabrit to the Atomic Energy Commission should be warmly applauded throughout the country.

Dr. Nabrit, president of Texas Southern University since 1955, has a long and distinguished career in education and the service of his government.

Dr. Nabrit, who would take a year's leave of absence from Texas Southern when his appointment is confirmed by the Senate, has now served three Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

President Eisenhower appointed him in 1956 to the National Science Board. In 1959, Nabrit was named to a national advisory committee to assist the Office of Education in a program to improve modern foreign language instruction.

Under President Kennedy, he became a special ambassador to represent the U.S. at independence celebrations in the Republic of Niger, and, in 1963, he became vice chairman of a new committee on equality of educational opportunity of the American Council on Education.

In 1963, Nabrit served on a committee to study the need for publicly supported institutions of higher learning in the District of Columbia and was one of 10 Americans to attend a UN conference in Geneva on assistance to underdeveloped nations.

Under his leadership, Texas Southern University has achieved high standards of education.

His presence will be missed in Houston. His services on the AEC will be of great value to the nation.

EDWARD KERNAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is with sadness and a deep sense of personal loss that I rise today to announce the death of my good friend and veteran Cleveland Plain Dealer reporter, Edward Kernan. Since Ed came to Washington in 1944 I have known him well and I have respected his fine ability as an objective and sensitive journalist.

Ed was born in Red Wing, Minn., in 1907. After working for Minnesota newspapers, he came to the Akron bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer in 1937. While in Washington he covered many presidential conventions.

In 1954 Ed Kernan was elected to the Gridiron Club of Washington. Many of us saw and enjoyed his performance as Crier in the annual skits of that club. Ed Kernan was a friend and I know that I speak for many in the Congress when I say that we shall miss him.

Ed Kernan was a delightful, jovial friend. It was my privilege to know him well from the time years ago I was Congressman at Large and he was on the staff of the Plain Dealer bureau in Washington. Ed Kernan was a most personable, generous, and kindly individual. He was also a great news reporter; thoroughly discerning and objective. He never overlooked what was important nor failed to discard what was unimportant. During the nearly 8 years I have served as U.S. Senator I came to regard him as a most knowledgeable, likeable, and gracious friend and also a superior news reporter. It was depressing and shocking to me to learn of his death at a comparatively early age.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1324.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the foreign aid bill this afternoon, but on Monday the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], will commence with the presentation of this bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITMENT OF U.S. MILITARY FORCES—FOREIGN AID BILL—LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF STATE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have received, today, from the Secretary of State, a letter which he has requested the leadership to bring to the attention of the Senate. It concerns the foreign aid bill which will be before the Senate directly.

The Secretary addresses himself to the question of whether or not the commitment of U.S. military forces may be implicit in the extension of U.S. assistance under aid legislation. If I may say so, the Secretary's letter is a most candid and welcome clarification of this question and I am delighted to read it in full to the Senate at this time.

JULY 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I have noted recent expressions of concern in the Senate over whether the Administration views the extension of aid to a country as a commitment to defend that country with United States troops if it is attacked. I think it important that any confusion on this issue be removed before the Senate considers the 1966 Amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and I would appreciate it if you would bring this letter to the attention of the members.

AID legislation relates to furnishing economic and military assistance to foreign countries. It has no bearing on commitments to employ United States forces to assist in the collective self-defense of other countries. Such commitments are made, pursuant to our laws and the Constitution, where the national interest so requires and not because the United States is or is not supplying the foreign country in question with foreign aid. In short, our aid program neither implies nor prohibits a commitment to use our armed forces in cooperation with the self-defense efforts of a foreign country.

This question has apparently arisen out of the discussion of Southeast Asia. I have stated to Congressional committees and elsewhere that each Administration since World War II has concluded, as a matter of policy, that the security of Southeast Asia was important to the security of the United States. This policy has been supported in a variety of ways. We have furnished substantial economic and military assistance to the countries in Southeast Asia. A specific security commitment was contained in the SEATO Treaty which applied directly to the signatories and to the protocol states. This commitment was reaffirmed by the Joint Resolution of Congress of August 10, 1964. The security commitment did not arise from the AID programs but from the formal and solemn action taken by the United States in accordance with its constitutional processes. I hope this distinction will now be clear.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

NATURAL DISASTER AT ULAN BATOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that a natural disaster of great proportions has befallen the people who live in and near the city of Ulan Bator, capital of the Mongolian People's Republic.

According to one source, thousands of families living along the Tula River have been driven from their homes as a result of torrential rains and massive flooding. Scores of persons have been killed, several bridges are out, and the capital, a city of 250,000 inhabitants, is without drinking water, electricity, and other essentials.

Misfortunes of this scope are of concern to all men. Natural calamities do not respect national boundaries, or ideologies. A final assessment of damage has not yet been made, but the indications are that Mongolia will require outside

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

assistance. I would hope that our national sympathies have already been extended through available channels to the people of the stricken area. I would hope, further, that the American Red Cross or other agencies would stand by to offer promptly such help as might be appropriate in the event the need for it arises.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ulan Bator Flood Kills Scores, Routs Thousands," written by Harrison E. Salisbury, and published in the New York Times of Friday, July 15, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ULAN BATOR FLOOD KILLS SCORES, ROUTS THOUSANDS—MONGOLIAN FAMILIES HOMELESS AS RAIN SWELLS RIVER—DISASTER PARALYZES CAPITAL DURING NATIVE HOLIDAY

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

ULAN BATOR, MONGOLIA, July 14.—Mongolia's sprawling capital struggled today to overcome the effects of a disastrous flood that has taken scores of lives and left thousands homeless.

Word spread that the Soviet Union was speeding generator trains south from eastern Siberia to provide power to the stricken city.

Mongolian authorities, assisted by Soviet army units, have been lifting hundreds of families from the flooded valley by helicopters.

The rain has stopped and the weather has cleared, but Ulan Bator is without water, electricity and other supplies. Virtually all industry in this city, with a population of 250,000, has been closed by flood waters or lack of power.

At least 4,000 families, most of whom live along the banks of the Tula River in yurts, the traditional Mongolian abode made of canvas and felt, were homeless and had lost their belongings.

The railroad south to China has been cut at several places and communications with the Ulan Bator airport were precariously maintained.

The flooding struck as the Mongolians prepared to celebrate Nadam, a traditional holiday. On Saturday the sky was clear and the air crystal cool. Sunday the sky clouded over and it began to drizzle. Sunday night the rain started in earnest.

By Monday morning, when all of Ulan Bator and thousands of guests were preparing for the three-day holiday, the rain came down in sheets.

Despite the downpour, a curtailed parade was held. The traditional games—wrestling, archery and horse racing over a 33-mile open country course, started but had to be cancelled.

An Tuesday the rain started anew. In the afternoon emergency radio broadcasts ordered everyone to get north of the river. The bridges were about to go out.

Thousands of Mongolians streamed over the high bridge, which survived the storm. But soon the smaller bridges began to collapse and areas near the river were cut off. Power stations were flooded and the water system knocked out. Communications from north to south were almost cut off.

The Ulan Bator Hotel, where hundreds of foreign guests here for the holiday were quartered, had only candlelight and no water or plumbing.

The homeless were moved to safer ground by trucks, amphibious vehicles, pontoon boats and rafts. They gradually collected in Sukhe Bator Square, which only a few hours before had been the scene of the holiday. An army field kitchen moved in to serve hot meals at the hotel. Helicopters lifted families from the flooded areas and took them to emergency rescue points in schools and hospitals.

The effects of the disaster have not been completely assessed. A Government commission is trying to determine what help must be sought from the outside world.

Restoration of normal services appears to be some distance off. No local power is expected before Aug. 1.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 15, 1966:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force precommission schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John F. Anderson, FV3178852.
Thomas B. Carroll, FV3183775.
Henry Christian, FV3183776.
Jerry M. Christian, FV3154335.
Pat O. Clifton, FV3157168.
Michael Colleran, FV3154321.
Wilfred L. Crossman, FV3183777.
Gerald W. Deakin, FV3178787.
Russel D. Durrett, FV3183779.
William Edwards, FV3178851.
Don W. Fishero, FV3183780.
James B. Fowler, FV3178721.
Walter J. Gomez, FV3154310.
Otto P. Hannemann, FV3183781.
Kenneth L. Hope, FV3178819.
Robert P. Howard, FV3154364.
William F. Jenkins, FV3154280.
Richard A. Keylor, FV3154288.
Julien V. Koschmann, FV3178719.
William T. Lohman, FV3183782.
Michael G. McBride, FV3178728.
Joseph L. Pecci, FV3154289.
Robert C. Sizemore, FV3183785.
Addison L. Smith, FV3183786.
David H. Stanforth, FV3150519.
Ray K. Stokes, FV3183788.
Paul G. Stokholm, FV3183789.
Tom S. Thorsen, FV3183791.
Warren E. Thurn, FV3183792.
John L. Wade, FV3183793.
Wallace L. Wiggins, FV3154307.
George E. Wilson III, FV3154360.
Richard P. Winslow, FV3183794.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

George T. Adams, FV3104261.
Robert W. Allerton III, FV3115669.
Gordon L. Anderson, FV3097292.
Frank N. Assaf II, FV3117095.
Sandor Babos, FV3106108.
George W. Baker, FV3101842.
James P. Baker, FV3073884.
Warren S. Barnes, FV3115299.
Louis E. Bartrand, FV3101790.
Thomas J. Bellanca, FV3095026.
Thomas G. Bertenshaw, FV3115414.
Monte E. Blews, FV3115377.
Donavon F. Bonertz, FV3117862.
William G. Bookout, FV3104120.
Larry J. Brandt, FV3117466.
Lester P. Brown, Jr., FV3104359.
Anthony N. Bua, FV3115307.
John G. Bulov, FV3068339.
David O. Caldwell, FV3116109.
Robert L. Cargill, FV2212066.
Raymond D. Chuvala, FV3115317.
Frank M. Clark, Jr., FV3109637.
Ernest J. Clarke, FV3115550.
David A. Clevenger, FV3106520.
David A. Cochenour, FV3106170.
Donald J. Cockrum, FV3118199.
Joseph T. Connell, FV3118285.
Blaine S. Corrick, Jr., FV3116375.
Richard Y. Costain, FV3080447.
Robert H. Custer, FV3037630.
Philip B. Davis, FV3117101.
Leo A. Delbridge, FV3031779.
Gerald K. Delles, FV3115930.
Frank J. Delzingaro, FV3115325.
Richard W. Densmore, FV3110023.
George A. Devorshak, FV3064949.
Richard L. Dillman, FV3117380.
Oliver P. Ditch, FV3096707.
Nicholas J. Donelson, FV3118140.
Thomas J. Doubek, FV3117381.
Robert A. Duganne, FV3099689.
Charles M. Edwards, FV3116872.
Donald R. Edwards, FV3115507.
Hermann J. Engelbach, Jr., FV3097713.
Jerald J. Erskine, FV3116413.
Edward J. Erxleben, FV3115521.
Leonard P. Estrada, FV3099769.
Jerry D. Fifer, FV3100616.
Neil Fisher, FV3115329.
John P. Flannery, FV3115826.
Richard R. Flynn, FV3115332.
James Fox, FV3116879.
James V. Franklin, FV3055974.
Maurice G. Fricke, FV3115333.
Charles Fritts, FV3115829.
William D. Fuchlow, FV3104124.
Manuel C. Garcia, FV3109654.
Kevin A. Gilroy, FV3109656.
Gerald I. Goldschlager, FV3104246.
Kenneth E. Gould, FV3104247.
Marvin M. Gradert, FV3059167.
Charles E. Graf, FV3106414.
Ronald A. Graves, FV3109699.
James D. Green, FV3087031.
Joseph A. Grimaud, Jr., FV3109756.
John H. Hall, FV3116622.
Joseph R. Hall, Jr., FV3104500.
Gerald J. Hamilla, FV3104372.
Trevor A. Hammond, FV3115838.
William J. Hanig, FV3104039.
David J. Hewer, FV3097075.
Charles H. Holden, FV3116431.
Thomas R. Howes, FV3115388.
Jerry E. Ikner, FV3117952.
John A. Jackson, Jr., FV3116632.
Donald L. Jacobsen, FV3115845.
Robert D. Jeffrey, FV3117985.
John E. Johnson, Jr., FV3117792.
Gerald D. Johnston, FV3115356.
William E. Jones, Jr., FV3116118.
Gerald R. Kailing, FV3117118.
Donald E. Kaneski, FV3118203.
David G. Kanter, FV3115713.
Eugene S. Kaye, FV3104379.
Louis W. Keeby, FV3109674.
Larry R. Keith, FV3058232.
Joseph R. Kempton, FV3100079.
Robert L. Kennison, FV3115851.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Bibb B. Kilpatrick, FV3115345.
William D. Kissler, FV3115354.
Joseph D. Kormanik, FV3098199.
Robert E. Kraig, FV3118158.
William M. Lamos, FV3117908.
Thomas A. Laser, FV3105666.
Roy C. LeCroy, FV3099717.
John L. Lenamon, FV3106441.
Rudolph Lioi, FV3115945.
Howard S. Loitwood, Jr., FV3118206.
Marcel I. Loosbrock, FV3106287.
John M. Loring, Jr., FV3115867.
Alvin W. Luedtke, FV3097342.
Larry N. Lydick, FV3100698.
Dewan D. Madden, FV3081338.
Bobby R. Mahoney, FV3115876.
Kenneth G. Martin, FV3100023.
Fredric E. McCabe, FV3117917.
Robert A. McCaughan, FV3118048.
Donald L. McEwen, FV3109876.
Jimmie J. McIlwain, FV3117700.
Eugene P. McKinney, FV3104443.
Thomas J. McQuaide, FV3105616.
John A. Milford, FV3069475.
Jerry A. Miller, FV3109691.
Ronald F. Miller, FV3104507.
Joseph E. Monaghan, Jr., FV3118207.
Richard W. Money, FV3117702.
John H. Moore, FV3115378.
Neville A. Morgan, FV3115629.
Malcolm B. Morrison, FV3117922.
James D. Muma, FV3104752.
Richard M. Murphy, FV3117817.
Glen H. Nelson, FV3118060.
Ronald L. Osborn, FV3099528.
William A. Ott, FV3115383.
Francis L. Owens, Jr., FV3098754.
Jerry E. Pankonen, FV3104316.
Gregg O. Parker, FV3117310.
John L. Pasciutti, FV3104510.
Eugene C. Patti, FV3116475.
Robert D. Peel, FV3117963.
Jack A. Phillips, FV3116477.
Oliver L. Pickens, FV3116478.
Michael M. Plecenik, Jr., FV3081865.
Laurence H. Potts, Jr., FV3115636.
Glenn L. Ramsdale, Jr., FV3118212.
Richard L. Reeser, FV3116130.
Kenneth R. Reiff, FV3105678.
Alan L. Rennick, FV3099816.
Jack W. Reppert, FV3117318.
Ronald G. Ribble, FV3115389.
James W. Rice, FV3104254.
Sanford, A. Richardson, FV3107580.
Ernest G. Rider, FV3106117.
Charles A. Rinchko, FV3117451.
Thomas L. Rish, FV3107581.
David L. Roberts, FV3116193.
Fletcher R. Robeson, FV3106961.
Ronald D. Ross, FV3115395.
Bruce R. Royal, FV3117325.
Larry J. Runge, FV3085823.
Martin J. Ryan, Jr., FV3116194.
Franklyn J. Selzer, FV3115400.
Lawrence E. Shannon, FV3109718.
Jerry C. Shilt, FV3117413.
Loy D. Shipp, FV3101527.
James S. Smith, FV3100529.
Michael J. Speer, FV3118086.
James E. Speight, FV3097938.
Anthony L. Stamant, FV3116496.
Richard A. Steckley, FV3115406.
Ralph H. Steding, FV3118183.
Edward B. Steele, FV3116497.
John J. Talbott, FV3109729.
Joe D. Tate, FV3118186.
Herbert F. Taylor, FV3117733.
John W. Taylor, FV3117458.
James C. Thomas, FV3054213.
John C. Thomas, FV3117505.
Thomas A. Tomasetti, FV3116198.
Carroll R. Turner, FV3105918.
Robert W. Undorf, FV3117223.
Gerard W. Vanderwaal, FV3115655.
Claude H. Vichierguerre, FV3115534.
Michael A. Vivian, FV3081324.
Gary J. Walter, FV3109741.
Ronald W. Wanner, FV3118092.
James F. Ward III, FV3105595.
Paul T. Webb, FV3117087.
Orion B. Whatley, Jr., FV3109907.
James J. Whipps III, FV3109744.
Alton B. Winkelman, FV3116090.
James R. Withers, FV3117348.
Harry J. Witt II, FV3104179.
Edward H. Wittmers, Jr., FV3100881.
Harley A. Yarber, Jr., FV3116514.
George V. Zimmerman, Jr., FV3106086.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Fred S. Ryan, Unalakleet, Alaska, in place of Frank Ryan, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Olga W. Morrison, Pinecrest, Calif., in place of A. J. Honett, deceased.

HAWAII

Hazel K. Kobayashi, Kealia, Hawaii, in place of Kenichi Masunaga, retired.

ILLINOIS

John I. Stoltz, Bellmont, Ill., in place of I. C. Stoltz, retired.

Helen M. Harding, Hammond, Ill., in place of E. L. South, retired.

INDIANA

Basil Hoffman, Birdseye, Ind., in place of D. E. Wright, retired.

IOWA

Gerald G. Culver, Dunlap, Iowa, in place of Paul Davie, retired.

John C. Hogan, Winthrop, Iowa, in place of G. E. Brubaker, retired.

KANSAS

Wilma M. Solander, Hutchinson, Kans., in place of E. R. Dicks, deceased.

Dean E. Kohlenberg, Louisburg, Kans., in place of K. L. Cook, resigned.

Lorin L. Sweetland, Seneca, Kans., in place of J. R. Houston, retired.

Raymond W. Reed, Stockton, Kans., in place of E. S. Riseley, retired.

KENTUCKY

David S. Miranda, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

James A. Cash, Fancy Farm, Ky., in place of M. C. Whittemore, retired.

LOUISIANA

Larry G. Chandler, Ida, La., in place of V. S. Clements, retired.

MARYLAND

Ruth R. Telemeco, Maugansville, Md., in place of William Telemeco, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

William J. Hogan, Westboro, Mass., in place of C. H. McDonald, retired.

MICHIGAN

Jerry J. Adamek, Chesaning, Mich., in place of J. D. Duguid, retired.

Donald R. Ahnen, Ramsay, Mich, in place of F. L. Brighenti, retired.

MINNESOTA

S. Wayne Sorenson, Fisher, Minn., in place of H. J. Widenhoefer, retired.

Frank T. Ashton, Preston, Minn., in place of W. R. Marx, deceased.

MISSOURI

Charles W. Hamilton, Carterville, Mo., in place of E. O. Griffin, retired.

Robert Harris, Waverly, Mo., in place of N. H. Glascock, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Clarence J. Abare, Troy, N.H., in place of C. L. McGinness, retired.

Richard L. Hutchins, Wolfeboro, N.H., in place of B. A. Landman, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Evelyn L. Bea, Dayton, N.J., in place of E. M. Latzo, resigned.

Joseph Sorelle, Glassboro, N.J., in place of G. H. McCullough, retired.

Frederick A. Moeller, Lavallette, N.J., in place of J. L. Cagni, retired.

NEW YORK

Dominic V. Munger, Fulton, N.Y., in place of G. F. Byrne, retired.

Marietta W. Miller, McLean, N.Y., in place of M. C. Sweetland, retired

Johnny F. Shaw, Perrysburg, N.Y., in place of H H. Parker, retired

NORTH CAROLINA

Doris I. Cameron, Broadway, N.C., in place of P. L. Morris, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elayne I. Enger, Erie, N. Dak., in place of C. J. Graff, retired.

OHIO

Helen T. Hanley, Harrod, Ohio, in place of D. F. Mayer, retired.

Thelma M. Davis, Jacksontown, Ohio, in place of W. R. Frye, resigned.

Vaughn A. Collins, Logan, Ohio, in place of C. C. Achauer, retired.

OKLAHOMA

O. P. Marshall, Miami, Okla., in place of W. A. Craig, retired.

Lee A. Adams, Snyder, Okla., in place of Max Anderson, transferred.

OREGON

Richard J. Lorenzen, Amity, Oreg., in place of E. B. Burch, retired.

Emma I. Thomson, Westlake, Oreg., in place of Genevieve Cain, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Samuel E. Turner, Furlong, Pa., in place of A. C. Flounders, retired.

Stanley A. Moskowski, Jeannette, Pa., in place of E. B Hebrank, retired.

Mancil E. Bradford, Jr., Modena, Pa., in place of E. E. Morris, retired

Joseph Sulewski, Nanticoke, Pa., in place of J. E. Bednar, retired.

Bernard J. Brashears, New Oxford, Pa., in place of G. M. Bower, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Herbert S. Bruce, Roebuck, S.C., in place of M. A. Foster, declined.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Joy L. Wallum, Iroquois, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Whites, retired.

VERMONT

Frank J. Varricchione, Burlington, Vt., in place of J. J. Burns, retired.

WASHINGTON

Cora G. Correia, Chimacum, Wash., in place of K. A. Bishop, retired.

Lotus D. Ewing, Lyle, Wash., in place of M. C. West, retired.

Thomas H. Nedderman, Vashon, Wash., in place of W. E. Mitchell, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Franklin D. Rapp, Renick, W. Va., in place of L. H. Christie, retired.

WISCONSIN

Dorothy E. Evjen, Glen Flora, Wis., in place of A. W. Kettering, retired.

David F. Gibson, Lena, Wis., in place of J. S. Rosera, retired.

WYOMING

Edwin Lebsock, Lingle, Wyo., in place of R. M. Smith, retired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

One Hundred Young Men Attending West Virginia's Fourth Annual National Youth Camp Hear President and Vice President During Tour of Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the annual National Youth Science Camp, a permanent outgrowth of the West Virginia centennial celebration in 1963, is held in scenic Pocahontas County, near Greenbank, W. Va. The camp is operated by the State of West Virginia and West Virginia University, and is under the direction of Charles N. Cochran, professor of mathematics at the university.

Each year two outstanding science-oriented young men represent each State at the camp. Delegates are selected on the basis of academic achievement and scientific knowledge.

Annually, the camp participants are brought to Washington to supplement the 3 weeks which are spent in camp activity ranging from work with computers and telescopes to group singing and sports participation.

This year's Washington visit was highlighted by two significant events on Wednesday—one a luncheon at which Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY addressed the 100 young men who were guests at the event over which I was privileged to preside. A number of Senators jointed us for the occasion and heard the Vice President remind that the wonders of science can be applied to create a better life for man.

We were also pleased to have had with us James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, both of whom have been our guest speakers in previous years.

Immediately following the luncheon, the students were transported to the navy yard where President Lyndon B. Johnson was dedicating a new research ship, the $9.2 million *Oceanographer.*

The President acknowledged the presence of the young men by referring to "the 100 outstanding high school science students who have joined us here today from all over the United States."

The President told them:

> I hope there are among you some of our oceanographers of tomorrow. You could not choose a more important and challenging career.

President and Mrs. Johnson greeted and talked with the campers individually. Certainly, it was a thrilling day for our young guests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 13, 1966

I am glad to see you here sharing your interests and exchanging your knowledge.

Science brings men together. It has brought men together over the centuries—across the boundaries of nations, races and generations.

Today, in America, we see a spirit of creative cooperation fostered by the quest for scientific knowledge. One of the rewarding experiences that has come to me, as chairman of the Space Council, has been to see universities . . . the many departments of government . . . labor . . . large and small businesses all working together to achieve our common goal—mastery of space.

With this and other similar examples to serve as a model, we must try to harness our divergent and separated resources, and our energies, to solve the problems of our earthly environment—problems of housing, of health, of education, of transportation . . . yes, and problems too of defeating poverty, injustice and discrimination, and of keeping the peace.

These problems are of immense magnitude. But if we create the science needed, discover the relevant knowledge, apply the best technologies, and utilize all our resources, each of these problems turns into an exciting opportunity to make life better.

A mathematician told me recently that, in his field, if a man or woman did not contribute some significant result before age 30—it was too late.

While I think he may have been exaggerating for effect—he assured me he was not. He was an old fogey of 33.

The truth is that scientists in their 20's and 30's *are* in important positions in our scientific programs. I expect that in the next few years I will be able to say the same to you.

It took mankind 200,000 years to emerge from the Stone Age.

It took another 10,000 years from the first use of metal tools to the Industrial Revolution, now hardly a century old.

Two key exhibits in our Smithsonian Institution vividly illustrate the dramatic acceleration in the tempo of progress. One is the first commercial computer, only 17 years old. The other is astronaut John Glenn's space capsule, only four years old, but already a museum piece.

If any age can lay claim to being a golden age of adventure and discovery, ours can. Yet we have barely begun.

Here are some of the developments we can look forward to within the next 20 years.

In agriculture, the large-scale use of desalinated sea water.

In medicine, the transplantation of natural organs and the use of artificial ones.

In psychiatry, the widespread application of drugs that control or modify the personality.

In education, the use of more sophisticated teaching machines.

In worldwide communication, the everyday employment of translating machines.

In industry, the extensive use of automation, up to and including some kinds of decision-making at the management level.

In space, the establishment of a permanent base upon the moon.

Some of you might say that there is nothing very surprising here. And you would be right.

Experience shows that it takes 10 to 30 years for a new idea to make its way from its inception in a scientist's mind to its general application in everyday life. Therefore, the world of 20 years from now already exists, in embryo, in today's advanced research establishments.

For the year 2000 however, we can foresee some really far-out developments.

The virtual elimination of bacterial and viral diseases.

The correction of hereditary defects through the modification of genetic chemistry.

The stepping-up of our food supply through large-scale ocean-farming and the fabrication of synthetic proteins.

Control of the weather, at least on a regional scale.

In space, the landing of men on Mars and the establishment of a permanent unmanned research station on that planet.

The creation, in the laboratory, of primitive forms of artificial life.

This can indeed be an age of miracles. It will be your age.

Your federal government is committed to working with you to help bring about a better tomorrow. The amount of the budget which is devoted to support of research and development has been the fastest growing item in the federal budget.

I have heard it suggested that this is a result not of public officials learning about science, but of scientists learning about politics. In fact, I think it has been a bit of both: The nation and its store of knowledge have been the beneficiaries of this mutual learning process.

The percentage of funds for research and development has gone up from about 25 per cent of the monies to support science in 1957 to about 40 per cent in 1965.

Since you have a mathematical background, you know that these percentages tell you nothing about the absolute dollar magnitude.

So I feel I must add that the 1957 figure is 25 percent of 3 billion dollars and the 1965 figure is 40 per cent of 15 billion dollars.

The funds available for scientific research have increased in the last 8 years by a factor of 8.

Of course, the costs of doing scientific research increase very quickly as scientists ask more sophisticated questions of nature, and expect answers which are much more precise. Probably the most dramatic example of this is the decision to build an atom smasher with the power of 200 Bevatron (billion electron volts) at a cost of approximately 300 million dollars.

Since this item and many others are beyond the financial limits of any of our universities, and since the benefits are for everyone, it is only right and proper for the federal government to play its role and it will continue to do so.

Research costs more. There has also been a change in the strategy of research.

I return, for my example, to our space program.

I have logged over a quarter of a million miles in looking into various aspects of our space program.

The discovery of the structure of space has required new theories, new instruments, new materials and techniques. We have begun to experiment on a vast scale and we are only now at the threshold. The impetus

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

which the space program has given us has led to advances in education, medicine, electronics, and many other fields.

And this has increasingly been done—as I pointed out before—through the creative development of many programs, involving many disciplines and many scientists, carried out not only by government but by all sectors of our society.

The value of our coordinated assault on the unknown has given us the impetus to extend our knowledge in other places. Luckily, for me, I am again involved.

I have recently been appointed chairman of a newly created National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development which will look at the state of our knowledge of the oceans to see what kind of national program is needed to extend and utilize our knowledge of this inner space. We are now in the position where current exploration and theory has revealed how little we know and has suggested the vast benefits which may be possible.

The oceans cover 70 per cent of the earth's surface and hold untold wealth. Maybe it is time we took the plunge.

I have only touched today on some of the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

But I will go no further. I would like to close by having a brief personal word with you.

I have heard it said that science is a cold and unemotional career.

We know better.

The world of science is the world of man's greatest adventure. It is an adventure far beyond that begun by Columbus or by Alexander the Great or by Cortez.

It is an adventure into the unknown. It is the search into the deep secrets which may yield answers far beyond man's hope. It is the place for the man or woman who will devote himself, through long hours of labor and difficulty, to mankind's cause. It is the place where years of dedication and effort may yield little. Yet it is the place where discovery and accomplishment can bring a sense of reward and exhilaration that comes to few people.

I applaud your choice of career. It is a career of excitement. I wish you well in it.

Remarks of the President at the Commissioning of the New Research Ship, the "Oceanographer," Navy Yard, Pier 2, July 13, 1966

Secretary and Mrs. Connor, Reverend Harris, Captain Wardwell, my beloved friend Senator MAGNUSON, Governor Burns of Hawaii, Distinguished Members of Congress, Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We meet here today at the beginning of a new age of exploration.

To some, this might mean our adventures in outer space. But I am speaking of exploring an unknown world at our doorstep. It is really our last frontier here on earth. I am speaking of mountain chains that are yet to be discovered, of natural resources that are yet to be tapped, of a vast wilderness that is yet to be chartered.

This is the sea around us.

While our knowledge of the sea is quite primitive, we do know something of its great potential for the betterment of the human race and all mankind.

We know that we can, for instance, greatly improve our weather predictions. We can save thousands of lives and millions of dollars in property each year. We just must start learning more about the sea.

We know that the sea holds a great promise of transforming arid regions of the earth into new, rich and productive farmlands.

We know that beneath the sea are countless minerals and fuels which can be found and exploited. We know—most important of all—that the sea holds the ultimate answer to food for the exploding population in the world. Nearly four-fifths of all life on earth actually exists in salt water.

Using science and technology, we must develop improved ways of taking food from the ocean.

But catching fish is just not enough. It has been said that throughout history we have been simple hunters of the sea. Men must now learn how to farm the sea.

Our scientists are developing a process for turning whole fish into a tasteless but highly nutritious protein concentrate which can be used as a supplement to our daily diet.

In addition, the United States Senate has recently passed a bill for the construction of several pilot plants to begin the commercial development of this fish protein food. The daily output of one of these plants would provide enough high protein supplement for well over half a million people each day.

It is toward a goal of understanding all aspects of the sea that we have commissioned the *Oceanographer* today.

Oceanographer is one of the Coast and Geodetic Survey's 14 research ships which will begin to help us explore the environment around us. Her sister ship, *Discoverer*, is under construction and also will be commissioned shortly.

In the past decade, our support of marine science and technology has grown from some $21 million to more than $320 million.

The Federal research fleet today totals 115 vessels.

Our progress has been the handiwork, of course, of many men. These men are in and out of Government. But the Nation owes a very particular debt to those particular members of the Congress, men such as our distinguished Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, who is here today and whose efforts have accomplished so much for oceanography over the last decade.

I want to pay tribute to the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, all the employees of the Department of Commerce and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other Government officials.

But I also want to say that today we must redouble our efforts. In the months ahead, we shall establish our priorities, we shall then set our timetables—and we shall follow them, just as we have followed an orderly and relentless program for the exploration of space. And the distinguished Scientific Adviser to the President, Dr. Hornig, is going to keep seeing that we do this. The frontier of our deep challenges our spirit and we want to see that that challenge from the deep is fully met.

My Science Advisory Committee has recently completed a report on "The Effective Use of the Sea." Through Dr. Hornig I am releasing that report today. I should like to commend it to the attention of all Americans.

I commend it, in particular, to the 100 outstanding high school students who have joined us here today and who have come to the Capital from the States of this Union. I hope that there are among you some of the great oceanographers of tomorrow. You could not choose, in my judgment, a more important or a more challenging career.

I am referring this report from my Science Advisory Committee to the new National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering set up by statute under the leadership of Senator MAGNUSON. This Council will be headed by our distinguished Vice President; distinguished members of the Cabinet and others will serve on it.

This Council will survey all marine science activities to provide for this Nation a comprehensive program in this field. I will ask them to complete their initial recommendations by the time the new Congress convenes next January.

Truly great accomplishments in oceanography will require the cooperation of all the maritime nations of the world. Today I send our voice out from this platform calling for such cooperation, requesting it, and urging it.

To the Soviet Union—a major maritime power—I today extend our earnest wish that you may join with us in this great endeavor.

In accordance with these desires I am happy to announce that one of the first long voyages of *Oceanographer* will be a six-month global expedition in which the scientists from a number of our great nations will participate. It is our intention to invite Great Britain, West Germany, France, the U.S.S.R., India, Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand, Chile, and Peru to participate in the first round-the-world voyage of *Oceanographer*.

We greatly welcome this type of international participation. Under no circumstances, we believe, must we ever allow the prospects of rich harvest and mineral wealth create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

The sea, in the words of Longfellow, "divides and yet unites mankind."

So to Captain Wardwell and his distinguished officers and men of *Oceanographer*, we say today: Yours is a most worthwhile mission. May you bring back much for the benefit of all humanity.

We congratulate you on the commissioning of your marvelous new ship. We wish you the best of results, fair winds, and smooth sailing.

And now I look forward with a great deal of personal pleasure to the opportunity to view the ship and some of the developments at first hand.

Thank you very much.

Chairman of Senate Public Works Committee Keynotes Leadership Seminar Which Initiates Citizen Workshops on Clean Water for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 15, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Izaak Walton League of America and 13 cooperating organizations have scheduled—for this summer and early fall—a series of citizen workshops on clean water for America. These workshops are designed to inform and educate the public in the need for active participation in the development of water quality standards, as called for by the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965. This educational project in all regions of the country is being financed in part through a grant to the Izaak Walton League from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated as keynote speaker in the initial nationwide planning and study seminar which was held at the University of Maryland's Center of Adult Education on June 17 to 19. Eighty officials representing the Federal Government, State agencies, conservation and wildlife organizations, business and labor groups attended this initial seminar which will contribute significantly to the success and effectiveness of the subsequent area workshops. My home State was represented by H. G. Woodrum, president of the Izaak Walton League in West Virginia.

The conferees pursued extensive discussions of the various aspects of State and Federal roles in water quality control, including proper financing of State agencies, adequate statutes, financial assistance for construction of abatement facilities, education, enforcement, and research. In this initial conference, special emphasis was placed on the Water Quality Act of 1965, under which States may establish water quality standards on interstate waters within their boundaries.

The 3-day leadership seminar at College Park was chaired by the able president of the Conservation Foundation, Russell E. Train, who has established a distinguished record of public service in conservation affairs. The distinguished national president of the Izaak Walton League, Reynolds T. Harnsberger, extended the official welcome to the conferees and the league's conservation director, J. W. Penfold, explained the objectives of the citizen workshops. Among the guest speakers was James M. Quigley, Commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. Commissioner Quigley discussed the "Federal Government and Clean Water." The Izaak Walton League and the cooperating organizations obviously visualize the 1965 act as offering significant opportunity for citizens to constructively participate with Federal and State officials in the critical effort to achieve clean water. The league considers it important that the leadership of the various workshops be in a position to advise citizen participants on pollution abatement programs and on how to participate in State hearings.

Those who were present at the initial planning and study seminar returned to their respective home areas to form committees to sponsor regional workshops. These workshops—consisting of discussions and planning sessions—will be attended by representatives of service clubs, conservation organizations, and other local and area persons who may be concerned with future water quality hearings in their regions. The importance of participating in public hearings and methods of effective presentation will be the theme of the regional citizen workshops on clean water for America.

For this commendable endeavor in the development of citizen education and awareness of the pressing national problem of water quality, I congratulate the Izaak Walton League of America and the cooperating organizations: Conservation Foundation, American Fisheries Society, Garden Club of America, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters Education Fund, National Association of Counties, National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, National Audubon Society, National Council of State Garden Clubs, National Wildlife Federation, Sport Fishing Institute, Wildlife Society, and Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program of the planning seminar for citizen workshops on clean water for America, the welcome by Mr. Reynolds T. Harnsberger, the remarks by Mr. J. W. Penfold, and the text of my address.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN WORKSHOPS ON CLEAN WATER FOR AMERICA—LEADERSHIP SEMINAR—JUNE 17–19, 1966—CENTER OF ADULT EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD., FRIDAY, JUNE 17

Morning Session—Chairman: Russell E. Train, President, The Conservation Foundation.

Welcome—Reynolds T. Harnsberger, National President, The Izaak Walton League of America.

Why the Workshops—J. W. Penfold, Conservation Director, The Izaak Walton League of America.

Address—Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Chairman, Committee on Public Works, United States Senate.

The Federal Government and Clean Water—Hon. James M. Quigley, Commissioner, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

State Government and Clean Water—James Coulter, Chief, Bureau of Environmental Hygiene, Maryland State Health Department.

Afternoon Session—Chairman: Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation.

WHAT QUALITY WATER IS NEEDED FOR

Fish and Wildlife—Richard H. Stroud, Executive Vice-President, Sport Fishing Institute.

Public Health and Recreation: C. L. Wilbar, Jr., Chairman, Pennsylvania Sanitary Water Board.

Industry: David E. Simon II, Cyrus Wm. Rice & Company.

Agriculture: Clarence S. Britt, Assistant to Branch Chief, Soil & Water Conservation Research Division, USDA.

Steering Committee Meeting on Regional Workshop Planning.

SATURDAY, JUNE 18

Chairman: Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

Water Quality Standards and Enforcement: Murray Stein, Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Working With Industry on State Water Quality Standards and Clean Water Programs: Harold Jacobs, E. I. DuPont Co.

Coffee and Doughnuts in Exhibit Hall.

Organizing Responsible Statewide Citizen Cooperation for Clean Water: Charles H. Callison, Assistant to the President, National Audubon Society.

Techniques of Effective Citizen Participation in the Hearings Process: Mrs. C. F. S. Sharpe, Program, Secretary Water Resources, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

WORKSHOPS CONVENE, 1:30

Workshop No. 1: Helping Local Government to Participate Effectively in Developing State Water Quality Programs. Chairman: Rodney Kendig, Field Service Director, National Association of Counties. Co-Chairman: John R. Sheaffer, Resources Planning Officer, Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission.

Workshops No. 2: Making the Most of State Hearings—the Procedural Process and Follow-up. Chairman: Sydney Howe, The Conservation Foundation. Co-Chairman: Philip Barske, Northeast Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute.

Workshop No. 3: Defining the Water Quality You Want—Expressing Clean Water Objectives in Terms of Uses, with Awareness of Costs, etc. Chairman: Gerard A. Rohlich, Director, University of Wisconsin Water Resources Center. Co-Chairman; Mrs. Frank O. Sandstrom, Northeastern Zone Representative The Garden Club of America.

Workshop No. 4: The Citizen's Water Quality Survey—How to Get and Present Useful Information. Chairman: Joseph Chantigney, General Vice-Chairman Cook County, Ill., Clean Streams Committee. Co-Chairman: Francis T. Christy, Jr., Vice-President (Conservation) Audubon Naturalist Society of the Central Atlantic States.

Workshop No. 5: Working Together—Organizing Effective Sustained Cooperation Among Citizen Groups, Local and Statewide. Chairman: Mrs. Donald E. Clusen, Chairman, Water Resources Committee, League of Women Voters of the U.S. Co-Chairman: William B. Morse, Northwest Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute.

SUNDAY, JUNE 19

Chairman: Mrs. Arthur E. Whittemore, League of Women Voters Education Fund.

Workshop Reports by Workshop Chairmen.

Report on Plan for Regional Workshops.

Summary: Frank Gregg, Vice-President, The Conservation Foundation.

Closing Remarks: J. W. Penfold, IWLA.

WELCOME

(Reynolds T. Harnsberger, national president, the Izaak Walton League of America)

Judge Train, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great privilege for me to open the first Citizen Workshop for Clean Water. I welcome you, individually as respected conservation leaders, and also as representatives of respected citizen organizations who—with us in the Izaak Walton League—are determined to improve the environment within which all Americans must live.

In a real sense, a welcome from me might be thought superfluous, because this workshop and seminar is yours as well as ours. Your interest and cooperation has helped make it possible—its values will assuredly be realized only as your talents, expertise, imagination and foresight are utilized during workshop sessions.

We in the Izaak Walton League of America have had a long history of interest, concern and action in the clean water movement. It can be said truthfully that a major reason for establishment of the League nearly 45 years ago was a growing disgust at the accelerating rate at which prime fishing waters were being lost to municipal, industrial and watershed pollution.

In 1927–1928, the League undertook at the request of President Coolidge's Outdoor Recreation Committee a nation-wide survey of water pollution. Handled through our State Divisions, local chapter and cooperating groups and individuals the survey was hardly a complete one, but it was the *first* national effort to appraise the water pollution problem nationally. What it found was shocking. And a shocked public very slowly began to take action. You have all been a part of that progress.

A great deal has happened since; a great deal of progress has been made, but the progress has not been fast enough and Congress itself in 1956—thirty years later—decided this was true and with enactment of PL-660 began to mobilize the resources of the Federal Government to supplement, compliment and stimulate State programs and community action.

Congress acted again in 1961 to strengthen the Federal role. And last year in passing the Water Quality Act launched an intensified program and announced an unequivocal

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

national policy that we are in business to enhance the Nation's water resources, that we are in business to get water clean.

The States still retain their prerogative and priority of position to Act. This is as it should be, but—if they can not or will not act—the public is through with temporizing, and the Federal Government will act.

I believe all of us here are unanimous in hoping that the States will act. The purpose of this workshop and those to follow is basically to help mobilize responsible citizens to help their individual States do the best possible job for themselves.

This is a worthy and most laudable objective. You are accepting the challenge of good citizenship in a most meaningful sense. We welcome you. We applaud you. We wish you God speed in your endeavor.

WHY THE WORKSHOPS

(J. W. Penfold, conservation director, the Izaak Walton League of America)

In the Water Quality Act of 1965, Congress threw a direct challenge to each of the 50 States "to put up or shut up." It calls on them to declare their intentions and to follow up with positive actions to clean up pollution of interstate waters within their boundaries, or to expect the Federal Government to act for them in the public interest. The almost unanimous vote for the measure in Congress makes it clear that positive action is what the public wants. The public is tired of temporizing with filthy, unusable water.

The Act provides for the establishment of "water quality standards" on interstate waters. It provides a period, ending June 30, 1967, during which each State has the opportunity to develop such standards and a program for their implementation and enforcement. If standards and programs proposed by a State are found satisfactory by the Secretary, he will declare them to be the Federal standards. If he does not find them satisfactory, or if a State does not act at all, the Secretary is directed by the Act to institute procedures whereby standards shall be established. In every sense this is a challenge to all the States to "get cracking."

The Act calls for each State to develop its water quality standards program "following public hearings." Congress thus emphasized that the general public has a stake, a right and a responsibility in establishing water quality standards. Thoughtful citizens should insist that full public hearings be held in their States. It is equally their obligation to participate responsibly and effectively in such hearings.

The hearings will provide opportunity for citizens to state their right to clean water. As the President said "no one has the right to use America's rivers . . . which belong to all the people, as a sewer." But reiteration of this truism is not enough. Citizens must be prepared to answer arguments against high standards.

Citizens must be prepared to state clearly the uses which the public wishes to make of public waters.

Essentially, determining the beneficial uses which each lake and stream in each State must serve is the basis of the water quality standards program. If the public decides that a stream should serve no purpose other than as a sewer, that will be a standard, and an unconscionable one. The Nation can't afford to waste water that way. If the public decides that it shall be kept clean enough to support trout (or other game fish) and to permit water-skiing and swimming, it will likely be clean enough for use as water supply and for industry and agriculture as well . . . a high standard and a desirable one.

To maintain such a standard, or to accept a lower one is a political decision which the people themselves must make, or in default, it will be made for them.

Briefly, this is what the whole water quality standard program is really about—the public deciding what standards of excellence, or of filth, shall be maintained in its public waters to fulfill, or to limit, the beneficial uses to which the public wants to put their lakes and streams.

Essentially the purpose of this workshop program, which we are getting underway this morning, is to broaden our own understanding of the problem and the opportunities available to citizens to help solve it and to broaden the base of understanding among citizen groups generally . . . to the end that citizens will more nearly fulfill their role in the nation-wide effort to achieve clean water.

It is not enough that we declare ourselves for clean water. We must be prepared to accept the more difficult tasks—to secure legislation, to pass bond issues, to accept increased taxes, to pay higher commodity costs and to stand up and be counted when the going is rough.

Citizens will do this and do it well, but they must have the confidence which comes with understanding. Our work is to develop such understanding ourselves and to communicate it effectively to as large a segment of the public as we can.

During the next two days we shall be discussing ways and means for achieving these objectives and designing the plan whereby each of us and the citizen organizations we represent may make the maximum contribution toward this vital public need . . . clean water for America.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, AT LEADERSHIP SEMINAR INITIATING NATIONWIDE CITIZEN WORKSHOP ON CLEAN WATER FOR AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Izaak Walton League for this manifestation of obligation as members of the American community.

The workshop, which begins today and is directed toward development of public interest in the establishment of water quality standards, is indeed a laudatory action.

When the Water Quality Act of 1965 was passed, the law provided that all affected segments of our national community should have an opportunity to participate in the establishment of water quality standards. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure there is no doubt in yours, that the industrial and governmental sectors of the economy will be well represented at any conference on standards.

The extent of citizen participation, however, would be clearly questionable were it not for the educational effort upon which you are embarking today. You are the consumers of water. You use it in every aspect of your daily life. Without it, you cannot function. Any problem associated with water becomes, uniquely, a human problem. Any decisions relative to the use or misuse of water, therefore, should be subject to the scrutiny of the people.

Last week in committee hearings on air pollution, as the new chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, I made a brief statement of my intentions regarding air and water pollution. As you are aware, that subcommittee is chaired by the very able Senator from Maine, **EDMUND S. MUSKIE**. I told Senator **MUSKIE**, and those present, that I intended to give my every support to an aggressive attack on the problems of air and water pollution. I stated that we are going to go into these problems in a depth and scope never before attempted or achieved.

For your information, I would like to expand on that commitment. The late Senator Pat McNamara, when chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, established the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and instructed that subcommittee to do whatever was necessary to protect the public health and welfare from the hazards society faces due to continued misuse of our vital air and water resource supplies.

That subcommittee, of which I am pleased to have been a member, has firmly set milestones on the path toward a solution of these problems. But the road is long, the job is tremendous, and time is not working in our favor. I therefore remind you—who will be working throughout the nation to achieve effective water quality standards—Senator McNamara said "Let us begin." I say, "Let us continue."

There is much that needs to be done. There are hurdles which must be passed over. The efforts that we make now are essential if we are to leave our future generations more secure in health and resources.

Water pollution control, adequate standards of water quality, effective enforcement, better and more economically feasible methods of treatment or, in sum, *clean rivers*—this is our goal. It is well that we understood both the problems and the costs associated with achieving that goal.

Before any acceptable program of water quality standards can be implemented, much of the eixsting pollution must be eliminated and all of it must be controlled. This in itself is a tremendous task, exemplified by the size of the pollution problem. I think we should look at the magnitude of the situation with which we are dealing.

The size of the pollution problem may be illustrated in a number of ways. One yardstick is available in terms of the population equivalent of wastes entering our watercourses. In 1900, these wastes equaled the raw, untreated sewage of a population of approximately 24 million. In 1960, this population equivalent had tripled to more than 75 million people. By 1980, if we do not markedly accelerate our efforts and results, we will be inflicting on our water resource the population equivalent of untreated sewage from 114 million people. This takes into account only municipal wastes.

Perhaps a better method of evaluation is the relation between total available supply of fresh water and how much of this supply is withdrawn and returned as waste-carrying water.

Our national available water supply is about 1,100 billion gallons a day. Currently, we withdraw about 355 billion gallons a day and return more than 190 billion gallons a day of waste-waters. By the year 2000 we will be withdrawing 990 billion gallons daily and returning 732 billion gallons of waste-carrying water. And, these are national averages. Many sections of the country can expect to overdraw their water supplies at a much earlier date.

Domestic sewage and other wastes that impose an oxygen-demand on the receiving waters have a serious impact on the aquatic life of our streams. By 1980, if waste treatment efficiency is not substantially improved, our treated effluents will impose an oxygen-demand great enough to consume the entire oxygen content of a volume of water equal to the dry weather flow of all the 22 river basins of the United States. This would be devastating.

Measured in immediate terms, we have only to admit the evidence of our senses of sight and smell to perceive the extent to which pollution has degraded our rivers, lakes, and streams.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 did not in any effective manner deal with the cost associated with a problem of this size.

Our investment in municipal waste treatment facilities is presently about $40 billion. It is conservatively estimated that an additional $20 billion of municipal waste treatment works construction is necessary to effectively control this important source of pollution. Combined sewer systems are another major source. Physical separation of these combined systems, which will ultimately be essential, will cost from $20 to $30 billion unless a more feasible and economical answer is found. Industrial treatment cost is generally estimated to be at least equivalent to that of the municipalities, about $20 billion, though this figure is purely conjectural.

All together, at least $70 billion, and perhaps $100 billion, is the price tag on dealing with the pollution problem if we are to preserve, maintain, and improve water quality to meet all of our legitimate needs and demands.

While the costs of pollution my present two alternatives, there is but one realistic choice. The nation's efforts *must* be geared to the preservation, maintenance and improvement of the quality of our available supplies. Time is not on the side of clean water. The problem is not one that will solve itself or even diminish by itself. Anticipated demands for clean useable water can only be met if pollution is swiftly checked and reversed. Each additional period of indecision results in increasing the necessary costs.

This year we are attempting to provide a more realistic Federal share of the cost of pollution control. As a result of hearings held throughout the nation last year, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee wrote legislation which was introduced by Senator **Muskie** and cosponsored by myself and 46 other members of the Senate. This legislation is designed to increase the federal commitment by removal of existing limitations on the federal share of a project's cost and providing, a minimum 30 per cent participation, regardless of the total cost involved. We determined that a full 30 per cent federal share would require at least $6 billion. We further determined that if minimum water quality needs are to be achieved, every effort should be made to deal with the problem within the next six years.

There is no question but that the problem requires earlier solution. However, it is equally obvious that it is not feasible to attempt to seek that earlier solution. The committee recognizes the problem of moving an effective program too rapidly.

The legislation sponsored by the subcommittee goes beyond broadening Federal participation, and increasing the total authorization. It was the opinion of most members of the subcommittee at the time the bill was drafted, that the states should be encouraged to participate on a much larger scale in the cost of pollution control. The subcommittee decided that an appropriate and acceptable method would be a Federal economic incentive. As introduced, the subcommittee's bill provides that when the states agree to match the Federal 30 per cent, and additional 10 per cent of the facilities cost will be provided by the Federal government.

There are other urgent needs which must be met. The subcommittee bill provides 25 million dollars annually for five years for a program of research in the area of advanced waste treatment and combined municipal and industrial treatment. It is particularly important that this research be done and that answers be found as quickly as possible.

Finally, the need for some kind of assistance to industry is highly apparent. Suggested alternatives include tax incentives and direct federal grants. The Congress cannot ignore this problem. Industrial effluent must be treated and in some instances has a higher priority than does municipal waste treatment. Some persons argue that industry should bear this burden alone. Unfortunately, and all too often, the cost of installation of adequate pollution control facilities would bankrupt an industry.

If a tax incentive approach seems warranted, Federal legislation would be handled by committees other than those presently concerned with pollution legislation. If a grant-in-aid approach is indicated, then my committee and its House counterpart would receive the legislation.

This matter needs, and will receive, intensive study. We are working closely with industry to decide the proper course to follow, and we shall find an answer.

In summary, I have discussed that which we are considering and will consider. But I would add that without a financially effective Federal grant program, the water quality standards which are achieved in the conference that many of you will attend, will be meaningless. Unless a method of treatment is developed for many of those wastes which do not lend themselves to the existing technology, water quality standards will suffer.

And even more importantly, unless the public is keenly aware and vitally interested in this process of standards setting, the public interest may not be protected.

But, I don't want to leave you on this negative note. The job is immense; the task is difficult; but with the research which is moving ahead today, and with the funds which will be made available, the job can be done. As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, I can assure you that efforts you make in the various regions of this nation to establish effective water quality standards will be worthwhile. The Congress did not pass the Water Quality Act of 1965 as a gesture. It will be implemented as rapidly as is possible and this generation will leave clean rivers to the generations yet to come.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?—Micah 6: 8.

O Thou whose will it is that we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee, grant unto us as we wait upon Thee the confidence to do what we ought to do, the courage not to do what we ought not to do and the wisdom to see our way clearly. Deliver us and our Nation from discord and disunity. May we find our concord and our unity in Thee. Give to each one of us the consciousness of Thy presence, the continual strength of Thy spirit and the constant awareness of our duty to lead our people in the ways of freedom and justice and peace.

Help us to keep our faith in Thee and may this faith keep us walking in the way of Thy commandments all the days of our lives: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 14, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14596. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14596) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Holland, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Mundt to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 916 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall be composed of twenty-six members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution, House Resolution 917, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Jerome R. Waldie, of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. RIVERS OF Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman clear this with the ranking minority member of this committee?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have not contacted the gentleman from

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] yet. No, I have not.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the gentleman contact Mr. SAYLOR first.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request at this point.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

I have cleared this with the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

WARNING NORTH VIETNAM ON CONDUCTING WAR TRIALS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is vital for all Americans and the press to speak out in strong opposition to the projected war crimes trials in Hanoi which according to press reports of Czech sources in Hanoi could be scheduled as early as July 20 or August 4. It is essential that the position of this country be clear and that it be made explicitly known to North Vietnam so that they will not labor under any illusions as to the seriousness and the gravity of the reaction in this country should Hanoi decide to treat captured American airmen as war criminals. I think it is also important that we make plain that the United States cannot be blackmailed and that any war trials of U.S. prisoners would make a peace settlement far more difficult. While the government of Hanoi has not yet issued any official statement on this subject, official publications of Hanoi have indicated clearly that the war trials are in prospect and that the government plans to proceed.

Ambassador Harriman has told me that he believes this situation to be very serious. Any such action by Hanoi to hold war crimes trials would be totally reprehensible and a grave contravention of the Geneva Convention. North Vietnam should desist from this planned action and treat Americans as prisoners of war and not as war criminals.

The wife of Lt. E. A. Brudno—a U.S. Air Force officer shot down October 18, 1965, over North Vietnam who is known to be a prisoner—resides in Harrison, N.Y.

It is imperative that our Government do everything possible—directly and indirectly—to dissuade Hanoi from these proposed trials—and secure the admission of the International Red Cross to North Vietnam.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today I addressed this House concerning the International Association of Machinists' strike against the five major airlines in this country. The fact is that I think I was the first Member to speak out on this subject. Two days later, on Wednesday, I introduced legislation and again pointed out what an impact this strike has on the Nation. It seems to me that the President of the United States has not hesitated to move toward settling strikes involving such things as the steel industry, the aluminum industry and in other places where they are talking about wage guidelines. The demands in this particular case go far beyond the guidelines, and it seems to me it is incumbent on every Member of this House to let the President know that he should move forward because of the impact on the economy of this uncalled-for strike.

CONTINUATION OF STRIKE AGAINST THE FIVE MAJOR AIRLINES WILL BE INTOLERABLE

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, a continuation of the strike against the five major airlines will be intolerable. The public interest is affected and this interest now deserves paramount consideration.

An emergency board created by the President made recommendations for settlement, but the recommendations were rejected by the union. Terms even more favorable to the workers than those proposed by the emergency board were offered but rejected.

Someone must act now to prevent further inconvenience and irreparable loss to those who rely on the airlines for transportation, yet are not directly involved in the dispute. The airline employees not involved also are suffering from its continuation and their interest must be protected. Many of my constituents have protested the prolongation of the strike and urged Government action.

Two courses of action are possible. Congress could enact legislation providing for compulsory arbitration. Bills have been introduced in both Houses to accomplish this. However, the congressional route would be a long one, involving committee hearings and action in both House and Senate to be followed by Presidential approval. Time is of the essence and settlement of this strike should not have to wait on congressional action.

The other course would be for the President to move aggressively in the use of his well-known persuasive powers and the prestige of his high office to protect the public interest and encourage an immediate settlement.

I have expressed these views to the President in urging him to take prompt action and have promised him my support.

PERSONAL LIFE OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matrimonial news of the past weekend should give us all pause for thought about the unique position of Federal judges, especially the Justices who sit on the Supreme Court.

In my view, the personal life of Justice Douglas points up a weakness in our judicial system. A procedure should be established under which Justices can be removed from the bench without the necessity of finding them guilty of "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors" against the United States.

I plan to devote a special order today to this subject and shall certainly welcome participation therein of any of my colleagues who would like to enter into the discussion.

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] for their remarks concerning the 67-year-old Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, who, over the weekend, entered into his fourth matrimonial venture with a woman 23 years old.

I have some idea of what the Justices of the Supreme Court do when they are in session, but I have often wondered what they do in their spare time.

Mr. Speaker, I have in hand a note from the United Press news wire which says in part:

> Supreme Court Justice Douglas has applied to the State Department for a passport and permission to visit Red China.

If the passport is granted, I hope that he takes a slow boat to China—the slowest boat that runs from here to China.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to disagree with my friend from Iowa, just a bit, and we do not often disagree, about the slow boat to China and say I hope the boat on the way over is a fast one and express the hope there will be no boat back or if there is I hope Justice Douglas misses it. We can do without him.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman and the last part of his observation.

BILL TO AMEND FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act and to prohibit the use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce.

I think many Members of the House will recognize this as a piece of legislation which our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] has been pushing for some time.

An additional feature which I would add in the bill that I am introducing would also make it a Federal offense to use a firearm which has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce in any assault or attempted assault upon a law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duty.

I think we have a very basic and growing problem in this country regarding respect for law enforcement and respect for those men who risk their lives in the very hazardous duty of enforcing the law.

I believe it is high time we recognize the need for some additional Federal protection for these gentlemen as they go about their very dangerous duties from day to day.

I am convinced that making it a Federal offense to use a firearm in an assault or attempted assault upon any law enforcement officer would help provide protection for the policemen and law enforcement officers of this country.

There is an old saying that the policeman's lot is not a happy one.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has an obligation and a duty to the men engaged in this very hazardous occupation and I hope this bill can be approved before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. I commend the gentleman for his additional proposal. I certainly thank the distinguished gentleman for supporting my own proposal and the gentleman can rest assured that I welcome his support and assure him I will help him in any way I can.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about a Justice of the Supreme Court who seems to change brides every time the weather changes. But nothing has been done. I am having a resolution prepared which I expect to introduce as soon as it is prepared calling on the Committee on the Judiciary of the House to investigate this man's character.

Now where there is smoke, there is bound to be a little fire and where three brides—wives—have said that this man is guilty of cruelty and one of them went so far in her petition as to say that he was guilty of "personal indignities," what does that mean?

I think some committee of this Congress should investigate that man, and if they find that he is a man of bad character—and I have always considered that a man who is cruel to his wife is a man of bad character—he should be impeached. But I have no hope that he could be impeached. At least he could be relieved from office or his character could be X-rayed to the American people.

Frankly, I am a little sorry to see a man of that type responsible for the laws of this land which are now being made by the Supreme Court on 5-to-4 decisions where he is 1 of the 5. Let us see what kind of a man is writing the laws of our land.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7315), relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FURNISH BOOKS TO HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13783) to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE AS A NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE

The Clerk called the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1030) to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the great fire in Rome. It broke out on the night of July 18, A.D. 64, and raged for 6 days, then roared on after apparently being brought under control. Large sections of the city were destroyed, but by now Nero had been emperor for a decade and knew something about raising money for government expenses. His rebuilding program included a great palace—the golden house—for himself, and according to some historians Italy and the provinces were ransacked in order to defray the enormous costs.

In A.D. 65, Petronius Arbiter during the government of Nero stated:

> We tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency, and demoralization.

We have before us today a resolution which could lead to the devastation of the beauty and historic significance of Pennsylvania Avenue without fire, and with funds for rearranging the finery to come through the simple expediency of continuing the raid on the earnings of American taxpayers. And when the pie is opened, Pennsylvania Avenue—devoid of the landmarks that have made it famous—will have been transformed into little more than a superhighway for ceremonial parades.

Such landmarks as the Willard Hotel and National Theater are designed for junking under the master scheme to create more open space between the Capitol and the White House, but sponsors promise that one of the benefits for the anticipated $500 million that the project would cost would be parking spaces for 10,000 automobiles. Now, what sort of an exchange is this?

To me, the Willard Hotel has a prominent place in the history and tradition of this Nation. It has housed some of our Presidents and other famous Americans, and it is remindful of eras in history when there was a greater value on integrity, moral value, and patriotism than we find in these parts today. I recognize that the actual building which stands at 14th Street and Pennsylvania today is not the same Willard whose guests included celebrities of the past century; still it is some 65 years old and represents periods far beyond. Visitors to this city like to look upon it as the hostelry where noted figures lived for a century and more, and I for one would like that tradition to be preserved.

I feel that any attempt on the part of supporters of this legislation to lessen the importance of the Willard as an historic site by recalling that it was rebuilt in 1901 is cheap and unnecessary. We had an old fellow in western Pennsylvania who delighted in showing children his ax and complaining that it had been the property of George Washington's men

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

when they hewed their way over the Allegheny Mountains in 1754. He would admit that the passing years of wear required an occasional new cutting edge and an occasional new handle, but he allowed as how George Washington himself might at sometime have used that ax. And children could envision the exciting experiences—with all the hardships and disappointments that traveled with our pioneers—that were a part of developing this country. Their hearts throbbed a little faster at the daring and determination of our forebears, and maybe they can think back to this sort of image as they encounter a few obstacles on their way to the age of responsibility.

John Glenn had a word for this intangible something when he came up to Capitol Hill a few years ago and described his feelings when he sees the Stars and Stripes. I think that we should try to instill patriotism in our youth in every way possible, and I do not think that we are going to help attain this objective if we destroy monuments to the past and replace them with parking lots.

Nor do I think that Congress should be so generous with tax funds as to approve a scheme that is going to require an investment of a half-billion dollars for a highly dubious return. Our people have already been battered around by the eroding winds of inflation caused by Federal extravagance, and I feel that it would be an insidious imposition on the taxpayer to reduce his buying power another hitch by approving this kind of unnecessary spending.

The very idea of creating another commission as provided in House Joint Resolution 678 is ridiculous on the face of it. A new commission is one thing we need least of all. The National Capital Planning Commission performs a function largely in the area of master planning for the whole of the District of Columbia. For the information of my colleagues, I should like to list at the conclusion of my remarks the various District of Columbia government and related agencies now in existence, and their purposes. I also include a rundown of citizen action groups and their purposes.

I might point out that the 1966 appropriation for the National Capital Planning Commission alone is $818,000, yet supporters of House Joint Resolution 678 want us to provide another quarter-billion dollars annually for the life of the commission it proposes. It is difficult to study over the purposes of the various agencies already in being and come to any conclusion other than that there could be combining of activities somewhere along the line. There is no doubt but that Congress would be compounding duplication if it were to establish still another commission at this time.

This point was developed carefully at hearings before the Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation on March 21 of this year, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues should read these hearings. Certainly they will not want to accept a proposal of this magnitude on the basis of what was developed before the subcommittee.

The listings of the local organizations follow:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES

Commissioners' Interagency Committee on Beautification Programs: Advises on the development of a comprehensive beautification program for District-owned or supported properties, and on the use of funds for such projects.

Commissioners' Committee on Community Renewal: Advises on goals and objectives for the elimination of blight and deterioration in the District through a community renewal program.

Washington Planning and Housing Association, Inc., Room 800, 1010 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, Tel. 737–2883.

Provides a form for interested citizens of the Metropolitan Area to participate in decisions affecting housing conditions, urban renewal, planning, zoning and mass transportation to stimulate and sponsor community action programs.

Director of Planning, Zoning Commission, Tel. 629–4426.

Advisor to the President for National Capital Affairs, The White House, Washington, D.C. 20006, Tel. 456–1414.

A link between the White House and the National Capital region; coordinates the work of government and non-governmental groups concerned with Washington metropolitan affairs. (White House funds)

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (1957), 1250 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, Tel. 298–8166.

Funds are provided by member jurisdictions according to population.

Commission of Fine Arts (1910), Room 7000, Interior Bldg., 19th & C Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240, Tel. 343–5324.

Appropriation $123,000: Created by Congress, the Commission passes upon the artistic and design aspects of private and public works in the National Capital area.

Joint Committee on Landmarks, 4605 Drummond Ave., Chevy Chase, Md. 20015, Tel. 462–6461.

Sponsored by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, purpose is to single out buildings and landmarks in Washington worth preserving from the point of view of artistic or historic significance, and to make an inventory of existing landmarks.

National Park Service, Nat'l Capital Region, 1100 Ohio Dr., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20242, Tel. 381–7000.

Provides and operates national parks, monuments and historic sites. Assists in developing public park and recreational area facilities.

National Capital Planning Commission (1952), 1701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20576, Tel. 382–1161.

1966 Appropriations $818,000: Established by Congress to prepare, adopt, and amend a comprehensive plan for the National Capital and to develop plans for Federal installations in the region. Members appointed by the President.

National Capital Regional Planning Council (1952), 1701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20576, Tel. 382–1114.

Established by Congress to prepare, adopt, and amend a general framework for physical development of the Capital Region. Members nominated by subregional planning agencies and local governments and appointed by the National Capital Planning Comm.

Citizens Council for the District of Columbia, Tel. 629–4403.

Seeks to increase citizen participation in municipal government; acts in an advisory capacity to the Commissioners on matters affecting the general public.

Commissioners' Planning & Urban Renewal Advisory Council, Tel. 629–3331.

Advises on long-range planning and programming, including urban renewal. Provides citizen leadership in the physical renewal and preservation of the District of Columbia.

CITIZEN ACTION GROUPS

Committee of 100 on the Federal City, 1307 N. Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, Tel. 234–5068.

Businessmen and civic leaders organized to promote the development of Washington as the Nation's Capital and a better place to live.

The Committee on Urban Conservation (1965), 7325 Takoma Avenue, Takoma Park, Md. 20012, Tel. 589–0614.

Promotes public understanding of problems confronting conservation and beautification efforts in the Nation's Capital.

Council of Citizens, Room 200, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, Tel. 298–8166.

Composed of 25 business, civic, and special interest organizations in the Metropolitan Area, the Council sponsors the Annual Citizens' Conference on Metropolitan Issues.

Federal City Council (1954), Room 817, 1155 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, Tel. 223–4560.

A non-profit corporation which develops, stimulates and encourages civic leadership in community development in Washington.

Fed. of Citizens Ass'ns of D.C. (1910), 1638 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, Tel. 265–1742; 243–0103.

Delegates from more than 47 citizens' associations, with a membership of 15–20,000, concerned with community improvement.

Metro. Washington Board of Trade (1889), 1616 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, Tel. 783–3545.

Comprised of 3,500 enterprises representing a cross section of the business and professional community, its primary objective is the promotion of Washington's economy.

More Beautiful Capital, First Lady's Committee For a (1965), The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Tel. 456–1414.

The Committee is interested in establishing an attractive, pleasureable urban environment.

More Beautiful National Capital, Inc., Society For A (1965), 1229 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, Tel. 338–3700.

To preserve, protect, foster and improve, for the benefit of the people of the nation, the beauty of the Nation's Capital.

Nat'l Cap. Downtown Committee, Inc. (Downtown Progress) (1960), 521 12th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004, Tel. 393–8387.

A non-profit corporation financed by business and civic leaders to prepare and help carry out plans for revitalization of Downtown Washington east of 15th St. between the White House and the Capitol.

Northwest Committee for Transportation Planning (1959), 3406 Macomb Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., Tel. 628–4460, ext. 2457.

A citizens planning and study organization concerned with promotion of sound transportation planning for the metropolitan area.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF GOLD STAR LAPEL BUTTONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3013) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3013

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1124. Gold star lapel button: eligibility and distribution

"(a) A lapel button, to be known as the gold star lapel button, shall be designed, as approved by the Secretary of Defense, to identify widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces of the United States—

"(1) Who lost their lives during World War I, World War II, or during any subsequent period of armed hostilities in which the United States was engaged before July 1, 1958; or

"(2) who lost or lose their lives after June 30, 1958—

"(i) while engaged in an action against an enemy of the United States;

"(ii) while engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force; or

"(iii) while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent party against an opposing armed force.

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary concerned, upon application to him, shall furnish one gold star lapel button without cost to the widow and to each parent of a member who lost or loses his or her life under any circumstances prescribed in subsection (a). Gold star lapel buttons shall be furnished, upon application and payment of an amount sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture and distribution, to the next of kin other than the widow and parents of any such deceased member.

"(c) Not more than one gold star lapel button may be furnished to any one individual except that, when a gold star lapel button furnished under this section has been lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use without fault or neglect on the part of the person to whom it was furnished, the button may be replaced upon application and payment of an amount sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture and distribution.

"(d) In this section—

"(1) 'widow' includes widower;

"(2) 'parents' includes mother, father, stepmother, stepfather, mother through adoption, father through adoption, and foster parents who stood in loco parentis;

"(3) 'next of kin' includes only children, brothers, sisters, half brothers, and half sisters;

"(4) 'children' includes stepchildren and children through adoption;

"(5) 'World War I' includes the period from April 6, 1917, to March 3, 1921; and

"(6) 'World War II' includes the period from September 8, 1939, to July 25, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon."; and

(2) By adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"1124. Gold Star lapel button: eligibility and distribution."

SEC. 2. The Act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 710), as amended (36 U.S.C. 182a–182d), is repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 20, after the word "parent" add the words "and next of kin."

On page 2, starting on line 22, strike the last sentence of subsection (b).

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF TROPHIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13374) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of trophies for the recognition of special accomplishments related to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13374

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 57 is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1125. Recognition for accomplishments: award of trophies

"The Secretary of Defense may—

"(1) award medals, trophies, badges, and similar devices to members, units, or agencies of an armed force under his jurisdiction for excellence in accomplishments related to that armed force; and

"(2) provide badges or buttons in recognition of special service, good conduct, and discharge under conditions other than dishonorable."

(2) The analysis of chapter 57 is amended by adding the following new item:

"1125. Recognition for accomplishments: award of trophies."

(3) Chapter 631 is amended by repealing section 7218.

(4) The analysis of chapter 631 is amended by striking out the following item:

"7218. Recognition for accomplishments, special service, and good conduct."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1 after the word "accomplishments" add "or competitions".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVISION FOR RETIREMENT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3150) to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone if the bill would limit the retirement for the Comptroller General to one retirement system, or might he participate in both systems, that is, the Civil Service retirement system and the retirement plan or system that was set up for the Comptroller General?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I can inform the gentleman that the bill would allow the Comptroller General to choose between the two systems. He could not exercise a right under both systems. As the gentleman knows, the Comptroller General has accumulated many years of service under the Civil Service retirement provisions, and this bill would merely allow him to choose as to whether he should receive his retirement under that particular arrangement or under the special arrangement pertaining to Comptrollers General.

Mr. GROSS. But he could not pick and choose as between the best benefits of both systems?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, he could not. He must choose one or the other.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 3150

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 43), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"Notwithstanding the preceding paragraph of this section, any person appointed to the Office of Comptroller General after January 1, 1966, and who at the time of his appointment is or has been subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, shall be subject to all of the provisions of that Act, unless he shall in writing elect to be subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph of this section. Such election may be made at any time, but not later than sixty days after the expiration of the first ten years of service as Comptroller General, and shall be irrevocable. Any Comptroller General making such an election under this paragraph shall be entitled to a refund of the lump-sum credit to his account in the Civil Service retirement and disability fund, but shall receive no benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act."

SEC. 2. Section 319 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 43b), is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of subsection (a) and adding the following: "*Provided*, That in the case of a Comptroller General who elects in accordance with the third paragraph of section 303 of this Act to be subject to the provisions of the second paragraph of such section the election permitted by this section may be made within sixty days after the making of the election permitted by the third paragraph of section 303."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO IMPROVE THE UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS DEPOSIT PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14875), to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this confined strictly to the uniformed services?

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Yes, sir.

Mr. **GROSS**. Is the interest rate at 7 percent compounded quarterly, or is it on some other basis?

Mr. **HÉBERT**. It is compounded quarterly while the individual is serving overseas.

Mr. **GROSS**. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14875

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By amending section 1035 to read as follows:

"§ 1035. Deposits of savings

"(a) Under joint regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of the armed forces who is on a permanent duty assignment outside the United States or its possessions may deposit during that tour of duty not more than his unallotted current pay and allowances in amounts of $5 or more, with any branch, office, or officer of a uniformed service. Amounts so deposited shall be deposited in the Treasury and kept as a separate fund, and shall be accounted for in the same manner as public funds.

"(b) Interest at a rate prescribed by the President will accrue on amounts deposited under this section. However, the maximum amount upon which interest may be paid under this Act to any member is $10,000. Interest under this subsection shall terminate ninety days after the member's return to the United States or its possessions.

"(c) Except as provided in joint regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, payments of deposits, and interest thereon, may not be made to the member while he is on duty outside the United States or its possessions.

"(d) An amount deposited under this section, with interest thereon, is exempt from liability for the member's debts, including any indebtedness to the United States or any instrumentality thereof, and is not subject to forfeiture by sentence of a court-martial."

(2) By amending the item in the analysis relating to section 1035 to read as follows: "1035. Deposit of savings."

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the first section of this Act, an amount on deposit under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, on the date of enactment of this Act, shall accrue interest at the rate and under the conditions in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, until the member's current enlistment terminates or earlier, as may be jointly prescribed by the Secretaries concerned. However, a member who is on a permanent duty assignment outside the United States or its possessions on the date of enactment of this Act, or who reports for that duty on or after that date but before the termination of his current enlistment, will be entitled to interest on such deposit, on and after that date, at the rate and under the conditions prescribed pursuant to section 1.

Sec. 3. (a) Section 3(a) of the Act of August 10, 1956, as amended (33 U.S.C. 857a(a)), is amended by adding the following new clause:

"(12) Section 1035, Deposits of Savings."

(b) Section 221(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 213a(a)), is amended by adding the following new clause:

"(11) Section 1035, Deposits of Savings."

(c) Regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under subsections (a) and (b) shall be prescribed jointly with regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 1 through 14 in their entirety, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. (a) Notwithstanding the first section of this Act, an amount on deposit under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, on the date of enactment of this Act, shall accrue interest at the rate and under the conditions in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, until the member's current enlistment terminates or earlier, as may be jointly prescribed by the Secretaries concerned. However, a member who is on a permanent duty assignment outside the United States or its possessions on the date of enactment of this Act, or who reports for that duty on or after that date but before the termination of his current enlistment, will be entitled to interest on such deposit, on and after that date, at the rate and under the conditions prescribed pursuant to section 1. Payments of deposits, and interest thereon, may be made to the member's heirs or legal representative.

"(b) Any amounts deposited between May 4, 1966, and the date of enactment of this Act while a member was assigned to permanent duty within the United States and its possessions, and any amounts deposited between May 4, 1966, and the date of enactment of this Act by a member on permanent duty assignment outside the United States and its possessions which are in excess of his unallotted pay and allowances for that period, shall accrue interest at the rate in effect before enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL LANDS AT CHILOCCO, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5380) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the gentleman from Oklahoma on the bill.

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to answer any questions the gentleman has concerning this bill.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It would place back in the hands of the Cherokee Indian Tribe a tract of land which has been used since the 1880's for school purposes but which is now surplus to the needs of this Government Indian school.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman please state to the House what the Indian tribe will pay the Government for this land?

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. The Indian tribe will pay to the Government the same amount of money that the Government paid the tribe for the tract of land in two separate transactions.

The Government originally paid $1.29 an acre. Later, after a review by the Indian Claims Commission, more than 50 years later, it was concluded that they should have been paid $3.75 an acre for the land. So the Government paid to the tribe the difference between $1.29 an acre and $3.75 an acre.

What is proposed is to permit the tribe to recover this land from the Government, now that it is surplus, for the same total price per acre that was paid to the tribe by the Government.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. I have another question. What is the present appraised value of this approximately 3,000 acres which will be turned back to the Indians?

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. The total figure we have on appraisal is considerably above the $3.75 figure. I believe the report indicates a value considerably above that figure. I am sorry I do not have the precise figure on it.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Is not the figure $450,000?

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. I think it would be in that neighborhood; yes, sir.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman in his committee have a policy to sell land back to the original donors, shall we say, for the same price as was paid for it in the first place?

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. I do not believe the committee's policy on this particular point would be applicable in this situation, because we have a situation here in which there has been a finding that the price paid originally by the Government was an unconscionable price, and that the tribe in effect was forced to part with this land at a price that was not fair, and that was the holding of the Indian Claims Commission.

So I believe we are in a different situation than we would have been had we had a transaction for the land that provided a fair price in the first place.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. All right. Then, if the land is given back to the Indian tribe, and it is worth more than a half million dollars, will the tribe use the land to good advantage so they will be able to get a return on the value?

Mr. **EDMONDSON**. The testimony of the chief counsel for the tribe before the committee was that the proceeds from the rentals of this land will be used to provide scholarship funds for Indians to go through trade schools and college. In that sense, at least, it will relieve the Government of an expense that we are incurring with reference to the Indians who have been receiving assistance in their educational pursuits.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman believe it is establishing a precedent to sell land for $3.75 an acre, when the land has a value of some $455,000 and this would amount to a payment of about $10,000 for it?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not believe this bill will establish any precedent except in a situation when the Government has taken advantage of a ward, as it did in the case of this tribe in the 1880's, and paid an unconscionable price. I believe in a situation like that it is a healthy precedent to say we will enable that tribe to regain the land at the same total compensation paid for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5380

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in 2,667.94 acres, more or less, of the following described land, which has been determined to be surplus to the needs of the Chilocco Indian School, will be held by the United States in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment therefor at the rate of $3.75 per acre, the original cost of the land:

INDIAN MERIDIAN

Township 29 north, range 2 east

Section 13, lots 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter; and lot 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter (lying east of Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad), 339.53 acres.

Section 16, lots 3 and 4, south half northwest quarter, and southwest quarter, 313.85 acres.

Section 17, lots 1 and 2 (except that part described as "Beginning at a point 39 rods south of the northeast corner of the northeast quarter section 17; township 29 north, range 2 east, Indian meridian; thence 24 rods south, thence 33⅓ rods west, thence 24 rods north, thence 33⅓ rods east to point of beginning, containing 5 acres"), lots 5 to 7, inclusive, southeast quarter northeast quarter, and east half southeast quarter, 313.62 acres.

Section 20, lots 1 and 2 and east half northeast quarter (except that part described as "Beginning at a point 67 rods north of southeast corner of the northeast quarter section 20, township 29 north, range 2 east, Indian meridian, thence north 20 rods, thence west 50 rods, thence south 10 rods, thence east 20 rods, thence south 10 rods, thence east 30 rods to point of beginning, containing 5 acres"), lots 3 and 4, and east half southeast quarter, 316.36 acres.

Section 21, northwest quarter and southwest quarter (lying west of S.L. & S.F. Railroad), 150.26 acres.

Section 24, lots 1 to 4, inclusive, west half northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, and east half northwest quarter and southwest quarter (lying east of Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad), 398.39 acres.

Section 25, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, west half northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, and northwest quarter and north half southwest quarter (lying east of Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad), 583.25 acres.

Section 26, lot 1 (lying east of Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad), 12.68 acres.

Section 29, north half southeast quarter and northeast quarter, 240.00 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 3 through 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 13, lots 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter; and the parts of lot 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Sante Fe Railroad, 339.53 acres."

Page 3, strike out all of lines 1 through 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 21, those parts of the northwest quarter and southwest quarter lying west of the west right-of-way line of the S. L. & S. F. Railroad, 150.26 acres.

"Section 25, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, west half northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, and those parts of the east half northwest quarter and southwest quarter lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, 398.39 acres.

"Section 25, lots 1 to 7, inclusive, west half northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, and those parts of the northwest quarter and north half southwest quarter lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, 583.25 acres.

"Section 26, that part of lot 1 lying east of the east right-of-way line of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, 12.68 acres."

Page 3, after line 14 add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. All of the mineral interests of the United States in lots 1 and 2 (south half southeast quarter), section 29, township 29 north, range 2 east, Indian meridian, Oklahoma, comprising 77.84 acres more or less are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the Cherokee Nation. If title to the surface of any of this land should revert to the United States, the land shall become subject to the provisions of section 1 of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTING ASIDE CERTAIN LANDS IN MONTANA FOR THE INDIANS OF THE CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF THE FLATHEAD RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14687) to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the beneficial title to the real property, and the improvements thereon, consisting of approximately seven hundred and five acres which were heretofore reserved for agency and other purposes under section 12 of the Act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. 302), as amended by the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1049), and now surplus to the needs of the Department of the Interior, is hereby conveyed to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, and such property is hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for said tribes in the same manner and to the same extent as other real property held in trust for said tribes.

Sec. 2. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative determines that other real property, and the improvements thereon, which was heretofore reserved for agency and other purposes under section 12 of the Act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. 302), as amended by the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1049), is surplus to the needs of the Department of the Interior, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to convey beneficial title to the property to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, and the United States shall, from the time of the conveyance, hold the property in trust for said tribes in the same manner and to the same extent as other real property held in trust for said tribes.

Sec. 3. The real property and the improvements thereon declared to be held in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes by this Act is hereby declared to be a part of the Flathead Reservation for the use and benefit of said tribes.

Sec. 4. This Act shall become operative when accepted by the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. Such acceptance shall constitute a renunciation of any claim now existing against the United States respecting and to the extent of any land conveyed under the authority of this Act. Neither the lands nor improvements thereon herein authorized to be disposed of, nor the cost or value of said lands, shall be considered by way of offset under section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049). Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States with respect to these or any other lands.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language:

"That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the 487 acres, more or less, described below are hereby declared to be held in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.

"PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, MONTANA

"Township 18 north, range 21 west, section 8, lot 7; section 17, lot 2.

"The areas described aggregate 66.54 acres.

"Township 19 north, range 23 west, section 31, northeast quarter southwest quarter.

"The area described contains 40 acres.

"Beginning at the southwest corner of southeast quarter southeast quarter section 14, township 18 north, range 20 west, principal meridian, from the initial point—

"north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 660 feet, east 330 feet,

"north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 1,320 feet, east 990 feet,

"south 0 degrees 01 minutes east, 275.9 feet,

"south 59 degrees 0 minute west, 849.6 feet,

"south 45 degrees 33 minutes east, 43.1 feet,

"south 58 degrees 50 minutes west, 96 feet,

"south 31 degrees 10 minutes east, 130 feet,

"south 56 degrees 37 minutes east, 298 feet

"south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 72.7 feet,

"north 56 degrees 37 minutes west, 377.6 feet,

"south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 462.8 feet,

"north 89 degrees 35 minutes east, 314.3 feet,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 589.5 feet,

"west 858 feet to the point of beginning.

"The tract as described contains 28.66 acres, more or less.

"Township 21 north, range 20 west, section 36, southeast quarter southeast quarter, east half east half east half northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter south east quarter, north half southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, east half east half southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

"The areas described aggregate 58.4375 acres.

"Beginning at the northwest corner of section 1, township 20 north, range 20 west, principal meridan, Montana.

"Thence from the initial point, east along north line of said section 1,660 feet, south 0 degrees 01 minutes east, 396 feet, west 660 feet, north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 396 feet, to the point of beginning.

"The area described contains 6 acres, more or less.

"Township 22 north, range 24 west, section 33, southeast quarter southeast quarter.

"The area described contains 40 acres.

'Township 21 north, range 20 west, section 11, east half southeast quarter northeast quarter, section 12, northeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

"The areas described aggregate 137.5 acres.

"Township 16 north, range 19 west, section 16, west half east half southwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter.

"The area described contains 80 acres.

"Beginning at the southwest corner of section 16, township 16 north, range 19 west, from the initial point—

"north 0 degrees 02 minutes west 1,320 feet, east 1,317.36 feet, south 0 degrees 02 minutes east 528 feet, west 462 feet, south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 792 feet, west 857.34 feet, along section line to point of beginning, excepting east half northwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter and west half west half northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 16, township 16 north, range 19 west.

"The area described contains 29.725 acres, more or less.

"The areas of the tracts listed above aggregate 486.8625 acres, more or less.

"Sec. 2. This Act shall become effective when the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes by resolution accepts the transfer of the property involved.

"Sec. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission. The Court of Claims is directed to make the same determination in connection with any claim against the United States adjudicated by it."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2948) to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., a similar bill to the one the House just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2948

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the 487 acres, more or less described below are hereby declared to be held in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.

PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, MONTANA

Township 18 north, range 21 west, section 8, lot 7; section 17, lot 2.

The areas described aggregate 66.54 acres.

Township 19 north, range 23 west, section 31, northeast quarter southwest quarter.

The area described contains 40 acres.

Beginning at the southwest corner of southast quarter southeast quarter section 14, township 18 north, range 20 west, principal meridian, from the initial point—

north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 660 feet, east 330 feet,

north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 1,320 feet, east 990 feet,

south 0 degrees 01 minutes east, 275.9 feet,

south 59 degrees 0 minutes west, 849.6 feet,

south 45 degrees 33 minutes east, 43.1 feet,

south 58 degrees 50 minutes west, 96 feet,

south 31 degrees 10 minutes east, 130 feet,

south 56 degrees 37 minutes east, 298 feet,

south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 72.7 feet,

south 56 degrees 37 minutes west, 377.6 feet,

south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 462.8 feet,

north 89 degrees 35 minutes east, 314.3 feet,

south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 589.5 feet,

west 858 feet to the point of beginning.

The tract as described contains 28.66 acres, more or less.

Township 21 north, range 20 west, section 36, southeast quarter southeast quarter, east half east half east half northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, north half southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, east half east half southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

The areas described aggregate 58.4375 acres.

Beginning at the northwest corner of section 1, township 20 north, range 20 west, principal meridian, Montana.

Thence from the initial point, east along north line of said section 1,660 feet, south 0 degrees 01 minutes east, 396 feet, west 660 feet, north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 396 feet, to the point of beginning.

The area described contains 6 acres, more or less.

Township 22 north, range 24 west, section 33, southeast quarter southeast quarter.

The area described contains 40 acres.

Township 21 north, range 20 west, section 11, east half southeast quarter northeast quarter, section 12, northeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

The areas described aggregate 137.5 acres.

Township 16 north, range 19 west, section 16, west half east half southwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter.

The area described contains 80 acres.

Beginning at the southwest corner of section 16, township 16 north, range 19 west, from the initial point—

north 0 degrees 02 minutes west 1,320 feet, east 1,317.36 feet, south 0 degrees 02 minutes east 528 feet, west 462 feet, south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 792 feet, west 857.34 feet, along section line to point of beginning, excepting east half northwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter and west half west half northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 16, township 16 north, range 19 west.

The area described contains 29.725 acres, more or less.

The areas of the tracts listed above aggregate 526.8625 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. This Act shall become effective when the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes by resolution accepts the transfer of the property involved.

Sec. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission. The Court of Claims is directed to make the same determination in connection with any claim against the United States adjudicated by it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2948 and insert the provisions of H.R. 14687 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14687) was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE QUILEUTE TRIBE OF INDIANS, INCLUDING THE HOH TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10633) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Quileute Tribes of Indians, including the Hoh Tribe, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Quileute and Hoh Tribes that were appropriated by the Act of January 6, 1964 (77 Stat. 857), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 155, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be divided on the basis of tribal base membership rolls for the respective groups after approval of such rolls by the Secretary of the Interior, and the funds so divided, including the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the respective tribal governing bodies and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That until the Hoh Indians develop a formal organization with a recognized governing body, their share of the judgment funds, and any other Hoh tribal funds, may be expended by the Secretary for the benefit of the Hoh Reservation and the Hoh tribal members.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare base membership rolls for the Quileute and Hoh Tribes. No person shall be eligible to have his name placed on either membership roll who at the same time is a member of any other tribe, and no person shall be permitted to be enrolled in both the Quileute and Hoh Tribes: *Provided,* That persons eligible for enrollment or already enrolled with other tribes may relinquish that membership through filing a formal statement of relinquishment with the Secretary according to rules and regulations which he may prescribe.

SEC. 3. When preparing a Quileute tribal base roll, the Secretary shall employ the criteria in article II of the approved constitution and bylaws of the Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation, except that, in the absence of the 1935 census referred to in article II, section 1(a) of the constitution and bylaws, the Secretary, with the assistance of the governing body of the Quileute Tribe, shall construct a base roll from pertinent records, including other census data, of the same period. No person shall be eligible to have his name placed thereon if born after December 31, 1940. Upon approval of such base roll by the Secretary and the Quileute tribal governing body, it shall henceforth serve as the Quileute base roll for all purposes, the provisions of article II, section 1(a) notwithstanding.

SEC. 4. When preparing a Hoh tribal base roll, the Secretary shall include only the names of applicants who demonstrate that (1) their names or the names of lineal ancestors from whom they are descended appear on the Census of the Hoh Indians of Neah Bay Agency, Washington, June 30, 1894, and (2) they were domiciled on the Hoh Reservation on the date of this Act. Upon approval by the Secretary, such roll shall henceforth serve as the Hoh base roll for all purposes.

SEC. 5. Upon completion of a Hoh base roll in accordance with section 4 of this Act, the Secretary shall assist the Hoh Indians in developing a tribal organizational document and shall call an election for the purpose of voting on the adoption of such document.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to advance or expend, as provided in section 1 of this Act, the Hoh tribal funds now on deposit, or hereafter placed on deposit, in the Treasury of the United States under the following symbols and titles:

14X7235 Proceeds of Labor, Hoh Indians, Washington;

14X7735 Interest and Accruals on Interest, Proceeds of Labor, Hoh Indians, Washington.

SEC. 7. Any part of the funds that may be distributed to individual members of the Quileute and Hoh Tribes under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "base".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "members." and insert in lieu thereof "members, upon approval by him of plans adopted by a majority of the adult Hoh Indians voting at a general meeting of the tribal membership called by the Secretary."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "base".

Page 2, line 20, strike out "base".

Page 3, lines 9 to 15 inclusive, strike out all of the first sentence of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"When preparing a Hoh tribal base roll, the Secretary shall include only the names of applicants who demonstrate that their names or the names of lineal ancestors from whom they are descended appear on the Census of the Hoh Indians of Neah Bay Agency, Washington, June 30, 1894."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING GREAT SALT LAKE RELICTED LANDS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15566) to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441; 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT IN HIGHEST GRADE SATISFACTORILY HELD IN ANY ARMED FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2450) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2450

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 69 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1377. Highest grade satisfactory held

(a) For the purpose of the provisions of this title and title 14 relating to retired grade, retired pay, and disability severance pay, active service by a member in any grade, permanent or temporary, in any armed force is considered active service in the equivalent temporary grade in the armed force from which he retires or is separated.

"(b) The Secretary having jurisdiction over the armed force in which a member performed active service determines whether that service, or any period of that service, was satisfactory."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"1377. Highest grade satisfactorily held."

SEC. 2. (a) Except for persons covered by section 3, a retired member or person to whom retired pay has been granted, who would have been eligible to be retired in a higher grade or advanced to a higher grade on a retired list if the amendments made by section 1 of this Act had been in effect at the time of his retirement, or at the time he was granted retired pay, shall, if he applies within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, be advanced on the applicable retired list to that higher grade and, if otherwise entitled to retired pay under any law, be entitled to retired pay on and after the date of enactment of this Act at the rate prescribed by law for that grade, except that a member of the armed forces who is advanced to a higher retired grade under this Act may elect to receive the retired pay to which he was entitled on the day before the enactment of this Act.

(b) Except for persons covered by section 3, this Act does not entitle any person to advancement on the retired list, or to an increase in retired or retirement pay, for any period before the date of enactment of this Act. No person who was separated for physical disability before the date of enactment of this Act is entitled to any increase in disability severance pay because of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding section 1377 (b) of title 10, United States Code, any member of the Air Force who retired before the date of enactment of this Act, and who held a temporary grade in the Army that was higher than the highest temporary grade in which he served satisfactorily in the Air Force, is entitled to be advanced on the retired list to that higher grade if his service while in that grade was satisfactory, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force and in the case of service in a commissioned grade if such service was for at least six months.

(b) This section became effective for all purposes as of June 29, 1948.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 8963 (a) and 8964 of title 10, United States Code, a member of the Air Force under section 208 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (63 Stat. 591), shall be treated as if his service in the Army was performed in the Air Force.

SEC. 5. Section 6151(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "officer" and the words "under a temporary appointment".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"That chapter 69 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

" '§ 1377. Highest grade satisfactorily held

" '(a) For the purpose of the provisions of this title and title 14 relating to retired grade, retired pay, and disability severance pay, active service by a member in any grade, permanent or temporary, in any armed force is considered active service in the equivalent temporary grade in the armed force from which he retired or is separated.

" '(b) The Secretary having jurisdiction over the armed force in which a member performed active service shall determine whether that service, or any period of that service, was satisfactory.'; and

"(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

" '1377. Highest grade satisfactorily held.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Except for persons covered by section 3, a retired member or person to whom retired pay has been granted, who would have been eligible to be retired in a higher grade or advanced to a higher grade on a retired list if the amendments made by sections 1 and 5 of this Act had been in effect at the time of his retirement, or at the time he was granted retired pay, shall, if he applies within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, be advanced on the applicable retired list to that higher grade and, if otherwise entitled to retired pay under any law, be entitled to retired pay on and after the date of enactment of this Act at the rate prescribed by law for that grade, except that a member of the Armed Forces who is advanced to a higher retired grade under this Act may elect to receive the retired pay to which he was entitled on the day before the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Except for persons covered by section 3, this Act does not entitle any person to advancement on the retired list, or to an increase in retired or retirement pay, for any period before the date of enactment of this Act. No person who was separated for physical disability before the date of enactment of this Act is entitled to any increase in disability severance pay because of this Act.

"SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding section 1377(b) of title 10, United States Code, any member of the Air Force who retired before the date of enactment of this Act, and who held a temporary grade in the Army that was higher than the highest temporary grade in which he served satisfactorily in the Air Force, is entitled to be advanced on the retired list to that higher grade if his service while in that grade was satisfactory, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, and in the case of service in a commissioned grade if such service was for at least six months.

"(b) This section becomes effective for all purposes as of June 29, 1948.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 8963(a) and 8964 of title 10, United States Code, a member of the Air Force who was transferred to the Department of the Air Force under section 208 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (63 Stat. 591), shall be treated as if his service in the Army was performed in the Air Force.

"SEC. 5. Chapter 561 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

" '6151. Higher retired grade and pay for members who serve satisfactorily under temporary appointments.'

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

" '6151. Higher retired grade and pay for members who serve satisfactorily.'

"(2) by striking out from the catchline of section 6151 'under temporary appointments'.

"(3) by striking out in section 6151(a) 'officer' and 'under a temporary appointment'.

"SEC. 6. Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

" '§ 1406. Effect of retirement in highest grade

" 'A member of the Armed Forces who is retired in, or advanced on a retired list to, the highest grade in which he served on active duty satisfactorily is entitled to retired pay for that grade but he may elect to receive retired pay for any other grade in which he served on active duty satisfactorily, as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned.'; and

"(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

" '1406. Effect of retirement in highest grade.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANDIDATES FOR APPOINTMENT TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9916) to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask one question concerning this bill. Does this establish a career in the military service as having been constituted by 8 years of consecutive service?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. This bill merely extends the right of appointment to the Academies to the dependents or children of those veterans who have died in South Vietnam. The privilege of appointment to the dependents or children of veterans has been extended to the veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but does it not also establish a criterion for career service? Do I understand correctly that career service is based upon 8 years of consecutive duty, or may it be broken service?

Mr. HÉBERT. It must be 8 years of consecutive service.

Mr. GROSS. Eight years of active duty?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Not just service but 8 years of active duty?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes; it must be 8 years of active duty.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9916

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 4342(a)(1), 6954(a)(1), and 9342(a)(1) are each amended as follows:

(A) By inserting ", or have a service-connected disability rated at not less than 100 per centum resulting from," after "died of".

(B) By amending clause (B) to read as follows:

"(B) after June 26, 1950—

"(i) while engaged in an action against an enemy of the United States;

"(ii) while engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force; or

"(iii) while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict against an opposing armed force in which the United States is not a belligerent party."

(C) By inserting "or disability, and the percentage at which the disability is rated," after "death" in the last sentence thereof.

(2) Sections 4342(a)(2), 6954(a)(2), and 9342(a)(2) are each amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof "or, if there is no Vice President, by the President pro tempore of the Senate".

(3) Sections 4342(b)(1), 6954(b)(1), and 9342(b)(1) are each amended to read as follows:

"(1) one hundred selected by the President from the sons of members of an armed force who—

"(A) are on active duty (other than for training) and who have served continuously on active duty for at least eight years;

"(B) died while they were on active duty (other than for training); or

"(C) are, or who died while they were, retired with pay or granted retired or retainer pay, other than those granted retired pay under section 1331 of this title;

however, a person who is eligible for selection under clause (1) of subsection (a) may not be selected under this clause."

(4) Section 4342(b)(3) is amended by striking out "the Army Reserve" and inserting in place thereof "reserve components of the Army".

(5) Section 9342(b)(3) is amended by striking out "the Air Force Reserve" and inserting in place thereof "reserve components of the Air Force".

(6) Sections 4342(g) and 9342(g) are each amended by striking out "the Secretary after consulting with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives" and inserting in place thereof "him".

(7) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 6956 are each amended by striking out "fourth of March" and inserting in place thereof "first of February".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 4342(a)(1), 6954(a)(1), and 9342(a)(1) are each amended as follows:

(A) By inserting ", or have a service-connected disability rated at not less than 100 per centum resulting from," after "died of", and by striking out "active service" and all that follows through "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "active service.".

(B) By inserting "or disability, and the percentage at which the disability is rated," after "death" in the last sentence thereof.

(2) Sections 4342(a)(2), 6954(a)(2), and 9342(a)(2) are each amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof "or, if there is no Vice President, by the President pro tempore of the Senate".

(3) Sections 4342(b)(1), 6954(b)(1), and 9342(b)(1) are each amended to read as follows:

"(1) one hundred selected by the President from the sons of members of an armed force who—

"(A) are on active duty (other than for training) and who have served continuously on active duty for at least eight years;

"(B) are, or who died while they were, retired with pay or granted retired or retainer pay, other than those granted retired pay under section 1331 of this title;

however, a person who is eligible for selection under clause (1) of subsection (a) may not be selected under this clause."

(4) Section 4342(b)(3) is amended by striking out "the Army Reserve" and inserting in place thereof "reserve components of the Army".

(5) Section 9342(b)(3) is amended by striking out "the Air Force Reserve" and inserting in place thereof "reserve components of the Air Force".

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the additional appointments authorized in sections 4342(b)(1), 6954(b)(1) and 9342(b)(1) as provided by this Act shall serve to reduce or diminish the number of qualified alternates from congressional sources who would otherwise be appointed by the appropriate service Secretary under the authority contained in sections 4343, 6956, and 9343 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, my legislation, H.R. 9916, would remove inequities in the laws relating to the selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

Some years ago a career naval officer, William Bliss, called to my attention what he felt was a very great inequity in not giving a reasonable chance for Academy appointments to sons of military personnel who were, in fact, career personnel even though they did not hold regular commissions. I told him that I thought such an amendment to the laws would be seriously considered by Congress if it had the backing of some nationwide organization representing a wide, general interest. He took the idea up with the Reserve Officers Association and that organization passed at its national convention a request for legislation along that line. The Department of Defense subsequently reported favorably on the idea, and it has since that time recommended enactment of a similar but more comprehensive proposal, which is today before this committee as H.R. 9916.

In a nutshell, H.R. 9916 would make the sons of all career members of the Armed Forces eligible to compete for appointment to the service academies under the Presidential quota, thereby properly including the sons of career officers who hold Reserve commissions—Reserve officers make up 35 percent of all career officers—extend eligibility to sons of career members who die on active duty, or after retirement, and to sons of former military personnel who have a 100-percent, service-connected disability; and extend eligibility to sons of members of the Armed Forces who die, or are disabled, as a result of "cold war" conditions short of situations in which the Armed Forces of this country are at war with an enemy of the United States.

As of July 9, 1966, 4,239 American servicemen have been killed in Vietnam. As far as I am concerned the sons of these men should be entitled to compete for Academy appointments like the sons of those who died in Korea and earlier wars. In Vietnam, like Korea, no formal declaration of war by the United States exists, but one need only look at the latest figures showing 4,239 American servicemen killed and 23,411 seriously wounded there, for a grim reminder of the hostility of that conflict.

The bill also makes certain technical amendments to the present law by clarifying the definition of career members of the Armed Forces as persons who are on active duty and who have served continuously on active duty for 8 years, and by establishing beyond question that members of the National Guard are included within the authority to appoint enlisted members of the Army and Air Force Reserve. In addition, the bill would permit appointments by the President pro tempore of the Senate when there is no Vice President, and would change the nomination deadline for the Naval Academy from March 4 to February 1, thereby reducing the loss of many highly qualified nominees to civilian colleges and universities.

In closing, I would again like to emphasize my enthusiasm for the view that sons of career reservists and serviceman killed in operations such as that now taking place in Vietnam have an opportunity to be appointed under the Presidential quota.

The bill, recommended by the House Armed Services Committee, also insures that there will be no diminution in the number of qualified congressional alternates who would ultimately obtain appointments to the various service academies. Additional numbers would come from Presidential sources as opposed to congressional sources.

I urge adoption of my bill.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 9916. I am vitally concerned with the caliber of young men attending our service academies.

For that reason I have selected a group of outstanding citizens of my district to assist me in making the determinations involved.

My statement on this to the people of my district follows:

THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, Congressman from the 17th District, of New York, today announced the appointment of a Committee of leading citizens of the District to assist him in choosing recipients for appointment to the United States Service Academies.

Each Congressman is entitled to one appointment to each of the Service Academies at West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.

Congressman KUPFERMAN stated, "recognizing the heavy responsibility which is placed on a Member of Congress in choosing young men for appointment to the Service Academies, I feel that I need the advice and counsel of leading members of our community who will interview and report on the candidates for these nominations."

The members of the Committee are:

Mrs. Alfred E. (Selma F.) Fischer, 1122 Park Avenue, Secretary of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; member of the Board of New York Diabetes Association; wife of Dr. Alfred E. Fischer, prominent pediatrician.

Mr. Joseph Gimma, 800 Park Avenue, partner in the firm of Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill Noyes; Chairman, New York Racing Commission, and member of the Cardinal's Committee of the Laity; he is married to Licia Albanese, the opera star.

Mr. Bary Gray, 415 Madison Avenue, leading radio commentator, who presents "The Barry Gray Show" over WMCA, New York; he is a Major in the Reserves.

Mr. Daniel Gutman, 11 Fifth Avenue, Dean of New York Law School; formerly President Justice of the New York City Municipal Court, and Counsel to former New York Governor Averell Harriman.

Mr. Al Knopf, 261 West 52 Street, Vice President of Local 802, American Federation of Musicians, resident of Stuyvesant Town.

Mr. Eugene Nixon, 20 Fifth Avenue, Account Executive with Dreyfus & Co.; President of the Board of Trustees of Northern Dispensary.

Mr. Fergus Reid III, 130 East 67 Street, partner in Dick & Merle-Smith, investment bankers, 48 Wall Street.

Rabbi Arthur Schneier of Congregation Zichron Ephraim, 163 East 67 Street; President of Appeal of Conscience Foundation.

Mr. Robert Sorensen, Vice President and Corporate Director of Research of D'Arcy Advertising Co.; writer; member Board of Trustees of Scandinavian Seminar, and the Foster Parents Plan; formerly Director of Research and Evaluation, Radio Free Europe.

Mrs. Richard (Nancy) Ticktin, 40 East 88 Street, member of Local School Board No. 2; Community Planning Board No. 8; Yorkville Civic Council; Past President of Parents Council No. 2, and of Parents-Teacher Association of P.S. 6; she is married to Richard Ticktin, Secretary of The Hertz Corporation.

Mr. Robert Wishnick, 277 Park Avenue, Chairman of Executive and Finance Committee, Witco Chemical Co., chemical engineer.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VEHICLE TRANSPORTATION—MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15712) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of expenses incidental to the transportation of motor vehicles of certain members of the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a member stationed outside the United States or in Alaska or Hawaii may, in cases of hardship or where an inequitable situation will otherwise result, be authorized necessary expenses, incidental to the transportation of his motor vehicle under this section, including expenses incurred in delivering the vehicle to the port and in moving the vehicle from the port to the member's new duty station, or home."

SEC. 2. This Act becomes effective on March 31, 1966.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, delete the words "or where an inequitable situation will otherwise result" and insert the words "caused by the inability of the Government to provide for the normal return of his motor vehicle" in place thereof.

On page 2, line 4, after the word "station", insert, "in the United States or its possessions,".

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, a Member of Congress has brought to my attention a case where it is purported that an officer came back to the United States and had no automobile at all and then purchased an automobile in Europe and then attempted or succeeded in having the automobile shipped to the United States after he had come back to the United States. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if that is contemplated in this legislation.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is already on the books in a regulation dating to 1961 that transportation at Government expense of a foreign-made car purchased in Europe is prohibited.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. FLAGS AROUND WASHINGTON MONUMENT

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 421) providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 421

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall arrange [illegible] appropriate ceremonies to be conducted in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 421.

This bill was introduced by me and passed during the 88th Congress. However, the Senate, presumably because of the pressure of other legislative matters, failed to take action on the resolution.

I am hopeful that after the House approves this measure today the Senate will see fit to take priority action with respect to it.

Our Capital City is visited by millions of Americans each year. I would venture to say that every one of these tourists visit the Washington Monument because of its historical and national significance. Therefore, I consider it disgraceful that the executive branch of Government has failed to recognize the importance of an appropriate ceremony in connection with the raising and lowering of our Nation's flag at the Washington Monument.

I know that in some circles of our society today patriotism is looked upon with scorn—but I am certain that this feeling is not shared by the overwhelming majority of the American public. I am equally certain that those Americans who visit the Washington Monument at the time of these flag raising ceremonies would experience a refreshing and welcomed patriotic note that would leave a lasting and inspiring recollection of their Nation's Capital.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support House Joint Resolution 421, and commend Congressman Bob Wilson on its introduction.

I have repeatedly stated that no amount of rightful dissent about our Vietnam policy can interfere with our continued recognition of our great heritage.

This is done by the joint resolution before us providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument. Report No. 1692 sets forth the reasons for this resolution.

I have been concerned about proper observance for some time.

In the Congressonal Record of June 30, 1966, at page 14912, I called attention to the failure to observe decorum and propriety at Arlington Cemetery where we honor our dead.

My letter of June 30 to the Superintendent of Arlington National Cemetery on that score follows:

June 30, 1966.

Mr. J. C. Metzler,
Superintendent, Arlington National Cemetery, Military District of Washington, Arlington, Va.

Dear Superintendent Metzler: As we approach July 4, our national holiday celebration of this country's independence, Washington can be expected once again to become the focal point for thousands of visitors. While I am proud that so many Americans come to their Nation's Capital during a special holiday weekend, I am also perturbed by the complete informality of their dress when visiting Arlington National Cemetery and feel something should be done about it.

I am appalled at those who arrive at the gates of Arlington in attire more suitable to a public amusement park or a beach. Arlington is not a public park; it is a sanctuary and final resting place for many of those who died in the service of their country.

The dress of tourists is particularly disturbing to me because they also visit the gravesite of President John F. Kennedy dressed as if they were going on a picnic. The fact that signs must be posted in Arlington admonishing visitors that picnicking is not allowed is a sad commentary on the atmosphere engendered, in part, by a too permissive attitude toward dress. This atmosphere must be distracting, and perhaps irreverent, to those families visiting the graves of relatives.

While I can appreciate the desire to dress as comfortably as possible during the stifling heat of the summer months, I nevertheless feel that visitors to this country's national cemetery should be attired in a dignified manner conforming to the propriety of the occasion. Accordingly, I ask that you look into the feasibility of establishing a policy requiring this.

Sincerely,
Theodore R. Kupferman,
Member of Congress.

His thoughtful reply of July 1 points up some reasons for continuing consideration of the need for emphasizing our national origins and the purposes of our democratic republic, so that people will have it in mind when they visit the Nation's Capital.

The superintendent's reply follows:

Department of the Army,
Arlington National Cemetery,
Arlington, Va., July 1, 1966.

Hon. Theodore R. Kupferman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kupferman: This is in reply to your letter of June 30, 1966.

Upon receipt of same, inquiry was made of the White House, Congress, Supreme Court and the National Cathedral to determine procedures followed to control dress of tourists and other visitors. It was learned that in no case are there any rules or regulations covering the subject of tourist dress and except for enforcing requirements of decency according to modern custom, no attempt is made to apply standards of dress to visitors. The wearing of shorts and other abbreviated attire by tourists is reported to be commonplace during the summer months.

Although, one might wonder at the degree of reverence prevalent among groups of scantily attired visitors, it would be difficult to judge a particular individual. This seems especially evident, in view of the fact that large numbers of visitors have a rural rather than urban backgrounds and come from all levels of culture, education and environment.

While I appreciate and concur in your observations I do not believe the establishment of a policy of requiring visitors to be attired in a dignified manner would be feasible of enforcement by Arlington National Cemetery alone. If by resolution of Congress or in some suitable administrative manner, the public could be made aware that decorum and dignity in dress, as well as in deportment, was appropriate during visits to our national shrines, it might be possible to achieve the desired results.

With kindest regards I am

Sincerely,
John C. Metzler,
Superintendent.

In my reply letter of July 14, which follows, I call attention to the necessity of looking into the question of what can be done to have people recognize the solemnity of the occasion when they visit a national shrine:

July 14, 1966.

Superintendent John C. Metzler,
Department of the Army,
Arlington National Cemetery,
Arlington, Va.

Dear Superintendent Metzler: It was good of you to send me your letter of July 1st in reply to mine of June 30th.

I appreciate the fact that you have made inquiries to determine what the procedures are in other areas, such as the White House, etc. for controlling the dress of tourists and other visitors.

I do believe the situation for Arlington Cemetery is a little bit different in view of the fact that a visit there can not be considered a joyous occasion.

Some effort must be made to indicate the solemnity of the situation.

I will look into the matter to see if we can find some suggestions for you.

Sincerely yours,
Theodore R. Kupferman,
Member of Congress.

The joint resolution before us is helpful on that score.

I ask for the suggestions of my colleagues as to other steps to take.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11671) to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11671

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proposed contract designated "FST031765" negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior with the El Paso County Water Improvement District Numbered 1, Texas, to extend the period for repayment of reimbursable costs incurred on the Rio Grande project for construction and for rehabilitation and betterment work and to establish a variable repayment schedule and such costs allocated to this district is approved and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to execute such contract on behalf of the United States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, west Texas has no more precious commodity than water. Severe drought has plagued west Texas for many years, and the increasingly short supply of our vital natural resource, water, has posed a hardship to the irrigation economy of the Southwest. It is important that the Congress recognize the present water shortages in our Southwest and develop wise water policies accordingly.

The legislation we are considering today recognizes such prevailing drought conditions in the farming areas of El Paso County, Tex.

H.R. 11671, which I have introduced, will approve and execute a contract negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1. The contract, supplanting earlier arrangements, provides a variable formula, based on water availability, for computing annual repayment installments on the district's construction, betterment, and rehabilitation obligations to the United States.

The original contract for repayment was made during the years of plentiful water supply. At the time former contracts were concluded the normal farm delivery of 3 acre-feet per irrigable acre was readily available, and repayment prescribed by the contracts was a set annual charge.

Repayment contracts negotiated over the years obligated the water district for construction costs of $4,446,111 at a repayment rate of $98,863 annually, regardless of water supplied to the district. Matured construction costs at the end of fiscal year 1966 totaled $3,781,540, all of which has been paid. Unmatured construction charges total $664,671, and this is presently scheduled for payment by 1971. On May 15, 1959, the district entered into a contract for rehabilitation and betterment costs not to exceed $2,300,000. This contract provided for annual district payments of $133,860 less the amount payable under construction cost repayment contracts. Repayment of rehabilitation and betterment costs commence in 1966 and is scheduled under present contracts for repayment in full by 1988.

Severe and continuing water shortages began in 1950, and only once since that time has it been possible to begin the irrigation season with the required allotment of 3 acre-feet of water per acre. In 5 of the years the initial allotment was less than 6 inches per acre. Yet the set payments continue, to the economic hardship of the farmers.

The new repayment formula is tied to water availability. Under this contract the amount of the base annual charge, now set at $133,860, would be payable as the required annual charge, if the estimated water allotment—as of July 10—were equal to a full water supply. If the water allotment were less than a full water supply—3 acre-feet per acre—the base annual charge would be reduced proportionately. The irrigator would pay in proportion to the benefit of water he receives. The proposed variable repayment formula we are considering would apply to the annual payments of $133,860 on construction and/or rehabilitation and betterment obligations.

The early approval of this new repayment contract tied to water supplied is vital to the agricultural economy of El Paso County. The contract is equitable and efficient and is in keeping with U.S. interest in sound water management policies.

I strongly urge your approval of H.R. 11671.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14548) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice, in view of the fact that it is scheduled under a call of the suspensions and, also, that there is some question about it on the part of the General Accounting Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 166]

Abbitt
Addabbo
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Clevenger
Conyers
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Curtis
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Farnsley
Fino
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gathings
Gilbert
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Ichord
Keith
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Love
McEwen
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Mills
Monagan
Morrison
Morse
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pepper
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Roudebush
St Germain
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Slack
Stalbaum
Stephens
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tuten
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 313 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LIMITING REVOCATION OF RETIRED PAY

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5297) to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the revocation of retired pay of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5297

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1331 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) The Secretary concerned shall provide for notifying each person who has completed the years of service required for eligibility for retired pay under this chapter. The notice must be sent, in writing, to the person concerned within one year after he has completed that service."

SEC. 2. Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1406. Limitations on revocation of retired pay

"After a person has been granted retired pay under chapter 67 of this title, or has been notified in accordance with section 1331(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for retired pay under chapter 67 of this title, the person's eligibility for retired pay may not be denied or revoked on the basis of any error, miscalculation, misinformation, or administrative determination of years of service performed as required by section 1331(a)(2) of this title, unless it resulted directly from the fraud or misrepresentation of the person. The number of years of creditable service upon which retired pay is computed may be adjusted to correct any error, miscalculation, misinformation, or administrative determination and when such a correction is made the person is entitled to retired pay in accordance with the number of years of creditable service, as corrected, from the date he is granted retired pay."; and

(2) By adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"§ 1406. Limitations on revocation of retired pay."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding section 1406 of title 10, United States Code, as added by this Act—

(1) the granting of retired pay to a person under chapter 67 of that title is conclusive as to that person's entitlement to such pay only if the payment of that retired pay is begun after the effective date of this Act; and

(2) a notification that a person has completed the years of service required for eligibility for retired pay under chapter 67 of that title is conclusive as to the person's subsequent entitlement to such pay only if the modification is made after the effective date of this Act.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **BOB WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5297 and recommend its approval as reported.

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSAL

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to make it a requirement that the respective service Secretary notify, in writing, each reservist who has completed at least 20 years of satisfactory Federal service for retirement with pay as described in section 1331(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code. This notification would be made within 1 year after he has completed the required service. Additionally, it would provide that once retirement pay has commenced or the Secretary had notified the individual he had completed the required service, his eligibility for retired pay may not be denied or revoked because of error unless it resulted from fraud or misrepresentation by the person concerned. Should an error, not resulting from fraud, be later discovered, the number of years of creditable service may be adjusted to correct such error; however, eligibility for retired pay would be voidable. Entitlement under the proposed legislation would only be effective for determinations made after the effective date of the act.

BACKGROUND

Public Law 810, 80th Congress, provided for retirement with pay of officers and enlisted personnel of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. Those who complete a total of 20 years of satisfactory Federal service have met the basic requirements, entitling them to retired pay upon application at age 60.

While 20 years of satisfactory Federal service has been recognized as a significant milestone in the career of a reservist, the variety of ways in which credit may be earned with the inherent complicated method of computation, as set out in section 1332 of title 10, based on a point system, often leaves the reservist in serious doubt as to whether he has in fact passed this milestone.

The services have, by a variety of administrative procedures, attempted to keep an accurate and up-to-date record of the progress of the reservist and advise him of his status in regard to the completion of the required satisfactory Federal service. Nevertheless, there have been cases where the reservist has received erroneous information that he has attained the required number of years or has miscomputed these years himself and, relying thereon, has ceased his participation in the Reserve program. Consequently, upon his application for retired pay at age 60, which may be some 15 years later, the error is discovered and because of his age or other reason he is not able to renew Reserve participation to acquire the necessary service and thus loses his retirement pay.

REQUIREMENT FOR LEGISLATION

This situation has resulted in an appeal from the Reserve community for a system of notification which will be final and conclusive. The services are not able to grant this, because without legislation the administrative determination remains subject to final review according to title 10, United States Code. Accordingly, the Department of Defense has advised the Committee on Armed Services that it supports enactment of H.R. 5297.

COST

The Department advises that the final increased cost that will result from enactment of this legislation will occur in its first year and amount to approximately $1,756,716. This increased cost of $1,756,716 would result from the establishment of an administrative system to permit implementation of the notification procedure established in this legislation. Costs in subsequent years will be very nominal and are estimated to be $143,000 in fiscal years 1968, $140,000 in fiscal year 1969, and $101,000 in fiscal year 1970.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

On behalf of the Department of Defense, the Department of the Navy recommends support of the proposal as is evidenced by letter included in the committee report.

COMMITTEE POSITION

A quorum being present, the committee unanimously approved the bill as amended.

Mr. **BOB WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5297, as amended, and recommend its approval by the House.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on this legislation has given the House a very complete and adequate explanation of its provisions. It is meritorious legislation and will allay a great deal of apprehension by members in the Reserve community as to their possible entitlement to future Reserve benefits.

I therefore urge the House to approve this legislation without change.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5297.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTIVE SERVICE CREDIT FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3313) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3313

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1405(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "205(a) (7) and (8)" and inserting "205(a) (7)–(11)".

SEC. 2. Section 3287 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection after subsection (D):

"(E) Up to three years if he is appointed in a specialty which requires training beyond the four-year-college level as a precondition to his appointment, one year for each academic year so required."

Section 5600 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection after subsection (3):

"(4) A person appointed in the Naval Reserve whose appointment is conditional upon his possessing training beyond the four-year-college level shall be credited with up to three years service in an active status, one year for each academic year so required."

Section 3353 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection after subsection (d):

"(e) A person covered by subsection (a) and whose appointment is conditional upon his possessing training beyond the four-year-college level shall be credited upon his appointment for the purposes of subsection (a) with up to three years service in an active commissioned status, one year for each academic year so required."

Section 8287 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection after subsection (5):

"(6) Up to three years, if he is appointed in a specialty which requires training beyond the four-year-college level as a precondition to this appointment, one year for each academic year so required."

Section 8353 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection after subsection (d):

"(e) A person covered by subsection (a) and whose appointment is conditional upon his possessing training beyond the four-year-college level shall be credited upon his appointment and for the purposes of subsection (a) with up to three years service in an active commissioned status, one year for each academic year so required."

SEC. 3. Section 205 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and (f)" after "(b)–(d)" in the introductory language;

(B) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (8);

(C) by redesignating clause "(9)" as "(12)";

(D) by inserting the following new clauses:

"(9) for an officer credited with service under—

"(A) section 3287(a)(2) (A), (B), or (E) of title 10;

"(B) section 3353(b) (3), (4), or (5), (c) or (d) of title 10;

"(C) section 5600(b)(1)(C), (2), (3), or (4) of title 10;

"(D) section 8287(a) (2), (3), or (6) of title 10;

"(E) section 8353(b) (3), (4), or (5), (c) or (d) of title 10;

the service so credited to him, but not more than three years

"(10) for an officer whose appointment is conditional upon his possessing a doctor of philosophy degree—three years;

"(11) for an officer whose appointment is conditional upon his possessing training beyond the four-year-college level—up to three years, one year for each academic year so required; and"; and

(E) by striking out "(9)" in the last sentence and inserting in place thereof "(12".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out "clause (7) or (8)" and inserting in place thereof "clause (7), (8), (9), (10), or (11)".

(3) The following new subsection is added after subsection "(e)":

"(f) Notwithstanding any other law, service credited under clauses (9), (10), or (11) of subsection (a) of this section may not—

"(1) be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary retirement or separation from a uniformed service; or

"(2) increase the retired or retirement pay of a person who became entitled to that pay before the effective date of the Act enacting this subsection."

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **BOB WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables and other extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3313, as amended, and recommend favorable action by the House.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The provision of constructive service credit for officers in the original language of H.R. 3313 would have been at the discretion of the Secretary concerned; whereas the committee amendment would make the granting of such credit mandatory in those instances in which the required professional training beyond the 4-year college level was a precondition to the appointment of the officer concerned. Thus, the amendment more clearly identifies those officers who would be eligible for constructive service credit.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces. The categories of officers that would be covered by the proposal include chaplains, judge advocates, veterinarians, Medical Service Corps officers with advanced degrees, and certain officers holding advanced degrees in technical, scientific, or engineering fields.

Under this legislation, an officer in one of the above categories would be credited with constructive service—additional service credit—for the purpose of computing both his active duty and retirement pay. The service so credited would be generally equivalent to the years of postgraduate college education obtained by that officer at his own expense before he entered military service, but not to exceed 3 years.

Under existing law, physicians and dentists already are authorized constructive service credit benefits similar to those proposed by this legislation—in addition physicians and dentists are entitled to professional special pay from $100 to $300 per month.

This legislation would not provide any special pay to the officers affected but would be limited to the granting of constructive service credit.

BACKGROUND

An officer who obtains professional or graduate education beyond the normal 4-year undergraduate level usually enters military service from 1 to 3 years later than his college contemporary who obtains only a basic baccalaureate degree. Since he has less active service, he is entitled under present law to less pay than his college contemporary, even if they both have the same military grade. Thus, although the armed force of which he is a member both requires and receives the benefit of his professional or graduate training, he is, in effect, penalized for the time spent in obtaining additional education.

The proposed legislation would eliminate this penalty and thereby encourage a greater number of professionally trained officers to remain in the Armed Forces on a career basis.

Under certain limited circumstances, various categories of officers with required professional training are today given constructive credit for initial appointment in a grade higher than their line contemporaries. This credit, however, with the exception of physicians and dentists, is limited to credit for rank or promotion purposes.

Here is a table which reflects the financial impact of this practice together with resulting changes which will occur when the provisions of this bill are enacted into law.

The table illustrates the changes which would be effected throughout a full 30-year military career:

Application of constructive service credit and its impact on annual basic pay plus quarters allowance

Active service year	Due course [1] officer	3 years' service for promotion only, current law	3 years' service for pay and promotion, H.R. 3313, as amended
1 (O-1)	$4,852.40	(O-2) $5,551.20	$7,308.00
2 (O-1—O-2)	5,201.80	(O-3) 6,494.20	8,343.00
3 (O-2)	6,328.80	(O-3) 7,295.40	8,343.00
4 (O-2)	7,308.00	(O-3) 7,687.80	8,667.00
5 (O-3)	8,343.00	(O-3) 8,343.00	8,667.00
6 (O-3)	8,343.00	(O-3) 8,343.00	8,926.20
7 (O-3)	8,667.00	(O-3) 8,667.00	8,926.20
8 (O-3)	8,667.00	(O-4) 9,041.40	9,887.40
9 (O-3)	8,926.20	(O-4) 9,369.00	9,887.40
10 (O-3)	8,926.20	(O-4) 9,369.00	10,344.60
11 (O-4)	9,887.40	(O-4) 9,887.40	10,344.60
12 (O-4)	9,887.40	(O-4) 9,887.40	10,737.00
13 (O-4)	10,344.60	(O-4) 10,344.60	10,737.00
14 (O-4)	10,344.60	(O-5) 10,828.00	12,134.80
15 (O-4)	10,737.00	(O-5) 11,408.40	12,134.80
16 (O-4)	10,737.00	(O-5) 11,408.40	12,711.60
17 (O-5)	12,134.80	(O-5) 12,134.80	12,711.60
18 (O-5)	12,134.80	(O-5) 12,134.80	13,035.60
19 (O-5)	12,711.60	(O-6) 14,101.20	14,364.00
20 (O-5)	12,711.60	(O-6) 14,101.20	15,080.40
21 (O-5)	13,035.60	(O-6) 14,364.00	15,080.40
22 (O-6)	14,101.20	(O-6) 14,364.00	15,080.40
23 (O-6)	15,080.40	(O-6) 15,080.40	15,080.40
24 (O-6)	15,080.40	(O-6) 15,080.40	16,185.60
25 (O-6)	15,080.40	(O-6) 15,080.40	16,185.60
26 (O-6)	15,080.40	(O-6) 15,080.40	16,185.60
27 (O-6)	16,185.60	(O-6) 16,185.60	16,185.60
28 (O-6)	16,185.60	(O-6) 16,185.60	16,185.60
29 (O-6)	16,185.60	(O-6) 16,185.60	16,185.60
30 (O-6)	16,185.60	(O-6) 16,185.60	16,185.60
Total	330,395.00	350,189.20	370,831.60

[1] A "due course" officer is, generally speaking, a line officer whose creditable service does not include any constructive service credit.

The preceding table illustrates the monetary advantages that would accrue to officers with professional graduate training who as a precondition to commissioning were required to have such advanced training. The table indicates that the greatest benefits under the proposed legislation would accrue to the younger officer. Thus, the additional monetary incentives to the young lawyer, scientist, engineer, or medical specialist during his initial tour of duty would act as an affirmative incentive for him to ultimately seek a full-time career in the Armed Forces.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Defense, by letter dated March 2, 1966, stated that it "recognizes the need for reviewing military compensation, promotion, and retirement systems to assure an equitable reward for all required specialists, including physicians and dentists." The Department went on to say that it is presently engaged in these studies for the purpose of recommending appropriate legislative changes to the next Congress in compliance with section 1008 of title 37, United States Code, and therefore recommended that no action be taken on this legislation and related bills. However, departmental witnesses, on June 8, 1966, testified that—

First, it is apparent that there is an inequity today between, first, doctors and dentists on the one hand, and second, veterinarians, lawyers, chaplains, and Medical Service Corps officers on the other. The former receive constructive credit for entrance rank and precedence in promotion, as well as longevity pay and retirement; the latter receive such credit only for entrance rank and promotion precedence.

Second, it is apparent that the Department of Defense today is failing to recognize the special preservice education of many other advanced degree officers, whose special knowledge is of vital importance to Defense missions, particularly in the scientific, technical, and engineering fields. This means that we are not competitive with private employers in attracting and retaining such personnel. It also means that the officer with no postgraduate degree enters service 3 years before his contemporary who obtains a postgraduate degree and enjoys a 3-year longevity pay advantage throughout his military career.

COSTS

The Department of Defense has provided the committee with the following cost estimates relating to this legislation:

ACTIVE DUTY COSTS

The following additional costs are estimated for those officers who currently are credited with constructive service for grade and promotion but not for pay. These estimates are based on normal distribution of pay service of officers in each grade.

5,475 officers, additional active duty costs____________________millions__ $4.6

In the Medical Service Corps in each service there are officers performing professional duties requiring education which would be creditable although not at the Ph. D. level (which establishes advanced grade and precedence). The estimated costs for such officers are:

1,381 officers, additional active duty costs____________________millions__ $0.58

In other categories, the probable applicability of this bill can be estimated only very roughly, based on the estimates of utilization of education of officers currently on board. On this very approximate basis the following is estimated:

2,300 officers, additional active duty costs____________________millions__ $0.98

Recapitulation, additional active duty cost estimates

	Millions
Officers currently credited____________	$4.60
Officers, medical service categories____	.58
Officers, prospective other categories__	.98
Total________________________	6.16

INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY

The Department of Defense has advised the committee that the increased cost in retired pay that would result from enactment of this legislation is most difficult to estimate. Any estimate of retired pay cost must rest on assumptions as to timing of retirements and also on assumptions that service credits for pay consist entirely of active service plus constructive service.

Based on assumptions that 10 percent of the colonels, 15 percent of the lieutenant colonels, and 12 percent of the majors will retire each year with retired pay based in part on constructive service credits and that the retirement points will be at the 24th year of active service for colonels, and at the 20th year for lieutenant colonels and majors, the following estimates would apply:

10 percent of 390 colonels, 39, additional annual retired pay____	$43,954.56
15 percent of 1,128 lieutenant colonels, 169, additional annual retired pay____________________	179,396.88
12 percent of 1,400 majors, 168, additional annual retired pay_	76,848.48
Annual increase in retired pay, total______________	300,299.92

COMMITTEE POSITION

The Committee on Armed Services concurs with the Department's views that professionally trained officers in the armed services with advanced degrees are not now being treated equitably. However, the committee does not believe that corrective action should be delayed or postponed until the Department completes its current study of the military compensation system.

It was clearly evident during committee hearings, that the corrective action proposed in this legislation would not, in any way, conflict with any possible further action the Department may recommend in this area in connection with its current compensation studies.

In view of these circumstances, the committee strongly believes that the proposed corrective action as embodied in this legislation should be both enacted and implemented at the earliest possible time.

In receiving testimony on this legislation, the committee also gave consideration to the following related bills: H.R. 2237, H.R. 3822, H.R. 9953, Mr. PRICE; H.R. 7310, Mr. PHILBIN; H.R. 5040, H.R. 14622, Mr. ICHORD; H.R. 9731, Mr. LEGGETT; H.R. 9880, Mr. MACHEN; H.R. 9891, Mr. ST. ONGE; H.R. 10534, Mr. ARENDS; H.R. 13624, Mr. JOELSON; and H.R. 14490, Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. Speaker, the committee therefore recommends enactment of the proposed legislation, as amended.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3313, as amended, and recommend its adoption.

H.R. 3313 as reported by the committee struck all language after the enacting clause and substituted the language of H.R. 9731. The purpose of this committee action was to insure that constructive service credit would be provided these professionally trained officers.

Under the original language of H.R. 3313, the granting of this constructive service credit would have been at the discretion of the Secretary concerned. Under the committee amendment, such credit would be made mandatory.

In addition, the utilization of the language in H.R. 9731 makes crystal clear those officers eligible for such constructive service credit whereas the language of H.R. 3313 left some question as to not only eligibility but also the likelihood of these officers receiving such necessary credit.

In summary, the legislation is long overdue and should be approved by this body without objection.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3313 which will provide constructive service credit for certain professionally trained officers in the Armed Forces. I introduced this legislation because I was firmly convinced that it is vitally needed and, in fact, crucial, if we are to retain qualified, high-caliber professional service personnel. This measure is strongly supported by the American Bar Association and the Judge Advocates Association, with both of which I am closely affiliated, and by many other professional groups.

Briefly, this measure makes mandatory the granting of constructive service credit in those instances in which the required professional training beyond the 4-year college level is a precondition to the appointment of the officer concerned. The categories of officers covered by the bill include chaplains, veterinarians, Medical Service Corps officers with advanced degrees, and certain officers holding advanced degrees in technical, scientific, or engineering fields.

Under this legislation, an officer in one of the above categories would be credited with constructive service for the purpose of computing both his active duty and retirement pay. The service so credited would be generally equivalent to the years of postgraduate college education obtained by that officer at his own expense before he entered military service, but not to exceed 3 years.

Under existing law, physicians and dentists already are authorized constructive service credit benefits similar to those proposed by this legislation—in addition physicians and dentists are entitled to professional special pay from $100 to $300 per month.

This legislation would not provide any special pay to the officers affected but would be limited to the granting of constructive service credit.

An officer who obtains professional or graduate education beyond the normal 4-year undergraduate level usually enters military service from 1 to 3 years later than his college contemporary who obtains only a basic baccalaureate degree. Since he has less active service, he is entitled under present law to less pay than his college contemporary, even if they both have the same military grade. Thus, although the Armed Forces of which he is a member both require and receive the benefit of his professional or graduate training, he is, in effect, penalized for the time spent in obtaining additional education.

The proposed legislation would eliminate this penalty and thereby encourage a greater number of professionally trained officers to remain in the Armed Forces on a career basis.

Under certain limited circumstances, various categories of officers with required professional training are today given constructive credit for initial appointment in a grade higher than their line contemporaries. This credit, however, with the exception of physicians and dentists, is limited to credit for rank or promotion purposes.

This legislation is designed to provide a career incentive for the junior officers of today, those who will be the leaders and senior officers of tomorrow. It is most important that they be retained if we are to have experienced and competent men performing professional assignments in our Armed Forces. This goal will not be achieved if the financial limitations imposed upon them are excessive. This bill seeks to give some recognition to the extended period of preparation which professional schools represent. By requiring the Secretary of Defense to grant 1 year of longevity credit for each year of graduate school education we will place the other professionally trained officers on a more equal level, as far as basic and retirement pay is concerned, with contemporaries in the medical or dental field. This is as it should be.

There is no claim that the enactment of this measure will completely solve the retention problem. However, it may move in that direction. I urge my colleagues to give it favorable consideration.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3313, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7315) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7315

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Museum Act of 1965"

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall—

(1) cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems and opportunities, both in the United States and abroad;

(2) prepare and carry out programs for training career employees in museum practices in cooperation with museums and their professional organizations, wheresoever these may best be conducted;

(3) prepare and distribute significant museum publications;

(4) perform research on, and otherwise contribute to, the development of museum techniques;

(5) cooperate with departments and agencies of the Government of the United States operating, assisting, or otherwise concerned with museums; and

(6) shall report annually to the Congress on progress in these activities.

SEC. 3. The first paragraph under the heading "National Museum" contained in the Act of July 7, 1884 (23 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 65), is amended by deleting the following sentence: "And the Director of the National Museum is hereby directed to report annually to the Congress the progress of the museum during the year and its present condition.".

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the National Museum Act of 1965 is designed to give recognition to the Nation's museums as cultural and educational institutions and will give the Smithsonian Institution statutory authority to have a sustained program of research, training and service activities for museums throughout the Nation.

I might add there are some 4,000 or more museums ranging from the very small museums to the larger ones such as we have in large cities like the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington, D.C.

The other body has passed a bill which would put a ceiling of $200,000 annually on the funds to be used in this program. Apparently the other body placed this ceiling in their bill by amendment. The only difficulty is that the Smithsonian is, of course, already assisting many of the museums, particularly in the training of directors and other officials of these museums, and it would create confusion if we tried to place this limitation in the legislation because, in effect, the Congress is already appropriating more money than that and it might be presumed that by this limitation the work should actually be reduced rather than be extended.

The committee after due consideration felt that this is an item which should be brought up each year and be before the Committee on Appropriations.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in supporting this bill.

This legislation is designed to give recognition to the Nation's museums as high cultural and educational institutions, and it will give the Smithsonian Institution statutory authority to have a sustained program to implement the items in this bill.

I believe it is a worthwhile piece of legislation and that it will increase the prestige of the Smithsonian Institution and our national museums.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question or two concerning the language on page 2 of the report.

It says that this legislation would permit the Smithsonian to participate in and help support a documentation and information center.

What does the gentleman from Missouri envisage that we are getting into here? Are we going to be called upon at some later time to construct a documentation and information center? Or is such a center already provided?

I would also like to ask why there are no reports on this bill, that is, reports from any agency or department of Government?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The documentation and information activity they are proposing in this bill is to set up information on techniques for the better managreement for our Nation's libraries. It is proposed to commission people to write articles on how to set up and display exhibits and how to air-condition exhibits and to have this information available so that when representatives of the smaller museums throughout the Nation come to the Smithsonian Institution they can have these documents available, this will result in better museum service.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not have an answer to my question. Is it proposed to establish at some time in the future a documentation and information center at the expense of the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman, there is no intention of building any center or information facility in a new building. This information area would be taken care of in the existing facilities of the Smithsonian.

It is not intended that this would be a separate building.

Mr. GROSS. It is not intended, then, to come in at some future time and ask for money to establish a documentation and information center?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman is referring to a center which would be a new building or a new facility, the answer is "No." Undoubtedly there will be within existing facilities an information center and a documentation center under existing facilities of the Smithsonian. But there is no intention in this bill of building a new facility for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. There is no limitation on expenditures under this bill?

Mr. BOW. Under the bill which I have introduced there is no limitation on expenditures, but there would be an annual review by the Appropriations Committee of the requests of the Smithsonian for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we here today pass an open-end bill with no limitation? I read on page 5 of the report the following: "that a specific dollar limitation would almost certainly present serious problems of administration and review in attempting to identify expenses of established Smithsonian departments incurred solely under this act."

What serious problem of administration and review would be presented by virtue of a limitation as to spending?

Mr. BOW. I think the committee considered that and has written that report. That is not my language, I will say to the gentleman. But I believe if we have a yearly review by the Congress of the expenses of the operation of this institution, that would be better than setting up a definite amount.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 more minute.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, this takes us right back to the age-old fight around here. Apparently the Appropriation Committee would be the sole judge with respect to the expenditure.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman knows that the Appropriations Committee is not the sole and final judge. The measure comes to this House, Mr. Speaker. The House of Representatives is the final and sole judge of what appropriations are going to be, and not the Appropriations Committee. We make the recommendation, the same as the gentleman's committee makes recommendations.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the procedures and I know the gentleman from Ohio understands the procedures. Am I correctly informed that under these terms of the bill no longer would it be required that there be reports to the Congress?

Mr. BOW. No; in this bill there is no report; but certainly under the other bills, the basic legislation relating to the Smithsonian, there is required reports to the Congress. There is no repeal of that provision in this legislation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Under section 5(7) of title 20 there is language which requires the Smithsonian Institution to file a report with Congress. Under this legislation we would repeal the section which deals with the National Museum because the Smithsonian has to report already under that other language in the act. In this bill, page 2, we instruct the Secretary of the Smithsonian to file annually progress reports of these activities as contained in this act. So the reports would still be in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time.

In the beginning I wish to say I am a bibliophile, and certainly appreciate the cultural and other interests preserved by the great museums of this country of an historical and traditional nature, to say nothing of the archeological and other works that we have. I would be strongly in favor of passing this bill for additional requests or acquisitions, and I am well aware of the fact that we have reconstituted destroyed museums around the world of photomicrofilm and replacement of destroyed objects and cultural assets down through the years.

There is a part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, which worries me in particular, that is, whether by passage of this and other multiple legislation, including the Presidential Reorganization Acts, we are making the Smithsonian Institution something other than that for which its donor, Mr. Smithson intended. I wonder if it is possible that it is becoming a sprawling octopus which is reaching its tentacles into many areas in which it dot not necessarily have expertise?

For example, we recently had introduced before this body by the President a reorganization act which gave the Smithsonian charge of rearrangement of the Mall, and which in effect eliminated the Capital Planning Commission. I am not sure that the curators of the Smithsonian Institution, even backed up by their very erudite board of directors, are expert in architectural control, in city design, and in long-range community planning.

We have recently had before this body a discussion as to whether or not we should change the shape of the Mall. There is before the Committee on Public Works a recommendation concerning the acceptance of the very wonderful Hirshhorn Museum acquisitions and the sculpture gardens as they would affect the Mall. The Smithsonian has recently been given by Presidential recommendation the powers of control over the National Zoological Gardens, which is not what we ordinarily think of as acquisitions for museums, but is for studies of ongoing comparative and vertebral anatomy.

I think all these are matters of concern, to say nothing of the new $40 million aviation and space museum, authorization legislation which has been passed by this body under the eagle eye and watchful aegis of this Committee on Appropriations, which is apparently not necessarily always the best watchdog of the Treasury as far as spending in times of war is concerned. I wonder if my distinguished colleague from Missouri feels that perhaps under these circumstances we are pushing the Smithsonian Institution a little bit too far, too rapidly, and beyond its expected boundaries?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, actually what we are doing here—at least this was in the mind of this speaker and I believe in the minds of members of the subcommittee and the full committee which considered this bill—is stated on page 3 of the report:

> The proposed National Museum Act will inaugurate a continuing study and consultation program for the development and strengthening of museums throughout the United States.

We were interested in this, because in many areas of the country, particularly in some of our smaller communities, we do have museums which are unique to that particular locality and yet which furnish information and historical data that is of interest to the world. They need more technical knowledge. I believe with the channeling of this information through the Smithsonian Institution, we will be helping them and will be giving many people an opportunity to enjoy some of the cultural benefits that are usually restricted to those who visit Washington, D.C., for instance.

I believe the fear the gentleman has expressed about the Smithsonian Institution, while it may have some basis, will not be added to by this particular legislation. This legislation is intended to give an opportunity for dissemination to the local levels the expertise which the Smithsonian has along certain lines.

Frankly, the thing which interested me in this legislation and which caused me to support it was just that.

I believe the gentleman knows that ordinarily I look at the spending of a dollar pretty closely. I feel on this particular thing we are getting the money back and putting it into a place where it will benefit a great number of people. I believe, while the gentleman's fears may be groundless, this particular piece of legislation will not contribute to those fears.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It does reassure me, because I revere his opinion and I agree that he is also one of the watchdogs of the Treasury.

I find a little difficulty with respect to this institution being expanded rather suddenly, and perhaps in many directions, and wanting to tear down the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology and the Armed Forces Medical Museum—recently declared a national shrine—on the one hand and expanding the Mall on the other; because I do not consider them particularly expert in this regard. I do not believe the art and science of medicine should be removed from the area of the cultural arts to the downtown Mall of Washington, D.C., while this other is going on, out of inconsistency, in helping other areas around the world and throughout the United States.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7315, the National Museum Act of 1965. Enactment of this legislation will increase the capacity of the Smithsonian to provide information, advice, and assistance to museums in the United States and abroad. It would provide the legislative framework for programs of museum training, research, conservation, surveys, and publications to be carried out by the Director of the National Museum under the guidance of the Secretary of the Smithsonian. These activities would be carried out by the Institution through direct cooperative programs with museums or through their national and regional professional societies.

The Smithsonian has a long history of cooperation with the museum community, with established museums seeking advice on new programs and with proposed museums requesting professional guidance, in their efforts to preserve the Nation's heritage and to enrich the lives of the communities in which they are located. From these museums the Smithsonian is requested to advise on museum programs, museum buildings, conservation of museum objects, the design and production of exhibits, and the training of museum professionals and technicians.

During the past year the Director of the National Museum has received more than 200 requests for advice in planning new museums or the instruction of personnel. These requests have come from 30 States and 24 foreign countries. At the hearing on H.R. 7315, the Director of the National Museum testified that on 1 day during the current year the Smithsonian received simultaneously two architects, several university scientists, and an exhibits designer, from a group engaged to produce a State museum of a comprehensive scope on an extremely short schedule.

There has been a remarkable growth in the number, size, and activities of musuems throughout the country during the past 15 years. At the hearings of H.R. 7315, the Secretary of the Smithsonian stated that there are over 5,000 museums now in existence and a great many more in the planning state. With this growth, the museum profession has been unable to find or develop the trained personnel necessary for fully effective planning and operation. The evidence is convincing that there is a present and critical need for legislative recognition of this situation and encouragement of cooperative studies and training which are its remedy.

The Smithsonian Institution is well suited to provide substantial assistance to the museum field in the solution of its planning and operating problems. The scope of the collections and the variety of the exhibits of the Smithsonian have required a constant search for improvements in documentation, conservation, collection management, museum planning techniques, and in the training of personnel of these functions. The Smithsonian's program in the conservation of objects is being constantly advanced in its laboratory facilities. In the exhibits field the extensive public galleries of the Smithsonian museums are, in effect, laboratories for developing and improving new techniques to capture the interest of visitors, particularly students, and for the communication of a sense of active participation in science, history, and the arts.

In summary, the enactment of H.R. 7315 will give new meaning to well established Smithsonian activities by providing it with affirmative statutory authority for coordinated and continuing programs of research, training, and service to stimulate progress and encourage excellence in the museum community as a whole. I strongly urge the passage of this legislation by the Congress.

The estimated first-year costs of the programs authorized by this legislation would not exceed $200,000. It is expected that these programs will grow in coverage and support in proportion to the specific needs of the museum field, but in no event would involve an annual cost exceeding $1 million.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has spoken generally and broadly on the activities of the Smithsonian Institution, rather than confining himself to the bill and what it would do.

So far as the Zoological Gardens are concerned—the zoo—the Smithsonian Institution has been in charge of that for many years. The Presidential edict on that would simply turn over to the Smithsonian the responsibility for the planning and building of buildings. It has been a Smithsonian operation for many years.

So far as the Air Museum is concerned, the gentleman has discussed this with me a number of times, and has been rather surprised that I would be a party to the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum.

I believe it is necessary for this Nation of ours to preserve the mementos of air and of space. We have been a great leader, and the originator of the airplane.

The Kitty Hawk will be there. We have gone into space. I believe it is proper we should have a museum.

I say to the gentleman, as I have said to others, so far as I am concerned, this is not the time to build it. I would not support an appropriation at this time for building an Air and Space Museum. I believe we should have it authorized and we should go ahead with the authorization, so the plans for it are complete, and not expend that money at this time, when we are in the situation we are in in Vietnam.

About this bill, I should like to say this bill simply will put the Smithsonian in a position to help the small museums and libraries throughout the country. They have the expertise needed. That has been well known over the years.

Of course, we are doing a little more than Smithson gave this fund for years ago, but nevertheless the Smithson will, I believe we would find, encompasses everything that we have in the Smithsonian operation.

I would suggest to the gentleman that he go back to read Smithson's bequest to this Nation. I doubt he has done so recently, or he would not have made the statement he did.

This particular bill will merely give information to museums and libraries of this country. There will be a place they can come to for the information needed, when a local community or a State is about to build a new museum or a library. It will be a place they can come to to get information on exhibits, the preservation of exhibits, the proper building of buildings, air conditioning, and all the other things which go into the necessity of making a proper museum.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is dead wrong. I read the will of Mr. Smithson the last time an expansion of the Smithsonian Institution was before us. I would, generally, prefer that the gentleman keep his doubts to himself, rather than making them a matter of public record.

Mr. BOW. I still have the doubt, because I know the gentleman's ability and how capable he is. I believe if he had read that will he would not have made the statement he made a few minutes ago.

Mr. HALL. I have read the will recently, and I reaffirm the statement in the context in which it was given, recalling the fact that I said at the beginning I much appreciated the value of the Smithsonian Institution as a whole and its cultural and technical exhibits and its preservation for posterity of that which is historic.

Mr. Speaker, it is very reassuring to hear the gentleman, who submits the 5-percent across-the-board-reduction amendments on all of the appropriation bills, make this statement.

Mr. BOW. Not all of them.

Mr. HALL. It is reassuring to see he is not going to recommend or approve—as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations—that this museum for the Wright brothers, original plane at Kitty Hawk, N.C., for the *Spirit of St. Louis*, which I love very dearly, be built during the period of the Vietnam war. I simply want to reaffirm the fact that my only fear is by reason of this and the machinations of others who are perhaps more interested in the construction of museums for the maintenance of historical relics and other things which are valuable for the future; rather than valuable in balancing the budget at the present time of war—my only fear is that they might be expanding the Smithsonian Institution to jurisdictional things other than that to which it originally pertained.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, may I again assure the gentleman.

I know how concerned he is about the medical building down there; lest somebody take away this medical museum and place it somewhere else. This will be a decision by the Congress as to whether the museum is going to be there. Congress will decide this. The Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents have not moved in to take over the responsibilities, so I suggest to the gentleman that I know he has been a little unfriendly to the Smithsonian Institution since this idea came about, but I assure the gentleman that Congress will have the opportunity to work its will.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Smithsonian Institution is being expanded for the purposes which the American people need, that is, to provide an information center for museums and institutions all around the country. We are at present in a tremendous cultural expansion in this country. Since being in Congress, and Washington, I have had a special interest in the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the many cultural activities of the Smithsonian. To give these activities wide coverage I put the schedule of the National Gallery and its calendar in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every month. I have also been on the Joint Congressional Committee for building of the new Museum of History and Technology on Constitution Avenue, Washington.

May I compliment the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bow], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] on their excellent service, each of whom is on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and has a great pride in serving there. Likewise I would like to compliment, Mr. Speaker, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], on their constructive and dedicated efforts in serving on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

We in the U.S Congress have a special interest in this museum because we have participated in its expansion and development. Congress and the Board of Regents have expanded the facilities and many activities from space to cultural activities, painting, sculpture, science, aircraft, to ordinary U.S. life, customs, dress, and homes as various new interests have arisen. I believe that the Smithsonian Institution is now the outstanding museum complex in the world, the most general and broad in its development. We American citizens are proud of these fine accomplishments.

Congress should therefore authorize further expansion and development of Smithsonian Institution facilities and services, for the benefit of all U.S. citizens, and the development and progress of all our U.S. cultural and museum institutions throughout the United States.

I strongly favor this legislation for these purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7315.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1310

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Museum Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. (a) The Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall—

(1) cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems and opportunities, both in the United States and abroad;

(2) prepare and carry out programs for training career employees in museum practices in cooperation with museums and their professional organizations, wheresoever these may best be conducted;

(3) prepare and distribute significant museum publications;

(4) perform research on, and otherwise contribute to, the development of museum techniques;

(5) cooperate with departments and agencies of the Government of the United States operating, assisting, or otherwise concerned with museums; and

(6) shall report annually to the Congress on progress in these activities.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $200,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 3. The first paragraph under the heading "National Museum" contained in the Act of July 7, 1884 (23 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 65), is amended by deleting the following sentence: "And the Director of the National Museum is hereby directed to report annually to the Congress the progress of the museum during the year and its present condition.".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1310 and insert the provisions of H.R. 7315 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7315) was laid on the table.

FURNISH BOOKS TO HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13783) to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13783

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to provide books for the adult blind", approved March 3, 1931, as amended (2 U.S.C. 135a, 135b), is amended to read as follows:

"That there is authorized to be appropriated annually to the Library of Congress, in addition to appropriations otherwise made to said Library, such sums for expenditure under the direction of the Librarian of Congress as may be necessary to provide books published either in raised characters, on sound-reproduction recordings or in any other form, and for purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for such sound-reproduction recordings, for the use of the blind and for other physically handicapped residents of the United States, including the several States, territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia, all of which books, recordings, and reproducers will remain the property of the Library of Congress but will be loaned to blind and to other physically handicapped readers certified by competent authority as unable to read normal printed material as a result of physical limitations, under regulations prescribed by the Librarian of Congress for this service. In the purchase of books in either raised characters or in sound-reproduction recordings the Librarian of Congress, without reference to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5), shall give preference to nonprofitmaking institutions or agencies whose activities are primarily concerned with the blind and with other physically handicapped persons, in all cases where the prices or bids submitted by such institutions or agencies are, by said Librarian, under all the circumstances and needs involved, determined to be fair and reasonable.

"Sec. 2. (a) The Librarian of Congress may contract or otherwise arrange with such public or other nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations as he may deem appropriate to serve as local or regional centers for the circulation of (1) books, recordings, and reproducers referred to in the first section of this Act, and (2) musical scores, instructional texts, and other specialized materials referred to in the Act of October 9, 1962, as amended (2 U.S.C. 135a–1), under such conditions and regulations as he may prescribed. In the lending of such books, recordings, reproducers, musical scores, instructional texts, and other specialized materials, preference shall at all times be given to the needs of the blind and of the other physically handicapped persons who have been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

Sec. 2. The Act entitled "An Act to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional materials to further educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music for blind persons", approved October 9, 1962 (2 U.S.C. 135a–1), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the Librarian of Congress shall establish and maintain a library of musical scores, instructional texts, and other specialized materials for the use of the blind and for other physically handicapped residents of the United States and its possessions in furthering their educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music. Such scores, texts, and materials shall be made available on a loan basis under regulations developed by the Librarian or his designee in consultation with persons, organizations, and agencies engaged in work for the blind and for other physically handicapped persons.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. **LIPSCOMB.** Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13783 would amend existing laws relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the books and other materials to persons who are unable to read normal print because of a physical handicap. The expanded program would make books and raised character talking books and other musical and instructional material avaliable not only to the blind but other physically handicapped persons, quadriplegics, the near blind, victims of multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and so forth.

It is estimated that for the first full year of operation there would be an increase of $1,500,000 over the current budget of $2,670,000 for the existing talking book program. It is estimated that there are almost 2 million persons in the United States today who cannot read ordinary printed material because of impaired eyesight or other physical factors which make them unable physically to manipulate these materials. The original bill was amended by eliminating the word "medical" which appears on page 2, line 11. This was done in order to avoid the addition of limitations which are not existent in the present law providing books for the blind.

Regulations issued by the Librarian of Congress and published in the Code of Federal Regulations will spell out how eligibility may be certified. This is now done in the existing talking book program.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I know there is no objection whatsoever to the consideration of this bill.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of this legislation.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **BINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in support of H.R. 13783, a bill authorizing the Library of Congress to furnish "talking books" and other such material to handicapped persons. This bill will fulfill the needs of the many who have been denied too long the adequate library services that most of us take for granted.

The national books-for-the-blind program is now 35 years old and is acclaimed as one of the finest programs enacted by Congress. Yet nearly 2 million people in this country who cannot read or use conventional printed books have been ineligible for the benefits of this program. These include 600,000 near-blind, 4,700 persons who have lost both arms or the use of them, 1,600 who are in iron lungs or other respiratory devices, as well as 758,000 victims of other crippling ailments.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials of the House Administration Committee, I was privileged to participate in the hearings on this bill, conducted earlier this year. At these hearings, various witnesses presented eloquent testimony as to the need for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main thrusts of recent congressional legislation has been to extend educational opportunities to all segments of our population. We have been especially concerned, and rightly so, with making such opportunities available to the culturally deprived. I have been very proud to be among the supporters of such worthwhile programs as Headstart and the Teacher Corps. Today we extend these opportunities to a deprived group formerly beyond our reach, the physically deprived. The country as a whole will richly benefit from this effort.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. **CHAMBERLAIN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CHAMBERLAIN.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13783, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the near blind and other physically handicapped persons.

This bill provides for expansion of the national books-for-the-blind program administered by the Library of Congress to provide materials for those people who have handicaps which physically preclude their use of conventional reading materials but who, not being legally blind, are unable to obtain such materials under present law.

No longer need disabled people be deprived of adequate library service merely because they are not legally blind and so do not qualify to use present facilities. No longer need people who cannot move to turn the pages of a magazine go without exposure to such materials.

All of us constantly have newspapers, magazines, and books at our side. While we often complain of the burden of material to be covered, we thrive on what we can and do read. For 1 minute, imagine life without these things. There ought to be no question but that we must provide means for handicapped people to enjoy at least some of the benefits of reading which we take almost for granted.

Without this bill, people unable to manipulate reading materials are greatly limited in their access to the enrichment offered by familiarity with the information and ideas of books and magazines. With this bill, the handicapped will be able to have all of these things. The knowledge they are exposed to will not only make them happier and more satisfied human beings, but also more alert and responsible citizens. In the process, some may acquire information specialized enough to increase their employability.

People who have the capability to develop intelligently but are unable to satisfy their thirst for knowledge and increased awareness can only be continually frustrated when reading facilities are just out of their reach as they are now. Gradually they fall further and further behind their peers. For school-age children, this is an especially real and crucial problem.

It has been estimated that some 20,000 people who suffer from these types of afflictions will be brought under this program in the first year. This would require additional funds of $1.5 million over the current budget of $2,675,000. Certainly in comparison with many of the other Federal programs this is a modest undertaking, but—just as certainly—there is, in this case, little question as to the need for it. While it is, of course, important to insure that the expansion of the number of persons to whom these facilities are available in no way impairs the type of service the people already covered by this program have enjoyed it is equally important that persons who cannot use normal library materials be not discriminated against because their particular handicap is not recognized by Federal law. The Librarian of Congress has assured us that present services to the blind will not be diminished by enactment of this bill. On the contrary, he feels that the broader base of support yielded by inclusion of more kinds of handicapped people ought to result in increased resources—making more titles and materials available to all.

Mr. Speaker, the real meaning of this legislation cannot be conveyed in terms of numbers and dollars but in the promise it holds for each individual that it may benefit. This can best be illustrated perhaps in the case of a family who live in the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, Mr. and Mrs. Ivan F. Schneider of East Lansing, who provided the committee with inspiring testimony as to what the facilities of this bill can provide—accomplished by their own efforts in the case of their son who is cerebral palsied. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I will include at this point in the RECORD two editorials from the East Lansing Towne Courier of June 24 and June 30, 1965, which give dramatic indication of the boosted morale possible when a courageous boy is lucky enough to have access to reading materials in a manageable form. Not all people have the capability to provide for the handicapped as the Schneiders are doing for their son. Passage of bill 13783 will insure that such facilities are available to every qualified individual who desires to benefit from them.

As John F. Nagle, Chief of the Washington Office of the National Federation of the Blind, said during committee hearings:

> Not to be able to read, we believe, to have to live without books, is not to live at all but merely to exist.

How can we deny the possibility of living to the nearly 2 million people who fall in the category of people physically handicapped under the meaning of this bill? Let us pass bill 13783 and extend the chance to live to hundreds of thousands of people.

The editorials are as follows:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF A HANDICAPPED BOY

Despite his handicaps, young Paul Schneider of 1658 Woodside Dr. fought back, competed with non-handicapped students, and won five awards at his junior high school assembly.

Last week the Towne Courier told the story of this boy in words written by reporter Lynn Totten.

This week we had planned to tell more of the story in the boy's own words in a news story. We decided Paul's story, in his words, deserved to be in the editorial column, rather than the news columns.

There is much that needs to be done to create a community of understanding for the handicapped. And Paul and his parents are among those who are doing more than their share.

What follows was not written by Paul for publication. He wrote the following words at other times for other purposes.

Paul and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ivan F. Schneider, consented to let the Towne Courier publish them in the hopes that his words might help someone directly, and might help create the needed community of understanding for the handicapped.

The following words are from an autobiography written for his ninth grade social studies class last fall.

"My life began on January 5, 1949, in Sparrow Hospital, Lansing, Michigan. In the delivery room, unavoidable misfortune struck. As I started down the birth canal, I got stuck.

"The doctor tried hard to turn and twist me to get me free. That failed. Finally, he was forced to place his forceps on both sides of my head and drag me from my mother's body.

"The forceps crushed my skull and caused a brain hemorrhage. The blood released by this hemorrhage destroyed a part of my brain that governs muscular control.

"For 48 hours, I lingered between life and death. After two weeks, my parents were allowed to take me home but I had a very black eye for several months.

"The pediatrician and my parents took very good care of me through this difficult time. I couldn't do many things babies usually do but I learned to do them later.

"When I was a year and a half old, the doctor told my parents that I had a disability called cerebral palsy and he referred me to an orthopedic specialist.

"He had me wear short leg braces and told my parents that I might never be able to walk or to talk. A few months later, a specialist from out of town came to examine all the cerebral palsied children in Lansing. He told my parents that the reason I might be unable to walk or talk was that I was mentally retarded.

"My parents determined to give me every opportunity to progress as far as I was capable. Through the love and understanding of my family and the help of professional people, I have progressed to where I am now.

"It is much further than most people thought I could ever go.

"My parents, my older brother, Harold, and I are a good team. We cooperate and help each other through our happy and sad moments.

"My brother worked endlessly with me and finally got me so that I could bat a ball and make a basket. With a few modified rules, we get along real well in our recreation.

"He has always taken me places with him and it has never seemed to bother him that I am different. My parents are always patient and always have their eyes open for opportunities that will help me.

"For the first thirteen years of my life, I lived at 143 Northlawn Drive, East Lansing. It was a two story brick house on a corner. We had real nice neighbors and they all were pulling for me. I had one special friend, Jeff Prince, who was my age. We spent many happy hours playing together. It didn't make any difference to him either that I was disabled."

(Editor's note: there are four more, well-written pages, of which we will quote several excerpts.)

"My ambition is to be as independent as I can be. This is my highest goal in life.

"It has been like the climbing up a ladder. The first three steps were learning to walk, to talk, and to use my hands. The next step was proving that I was not mentally retarded.

"Many people such as the 'carbon paper boys' (his classmates make carbons of their notes for him at classroom lectures) have helped to make my life somewhat easier.

"I believe that faith is the backbone to everyday living. It is especially important in a life like mine. Every night I pray to God to help me to realize that I am different and that it is going to take me a little longer to do things that other people do.

"With God's help, I am certain that I'm going to do all right in the years ahead."

Those were Paul's words, filled with a strong faith. Much of this faith came to him through his parents, and much of it through the influences of Dr. Wallace Robertson and Peoples Church.

His words need no added flourish, decoration, or comment. Paul Schneider makes his own case for courage and faith.

(By Lynn Totten)

"Time to me is not what time is to you."

This is an ever-present thought in the mind of Paul H. Schneider, 15-year old junior high school graduate.

For Paul is a physically handicapped child who attends a regular school and competes with normal students.

How well did he do this last school year? The record is almost unbelievable.

At his junior high honors assembly Paul was recognized for five awards. And all were achieved in competition with students who were not weighed down by the same handicaps.

As Paul's name was announced each time, it was an emotionally-packed moment for his parents, the Ivan F. Schneiders of 1658 Woodside Dr. Mr. Schneider is an associate professor in soil science at Michigan State University.

When Paul was born, he was disabled by cerebral palsy, the result of a brain injury suffered in delivery. This motor disability, affected his walking, talking, and functions, and eye movements.

He has been enrolled in the Ingham County Special Education program. This required him to attend school in Lansing along with other orthopedic students.

At the start of this year in the eighth grade (fall, 1963), his orthopedic group was transferred from Pattengill Junior High School to another school. But Paul asked to stay on at Pattengill and become a member of a regular class under regular conditions. He was accepted.

Meanwhile he continues to take orthopedic treatments at Walnut School several times a week. Paul has had therapy since he was 1½ years old.

THREE TIMES AS LONG

Because of his handicap, it requires Paul about 3-times as long to read, write, or do most anything as it does a normal student.

In junior high school, the amount of required reading has been substantial, one teacher explained. For Paul, with his slow eye movement, this would have been insurmountable.

At once, parents began to read to him directly or recorded his material onto tapes which he could play back whenever and as often as he desired.

During the past year Alpha Chi Omega alumnae have helped perform this service for Paul.

This work will be continued during the summer to ready his material for next fall.

During each class, a fellow student has made carbon copy notes of lectures that are later taped by Paul's mother.

At Pattengill's Awards assembly last week, Paul was chosen to introduce and present the third General Organization (student council) Awards. He himself had won one of these awards.

In his class of 403 students, he was one of 8 who received an award for perfect attendance for 3 years.

He shared the Journalism Award with one other student. He was one of 2 to win the Daughters of the American Revolution Award, and he gained the Scholarship Award for his 3.7 average.

Paul was also runner-up for the American Legion Award, in which the students themselves do the voting.

In addition to his regular classroom activities, Paul was a page editor for the school's paper, East Courier, in which he wrote editorials, feature and news stories.

He was a home room manager of the basketball team and a library helper.

Popular with the other students, he was voted home room representative to the General Organization, and was named Student of the Month. He was nominated for mayor and lieutenant governor in his social studies class.

At Camp Indian Trails (which Paul has attended for many summers) he received the Best Camper Award for 5 out of 6 years.

HIS DAILY SCHEDULE

How can Paul accomplish so much?

"Time to me is not what time is to you," is his explanation.

Paul lives by a time schedule every day of his life. It goes something like this:

Arises at 6 a.m. Breakfasts with father while watching newscast. Practices spelling words and doing definitions as he awaits bus for school.

Greets teachers or practices on electric typewriter before classes begin. Attends classes: English, social studies, physical science. Study period with future teacher from Eastern High School to write or read. Attends algebra class.

After classes on Monday and Wednesday, Walnut School for therapy—physical, occupational and speech.

On Tuesdays and Thursdays, a school newspaper meeting, and helping in library.

Arrives home about 4 p.m. Snacks, reviews day with mother, plans study program for evening. Naps for 2 hours.

Dinner at 6:30. Listens to Walter Cronkite to keep up on current events.

Studies from 7–10 on algebra and physical science with father. Mother usually types any work previously dictated by Paul to parents or future teachers, and lecture notes taken by students on pencil carbons.

Break for snack. Now mother steps in to relieve father and assist with English and social studies. Then Paul works on by himself, sometimes until 3 a.m.

On Friday, Paul's mother picks him up at school and time is taken for medical, dental, etc., appointments, hair cuts, purchase of clothing, field trips, or errands of interest.

In the evening, he attends sports events with his father or has a free night.

Paul sleeps until 12 on Saturday. He then studies or works on articles for the school newspaper.

Saturday evenings are reserved for sports events, the World Adventure Travel series at Michigan State University, special grooming needs and leisure. He retires about 1 a.m.

After breakfast on Sunday, Paul attends Sunday school and later studies or does something he wishes to do. Bed, midnight.

"What Paul is today is the result of a tremendous, coordinated team effort involving Paul himself, his family, including a brother, Harold (a sophomore at Albion College), the medical profession, the therapists and other special education personnel, administration and teachers in regular school, church and community," said Mrs. Schneider.

"The professionals consider him the classic example of how far these children can go, provided they are given services and opportunities and are surrounded by an environment of love and understanding.

"The goal of rehabilitation is to bring each individual to his maximum potential—and then buttress him with the emotional strength to accept and live with what can't be helped."

Mrs. Schneider and her husband have worked with children in Special Education since Paul's birth.

"The first step is to know that everything known and possible that can be done for Paul is being done. The second is for the family to be able to see and involve itself beyond its own child," said Mrs. Schneider.

Paul's strong points include his normal intelligence which he compounds with high motivation, (a school psychologist once told Paul's parents that he consistently achieves more closely to his potential than any one she had tested), his pleasing personality traits, and the ability to communicate with everyone he comes in contact with.

And a particularly strong point is his complete faith that he and "his team" will be able to bring him as far along the road to self sufficiency and self support, acceptance and happiness within himself as he can be brought.

This summer Paul will spend 5 weeks, during the mornings, as a volunteer counselor at Camp Chippewa, a day-camp for blind, retarded and orthopedically handicapped children.

He will also be a camper for 2 weeks at Indian Trails Camp near Grand Rapids, which is sponsored in part by the Lansing Rotary Club.

Work on his reading improvement studies, eye exercises (orthopedic training), typing practice with a dictaphone and speech practice will take up much of his time.

A trip with the family will highlight his summer months.

Next year, at Eastern High School, he will study American literature, biology, geometry and his therapies.

For Paul Schneider, time is not what it is to most people, in a second, concluding article in next week's Towne Courier, Paul writes in his own words about his experiences, and he expresses his own philosophy of daily living.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I pioneered in this field by introducing legislation to furnish this service to the paraplegics particularly back in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, because the legislation represented a new approach and because the Committee on House Administration was not sure of the amount of money involved, the committee, the past 4 years, worked diligently and as a result thereof, we have this legislation which is pending before us today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope that all Members will join in this program and support this legislation, because a paraplegic, for example, cannot move a muscle or limb or, perhaps, he has no hands or no feet. They cannot turn pages and so forth. They need this program just as much as the blind need it.

I hope that this bill will be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to strongly recommend the enactment of H.R. 13783, authorizing the furnishing of books and other materials to certain handicapped persons under the books for the blind program.

Sometimes I think all of us become so engrossed in international problems and issues and major domestic problems and issues that we do not give, at least I know I do not have the opportunity to give, consideration to what we might term less important subjects as far as legislative enactment is concerned and sometimes these are not brought to our attention. For that reason, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the merits of the bill now before us.

The existing talking books program, conducted by the Library of Congress in cooperation with the States, is one of the finest programs of the Federal Government. Blind persons are able to be educated, informed, and entertained.

The talking books program provides record players to those blind persons who do not have them, and they select books which they want to read. They are then sent recordings of someone reading the books aloud.

The needs of other handicapped persons, however, are equally great. A few years ago I met with some of these persons from my district in Nebraska and I was deeply impressed with their sincere desire to educate themselves by being permitted to share in this worthwhile program. I did not believe then—and I do not believe now—they any person desiring to further his or her education and cultural abilities should be deprived of the opportunity to do so because of physical handicaps. Consequently, in 1962, I introduced legislation which would expand the talking books programs for the blind so as to enable other handicapped persons to participate. The legislation presently before this body will make talking books and other material available to other physically handicapped persons who are unable to read normal printed matter.

I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] for incorporating my suggested legislation into the bill which is now before this body. His bill, H.R. 13783, is deserving of the support of every Member.

There are so many persons who would benefit and who are so eager to have access to these books, I am hopeful their needs will not be overlooked.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 13783, "A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 19, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons."

I am vitally concerned with the problems of these physically handicapped people as was my predecessor, John V. Lindsay.

Mayor Lindsay of New York, when a Congressman, as one of his first acts in the 89th Congress, 1st session, on January 4, 1965, introduced H.R. 94, having a similar purpose to the legislation before us, to help quadriplegics.

Incidentally, the functions of the Library of Congress in this field administered at the Division for the Blind and referred to in Report No. 1600, are analyzed and considered at length in an article in the New Yorker magazine of November 3, 1962, commencing at page 204, "A Reporter at Large, the Recorded Companions."

It points up the valuable educational function performed.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13783, which would extend library service to all persons who cannot handle or read ordinary printed materials.

For the past three decades Congress has been providing a free library service of books and magazines produced in braille or recorded form so that blind persons throughout the country can enjoy all the benefits of reading. Administered by the Library of Congress, this time-tested program has demonstrated tangible results in increased educational opportunities, as well as the intangible satisfaction and happiness which is brought to blind persons by being able to read good books in the comforts of their own homes.

In addition to the blind, it is estimated that there are in this country about 1½ million persons who cannot read ordinary printed materials because of physical impairments which prevent them from seeing the materials properly or handling the materials adequately. Crippling ailments such as paralysis, severe arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy are only a few of the factors which can make it impossible for an individual to use a book or magazine. For such persons there has been no program to provide suitable reading materials.

The most practical operating service which could be made available to such persons is that which is available to the blind through the Library of Congress. H.R. 13783 would make this possible by amending 2 United States Code 135 A and B so as to specifically extend this service to all persons who cannot handle or read ordinary printed books and magazines. The need for such a humane extension of this existing service has been ably testified to by experts and representatives from many professions and fields of social work. Blind persons have also testified as to the benefits which this program has brought to them and which it could bring to other physically impaired persons who cannot now read.

In a time when it is becoming more and more important for all citizens to be well informed and mentally alert, I can think of no program which can bring as significant results for as modest an expenditure as would be possible under passage of H.R. 13783. I am confident that my colleagues will join me in strong support of this vital legislation, and, accordingly, I urge its speedy passage by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13783 introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas. Mr. BURLESON's bill will contribute measurably to the services currently being offered to those individuals throughout the Nation afflicted with physical handicaps who have a need for books, tapes, musical scores, and other specialized materials. By expanding the number of people who might be served under existing legislation the bill will also contribute to a broadening of the types of materials to be made available to all persons with physical handicaps, as the Librarian of Congress so forcefully stated in his testimony before the Committee on House Administration.

My support for this bill is matched by my conviction that a great deal still remains to be done with respect to the development and provision of materials for all the handicapped including, for example, the mentally retarded and the seriously emotionally disturbed. While the passage of H.R. 13783 will contribute in important ways to broadening the services now available, there is urgent need for new legislation which will extend the production and loan services now available under such legislation as Captioned Films for the Deaf, Public Law 85-905, and the bill under consideration here today, to all areas of the handicapped.

Production and loan programs for the blind and the deaf have filled an obvious need. Research, however, is showing us that new techniques and new equipment can contribute measurably to the education of children with other kinds of handicaps. Certain kinds of programed instruction or computer-based instructional techniques are proving successful with mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed youngsters, but the equipment and materials involved are of sophisticated design and are financially beyond the reach of most schools. Similarly, the obvious needs of crippled children might be met through production, or loan services.

Mr. BURLESON's bill moves us another step closer to our general goal. We must not conclude, however, that by passing it, as I think we must, we have completed the task. Other youngsters and adults will still have equally demanding needs and we must not rest until we have developed programs similar to H.R. 10737 which I introduced last August. The method of attack proposed in my bill is broad gaged, but it is essential that we continue toward the general goal toward which Mr. BURLESON's bill constitutes an important step.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of legislation to extend the Library of Congress books-for-the-blind program to other physically handicapped persons, I am very pleased that H.R. 13783 is before the House today. The Committee on House Administration is to be congratulated for moving ahead so promptly with such a good bill.

The program to provide books for the blind, which has been ably administered by the Library of Congress for more than three decades, has brought inestimable benefits to those who are eligible. It seems to me very important to extend the program, as this bill would do, to those persons who, although they are not blind, are so physically limited that they are unable to read normal printed matter.

Many persons who would be eligible to participate in this program are handicapped as a result of their service in the military forces of the United States. This measure would be one important way in which the Congress may express its appreciation for the sacrifices they have made for us on the battlefield.

It is surely in the national interest that all citizens have an equal opportunity to participate in free public library service. This bill will help immeasurably in meeting the reading needs of all the physically handicapped in this country.

I particularly want to compliment the committee for adopting a suggestion I made when I testified during its public hearings on the bill; namely, that the bill be amended to provide that approval for participation in the program may be made by "competent authority" rather than by "competent medical authority"—the language of the original bill. Although I am sure that the Library of Congress would give broad interpretation to the term "competent medical authority," I think it is desirable to use a broader definition in order to avoid any confusion that might have resulted from the more restrictive term.

The bill also provides for improvement of existing regional distribution centers and the creation of new ones as needed. This is an excellent provision and is good news for New Hampshire, which is 1 of the 22 States which does not have a regional center for distribution of reading materials for the blind. New regional centers will undoubtedly be necessary as the program expands, which it is certain to do with the passage of H.R. 13783.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity of paying special tribute to two of my friends in New Hampshire who were extremely instrumental in attracting my attention to this problem. They are Richard Chaput, of Nashua, author and lecturer who has been nearly totally paralyzed since childhood polio, and Mrs. Marilyn Woods, of South Merrimack, president of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped. Mr. Chaput may be remembered by my colleagues as 1 of the 10 outstanding young men of 1965 selected by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce. Handicapped persons throughout the country should be grateful to them both for the efforts and their examples.

Again, I commend the committee for its work on this bill and urge its passage by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13783, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3093) to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 9, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill, a bill identical to the bill, H.R. 13783, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to provide books for the adult blind", approved March 3, 1931, as amended (2 U.S.C. 135a, 135b), is amended to read as follows:

"That there is authorized to be appropriated annually to the Library of Congress, in addition to appropriations otherwise made to said Library, such sums for expenditure under the direction of the Librarian of Congress as may be necessary to provide books published either in raised characters, on sound-reproduction recordings or in any other form, and for purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for such sound-reproduction recordings, for the use of the blind and for other physically handicapped residents of the United States, including the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia, all of which books, recordings, and reproducers will remain the property of the Library of Congress but will be loaned to blind and to other physically handicapped readers certified by competent authority as unable to read normal printed material as a result of physical limitations, under regulations prescribed by the Librarian of Congress for this service. In the purchase of books in either raised characters or in sound-reproduction recordings the Librarian of Congress, without reference to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5), shall give preference to nonprofitmaking institutions or agencies whose activities are primarily concerned with the blind and with other physically handicapped persons, in all cases where the prices or bids submitted by such institutions or agencies are, by said Librarian, under all the circumstances and needs involved, determined to be fair and reasonable.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Librarian of Congress may contract or otherwise arrange with such public or other nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations as he may deem appropriate to serve as local or regional centers for the circulation of (1) books, recordings, and reproducers referred to in the first section of this Act, and (2) musical scores, instructional texts, and other specialized materials referred to in the Act of October 9, 1962, as amended (2 U.S.C. 135a–1), under such conditions and regulations as he may prescribe. In the lending of such books, recordings, reproducers, musical scores, instructional texts, and other specialized materials, preference shall at all times be given to the needs of the blind and of the other physically handicapped persons who have been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

Sec. 2. The Act entitled "An Act to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional materials to further educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music for blind persons", approved October 9, 1962 (2 U.S.C. 135a–1), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the Librarian of Congress shall establish and maintain a library of musical scores, instructional texts, and other specialized materials for the use of the blind and for other physically handicapped residents of the United States and its possessions in furthering their educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music. Such scores, texts, and materials shall be made available on a loan basis under regulations developed by the Librarian or his designee in consultation with persons, organizations, and agencies engaged in work for the blind and for other physically handicapped persons.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 13783, was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950 TO MAKE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE FOUNDATION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14838) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14838

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

"Sec. 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

"(1) to initiate and support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) to support such scientific activities and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

"(2) to award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences;

"(3) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

"(4) to evaluate the status and needs of the various sciences as evidenced by programs, projects, and studies undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, by individuals, and by public and private research groups, employing by grant or contract such consulting services as it may deem necessary for the purpose of such evaluations; and to take into consideration the results of such evaluations in correlating the research and educational programs undertaken or supported by the Foundation with programs, projects, and studies undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, by individuals, and by public and private research groups;

"(5) to maintain a current register of scientific and technical personnel, and in other ways to provide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on the availability of, and the current and projected need for, scientific and technical resources in the United States, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation by other agencies of the Federal Government; and

"(6) to initiate and maintain a program for the determination of the total amount of money for scientific research, including money allocated for the construction of the facilities wherein such research is conducted, received by each educational institution, nonprofit organization and private contractor in the United States, by grant, contract, or other arrangement from agencies of the Federal Government, and to report annually thereon to the President and the Congress.

"(b) When requested by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense, the Foundation is authorized to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation or national security by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific activities.

"(c) In addition to the authority contained in subsections (a) and (b), the Foundation is authorized to initiate and support scientific research, including applied research, at academic and other nonprofit institutions. When so directed by the President, the Foundation is further authorized to support, through other appropriate organizations, applied scientific research relevant to national problems involving the public interest. In exercising the authority contained in this subsection, the Foundation may employ by grant or contract such consulting services as it deems necessary, and shall coordinate and correlate its activities with respect to any such problem with other agencies of the Federal Government undertaking similar programs in that field.

"(d) The Board shall recommend and encourage the pursuit of national policies for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.

"(e) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in the foregoing subsections, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

"(f) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include information as to the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

"Sec. 4. (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio. In addition to any powers and functions otherwise granted to it by this Act, the Board shall establish and be responsible for the policies of the Foundation.

"(b) The Board shall have an Executive Committee as provide in section 7, and may delegate to it or to the Director or both such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this Act as it deems appropriate.

"(c) The persons nominated for appointment as members of the Board (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic, medical or social sciences, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of person for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

"(d) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Any person, other than the Director, who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

"(e) The Board shall meet annually on the third Monday in May unless, prior to May 10 in any year, the Chairman has set the annual meeting for a day in May other than the third Monday, and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail or certified mail mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(f) The election of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall take place every second annual meeting. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

"(g) The Board shall render an annual report to the President, for submission on or before the 31st day of January of each year to the Congress, on the status and health of science and its various disciplines. Such report shall include an assessment of such matters as national scientific resources and trained manpower, progress in selected areas of basic scientific research, and an indication of those aspects of such progress which might be applied to the needs of

American society. The report may include such recommendations as the Board may deem timely and appropriate.

"(h) The Board may, with the concurrence of a majority of its members, permit the appointment of a staff consisting of not more than five professional staff members and such clerical staff members as may be necessary. Such staff shall be appointed by the Director and assigned at the direction of the Board. The professional members of such staff may be appointed without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949 and compensated at a rate not exceeding the appropriate rate provided for individuals in grade 15 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as may be necessary to provide for the performance of such duties as may be prescribed by the Board in connection with the exercise of its powers and functions under this Act. Each appointment under this subsection shall be subject to the same security requirements as those required for personnel of the Foundation appointed under section 14(a).

"(i) The Board is authoried to establish such special commissions as it may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act.

"(j) The Board is also authorized to appoint from among its members such committees as it deems necessary, and to assign to committees so appointed such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate to assist it in exercising its powers and functions under this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 5. (a) The Director of the Foundation (referred to in this Act as the 'Director') shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Before any person is appointed as Director, the President shall afford the Board an opportunity to make recommendations to him with respect to such appointment. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act (1) the Director shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act (including any powers and functions which may be delegated to him by the Board), and (2) all actions taken by the Director pursuant to the provisions of this Act (or pursuant to the terms of a delegation from the Board) shall be final and binding upon the Foundation.

"(c) The Director may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, agency, or employee of the Foundation of any of his functions under this Act, including functions delegated to him by the Board; except that the Director may not redelegate policymaking functions delegated to him by the Board.

"(d) The formulation of programs in conformance with the policies of the Foundation shall be carried out by the Director in consultation with the Board.

"(e) The Director shall not make any contract, grant, or other arrangement pursuant to section 11(c) without the prior approval of the Board if such contract, grant, or other arrangement involves a new type of program, or involves a total commitment of over $2,000,000, or over $500,000 in any one year, or a commitment of such other amount or amounts and subject to such other conditions as the Board in its discretion may determine and publish in the Federal Register.

"(f) The Director, in his capacity as ex officio member of the Board, shall, except with respect to compensation and tenure, be coordinate with the other members of the Board. He shall be a voting member of the Board and shall be eligible for election by the Board as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Board."

SEC. 4. The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is further amended by striking out section 8, by redesignating sections 6 and 7 as sections 7 and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 5 the following new section:

"DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

"SEC. 6. (a) There shall be a Deputy Director of the Foundation (referred to in this Act as the 'Deputy Director'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Before any person is appointed as Deputy Director, the President shall afford the Board and the Director an opportunity to make recommendations to him with respect to such appointment. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule and shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe. The Deputy Director shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Director.

"(b) There shall be four Assistant Directors of the Foundation (each referred to in this Act as an 'Assistant Director'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Before any person is appointed as an Assistant Director, the President shall afford the Board and the Director an opportunity to make recommendations to him with respect to such appointment. Each Assistant Director shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule and shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Director may prescribe."

SEC. 5. The section of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 redesignated as section 7 by section 4 of this Act is amended to read as follows:

"EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

"SEC. 7. (a) There shall be an Executive Committee of the Board (referred to in this Act as the 'Executive Committee'), which shall be composed of five members and shall exercise such powers and functions as may be delegated to it by the Board. Four of the members shall be elected as provided in subsection (b), and the Director ex officio shall be the fifth member and the chairman of the Executive Committee.

"(b) At each of its annual meetings the Board shall elect two of its members as members of the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee members so elected shall hold office for two years from the date of their election. Any person, other than the Director, who has been a member of the Executive Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for service as a member thereof during the two-year period following the expiration of such sixth year. For the purpose of this subsection, the period between any two consecutive annual meetings of the Board shall be deemed to be one year.

"(c) Any person elected as a member of the Executive Committee to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term.

"(d) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee shall be included in such reports."

SEC. 6. The section of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 redesignated as section 8 by section 4 of this Act is amended to read as follows:

"DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 8. There shall be within the Foundation such Divisions as the Director, in consultation with the Board, may from time to time determine."

SEC. 7. Section 9(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "section 3(a)(7)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4(i)".

SEC. 8. Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 17" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 16";

(2) by inserting "social," after "engineering," and

(3) by striking out "among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "throughout the United States".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 11(c) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "basic";

(2) by striking out "research" each place it appears;

(3) by inserting "Secretary of State or" befor "Secretary of Defense"; and

(4) by striking out "the national defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "international cooperation or national security".

(b) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "activities".

SEC. 10. Section 13(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out ", with the approval of the Board,"; and

(2) by striking out "section 16(d)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 15(d)(2)".

SEC. 11. Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is repealed.

SEC. 12. (a) Section 15 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is redesignated as section 14, and is amended to read as follows:

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Except as provided in section 4(h), such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided*, That the Director may, in accordance wtih such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The members of the special commissions shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws or regulations.

"(b) Neither the Director, the Deputy Director, nor any Assistant Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while serving in such position; nor shall the Director, the Deputy Director, or any Assistant Director, except with the approval of the Board, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any grant, contract, or other arrangement under this Act.

("c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

"(d) The members of the Board and the members of each special commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel ex-

penses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

"(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

"(f) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the 'United States,' (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided, will advance scientific research, and (4) encouraging independent scientific research by individuals.

"(g) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

"(h) For purposes of this Act, the term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense means the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and all territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 13. Sections 16 and 17 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are redesignated as sections 15 and 16, respectively. Subsection (a) of the section redesignated as section 15 is amended by striking out "1946" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1954". Subsection (b) of the section redesignated as section 15 is amended by striking out "section 15(h)" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 14(g)".

SEC. 14. (a)(1) Section 303(b) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(20) Director of the National Science Foundation."

(2) Section 303(c) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (41), and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(47) Deputy Director, National Science Foundation."

(3) Section 303(e) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (66), and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(101) Assistant Directors, National Science Foundation (4)."

(4) The amendments made by this subsection (and the amendments made by sections 3 and 4 of this Act insofar as they relate to rate of compensation) shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 902(c) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

SEC. 15. Except as otherwise specifically provided therein, the amendments made by this Act are intended to continue in effect under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 the existing offices, procedures, and organization of the National Science Foundation as provided by such Act, part II of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1965. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, part II of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1965, shall be of no force or effect; but nothing in this Act shall alter or affect any transfers of functions made by part I of such Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of H.R. 14838, I would like to offer a few remarks to my colleagues which may prove useful in their consideration of this bill.

I will explain the background of our review of the National Science Foundation. Second, I will describe our procedures in reviewing National Science Foundation. Third, I will explain what we found in National Science Foundation that needed improvement, and, fourth, I will give you our recommendations for changes in National Science Foundation.

BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW

We undertook a review of the National Science Foundation primarily to determine whether existing legislation and the current operations of National Science Foundation were adequate to fulfill contemporary needs. The National Science Foundation was created in 1950 largely as a result of public recognition of the value of research and development during and after World War II. The Foundation was directed by Congress "to develop and encourage the pursuit of national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences." Once organized and functioning, the National Science Foundation had carried out its functions with considerable expansion of activities and little review by Congress other than the annual inspection of the National Science Foundation budget.

However, in 1962–63, when the Federal budget for science and technology first went over $12 billion a year, the Congress began to be concerned about its ability to oversee the work being done.

Becoming concerned that it be given adequate information and advice regarding scientific and technological matters, the Congress looked for new sources of advice on science and technology outside the executive branch. The Science Policy Research Division of the Library of Congress and the Research Management Advisory Panel to our committee were set up for this purpose. Also, the committee contracted with the National Academy of Sciences to make a study on the needs of the Nation for basic research, and this resulted in a report called "Basic Research and National Goals."

It was at this time that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE MILLER], chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, stimulated by the Academy recommendation for an increased role for National Science Foundation, directed a thorough review of the Foundation. This review, begun late in 1964 by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, is the first comprehensive legislative review of the Foundation in its 15 years of operation. It is a critical review in the sense that it evaluates a major ongoing operation of the Government against the backdrop of current and future needs of the Nation. It has been directed toward the Foundation's relatively slow evolution in relation to the expanding, fast-changing contemporary problems of the Nation and toward the Foundation's underutilized potential as a member of the executive's scientific and technological family.

I would like to stress the point that it was congressional concern which prompted the review of the National Science Foundation. In recent years, the high rate of growth of science and technology has had an unprecedented impact on modern society. In fact, a great number of the problems which plague us have often been created by science and technology, and just as often depend upon science and technology for at least a part of their solution. This increased congressional concern has resulted in the proposed legislation which I am presenting today—legislation which has gained the support of both the administration and the scientific community.

PROCEDURES USED

Our procedures in reviewing the National Science Foundation began with a careful survey of the Foundation's operations made at our request by the Library of Congress entitled "The National Science Foundation—A General Review of Its First 15 Years."

In June 1965 the subcommittee began 7 weeks of public hearings focusing on National Science Foundation's 15 years of operation, its contemporary role, and its outlook for the future. The subcommittee heard testimony from 41 witnesses, representing Government agencies including the National Science Foundation, OST, Department of Defense, NASA, and other departments and agencies, educational institutions, and professional and nonprofit associations. To supplement the testimony, the subcommittee also submitted some 560 written questions to which the witnesses responded. The testimony of the 7 weeks of hearings and the supplementary questions and answers are critically evaluated in the subcommittee report, "The National Science Foundation, Its Present and Future." This report outlined the problems uncovered in the hearings and set forth a number of recommendations for legislative change. In January of 1966, the full Committee on Science and Astronautics unanimously voted to accept this report—House Report No. 1236.

On March 16, 1966, I introduced H.R. 13696, which incorporated the recommendations contained in the committee report and which was favorably reported by the full committee. Hearings were then held on H.R. 13696 during April 19 through 21. Witnesses were the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Director of International Scientific and Technological Affairs of the Department of State, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, the Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the National Science Board, and the President of the National Academy of Sciences. By and large, all witnesess were in agreement with the general objectives of the bill. At the conclusion of these hearings, the subcommittee met in executive session and modified H.R. 13696 to incorporate some of the witnesses' suggestions for change. On May 3, I introduced a clean bill, H.R. 14838, which was reported favorably by the full committee on May 10.

WHERE IMPROVEMENTS ARE NEEDED

Almost without exception witnesses and other participants were strong in their support of the Foundation, its work, and its value as a national asset. None suggested a reduced or altered role for the National Science Foundation, and yet it did come through that changes were in order. The fact that the Foundation has not kept pace with the demands of society nor adequately oriented itself within the shifting machinery of government was made clear to the committee again and again. The committee's cardinal criticism, then, is that the Foundation has operated, and is largely organized to operate, in a manner which was satisfactory a decade ago but which does not appear adequate for either today or tomorrow.

The Foundation's approach and attitude toward its mission, its relationship with the Executive Office and other agencies of Government, and its legislative machinery, all in varying degree, appear to be in need of overhaul. In general, the Foundation has functioned, and still does, in a manner that is largely passive. It has not itself put a sustained effort into developing substance, form, and direction of the programs it supports. Once granted its annual budget, National Science Foundation has to a large extent followed a practice of waiting for talented outsiders to suggest appropriate projects on which to spend it. However, the time is past due for the Foundation to assume a more positive, dynamic stance. There are at least three good reasons which demand this change.

First, the problems of living in today's environment are reaching proportions which are truly monumental. They will not be solved without an equally monumental lift from science and technology.

Second, the Federal Government's interest in—and support of—research and development has become so broad and pervasive that the development of national policy concerning it has become correspondingly difficult. The Foundation's input toward the evolution of national policy, never strong, seems to have weakened further in recent years. This has been particularly true since the establishment of the Office of Science and Technology with all its organizational overlap with the Federal Council, the President's Science Advisory Committee, and the Presidential science adviser himself. There should be a scientific and technological stature about the Foundation sufficient to warrant an extraordinary voice in the science policy of the administration. National Science Foundation is the only Federal agency with an exclusive scientific mandate, and it should make itself heard. When National Science Foundation was formed it was given unique responsibilities in the crucial field of basic research. For the good of the Nation it should now step forward and speak with the loud voice of a senior partner in the scientific and technological echelons of the executive branch.

The third reason for a more dynamic posture of National Science Foundation is that as the Nation's scientific resources become more in demand to meet the exigencies of modern living, the Federal departments and agencies will have to depend more heavily on the Foundation to pursue avenues of basic research which they themselves cannot provide nor afford. At the same time, the Government will need better overall evaluation of the status of our science resources and scientific disciplines. The Foundation is the logical government component to fulfill this "balance wheel" function.

Bearing in mind this need for a more dynamic National Science Foundation to keep pace with the demands of modern society and to assert itself as a voice in scientific policymaking within the shifting machinery of government, the subcommittee recommends changes directed toward the promotion of four major goals. These are:

First. To give new emphasis to the Foundation's basic missions, adjusting to the changes effected by several reorganization plans;

Second. To strengthen and add to the functions of the National Science Board;

Third. To unify and strengthen the operational authority of the Director; and

Fourth. To modify and streamline the Foundation's organization and structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

With these purposes in mind, the committee makes the following recommendations:

H.R. 14838 authorizes or directs a number of new NSF activities:

1. It provides authority for the Director to support some applied research or engineering, at his discretion. In fields where research seems essential to the solution of major national problems involving the public interest—the Director may, at the request of the President, authorize support for research through profit-making organizations. The Committee intends mainly that the Foundation be permitted to support applied research where national requirements justify it and where the research field involved is not adequately being investigated by others—and then only to the point where other agencies or private organizations could take over. The Foundation's current responsibility for both basic and applied research in weather modification is an example of the need for this legislation. In 1958 the NSF Act of 1950 was amended to give the Foundation the added function of supporting an applied research program in weather modification. At present, work in this field has reached a point where development is required, development which can be taken over by other departments or agencies, although NSF will continue to support basic research in the field. H.R. 14838 accordingly removes responsibility for applied research in weather modification from the Foundation.

It must be remembered that NSF was established to further basic research, and it is not the intent of H.R. 14838 to change this central mission. Although there are important occasions when applied research is needed, the authority to engage in support of applied research should not be used at the expense of basic.

2. NSF is presently required to collect data on national scientific and technical resources. This bill would require the Foundation to analyze and interpret the data as well. This change is an essential input to the decision-making processes of Congress and of the scientific offices of the President.

3. NSF is given a new task of keeping track of where Federal research money goes. This requirement is intended to make it possible for Congress or the executive branch to find out quickly how much Federal research money finds its way to what educational institution, nonprofit organization, or private contractor—and from what agencies. This task is admittedly a complicated one which will require the cooperation of many Federal agencies and departments as well as nongovernment organizations.

4. NSF is authorized to undertake the support of scientific activities relating to international cooperation and foreign policy, at the request of the Secretary of State. The new authority represents an extension of that already given to NSF with regard to international cooperation. It permits NSF support of scientific "activities", not merely research or education, and in support of objectives broader than the promotion of science or science education so long as they coincide with national policy. The Committee also recommends NSF support for the State Department's science attache program and making funds and personnel available for this use upon request.

5. The Foundation is urged in this bill to support the social as well as the physical sciences. The authority for such support already exists, but H.R. 14838 spells out and emphasizes this function.

6. Requirements for the annual report of the Foundation have been altered to place this responsibility with the Director rather than the Board. This legislation gives effect to what has become the actual practice.

7. H.R. 14838 removes one current function of the NSF: the responsibility for applied research on weather modification. The reasons for this change are, first, that the ramifications of weather modification are so broad as to encompass far more issues than scientific ones and, second, as I have already discussed, that research in this area has reached the point where it requires much developmental work as well as basic research, and properly belongs in an operating agency. NSF still retains authority to support the basic area and it should continue to do so.

8. H.R. 14838 would update and clarify a number of functions and characteristics of the National Science Board, the 24-member governing body of the Foundation.

(a) The Board is made primarily responsible for establishing and overseeing the policies of the Foundation and is relieved of operational duties. This is consistent with what has become a de facto method of operation through delegation of Board powers to the full-time Director, who is an ex officio member of the Board. The Board will continue to review NSF programs from time to time, whenever it feels such reviews to be appropriate. Additionally, the Board will retain its power of approval on new types of programs as well as on any requiring an annual expenditure of over $500,000 or a total commitment of over $2 million, retaining to itself the authority to change the limits on which it exercises its approval powers.

(b) Since Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962 removed from the Foundation any previous authority to coordinate or evaluate the scientific research supported by other Federal agencies, the language of the existing law which pertains to NSF responsibilities toward national science policy has been left confused. Accordingly, H.R. 14838 provides that the Board shall recommend the pursuit of national policies for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. Thus, it is intended that the Board have a strong advisory voice in the determination of the national science policies of the Administration.

(c) The Board has been given a major new responsibility—that of rendering an annual report to the Congress on the status and health of science and its various disciplines. The idea for this report originated within the Congress, as it became increasingly aware of the need for this type of report in its deliberations on policy matters concerning science and technology. Since the science and technology report was first suggested by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, recommendations for such a report have been included within Report No. 34, made on June 27, 1966, by the House Committee on Government Operations and S. 3599, introduced by Senator ALLOTT, on July 11, 1966.

The Committee would expect the report to be selective—somewhat similar to the President's annual Economic Report—concentrating on areas and developments which appear most significant, most timely, where achievements have occurred, or where the greatest gaps and needs exist.

(d) To assist the Board in its new tasks the bill provides for a small professional staff of five people to be made available to the Board at its discretion. The duties of this staff are administrative. The Director shall provide the staff upon request, to be used as the Board may direct.

9. H.R. 14838 makes a number of important changes in the legislative philosophy governing the Office of the Director.

(a) All authority relating to the management and operations of the Foundation is vested in the Director. This proposal is intended to increase the administrative stature of the Director, to give him the authority and flexibility he needs to do his job under better management procedure.

(b) The Director is given specific statutory authority to delegate any of his duties and powers that he deems appropriate. This provision merely incorporates the changes in authority made in Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1965. He may not, however, redelegate any policymaking functions which the Board has delegated to him.

(c) Although the Director is given operational authority over Foundation affairs, H.R. 14838 places a limit upon his authority to make grants and contracts with other organizations or persons. Prior approval of the Board is necessary if the grant involves a new type of program or an annual commitment of over $500,000 or a total commitment of over $2 million.

(d) The bill elevates the Director from level III to level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. This is in accordance with the Committee's view that the Foundation deserves, and should be accorded, a top-level role in the Federal scientific structure. The Director is thus placed on a par with the heads of most other independent agencies.

(e) For similar reason, the bill elevates the NSF Deputy Director from level V to level III of the Federal Salary Schedule.

(f) The bill provides the Director with four Assistant Directors, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. These assistants are to become part of the Office of the Director. Their availability would permit the Director to delegate more authority and improve the management techniques of NSF. In addition, they would give NSF increased prestige within the administration, as well as permitting increased accountability to Congress by virtue of their method of appointment.

10. Whereas the present law stipulates that the Foundations' internal structure be organized around particular branches of science, H.R. 14838 leaves such organization to the Director and thus gives more flexibility of operation. The Committee believes that organization along functional lines would help to identify program and budget elements, facilitate Presidential and Congressional review, and clarify the role of NSF vis-a-vis the Office of Science and Technology.

11. In addition, H.R. 14838 incorporates the provision of the Reorganization Plan No. 2, which provides for an Executive Committee set up on a permanent basis, composed of five voting members of the Board, and chaired by the Director. The Board could delegate its powers and functions to the committee as it chooses. H.R. 14838 contains one innovation here, in that it allows delegation of policy functions to Executive Committee, which were previously restricted from delegation. This authority should help to streamline operations of NSF, along lines of better management.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain in some detail the expansion of the powers of the Board of the Foundation from the natural science field into the field of research in social sciences?

I believe we should have some comment on that, because I believe there should be some limit on how far they are to go. We should have some sort of congressional or legislative intent expresssed on the floor as to the direction in social sciences.

My corollary to that question is: Does this mean they will go into such things as the national policy on segregation, or on civil rights, or on transportation, or on urban renewal, or in housing? Just where does it stop?

Mr. DADDARIO. The National Science Foundation does in fact have authority, over research in the field of social sciences under the terminology of present law which includes "and other sciences." What we are doing here is emphasizing that this is an important research requirement in this day and age.

We are simply, by the language involved in this bill, emphasizing the importance of basic research in the social sciences. We do not in any way lend credence to the fears that are indicated in the question the gentleman has asked.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for clarification, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with the expansion of the power of the National Science Foundation Board not only from basic research but to applied research, then of course that brings up the question of what we mean by applied research in the social sciences.

Does that put us into specific programs, such as urban renewal or civil rights or segregation or public schools, in this particular social research? For example, when there are various agencies which have specific missions in these fields, will there not be an overlapping of effort, if the National Science Foundation comes likewise into these very disputed fields?

Secondly, if the agency is handling the jurisdiction on a specific applied mission approach, where will the National Science Foundation authority begin and where will that of the other mission, which has a specific mission, end?

That leads me to a final point. Is the National Science Foundation to take up the elements of other agency jurisdiction on research, if the National Science Foundation feels those agencies either have not done enough, or are not doing it thoroughly, or are not moving fast enough in the field? Will this not make for a competition between the National Science Foundation and these other specific mission agencies in these social science fields, to see who gets there first with the most—and that will mean money?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly answer all of the ramifications of the gentleman's question, because it involves all the basic facets of what we are talking about. In my opinion the answers to all these questions are included in the proceedings and reports of the committee which have led to this bill.

I would like to ease some of the gentleman's fears by saying simply that in this area of applied research all that is intended is that the director have the authority to pursue those basic areas—mainly in engineering—which he feels offer special opportunity.

We do not mean in any way to detract from National Science Foundation's fundamental responsibility in basic research.

I do not have time to go into all the points raised, but I would like to mention one thing which I believe is important; that is, what is the status of the Foundation? What is the status of science? What is being done where?

This bill largely is involved in this field. It provides for more complete reports. It asks the National Science Board to go into the status of science and technology and to make an annual report so that we can see where the gaps exist, where there is duplication, where emphasis must be given, and where funding is of an overlapping nature.

The fact is that what we are doing is putting together a managerial capability, a knowledge of what is going on in science and technology, so that it can be handled better than it is now, so that we can in fact direct our effort more precisely and exactly to getting the job done, so that monies will be better managed and we can know in a more encompassing fashion where we stand in this entire field.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I ask a question on the money control, which the gentleman mentioned?

If we are expanding the National Science Foundation's power so broadly from basic research to applied programs, both in the natural sciences and in the social science fields, should we not then all the more have an annual authorization and review by the committee which has jurisdiction over this particular agency, which is the Committee on Science and Astronautics? For years I have been urging that there be an annual authorization so that some legislative committee of the House shall have a proper opportunity to determine what are the good programs and what are the bad ones.

We hear so much about money being spent crazily on programs of research that really make no sense to many of us who are interested in science research and progress.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman knows very well we discussed this matter involving whether we should request authorization authority or not. It was our decision that we ought not to request it and the steps we were taking should at least move us along the road so that that determination could be made better at a later time. We are here simply doing the job that the Committee on Science and Astronautics is bound to do by this Congress. We have moved in this direction because of the concern expressed by many Members of Congress as to where we did in fact stand in the field of science and technology. That is all that this bill does. It puts the National Science Foundation in a position where it can better perform its responsibilities, and we do that, recognizing that the Committee on Science and Astronautics now has legislative jurisdiction and that this has not been previously exercised during the entire 15 years of the life of the Foundation. It has grown from a very small agency to the point where it spends almost half a billion dollars each year, and all we are doing here is performing a legislative responsibility, keeping in mind as well that this is the first occasion I can think of where Congress itself has made the recommendation for the restructuring of a Federal agency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. Speaker, in the few moments I have remaining I would just like to say that this bill was unanimously reported out of the subcommittee and unanimously reported out of the full committee and during the course of this there was a completely bipartisan approach. I wish to thank all of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to spend a little time at our Air Force Academy and to tour its facilities in their wonderful setting. But a letter I received recently from two parents in my district told me how very much I have missed in never having attended graduation exercises at the Academy.

The letter was sent to me by Mr. and Mrs. Dale W. Cook of 2007 Holly Street, Harrisburg, Pa. They had just returned from Colorado Springs where they witnessed the exercises leading up to the graduation of their son, Richard Cook. It was my privilege to appoint Richard to the Academy some 4 years ago.

I share a vicarious pride in Richard's fine achievements there. Through their letter, the Cooks have permitted me to share also in the excitements experienced by the parents of an Air Force Academy cadet over a period of 4 years, as well as the thrills of June Week and graduation. It paints a beautiful and inspiring picture and makes one feel almost as though he were right there looking on in person.

In the thought that many others also will enjoy its descriptive passages, I submit the letter today for the RECORD:

JUNE 18, 1966.

Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

OUR DEAR MR. KUNKEL: We have just returned from attending Richard's graduation at the Air Force Academy. It was a wonderful and unforgettable experience to participate in the activities of June Week. The Sunday morning Baccalaureate service in the Academy Chapel carried a message that shall always be meaningful to those new Air Force officers. In the afternoon, we were privileged to attend the Superintendent's Reception in the beautiful gardens of his residence. On graduation eve the cadets with their parents and guests were treated to a superb buffet in the Academy dining hall. The head chef and his assistants had prepared an artistic display of ice sculptures in shapes of the Air Force Falcon, the Chapel spires, and animals. The result of his handiwork became the conversation piece of the evening. The Graduation Ball followed and the girls in their formal gowns and the cadets in their dress uniforms were a heart warming sight. They are true ladies and gentlemen to whom we can confidently entrust the future. Of course, the culminating moment came on Graduation Day.

To be the parents of an Air Force Academy cadet is to run the gamut of emotions. When you called on the telephone prior to Christmas 1961, to tell us of your decision to nominate Richard as the principal candidate to attend the Academy, we were overwhelmed with the news. When we told Richard on Christmas Eve he was thrilled.

We vividly recall the anxieties of the first summer and fall when all the rights of the Doolies were taken from them to be earned back as privileges.

The Doolies were not permitted to leave the Academy during their first Christmas but the parents were invited and very cordially welcomed to share the holiday with their cadet. The Academy in its grand and beautiful setting in the foothills of the Rampart Range was bedecked with spectacular decorations. Christmas of '62 was a memorable occasion.

At summer vacation time, what a thrill to see your cadet's eyes light up as he recounts the highlights of his first summer tour of Air Force, Army and Navy bases. A week on a Navy carrier; his first jet fighter plane ride at faster than the speed of sound; and the power display of Army might at Fort Benning.

You share with your cadet the happy event of making the Dean's list and lend encouragement as the overload of the enrichment Program demands diligent and continuous hard work. Richard's academic achievements exceeded our expectations.

We became experts of flight lines at neighboring Air Force bases as we met hops he was fortunate to get during Christmas or vacations.

These are just a few of the experiences of the past four years. His life and ours has been, and will continue to be, far different because of your decision. We are extremely grateful to you for selecting Richard.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE and DALE COOK.

HARRISBURG, PA.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], I want to emphasize that our Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, including the Members on both sides of the aisle, feel strongly that the time is near when the Committee on Science and Astronautics should be granted annual authorization authority in regard to the National Science Foundation budget.

That proposal is not part of H.R. 14838, the bill before us today, and we are not making any such recommendation to the 89th Congress. But our very thorough review of the activities of NSF, in hearings on H.R. 14838, rather dramatically reveals its rapid growth, the complexity of its functions, and their vital importance for this Nation's future.

The obligation for effective congressional oversight of the National Science Foundation's rapidly expanding activities will be increasingly difficult to accomplish. We doubt that it can be done in the future without placing in the proper committee the authority and specific responsibility for thorough and detailed authorization hearings on the NSF annual budget requests.

I believe it is important that the House Members be warned today of that need.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full support of H.R. 14838, and speaking for the minority side of our committee, I want to express our admiration for Chairman DADDARIO, for his able, considerate leadership during the committee's long and thorough study of the National Science Foundation, and the preparation of this legislation.

I also am proud of the diligent and creative role that minority members of the commitee were able to play in perfecting this bill.

We on this side of the aisle salute the committee staff for an exceptional job, well done. And in addition we recognize the extraordinary, effective support of incalculable value we have received from the Science Policy Research Division of the Library of Congress.

Our hearings revealed a remarkable unanimity of opinion that the National Science Foundation is performing a most valuable, in fact an urgently essential function, in the Nation's interest. I know of no informed person who would suggest that NSF's activities should be curtailed.

Nevertheless, NSF can do better. And the point of this bill is to help it realize its full potential in helping the Nation meet its needs and obligations in the ever more complex and expanding world of science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I will confine these remarks to what I consider to be some of the more important aspects of H.R. 14838.

The Foundation was created 16 years ago to fulfill a need, which became evident during and immediately after World War II, for an agency to sponsor basic research and education in the sciences. It was an innovation among Federal agencies, a unique compromise between scientific autonomy and governmental responsibility. A part-time National Science Board composed predominantly of scientists was charged with exercising the general authority of the Foundation. The day-to-day operations of the Foundation were handled by a director, who was made responsible to both the President and to the Board.

As the size of the Foundation's budget increased over the years, the Board delegated more and more of its authority to the Director, keeping for itself those items which primarily involved questions of policy. Nevertheless, there were still a number of rather routine management tasks which the Board was required to perform, and which consumed a considerable amount of the Board's time and energy.

In this bill, we have tried, insofar as possible, to draw a clear dividing line between the functions of the Board and those of the Director. In section 2 of the bill we state that the function of the Board shall be to "establish and be responsible for the policies of the Foundation." In section 3 of the bill, we state that the "Director shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act" and "all actions taken by the Director shall be final and binding upon the Foundation."

Although there may still arise issues that will involve questions of policy and questions of management, such areas of potential overlap should be relatively few, and this provision will make more efficient the organization and management of the Foundation. As a further effort to increase the efficiency of the Foundation's management, we have provided additional high-level staff for the Director and have authorized the Director to delegate such of his powers and functions as he deems necessary to subordinate personnel. Sound evidence before the committee demonstrated the need for these changes.

We also have added a number of new responsibilities to the Foundation and to the Board itself.

One of the most important provisions is contained in section 3(a)(6) whereby the Foundation is authorized and directed "to initiate and maintain a program for the determination of the total amount of money for scientific research received by each educational institution, nonprofit organization, and private contractor in the United States."

For many years some Members of this body have decried the fact that their States were not receiving a fair share of the Federal research funds. In many cases the excellent educational institutions in these States had produced some of the outstanding scientists and engineers who subsequently had migrated to some of the more wealthy neighboring States which receive the lion's share of Federal research and development funds.

Although many have speculated as to this apparent inequity, the facts concerning the distribution of Federal research funds have never been centrally gathered in one location. Now more speculation will not be necessary, since the Foundation will compile the actual data. Henceforth, any Member of this House will be able to determine at a glance how much money a particular education institution in his district is receiving for the performance of basic or applied research, and from what government agency it is being received.

As the program becomes fully operational—and if indeed it fulfills our expectations—we could amend this provision to require the Foundation also to keep track of Federal funds spent for the development of hardware as well. However, this would tremendously increase the scope and cost of this program, and I believe that this decision would be premature at this point in time.

Another item of the utmost significance to our universities and to society in general is the authority of the Foundation to support applied research. Previously the Foundation was authorized to support only basic research. The distinction between basic research and applied research is somewhat artificial since research itself cannot be neatly compartmentalized into basic and applied research, or development. In addition, although the Foundation has the authority to support basic research in engineering, this authority is somewhat contradictory since engineering involves, in essence, the application of the laws of science—in other words, applied research.

I can visualize at least three situations where this new authority may be used.

First. It will allow the Foundation to support research directed toward solving some of our major national problems such as transportation or urban renewal when such activities are not being adequately supported by other agencies.

Second. It will allow the Foundation to continue to support a scientist even though his investigation has moved beyond the limits of basic research. We have referred to this as the hot pursuit situation. Previously, the Foundation would have been required to discontinue its support of the project, and the investigator would have been required to halt his research and spend additional time and money in seeking the support of a mission-oriented agency such as DOD or NASA.

Third. It will authorize the Foundation to fund promising research in this ill-defined gray area between basic and applied that I mentioned a moment ago. Currently, the Foundation would be reluctant to support such research for fear of overstepping its authority.

Finally, I would like to briefly discuss a new requirement which has been placed on the National Science Board. This bill requires the Board to make an annual report on the status and health of science and its various disciplines. This report will include an assessment of such matters as national scientific resources and trained manpower, progress in selected areas of basic scientific research, and an indication of those aspects of such progress which might be applied to the needs of American society.

The report should be of inestimable value to Congress in its deliberations on policy matters relating to science and technology, and to the executive branch by indicating those areas of science which are lacking in support—or those which are oversupported.

Equally important to forecasting the beneficial aspects of science, it is hoped that the Board will be able to foresee some of the implications of science which might be potentially harmful to society. For example, the United States has realized tremendous benefits as a result of the creation of the internal combustion engine and insecticides. Yet, if one could have foreseen the polluting effect those innovations would have on air, soil, and water, perhaps we would much earlier have supported additional research to solve or control that pollution before it became so widespread. Of course, the difficulty here is that reasonable men cannot always foresee what potentially harmful effects may arise, nor does it follow that men may foresee the same effects as potentially harmful. Nevertheless, in our complicated present-day society, a start must be made to maintain man in harmony with his environment. I believe this bill provides that start. The Board is composed of men eminent in the fields of science and public policy, and they are admirably qualified to render insights into this question.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 14838 is needed legislation, well considered, carefully and wisely drafted, unanimously recommended by our committee. I urge that the House give it full support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE].

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is natural for a member of a subcommittee to be proud of the work with which that subcommittee has been deeply involved long before it reaches the floor of the House. I am no exception: I feel that the hearings conducted by our learned and distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario] last summer, in investigation of the work of the National Science Foundation, were in the best traditions of this body. The scientific community may have had its misgivings about a congressional investigation of such an important agency in the scientific and educational life of this country, but if so, these misgivings were quickly dispelled by the fair and open treatment the chairman of our subcommittee gave to the broad selection of scientists and educators who testified about the work of the Foundation. This bill makes modest organizational proposals in keeping with the tremendously increased activities and responsibilities of the National Science Board since it was first established in 1950. I doubt that Congress will fail to review the work of the National Science Foundation during the next 15-year period as it did during the last. Indeed the annual budget of the Foundation is now so large, as it approaches the half billion dollar mark, that Congress should consider the granting of specific authorizing power to the responsible committee.

As a result of this legislation we think the National Science Foundation will be better equipped to handle the program which Congress has laid out for it. Certainly the hearings out of which this legislation arises will have an impact far beyond the legislative changes which we are now submitting. The process of self-examination by an agency like the National Science Foundation is a productive one and the depth and scope of our hearings insured such self-examination. I am sure the reports of these hearings will also provide valuable information for the Appropriations Committee as it considers the substantial sums of money which the National Science Foundation is requesting as it continues its transforming work.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the pending legislation and urge my colleagues also to support it.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for many years, I have worked for the progress of science, aeronautics and astronautics, and the development of both pure and applied research in science.

I do believe that we in Congress must be careful as to how we expand power of various Government agencies, and any questions coming up on the method of expanding powers should be resolved, before authority is granted, or when authorization is made. In the legislation for the National Science Foundation, are we making these powers indefinite and are we then encroaching upon other fields or upon other agencies which have specific missions? Is Congress by this broadening of powers mixing up jurisdictions and missions in certain areas where legally we cannot tell which U.S. Government agency has the power involved?

For many years I have felt that the National Science Foundation has many good programs that have produced excellent results. Many research programs likewise have been of doubtful value to the scientific community, the National Science Foundation, the progress of research, or the American people.

As a matter of fact, with reference to many of the criticisms of our Federal Government in scientific programs, many of these programs have originated in the National Science Foundation, with no legislative committee of this Congress having anything to determine or authorize ahead of time what investigations or plans should be made, or research policies should be carried on with the U.S. taxpayers' hard-earned money.

If the Members of Congress will look to see what some of these research programs are, I am sure they will be surprised and shocked as well at the lack of results obtained. From that standpoint I do not believe the real scientific value has justified the result of the money spent.

I have felt strongly that not only the House Committee on Appropriations, but the Committee on Science and Astronautics people who are experienced and able in scientific fields with scientific and professional staff personnel, should have the evaluation and authorization legislation for these scientific programs in order to see whether one program should be given preference over another and whether the tax money is likely to result in a scientific achievement or a scientific finding of value.

As one of those who have had experience in this field over the years, I feel first that we are not consulted and, secondly, that the scientific programs have gone so far that nothing can be done about it, when these programs are brought to our attention.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the point the gentleman makes about reducing the gray areas of conflict of interest among the Federal agencies and those interested in scientific research hits exactly at what this bill does.

This legislation clarifies the purposes of the National Science Foundation. It does put in perspective what their responsibilities are. It does constitute a restructuring—not by a Federal agency but by the Congress itself, as the gentleman desires. Actually the National Science Foundation has had good leadership and has done a good job.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If I may comment on that. Will the gentleman please tell me whether this bill and proposed legislation expands the applied research authority of the National Science Foundation, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mosher] says in his statement, into the field of urban renewal and national transportation policy? I do not believe that these are appropriate fields for the National Science Foundation, nor do I feel that social studies applications without definite purposes and limitations are appropriate fields as distinguished from the natural sciences. These social research studies are certainly a mixed can of worms, and at present have no specific legislative authorization, direction, policy, method, or limitation. I oppose the National Science Foundation expansion into policies of national transportation, urban renewal and development, housing, highways, civil rights, desegregation and nonscience programs of that nature. If the National Science Foundation, its Director, Board, and executive committee do not have enough to do in the principal scientific fields and disciplines, in national sciences, basic and applied research, we need a new wide-awake Board, Director, and executive committee.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Perhaps the gentleman does not feel that the area of social studies is a proper field for the involvement of the National Science Foundation, and I am inclined to agree, but I would point out to the gentleman that the National Science Foundation has that authority now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize].

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

I, and several others of our colleagues have introduced a resolution which is now before your committee which, if adopted, would direct the National Science Foundation to formulate and transmit to the Congress at the earliest practicable date its recommendations for such changes in—first, the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes; or second, the administration of such laws; as may be necessary and desirable to provide for a more equitable distribution of such funds to all qualified institutions of higher learning to avoid the concentration of such activities in any geographical area and to insure a continuing reservoir of scientific and teaching skills and capacities throughout the several States.

I would like to ask one question. Is there anything in the bill that we are being asked to vote on here today which would tend to implement the objectives of this resolution that we are asking your committee to consider, and which I have just read?

Mr. DADDARIO. There is nothing specifically in the bill, but what I think is important is the overall intention of the committee in this regard.

In the first instance, as a step leading to this bill, the committee held hearings on the geographical distribution of funds for science and research. We made recommendations in the report that this was a field of extreme importance and that justment throughout the country recognizing however as we did so that we ought not to be tearing down the peaks in order to fill the valleys. I do think we are headed in that direction. As I have already mentioned, we do require NSF to keep track of where the research money comes from and where it goes.

But to come more specifically to the question the gentleman raises, there is no doubt in my mind that the National Science Foundation, by better reporting the status of its activities and by the Board looking at the whole field of science and technology will help to establish a better balance for science and technology throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] did not get a better answer to his question as to how far it is proposed that the National Science Foundation get into the social sciences.

I regret I will find it most difficult to support this legislation if it is going to embark the National Science Foundation in the field of the social sciences.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would like to take another crack at answering the question, although I thought I had answered it adequately. The emphasis here is not on the applied aspects of the social sciences. The objective is that there be better work done on basic research in the social sciences. The only emphasis given to applied research is that the Director have the opportunity, in those fields of basic research which give promise of development for practical application, to pursue such efforts a bit further.

It is not our intention to push applied research in the social sciences, although we are not trying to preclude it. I might add here that much of the initiative for support in this area comes from the academic and scientific communities themselves—as well as the Foundation.

Mr. GROSS. Since we are already spending uncounted millions of dollars in one way or another upon social sciences, I can see no reason whatever for the National Science Foundation to get into this field, and I would hope that the committee would keep a close watch on the National Science Foundation with respect to spending and efforts in that direction.

The only figure I see in the report, with respect to the cost of this National Science Foundation, is an additional minimum annual cost of $3,100,000. My question is, What is this $3,100,000 in addition to?

Mr. DADDARIO. The question which the gentleman has asked is an excellent one, because in any of these bills it is our responsibility to try to determine what additional cost will result.

Let me cite what the new money would do. For example, an important addition there ought to be a more equitable adjustment is in the interpretation and analysis of science resources data. This is the data which involves manpower, facilities, and science information. At the moment $880,000 is being spent in gathering that data. This bill would probably boost that figure to $1,500,000—but it would do so by requiring the interpretation and analysis of such data, without which the data is not much good. That is part of it.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the overall expenditure for the National Science Foundation. What is the figure?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOSHER. The figure for this coming fiscal year is $479,950,000.

Mr. GROSS. Almost $480 million, and you estimate that as a result of this legislation there will be an additional cost of $3,100,000? Is that the story?

Mr. DADDARIO. I do not know what the size of next year's Foundation budget will be. Whatever it may be, we estimate this bill might add as much as $3.1 million to it—which is to insure that NSF's half a billion dollar budget is better managed, better allocated, and better spent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], and the members and staff of his subcommittee, for the thorough and painstaking review of the National Science Foundation and national science policy, which forms the basis of this legislation.

I think that the committee has produced a thoughtful report and a sound bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act.

In particular, I would like to emphasize two provisions of the new act which I think are especially constructive.

The new section 3(b) gives the National Science Foundation, at the request of the Secretary of State, the power, the power "to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation." I am particularly interested in this provision, because I believe that through science and technology the United States has an enormous amount to contribute to the rest of the world.

In particular, I think that new and dramatic efforts should be made to apply American scientific know-how to the problems of developing nations, and to find ways to disseminate the results of relevant scientific research throughout developing nations.

For that reason, I have proposed that the United States train a career corps of men and women to disseminate scientific and technological information throughout the developing world. I have proposed that it be called the International Development Corps.

The corps might draw, for example, on men and women who, after returning from the Peace Corps, want to continue to work in developing countries.

Upon returning to the United States, I have suggested that the Peace Corpsmen and others might participate in a graduate program to gain proficiency in a scientific subject which is relevant to the needs of a developing nation. There they would be joined by men and women from the nation for which the proposed project would be conducted.

After graduate training, the corpsmen would go to the nation itself. Perhaps a scientific research project, relevant to some precise need of the country, would already be underway. In the country the corpsmen would spend their time getting acquainted with the nation and its people, and with the research project itself. Moreover, as the project neared completion, they could experiment with various methods of teaching the new information.

Then, when the research project was completed, members of the International Development Corps would embark on the challenging prospect of spreading the new knowledge throughout the nation.

These amendments to the National Science Foundation Act present a significant step toward the creation of governmental machinery through which an International Development Corps could easily emerge. Taken together with the International Education Act and with the new emphasis on research in the Foreign Assistance Act, amendments which we passed last week, this provision in the National Science Foundation Act should make possible striking new programs for the use of science and technology in developing nations in the next few years.

The second provision of the new act which I consider especially important, is the inclusion of social science as a scientific discipline.

I think that further investment in the social sciences by an impartial Federal source will encourage the growth of some of the most important disciplines in the world, and ones which one day may do much to solve the problems of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the pending legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to compliment the subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics that has brought this bill to the floor of the House. They have worked hard and industriously and they have come up with constructive legislation.

It is very hard to evaluate and answer questions that can be posed on the floor of the House without going into some of the background on these things, but I believe the record speaks for itself that the National Science Foundation, which is now 15 years old, has grown from $225,000 a year to $480 million a year.

This is really the first time that we have attempted to put wraps on it. We are not going to do this overnight without destroying a great deal of the effort of the Foundation, but this is the beginning. I am certain that with the amendment suggested here, we will be in a better position to police this Foundation, which has grown rather haphazardly under the demands of the times.

This is a constructive piece of work, which I hope will be supported.

Mr. DADDARIO and Mr. MOSHER deserve our thanks.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with something of the affection of a parent that I rise in support of H.R. 14838 and in commendation of my good friend, the distinguished and learned gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], and his associates on the great Committee on Science and Astronautics.

In 1948 I was elected to the 81st Congress from a district that includes the University of Chicago. After my election and when I had returned to make report to my constituents on the proposed legislation before the 81st Congress I learned of the wide interest in a bill to create the National Science Foundation. Up to that time I had known little if anything about basic science and its sad neglect in the United States when we had the basic scientists of Europe to supply us with the know-how while we went our merry and more glamorous way on the path of applied science.

I became fascinated with the subject and the bill to create the National Science Foundation became the first attachment of my congressional devotion. It has been 16 years and more since the enactment of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, but the thrill of satisfaction that at long, long last the basic sciences have come into their own in our own United States has never left me.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in my period of service in this historic body is the source of greater satisfaction to me than the support I have been privileged to give, humble though it may have been, by my voice and my vote, to the National Science Foundation from its inception in 1950 and all down the years to the present. The Foundation well has earned the enlargement of its scope and sphere of useful service granted by H.R. 14838. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I am in receipt of letters from my constituents among the scientists at the University of Chicago and all are in strong endorsement of H.R. 14838.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support H.R. 14838, proposing amendments to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. First, I wish to express my personal satisfaction with the outstanding work which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] has done in chairing, during the past year, the thorough legislative review of the National Science Foundation which resulted in the bill before us today. The gentleman from Connecticut is an able and dedicated legislator. It has been a pleasure to work with him as a member of his subcommittee.

As a research engineer and corporate officer, I have long known of the outstanding scientific research supported by the National Science Foundation since it was organized over 15 years ago. The bill before us today will amend the act establishing the Foundation, to permit the Foundation to take an even greater role. The chairman has very ably described the legislation and its intended consequences.

I would like at this time to remind the Members of some of the fascinating and productive successes of the Foundation over the past 15 years, so that we can all appreciate the value of its present efforts, and lend encouragement and support to its future endeavors.

Although the mission of the National Science Foundation is to support basic research, an activity that by its nature can only rarely yield immediate practical results, numerous individual research projects supported by the National Science Foundation have resulted in useful "spinoff"—information of immediate help in solving some of man's problems.

Prof. R. H. Wilhelm of Princeton University has successfully tested in his laboratory a radically different chemical engineering principle for separating fluid mixtures, a procedure called chemical parametric pumping. Studies are now underway to determine its economic feasibility compared to conventional separation processes such as distillation and solvent extraction.

Engineers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have found clues to the nature of catalysis, a widely used but somewhat mysterious chemical process important in the manufacture of as much as 15 percent of the Nation's goods. In catalysis, raw materials are changed into desired end products in the presence of another product, called the catalyst, which itself is not changed, although it controls the process. Until Drs. Max Deibert and Raymond Baddour did their work, no one knew why this happened and new catalysts were selected on a trial-and-error basis. Their work opens the door to a systematic and scientific selection of catalysts.

A marine geologist from Duke University, carrying on underwater explorations off the coast of North Carolina, recently discovered an area of at least 20 square miles of phosphate rock—a substance valuable in the manufacture of fertilizer, detergents, and baking soda. The deposit is on the Continental Shelf in water 60 to 100 feet deep, and is of commercial grade. Dr. Orrin Pilkey, the scientist who made the discovery, is carrying on additional studies to find out the extent and thickness of the layer.

The Joint Oceanographic Institutions for Deep Earth Sampling—JOIDES—program, carried out by a group of oceanographic institutions, discovered two sources of fresh water under the ocean floor about 22 miles east of the northern Florida coast. At drill hole depths of 500 to 700 feet, artesian water gushed up with a head of more than 30 feet above sea level. Such new reservoirs, when tapped, will increase the amounts of water available to coastal communities.

Dr. Vincent E. Noble of the University of Michigan, located in my district, has devised a method of predicting in advance the amount of winter ice cover on the Great Lakes, through his research on deepwater temperatures and the heat budget of the lakes. The ability to predict ice cover could bring about significant reductions in shipping costs by making possible more accurate scheduling, and permitting the use of fewer ships for longer periods.

The International Indian Ocean Expedition has contributed considerable knowledge of great practical benefit to the peoples of the area. The National Science Foundation research vessel *Anton Bruun*, working along the coasts of Muscat and Oman, discovered an extensive, previously untapped area of bottom fish and crabs that can easily be reached by commercial fishery vessels. Two other areas wealthy in food fish that had never been harvested were discovered off Delgoa Bay, Mozambique, and off Formosa Bay, Kenya, by scientists from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries working aboard the *Bruun*.

Dr. Warren Wisby of the University of Miami, supported by both National Science Foundation and the Office of Naval Research, discovered that sharks can use underwater sound waves to "home in" on a suspected food source with remarkable speed and accuracy. His findings are serving as a basis for understanding the amazing ability of fish to orient themselves in an environment that to most humans seems without landmarks, and are proving of great interest to military and civilian seafarers who hope to find ways to "imitate" this characteristic of fish.

Geological studies of earthquakes have enabled scientists not only to know more about the structure of the earth in earthquake-prone territory, but to hope that they will be able to predict when earthquakes will occur, with increasing accuracy. The California Institute of Technology network of seismological stations in southern California has used data for more than 10,000 earthquakes in the area to develop information of great potential value to earthquake prediction along the San Andreas fault and nearby areas.

In the course of a National Science Foundation-sponsored research project on a related topic, Prof. N. H. Polakowski of the Illinois Institute of Technology discovered a means of avoiding certain types of defects inherent in rolling low carbon strip steel—of which more than 20 million tons are produced each year in the United States. Almost every major steel company throughout the world has had a continuing research program on this problem, and several commercial firms are supporting further development of the process. If Professor Polakowski is awarded a patent on this process, the Federal Government will receive a royalty-free license on it.

Colorado State University engineers conducting a mathematical-statistical study of rainfall and runoff sequences have discovered many surprising facts tending to challenge some previous notions about water resources. In particular, they have found that drought regions of given characteristics can be measured in terms of 1,000- to 1,500-mile diameter, and that data so gathered can be very useful in planning measures to overcome the consequences of a drought.

In the course of studying the effects of certain hormones on the growth and development of moths, Prof. C. M. Williams of Harvard discovered that insects in the larval stage are extremely sensitive to a particular "juvenile" hormone—that, although a little of it is necessary for their growth, too much of it kills them. This offers enormously exciting possibilities for the development of insecticides that are specific to certain insects, but that are absolutely harmless to other forms of life—and that the insects cannot develop resistance to—as they do with DDT—because the hormone is necessary to their development. Through an astonishing scientific coincidence, he also found that American paper products yield a crude product with extremely high hormonal activity, and when extracted may be used to control such insects as the red cotton bug, a most destructive insect in India.

These are fascinating and productive accomplishments. We can encourage more supporting the bill before us today.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 14838.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN JUAN ISLAND NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, WASH.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2623) to authorize the establishment of the Pig War National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange, lands, interests in lands, and such other property on San Juan Island, Puget Sound, State of Washington, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of interpreting and preserving the sites of the American and English camps on the island, and of commemorating the historic events that occurred from 1853 to 1871 on the island in connection with the final settlement of the Oregon Territory boundary dispute, including the so-called Pig War of 1859. Lands or interests therein owned by the State of Washington or a political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation.

SEC. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be known as the San Juan Island National Historical Park and shall commemorate the final settlement by arbitration of the Oregon boundary dispute and the peaceful relationship which has existed between the United States and Canada for generations. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, and develop such park in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Washington, political subdivisions thereof, corporations, associations, or individuals, for the preservation of nationally significant historic sites and structures and for the interpretation of significant events which occurred on San Juan Island, in Puget Sound, and on the nearby mainland, and he may erect and maintain tablets or markers at appropriate sites in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $3,542,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests therein and for the development of the San Juan National Historical Park.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2623, introduced by our colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MEEDS] will authorize the establishment of San Juan Island National Historical Park, if enacted.

Like the Chamizal Treaty National Memorial which we authorized earlier this year, the national historical park which is involved in this legislation commemorates the peaceful settlement of a boundary dispute—in this instance the settlement of the last such dispute with our neighbor to the north.

San Juan Island, and the events there, played a colorful role in the relations between the United States and Great Britain in the mid-1800's. The dispute over ownership of the Puget Sound Island arose as a result of a treaty in 1846 which was based on an imperfect knowledge of the area involved. As a consequence, both countries laid claim to the island.

Because of this confused situation, Americans began to settle on the island in spite of the attempt of the British Hudson's Bay Co. to claim possession of it. Tension in the area increased until an incident involving the shooting of a British-owned pig by an American settler escalated into an international crisis. The military buildup, following the "Affair of the Pig" was resolved without actual conflict only after the two nations agreed to refer the entire boundary problem to arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, your committee is recommending that the name of this park be changed from "Pig War National Historical Park" because most of the members felt that the object was not to commemorate the whimsical slaying of the swine, but rather to mark the amicable settlement of the last boundary dispute with our friend, Canada.

Another amendment which the committee is recommending requires that any State-owned land included within the park must be donated. It has been the feeling of the members of the committee that these areas provide many benefits for the people of the State and that, therefore, the State should willingly donate whatever interests it has in the lands included in the project.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the committee is recommending that the amount authorized to be appropriated under H.R. 2623 be increased to $3,542,000—about half of which is to be used for land acquisition and the balance for development. This amount represents the most current available estimated cost of the project.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me, as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to present this legislation to the House for its consideration and to recommend its approval.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2623, a bill to authorize the establishment of the San Juan Island National Historical Park, in the State of Washington.

This proposed national historical park will commemorate the final settlement by arbitration, of the Oregon Treaty boundary dispute in 1872, and the harmonious relationship which has prevailed between the United States and Canada.

An attempt to resolve the boundary dispute was made by the Oregon Treaty of 1846, fixing the northern boundary of the Oregon Territory at the 49th parallel. However, a portion of that treaty did not define precisely the water boundary leaving the status of several islands in doubt. The largest of these islands being San Juan Island.

Subsequent to the ratification of the Oregon Treaty, the boundary dispute manifested itself in many ways. In June 1859, tension in the boundary dispute reached a summit as a result of the slaying of a black boar by an American settler on San Juan Island.

The slaying raised again the question of jurisdiction over the islands in Puget Sound. Attempts by Canadian authorities to arrest the American led to encampment of U.S. troops on San Juan Island to oppose a British man-of-war lying offshore prepared to land marines and seize the island. A clash of arms was avoided and agreement for joint military occupation of the island until the boundary question could be resolved was reached.

In 1871 the Treaty of Washington referred the dispute to the German Emperor for arbitration. On October 21, 1872, the position of the United States was upheld by Emperor Wilhelm.

Mr. Speaker, eminent historians have termed the settlement of this boundary dispute as "an event of cardinal importance in the history of the relations of the two English-speaking powers."

The proposed national park will commemorate the peaceful settlement of the longstanding international boundary dispute and include between 1,750 and 1,800 acres. Evidence of the two opposing military encampments are preserved within the area. Present estimates provide that $1,750,000 will be required for land acquisition and $1,792,000 for restoration and preservation work, visitor facilities, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed San Juan Island National Historical Park will preserve for future generations a vivid illustration of a broad phase of our American history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and H.R. 2623 be passed by this body.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to express my thanks to the chairman and the members of this committee for urging passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, small and beautiful, the island lies amidst the spectacular San Juan Islands of Puget Sound. An incident, unique in the history of our Nation, occurred in these environs. This quiet rolling land was host to soldiers of two nations who fought a war in which just one shot was fired and in which the only casualty was a pig. But this confrontation, that involved so little fireworks and no human casualties, lasted for 12 years. It was peopled by some of the most important military leaders of the day.

I heartily urge the passage of H.R. 2623 to establish the San Juan Island National Historical Park. With this park, I believe we have an opportunity to preserve history and provide additional recreational facilities for the residents and visitors of the Northwest.

What caused the incident, and what brings us here today over 100 years later was the shooting of a British pig by an American farmer on June 15, 1859. The farmer, Lyman A. Cutler, was angered because a pig, owned by the Hudson's Bay Co., was rooting in his potato patch. More a man of action than of subtle judgments, he shot it.

By coincidence, on the day the pig died, the son-in-law of the British Columbia governor arrived on the island. Inevitably, difficulty developed between the two men. It sparked a flame of disagreement that had been smoldering between the two nations for a long time. When British authorities threatened to take Cutler, forcibly, to Victoria for an English trial, the ambiguities of exactly where the international boundary lay caused an international incident. The treaty of 1846 established the middle of "the channel" as part of the boundary. Those who framed the treaty were apparently unaware that there were at least two channels. For years friction had developed around this territorial question. The Hudson's Bay pig's fondness for Cutler's potatoes was all that was needed to set it off.

The Americans on the island immediately called for armed support from the mainland. Three days later Capt. George Pickett, later famed for leading "Pickett's Charge" at Gettysburg during the Civil War, was ordered from his post in Bellingham to the island "to resist all interference by the British authorities." He arrived on July 26 and established the American camp and pronounced the island to be U.S. territory.

During the next week an array of British warships and 61 marine and royal engineers arrived on the island.

Finally, tempers were smoothed somewhat when two older and wiser military men arrived on the scene. British Rear Adm. Robert Lambert Baynes refused to open hostilities over the shooting of a pig.

American Gen. Winfield Scott, no less than the U.S. Army commanding general, arrived to investigate the situation on the spot. He worked out an agreement whereby the "menacing attitude" of the opposing forces was cooled and arrangements were made for both sides to withdraw all forces except for one company, not to exceed 100 men each. This joint occupation continued until final settlement of the boundary question. So on March 21, 1860, a detachment of British royal marines arrived on San Juan Island and under terms of the agreement established a post now known as English Camp.

For 12 years, while the American Civil War was being fought in the East, two lonely contigents of men jointly occupied far western outposts on San Juan Island.

Ultimately, the Treaty of Washington of 1871 referred the matter to the German Emperor for arbitration and on October 21, 1872, Emperor Wilhelm I upheld the contention of the United States regarding the San Juan Island. This ended a long and often dangerous series of border disputes. For the first time in the history of the United States, the Republic had no boundary disputes with Great Britain.

The remnants of both the American and British Camps exist today and are firmly identified by local tradition and by local residents whose parents were connected with the camps. The U.S. Department of Interior and the Washington State Historical Society have made extensive research to establish the historical authenticity of the event and its physical remains.

This bill would provide that this historical park be established to protect the significant historic features at the English and American camps for public enjoyment. Development would preserve the integrity of the historic features while at the same time making access to these features available for visitors. There would also be provision for appropriate management and protection of the park.

The two sites and surviving historic structures, once restored, would present no unusual maintenance problems. The repair of the earthworks at American Camp, the restoration of the several historic buildings at English Camp and preservation of the landscape at both American and English Camps would not be major undertakings. The costs of staffing, operating, and maintaining a national historical park on San Juan Island would be reasonable even though access is limited to automobile, ferry, and private pleasure boat.

The windswept southeastern coastline of San Juan Island affords an imposing setting for the historic American campsite. The site itself does not support the lush vegetation typical of the island. Broad areas of open grassland are edged with a few shrubs and occasional groups of Douglas fir sculptured by the wind. The site of the American camp earthworks enjoys a view of the low dome of Mount Finlayson to the east and the magnificence of the Olympic Range visible to the south across Puget Sound. On clear days, Mount Baker's snowy summit appears above the complex of islands and channels which dominate the view to the northeast.

Remnants of buildings thought to be part of the former Hudson's Bay farm are visible from the ridgetop site, and the gentle sweep of Griffin Bay's shoreline loses itself in the increasingly dense timber on the more protected parts of the island to the north.

Contrasting with the harshness of the American Camp site, English Camp rests serenely along the eastern shore of Garrison Bay, one of the many intimate inlets and channels which frequent the north end of San Juan Island. The heavily timbered softness of the surrounding hills is broken here and there by small meadows cleared by the local residents who cultivated this area.

Upon climbing Young Hill to the English cemetery and further to the old lookout site on the summit, the vegetation opens up rewarding views to the north and west. Vancouver Island is low on the western horizon and the deeply indented shoreline of San Juan and adjacent islands lie in the foreground.

Tourism in the San Juan Islands is increasing. The outstanding beauty of these islands draw more visitors yearly. The come by automobile, on ferries, by private pleasure boats, and by air.

The National Park Service estimates that visitors to this historical park would number 50,000 the first year and would grow to at least 75,000 annually within a few years. If these people stayed just 1 day on the island, the economic impact would be extremely significant.

According to 1960 figures showing the average expenditure of travelers in Washington State, this could mean $600,000 would be added to the economy of this island each year.

In establishing the San Juan Island National Historical Park we have an opportunity to increase recreational facilities, improve the economy of the San Juan Islands and preserve a significant historical landmark. I think it is important that we seize this opportunity to receive multiple benefits by establishing this park.

It will stand at the westernmost end of the longest unguarded international border in the world, to signify a milestone in the history of our national maturation. This park would be a monument to an entirely unique incident that nearly brought about a needless war between two nations. The park would be a permanent reminder, not only of this "war" but, in contrast, it would remind us of the 105 years of peaceful, cooperative negotiation of mutual problems and differences between the United States and our friendly neighbor to the north, Canada. In these troubled times of international turmoil, that record of peace and cooperation is well worth noting.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2623 as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to authorize the establishment of the San Juan Island National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 489) to authorize the establishment of the San Juan Island National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, a bill similar to the one the House has just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 489

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange, lands, interests in lands, and such other property on San Juan Island, Puget Sound, State of Washington, as the Secretary may deem necessary for the purpose of interpreting and preserving the sites of the American and English camps on the island, and of commemorating the historic events that occurred from 1853 to 1871 on the island in connection with the final settlement of the Oregon Territory boundary dispute, including the so-called Pig War of 1859. Lands or interests therein owned by the State of Washington or a political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the consent of the owner.

Sec. 2. The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be known as the San Juan Island National Historical Park and shall commemorate the final settlement by arbitration of the Oregon boundary dispute and the peaceful relationship which has existed between the United States and Canada for generations. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, and develop such park in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Washington, political subdivisions thereof, corporations, associations, or individuals, for the preservation of nationally significant historic sites and structures and for the interpretation of significant events which occurred on San Juan Island, in Puget Sound, and on the nearby mainland, and he may erect and maintain tablets or markers at appropriate sites in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, of which not to exceed $2,198,021 may be expended for the acquisition of lands and interests therein, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall of Colorado: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 489 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2623, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2623) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ENGAGE IN FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Mr. **ROGERS** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13419) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

(a) to perform such additional analysis and studies as may be required on the following proposals which are pending before the Congress:

Region 1

Chief Joseph Dam project, Chelan division, Manson unit, along Lake Chelan in north-central Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division, on Jumpoff Joe Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Tualatin project, first phase, on the Tualatin River, near the city of Portland, Oregon;

Walla Walla project, Touchet division, on the Touchet River in southeastern Washington;

Yakima project, Kennewick division extension, near the mouth of the Yakima River in south-central Washington.

Region 3

Lower Colorado River Basin project, in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

Region 5

Canton project on the Canadian River below the existing Canton Reservoir in northwestern Oklahoma;

Columbus Bend project on the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas;

Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Midstate division, on the north side of the Platte River in central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, North Loup division, on the North Loup and Loup Rivers in east-central Nebraska; and

(b) to complete his analysis and studies and to prepare and process reports on the following proposals, which he anticipates will be completed or substantially completed on or before June 30, 1966:

Region 1

Challis project, Challis Creek division, on Challis Creek in southern Idaho;

Rathdrum Prairie project, Prairie division, East Greenacres unit in Idaho, along the Idaho-Washington State line east of Spokane, Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Illinois Valley division, on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Mountain Home division, in the Snake River Basin near the cities of Boise and Mountain Home, Idaho;

Umpqua River project, Olalla division, on Olalla and Lookingglass Creeks in the south Umpqua Basin in southwestern Oregon;

Upper Snake River project, upper Star Valley division, on Salt River and Cow Creek, near the town of Afton, Wyoming;

Willamette River project, Monmouth-Dallas division, on the west side of the Willamette River in the vicinity of Monmouth and Dallas, Oregon;

Willamette River project, Red Prairie division, along the South Yamhill River near the town of Sheridan, Oregon;

Yakima project, Bumping Lake enlargement, on Bumping River in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

Region 2

Central Valley project, Consumnes River division, initial phase, in and adjacent to the Consumnes River Basin east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, peripheral canal, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, Kellogg unit, south of the city of Antioch, California;

Central Valley project, east side division, initial phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Sacramento River division, West Sacramento canal unit, on the west side of the Sacramento River Valley and in the Putah Creek Basin in California;

Central Valley project, San Felipe division, in the Santa Clara and Pajaro River Basins in the central coastal area of California;

Sespe Creek project, on the Santa Clara River and tributaries in southern California;

Walker River project on the Walker River in west-central California and east-central Nevada.

Region 4

Bear River project, first phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho.

Region 5

Chikaskia project on the Chikaskia River in south-central Kansas and north-central Oklahoma;

Cuero project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas;

Liberty Bottoms project on the Red River below Denison Dam in south-central Oklahoma;

San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division, in the Rio Grande Basin in south-central Colorado.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit (exclusive of Mitchell area), involving the diversion of water from the existing Oahe Reservoir into the James River Valley;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Wagner unit on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Fort Randall Dam in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, Jefferson and Whitehall units on the Big Hole and Jefferson Rivers above Canyon Ferry Dam in southwestern Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, West Bench unit, on the Big Hole River in southwestern Montana near the town of Dillon;

Missouri River Basin project, White division, Pine Ridge unit, on the White River in southwestern South Dakota.

Region 7

Mirage Flats project on the upper Niobrara River near Hay Springs, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Cedar Rapids division, on the Cedar and Loup Rivers near Spalding, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, lower Niobrara division, O'Neill unit, on the lower Niobrara River in north-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Ellis unit, on Big Creek in west-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, South Platte division, Narrows unit, on the South Platte River near Fort Morgan, Colorado.

ALASKA

Devil Canyon project, on the Susitna River about midway between the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue feasibility studies on the following proposals, which are presently under study and which will require further study before completion of such studies:

Region 1

Burnt River project, Dark Canyon division, on the Burnt River in west-central Oregon;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Okanogan unit, on the Okanogan River in north-central Washington;

Deschutes project, Central division, in the Deschutes and Crooked River Basins in central Oregon;

Flathead River project, encompassing the Flathead River Basin in northwestern Montana;

Grand Ronde project on the Grande Ronde River in northeastern Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Applegate Valley division, on Applegate Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, near the city of Grants Pass, Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Medford division, on the Rogue River in the vicinity of the town of Medford, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Garden Valley division, along the Payette River and in the general vicinity of Boise, Idaho;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Weiser River division, in the Weiser River Basin in Idaho;

Umatilla Basin project, encompassing the Umatilla River Basin, centering near the town of Pendleton, Oregon;

Upper Snake River project, American Falls Dam replacement on the Snake River near the city of American Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Lynn Crandall division, on the Snake River below Palisades Dam in southern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division, south of the Snake River, near the city of Twin Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Snake Plains recharge division, encompassing the Snake River Plains area north of the Snake River in southern Idaho;

Walla Walla project, Marcus Whitman and Milton-Freewater divisions, in the Walla Walla River Basin in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington;

Willamette River project, Carlton division, on the Yamhill River in northwestern Oregon;

Willamette River project, Molalla division, on the Molalla and Pudding Rivers in northwestern Oregon;

Yakima project, Ahtanum unit, on Ahtanum Creek in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

Region 2

Central Valley project, American River division, Placerville Ridge unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Consumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, American River division, Pleasant Oaks unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, Fair Play unit, on the Middle Fork Consumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, East Side division, ultimate phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Pit River division, Allen Camp unit, on the Pit River northeast of Redding, California;

Central Valley project, Stanislaus River division, Sonora-Keystone unit, on the Stanislaus River in the general vicinity of Sonora, California;

Lompoc project on the lower Santa Ynez River in southern California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, English Ridge unit, on the upper Eel River and in the Putah Creek and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, Knights Valley unit in the Russian River Basin and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, ultimate phase, in the Eel River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Klamath River division, in the Lower Klamath River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Trinity River division (exclusive of Paskenta-Newville Reservoir), encompassing that portion of the Trinity River Basin below the existing Lewiston Dam of the Central Valley project, the upper portion of the Mad and Van Duzen Rivers and the west side tributaries of the Sacramento River in California;

North Coast project, lower Trinity River division, Paskenta-Newville Dam and Reservoir on Stony and Thomes Creeks in the Sacramento River Basin in California;

Ventura River project extension in the Ventura River Basin near Ventura, California;

Washoe project, Hope Valley division, on the Carson River in California and Nevada;

Washoe project, Newlands extension division, on the lower Carson River near the city of Fallon, Nevada.

Region 3

Black River-Springerville-Saint Johns project on the Black River and Little Colorado River near Springerville and Saint Johns, Arizona;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Coachella division, on the Coachella Canal in southern California;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Imperial division, on the All-American Canal and the Imperial Valley distribution system in southern California;

Flagstaff-Williams project, near the cities of Flagstaff and Williams, Arizona;

Kingman project, on the Colorado River and near the city of Kingman, Arizona;

Moapa Valley pumping project in the Muddy River Basin in southern Nevada;

San Pedro-Santa Cruz project in the San Pedro and Santa Cruz River Basins in southeastern Arizona;

Upper Gila River project on the Gila River and its tributaries in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona.

Region 4

Bear River project, second phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho;

Central Utah project, ultimate phase, Uintah unit, on the Whiterock and Uinta Rivers in northeastern Utah.

Region 5

Brantley project on the Pecos River upstream from Carlsbad, New Mexico;

Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in the San Antonio River Basin in Texas;

Eastern New Mexico water supply project in northeastern New Mexico;

Nueces River project on Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas;

Portales project near the town of Portales in eastern New Mexico;

Rio Grande water salvage project, New Mexico division, on the Rio Grande River between the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and the existing Caballo Reservoir;

Texas Basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, Big Horn Basin division, Shoshone extension unit, Polecat Bench area, in northwestern Wyoming near the city of Powell;

Missouri River Basin project, Cannonball division, Mott unit, on the Cannonball River in southwestern North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Helena-Great Falls division, Fort Benton unit, on the Missouri River in north-central Montana near the town of Fort Benton;

Missouri River Basin project, Musselshell division, Lower Musselshell unit, on the lower reaches of the Musselshell River near the town of Mosby, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Powder division, Kaycee unit, on the Middle Fork and main stem of the Powder River in northeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Marias division, Marias-Milk unit, in the Marias and Milk River Basins in north-central Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Pollock-Herreid unit, on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Sun-Teton division, Sun-Teton unit, on the Sun and Teton Rivers in the vicinity of Great Falls, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Billings pump unit, at the city of Billings, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Cracker Box and Stipek units, along the Yellowstone River near the town of Glendive, Montana.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Little Blue unit, along the Little Blue River in south-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Sunbeam unit, on the West Fork of the Big Blue River in southeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Laramie division, Wheatland unit, on the Laramie River in southeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Mount Evans division, Upper South Platte unit, on the South Platte River near the city of Denver, Colorado;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, La Prele unit, on La Prele Creek, near the town of Douglas, Wyoming.

ALASKA

Lake Grace project on Grace Creek on Revillagigedo Island, Alaska;

Takatz Creek project on Takatz Creek on Baranof Island near Sitka, Alaska.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on—

(a) the following proposals, presently scheduled for initiation on or before June 30, 1967:

Region 1

Umpqua River project, Azalea division, on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit, Washington.

Region 2

North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California.

Region 3

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit, on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

Region 4

Ute Indian unit, developing waters tributary to the Colorado River in northeastern and north-central Utah.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas; and

(b) the following proposals, presently scheduled for initiation after June 30, 1967:

Region 1

Chehalis River basin, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

Tualatin project, second phase in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon.

Region 2

Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

Region 3

Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project in Riverside County, California;

Little Rock dam and reservoir, Little Rock, California.

Region 4

Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

Grand County development, in the Colorado River Basin in southeastern Utah;

Gray Canyon project, on the Green River in eastern Utah;

Price River development, in the Price River basin in eastern Utah;

San Juan County development, in the Colorado River basin in southeastern Utah;

Ute Indian unit of the Central Utah project, ultimate phase.

Region 5

Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Marais des Cygnes River Basin project.

SEC. 4. The Secretary, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 2 and 3 of this Act, shall submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives within one year after completion of the final feasibility plan those studies of proposals determined to be feasible, with alternate studies for the construction, operation, and maintenance of each water resource project or proposal in all instances where practical alternatives are known to the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide in the initial and/or alternate studies all the data and information on short-term and long-term benefits and costs necessary for the comprehensive and integrated development of each water resource project or proposal, including any and all factors directly, indirectly, ancillary, and/or incidental to the comprehensive development of each water resource project or proposal.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on additional proposals when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the the purpose of H.R. 13419 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations under reclamation law of specifically identified potential water resource development projects. Except for a few project investigations that are authorized in existing law, the project studies identified in this legislation constitute the entire program of feasibility investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

In the past, the Bureau of Reclamation has had general authority to investigate and report on proposed reclamation projects. However, last year, in connection with the consideration of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, study was given to the matter of whether feasibility investigations should not be specifically authorized prior to their initiation.

It seemed to those of us who considered this matter that the authorizing Committees should be brought into the project planning procedure before the feasibility studies were undertaken because these are the studies which serve as the basis for authorization and construction of a project. Heretofore, the authorizing committees have had no official knowledge of these studies until they are completed and are before the committee with a recommendation for authorization. Another reason for prior approval of feasibility studies is that this is the stage that decisions must be made with respect to maintaining a balance between the planning program and the construction program.

As the result of the consideration of this matter last year, the Congress included a provision in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act requiring that, henceforth, all feasibility investigations will have to be specifically authorized by the Congress, including the investigations already underway. This limitation is applicable only to feasibility studies and does not change the Bureau's authority to conduct reconnaissance studies or basin surveys. Since H.R. 13419 is the first legislation considered under the terms of this provision in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, it is necessary that this bill include authority for continuing all going investigations. This explains the large number of investigations listed in the bill. In future legislation to authorize feasibility investigations, it will be necessary only to include new planning starts. It is expected that legislation to provide authority for future studies wil be considered every year or two as the need develops.

The feasibility investigations included in H.R. 13419 are divided into three categories:

Section 1 includes those projects which are now pending before Congress and projects for which reports are completed except for final processing within the executive branch. Feasibility investigations for all the projects listed in section 1 have already been completed. They are included in the legislation in the event that additional studies and analyses may be required in connection with their review and processing at the agency and departmental level or in connection with congressional consideration.

Section 2 provides authority for continuation of feasibility investigations of all those projects and units which are underway and are in various stages of completion. Substantially all of the Bureau's ongoing program for feasibility investigations is included in this section. These are active studies, but they cannot be continued without the additional authority which this legislation provides. Investigations listed in this section represent a flow of finished feasibility reports over the next 5 or 6 years. The funds for continuing all of these investigations are included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967 which the Appropriation Committees are presently considering.

Section 3 authorizes the Secretary to undertake additional feasibility investigations not currently underway or funded. Funds for some of these investigations are included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967. Others are recommended for authorization but would not be started until fiscal year 1968 or thereafter. These proposed new planning starts have been recommended on the basis of completed reconnaissance investigations indicating favorable prospects for development of feasible and justifiable plans. No feasibility investigation will be started unless this criteria has been met.

Section 4 of H.R. 13419 requires the submission of favorable feasibility studies to the authorizing committees within 1 year after completion, along with studies of practical alternatives and all detailed information developed during the studies which relates to formulation of the project plan. This provision is intended to provide the committees with sufficient information in order for them to make intelligent and informed decisions with respect to the project plan to be authorized.

Section 5 of H.R. 13419 authorizes the Secretary to undertake additional feasibility studies in those cases where they are financed from non-Federal funds. This will permit a State or local entity to advance the start of a study that they are interested in by financially participating in the cost. It is intended to continue to encourage local financial participation.

While the cost of completing all of the investigations included in H.R. 13419 will be about $21 million, it will be spread over at least the next 10 years. In the face of the growing national water problems, the committee feels that this planning program is justified and necessary to assure adequate water supplies to meet local and regional economic growth throughout the Western United States. The program will provide for the submission to the Congress of meritorious project plans for its consideration. This authority to conduct the studies in no way obligates the Congress to authorization of the projects. Many of the projects will never be authorized for one reason or another, but that is true for any program of this type. The committee intends to exercise close surveillance and control over this program to see that the planning, as compared with the authorization of construction, does not get out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this legislation is necessary if we are to move forward with the orderly development of plans for needed water resource conservation and utilization projects.

I urge the approval of H.R. 13419.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the 11 projects included in subsection 1(a)—can this be interpreted as meaning that these will receive priority from the committee for hearings and approval of the projects?

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, I cannot promise my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], that that will occur, of course, because this would depend upon when they get to us. However, these are included within this particular section because they already have priority. They should come to the Congress ahead of the others.

If there is any additional work, that work is authorized here so that it can be taken care of and we can study and either approve or disapprove the projects.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I see. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for the legislative record which he has made in behalf of this piece of legislation which has been reported to the House for consideration today.

As the chairman well knows, I am particularly interested in two projects which are located in my district, the midstate division and the North Loup division projects which are included in subsection 1(a).

Mr. ASPINALL. The chairman of the full committee has sincere hopes that they will be fitted into our program for study and consideration, and for further consideration, may I say, because we have already considered both of them to some extent and should get them underway.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the so-called section 3(a) and so-called section 3(b) projects.

As I understand it, all of those projects listed under section 3(a), such as the Scandia unit and the Kanopolis unit in my District, are included in the President's budget; is that correct? In other words, there is no question about the studies being started on those projects?

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, these projects are included in subsection 3(a), and subsection 3(b), and are projects for consideration in the immediate future.

Mr. DOLE. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the section 3(b) projects, such as the Glen Elder unit in my district, as I understand it, are those scheduled for initiation after fiscal 1967; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. Insofar as possible. They cannot be included in fiscal 1967 projects because 1967 projects have already been taken care of in budgetary procedures.

Mr. DOLE. But, they are available and the possibility is that they could be started soon?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, that is right.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. I think the bill, as reported to the House, on which favorable action is called for today is a much better bill than was presented by the administration to our committee.

Last year, or in 1965, in the last session of the Congress, we passed the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. In that act we had the following language:

> SEC. 8. Effective on and after July 1, 1966, neither the Secretary of the Interior nor any bureau nor any person acting under his authority shall engage in the preparation of any feasibility report under reclamation law with respect to any water resource project unless the preparation of such feasibility report has been specifically authorized by law, any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

This language contained in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act limits the general authority of the Bureau of Reclamation to investigate and report on reclamation projects as to their feasibility. The present authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct any feasibility investigations and studies expired on June 30, 1966.

H.R. 13419 will authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to engage in feasibility investigations on certain water resource development proposals specifically authorized in the legislation.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes necessary additional investigations in connection with 45 proposed projects either before the Congress or in the final stages of completion and review.

Section 2 of the bill provides for feasibility grade studies or investigations on 68 potential projects which constitute a continuing program or going work program of the Department and the Bureau of Reclamation of various investigations in various stages of completion.

Section 3 of the bill will authorize the initiation of feasibility grade investigations on 31 projects on or after June 30, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, section 4 of the bill is a committee amendment to the bill which serves as the basis for the separate views included in the report and my support of this legislation.

I point this out, Mr. Speaker, because at the present time the Bureau of Reclamation is working on authorized projects which will require over $2.7 billion to complete. There is pending in the Congress legislation favorably recommended by the administration, calling for authorizations on additional projects requiring appropriations of another $2 billion. In this Congress the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has already approved projects totaling approximately $1.2 billion. This Congress may increase this $1.2 billion by at least another $3 billion if the proposed Lower Colorado River Basin Project Act is passed without any additions.

Section 4 requires the Secretary of the Interior to present all of the facts to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate upon which he has based his recommendations for any of the projects described in the first three sections of this bill.

The reason the committee added section 4 is that until how it has become the policy of the Bureau of Reclamation to present the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its counterpart on the other side of the Capitol only one set of facts. The proposal is presented to us as something that is complete in every detail. The people downtown have made all of the political and all of the economic decisions.

It is the belief of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Bureau of Reclamation should not make these political decisions. These are matters to be decided by the Congress.

For example, we have not been given in all of our projects some of the long-term costs or some of the long-term benefits.

Some years ago, Congress authorized Hoover Dam to be built. There was no program submitted to the Congress showing us some of the possible long-term charges that might be made. We discovered that the Bureau of Reclamation each year has a dredge in the Colorado River for which they ask the Committee on Appropriations each year to make an annual appropriation of upward of a million dollars for the purpose of dredging the river. These are things that Congress might have taken another look at or we would have put something in the original bill had we known these facts.

Section 4 is not intended to prohibit the Bureau of Reclamation or limit them in any way. It proposes to give them all the authority they need so that they can make a complete investigation of all of the factors. With this authority, if this bill is passed, and considering the legislation which is already before our Committee, and that passed by the Congress and signed by the President, the Bureau of Reclamation will have somewhere between 16 and 25 years' work if all of these projects are completed and funded at the rate the Congress is presently funding reclamation projects.

I believe that this bill is an excellent bill, and if it is kept intact by the other body and signed by the President, it will be a tremendous step forward in solving the water problems of the 17 reclamation Western States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. People in my district are concerned with some of the areas involved and covered by this bill. It is clear, is it not, that there will not be any specific action contemplated, but only studies, and before there can be additional action in these areas, they will have to come back to Congress?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. The Bureau will make the studies, report them to the Congress, and if acted upon favorably by legislation, they will then be authorized to proceed with construction.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the full committee [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] have rather fully explained the purposes and need for this legislation. I want to reemphasize the fact that we have this legislation before us today because of the desire of the legislative committees to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to feasibility grade investigations and the preparation of feasibility reports. In other words, this bill implements the limiting provision adopted by the Congress last year when we passed the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Up until now, since 1902, the Bureau has had general authority to conduct these studies. From now on, each feasibility investigation must be specifically authorized.

The reason for the great number of studies listed in this bill is because this is the first legislation considered since enactment of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Thus, this bill must provide authority to continue all the investigations underway at the present time, including even those that have been completed where the projects have not been authorized for construction by the Congress. In the future, the Congress will need to authorize only the new planning starts.

The restriction on the Bureau's general authority, approved by the Congress last year, permits the legislative committees to examine these proposed projects at an earlier stage in the planning procedure and to exercise better control over the program. Past experience has shown that, once a project study reaches the feasibility stage, the impression prevails among the people in the local project areas that congressional authorization is pretty much a routine matter and foregone conclusion.

The local people and the local sponsoring groups are usually surprised to learn of possible delays in authorization. They cannot understand why the projects should not immediately be authorized once the feasibility report has been completed. They are unaware of the problem of imbalance between the Bureau of Reclamation's planning program and construction program, and that all of the projects with completed feasibility reports cannot be authorized because of budget ceilings.

Under the new procedure, it will be possible for Members of Congress to be familiar with the studies that are being conducted, and they will not be suddenly confronted with a completed projects report and local pressure for immediate authorization.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been pointed out, the investigations authorized in this legislation will be conducted over a period of at least the next 10 years. These investigations will result in a flow of completed feasibility reports to the Congress and will provide all of the information necessary for Congress to approve those projects that are meritorious and needed. The enactment of this legislation will permit orderly development of plans to meet the ever-growing water problems and needs of the Western United States.

I urge the approval of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13419, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 13419, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3034

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

(a) to perform such additional analysis and studies as may be required on the following proposals which are pending before the Congress:

Region 1

Chief Joseph Dam project, Chelan division, Manson unit, along Lake Chelan in north-central Washington;

Columbia Basin project, third powerplant, on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division, on Jumpoff Joe Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Tualatin project, first phase, on the Tualatin River, near the city of Portland, Oregon;

Walla Walla project, Touchet division, on the Touchet River in southeastern Washington;

Yakima project, Kennewick division extension, near the mouth of the Yakima River in south-central Washington.

Region 3

Lower Colorado River Basin project, in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

Region 5

Canton project on the Canadian River below the existing Canton Reservoir in northwestern Oklahoma;

Columbus Bend project on the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas;

Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Midstate division, on the north side of the Platte River in central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, North Loup division, on the North Loup and Loup Rivers in east-central Nebraska; and

(b) to complete his analysis and studies and to prepare and process reports on the following proposals, which he anticipates will be completed or substantially completed on or before June 30, 1966:

Region 1

Challis project, Challis Creek division, on Challis Creek in southern Idaho;

Rathdrum Prairie project, Prairie division, East Greenacres unit in Idaho, along the Idaho-Washington State line east of Spokane, Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Illinois Valley division, on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rouge River, in southwestern Oregon:

Southwest Idaho water development project, Mountain Home division, in the Snake River Basin near the cites of Boise and Mountain Home, Idaho:

Umpqua River project, Olalla division, on Olalla and Lookingglass Creeks in the south Umpqua Basin in southwestern Oregon;

Upper Snake River project, upper Star Valley division, on Salt River and Cow Creek, near the town of Afton, Wyoming;

Willamette River project, Monmouth-Dallas division, on the west side of the Willamette River in the vicinity of Monmouth and Dallas, Oregon;

Willamette River project, Red Prairie division, along the South Yamhill River near the town of Sheridan, Oregon;

Yakima project, Bumping Lake enlargement, on Bumping River in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

Region 2

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, initial phase, in and adjacent to the Cosumnes River Basin east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, peripheral canal, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California.

Central Valley project, Delta division, Kellogg unit, south of the city of Antioch, California;

Central Valley project, east side division, initial phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Sacramento River division, West Sacramento canal unit, on the west side of the Sacramento River Valley and in the Putah Creek Basin in California;

Central Valley project, San Felipe division, in the Santa Clara and Pajaro River Basins in the central coastal area of California;

Sespe Creek project, on the Santa Clara River and tributaries in southern California;

Walker River project on the Walker River in west-central California and east-central Nevada.

Region 4

Bear River project, first phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho.

Region 5

Chikaskia project on the Chikaskia River in south-central Kansas and north-central Oklahoma;

Cuero project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas;

Liberty Bottoms project on the Red River below Denison Dam in south-central Oklahoma;

Mountain Park project in the vicinity of Altus, Oklahoma;

San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division, in the Rio Grande Basin in south-central Colorado.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit (exclusive of Mitchell area), involving the diversion of water from the existing Oahe Reservoir into the James River Valley;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Wagner unit on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Fort Randall Dam in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, Jefferson and Whitehall units on the Big Hole and Jefferson Rivers above Canyon Ferry Dam in southwestern Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, West Bench unit, on the Big Hole River in southwestern Montana near the town of Dillon;

Missouri River Basin project, White division, Pine Ridge unit, on the White River in southwestern South Dakota.

Region 7

Mirage Flats project on the upper Niobrara River near Hay Springs, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Cedar Rapids division, on the Cedar and Loup Rivers near Spalding, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, lower Niobrara division, O'Neill unit, on the lower Niobrara River in north-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Ellis unit, on Big Creek in west-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, South Platte division, Narrows unit, on the South Platte River near Fort Morgan, Colorado.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue feasibility studies on the following proposals, which are presently under study and which will require further study before completion of such studies:

Region 1

Burnt River project, Dark Canyon division, on the Burnt River in west-central Oregon;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Okanogan unit, on the Okanogan River in north-central Washington;

Deschutes project, Central division, in the Deschutes and Crooked River Basins in central Oregon;

Flathead River project, encompassing the Flathead River Basin in northwestern Montana;

Grand Ronde project on the Grande Ronde River in northeastern Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Applegate Valley division, on Applegate Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, near the city of Grants Pass, Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Medford division, on the Rogue River in the vicinity of the town of Medford, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Garden Valley division, along the Payette River and in the general vicinity of Boise, Idaho;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Weiser River division, in the Weiser River Basin in Idaho.

Umatilla Basin project, encompassing the Umatilla River Basin, centering near the town of Pendleton, Oregon;

Upper Snake River project, American Falls Dam replacement on the Snake River near the city of American Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Lynn Crandall division, on the Snake River below Palisades Dam in southern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division, south of the Snake River, near the city of Twin Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Snake Plains recharge division, encompassing the Snake River Plains area north of the Snake River in southern Idaho;

Walla Walla project, Marcus Whitman and Milton-Freewater divisions, in the Walla Walla River Basin in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington;

Willamette River project, Carlton division, on the Yamhill River in northwestern Oregon;

Willamette River project, Molalla division, on the Molalla and Pudding Rivers in northwestern Oregon;

Yakima project, Ahtanum unit, on Ahtanum Creek in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

Region 2

Central Valley project, American River division, Placerville Ridge unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, Fair Play unit, on the Middle Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, East Side division, ultimate phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Stanislaus River division, Sonora-Keystone unit, on the Stanislaus River in the general vicinity of Sonora, California;

Lompoc project on the lower Santa Ynez River in southern California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, English Ridge unit, on the upper Eel River and in the Putah Creek and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, Knights Valley unit in the Russian River Basin and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, ultimate phase, in the Eel River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Klamath River division, in the Lower Klamath River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Trinity River division (exclusive of Paskenta-Newville Reservoir), encompassing that portion of the Trinity River Basin below the existing Lewiston Dam of the Central Valley project, the upper portion of the Mad and Van Duzen Rivers and the west side tributaries of the Sacramento River in California;

North Coast project, lower Trinity River division, Paskenta-Newville Dam and Reservoir on Stony and Thomes Creeks in the Sacremento River Basin in California;

Ventura River project extension in the Ventura River Basin near Ventura, California;

Washoe project, Hope Valley division, on the Carson River in California and Nevada;

Washoe project, Newlands extension division, on the lower Carson River near the city of Fallon, Nevada.

Region 3

Black River-Springerville-Saint Johns project on the Black River and Little Colorado River near Springerville and Saint Johns, Arizona;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Coachella division, on the Coachella Canal in southern California;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Imperial division, on the All-American Canal and the Imperial Valley distribution system in southern California;

Flagstaff-Williams project, near the cities of Flagstaff and Williams, Arizona;

Kingman project, on the Colorado River and near the city of Kingman, Arizona;

Moapa Valley pumping project in the Muddy River Basin in southern Nevada;

San Pedro-Santa Cruz project in the San Pedro and Santa Cruz River Basins in southeastern Arizona;

Upper Gila River project on the Gila River and its tributaries in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona.

Region 4

Bear River project, second phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho;

Central Utah project, ultimate phase, Uintah unit, on the Whiterock and Uinta Rivers in northeastern Utah.

Region 5

Brantley project on the Pecos River upstream from Carlsbad, New Mexico;

Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in the San Antonio River Basin in Texas;

Eastern New Mexico water supply project in northeastern New Mexico;

Nueces River project on Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas;

Portales project near the town of Portales in eastern New Mexico;

Retrop project on the North Fork of the Red River in the vicinity of the W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma;

Rio Grande water salvage project, New Mexico division, on the Rio Grande River between the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and the existing Caballo Reservoir;

Texas Basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, Big Horn Basin division, Shoshone extension unit, Polecat Bench area, in northwestern Wyoming near the city of Powell;

Missouri River Basin project, Cannonball division, Mott unit, on the Cannonball River in southwestern North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Helena-Great Falls division, Fort Benton unit, on the Missouri River in north-central Montana near the town of Fort Benton;

Missouri River Basin project, Musselshell division, Lower Musselshell unit, on the lower reaches of the Musselshell River near the town of Mosby, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Powder division, Kaycee unit, on the Middle Fork and main stem of the Powder River in northeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Marias division, Marias-Milk unit, in the Marias and Milk River Basins in north-central Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Pollock-Herreid unit, on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Sun-Teton division, Sun-Teton unit, on the Sun and Teton Rivers in the vicinity of Great Falls, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Billings pump unit, at the city of Billings, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Cracker Box and Stipek units, along the Yellowstone River near the town of Glendive, Montana.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Little Blue unit, along the Little Blue River in south-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Sunbeam unit, on the West Fork of the Big Blue River in southeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Laramie division, Wheatland unit, on the Laramie River in southeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Mount Evans division, Upper South Platte unit, on the South Platte River near the city of Denver, Colorado;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, La Prele unit, on La Prele Creek, near the town of Douglas, Wyoming.

Alaska

Lake Grace project on Grace Creek on Revillagigedo Island, Alaska;

Takatz Creek project on Takatz Creek on Baranof Island near Sitka, Alaska.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on the following proposals:

Region 1

Umpqua River project, Azalea division on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

Chehalis River project, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho Water Development project, Bruneau division in the vicinity of Bruneau in southwest Idaho;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit.

Region 2

North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California;

Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

Region 3

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

Region 4

Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

Price River project, Price River Basin in eastern Utah.

Region 5

Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota.

Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Lower Bighorn division, Hardin unit on the Bighorn River near Hardin, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Kanaska division, Nelson Buck union on Beaver Creek in northwestern Kansas.

SEC. 4. The Secretary may accelerate feasibility studies authorized by law when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources.

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes", approved June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 2";

(2) by striking out "That" at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, that"; and

(3) by inserting at the end of such section two new subsections as follows:

"(b) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest to receive financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system shall receive such assistance only from the net revenues of that system as provided in this subsection, and that their construction shall be so scheduled that the financial assistance, together with similar financial assistance for previously authorized reclamation projects (including projects not receiving financial assistance for which the Congress hereafter may authorize financial assistance) will not cause increases in the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration. In no event shall such financial assistance from net revenues be required in any case before the last year of the period authorized by law for repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to irrigation and assigned for repayment by the water users; nor shall any such project receive such assistance prior to the year 2026; nor shall the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest average more than $30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years beginning with the year 2026. Any analyses and studies authorized by the Congress for reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section. As used in this section, the term 'net revenues' as determined from time to time means revenues not required for the repayment of (1) all costs allocable to power at projects in the Pacific Northwest then existing or authorized, including the cost of acquiring power by purchase or exchange, and (2) presently authorized assistance from power to irrigation at projects in the Pacific

Northwest existing and authorized prior to the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(c) On December 20, 1974, and thereafter at intervals coinciding with anniversary dates of Federal Power Commission general review of the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Secretary of the Interior shall recommend to the Congress any changes in the dollar limitations herein placed upon financial assistance to Pacific Northwest reclamation projects that he believes justified by changes in the cost-price levels existing on July 1, 1966, or by other relevant changes of circumstances."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The CLERK. The amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

(a) to perform such additional analysis and studies as may be required on the following proposals which are pending before the Congress:

Region 1

Chief Joseph Dam project, Chelan division, Manson unit, along Lake Chelan in north-central Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division, on Jumpoff Joe Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Tualatin project, first phase, on the Tualatin River, near the city of Portland, Oregon;

Walla Walla project, Touchet division, on the Touchet River in southeastern Washington;

Yakima project, Kennewick division extension, near the mouth of the Yakima River in south-central Washington.

Region 3

Lower Colorado River Basin project, in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

Region 5

Canton project on the Canadian River below the existing Canton Reservoir in northwestern Oklahoma;

Columbus Bend project on the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas;

Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Midstate division, on the north side of the Platte River in central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, North Loup division, on the North Loup and Loup Rivers in east-central Nebraska; and

(b) to complete his analysis and studies and to prepare and process reports on the following proposals, which he anticipates will be completed or substantially completed on or before June 30, 1966:

Region 1

Challis project, Challis Creek division, on Challis Creek in southern Idaho;

Rathdrum Prairie project, Prairie division, East Greenacres unit in Idaho, along the Idaho-Washington State line east of Spokane, Washington;

Rogue River Basin project, Illinois Valley division, on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Mountain Home division, in the Snake River Basin near the cities of Boise and Mountain Home, Idaho;

Umpqua River project, Olalla division, on Olalla and Lookingglass Creeks in the south Umqpua Basin in southwestern Oregon;

Upper Snake River project; upper Star Valley division, on Salt River and Cow Creek, near the town of Afton, Wyoming;

Willamette River project, Monmouth-Dallas division, on the west side of the Willamette River in the vicinity of Monmouth and Dallas, Oregon.

Willamette River project, Red Prairie division, along the South Yamhill River near the town of Sheridan, Oregon;

Yakima project, Bumping Lake enlargement, on Bumping River in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

Region 2

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, initial phase, in and adjacent to the Cosumnes River Basin east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, peripheral canal, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California;

Central Valley project, Delta division, Kellogg unit, south of the city of Antioch, California;

Central Valley project, east side division, initial phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Sacramento River division, West Sacramento canal unit, on the west side of the Sacramento River Valley and in the Putah Creek Basin in California;

Central Valley project, San Felipe division, in the Santa Clara and Pajaro River Basins in the central coastal area of California;

Sespe Creek project, on the Santa Clara River and tributaries in southern California;

Walker River project on the Walker River in west-central California and east-central Nevada.

Region 4

Bear River project, first phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho.

Region 5

Chikaskia project on the Chikaskia River in south-central Kansas and north-central Oklahoma;

Cureo project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas;

Liberty Bottoms project on the Red River below Denison Dam in south-central Oklahoma;

San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division, in the Rio Grande Basin in south-central Colorado.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, James divison, Oahe unit (exclusive of Mitchell area), involving the diversion of water from the existing Oahe Reservoir into the James River Valley;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Wagner unit on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Fort Randall Dam in southeastern South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, Jefferson and Whitehall units on the Big Hole and Jefferson Rivers above Canyon Ferry Dam in southwestern Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, West Bench unit, on the Big Hole River in southwestern Montana near the town of Dillon;

Missouri River Basin project, White division, Pine Ridge unit, on the White River in southwestern South Dakota.

Region 7

Mirage Flats project on the upper Niobrara River near Hay Springs, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Cedar Rapids division, on the Cedar and Loup Rivers near Spalding, Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, lower Niobrara division, O'Neill unit on the lower Niobrara River in north-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Ellis unit, on Big Creek in west-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, South Platte division, Narrows Unit, on the South Platte River near Fort Morgan, Colorado.

Alaska

Devil Canyon project, on the Susitna River about midway between the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue feasibility studies on the following proposals, which are presently under study and which will require further study before completion of such studies:

Region 1

Burnt River project, Dark Canyon division, on the Burnt River in west-central Oregon;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Okanogan unit, on the Okanogan River in north-central Washington;

Deschutes project, Central division, in the Deschutes and Crooked River Basins in central Oregon;

Flathead River project, encompassing the Flathead River Basin in northwestern Montana;

Grand Ronde project on the Grande Ronde River in northeastern Oregon;

Rogue River Basin project, Applegate Valley division, on Applegate Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, near the city of Grants Pass, Oregon.

Rogue River Basin project, Medford division, on the Rogue River in the vicinity of the town of Medford, Oregon;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Garden Valley division, along the Payette River and in the general vicinity of Boise, Idaho;

Southwest Idaho water development project, Weiser River division, in the Weiser River Basin in Idaho;

Umatilla Basin project, encompassing the Umatilla River Basin, centering near the town of Pendleton, Oregon;

Upper Snake River project, American Falls Dam replacement on the Snake River near the city of American Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Lynn Crandall division, on the Snake River below Palisades Dam in southern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division, south of the Snake River, near the city of Twin Falls, Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Snake Plains recharge division, encompassing the Snake River Plains area north of the Snake River in southern Idaho;

Walla Walla project, Marcus Whitman and Milton-Freewater divisions, in the Walla Walla River Basin in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington;

Willamette River project, Carlton division, on the Yamhill River in northwestern Oregon;

Willamette River project, Molalla division, on the Molalla and Pudding Rivers in northwestern Oregon;

Yakima project, Ahtanum unit, on Ahtanum Creek in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

Region 2

Central Valley project, American River division, Placerville Ridge unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, American River division, Pleasant Oaks unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, Fair Play unit, on the Middle Fork

Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

Central Valley project, East Side division, ultimate phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

Central Valley project, Pit River division, Allen Camp unit, on the Pit River northeast of Redding, California;

Central Valley project, Stanislaus River division, Sonora-Keystone unit, on the Stanislaus River in the general vicinity of Sonora, California;

Lompoc project on the lower Santa Ynez River in southern California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, English Ridge unit, on the upper Eel River and in the Putah Creek and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, Knights Valley unit in the Russian River Basin and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

North Coast project, Eel River division, ultimate phase, in the Eel River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Klamath River division, in the Lower Klamath River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

North Coast project, Lower Trinity River division (execlusive of Paskenta-Newville Reservoir), encompassing that portion of the Trinity River Basin below the existing Lewiston Dam of the Central Valley project, the upper portion of the Mad and Van Duzen Rivers and the west side tributaries of the Sacramento River in California;

North Coast project, lower Trinity River division, Paskenta-Newville Dam and Reservoir on Stony and Thomes Creeks in the Sacramento River Basin in California;

Ventura River project extension in the Ventura River Basin near Ventura, California;

Washoe project, Hope Valley division, on the Carson River in California and Nevada;

Washoe project, Newland extension division, on the lower Carson River near the city of Fallon, Nevada.

Region 3

Black River-Springerville-Saint Johns project on the Black River and Little Colorado River near Springerville and Saint Johns, Arizona;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Coachella division, on the Coachella Canal in southern California;

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Imperial division, on the All-American Canal and the Imperial Valley distribution system in southern California;

Flagstaff-Williams project, near the cities of Flagstaff and Williams, Arizona;

Kingman project, on the Colorado River and near the city of Kingman, Arizona;

Moapa Valley pumping project in the Muddy River Basin in southern Nevada;

San Pedro-Santa Cruz project in the San Pedro and Santa Cruz River Basins in southeastern Arizona;

Upper Gila River project on the Gila River and its tributaries in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona.

Region 4

Bear River project, second phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho;

Central Utah project, ultimate phase, Uintah unit, on the Whiterock and Uinta Rivers in northeastern Utah.

Region 5

Brantley project on the Pecos River upstream from Carlsbad, New Mexico;

Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in the San Antonio River Basin in Texas;

Eastern New Mexico water supply project in northeastern New Mexico;

Nueces River project on Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas;

Portales project near the town of Portales in eastern New Mexico;

Rio Grande water salvage project, New Mexico division, on the Rio Grande River between the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and the existing Caballo Reservoir;

Texas Basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, Big Horn Basin division, Shoshone extension unit, Polecat Bench area, in northwestern Wyoming near the city of Powell;

Missouri River Basin project, Cannonball division, Mott unit, on the Cannonball River in southwestern North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Helena-Great Falls division, Fort Benton unit, on the Missouri River in north-central Montana near the town of Fort Benton;

Missouri River Basin project, Musselshell division, Lower Musselshell unit, on the lower reaches of the Musselshell River near the town of Mosby, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Powder division, Kaycee unit, on the Middle Fork and main stem of the Powder River in northeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Marias division, Marias-Milk unit, in the Marias and Milk River Basins in north-central Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Pollock-Herreid unit, on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, Sun-Teton division, Sun-Teton unit, on the Sun and Teton Rivers in the vicinity of Great Falls, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Billings pump unit, at the city of Billings, Montana;

Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Cracker Box and Stipek units, along the Yellowstone River near the town of Glendive, Montana.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Little Blue unit, along the Little Blue River in south-central Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Sunbeam unit, on the West Fork of the Big Blue River in southeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Laramie division, Wheatland unit, on the Laramie River in southeastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Mount Evans division, Upper South Platte unit, on the South Platte River near the city of Denver, Colorado;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, La Prele unit, on La Prele Creek, near the town of Douglas, Wyoming.

Alaska

Lake Grace project on Grace Creek on Revillagigedo Island, Alaska;

Takatz Creek project on Takatz Creek on Baranof Island near Sitka, Alaska.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on—

(a) the following proposals, presently scheduled for initiation on or before June 30, 1967:

Region 1

Umpqua River project, Azalea division, on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit, Washington.

Region 2

North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California.

Region 3

Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit, on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

Region 4

Ute Indian unit, developing waters tributary to the Colorado River in northeastern and north-central Utah.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas; and

(b) the following proposals, presently scheduled for initiation after June 30, 1967:

Region 1

Chehalis River Basin, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon.

Region 2

Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

Region 3

Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project in Riverside County, California;

Little Rock dam and reservoir, Little Rock, California.

Region 4

Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

Grand County development, in the Colorado River Basin in southeastern Utah;

Gray Canyon project, on the Green River in eastern Utah;

Price River development, in the Price River basin in eastern Utah;

San Juan County development, in the Colorado River basin in southeastern Utah;

Ute Indian unit of the Central Utah project, ultimate phase.

Region 5

Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

Region 6

Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

Region 7

Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

Missouri River Basin project, Marais des Cygnes River Basin project.

SEC. 4. The Secretary, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 2 and 3 of this Act, shall submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives within one year after completion of the final feasibility plan those studies of proposals determined to be feasible, with alternate studies for the construction, operation, and maintenance of each water resource project or proposal in all instances where practical alternatives are known to the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide in the initial and/or alternate studies all the data and information on short-term and long-term benefits and costs necessary for the comprehensive and integrated development of each water resource project or proposal, including any and all factors directly, indirectly, ancillary, and/or incidental to the comprehensive development of each water resource project or proposal.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on additional proposals when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Without objection, a similar House bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SIMPLIFICATION OF LAWS—FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes, with amendments, to suspend the rules, and pass the bill with amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration relating to Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, banks for cooperatives, farm credit board elections and compensation of Federal Farm Credit Board, are amended as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL LAND BANKS

SEC. 2. Title I of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) by adding the following subsection at the end of section 10 thereof (12 U.S.C. 751–757):

"(h) To the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal land bank of the district, and the board of directors of a Federal land bank association, a written report and approval by the manager or another employee of the association designated for the purpose shall be acceptable in lieu of the written report and approval otherwise required of the loan committee under this section; and in such cases the favorable report and approval by the manager or other employee shall constitute the applicant a member of the association."

(b) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of paragraph First of section 12 thereof (12 U.S.C. 771 First) and immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence and immediately before the second comma in the second sentence of paragraph Second of section 13 thereof (12 U.S.C. 781 Second) the following: "and which mortgages may include farm land within other farm credit districts to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration";

(c) by striking "and unless owner of stock in the corporation assume personal liability for the loan to the extent required under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration" from the fourth sentence of paragraph Sixth of section 12 thereof (12 U.S.C. 771 Sixth); and

(d) by substituting "an amount specified by the Farm Credit Administration" for "$100,000" in paragraph Seventh of section 12 thereof (12 U.S.C. 771 Seventh).

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

SEC. 3. Title II of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended—

(a) in section 202(a) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1031), by deleting "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by substituting "; and" for the period at the end of paragraph (3) and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(4) to purchase for investment obligations of the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives and, to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration, obligations of any agencies of the United States."; and

(b) by changing section 208(b) thereof (12 U.S.C. 1092) to read as follows: "The Farm Credit Administration may require reports in such form as it may specify from any or all of the Federal intermediate credit banks whenever in its judgment the same are necessary for a full and complete knowledge of its or their financial condition or operations."

BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 41 and 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1134c and 1134j), are each amended—

(i) by striking from clause (a) in the first sentence thereof the following: ", for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such Act, as amended"; and

(ii) by adding the following sentence immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Loans to cooperative associations made by any bank for cooperatives shall bear such rates of interest as the board of directors of the bank shall from time to time determine with the approval of the Farm Credit Association, but in no case shall the rate of interest exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal of a loan.".

(b) The Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, is amended by deleting subsection (a) of section 8 thereof (12 U.S.C. 1141f(a)).

FARM CREDIT BOARD ELECTIONS

SEC. 5. The Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting "sixty" for "thirty" in the last sentence of section 5(e) thereof (12 U.S.C. 640e) and in the third last sentence of section 5(f) thereof (12 U.S.C. 640f) and by inserting the following immediately before the period at the end of each of such sentences: ", except that for elections to fill vacancies the Farm Credit Administration may specify a shorter period than sixty days but not less than thirty days". This section shall be effective after the calendar year in which it is enacted.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

SEC. 6. Section 4 (f) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (12 U.S.C. 636c(f)) is amended by substituting "$100" for "$50" therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered. The gentleman from Texas will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to revise certain of the farm credit procedures and involves some six items. The first relates to the land banks and provides that the land banks may make loans covering land which is situated in two or more different farm credit districts. The present law would require that if a loan is made on a farm that happens to lie on the boundary line between two districts, that two separate loans must be made, although the land belongs to the same owner and is in one unit. We simply felt that this is a practical situation which should be cured. The land bank district lines are purely arbitrary, but there have to be land bank district lines, and we feel that this will reduce the burden of work on both the borrower and on the banks.

A second amendment relates to the intermediate credit banks and provides that they may invest in the obligations of the land banks and the banks for cooperatives, and to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration Board, in any other obligations of any of the agencies of the United States.

The purpose of that is simply to make it plain that these agencies may buy the obligations issued by other Farm Credit institutions and, where the Farm Credit Board approves it, any of the other agencies of the country.

The next amendment provides that the Board of the Farm Credit Administration may require reports from the intermediate credit banks at any time and ask for a full and complete disclosure of their financial operations. In the past those reports have been required, I believe, on an annual basis. It was felt that it would be much better to simply give the Board the right to make the demand at any time.

The next amendment relates to the banks for cooperatives and provides that the banks for cooperatives may make loans for any lawful purpose to their member cooperatives without regard to the act of 1929, which was actually passed before we got into these present operations, and which related to the old agencies that have been superseded by the Farm Credit Administration.

The next amendment relates to the election of the members of the Farm Credit Board—which is held by mail, incidentally—at present the results are reported from the separate associations all over the country as soon as possible after a Board meeting. Previously, we have had only 30 days to make those reports. This gives 60 days, the purpose being to enable the associations to hold the election, report it back, and get it done without the necessity of calling any special meetings of the Board. They usually meet once a month, and about half of them normally meet at such time that, in order to get the report in in the 30-day period, they have required a special meeting, for which the local agency has to pay.

Finally, the last amendment relates to the compensation of the members of the Federal Farm Credit Board—that is the National Board. The amendment increases that compensation from $50 to $100 per day. Presently most of the members of the local boards—and there is a board for each of these banks—draws $75 a day, whereas the Federal Board members draw less than most of the local board members do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I just came in and I did not understand all of the gentleman's explanations. I refer to page 6, section 2(d), of the report that accompanies S. 2822. I do not have the bill in front of me. As I understand it, the committee is amending the present law to remove the prior approval of the Farm Credit Administration to loans that go beyond the $100,000 mark. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will follow it, he will find that the committee did not approve that amendment, which was in the original bill. The committee felt as the gentleman does, that these larger loans should be reviewed.

We have brought the bill in with the amendments, and that section is stricken out by one of the amendments. That is a provision which the administration suggested but which we did not approve. Our committee agrees with the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman has clarified that situation, because I could not see why that particular provision should be in the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has explained the purpose of this bill very well. There is no reason for me to repeat that.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit and by the full Committee on Agriculture. I urge that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now such time as he may consume to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2822 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Basically this bill consists of six amendments to the various farm credit laws and is designed to perfect and improve these programs which have been and are operating so successfully.

As the bill came to the committee from the other body it contained nine amendments to the laws dealing with the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, the banks for cooperatives, and the Farm Credit Administration in general.

The Conservation and Credit Subcommittee held hearings on the bill and unanimously recommended to the full committee that three of these amendments be deleted. These three amendments are explained at page 2 of the committee report. The full committee has approved this bill unanimously.

In brief the bill would do six things.

First. Federal land banks would be permitted to take mortgages on land in other farm credit districts.

Second. Federal intermediate credit banks would be permitted to invest in obligations of the land banks, banks for cooperatives, and any agencies of the United States.

Third. Federal Intermediate Credit Bank financial reports could be submitted when deemed necessary rather than at regularly scheduled times.

Fourth. The loan purpose limitations presently applying to the banks for cooperatives would be broadened, but the interest rates in present law would be continued.

Fifth. A 60-day—rather than a 30-day—period would be provided for election ballots to be cast in the election of district board members.

Sixth. The compensation of Board members would be increased from $50 per day to $100 per day for official duties, but not more than 75 days per year could be devoted to such duties.

SUMMARY

This bill was considered both in subcommittee and in full committee. It was unanimously reported to the House, and it should be approved by the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2822. As pointed out by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas this bill was very carefully considered by our committee and was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I also support this bill. I believe particularly the proposals which are incorporated in it are in the interest of better operations of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I wish to say, however, that in the opinion of most of us—and I believe all of us who serve on the Committee on Agriculture—the Farm Credit Administration is one of the better Federal agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 2822 as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14548) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2109 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2109. Time limitations on agreements

"Agreements may not be entered into under sections 2104 and 2105 of this title after July 22, 1964."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a vital and urgently needed leasing, land acquisition, and land disposition authority for use by the Post Office Department will terminate on December 31, 1966, unless favorable action is taken here today on H.R. 14548.

This bill, which is based upon an official recommendation of the Postmaster General, was reported unanimously from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is identical to H.R. 9653 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House by unanimous consent on May 18, 1963. The measure was amended in the Senate to continue the authority only until December 31, 1966, and in the closing days of the 88th Congress the House agreed to the Senate amendment—Public Law 480, 88th Congress.

The provisions of this bill are very simple. It will amend section 2109 of title 39, United States Code, by deleting the phrase, "and under section 2103 after December 31, 1966." The effect of this amendment will be to extend indefinitely the authority of the Postmaster General to acquire title to sites and to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, as provided in section 2103 of title 39.

When first enacted as a part of the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, Public Law 519, 83d Congress, the lease construction program—authorized by section 2103—and the lease purchase program—authorized by sections 2104 and 2105—were both relatively new and untried programs as far as the Federal Government was concerned. Since they were new programs, the Congress placed 10-year limitations on the use of both programs and this limitation is contained in section 2109.

Under the lease purchase program, the Postmaster General was authorized to negotiate and enter into lease purchase agreements for periods of not less than 10, nor more than 25 years, with provisions requiring the title to the property to be vested in the United States at, or before, the end of the specified term. This program never was used to any great extent by the Post Office Department. In fact, lease purchase agreements were prohibited since 1958 by provisions of Public Law 85-844 and statutory authority, under sections 2104 and 2105, actually did expire on July 22, 1964.

Under the lease construction program, the Post Office Department acquires land by purchase, condemnation, lease, donation, or by assignable options. The land is then offered to the lowest successful bidder, as determined by competitive bidding procedures, who agrees to construct a post office building to Department specifications and lease it to the Department at the lowest rent for a specified term of years, not in excess of 30. This program has been most successful and will continue to provide urgently needed authority for the Postmaster General if favorable consideration is given here today to H.R. 14548.

The law which H.R. 14548 will continue—

First, gives the Postmaster General authority to enter into leases for any period—10, 20, or 30 years' duration—not in excess of 30 years;

Second, gives the Postmaster General condemnation and other land acquisition authority and related land disposition authority; and

Third, requires that all leases entered into under this program may be awarded only after advertised competitive bidding.

During fiscal years 1967 and 1968, the Post Office Department is scheduled to award 23 major lease construction projects under the 30-year lease construction authority. These 23 projects, all located in large metropolitan areas, will provide the Department with an additional 7 million square feet of space. The land for these projects has been acquired under authority of section 2103. However, if the authority of section 2103 is not extended beyond December 31, 1966, the Department will lose its authority to transfer this land to a successful bidder under a lease construction agreement. Consequently a major portion of the Department's space acquisition program for the future will come to a halt.

It is important here to note that if these 23 major projects are to be constructed directly by the Federal Government, it would require an appropriation of at least $170 million.

In addition to the lease construction program under section 2103, the Department also utilizes authority under section 2102 to negotiate and enter into leases for periods not in excess of 20 years. It is contemplated that over 1,000 leases will be awarded during fiscal year 1967 under this authority.

The Department also acquires a substantial amount of space for postal purposes under the Federal construction program when postal space is built as a part of a Federal building.

The Department utilizes and needs all three of these programs to fulfill the need of 7 million additional square feet of new space required annually to handle the growing mail volume and to replace substandard facilities now in use.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt, and the members of our committee had no doubt when they considered this bill, that there is an urgent need for the continued use of the lease construction program under section 2103.

I urge your favorable consideration here today on H.R. 14548 in order that this vital program may be continued by the Post Office Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this bill comes to the floor of the House under suspension of the rules. If it had come to the floor under an open rule, I certainly would offer an amendment embracing the recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Staats, who, until only recently, was the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and, of course, is very well acquainted with the expenditures of the Post Office Department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to extending the authority of the Postmaster General to make leases, and so on and so forth.

But, I do feel that it should have been provided in this bill that the General Services Administration, as recommended by the Comptroller General, have some oversight authority with respect to leasing and so on and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the House to the statement of the Comptroller General, to be found on page 12 of the report:

> We estimate that, if the office spaces for 10 major leased facilities covered by our review—

That is, the review of the General Accounting Office—

> had been planned on the basis of the General Services Administration's standards, the reductions of office space would have resulted in savings in rental costs of about $2.6 million over the life of the leases.

Comptroller General Staats goes on to say:

> In view of the significance of our findings and the possibility of substantial savings to the Government, we recommend that H.R. 14548 be amended to provide that the General Services Administration shall be responsible for either establishing or approving the standards to be used in planning space for the Post Office Department's administrative activities in both leased facilities and Federally-owned buildings.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. Is the gentleman from Iowa aware that the former Comptroller General made similar recommendations when the previous bill was enacted in the 88th Congress, H.R. 9653, and that that bill unanimously passed this House of Representatives?

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not recall that. Perhaps it is an oversight on my part.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is true, sir, that similar recommendations were made by the former Comptroller General, but our committee felt that they were not appropriate, and the bill passed this House unanimously and went to the other body where an amendment was attached to it extending the bill only to December 31, 1966.

And I might also say in addition thereto that there is another reason I oppose such an amendment as the gentleman suggests, because these buildings are special-purpose buildings.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] knows as well as I do that the volume of mail is increasing by 2 or 3 percent a year and it is anticipated that the volume of mail this year, mail handled by the Post Office Department, will run up to 75 billion pieces.

Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department recommended to the House of Representatives, and the House passed here recently, a bill appointing a sixth Deputy Postmaster General to supervise a new department in the Post Office Department known as Research, Development and Engineering, because of this mail volume in order to give the public better service.

Mr. Speaker, in Detroit, Mich., we are building or have built a new, automated, up-to-date post office there. These are special buildings. They are new buildings. There is no one presently equipped to handle such type construction as recommended by the Postmaster General himself and by his agents.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quarreling, as I previously stated, with extension of the authority of the Postmaster General to lease; not at all.

What I am protesting is the fact that there is apparently no oversight on the part of the General Services Administration, and I can see no reason why there should not be, I will say to my friend.

Mr. DANIELS. As I said, sir, I do not believe the General Services Administration should have anything to do with it except in cases of a multiple-purpose building, a Federal building, where other agencies of the Government require space. But where there is a special-purpose building strictly for the Post Office Department, then that should be in the hands of the Post Office Department itself.

Mr. GROSS. I think the General Services Administration might well constitute an oversight agency on all buildings that are constructed, directly or indirectly, with Federal funds or leased with Federal funds.

In other words, I know of no reason why the Postmaster General should not be accountable to the General Services Administration on the leasing of buildings throughout the country.

Mr. DANIELS. The Postmaster General is accountable to our own Subcommittee on Facilities and Modernization which is headed by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

I might also point out to you that the Defense Department, the State Department, NASA, and the Atomic Energy Commission are not accountable to the General Services Administration. They are accountable to their own oversight legislative committee.

Mr. GROSS. This constitutes a difference of opinion as between the gentleman and myself. Of course, I am going to support this bill that is before the House. I only wish I had the opportunity to amend it here on the floor. This is becoming big business—this business of rental and lease of property on the part of the Post Office Department. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the amount involved has gone from approximately $30 million in 1955 to an estimated $160 million in 1970—in other words, increased 5 to 6 times in that period of time.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I submit that in my opinion we ought to have all the oversight possible without hampering this program—but we ought to have all the oversight possible.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to support my colleagues in urging favorable consideration of H.R. 14548. The Post Office Department has had legislative authority, dating as far back as 1885, to enter into leases for postal purposes for periods not to exceed 20 years. This 20-year leasing authority, which is contained in 39 United States Code 2102, is not affected in any way by this legislation and, of course, such authority will continue.

The Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, approved July 22, 1954, Public Law 519, 83d Congress, gave the Department additional leasing authority.

There are two principal features of the 1954 authority, as now contained in 39 United States Code 2103:

First, lease agreements may extend for any period up to 30 years; and

Second, the Post Office Department may acquire real property by purchase, condemnation, lease, donation, or otherwise and may dispose of such property to a contractor who agrees to construct a building for postal purposes on the property and lease the building back to the Post Office Department.

The 1954 act provided that no agreements could be entered into by the Postmaster General later than 10 years after date of enactment. The 10-year period would have expired on July 22, 1964, except that it was extended until December 31, 1966, by Public Law 480 of the 88th Congress.

This legislation will have the effect of permitting the 30-year leasing and related authorities to continue without limitation after December 31, 1966.

Related provisions of the 1954 act, which granted the Postmaster General authority to enter into lease purchase agreements, terminated on July 22, 1964.

The 1954 legislation received bipartisan support, and H.R. 14548 received the same support in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I am convinced that the continued existence of the land acquisition and land disposal authority, and the related leasing authority, is vital to the Department's space acquisition program. I believe the major reasons justifying the continuation of the authority under section 2103 may be summarized as follows:

First, it is the most economical method of procuring space under any leasing program where a long-term occupancy is projected.

Second, the 30-year term enables the Department to more evenly match space cost and revenue while, at the same time, minimizing Government financing.

Third, the 30-year leasing authority will continue to be essential to the development of facilities even if a major Federal construction program is developed after fiscal year 1967.

Fourth, the condemnation and disposal authority protects the Department against excessive land costs, and its very existence enables the Department to obtain options at fair prices which would not otherwise be obtainable.

Fifth, without land disposition authority, and in the absence of an appropriation for a Federal construction program, the entire postal construction program of major facilities will come to a halt during fiscal year 1967.

It is argued by many that the least costly method of providing space for the Post Office Department, in most cases, would be direct construction by the Federal Government. However, even if an adequate Federal construction and ownership program of postal facilities were to be commenced, there would continue to be situations in which the 30-year leasing authority, and the supporting land acquisition and disposition authority, would be required to enable the Department to fill its space needs.

In the absence of an adequate Federal construction and ownership program for providing sufficient space for the postal service which, of course, we do not have at the present time, I know of no alternative but to continue the existing 30-year leasing, and related condemnation, authority.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this legislation will not result in any additional cost. It will, in fact, result in less cost if the Department can continue to use the 30-year term lease, which results in lower rents than would be obtainable under a 20-year lease.

Enactment of H.R. 14548 will permit the Post Office Department to continue the 30-year lease program which is vitally needed in the Department's space acquisition program. I urge your favorable consideration of this legislation here today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wrote some individual views on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to criticize either the handling of this bill or the procedure except to make a little bit of legislative history here.

I do not believe an item of this far-reaching consequence should have moved through the committee so easily without a thorough hearing.

I do note, however, when we took up in the Post Office Committee the bill for an additional assistant postmaster general, I happened to get on this subject. I wandered off the subject of the assistant postmaster general to the subject of leasing.

Mr. Abell of the Post Office, in answer to a question, stated—and I quote Mr. Abell:

> We feel there is also need to have direct construction authority so that we can construct some of these buildings and own them rather than lease them.

I feel that the very fact that the Post Office Department is thinking of returning to, or perhaps expanding, a major specialized post office building would warrant serious attention by our committee. I do not think we have given it enough attention.

I would also like to point out my observation in traveling about the country, that these leased buildings are rather interesting. Most of them I note are rather uniform in architecture and outside of a few flourishes, perhaps for landscaping and adjustments for local materials, resemble nothing but big, huge warehouses with rather plain and sometimes impractical lobby space and just a vast, dreary working space without any real innovations for post office needs.

I feel that it would be helpful if our committee, regardless of having passed this bill would hold hearings and take a good look at the subject.

Will the gentleman from New Jersey indicate if he has any idea of whether or not we shall at least discuss this subject more thoroughly in committee?

Mr. DANIELS. I am not the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the issue, but I shall surely convey the gentleman's message to the chairman. I am inclined to agree with you. In the future we should have hearings on this subject, and the problem should be thoroughly discussed.

On the question of construction, the Postmaster General has recommended to the Public Works Committee that he be given authority to construct buildings, but the 30-year leasing authority, which is the subject matter of the jurisdiction of our committee, is really needed by the Post Office Department at this time because the present legislation expires December 31, 1966.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I have supported this legislation, and I am aware of the fact that a Senate subcommittee has held hearings on the possibility of granting additional construction power to the Post Office Department. Frankly, I think they need specialized post offices to meet the new demands that are being made upon them, and I do hope that we cover the subject at the first opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14548.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIKING THE HIGHWAYS OF MATRIMONY

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are honored to hold positions in any of the three branches of our Government are expected by the people of this great country to conduct ourselves in a manner in keeping with the office we hold and also in a manner that befits a life of highest standards and impeccable conduct. Americans particularly expect such of those who serve in the judiciary, and more particularly of one honored to serve on the highest Court of the land, the Supreme Court of the United States.

In recent years the High Court has given us enough trouble with its decisions and interpretations of the law. It has made itself famous—or infamous, depending on one's point of view—with its questionable interpretations of our basic law and for its invasion of that segment of government which belongs to the legislative branch.

But, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any of its decisions have lifted more brows than the news over the weekend which told us that one of our High Court Justices had begun his fourth journey on the highway of matrimony, this time with one only one-third his age. And as we recall the third journey, it, agewise, was about the same.

Heretofore this Justice made his best headlines hiking highways of another kind—through the woods, alongside historic canals and up to the mountain peaks, all because, so we were told, of his great love for the great outdoors.

Surely thousands were quite amazed and maybe even disgusted, as I was, on reading over the weekend of the fourth venture of this Justice on the highway of matrimony, a type of hiking for which he is now much better known. Under a picture of the bride and groom simultaneously sipping from a martini glass, it was said that this latest matrimonial journey was begun over a "scotch and soda plunked in front of the gray-haired judge." Mr. Speaker, it could have hardly begun any other way.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that this experienced groom has clearly demonstrated he is not devoting a fair share of his judging ability to an interpretation of the law.

In all candor, he would do himself and his country a favor if he would quietly resign from the High Court and devote full time to that in which he appears to be the most learned and most proficient—hiking the highways of matrimony.

NEED TO CONTROL POLLUTION OF AIR AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the critical need to control the pollution of our air and water resources is of great and growing concern to Congress, our Federal, State, and local governments, and to our people.

Time is rapidly running out, and we are far behind in the battle.

Vast urban areas in our country are virtually cesspools of pollution. To many of our people, it is a rarity for them to behold a crisp, clean day with skies free of smog and industrial haze. Many remember with yearning for the days of clean running rivers, lakes, and bays where fishing, swimming, and boating provided hours of recreation free of the threat to health from the hazards of pollution.

We can, and must, take whatever steps necessary to stop the slow poisoning of our natural habitat. Many State and local governments have vast programs already in operation, many sponsored or funded by our Federal Government. But we in Congress can provide an additional weapon, one long needed, and that is a tax incentive to encourage private industry to spend the huge sums necessary to install pollution control equipment.

I have, today, introduced a bill which in my judgment would be of great benefit in our pollution control programs.

My bill would authorize an incentive tax credit for industries for the cost of constructing or installing facilities to control air or water pollution. It would permit such expenses to be amortized over a period of from 1 to 5 years, if the facility is certified to be in conformity with the pollution control program of the appropriate State agency and with applicable Federal regulations.

Many industries today are taking steps on their own to stop their plants from poisoning our atmosphere and our water resources. Some of the most flagrant violators must be brought forcibly to the bar of justice before they will make the heavy outlay for the necessary equipment to abate pollution.

As one with firsthand knowledge of local efforts to control this great problem, I am not unmindful of the problems of industry in taking all necessary steps.

Few people realize that it may cost an industrial plant millions of dollars to install an air scrubber to remove noxious or offensive pollutants from the plant's effluent. Often, this is an investment from which there is no profitable return, other than in goodwill and the knowledge the plant is operating in conformity with existing law. Many plants operating on a slim profit margin cannot afford the tremendous outlay for research or equipment, and the provisions of my bill would be of great importance in bringing their voluntary compliance.

A few years ago, in Houston and Harris County, Tex., we were faced with serious pollution problems. Our air was fouled, and our streams and bayous often were carriers of raw sewage, bypassed from overloaded treatment plants. Airline pilots needed no instruments to find Houston, for they were guided by a gigantic stream of smog from our ship channel plants that flowed like a poisonous river 200 or 300 miles inland. Schools near some of the plants held gas drills, women complained that pollutants in the air caused their nylon hose to unravel, and white houses turned black when pollutants reacted with the lead in the white paint.

Under my tenure as Harris County judge, we instituted a countywide pollution abatement control program. We were largely successful in getting voluntary compliance from many of the industrial plants. But we were also forced to bring nearly 100 major violators into court before forcing their compliance with our pollution control program. We were among the first major communities in our country to realize the growing hazard posed by the steady fouling of our air and water resources, and to take steps to control and abate it. In my judgment, our early action during the 1950's headed off more critical problems. Much remains to be done, for we have not solved the problem completely in our community, nor in our State and Nation.

We can and must give industry the incentive to voluntarily join in this fight before it is too late. To me, the fight for clean air and water is our most pressing domestic problem, and every day sacrificed through delay is costing future generations heavily.

I urge my colleagues to give this problem their most earnest attention, and if they believe this bill is meritorious, to join with me in urging the Ways and Means Committee to give expeditious consideration to the program as outlined under my bill.

SECRETARY McNAMARA'S REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON THE FIRST 5 YEARS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter, including tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, we hear much criticism in this honorable body for programs which involve the expenditure of money. At times, it seems that every program—no matter how farsighted or deserving—gets criticized simply because it involves the expenditure of money to help the poor help themselves, to provide educational opportunity, to heal the sick or to feed the starving.

Yet, surprisingly enough, we hear very little praise indeed whenever we save money. Why? I do not know. Perhaps it is because it is far easier to talk about saving money than actually to do so.

But July 8 was a historic day for economizing in this country. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara announced that his Department alone realized savings of $4.5 billion during fiscal year 1966—$400 million more than estimated.

In fact, in the 5-year period in which the Department of Defense has been involved in an intensive program to improve its operating efficiency and reduce its costs, we have realized cumulative savings of over $14 billion.

This economy has not meant military inadequacy. In fact, while saving over $14 billion we have at the same time improved the efficiency of the Nation's military logistic system and met the manpower and material needs of a major conflict in southeast Asia.

Finally, these savings are not inflated or exaggerated; they are real. The prestigious independent public accounting concern of Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart has reviewed the formula used by the Department of Defense in calculating these savings and concluded that it is "logical and reasonable."

What are these savings? A few examples give a good idea of the ingenious techniques the Department of Defense is developing—and perfecting—to economize without strangling our military effort.

For example, a special bolt for helicopter armor cost $34—but the Department substituted another, equally good bolt which costs only 40 cents. This meant a total savings on recent procurement of $13,104.

Another example: titanium coating on compressor blades and vanes on the J-79 engine was replaced by a cheaper process of corrosion control. This meant a total savings on recent procurement of $1,352,360.

This is the kind of economy in Government that should always be practiced and encouraged.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it gives me great satisfaction to know that the taxpayer's money is being spent so wisely and frugally by the Defense Department. I commend its program to other governmental agencies, and believe that many of my colleagues join me today in expressing admiration and gratification to Secretary McNamara and the President for their continued efforts in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Secretary McNamara's report to the President on the first 5 years of the Defense Department's cost reduction program in the RECORD at this point:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1966.

Memorandum for the President.

Subject: Department of Defense Cost Reduction Program—Fourth Annual Progress Report.

Four years ago, on July 5, 1962, I reported to President Kennedy on the progress made by the Defense Department since January 1961 in improving operating efficiency and reducing costs, and on our goals for the future. Now, with the completion of the fifth year of operation under this program, I can report to you that notwithstanding the extraordinary demands of our military operations in Southeast Asia:

Savings of $4.5 billion were realized during FY 1966 through efficiency improvements—$400 million more than estimated.

Savings of $6.1 billion a year by FY 1969 and each year thereafter have again been set as our long range goal—unchanged from last year.

Actual accomplishments in each year have far exceeded the original goals announced in July 1962. Cumulative savings over the five year period now exceed $14 billion.

The savings in FY 1966 were achieved at the same time we were building up a military force of about 350,000 men in Southeast Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores, and providing the facilities, weapons, ammunition, equipment and supplies required to support them in combat. During the last twelve months our military effort in Southeast Asia has been increased by:

240% in the number of military personnel deployed
480% in the number of combat maneuver battalions
235% in the number of helicopters
110% in the number of land-based attack aircraft
70% in the number of naval vessels in offshore waters
145% in air ordnance expended
310% in the capacity of the ports
240% in the volume of dry cargo delivered by ship
170% in the tonnage delivered by aircraft

During the same period we have greatly expanded our production of the ammunition, equipment and supplies required by our forces in Southeast Asia. From June 1965 to June 1966, production has been increased by:

15% in fixed-wing aircraft
60% in helicopters
2100% in aluminum airfield matting
1300% in air delivered munitions
160% in ground delivered munitions
6700% in tropical uniforms

All of this has been accomplished:

Without imposing the usual wartime controls on wages, prices, and civilian production and consumption

Without calling up the Reserve Forces

Without imposing wartime tax burdens, and while holding Defense expenditures in FY 1966 (as a percent of GNP) at a level lower than that of four of the past five years.

THE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM IN RETROSPECT

With five years of experience behind us and with the "test in combat" provided by the Vietnam conflict, I believe this to be a most appropriate time to assess the contribution of the Cost Reduction Program to the more effective management of the Defense effort.

To obtain an independent, outside assessment of the true savings to the nation produced by the Program and to recommend further improvements in its operation, a leading firm of public accountants, Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart, was engaged. Their principal conclusions are:

1. That the rules established by the Defense Department to assess the savings resulting from cost reduction actions "have been logical and reasonable".

2. That the reporting system which applies these rules to the classification, validation and summarization of the cost reduction actions "has produced a reasonable overall monetary expression of savings achieved under the Program".[1]

3. That the Program "has achieved the purpose intended".

In short, Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart believe that the Cost Reduction Program is stimulating economy and efficiency throughout the Defense Establishment. It is a brief I share.

When appraising both the need for and accomplishments of the Cost Reduction Program, we should bear in mind that the primary responsibility of the Defense Department is to be ready for combat. Therefore, it is to be expected that in making day to day decisions, we will normally tend to err on the side of surpluses rather than shortages. Thus, without some offsetting incentive for economy, we would always be confronted with a pervasive tendency to overstate requirements, to hoard supplies and manpower, to pyramid "safety stocks" at successive management echelons, to establish standards without regard to cost, and, in general, to stick with the "tried and true" rather than risk innovation. Certainly, we want to be sure that we have everything we need to maintain our combat readiness. But there is absolutely nothing to be gained, and indeed much to be lost, by acquiring more than we need.

The tendency to over-finance and over-order is especially prevalent when our forces are actually engaged in combat. We came out of the Korean War, for example, with about $12 billion of surplus stocks on hand—we hope to avoid a similar waste of national resources during the Vietnamese conflict. The over-funding in certain areas during the Korean War was startling. In June 1953 the Defense Department reported to the Senate Appropriations Committee that a total of $12.7 billion had been programed for Air Force aircraft spare parts for the four fiscal years, 1951–1954 compared with actual and projected consumption in those years of only $1.7 billion, and an inventory requirement of only $1.5 billion. This is the kind of pitfall we are seeking to avoid in the current military build-up.

---

[1] With regard to the validation of the cost savings, the accounting firm believes that the program has matured to a point where the scope and intensity of the Defense Department's audit of smaller transactions could be reduced, and I would tend to agree. From the very inception of this program, I have insisted on an independent audit of the savings to ensure that they are bona fide. This is simply good business practice; no manager should report on his own performance without some form of independent verification. Originally, I invited the General Accounting Office to undertake this auditing task, but for understandable reasons the Comptroller General thought it would be inappropriate. I, therefore, assigned the job to the Comptroller of the Defense Department under whose direction some 200 man-years are devoted annually to the review and verification of the quarterly savings reports. All claims of savings which do not fully meet the established criteria are eliminated from our final reports to you and to the public In FY 1966, about 40% of the total savings claimed by the logistics managers were rejected, and these are not included in the results which I am now reporting.

Of course, whenever the level of operations rises, as it does when our forces engage in combat, an increase in Defense expenditures will be required. This in no way invalidates savings previously made under the Cost Reduction Program, which is designed to achieve maximum operating efficiency at any level of operation. Our objective in peacetime is to achieve a sound logistics base which can be expanded quickly in time of war. Our requirements for ammunition and other consumables, for example, are computed on the assumption that production will immediately be increased when our forces are committed to combat. In other words, we stock only enough to meet our normal peacetime needs plus the amount required to tide us over in wartime until production can catch up with consumption. Thus, even though our munitions inventories amounted to some $8 or $9 billion when the tempo of the Vietnam conflict suddenly increased a year ago, we had to add $3.1 billion for ammunition to the FY 1966 Budget, making a total of about $4.2 billion—and another $3.7 billion for ammunition was included in the FY 1967 Budget.

With regard to spare parts, obviously consumption is greatly increased by combat operations. Weapons and equipment are used much more intensively, requiring more frequent overhaul; some are damaged by enemy action, requiring repair; and in the case of Vietnam, new, very long supply pipelines have to be established and filled to assure that spare parts are available when needed. But here again, all we need to stock in peacetime are sufficient spares to support normal operations and the initial demands of combat until production can be expanded to meet the higher rates of consumption. Accordingly, it was to be expected that we would add, as we did, well over a billion dollars for spares to our FY 1966 Budget.

My own conclusion is that, even with hindsight, we could not have significantly improved on the overall performance of the Cost Reduction Program during the past five years. Certainly, some mistakes have been made. In a few cases, for example, some savings may well have been reported and accepted which, in retrospect, should not have been. But the monetary value of these is minor indeed (probably not in excess of 3% or 4% of the cumulative savings of $14 billion). Moreover, for each such instance, there were many other true cost reductions which were either not reported at all or not accepted by the auditors because of a technicality such as insufficient documentation. Certainly, there is room for improvement in the mechanics of the program, as the Touche, Ross, Bailey and Smart report points out. But the fact remains that:

Of the 862 "base closure" actions taken during the last five years—actions which will save over $1.4 billion per year—not a single one has had to be reversed, even though a total of nearly 540,000 military and civilian personnel have been added to our rolls in the past twelve months.

The percentage of contracts awarded on the basis of competition continued to increase and the percentage of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts continued to decline during FY 1966, despite the heavy pressure of our wartime procurement.

Even with the greatly increased workload imposed by the Vietnam war, the Defense Supply Agency is still operating with 13% fewer employees than its predecessor agencies in 1961.

Notwithstanding the extraordinary demands of the Vietnam conflict, continued progress was made during FY 1966: in the use of excess inventories in lieu of new procurement; in the elimination of "goldplating"; and in reducing the number of different items in our inventories.

In the opinion of our military commanders, no military force in this century has been moved so far so fast, has been as well supplied, and has fought as effectively as the force of 350,000 men, 1,800 fixed-wing aircraft, and 1,700 helicopters which we currently have deployed in Southeast Asia. And this has been achieved after realizing, during the past five years, $14 billion in savings from the Cost Reduction Program and after eliminating, during the same period, almost $60 billion from the budget requests of the Military Services.

Our cost reduction techniques have been adopted by many of our defense contractors on their military work, and are now being applied on their civilian work as well. Indeed, we have discovered that they are being used by many firms not directly connected with the defense program. A recent survey by the Wall Street Journal found that:

"There's evidence that stepped-up cost reduction efforts among Government contractors are spilling over into the civilian economy as well. A New York management consultant, hired by a major defense contractor to establish a cost reduction program, says the company extended the system to commercial production with such startling results that non-defense competitors set up similar programs to avoid being under-sold on the commercial market".

THE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM IN FY 1966

The following discussion highlights some of the specific actions taken and the savings achieved during the past year. As you know, the many individual elements of the program are organized around three basic principles:

1. Buying only what we need to achieve combat readiness.
2. Buying at the lowest sound price.
3. Reducing operating costs through the termination of unnecessary operations, standardization and consolidation.

The year's results will be reported in the same categories.

I. Buying Only What We Need: One of our major goals has been to improve the process by which we initially calculate what, when and how much we need to buy. How well we perform this task not only bears heavily on the overall cost of the Defense program but ultimately also helps to determine the military effectiveness of the forces we support. Savings in this area in FY 1966 are estimated at $1.6 billion.

A. Refining Requirements Calculations: In the case of major weapons and equipment, requirement calculations are refined by a continuing series of program reviews and analyses which seek to establish: sound wearout, attrition and pipeline factors; the proper balance between stocks on hand and post-D-Day production potential; the optimum mix of various types of items in the inventory; etc.

For example:

A review of recent experience showed that the 5% annual replacement factor planned for the AN/GRC-50 tactical radio relay unit could be reduced to 2%—saving $2,114,073.

A reexamination of ground equipment requirements for the UH-1 helicopter revealed that two sets of ground handling wheels could support three aircraft, instead of one set for each aircraft—saving $500,000.

For the literally millions of secondary items, the management of which is necessarily largely decentralized, we have sought to achieve a more precise determination of requirements and a more rapid response to the user through the extensive uses of automatic data processing equipment and specialized logistics communications systems, and through the continuous revalidation of pipeline, maintenance and safety factors. For example:

A new computerized method for estimating the amount of repair parts needed for new shipboard equipment made possible a more precise determination of requirements—saving $587,440.

The expeditious return of unserviceable fire control devices for the SS-11 missile made possible a reduction in procurement—saving $136,200.

B. Increased Use of Excess Inventories: The greatly increased demand for materiel resulting from combat operations in Vietnam has significantly expanded the opportunities to use excess equipment and supplies and idle production tools owned by the Government. The computerized screening procedures installed in recent years have helped us to take advantage of these opportunities since they quickly identify requirements which can be satisfied by idle assets in lieu of new procurement. The results are shown below:

Fiscal year	Value of long-supply stocks returned to productive use	Increase over fiscal year 1961 rate
1961	$956	
1962	1,080	$124
1963	1,120	164
1964	1,287	331
1965	1,451	495
1966 (estimate)	1,535	579

Here are just two recent examples of how these stocks were reutilized:

1. By modifying an obsolete 155 mm projectile at a unit cost of $2.34, the Army avoided procurement of some 270,000 new projectiles costing $24.13 each—saving $5,889,576.

2. By dyeing and mildew proofing webbing already in stock, the Defense Supply Agency was able to meet the needs of a contractor manufacturing carrying slings for weapons and equipment—saving $276,898.

C. Eliminating Goldplating: When we specify costly quality or performance features not actually required for the achievement of the desired military effectiveness, the waste is truly as real as when excessive quantities are purchased. To stimulate efforts to eliminate "goldplating", our contracts, wherever appropriate, permit the producer to share in any savings that result. Approved contractor proposals rose from about 288 in FY 1964 to 700 in FY 1965 and in FY 1966 are estimated at over 1000. These actions not only produce substantial savings, but also often contribute directly to the military effectiveness of our weapons and equipment by improving their reliability and ease of maintenance. Three recent examples are shown below:

	Unit cost		Savings on recent procurement
	Before redesign	After redesign	
1. 2.75-inch rocket motor tube: Number of components reduced from 4 to 1	$5.08	$3.73	$760,522
2. Corrosion control, J-79 engine: Titanium coating on compressor blades and vanes replaced by cheaper process	5,234.00	2,633.00	1,352,360
3. Bolt for helicopter armor: Standard bolt substituted for special, high heat resistant type	34.00	.40	13,104

D. Inventory Item Reduction: Every different item carried in our inventory requires separate management, the cost of which is conservatively estimated at $100 per item per year. With the continuing introduction of new weapons and equipment, hundreds of thousands of new items must be added annually. Without a concerted effort to keep new items to a minimum and to purge existing inventories of unneeded, duplicative or interchangeable items, the total number of different items in the supply system would rise indefinitely. Fortunately, we have been able to reverse this trend which had seen the number of items in our catalog rise from 3.3 million in FY 1958 to about 4 million in FY 1962. Through a vigorous standardization program, the development of an automated Item Entry Control System, the conscious avoidance of parallel development projects by different Services and the continuous screening of the supply inventory, the number of different items in the system has now been reduced to about 3.8 million. In the first nine months of FY 1966, over 334,000 items were eliminated from the catalog.

II. Buying At The Lowest Sound Price: One of the outstanding, and I believe lasting, accomplishments of the Cost Reduction Program has been the vast improvement in our procurement operations, as reflected in the increased proportion of contracts awarded on the basis of price competition and in the drastic shift away from cost-plus-fixed-fee to fixed price or incentive type contracts. Savings achieved are estimated at $1.3 billion in FY 1966.

A. Shifting from Non-Competitive to Competitive Procurement:

Forty-six and four-tenths percent of our prime contracts were awarded on the basis of price competition through the first ten months of FY 1966, compared with forty-three and four-tenths percent for all of FY 1965.

This is a remarkable accomplishment in view of the fact that many of the urgent Vietnam requirements could, as a practical matter, be met only by adding to the contracts of suppliers already in production. In such cases, even if the original contract was awarded through price competition, the follow-on procurement could not qualify as competitive. Even if the results for May and June slip below the ten month average, I believe FY 1966 will still exceed or at least equal FY 1965. Experience has shown that, on the average, at least 25 cents is saved on each dollar shifted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement. This means an estimated $605 million savings in FY 1966. Some of the interesting recent examples of action in this area are shown below:

Item	Noncompetitive unit price	Competitive unit price	Percent reduction	Savings
Wing tank release, F-104	$66.92	$9.48	86	$285,591
Bomb tail fuse, M905	14.82	11.91	20	168,780
Attitude indicator	1,425.00	987.00	31	206,736
Extendible earth anchor	75.43	47.50	37	231,800
Asroc launcher	331,243.00	215,694.00	35	4,853,058

B. Shifting from Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) to Fixed-Price Contracts: The first ten months of FY 1966 show a continuing decline in the proportion of CPFF type contracts awarded, reaching a rate of 8.9% compared with the peak of 38% recorded in March 1961.

CPFF contracts, while being the easiest to award, are the most difficult to administer, and more important, provide little or no incentive for the contractor to hold costs down or meet performance and delivery specifications. Because they do permit work to get under way rapidly and are particularly suited to highly uncertain situations, we have had to use CPFF contracts in the case of a number of Vietnam-related projects, for example, the construction of U.S. military facilities in that country. Despite these unusual requirements, we were able to show further progress in FY 1966. Since on the average at least ten cents is saved on each dollar shifted from CPFF to some other form of contract, this means an estimated saving of $684 million. Again, the actual results of the last two months may increase the CPFF rate somewhat, but we should still be able to better the goal set for the year.

As the proportion of CPFF contracts has declined, that of firm, fixed-price contracts has risen, and by virtually the same amount. This is especially gratifying inasmuch as under most conditions, the firm, fixed-price contract is preferable, with the contractor assuming full cost responsibility and guaranteeing performance and timely delivery.

C. Multi-year Procurement: Multi-year competitive contracts enable bidders to offer the Government lower prices since the larger quantities and longer production runs usually result in lower unit costs, as shown on the table below:

	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966
Number of actions	42	129	193
Value of actions (millions)	$230	$854	$850
Savings (millions)	$7	$69	$80
Rate of savings (percent)	3.2	8.1	9.4

Here are some recent examples of such contracts:

	Unit price		Percent reduction	Savings on recent procurement
	Single year	Multiyear		
1. Cargo carrier M548	$21,414	$16,187	24	$4,474,312
2. 20 horsepower standard engines	615	557	6	425,000
3. Rocket motor, inert parts	395	299	24	174,000
4. Fuel tank assembly	950	780	18	1,744,540
5. Radio receiver	1,970	1,874	5	112,128

III. Reducing Operating Costs: The third category of cost reductions comprises those programs designed to increase the efficiency of our far flung supply, maintenance, communications, transportation and other logistic support activities. Savings here in FY 1966 are estimated at $1.6 billion.

A. Terminating Unnecessary Operations: During the past year we have continued our effort to identify and terminate unnecessary operations. Since this time a year ago, another 159 activities have been selected for closure, reduction in scope or consolidation—with an ultimate saving of $410 million each year. The present status of the program (on a "when completed" basis) is shown below:

	Total through June 30, 1965	Total through June 30, 1966	Increase
Number of actions	703	862	159
Acres released	1,631,000	1,740,000	109,000
Industrial plants with commercial potential made available for sale	64	66	2
Job positions eliminated	147,801	200,001	52,000
Recurring annual savings (millions)	$1,034	$1,444	$410

The land and facilities made available by this "base closure" program usually find other productive uses quickly. The table below summarizes the disposition of military property released since 1961:

New use	Number of locations through—		Increase
	June 30, 1965	June 30, 1966	
Civic airports	23	28	5
Schools and universities	98	157	59
Parks, recreation, community development	78	90	12
Private industry for production	37	56	19
Individuals and small companies	171	306	135
Federally owned reserve lands	6	6	0
Other Federal agencies	57	79	22
Total acres involved	789,821	862,788	72,967

Our own Office of Economic Adjustment has helped plan many of these successful conversions, collaborating with local officials in some 59 instances. In this connection, an important facet of our base closure program is the early identification and announcement of those installations affected so as to give all concerned—the employees, the communities and state and federal agencies—the maximum amount of time to plan for the adjustment process.

For our own employees affected by closings, we have established a broad program of assistance which includes the guarantee of a new job opportunity, a centralized job referral activity to match displaced employees with job vacancies, a preference system for the placement of such employees, retraining, severance pay, income protection and Government payment of moving costs to a new Defense job. The following table shows what has happened to civilian career employees displaced by the base closure program between January 1964 and April 30, 1966:

	Employees	
	Number	Percent
Accepted offer of another DOD job	66,264	69.7
Placed in another Federal job	3,887	4.1
Placed in a non-Federal job	2,314	2.4
Declined job offer, transfer or placement assistance	5,290	5.6
Retired or resigned	13,481	14.2
Other (death, military service, etc.)	3,827	4.0
Total employees affected	95,063	100.0
Separated without job opportunity	None	None

B. Consolidation and Standardization of Operations: The more extensive use of air transportation, improved communications and automatic data processing techniques has made possible an increasing degree of consolidation and standardization in our logistics operations. The result is more economical and efficient support of our military forces.

The performance of the Defense Supply Agency (DSA) during FY 1966 in coping with the increased demands of the Vietnam conflict adds impressive evidence to the wisdom of this largest and most important functional consolidation in the past five years. During the first nine months of FY 1966, DSA's supply centers processed 30 percent more requisitions, handled 55 percent more tons of supplies, and procured more than double the dollar volume of supplies than in the comparable period a year before—and, with an improvement in productivity per manhour expended of over 20 percent.

C. Increasing Efficiency of Other Support Operations:

1. Communication Systems Costs—Savings in this area in FY 1966 are estimated at $151 million and stem principally from the consolidation and integration of leased long line communications by the Defense Communications Agency.

2. Transportation and Traffic Management—Savings in FY 1966 are estimated at $78 million and result from such actions as: minimizing the use of premium air travel; improving routings of high cost, air delivered shipments; obtaining more favorable rates for commercial airlift and shipment of household goods; and reducing transportation costs of overseas mail.

3. Maintenance Management: FY 1966 savings are estimated at $178 million and were obtained from a wide variety of actions, for example, lengthening the time between overhaul through better inspections and scheduling, by seeking out opportunities to rebuild existing equipment in lieu of new procurement, etc.

4. Other: Additional savings estimated at $134 million were realized in such fields as family housing and other real property management, the use of contract technicians, commercial type vehicle management, etc.

SUMMARY

With a record of five years of achievement behind us, there should be no question as to the value of the Defense Department's Cost Reduction Program. Not only has it produced very substantial savings but also it has significantly improved the overall efficiency of our logistics system, as evidenced by its ability to support promptly the sudden increase in workload imposed by the conflict in Vietnam. Six weeks ago Senator Douglas, speaking as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation summed up the Committee's annual review of our Cost Reduction Program with the following comment:

"Cost reductions of several billions of dollars annually have been achieved by adopting, among others, many of the suggestions of this subcommittee. In the process . . . toes have been trod upon, oxen gored, and hostility encountered which is inevitable.

Errors may have been committed and certainly much remains to be done in carving more fat and waste . . . but I urge everyone to view our suggestions and recommendations against the background of the scope of the job and the unprecedented accomplishments. We must not undermine . . . the greatly improved structure . . . nor . . . relax our efforts toward further progress."

It is my intention to ensure that there is no relaxation of effort and that further progress is achieved in the year ahead.

Robert S. McNamara.

EDWARD MICHAEL KERNAN

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, July 15, Ed Kernan, Washington correspondent for the Cleveland Plain Dealer for over 22 years, passed away after a prolonged illness. During the past 12 years on the Washington scene, I came to know him for his warm and sincere devotion to the highest traditions of the fourth estate. His interest concentrated on the news and those who made it. The Washington beat is shadowed by his passing.

The following summary, written by his close associates at the Plain Dealer, aptly describes his journalistic life and achievements:

> Francis Edward Michael Kernan, in his 22 years in the Plain Dealer's Washington bureau, was known affectionately throughout the massive press corps in the Nation's Capital as "Eddie—with 1,000 friends", including five Presidents.
>
> Amiable, shrewd and gregarious, Eddie landed in Washington in 1944 via service on newspapers in his native Red Wing, Minn. and in 1937 the Akron bureau of the Plain Dealer.
>
> Walker Buel, then chief of the Washington bureau used to tell the story of how Eddie worked himself into the Washington staff "as a natural because he could not stay away from political conventions." Eddie spent his 1944 vacation doing odd chores for the bureau at the 1944 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, which brought him to Buel's attention.
>
> Here Eddie covered the funeral procession of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and confessed he wept just like the throngs who watched the cortege roll by. He was one of the original staff of newsmen who covered the beginnings of the United Nations when it was located at Lake Success, New York.
>
> Innumerable other reporters borrowed his "blacks" or carbon copies of stories during the campaign trips with Presidential candidates on trains before the jet age. A classic story in Washington was the air trip in more recent times when the presidential tour had gone through Cleveland, where the press had read Eddie's story in the Plain Dealer, and then arrived in another great midwestern city.
>
> There, in the eminent local journal was Eddie's story, word for word, except for the byline. Fletcher Knebel of Look magazine and a Plain Dealer alumnus and former bureau colleague of Eddie's cracked: "They sure worked Eddie to a fare-the-well last night."
>
> Eddie in particular knew Congress like the back of his hand. Innumberable Representatives and Senators on "Capitol Hill" also knew Eddie, and from time to time used to try to steal him away from the Plain Dealer to serve as a press aide.
>
> But Eddie preferred the glamor and excitement of newspaper life and used to spend hour after hour at times with cronies at the National Press Club bar recounting wild and wooly tales of an era of newspapering which today has just about died out.
>
> In 1954 Eddie was elected a member of the Gridiron Club, the famed dining organization limited to 50 top Washington correspondents. Eddie achieved fame in the club by being the annual crier of the classic opening line for some of the organization's star skits. Eddie's role was to cry: "Make way!" in a stentorian voice, as he ushered in the actors who were to parody the famous and near-great "victims" of the club's satire.
>
> None of the many notables who attended the club's luxurious banquets was ever happier to see Eddie than his old high school football teammate, Gen. Lauris E. Norstad, former commander-in-chief of NATO forces in Europe.
>
> In fact, many Washington correspondents who went to Paris to see Gen. Norstad, used to ask Eddie for an introduction to the general. But, as many later humorously told Eddie, they lived to regret it. The characteristic complaint was: "Norstad spent 20 minutes of my half hour's allotted time talking about Eddie and Red Wing."
>
> In recent years Eddie discovered he had a light touch in pinpointing the human side of political figures in the news, and used to write frequent columns in this vein for the Plain Dealer.
>
> He had been progressively ill for the past two years and had planned to retire next Dec. 1st. Surviving are his wife, Dorothy, whom he started to date in high school, and two daughters, Mrs. Margaret Hertz and Mrs. Kathleen Smith.

My Ohio colleagues and his many friends on the Washington beat will miss the good spirit of Ed Kernan.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have depended on the Plain Dealer for many years are grieved that Ed Kernan's days have come to an end. He was always friendly and congenial. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kernan and his family.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Ed Kernan's straightforward and accurate reporting of events in this city made him stand out among the Washington press corps. His distinguished news coverage and contribution to the Washington press corps earned him a membership in the exclusive Gridiron Club, a place with the Nation's most important writers. In all my contacts with Ed Kernan he not only proved himself as an accomplished writer, but as one of the fairest news gatherers that I have ever known. I considered him both an outstanding journalist and a good friend.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to realize that Eddie Kernan of the Cleveland Plain Dealer is gone.

Only a few weeks ago he telephoned me, full of good humor and typical Kernan repartee despite the fact that pain was his constant grim companion. Illness had limited his activities and, after covering my office for nearly a dozen years, I missed his frequent visits. He promised to come up to Capitol Hill for lunch as soon as he was feeling a little better.

It was the only promise Ed Kernan ever made to me that he failed to keep. He was a man of his word.

Eddie's integrity and fairmindedness was such that he held the confidence of hundreds of men in public office. But beyond that he captured the friendship and loyalty of literally thousands of people in all walks of life, ranging from the elevator operator in the Plain Dealer bureau's Washington headquarters up to the White House. He was one of the most affectionately regarded members of the Washington press corps.

Ed had a roguish wit, a high sense of tolerance of the shortcomings of others and an uncanny ability to translate even a mundane news event into striking journalism. It was a winning combination.

He was held in the greatest respect by the Plain Dealer to which he gave so many years of service, as the following tributes indicate.

Ed Kernan was a man's man and a newspaperman's newspaperman.

It is very hard to say goodby.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, July 16, 1966]

EDWARD KERNAN, PD WRITER, DIES

WASHINGTON.—F. Edward Kernan, veteran member of the Plain Dealer Washington bureau, died yesterday in Holy Cross Hospital, Silver Spring, Md. He was 59.

Mr. Kernan had been on sick leave for nearly two years. He was hospitalized July 7 after suffering a cerebral hemorrhage which caused his death.

Francis Edward Michael Kernan, in his 22 years in the Plain Dealer Washington Bureau, was known affectionately throughout the huge press corps in the nation's capital as "Eddie—with 1,000 friends," among them five presidents.

Amiable, shrewd and gregarious, Eddie landed in Washington in 1944 after reporting stints on newspapers in his native Red Wing, Minn., Minneapolis and the Plain Dealer's Akron bureau.

Walker S. Buel, the late chief of the Washington bureau, used to tell the story of how Eddie worked himself into the Washington staff "as a natural, because he could not stay away from political conventions."

Eddie spent his 1944 vacation doing odd chores for the bureau staff at the 1944 Democratic national convention in Chicago, which brought him to Buel's attention.

In Washington, Eddie covered the funeral procession of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and confessed he wept just like the throngs who watched the cortege roll by. He was one of the original staff of newsmen who covered the beginnings of the United Nations when it was situated at Lake Success, N.Y.

Innumerable other reporters borrowed his "blacks," or carbon copies of his articles, on the campaign trips with presidential candidates on trains before the jet age.

A classic story in Washington was the air trip in more recent times when the presidential tour had stopped in Cleveland, where the other reporters had read Eddie's story in The Plain Dealer, and then arrived in another great midwestern city.

There in the eminent local journal was Eddie's article, word for word, except for the byline. Fletcher Knebel, a writer for Look magazine and a Plain Dealer alumnus and former bureau colleague of Eddie's cracked:

"They sure worked Eddie to a fare-thee-well last night."

Eddie, in particular, knew Congress like the back of his hand. Innumerable representatives and senators also knew Eddie, and from time to time used to try to steal him away from The Plain Dealer to serve as their press aides.

But Eddie preferred the glamor and excitement of newspaper life and used to spend hour after hour with cronies at the National Press Club bar recounting wild and woolly tales of an era of newspapering that today has just about died out.

In 1954, Eddie was elected a member of the Gridiron Club, the famed dining organization limited to 50 top Washington correspondents. Eddie achieved fame in the club by being the annual crier of the classic opening line for some of the organization's star skits. Eddie's role was to cry, "Make way!" in a stentorian voice, as he ushered in the actors to parody the famous and near-great "victims" of the club's satire.

None of the many notables who attended the club's luxurious banquets was ever happier to see Eddie than his old high school football teammate, Gen. Lauris E. Norstad, former commander-in-chief of NATO forces in Europe.

In fact, many Washington correspondents who went to Paris to see Gen. Norstad used to ask Eddie for an introduction.

But, as many later humorously told Eddie, they lived to regret it. The characteristic complaint was:

"Norstad spent 20 minutes of my half hour's allotted time talking about Eddie and Red Wing."

In recent years Eddie cultivated a light touch in pinpointing the human side of political figures in the news and wrote many columns in that vein for The Plain Dealer.

From 1937 until 1944, when he joined the Washington bureau, Kernan covered the news in Akron. He was in charge of the Akron bureau during World War II. There his knowledge of the rubber industry and labor relations gave The Plain Dealer a widely respected reporter.

He had been ill for the last two years and had planned to retire Dec. 1.

Visiting hours for Mr. Kernan will be at the Warner E. Pumphrey funeral home, 8434 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, from 7 to 9 p.m. today and 3 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow.

The body will be taken to his home town of Red Wing, Minn., arriving there Tuesday evening.

Visiting hours will be at the Ferrin funeral home, 301 Main Street, Red Wing, from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Wednesday. Services will be in Red Wing, Thursday morning at a time and place to be announced.

Interment will be in Calvary Cemetery, Red Wing.

Mr. Kernan is survived by his wife, Dorothy; two daughters, Mrs. Herbert Hertz and Mrs. James E. Smith, both of Silver Spring; two grandchildren; two sisters, Mrs. David Budensiek and Mrs. Jeanette Kalland, both of St. Louis Park, Minn.; and two brothers, Joseph, of Red Wing and John K. of Miami Beach, Fla.

THIRTY FOR KERNAN, PD VETERAN

Francis Edward Kernan, dead at 59, lacked only a few months of completing 30 years of service with The Plain Dealer. At his death he was on sick leave from the Washington Bureau where his byline was a familiar one on governmental and political stories.

Kernan went to The Plain Dealer's bureau in the capital city in 1944. He began his service with this newspaper in 1937 at the Akron Bureau after previous experience on smaller newspapers including the Daily Republican in his home town of Red Wing, Minn.

It was in Red Wing that Kernan played football on the same team with Gen. Lauris Norstad who later became supreme allied commander in Europe. Both played end. Kernan also attended Red Wing Seminary, University of North Dakota and University of Minnesota and, in Washington, was a member of the Gridiron Club, indicative of his standing in the newspaper community there. A congenial gentleman and a good reporter, Ed Kernan will be missed by his many friends both in government and newspaper circles.

Kernan was known among his contemporaries as the "man with a thousand friends." That is a goodly number for any human to accumulate. Among them were five presidents of the United States. Kernan confessed he stood by the side of the road and wept when the funeral procession of President Franklin D. Roosevelt passed by.

Among his notable assignments was coverage of the United Nations when it was located at Lake Success, New York.

But it was as a reporter of the political scene, per se, that Kernan established his reputation as something more than a mere recorder of events. In late years he devoted more time to what might be called the "human" side of Washington and its politicians and he sought out and printed the lighter aspects of life in the District of Columbia.

THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], has brought to light certain facts and raised serious questions regarding the possible connection between the Justice Department's dropping an antitrust suit against a St. Louis beer company and the membership of that company's officers in the exclusive $1,000 President's Club.

Whatever else may be said of the peculiar series of coincidences surrounding the beer company executives' contribution to the Democratic Party and the Justice Department's dropping the case, it is clear that Vice President HUMPHREY and Mr. Donald Turner, the Justice Department's antitrust chief, were guilty of incredible naivete as public officials when they accepted a gift ride to the All-Star game last week on the beer company's airplane.

Mr. Turner, the man charged with the responsibility under the Johnson administration for enforcing our antitrust laws, is quoted as saying that although he had his doubts about boarding the private airplane, he finally concluded that if taking the gift ride was good enough for Vice President HUMPHREY, it was good enough for him. It would seem then that a new standard for ethical conduct has been established by the Johnson administration; that, is when you are in doubt, ask yourself, "What would HUBERT HUMPHREY do?

But the country is entitled to know a great deal more about this $1,000 exclusive President's Club. What kind of "club" is this President's Club? Is it a club to be used against private and business interests who do not belong to it—or against the public interest on behalf of those who do put $1,000 into the Democratic Party campaign kitty?

We have heard a great deal about the administration's Poverty and Peace Corps. But it would appear that the time is overdue when the American people are told the truth about the administration's affluence and influence corps—that is, its $1,000 per member President's Club.

I believe that an investigation is in order to find out whether there are other peculiar coincidences and special considerations surrounding membership in the President's Club. The Justice Department is hardly qualified at this point to make such investigation. I recommend an appropriate committee of Congress. A serious question has been raised regarding the possible misuse of political influence in dealings with an executive department agency.

If there is no impropriety involved in the dropping of the antitrust suit against the St. Louis beer company, then it is important that this be made clear and public confidence in the Justice Department restored. At present this confidence is seriously undermined.

LIBERALIZING VETERANS PENSION PROGRAM

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 16247, a bill to liberalize and make more equitable the veterans' pension program.

Considerable interest has been manifest in recent months in legislation to revise and liberalize the veterans' pension program. More than 150 bills on this subject have been introduced and are pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Undoubtedly, this great expression of interest has been stimulated by the adverse effect of last year's social security annuity increase upon the monthly pension of many veterans. It is true that the 88th Congress, anticipating the social security increase, enacted legislation to exclude 10 percent of any retirement income from the computation of income for pension purposes. Because the social security increase was not enacted until more than a year later, many veterans received a nominal increase in social security and at the same time their pensions were reduced substantially. In some cases, veterans had been on the pension rolls only a few months when their pensions were summarily reduced or terminated because of the receipt of the nominal increase in social security.

This is only part of the problem facing us, Mr. Speaker. The continually rising cost of living has made the income limitations of existing law that were established in 1960 completely obsolete in establishing financial need and entitlement to pension. Even the monthly rates of pension, which were last increased in 1964, have not kept peace with the increased cost of living.

This 89th Congress is continually being called upon to vote for social reforms that are designed to improve the financial status of various segments of our population. Even now, the administration is considering the so-called reverse income tax plan that would have the effect of guaranteeing everyone a minimum annual wage of more than $3,000. With this trend continuing, and the cost of living increasing, it is essential that we reappraise the needs of our Nation's aging veteran population.

I have devoted considerable time and effort to a study in depth of this problem. I believe the bill I have introduced to liberalize the veterans' pension program will permit the Federal Government to more adequately discharge its continuing obligation to our Nation's wartime defenders and, at the same time, recognize its obligation to all citizens as taxpayers.

The measure will increase most of the income limitations that control the monthly rate of pension under existing law. It will establish a new maximum rate of pension and a new minimum income limitation for the most needy veterans. The proposal will, for example, permit the married veteran with income of $500 annually to receive $130 monthly instead of the $105 monthly he is now receiving. It will permit the widow with no children and income of less than $250 to receive $80 monthly instead of the $64 she currently receives.

The proposal will also permit any veteran in receipt of retirement income to waive up to 10 percent of that retirement income so he may qualify for pension.

A frequent complaint of pensioners is that the income of a working wife is not counted as the veteran's income for pension purposes. When the working wife retires, however, all but $1,200 of her retirement income is counted as the veteran's income for pension purposes. Thus, a veteran's pension may be adversely affected at a time when his family income has been substantially reduced. This proposal will correct this situation by excluding all of a spouse's income when she reaches age 62, in computing the veteran's income for pension purposes.

These are the principal provisions of the bill I have introduced. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Speaker, will begin hearings tomorrow on this important subject. I am extremely hopeful that these hearings will result in the reporting of this bill or a similar measure to provide a more generous pension program for the Nation's sick and needy veterans and widows.

A section-by-section analysis of H.R. 16247 follows:

ANALYSIS OF VETERANS' PENSION ACT OF 1966

(Introduced by Hon. E. Ross Adair, July 14, 1966)

This is a bill to increase the rates of pension payable to veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korean Conflict and their widows and to liberalize and make more equitable the provisions of the pension law.

Section 1. This section contains the short title and provides that the Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Pension Act of 1966."

Section 2. This section permits veterans to waive the receipt of not more than 10% of any retirement annuity, including Social Security, administered by an agency of the Federal Government. The Section further provides that 10% of any waived retirement income shall not be considered as income for pension purposes.

This section also provides that the nominal remuneration received by patients and members in Veteran's Administration hospitals and domiciliaries for services performed as therapeutic and rehabilitative activities, as set forth in Section 618 of Title 38, shall not be counted as income for pension purposes.

Section 3. This section revises the income limitations controlling the monthly rate of pension for veterans and widows. The existing pension rates are increased by approximately five percent.

The section adds a new monthly rate of $125 for veterans with no dependents having incomes of less than $250 annually and a monthly rate of $130; $135; or $140 for veterans with one, two, or three or more dependents respectively and having incomes of less than $500 annually.

A new monthly rate of $80 for widows with no dependents having incomes of less than $250 annually and a new monthly rate of $100 for widows with dependents having incomes of less than $500 annually are also provided by this section.

Section 4. This section removes the requirement that a veteran who has attained the age of sixty-five must have a 10% disability and that his unemployability be attributable thereto. These veterans would, of course, continue to be required to meet the service, income and discharge requirements of existing law.

Section 5. This section clarifies and liberalizes the criteria for entitlement to the additional $35 monthly pension for veterans who are permanently housebound.

Section 6. This section provides that none of a spouse's income, in the case of a spouse who is sixty-two years of age or older, shall be counted as the veteran's income for pension purposes. Under existing law, a spouse's earned income or $1,200, whichever is greater, is not counted for pension purposes, irrespective of the age of the spouse.

Section 7. This section will permit veterans who are entitled to special monthly compensation for the service connected loss of a limb or certain other disabilities and who are also entitled to non-service connected pension benefits to receive the pension concurrently with the special monthly compensation.

Section 8. Under existing law, veterans with less than ninety days of wartime service are entitled to pension only if they are separated for service connected disability. The Veterans' Administration has held that service connection established by certain legal presumptions in such cases is not sufficient to establish entitlement to pension. This section will clarify the language so that service connection established by the "presumption of soundness at enlistment" doctrine as set forth in Section 311 of Title 38, United States Code, shall be sufficient to meet the service connected disability requirement for entitlement to pension in cases of less than ninety days service.

Section 9. This is the effective dates section and provides that Sections 2 and 6 shall be effective January 1, 1967, while all other sections are effective on the first day of the third calendar month after date of enactment.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 1 week now, this country has been in the throes of a major economic crisis as a result of the strike against the major airlines by the machinists union. The estimated revenue loss as a result of this strike runs to something like $7 million a day—a total close to $70 million so far. And there seems little immediate hope for an early settlement.

Many of us in the Congress have already experienced the frustrating inconvenience of being unable to make travel arrangements by air in trying to get back to the Nation's Capital following our recent summer recess. But inconvenience is the very least of the headaches that are piling up as a result of the airline strike.

Some 106,450 workers have stood idle since the strike began. And on July 14, some 58,100 idle workers went off the payroll as a direct result of the work stoppage.

These are grim statistics indeed, especially at a time when this Nation is undergoing critical economic stresses from other sources.

We have listened to a lot of urgent talk from the present administration about maintaining a calm, rational attitude toward the pressures that have been building for over a year as a result of the Vietnam war. We have heard a lot of talk about wage-price guidelines and, in fact, we have seen swift and forthright action taken to bring a settlement to the recent labor difficulties in the steel industry.

It seems to me the same sort of firmness and vigor is demanded now to bring the airline strike to an end. The consequences for failing to act are too great for anything less than an all-out effort by the administration to get this vital cog in our Nation's transportation system moving again.

Some 4,100 separate flights are canceled each day the strike persists. This is forcing an average of 150,000 passengers each day onto the facilities of other carrier systems—systems adequate for their own carefully calculated market, but perhaps not equipped for the efficient handling of the sudden influx of new and often urgent business.

As a result of the tieup, 735 jet and piston engined aircraft have been grounded, cutting off service to 231 American cities and 23 foreign countries.

We can ill afford the losses and the chaos which this strike is bringing to this country's transportation and communications networks. I cannot urge more strongly that the President exploit every possible avenue of solution—that he demand, if necessary, a settlement of this most costly dispute. It is critically important and, in my judgment, should have a No. 1 priority among the domestic problems currently facing this Nation.

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S FIRST YEAR AT U.N.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the headline "Goldberg Rounding Out First Year at U.N.," the Washington Post of this morning carries an article by Louis B. Fleming, correspondent of the Los Angeles Times, at the United Nations, that gives high praise to the permanent Ambassador of the United States at the United Nations, and concludes with this observation:

> Foreign diplomats here think the United States is now served as well, and probably better, than at any time in its 21 years at the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, with pride in the accomplishments of one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. Justice Goldberg, under whose magnetic leadership I was privileged to serve as a delegate to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations, and by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the article by Louis B. Fleming in the Washington Post of July 18, 1966, as follows:

GOLDBERG ROUNDING OUT FIRST YEAR AT U.N.

(By Louis B. Fleming)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., July 17.—Arthur J. Goldberg will complete his first year as U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations Wednesday with a record of remarkable accomplishment and a feeling of almost overwhelming disappointment.

He has restored the power that Henry Cabot Lodge brought to the post and gone beyond anything that any other American representative has accomplished in a single year here for the last 21 years.

And yet he has failed so far in the peace mission that probably was the principal factor in his decision to leave the Supreme Court and enter diplomacy; He has not found a way out of Vietnam.

The anniversary will find Goldberg in Geneva, trying to negotiate a treaty on the peaceful exploration of the moon and space with the Soviet Union. His personal participation in those negotiations is typical of the direct involvement he has brought to the U.N. job. It also is a measure of his eagerness to accomplish something in international detente beyond the immediate circle of the U.N. routine.

Goldberg has found the job more difficult and probably less influential than he had expected. His successes in the work of the United Nations have not compensated, in his own thinking, for his failure to influence a peaceful solution in Vietnam. There may even be a suspicion of disappointment that his views may not be have prevailed in the White House on this problem.

This has not, however, discouraged Goldberg. He has no intention of quitting. He has no plans at this time except to continue to work as Ambassador here. He disavows political ambition and apparently has no interest whatsoever in being secretary of state. He already is working on ways to improve his performance in the second year as Ambassador.

Goldberg has played the key role in four major developments:

He persuaded the United States to change its policy toward Rhodesia, accepting the usefulness of economic sanctions and then accepting for the first time the preventive use of force under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter. The implications of these policy changes as precedents for the future action against South Africa are awesome.

He reorganized and returned the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to a new level of efficiency. More important, he has become the first really fulltime American Ambassador at the United Nations, less diverted than his predecessors by other obligations and interests.

He masterminded the delicate Security Council negotiations which led to a ceasefire between India and Pakistan in September. The crisis, his first experience on the Council, was historic in terms of the regrouping of the United States with the Soviet Union in a politically defensive action against troublemaking by Communist China.

He preserved American participation in the United Nations through the crushing defeat in the fight over Article 19 of the Charter. It was not his idea to drop the fight to force France and the Communists to pay their assessments. He inherited the decision but agreed with it and was effective in explaining it both to Congress and the American people—effective enough, anyway, so that neither appropriations nor public opinion polls reflected any backlash.

Goldberg has achieved all this with humorless hard work, a sincerity so simple that it arouses suspicions, and a directness of speech that falls flat following the oratory of Adlai Stevenson.

From time to time he has stumbled.

In the last Assembly he sought to amend a declaration on racial discrimination to prohibit anti-Semitism. The move was aimed at the Soviet Union, but it produced a bitter reaction from the Arabs who saw in the strategy confirmation to their fears of Goldberg as a Zionist. The amendment was withdrawn.

In his determination to be involved in all activities of the last Assembly, and to speak in all committees, he was not always helpful. One diplomat commented: "It took the regular American representative in our committee a week to repair the damage done by Goldberg's appearance."

Goldberg's deep concern with Vietnam may have been responsible for the major disaster of the year, the decision at the end of January to bring Vietnam before the Security Council.

The decision was taken against the advice of just about everyone from Secretary General U Thant on down. It was a fruitless exercise, and Goldberg's protests to the contrary did not raise his credibility with the press. At best, it was a misuse of the highest U.N. body for domestic political effect. Criticism was sharpened by the fact that the Council move came simultaneously with the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam.

There is evidence that Goldberg has improved relations between Washington and Thant.

Goldberg is a great believer in the benefits of face-to-face consultation. He has been seeking, for example, to win approval from Africans and Portuguese officials for resumption of direct talks about the future of the Portuguese territories in Africa.

His faith in this kind of negotiation, encouraged by his success in the India-Pakistan negotiations, suggested to some observers that Goldberg is less the intellectual theoretician than some presumed and is more of a pragmatic activist.

In one of his rare philosophical speeches in the last year, he argued before an audience of lawyers for a pragmatic interpretation of the U.N. Charter that would support unilateral intervention, and he specifically referred to American action not only in Vietnam but in the Dominican Republic.

In all of these matters, there has been some perplexity among observers as to how much of the action was Arthur Goldberg, the liberal jurist, and how much was Arthur Goldberg, the obedient and instructed diplomat.

If he has felt a conflict of conscience in carrying out some of his duties, he has given no outward sign.

Foreign diplomats here think the United States is now served as well, and probably better, than at any time in its 21 years at the United Nations. They know that one year is just a beginning, but they regard it as a good beginning.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE RULING AGAINST LIBERIA AND ETHIOPIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have to report that the International Court of Justice has ruled against Liberia and Ethiopia in the matter of South Africa's treatment of South West Africa. The decision of the court comes as a surprise and, I think, to many of us, as a disappointment. But, Mr. Speaker, the United States is committed to the rule of law. Ambassador Stevenson said on a number of occasions, and Ambassador Goldberg has made the same assertion, that no matter how the International Court of Justice might rule on any question, it would have the complete respect and the complete support of the United States of America.

I am informed, and I trust my information is correct, although it is a little bit difficult to understand, that in this case the decision comprises 1,000 pages. I am inclined to think that maybe there is a bit of an error. That may be the size of the record. Anyway, it is a long decision, and until we have read the decision and have considered it thoroughly, I do not think that anyone speaking for the Congress or for the U.S. Government should criticize the International Court of Justice.

Next week the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am the chairman, will hold perhaps its concluding sessions on the matter of apartheid in South Africa. At that time, we hope to have with us as a witness Mr. Ernest Gross, who represented Liberia and Ethiopia in the court case before the International Court of Justice. We are sure Mr. Gross will be with us and will give us a firsthand recital of what he has in mind.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we hope to have with us—I am pretty sure we will—as one of our concluding witnesses the great statesman from New York, Senator KENNEDY, who recently returned from South Africa.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may be permitted to include portions of House Report 1652 and other pertinent material during debate tomorrow on H.R. 15941.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE TRAGEDY OF SPAIN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, on July 18, 1936, Gen. Francisco Franco launched a military uprising which led to the bitter civil war and to the fall of the second Spanish Republic in the spring of 1939.

There are few lessons that are unambiguous in the Spanish Civil War. But the results are clear: General Franco won, and Spain and the whole Spanish people lost. Spain, on the eve of the civil war, was already torn by numerous opposing factions; and 2½ years of cruel civil strife—civil strife accompanied by foreign intervention—left scars that have not yet healed today.

Order, stability, and 27 years of peace are the boasts of Franco's regime. But what a price has been paid for them. Order and peace have been bought by cruel repression. A people exhausted by the civil war has not been allowed to refind its native vitality and genius for fear that progress and movement would undermine the status quo. In reality, order and peace have meant immobility. While the rest of Western Europe has undergone vast social and economic change since World War II, Spain has moved so little that it has seemed to stand still. The fetters of a dictatorship have assured relative tranquillity. But this tranquillity has been that of a backwater.

Political stability too is a boast of the regime. But what kind of stability? Stability that reposes on the life of one man, stability that is maintained by the perpetuation of the status quo, stability that is uncertain in the future. For it is questionable that after the Franco regime there will be a smooth transition to another regime. It would appear that Franco has deliberately prevented the emergence of any viable alternatives to his regime in order to maintain himself in power.

Sometime this year, a new organic law of the state will be offered to the people of Spain for their approval or rejection. Supposedly, this organic law will make some provision for a regime to succeed Franco when the Caudillo passes from the scene. But such a law, imposed from above, offers no guarantees for the future. As long as no organized opposition is permitted in Spain, the political future of Spain will remain a question mark.

Mr. Speaker, Spain is out of harmony with the Western Europe of today. While Greece and Turkey have been able to work out association agreements with the more advanced countries of the European Common Market, Spain has seen her application for association rejected. It is not so much bitter memories of the past that have motivated this rejection. It is rather a realistic appraisal that, as long as the present political system prevails in Spain, the country will be so out of step with the rest of Western Europe that no institutional bonds with that Europe will be meaningful or mutually rewarding.

The price of order and stability may be summed up, therefore, as relative social and economic immobility, an uncertain political future, and semi-isolation from the rest of Europe.

Some will say, of course, that this assessment is out of date. They will point to the new press law of April 1966 and the government's toleration of purely "economic" strikes as evidence of increasing liberalization. They will point to growing industrialization and an ambitious plan for economic development as evidence of movement in Spain's economy and society. They will point to the hundreds of thousands of Spaniards working abroad, to the more than 15 million tourists visiting Spain annually, to Spain's membership in the OECD, and to Spain's agreements for military cooperation with the United States as evidence that Spain is emerging from isolation and entering a period of profound change.

Above all, they will point to the emergence of a new generation in Spain, a generation that has no memories of the Civil War, a generation impatient for modernization, a generation representing perhaps as much as 60 percent of the population. But before we reach any conclusions about just how far Spain has progressed on the road to political liberalization, let us see how this younger generation has been treated by the regime.

For over 2 years, there has been unrest among the students of Spain who have chafed at restrictions on freedom of expression and on freedom to organize in student unions under freely chosen leaders. This unrest has been matched by unrest among the younger Catholic clergy, who have sympathized not only with the complaints of the students but also with the struggle by Spanish workers for better living conditions, and with moves in the provinces for more autonomy. Student and clerical unrest reached new heights this spring. And in reacting to this unrest, the regime showed its state of progress.

Student demonstrations and meetings were brutally repressed by the police. A March 1966 gathering of students, priests, and intellectuals at a Capuchin monastery in Barcelona ended in arrests and violence after a 2-day siege by the police. A May 1966 peaceful and silent demonstration by over a hundred priests and monks of Barcelona, who were protesting the conditions of detainment of students, was broken up by police wielding truncheons in an unprecedented display of brutality. The press felt sufficiently free under the new press law to report only that a gathering of priests had been "dispersed" and not to mention how they were dispersed. The University of Barcelona has been closed as a result of demonstrations. Professors at the Universities of Madrid and Barcelona who have expressed their sympathy with the students have been suspended from their positions.

Mr. Alastair Reid, in a "Letter from Spain" appearing a year ago in a July 1965 issue of the New Yorker, wrote as follows on trends in Spain:

> Spain's liberalization is illusion rather than reality, promise rather than performance; Spaniards are tasting a semi-freedom in which they are less likely than before to suffer *personal* persecution but in which they are as far as ever from a revision of the whole clumsy structure of their society.

In today's New York Times Tad Szluc sums up the 30 years of the Franco regime and analyzes the crossroads at which he finds Spain. He points out that the Generalissimo holds the key to Spain's future. There are increasing signs, he writes:

> The aging Generalissimo—contrary to the earlier hopes of many Spaniards—is not planning to encourage the advent of a liberal democracy in Spain.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary, which marks a tragedy for the Spanish people, let us encourage those in Spain who cherish freedom and democracy. Let us hope that in the years to come there will be a meaningful change and a true liberalization of Spanish institutions. The efforts of the Spanish people in this direction deserve the support and sympathy of the people and Government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the New York Times article by Tad Szulc which deserves a careful reading as we contemplate the past and future of Spain.

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1966]

Thirty Years Later: An Old Franco and a New Spain

(By Tad Szulc)

Madrid, July 17.—The Spanish Civil War exploded 30 years ago tomorrow. Now, after the three years of warring that cost 500,000 to a million dead and after "27 years of peace" under a dictatorship, Spain again stands at a crossroads.

Not only is Generalissimo Francisco Franco Bahamonde approaching his 74th birthday but also a whole new generation of Spaniards with a new outlook, new ideas and new needs has come to the fore.

The pressures for changes are therefore mounting. The problem of the succession from General Franco to a new leadership is the dominant Spanish theme. The crucial question is what sort of future will be allowed to emerge.

Both legally and politically, the Generalissimo holds the power to determine Spain's future. His recent activities leave no doubt that he fully tends to exercise it.

Always the political lone wolf, General Franco has kept the nation guessing as to what he has in store for his 32 million fellow citizens. But, increasingly, signs from his El Pardo Palace are that the aging Generalissimo—contrary to the earlier hopes of many Spaniards—is not planning to encourage the advent of a liberal democracy in Spain.

Current plans seem to provide for the perpetuation in a streamlined form of the highly authoritarian system. Under this system the regime-controlled labor unions are balanced with favored sectors of economic free enterprise and both are made to operate under considerable state controls.

The streamlining being engineered under the Franco stewardship includes a freer but not completely free press, tolerance of labor strikes and a commitment to a constitutional readjustment. The constitutional change would separate the powers of chief of state from those of chief of government, both now held by General Franco, and would provide for a more representative parliament.

Because the 1947 succession law, approved by a referendum, establishes Spain as a kingdom, General Franco is likely to propose a royal-blood successor to serve as King and chief of state or a commoner to exercise a prolonged regency.

If General Franco died without a clear political testament, the likelihood is that the Franco power structure would still attempt to put forth a candidate who would represent a Francoist "continuism," the current expression here.

It appears unlikely at this stage that the Generalissimo would allow the kind of liberal monarchy that, for example, might be brought, to Spain by the exiled pretender, Don Juan de Borbon y Battenberg.

A question now facing Spain—and presumably General Franco—is whether a solution based on continuism imposed from the top could thrive in the long run amid the rising pressures from the new generation and from the spreading economic prosperity. A radical political movement could then emerge as a threat to Spanish stability.

The Spanish Civil War, because of its tremendous emotional impact, is still strongly alive in the memories of many Europeans. So domestic policies tending to deflect Spain's progress toward democracy might raise new obstacles along her road toward membership in such organizations as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the Common Market.

Essentially, the rising political contest is between the stubborn "immobilism"—another current word here—of the official establishment and the desire for meaningful change on the part of the younger generation and the middle-aged liberals.

The Franco establishment made a major concession to Spanish liberalism last April when, after a three-year inner struggle. it proclaimed a new press law abolishing direct censorship.

The law does not offer full press freedom because the regime retains extensive powers of seizure and judicial proceedings. But the law has already revised a long-dormant political process. For the first time since July 18, 1936, when General Franco issued the order beginning the civil war against the Spanish Republic, the political future of Spain is being openly debated. The discussion includes choice between a monarchy or a republic.

Newspapers, cautiously at first but increasing openly, are conveying the nationwide impatience with the Government's immobilism. Since General Franco expressed in Barcelona this month some strong hints of favoring a policy of continuism, editorials have appeared warning against decisions imposed on a nation that had not been consulted.

Whether General Franco intended it this way or was caught by surprise by the vigor of the Spanish political forces released by the press law, the fact remains that a dialogue about the future is already in progress.

There is no seriously organized political opposition to the Franco regime. This is because those opposing the present state of affairs—Socialists, Christian Democrats and unaffiliated liberals—have been more concerned with efforts to prepare themselves and Spain for the post-Franco period.

Their reasoning is that a successor to General Franco is evidently only a matter of time, so the risks of actively conspiring against a lame-duck regime hardly seem worth the effort.

The few anti-regime activities of recent years, and especially this summer, were intended to force the Spanish establishment to quicken the pace of liberalization rather than to seek abrupt political change.

Students have fought for free unions in their universities. Workers have agitated for trade-union freedom.

Liberal Roman Catholic priests have risen against the conservatism of the church hierarchy and in favor of rapid adoption of the liberal tenets of the Vatican Ecumenical Council. But all this ferment can be easily absorbed by Spain without threatening the jealously guarded national stability.

But should immobilism and continuism—the twin specters for Spanish liberals—really set in, the ferment might spill into the political area and provide the fuel for a meaningful movement of opposition to the Franco regime. Among those likely to profit from such a turn of events would be the Communists. They do not now represent a sizable force in Spain.

General Franco, a seemingly mellowed elder statesman, does not evoke animosity among most Spaniards, even those who can hardly wait for him to depart. The memories of the cruel Civil War are being erased by time. But even the new breed of Falangists—young members of the regime's official political party—demand changes and an emphasis on social justice.

The key fact about Spain is that she is becoming a modern European nation. The consensus here is that the post-Franco political system must adjust to this new reality.

THE UNIQUE POSITION OF FEDERAL JUDGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matrimonial news of the past weekend should make all of us pause for thought about the unique position of Federal judges, especially those who sit on the Supreme Court. As its name implies, the High Court is the very apex of our judicial system. It is the Court of last resort, the final determination in cases which involve broad questions of morals and custom—even the institution of marriage and family relationship.

The Court is at the very top of the governmental branch wherein authority is vested to perform marriage ceremonies which routinely invoke the lifetime character of the vows. In a sense, the Court is the referee and arbiter of our most critical ethical standards. Because of this position of unparalleled preeminence and importance, the Court—both collectively and as individuals—has a duty to the American people which goes beyond rendering decisions on cases.

Its members must maintain a standard of personal conduct in keeping with their office. Everyone should be able to look up to the Justices of the Supreme Court as good examples of the morals and habits their decisions often influence.

The news of the fourth marriage of Justice William O. Douglas, following by less than a month the divorce of his third wife, brings this matter into sharp focus. Divorce and subsequent remarriage in certain circumstances are considered proper and justifiable by a growing circle of people, perhaps a large majority, but Mr. Douglas' matrimonial pace is above the average norm and seems to be accelerating as his age advances.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if Associate Justice Douglas takes so lightly his marriage vows, is there not a likelihood that he will take in a similar light way his vows to uphold the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. FINDLEY. This very deep and searching question is one that could quite naturally come to mind. It is with this problem of personal conduct that I chose to deal in the special order. I welcome the gentleman's comments.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for doing an excellent job of dealing with this matter in this special order today. He deserves the applause of this entire Congress.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Certainly those wishing to strengthen this institution of marriage will hardly find Justice Douglas a good person of reference.

I am sure I speak for many Americans in questioning whether his conduct is measuring up to the high office that he presently occupies.

Happily, Mr. Douglas' conduct is the rare exception on the Federal bench. Indeed, very likely it is the source of some considerable embarrassment to his colleagues. Certainly almost all Justices in history, including the other eight presently on the Court, have set good examples in their personal conduct.

I think we should all say, too, that as a citizen Mr. Douglas has the right to divorce his wife and to remarry the woman of his choice. No one should attempt to deny him that right. He has the right to the pursuit of his own happiness, but apparently he does not see that this right, pursued to excess, conceivably can impair his performance in a Government which seeks an even broader "pursuit of happiness."

In my boyhood the romance of King Edward of England with an American divorcee was very much in the news. The British view of divorce, in royal circles at least, was such that the King had to choose between the woman and the throne, even though he himself would not be personally involved in divorce. It was the other party involved in divorce. And in fairness we should also recall that most of the world applauded when the King renounced his throne in order to marry "the woman I love."

Like the King, Justice Douglas occupies a position of national importance. Otherwise the circumstances are hardly parallel. Justice Douglas enjoys an independence of custom and convention denied even to the King of England. He is able to continue his extraordinary schedule of divorce and remarriage without putting in the slightest jeopardy his high and well-paid position.

Under present circumstances the Congress and the President are powerless to restrain him. If the Court itself has any way to discipline or even censure its own Justices, this means has escaped my notice.

Under present law, Justices can be touched only by impeachment. This cumbersome, seldom-used procedure requires an indictment for—and I am quoting from the Constitution—"treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

Assuming "good behavior," a term that is set forth in the Constitution in regard to the term of office for judges and justices—assuming "good behavior,"—they hold office for life. But the Congresses have never seen fit to amplify this term "good behavior," and for all practical purposes the judges and justices of the Federal bench are completely impervious to adverse public opinion, no matter how thoroughly and justifiably it may be aroused.

In my view, Justice Douglas' personal life points up a weakness in our judicial system. A means should be established under which the justices can be removed from the bench without the necessity of finding them guilty of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I believe we should discuss the Constitution and the legal problem the gentleman has raised; that is, whether the Congress or the people are powerless to take any action in the case the gentleman has outlined.

I wish to point out that the right of impeachment rests entirely with the U.S. Senate. As the gentleman well knows, article I, section 2, has a provision that the Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.

I would further like to point out that section 4 of article II of the Constitution also provides, as the gentleman has so well stated, that "the President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

I would further like to point out to the gentleman from Illinois that article III of the Constitution, section 1, says:

> The judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

I would further like to point out that as a result of these provisions; that is, at least article III, that the first time this was directed to the attention of the people was in the impeachment of Chief Justice Chase wherein they took the position that they had to commit these crimes as outlined in this provision of the Constitution. However, in later action taken by the Congress of the United States, I believe in 1913, they took the position in the case of the impeachment of a judge.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is that the Pickering case?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. That is the first case in 1913. Justice Archibald of the commerce court was removed from office by the impeachment process and disqualified to hold and enjoy any office of honor, profit, or trust under the Constitution for soliciting for himself and friends valuable favors from railroad companies some of which were at the time litigants in his court, although—and here is the point—although it was conceded that in so doing he had not committed any indictable offense.

Furthermore, in 1936 Judge Ritter of the Florida District Court was similarly removed for conduct in relation to a receivership case which invoked serious doubts as to his integrity, although on the specific charges against him he was acquitted.

I may say in connection with that case that he was charged with various crimes and then they had a shotgun charge at the end which just said that he was disqualified to told the office. While the Senate acquitted him on every charge except the last one, they convicted him on it and it stood. That means, according to my understanding of it, if any member of the court or of the judiciary is subjected to so-called, should I say, as we outlined here, so-called good behavior procedures, that is to say, it is not necessary that he commit a misdemeanor or a crime in order for an impeachment to be filed against him.

And, if the Senate should sustain it, then he could be impeached without the article that you have outlined, the judge being indictable.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I am aware, generally, of the citations and language to which he has referred. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the impeachment process, as he has outlined it to us, is indeed a cumbersome one and one that is little used?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well——

Mr. FINDLEY. And one suggestion that I had hoped to make here today is that there should be a process less cumbersome and perhaps devoid of the onus of treason and high crimes which necessarily is carried with impeachment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out that under title 28, section 372, there is a method of removing the judges upon a certificate, usually, because of disability or during a failure in office, wherein it is stated essentially that any judge to hold office during good behavior who becomes permanently disabled from performing his duties may retire, and it provides a method whereby this is carried out.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is optional on the part of judges, though; is it not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. I do not believe Justice Douglas is about to take that option, insofar as I can tell.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, here is a further situation. May I say as to a district judge or a judge of the circuit court of appeals or judges of claims, customs and patent, and so forth, there is a provision that when a judge of the United States is appointed to hold office during good behavior, then if he becomes disabled or does not perform, then upon a certificate by——

Mr. FINDLEY. This would presume either physical disability or simply absence from office; would it not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It would. What I am pointing out—and the problem has probably been studied—is that we have authorizations in all instances, except the justices of the Supreme Court, that they may be removed under certain circumstances because of physical disability, when proper certificates are signed by the presiding judge or the judicial council.

Mr. FINDLEY. But nothing similar has been applied to the High Court; am I correct as to the gentleman's comments?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How is that?

Mr. FINDLEY. No such provision has been made for members of the High Court?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No.

Mr. FINDLEY. Well, the gentleman has pointed out another weakness in our judicial system.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would the gentleman suggest that these statutes be amended to provide for his removal, the same as it does for circuit judges or a district judge or the other judges?

Mr. FINDLEY. This is, I believe, a worthy suggestion that should be investigated, and before I complete my statement I will have two other suggestions that I would like to bring to the attention of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified at the gentleman's interest in this question. I feel that it is good that we have full discussion of this matter, especially in view of the matrimonial news of the last weekend.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for taking this time to discuss what I believe is of utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps this makes little difference to the person involved, but in my opinion this particular Justice has not only used bad judgment from a matrimonial standpoint but also in a number of 5-to-4 decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I have checked only a few of them, and there are many more. I would call attention to the case of Wong Sun against United States, dealing with curbs on police power which was decided on January 14, 1963, by a 5-to-4 vote.

This case increased the requirements of "probable cause" for arresting criminal suspects.

Then there is the famous case of Escobedo against Illinois which was decided June 22, 1964.

This was the first case which required the furnishing of counsel to a suspect outside of the courtroom. Thus, whenever an individual is arrested as a suspect, upon request, he is entitled to counsel.

Then there is the most recent case where Justice Douglas who professes to be a great liberal and always votes with the liberal wing of the Court, was with the majority. This 5-to-4 decision, Miranda against Arizona, was decided June 13, 1966.

This case made a defendant's confession inadmissible as evidence if he had not been provided with counsel at the time the police questioned him.

I might add that this decision is already the subject of controversy because of the infamous case in Chicago last week where eight young nurses were allegedly murdered by one Mr. Speck.

The police, as I understand it, have not even questioned Mr. Speck because of fear the case may be overturned by the Supreme Court.

Another case where Justice Douglas lined up with the 5-to-4 majority was decided just a month ago, the case of the Federal Trade Commission against Dean Foods.

This case gave the FTC the power to go into a Federal court and get injunctive relief for potential Clayton Act violations; notwithstanding the fact that such powers had never been granted by the Congress.

Then finally I would touch very briefly on one case in the field of basic rights.

This involves the case of Swain versus Alabama, decided on March 8, 1965.

In my opinion, this case represents a threat to the fundamental concept of the Anglo-Saxon jury system in that the majority opinion—again a 5-to-4 decision, with Justice Douglas with the 5. In that case the majority opinion was seeking to limit peremptory challenges.

I would also point out that in many other areas including cases involving prayers and scripture reading in schools and reapportionment cases, Justice Douglas is always on the so-called liberal side. He apparently believes in one man, one vote. but one judge, many wives.

I do not suggest that Justice Douglas alone was responsible for each of the decisions mentioned nor that his liberal views explain his many matrimonial ventures. My point is that he occupies a most important position in America and that perhaps a close study of every decision he has participated in would provide some insight about the man and his many marriages. Marriage and divorce are private personal matters, and I would presume this is true regardless of how often, but the gentleman from Illinois has raised the question of the standards of personal conduct which should be maintained by Justices of the highest Court in our land. As often as Douglas changes his mind, it is time such conduct is openly questioned, and I personally feel it is a good time to review all of his past activities as a member of the Court.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kansas is really begging the question because if you are going to impeach one man by joining him with four more, you are going to have to impeach all five of them.

For that reason you should not get the question of his thinking, or his decisions, mixed up with the question that you have advocated here, Because if this is misbehavior on his part, you as a Member of the House of Representatives or I, as a Member of the House of Representatives, have the right and the privilege to prefer charges of misbehavior—not based upon any opinion that he may have written.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. But this charge would have to be brought under the impeachment procedure. Am I not correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right. I think you would have the right if you set forth in your impeachment proceedings not that he has committed any indictable offense; or not that his thinking as it relates to a decision that he may have written or may have participated in, but the question of whether or not this constitutes good behavior for under the Constitution he is entitled to hold office so long as he conducts himself with good behavior.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman may be correct in his interpretation of the Constitution. But I believe there is some question as to what bad conduct might be involved which is not actually punishable by law as a crime.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Here it says he shall hold the office during good behavior. That is what the Constitution says.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yet the charge has to be brought through the impeachment process which does indeed carry with it this onus of treason and high crime.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. My contention is in the two instances, particularly in the Ritter case which is probably the last impeachment case we had, were cases where the Senate found the judge not guilty on every charge except that of incompetence, in connection with good behavior, so to speak.

Mr. FINDLEY. This case that you are citing involves a Federal judge; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, a Federal district judge from Florida who, incidentally, came from Denver before he went to Florida.

The point is if he is guilty of misbehavior under the Constitution you or anybody else who thinks he is guilty of misbehavior has the right to file an impeachment against him and you do not have to allege an indictable offense.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I feel he has made a very good point, but the purpose of my remarks today is to suggest that the Judiciary Committee undertake a study of this problem and perhaps make possible a procedure that seems even more realistic and more explicit than that to which the gentleman has referred. I think he will agree that there is nothing explicit in our statutes setting forth a procedure under which good behavior can be determined other than by the impeachment road.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I would just like to add that I do not wish to deal with the impeachment question, about which the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Illinois have been speaking. It occurs to me, however, that there was some fuzzy thinking involved with reference to decisions in some past cases and that I disagree with the Justice.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The question occurs to me, What is misbehavior? Is it the failure to discharge reasonably the duties of the office? What constitutes misbehavior in its fullest sense? I have in mind the transcript of evidence that laid in the files of the Supreme Court for at least 3 years, a transcript of evidence, revealed only a comparatively short time ago, which was compiled through the efforts of a Federal judge in Oklahoma City before the judges of the 10th circuit, in which this one judge charged two of his colleagues on the bench in this Oklahoma district court with wrongdoing of almost all kinds.

Mr. FINDLEY. What sort of action did he bring, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. The Supreme Court did nothing with the transcript nor with the charges contained therein. I say they gathered dust for more than 3 years in the files of the U.S. Supreme Court. What is their responsibility? I was assured weeks and weeks ago that the Judiciary Committee of the House would conduct an investigation of the allegations made by this judge against his colleagues on the bench in Oklahoma City. What has been done? Exactly nothing has been done. What is the moral responsibility of the Supreme Court of the United States in all its ramifications? I ask the question.

Mr. FINDLEY. To me it is the very highest moral responsibility any citizen of our country could possibly carry.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is correct, or it ought to be, let us say.

Mr. FINDLEY. It ought to be, indeed.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, and then I would like to complete the very brief remaining portion of my statement. Then, indeed, I will welcome further contributions.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman. I believe the gentleman from Iowa was talking about malfeasance or nonfeasance rather than misconduct or misbehavior in my personal opinion. There seems to be considerable difference between the two. We are talking about misbehavior as referred to in the Constitution by the gentleman from Colorado.

If the gentleman would be so gracious as to yield further, I would like to have some indication from the gentleman from Colorado about what misconduct and what misbehavior might actually be in the eyes of the Supreme Court. I personally refer to it as "inferior court" myself. I have no objection to getting rid of another four.

Mr. FINDLEY. Before yielding to the gentleman from Colorado, I would like to complete my statement. Prior to doing so, may I comment that the Constitution does not use the word "misbehavior" but uses the affirmative term "good behavior." Apparently our forefathers expected exceptional, above-average behavior in the way of personal conduct on the part of our Justices and Federal judges. I do not think it is necessary to prove misbehavior. It is indeed necessary only to establish that the person involved is not conducting himself in good behavior.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Could it not be that we are talking about personal indignities?

Mr. FINDLEY. That may indeed be involved.

If I may return to my prepared statement, I should like to conclude and then I shall yield at the conclusion of it.

I wish to make very clear that I recognize the importance of the separation of the judicial branch from the executive and the legislative. It is one of the vital policies of our governmental system. But I do not feel that this separation should be as absolute as present circumstances seem to make it.

In many States judges are chosen by popular vote. Of course, the responsibility to face the electorate at intervals provides an effective restraint upon their personal behavior. Illinois, which once had this system, recently adopted one under which judges are initially chosen by direct vote and then must periodically be either disapproved or approved by the electorate in a general election.

This, too, provides a healthy and desirable restraint on their personal conduct.

No such restraint, so far as I can determine—at least of a comparable level—exists in the Federal judiciary. If the U.S. electorate had had the opportunity periodically to approve or disapprove Justice Douglas' performance, I am sure he doubtless long ago would have had to choose between the bench and his personal matrimonial desires.

Does anyone believe that Justice Douglas today would be confirmed if his name were presented as a nominee to the U.S. Senate. Or, for that matter, does anyone believe that any President in our history would under present circumstances even nominate Justice Douglas to the High Court?

A periodic referendum on Federal judges is hardly practical in view of the multitude of such judges. But surely some means can be devised to bring the conduct of Federal judges under reasonable restraint and review.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FINDLEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Any new procedure must be put together with great care. I myself would not want to initiate anything to upset our judicial system, in which independence is critically important. Whatever procedure is devised must minimize the possibility of frivolous removal or other forms of abuse of this procedure.

One possibility that occurs to me would be to permit, after proper review—which would be set forth in the statute—the same authority which puts judges on the bench to take them off. Supreme Court Justices and other Federal judges, of course, are appointed by the President with the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. Under this proposal, removal would require the joint concurrence of the President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate.

To my way of thinking, this would reduce the danger of frivolous action to a minimum.

Then another possibility that would reduce it still further would be to require the concurrence of two-thirds of the Membership of the House in addition to that of the Senate and the President.

Either procedure could be accomplished, probably without constitutional amendment, simply by setting forth by statute how the term "good behavior," which is mentioned in the Constitution of the United States in regard to judicial term, should be determined. The mere existence of this special procedure, in my view, would probably provide an adequate restraint on the personal conduct of the judges.

Therefore, I would recommend that the House Judiciary Committee give serious consideration at an early date to this matter.

Justice Douglas could have followed wisely the example of King Edward. If he felt that divorce and immediate remarriage must have the highest priority in his personal life, he could have quit the bench and thus cleared himself and the Court of any just criticism. In failing to do this, he gives the Congress an impelling reason to develop a procedure to unseat Federal judges whose personal conduct does not meet appropriate standards.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the gentleman's suggestion that King Edward's conduct be a precedent. Would the gentleman suggest that example also apply to Governors of States?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that Governors are elected for specific terms of office. Unless I am misinformed about the laws and the constitution of the State of New York, there is ample provision for removal from office of those who do not measure up, and this initiative can be very easily taken. If the gentleman would like to be more specific about this point, I will yield further to him, because perhaps he does have something very definite in mind.

Mr. RYAN. I merely wondered if the gentleman had any advice for the Governor of a certain State.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. I know of no problem at the State level. If a problem has arisen that the gentleman would like to call to my attention, I hope he will do so.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FINDLEY**. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. I believe when I used the word "misconduct" in a former statement I should have said that the Constitution itself provides that he shall hold office during good behavior. The question is, What constitutes "good behavior"?

Mr. **FINDLEY**. That is the question.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. The only way we will ever be able to determine what is "good behavior" is to file an impeachment charge based upon something not being good behavior, and then perhaps the Judiciary Committee could receive the same, to look into it. That is one way to determine it. The House of Representatives and two-thirds of the U.S. Senate would determine whether or not it was "good behavior."

If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to give an answer for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. I hope the gentleman will be brief, because my time is running out.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. In connection with the Oklahoma case, I am sure if the gentleman will look into it he will find that the judge is proceeding in regular order and proceeding with the case as he has in the past.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FINDLEY**. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **GROSS**. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If the Judiciary Committee is proceeding in order, I expect it will be 10 years before they get around to this case.

Mr. **KUPFERMAN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FINDLEY**. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **KUPFERMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Mr. Justice Douglas would exercise more self-restraint, and I have little hope for his future matrimonial status, having done the mathematical progression of marriage 1 for 30 years, marriage 2 for 10 years, marriage 3 for 2½ years, wherefore marriage 4 should be for 6 months.

Nonetheless, I believe that our entire discussion is out of order. Marriage is a private matter and unless we are prepared to say that there is a violation of oath of office or a mental disability, we are going too far afield.

We may not agree with Mr. Justice Douglas' opinions, but it has no application to his marital status.

I believe the gentleman from Illinois has proceeded with self-restraint, but I do believe our whole discussion has been out of order. We may not agree with Mr. Justice Douglas' opinions, but that has no relationship to his marital status.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Is the gentleman suggesting that I am out of order in making these comments?

Mr. **KUPFERMAN**. I believe the gentleman's statements have proceeded with restraint, considering the circumstances.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. I appreciate that comment.

Mr. **KUPFERMAN**. I just feel that Mr. Justice Douglas' opinions ought not to be the occasion for our questioning his marital status. I am inclined to believe that if his opinions were otherwise his status as a married man might not have been raised.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. In the case of an ordinary citizen perhaps the gentleman would have a valid point. Now we are discussing the personal life—and indeed it is the personal life—of a man who is one of nine select people who sit at the very apex of our judicial system and because of the office he holds I feel that his personal conduct is very much the public business.

PELLY OPPOSES CANYON DAM PLAN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, before commencing my prepared remarks I should like to say I consider it a very fortunate circumstance, if not by my own design, that the present occupant of the chair is a captive audience, because I am about to express my views as to the Grand Canyon dam plan. I am sure that during the remarks I have prepared the gentleman will find considerable in the way of facts which will interest him, and I have no doubt many with which he will disagree.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams in the Grand Canyon is not a simple case of water needs for people on the one hand, as against preservation of canyon scenery on the other. It is a more complicated issue than water against scenery. Rather, it is a matter of determining what best satisfies the overall water needs of the entire West. In its attempt to solve the problem, Congress must not forget that it is water which is needed in the Southwest, not electric power; nor the cash register sources of income which hydroelectric dams become. The need is for water, and no one, I am sure, wants to deny the Southwest the water which it needs and which it is entitled to under existing law.

But the proposal offered under H.R. 4671 and suggested solutions are completely inadequate to deal with the problem. The proposed dams would neither be able to provide the expected income to finance the central Arizona project, nor would they increase the Southwest's water resources. As to such profits, I am assured their economic feasibility is overstated, and instead the power would be a losing proposition while as reclamation projects there would be a great waste of water. Moreover these dams are neither a necessary nor an efficient solution to the water problem which properly should concern us all. The dams' proponents say that if they are not constructed the Southwest will suffer a grave drought. This is not the case at all.

Mr. Speaker, I will discuss alternatives to additional hydroelectric plants on the Colorado River, but the first question should be raised as to what purpose Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams are expected to serve. Title I of the bill says the Colorado River Basin project is designed to furnish water to the Southwest. The generation of any electric power is incidental to this purpose.

The issue is not whether the water is needed, but rather whether the construction of additional dams will provide it, and of course, the answer is "No."

And speaking of providing water the reservoirs behind the existing Hoover Dam and Glen Canyon Dam already evaporate enough water to supply the needs of a city the size of Phoenix. The new dams would suffer similar evaporation. Furthermore, seepage into the porous limestone and sandstone walls of the canyon at the damsites would result in much additional loss of water.

But, even if there were no wasted water and diminished plant capacity, there would still not be enough water in the Colorado to keep both the new and existing plants in operation. As I understand it, Hoover and Glen Canyon Dams today are unable to generate the power loads or operate at capacity because of an insufficient water supply. Furthermore, the river's flow over the past 50 years has been sufficient to fulfill our 1927 treaty arrangements with Mexico, on the average of only 1 out of every 4 years.

If the dams, then, are not expected to provide water, but to generate power, which will in turn be sold to finance the central Arizona project, where will the water come from to operate the turbines? And will the dams produce the projected profits?

The answer to the first question is that the water of the Columbia River is already earmarked by the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of Arizona for diversion to irrigate land in the Southwest; and the answer to the second question is that assuming this Columbia River water was used to run the generators, the power produced would not be competitive enough to justify the sacrifice of the Grand Canyon and the expenditure of $1.3 billion to produce it.

The Southwest needs water; with that I am in agreement. But what of the future needs of the Columbia Basin States; for title II of this bill anticipates the diversion project even before feasibility studies have been authorized. In other words, before the Columbia River water is diverted to the Southwest, the people of the Pacific Northwest have a right to know the effects of a reduced flow upon the three powerplants of the lower Columbia, upon their salmon runs and upon navigation. The citizens of the Northwest rightly want to know the effect on current use of the river, as well as on estimated future needs for Columbia water in their own States. The current, wide-ranging controversy over water rights points up the need for studies such as those which would be authorized by S.

3034 as passed by the Senate, to insure the most productive use of the Nation's water resources, and where and how they are most needed.

To answer the claims of those advocates of the proposed Grand Canyon dams who are impatient of such studies, and who cannot see beyond the immediate needs of this year, let me discuss in more detail the more important of the dam's twofold purposes; let us examine the expected revenue from the sale of power the dams are supposed to generate, assuming the water is there to generate it.

The Bureau of Reclamation refers to its dams as "cash registers," and it has already earmarked their revenue for financing of the importation project. But let me point out a clear discrepancy in the purposes of the dams as set forth in the bill, and as stated by the Bureau. Are they power sources, or water sources? The Bureau expects them to be power sources. However, will the dams in fact produce enough income to pay for their own construction, and that of the central Arizona project as well?

Judging from the payout performance of already existing dams, the answer is "No." In 1947, Bridge Canyon Dam was expected to cost $146.5 million. Now it is estimated at $511 million, as of 1960, and the central Arizona project is expected to run to $500 million. In addition, of course, any delay met in filling the Bridge Canyon Reservoir would mean a reduction in power revenue, and an increase in interest charges, to be added to the total construction costs. Even overlooking the increased cost factor due to continuing inflation, objective engineers say it would be quite unrealistic to expect power sales to supply this much money.

Hydroelectric power has its advantages in parts of the country where construction is near the production site, and expensive transmission facilities need not be built.

However, sale of Glen and Marble power is expected to be to the Los Angeles area, a distance of 500 miles. Meanwhile, the National Parks Association says that if for a 50-year average the cost of electric power were to fall below 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour, it would be more economical to buy power than to construct new dams and enter into competition on the existing market.

Just recently the Tennessee Valley Authority announced construction of a nuclear powerplant at Brown's Ferry, Ala., which will sell its power for 2.37 mills. With advancing nuclear technology and an expanding market for electric power, this figure is expected to decrease due to a decline in fuel costs anticipated in the 1970's.

The most liberal estimate for the cost of Bridge and Marble power is 2.3 mills per kilowatt-hour, with most experts placing it closer to 4 mills. Looking at the history of other hydroelectric plants, notably Glen Canyon, 55 miles upstream from the Marble Canyon site, experience shows that hydroelectric power costs do not decline even after the initial investment is paid out, and I am told that we may expect hydroelectric power rates to remain constant, while on the other hand, nuclear costs as I said would decline.

An alternative to nuclear power is a coal plant such as the one operated by the Arizona Public Service at the junction where the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah meet, which, with the completion in 1969 of an additional plant being built at Four Corners by a cooperative of 10 electric utilities of the Southwest, is expected to sell its power for 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. This site is 200 miles from the controversial sites under construction.

If the margin is this close, what is it that causes the Bureau of Reclamation to state its case with such urgency? If the difference is so small, why is not more attention and time being spent on the study of alternatives? With the invasion and sacrifice of one of our most majestic and unique national parks imminent, there is too much at stake to be content or satisfied with a limited solution such as offered by the construction of 2, or for that matter, 20, hydroelectric plants.

The Bureau of Reclamation began by saying the central Arizona project was impossible without these dams. At the May hearings before the subcommittee, Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, reduced this claim to an admission that the project was theoretically feasible without Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended a deferral of Bridge Canyon Dam, pending further study of its feasibility under the auspices of the National Water Commission.

The Bureau of Reclamation's chief argument for the necessity of hydroelectric power is based on its fulfillment of peaking capacity requirements. That is, hydroelectric power can be used to rapidly meet the needs of peak periods of consumption, while fuel plants provide a more economical baseload.

On the other hand, in Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia, fuel plants are used for peaking power, and in this regard, transmission lines from already existing hydroelectric plants could be constructed more economically in order to furnish the additional requirements for peaking power, with on-site construction of coal-fired or nuclear baseload plants, thus making expensive transmission lines from distant hydroelectric baseload plants unnecessary. Peaking power does not have to be provided solely by the construction of additional hydroelectric plants.

As to the sale of hydroelectric power to produce revenue, the Bureau's expectation that it will make the central Arizona project a self-sufficient concern financed by the sale of noncompetitive power strikes me as wishful thinking. In fact to me it would be preferable to admit the need of directly subsidizing the project than to pretend it can be independently financed. But in any event, it would be more practical to think in terms of solving the problem with new, long-range alternatives.

In considering the solution which the Bureau of Reclamation offers to us to meet the Southwest's water needs, should the Congress permit the sacrifice of the Grand Canyon? After all, this would be a temporary, stopgap answer to a problem which ranges into the 21st century. Indeed if dams on all the rivers in all the States were built, and if we violated all of our national parks, the problem would still be with us. The time is now, to meet those needs with long-ranging solutions which utilize the technological and economic advances of the 20th century and which conserve the precious few areas of natural, unspoiled country which remain to us. Mr. Speaker, we must not permit the desecration of natural resources, without study, for temporary solutions to problems which confront the Nation. Let us move in an orderly way. Let us enact the Jackson bill, S. 3034, and provide feasibility studies first.

True, the dams would not obliterate the Grand Canyon, as their proponents argue. Man is not capable of building a dam which would flood out the canyon up to the level of the plateau. But it would damage it and despoil it. And once the Grand Canyon is sacrificed, what is to protect the rest of our national parks from such senseless desecration? Future generations will never forgive us if we violate this and other areas of natural beauty and grandeur.

Those of us in opposition will, I am sure, rededicate ourselves in an effort to find new means of solving the water problem, and to find ways which will be more economical, more efficient, and more conserving of the resource of water itself. Meanwhile we would conserve the unique and magnificent natural wonders of the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Speaker, even though proposed damsites are outside the actual park boundaries, the effect upon the park would be the same as if the concrete were poured within the park itself. With Marble Canyon 12 miles above the park, and Bridge Reservoir below, backing up into it for 13 miles, the effects would be the same as though the concrete structures were located within the park boundaries. Do not make any mistake about it. The effect on the park below Marble Gorge would be similar to that below Hoover Dam, where the clear water released by the dam will scour out the channel, picking up all available sediment and depositing it in the first stretch of slack water. This would change the configuration of the channel and the slope of the streambed.

Above the dam, silt and detritus would accumulate in the reservoir, creating a series of mud lakes and silted shallows. Lake Powell Reservoir above Glen Canyon Dam would be duplicated above Bridge Canyon, flooding out the inner gorge, where the oldest geological formations are exposed, flooding all of the national monument, and extending back into the park. Reservoirs such as Lake Powell have no beaches or plant life, and are bordered by the abrupt meeting of lake water and bare rock, a sterile, fluctuating shoreline with mud flats at the ends of the lake.

It is a folly to assume that these dams would not damage the canyon or set a precedent which would end with desecration of other of the Nation's natural wonders and national parks.

The national treasure which we possess in Grand Canyon, caused by a free-flowing river at work on the earth's surface for millions and millions of years, is threatened. It is threatened by an ill-conceived and inadequately considered proposal. Legislation to authorize these projects must be defeated. I repeat, a dam would not supply needed water and indeed is only a clumsy promotion which must not be permitted at any cost.

I strongly urge my colleagues of the Congress to protect and preserve the majesty and uniqueness of this national park and this natural wonder; I urge as well a full and complete study of the water problems of today and tomorrow. Surely, what is needed is proper planning before and not after we have spoiled the Grand Canyon, and at the same time, leaving the needs of the future unmet and unsolved.

Let me emphasize finally that for either of its stated purposes, power production or irrigation, the construction of hydroelectric dams in the Grand Canyon is an unrealistic short-range answer to long-range problems. Let me emphasize further that a lasting solution requires study and far-ranging consideration. To anticipate the water needs of this country for the 21st century requires more than expediency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to defeat H.R. 4671, and instead to study the problem from a realistic economic basis. I urge the Congress to defeat this project which would be outmoded as soon as it was completed. Rather let us preserve this country's unique and magnificent natural wonders for our children and our children's children.

INDEMNIFICATION BONDS FOR CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last February a small Negro contractor in Harlem spoke to me about the difficulty he was having getting construction work. He said that his firm was unable to get jobs because it could not persuade surety companies to provide it with performance or payment bonds. Since most construction contracts require such bonds, the Harlem contractor was unable to get construction work.

During the past few months I have had a series of conversations with representatives of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Small Business Administration, and other Government agencies concerned with small businessmen or with construction work. They all seem to agree that many potentially viable small construction firms are blocked—or discouraged from even entering the business—by the difficulty of getting bonded.

To meet this problem, I have today introduced legislation which would permit the Small Business Administration to indemnify any surety company against losses which might result from the bonding of a construction firm, if such indemnification would "be in furtherance of the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation could have a significant effect in the slums of our cities. Not only would it help small businessmen to build viable construction firms, but it would also help to provide thousands of new jobs for those who live in the slums and ghettoes. At present, as is well known, Negroes and Puerto Ricans in cities like New York have an enormously difficult time getting jobs in the construction industry.

The legislation which I have introduced today is designed to assist precisely those firms which would give jobs to the minority groups which most need them.

I should note, however, that my legislation will not by itself assure that such construction firms will be established, or that people from the urban ghettos will get jobs in construction. As I see it, three major steps are required to achieve these goals.

First, the Government should encourage people from the ghetto to form construction firms; and it should encourage the expansion of firms which already hire people from the most impoverished communities. In part, this program can be carried out by outreach programs for new businessmen carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration in their efforts to encourage the creation of new businesses in impoverished areas. Such programs, of course, would have to be accompanied by management training programs for prospective businessmen, and on-the-job and apprenticeship training programs for prospective construction workers.

Second, institutional and legal obstacles to the success of such firms should be removed. The legislation which I have introduced today is designed to deal with one of the most devastating of these obstacles.

Third, we must find ways to help small and new firms to get construction jobs once they are established and bonded. In part they might be assisted by Government agencies like the Department of Housing and Urban Development in obtaining construction work in the ghetto.

Mr. Speaker, as the Nation begins to recognize that the effort to revitalize city slums is one of the greatest battles in the war against poverty, the role of construction firms will become increasingly important. We can use the process of urban rehabilitation to build new firms, to teach new skills, and to give substance to new hopes.

The best soldiers in the war against poverty can be the poor themselves, if only we give them a chance. By removing bonding as an obstacle to the participation of the poor in the process of urban construction, the legislation which I have introduced today would help to give the poor a chance to help themselves.

LATIN AMERICA CAN BE CHANGED FROM A LAND OF HUNGER TO ONE OF ABUNDANCE: THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK MUST PROVIDE AN ACTION PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, too many of us tend to identify the world food problem with the massive populations of far-off nations in Asia. But hunger, malnutrition, and the threat of famine are not far-off problems. They are problems of our own hemisphere. Latin America has no inherent immunity to starvation. Here in a nutshell is the food situation in Latin America.

The 1961 Charter of Punta del Este establishing the Alliance for Progress, set a target for economic growth of 2.5 percent per person a year. But in fact food production per person, in this 5-year period, has failed to grow at all.

Population in Latin America is increasing at the rate of 3.1 percent per year, the highest regional rate in the whole world. The rate of population growth in some individual countries is over 3.5 percent. With a doubling of its population in sight within about 20 years, Latin American food production is barely maintaining the per capita levels of 10 years ago, and is actually below the pre-World War II level. Latin America will shortly be producing people at a faster rate than it is producing the food to feed them.

The state of Latin America's agriculture and food situation is evident enough from these few statistics. Half of Latin America's people suffer from malnutrition. Total daily intake of individuals is at low levels, and, particularly in rural areas, far below the levels that can provide enough energy to do man's work. To worsen the situation, diets are badly balanced, with inadequate animal proteins. Latin American meat production per capita is only 85 percent of the 1957 level, and per capita milk production is only 2 percent above the 1957 level.

It is small comfort that today's situation in Latin America is not yet at the state of widespread death from starvation, as is India's plight. The nations of Latin America—our hemispheric neighbors and brothers, to whom we have pledged our special concern—are rapidly and inexorably being led toward famine by the failure to meet the agricultural challenge.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN OVEREMPHASIZED

Latin America is a rural society, not an urban one. Eighty percent of the people live on the land, many of them barely subsisting, victims of overt or disguised unemployment and completely withdrawn from any form of market economy. Yet the policies of their governments still give undue emphasis to industrialization, to substitute domestic manufactures for imported ones, even where the imported goods are demonstrably cheaper. This orientation prevails both in the way governments seek foreign assistance for development and in the way the external providers of bilateral and multilateral aid furnish it.

This is a mistaken emphasis. For the foreseeable future, it is the agricultural sector in Latin America that can provide the economic output from which savings can be realized in sufficient volume to finance development. At present, therefore, the failure of agricultural growth to keep pace is acting as a brake on economic growth. Latin America, which should have a food surplus, currently imports $600 million of agricultural products annually from outside the region.

NEEDED: A DEMONSTRATION HEMISPHERE

Since Latin America is our special concern, it is in Latin America that the United States must work most diligently for improvement. The solution is not and can never be the shipment to Latin America of food grown here. Latin America itself must be changed from a land slipping toward famine to a land of abundance, not only meeting its own food needs but making a contribution to the food supplies of the rest of the world and at the same time gaining command of external resources through exports of nonfood agricultural raw materials. Latin America differs from the two other developing continents of Africa and Asia in that it has large unexploited agricultural resources, and in that its population has not reached as dangerous levels.

A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION IS NEEDED

None of this will come about if we and our Latin colleagues confine ourselves to talk and a simple acknowledgement that a problem exists. Nor will it come about if the problem is approached on a piecemeal basis. The undernourishment that exists today and the waste of human resources that that undernourishment implies, demand a comprehensive plan, tied to specific goals.

Work on some of the elements of an overall plan is already going forward. But the work lacks focus. It is spread out among many institutions. The Food and Agriculture Organizations—FAO—the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America—ECLA—the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—the Inter-American Economic and Social Council—IAECOSOC—all of these and more are working on aspects of the problem, but a unifying force is necessary.

I believe the instrument is at hand to weld all these diverse efforts into an integrated and meaningful program for Latin American agriculture. The Inter-American Development Bank, the financial arm of the Alliance for Progress, can and must assume the responsibility for translating the studies and the diverse efforts made to date into a concrete program of action. The Bank can and must assume the responsibility for infusing its Latin member governments with the dynamism and sense of urgency that the foreseeable food crisis in Latin America requires if catastrophe is to be averted.

The membership of the Inter-American Development Bank—IDB—consists of the United States and 19 Latin American Republics. Since its establishment in 1959, the Bank has made loans totaling $1.5 billion for Latin American development. The paid-in and callable subscriptions of members to the Bank's ordinary capital total $1.8 billion, of which the United States has provided $760 million. Nearly $300 million has been borrowed by the Bank in the United States and elsewhere for its ordinary lending operations. The Bank's Fund for Special Operations, which lends on easier repayment terms than its ordinary capital window, has resources of $1.1 billion, of which the United States is providing $900 million. Finally, the Bank has had available to it almost $500 million provided by the United States in the form of the Social Progress Trust Fund, whose resources have now been fully committed.

Clearly, the IDB—modeled after the World Bank—is an institution of appropriate size and standing to take on the leadership of the campaign. I propose that the trends that now threaten the foundations of Latin American society be reversed.

UNITED STATES MUST ASSUME LEADERSHIP ROLE

I do not believe the IDB will assume this role unless the U.S. Government, with 42 percent of the Bank's voting power, helps lead it in that direction. Since it commenced lending in 1961, the Bank has devoted only 21 percent of its loans to agriculture. I regard this as far from an adequate emphasis. Positive steps are necessary to get the Bank's management to "think big" about a problem that is literally a life-or-death matter for its member countries.

BANK MUST ACT TO MEET CRISIS

At the seventh annual meeting of the IDB's Board of Governors in Mexico City last April, which I attended as a member of the U.S. delegation at Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler's invitation, the Governors instructed the Bank's Directors to formulate by October a plan for replenishing the resources of the Fund for Special Operations. Currently, the United States is providing $250 million per year for this fund. The Latin American countries are providing a further $50 million per year in their own currencies. New pledges are required for the period beginning in 1967, and the Directors must present their proposals by October of this year.

U.S. financial participation in any agreed increase will require congressional approval, and legislation will therefore be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee early next year. These circumstances represent a readymade opportunity for effectively impressing on the IDB the vital necessity for it to take up the challenge before it.

Any realistic appraisal of the resources necessary for Latin American development financing through the Fund for Special Operations over the next few years must come to grips with the problem of increasing food production. I call upon the Bank's Directors, therefore, to turn their attention immediately to the problem of assuming leadership among the institutions concerned to formulate as soon as possible a comprehensive operational plan for meeting Latin America's food needs—a plan to which governments would commit themselves, a plan that would establish the goals to be obtained after 10 years of intense effort, a plan with the specific undertakings that are necessary, country-by-country, crop-by-crop, institutional reform by institutional reform.

The main outlines of such a plan should be an integral part of the October report of the IDB Directors, and the process of refining estimates and goals should be pursued vigorously in the months following. A declaration of policy by the Bank is essential to make it clear that projects to insure adequate food supplies for Latin America and the production of exportable surpluses have a priority claim on the new FSO resources. Moreover, the Directors should explicitly contemplate that the level of resources now being recommended will be reviewed further as the financial implications of the details of the plan become clear.

I set no easy task before the Inter-American Development Bank. It will require some immediate additions to its excellent staff. Nothing less is required than a full investigation of the self-assisting actions the Latin countries must undertake, as well as the role that will have to be played by external financing from the United States, other aid donors, and international institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank.

In his address as U.S. Governor to the Mexico City meeting of IDB in April, Secretary Fowler rightly stressed the importance of stepping up Latin America's agricultural output, and suggested that the IDB examine closely the adequacy of its contribution to agriculture generally and food production in particular. I look to him to insure that the report by the IDB Directors to the Governors reflects a new determination by the Bank to spur its members to a massive program of agricultural growth.

THE POPULATION PROBLEM

I am fully prepared to admit that the solution to these problems is infinitely complex. There is, for example, the other half of the food supply equation—the question of population growth.

The President's message on international education and health, of February 2, 1966, urged expanded research in human reproduction, enlarging the training of American and foreign specialists in the population field and assisting family planning programs in nations which request such help. Therein the President stated:

> The growing gap—between food to eat and the mouths to feed—poses one of mankind's greatest challenges. It threatens the dignity of the individual and the sanctity of the family.

I certainly do not urge the imposition of unwanted solutions on peoples, nor would I suggest that we in any way condition the granting of economic aid upon the implementation of birth control programs. But I do not believe that we must assume a completely passive role. Our positive support for such programs and our willingness to aid in their implementation should become an affirmative aspect of our policy in both bilateral and multilateral dealings.

Apart from the population question, Latin America needs to face squarely the multitude of institutional changes that must come about if famine is to be avoided. Here are some of them.

LAND REFORM

A successful land reform program is near the top of the list. In 1846, A. P. Figueiredo, writing on the objectives of agrarian reform in Brazil, stated:

> It is essential that people of slight means be able to obtain lands and cultivate them with the certainty of enjoying the products.

The validity of Figueiredo's message is unchanged. The pace of progress on agrarian reform in Latin America must be accelerated if the job is to be done.

The President's foreign aid message begins with the admonition:

> I recommend a foreign aid program to help those nations who are determined to help themselves.

In my view land reform is a necessary and fundamental indication of a determination to help oneself. Yet as the Latin American Economic and Social Council recently reported, "With the exception of Bolivia, Mexico, and maybe Venezuela, if the process of agrarian reform in Latin America continues at the present rate, it will be indefinitely prolonged."

The Bank can provide vital technical assistance in working out such programs. Financing requirements resulting from agrarian reform programs will have to be taken into account in the overall plan for financing agricultural development. The preparation of model laws for land reform, cooperative marketing organization, rural electrification, rural credit, and the like can serve to provide vital guidance where it is needed.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION FOR AGRICULTURE

Improvement of agricultural knowledge also ranks in the forefront of institutional change. The temperate zone techniques of North America will not apply to the tropical zones in which 18 Latin American countries are located. Building agricultural capital like farm to market roads or rural electrification, will not provide "know-how." Education and research will.

A survey conducted in five Central American States in 1962 revealed that out of 10,546 university students only 187 or 1.7 percent were studying agriculture. Of the Central American students studying in the United States in 1962 only 0.8 of 1 percent were engaged in agricultural studies. When we consider that the Central American region is virtually solely agricultural, we can further appreciate the need of stimulating young men and women to enter the fields of agricultural research and education.

To the extent that educational problems are even more fundamental where literacy itself is a limiting factor, consideration must be given to the development of phonovisual aids for agricultural instructions to working farmers—educational movies, television, radio, and pictorial materials should be developed to reach the campesinos. We do not have the time to wait for the window of literacy to be opened on their sons and daughters.

Every effort must be made to raise the prestige of the agricultural sector. Loans and grants to experimental stations, colleges, universities and secondary schools for agricultural education should receive primary consideration. Extension services must be greatly expanded to bring new grading and fertilizing techniques and information on marketing opportunities to the small and remote producer. I include the availability of credit among the improvements in the institutional framework that must be woven into the pattern of thinking of the small farmer.

INCREASING PRODUCTIVITY BY BETTER SEEDS, FERTILIZER, INSECTICIDES

Physical inputs, too, must accompany the necessary institutional changes. Latin America is at least fortunate in having a substantial reserve of that most fundamental of all physical inputs, arable land. Per acre productivity must be vastly increased through use of improved seeds, pesticides, and insecticides. Recent experiments by the Rockefeller Foundation with new strains of wheat and corn in Mexico, and by the Ford Foundation with rice culture in the Philippines, show the dramatic breakthrough possible with better seeds.

Throughout the agricultural economy, more use of fertilizer is a prime necessity. The per capita use of fertilizer in Latin America is less than one-tenth that in North America.

Over the past 25 years, North American food production per acre has increased by 109 percent. According to FAO experts, adequate use of fertilizers could increase Latin American food production by at least 50 percent.

REGIONAL PLANNING OF THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

Food production would be increased by integration and coordination in the agricultural sector throughout Latin America. The Bank could furnish the communication bridge to enhance such coordination. Coordination would permit diversification and specialization in agriculture, resulting in increases in productivity and in income for farm families. Overreliance on such crops as sugar, coffee, and cocoa can be offset by developing such new resources as meat, timber, and fish. The notable success of coordination and integration in Central America holds promise for expanding these concepts to the entire region.

Institutional reform, research, and education, increasing productivity, and improved technology, as well as coordination and integration, are only some of the basic steps necessary to provide agricultural development in Latin America.

EXTERNAL FINANCIAL AID

In addition, external assistance at levels above the goals set in the past will be required. The current FAO program of cooperation with the IDB and the World Bank in identifying priority projects points the way toward better utilization of foreign aid. This process needs to be expanded to provide a ready agenda of well-conceived projects for financing both bilateral and multilateral agencies.

The IDB must tell the hemisphere what amounts of foreign financing, bilateral and multilateral, will be necessary for the next 10 years in order to produce an adequate diet and a strengthened continental economy. It must estimate and program the amounts of IDB assistance not only to finance needed imports of agricultural capital goods, but also to supplement the domestic budgets of Latin American countries in order that they may provide the research, educational, marketing, and technical services that Latin American agriculture so desperately needs.

I raised these questions now because the time for constructive decision and action is at hand. The efforts made to date have not been enough. The Inter-American community must take full cognizance of the crisis in the agricultural sector. The U.S. representatives to the Inter-American Development Bank must help assure that the forthcoming report on an increase in the resources of the Bank and Fund for Special Operations amply reflects not only recognition of the need to close the food gap but, more meaningfully, an indication of the concrete means to that end.

WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE, BUT KNOW NOT WHAT WE MAY BE

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1966, Mr. Herbert V. Prochnow, president of the First National Bank of Chicago, delivered a commencement address to the University of North Dakota, on the subject, "We Know What We Are, But Know Not What We May Be." It was one of the most thought-provoking addresses it has been my pleasure to read for a long time, and I am sure it would be appreciated by the readers of the RECORD.

The address follows:

WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE, BUT KNOW NOT WHAT WE MAY BE

(By Herbert V. Prochnow, president, the First National Bank of Chicago, at the commencement exercises of the University of North Dakota, June 5, 1966)

In his Hamlet, Shakespeare said, "we know, what we are, but know not what we may be." This is a profound statement as it relates to the history of both men and nations. Within it one may experience achievement and failure, hope and despair, joy and tragedy.

Many of you have stood as I have on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, walked in the streets of the historic cities of Damascus and Bethlehem and flown over the rolling hills of Judea to the City of Jerusalem.

One night I stood on the top of the Mount of Olives with one of the world's great scholars who was in Jerusalem translating the Dead Sea Scrolls of the Old Testament. Only a short distance away was the little village of Bethany and on beyond in the distance was the City of Jericho, the oldest city known to man. To the right was the Dead

Sea, and the soft light of an October moon was falling gently across its calm waters.

We turned and looked in the other direction down the barren, rocky slope of the Mount of Olives over the dark, gnarled and old olive trees where the Garden of Gethsemane had been. Just across a little valley a few blocks in width was Jerusalem on the opposite hill. In that historic spot that evening it seemed to me I could look down through the centuries. There was the place where Solomon—who "exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and in wisdom"—had built his temple. There was the place where many of the heroic figures of Jewish and Christian history—Abraham and Isaac and David and Peter and John and Matthew had walked. These men could say, "we know what we are—shepherds, tax collectors, fishermen." But they did not know what they were to be. They were to walk not only in the little valley at the foot of Jerusalem, but they were to walk across the pages of history forever.

There was the birth place of both the Jewish and Christian religions. There was the place where many of the ideals of Western civilization had been cradled. On that hill, Herod, too, had built his temple, and the authorities of the great Roman Government had once ruled there in all their majesty, when the Roman Empire had flung its legions to those remote frontiers. It had the greatest armies and the most powerful fortifications in its history. With their skill in law and government, with their distinguished jurists and generals, the citizens of Rome could say, "we know what we are—the greatest nation of our time." But they did not know that Rome in all its grandeur would disintegrate and fall.

That night I also saw Egypt, once the mother of the arts and sciences, but now with her greatness forever gone and her people today in desperate poverty. I saw Athens where Plato taught, and Pericles gave his nation the Golden Age. Athens knew what she was as she beheld her greatness. In her pride Athens may well have believed that her culture would mold the future of architecture, science, mathematics and medicine for centuries, and it did. But Athens did not know that she would fall and never again regain her power. In these great centers of civilization there was wisdom. There was genius. There was power. They knew what they were, but they did not know what they were to be.

That evening I saw other great empires through the centuries—Great Britain, Spain, Portugal, France, Belgium, the Netherlands. They knew what they were—the most powerful empires of their time. But they did not know that one night in August 1914, the somber shadow of war would fall across the world, only to be followed by a second World War, engulfing almost all of mankind and ending only when the terrifying clouds had left behind their dead at Hiroshima. These great empires did not know that they would be shattered and that the winds of political freedom would pull down the pillars of reverence and loyalty from under ruling groups that had provided the world with some stability.

In 1783, thirteen colonies had won a Revolutionary War. Men had sacrificed eight years out of their lives to face a seemingly hopeless future. There was no unity. European nations did not know whether they were dealing with one nation or thirteen. The country was impoverished and saddled with a great war debt. Soldiers were clamoring for their pay. The government had no power to enforce its acts. A band of soldiers marched upon the government at Philadelphia, demanding their pay at the bayonet's point, and Congress fled to Princeton, New Jersey. Riots broke out. The country was flooded with paper money that was rapidly to become practically worthless. But out of that chaos came the Constitutional Convention and a constitution which was to assure independence, freedom and equality to all men. In that convention, old Benjamin Franklin quietly placed all the weight of his wisdom and experience at the service of the nation he was founding. Robert Morris, financier of the Revolution, sat there on his way to a debtor's prison. Hamilton swayed the assembly with his eloquent utterance. Madison wrote with a clarity that had in it no slick political subterfuge. Then with George Washington as President, Thomas Jefferson as Secretary of State, and Alexander Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury, a new nation opened for business. These men could say, "we know who we are—land owners, surveyors, printers, businessmen." But they did not know that they were to be the founders of the most powerful nation in all history.

Perhaps we may conclude as we look at history that men and nations know what they are but they do not know what they may be. However, by their decisions and their lives they often determine day by day what they will finally be.

In our great metropolitan centers we know what we are, and we are proud of our modern industrial and business organizations, our libraries, museums and other achievements. But we do not know what we may be, for we have problems with which to deal that may profoundly change our future for better or for worse. We have extraordinarily difficult and complex problems in most great cities which require urgent consideration of housing and educational facilities. An analysis of the trends in important areas of almost every city must give any thoughtful person concern as he looks ahead only 10 or 15 years. How will we meet the massive problems of housing and educational facilities and their great cost? Will the most influential citizens in our cities concentrate their time and talents on these perplexing problems until a solution is found before we witness the future decay of certain areas of our cities?

We live in a world of tangled economics and treacherous politics. Here, too, we know what we are—the most powerful nation in the world, but ought we to be more concerned regarding what we may be? The shattering of the great colonial empires following two world wars has resulted in the emergence of dozens of new nations. This may be the single most important economic and political development in your life and mine. It has already involved us in a difficult situation in Southeast Asia. These nations have awakened disillusioned from their dreams that independence would bring stability, peace and prosperity. In their struggle against poverty and ignorance, the people of these new nations will constitute for years a continuing threat to the peace of the world. We cannot ignore this threat nor is there any assurance that we can adequately meet it. This is the kind of world in which you and I shall have to live out our lives.

With only 195 million people, can this nation possibly solve the problems of poverty, illiteracy, disease, inadequate tax systems, inflation, and land reform for almost one and one-half billion people? Eight hundred million of these people live in India, Pakistan, Indonesia and Southeast Asia, 50 million in the Middle East, 240 million in Africa and 230 million in Latin America. Today, African and Asian nations represent over 53 per cent of the United Nations membership. The 36 African nations alone represent almost one-third. If current population trends continue for only 35 years, there will be five to six billion people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and they will constitute well over 80 per cent of the world's population.

In India alone there are nearly 500 million persons, one-seventh of the world's population. The increase in population is between 10 and 12 million annually. The birth rate is among the highest in the world. Eight out of ten persons are illiterate. The overwhelming majority do not have enough income to feed themselves adequately.

Even in the large cities, only one-half the houses at the most have sewage disposal. An estimated one million people in Calcutta have no homes at all. Hundreds of thousands of villages in India are without electric power.

With the exception of Red China, here in one nation of five hundred million persons in an area about two-fifths the size of the continental United States there is the greatest poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and mass misery of any place on earth. India is engaged in a struggle for survival. There are major food shortages. Inflation is bad. Food, machinery, and raw materials must be imported on a large scale, resulting in heavy trade deficits. Large crash development programs by the government have resulted in substantial budget deficits and heavy borrowing from the central bank. No other nation has so many unemployed or underemployed. Some sources estimate that perhaps 40 million persons have work less than one-half day a week. The United States and several other nations are pouring many hundreds of millions of dollars of aid annually into India to feed her people and to assure some economic progress at the same time India seeks to maintain the freedom of its people. Our total economic aid to India has probably exceeded $6 billion.

However, India is only one country. Nearby is Pakistan with 100 million persons with comparable problems. To the Southeast is Indonesia with 100 million people. There are other nations in the Far East—the Philippines, Korea, Viet Nam, Burma, Thailand, Laos—with equally difficult economic and political problems. With the possible exception of Israel, there are an additional fifty million persons in the nations of the Middle East—Iran, Iraq, Jordan and others—who are struggling against illiteracy and poverty.

Two entire continents, Africa and Latin America, have come forward as areas whose economic and political problems require attention.

Historically, the greatest single event of the 1960's may be the political liberation of Africa. This continent is about four times as great in area as the United States, 50 per cent larger than Soviet Russia and larger than all of North America. It is almost 5,000 miles long and 4,500 miles wide—with an area as great as the United States, Western Europe, India and Red China combined. Ninety-seven per cent of the 240 million people are of African origin and they speak seven hundred languages or dialects. Approximately eighty-five per cent of the people cannot read or write, and 62 million of the 83 million children of school age are not in school. The average annual income of $132 per person is less than that of any other continent.

This continent has over forty per cent of the world's hydroelectric potential and one-fifth of its forests. For some years Africa has provided the Free World with nearly all its industrial diamonds, more than one-half of its newly-mined gold, one-fourth of its copper and important quantities of lead, zinc, manganese, iron, cobalt, bauxite, platinum, uranium and other metals. There are also important new discoveries of oil. The continent has nearly every mineral and can produce almost every crop. Here are great resources available to the industrial expansion of the Free World in the years ahead.

Today there are fifty-six nations in Africa. Although each of the fifty-six countries is at a different level of economic and political development, there is over all a potentially explosive nationalism. Unfortunately, as Arnold Toynbee has indicated, freedom came to Africa while the masses of its people south of the Sahara were still living in a pre-civilization state of development. They are therefore faced with the overwhelming problem of setting up governments with little or no experience to prepare them for this difficult responsibility.

Africa as a whole is one of the least developed areas of the world. The continent provides an unfortunate example of poverty, illiteracy, hunger, disease and inadequate medical facilities, industrial skills and capital. In twenty-two countries of tropical Africa less than one-half the children go even to the first primary grade in school. Moreover, in these twenty-two countries an average of ninety-five per cent of the primary school children never enter a secondary school.

Even if there had been no colonization, there is no reason to believe that Africa would have overcome its tragic poverty. There is no assurance that if Africa is left to itself it will enter a period of accelerated economic progress. Here then are the ingredients of political instability and revolution. Here also are 240 million persons we hope will achieve economic progress peacefully within the framework of democracy.

In addition to these underdeveloped areas of the world, we need also to evaluate the magnitude of the problems in Latin America. Many Latin American nations have had independence for more than a century. There are in Latin America approximately 230 million people in an area about twice the size of the United States. The population is increasing at the striking rate of 2.3 per cent each year, faster than any other major part of the world. cities are growing at the remarkable rate of 5 per cent a year, and three of ten largest cities of the world are now in Latin America—Mexico City, Buenos Aires and Sao Paulo.

Over 50 per cent of the adults in Latin America are unable to read or write. Despite Brazil's progress, the illiteracy rate is still over 50 per cent. Argentina rates best with only 13 per cent of illiteracy. Fifteen million Latin American children are without classrooms. Even in a Latin American nation as advanced as Mexico, it is estimated that more than one-third of the people have never been to any school. Forty million of the seventy million children who are 5 to 19 years of age in Latin America do not attend any school. Moreover, the number of children to be educated is increasing at the rate of five million every year which is making the problem almost impossible of solution.

Raising the living standards of the present population of 230 million people is a mammoth undertaking, but the problem will be infinitely greater if the population of Latin America continues to grow at the present rate, and reaches 600 million in 35 years. This would be an almost insuperable problem for nations with highly advanced industrial economies, but with economically retarded and politically volatile countries it almost certainly means periods of turmoil and serious trouble for the governments involved.

We know who these 1½ billion people are. They are the millions who suffer from illiteracy, poverty, and malnutrition. They are the millions who are born but never live. But we do not know what they may become in only a few years when they constitute 80 per cent of the world's population. We do not even know what Red China will become in just 35 years when she has 1½ billion people and when she also has further developed destructive nuclear capacity.

Will these nations, many of which are largely unprepared for self-government, constantly endanger the peace of the world through revolutions and violence? Will there in the foreseeable future be educational facilities for the hundreds of millions who are illiterate?

Will they have even the necessary food when per capita food production in various areas now is less than it was before World War II? World food production has been lagging behind population growth. In Latin America, Africa and the Far East, food production is growing only two-thirds as fast as population. In Latin America food production is below the levels of 25 years ago. In the last five years, the population of Latin America has increased almost twice as fast as food production. Medical science has brought about a sharp decrease in infant mortality in the less developed nations, and children under 15 years of age who are unable to add to production constitute 40 to 45 per cent of the population, compared to 20 to 30 per cent in the developed industrial countries.

Will these hundreds of millions of people have pure water supplies and drainage systems? Who will supply means of transportation, communication and power to many countries that are completely without such facilities? There is not sufficient available investment capital in the entire world to accomplish these objectives within a reasonably short time.

It is no easy task for governments in these nations in their present stage of development and with widespread illiteracy and poverty to follow middle-of-the-road policies that satisfy the radical elements, the military groups, the large landowners and businessmen. The leaders of many of these countries who are constantly facing crises feel impelled to speak the language of economic urgency and to adopt policies of expediency rather than wisdom. Governments will be considered politically inadequate if they are not economically responsive to need.

We know the magnitude of these problems now. But we do not know how great they will be in the future, and whether they will challenge all of western civilization. The underdeveloped nations are falling increasingly behind the more advanced nations in income. The gap is widening. Will these trends continue so that we shall face increasing turbulence and widespread violence in the world?

We are now the most powerful nation in the world, but we do not know whether we shall be sufficiently powerful to maintain law and order everywhere in this kind of restless world.

We know what we are—a nation at the peak of its greatest prosperity and yet unwilling to balance its budget, and this has been true for decades. A nation with a substantial surplus in its international trade and yet seemingly unable to balance its international payments. A nation whose people have the highest standard of living in history, but whose great cities need a massive development of educational facilities, housing and transportation. A nation with its plant, equipment, labor and capital operating close to optimum capacity, and yet reluctant to accept economic discipline. A nation with $50 to $60 billion of defense expenditures with vast programs for the welfare of its people now faced with the hard reality of establishing priorities for its expenditures if it is not to be overwhelmed by its own budget. We know how great we are, but have we the wisdom and courage now to meet the hard problems confronting us and determine what we are to be in the years ahead?

Finally, you and I know what we are personally, but have we really thought as the successive years crumble under our feet what we might become. Achievement sleeps in many minds. To the great disadvantage of some young people, I once taught university classes. I often thought that if I could lead only one student out of hundreds to decide that he would become the greatest authority in the world in some field it would be a far-reaching achievement. It might be economics, law, accounting, literature, medicine, science or any other field. Every minute of the day and night when he was free he would read and study in his field. He would be ruthless in eliminating from his life every unnecessary activity. Five years after he had finished his formal education he would know a little about his field. In 10 years he would begin to be informed. In 20 years he would be able. In 25 years he would become an authority with national recognition. In 30 years he might become distinguished, as one of the great men of the world in his field. Young men know what they are now, but do they really realize what they might become with a complete dedication to some great objective.

Over the centuries man's deepest and most profound longing—and this holds true of great cities and nations—is the desire to live on, to be remembered. The tools and the machine he invents, the pyramid or the skyscraper he builds, the arch he erects, the marble he carves, the book he writes—the business and profession which consume his life—all these are revelations of man's deep longing to be remembered through his work after the tool has dropped from his hand and his mind no longer lives. If his life by the grace of Providence should represent such lasting accomplishments, one may hope he would recognize that humility is never so impressive as when it is present in those whose achievements are great. Simplicity is never so appealing as when it is found in the midst of the ostentation of success. Gentleness is never so touching as when it exists in the powerful.

But life may bring no such crowning victory to you and to me. We may win no brilliant battles in business or the professions for which we shall be remembered. We may figure in no exciting dramas in our lives. Our destiny may be obscurity and not fame or distinction. And yet, one may follow great principles in small duties. One may hold fast to what is right in difficult decisions. One may accept defeat and even disaster rather than yield convictions to ambition.

In the play, "Green Pastures," Noah said to the Lord, "I ain't very much, but I'm all I've got."

One may say to young men and women, in fact to all of us, "You're all you've got." You know what you are, but you do not know what you may be. One may say to men, to cities and to nations, "you know what you are, but are you really striving to achieve what in moments of great vision you hope you may be."

NEW WORLD RECORD IN THE 1-MILE RUN

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, from these microphones here in the well of the House I have heard praised many causes and many people. Today I would add to those worthy of commendation of the Congress and the people, the name of Jim Ryun, a young man who yesterday set a new world's record in the 1-mile run. By this feat, Jim has returned to this country the most prestigious of all track and field crowns for the time since 1937 when the record was held by another Kansan, the great Glenn Cunningham. Jim, a freshman at the University of

Kansas, has reached the pinnacle of success at the early age of 19. However, the long years of training and sacrifices necessary to Jim's achievement and his frank and modest acceptance of his accomplishments set an encouraging example for all Americans—young and old alike. It is indeed a high honor for me to represent such a fine young man as Jim, and a privilege to bring forth his name for the well-deserved praise and commendation of this body.

THE GRAND DECEPTION ABOUT THE PROPOSED GRAND CANYON DAMS

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in their enthusiasm for prevailing upon Congress to approve the central Arizona project, some proponents are taking such wanton liberty with the facts of the case that distortion has become rampant and irresponsible reporting by segments of the press is commonplace. Whether by deliberate design or through a pathetic lack of understanding, the proposed Bridge and Canyon Dams are presented as essential components of any program to supply Arizona with a heavy flow of Colorado River water.

In truth, the dams have become a part of the project for the purpose of producing revenues that allegedly could be used to write off some of the costs of the scheme. They would not create increased water availability; on the contrary they would lessen overall supply of water in the Colorado because of the evaporation and seepage that inevitably take place.

Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams have been brazenly called "cash registers" by supporters who do not attempt to conceal their desire to enhance the dollar appeal at whatever cost to the beauty of the Grand Canyon and at whatever sacrifice of water. That steam plants could provide an equivalent amount of electricity at lower cost is apparently of no consequence.

Of the many letters coming into my office in opposition to H.R. 4761, one contained a clipping that all Members of Congress should read. In it, a reader of the Arizona Republic takes issue with that publication's representation of several facets of the CAP. The newspaper is to be complimented for publishing this refutation of its questionable reporting exuberance about the merits of the dams. Under unanimous consent I ask that the letter to the Arizona Republic be printed in the Record:

[From the Arizona Republic, June 9, 1966]

THE PEOPLE SPEAK: WATER EDITORIAL BLASTED FROM HERE TO CANYON

EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

Your editorial, "Help Win Water Fight," (May 29) is characteristic of the unprofessional treatment you have given the entire reclamationist-conservationist controversy. Further evidence of your irresponsible journalism is your request that readers write to friends, as well as the President, Wayne Aspinall and Henry Jackson, to parrot the following:

"(a) . . . Arizona desperately needs the water which it was awarded by the U.S. Supreme Court; (b) . . . the water can be transported only by the traditional reclamation method of using hydro-electric power for this purpose; and (c) the dams required to generate the power will not in any way destroy the scenic grandeur of the Grand Canyon but will, in fact, make it far more accessible than it has ever been."

Good journalism requires that news articles give full and objective presentation of the story. Your "news articles" are liberally seasoned with opinion-manipulation devices. They have consistently failed to include opposing arguments unless you could follow with a retort, relevant or not. Consequently a great many important arguments have been omitted.

You have not supported generalizations with detail. You have utilized disparagement innuendo and editorial inconsistencies to influence your readers. If you had chosen instead to be constructive, the complexity of the water problems provides great opportunity for creative reporting.

With reference to opinion (a) just how "desperately" does Arizona need water? The situation is serious, but not frightening. Arizona does need water to accommodate its share of an expanding population. However, if corrections in allocations and pricing of water were made, the vast majority of Arizonans wouldn't be threatened with water shortage. A crackdown on waste (excessive irrigation by farmers, lining of canals and ditches, etc.) would also conserve the water we have. Such measures could provide the respite we need to effectuate solutions more far-reaching than dams. You could choose to illuminate the problems and bring pressure to bear for their solution.

As for your opinion (b), a great deal of expert discussion is emerging in magazines of high journalistic reputation. Their reports say hydro-electric dams are outmoded and that alternatives not only show promise but are necessary. Arizona's politicians would do well to seek out experts and solicit their advice on new methods. Since you deal in information, you could make some positive contributions based on investigation. Your recent series on atomic desalinization is typically selective of information to justify its unenthusiastic tone.

Opinion (c) is beside the point. The mass recreation and accessibility arguments amounts to sugar-coating a project that would not be undertaken for recreation per se. The point is that the intent of the law is to protect the uniqueness of a natural phenomenon. Moreover, there is a good deal in our psychological, philosophical and literary heritage that endorses conservationism. You have chosen to degrade this entirely worthy position in favor of expediency.

I don't know why, eschewing the interests of the people of Arizona the Southwest and the nation, you have elected to be the mouthpiece of the local establishment. Your chosen policy, in my opinion, is an abuse of the power and function of the press. For the good of everyone, and particularly Arizona, I hope you will reappraise your position and approach. Until you replace your present techniques by impartiality, you have no right to solicit letters from your readers.

Mrs. Elizabeth B. Barnett.

THE MEANING OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this week we are celebrating Captive Nations Week, inaugurated in 1959 during the Eisenhower administration by a joint resolution of Congress. I am pleased to join in recognizing this significant observance.

We must not be fooled into thinking that communism has undergone such fundamental changes it is no longer a threat to the free peoples of the world.

The captive nations of East Central Europe are still captive. The Berlin wall is still there. And the free peoples of southeast Asia and the southern half of our own hemisphere are increasingly threatened by brutal Communist aggression and subjugation.

Repressive conditions still exist in the nine countries made captive by the U.S.S.R. during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. In these countries the people still do not have free speech or a free press. Their freedom to travel is severely restricted. Their religious leaders are under constant attack by the ruling Communist regimes, with many clergymen of various faiths imprisoned. Political dissent is not tolerated. In short, personal or political freedom in these countries is a fiction.

Only recently, the Communist rulers of Poland would not even allow Pope Paul VI or American bishops to attend the great religious festivities making Poland's millennium.

Under such circumstances, it is up to the people of America and the free world to give all possible support and recognition to the principles of national independence, personal and political liberties constitutionally guaranteed, and respect for basic human dignity. Through Captive Nations Week we give expression to our commitment to these great principles. Through Captive Nations Week, we of the free world signal our friends behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains that they are not forgotten, nor is their cause lost. This is the real meaning of Captive Nations Week.

ADMINISTRATION'S POWER GRAB

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the House Republican task force on agriculture are deeply concerned over the Johnson administration's grab for power in the case of watershed projects around the country.

Fifty-five watershed project plans are being held up in the bureaucratic maze of Washington upon the orders of President Lyndon Johnson. These important projects, designed to save and improve land and water areas in this country, lie dormant in the files of the Bureau of the Budget because of the power-hungry tactics of the administration.

In 1956, Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, was amended to provide for approval of watershed projects by the Committees on Agriculture and Public Works of the House and Senate. Since September of 1965, however, none of the requests filed with the Bureau of the Budget have been forwarded to these committees for action.

Budget Bureau Director Charles L. Schultze said in a recent letter to Congressman W. R. Poage, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit:

> We expect to be able to forward the individual projects, in virtually all cases, as soon as a single, but fundamental, problem is resolved.

The problem involves the question of whether the President or the Congress should be allowed control over watershed project decisions. The current law reserves that right for the Congress, but administration officials are challenging the legality and constitutionality of the provision.

This most recent attempt by the Johnson administration to balloon the ever-increasing scope of Presidential authority is being made at a great cost to the taxpayers, local governments, and to the land itself.

Financial commitments and time schedules are just two of the hapless victims of the refusal of Budget Bureau officials, acting on order to the President, to submit watershed plan projects to Congress for review and decision.

For nearly 12 years Congress has been handling these projects. A total of 446 stamps of approval have been given watershed proposals following intense study of them by the committees.

Congress can stand on its record of careful consideration of watershed projects and genuine concern for the best possible use of conservation funds in this area. Administration efforts to take over this function are only hampering the smooth effective process that has worked so well over the years.

THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM REDEFINED

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last April I was privileged to address the annual meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association in Dallas, Tex. At that time, I spoke about a subject which is being all too quickly passed over in our country today—the free enterprise system. We must not forget that the private enterprise system is the essence of economic democracy. Moreover, it is the counterpart of political democracy. I say "counterpart" because political democracy and economic democracy are not one and the same thing. They are separate and distinct areas; and combining the two spheres of political and economic decisionmaking can only lead to totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, my comments before the annual meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association have been printed in the July 1966 issue of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association. For the further information of my colleagues in the House, I request that this speech be inserted into the Congressional Record.

The Free Enterprise System Redefined

(By Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, from Missouri)

Note.—Thomas B. Curtis, is the senior Republican on the joint Senate and House economic committee and second ranking Republican on the House ways and means committee. In 1963, he was selected by the American Political Science Association to receive a biannual award for distinguished congressional service. A Dartmouth College graduate, Congressman Curtis is a life trustee of the school. He received his law degree from Washington University Law School in St. Louis.

Advancements in the field of health have revolutionized American living. Almost one-tenth of our population is 65 years or older and this percentage figure will continue to rise in the foreseeable future. One of the aspects of old age which formerly gave it dignity and importance, namely uniqueness, has disappeared. To be 70 years old is still somewhat a badge of honor but increasingly it is simply placement in a category.

Orphanages have disappeared from the American scene because there are practically no double orphans, a commonplace when plagues decimated families. The population in mental institutions is continuing to decline and the long stay or permanent population in hospitals is declining radically. The nation increasingly is losing less worktime from illness and time lost from accidents has diminished, not necessarily from the lessening of the incidence of accidents but from the time taken recovering from accidents. Rehabilitation from and lessening the incidence of genetic and natal defects is likewise improving the nation's per capita working capacities.

In place of orphanages and other such institutional buildings we have increased numbers of hospitals, nursing homes and rehabilitation centers. In place of beggars we have rehabilitated people making their own way in a dignified manner—possibly with a dignity a cut above the average because of the knowledge that through self-discipline a misfortune has been overcome.

I believe it is important in these times to start counting our blessings, not to boast about them nor to stifle continued progress through enervating complacency but to understand better the system that has brought them about. With our desires and humanitarianism whetted by the rapid progress that has been made in a few generations, it is so easy, through impatience to reach nirvana in our lifetime, to lose the essence which has produced the present wonders and which, if properly cherished, will continue to unfold even greater wonders.

THE GREATEST HEALTH CARE SYSTEM?

Just a few weeks ago an assistant secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, now retired, made a speech in which he denied that the United States had the greatest health care system in history and in the world today. To support this chastisement of the national ego he cited a few selected statistics and carefully quoted them out of context. I responded in a speech in the Congressional Record. The popular news media widely reported his remarks and paid no attention to mine.

This reporting is symbolic of the national dialogue involving our basic social, economic, political, moral and religious institutions which has been going on for the past three decades. It seems we derive a thrill from this kind of masochism. Or perhaps the emotion stems from a satiation of a guilt complex inherent in the makeup of man. Whatever it is it badly hinders objective study which we need if we are to continue to progress.

I think it is important to know how well we are doing. If we are doing poorly, then there is real cause to look around the world in a concentrated way to see how others are doing, to benefit from these observations; if, however, we are doing remarkably well comparatively, there is every reason to keep our minds directed to our own laboratories and keep moving. This is not to say that there is nothing we can learn from abroad or from history—because there will always be much we can learn from any source—but it is to say that our main source of future progress must come from utilizing and developing our own system. It is also to say it would be foolhardy to change our basic system.

I find that very little attention has been paid in recent years to what I have referred to as our basic system other than to denigrate it obliquely in this masochistic kick we have been indulging in as a nation. Restating what I think the essence of our political economic mechanisms to be will lead by indirection into a number of current and hot issues which face your profession today.

ESSENCE OF POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

We all still have a pretty good concept of the essence of political democracy, namely that it is a method whereby the people by majority vote make the ultimate governmental decisions within a society. Where government stops is another question. There is a great deal of argument today to the effect that the people cannot make the best kind of decisions for their own welfare and it is preferable to have a group of wise experts make the decisions for them and then merely have the people or their representatives ratify these judgments. And if the people are so unenlightened as not to recognize the wisdom of these decisions made in their behalf, we should propagandize them or bribe or kick them so they will go along. Perhaps this system would work if someone were to select who are the wise ones to make these decisions. However, it is my observation that usually the wise ones try to select themselves. Thus their expertise tends to be in the area of self-promotion rather than in any substantive field of study or endeavor, be it government, health care or astronautics. Their judgments in areas outside the field of social psychology as it relates to self-promotion are not so wise. Furthermore, there is always a tussle between many different groups all of whom, understandingly, think they are wise. In the emotionalism that seems to follow such tussles, reason is left by the boards.

It took many centuries to come to the conclusion that slow as representative government may seem to be, those who were born with many of the answers to life's interesting problems would do better to curb their impatience and maintain a climate of peace and tranquility in which those of slower mentality could work because in the long run more could be accomplished through the efforts of many rather than through the brilliant accomplishments of the few. The interesting thing is that the record of less than 200 years shows the results derived from representative government have been far from slow. This leads us to consider whether, in oligarchies or dictatorships, the wise ones were not pushing out of the decision-making process many of those who were a great deal more knowledgeable—as well as wiser—than they. So haste was again making waste.

What we do not fully understand—and yet we of all societies should understand—is the essence of economic democracy, namely the private enterprise system. The private enterprise system is the counterpart of political democracy. Instead of the ballot box and electioneering being the mechanism and method whereby the majority of the people make their political decisions for the society, the marketplace and advertising are utilized for them to make the economic decisions.

Thomas Jefferson wisely observed that a democracy could not function without an educated populace. He could have said equally that the marketplace cannot function without an educated populace. Today it must be emphasized that an educated populace is insufficient to make either democracy or the marketplace operate. There must also be an informed populace—accurately and honestly informed. And let me state that a "truth in political labeling" is the most important "truth" bill that needs to be before the political leaders and the people today. If this bill were observed as law, most of what is contained in the truth in lending and truth in packaging bills would have to be jettisoned, particularly their titles.

What is not so well recognized today is that in their fields of government and economics both democracy and the private enterprise system are the counterparts of the laboratory method in the physical sciences, the scientific method as opposed to the medieval scholastic system for testing and learning new truths.

TOTAL OF 100,000 LABORATORIES

Justice Brandeis once referred to the U.S.A. as 48 laboratories established to test out new ideas in the field of political science. In our society we have almost 100,000 laboratories set up to test out new ideas in the field of political science. There are that many self-contained governmental taxing authorities run by the people on the principle of representation and majority decision—namely, along with the 50 states, the 5,000 counties and the thousands of municipalities, townships, school districts, fire districts, sewer districts, etc.

So in the field of economics the consumer, usually the housewife, every day casts many economic ballots, thus rendering judgments on competitive products and services. Furthermore, utilizing the marketplace mechanism as a laboratory, any person who thinks he has a bright idea for a new product or service and can persuade his father-in-law, or whomever, to finance it can test it out. He does not have to dance attendance upon a political bureaucrat to get his affirmative nod. And if he is wrong, he goes broke—but in this system he can die to live again—and if he is right, he gains the wherewithal to test out other ideas.

As an aside I must enter a very important caveat. Democracy, according to the theorists who set it up on this continent in 1789, relied upon human freedom to set it up, to make it work and to insure its survival. Human freedom, these theorists argued, could only be preserved if the powers within the society were separated and divided so that no group of men—no matter how wise—had all decision-making power concentrated in their hands.

The dangers to human freedom from concentrating religious and political power in the hands of the same men were clear to them, not just from history but from current events. Likewise the dangers of concentrating military and political powers. Even the powers of political government were thought to be so great that they too must be divided and separated into the hands of different groups of men—horizontally into legislative, executive and judicial, vertically into federal, state and local.

It is equally important that we keep separate and divided the economic power of decision-making from the power to make political decisions. Combining economic and political power into the same hands produces totalitarianism, whether it be called nazism or communism. Indeed, one of the features of the marketplace system is separating and dividing economic power—union from management and management from itself to prevent its becoming trusts and cartels; unionism itself needs a similar separation and division to break up nationwide strikes and bargaining if we are to continue to have freedom and sound economic decision-making.

The marketplace system has not been understood by the very people who operate in it and operate it, let alone by the outside critics who benefit from it. Indeed, some of the basic features which make it work have become the subject of great public denigration and this factor is having a dangerous effect on popular opinion. The profit motive is the feature most often misunderstood and attacked.

Aside from the fact that profit is a motive which makes men act, activity not lethargy, I would argue, is a necessary ingredient for progress. It also provides the test and discipline necessary to make any trial and error laboratory system work—in this instance, the marketplace system, the economic laboratory. My definition of a nonprofit organization incidentally is one that has a poor accounting system. The managers of a nonprofit organization usually don't know whether they have really rendered a public service or not. They just count on the humanitarian objective to cover all mistakes, including the mistakes which may defeat their very humane purpose. They seldom know whether they have rendered the service with the minimum of waste and the maximum of quality, efficiency and courtesy.

The profit system is the only system I know which will encourage a man to do that which he has to do if working by himself, namely to save some of the produce he has created by the sweat of his brow for future contingencies and, even more important because all progress is based upon these, expansion and innovation. I am not saying that a man will not save in a system without this encouragement, but I am saying he is not as likely to and the odds are he will seek a system—if one is available—where this encouragement exists. Otherwise, he finds a great deal of his savings are not for his future contingencies or his expansion and his interests in research and development, but for someone else's and in the long run really for no one because the system eats upon the wealth accumulated by others and destroys itself.

Once a man has the incentive to save there must also be the incentive to invest the saving, that is to spend the saving for capital purposes, to sow the seed for a future harvest rather than to eat it, to use the gold to buy a plow instead of to bury it in a pot in the ground. I agree with one point I think the new economists are trying to make—although I must confess I have never heard them make it—hoarding is an economic sin. It is almost as bad a sin, not quite, as using borrowed money to "live it up" and not using it to create wealth or new purchasing power. I have never heard an economist, classical or otherwise, say that debt acquired in the latter way was bad. What I have heard economists say, and I agree with them, is that foolish expenditures, whether from borrowed money or from one's own savings or from sales of capital assets, are bad. But that has to do with expenditures, not debt.

THE DISTRIBUTIVE PROCESS

A second aspect of the marketplace system that has become a major point for denigration second only to that of the profit motive is the distributive process, be it storage, retailing, wholesaling, packaging, labeling, pricing, market research or whatever. The attack on the distributive process is so unreasoning as almost to deny that there is an economic and cost function involved in getting a product from the place of manufacture or production to the consumer.

This ignorance currently is exhibited by the popular political hoop and hurrah going around that the United States should feed the hungry people of the world. The logic behind this great humanitarian emotion is that the United States produces agricultural products far in excess of its needs and in the process has accumulated great quantities of surpluses and there are starving people abroad. Both premises are accurate and it is certainly logical and humane that we should put food and hungry people together. But the next step in the syllogism advanced in behalf of the food for peace program is neither humanitarian nor accurate, namely that anyone who does not support governmental intervention into this economic area is motivated by selfishness or unmotivated because of callousness. Such an ignorant and arrogant approach to the difficult problems of distribution is hardly conducive to solving the problem of hunger and starvation of the people now alive around the world or of their progeny in the future.

It is important for us to understand that mass production is economically unfeasible without mass distribution. The great efficiencies of mass production cannot be realized without mass marketing which includes everything from warehousing to the shelf-stocking of the retailer, from information being disseminated by national advertising to information carefully passed on by the retailer to the consumer. Stuart Chase, in his denigration of the distributive process, made the point that the ingredients in a bottle of antiseptic cost only 15 percent of the consumer cost of the product. This bit of information even if accurate was completely out of any proper economic context, yet I continue to see economic textbooks and statements of teaching economists directed along this same line.

This kind of ignorance aided and abetted by those knowledgeable in the field of economics shows up strongly in Congressional hearings of the day, not the least illustrative of this point being the various hearings into the cost and pricing of drugs.

FROM THE DRAWING BOARD

It is always a fair subject of inquiry to find the cost of various aspects of the economic process involved in getting an item out of the mind of men onto a drawing board into production and then distributed to the consumers. The whole subject or science of cost analysis in the private enterprise system is based upon this understanding. But it is certainly not fair or instructive, nor really feasible, to conduct such an analysis of one component out of context with the whole.

My next nominee for the most misunderstood aspect of the private enterprise system—next to the profit motive—is the cost of investment money and next to the distributive system is research and development.

Our constitutional authors fully understood the need for research and development and its basic economic features. As usual, they put it succinctly and basically. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution says that among other powers granted to Congress is the power *to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and investors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries. . . .*

This, of course, is the basis for all our patent and copyright laws. Now if we want research and development to come, we had better figure on how to "promote" it. The only natural resource any society ever truly has is the brains of its citizens. This conclusion is exemplified by one incident. When it became important for this nation to have a supply of uranium ore—a useless rock until research and development made it valuable—we could have gone about getting that supply of ore in two ways—one by setting up a federal bureau for uranium research, hiring a lot of people to work, probably on a schedule of a 40-hour week and an eight-hour day, supplying them with Geiger counters and instructing them to go over the public lands of the West and find the uranium ore. The finds, of course, would be the property of the government, of all citizens. What right should the finder have in this discovery? It wasn't his. The land belonged to the people. He didn't finance the project, did he? And, anyway, why should he, through luck, be entitled to so much wealth when others had so little?

Under this system I suspect we still would be looking for an adequate supply of uranium ore just as we still are looking for the solution to many questions and problems in many fields where we are going about finding our answers in this fashion.

The other way to proceed was the way we did proceed. Under United States laws, still not altered, anyone who finds uranium ore on public lands, or any ore for that matter, can stake out a claim and it is his. He is not entitled to it, some may argue, but if we are after uranium ore and not some collateral concept of social justice, this method will get uranium ore. It did get uranium ore. So much ore was found that the price went down and it is no longer as profitable for men to spend months and years at their own expense, sometimes 70 hours a week, looking for it.

Another misconception about research and development centers around its costs. Once something is found—a truth or a needed raw material—the finding looks easy. The now obsolete drug salvarsan was named 606. How did it get the name? Because 605 times it eluded the search of its discoverers in the laboratory. What is the cost of research pursuing a trial and error technic—educated trial and error it is hoped but in its essence trial and error? Aside from the economic cost, what is the human patience required to fail 605 times not even knowing if 606 will come up or anything will ever come up? Or how many dry holes are drilled before an oil-producing well is obtained?

Certainly it is easier to retrace the steps of scientific discovery—that which at one time was so hard becomes so easy—and how stupid we were not to have recognized the obvious. What person in political life would dare embark upon an adventure where he failed 605 times just to produce the success of the 606 attempt? Indeed, what system other than the private enterprise system—or the scientific method in the field of physical science—could bring about these discoveries each in their own fields of discipline?

THE WISE FOOLS

When I see the sophomore discussing the cost of drugs and medical service as reflected in the *Consumer Price Index* out of context with no regard for quality and variety or for the costs of research and development, the costs of distribution, the costs of investment and the high costs of what some may feel is an overly complicated, officious and inefficient government, I begin to wonder if we are ever going to get the public dialogue onto a rational plane on the serious and yet unsolved political and economic questions.

I would say to you pharmacists in a great profession, thank you for a splendid job you have done and the splendid job you are still doing for our society and for mankind under considerable heckling. This accolade does not mean I am in agreement with all the decisions now being made by you, whether they are reflections of your studies in your laboratories of physical science or in your equally important and yet popularly unidentified laboratories of social science and economics—financing, costing, pricing, packaging, labeling, wholesaling, practicing—you name it. It does mean that I commend your attitude and your adherence to an economic system that has proved it can solve human problems ably and timely if one is not too impatient. It also means that as a politician I do not seek to have the power to overrule or even comment upon your judgments—I want that power only as an economic voter, a consumer. As a politician and a political voter I have a responsibility, as I see it, to keep the marketplace a good laboratory—free, clean and open to all who seek to use it to test out economic ideas. In this manner the consumers, who by their collective economic votes are an essential part of this process, will best be served in increased quality, variety and quantity of goods and services and at lowered costs. In this manner also society itself will be kept free in all disciplines of learning not the least of which is the discipline of government which must preserve the separation and the balancing of these disciplines and the powers they carry within our society.

THE TRADITION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the week of July 17–23, the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week is being conducted by the National Captive Nations Committee and held by Americans across this Nation. In what has developed into an international movement, our people will be joined in the observance by freedom advocates in Canada, Australia, the Republic of China, Ceylon, West Germany, Sweden, Turkey, and several other countries. As in previous years, the President issues his proclamation in the spirit of Public Law 86-90, and our Governors and mayors also issue their inspiring proclamations.

It is evident that the annual observance of Captive Nations Week has become a tradition. It is a fitting period for us to remind ourselves of the plight suffered by almost 1 billion people. It is also a time for use to deliberate on measures that would advance the freedom interests of the captive nations, and thus the security of our own freedom and that of the free world. Among the many measures worthy of our sober consideration now is the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, a measure that I, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FLOOD, have urged for some time. When Congress observes the week this week, it is hoped that this and other constructive steps of action will be duly considered by the leadership. It is scarcely in the democratic tradition to bottle up this measure in the Rules Committee where a majority of eight members are in favor of it.

For years now the syndicated totalitarian regimes in the Red empire have sought to have us ignore and forget the captive nations and peoples. This objective has been an essential part of their strategy to weaken and demoralize us politically and spiritually and to crush forever any and every source of patriotic nationalism and opposition in the Red empire. This objective will never be realized so long as the American people maintain and uphold the ideals, of our democracy and, following upon our own independence of all the captive nations—in the third week of July—Captive Nations Week—toward the freedom and independence of all the captive nations—in Central-South Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia, and Cuba.

To make the coming 1966 Captive Nations Week the most successful yet, I request that the pamphlet written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee on "The Traditional Captive Nations Week" be printed in the RECORD. All the ABC's of Captive Nations Week are contained therein:

THE TRADITIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—RED NIGHTMARE, FREEDOM'S HOPE

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Confusion, misdirected thinking, and the repetition of old errors dominate the current scene in the United States and thus much of the Free World. These dominant trends are, in part, the logical consequences of the superb maneuver engineered by Moscow in the last decade under the deceptive banner of "peaceful coexistence." Continue to build and strengthen the empire within, while all feasible forces are utilized to undermine the enemy without has been the practical essence of this highly successful maneuver. The functionaries in Moscow's *Agitprop* have good reason to gloat over the results and doubtless are banking on even phenomenal successes in the near future.

The needless mess in Vietnam, the NATO rupture, self-paralyzing absurdities about "arrogant power," "escalation," and "containment" again, the steady over-all Red penetrations in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, the repeated softening-up process on communism in our own body politic, and the insidious deterioration of our national will for positive victory, whether military or psycho-political, are only a few evidences of the new pattern of confusion and old errors. As though the lessons of U.S. trade with the Axis powers into World War II were never learned, the present drive for easy trade with the Red Empire is another point of evidence. Self-nurtured illusions about "national independence" among the so-called satellites in Central Europe, "the evaporation of the Cold War," a materially explosive Peking-Moscow showdown, and the spread of peace-orienting "capitalism" in the empire also have their able precedents in the illusions of the 30's, when the nature of modern imperio-colonialist totalitarianism eluded the understanding of that generation.

What in all these years has been a cardinal objective of the totalitarian Red Syndicate is a progressive Free World disinterest in the genuine liberation and independence of the captive nations, the oppressed peoples themselves as against the Red states dominated by totalitarian Communist Parties. The enormous advantages of achieving this should be obvious: easier consolidation of the empire, stronger posture for Cold War successes in the Free World, and the moral and political demolishment of Free World democracies. This Red objective, shared by all in the syndicate, is a crucial and integral part of Red psycho-political warfare which Brezhnev, in his report to the 23rd Party Congress last March, lauded as the prime, unsurpassed weapon wielded by "a political army of revolutionaries for class struggles."[1] The heavy emphasis placed at the Congress on the "great, complex art" in "leadership of class struggle"—meaning the imperio-colonialist art of psycho-political warfare—is unmistakable as to what we can expect in the years ahead.

High on the priority list in Red psycho-political warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week. This has been evident since 1959, and unfortunately some in this country have sought to assist Moscow and the syndicate in realizing this aim. One major element that they hope to capitalize on is a protracted American ignorance of the many captive nations in the Red Empire, particularly in the USSR. Another is the significance of the Week in the current struggle, measured especially by their own reactions. The mountain of evidence formed since 1959 clearly shows that Captive Nations Week is a deep thorn in the side of the Red totalitarians and their efforts to expand the Red Empire chiefly through the art of psycho-political warfare. As in many other cases, they depend on apathy, distraction, indifference, ignorance, and even educated stupidity to accomplish their work for them.

THE ABC'S OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When this writer wrote the Captive Nations Week Resolution in June, 1959, little did he appreciate the extent to which elements of misunderstanding and cultured ignorance can contribute to Moscow's ends. A sterling example of this was an editorial in a Washington paper that was promptly refuted by the writer.[2] In 1964, another editorial attack against the captive nations in the same organ evoked delight and praise in Moscow.[3] To identify the misleading and disinforming sources among us and, at the same time, to prevent Red manipulation of such misguiding opinions, it is most essential for every American to become familiar with the ABC's of Captive Nations Week.

The Week is sponsored each year by the National Captive Nations Committee with headquarters at 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover was the honorary chairman of the Committee from 1960 to 1964; Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has occupied this position since 1965. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate are members of NCNC. Every year half of the Governors issue Captive Nations Week proclamations, as does every Mayor in each of our major cities.

NCNC is supported by voluntary contributions from individuals and organizations. Its activities are mainly supported by local Captive Nations Committees that extend from Boston to Miami, Washington, D.C. to San Francisco. Almost every major city has a committee made up of citizens who are quite versed in the ABC's of the Week. In the past few years the movement has extended overseas so that observances now are held in Free China, West Germany, Turkey, and Sweden. Much of this steady growth is regularly noted in the U.S. Congress which legislated the Week in 1959.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

It is often curious that some commentators who write about the Week give every evidence of never having read the resolution and law upon which it is based. For example, one writer has this to say: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."[4] As I pointed out in another article, this comment is "a gem of fact, illogic, and fiction."[5] Fact, the Russian's violent denunciation; illogic, the supposed innocuousness of the resolution; fiction, Congress' passing it every year to attract minority votes. Now, to see how writers can misguide, read the resolution which is Public Law 86–90, one of the ABC's:

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

"*Whereas*, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgounds; and

"*Whereas*, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"*Whereas*, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"*Whereas*, since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"*Whereas*, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others; and

"*Whereas*, these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas*, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"*Whereas*, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"*Whereas*, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

"*Now, therefore*, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

"*The President* is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: WHO'S NEXT?

The reader will observe that in its fifth paragraph the resolution contains an open-end clause as concerns the enumeration of captive nations. In 1959, after a year of disputes with certain House members who were offered the first opportunity to consider the measure, the writer found it necessary to insert "and others" in order to allow for new captive nations, such as Cuba in 1960, and to gradually familiarize many segments of our public with some old ones. Here, too, the force of stubborn and narrow preconception had to be combatted.

Perspective is the usual, lacking quality in the thinking of those who draw mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, "liberal" and "doctrinaire" Communists, and "independent" and "Soviet-dominated" Red states. Similar distinctions were concocted in the 30's with respect to the imperio-colonialist totalitarians of that period, and easy trade, cultural exchange and other devices were also employed then in the interest of world peace. The list below clearly shows the unitary base of the Red Syndicate; it shows the phenomenal success of the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians, building an unprecedented empire in the span of less than fifty years and with strikingly inferior resources; it also indicates the poverty of U.S. foreign policy, which committed two colossal political blunders in this century (contributing to the power of the Soviet Russian Empire both after World War I and during World War II) and is now on the brink of committing another with East-West trade plans, the Consular Convention and other myopic measures.

There is nothing like success, and this list is the roll call of Red success, primarily in psycho-political warfare. Given the same course of U.S. foreign policy and the pathetic absence of psycho-political warfare training, this list is bound for extension. Read it carefully and think:

Country and people:	*Year of Communist domination*
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byleorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920

---

[1] Leonid Brezhnev, Report to 23rd Party Congress, *Pravda*, March 31, 1966.

[2] "Irritating the Bear," *The Washington Post*, July 24, 1959; author's reply, July 29, 1959.

[3] *Izvestia*, July 15, 1964.

[4] Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," *Saturday Evening Post*, December 16, 1961.

[5] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism and the Free World," NATO's Fifteen Nations, September 1963.

Country and people—Con.	*Year of Communist domination*
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc., in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's next? South Vietnam? Guinea? Colombia? Congo? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand?

REPRESENTATIVE RED REACTIONS

A most important part of the ABC's of Captive Nations Week is the three R's, representative Red reactions to the Week. Accumulated since July 1959, they can fill several volumes. Be they the Khrushchevs, the Maos, Gomulkas, Titos, Castros, and all other squabbling or non-squabbling members of the Syndicate, the Red totalitarians screech at the list of captive nations and vituperatively condemn the Week. There's no mystery as to why they react so. The two mirror their wretched past and their deceptive present—and perhaps their doomed future. Conquest, terror, tyranny, genocide, totalitarian oppression, Cold War operations, the USSR as an "imperium in imperio," illegitimacy, imperio-colonialism, philosophical fraudulence and many other things are reflected by the mirror.

The following, selected at random, scarcely require comment:

"This resolution stinks." (Then, according to Vice President Nixon, "he spelled out what he meant in earthy four-letter words.")[6]—Nikita S. Khrushchev, July, 1959.

It represents an "hysterical campaign of petty provocation, proving that panic-stricken monopolists are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions."[7]—N. S. Khrushchev, July, 1959.

"The resolution is a new American provocation and a hostile act."[8]—Protest of Red Czech regime, 1959.

"I would not be telling the full truth if I did not say that the adoption of this ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation."[9]—Khrushchev, August 1959.

"Take, for instance, the much-to-be-regretted decision of the American Congress to hold the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' and to pray for their liberation. In this case words other than 'rolling back' were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other people's affairs."[10]—Khrushchev, October, 1959.

"When in July of this year American Senators officially shed crocodile tears over the captive nations, they did not forget to cry for Ukraine . . . It would appear that the Ukrainian people are enslaved."[11]

—Red publication, August 1960

"Some members of the U.S. Congress, who apparently are not too busy with state affairs deliver 'moving' speeches, using the same mimeographed crib concerning the so-called 'week of captive nations' . . .[12]

—Nicholas V. Podgorny, U.N., October 1960.

"It is not all fortuitous that this time the farce presented by the 'Captive Nations Week' should coincide with the hullabaloo created by American propaganda around the West Berlin question."[13] (Khrushchev again denounced the Week at the Communist Party Congress in October, 1961.)

—Moscow, 1961

"All progressive mankind greeted the news of the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' with a feeling of anger and indignation. With foaming mouths the imperialist predators insist on the fantastic idea of restoring the capitalist order in the lands of the peoples' democracies and Soviet socialist republics."[14]

—*Radyanska Ukraina,* July, 1961.

"The Americans who invented the 'Captive Nations Week' are like those proverbial thieves who are yelling 'Catch the Thief', while they themselves are living off the exploited masses in many countries of the world."[15]

—Petro Panch, poet, USSR, August 1961.

"On the basis of the 'weeks' held in the past, we already know what these appropriate ceremonies represent—unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-communist slander . . . Yes, it is only thanks to American bayonets that oppressors of freedom and blood-thirsty dictators are sustained in power in a number of countries of the Latin American continent and Southeastern Asia."[16]

—Moscow, 1962.

(In 1962 the Russian imperio-colonialists scored a victory in getting UNESCO to publish the scandalous and fraudulent *Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the USSR.*)

"Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much as dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question.' "[17]

—Moscow, January, 1963.

"The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared 'a week of the Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."

—*Pravda,* Moscow, July 8, 1963.

"Kennedy is a third-class clown proclaiming Captive Nations Week, which is a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles."

—Pyongyang Radio, N. Korea, July 10, 1963.

"With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance. The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the U.S.A."

—*Izvestia,* Moscow, July 15, 1964.

"In the United States a farce entitled 'captive nations week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."[18]

—Khrushchev, August 1964.

"An annual, pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke. . . . One could treat it like that, if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S."

—*Trybuna Ludu,* Poland, July 27, 1965.

"They are beating the drums again across the sea, filling columns in newspapers and delivering hypocritical speeches. For the umpteenth time the ruling circles of the United States are holding the so-called 'Captive Nations Week.' And the progaganda machine is deafening the citizens with 'atrocious' inventions about the fate of nations which are suffering under the yoke of the Kremlin regime."

—*Radyanska Ukraina,* Ukraine, July 25, 1965:

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Lativa and Estonia. But that will never happen.' "

—Mikhail Suslov, chief Russian ideologist, Vilnius, Lithuania, July 17, 1965.

One can go on and on with these denunciations, drawn from Red China, Cuba, Hungary and elsewhere in the Red Empire. The most important place is, of course, the Soviet Union, which in every respect is the central power base of the empire. In ultimate calculation, every other Red regime, including the Chinese, Yugoslav, Rumanian, and Cuban, depends for its survival on the USSR. No amount of inter-Party squabbles and rifts can hide this supreme truth. So, when Vice President Nixon candidly reported "The Captive Nations Resolution was the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour," what in effect he was saying was that the resolution's ideas tore into the whole tenuous, psycho-political fabric of this power center of "world communism." It opened up a fundamental and promising opportunity that we haven't even begun to explore and cultivate.

THE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS

Another integral part of the ABC's of Captive Nations Week is the successive Presidential Proclamations. Prepared by the restraining and unimaginative hand of the State Department, the general content of these proclamations explains in part why we are still faced with fear and reluctance to seize this opportunity. The reader will find it a most productive exercise to read these proclamations carefully, compare a number of them, and then compare all of them with the resolution upon which they are based. Your comparisons should reveal the essence of our foreign policy plight in the most recent period. They should also motivate you to fight for the elimination of this plight. Read them carefully:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

---

[6] Richard M. Nixon, *Six Crises,* 1962, p. 252.

[7] *The Washington Post,* July 24, 1959, p. A8.

[8] *Associated Press,* Prague, July 24, 1959.

[9] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "On Peaceful Coexistence," *Foreign Affairs,* October 1959, pp. 6–7.

[10] *N. S. Khrushchev's Report to Supreme Soviet,* Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, November 2, 1959, pp. 1–2.

[11] *For the Return to the Homeland,* No. 57/444, August 1960.

[12] Address, U.N. General Assembly, New York, October 4, 1960.

[13] *Pravda,* July 21, 1961.

[14] "Dirty Provocation," *Radyanska Ukraina,* Kiev, July 25, 1961.

[15] *Visti z Ukrainy,* No. 63, August 1961.

[16] *Izvestia,* July 17, 1962.

[17] *The New Times,* Moscow, January 23, 1963.

[18] *Reuters,* Banska Bystrica, Czecho-Slovakia, August 29, 1964.

"*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"*Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1959, and of the independence of the United States of America the 184th.

"By the President.

(Seal) "DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

"CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"*Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

By the President.

(Seal) "DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

"CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1961—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

"*Whereas* it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest their interests in the freedom of other nations:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1961, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 14th day of July in the year of our Lord 1961, and the independence of the United States of America the 186th.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.

"By the President: (Seal)

"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State*."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1962—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 1, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* there exists many historical and cultural ties between the people of these captive nations and the American people; and

"*Whereas* the principles of self-government and human freedom are universal ideals and the common heritage of mankind:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 13th day of July in the year of our Lord 1962, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.

"By the President (Seal)

"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State*."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1963—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"*Whereas* justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

"*Whereas* this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the City of Washington this 5th day of July in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.

"By the President: (Seal)

"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State*."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as 'Captive Nations Week' until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"*Whereas* this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

"*Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson*, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof*, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

"By the President: (Seal)

"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1965—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as 'Captive Nations Week' until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"Whereas all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

"Whereas these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

"Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

"Whereas it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom:

"Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this 2nd day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 190th.

"By the President.

(Seal) "LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

THE ABC'S AND SOME BASIC ISSUES

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly on the issues basic to the security and freedom of our nation. Some of these issues deserve mention here. One is an intelligent, concentrated effort focused on the fundamental reality of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In the U.N. or elsewhere we have done virtually nothing in this fundamental respect. The more the Red totalitarians prattle about "American imperialism," the more millions of minds about the world will believe it. One would think that Goebbels taught us something thirty years ago.

A second basic issue is the formulation of a sensible liberation policy as the best guarantee against both a hot global war and an interminable string of guerrilla wars. This policy, with its almost exclusive emphasis on psycho-political activity and skillful paramilitary engagement, wasn't sufficiently understood in the 50's, and with the re-emerging discussion on "containment" today, not to speak of further communist takeover tomorrow, it stands as the real and winning alternative to the policy of patched-up containment. How unrealistic the proponents of containment are can be gleaned from the evident fact that the Red Syndicate leaped over the Maginot-like containment wall years ago, into Cuba in our hemisphere, into the Middle East, into Africa and Asia. All this through means of calculated, psycho-political warfare, which is even being applied forthrightly in our own country today.

Thirdly, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is necessary for obvious symbolic, legislative, and educational reasons. Equally necessary is the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy for psycho-political warfare training. Had this

Other significant issues are the Consular Convention with the USSR, which should be repudiated by the Senate because it plays into Russian imperio-colonialist hands, and liberalized East-West trade, which should be strongly opposed as a blind repetition of our been in existence ten years ago, with a do-it-yourself course for foreign nationals, I am convinced that we wouldn't today be sacrificing American lives and treasure in Vietnam. Last-minute recourse to military arms is not the answer to the Red-staged conflict of our day; nor is economic aid and welfare the answer.

errors of the 30's and falling into the trap of an over-all Red economic strategy that by now should have been honestly portrayed to our people. Representative MILLS of Arkansas has earned the praise of all sober-thinking Americans who refuse to be stampeded into the Syndicate's trap.

THE UNITARY REALITY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Through all the foggy and murky talk about "East European independence," "the nationalism of Rumanian Communists" and other such ghosts, "containment," "building bridges of understanding" (with whom?), "detente with the Russians," and similar figments of confused minds, there is one massive, unitary reality that cannot be beclouded by these illusions and exercises in self-deception—the captivity of close to a billion people. These are the people who constitute the captive nations. They are in Red states, but they are not of these states.

Our primary appeal, our foremost efforts should be directed toward the freedom of the captive nations, and not the freedom of action of their unrepresentative Red regimes which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the expansion of the Red Empire. The mistakes being made today are in great measure a repetition of those committed in yesteryear. Real, progressive change demands revisions of thought, policy, and action; an ever-broadening knowledge of all the captive nations, particularly those in the USSR, propels such change—a change for a more secure peace, expanded freedom, and positive victory in the Cold War.

NEGROES IN VIETNAM

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the June 26, 1966, issue of Parade, I read an article entitled "Negroes in Vietnam," which follows:

NEGROES IN VIETNAM

Of the 250,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam at this writing, approximately 37,500, or 15%, are colored. In the top fighting units, however, such as the airborne troops, the proportion is frequently 50%. The war in Vietnam is the most integrated war U.S. servicemen have ever fought.

Since many individuals and groups these days have expressed concern about the role of the Negro servicemen in Vietnam, such figures are quite significant.

I contacted the Department of Defense to seek verification of this article. The reply and the fact sheets which I received will be of interest to Members of the House and their constituents alike.

It appears that the percentage of Negroes in Vietnam, particularly in the "top fighting units," cited by the article cannot be confirmed by Department of Defense statistics. The Army in Vietnam evidently is about 15 percent Negro, but the percentage for all Armed Forces there is lower. Due both to the high reenlistment rate of Negroes and to the sizable number who volunteer for "elite" combat units, however, the Defense Department suggests that it is possible that such units may have very high percentages of Negroes.

My correspondence with the Department of Defense and the fact sheets which they sent me follow:

JUNE 30, 1966.

Col. JAMES F. LAWRENCE, Jr.
U.S. Marine Corps, Deputy Director, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of Defense.

DEAR COLONEL LAWRENCE: I noticed in the June 26, 1966 issue of *Parade* an article entitled "Negroes in Vietnam." The article read as follows:

"Of the 250,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam at this writing, approximate 37,500, or 15% are colored. In the top fighting units, however, the proportion is frequently 50%."

The figures cited in the article are of interest to me. I would be interested in knowing if they can be verified.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: This is in reply to your letter concerning an article appearing in the June 26, 1966 issue of PARADE which cited certain figures pertaining to Negroes serving in Vietnam.

Although our records do not indicate the percentage of Negroes in any particular unit, it is quite possible that some units have a significantly larger percentage of Negroes than their percentages of the total Armed Forces. Factors contributing to this situation are that the reenlistment rate of Negroes, who are making a career of service in the Army, far exceeds the white rate and that sizable numbers volunteer for our elite combat units which, by the nature of the conflict, are being extensively employed in Vietnam.

For your information I have enclosed a Fact Sheet which the Department of Defense has developed on this subject.

I trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

JACK MOSKOWITZ,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
(Civil Rights and Industrial Relations).

Enclosure.

FACT SHEET: NEGRO PARTICIPATION IN THE ARMED FORCES AND IN VIET NAM

The Department of Defense has recently received many requests for information concerning participation of Negroes in the

Armed Services, especially in Viet Nam. Statistical data on Negro participation in the Armed Forces as a whole is routinely recorded by the Military Departments for evaluation of the progress of equal opportunity in the Armed Forces. For Viet Nam, no such data has been available. At the request of the Department of Defense, the Military Departments have recently undertaken a partial one-time survey of Negro participation in Viet Nam, including fatalities.

The most recent available data concerning participation of Negroes in the Armed Forces is shown in Enclosures 1 and 2.

Data developed by the Services concerning Negro participation in Viet Nam is summarized in the following tables:

1. Assignments in Viet Nam:

Negro participation

	Percent
Army, Dec. 31, 1965 (16,531)	14. 8
Navy, Dec. 31, 1965 (500)[1]	5. 1
Marine Corps, Dec. 31, 1965 (3,580)	8. 9
Air Force, Sept. 30, 1965 (908)	8. 3

[1] Navy strength is an estimate, based upon the percentage of Negroes in the Navy as a whole.

These figures are extracted from data which account for approximately 98% of the military personnel in Viet Nam at the time.

2. Casualties. No racial breakout is available on wounded personnel, since no racial designations appear upon many of the medical records involved. A racial breakout is available on fatalities, however, because the forms for identifying remains have a racial designator for identification purposes. For the years 1961 through 1965, the fatalities suffered in Viet Nam because of hostile action are the following:

	Army			Navy			Marine Corps			Air Force			Total DoD		
	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total
Total	213	865	1078	49	27	76	37	309	346	93	27	120	392	1, 228	1, 620
Negro	6	191	197		1	1	2	37	39				8	229	237
Percent	(2. 8)	(22. 1)	(18. 3)	(0)	(3. 7)	(1. 3)	(5. 4)	(12)	(11. 3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(18. 6)	(14. 6)

Inquiries on this subject should be directed to Mr. Jack Moskowitz, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights & Industrial Relations), Room 3B946, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C., telephone OX 7-6381.

Negro commissioned officers (as of Dec. 31, 1965)

[Number and percent (in parentheses) of Negro personnel in each rank]

Rank	Army		Navy		Marine Corps		Air Force	
O-7 up	0		0		0		1	(0.2)
O-6	9	(0. 2)	0		0		16	(0.2)
O-5	172	(1. 3)	5	(0. 1)	0		61	(0. 5)
O-4	788	(4. 5)	46	(0. 3)	7	(0. 3)	209	(0. 9)
O-3	1, 580	(5. 2)	105	(0. 5)	15	(0. 3)	934	(2. 0)
O-2	541	(3. 5)	50	(0. 3)	19	(0. 4)	502	(2. 1)
O-1	555	(2. 8)	42	(0. 4)	9	(0. 4)	343	(2. 5)
Total	3, 647	(3. 6)	248	(0. 3)	50	(0. 3)	2, 066	(1. 6)

Negro enlisted personnel (as of Dec. 31, 1965)

[Number and percent (in parentheses) of Negro personnel in each rank]

Rank	Army		Navy		Marine Corps		Air Force	
E-9	162	(3. 7)	42	(1. 3)	7	(0. 9)	78	(1. 4)
E-8	980	(7. 1)	178	(2. 0)	41	(1. 4)	244	(2. 3)
E-7	3, 884	(9. 8)	1, 077	(3. 0)	169	(2. 7)	1, 088	(3. 4)
E-6	13, 063	(15. 5)	3, 518	(5. 0)	567	(5. 3)	3, 625	(5. 6)
E-5	27, 241	(18. 4)	6, 107	(6. 5)	3, 003	(11. 9)	15, 355	(11. 0)
E-4	25, 632	(14. 6)	7, 276	(5. 9)	2, 666	(9. 7)	18, 456	(13. 7)
E-3	28, 524	(14. 9)	10, 478	(6. 6)	3, 363	(8. 6)	14, 598	(10. 0)
E-2	12, 490	(13. 4)	7, 057	(6. 0)	4, 608	(10. 0)	16, 472	(13. 9)
E-1	21, 325	(10. 1)	1, 230	(4. 4)	3, 202	(8. 4)	2, 946	(10. 4)
Total	133, 311	(13. 9)	36, 963	(5. 8)	17, 626	(9. 0)	72, 862	(10. 7)

NEGRO PARTICIPATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

The percentage of Negroes in the Armed Forces is steadily rising. The overall percentage as of the last report, 31 December 1965, was 9.5 percent, up from 9.0 percent in 1964 and 8.2 percent in 1962:

Calendar year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
Enlisted:				
1949	12. 4	4. 7	2. 1	5. 1
1954	13. 7	3. 6	6. 5	8. 6
1962	12. 2	5. 2	7. 6	9. 2
1964	13. 4	5. 8	8. 7	10. 0
1965	13. 9	5. 8	9. 0	10. 7
Officers:				
1949	1. 8	0	(	. 6
1954	3. 0	. 1	. 1	1. 1
1962	3. 2	. 2	. 3	1. 2
1964	3. 4	. 3	. 4	1. 5
1965	3. 6	. 3	. 4	1. 6

During the past five years the increase is attributable to a steadily increasing rate of enlisted accessions, and to a markedly high Negro re-enlistment rate:

Percent nonwhite among accessions to active duty

Fiscal year	Total, DOD	Army		Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
		Ind.	Enl.			
1961	8. 2	14. 4	8. 2	2. 9	5. 9	9. 5
1962	9. 7	15. 3	9. 0	4. 1	6. 5	8. 6
1963	10. 6	18. 5	11. 2	4. 3	5. 5	10. 5
1964	10. 7	14. 2	12. 2	5. 0	8. 7	9. 1
1965	12. 2	16. 3	14. 1	5. 8	8. 4	13. 1

Reenlistment rates by race, calendar year 1965

Service	1st-term		Career	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Army	13. 7	49. 3	80. 7	96. 9
Navy	24. 2	44. 8	89. 6	93. 4
Marine Corps	18. 9	38. 9	77. 7	92. 3
Air Force	19. 1	39. 2	88. 9	92. 2
Department of Defense total	17. 1	45. 7	86. 4	94. 2

GROWING DISREGARD FOR THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out on a number of occasions against what seems to be a growing disregard in our country for the individual's right of privacy on the part of many larger businesses, including private utilities, and often by public agencies both in Washington and in the States.

As a citizen, as a Member of Congress, and as a member of the legal profession, I am distressed by each new evidence brought to light of the invasion of privacy.

It can be understood why certain public agencies may feel impelled to infringe upon private rights in cases where the security of our country may be jeopardized, but infringement to privacy should stop there.

Perhaps it would be well to examine this basic right that each American has—a right that must be vigorously defended in the years to come.

The right of privacy simply defined is the right to be let alone. Recognizing and defining privacy as an independent right with distinctive characteristics, Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis—later Justice Brandeis of the U.S. Supreme Court—in an article in the Harvard Law Review of December 1890 wrote:

> That the individual shall have full protection in person and in property is a principle as old as the common law; but it has been found necessary from time to time to define anew the exact nature and extent of such protection. * * * Gradually the scope of (these) legal rights broadened; and now the right to life has come to mean the right to enjoy life—the right to be let alone. * * * (4 Harvard L. Rev. 193).

Justice Brandeis continued his advocacy of the right to privacy in the now famous Olmstead case. In that case—*Olmstead* v. *United States,* 277 U.S. 438

[1927]—the majority of the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the conviction of men accused of violating the National Prohibition Act even though the sole evidence against some of the men was obtained by Government agents from telephone conversations intercepted by means of tapped telephone lines. It was contended that such wiretapping was a violation of the fourth amendment's guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures and the fifth amendment's protection against a person in a criminal case being compelled to be a witness against himself. Justices Butler, Holmes and Hughes, as well as Justice Brandeis, dissented but it was Justice Brandeis who wrote:

> When the Fourth and Fifth Amendments were adopted . . . force and violence were then the only means known to man by which a Government could . . . compel the individual to testify. . . .

He then reviewed the history of the fourth and fifth amendments as they affected "the very essence of constitutional liberty and security." He extolled the indefeasible and sacred "right of personal security—and—personal liberty" and drew the conclusions that:

> As a means of espionage, writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wire tapping. . . . The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. . . . They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man.

The right of privacy is the most comprehensive right and is undoubtedly the right most valued by civilized man, and it may well be the right most difficult to attain and retain in the future of increasing population where, whether we like it or not, the tendency toward conformity and uniformity will inexorably increase. The sheer weight of numbers of people adds to the difficulty of consideration for the individual and his pursuit of happiness.

The U.S. Supreme Court undertakes to protect the rights of individuals accused of crime, and each new decision brings an outcry of outrage from local officials charged with the right of protecting society. They forget Justice Brandeis' warning that:

> The door of a court is not barred because the plantiff has committed a crime. The confirmed criminal is as much entitled to redress as his most virtuous fellow citizen; . . . . In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperilled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. (*Olmstead* v. *U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, 485).

Our Government must observe the law including the most comprehensive and most valued right of privacy for the individual.

The first Justice Harlan said:

> The principles that embody the essence of constitutional liberty and security forbid all invasions on the part of the government and its employees of the sanctity of a man's home, and the privacies of his life. (*I.C.C.* v. *Brimson*, 154 U.S. 447, 479.)

Justice Douglas in two different cases stated:

> The dignity and privacy of the individual are worth more to society than an all-powerful police. (*U.S.* v. *Carignan*, 342 U.S. 36, 46).

And again:

> Once privacy is invaded, privacy is gone. (*Comm.* v. *Pollak*, 343 U.S. 451, 469).

It was Justice Douglas who delivered the opinion of the Court in the case of *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*—No. 964, June 7, 1965—when the Connecticut birth control law was held unconstitutional, and in it he enumerated the first, third, fourth, fifth, and ninth amendments as those which "enable the citizen to create a zone of privacy which Government may not force him to surrender to his detriment." He acknowledged the existence of controversies over the rights of "privacy and repose" and concluded that they were dealing in this case with a "right of privacy older than the Bill of Rights—older than our political parties, older than our school system."

A man's right of privacy must be protected in this country—now more than ever before. Without the right of privacy, a man loses his right to dissent and with it, the country loses, for all progress begins with the lone voice of the dissenter. "The right to be let alone is indeed the beginning of all freedom." Douglas: *Pub. Util. Comm.* v. *Pollack*, 343 U.S. 451, 467.

AFL–CIO POINTS OUT MOUNTING EVIL

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an article by Frank L. Fernbach, assistant director of the AFL–CIO Department of Research, in the July issue of the American Federationist, graphically describes the evils attached to the growing practice of States, municipalities, and their dummy corporations issuing tax-exempt securities to finance industrial development. Mr. Fernbach refers to it as a "sophisticated plant-pirating device," and that is exactly what it is.

His story lists numerous instances of the abuse of tax-exemption privileges—abuses so vast in scope that they deserve to be brought to the attention of the entire Congress:

SUBSIDIZED PLANT MIGRATION

(By Frank L. Fernbach)

In the spring of 1961, something was happening in two small American communities which, although hardly noted elsewhere, was a forewarning of a significant and dangerous trend.

In Muskegon, Michigan, the management of the Norge Division of the Borg-Warner Corporation suddenly announced plans to close down its plant. Not even the bargaining representative of the company's 1,400 plant workers—Local 404 of the Allied Industrial Workers, AFL–CIO—had been consulted in advance. Yet these workers had given 21,000 years of their lives—an average of 15 years per employe—to the production of Norge refrigerators and the earning of substantial profits for this wealthy corporation. Almost 900 of the soon-to-be-abandoned workers were over 40 years old; 235 were over 55 years of age.

During the same springtime that this disaster was overtaking Muskegon—it was already a depressed, labor-surplus area even before the shutdown announcement—a more pleasant prospect was unfolding for Greenwood, Arkansas, 700 miles away. In that small community, a brand new $7.5 million factory, financed by the proceeds from the sale of taxfree municipal bonds, was nearing completion. It was being built for, and according to the precise specifications of, the Norge Division of the Borg-Warner Corporation, the Muskegon runaway. What is more, in large measure the plant would be subsidized not only by the citizens of Greenwood but by all the taxpayers of the United States.

American workers always have had to face the grim fact that unavoidable economic circumstances—for example, the changing market for a product or a dwindling local raw material supply—sometimes make a plant closing and its relocation a necessity. In all too many cases, however, employers are lured away by a deliberate act of plant piracy. Many states and communities have spent and still spend vast sums to dramatize the attraction of their cheap non-union labor, their low-benefit, and thus low-cost, welfare laws and their special tax-avoidance schemes. These enticements—used for years as bait to pirate plants from one community to another—played their part in luring Borg-Warner from Michigan to Arkansas.

In this instance, however, a much newer and more sophisticated plant-pirating device was employed. It is known in the investment banking trade as "industrial-bond financing."

Arkansas set the stage for the use of this device in 1958 when it authorized its cities, counties or municipalities to sell tax-free public bonds and use the proceeds to build and lease publicly-subsidized plants for private use. Greenwood was not the first Arkansas community to utilize this newly legalized industry-luring scheme, but its $7.5 million bond issue in behalf of Borg-Warner was the largest approved up to that time under the new law. Nor was Arkansas the first state to sanctify this misuse of public bonds for private profit purposes; it merely copied what a dozen states, mostly in the South—and beginning with Mississippi in the 1930s—had already begun.

Today, this unsavory practice of plant enticement through industrial-bond financing is already sanctioned by 30 of the 50 states. Since the spread of the practice increasingly threatens workers' job security and runs counter to the national welfare in many other ways, it is important to note how the scheme works and its many unfortunate results.

Long ago, the federal government granted state and local governments the right to issue tax-exempt bonds, but for the single purpose of helping them reduce their costs when borrowing to finance public facilities—like schools, hospitals, roads and the like. Because the buyers of these bonds, therefore, are not required to pay any federal tax on the interest they receive on their loans, state and local governments are able to sell their securities at a low interest rate. The federal government thus forgoes tax revenues, which otherwise would flow to Washington, in order to reduce state and local public facility and service costs. This is clearly a federal subsidy that, in effect, all American taxpayers underwrite.

But when the states, their local governments or their specially authorized "development organizations" misuse these tax-exempt securities to finance the construction of industrial or commercial facilities for sale or rent to profit-making corporations, in reality they are funneling the benefits of cheaper, subsidized tax-exempt financing meant for public purposes into private pockets instead. This kind of raid on the federal treasury is a perversion of the intent of the tax-free state and local bonding privilege.

The cash advantage to a corporation that can climb on the industrial-bond financing gravy train is very substantial. Here is how Representative Henry Reuss (D-Wis.)—a long-time student and foe of this bonanza—has described it:

"First, a local government with a good bond rating for its tax exempts can borrow money 1 to 2 percent cheaper than even the most creditworthy industrial corporations. When the local government uses this cheaper money to build a brand new, modern plant for a business on a lease arrangement, a business can get an efficient, economical layout at a far lower cost than it could construct by itself.

"Second, a company occupying leased quarters can charge off all of its rental cost as a 'business expenditure' for tax purposes. What is more, by arrangement with the local government it can elect to pay a high annual rental over a short period rather than a low annual rental over a longer period. In the former case, a company would have the equivalent of accelerated depreciation beyond that which the federal government would permit on self-financed facilities. This might be very attractive for some corporations anxious to offset large earnings from other operations.

"Third, when business property is owned by a local government and leased, the lessee is under no legal requirement to pay local property taxes during the term of the lease. Many municipalities permit this extra 'sweetener' to remain in deals with private corporations.

"Fourth, the local government issuing tax-exempt bonds can offer to sell them to the corporation leasing the new plant. This enables the corporation to earn tax-free income at the same time that it enjoys lower rental cost due to tax-exempt financing."

It it worth noting that Borg-Warner bought $6 million worth of the bonds sold by Greenwood to finance its own plant and every year is pocketing the tax-free interest it receives on its loan made in its own behalf.

According to the Investment Bankers Association—another opponent of industrial-bond financing—the gain to a corporation would be tremendous when the above four steps are combined. By its arithmetic, a company that signed a 30-year lease on a $4 million municipally-built plant and then itself bought the bonds that were issued to finance it, would, in effect enjoy use of the plant rent-free for 30 years and, in addition, pile up a $480,000 profit on its $4 million tax-free loan.

And this isn't all. Since most of the companies which are industrial-bond beneficiaries have located their cutrate subsidized plants in small towns and in rural areas, they very frequently also enjoy the cost savings of low non-union wages and of the low-benefit public welfare laws that generally prevail. Moreover, when a company enticed by industrial-bond financing is also a runaway, as in the case of Borg-Warner, there often are other advantages. It can also divorce itself from pension, paid vacation and other accumulating obligations to employes that would have become due if it had continued with its original workforce.

Reliable statistics on the use of the industrial bonding device—such as how many communities have used it, how many plants were built and at what cost and how many of these were pirated from other communities—are not easy to come by. No federal agency collects this information and the figures gathered by the Investment Bankers Association do not jibe with those of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. And both are rough estimates.

Nonetheless, despite the murkiness that characterizes municipal industrial-financing practices, this is what is happening.

From the mid-1930s to 1950, only three states—Mississippi, Kentucky and Alabama—had authorized their local governments to engage in industrial-bond financing. During those years, however, the amount of financing per plant was small. According to one estimate, the total volume of all municipal industrial bonds sold before 1951 was only about $7 million.

Between 1950 and 1960, however, about a dozen additional states authorized use of this plant-luring device and the total issues began to rise. During 1960, $40 million worth of municipal industrial bonds were issued by 54 local communities, according to the IBA. The Association views this figure and its other yearly totals to be understatements, however, because it assumes that some of its affiliates which profit from the sale of these bonds prefer not to report their activities.

Since 1960, the new kind of "war between the states" to attract employers via subsidized municipal financing has really gathered force. Fifteen additional states have authorized the issuance of tax-free industrial development bonds for at least some of their political subdivisions. Some took the step, it was announced, with extreme reluctance and only as a countermeasure to protect themselves against the practices of other states.

According to IBA estimates, in 1962 industrial-bond sales reached $85 million, more than double the 1960 total. During 1965, however, sales had more than doubled again—they totaled $216 million, according to the IBA's concededly short count.

What is more, during the first four months of 1966 alone, $228 million worth of tax-free industrial bonds have been sold, according to reports received by the Association. This already is more than the total sold last year. How far short even this count may be we do not know. According to a Wall Street Journal report, Eastman Dillon Union Securities & Co.—a New York investment banking firm that underwrites a major share of these industrial-bond offerings—estimates that nearly $1 billion worth of these issues actually were sold last year.

Although industrial-bond financing still remains a relatively minor factor when compared with total private financing for plant construction, it is conceded that resort to this public subsidy device to underwrite a traditionally private function is spreading states, however, the practice is only getting rapidly. In most of the recently approving under way; it takes time for their local governments to learn how to use this new industry-enticement device. As a matter of fact, 87 percent of the approximately $500 million of industrial-bond financing underwritten between 1951 and 1962 is reported to have been accounted for by Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee—five very experienced plant-luring states.

The recent explosive growth of industrial-bond financing reflects not only the rise in the number of states permitting its use but, as more and more businesses realize how immensely profitable the scheme can be, it reflects a rapid rise in the participation of very large corporations as well.

From the mid-1930's until about 1960, small companies—particularly soft-goods manufacturers—were especially attracted by this lure. The value of the municipal bonds issued to finance most plants was low and, in the main, they were general obligation bonds. Recently, very large corporations have begun to respond to the enhanced profit opportunities of industrial-bond financing, the majority of issues are revenue bonds and often the sums involved are tremendous.

During the last five years, some very substantial corporations have joined the subsidized plant-building parade. They include the U.S. Rubber Company, Armco Steel, Harvey Aluminum, Continental Oil, Litton Industries, the Cutler-Hammer Corporation, Borg-Warner, Revere Copper and Brass, American Sugar Refining, the United Fruit Company and a dozen other blue-chip concerns.

It is noteworthy that most of the very generous subsidized plant construction in behalf of these companies is underwritten by surprisingly small communities, indeed. For example, Cherokee, Alabama—population 1,400—has put up $25 million through its tax-free bond issuing privilege to build a cut-rate chemical plant for Armour and Company. Lewisport, Kentucky—population 750—has issued and sold $50 million to accommodate the Harvey Aluminum Company with a tax-free plant-financing scheme. Last February, the townsfolk of Champ, Missouri, which has only 14 eligible voters, approved a $12.5 million bond issue to build new plants for three companies and "all will be replacements for plants operating elsewhere," according to a Wall Street Journal report.

Although it might be assumed that private industry should be able to finance its own plants in the traditional way—corporate profits and cash flow have been reaching new peaks year after year—apparently something-for-nothing is an inevitable temptation. Even the federal government itself now subsidizes 7 percent of the private business outlay for new machinery and equipment under the new federal investment tax credit. Why shouldn't local governments, therefore—in the same generous spirit—be allowed to subsidize new plants as well, particularly when these communities are so eager to help and the private money market is now so tight? Furthermore, the practice of diverting an intended public subsidy to a private purpose through municipal-bond financing is so simple. It all can be done on a do-it-yourself basis—by a quiet and cozy arrangement between a local government and a corporation—without the inconvenience of having to obtain the consent of the federal government at all.

The consequences of industrial-bond financing have been so evident to organized labor since the practice first began that it has long sought to close the loophole in the Federal Revenue Code which allows this evil to exist and grow. In 1954, when the Code was substantially revised, the issue was brought before the tax-writing committees of the Congress, but to no avail. In 1964, when the next major effort at tax reform was undertaken, the subject again was ignored.

Fortunately, the misuse of the local bonding privilege for private gain is gradually becoming widely recognized and influential groups now seek to end it, although for varying reasons.

Alarm is finally being expressed in high places that industrial-bond financing perverts the public purpose for which the tax-free status of state and local bonds was conceived; that private beneficiaries are enjoying a bonanza to which they are not entitled; that use of this lure can undermine—and already has—local government solvency and diverts the use of public credit away from the meeting of genuine public service needs; that resort to the practice shifts greater tax burdens to local citizens and established businesses; that, as more and more states authorize use of this plant-luring bait, increased competition will simply cancel the advantage out and even more costly industry lures will have to be invented.

All of these charges are true.

Mainly based upon these considerations, the influential, congressionally-sponsored Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations declared three years ago that industrial-bond financing is a device "which the Commission does not endorse or recommend."

The Investment Bankers Association, although it represents those who make a profit from the sale of state and municipal bonds, long has wanted industrial-bond financing ended. The IBA fears that this odious scheme could lead to a public outcry against tax-free status for any state and local bonds—a fear with some justification in the face of the further fact that these bonds are brought in substantial number by the very rich for tax-avoidance purposes.

Spokesmen for the U.S. Treasury also have watched the spread of industrial-bond financing with rising apprehension. In public testimony in 1965, former Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon declared: "Sooner or later, it is perfectly inevitable that practically every state will adopt this procedure." He went on to point out that this will result in "a substantial erosion of federal revenues."

Only a month ago, Secreary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler predicted that the use of tax-free industrial development bonds "would eventually become self-defeating." He informed a conference of state legislative leaders that "this practice merits careful attention and is curently under study."

Of all the evils inherent in industrial-bond financing, the public indictment should especially condemn the evil of allowing the federal tax law to be misused to aid and abet plant piracy. There is no record anywhere of the total extent of the job discplacement and personal tragedy that governmentally-subsidized plant migration already has brought about. But the files of the AFL–CIO give ample proof that scores of American workers already have been cruelly victimized by the loophole in the Federal Revenue Code that induces plant piracy.

It sometimes is argued that municipal factory-financing helps depressed areas achieve industrial growth and that this is a commendable objective. This self-serving argument, however, ignores the obvious fact that no legitimate national purpose can be served by a federal subsidy that encourages plant migration and, thus, robs Peter simply to pay Paul. Ironically, even the worker who is deprived of his job due to plant pirating is forced to contribute via taxes to the federal subsidy which is used to lure away his livelihood. Furthermore, even when an employer who is aided by municipal-bond financing actually is not a runaway, the welfare of workers and owners of competing enterprises is put in jeopardy. The subsidy conferred by the misuse of tax-free bonds reduces the ability of unsubsidized firms to compete and thereby undermines job security at those workplaces.

The American labor movement long has been aware of the plight of the distressed areas—rural as well as urban—and it has provided leadership in the effort to inaugurate a constructive federal program to aid them. Towards this end, the AFL–CIO actively worked for the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act (now succeeded by the Public Works and Economic Development Act) and for special legislation tailored to the needs of the neglected people of Appalachia.

In enacting these measures, the Congress recognized that communities and whole areas may be economically non-competitive for differing reasons and it approved a well-rounded program—including proper safeguards to protect the well-being of the rest of the nation—in an effort to realistically help them.

At the outset it was recognized that a distressed area not only lacks job-creating private enterprise but generally also lacks essential public facilities—for example, water for industrial use, an adequate sewerage system, good transportation and the like—that are also vital if job opportunities are to grow. It was also recognized that a careful, hard-headed assessment of a community's economic potential—to determine what should and should not be done—must be undertaken before a redevelopment effort gets under way. As a consequence, the new federal programs embrace a whole package of indispensable and interrelated aids; technical assistance and planning—sometimes multi-county and multi-state in scope—to lay the groundwork for sound long-range growth; public facility grants and loans; private industrial and commercial long-term, low-interest loans; manpower training assistance and the like. It is recognized that an effort merely to acquire a factory, pirated or not, is not the way to ensure the sound development of a community.

What is more, automation and technological change are rapidly reducing the proportion of the total American labor force employed in manufacturing. As a consequence, it is delusion to believe that there ever will be enough manufacturing plants to help all distressed localities resolve their unemployment problem. As a matter of fact, the hope of some of these communities lies primarily in developing their recreational and tourist potentials or in attracting job-creating public institutions—health, penal, educational and so on. Moreover, in some areas a proper assessment reveals that there just isn't a realistic probability that economic growth can be achieved; in such situations, out-migration should be encouraged.

Of major importance, the new federal programs to assist hardship areas specifically prohibit aid of any kind that would merely transfer jobs from one part of the United States to another. In writing these new laws, the Congress has clearly recognized that neither the American economy nor the American people is served by robbing Peter to pay Paul. What is more, under these laws well-off corporations with the ability to finance their own expansions are specifically excluded from receiving federal aid.

If the distressed areas really want to be helped, and without the rest of the nation being harmed as a consequence, they must come to realize that plant luring via industrial-bond financing is not the best way. The effective use of the well-conceived and safeguarded federal programs is a better alternative. As a matter of fact, the spread of the tax-free municipal factory-financing scheme will increasingly menace the distressed areas. As the use of this bait extends across the country, it is evident that new plants will more and more be enticed to wealthier communities with well-established public facilities and not to the less attractive depressed areas that need them most.

It is high time to finally put an end to the scandal of industrial-bond financing and it must be done by the Congress.

More than a year ago, Representatives REUSS and CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, (D-Wis.) introduced measures which would end industrial-bond financing.

Under the first proposal, the curb would be indirect. Whenever the proceeds from a tax-exempt bond issue are used to construct facilities, for sale or lease, for a private profitmaking firm, the rent or other payments relating to the use of the facility would be disallowed as a deduction in computing the firm's federal income tax liability.

The second proposal takes a more direct approach. It provides that tax exemption shall be removed on state and local obligations to the extent that the proceeds are used to construct industrial or commercial facilities for sale or lease to private profit-making enterprises. It stipulates that the removal of tax exemption would not apply to the purchase of land for urban renewal or other public purposes.

The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress could perform a great service by conducting an investigation, including public hearings, on all aspects of plant relocation in the United States. It is high time that the Congress and the American people have an opportunity to know all the facts about the murky and unsavory practice of industrial-bond financing.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, this week the United States is marking Captive Nations Week. I feel it is fitting to call attention to the fact that while the Communist nations continue to make a public show of denunciation of U.S. policy in southeast Asia, their own oppressive rule over nine European nations continues to deny fundamental human rights to 100 million people.

Communist regimes today are seeking by infiltration, subversion and so-called wars of liberation to force their oppressive system upon yet other nations. The Soviet Union has precipitously abrogated a bilateral cultural exchange program athletic meet this month in an alleged denunciation of our participation in the Vietnamese conflict. At the same time, however, the Soviet Union has under its totalitarian regimes some 100 million people in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania who are robbed of the right of self-determination.

Since the end of World War II, fought to assure the continued existence as free, democratic states our Nation and all nations, the fact is that today, more than two decades later, the people of these nine European nations are not free. During the same era, numerous peoples of Africa and Asia have achieved nationhood with full freedom of self-determination and are now represented in the United Nations. Yet, the millions of formerly free people in the captive nations, many of whom still recall living in freedom, live under more oppressive regimes than did many of the African and Asian peoples now enjoying statehood.

One of the foremost objectives of the leaders of the Communist world is to cause those of us in the free world to forget about the captive nations and, in effect, accept their totalitarian governments as legitimate bodies. Silence contributes to this objective and, for that reason, the proclamation of Captive Nations Week gives those of us in the United States an opportunity to audit again the world's "balance sheet" and determine which nations are villains. The answer is obvious.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems altogether fitting that, during Captive Nations Week the United States rededicate itself to standing firm against any further inroads by communism on the people of the free world, and offer to the enslaved people of those captive nations renewed assurance that we are working unceasingly for a world based on freedom, justice, and peace for all people everywhere.

DEMISE OF THE STRIKE

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the demise of the strike as an effective, usable instrument in labor disputes is eminent. Like the atomic bomb it is too destructive to be accepted in industrial confrontation. In my judgment it has no more than 3 to 5 years to live, if that long.

I speak not in reprobation but rather as a friend with a word to the wise. My record as a legislator reflects the level of concern I have consistently entertained for the workingman and his welfare. It is from that concern I now urge attention.

The American public is a tolerant body. It will in the name of the rights of its citizens suffer necessary burdens matching the performance of any modern state. There is a threshold for this tolerance, however, and it is becoming increasingly more critical. Not for any reason particularly germane to labor per se but arising more from the fact of the complexity and interdependence of our life.

That complexity and interdependency is the harsh fact that day by day pushes upward the cost of the strike. Day by day the benefits to be derived by one group comes at a higher and higher burden to the other segments of our country. Labor like all other elements of American society must come out of the well in which they have performed their functions as though in "splendid isolation." They must like others of us drop the "tunnel vision" which our past era of specialization and division of labor encouraged. In the complexities of today and the size and load factors built into our social machinery the relationships between the parts of our economy are as important as the integrity and efficiency of the parts. Social friction and economic friction are at once the most dangerous and most challenging facts of our times.

Let me demonstrate the problem. Five years ago the Los Angeles supermarkets were struck by the retail clerks, obviously for what the clerks saw as reasonable and just cause. That action struck with devastating swiftness and with dangerous cost at the milk producing dairies in my district. That industry had just concluded a historic shift in makeup which commenced in the middle 1930's. The proliferation of 40- to 60-cow dairies with partial homegrown feed and inhouse heifer development had emerged into an impressive industrial operation; 300 to 600 cows, carefully selected, operating on small acreage containing not one blade of grass demonstrated the ultimate in agribusiness. The feed was daily hauled by gasoline haywagons into the feed yards where a mechanized system broke it down and delivered it to the cows for feeding. Milking and storage processes were fully automated. The cows were organized into shifts: while one group fed, another was being milked and another rested. At the appropriate time the groups were shifted and no cow was maintained when it fell below a certain level of output; replacements are purchased, not produced. The business requires a million dollars to start and costs tens of thousands of dollars per month to operate.

The clerk strike shifted milk prices to the consumer from State-controlled profit price for grade A milk to the creamery controlled loss price for excess or grade B milk. In this posture every dairyman in the Los Angeles basin began at once to operate at a loss. A sustained strike could wipe out the dairies; destroy the carefully evolved milk production balance and create en fin a potential health and price problem for the consumer. Is it logical to assume that the public would tolerate such attendant costs and burdens?

The first national death knell for the strike rings through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the late railroad tieup. The current airline dispute and work stoppage have these bells pealing loudly once more.

Again, in the wake of strike we see the debilitating and destructive cut across the economic, political, military, and social life of our country. Countless persons, activities, and enterprises which have nothing to do with the dispute between the warring factions can become tragically involved. The lobster man of Maine and the restaurateur of California, for instance, or the travel agent in Pennsylvania and the hotelman in Seattle; the Congressman from Michigan and his constituents who expected his participation in an important local forum on education; the military effort in Saigon and a vital parts manufacturer in Maryland; vacationers everywhere and the recreational activities in many parts of our country who depend upon the short months of summer to sustain their operation and support their community. Well, labor may say these are but the positive elements of our bargaining position. My friends, the largess of our great democracy does not extend so far that you may with impunity put in peril so many critical and diverse interests.

Strikes which persist threaten business, great and small, but, whereas they are only costly and damaging to the large interests, they are deadly to the small enterprise. We cannot tolerate that. Strikes which persist not only annoy the traveler but can be critical to the Nation's security. We cannot tolerate that.

Where does this leave us, my friends? Whereas we have indicated to labor that the public support is no longer going to sustain their bargaining position. It should be clear that this does not mean an abdication for the full benefit of the management position in labor-management disputes. A substitute for present techniques and instruments will be ordered. In the balanced interest of all sides we must give the highest priority as well as immediate and full attention to this matter of a suitable alternative to the strike.

Mr. Speaker, against the background of this presentation I urge those persons in positions of responsibility in labor, in industry, in government, and in Congress to put their best minds and most creative efforts to this task. A quick turn of compulsory arbitration is not acceptable, I am sure. While we have a short running time available, can we not provide other alternatives? The public interest is in maintaining a balance of profits for business and a fair share of the economic systems' bounty for labor and that balance to be worked out with the minimum of government interference. Such a broadly stated goal loses its meaning, however, in the political pressures generated by intolerable burdens which are the fallout from the use of the ultimate negotiating weapon, the strike.

I have no personal panacea, but I stand ready and anxious to support any honest and sincere proposal for constructive change.

WHITE HOUSE HONORS THE PRIME MINISTER OF OUR PACIFIC NEIGHBOR

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as a Repsentative from the West, I wish to note my gratification at the increasingly positive posture being taken by the administration toward the Pacific community.

For too low now, we have needed but lacked a unified view of the Pacific in contrast to our well conceived policy toward the Atlantic. The recent White House luncheon honoring Prime Minister Holt of Australia on his second visit here this year symbolizes this Nation's new, broadened outlook on the Pacific community.

Having been privileged to attend that luncheon, I listened with great interest to the words of our President and those of the Prime Minister from Australia. Those words reminded us well that the Pacific does not separate us from our Pacific neighbors: it binds us closer to them. While that fact means obligation on the one hand, we must not forget that on the other it means opportunity—opportunity for a better, more peaceful, more prosperous world. As the President so rightly observed:

> The Pacific is not an ocean. It is not a region. It is a crucible in which the free, proud, and peaceful world of tomorrow is today moulding and taking its shape.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks of the President and those of the Prime Minister, and to insert into the RECORD the joint communique issued by them at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's visit. I believe that my colleagues will find the words of the two leaders enlightening, encouraging, warm and human:

TEXT OF THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND THE RIGHT HONORABLE HAROLD E. HOLT, PRIME MINISTER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA FOLLOWING TALKS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 14, 1966

At the invitation of President Johnson, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Right Honourable Harold E. Holt, has returned to Washington to continue the discussions which they held on subjects of mutual interest on June 29.

The President expressed his sincere appreciation for the Prime Minister's willingness to arrange travel arrangements to make their meeting possible.

The President and the Prime Minister reaffirmed the determination of their two Governments to assist the Republic of Vietnam and its people in their efforts to repel the armed aggression mounted against the Republic of Vietnam by the regime in Hanoi, and expressed full confidence that those efforts will be successful. They expressed again the desire of both Governments that the fighting in South Vietnam be brought to an end as soon as possible through negotiation of an honorable peace, welcomed the initiative of the Prime Minister of India appealing to the Government of the USSR to reconvene a meeting of the Geneva powers and reaffirmed their readiness to take part in this or other negotiations whenever the Hanoi regime indicates a willingness to do so. President Johnson reviewed for the Prime Minister military developments in Vietnam during the past two weeks. The Prime Minister expressed appreciation for this review of recent events.

The Prime Minister discussed with the President his recent visit to London.

The President and the Prime Minister reviewed the political, economic and social progress and development which has occurred in Free Asia in recent years, most particularly in the first half of 1966, and agreed that these developments are of the greatest significance for the future of Asia, the Pacific area, and the world. The President and the Prime Minister noted that among these developments has been the healing of old quarrels between nations of the region, the recent establishment of the Asian and Pacific Council, the imminent formal inauguration of the Asian Development Bank in which both the United States and Australia are participating, and concrete steps toward the development of the Mekong Basin. The President and the Prime Minister described these events and the growing sense of regional identity in Asia and the Pacific area as most encouraging for the possibility of future peace and peaceful progress in the region. They expressed their belief that these developments have in no small measure been made possible by the shield of security provided to the region by the determination of the gallant people of Vietnam and those assisting them to repel Communist aggression.

The President and the Prime Minister noted with satisfaction the steady strengthening in the ties linking their two countries, particularly the flow of trade and investment, cooperation in exploring the mysteries of space, and common efforts in a broad range of other scientific projects.

The President and the Prime Minister agreed that there exist opportunities for further great undertakings in the peaceful development of Asia, and these opportunities will be greatly expanded when peace returns to the region.

TOAST BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Prime Minister and my friends:

A house twice visited by a good friend is a house twice blessed. So, Mr. Prime Minister, we welcome you back here to the White House and we are very grateful that you were able to arrange your very busy schedule so as to return and pay us a visit.

While you were away, I spoke to my countrymen, and I hope to yours also, about the Pacific area that we share with many of our Asian friends.

I said the other night, and I should like to reemphasize it now, that I believe that the past is the great testing ground of man's yearning for independence, order, and for a peaceful and productive life.

Mr. Prime Minister, if we can win that test in the Pacific, we may very well have won the fruits of peace for all of our fellow men in the world we would hope, perhaps, for all time. But if we lose it in the Pacific, we will have lost achievement and hope, perhaps, for all time, too.

But we shall not lose the test, because Americans and Australians and Vietnamese, New Zealanders and Koreans, and our other allies shall prove in the Pacific that aggression cannot succeed on any continent, in any country, against any people in the world in the 20th Century.

The Pacific is not an ocean. It is not a region. It is a crucible in which the free, proud, and peaceful world of tomorrow is today moulding and taking its shape.

So, as we meet here this afternoon, the winds of hope are blowing fresh and strong off the Pacific and they are blowing throughout free Asia. We are partners in stirring that excitement.

Yes, Mr. Prime Minister, we are partners in creating the billion dollar Asian Development Bank. We are partners in developing the Mekong River Delta, in denying those who would destroy the promise of stability and growth, and in encouraging those who would make that promise a reality.

And that is the great and urgent work that, after your extremely important meetings in London and here, you will return to Australia to advance, Mr. Prime Minister.

So today you leave us not only as our trusted partner and our cherished friend, but as a man who has left much behind while the bravery and the nobility of the Australian people, a new generation of Americans, are living the lessons that their fathers learned.

I see in front of me Captain Stevens, a teacher at West Point. It was 25 years ago that I got out of bed in Townsville one morning about 3 o'clock with Colonel Stevens, with whom I had roomed. He died that day over Lae and Salamaua. He left a little five-year old boy, who is now this teacher at West Point, to carry on for him.

But we learned that quarter of a century ago, Mr. Prime Minister, that one can never ask for finer comrades on the battlefield, or more willing colleagues in the works of peace than our Pacific brothers, our Australian allies.

And so it is our prayer today that God grant that your young men and ours will soon return from conflict to enjoy the peace that we seek so fervently together.

And until they do return, we will stand shoulder to shoulder supporting them all the way.

So gentlemen, I should like to ask you to toast that bright hope and its living symbol, the very able, courageous, and distinguished Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, Mr. Holt.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Mr. President and gentlemen:

Any man who had been honored by a luncheon given to him by the President of this great democracy would treasure that as a memory for a lifetime. To be so honored twice in so short a space of time is not merely a great honor to me and my country, but it has been tremendously gratifying to my colleagues, as they notified me by cable from Australia.

What you have done by your warm gesture, Mr. President, is a further strand strengthening these close bonds which have developed between us.

Since I was last with you, I have been across the Atlantic to London. As you know, my main purposes in coming abroad were to see you and to develop a warmer and closer, more intimate relationship with you. You had kindly suggested that and so, in his place, had the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

I have gone through this process with Harold Wilson in London. Last Sunday night at Chequers, that historic establishment of British Prime Ministers, after his wife and mine had left us for the evening, he kicked his shoes off and lay down on a couch and for three hours we settled the problems of the world.

I told him, Mr. President, that you had been so generous to me that I felt that if I had asked you for the Statue of Liberty you would have gladly given it to me.

He said, "Why didn't you ask him for Fort Knox?" Well, he may have felt that it would have been handy.

But earlier in that evening he had taken me on a conducted tour—which you were kind enough to do this for me last night at the White House—of Chequers.

At one point in the establishment there is a picture by Rembrandt illustrating the fable of "The Lion and the Mouse". It is a wonderful picture, of course, greatly celebrated and beautifully painted.

But when the Chequers were occupied by Winston Churchill, Winston used to study this. He was, as you know, an amateur painter. In fact, I think he was almost a professional painter by the fees he got toward the end.

But he studied the picture. Perhaps it was failing eyesight or Rembrandt had left something to the imagination, but he said, "I cannot see the mouse." So he painted in the mouse on the picture, and there it is. And so you have Rembrandt and Churchill on this particular picture.

But there was a moral in it, of course, for me. My countrymen won't like me describing them as mice. Indeed we produce the largest rat in the world. It stumps itself along and calls itself a kangaroo.

But I remember the moral of the fable was that little friends may prove great friends. In a sense, my country is a little friend, because there are less than 12 million of us.

But think of the men that this country produced when there were 2½ million of you and you signed the Declaration of Independence. I have often marveled at the greatness of the men you produced from that small community at that time.

I think it was Smuts who said that the great countries are the countries which produce great men, and you produced great men as early as the period in which you had something less than 2½ million.

Washington, himself, Jefferson, Franklin, Alexander Hamilton. You know the list of them so much better than I. But these are men whose names stand in the common heritage of democracy and freedom around the world.

I talked about myself. Perhaps I could return to that for a moment, because we have so many distinguished press representatives and columnists and people of that sort here. I had a recent example in London of how important correct reporting can be.

My wife was interviewed by the press while she was there and was asked what she had been doing. Naturally, being the wife of a politician, she was quite cautious about this. So they asked her if she had been doing any shopping.

You know nothing can embarrass a politician any more than to have it reported that his wife had been doing a lot of expensive shopping. So she said that she had bought a couple of white mice.

This was solemnly reported back in Australia. Then the cables started to flow in the most intriguing jargon of the public service of the Commonwealth pointing out that the import of white mice into Australia was prohibited under our quarantine arrangements; that these white mice would have to be exterminated, if they arrived; it would be very embarrassing for all concerned if the wife of the Prime Minister had to be subjected to this treatment.

Now if the press had only added what was the fact, that these white mice were made of china and were designed for our grandchildren, then everybody would have been happy.

But I have had, Mr. President, on this journey, memorable, unforgettable, and very stirring experiences. And you, sir, have contributed notably to these in ways which my country will not forget and certainly I shall not. And then in England, of course, I have these memories, also.

But one would expect to find some disappointments along the way and I found one here. I found one when I went to England. Perhaps there were others, but these are the ones I mention.

The disappointment I found here was to discover how little of the total story of what is going on in the Pacific area was reaching you through the columns of the press. There was a vivid, dramatic, day-to-day reporting of the military operations in South Vietnam and this, I suppose, is the first war which has been fought on a television screen for most people, and, therefore, not necessarily the most objectively understood by most people.

And so I was disappointed that while I knew of the feeling and appreciation that your own Administration has for this area and its problems, and you have given eloquent testimony to that in the words you have given to us this lunchtime, it was to me, I repeat, a disappointment that we didn't hear more of what was going on in this area of the world which contains half the human race, which by the end of the century will contain rather more than half the human race, because the rate of increase there is significantly greater than in the area of Western Europe or even in these United States.

But you and your colleagues have shown your own awareness of the problems of that area and your determination to play a significant part in seeing those of us who live there through the challenges and through the opportunities which lie ahead for us.

In England I found some disappointment in the fact that Great Britain, and even more so the other countries of Western Europe, seem to be almost oblivious to the existence of that area of the world, almost as if they had quite deliberately turned their backs upon a large part of life, history, and experience in these modern times, because so much that is stirring and exciting in these modern times is occurring in this area of the world.

To bring out the best in the people of a country, you need a cause that will stir the pulse. We have, I am glad to say, several such causes moving in my own country at this time; the problem of developing a large continent, of bringing people in from so many different countries, the challenge of great projects which have to be opened up, the comparatively recent discovery—

Perhaps I should, in saying this, mollify what one has said in a critical vein of these other countries, because it is only in comparatively recent times that we, in Australia, have become conscious and sensitive to the fact that we, by force of geography and circumstance and the history of the future, have a significant place in Asia and, in particular, in the Asia of tomorrow.

These were the disappointments.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I was to find in the United Kingdom an expression, on behalf of the Prime Minister, of determination to support your presence in Vietnam, recognition of the need for the two great democracies of the United States and the United Kingdom to maintain a close comradeship in the affairs of the world.

And you will shortly be visited by the Prime Minister, again keeping close and warm the link between these two democracies whose leadership means so much to the well-being of mankind.

But the primary responsibility of that leadership falls upon you as the head of the mighty nation which these days leads the free world. It is an awesome responsibility and it is fortunate for all of us who value freedom, the opportunities, and liberties of free men that we should have, as the leader of this great democracy in turn leading the free world, a man of your own courage, character, and resolution.

And the lesson that we shall carry out to the rest of the world and, indeed, I know this is the judgment of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, is that here we have a man of resolution determined to see the issues in Vietnam through to the end, however difficult or long that task may be.

But you and I, as men who have this stirring of the pulse for the things that can be done and perhaps because we come from great open spaces and can draw a big fresh breath from the country in which we live and breathe that we tend to take the long view, perhaps the visionary view.

But the visions help to provide the causes and the causes help to evoke the qualities that are the best that lie within us.

And we share this great cause in the Asia of the future.

This, to me, has been one of the really heartening experiences of my journey to the Northern Hemisphere from Down Under. Here in this country is the resolution to see the job through where the difficulties lie and eager determination to take up the opportunities in comradeship and collaboration with those of us who live in the area to make something of Asia which will mark a new and hopeful phase in the history of mankind.

Mr. President, this is the sort of hope you leave with me and which I take back to my country. And it is a stirring thing. It is a comforting thing. It is a heartening thing to be able to feel that we can go on through the many difficulties which face a small people in a large continent with hundreds of millions of people of different race, different history, different tradition, different religion, different outlook immediately about us, but confidently facing that future, because we believe that our own friendship, our own enterprise, our own willingness to join in the task of Asia we will build ourselves new friendships that will see us through the difficulties that we face.

And underlying it all will be the knowledge that we have a friend, a very powerful friend whom you symbolize on this occasion. Thank you. For meaning that strength and that inspiration that is heartening to us all.

In that spirit, from Australia, I salute the President of the United States.

PLIGHT OF CAPTIVE AIRMEN IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by increasing reports that North Vietnam plans to try captured American airmen.

The U.S. Government must make it abundantly clear to the leaders in Hanoi that such a course would invite the gravest of consequences. I think I can say with assurance that the American people would demand a swift and mighty response if such trials were to result in harm to American prisoners.

But most important, the cause of peace in Vietnam would receive a tremendous setback.

Mr. Speaker, Hanoi must not be allowed the dangerous notion that America's earnest desire for peace would prevent the American people from responding to this treatment.

Although opinion in this country differs on the subject of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, the American people would surely unite in demanding the sternest of measures if our men were subjected to trials in defiance of the humane treatment required by the Geneva Convention.

Hanoi must be made to understand in advance that trying American prisoners could deal a fatal blow to the world's hopes for peace in Vietnam.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE—AN EXERCISE IN DEMOCRACY

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the current airline strike enters its second week, no individual has greater reason to regret and be inconvenienced by the loss of transportation than myself. I have made a round trip to my home district in San Antonio, Tex., from Washington, D.C., every weekend that the House has been in session since I came here after my initial election to Congress in 1961. These trips are an essential part of my routine and of my responsibility to my district, as I see it. So I view the airline strike from the vantage point of a veteran traveler of the airlines and a weekend commuter.

Still, I firmly believe that this airline strike, and any strike not in violation of the law of the land, is an exercise in American democracy. The right to strike is a vital element of our system. The loss of this right would help to close our open society. I am therefore concerned over the amount and the tone of the criticism and the animosity directed against the employees involved in this strike.

Without full knowledge of the intricate details in the controversy with the airlines, I do not feel competent to comment on the merits of the proposals of either side. But from the intemperance of the criticism that has been spoken and written, it is clear that many of the critics are equally incompetent. For the most part, however, they represent the longtime foes of collective bargaining and the workingman. To them the fact, which even I am aware of, that the airlines are enjoying recordbreaking corporate profits and unprecedented prosperity, does not indicate that the claims of the employees may be just and reasonable. These traditional antiunion spokesmen are one sided and narrow minded and they will perhaps never comprehend the contributions that the free union movement has made to the growth and development of this country.

Some of them go so far as to advocate compulsory arbitration. They sometimes condition their demand for compulsory arbitration by qualifying it for cases involving the national interest only. But in these days of national and even international business organizations, of mergers and consolidations, how easy it is to establish a case for the national interest in almost any strike. Fortunately, the labor-baiters are in the minority and the vast majority of the people support the right to strike.

I therefore say that the machinists, members of the International Association of Machinists—IAM—are to be commended for protecting and exercising the rights of every workingman. They are acting in the finest tradition of the Nation. It should be pointed out that in exercising this right, there has been no interruption of work on military airlift flights, military charter flights, flight simulators, and training flights.

To those who can offer as a solution only the interference of the Federal Government, I say what the President has indicated: Let labor and management work out their own difficulties within the framework of collective bargaining.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY SPEAKS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND WEST POINT

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Hubert Humphrey is a man with a long and distinguished career of public service. He has served his country as mayor of Minneapolis, as U.S. Senator for 16 years, and now as our Vice President.

Hubert Humphrey is a man of tremendous versatility and range of interests. Among the achievements in which he has played a major role are the bills which created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Peace Corps, the food stamp program, the food-for-peace program, and the National Defense Education Act. He was also instrumental in passage of the nuclear test ban treaty and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These are but a few of his many accomplishments.

Perhaps the greatest of the Vice President's interests is in education. He has said:

> I can think of no item of legislative business which is more important than education. If this Nation is to continue as a leader of the world, we must make sure that our children are trained and educated to live in this age of scientific revolution.

Recently, the Vice President again demonstrated his interest in our students and future leaders by addressing them at commencement ceremonies. I submit for the Record the speeches by the Vice President at commencement programs at Michigan State University and West Point. I believe they are worthy of careful reading and attention:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., June 12, 1966

Hubert Humphrey feels a kinship with college students.

I like to be where the action is.

I was raising Cain with the system before you were born, and as I am just beginning to get started, I don't doubt that I will be raising Cain when you are running things too.

In fact, I wish I were being graduated today. I might have a better idea where my next job is coming from.

Today I speak in a relatively new role. I speak for management.

As management's spokesman, I wish first to thank you for service to your nation.

In all these years of study, I am sure you thought you were improving your position to compete in the years ahead or to enter a profession. But you today are more than college graduates.

From management's viewpoint, you are valuable national resources.

More Americans are in college this year than all the Americans alive when our nation was founded. More Americans are in graduate schools today than all the Americans who bore arms during the Revolution. Those are lots of resources.

And we will need them all.

For by the time one of you is likely to stand in this place at some future Commencement, the American people will number more than 300 million—and the people in the world almost too many to even think about.

And I need not recite for you the future needs and problems of those people.

You will be in charge. You will be responsible for our national security and my medicare.

You will be responsible for the education of my grandchildren and the freedom of my great-grandchildren.

So I propose to take a look at you and have a talk with you.

But, first, about your parents.

It may be hard to believe but, in another century's history books, the very people who have been helping with your tuition may be ranked among the greatest radicals in modern history.

Some of your parents might flinch if you told them there were radicals in your family. But they have been nothing less.

Theirs is the first generation in all of history which, by its own hand, has surrendered the privilege of telling its offspring: This is how things are; this is how they always have been; this is the way the world goes.

Your fathers and mothers were born children of hills and valleys. Today they see the galaxy itself.

They have created amazing new systems of management, science and technology.

They have found new and better systems to care for people.

And I have been right in the midst of it with them, just as I am with you.

I am not going to bore you with tales of the Great Depression, or of World Wars, and of the hardships your parents faced.

Nor will I recount the struggles that took place in our country to achieve the measure of well-being and social justice we have reached today.

But I can tell you, it has been no picnic. It has been no improvised "happening."

It has taken involvement, and hard work, and study, and self-doubt, and passionate disagreement, and finally, understanding and motion.

Progress has ridden no fast express. It has been a local all the way.

Thus, as older generations welcome you aboard, I think you ought to know that they've not been cooling their heels waiting for you.

The generation of your parents has lived amid the floodwaters of history. Most of them have known genuine hardship. Many of them have lost loved ones on other continents. Their old horizons have gone far off in space, yet they have followed, cautious but willing. The world has come to their dinner table, and at times has seemed to stay a long while, yet they remain hospitable.

They have made history. Yet to many of you, I know, it seems "the heavy hand of history."

Remember this: The challenges they have faced didn't leave room for some of the niceties of today.

They have had to meet trouble in large sizes.

They have had to feed and clothe and house and transport and produce and educate and struggle in big portions, just to overcome the clear and present perils of their time.

Individualism has been the backbone and concern of their work. Yet to serve the individual, they have had to build on a scale which has seemed at times to dwarf the individual.

By and large they have been, I believe, a resourceful and courageous generation.

And now, to you, I know, it seems they have hidden their history.

Over the battlefield they have laid out the golf course.

For those of you who have grown up within putting distance of a country club or within walking distance of a second car, it is hard, I know, to recognize many vestiges of radicalism.

"Where's the action?" you ask.

And I reply: There's plenty of action. Roll up your sleeves and have some.

Your parents had to fight desperately, at your age, to stave off poverty at home and violence abroad—and they in large part succeeded.

Yet the challenges you face are far greater, and far more exciting, than those they faced. The scale of effort to be required of you will be far greater than that required of them.

For the fact of our time is this: The poverty our nation knew in the Great Depression . . . the peril that mankind knew in World War II—these are nothing compared to the poverty and peril that surround our strong, rich America in the world today.

There are desperate conditions of injustice and hunger and disease throughout most of the human family.

There are, in human society, conditions which not only bring a sense of shame and insufficiency to those of us who live in such a blessed land . . . but conditions which can lead to the eruption of the little disorder, which can grow to the small war, which can build to the cataclysm which could destroy rich and poor, black and white, believer and non-believer—all of us alike.

That is where the action is.

This is the environment in which you will be in charge.

This is the human adventure on which you embark.

I believe you sense the full measure of what you face.

I feel a sense of concern and of involvement among you.

I have seen you in the Peace Corps, helping strangers.

I have seen you marching down dusty roads on behalf of fellow Americans whose skin doesn't happen to be white.

I have seen you, in VISTA lifting the forgotten to a place of self-respect in life.

I have seen you, standing calm, resisting the temptation of violence, for what you believe in.

I have seen you, wearing your nation's uniform, fighting bravely for a cause far more difficult to understand than any we have defended before.

I have seen you speaking out, from deep personal conscience, without thought of personal popularity.

You perform remarkably well in the system your parents built, yet I know that you are probing relentlessly to find your own personal relationship to it . . . desperately seeking identity in a society of bigness.

For your generation, the old labels seem to have little meaning.

Whether you are part of the "New Left" or the "New Right" or the "Out" or the "In," your concerns are far more for basic humanity than they are political.

And I think it is a mistake to see in either your protests, your reservations, or your dissent, much that can fit into the traditional political categories.

Indeed, if much of our political history seems to have escaped you, you are not too troubled by the loss. You are deeply and personally caught up in what matters today.

You set high standards for yourselves, and you judge yourselves harshly.

And you show a remarkable degree of serious introspection for the children of prosperity.

And I sometimes fear that, in your introspection, you may come to believe you are alone.

I tell you now that when you stand alone, you are not alone.

When you speak out and act alone in America, you are more a part of this land and more a source of its strength than are all of the multitude who join in silence, no matter how vast they may seem.

"The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us," said Ibsen, "is the compact majority."

Oppose that compact majority, and you are sure to collect a few bruises. But I have found that the best remedy for a bruise is to collect a few more.

The more you speak out, and the more you act, the more you are going to discover that you are lending courage to a surprising number of people whose feelings will come to the surface in response to yours.

True freedom in any land is a relentless, never ending process of self-discovery among its people.

This you will preserve, for our own land, not because it is your inheritance; nor because some destiny says you must; but because your own free search for individual identity in the living present, demands it.

The strongest bulwark of liberty is man, free and in search of himself.

A good number of your generation have already learned this lesson, in search of themselves in places and causes far distant from East Lansing, Michigan.

It is your opportunity to carry that lesson into forgotten corners of our country—and of the world—where peple have never had any reason to learn it, or believe it.

We face today the incomparable opportunity—in the red dust of South American villages, in the neon minefield that is Watts, California—to stimulate the will to seek identity and to discover one's course.

You will be tempted to chart your progress by Gross National Product or by trade indices, or by many other of the quantative measures you so distrust today.

Keep your distrust of these things.

Measure your progress by whether those you help—those who have known in their lives nothing but despair and defeat—by whether they can begin to have faith, by whether they can begin to have hope, by whether they can begin to find themselves.

Yours is the opportunity to prove in the world what the generation of your parents has already begun to prove in America: That the course of history is not a mindless juggernaut we are powerless to control, but a fresh challenge susceptible to courageous action in each generation.

I hope you will be sensitive to that opportunity.

I hope you will waste no time in seizing it.

The story is told that Pericles of Ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply devoted to causes, who wished to change immediately what was wrong in the world.

Pericles chastized the young man for being too bold and brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men.

The older man patronizingly said: "Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved."

To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

Despite the fact that I represent management here today, I will tell you this: If you do not choose to follow, precisely the trails that others have blazed, then I do not think we ought to count the future unsafe in your hands.

In your search for identity and self-knowledge, you will have much to discover before you determine what is worthwhile, and what is worthless.

But in a land of individuals, better the mystery of the search than some counterfeit security. In a world society desperate for change, better your dedication to it than your fear of it.

It is the special blessing of this land, that each generation of Americans has called its own cadence, and written its own music—and our greatest songs are still unsung.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y., JUNE 8, 1966

Gentlemen, I salute you. You have completed four years of rigorous training—of mind, of body, and of spirit. You have done well.

But I congratulate you even more on what lies ahead—for the lives of service to your country and to your fellowmen which you begin here today.

The demands on you will be great—greater than on any previous generation of the "Long Gray Line" that has passed proudly through this great institution.

Never before has your country been so deeply linked with every part of a rapidly shrinking and changing world.

Never before has the power available to men been so awesome.

Yet never before have men everywhere been so aware that power alone cannot solve their most urgent problems nor satify their deepest needs.

You are soldiers. There will be times when your courage, your coolness, and your command of the military arts will be required in full measure.

But you will have to be more—much more—than fighting men.

You will have to be builders.

You will have to be diplomats and psychologists, engineers and politicians, advisers, educators, and friends.

For in the years ahead, the peace and security of the human family will be threatened by aggressors far more subtle than those of armed regiments moving across national frontiers.

World peace and security will be threatened by propaganda, subversion and agitation . . . by economic warfare . . . by assassinations of honest and able leaders . . . as well as by the naked use of armed force

World peace and security will be threatened, above all, by the very existence, for two-thirds of mankind, of conditions of hunger, disease and ignorance.

We must learn that the simple solutions of times past will not meet the present-day challenges, and new forms of aggression, we face.

Our "doves" must learn that there are times when power must be used. They must learn that there is no substitute for force in the face of a determined enemy who resorts to terror, subversion and aggression, whether concealed or open.

Our "hawks" must learn that military power is not enough. They must learn, indeed, that it can be wholly unavailing if not accompanied by political effort and by the credible promise to ordinary people of a better life.

And all of us must learn to adapt our military planning and actions to the new conditions of subversive warfare—the so-called wars of national liberation.

We must learn to meet and defeat our enemy on all, not just one, of the battlefields. We must use the techniques of politics, of economic development, of information and social advancement—and of coordinating all these efforts in a rational and effective total effort.

We are linked to all parts of a complex and changing world. I want to turn now to one part—but a most important part—of that world. It is a part of the world that I know is much on your minds. I speak of Asia, and of America's role there.

In this Spring of 1966, we urgently need perspective on Asia—on its history and the history of our relationship. That perspective can give us guidelines for wise choices—and a solid base for realistic hopes.

I believe the ingredients of perspective can be found in the answers to three questions: Who and what is Asia? How did we get involved with Asia? And, finally, can be achieve sensible goals in Asia?

Who and what is Asia?

Asia means people—more than half of mankind.

Asia means civilizations—venerable, inventive, artistic, and deeply rooted cultures.

Asia means religions—the great compassionate religious and ethical systems of Hinduism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity.

Asia means problems—the age-old afflictions of poverty, illiteracy, disease, exploitation, and oppression.

And in the modern era—the past hundred years or so—Asia means revolution.

It was a revolution that was long in coming but inevitable once West met East with full force.

Revolution is seldom peaceful, never easy. For Asia the period of Western impact—and the transformation it produced—has been often turbulent, bitter, and humiliating.

Take three major ingredients of modern Western history—the spectacular rise of nationalism, capitalism, and science. Bring them to bear on proud older cultures, either through direct colonial rule—as in India, in Indonesia, or Indo-China—or through enclaves and spheres of influence—as in China.

Little wonder the effect would be disruptive on Asian societies, as well as sometimes constructive. Little wonder that the results would engender resistance and resentment among Asian peoples toward the Westerner, as well as curiosity and sometimes friendship.

And little wonder that the history of Asia in the modern era is the history of Asia's response to the West, an unfolding revolutionary process of which the end is by no means in sight.

It is a process that seeks first to expel the foreign colonial master, and has largely succeeded in doing so.

But independence is only a fragile beginning, not an end.

With independence comes the struggle for nationhood in the full sense of the word—the struggle to create national unity out of religious and linguistic and even geographic fragmentation . . . the struggle to create national power, in order to maintain stability within and to deter and resist any would-be aggressors without . . . and the struggle to create both wealth and justice, to create a society of expanding opportunities and hope.

The revolutionary process is turbulent and fraught with dangers: It contains the danger of unbridled competing nationalisms; the lure of false prophets and demagogues; the temptation of illusory short-cuts that lead to new tyranny; the passions aroused by unfulfilled expectations.

Nearly fifty years ago a new specific danger was first added to this process: The doctrines of Marx and Lenin—offered as an explanation of Asia's past, a plan of action for Asia's present, and a blueprint for Asia's future.

Though always a tiny minority, the agents of Marxism-Leninism were able in parts of wartime and post-war Asia to ride the tide of nationalism and anti-colonialism.

With perseverence and discipline, they produced an impact far beyond their numbers.

Today we see in mainland China the tragic result of one Asian revolution that lost its way—a revolution captured by a disciplined Communist minority.

The high price of that tragedy is, for the people of China, a life of isolation in the world's most rigidly totalitarian state, and, for the people of Asia, a profoundly disturbing neighbor.

Today we see in the Indo-China peninsula the tragic result of another Asian revolution that lost its way. The people of Vietnam, who have lived with violence for a quarter of a century, not only find half their country ceded to a Communist minority regime in Hanoi. At the same time they also face a determined effort by that regime to force South Vietnam under Communist rule.

I come to my second question: How did we get involved with Asia?

The question may sound naive. Yet I frequently hear the statement from those who should know better that "America has no business in Asia."

In part this view stems from frustration in the face of Asia's complexity. How much easier to withdraw and let nature take its course.

But in part this view also stems from a misreading of history.

We are all in some degree both heirs and captives of history. And our involvement in Asia is no recent abberration but rather a rooted fact of history.

In one sense, of course, America is simply a something funny that happened to Columbus on his way to Asia.

In a deeper sense, we are and have been a Pacific power from the days of New England's clipper ships in the late 18th century.

Our traders and entrepreneurs soon were joined by our missionaries—not simply evangelists, but doctors and nurses, teachers, engineers and agricultural specialists. By the mid-19th century American ships had opened up Japan, and American citizens were leading participants in what became the greatest export of people and technology ever attempted from one civilization to another—much of it focused on China.

In the process, we became catalytic agents of transformation. In the process, too, we became unwitting participants in Asian history, and in revolution.

America's role in Asia today is a direct product of the century that preceded World War II and of the war itself.

For with the end of that war, the responsibilities of victory imposed on us a stabilizing role in Japan and Korea.

And with the beginning of the Cold War, the Communist victory in China, and the outbreak of the Korean War, American power was the only shield available to fragile and newly independent nations in non-Communist Asia.

This was not a role we had sought. This was not the peace for which we yearned.

Nor is it a role we seek to perpetuate today. But the peace still eludes us. For there are those in Asia who still pursue their objectives by aggression and subversion. And there are others who ask our help in meeting this threat.

I come to my final question: Can we achieve sensible goals in Asia?

What, in simplest form are those goals?

First, we seek to assist free nations, willing to help themselves, in their deterrence of and resistance to all forms of aggression.

Second, we seek to assist free nations, willing to help themselves, in the great tasks of nation-building. We must lead other rich nations in the war on poverty, ignorance and disease in Asia.

Third, we seek to strengthen the forces of regional cooperation on the basis of Asian initiatives.

And finally, we seek and will continue to seek to build bridges, to keep open the doors of communication, to the Communist states of Asia, and in particular Communist China—just as we have to the Soviet Union and the Communist states of Eastern Europe.

The isolation of the Asian Communist states—however caused—breeds unreality, delusion, and miscalculation.

Efforts to break that isolation may, for the time being, provoke denunciation and hostility. But we shall persevere and explore means of communication and exchange, looking to the day when the leaders of Asian communism—as their former colleagues in Europe—will come to recognize the self-destructiveness and wastefulness of their present bellicose policies.

Prudence and reason, not the slogans of the past, will guide us as we try to reduce the unacceptable risks of ignorance and misunderstanding in a thermonuclear age.

Let me underline what we do not seek:

We do not seek alignment, except from those who choose it. We do not seek economic privilege. We do not seek territory or military bases. We do not seek to dominate or to conquer.

Our objectives are best served by one result in Asia:

The emergence of nations dedicated to their own national independence, to the well-being of their people, and to the pursuit of peace.

I return now to my question: Can these objectives be achieved?

My answer is yes. But much depends on our actions as a nation, and on the understanding that prompts those actions.

In the struggle for a peaceful, strong, and developing free Asia, our assets in the region are great.

In Japan, at one end of Asia's arc, we have a staunch friend, a highly developed nation, our second trading partner, an immense potential force for the development of Asia.

On the South Asian subcontinent, at the other end, we have close friends in India, the world's largest democracy, and in Pakistan. Both nations are dedicated to independence and bravely embarked on programs of development.

And in the Southwest Pacific, completing the triangle, are our friends in Australia and New Zealand who share our commitment to the future of Asia.

Elsewhere—in Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia—we find nations committed in differing fashions to independence and development. We respect their commitment, and we respect their differences. We applaud their leadership.

But what of the states of former French Indo-China?

There, of course, is the present focal point of war and revolution in Asia. And there we are tested as never before. We face a situation of external aggression and subversion against a post-colonial nation that has never had the breathing space to develop its politics or its economy.

In South Vietnam, both defense and development—the war against the aggressor and the war against despair—are fused as never before. Vietnam challenges our courage, our ingenuity, and our ability to persevere.

If we can succeed there—if we help sustain an independent South Vietnam, free to determine its own future—then our prospects, and the prospects for free man throughout Asia, will be bright indeed.

We know this. Our friends and allies know it. And our adversaries know it. That is why one small country looms so large today on everyone's map of Asia.

But Asia will not disappear with a Vietnam settlement.

Nor will our objectives and responsibilities in Asia disappear.

The peace and development of Asia will be high on our national agenda for the rest of this century.

So will our relations with the nations of Asia—including our relations with mainland China.

President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins University last year was an historic formulation of American purposes in Asia.

In that speech he said that our commitment to South Vietnam was firm, that our quest for peace would be unremitting, and that our continuing concern with the welfare of the peoples of Southeast Asia could be tested by Asians ready to initiate cooperative ventures of peaceful development. The President pledged 1 billion dollars to projects that might be developed.

In that speech, too, President Johnson envisaged participation by North Vietnam in constructive social and economic arrangements once Hanoi had decided to stop the shooting. And last February, he again appealed to the "men of the north" to stop aggression and to join in helping fulfill the unsatisfied wants of the people of the region.

Termination of war alone would be a major contribution to the process of accelerated social and economic development in Asia.

But there are other basic problems which face most of the countries in the area.

In Asia, incomes are low. Population growth is high. There is a shortage of capital. The need for investment is almost limitless. There is excessive dependence on a limited number of products for foreign exchange earnings.

These problems demand the attention of countries in the area as well as countries outside which are able to help.

But there is promising ferment in free Asia today—ferment that can lead to higher standards of performance on the part of individual countries and a greater sense of community among them.

War is always cruel. But the war in Vietnam should not obscure for us the fact that behind the smoke and uproar is the testing of an issue vital to all of Asia, and indeed the world.

Can independent, non-Communist states not only survive, but grow and flourish in face of Communist pressure?

In that confrontation, a review of free Asia's achievements should give us solid ground for hope.

Consider South Korea, where exports have increased by 500 percent in the past three years. Consider Taiwan, which has been transformed from an aid-receiving to an aid-giving country and enjoys a rate of economic growth higher than even that of Japan. Consider Malaysia and Thailand, where ambitious development plans are being launched. Yes, consider Indonesia, where new leaders are determined to see that potentially rich country resume a responsible place in the world community.

All of these developments are striking evidence that, notwithstanding Communist boasts that they represent the wave of the future, the real achievements taking place within Asia have occurred in areas that rely upon independence, competition, and respect for national integrity as the bases for genuine and enduring social and economic progress.

As we Americans strive to deal with the immense problems—and the promise—of a vibrant, modernizing interdependent Asia in the years ahead, we will be called upon to show special qualities of mind and spirit and understanding as a nation.

We will have to learn far more about Asian history and Asian cultures than any of us now know. We need more than nodding acquaintance with the key critical issues that absorb the attention of Asians.

We will have to learn to speak and read Asian languages.

We will have to become more sensitive to the differences among Asian nations as well as their similarities.

We should also be sensitive to the pride, dignity and nationalism of Asian peoples and nations. Like most people, Asians prefer to rule themselves badly than to be well ruled by some foreigner. The same goes for advice and initiatives. Otherwise good ideas inevitably lose some of their appeal if carried through Asia in clearly foreign wrappings.

Asians prefer Asian initiatives, proposed by Asians. So do we.

Finally, we must learn to suppress our national enthusiasm for quick solutions.

Asia's problems are extraordinarily complex and intractable; they will be with us for a long time to come, and we should force ourselves to practice some traditional Asian patience.

It is patience—and perspective—that we will need in the years ahead.

For I have no doubt that we will meet, in Asia as in the rest of the world, time and again with disappointment, disillusionment, ingratitude and frustration.

Yet we must not be deterred.

It is our good fortune to be free citizens of the most prosperous and powerful nation in the history of the earth.

It is the prosperous who can most afford compassion and humility.

It is the powerful who can most afford patience and perspective.

Let us, then, not pursue policies—or judge ourselves—in consonance with the passion of the moment.

Let us pursue those courses of which, in the judgment of history, it can be said: "These were the paths taken by wise men."

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1966 currently being considered by the House Committee on Public Works, Mayor Ralph S. Locher, of the city of Cleveland, presented excellent testimony concerning the special problems in the large cities of America. Unless the Federal legislation is amended to meet these special problems, the Federal pollution control legislation may fail to reach the tremendous population of our large urban centers.

Following is Mayor Locher's statement:

H.R. 16076—Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966

(Statement of Ralph S. Locher, mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, on behalf of U.S. Conference of Mayors and National League of Cities, before the House Public Works Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, room 2167, July 13, 1966)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Public Works, my name is Ralph S. Locher. I am the Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio. I am a member of the Advisory Board of the United States Conference of Mayors and a member of the Executive Committee of the National League of Cities. I am appearing before you today on behalf of both these national organizations as well as on behalf of my own City of Cleveland.

The Resolution on Clean Water passed by the Conference of Mayors in Dallas last June is appended to this statement along with the policy statement on Water Pollution Control of the National League of Cities.

Also, I have the privilege of serving as a member of Secretary Udall's ad hoc local Government Advisory Committee on Water Pollution Control. The Committee met with Mr. Udall in June to discuss the nation's water problems and Interior's plans for the future. I also had an opportunity to discuss the water pollution problem with Secretary Udall two weeks ago at the second Lake Erie Conference which was held in Cleveland.

In all candor, I must admit many local officials viewed the transfer of the pollution control program from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior with some misgivings since Interior's past has been tied basically to agricultural interests and resources management, and its experience in dealing with urban areas is quite limited.

I think I can safely say that the members of the ad hoc Committee were tremendously impressed with Secretary Udall's grasp of the problem and his detailed knowledge of the pending legislation and his great enthusiasm to get on with the job.

The result of that meeting was that the Secretary did succeed in allaying our fears about Interior's potential for dealing effectively with the tremendously important problem of water pollution abatement. The Secretary's impact on the water pollution problem has already been felt.

The National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council stated in its recent publication "Waste Management and Control":

"The problem is of the utmost urgency because of many of the effects of pollution on our environment may be irreversible or, at least, may take generations to correct even if we start right now."

None of us here will dispute the findings of the Council—we are in agreement as to the immediacy of the need and the utmost urgency to take action—to assign this problem the very highest priority to move ahead now with an effective and efficient action program.

Generally, when a Mayor appears here in Washington before a Committee such as this one, he sometimes faces a member who feels that local government has not really made the effort it should to solve the problem on its own—and all that is needed is a little more effort on the part of the locality itself to rise up and solve the problem with its own resources.

By the way, I want to tell you about the Blauschild case—where the state permits certain industries to discharge industrial wastes into our streams and an irate citizen sues the Mayor of Cleveland for failing to halt it. That's typical—the state allows it—the City gets blamed—and I get sued.

The federal attitude and thought apparently is one in which there is the feeling that they are the only level of government making substantial efforts to meet these problems head on.

Let me assure you local governments have made the effort. For example, during the period between 1946 and 1964:

Federal general revenue increased by 134 percent—but local general revenue from local taxes only increased by 397 percent or almost four times.

The Federal tax take increased by 149 percent—but local taxes increased by 357 percent or more than twice as fast.

Local government revenues, that is general revenues from nontax sources, increased 626 percent while the federal government's revenue from non-tax sources increased by 61 percent.

General expenditures on the part of the federal government increased by 63 percent (excluding national defense and intergovernmental transfers of funds), while local expenditures increased by 280 percent.

The total debt of the federal government increased by 16 percent—but local government debt increased by 395 percent.

Federal expenditures for total salaries and wages have increased 173 percent—local expenditures have increased by 429 percent.

In the matter of changes that are directly concerned with wastewater treatment plants Cleveland has increased its sewerage service charge by 160 percent in the last five years.

The above, I think, provides some evidence of the extent to which local governments have tried to solve their own problems, using their own resources.

According to the latest expert estimates the country may be facing an abatement job which will probably cost over $100 billion during the next 35 years.

Some may think that this is an enormous amount of money but it really is not when you stop and consider the benefits derived from our highly industrialized civilization. We must weigh the equities and face the facts and steel ourselves to the necessity of developing action programs which can meet the problem in a responsible and economical way.

H.R. 16076, which provides for $6 billion over the next six years, is a realistic and responsible start toward meeting the high level of effort we will have to eventually achieve to do the job.

Also the bill provides for the first time that grants of substance will be made available to the nation's larger cities for the construction of needed waste treatment facilities. We are greatly encouraged by its introduction. But the bill does not apply the bulk of the Federal grant assistance where that assistance is needed most.

Section 5 provides an extra 10 percent grant for plant construction where state matches the Federal 30 percent contribution. This means that the local share amounts to 30 percent—which is still high—when one thinks in terms of the 90-10 Interstate Highway program. This approach assumes the states will have the fiscal capability and the necessary drive to participate. In some states, at least, these are questionable assumptions; but the point is that local government will be entirely at the mercy of the states because without state participation, the local share would be 70 percent. The Conference of Mayors policy resolution as passed in Dallas in June calls for 90 percent federal grants for this program.

The bill's mandatory involvement of the state raises several problems:

If the state agrees to 30 percent matching in one area, it will have to do it for all proposed new facilities in all of its communities. This may prove beyond the states' own limited financial resources, especially in highly urbanized states; for example, Ohio, New York, California, etc.

Beyond that, under the terms of the Act, state pollution control agencies which match would still control the assignment of priorities and the case could be made by some that with the limited state funds available, only so many projects could be supported each year. (This is now the case in Ohio). This could mean that the relatively large projects needed for some of our major metropolitan areas could be cut out just as they have been in the past under the old program.

We favor increased state participation, particularly in terms of financial assistance, so long as it is cooperative, constructive, and positive, and gives added impetus to our overall metropolitan state and national pollution abatement effort. We are not for just such participation for the sake of adding another level of governmental involvement, or because of a romantic attachment some of us might have to the sanctity of the states' rights to be involved for the sake of being a party to the program.

Before the Federal government permits the state to assume full responsibility for establishing grant priorities, the state should be required to meet the following conditions: (1) have federal approval of a statewide water pollution control plan complete with the necessary interstate compacts where such compacts would be required in order to meet the objectives of the plan; (2) have established water quality standards which meet minimums established by the Federal government, and (3) be committed to provide full 30 percent matching of all Federal contributions over the six-year period of the program.

But, in any event, and I think it is important to note here that in many instances we cannot afford to delay the construction of needed water treatment facilities pending action by the state to appropriate needed funds or the establishment of a basin plan.

Further, the construction grants program should be related to the enforcement program. Where Federal or state enforcement action is taken, the community, communities or metropolitan area involved should automatically be assigned the highest priority for a maximum grant. This approach could assure the federal grant money would go where pollution is most critical.

The focus of the program should be on the solution of the urban metropolitan water pollution control problem. This is, after all, where the problem begins, where it has its most marked effect, and where it generally ends.

To achieve the most effective approach to the problem, federal grants should encourage the development of comprehensive waste treatment systems in the nation's urban regions or metropolitan areas. In terms of achieving the most effective kind of institutional arrangement for the initiation, development and management of the system, the federal government should encourage all local governments to cooperate—to coordinate—and to work together in meeting the common problem.

As the National Research Council points out:

"Public policies and institutional arrangements, and the extent to which they are supported, will largely determine the effectiveness with which the challenge of pollution is met."

The program should encourage the development of continuing planning process for comprehensive water management resource and pollution control. Such a planning requirement would be analogous to the planning requirements for aid under the Federal Interstate Highway program (Highway Act of 1963) and for aid under the open space and urban beautification program planning and others. Such planning process should be developed out of the needs of the area with full control and participation on the part of the local elected officials who are responsible to the people of the area. We do not believe that the proper and necessary support from the citizens of the area can be provided on any other basis—certainly not by the establishment by the states of specialized units of government such as river basin planning agencies with appointive boards whose members are not directly responsible to the people of the areas affected by their decisions.

We would also add that the Act should provide for continuing Federal participation in carrying out systems for qualitative and quantitative monitoring of water resources which would be part of a national monitoring network.

Also continuing aid for research should be done in conjunction with monitoring to note the flow and adapt treatment processes to deal with regional differences in pollution trends and patterns.

Both of these programs would do much to assure metropolitan systems of getting and holding high quality personnel to operate the areas' treatment facilities at the maximum levels of efficiency.

Section 12 of the bill "Clean Rivers Restoration" has some very laudable objectives to which all local government officials will subscribe.

But the implementation of these objectives raises some serious questions:

The institutional approach is too narrow and limited. The measure assumes that River Basin Planning Organizations can provide a universally applicable method of providing long-range solutions to water resource problems.

This would not seem to be a reasonable assumption; for example, in the face of the Great Lakes problem—or in situations where the city must go beyond one basin for an adequate water supply, or in the case of some port cities and/or cities on the receiving end of more than one river basin, e.g., the New York Metropolitan Area, the Greater Philadelphia Area, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Denver, St. Louis, etc.

What is needed is, of course, a variety of institutional types which reflect the unique problems and conditions of the area which they are intended to serve.

No federal grants could be made until the River Basin Plan was completed. The time involved in developing the plan would probably prove considerable. In some areas it is possible that the development of the plan would take years, particularly where an interstate compact would be required to establish the basic planning operation to begin with.

Our experience so far leads us to believe that the River Basin approach is a federal-state approach and that little or no attention will be paid to the needs of the local governments involved.

Also, we are inclined to believe that such basin planning agencies would prove more responsive to agricultural power and extractive industries than they would be to the needs of urban areas.

We have no objection to legislation which provides for carrying out planning functions of a technical nature relating to water needs. This kind of resource evaluation and research, which is basically highly technical in nature, should be done under federal aegis. (We understand the Corps of Engineers is already carrying out such resource evaluation programs in New England and elsewhere in the East.)

We would seriously question the advisability of giving such technical bodies the authority to develop definitive plans, to levy taxes, undertake abatement enforcement activity and generally control the water resources of a region—interstate or otherwise—without the continuing involvement and reasonable control on the part of the elected local government officials of the areas affected.

We consider the tremendous supply of water in Lake Erie as the most important resource and asset of Northern Ohio and Cleveland will do everything possible to preserve and protect the quality of this magnificent water supply. Our water department is the largest potable water supplier in Ohio and also on Lake Erie. It serves almost 20% of the population of Ohio.

Cleveland's efforts to provide water of high quality have been eminently successful and the real proof of this statement lies in the health of the community it serves.

In particular, the necessity of giving treatment to wastewater was recognized over fifty years ago. Cleveland's efforts toward providing adequate treatment at its three wastewater plants have been continuous and ever-increasing since its first full size plant went into service in 1922.

At the present time, 84% of the capacity of the Cleveland plants provides complete treatment. However, we still have a water pollution problem that we are trying to correct. This, to a considerable degree, is due to the combined sewer system that serves Cleveland. However, the broader Lake Erie problem concerns nutrients and excessive algae growth, and dissolved oxygen depletion.

We are very much concerned with the guesstimates that have been made regarding the cost of restoring the waters of Lake Erie to acceptable water quality levels. This cost has been estimated at between 10 and 20 billion dollars, the larger figure being reported in a recent Ohio State University study and report. The use of the smaller estimate of 10 billion dollars, prorated over the present Lake Erie basin population, amounts to $1,000 per capita or approximately $1.8 billion for Metropolitan Cleveland (Cuyahoga County).

With these estimates in mind, and my own personal opinion that the water pollution problem will be solved more speedily and with more certainty, I have advocated that the formula for construction that is being used on the interstate highway system, namely, 90 percent federal, 5 percent state, and 5 percent local, be used to finance the necessary sewage facilities. Even the 5 percent share for the local community in this case would be in the neighborhood of $90 million. If there is no Federal help available, $900 million, which would be approximately Cleveland's share for eliminating pollution, is equivalent to nearly 15 years of our general fund budget of $62 million. Think of it—for the next 15 years, we would have to devote as much to water pollution as we now spend for all city operations other than utilities. There is only one word to describe that—impossible.

Lake Erie poses a tremendous problem because of nutrients flowing into the lake. Algae and other water plant growths have been stimulated to a high degree. Thermo stratification of the lake waters has occurred over large areas and has resulted in severe oxygen depletion of the bottom waters and has changed the ecology of the entire lake.

The Lake Erie Conference recommendations and conclusions require that the waste water treatment plants be so designed and operated to maximize the removal of phosphates. Federal estimates of costs for removing phosphates are $360 million for the Lake Erie basin for facilities, and an additional $40 million per year for the cost of chemicals and other operational costs.

The City of Cleveland has always taken a leading role in water pollution control and treatment.

We are now in the process of carrying out an estimated $40 million enlargement, replacement and improvement program for Cleveland's three plants, which will provide complete treatment. A substantial portion of the program of about $11 million is already constructed or under construction. There has been no federal grant money available for this construction to date. I'm very happy to see that H.R. 16076 provides retroactive credits for construction begun after June 30, 1966. Cleveland has substantially completed the Cuyahoga River low-level system of sewers and pumping station at a cost of about $4,800,000, without Federal grant participation.

Cleveland has authorized a comprehensive water pollution and sewer study to be made that will result in a master plan for water pollution abatement and control. The first phase of this study has been completed and a recommendation has been made as to those projects which can be safely authorized to be started before the entire study is completed. Under immediate consideration is the recommendation that new trunk sewers be constructed to deliver sanitary sewage from a number of suburban areas direct to the Cleveland plants. At present, this sewage is being discharged to the Cleveland combined sewer system.

Cleveland is doing everything possible to eliminate raw sewage from leaving the combined sewer system during dry weather and low precipitation periods.

Cleveland is complying with the Lake Erie Enforcement Conference recommendation that "combined storm and sanitary sewers be prohibited in all newly-developed urban areas, and eliminated in existing areas wherever feasible." The new University Circle Urban Renewal Area in Cleveland is proceeding with the installation of separate storm and sanitary sewers. The same is true of planning for the new Cleveland State University area.

In conclusion, I wish to stress that the new and costly facilities that are being required to control water pollution in cities like Cleveland are skyrocketing construction as to the extent that massive federal and state financial aid will have to be made available, otherwise regardless of the merits of water pollution abatement programs, if the local burden is considered excessive by the public the program either will not proceed or will be cut down materially before it becomes acceptable to the public pocketbook.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear on behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the City of Cleveland.

13. Clean Water

(Resolution adopted by 1966 Conference of Mayors, Sheraton Dallas Hotel, Dallas, Tex., June 15, 1966)

Whereas, the Water Quality Act of 1965 relaxed some of the limitations of the existing federal program of grants for construction of waste treatment systems, authorized expanded research and demonstration projects, instituted more adequate water quality standards and set up comprehensive enforcement procedures for its provisions for the conservation and utilization of the nation's water resources; and

Whereas, expert analysis of improvements required for existing systems and to meet demands of new population growth reveals that costs of needed treatment plant facilities in urban areas will exceed $20 billion by 1972; and

Whereas, the existing program for construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities, which authorizes $150 million annually and which expires in 1967, falls far short of the level of assistance communities must have to provide adequate processing of waste water; and

Whereas, present restrictions in the Water Pollution Control Act, even as modified by the Water Quality Act, adversely affect communities with populations of 50,000 or more; and

Whereas, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, in its 1966 report "Steps Toward Clean Water," recognized that the extraordinary financing problems confronting large metropolitan centers require vastly increased federal assistance; and

Whereas, present waste treatment systems are based for the most part on concepts developed 40 years ago; and

Whereas, there is great need in the cities for increased numbers and improved training of technical, engineering and operating personnel for these systems; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors commends the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution for its clear exposition of water pollution problems; be it further

Resolved, That the Conference supports federal legislation this year which would: (1) Provide 90% federal grants for every approved municipal waste treatment project, single or multiple, regardless of the aggregate cost. (2) Authorize local governments to apply directly to the federal government for construction grants. (3) Automatically qualify any local government for a maximum grant when the local governmen has a state or federal enforcement action pending against it. (4) Authorize such amounts as are necessary for program needs in appropriations for sewage treatment construction grants through fiscal 1972. (5) Authorize increased appropriations for research, development and demonstrations of advanced waste treatment and water purification methods. (6) Initiate a program for training of municipal and industrial and other private operators of treatment plants.

Water Pollution Control

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 provide a comprehensive definition of the federal government's role in the control of water pollution, extend federal pollution control on navigable waters and strengthen federal enforcement authority. Municipalities are accorded a measure of partnership with federal and state authorities in the enforcement process. Storage in federal reservoirs is authorized for regulation of stream flow for water quality control purposes. The amount of federal grants and financial assistance were increased and were made available to each municipality participating in joint construction programs. Important new research facilities, including field laboratories, were authorized. The Congress is commended for great progress in the field of water pollution control and in the development of research, technical and enforcement facilities supporting, but not duplicating, municipal and state activities.

The Congress is urged to continue and expand the 1956 Water Control Act by:

1. Providing for the comprehensive control of pollution on all surface, coastal and underground waters in accordance with a program of reasonable stream use, based on standards recognizing the characteristics and uses of each waterway. Such a program shall be established and enforced by the federal government with the primary responsibility for the establishment and enforcement of standards for other than interstate waters retained at the state and municipal levels.

2. Providing adequate appropriations for an expanded program of research, training, and technical services in the regional laboratories established under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

3. Liberalizing present financial provisions of the Act of 1961 and 1965 by increasing the total grant authorization and by raising the percentage of federal contributions available for each project to a least 50% of the cost of the project with no ceiling limitation as to the maximum amount.

4. Increasing the annual authorization to provide funds for the support of the above.

5. Providing funds to expand and maintain the national water quality network and urging the states and municipalities to cooperate in their respective areas of responsibility.

6. Appropriating adequate funds to provide for expanded research programs, especially those related to the development of advanced waste treatment methods.

7. Authorizing studies of water pollution causes by the discharge of sewerage and refuse from ships and pleasure craft operating in waters of the United States, and the development of methods for controlling this pollution.

8. Providing for the full appropriation of funds authorized for grants to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment facilities and for grants to states in support of water pollution control programs.

9. Providing financial incentives for sewage treatment projects consistent with urban development plans for the area.

10. Providing authorization and appropriations for federal grants to municipalities for the purpose of assisting in the development of projects which will demonstrate new or improved methods for the control of pollution from mixtures of sewage and storm water discharged to any waters from combined sewer systems.

We urge that Congress amend the Internal Revenue Code (1) to give appropriate tax relief to reimburse industries for costs of constructing nonproductive waste treatment works installed to eliminate water pollution in accordance with state and/or local law or ordinances and (2) to permit five year depreciation of productive or profit-contributing waste treatment works.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Henderson (at the request of Mr. Fountain), for the remainder of week, on account of personal illness.

Mr. Pepper (at the request of Mr. Boggs), **for today July 18, 1966**, on account of illness.

Mr. STALBAUM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, July 18, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. NEDZI (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Michigan) on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER), for 15 minutes, on July 19; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER), for 60 minutes, on July 19; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. MACKIE.

Mr. JONAS and to include extraneous matter.

All Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER) to extend their remarks following the remarks of Mr. VANIK today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of California.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. DYAL.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MCVICKERS.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. REUSS.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 15, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States;

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2566. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2567. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks and loans made by Federal land banks and banks of cooperatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2568. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of significant problems in the administration of right-of-way acquisition activities for the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Utah, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2569. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through greater use of available Government gasoline outlets, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2570. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of procurement of equipment for implementing automation of water data records, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2571. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of visa petitions approved, according beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2572. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 213(c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2573. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report that the Agency made no grants during fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2574. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, for the year ending May 31, 1966, pursuant to the requirements of the act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 13, 1966, the following bill was reported on July 15, 1966:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 15890. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas, to improve and amend our housing programs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. Accompanying document relating to H.R. 15890. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas, to improve and amend our housing programs, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 1699, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 14, 1966, the following bill was reported on July 15, 1966:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 13290. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for highway safety research and development, certain highway safety programs, a national driver register, and a highway accident research and test facility; with amendment (Rept. No. 1700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 12, 1966, the following bill was reported on July 15, 1966:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 15963. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 18, 1966*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report. No. 1702. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7028. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 14359. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4841. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala. (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4861. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Boulder County, Colo., to W. F. Stover; with amendment (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H.R. 16280. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275) as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 16281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 16282. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16283. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Board-Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 16284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 16285. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to increase the exemption from duty for returning residents from $100 to $200, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16286. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 16287. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 16288. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 16289. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16290. A bill to place deputy U.S. marshals under the competitive civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 16291. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 16292. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 16293. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 16294. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 16295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16296. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a Talented American Senior Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16297. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administration to indemnify corporate sureties on bonds covering contracts of sound small business concerns where such action will further the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16298. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 16299. A bill providing that certain privately owned irrigable lands in the Milk River project in Montana shall be deemed to be excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 16300. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 16301. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make presumptions relating to certain diseases applicable to veterans who served during the period between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 16302. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16303. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 16304. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 16305. A bill to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 16306. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 16307. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 16308. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 830. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H. Con. Res. 831. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 918. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the moral character of Justice William O. Douglas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. Res. 919. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the moral character of Justice William O. Douglas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 920. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the moral character of Justice William O. Douglas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 921. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the moral character of Justice William O. Douglas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H. Res. 922. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the moral character of Justice William O. Douglas; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 16309. A bill for the relief of Sherman Webb and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 16310. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Angelopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16311. A bill for the relief of Francesco Campanile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16312. A bill for the relief of Antonio Iocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16313. A bill for the relief of Isaac Chervony, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16314. A bill for the relief of Josefina Fulgueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16315. A bill for the relief of Sherif Shafey, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 16316. A bill for the relief of Antonio I. Villarreal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 16317. A bill for the relief of the William Wallace Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

413. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the free distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Defense component libraries in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

414. Also, petition of City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., relative to the removal of the prohibition ordered by the Federal Aviation Administrator against the landing of certain flights at National Airport, Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 18, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being: We humbly beseech Thee to direct us in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favor, and to further us with Thy continual help; that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in Thee we may glorify Thy holy name.

In these times of tension and strain, keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, sound of heart, in spite of ingratitude, meanness, or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable Thy servants here, in posts of high public office, to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God.

Thus, may we be true to all truth the world denies, not tonguetied by its gilded lies; not always right in all men's eyes, but faithful to the light within. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PASTORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 15, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills;

H.R. 8337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DELETION OF INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBENTURES ISSUED BY FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks and on loans made by Federal land banks and banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1965–May 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON RELATIVE COST OF SHIPBUILDING IN THE VARIOUS COASTAL DISTRICTS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, dated June 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Committee on the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the cultural presentations program, Department of State, for the year July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated July 8, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3621. A bill for the relief of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3622. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF THE SENATE THAT RAILROADS AND THE PUBLIC RECEIVE EQUAL RIGHTS OF JUDICIAL APPEAL

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Kuchel) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 284) expressing the sense of the Senate that railroads and the public receive equal rights of judicial appeal, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Aiken, which appears under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. Inouye, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO PROF. D. C. McAULIFFE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when I think of the Montana School of Mines, I automatically think of Prof. D. C. McAuliffe, vice president and dean of that school. Last year the name was changed from the Montana School of Mines to the Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology.

Charlie McAuliffe has served that institution, the Butte-Anaconda area, and the State of Montana for more than four decades. As a graduate of the institution, he was for many years its football and basketball coach and athletic director, and he has carried his burdens with cheerful optimism and good-natured determination.

When I attended the School of Mines in 1927 and 1928, Charlie McAuliffe was then an instructor in mathematics as well as athletic coach. In that school year we had an enrollment of approximately 120 students, and included in that student body were approximately 25 girls from the Butte and Anaconda area who were admitted to the school for the first time. Today, Montana Tech has an enrollment of approximately 600 and is continuing to grow.

Getting back to Charlie McAuliffe, he was born in Butte and enrolled in the School of Mines prior to World War I. After the war, in which he served in France—where he was gassed, wounded, and highly decorated—he returned to the School of Mines to complete his degree. He has contributed significantly and on a wholesome basis to the development and outlook not only of young Montanans attending the school but also to young men and women from every other State in the Union, almost all the Canadian Provinces, and many foreign countries.

Those of us who knew him well appreciated the patience and understanding he has always shown. He was an inspirational teacher and coach and a kind, considerate, and unusually understanding professor. Charlie McAuliffe will be missed from the faculty of the Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology. But he, as have many of his colleagues, has done more than his share to make this institution one of the greatest, if not the best school of its kind, in the world. I do not make this statement on the basis of State pride. But I do make this declaration on the basis of the fact that this institution is so recognized, and its standing has been proved not only by its many graduates scattered throughout the world, but by the number of foreign students who seek admittance to the school each year.

As I say, it is hard to differentiate between the School of Mines—now Montana Tech—and Charlie McAuliffe. They are synonymous in the minds of most of Montana's people, and their twin reputations are of the highest caliber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Montana Standard-Post of June 27, 1966, about Professor McAuliffe.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Professor McAuliffe—He Will Be Missed at Montana Tech

In the retirement of Prof. D. C. McAuliffe, vice president, dean and placement director, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology loses an able administrator, and teacher, and former athletic director and coach of extensive, dedicated experience.

Prof. McAuliffe, a native of Butte, is a graduate of the college he served so long and so well. His studies were interrupted by service in France in World War I service for which he was highly decorated. The professor has devoted his talents and energy to education in Montana for 45 years, 43 of those years at the famed Butte institution. He contributed significantly to the stature of the college in that long tenure.

Prof. McAuliffe is one of those rare individuals who constantly displays patience and understanding, especially where students are concerned. Hundreds of those he taught and coached long will remember him for these qualities and as a kind, considerate instructor and inspiration.

To Butte people, his name, popularized through athletics, is almost synonymous with that of the School of Mines, the institution's title until last year.

To fellow educators and those in the engineering profession, Prof. McAuliffe is deeply appreciated for his devoted service and abiding interest.

Long after he leaves the campus July 1, his name will be recalled in the halls of learning and especially on the athletic field, for he coached the Miners for almost a quarter of a century.

OIL SANDS AMENDMENT TO MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to delete the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act which require separate mineral leases for oil sand materials on Federal lands, and establish instead a single lease for all hydrocarbon deposits with the exception of coal, oil shale, and helium. This would change the present system of separate leases for oil and oil sands on the same tract to a system of a single lease for both types.

This bill grew out of the problems arising when oil and gas and bituminous sands leases are held on the same land and both lessees wish to develop the oil by the in situ method. Because of this problem the Department of Interior has refrained from issuing any more bituminous sands leases. The Utah State Land Board is also facing this problem and is considering the recommendation of a single hydrocarbon lease by a committee of the Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association.

Among the questions which arise from separate leases are these:

Can a bituminous leaseholder turn sands which lie below the surface into liquid and pump the oil to the surface?

If so, does this conflict with rights of the oil and gas leaseholder who under the terms of his lease already has the right to pump liquid oil to the surface?

What happens when oil with a viscosity that allows it to flow to the oil bore is mixed with sands that will release liquids under certain circumstances?

Because the Utah State Land Board has been unable to find a solution to this problem, the board is now declining to issue any more bituminous sand leases and oil and gas leases where they would be in conflict.

Extensive bituminous sand deposits are known to exist in eastern Utah and other sections of the West but until satisfactory leasing arrangements can be made, their development will be held in abeyance. The bill I am introducing today will provide a vehicle for further discussion of the problem, and, I hope, a solution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3622) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR RAILROADS AND THE PUBLIC

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as a rule, I have great resepect for the agencies of our Federal Government, including the quasi-judicial agencies.

When they deal with borderline cases, I am inclined to give them the benefit of the doubt.

However, two recent decisions of the ICC have been so unfair and illogical as to greatly weaken my confidence in that agency.

On April 27, 1966, the Interstate Commerce Commission gave its approval to the merger of the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the New Haven railroads.

I do not intend to go into the terms of this approval except in one particular—that which relates to the order that the New Haven road be required to continue to operate three passenger trains commonly known as the "Federal," the "Gilt Edge," and the "Montrealer."

The particular concern of my State happens to be with the Montrealer, which operates daily between Montreal and Washington, D.C., and return.

This train provides the only through passenger rail service between Washington and Montreal and thence to Ottawa, the Capital of Canada.

It operates over the tracks of the Central Vermont Railroad, a Canadian National subsidiary, the Boston and Maine, the New Haven, and the Pennsylvania.

In announcing its approval of the merger of the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the New Haven roads, the ICC said this about the "Montrealer," or the "Washingtonian," as it is called:

> The "Washingtonian," arriving in New New York at 8:10 a.m., has generally light patronage and and low passenger train mile earnings, but it does handle a quite high volume of through passengers in through train service from Montreal and Boston & Maine origins, as well as a high volume of passengers moving beyond New York City. The "Washingtonian," a conveniently scheduled through Montreal-to-Washington, D.C., train, should not be discontinued in the absence of clear evidence that it has no potential for economic viability.

The ICC further ruled that:

> Examining the patronage and revenue levels, scheduling, alternative train service and feasibility for use in connecting carrier service of all of these evening through trains, we conclude that the New Haven should be required to continue to operate only trains Nos. 28 (the "Gilt Edge"), 168 ("Montrealer"), 176 (the "Federal").

Thus, on April 27, the ICC held that the operations of the Montrealer should be continued.

On July 6, 1966, only a few weeks after this finding, the ICC issued an order relative to the proposed discontinuance of passenger service between Springfield, Mass., and White River Junction, Vt., by the Boston & Maine Corp., wherein the Commission stated as a conclusion of law that four passenger trains, including the "Washingtonian" and "Montrealer," were indeed a burden upon interstate commerce, and authorized their discontinuance, but issued no report in connection with this finding at the time.

Almost immediately, the Boston & Maine announced its intention to discontinue operating these trains on July 11, and was only prevented from doing so by a temporary restraining order issued by U.S. District Judge Ernest W. Gibson.

The validity of this order will be considered by a three-man panel of the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals today, July 18.

Thus, we find now that the New Haven road is directed to continue to operate the same trains that the Boston & Maine is authorized to discontinue, although the tracks of both lines are necessary to the operation of the trains.

It is not my purpose today to pass on the essentiality of operating these trains, although, as I have pointed out, they constitute the only rail passenger link between Washington and Montreal and Ottawa.

I shall not dwell on the national security aspects of this service—although the State of Vermont is expected to accept refugees from southern New England in time of crisis.

Nor do I know how thousands of persons from southern New England and the eastern seaboard, will get to the Montreal World's Fair next year if all train service is discontinued.

The point which I wish to stress today is much more important than the operation of one, two, three, or four trains.

It concerns either an indictment of the Congress or a misinterpretation of the intent of Congress.

It may be that the Second Circuit Court of Appeals will find that it has no jurisdiction over this matter—since in a previous case—State of New Hampshire against Boston & Maine Corp., United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, civil action No. 2570, the court held:

> While Congress did not expressly deny judicial review of § 13(a)(1) proceedings, we find apart from the terms of § 13(a)(1) the difference between subsections (1) and (2) highly persuasive that Congress did, indeed, intend that result.
>
> The most appealing argument in support of jurisdiction on these facts is one based simply on fairness and equity. Since the railroad would have a right to appeal the Commissions order that seven trains are required by the public convenience and necessity and must, therefore, be continued in service, the public should have a right to judicial review with respect to the discontinued trains as well. But the short answer to this argument is that Congress does not have to be fair.

By this decision, it was held that while the railroads under the law have the right to appeal certain decisions of the ICC, the public has no similar rights.

Please note the last sentence of this quotation from the court decision:

> But the short answer to this argument is that Congress does not have to be fair.

The implication of this sentence is that Congress, in amending the ICC Act in 1958, either was not fair, did not intend to be fair or was not aware of the implication if its acts.

This indictment of the Congress should not be permitted to stand unchallenged.

The very first line of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, reads:

> It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all mode of transportation, etc.

The Congress today stands indicted of perpetrating an outrageous and unfair act on the people of the United States.

Congress should refute this indictment without delay.

For that reason, I am submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that this body does intend to be fair and that both the public and the railroads should be accorded fair and equal recourse to the courts.

Mr. President, I wish to add that a long time ago President Johnson asked for the establishment of a Department of Transportation. This followed a recommendation by the Hoover Commission in 1948 that transportation should not be separated into several sections, each regulated by a different agency of Government, with each agency strongly suspected of promoting the particular mode of transportation they are charged with regulating.

I believe it is time for us to give serious consideration to the President's recommendation for the establishment of a Department of Transportation.

So far as I know, there has not been a waterway authorized or really improved for the last 3 years due to the opposition of other modes of transportation.

I think it is time for us to look into the entire situation and do something about it. In the meantime, I could not resist calling to the attention of the Senate the indictment which has been made against the Congress, an indictment of being unfair to the public and that is why I am asking the Committee on Commerce to correct that situation, either by statement or legislation.

I do not vouch for the proper wording of the resolution which I am introducing on behalf of myself and Senator PROUTY, but I do vouch for the statement that the situation is very bad. Congress cannot afford to let this charge against it go unchallenged.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

> Whereas, in 1958 the Congress enacted 49 U.S.C. 13(a) giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to investigate passenger discontinuance cases;
>
> Whereas, certain federal courts have so interpreted said law so as to give private railroad companies a right of appeal to the district courts when the decision of the Commission is adverse to them but denied the right of appeal to the public protesting such discontinuance when the Commission's decision favors private railroad companies;
>
> Whereas, on April 5, 1966, the Interstate Commerce Commission in Finance Docket No. 23831 ordered the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company to continue passenger service provided by the "Washingtonian" from Springfield, Mass. to New York City, and as reason for such decision stated:
>
> "Three daily morning trains, Nos. 169 (the 'Washingtonian'), 67 (the 'Bankers'), and 69 (the 'Nathan Hale'), provide inbound service during New York's long rush period and we conclude that these trains should be continued. The 'Washingtonian,' arriving in New York at 8:10 a.m., has generally light patronage and low passenger train mile earnings, but it does handle a quite high volume of through passengers in through train service from Montreal and Boston & Maine origins, as well as a high volume of passengers moving beyond New York City. The 'Washingtonian,' a conveniently scheduled through Montreal-to-Washington, D.C. train, should not be discontinued in the absence of clear evidence that it has no potential for economic viability." Page 214.
>
> The Interstate Commerce Commission further ruled that the "Montrealer" providing passenger service from New York City to

Springfield, Mass. should be continued and as reason, therefore, held:

"Examining the patronage and revenue levels, scheduling, alternative train service and feasibility for use in connecting carrier service of all of these evening through trains, we conclude that the New Haven should be required to continue to operate only trains Nos. 28 (the 'Gilt Edge'), 168 (the 'Montrealer'), 176 (the 'Federal')." Page 210.

Whereas, on July 6, 1966, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order relative to the proposed discontinuance of passenger service between Springfield, Mass. and White River Junction, Vermont, by the Boston & Maine Corporation, Finance Docket No. 24000, wherein the Commission stated as a conclusion of law that four passenger trains including the "Washingtonian" and the "Montrealer" were indeed a burden upon interstate commerce but delayed issuing a report until some time in the future. Said "Washingtonian" and "Montrealer" are the very same trains which the Commission ordered the New Haven to continue in April of this year because of through service from Washington and New York to Montreal;

Whereas, in certain federal cases, the public has protested unfair treatment by the Interstate Commerce Commission but certain federal courts have held that there is no requirement for a right of appeal as far as the public is concerned and that the federal courts have no jurisdiction to hear such appeals. Thus, in *State of New Hampshire vs Boston & Maine Corporation, United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,* Civil Action No. 2570, the Court held:

"While Congress did not expressly deny judicial review of S13(a)(1) proceedings, we find apart from the terms of S13(a)(1) the difference between subsections (1) and (2) highly persuasive that Congress did, indeed, intend that result.

"The most appealing argument in support of jurisdiction on these facts is one based simply on fairness and equity. Since the railroad would have a right to appeal, the Commission's order that seven trains are required by the public convenience and necessity and must, therefore, be continued in service, the public should have a right to judicial review with respect to the discontinued trains as well. *But the short answer to this argument is that Congress does not have to be fair.*" (Pages 11 and 12).

Now, therefore, it is hereby *resolved* that Congress in enacting 49 U.S.C. 13(a) intended to be fair and to give the same right of appeal to the public as to private railroad companies;

Resolved, That Congress in enacting 49 U.S.C. 13(a) did not intend and does not intend to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the right of decision without review;

Resolved, That Congress intends the Interstate Commerce Commission to treat members of the public in Vermont with the same degree of fairness as members of the public in any other State.

Resolved, That Congress intends that the Interstate Commerce Commission treat private railroad companies, such as the New York New Haven and Hartford Railroad, with the same degree of fairness as when dealing with the Boston and Maine Corporation;

Resolved, That if the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot, or will not, fairly treat all private railroad companies equally and if said Commission cannot, or will not, treat all members of the public with equal fairness, that Congress will duly consider the necessary steps to restrict the powers of the Commission or to abolish it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I would be honored if the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] included his friend, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. I am delighted to add the name of the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Although this is a New England situation that brought the matter up, I have no doubt that other parts of the country have similar situations.

I am delighted to add the name of the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] as a cosponsor of the resolution.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 650

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record, together with a proposed revision as it would read with matter in brackets eliminated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and proposed revision will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 650) is as follows:

On page 16, in lines 2, 7, 8, and 9, strike out "RECONSTRUCTION" and insert "DEVELOPMENT".

In line 10, strike out "underdeveloped" and insert "less developed".

In line 10, strike out "in Asia and Africa".

In line 12, strike out "Reconstruction" and insert "Development".

In line 13, strike out "two" and insert "one or more".

In line 14, strike out "three" and insert "one or more".

In line 15, after "established." insert "A majority of the members of each such Commission shall be citizens of the country in which it is established.".

In line 16, strike out "that" and insert "for the selection of".

In line 17, after "established" insert "who wherever feasible".

In line 20, insert a period after "office" and strike out the rest of the sentence.

In line 24, strike out "reconstruction in" and insert "development of".

In line 25, strike out "shall" and insert "may".

On page 17, insert a comma after "research"; strike out "and"; after "training" insert "and other".

In line 2, strike out "reconstruction" and insert "development".

In line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

After line 12, add the following:

"'(e) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to restrict the authority contained in any other chapters of this Act.'"

The proposed revision, presented by Mr. Hickenlooper, is as follows:

Proposed Revision of Hickenlooper Amendment as It Would Read With Matter in Brackets Eliminated

CHAPTER 7—JOINT COMMISSIONS ON RURAL [RECONSTRUCTION] DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 471. Joint Commissions on Rural [Reconstruction] *Development* (a) the President is authorized to conclude agreements with [under-] *less* developed countries [in Asia and Africa] providing for the establishment in such countries of Joint Commissions on Rural [Reconstruction] *Development* each of which shall be composed of *one or more* [two] citizens of the United States appointed by the President and *one or more* [three] citizens of the country in which the Commission is established. *A majority of the members of each such Commission shall be citizens of the country in which it is established.* Each such agreement shall provide *for the selection of* [that] the members who are citizens of the country in which the Commission is established *who wherever feasible* shall be selected in such manner and for such terms of office as will insure to the maximum extent possible their tenure and continuity in office. [independently of any changes in political regimes in such country.]

(b) A commission established pursuant to an agreement authorized by this section shall be authorized to formulate and carry out programs for [reconstruction in] *development of* rural areas in the country in which it is established, which [shall] *may* include such research, [and] training *and other* activities as may be necessary or appropriate for such [reconstruction] *development.*

(c) Not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available pursuant to section 212 shall be available to the President in negotiating and carrying out agreements entered into under this section, including the financing of appropriate activities of Commissions established pursuant to such agreements.

(d) The furnishing of assistance under this section shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the United States of any responsibility for making further contributions for such purpose.

(e) *Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to restrict the authority contained in any other chapters of this Act.*

AMENDMENT NO. 652

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the foreign aid bill, S. 3584. The purpose of this amendment would be to assure that the Agency for International Development, in purchasing iron and steel products for Vietnam's commodities import program, would implement congressional policy in a manner which would benefit our balance of payments. If adopted this amendment would prevent the payment of exorbitant prices for inferior steel at a time when our own steel industry has been confronted with serious foreign competition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 653

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Gruening) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 654

Mr. McGEE (on behalf of himself, Mr. Sparkman, and Mr. Clark) proposed an amendment to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 655

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 656 THROUGH 665

Mr. **DIRKSEN** submitted 10 amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 666 THROUGH 671

Mr. **MORSE** submitted six amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the Record.

(See the above amendments printed in full when submitted by Mr. Morse, which appears under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 651

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], had intended to be present today to introduce for himself and the other Senators from the Great Lakes States an amendment to S. 3010, the bill proposing the establishment of a Department of Transportation.

This amendment would place the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation in the proposed new Department by specific statutory provision. It is consistent with the intent of Congress at the time the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation was first established in 1954.

Every year it is becoming increasingly clear that the seaway is of the greatest importance to the growth of commerce, industry, and agriculture in the heartland of the United States. It is imperative that the management and operations of the U.S. portion of the seaway be given a significant statutory position in the new Department to enable it to work effectively with other Federal agencies and with agencies of the Canadian Government.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the letter we have sent to Chairman John McClellan, of the Government Operations Committee, together with the text of the amendment, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and letter will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 651) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

On page 15, between lines 13 and 14 insert the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby transferred to the Department, where it shall be subject to the direction and supervision of the Secretary, and there are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all functions, powers, and duties, relating to the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, of the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and other officers thereof.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator shall report directly to the Secretary.

"On page 15, line 14, strike out '(c)' and substitute '(d)'.

"On page 15, line 18, strike out '(d)' and substitute '(e)'.

"On page 15, line 23, strike out '(e)' and substitute '(f)'.

"On page 18, line 6, strike out '(f)' and substitute '(g)'.

"On page 26, line 19, strike out '6(c)' and substitute '6(d)'."

The letter, presented by Mr. Mansfield, is as follows:

July 18, 1966.

Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: As your Committee begins its consideration of the proposed Department of Transportation, we would like to have before the Committee the enclosed amendment which would place in the new Department the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

In 1954, with the enactment of PL 83–358, the Congress established this Corporation, and provided that:

"There is hereby created, subject to the direction and supervision of the President, or the head of such agency as he may designate, a body corporate to be known as the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation."

There is no question but that enormous benefit has accrued to the commerce, industry and agriculture of the Great Lakes-midcontinent region because of the growing utilization of this transportation facility. The prospects for the future, given proper coordination of U.S. transportation policy and continued cooperation with the Canadian Government, can mean that even more benefits will accrue from commerce flowing to and from this fourth seacoast.

Recently, Departmental Order 185, placing the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation under a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and considering it a primal unit for organization purposes, has raised serious doubts in our minds that the intent of the Congress as expressed in PL 83–358 is being carried out. We believe that a reaffirmation of this intent is essential at the time that the new Department of Transportation is created and organized. It is not sufficient to leave this problem to be resolved by Executive Order following establishment of the new Department; past experience indicates that this will not provide adequate remedy for the organizational down-grading of an agency which must play a very important role in national as well as international transportation policy.

Hopefully, your Committee will have the opportunity to review this problem fully. The future of the United States' participation in the growth of the Seaway could well be affected by this decision, and failure to provide for this agency within the legislation establishing the Department of Transportation would materially lessen the desirability of the bill from our point of view.

Admittedly, we speak with a regional voice, but believe with deep conviction the national interest will be served by insuring primary recognition to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

Sincerely,

Senator Birch Bayh, Senator Philip A. Hart, Senator Robert Griffin, Senator Gaylord Nelson, Senator Everett Dirksen, Senator Stephen M. Young, Senator Paul H. Douglas, Senator Frank J. Lausche, Senator Eugene McCarthy, Senator William Proxmire, Senator Vance Hartke, Senator Walter F. Mondale.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND AMENDMENT

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and amendment:

Authority of June 28, 1966:

S. 3565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Morton, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Scott.

Authority of June 30, 1966:

S. 3578. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage, under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B thereof, of certain expenses incurred by an insured individual in obtaining certain drugs: Mr. Gruening.

S. 3579. A bill to establish a Judicial Service Commission: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Miller, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Simpson.

S. 3580. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes: Mr. Aiken, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bass, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tower, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

Authority of July 12, 1966:

S. 3602. A bill to prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building: Mr. McGovern.

Amendment No. 638, intended to be proposed by Mr. Kuchel, to the bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty: Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Thurmond.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor to S. 3408, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. This has the approval of the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie].

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the

Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor to my amendment No. 639 to S. 3584, the foreign aid bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON CATV

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled a public hearing on S. 1006, the copyright revision bill, as it relates to community antenna television systems.

These hearings will be held on Tuesday, August 2; Wednesday, August 3; and Thursday, August 4, commencing at 10 a.m. in room 1318, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone who wishes to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the subcommittee, room 349–A, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–2268.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself.

JIM RYUN SETS 3:51.3 WORLD RECORD FOR MILE RUN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the outstanding achievement of one of our State's young men.

Yesterday another Kansan, Jim Ryun, a 19-year-old Kansas freshman, set a world record of 3:51.3 for the mile run at the All American Track Meet at the University of California.

In 1934 Glenn Cunningham, another Kansan, became the first American holder of the world mile record, which he ran in 4:06.8.

In addition to Ryun and Cunningham, Kansas has produced other outstanding nationally and internationally known mile runners, such as San Romani and Wes Santee.

Kansans are all proud of the outstanding achievement of this young man.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of July 18, 1966, entitled "Ryun Predicts 3:50 Before Year Is Out."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RYUN PREDICTS 3:50 BEFORE YEAR IS OUT BUT NOT BY HIM

BERKELEY, Calif., July 17.—Jim Ryun, Kansas' amazing 19-year-old freshman, ran man's greatest mile today and then predicted, "Someone will run a 3:50 mile this year."

But it won't be Ryun, the 6-foot-2, 155-pound super athlete whose 3:51.3 was 2.3 seconds faster than Frenchman Michel Jazy's world record of 3:53.6 set last year.

"This is my last mile race this year," Ryun said, explaining that he has been anxiously looking forward to a vacation "when I can be human again."

Human?

"There are so many things you can't do in training," said the blond young man who rises early and runs as many as 80 miles a week, divided among sprints and distances.

Ryun, who will run a half mile in Los Angeles next week and then lay off until cross-country season, ran his record mile with two taped blisters on the inside of his right foot and developed another on the inside of his left foot during the race. He said they didn't bother him.

He termed everything just great—the track, the weather, the mild breeze.

He said his race was run almost ideally. He always felt there was a chance for a record and was encouraged by the loudspeaker's blaring of his quarter mile times, by his competitors who set the pace until he took over just after the midpoint and by the 15,000 fans in California's Edwards Stadium who stood and cheered throughout the race.

Ryun explained that all six runners in the race were determined to run their personal best. Cary Weisiger of San Diego, Calif., second in 3:58, and Richard Romo of Texas, fourth in 4:01.4, also did.

Ryun hasn't decided yet upon his major subject in college. This summer he is a newspaper photographer with the Topeka, Kan., Capital, where they say he is a good lensman.

But today he couldn't take what may be the sports picture of the year.

RAPID HOUSE ACTION NEEDED ON CHILD NUTRITION LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed legislation extending the school milk program for 4 years. This proposal was quite similar to a bill introduced by me, and cosponsored by 67 of my Senate colleagues, which would have made the school milk program permanent. However, it was only part of a more inclusive bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee [Mr. ELLENDER], extending and revising both the school lunch and school milk programs.

At the time this legislation was ordered reported to the floor of the Senate I congratulated the Senate Agriculture Committee for taking speedy action to extend the school milk program, but expressed concern over the possibility that the program might become simply an adjunct of the lunch program. I was quite pleased when I read language in the committee's report on the bill making it crystal clear that the milk program was to continue to be administered as in the past.

Subsequent events, however, have unfortunately served to confirm my fears. Had my bill, S. 2921, been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and passed on the floor it would have undoubtedly been referred to the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives where more than 50 bills similar to mine are pending and where we could have expected speedy action. However, because the child nutrition legislation passed by the Senate concentrated on the school lunch program, the Senate bill was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee.

I certainly would not want to imply, Mr. President, that the Education and Labor Committee of the other body will be slow to act on this matter. But where the Agriculture Committee of the other body has held hearings on this legislative area earlier in the year and is presumably ready to move, the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives will have to take the matter up de novo.

I deeply hope that the House of Representatives will move quickly to affirm the Senate's recently expressed support for the milk program. The House of Representatives can do this either by reporting a bill similar to S. 2921, making the school milk program permanent, from its Agriculture Committee or by taking speedy action to approve the Ellender bill in its Education and Labor Committee.

House Agriculture Committee action might well be the quickest road to the goal of an extended program. Certainly a school milk bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee and passed by the full House of Representatives would receive speedy Senate approval. After all, 68 Senators have sponsored similar legislation. In any event, I wish to emphasize the importance of rapid action in the House of Representatives to resolve any doubts the Nation may have about the future of the school milk program.

DRAMATIC ECONOMIC SLOWDOWN IN SECOND QUARTER SHOWS TAX HIKE, INTEREST RATE INCREASE COULD BE DISASTROUS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this weekend America's newspaper readers and television viewers were almost buried under stories about inflationary pressure on the economy, and the threat of rising prices.

This morning's poll by Louis Harris on President Johnson's popularity, in my judgment, turned on the same theme—the public concern with the rise in the cost of living.

To read the news of the weekend most persons would have received the impression that the economy is roaring ahead as never before, that Americans are recklessly stepping on the gas and wildly careening into a boom that must end in a bust unless further restraints are promptly slapped on by the Government.

Mr. President, the only trouble with this picture is that it is wrong, almost completely wrong.

This great American economy is not accelerating. It is slowing down. And this morning's news shows it. The Department of Commerce's announcement on what happened to the country's business activity in the second 3 months of 1966—that is, April, May, and June—was released for this morning's newspapers. This was the report on the gross national product, the GNP, the prime measure of economic activity.

Did it show a runaway boom?

Consider that in the final quarter of 1965 and the first quarter of 1966, growth had averaged $17 billion in money terms but $6 billion of this was because of the rise in prices, the growth in real terms, the actual economic growth in the last quarter of 1965 and the first quarter of 1966, was $11 billion per quarter.

Now, consider what has actually happened to the American economy in the past 3 months ending June 30th. Instead of the earlier money growth of $17 billion, the economy did not speed up. It actually slowed down to a growth rate of $10.8 billion; and instead of a real growth rate of $11 billion as in the two preceding quarters, the economy only increased its growth by $3.7 billion or one-half of 1 percent.

Incidentally, that real growth rate of one-half of 1 percent for the immediate past quarter would mean an annual growth rate of only about 2 percent which compares with the 1965 real growth of 5.9 percent.

Mr. President, we should start becoming alarmed at that 2-percent growth figure. It is not enough for this great economy of ours. It means that during the last quarter we not only did not go too fast, it means we did not go nearly fast enough. We stagnated.

Mr. President, can anyone doubt that the economy has slowed down and sharply slowed down in the actual production of goods and services. It has. The statistics are clear and undeniable.

Now, Mr. President, prominent Members of Congress, and even competent economists, nod yes, this is true and then turn around and suggest that because of rising prices we need further economic brakes; we need to slow down the economy further to prevent prices from rising.

What these slap-on-the-brakes advocates overlook is that a 2-percent real growth rate in this economy of ours in which one and a half million new workers are pouring into our economy each year, an economy that has expanded its plant and equipment to increase its production as never before, that has vastly upgraded its skills and intensely automated its production, that this 2-percent real growth rate is not enough to keep us busy, to keep our men and our plant occupied. It spells, unless it is reversed, unemployment. That is right. It means unemployment.

Mr. President, this is not to say that we should not be concerned about rising prices. Of course, we should. Prices may rise more rapidly than before. But not because of excessive demand, and not because of Vietnam pressures. We are producing all the planes, ammunition, ships, helicopters, and manpower we can use in Vietnam, but our economy is producing all this and yet so immensely productive that it is actually slowing down for lack of demand.

No, demand is not excessive. It is deficient. The times do not call for a tax increase or a further tightening of the interest rate screws to hold down prices.

The times call for restraint on the part of labor in their wage demands, and I say this although labor has been amazingly restrained for the past 3 years. They have done a remarkable job of keeping wages down to the wage price guidelines with few exceptions. Wages have risen far, far less rapidly than profits. Labor has shown continuing statesmanship in exercising this restraint at a time when profits were soaring way out beyond what American business had ever seen before, and when the growing shortages of skilled labor could have provided the basis for sharp wage hikes.

The times even more emphatically call for restraint on the part of business. Many contend that if what we say about the GNP continues to be true—if the economy does slow down—that competition will take care of prices; that prices will not go up in the face of a continuing slowdown in growth.

Mr. President, the answer is that prices can and very well might rise more rapidly in the face of a slowdown in growth. This is what happened in the late fifties and it could happen again, particularly in the big industries where a few giants exercise effective domination of the market or a price leadership power that virtually fixes prices.

This is why price restraint is so important, and why the Johnson administration is playing such a vital role in holding down prices by such actions as the molybdenum incident of last week.

This is why the settlements that emerge from labor management negotiations are so crucial to our price future.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times reporting the slowdown in the gross national product.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

ECONOMIC SLOWDOWN SUBSTANTIAL—CONSUMERS SPEND LESS AS LARGER TAX BITE IS FELT

The economy showed a "substantial slowdown" in the second quarter of 1966, primarily because Americans finally were ending a months-long spending spree.

The Commerce Department reported yesterday that the Gross National Product (GNP)—the price tag on the Nation's total output of goods and services—increased in April, May and June by only $10.8 billion. This was the smallest gain since the fall of 1964, and put the GNP at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $732 billion.

While the economy was slackening, prices were rising as fast as the previous three months. In fact, inflation ate up $6.5 billion of the $10.8 billion second-quarter gain, leaving only $4.3 billion as a "real" increase.

The slowdown is pointed up by comparing the $4.3 billion figure with the first quarter, when the real gain was $10.8 billion, and the last quarter of 1965, when it was $14.5 billion.

Although the real growth has slowed, the amount of the GNP reflecting inflation has climbed from $3.4 billion in the fourth quarter of 1965 to $6 billion in the January–March period and to the $6.5 billion in the second quarter.

While the inflation bothers Administration economists, the slowing real growth will contribute to the already substantial evidence that President Johnson will not seek a tax increase this year.

In making the newest figures public, the Commerce Department said the economy over the last 3½ years has grown at a faster clip than Government economists previously thought. It revised upward all quarterly GNP figures beginning in 1963.

The new revision—based mainly on more up-to-date data from the Internal Revenue Service, State Unemployment Insurance payrolls and the Census Bureau—boosted GNP for the first quarter of this year to a seasonally adjusted annual level of $721.2 billion. It had earlier been estimated at $713.9 billion.

The $10.8 billion increase during the second quarter of this year was the smallest since the last three months of 1964, but it was more in line with what the Administration anticipated last January in projecting an increase from 1965 to 1966 of about $46.5 billion.

Some economic indicators for June, the Commerce Department said, show that business conditions at the end of the second quarter may have been stronger than for the quarter as a whole.

The main reason for the second-quarter slowdown was "a marked tapering in consumer spending" following a long period of rapid gains, the Government said. Automobile sales alone dropped $3 billion at an annual rate.

Behind the drop in consumer spending were increased payroll withholding and Social Security taxes, the latter to help finance Medicare. The auto safety controversy also might have played a role.

Other elements in GNP showed mixed trends. Homebuilding declined slightly, and officials predicted a bigger drop this summer as the shortage of home mortgage money is felt in construction.

Businessmen invested less in new plant and equipment but more in inventories, reflecting bigger stocks of unsold cars. Imports rose faster than exports.

As a result of higher taxes and lower economic activity, disposable personal income advanced only $4.6 billion, less than in any other quarter since the spring of 1963.

[From the New York Times]

SLACKENING SEEN IN GROSS PRODUCT—GROWTH IN TOTAL FOR QUARTER WELL BELOW HECTIC PACE FOR PRECEDING PERIODS—PRICE UPTURN IS CITED—RISE IN U.S. OUTPUT OF GOODS AND SERVICES IN 3 MONTHS IS SET AT $10.8 BILLION

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The second-quarter growth in the nation's total output of goods and services, the gross national product, was $10.8-billion, well below the hectic pace of the preceding two quarters, the Commerce Department reported today.

About two-thirds of the rise in the dollar value of the gross product in the second quarter simply represented higher prices, the report said. The "real" growth was about $3.7-billion, or one-half of one per cent.

In the final quarter of 1965 and the first quarter of this year, growth had averaged $17-billion in dollar terms and $11-billion in "real" terms.

Today's report also contained the regular July revisions of the G.N.P. for several previous years. It showed that total output last year, at $681.2-billion, was $4.9-billion higher than the earlier estimates had indicated. Real growth last year turns out to have been 5.9 per cent, the highest among the leading industrial countries.

UPWARD REVISIONS

For the second quarter of this year, the gross national product was put at an annual rate of $732-billion, compared with the revised figure of $721.2-billion in the first quarter and $704.3-billion in the last quarter of 1965.

The upward revisions in the nation's total output help account for the spectacular growth in government revenues, which have been running well ahead of estimates.

The slowing of the rate of growth in the second quarter was generally welcomed both in and out of government. It meant some reduction in inflationary pressure, which had begun to reach dangerous proportions in the six-month period from last October to March.

The G.N.P. measures output by measuring total spending in the economy. By far the most important factor in slowing the expansion in the second quarter was a dip in consumer spending, concentrated on automobiles.

PERSONAL CONSUMPTION

Total personal consumption expenditures in the second quarter were at a rate of $458.9-billion, up only $3.3-billion from the first quarter. This compares with increases of $10-billion in the two previous quarters.

There was an actual decline of $3.5-billion in purchases of durable goods dominated by autos. Consumer spending on "soft" goods and on services continued to rise, though the rise in purchases of soft goods was less than in previous quarters.

Possibly because of delivery delays, business investment in plant and equipment apparently fell below the average quarterly gains of last year and the first quarter of this year. Housing construction also declined slightly in the second quarter.

The report put defense outlays in the second quarter at an annual rate of $57-billion, up $2.4-billion from the first quarter and $8-billion above the second quarter of last year before the major military commitment to Vietnam was made.

The defense figure in the G.N.P. accounts is not precisely the same as the military budget, but it gives a good picture of the growth in the cost of the war. On a G.N.P. basis, defense spending rose $16-billion in the third quarter of last year, $1.8-billion in the fourth quarter, $2.1-billion in the first quarter of this year and $2.4-billion in the second quarter.

One unusual feature of the second quarter was a very large rise in business inventories, at an annual rate of $12-billion, compared with less than $10-billion in the previous two quarters. The chief reason was a buildup of stocks of autos at the dealer level.

[From the New York Times]

PRICE INDEX CRITICIZED

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The Government's system for keeping an eye on inflation came under fire today in a special economic study that recommended an urgent overhaul of the system to permit advance warning of rising prices.

The study, "Inflation and Price Indexes," was released by the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, which already has criticized handling of Government statistics used by President Johnson in fighting inflation.

The study was made by Jules Backman of New York University and Martin Gainsbrugh of the National Industry Conference Board for the Life Insurance Association of America.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, said the committee was releasing the study because "evidences of price inflation are prompting widespread concern as to the possible need for its control by added fiscal measures, selective controls or an even more restrictive monetary policy."

Breaking with current economic thinking, the report gave top billing to the consumer price index—the cost-of-living guide—over the wholesale price index as an inflation spotter.

Most government economists contend the wholesale index is a more accurate indicator of inflation. They contend the consumer index fails to account for quality in product improvement and over-states price increases.

Although the report said the wholesale index provided an earlier inflation warning than the consumer guide, it said the latter "provides the best measure of magnitude of price inflation."

ADMINISTRATION MUST NOT PLAY POLITICS WITH U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 9 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard with deep interest what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has just stated. Interestingly enough, I came to the floor prepared to address myself to the same subject, but with a different conclusion.

The administration's unwillingness or inability to stop the present drift in economic policy and to deal with inflation effectively is threatening a major crisis for the United States.

The administration never hesitates to take credit for the expansionary effects of the tax cut of 1964; now it should be prepared to take the necessary difficult and politically sensitive fiscal actions before this fall's elections. Unfortunately, the American economy will not stand still while the administration awaits the outcome of the November elections, and continues to rely almost solely on a tight money policy as a means to stabilize the economy.

The administration was quick to criticize the Federal Reserve Board for increasing the rediscount rate December last. Since then, it has abdicated its commanding role in economic policymaking and left the main burden on the shoulders of the Federal Reserve Board. The result has been that credit has become unnecessarily and dangerously tight and interest rates today are at their highest point since World War II. This has already caused serious distortions in key sectors of the economy, such as the home building industry, small business, State and local governments; and has started an undesirable rate war between savings and loan associations and savings banks and other credit institutions. Unless the credit situation eases soon we may soon be faced with something far more serious—a recession.

The administration's most recent response to the problem of rising interest rates has been to suggest that the House Banking and Currency Committee begin work on legislation to limit temporarily the amount of interest which commercial banks and other financial institutions can pay on certain types of deposits. Should Congress act on this recommendation, it would be like clamping the lid on a boiling pot without turning down the heat. If study by appropriate congressional committees indicates, however, that this would be an appropriate action to take, it is my view that this action must be coupled with basic fiscal action to moderate the demand for credit, which is one basis of our high interest structure.

Credit demand for marginal projects can be reduced by a more restrictive fiscal policy. Improving the mix between fiscal policy and monetary policy would result in reducing the overall level of demand but at a lower structure of interest rates than in the present situation. where emphasis is placed on restrictive monetary policy alone.

While the rate of increase in the price level appears to have diminished in recent weeks, the inflation hazard is by no means a thing of the past. We are in the midst of a guideline—jettisoning machinists' strike against one-half of the major domestic airline carriers, right now. Next year, labor contract negotiations are scheduled involving 3 million workers in a number of key industries, such as rubber, trucking, communications, paper, construction, and automobiles. Vietnam costs are certain to increase before the year is out, and capital spending is not diminishing. The administration cannot permit any further delay in adopting a policy mix that will permit continued economic growth in the United States without inflation.

This policy mix, in my view, calls for an easing of credit and lowering of interest rates balanced by an increase in both individual and corporate tax rates totaling about $6 billion.

Mr. President, the administration is way behind the times—a matter of 6 months behind. Even now, it is questionable whether the danger will be met by an increase in taxes, even though it comes at least 6 months too late. If the administration would take the lead in fiscal policy, the Federal Reserve Board would, I believe, be ready to adjust monetary policy accordingly. If administration-Federal Reserve Board coordination has any meaning whatever it means just such cooperation and Congress has every right to expect this from the Federal Reserve Board.

It is fair to say that our current economic outlook is cloudy and there are no quick or easy policy solutions. Nevertheless, the administration's abdication of economic leadership over the past 6 months has aggravated the uncertainty about the economic outlook and made the selection of an appropriate policy response more difficult and hazardous than would have been the case early this year.

Further delay in making hard economic decisions would be the worst solution. A modest increase in individual income taxes—1½ or 2 percentage points—coupled with an increase in corporate income taxes—2½ to 3 percentage points—would yield $5.5 to $7 billion in Government revenues and would affect the economy across the board more equitably than a tight money policy; a policy which is essentially nonselective except as individual banking institutions carry out selectivity. A corresponding easing of credit and a fall of interest rates would at the same time improve the situation of those credit institutions and businesses which today are carrying the main burden of the administration's unwillingness to "face the music."

Mr. President, I understand very clearly why the attitude taken is the one which has been designated by my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin. I understand it politically, but it is unsound economically. It is the duty of the minority to protest against it. Notwithstanding the fact that I and others are going to vote yea and nay on such a proposal, it will be infinitely less costly and less dangerous to the American people than the present policy with the salve put over it, on the ground that in one quarter the gross national product has gone down. Why? Because money is tight, and building construction is going down? For the wrong reasons, Mr. President, because the administration will not face the music. It is 6 months late now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economic Impact—L.B.J. To Blame for Churning Interest Rates," written by Hobart Rowen, and published in the Washington Post on yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 17, 1966]

L.B.J. TO BLAME FOR CHURNING INTEREST RATES

(By Hobart Rowen)

More than it cares to admit, the Johnson Administration is worried about price inflation, which resumed a dangerous upward course last month. Yet, the President stubbornly resists a tax increase that would slow the boom, especially in business investment.

As Gov. Sherman J. Maisel of the Federal Reserve Board said in a speech last week, that would have been "the simplest . . . the most direct" way of holding things in check.

Instead, President Johnson—who was supposed to have had a Populist abhorrence of high interest rates—has allowed monetary policy to carry the ball.

We have had, as a result, a disastrous "rate war", with interest charges leap-frogging out of sight. Banks, savings institutions, and Uncle Sam himself are in a mad competition for money.

Interest and dividend rates of 5¼ and 5½ per cent are now common. One Alaska savings bank offers depositors 5.65 per cent. Shrewd investors can get around 5.7 per cent on some Government issues. Home mortgage rates under 6 per cent are almost nonexistent.

And the end is not in sight, although on Friday, the Federal Reserve moved to clip back some of the more tantalizing rates banks have offered small depositors.

While money is "tight", in the sense that interest rates are high, the traditional impact of costlier money has been absent. The money supply, since the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate last December, has actually been increasing faster than before.

The classic expectation was that costlier money would discourage borrowing. But it simply hasn't worked out that way. Convinced of good markets and boom times, businessmen have willing paid the price—higher interest rates—to expand their operations and build up inventories.

So what we have is an economy crying for restraint through fiscal policy or monetary policy—and getting neither. The only restraint that LBJ's present policy (or nonpolicy) is enforcing is excessive trouble for the housing and construction industry.

At some point in this process, unless the Administration acts on the fiscal side, the Federal Reserve Board may be tempted to do what it has resisted so far—and that is to make interest rates frighteningly high.

The discount rate is now 4½ per cent. In the present circumstances, one could justify a 5 or 5¼ per cent discount rate. The banks' prime lending rate, now 5¾ percent, could go to 6¼ or 6½ per cent. Loans to smaller customers could go to 7 per cent.

All of this could also knock the economy into a cocked hat, and the FRB fears it may be tagged with responsibility for a recession.

But what are the other options?

The Administration seems to be sitting around waiting for "good news" in the form of a slow-down in some important sector of the economy. For example, officials take cheer that the Gross National Product apparently rose only $10–$11 billion (at annual rates) in the second quarter, compared with $17 billions in the first.

But the drift of the war in Vietnam—and perhaps, ultimately elsewhere in Asia—leads everyone in Washington to the conclusion that the arms spending will move up, not down in the year ahead.

Thus, the "comfort" from a slower-paced GNP in the second quarter may dissipate with a new bulge in the third.

Nevertheless, high-placed insiders in the Administration told me in the past few days, that there will be no move toward higher taxes at this time.

They profess to fear that Congress might stall on a tax bill, and pass it only after the peak of inflationary pressures has past.

The only anti-inflationary action which the Administration has summoned courage recently was a roll-back of a 5 per cent increase in the alloying metal, molybdenum.

There, it had a sitting duck in a two-company industry where the leader had an outstanding profit record. In thousands of other situations, more meaningful to be consumer, prices are escalating, and the Administration has no plan or program to keep them in check.

The economy today is a complex of record profits, rising prices, record interest rates. There is an open invitation to labor to translate 1966's price inflation into 1967's wage inflation.

It's not anything this Administration can be proud of. What we have here is not "new", nor "old", just bad economics.

BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY—SITE FOR PROPOSED ATOM SMASHER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the approaching decision by the Atomic Energy Commission concerning a location for their proposed 200-billion-electron-volt particle accelerator. This atom smasher, when completed, will be the world's largest scientific instrument, and will further strengthen U.S. world leadership in basic science. The AEC, after studying more than 150 sites for the accelerator, has narrowed down its final consideration to six locations throughout the Nation, including the Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, which I have had the pleasure of personally inspecting earlier this year.

The Brookhaven Laboratory is the location most ideally situated for the project. Basic economic considerations suggest the choice of Brookhaven. It is the only site for which the accelerator would not require the establishment of a giant new Federal laboratory, with the attendant delay and high costs. By coordinating the new atom smasher with a smaller 33-billion accelerator already in use at the laboratory, it is estimated that approximately $60 million in construction costs could be saved, and that when complete it can be operated at a $9,500,000 annual saving.

A completely new staff would not need to be trained. As the National Academy of Sciences reported,

> The highly competent accelerator design group already there could serve as a nucleus for the staff of the 200-Bev facility. While the new accelerator is being built, experimental physicists would be able to use the 33 Bev machine that is now operating. This would materially aid in the recruitment of staff.

However, it is not only in economic considerations in which Brookhaven excels. The facility is also presently situated in the middle of one of the greatest complexes of scientific talent for research and technology. The laboratory itself is now operated for the Atomic Energy Commission by a group of universities called Associated Universities, Inc., which is composed of Columbia University, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Rochester and Yale.

The close ties of the Brookhaven scientists and additional distinguished universities in the area should also be recognized. More institutions use these atomic facilities than use any other in the Nation. Over 65 percent of all the research performed there is carried on by visiting scientists from 35 outside institutions. It was the Seaborg Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee which stressed that basic research and graduate education should remain intimately coupled. In short, the wealth of scientific personnel in the universities which manage Brookhaven, and in the other universities within easy reach of it, represents by far the greatest concentration of brain power available to utilize this accelerator anywhere in the United States.

Added to the strong educational support is the support of the business community. Industries and business groups on Long Island, throughout New York State, and indeed throughout the eastern seaboard have joined in their support for this advance of science. Particularly strong is the Long Island-wide support for the accelerator, including that of the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Commission, the Long Island Association, as well as representatives of financial, labor, and industrial groups. Statewide, the New York State Science Foundation and the New York State Advisory Council for the Advancement of Industrial Research and Development, among others, have assured the AEC of their complete willingness to assist in strengthening the coordination of the educational institutions with Brookhaven.

This support by both educational and business groups is unusual and indeed significant. Furthermore, the added advantage of the superb transportation system in the area makes the Brookhaven site unparalleled. Because of the excellent rail, highway, and shipping networks of which New York is the focal point, the new atom smasher at Brookhaven would be uniquely accessible to scientists from all over the United States and the world.

In fact, Brookhaven is already an established center for the world scientific community, with over 350 visiting scientists participating in its research programs each year.

In summary, with its obvious advantages of the nearby universities, an available, federally owned location, a nucleus of experienced nuclear scientists, strong support from the business and academic communities, and an outstanding transportation system, Brookhaven clearly is the superior location for the atom smasher.

And, these factors will, I am sure, be given the fullest consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission and by the President in reaching a decision.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article published in the New York Times of June 30, regarding a meeting which I attended under the auspicies of the Long Island Association of Commerce and the First National City Bank, in which leading executives of some 250 New York and New England corporations participated. Presiding at this conference were Richard S. Perkins, chairman of the executive committee of the First National City Bank and Carlyle H. Jones, president of the Long Island Association of Commerce and Industry and vice president of Sperry Gyroscope Division of Sperry Rand Corp. Presentations were made by Dr. John Baiardi, Provost of the Brookhaven campus of Long Island University; Joseph F. Dytra, Jr., executive vice president of the Long Island Association of Commerce and Industry; and John F. Woog, Esq., Legislative Counsel of the association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 30, 1966]

LONG ISLAND IS URGED AS SITE FOR A HUGE REACTOR

Leading executives of some 250 New England corporations were urged yesterday to lend their influence and prestige to a drive to locate a $370-million atomic accelerator on Long Island.

The accelerator, a 200-billion electron volt reactor, commonly called an atom smasher, is to be constructed by the Federal Government at one of six sites across the country.

Already, some government and business leaders in 13 northeastern states have endorsed a bid to locate the reactor at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in Suffolk County. A 33-billion electron volt reactor is now in operation at Brookhaven.

Yesterday's meeting of executives—one of the rare efforts to organize the usually independent Atlantic states into a political bloc—was held in an auditorium of the First National City Bank at 339 Park Avenue near 51st Street.

Mayor Lindsay and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS were both on hand to urge the business leaders to support the drive, aimed at influencing the Atomic Energy Commission and President Johnson to choose the Long Island location.

Officials of the Long Island Association of Commerce and Industry told the group that construction of the world's largest reactor at Brookhaven would mean an "economic fallout" in the Northeast of $1.25-billion in building and operating costs over a 10-year period.

The businessmen were asked to write to their Congressmen, key government officials and the presidents of universities and colleges in their areas asking for support for the Brookhaven project.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in Newsday, the Long Island newspaper, of June 27, entitled "One More Push."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsday, June 27, 1966]

ONE MORE PUSH

The Atomic Energy Commission is now making its final consideration of six possible sites for a $375,000,000 atom smasher, by far the largest in the world. These sites are at Brookhaven, on Long Island; at Ann Arbor, Mich.; at Madison, Wis.; at Weston, Ill.; at Denver, Colo., and at Sacramento, Calif. Each has certain features that recommend it, but the Brookhaven site is the only one that has all of them in abundance.

The basic criteria are (1) land suitability; (2) availability of electric power and clean water; (3) cost of construction; (4) cost of operation; (5) fast transportation, both local and nationwide; (6) proximity to colleges and universities; and (7) suitable surrounding communities to house 2,400 resident scientists and technicians. On the evidence, Brookhaven excels on every count.

Most of the land required is already owned by the federal government, and excellent for construction. Electric power and water to spare are close at hand. The atom site can be built at a savings of $59,000,000 at Brookhaven because of supporting facilities which are already in place. When complete, it can be operated at a $9,500,000 annual savings—a total of $154,000,000 over ten years.

Overriding all these favorable factors, which include the scientific nucleus already created by the State University at Stony Brook, other colleges, defense production plants and the national laboratory, is the political pressure that is being brought by every area being considered. The governors of many northeastern states and the members of Congress from those states are pushing hard for Brookhaven. That pressure must be intensified, for the final decision is to be made in two stages—first by the Joint Congressional Committee for Atomic Energy, and finally by President Johnson.

On the merits, Brookhaven should win the award of the atom smasher. On the basis of practical politics, every ethical effort should be made to insure that the whole of the northeastern U.S., with its unmatched scientific and educational facilities, benefits by the location of this new facility on Long Island.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the celebration of Captive Nations Week expresses the determination of this Government to keep alive the hope of freedom in the hearts of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Communist tyranny has enslaved millions of Europeans for two decades. No one regrets more than I the necessity for a Captive Nations Week; yet until national independence is restored to these East European countries, the American people will continue to take the opportunity every year to publicly recommit ourselves and our Nation to a policy whose ultimate goal is the restoration of human freedom.

The United States has been founded on principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity—those very principles now denied our friends and relatives in Eastern Europe. Indeed, many of those who helped found these principles in America are heroes of now captive nations—heroes as illustrious as Kosciusko and Pulaski. The United States thus shares with these Eastern European people ties of history and cultures, as well as ties of sympathy and understanding.

Captive Nations Week has acquired an added significance now in view of events in Vietnam and east-central Europe. Most recently in the press we read of Rumania's attempts to introduce some flexibility in the tightly controlled eastern bloc and Warsaw Pact. This is a positive sign and we can assist such moves toward independence by trade, cultural exchanges, and moral encouragement. In East Germany, despite a manmade barrier to freedom, people daily seek asylum and a new life in the West. Indeed, in each satellite country, one can find inspiring examples of restlessness and a search for freedom. We particularly note these events during Captive Nations Week, and we pray for the time when all these people can be restored to the ranks of the free, and a Captive Nations Week will no longer be necessary.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make some observations regarding the agriculture appropriation bill the Senate passed last Friday, and which will soon be the subject of a Senate-House conference. First, I wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for restoring the administration's proposed cutbacks in the school milk, school lunch, land-grant college and agricultural research programs. Certainly, these long-existing, vital programs deserve the full support of the Congress. By recommending cuts in these valuable programs, the administration, which should have known full well that the Congress would surely restore the cuts, in effect attempted to make the Congress appear to be the "big spenders."

I hope that the Senate conferees will press for adoption of the sums allotted by this body particularly in regard to the following two programs:

First. Rural Community Development Service:

I believe that the Senate provided a valuable service when it increased the funds available to the Rural Community Development Service from last year's $637,000 to $2.5 million. Unfortunately, the House agreed only to maintain the fiscal 1966 level. I would like to add my support to the Senate figure and would hope that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] will urge the House to take the $2.5 million figure. The Rural Community Development Service provides a force of specialists in rural development thoroughly trained in the procedures of other Federal agencies—as well as the Department of Agriculture programs—assigned a clear and full-time responsibility of helping rural communities in each State make full use of available forms of assistance. Our Federal programs are of inadequate value if we cannot make them reach the rural citizen who has little access to information concerning the various aid available. The $2.5 million appropriated by the Senate will allow this agency to expand its services beyond the 23 States in which it now has offices. The agency had estimated that it would need at least $1,750,000 to maintain the present level of operation. Thus, by giving added life to this service we are pursuing the goal of seeing that rural people share equitably in our Federal system.

Second. School lunch program for needy children:

I was glad to see the Senate adopt an amendment to increase to $4.5 million funds available for section 11 of the school lunch program. That section authorizes special assistance in the form of a larger subsidy to schools in low-income areas. This added sum will allow needy children to receive more well-rounded nutritional diets. The House merely continued the $2 million appropriated last year.

At the same time I hope the conferees will be sympathetic to the views of the House with regard to new starts in watershed planning. Whereas the House allowed for 100 new starts for this important program to increase our flood prevention methods, the Senate has allowed for only 60 new starts. I am informed the actual building of the various watershed projects has been bogged down and I hope that an increased effort within the Department of Agriculture will be made to push this program along at a faster pace.

I am also pleased to point out that although only $50 million was allocated for expenses for the cropland adjustment program, the committee in its report states that should it be determined later that actual needs for fiscal 1967 are much greater, additional funds will be sought in a supplementary appropriation bill. The cropland adjustment program was created as a result of the 1965 Agriculture Act and it is still unfamiliar to many farmers. However, as the word spreads across the country, I believe that there will be great demand by farmers who may wish to divert land from the production of unneeded crops to uses that will promote the development and conservation of our soil. Also the program may be used to preserve open spaces, promote natural beauty, and for rural recreation facilities.

Earlier in the session, the Senate passed S. 902, a bill sponsored by Senator ELLENDER and myself to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding areas and other agriculture use areas. We can ill afford to make mistakes in land development as the cities expand into our rural areas. I am informed that community planners have expressed great interest in the aid given them by the soil maps resulting from surveys conducted by the Soil Conservation Services. I had hoped that the committee would have seen fit to restore the entire $3.6 million which the administration sought to cut from this year's budget. However, the Senate did restore $2 million of that amount which is the sum agreed to by the House.

Finally, I should mention that by restoring the funds which the administration would have cut in agricultural research, the committee returned $320,000 to the joint Federal-State fight against the golden nematode—an insect which has the capability of destroying the entire Long Island potato crop. Such destruction would result in the loss to New York State of over $25 million annually. I am informed that the combined Federal-State effort over the past 20 years is within 3 or 4 years of containing this infestation. It would be tragic if the Federal Government were to withdraw its support at this time.

STEINBECK REPLIES TO YEVTUSHENKO ON VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a poem published July 7 in a Moscow literary newspaper, Yevgeny Yevtushenko chided Pulitzer and Nobel Prize-winning Author John Steinbeck for his silence on Vietnam and urged him to deplore the recent bombing raids.

Mr. Steinbeck, who has a son in Vietnam, turned the tables on Yevtushenko. He said that he does not "know a single American who is for (the war in Vietnam). But, my beloved friend, you ask me to denounce half a war, our half."

Steinbeck called the war Chinese-inspired and insisted that the United States would not be there in the first place were it not for the fact that others began the conflict.

Instead, Steinbeck called on Yevtushenko to use his influence in the Soviet Union to get the Moscow government to "stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South."

I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of John Steinbeck's letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following is the full text of Steinbeck's open letter to Yevtushenko:

"MY DEAR FRIEND GENYA:

"I have just now read those parts of your poem printed in the New York Times. I have no way of knowing how good the translation is, but I am pleased and flattered by your devotion.

"In your poem, you ask me to speak out against the war in Vietnam. You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

"Surely you don't believe that our 'pilots fly to bomb children,' that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.

"You know as well as I do, Genya, that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. They are marked in pictograph and in Cyrillic characters.

"I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Vietnam at all. If this were a disagreement between Vietnamese people, we surely would not be there, but it is not, and since I have never found you to be naive you must be aware that it is not.

"This war is the work of Chairman Mao, designed and generalled by him in absentia, advised by Peking and cynically supplied with brutal weapons by foreigners who set it up. Let us denounce this also, my friend, but even more, let us together undertake a program more effective than denunciation.

"I beg you to use your very considerable influence on your people, your government, and on those who look to the Soviet Union for direction, to stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South.

"For my part, I will devote every resource I have to persuade my government to withdraw troops and weapons from the South, leaving only money and help for rebuilding. And, do you know, Genya, if you could accomplish your part, my part would follow immediately and automatically.

"But even this is not necessary to stop the war. If you could persuade North Vietnam to agree in good faith to negotiate, the bombing would stop instantly. The guns would fall silent and our dear sons could come home. It is as simple as that, my friend, as simple as that, I promise you. I hope to see you and your lovely wife Galya soon.

"With all respect and affection,

"JOHN STEINBECK."

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last week, I called upon the administration to make proposals to Congress for the revision and strengthening of the emergency labor dispute provisions of our national labor laws—proposals which the President assured us, in his state of the Union message, he would deliver but which have never been presented.

The airlines strike is but one more example of the critical weakness in our labor laws which periodically and regularly subjects us to strikes endangering the national health and safety.

Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Post published an excellent editorial, reiterating my call for legislative action. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
July 17, 1966]

EMERGENCY STRIKE VOID

Senator JAVITS has issued a timely reminder that the promised recommendations for emergency strike legislation have never been forthcoming. The President indicated in his state of the Union message last January that he would have proposals to make on the subject. At the time the country was much concerned about the helplessness of Government in the face of stalled public services because of the New York subway strike. The crisis passed, however, and nothing was done. Now the country is face to face with a similar crisis in the airlines strike, and there is no legislation on the books through which the public interest can be protected.

This newspaper has often noted the inadequacies of the emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. The airline strike has once more demonstrated the similar weaknesses of the Railway Labor Act. So long as these defects remain uncorrected the public must expect periodic crises resulting in the suspension of services that, in our modern civilization, must be deemed essential.

Mr. JAVITS is not asking others to rush into a delicate legislative field which he himself avoids. On the contrary, he has long sponsored legislation that would give the President what he calls "one last-resort weapon" that could be used after all else had failed. If fact-finding with recommendations and a cooling-off period for additional negotiations should fail, he would authorize the President to go to court and ask for the appointment of a special receiver to operate the struck property whenever necessary to protect the public health and safety.

Whether or not this is the right approach, it would be a useful starting-off place for discussion of an extremely difficult problem. It is a grave illusion to suppose that the problem will go away if the Congress and the White House continue to ignore it. On the contrary, it is likely to get worse.

DEATH OF POLICE CHIEF WILLIAM H. PARKER, OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Saturday night, a distinguished American, Chief of Police William H. Parker, of Los Angeles, died suddenly of a heart attack. He was 64. My wife and I send to his widow our most heartful condolences.

I have no doubt that his reputation is known to all the Members of the Senate who would wish to join with me in extending sincere sympathies.

Chief of Police Parker was a man of unswerving loyalty to the enforcement of the law. If a crime were committed, or suspected, in the city of Los Angeles, he considered it his bounden duty to ferret out the guilty, no matter who they were, nor what their reputation might be.

Bill Parker brought honor and courage and devotion to the public trust and to all of his official labors.

He reorganized the police department of the great city of Los Angeles into one of the finest law enforcement agencies in this Nation.

He would remove an incompetent or one derelict to his duty as instantly as he would honor a member of his department for valor in line of duty. He was impervious to both politics and threats.

Chief Parker sought no public laurels. He had no political ambitions. He was content with his lot, and eternally proud of it. He was not interested in winning popularity contests. When he spoke, he spoke bluntly. He did not seek a reputation as a public speaker, or as a raconteur, or as a clubman. First and last, it was the enforcement of the law and the protection of the innocent which marked the bounds of his duties and his days as chief of police.

For the last many months, Bill Parker was not well. He underwent heart surgery last October. But he stuck to his duty, for duty, as he saw it, was his guide. He feared God, but nothing else.

I had the pleasure of knowing the late Chief Parker since the end of the Second World War. In the intervening years, I came to know him as a friend. But seared into my soul is the eternal gratitude which I shall have for him because of the superb professional investigation which he and the members of his excellent police department undertook many months ago when I became the victim of a criminal libel. Chief Parker ordered a complete inquiry, and his police force proceeded precisely as he ordered. Unquestionably, the truth would not have been known, nor would justice have prevailed, in this instance, were it not for Bill Parker's penchant for law enforcement all across the board. Here, as in every other instance he confronted in his official labors, it was the law of organized society that Bill Parker viewed as supreme.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter which I wrote to him on February 25, 1965, and his answer to me on March 2, 1965, may appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM H. PARKER,
Chief of Police,
City of Los Angeles,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CHIEF PARKER: I wish to repeat what I told you at lunch last week. As a Californian, I take great pride in the integrity and the ability of the Los Angeles Police Department under your leadership. I have abundant reason to know what I say. The recent investigation which your Department undertook, at my request, demonstrated a high degree of skill in uncovering a complex series of well hidden facts, by which your Department established the commission of an evil crime against society.

The investigation did more. It reflected a dedicated devotion by your Department to its public trust.

With my sincere thanks,
Very sincerely yours,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF POLICE,
W. H. PARKER,
March 2, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Thank you so very much for your expression of confidence and support concerning the manner in which officers of this Department are performing their duties.

I am uncommonly proud of the especial tribute you have paid to the officers who were assigned to the recent investigation.

Be assured that they shall know of your gratefulness for their efforts in your behalf.

Sincerely yours,
W. H. PARKER,
Chief of Police.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the President's message on the state of the Union he said:

> I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority will enable us to deal effectively with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

That message was delivered last January. No implementing legislation was recommended.

The status of the Nation in being at the mercy of labor leaders is now identical with what it was on the night the message on the state of the Union was presented to Congress. Undoubtedly, when the President made that statement, he had in mind the paralysis that the city of New York suffered when it was subjected to a strike against the metropolitan transportation system. The impact of that strike was still vivid with the President and the people of the Nation, and, in my opinion, it was on that basis that he said he would present to the Congress ways and means of protecting the country against work stoppages which caused irreparable damage to the economy.

The question now is, Does the strike of the airlines involve a national interest? My position is that to contend to the contrary is ridiculous. The strike does involve the national interest. It comes completely within the letter and the spirit of what the President said to the Congress last January.

That the national interest is involved is quite pointedly demonstrated when we recognize that the Continental Air Command has had to institute an emergency airlift to carry soldiers returning from or en route to South Vietnam and to facilitate other military operations.

However, even apart from the problem of transporting military men, the strike has caused economic damage in untold amounts and has subjected the citizenry to an inconvenience which is wholly unjustified.

Last week I presented to the Senate a bill the provisions of which declared that after conciliation and mediation, under the Railway Labor Act, a finding had been——

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 or 3 additional minutes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. After the preliminary instrumentality had been exercised and no adjustment had been made of the dispute, the President, under my bill, would be empowered to create a five-man board, three to represent the public, one the striking unit, and one the employers.

That five-man board is granted plenary powers to take testimony and finally render judgment on what has been done. That judgment is final, except if there be a digression from the procedural provisions of the law.

On the following day, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] introduced a bill, contemplating creating an instrumentality of the Government that would make possible the termination of a dispute of the type involved. I shall not attempt to describe the provisions of his bill. My understanding is that certain preliminary instrumentalities are used, and if those instrumentalities do not produce a settlement, he would then give jurisdiction to the U.S. courts to appoint a receiver and operate the system, with all parties being in status quo except that the receiver is operating the system.

The point I wish to make is this: Not one word is heard from the White House about either Senator JAVIT's bill or mine. I know of no condition that would more urgently demand some expression. The White House cannot say, "We will not intervene." The problem is too serious.

I say to the Senator from New York, it is my hope that we will not, at the end of this strike, find ourselves in the same position that we were in at the end of the New York metropolitan transportation strike. Something must be done to permanently deal with this problem, and I intend to continue speaking on the subject. I have one view of how it should be done, the Senator from New York has another; others may propose other means. But some effective instrumentality must be created.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we Senators generally get to know one another pretty well, and it is well known that my views on social welfare and even on labor questions often differ from those of the distinguished Senator and my beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. But that does not detract one iota from my respect and affection for him.

One matter on which we see eye to eye is that at no time must the United States be powerless. A great sovereign government with enormous responsibilities cannot be stricken powerless, Mr. President. Upon this issue liberals, conservatives, and all parties must agree.

That is the issue in a strike such as this: Does the United States have any residual authority remaining? The answer under the present state of the law is that it does not. Mr. President, I respectfully submit that to this issue the President of the United States must address himself. The Nation cannot be left powerless. Whatever may be the formula, the Nation must have a remedy.

I look with no pride upon the flap we got into on this floor when we faced the firemen's and enginemen's strike and, at the last minute, some action had to be taken. I had to vote for a bill I despised, because it involved what I thought was compulsory arbitration. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] had to vote for a bill he despised, because it was a laggard improvisation in the face of a terrible national emergency.

It is painful, Mr. President, that we are in this position. It is a manmade crisis. We could easily work out legislation which would put us in a position where we can act. I think it is the bounden duty of the President of the United States to come through this time, so that, as the Senator from Ohio has said, this strike may be ended in some fashion. Otherwise, again and again, we shall find ourselves as vulnerable as we are now. It is a shameful situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to take note of the fact that the Teamsters Union, within the past few weeks, has voted plenary powers to Hoffa, if and when he deems it advisable, to declare a nationwide strike of that union. Effective power, in such circumstances, is taken away from the Government and transferred to labor leaders.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hopes Senators will restrain themselves in debating during the morning hour.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, is this the morning hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. McCARTHY. Are we subject to the 3-minute limitation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does that apply to all Senators?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. To all Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New York in their remarks. The President and Congress have a responsibility to act in this field.

We had an example a few months ago of what a crippling transportation strike could do to a metropolitan city. We have an example today in the airlines strike of what can happen to the entire Nation. We faced a similar emergency a few months ago in the threatened rail strike.

I believe that both Congress and the executive branch have a responsibility to propose and enact legislation to give the Government adequate authority to act in such a crisis.

The interests of the public must be paramount to that of either management or labor.

DEATH OF F. EDWARD KERNAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I were both shocked and saddened last Friday when we learned of the death of F. Edward Kernan, a member of the Cleveland Plain Dealer Washington Bureau, at the early age of only 59 years.

Eddie Kernan, as both of us affectionately knew him, was a fine, gracious gentleman, our friend for more than 20 years, and, throughout his lifetime an objective and fine news reporter. Ohio and the Nation have suffered a loss by reason of his passing.

He was for many years a leading member of the Gridiron Club of Washington. There is very little one can say about a tragedy such as this, but I ask unanimous consent, in behalf of my colleague [Mr. LAUSCHE] and myself, to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Edward Kernan, Plain Dealer Writer, Dies," and an article entitled "Statesmen Pay Kernan Tribute," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 16, 1966.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON BUREAU MEMBER EDWARD KERNAN, PLAIN DEALER WRITER, DIES

WASHINGTON.—F. Edward Kernan, veteran member of The Plain Dealer Washington bureau, died yesterday in Holy Cross Hospital, Silver Spring, Md. He was 59.

Mr. Kernan had been on sick leave for nearly two years. He was hospitalized July 7 after suffering a cerebral hemorrhage which caused his death.

Francis Edward Michael Kernan, in his 22 years in The Plain Dealer Washington Bureau, was known affectionately throughout the huge press corps in the nation's capital as "Eddie—with 1,000 friends," among them five presidents.

Amiable, shrewd and gregarious, Eddie landed in Washington in 1944 after reporting stints on newspapers in his native Red Wing, Minn., Minneapolis and The Plain Dealer's Akron bureau.

Walker S. Buel, the late chief of the Washington bureau, used to tell the story of how Eddie worked himself into the Washington staff "as a natural, because he could not stay away from political conventions."

Eddie spent his 1944 vacation doing odd chores for the bureau staff at the 1944 Democratic national convention in Chicago, which brought him to Buel's attention.

In Washington, Eddie covered the funeral procession of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and confessed he wept just like the throngs who watched the cortege roll by. He was one of the original staff of newsmen who covered the beginnings of the United Nations when it was situated at Lake Success, N.Y.

Innumerable other reporters borrowed his "blacks," or carbon copies of his articles, on the campaign trips with presidential candidates on trains before the jet age.

A classic story in Washington was the air trip in more recent times when the presidential tour had stopped in Cleveland, where the other reporters had read Eddie's story in The Plain Dealer, and then arrived in another great midwestern city.

There in the eminent local journal was Eddie's article, word for word, except for the byline. Fletcher Knebel, a writer for Look Magazine and a Plain Dealer alumnus and former bureau colleague of Eddie's cracked:

"They sure worked Eddie to a fare-thee-well last night."

Eddie, in particular, knew Congress like the back of his hand. Innumerable representatives and senators alone knew Eddie, and from time to time used to try to steal him away from The Plain Dealer to serve as their press aides.

But Eddie preferred the glamor and excitement of newspaper life and used to spend hour after hour with cronies at the National Press Club bar recounting wild and woolly tales of an era of newspapering that today has just about died out.

In 1954, Eddie was elected a member of the Gridiron Club, the famed dining organization limited to 50 top Washington correspondents. Eddie achieved fame in the club by being the annual crier of the classic opening line for some of the organization's star skits. Eddie's role was to cry, "Make way!" in a stentorian voice, as he ushered in the actors to parody the famous and near-great "victims" of the club's satire.

None of the many notables who attended the club's luxurious banquets was ever happier to see Eddie than his old high school football teammate, Gen. Lauris E. Norstad, former commander-in-chief of NATO forces in Europe.

In fact, many Washington correspondents who went to Paris to see Gen. Norstad use to ask Eddie for an introduction.

But, as many later humorously told Eddie, they lived to regret it. The characteristic complaint was:

"Norstad spent 20 minutes of my half hour's allotted time talking about Eddie and Red Wing."

In recent years Eddie cultivated a light touch in pinpointing the human side of political figures in the news and wrote many columns in that vein for The Plain Dealer.

From 1937 until 1944, when he joined the Washington bureau, Kernan covered the news in Akron. He was in charge of the Akron bureau during World War II. There his knowledge of the rubber industry and labor relations gave The Plain Dealer a widely respected reporter.

He had been ill for the last two years and had planned to retire Dec. 1.

Visiting hours for Mr. Kernan will be at the Warner E. Pumphrey funeral home, 8434 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, from 7 to 9 p.m. today and 3 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow.

The body will be taken to his home town of Red Wing, Minn., arriving there Tuesday evening.

Visiting hours will be at the Ferrin funeral home, 301 Main Street, Red Wing, from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Wednesday. Services will be in Red Wing, Thursday morning at a time and place to be announced.

Interment will be in Calvary Cemetery, Red Wing.

Mr. Kernan is survived by his wife, Dorothy; two daughters, Mrs. Herbert Hertz and Mrs. James E. Smith, both of Silver Spring; two grandchildren; two sisters, Mrs. David Budensiek and Mrs. Jeannette Kalland, both of St. Louis Park, Minn.; and two brothers, Joseph, of Red Wing and John K. of Miami Beach, Fla.

Statesmen Pay Kernan Tribute—Humphrey Saddened

Washington.—Vice President Humphrey and House Speaker John W. McCormack joined Ohio Congressmen yesterday in paying tribute to "Eddie" Kernan, Plain Dealer reporter who died yesterday.

The vice president said: "Eddie Kernan was a dear friend of mine for many years. I am terribly saddened by his death, for I will miss his friendship and his excellent abilities as a journalist."

The Speaker said: "The newspaper profession has lost one of its most dedicated persons. Eddie was known not only for his brilliance but also for his fair play."

Among other tributes:

U.S. Senator Frank J. Lausche, D-O.—"Mrs. Lausche and I are both sorry to learn of the passing of Eddie Kernan. He was a very intimate friend of both of us. He was a devoted reporter and an extremely objective one."

U.S. Senator Stephen M. Young, D-O.—"He was a delightful, jovial friend—a most personable, generous and kindly individual. He was also a great news reporter."

U.S. Representative Michael A. Feighan, D-O.—"His straightforward and accurate reporting made him stand out among the Washington press corps. He was one of the fairest newsgatherers I've ever known."

U.S. Representative Charles A. Vanik, D-21.—"I came to know him for his devotion to the highest traditions of the Fourth Estate. The Washington beat is shadowed by his passing."

U.S. Representative Frances P. Bolton, R-22—"All of us who have depended on The Plain Dealer for many years are deeply grieved that Eddie Kernan's days have come to an end. I'll miss him very much."

U.S. Representative William E. Minshall, R-23—"A capable and lovable man, trusted by all, has been lost to the Washington scene. He had a quick grasp of national trends and problems, particularly as they affected Ohio."

U.S. Representative Robert E. Sweeney, D-at large.—"Eddie Kernan was a veteran here. He had a way of endearing himself to everyone he encountered. His personality and ready wit will be missed."

U.S. Representative Michael J. Kirwan, D-19—"Not only as a newsman but also as a good American, I've never known Eddie to break a confidence. He was a true, good friend."

J.R. Wiggins, editor of Washington Post and president of the Gridiron Club, an exclusive association of Washington newsmen—"For more than 10 years he was one of our esteemed and admired members. He carried on a long tradition of membership in our organization by Plain Dealer staff members."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by my colleagues. To me, Edward Kernan was a true and devoted member of the journalistic profession. The best tribute that I can pay to him is to take note of his complete objectivity. No consideration or purpose could persuade him to color his stories. He wrote them factually. He presented both sides.

I respected him deeply, and I mourn his loss. My condolences go to his wife and to the members of his family.

J. ROBERT LOFTIS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the July 13, 1966, issue of the Des Moines Register there appears an article by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff concerning the case of a former McNamara $20,000 aid who quit after a fund shortage in his department was discovered.

This same man is now drawing an income of $33,820 per year, which includes a $25,000 salary from the Communications Satellite Corporation and an $8,820 Government pension.

His lucrative position with Communications Satellite Corporation, a company in which the Government has a substantial interest, was obtained upon the recommendation of his former superiors who were in charge of the Defense Department during the embezzlement in which he was alleged to have been involved, and the $8,820 retirement was obtained as the result of a series of strange maneuvers at the time of his separation in 1964.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts of my remarks in the Congressional Record, volume 111, part 9, pages 12214 to 12217, in which I outlined the strange circumstances of Mr. Loftis' separation and the special arrangements made to enable him to get an $8,820 annual retirement benefit 10 years earlier than a normal employee, who did not have such influential friends, would have received.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JAMES ROBERT LOFTIS

Mr. Loftis was the second employee to get kid-glove treatment after being suspected of embezzlement.

At the time of the audit of the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense on October 31, 1963, which revealed possible irregularities in the handling of certain funds in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. John A. Wylie was serving as the Head of the Budget and Finance Branch. This was the office in charge of these funds, and the Budget and Finance Branch was a component of the office of Mr. J. Robert Loftis, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Let us follow the extraordinary procedure which was followed in order to boost Mr. Loftis' retirement benefits after his part in this embezzlement was suspected. This time they shuffled the duties of his office, changed a few titles, and then presumably abolished his old job thus making it possible for Mr. Loftis to retire on the basis of reduction in force.

Beginning on *January 13, 1964* (6 days after Mr. Wylie had been notified of his pending separation), all functions of the Budget and Finance Branch were transferred to the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. This was just three days before the case was referred to the F.B.I.

January 31, 1964. All remaining functions of the Administrative Assistant (Mr. Loftis) were transferred to the Assistant Secretary (Manpower).

February 3, 1964. The position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Defense was abolished, and on the same date Mr. Loftis was given notice of separation due to reduction in force pursuant to the abolishment of the position he had been holding.

March 27, 1964. Mr. Loftis was officially separated and elected optional retirement as a result of reduction in force separation. This sounded so much better than being fired under suspicion of embezzlement.

The next day, *March 28, 1964,* Mr. Loftis elected optional retirement as a result of reduction in force separation and was granted an immediate annuity of $735 per month on the basis of his *involuntary separation* (by the abolishment of his position or reduction in force).

Had these special arrangements not been made whereby Mr. Loftis could have qualified for an involuntary separation he would not have been eligible for retirement until March 10, 1974, at which time he would have reached the age of 62. Then he would have received $795 per month.

However, Mr. Loftis is now receiving an annuity of $735 per month which began March 28, 1964. As a result of qualifying for retirement benefits under an arranged reduction in force procedure Mr. Loftis will, for the remainder of his life, now receive an annuity of $735 per month or $8,820 per year. Mr. Loftis upon his retirement was 52 years of age and, assuming a normal life span of 77 years, this means that he will for the next 25 years collect $8,820 per year, or a grand total of $220,500.

Had he not been dismissed under this reduction in force arrangement but merely separated he would not have been eligible for retirement until 1974, when he would reach the age of 62. Then he would have been eligible for retirement benefits of $795 per month. Still assuming the same 77-year normal age, this would have meant that he would have received $9,540 annual retirement ($795 per month) for 15 years or a total of $143,100 instead of the $220,500 which he will now get.

Thus we find that as a result of this special arrangement, all of which took place after the embezzlement was discovered, Mr. Loftis will be able to collect an additional $77,400 (assuming the normal span of life).

The Great Society has been boasting that it will eliminate poverty, and based on these two examples who can say that they have not started?

On *December 16, 1964,* Mr. James Robert Loftis, Mr. Wylie, and one other employee, were indicted in the Federal Court for participation in the embezzlement of about $66,000 in Government funds.

Here we find two men who in October 1963 were in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, suspected of embezzlement of government funds, a suspicion which in January 1964 developed to the point where one of the men was notified of his suspension. Both men were carried on the payroll until one could qualify for total disability retirement benefits and the job of the second man could be abolished in order that he could qualify for immediate retirement benefits as a victim of reduction in force. The result was that these two men, both of whom are now under Federal indictment for misappropriation of approximately $66,000 in government funds, will draw approximately $120,000 in additional retirement benefits from the United States Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Next I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Clark Mollenhoff published in the Des Moines Register of July 13, 1966, entitled "A $25,000 Job for McNamara Aid Who Quit After Fund Shortage."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 13, 1966]

A $25,000 JOB FOR MCNAMARA AID WHO QUIT AFTER FUND SHORTAGE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—J. Robert Loftis, who resigned from the Pentagon following a controversy over disappearance of thousands of dollars in "confidential" funds, is now serving as the $25,000-a-year director of organization and manpower planning for the Communication Satellite Corp.

Loftis was involved in the controversy which resulted in his indictment with two other high Pentagon officials on charges of embezzlement and false statements.

Loftis, who in 1964 was making $20,000 a year at the Pentagon in addition to the new job draws a government pension of about $9,000 a year.

The other two men indicted with him, John A. Wylie, former director of budget and finance in the office of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and William H. Godel, deputy director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency were convicted on charges of embezzlement and false statements involving more than $50,000 that disappeared from the so-called "confidential cash" account in McNamara's office.

Both Wylie and Godel have been sentenced to 5-year prison terms.

Loftis was the administrative assistant to McNamara, and Wylie and Godel were subordinates who actually handled the "confidential cash."

OFFICIALS RECOMMEND

Officials of the Communications Satellite Corp. said Tuesday that Loftis was recommended for the newly created job by many high officials and former officials, including former Defense Secretary Neil McElroy, now chairman of the board of Procter & Gamble, and Cyrus Vance, the present Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Others recommending Loftis include W. J. McNeil, comptroller of the Defense Department in the Eisenhower administration and president of Grace Lines; Frank X. Brown, a Washington lawyer; Robert B. Anderson, the former deputy secretary of defense and former secretary of the treasury; Thomas D. Morris, an assistant secretary of defense, and Representative GERALD FORD (Rep., Mich.), the minority leader in the House.

Loftis asked for a separate trial. Wylie and Godel were convicted. When Loftis went to trial in the fall of 1965, Wylie appeared as a government witness against him. At the trial, Wylie stated that he loaned thousands of dollars to Loftis from the Defense Department funds, and that these funds were never repaid.

Wylie also testified that he bought expensive gifts, including cases of Scotch whisky, for Loftis from the funds.

Loftis did not take the stand in his own defense, but introduced the testimony of a number of character witnesses including McElroy. Also, his lawyer charged that Wylie committed perjury in denying that he had been offered a lighter sentence by Justice Department lawyers if he would give testimony to help convict Loftis.

OFFERED DEAL

James Fitzgerald, a lawyer for Wylie, testified that the government had offered light treatment of Wylie if he would cooperate in giving testimony involving Loftis.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (Rep., Del.) has been critical of McNamara for not firing Loftis or bringing charges against him. Instead, McNamara reorganized his office to abolish the job Loftis held. This permitted Loftis, who was then 52, to retire on a government pension of $735 a month.

Loftis said that he has never been criticized by McNamara for his handling of the funds, and that there had been only a few comments that he might have "been naive" in not being aware that Wylie and Godel were engaged in large-scale embezzlement.

"My lawyer proved that Wylie was a perjurer," Loftis said Tuesday. "He put Wylie's lawyer, Fitzgerald, on the stand and he said that there was a deal with the Justice Department."

Loftis said he did not make an explanation of the testimony by Wylie at the time because he felt that no explanation was needed in the light of the high caliber of the character witnesses he was able to produce.

OFFERED JOB BACK

Loftis said that since his acquittal, McNamara told him that he can come back to the Defense Department "at any time I want to go back."

"I wasn't forced out and I wasn't fired," Loftis said. "I just resigned because I had wanted to leave. The defense secretary told me I could have had another job at the time, but I didn't take it."

He said that Vance and others with whom he worked at the Defense Department had given him permission to use their names in seeking another job, and that they had made recommendations for him at his request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, here we have a man who under charges of embezzlement 2 years ago left a Government position and a $20,000 salary and is now drawing a total of $33,820, including a Government pension and a salary from a semi-Government agency. Who said the Great Society is not generous—especially when spending the taxpayers' money.

THE RELIGIOUS FAITH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have long been interested in the religious faith of Abraham Lincoln, who was never a member of any church.

The literature which has grown up around Lincoln numbers thousands of volumes. Anyone who delves in this literature to any substantial extent is deeply impressed by the conflict in the testimony concerning his attitude toward religion.

William H. Herndon, his law partner of many years, asserts that Lincoln "was an infidel, sometimes bordering on atheism." Dr. Lyman Abbott declares that he was an agnostic. Dr. J. G. Holland, who visited Illinois soon after the assassination to collect material for his biography of Lincoln, informs us that residents of Springfield expressed these contradictory opinions in respect to Lincoln: "That he was very religious, but that he was not a Christian; that he was a Christian, but did not know it," and "that he was so far from being a religious man or a Christian that 'the less said upon the subject the better'." John Hay and John G. Nicolay, secretaries to Lincoln during his occupancy of the White House, assure us that "he was a man of profound and intense religious feeling." Moreover, a number of rigidly orthodox Christians recount various improbable stories about Lincoln to indicate that he embraced their orthodoxy in all its details.

Many persons of a philosophic turn maintain that every individual is the inevitable product of his heredity and environment.

Lincoln was cautious to a fault. As a consequence, he suffered at times from what has been aptly called "The obstinacy of irresolution." As Dr. William E. Barton says: "When he did not know what to do, he would not do anything."

This cautiousness had its origin in one of Lincoln's chief mental characteristics. He found it extremely difficult to accept as valid any proposition whose truth he could not prove by reasoning. Herndon described the effect of this mental characteristic upon Lincoln's attitude toward religion in these words:

> In order to believe, he must see and feel, and thrust his hand into the place.

Whether this mental characteristic was inherited from ancestors or acquired from environment we do not know. But we can trace with virtual certainty some of the effects of Lincoln's environment upon his attitude toward religion.

Abraham Lincoln spent his boyhood in the backwoods of Kentucky and Indiana. During this period, he received less than 12 months of schooling in the aggregate over a space of 9 years; read and reread the Bible, "Pilgrim's Progress," "Aesop's Fables," "Robinson Crusoe," Weems' "Life of Washington," and "Franklin's Autobiography"; assisted his poverty-stricken father in farming; and attended his family's Calvinistic Baptist Church, where he heard somewhat unlettered ministers preach many long sermons on predestination and eternal damnation.

This preaching left two indelible imprints on Lincoln's mind, one a belief in predestination and the other a disbelief in eternal punishment. The strength of his belief in predestination caused Herndon to assert that "in philosophy Lincoln was a fatalist."

Lincoln's disbelief in eternal punishment constituted a reaction to the hellfire sermons he heard in his youth and was based on his conviction that punishment was "intended for the good of the offender" and "must cease when justice is satisfied." He often manifested his disbelief in endless punishment by quoting this paraphrase of Martin Elginbrod's famous epitaph:

> Here lies poor Johnny Kongapod;
> Have mercy on him, Gracious God,
> As he would do if he was God,
> And you were Johnny Kongapod.

Abraham Lincoln spent his young manhood at New Salem, Ill., a long since vanished village which stood beside the Sangamon River about 15 miles from Springfield.

During this period, he engaged in merchandising and surveying; won election to the Illinois Legislature and to the captaincy of a military company which saw noncombatant service in the Black Hawk War; read law, the Bible, Shakespeare, and such supposedly heretical books as Paine's "Age of Reason" and Volney's "Ruins of Time"; expressed very decided and somewhat radical views to his contemporaries on the subject of religion; and formed the habit of attempting to clarify his thoughts by committing them to writing.

Herndon says that Lincoln assimilated Paine's "Age of Reason" and Volney's "Ruins of Time" into his own being. Acting under the influence of their teachings, he allegedly wrote two papers, one defending universal salvation, and other asserting "that the Bible was not God's revelation" and "that Jesus was not the Son of God." Be that as it may, circumstances indicate that while living in New Salem "he was surrounded by a class of people exceedingly liberal in matters of religion" and became acquainted with all of the arguments advanced against the major tenets of Christianity.

Abraham Lincoln was admitted to the Illinois bar in 1837. He forthwith removed from New Salem to Springfield, where he resided and practiced law until his departure for Washington to be inaugurated as 16th President of the United States. He spent the remainder of his life in Washington.

If we are to understand his attitude toward religion, we must understand the mind of Lincoln and the methods by which he reached conclusions in that area of life.

Lincoln judged most things by his simple sense of justice. He subjected religious dogmas to these additional tests: First, his belief in predestination, which he absorbed from the Calvinistic sermons he heard; and, second, his inherent rationalism, which was strengthened by his reading of Paine. Whether his belief in predestination and his rationalism were consistent Lincoln did not inquire. He was not a theologian, and did not attempt to construct a consistent creed.

His rationalism engendered in his mind the conviction that all things in the universe were governed by absolute and eternal laws. He read books on the natural sciences and became a convert to the theory of evolution.

These things being true, it is not altogether surprising that Lincoln entertained negative doubts and positive disbeliefs concerning the literal truth of some passages of the Bible and some of the generally accepted theological dogmas of the Christian churches.

Note has been taken of his disbelief in eternal punishment, which was repugnant to his simple sense of justice. As a rationalist, he was unable to prove by reasoning the dogma of the supernatural birth of Christ and in consequence doubted, if he did not disbelieve, that dogma. As a believer in an ordered universe governed by absolute and eternal laws, there was no place in his philosophy for accidents or miracles. As an evolutionist, he could not accept as literal truth the Biblical story of the creation. He may also have questioned at times the divine revelation of the Scriptures. At least an inference to that effect is justified by his own statement attributing his defeat in his first race for Congress to churchmen who opposed him because he was reputed to be a deist and did not attend church.

During his sojourn in New Salem and his early years in Springfield, Lincoln expressed his doubts and disbeliefs rather freely. As a consequence, many of his contemporaries characterized him as an infidel.

In so doing, they did not imply that he denied the existence of God. They meant that he did not accept the Bible as literally true in its entirety and had doubts and disbeliefs as to certain religious dogmas. This is made plain by Herndon. Although he asserts that Lincoln was an infidel, he assures us that "Lincoln believed in God and immortality as well as heaven—a place."

As he grew older, Lincoln became extremely reticent about matters of religion.

All Americans are familiar with Lincoln's remarkable evolution as a lawyer, orator, writer, and statesman. He underwent an equally remarkable evolution in religion. As Herndon observes, "he gradually rose up, more spiritualistic."

Contrary to the popular impression, Lincoln was a man of few books. Herndon tells us that he read less and thought more than any other prominent person of his day. A few of the books he read impresed him profoundly, and assisted him in concluding that Christianity is essentially a way of life rather than a creed.

One of these books was "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation" by the Scottish author, Robert Chambers, which came to his hands a few years after his removal to Springfield. According to its author, this book constituted "the first attempt to connect the natural sciences with the history of creation." It convinced Lincoln that the theory of evolution was consistent with faith in God and the Bible.

The religious faith of Lincoln was profoundly deepened and ripened by the discipline of sorrow and its consequences.

On February 1, 1850, Abraham and Mary Todd Lincoln were bereaved by the death of their second son, Eddie, who was between 3 and 4 years of age. At that time Lincoln was virtually out of the habit of attending church, and Mrs. Lincoln's pastor, the Episcopal minister, was absent from Springfield. Under these circumstances, they asked Dr. James Smith, the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Springfield, to conduct funeral services for Eddie.

Dr. Smith complied with the request, and a strong bond of mutual respect grew up between him and Lincoln. Lincoln discussed his doubts and disbeliefs with Dr. Smith, and read Dr. Smith's book entitled "The Christian's Defense," which gave the arguments for and against the divine authority and inspiration of the Scriptures.

This was one of the books which profoundly influenced Lincoln, who made this statement to his brother-in-law, Ninian W. Edwards:

> I have been reading a work of Dr. Smith on the evidences of Christianity, and have heard him preach and converse on this subject, and am now convinced of the truth of the Christian religion.

As a consequence of these things, Lincoln became a pewholder in the First Presbyterian Church of Springfield. Mrs. Lincoln transferred her membership from the Episcopal Church to that church, and the Lincolns worshipped there with regularity until they took up their residence in the White House. After that time they consistently attended the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, whose pastor, Dr. Phineas D. Gurley, was a source of much spiritual support to Lincoln during the dark days of the Civil War.

Notwithstanding these events, Lincoln did not seek membership in any church. He simply could not give intellectual assent to all the articles in any orthodox creed. Paradoxical as it may seem, the requirements prescribed by the theology of his day for admission to church membership were stricter than those established by the good Lord for entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven.

As the result of his spiritual evolution, Lincoln became a deeply religious man. While we cannot say with certainty that his every doubt was satisfied and that his every disbelief was removed, we can affirm these things with assurance: He believed in God. He had faith in the Bible. He accepted the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. He practiced prayer. He revered Christ.

His belief in God as the Creator of the Universe and as the Sovereign Ruler of men and nations was attested time and again in his Presidential papers and public speeches.

His faith in the Bible was demonstrated in emphatic words used by him during the summer before he was assassinated. On that occasion he gave his longtime friend, Joshua Fry Speed, this advice and assurance concerning the Bible: "Take all of this Book upon reason that you can, and the balance on faith, and you will live and die a happier man."

His belief in the immortality of the soul was reflected with clarity in his letter which he wrote to his stepbrother, John D. Johnson, while his father, Thomas Lincoln, was dying:

> I sincerely hope father may recover his health, but, tell him to remember to call upon and confide in our great and good and merciful Maker, who will not turn away from him in any extremity. He notes the fall of a sparrow, and numbers the hairs of our head, and He will not forget the dying man who puts his trust in Him. Say to him that . . . , if it be his lot to go now, he will soon have a joyous meeting with many loved ones gone before, and where the rest of us, through the help of God, hope ere long to join them.

The testimony concerning his disposition of mind toward prayer before his elevation to the Presidency is somewhat scant. After that event, however, he resorted to prayer with increasing frequency. He explained this practice by saying that many times he was forced to his knees, "not knowing where else to go."

His reverence for Christ was well illustrated by two statements made by him near the end of his life.

In accepting the gift of a Bible from a committee representing the Negroes of Baltimore, he said:

> In regard to this great Book, I have but to say, it is the best gift God has given to man. All the good Savior gave to the world was communicated through this Book.

In answering a question of Congressman Henry C. Deming as to why he had never united with a church, he said:

> I have never united myself to any church because I have found difficulty in giving my assent, without mental reservation, to the long, complicated statements of Christian doctrine which characterize their articles of belief and confessions of faith. When any church will inscribe over its altar, as its sole qualification for membership, the Savior's condensed statement of the substance of both law and gospel "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself," that church I will join with all my heart and all my soul.

When all is said, his secretary, John G. Nicolay, was not in error in his declaration that Lincoln "had faith in the eternal justice and boundless mercy of Providence, and made the golden rule of Christ his practical creed."

SECRETARY HENRY H. FOWLER'S SPEECH AT WINSTON-SALEM, N.C., COMMEMORATING THE FIRST OFFICIAL FOURTH OF JULY CELEBRATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the celebration of this country's Declaration of Independence from Great Britain is the most cherished of our national holidays. The date of this declaration, July 4, 1776, marked the spiritual union of the 13 colonies as a Nation. All North Carolinians are particularly proud that the first official celebration of the Fourth of July was in Salem Square, Winston-Salem, and we were indeed fortunate in having one of the United States' most dedicated public servants, Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, to help us commemorate this significant event.

I recommend Secretary Fowler's address because it illustrates the permanence of those ideas contained in the Declaration of Independence and the thought and deliberation with which our Founding Fathers approached the formation of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Fowler's remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, at Ceremonies Commemorating the First Official Fourth of July Celebration in America in Salem Square, Winston-Salem, N.C., July 4, 1966

It is with a very deep sense of honor and privilege that I come here today, on behalf of President Johnson, to share with you so meaningful and memorable an occasion for Winston-Salem, for North Carolina and for America.

No American could fail to understand your intense pride in the knowledge that one hundred and eighty three years ago, in this square, in what was once the city of Old Salem, your forefathers gathered for the first official celebration of the Declaration of Independence—a celebration whose original simplicity and splendor came to life once more only moments ago as we listened and were moved by the same Moravian music that once long ago filled this square and the hearts of all here assembled.

And no American could fail to understand the intense pride of all North Carolinians in the knowledge that, in the Halifax Resolves of April 12, 1776, North Carolina became the first colony to declare, officially and explicitly, its support for absolute separation from Great Britain and for full national independence.

No American could fail to understand—for in those few, familiar words of the Declaration of Independence—". . . that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed . . ."—in those few, familiar words are embodied those ideas and ideals that underlie all we are as Americans and all we aspire to be.

The act of Independence on July 2, 1776—and the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776—marked one of those moments in history which was radically to alter the entire course of history—a moment that was to have a profound impact not only upon the lives of all generations of Americans to come, but upon the lives of all mankind as well.

I do not think we are always aware of how extraordinary that moment was in the history of man—and how unique is America and all it means.

"America," wrote the Englishman G. K. Chesterton, "is the only nation in the world that is founded on a creed. That creed is set forth with dogmatic and even theological lucidity in the Declaration of Independence; perhaps the only piece of practical politics that is also theoretical politics and also great literature."

Or to quote the words of a contemporary American scholar: ". . . it can be said that the revolution which gave birth to the United States is the only true revolution in history, because it is the only one in which men as creatures of history rationally chose to become its creators, to start history afresh by ridding themselves of its burdens and heeding its lessons, to give their nation a novel purpose. . . . The American revolution was an attempt not at restoring an ancient order that was supposed to have existed previously, but at creating a new order of things the like of which had never been seen before."

That revolution, therefore, did not end with the surrender of Cornwallis. It continues and will never cease to continue as each generation of Americans seeks, in the context of its own times, to bring the America it knows closer to the America it dreams. It continues and will never cease to continue as each generation of Americans seeks, in the context of its own times, to give new life to those beliefs that first gave life to the nation in which we live.

Today, as nearly two centuries ago, that revolution rests upon the conviction that all men equally and alike are members of the same human race, no man more than any other—that all men equally and alike share those rights and those responsibilities that are inherently human—and beyond this, that every man, in common with every other man, has a unique dignity and destiny.

This, then, is our faith—that all men are equal and that every man is unique, that all men have an equal right to the freedom and the opportunity to fulfill themselves both as men sharing a common humanity and as men possessing a distinct and unique individuality.

We know as our forefathers knew, that no man is exactly like another—one is brighter than another, one has different interests than another, one works harder than another. These are natural differences—the very differences we seek to afford the freedom and the opportunity to flourish and, so, immeasurably to enrich our lives as individuals and as a people.

We must also know, as our forefathers knew, that these differences cannot flourish—that we cannot fulfill ourselves as individuals—unless we are all assured the full and free exercise of those rights we all share in common. We must know that these differences cannot flourish—that we cannot fulfill ourselves as individuals—when we seize upon other differences, of race, of religion, of economic circumstances—differences innocent enough in themselves until we make of them artificial barriers that stifle talent, that diminish individual opportunity and deny human rights.

If we would live by the faith that is ours, we cannot deny to others the rights we demand for ourselves—we cannot deny the dignity of another as an individual or as a man without demeaning our own.

For this is our creed, if it has not always been our conduct. In that, we are no different from other men—for it has always been in the history of man that between the creed and the conduct, the ideal and the deed, the distance is often very great. But we do differ from other men in that we are the direct heirs of a revolution that requires of us, as it gives us, more than is required of others or given to them.

And it can be said of us that if the distance is still great between what our deeds and what our ideals declare, it is not as great today as it was five or ten or twenty years ago—and it is growing smaller day by day.

We are, in our own land, continuing to break down the barriers of poverty and prejudice and ignorance. We are continuing to hasten the day when ability to learn rather than ability to pay will be the sole standard of educational opportunity in America—when no American need fear the economic consequences of unemployment, of old age, or of ill health—when our political, our social, our moral and our physical environment shall offer to every American, of every race, creed and color, abundant incentive and opportunity for a full and free life.

And we are, in the world we share with other nations, continuing to do all we can to extend the frontiers and the fruits of freedom and to advance the prospects of peace. We are continuing to do all we can to help others in their struggle to achieve for themselves the independence and the abundance that we have achieved.

We are therefore doing in our time what is asked of all Americans in their time: that with all our resources we wrestle with the problems of our time, that with all our resolve we seek to realize in our time the ideals that are America's for all time, so that our lives and the lives of those after us will be fuller and more free.

We are struggling, like all generations of Americans before us and all generations to come, to bring to life what Abraham Lincoln once called that ". . . something in the Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time . . . that which gave promise that in due time the weight should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that *all* should have an equal chance."

In closing, may I congratulate you who are midway in this year of commemoration, marking the 200th Anniversary of the founding of a new community in a new world seeking a great society.

Think of the spirit—the religious faith and the regard for each other that moved those early Americans to this spot.

What a day it must have been—a bare seventeen years later—when they came together here to celebrate not just the end of a long war—but the birth of a new society dedicated to a new creed embodied in a Declaration of Independence.

This was a belief men could not only die for but live by.

Indeed, it was a belief that fitted the way of life of these Moravians who celebrated on that fourth of July. Bound together by deep religious feeling and a tradition of community responsibility that esteemed each man or woman a child of God—they reflected in their lives the very tenets of the Declaration they celebrated.

So, my friends, it is peculiarly fitting that we assemble at this particular place on this especial day to dedicate an enduring symbol. It is a high honor for me to join you in this act of dedication for us all by unveiling this plaque on the very site those early Americans conducted the first official celebration of the fourth of July.

SAIGON TAKES REINS OF CIA'S SCHOOL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the New York Times of this morning publishes a somewhat serious and confused story about the CIA school in Saigon.

I find it rather difficult to understand just what happened. However, as nearly as I can understand, the school run by the CIA was infiltrated and taken over by a third force group which was conducting propaganda against the propaganda line being presented by the CIA.

I read a paragraph from the article:

> The changeover of the training program took place in mid-June in a dramatic confrontation at the seaside city of Vungtau. It came after political instructors in the rural pacification training school there seized a supply of arms and threatened to resist a change in the leadership of the school.

It seems rather contradictory that a pacifist school group should seize the arms in order to take over the leadership of the school.

The article further states, quoting in this case a Vietnamese source:

> "But we cannot have the cadre controlled by one political party," said one Vietnamese source. He added: "Also, there could never be success in this program as long as Americans seem to run it, and this is no criticism of the CIA. It has to be our program."

The final paragraph reads:

> Actually, many employees of the agency remain in the training and field supervision program because there is no one to replace them. But informed sources said the agency was not happy to take a less prominent part in what has become the largest overt program in its history.

Since this is described as an overt program, I assume that information about it could probably be given to the Senate by those Members of the Senate whom the Senate last week decided could be trusted with the deep secrets of the CIA.

I hope that the members of that committee will look into this matter and, if possible, satisfy themselves about it. If they see no danger in the security of the country, I hope they will inform the Senate as to the facts of this situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Saigon Takes Reins of CIA's School," written by Charles Mohr, and published in the New York Times of July 18, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 18, 1966]

SAIGON TAKES REINS OF C.I.A.'S SCHOOL

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 17.—Large numbers of South Vietnamese who had been hired to preach support of the Saigon Government were secretly indoctrinated to believe the Government was unworthy of support, it was disclosed today by South Vietnamese sources.

As a result, Saigon Government officials have taken control from the Central Intelligence Agency of the program for training the "revolutionary development cadre"—armed experts in political propaganda.

The anti-Government indoctrination was conducted by a South Vietnamese army major, employed by the C.I.A., who spread the doctrine of a highly nationalistic political society of the Dai Viet political party. The doctrine was neither pro-Communist nor did it subscribe to salvation through the present Government.

South Vietnamese sources consider this to be a third-force doctrine that waits only for a propitious moment to seize power.

The major, Le Xuan Mai, is believed to have infiltrated a considerable part of South Vietnam's propaganda and pacification teams with cells of workers indoctrinated in this third-force philosophy.

The changeover of the training program took place in mid-June in a dramatic confrontation at the seaside city of Vungtau. It came after political instructors in the rural-pacification training school there seized a supply of arms and threatened to resist a change in the leadership of the school.

In the end, the "struggle force" formed by the instructors bowed without violence to the wishes of the Saigon Government.

TAKEOVER FROM C.I.A.

The most important result of the affair appears to be that the South Vietnamese officials have taken from the hands of the United States Central Intelligence Agency, which financed and controlled the program, primary responsibility for the training of members of a rural pacification cadre.

United States officials do not appear to have consciously fostered the kind of political indoctrination of the cadre that Maj. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, Minister of Revolutionary Development, found offensive or dangerous.

The training program and secret indoctrination had been devised by Major Mai, Vietnamese sources said.

Major Mai has been dismissed as director of the Vungtau training center, along with two captains and about five political instructors. Other instructors may be dismissed in the future.

An important South Vietnamese official said today, "I will work with anybody and I will take support from any American group, but we must have control of this program."

HOW PROBLEM DEVELOPED

As pieced together from various informants, this is the story:

Other United States and South Vietnamese agencies could not forsee or appreciate the necessity for armed propaganda teams to combat similar Vietcong organizations. But the C.I.A. did grasp this need. By the end of 1965, the agency had trained about 19,000 members of Political Action Teams.

Although their effectiveness may have been exaggerated, the teams were impressively effective in some areas. When a new rural pacification program was evolved late last year by South Vietnamese and United States officials, both the existing Political Action Teams and their training center at Vungtau were visualized as the core of the new program.

General Thang was appointed Minister of Revolutionary Development, or pacification. He in turn appointed Col. Tran Ngoc Chau, a respected thinker on guerrilla warfare, as director of cadre.

According to some South Vietnamese sources, it came to the attention of these officials that Major Mai was a member of something called the Duy Tan sect of the Dai Viet or Greater Vietnam political party.

As interpreted by Major Mai, the doctrine of this political society was that neither Communism nor the series of "ineffective" governments in Saigon offered salvation to the Vietnamese people.

THIRD-FORCE PHILOSOPHY

He is thus accused of having taught a third-force philosophy at Vungtau, centered on the idea that members of a political action team should appear to support the Government but wait for the right moment when it could be replaced with a more idealistic movement.

There may have been a certain anti-American tone to this indoctrination, but it was neither pro-Vietcong nor corrupt, observers concede.

According to unverifiable reports, Major Mai and his assistants may have placed four-man Duy Tan cells in each Political Action Team platoon graduated from Vungtau and in each 59-man rural pacification team graduated from the first class of 4,500 such workers. This is in addition to open training and spare-time indoctrination of all other members in aspects of the sect's philosophy.

LINK TO PARTY REPORTED

Major Mai, the sources said, also built subtly for the future. He conceived an emblem for the Political Action Teams built around the letter "T" superimposed on the letter "H," which ostensibly represented a Vietnamese slogan meaning "Service Through Sacrifice."

But the "T–H" symbol is also that of the Duy Tan sect of the Dai Viet party.

General Thang moved cautiously at first but in mid-June, after the first class of the pacification cadre had been graduated and before the second enrolled, General Thang sent Colonel Chau to be commandant of the camp over Major Mai.

Different versions of the events that followed can be heard. The versions generously agree that Major Mai's subordinates formed a "struggle" group to demand that Colonel Chau return to Saigon and that the camp be left undisturbed. They also agree that political instructors seized some arms.

C.I.A. officials urged a compromise under which Major Mai would have been retained in a job at Vungtau. But when this proved unacceptable to General Thang, the agency agreed to the change and to an assumption of much greater South Vietnamese control of the whole program.

It should not be thought that Major Mai succeeded in turning all of his cadre into members of his political party. Many were already under strong political influence from other groups in their home provinces. It is difficult, in fact, to assess accurately just how much effect the indoctrination had.

"But we cannot have the cadre controlled by one political party," said one Vietnamese source. He added: "Also, there could never be success in this program as long as Americans seem to run it, and this is no criticism of the C.I.A. It has to be our program."

Actually, many employes of the agency remain in the training and field supervision program because there is no one to replace them. But informed sources said the agency was not unhappy to take a less prominent part in what has become the largest overt program in its history.

THE HIGH COST OF THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President as I am sure telegrams, letters and telephone calls received by every Member of Congress reveal, the general public is becoming more insistent on action to bring to an end the national airlines strike, now in its 11th day.

In my own State of Missouri, Trans World Airlines has furloughed 5,977 employees, meaning an immediate loss, until the strike is settled, of $3,740,000 in monthly payroll.

This one airline has 9,000 employees in Missouri with an $80 million annual payroll. If the labor dispute continues, it is only a question of time until others will have to be furloughed, and the value of this payroll in our State will further decline.

The president of the Kansas City Hotel Association called Friday to report business in the hotels there was off one-third to one-half. One national convention had booked 450 rooms in his hotel. Because these five major airlines are not flying, 150 rooms had been cancelled the day before the convention opened, and management expected a great many more "no shows."

The Merchants Association in Kansas City also reports that business is off considerably now and will suffer for months to come because store buyers are not able to make their annual trips for winter merchandise.

Other businesses all over Missouri report difficulty because it is impossible to get or send air freight. Machines cannot be repaired so promptly, scarce supplies cannot be obtained or shipped to meet the current tempo in our business activities.

Over the years, both labor and management have been opposed to compulsory arbitration, but demands for legislation to that end are increasing every day.

If negotiators for labor and management in the current dispute do not get the airlines back into operation in the very near future, demands for the Congress to act will continue to mount until the Congress will have to respond.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some of the scores of telegrams and letters I have received be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 12, 1966.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Association of Machinists strike against the five major airlines is substantially affecting the business and economy of the Greater Kansas City area. I know that you are concerned about this national emergency and I hope that you, in your legislative role and collectively with your colleagues will take every possible action to bring this national crisis to an early and successful conclusion. In a separate communication I have advised the President of the United States of my interest in this matter for I am convinced that this should be a concern of all levels and divisions of government. I want you to know that this office stands willing to be of assistance in resolving this serious labor dispute.

ILUS W. DAVIS, *Mayor.*

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 14,1966.*

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We operate 517 stores and leased departments in 42 States from our headquarters. The airline strike is doing untold damage to the economy and requires government action of the most intense nature. We will appreciate your help.

EDISON BROS. STORES, INC.,
IRVING EDISON, *President.*

KANSAS CITY, MO., *July 15, 1966.*

Senator STUART B. SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want to express our deep concern over the impact that the strike against the airlines is having on the more than 1,000 employees of Automatique, Inc., and on its suppliers and subcontractor we urge the total effort of your office for an early settlement.

DON COUSINS,
Director of Marketing Services,
Automatique, Inc.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 15, 1966.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Prolonged airline strike causing serious delays in essential business travel and air freight. Economy of area adversely affected. Imperative you intercede and urge prompt steps to restore service to public.

GUSTIN-BACON MFG. CO.,
J. O. BIGGS, *President.*

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
July 16, 1966.

STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strike by machinists against 5 airlines is severely damaging our business in St. Louis. Please use your good offices and bring all influence to bear to end strike promptly.

DONALD J. KILEY,
City Manager, Avis Rent-a-Car, St. Louis.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
July 16,1966.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your concern and action is urgently requested in the interest of the settlement of the disastrous airline work stoppage now in progress.

B. J. GROFF.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 16, 1966.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please suggest Government operate airline immediately to end this unwarranted strike affecting entire Nation.

HELEN and RALPH SAUNDERS.

MARCELINE, MO.,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Our firm would greatly appreciate anything your office can do to quickly settle the airline strike.

Walsworth Publishing Co., Marceline, Mo , Do Walter, Rush Johnson, Jr., Herald Davolt.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The air strike is beginning to hurt the country. Can't some way be found to make the unions work while differences are being arbitrated.

LEWIS KITCHEN.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The continued work stoppage at TWA and other airlines is seriously interfering with production of our important Department of Defense contracts. Please use your good offices to insure an early settlement.

WILCOX ELECTRIC CO.,
JAMES E. GARDNER.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Due to airline strike our company is losing many hundreds of dollars daily because of inability to get air freight shipments on much needed and critical tools and equipment. Anything you can do to influence the President to intercede to get this airline strike settled, which unduly works a hardship on the midwest, will be appreciated.

C. N. OUTMAN.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Six thousand airline employees in this area are out of work as a result of the mechanics strike millions of dollars of payroll is lost to local economy this has a damaging effect on the economy plus great inconvenience and loss of time to many of our citizens I urge your influence in any way possible to bring the disastrous strike to an early end.

SMITH GRIEVES CO.,
EARL SMITH.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike causing curtailment our business due to not receiving daily shipments fresh fish and live lobsters from East Coast. Urgent you exert all pressure possible to get this strike settled that is so damaging to our entire country.

MID-CENTRAL FISH &
FROZEN FOODS, INC.,
E. S. GRAHAM,
Vice President.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectively request your utmost effort to promote agreement in strike of five major airlines permitting settlement satisfactory to union, management and our country. Each passing day multiplies hardships seriously affecting business and the national economy.

A. C. Swanson,
President, Western Auto Supply Co.

St. Louis, Mo.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. Stuart Symington,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Please use your powers to have Government intercede in settling airlines strike. A few people disrupting the entire Nation, costing billions of dollars, will prove more disastrous to our economy and efficiency if allowed to continue.

W. M. Upthegrove,
President, the Grove Co.

Kansas City, Mo.,

Senator Stuart Symington,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike is causing severe problems in transporting both personnel and material. Would appreciate any intercession or help you are able to provide to bring air strike to a close. Thank you.

Cook Chemical Co.,
Robert C. Conn,
Director of Transportation.

Kansas City, Mo.,
July 15, 1965.

Senator Stuart Symington,
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The airline strike has moved into its seventh day it is seriously affecting the normal operation of our company which depends heavily on serving its customer emergency spare parts needs via air freight and dispatches service personnel to points all around the country via commercial airlines. Inability to provide parts and service means envelope manufacturers throughout the country are deprived of machine productivity and hence revenue even as small operation as our is being seriously handicapped in its normal operation with much more serious consequences to our customers. We urge you to intercede for rapid settlement of the airline strike.

James W. Lenk,
Vice President, Berkley Machine Co.

July 14, 1696.

Attention Senator Symington:

Please do everything in your power to press that the air strike end as soon as possible. It is causing us and our customers undue delays.

Century Electric Co.,
Glen Reinhold.

Blue Springs, Mo.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. Stuart Symington,
Senator, Missouri,
Senate Office Building:

This wire is to make you aware of the fact that we along with all service industries like ourselves are at a great disadvantage to continue giving our normal air freight shipments due to the machinists strike against the airlines. We normally have a minimum of two air freight pickups per day and a great percentage of this freight goes and must go via TWA anything you can do to expedite an equitable fair settlement will be greatly appreciated and much help.

Fike Metal Products Corp.,
L. L. Fike, *President.*

Kansas City, Mo.,
July 14, 1966.

Senator Stuart Symington,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our firm depends on air freight service into Kansas City for 85 percent of our shipping. Please do what you can to help in this air strike.

Earl G. Lacey,
Wholesale Florist.

Kansas City, Mo., *July 12, 1966.*

Hon. Stuart Symington,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Greater Kansas City business community deeply concerned about deleterious impact on area economy resulting from continuation of airlines strike. Urge your influence and assistance in whatever manner possible to bring about a speedy termination to this increasingly grave situation.

Louis P. Abrams,
Executive Vice President, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City, Missouri.

St. Louis, Mo., *July 12, 1966.*

Senator Stuart Symington,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Travelling public here severely inconvenienced by airlines strike. Urgently request use of your good offices towards settlement of dispute.

Aloys P. Kaufmann,
President, Chamber of Commerce, Metropolitan St. Louis.

St. Louis, Mo.,
July 15, 1966.

Senator Stuart Symington,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The disruption of commercial air service due to mechanics strike is imposing greater and greater financial burdens as well as intolerable inconveniences and delays upon business travelers. The loss of time and money due to the strike is becoming alarming. We urgently request that you do everything in your power to help end this damaging service stoppage as quickly as possible.

Gordon Ellis,
Executive Vice President, Operations, Pet Milk Co., St. Louis, Mo..

St. Joseph, Mo.,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. Stuart Symington,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In the name of Philips Roxane Inc. subsidiary companies Anchor Serum Company Research Laboratories Inc., we kindly request your assistance every way possible to solve problem of the airline strike which is causing difficulties in our business mainly export operations which hurting U.S. balance payments situation also cannot fill requirements from friendly countries for medicines vaccines urgently needed.

Respectfully,

Philips Roxane, Inc.,
Mariano J. Bosisio.

A. P. Green Refractories Co.,
Mexico, Mo., July 14, 1966.

Hon Stuart Symington,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Symington: The strike that has grounded several airlines appears to have reached a stalemate.

In the interest of restoring somewhat normal fast travel and freight service on which we can rely on international business, I appeal to you to lend our influence in bringing about a solution of this dispute.

The present situation intereferes with travel by our men who are regularly engaged in selling our products for export. For example, our District Sales Manager of San Juan was scheduled to come here July 24, but he has advised that he is unable to arrange for space until August 4. He attributes this delay to the strike of several of the airlines. He will thus have to postpone going to Latin countries to solicit customers.

Your consideration will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

—— ———.

Hazel Vinyl Products,
Washington, Mo., July 14, 1966.

Senator Stuart Symington,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: The current airline mechanic strike is causing all of us a great deal of hardship and inconvenience.

To travel and ship cargo by air, which was once considered a luxury, is now an everyday necessity.

Our Company strongly urges you to use your strong influence in settling this dispute.

Sincerely,

Glen Holt, CAS,
Vice President, Sales, Hazel Vinyl Products.

THE OHIO RIVER VALLEY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the New York Times of yesterday, July 17, 1966, devoted the front page of its travel section to the Ohio River Valley. The article is headed by a picture of a sweeping bend of the Ohio River as it passes through the rolling countryside between Cincinnati and Louisville, and the newpaper calls both this view and the one from a trip up the Kentucky River a "panorama of gentle peace and beauty."

The article itself, entitled "New Era on the Ohio River," describes the importance of this vital waterway in regard to commerce, recreation, and general river travel. While the author, Mr. Underwood, notes the great expansion of industry and commerce, as well as the rise in recreation use, he also describes the steady reduction in pollution of the Ohio and its tributaries, many of which flow through Kentucky.

The Senate last week passed legislation designed to increase sharply the efforts being made to abate pollution in waterways all across the land and, as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee which reported the bill, I was glad to support it in the Senate. This article particularly discusses abatement of pollution throughout this great valley.

At a time when attention is being given in the Congress to a coordinated program of cleaning the rivers of the Nation, I think it good to note the work that has been done over the last 20 years on the Ohio River and on the tributaries in its basin. In this period, more than $1 billion has also been spent on sewage treatment facilities by towns and communities in the basin, and the compact between the States—the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission—has established basic controls for the river.

I also want to call attention to the work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in replacing the old system of locks and dams with modern structures, which are larger and which are establishing, in effect, a chain of connecting lakes along the Ohio.

The Senate Public Works Committee has given support year in and year out to the replacement of the old traffic system along the 2336 navigable miles of the river. Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, has worked for many, many years to insure that construction go forward regularly and rapidly on the system, and I recall that it was my opportunity in 1953, with former Senator Bricker of Ohio, and the late Congressman Tom Jenkins of Ohio, to help secure the first appropriation for the modernization program for this great river system.

I am glad that a large part of the development program is being completed or is now underway along the Ohio, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, "New Era on the Ohio River," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ERA ON THE OHIO RIVER—RECREATION IS ON RISE AS CLEAN-UP DRIVE REDUCES POLLUTION

(By Paul Underwood)

PITTSBURGH.—In the moonlight, the city rides like a ship at anchor. Faint in the distance—beyond the dark, sharp prow where the two tides rush together—the hoarse blast of a diesel towboat reverberates up the deep V of the hill-jostled valley.

Here, just below the massive, shadowed piles of the handsome new complex of buildings in Pittsburgh's "Golden Triangle," the Monongahela and Alleghany Rivers join to form the mighty Ohio. From here, the moon-silvered flood rolls—past cities and hamlets, open farmland and dark-forested hills—981 miles westward to the Mississippi at Cairo, Ill.

A vital artery in the westward push of our pioneer forefathers and a commercial waterway of major importance since before the days of the Revolutionary War, the Ohio is now becoming also a playground for pleasure-boat owners.

Before World War II, except for canoes and rowboats used mainly for fishing, there were comparatively few private pleasure boats in the basin. Today, the Army Engineers' headquarters in Cincinnati estimates there are at least 730,000, and the number increases daily.

EMPIRE TO EXPLORE

The Ohio Valley is not unique in this, of course. The expansion of private boating in recent years has been nationwide. But here, the main river and tributaries such as the Beaver, Kanawha, Big Sandy, Muskingum, Scioto, Great Miami, Kentucky, Wabash, Cumberland and Tennessee open a vast empire for exploration.

The entire basin of the Ohio covers 163,000 square miles. It includes major portions of the states of Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, West Virginia, substantial parts of Pennsylvania, Illinois and Tennessee and smaller areas of New York, Maryland, Virginia and even North Carolina.

Counting only channels with a controlled depth of nine feet or more, the Ohio navigation system is 2,336 miles long. For small boats, which draw less water than commercial craft, the possibilities are many times that figure.

COMMERCIAL WATERWAYS

The main stream and several of its major tributaries are important commercial waterways and are canalized; that is, they have dams built across them at intervals in order to maintain a minimum depth.

As a result, the Ohio River system carries more commercial traffic than either the Panama Canal or the St. Lawrence Seaway, and almost as much as the two combined. Some of the tows are enormous. It is not unusual to see a 9,000-horsepower towboat pushing a cluster of barges that covers 11 acres of water.

Some stretches of the river are heavily industrialized. The Ohio River basin is one of the great industrial centers of the world, producing far more coal and steel than Germany's famous Ruhr Valley and more chemicals than the Rhine area.

VAST REGION

So vast is the area reached by the river system that industry has scarred only a comparatively small part.

For a panorama of gentle peace and beauty, it would be difficult to top a trip by boat up the winding Kentucky River, which flows 225 miles through the heart of the famous bluegrass country. The deep, narrow Kentucky is canalized, but the works were completed more than 100 years ago and are too small for most commercial use today.

Operators of small boats have the river almost to themselves as they sail past some of the most beautiful farmland in America, past wooded hills and alongside the place where, according to folklore, Daniel Boone, with a mighty bound, leaped the river—to the amazement of his scalp-seeking Indian pursuers.

A dam means a wait, for traffic is so slight that lockkeeping is not a fulltime duty. But a honk of the boat's horn will call the keeper from a nearby field to open the antique locks and let the craft move on to other scenes.

In accounting for the vast increase in private boating in the Ohio basin, one development that has passed with little notice elsewhere is of major importance. This is an almost spectacular decline in the pollution of the basin's waters.

Twenty years ago, the Ohio and several of its major tributaries were so polluted that use of their water was becoming hazardous. Many of the channels looked and smelled like open sewers. The fish were dying, swimming was out of the question, and it was no place for boating.

In such a situation, there was little attraction in having a boat. People who now flock to the river to enjoy it avoided it at that time.

SANITATION COMPULSION

Alarmed by the deterioration of the waters, the eight states in the Ohio watershed entered into a compact in 1948 to clean up the valley. They set up the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, popularly known as ORSANCO, with the duty of establishing regulations and coordinating state efforts at control.

Since then, more than $1 billion—roughly $100 per capita for every man, woman and child living in the Ohio Valley—has been spent on sewage-treatment facilities. Today, 99.5 per cent of the sewage from towns and villages in the basin undergoes at least primary treatment, and larger communities all have secondary-treatment capacity.

The fight against pollution has not ended yet, but the results so far include a river that looks clean and sparkling, a river that now offers many wide stretches for safe swimming. Fishing has come back with a bang. Experienced anglers say the Ohio is as good fishing today as it was when they were boys.

Now, water-skiing is a popular sport on the Ohio. Marinas and docking facilities are springing up, and restaurants and other services are moving to riverside locations in order to cash in on the booming boating trade.

Every indication is that this is only the beginning. Careful estimates are that more than a million privately owned boats will be registered in the basin before many years.

COMPLETELY CANALIZED

The Ohio has been completely canalized since the 1920's. Forty-six low-lift dams scattered along its course maintained a minimum nine-foot channel from Pittsburgh to Cairo; however, the growth of commercial traffic on the river since World War II has been so great that it has outgrown the system.

The Army Engineers are gradually replacing the old locks and dams. This time, however, they are building much larger dams—dams with 1,200-foot locks, or twice the size of the old ones. There will be only 19 of these, and they will be spread much farther apart than the old ones.

When the project is completed—sometime in the 1970's, if the present schedule is met—the river will become, in effect, a chain of connected lakes, each about 50 miles long and about a mile wide. The minimum depth of the channel will be 12 feet.

A preview of what the river will look like then is provided by the stretch above and below Cincinnati. Two of the new dams are already in place there—one 34 miles upstream and the other more than 60 miles downstream. The resulting pool is wide enough not only for the commercial traffic and power boating, but even for sailboat racing.

AUTHORITY OF POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington press recently carried a newsstory regarding the opinion which was prepared for the District of Columbia Commissioners by Acting Corporation Counsel Milton D. Korman in connection with the portions of disorderly conduct laws relating to the authority of police officers to order persons in public places to "move on."

I have asked Mr. Korman for a copy of the opinion, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 7, 1966.

IN RE AUTHORITY OF POLICE OFFICER TO ORDER PERSONS CONGREGATING ON PUBLIC STREETS TO MOVE ON

[CCO: 3.P6.1—Congregation on public streets]

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

GENTLEMEN: I have been requested by the Chief of Police to furnish to him a summary of the law pertaining to the authority of a police officer to order to "move on" persons congregating on public streets. I deem the matter of sufficient importance, particularly in the light of subsequent comment thereon by the Complaint Review Board, to draft a formal opinion on the subject.

Section 22–1121(2), D.C. Code, 1961 ed., defines one type of disorderly conducts as follows: "Whoever, with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or under circumstances such that a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby * * * congregates with others on a public street and refuses to move on when ordered by the police."

It should be clear from a reading of the quoted Code Section that the mere refusal to obey a policeman's order to move on, without more, is not sufficient to make out a case of disorderly conduct. The statute would be unconstitutionally broad if its purpose was to sanction standing on a public sidewalk only at the whim of a police officer. *Shuttlesworth* v. *Birmingham,* 382 U.S. 87 (1965). There must be both an actual or impending breach of the peace *and* the refusal to obey the order. Cf., *Brown* v. *Louisiana,* 15 L. Ed. 2d 637, 643 (1966).

The refusal to obey an order to move does not necessarily constitute a breach of the peace. *Wright* v. *Georgia,* 373 U.S. 284, 291 (1963). For instance, if the police order is violative of the Constitution and consequently unlawful, there is no duty to obey it, and a person who so refuses cannot be punished for disorderly conduct. *Wright* v. *Georgia, supra* at 292. Indeed, if a person's presence in a public place is lawful and there are no other special circumstances, there would be no basis for an order to move on. *Brown* v. *Louisiana, supra.*

Additionally, to support a finding of guilt under Code Section 22–1121(2) it must be established that one *"congregates with others* on a public street." It has been held by some courts that to establish this element of the offense at least three persons must be present. *People* v. *LoVechhio,* 56 N.Y.S. 2d 354, 358 (1945); *People* v. *Carcel,* 165 N.Y.S. 2d 113, 144 N.E. 2d 81, 65 ALR 2d 1145 (1957).

The appropriateness of a police command given to persons congregating in a public street is dependent upon a showing of an actual or potential breech of the peace. See *People* v. *Turner,* 265 N.Y.S. 2d 841, 855 (Sup. Ct. 1965). The question of what conduct is necessary to satisfy the breach of the peace element of the statute is therefore not easy to resolve. In *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut,* 310 U.S. 296, 300 (1940) the Supreme Court set forth a fairly comprehensive definition of breach of the peace: "The offense known as breach of the peace embraces a great variety of conduct destroying or menacing public order and tranquility. It includes not only violent acts but acts and words likely to produce violence in others. No one would have the hardihood to suggest that the principle of freedom of speech sanctions incitement to riot or that religious liberty connotes the privilege to exhort others to physical attack upon those belonging to another sect. When clear and present danger of riot, disorder, interference with traffic upon the public streets, or other immediate threat to public safety, peace, or order, appears, the power of the state to prevent or punish is obvious."

On the other hand, the term breach of the peace cannot be construed so broadly so as to include innocent conduct. For instance, if the conduct in question merely "stirs the public to anger, invites dispute, [or] brings about a condition of unrest," it cannot be made the basis of a crime, since that would violate rights protected by the First and Fourteenth amends of the United States Constitution. *Terminiello* v. *Chicago,* 337 U.S. 1, 5 (1949). This is so because: "[A] function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. Speech is often provocative and challenging. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea. That is why freedom of speech, though not absolute, *Chaplinsky* v. *New Hampshire,* supra, pp. 571–572, is nevertheless protected against censorship or punishment, unless shown likely to produce a clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest". 337 U.S. at 4.

It has also been held that "to agitate, to arouse from a state of repose, to interrupt, to hinder, to disquiet" does not necessarily constitute a breach of the peace since to construe the term thusly would "allow persons to be punished merely for peacefully expressing unpopular views." *Cox* v. *Louisiana,* 379 U.S. 536, 551 (1965).

Clearly, acts of violence constitute a breach of the peace. Additionally, acts or words which are likely to produce violence in others have been held to constitute a breach of the peace. For instance, where demonstrators sat in front of and under the wheels of trucks at the entrance to a building site and refused to move, the court found that their acts would tend to "possible violence on the part of those against whom the acts were directed and thereby breach the peace." *People* v. *Penn,* 265 N.Y.S. 2d 155, 160 (Sup. Ct. 1964) aff'd 260 N.Y.S. 2d 874, 208 N.E. 2d 789 (Ct. App. 1965). In *Chaplinsky* v. *New Hampshire,* 315 U.S. 568, 574 (1942) the Supreme Court recognized that certain types of speech which "include the lewd or obscene, the profane, the libelous and the insulting or 'fighting' words" are likely to provoke the average person to retaliate and create a breach of the peace.

On the other hand, the fact that certain conduct may provoke others to violence is not always determinative on the breach of the peace issue. For instance, if a person's actions or presence on a public street are orderly and peaceable, the fact that others may resent or be violently opposed to that person's presence or viewpoint would not necessarily justify a police order removing such a person from the public street. See *Wright* v. *Georgia,* 373 U.S. 284, 292–293 (1963); *Cox* v. *Louisiana,* 379 U.S. 536, 550–551 (1965).

The possibility of disorder by others then should not be used as a sole test as to whether a breach of the peace has or is likely to occur. It is, of course, one factor which should be considered; but normally to constitute an actual or impending breach of the peace, other conduct of a disturbing nature must also be manifested. For instance, in the *Chaplinsky* case the other conduct was highly insulting and profane language. In the *Penn* case the other conduct was the obstruction of vehicular traffic.

The obstruction of or interference with vehicular or pedestrian traffic in combination with a congregation of persons will nearly always justify a police officer in ordering dispersal. See *Schneider* v. *State of New Jersey,* 308 U.S. 147, 160 (1939): "Municipal authorities, as trustees for the public, have the duty to keep their communities' streets open and available for movement of people and property, the primary purpose to which the streets are dedicated. So long as legislation to this end does not abridge the constitutional liberty of one rightfully upon the street to impart information through speech or the distribution of literature, it may lawfully regulate the conduct of those using the streets."

See also *Cox* v. *New Hampshire,* 312 U.S. 569, 574 (1941), holding: "Civil liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuse. The authority of the municipality to impose regulations in order to assure the safety and convenience of the people in the use of public highways has never been regarded as inconsistent with civil liberties, but rather as one of the means of safeguarding the good order upon which they ultimately depend. The control of travel on the streets of the cities is the most familiar illustration of this recognition of social need. Where a restriction of the use of the highways in that relation is designed to promote the public convenience in the interest of all, it cannot be disregarded by the attempted exercise of some civil right which in other circumstances might be entitled to protection."

Thus, a police request to disperse made in the line of a "duty and responsibility to keep the streets open for movement" (*Cox* v. *Louisiana.* 379 U.S. at p. 555) would be proper.

D.C. Code Section 22–1121(2) was patterned upon Section 722 of the New York Penal Law. Sen. Rep. No. 364, 83rd Cong., 1st Sess., p. 9; H.R. Rep. No. 514, 83rd Cong., 1st Sess, p. 8. In the case of *Feiner* v. *New York,* 340 U.S. 315 (1951) the Supreme Court upheld a conviction for disorderly conduct under that particular section of the New York law.

In *Feiner,* the petitioner had been arrested in the early evening hours at an open air meeting at which he had been addressing a mixed audience of about 75 to 80 people who were filling the sidewalk and spreading into the streets causing pedestrians to walk into the roadway in order to avoid the crowd. In his speech Feiner gave the impression that he was endeavoring to arouse Negro people against the whites and there was pushing, shoving and milling around, and one member of the crowd threatened violence if the police did not act. An officer had several times requested Feiner to break up the crowd which had become unruly but the petitioner had refused and continued speaking to the crowd.

In holding that the conviction did not exceed the bounds of proper state police action the Court said [citing *Schneider* v. *State,* 308 U.S. 147, 160 (1939); *Kovacs* v. *Cooper,* 336 U.S. 77, 82 (1949)] that it must respect "the interests of the community in maintaining peace and order on its streets."

"* * * It is one thing to say that the police cannot be used as an instrument for the suppression of unpopular views, and another to say that, when as here the speaker passes the bounds of argument of persuasion and undertakes incitement to riot, they are powerless to prevent a breach of the peace. Nor in this case can we condemn the considered judgment of three New York courts approving the means which the police, faced with a crisis, used in the exercise of their power and duty to preserve peace and order.

"The findings of the state courts as to the existing situation and the imminence of greater disorder coupled with petitioner's deliberate defiance of the police officers convince us that we should not reverse this conviction in the name of free speech." 340 U.S. at 320–21.

In two recent cases arising out of civil rights demonstrations in southern states, the Supreme Court found the conduct upon which the convictions were based to fall short of breach of the peace even though the demonstrations caused disorder and required extra police protection.

Edwards v. *South Carolina,* 372 U.S. 229 (1963) involved a group of 187 Negro students who had assembled on the State House grounds and marched through the area carrying signs. Some 200 to 300 onlookers were present but had not threatened trouble. Although traffic was somewhat slowed, the Court found that there was no actual obstruction of pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The City Manager had advised the leader of the group that, in view of the circumstances, the students should disperse and leave the Capitol grounds within fifteen minutes or face arrest. Upon failing to comply with this order, they were arrested and convicted of common law breach of the peace. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction on the grounds that the charge was unconstitutionally vague and that evidence showed that the demonstrators had done nothing more than peaceably express their views which were "sufficiently opposed to the views of the majority of the community to attract a crowd and necessitate police protection". 372 U.S. at 237.

In *Cox* v. *Lousiana,* 379 U.S. 536 (1965) the conviction was for violation of La. Rev. Stat., Sec. 14.103.1, a statute strikingly similar to D. C. Code Section 22–1121(2). The statute read: "Whoever with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or under circumstances such that a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby . . . crowds or congregates with others . . . in or upon . . . a public street or public highway, or upon a public sidewalk, or any other public place or building . . . and who fails or refuses to disperse and move on . . . when ordered so to do by any law enforcement officer . . . shall be guilty of disturbing the peace."

The leader of a group of civil rights demonstrators had been arrested the day following a demonstration of approximately 1500 students who had gathered near the Baton Rouge Court House. The students had demonstrated against discrimination and the jailing of twenty-three fellow students. Cox, the leader of the demonstrators, had refused the sheriff's order to break up the demonstration and, when the demonstration was broken up by tear gas, had urged the students to go uptown to several luncheon counters and sit-in. In reversing, the Court held that the petitioner could not constitutionally be punished for this type of conduct, revealed in the record.

The case of *Feiner* v. *New York, supra,* was neither overruled nor modified by the decisions in the *Edwards* or *Cox* cases. The Supreme Court observed that the factual situations were "a far cry from the situation in *Feiner* v. *New York.*" *Edwards* v. *South Carolina,* 372 U.S. at 236; *Cox* v. *Louisiana,* 379 U.S. at 551. See also *People* v. *Turner,* 265 N.Y.S. 2d 841, 855 wherein the court, after a lengthy analysis, concluded that the *Cox* and *Edwards* cases had not undermined the *Feiner* decision which upheld the constitutionality of subdivision 3 of section 722 of the New York Penal Law.

Another question pertinent to this discussion concerns the discretion of a police officer in ordering citizens on a public sidewalk to move on, and the corresponding obligation of the persons so ordered to comply. For instance, if the surrounding circumstances fall short of an actual or impending breach of the peace, must a person still comply with the police order to move on? The rule in New York appears to be that a person must comply with an order to move on unless the order is shown to be clearly arbitrary. In *People* v. *Galpern,* 181 N.E. 572, 83 ALR 785 (Ct. App. 1932) the defendant had stopped on the sidewalk with five or six other persons at an entrance to a restaurant and engaged in social conversation. A police officer had ordered the group to disperse, the defendant refused and was arrested for disorderly conduct. The court found that, although the actions of the defendant and his companions on the sidewalk were not unreasonable and there was no indication of disorderly or offensive conduct, it was the duty of the police officer to see that the pedestrian passage was not unreasonably obstructed. Even if the police officer's interference was unnecessary or ill advised, the court decided that it must uphold the officer's discretion since the law authorized the officer to use his judgment under such circumstances. The court stated: "A refusal to obey such an order can be justified only where the circumstances show conclusively that the police officer's direction was purely arbitrary and was not calculated in any way to promote the public order.". 181 N.E. at 574.

This position was reiterated by a New York court as recently as 1965 in *People* v. *Turner,* 265 N.Y.S. 2d 841, 855.

The *Galpern* case was heavily relied upon by a New Jersey court in *State* v. *Taylor,* 118 A. 2d 36 (1955) in finding a defendant guilty of interfering with a police officer in the lawful discharge of his duty. In *Taylor* the defendant had approached two police officers who were questioning a group of persons on a sidewalk, had demanded to know what was going on, and had refused to move on when ordered by the officers. The court, recognizing the discretion of police officers to give reasonable directions to citizens, applied the *Galpern* test of arbitrariness and took the position that courts should not second guess the "wisdom of a police officer's directions when he is called upon to decide whether the time has come in which some directions are called for". 118 A. 2d at 49.

A D.C. case, *Scott* v. *District of Columbia,* 184 A. 2d 849 (1962) cites with approval the *Galpern* case and seems to indicate that a conviction for failure to move on after an order by the police can be upheld without proof of an actual or impending breach of the peace. There was in that case, however, proof that the demonstrators had assembled at the northwest gate of the White House which the court judicially noticed is used by visitors and others on official business. The court further noted that the police had adopted reasonable measures to keep that area free of congregants while permitting pickets and demonstrators to use a large area on the sidewalk to the east of the gate. The deliberate refusal of the defendants to comply with these reasonable police measures might well establish "circumstances under which a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby."

The New York test that a citizen is justified in not obeying a police order to move on only if that order is arbitrary may not be good law. In several recent Supreme Court cases arising from convictions of Negroes in southern states, the Court has indicated that a police order to move on must be justifiable and in all respects lawful before a person may be punished for failing to obey that order. See *Wright* v. *Georgia,* 373 U.S. 284, 292 (1963); *Brown* v. *Louisiana,* 15 L. Ed. 2d 637, 643 (1966); *Shuttleworth* v. *Birmingham,* 382 U.S. 87, 96 (1965) (concurring opinion); *Edwards* v. *South Carolina,* 372 U.S. 229, 241 (1963) (dissenting opinion).

Whether the referred-to New York test is valid in the District of Columbia need not, however, be finally resolved in this opinion. On the contrary, it is my view that, because of the language of the District Code provision and in the interests of good police-community relations, the Metropolitan Police Department should operate on the assumption that a police officer must have a substantial basis for his order *before* ordering citizens to move on. Such a basis would necessarily involve an observation of a congregation on a public street and of additional circumstances which would measure up to the legal definition of breach of the peace as hereinabove outlined.

Note should also be taken of a related disorderly conduct statute found in Section 22–1107, D.C. Code, 1961 ed. It reads: "It shall not be lawful for any person or persons within the District of Columbia to congregate and assemble in any street, avenue, alley, road, or highway, or in or around any public building or inclosure, or any park or reservation, or at the entrance of any private building or inclosure, and engage in loud and boisterous talking or other disorderly conduct, or to insult or make rude or obscene gestures or comments or observations on persons passing by, or in their hearing, or to crowd, obstruct, or incommode, the free use of any such street, avenue, alley, road, highway, or any of the foot pavements thereof, or the free entrance into any public or private building or inclosure; it shall not be lawful for any person or persons to curse, swear, or make use of any profane language or indecent or obscene words, or engage in any disorderly conduct in any street, avenue, alley, road, highway, public park or inclosure, public building, church, or assembly room, or in any other public place, or in any place wherefrom the same may be heard in any street, avenue, alley, road, highway, public park or inclosure, or other building, or in any premises other than those where the offense was committed, under a penalty," etc.

It may well be that in some instances there will be a congregation which will result in the incommoding of the sidewalk or the entrance to a building constituting a violation of the above-quoted section.

If the Chief of Police desires a short summary of the foregoing to disseminate among members of the force, I suggest the following for distribution. It sets forth principles or general guidelines to be followed by police officers in the enforcement of the applicable Code provisions.

When a police officer may order citizens to "move on."

Code Section 22–1121(2) reads, in pertinent part, as follows: "Whoever, with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or under circumstances such that a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby * * * congregates with others on a public street and refuses to move on when ordered by the police; * * * shall be fined * * * or imprisoned * * * or both."

Section 22–1107 of the Code reads, in pertinent part: "It shall not be lawful for any person or persons within the District of Columbia to congregate and assemble in any street, avenue, alley, road, or highway, or in or around any public building or inclosure, or any park or reservation, or at the entrance of any private building or inclosure, and * * * incommode, the free use of any such street, avenue, alley, road, highway, or any of the foot pavements thereof, or the free entrance into any public or private building or inclosure."

Neither the foregoing partial quotations nor that which follows relates to other forms of disorderly conduct such as boisterousness, obscenity, etc., nor to other violations of law.

1. A congregation of persons on a public street is not, in and of itself, sufficient to justify a police order to "move on". There must, *in addition to the congregation,* be other circumstances which (a) amount to an actual obstruction of vehicular or pedestrian traffic, *or* (b) constitute an immediate threat to public safety, public peace or public order. Such threat need not necessarily be verbal; it may derive from the particular surrounding circumstances, and obscenities and the use of so-called "fighting words" *may* be included amongst the circumstances.

2. In the event the activities of a congregation of persons involve the exercise of some constitutionally protected right, such as freedom of speech, religion or assembly, police officers should endeavor to protect the participants and prevent any violence from occurring. However, if the assemblage of people around a speaker should result in obstruction to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, or if there are manifestations of anger and hostility in such a manner as to clearly indicate that a disorder is imminent, the police officer should instruct the speaker to stop speaking, break up the crowd, and distinctly give other appropriate orders for the preservation of public safety and order. If such orders are not complied with, then an arrrest for disorderly conduct under Section 22–1121 (2) may properly be made.

3. If a congregation of persons on a public street *actually incommodes* the sidewalk or the entrances to a building and constitutes a substantive violation of Section 22–1107, and the persons refuse to comply with a police order to move on, the police officer may, even in the absence of an actual or impending breach of the peace, charge the offenders under Code Section 22–1107—not under Code Section 22–1121(2).

4. Proceed always upon the principle that a police officer has no more *inherent* right than a civilian to order persons to "move on". His authority to do so depends upon special circumstances outlined in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 hereof and, in the interest of police-community relations, should be exercised only when it appears that Code Section 22–1107 has been violated *or* that there is a *clear and present danger* that a breach of the peace will result if the order is not issued and obeyed.

Respectfully,

MILTON D. KORMAN,
Acting Corporation Counsel,
District of Columbia.

SENATOR MONDALE'S FAIR WARNING ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on June 24 the Senate passed the Traffic Safety Act of 1966 by a unanimous vote of 70 to 0. The Senate bill included a classic piece of consumer protection legislation originally proposed by Senator Walter F. Mondale as the Fair Warning Act. As a cosponsor of the subsequent fair warning amendment to the traffic safety bill, I am most pleased that the Senate Commerce Committee and the administration supported its inclusion in that bill.

This legislation simply requires the automobile manufacturer to notify car owners of any safety-related defects which are discovered by the manufacturer. It asks nothing more than that the car owner, who has made a substantial investment in that purchase, be told as quickly as possible if it is known that the car contains a defect which threatens safe travel.

As Senator Mondale points out in an American Trial Lawyers' recent article published in Trial, the publication:

> A fundamental right of consumers is the right to know about any hidden hazards associated with products they buy.

This fair warning provision has been recognized nationally as one of the important features of the Senate traffic safety bill. I am hopeful that our colleagues in the House of Representatives will see fit to make it a part of the bill they are considering.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Mondale's explanation of this measure, as published in Trial, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fundamental: Consumers Have Right To Know Hidden Hazards

(By U.S. Senator Walter F. Mondale, Democrat, of Minnesota)

A fundamental right of consumers is the right to know about any hidden hazards associated with products they buy.

This right has long been recognized through laws and regulations requiring warning notices on such items as drugs, chemicals, inflammables, and other products which are inherently or potentially dangerous.

There are no warning labels on many dangerous items, of course, because the hazards associated with their use are inherent in the nature of the products and are assumed to be well-known, for example, guns—and automobiles.

But not all of the hazards of the automobile, it seems, are so obvious. Recent disclosures indicate that this intricate piece of machinery containing almost 15,000 parts is frequently subject to hazards which may not be apparent until too late—if then.

These are the so-called safety defects which have been so much in the news recently. The include design faults such as improper weight distribution which would cause the rear wheels to leave the ground in emergency stops; engineering defects such as a brake line which comes into contact with a wheel where it may be weakened and ruptured when braking pressure is applied; and construction deficiencies such as an inadequately secured steering linkage which could fall apart causing complete loss of control.

Quite obviously, things like this can cause serious accidents. And when they are discovered, it seems to me, the manufacturer has an obligation to warn those who might be injured or killed by them.

Nonetheless, Congressional inquiries last year and again this year—plus the private research of auto critic and attorney Ralph Nader—have revealed case after case where automobile manufacturers have not issued such warnings. The evidence accumulated to date includes instances where nothing whatsoever was done, except perhaps to correct the defect in next year's model; instances where only dealers were notified to make modifications on cars in their possession, and instances where cars were recalled for inspection or correction of a defect—but without telling the owner of the hazard involved.

As a result of these disclosures, I have introduced a proposed "Fair Warning" law in the U.S. Senate to require that car makers notify both owners and dealers by registered mail of any safety defect which might exist in their cars. The notice would contain a description of the defect, an evaluation of the safety risk involved, and a statement of the measures which should be taken to correct the problem.

No one knows, of course, exactly what percentage of traffic accidents are caused by safety defects of this kind. Available statistics—which are suspect in view of our almost total preoccupation with driver error to date—indicate the percentage is small.

The question, however, is irrelevant. We have a right to know about defects which could cause death and injury, regardless of the number of accidents they may have caused in the past.

And the fact remains that there is growing evidence that the possibility of vehicle failure has been grossly underestimated. For example, my own investigatory efforts turned up the startling fact that more than 20% of all new cars inspected by the District of Columbia and New Jersey are rejected for safety deficiencies, mostly minor, but some major. The District and New Jersey are the only jurisdictions with government-owned and operated inspection systems which require inspection of new cars. Thus they are the best guides we have as to the condition of new cars when they begin their life on our streets and highways.

There is also the data the auto industry supplied Senator Ribicoff last month showing that over the past six years, some 8.5 million cars have been recalled for inspection or correction of defects—about half of which involved a possible safety factor.

The auto industry has argued that these recalls show their concern for safety. This may be true, but it is also true that in many other instances involving safety defects cars were not recalled, while in those instances where cars were recalled, the owners were not told of a safety hazard.

There have been indications recently that some segments of the auto industry are ready to improve defect notification procedures, including telling the owner whether or not safety is involved. The importance of such information is obvious. A representative of one company emphasized recently, in his zeal to show the industry's concern about car owners who fail to respond to recall notices: "Some people think the letter we send them to bring their cars in are just gimmicks to get business." Little wonder when one considers the kind of letter the industry has been sending out.

For example, here is the key paragraph of a recall letter Ford Motor Co. sent some 5,500 owners of 1965 Comets last year:

"As part of the continuing effort of the Lincoln-Mercury Division to provide owners of our products with the highest quality standards, an improvement has been made in the 1965 Comet, and is currently being incorporated in production. It is our desire to similarly modify your car, at no cost to you, whatsoever. The changes are calculated to improve your enjoyment and contribute to continued satisfaction with your 1965 Comet."

And what was the "improvement?" According to information recently made available by Ford Motor Co., the rocker arm cover and the brake tube on 8-cylinder power brake equipped vehicles were too close together. "This condition," the company said, "could result in brake tube abrasion during engine roll"—and also, it would seem fair to assume, brake failure when the rubbing action wore through or weakened the brake tube.

Yet this information, which might have conveyed a more appropriate sense of urgency than commercials about changes "to improve your enjoyment and contribute to continued satisfaction," was totally absent from the Ford letter—as it also has been totally absent from recall letters sent out by General Motors, American Motors and Chrysler.

It has been absent, one assumes, because of fears that admitting the existence of a safety defect might hurt new car sales or be used as evidence in lawsuits arising out of accidents.

And well it might—in both instances.

Thus the question becomes: Who should bear the risks of safety defects—the manufacturer, who has economic considerations at stake, or the motorist, who has his life at stake? I don't think there is much room for argument.

Human life is more important than corporate profits.

PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, congressional hearings are scheduled this week on proposed legislation to authorize increased appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The bill, introduced in both Houses at the request of the Department of the Interior, would authorize a ceiling of $172 million for a 5-year capital improvement and public works program in the fields of health and education, utilities, roads, transportation, communications, and public buildings. The bill also authorizes additional Federal funds for the administration of the trust territory.

As the administering authority under agreement with the United Nations Security Council, the United States has committed itself to promote the political, economic, and social development of the people of the trust territory.

Some progress in this direction has been made since our Government assumed responsibility for the Micronesian people in the western Pacific. But much more needs to be done; therefore, the request for authority to expend the increased sum of Federal funds to step up the tempo of progress in the trust territory.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Hawaii's largest newspaper, has begun a timely series of articles on American-controlled territories in the western Pacific. The series is being written by the editor, A. A. Smyser, a capable, longtime newsman familiar with Pacific affairs, who is on a 3-week trip of the area.

I call attention to the first article over "Bud" Smyser's byline. It describes the staggering problems of communications and transportation facing the farflung Pacific islands. It furnishes strong arguments why more must be done to promote the development of Micronesia.

I ask unanimous consent to have "Bud" Smyser's article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Guam and Micronesia

(By A. A. Smyser)

(The editor of the Star-Bulletin is on a 3-week trip to the Western Pacific to write about topics of interest to Hawaii. Here is the first article of a series on Guam and Micronesia.)

The great—almost desperate—need of American-controlled territories in the Western Pacific is for communications and transportation.

An area bigger than the continental U.S. now can be entered by commercial air passengers only eight times a week—four flights in from Honolulu, two from Manila, two from Saigon.

Pan American is the only carrier serving Guam, which is the gateway to the whole area, and its space has been fully booked three and four weeks in advance.

A Trust Territory doctor who won a fellowship to Manila found, after he left his home in Palau, that he had to sit in Guam three weeks waiting for a plane.

New Guinea is only 1,500 miles from Guam but Governor Manuel Guerrero recently had to travel 7,500 miles to get there: Guam to Manila, to Sydney and back to Lae in New Guinea.

Tokyo is only 1,600 miles away—and a potential source of thousands of tourists for Guam and the Trust Territory, which badly need economic bolstering—yet the shortest way to fly there now is 3,400 miles via Manila.

If a Pan American plane is delayed—as all planes sometimes are—there is nothing to do but grin and bear it.

One day this month an important Japanese businessman missed a long-standing appointment with President Marcos of the Philippines because the PAA flight out of Guam was delayed 24 hours.

There is no other line to turn to. Some 20 have applied for certification to serve Guam in the pending transpacific air route case, but solution of that case is years away.

In the meantime, Pan Am—which has authority to add a Guam-Tokyo service anytime it wants—has not yet elected to do so. It has suggested a late 1966 date for the start of this service but has mentioned that equipment pressures of the Viet Nam war could delay this. Guam also could use direct links to points like Taiwan, Okinawa and Sydney (via New Guinea).

A final frustration for some would-be travelers is that a reservation is no absolute guarantee of space. Reservation-holders both in and out of Guam can and have been "bumped" even after their long waits for space.

Reach Guam and then you face new frustrations—trying to reach the widely-separated island districts that make up the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Service into the six areas is weekly in most cases—which means that your visit must be limited to the time of a plane-stop or stretched to a week. There can be no middle ground—and here, too, space often is at a premium.

Low priority passengers often get "bumped" and have to wait for the next plane.

This service is a responsibility of the Trust Territory government which obtains it at present on a charter contract from Pan American. (Hawaiian Airlines is bidding to take over this operation, or operate its own scheduled service in the area—and says it could both improve frequency and lower costs to the Trust Territory, which, in turn, sets passenger fares.)

TERRITORY'S AIR FLEET

The Trust Territory air fleet consists of two DC-4's and two amphibians. Frequently one plane will be tied up ferrying parts to another one, stranded at some remote base.

Civilian officers of both Guam and the Trust Territory are upset about the transportation troubles and pushing for better service.

They see improvement as essential if Guam and the Trust Territory are to develop tourism and otherwise bolster their economies. (There will be more on this in later articles.)

Almost as frustrating as the transportation problem is the communication problem—not in Guam, but in the Trust Territory.

America prides itself on its great worldwide communication network. Mainland TV already spans the Atlantic. Soon it will add the Pacific. The Navy boasts it can get messages to any ship anywhere almost instantaneously.

From Camp Smith in Honolulu, Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp can talk promptly with President Johnson in the White House or General Westmoreland in Saigon.

Hawaii Space tracking stations are part of a worldwide network that has facilities for conferences by people spread around the globe.

PRE-WORLD WAR II STANDARD

Despite the million or billions invested in these systems or others like them, the strategic islands of the Pacific that make up the Trust Territory still have communications of about a pre-World War II standard. Incongruously this is so even though Guam and Micronesia provide antenna sites for some of the more advanced systems.

Message traffic can go out by radio from Saipan, the Micronesian capital, to the five other district headquarters—if someone in the other headquarters is listening. But its travel from the six district headquarters to outlying areas in the districts can be slow indeed.

One key figure in the Congress of Micronesia, now meeting in Saipan, said it will be a week before much news of the Congress will filter even to the central island in his district (Truk), another week before it reaches the outer islands.

Since the Congress lasts only a month, this does not allow for much political give-and-take, communication with the folks back home.

News of the Congress isn't going out over the central radio system. That is reserved for official message traffic. Congressional news will go mostly by plane—in the form of press releases and radio tapes. The further point that both of these will leave much to be desired is not a technical problem of the communications system.

Not many people will disagree with the proposition that transportation and communications are a major headache for the area, a major shortcoming, a major bar to progress in other areas.

But Guam and Micronesia are far away from the center of power in Washington and usually they have trouble being heard. That is just what the trouble is.

WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CALLS FOR AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, the West Texas Chamber of Commerce held it 48th annual convention at Fort Worth on April 21, 22, and 23. At this meeting the delegates passed a number of important resolutions which directly affect the agricultural economy of west Texas, the most important single facet of the west Texas economy. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce

Whereas, to improve the agricultural income of West Texas, the West Texas Chamber of Commerce believes one of the most urgent needs is to develop adequate research and demonstrations in the field of range management, forage crops, and mesquite and brush eradication. Such research and demonstrations will result in more efficient utilization of available moisture and a more productive West Texas agriculture,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the West Texas Chamber of Commerce continue its efforts to see that the necessary research is established to accomplish this objective.

Attest:

Beeman Fisher,
President.
Jack G. Springer,
Executive Vice President.

Adopted at the 48th Annual Convention in session at Fort Worth, Texas, April 21-22-23, 1966.

Resolution of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce

Whereas, the policy of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service presently allows the planting of edible field peas on normal conserving base acreage, but prohibits the sale of said peas for any purpose, and

Whereas, there exists a nation-wide shortage of edible peas, and there are adequate normal conserving base acres in West Texas to greatly alleviate the shortage of this nourishing food, and

Whereas, field peas are recognized as the soil building legume best adapted to the soils and climate of West Texas, and the harvesting, processing, marketing, and transportation of this crop would greatly help the economy of a large area of the nation, and

Whereas, the sale of field peas for human consumption would not adversely affect the price structure of any allotted or price-supported crop, and normal conserving base acres consist of land on which our government is not making any type payment whatever,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the West Texas Chamber of Commerce in their annual meeting in Fort Worth, Texas, requests the United States Department of Agriculture and/or Congress to take such action as needed to allow the sale on the open market of all edible peas produced on normal conserving base acres.

(Edible field peas defined as: included blackeyed, purple hulls, cream and all crowder type peas.)

Attest:

Jack G. Springer,
Executive Vice President.
Beeman Fisher,
President.

Adopted at the 48th Annual Convention in session at Fort Worth, Texas, April 21-22-23, 1966.

Resolution of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce

Whereas, on numerous occasions agricultural leaders have made reference to the agricultural income of Texas in comparison to other states, particularly California.

Whereas, in 1949 according to agricultural statistics, Texas and California agricultural income were equal, Whereas, in 1963 Texas agricultural income was $2,600,000,000—California was $3,400,000,000. The spread in income has continued to widen since 1963,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the West Texas Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors endorse a special study group composed of leaders from business, industry, and agriculture to make a detailed study by personal visitation to California to determine why Texas lags behind in agricultural income,

Be it further resolved, that the West Texas Chamber of Commerce initiate this program by contacting the three other Regional Chambers of Commerce to determine if they will join WTCC in a state-wide coordinated effort to make this study possible.

Attest:

JACK G. SPRINGER,
Executive Vice President.
BEEMAN FISHER,
President.

Adopted at the 48th Annual Convention in session at Fort Worth, Texas, April 21–22–23, 1966.

RESOLUTION OF THE WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas, soybeans are a high nitrogen producing soil-building crop and are ideally suited in crop rotation, and

Whereas, the current cotton program will materially reduce the production of vegetable oil and protein in the United States, and

Whereas, the need for additional vegetable oil and protein is being anticipated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in meeting commitments to foreign countries, and

Whereas, the planting of soybeans on diverted acres will fulfill this great need and at the same time bolster the general economy, and

Be it, therefore, resolved, that the West Texas Chamber of Commerce is now urging the USDA and the Congress to recognize these needs and make provision for soybeans to be planted on acreage on which diversion payments of feed grains and cotton have been made.

Attest:

JACK G. SPRINGER,
Executive Vice President.
BEEMAN FISHER,
President.

Adopted at the 48th Annual Convention in session at Fort Worth, Texas, April 21–22–23, 1966.

RESOLUTION OF THE WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Be it resolved, that the West Texas Chamber of Commerce is on record in support of H.R. 13057 with the addition of the following commodities: non-textile cotton, soybeans, or any crop the Secretary of Agriculture finds in short supply.

Attest:

JACK G. SPRINGER,
Executive Vice President.
BEEMAN FISHER,
President.

Adopted at the 48th Annual Convention in session at Fort Worth, Texas, April 21–22–23, 1966.

ADDRESS OF ROBERT L. RIGGS BEFORE YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER, Mr. President, Robert L. Riggs, Washington bureau chief of the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, made an illuminating and entertaining speech on politics and government to the state convention of the Young Republicans of Kentucky on June 25. Mr. Riggs, who has been covering Washington since the early 1940's, is a past president of the Gridiron Club and a member of that able group of newsmen here who know what they are talking about. While I do not agree with everything he has said, the Senate will find his remarks interesting and useful, and I ask that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SPEECH BY ROBERT L. RIGGS BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF KENTUCKY AT THE LAMPLIGHTERS INN, DIXIE HIGHWAY, COVINGTON, ON JUNE 25, 1966

My assigned topic calls on me to attempt to answer a doublebarreled question. First, can the "loyal opposition" survive? Second, should it survive?

The reply to both questions is, of course, an emphatic yes. It's a temptation to give that answer—and then sit down—instead of yapping at you for what may come to seem like an interminable period.

Such a course, however, would be a cowardly betrayal, a blow at the very foundations upon which political meetings are built. When an audience has come braced to sit through a long harangue, it would destroy public morale for the scheduled speaker to shirk his task.

Besides, this is a unique opportunity. For forty years as a reporter, I have listened to politicians. I have heard them on court house lawns, on street corners, in vast armories, in state conventions and national conventions. I have heard them in Madison Square Garden, in college auditoriums. I've heard them speak from piled up snow in New Hampshire and in the fog surrounding San Francisco's Cow Palace. I once heard Wendell Willkie speak from a manure spreader in Wisconsin. But this is the first opportunity I ever had to talk to them.

I'm sure there is no institution in the world quite like an American political party. That is one reason the citizens of other nations often have a hard time understanding what goes on in this country.

Our parties resemble neither the British system, with their strict control from the top, nor the French and Italian systems which produce a sort of planned political chaos with every little idea having a full-blown party of its own.

In the years during which our system has evolved, we have managed to work something of a miracle by combining two notions which, on the surface, seem to contradict each other.

First of those notions is that the chief function of a political party is to put into public office men and women who wear its label—from sheriff to governor, from member of Congress to President. A hard-and-fast adherence to this concept could mean—and often does mean—a total lack of interest in political philosophy.

The second notion is that the only excuse for the existence of a political party lies in its advocacy of a specific social or political doctrine. Full acceptance of this second concept would mean that membership in a party would be limited to those who share an undeviating devotion to a very narrow principle.

We have rejected rigid adherence to either of these notions. Had we accepted the first one without qualification, our political institutions would have been sterile organizations, entirely without philosophical justification.

Had we accepted the second one unmodified, had we approved the doctrinaire requirement for political affiliation, we would have been overrun with a multiplicity of ineffective parties. It is true, that over the last 150 years we have seen many parties born and die. We have had pro-prohibition parties, anti-prohibition, pro-slavery, anti-slavery, pro-income tax, anti-income tax, hard money, soft money and many others.

But it has been the genius of the American politician, and one of his great contributions to the art of self-government, that he has managed to wrap up each of those political off-shoots into the big package represented by one or the other of the two major parties. The ability to compromise, the willingness to reverse himself, the courage to advocate today what he opposed yesterday, the capacity to change horses in the middle of a stream—those are the qualities which distinguish the great politican, which mark the difference between the skilled craftsman and the amateur bungler who holds fast to a dead or dying philosophy. The greatest lesson of politics is contained in the cliche—if you can't whip 'em, join 'em.

Out of all the scores of "third parties" which have appeared on the American scene, only one has survived to become an instrument of national government. That party is the one under whose banner you assemble here today. The Republican Party was born of an evangelistic fervor for the flaming idea that all men should be free.

But it was nursed to effectiveness by men who understood the practical operations of politics, from the Senate floor to the precinct. But what really gave it strength was the utter ineptitude of the two major parties of that day.

The Democrats of the north stood helplessly by in 1860 while the pro-slavery wing of their party transformed it into an instrument with which to defend a doomed institution. By contrast, the Whig Party had neither the gumption to fight the pro-slavery forces nor the will to join them. Its managers yielded to the temptation, which so often confronts politicians, to ignore the problem, to hope that if no one noticed it, it would go away.

Problems do not go away, of course, and the Whigs managed to make of their party the prime example in American history of what happens to political institutions which do not advance with their times.

I know we all get tired of hearing what happened to the Whigs.

But it's important because it may have been that particular lesson which taught our two great parties what they needed to know to stay alive. Certainly nothing has taken hold like the idea that the major parties have more similarities than they have differences—that instead of being two neatly divided groups they are two big tents, each of which offers shelter to diverse elements or side shows.

Only an impractical theorist with a passion for neatness that outweighs his interest in political achievement would demand that the opposing parties be divided sharply against each other in interest and doctine.

In fact, when our system is working at its best, the party nominees put forward by the Democrats and Republicans do not differ so much from each other as do the Republicans who fought each other for the nomination and the Democrats who did the same within their party.

There may be many who bemoan the fact that so often there is little difference between the Democrat and the Republican. What they overlook is the fact that the winnowing and sifting process of American politics takes place, not in the general elections, but in the party primaries and party conventions. Those are the kettles in which the conflicting ideas simmer and boil until they are turned into a dish palatable to the American people.

It is not, in my opinion, the function of a political party to offer the voter a bill of fare radically different from that presented by the other party. Rather, it is the function of both parties to fight within their own ranks until each has produced something that goes by that currently popular designation—concensus. Sometimes it's even called "Main stream Republicanism."

I know there are those who scorn this notion. They cry out for a choice, not an echo. They claim that what their party needs to assure it victory is to throw away the "me-too" role and to oppose nearly everything the other party espouses.

There is a certain attractiveness about this notion. It appeals to our love of spectator sports to envision the two great political forces providing a clear-cut test on every imaginable problem before the country from the repeal of all income taxes to providing hospital care for the aged.

Fortunately, that is not the sort of contest that appeals to the wise old professionals whose concept of duty to their party is to do everything possible to carry an election.

Hence, they usually manage to restrain the enthusiasts who want a clean-cut showdown. The professionals usually manage to fuzz up the differences and to emphasize the similarities of the two parties to such a point that the typical contest is between two similar viewpoints such as was offered in 1960 by Richard M. Nixon and John F. Kennedy.

So far as political attitudes go, there was not enough difference between Adlai E. Stevenson and Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956 to affect the outcome. We can all agree that what made the difference in those two elections was the special and peculiar place the Republican nominee occupied in the public's esteem.

There seems little doubt to me that Robert A. Taft could have been nominated at Chicago in 1952. I'm sure he was the choice of professionals who had enough influence to hand him the prize. But, devoted to him as were those pros, they preferred to have certainty of victory at the polls rather than to follow their own personal preferences.

They had become convinced that the conservative image which Mr. Taft bore before the country created too much of a bulge in the tent for them to risk nominating Mr. Republican.

I don't wish to tread on sore tores or to pour any salt on recent wounds. But I'm sure that within the memory of everyone here, there has been only one occasion on which control of one party has been seized by those demanding an end to me-tooism. That was only two years ago when, after more than three decades of frustration, the Republican Party put itself in the hands of those calling for a choice not an echo. I won't dwell upon the results of that election. Suffice it to say, I can't imagine the party pros consenting to another such showdown on a national scale any time soon.

I know of no other way to interpret what is going on among such eminent Republicans as Nelson A. Rockefeller, JACOB K. JAVITS, William W. Scranton, George Romney and Richard M. Nixon. Those of you who were in the Goldwater camp early in 1964 and those who suddenly found, to their surprise, that he was the Party nominee, will remember that the so-called moderates and liberals coasted through early 1964 on the calm assumption that the Arizona Senator would be stopped at the convention.

They assumed that after he had been stopped there would be plenty of time to select a nominee. Of course, it worked out just the opposite. Which accounts for the current early forming of lines. Of course, 1968 is a long way off, but you don't have to do much reading of tea leaves to see what is before the Party.

Mr. Nixon, who has had a foot in each camp, liberal, moderate and conservative, throughout his career, is unquestionably hoping to cash in on the fact that while he can lay claim to support from the moderates, he also has a right to expect the most devoted Goldwater followers to remember he rallied to their cause not only at the San Francisco convention but also throughout the campaign.

It's equally clear that the liberal wing of the Party is basing its current maneuvers on the assumption that Rockefeller has given up and that he and Scranton are getting ready, at least as a temporary maneuver, to form ranks behind a Romney-Javits ticket.

Of course, if Ronald Reagan defeats Pat Brown in California, he will be a strong competitor against Mr. Nixon for the affection of Senator Goldwater's followers. Mr. Reagan certainly has one trait that I have been praising this morning. He is showing every inclination to adjust to new conditions. Either on his own motion, or at the instigation of the smart public relations people who are handling him, Mr. Reagan is moving as rapidly as he can toward the center of the political spectrum. Without turning his back on the Goldwater wing, Mr. Reagan will, if he is elected governor, be on speaking terms with both center and the liberal wing of the party. An attractive new face in national politics, he will be in excellent position not only to usurp Mr. Nixon's former political base in California, but also to compete with the former vice president as the one best able to unite liberals, moderates and conservatives into an effective national opertion for 1968.

We all remember a Texas Congressman who helped write the Taft-Hartley Act, and sneered at liberals as pinkos. As Senate majority leader, he stole the pinkos' thunder and after he got to the White House, he adjusted himself into championship of the Great Society.

Hubert Humphrey has adjusted. In fact, some of his old liberal friends of the Minnesota Democratic Farmer-Labor Party think he has adjusted so well that they are calling him the late liberal.

On the other side, Robert Kennedy, known for years as the gutfighting, ruthless political ax-man, has adjusted so far that he is now the favorite of many liberal groups, even though the cynical dub him a "liberal-come-lately."

This is as good a time as any to pay tribute to the professional politician. I have tremendous admiration for him whether he be a technician employed by the Republican or Democratic Congressional campaign committee, a national chairman such as Ray Bliss, or a ward or precinct leader.

When I want to employ someone to fill a political job, I prefer a man skilled in politics.

It's an odd thing that the people of this country take such a split view of politicians. They admire presidents, senators, mayors and governors—but they are inclined to look down upon the men who seek those offices. The worst thing they can say is "Oh, he's a politician," an expression which ought to be a tribute when you're seeking someone to fill a political office.

I don't mean to imply that simply because the Republican professionals are going to be leery about letting Senator Goldwater lead the party again he will be without influence in the party. Senator Goldwater's friends and his ideas certainly occupy a large space within the Republican tent.

When I have talked about the two great parties confronting each other with their similarities, I have had in mind the national political scene. There is, of course, no such thing as a national Democratic party or a national Republican party. What appears on the national scene every four years is a coalition of local, state and regional groups.

It is at the Congressional district level and state level that the conflicts are fought out. One district in a state will produce a member of congress who justly bears the label of liberal. An adjoining district may produce one who proudly boasts of being a conservative.

Nothing illustrates that better than the outcome of the Republican primary in the Congressional district where we stand today.

If there ever was an example of the all-embracing tent which gathers beneath it men of diverse political views, it is that of the Kentucky Republican Party offering to the voters a senatorial nominee in the person of JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and a nominee for the House of Representatives from the newly-created Fourth Congressional District in the person of "Gene Snyder."

Here we have the Ray Bliss theory in its finest flowering. If there is a bona fide, full-fledged, Barry Goldwater-type conservative outside of Arizona, it is Gene Snyder.

If there is a Republican dear to the hearts of the nation's liberals, it is JOHN COOPER. This is what Ray Bliss has been talking about when he kept urging Republicans to forget about conflicting philosophies at general election time and to work for the election of anyone willing to wear the party label.

I said a while ago that it is the ambition of the political pro to get all the ideological fighting done within the confines of the party and to present to the country a candidate not too far removed in philosophy from the one to be presented by the enemy. But I think all pros will agree that there comes a time when one side or the other has to be a bit different, has to offer something in contrast to the foe. The Fourth District of Kentucky certainly ought to offer such an opportunity this time. I am not so well acquainted with the views of the Democratic nominee for Congress, Mr. Maloney, but I take it they are sufficiently different from those of Mr. Snyder to offer the voters an opportunity to express their preferences.

The fact that the fourth district, as now constituted, has never been tested in a Democratic-Republican contest, makes the Snyder-Maloney showdown doubly interesting.

What about the suburbia that supplies the bedrooms for Cincinnati? Are they as conservative as such areas are reputed to be? What about the heavy liberal Democratic vote in Kenton, Boone and Campbell counties—the vote that kept New Dealer Brent Spence in office so long and which also has a habit of sneaking over into the Republican column to support JOHN COOPER. Will Mr. Snyder be able to share in that vote?

While I sympathize with the efforts of the professionals to get elections down to a point of precinct working, card indexing, get-out-the-vote efforts, I'm sure even they would agree that providing a vehicle on which candidates can ride is only part of the function of a political party. No matter how shiny and glistening and efficiently operated the machine may be, it can accomplish nothing without the fuel provided by ideas and concepts of government.

Which brings me again to the topic assigned to me by your national committeeman—"The Loyal Opposition, Can It and Should It Survive?"

I've heard many members of Congress, in both parties, say life is easier and simpler when you are in the minority than when your party holds the White House, Senate and House of Representatives, because the opposition serves a valuable purpose simply by existing, simply by opposing.

I know it's considered poor form to criticize without offering an alternative—I know it's considered unsporting simply to sit around and wait for the party in power to make mistakes. But, actually, it is one of the functions of the opposition just to wait for mistakes.

I suppose anyone who remembers the Hoover Administration is too aged to belong to the Young Republicans of Kentucky.

But I remember the era well and I don't recall anything the Democratic Party did except needle the Republicans about the depression and wait for a frustrated country to throw the G.O.P. out in 1932.

I'm sure you've read enough about that campaign to know that there was nothing radical about the Democratic Party before election day. There was no hint of the New Deal, the welfare state in Franklin D. Roosevelt's campaign. Yet, just by waiting for hard luck to overtake the Republicans, the Democrats gave the country a chance to vote its lack of confidence in the people who had the misfortune to be in office when the depression struck and who gave the impression of not knowing what to do next.

There is no reason to believe that Mr. Roosevelt's people had any plans less vague than those of the Hoover Administration. The truth is, that in its stumbling, fumbling effort to find some way to restore our economy, the New Dealers hit upon a number of welfare measures. Some of them were so popular that the nation will never surrender them. Some, including the N.R.A., lasted so briefly that they are gone from memory.

I'm sure no professional politician would be caught today recommending the repeal of a long list of welfare measures which deal with education, with pensions for the aged, with medical and hospital care, with housing, with the right to belong to a labor union. Every now and then, a voice is raised to call for wiping out everything that has happened since 1932. But people who like to be elected to office—which is the first duty of the practicing politician—don't do that. There are a lot of politicians in the loyal opposition who are ready to swallow what already has been done, so long as they can hope that the tide of welfarism can be checked eventually.

The hard fact of life is—as was so forcibly demonstrated in 1964—the Republican Party is going to remain permanently in opposition if it permits the voters to get the notion that it is unfriendly toward what already has been done to increase the services each citizen can expect from a beneficient government. How well it can succeed in convincing the public that there must be a limit to all these good things is yet another matter. But on that subject, I take my text from a well-known Republican, former Governor Thomas E. Dewey. He said—"Free nations do not go backward. They may abandon their follies, but rarely their successes. The only way the opposition party can prepare itself to be recalled to power is by offering better solutions for the problems of the day than are offered by the party in power."

It has been noted that whenever the parties of the left in Australia or New Zealand or in Great Britain have been ousted by conservative parties, the victors have made no attempt to repeal the social legislation of the labor or socialist regimes. So-called socialized medicine was practiced as extensively in England under the Tories as under the Laborites.

While it is true that the Eisenhower Administration showed little enthusiasm for new social welfare legislation, it did nothing to remove the programs started by Roosevelt and Truman.

In fact, I believe we can arrive at a description of the differences between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. People are always complaining they can't tell the difference. But I say the difference is that the Democrats spend the nation's money for welfare services gladly, happily, eagerly, with the conviction they are doing a fine thing and with their eyes peeled for new ways to help the citizen.

On the other hand, the Republicans, spending the same amount of money for the identical purposes, go about the task with obvious reluctance, with shame, with regret, with feelings of guilt, all the while groaning that the country is on the way to economic ruin, that it is destroying the character of its citizens by encouraging them to look to the federal government for handouts.

Republicans look upon participation in political affairs as a grim necessity, a duty forced upon them because they need to protect their property from creeping socialists.

By contrast, the Democrats bring to politics a lusty, brawling, joy of battle that makes their gatherings zestful and interesting, except in those cases, such as Atlantic City, when Lyndon Johnson squelches the life out of them.

There can be no doubt that the Democrats, at least in the last three decades, have shown more expertise than have the Republicans. It's inexcusable that the Republicans, who kept their party in power nationally from 1860 to 1932, with sixteen years out for Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson, should let themselves be put into the minority position they hold today. It is nothing short of an outrage that the party of Abraham Lincoln should let the Democrats—the party of the slaveholder—steal the Negro vote on the bread-and-butter issue of economic assistance, as well as on the emotional issue of civil rights. The fantastic thing about this Democratic performance has been that the party captured the Negro vote while still holding on, most of the time, to the support of its Southern wing.

Where the Democrats showed their expertise as a national party was in never letting the Southern conservative bloc win out over its liberal northern wing on economic or social issues—particularly those dealing with the racial issue.

But now what is happening. The Southerner who clings to his social and economic conservatism and to his segregationist prejudices is moving into the Republican Party. And what is happening to the Democratic Party in the South? It is becoming the home of the reenfranchised Negro. And the first thing you know, the Republicans nationally are going to have to carry the burden of being the party of Southern conservatism and racialism, with no indication that they can juggle that problem so adroitly as did the Democrats for so many years.

Let it be said to the credit of the leaders of the Republican Party in Louisville that they have known how to win the Negro vote. They couldn't, of course, stem the 1964 tide in which their party was made to appear to be the enemy of civil rights legislation. Nor were they entirely to blame when the Republican nominee for Governor of Kentucky in 1963 made an all-out and nearly successful gamble by frightening voters with what the public accommodations act might do to their property in West End Louisville.

The Republican Party was born as a party of the rag-tag and the bob-tailed, the disadvantaged, the unorthodox and the unwashed. But somewhere along the line it acquired the curse of respectability. It never seems entirely at home among what the politicians like to call the common man.

By contrast, no matter how many millionaires the Democrats have in their ranks, no matter how many college professors they put in office, there is always room in it for the labor union stiff, the taxicab driver, the mill hand, the precinct captain and the ward heeler.

A multi-millionaire like Ave Harriman and an intellectual snob like Dean Acheson can, within the Democratic Party, form an attachment and admiration for Boss Pendergast's protege, Harry S. Truman, that is unmatched in history. That has been true of the Democratic Party ever since those eggheads Thomas Jefferson and James Madison took their trip to New York and formed an alliance with the city's machine bosses.

Well, after all that generalizing, we come face to face with a specific reality.

From the point of view of the practicing politician, there is only one thing on our minds this year—Vietnam. Everything that Washington touches, everything that is proposed, somehow or other winds up in talk about escalation, about de-escalation, about turning tail and running, about the will to win, about preventive war.

The size of appropriations for welfare programs at home, the question of inflation, what to do about the draft, whether to increase taxes—all these matters are controlled by what happens in the steaming jungles of Southeast Asia.

What is the function of the Opposition party in a situation like this? As you well know, the real opposition—or at least the vocal opposition—to the President's policies in Asia has come not from the Republican Party but from an extremely articulate group of dissenters in his own party, especially among Democrats on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Speaking strictly from a point of view of political strategy, it seems to me that the Republicans, as members of the official opposition, have shown great wisdom on the Vietnam subject—that is, they have been content merely to stand and wait.

Of course, there wasn't much else the party could do, but that in no way detracts from the fact that the Opposition is performing a useful function simply by providing the vehicle through which the American people can express their dissatisfaction, their disapproval, their great frustration over the course of affairs.

The Vietnam problem could send dozens of Republicans into Congress in November in place of Democrats. If, by some miracle not now in the offing, we should find a solution to Vietnam before November arrives, President Johnson's party will benefit. But if things continue as they are, or get just a bit more discouraging, the Republican candidates, without commiting themselves either as hawks or doves, will get the votes of two groups of deeply unhappy people.

One group is composed of those who are impatient at the slow pace of the war, who demand that we display the will and purpose to win. The other group is composed of those at the other end of the row, those who think we never should have been in Vietnam in the first place and who believe that the thing to do now is get out, whether we can save face or not.

Those who remember the 1952 campaign will recall that the most popular promise candidate Eisenhower made was his pledge to go to Korea and bring the fighting to an end. He did just that, but people sometimes forget, in their delight over the cessation of combat, that that desirable end was achieved simply by agreeing to a military stalemate which has lasted from 1952 until this very day. If a stalemate was popular in 1952, why not in 1966?

Certainly, a stalemate is not what the hawks have been demanding, not what is in the minds of those who say we have to seize this opportunity to stop Red China. But it undoubtedly would be popular with a majority of the voters. From the Administration's point of view, the problem is that it may be just a bit early to negotiate a stalemated peace. After all, full scale fighting had been going on in Korea for nearly three years before it became just a "dirty little war" to be stopped on almost any terms.

Perhaps it is too early for even a political magician like Johnson to negotiate an end to the venture. All the loyal opposition can do about it is wait and see, ready to cash in at the polls if things got no better, resigned to seeing the Democrats retain their large majorities in House and Senate if the President passes no miracle.

So far as flat predictions go, it is, of course, mathematically impossible for the Republicans to capture the Senate. Nor do I think it likely, as things are today, that they could gain a majority in the House. But it is entirely possible that many Northern Democrats, elected on Lyndon Johnson's coattails two years ago, will be beaten. If that happens, there could well be a return to control by the Republican-Southern coalition, a change that would make the House much more conservative than it now is.

But regardless of what your party's congressional nominees do this fall, I think there is one political fact of life we can be sure of. That is that in 1968, on the national front, your party is going to return to the policy of the all inclusive "tent." It's apparent that the people who, in 1964, finally got their chance to offer "a choice not an echo," are not going to get that chance again.

The "moderates," the "consensus people," who hung back last time in the delusion that Senator Goldwater would be stopped at the convention, obviously have learned their lesson. They are organizing early to make sure that they do not lose by default as they did in San Francisco. They are not going to be caught flat-footed again.

If this be offering the American people only a choice between a Democratic tweedledum and a Republican tweedledee, then that will be in the great tradition of American political parties.

AN END TO ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last Friday on the NBC "Today Show" there was a most interesting presentation on architectural barriers to the handicapped.

This is a subject which is receiving more and more attention, and justly so. In the past, we have given little thought to the needs of the handicapped—to the large percentage of our population which is unable to cope easily with large flights of steps, heavy doors, slippery floors, and improperly planned restroom facilities.

Many of these barriers are unnecessary. Most of them are the result of lack of thought and poor architecture. As has been readily demonstrated, a building can be designed for the use of all the people—including the elderly with heart conditions, the young expectant mother, and the person in the wheelchair—without additional cost and without harm to the esthetics of the structure.

All it takes is a little planning, a little forethought.

It was with this thought in mind the Congress last year created the National Commission on Architectural Barriers. This Commission although only now getting underway, promises to present at the conclusion of its studies a program for focusing national attention on the need for the elimination of unnecessary barriers in new construction. This Commission has my strong support. Its task is important and I urge officials both within and without government to give it their full cooperation and encouragement.

This is why I was pleased to hear Mrs. Aline Saarinen present the problem and discuss the possible solutions on the "Today Show." She is to be congratulated and so are the producers of the program. They have performed once again a public service.

A HOMETOWN TRIBUTE TO VIRGINIA KELLY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Paris, Tenn., Post-Intelligencer is observing its centennial year of publication. The paper has conscientiously recorded the history of Paris, Henry County, Tenn., and the United States over the span of 100 years.

I would like to extend my good wishes and congratulations to Percy Williams, editor and president of the Paris Publishing Corp.; to his son, Bryant Williams, the publisher; to their staff; and to all the citizens of Paris and Henry County, Tenn.

This historic 100th anniversary edition of the Post-Intelligencer contains biographies of leading citizens of the past and present, members of pioneer families of Paris and Henry County. These citizens have contributed to the development of our Nation. I was pleased to read a story about a family friend, a respected member of the press, a member of the Congressional Press Gallery, Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly, wife of Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly, U.S. Navy, retired.

I have known Virginia Kelly for 20 years but have never heard her mention her own accomplishments or that she is a descendent of pioneers of this country. I believe her life story is typical of devotion to the highest principles and to love of the United States which motivates millions of good Americans. I believe this story will be of interest to the public. I ask that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer, June 2, 1966]

WASHINGTON WRITER VIRGINIA KELLY COLUMNIST FOR P-I, BORN IN PARIS

Virginia Weldon Kelly, Washington newspaper correspondent who writes the "Wonderful Washington" column appearing in the Post-Intelligencer, was born in Paris, the daughter of the late Dr. John D. Weldon and Mrs. Weldon. Her mother makes her home with the Kellys in Washington.

Virginia was graduated from Grove High School and attended Ward-Belmont Junior College in Nashville.

She is the wife of Rear Admiral Thomas J. Kelly, USN, Retired. After her marriage to the then Lieutenant Kelly, she attended Peabody Conservatory in Baltimore, and the Pittsburgh Musical Institute. Before women were admitted to St. John's College, in Annapolis, Md., Mrs. Kelly and a small group of men and women were permitted to take evening classes in philosophy and literature at St. John's College.

After his retirement from the Navy at 50, Admiral Kelly served as Assistant to the Chairman of the Board of Socony Mobil Oil Company until mandatory retirement age at 65. He maintained offices in New York and Washington. Admiral Kelly presently has his own offices at 1028 Connecticut Avenue and is an international and national business consultant.

Until her marriage, Virginia lived in Paris and also in the family home, Paris Landing, which had been owned by her father, Dr. Weldon, her grandfather, Dr. Andrew Jackson Weldon, and her great grandfather, William E. Weldon.

The real Paris Landing, the ancestral home of Virginia, is now under the waters of the Kentucky-Tennessee Lake. For many years Paris Landing was noted for its rich farmland, and as a thriving business point and river landing. Mrs. Kelly's grandfather owned 5,000 acres of land there. Dr. A. J. Weldon, and Dr. J. D. Weldon also had extensive land holdings in Stewart County.

Mrs. Kelly, when she was five years old, attended Oak Hill School, for six weeks. Rural schools, at that time, opened in the mid-summer. Virginia has always maintained close ties with family friends not only in Paris but throughout the county. Her happiest memories are associated with Henry County. Her grandfather and her great grandmother Gillian Cooke Weldon were Tennessee pioneers. They were born in the Eighteenth Century in North Carolina and were close friends of President Andrew Jackson.

Mrs. Kelly is a direct descendant of Charles Calvert, the Lord Baltimore and of the Lady Anne Arundel, for whom the Maryland County was named. Annapolis is in Anne Arundel County. Virginia is also a direct descendant of Colonel Richard Owing, English officer who commanded British Rangers in 1696, in a fort on an island in the Potomac River, near Cabin John, now in the Metropolitan Washington area. She is a member of the Maryland Society of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America; of the Club of Colonial Dames in Washington; and is a Past Regent of Manor House Chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

In Paris, Tennessee, Virginia started attending the First Methodist Church Sunday School when she was only two, and was a pupil of Miss Nina Wynn. She was active in that church until she was married. Virginia began to study piano, harmony and theory when she was six years old as a pupil of Miss Mae Corum.

Virginia is a member of Martha Chapter No. 155, Order of the Eastern Star in Paris, and her mother served as Third Worthy Matron of the Chapter. Mrs. Weldon is the only surviving fifty-year member of the Chapter. Virginia's father was Worthy Patron.

Virginia's late father was a 32nd degree Mason, and a Knight Templar. Her grandfather and great grandfather were also dedicated Masons who were members of the Mount Vernon, Virginia Chapter of which President George Washington was a member.

Virginia has always been an avid bookworm. The Paris public library was one of her favorite places. Every Saturday she trudged home from the library with as many books as she could carry. Even Virginia's fox terrier, Suzanne wore a harness and carried one or two books.

She was devoted to the faculty of Grove High School and enjoyed her four years there. She was Editor of "The Comet" and of the yearbook, and was an ardent debater. She participated in many of the activities at Grove, and took the classical scholastic course including four years of Latin. She mourned that there was no Greek. But since 1964, she has tried to remedy that lack in her education, and has been studying Classical Greek.

As a child and a young girl, Virginia liked horseback riding, fishing, dancing and bridge. Today, she is a naturalist, ornithologist, and is interested in Bible archeology, cooking, gardening, fine art and music. She is enthusiastic about Bible study.

Virginia started developing cataracts when she was in her twenties and had an operation at Johns Hopkins several years ago. She now has the informal Virginia Weldon Kelly Eye Club and devotes some time to encouraging eye patients. Virginia's particular interest is in hospital care. She has spent thousands of hours as a Red Cross Volunteer in military hospitals.

When Admiral Kelly was in the Navy, Virginia followed his ship whenever possible.

She has lived in San Diego, Coronado, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Vallejo, Seattle, Bremerton, Panama, Norfolk, Annapolis, Newport, and New York. She has traveled extensively in Central America, South America, Europe and the Middle East. She was a successful singer but, in the years she has lived in Washington, she has devoted her time to newspaper writing.

She is a Washington Correspondent for the Long Beach, California Independent and Press-Telegram; the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch; the Honolulu Star-Bulletin; the Pasadena Independent and Star-News; the Coffeyville, Kansas Daily Journal; and is Special Correspondent for the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

In 1965, the Associated Press News Features syndicated not only in the United States but in Canada, Europe and the Middle East, a series that she wrote.

Virginia is a member of the White House Correspondents Association; the Congressional Press Gallery; and the State Department's Correspondents Association. She is a member of the 1925 F Street Club; the Washington Club; the International Club; the Woman's National Democratic Club where she serves on the Hospitality and Legislative Committees; the Women's National Press Club; and the American Newspaper Women's Club.

She is a Red Cross Gray Lady and is a member of the Salvation Army Auxiliary.

Virginia was the first woman to receive the Navy's Meritorious Public Service Award given in recognition of her many years of service to the Navy, their dependents, aid to Navy widows and orphans.

In presenting the decoration, the then Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth said that the Navy Hospital now under construction in Long Beach, California, should be called "The Virginia Weldon Kelly Hospital."

She is a trustee of the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation which is constructing a 3.5 million dollar residence, Vinson Hall in nearby McLean, Virginia. Vinson Hall will house widows of Navy, Marine and Coast Guard officers. President and Mrs. Johnson; and Vice President and Mrs. HUBERT HUMPHREY serve as Chairmen of Honorary Sponsors of the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation.

Mrs. Kelly is a cousin of Mrs. Mary Weldon Williamson, of Paris. The late Charles E. Hastings and the late Mrs. Louise Weldon Robison were also first cousins.

SMOKING AND LUNG DAMAGE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the most recent evidence that cigarette smoking causes lung damage comes from experiments conducted by Dr. Oscar Auerbach, a pathologist at the East Orange, N.J., veterans hospital.

Dr. Auerbach taught a number of beagles how to smoke and then checked the results. They were catastrophic. Five of the dogs died, and all exhibited lung damage.

I realize that what happens to a dog's lungs under heavy, steady smoking may not exactly parallel what will happen to a man's lungs. But granting every concession cigarette companies and smokers might request, the New Jersey experiment still adds significant data to the mounting evidence that the heavy cigarette smoker is asking for trouble.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the July 15 issue of Time, discussing the Auerbach experiments, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH: DOGS, DEATH, AND SMOKING

Medical researchers have tried for years to train laboratory animals to smoke. And as if in testament to the animals' innate wisdom, the training always failed. It did, that is, until Dr. Oscar Auerbach, a pathologist at the East Orange, N.J., Veterans Administration Hospital, finally found a way to force the habit. In relentless pursuit of a sure link between lung damage and smoking, Dr. Auerbach turned on man's best friend, specifically the trusting little beagle.

Willingly Hooked. For his experiments, he told the A.M.A., he opened the throats of nine males and one female with a tracheotomy. When they were assustomed to breathing through the permanent holes in their necks, the dogs were hooked up to a smoking machine every morning and afternoon. After a cigarette was lit, the dogs were permitted to inhale at will. After five straight puffs, they were given a few breaths of fresh air. They were broken in gently on just one filter-tip cigarette for the first few days; after seven months they worked up to as many as a dozen regular-length nonfilters a day. Beagles were chosen because their lung structure resembles humans', and the twelve-cigarette daily dosage was considered the equivalent of heavy smoking in a man.

Like any small boy, the beagles reacted to the initial cigarettes with tears and redness of the eyes, coughing and, sometimes, nausea. After a few weeks, many of them seemed to have developed a taste for tobacco. They wagged their tails and jumped willingly into the box where they were hooked up. Then, on the 24th day of the experiment, the first dog died. The second died 205 days later, and three more died before the experiment was ended after 14 months. The remaining five were sacrificed for autopsies. Ten nonsmoking control dogs, two of them with tacheotomies, were also sacrificed.

Massive Damage. Post-mortems revealed that the lungs of the nonsmokers were entirely healthy. Damage to the smokers' lungs was massive. The lung tissue of the last two to die spontaneously was so completely destroyed that doctors had difficulty evaluating what had happened. In the others, reported Dr. Auerbach, the changes in the lungs were remarkably similar to the effects of emphysema in man. The experiment had not continued long enough to see whether cancer would develop.

Critics, including the Tobacco Institute Inc., as well as many doctors, quickly pointed out that beagles are not humans, and more important, that humans smoke differently. They rarely inhale five times in a row, and they normally do not smoke butts down to less than a quarter of an inch, as the dogs did. Nonetheless, the dead beagles provided the first controlled experimental evidence of the relationship of cigarettes to lung damage.

OTHER CITIES FOLLOWING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN GHETTO TREND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting column, entitled "Other Cities Following District of Columbia in Ghetto Trend," by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the July 15 edition of the Bluefield, W. Va., Sunset News-Observer, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OTHER CITIES FOLLOWING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN GHETTO TREND

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Unless very radical measures are taken, the average, representative great American city will become a super-Watts—a Negro ghetto on a metropolitan scale—within the lifetime of the vast majority of our cities' present inhabitants.

If that forecast seems a bit startling, the reason is quite simple. In this statistically minded country we have been neglecting to gather and to interpret the most significant of all statistics—the figures on the population changes in the great cities with all their immense social, political and even economic implications.

WANTS FIGURES

Secretary John Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just ordered the figures to be gathered for the 20 American cities that had populations above 500,000 in 1960. At present, figures are available for only nine cities, all in the East and Midwest, namely Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Washington.

Of these nine, every single city except New York and Boston is clearly on the way to becoming a kind of super-Watts. The figures on the Negro-white proportions in the urban school systems are the real indicators, as already pointed out in earlier reports in this space. Additional figures have now been obtained by further spadework.

TWO POINTS

Two points must be understood to make the figures understandable. First, no one has been paying much attention to the population changes in the District of Columbia, partly because Washington is not self-governing and partly because it has been thought a special case. Second, however, Washington is not a special case. It is a typecase, though a more advanced case than the other cities on the list.

If this key fact is grasped, Washington can be used to provide the benchmarks that show the other cities where they are along the road. The turning point year was 1947 when the District of Columbia, with a population one-third Negro, had an elementary school population that was 50 per cent Negro.

PARALLEL CURVES

Thenceforward, the elementary school and city-wide populations changed on parallel curves. By 1957 the city was half-Negro, and the elementary school population was 75 per cent Negro. Today, the city is just under two-thirds Negro, and the elementary school population is 91 per cent Negro. Rather shortly, behind its fine federal facade, Washington is due to become an almost purely Negro city—a vast metropolitan ghetto in fact.

A table can thus be made, showing how far along the road Baltimore and the other cities were in 1960 and how far along the road they are today, in each case in terms of the record here in Washington. Beginning with 1960, the picture was as follows, for percentages of Negro children in the cities' elementary schools:

Baltimore, 52 per cent, equaled Washington in 1950.

Chicago, 44 per cent, equaled wartime Washington.

Cleveland, 47 per cent, equaled wartime Washington.

Detroit, 46 per cent, equaled wartime Washington.

Philadelphia, 50 per cent, equaled Washington in 1947.

St. Louis, 57 per cent, equaled Washington in 1953.

FIVE-YEAR JUMP

In all these cities, as in Washington, New York and Boston as well, the percentage of Negro children in the elementary school has increased materially since 1960. The same table, showing where the above-listed cities stand this year, looks as follows:

Baltimore, 64 per cent, equals Washington in 1954–55.

Chicago, 56 per cent, equals Washington in 1952–53.

Cleveland, 53 per cent, equals Washington in 1951.

Detroit, 57 per cent, equals Washington in 1953.

Philadelphia, 60 per cent, equals Washington in 1954.

St. Louis, 64 per cent, equals Washington in 1954–55.

Making the projection on the same curves, then, all of these cities are only a few years away—in one or two cases perhaps only two or three years away—from the moment Washington reached in 1957 when the population of its Negro ghetto amounted to half of the total city population. Using the school figures to predict this moment for the other cities is unquestionably reliable, moreover, simply because the school figures are one of the prime causes of the urban population curves.

EMIGRATION TO NORTH

The other prime cause, of course, is the emigration northward of Southern Negroes fleeing segregation. Some 12.5 million persons are thought to have joined this movement thus far. But mainly through the urban schools this movement has produced a secondary movement of greater magnitude. Briefly, as the percentage of Negro children has risen in the city school systems, more and more white families with children have emigrated to the suburbs.

In Washington we have almost literally reached the stage of having no white children of school age living in the city limits. That is what may be called the stage of full ripeness. For those who do not think anyone will benefit, and least of all the Negro people, when the average American great city has become a super Watts, the watchword is, "You should be warned."

TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE ENDORSES S. 3035, FOR THE PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas State Historical Survey Committee recently passed two resolutions, one urging more funds for the National Park Service program of recording historic American buildings, and the other endorsing S. 3035, a bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation.

S. 3035, which passed the Senate on July 11, 1966, was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. Senator JACKSON's leadership in this legislation has been outstanding, and I am honored to have my name appear on the bill as a cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the National Park Service has provided a greatly needed program of recording Historic American Buildings; and

Whereas it is recognized that all old buildings cannot be saved from destruction; but it is also recognized that those which illustrate the development of architectural taste and reflect the culture of all sections of the United Sttaes, should be recorded by measured drawings and photographs before they are destroyed; and

Whereas this recording program has not been expanded to its fullest capacity because of budgetary limitations; and

Whereas the appropriation requested by the National Park Service for 1967 would enable them to carry on this most worthwhile program at an accelerated rate: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas State Historical Survey Committee, at its quarterly meeting in Fort Worth, Texas, on April 15, 1966, A.D., recognizes the need for a more realistic appropriation to carry out the program of recording Historic American Buildings, and thus urges the members of the House Appropriations Committee to give favorable consideration to an additional appropriation as requested by the National Park Service.

Done at Fort Worth, Texas, this 15th day of April, 1966.

JOHN BEN SHEPPERD,
President.
TRUETT LATIMER,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION

Whereas President Johnson in his February 23, 1966, message to Congress dealing with the quality of our environment, said "Historic preservation is the goal of citizen groups in every part of the country. To help preserve buildings and sites of historic significance, I will recommend a program of matching grants to States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation"; and

Whereas the recommendations of the President are embodied in H.R. 13491 and S. 3035, Second Session of the 89th Congress; and

Whereas the chief method of promoting historic preservation at the state, county, and municipal levels are the identification of the significant sites and their acquisition, rehabilitation, and maintenance; and

Whereas the proposed legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to maintain a national register of sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture including both historic and archeological sites; and

Whereas the bill would establish a program of matching grants-in-aid to States and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States for projects having as their purpose the preservation for public benefit of properties that are significant in American history and culture; and

Whereas the program of grants-in-aid would begin with a statewide historic sites survey financed by the Federal Government and conducted according to standards and procedures reflecting those of the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings; and

Whereas the statewide surveys would include sites already determined to be of national significance by the Secretary of Interior but will be aimed primarily at identifying and evaluating other properties that are significant in American history and culture; and

Whereas on the basis of such survey, each State will prepare a comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan which, when approved by the Secretary of the Interior after considering its relationship to the statewide outdoor recreation plan, will form the basis for matching grants-in-aid to States for the acquisition and development of historical properties in non-Federal, public or private ownership; and

Whereas properties of national, regional, state, or local historical significance will be eligible for inclusion in the statewide plan, whether they are operated by a public agency or private organization or individual; and

Whereas grants to the National Trust under the proposed bill will enable the Trust to proceed to encourage on an accelerated basis the local initiative and support that is needed for preservation of our historic heritage; and

Whereas the estimated cost of the program authorized by the proposed legislation is $2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 and cost for succeeding fiscal years would depend upon the needs identified in the surveys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas State Historical Survey Committee wholeheartedly endorse this legislation and urges members of the Texas Congressional delegation to vote for the bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to each member of the Texas Congressional delegation and each member of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Done at Austin, Texas this 31st day of May, 1966, A.D.

JOHN BEN SHEPPERD,
President.
TRUETT LATIMER,
Executive Director.

WILLIE MAYS AIDS JOB CORPS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the July issue of the UAW Solidarity, entitled "Willie Mays' Heroes: The Job Corps Men."

The article, by Howard Lipton, describes the great interest that the famous baseball player has taken in the Job Corps program. Willie Mays was a poor boy who was fortunate to be born a gifted athlete and thereby able to achieve success in life. He has noted that the boys he grew up with have not been so fortunate. He has said:

> The Job Corps wasn't around when I was a boy. If it had been, a lot of kids I grew up with would be proud working people today.

Mays has met with boys from the Job Corps centers, spoken with them, and been most effective in encouraging them to continue in the program and realize their hopes for a better life. Willie's attitude toward the Corps importance can be best understood from his own words:

> This Job Corps is going to save these boys. They're going to make it. Without this chance they were dead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIE MAYS' HOMERS: THE JOB CORPS MEN

(By Howard Lipton)

"If I hadn't been able to play baseball," Willie Mays will tell you, "I might have been one of those kids."

"Those kids" are Job Corps youngsters. They were born with two strikes against them. Just like Willie. They were raised with two strikes against them. Just like Willie. They feel as if life is ready to breeze that third strike past them any time.

They're in the Job Corps because they want to get at least to first base. On their own.

The biggest Giant of them all, Willie the Wonder, the Amazing Mays, has been trying to get through to them—and to a million or so others who still are outside the Job Corps program. He insists they can make it. Even to second or third and maybe all the way home.

The San Francisco Giant centerfielder—everybody's all-star—spent part of his winter visiting and talking with Job Corps youth. That's the first time Solidarity caught up with him.

"The Job Corps wasn't around when I was a boy" says Willie. "If it had been, a lot of kids I grew up with would be proud working people today. Instead . . ." and he must have thought hard of those years growing up in the streets of New York City.

From time to time during spring training, he took advantage of a day off to get together with the Job Corps boys. The visits were arranged by the Office of Economic Opportunity which runs the youth training program.

"Those kids" are tough. Life's a battle for them as well as a struggle. The blows leave scars, and hard callouses develop to cover over the steady hurt they feel inside.

Few people who haven't felt the same deep hurt for the same reasons can understand them. Few can get through to them.

They've heard talk before. They've heard promises. Dreams and hope too often become something to cuss at instead of realities, or maybe just something to cry yourself to sleep over.

It takes skill to get through to them. It takes sincerity. It takes "knowing"—knowing by the kids that you know what they feel, how they've been knocked around and what they've been up against.

Since he became interested in the youth program, Mays has talked to hundreds of youngsters. They've carried his words to thousands of others.

For there are currently about 26,000 Job Corps men in almost 100 centers throughout the U.S. and Puerto Rico. The program is designed to give them basic education, skill training and useful work experience.

It's also aimed at young men and women 16 to 21 years of age who need individual help to develop abilities, self-confidence and the incentive to improve themselves.

So-called "urban center" training includes such occupational skills as auto mechanics, office machine operation, appliance repair, machine tool operator, sales, shipping and file clerk, waiters and cooks, and laundry or custodial work.

Rural centers focus on forestry, insect control, surveying, farm skills, carpentry and masonry, and vehicle and heavy equipment operation and maintenance.

One Job Corps Center where kids talked with Willie Mays is at Heber, Ariz., in Sitgreaves National Forest. From there, six of the youths visited with the star outfielder while the Giants were at their Phoenix training camp this spring.

They were Richard Doise, 18, of Los Angeles; William Bosley, 18, of Lilbourn, Mo.; John Valenzuela, 18, of Los Angeles; Boyce Little, 18, of Athens, Ga.; Roland Upshur, 21, Oyster Bay, N.Y., and Anibal "Chico" Colon, 16, of New York City.

A corpsman receives $30 a month plus a readjustment allowance when he leaves of $50 for each month of satisfactory service. If a youth sends home a monthly allotment of up to $25 from his readjustment allowance, the corps matches the allotment.

Each of the six boys who visited Willie Mays at the ballclub's training camp was a dropout. They'd felt they "couldn't make it" in school. But the Job Corps is giving them an education they're interested in. They believe that with it, they'll be useful to themselves as well as society.

Doise, for instance is learning to be a welder. So are Bosley and Colon. Valenzuela is studying auto mechanics. Little is working on welding and truck driving, and Upshur on heavy equipment.

They'd heard about the corps in a variety of ways. Bosley and Valenzuela inquired about it after seeing a TV commercial. Doise became interested when he went to the state employment service office in search of work. Upshur and Colon were told of the corps by friends. Little's former teacher wrote to corps headquarters in Washington to get information for him.

But each had something in common: each was scrounging for some kind of break. They wanted to "make it." Not big. Just "make it."

A look at a Job Corps analysis of the first 10,000 enrollees tells why:

"Although they averaged 17 years in age, some were more like 13-year-olds in size. Most had never slept between sheets before, never shared a bedroom with only one other. Some had never had electric lights. Almost all had developed an acute resistance to conventional schooling.

"Nearly two-thirds had lived in substandard housing . . . almost 40 per cent were from families receiving public assistance . . . more than 60 per cent came from families where the primary wage earner was unemployed . . . half came from homes where the parents had less than an eighth grade education.

"The average enrollee had never completed the ninth grade, and he could read no better than a fifth grader. It was little wonder that fewer than one in 10 had ever held a job . . . although all had tried to find work."

Willie Mays turned out to be a giant in getting through to the kids.

He had trouble at first. The group he talked to before taking off on a tour of Job Corps centers was in Washington, D.C. They'd been bussed there from a nearby camp to sit down with him.

They were tough. They were listening as be began with the look on their faces that might as well say: "We're hearing the words man, but we're not getting the message."

Then a boy stood up. He wanted eagerly to say his piece. But his voice grew louder, more tense, as he venomed his anger at all the "they's" who, he said, wouldn't let him work to become what he most wanted—a minister.

He started naming the people he insisted were throwing roadblocks in his way. He began sputtering. He seemed about to explode with frustration and emotion.

Then Mays, as cool on the platform as he is on the ballfield, held up his hand. "Cool it, baby," he said. "I'm on your side."

The youth stopped, looked at him, quieted.

"If you want to be a minister," Willie said, "you can be. Don't let anybody stop you. I'd never listen to anybody who told me I couldn't do something. If you do, you're defeated right away.

"When I was 19—that's about how old you are now—I went zero for 24 with the Birmingham Giants. That was my first 24 times at bat, too. If I had listened to all the poormouths who were giving me advice, I'd have quit baseball right then.

"It takes a great deal of hardship to be a minister and you have to keep trying. But if you want to be one, you'll keep on trying and you'll fight and overcome."

They were listening to Willie Mays now. He was talking their language. I went zero for 24 and I kept trying. Cool it, baby, I'm on your side.

Another boy jumped to his feet, said he wanted to be an athlete "just like you, Willie."

"That's what you say," Mays challenged him. "But you're smoking and you ought to know you can't do that and be an athlete."

That wasn't what the boy expected to hear. But the idea got through. "Making it" when you've been down takes hard work. It takes giving up something you might not like to give up.

It was Willie Mays' personal message. Maybe they agreed with all he was telling them. Maybe not. But they were listening and trying to understand because he was saying these things to them—and he had come up from being "down," too.

Education is important, he told them—"the most important thing, and that's what the Job Corps is all about."

In that roomful of boys, maybe there were still a few who dreamed of making $100,000 a year like Willie. If there were, they didn't show it.

What they did show was a deep-down yearning to be somebody. And "somebody" for underprivileged kids is anybody with the talent to hold down a steady job. Not the drifters they've seen all their lives.

"Kids today are no different than they were when I was a boy. They see television and they've got a right to dream. I was the biggest dreamer on our block. Then, when you're out of school a few years and you find you're drifting just like a lot of the older people, that's the time a kid says to himself: I gotta get out of this. Out!"

Willie was standing now. His right foot moved back and forth, the spikes raking the hard ground just outside the Giant dugout.

"When a kid gets to the age—like these kids—when they say they've gotta get out, that's when society has to let them in. This Job Corps is going to save these boys. They're going to make it. Without this chance, they were dead.

"These kids are my heroes!"

THE STRIKE MUST END

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Nation is now suffering its 10th consecutive day of an almost-paralyzing airline strike. The effect of this stalemate upon the economy of many sections of the country is reaching grave proportions. It is having serious repercussions in my own State of Idaho, which is served by two of the major airlines, now strikebound. I bring this to the attention of the Senate with the hopes, Mr. President, that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in an urgent plea to both parties in this dispute to come to immediate terms in the national interest.

I have received numerous requests from civic and business groups and individuals in Idaho to seek a means to early settlement of the airline dispute. The president of one of the largest corporations in the State as well as a major national corporation informs me that the operations of the company are seriously threatened by the critical lack of available air transportation in the Pacific Northwest.

For those of us in Idaho who rely greatly upon air transportation for much of our daily communication with the rest of the Nation, the strike has now worked severe hardships that will only be magnified with each day the walkout continues.

Our mails are delayed, employment is threatened by potential production cutbacks, perishable goods are not reaching their destinations despite the herculean efforts of the nonstruck airlines and other means of ground transportation, and essential business travel is most severely and dangerously curtailed.

While I am in no position to pass judgment on the merits of this strike, I urge the disputants to heed public demands for an end to the growing strangulation of both air and surface transportation. In deference to national interests and in their accepted roles as public service functionaries, both sides must find a reasonable compromise soon.

THE MOTORCYCLE CRISIS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, one of the Nation's leading health authorities—Dr. Howard A. Rusk—recently described the motorcycle as a "greater threat than autos in terms of accidents." Dr. Rusk cites National Safety Council statistics which show that there are 13 deaths for each 10,000 registered motorcycles in 1962, compared to 5.1 deaths for each 10,000 registered passenger cars, trucks, buses, and taxis.

The subject of motorcycle safety has been receiving increased attention of late. Just last week the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] discussed the problem on the Senate floor and made certain recommendations which I endorse completely. I am most pleased that he pointed out that under the terms of the new Traffic Safety Act of 1966 it will be possible, for the first time, to set adequate safety standards for the design and construction of motorcycles.

In Connecticut the problem is receiving the prompt attention of State officials and private citizens alike. Richard E. Bastian, a staff reporter for the New Haven Register, has written an excellent two-part article on the problem in Connecticut and what is being done to combat it.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Bastian's articles in the Record at this point together with an article from the New York Times by Dr. Rusk and an article from the Wall Street Journal by Tim Metz entitled "Road Safety Forces Turn Their Attention to All Those Cycles."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, June 30, 1966]

The Motorcycle Crisis (1)—Police Attacking Hazard Spawned by 15,000 Motorcycles in State

(By Richard E. Bastian)

State Police will be opening a new era Friday in the battle to cut down on motorcycle accidents and fatalities. Stepped-up efforts come with the support of Gov. John N. Dempsey as complaints against two-wheel motor driven vehicles soar.

But the crackdown will not be limited to the stereotyped blackjacketed cyclist. With the sales and rental of motor bikes and scooters also booming, state and local officials are growing concerned about the need for stiffer law enforcement and regulations.

SEES HAZARD

Lt. Joseph Hart, commanding officer of the State Police Barracks in Westbrook, said he considers motorcycles and motor bikes "one of the greatest hazards that exist on the highway today."

Motorcycles and bikes are safe only if there are no vehicles on the road, Lt. Hart said.

State Police will launch an intensive program Friday aimed at reducing the growing number of motorcycle accidents.

The 10 persons killed so far this year is expected to exceed the 23 killed in 1965 before the end of the warm weather. During this time of year an overwhelming number of the deaths occur.

Gov. Dempsey has announced the creation of a special task force of State Police specialists, representing each of the 11 troops throughout the state who will undergo special safety enforcement training.

Each trooper taking the course Friday will be responsible for investigations of all accidents involving motorcycles at their barracks as well as handling complaints and enforcement of motorcycle regulations.

Meanwhile, State Motor Vehicle Commissioner John J. Tynan is looking into leasing practices involving two-wheeled motor vehicles since any one with a license to drive a car in Connecticut can rent a motor-driven two-wheel vehicle even without experience or schooling in actually operating one.

Motorcycle sales which have shown a marked increase in the past two years are one of the reasons for concern by police.

MORE REGISTERED

According to statistics provided by the State Motor Vehicles Department, there are 14,926 motorcycles registered in Connecticut, an increase of nearly 6,000 over last year. Registrations in 1965 totaled 9,017, a jump from 6,111 listed in 1964.

With this increase, calls by State Police Commissioner Leo J. Mulcahy to require crash helmets, restrict the number of motorcycles driving abreast and special licensing laws has drawn strong support from police chiefs throughout the area.

"I'm behind the commissioner 100 per cent," said East Haven Police Chief Joseph A. Pascarella Jr. He noted "quite a few more motorbikes than usual" in East Haven since spring.

The chief added that motorcycles in his area were making "much more noise than they should."

He said he was also concerned about the problem of the two-wheelers riding two or three abreast on the highways. "They should ride single file, just like cars. Otherwise it's very hard to get around them because you can't tell what they're going to do."

Lt. Hart who drove a motorcycle for three years as a trooper pointed out, "You don't have minor accidents with motorcycles. They don't exist."

West Haven Police Chief Michael Onofrio is also concerned about the large number of young motorcyclists attracted to the shores and beaches of his community.

"Some are gentlemen and all right," Chief Onofrio noted. "Others act like a bunch of maniacs. I'd say it's about 50–50." His department has been cracking down in recent weeks on violations by motorcyclists.

Motorcyclists in Southington have also been feeling the sting of the law where arrests are being made for riding three on a machine and lack of a rear view mirror.

In Hamden, Police Chief Robert S. Thatcher recently issued a warning to motorcyclists as he received increased complaints.

The chief said, "We received numerous complaints from residents all over town concerning the wild conduct of many motorcyclists. They are going wild, really hopping all over the place and it must be discontinued."

Old Saybrook Police Chief Walter Patti said he has experienced no major problem with motorcycles but is apprehensive about the future in his shoreline area.

ASKS LIMITS

Patti agrees that registration of motorcycles should be limited to persons 18 years of age and older. The number of persons on each motorcycle should also be strictly controlled, the chief contends.

Backing proposals to prohibit two-wheelers from going two abreast on any given highway, he recalls an incident when 16 Hartford area motorcyclists were issued written warnings for driving caravan-style down Route 1 making it virtually impossible for motorists to pass.

Patti is particularly concerned about the noise in the operation of the motorcycles.

Manufacturers make it relatively easy at present to remove the baffle plates in the motorcycle mufflers increasing the noise level of the two-wheelers on local highways.

There are two reasons for removing the baffles. One is an increase in thrust as compression gases pass unrestricted through the short tailpipe to the rear of the vehicle.

The second reason for removing the baffles is the increase in noise which younger drivers seem to enjoy. Someone seems to think there is fun in a loud roar of the two-cylinder engine.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, July 1, 1966]

The Motorcycle Crisis (2)—Rising Cyclist Toll Laid to Inexperience, Passenger Error, Alcohol

(By Richard E. Bastian)

Driving inexperience, mistakes by rear passengers and, in some cases, alcohol are listed by State Police as causes for the upswing in fatal accidents throughout the state involving motor-driven cycles.

Lt. Walter Stecko and Trooper Joseph Bowan at State Police Headquarters in Hartford have been compiling statistics on the accidents provided by the Department of Motor Vehicles and other police agencies in addition to their own.

In addition, Lt. Joseph Hart, State Police commander in Westbrook, who drove a motorcycle as a trooper, contends two-wheelers on the road today are not as maneuverable as some advocates claim and have inferior braking systems compared to those of standard automobiles.

He added he will not permit his men to take the two-wheeled vehicles onto the Connecticut Turnpike.

Compilation of the statistics follows in the wake of a request by State Police Commissioner Leo J. Mulcahy for the passage of stiffer laws in the next session of the Connecticut General Assembly on motorcycles and their drivers.

Mulcahy, in a memorandum to Gov. John N. Dempsey, called for adoption of a law requiring special licenses for motorcycle drivers, another law to make crash helmets mandatory for drivers and passengers on the two-wheelers, and a law to prohibit two-abreast motorcycle driving on the state's highways.

Mulcahy taught rookie state troopers to drive motorcycles when the two-wheelers were a major part of patrol activity by the law enforcement agency, and today doesn't wish to discriminate against the cyclist who has been operating safely for 20 years.

"I don't want to blacken all drivers," the commissioner said in an interview.

The proposed laws would, however, crack down on the new cyclist and the exhibitionist, Mulcahy contends.

LAWS IN FOUR STATES

Four states presently have laws requiring special licensing for cyclists.

They are Oregon, New York, Vermont, and Maine. In Connecticut, anyone with a license to operate an automobile can drive a motorcycle.

Maine also prohibits a passenger on the rear seat unless he holds a motorcycle operator's license.

One State Police official said the law was most likely enacted because of the delicate balance necessary in the safe operation of the two-wheelers.

An accident on the Connecticut Turnpike last year was believed caused when the rear passenger shifted her weight, sending the two-wheeler out of control.

Alcohol plays a role in motorcycle deaths as it does in automobile fatalities, but probably not to the same degree.

In two of the 10 fatal crashes this year, the cause was attributed to alcohol, and it is suspected in two cases where investigations are incomplete.

INEXPERIENCE FACTOR

Inexperience is another factor. One driver was killed on his first motorcycle ride. Police theorize that another, with a minimum amount of experience, probably didn't "lean" into a curve, but simply turned the handlebars. He was killed in the resulting crash.

Then there are those accidents where the motorcyclist is not at fault. Lt. Stecko recalls one fatal accident where the driver of the two-wheeler was hit by a left-turning car.

But Dave Feinberg, co-owner of the Honda shop in Old Saybrook, takes issue with criticism being heaped on the two-wheelers.

Motorcycles and bikes are the third safest transportation vehicle, he contends, surpassed only by airplanes and boats. They feature a high degree of maneuverability combined with unlimited visibility, he pointed out.

However, he adds, "They are as safe as the guy that drives."

Insurance rates point up the safety of the motorbikes, Feinberg asserts. The current rates range from $38 to $60, depending on the weight. Comparable car liability insurance, he added, would be more than $300.

The driver of a motorbike doesn't ride the two-wheeler, Feinberg continued, "he drives it," always leaning his body and sometimes putting out a foot to help negotiate a turn easier.

Some degree of safety is indicated in the way sales have accelerated since last year, an increase of 30 per cent, Feinberg said. Honda has more than doubled the number of its facilities in the state, he noted, since 1964, when there were eight showrooms and sales outlets. At least one store will open before the end of the year to add to the present 17.

But the claims on the insurance rate is scoffed at by a state legislator who sells insurance.

State Rept. Earl Endrich of Old Saybrook notes that rates for liability insurance are indeed low but points out that collision insurance to cover the motorcycle and the rear passenger is more difficult to obtain. He does not know of any insurance firm writing insurance of this type.

CITY ACCIDENTS LEAD

Statistics provided by the Motor Vehicle Department show the largest number of accidents involving motorcycles occur in urban areas of the state. Hartford leads the list this year with 80 accidents listed to date. Bridgeport has recorded 49.

Poor visibility is a major factor for the high accident rate in the city, police believe, although higher speeds are possible in more rural areas.

While the total number of fatal accidents in the state is less than half of last year's figure, police point out that the late, cool spring this year cut down on motorcycling activity.

The first fatal accident this year occurred April 23 in Waterbury.

Crash helmets, Mulcahy said, would help only "on occasion" in an accident involving a motorcyclist. While regulations can be enacted without special legislation on equipment specifications, the helmet worn by a cyclist is not regarded as motorcycle equipment.

A law passed by the General Assembly in 1964 bans handlebars more than 15 inches above the seat "when depressed by the weight of the operator." No explanation is offered as to why the seat has to be depressed.

Restrictions on "ganging up" along the highways "is a must, with a requirement calling for a 20-foot separation between drivers," the State Police commissioner said. Motorcycle drivers should also be required to stay on the extreme right hand side of the roadway, he concluded.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 15, 1966]

ROAD SAFETY FORCES TURN THEIR ATTENTION TO ALL THOSE CYCLES—BUT MOTORCYCLE MAKERS SEEK TO AID SAFETY ON THEIR OWN; SENATOR HARTKE CITES "EPIDEMIC"

(By Tim Metz)

Compared with the motorcycle, the automobile is as safe as a hobby horse.

That's what that growing band of vociferous road-safety advocates claims, and they propose to do something about it. But major makers of the motorcycles—aware of the hole auto makers put themselves into by seemingly ignoring initial safety outcries—hope to fend off the attack by doing something about safety themselves.

"You betcha we're worried about safety," says James E. Jingu, director of advertising and public relations for Yamaha International Corp. "If there's anything that could slow this great motorcycle boom, it would be legislation that might weaken the industry's sales." As a result, he says, Yamaha, a major seller of the cycles in the U.S., has started working on several safety innovations and plans a nationwide safety-education campaign for motorcyclists.

"We don't want to get caught flat-footed by any Governmental action," declares Matt I. Matsuoka, public relations director of American Honda Motor Corp., which has an estimated 65% of the U.S. motorcycle market. The company is readying a motorcycle safety program for high schools, and is preparing to set up the "first motorcycle accident research program ever undertaken in this country." The program, to be set up in conjunction with an arm of the University of California at Los Angeles, would be aimed at making the cycles safer. Says Mr. Matsuoka: "Our concern with safety has to increase as the number of cycles does."

IS IT TOO LATE?

But it may be too late. Only yesterday Sen. VANCE HARTKE, the Indiana Democrat, gave a Senate speech calling attention to the "epidemic of motorcycle mishaps." He recommended a seven-point program to reduce accidents, including Federal motorcycle-design standards.

There's no question that safety is a problem. A National Safety Council study of motorcycles, completed but not yet issued, will show that 1,580 cyclists were killed last year, up from 1,118 in 1964 and 882 in 1963. Deaths have increased faster than the number of cycles recently, say officials of several states.

The council also found that in many states motorcycle deaths "range between 20 and 40" per 100 million miles of travel, compared with a 5.6 death rate for automobiles. Says Dr. Paul W. Gikas, associate professor of pathology at the University of Michigan who has made a study of traffic accidents: "As things are now I believe the motorcycle safety situation is just about hopeless."

The motorcycle death rate has been high for many years, but the actual number of deaths has never been as startling as at present because only recently have motorcycles become really popular. Sales of the machines last year nearly doubled to 650,000 from 350,000 in 1964 and this year's total could exceed 700,000. The industry had been counting on volume of 800,000, but increased draft calls have cut into the list of potential buyers. The cycles now are used by commuters in some cities and by a growing number of high school and college students. It is estimated there are about 2 million motorcycles in use in the U.S.

FEELING THE PRESSURE

It isn't known just exactly what standards, if any, the governments finally will enact. "We've felt a pressure from governments with regard to noise, the wearing of protective headgear, licensing and other safety items. How much farther these will go we just don't know," says William H. Davidson, president of Harley-Davidson Motorcycle Co., the biggest U.S. maker. (Honda and Yamaha are Japanese companies.)

Some states are considering making the wearing of safety helmets mandatory ("Don't call them crash helmets," pleads one motorcycle dealer), and this already has shown up in the sales of the gear. American Safety Equipment Corp. says it sold almost as many helmets in the first half of this year as it sold in all 1965.

But making all cyclists wear them is controversial. "The motorcyclist uses his ears and his peripheral vision to a far greater extent than a car driver and some helmets would impede this," says an official of the American Motorcycle Association. Adds Thomas Johnson, vice president of American Safety Equipment: "There's the problem of defining a safety helmet. Hundreds of companies make them and a lot of cheap ones are virtually useless." (His company's model cost $20.)

Nevertheless, there is some feeling that legislation eventually will come. Dot Robinson, co-owner of a Detroit Harley-Davidson dealership, says: "With the terrific influx of new cyclists, it's impossible to adequately educate them about safety. So I guess the law will have to step in."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 17, 1966]

TRAFFIC SAFETY II—MOTORCYCLES POSE A GREATER THREAT THAN AUTOS IN TERMS OF ACCIDENTS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

While charges and countercharges regarding the mechanical safety features of automobiles have made headlines in recent months, even more lethal highway vehicles have emerged in recent years—motorcycles and scooters.

According to the National Safety Council, there were 13 deaths for each 10,000 registered motorcycles in 1962, compared to 5.1 deaths for each 10,000 registered passenger cars, trucks, buses and taxis.

The Commerce Department reports that there was 984,800 motorcycles registered in 1964, as compared to 786,300 in 1963. Because sales exceed 300,000 a year the number of such vehicles on the highways of America is probably now approaching 1.5 million.

A study recently reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association showed that motorcycle accidents frequently resulted in particularly severe head and extremity injuries. As could be expected, the study also showed that teen-agers were the most frequently involved.

THREE DEATHS IN 38

In the 38 cases analyzed, there were three deaths and one case of total blindness, one of paraplegia and one of facial disfigurement. The last case involved a girl who was given a small motorcycle as a present on her 17th birthday and was injured the following day.

The study also disclosed that in most cases the parents had been opposed to letting their children have such vehicles, but reluctantly agreed after considerable pressure. When their children were involved in these severe accidents, the parents naturally experienced a great deal of guilt.

The most frequent causes of injuries are hitting an automobile or loss of control of a vehicle and overturning. Falling off the vehicle, however, is not unusual, and two of the 38 cases resulted from hitting or swerving to miss a dog.

The findings in this study, which was conducted in Maine, confirmed an earlier study of 200 such victims in Minneapolis in 1964. In the Minneapolis group there were two deaths resulting from skull fracture with brain damage and a high percentage of single and multiple fractures of the tibia, femur and pelvis.

PROTECTION IS LIMITED

Researchers emphasize that although the use of helmets may reduce fatalities from skull fracture, there is no protection available for the extremities of drivers and passengers.

Studies in Britain have shown that protective helmets can reduce the risk of head injuries by about one-third. There are many states and communities, however, that do not make the use of such helmets compulsory.

The nature of motorcycle accidents is quite different from automobile accidents. In motorcycle accidents, head injuries tend to be much more severe because the head receives the full force of the impact when the cycle is in a collision and the cyclist is catapulted over the handlebars. Compounding and contamination of fractures are also more common.

Dr. Robert C. Waltz, chairman of the trauma committee of the Cleveland Academy of Medicine, has commented:

"We have seen few minor motorbike injuries. There is often horrible trauma involved, but the youngsters are in good physical condition and they usually remain alive."

Our experience in the United States in the increasing fatalities from motorcycles and motorscooters parallels that of Britain, where such vehicles have been in widespread use since World War II.

In 1951 there were 1,175 Britons killed and more than 30,000 injured in accidents involving two wheel vehicles. There were 1,743 persons killed and more than 97,000 injured in 1960.

The survey showed that in Britain a boy between the ages of 16 and 19 who owns a motorcycle has an 8 per cent probability of being killed or severely injured.

One effective means of reducing motorcycle and motorscooter accidents is through more effective licensing laws. Since last Oct. 1, New York State has required new drivers who wish to operate such vehicles to take special tests. Tests include road maneuvers such as "figure eights."

The state of Pennsylvania requires that all motorcycles and motorscooters pass a semiannual inspection. This includes the steering apparatus, tires, wheels, rims, exhaust and fuel systems, brakes, lighting and electrical systems.

Some researchers concerned with these problems have suggested that "buddy seats" should be prohibited and that these vehicles be limited to the driver.

TRAFFIC IS HAZARD

The drivers of cycles are particularly at a great disadvantage in heavy traffic. Even though his machine is more maneuverable than the automobile, it is also very unstable at a slow rate.

Shifting gears is a complex process on some scooters, requiring the use of both hands and one foot and excellent coordination. Slowing down and turning usually requires both hands and both feet, making it impossible to execute a hand signal.

Currently the Cleveland Health Museum, a pioneer in health education, is presenting an educational exhibit on motorcycle and motorscooter safety. The exhibit shows safety devices and the figure of a rider wearing proper protective clothing. It also includes a sound film on safety driving techniques.

The exhibit will tour high schools and colleges for several years. It emphasizes that in the slogan, "You May Meet the Nicest People on a Motorbike," the nicest people are quite likely to be surgeons, nurses, ambulance attendants, policemen, the makers of artificial limbs and sometimes undertakers.

Dr. James C. Drye, professor of surgery at the University of Louisville School of Medicine, calls the motorbike "the most lethal weapon on our highways and streets." He has also said:

"If you get a boy a motorcycle for his birthday, it may be his last birthday."

DANGERS OF COURT CURBS ON POLICE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a timely and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Ohio Judge Cites Dangers of Court Curbs on Police," which appeared in the July 16 edition of the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OHIO JUDGE CITES DANGERS OF COURT CURBS ON POLICE

The public is indebted to Cleveland Juvenile Court Judge Angelo J. Gagliardo for his forthright and courageous statement calling attention to the shocking consequences of a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The statement referred to the 5–4 split decision read by Chief Justice Earl Warren on June 13 holding that the constitutional prohibition against forcing a defendant to testify against himself applies to police questioning of a prisoner as well as to the conduct of a trial.

The ruling declared that before questioning begins police must warn a prisoner that he may remain silent, that anything he says may be used against him in a trial and that he has a right to the presence of an attorney during the interrogation.

If the prisoner desires counsel and is without funds for the fee, the questioning must wait until a court-appointed attorney is present. If at any time the prisoner declares he does not want to be questioned further, it must stop.

The increasingly dangerous national conditions into which the five majority members of the Supreme Court tossed this unprecedented gift to criminals has been made clear by daily news headlines telling of spreading crimes of violence.

The situation was emphasized in a New York address the other day by U.S. Associate Justice Tom C. Clark, who dissented from the majority opinion.

"The law today," he declared, "faces perilous times. Never before was it afforded less respect and expected to perform more miracles."

But it remained for Judge Gagliardo to point up the serious consequences of the specific application of the decision. An East Side juvenile already on probation for five violations had been brought into court on a murder charge.

He had made a statement admitting the fatal shooting on May 29 of Ronnie E. Abbott, 20. Presumably the police questioning had taken place before the Supreme Court's June 13 decision, for the prisoner had not been informed of all his so-called constitutional rights.

Consequently on the basis of the Supreme Court's subsequent ruling, Judge Gagliardo had to bar the confession, "with great regret."

The murder charge collapsed.

"There is no question in my mind," the judge declared, "that this is anything but a willful, deliberate act of homicide, murder in the first degree, committed by this minor without any justification."

Realizing the injustice of the decision he had to make and the consequences of possibly scores of decisions releasing dangerous criminals to prey upon society, the juvenile judge said further:

"Somewhere, someday, some illustrious members of the Supreme Court will engage themselves in the practical problems of life in a modern urban society and deal with realities, rather than theories that place individual rights above the rights of the community.

"I trust the day is not far off when the Supreme Court in its ivory tower can look upon the tremendous damage and the impossible task it has placed upon law enforcement agencies in bringing to the bar of justice perpetrators of crime."

In its concern for the rights of vandals, murderers, robbers and rapists, the court seems to have overlooked the major purposes of the Constitution as set forth in the preamble:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

As the Cleveland case clearly demonstrated, the decision read by Chief Justice Warren will thwart the administration of justice and will encourage domestic violence rather than tranquillity.

Certainly it will not promote the general welfare of the nation.

Alarming as the decision is in opening the way for the release of habitual criminals, it is even more dangerous in its tendency to breed contempt for law enforcement officers and to promote defiance of authority.

Those responsible for this culmination of a series of restrictions upon police should take a good clear look at conditions in Chicago.

While the police department there was trying to solve the murder of eight nurses, one of the most revolting crimes of the century, it had to divert hundreds of officers to deal with the wanton violence and vandalism of rampaging mobs.

The only apparent solution to the alarming national situation lies in a public revolt against placing the rights of criminals before the right of law-abiding citizens to protection from them.

People alarmed by the growing rate of crime should lose no time in letting Congress know that it should submit a constitutional amendment setting forth in specific terms just what the rights of the police are in questioning prisoners.

There should be no brutality or undue coercion, of course, but neither should there be any modern-day liberality to prisoners that handcuffs police and courts in dealing with them.

Every community and state should join in a national organization to see that Congress responds promptly to correct the dangerous situation created by the bare majority of the Supreme Court.

THE STERLING CRISIS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Britain's troubles are our troubles. Americans came to realize this during that desperate period between the collapse of the pound sterling in 1931 and the Battle of Britain in 1940. Today, Britain's back is once more against the wall. Our first enemy and our closest friend is today faced with the cruel dilemma: deflate the economy to the point of economic distress—or devalue the pound.

Neither method of dealing with Britain's economic problems offers anything but trouble for the United States. An underemployed British economy raises the threat of export dumping to keep surplus men and machines busy and poses the certainty of a reduction in Britain's purchases of American exports. A devalued pound—with the rest of Europe following the move—will tear the fabric of our entire international monetary system at the same time as it confronts the United States with the undervalued currencies and exports of our major competitors.

The immediacy of the dilemma which faces Prime Minister Wilson's government is made clear by an article in the Washington Post of July 13, by Karl Meyer. Writing from London, Mr. Meyer reports:

> Pessimistic speculation heightened today that Britain would be forced to resort to more severe deflationary measures or to face realistically the prospect of devaluing sterling.

The financial background for this depressing prognosis is laid out clearly in an article by Clyde Farnsworth in the New York Times for July 13. "Sterling," Mr. Farnsworth writes from London, "under heavy pressure, sank today to its lowest level since November 1964."

The facts are becoming clear. Having survived two crises—in November 1964 and August 1965—Britain is once more fighting a battle for economic survival. Quietly, almost unnoticed in America, obscured by more dramatic—and for Americans more immediate—events in Asia and at home, the free world's economy is reaching a crossroads. In 1931, the fate of the world economy was sealed by Britain's devaluation of the pound. The question and the crisis is with us once again: will Britain's defeat in a battle of finance signal the shattering of our prosperity and the free world's prosperity?

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Washington Post of July 13, "Britain in Red, Faces Further Curbs," by Karl Meyer, and the article in the New York Times of July 13, "Pound Rate Sinks to 20-Month Low," by Clyde Farnsworth, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1966]

BRITAIN IN RED, FACES FURTHER CURBS

(By Karl E. Meyer)

(Washington Post Foreign Service)

LONDON, July 12.—Pessimistic speculation heightened today that Britain would be forced to resort to more severe deflationary measures or to face realistically the prospect of devaluing sterling.

The Government is braced for a fresh flurry of bad headlines on Wednesday, when the monthly trade figures for June are due to be released. The figures are certain to show that Britain is deeper in the red, even though much of the bad news can be attributed to the distortion of a 6½-week seamen's strike.

In Parliament today, Chancellor of the Exchequer James Callaghan said the strike, combined with rising prices for such commodities as copper, had the effect of putting the balance back.

But he said that Britain would move out of deficit during the course of next year, confirming that the Labor Government had abandoned hope of bringing trade accounts into balance by the end of this year.

DEFLATIONARY STEPS

The feeling in business circles is that the Chancellor will probably be impelled to take further deflationary steps soon, if only to counter speculative attacks on sterling during an uncertain and troubled few months.

One orthodox deflationary step would be to increase in the bank rate, and the well-informed Financial Times reported this morning that the odds in favor of such an increase are mounting daily.

As it is, the Chancellor told Parliament today that he was extending until the end of next year, and possibly longer, existing credit restrictions on bank loans.

The Government is counting on an additional deflationary squeeze this autumn when the new Selective Employment Tax begins to take money out of the economy. But this gain will be offset in November by the removal of the 10 per cent surcharge on industrial goods imported from Britain's partners in the European Free Trade Association.

SURCHARGE TO GO

Britain has told her EFTA partners that she will not reinstate the unpopular surcharge. If the import bill continues to rise while exports continue to lag, the country will be impelled to take more drastic countermeasures.

One possibility would be import controls, but the argument against them is that they are difficult to administer and take time to put into legislative effect. Another possibility is devaluation of sterling.

Inquiries suggest that a majority of British economists favor devaluation. If the pound were devalued by 15 per cent, the immediate effect would be to send a rush of foreign exchange into the British market.

The argument against devaluation are both economic and political. It is contended that other countries would promptly follow suit, wiping out Britain's temporary advantage.

OBJECTIONS POLITICAL

The most frequently heard objection is political—that Prime Minister Harold Wilson is committed to defend sterling, and that he is determined to prove that Labor can manage the currency. A Labor Prime Minister was in office on the two previous occasions—in 1931 and 1949—that sterling was devalued.

Moreover, there are strong American objections to devaluation on the grounds that the first result would be to bring intense pressure on the dollar.

But the step cannot be wholly ruled out. If it happened, it would be announced without warning on a Saturday, which is how it happened twice before.

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1966]

POUND RATE SINKS TO 20-MONTH LOW: PRICE OF GOLD EDGES UP AND STOCK MARKET IS SHAKY—SILVER DEMAND CLIMBS—CALLAGHAN QUESTIONED—CHANCELLOR TELLS COMMONS LENDING CURB WILL STAY—TAX AID IS DOUBTED

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

LONDON, July 12.—Sterling, under heavy pressure, sank today to its lowest level since November, 1964. The price of gold edged higher. Silver was in great demand. The stock and Government bond markets continued shaky.

This was the background as Chancellor of the Exchequer James Callaghan walked into the House of Commons. The questions came from all sides of the House.

He parried them, then made two pronouncements, both of which affect the future more than the current period of trial for the pound:

The squeeze on bank lending is to continue "until the end of March, 1967, and until further notice thereafter." Banks have been ordered to restrict lending to no more than 5 percent above the levels of March, 1965. There had been no question the order would be rescinded in the near future.

There will be no temporary easing of the squeeze to help companies meet new deflationary tax payments beginning in September An employment tax will extract £300-million ($840-million) from the economy between September and the end of the financial year next April.

Mr. Callaghan had hinted in his last budget that he might help the companies over their liquidity pinch. Now he says there will be no help.

RATE CHANGE POSSIBLE

The Chancellor is reluctant to do more just now, but the state of the financial markets may well cause him to change his mind. A few days ago his officials were saying the situation was not serious enough to warrant any action.

There is the strong feeling he may have to order an increase in the bank rate from the present 6 per cent to 7 per cent this week to halt the exodus of short-term funds seeking better yielding investments abroad.

There is pressure on him also to act immediately to curb domestic consumption, which despite successive disinflationary budgets is still rising. Stiffer installment credit controls and higher taxes for consumer goods are being suggested as possible measures.

A high rate of consumption means high imports, which Britain cannot afford if she wants to balance her external accounts. She imports far more than she exports.

There was what was described as "considerable pressure" on the pound today in the foreign exchange market. The Bank of England intervened in the forward market offering dollars for delivery in three months, six months and a year.

These transactions had the effect of steadying the rate for both spot and forward sterling. The spot rate slipped 1/32 cent to $2.78656—a new 20-month low.

The Bank of England prefers forward market intervention because there is no immediate call on currency reserves. There is always the hope that dollars can be creamed off the exchange market before the forward obligations fall due.

The price of gold continued creeping toward its recent high, set last February reflecting over-all monetary uncertainties.

At today's "fixing," London bullion dealers set a working rate at $35.17 a fine ounce, up ¼ cent over yesterday.

There is as yet no sign of Soviet gold sales to finance recent wheat purchases from Canada. The possibility that such sales may be in the offing has kept the market quiet in recent weeks.

The sterling price for gold rose to 252 shillings and a pence ($35.34) today, a high since January 1961, reflecting the eroding sterling exchange rate.

The sterling price of silver also moved up reflecting both the weak exchange rate and speculative demand. Silver, unlike gold, can be bought in Britain as a hedge against currency devaluation.

The stock market continued to react to fears the government would take new measures to curb excessive demand. The financial Times index for common stocks fell 2.5 points to 354.2, its lowest point since May 2.

Government bonds weakened this morning, but the selling dried up in the afternoon about the time the Chancellor was speaking in the House of Commons.

LAKE POWELL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Lake Powell is a beautiful blue-green lake extending more than 180 miles upstream from Glen Canyon Dam in the gorge of the Colorado River and the San Juan River. Many have tried to describe the beauties of this lake with its contrasting colors from the great, massive red sandstone cliffs that rise from the shoreline and the wondrous side canyons which may be entered now by boat. The lake is also the pathway to Rainbow Bridge, the world's greatest natural arch. Without exaggeration it can be said that Lake Powell is the most spectacular lake in all the world.

In the Washington Post of July 17, Merlo J. Pusey has written an article entitled "Artificial Lake Proves Man Can Enhance Nature." I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in full in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to read it through. Especially do I urge reading by those people who say that building a dam on the Colorado River in some manner destroys or degrades scenic beauty. Mr. Pusey points out that the scenery has been enhanced and has been made available to all. In years gone by, I went down the river before the dam was built and camped on the sandbars, and I saw the beauties of the canyon then. But I went on a muddy river; it took me several days. I had to possess a degree of physical stamina and be prepared to camp out and to hike considerable distances to places like Rainbow Bridge. Now I can go on the surface of a great, clear lake and sail up the canyon in which Rainbow Bridge stands, disembark from my boat, and walk less than a mile to the base of this great sandstone arch. Not only I, but my friends, those who have physical impediments even to the exent that some are on crutches, can make the trip. So the dam and lake have made available to all the people of the United States a thing of beauty that belongs to them. No longer is it reserved to the rich and the hardy and those with time on their hands, who could make the arduous journey into the great scenic arch. The beauties of the great canyon gorge have been improved and enhanced by the filling of the lake. Those who wring their hands and claim destruction because of the building of reservoirs on the Colorado, simply have not been to see.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTIFICIAL LAKE PROVES MAN CAN ENHANCE NATURE

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

WAHWEAP, ARIZ.—Can man ever add anything to the beauty of nature? Most conservationists reply with an emphatic "no." Even the rank and file of outdoorsmen doubtless agree in principle that rivers, lakes, mountains, forests and wildlife should be left in their natural state. But in the minds of increasing thousands, Lake Powell is posing a formidable challenge to that sweeping generalization.

Lake Powell is the reservoir created by the Glen Canyon Dam in the Colorado River. It is probably the most beautiful artificial lake in the world. Extending 175 miles upstream from Glen Canyon, it has created a new aquatic paradise in one of the most arid parts of the country.

People not familiar with the Four Corners region, where Colorado, Utah, Arizona and New Mexico meet, can have little concept of its desolation. Bare clay hills and parched prairies extend for hundreds of miles. The recent addition of more than 72,000 acres of clear blue water to this blistered expanse is like creating a bit of heaven in the nether region.

REMINISCENT OF NORWAY

When the reservoir is full, its waters will cover more than 169,000 acres and the volume (now about 9.5 million acre-feet) will be tripled. It has both the size and the setting for a major recreational area, for Lake Powell has produced a new dimension in scenic beauty for the American West.

Fjords of idyllic loveliness have suddenly come into being where only dry and inaccessible chasms existed before. Although the setting is very different, many of these fjords are as spectacular as those of Norway.

It is doubtful, however, whether this particular combination of blue or deep green water, fantastic red cliffs and blue sky can be duplicated anywhere. The mountains—some weird, some beautiful—often appear to be a painted streak between infinite depths of blue, above and below.

The public response to this attraction speaks for itself. More than 300,000 visitors saw Lake Powell last year at a time when it was little known outside the area. At least half a million are expected in 1966. Despite the long trailer haul over desert country, about 11,000 boats were in the lake near the Wahweap marina on Memorial Day.

PHILSOSOPHY SECONDARY

Like canyonlands to the north, the country that has thus been transformed was extremely rough. For centuries it had repelled human invasion. But water in some measure subdued it, turning scorching and impassable canyons into cool coves where a person may fish or swim or sit and drink in the beauty around him.

The people who are flocking to Lake Powell, with its 1900 miles of shoreline, are little concerned over whether man can really add to the beauty of nature. Even the National Park Service, which administers the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and which is extremely sensitive to any encroachment of artificiality, has put the philosophical question aside. The officials with whom I talked are delighted that the lake is here.

Of course, the Bureau of Reclamation, which built the Glen Canyon Dam, is deeply concerned with questions of water storage and the generation of electric power, but these aspects of the project are not overly conspicuous. The 710-foot dam obstructs a very narrow canyon at a point that has little natural attraction. Indeed, leaving the Wahweap marina on the first western arm of the lake, one need not even see the dam as his boat swings into the main channel of the tamed Colorado.

A FABULOUS FJORD

For some distance, the deep water is confined between relatively low walls of stone, then the lake widens with an excellent view of Gunsight Butte on the left and Tower Butte and the cliffs of Labyrinth Canyon on the right. Numerous arms of the lake extend in both directions with plenty of open water worth exploring.

Then comes a series of narrower deep-water canyons: Dungeon Canyon (about 45 miles by water from Wahweap), Cathedral Canyon, Driftwood Canyon, Twilight Canyon, Hidden Passage and many others. We concentrated on Cathedral Canyon, a fabulous fjord.

At first the canyon winds among immense sandstone boulders. Then it narrows until the lake becomes more like a quiet-flowing river between gigantic blocks of stone rising vertically from the water or in some places leaning out over it. As the boat glides from the deep shade of sheer walls hundreds of feet high into patches of sunlight and then into shade again, there is an everchanging series of superb views.

In the next canyon on the right, the Park Service has installed a "floating facility." This service station on the water is not only a marina with gasoline and supplies for visitors' boats; it also has a store and boat houses for the maintenance personnel who live in a fantastic stone-walled world.

A 278-FOOT BRIDGE

Just beyond the "floating facility" is the well-maintained trail to Rainbow Natural Bridge, which spans a ravine 309 feet above the streambed and has a span of 278 feet. It is the largest known natural bridge and would straddle the Capitol in Washington.

Although it has been the central attraction of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument since 1910, relatively few people have seen its delicate pink sandstone against the sky because it could be reached only by means of a wretched road and extended hiking. Now, with a good boat, the 58-mile trip from Wahweap to Rainbow can be made in a day.

Some visitors are inclined to think that after taking this trip and darting into one or two side canyons, they have seen Lake Powell. Actually they have seen only a small part of the area into which the lake reaches.

The San Juan Canyon arm of Lake Powell runs all the way to the Utah state park at the Goosenecks. On the west side of the Colorado in the same area are Reflection Canyon, Hidden Passages and Hole in the Rock, a seemingly impossible crossing of the Colorado used by the Mormons in 1879–80.

The Escalante River is now lake for a considerable distance before it joins the Colorado. On the main stem of the Colorado is the Waterpocket Fold, a doubling of the earth's crust of much interest to geologists.

INDIAN RUINS ACCESSIBLE

Lake Powell has also given easier access to some ruins of the ancient Indian cultures of this area while at the same time inundating some others. The Basketmakers inhabited much of this wild country in the early centuries of the Christian era, and they were followed by the cliff-dwelling Pueblos. These people left the region, probably because of drought, about 800 years ago, but remnants of their tools, pottery, weapons and baskets remain, along with ruins of their dwellings. The Navajo Canyon arm of Lake Powell leads to the Betatakin and Keet Seel ruins, which are some of the best specimens in the Southwest.

The biggest problem at Lake Powell now is accommodating the hordes of visitors. The National Park Service plans eight major centers to facilitate boating, exploring, fishing, camping and swimming. At most of these there will be information and ranger stations, camp grounds, picnic areas and boat-launching ramps.

The Glen Canyon Recreation Area, including the lake, is now administered by the National Park Service under agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation. However, the Johnson Administration has approved a bill by Sen. FRANK E. MOSS (D-Utah) to give statutory backing to the area.

With the establishment of this immense playground, all of the scenic parts of the

Colorado River system from Moab, Utah, to the California border, except Marble Canyon, would be brought under Federal control for recreation purposes. This series of parks includes in addition to Canyonlands National Park and Lake Powell, the Grand Canyon National Park, the Grand Canyon National Monument and the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. A strong argument can be made for adding Marble Canyon.

A PRETTIER LAKE

Lake Powell might well become the most used portion of this vast recreation system when its facilities are developed as fully as those of Lake Mead. Powell's scenery is greatly superior.

No doubt there will be some loss of beauty when the lake becomes subject to drawdown to meet water demands downstream. Drawdown will be less evident than in the case of most reservoirs, however, because of the many precipitous stone walls enclosing Lake Powell.

In the case of Lake Powell, therefore, it does appear that man has added an element of beauty as well as usefulness to this segment of the Colorado River, but no loose generalizations would be warranted from this result. Flooding of the Grand Canyon, for example, would be a totally different proposition.

THE PRESENT AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, we are now in the 11th day of the strike that has crippled the major airlines of the country, a strike that began on July 8. Although the parties—union and management—have been negotiating since August 1965 on the terms for a new contract, no agreement has yet been reached; the existing agreements expired on December 31, 1965.

Earlier this year, when negotiations failed, the parties applied to the National Mediation Board. When mediation proved to be unsuccessful, the Mediation Board offered the parties arbitration, but this process was not put into use. On April 21, the President appointed an Emergency Board to determine the facts and to recommend a settlement. These recommendations have been accepted by the carriers but rejected by the union.

Mr. President, I have received telegrams from the business, industrial, and hotel interests of my State pointing out the economic hardship to all businesses, large and small, that are dependent in some way on air transportation. This is particularly true for the metropolitan cities of Louisville and Lexington, Ky.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several of these telegrams be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this is one of several strikes in the past year that has affected the Nation's entire transportation system. I believe it is time that the emergency dispute section of the Taft-Hartley Act should be overhauled, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the other day on the floor.

Where a dispute exists between a regulated industry and its employees and a national emergency is created, then certainly Congress has an obligation to establish, by legislation, some procedure for safeguarding the public interest. I am hopeful that the Senate Labor Subcommittee can begin hearings soon on bills now pending before the subcommittee.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has introduced a bill which would authorize a U.S. District Court to appoint receivers to manage such transportation facilities in a national emergency, pending a settlement of the issues. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has introduced a bill which would authorize the President to appoint—when all else fails—a five-member Board, three from the public, one from the union, and one from management, and which provides for compulsory arbitration.

We cannot continue to limp along from crisis to crisis in the field of national transportation, when so many industries are affected and the livelihood of so many individuals beyond the parties to the dispute are involved.

EXHIBIT 1

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senator from Kentucky,
Washington D.C.:

Louisville has been greatly hampered by lack of adequate air line service since the labor dispute July 8. The economics of this city greatly depend on commercial air service. Eastern Airlines which is now on strike is the principal air carrier serving this city and I would consider it a personal favor if you would do everything within your power to see that the air lines resume their regularly scheduled flights while negotiations between management and labor are going on. If I may be of any assistance whatsoever I will be more than pleased to do anything within my power to assist cordially.

KENNETH A. SCHMIED,
Mayor, City of Louisville.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
July 12, 1966.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Economic effects of airline strike—disruption of business; loss of wages and income, and tourist and convention dollars; and personal inconvenience—becoming more severe here. We urge you to take all steps possible to effect a just and rapid settlement. Your help is needed and appreciated.

THOMAS A. BALLANTINE,
Chairman, Aviation Committee, Louisville, Chamber of Commerce.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

The strike against five domestic airlines is seriously affecting business and the public. Companies and their employees serving the carriers are at a disadvantage for planning purposes. Unfortunately it is necessary that we look to you for counsel in seeing that this strike is brought to a fair and equitable conclusion. I would appreciate your help so that we may advise our employees, whose duties are affected because of the strike relative to their continued employment status.

STANDARD OIL CO.,
KENTUCKY,
W. C. SMITH.

LEXINGTON, KY.,
July 11, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope that you are urging all appropriate Federal agencies to do whatever is necessary to bring about an immediate end to the airline strike. Cannot the President involve the Taft-Hartley Act. A group of willful selfish union officials should not be able to paralyze the life of this Nation.

DR. WESLEY YOUNG,
Department of Community Denistry College of Dentistry, University of Kentucky.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your help if at all possible in resolving the airline dispute which is adversely affecting business in Kentucky.

LESTER M. NICHOLS,
Executive Secretary Kentucky Hotel and Motel Association.

LOUISVILLE, KY.
July 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Airlines strike imposing increasing difficulties in transaction of essential business of Brown and Williamson. Our dependence on commerical air travel makes settlement of strike of great concern. Hopeful your personel influence will be exerted in calling for early resumption of service.

Regards,

EDWIN P. FINCH,
President.

JEFFERSONVILLE, IND.,
July 15, 1966.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.:

The strike of the five major domestic air lines have caused much suffering to many thousands of small businessmen such as myself all over the country. My office is faced with substantial losses because of the effects of this strike and we are faced with the possibility of laying off employees. As a small businessman I ask that you use all your available power to help bring this strike to a conclusion.

J. T. WATSON,
Fort Knox Travel Agency.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
July 15, 1966.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

While the citizens of Louisville are being inconvenienced by the strike, businesses like ours are losing considerable income because of it. Any assistance you might give toward getting the airplanes back in the air will be greatly appreciated by us.

Yours very truly,

LOUISVILLE TAXI CO. &
TRANSFER CO.,
J. A. GAMMON, *President.*

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
July 15, 1966.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The airline strike is causing a great hardship upon the business and commercial interest of the Commonwealth. We will be most grateful for your efforts in helping to bring this serious dilemma to a conclusion.

JOHN M. LEWIS,
Kentucky Chamber of Commerce.

TOURISM IN SOUTHERN INDIANA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, southern Indiana has a tremendous amount to offer the tourist—abundant natural beauty, numerous areas of historical interest, and ever-increasing facilities for summer recreation. We in Indiana celebrate our sesquicentennial this year—150th year of statehood—and southern Indiana's residents invite the Nation's vacationers to come help us celebrate.

Southern Indiana is a land of rolling, wooded hills, covered bridges, and countless traces of a rich pioneer past. It was in southern Indiana, in towns like Vincennes and Corydon, that events of high significance to America's and Indiana's early history took place. Vincennes played many roles—territorial capital, civilization's last outpost in the early Northwest Territory—in the days before 1816, when Indiana won statehood. Corydon was the new State's first capital city. Today, tourists can travel the Lincoln Heritage Trail, a highway tracing the route taken by the Lincoln family from Kentucky through Indiana to Illinois. They can see the remnants of the Whitewater and the Wabash and Erie Canals, 19th century Indiana's most efficient forms of transportation. They can visit the old pioneer inns, homes, and courthouses, and the many museums testifying to the area's rich past.

Southern Indiana offers us more than a glimpse into a pioneer past, however; 15 of Indiana's 22 State parks are located in southern Indiana, and 11 of the State's 13 State forests. The southern Indiana area offers the tourist two national parks—one, the site of Lincoln's boyhood home; the other, created a national park by the Congress only a few days ago, the George Rogers Clark Memorial, at Vincennes.

An economic renaissance is predicted for the area's near future, with a reinvigorated limestone industry bringing the promise of greater prosperity to this land so full of history and natural beauty.

I commend Gov. Roger D. Branigin and Lt. Gov. Robert Rock, for their interest and assistance in the promotion of tourism in Indiana, and in the organizing of a Sesquicentennial celebration of which we can all be proud.

In view of our sesquicentennial year and the relatively limited knowledge by the general public of southern Indiana's many resources for summer enjoyment, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article describing southern Indiana's attractions written by Charles Yarbrough, an Indiana native and travel editor of the Washington Star, which appeared in the July 10 issue of the Sunday Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOSIER SESQUICENTENNIAL: INDIANA MAKING BID AS NEW FRONTIER OF TOURISM

(By Charles Yarbrough)

WASHINGTON, IND.—To a returning native, this pristine, 101-year-old city of 12,000 has a bountiful land around it, a militant civic pride and the rare distinction of claiming nothing to dangle before tourists except room and board.

This year, as the county seat of Daviess county, it joins in Indiana's statehood Sesquicentennial, lackadaisically proud of its long, but uneventful history; too modest to lay claim even as a "gateway" to the land of young Abraham Lincoln to the south; the rich history of Vincennes to the west.

"Frankly," says Brooks Allen, energetic chairman of the local Sesqui observance, "Daviess county just doesn't have anything to interest the tourist." He might have added—"except hospitality."

LINCOLNS WENT BY

Those early travelers, the Lincolns, in moving from the scenes of Abraham's childhood to Illinois, by-passed the area by 12 miles.

George Rodgers Clark's heroic conquest of the British at Vincennes, had no reason to push on another 18 miles to the east; they had all the wilderness they wanted.

But close by the eastern border of the State, near present day Aurora, 100 soldiers enroute to aid Clark at Vincennes were slaughtered by Indians. There is a marker commemorating Lochry's massacre.

The savages pounced on a small group of pioneers in the southeastern section and there's a 44-foot-high monument over their mass graves at today's Pigeon Roost State Memorial near Scottsburg.

AN EARLY ONE

It seems everyone was by-passing Washington in those days, with the possible exception of a hardy pioneer named William Ballow, who settled in the southeastern part of Daviess county in 1801.

History doesn't record whether he may have been one of three settlers picked off by the Indians, but three was too many and by the 1820s there were 10 forts ranging up and down the county.

In a way, Brooks Allen is right about the lack of tourist lures in Washington and Daviess county. The passing traveler, whizzing through town on U.S. 50 east or west; Highway 57 north or south or riding the Baltimore & Ohio's mainline to St. Louis or Cincinnati, is apt to dismiss it with fleeting compliment "my, what a well-kept town."

What's here is largely for the local trade. It's doubtful that anyone save the real and constant observer could scrape up anything distinguishing.

SOME DISTINCTION

The fact that for decades, Washington was one of the few places of its size in the world sporting two competing, afternoon daily newspapers meant little to the residents save a choice; even less to a tourist. After about 93 years as The Democrat, one of them suddenly decided the name might connote too close a connection with you-know-what-party and changed it to The Times.

Then it merged with The Herald, where this newspaper career began, and became The Washington Times Herald, which, to Washington, D.C., has a nostalgic ring.

At one time, when the population was about 7,000, this Washington had two high school gymnasiums that would seat the entire town. The basketball fever being what it is in Indiana, they often did.

But 150 years of Statehood and the attendant celebrations are focusing new attention on all parts of the State, long a tailender in the tourism industry.

If the occasion does nothing else for Washington, it has created the first Daviess County Historical Society. As Brooks Allen optimistically put it, 'with research and time, 10 years from now we may have uncovered something we've been sleeping on."

A new awareness of the tourism potential is spreading out from the Statehouse offices of Lieut. Gov. Robert L. Rock in Indianapolis.

Two years ago the State had $30,000 to spend to attract new money, industry and, almost as an after-thought, tourists.

This year, it has $150,000 and the welcome drums are beating.

"Indiana, State of Surprises," is the theme and a bag-full of excellent literature goes out to anyone who asks. The publicity department handled 27,000 requests in the early months; geared for 50,000 and received 86,000 in the first five months of this year.

Queries should go to the Indiana Division of Tourism, Department of Commerce, 333 State House, Indianapolis.

The attractions run a truly surprising range. Ask the average traveler about Indiana and he'll usually come up with the Indianapolis 500 Memorial Day Race, exciting grandpappy of them all, and Hoosier basketball.

I don't know what has happened to Indiana basketball, but it was a little depressing during a recent visit to Indianapolis to hear a taxi driver say he "couldn't remember who won the high school championship this year. I think it was some out-of-town team."

CROPS AND LIMESTONE

In between those interests, the potential tourist lures run from the dunes of Lake Michigan down through history started by the French explorer LaSalle to the Ohio river, pioneer waterway which opened the state to settlement and made Vincennes-on-the-Wabash an early cradle of culture of the Northwest Territory.

In the southeast is the land where Lincoln did that reading by firelight. His mother, Nancy Hanks, is buried at Lincoln City.

The variety is boundless from dunelands to the grottoes of Wyandotte; from the flat plains of wheat and corn to the scenic and rustic hills of Brown county, so reminiscent of the Ozarks.

Around Bedford, nature was lavish. Many a building in the Nation's Capital is built of Bedford limestone.

One of the last strongholds of the old covered bridge will be found in Parke county, which boasts of 38, many of them still in use.

There are more than a dozen State Forests; 17 State parks, a score or more areas for fish and game and recreation.

A new 2,500-acre lake is filling in southern Daviess County.

Corydon and New Harmony in Southern Indiana reek of rich history and legend. Corydon still has its aging documentation of the State's beginnings, including a part of the Constitutional Elm, under which the first constitution was drawn.

BEARDS AND RIFLES

New Harmony shows many vestiges of an era started in 1814 by a German religious sect, the Rappites. In sharp contrast to the many restored Rappite homes is the startingly modernistic "roofless" church which looks like a drooping mushroom.

The Sesquicentennial programs run the gamut from newly-grown beards and old long rifles and are as numerous over the State this year as they are diverse.

Some of the highlights:

Tell City's Swiss Schweizer Fest, Aug. 14–20; National Drag-Racing championships in Indianapolis Sept. 1–5; the Lincoln-land Fall Foilage tour out of Troy in the Ohio valley; the Indiana State Fair Aug. 26–Sept. 3; the Madison Regatta Sept. 3–4 and Parke County's Covered Bridge Festival at Rockville Oct. 7–16.

Indianapolis itself, once as somnolent a capital as you've ever seen, is bustling. Aside from Sequicentennial staging, the place comes alive with new apartment architecture, new motor hotels in the heart of the city; a throbbing economic vitality.

It may sound a bit incongruous to the former Hoosier to know there is a swank new area near the State Fairgrounds with the unlikely (for Indiana) name of Chateau de Ville with a street called Rue Flambeau.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION OF 1949—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE TOMORROW AT 12:30 P.M.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate vote on the protocols to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, set forth below are excerpts from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Protocols to the North Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949—Executive Report No. 7, 89th Congress, 2d session.

In accordance with an agreement entered into earlier today, these protocols will be voted on tomorrow at 12:30 p.m.

MAIN PURPOSE

The protocol on measures of control would amend the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries so as to permit the International Commission to propose inspection and enforcement measures to be considered by the contracting powers under terms proposed by the Commission.

The protocol on entry into force is designed to expedite the procedure for action on regulations proposed by the Commission.

BACKGROUND

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949 has as its aim the protection and preservation of the fisheries of the northwest Atlantic Ocean in order to make possible the maintenance of the maximum sustained catch from those fisheries. Territorial waters of the contracting parties are excluded from the provisions of the Convention. The 13 signatory states are Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Convention established the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, to which each participating government may appoint not more than three Commissioners who exercise one vote. The Convention divides the northwest Atlantic area (42° longitude west) into five subareas each of which has a special panel of Commissioners drawn from countries fishing in the subarea or adjacent to it. The principal fish involved are rosefish, cod, haddock, and flounder. Neither the Commission nor the panels have direct regulatory powers but they are authorized to make recommendations to the signatory nations. Some of these regulations, such as regulation by mesh size for certain fish, have been adopted by the parties to the Convention for certain of the subareas.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROTOCOLS

The protocol on measures of control was drafted, and is strongly supported, by the United States. At present, under the terms of the original Convention, each contracting state enforces the adopted conservation regulations with respect to its own nationals. Some European states far from the fishing grounds find it difficult to enforce the Convention in the convention area. Others, like the United States (through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Coast Guard), enforce it both in port and at sea from enforcement vessels. As a result different degrees of enforcement are exercised to the disadvantage of some fishermen and the advantage of others. The protocol, therefore, will make it possible for the Commission to make proposals for international enforcement measures, as it does now for conservation regulations, to the member governments. The control measures to be proposed have not yet finally been decided. The protocol will enter into force when acceptance by all parties has been signified or, after the second protocol enters into force, in accordance with the new provisions.

The protocol relating to entry into force of proposals was also initiated by the United States. It provides for their entry into force in the absence of objection rather than upon notification of acceptance, thus assuring prompt action on such proposals, including the proposal for measures of control submitted under the first protocol. At the present time, a proposal for conservation must be accepted by each government participating in the panel for the subarea to which the proposal applies or in the case of proposals affecting the entire convention area by each contracting party. Due largely to inertia, some two dozen proposals dating back to 1957 are presently outstanding. Under the procedure proposed in the protocol, such proposals would enter into force after 6 months unless objection is made by one or more contracting parties. If objection is received, there would be an additional period of 60 days, or 30 days after receiving notice of an objection by another party—whichever date is later—during which other parties could reconsider their nonobjection in the light of the objection. After the period or periods for objecting expire, if a majority of contracting governments object the proposal would not enter into force. If less than a majority object, the proposal would enter into force but only for those parties which did not object. As far as the United States is concerned, this procedure fully protects its freedom to be bound or not to be bound by conservation proposals. Moreover, under the convention, a contracting party can give 1 year's notice of termination of its acceptance of a proposal any time after that proposal had been in force for 1 year.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

These protocols, dated November 29, 1965, were transmitted to the Senate on June 27, 1966, with the strong endorsement of the administration. This was reiterated by Burdick Brittin, Deputy Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife at the Department of State, at the public hearing held by the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 12. His prepared statement is appended to this report.

Both protocols serve to strengthen the Convention on the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and as such deserve the vigorous support of the U.S. Senate in line with the U.S. tradition of promoting conservation measures in the fisheries field, as well as in others.

Both protocols are based on precedents established in other fisheries conventions. The one relating to measures of control finds a basis in the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention, which, however, spells out the form of international inspection or enforcement to be followed. The protocol on entry into force is similar to the terms of the International Whaling Convention and the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Convention to which the United States is not a signatory.

The Committee on Foreign Relations concurs with the recommendation of the President and urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification of both protocols at an early date.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, each year it becomes more difficult for those of us who believe in the desirability of a foreign assistance program to support a continuation of the program as now conceived and administered. The reports of the Foreign Relations Committee over the last few years have reflected our profound dissatisfaction with conduct of the aid program under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and have suggested certain changes which we thought desirable.

Three years ago, in the Foreign Relations Committee's report on the foreign aid bill, the committee expressed the hope that the administration would submit to Congress the following year a program which had been revamped in major respects.

That report said:

> Specifically the committee believes that countries which can take care of themselves should be eliminated from the program, that even more selectivity among countries should be introduced, and that prompt and serious consideratian should be given to a greatly increased utilization of multilateral agencies, such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its subsidiaries, notably the International Development Association.

The hope that the administration would submit such a program proved to be in vain.

Last year, the committee reported and the Senate approved a bill which provided for a joint executive-legislative Foreign Aid Planning Committee to revamp the program and which laid down general guidelines for that committee to follow. Unfortunately, it proved to be impossible in conference to persuade the House of the merits of this approach.

Despite a number of fine pronouncements concerning the application of new criteria in the granting of foreign economic assistance, the legislative proposals submitted by the administration this year fell short, in many respects, of what the committee deemed desirable.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has itself undertaken the task of writing these revisions into law. They are generally consistent with what the Senate has approved in the past, and they are consistent with the discharge of the Congress' responsibility for establishing the terms of the program which the executive branch is to administer.

The committee has approved the administration's proposal to authorize economic and military assistance in separate bills. This is a reform which the Senate has itself previously supported and which will make it easier for the Senate and the public to consider each major type of aid on its own merits and to draw clearer distinctions between them. I want to emphasize that it will have no effect on the relative authorities and responsibilities of the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

The principal changes which the committee has made in the economic aid program are to concentrate it in fewer countries and to emphasize multilateral rather than bilateral administration.

One of the frequent criticisms that has been made of the aid program, by the Foreign Relations Committee as well as others, has been that it is too diffuse and spread too thinly over too many countries. In the Senate version of the foreign aid bill last year, one of the guidelines provided for revising the program was to limit aid to 50 countries. In their testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee this year, both AID Administrator Bell and Secretary Rusk have made much of the fact that a major proportion of aid is indeed concentrated in a mere handful of countries. In his message to Congress on foreign aid, the President himself said:

> We must concentrate on countries not hostile to us that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves.

The Foreign Relations Committee has made this a legal requirement as well as an administrative policy. The committee believes that this action is necessary in order to compel more careful and selective consideration of the assistance which we extend to those countries in which we have an overriding interest. There is clearly a need to arrest the tendency of the executive branch to consider foreign assistance as an inevitable and, indeed, automatic feature of our bilateral relations with developing nations. The numerical limitation will go far toward avoiding situations where an ill-considered reliance on aid as a short term expedient jeopardizes our long-range interests by creating complicating commitments and expectations.

This limitation need not unduly restrict the flexibility of the executive branch in dealing with unexpected situations. The bill provides two escape procedures for such situations—the executive branch may obtain additional authorization from the foreign policy committees of the Congress upon presentation of adequate justification, or it may proceed through multilateral channels, because the committee's limitations do not apply to aid furnished through the International Bank or its affiliates.

With respect to multilateralism as with concentration of effort, the administration has endorsed a principle which the committee has previously sought to promote. In his message to Congress, the President expressed his "confidence in the multilateral method of development finance." Both Mr. Bell and Secretary Rusk likewise endorsed an increasing emphasis on multilateral aid. The draft legislation submitted by the administration did not, however, reflect their statements.

The committee does not propose in this bill to turn the entire aid program over to the multilateral institutions but it has written into the bill several provisions which will push the program toward greater multilateralism. The most direct of these is the requirement that 15 percent of development loan funds be used through the International Bank or its affiliates, the International Development Association, and the International Finance Corporation. In addition, permissive authority—not a requirement—is provided for use of 15 percent of Alliance for Progress funds through the World Bank family or the Inter-American Development Bank. Finally, all Alliance for Progress loans are made contingent upon approval of individual country economic plans by the Alliance's multilateral review agency, the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, or CIAP as it is known after its Spanish initials.

When aid passes through an international organization, such as the World Bank or the International Development Association, en route from the aid-supplying to the aid-receiving nation, it is denationalized and an international buffer is erected between lender and borrower, or between giver and receiver. This has great political advantages for both sides. It avoids the political problems which arise from the day-to-day involvement in the affairs of the recipient in the course of administering the aid. It avoids the physical presence in the territory of the recipient of large numbers of official Americans, and their dependents, inevitably calling attention—no matter how circumspect they might be—to their wealth contrasted with the poverty of the recipient. It avoids resentment on the part of the aid donor when he does not receive the gratitude which he expects, and it avoids the resentment on the part of aid recipients who often feel that in order to maintain their self-respect they must demonstrate their independence by rejecting the advice of the donor. Whoever heard of anybody being grateful to a bank—or of a bank expecting gratitude?

Finally, a multilateral lending agency, because it is nonnational and apolitical, is in a position to tie more sensible economic strings to its loans, to demand better economic performance, and to police that performance better. It is much easier for the political leaders of a poor country to accept and act on the unpalatable advice of an international agency than on that of a national government.

There are a number of other noteworthy innovations in the bill, notably more specific authority and expanded funds for population control work, and authority to apply to the other countries of Asia and Africa the technique of the joint commission on rural reconstruction which has been so successful on Formosa. These and other provisions are fully explained in the committee report, and I shall not detain the Senate with a further review of them at this time.

I do, however, want to comment briefly on the action of the committee in limiting the authorization of all aid programs to a single year. Until this year, I have myself advocated longer term authorizations, but recent events have persuaded me of the continuing necessity—time consuming as it is—for the annual review by Congress of our foreign aid activities.

The first factor influencing this decision is the astonishing assertion of the Secretary of State that the fact of U.S. aid to Vietnam is one of the bases for the commitment of 300,000 American troops there. The clearest statement of this point by the Secretary came in a speech before the national convention of Rural Electric Cooperative Associations in Las Vegas February 16. As reported in the Department of State's own press release, the Secretary said:

> We are committed to assist South Vietnam to resist aggression by the SEATO Treaty, which was approved by the Senate with only one dissenting vote; by the pledges of three successive Presidents; by the aid approved by bipartisan majorities in Congress over a period of 12 years; by joint declarations with our allies in Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific; and by the Resolution which Congress adopted in August 1964, with only two dissenting votes.

But there is more than our involvement in Vietnam which has brought about a change in my thinking on the question of multiyear authorizations. I am most apprehensive about the tendency in the executive branch of Government to escalate the extent of our aid commitments.

In a television interview April 19, the Vice President said of the Honolulu declaration resulting from the Johnson-Ky conference that it was the articulation of a Johnson doctrine for Asia, that "it was directed towards an Asia, a modern Asia, an Asia with abundance, an Asia with social justice, an Asia at peace, an Asia with tremendous programs of social, economic betterment." It was, he continued—

> A pledge to ourselves and to posterity to defeat aggression, to defeat social misery, to build viable, free political institutions, and to achieve peace. Now, those are broad terms, but these are great commitments. And then you add onto this, sir, our relationships with India and Pakistan, but particularly now India, where the discussions between our two governments have gone far beyond just food; they have gone into the whole matter of development of the economy, the social, political structure. I think there is a tremendous new opening here for realizing the dream of the Great Society in the great area of Asia, not just here at home.

It may well be that the Congress would agree on the desirability of a "Johnson doctrine for Asia." I do not believe, however, that it would be proper for the executive branch to embark upon a program without thorough congressional review. I would be much more inclined to support multiyear authorizations if there were not this tendency to escalate our commitments by such statements. In the circumstances, I think it well to keep a tighter rein on the aid program than might otherwise be necessary, or even desirable.

Further, Mr. President, on the question of multiyear authorizations, it should be recalled that the Senate's action last year in voting a 2-year authorization was directly linked to a provision terminating the aid program in its present form at the end of fiscal year 1967, and the establishment of a Foreign Aid Planning Committee to undertake an exhaustive study of the premises and conduct of our foreign assistance programs. It was only under these conditions that the Foreign Relations Committee members were willing to approve a 2-year authorization. In the words of last year's committee report:

> These two major provisions were almost indissolubly connected with respect to the committee's heavy vote in favor of the bill.

Unfortunately, as I noted earlier, the House, which had voted a 1-year authorization, would not concur in these provisions of last year's Senate bill. The House bill this year, on the other hand, contains a 5-year authorization for development loans and the Alliance for Progress, and a 2-year authorization for the remainder without revision of the program or provision for its review.

Mr. President, the burden which has been carried by those of us who have supported this program in the past arises not from any basic fallacy in the principle of assisting other nations, but rather from the imperfections in the basic approach and administration of the program in the past. The extent of the present public and congressional dissatisfaction with our aid program is such that it cannot be overcome by administrative reforms and certainly it does not merit the confidence inherent in a long-term authorization.

As I have said before, the problem is simply that as long as we continue to go about foreign aid in the wrong way it will fail to produce the hoped-for results. I believe that the reforms which we have written into this bill are a step in the right direction, but until they have been tested, and other reforms made, and until the world situation stabilizes somewhat, I believe that we would be abdicating our responsibilities if we did not continue to conduct an annual review of our aid policies.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to conclude with the thought that what is at issue is not so much whether we have a foreign aid program as what kind of program it should be. Segments of the press have berated the Foreign Relations Committee rather severely because of its action with respect to this bill. Yet the committee has approved an authorization only $117 million less than the appropriation requested by the President. This is a cut of less than 5 percent, and is extremely moderate as foreign aid cuts go and less than I favor in this bill. This is evidence, I think, of the general conviction of the committee that some sort of foreign aid program is necessary. The committee believes it will be a more effective program if it is changed in the ways provided by the committee bill.

Speaking for myself alone, for reasons which I have indicated and shall develop more fully later on, I am willing to support more substantial contributions to development financing through multinational organizations, but am unwilling to continue indefinitely large scale binational aid programs.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of this morning concerning a proposal of the President of the World Bank to ask the developed nations to contribute $1 billion a year—aside from whatever they may be doing bilaterally—for administration by the International Development Association.

This is an illustration of what I mean as a more effective procedure, and I favor the proposal of Mr. George Woods, who I believe is an extraordinarily able administrator of the World Bank and its affiliated organizations. This is precisely what I have in mind.

I favor the diversion of a major part of our development lending into this type of international lending. In fact, I would not hesitate to support a larger U.S. contribution to the IDA because I believe that this approach would be more effective. It would avoid our getting involved in the kind of controversies such as that facing us in Vietnam. That is an extreme example, but there are other instances of less serious involvement which, I believe, may lead to similar troubles if bilateral lending is continued.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD BANK SEEKS $1 BILLION TO LEND TO POOR COUNTRIES—RICH NATIONS TO BE ASKED TO QUADRUPLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROVIDE "EASY" LOANS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The United States and the other industrial countries will shortly be asked to quadruple, to $1-billion a year, their contributions to the World Bank for "easy" loans to poor countries.

The request will probably be made this week by George D. Woods, the president of the bank. The formal title of the World Bank is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The contributions, now running at $250-million a year, would go to the bank's easy-loan subsidiary, known as the International Development Association. The bank itself raises funds by selling bonds on the world's capital markets.

NO INTEREST AND 50 YEARS TO PAY

The United States share of the contributions to the association would remain at about 40 per cent, or $400-million a year instead of the present $100-million. The money is lent to the world's poorest countries with no interest and 50 years to pay.

The Woods request will pose a major choice for the United States and the other rich countries. It will bring to a head the question of whether a much larger portion of economic aid to the poor countries should be given through international institutions instead of bilaterally.

It will also pose dramatically the question of the willingness of the rich countries to increase the total volume of aid to the developing countries. The World Bank has calculated that the developing countries are now in a position to absorb usefully from $3-billion to $4-billion more a year than they are currently receiving.

AID TOTALED 9.1 BILLION

In 1964, the last year for which figures are available, total government aid was $5.9-billion and private capital flow was $3.2-billion.

Mr. Woods has chosen this week to make his formal request for additional funds for the I.D.A. because the top foreign aid officials of 15 countries will be here for a meeting not directly connected with the World Bank.

This is a meeting of the Development Assistance Committee, an arm of the 21-country Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The committee seeks to coordinate the aid programs of individual aid-granting countries.

The member nations of this committee are also the main contributors to the I.D.A.

The bulk of support for the association comes from the United States, Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan and Canada.

Mr. Woods will speak to the meeting, but he is expected to make his formal request for funds for the I.D.A. separately.

The donor countries have known for months that a request for a new round of contributions for the I.D.A. was impending because its association funds are running out. The last round of contributions was $750-million over a three-year period.

Mr. Woods has given no hint, however, of how much he will ask. His asking figure of $1-billion was learned from highly authoritative sources.

What the United States reaction to the request will be is not known. Top officials have indicated a definite sympathy with the idea that the rate of aid given by the association should be increased, but whether they will go along with a quadrupling of the aid is uncertain.

Furthermore, the United States is eager to find a device by which its contributions to the I.D.A. would not further worsen its deficit in the balance of international payments. Dollars donated to the association are disbursed by the bank on the basis of competitive world-wide biding, and thus many of them eventually flow by way of the poor countries to other developed countries.

RIGHT TO REDUCE

Mr. Woods is known to have strong reservations about two possible ways that the United States, or other donor countries, could be protected against any adverse balance-of-payments effect.

One would be to give a nation in balance-of-payments difficulty the right, at the time the money is disbursed by the I.D.A. several years from now, to reduce its contribution by some specified amount for the year in question. This poses for Mr. Woods the problem of not knowing precisely how much money he could commit for loans.

The second would be a requirement that the bank "tie" its disbursements to goods procured in the nation suffering payments difficulties. Dollars would have to be spent in the United States, for example. This would require a sharp revision of the bank's current practice.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not like this opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the outstanding service he has rendered in holding the hearings and in having this bill properly presented to the Senate for consideration.

I can think of no more difficult assignment in connection with legislative matters than one involving the handling of foreign aid legislation—which is always a controversial subject, in its least, in addition to involving the varied opinions of the members of the committee.

I state frankly that while the bill was reported, many different viewpoints were expressed on it, and still are being expressed. The Chairman is entitled to much credit for the fine way in which he conducted the hearings, for his thorough knowledge of the problems confronting us in the foreign aid field, and for his devotion to a cause that I believe is essential to our international interest.

Experience clearly demonstrates that friends and cooperation cannot be bought with money, and that neither people nor governments can be remade in our own image. That has been one of the problems confronting not only our Nation but also the committee in dealing with this problem. We have not hesitated to spend large sums of money, but in many instances the results have been far from satisfactory.

With that thought in mind, Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Kansas. He has followed these hearings closely, and has made a great contribution to the consideration of what I regard to be one of the most difficult bills which has come before the Senate.

It is difficult because it undertakes to deal with what I believe is the major problem confronting the world—that is, the great disparity between the incomes and living standards of industrialized nations and the underdeveloped nations.

I recognize the problem. I have been criticized, as have other members, for not being fully conscious of this problem, and sympathetic to criticisms based on some of my actions and statements in the last 2 years on this subject. I believe that this is perhaps due to my failure to convey adequately to the press, who have commented on this, what I feel about the problem.

I have always supported foreign aid beginning with the Marshall plan. But as time passed, it became more evident, in my view, that something basic is wrong with the aid program.

The program has not achieved its purpose in the underdeveloped world, as it did in Europe. I believe that the experience with the Marshall plan misled some of us to believe that we can do with money what we did in Europe. The difference, of course, has been commented upon often: The situation in Europe involved a highly developed economy and society which was severely damaged by the war. That society contained the manpower, the know-how, the men and the traditions—everything except the capital. All it needed was the infusion of capital. We supplied that and the aid program worked well.

The situation in the rest of the world is not comparable to that in Europe after the war. I do not believe that a bilateral approach by a great nation assuming a kind of patronizing attitude—a new kind of colonial attitude, in which we undertake to supervise and tell the underdeveloped countries what to do—can succeed. The word "colonial" may not be proper, but I cannot think of a better word at the moment.

We are becoming involved in the internal affairs of a great many countries, and I do not believe we are capable of making the existing program work effectively. That is why, in frustration at the lack of success and also because of the involvement in such instances as in Vietnam, I have turned to the multilateral approach.

Within their respective areas of operation, the agencies such as—IDA, the United Nations Special Fund, IFC, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank—have done a good job. The Asian Development Bank has just been created, but the organizations that have operating experience have been doing a good job, free from the involvements and the difficulties that we are suffering from in our various aid relationships throughout the world.

This is the main point. I am not minimizing the importance of the developed countries doing something to bring about better conditions in the underdeveloped world. I believe we should. But we should do this in a more effective way than we have in the past.

In passing, I wish to say that economic aid, whether given bilaterally or multilaterally, is not the whole answer to the problems of the developing nations by any means. It is only a supplement. I believe that of far greater importance is the question of terms of trade—that is, how to stabilize and increase the income of underdeveloped countries for their basic raw materials.

It has always seemed very sad to me that great countries, like ours and those of Western Europe, use their ingenuity in trying to get commodities from the underdeveloped countries at the lowest possible cost, in the old tradition of our capitalistic system, and then have to turn around and supplement the economies of those underdeveloped countries with aid. It makes no sense for us to pay too low a price for the basic commodities—the minerals, the foodstuffs of the underdeveloped countries—and then give aid to the same countries. A way should be found to enable these countries to benefit more from their trade. This is what I mean when I say we need to improve the terms of trade.

A great disparity has developed between the prices of industrialized goods and raw materials. Of course, that same problem has afflicted us in the United States, as a result of which for many years our farmers, who produce the wheat, the cotton, the soybeans, and the corn, never received a fair price for their commodities. That is why the Federal Government had to step in with price support and other programs in an attempt to rectify the situation.

The same system cannot be applied internationally, but I do believe that a system should be instituted which would enable the developing countries to obtain better—and more stable—prices for their raw materials. This would be a far superior way in which to eliminate this great disparity in income between the rich and the poor nations than continuation of aid would be.

To me, aid is a temporary palliative, rather than a real solution to this problem. I have supported aid, and I support it now. However, I wish to say again that I shall not continue to support bilateral lending because of the unfortunate political results of it.

I believe bilateral aid contributes to making unsatisfactory relationships in many cases. We have had libraries burned. I do not know how many.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. **AIKEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I yield.

Mr. **AIKEN**. I was interested in what the Senator said about raising the income of the people of the countries where we are doing business.

While our aid program has been unable to achieve that purpose in a material degree, some of our business concerns—and I am thinking particularly of Sears, Roebuck at this point, and others—have achieved that purpose and improved the lot of the people in the countries where they operate. They gradually produce more of what they sell. I believe that in one Latin American country they produced 100 percent of what they sold in that country. There is more business for the company, it improves the lot of the people, and it improves business generally.

I am sure that the chairman of our committee is familiar with the commencement address given by the Honorable Eugene Black at Wellesley College early in June, in which he pointed out many weaknesses in our methods of extending aid. That speech of Mr. Black was so good that it did not get the press coverage it deserved. I inserted it in the RECORD.

Mr. Black pointed out that our State Department is so busy conducting programs and they spend so much time at it that it detracts from their ability to carry out the normal functions of the Department of State.

He recommended that more of our aid be extended through international organizations, which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] referred to, and also through nonprofit organizations. He even went so far as to suggest that we could extend aid through some of our business organizations or corporations.

I realize that there are risks—political risks, at least—in the latter suggestion. However, we must admit that most of our big corporations are many times more efficient than Government agencies.

Mr. Black pointed out how many of our Government agencies spend so much money competing with each other; issuing statements of what they are going to do in a country, and then not doing it. That does not make the people of the country feel good about the program.

I think we should pay more attention to the recommendations of Mr. Eugene Black. He has been reasonably successful with the International Bank which he headed for several years. It not only did a great deal of good throughout the world but accumulated a billion dollars in reserves at the same time, all of which was invested in U.S. securities, showing that somebody, at least, has some confidence in the financial position of the United States.

I think we should pay more attention to recommendations such as those made by Mr. Black.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to endorse what the Senator has said about Mr. Black. I have spoken with him many times in the past about this subject. Mr. Woods is now carrying on the tradition of the Bank.

Mr. John Rockefeller III, who has been very interested in Asia, made a speech recently in New York along the same lines. Many people with great experience in this field endorse the principle of providing aid through multilateral agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. While on a very fruitful trip, which was known as the Mansfield mission, we found that all countries in southeast Asia, bar none, excluding North Vietnam, of course, were very much interested in the cooperative proposals for improving the economy of the region.

Perhaps if that program were implemented they would not think so much about fighting or taking over a neighboring country.

I notice this morning in one of the news items that the Saigon government decided to take away the aid programs of South Vietnam from the CIA. I fear that not many people knew that the CIA was operating aid programs in many countries. I am not so sure that that is a good thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean take it away from them?

Mr. AIKEN. In this case the CIA seems to have operated efficiently.

I want to say that it was a pleasure to go on that trip under the leadership of Senator Mansfield, who is very much respected in every country of the world where we went.

But these southeastern Asian countries must have some means and plans to work together or they will constantly be at war with each other, and we may be at war with them.

There is, in my opinion, a great opportunity to carry out projects for raising the standard of living of the people in foreign countries through some of our business corporations.

I think that the Senator from Arkansas has done well to bring this subject up. A bilateral program has many drawbacks. Where there is a multilateral program we at least have several countries watching each other to see that this program is operated efficiently, fairly, and honestly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And there is taken away the idea that one country is seeking to dominate another. This is a complaint we get around the world. I do not believe the President had that intention in mind in carrying out our aid program. But conditions arise which give credence to this complaint, and it creates a bad relationship.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. On the point that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] made, it seems to me that we should insist on private industry, both domestic and foreign participation, in these programs, and in these countries, in every way possible. I feel that that is the way that we get efficient management based on experience. That is true of domestic corporations, and I am sure it is true of foreign corporations as well. They can use this money to its greatest advantage. That is one of the problems facing me when it comes to voting on the foreign aid bill.

As the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] know, from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1966, we spent $550 million in South Vietnam on the foreign aid program, all outside of the military.

In testimony before our committee—and it appears in the hearings—a man formerly in the AID program sent over as a consultant came back and said that only 10 or 20 percent of this money reached the people to render benefits to them that we really intended.

It has been a privilege to support foreign aid programs. I support them now.

I believe that our Nation can be of assistance to underdeveloped countries. It does concern me that we do not get more value for our money. Money does not seem to buy friends in this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. CARLSON. We have to try to get the money out to the people themselves. In many instances we have been lacking. I regret it very much.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if I might question the distinguished majority leader.

Does the Senator have any definite idea how we should proceed on this bill? Will we vote on it today? I am ready to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that there are some Senators who have amendments, and I would hope that they offer them. It is my intention to ask for a live quorum, in order to get Members over here to offer their amendments which they supposedly have ready.

Let me ask the Chair, how many amendments are there at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are four printed amendments, and two additional were submitted today.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] advised me before he left the Chamber that he would be anxious to come back within a short time, because he has some amendments to offer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that he has three.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 141 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Dominick
Fulbright
Holland
Jordan, Idaho
Mansfield
McClellan
Mundt
Neuberger
Simpson
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from South Carolian [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion is agreed to, and the Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kuchel
Lausche
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. A quorum is present.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I shall address myself to the pending measure and make some general observations about it and then speak specifically with regard to four amendments which I shall offer to the pending bill.

My first amendment is an effort to authorize the program for 2 years instead of for 1 year, as now set forth in the legislation.

The amendment is sponsored by Senators FONG, HARRIS, INOUYE, MORSE, NELSON, DOUGLAS, and myself.

The second amendment is to prohibit aid to military juntas that have undertaken takeovers of constitutional government—and Argentina, of course, is the prime, present example—unless they give appropriate assurances of the restoration of human and civil rights and of free election at the earliest possible date. The amendment contains the necessary escape clause of the President to certify to Congress that the national security requires the continuance of some aid.

The third amendment would deal with President Nasser and the United Arab Republic. Congress has dealt with that subject before. However, somehow or other we cannot get through to the administration that we cannot see the wisdom of giving aid to Nasser when he is working completely opposite to the interest of the United States in almost every department. The amendment is the same as the one agreed to by the House of Representatives. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I cosponsor that amendment.

The fourth amendment endeavors to incorporate in the Senate bill what I think was a very fine proposal in the bill just passed by the House of Representatives. I am somewhat at a loss to understand why this was not even referred to in the Senate committee. That proposal concerns the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council in order to determine what part and whether an adequate part is being played in the foreign aid program by private enterprise.

A great, historic report was issued last August by a Committee headed by Mr. Arthur K. Watson, the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. This report concerned private enterprise in foreign aid.

The Committee was set up pursuant to an amendment which I offered to the foreign aid bill. That report requires extensive implementation. When the amendment is offered, I shall introduce two reports given to me by AID as to the extent to which the committee's recommendations have been implemented.

I think the idea of maintaining a private enterprise advisory committee and seeing to the further implementation of the Watson Committee is splendid. It seems to me that it should receive universal acclaim. I hope that the Senate thinks well enough of it to include it in the bill and thereby make the Congress unanimous on the subject.

Those are the four amendments to which I shall address myself in due course. Before I deal with the amendments, I wish to make an observation upon one matter which has been raised, rather importantly, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for whom I have the very highest regard.

I do not think the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas renders good service to the foreign aid program. That suggestion involves the thesis that, because we give foreign aid to a nation, we become so involved with that nation that foreign aid leads to other involvement, and we find ourselves up to our necks in military involvement.

The Senator from Arkansas cites Vietnam as a prime example of how the foreign aid program can lead us into military involvement and war.

Indeed, this statement is given as one of the main reasons why the authorization for foreign aid is only on a 1-year basis. I think everybody realizes the completely valid arguments against the grave lack of flexibility which is attributable to the 1-year basis.

Mr. President, I have sought to find in the transcript of the foreign aid hearings the basis for the view of Senator FULBRIGHT. I do not find any real basis for it. In fact, I find the situation to be the opposite.

In a statement before the Foreign Relations Committee on May 9, 1966, at pages 549 to 554, Secretary Rusk offered substantial evidence showing that our involvement in Vietnam, whether it was good or bad judgment, was the result of a decision on the part of the United States that it has a vital stake in the security and independence of southeast Asia. Indeed, statistics show that United States economic aid to Vietnam followed rather than preceded the military escalation of that struggle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a table of total United States economic aid to Vietnam for the fiscal years 1958 to 1966.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total U.S. economic aid to Vietnam, fiscal years 1958–66

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

1958	188.7
1959	207.1
1960	180.5
1961	144.6
1962	143.3
1963	197.5
1964	223.7
1965	268.9
1966 (estimated)	541.1

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, it appears that our aid remained relatively stable until after President Kennedy took his historic position on July 15, 1963, to increase our Vietnam troop strength from 2,000 to 16,000, and to change their status to combat troops. A material escalation occurred after December 12, 1965, when President Johnson increased our troop commitment to Vietnam by 175,000.

In other words, the situation did not change in magnitude in all the years down to about 1963, when a 25 percent increase occurred in economic aid to Vietnam, and in 1964, 1965, and 1966, when the figure was really high.

I cannot see the validity of this thesis, Mr. President, nor do I believe that it should have an influence—in this case, an adverse influence—upon our policy with respect to foreign aid, because it is not borne out by the facts.

The facts are that foreign aid is intended to endeavor to redress the balance in the world to some extent. The more developed countries are advancing at such a faster rate as to widen the gap with the underdeveloped countries, notwithstanding the revolution of rising expectations. In some effort to level off that situation, to close that gap, we and other industrialized nations give foreign aid, realizing that a relatively wealthy nation cannot live on a poverty-stricken street unless it does its share and its part in attempting to bring up the others who are not so fortunate.

One other feature that has come out of Senator FULBRIGHT's thesis is the strong view that our aid should be placed on a multilateral basis. A strong argument exists for that view, and on the whole I am sympathetic to it. A great deal of experience in the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Development Association has shown that aid handled through international agencies is effective in shielding us from criticisms and the antipathies which result on the part of the receiver toward the aid giver.

However, Mr. President, under present world conditions, it is impractical to expect the bulk of our foreign aid efforts and that of other countries to be made entirely on a multilateral basis.

The bill calls for 15 percent of the aid funds to go through international agencies. That is probably just about as much as can be expected.

I have a letter from the League of Women Voters of the State of New York, in which they state their objection to some of the limitations recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in S. 3584. Among them the league objects to the requirement in this bill that 15 percent of development loans be channeled via the IBRD and IDA—much as they favor the idea of aid through multilateral channels—on the grounds that it may lead to a further reduction of funds for development loans. However, whether or not the requirement is mandatory, it is just about as far as we can go.

In deference to the views of the League of Women Voters of New York State, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be made a part of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **JAVITS**. Similarly, I have a letter from the League of Women Voters of the City of New York. This organization feels more kindly toward the 15 percent requirement, but also joins the State league in protesting the 1-year authorization. I join them in considering that extremely unwise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the League of Women Voters of the City of New York be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. **JAVITS.** The share of total free world economic assistance channeled through international agencies is about 17 percent of the total commitments, and has remained fairly constant in recent years. Thus, despite strenuous efforts on our part through the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD and other channels, the Governments of France, West Germany, the United Kingdom, and Japan have been unwilling to relinquish control over their AID funds to international lending institutions.

The reasons for this are varied. The French, for example, link their program closely to countries which they formerly administered and with which they now have a rather close political and economic relation. The United Kingdom gives assistance to former British possessions or territories, which makes the desire to keep it bilateral.

The German program is motivated not only by a genuine desire to assist in the social and economic progress of the less developed world, but also by strong emphasis both on the expansion of trade with Germany and on exercising political pressures in support of the so-called Hallstein doctrine—that is, the refusal of Germany to recognize a nation which recognizes East Germany.

I deeply regret that the Committee on Foreign Relations opposed a multiyear authorization in respect to the program. Indeed, the classic reasons given for multiyear authorizations are, in my judgment, extremely persuasive. In the first place, almost every administration has asked for it, and that includes Republican and Democratic administrations. The administration of President Eisenhower led in seeking a multiyear authorization here.

Indeed, in 1961, Congress approved a 5-year authorization for the development loan, part of it from the AID program. In 1962, Congress approved a 4-year authorization for the Alliance for Progress. Congress has also approved long-term authorizations for U.S. subscriptions to the World Bank, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank in the shape of contributions to their basic capital.

Mr. President, the classic arguments for a 2-year authorization are, first, of course, the added flexibility which such an authorization will provide. Incidentally, 2 years is just about the basic minimum in which any flexibility at all could be experienced.

But it is essential that an effort be made to give some opportunity for planning, both to our own agencies and the recipients of aid, and it is the universal opinion of all of the technicians and the directors of these programs that at the very minimum a 2-year authorization is necessary to give some elbowroom for anybody to plan, including ourselves.

In fact, the need for the Committee on the Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations to deal with an authorization every year is one of the serious arguments against the single-year authorization because it impedes very materially their opportunity to probe the foreign aid program.

Indeed, there is no feeling, no particular grassroots feeling on the subject, for the other body just voted the other day 237 to 146 to give a 5-year authorization for development loans in the Alliance for Progress; and 2-year authorizations for the remainder of the aid program.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me very clear on all programs of efficiency of operation, the testimony of experts, the request of the administration, and the opportunity for the Senate and the other body to do their jobs, that at the very minimum we should have a 2-year authorization.

As I said before, I introduced an amendment sponsored by myself and Senators FONG, HARRIS, INOUYE, MOSS, NELSON, and DOUGLAS—completely bipartisan sponsorship—for a 2-year program across the board: military, economic, development loan, and all phases of the bill.

I am advised that two members of the committee are proposing to offer this amendment. Normally, we yield to members of the committee in the offering of amendments when they choose to do so.

I have decided, assuming these members go forward with an amendment which is in form satisfactory to me and the cosponsors of my amendment, that I would rest content with joining them, and I trust other cosponsors of my amendment will join, so that we may present a common effort to attain the 2-year authorization for the program.

After all, the 2-year authorization would be a very much reduced multiyear authorization than that already authorized in the House of Representatives.

Mr. **CARLSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JAVITS.** I yield.

Mr. **CARLSON.** Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is making an effective argument why the period of time should be longer than 1 year, or possibly 2 or more years. I believe that the Senator from New York mentioned a vote taken in the other body on the 5-year extension, which I believe was a final vote. I wonder if it is not correct to say that there was a vote of 191 to 193 reducing the 5-year term.

Mr. **JAVITS.** The House rejected the motion to recommit containing a reduction from 2 years to 1 year all authorization, except for the 5-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress and a $256 million cut in the Development Loan Fund. There was a vote of 237 to 146. Support for the 2-year authorization principal was sustained on several other votes during this debate.

I was giving that vote as authority for the limited proposition that I was advancing rather than for more than I was contending for.

Mr. **CARLSON.** Has the Senator given thought to the fact that the House passed the 5-year extension and that is now the pending matter before the Senate? We have a 1-year extension. Would it not be reasonable to assume that in the conference the conference committee might agree to 2 or 3 years, and, therefore, it is not necessary to take action on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. **JAVITS.** I have always found when we legislate that way that we are likely to lose our position, because I have been in many conferences. I am the senior member of one of our important committees and I am in all of those conferences. I say that is sui generis, as lawyers say. Things that get traded off in conference might include something where the Senate conferees are in a position to say, "The position of the Senate is 1 year and we are going to stick to that." Therefore, unless it is challenged on the floor of the Senate and we get some consequences, what is the view of the Senate? There would be no reason why the conferees could not stand fast.

I do not believe that I am prepared to accept that alternative.

Mr. **CARLSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JAVITS.** I yield.

Mr. **CARLSON.** As one who has served on conferences between the House of Representatives and the Senate, I can assure the Senator that House conferees are not only tough but they usually prevail. That is why I made that suggestion.

Mr. **JAVITS.** I thank the Senator, who is very capable. And knowing him and loving him as I do, it was my feeling that we would have to put this one to the test, because it is so important. I do not think there should be any room for doubt about it.

I value very much the intercession of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. He is always most helpful and gracious. I agree that the foreign aid program in its present form is inadequate, principally because the total impact, in terms of public and private capital flowing to underdeveloped countries, is vastly below the needs of developing nations for development capital. This is a failure in terms of direct assistance and tends to encourage the flow of private capital and increased AID contributions to industrialized countries.

One of the prime arguments for multiyear authorization is the ability to get increased aid contributions from other industrialized countries.

The 10 principal aid givers in the world are members of the OECD and when you ask for more or for their part you are met with the argument: Who knows what the Congress of the United States is going to do next year; therefore, why ask us; why not see what your Congress is going to do?

This hampers and cripples the effort of the United States to bring up the level of countries. The level of countries needs eventually to be brought up. The United Nations' goal is that each industrialized country should make 1 percent of its national income available for assistance.

We are 15 percent short of the economic aid the world needs to make reasonable progress. GATT is increasing, not being lost. About 1 percent on the part of the United States would mean twice as much aid as authorized by this bill, something in the neighborhood of $6 billion.

In respect to Italy, its aid is fifteen-one hundredths of 1 percent of Italy's national income. In the case of Japan it is one-third of 1 percent. In the case of Canada it is about .39 of 1 percent. In the case of the United Kingdom it is more like our own, three-fourths of 1 percent. France is well over 1 percent—1.26 percent.

These deficiencies, Mr. President, indicate what can be done and what eventually needs to be done in terms of some kind of world peace and security.

I respectfully submit that one of the great keys to it is confidence in our own program and giving it some status which will enable our negotiators in the international negotiating forums of the world to seek additional aid from others because we are practicing what we preach, and that we give them some assurance over a period of time, which gives capability for negotiations instead of shutting the door to it.

I think that the argument for a 2-year authorization is absolutely irrefutable. I hope very much that the Senate will see the justice of the proposal and will vote, at the very least, for a 2-year authorization so that we may go into conference knowing how the Senate feels, instead of with the uncertainty, at the very least, and the ability, as it stands now, of the conferees coming out of the Foreign Relations Committee just saying, "Well, 1 year it is, and the Senate went along with us and so we are going to stick by it." I think this would be a great mistake for our country.

Now, Mr. President, the other amendment, aside from the 2-year proposal which I shall press, is an amendment to deal with the problems created by military juntas, particularly the Argentine takeover which has just occurred, followed with unseemly haste—and I say that advisedly—by recognition of the military regime on the part of the United States.

I say "unseemly haste," because only last November we adopted a resolution at Buenos Aires with the other American states, declaring that when such a military or nonconstitutional takeover occurred, we would consult with the other American states so that the assassination of democracy in the Western Hemisphere should not become fashionable, so that it should become unprofitable. We would consult with the other American states, we would not recognize, and we would not give aid unless there were reasonable assurances that free elections would be held as soon as possible, and that human and civil rights would be safeguarded.

Mr. President, so far as we know, no such assurances were given or are available in the Argentine coup. On the contrary, we hastened in to recognize General Ongania and his regime. I am well aware of the fact that many feel we could do worse in Argentina. Perhaps that is true. I was there not very long ago and I saw the situation. But, we have been suffering through Presidents and administrations which were unhappy for the country and which created difficulties, and because of other exigencies of the particular moment, or the particular months or years, and we know from experience, that to preserve the system is the highest calling of our society.

Thus, we must favor this kind of approach in Latin America which has been torn so bitterly for so long, the Caudillo system, the very system which we encourage by hasty recognition of governments which are taken over by nonconstitutional means. The amendment which I have proposed would sustain the Charter of the Organization of American States by demanding evidence of an early return to freely elected representative democracy in Argentina, and the extension of civil and human rights.

I was very much disquieted by the indications of a revival of anti-Semitic feeling in Argentina under the guise of this new regime, but I am very glad to report to the Senate that, so far, the evidence we have heard on that point is quite reassuring. However, the very existence of the disquiet, which was widely noted in the international press, demonstrates why we should insist on some agreement, or some understandings, or some reason to believe that there will be effective human and civil rights in connection with the situation where such a military coup has occurred.

Past foreign assistance acts have contained numerous provisions cutting off aid to Communist governments and governments which aid Communist governments. It seems to me that the United States should be against dictatorship in any form, military of the right or Communist of the left. I have strongly supported all of these prohibitions and I strongly support this one.

Of the 19 Democratic American states, 7 have still not recognized Argentina, Ecuador, Venezuela, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Panama. They look to us for leadership. Those American states which have recognized Argentina may have some special reason for doing so.

Brazil is also governed by a military administration. Mexico has the Estrada doctrine, which requires recognition as soon as there is any effective government in control of a country. Chile, because of its physical contiguity, and so forth. Our country should try to hold some realization of principle and of the mistakes of broad policy for the other American states and for the temptation which always exists, apparently, in the military in so many of the beleaguered and troubled countries, where it is just a question of a takeover whenever they feel that things are not going exactly to their liking.

The amendment which I have proposed in this regard would direct the President to cut off aid unless he finds national security interests to require otherwise, and so certifies to the country.

Mr. President, I have no illusions about the fact that this is an aid cut-off amendment, or that the President may not very well almost immediately certify to us that he intends to continue giving some kind of aid to Argentina. But it is salutary when the President of the United States is put to his proof in matters of this kind, and it is salutary when Congress expresses in this way its displeasure with military or nonconstitutional takeovers, as we have expressed it so often with Communist takeovers or efforts at Communist takeovers.

Mr. President, I think that this is an extremely important amendment. I shall press it hard, and I hope that the Senate will adopt it.

Now, Mr. President, another amendment which I have put in for printing today would restrict aid to the United Arab Republic. This amendment is sponsored by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself. The amendment is identical in language to the one adopted in the other body, and is similar to the amendment we adopted as part of the appropriations measure for fiscal year 1966.

There is a long catalog of how President Nasser has outraged his relations with the United States, treating us as suckers in regard to food aid—taking aid from us with one hand and torpedoing and destroying American policy with the other. What is even worse, he has dashed the hopes for peace in a critically important part of the world—to wit, the Middle East, as well as Africa—with Nasser literally thumbing his nose at the United States for so long.

As recently as June 21, 1965, the President of the United States thought that we were going to resolve our differences with the United Arab Republic. I quote from his message to the Congress: "to our mutual satisfaction." Therefore, that aid to the United Arab Republic was in the national interest.

Again, as it has time and again before, our hopes were dashed and the situation is stickier and worse today than it was before. I will deal with those points during detailed argument on the amendment. But, at the very least, we should put the President to his proof in this matter and indicate our displeasure with the way in which the situation with Mr. Nasser has been handled by the United States, and the inadvisability of continuing aid which has worked out in such a counter-productive way so far as the interests of this Nation are concerned.

Finally, I shall propose an amendment with respect to the inclusion of an excellent provision in the House bill for an International Private Investment Advisory Council, to be composed of elements of leading American business specialists, to make recommendations to the Administrator of the foreign aid program in connection with particular programs and activities where private enterprise can make an effective contribution, and serve as liaison for the administrator with specific private enterprises which may be interested or involved in the foreign aid program.

I shall do this to help implement the enormous, and I hope, historic labors of the so-called Watson committee which came into existence through an amendment which I sponsored to the Senate bill 2 years ago which, in a magnificent report, developed exactly what needed to be done to bring private enterprise more effectively into foreign aid.

Certainly, foreign aid needs it most urgently. I have reports from AID as to the implementation of the Watson Committee report. I shall introduce them when I argue for this amendment.

I think the amendment is indispensable to the health of this bill and its future.

I hope very much the Committee on Foreign Relations will see fit to accept it. It certainly deserves to be accepted, rather than to be argued about, but I am quite prepared to bring the matter to a vote, if need be, because of the fact that it is so directly calculated to deal with the implementation of the report of the distinguished Watson Committee to which I have referred.

I wish to say to the manager of the bill that I am prepared to yield the floor, but I shall be ready, at a later time this afternoon, to bring up the amendment on an International Private Investment Advisory Council. I shall not prepare to do it for about an hour, but I shall be prepared thereafter.

I suggest to the manager of the bill that other Senators may wish to speak at this time, but I shall be back to present at least that amendment, if it meets with the convenience of the manager of the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The League of Women Voters of New York State views with deep concern the limitations which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended to the authorization for foreign aid. We have taken pride in the past in your staunch support of adequate and flexible aid programs. We hope very much that we may look to you now for support of moves to reconsider, on the Senate floor, some of the restrictions attached to the authorization by the Foreign Relations Committee.

We hope the Senate will reverse the cut of $117.1 million from the Administration request for economic aid, the one year limit, the fixed ceiling on the number of countries to receive aid and technical assistance, and the restriction of 15 percent of development loan funds for use through the World Bank group.

The League has been convinced over a period of years that economic aid is a long-term proposition. We believe that the House bill, which authorizes development loans and the Alliance for Progress funds for five years, and the rest of the program for two years, is a much sounder approach.

Assistance given to the underdeveloped nations should be proportionate to our national resources. The ratio of this aid to our Gross National Product has been declining, and will take a marked drop with the proposed cut. This we cannot justify.

The proposed increase in the interest rate on development loans after a 10-year grace period would have the effect of creating a greater debt burden in the developing countries. It is already costing the countries an increasing amount of money to service their foreign debts.

The recommendations for limiting long-term development loans, in any fiscal year, to ten countries, exclusive of the Alliance for Progress, except through multilateral organizations and except with the specific approval of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees is, we believe, an ineffective device for achieving the selectivity in aid programs which we have consistently supported. The same is true of the limitation to forty countries to which technical assistance grants may be made, with similar exceptions for increasing that number. The League is convinced that selectivity can be achieved effectively only if the President is given discretionary power to make assistance available to countries as conditions are altered and as they meet the criteria of self-help, etc.

Since the League has long supported greater use of multilateral channels for foreign assistance, it may surprise you that we do not applaud the move to require that 15% of development loans be channeled into the World Bank and International Development Association. We see this as another restriction which might further reduce the total of funds available for development loans, since the Appropriations Act has consistently prohibited the transfer of funds even when permitted under the Authorization bill.

We think you may be interested in the League's publications, *Foreign Aid at the Crossroads*, just off the press. I am delighted to enclose a copy.

Sincerely,
Mrs. KENNETH W. GREENWALT,
President.
Mrs. LANDON ROCKWELL,
Foreign Policy Chairman.

EXHIBIT 2

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The members of the League of Women Voters of the City of New York note with approval that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has provided for the separation of military and economic aid in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

We are, however, seriously concerned about the restrictions included in the bill. As you know, the members of the League, on the basis of their long interest in and study of United States foreign economic aid programs, have placed great importance on the programs' being long-range in character, recognizing that the problems involved require many years in their solution. For this reason, we are opposed to the Senate Committee's restriction to one-year for all programs and hope you will work to have this changed to the five-year authorization requested.

Furthermore, we believe the total amount requested is not adequate to meet the essential need for sustained and accelerated economic growth in the developing world. We hope you will consequently not only work against any further cuts but will try to have those already made, restored.

It is our belief, also, that increasing the interest rate on development loans will have the effect of deterring development by creating a greater debt burden in the developing countries, forcing them to borrow more funds to pay for their imports. We would, consequently, urge you to seek to have the interest rate reduced to the present 2.5% on such loans.

Finally, we have long been in favor of greater use of multilateral channels for the distribution of aid and do, of course, *approve the move to direct 15% of development loans into the World Bank and the International Development Association.* However, we question whether the phrase "would be available *only*" might not result in further reduction of development loans, if action at the appropriation level follows that of previous years. We would prefer that permissive authority be provided the President for such transfers. This, we believe, would not tie his hands nor risk further reductions in the total amount of development loans available.

We will appreciate any efforts you may be able to make to change these provisions of the present Senate bill.

We are enclosing, herewith, the League's new pamphlet, "Foreign Aid at the Crossroads." We believe you will find it a useful, concise and comprehensive presentation of the foreign aid picture.

Cordially yours,
Mrs. IRWIN TOBACK, *President.*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the foreign economic aid bill (S. 3584).

Mr. President, this amendment would prohibit U.S. economic assistance to countries which allow ships and aircraft under their registry to transport supplies to North Vietnam.

Existing law merely requires consideration of denying our assistance to such countries. This amendment makes denial mandatory. It corresponds to a prohibition written into the foreign aid bill as passed by the House of Representatives last Thursday.

The Vietnam war is costing the lives of nearly 100 Americans a week, and billions of American dollars. Yet, ships flying the flags of nations with whom we have mutual defense alliances have been delivering commodities and materials to North Vietnam ports.

The purpose of this amendment is to state the attitude of the people of the United States toward recipients of our assistance—past and present—who persist in supplying a Communist enemy.

While the number of allied ships going into Haiphong has declined in recent weeks, we should take all possible steps to assure that countries which have engaged in the trade before will not resume shipments, and to discourage other countries from starting to trade with North Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(f) Section 620(n), which relates to prohibition on furnishing assistance to countries trading with North Vietnam, is amended to read as follows:

" '(n) In view of the aggression of North Vietnam, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966—

" '(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to North Vietnam—

" '(i) any items of economic assistance,

" '(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

" '(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

"'(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from North Vietnam.'"

(Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I propose at this time to make my first speech in opposition to the report of the Foreign Relations Committee on economic aid, a report which I voted against and refused to sign. My speech will take the form, primarily but not entirely, of the minority views that I filed, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator.

These minority views bear in part upon an amendment which I understand, but did not have the privilege of hearing, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] discussed earlier this afternoon, amendment No. 641, which reads that:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any member state of the Organization of American States the government of which came into power by the constitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government which had been acting in accordance with its constitutional mandate, unless (1) the President finds that the prohibition against furnishing such assistance is contrary to the national security interest of the United States, or (2) the President is satisfied that the government of such member state has agreed to take appropriate steps, within a reasonable time, for the restoration of constitutional government, the holding of free elections, and application of human and civil rights and liberties within such member state.

Part of the amendment I thoroughly endorse. It seeks an objective I have sought in recent years, and accords with the principle I hold to, of being in opposition to aiding military dictatorships in Latin America. I am against any economic aid to any military dictatorship anywhere in the world, not only in Latin America, but it may be necessary to approach this problem piecewise.

I shall, in due course of time, after the Senator from New York offers the amendment—and the majority leader advises me the Senator from New York will do it—offer a substitute for the amendment.

Mr. President, I oppose now, as I have opposed before, giving an escape clause to the President of the United States in the field of foreign policy. That is part of our trouble. That is one of the reasons we are in the serious crisis we are in—because Congress, in my judgment, has not exercised its constitutional checks, but year after year has passed the buck to the President. In 1963, the Senate rejected an amendment I offered to the same effect as that now proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Had it been adopted, the countries of Latin America and Presidents of the United States might have done better in protecting constitutionalism in the hemisphere.

The question of whether we shall support dictatorships or shall not support dictatorships is just that clear. I am just as much opposed to supporting dictators that the President of the United States thinks we should support as I am to supporting dictators the President of the United States might think we should not support. The issue here is whether or not the money of the American taxpayers shall be spent to support dictatorships.

What is the matter? Have we in Congress lost our courage? What is the matter? Have we become so partisan, in Congress, that we now support a President when he is wrong? What is the matter? I ask Members of my party. What has happened to the Democrats in Congress? Have we forgotten that we took the same oath the Republicans took to uphold the Constitution, and apply checks against the President when he is following a course of action in the field of foreign policy that cannot be reconciled with the public good?

Any time a President of the United States, after we have denied funds to a dictator, wishes to come to a joint session of Congress and make a case for legislation that will authorize him, on the basis of facts he presents, to support a dictator, let him do it. But this before-the-fact program which has come to be used in Congress to let the President do whatever he wishes to do, by giving him an escape clause, must stop. If we do not stop it, our failure to do so will result in the killing of Americans by the hundreds of thousands—whether we fail to check this President or any other President. This is the granting of an Executive power that never should be granted in a democracy to any President, be it Lyndon B. Johnson or any other. It is the responsibility of a Congress to check a President from following an unwise course of action.

At any time a President believes that a law on the books should be modified, because he has some facts that he thinks would justify modifying the law, let him come up here, either send up a message or come in person—and I should think in a situation such as this he would come in person—to a joint session, and set forth the facts as to why the taxpayers should be supporting a dictatorship, anywhere in the world, that has destroyed constitutional government.

The fact is, Mr. President, this is only another one of the places where we prove our hypocrisy. We talk a good game about freedom, and support dictatorships. We talk a good game about self-determination, and then we support dictators who trample freedom underfoot, and try to rationalize our support in the vague general terms that a President of the United States "has found it in the national interest."

Mr. President, that is the way to develop a dictatorship in our own country under a democratic label. I know that many do not like to hear these things said, but they need to be said. For American boys are dying, in my opinion, because Congress has not exercised the checks that it should exercise against the executive branch of the Government. American boys are dying in Asia today because the Congress of the United States has stood by and let the executive branch of the Government exercise unchecked powers. American boys are dying because in August 1964, Congress passed a resolution which, in my judgment, under the Constitution it cannot possibly justify; for I think it was clearly an unconstitutional resolution, seeking to give to the President the right to make war without a declaration of war.

What is the matter with us? What has happened to us, that we sit here and permit the building up of that kind of increasing unchecked power in the office of the Presidency of the United States, and through that office in the offices of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. President, I shall offer, in due course, a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from New York, that will strike any provision in it that gives an escape clause through which Congress would escape its responsibilities and pass the buck to the President of the United States—any provision which in effect says, "Mr. President, you go right ahead. You just go right ahead, Mr. President. If you want to support a dictator who has thrown out a constitutional government, if you want to support a dictator in Latin America who is trampling freedom underfoot, that is all right with us. So long as you just tell us it is in our national interest, go ahead."

We cannot reconcile such action with the advice and consent clause in the Constitution in the field of foreign policy, Mr. President. For our constitutional fathers were more foresighted than I fear Congress is these days. Our constitutional fathers were foresighted enough that they wrote into that organic law the power of the U.S. Senate to advise and consent in the field of foreign policy. If you call such escapism advice and consent, then I say you abuse the meaning of the words "advice and consent." Advice and consent means that we advise and consent on the basis of a body of facts presented to us at the time we take legislative action. But what this type of amendment does is give us an opportunity to avoid facing up to the facts.

With a broad brush stroke, Congress passes a bill that says no support shall be given to military dictatorships which have overthrown constitutional governments. Fine. But then the Senator would add the destroyer clause, "But if the President wishes to do it, he can go ahead and do it if he says it is in the national interest."

We in Congress have a responsibility to take a look at the facts and decide whether or not it is in the national interest. And I wish to say, Mr. President, that unless I am growing deaf as far as American public opinion is concerned, what I am hearing from the grassroots of America is an increasing demand on the part of millions of Americans that Congress start living up to its responsibilities, and start exercising its duty to check the granting of more and more power to the executive branch of the Government; that Congress assume its responsibility, 100 percent, for the legislative process, but not, through an escape clause such as this, let the President do the legislating for us.

So, Mr. President, I say again, that Congress must check the President of the United States in the field of foreign policy, or we shall find ourselves the most isolated nation on earth.

Mr. President, we are not getting support in the world for our undeclared war in Asia. The leaders of the world—and I do not like some of those leaders, but they happen to be leaders of their countries—are trying to warn us before it is too late that they are not going to give support to America's course of action in Asia in prosecuting outside of the framework of our own Constitution the undeclared war.

We now have it proposed in the early hours of the foreign aid debate this year that we will give blanket authority to the President of the United States. It will not be done with the vote of the senior Senator from Oregon at any time.

I want the majority and minority leaders to know that the senior Senator from Oregon will give no consent—as I have not for the last 2 years—at any time during the debate on foreign aid for any unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate or fix a time certain to vote.

Mr. President, once again the foreign aid bill, as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, will be considered under the rules of the Senate, with no unanimous-consent agreement whatsoever modifying the application of those rules.

To the extent that foreign aid has been the tool of American foreign policy, it has been a costly and highly ineffective tool.

I am so glad to see the chairman of my committee here, the great Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I do not expect that the Senator from Arkansas will agree with me on all of the details of my opposition to foreign aid on the floor of the Senate any more than in committee, economic or military. However, that is not necessary for there to exist a great respect, and I have the deepest of respect for the Senator from Arkansas.

I know of no one in the recent history of this Republic that has done more than has the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in carrying out his obligations as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in an effort to warn the American people of the great and serious problems that face them in the field of American foreign policy.

If the American people do not receive the facts in regard to foreign aid and foreign policy, if they are not given reason to ponder and analyze with deep, penetrating thought the great problems of foreign aid that face the people of this country in hours of crises, it is not due to any fault of the Senator from Arkansas. He has had the courage and the brilliance to bring before the American people an elucidation of some of the great dangers that face us in the field of foreign policy.

I therefore take this opportunity to have the RECORD show my deep appreciation for his leadership and my sincere thanks for his statesmanship.

In some phases of the foreign aid program, as far as criticisms are concerned, the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Arkansas agree. In fact, in committee, I approved and supported a series of amendments offered by the Senator from Arkansas. This history of our past years of debate on foreign aid show that many of the principles of those amendments were identical with the principles of amendments offered by me in the past.

I welcome someone's taking the lead this year in pressing some of the same viewpoints that I have pressed before. However, the Senator from Arkansas went much further. He improved greatly upon the past proposals of the Senator from Oregon. He presented new material and a new point of view in regard to many of them.

That causes me to be very enthusiastic in support of the position he took on issue after issue before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to my chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his kind remarks about the chairman, who appreciates a word of approval. There have been an ample number of words of a contrary nature in the past several months.

We are now operating in a very controversial era. The Senator from Oregon certainly has demonstrated great foresight in the last several years in regard to our present troubles in southeast Asia, and also I think with regard to the foreign aid program, even as disassociated from southeast Asia.

It is true that I have come around to a point of view that is very similar to that of the Senator from Oregon.

The change in my attitude has been greatly influenced by the course of events, particularly by policy developments in Asia and in the Caribbean.

I have tried to describe the drift of our policy in a number of speeches. The senior Senator from Oregon has described this trend in the past in much stronger and more colorful language than I have. I am concerned about this tendency for a great power—such as the United States—to lose its humility and to become arrogant in the use of its power.

This makes a difference as to whether I am willing to continue to support great additional power being given such as is represented by foreign aid. It is a substantial power, it is not a power such as is involved by the possession of the atomic bomb. However, it is a very important power, a power that can inject us into the internal affairs of many nations around the world.

That is one of the reasons that has brought me around to a point of view in respect to many of the aspects of this program that is similar to the point of view of the Senator from Oregon.

I am not sure that we have exactly the same basis for our views on these subjects. However, we come out at the same place on many programs and policies.

I still feel very strongly the need for assistance to the underdeveloped countries. I should prefer that it be in the form of better trade terms, but bringing about the needed changes will require a long time to accomplish. In the meantime, as an interim proposal, I am quite prepared to support more direct assistance through an international organization.

The Senator from Oregon has made a great contribution in foreseeing many of the developments that we are now experiencing. I believe that the Senator from Oregon has had greater foresight in southeast Asia than have most of us in the committee or in the Senate. I compliment him for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am changing my viewpoint in some degree.

I have not gone as far as the Senator from Arkansas as yet. I may do so in regard to multilaterally administered foreign aid in place of the so-called bilaterally administered foreign aid. I intend in a part of my speech this afternoon to give some of my reasons why I think we will have to change the administrative format of our foreign aid if we are going, in my judgment, to avoid increasing the danger of our isolation in the world, as the result of the use of our bilateral economic aid eventually, and I think inevitably in most instances, leading us to military commitments along with them.

That is one of the great dangers in our aid program as it is now operated, and we are seeing the evidence of it in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senator to the article I had printed in the RECORD today about Mr. Woods' International Bank making a proposal to increase the IDA fund.

This would be a step in the right direction. It is not a complete solution, but this approach to dispensing aid would help to insulate us from the political involvements which happen all too often under our bilateral aid program.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, one of my major problems with so-called multilateral aid programs under the World Bank or any of the other national financial obligations is the problem of Congress losing an effective check upon the use to which American money may be put in the field of foreign policy. Although the record of these international bodies to date is very good, nevertheless, we have no assurance that it will always be good.

The problem that concerns me is that large contributions of American money to a multilateral body, such as an international financial institution, may be used to support programs that do not enhance peace but can very well create the danger of war.

I believe that these proposed agreements should be examined very carefully, to determine what checks, if any, we can insist upon, within the charter of the bodies and within available principles of international law, to protect us from what I consider to be a misuse of the American contributions to those bodies.

That is why I am coming more and more to the point of view that in order to give assurance that we are not seeking our nationalistic interests in connection with the aid programs that we make available under bilateral arrangements, we should give more thought to whether the organization can be strengthened and to having our aid made a part of a multilateral program that would be administered through the United Nations, of which the World Bank is an arm, rather than on a bilateral arrangement.

I plan to say later—I shall say this much now—that what worries me is that our President speaks over the television to a convention in West Virginia, and creates the impression in our country—with some different interpretation in emphasis in other parts of the world—that the United States is about to inaugurate on a unilateral basis, on the basis of our selectivity, an American "Great Society" program in Asia. The President seeks to give assurance that we seek to improve the lot of the people in Asia, not giving much thought to whether or not they like the format of his proposal.

Nothing contained in that speech indicated any assurance that the unilateral program of this country would be welcomed in Asia. Yet here is a proposal of the President of the United States that we are going to do it. We announce to the world that we are moving into Asia. What concerns me is the thought of the thousands of Americans who will die when Asia decides to move us out.

This assumption that our moving in will be welcomed, this assumption that we will be allowed to stay in, entails my fear—I make this interpretation myself, without attributing anything to anyone else—that if we go in with the kind of economic program that I believe is in capital letters between the lines of sentences after sentences in the President's speech, and it is challenged, we will be in with guns. We will decide our investment has to be defended with guns. We will be in to force our presence in Asia.

This practice must stop. The American people, in my judgment, must make clear to this administration that it must stop this executive branch deciding that we are going to move here, there, and beyond, in various parts of the world, and plant our presence in those places, on the basis of the fine-sounding rhetoric of the President in the West Virginia speech that it is good for them, that it is good for the world, and that this is the way to improve the lot of mankind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is not this speech, though, quite consistent in carrying out the doctrine that the Vice President described, both in a communique from Bangkok and later, I believe, in an interview in Washington?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing new about it. He is just carrying it on.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, there is nothing new about it.

This is a developing program. They are ready for this chapter now.

The Bangkok proposal of the Vice President was a trial balloon. Some of the proposals of the administration in Latin America are trial balloons. Now we have the situation in which the President of the United States, in the West Virginia speech, seeks to prepare American public opinion for a longtime presence, emphasizing economic presence, emphasizing schools and food and dams and economic development, appealing to our humanitarianism.

But that is not answering the question of how you are going to do it, Mr. President. How are you going to enforce it, Mr. President? Oh, Mr. President, what worries me is that this unilateral economic aid program of our country is but a facade or a camouflage for our military presence in these underdeveloped areas of the world.

In the West Virginia speech, in the speech before the so-called Freedom Banquet in New York some weeks ago, and in none of his other speeches, has the President told the American people what would be involved in backing up American economic aid in trouble spots of the world where the aid is challenged.

The fear of the senior Senator from Oregon is not only that it will be challenged in Asia, but also that Asia will find that this kind of unilateral action, in the so-called economic format proposed by the President, means military bases and military personnel to guard it, to protect it, to carry it out.

It is just a finagle, semantically, for what I had believed was an outworn American foreign policy, that we would send in the troops to protect American economic interests when we decide that they are threatened, when the country in which they are located has decided it is time to get them out.

This situation raises some basic questions of national sovereignty. I see in the wings of this play of the administration, waiting for their entrance on the stage, as act after act progresses in the play, the maintaining in Asia, for decades to come, tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of American troops, if this unilateral program of the President of the United States is carried out.

That cannot be reconciled with peace. So, Mr. President, I think what we, the American people, should face up to is that we should join with countries in trying to bring the so-called good life to the suffering masses of Asia. But we cannot do this job alone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think of what the Senator has said as a multilateral approach to it.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I said that I am coming over to the point of view that we have to have a multilateral foreign aid program; and at the present time I think the major difference between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—if there is a difference it is minor—is the format, the instrumentality, the procedure for effectuating a multilateral worldwide foreign aid program.

I want to say, Mr. President, that there is a danger, if we continue this unilateral U.S. foreign aid program, it will take on, in fact, nationalistic characteristics and is going to be interpreted by our enemies and by neutral countries as nationalistically motivated. I ask this afternoon: How far wrong would they be?

If anyone thinks that the economic program of a Dean Rusk, or the military program of a Robert McNamara, or a combined economic-military program of both of them, is not nationalistically motivated, I do not think he could be more wrong. The sad thing is that much of our American foreign policy is nationalistically motivated. A nationalistically motivated foreign policy, in my judgment, is not going to stop us from being more and more isolated by more and more countries in this world.

That is why I am speaking in the very beginning of the speech this afternoon, presenting my opposing views to the economic aid program, in support of our bringing to an end the unilateral approach that the United States is making.

I wish to stress that that unilateral approach is bound to be characterized in no small degree by American military presence in countries in which we make the economic aid in one form or another, either directly or through our mercenary juntas we support in those countries.

That is what is involved in part in the Javits amendment—the general principle of which I support—and by the presidential escape clause provision—which I shall continue to oppose—and for that reason I will offer a substitute to it.

So, Mr. President, at best I wish to say that our foreign program has helped some countries at an extravagant price to the American taxpayer; at worst, it has sucked the military forces of the United States into foreign lands where we believed our prestige was involved because we had expended lavish aid on a particular political faction.

The Congress cannot escape the full responsibility for the direction, the effectiveness, and the cost of economic assistance. This is not foreign policy of the kind that the Constitution vests in the Executive. If it were, no legislation would be involved.

Economic assistance from the United States to any foreign country requires legislation, and while wide discretion may be given to the executive branch for its administration, the responsibility for its successes and failures will always lie with Congress.

In the recent past, indiscriminate aid programs have served to stimulate and underwrite the war between India and Pakistan, the near-war between Greece and Turkey, the growing arms race in the Middle East, widespread corruption in numerous countries, and a rash of military juntas in Latin America. So long as Congress fails to prescribe the terms and conditions that will curtail or suspend aid in these situations, and impose guidelines that will discourage our involvement in them in the future, we do not fulfill our legislative duty.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORTS REMAIN CRITICAL

Sometime during this week in a speech in the course of this debate, I shall once again, as I have in the past several years, bring to the floor of the Senate all of the reports of the Government Accounting Office, setting forth its findings in its spot check investigations and surveys of foreign aid, both economic and military, around the world.

As we know, all the military reports are top secret and not one of them should be. I have read them all and I do not know of a single line in a single one of them that the American taxpayer is not entitled to know. I do not propose to let the Pentagon Building decide for me what should be disclosed to the American people in a democracy. That is the responsibility of the Congress.

Some of the economic aid reports of the Comptroller General's office are still not made available to the people, and there is not a sentence in a single one of them that should not be.

We on the Committee on Foreign Relations have discussed this matter with the AID people in the State Department. We have not had any firm commitments, but I think the transcript of the record is clear that at least the administration was going to make more of them available than in the past, but their pace is that of a turtle.

I was not there the other day but I understand when the new Director of AID was before the committee on his confirmation hearing, there was some discussion of this matter with him. I have read, however, the newspaper accounts. I could not see that Mr. Gaud sounded any different than Mr. Bell before him in regard to this matter because Mr. Bell was going to look into it and the newspapers report that Mr. Gaud is going to look into it, too.

I wish to repeat to the American people that if they knew what was in those reports the senior Senator from Oregon would not have as much difficulty as he does in the Senate getting amendments adopted to the foreign aid bill.

If the American people knew the shocking waste the Comptroller General found, if the American people knew the gross inefficiency with which the Comptroller General found in investigation after investigation, if the American people knew the relationship between our foreign aid program and the cause of corruption in many of the underdeveloped countries of the world that get our foreign aid, I would not have so much trouble getting amendments to the foreign aid bill.

(At this point Mr. INOUYE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. In praise of Congress, let me say that last year some amendments to the bill were adopted by the Senate. The principal one was the Fulbright and the Morse amendment for a 2-year authorization, which would have brought foreign aid to an end at the beginning of fiscal year 1967, and have it start all over again on the basis of new regulations, procedures, and policies to be developed as a result of a special congressional committee contained in the program the Senator from Arkansas and I offered last year, which would make not a spot check investigation of foreign aid but would spend the 2 years up until the beginning of fiscal year 1967 conducting a study of foreign aid. The committee would then prepare a foreign aid program to be limited to some 50 countries instead of the 93 which were receiving foreign aid and which, as has been pointed out so many times, in many instances we have rammed that foreign aid down the so-called diplomatic gullets of a good many of the small countries of the world which would not have asked for it if we had not forced it upon them.

One of the major reasons why we received the votes we did, in my judgment, was that I brought to my desk in the Chamber last year—as I shall do again this year—all of the Comptroller General's reports. I piled them up in front of me and brought along a ruler—as I shall do again this year—and I measured the pile of documents for the sight of the Senate.

Each year the pile gets higher, and the reports get more damaging.

The titles I read at that time were illuminating. I had only to read the titles to have a Senator's curiosity whetted, because the titles used descriptive language which left no room for doubt that I was right in the general portrayal of the secrecy or limited investigation, in describing the nature of the report.

During the next few days after that, many Senators said they read them in the Foreign Relations Committee room. They were appalled. They did not realize the situation was that bad, and they wanted me to know they were going to support my amendment.

I should like to repeat that if Senators will go down to the Foreign Relations Committee room this year and read any of the reports they have not read heretofore, prior to this year, and read the new reports, they will understand why the pending foreign aid bill in its present form should be defeated.

Mr. President, do you think that the administration likes those reports from the Comptroller General? They certainly do not.

The Comptroller General of the United States is an agent of Congress, not the President. I think that we should change it so that the executive branch cannot put the stamp of "confidential" or "secret" upon a report from the Comptroller General.

Those reports are not made for the President, they are not made for the Secretary of State, they are not made for the Secretary of Defense; they are made for Congress.

This afternoon, let me say most respectfully that, in my judgment, Congress owes it to one of the most dedicated public officers I know—the Comptroller General of the United States—to read his reports on foreign aid. This man has been trying to protect the interests of the American taxpayers in administration after administration which has wasted hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, as they have poured military and economic aid money down one rathole after another all around the world. And they call it aid.

Mr. President, I want to point out that I think we owe it to the American taxpayers to stop some of the waste, the inefficiency, and the corruption which is flowing from our foreign aid program.

FOREIGN AID AND FOREIGN INTERVENTION

These objections are bad enough, but the objection that concerns me most this year more than any other heretofore, due to the announcements of the Johnson administration in the field of foreign policy, is that we are going to live to see a direct relationship between pouring into any underdeveloped area of the world billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money into foreign aid, with subsequent direct military intervention in order to protect the expenditure of that aid.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has put it a little differently in some of his public criticisms, although in presiding at the public hearings on South Vietnam, the Senator made statements—I do not quote him—but he presented points of view with which I found myself in complete agreement, expressing his concern over the possibility of a dangerous relationship between economic aid leading to military intervention.

To me, it will be perfectly clear when history of South Vietnam is written and America's inexcusable and unjustifiable participation in what started out to be a civil war in South Vietnam can be separated from the fact, that we proceeded to give President Diem millions and millions of dollars worth of economic aid, soon followed with military aid, and then followed with military support to the extent that we now have some 300,000 American boys in South Vietnam engaged in an ever-expanding and an ever-escalating war with very little support elsewhere in the world. Particularly no support, except lipservice, from a few Prime Ministers like Harold Wilson of Great Britain.

The last statistics I heard in the Foreign Relations Committee about British manpower participation in South Vietnam was that they had seven—seven—I do not misspeak myself—seven from the British military in South Vietnam, but provision was made that they would not be in the combat areas. Counsel has advised me that, in my behalf, the committee has checked with the Vietnamese desk in the State Department. They state that the only British military authorities, troops or otherwise, in Vietnam are attached to their own embassy in the capacity of military embassy personnel.

Mr. Marcy states that there are only five or six there in that capacity. The reason is that the British were cochairmen with the Russians at the Geneva Conference and so are maintaining an air of scrupulous noninvolvement.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain did not impress me very much with his lipservice concerning alleged support of the American policy in South Vietnam.

No British boys are dying in South Vietnam. It is easy for the British Prime Minister to make these statements from 10 Downing Street about approval of American foreign policy in South Vietnam. But, Mr. Prime Minister, may I say from the floor of the Senate today:

You do not impress me at all. You would impress me, as far as there being any weight to your statement, if you were in there—if you think it is the place for the United States to be—with your own troops, and let them do some of the dying, although I do not think you could justify it any more than the President of the United States, in my opinion, can justify the killing of American boys in South Vietnam.

Let me say also, Mr. Prime Minister, that you would impress me a lot more if you were carrying the fight to the United Nations, representing a country that was one of the charter members at San Francisco, and doing what you could to have the United Nations carry out its treaty obligations to enforce the peace. Until you start reconciling your lipservice with your actions, Mr. Prime Minister, you will not make much of a favorable impression on the senior Senator from Oregon or on many others in the United States, whose criticism is mounting in regard to this so-called noncombatant activity of the British, while their Prime Minister says he approves of the course of action we are taking in Vietnam.

I have found nothing in any of the statements of the Prime Minister of Great Britain that gives me any enthusiasm for his alleged world statesmanship.

I make the point that if we continue this course of action, we shall continue to be isolated, because, after all, heads of other governments have a public opinion they have to deal with, and I find more and more people in other parts of the world are better informed as to what is going on in southeast Asia than are the American people, because their press prints more of the facts.

Mr. President, one cannot understand the objections to this bill that I am about to enumerate unless he understands my deep fear that if we continue the American policy of economic aid, we shall extend American policy of military intervention.

I think the American people should make perfectly clear to this administration that we should not be set up as the the military policeman of the world. That is a multilateral responsibility. If other nations of the world do want to join in a program that is worked out on a multilateral basis, then the United States should stop its policy of military intervention; and economic aid, in my judgment, is an inducement to eventual military intervention.

That is why I think a great many restrictions should be adopted in the debate that will take place in the next several days as amended after amendment is offered, seeking to restrict the executive branch of the Government from following a course of action which, in my opinion, if we do not stop it, will endanger the peace of the world.

If we want to support freedom in Latin America, we should not be rushing in to recognize military juntas in the Argentine, as we did over the weekend, without any guarantee of a return to constitutional government. All that course of action on the part of the President of the United States did was to encourage potential military juntas elsewhere in Latin America.

That is why I said to the press, when then asked me what I thought about the recognition of the military dictatorship in the Argentine, "Once again, as has so often been true, the United States walked out on freedom in Latin America when the chips were down."

A sorry and a sad mistake was made when the dictatorship of the Argentine was recognized. Of course, we expect the stereotyped alibi of the State Department that a good many other countries recognized it, too.

So what? I certainly do not think American foreign policy should be cut to fit the pattern of a wrong foreign policy adopted by some other country. No; we should have recognized a government in the Argentine when constitutionalism was returned.

The Congress cannot escape the full responsibility for the direction, the effectiveness, and the cost of the economic assistance. This is not foreign policy of the kind that the Constitution vests in the Executive.

As I said, if it were, no legislation would be involved.

Aside from partisans of aid who view it as an obligation owed the poor by the rich, there are partisans throughout the United States who view it as furnishing the United States a toehold for intervention. These partisans argue that aid is simply a tool of foreign policy which gives us the means to deal with situations which may occur in a foreign country.

This is a cynical exploitation of foreign people for alleged security interests of the United States. Worse, it will delay rather than advance the time when the people of these countries will have the home-grown institutions and conditions that will enable them to resist the lures or pressures of communism.

The only realistic test of sound economic aid is results. The major way to test results is to measure them against what was planned or anticipated when an aid program was begun. Where the results fail to measure up, Congress must write corrective measures into the program, for the American people will not support permanently a multibillion-dollar program that does not produce what is advertised for it.

This year, public confidence in foreign aid is sagging lower than ever. Results from many years of the program are coming in at a time of crisis in American foreign policy, and the public does not like what it sees. Public confidence will further deteriorate if Congress continues to relax its already lax guidance of the program.

IMPROVEMENTS IN COMMITTEE BILL

The committee has made some improvements in this year's bill. Fixing the number of countries in each category is the only way to assure that our financial efforts will be concentrated on countries where they have the best prospects for achievement.

But no loophole should have been left for supporting assistance to additional countries, for this is the worst rathole in the whole program. Moreover, the development lending, and technical assistance country limits are exclusive of Alliance for Progress countries. American foreign policy officials are so accustomed to offering money as an integral part of diplomatic relations with poor countries that $2 million for Guyana was announced before it had been independent a week and before a U.S. Ambassador had been confirmed. This assumption that establishing diplomatic relations or recognizing a government means adding that country to the U.S. dole is not one that will be abandoned readily by any administration. It can only be abandoned by strong congressional action.

Retaining annual review at the authorizing stage as well as the appropriation stage is the only way to notify recipients that the American people want performance and not promises as a condition of aid.

This represented one of the points I made earlier in my speech this afternoon, in my colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], with respect to the position he took on the bill this year, because he, too, came to the conclusion that we need an annual review of our foreign aid program and ascertain what the facts are to the simple question, "What have been the results? What are the weaknesses and shortcomings?" in order to see to it that Congress takes advantage of carrying out its duty and its checking power in connection with the new authorization bill.

Restoration of the $100 million limit on new programs or projects that may be undertaken without specific authorization by Congress will enable Congress to consider new directions or major new obligations of the aid program.

SHORTCOMINGS OF BILL

The bill's chief shortcoming is its failure to reduce the amounts in each category. Expansion of other channels of lending, the demands of the war, the threat to the balance of payments, and the lack of performance by many recipients, to say nothing about the great cutback in the Great Society program, justify marked reductions in all aid categories in the bill.

I shall give the Senate an opportunity to vote on reductions amendment by amendment, category by category, before we complete the debate on this legislation.

As reported, the bill also fails to put limits on economic aid to nations using our substance as a foundation for military establishments beyond their needs, and adventures aimed at non-Communist neighboring countries.

I shall read at this point the final paragraphs from my dissenting views on the military aid program—which I shall discuss fully when that bill is before the Senate. This excerpt fits into the point I have just made:

> The benign American attitude toward Latin American military establishments has just helped deprive Argentina of a constitutional government. The pattern whereby the United States extended both economic and military aid to juntas in the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Ecuador, and El Salvador helped bring about the Castelo Branco coup in Brazil. And when we rushed to approve and to stake the Castelo Branco junta with vast new sums of aid, we encouraged the Argentine military establishment to take over its Government.
>
> Argentine generals are quoted as believing that U.S. support of the Brazilian military junta meant that formal U.S. opposition to

a coup in Argentina was "just window dressing." They are right. It is just window dressing. We have been proving by our actions for 3 years that we have little interest in constitutionalism. Whatever our military missions in Latin America are teaching the Latins, it is encouraging and not discouraging their coups against constitutionalism.

The whole rationale that our military aid tends to teach civilians control of the military, and to interest them in civic action, has been totally refuted by events. It was bad enough when these coups occurred in the small nations of central America. Now they have engulfed Brazil and Argentina. They are fed by our military aid, and they are destroying the objectives of the Alliance for Progress in country after country.

That is why I said earlier in the day, in the absence of my friend the Senator from New York, that while I shall support the main objective of his amendment when it is offered, I shall seek to strike out the provision that gives the President the right to support, with military aid, a junta, if he, the President, decides it is in the national interest. I happen to believe that is a checking obligation of Congress. I feel that if the President, after we prohibit military aid to a junta, feels, in any particular situation that may develop, there is some need for him to give special consideration, let him come up or send up a message and prove his case. But I do not intend to vote to give to a President of the United States the right to give aid to any military junta in the light of what he considers to be our national interest. I believe we must have a check, and not grant this blanket authority, for it destroys much of the real import and soundness of the rest of the amendment. Therefore I shall offer a substitute, in due course of time, if the Senator's amendment is presented in the form I read it to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to know the Senator's intentions. That knowledge is extremely helpful to me.

I shall offer the amendment in the form printed. I say to the Senator that rather long experience here leads me to believe this is the only kind of amendment likely to succeed, and I believe that success is imperative in this matter, so that we will be able at least to show, in whatever way is open to us, our disapproval of military takeovers, and our solidarity with those who oppose them.

I fully respect the Senator's view. With his customary graciousness to me, he has outlined a course of procedure which is entirely satisfactory to me, and which will put to the test, under the parliamentary situation, first any amendment or substitute to my amendment which he may propose, and then leave us the residual of my amendment for action.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. We certainly are not far apart in our ultimate objective of seeking to stop alining ourselves with juntas.

ECONOMIC AID OUTSIDE VIETNAM RISING

Mr. President, the separate provision of funds for southeast Asia and the Asian Bank have raised total economic assistance well above last year's level. In fact, if any Senator thinks the economic aid bill this year is less than last year, I assure him he is dead wrong. If Senators think the foreign assistance program proposed by the Johnson administration this year is less than last year, they are dead wrong. And I refer to aid exclusive of South Vietnam.

But, Mr. President, Senators would not be incorrect if they recognized that what is happening is that our domestic programs, important to large segments of our population, are being cut by this administration. As I said in the education hearing the other day, when the representatives of the American Council on Education were testifying, I did not intend to support a budget that would cause the schoolchildren of America to pay large sums for the cost of the war in Vietnam, by denying to them the authorizations and the appropriations necessary to meet the educational crisis in this country.

As I also said at that hearing, I repeat today, I do not propose to deny to the Negroes of America the funds to which they are entitled in order to properly carry out the Civil Rights Act, and thus have them pay for the cost of the war in South Vietnam. And as I further said in the hearing, I repeat today, that I do not propose to have the poverty-stricken people in this country pay for the war in South Vietnam, by denying to them the funds that are needed to carry out the Poverty Act, and to expand it.

Likewise, Mr. President, I do not propose to have the people of this country who are entitled under the Great Society program promises, to the development of our natural resources, to the elimination of pollution, to the giving of attention to the falling water table in many parts of the country, pay for the war in Vietnam by denying to them the funds needed domestically.

We are in much greater need of a domestic aid program than we are of a foreign aid program. Before the President of the United States talks about a foreign aid program, with the increases that he has in the bill this year in various forms, I wish to hear more from him in support of adequate funds for a domestic aid program which is so sorely needed.

But I am asked, "What are you going to say, Mr. Senator, about who should pay for that war?"

My position, Mr. President, is perfectly clear. We should pay for that war with a tax program based upon ability to pay, with special consideration to those who are making their profits out of blood money.

Let us pay for the war with a tax program, not by denying money sorely needed by the schoolchildren of the country, the poverty stricken people of the country, the Negroes of the country, and the people of the country who are entitled to have various essential domestic needs met.

I offered in the Foreign Relations Committee an amendment—and I shall offer it here on the floor—which in effect sought to cut down on foreign aid in the amount of the aid that we send into Vietnam. Mr. President, I think the other nations of the world, who have been the recipients of hundreds of millions of dollars of our largess, should be told that it cannot continue, with an undeclared war raging in Asia.

I believe, for example, that Russia and Great Britain, who are the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, should be told that we cannot continue to spend the largess of our country elsewhere in the world while these billions have to go into Asia, when they have a treaty responsibility, in my judgment, to take the steps necessary at least to endeavor to reconvene the Geneva Conference.

I think the Security Council of the United Nations and the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations should have notice served on them that we cannot continue to make available to those members that are the recipients of our largess the millions of dollars they are now receiving while we spend these huge sums of money on the war in South Vietnam.

Oh, it can be answered that we ought to stop spending the money there and followed a different course of action. No one would welcome that more than would the senior Senator from Oregon. However, I am also realistic enough to know that is not going to happen, at least in the immediate future. In fact, I do not think it is going to happen until the other nations of the world that have treaty obligations to enforce, when there is a threat to the peace of the world, start living up to their treaty obligations, and that goes for every member of the United Nations.

The major point I am making here is that in my judgment we cannot justify the cuts that are being made in essentially needed domestic programs while, at the same time, our administration fails to move ahead with its obligation of putting this country on a war footing. A war footing means taxation. A war footing means inflation control. A war footing means a wartime procedure through legislation for the handling of disputes between management and labor. A war footing means that the administration must take the necessary steps to raise the money to pay for the war and to protect the greatest defense weapon we have; namely, our economy.

We cannot protect our economy by sitting back with a wait-and-see attitude. We already know that the economy is in trouble. We already know that Congress—in my judgment—cannot justify adjourning, whether it is recommended by the President or not, without passing some legislation aimed at protecting the value of the American dollar, for its value day by day is becoming more and more in danger.

Mr. President, there is no place in the Federal Government where the American citizen can go to get a reliable dollar figure on the total cost of the United States for any annual foreign activities. But the economic bill before the Senate, in the amount of $2.46 billion, is but a small portion of this Government's outlay for our economic aid purposes—or which have that effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation entitled, "Funds

Available or Requested for the Fiscal Year 1967."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Funds available or requested for fiscal year 1967 (in billions)

Agency for International Development	$2.460
Food for peace	1.600
Anticipated supplemental for southeast Asia	.500
Asian Bank	.120
Inter-American Bank	.250
International Development Association	.104
Total	5.034

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the total of $5,034 million still does not include such economic expenditures as the Peace Corps, the World Bank subscriptions sold to private investors, the United Nations Development Agencies, or the Federal Reserve and Export Bank contingency support of the British pound sterling. Nor does it include any military aid or expenditures abroad by 800,000 American servicemen and their families.

I will ask next year that the administration present the Senate with a bill of particulars and include in it the total amount of assistance of every kind in which we spend American dollars for what amounts to some form of foreign assistance.

I believe that the annual foreign drain on the budget of the United States, exclusive of the war in Vietnam, is in the magnitude of $10 billion a year. That is a far outcry from the $2.46 billion set forth in the pending bill.

It is an educated guess. Let the administration prove that the figure is too high or too low, and they have the figures and the personnel with which to do the job.

One of my reservations about increased aid through multilateral agencies is that it generally is only added on to bilateral programs. We should be subtracting the funds for the Inter-American Bank, the anticipated new request for the IDA window at the World Bank from the Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan Fund respectively. If it worked that way, I would be a much more enthusiastic advocate of the use of multilateral channels.

EFFECT OF AID ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. President, I opposed the bill in committee also because of its effect on our balance-of-payments problem. As the costs of the Vietnamese war accentuates the problem with our deficient international financial accounts, the Congress must examine more closely than ever the extent to which the aid program contributes to that problem.

Here is one of the key areas where we cannot afford a business-as-usual attitude toward foreign aid. That sector of American business which enjoys AID contracts to send its goods abroad at taxpayer expense has largely dominated the foreign aid debate within the business community.

But American business which exports for sale is making a stronger case each year against the effects of assistance which mean loss of cash business.

The International Economic Policy Association sets forth evidence on this point that Congress can continue to ignore only at real peril. The association's spokesman, N. R. Danielian, pointed out to the committee that voluntary restraint in oversea investment by U.S. business helped bring our deficit in 1965 down to $1.3 billion, compared with $2.8 billion in 1964.

But outlays for the Vietnam war, plus increased imports resulting from a high level of economic activity for which the war is also partly responsible, have worsened the outlook.

Despite assertions that AID lending is tied to American industry, the flight of foreign cash business away from the United States through substitution is alarming. Geographically, it is most acute in Latin America, and it is most acute financially where "program lending" is used.

Latin America, the Near East, and south Asian countries received 90 percent of program loans in fiscal 1964 and 1965. In 1965, 58 percent of U.S. aid in these areas took the form of program loans.

During the years 1958–64, our economic assistance exceeded our trade deficit by amounts running between $1.1 and $1.5 billion a year. Increased efforts to tie our assistance has not changed this picture.

Mr. Danielian stated the case in a nutshell when he said:

> Since we put a line of credit at their disposal against which they can charge anything they buy in this country, except some questionable items like luxury goods, they shift their cash purchases to purchases with aid money, and they use the resulting savings of their own foreign exchange to buy in other countries. * * *
>
> I think the first important point to realize is that development loans should be used for development purposes, and development is the creation of industrial capacity for production. This can only be accomplished by projects, whether they are powerplants, shoe factories, food processing plants, and so on, and if this is the purpose of the aid program, then let us put our money into these kinds of projects, incremental projects, that add to the capacity of the country to increase its production.

Mr. President, I could not agree more than I do with Mr. Danielian. This is the project approach that the senior Senator from Oregon has argued for in the Senate for the past several years in connection with foreign aid. That is why I frequently refer to myself as a project-to-project man, rather than a government-to-government man.

We should see to it that our AID dollars are invested in specific projects that will help the people living within the economic environment of those projects, in relationship to their standards of living. Our AID dollars should reflect improvement upon the standard of living of the people in the country, rather than the AID dollars being used on a government-to-government basis, which results in many instances, as Mr. Danielian pointed out in his testimony, of giving them a line of credit to draw upon for those goods that they buy in this country, and then enabling them to use the considerable benefits of our AID program—the so-called cash benefits, as he calls them—to buy goods from other countries.

So, what is happening is that we are hoping to subsidize various underdeveloped countries with the money that is used to the competitive disadvantage of American business. I do not know how shortsighted we can be. I do not know how we can exceed that for shortsightedness.

I point out again what Mr. Danielian has said:

> Since we put a line of credit at their disposal, against which they can charge anything they buy in this country, except some questionable items like luxury goods, they shift their cash purchases to purchases with aid money, and they use the resulting savings of their own foreign exchange to buy in other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time table 3 from Mr. Danielian's testimony to the Committee on Foreign Relations, entitled "U.S. Nonmilitary Foreign Assistance Net and Trade Balances by Countries, 1958–64."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*U.S. nonmilitary foreign assistance (net) and trade balances by countries, 1958–64*

[Millions of dollars]

Countries	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964	
	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance
Afghanistan	19	−4	19	−10	13	−10	30	6	13	−8	32	−3	37	6
Bolivia	22	17	22	14	13	14	23	16	29	20	44	18	33	17
Brazil	145	−33	35	−216	42	−147	270	−68	157	−117	138	−186	212	−148
Cambodia	37	−2	21	−7	25	----------	24	9	20	5	20	2	7	−1
Ceylon	20	−5	19	−12	8	−25	9	−17	8	−19	4	−21	4	−27
Chile	47	−7	33	−76	10	----------	121	43	87	−24	109	−32	96	−38
Colombia	92	−147	32	−134	7	−54	54	−31	43	−50	69	−9	38	−35
Ecuador	3	−9	2	−12	7	−11	11	−4	11	−26	14	−11	17	−4

TABLE 3.—*U.S. nonmilitary foreign assistance (net) and trade balances by countries, 1958–64*—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Countries	1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964	
	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance	Economic aid	U.S. trade balance
India	243	63	320	129	523	412	370	230	528	411	736	509	864	651
Indonesia	24	−112	17	−123	45	−132	54	−29	88	−15	77	−7	32	−102
Jordan	57	10	60	16	62	17	61	24	53	20	54	37	45	20
Korea	311	213	232	131	261	148	228	155	233	204	231	211	157	169
Laos	30	2	35	3	33	1	51	2	30	4	31	6	39	7
Liberia	8	14	9	59	8	−4	19	17	35	20	11	4	12	−13
Malaysia	(1)	−85	(1)	−150	1	−138	2	−126	12	−155	6	−150	2	−82
Morocco	26	33	45	29	61	29	97	55	48	42	53	49	38	31
Nepal	6	(2)	3	(3)	8	(3)	10	(3)	9	(3)	14	(3)	17	(3)
Pakistan	145	81	142	65	229	131	218	158	322	243	378	341	377	336
Philippines	42	18	24	−36	24	−10	11	17	24	−59	8	−34	49	−27
Poland	99	75	66	43	127	111	57	34	60	48	46	66	52	84
Thailand	30	−4	48	−28	42	11	29	25	31	32	29	57	18	58
Tunisia	26	4	30	7	55	21	77	38	53	44	38	25	45	31
Turkey	122	72	111	44	101	66	153	69	202	106	173	154	126	96
Vietnam	204	57	168	46	186	48	144	62	148	101	189	114	221	131
Yemen	---------	(3)	5	(3)	5	(3)	6	(3)	6	(3)	8	(3)	6	(3)
Total	1,758	251	1,498	−218	1,882	478	2,129	685	2,250	827	2,512	1,140	2,544	1,160

[1] Less than $500,000.
[2] Not statistically significant.
[3] Not available.

Sources: International Monetary Fund, Direction of Trade, annual 1958–62, pp. 128–130; and March 1965, pp. 63–64; National Advisory Council, Semiannual Report to the President and Congress, January–June 1964, pp. 75–77; U.S. Department of Commerce, Foreign Grants and Credits (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office 1964).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the next table, also from Mr. Danielian's statement, table 4, "U.S. Share of Latin American Imports, 1955 to 1964; Latin American Exports to the United States, 1956 to 1964."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—*U.S. share of Latin American imports, 1956–64; Latin American exports to the United States, 1956–64*

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Imports of Latin America			Latin American exports to the United States—f.o.b.[2]	U.S. net aid to Latin America [3]	IDB [4]
	Total [1]	From the United States [1]	Percent U.S. share			
1956	7,226	3,480	48.2	3,182	212	------------
1957	8,419	4,356	51.7	3,287	320	------------
1958	7,690	3,518	45.8	3,061	639	------------
1959	7,220	3,228	44.7	3,126	397	------------
1960	7,690	3,479	45.2	3,170	271	------------
1961	7,950	3,510	44.2	3,178	834	7
1962	8,040	3,457	43.0	3,387	656	59
1963	7,860	3,380	43.0	3,451	630	141
1964 [5]	8,400	3,789	44.1	3,524	[6] 489	198

[1] Excludes Cuba; CIF basis.
[2] Overseas Business Reports (63–101), April 1963, table 9; Overseas Business Reports (65–35), June 1965, table 2.
[3] Actual disbursements; does not include aid from international institutions.
[4] Actual disbursements; approximately $320,000,000 were U.S. dollar disbursements.
[5] Preliminary.
[6] U.S. Government aid commitments to Latin America in 1964 were $1,400,000,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, IDB Information Office, International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics, October 1959, p. 25, October 1965, p. 35; Direction of Trade Annual 1958–62, pp. 85–87; Annual 1960–64, p. 93.

CASE STUDIES OF FOREIGN AID FAILURES

Mr. MORSE. The failures of program lending in a major test country, Chile, will be dealt with before I finish this speech. I with to discuss case study failures of foreign aid—the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Nepal, and Chile.

The administration has not been able to show that economic assistance as presently administered is either an effective instrument of foreign policy or a significant stimulus to economic development in recipient countries.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Dominican Republic is a particularly tragic evidence of the political and economic inadequacy of foreign aid as an instrument to promote political stability and economic development. It has a population of only 3½ million. Starting with the election of Juan Bosch in 1962, we poured money into the country in profuse quantities:

Bosch government	$86.6
Reid-Cabral junta	61.6
U.S. occupation	128.7
Total (includes food for peace)	276.9

It will be seen that well before the civil war and foreign intervention we had extended some $42 in aid per capita. Funds planned through 1967 will bring the figure to $100, and that does not include the cost to the United States of support of United States and Latin American forces that have been in the Dominican Republic since a year ago last April.

What are the results? On June 13, 1966, Newsweek magazine summed up economic life in the country as follows:

> The hate-wracked Republic which Balaguer inherits is plagued with almost every infirmity of the underdeveloped world. Probably one-third of its labor force is jobless, a third of its children never enter school and many of its people are undernourished, diseased, and illiterate. The population is growing at a breakneck 3.5 percent a year while the economy is stagnant, the budget solidly in the red, and only the monthly $6 million handout from the United States carries the overpadded Government payroll. "This country is asleep in dead center," a U.S. official said last week, "and it'll be a major project to wake it up."

In 1961, when our aid began, the gross national product of the Dominican Republic was about $788 million. It has dropped about 15 percent despite these massive infusions of U.S. aid.

It will be argued that the Dominican Republic is a special case. If so, it is special testimony to the strangling effect of excessive American financial intervention.

On a per capita basis the Dominican Republic is relatively well off, with a gross national product in 1964 of about $225 per capita. There is dozens of nations, where we have assistance programs, which are much power in an economic sense and potentially less stable in a political sense. The American people need to beware because the present philosophy of AID is that each of these countries is of vital concern to the United States and we, as guardian of economics and policeman of politics, must send our advice, our bounty, and our military assistance "on demand" and sometimes even without it.

VIETNAM

Vietnam is a classic case of how far the United States can become enmeshed by policies based on aid and limitless commitments of men, money, and advice.

The Secretary of State has told the Committee on Foreign Relations on at least two occasions—and he has also so remarked in public—that there is a direct relationship between our aid programs to Vietnam and our involvement there. From time to time the Secretary of State has sought by other means to justify the "war" in Vietnam, but the essence of his position was set forth to the committee in August of 1964 when he asserted that the President has authority under the aid programs and on his own responsibility to involve the Nation in war in Vietnam.

During hearings on the Vietnam supplemental bill this year, the Secretary referred again to the action of the Congress in providing "bilateral assistance" and "annual aid appropriations" as authority for our involvement in Vietnam. Finally, in February of this year, the Secretary of State in Las Vegas, Nev., said we were committed to assist South Vietnam, among other things, "by the aid approved by bipartisan majorities in Congress over a period of 12 years."

What did our economic aid develop for Vietnam?

In 11 years from 1953 through 1963, the United States provided $1,885,400,000 of economic assistance—including food for peace—to a nation of 15 million people, mostly farmers. This was an average of about $170 million a year up to the collapse of the Diem government and the upswing in the civil war. We had made Diem our agent and supplied him with ample funds, but such lavish and only served to hasten his departure. At Honolulu in 1966, there were announced development plans for South Vietnam that only bore out the failure of all previous aid to develop the country.

For 1966 and 1967, an additional $1 billion is programed for Vietnam, excluding food for peace, military assistance, civilian construction, and other direct costs of the war. Thus the grand total of economic assistance alone to Vietnam over a period of 14 years will total at least $3,375 million—about $225 for every man, woman, and child. This is enough in family terms to have built every family a house—at the low cost there—furnish it, and have enough left over to get a good start on a school construction program.

The above figures do not include military assistance which over the same period of time is nearly as great in magnitude.

In 14 years the total amount of assistance, both military and economic, which we have given Vietnam is over $5 billion—one-third of the total cost of the Marshall plan.

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS ON VIETNAM ECONOMIC AID

Members would be well advised to read with care the maiden speech of our new colleague from Michigan, Mr. Griffin, who reported on June 23 on some aspects of the aid program which he observed in Vietnam. For example, Mr. Griffin says:

> In my judgment, based on my recent visit to Vietnam, the weakest link in U.S. activities is, inexcusably, the economic one. A result of serious mismanagement and ineffective controls * * * they have made the rich richer and the poor poorer; and they have indirectly routed American supplies into the hands of the Communist Vietcong. * * *

Representative John E. Moss, recently back from Vietnam, was reported in the New York Times of May 18, 1966, as demanding that AID completely overhaul its $400 million commodity program for South Vietnam. He stated that this program, instead of combating inflationary pressures, was actually "feeding inflation."

Members of the Senate interested in the problems of dealing with a corrupt government in Vietnam should examine the report of a distinguished former administrator of the point 4 program, Mr. Stanley Andrews. His report appears on page 590 of the committee hearings and is critical in many respects of the rural aid program.

NEPAL

A small case study has been done in Nepal and the results published in "Foreign Aid and Politics in Nepal—A Case Study," by Eugene B. Mihaly. The author was until recently with AID's policy planning staff and is now with the Peace Corps. He reports:

> In Nepal, aid, despite its successes in some areas, actually reduced the prospect for growth by its impact on the political scene.
>
> We assumed that Nepal was merely poor and that, therefore, there was no fundamental barrier to the introduction of Western techniques. * * * Yet the more [our aid projects] demanded of Nepal, the less they accomplished.

This stinging indictment is directed at an aid program which in about 10 years has put a total of $90 million—including food for peace—into a nation of 10 million people. And the result, in the words of Mr. Mihaly:

> In Nepal, aid, despite its success in some areas, actually reduced the prospect for growth by its impact on the political scene.

CHILE

An intensive study of aid to Chile prepared by Senator Gruening for the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee should be read by every Senator before he votes on this bill.

Per capita, assistance to Chile is the highest in Latin America. It is a testing ground for program loans and with its small population of 8.5 million, its stable and democratic government, Chile seemed to be the one place where foreign assistance could bring meaningful results.

U.S. economic assistance to Chile from 1961 through 1965 has totaled nearly $700 million, and was presumably in conformity with a 10-year economic plan laid out in March of 1962.

Yet Senator Gruening finds:

> The economy has been virtually stagnant for a decade—its rate of growth in recent years has averaged about 3 percent a year, only inching ahead of the annual 2.5 percent population growth.
>
> Inflation has been endemic. During the decade 1950–60, the cost of living rose by an annual average of 36 percent. In 1960 and 1961, under an austerity program, inflation was held to 5 and 10 percent respectively. But as inflationary pressures were felt again, living costs rose 28 percent in 1962, 45 percent in 1963 and 38.4 percent in 1964.
>
> In recent years Chile's monetary and fiscal position has been bleak. The balance of trade has been unfavorable, with imports exceeding exports by some $95 million in 1963 and $93 million in 1964. At the same time, the Chilean Government is responsible for many social and economic services which contribute to recurring budget deficits (the budget deficit reached 452.4 million escudos at the end of 1964, or about $165 million). Meanwhile, the Chilean Government has been forced to rely more heavily upon foreign borrowing. In recent years foreign credit has financed as much as 40 percent of official investment. As a result, Chile faces increasingly serious difficulties in servicing its medium- and long-term foreign debt (currently amounting to $1.4 billion) with payments of interest and amortization imposing a heavy burden on the balance of payments. International reserves of the monetary system dipped to a minus $263.7 million on December 31, 1964.

He finds that Chilean firms produce at high cost for a limited market. In agriculture, the largest source of employment, the feudal system has turned Chile, once an exporter of foodstuffs, into a heavy importer of agricultural commodities and a dependent upon food for peace.

Sixty-five percent of agricultural income goes to 8 percent of the landowners. The rural laborers and their families who comprise a third of the nation's population remain at the bottom of the economic ladder:

> It is estimated that only 6 percent of the rural population has access to safe water service. Housing for almost half the rural population is primitive. Sewage facilities are practically nonexistent. Despite Chile's educational achievements relative to other underdeveloped countries, one-third of the rural population 15 years and over has received no schooling whatsoever, while another third has completed 1 to 3 years of primary education—hence, two-thirds are functional illiterates.
>
> A large segment of Chilean landlords have demonstrated little concern for their tenant farmers and laborers or for increasing the productivity of their lands. With plenty of cheap labor available, large landholders earn comfortable livings from extensive farming. Significantly, agriculture in recent years, although accounting for only about 10 percent of gross national product, has received about 35 percent of the private credit outstanding. Most of the credit has gone to a small group of producers, and much of this has been diverted to relatively nonproductive or to nonagricultural uses. Studies of the expenditure patterns of large landowners reveal that they spend almost 80 percent of their sizable incomes for personal consumption.

Although Chile in the past has had a relatively highly developed education system, it has fallen tragically far behind modern needs:

> It has become increasingly clear that the school system, organized in the 19th century, has failed to adapt to the country's real needs. Emphasis has traditionally been upon academic training and the liberal professions, with the result that few people have vocational skills. The dropout rate is high: of every 100 students who enter primary schools, only 33 complete the sixth year of the curriculum.

These are not the conditions of 1960 the Alliance for Progress was designed to correct: these are the conditions that prevail in a primary recipient of development money from the United States, 5 years after massive aid has been underway.

The Gruening report demolishes much of the case the administration tries to make for nonproject, or program, lending:

> Program lending, initiated in 1963, and now the overwhelming component of the U.S. program in Chile, is a highly dubious device for linking assistance to performance.

A $35 million program loan was made in 1963 and a $55 million loan in 1964.

Following the 1964 election of President Frei we expected the genuine reforms, and an $80 million program loan was signed early in 1965.

Senator GRUENING finds the results not much different than before. Moreover:

> Chile's investment budget remains largely a random shopping list of unevaluated, unrelated projects submitted by various agencies and ministries. * * * Program lending erodes Chile's incentive to undertake the necessary steps to formulate its investment program on a rational basis. So long as dollars are available through the program loan route, the Chilean Government feels no urgency to build an institutional capability for projectizing its bids for foreign financing. * * * Another serious and related consequence of program lending has been the undermining of the proposed consortium of international lending agencies and governments to be organized under the auspices of the World Bank. Chile much prefers receiving external assistance not tied to specific projects, a situation which the consortium was designed to end. Furthermore, dealing with AID within an international group promised to be a good deal tougher than negotiating bilaterally where considerations other than economic can be raised. Meanwhile, continuation of U.S. program loans made it unnecessary for Chile to prepare projects suitable for international financing. The result: no projects, no consortium. In effect, the program loans helped to scuttle the international consortium, the instrument by which the United States intended to get out of the business of supplying assistance unrelated to specific projects.

These objections to the nature and results of aid to Chile are in no way a reflection upon Chileans. Nor do I intend to criticize by implication any other recipient of American aid. It is our money, and we are entirely responsible for its use or misuse.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID ARE INDIVISIBLE

Now I come to the subject of economic aid and military assistance, and I shall discuss them under the same subject, as they are inseparable.

One of the tragedies of the American economic aid program is the degree to which a direct relationship has developed between economic assistance and military expenditures of recipient countries. It argues convincingly against separating economic and military aid in the legislative process.

That is one of the issues that will be before us in the days immediately ahead, for I shall attempt in the Senate, as I did in committee—but failed there—to stop this trend toward the separation of economic and military assistance..

This administration has failed in the past in attempting to separate military aid from economic aid and in assigning it to the Committee on Armed Services. I warn the Senate that that is what the Pentagon Building is after. In my judgment, they will not be satisfied unless they succeed in accomplishing that objective. They do not want the subject of military aid before the Committee on Foreign Relations. They know that the Committee on Foreign Relations knows that military aid cannot be separated from American foreign policy.

The Pentagon Building certainly would like to acquire jurisdiction over military aid. Well, they have failed in the past. There was a great deal of talk of attempting it again this year, as they have attempted it in the past, but this year they are following a new gimmick. Apparently, they approach this a step at a time.

This year, Mr. President, the administration did recommend that military aid be turned over to the Committee on Armed Services. This year, the administration recommended that economic aid be considered in one bill and that military aid be considered in another bill, and that we authorize them separately. That is why this afternoon we do not have a combined economic aid and military aid bill, as we always have had in the past.

(At this point Mr. ERVIN assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. This afternoon, Mr. President, we have only the economic aid bill. In my judgment, it is even a mistake to consider them in debate separately because they are so interrelated and so intertwined that they should be considered together.

I want the record to show a warning that I issue today. In my judgment, if they get by with it, next year we will not have a military aid bill before the Committee on Foreign Relations. We will have it before the Armed Services Committee. All we will have next year is an economic aid bill before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

But, Mr. President, military aid is inseparable from American foreign policy. I think it would be against the best interests of the American people if this administration is ever allowed to get by with what I am satisfied is at the present time a covert design. Whenever they think they can get military aid assigned to the Armed Services Committee they will attempt it, as they have in the past, and in the past they have failed.

Procedurally I am opposed to the separation of the two bills, economic aid and military aid. We cannot discuss economic aid without giving some thought to military aid, and that is why in this part of my speech I am taking up what I think is the relationship between economic aid and military aid.

I want the Senate to know, Mr. President, what I think the Pentagon Building is up to. We stopped them in the Committee on Foreign Relations on another little gimmick that they had all greased for passage. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, is not very happy about the reports of the Comptroller General. I discussed the reports of the Comptroller General in broad outline earlier this afternoon.

The Comptroller General in report after report over the years has found shocking example after shocking example of inexcusable waste, mishandling of funds by the recipient countries to which we have given military aid, the selling of equipment they did not need; and not only that but in some instances the relationship between military aid and corruption within the governments of recipient countries. Of course, as I pointed out, I think there is no doubt about the fact that there is a direct relationship between American military aid and the building up of military juntas around the world. When you build up a military junta you are in the field of foreign policy because it is only a matter of time in many instances before that junta will overthrow the constitutional government.

(At this point, Mr. BURDICK assumed the chair.)

Mr. MORSE. How did the Secretary of Defense try to get around the Comptroller General? The record is clear. He set up, so the Committee on Foreign Relations found, an inspection unit of his own, with more auditors, with more investigators, and with more inspectors than in the entire Comptroller General's office for surveillance over the American Government in its entirety.

Then, what did the Secretary of Defense propose? Without any fanfare, only added in the administration bill, they would do away with any inspection by the Comptroller General. McNamara knows that he does not dare to leave the Comptroller General a free hand in the inspection of American military aid because McNamara knows that the Comptroller General will continue to investigate fearlessly and impartially and disclose facts in the reports as he finds them.

The sad thing is that McNamara is protected by the fact that those reports have to be marked "Top Secret." But as the Comptroller General has testified before our committee time and time again, that is not by his request. The Comptroller General has not asked to have any of the reports marked "Top Secret."

Mr. President, I discovered that Defense Department gimmick in the bill and I made a fight against it in committee. The committee refused to go along with the administration proposal to have the Defense Establishment exempted from Comptroller General inspections and investigations.

But this should be taken as warning to be on guard next year for a further attempt on the part of the administration to get military aid under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. That would be a great mistake for the reason I have stated: The direct relationship between military aid and foreign policy.

Economic aid, as I said, often supports the creation of military machines in countries which cannot support them. The administration and the Congress have not come to grips with this problem.

The classic case involves the assistance which the United States has given to India and Pakistan, and also our aid to Greece and Turkey. But let us take a little longer look at India and Pakistan. When the United States agreed to arm Pakistan on the theory that it would be a bulwark against possible Communist aggression, India complained. The Indians were worried that U.S.-supplied arms would enable Pakistan to use force some day against India, rather than against a Communist onslaught as the United States feared. India, therefore, used its own budgetary resources to purchase and manufacture arms with which to meet potential threats not only from China, but from Pakistan.

But with India putting funds into armaments, there was little left over for food and other necessary imports.

The present Presiding Officer, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] knows whereof I speak on this point, for with his own eyes, as a member of my delegation last fall, as we went to India, he saw some of the clear implications of the argument that the Senator from Oregon is now making.

Mr. President, there is no question as to what India and Pakistan have been doing in military spending. They should be spending their money for food. They should be spending their money for worthwhile projects. They should be doing something about their agriculture. In addition to what aid they receive for nothing, the military aid they can spend for military purposes, but then they count on the United States subsequently coming to their assistance with food.

I shall vote to come to their assistance when starvation stalks their land, but I am not going to vote to come to their assistance in the field of food when, in those instances in which they can spend their own money, they can obtain the food instead of using the money for tanks, aircraft, or bullets.

But with India putting funds into armaments, there was little left over for food and other necessary imports. So the United States provided economic aid in the amount of $5.8 billion from 1949 until 1965, thus freeing Indian funds for armament.

Those in India and Pakistan who suffered from this arrangement were the people—the little people—the ones who needed food and fertilizer. Then, of course, there were the soldiers who served in the armies which finally clashed last August in battles which pitted American-supplied Patton tanks manned by Pakistanis, against British Centurion tanks purchased from the British and manned by Indians.

Much the same thing is happening in the Middle East. We supply arms directly by grant to Jordan and sell them to Israel and Saudi Arabia. Meanwhile, Egypt's economic base for a Soviet-supplied military establishment is strengthened by our munificient extension of food. Our policymakers believe they are balancing these forces against each other. What they are doing is building a house of matchsticks. When it collapses, the United States will once again be encouraged to believe that military intervention by the United States is the only thing that can save the situation.

That is why I find myself in agreement—and I have said so in committee and elsewhere—with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as he warns the American people of the danger that military and economic aid can lead to American military intervention. I think we have to exercise more checks against the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense if we are going to protect the American people from that danger.

WHAT DO WE OWE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES?

Grants and loans for development purposes, as contrasted with reconstruction, began about 15 years ago. Enough time has elapsed to arrive at some firm judgments about the value and effectiveness such programs can have in undeveloped countries.

The first conclusion must surely be that local interest, determination, and leadership are the essential ingredients for development and not American capital. Our loans and grants can supplement but can never replace those ingredients.

Our 15-year experience surely demolishes the worst fallacy about foreign aid. This fallacy holds that wealthy, industrial countries owe some obligation to contribute a fixed percentage of their national wealth to the poor nations. Yet the advocates of this theory would be horrified to see it applied within the United States. It would mean taxing the rich States in order to give money to the poor States just because they are poor, without providing extensive guidelines on how it is to be used, intensive supervision to see that the purposes of the program are carried out, and prompt suspension of assistance when specifications of the national purpose are not carried out.

The first and foremost obligation to the undeveloped countries lies with the people of the undeveloped countries, and their governments. It is the obligation to use outside financial help as effectively as possible. Too much American money is simply foisted on them for purposes and projects in which they have no interest and which they merely tolerate because the United States wants them to have it.

Proponents of the "we owe you a fixed percentage of our gross national product" theory give little attention to the real needs of poor nations. The one thing the people of these nations do not need is American subsidization of their old, semifeudal ways of doing things. Such subsidizing is not sound policy for the United States, either, for it induces us to throw more and more resources—even military forces—behind an unpopular and precarious government in the effort to justify our initial bad judgment.

Secondly, in our zeal to push funds into many of these countries we have found it much easier to push products and commodities than to promote or finance the development of natural and human resources. Much of this development probably calls for grants rather than loans. But it is being dangerously neglected by both borrowers and lenders.

Education in too many poor countries remains the mark of the privileged. In some, sending sons abroad for degrees from America or Britain is a sine qua non of the upper classes. Too much of our AID education assistance simply accommodates them in this neglect of their total national human resources. Despite the overcrowding of American campuses with American students, we continue to jam foreign students into them instead of concentrating on building education centers in their home countries.

We are also neglecting in our aid programs the basic education that we would call elementary and secondary. Figures for the Alliance for Progress, which is the most purely development program of any we have, show a distressing lack of emphasis on education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables, one entitled "Alliance for Progress Breakdown of Total Fiscal Year 1966 Technical Cooperation Funds," and the other "Breakdown of Total Fiscal Year 1966 Development Loan Program Funds."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alliance for Progress breakdown of total fiscal year 1966 technical cooperation funds

	Amount (thousands)	Percent
Basic education	$8,471	10.8
Technical training in industry and agriculture	6,012	7.7
Natural resources development-land reform	[1] 4,369	5.6
Other	59,148	75.9
Total	[2] 78,000	100.0

[1] Natural resources development including land reform as shown above is restricted to natural resource surveys, forest management, land settlement, agrarian reform, and related activities. Excluded are overall agricultural productivity programs such as agricultural extension, crop research and development, cooperatives development, rural community development, agricultural marketing, agricultural diversification, etc. If the category of natural resources development is expanded to include all food and agricultural activities, including technical training in agriculture, the total TC funds would be 13,629 and the percentage would be 17.4.

[2] Total of $78,000,000 excludes $10,000,000 for Alliance for Progress share of nonregional costs.

Breakdown of total fiscal year 1966 development loan program funds

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Basic education	$3.2	(1)
Technical training in industry and agriculture		
Natural resources development-land reform	[2] 111.4	22
Commodity imports (nonproject)	305.0	[3] 62
Other	73.5	15
Total	493.1	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

[2] Includes loans for supervised agricultural credit; livestock, agricultural, and mining banks; access roads; fertilizer imports; and related activities.

[3] Local currency counterpart also programed in many cases for education, agriculture, and other natural resources development.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the use to which proceeds of nonproject, or program, loans are put are not included in the above table. But the breakdown of the proceeds from program loans to Chile shows that about 9 percent of the 1963 loan went for education, about 5 percent of the 1964 loan, and about 16 percent of the 1965 loan. This is a meager allotment relative to need.

Although Chile has a high literacy rate relative to other South American countries, 40 percent of its total population is under 15 years of age. Literacy rates in many of these countries experiencing a population explosion will not even be maintained, much less reduced, unless faster progress is made to expand teaching facilities.

Education is perhaps the most important key to the development of poor nations. It cannot be forced on them; it cannot be financed by the United States on our say-so and without their enthusiastic cooperation.

Unless recipients move much faster and further in this field, they will never achieve sufficient productive capacity of their own to sustain growth or repay our loans.

CONCLUSION

We will not have a useful and effective aid program of the kind that seeks to build stable and autonomous governments until we learn that a massive American presence is not the key to this process. It can be a great hindrance. The Wall Street Journal of June 10, 1966, reports from Tokyo the high returns that Japan is enjoying from its modest aid efforts:

> Compared to exportable great societies, massive U.S. overseas spending and America's awesome foreign military commitments, Japan's modest approach to international affairs may seem, to some Americans, almost amusing. Yet Asian recipients of even small Japanese offerings, tied as they are to goods made in Japan, are nonetheless grateful. In fact, some appear more appreciative of small Japanese help than they are of infinitely more lavish U.S. gifts.
>
> And if Japan isn't hailed as Asia's new political precursor, she at least isn't damned, as is the United States so often, for meddling in others' internal affairs or supporting unpopular regimes.

General Ne Win, of Burma, a country which needs capital and technical assistance, took the initiative a few years ago to throw us out. Recently he was quoted—New York Times, June 20, 1966—as saying:

> Unless we Burmans can learn to run our own country we will lose it. Of course there are hardships. But we must put our own house in order.

He referred to some of his southeast Asian neighbors staggering under loads of money from the United States. The general said:

> This kind of aid does not help. It cripples. It paralyzes. The recipients never learn to do for themselves. They rely more and more on foreign experts and foreign money. In the end they lose control of their country.

Very well put. The Burmese are poor but not much worse off than Indonesians, Thai, Laotians, Indians, Pakistanis, and Vietnamese, all of whom have been deluged with U.S. aid.

George Kennan stated the case very well before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East when he said:

> I do feel very strongly that the only people really worth helping in this world are the people who say: We propose to survive whether you help us or not, but it will be a little easier for us if you help. The ones who come along and say to us: "If you don't help us, we are going to go Communist, and then where would you be?" I think by definition are beyond helping.

Mr. President, I quite agree with the statement of Mr. Kennan. In fact, to the international blackmail argument—to which the U.S. Government has yielded time and time again—when various countries say, "If you do not help us we will turn to Russia," or, "If you do not supply us with military equipment, we will buy it from Russia," my answer to this is, "Go ahead and do it. You will be paying a price in something more than money."

But, Mr. President, I think that we have performed a disservice to many of those countries by yielding to their blackmail. I do not think that this has furthered the cause of peace by providing them with military assistance. In some instances, that goes for economic assistance, too, where they use some of it in order to build up unnecessary military purchases.

But there is another side to the aid coin. Not only do we alienate the people we are trying to help, but we alienate those we are not trying to help. The latter are likely to view us as meddlesome neighbors anxious to tell others how to act and what to do. There is a further effect on the United States when it assumes responsibilities everywhere.

This point was made a few days ago by Dr. Henry Kissinger, of Harvard University, when he testified on June 27 before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Although he was referring specifically to the American attitude toward Europe, his comment is equally applicable to our posture toward Asia and toward recipient aid countries generally. He said in part:

> Some critics of American policy argue that the attempt to play a role simultaneously in every part of the globe is beyond our physical resources. It seems to me clearly beyond our psychological resources. If we insist on assuming the principal responsibility for every square mile of territory at every moment of time, we will tear ourselves to pieces inwardly. The continent closest to us culturally, with similar political traditions and substantial economic resources should—for our sake as well as its own—assume a greater responsibility for its policy and defense. It is neither in our interest nor that of Europe that Europe become the Greece to our Rome—a political backwater, interesting culturally but unable to play an active role. This would not be healthy for us because hegemony is demoralizing in the long run.
>
> Painful as it may be to admit, we could benefit from a counterweight to discipline our occasional impetuosity and to supply historical perspective to our penchant for abstract and "final" solutions.

I have made this extensive report to buttress what seem to me to be two fundamental points: first, that aid as such does not necessarily advance our foreign policy interests but as presently conceived may actually damage our interests abroad; and second, that even when we pour in economic aid, it too often does not bring economic results—to use the words of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], "it often makes the rich richer and the poor poorer."

Furthermore, it often creates an unhealthy dependency upon the United States at the very time when recipient countries should begin to make way on their own. Sooner or later the spoon-fed baby will knock the spoon out of his mother's hand; and that is what is going to happen to the United States if we continue present policies.

I would not begrudge the expenditure of 1 cent of these sums were I convinced that the American people were getting their money's worth. But they are not. Much of our aid—military as well as economic—is creating abroad societies which will be ever resentful of the United States. Their resentment will be focused on military forces we have created which stifle change and often promote military domination. Their resentment will be focused on our unilateral interference, financial or military, in their internal affairs, when there were international institutions available. Their resentment will well up from their desire to be independent and to do things for themselves—or at least not under the benign thumb of the United States.

I shall from time to time offer amendments seeking to modify the bill reported by the Senate committee.

I ask unanimous consent that I may submit this afternoon six amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments, submitted by Mr. MORSE, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 666

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That whenever the President determines that—

"(1) for at least two consecutive calendar quarters, the balance of payments has been favorable to the United States, and

"(2) the annual rate of military and economic expenditures from all United States sources for the defense of South Vietnam has been reduced to a rate not exceeding 1 per centum of the gross national product of the United States,

he shall transmit to the Congress a report containing his recommendations for continuing or reinstituting such foreign assistance programs as he may deem appropriate.

"SEC. 2. Section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 637. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1967 and subsequent fiscal years such amounts as may be necessary for administering programs under part I which are carried out with funds authorized during the fiscal year 1966 or any prior fiscal year.' "

AMENDMENT NO. 667

On page 10, after line 21, add the following:

"(c) Add the following new section:

" 'SEC. 254. Restriction on Assistance to Latin America.—None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be used to provide assistance to any country in Latin America in any fiscal year if the total estimated expenditures of such country for defense purposes for such year are expected to exceed an amount equal to 3.5 per centum of the estimated gross national product as determined by the President of such country for such year.' "

AMENDMENT No. 668

On page 6, before the period in line 18 insert a comma and the following: "and by striking out '$210,000,000' and substituting '$200,000,000' ".

AMENDMENT No. 669

On page 10, line 15, strike out "$543,000,000" and substitute "$510,000,000".

On page 10, lines 16 and 17, strike out "$87,700,000" and substitute "$75,000,000".

AMENDMENT No. 670

On page 14, line 23, strike out "$700,000,000" and substitute "$650,000,000".

AMENDMENT No. 671

On page 4, line 5, strike out "$620,000,000" and substitute "$570,000,000".

Mr. MORSE. Also, I do not think the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was on the floor when I made the announcement earlier that I shall speak on this matter from time to time in the days immediately ahead, and that I shall agree to no unanimous-consent agreement of any kind whatsoever to limit debate or fix a time for debate. I shall again this year, as I have in the past several years, insist that the foreign aid bill be handled under the rules of the Senate, without any unanimous-consent agreements relative to amendments or debate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the foreign aid bill now before the Senate should be amended to prohibit aid to countries which continue trading with North Vietnam, as proposed in the pending amendment.

The No. 1 objective of U.S. foreign policy should be that of bringing the war in Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion, and the foreign aid program must be coordinated with this goal.

To put it bluntly, we should not be helping people who are helping our enemies.

The State Department has made "real headway" in getting nations receiving U.S. foreign aid to stop trading with Communist North Vietnam.

Last year 10 countries receiving U.S. assistance had ships in North Vietnamese ports, but in the first quarter of 1966 there were only three.

But, I believe we should write a prohibition into law, stopping all assistance to such nations, thus clearly showing the intent of Congress.

The countries receiving U.S. assistance which had ships in North Vietnamese ports during the first quarter of 1966 were Cyprus, Greece, and Italy.

Cyprus is receiving economic aid and food supplies through voluntary agencies, while both Greece and Italy receive U.S. food surpluses and Greece gets military assistance.

Foreign aid nations which traded with Communist North Vietnam last year but have not had ships in Vietnamese ports in 1966 include Japan, Lebanon, Norway, Liberia, Panama, France, and Malta.

I have had prepared a sheet which sets forth this information, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Free world flagships in North Vietnamese ports

Country	1965	1st quarter, 1966
United Kingdom	136	29
Japan	37	
Greece	28	4
Lebanon	9	
Norway	29	
Italy	1	1
Netherlands	5	
Liberia	3	
Panama	1	
Cyprus	3	2
France	2	
Malta	2	
Total	256	36

Which of these received U.S. aid?

Country	Economic aid	Public Law 480 (food)	Military assistance
United Kingdom	No	No	No.
Japan	No	No	Training.
Greece	No	Yes [1]	Yes.
Lebanon	No	Yes	Training.
Norway	No	No	Yes.
Italy	No	Yes [1]	No.
Netherlands	No	No	No.
Liberia	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Panama	Yes	Yes [1]	Yes.
Cyprus	Yes	Yes [1]	No.
France	No	Yes [1]	No.
Malta	No	Yes [1]	No.

[1] Through voluntary agencies only.

NOTE.—Concerning shipping during the current year, only the United Kingdom, which receives no assistance is continuing to ship in significant amounts. The only country receiving economic assistance which had ships in North Vietnamese ports was Cyprus (2).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I support the pending amendment. I hope it can be accepted by the committee chairman and agreed to by the Senate.

It conforms to an amendment adopted to this bill in the other body. It follows a similar amendment adopted in the Senate committee, I am informed, to the military assistance bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3093. An act to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 9, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; and

S. 3150. An act to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General.

THE VIEW FROM EUROPE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR CHURCH OF IDAHO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The View From Europe," by our colleague Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Leader, June 20, 1966]

THE VIEW FROM EUROPE

(By FRANK CHURCH)

NOTE.—FRANK CHURCH, *Democratic Senator from Idaho, recently visited Europe to ascertain opinion there toward the U.S. This article is adapted from his report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.*

WASHINGTON.—In the eyes of most Western Europeans, the postwar period has ended. Western Europe has fully regained its vitality, with living standards far above prewar levels. The threat of a Soviet armed attack appears to be subsiding, making the prospect of a new war there increasingly unlikely. Consequently, Western Europeans long for a thaw in the cold war. They sense that now may be an opportune time for a gradual relaxation of tensions between the two halves of Europe—a necessary precondition for an eventual settlement which could bring an end to the present partition.

Although reasonably satisfied with the present and sanguine about the future, there is still a feeling of uneasiness when our allies in Europe look either to the East or to the West. In the East, Western Europeans see a less militant Soviet Union and its neighbor Communist countries evolving some more rapidly than others, in the direction of a more independent relationship with Russia. At the same time, Western Europeans see no evidence of any present disposition on the part of the Soviets to release their hold on East Germany to permit a reunification that would end the uneasy, potentially explosive, military confrontation in the heart of the Continent. Thus, while a Soviet military thrust into Western Europe is regarded as highly improbable, it is not dismissed as impossible. And there appears to be virtually unanimous recognition among Western Europeans that, should war threaten again, their protection still rests on American nuclear power.

Looking westward, many Europeans suspect that the United States is unattuned to the changing sentiment in Europe—that we remain wedded to concepts which reflect the old status quo. In particular, Europeans would welcome our placing less emphasis upon NATO's role as a fort and more upon its use as a forum for reaching agreement on Western initiatives directed toward the normalization of relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

As for closer ties with the United States, Europeans are apprehensive about being smothered in our embrace. They are uneasy about the magnetic attraction of a voracious American economy. As cause for alarm, they point to the "brain drain," the disparity between research and development funds in the United States and Europe, and the widening American technological superiority in such growth industries as electronics, aircraft and space. Against these American advantages, even the Common Market is a meager and insufficient answer. "We shall be reduced," a renowned economist lamented to me, "to the same subordination to the United States as ancient Greece bore toward imperial Rome. Unless the trend can somehow be reversed, we are destined to become a continent of hotel keepers, store clerks, salesmen, and tourist guides."

On the one hand, therefore, there is much evidence in Western Europe today of a satisfaction derived from recovery, of a pride associated with the present prosperity, of a desire for the reassertion of European prerogatives, of a wish for reconciliation with the East and, above all, of a general belief that the danger of war in Europe is diminishing. But, on the other hand, a feeling of vulnerability remains. Europeans have yet devised no substitute for the American nuclear shield—and they do not see any in the offing. As a consequence, they regard the continued deployment of U.S. troops in Europe as vital to the credibility of the American nuclear deterrent. Opinions vary, however, as to the number of troops we need to keep in the Federal Republic of Germany.

In attempting to cope with these somewhat ambivalent sentiments, the interests of American policy would seem to call for less dogmatism, less insistence on American solutions which meet with strong European resistance, and a certain relaxation of pressure—an approach which could be best described by that idiom of the American West, "riding a little looser in the saddle."

For if we are regarded as the sentinel of the status quo in Europe, then President de Gaulle of France is looked upon as its challenger. To the degree that he has plumbed the European desire to reach eastward—and to the extent that he has appealed to the dignity, pride, and independent spirit of Europeans, he is not isolated either in France or in Europe. His defiance of what is sometimes described as the American hegemony over Western Europe has engendered admiration, as well as apprehension. In this sense, it seems likely that much of what is called Gaullism will outlive de Gaulle. Moreover, his goal of *rapprochement* with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, together with his hopes for overcoming the present partition of Europe, represent objectives to which all of Western Europe and the United States can and do subscribe.

But while there is widespread support for these stated objectives, there is anguish over the separatist course de Gaulle has chosen for pursuing them. Outside France, and to some extent even within it, de Gaulle's preemptory treatment of the alliance in general, and of the United States in particular, is deeply resented. There is misgiving that, even though he has declared his intention to remain in the Western alliance, de Gaulle's withdrawal of France from NATO's integrated command will stiffen, rather than lessen, Soviet intransigence. There is also considerable skepticism that France, lacking the needed size and strength in the great power equation, can possibly act as a catalyst in engaging the Soviet Union in meaningful negotiations on European security questions.

Nevertheless, there seems to be a certain grudging awe of de Gaulle among many, although certainly not all, Europeans—an inkling that he may be in tune with the trend of the times and that we are not. As one perceptive political observer remarked to me: "France has the objective but not the means, while the United States has the means but not the objective."

One final observation about our relations with France: I left Paris with the impression that a diplomatic glacier now separates France and the United States. Communication between the two governments appears to have dangerously broken down. If a useful dialogue is to commence again, humility must somehow prevail over pride. Overtures will have to come, so it would seem, from the highest levels.

An early overture might deal with the alliance. I found abundant sentiment in Western Europe that reform of NATO is overdue. In the first place, there is pronounced support for "Europeanizing" the alliance, for giving a larger role to the European countries. Secondly, there is a strong desire to see the North Atlantic Council used for the forging of united Western initiatives toward Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Central to both objectives is the question of how the members of the alliance should share in NATO's nuclear defense system. There appears to be little enthusiasm for a "hardware solution" to this problem, outside of a certain circle of officials in Bonn, and, I gather, in Washington. Indeed, I was told repeatedly that the United States had been ill-advised in pushing the MLF proposal so aggressively. Far from demanding nuclear weapons for themselves, the German people were said to be either disinterested or opposed. Moreover, the conflict is apparent between striving for greater German access to nuclear weapons, on the one hand, and seeking the reunification of Germany on the other. Finally, candor requires the admission that an antipathy toward Germany still pervades Europe. More than once, from among the most highly placed, I was told: "If West Germany ever acquires nuclear weapons, there will never be a solution to the German problem."

At the same time, I found little resistance expressed against giving West Germany a direct voice in nuclear defense planning and strategy. For these reasons, among all the countries concerned, a consultative solution to the nuclear sharing problem, along the lines of the McNamara committee, appears to have by far the widest measure of popular and official support and to afford the most promising compromise on the problem of German desires for nuclear weapons.

Germany lies in the middle of Europe, not only geographically but economically and politically as well. Germany is also the frontier in Europe today, for the line which divides it at the same time separates Communist from non-Communist Europe. Thus, so long as Europe lies broken between two hostile camps, Germany, it would seem, will also stay divided.

Western Europeans seem to have reached a consensus that the solution to the German problem will come only after an "improvement in the general climate of confidence" is realized; that a process of reconciliation between Western and Eastern Europe is a necessary precondition to any possible reunification of Germany; in sum, that reunification will follow detente and not vice versa. Even the West Germans themselves appear not to dispute this sequence.

Additionally, it seems to be accepted that a final resolution of the German problem will have to result from negotiations in which the United States and the Soviet Union will be the principal parties. A new all-European security arrangement, guaranteed by the two great nuclear powers, will be required. Given present rigidities on both sides, any speculation as to the specific form of such an arrangement, or what Germany's status within it might be, is obviously premature.

In light of these considerations, many West Germans now seem to be thinking more about what practical action can be taken to improve the lot of their East German brothers. There seems to be growing sentiment for doing everything possible to broaden contact and communication across the Wall so that East and West Germans will continue to think of themselves as one people. Support for such small steps, however, appear to be stronger within the opposition in West Germany than within the governing coalition. Bonn is skeptical as to what these small steps can accomplish and remains adamantly opposed to recognizing the Oder-Neisse line or modifying the Hallstein Doctrine, preferring to retain such concessions for future bargaining in connection with a final settlement.

At the other frontier of Europe, the British appear to have decided tentatively to enter the Common Market when the time is right, but this decision, like the West German decision to make overtures to the East, betrays definite elements of equivocation. Certainly, there is no evidenced disposition to move until it is certain that there will not be another French veto. The debate continues on collateral questions: the need first to strengthen sterling by overcoming Britain's adverse balance of payments, the resistance to the supranational character of the Common Market, the uneasiness about the Common Market's agricultural policies, the concern that Britain's close ties with the United States might be attenuated, and the feeling that Common Market membership will inhibit Britain's role in the world at large. Still, there is an underlying realization, both in Britain and on the Continent, that admission of the United Kingdom (which would also entail the entry, either as members or associates, of most of the other European Free Trade Association countries) would have highly desirable consequences: it would furnish a healthy counterbalance to West German's economic weight, the Common Market itself would be strengthened and enlarged, and the cause of European unity would be advanced.

Looking into the future, it is likely, then, that Britain and some, if not all, of her Free Trade Area partners, will enter the Common Market within the next five years. However, the chances for immediate entry, specifically within the next year or so, appear slim.

Meanwhile, at Geneva, negotiations proceed which may ultimately affect all the other European issues. But there are grave misgivings that if the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference produces no tangible results by this fall, after three years' running, further negotiations there may be broken off, with the United Nations assigning disarmament problems to a much less satisfactory forum. Most of the countries represented at Geneva seem to feel that such a setback would impair whatever chance there may be for agreement on two treaties of far-reaching importance: a nonproliferation argeement, and a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The impasse blocking agreement on a nonproliferation treaty results from Soviet unwillingness to accept the so-called European clause in the American draft which would allow for the creation, sometime in the future, of a European nuclear force, to which West Germany could belong. I found little evidence that Europeans either want such a force or think it now feasible to create one. This has given rise to some suspicion in Geneva that we are not really serious about consummating a nonproliferation agreement at this time; otherwise, some contend, we would not be mortgaging present prospects for the sake of a highly problematical development which, at best, lies way off in an uncertain future.

The practical effect of a nonproliferation treaty is open to legitimate question. It is possible that the key non-nuclear states, wishing to retain the option of developing nuclear weapons, will refuse to sign. As of now, France and China are not likely to adhere. Moreover, it can be argued that none of the nuclear states intends to help non-nuclear states develop these lethal weapons anyhow. But Europeans see the importance of a nonproliferation agreement as less military than political. They believe that such a treaty could contribute significantly toward improving the climate of confidence in which detente can grow. For all who perceived the positive psychological effect in the United States of the limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the question of political consequences is a very important one; no other single event has done more to ease Soviet-American tensions than this first-step agreement.

As for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, it seemed obvious to me that Europeans are not sufficiently aware of the political problems that would arise in the United States if the Senate were asked to ratify a comprehensive test-ban treaty which did not include the right to on-site inspection. Consequently, our reluctance to drop our insistence on inspection—that is, our refusal, as they see it, to accept a small risk for large political gains—is considered, in some quarters, to be an indication of the dominance of military influence over U.S. policy. This is all the more regrettable because, to many at Geneva, a comprehensive test-ban agreement is considered to be the most effective nonproliferation measure, for nations are apparently unable, at present, to develop nuclear weapons without testing them.

The United States retains considerable latitude for action and influence. On the basis of my own observations, I would recommend the following:

1. In the conduct of our relations with France, our manner should be firm but correct. We must avoid over-reacting to French initiatives, even though we may regard them as undesirable. In no case should we disparage the greatness of France, our oldest ally or engage in any sort of political guerrilla war against the French government; such tactics should be reserved for our enemies. Above all, we should resist the temptation of interjecting our voice into the internal politics of France. Any American appeal directed over, under, or around the French President would surely backfire.

2. It is crucial that effective communication be restored between the French and American governments. If a summit meeting between the two Presidents is not now feasible, then consideration should be given to the appointment of a special American emissary, who would endeavor to act between President Johnson and General de Gaulle, as Harry Hopkins acted between President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. His purpose would be to reopen and develop a dialogue to the point where a summit meeting between the two Presidents would seem likely to bear fruit.

3. If the NATO structure is to be salvaged without France, the old architects must come up with new plans or new architects must be engaged. Clearly, SHAPE should be moved to a new site in the Benelux countries and streamlined, its bulk trimmed back in adjustment to the diminished danger. The European role in SHAPE should be sharply upgraded. Since the headquarters exists for the defense of Europe, I would suggest among the specific steps that should be taken to Europeanize NATO:

a) Appointing a European general to serve as SACEUR, under a command arrangement which would leave control of our nuclear weapons in the hands of the President of the United States. *b*) Moving the Military Committee of NATO out of the Pentagon and relocating it in Europe in close proximity to SHAPE and the North Atlantic Council. *c*) Establishing a hot line communications system, linking together the heads of the NATO governments, to enable immediate consultation in case of emergency.

4. With regard to European integration, the Common Market appears to be weathering its way to success. This is, by all odds, the most significant achievement in the direction of European unity since the War. The economic cement binding the six members of the Common Market together is the best guarantee against any reversion in Western Europe to the rampant nationalism of the prewar period. Accordingly, in lining up 14–1 against France in the current dispute over the command structure of NATO, we should strive to avoid any rupture between France and her European neighbors so bitter as to propel the French toward neutralism or vengeance. As between vindicating our position in favor of an uncompromised NATO command, and jeopardizing either the underlying Western alliance or the prospects for strengthening and enlarging the Common Market, the course of prudence should be clear.

5. As for Geneva, I recommend that immediate attention be given to pumping life back into these moribund negotiations. A decision should be delayed no longer on the issue of nuclear sharing within NATO. We must make up our minds whether to give priority to binding West Germany more tightly into the remnants of the NATO organizational structure, or whether to seek further agreements with the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear arms control. If a consultative arrangement, along the lines contemplated by the McNamara committee, is settled upon with West Germany, then the way may yet be open to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on a nonproliferation treaty. I strongly recommend this course as best suited to our highest national interests. But time is fast running out at Geneva.

6. Respecting a comprehensive test ban, I urge that immediate attention be given to the "threshold" approach. It would limit the ban on underground tests to explosions above an agreed size which could be detected by seismic devices without need for on-site inspections. It is possible this may prove a feasible area for enlargement of the present treaty to correspond with the advances that have been made in detection techniques.

7. Finally, a prime objective both in the revision of NATO and in our relations with Europe in general should be to make the alliance and our policies outward looking—concerned not only with the negative aspects of military defense but also with the positive aspects of the quest for peace. Here, it is de Gaulle who has seized the initiative in Europe. Yet, it remains the United States, not France, which possesses the size and power to engage in meaningful negotiations in the field of East-West relations. President Johnson has spoken of the need for "building bridges" to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. President de Gaulle's initiative makes it more urgent that we assume our natural position of leadership in this vital endeavor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article appears in the New Leader of June 20, 1966. It is a condensation of a splendid report on the situation in Europe made to the Foreign Relations Committee by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] after an extensive trip which he made to Europe a month or 6 weeks ago at the request of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright].

I associate myself entirely with the views of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], regarding the situation in Europe, both with respect to current opinion there toward the United States, and, more particularly, with respect to the recommendations he makes for a salutary change in foreign policy on the part of our country.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, prior to the adjournment of the Senate last week, I was privileged and pleased to join in a statement by a group of Senators under the leadership of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] expressing our great concern over the rumors and news stories to the effect that the Government of North Vietnam might be planning and contemplating to conduct so-called war trials of American aviators who have been shot down over North Vietnam and captured.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Senator Church issued last week in behalf of some 18 Senators be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Plea for Sanity

We, the undersigned, have previously protested the relentless escalation of the war in Vietnam. We have deplored those decisions, taken on both sides, which have steadily extended the dimensions of the war and intensified its fury.

The struggle in Vietnam now approaches a peril point of no return. Violence begets more violence; the fever of reprisal rises, feeding upon itself; reason is in danger of falling prisoner to blind passion. Then the war becomes a raging inferno, burning away the last barriers of restraint.

We apprehend that the execution of American prisoners, as threatened by the government of North Vietnam, would provoke the gravest reprisals, and further blacken the hope for peace.

In the past, we have worked for an honorable settlement of this tragic war. We have publicly criticized the mounting involvement of our own country, and have sought to keep open the path of moderation that could lead to negotiated peace.

So, before the last remnants of reason are irrevocably abandoned, we call upon the Hanoi government to refrain from any act of vengeance against the American airmen. They are prisoners of war, fully entitled to the protection extended to men in uniform when captured in the performance of their duty. Their execution would drastically reduce the influence of all those in the United States who have tried to curtail the fighting. It would incite a public demand for retaliation swift and sure, inflicting new levels of suffering and sorrow, and fixing more firmly still the seal of an implacable war.

Frank Church, U.S. Senate; George McGovern, U.S. Senate; Gaylord Nelson, U.S. Senate; E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senate; Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senate; Eugene J. McCarthy, U.S. Senate; Maurine B. Neuberger, U.S. Senate; J. William Fulbright, U.S. Senate; Quentin N. Burdick, U.S. Senate; Frank E. Moss, U.S. Senate; Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senate; Stephen M. Young, U.S. Senate; Vance Hartke, U.S. Senate; Wayne Morse, U.S. Senate; William Proxmire, U.S. Senate; Abraham Ribicoff, U.S. Senate; Joseph S. Clark, U.S. Senate; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., U.S. Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we issued the statement under the heading "A Plea for Sanity." I not only stand foursquare behind every word of it and the clear implications of the statement, but I wish to make further brief remarks about the problem today.

As every Member of the Senate knows, concern has continued over the weekend that there may be underfoot a plan on the part of Ho Chi Minh and the other officials of his government to try these American aviators under some trumped-up charge that they are war criminals.

I do not know whether it is possible for any reason, any sense of reason, any commonsense, any sense of human values, to be transmitted to the leaders of the North Vietnam Government, but if they carry out any plan to try these American aviators or other captured American prisoners of war in North Vietnam, there is no doubt in my mind that they will stand in open violation of the Geneva Convention for the protection of prisoners of war.

Mr. President, in my judgment, not only would a so-called war crimes trial of these American military prisoners stand in clear and open violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of war prisoners of August 12, 1949—signed by North Vietnam—but it would be a total and unbridled violation of human rights recognized by civilized man as basic in guiding our conduct in relationship to each other, irrespective our nationality.

So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the language of the Geneva Convention relative to war prisoners be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the convention was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENEVA CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR OF AUGUST 12, 1949

[TIAS 3364]

MULTILATERAL

Protection of war victims

Prisoners of War

[TIAS 3364, Aug. 12, 1949]

Convention, with annexes, dated at Geneva August 12, 1949.

Ratification advised by the Senate of the United States of America, subject to a statement, July 6, 1955;

Ratified by the President of the United States of America, subject to said statement, July 14, 1955;

Ratification of the United States of America deposited with the Swiss Federal Council August 2, 1955;

Proclaimed by the President of the United States of America August 30, 1955

Date of entry into force with respect to the United States of America: February 2, 1956.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A proclamation

WHEREAS the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War was open for signature from August 12, 1949 until February 12, 1950, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and sixty other States;

WHEREAS the text of the said Convention, in the English and French languages, as certified by the Swiss Federal Council, is word for word as follows:

[TS 846. 47 Stat. 2021.]

The undersigned Plenipotentiaries of the Governments represented at the Diplomatic Conference held at Geneva from April 21 to August 12, 1949, for the purpose of revising the Convention concluded at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, have agreed as follows:

PART I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances.

Article 2

In addition to the provisions which shall be implemented in peace time, the present Convention shall apply to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them.

The Convention shall also apply to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party, even if the said occupation meets with no armed resistance.

Although one of the Powers in conflict may not be a party to the present Convention, the Powers who are parties thereto shall remain bound by it in their mutual relations. They shall furthermore be bound by the Convention in relation to the said Power, if the latter accept and applies the provisions thereof.

Article 3

In the case of armed conflict not of an international character occurring in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties, each Party to the conflict shall be bound to apply, as a minimum, the following provisions:

(1) Persons taking no active part in the hostilities, including members of armed forces who have laid down their arms and those placed *hors de combat* by sickness, wounds, detention, or any other cause, shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, without any adverse distinction founded on race, colour, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria.

To this end the following acts are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever with respect to the above-mentioned persons:

(*a*) violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture;

(*b*) taking of hostages;

(*c*) outrages upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment;

(*d*) the passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples.

(2) The wounded and sick shall be collected and cared for.

An impartial humanitarian body, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, may offer its services to the Parties to the conflict.

The Parties to the conflict should further endeavour to bring into force, by means of special agreements, all or part of the other provisions of the present Convention.

The application of the preceding provisions shall not affect the legal status of the Parties to the conflict.

Article 4

A. Prisoners of war, in the sense of the present Convention, are persons belonging to one of the following categories, who have fallen into the power of the enemy:

(1) Members of the armed forces of a Party to the conflict, as well as members of militias or volunteer corps forming part of such armed forces.

(2) Members of other militias of other volunteer corps, including those of organized resistance movements, belonging to a Party to the conflict and operating in or outside their own territory, even if this territory is occupied, provided that such militias or volunteer corps, including such organized resistance movements, fulfil the following conditions:

(*a*) that of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates;

(*b*) that of having a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance;

(*c*) that of carrying arms openly;

(*d*) that of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

(3) Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the Detaining Power.

(4) Persons who accompany the armed forces without actually being members thereof, such as civilian members of military aircraft crews, war correspondents, supply contractors, members of labour units or of services responsible for the welfare of the armed forces, provided that they have received authorization from the armed forces which they accompany, who shall provide them for that purpose with an identity card similar to the annexed model.

(5) Members of crews, including masters, pilots and apprentices, of the merchant marine and the crews of civil aircraft of the Parties to the conflict, who do not benefit by more favourable treatment under any other provisions of international law.

(6) Inhabitants of a non-occupied territory, who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, without having had time to form themselves into regular armed units, provided they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.

B. The following shall likewise be treated as prisoners of war under the present Convention:

(1) Persons belonging, or having belonged, to the armed forces of the occupied country, if the occupying Power considers it necessary by reason of such allegiance to intern them, even though it has originally liberated them while hostilities were going on outside the territory it occupies, in particular where such persons have made an unsuccessful attempt to rejoin the armed forces to which they belong and which are engaged in combat, or where they fail to comply with a summons made to them with a view to internment.

(2) The persons belonging to one of the categories enumerated in the present Article, who have been received by neutral or non-belligerent Powers on their territory and whom these Powers are required to intern under international law, without prejudice to any more favourable treatment which these Powers may choose to give and with the exception of Articles 8, 10, 15, 30, fifth paragraph, 58–67, 92, 126 and, where diplomatic relations exist between the Parties to the conflict and the neutral or non-belligerent Power concerned, those Articles concerning the Protecting Power. Where such diplomatic relations exist, the Parties to a conflict on whom these persons depend shall be allowed to perform towards them the functions of a Protecting Power as provided in the present Convention, without prejudice to the functions which these Parties normally exercise in conformity with diplomatic and consular usage and treaties.

C. This Article shall in no way affect the status of medical personnel and chaplains as provided for in Article 33 of the present Convention.

Article 5

The present Convention shall apply to the persons referred to in Article 4 from the time they fall into the power of the enemy and until their final release and repatriation.

Should any doubt arise as to whether persons, having committed a belligerent act and having fallen into the hands of the enemy, belong to any of the categories enumerated in Article 4, such persons shall enjoy the protection of the present Convention until such time as their status has been determined by a competent tribunal.

Article 6

In addition to the agreements expressly provided for in Articles 10, 23, 28, 33, 60, 65, 66, 67, 72, 73, 75, 109, 110, 118, 119, 122 and 132, the High Contracting Parties may conclude other special agreements for all matters concerning which they may deem it suitable to make separate provision. No special agreement shall adversely affect the situation of prisoners of war, as defined by the present Convention, nor restrict the rights which it confers upon them.

Prisoners of war shall continue to have the benefit of such agreements as long as the Convention is applicable to them, except where express provisions to the contrary are contained in the aforesaid or in subsequent agreements, or where more favourable measures have been taken with regard to them by one or other of the Parties to the conflict.

Article 7

Prisoners of war may in no circumstances renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them by the present Convention, and by the special agreements referred to in the foregoing Article, if such there be.

Article 8

The present Convention shall be applied with the cooperation and under the scrutiny of the Protecting Powers whose duty it is to safeguard the interests of the Parties to the conflict. For this purpose, the Protecting Powers may appoint, apart from their diplomatic or consular staff, delegates from amongst their own nationals or the nationals of other neutral Powers. The said delegates shall be subject to the approval of the Power with which they are to carry out their duties.

The Parties to the conflict shall facilitate to the greatest extent possible the task of the representatives or delegates of the Protecting Powers.

The representatives or delegates of the Protecting Powers shall not in any case exceed their mission under the present Convention. They shall, in particular, take account of the imperative necessities of security of the State wherein they carry out their duties.

Article 9

The provisions of the present Convention constitute no obstacle to the humanitarian activities which the International Committee of the Red Cross or any other impartial humanitarian organization may, subject to the consent of the Parties to the conflict concerned, undertake for the protection of prisoners of war and for their relief.

Article 10

The High Contracting Parties may at any time agree to entrust to an organization which offers all guarantees of impartiality and efficacy the duties incumbent on the Protecting Powers by virtue of the present Convention.

When prisoners of war do not benefit or cease to benefit, no matter for what reason, by the activities of a Protecting Power or of an organization provided for in the first paragraph above, the Detaining Power shall request a neutral State, or such an organization, to undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by a Protecting Power designated by the Parties to a conflict.

If protection cannot be arranged accordingly, the Detaining Power shall request or shall accept, subject to the provisions of this Article, the offer of the services of a humanitarian organization, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, to assume the humanitarian functions performed by Protecting Powers under the present Convention.

Any neutral Power or any organization invited by the Power concerned or offering itself for these purposes, shall be required to act with a sense of responsibility toward the Party to the conflict on which persons protected by the present Convention depend, and shall be required to furnish sufficient assurances that it is in a position to undertake the appropriate functions and to discharge them impartially.

No derogation from the preceding provisions shall be made by special agreements between Powers one of which is restricted, even temporarily, in its freedom to negotiate with the other Power or its allies by reason of military events, more particularly where the whole, or a substantial part, of the territory of the said Power is occupied.

Whenever in the present Convention mention is made of a Protecting Power, such mention applies to substitute organizations in the sense of the present Article.

Article 11

In cases where they deem it advisable in the interest of protected persons particularly in cases of disagreement between the Parties to the conflict as to the application or interpretation of the provisions of the present Convention, the Protecting Powers shall lend their good offices with a view to settling the disagreement.

For this purpose, each of the Protecting Powers may, either at the invitation of one Party or on its own initiative, propose to the Parties to the conflict a meeting of their representatives, and in particular of the authorities responsible for prisoners of war, possibly on neutral territory suitably chosen. The Parties to the conflict shall be bound to give effect to the proposals made to them for this purpose. The Protecting Powers may, if necessary, propose for approval by the Parties to the conflict a person belonging to a neutral Power, or delegated by the International Committee of the Red Cross, who shall be invited to take part in such a meeting.

PART II—GENERAL PROTECTION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

Article 12

Prisoners of war are in the hands of the enemy Power, but not of the individuals or military units who have captured them. Irrespective of the individual responsibilities that may exist, the Detaining Power is responsible for the treatment given them.

Prisoners of war may only be transferred by the Detaining Power to a Power which is a party to the Convention and after the Detaining Power has satisfied itself of the willingness and ability of such transferee Power to apply the Convention. When prisoners of war are transferred under such circumstances, responsibility for the application of the Convention rests on the Power accepting them while they are in its custody.

Nevertheless, if that Power fails to carry out the provisions of the Convention in any important respect, the Power by whom the prisoners of war were transferred shall, upon being notified by the Protecting Power, take effective measures to correct the situation or shall request the return of the prisoners of war. Such requests must be complied with.

Article 13

Prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited, and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention. In particular, no prisoner of war may be subjected to physical mutilation or to medical or scientific experiments of any kind which are not justified by the medical, dental or hospital treatment of the prisoner concerned and carried out in his interest.

Likewise, prisoners of war must at all times be protected, particularly against act of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity.

Measures of reprisal against prisoners of war are prohibited.

Article 14

Prisoners of war are entitled to all circumstances to respect for their persons and their honour.

Women shall be treated with all the regard due to their sex and shall in all cases benefit by treatment as favourable as that granted to men.

Prisoners of war shall retain the full civil capacity which they enjoyed at the time of their capture. The Detaining Power may not restrict the exercise, either within or without its own territory, of the rights such capacity confers except in so far as the captivity requires.

Article 15

The Power detaining prisoners of war shall be bound to provide free of charge for their maintenance and for the medical attention required by their state of health.

Article 16

Taking into consideration the provisions of the present Convention relating to rank and sex, and subject to any privileged treatment which may be accorded to them by reason of their state of health, age or professional qualifications, all prisoners of war shall be treated alike by the Detaining Power, without any adverse distinction based on race, nationality, religious belief or political opinions, or any other distinction founded on similar criteria.

PART III—CAPTIVITY

Section I—Beginning of captivity

Article 17

Every prisoner of war, when questioned on the subject, is bound to give only his surname, first names and rank, date of birth, and army, regimental, personal or serial number, or failing this, equivalent information.

If he willfully infringes this rule, he may render himself liable to a restriction of the privileges accorded to his rank or status.

Each Party to a conflict is required to furnish the persons under its jurisdiction who are liable to become prisoners of war, with an identity card showing the owner's surname, first names, rank, army, regimental, personal or serial number or equivalent information, and date of birth. The identity card may, furthermore, bear the signature or the fingerprints, or both, of the owner, and may bear, as well, any other information the Party to the conflict may wish to add concerning persons belonging to its armed forces. As far as possible the card shall measure 6.5×10 cm. and shall be issued in duplicate. The identity card shall be shown by the prisoner of war upon demand, but may in no case be taken away from him.

No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.

Prisoners of war who, owing to their physical or mental conditions, are unable to state their identity, shall be handed over to the medical service. The identity of such prisoners shall be established by all possible means, subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph.

The questioning of prisoners of war shall be carried out in a language which they understand.

Article 18

All effects and articles of personal use, except arms, horses, military equipment and military documents, shall remain in the possession of prisoners of war, likewise their metal helmets and gas masks and like articles issued for personal protection. Effects and articles used for their clothing or feeding shall likewise remain in their possession, even if such effects and articles belong to their regulation military equipment.

At no time should prisoners of war be without identity documents. The Detaining Power shall supply such documents to prisoners of war who possess none.

Badges of rank and nationality, decorations and articles having above all a personal or sentimental value may not be taken from prisoners of war.

Sums of money carried by prisoners of war may not be taken away from them except by order of an officer, and after the amount and particulars of the owner have been recorded in a special register and an itemized receipt has been given, legibly inscribed with the name, rank and unit of the person issuing the said receipt. Sums in the currency of the Detaining Power, or which are changed into such currency at the prisoner's request, shall be placed to the credit of the prisoner's account as provided in Article 64.

The Detaining Power may withdraw articles of value from prisoners of war only for reasons of security; when such articles are withdrawn, the procedure laid down for sums of money impounded shall apply.

Such objects, likewise sums taken away in any currency other than that of the Detaining Power and the conversion of which has not been asked for by the owners, shall be kept in the custody of the Detaining Power and shall be returned in their initial shape to prisoners of war at the end of their captivity.

Article 19

Prisoners of war shall be evacuated, as soon as possible after their capture, to camps situated in an area far enough from the combat zone for them to be out of danger.

Only those prisoners of war who, owing to wounds or sickness, would run greater risks by being evacuated than by remaining where they are, may be temporarily kept back in a danger zone.

Prisoners of war shall not be unnecessarily exposed to danger while awaiting evacuation from a fighting zone.

Article 20

The evacuation of prisoners of war shall always be effected humanely and in conditions similar to those for the forces of the Detaining Power in their changes of station.

The Detaining Power shall supply prisoners of war who are being evacuated with sufficient food and potable water, and with the necessary clothing and medical attention. The Detaining Power shall take all suitable precautions to ensure their safety during evacuation, and shall establish as soon as possible a list of the prisoners of war who are evacuated.

If prisoners of war must, during evacuation, pass through transit camps, their stay in such camps shall be as brief as possible.

Section II—Internment of prisoners of war

Chapter I—General Observations

Article 21

The Detaining Power may subject prisoners of war to internment. It may impose on them the obligation of not leaving, beyond certain limits, the camp where they are interned, or if the said camp is fenced in, of not going outside its perimeter. Subject to the provisions of the present Convention relative to penal and disciplinary sanctions, prisoners of war may not be held in close confinement except where necessary safeguard their health and then only during the continuation of the circumstances which make such confinement necessary.

Prisoners of war may be partially or wholly released on parole or promise, in so far as is allowed by the laws of the Power on which they depend. Such measures shall be taken particularly in cases where this may contribute to the improvement of their state of health. No prisoner of war shall be compelled to accept liberty on parole or promise.

Upon the outbreak of hostilities, each Party to the conflict shall notify the adverse Party of the laws and regulations allowing or forbidding its own nationals to accept liberty on parole or promise. Prisoners of war who are paroled or who have given their promise in conformity with the laws and regulations so notified, are bound on their personal honour scrupulously to fulfil, both towards the Power on which they depend and towards the Power which has captured them, the engagements of their paroles or promises. In such cases, the Power on which they depend is bound neither to require nor to accept from them any service incompatible with the parole or promise given.

Article 22

Prisoners of war may be interned only in premises located on land and affording every guarantee of hygiene and healthfulness. Except in particular cases which are justified by the interest of the prisoners themselves, they shall not be interned in penitentiaries.

Prisoners of war interned in unhealthy areas, or where the climate is injurious for them, shall be removed as soon as possible to a more favorable climate.

The Detaining Power shall assemble prisoners of war in camps or camp compounds according to their nationality, language and customs, provided that such prisoners shall not be separated from prisoners of war belonging to the armed forces with which they were serving at the time of their capture, except with their consent.

Article 23

No prisoner of war may at any time be sent to, or detained in areas where he may be exposed to the fire of the combat zone, nor may his presence be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations.

Prisoners of war shall have shelters against air bombardment and other hazards of war, to the same extent as the local civilian population. With the exception of those engaged in the protection of their quarters against the aforesaid hazards, they may enter such shelters as soon as possible after the giving of the alarm. Any other protective measure taken in favour of the population shall also apply to them.

Detaining Powers shall give the Powers concerned, through the intermediary of the Protecting Powers, all useful information regarding the geographical location of prisoner of war camps.

Whenever military considerations permit, prisoner of war camps shall be indicated in the day-time by the letters PW or PG, placed so as to be clearly visible from the air. The Powers concerned may, however, agree upon any other system of marking. Only prisoner of war camps shall be marked as such.

Article 24

Transit or screening camps of a permanent kind shall be fitted out under conditions similar to those described in the present Section, and the prisoners therein shall have the same treatment as in other camps.

Chapter II—Quarters, Food and Clothing of Prisoners of War

Article 25

Prisoners of war shall be quartered under conditions as favourable as those for the forces of the Detaining Power who are billeted in the same area. The said conditions shall make allowance for the habits and customs of the prisoners and shall in no case be prejudicial to their health.

The foregoing provisions shall apply in particular to the dormitories of prisoners of war as regards both total surface and minimum cubic space, and the general installations, bedding and blankets.

The premise provided for the use of prisoners of war individually or collectively, shall be entirely protected from dampness and adequately heated and lighted, in particular between dusk and lights out. All precautions must be taken against the danger of fire.

In any camps in which women prisoners of war, as well as men, are accommodated, separate dormitories shall be provided for them.

Article 26

The basic daily food rations shall be sufficient in quantity, quality and variety to keep prisoners of war in good health and to prevent loss of weight or the development of nutritional deficiencies. Account shall also be taken of the habitual diet of the prisoners.

The Detaining Power shall supply prisoners of war who work with such additional rations as are necessary for the labour on which they are employed.

Sufficient drinking water shall be supplied to prisoners of war. The use of tobacco shall be permitted.

Prisoners of war shall, as far as possible, be associated with the preparation of their meals; they may be employed for that purpose in the kitchens. Furthermore, they shall be given the means of preparing, themselves, the additional food in their possession.

Adequate premises shall be provided for messing.

Collective disciplinary measures affecting food are prohibited.

Article 27

Clothing, underwear and footwear shall be supplied to prisoners of war in sufficient quantities by the Detaining Power, which shall make allowance for the climate of the region where the prisoners are detained. Uniforms of enemy armed forces captured by the Detaining Power should, if suitable for the climate, be made available to clothe prisoners of war.

The regular replacement and repair of the above articles shall be assumed by the Detaining Power. In addition, prisoners of war who work shall receive appropriate clothing, wherever the nature of the work demands.

Article 28

Canteens shall be installed in all camps, where prisoners of war may procure foodstuffs, soap and tobacco and ordinary articles in daily use. The tariff shall never be in excess of local market prices.

The profits made by camp canteens shall be used for the benefit of the prisoners; a special fund shall be created for this purpose. The prisoners' representative shall have the right to collaborate in the management of the canteen and of this fund.

When a camp is closed down, the credit balance of the special fund shall be handed to an international welfare organization, to be employed for the benefit of prisoners of war of the same nationality as those who have contributed to the fund. In case of a general repatriation, such profits shall be kept by the Detaining Power, subject to any agreement to the contrary between the Powers concerned.

Chapter III—Hygiene and Medical Attention

Article 29

The Detaining Power shall be bound to take all sanitary measures necessary to ensure the cleanliness and healthfulness of camps and to prevent epidemics.

Prisoners of war shall have for their use, day and night, conveniences which conform to the rules of hygiene and are maintained in a constant state of cleanliness. In any camps in which women prisoners of war are accommodated, separate conveniences shall be provided for them.

Also, apart from the baths and showers with which the camps shall be furnished, prisoners of war shall be provided with sufficient water and soap for their personal toilet and for washing their personal laundry; the necessary installations, facilities and time shall be granted them for that purpose.

Article 30

Every camp shall have an adequate infirmary where prisoners of war may have the attention they require, as well as appropriate diet. Isolation wards shall, if necessary, be set aside for cases of contagious or mental disease.

Prisoners of war suffering from serious disease, or whose condition necessitates special treatment, a surgical operation or hospital care, must be admitted to any military or civilian medical unit where such treatment can be given, even if their repatriation is contemplated in the near future. Special facilities shall be afforded for the care to be given to the disabled, in particular to the blind, and for their rehabilitation, pending repatriation.

Prisoners of war shall have the attention, preferably, of medical personnel of the Power on which they depend and, if possible, of their nationality.

Prisoners of war may not be prevented from presenting themselves to the medical authorities for examination. The detaining authorities shall, upon request, issue to every prisoner who has undergone treatment, an official certificate indicating the nature of his illness or injury, and the duration and kind of treatment received. A duplicate of this certificate shall be forwarded to the Central Prisoners of War Agency.

The costs of treatment, including those of any apparatus necessary for the maintenance of prisoners of war in good health, particularly dentures and other artificial appliances, of spectacles, shall be borne by the Detaining Power.

Article 31

Medical inspections of prisoners of war shall be held at least once a month. They shall include the checking and the recording of the weight of each prisoner of war. Their purpose shall be, in particular, to supervise the general state of health, nutrition and cleanliness of prisoners and to detect contagious diseases, especially tuberculosis, malaria and venereal disease. For this purpose the most efficient methods available shall be employed, e.g. periodic mass miniature radiography for the early detection of tuberculosis.

Article 32

Prisoners of war who, though not attached to the medical service of their armed forces, are physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses or medical orderlies, may be required by the Detaining Power to exercise their medical functions in the interests of prisoners of war dependent on the same Power. In that case they shall continue to be prisoners of war, but shall receive the same treatment as corresponding medical personnel retained by the Detaining Power. They shall be exempted from any other work under Article 49.

Chapter IV—Medical Personnel and Chaplains Retained To Assist Prisoners of War

Article 33

Members of the medical personnel and chaplains while retained by the Detaining Power with a view to assisting prisoners of war, shall not be considered as prisoners of war. They shall, however, receive as a minimum the benefits and protection of the present Convention, and shall also be granted all facilities necessary to provide for the medical care of, and religious ministration to prisoners of war.

They shall continue to exercise their medical and spiritual functions for the benefit of prisoners of war, preferably those belonging to the armed forces upon which they depend, within the scope of the military laws and regulations of the Detaining Power and under the control of its competent services, in accordance with their professional etiquette. They shall also benefit by the following facilities in the exercise of their medical or spiritual functions:

(*a*) They shall be authorized to visit periodically prisoners of war situated in working detachments or in hospitals outside the camp. For this purpose, the Detaining Power shall place at their disposal the necessary means of transport.

[TIAS 3362. *Ante*, p. 3132.]

(*b*) The senior medical officer in each camp shall be responsible to the camp military authorities for everything connected with the activities of retained medical personnel. For this purpose, Parties to the conflict shall agree at the outbreak of hostilities on the subject of the corresponding ranks of the medical personnel, including that of societies mentioned in Article 26 of the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field of August 12, 1949. This senior medical officer, as well as chaplains, shall have the right to deal with the competent authorities of the camp on all questions relating to their duties. Such authorities shall afford them all necessary facilities for correspondence relating to these questions.

(*c*) Although they shall be subject to the internal discipline of the camp in which they are retained, such personnel may not be compelled to carry out any work other than that concerned with their medical or religious duties.

During hostilities, the Parties to the conflict shall agree concerning the possible relief of retained personnel and shall settle the procedure to be followed.

None of the preceding provisions shall relieve the Detaining Power of its obligations with regard to prisoners of war from the medical or spiritual point of view.

Chapter V—Religious, Intellectual and Physical Activities

Article 34

Prisoners of war shall enjoy complete latitude in the exercise of their religious duties, including attendance at the service of their faith, on condition that they comply with the disciplinary routine prescribed by the military authorities.

Adequate premises shall be provided where religious services may be held.

Article 35

Chaplains who fall into the hands of the enemy Power and who remain or are retained with a view to assisting prisoners of war, shall be allowed to minister to them and to exercise freely their ministry amongst prisoners of war of the same religion, in accordance with their religious conscience. They shall be allocated among the various camps and labour detachments containing prisoners of war belonging to the same forces, speaking the same language or practising the same religion. They shall enjoy the necessary facilities, including the means of transport provided for in Article 33, for visiting the prisoners of war outside their camp. They shall be free to correspond, subject to censorship, on matters concerning their religious duties with the ecclesiastical authorities in the country of detention and with international religious organizations. Letters and cards which they may send for this purpose shall be in addition to the quota provided for in Article 71.

Article 36

Prisoners of war who are ministers of religion, without having officiated as chaplains to their own forces, shall be at liberty, whatever their denomination, to minister freely to the members of their community. For this purpose, they shall receive the same treatment as the chaplains retained by the Detaining Power. They shall not be obliged to do any other work.

Article 37

When prisoners of war have not the assistance of a retained chaplain or of a prisoner of war minister of their faith, a minister belonging to the prisoners' or a similar denomination, or in his absence a qualified layman, if such a course is feasible from a confessional point of view, shall be appointed, at the request of the prisoners concerned, to fill this office. This appointment, subject to the approval of the Detaining Power, shall take place with the agreement of the community of prisoners concerned and, wherever necessary, with the approval of the local religious authorities of the same faith. The person thus appointed shall comply with all regulations established by the Detaining Power in the interests of discipline and military security.

Article 38

While respecting the individual preferences of every prisoner, the Detaining Power shall encourage the practice of intellectual, educational, and recreational pursuits, sports and games amongst prisoners, and shall take the measures necessary to ensure the exercise thereof by providing them with adequate premises and necessary equipment.

Prisoners shall have opportunities for taking physical exercise, including sports and games, and for being out of doors. Sufficient open spaces shall be provided for this purpose in all camps.

Chapter VI—Discipline

Article 39

Every prisoner of war camp shall be put under the immediate authority of a responsible commissioned officer belonging to the regular armed forces of the Detaining Power. Such officer shall have in his possession a copy of the present Convention; he shall ensure that its provisions are known to the camp staff and the guard and shall be responsible, under the direction of his government, for its application.

Prisoners of war, with the exception of officers, must salute and show to all officers of the Detaining Power the external marks of respect provided for by the regulations applying in their own forces.

Officer prisoners of war are bound to salute only officers of a higher rank of the Detaining Power; they must, however, salute the camp commander regardless of his rank.

Article 40

The wearing of badges of rank and nationality, as well as of decorations, shall be permitted.

Article 41

[*Post*, p. 3432.]

In every camp the text of the present Convention and its Annexes and the contents of any special agreement provided for in Article 6, shall be posted, in the prisoners' own language, in places where all may read them. Copies shall be supplied, on request, to the prisoners who cannot have access to the copy which has been posted.

Regulations, orders, notices and publications of every kind relating to the conduct of prisoners of war shall be issued to them in a language which they understand. Such regulations, orders and publications shall be posted in the manner described above and copies shall be handed to the prisoners' representative. Every order and command addressed to prisoners of war individually must likewise be given in a language which they understand.

Article 42

The use of weapons against prisoners of war, especially against those who are escaping or attempting to escape, shall constitute an extreme measure, which shall always be preceded by warnings appropriate to the circumstances.

Chapter VII—Rank of Prisoners of War

Article 43

Upon the outbreak of hostilities, the Parties to the conflict shall communicate to one another the titles and ranks of all the persons mentioned in Article 4 of the present Convention, in order to ensure equality of treatment between prisoners of equivalent rank. Titles and ranks which are subsequently created shall form the subject of similar communications.

The Detaining Power shall recognize promotions in rank which have been accorded to prisoners of war and which have been duly notified by the Power on which these prisoners depend.

Article 44

Officers and prisoners of equivalent status shall be treated with the regard due to their rank and age.

In order to ensure service in officers' camps, other ranks of the same armed forces who, as for as possible, speak the same language, shall be assigned in sufficient numbers, account being taken of the rank of officers and prisoners of equivalent status. Such orderlies shall not be required to perform any other work.

Supervision of the mess by the officers themselves shall be facilitated in every way.

Article 45

Prisoners of war other than officers and prisoners of equivalent status shall be treated with the regard due to their rank and age.

Supervision of the mess by the prisoners themselves shall be facilitated in every way.

Chapter VIII—Transfer of Prisoners of War After Their Arrival in Camp

Article 46

The Detaining Power, when deciding upon the transfer of prisoners of war, shall take into account the interests of the prisoners themselves, more especially so as not to increase the difficulty of their repatriation.

The transfer of prisoners of war shall always be effected humanely and in conditions not less favourable than those under which the forces of the Detaining Power are transferred. Account shall always be taken of the climatic conditions to which the prisoners of war are accustomed and the conditions of transfer shall in no case be prejudicial to their health.

The Detaining Power shall supply prisoners of war during transfer with sufficient food and drinking water to keep them in good health, likewise with the necessary clothing, shelter and medical attention. The Detaining Power shall take adequate precautions especially in case of transport by sea or by air, to ensure their safety during transfer, and shall draw up a complete list of all transferred prisoners before their departure.

Article 47

Sick or wounded prisoners of war shall not be transferred as long as their recovery may be endangered by the journey, unless their safety imperatively demands it.

If the combat zone draws closer to a camp, the prisoners of war in the said camp shall not be transferred unless their transfer can be carried out in adequate conditions of safety, or unless they are exposed to greater risks by remaining on the spot than by being transferred.

Article 48

In the event of transfer, prisoners of war shall be officially advised of their departure and of their new postal address. Such notifications shall be given in time for them to pack their luggage and inform their next of kin.

They shall be allowed to take with them their personal effects, and the correspondence and parcels which have arrived for them. The weight of such baggage may be limited, if the conditions of transfer so require, to what each prisoner can reasonably carry, which shall in no case be more than twenty-five kilograms per head.

Mail and parcels addressed to their former camp shall be forwarded to them without delay. The camp commander shall take, in agreement with the prisoners' representative, any measures needed to ensure the transport of the prisoners' community property and of the luggage they are unable to take with them in consequence of restrictions imposed by virtue of the second paragraph of this Article.

The costs of transfers shall be borne by the Detaining Power.

Section III—Labour of prisoners of war

Article 49

The Detaining Power may utilize the labour of prisoners of war who are physically fit, taking into account their age, sex, rank and physical aptitude, and with a view particularly to maintaining them in a good state of physical and mental health.

Non-commissioned officers who are prisoners of war shall only be required to do supervisory work. Those not so required may ask for other suitable work which shall, so far as possible, be found for them.

If officers or persons of equivalent status ask for suitable work, it shall be found for them, so far as possible, but they may in no circumstances be compelled to work.

Article 50

Besides work connected with camp administration, installation or maintenance, prisoners of war may be compelled to do only such work as is included in the following classes:

(*a*) agriculture;

(*b*) industries connected with the production or the extraction of raw materials, and manufacturing industries, with the exception of metallurgical, machinery and chemical industries; public works and building operations which have no military character or purpose;

(*c*) transport and handling of stores which are not military in character or purpose;

(*d*) commercial business, and arts and crafts;

(*e*) domestic service;

(*f*) public utility services having no military character or purpose.

Should the above provisions be infringed, prisoners of war shall be allowed to exercise their right of complaint, in conformity with Article 78.

Article 51

Prisoners of war must be granted suitable working conditions, especially as regards accommodation, food, clothing and equipment; such conditions shall not be inferior to those enjoyed by nationals of the Detaining Power employed in similar work; account shall also be taken of climatic conditions.

The Detaining Power, in utilizing the labour of prisoners of war, shall ensure that in areas in which such prisoners are employed, the national legislation concerning the protection of labour and, more particularly, the regulations for the safety of workers, are duly applied.

Prisoners of war shall receive training and be provided with the means of protection suitable to the work they will have to do and similar to those accorded to the nationals of the Detaining Power. Subject to the provisions of Article 52, prisoners may be submitted to the normal risks run by these civilian workers.

Conditions of labour shall in no case be rendered more arduous by disciplinary measures.

Article 52

Unless he be a volunteer, no prisoner of war may be employed on labour which is of an unhealthy or dangerous nature.

No prisoner of war shall be assigned to labour which would be looked upon as humiliating for a member of the Detaining Power's own forces.

The removal of mines or similar devices shall be considered as dangerous labour.

Article 53

The duration of the daily labour of prisoners of war, including the time of the journey to and fro, shall not be excessive, and must in no case exceed that permitted for civilian workers in the district, who are nationals of the Detaining Power and employed on the same work.

Prisoners of war must be allowed, in the middle of the day's work, a rest of not less than one hour. This rest will be the same as that to which workers of the Detaining Power are entitled, if the latter is of longer duration. They shall be allowed in addition a rest of twenty-four consecutive hours every week, preferably on Sunday or the day of rest in their country of origin. Furthermore, every prisoner who has worked for one year shall be granted a rest of eight consecutive days, during which his working pay shall be paid him.

If methods of labour such as piece work are employed, the length of the working period shall not be rendered excessive thereby.

Article 54

The working pay due to prisoners of war shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of Article 62 of the present Convention.

Prisoners of war who sustain accidents in connection with work, or who contract a disease in the course, or in consequence of their work, shall receive all the care their condition may require. The Detaining Power shall furthermore deliver to such prisoners of war a medical certificate enabling them to submit their claims to the Power on which they depend, and shall send a duplicate to the Central Prisoners of War Agency provided for in Article 123.

Article 55

The fitness of prisoners of war for work shall be periodically verified by medical examinations at least once a month. The examinations shall have particular regard to the nature of the work which prisoners of war are required to do.

If any prisoner of war considers himself incapable of working, he shall be permitted to appear before the medical authorities of his camp. Physicians or surgeons may recommend that the prisoners who are, in their opinion, unfit for work, be exempted therefrom.

Article 56

The organization and administration of labour detachments shall be similar to those of prisoner of war camps.

Every labour detachment shall remain under the control of and administratively part of a prisoner of war camp. The military authorities and the commander of the said camp shall be responsible, under the direction of their government, for the observance of the provisions of the present Convention in labour detachments.

The camp commander shall keep an up-to-date record of the labour detachments dependent on his camp, and shall communicate it to the delegates of the Protecting Power, of the International Committee of the Red Cross, or of other agencies giving relief to prisoners of war, who may visit the camp.

Article 57

The treatment of prisoners of war who work for private persons, even if the latter are responsible for guarding and protecting them, shall not be inferior to that which is provided for by the present Convention. The Detaining Power, the military authorities and the commander of the camp to which such prisoners belong shall be entirely responsible for the maintenance, care, treatment, and payment of the working pay of such prisoners of war.

Such prisoners of war shall have the right to remain in communication with the prisoners' representatives in the camps on which they depend.

Section IV—Financial resources of prisoners of war

Article 58

Upon the outbreak of hostilities, and pending an arrangement on this matter with the Protecting Power, the Detaining Power may determine the maximum amount of money in cash or in any similar form, that prisoners may have in their possession. Any amount in excess, which was properly in their possession and which has been taken or withheld from them, shall be placed to their account, together with any monies deposited by them, and shall not be converted into any other currency without their consent.

If prisoners of war are permitted to purchase services or commodities outside the camp against payment in cash, such payments shall be made by the prisoner himself or by the camp administration who will charge them to the accounts of the prisoners concerned. The Detaining Power will establish the necessary rules in this respect.

Article 59

Cash which was taken from prisoners of war, in accordance with Article 18, at the time of their capture, and which is in the currency of the Detaining Power, shall be placed to their separate accounts, in accordance with the provisions of Article 64 of the present Section.

The amounts, in the currency of the Detaining Power, due to the conversion of sums in other currencies that are taken from the prisoners of war at the same time, shall also be credited to their separate accounts.

Article 60

The Detaining Power shall grant all prisoners of war a monthly advance of pay, the amount of which shall be fixed by conversion, into the currency of the said Power, of the following amounts:

Category I: Prisoners ranking below sergeants: eight Swiss francs.

Category II: Sergeants and other non-commissioned officers, or prisoners of equivalent rank: twelve Swiss francs.

Category III: Warrant officers and commissioned officers below the rank of major or prisoners of equivalent rank: fifty Swiss francs.

Category IV: Majors, lieutenant-colonels, colonels or prisoners of equivalent rank: sixty Swiss francs.

Category V: General officers or prisoners of war of equivalent rank: seventy-five Swiss francs.

However, the Parties to the conflict concerned may by special agreement modify the amount of advances of pay due to prisoners of the preceding categories.

Furthermore, if the amounts indicated in the first paragraph above would be unduly high compared with the pay of the Detaining Power's armed forces or would, for any reason, seriously embarrass the Detaining Power, then, pending the conclusion of a special agreement with the Power on which the prisoners depend to vary the amounts indicated above, the Detaining Power:

(*a*) shall continue to credit the accounts of the prisoners with the amounts indicated in the first paragraph above;

(*b*) may temporarily limit the amount made available from these advances of pay to prisoners of war for their own use, to sums which are reasonable, but which, for Category I, shall never be inferior to the amount that the Detaining Power gives to the members of its own armed forces.

The reasons for any limitations will be given without delay to the Protecting Power.

Article 61

The Detaining Power shall accept for distribution as supplementary pay to prisoners of war sums which the Power on which the prisoners depend may forward to them, on condition that the sums to be paid shall be the same for each prisoner of the same category, shall be payable to all prisoners of that category depending on that Power, and shall be placed in their separate accounts, at the earliest opportunity, in accordance with the provisions of Article 64. Such supplementary pay shall not relieve the Detaining Power of any obligation under this Convention.

Article 62

Prisoners of war shall be paid a fair working rate of pay by the detaining authorities direct. The rate shall be fixed by the said authorities, but shall at no time be less than one-fourth of one Swiss franc for a full working day. The Detaining Power shall inform prisoners of war, as well as the Power on which they depend, through the intermediary of the Protecting Power, of the rate of daily working pay that it has fixed.

Working pay shall likewise be paid by the detaining authorities to prisoners of war permanently detailed to duties or to a skilled or semi-skilled occupation in connection with the administration, installation or maintenance of camps, and to the prisoners who are required to carry out spiritual or medical duties on behalf of their comrades.

The working pay of the prisoners' representative, of his advisers, if any, and of his assistants, shall be paid out of the fund maintained by canteen profits. The scale of this working pay shall be fixed by the prisoners' representative and approved by the camp commander. It there is no such fund, the detaining authorities shall pay these prisoners a fair working rate of pay.

Article 63

Prisoners of war shall be permitted to receive remittances of money addressed to them individually or collectively.

Every prisoner of war shall have at his disposal the credit balance of his account as provided for in the following Article, within the limits fixed by the Detaining Power, which shall make such payments as are requested. Subject to financial or monetary restrictions which the Detaining Power regards as essential, prisoners of war may also have payments made abroad. In this case payments addressed by prisoners of war to dependents shall be given priority.

In any event, and subject to the consent of the Power on which they depend, prisoners may have payments made in their own country, as follows: the Detaining Power shall send to the aforesaid Power through the Protecting Power, a notification giving all the necessary particulars concerning the prisoners of war, the beneficiaries of the payments, and the amount of the sums to be paid, expressed in the Detaining Power's currency. The said notification shall be signed by the prisoners and countersigned by the camp commander. The Detaining Power shall debit the prisoners' account by a corresponding amount; the sums thus debited shall be placed by it to the credit of the Power on which the prisoners depend.

To apply the foregoing provisions, the Detaining Power may usefully consult the Model Regulations in Annex V of the present Convention.

Article 64

The Detaining Power shall hold an account for each prisoner of war, showing at least the following:

(1) The amounts due to the prisoner or received by him as advances of pay, as working pay or derived from any other source; the sums in the currency of the Detaining Power which were taken from him; the sums taken from him and converted at his request into the currency of the said Power.

(2) The payments made to the prisoner in cash, or in any other similar form; the payments made on his behalf and at his request; the sums transferred under Article 63, third paragraph.

Article 65

Every item entered in the account of a prisoner of war shall be countersigned or initialled by him, or by the prisoners' representative acting on his behalf.

Prisoners of war shall at all times be afforded reasonable facilities for consulting and obtaining copies of their accounts, which may likewise be inspected by the representatives of the Protecting Powers at the time of visits to the camp.

When prisoners of war are transferred from one camp to another, their personal accounts will follow them. In case of transfer from one Detaining Power to another, the monies which are their property and are not in the currency of the Detaining Power will follow them. They shall be given certificates for any other monies standing to the credit of their accounts.

The Parties to the conflict concerned may agree to notify to each other at specific intervals through the Protecting Power, the amount of the accounts of the prisoners of war.

Article 66

On the termination of captivity, through the release of a prisoner of war or his repatriation, the Detaining Power shall give him a statement, signed by an authorized officer of that Power, showing the credit balance then due to him. The Detaining Power shall also send through the Protecting Power to the government upon which the prisoner of war depends, lists giving all appropriate particulars of all prisoners of war whose captivity has been terminated by repatriation, release, escape, death or any other means, and showing the amount of their credit balances. Such lists shall be certified on each sheet by an authorized representative of the Detaining Power.

Any of the above provisions of this Article may be varied by mutual agreement between any two Parties to the conflict.

The Power on which the prisoner of war depends shall be responsible for settling with him any credit balance due to him from the Detaining Power on the termination of his captivity.

Article 67

Advances of pay, issued to prisoners of war in conformity with Article 60, shall be considered as made on behalf of the Power on which they depend. Such advances of pay, as well as all payments made by the said Power under Article 63, third paragraph, and Article 68, shall form the subject of arrangements between the Powers concerned, at the close of hostilities.

Article 68

Any claim by a prisoner of war for compensation in respect of any injury or other disability arising out of work shall be referred to the Power on which he depends, through the Protecting Power. In accordance with Article 54, the Detaining Power will, in all cases, provide the prisoner of war concerned with a statement showing the nature of the injury or disability, the circumstances in which it arose and particulars of medical or hospital treatment given for it. This statement will be signed by a responsible officer of the Detaining Power and the medical particulars certified by a medical officer.

Any claim by a prisoner of war for compensation in respect of personal effects, monies or valuables impounded by the Detaining Power under Article 18 and not forthcoming on his repatriation, or in respect of loss alleged to be due to the fault of the Detaining Power or any of its servants, shall likewise be referred to the Power on which he depends. Nevertheless, any such personal effects required for use by the prisoners of war whilst in captivity shall be replaced at the expense of the Detaining Power. The Detaining Power will, in all cases, provide the prisoner of war with a statement, signed by a responsible officer, showing all available information regarding the reasons why such effects, monies or valuables have not been restored to him. A copy of this statement will be forwarded to the Power on which he depends through the Central Prisoners of War Agency provided for in Article 123.

Section V—Relations of prisoners of war with the exterior

Article 69

Immediately upon prisoners of war falling into its power, the Detaining Power shall inform them and the Powers on which they depend, through the Protecting Power, of the measures taken to carry out the provisions of the present Section. They shall likewise inform the parties concerned of any subsequent modifications of such measures.

Article 70

Immediately upon capture, or not more than one week after arrival at a camp, even if it is a transit camp, likewise in case of sickness or transfer to hospital or to another camp, every prisoner of war shall be enabled to write direct to his family, on the one hand, and to the Central Prisoners of War Agency provided for in Article 123, on the other hand, a card similar, if possible, to the model annexed to the present Convention, informing his relatives of his capture, address and state of health. The said cards shall be forwarded as rapidly as possible and may not be delayed in any manner.

Article 71

Prisoners of war shall be allowed to send and receive letters and cards. If the Detaining Power deems it necessary to limit the number of letters and cards sent by each prisoner of war, the said number shall not be less than two letters and four cards monthly, exclusive of the capture cards provided for in Article 70, and conforming as closely as possible to the models annexed to the present Convention. Further limitations may be imposed only if the Protecting Power is satisfied that it would be in the interests of the prisoners of war concerned to do so owing to difficulties of translation caused by the Detaining Power's inability to find sufficient qualified linguists to carry out the necessary censorship. If limitations must be placed on the correspondence addressed to prisoners of war, they may be ordered only by the Power on which the prisoners depend, possibly at the request of the Detaining Power. Such letters and cards must be conveyed by the most rapid method at the disposal of the Detaining Power; they may not be delayed or retained for disciplinary reasons.

Prisoners of war who have been without news for a long period, or who are unable to receive news from their next of kin or to give them news by the ordinary postal route, as well as those who are at a great distance from their homes, shall be permitted to send telegrams, the fees being charged against the prisoners of war's accounts with the Detaining Power or paid in the currency at their disposal. They shall likewise benefit by this measure in cases of urgency.

As a general rule, the correspondence of prisoners of war shall be written in their native language. The Parties to the conflict may allow correspondence in other languages.

Sacks containing prisoner of war mail must be securely sealed and labelled so as clearly to indicate their contents, and must be addressed to offices of destination.

Article 72

Prisoners of war shall be allowed to receive by post or by any other means individual parcels or collective shipments containing, in particular, foodstuffs, clothing, medical supplies and articles of a religious, educational or recreational character which may meet their needs, including books, devotional articles, scientific equipment, examination papers, musical instruments, sports outfits and materials allowing prisoners of war to pursue their studies or their cultural activities.

Such shipments shall in no way free the Detaining Power from the obligations imposed upon it by virtue of the present Convention.

The only limits which may be placed on these shipments shall be those proposed by the Protecting Power in the interest of the prisoners themselves, or by the International Committee of the Red Cross or any other organization giving assistance to the prisoners, in respect of their own shipments only, on account of exceptional strain on transport or communications.

The conditions for the sending of individual parcels and collective relief shall, if necessary, be the subject of special agreements between the Powers concerned, which may in no case delay the receipt by the prisoners of relief supplies. Books may not be included in parcels of clothing and foodstuffs. Medical supplies shall, as a rule, be sent in collective parcels.

Article 73

In the absence of special agreements between the Powers concerned on the conditions for the receipt and distribution of collective relief shipments, the rules and regulations concerning collective shipments, which are annexed to the present Convention, shall be applied.

The special agreements referred to above shall in no case restrict the right of prisoners' representatives to take possession of collective relief shipments intended for prisoners of war, to proceed to their distribution or to dispose of them in the interest of the prisoners.

Nor shall such agreements restrict the right of representatives of the Protecting Power, the International Committee of the Red Cross or any other organization giving assistance to prisoners of war and responsible for the forwarding of collective shipments, to supervise their distribution to the recipients.

Article 74

All relief shipments for prisoners of war shall be exempt from import, customs and other dues.

Correspondence, relief shipments and authorized remittances of money addressed to prisoners of war or despatched by them through the post office, either direct or through the Information Bureaux provided for in Article 122 and the Central Prisoners of War Agency provided for in Article 123, shall be exempt from any postal dues, both in the countries of origin and destination, and in intermediate countries.

If relief shipments intended for prisoners of war cannot be sent through the post office by reason of weight or for any other cause, the cost of transportation shall be borne by the Detaining Power in all the territories under its control. The other Powers party to the Convention shall bear the cost of transport in their respective territories.

In the absence of special agreements between the Parties concerned, the costs connected with transport of such shipments, other than costs covered by the above exemption, shall be charged to the senders.

The High Contracting Parties shall endeavour to reduce, so far as possible, the rates charged for telegrams sent by prisoners of war, or addressed to them.

Article 75

Should military operations prevent the Powers concerned from fulfilling their obligation to assure the transport of the shipments referred to in Articles 70, 71, 72 and 77, the Protecting Powers concerned, the International Committee of the Red Cross or any other organization duly approved by the Parties to the conflict may undertake to ensure the conveyance of such shipments by suitable means (railway wagons, motor vehicles, vessels or aircraft, etc.). For this purpose, the High Contracting Parties shall endeavour to supply them with such transport and to allow its circulation, especially by granting the necessary safe-conducts.

Such transport may also be used to convey:

(*a*) correspondence, lists and reports exchanged between the Central Information Agency referred to in Article 123 and the National Bureaux referred to in Article 122;

(*b*) correspondence and reports relating to prisoners of war which the Protecting Powers, the International Committee of the Red Cross or any other body assisting the prisoners, exchange either with their own delegates or with the Parties to the conflict.

These provisions in no way detract from the right of any Party to the conflict to arrange other means of transport, if it should so prefer, nor preclude the granting of safe-conducts, under mutually agreed conditions, to such means of transport.

In the absence of special agreements, the costs occasioned by the use of such means of transport shall be borne proportionally by the Parties to the conflict whose nationals are benefited thereby.

Article 76

The censoring of correspondence addressed to prisoners of war or despatched by them shall be done as quickly as possible. Mail shall be censored only by the despatching State and the receiving State, and once only by each.

The examination of consignments intended for prisoners of war shall not be carried out under conditions that will expose the goods contained in them to deterioration; except in the case of written or printed matter, it shall be done in the presence of the addressee, or a fellow-prisoner duly delegated by him. The delivery to prisoners of individual or collective consignments shall not be delayed under the pretext of difficulties of censorship.

Any prohibition of correspondence ordered by Parties to the conflict, either for military or political reasons, shall be only temporary and its duration shall be as short as possible.

Article 77

The Detaining Powers shall provide all facilities for the transmission, through the Protecting Power or the Central Prisoners of War Agency provided for in Article 123, of instruments, papers or documents intended for prisoners of war or despatched by them, especially powers of attorney and wills.

In all cases they shall facilitate the preparation and execution of such documents on behalf of prisoners of war; in particular, they shall allow them to consult a lawyer and shall take what measures are necessary for the authentication of their signatures.

Section VI—Relations between prisoners of war and the authorities

Chapter I—Complaints of Prisoners of War Respecting the Conditions of Captivity

Article 78

Prisoners of war shall have the right to make known to the military authorities in whose power they are, their requests regarding the conditions of captivity to which they are subjected.

They shall also have the unrestricted right to apply to the representatives of the Protecting Powers either through their prisoners' representative or, if they consider it necessary, direct, in order to draw their attention to any points on which they may have complaints to make regarding their conditions of captivity.

These requests and complaints shall not be limited nor considered to be a part of the correspondence quota referred to in Article 71. They must be transmitted immediately. Even if they are recognized to be unfounded, they may not give rise to any punishment.

Prisoners' representatives may send periodic reports on the situation in the camps and the needs of the prisoners of war to the representatives of the Protecting Powers.

Chapter II—Prisoner of War Representatives

Article 79

In all places where there are prisoners of war, except in those where there are officers, the prisoners shall freely elect by secret ballot, every six months, and also in case of vacancies, prisoners' representatives entrusted with representing them before the military authorities, the Protecting Powers, the International Committee of the Red Cross and any other organization which may assist them. These prisoners' representatives shall be eligible for re-election.

In camps for officers and persons of equivalent status or in mixed camps, the senior officer among the prisoners of war shall be recognized as the camp prisoners' representative. In camps for officers, he shall be assisted by one or more advisers chosen by the officers; in mixed camps, his assistants shall be chosen from among the prisoners of war who are not officers and shall be elected by them.

Officer prisoners of war of the same nationality shall be stationed in labour camps for prisoners of war, for the purpose of carrying out the camp administration duties for which the prisoners of war are responsible. These officers may be elected as prisoners' representatives under the first paragraph of this Article. In such a case the assistants to the prisoners' representatives shall be chosen from among those prisoners of war who are not officers.

Every representative elected must be approved by the Detaining Power before he has the right to commence his duties. Where the Detaining Power refuses to approve a prisoner of war elected by his fellow prisoners of war, it must inform the Protecting Power of the reason for such refusal.

In all cases the prisoners' representative must have the same nationality, language and customs as the prisoners of war whom he represents. Thus, prisoners of war distributed in different sections of a camp, according to their nationality, language or customs, shall have for each section their own prisoners' representative, in accordance with the foregoing paragraphs.

Article 80

Prisoners' representatives shall further the physical, spiritual and intellectual well-being of prisoners of war.

In particular, where the prisoners decide to organize amongst themselves a system of mutual assistance, this organization will be within the province of the prisoners' representative, in addition to the special duties entrusted to him by other provisions of the present Convention.

Prisoners' representatives shall not be held responsible, simply by reason of their duties, for any offences committed by prisoners of war.

Article 81

Prisoners' representatives shall not be required to perform any other work, if the accomplishment of their duties is thereby made more difficult.

Prisoners' representatives may appoint from amongst the prisoners such assistants as they may require. All material facilities shall be granted them, particularly a certain freedom of movement necessary for the accomplishment of their duties (inspection of labour detachments, receipt of supplies, etc.).

Prisoners' representatives shall be permitted to visit premises where prisoners of war are detained, and every prisoner of war shall have the right to consult freely his prisoners' representative.

All facilities shall likewise be accorded to the prisoner's representatives for communication by post and telegraph with the detaining authorities, the Protecting Powers, the International Committee of the Red Cross and their delegates, the Mixed Medical Commissions and the bodies which give assistance to prisoners of war. Prisoners' representatives of labour detachments shall enjoy the same facilities for communication with the prisoners' representatives of the principal camp. Such communications shall not be restricted, nor considered as forming a part of the quota mentioned in Article 71.

Prisoners' representatives who are transferred shall be allowed a reasonable time to acquaint their successors with current affairs.

In case of dismissal, the reasons therefor shall be communicated to the Protecting Power.

Chapter III—Penal and Disciplinary Sanctions

I. General Provisions

Article 82

A prisoner of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations and orders in force in the armed forces of the Detaining Power; the Detaining Power shall be justified in taking judicial or disciplinary measures in respect of any offence committed by a prisoner of war against such laws, regulations or orders. However, no proceedings or punishments contrary to the provisions of this Chapter shall be allowed.

If any law, regulation or order of the Detaining Power shall declare acts committed by a prisoner of war to be punishable, whereas the same acts would not be punishable if committed by a member of the forces of the Detaining Power, such acts shall entail disciplinary punishments only.

Article 83

In deciding whether proceedings in respect of an offence alleged to have been committed by a prisoner of war shall be judicial or disciplinary, the Detaining Power shall ensure that the competent authorities exercise the greatest leniency and adopt, wherever possible, disciplinary rather than judicial measures.

Article 84

A prisoner of war shall be tried only by a military court, unless the existing laws of the Detaining Power expressly permit the civil courts to try a member of the armed forces of the Detaining Power in respect of the particular offence alleged to have been committed by the prisoner of war.

In no circumstances whatever shall a prisoner of war be tried by a court of any kind which does not offer the essential guarantees of independence and impartiality as generally recognized, and, in particular, the procedure of which does not afford the accused the rights and means of defence provided for in Article 105.

Article 85

Prisoners of war prosecuted under the laws of the Detaining Power for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present Convention.

Article 86

No prisoner of war may be punished more than once for the same act or on the same charge.

Article 87

Prisoners of war may not be sentenced by the military authorities and courts of the Detaining Power to any penalties except those provided for in respect of members of the armed forces of the said Power who have committed the same acts.

When fixing the penalty, the courts or authorities of the Detaining Power shall take into consideration, to the widest extent possible, the fact that the accused, not being a national of the Detaining Power, is not bound to it by any duty of allegiance, and that he is in its power as the result of circumstances independent of his own will. The said courts or authorities shall be at liberty to reduce the penalty provided for the violation of which the prisoner of war is accused, and shall therefore not be bound to apply the minimum penalty prescribed.

Collective punishment for individual acts, corporal punishment, imprisonment in premises without daylight and, in general, any form of torture or cruelty, are forbidden.

No prisoner of war may be deprived of his rank by the Detaining Power, or prevented from wearing his badges.

Article 88

Officers, non-commissioned officers and men who are prisoners of war undergoing a disciplinary or judicial punishment, shall not be subjected to more severe treatment than that applied in respect of the same punishment to members of the armed forces of the Detaining Power of equivalent rank.

A woman prisoner of war shall not be awarded or sentenced to a punishment more severe, or treated whilst undergoing punishment more severely, than a women member of the armed forces of the Detaining Power dealt with for a similar offence.

In no case may a women prisoner of war be awarded or sentenced to a punishment more severe, or treated whilst undergoing punishment more severely, than a male member of the armed forces of the Detaining Power dealt with for a similar offence.

Prisoners of war who have served disciplinary or judicial sentences may not be treated differently from other prisoners of war.

II. Disciplinary Sanctions

Article 89

The disciplinary punishments applicable to prisoners of war are the following:

(1) A fine which shall not exceed 50 per cent of the advances of pay and working pay which the prisoner of war would otherwise receive under the provisions of Articles 60 and 62 during a period of not more than thirty days.

(2) Discontinuance of privileges granted over and above the treatment provided for by the present Convention.

(3) Fatigue duties not exceeding two hours daily.

(4) Confinement.

The punishment referred to under (3) shall not be applied to officers.

In no case shall disciplinary punishments be inhuman, brutal or dangerous to the health of prisoners of war.

Article 90

The duration of any single punishment shall in no case exceed thirty days. Any period of confinement awaiting the hearing of a disciplinary offence or the award of disciplinary punishment shall be deducted from an award pronounced against a prisoner of war.

The maximum of thirty days provided above may not be exceeded, even if the prisoner of war is answerable for several acts at the same time when he is awarded punishment, whether such acts are related or not.

The period between the pronouncing of an award of disciplinary punishment and its execution shall not exceed one month.

When a prisoner of war is awarded a further disciplinary punishment, a period of at least three days shall elapse between the execution of any two of the punishments, if the duration of one of these is ten days or more.

Article 91

The escape of a prisoner of war shall be deemed to have succeeded when:

(1) he has joined the armed forces of the Power on which he depends, or those of an allied Power;

(2) he has left the territory under the control of the Detaining Power, or of an ally of the said Power;

(3) he has joined a ship flying the flag of the Power on which he depends, or of an allied Power, in the territorial waters of the Detaining Power, the said ship not being under the control of the last named Power.

Prisoners of war who have made good their escape in the sense of this Article and who are recaptured, shall not be liable to any punishment in respect of their previous escape.

Article 92

A prisoner of war who attempts to escape and is recaptured before having made good his escape in the sense of Article 91 shall be liable only to a disciplinary punishment in respect of this act, even if it is a repeated offence.

A prisoner of war who is recaptured shall be handed over without delay to the competent military authority.

Article 88, fourth paragraph, notwithstanding, prisoners of war punished as a result of an unsuccessful escape may be subjected to special surveillance. Such surveillance must not affect the state of their health, must be undergone in a prisoner of war camp, and must not entail the suppression of any of the safeguards granted them by the present Convention.

Article 93

Escape or attempt to escape, even if it is a repeated offence, shall not be deemed an aggravating circumstance if the prisoner of war is subjected to trial by judicial proceedings in respect of an offence committed during his escape or attempt to escape.

In conformity with the principle stated in Article 83, offences committed by prisoners of war with the sole intention of facilitating their escape and which do not entail any violence against life or limb, such as offences against public property, theft without intention of self-enrichment, the drawing up or use of false papers, or the wearing of civilian clothing, shall occasion disciplinary punishment only.

Prisoners of war who aid or abet an escape or an attempt to escape shall be liable on this count to disciplinary punishment only.

Article 94

If an escaped prisoner of war is recaptured, the Power on which he depends shall be notified thereof in the manner defined in Article 122, provided notification of his escape has been made.

Article 95

A prisoner of war accused of an offence against discipline shall not be kept in confinement pending the hearing unless a member of the armed forces of the Detaining Power would be so kept if he were accused of a similar offence, or if it is essential in the interests of camp order and discipline.

Any period spent by a prisoner of war in confinement awaiting the disposal of an offence against discipline shall be reduced to an absolute minimum and shall not exceed fourteen days.

The provisions of Articles 97 and 98 of this Chapter shall apply to prisoners of war who are in confinement awaiting the disposal of offences against discipline.

Article 96

Acts which constitute offences against discipline shall be investigated immediately.

Without prejudice to the competence of courts and superior military authorities, disciplinary punishment may be ordered only by an officer having disciplinary powers in his capacity as camp commander, or by a responsible officer who replaces him or to whom he has delegated his disciplinary powers.

In no case may such powers be delegated to a prisoner of war or be exercised by a prisoner of war.

Before any disciplinary award is pronounced, the accused shall be given precise information regarding the offences of which he is accused and given an opportunity of explaining his conduct and of defending himself. He shall be permitted, in particular, to call witnesses and to have recourse, if necessary, to the services of a qualified interpreter. The decision shall be announced to the accused prisoner of war and to the prisoners' representative.

A record of disciplinary punishments shall be maintained by the camp commander and shall be open to inspection by representatives of the Protecting Power.

Article 97

Prisoners of war shall not in any case be transferred to penitentiary establishments (prisons, penitentiaries, convict prisons, etc.) to undergo disciplinary punishment therein.

All premises in which disciplinary punishments are undergone shall conform to the sanitary requirements set forth in Article 25. A prisoner of war undergoing punishment shall be enabled to keep himself in a state of cleanliness, in conformity with Article 29.

Officers and persons of equivalent status shall not be lodged in the same quarters as non-commissioned officers or men.

Women prisoners of war undergoing disciplinary punishment shall be confined in separate quarters from male prisoners of war and shall be under the immediate supervision of women.

Article 98

A prisoner of war undergoing confinement as a disciplinary punishment, shall continue to enjoy the benefits of the provisions of this Convention except in so far as these are necessarily rendered inapplicable by the mere fact that he is confined. In no case may he be deprived of the benefits of the provisions of Articles 78 and 126.

A prisoner of war awarded disciplinary punishment may not be deprived of the prerogatives attached to his rank.

Prisoners of war awarded disciplinary punishment shall be allowed to exercise and to stay in the open air at least two hours daily.

They shall be allowed, on their request, to be present at the daily medical inspections. They shall receive the attention which their state of health requires and, if necessary, shall be removed to the camp infirmary or to a hospital.

They shall have permission to read and write, likewise to send and receive letters. Parcels and remittances of money however, may be withheld from them until the completion of the punishment; they shall meanwhile be entrusted to the prisoners' representative, who will hand over to the infirmary the perishable goods contained in such parcels.

III. Judicial Proceedings

Article 99

No prisoner of war may be tried or sentenced for an act which is not forbidden by the law of the Detaining Power or by international law, in force at the time the said act was committed.

No moral or physical coercion may be exerted on a prisoner of war in order to induce him to admit himself guilty of the act of which he is accused.

No prisoner of war may be convicted without having had an opportunity to present his defence and the assistance of a qualified advocate or counsel.

Article 100

Prisoners of war and the Protecting Powers shall be informed as soon as possible of the offences which are punishable by the death sentence under the laws of the Detaining Power.

Other offences shall not thereafter be made punishable by the death penalty without the concurrence of the Power on which the prisoners of war depend.

The death sentence cannot be pronounced on a prisoner of war unless the attention of the court has, in accordance with Article 87, second paragraph, been particularly called to the fact that since the accused is not a national of the Detaining Power, he is not bound to it by any duty of allegiance, and that he is in its power as the result of circumstances independent of his own will.

Article 101

If the death penalty is pronounced on a prisoner of war, the sentence shall not be executed before the expiration of a period of at least six months from the date when the Protecting Power receives, at an indicated address, the detailed communication provided for in Article 107.

Article 102

A prisoner of war can be validly sentenced only if the sentence has been pronounced by the same courts according to the same procedure as in the case of members of the armed forces of the Detaining Power, and if, furthermore, the provisions of the present Chapter have been observed.

Article 103

Judicial investigations relating to a prisoner of war shall be conducted as rapidly as circumstances permit and so that his trial shall take place as soon as possible. A prisoner of war shall not be confined while awaiting trial unless a member of the armed forces of the Detaining Power would be so confined if he were accused of a similar offence, or if it is essential to do so in the interests of national security. In no circumstances shall this confinement exceed three months.

Any period spent by a prisoner of war in confinement awaiting trial shall be deducted from any sentence of imprisonment passed upon him and taken into account in fixing any penalty.

The provisions of Articles 97 and 98 of this Chapter shall apply to a prisoner of war whilst in confinement awaiting trial.

Article 104

In any case in which the Detaining Power has decided to institute judicial proceedings against a prisoner of war, it shall notify the Protecting Power as soon as possible and at least three weeks before the opening of the trial. This period of three weeks shall run as from the day on which such notification reaches the Protecting Power at the address previously indicated by the latter to the Detaining Power.

The said notification shall contain the following information:

(1) Surname and first names of the prisoner of war, his rank, his army, regimental, personal or serial number, his date of birth, and his profession or trade, if any;

(2) Place of internment or confinement;

(3) Specification of the charge or charges on which the prisoner of war is to be arraigned, giving the legal provisions applicable;

(4) Designation of the court which will try the case, likewise the date and place fixed for the opening of the trial.

The same communication shall be made by the Detaining Power to the prisoners' representative.

If no evidence is submitted, at the opening of a trial, that the notification referred to above was received by the Protecting Power, by the prisoner of war and by the prisoners' representative concerned, at least three weeks before the opening of the trial, then the latter cannot take place and must be adjourned.

Article 105

The prisoner of war shall be entitled to assistance by one of his prisoner comrades, to defence by a qualified advocate or counsel of his own choice, to the calling of witnesses and, if he deems necessary, to the services of a competent interpreter. He shall be advised of these rights by the Detaining Power in due time before the trial.

Failing a choice by the prisoner of war, the Protecting Power shall find him an advocate or counsel, and shall have at least one week at its disposal for the purpose. The Detaining Power shall deliver to the said Power, on request, a list of persons qualified to present the defence. Failing a choice of an advocate or counsel by the prisoner of war or the Protecting Power, the Detaining Power shall appoint a competent advocate or counsel to conduct the defence.

The advocate or counsel conducting the defence on behalf of the prisoner of war shall have at his disposal a period of two weeks at least before the opening of the trial, as well as the necessary facilities to prepare the defence of the accused. He may, in particular, freely visit the accused and interview him in private. He may also confer with any witnesses for the defence, including prisoners of war. He shall have the benefit of these facilities until the term of appeal or petition has expired.

Particulars of the charge or charges on which the prisoner of war is to be arraigned, as well as the documents which are generally communicated to the accused by virtue of the laws in force in the armed forces of the Detaining Power, shall be communicated to the accused prisoner of war in a language which he understands, and in good time before the opening of the trial. The same communication on the same circumstances shall be made to the advocate or counsel conducting the defence on behalf of the prisoner of war.

The representatives of the Protecting Power shall be entitled to attend the trial of the case, unless, exceptionally, this is held *in camera* in the interest of State security. In such a case the Detaining Power shall advise the Protecting Power accordingly.

Article 106

Every prisoner of war shall have, in the same manner as the members of the armed forces of the Detaining Power, the right of appeal or petition from any sentence pronounced upon him, with a view to the quashing or revising of the sentence or the reopening of the trial. He shall be fully informed of his right to appeal or petition and of the time limit within which he may do so.

Article 107

Any judgment and sentence pronounced upon a prisoner of war shall be immediately reported to the Protecting Power in the form of a summary communication, which shall also indicate whether he has the right of appeal with a view to the quashing of the sentence or the reopening of the trial. This communication shall likewise be sent to the prisoners' representatives concerned. It shall also be sent to the accused prisoner of war in a language he understands, if the sentence was not pronounced in his presence. The Detaining Power shall also immediately communicate to the Protecting Power the decision of the prisoner of war to use or to waive his right of appeal.

Furthermore, if a prisoner of war is finally convicted or if a sentence pronounced on a prisoner of war in the first instance is a death sentence, the Detaining Power shall as soon as possible address to the Protecting Power a detailed communication containing:

(1) the precise wording of the finding and sentence;

(2) a summarized report of any preliminary investigation and of the trial, emphasizing in particular the elements of the prosecution and the defence;

(3) notification, where applicable, of the establishment where the sentence will be served.

The communications provided for in the foregoing sub-paragraphs shall be sent to the Protecting Power at the address previously made known to the Detaining Power.

Article 108

Sentences pronounced on prisoners of war after a conviction has become duly enforceable, shall be served in the same establishments and under the same conditions as in the case of members of the armed forces of the Detaining Power. These conditions shall in all cases conform to the requirements of health and humanity.

A woman prisoner of war on whom such a sentence has been pronounced shall be confined in separate quarters and shall be under the supervision of women.

In any case, prisoners of war sentenced to a penalty depriving them of their liberty shall retain the benefit of the provisions of Articles 78 and 126 of the present Convention. Furthermore, they shall be entitled to receive and despatch correspondence, to receive at least one relief parcel monthly, to take regular exercise in the open air, to have the medical care required by their state of health, and the spiritual assistance they may desire. Penalties to which they may be subjected shall be in accordance with the provisions of Article 87, third paragraph.

PART IV—TERMINATION OF CAPTIVITY

Section I—Direct repatriation and accommodation in neutral countries

Article 109

Subject to the provisions of the third paragraph of this Article, Parties to the conflict are bound to send back to their own country, regardless of number or rank, seriously wounded and seriously sick prisoners of war, after having cared for them until they are fit to travel, in accordance with the first paragraph of the following Article.

Throughout the duration of hostilities, Parties to the confict shall endeavour, with the cooperation of the neutral Powers concerned, to make arrangements for the accommodation in neutral countries of the sick and wounded prisoners of war referred to in the second paragraph of the following Article. They may, in addition, conclude agreements with a view to the direct repatriation or internment in a neutral country of able-bodied prisoners of war who have undergone a long period of captivity.

No sick or injured prisoner of war who is eligible for repatriation under the first paragraph of this Article, may be repatriated against his will during hostilities.

Article 110

The following shall be repatriated direct:

(1) Incurably wounded and sick whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely diminished.

(2) Wounded and sick who, according to medical opinion, are not likely to recover within one year, whose condition requires treatment and whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely diminished.

(3) Wounded and sick who have recovered, but whose mental or physical fitness seems to have been gravely and permanently diminished.

The following may be accommodated in a neutral country:

(1) Wounded and sick whose recovery may be expected within one year of the date of the wound or the beginning of the illness, if treatment in a neutral country might increase the prospects of a more certain and speedy recovery.

(2) Prisoners of war whose mental or physical health, according to medical opinion, is seriously threatened by continued captivity, but whose accommodation in a neutral country might remove such a threat.

The conditions which prisoners of war accommodated in a neutral country must fulfil in order to permit their repatriation shall be fixed, as shall likewise their status, by agreement between the Powers concerned. In general, prisoners of war who have been accommodated in a neutral country, and who belong to the following categories, should be repatriated:

(1) Those whose state of health has deteriorated so as to fulfil the conditions laid down for direct repatriation;

(2) Those whose mental or physical powers remain, even after treatment, considerably impaired.

[Post, p. 3432, Post, p. 3442]

If no special agreements are concluded between the Parties to the conflict concerned, to determine the cases of disablement or sickness entailing direct repatriation or accommodation in a neutral country, such cases shall be settled in accordance with the principles laid down in the Model Agreement concerning direct repatriation and accommodation in neutral countries of wounded and sick prisoners of war and in the Regulations concerning Mixed Medical Commissions annexed to the present Convention.

Article 111

The Detaining Power, the Power on which the prisoners of war depend, and a neutral Power agreed upon by these two Powers, shall endeavour to conclude agreements which will enable prisoners of war to be interned in the territory of the said neutral Power until the close of hostilities.

Article 112

Upon the outbreak of hostilities, Mixed Medical Commissions shall be appointed to examine sick and wounded prisoners of war, and to make all appropriate decisions regarding them. The appointment, duties and functioning of these Commissions shall be in conformity with the provisions of the Regulations annexed to the present Convention.

However, prisoners of war who, in the opinion of the medical authorities of the Detaining Power, are manifestly seriously injured or seriously sick, may be repatriated without having to be examined by a Mixed Medical Commission.

Article 113

Besides those who are designated by the medical authorities of the Detaining Power, wounded or sick prisoners of war belonging to the categories listed below shall be entitled to present themselves for examination by the Mixed Medical Commissions provided for in the foregoing Article:

(1) Wounded and sick proposed by a physician or surgeon who is of the same nationality, or a national of a Party to the conflict allied with the Power on which the said prisoners depend, and who exercises his functions in the camp.

(2) Wounded and sick proposed by their prisoners' representative.

(3) Wounded and sick proposed by the Power on which they depend, or by an organization duly recognized by the said Power and giving assistance to the prisoners.

Prisoners of war who do not belong to one of the three foregoing categories may nevertheless present themselves for examination by Mixed Medical Commissions, but shall be examined only after those belonging to the said categories.

The physician or surgeon of the same nationality as the prisoners who present themselves for examination by the Mixed Medical Commission, likewise the prisoners' representative of the said prisoners, shall have permission to be present at the examination.

Article 114

Prisoners of war who meet with accidents shall, unless the injury is self-inflicted, have the benefit of the provisions of this Convention as regards repatriation or accommodation in a neutral country.

Article 115

No prisoner of war on whom a disciplinary punishment has been imposed and who is eligible for repatriation or for accommodation in a neutral country, may be kept back on the plea that he has not undergone his punishment.

Prisoners of war detained in connection with a judicial prosecution or conviction and who are designated for repatriation or accommodation in a neutral country, may benefit by such measures before the end of the proceedings or the completion of the punishment, if the Detaining Power consents.

Parties to the conflict shall communicate to each other the names of those who will be detained until the end of the proceedings or the completion of the punishment.

Article 116

The cost of repatriating prisoners of war or of transporting them to a neutral country shall be borne, from the frontiers of the Detaining Power, by the Power on which the said prisoners depend.

Article 117

No repatriated person may be employed on active military service.

Section II—Release and repatriation of prisoners of war at the close of hostilities

Article 118

Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities.

In the absence of stipulations to the above effect in any agreement concluded between the Parties to the conflict with a view to the cessation of hostilities, or failing any such agreement, each of the Detaining Powers shall itself establish and execute without delay a plan of repatriation in conformity with the principle laid down in the foregoing paragraph.

In either case, the measures adopted shall be brought to the knowledge of the prisoners of war.

The costs of repatriation of prisoners of war shall in all cases be equitably apportioned between the Detaining Power and the Power on which the prisoners depend. This apportionment shall be carried out on the following basis:

(*a*) If the two Powers are contiguous, the Power on which the prisoners of war depend shall bear the costs of repatriation from the frontiers of the Detaining Power.

(*b*) If the two Powers are not contiguous, the Detaining Power shall bear the costs of transport of prisoners of war over its own territory as far as its frontier or its port of embarkation nearest to the territory of the Power on which the prisoners of war depend. The Parties concerned shall agree between themselves as to the equitable apportionment of the remaining costs of the repatriation. The conclusion of this agreement shall in no circumstances justify any delay in the repatriation of the prisoners of war.

Article 119

Repatriation shall be effected in conditions similar to those laid down in Articles 46 to 48 inclusive of the present Convention for the transfer of prisoners of war, having regard to the provisions of Article 118 and to those of the following paragraphs.

On repatriation, any articles of value impounded from prisoners of war under Article 18, and any foreign currency which has not been converted into the currency of the Detaining Power, shall be restored to them. Articles of value and foreign currency which, for any reason whatever, are not restored to prisoners of war on repatriation, shall be despatched to the Information Bureau set up under Article 122.

Prisoners of war shall be allowed to take with them their personal effects, and any correspondence and parcels which have arrived for them. The weight of such baggage may be limited, if the conditions of repatriation so require, to what each prisoner can reasonably carry. Each prisoner shall in all cases be authorized to carry at least twenty-five kilograms.

The other personal effects of the repatriated prisoner shall be left in the charge of the Detaining Power which shall have them forwarded to him as soon as it has concluded an agreement to this effect, regulating the conditions of transport and the payment of the costs involved, with the Power on which the prisoner depends.

Prisoners of war against whom criminal proceedings for an indictable offence are pending may be detained until the end of such proceedings, and, if necessary, until the completion of the punishment. The same shall apply to prisoners of war already convicted for an indictable offence.

Parties to the conflict shall communicate to each other the names of any prisoners of war who are detained until the end of the proceedings or until punishment has been completed.

By agreement between the Parties to the conflict, commissions shall be established for the purpose of searching for dispersed prisoners of war and of assuring their repatriation with the least possible delay.

Section III—Death of prisoners of war

Article 120

Wills of prisoners of war shall be drawn up so as to satisfy the conditions of validity required by the legislation of their country of origin, which will take steps to inform the Detaining Power of its requirements in this respect. At the request of the prisoner of war and, in all cases, after death, the will shall be transmitted without delay to the Protecting Power; a certified copy shall be sent to the Central Agency.

Death certificates, in the form annexed to the present Convention, or lists certified by a responsible officer, of all persons who die as prisoners of war shall be forwarded as rapidly as possible to the Prisoner of War Information Bureau established in accordance with Article 122. The death certificates or certified lists shall show particulars of identity as set out in the third paragraph of Article 17, and also the date and place of death, the cause of death, the date and place of burial and all particulars necessary to identify the graves.

The burial or cremation of a prisoner of war shall be preceded by a medical examination of the body with a view to confirming death and enabling a report to be made and, where necessary, establishing identity.

The detaining authorities shall ensure that prisoners of war who have died in captivity are honourably buried, if possible according to the rites of the religion to which they belonged, and that their graves are respected, suitably maintained and marked so as to be found at any time. Wherever possible, deceased prisoners of war who depended on the same Power shall be interred in the same place.

Deceased prisoners of war shall be buried in individual graves unless unavoidable circumstances require the use of collective graves. Bodies may be cremated only for imperative reasons of hygiene, on account of the religion of the deceased or in accordance with his express wish to this effect. In case of cremation, the fact shall be stated and the reasons given in the death certificate of the deceased.

In order that graves may always be found, all particulars of burials and graves shall be recorded with a Graves Registration Service established by the Detaining Power. Lists of graves and particulars of the prisoners of war interred in cemeteries and elsewhere shall be transmitted to the Power on which such prisoners of war depended. Responsibility for the care of these graves and for records of any subsequent moves of the bodies shall rest on the Power controlling the territory, if a Party to the present Convention. These provisions shall also apply to the ashes, which shall be kept by the Graves Registration Service until proper disposal thereof in accordance with the wishes of the home country.

Article 121

Every death or serious injury of a prisoner of war caused or suspected to have been caused by a sentry, another prisoner or war, or any other person, as well as any death the cause of which is unknown, shall be immediately followed by an official enquiry by the Detaining Power.

A communication on this subject shall be sent immediately to the Protecting Power. Statements shall be taken from witnesses, especially from those who are prisoners of war, and a report including such statements shall be forwarded to the Protecting Power.

If the enquiry indicates the guilt of one or more persons, the Detaining Power shall take all measures for the prosecution of the person or persons responsible.

PART V—INFORMATION BUREAUX AND RELIEF SOCIETIES FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

Article 122

Upon the outbreak of a conflict and in all cases of occupation, each of the Parties to the conflict shall institute an official Information Bureau for prisoners of war who are in its power. Neutral or non-belligerent Powers who may have received within their territory persons belonging to one of the categories referred to in Article 4, shall take the same action with respect to such persons. The Power concerned shall ensure that the Prisoners of War Information Bureau is provided with the necessary accommodation, equipment and staff to ensure its efficient working. It shall be at liberty to employ prisoners of war in such a Bureau under the conditions laid down in the Section of the present Convention dealing with work by prisoners of war.

Within the shortest possible period, each of the Parties to the conflict shall give its Bureau the information referred to in the fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of this Article regarding any enemy person belonging to one of the categories referred to in Article 4, who has fallen into its power. Neutral or non-belligerent Powers shall take the same action with regard to persons belonging to such categories whom they have received within their territory.

The Bureau still immediately forward such information by the most rapid means to the Powers concerned, through the intermediary of the Protecting Powers and likewise of the Central Agency provided for in Article 123.

This information shall make it possible quickly to advise the next of kin concerned. Subject to the provisions of Article 17, the information shall include, in so far as available to the Information Bureau, in respect of each prisoner of war, his surname, first names, rank, army, regimental, personal or serial number, place and full date of birth, indication of the Power on which he depends, first name of the father and maiden name of the mother, name and address of the person to be informed and the address to which correspondence for the prisoner may be sent.

The Information Bureau shall receive from the various departments concerned information regarding transfers, releases, repatriations, escapes, admissions to hospital, and deaths, and shall transmit such information in the manner described in the third paragraph above.

Likewise, information regarding the state of health of prisoners of war who are seriously ill or seriously wounded shall be supplied regularly, every week if possible.

The Information Bureau shall also be responsible for replying to all enquiries sent to it concerning prisoners of war, including those who have died in captivity; it will make any enquiries necessary to obtain the information which is asked for if this is not in its possession.

All written communications made by the Bureau shall be authenticated by a signature or a seal.

The Information Bureau shall furthermore be charged with collecting all personal valuables, including sums in currencies other than that of the Detaining Power and documents of importance to the next of kin, left by prisoners of war who have been repatriated or released, or who have escaped or died, and shall forward the said valuables to the Powers concerned. Such articles shall be sent by the Bureau in sealed packets which shall be accompanied by statements giving clear and full particulars of the identity of the person to whom the articles belonged, and by a complete list of the contents of the parcel. Other personal effects of such prisoners of war shall be transmitted under arrangements agreed upon between the Parties to the conflict concerned.

Article 123

A Central Prisoners of War Information Agency shall be created in a neutral country. The International Committee of the Red Cross shall, if it deems necessary, propose to the Powers concerned the organization of such an Agency.

The function of the Agency shall be to collect all the information it may obtain through official or private channels respecting prisoners of war, and to transmit it as rapidly as possible to the country of origin of the prisoners of war or to the Power on which they depend. It shall receive from the Parties to the conflict all facilities for effecting such transmissions.

The High Contracting Parties, and in particular those whose nationals benefit by the services of the Central Agency, are requested to give the said Agency the financial aid it may require.

The foregoing provisions shall in no way be interpreted as restricting the humanitarian activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross, or of the relief societies provided for in Article 125.

Article 124

The national Information Bureaux and the Central Information Agency shall enjoy free postage for mail, likewise all the exemptions provided for in Article 74, and further, so far as possible, exemption from telegraphic charges or, at least, greatly reduced rates.

Article 125

Subject to the measures which the Detaining Powers may consider essential to ensure their security or to meet any other reasonable need, the representatives of religious organizations, relief societies, or any other organization assisting prisoners of war, shall receive from the said Powers, for themselves and their duly accredited agents, all necessary facilities for visiting the prisoners, for distributing relief supplies and material, from any source, intended for religious, educational or recreative purposes, and for assisting them in organizing their leisure time within the camps. Such societies or organizations may be constituted in the territory of the Detaining Power or in any other country, or they may have an international character.

The Detaining Power may limit the number of societies and organizations whose delegates are allowed to carry out their activities in its territory and under its supervision, on condition, however, that such limitation shall not hinder the effective operation of adequate relief to all prisoners of war.

The special position of the International Committee of the Red Cross in this field shall be recognized and respected at all times.

As soon as relief supplies or material intended for the above-mentioned purposes are handed over to prisoners of war, or very shortly afterwards. receipts for each consignment, signed by the prisoners' representative, shall be forwarded to the relief society or organization making the shipment. At the same time, receipts for these consignments shall be supplied by the administrative authorities responsible for guarding the prisoners.

PART VI—EXECUTION OF THE CONVENTION

Section I—General provisions

Article 126

Representatives or delegates of the Protecting Powers shall have permission to go to all places where prisoners of war may be, particularly to places of internment, imprisonment and labour, and shall have access to all premises occupied by prisoners of war; they shall also be allowed to go to the places of departure, passage and arrival of prisoners who are being transferred. They shall be able to interview the prisoners, and in particular the prisoners' representatives, without witnesses, either personally or through an interpreter.

Representatives and delegates of the Protecting Powers shall have full liberty to select the places they wish to visit. The duration and frequency of these visits shall not be restricted. Visits may not be prohibited except for reasons of imperative military necessity, and then only as an exceptional and temporary measure.

The Detaining Power and the Power on which the said prisoners of war depend may agree, if necessary, that compatriots of these prisoners of war be permitted to participate in the visits.

The delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross shall enjoy the same prerogatives. The appointment of such delegates shall be submitted to the approval of the Power detaining the prisoners of war to be visited.

Article 127

The High Contracting Parties undertake, in time of peace as in time of war, to disseminate the text of the present Convention as widely as possible in their respective countries, and, in particular, to include the study thereof in their programmes of military and, if possible, civil instruction, so that the principles thereof may become known to all their armed forces and to the entire population.

Any military or other authorities, who in time of war assume responsibilities in respect of prisoners of war, must possess the text of the Convention and be specially instructed as to its provisions.

Article 128

The High Contracting Parties shall communicate to one another through the Swiss Federal Council and, during hostilities, through the Protecting Powers, the official translations of the present Convention, as well as the laws and regulations which they may adopt to ensure the application thereof.

Article 129

The High Contracting Parties undertake to enact any legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing, or ordering to be committed, any of the grave breaches of the present Convention defined in the following Article.

Each High Contracting Party shall be under the obligation to search for persons alleged to have committed, or to have ordered to be committed, such grave breaches, and shall bring such persons, regardless of their nationality, before its own courts. It may also, if it prefers, and in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, hand such persons over for trial to another High Contracting Party concerned, provided such High Contracting Party has made out a *prima facie* case.

Each High Contracting Party shall take measures necessary for the suppression of all acts contrary to the provisions of the present Convention other than the grave breaches defined in the following Article.

In all circumstances, the accused persons shall benefit by safeguards of proper trial and defence, which shall not be less favourable than those provided by Article 105 and those following of the present Convention.

Article 130

Grave breaches to which the preceding Article relates shall be those involving any of the following acts, if committed against persons or property protected by the Convention: wilful killing, torture or inhuman treatment, including biological experiments, wilfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health, compelling a prisoner of war to serve in the forces of the hostile Power, or wilfully depriving a prisoner of war of the rights of fair and regular trial prescribed in this Convention.

Article 131

No High Contracting Party shall be allowed to absolve itself or any other High Contracting Party of any liability incurred by itself or by another High Contracting Party in respect of breaches referred to in the preceding Article.

Article 132

At the request of a Party to the conflict, an enquiry shall be instituted, in a manner to be decided between the interested Parties, concerning any alleged violation of the Convention.

If agreement has not been reached concerning the procedure for the enquiry, the Parties should agree on the choice of an umpire who will decide upon the procedure to be followed.

Once the violation has been established, the Parties to the conflict shall put an end to it and shall repress it with the least possible delay.

Section II—Final provisions

Article 133

The present Convention is established in English and in French. Both texts are equally authentic.

The Swiss Federal Council shall arrange for official translations of the Convention to be made in the Russian and Spanish languages.

Article 134

[TS 846. 47 Stat. 2021.]

The present Convention replaces the Convention of July 27. 1929, in relations between the High Contracting Parties.

Article 135

[TS 403, 539. 32 Stat. 1803; 36 Stat. 2277.]

In the relations between the Powers which are bound by the Hague Convention respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, whether that of July 29, 1899, or that of October 18, 1907, and which are parties to the present Convention, this last Convention shall be complementary to Chapter II of the Regulations annexed to the above-mentioned Conventions of the Hague.

Article 136

The present Convention, which bears the date of this day, is open to signature until February 12, 1950, in the name of the Powers represented at the Conference which opened at Geneva on April 21, 1949; furthermore, by Powers not represented at that Conference, but which are parties to the Convention of July 27, 1929.

Article 137

The present Convention shall be ratified as soon as possible and the ratifications shall be deposited at Berne.

A record shall be drawn up of the deposit of each instrument of ratification and certified copies of this record shall be transmitted by the Swiss Federal Council to all the Powers in whose name the Convention has been signed, or whose accession has been notified.

Article 138

The present Convention shall come into force six months after not less than two instruments of ratification have been deposited.

Thereafter, it shall come into force for each High Contracting Party six months after the deposit of the instrument of ratification.

Article 139

From the date of its coming into force, it shall be open to any Power in whose name the present Convention has not been signed, to accede to this Convention.

Article 140

Accessions shall be notified in writing to the Swiss Federal Council, and shall take effect six months after the date on which they are received.

The Swiss Federal Council shall communicate the accessions to all the Powers in whose name the Convention has been signed, or whose accession has been notified.

Article 141

The situations provided for in Articles 2 and 3 shall give immediate effect to ratifications deposited and accessions notified by the Parties to the conflict before or after the beginning of hostilities or occupation. The Swiss Federal Council shall communicate by the quickest method any ratifications or accessions received from Parties to the conflict.

Article 142

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall be at liberty to denounce the present Convention.

The denunciation shall be notified in writing to the Swiss Federal Council, which shall transmit it to the Governments of all the High Contracting Parties.

The denunciation shall take effect one year after the notification thereof has been made to the Swiss Federal Council. However, a denunciation of which notification has been made at a time when the denouncing Power is involved in a conflict shall not take effect until peace has been concluded, and until after operations connected with release and repatriation of the persons protected by the present Convention have been terminated.

The denunciation shall have effect only in respect of the denouncing Power. It shall in no way impair the obligations which the Parties to the conflict shall remain bound to fulfill by virtue of the principles of the law of nations, as they result from the usages established among civilized peoples, from the laws of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience.

Article 143

The Swiss Federal Council shall register the present Convention with the Secretariat of the United Nations. The Swiss Federal Council shall also inform the Secretariat of the United Nations of all ratifications, accessions and denunciations received by it with respect to the present Convention.

In witness whereof the undersigned, having deposited their respective full powers, have signed the present Convention.

Done at Geneva this twelfth day of August 1949, in the English and French languages. The original shall be deposited in the Archives of the Swiss Confederation. The Swiss Federal Council shall transmit certified copies thereof to each of the signatory and acceding States.

For Afghanistan: M. Osman Amiri.

For the People's Republic of Albania: J. Malo.

For Argentina: Guillermo A. Speroni.

For Australia: Norman R. Mighell.

For Austria: Dr. Rud. Bluehdorn.

For Belgium: Maurice Bourquin.

For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic: I. Kushoinikov.

For Bolivia: G. Medeiros.

For Brazil: João Pinto da Silva.

For the Bulgarian People's Republic: K. B. Svetlov.

For Canada: Max. H. Wershof.

For Ceylon: V. Coomaraswamy.

For Chile: F. Cisternas Ortiz.

For China: Wu Nan-Ju.

For Colombia: Rafael Rocha Schloss.

For Cuba: J. de la Luz León.

For Denmark: Georg Cohn, Paul Ipsen.

For Egypt: A. K. Safwat.

For Ecuador: Alex. Gastelú.

For Spain: Luis Calderón.

For the United States of America: Leland Harrison, Raymund F. T. Yingling.

For Ethiopia: Gachaou Zelleke.

For Finland: Reinhold Svento.

For France: G. Cahen-Salvador.

For Greece: M. Pesmazoglou.

For Guatemala: A. Dupont-Willemin.

For the Hungarian People's Republic: Anna Kara.

For India: D. B. Desai.

For Iran: A. H. Meykadeh.

For the Republic of Ireland: Sean MacBride.

For Israel: M. Kahany.

For Italy: Giacinto Auriti, Ettore Baistrocchi.

For the Lebanon: Mikaoui.

For Liechtenstein: Comte F. Wilczek.

For Luxemburg: J. Sturm.

For Mexico: Pedro de Alba, W. R. Castro.

For the principality of Monaco: M. Lozé.

For Nicaragua: Lifschitz.

For Norway: Rolf Andersen.

For New Zealand: G. R. Laking.

For Pakistan: S. M. A. Faruki, M. G., A. H. Shaikh.

For Paraguay: Conrad Fehr.

For the Netherlands: J. Bosch de Rosenthal.

For Peru: Gonzalo Pizzaro.

For the Republic of the Philippines: P. Sebastian.

For Poland: Julian Przybos.

For Portugal: G. Caldeira Coelho.

For the Rumanian People's Republic: I. Dragomir.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Robert Craigie, H. A. Strutt, W. H. Gardner.

For the Holy See: Philippe Bernardini.

For El Salvador: R. A. Bustamante.

For Sweden: Staffan Söderblom.

For Swtizerland: Max Petitpierre, Plinio Bolla, Colonel div. du Pasquier, Ph. Zutter, H. Meuli.

For Syria: Omar El Djabri, A. Gennaoui.

For Czechoslovakia: Tauber.

For Turkey: Rana Tarhan.

For the Ukranian Soviet Socialist Republic: Prof. O. Bogomolet.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: H. Slavin.

For Uruguay: Conseiller Colonel Hector J. Blanco.

For Venezuela: A. Posse de Rivas.

For the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia: Milan Ristic.

Annex I—Model Agreement Concerning Direct Repatriation and Accommodation in Neutral Countries of Wounded and Sick Prisoners of War

(*See Article 110*)

I. PRINCIPLES FOR DIRECT REPATRIATION AND ACCOMMODATION IN NEUTRAL COUNTRIES

A. Direct repatriation

The following shall be repatriated direct:

(1) All prisoners of war suffering from the following disabilities as the result of trauma: loss of a limb, paralysis, articular or other disabilities, when this disability is at least the loss of a hand or a foot, or the equivalent of the loss of a hand or a foot.

Without prejudice to a more generous interpretation, the following shall be considered as equivalent to the loss of a hand or a foot:

(*a*) Loss of a hand or of all the fingers, or of the thumb and forefinger of one hand; loss of a foot, or of all the toes and metatarsals of one foot.

(*b*) Ankylosis, loss of osseous tissue, cicatricial contracture preventing the function of one of the large articulations or of all the digital joints of one hand.

(*c*) Pseudarthrosis of the long bones.

(*d*) Deformities due to fracture or other injury which seriously interfere with function and weight-bearing power.

(2) All wounded prisoners of war whose condition has become chronic, to the extent that prognosis appears to exclude recovery—in spite of treatment—within one year from the date of the injury, as, for example, in case of:

(*a*) Projectile in the heart, even if the Mixed Medical Commission should fail, at the time of their examination, to detect any serious disorders.

(*b*) Metallic splinter in the brain or the lungs, even if the Mixed Medical Commission cannot, at the time of examination, detect any local or general reaction.

(*c*) Osteomyelitis, when recovery cannot be foreseeen in the course of the year following the injury, and which seems likely to result in ankylosis of a joint, or other impairments equivalent to the loss of a hand or a foot.

(*d*) Perforating and suppurating injury to the large joints.

(*e*) Injury to the skull, with loss or shifting of bony tissue.

(*f*) Injuring or burning of the face with loss of tissue and functional lesions.

(*g*) Injury to the spinal cord.

(*h*) Lesion of the peripheral nerves, the sequelae of which are equivalent to the loss of a hand or foot, and the cure of which requires more than a year from the date of injury, for example: injury to the brachial or lumbosacral plexus median or sciatic nerves, likewise combined injury to the radial and cubital nerves or to the lateral popliteal nerve (N. peroneous communis) and medial popliteal nerve (N. tibialis); etc. The separate injury of the radial (musculospiral), cubital, lateral or medial popliteal nerves shall not, however, warrant repatriation except in case of contractures or of serious neurotrophic disturbance.

(*i*) Injury to the urinary system, with incapacitating results.

(3) All sick prisoners of war whose condition has become chronic to the extent that prognosis seems to exclude recovery—in spite of treatment—within one year from the inception of the disease, as, for example, in case of:

(*a*) Progressive tuberculosis of any organ which, according to medical prognosis, cannot be cured or at least considerably improved by treatment in a neutral country.

(*b*) Exudate pleurisy.

(*c*) Serious diseases of the respiratory organs of non-tubercular etiology, presumed incurable, for example: serious pulmonary emphysema, with or without bronchitis; chronic asthma*; chronic bronchitis* lasting more than one year in capitivity; bronchiectasis*; etc.

(*d*) Serious chronic affections of the circulatory system, for example: valvular lesions and myocarditis*, which have shown signs of circulatory failure during captivity, even though the Mixed Medical Commission cannot detect any such signs at the time of examination; affections of the pericardium and the vessels (Buerger's disease, aneurisms of the large vessels); etc.

(*e*) Serious chronic affections of the digestive organs, for example: gastric or duodenal ulcer; sequelae of gastric operations performed in captivity; chronic gastritis, enteritis or colitis, having lasted more than one year and seriously affecting the general condition; cirrhosis of the liver; chronic cholecystopathy*; etc.

---

*The decision of the Mixed Medical Commission shall be based to a great extent on the records kept by camp physicians and surgeons of the same nationality as the prisoners of war, or on an examination by medical specialists of the Detaining Power.

(*f*) Serious chronic affections of the genito-urinary organs, for example: chronic diseases of the kidney with consequent disorders; nephrectomy because of a tubercular kidney; chronic pyelitis or chronic cystitis; hydronephrosis or pyonephrosis; chronic grave gynaecological conditions; normal pregnancy and obstetrical disorder, where it is impossible to accommodate in a neutral country; etc.

(*g*) Serious chronic diseases of the central and peripheral nervous system, for example: all obvious psychoses and psychoneuroses, such as serious hysteria, serious captivity psychoneurosis, etc., duly verified by a specialist*; any epilepsy duly verified by the camp physician*; cerebral arteriosclerosis; chronic neuritis lasting more than one year; etc.

(*h*) Serious chronic diseases of the neurovegetative system, with considerable diminution of mental or physical fitness, noticeable loss of weight and general asthenia.

(i) Blindness of both eyes, or of one eye when the vision of the other is less than 1 in spite of the use of corrective glasses; diminution of visual acuity in cases where it is imposssible to restore it by correction to an acuity of ½ in at least one eye*; other grave ocular affections, for example: glaucoma, iritis, choroiditis; trachoma; etc.

(*k*) Auditive disorders, such as total unilateral deafness, if the other ear does not discern the ordinary spoken word at a distance of one metre*; etc.

(*l*) Serious affections of metabolism, for example: diabetes mellitus requiring insulin treatment; etc.

(*m*) Serious disorders of the endocrine glands, for example: thyrotoxicosis; hypothyrosis; Addison's disease; Simmonds' cachexia; tetany; etc.

(*n*) Grave and chronic disorders of the blood-forming organs.

(*o*) Serious cases of chronic intoxication, for example: lead poisoning, mercury poisoning, morphinism, cocainism, alcoholism; gas or radiation poisoning; etc.

(*p*) Chronic affections of locomotion, with obvious functional disorders, for example: arthritis deformans; primary and secondary progressive chronic polyarthritis; rheumatism with serious clinical symptoms; etc.

(*q*) Serious chronic skin diseases not amenable to treatment.

(*r*) Any malignant growth.

(*s*) Serious chronic infectious diseases, persisting for one year after their inception, for example: malaria with decided organic impairment, amœbic or bacillary dysentery with grave disorders; tertiary visceral syphilis resistant to treatment; leprosy; etc.

(*t*) Serious avitaminosis or serious inanition.

B. Accommodation in neutral countries

The following shall be eligible for accommodation in a neutral country:

(1) All wounded prisoners of war who are not likely to recover in captivity, but who might be cured or whose condition might be considerably improved by accommodation in a neutral country.

(2) Prisoners of war suffering from any form of tuberculosis, of whatever organ, and whose treatment in a neutral country would be likely to lead to recovery or at least to considerable improvement, with the exception of primary tuberculosis cured before captivity.

(3) Prisoners of war suffering from affections requiring treatment of the respiratory, circulatory, digestive, nervous, sensory, genito-urinary, cutaneous, locomotive organs, etc., if such treatment could clearly have better results in a neutral country than in captivity.

(4) Prisoners of war who have undergone a nephrectomy in captivity for a non-tubercular renal affection; cases of osteomyelitis, on the way to recovery or latent; diabetes mellitus not requiring insulin treatment; etc.

(5) Prisoners of war suffering from war or captivity neuroses. Cases of captivity neurosis which are not cured after three months of accommodation in a neutral country, or which after that length of time are not clearly on the way to complete cure, shall be repatriated.

(6) All prisoners of war suffering from chronic intoxication (gases, metals, alkaloids, etc.), for whom the prospects of cure in a neutral country are especially favourable.

(7) All women prisoners of war who are pregnant or mothers with infants and small children.

The following cases shall not be eligible for accommodation in a neutral country:

(1) All duly verified chronic psychoses.

(2) All organic or functional nervous affections considered to be incurable.

(3) All contagious diseases during the period in which they are transmissible, with the exception of tuberculosis.

II. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

(1) The conditions given shall, in a general way, be interpreted and applied in as broad a spirit as possible. Neuropathic and psychopathic conditions caused by war or captivity, as well as cases of tuberculosis in all stages, shall above all benefit by such liberal interpretation. Prisoners of war who have sustained several wounds, none of which, considered by itself, justifies repatriation, shall be examined in the same spirit, with due regard for the psychic traumatism due to the number of their wounds.

(2) All unquestionable cases giving the right to direct repatriation (amputation, total blindness or deafness, open pulmonary tuberculosis, mental disorder, malignant growth, etc.) shall be examined and repatriated as soon as possible by the camp physicians or by military medical commissions appointed by the Detaining Power.

(3) Injuries and diseases which existed before the war and which have not become worse, as well as war injuries which have not prevented subsequent military service, shall not entitle to direct repatriation.

(4) The provisions of this Annex shall be interpreted and applied in a similar manner in all countries party to the conflict. The Powers and authorities concerned shall grant to Mixed Medical Commissions all the facilities necessary for the accomplishment of their task.

(5) The examples quoted under (I) above represent only typical cases. Cases which do not correspond exactly to these provisions shall be judged in the spirit of the provisions of Article 110 of the present Convention, and of the principles embodied in the present Agreement.

ANNEX II—REGULATIONS CONCERNING MIXED MEDICAL COMMISSIONS

(*See Article 112*)

Article 1

The Mixed Medical Commissions provided for in Article 112 of the Convention shall be composed of three members, two of whom shall belong to a neutral country, the third being appointed by the Detaining Power. One of the neutral members shall take the chair.

Article 2

The two neutral members shall be appointed by the International Committee of the Red Cross, acting in agreement with the Protecting Power, at the request of the Detaining Power. They may be domiciled either in their country of origin, in any other neutral country, or in the territory of the Detaining Power.

Article 3

The neutral members shall be approved by the Parties to the conflict concerned, who shall notify their approval to the International Committee of the Red Cross and to the Protecting Power. Upon such notification, the neutral members shall be considered as effectively appointed.

Article 4

Deputy members shall also be appointed in sufficient number to replace the regular members in case of need. They shall be appointed at the same time as the regular members or, at least, as soon as possible.

Article 5

If for any reason the International Committee of the Red Cross cannot arrange for the appointment of the neutral members, this shall be done by the Power protecting the interests of the prisoners of war to be examined.

Article 6

So far as possible, one of the two neutral members shall be a surgeon and the other a physician.

Article 7

The neutral members shall be entirely independent of the Parties to the conflict, which shall grant them all facilities in the accomplishment of their duties.

Article 8

By agreement with the Detaining Power, the International Committee of the Red Cross, when making the appointments provided for in Articles 2 and 4 of the present Regulations, shall settle the terms of service of the nominees.

Article 9

The Mixed Medical Commissions shall begin their work as soon as possible after the neutral members have been approved, and in any case within a period of three months from the date of such approval.

Article 10

The Mixed Medical Commission shall examine all the prisoners designated in Article 113 of the Convention. They shall propose repatriation, rejection, or reference to a later examination. Their decisions shall be made by a majority vote.

Article 11

The decisions made by the Mixed Medical Commissions in each specific case shall be communicated during the month following their visit, to the Detaining Power, the Protecting Power and the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Mixed Medical Commissions shall also inform each prisoner of war examined of the decision made, and shall issue to those whose repatriation has been proposed, certificates similar to the model appended to the present Convention.

Article 12

The Detaining Power shall be required to carry out the decisions of the Mixed Medical Commissions within three months of the time when it receives due notification of such decisions.

Article 13

If there is no neutral physician in a country where the services of a Mixed Medical Commission seem to be required, and if it is for any reason impossible to appoint neutral doctors who are resident in another country, the Detaining Power, acting in agreement with the Protecting Power, shall set up a Medical Commission which shall undertake the same duties as a Mixed Medical Commission, subject to the provisions of Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8 of the present Regulations.

Article 14

Mixed Medical Commissions shall function permanently and shall visit each camp at intervals of not more than six months.

ANNEX IV

A. IDENTITY CARD

(see Article 4)

NOTICE

This identity card is issued to persons who accompany the Armed Forces of but are not part of them. The card must be carried at all times by the person to whom it is issued. If the bearer is taken prisoner, he shall at once hand the card to the Detaining Authorities, to assist in his identification.

Official seal imprint

Blood type ----------------

Religion ----------------

Fingerprints (optional)

(Left forefinger) (Right forefinger)

Any other mark of identification............

Height	Weight	Eyes	Hair
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Photograph of the bearer

(Name of the country and military authority issuing this card)

IDENTITY CARD

FOR A PERSON WHO ACCOMPANIES THE ARMED FORCES

Name..

First names...

Date and place of birth...

Accompanies the Armed Forces as.................................

Date of issue -- Signature of bearer --

Remarks.—This card should be made out for preference in two or three languages, one of which is in international use. Actual size of the card: 13 by 10 centimeters. It should be folded along the dotted line.

ANNEX IV

B. CAPTURE CARD

(see Article 70)

1. Front

PRISONER OF WAR MAIL

Postage free

CAPTURE CARD FOR PRISONER OF WAR

IMPORTANT

This card must be completed by each prisoner immediately after being taken prisoner and each time his address is changed (by reason of transfer to a hospital or to another camp).

This card is distinct from the special card which each prisoner is allowed to send to his relatives.

CENTRAL PRISONERS OF WAR AGENCY

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

GENEVA

SWITZERLAND

B. CAPTURE CARD—Continued

2. Reverse side

Write legibly and in block letters

1. Power on which the prisoner depends..............

2. Name 3. First names (in full) 4. First name of father*

....

5. Date of birth................ 6. Place of birth...............

7. Rank...

8. Service number...

9. Address of next of kin.....................................

*10. Taken prisoner on: (or) Coming from (Camp No., hospital, etc.)....................

*11. (a) Good health—(b) Not wounded—(c) Recovered—(d) Convalescent—(e) Sick—(f) Slightly wounded—(g) Seriously wounded.

12. My present address is: Prisoner No.........................

Name of camp..

13. Date.......................... 14. Signature....................

*Strike out what is not applicable—Do not add any remarks—See explanations overleaf.

Remarks.—This form should be made out in two or three languages, particularly in the prisoner's own language and in that of the Detaining Power. Actual size: 15 by 10.5 centimetres.

ANNEX IV

C. CORRESPONDENCE CARD AND LETTER

(see Article 71)

I. CARD.

1. Front

PRISONER OF WAR MAIL

Postage free

POST CARD

To..

Sender:

Name and first names ....

Place and date of birth ....

Prisoner of War No. ....

Name of camp ....

Country where posted ....

Place of Destination ....

Street ....

Country ....

Province or Department ....

2. Reverse side

NAME OF CAMP .... Date ....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

Write on the dotted lines only and as legibly as possible.

Remarks.—This form should be made out in two or three languages, particularly in the prisoner's own language and in that of the Detaining Power. Actual size of form: 15 by 10 centimetres.

ANNEX IV

C. CORRESPONDENCE CARD AND LETTER

(see Article 71)

2. LETTER

PRISONER OF WAR MAIL

Postage free

To...

Place ....

Street ....

Country ....

Department or Province ....

Sender:

Name and first names ....

Date and place of birth ....

Prisoner of War No. ....

Name of camp ....

Country where posted ....

****

Remarks.—This form should be made out in two or three languages, particularly in the prisoner's own language and in that of the Detaining Power. It should be folded along the dotted line, the tab being inserted in the slit (marked by a line of asterisks), it then has the appearance of an envelope. Overleaf, it is lined like the postcard above (Annex IV C 1); this space can contain about 250 words which the prisoner is free to write. Actual size of the folded form: 29 by 15 centimetres.

ANNEX IV

D. NOTIFICATION OF DEATH

(see Article 120)

(Title of responsible authority)

NOTIFICATION OF DEATH

Power on which the prisoner depended ....

Name and first names ....

First name of father ....

Place and date of birth ....

Place and date of death ....

Rank and service number (as given on identity disc) ....

Address of next of kin ....

Where and when taken prisoner ....

Cause and circumstances of death ....

Place of burial ....

Is the grave marked and can it be found later by the relatives? ....

Are the personal effects of the deceased in the keeping of the Detaining Power or are they being forwarded together with this notification? ....

If forwarded, through what agency? ....

Can the person who cared for the deceased during sickness or during his last moments (doctor, nurse, minister of religion, fellow prisoner) give here or on an attached sheet a short account of the circumstances of the death and burial? ....

(Date, seal and signature of responsible authority.) ....

Signature and address of two witnesses ....

Remarks.—This form should be made out in two or three languages, particularly in the prisoner's own language and in that of the Detaining Power. Actual size of the form: 21 by 30 centimetres.

ANNEX III—REGULATIONS CONCERNING COLLECTIVE RELIEF

(*See Article 73*)

Article 1

Prisoners' representatives shall be allowed to distribute collective relief shipments for which they are responsible to all prisoners of war administered by their camp, including those who are in hospitals, or in prisons or other penal establishments.

Article 2

The distribution of collective relief shipments shall be effected in accordance with the instructions of the donors and with a plan drawn up by the prisoners' representatives. The issue of medical stores shall, however, be made for preference in agreement with the senior medical officers, and the latter may, in hospitals and infirmaries, waive the said instructions, if the needs of their patients so demand. Within the limits thus defined, the distribution shall always be carried out equitably.

Article 3

The said prisoners' representatives or their assistants shall be allowed to go to the points of arrival of relief supplies near their camps, so as to enable the prisoners' representatives or their assistants to verify the quality as well as the quantity of the goods received, and to make out detailed reports thereon for the donors.

Article 4

Prisoners' representatives shall be given the facilities necessary for verifying whether the distribution of collective relief in all subdivisions and annexes of their camps has been carried out in accordance with their instructions.

Article 5

Prisoners' representatives shall be allowed to fill up, and cause to be filled up by the prisoners' representatives of labour detachments or by the senior medical officers of infirmaries and hospitals, forms or questionnaires intended for the donors, relating to collective relief supplies (distribution, requirements, quantities, etc.). Such forms and questionnaires, duly completed, shall be forwarded to the donors without delay.

Article 6

In order to secure the regular issue of collective relief to the prisoners of war in their camp, and to meet any needs that may arise from the arrival of new contingents of prisoners, prisoners' representatives shall be allowed to build up and maintain adequate reserve stocks of collective relief. For this purpose, they shall have suitable warehouses at their disposal; each warehouse shall be provided with two locks, the prisoners' representative holding the keys of one lock and the camp commander the keys of the other.

Article 7

When collective consignments of clothing are available, each prisoner of war shall retain in his possession at least one complete set of clothes. If a prisoner has more than one set of clothes, the prisoners' representative shall be permitted to withdraw excess clothing from those with the largest number of sets, or particular articles in excess of one, if this is necessary in order to supply prisoners who are less well provided. He shall not, however, withdraw second sets of underclothing, socks or footwear, unless this is the only means of providing for prisoners of war with none.

Article 8

The High Contracting Parties, and the Detaining Powers in particular, shall authorize, as far as possible and subject to the regulations governing the supply of the population, all purchases of goods made in their territories for the distribution of collective relief to prisoners of war. They shall similarly facilitate the transfer of funds and other financial measures of a technical or administrative nature taken for the purpose of making such purchases.

Article 9

The foregoing provisions shall not constitute an obstacle to the right of prisoners of war to receive collective relief before their arrival in a camp or in the course of transfer, nor to the possibility of representatives of the Protecting Power, the International Committee of the Red Cross, or any other body giving assistance to prisoners which may be responsible for the forwarding of such supplies, ensuring the distribution thereof to the addresses by other means that they may deem useful.

ANNEX IV

E. REPATRIATION CERTIFICATE

(See Annex II, Article 11)

Repartriation Certificate

Date:
Camp:
Hospital:
Surname:
First names:
Date of birth:
Rank:
Army Number:
P. W. Number:
Injury Disease:
Decision of the Commission:
Chairman of the Mixed Medical Commission
A = direct repatriation
B = accommodation in a neutral country
NC = re-examination by next Commission

ANNEX V—MODEL REGULATIONS CONCERNING PAYMENTS SENT BY PRISONERS TO THEIR OWN COUNTRY

(see Article 63)

(1) The notification referred to in the third paragraph of Article 63 will show:

(*a*) number as specified in Article 17, rank, surname and first names of the pirsoner of war who is the payer;

(*b*) the name and address of the payee in the country of origin;

(*c*) the amount to be so paid in the currency of the country in which he is detained.

(2) The notification will be signed by the prisoner of war, or his witnessed mark made upon it if he cannot write, and shall be countersigned by the prisoners' representative.

(3) The camp commander will add to this notification a certificate that the prisoner of war concerned has a credit balance of not less than the amount registered as payable.

(4) The notification may be made up in lists, each sheet of such lists being witnessed by the prisoners' representative and certified by the camp commander.

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA

Mr. MALO, First Secretary to the Albanian Legation in Paris:

[TIAS 3362. *Ante*, p. 3114.]

(1) Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field.

Article 10: "The People's Republic of Albania will not recognize a request by a Detaining Power to a humanitarian organization or to a neutral State to take the place of a Protecting Power, as being in order, unless the Power of which the protected persons are nationals has given its consent."

[TIAS 3363. *Ante*, p. 3217.]

(2) Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea.

Article 10: "The People's Republic of Albania will not recognize a request by a Detaining Power to a humanitarian organization or to a neutral State to take the place of a Protecting Power, as being in order, unless the Power of which the protected persons are nationals has given its consent."

[*Ante*, p. 3326]

(3) Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

Article 10: "The People's Republic of Albania will not recognize a request by a Detaining Power to a humanitarian organization or to a neutral State to take the place of a Protecting Power, as being in order, unless the Power of which the prisoners of war are nationals has given its consent."

Article 12: "The People's Republic of Albania considers that in the case of prisoners of war being transferred to another Power by the Detaining Power, the responsibility for the application of the Convention to such prisoners of war will continue to rest with the Power which captured them."

Article 85: "The People's Republic of Albania considers that persons convicted under the law of the Detaining Power, in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, of war crimes and crimes against humanity, must be treated in the same manner as persons convicted in the country in question. Albania does not, therefore, consider herself bound by Article 85 so far as the category of persons mentioned in the present reservation is concerned."

[TIAS 3365. *Post*, p. 3516.]

(4) Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

Article 11: "The People's Republic of Albainia will not recognize a request by a Detaining Power to a humanitarian organization or to a neutral State to take the place of a Protecting Power, as being in order, unless the Power of which the protected persons are nationals has given its consent."

Article 45: "The People's Republic of Albania considers that in the case of protected persons being transferred to another Power by the Detaining Power, the responsibility for the application of the Convention to such protected persons will continue to rest with the Detaining Power."

ARGENTINA

Mr. SPERONI, First Secretary to the Argentine Legation in Berne, made the following reservation to the four Geneva Conventions:

"The Argentine Government has followed the work of the Conference with interest and the Argentine Delegation has taken part in it with pleasure. The task was a difficult one, but as our President said at the closing meeting, we have succeeded.

"Argentina, Gentlemen, has always taken a leading place among many other nations on the questions which have formed the subject of our discussions. I shall, therefore, sign the four Conventions in the name of my Government and subject to ratification, with the reservation that Article 3, common to all four Conventions, shall be the only Article, to the exclusion of all others, which shall be applicable in the case of armed conflicts not of an international character. I shall likewise sign the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons with a reservation in respect of Article 68."

BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

Mr. KOUTEINIKOV, Head of the Delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Sovialist Republic:

(1) On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained."

(2) On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained."

(3) On signing the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic makes the following reservations:

Article 10: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the prisoners of war are nationals has been obtained."

Article 12: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred prisoners of war to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to such prisoners of war while the latter are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

Article 85: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the obligation, which follows from Article 85, to extend the application of the Convention to prisoners of war who have been convicted under the law of the Detaining Power, in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, for war crimes and crimes against humanity, it being understood that persons convicted of such crimes must be subject to the conditions obtaining in the country in question for those who undergo their punishment."

(4) On signing the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic feels called upon to make the following declaration:

"Although the present Convention does not cover the civilian population in territory not occupied by the enemy and does not, therefore, completely meet humanitarian requirements, the Byelorussian Delegation, recognizing that the said Convention makes satisfactory provision for the protection of the civilian population in occupied territory and in certain other cases, declares that it is authorized by the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to sign the present Convention with the following reservations:

Article 11: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected person are nationals has been obtained.

Article 45: "The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred protected persons to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to the persons transferred, while the latter are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

BRAZIL

Mr. PINTO DA SILVA, Consul-General of Brazil at Geneva, made the following reservations to the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War:

"On signing the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, Brazil wishes to make two express reservations—in regard to Article 44, because it is liable to hamper the action of the Detaining Power, and in regard to Article 46, because the matter dealt with in its second paragraph is outside the scope of the Convention, the essential and specific purpose of which is the protection of persons and not of their property."

BULGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Mr. Kosta B. SVETLOV, Bulgarian Minister in Switzerland, made the following declaration:

"In my capacity as representative of the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic, I have the pleasant duty of expressing here its satisfaction at having been able to take part in drawing up a humanitarian instrument of the highest international importance—a group of conventions for the protection of war victims.

"Nevertheless, my wish is that there shall be no need to apply them; that is to say, that we may exert every effort to prevent a new war, so that there may be no victims to be helped in accordance with the provisions of a convention.

"I must, first of all, express my Government's deep regret that the majority of the Diplomatic Conference did not accept the Soviet Delegation's proposal for the unconditional banning of atomic weapons and other weapons for the mass extermination of the population."

Therefore, on signing the Conventions, the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic makes the following reservations, which constitute an integral part of the Conventions:

(1) Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of August 12th, 1949.

On signing the present Convention, the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic makes the following reservations, which constitute an integral part of the Convention:

With regard to Article 11: "The Bulgarian People's Republic will not recognize as valid the action of a Detaining Power of civilian persons in time of war, in approaching a neutral Power or a humanitarian organization with a view to entrusting it with the protection of such persons without the consent of the Government of the country of which the latter are nationals."

With regard to Article 45: "The Bulgarian People's Republic will not consider the Detaining Power of civilian persons in time of war, which has transferred such persons to another Power which has agreed to accept them, as being freed from responsibility for applying the provisions of the Convention to such persons during the time that they are detained by the other Power."

(2) Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea of August 12th, 1949.

On signing the present Convention, the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic makes the following reservation which constitutes an integral part of the Convention:

With regard to Article 10: "The Bulgarian People's Republic will not recognize as valid the action of a Detaining Power of wounded, sick and shipwrecked persons or of medical personnel of armed forces at sea, in approaching a neutral Power or a humanitarian organization, with a view to entrusting it with the protection of such persons without the consent of the Government of the country of which the latter are nationals."

(3) Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12th, 1949.

On signing the present Convention, the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic makes the following reservations, which constitute an integral part of the Convention:

With regard to Article 10: "The Bulgarian People's Republic will not recognize as valid the action of a Detaining Power of prisoners of war, in approaching a neutral Power or a humanitarian organization with a view to entrusting it with the protection of such persons without the consent of the Government of the country of which the latter are nationals."

With regard to Article 12: "The Bulgarian People's Republic will not consider the Detaining Power of prisoners of war, which has transferred such persons to another Power which has agreed to accept them, as being freed from responsibility for applying the provisions of the Convention to such persons during the time that they are detained by the other Power."

With regard to Article 85: "The Bulgarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound to extend the application of the provisions derived from Article 85 to prisoners of war convicted, under the law of the Detaining Power and in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, of war crimes or crimes against humanity which they committed before being taken prisoner, because those thus convicted must be subject to the regulations of the country in which they have to serve their sentence."

(4) Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field of August 12th, 1949.

On signing the present Convention, the Government of the Bulgarian People's Republic makes the following reservation, which constitutes an integral part of the Convention.

With regard to Article 10: "The Bulgarian People's Republic will not recognize as valid the action of a Detaining Power of wounded and sick persons or of medical personnel in armed forces in the field, in approaching a neutral Power or a humanitarian organization with a view to entrusting it with the protection of such persons without the consent of the Government of the country of which the latter are nationals."

CANADA

Mr. **Wershof**, Counsellor, Office of the High Commissioner for Canada in London, made the following reservation to the Geneva Convention for the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War:

"Canada reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of Article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offences referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins."

SPAIN

Mr. **Calderón y Martin**, Spanish Minister in Switzerland, made the following reservation to the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the text of the reservation being submitted in the Spanish, French and English languages:

"In matters regarding procedural guarantees and penal and disciplinary sanctions, Spain will grant prisoners of war the same treatment as is provided by her legislation for members of her own national forces.

"Under 'International Law in force' (Article 99) Spain understands she only accepts that which arises from contractual sources or which has been previously elaborated by organizations in which she participates."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[TIAS 3365. *Post,* p. 3516.]

Mr. **Vincent**, Minister of the United States of America in Switzerland, on signing the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of August 12th, 1949, made the following declaration:

"The Government of the United States fully supports the objectives of this Convention.

"I am instructed by my Government to sign, making the following reservation to Article 68:

"The United States reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of Article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offences referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins."

HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Mrs. **Kara** made the following reservations:

"At the meeting of the Diplomatic Conference on August 11th, 1949, the Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic reserved the right to make express reservations on signing the Conventions, after having examined them. In their speech at the above meeting the Hungarian Delegation observed that they were not in agreement with all the provisions of the Conventions. After a thorough study of the text of the Conventions, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic decided to sign the Conventions in spite of their obvious defects, as it considered that the Conventions constituted an advance in comparison with the existing situation from the point of view of the practical application of humanitarian principles and the protection of war victims.

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is obliged to state that the concrete results achieved by the Diplomatic Conference which ended on August the 12th do not come up to expectations, since the majority of the members of the Conference did not adopt the proposals of the Soviet Delegation concerning the atomic weapon and other means of mass extermination of the population.

"The Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic noted with regret the point of view of the majority of the Conference, which was contrary to the wishes of the nations engaged in the struggle for peace and liberty. The Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic is convinced that the adoption of the Soviet proposals would have been the most effective means of protecting war victims. The Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic wishes, in particular, to point out the essential defects of the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War; they drew the attention of the States taking part in the Conference to those defects during the meetings. A particular case in point is that of Article 4 of the Convention; by virtue of that Article the provisions of the Civilians Convention do not apply to certain persons, because the States whose nationals they are, have not adhered to the Convention. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic considers that the above provision is contrary to the humanitarian principles which the Convention is intended to uphold.

"The Hungarian People's Government has also serious objections to Article 5 of the said Convention; according to the terms of that Article, if protected persons are definitely suspected of activities hostile to the security of the State, that is enough to deprive them of protection under the Convention. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic considers that that provision has already made any hope of realizing the fundamental principles of the Convention illusory.

"The express reservations made by the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic on signing the Conventions, are as follows:

(1) "In the opinion of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, the provisions of Article 10 of the Wounded and Sick, Maritime Warfare and Prisoners of War Conventions and of Article 11 of the Civilians Convention, concerning the replacement of the Protecting Power, can only be applied if the Government of the State of which the protected persons are nationals, no longer exists.

(2) "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic cannot approve the provisions of Article 11 of the Wounded and Sick, Maritime Warfare and Prisoners of War Conventions and of Article 12 of the Civilians Convention, according to which the competence of the Protecting Power extends to the interpretation of the Convention.

(3) "In regard to Article 12 of the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic maintains its point of view that in the case of the transfer of prisoners

of war from one Power to another, the responsibility for the application of the provisions of the Conventions must rest with both of those Powers.

(4) "The Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic repeats the objection which it made, in the course of the meetings at which Article 85 of the Prisoners of War Convention was discussed, to the effect that prisoners of war convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity in accordance with the principles of Nuremberg, must be subject to the same treatment as criminals convicted of other crimes.

(5) "Lastly, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic maintains the point of view which it expressed in regard to Article 45 of the Civilians Convention, namely that, in the case of the transfer of protected persons from one power to another, the responsibility for the application of the Convention must rest with both of those Powers."

ISRAEL

Mr. KAHANY, Delegate of Israel to the European Office of the United Nations and to the International Committee of the Red Cross, made the following declaration:

"In accordance with instructions received from my Government, I shall sign the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War without any reservation. But in the case of each of the other three Conventions, our signature will be given with reservations the purport of which is as follows:

(1) Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field.

"Subject to the reservation that, while respecting the inviolability of the distinctive signs and emblems of the Convention, Israel will use the Red Shield of David as the emblem and distinctive sign of the medical services of her armed forces."

(2) Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea.

"Subject to the reservation that, while respecting the inviolability of the distinctive signs and emblems of the Convention, Israel will use the Red Shield of David on the flags, armlets and on all equipment (including hospital ships), employed in the medical service."

(3) Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

"Subject to the reservations that, while respecting the inviolability of the distinctive signs and emblems provided for in Article 38 of the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field of August 12, 1949, Israel will use the Red Shield of David as the emblem and distinctive sign provided for in this Convention."

ITALY

Mr. AURITI, Ambassador, made the following declaration concerning the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War and Resolutions 6, 7 and 9 of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva:

(1) Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

"The Italian Government declares that it makes a reservation in respect of the last paragraph of Article 66 of the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War."

(2) Resolution 6 of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva.

"Whereas the Conference has recommended 'that the High Contracting Parties will, in the near future, instruct a Committee of Experts to examine technical improvements of modern means of communication between hospital ships, on the one hand, and warships and military aircraft, on the other the Italian Government expresses the hope that the said Committee of Experts may be convoked, if possible during the coming months, in order that they may draw up an international code of rules for the use of the above means of communication.

"The Italian Armed Forces are at present engaged in making a thorough study of the above subject and will, if necessary, be ready to submit concrete proposals of a technical nature as a basis for discussion."

(3) Resolution 7 of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva.

"The Italian Government is prepared to arrange that, whenever conveniently practicable, hospital ships shall frequently and regularly broadcast particulars of their position, route and speed."

(4) Resolution 9 of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva.

"In regard to the second paragraph of Resolution 9, the Italian Government considers that the departments dealing with telecommunications in the countries of the High Contracting Parties must collaborate in drawing up some method of grouping telegrams of prisoners of war, so as to facilitate the transmission of numbered messages and thus avoid errors and the duplication of international transmissions and the consequent increase in their cost."

LUXEMBURG

Mr. STURM, Chargé d'Affaires of Luxemburg in Switzerland, made the following reservation:

"The undersigned Delegate of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, duly empowered by its Government, has this eighth day of December, 1949, signed the Convention established by the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, with the reservation:

"that its existing national law shall continue to be applied to cases now under consideration."

NEW ZEALAND

Mr. GEORGE ROBERT LAKING, Counsellor to the New Zealand Embassy in Washington, made the following declaration:

"In signing the four Conventions established by the Diplomatic Conference at Geneva 1949, the New Zealand Government desire me to state that as there has been insufficient opportunity to study the reservations made on behalf of other States, the Goverment for the present reserve their views in regard to such reservations.

"In signing the Convention relating to the protection of civilian persons in time of war, the New Zealand Government desire me to make the following reservations:

(1) "New Zealand reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of Article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offences referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins;

(2) "In view of the fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations, having approved the principles established by the Charter and judgment of the Nuremberg Tribunal, has directed the International Law Commission to include these principles in a General codification of offences against the peace and security of mankind, New Zealand reserves the right to take such action as may be necessary to ensure that such offences are punished, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 70, paragraph I."

NETHERLANDS

Mr. BOSCH, Chevalier VAN ROSENTHAL, Minister of the Netherlands in Switzerland, made the following declaration:

"My Government has instructed me to sign the four Conventions established at the Diplomatic Conference held at Geneva from April 21 to August 12, 1949, but my Government wishes to make the following reservation regarding the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which reservation reads as follows:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of Article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offenses referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins."

POLAND

Mr. PRZYBOS, Polish Minister in Switzerland, made the following reservations concerning the four Geneva Conventions:

(1) "On signing the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, I declare that the Government of the Polish Republic adheres to the said Convention, with a reservation in respect of Article 10.

"The Government of the Polish Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of the wounded and sick, or medical personnel and chaplains, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent."

(2) "On signing the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, I declare that the Government of the Polish Republic adheres to the said Convention, with a reservation in respect of Article 10.

"The Government of the Polish Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of the wounded, sick and shipwrecked, or medical personnel and chaplains, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

(3) "On signing the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, I declare that the Government of the Polish Republic adheres to the said Convention, with reservations in respect of Articles 10, 12, and 85.

"In regard to Article 10, the Government of the Polish Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of prisoners of war, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent."

"In regard to Article 12, the Government of the Polish Republic will not consider it legal for a Power, which effects a transfer of prisoners of war, to be freed from its responsibility for applying the Convention, even for the time during which such prisoners of war are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

"In regard to Article 85, the Government of the Polish Republic will not consider it legal for prisoners of war convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity in accordance with the principles set forth at the time of the Nuremburg trials, to continue to enjoy protection under the present Convention, it being understood that prisoners of war convicted of such crimes must be subject to the regulations for the execution of punishments, in force in the State concerned."

(4) "On signing the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, I declare that the Government of the Polish Republic adheres to the said Convention, with reservations in respect of Articles 11 and 45.

"In regard to Article II, the Government of the Polish Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of protected persons, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

"In regard to Article 45, the Government of the Polish Republic will not consider it legal for a Power, which effects a transfer of protected persons, to be freed from its responsibility for applying the Convention, even for the time during which such protected persons are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

PORTUGAL

Mr. GONCALO CALDEIRA COELHO, Chargé d'Affaires of Portugal in Switzerland, made the following declaration:

(*a*) *Article 3, common to the four Conventions:*

"As there is no actual definition of what is meant by a conflict not of an international character and as, in case this term is intended to refer solely to civil war, it is not clearly laid down at what moment an armed rebellion within a country should be considered as having become a civil war, Portugal reserves the right not to apply the provisions of Article 3, in so far as they may be contrary to the provisions of Portuguese law, in all territories subject to her sovereignty in any part of the world"

(*b*) *Article 10 of Conventions I, II and III and Article 11 of Convention IV:*

"The Portuguese Government only accepts the above Articles with the reservation that requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization to undertake the functions normally performed by Protecting Powers are made with the consent or agreement of the government of the country of which the persons to be protected are nationals (Countries of origin)."

(*c*) *Article 13 of Convention I and Article 4 of Convention III:*

"The Portuguese Government makes a reservation regarding the application of the above Articles in all cases in which the legitimate Government has already asked for and agreed to an armistice or the suspension of military operations of no matter what character, even if the armed forces in the field have not yet capitulated."

(*d*) *Article 60 of Convention III:*

"The Portuguese Government accepts this Article with the reservation that it in no case binds itself to grant prisoners a monthly rate of pay in excess of 50% of the pay due to Portuguese soldiers of equivalent appointment or rank, on active service in the combat zone."

RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Mr. IOAN DRAGOMIR, Chargé d'Affaires of Rumania in Switzerland, made the following declaration:

(1) "On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Rumanian People's Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protecting persons are nationals has been obtained.

(2) "On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Rumanian People's Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

(3) "On signing the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Rumanian People's Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the prisoners of war are nationals has been obtained.

Article 12: "The Rumanian People's Republic does not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred prisoners of war to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to such prisoners of war while the latter are under the protection of the Power accepting them.

Article 85: "The Rumanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the obligation, which follows from Article 85, to extend the application of the Convention to prisoners of war who have been convicted under the law of the Detaining Power, in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, for war crimes and crimes against humanity, it being understood that persons convicted of such crimes must be subject to the conditions obtaining in the country in question for those who undergo their punishment.

(4) "I am authorized to make the following declaration on signing the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War:

"The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic considers that this Convention does not completely meet humanitarian requirements, owing to the fact that it does not apply to the civilian population in territory not occupied by the enemy.

"Nevertheless, taking into consideration the fact that the Convention is intended to protect the interests of the civilian population in occupied territory, I am authorized by the Rumanian People's Government to sign the said Convention with the following reservations:

Article 11: "The Rumanian People's Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

Article 45: "The Rumanian People's Republic will not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred protected persons to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to the persons transferred, while the latter are under the protection of the Power accepting them."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert CRAIGIE, Foreign Office, made the following declaration:

"In signing the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom desire me to make the following reservation:

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reserve the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of Article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offences referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. TAUBER, Minister of Czechoslovakia in Switzerland, made the following reservations:

(1) "On proceeding to sign the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, I declare that the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic adheres to the said Convention, with a reservation in respect to Article 10.

"The Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of the wounded and sick, or medical personnel and chaplains, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

(2) "On proceeding to sign the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, I declare that the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic adheres to the said Convention, with a reservation in respect of Article 10.

"The Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of the wounded, sick and shipwrecked, or medical personnel and chaplains, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

(3) "On proceeding to sign the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, I declare that the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic adheres to the said Convention, with reservations in respect of Articles 10, 12 and 85.

"In regard to Article 10, the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of prisoners of war, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

"In regard to Article 12, the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider it legal for a Power, which effects a transfer of prisoners of war, to be freed from its responsibility for applying the Convention, even for the time during which such prisoners of war are in the custody of the Power accepting them.

"In regard to Article 85, the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider it legal for prisoners of war convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity in accordance with the principles set forth at the time of the Nuremberg trials, to continue to enjoy protection under the present Convention, it being understood that prisoners of war convicted of such crimes must be subject to the regulations for the execution of punishments, in force in the State concerned.

(4) "On proceeding to sign the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, I declare that the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic adheres to the said Convention, with reservations in respect of Article 11 and 45.

"In regard to Article 11, the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of protected persons, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent:

"In regard to Article 45, the Government of the Czechoslovakian Republic will not consider it legal for a Power, which effects a transfer of protected persons, to be freed from its responsibility for applying the Convention, even for the time during which such protected persons are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

Mr. Bogomoletz, Head of the Delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

(1) "On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic makes the following reservations:

Article 10: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the vaiidity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

(2) "On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

(3) "On signing the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic makes the following reservations:

Article 10: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the prisoners of war are nationals has been obtained.

Article 12: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred prisoners of war to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to such prisoners of war while the latter are in the custody of the Power accepting them.

Article 85: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the obligation, which follows from Article 85, to extend the application of the Convention to prisoners of war who have been convicted under the law of the Detaining Power, in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, for war crimes and crimes against humanity, it being understood that persons convicted of such crimes must be subject to the conditions obtaining in the country in question for those who undergo their punishment.

(4) "On signing the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic feels called upon to make the following declaration:

"Although the present Convention does not cover the civilian population in territory not occupied by the enemy and does not, therefore, completely meet humanitarian requirements, the Ukrainian Delegation, recognizing that the said Convention makes satisfactory provision for the protection of the civilian population in occupied territory and in certain other cases, declares that it is authorized by the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to sign the present Convention with the following reservations:

Article 11: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

Article 45: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred protected persons to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to the persons transferred, while the latter are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

General Slavin, Head of the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

(1) "On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

(2) "On signing the Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics makes the following reservation:

Article 10: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

(3) "On signing the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics makes the following reservations:

Article 10: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Power to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the prisoners of war are nationals has been obtained.

Article 12: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred prisoners of war to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to such prisoners of war while the latter are in the custody of the Power accepting them.

Article 85: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the obligation, which follows from Article 85, to extend the application of the Convention to prisoners of war who have been convicted under the law of the Detaining Power, in accordance with the principles of the Nuremberg trial, for war crimes and crimes against humanity, it being understood that persons convicted of such crimes must be subject to the conditions obtaining in the country in question for those who undergo their punishment.

(4) "On, signing the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics feels called upon to make the following declaration:

"Although the present Convention does not cover the civilian population in territory not occupied by the enemy and does not, therefore, completely meet humanitarian requirements, the Soviet Delegation, recognizing that the said Convention makes satisfactory provision for the protection of the civilian population in occupied territory and in certain other cases, declares that it is authorized by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to sign the present Convention with the following reservations:

Article 11: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not recognize the validity of requests by the Detaining Powers to a neutral State or to a humanitarian organization, to undertake the functions performed by a Protecting Power, unless the consent of the Government of the country of which the protected persons are nationals has been obtained.

Article 45: "The Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics will not consider as valid the freeing of a Detaining Power, which has transferred protected persons to another Power, from responsibility for the application of the Convention to the persons transferred, while the latter are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

FEDERAL PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. Milan Ristić, Yugoslav Minister in Switzerland, made the following declaration:

(1) "On signing the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, I declare that the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia adheres to the said Convention, with a reservation in respect of Article 10.

"The Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of the wounded and sick, or medical personnel and chaplains, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

(2) "On signing the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, I declare that the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia adheres to the said Convention, with a reservation in respect of Article 10.

"The Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of the wounded, sick and shipwrecked, or medical personnel and chaplains, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.

(3) "On signing the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, I declare that the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia adheres to the said Convention, with reservations in respect of Articles 10 and 12.

> "In regard to Article 10, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of prisoners of war, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.
>
> "In regard to Article 12, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia will not consider that the Power which has effected the transfer of prisoners of war, is freed from its responsibility for the application of the Convention for the whole of the time during which such prisoners of war are in the custody of the Power accepting them.
>
> (4) "On signing the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, I declare that the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia adheres to the said Convention, with reservations in respect to Articles 11 and 45.
>
> "In regard to Article 11, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia will not consider as legal a request by the Detaining Power that a neutral State or an international organization or a humanitarian organization should undertake the functions performed under the present Convention by the Protecting Powers, on behalf of protected persons, unless the Government whose nationals they are has given its consent.
>
> "In regard to Article 45, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia will not consider it legal for a Power, which effects a transfer of protected persons to another Power, to be freed from its responsibility for applying the Convention for the whole of the time during which such protected persons are in the custody of the Power accepting them."

Mr. MORSE. There are certain items of the convention upon which I wish to comment specifically. I turn to article 4, which provides:

> Prisoners of war, in the sense of the present Convention, are persons belonging to one of the following categories, who have fallen into the power of the enemy:

It then lists the categories, including military personnel.

There is no question, Mr. President, that these American soldiers fall within the terms of the definitive language of article IV.

Part B of the article continues:

> The following shall likewise be treated as prisoners of war under the present Convention:

That section then lists:

> Persons belonging, or having belonged, to the armed forces of the occupied country, if the occupying Power considers it necessary by reason of such allegiance to intern them,

It covers also another group of nationals which may fall within the jurisdiction of a country as a result of their being captured.

Mr. President, article 12 deals with the general protection of prisoners of war:

> Prisoners of war are in the hands of the enemy Power, but not of the individuals or military units who have captured them. Irrespective of the individual responsibilities that may exist, the Detaining Power is responsible for the treatment given them.
>
> Prisoners of war may only be transferred by the Detaining Power to a Power which is a party to the Convention and after the Detaining Power has satisfied itself of the willingness and ability of such transferee Power to apply the Convention. When prisoners of war are transferred under such circumstances, responsibilty for the application of the Convention rests on the Power accepting them while they are in its custody.
>
> Nevertheless, if that Power fails to carry out the provisions of the Convention in any important respect, the Power by whom the prisoners of war were transferred shall, upon being notified by the Protecting Power, take effective measures to correct the situation or shall request the return of the prisoners of war. Such requests must be complied with.

I have been informed that our general policy in South Vietnam is to turn the prisoners whom we capture over to the South Vietnamese. Charges are made by some that the South Vietnamese are in violation of the Geneva Convention for the treatment of war prisoners.

Mr. President, I here now call upon our administration to look into the matter of the handling of prisoners captured by U.S. military forces in South Vietnam, and to advise Congress as to whether or not they are turned over to the South Vietnamese forces, and also to advise as to whether there is any basis for the allegation that the South Vietnamese Government likewise does not follow the Geneva Convention for the handling of war prisoners, as the allegation is that North Vietnam does not or is contemplating not doing.

My point, Mr. President, is that all countries involved in the South Vietnamese war should be bound by the Geneva Convention for the handling of war prisoners. I am satisfied that as far as my Government is concerned, in the handling of any war prisoners over whom we retain jurisdiction, the world need have no doubt that our Government complies with its signature on the Geneva War Prisoner Convention.

But, Mr. President, I think we need to be ready to meet with evidence any allegation that may be made that the South Vietnamese are in violation of the Geneva Convention for the handling of war prisoners, and if there is any evidence that bears out such allegation, and if it is our policy to turn North Vietnamese and Vietcong prisoners that we capture over to the South Vietnamese for handling, then we ought to stop that policy, unless we can give the world assurance that the Geneva Conventions are being complied with. Because article 12, as I read the convention, does not prevent us from turning the prisoners over to others to take care of; but it does make perfectly clear that we have an obligation to make certain that the treaty convention is complied with, if we do take captured prisoners and turn them over to another power.

Thus I repeat the language:

> Prisoners of war are in the hands of the enemy Power, but not of the individuals or military units who have captured them. Irrespective of the individual responsibilities that may exist, the Detaining Power is responsible for the treatment given them.
>
> Prisoners of war may only be transferred by the Detaining Power to a Power which is a party to the Convention and after the Detaining Power has satisfied itself of the willingness and ability of such transferee Power to apply the Convention. When prisoners of war are transferred under such circumstances, responsibility for the application of the Convention rests on the Power accepting them while they are in its custody.
>
> Nevertheless, if that Power fails to carry out the provisions of the Convention in any important respect, the Power by whom the prisoners of war were transferred shall, upon being notified by the Protecting Power, take effective measures to correct the situation or shall request the return of the prisoners of war. Such requests must be complied with.

Mr. President, now is the time for our Government to see to it that it places itself in the position to meet any attack that may be made against it on the basis of any transferring of prisoners to the South Vietnamese. I cannot believe, I will not believe, I simply refuse to believe, unless proof is established, that any Vietcong and North Vietnamese prisoners are not being treated in accordance with the requirements of the Geneva Convention on war prisoners, even though they are being turned over by the U.S. Government—if they are being turned over—to the South Vietnamese.

But I wish to make clear again that our Government has the responsibility of keeping itself in a position where at all times it can assure the world that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese prisoners are being treated in accordance with the requirements of the Geneva Convention for the handling of war prisoners. It is particularly important that the senior Senator from Oregon and the other liberals in the Senate who signed the statement of last Friday make perfectly clear that our Government owes it to the American people to keep itself in a completely defensible position on the handling of war prisoners, so that if we are deluged with a lot of Communist propaganda emanating out of North Vietnam, Red China, Russia, or any other Communist area of the world, we shall have the facts with which to answer the propaganda.

Mr. President, North Vietnam cannot justify violating the Geneva Convention provisions for the handling of prisoners of war on the basis of any allegation that their prisoners are being mishandled by the South Vietnamese as far as living up to the requirements of the treaty are concerned.

Mr. President, and I do not want this point missed—even if some instances could be shown in which the South Vietnamese have not followed the Geneva Convention in the handling of any prisoners that have been turned over to it by the United States, if any have been turned over to it by the United States, that would not justify the North Vietnamese Government executing these American prisoners, nor would it justify bringing them to trial as war criminals.

Mr. President, on the contrary, these prisoners are entitled to incarceration and humane treatment until at last this war is brought to an end or until, during the war, negotiations which often occur during a war for the exchange of prisoners occur or until neutral bodies come in either as neutral countries or neutral agencies, such as the Red Cross, to take various degrees of jurisdiction over war prisoners.

Mr. President, article 13 of the treaty provides:

> Prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custory is prohibited, and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention. In particular, no prisoner of war may be subjected to physical mutilation or to medical or scientific experiments of any kind which are not justified by the medical, dental or hospital treatment of the prisoner concerned and carried out in his interest.
>
> Likewise, prisoners of war must at all times be protected, particularly against acts of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity.
>
> Measures of reprisal against prisoners of war are prohibited.

Mr. President, article 14 provides:

> Prisoners of war are entitled in all circumstances to respect for their persons and their honour.
>
> Women shall be treated with all the regard due to their sex and shall in all cases benefit by treatment as favourable as that granted to men.
>
> Prisoners of war shall retain the full civil capacity which they enjoyed at the time of their capture. The Detaining Power may not restrict the exercise, either within or without its own territory, of the rights such capacity confers except in so far as the captivity requires.

Mr. President, article 17 contains a section reading:

> No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.
>
> Prisoners of war who, owing to their physical or mental condition, are unable to state their identity, shall be handed over to the medical service. The identity of such prisoners shall be established by all possible means, subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph.
>
> The questioning of prisoners of war shall be carried out in a language which they understand.

Mr. President, article 22 provides:

> Prisoners of war may be interned only in premises located on land and affording every guarantee of hygiene and healthfulness. Except in particular cases which are justified by the interest of the prisoners themselves, they shall not be interned in penitentiaries.
>
> Prisoners of war interned in unhealthy areas, or where the climate is injurious for them, shall be removed as soon as possible to a more favourable climate.
>
> The Detaining Power shall assemble prisoners of war in camps or camp compounds according to their nationality, language and customs, provided that such prisoners shall not be separated from prisoners of war belonging to the armed forces with which they were serving at the time of their capture, except with their consent.

Mr. President, article 23 provides:

> Article 23
>
> No prisoner of war may at any time be sent to, or detained in areas where he may be exposed to the fire of the combat zone, nor may his presence be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations.
>
> Prisoners of war shall have shelters against air bombardment and other hazards of war, to the same extent as the local civilian population. With the exception of those engaged in the protection of their quarters against the aforesaid hazards, they may enter such shelters as soon as possible after the giving of the alarm. Any other protective measure taken in favour of the population shall also apply to them.
>
> Detaining Powers shall give the Powers concerned, through the intermediary of the Protecting Powers, all useful information regarding the geographical location of prisoner of war camps.
>
> Whenever military considerations permit, prisoner of war camps shall be indicated in the day-time by the letters PW or PG, placed so as to be clearly visible from the air. The Powers concerned may, however, agree upon any other system of marking. Only prisoner of war camps shall be marked as such.

Mr. President, I comment on that article because some of the press stories—and I am sure they are so-called speculative stories—indicate that there are some who fear that what the North Vietnamese Government might do is place these American war prisoners in areas where they think American bombs might drop and, with that sort of cruel design, cause them to be killed by our own bombs.

Mr. President, no one deplores more than does the senior Senator from Oregon the fact that we are bombing in North Vietnam. I have suggested time and time again and repeat this afternoon that I think my President should issue an order immediately to stop the bombing. I do not think there is any hope of ever getting to a peace table by escalating the war.

Mr. President, that does not have anything to do with the cruel, horrendous, abnormal course of action of, in effect, chaining our war prisoners in combat zones so that they will be killed by the attacking country, or so that they, being placed in a position in which they can be killed by the fire of an attacking country, can be used as hostages to prevent the country from carrying out combat operations.

The treaty specifically prohibits it. The treaty specifically took into account this possibility and article 23, which I have commented on and have had printed in the RECORD, prohibits it.

Mr. President, article 26 provides:

> The basic daily food rations shall be sufficient in quantity, quality and variety to keep prisoners of war in good health and to prevent loss of weight or the development of nutritional deficiencies. Account shall also be taken of the habitual diet of the prisoners.
>
> The Detaining Power shall supply prisoners of war who work with such additional rations as are necessary for the labour on which they are employed.
>
> Sufficient drinking water shall be supplied to prisoners of war. The use of tobacco shall be permitted.
>
> Prisoners of war shall, as far as possible, be associated with the preparation of their meals; they may be employed for that purpose in the kitchens. Furthermore, they shall be given the means of preparing, themselves, the additional food in their possession.
>
> Adequate premises shall be provided for messing.
>
> Collective disciplinary measures affecting food are prohibited.

Mr. President, there is no doubt about the fact that the treaty sets forth the bill of particulars, the rules of conduct, and the obligations of the country that has under its custody captured war prisoners. There is no language in the convention, in my judgment, that would justify any plan on the part of North Vietnam to try these American prisoners that have been captured in North Vietnam.

I close my comments by saying that I would like to believe that it is peace that the noncombatants in this war are seeking. I want to continue to believe that it is peace that we seek. I hope it is peace that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong seek.

But resort to brutality and cruelty and barbarism in the treatment of war prisoners by either the North Vietnamese or the South Vietnamese will not aid the coming of peace. Therefore, I hope that all the noncombatant nations in the world will recognize that here, too, as in regard to the other allegations of which I have spoken concerning their treaty duties under the United Nations, they should proceed to take concerted action.

This is a subject matter on which there should be action before the fact. This is a subject matter of which the members of the Security Council of the United Nations and the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations should take cognizance, and they should call for international discussions now. Let us not wait until brutality and barbarism break forth in the handling of war prisoners.

We certainly have a clear duty in this matter, and I have no doubt as to where my President will stand. I shall support the President in any endeavor he makes through so-called noncombatant nations, to arrive at an understanding with the North Vietnamese, without any delay.

If there is any reason to believe that South Vietnamese are violating the Geneva War Prisoner Convention, an endeavor should be made to work this matter out with the South Vietnamese, and certainly we can do something about that.

Mr. President, I see grave danger of any barbaric act on the part of the North Vietnamese increasing the possibility of a greatly escalated war, at a time when we should be moving in the direction of deescalation. Leaders of other nations of the world have at least a moral duty—I believe a legal duty, too—to take the steps necessary to attempt to reach an understanding if there is any basis in fact—if there is any basis in fact, I repeat—that North Vietnam intends to try these American military prisoners as war criminals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT.** Mr. President, what is the pending business?

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

Mr. **FULBRIGHT.** Does the Senator wish to offer the amendment at this time?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment is pending.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT.** I wish to say to the Senator from Virginia that we have read and examined the proposed amendment. It is similar to one we have in the military aid bill. I am disposed to accept it. I believe it is a good amendment.

In the past, I have objected to amendments seeking to achieve ulterior and somewhat irrelevant objectives, but that objection has been overriden so often that I cannot see that it is valid any longer, even though I used to object to the practice.

Therefore, in view of the fact that a similar provision is in the act with regard to Cuba, and the restriction is in the military bill, I accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. **BYRD** of Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The proposed amendment conforms the Economic Assistance Act to the Military Assistance Act, both of which were reported by the committee chaired by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I am pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has accepted the proposed amendment, and I move that it be agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, with respect to an International Private Investment Advisory Council, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is as follows:

On page 17, between lines 17 and 18, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(a) Section 601(c), which relates to the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c)(1) There is hereby established an International Private Investment Advisory Council on Foreign Aid to be composed of such number of leading American business specialists as may be selected, from time to time, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection. The members of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Administrator, who shall designate one member to serve as Chairman.

"'(2) It shall be the duty of the Council, at the request of the Administrator, to make recommendations to the Administrator with respect to particular aspects of programs and activities under this Act where private enterprise can play a contributing role and to act as liaison for the Administrator to involve specific private enterprises in such programs and activities.

"'(3) The members of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for travel and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their functions under this subsection.

"'(4) The expenses of the Advisory Council shall be paid by the Administrator from funds otherwise available under this Act.'"

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, the proposed amendment would establish an International Private Investment Advisory Council to make recommendations to the Administrator of the foreign assistance program with respect to particular aspects of programs and activities where private enterprise can make a contribution, and to serve as liaison for the Administrator with respect to private enterprises which may be interested or involved in the foreign assistance program. My interest in the proposed amendment stems from the fact that, with the kind cooperation of Senator Fulbright and other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I sponsored the establishment, by an amendment to the foreign aid bill 2 years ago, of the so-called Watson Committee, to report on what might be an effective participation by private enterprise in foreign aid.

This committee has made a very extensive report, which was put into the Record in the House of Representatives by Representative Curtis, and it can be read by Senators on pages 15430 to 15443 of the Record. The recommendations of this report have been implemented from time to time, but I have the deep conviction—and it is shared by others who are interested—that a continuous followup is required in order to make it meaningful.

That is one of the things that has been lacking in previous loans of the same kind.

I, therefore, Mr. President, welcome with the greatest pleasure the fact that the other body in its bill incorporated an International Private Advisory Council for the purpose of dealing with this problem and essentially following through on the recommendations of the Watson Committee.

It is a fact that the work of the private sector in foreign aid has been covered to some extent in the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs, the Perkins Committee, headed by James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University, and other members of the committee. That Committee has a Private Sector Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of David Rockefeller.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list may be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs

Chairman, Dr. James A Perkins, President, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Mr. Dwayne O. Andreas, Chairman, Executive Committee, National City Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Joseph A. Beirne, President, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Eugene R. Black, Spec. Presidential Advisor for SE Asian Economic & Social Dev., 230 Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Everett N. Case, 9 Washington Mews, New York 3, New York.

Dr. Luther H. Foster, President, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.

General Alfred M. Gruenther, 4101 Cathedral Ave., N. W., Washington, D.C.

Dr. J. George Harrar, President, Rockefeller Foundation, 111 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

Mr. William R. Hewlett, President and Director, Hewlett-Packard Company, 1501 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, Calif.

Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, Chairman of the Board, Xerox Corporation, Rochester, New York.

Professor Edward S. Mason, Department of Economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. George Meany, President, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, Chancellor, UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit, President, Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas.

Mr. David Rockefeller, President, Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Arthur K. Watson, Chairman, IBM World Trade Corporation, Old Orchard Road, Armonk, New York.

Mr. William J. Zellerbach, President, Zellerbach Paper Company, 343 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. **JAVITS.** There are also representatives of labor and educational institutions on the committee. There is Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and representatives of the so-called private organizations. Mrs. Case, chairman of the Board of Trustees of Skidmore College is a member.

There is no reason why the Rockefeller subcommittee must be displaced or replaced. If the amendment is agreed to, it would mean that it would be locked into the bill and provide a statutory floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement on this subject in the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on this bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Section 301(a)(3)—International Private Investment Advisory Council

Section 301(a)(3) of the bill amends subsection (c) of section 601 of the act to provide for establishing an International Private Investment Advisory Council composed of leading American business specialists to make recommendations to the administrator of the foreign assistance program with respect to particular aspects of programs and activities where private enterprise can make a contribution and to serve as liaison for the administrator with specific private enterprises which may be interested or involved in the foreign assistance program.

Members of the Council are to serve without compensation but are authorized to receive reimbursement for travel and per diem in accordance with Government regulations.

The expenses of the Council are to be paid from funds otherwise available under the act. No additional funds are authorized.

The purpose of the amendment is to assure that the foreign aid program makes use of the services of American business leaders.

The committee desires to avoid duplication and proliferation of advisory committees. The work of the Private Sector Subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Foreign Aid (Perkins Committee) established under the authority of section 261 of the act is recognized. It is the expectation of the committee that the authority contained in this section will be used to strengthen and expand what is underway rather than to supersede or parallel existing activities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not propose a new committee. It is the same committee except that we are giving a statutory base for it, which we think is most desirable. I would hope that the President would look over the list of members. For example, I see on the list William J. Zellerbach, a man whom I know very well. He is a member of the committee who is a prototype of the modern young executive with vigor and energy and would portray the interest of a young man like that in the committee, if it has a statutory base.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons I hope very much that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may see fit to accept this amendment, based on my explanation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the actual recommendations of the so-called Watson Committee, together with two reports which I have now had from AID, reporting on the implementation of the Watson Committee report as of February 7, 1966, and July 15, 1966, and a short statement on the AID form of organization, in support of private enterprise.

There being no objection, the reports and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID's Response to Date to the Report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid

INTRODUCTION

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid was appointed on May 26, 1964, held eleven meetings and concluded its work in July 1965. Its Report was given to the President in August 1965. This memorandum describes AID's response to date to the Report.

Although the Advisory Committee has disbanded, the individuals who served on it and the organizations they represent have a continuing contribution to make and are entitled to know what we are doing with their work. This memorandum is for them. The Report requests the Members of the General Advisory Committee for Foreign Assistance Programs, appointed by the President in May 1965, to give continuing attention to the role of non-government organizations. This memorandum is also for them. The Members of the Congress are vitally interested in this field. This memorandum is for them as well.

A Report such as this, if it is to be useful, cannot be treated as an isolated event. It must be one step in a continuing process of evaluation, questioning, and experimentation, and one step in the continuing dialogue between AID and the broad range of private organizations deeply concerned with the problems of developing nations. This memorandum is, then, a report to ourselves, a provisional balance sheet to guide us through the next stages.

A NOTE ON PROCEDURE

The Advisory Committee made thirty-three recommendations. Within A.I.D., responsibility for each of the recommendations has been assigned to a specific office. Overall coordination is assigned to the Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise. Consultations have been held with the Departments of State, Agriculture, Treasury, Justice, the Bureau of the Budget and the Export-Import Bank. A.I.D. and the Department of Commerce have established a joint working group. Consultations have also been held with the International Finance Corporation and the World Bank.

The Report has been widely distributed. Efforts are being made to draw on many firms, individuals and organizations outside of A.I.D. for comment, advice and suggestions. For example: the Report has been systematically reviewed by the Task Force on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid of the National Association of Manufacturers and its views given to A.I.D. at a joint meeting in January; the Council for International Progress in Management also reviewed the entire report with A.I.D. in January; many of the recommendations were discussed at a recent meeting of A.I.D.'s Advisory Committee on Economic Development, chaired by Professor Edward Mason of Harvard.

SECTION 1: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND FOREIGN AID

A.I.D. is in full agreement with the broad philosophy set forth by the Committee. The Report has been received throughout the A.I.D. organization in Washington and in the field as a thoughtful analysis of the role private resources can and must play in economic and social development. The Report, designed to influence the tone and shape the direction of A.I.D.'s programs, is having the intended effect:

1. Its influence began to be felt even before the final drafting in June. The program guidance for Fiscal Year 1967 programs sent by the Administrator to all Mission Directors on April 13, 1965, included the following: "Private sector development continues to be a subject of special A.I.D. concern. For each country in which private sector activity can play a substantial role in meeting U.S. objectives, the mission should consider including in its Country Assistance Strategy Statement as a major program goal plan a broad, comprehensive program of host country action, AID action, and strategy for fostering needed host country and other donor action to promote private sector development. The program should include an effort to develop a sequence of projects and programs designed to identify and eliminate obstacles to private investment, both foreign and local, and to strengthen private activity generally."

2. Particular attention was given to private sector development in the Administrator's Fall reviews of the major country programs.

3. The Agency is reaching out to many private organizations in the U.S. to explore new forms of government-private association. Illustrative are recent contacts with the American Institute of Banking, the American Management Association, the Investment Bankers Association, the National Industrial Conference Board and the Investment Company Institute. These groups are valuable sounding boards and sources of information and ideas.

4. A.I.D. is working to cause national and international planning organizations to give increased attention to the private sector and to increase private patricipation in the planning process. New organizations have been created and existing organizations strengthened, often with direct A.I.D. assistance, to represent the private sector. For example:

A private enterprise conference will be held in Panama in August of this year under the auspices of CONEP, the newly formed Panamanian national council of private companies. Participants are expected from all Latin American countries. The topic of the conference will be ways and means to involve private sector representatives more deeply in national planning.

A.I.D. is also encouraged to note that the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) is now emphasizing in its country reviews that meaningful participation by the private sector in the planning process is highly important.

5. In May 1965, A.I.D. proposed that the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD include private investment matters in its activities. Representatives of the member countries are preparing a work program to: exchange information on investment incentives, coordinate public and private development efforts, improve statistics on private capital flows and study the overall effects of foreign private investment in selected developing countries. The Business and Industry Advisory Committee of the OECD will participate, to represent the private business firms of the DAC member countries.

A number of developments in recent months are of interest in relation to the Committee's discussion of the attitude towards private enterprise prevailing in less developed countries: In November 1965, Brazil and the U.S. concluded the final arrangements under which A.I.D.'s investment guaranty program, covering both political and extended risks, is now available to U.S. investors in Brazil. This is one aspect of a basic change in attitude in Brazil towards foreign private investment. Its potential significance is shown by the applications now on hand in A.I.D. for coverage in Brazil—they total over $200 million in potential investments. Another example of the changed attitude is the decision of the Brazilian Government to permit certain iron ore and petro-chemical projects to be handled by private industry in association with foreign investors.

The governments of Tunisia and Ceylon are now making real efforts to attract foreign private investment. Chile and Bolivia have enacted improvements in their investment laws. India has made significant changes in its policies affecting private enterprise in the fertilizer industry. To facilitate investment in this field the government has announced that it will remove price controls, permit distribution to be handled by private firms, streamline project clearance, allot foreign exchange for materials imports and help to underwrite Indian capital in private joint ventures.

SECTION 2: THE FLOW OF DIRECT INVESTMENT

Recommendation No. 1: Status as of February 1966

"We recommend that *AID select a number of key aid-receiving countries* for intensive study of factors which may improve the investment climate; that such studies enlist the help and advice of the appropriate business communities concerned; that an explicit program be developed for the improvement of the climate in those countries studied; and that, wherever the foreign aid program offers some effective opportunity for the improvement of such climate, the opportunity be used to the full."

By September 1965, A.I.D. had selected six countries for the study—Korea, Brazil, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey and Chile. Instructions have emphasized: give the studies priority; consider the climate for local private investment as well as factors of special significance to foreign investment; involve both the local and foreign business communities in the studies; the desired product is not the study but a plan to improve the climate for private economic activity.

The Korea Mission started its study in October. Since several members of the strong private enterprise team in Taiwan had been transferred to Korea to build up Korea's private enterprise program, Mission personnel only were assigned to the job. The Mission's outline of its plan of work is attached as an example of the scope of these studies.

In performing its task, the team held many discussions with the Korean Businessmen's Association, a representative group of prominent men in industry and commerce. The report is expected by February 15, and the proposed actions will be reflected in Korea's country program submission due April 1.

Brazil's study was started by Mission personnel and supplemented by a consultant's report submitted in December. The Mission's official report will be based on this work, and is expected February 15.

Thailand retained a consultant who arrived at the Mission in January. He will transmit a status report on March 1, at which time we can establish a date for submission of the final report containing the survey generated action programs.

During November and December 1965, an A.I.D. consultant made a study of the investment climate in Tunisia. We received a preliminary report in late December. Arrangements are being made for a team representing one of the leading Edge Act Corporations to go to Tunisia shortly to look for new investment projects. (This plan is described more completely under Recommendation No. 4.) Their primary interest will be to work out actual investments, but while they are doing this, they will also be used to check the results of the consultant's study and, on the basis of this live experience, to propose specific actions for the A.I.D. program.

The study in *Turkey* is susbtantially farther along than the others. In May and June of 1965, A.I.D. decided to do a study of industrial development—particularly private development—in Turkey. This study, as was the case with many other agency actions in this field during this period, emerged from the normal planning processes of the Agency, but was directly influenced by the discussions of the Committee. As the study progressed, and the Committee's recommendations were released, it became clear that it covered material called for by this recommendation.

During the summer and fall of 1965, a team gathered information which was used as a basis for a series of decisions made by the Mission in October of 1965. In preparation for this, A.I.D. representatives who were to participate in making these decisions met with the NAM Task Force on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid to discuss the investment climate of Turkey. The principal decisions made were:

To work towards liberalization of controls on imports of raw materials and machinery for the private sector.

To help the Turks develop major projects in the private sector.

To encourage the Turks to carry on a rational infrastructure plan that will support private enterprise development needs.

To devise means of extending credit availability to areas outside Instanbul.

To work toward increasing the capability of Turkish institutions rendering credit, engineering, training and consultant services to the private sector.

Since that time, senior Mission personnel have worked to find private sector projects for possible financing. This campaign has turned up a substantial number with high investment content.

A full report on these activities is expected from the Mission this month.

The Chile study is to be done by a team of expert consultants. This team has not yet been put together. We have set a March 1 deadline for the design of this study and the contracting of consultants to execute it.

As the results of these pilot country studies become available, we expect to apply ideas and methods that have proven to be useful on a broader basis to other countries.

Recommendation No. 1: Status as of July 1966

A.I.D. has received investment climate studies made by the Missions in Brazil, Thailand, Korea and Turkey. While preliminary in nature, they are a useful first step toward eventual studies in depth of the private sectors in these countries. More important, they bring out some of the more serious impediments to private investment, which can and should be attacked in the near and intermediate future, pending elaboration of broader, longer term plans. A.I.D. has already set up high level committees for two of these countries and expects to set up similar committees for each country to be studied. These committees will, on a continuing basis, follow through on the studies made and to be made and their implementation, along the lines suggested in Recommendation No. 1. The results of the studies will begin to be reflected in Country Program submissions for FY 68.

Recommendation No. 2: Status as of February 1966

"We recommend that the United States Government accept in principle the concept of international arbitration; that it ratify the proposed International Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes; and that it seek to secure its ratification by others."

The U.S. Government does accept in principle the concept of international arbitration.

Secretary Fowler signed the International Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes on behalf of the United States on August 27, 1965. Submission of the Convention to Congress for ratification during the present session is expected.

As of January 3, 1966, thirty nations, including an encouraging number of less developed countries, had signed the Convention. No Latin American State has yet signed. One ratification, that of Nigeria, has been deposited. The Convention will come into force after ratification by twenty nations.

Recommendation No. 2: Status as of July 1966

On June 10, 1966, Congress ratified the International Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes under which a center will be set up within the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to handle such controversies. The United States deposit of ratification brought the total of ratifying nations to 7 out of a total of 43 signatures. U.S. support and ratification should be the impetus needed to arrive at the total of 20 ratifications necessary for the Convention to come into effect.

Recommendation No. 3: Status as of February 1966

"We recommend that the United States Government lend its full support to the principle of *an investment code under international sponsorship;* and that as part of such a code the United States be prepared to accept a reasonable statement of the obligations of investors, to accompany a statement of the obligations of host countries."

The U.S. Government has actively participated in the preparation of one code of this kind—the OECD draft Convention for the Protection of Foreign Property. The United Nations and the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress are both in the early stages of developing a statement of principles of this kind. We agree with the Committee about the kind of statement the United States should be prepared to accept. *No significant support for the OECD draft Convention has yet appeared among the developing countries.* As a result, the possibility of adoption of such a code appears slim for the present.

Recommendation No. 3: Status as of July 1966

The United States has stated before the OECD Council that it approves and is ready to sign the Convention for the Protection of Foreign Property.

Recommendation No. 4: Status as of February 1966

"We recommend that both the United States Government and private organizations assist the less developed countries in undertaking *large scale programs of market studies and feasibility studies,* to be used as part of a campaign in engaging the interest of prospective local and foreign private investors. In view of the need for persistence and continuity in the promotion of any given project, the *generating of such studies should be the prime responsibility of local entities,* such as a development bank or well-equipped ministry, motivated and equipped to maintain a follow-up campaign from the stimulation of an initial interest by investors to the final act of establishment. If necessary, the contracting of foreign technical assistance should be included. AID financing should be predicated on significant contributions by the local institutions but *might include the costs of a substantial effort to 'sell' proposals in face-to-face contact with enterprises in the United States.*"

A.I.D. agrees with this recommendation in general.

A.I.D. shares the view of the Committee that local entities such as development banks have a major role to play in project identification and promotion. For example, we are now considering an increase in our technical assistance to the Industrial Development Bank of *Pakistan* for the specific purpose of increasing the Bank's capability to promote private sector activity.

On January 31, 1966, A.I.D. signed a $3,000,000 loan agreement with COFIEC, a newly established private development bank in Ecuador. The new bank was organized by Ecuadoran businessmen and bankers and has $1,000,000 subscribed capital from numerous U.S., foreign and Ecuadoran private banks, companies and individuals. It will be staffed to seek out investment opportunities and bring them to the attention of potential investors. The A.I.D. loan will supply investment capital and finance feasibility studies, as well as technical assistance to the ultimate borrowers. It will provide medium and long term credits at 8% to private industry, a sector previously not served by private banks in Ecuador.

Last fall a new Office of Promotion and Assistance to Private Enterprise was established within the Guatemalan National Economic Planning Council. Although Guatemala has had a highly successful industry productivity center, little, if any, efforts were being directed toward identification and promotion of new investment. A.I.D. is providing, through a November 1965 contract with a Puerto Rican consulting firm and its own personnel, technical and advisory services to this new entity that will make it a one stop center of investor information, feasibility studies and aggressive promotional activities.

The A.I.D. loan to Brazil, authorized October 1965, is also relevant. It is to finance feasibility studies for both the private and public sector. It includes the provision of technical assistance to a newly established central agency and several related sub-lending agencies which will make the loans for the studies. The loans for private projects will be made to potential investors, so that the need for independent promotion is minimized. The loan will not only generate projects suitable for international financing but, notably, will create an institutional capacity to perform studies within all the Brazilian agencies involved.

A U.S. contractor is now making a preinvestment survey of the petrochemical sector in Korea which is expected to identify a number of private projects. American firms and banks are following the survey with great interest.

Joint arrangements now being worked out between A.I.D., a leading financial instiution, the *Tunisian* Chamber of Commerce and a Tunisian development bank, are an imaginative blending of resources bearing on the identification and promotion of investment opportunities. The banking representatives will provide financial know-how and provide personnel in Tunisia to coordinate with Chamber personnel in selection and promotion techniques. After collecting selected projects bearing approval of the Government of Tunisia and backed by pledges of local financing if necessary, the banking team will promote these projects through its U.S. banking connections, being prepared to lend or invest in them for its own account.

Plans are being made to apply this technique in other countries.

In March 1965, A.I.D. contracted with the International Marketing Institute of Cambridge, Massachusetts, to make an overall survey of export promotion services. This intensive survey is in its final phase and its findings should provide A.I.D. with a set of guidelines with which to help the less developed countries build productive export programs.

A task force has been set up by State, Commerce, and A.I.D. to review and evaluate the current programs of commercial, trade and investment reporting. The work of the Committee is well advanced and recommendations for improvement are expected soon.

A.I.D. is clearly involved in a lot of work of the general type recommended by the Committee: feasibility studies to be marketed by major consulting firms, market studies, the statutory program of investment surveys, financial and technical advisory support to local development banks and other institutions, promotional efforts by investment centers, etc. These activities represent the deployment of substantial resources, but *we have concluded that we need to learn more about their comparative efficiency.* To do this we are organizing an evaluation project. Planning of this project is underway. We expect the work to begin by March 1, 1966.

Recommendation No. 4: Status as of July 1966

Promotion of Projects

Pursuant to the recommendation that more data be gathered and more companies "sold" on the opportunities now prevailing, A.I.D. has done three things. It has intensified its call for more prefeasibility studies from the Fomentos in Latin America and from its missions in Africa and in the Near and Far East. It has initiated major experiments in new promotional techniques for two of the assisted areas. And, it has retained, for purposes of catalysing discussions here in Washington, a consultant for industrial promotion.

To accelerate the identification of projects, economists have been sent to Central and South America, and to selected countries in Africa and South Asia. Under the direction of an American industrialist with long experience in Latin America, a new approach to industrial promotion, using contractors whose knowledge and contacts relate to specific areas of industries, is being applied to the Latin countries. A correlative experiment in Africa is emphasizing the use of Edge Act Corporations both for identifying opportunities and for bringing them to the notice of their industrial clients. The latter program now involves banks in six major American cities. The projects specifically being considered include large-scale cattle raising in Kenya, paper production in Malawi, and a massive, mixed nucleus farm in Tunisia. Lastly, through a series of meetings attended by industrial and capital development officers from each of the regional offices, an effort is being made to develop a set of techniques, or methodology which can be commended to all of A.I.D.'s missions abroad. Through this combination of intensified action, experimentation, and analysis, A.I.D. is moving steadily toward a more effective method for encouraging American private investment in "the less developed countries."

Recommendation No. 5: Status as of February 1966

"We support the proposals under consideration by the Congress which would: (1) raise the $2.5 billion statutory ceiling on the guaranties against inconvertibility, expropriation and military hazards to a new level of $5.0 billion; (2) relax the statutory requirements for enterprises eligible for guaranty, to permit the coverage of foreign corporations jointly owned by more than one U.S. company; (3) relax the 20-year statutory limitation on the life of guaranties; and (4) permit AID to use income from the guaranty program not only for the management and custody of assets but also for certain other operational costs associated with the guaranty program.

"We urge in addition (5) that enterprises be permitted to insure comprehensively for all three categories of risk, rather than for each risk separately, thereby reducing the total amount of insurance coverage required; and (6) that consideration be given to a reduction in the rates applicable to such insurance so that the coverage of two specific risks costs ¾% rather than 1%, and the coverage of three specific risks costs 1% rather than 1-½%."

In the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, signed by the President on September 6, Congress adopted the proposals covering points 1 through 4 although the 20-year limit on guaranties was relaxed only for loans. In analyzing points 5 and 6, A.I.D. will make a number of changes. If the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems approves, A.I.D. will: offer a combined war and expropriation coverage at a combined premium rate of ⅞%; reduce the premium for convertibility coverage from ½% to ¼%; reduce the fee for standby coverage from ¼% to ⅒%.

Recommendation No. 5: Status as of July 1966

After approval by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, A.I.D., on March 15, 1966, announced that combined war and expropriation coverage is now offered at ⅞%; that the convertibility premium has been reduced from ½% to ¼%; and that the fee for standby coverage is reduced from ¼% to ⅒%.

Recommendation No. 6—Status as of February 1966

"We recommend *an expansion of the extended risk guaranty.* In undertakings in which businessmen are willing to risk as much as 25% of the total investment on a junior basis, *an amount not to exceed 75% of the investment should be eligible, upon approval by AID, for a 100% extended risk guaranty.*

"To permit adequate opportunity for the development of such programs, we recommend that the *statutory authority* to issue housing and extended risk guaranties *be prolonged to June 30, 1969.* We recommend also that *the $25 million guaranty limit in connection with loans and the $10 million limit in connection with other investments* be *removed.*

The Administration's proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 requests an expansion of authority to issue Extended Risk Guaranty contracts from the effective current availability of $175 million to $300 million. This authority would be available for *five years.* A.I.D. has altered its policy concerning 100% coverage to meet the Committee's recommendation *in part,* although it has not yet applied the full recommendation. Subject to approval by the National Advisory Council, A.I.D. is now offering to give direct 100% guaranty coverage to long-term lenders, provided other financing (presumably shorter term) is furnished by banks or other financial institutions equal to 25% of the loan financing. This would give institutional lenders the full 100% coverage which they require and which the Committee recommended. *It varies from the Committee's recommendation by seeking to bring a short-term lender into the picture at risk.*

At the same time A.I.D. is considering a reduction in fees in order to make the cost of money raised under this program more attractive, and to reduce the burden on the developing country's balance of payments. (The U.S. balance of payments is protected by a requirement for U.S. procurement.)

Six projects are now in the stage of active negotiations on this basis with good prospects of realization this year.

The Committee also recommended removal of the $25 million guaranty ceiling on loans; Congress enacted this provision in 1965. Congress also enacted the recommendation to remove the $10 million limit on other forms of investment, but extended the statutory authority to issue these guaranties to June 30, 1967, rather than June 30, 1969, as recommended by the Committee.

Recommendation No. 6: Status as of July 1966

A.I.D. now offers to long-term institutional lenders a direct 100% guaranty when other financing (generally shorter term) is furnished by banks or other private financial institutions equal to 25 percent of the loan financing. This gives institutional lenders the full 100% coverage they require and which the Committee recommended. A Standard Form Guaranty to be used in such cases has been completed, and we expect to issue guaranties on this basis for several projects shortly.

The reduction of fee is still under active consideration. Minor modifications have been embodied in the current Senate and House Foreign Aid Bills in the legislative provisions about both specific and extended risk guaranties.

Recommendation No. 7: Status as of February 1966

"We recommend that the United States Government urge the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank to explore further the feasibility of setting up a *guaranty system* which would selectively indemnify both locally-owned and foreign-owned enterprises in the less developed countries against the effect of a *devaluation*."

A.I.D. has forwarded this recommendation to the National Advisory Council for International Monetary and Financial Problems for its consideration as coordinator of U.S. policies on international matters of this kind. It will develop a U.S. position to guide the U.S. Executive Director of the World Bank. It has also been discussed informally by A.I.D. with the Bank's staff.

Recommendation No. 7: Status as of July 1966

The Executive Directors of the World Bank have extensively considered the establishment of a multilateral investment guaranty system. In their deliberations it has become quite clear that they do not at this time wish to establish a guaranty system which would indemnify private investments against the effect of devaluation and such approach has been specifically rejected. However, much progress has been made in connection with the multilateral investment guaranty system.

The Bank Staff is currently preparing a draft charter for a proposed Multilateral Investment Guaranty Corporation based upon positions taken by the Committee during meetings which on balance favored the Corporation's establishment as an affiliate of the Bank. It is presently planned to submit the draft charter to the Committee prior to the next Annual Meeting of the Bank and hold further discussion toward the end of the year.

This progress toward adoption of a suitable charter and the ultimate establishment of a corporation which would issue guaranties against political risks on private investments originating in capital exporting countries which join the Corporation in enterprises in particular lesser developed countries is highly encouraging since an institution providing this function will be another means of mobilizing additional private resources into the LDC's.

Recommendation No. 8: Status as of February 1966

"We recommend that the United States Government support both wholly-owned and jointly-owned enterprises in the less developed countries, and that it avoid any doctrinaire position on the issue.

"We recommend further that where the prospective investor has legitimate concerns regarding the nature of the arrangement proposed by the host government, and wishes to enlist the support of the United States Government in expressing these concerns to a host government, the United States Government should consider sympathetically the possibility of lending such support."

A.I.D. has no formalized policy requiring insistence on joint ownership in any given situation. We do see many advantages to jointly owned enterprises in less developed countries, and, wherever this is feasible and realistic, tend to favor them. At the same time we are aware that this type of ownership can create problems for the U.S. investor. In our discussions with business, we find a divergence of views. Although our policy is not doctrinaire, our attitude in specific cases should be based on a thorough understanding and the best available information. Accordingly, we expect continued consultation with business on this subject. On February 11, 1966, it will be reviewed at a meeting of the Advisory Committee on International Business Problems (the Randall Committee), when individual companies with particular problems in this area will present their views and experiences to the Committee, along with representatives of State, A.I.D. and Commerce.

Recommendation No. 8: Status as of July 1966

Subsequent to the discussion of the Government's policy towards joint ventures which took place at the February 11, 1966 meeting of the Advisory Committee on International Business Problems (the Randall Committee), guidance on this question was sent to all U.S. Missions overseas by the Secretary of State. The message reaffirmed that the U.S. Government has no doctrinaire policy requiring insistence on joint ownership. Government officials were advised to point out to American companies the advantages and disadvantages of the joint venture approach in a particular country or industry situation. However, the final determination is the sole responsibility of the American company involved.

Recommendation No. 9: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that the United States tax laws and regulations be amended so that the United States taxpayer's right to offset losses in subsidiaries against taxable income from other sources would be the same for subsidiaries in less developed countries as it is for subsidiaries in the United States."

Consultations with Treasury and expert private tax counsel lead us to question the advisability of adopting this recommendation. The Department of Treasury believes that the proposal would permit distorted allocation of profits and create double deduction for losses. Private experts have emphasized that a rule permitting current deduction of losses but no current taxability of earnings runs counter to generally accepted rules of taxation. They have also emphasized the complexity of enforcement problems which would be faced by the Internal Revenue Service. We will continue our consideration.

Recommendation No. 9: Status in July 1966

Further consideration has led us to conclude that it may be possible to develop legislation along these lines which would operate as an effective incentive to U.S. investors while at the same overcoming the objections which have been voiced in the past. We are developing a proposal for consideration by appropriate government officials.

Recommendation No. 10: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that the United States Senate accept the provisions of the United States-Thailand tax treaty which would apply a 7 percent investment credit to United States-owned investment in Thailand.

"We recommend also that the United States Government take steps to apply the same treatment to investment in other selected less developed countries, either by legislation or by treaty."

The tax treaty with Thailand and a treaty with Israel containing a similar provision were submitted to the first session of the 89th Congress. A Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on the bill but action was not completed prior to adjournment. A number of Administration witnesses, including the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, testified in support of the treaties. Although some opposition has been voiced, it is hoped that action will be completed during the current session of Congress. Negotiations with other countries have been started.

Recommendation No. 10: Status in July 1966

The United States has signed tax treaties containing a 7% investment credit clause with Thailand and Israel and has concluded a similar treaty with India which is awaiting signature. It is negotiating a treaty with Brazil (which is expected to a considerable extent to be a forerunner of treaties with other major Latin American countries), Trinidad and Tobago, and Korea—all of which involve the investment credit clause.

The full Senate Foreign Relations Committee is expected to consider the Thailand treaty in the near future. A Subcommittee which conducted hearings on the treaty has expressed some reservations on the 7% investment credit provision.

Recommendation No. 11: Status in February 1966

"We recommend the enactment of a proposal for a tax credit equal to 30 percent of the investment by United States investors in productive facilities in less developed areas, to be applied against the total United States tax liability of such investors."

In his remarks to the Advisory Committee in August 1965, the President said: "We have already made certain recommendations—both in tax treaties now before the Senate and in my foreign aid message—for using tax measures to encourage private investment in the developing countries. I am certain that the Congress, in its consideration of this subject, will give weight to the views of this Committee."

The submission of this tax credit proposal is currently under review by the Executive Branch.

Recommendation No. 11: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 12: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that the encouragement to investment offered by such *tax-sparing measures* in less developed countries should not be negated by United States tax laws."

Although the principle of tax sparing was incorporated in a tax treaty with Pakistan negotiated several yeras ago, the treaty was withdrawn by the Administration as a result of a basic change in policy. Tax sparing is disadvantageous to the developing country because it encourages rapid repatriation of profits. (It is only when the profits are brought back into the U.S. that the investor derives a direct U.S. tax benefit.) Further, tax sparing gives the greatest benefits to U.S. investors in countries with the highest rates of local taxation and gives local tax authority the power, in effect, to set U.S. tax levels.

Recommendation No. 12: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 13: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that the United States Government, working through its bilateral treaties of establishment, through the mechanisms provided by the OECD, or through other appropriate means, *widen and strengthen its collaborative practices with other governments in the antitrust field.* Wherever the activities of such governments seem likely to raise the problem of multiple standards and jurisdictional conflict in the application of antitrust policies, a major objective of the collaboration would be to reduce the uncertainty of the businessman concerning the jurisdictional authority and antitrust standards which would apply in his overseas activities."

The Department of Justice has been advised of this recommendation and, with the State Department, is taking an active part in the work of the Restrictive Business Practices Committee of the OECD, assisted by the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. In November 1965, the U.S. proposed that the OECD sponsor a system of bilateral consultations. The proposal will be considered further in future meetings. Justice and State officials have conferred this year with officials of Canada, the United Kingdom, the European Economic Community and Japan on antitrust matters. An active and successful Antitrust Modification and Consultation Procedure is in operation between the U.S. and Canada under which current consultations are held and advice is given prior to the institution of antitrust actions affecting the other country's interests or nationals. The Departments of Justice and State are seeking to expand cooperation with other nations in this field in order to prevent conflicts with other national laws and develop a common approach to antitrust law.

Recommendation No. 13: Status in July 1966

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly held extensive hearings April 20–29, 1966 on the broad range of questions covered by this recommendation.

The United States Government has announced that it favors in principle the OECD Draft Agreement on Restrictive Business Practices Affecting International Trade, dated May 1966, and favors opening it for signature by OECD members.

The Departments of Justice and State continue their efforts to further expand and improve international cooperation in this field in order to prevent conflicts with other national laws and develop a common approach to antitrust law.

SECTION 3: THE FLOW OF FINANCE CAPITAL

Recommendation No. 14: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that the Federal Reserve Board amend its recommendations to United States banks so that the restrictive effects on loans to less developed countries are eliminated."

The official statistics have shown substantial availabilities for credits to the less developed countries within the overall lending ceilings. It is possible that these availabilities are not in the institutions which do business in the developing countries, but to date the evidence of curtailment of lending to developing countries has not been sufficient to cause a policy change.

The guidelines were recently amended to make it possible for banks which heretofore have had little or no foreign lending activity to make some foreign credits.

The proportion of the total new foreign lending which has gone to developing countries has sharply increased since the Federal Reserve guidelines were issued in March 1965, but total lending to both developed and developing countries has decreased sharply. It is this decrease which concerns us now, and we are following the situation closely to be ready to act if called for. In specific cases, if financing is needed but not available because of the guidelines, procedures exist to consider relief if needed.

Recommendation No. 14: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 15: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that a large-scale program of assistance be expanded for the development and improvement of local financial institutions in support of private and cooperative enterprises in the less developed countries; and that the program draw heavily not only on the expertise of the United States and other advanced countries, but also on expertise in countries whose institutions may be more relevant to those of the less developed countries. Presumably, such a program could be conducted not only through the auspices of public international agencies such as the Organization of American States and the United Nations specialized agencies, but also through private organizations such as those in the cooperative and labor fields which have the necessary experience and interest."

A.I.D. considers this recommendation to be of major importance, and is addressing it in a number of ways. The studies made in response to Recommendation No. 1 will suggest specific projects. A.I.D.'s programs of capital and technical assistance to intermediate credit institutions should continue to support the goals of this recommendation.

A July 1965 message from AID/Washington to each Field Mission emphasized the significance of soundly conceived and well administered legal institutions responsive to modern developmental needs, encouraged the Missions to review their existing programs aimed at improvement of legislation and public administration and, as appropriate, to propose new efforts and projects in this field. The legal institutions of a number of developing countries as they affect the forms and ways in which business is conducted are now being analyzed.

A survey of the operations of the Brazilian stock exchange, made by experts from the SEC and the American Stock Exchange, has just been completed under an A.I.D. contract authorized in August 1965. Its recommendations have been welcomed by Brazilian authorities and appropriate technical assistance will be provided this year.

On February 15, 1966, a former Vice President of a leading U.S. investment bank, now an IESC volunteer, is going to Taiwan at the request of the China Development Corporation to undertake a similar study of the Taiwan Stock Exchange.

Turkey has been showing a more sympathetic attitude toward the private sector recently, particularly toward enterprise in mining and fertilizers. Suggested changes in the mining laws are being prepared with the help of A.I.D. supported consultants.

Last year an intensive study was made of the Korean financial sector as part of the Administrator's review of specific sectors in selected countries. Evaluations were made of all the major financing institutions in the country and programs directed toward this sector were scrutinized. This exercise resulted in a strengthening of the Mission staff to include, among others, a Banking Advisor, an Agricultural Economist, the extension of contracts with accounting and management consultants to work within banks, savings and loan associations and other credit institutions, and renewed program emphasis on increasing the effectiveness of this sector.

The Committee's suggestion that the experience of other countries, whose institutions may be more relevant to those of less developed countries than the U.S., be looked to as a source of guidance and expertise, is welcomed. We believe that the rapid development of corporate and financial techniques in Japan and Mexico in recent years may be particularly relevant and intend to draw on this experience to the extent possible.

In November 1965, the Liberian Bank for Industrial Development and Investment (LBIDI) was established to provide medium and long term capital to private enterprise in Liberia. Capital amounting to $1,000,000 was subscribed and paid in by the IFC, the Liberian Government and several U.S. firms. A $2,500,000 loan has been granted by Germany. A.I.D. is contributing to the cost of management and is providing the services of a U.S. consulting firm for loan reviews on behalf of the LBIDI. This is an excellent example of the joining together of private and public multilateral support for a private enterprise directed lending agency.

A.I.D. loans for cooperative type projects, housing, electrification and agricultural credits, now total $565 million. An example is the loan, authorized by A.I.D. in June 1965, of $3,650,000 to the Chilean Cooperative Bank. These funds will be used for subloans to cooperative organizations throughout Chile for various productive purposes.

In FY 1962, A.I.D. committed $2.8 million in support of technical assistance for cooperative development. By FY 1965, this figure rose to $16 million. A.I.D. sponsored cooperative programs in 39 countries during FY 1965. Eighty-eight contracts with American non-profit and cooperative organizations were the backbone of this activity. Among these organizations were:

American Institute for Free Labor Development.
Cooperative League of the USA.
Credit Union National Association.
Farmers Educational and Coop Union.
Foundation for Coop Housing.
Fund for International Development.
International Coop Development Association.
International Coop Training Center.
National League of Insured Savings Associations.
National Rural Electric Coop Association.

These institutions have over 280 men serving in the field, stimulating and guiding the development of indigenous counterpart organizations.

The Committee's views have led us to plan a systematic evaluation of our efforts to determine if we are doing the right thing in the right places with the right amount of resources.

Recommendation No. 15: Status in July 1966

A.I.D. continues to put major emphasis on financial support of and technical assistance to intermediate financial institutions and cooperatives. It is acutely aware of the importance of private capital building in the LDC's and is working unremittingly to encourage it. It continues and will continue to make loans to such institutions, both in dollars and, where appropriate, in local currencies (Recommendation 17). These institutions have been of a variety of types: generalized, as industrial development banks and specialized, such as credit unions, housing banks, agricultural banks, etc. Some of these loans are conditioned on their being relent to specialized borrowers, such as agricultural cooperatives, small farmers, rural electrification co-operative systems, and the like. In making these loans A.I.D. seeks to encourage private ownership of these institutions. In these efforts, A.I.D. supplements the activities of international organizations, notably IBRD, which has always been very active in this field (e.g., a recent $17,500,000 loan to a private development finance company in Morocco).

Recommendation No. 16: Status in February 1966

"We urge the United States Government to approve a proposal to permit the IFC to borrow up to $400 million from the World Bank for investment in private enterprise in the less developed areas; and we urge approval of the provision eliminating the need for the guaranty of such transactions by governments in the country of investment."

Congress has now approved the proposal that the IFC be authorized to borrow up to $400 million from the World Bank. (The provision for host country guaranty had been eliminated sometime ago.)

The necessary amendments to the IFC's Articles of Agreement entered into force on September 1, 1965 after adoption by the IFC Board of Governors. The necessary amendment to the World Bank's Articles of Agreement came into force on December 17, 1965 after adoption by its Board of Governors and acceptance by the required number of member countries.

IFC is now a shareholder in 14 development finance companies in 12 countries. With its new authority, it will be able to play a substantially increased role in private sector development.

Recommendation No. 16: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 17: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID review its policies with a view to *widening the use of United States-owned local currencies;* and in that connection, that it give serious consideration to the greater use of those currencies for increasing the capital base of financial intermediaries of both the commercial and cooperative types."

A.I.D. has created a task force to study ways in which more U.S. controlled local currencies can be used to increase the capital base of various kinds of financial intermediaries. From FY 1957 through FY 1964, A.I.D. has channelled the local currency equivalent of $773 million to intermediate credit institutions, primarily to industrial, agricultural and housing banks.

U.S. Controlled local currencies are in excess of our requirements for other U.S. Government use in only ten countries. Of these, potential applications of the kind recommended by the Committee seem feasible in India, Pakistan and the United Arab Republic. A change in A.I.D. policy authorized in January of this year now permits the lending of Cooley funds to U.S. banks overseas and their affiliates to be used for sub-loans to private borrowers. This channels local currency to the small investor who needs it and assures that control management of the lending operation funds is in competent hands. We have already authorized three such loans to a U.S. bank in Pakistan and are considering others in India.

Recommendation No. 17: Status in July 1966

No change. See No. 15 above.

Recommendation No. 18: Status in February 1966

"We urge the Administration to consider the possibility that any United States *tax credits* extended by treaty or legislation to the direct investments of United States investors in less developed countries, such as the 7% and 30% credits proposed in Section 2, also *should be extended to the portfolio investment of United States corporate or institutional investors,* wherever such investments meet the eligibility criteria which would apply to direct investments."

We are reviewing this recommendation as part of the overall analysis of fiscal incentives referred to in the discussion of Recommendation No. 11.

Recommendation No. 18: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 19: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID tailor its specific risk guaranties to permit their easier availability to United States buyers of selected issues of foreign private enterprises. Among the possibilities which AID should explore is: arranging for the application of such guaranties through negotiation and agreement with the underwriters rather than with the ultimate buyers, thereby sparing the buyers the cost and difficulty of direct negotiations and ensuring a wider United States market for the securities involved."

A.I.D. is advising the investment community of the advantages and problems of arranging for specific risk guaranty coverage with underwriters. Arrangements are being worked out. No statutory changes are needed, and this can be done. This coverage is feasible, although specific arrangements will have to be tailored to meet the requirements of different kinds of transactions. We believe this is understood by the firms that are active in the international financial community.

Recommendation No. 20: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID offer portfolio investors extended risk guaranties, combining risk-yield features which make selected securities of private enterprises in the less developed countries competitive with the alternative opportunities of such investors."

In our discussion of pending projects, we have proposed varying rates of return on early and late maturities and have attempted to interest institutional investors in something less than 100% coverage of risk. Thus far, we find them interested only in 100% coverage.

Recommendations Nos. 19 and 20: Status in July 1966

A.I.D. has recently drawn up a new form of specific risk guaranty contract for use in conjunction with extended risk guaranty contracts. This new form of contract is for use by lenders who are financial institutions or banks. It greatly simplifies the provisions involved and applies directly to the notes so that the guaranty contract is transferable and eliminates many of the difficulties in negotiations over a specific risk contract which might occur. The result should make specific risk guaranties much more easily available to U.S. buyers of certain kinds or notes of private enterprises abroad.

A.I.D. continues to explore possible applications of Recommendation No. 20. To date, however, we find that institutional investors are only interested in 100% coverage.

Recommendation No. 21: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that, in the administration of its aid programs in the less developed countries, United States representatives be instructed to subordinate other objectives to that of securing the economic and social development of the less developed nations. In this connection, it should be recognized that United States interests are usually best served by testing any project in these terms, rather than in terms of whether the project would affect the competitive position of particular branches of United States industry or United States agriculture."

The foreign assistance program is part of the total U.S. effort to achieve its foreign policy objectives. In general, we agree with the Committee's statement, recognizing, as does the Committee, that there may be cases where other policies and objectives may outweigh the objectives of pure economic development.

Recommendation No. 21: Status in July 1966

No change.

SECTION 4: DEVELOPING HUMAN RESOURCES

Recommendation No. 22: Status in February 1966

"We strongly urge AID, in reviewing and responding to a country's development strategy, to place major emphasis upon the planning, host country commitments to, and the execution of educational programs. In such programs, we urge AID to use every means to tap the rich resources in United States universities, labor unions, cooperatives, business enterprises, professional societies, and other non-governmental entities which have something to offer to the educational process."

A.I.D. fully endorses this recommendation. The desirability of increased emphasis on the place of education in the development process has been recognized by the President in the 1966 Foreign Aid Bill and in the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

Over the years a high proportion of A.I.D. loan and grant funds have gone into educational fields at all levels. Some 350 separate projects in the educational field are now underway, of which approximately 140 are being carried on by U.S. universities under A.I.D. funded contracts.

A.I.D. is attempting to ensure that all possible U.S. private resources be utilized in this field as well. For example, in Latin America 17 Worker Training Centers are being operated by the American Institute of Free Labor Development with A.I.D. funding support.

Recommendation No. 22: Status in July 1966

The Foreign Aid legislation now before the Congress strongly emphasizes educational programs. It, together with the pending International Education Act of 1966, demonstrates that the Administration fully shares the Committee's views.

Recommendation No. 23: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that, in selected cases, AID partially finance the sale of technical, professional or managerial assistance from United States organizations to entities in less developed countries, and that the subsidy contribute not only to the costs of the assisting enterprise but also to the costs of searching out and finding the appropriate source of such assistance."

A.I.D. shares the Committee's view of the importance of insuring an adequate transfer of technical information to enterprises in the less developed countries. There seem to us to be several possibilities for establishing or supporting institutions that can be called upon to carry out this proposal. The program of the International Executive Service Corps, a private organization which in its early years is receiving substantial funding from A.I.D., is very promising. In the fall of 1965, A.I.D. decided to continue funding this project at a substantial level for another year. The IESC is now operating in 20 less developed countries. Approximately 151 projects have been completed, are currently underway, or have had a volunteer assigned. The planned project level for Calendar Year 1966 is 250.

A.I.D. recently has asked VITA (Volunteers for Industrial Technical Assistance), also a non-profit, privately managed organization, to consider the possibility of VITA becoming A.I.D.'s principal source of technical industrial advice in response to inquiries generated from and through A.I.D. Missions.

In selected situations, A.I.D. is subsidizing part of the salaries of U.S. technicians engaged in improvement of operations in host country development banks. A typical example is the A.I.D. contribution which makes it possible for the Industrial Development Bank of the Sudan to maintain the services of a competent U.S. technician.

In Nigeria, A.I.D. has made it possible for the development bank to hire experienced U.S. personnel as loan application reviewers.

Taking the recommendation more broadly, A.I.D.'s technical and financial assistance to productivity centers, business and vocational schools and research institutes help fill the need for this kind of assistance.

A.I.D. loans usually provide for the hiring of technical experts from the private sector to act as advisors.

For example, the loan made in 1965 to two large chemical enterprises in Korea engaged in the manufacture of fertilizer, the Khinhae Chemical Company and the Yongnam Chemical Company, included the cost of U.S. engineering services as part of the loan. A loan to a private Brazilian cement company, authorized in August 1965, provides funds for engineering advice to the borrower.

Recommendation No. 23: Status in July 1966

A.I.D. does not believe that it is appropriate or administratively feasible to involve itself in the selection of particular commercial transactions involving the transfer of technology from a private U.S. firm to a private firm in a LDC which would receive special subsidy support. However, A.I.D. fully shares the views of the Committee on the importance of insuring an expansion of the transfer of technical, professional and managerial assistance. We believe that our efforts should be directed to supporting and strengthening institutional mechanisms which will increase the flow of skills and knowledge.

A.I.D.'s continuing support of the International Executive Service Corps is illustrative of this approach. Current IESC activity is summarized in the following table:

Summary of project activity (as of June 15, 1966)

	Completed	Active	Executive assigned	Other projects accepted	Total
Central America (74):					
Costa Rica	6	1	1	1	9
El Salvador		6	3	9	18
Guatemala				5	5
Honduras	3	1	1	5	10
Mexico				1	1
Nicaragua	6	1	4	7	18
Panama	8	1	1	3	13
South America (27):					
Bolivia				1	1
Brazil	7	1		7	15
Chile	1			1	2
Colombia	1		1		2
Paraguay				1	1
Peru	3		1		4
Venezuela	2				2
Middle East (56):					
Ceylon				3	3
India			1	1	2
Iran	12	7	3	14	36
Lebanon		1		9	10
Turkey			1	4	5
Africa (2):					
Ghana		1			1
Nigeria			1		1
Far East (50):					
Korea				2	2
Philippines	2	2	2	6	12
Singapore		1		4	5
Taiwan	5	1	2	2	10
Thailand	7	6	1	7	21
Total	63	30	23	93	[1] 209

[1] Total count does not include 17 projects which have been withdrawn.

The planned project level for the balance of the calendar year 1966 is 250.

Another illustration of the institutional approach is the current negotiations that A.I.D. is continuing with VITA (Volunteers for Industrial Technical Assistance), a nonprofit organization managed and directed by prominent businessmen and scientists, to provide a technical inquiry service directed primarily to the solution of problems confronting small and medium sized private businesses in the less developed countries.

A.I.D. hopes to enter into an agreement with VITA to provide funding support sufficient to permit the organization to sharply expand its activities.

Recommendation No. 24: Status in February 1966

"We urge AID to actively promote the development of *management schools and vocational institutions* in the less developed countries capable of generating the manpower needed for the management and operation of a society based on principles of private enterprise, cooperative ventures, and other non-centralized enterprise forms. We also recommend that AID survey the possibilities of more extensive use of facilities of American-owned subsidiaries and affiliates in the less developed countries for training purposes; and that it undertake to provide financial support, using local currency as available for such added training activities as these enterprises or other organizations might be willing to undertake with the use of these facilities."

We agree that the shortage of qualified management personnel is a serious obstacle to satisfactory economic development. Although we are supporting a number of management schools and vocational institutions, a broader effort is required. Our successes and failures are now being evaluated.

A three man team from the Harvard Business School supported by A.I.D. and headed by Mr. George Lodge, Director of International Activities, is in Tunisia now assessing the needs for a program to bring the Faculty of Business Administration and Economics of the University of Tunisia to an adequate scholastic level. The school was established under an original A.I.D. loan of $1,800,000 granted in 1963.

In Brazil, the Sao Paulo School of Business Administration, built through an A.I.D.-financed contract, is a successful management training institution with an outstanding reputation in Latin America.

We support the concept and activities of the International Center for the Advancement of Management Education, as well as other private groups. ICAME is in touch with some 55 business schools in 25 countries which have 4,000 full time graduate students, 35,000 undergraduate students and some 3,000 full or part time faculty members.

The American Management Association is assisting A.I.D. informally to investigate the possibility of greater use of American affiliated firms for training purposes and to help us develop an appropriate action program. Thus far, two firms have shown positive interest. Our tentative conclusion is that this kind of program can best be carried out by pooling the resources of several companies located in the same area.

Recommendation No. 24: Status in July 1966

A.I.D. continues to provide funds and technical assistance for the establishment, equipment and upgrading of management, vocational and trade schools. The importance of developing management and technical skills is emphasized in the country programs of virtually all A.I.D. missions, and they are conscious of the need to refine and improve on these projects. As recently as June 27, 1966, A.I.D. authorized a contract under which five members of the faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration will initiate a five-year program for the creation of a Center for Advanced Management Studies in Tunisia. A.I.D. is continuing to canvass the possibility of using American-owned plants in the less developed countries for training purposes and is cooperating with the OECD in making a pilot survey of training activities in the LDC's of private firms. An interim report by the OECD secretariat suggests that there are real possibilities of expanding these efforts through government support of the private firms. A.I.D. believes that joint sponsorship of new institutions, such as accounting schools, by a group of foreign private investors is particularly promising and stands ready to consider appropriate government support.

Recommendation No. 25: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID and the Export-Import Bank review their present policies for extending guaranties and export credits to exports of technical and professional services destined for the less-developed areas, with the object of eliminating any remaining disparities of treatment between exports of services and exports of goods."

A.I.D. and the Export-Import Bank have reviewed their policies in response to this recommendation. The Export-Import Bank is the primary source of guaranties and credits covering export sales of technical and professional services. Early in 1966 it decided to increase its coverage for the export of technical services.

A.I.D.'s Specific Risk Investment Guaranty Program does not cover export sales; it covers long-term investments. However, contracts running longer than five years for the provision of technical and professional services, as well as patents, processes and other technical information, may be covered under A.I.D. programs provided the agreement is not a simple sale of services on current account or short payment terms. Exports of services which are contributed for an equity interest are also eligible for coverage.

Recommendation No. 25: Status in July 1966

The Export-Import Bank has recently indicated that it is prepared to give guaranty contracts against political risks for the equipment of construction contractors while it is abroad. A.I.D. has been willing to write such insurance for a considerable period of time.

Recommendation No. 26: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID finance increased research imaginatively related to the agricultural, industrial, educational and administrative needs of the less developed countries. In some of these fields, such as agriculture, education and administration, the research would no doubt have to draw heavily upon United States resources, of the sort that can be provided by universities, agricultural research institutions and the like; but the experimentation itself would usually take place in the less developed areas themselves and should be directed towards strengthening research institutions and capabilities within these areas. Defining the problems to be studied and identifying qualified research capabilities requires of AID considerably more skill and more effort to involve the less developed countries than has heretofore been characteristic. Some of this activity might be financed by United States owned local currency where available."

An intensive examination of the direction and administration of A.I.D.'s research program in agriculture, industry, education and administration has recently resulted in a reorientation of the program in the direction suggested by the Committee. Research objectives have been more sharply defined and a number of administrative improvements put into effect. For example, research institutions are being developed in the less developed countries. Illustrative is the current planning for an institute of industrial technology and applied science in Korea. Another example is a new combined research and agricultural extension field project in Brazil.

A.I.D., together with the Ford, Rockefeller and Kellogg Foundations, will join in an effort to upgrade the Colombian Agriculture Institute. The effort will be directed at improving research, extension and the supporting educational capabilities. A.I.D., through a contract with the University of Nebraska, will devote itself to bringing the curricula of three Colombian universities into line with the demands for trained technicians that will be occasioned by refinements in the research and extension organizations. It is planned to employ as many as 20 U.S. university professors in the three Colombian schools.

The Agriculture Research Committee of A.I.D.'s Office of Technical Cooperation and Research has approved a Mississippi State University seed production research proposal that is particularly relevant to several of the recommendations of the Report. The project will investigate the reasons why U.S. private seed producers have not expanded their production of seeds in the less developed countries and devise ways of encouraging them to do so. Included in the scope of work will be an intensive study of those factors now apparently acting as a disincentive to further investment in this field and the determination of what changes are in order. The study will be carried out in 23 countries and its deliberations would be assisted by an advisory committee of representatives of FAO and the foundations.

Recommendation No. 26: Status in July 1966

A.I.D.'s Research Advisory Council has recently commended the Administrator for sharp improvement in both the substantive content and administrative conduct of A.I.D.'s research program. Especially noteworthy progress has been made in the agricultural field.

A particular effort is being made to increase the research capabilities of institutions in the less developed countries. A good example is A.I.D.'s support of the newly constituted Korean Institute of Science and Technology. Broad scale support to the Institute is being provided by the Battelle Institute under an A.I.D.-financed contract.

Recommendation No. 27: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID assist in financing the development of appropriate nonprofit institutions in the less developed countries and that it finance the development of links between such organizations and their counterparts in the United States, through which technical assistance could be effectively provided. Assistance of this sort could take many forms, from such familiar activities as assisting educational institutions to supporting public forums and discussion groups. We see this activity, too, as a fruitful possibility for the expenditure of United States-owned local currencies."

A.I.D.'s assistance to existing voluntary agencies, guided by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Aid, has produced excellent results. In many instances the programs of these agencies have changed from charitable operations to technical assistance efforts in a variety of fields. Community development and educational projects are being worked into the programs of the voluntary agencies in increasing numbers. At the field level a start is being made in unified planning between A.I.D. Missions and the voluntary agencies active in each country. Some Missions, Vietnam for example, now have a resident staff member working exclusively on such coordination.

A.I.D. has an increasing number of contracts with cooperative agencies, savings and loan associations, credit and labor unions, which are designed to encourage the establishment of counterpart organizations in the developing countries. The Report has further stimulated this trend. In addition, this recommendation will be given further consideration in connection with Recommendation No. 31.

Recommendation No. 27: Status in July 1966

See Recommendation 31.

SECTION 5: SOME ISSUES OF ORGANIZATION

Recommendation No. 28: Status in February 1966

"We urge the Congress to encourage not only well-conceived project loans but also well-conceived program loans in the administration of United States aid, especially when such program loans would stimulate the local private sector to a greater contribution in the process of social and economic development."

In FY 1966, to date, A.I.D. has authorized six program loans totalling $362,500,000. Disbursement of these loans is generally by installments. The release of each installment is conditioned on achievement by the recipient of specific economic performance criteria and reforms, many of which are designed to stimulate the private sector such as monetary stabilization measures and import control liberalization.

Recommendation No. 28: Status in July 1966

During Fiscal Year 1966 A.I.D. authorized 13 program loans totalling $822 million.

Recommendation No. 29: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID expand and improve its organization both in Washington and in the principal missions abroad so that it is appropriately staffed with persons who, by experience and competence, are capable of acting as an effective conduit between the private sector and the official aid organization. In this connection, we urge AID to take steps to establish a basis for co-opting men from the private sector for rotation back to their permanent organizations after a tour with AID."

Starting in 1962, A.I.D. has made a particular effort to respond to the concerns reflected in this recommendation. A number of experienced business executives have been brought into the Agency either as direct hire personnel or as consultants. Mission and Washington private enterprise organization is being continuously studied. Recently Korea and Thailand Missions have expanded their private enterprise staff and realigned certain other duties to bear more on private sector development. The Turkey Mission is planning to have a private enterprise officer resident in Istanbul.

In each of the principal missions one or more senior private enterprise officers have been designated. The Agency's Fiscal Year 1967 budget submission and Fiscal Year 1966 manpower allocations reflect an increase in mission direct-hire staffing for projects affecting private enterprise, and increased use of contractor personnel from private American institutions, although total Agency direct-hire staffing will remain virtually level through Fiscal Year 1967, except for Vietnam.

In Washington, the Africa Bureau of A.I.D. has split off private enterprise activities from the Capital Development Office. This new Office of Private Enterprise will report directly to the Assistant Administrator for Africa.

In the Bureau for the Far East and in the Bureau for Near East and South Asia, the functions of handling capital and technical assistance projects for stimulating the local private industrial sector and encouraging U.S. investment in less developed countries have been consolidated within a single unit headed by a senior officer. In the Bureau for Latin America, the region where lesser-developed countries' private sectors are most vigorous, there are separate units for housing and urban development, loans to private enterprise, cooperatives, labor and marketing programs.

To be fully satisfactory, a system of co-opting men from the private sector should protect accumulated pension rights and other fringe benefits derived from their permanent organization. However, this creates difficult to resolve conflict of interest problems. A.I.D.'s Office of Personnel, together with the General Counsel, are exploring possible solutions.

Recommendation No. 29: Status in July 1966

The sense of priority which the Committee's recommendations have given to the many facets of our private development programs has been and continues to be reflected in the allocation of positions in Washington and the field and all out efforts to attract the best men to fill them.

Recommendation No. 30: Status in February 1966

"We commend AID for its increasing use of contractors in the handling of specialized tasks and urge the Agency to extend this practice."

The trend towards the use of contractors in the handling of specialized tasks, noted with approval by the Committee, continues. Conversations with the investment banking community are currently underway to explore possible bases for contractor relationships for the purpose of identifying and promoting specific investment opportunities. This is an extension of the well established practice of using management consultant firms. As noted in other parts of this Report, the range of specialized tasks for which A.I.D. is turning to outside contractors in constantly being extended.

Recommendation No. 30: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 31: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that the Administration formulate specific proposals aimed at *creating one or more organizations which could increase the technical assistance commitments of private groups and in time more effectively administer publicly-funded technical assistance programs* in coordination with those which are privately funded. In view of the urgency of the problem, such proposals should be prepared in time for consideration and adoption in next year's AID program."

A task force within the Agency is in the process of evaluating: (a) A.I.D.'s current support of a number of private groups engaged in technical assistance; (b) those areas where A.I.D. purposes are not now adequately served and ways of strengthening the capacity of the professional community to serve them; (c) existing institutions which might provide the base upon which to build one or more autonomous groups as recommended in the Report; and (d) A.I.D.'s internal organization and method of dealing with the non-Federal technical assistance resources in an effort to improve this relationship.

The recommendation has also been discussed with the Advisory Committee on Economic Development composed of leading professionals in development economics and social science. The task force has begun a series of interviews with professional operating personnel and appropriate institutions and individuals outside the Government for their views. From these investigations will be drawn action recommendations for the Administrator.

Recommendation No. 31: Status in July 1965

The Agency has two evaluations underway related to both Recommendations 27 and 31:

1. An appraisal of A.I.D.'s internal structure for working with the increasing number and variety of non-government resources in the development program.

2. An evaluation of the mechanisms outside the Agency which are being used to encourage and enlarge the available resources—in the academic community, the business, industrial, labor, savings and cooperative fields.

As a result several tentative proposals have emerged. These will be considered by the executive staff at an early date and in the light of new language included in the Foreign Assistance bills now before Congress.

Recommendation No. 32: Status in February 1966

"(1) We commend AID on its initiative in seeking the creation of a binational nonprofit foundation in India. We urge AID to press forward with this experiment as a matter of high priority.

"(2) We urge that, if initial indications are encouraging, the experiment be repeated in other countries where local conditions are favorable."

In the Message on International Education and Health of February 2, 1966, *the President said:*

"We have at our disposal excess foreign currencies in a number of developing nations. Where conditions are favorable, I propose that significant amounts of these currencies be used to support *Bi-National Educational Foundations.* Governed by leading citizens from the two nations, they would have opportunities much like those afforded major foundations in the United States to invest in basic educational development."

Recommendation No. 32: Status in July 1966

No change.

Recommendation No. 33: Status in February 1966

"We recommend that AID draw up a plan for staffing the recommendations proposed in this report, and that the Congress and the Executive Branch give sympathetic consideration to the AID proposals."

It is too soon to establish an overall plan for staffing the recommendations contained in the Report, and it is probable that this can best be done piecemeal, as work proceeds and different projects are worked out. The requirements of each Regional Bureau, Staff Office and Field Mission are constantly changing. However, the Committee's recommendations have created a sense of priority for this work which can be expected to be reflected in the allocation of positions and in an intensification of our efforts to attract the best men possible to fill them.

Recommendation No. 33: Status in July 1966

In addition to the central office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise, many other organizational units in A.I.D. are deeply involved in private sector development. The broad range of the Watson Committee recommendations cuts across our geographic and functional units. Accordingly, it has not proved feasible to draw up an over-all staffing plan keyed to each of the Committee's recommendations.

CONCLUSION

The Advisory Committee's Report is of real value to A.I.D. It is functioning as the framework for further development of private enterprise programs. Its words of encouragement are reassuring; its conception of what can be achieved will spur us to greater efforts.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTLINE OF WORK IN RESPONDING TO RECOMMENDATION NO. 1—KOREA

[Department of State Cablegram]

To: AID/Washington.
From: AID Mission in Korea.
Subject: Private Enterprise Study.

1. USOM has reviewed in detail Watson Committee Report and Reference Airgrams. Study program to be undertaken in Mission devised against background accomplishments, current and planned activities.

2. Focus on investment climate improvement most timely and fits well into Mission strategy and program goals as set forth in recently submitted CAP. In fact such study recognized by USOM as integral part Mission emphasis on export development and modernization industrial sector. Many actions under these headings, as well as much of ongoing activities in public administration area bear directly on and are logical parts of program to improve investment problem.

3. In past year Mission has repeatedly brought to attention of ROKG and business leaders need for good investment climate for both domestic and foreign investment. After decade reconstruction and erratic but unspectacular progress, Korea past two years achieved relatively high rates economic growth, considerable reorientation economic policy in direction and ways conducive to improved investment climate. Past year ROKG taken number steps improve basic economic structure—floating of exchange rate, liberalized import procedures, stabilization measures which have diminished steady inflationary trend of recent years, liberalization of interest rates. Further improvements necessary include savings inducement, improved credit management, financial institutions restructuring, tax revenue improvements, promotion private sector. Also need continuous refinement stabilization measures insure price stability while investment and operating expenditures are met. Need wider Government acceptance value long-range planning, techniques to provide proper blending public, private development plans as vital factor for effective use domestic, foreign resources. In addition, significant positive factor is relative stability of Cabinet and Bureau Chiefs who have now been in office long enough to have gained confidence which in turn has resulted in increased ROKG attention to policy matters rather than expedients. Governmental stability also important to confidence of business community in word of Government. USOM notes improved Government-business relations, particularly where MCI involved. USOM feels accomplishments plus achievement goals cited should result in sharp change economic climate. Growing confidence country entering period accelerated growth.

4. Following studies to be conducted: (Some will require longer than 90 days to complete.)

A. Analysis all applicable business laws.

B. Survey existing financial institutions; effect on private investment.

C. Current participation businessmen in Government: at what levels business views heard; what degree response to legitimate business needs?

D. Study of and action needed to set up institution for aggressive investment promotion: structure, functions, location, staffing.

E. Definitive evaluation business education and training.

F. Survey labor practices, manpower availability, capabilities.

G. Analysis export and domestic marketing practices use of credit instruments.

H. Analysis recent business failures.

I. Current foreign investments Korea: how initiated problems encountered, how solved.

J. Procedural flow-chart of foreign investment from visa application to start of production.

K. Survey Korean business attitude re foreign investment.

L. Survey Japanese investment opinion re Korea.

5. In conducting studies plan utilize ROKG research capabilities, Government organizations and certain extent business community, as well as available Mission talent. Anton's mid-December arrival be most helpful this regard. Proceeding before October 30 to complete assignments and lay groundwork with ROKG and others for collaboration on study, will advise details. Success in enlisting ROKG energies will in itself be indicator of possible basic problem that while Korea preponderantly private enterprise country, traditional business-government relations characterized as adversarial. Government exerts heavy pressure on business while not providing in many areas services which Government should provide and at same time exercising self restraint necessary allow business make business decisions.

6. Suggest considerable benefit possible through exchange studies from other Missions result Watson Report. Also request AID/W study Korea reputation in U.S. investment community determine actions necessary improve Korea image to alter from popular concept of country engaged in hostilities in 1950s and on semi-permanent sick list. In addition, FYI all USOM divisions requested review proposed activities in latest E–IS to determine practical actions within scope each project area which can contribute to growth private enterprise and improvement investment climate.

AID'S ORGANIZATION IN SUPPORT OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Responsibility in A.I.D. for encouraging and coordinating private participation in the developing process is shared by geographic and functional units at the central staff, regional bureau and field Mission levels.

Primary responsibility for promoting private American investment in developing countries rests in the central Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise. This Office, headed by an Assistant Administrator appointed by the President, administers the Businessmen's Information Center, Catalog of Investment and Opportunities, and the Investment Survey, Specific Risk and Extended Risk Guaranty Programs. This Office also provides central leadership for the Agency's efforts to promote private enterprise, both local and foreign, within developing countries. In addition, this Office is concerned with the Agency's policies and procedures for dollar and local currency ("Cooley") loans to private borrowers. The Administration has assigned to the Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise responsibility for coordinating the Agency's response to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid ("Watson Committee").

The Agency's other central staff offices also work closely with the U.S. private sector—with universities, foundations, voluntary agencies, labor unions, professional organizations and cooperatives.

At the regional level, each of A.I.D.'s four geographic bureaus has staffs to facilitate private sector activities. The Africa Bureau has a separate Office of Private Enterprise reporting directly to the Assistant Administrator for Africa. In the Bureau of the Far East and the Bureau for the Near East and South Asia, capital and technical assistance staffs responsible for stimulating the local private industrial sector and for encouraging private investment are located in a single unit headed by a senior officer. In the Bureau for Latin America, separate units have been set up for housing and urban development, loans to private enterprise, cooperatives, labor and marketing programs. These capital and technical assistance staffs in the regional Bureaus, concerned with private enterprise, have their counterparts in A.I.D.'s Missions in the developing countries.

In its efforts to facilitate private participation in development, the Agency benefits from the advice and counsel of a number of advisory committees representing the U.S. private sector. These include the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs, the Advisory Committee on Aid-University Relations, the Housing and Urban Development Advisory Committee, the Cooperative Advisory Committee, Labor Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance and the Advisory Committees on Voluntary Foreign Aid and Health Manpower. The General Advisory Committee has established a separate Subcommittee on the Private Sector, chaired by David Rockefeller. This Subcommittee has a continuing interest in A.I.D.'s response to the Watson Committee's recommendations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is not the principle the same as the amendment that the Senator from Oregon cosponsored with the Senator from New York in the last 2 or 3 years?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. That is what produced the Watson committee report. It is the landmark in this field. Now, we were taking it one step further and giving a President's Committee a statutory base and mandate to see to the implementation of the Watson Committee recommendation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I continue to support those objectives, and I associate myself with the proposal.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that I support the amendment of the Senator. I think that the language in the amendment strengthens the language in the present House bill. I think it would be helpful in securing additional supervision in the domestic and private industry section of the foreign aid bill. I think that we need it badly.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the language of the Senator's amendment, I was under the impression that it was the same as the language of the other body.

Mr. JAVITS. It is, but they made a mistake in one word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the word?

Mr. JAVITS. They used the word "members" instead of the word "number." It is a typographical error.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was the same.

Mr. JAVITS. In line with the explanation which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] made, when we do it here we are keying it directly to the Watson Committee report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to the amendment. It is intended to be the same as the House of Representatives language.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Except for that word.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. (Putting the question.)

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

(At this point, Mr. Clark assumed the chair.)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], I am offering an amendment to the pending foreign aid authorization bill, S. 3584, to provide a 2-year authorization for the economic side of the foreign aid program, rather than the 1-year authorization which was reported from committee.

A similar amendment has also been proposed by Senators Javits, Fong, Harris, Inouye, Moss, and Nelson, who I understand will now want to add their names as cosponsors of the amendment Senator Sparkman and I are offering. We welcome their participation on the amendment to provide a 2-year authorization for the economic aid program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is a wise and objective lesson which demonstrates that we are not all tigers in pursuit of every headline that is around. We believe this measure would be best served from within the committee itself.

I have talked with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee,], who suggested to me that he and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would sponsor this amendment if it were agreeable to us.

I will consult with my cosponsors overnight, inasmuch as this has come up rather suddenly. On behalf of myself, as the principal sponsor, we do want to have it agreed to. We will have a chance to debate the issue as it goes along.

I am happy to join with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] in this effort.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from New York. I shall not speak at length on the measure. I will speak with regard to the matter tomorrow when it is the pending business.

At this point I would explain that the amendment provides a 2-year authorization for every aspect of the economic assistance program. It does not affect the military assistance program which, of course, will be before the Senate in a separate bill at a later date.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a technical explanation of the amendment as well as the text of the amendment.

There being no objection, the explanation and the amendment were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment for 2-Year Bill

This amendment (1) provides authorization for all assistance categories for 2 years, rather than 1, at the same authorization level for each year as that provided in the committee bill for the one year; (2) authorizes extended risk and Latin American housing investment guaranties for two more years, rather than 1; and (3) extends for 2 years, rather than 1, the requirement for the use of half of development loan and Alliance loan funds to encourage development through private enterprise.

The individual changes made are as follows (In several instances the amendment provides for striking "the fiscal year 1966," rather than striking "1966," as in the Committee bill, so that the language "each of the fiscal years . . ." may be substituted for "the fiscal year . . .", the plural being appropriate for a multiyear bill.):

Page 4, lines 5 and 6—Provides authorization for development loans for 2 years.

Page 4, lines 9 and 10—Extends requirement that not less than 50 percent of development loan funds be available to encourage economic development through private enterprise for 2 years.

Page 6, line 18—Provides authorization for technical cooperation and development grants for 2 years.

Page 6, line 22 and Page 6, line 23—Provides authorization for American Schools and Hospitals abroad for 2 years.

Page 7, line 16—Authorizes extended-risk investment guaranty program for 2 years.

Page 8, line 9—Authorizes the Latin American housing investment guaranty program for 2 years.

Page 10, lines 11 through 17—Provides authorization for the Alliance for Progress for 2 years.

Page 10, lines 19 through 21—Extends requirement that not less than 50 percent of Alliance loan funds be available to encourage economic development through private enterprise for 2 years.

Page 13, line 4 and Page 13 line 5—Provides authorization for the use of not to exceed $50 million of funds made available under the Act for purposes of the Southeast Asian Title for each of the next 2 years.

Page 14, line 2 and Page 14, line 3—Provides authorization for international organizations and programs for 2 years.

Page 14, line 22 and Page 14, line 23—Provides authorization for supporting assistance for 2 years.

Page 15, line 5 and Page 15, line 6—Provides authorization for the contingency fund for 2 years.

Page 21, line 3 and Page 21, line 4—Provides authorization for A.I.D. administrative expenses for 2 years.

Page 21, lines 6 and 7—Provides authorization for State Department administrative expenses for 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator call up his amendment?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr Clark] may be joined as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on another matter——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that is out of order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think, if the Senator would yield to me, that the regular order would be served if I asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who happens to be presiding in the chair at this moment, may be joined as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it was my understanding that no Senator, even presiding in the Chair, could be deprived of his rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair understands, but in view of the amenities of the situation, the Chair has no objection to permitting the Senator from New York to make the request, and without objection, the request is granted.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, lines 5 and 6, strike out "for the fiscal year 1967," and insert in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968,".

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "year ending June 30, 1967," and insert in lieu thereof "years ending June 30, 1967 and June 30, 1968, respectively,".

On page 6, line 18, strike out " '1966' and substituting '1967' " and insert in lieu thereof " 'the fiscal year 1966' and substituting 'each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968' ".

On page 6, line 22, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 6, line 23, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

On page 7, line 16, strike out "1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

On page 8, line 9, strike out "1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

On page 10, strike out lines 11 through 17. and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) Strike out in the first sentence the words beginning with "1963, 1965, and 1966," through the words "year 1966" and substitute "1967 and 1968, not to exceed $543,000,000 which sums are authorized to remain available until expended and, except for not to exceed $87,700,000,".

On page 10, strike out lines 19 through 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3) In the final sentence, strike out "June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966," the substitute "June 30, 1967 and June 30, 1968,".

On page 13, line 4, strike out "year 1967," and insert in lieu thereof "years 1967 and 1968,".

On page 13, line 5, after "use" insert "in each such fiscal year".

On page 14, line 2, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 14, line 3, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

On page 14, line 22, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 14, line 23, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

On page 15, line 5, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 15, line 6, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

On page 21, and line 3, strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 21, line 4, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

On page 21, lines 6 and 7, strike out "the fiscal year 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, may I ask the Chair for the parliamentary status of the question? Is the pending business the proposed amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, regarding the AID bill, in general, let me suggest, in terms of the AID budget request and the program now pending, that we should more carefully focus on the application of that program and its emerging consequences in southeast Asia in general and in Vietnam in particular.

It was my opportunity to make a recent visit over there a few weeks ago—my third trip to Vietnam—at which time I took it upon myself to look at the AID projects in particular, especially the newly emerging constructive programs which we are seeking to bring into being in the wake of the pending military moves which are now looming larger than ever on the horizon.

Because the military side of this question makes for, let us say, more fetching headlines from day to day, occasionally we lose sight of the nonmilitary efforts which have long been underway in that war-smitten part of the world.

When I was first there in 1959, there were serious programs underway even then, undertaken against overwhelming odds. Because of the many other forces that worked, the total effect of those programs, for example, in the realm of land reform, community reorganization, or reinstitution of many community activities in some areas of the country, were not given a full opportunity to come into play.

Even so, the seeds sown in those early economic programs are now beginning to bear fruit, many years later, and we are benefiting and profiting from those long-term measures which were undertaken in the early days of the Diem regime.

I mention this, because it is a commonplace generalization—and an inaccurate one at best—to suggest that we have been able to get nowhere with economic development in that part of the world.

The hard fact is that the faces of many of the small villages in South Vietnam have already been materially changed because of our economic indulgences there many years ago.

The fact is, one of the main reasons for the sharpening of guerrilla activities and the sudden decision, through the National Liberation Front, to move into Vietnam when they did in the early 1960's seemingly was to throw off balance the economic gains even then being made.

Their hopes, through sowing dissent, confusion, and disaster, to capitalize on the distraught conditions in that part of the world, seemed to be disappearing as viewed at least in Hanoi and points further north.

Therefore, there are those who make a rather substantial case that would suggest the prime reason for the precipitate moves from the north into South Vietnam, when they occurred, were to arrest the economic progress even then being made in 1959 and 1960.

All of those efforts stem from the AID programs that had earlier entered that part of the world. But even with the disruptions that have followed since, and the harsh criticism which has attended the projects of the program in Vietnam in the years which have followed, those gains continue to mount.

A few weeks ago, it was my observation, while in Vietnam, to note that AID had expanded the areas of its concern, and was witnessing an increasing impact in measurable results as a consequence of its endeavors.

Suffice it to say, as a reminder that in the long pull there would have been no military answer in Vietnam—and perhaps I am permitted to say that, in view of my position on that question—but there must be a military shield behind which the answers that civilized peoples everywhere ask time to work out then actually take place, that the ultimate answers in southeast Asia will have to be found in the social, eocnomic, cultural, ethical, philosophical, and diplomatic fronts.

Mr. President, the effort of the Agency for International Development to promote peace and stability in Vietnam has received too little publicity. In fact, AID's support of social and economic development in Vietnam has as much importance in the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict as our military efforts.

Communist aggression exploits the growing expectations for change and progress among peoples of underdeveloped countries. In Europe aid under the Marshall plan helped to strengthen the nations of Western Europe so as to provide sufficient strength and stability to stop Soviet aggression in that area. However, after the Communists took over China our resolve was tested first in Korea and now in Vietnam. We need to check in Vietnam the extension of Communist power in order to maintain a reasonable stability in a precarious world.

In Vietnam the Communists are deliberately exploiting, under a cloak of social revolution, the problems of underdevelopment that the South Vietnamese Government and its people face. These problems are illustrated by the fact that only 45 percent of the population is literate and the annual per capita gross national product amounts to only $115. Communist guerrillas attempt to drive a wedge between the people and the government by well-organized terrorism, intimidation, agitation and military force. The guerrillas cut off the hand of local government—in order to devastate any hope for governmental assistance—by its campaign of assassination of local officials. For example, in 1964 the Communists killed, wounded or kidnaped about 11,000 Vietnamese civilians of whom about 1,500 were local governmental officials. This attack on local government has not slackened. In fact Communist acts of terrorism averaged about 1,700 a month in 1965, reaching a peak in December of 2,500 incidents.

Our AID program is in the frontline position to defeat this revolutionary warfare of the Communists. Unlike the Communists we really believe in social revolution and AID is the prime mover in this area by promoting change and development in rural Vietnam. The United States has joined with the Vietnamese in a common commitment "to the work of social revolution; to the goal of free self-government; and to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease." AID assists the Vietnamese Government, both nationally and locally, to improve its effectiveness so that the problems of underdevelopment can be corrected and a feeling of hope for the future is instilled in the local people. AID's programs of social and economic assistance serves to shore up the morale of the people in the face of these intense Communist campaigns of terror and intimidation by giving the people something for which to fight. In reality the Vietnamese and American military forces provide the shield against Communist attack behind which these processes of national building take place. Peace and stability will come in the long run to Vietnam essentially through these AID efforts.

AID's efforts to promote social revolution complements the objectives of the United States in South Vietnam to support the right of the people to elect their own government freely and to decide for themselves without outside force and coercion their own affairs. In developing the institutions to realize this objective AID is supporting the Vietnamese Revolutionary Development program. This program reconstitutes the fabric of Vietnamese society by protecting the local farmer and meeting his basic needs. In this program AID first assists in the training of Vietnamese cadres and locally elected officials who organize the local farmers to protect themselves against the Vietcong and to improve themselves with AID assistance. Immediate needs of a rural community are met such as the construction of a schoolhouse, bridge, irrigation dam, well, or some agriculture project. These communities—formerly exposed to Communist attack and exploitation—are converted into new life hamlets where the people support the government. AID is assisting in the construction of more than 2,000 of these hamlets this year.

Since four-fifths of the population of Vietnam is composed of farmers, AID has put heavy emphasis on agricultural development. During the years 1954 to 1961, rice production—which uses about 80 percent of the cultivated land—increased 50 percent. Production rose another 12 percent between 1962 and 1965. These increases were achieved through the introduction of improved seed, fertilizer, better techniques and the use of insecticides. For example, the use of chemical fertilizers has increased nearly threefold in the last 5 years. A government subsidy allows farmers, particularly those residing in the new New Life Hamlets, to buy fertilizer on an interest-free loan at less than the commercial market price. Besides rice production, AID has attempted to introduce and promote secondary crops in order to diversify the rural economy and improve the local diet. Improved varieties of sweet potatoes, sugarcane, and corn have been introduced with the assistance of AID technicians and their American field representatives.

To meet the needs in education AID has supported a program of building schoolrooms on a self-help basis. Self-help engenders a sense of community spirit and cooperation to further the process of nation building. Some 2,300 schools have been built in this manner to date. AID-supported teacher training programs at the hamlet level have graduated more than 5,500 teachers in the past 3 years to meet the rapidly growing effort of the hamlet people to construct their own schools. More than 6 million textbooks have been printed for this new school population. AID support has also made gains in higher education and vocational training which is essential to providing the know-how for the expanding industrial sector and the modernization of agriculture. Four polytechnical schools and three vocational agricultural high schools have been established with AID assistance and the goal this year is to enroll 10,000 students in these technical schools.

AID efforts to correct primitive health conditions and lack of rural doctors in Vietnam have also been tied to our overall objectives of improving the effectiveness of the Vietnamese Government's efforts to meet the needs of its people and thereby win support of the people. Village and hamlet health stations have been established and stocked with medicine in nearly 6,000 locations. Nearly constructed maternity clinics and dispensaries have helped extend medical services where previously they did not exist. The threat of epidemics and disease has been reduced through 23 million inoculations for cholera, smallpox, plague, and other disease administered in 1965. Eighty-three percent of the population subject to malaria risk is now protected. Even more important for the long-term health needs of the Vietnamese is the expansion of medical school of the University of Saigon so that it can ultimately graduate 200 doctors annually, which would be one-fifth of today's total number of Vietnamese doctors.

One of the foremost needs of the rural Vietnamese people is protection from terrorism, tax ransom and forcible draft. AID's program to expand and improve the Vietnamese national police force has served to meet this need. Just this year 20,000 policemen are being recruited and trained.

In carrying out these revolutionary development programs AID has assigned field representatives in each of Vietnam's 43 Provinces. These Americans are the frontline of the war of social revolution by acting as catalysts in speeding up the Vietnamese Government's efforts to meet local needs and to gain the support of the people.

Since 1954 there has been a consistent pattern of refugee movement within Vietnam from Communist to non-Communist-controlled areas. Besides the nearly 1 million refugees who fled from the Communist regime in the north in 1954, there have been over 900,000 refugees since early 1965 who have sought Government protection and support AID's refugee relief assist the Vietnamese in relocating these people and providing food, clothing, and shelter.

The predominant factor in the current Vietnamese economic situation is the ever-accelerating increase in demand for goods and service and the consequent shortfall of local supplies in meeting this rising demand. To cope with the growing inflation, AID provides dollar credits through its Commercial Import Program to import commodities to meet shortages. The inflationary pressure is eased while the local currency generated from the sale of these commodities is used to help meet the Government's military and civilian budgets. These AID-financed commodities also provide for the expansion of Vietnam's industrial base.

The United States is not bearing the burden of aid to Vietnam alone, however. Some 34 free world countries are providing assistance. Germany, for example, has made available in loans and grants about $27 million. Australia has provided technical and economic assistance totaling nearly $8 million, and Japan has provided about $55 million chiefly in the form of reparations. More than 10 nations are sending medical teams which help provide for the medical needs of an entire province.

AID, supported by other nations, is fighting with the Vietnamese the battle against underdevelopment which Communist revolutionary warfare is attempting to exploit in its efforts to take control of South Vietnam. AID's support of economic growth, social improvements and new opportunities is dedicated to the development of a Vietnamese nation free of terrorism and coercion in which the people will decide for themselves their own future. AID's efforts toward constructive change and development in Vietnam are essential elements in checking Communists aggression and maintaining reasonable stability in the world during the second half of the 20th century.

In the interests of bringing to bear our concern with our nonmilitary endeavors in Vietnam, I have taken the time of this body to present very quickly and briefly these few thoughts on the AID program in that troubled part of the world.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Friday, July 15, during debate upon H.R. 14596, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, I engaged in a colloquy with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. The Senator from Maryland called attention to a commodity credit loan made to the Arkansas Grain Corp. in 1964, and he stated that:

> The taxpayers lost $6 million. (p. 15837 of the RECORD).

The Senator was mistaken.

The Department of Agriculture advises me that, as of September 15, 1965, the loan in question had been repaid in full, with interest. Furthermore, even if some portion of the loan had not been repaid, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have received title to soybeans pledged as security for the loan.

The Senator from Maryland also called attention to the amount of this loan, $16,353,580.93, and stated that the loan was included in "a complete list of all farmers who received over $25,000 a year in either direct purchases or loans" for the 1964 crop year—page 15821. He neglected to point out that this $16.4 million loan was made to a cooperative enterprise with over 18,000 individual farmer members. Thus, the loan averaged about $900 per farmer.

One effect of the amendment then under discussion might have been to deny to farmers the economies they achieve by joining together as a cooperative, and to deny to the Government the economies it achieves by dealing with one borrower instead of 18,000 otherwise eligible farmers.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland was defeated by a vote of 53 to 28.

TWO FARMERS FROM MONTANA GOING TO VIETNAM AS VOLUNTEERS TO TEACH AMERICAN FARMING SKILLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was delighted that the Senator from Wyoming mentioned the work which the AID program had accomplished.

Today, I notice that under the auspices of the Agency for International Development, the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture is sending eight volunteer agricultural workers to Vietnam.

President Johnson has commended these eight agricultural workers who have volunteered to teach American production skills and farming methods to the farmers of South Vietnam.

As usual, as has been the tradition in the Peace Corps, in the armed services, and in many other agencies of the Government, two of these agricultural extension agents are farmers from Montana. So that this group of farmers who were commended by President Johnson for their service in providing American technical and practical aid to the Vietnamese in their second front war on hunger, poverty, illness, illiteracy, and injustice are being led by two Montana farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of these eight volunteer workers be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clifford A. Ejergo, country extension agent, Whitehall, Mont. Noble E. Dean, county extension agent, Kalispell, Mont. Arthur L. Gehlbach, county extension agent, Bloomington, Ind. Robert H. Dodd, county agricultural agent, Fonda, N.Y.

James S. Holderness, agricultural editor, College of Agrculture, University of Idaho.

Dennis K. Sellers, director, community action area of four counties, Lovering, Mich.

William E. Schumacher, cooperative extension agent, Catskill, N.Y.

Charles E. Wissenbach, county extension agent, leader for 4–H clubs, Hydenville, Mass.

NEW INVASIONS OF THE PRIVACY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for some years the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has been concerned with the rights of Federal employees to due process and fair play where their jobs are concerned. Each year we see some improvements in the protection of these rights through procedural innovations or judicial decisions. But each year, also, in the interest of achieving greater national goals, we see increasing reliance on methods, instruments, and devices which tend to invade basic rights which an employee should enjoy simply because he resides in a democracy under the type of Constitution which America has always boasted. Currently, for every step forward, the Federal Government seems to be taking two steps back.

Attitudes and procedures affecting Federal employees have a way of pervading our whole society, governing the employer-employee relationship wherever it is found. This is especially true today when in the wake of expanding Federal activities private industries and firms hold contracts with the Federal Government which subject their employees to Federal personnel rules and to Federal industrial security regulations. For these reasons the practices governing Federal employees affect not only 2.6 million or more Federal civil servants, but over 10 million public servants throughout Government in the United States and millions more employees in private industry. These citizens represent not only a large part of our population, but a significant segment of our national economy and a sizable piece of Federal, State, and local governmental budgets.

From the reports coming to the subcommittee, I believe there is now being created in the Federal service a climate of fear, apprehension, and coercion which is detrimental to the health of the service and is corroding the rights of Federal employees. It should disturb every American citizen who takes pride in his Government and it should disturb administrators concerned about achievement of substantive goals. Psychological testing, psychiatric interviews, race questionnaires, lie detectors, loyalty oaths, probing personnel forms and background investigations, restrictions on communicating with Congress, pressure to support political parties financially, yet restrictions on all other political activity, coercion to buy savings bonds, extensive limitations on outside activities, rules for speaking and writing and even thinking, forms for revealing personal data about finances, creditors, property and other interests of employees and their families—all of these raise due process questions of a substantive nature, for they increasingly shrink the realm of personal liberty and violate individual privacy.

Taken alone, no one of these practices or policies may be important enough to arouse the sustained concern which is sufficiently widespread to result in a complete study of the sources of discontent and action to resolve them. At the most, there is a temporary interest in the more sensational aspects of the practices, for instance, the sex questions on the psychological tests, while the more complex aspects are passed over. However, in the aggregate, they constitute an imposing and alarming collection of practices and devices with infinite potential for arbitrary personnel decisions affecting the jobs and lives of millions.

Today I should like to direct attention to two of the more recent examples which form a part of this growing series of techniques for surveillance and probing.

MINORITY STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE

The first of these is the minority group status questionnaire which, in the interest of insuring "equal employment opportunity," is currently being administered to Federal employees. This form requires the employee to check a box indicating whether he is "American Indian," "Negro," "Oriental," "Spanish-American," or "none of these."

Mr. President, the purposes of the equal employment program are commendable. I do not believe that the Federal Government should discriminate because of race, color, or ethnic background or for any other reason unrelated to the ability to do a job. This is the principle behind the merit system in our civil service, and I firmly support it. However, I do question the reasonableness of the methods chosen to try to attain some of our stated goals. The goal of equality of opportunity for some citizens does not and should not encompass the denial of personal privacy to millions. In our system of government the traditions of due process and the concept of fairness limit the conditions which government can place on its employment. Why should an employee who considers himself an American be asked to sit down with a questionnaire and check what his race of ancestry might be? Whose business is it? The complaints which have poured into the subcommittee by letters, telegrams, and phone calls suggest that many citizens, not just Federal employees, share my concern. The indignation expressed is based almost entirely on resentment as being asked to supply such information and reflects a deep awareness of the privacy interest at stake here as well as concern over the confidentiality and eventual use of the data.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for the Record excerpts from some of these letters.

There being no objection the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 17, 1966.

Senator Sam Ervin, Jr.,
Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Dear Sir: I am a supervisor with a government agency. On May 21, 1966 we will distribute a punch-card questionnaire to all employees on which they are requested to give information about their race, or national origin. I do not believe that this is proper to request that employees of any government agency reveal information of this nature, which would seem to be of concern only to the individual involved. The instructions accompanying these questionnaires indicate, but not pointedly enough, that the completion of the forms is not mandatory. Even though their completion is not mandatory, most employees would not consider that they have the right to refuse to complete them. I believe that this should be unequivocally pointed out in plain language to all employees.

I believe this to be an unconscionable invasion of one's privacy, and another giant step toward the regimentation and destruction of individual rights in favor of the governmental monolith as so graphically pointed out in Orwell's 1984.

Since we in the government service, that is to say most of us, at least, have no unions to fight this sort of encroachment upon our privacy, we must depend on you. Please do not let us down.

Thank you,

——— ———.

Dear Senator: I recently read where your Senate group on constitutional rights was concerned with the recent poll of Federal employees as to their race. When I was asked to fill out the form I was told it was voluntary, which of course it was. What I really object to is the fact that a list of the names of those who elected not to fill out these ridiculous forms was sent to the regional headquarters of the Federal Aviation Agency in Atlanta. I think this was unfair. This survey should have never been taken and if taken should have been handled by the Civil Service Commission instead of each agency handling it.

Thank you,

——— ———.

DEAR SIR: I have just read David Lawrence column on the New Federal Questionnaire on Racial Classification.

I am the wife of an Air Force man (white), I am white also and our 8 children, all white! We have tried to teach our children to not be too conscious of skin color or religion or buck-teeth but rather to see the real persons. What shall we teach them now? Of course, I am not really asking, I know.

A Questionnaire such as this should never even have been thought of. If there is a job to be done, what matter the color of the persons skin who does it. As far as "racial balance" is concerned, it could become so involved & cost so much money and in the end find no answers. No man, black or white, wants to be regimented or balanced—this is not freedom.

My mind becomes a turmoil the more I think of it but one thing is clear—such a questionnaire may seem unimportant in a way but my reaction is no, no it is wrong!

——— ———.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this new technique is not limited to Federal employees, but was recently extended to private employees when Secretary of Labor Wirtz announced in May a complete reversal of previous Department of Labor policy regarding race identification on employment records. He has said that such identification will now be required on employment records in any situation affecting racial discrimination or membership practices subject to control of the Department.

Secretary Wirtz has said this identification "will always be voluntary" and that procedures are being established to make it clear to any person asked to record his race that it is solely to help fight discrimination. I believe Mr. Wirtz should take a lesson from the experiences of Federal civil servants in this matter of voluntariness.

Despite the fact that the Commission informed the subcommittee that the form was voluntary, that no employee was required to fill it out if he did not wish to do so, the complaints show that this use of the word "voluntary" is mere euphemism. It is totally meaningless. Supervisors, or those charged with administering the program in numerous reported cases did not mention the voluntary nature of the survey; names of those who did not complete the form or return a questionnaire were listed and forwarded—in some cases to regional or head offices—and followup contacts are being made by supervisors to gain compliance. Apparently a number of unfortunate office situations have developed as a result, and employee-management relations reached a low ebb in some cases.

Despite the fact that the Commission assures us the survey reply is confidential, that social security numbers are used instead of names to protect the identity of the individual employee and that replies are placed in sealed envelopes, this is just not so in the many cases reported to the subcommittee. Complete names or the first two letters of names, with social security number and birthdates, are printed on the cards in most agencies, and in one agency, according to reports, employees were denied envelopes.

The inconsistency between Mr. Macy's statement that no employees is required to complete a form and Commission regulations prescribing followup procedures to assure compliance is so glaring as to be ridiculous. Invited to obtain compliance with such ready-made forms as that suggested by the Commission, no administrator worth his salt could afford to be reticent in acquiring replies from his employees.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Commission's form together with a memorandum issued in the State Department by the office of the Deputy Secretary of State for Administration is typical of the type of administrative followup which the Commission directive encourages.

There being no objections, the Commission Directive and State Department June 30 directive were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY,
FOR ADMINISTRATION,
June 30, 1966.

MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Directors and/or Administrative Officers (All Diplomatic and Consular Posts).

From: O/EP—Eddie N. Williams, Special Assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration (and MGSS System Monitor).

Subject: Follow-up on Questionnaires Designating Minority Groups Status (Minority Group Statistics System).

Unusable questionnaires (or no questionnaires at all) have been received from one or more employees of your organization. The names of these employees are listed in the attachment to this memorandum. Also enclosed are new questionnaires and preaddressed envelopes for the employees listed. It is essential that these questionnaires be completed accurately and returned so that a complete and valid record can be established.

After discussion with the employee, the unit supervisor should follow the original procedure in allowing him to complete the form in privacy, seal it in the preaddressed envelope and return it immediately to the Systems Monitor.

Please cooperate in getting these questionnaires completed and returned to this office not later than July 31, 1966. The accuracy of future minority group reports is entirely dependent upon the base of information which the questionnaires establish.

Most employees of the Department have responded forthrightly and enthusiastically to this questionnaire. We hope to receive 100% participation in this voluntary self-identification project which will contribute substantially to the success of our equal employment opportunity program.

Attachments:

1. Questionnaires.
2. Background Information.
3. Reprints on Equal Employment Opportunities.

TALLY SHEET FOR EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRES

Agency or Establishment: ______________.
Office: ______________________________.
Location ______________________________.

Number

1. Questionnaires received ________ ____
2. Questionnaires distributed _____ ____
3. Questionnaires collected _______ ____

If the figures in 1, 2, and 3 are not the same, please explain:

____
____
____
____
____
____
____

____
(*Administrative Officer*)

____
(*Date*)

(Attachment 5 to FPM Ltr. 293-5)

[Exhibit E]

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Followup on Questionnaires Designating Minority Group Status.

From:

To:

Usable questionnaires have not been received from one or more employees of your organization. The names of these employees are listed in the attachment to this memorandum under headings which show the reason why a followup is necessary. Also enclosed are new card questionnaires and preaddressed envelopes for the employees listed. It is essential that these questionnaires be completed accurately and returned so that a complete and valid record can be established.

Employees should have explained to them the reason why their first submission is not usable. After discussion with the employee, the unit supervisor should follow the original procedure in allowing him to complete the card in privacy, seal it in the preaddressed enevelope and return it immediately.

Please cooperate in getting these questionnaires completed and returned as soon as possible. The accuracy of future minority group reports is entirely dependent upon the base of information which the questionnaires establish.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this particular memorandum is sent to the executive directors and administrative officers of all diplomatic and consular posts, together with the names of employees from their organizations who did not return or complete questionnaires. Unit supervisors are urged to discuss the matter with the employee, give him a new form and allow him to complete the form in privacy, seal it in the envelope and return it. Supervisors are told to have the questionnaires completed and returned by July 31. They are then admonished hopefully:

> Most employees of the Department have responded forthrightly and enthusiastically to this questionnaire. We hope to receive 100% participation in this voluntary self-identification project which will contribute substantially to the success of our equal employment opportunity program.

Mr. President, this "voluntary self-identification project" was a pipedream in the mind of its creator. There is nothing voluntary about it. It appears to me that the "voluntary" nature of this questionnaire raises issues similar to the use of polygraphs and psychological tests by Government. When a man wants a job, when he knows that his cooperation or lack of it in such data collecting may mark him in personnel files as well as in his supervisor's eyes, and when a supervisor knows that his own performance in obtaining compliance is being watched, there is implicit in such procedures economic coercion to an employee's consent to this invasion of his privacy.

There is an old Infantry drill regulation which says:

> A request from a superior is equivalent to a command.

I think we have a comparable situation here.

Some people have had the sense not to use the questionnaire. On the eve of the survey in Federal agencies in Hawaii, the Civil Service Commission, realizing the inappropriateness of the questionnaire for people in that State of many racial and ethnic groupings, postponed the survey there indefinitely. Administrators in a few agencies, recognizing the problems inherent in the survey, or lacking automation, have refrained from using the questionnaire and have returned to or continued with the old system of head counting. Under this system the immediate supervisor lists the numbers of minority employees under his supervision. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the following Army regulation describing the procedures the Army is using for over 315,000 employees.

There being no objection, the regulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF ARMY, OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., S–15 July 1966.

In reply refer to AGAM–P (M) (10 June 66) DCSPER–P&R, 20 June 1966.

Subject: Minority Group Study, Reports Control Symbol USCSC 1080.

To: See distribution.

1. Purpose:

The Civil Service Commission, designated by Executive Order 11246, 24 September 1965, to supervise and provide leadership and guidance in the conduct of equal employment opportunity programs in the executive departments and agencies, has requested data on the employment of selected minority group members in the Federal Civil Service, as of 30 June 1966.

2. Coverage:

Reports will include all full-time Department of Army employees (including temporary employees) world-wide who are paid from appropriated funds, *except that employees actually assigned to duty in Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and all foreign nationals outside the United States will be excluded from all reports.* The total personnel reported, therefor, will equal the total full time U.S. Citizen personnel included in the Basic Pay Report (RCS CSGPA-487 (R3)), as of 30 June 1966, as provided in CPR 200, Change 3, dated 14 April 1966.

3. New Features of This Study:

This report incorporates the following new features:

a. A Spanish American minority group designation will be used in lieu of Mexican American and Puerto Rican.

b. Except as provided in paragraph 2, above, minority groups will be reported for all geographic areas rather than for selected areas. For the first time, Alaska will be included.

c. A report on full-time employees paid from *nonappropriated* funds will be required; however, a separate reporting directive will be issued by the Department at a later date.

d. Personnel hired under the Youth Opportunity Campaign for 1966 will be reported in Part 2 of this report.

e. Personnel not identified as minority group members will be included on each report under the heading of "All Others."

4. Minority Group Designation:

a. The minority group designations of race and national origin used in this report are admittedly not anthropologically precise. It is understood also that a count of minority group members by their supervisors has limitations in its accuracy. However, the minority groupings used herein and the supervisory head count method of identifying minority group status are considered to be the most practicable under present conditions.

b. The minority group designation of an individual for this report is that which he considers himself to be, or that which he is regarded to be by others in the work environment or community. It is reasonable to assume that discriminatory considerations would not enter into the employment of a minority group person if his personal characteristics (visual, language, etc.) are not definite enough for the supervisor to identify him within the minority groups listed in paragraph d, below. Consequently, specific scientific definitions of the respective groups would not increase accuracy beyond that obtainable through the supervisor's first-hand knowledge of how his employees are regarded as to their group affiliation.

c. In view of the above, there will be no identification of the individual employee at any point in this reporting process beyond the first line supervisor. Neither is it desired that the supervisor seek confirmation from the individuals involved of the minority group designations he makes. Each supervisor will forward to the civilian personnel office only the number of employees under his supervision which he identifies with each of the minority groupings listed below, and the pay category of each member so identified:

(1) Negro—Persons having visual characteristics of this group and who are so regarded in the establishment where they work or in the community where they live.

(2) Spanish American—This group includes persons of Latin American, Puerto Rican, Mexican or Spanish origin or ancestry.

(3) American Indian—Persons who are regarded in the establishment or community as members of this group and those who so designate themselves. Differentiations based on the amount of Indian blood need not be attempted by the supervisor.

(4) Oriental—Employees who are regarded in the establishment or the community as members of this group, which includes persons of several national origins; e.g., Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, and other much smaller groups—Koreans, Polynesians, Indonesians, etc.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this procedure at least has the advantage of assuring that an employee is numbered as a member of the group he appears to society to represent, and avoids the problem of identification for any dossier. And it appears to me to produce more accurate results. The subcommittee has been told that many employees and groups are refusing to complete the questionnaire for one reason or another. In some cases entire offices have refused to fill out the form; in others, members of minority groups have considered the questions offensive and refused. Under the circumstances, the goal is frustrated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following letter, for instance, reprinted in the July 20 issue of the Federal Times, which is typical of many received by the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERING WITH MACY

ATLANTA, GA.—In a recent article in Federal Times regarding the controversial Civil Rights questionnaire, it was reported that Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission stated that social security numbers rather than names would be used to protect the identity of the individual employee.

I beg to differ with Mr. Macy in this matter as the questionnaire submitted to me contained name, social security number and complete designation of the employing unit. I refused to complete the questionnaire and I was constantly harassed until I had to state that I would not complete it. At this point I was informed that it was not mandatory that the form be completed, but that it was mandatory that the questionnaire be returned to the supervisor.

I was greatly disturbed over the tactics employed in this matter, and it would be interesting to hear of experiences from some other Federal employees.

For obvious reasons, I cannot sign this letter nor identify the agency in which I am employed.

READER.

Mr. ERVIN. Joe Young verifies this in his column in the Washington Star, July 17, reporting that Negro as well as white Government employees are voicing increased concern and resentment over the administration's use of the race questionnaire. I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.), Sunday Star, July 17, 1966]

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT: RACE QUESTIONNAIRES RESENTED BY NEGRO AND WHITE EMPLOYEES

(By Joseph Young)

Negro as well as white government employes are voicing increased concern and resentment over the Johnson administration's use of race questionnaires in the federal service.

The postal service, which employs the largest number of Negroes in government, as well as other federal agencies are receiving increasing complaints from Negro employes over the use of the questionnaires. Employes are asked to list their race and national origin.

White employes previously registered their protests, many of them listing themselves as "American Indians" to show their disapproval of the program.

Negro employes are now complaining also, many of them on the basis that such information could be used by supervisors and management people to discriminate against them in promotions.

Ironically, the administration says the race questionnaire is, in the words of Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy, "essential for agency management in fulfilling its responsibility to insure equal employment opportunity in the federal service."

White employes are suspicious that the purpose is to set up a quota system for promotions that would assure Negroes a specific percentage of promotions whether they qualified for them or not.

Negro employes are suspicious that such data on race and ethnic groups would fall in the hands of the wrong people who would use such data to deny them promotions.

Macy says the entire data will be used for statistical purposes only.

Sen. SAM ERVIN, D-N.C., chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, whose group is investigating the situation, has grave doubts about the program.

ERVIN feels the questionnaires "invade the privacy" of individual government employes and that there are no safeguards against the information's being used against individual employes if supervisors want to discriminate.

One thing is certain. Nobody is happy about the program.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Young also notes that "white employees previously registered their protest, many of them listing themselves as "American Indians" to show their disapproval of the program. I might add parenthetically that we need no such questionnaire for evidence that massive discrimination is practiced against the American Indian. The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee in its 5-year study of the rights of the American Indian, has found that the same Government denies the Indian such basic constitutional rights as the right to counsel and jury trial. It takes very little perception to see that equality of opportunity is nowhere within his reach.

The alleged purpose for the changeover in the method of gathering information is the efficiency of automation and the ease with which such information can be computerized. I fear that in the long run we may be surrendering more in individual rights than we gain in economy. These questionnaires should be recognized for what they are—part of the vanguard of the era of the dossiered man. Whereas the stopgap solution for problems used to be "establish a commission," it is now "make a statistical survey." With automatic data processing this is even more rampant. The increasing use of computers for data processing provides an irresistible temptation to feed them all sorts of survey data demanded from employees and other conveniently organized groups. I believe Congress should act now to check this trend, while the concept of a Federal Data Center is still in the planning stages.

I do not presume to know the answers to all of the problems raised by use of the questionnaire. The most obvious solution is to stop using it. I do feel that in planning this program to gain statistics, not enough consideration was given to the sentiments, reactions, and feelings of individual employees and to the individual's interest in protecting his privacy regarding his race or ethnic background. At the least, the established procedures as well as the elements of coercion inherent in the process suggest a lack of awareness by civil service management of some basic principles in our system of government. At the most, they suggest a deliberate and conscious decision to override those principles in the interest of a convenient personnel "short-cut."

In May, I described to the Civil Service Commission the complaints which the subcommittee had received, pointed out the administrative coercion and the privacy issues involved, and I requested that they reconsider the use of the questionnaire. I also noted the inconsistency between the questionnaire and the Commission's May 1959 directive prohibiting inquiry about the race or religious belief of employees or applicants.

Chairman Macy replied recently that the Commission has reexamined the minority statistics procedures in light of my comments and still "finds them both essential and proper" to their carrying out their responsibilities under the equal employment opportunity program." Regarding the 1959 policy, he states that such inquiries were prohibited to prevent use of the information for discrimination against the employee.

He writes:

> It is not designed to prevent a government agency, which is responsible for furthering the government's nondiscrimination policy, from collecting statistical information on the nature and extent of the employment of minority group members, when such information is to be used to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the Equal Employment Opportunity Program.

The logic of this argument escapes me.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the Civil Service Commission's Federal Personnel Letter 293-5 of March 4, 1966, which established the minority group statistics procedures, together with a copy of the questionnaire and the correspondence between the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and the Civil Service Commission regarding this matter.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1966.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL MANUAL SYSTEM LETTER
FPM letter No. 293-5.

Subject: Minority Group Statistics System.

Heads of Departments and Independent Establishments:

I. INTRODUCTION

Executive Order 11246 reemphasized the responsibility of the head of each executive department and agency for establishing a positive and continuing program to promote the full realization of equal opportunity applicable to every aspect of Federal employment policy and practice. The Executive order charged the Civil Service Commission with providing leadership and guidance in the conduct of these programs and for reviewing agency accomplishments.

It is desirable to make use of all available statistical information about the status of minority employment in order to assist management in carrying out the affirmative actions needed to achieve full participation by minority groups. The minority data available since 1961 generally has been only that obtained by head count in the annual census requested by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The majority of Federal agencies have more detailed personnel data, maintained continuously up-to-date on ADP equipment, which would be extremely useful in advancing the affirmative purposes of the EEO program if it could be correlated with minority group status, i.e., it would permit statistical analyses by occupation, sex, length of time in grade, etc. The former PCEEO had pilot research done by the Department of Agriculture which determined that it is entirely feasible to add minority group identification to an ADP personnel records system in a manner which protects the confidentiality of the self-identification and assures that it cannot be used for discriminatory purposes. Accordingly, the Commission has authorized agencies, by part 713 of the regulations to establish and maintain records of employees' minority group status in automated systems. Agencies are also authorized to establish manual records of minority group status under prescribed conditions.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this letter is to prescribe procedures for gathering and maintaining data on minority group employment under the conditions of confidentiality specified in part 713 of the Commission's regulations, whether an automated, a manual (visual record) or a head count system is used. Agencies planning to institute automated or manual record systems are urged to act promptly to obtain and incorporate the self-identification data so as to be prepared to furnish statistical reports from the new system by the time of the annual census, June 30, 1966. Agencies will be expected to provide the report data through head count if they do not have an automated or approved manual system established by that time. Part III A below specifies the minimum controls necessary for each of the three systems; part III B pertains to ADP or manual record systems only. Part IV offers suggestions for establishing automated or manual systems which conform with the requirements, while part V applies to head count systems.

III. MANDATORY ITEMS

A. General

1. Agency heads will designate in writing a responsible official, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, or his deputy, to act as system monitor. He will be responsible for direct surveillance over the operating system, whether automated, manual record or head count, *to insure compliance* with the provisions of this letter.

2. Automated or head count systems which are in accord with the mandatory items of this letter may be implemented without prior approval of the Commission. Proposed manual systems must be submitted to the Commission (Attention: Management Systems Division) for prior review and must have Commission approval before they are implemented.

Agencies seeking exceptions to the mandatory items will submit justification in a written request to the Commission (Attention: Management Systems Division). Requests from individual installations and activities will be forwarded to the Commission through agency headquarters. Prior Commission approval of exceptions must be received before they are implemented.

4. The minority group designations used will be: American Indian, Negro, Oriental and Spanish-American. (These are the same categories as prescribed for private industry by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under title VII of the Civil Rights Act and by the Labor Department's Office of Federal Contract Compliance for government contractors.) For the purposes of this program, the term "Spanish-American" means persons of Latin American, Puerto Rican, or Spanish origin or ancestry.

5. The system must be such that statistical reports which relate the data on minority groups to other meaningful data about employees may be compiled. As a minimum, these items must include the following data elements:

Sex, Birth Date, Service Computation Date, Pay Plan, Occupation Code and Grade or Level, Salary or Pay Rate, Effective Date of Current Grade or Level, Name and Address of Organization to Which Assigned.

B. Automated and manual (visual record) systems

1. The complete system for collecting source data, maintaining currency, insuring confidentiality, and controlling the output of information must be reduced to writing.

Manual system descriptions will be submitted for prior approval as provided in A.2. above. An information copy of ADP system descriptions will be sent to the Civil Service Commission (Attention: Management Systems Division).

2. The system must encompass the following elements:

(a) The employee, himself, will be requested to provide information about his minority group status on a card questionnaire. Exhibit A is a sample of the card to be used. (This card will be published as a Standard Form in the near future. Agencies will reproduce their own supplies prior to its issuance as a Standard Form.) The employee's self-designation will determine whether he is included in one of the four designated minority groups. All employees who are not included in one of the minority groups listed will be identified as "None of These".

(b) *Every full-time employee* on the rolls as of the date the system becomes effective, whether or not in a pay status on that date, *will be requested to provide information about his minority group status.*

(c) Appropriate followup procedures may be established to obtain information from employees who do not complete the questionnaire or who give unusable answers. However, no employee will be *required* to provide information about his minority group status and no disciplinary action will be taken against an employee who does not furnish the information.

(d) The completed cards will be treated confidentially during their collection and processing and no unauthorized person will have access to them.

(e) In automated systems, the cards will be destroyed as soon as practicable after the information is entered on the tape or punched cards. In both ADP and manual systems, the recorded data whether on tape, punched cards, or visual cards, will remain in the custody of or under the control of the system monitor.

(f) The system will be so designed that it normally will be necessary to ask the employee for information about his minority group status only once.

(g) The minority group status of appointees after the date of the original census will be determined at the time of the accession. New employees will be asked to complete a card questionnaire, following the same procedure as in the original census. They will not be *required* to furnish the information, nor will adverse action be taken for their refusal to do so.

3. Records and reports.

(a) The record established will comprise all full-time employees. Incorporation of other than full-time employees is optional with the agency as long as they can be excluded in reports to the Commission.

(b) All requests for reports or printouts of minority group statistics from the record, other than those prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, will be reviewed by the system monitor. He will base his approval or disapproval on a determination of whether the report contributes to the achievement of the objectives of the equal employment opportunity program, while protecting the confidentiality of individual minority group designations.

(c) Records which identify the minority group status of employees will be physically located outside the personnel office, under the control of the system monitor.

(d) The system monitor will insure that a file is maintained of the following:

(1) A copy of the system description as required in B.1. above.

(2) A copy of each request for a new or different type of report or printout, the date of the request, the reason for it, the use to be made, and the signature of the requesting official. The action of the system monitor approving or disapproving the request will be shown on the file copy.

(3) A copy of each report compiled.

(4) The records required by (2) and (3) above will be retained for two years, or until inspected and disposal approved by the Civil Service Commission representatives, whichever occurs first.

This file will be maintained in such condition that it can be inspected by representatives of the Civil Service Commission.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR ESTABLISHING AUTOMATED OR MANUEL RECORD SYSTEMS

The suggestions below are for guidance only; their adoption in whole, in part, or in modified form is optional with the department or agency. They are based in part on the results of the pilot study conducted by the Department of Agriculture mentioned previously.

A. Conducting the census

1. Prior Publicity and Discussion. The first step in instituting a system will usually be to communicate clearly and simply the purposes and procedures of the new system. Exhibit B is an example of a bulletin directed to the management level. The publication might be followed by a meeting with representatives of the constituent units to elaborate upon the information published in the communication, to resolve any questions and to get feedback. The sample bulletin can be adapted as a separate issuance to inform employees.

2. Collection of Data. The second stage will be collecting source data to establish the record.

(a) Exhibit B contains the details of a suggested method which meets the mandatory requirements.

(b) Unit supervisors will have a most sensitive role in collecting the data. Specific written instructions, such as those in exhibit C, will be needed for them. They should fully understand and support the purposes of the census and the procedures to be used in carrying it out. They should be prepared to answer questons of their employees and to bring about good understanding and acceptance. Training, in addition to written instructions, may be desirable.

(c) The sample tally sheet shown in exhibit D will help to insure that the supervisor gives proper attention to accounting for questionnaires as they are distributed and collected from employees.

3. Followup on Missing or Unusable Questionnaires. Questionnaires may not be received from some employees because they are overlooked; other employees may turn in partially completed, illegible or otherwise unusable questionnaires. One way to follow up in these cases is through the use of a memorandum, such as the one in exhibit E, to which a list of the names of employees necessary to follow up on is attached. Names of employees may be listed under headings which explain the reason why followup is necessary. The procedure to be used, essentially the same as in the original census, is explained in the sample memorandum (exhibit B).

4. Record Maintenance and Report Preparation. The procedures for conducting the original census and obtaining minority group data from subsequent accessions, as explained in exhibit B, will be the same for both ADP and manual systems. Some practical method for keeping the minority group file current after the original census and for relating the information in it to the personnel data elements on which reports are to be based must be established. The manner in which this is accomplished on ADP equipment will, of course, be governed by the type of automated system the agency is operating.

One way for setting up a manual minority group file, keeping it current, and preparing reports from it is described below.

When employee returns are received, the system monitor's office sorts the cards into five categories: American Indian, Negro, Oriental, Spanish-American, and None of These. Cards marked None of These may be placed in an inactive file or discarded. Cards marked to indicate one of the minority group designations are used to establish the minority group status file.

Cards completed by new hires are sent to the system monitor who adds those of employees indicating minority group status to his file. Others may be placed in the inactive file or discarded.

For personnel actions other than accessions, the file may be updated from the Standard Form 50, or equivalent. The simplest way to do this is for the system monitor (or an employee outside the personnel office acting for him) to review the chronological file of personnel actions immediately prior to collecting data for the report. Pen-and-ink changes on the cards may be used to record name changes and corrections to name, birthdate or social security number. Cards of separated minority group members are removed from the active file.

Another way to maintain currency is to have all personnel action documents affecting name, birthdate, or social security number and those effecting separations channeled through the system monitor. Pen-and-ink changes can be made and cards removed, as appropriate.

When reports are to be compiled, the personnel office makes available the personnel records (service control file or official personnel folders) which are needed. The compilation of data for reports must be done by employees outside the personnel office. The status of each minority group employee in relation to the element being reported on, e.g., grade, occupation code, etc., may be determined and tabulated. Most reports will be based on statistical comparisons between minority group employees and all employees with respect to the elements which are reported on.

V. HEAD COUNT SYSTEMS

Agencies electing to continue to rely on head counts will generally follow the same procedures as in the past. Supervisors will compile the necessary employee data from visual observation of the employees in their units. Minority group designations will be reported only in the form of statistical data, without identification of individual employees.

NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Executive Director.

Attachments: 5.

EXHIBIT A: ATTACHMENT 1 TO FPM LTR. 293-5

MINORITY GROUP STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE

(Surname———. Date of Birth———. Social Security No.———)

To Employee:

1. Please read the statement on the other side of this card if you have not already done so.

2. Check the one block below which best describes your race or national origin:

[ ] American Indian
[ ] Negro
[ ] Oriental
[ ] Spanish-American
[ ] None of These (Check this block if you are other than listed above.)

3. After you have checked your answer, return this card according to the instructions given by your supervisor.

To Employee:

The Federal government and your employer want to be sure that every individual whatever his race or national origin gets fair and equal treatment. To do this, we need to know how many minority group employees there are, what kinds of jobs they hold, what grade level their jobs are, and other things that will show whether or not there is discrimination. Minority group records are being set up for this purpose.

You are asked to help by checking the block on the other side of this card which describes your race or national origin. Your answer will be kept confidential and will not be used against you in any way.

EXHIBIT B: ATTACHMENT 2 TO FPM LTR. 293-5

BULLETIN

Bulletin No.

Subject: Establishing and Maintaining a Record of Minority Group Status.

PURPOSE

This bulletin explains a new system for collecting and maintaining information on the minority group status of employees with this agency. The system, which has the approval of the Civil Service Commission, will provide statistics for minority group reports and will eliminate the need in the future for "head counts" of minority group members.

More importantly, the new system will provide information in greater detail than has been available in the past; information needed to measure progress in providing equal opportunity to all employees, including members of minority groups. With better statistics, we will be able to pinpoint and eliminate discriminaton that may exist in specific areas and thus provide a practical means for affirmative action. In brief, the information will be used to insure that all actions that affect employees of this agency are taken on the basis of merit alone, without regard to race or national origin.

Safeguards will be installed to prevent the reporting of information which identifies an individual employee by his race or national origin. Employees will be fully protected against the use of the records, themselves, as a means to discriminate against minority group members.

COLLECTION OF ORIGINAL DATA

To get the new system underway, we will prepare a card questionnaire for each full-time employee as of (Date). These cards will be delivered to (appropriate agency office) with a supply of preaddressed envelopes, "Instructions to Supervisors", and tally sheets to control the questionnaires issued to and collected from employees. A number of blank questionnaires will also be included. These blanks will be used to prepare cards for new hires employed between (date same as above) and the date of the census, so that every full-time employee, as of the census date, will have a card questionnaire. Cards received on employees who are separated prior to the date of the census should be returned uncompleted, with the reason for return clearly shown. The card questionnaires will be distributed to unit supervisors, and on the census date, (show date census to be conducted), each supervisor will furnish cards to his employees. The employee will be asked to complete his card in privacy, seal it in the preaddressed envelope which will be furnished him, and return it to the supervisor immediately. If the employee does not wish to complete the card, he will not be required to do so, but will be asked to return it and the unsealed envelope to the supervisor.

The envelopes containing the questionnaires will be turned in daily by the supervisors to the (system monitor). Normal bulk mailing practices will be followed, if mailing is necessary.

Supervisors will maintain a record so that they can complete the tally sheet attached to the "Instructions to Supervisor" within two weeks after census date. Only in exceptional cases should there be any difference between the number of questionnaires received and the number returned. All tally sheets will be collected by two weeks after census date and delivered to (system monitor).

We expect that some of the returns will be unusable because the employees do not fill them out properly or not at all. These unusable returns will be sorted out and returned with instructions for appropriate followup.

SUBSEQUENT COLLECTION OF DATA

We will need to know the minority group status of each new employee hired after the census date. The blank card questionnaires will be used for this purpose. Each new full-time employee, including temporary, will be be asked during his processing to complete one of the card questionnaires in privacy, seal it in an envelope, and return it with his other processing papers. The Personnel Office will send the sealed envelope to (system monitor).

CONCLUSION

This is an important undertaking which will require the full support of all concerned to insure full understanding by employees and to establish a complete and accurate record. Once the information is on record, it will be kept current so that it will not ordinarily be necessary to ask either the employee or his supervisor for the information again. With your cooperation, we will have more complete and accurate statistical foundation upon which to base actions and programs to improve the utilization of our human resources through the operation of a true merit system without regard to race or national origin.

EXHIBIT C: ATTACHMENT 3 TO FPM LTR. 293-5

SUPERVISORS' INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR PROCESSING EMPLOYEE CARD QUESTIONNAIRES DESIGNATING MINORITY GROUP STATUS

Enclosed are card questionnaires which your employees are to use to designate their minority group status. A preaddressed envelope is furnished for each card. Please check the cards to be sure there is one for each employee under your supervision. If not, notify the Personnel Office at once for further instructions. Also check the name, date of birth, and social security number for accuracy and make pen-and-ink changes as necessary. When you have an accurate card for each employee, enter the total number of cards in the tally sheet which is attached to this instruction sheet.

On (date of census), deliver the card questionnaire and one of the preaddressed envelopes to each employee. Answer any questions he may have, then give him an opportunity to complete the questionnaire in privacy, seal the card in the preaddressed enevelope, and return it to you. No employee will be required to complete the questionnaire against his wishes and no disciplinary action will be threatened or taken for his failure to do so. You are to turn the sealed envelope in to the (system monitor) the same day that the employee completes his questionnaire.

You may have employees who are not available on the date the cards are to be completed. If you know the employee will return within two weeks of the date, hold his card until he returns and ask him to complete it immediately upon his return. If he will not be available within two weeks, return the card to the Personnel Office.

As the questionnaires are completed and the envelopes returned to you, keep a running tally. When all envelopes have been returned, enter the total on the tally sheet. The tally sheet must be completed by (2 weeks after census date) in any event. If all questionnaires are not returned by that time, explain the reasons in the space at the bottom of the tally sheet, sign it, and return it to the (system monitor).

EXHIBIT D: ATTACHMENT 4 TO FPM LTR. 293-5

TALLY SHEET FOR EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRES DESIGATING MINORITY GROUP STATUS

Agency or Establishment: ———.
Location: ———.

	Number
1. Questionnaires received__________	______
2. Questionnaires distributed________	______
3. Questionnaires collected__________	______

If the figures in 1, 2, and 3 are not the same, please explain:

——— ———,
(Unit Supervisor).

(Date.)

EXHIBIT E: ATTACHMENT 5 TO FPM LTR. 293-5

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Followup on Questionnaires Designating Minority Group Status.
From: ———.
To: ———.

Usable questionnaires have not been received from one or more employees of your organization. The names of these employees are listed in the attachment to this memorandum under headings which show the reason why a followup is necessary. Also enclosed are new card questionnaires and preaddressed envelopes for the employees listed. It is essential that these questionnaires be completed accurately and returned so that a complete and valid record can be established.

Employees should have explained to them the reason why their first submission is not usable. After discussion with the employee, the unit supervisor should follow the original procedure in allowing him to complete the card in privacy, seal it in the preaddressed envelope and return it immediately.

Please cooperate in getting these questionnaires completed and returned as soon as possible. The accuracy of future minority group reports is entirely dependent upon the base of information which the questionnaires establish.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
May 17, 1966.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of May 3, which we acknowledged on May 10, you raised several questions about the use of a minority group status questionnaire in the Equal Employment Opportunity Program. I am glad to respond to your questions.

It is not mandatory that employees fill out the questionnaire. Employees are asked to fill out the questionnaire so that the data may be entered into computers and combined with other personnel data. Social security numbers are used instead of names to protect the identity of the individual employee.

Inclosed is a copy of our FPM Letter No. 293-5 of March 4, 1966, which gave instructions to Federal agencies as to how the minority group statistics system would operate. Heretofore, such statistics were gathered annually by a "head count" made by supervisors. We feel that the use of automatic data processing equipment by agencies that have this capability will produce more valid statistics. Use of ADP has the further advantages of: (1) insuring confidentiality; (2) permitting the employee, rather than his supervisor, to designate his race or national origin; and (3) providing the means for a more penetrating occupational analysis of minority group employment.

The second sentence on page 4 of the inclosed FPM Letter 293-5 instructs agencies as follows:

"However, no employee will be *required* to provide information about his minority group status and no disciplinary action will be taken against an employee who does not furnish the information."

Again in the proposed instructions to supervisors (Exhibit C of FPM Letter 293–5), there appears a similar statement in the third sentence of the second paragraph:

"No employee will be *required* to complete the questionnaire against his wishes and no disciplinary action will be threatened or taken for his failure to do so."

It was our feeling that these quoted statements should get the point across that this is an entirely voluntary effort. However, we do need a sizeable response from employees in order to have really useful data.

I appreciate the concern about invasion of privacy. The automated system is set up in such a way as to protect the identity of the individual. At the same time, those employees who object to filling out the questionnaire on any ground do not have to fill it out.

The minority group categories shown on the questionnaire represent the groups whose members have filed complaints of discrimination in significant numbers. We are striving for a time when there will be no valid basis for such complaints, and no need to maintain statistics on the employment of minority group members.

The purpose of the minority group statistics system is to provide some solid basic data, in lieu of the inexact data we have had so far, to help determine those areas of Federal employment in which there may be denial to minority group members of an equal opportunity for employment. There is no intent to compromise the principle of open competition for civil service jobs in any way or to establish a quota system for any group. We are firmly committed to combat discrimination against a majority group as well as against minority groups.

If you wish additional information about the statistics system, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr., *Chairman.*

Text of Senator ERVIN's letter to Chairman Macy.

MAY 24, 1966.

DEAR MR. MACY: Thank you for your letter of May 17 describing the purpose of the Minority Group Status Questionnaire which is being circulated to all Federal employees.

Despite the assurances expressed in your letter, several aspects of this questionnaire continue to disturb me.

The Subcommittee was pleased to learn that the Commission has no intent to compromise the principle of open competition for civil service jobs or to establish a quota system for any group. Unfortunately, however, regardless of intent, I fear that this ultimately may be the unavoidable result of such a process as you are inaugurating. I sincerely doubt the wisdom of any such attempt to categorize millions of Federal workers and their families by race or ancestry. It would seem that extreme care must be exercised at all levels to insure that the new system does not serve to increase the very problems which you seek to alleviate. I am not at all sure that we have in government people who are sufficiently equipped to deal with all of the problems which can arise under such procedures, or that it is possible to train them adequately for the job.

The many letters and telegrams received by the Subcommittee from individuals and organizations indicate a widespread concern throughout the county over the government invasion of personal privacy represented by this questionnaire. In balancing the interests, I think you may find on reconsideration that the value of privacy being affected here is far more important to our society and to the principle of the dignity of the individual which we have always sought to promote than are the time and effort saved by the use of such a personnel short-cut.

You state in your letter that the replies are voluntary; however, I invite your attention to the various provisions in your regulations for obtaining compliance and for follow-up checks by supervisors to insure full participation in the census. In one instance reported to the Subcommittee, field employees of an agency were told the questionnaire was voluntary, yet a list of names of those who elected not to complete it was sent to the regional office. To my mind, the "voluntary" nature of this management tool raises issues similar to the use of polygraphs and psychological tests by government. When a man wants a job, when a supervisor knows the success of his performance may be noted, it might be said that there is implicit in such procedures a form of economic coercion to the employee's consent to such an invasion of his privacy.

For these reasons, I was particularly alarmed to discover that these questions are being asked not only of present employees, of which there are about two and a half million, but that they will be asked of all future applicants, which will mean countless thousands in the years ahead.

It would appear, furthermore, that the policy which is being initiated with this questionnaire contradicts the Commission's letter of May 11, 1959 (C2–19) which prohibits any inquiry concerning the race or religious beliefs of employees or applicants. The Subcommittee would like to know, therefore, whether or not that regulation has been rescinded and, if not, how it can be reconciled with your regulations of March 4 authorizing the questionnaire.

The major points I wish to stress are these: The purpose of the questionnaire and the motives behind this new policy are, I am sure, commendable and worthy. The Federal government should not discriminate because of race or color or ancestry. I do, however, question the reasonableness of the methods chosen to try to attain the goals. The goal of equality of opportunity for some citizens does not and should not encompass the denial of personal privacy to millions. This is especially true when there is no proof that the information solicited will be of any relevant or overriding value to the nation or to the operation of government, or that it will be instrumental in achieving the goals of public policy as expressed by Congress.

In the light of these comments, I hope that the Commission will reconsider the advisability of using the Minority Group Status Questionnaire. I would be interested in receiving your views on these matters.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR., *Chairman.*

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am glad to furnish our views on the further questions raised in your letter of May 24 concerning the minority group statistics system prescribed for Federal departments and agencies.

The principal questions relate to the reasonableness or propriety of obtaining statistical data on the employment of members of minority groups in the Federal work force, which involves the matter of personal privacy, and whether such data will be relevant and instrumental in achieving the goals of equal employment opportunity pursuant to public policy as expressed by the Congress.

It is our experience that data on current minority employment is essential information for agency management in fulfilling its responsibility to ensure equal employment opportunity in the Federal service. It has proved extremely useful in appraising employment practices ever since the first statistical survey was directed by President Kennedy in Executive Order 10925, dated March 6, 1961.

The Congress recognized the propriety and necessity for such data by directing private employers, in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to make and keep such records relevant to the determination of whether unlawful employment practices have been or are being committed, and to make such reports therefrom, as are prescribed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The same Title provided that it shall be the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees and that the President should utilize his existing authority to effectuate this policy.

The minority data requirements established by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for reporting by covered employers were established after extensive consultation with representatives of the employers and other interested parties and the public hearing prescribed by the Act. They call for data reports showing the total number of employees and the number of American Indian, Negro, Oriental, and Spanish American employees, by specified occupational categories. Employers are authorized to obtain the necessary information either by visual surveys of the work force or, at their option, by the maintenance of post-employment records as to the racial or ethnic identity of employees. In the latter case, however, the EEO Commission recommended that any such records maintained be kept separate from the employee's records available to those responsible for personnel decisions. The same rules were established for Government contractors covered under Executive Order 11246 and for employers participating in the Plans for Progress program.

The minority group statistics system established by the Civil Service Commission for Federal employees, under Executive Order 11246, covers the same minority groups and follows the same pattern of maintaining data as described above. Being mindful of the desirability of preserving personal privacy to the maximum extent possible, our regulations specify—where data is being gathered by employee questionnaire—the conditions of employee option, privacy in completing the questionnaire, and confidentiality in collecting and maintaining the data outside the normal personnel process, as reported in my May 17 letter. A point which my letter apparently did not make clear is that the minority statistics system does not apply to applicants but only to employees in the Government.

We are concerned, of course, to see that these safeguards are carefully preserved in the operation of the system. If any of the complaints received by the Subcommittee allege a violation of the safeguards, which are mandatory, we would appreciate very much your sharing them with us so that we can make a prompt investigation.

The follow-up provisions in the system are for the purpose of insuring that employees have not been overlooked in the distribution of questionnaires or merely neglected to return them, and to correct questionnaires that are incomplete or illegible. This procedure is normal in statistical surveys and is not intended to compromise the voluntary character of surveys. If an employee returns the questionnaire telling his supervisor that he does not wish to complete it, there should be no follow-up to the employee. Even if another questionnaire should be sent to this employee, he need only return it again uncompleted to his supervisor.

The Commission's letter of May 11, 1959, prohibiting inquiries into the race or religious beliefs of employees provided that such inquiries were permissible when required for employment surveys. The general prohibition on inquiries into race or religious beliefs stems directly from Section 4.2 of Civil Service Rule IV. Section 4.2 is designed to prevent persons from ascertaining, through inquiry, the race or religious beliefs of any individual employee because the information may be used to discriminate against the employee. It is not designed to prevent a government agency, which is responsible for furthering the government's nondiscrimination policy, from collecting statistical information on the nature and extent of the employment of minority group members, when such information is to be used to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the Equal Employment Opportunity Program.

We have reexamined the minority statistics procedures in light of your comments and find them both essential and proper to our carrying out our responsibilities under the Equal Employment Opportunity Program.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr., *Chairman.*

Mr. ERVIN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following articles: "Lollypop Equality," an article by W. O. Rittenhouse in the June 15, 1966, edition of the Government Employees Exchange; and article, entitled "Under Fire: Race Check on Federal Workers," from the May 23, 1966, edition of U.S. News & World Report; and a column by David Lawrence entitled "Questionable Questionnaires." All of these are enlightening, perceptive analyses of the meaning of these questionnaires.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Government Employees Exchange, June 15, 1966]

LOLLYPOP EQUALITY

(By W. O. Rittenhouse)

The May 18, 1966, issue of *The Exchange* gave a full report on the "Minority Group Status Questionnaire" which was added to the Federal personnel record keeping system by FPM Letter No. 293–5, dated March 4, 1966. Under instructions issued by the Civil Service Commission, all full-time Federal employees are expected to complete a card form, checking one of four blocks which best describes their race or national origin. The fifth block is reserved for *"None of These."* Related statistical reports required by the FPM Letter include "Effective Date of Current Grade or Level."

BACKGROUND

Some years ago, candidates for Civil Service examinations were required to attach their photographs to their application forms. In some cases, this served to identify distinctive racial differences when applicants were considered for jobs. Beyond the point of hire, the record keeping system then in effect made no provision for identifying the race or national origin of employees.

Later, one of the minority group organizations objected—and properly so—to the use of photographs. Photographs were eliminated, and Federal agencies were instructed by the Civil Service Commission to stop using any informal type of coding system on application forms which might serve to identify a candidate's race. This and related events combined to form the cornerstone for what now is known as the "Equal Employment Opportunity" program in Government.

There was an abrupt about-face on identifying job applicants and employees by race, beginning in about 1961. Periodically, Federal agencies were required to furnish data on minority employment based only on a head count. Occasionally, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity requested some or all agencies to furnish "flash reports," due within a matter of several days, on the number of Negroes hired and promoted. The cost to taxpayers was staggering. Think of this in terms of one of the military departments. Several high paid employees in the Washington headquarters had to spend hours on the phone contacting their command headquarters, scattered throughout the world, to outline information needed. There were more telephone calls from the command headquarters to their many subordinate bases. And all of this was repeated in reverse to get the data back to the Washington headquarters.

The new questionnaire form will eliminate the costly head count. It will also encourage racial consciousness and create morale problems.

UNHINGED CLASSIFICATIONS

The classifications listed in the questionnaire form, for the most part, must be the product of an unhinged imagination. "American Indian" is a proper classification and indicates that the Indian is an American first. They are a great and proud people. Unfortunately, they represent a relatively small segment of our total and Federal-employee population. To the knowledge of this column, this is the first time American Indians have been identified in Civil Service statistics as members of a minority group.

The next category is "Negro." This is a proper racial identity, but there are Negroes scattered throughout the world. The same is true of the third classification, "Oriental." Unlike Indians, Negroes and Orientals are not identified as American Negroes or American Orientals. They have contributed much to our society. Have they not earned the right to be classified as Americans?

The next designation is "Spanish-Americans." Is this a special category of people who consider their national origin more meaningful than their American citizenship? Americans of Spanish descent and the peoples of other national origin who came to our shores and became citizens of the United States are, and have reason to be proud of their citizenship.

The final classification is a catch-all for the faceless American, "None of These." Apparently, this includes Americans of British, Irish, Italian descent and so on down the alphabet. It includes the peoples of Europe and elsewhere who came to America to seek freedom from political or religious persecution. It includes the peoples who went through troubled times, but who helped each other. They grew in numbers as America became known as a haven for freedom-loving people, and now form the largest segment of our population. These and other peoples who have made America great have been stigmatized as "None of These."

"NONE OF THESE"

What does "None of These" mean? Does it mean that "None of These" have reason to expect equal treatment when it comes to getting a government job or being considered for promotion?

Many employees in government are shocked by the possible implications of the questionnaire. They know there is relatively little question of discrimination in hiring and promoting individuals in the classifications listed. They ask whether a few have been included as window-dressing to obscure the real purpose of collecting and reporting minority group data. They wonder whether this will encourage over-zealous, crusading officials in government to translate "equal employment opportunity" into "political opportunity" or "racial balance." All responsible citizens—even including the "None of These"—do not like the political overtones obvious in an attempt to reach a "racial balance" in government employment.

Discrimination because of racial or other identity is an evil. It exists in all societies. It cannot be eliminated overnight. The cure is not to encourage racial consciousness, nor to identify the large segment of our population as "None of These." An attempt to reach a "racial balance" in employment and promotional opportunities is an over-simplification of the basic problem. It bears the mark of its manufacturer too clearly. It compliments neither the giver, nor the receiver of the special consideration implied. As an objective, it disregards the human dignity characteristic of Americans who prefer to get ahead by hard work, determination and devotion to duty.

QUESTIONABLE QUESTIONNAIRE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Racial consciousness, which has long been deplored, is likely to be encouraged unwittingly by a new move just taken by the federal government. A card has been issued to all government employes to set up a racial classification, though for some unexplained reason it lists only certain races and nationalities. "A minority group status questionnaire" is being handed to every employe with the requirement that it be filled out with his surname, date of birth and Social Security number. The card reads as follows:

LISTS ONLY CERTAIN RACES

"To EMPLOYE:

"1. Please read the statement on the other side of this card if you have not already done so.

"2. Check the one block below which best describes your race or national origin:

( ) American Indian
( ) Negro
( ) Oriental
( ) Spanish-American
( ) None of these (check this block if you are other than listed above.)

"3. After you have checked your answer, return this card according to the instructions given by your supervisor."

On the reverse side of the questionnaire is the following message:

"To employe:

"The federal government and your employer want to be sure that every individual whatever his race or national origin, gets fair and equal treatment. To do this, we need to know how many minority group employes there are, what kinds of jobs they hold, what grade level their jobs are, and other things that will show whether or not there is discrimination. Minority group records are being set up for this purpose.

"You are asked to help by checking the block on the other side of this card which describes your race or national origin. Your answer will be kept confidential and will not be used against you in any way."

Many government employes are astounded by the nature of the questionnaire, and some of them are asking why there is no reference to other racial groups, such as Polish-American, Greek-American, Italian-American, or to any religion. Since the questionnaire ignores these classifications, it gives the impression that a few have been mentioned as window-dressing and that the real purpose is to obtain information as to the number of Negroes and whites actually employed. Certainly it is not assumed that, in the offices of those agencies of the government where there is a predominance of Negroes, any employes will be discharged to make room for whites, but some of the latter are concerned nevertheless that they may be removed to permit more Negroes to get jobs.

The use of the questionnaire among government employes could mean that before long, the government would issue the same questionnaire to every private business, from which a tabulation could be made to determine whether the proper percentage of

Negroes is being employed according to government concepts.

The attempt to reach a "racial balance" through some quota system disregards, of course, whether an employe holds his job by reason of merit or because of discriminatory practices. The emphasis now apparently is on whether there is discrimination because of race or color. The same reasoning can be applied by the government to deal with any religious discrimination that may exist.

No information has been made available by any government source as to what standards will be used in making the final judgment as to whether "every individual whatever his race or national origin gets fair and equal treatment."

Would it be based on population percentages alone?

QUESTIONS NOT CHALLENGED

The truth of the matter is that, inside the government, there are some crusading officials who believe that "equal employment opportunity" cannot be achieved except by compelling a "racial balance."

The new questionnaire is being studied by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which Sen. SAM ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, is chairman. Concern is expressed that thus far no action has been taken, either through the courts or through legislation, to block the use of the questionnaire which now has been distributed to hundreds of thousands of government employes, together with instructions to their supervisors to obtain the answers.—(c).

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 23, 1966]

UNDER FIRE: RACE CHECK ON FEDERAL WORKERS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Government is running into trouble in its campaign—just getting started—to record the race of every employee and put the results through a computer system.

A growing number of federal workers are refusing to fill out the computer-type cards that have been handed out in the racial survey. Many protest that the questionnaire violates their constitutional right to privacy.

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has expressed concern about the situation. Its chairman, Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr. (Dem.), of North Carolina, has just asked the Civil Service Commission to state "whether or not the survey indicates an intent to establish a quota system for the federal service."

What the law says. Civil-service law prohibits any consideration other than merit and fitness in hiring workers. Up to now, it has been Government policy not to include racial designations on application forms and personnel records.

Nevertheless, since 1961, all federal agencies have been making an annual head count of white persons and Negroes on their payrolls. Supervisors would literally count heads, deciding the race of an employee by his physical characteristics.

One result of this annual head count has been an increase in the number of Negroes hired and the advancement of more Negroes to better-paying jobs.

This year, the Civil Service Commission decided to try the card system for a more accurate count. Going into the computers, the cards will be keyed to the employees' Social Security numbers. Officials said the information would be kept confidential, and used on a group rather than an individual basis.

"If we are to offer equal employment opportunities," a Commission official added, "we need to have some basic data to tell where the soft spots are."

Cards sent recently to hundreds of thousands of U.S. employees stated:

"The Federal Government and your employer want to be sure that every individual whatever his race or national origin gets fair and equal treatment. To do this, we need to know how many minority-group employes there are, what kind of jobs they hold, what grade level their jobs are, and other things that will show whether or not there is discrimination. Minority-group records are being set up for this purpose."

The choices. The employe is then asked to indicate on the card whether he is American Indian, Negro, Oriental, Spanish-American or "None of These."

Asked why the questionnaire was confined to four specific minority groups, a Civil Service spokesman replied that it was in these groups that most complaints of discrimination originate. "We don't have the problem with other minorities," he said.

No employee is required to complete the questionnaire against his will, and he is assured that "no disciplinary action will be threatened or taken for failure to do so."

Senator ERVIN has commented, however, that when an employe is asked to do something by a superior he is subjected to pressure that is hard to resist.

Subcommittee staff members point out that there is to be a close follow-up on the questionnaire, and that supervisors will be asked for an explanation if any employe doesn't fill one out.

What many federal workers are now worried about, they say, is this:

"If I refuse to fill out this thing, will I go down in the records as an un-cooperative employe?"

CODE OF ETHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. ERVIN. The second device for invading employee privacy is the questionnaire requiring disclosure of financial and property interests, creditors, and other personal data for employees and members of their families, to assure that they are not violating the conflict of interest statutes or the codes of ethics. This is not a one-time disclosure. It now must be done periodically. Authority for this new questionnaire is Executive Order 11222, which the President signed on May 8, 1965, prescribing standards of ethical conduct for Government officers and employees.

Here is another example of how the career Federal civil servant—as well as uncompensated expert volunteers—must bear the brunt of a campaign to wipe out some evil or promote some cause in Government. There are over 26 Federal laws dealing with conflict-of-interest matters and most departments and agencies have published standards of conduct for their employees. Civil servants have been held responsible for observance of these statutes and standards and could be reprimanded, dismissed, or prosecuted for violations. While a few agencies required disclosure by special categories of employees, there was no governmentwide disclosure requirement. In the interest of apprehending an occasional corrupt employee, we have now consented to having the private lives of countless civil servants monitored and tabulated and evaluated.

In the process, we seem also to have sanctioned the establishment of counseling systems in the departments so that employees may go to their advisors before they or members of their families engage in outside activities, buy property, or seek credit.

Mr. President, I do not believe Congress would sanction the wholesale invasions of privacy which are possible under this new system. I would yield to no one in my interest in promoting adherence to the highest ethical standards and in prohibiting the appearance of conflict of interest in Government, but I have the gravest doubts about the wisdom of these questionnaires. They offer untold opportunities for Government continually to examine every facet of an employee's life. They sanction a big-brother approach to the employer-employee relation which will seep into every cranny of our national life.

I predict that, if continued unchecked, the present devil-may-care attitude of the Federal Government toward the American citizens who also happen to be its employees, will result in an intimidated, lack-luster, unimaginative and fearful civil service. And I predict that not all the heavily financed attractive recruitment policies of Federal management, not all the pay raise bills passed by Congress, will offset the long-term effects on the operations of Government and on our society.

At the time the order was issued last year, considerable emphasis was placed on disclosure by high-level political appointees, which raises different, if related, problems. But few realized the extent of this questioning, down into the ranks of the civil service and into the lists of thousands of private citizens who serve as unpaid consultants and advisors.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD the following article from the Charlotte Observer by Jay Jenkins which is a subtle and eloquent illustration of the losses which Government can expect to sustain as a result of these questionnaires. This case involves a North Carolina journalist who is one of many newsmen, professors and others who were asked to serve as unpaid consultants to the U.S. Information Agency, and who are now being told this makes them Government employees subject to disclosure requirements.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte Observer, July 6, 1966]

NO-DOLLAR-A-YEAR USIA EMPLOYEE QUITS

(By Jay Jenkins)

RALEIGH.—First, let us fix the scene:

The U.S. Information Agency tapped a number of Tar Heel newsmen, professors and others for the USIA reserve so that in times of emergency we could help continue the functions of the agency.

We are unpaid, unhonored and unsung. The one honorarium we did receive, several years ago, was a week in Washington as the guests of USIA.

It was a sort of introductory training session. Various officials pumped us up about the importance of our mission. We felt like true patriots.

The other day, I, along with the other USIA reservists, received a letter from J. A. Bush, USIA coordinator for emergency planning. The salutation was, "Dear Dr. Jenkins."

Momentarily, I was elated because the "Dr." certainly should improve my credit standing. But the elation died in the first paragraph:

"For some years now you have served as a consultant to the agency. From the standpoint of routine this makes you a government employee and a recent regulation requires certain information of all of us who fall in that category."

Enclosed was a 19-page single-spaced, typewritten document entitled "Uniform Regulations on Employee Responsibilities and Conduct," and a JF-1" form I was asked to fill out and return to Richard M. Schmidt Jr., USIA general counsel.

The JF-1 form was titled, "Confidential Statement of Employment and Financial Interests," and I was told that unless I completed it I would lose my unpaid, unhonored and unsung position.

Presumably also, I would lose my nonexistent status as a federal government employee. The stakes, as you can see, are considerable.

What JF-1 asked was that I list my creditors, my interests in real property, and every dime of my financial holdings. After you get past the creditors, the listing is brief indeed.

Of what possible use to Uncle Sam would be information about a 1963 station wagon with a knock in the motor, a modest deposit in The Observer's Credit Union and two Kennedy half-dollars?

U.S. Sen. Sam Ervin, head of a subcommittee on constitutional rights, has his dander up because the 2.5 million federal civil servants have been asked to fill out the JF-1 form.

"A colossal vote of nonconfidence in the integrity" of the civil service brigade, Sen. Ervin. called it.

When he finds out that the dollar-a-year men, as well as we no-dollar-a-year men, also are being asked to fill out the form, Senator Sam may really blow a gasket.

I was tempted to call a few of my USIA reservist colleagues and ask them to join me in a test case of this thing.

USIA, I quit.

Mr. **ERVIN.** The subcommittee study has shown that the Commission regulations accompanying the Executive order give great leeway to agency and department heads to formulate their own questionnaires, to prescribe the type of information to be solicited and to designate the employees required to fill out the forms and supplement them periodically.

Far from being limited to top-level employees, part 735.403 of the regulations require statements from:

(a) Employees paid at a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established in 1964;

(b) Employees in grade GS–16 or above of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in comparable or higher positions not subject to that Act;

(c) Employees in hearing examiner positions;

(d) Employees in positions specifically identified in the agency regulations as positions in the basic duties and responsibilities of which require the incumbent to exercise judgment in making or recommending a Government decision or in taking or recommending Government action in regard to:

(1) contracting or procurement;

(2) administering or monitoring grants or subsidies;

(3) Regulating or auditing private or other non-Federal enterprise; or

(4) other activities where the decision or action has an economic impact on the interests of any non-Federal enterprise.

(e) Employees in positions specifically identified in the agency regulations as positions determined by the agency head as requiring the incumbent thereof to report employment and financial interests in order to carry out the purpose of law, the Executive Order, this Part, and the agency regulations.

In the Department of Commerce alone, the subcommittee is informed, it is estimated that 3,555 officers and employees will be asked to complete the questionnaires. The complex administrative problems faced by the Office of Civil Defense in deciding who should file statements is reported in an article in the Federal Times of July 13, 1966. I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Federal Times, July 13, 1966]

Army Civil Defense People Wonder How It Happened

Washington.—Employees in the Army's Office of Civil Defense recently wondered how some of their jobs could be covered by the Standards of Conduct directive. They scratched their heads in trying to learn how their positions had any financial impact on the federal government or the private economy. The employees in the GS–13 and higher levels were busy right through June 30 in meeting that day's deadline for filing their financial statements.

Although the Department of the Army had not issued its implementing regulation, AR 600–50, to carry out the DoD directive, civil defense chiefs decided to be bound by the June 30 deadline set by Defense. The Army's regulation will permit reports to be filed by August 15, retroactive to the June 30 deadline.

But William P. Durkee, director of Civil Defense, on May 20 issued a memorandum to his employees, "I have determined that all OCD personnel in Grades GS–13 or above shall file a statement of employment and financial interest by June 30, 1966."

All very proper, agreed an Army official in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. "They had the forms, so they could go ahead," he said. "It will take a while longer for them to reach all of the field commands."

Now that it had been "determined" that the statements were due, several more points were questioned by employees.

The March 22 DoD directive number 550.7 requires financial reports from civilian GS–13 and above, and military of lieutenant colonel of commander rank and above whose duties are in contracting or procurement, auditing or "other" fields.

The public and employees will generally applaud the DoD directive's purpose stating that "Close adherence to these principles will insure compliance with the high ethical standards demanded of all public servants."

Very well, some civil defense employees ask, how about some fair ground rules being laid down by the bosses? Section B of subchapter XV states under "Review of Positions:"

"Each DoD component shall review its positions in Category 4 above military and civilian, and include in each military and civilian position description, or similar document describing the duties and responsibilities of the position, a statement as to whether the incumbent of the position must file a statement of employment and financial interest as required by this section."

These "civilian position descriptions" have been in the process of being rewritten since last September. As the Army told Federal Times earlier, "Job descriptions are being prepared to reflect the current duties and responsibilities required to carry out the OCD mission."

But the new job descriptions haven't been completed, an employee stated: he said OCD is thereby flouting this part of the Defense Dept. Directive.

Feeling now like the baseball manager who always loses the argument to the umpire, some employees this week asked why they must file a statement when their jobs were not connected with contracting or procurement, or auditing.

To which the legal counsel of the OCD handed down the opinion that such GS–13 and higher jobs came under "Other," or "Activities in which the decision or action has an economic impact on the interests of any non-Federal enterprise."

In other words, all federal jobs could have an economic impact on the business economy, an employee concluded.

Still not bowing to this reasoning, an employee who disliked the oblique questioning of his honesty, prepared a list of civil defense positions that have no "economic impact on the interests of any non-Federal enterprise." They include:

Resources officer, digital computer officer, intelligence officer, foreign liaison officer, program analyst, operations liaison, labor liaison (working with unions), special assistant for civil rights.

Program officer, shelter operations plans officer, doctrine and system officer, support systems officer, fire protection engineer, survey and analysis engineer, survey statistician.

Management systems officer, personnel officer, statistics and reports chief, research administration officer, research management analyst, general engineer, program engineer, support system electronic engineer, fire research coordinator, general chemist, social science research analyst, systems evaluation officer, and social science officer.

The employment and financial statements of these 359 employees in grades GS–13 through 15 will be kept in the general counsel's Defense. Records of GS–16 and higher will be sent to the general counsel's office of the Defense Department.

Director Durkee's letter stated the employee didn't need to report "checking accounts, savings accounts in banks and savings and loan associations, or shares in a credit union need not be listed, nor need an employee list his life insurance policies."

But, Mr. Durkee pointed out, "It should be noted that the interest of a spouse, minor child or other member of an employee's immediate household is considered to be an interest of the employee."—Dick Ritter.

Mr. **ERVIN.** In view of the scope of Federal activities today, it is obvious that, far from being limited, this regulation amounts to a mandate for a nationwide probe of the personal affairs of Federal employees, consultants, and advisors, and their families. It places all of them under the rule of administrative judges who will determine whether their conduct and proposed conduct meets the vague standards of each agency's particular program.

I have directed the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to conduct a survey of all Federal agencies and departments to determine how this Executive order is being implemented, just what type of information is being solicited in each agency, what provisions have been made for confidentiality of replies and who in each organization will review the data. I ask unanimous consent to have that survey letter printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE
JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
July 11, 1966.

DEAR ———: As part of its study of the rights of Federal employees, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is investigating the use of questionnaires to elicit information about creditors, property, business, financial and other interests and activities of Federal employees and members of their families.

In this connection, we should appreciate your supplying the Subcommittee with copies of any regulations, memoranda, directives and forms issued by your agency or any of its components to implement Executive Order 11222, Prescribing Standards of Conduct for Government Officers and Employees.

Would you also indicate:

(1) How many employees in your agency and what categories of employees have been or will be asked to complete standard of conduct questionnaires under the Order?

(2) Who in your agency is responsible for soliciting this information?

(3) Which officials review it for violation of the standards?

(4) (a) What administrative procedures have been established to safeguard the confidentiality of the data?

(b) Where is the information deposited when it has been reviewed?

(5) Have you previously utilized similar questionnaires or required such information from your employees? If so, how does the new system differ from your former practices? Please supply copies of earlier forms.

Thank you for your assistance in our study.

With all kind wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
Chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. On June 23 I expressed my deep concern about these matters in a letter to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. I ask unanimous consent to insert that letter in the RECORD at this point, together with Executive Order 11222 and the text of the Commission regulations implementing the Executive order.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL MANUAL SYSTEM LETTER

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1965.

FPM Letter No. 735-2.

Subject: Regulations on Employee Responsibilities and Conduct Implementing E.O. 11222, Prescribing Standards of Ethical Conduct for Government Officers and Employees

Heads of Departments and Independent Establishments:

Under Executive Order 11222 of May 8, 1965, the Commission is responsible for issuing Government-wide regulations setting forth the standards under which each agency head shall issue regulations governing the conduct of employees and special Government employees covering such matters as the acceptance of gifts, entertainment and favors, outside employment, teaching and writing, and the use of Government information for private gain. The order also directs the Commission to issue regulations requiring that certain employees and officials file statements of employment and financial interests.

The Commission has approved regulations setting forth the standards under which each agency head shall issue regulations governing the conduct of Government employees and special Government employees and the reporting of employment and financial interests. These regulations (new part 735), issued in accordance with the order, are attached.

Each agency must prepare its own regulations in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's regulations and submit two copies of them for approval to the Office of the General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. 20415, not later than December 30, 1965.

The Commission's regulations are designed to allow maximum flexibility for each agency to prescribe regulations that will meet its particular needs so long as they are consistent with the intent of the Executive order to achieve Government-wide uniformity with respect to the minimum standards set forth in the Commission's regulations. Realistic and effective communication to employees and to the public doing business with the Government of the ethical standards under which Government business shall be conducted is called for. Also, the individual privileges of employees of the Government have been specifically recognized by the regulations in such sensitive areas as teaching, lecturing, and engaging in financial transactions in which no conflicts of interest issue exists.

The regulations contain the following particularly significant provisions which should be noted.

(1) After Commission approval of agency regulations, the regulations must be submitted to the Federal Register for publication.

(2) Each agency shall designate a top ranking employee who has appropriate experience, preferably legal, to be the counselor for the agency and to be the agency's designee to the Commission on matters covered by these regulations.

(3) The agency's regulations (or a comprehensive summary) must be given to each employee.

(4) The establishment of an interpretation and advisory service in each agency so that counselors are available to any employee who requests guidance is required.

(5) Statements of employment and financial interest are required from employees in specified positions and from other employees whom agencies may designate.

Under Executive Order 11222, the issuance of these regulations revokes the President's Memorandum of May 2, 1963, Preventing Conflicts of Interest on the Part of Special Government Employees. However, the Commission is administratively adopting as Federal Personnel Manual instructions those portions of the memorandum which set forth rules for obtaining and utilizing the services of a consultant, adviser, or other temporary or intermittent employee. Those rules are the section entitled, Conflict of Interest Statutes, in the revoked memorandum. Therefore, agencies should continue to observe these rules until such time as the Commission publishes a revised FPM Chapter 735 incorporating them.

These regulations are effective October 1, 1965.

By direction of the Commission:

NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Executive Director.

Attachment: New part 735 regulations.

PART 735—EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT

SUBPART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec.
735.101 Purpose.
735.102 Definitions.
735.103 Applicability to members of the uniformed services.
735.104 Issuance, approval, and publication of agency regulations.
735.105 Interpretation and advisory service.
735.106 Reviewing statements and reporting conflicts of interest.
735.107 Disciplinary and other remedial action.

SUBPART B—AGENCY REGULATIONS GOVERNING ETHICAL AND OTHER CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EMPLOYEES

Sec.
735.201 Specific provisions of agency of agency regulations.
735.202 Gifts, entertainment, and favors.
735.203 Outside employment.
735.204 Financial interests.
735.205 Use of Government property.
735.206 Misuse of information.
735.207 Indebtedness.
735.208 Gambling, betting, and lotteries.
735.209 General conduct prejudicial to the Government.
735.210 Miscellaneous statutory provisions.

SUBPART C—AGENCY REGULATIONS GOVERNING ETHICAL AND OTHER CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Sec.
735.301 Specific provisions of agency regulations.
735.302 Use of Government employment.
735.303 Use of inside information.
735.304 Coercion.
735.305 Gifts, entertainment, and favors.
735.306 Miscellaneous statutory provisions.

SUBPART D—AGENCY REGULATIONS GOVERNING STATEMENTS OF EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Sec.
735.401 Form and content of statements.
735.402 Specific provisions of agency regulations for employees.
735.403 Employees required to submit statements.
735.404 Employees not required to submit statements.
735.405 Time and place for submission of employees' statements.
735.406 Supplementary statements.
735.407 Interests of employees' relatives.
735.408 Information not known by employees.
735.409 Information prohibited.
735.410 Confidentiality of employees' statements.
735.411 Effect of employees' statements on on other requirements.
735.412 Specific provisions of agency regulations for special Government employees.

Authority: Secs. 735.101 to 735.412 issued under secs. 602, 701, 703, E.O. 11222, 30 F.R. 6469, 3 CFR, 1965 Supp.

SUBPART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 735.101 Purpose: The maintenance of unusually high standards of honesty, integrity, partiality, and conduct by Government employees and special Government employees is essential to assure the proper performance of the Government business and the maintenance of confidence by citizens in their Government. The avoidance of misconduct and conflicts of interest on the part of Government employees and special Government employees through informed judgment is indispensable to the maintenance of these standards. To accord with these concepts, this Part sets forth the Commission's regulations under which each agency head shall issue regulations covering the agency's employees and special Government employees, prescribing standards of conduct and responsibilities, and governing statements reporting employment and financial interests.

Sec. 735.102 Definitions: In this Part:

(a) Agency means an executive department or independent establishment or agency in the executive branch, including a Government-owned or controlled corporation.

(b) Employee means an officer or employee of an agency, but does not include a special

Government employee or a member of the uniformed services.

(c) Executive order means Executive Order 11222 of May 8, 1965.

(d) Person means an individual, a corporation, a company, an association, a firm, a partnership, a society, a joint stock company, or any other organization or institution.

(e) Special Government employee means a "special Government employee" as defined in section 202 of title 18 of the United States Code who is employed in the executive branch, but does not include a member of the uniformed services.

(f) Uniformed services has the meaning given that term by section 101(3) of title 37 of the United States Code.

Sec. 735.103 Applicability to members of the uniformed services: This Part, except this section, is not applicable to members of the uniformed services. Each agency having jurisdiction over members of the uniformed services shall issue regulations covering those members and regulating their ethical and other conduct and the reporting of employment and financial interests in a manner consistent with the Executive order and this Part.

Sec. 735.104 Issuance, approval, and publication of agency regulations: (a) Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, each agency head shall prepare, and submit to the Commission for approval, regulations in accordance with this Part that:

(1) Implement the requirements of law, the Executive order, and this Part; and

(2) Prescribe additional standards of ethical and other conduct and reporting requirements that are appropriate to the particular functions and activities of the agency and are not inconsistent with law, the Executive order, and this Part.

(b) After Commission approval each agency head shall:

(1) Submit the agency's regulations to the Federal Register for publication;

(2) Furnish each employee and special Government employee a copy of the appropriate agency regulations (or a comprehensive summary thereof) within 90 days after approval;

(3) Furnish each new employee and special Government employee a copy of the appropriate agency regulations (or a comprehensive summary thereof) at the time of his entrance on duty;

(4) Bring the appropriate agency regulations to the attention of each employee and special Government employee annually, and at such other times as circumstances warrant;

(5) Assure the availability of counseling to each employee and special Government employee as provided in section 735.105; and

(6) Have available for review by employees and special Government employees, as appropriate, copies of laws, the Executive order, agency regulations, and pertinent Commission regulations and instructions relating to ethical and other conduct.

(c) Agency regulations issued under this Part are effective only after approval by the Commission and publication in the Federal Register.

(d) Requests for approval of agency regulations to be issued under this Part shall be directed to the United States Civil Service Commission, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, D.C. 20415.

(e) This section applies to any amendment of agency regulations issued under this Part.

(f) Any agency head who does not consider it feasible to prepare agency regulations under this Part because of the small number of his employees, or for another reason acceptable to the Commission, may adopt the regulations in this Part for application, as appropriate, to the employees and special Government employees of his agency if:

(1) He obtains the approval of the Commission for that adoption; and

(2) After obtaining that approval, he submits a notice to the Federal Register announcing the applicability of this Part to his employees.

Sec. 735.105 Interpretation and advisory service. (a) Each agency head shall designate a top-ranking employee of his agency who has appropriate experience, preferably legal, and in whom he has complete personal confidence, to be the counselor for the agency and to serve as the agency's designee to the Commission on matters covered by this Part. The counselor shall be made responsible for coordination of the agency's counseling services provided under paragraph (b) of this section and for assuring that counseling and interpretations on questions of conflicts of interest and other matters covered by this Part are available to deputy counselors designated under paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) Each agency head shall designate deputy counselors for the agency's employees and special Government employees. Deputy counselors designated under this section shall be qualified and in a position to give authoritative advice and guidance to each employee and special Government employee who seeks advice and guidance on questions of conflicts of interest and on other matters covered by this Part.

(c) Each agency shall notify its employees and special Government employees of the availability of counseling services and of how and where these services are available. This notification shall be made within 90 days after approval of the agency regulations to be issued under this Part, and periodically thereafter. In the case of a new employee or special Government employee appointed after this notification, notification shall be made at the time of his entrance on duty.

Sec. 735.106 Reviewing statements and reporting conflicts of interest: (a) Agency regulations issued under this Part shall establish a system for the review of statements of employment and financial interests submitted under Subpart D. The system of review shall be designed to disclose conflicts of interest or apparent conflicts of interest on the part of employees and special Government employees.

(b) The system of review established under paragraph (a) of this section shall provide that, when a statement submitted under Subpart D or information from other sources indicates a conflict between the interests of an employee or special Government employee and the performance of his services for the Government and when the conflict or appearance of conflict is not resolved at a lower level in the agency, the information concerning the conflict or appearance of conflict shall be reported to the agency head through the counselor for the agency.

(c) The employee or special Government employee concerned shall be provided an opportunity to explain the conflict or appearance of conflict.

Sec. 735.107. Disciplinary and other remedial action: (a) Agency regulations issued under this Part shall provide that a violation of these regulations by an employee or special Government employee may be cause for appropriate disciplinary action which may be in addition to any penalty prescribed by law.

(b) When, after consideration of an explanation of the employee or special Government employee provided by section 735.106, the agency head decides that remedial action is required, he shall take immediate action to end the conflicts or appearance of conflicts of interest. Remedial action may include, but is not limited to:

(1) Changes in assigned duties;

(2) Divestment by the employee or special Government employee of his conflicting interest;

(3) Disciplinary action; or

(4) Disqualification for a particular assignment.

Remedial action, whether disciplinary or otherwise, shall be effected in accordance with any applicable laws, Executive orders, and regulations.

SUBPART B—AGENCY REGULATIONS GOVERNING ETHICAL AND OTHER CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EMPLOYEES

Sec. 735.201 Specific provisions of agency regulations: Agency regulations issued under this Subpart, as a minimum, shall contain provisions covering the standards of and governing the ethical and other conduct of its employees set forth in sections 735.202 through 735.210.

Sec. 735.202 Gifts, entertainment, and favors: (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, an employee shall not solicit or accept, directly or indirectly, any gift, gratuity, favor, entertainment, loan, or any other thing of monetary value, from a person who:

(1) Has, or is seeking to obtain, contractual or other business or financial relations with his agency;

(2) Conducts operations or activities that are regulated by his agency; or

(3) Has interests that may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of his official duty.

(b) Agency regulations implementing paragraph (a) of this section may provide for such exceptions as may be necessary and appropriate in view of the nature of the agency's work and the duties and responsibilities of the employees. Appropriate exceptions which may be made by an agency include, but are not limited to, those that:

(1) Govern obvious family or personal relationships (such as those between the parents, children, or spouse of the employee and the employee) when the circumstances make it clear that it is those relationships rather than the business of the persons concerned which are the motivating factors;

(2) Permit acceptance of food and refreshments of nominal value on infrequent occasions in the ordinary course of a luncheon or dinner meeting or other meeting or on an inspection tour where an employee may properly be in attendance;

(3) Permit acceptance of loans from banks or other financial institutions on customary terms to finance proper and usual activities of employees, such as home mortgage loans; and

(4) Permit acceptance of unsolicited advertising or promotional material, such as pens, pencils, note pads, calendars and other items of nominal intrinsic value.

(c) An employee shall avoid any action, whether or not specifically prohibited by this Subpart, which might result in, or create the appearance of:

(1) Using public office for private gain;

(2) Giving preferential treatment to any person;

(3) Impeding Government efficiency or economy;

(4) Losing complete independence or impartiality;

(5) Making a Government decision outside official channels; or

(6) Affecting adversely the confidence of the public in the integrity of the Government.

(d) An employee shall not solicit contributions from another employee for a gift to an employee in a superior official position. An employee in a superior official position shall not accept a gift presented as a contribution from employees receiving less salary than himself. An employee shall not make a donation as a gift to an employee in a superior official position (5 U.S.C. 113).

(e) An employee shall not accept a gift, present, decoration, or other thing from a foreign government unless authorized by Congress as provided by the Constitution and in 4 U.S.C. 114–115a.

Sec. 735.203. Outside employment: (a) An employee shall not engage in outside employment or other outside activity not compatible with the full and proper discharge of the duties and responsibilities of his Government employment. Incompatible activities include but are not limited to:

(1) Acceptance of a fee, compensation, gift, payment of expense, or any other thing of monetary value in circumstances in which acceptance may result in, or create the appearance of, conflicts of interest; or

(2) Outside employment which tends to impair his mental or physical capacity to perform his Government duties and responsibilities in an acceptable manner.

(b) An employee shall not receive any salary or anything of monetary value from a private source as compensation for his services to the Government (18 U.S.C. 209).

(c) Employees are encouraged to engage in teaching, lecturing, and writing that is not prohibited by law, the Executive order, this Part, or the agency regulations. However, an employee shall not, either for or without compensation, engage in teaching, lecturing or writing that is dependent on information obtained as a result of his Government employment, except when that information has been made available to the general public or will be made available on request, or when the agency head gives written authorization for the use of nonpublic information on the basis that the use is in the public interest. In addition, an employee who is a Presidential appointee covered by section 401(a) of the Order shall not receive compensation or anything of monetary value for any consultation, lecture, discussion, written, or appearance the subject matter of which is devoted substantially to the responsibilities, programs, or operations of his agency, or which draws substantially on official data or ideas which have not become part of the body of public information.

(d) An employee shall not engage in outside employment under a State or local government, except in accordance with Part 734 of this chapter.

(e) This section does not preclude an employee from:

(1) Receipt of bona fide reimbursement, unless prohibited by law, for actual expenses for travel and such other necessary subsistence as is compatible with this Part for which no Government payment or reimbursement is made. However, an employee may not be reimbursed, and payment may not be made on his behalf, for excessive personal living expenses, gifts, entertainment or other personal benefits.

(2) Participation in the activities of national or State political parties not proscribed by law.

(3) Participation in the affairs of or acceptance of an award for a meritorious public contribution or achievement given by a charitable, religious, professional, social, fraternal, nonprofit educational and recreational, public service, or civic organization.

(4) Outside employment permitted under the regulations of his agency issued under this Part.

Sec. 735.204. Financial interests: (a) An employee shall not:

(1) Have a direct or indirect financial interest that conflicts substantially, or appears to conflict substantially, with his Government duties and responsibilities; or

(2) Engage in, directly or indirectly, a financial transaction as a result of, or primarily relying on, information obtained through his Government employment.

(b) This section does not preclude an employee from having a financial interest or engaging in financial transactions to the same extent as a private citizen not employed by the Government so long as it is not prohibited by law, the Executive order, this section, or the agency regulations.

Sec. 735.205 Use of Government property: An employee shall not, directly or indirectly, use or allow the use of, Government property of any kind, including property leased to the Government, for other than officially approved activities. An employee has a positive duty to protect and conserve Government property, including equipment, supplies, and other property entrusted or issued to him.

Sec. 735.206 Misuse of information: For the purpose of furthering a private interest, an employee shall not, except as provided in section 735.203(c), directly or indirectly use, or allow the use of, official information obtained through or in connection with his Government employment which has not been made available to the general public.

Sec. 735.207 Indebtedness: An employee shall pay each just financial obligation in a proper and timely manner, especially one imposed by law such as Federal, State, or local taxes. For the purpose of this section, a "just financial obligation" means one acknowledged by the employee or reduced to judgment by a court, and "in a proper and timely manner" means in a manner which the agency determines does not, under the circumstances, reflect adversely on the Government as his employer. In the event of dispute between an employee and an alleged creditor, this section does not require an agency to determine the validity or amount of the disputed debt.

Sec. 735.208 Gambling, betting, and lotteries: An employee shall not participate, while on Government-owned or leased property or while on duty for the Government, in any gambling activity including the operation of a gambling device, in conducting a lottery or pool, in a game for money or property, or in selling or purchasing a numbers slip or ticket. However, this section does not preclude activities:

(a) Necessitated by an employee's law enforcement duties; or

(b) Under section 3 of Executive Order 10927 and similar agency-approved activities.

Sec. 735.209 General conduct prejudicial to the Government: An employee shall not engage in criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, or other conduct prejudicial to the Government.

Sec. 735.210 Miscellaneous statutory provisions: Each employee shall acquaint himself with each statute that relates to his ethical and other conduct as an employee of his agency and of the Government. An agency shall direct the attention of its employees, by specific reference in the agency regulations issued under this Part, to each statute relating to the ethical and other conduct of employees of that agency and to the following statutory provisions:

(a) House Concurrent Resolution 175, 85th Congress, 2d Session, 72 Stat. 312, the "Code of Ethics for Government Service".

(b) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, as appropriate to the employees concerned.

(c) The prohibition against lobbying with appropriated funds (18 U.S.C. 1913).

(d) The prohibitions against disloyalty and striking (5 U.S.C. 118p, 118r).

(e) The prohibition against the employment of a member of a Communist organization (50 U.S.C. 784).

(f) The prohibitions against (1) the disclosure of classified information (18 U.S.C. 798, 50 U.S.C. 783); and (2) the disclosure of confidential information (18 U.S.C. 1905).

(g) The provision relating to the habitual use of intoxicants to excess (5 U.S.C. 640).

(h) The prohibition against the misuse of a Government vehicle (5 U.S.C. 78c).

(i) The prohibition against the misuse of the franking privilege (18 U.S.C. 1719).

(j) The prohibition against the use of deceit in an examination or personnel action in connection with Government employment (5 U.S.C. 637).

(k) The prohibition against fraud or false statements in a Government matter (18 U.S.C. 1001).

(l) The prohibition against mutilating or destroying a public record (18 U.S.C. 2071).

(m) The prohibition against counterfeiting and forging transportation requests (18 U.S.C. 508).

(n) The prohibitions against (1) embezzlement of Government money or property (18 U.S.C. 641); (2) failing to account for public money (18 U.S.C. 643); and (3) embezzlement of the money or property of another person in the possession of an employee by reason of his employment (18 U.S.C. 654).

(o) The prohibition against unauthorized use of documents relating to claims from or by the Government (18 U.S.C. 285).

(p) The prohibition against proscribed political activities—The Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. 118i), and 18 U.S.C. 602, 603, 607, and 608.

SUBPART C—AGENCY REGULATIONS GOVERNING ETHICAL AND OTHER CONDUCT AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Sec. 735.301 Specific provisions of agency regulations: Agency regulations issued under this Subpart, as a minimum, shall contain provisions covering the standards of and governing the ethical and other conduct of its special Government employees as set forth in sections 735.302 through 735.306. In addition, to the extent considered appropriate by the agency head, the agency regulations issued under this Subpart shall require its special Government employees to adhere to the standards of conduct made applicable to employees by the agency regulations issued under Subpart B of this Part.

Sec. 735.302 Use of Government employment: A special Government employee shall not use his Government employment for a purpose that is, or gives the appearance of being, motivated by the desire for private gain for himself or another person, particularly one with whom he has family, business, or financial ties.

Sec. 735.303 Use of inside information: (a) A special Government employee shall not use inside information obtained as a result of his Government employment for private gain for himself or another person either by direct action on his part or by counsel, recommendation, or suggestion to another person, particularly one with whom he has family, business, or financial ties. For the purpose of this section, "inside information" means information obtained under Government authority which has not become part of the body of public information.

(b) Agency regulations implementing paragraph (a) of this section may provide that special Government employees may teach, lecture, or write in a manner not inconsistent with section 735.203(c) in regard to employees.

Sec. 735.304 Coercion: A special Government employee shall not use his Government employment to coerce, or give the appearance of coercing, a person to provide financial benefit to himself or another person, particularly one with whom he has family, business, or financial ties.

Sec. 735.305 Gifts, entertainment, and favors: (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, a special Government employee, while so employed or in connection with his employment, shall not receive or solicit from a person having business with his agency anything of value as a gift, gratuity, loan, entertainment, or favor for himself or another person, particularly one with whom he has family, business, or financial ties.

(b) Agency regulations implementing paragraph (a) of this section may provide for exceptions for special Government employees that are not inconsistent with the exceptions authorized for their employees under section 735.202(b).

Sec. 735.306 Miscellaneous statutory provisions: Each special Government employee shall acquaint himself with each statute that relates to his ethical and other conduct as a special Government employee of his agency and of the Government. An agency shall direct the attention of its special Government employees, by specific reference in the agency regulations issued under this Part, to each statute relating to the ethical and other conduct of special Government employees of that agency and to those statutory provisions listed in section 735.210 that are applicable to special Government employees.

SUBPART D—AGENCY REGULATIONS GOVERNING STATEMENTS OF EMPLOYMENT AND FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Sec. 735.401 Form and content of statements: The statements of employment and financial interests required under this Subpart for use by employees and special Government employees shall contain, as a minimum, the information required by the formats prescribed by the Commission in the Federal Personnel Manual.

Sec. 735.402 Specific provisions of agency regulations for employees: Agency regulations issued under this Subpart for employees, as a minimum, shall contain provisions covering the reporting requirements set forth in sections 735.403 through 735.411.

Sec. 735.403 Employees required to submit statements: Except as provided in section 735.404, each agency head shall require statements of employment and financial interests from the following employees:

(a) Employees paid at a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, as amended.

(b) Employees in grade GS-16 or above of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in comparable or higher positions not subject to that Act.

(c) Employees in hearing examiner positions as defined by section 930.202(c) of this chapter.

(d) Employees in positions specifically identified in the agency regulations as positions the basic duties and responsibilities of which require the incumbent to exercise judgment in making or recommending a Government decision or in taking or recommending Government action in regard to:

(1) Contracting or procurement;

(2) Administering or monitoring grants or subsidies;

(3) Regulating or auditing private or other non-Federal enterprise; or

(4) Other activities where the decision or action has an economic impact on the interests of any non-Federal enterprise.

However, employees in positions that meet these criteria may be excluded from the reporting requirements when an agency head determines that the duties of a position are at such a level of responsibility that the submission of a statement of employment and financial interests by the incumbent is not necessary because of the degree of supervision and review over the incumbent and the remote and inconsequential effect on the integrity of the Government.

(e) Employees in positions specifically identified in the agency regulations as positions determined by the agency head as requiring the incumbent thereof to report employment and financial interests in order to carry out the purpose of law, the Executive order, this Part, and the agency regulations.

Sec. 735.404 Employees not required to submit statements: A statement of employment and financial interests is not required by this Subpart from an agency head, a Presidential appointee in the Executive Office of the President who is not subordinate to the head of an agency in that Office, or a full-time member of a committee, board, or commission appointed by the President. These employees are subject to separate reporting requirements under section 401 of the Executive order.

Sec. 735.405 Time and place for submission of employees' statements: An employee required to submit a statement of employment and financial interests under the regulations of his agency shall submit that statement to the office designated in the agency regulations not later than:

(a) Ninety days after the effective date of the agency regulations issued under this Part if employed on or before that effective date; or

(b) Thirty days after his entrance on duty, but not earlier than ninety days after the effective date, if appointed after that effective date.

Sec. 735.406 Supplementary statements: Changes in, or additions to, the information contained in an employee's statement of employment and financial interests shall be reported in a supplementary statement at the end of the quarter in which the changes occur. Quarters end March 31, June 30, September 30, and December 31, except when the Commission authorizes different dates on a showing by an agency of necessity therefor. If there are no changes or additions in a quarter, a negative report is not required. However, for the purpose of annual review, a supplementary statement, negative or otherwise, is required as of June 30 each year.

Sec. 735.407 Interests of employees' relatives: The interest of a spouse, minor child, or other member of an employee's immediate household is considered to be an interest of the employee. For the purpose of this section, "member of an employee's immediate household" means those blood relations who are residents of the employee's household.

Sec. 735.408 Information not known by employees: If any information required to be included on a statement of employment and financial interests or supplementary statement, including holdings placed in trust, is not known to the employee but is known to another person, the employee shall request that other person to submit information in his behalf.

Sec. 735.409 Information prohibited: This Subpart does not require an employee to submit on a statement of employment and financial interests or supplementary statement any information relating to the employee's connection with, or interest in, a professional society or a charitable, religious, social, fraternal, recreational, public service, civic, or political organization or a similar organization not conducted as a business enterprise. For the purpose of this section, educational and other institutions doing research and development or related work involving grants of money from or contracts with the Government are deemed "business enterprises" and are required to be included in an employee's statement of employment and financial interests.

Sec. 735.410 Confidentiality of employees' statements: An agency shall hold each statement of employment and financial interests, and each supplementary statement, in confidence. An agency may not disclose information from a statement except as the Commission or the agency head may determine for good cause shown.

Sec. 735.411 Effect of employees' statements on other requirements: The statements of employment and financial interests and supplementary statements required of employees are in addition to, and not in substitution for, or in derogation of, any similar requirement imposed by law, order, or regulation. The submission of a statement or supplementary statement by an employee does not permit him or any other person to participate in a matter in which his or the other person's participation is prohibited by law, order, or regulation.

Sec. 735.412 Specific provisions of agency regulations for special Government employees: (a) Agency regulations issued under this Subpart for special Government employees, as a minimum, shall contain provisions covering the reporting requirements set forth in this section.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, each agency head shall require each special Government employee to submit a statement of employment and financial interests which reports:

(1) All other employment; and

(2) The financial interests of the special Government employee which relate either directly or indirectly to the duties and responsibilities of the special Government employee.

(c) An agency head may waive the requirement in paragraph (b) of this section for the submission of a statement of employment and financial interests in the case of a special Government employee who is not a consultant or an expert when the agency finds that the duties of the position held by that special Government employee are of a nature and at such a level of responsibility that the submission of the statement by the incumbent is not necessary to protect the integrity of the Government. For the purpose of this paragraph, "consultant" and "expert" have the meaning given those terms by Chapter 304 of the Federal Personnel Manual, but do not include:

(1) A physician, dentist, or allied medical specialist whose services are procured to provide care and service to patients; or

(2) A veterinarian whose services are procured to provide care and service to animals.

(d) A statement of employment and financial interests required to be submitted under this section shall be submitted not later than the time of employment of the special Government employee as provided in the agency regulations. Each special Government employee shall keep his statement current throughout his employment with the agency by the submission of supplementary statements.

LETTER FROM SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

JUNE 23, 1966.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with its study of the rights of Federal employees, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has been increasingly concerned about the massive surrender of individual privacy to which the government is subjecting its civil servants by the use of various questionnaires and scientific instruments. Although many of these intrusions may be justified in the name of worthwhile ends of public interest, national security, and program goals, I am disturbed, as I indicated in my letter of May 24, about their effects on the individual employee, on our civil service, and on our society generally. While some agencies have issued regulations demonstrating a concern for providing employees due process in some matters, many seem all too willing to utilize expedient devices for personnel purposes which invade basic rights and offend the individual's sense of fairness.

The latest in this long series of devices for gathering information is the questionnaire requiring employees to list creditors, property, financial interests and outside activities, not only for himself but also for members of his family, and to update the data periodically. As though this self-disclosure were not insulting enough, we understand that it is proposed to establish within agencies and departments a system of "special counselors" to advise employees about matters relating to standards of conduct. Furthermore, contrary to the impression given the public in press reports, the policy applies not only to top-level presidential appointees but to thousands of Federal employees throughout the country.

This "big brother" approach to the employer-employee relation will, I believe, prove detrimental to the morale of our Federal service which throughout its history has demonstrated the highest caliber integrity and honesty. It is strange that in a technological era marked by an inescapable potential for privacy invasion, government should add to this burden by requiring a man to spell out his credit situation and details of his personal life in order to obtain and hold a job. For many years we have relied on a system in which employees were trusted and generally held accountable for observance of standards of conduct prescribed by regulation and statute, while affording government the option of reprimanding, dismissing and prosecuting an employee who violated those standards. Although this approach does entail more time and work for personnel people, it has preserved certain basic values in our system of government.

I am not unaware that there have been a few cases of conflict of interest in different agencies, some of which have been damaging to the public interest, to the public image of the agency involved, and generally embarrassing to all concerned. To apprehend a few corrupt individuals, however, it seems unwarranted to require countless thousands to reveal their personal business and financial affairs. In effect, this policy amounts to a demand that the employee, on pain of losing his job, prove every few months that he and members of his family are not violating or even appearing to violate Federal laws. To my mind, this questionnaire constitutes a colossal vote of no-confidence in the integrity of over two and a half million citizens who work for the Federal government.

I have in the past registered my strong protest about some of the instruments and procedures being used to gather information from and about an employee or applicant which has nothing to do with his ability and qualification to do a job. Although I would yield to no one in my interest in promoting adherence to the highest ethical standards and in prohibiting the appearance of conflict of interest in government, I have the gravest doubts about the wisdom of these questionnaires.

It is my understanding that each department and agency may formulate its own questionnaire specifying any additional personal information it feels it must obtain from employees, and may determine which employees are required to submit the data. Would you inform the Subcommittee approximately how many Federal employees are affected by this requirement and what is being done to assure the confidentiality of replies? In addition, we should like to know (1) what prompted this new policy, (2) what in particular it is envisioned that employees will list under the heading of "Creditors," and (3) what type of personnel action is indicated for employees who refuse to reply.

Although considerable publicity was engendered last year when the Executive Order was issued, the primary emphasis was on reporting of major conflict of interest holdings by Cabinet members and other political appointees. Now that departments and agencies are issuing their regulations implementing the Order and the full impact of the policy is beginning to be felt, the Subcommittee is finding the complaints and questions raised by employees warrant an inquiry into the matter.

Thank you for your assistance in our study.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
Chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. In reply to my letter the subcommittee has just received a letter stating that the new program "is not a response to past abuses," but "looks to the future and its preventative." Mr. President, in dosing its patient with preventative medicine, I fear the Commission will render him immobile. As I wrote Mr. Macy:

> I am not unaware that there have been a few cases of conflict of interest in different agencies, some of which have been damaging to the public interest, to the public image of the agency involved, and generally embarrassing to all concerned. To apprehend a few corrupt individuals, however, it seems unwarranted to require countless thousands to reveal their personal business and financial affairs. In effect, this policy amounts to a demand that the employee, on pain of losing his job, prove every few months that he and members of his family are not violating or even appearing to violate Federal laws.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Macy's letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1966.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: Your letter of June 23, 1966, expressed concern over possible adverse effects of the questionnaire concerning outside employment and financial interests of Federal employees and asked several questions about the arrangements involved. I appreciate this opportunity to explain the use of the confidential statement of employment and financial interests in our ethical conduct program.

In issuing Executive Order 11222, the President emphasized that its purposes were to codify, clarify, and strengthen the standards of ethical conduct for executive branch personnel and to direct the attention of both the Federal employees and those who do business with the Government to situations in which careful attention is needed in order to avoid improper conduct or conflicts of interest. The order and related Commission and agency regulations brought together, in order to communicate in a more understandable way, the requirements of existing laws, executive memoranda and agency policies on this subject and added express limitations with respect to the acceptance of gifts, entertainment and favors.

Thus, in reply to your inquiry as to "what prompted the new policy", the ethical conduct program, including the use of statements of employment and financial interests, looks to the future and is preventative; it is not a response to past abuses. It meets the evolving needs to communicate meaningfully and systematically with both Federal employees and the large segment of private industry which deals with the Government on business or regulatory matters. The mutual understanding we hope to engender among Government and industry should help to ensure against unwitting or careless violation of the many specific provisions of law including the criminal laws on conflict of interests which relate to Government employees.

I should point out that the new counseling service established by the order and regulations is provided only because employees in the past have requested such a facility to assist them in making ethical judgments. The counselor's function is limited to the furnishing of advice and guidance to employees who seek his assistance.

The requirement to submit statements of employment and financial interests is specifically limited by the executive order, the Commission's regulations, and agency regulations approved by the Commission to those employees in (a) the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, in grade GS–16 or above, in hearing examiner positions, and (b) in positions which involve the exercise of judgment in making or recommending a Government decision relating to contracting, procurement, grants, subsidies, audits, or which have an economic impact on non-Federal enterprise. An agency head may exclude positions from the reporting requirement in category (b) or include additional positions which he considers necessary to carry out the laws peculiar to his agency and the intent of the executive order.

Disclosure is directly related to avoidance of conflict of interest situations within the meaning of the criminal law as well as to avoidance of improprieties of a noncriminal nature. It is in no way intended to reflect upon the integrity of Federal employees and to my knowledge has had no significant adverse effect upon morale. That public employment involves a public trust has been generally well recognized by employees.

As to the number of employees required to file statements, there are approximately 9,000 employees in category (a). I do not at this time know the number of employees in category (b) since the program has not been in operation long enough to gather statistics. We will get this information as soon as it is feasible to do so and I will be glad to advise you further when the information becomes available.

In connection with the disclosure requirements I want to correct any misunderstanding that an agency is free to require additional personal information from employees beyond that related to employment and financial interests. The Commission's formats for confidential disclosure statements are designed to obtain the minimum information necessary to ensure that official duties are performed in compliance with the conflict of interest laws, the order, and applicable regulations. An agency may alter these formats to suit its individual needs, but requests for personal information unrelated to this purpose would not be justifiable on the basis of the ethics program.

In response to your question as to the particulars to be listed under the heading of "Creditors", the format expressly excludes those to whom the employee is indebted by reason of a mortgage on his personal residence or for ordinary household and living expenses. This makes it unnecessary to report the great majority of credit relationships and limits the listing to credit situations which may be related to the conflict of interest prohibitions. The purpose, here again, is to foster a systematic review by the individual and his employing agency of circumstances which may indicate a conflict between his financial interests and the performance of his services for the Government.

The executive order and the Commission's regulations expressly require that all statements of employment and financial interests be held in the strictest confidence. Only the Commission or any agency head for good cause shown can disclose any information from a statement. Agency procedures to insure confidentiality are the subject of Commission inspection. We will require strict adherence to these procedures.

With respect to your question as to the type of personnel action indicated in the event an employee should refuse to file a required statement, the agency head should take whatever remedial or disciplinary action might be needed in order to obtain compliance with the order and regulations. If a less severe action would not serve he might have to change the employee to another position where the responsibilities did not require the filing of a statement or, if this were not possible, to effect his removal from the service. In any case, as spelled out in our regulations, no adverse action could be taken against an employee without full compliance with any laws, executive orders and regulations applicable to such action.

In closing I would like to emphasize that we in the Commission are entirely dedicated to the preservation of individual rights against unwarranted invasions of privacy. The standards of ethical conduct and the requirement of confidential statements of employment and financial interests from certain employees in responsible positions, in our judgment, will contribute materially to the public's confidence in the integrity of Government and are in the public interest. I am confident that the great majority of those in the Federal workforce whose positions necessitate the submission of these statements will recognize their proper value as well as the spirit in which they are required.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. **ERVIN**. Mr. Macy also writes that the requirement of such data from employees "will contribute materially to the public's confidence in the integrity of Government and are in the public interest."

In considering the Commission's argument as expressed in this letter, I think it is interesting to note that the New York City Bar Association, in its 1960 report on conflict of interest, discussed the proposal for compulsory full disclosure and found that to the extent that the conflicts problem is one of public confidence, it is probable that disclosure of personal economic affairs would make a favorable public impression and a contribution to public confidence, yet "on balance, a statute requiring full disclosure does not seem to be the best route to pursue." They cited impeding of recruitment as the first objection and noted that "interviews indicate that among the obstacles encountered in efforts to fill vacancies, the disclosure requirement stands high." The report states on page 255:

> Americans are loath to reveal their personal assets and income, for many reasons, and many will resist bitterly any efforts to make them do so.
>
> Apart from the recruitment question the full disclosure approach raises substantial risks of another kind. It is an almost certain invitation to demagogic political attack of one kind or another—upon the poor man as one who cannot manage even his own economic affairs, and upon the rich man as one who is privileged and has lost contact with the mass of the citizenry.
>
> But most important, disclosure alone will not do the job. The basic rules spelled out in the program advanced here are still needed—disqualification, bar on assisting outsiders, limits on gifts, post-employment control, and so forth. Disclosure as a remedy suggests that the main problems of conflict of interest arise out of asset holdings. As this entire book seeks to make clear, this is too simplified a view of the problem.
>
> At best disclosure would help to police the kind of substantive restrictions that are needed . . . unless and until it can be shown that an integrated and aggressive program on all fronts has been a failure in relying upon a combination of rule and policing devices, the severe unfortunate side effects of the all-out disclosure requirement argue overwhelmingly against its adoption.

I think this report suggests important aspects of this whole disclosure problem, and that is that morality can neither be created nor enforced by questionnaires. First, an employee or official deliberately bent on conflict of interest and disobeys existing statutes can easily falsify his replies.

As with the minority status questionnaire, there is nothing to be gained by the invasion of privacy.

Second, the questionnaire policy ignores the fact that the most significant conflict-of-interest problems do not arise from business affairs and asset holdings, which can be listed, but from a wide range of more subtle activities, behavior, and pressures too varied to catalog. They involve judgment and commonsense, as well as personal morality and these are qualities which cannot be legislated or instilled by questionnaires. Throughout administrative history their presence in the civil service has depended in large measure on the appointment and recruitment process for Federal service; on the acumen and judgment of the Chief Executive, his department and agency chiefs, and his administrative people and on the skills of personnel specialists.

The Civil Service Commission has established rules and examinations to determine the qualifications of an applicant and his ability to do a job. Supposedly, this determination is based on a merit system. The use of these questionnaires is an admission by the Commission that it has failed in its mission. Its process of recruitment is apparently so unsuccessful for ascertaining the qualification of applicants and employees, that it must resort to many types of privacy invasions to check their private lives.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is continuing its investigation of these and other problems affecting the rights of employees and will hear expert witnesses discuss them for us during public hearings in the near future.

It has been ably stated by Frederick Mosher that:

> Through its own personnel practices, the Federal Government may, by the force of example, give persuasive force toward social reforms it seeks in the non-public sectors of society. Conversely, by failing to practice what it preaches it may embarrass its leadership and severely weaken its case.

Forms and practices such as these I have described are appropriate to totalitarian countries and gestapo states. They have no place in a free society of free men.

In furthering protection of basic constitutional rights and liberties for all citizens, I believe Government clearly should be setting an example as a model employer for the Nation by respecting the privacy, the dignity and the integrity of those American citizens who are also its employees. In this we have much at stake as a government, as a nation, and as individuals.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR HOLLAND TO BE RECOGNIZED IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE VOTE TOMORROW ON THE PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on the treaty tomorrow I be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes to speak on the airline strike situation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Constituents' Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. **KEITH**. Mr. Speaker, in late spring, I sent a questionnaire to all of the residents in my district. About 160,000 poll cards were delivered, and more than 12,000 replies have been received to date in my office.

I found that many of my constituents liked the convenience of the computer card method of expressing themselves. They not only completed the questionnaire, but wrote notes and letters to comment on other matters not specifically mentioned. It was a pleasure to hear from so many of my constituents.

The results of the poll have been widely circulated in the district through my newsletter and by an interested press as well. I would like to bring the poll results—and a few of what I found to be the more amusing and interesting letters—to the attention of the Members of the House by publishing my newsletter, in part, in the RECORD:

JULY 1966.

DEAR FRIENDS: Thanks to the 11,000 of you who answered my questionnaire. I can say in all sincerity that I have seldom—during my nearly eight years in Congress—been as truly informed as I am today in my constituents' views on such a variety of important issues. They will be an invaluable guide to me as I wrestle with the complex problems confronting our country and the Congress.

Some poll cards are still coming into my Capitol Hill office, but we had to call a halt somewhere so that the computer could do its work.

As usual, the most interesting questions proved to be those producing highly divided responses—such as Number 7. As you can see in the results below, a substantial minority (37 percent) favor expanded trade with Russia and the European Communist-bloc nations. And 32 percent believe Red China should be admitted to the United Nations!

Many cards were accompanied by letters and notes—not a few of which complained that the questions were too complex to answer with a simple "Yes" or "No." I agree—but this is the problem your Congressman must face when the roll is called: His vote must be cast on the issues as presented—not in the form he might prefer.

The notes proved that no mere machine will ever take the "people" out of human beings!

One letter caused a few smiles amongst my staff. It falls in the "answer at my own risk" category. "Recently," the man wrote, "I was considering running for a position such as yours as Congressman, but I didn't know how to go about it. What is the procedure?"

Several constituents displayed real ingenuity in answering the questionnaire, such as the wife who wrote to explain ". . . our answer is a combination of both my husband's and my opinions . . . we had to compromise on 3 questions . . . I conceded 2 and he 1." And then there was the democratic spirit of the father who used the poll as the basis of a round-table discussion with his family of eight. They came up with the answers by voting on each issue!

The cost of living is a disturbing problem to many. I like the way this man put it: "I do not know this country's financial standing, but . . . apple turnovers are more small, less filled, and twice as costly as the ones I bought in 1939."

* * * * *

History Lessons: "Two-year term for Congressmen extended to 4 years? Two is enough. We are no wiser than Washington was." Also: "I am never, I repeat never, in favor of deficit spending. I can't ever believe the first 31 Presidents were wrong about deficit spending and the last 5 were right."

Most replies were heartwarming and encouraging, and all were appreciated. In, around and between my heavy Committee and floor schedules, I am trying to answer each, but the flood of correspondence has made it most difficult.

Questionnaire results

	Yes	No	Percent yes
Do you favor:—			
1. Further Federal action to rid our waterways and air of pollution?	10,539	717	93.6
2. A constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools?	9,329	1,933	82.8
3. Allocating a portion of Federal income back to the States to be used for educational purposes as each State sees fit?	7,860	3,377	69.9
4. (a) A cutback in the great society war on poverty if necessary to hold spending within income?	9,393	1,859	83.4
(b) Continued deficit spending to finance both the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty?	1,650	9,569	14.7
5. Continuing the poverty program in its present form?	1,644	9,574	14.6
6. Economic sanctions against free world countries who persist in trading with Cuba and North Vietnam?	8,137	3,012	72.8
7. Expanded trade with Russia and European Communist bloc countries such as Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, etc.?	4,197	7,038	37.3
8. Reduction of U.S. expenditures and expanded participation by other free world countries in foreign assistance programs?	9,693	1,538	86.3
9. Extension of 2-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to 4 years?	7,073	4,183	62.8
10. Admission of Red China to the United Nations?	3,603	7,639	32.5

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate Captive Nations Week, it seems to me particularly ironic that on the same recent day when the Soviet Union canceled its participation in the annual track and field meet with the United States, our State Department announced a liberalization on travel by U.S. citizens to Communist countries with which we have no diplomatic relations.

Although the countries involved in this lift of travel restrictions are not among the east-central Europe captive nations, where travel by Americans is already relatively easy, there still is a most unsatisfactory inconsistency in the two announcements on the same day.

The Russians said they were canceling their athletes' trip to our country because of "our hatred for the American military who are perpetrating atrocities in Vietnam and our solidarity with the people of Vietnam."

That was the same day the State Department announced that persons in cultural, athletic, commercial, educational, public affairs, and professional fields will henceforth be eligible to apply for validation of their passports for travel to restricted areas. These are Communist China, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, and Albania.

These simultaneous announcements also graphically illustrate a gradually diminishing concern on our part—by our Government and the people—over the plight of the people of the captive nations of east-central Europe.

Now is a time when Communist propaganda machinery is concentrating its attacks on alleged U.S. mistreatment of smaller nations, to recognize anew the Soviet imperialist record in east-central Europe. Now is a time for us to rededicate ourselves to the principles set forth in Public Law 90, enacted by Congress in July 1959 providing for the designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week."

The resolution by which the law was enacted stated, in part:

> Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and
>
> Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

A Tribute to Wilfred E. Roosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Superintendent of Mails Wilfred Roosa last winter completed 53 years of service as a postal employee in the city of Passaic. This is a record of service in the Passaic Post Office. Since I was out of the country at the time, the occasion of his retirement escaped my notice.

It is unsung heroes like Wilfred Roosa, doing their jobs with dedication from day to day, who do so much to keep the wheels of our government moving.

The people of his area have every reason to be grateful to him for his splendid service.

Captive Nations Week: 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual observance of our recognition of the plight of the captive nations. President Johnson, in a special captive nations proclamation, has asked us to consider the situation of peoples who still do not enjoy national independence and democratic liberties.

In the immediate aftermath of World War II the list of nations which had fallen under Soviet domination grew alarmingly long. More and more nations fell under the yoke of a new form of imperialism at the very time when the list of countries under Western colonialism was growing shorter.

Although we still have no cause for unguarded optimism, it is possible to point to a number of trends which are already threatening monolithic Communist domination in a number of countries.

Communist dogmatists are having to face the fact that the same political forces which propelled many African and Asian peoples into nationhood are operating in the countries under Communist rule. For the desire for self-determination and national independence is universal. It is even beginning to influence and divide Communist hierarchies. Only a few months ago Rumania's growing independence on economic questions was extended to certain political matters. Rumania suggested Soviet troops have been in Eastern Europe long enough.

I suspect that we have only begun to witness the changes which the forces of polycentrism will bring. For even a small amount of independence and internal liberalization tends to make people want more.

Another factor which is operating against the perpetuation of a Communist empire is the failure of Communist economic theories when they are actually put into practice. Yugoslavia has essentially abandoned collectivization of agriculture and has instituted a semimarket economy. The Polish regime has had to relax its policy of agricultural collectivization.

We must do all we can to help insure that these processes continue and become more widespread. For, by themselves, these changes are only a beginning. The peoples of Eastern Europe are still far from achieving true freedom and national independence. In some countries these liberalizing tendencies have not even begun.

Because America is committed to the ideas of political freedom and independence, we cannot remain indifferent to the fate of the captive nations. We must look with hope toward the day when it will no longer be possible to speak of "captive nations." We must have faith that this day will come. Great empires have inevitably crumbled because conquerors could not continue to enforce their will on diverse peoples. The Communist empire is no exception.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago the Congress set aside this week of the year for the observance of Captive Nations Week. Much of our attention has been focused this year on the war in southeast Asia, but we dare not forget that already for more than 24 years the peoples of East Europe have been dominated by an alien power, mainland China for 17 years, Tibet for 15, North Vietnam for 12, and Cuba for 6 years.

This occasion is a solemn reminder of the tragic plight of courageous people, of the violation of promises, treaties and international law, and of the responsibility of freedom-loving people everywhere to pursue a course that will bring peace to those in captivity.

In the last several weeks our press has reported new efforts to break down trade barriers into these countries, new endeavors to establish cultural exchange, and new attempts by captive nations to obtain a greater measure of freedom. We continue to hope for improvement in enslaved countries and look forward to the time when there will be no more captivity.

It is my hope that all Americans will join in observing this week to reaffirm their concern for those in restricted lands.

The Captive Nations, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the attention of this country, indeed of the entire world, is presently focused on the struggles in Asia. Some attention is also being paid to the crisis in the Western Alliance in Europe. But one area of contention in this age of international upheaval is given little notice. This area comprises what are properly called the captive nations.

The nations which disappeared as independent entities behind the Iron Curtain of Josef Stalin two decades ago are still held by brute force within the pattern of relationships which comprise the Soviet Communist empire established by the late dictator. The methods of repression of dissent—there is no question of anything stronger such as outright opposition—may now be more subtle than in the past, but they are still actively used. Students demonstrate against some aspects of the floundering regime in Prague and are hauled off to prison. Religion is still vigorously attacked in all these countries. Ties with the West are not as strongly built as is sometimes supposed. Witness the refusal to allow the Pope to attend celebrations of the Polish millennium held earlier this year.

The fate of those brave young patriots who defied the mechanized power of the Red army in Hungary is not yet fully known. But we can be certain that it was an unpleasant one, as the accounts of the mass deportations which followed the Soviet intervention would indicate. The tales of horror of the police state which existed with the sanction of the Soviet Union before the revolt in 1956 have been admirably recounted in the book by James Michener, "The Bridge at Andau."

There have been some changes in the economic management policies of some of the states fashioned in the Soviet image. However, other forms of what might be called liberalization have not appeared. The absolute monopoly of power is still held by the currently supreme cliques within the Communist oligarchies which have furnished all the leaders since the Russians conquered the East European states. The basic sources of power of these regimes is still that which helped to establish and cement their capture of power 20 years ago. These sources are the omnipresent domestic police apparatus and the less obvious, but never-forgotten might of the Red army.

Mr. Speaker, we should never let the dramatic news of current events in other parts of the world, and here at home, cloud our realization of what has happened to millions of human beings living under the yoke of Soviet imperialism and its nefarious agents. We must do our utmost to let the ordinary citizens of these horrid replicas of a dark age of despotism know that we do remember them, that we do not agree that their present condition is either morally acceptable or permanent.

The observance of Captive Nations Week here in this bastion of freedom is a correct and necessary event. We are the bulwark against the tide of aggression and tyranny which has flowed from the state of Lenin and Stalin and their successors. If we do not realize that the terrible results of their previous actions are still existent in the world today, then who will bother or dare to remember and call out against the evil?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add here my personal wish that it will not be long in the future before the observance of this week is unnecessary. I want to extend to the unbowed patriots of the captive nations my deepest sympathy and my sincerest hopes that soon we may be able to celebrate with them the achievement of their national freedom and independence.

New Athens, Ill., Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked the beginning of the centennial celebration of New Athens, Ill. Located in St. Clair County in the 24th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, New Athens prepared an outstanding 3-day commemoration of its 100th birthday.

The citizens of New Athens are proud of their town, and rightfully so, and scheduled numerous festivities for the occasion. New Athens boasts some of the finest farmland in the Midwest; its schools and churches are among the best, contributing to the well-being of the community, and its local industries have fine records and have contributed greatly to the town's progress and prosperity.

New Athens, originally known as Athens, also marks the spot of some of the initial construction and channelization work of the $77 million Kaskaskia navigation project. The residents of New Athens and their neighbors have worked long and hard on this project; it is fitting that this proud community of 1,923 should play such an important role in the development of the biggest navigation and flood control project in southern Illinois.

I salute New Athens and congratulate its fine people on their town's 100th birthday.

Resource Development Action in Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much encouraged by the determined efforts of rural people in the Appalachian area of Kentucky to improve their economic base by developing their land and water resources. They are moving forward in working out resource problems that have been a bottleneck to progress.

I have been following with interest the Mill Creek small watershed project in Monroe County, Ky., my home county in the congressional district I represent. It is a good example of local action that is being taken with State and Federal help. It is an indication of how tools of the Appalachian Regional Development Act are being put to work in combination with the small watershed program.

The project work plan has been completed and is under agency review before being presented to congressional committees for approval. The project area is one where there is urgent need to increase family income, which, of course, affects the economy of the entire county. Farmland, roads, and bridges are beset annually by damaging floods. This flooding has an adverse effect not only on land use, but on the economy of the watershed. Cropland, grassland, and forestland need conservation practices if they are to contribute to economic stability and halt erosion. However, many of the people involved have not been able financially to carry out this work.

The Mill Creek project was approved for help under section 203 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. As a result, farmers have already started to apply needed conservation practices. It is significant, I think, that the majority of the people who are receiving this help have not been reached before by other programs. This is a good sign. It is an indication that the purposes of the Appalachian Act are being fulfilled.

The land treatment is a basic element of the watershed project itself. Plans call for all feasible measures to solve soil and water problems and, in addition, to enhance the overall economy of the watershed community, especially low-income farms.

The city of Tompkinsville will have a new source of water supply from a planned 72-acre multipurpose reservoir at which public recreation facilities are also to be developed. Growth and development of Tompkinsville presently is seriously hampered by lack of adequate quality water. The recreation area is expected to serve over 18,000 people annually. This recreation area will complement a smaller development at the adjacent Old Mulkey House State Park, a historic shrine dating back to the days of Daniel Boone.

I think those people are doing a tremendous job and they have my support, as do other similar small watershed projects in the area. In many Appalachian communities, the sound development of natural resources is the main hope if sustained benefits are to be realized. Projects such as Mill Creek serve to carry out the purposes of the tools we have given rural people to stimulate economic activity.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July, celebrations of our national independence and individual freedom echo throughout the land. We are proud of our democratic heritage in as far as Americans may pursue distinctive courses in politics, economics, and religion. The American way of life is characterized by personal liberty. We have consistently sympathized with freedom movements throughout the world as a free America would find it hard to survive in a world dominated by communism. For the fourth time in the last five decades the United States is engaged in a battle to contain menacing imperialism. But, while our attention is focused on southeast Asia let us not forget the plight of the hundreds of millions of peoples living behind the Iron Curtain.

Americans are apt to take their freedom for granted. We unconsciously enjoy our individual liberties. Disagreement and criticism in politics, a profession of one's own choosing, and religious worship based on individual beliefs have become so essential to every American that they are pursued without second thought. Captive Nations Week must serve as a time when the American people will consider their fortunate position, and, at the same time, rededicate themselves to the peoples living under the oppressive rule of the Communists.

As the world continues to divide itself into camps of haves and have-nots, we cannot afford to lose sight of our responsibilities. As the leader in the free world we must continue our policy of building bridges to the East. The peoples behind the Iron Curtain must be aware of our sincere concern for their plight. The flame of liberty still burns in the hearts of those peoples subjugated by the Communists. We as a nation must at all times be willing to rekindle that flame.

Results of a Public Opinion Survey Taken in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the results of my annual public opinion survey among residents of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina.

I would like to express appreciation to all those who took the trouble to inform me of their stands on some of the important issues before this session of Congress. A total of 14,104 persons completed questionnaires and mailed them to my Washington office—a return of approximately 2,000 more than last year.

One especially gratifying aspect of this year's questionnaire is that so many persons—I would estimate a majority—added comments elaborating their views on one or more of the questions or on some other issue of concern to them.

It is interesting to observe that a majority of those answering voted against a proposed International Education Act but for an International Health Act, thus indicating that the answers were given after deliberation and thought.

Questionnaires were mailed to the broadest possible cross section of district residents and returns were received from all of the counties of the district. This would indicate that the responses constitute a fair reflection of the thinking of Eighth District residents.

The answers were tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Washington, D.C., by the use of data processing equipment.

Following are the questions asked in the 1966 poll and the responses by numbers and percentages:

1. Which of the following policies would you like to see the U.S. follow in Vietnam?

	Percent
(a) Continue present policy (2,070)	14.7
(b) Withdraw all U.S. combat troops (2,193)	15.5
(c) Transfer U.S. troops to coastal enclaves and fight a strictly defensive war (653)	4.6
(d) Expand air attacks against North Vietnam to include industrial targets, close to the port of Haiphong to reduce the flow of war supplies to South Vietnam, and do whatever else is necessary to bring the war to a successful conclusion even at the risk of intervention by Red China (9,048)	64.2
No answer (982)	7.0

Please note that this questionnaire listing the foregoing questions was circulated before the present stepped-up air strikes against North Vietnam.

2. The President has proposed a new program under which the government would subsidize rents of families eligible for public housing but who would reside in housing units provided by non-profit, low-dividend, or cooperative housing owners. (The family would pay 25% of its income for rent and the Federal Government would pay the rest). Do you favor this proposal?

	Percent
Yes (1,708)	12.1
No (12,028)	85.3
No answer (368)	2.6

3. The President has proposed, in addition to existing financial aids to cities for urban renewal, etc., spending $2.3 billion during the next 6 years for what he calls a massive demonstration cities program. Certain cities around the country would be selected as "demonstration cities," and a federal coordinator would be assigned to each one. Do you favor this proposal?

	Percent
Yes (1,436)	10.2
No (12,339)	87.5
No answer (329)	2.3

4. The President is proposing the International Education Act of 1966, "to give children in other continents the same head start we are trying to give our own children." Do you favor this program?

	Percent
Yes (2,538)	18.0
No (11,034)	78.2
No answer (532)	3.8

5. The President is also proposing the International Health Act of 1966, "to wipe out smallpox, malaria, and control yellow fever over most of the world in this decade." Do you favor this program?

	Percent
Yes (7,836)	55.6
No (5,489)	38.9
No answer (779)	5.5

6. Do you believe the U.S. should provide funds to assist over-populated countries in promoting birth control?

	Percent
Yes (6,406)	45.4
No (7,026)	49.8
No answer (672)	4.8

7. Would you favor civil rights legislation—

(a) To give the Federal Government jurisdiction over the selection of juries in state courts to assure non-discriminatory jury selection?

	Percent
Yes (1,542)	10.9
No (12,026)	85.3
No answer (536)	3.8

(b) To confer authority of federal courts to prosecute persons charged with murdering, assaulting or intimidating those engaged in civil rights activities?

	Percent
Yes (3,406)	24.1
No (10,023)	71.1
No answer (675)	4.8

(c) To prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing?

	Percent
Yes (2,234)	15.8
No (10,994)	77.9
No answer (876)	6.3

8. Would you favor granting industry a tax credit for expenses incurred in operating on-the-job training programs for unskilled labor?

	Percent
Yes (8,886)	63.0
No (4,637)	32.9
No answer (581)	4.1

9. Would you favor recognition and admission to the United Nations of Red China?

	Percent
Yes (3,914)	27.8
No (9,177)	65.1
No answer (1,013)	7.1

10. Would you favor legislation which would invoke binding compulsory arbitration in labor-management disputes involving public services or which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest?

	Percent
Yes (10,567)	74.9
No (2,699)	19.1
No answer (838)	6.0

11. Do you favor four-year terms for Representatives in Congress?

	Percent
Yes (8,521)	60.4
No (4,968)	35.2
No answer (615)	4.4

12. The President is recommending an expansion of the anti-poverty program. The appropriation last year was $1½ billion and the request this year is for an additional $1¾ billion. Would you recommend:

	Percent
(a) Increasing and expanding the program as recommended? (1,197)	8.5
(b) Ending the program altogether? (6,866)	48.7
(c) Reducing the money spent on it? (3,513)	24.9
(d) Keeping it at the present level? (2,942)	20.9
No answer (412)	2.9

13. Do you favor stricter laws regulating the rights of individuals to purchase firearms?

	Percent
Yes (8,912)	63.2
No (4,695)	33.3
No answer (497)	3.5

14. Do your favor federal standards for the transporting and sale of dogs, cats and other animals for use in medical research:

	Percent
Yes (8.995)	63.8
No (3,810)	27.0
No answer (1,299)	9.2

Captive Nations Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today in marking Captive Nations Day as a part of the observance of Captive Nations Week from July 17 through July 23.

Liberty is our dearest possession in the United States. It is a condition of life we seek not for ourselves alone but for all men, everywhere. It is important, therefore, that we remind ourselves today of the peoples of Europe and Asia living in bondage and of their aspirations to become free to choose their own destinies.

Although the Western nations have granted independence and freedom to more than 50 nations since World War II, the Soviet Union has not only retained its 19th century empire in the east and south but extended its sway to the west, encompassing the ancient and proud nations of eastern and middle Europe.

These peoples' resistance to subjugation has expressed itself again and again—in the East German revolt of 1953, in the Polish stirrings of 1956, in the great Hungarian uprising of 1956, and in the individual decisions of some 4 million East Germans to seek freedom in the West.

Tyranny takes many forms. To continue to work for liberty from within the modern totalitarian states requires a rare courage and tenacity. It is fitting, therefore, that this eighth Captive Nations Day takes place on the 22d anniversary of a grasp for freedom by men with just such qualities. On July 20, 1944, the men of the German resistance carried out their plan to rid Germany and the world of Hitler and Hitlerism—and only the most bitter misfortune prevented their success.

To all those who have given their lives for freedom in middle and eastern Europe, we in the West and their countrymen owe a great debt of gratitude. They have helped to keep alive the flame of liberty that Nazi and Communist governments worked to snuff out.

For ourselves, we must pursue policies that aid the countries of middle and eastern Europe in their efforts to achieve greater independence from the Soviet Union. We must encourage the tendencies toward economic liberalization that have already begun. We must, despite the conflict in Asia, go on to build the bridges to Eastern Europe that offer the best hope of an expansion of individual freedom for the captive peoples.

A Potential Presidential Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent and troublesome times, I would like to call to your attention a gentleman who, I believe warrants the Nation's serious consideration because of his high qualifications and capabilities. The gentleman to whom I have reference is Mr. Potter Stewart, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, who was appointed to his position by former President Eisenhower in 1958 at the young age of 43. At the time of his appointment, he was the second youngest Justice to have been appointed to such a position in 105 years. Justice Stewart has distinguished himself in other areas as well, which prompts me to call him to your attention as I feel this young Associate Justice is one who should be given serious consideration as a potential presidential candidate.

Justice Stewart was born on January 25, 1915, in Jackson, Mich., but he lived the major portion of his life in Cincinnati, Ohio, attending the Cincinnati public schools and later Hotchkiss School of Connecticut on a scholarship. Following graduation from Hotchkiss, he entered Yale University on a scholarship and, prior to his graduation in 1937, he served as chairman of the Yale Daily News. He graduated with a B.A. degree and with cum laude honors. He was unable to decide after graduation whether to pursue his interest in law or journalism. But after a year at Cambridge on a Henry Fellowship, he returned to Yale Law School. Justice Stewart was again active in student organizations. He won the Moot Court Competition, became editor of the Yale Law Journal, and graduated in 1941 with an LL.B. degree and cum laude honors.

Justice Stewart was admitted to the Ohio Bar Association in 1941. He began his practice in New York and remained there until 1942 when his Navy Reserve unit was called into active service. He served 3 years on active sea duty and humorously refers to his service as a "sort of a 'Mr. Roberts' Navy—scared to death a very small percentage of the time and bored the rest." Mr. Stewart may be too modest, however, because during those 3 years of sea duty he received three battle stars.

Upon his discharge in 1945 as a lieutenant, he returned to his law practice in New York and his wife, the former Mary Ann Bertles, of Long Island, N.Y., whom he married on April 24, 1945. He continued to practice there until 1947 when he decided to move his family, which then included a daughter, back to Cincinnati.

Mr. Stewart not only moved back to his hometown but into a rich tradition in law and politics which had been established by his father, James Garfield Stewart. Among the many positions his father held were the office of mayor of Cincinnati and member of the Supreme Court of Ohio. At one time he was an unsuccessful Republican candidate for the Governor's office of Ohio. Mr. Potter Stewart was a dedicated attorney but he found himself being lured into public office by 1950 when he began a 3-year tenure as a member of the Cincinnati Council. He served as vice mayor from 1952 to 1953 but rejected the opportunity to campaign for the mayor's office in order to spend more time with his family which was now complete with the addition of two sons.

He was only allowed a year's seclusion from public office, however, for he was soon called upon to serve on the Sixth District U.S. Court of Appeals by President Eisenhower. It was a difficult decision; for although he wished to be a justice, he had not thought the opportunity would come so soon. He wanted to continue his law practice, but he finally decided to accept the opportunity, and on April 27, 1954, Mr. Potter Stewart was appointed to the court of appeals. The courage with which Justice Stewart pursued justice and the ability he showed in deciding issues did not go unnoticed. During the Senate recess of 1958, a vacancy occurred on the U.S. Supreme Court and Justice Stewart was called upon to fill this position.

It is most difficult for one to assess the philosophy of a Justice and even more difficult for a layman to undertake such a task during a few moments on the floor. It is necessary, however, to point out a few of the more pertinent areas where Justice Stewart has made outstanding contributions to our society. He has been categorized as a "swingman," "conservative," and various other classifications; but he defies all categories except that of a "Justice." His voting record places him in the conservative category. Justice Stewart is an advocate of judicial restraint which influences his decisions such as the school prayer rulings, for on three separate occasions he was the lone dissenter, standing for the right of children to voluntarily participate in religious activities.

Conversely, he has been in the forefront of some decisions which have liberalized our criminal procedure with needed reform. Throughout his tenure Justice Stewart has supported the right for accused to have counsel and has, therefore, been the guide for applying the sixth amendment to the States which requires a counsel to be appointed for indigents in all State criminal trials. The examples could continue but the important point is that Justice Stewart has exemplified courage and qualifications both as a speaker for the minority and as a leader of the majority.

His ability and achievements not only compel us to honor him as a capable administrator of the law but obligates us to seriously consider him as a potential candidate for President of our Nation.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Captive Nations Week, following as it does our own Independence Day here in the United States, is a time to hail the forcefulness and the fortitude of those peoples of Eastern Europe who have maintained their identity and independence despite all the vicissitudes and would-be dominance to which they have been victim.

Captive Nations Week is a reminder to all the world that the spirit of man prevails no matter what the physical conditions to which he is subjected. The nations which have been caught up in the net of Communist domination have never ceased to exist as entities, personalities in their own right. The Iron Curtain which fell around them never smothered them. The dominance of that communism which sought to amalgamate them into one cohesive mass has never succeeded in erasing their identities. Each of the captive nations is today as readily identifiable as it was before the heavy hand of modern communism fell upon it.

Among these nations were those whose history of independence dates from the Middle Ages—such as Poland, Lithuania, Hungary. Some were nations of great modern development, such as Czechoslovakia. Whether by tradition or recent training, all were nations whose independence had been hailed in the 20th century with its emphasis upon the self-determination of peoples.

The attempted subjugation by communism was, therefore, the more to be deplored. It was too, however, the more to be withstood. And it has, indeed, been withstood valiantly in the hearts and minds of the people. The basis of the tenacity of separate statehood lies in the spirit of the people who compose these individual nations. There endurance, their courage, their patriotism have persisted in the current era as they persisted before communism became a threat to the free world. These nations shared a history of collective sacrifices within their separate groups, of incredible hardships endured because of their determination to maintain their identity in spite of all aggression, and their faith in the enduring fruits of their efforts.

In recent decades we could but deplore the plight of these capitive nations. Theirs was a common fate of political domination over peoples whose national spirit had never succumbed, whose national characteristics had never been overcome, who carried a torch lighted by a memory of past freedom and shining hope for the future.

In the last few years there seems to have been renewed hope. There have been brave signs of protest against the regime superimposed by communism. There has been open defiance of it and evidence of a renewed independence of spirit.

In honoring Captive Nations Week we hail this love of freedom, this spirit of liberty, and the faith that endures and motivates man to withstand all domination.

Report From Congressman Lester L. Wolff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important functions of a Congressman is to keep his constituents informed on the major issues of the day. I would like to include in the RECORD a report to my constituents stating my opinions in recent developments and activities in Washington:

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN LESTER L. WOLFF, THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW YORK

DEAR NEIGHBOR: The developments in Washington that affect today's fast-moving events in the world, the nation and in our District make it vitally important that you be constantly apprised of the active part your Congressional representative has assumed and will continue to assume in shaping these developments. In order to keep you informed of my activities in Washington on your behalf, I shall continue to send you this report. I am presently engaged in these activities: Viet Nam, space, foreign affairs, jet noise, conservation, oceanographic development, consumer protection, industry and job development on Long Island, Post Office matters, draft problems, Veteran affairs, and current government appropriations. I thought you would be interested in a more detailed report on some of these matters.

VIETNAM: THE BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG OIL DUMPS

My position: On the morning of the day that I learned the Administration had ordered the bombing of oil supplies at Hanoi and Haiphong, I made the following statement on the floor of the Houes:

"It is easy to destroy. Our capability goes much further than the destruction of oil dumps. We can destroy all of Viet Nam and much more, if we so desire. However, our purpose is not to destroy a nation, but to permit a people the opportunity to build a nation. This is a more difficult task. The consequences of our recent action only await time. We have taken a big chance. I would have preferred our giving one more try for a bilateral cease-fire. Since there are none of the 'King's Men' around, we can't put back that which has fallen. I hope that this is not a prelude to one-upmanship that would bring us into an expanded war instead of the intended peace. People who have nothing to lose become desperate people. Desperate people do desperate things."

TRADING STAMPS ADD TO COST OF FOOD

My fight to alert consumers to the widespread abuses of the inadequately regulated trading stamp industry, which result in increased food costs, has at last been confirmed by a U.S. Government-sponsored report. The long-awaited results of a National Commission on Food Marketing independent survey corroborate the findings of my exhaustive Congressional investigation of the industry's activities in the food field. My investigation, conducted at my personal expense, concluded, as did the Commission report, that the billion-dollar trading stamps industry, which does a large part of its business in the retail food trade, makes its swollen profits at the cost of adding considerably to your food bill.

The results of the President's Committee report bear out my contention that, while a properly regulated stamp industry can perform a valuable promotional service to the retail food business, the present uneven state regulations are entirely unsatisfactory and cost you, the consumer, an added 2% each week on your grocery budget.

The independent report of the Commission cites trading stamps as "a form of promotion whose costs are borne largely by consumers" and points to the "1964 figures of 2 billion dollars spent for advertising food and 680 million spent for trading stamps by retailers as significant in the size of the food bill that year." Recent rises in the cost of living have been substantially the result of increased food prices.

Thus, the Commission survey results support the basic fact that emerged from my informal Congressional inquiry: that part of the inflationary trend resulting from spiraling food prices is attributable to the lack of proper regulation of the trading stamp industry. Before the close of the 89th Congress, I shall have introduced a bill authorizing the creation of a federal trading stamp agency to bring about the end of practices that dip into your pocket.

YOUR FEDERAL TAX DOLLAR AT WORK IN THE DISTRICT

As your Congressman, I believe it is my responsibility to secure for the District as many federal grants and contracts as possible. In the past week I was gratified to announce the latest in a series of grants and contracts awarded in the District during the past 2 years: a $333,000 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health for a community mental health center in Woodbury; a $74,105,495 Navy contract to Grumman Aircraft for production of A6-A aircraft; a $65,000 grant from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration toward the cost of sewage plant additions in Great Neck; a Post Office Dept. contract for a new 20,000 square foot post office in Roslyn Heights.

OFFICIAL TRIP TO ARGENTINA

My visit to Buenos Aires was made on behalf of our House of Representatives at the invitation of Dep. Arturo Mor Roig, then President of the Argentine National Congress. On my return from Argentina, less than a week before the coup there, I called the political situation in that country 'volatile' and one in which anything could happen. My evaluation of the situation was based on 5 days of intensive talks with President Arturo Illia, his Min. of War, Gen. Castro Sanchez, Min. of Defense Leopoldo Suarez, and others in the congress, the Illia cabinet and military. All expressed to me deep concern over the threat posed to their government. They also voiced their determination to do all in their power to preserve the constitutional government in Argentina, a course our own nation and I favored.

The ousting of Illia's administration is, to my mind, a real setback for Argentina. He had served for almost 3 years and had done more than any other man to repair the economic ravages to his country caused by years of Peronism. He had ambitious plans, both economic and social, designed to complete his nation's recovery.

When I returned to Washington after my 5 day visit to Argentina, I was able to supply valuable information on the Argentine situation to Washington officials responsible for our Latin American policy.

TAPE A MESSAGE TO THE MEN IN SERVICE

To help keep the lines of communication open to our servicemen overseas, my Port Washington office will continue its tape-a-message service and forward your message at no cost. To avoid delay, call 767-4343 for an appointment.

AN INVITATION

If you desire more detailed information on the matters reported above, please do not hesitate to contact me. Planning to visit Washington? Visit our office (Room 1629, Longworth Building). To those of you planning vacations in the coming months, may I extend my best wishes for a most enjoyable time.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF.

We Must Not Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, this week will mark the eighth annual commemoration in this country of Captive Nations Week. Since 1959, at the request of the Congress, our Presidents have issued the call to all Americans to remember the sorry circumstances which prevail within the area of Europe dominated by the presence or fear of the Red Army. It behooves all who love the blessings of liberty, who believe that freedom and national self-determination are just goals of political action to once again reassert their feelings on the existence of the Communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe.

We who have been nurtured in the traditions of justice and the right of man to govern himself cannot prudently or morally stand by and not decry the terrible state of affairs in the captive nations. It is imprudent to ignore an evil which threatens all we hold dear. It would be an insult to our beliefs not to proclaim the deepest sympathy for the plight of millions now held in bondage by the criminal techniques of Communist domination.

We have our roster of heroes who have fought and often died to make the heritage we take so easily for granted a living and strong reality. We may well not remember that the cause of freedom suffered a grievious, but not mortal, blow when other national patriots behind the wall of Soviet armed power fought for liberty and perished in the attempt. The names of such men as Nikola Petkov, of Bulgaria and Jan Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia should be engraved on the tableaus of those who held human freedom and dignity dearer even than life.

Thousands died opposing the imposition of Communist regimes. Thousands more perished or suffered terribly in the years which followed when the new tyrannies were destroying all opposition. In some cases, large segments of the native population were deported to camps in the Soviet Union when that state unilaterally proclaimed that small historic nations were henceforth part of the Communist Empire of Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, these events were not a tragedy in the sense of being caused by the actions of the small nations of Eastern Europe themselves. The creation of Communist puppets was the result of the cynical and cruel acts of the leaders of the Soviet Union. The nations now called "captive" were the victims of both the desire for dominance which has long characterized the Russian state, and of the sordid urge to impose communism even when it was not the choice of the people. These brave nations were the victims of one of the most colossal robberies of history. At just the time when they felt that the future was bright with promise, when the hideous terror of Nazi occupation was ended, when the course of national development was apparently clear, they were thrown into the hands of groups of men who would not serve the interests of the people.

The Communist conspirators who came to absolute power were interested in two things. One was to stifle all opposition to the satisfaction of their shameful desire for total power. The other was to see that the demands of the source of their strength, the Soviet Union, were met. The result was not only the destruction of liberty, but subservience to the goals of an alien state.

Mr. Speaker, foreign military power and a local daemonic police apparatus cannot perpetually hold down the legitimate aspirations of human beings for liberty and dignity for themselves and their nations. We may be sure that our call to the enslaved peoples during this week will not go unheeded. They will know that our belief in their eventual deliverance is correct. Let me then extend my personal wish to these brave, unfortunate peoples, that the light of freedom will soon shine again in their lands.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time we observe Captive Nations Week, dedicated to the millions of people suffering under the yokes of communism in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe who are our silent allies in the worldwide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny. This observance has become traditional since a unanimous Congress adopted a resolution designating this particular week as Captive Nations Week in July of 1959.

Although east-central Europe today is a showcase of Communist failures, as shown by the continuing nationalism and allegiance to Western democratic ideals of the peoples within this area, progress toward the liberation of the captive nations has been laborious and too slow to satisfy popular demands. The "liberalization" of the totalitarian rule in Eastern Europe is still held firmly in check by the Communist regimes, which invariably draw the line the moment the Communist Party's monopoly on power and ideas is threatened. The status quo in east-central Europe has been and still is perpetuated by the force of the Communist overlords; little progress has been made toward securing the right of self-determination; the peoples remain under alien rule and are still denied basic human rights.

We in the free nations must continue to stand fast by our solemn pledges to defend freedom and self-determination where it still exists and to help extend it wherever possible, if we are to keep alive the hopes of enslaved peoples so they will continue their struggle and their efforts for survival. We must reaffirm the conviction that a policy of peaceful evolution must not digress from the primary objective—an east-central Europe unfettered by totalitarian regimes. By reaffirming our ideals embodied in the concept as represented by Captive Nations Week, we encourage these peoples and contribute toward the ultimate achievement of that goal. We help to lighten their burden of suffering and degradation.

Of utmost importance to the righteous cause of these people is our discussion of this problem, which focuses attention on the treatment of these captives by their Communist masters and helps to expose the ruthless face and features of Communist imperialism for all the world to see. In these days of swift historic changes, when east-central European Communists are themselves beginning to speak out, even by inference, of the illegality of Soviet imperialistic annexations, the free peoples and their governments have an added duty of being heard clearly and forcefully on this key problem.

It gives me pleasure to join in the observance of Captive Nations Week as a way of demonstrating our support of these nations in their efforts to gain freedom to chart their own futures. It is our way of expressing renewed assurance to all captive and oppressed nations of the world that we stand for freedom, justice, and human dignity for all mankind.

Address of Hon. John E. Fogarty, Second Congressional District, Rhode Island, Before the American Association of School Librarians' Convention, New York Hilton, July 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND, BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL LIBRARIANS' CONVENTION, NEW YORK HILTON, JULY 11, 1966

School libraries are caught in the middle of a whirlwind. This whirlwind will toss American education into the uncharted future of all Western civilization.

Never before in recorded history have a people turned so decisively to formal education as the basis for reaching their economic, political, and social goals. The industrial revolution depended on the human body, not the human mind. The electronic and the nuclear revolution will increasingly depend on the power and flexibility of highly trained intelligence.

As school librarians, you must not try to take shelter from this educational whirlwind. Such an act would invite disaster. Instead, face the wind at its strongest point, the electronic processing of intelligence and its immediate communication to the point of need.

I predict that it will become increasingly difficult to tell a librarian from a teacher. Any kind of librarian at any level, from all kinds of teachers at all levels. Education involves learning. Learning is something that each of us does for himself. Teachers, colleagues, librarians, or machines can only assist in making such learning as efficient and productive as possible.

Since learning is exclusively an individual process, more and more educational emphasis is being placed on individual instruction. New educational technology will soon make it possible to bring the best teacher, the best book, the best educational experience to each student.

We can realistically expect to achieve in the forseeable future, the electronic equivalent of Mark Hopkins on one end of the log and each of us—all students everywhere—on the other.

Individualized instruction is, in a sense, the fundamental concept behind libraries. "The right book for the right reader at the right time" still sums up the best basis for developing library services. As this concept pervades educational theory, practice, the means, but not goals, will change and develop. It is the size of the job to be done and its urgency, that demands innovation, flexibility, and prompt action. We must shorten or eliminate the lag that has existed between the best library practices anywhere and all other libraries everywhere.

I have watched with interest the Knapp School Libraries project as an indicator of things to come. Oak Park, for example, has taken advantage of both the Knapp Project and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the electronic retrieval of concept films in the library. This effort will involve teachers, librarians, administrators, and private industry in the effort to improve learning. The library plans to provide several hundred carrels so that students may individually dial their selection at a time convenient to them.

In fact, a child at home in the evening will be able to dial the core and the required concept film would be received over his standard TV set. This kind of development which, when fully operational, should be immediately exploited by other schools to meet their particular need. I am not advocating faddism here. I do not suggest that we bow with every breeze in the whirlwind. But I do submit that we must identify what techniques are effective and we must move swiftly to equalize their impact on all students.

A vehicle for such educational improvement may be found in the network of regional educational laboratories being established by the U.S. Office of Education. Their purpose is to assist local school districts in assessing their own educational programs and practices, developing or identifying new methods for their improvement, and actually implementing worthwhile innovations. Many of these laboratories will be investigating the potential of projects like Oak Park's in solving their educational problems. Whenever they are convinced that the equipment does indeed make a significant contribution to the educational function commensurate with its cost, they will develop demonstration projects to encourage local school districts to follow their lead wherever similar educational problems exist. The laboratories will have the technical competence to determine whether the software has been adequately evaluated and will recommend to the local districts those systems which have been proven effective.

This effort of the laboratories is an extension of the research which has been carried on by the Office of Education for a number of years, but the laboratories take the planning and implementation of the research and development activity out to the schools themselves and thus give the whole effort a practical orientation which will help to speed up and give direction to the entire educational improvement effort. The Federal Government will continue to carry on a wide range of research and development activities, ranging from basic studies in cognitive psychology, through development and evaluation of educational techniques, to the dissemination programs necessary to acquaint local districts with these efforts.

It is significant to note that library-related projects are being conceived and funded under every Title of ESEA. Libraries are not being confined merely to the acquisition of materials under Title II.

The technological advances which I have mentioned can make their greatest contribution to educational improvements if we maintain a close working relationship between the "hardware" and the "software" people. It is clear from the many weddings of publishers and electronics firms that industry is becoming increasingly aware of this need. But this is not enough. The partnership must be extended also to all those in industry who depend upon the human resource development of the educational enterprise and to all those in education including librarians who must somehow get a vision of the future for which our youth are being prepared.

I am glad to report that Warwick, Rhode Island has one of the first projects approved under Title III of ESEA. This operational project was designed to be a demonstration of an exemplary library established in an elementary school. The area served has a high concentration of children from low-income families. By next year, the facility will be used to train librarians, teachers and school administrators from all over the State on an inservice basis.

These Title III projects are becoming the pacesetters in innovation. The term PACE refers to "Projects to Advance Creativity in Education". Another example comes from Asheville, North Carolina. Their operational project calls for the establishment of an audio-visual and library center. This center is delivering instructional materials to 33 schools in an area covering 600 square miles. Services include: repairing and circulating educational films; processing library books and materials; centralizing ordering and billing; and providing facilities for inservice education of teachers and librarians. This project directly serves an estimated 21,000 students, librarians, and teachers.

These developments have enormous implications for the training and competencies of school librarians. You will be called upon to work closely with teachers in arranging schedules and facilities to aid students in individual projects. New programs will call for a new approach by school librarians in selecting and utilizing library resources. Librarians will be aiding children in learning to analyze and seek solutions to the many local, contemporary problems.

Just as the public library has a responsibility to the general public for stocking the current materials on community problems, the school library also holds a responsibility for keeping students well informed on local problems. Students will be seeking answers to the problems of mental health, water pollution, and conservation as they are learning to become active, interested citizens. School librarians should aid children in searching through books and materials for the many conflicting points of view. School librarians will, therefore, be asked to perform the job of a good public relations and information officer. They will prepare picture exhibits, lecture series and informational pamphlets to relate the modern world to academic studies. The school library will become the first place to which a child turns naturally for information, and the school librarian should be far ahead of him in knowing what the young student needs.

You, as an organization of school libarians, realize what a tremendous task it will be to reorganize and reshape many of our school libraries to meet such demands. The concept of the library as a center for individual and group research on historical and contemporary problems, will naturally cause the physical facilities of the school library to change. It will contain projectors, computers, tape recorders and consoles to enable the students to utilize library resources to maximum individual advantage. Computers will house both accurate, cross-referenced indexes for information retrieval and factual informational data. Students will use tape recorders to record oral presentations and to listen to research tapes.

The school library administered in this context has created a demand for a new kind of school librarian. Institutions providing professional education for school librarians, and others concerned with inservice programs are giving increased attention to the content of the school librarian's education. Many library schools now offer courses in the school library administered as an instructional materials center. Institutes and workshops teach librarians new skills and help them become acquainted with new materials and equipment. In addition to library school improvements, there must be more school librarians. Present standards for staffing school libraries are too low for today's instructional programs. More young people should be encouraged to become school librarians; classroom teachers and other qualified adults should be recruited to librarianship. Librarians now in service should be used more effectively by providing supporting personnel.

Routine tasks should be delegated to library clerks who can be employed at lower salaries. Other jobs may be performed by librarian aides or technicians. People like these can provide many services under the supervision of professional school librarians, thus freeing them for crucial curriculum related activities. Jobs not requiring extensive professional knowledge and judgment can be performed at lower cost and more efficiently by personnel with a training at a lesser level. In a world of specialists it is obvious that using school librarians as clerks or technicians is poor economy. It is also poor educational practice. In today's changing school libraries, the school librarians should provide sound professional library service to education.

The movement of the school library from a book-centered agency on the fringes of the educational program to one that supplies the broadest range of instructional materials has radically altered its role in the school. It has moved front and center, and now must become a dynamic new force in the whole picture of elementary and secondary education.

In assessing the role of the school library in the entire educational community, we must not overlook the vast potential of Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1966. This Title, which provides funds for interlibrary cooperation, will include school libraries in library networks designed to provide maximum access to materials needed by all library users. This provision of LSCA will directly supplement both ESEA and the Higher Education Act to bring focus and direction to our library efforts.

In fiscal year 1967, more than $1¼ billion will be available in Federal grants from the U.S. Office of Education alone to improve libraries of all kinds. An investment on this scale is a great and exciting challenge to all of us interested in good libraries. Now is the time for all of us to give our best efforts toward an educational system that will be equal to our times. We in the Congress have done our part to help assure good schools and good libraries. It is now up to you and your colleagues across the Nation to put these programs to work in a way that will do the job. Godspeed and good luck!

Whither the Earthbound Astronauts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a dedicated backer of an improved society. I have had too much humbling experience to expect the achievement of a Great Society. To my colleagues of like persuasion I give this solemn warning; money, however much, and ideals, however high, will not achieve for us the desired purpose. It can no longer be accepted that our role is simply to approve ideas and then grant requested funds. Our responsibilities to the people require a continued attention to assure that the ideas are soundly conceived and effectively executed by the administrators and to determine that the moneys appropriated are wisely and prudently applied.

Now, I am going to demonstrate to you an immense area in which there is very little likelihood that either of the above aims is to be achieved. The newest, most important undertaking of our Federal Government is in the field of environmental improvement. We have at long last accepted as a national goal the responsibility for the reclamation and maintenance of clean air, clean water, and healthy soil. Pollution has become such a damaging intrusion into the sustaining life activities of drinking, eating, and breathing that the threshold of tolerance is being challenged and the health of all is in jeopardy. To undertake the massive requirements of this job in society will call upon resources in our Treasury comparable to the costs of World War II. Virtually billions and billions of dollars in a 10- to 20-year program.

I stand with other of my colleagues saying it is necessary, and even vital, that we commit ourselves to the programs which will clean our environment. Still I say, beware, take care, for we are not proceeding wisely. When you spend massive funds, when you hope to have the talents and products of your private sector and your academic centers you must have organization, control, and cooperation to get results that are not prohibitively expensive.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that all Members soberly reflect the following analogy. We, in the recent past, embarked upon another challenging and demanding venture, the penetration of space. Into this program we have poured over $22 billion to date. The mission of this program is twofold. First, the successful penetration of space with practical reentry of vehicle. Second, if not paramount in importance, the sustaining of the life of the astronauts in hostile conditions; that is, provision of a quality controlled environment traveling with the space vehicle capable of sustaining life at a level to allow high performance in space tasks.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are all of us astronauts. We are traveling in a spacecraft, 3 billion of us, and we have the same problem in this craft as Glenn, White, Grissom, and others have faced. We must maintain a quality of life supporting environment which will allow for a high performance of the activities which allow for an expansion of meaningful and satisfying living. As we crowd the space of our craft and increase the demands upon the elements of air, water, and land, the management and use of these elements become more critical.

We in Congress created NASA and charged that agency with responsibility for the two missions and hold it responsible for a careful and effective expenditure of funds. In recent years we have developed a set of documents and a pattern of procedures for dealing with the Government in this field. NASA procurement regulations were written to implement the Space Act of 1964. A contractor must consider these along with the board of contract appeals decisions, case laws from court cases and other interpretations. Borrowing from the longer experience of the Department of Defense and with working experience now of its own NASA, through these regulations, has been bringing together the "incompatibles" of the free enterprise system, the great academic society and the Government to accomplish NASA's chief missions, exploration of space and sustaining of human life. The history of both DOD and NASA in procurement is not without some blemish but by and large with the advisory committees as consultants and with procedures of cooperation, there painfully evolved an impressive teamwork, coordination and cooperation which serves the Nation well and will gradually improve.

I ask now, my colleagues, that you turn your consideration to the civilian agencies which we are now involving in the impressive and ambitious program against pollution and waste on land, water, and air: in this case, Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Commerce; Agriculture; Interior; and State, to name a few. These agencies procure their goods and services under a set of rules flowing from the Federal Procurement Regulations—the FPR's—which are an implementation of the Office Appropriation Act of 1949. Up to now this procurement has affected U.S. industry very little. It involved housekeeping supplies, office equipment and the like. In the past, civilian agencies of Federal Government have accomplished most of their R. & D. work internally or through grants to higher education and nonprofit institutions.

A new era must be recognized by the agencies involved in the earth environmental health problem. The interface between Government and industry must provide for cooperation, coordination, and a sense for and a definition of mission. Cooperation and coordination must flow between agencies in the same mission and between agencies and industries. The mission concept must come alive as it has for DOD and NASA.

In a recent presentation of this subject matter one of my constituents, Stuart N. Davidson, director of the Contracts Division of Beckman Instruments, presented the problem I am so concerned about in these words:

> To understand this best, let us look again at NASA. We have described its mission as one of space exploration. Of course, NASA's mission can be described in many other ways, but one of the definitions of the mission of NASA must certainly be the "survival of man in a closed atmosphere." The principal problem in Mercury and Gemini, and the principal problem that will be encountered in Apollo, and in orbiting space stations and in manned exploration of the planets will be the survival of a crew in a closed atmosphere. Recent research has indicated to us that men cannot survive long in a closed atmosphere, such as a space capsule or a submarine, unless certain things are done. It is not merely a matter of having enough oxygen along for men to breathe. For if you put a man in a closed atmosphere and provide him all the oxygen he needs to breathe, he will still die sooner or later. This is because the human body emits some 400-odd chemicals through the sweat glands, tear ducts, lungs, etc. Many of those 400 chemicals, which taken in even small quantities, are quite poisonous. A man, even though having enough oxygen, will die from the effects of these poisons even without breathing them. Man simply cannot survive in a closed atmosphere without some means being taken to regenerate his waste material into usable or harmless chemicals.
>
> Consider, if you will, our planet earth. In reality, it is a spacecraft. A relatively small spacecraft hurtling through the uncharted void of space. It happens to be large enough, to have enough mass, so that it holds unto itself its own atmosphere. This enables its crew of three billion people to live on the outside of the capsule rather than on the inside. Nevertheless, the earth and its crew, this spaceship, is a closed atmosphere with limited resources. Now then, up to about 50 years ago there was, very fortunately for the human race, a good ecological balance. The carbon dioxide emitted by animals was taken up by plants and converted back to oxygen and we had a very balanced atmosphere which changed little, if at all, over the centuries. Waste was regenerated through natural means. Today, things are quite different. The crew of three billion on this spacecraft and the mechanisms which they build and operate are busily destroying the environment and upsetting the natural balance severely. The crew, itself, gives off something like 100,000 tons of dead skin, hair, nails and dandruff per day into this environment. It manages somehow to create six million tons of garbage per day consisting of paper bags, towels, empty beer cans, pop bottles, etc. The 200 million internal combustion engines that are constantly running on the highways or in fixed installations give off countless billions of cubic feet of polluted air per day, and into our streams and oceans are dumped millions of tons of industrial and personal refuse and pollution. The most optimistic of scientists when viewing this situation give the human race a few centuries of survival at the present rate. The more pessimistic scientists indicate to us that our great grandchildren may well be the last humans on earth if something isn't done.
>
> Well, something has started. Something is being done about this problem. This is reflected very clearly in the present restructuring of the civilian agencies of the Federal Government who now make, and will be making, their procurements under the Federal Procurement Regulations. In recent months, much legislation has gone through the Congress of the United States. To mention a few of them, there's the Public Health Services Act as amended in the 89th Congress last year; the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 amended last year, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Water Quality Control Act of 1965; the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965; the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; the Pure Water Act of 1965; and many other public laws which bear upon the cleaning up of our environment and the health of our citizens.
>
> The President's Reorganization Plan Number 2 of 1966 has gone into effect. It has created the Environmental Sciences Services Administration (ESSA) which includes the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and is probably the administration in the Government which will concern itself most with oceanography. This reorganization plan also created within the Department of the Interior, the Federal Pure Water Control Administration, which will concern itself with stream and ocean pollution. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is constantly being reorganized and is taking giant strides in medical research. Apparently, HEW will administer the air pollution efforts of the Federal Government. The Department of Commerce has written its own procurement regulations to implement the Federal Procurement Regulations. The Department of Agriculture and others have done the same. All of these civilian agencies are starting to make their move to become heavy buyers of research and development and hardware from American industry.
>
> We have been used to regarding the Department of Defense and NASA as the complex within the Government which has the most impact on industry. This is the complex which has done a great deal of procurement in the past with billions of dollars and they are the Federal agencies which have had the most direct influence on American industry. Now, however, the civilian agencies are beginning to enter into contracts, either directly or indirectly, with American industry. One can assume that in view of the urgency of their mission, the survival of the human race, that these civilian agencies, operating under the Federal Procurement Regulations, will soon be spending more money with industry than does NASA today. Further, barring some kind of international strife, these agencies will be more important in the future procurement arena than either NASA or DOD, and probably more important in dollar volume of procurement than both of them put together. The sales opportunities for industry in this arena are fantastic (but that is not my subject today.)
>
> Already, industry is beginning to feel the effects of this new Federal customer. Some specific examples: Five universities scattered throughout the country within the last two or three weeks, have gone to industry with requests to buy certain kinds of scientific laboratory equipment. They have issued purchase orders for this equipment, the "boiler-plate" of which has embodied the requirements of the Federal Procurement Regulations in the same way that contracts issued from the large prime contractors to their subcontractors have, in the past, embodied the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations for DOD, or the NASA Procurement Regulations for NASA. What I am saying here is that the rules of procurement of the Federal Government are filtering down to industry today through universities. In the past, universities have accomplished their procurement from industry principally with Federal grant money. In most cases they were regarded as purely commercial transactions between the university and industry. Today, this is becoming not so. The universities' purchase orders for scientific equipment in these specific examples have been made under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
>
> I have no such specific examples concerning hospital procurements, but I do know that at the hospital level there are some indications that we will soon see what used to be purely commercial procurements made by hospitals and hospital complexes now taking the form of incorporating the requirements of Federal Procurement Regulations and the enabling legislation.
>
> Local governments are procuring a great deal of research and hardware to help solve their local air pollution problems and their water pollution problems. All of these—traffic control, crime detection, air pollution, sewage disposal, water pollution—problems to which the local governments are addressing themselves and under which they are de-

manding increasing skills from industry, all of these programs are backed up in one degree or another by federal funds. At the same time we are seeing the Federal Government preparing itself to exercise considerable surveillance over the local governments as to their means of procurement. For the Government has taken the position in all of the acts of legislation that I have mentioned before, that in order to get money for these programs—for universities, for hospitals, or for the local governments—the states have got to submit to the Government a plan which must include a means by which the local institutions can show the Federal Government that they are making wise procurements, and that they are passing on to their suppliers all the terms and conditions in these procurements that are required by the legislation and the regulations.

The Federal Government has taken great strides in computerizing the procurement process. The Department of Defense and NASA are leaders in this. We have programs with the Department of Defense—one of them, for example, is called Contract and Performance Evaluation (CPE), where the detail performance of every contractor in the country on every contract above a certain size is retained in a computer's memory. All of these facts are being gathered together by DOD and put on the computer so that at any one time one can read out what is going on in the contracting area; how the prime contractors are handling procurements; what kind of performance they are getting from each and every subcontractor, etc. Audits are also posted in this great memory so that the DOD has a readout available of the whole procurement process.

With this kind of information and these kinds of techniques available, one can be sure that the Department of Commerce; Health, Education and Welfare; Interior; indeed, all of these Federal civilian agencies who will be the biggest procurers from industry in the next ten years will use them. They are going to follow the same techniques so that all this federal money that flows down from the civilian departments to local governments, hospitals, universities and out to industry is going to be watched carefully. They have the mechanism to examine the whole contracting process and it will be examined in some great detail.

The point I am trying to make with all of this is that the procurement people—the buyers—in educational institutions, in medical institutions, and in local governments are going to have to begin to understand more intimately the federal procurement process. They are going to be audited, for indeed the legal right of audit rests in the Federal Government. They are going to be audited as to how they spend this money, their procurement methods, the degree to which they solicit competition, conduct price analysis, etc. They are going to be examined carefully. They are, in short, going to have to learn to live with the Federal Procurement Regulations (the FPR's) in much the same way as those of us who have been in the space and defense business have learned over the years to understand and abide by the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, in the case of DOD, and NASA Procurement Regulations, in the case of the space agency.

Finally, and most important, if this is to be an efficient government-industry partnership, the same kind of rapport now existing between industry and government in the space and defense arena must be established with the civilian agencies so that the mission of survival can be accomplished.

Mr. Davidson speaks from long, practical experience in the interaction between government and business at the interface of procurement. His observations are most penetrating and significant. I would add that Congress must be as aware on its part as this industry representative has demonstrated he is. The situation demands that we be prepared to amend and adjust the implementary legislation supporting bills providing the major thrusts into environmental health. We must be concerned with procurement procedure with coordination of efforts for cooperation in projects so we meet the mission requirements. We must expect and encourage the painful yet necessary development of lines for adjustment in the face of inevitable new areas of "incompatibility between the Federal Government and its partners in both the public and private sector. We must demand and help develop new methods of measurement so that we can distinguish between real performance and a "snow job." We must be aware of the critical balances which are constantly present in the areas of material and manpower where the Federal Government and its partners are making excessive demands on limited quality and quantity. Finally the appropriate committees should keep a constant, constructive surveillance else these important programs will be at best wasteful and at worst miss completely their important, vital mission. Only in this way can the achievement match the promise in this new and noble experiment. Only thus can we extend the comfort and the length of the journey for the earthbound astronauts.

The tocsin has been sounded, my brethren, which of you will answer?

Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 the House approved the allied health professions personnel training amendments, which authorize a 3-year program of Federal assistance to schools and students of the allied health professions. It passed unanimously; 364 to 0. I was proud to record my vote in favor of this forward-looking and urgently needed bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Senate will act quickly on this measure. There is no question of partisanship—only one of health.

The allied health professions personnel training amendments is one of the three major proposals of President Johnson's health message this year. In combination with the others—one to strengthen our attack upon the obsolescence of hospitals and other health facilities; and another to stimulate the development of comprehensive public health services—it will permit the Nation to move ahead in its efforts to insure, for all its people, the benefits of an unsurpassed medical capability.

The final enactment of H.R. 13196 is essential. In this decade of the 1960's, the Nation's shortages of health manpower have for the first time received the congressional attention they so long demanded. With the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and the Nurse Training Act, we have made possible a long overdue expansion of the training capacity of our professional schools. We have taken an important step toward assuring the quality and quantity of highly trained doctors, dentists, and nurses required by our national goals in health.

But health care is very much a team effort today. The team includes our physicians and dentists, our home health aids and practical nurses, our medical technologists and hospital administrators. I am happy that we are at last moving to assure that the needed allied health professions workers will be available.

A major gap has existed in what should be a comprehensive training effort—until now, with the hope of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act becoming law, there has been no attempt to deal with the allied health professions. The allied health professions encompass some 30 occupations, each one vital to modern health services. Some of their members—medical record librarians, X-ray technologists—provide services essential to the operation of our hospitals and health facilities. Others—dental hygienists, for example—render health services under the supervision of more highly trained members of the health team.

Baccalaureate level training in the allied health professions is offered by colleges and universities throughout the country. And a growing number of junior colleges are preparing students for careers in certain allied professions through associate degree programs. Our manpower needs are so great that we must take advantage of all existing opportunities for training, and I was delighted that the bill, as reported from committee, and as passed by the House, will permit Federal assistance to both baccalaureate and associate degree programs.

For just seven of the allied health professions—dental hygiene, medical record library service, medical technology, occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech pathology and audiology, and X-ray technology, manpower estimates indicate the necessity for more than doubling our current manpower by 1975. To reach this goal, schools in the fields will have to graduate annually before 1975—twice as many medical X-ray technologists as they are now doing; twice as many speech pathologists and audiologists; three or four times as many dental hygienists. There must be even greater increases in the numbers of workers trained in such occupations as medical record library service and physical therapy.

H.R. 13196 will provide major support in reaching this goal. Through grants, it will aid colleges, universities, and junior colleges in expanding and modernizing their teaching facilities and in improving their educational programs. Through traineeships for advanced training, it will prepare members of these professions for teaching, supervision, and administration. The shortage of teachers is a major block to still larger training programs. This bill, in addition, looks to the future of education in the allied health professions by encouraging the development of new types of health technologists and technicians.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and its distinguished chairman, should be commended for its most thoughtful consideration of this measure which is so important to the welfare of our country.

The health sciences move forward with every passing day. As they do, their potential benefits for the improved health of our people grow ever larger.

Medical science promises the rehabilitation to productive lives of the victims of accidents and strokes and heart attacks. It has made possible the early detection of such diseases as cancer and glaucoma—and the prevention of death and disability. To assure the full benefits of our great scientific advances to all who need them, there must be technologists and technicians to provide specialized services, to administer and process diagnostic tests.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the House on June 23 was a much needed step. We are at a crossroad. Our national commitment is a broad one—to provide the best possible health care to every citizen. Medicare and other new programs will make medical and hospital services accessible to many millions of Americans who have been unable to afford good medical care. Our great scientific advances are making medical diagnosis and treatment both more complex and more costly. Thus, even as we progress we have only begun—there must be changes in organization for the delivery of health care. There must be new and better kinds of facilities. And they cannot be delayed.

I am sure that all of my colleagues share my concern, and that they will continue to support the legislation we need to underwrite our promise of good health for all America.

Jamestown, Ohio, Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1966

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, Jamestown, Ohio, located in Greene County in my congressional district celebrated its sesquicentennial from June 30 through July 4, 1966. It was my pleasure to participate in the "Veterans Day" observance of the sesquicentennial on July 2, and "Old Fashioned Day" on July 4.

The honored guests on "Veterans Day" were distinguished Jamestown native sons Maj. Gen. Clement F. St. John, M.D., U.S. Army, retired, now vice president of the University of Cincinnati, and Lt. Comdr. Vernon H. Fix, officer in charge of gunnery school, Great Lakes Naval Training Center. Also honored that day were Col. J. C. Wise, commander of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and Capt. C. J. Flessner, U.S. Navy liaison officer at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

On "Old Fashioned Day" Mr. Samuel A. Noblet of the Armco Steel Corp. made remarks citing the contribution to American industry of Jamestown native, George M. Verity, who was the founder of the Armco Steel Corp.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting the two speeches I prepared for "Veterans Day" and "Old Fashioned Day," as well as the remarks made by Mr. Noblet honoring George M. Verity:

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, SESQUICENTENNIAL "VETERAN'S DAY" JULY 2, 1966

Mayor Borst, distinguished guests, citizens of Jamestown, as a veteran of World War II and the Korean Conflict, it is a pleasure to be here to participate in the "Veterans Day" observance of the Jamestown Sesquicentennial, and to pay tribute to the men from Jamestown and the surrounding area who have participated in all the important wars in which this nation has been engaged since the Village was founded in 1816.

Jamestown men have served at Bull Run and Gettysburg, Manila Bay and San Juan Hill, in the Argonne Forest, the Coral Sea and Midway, Anzio, Heartbreak Ridge—and now we are adding the names of such places as Chu Lai, Pleiku, and Mekong Delta.

Last Wednesday on the Floor of the House the Armed Services Committee Chairman, MENDEL RIVERS, announced that there have been more than 24,000 casualties in Viet Nam, 4000 of whom are dead.

According to the casualty lists which I receive in my office every morning, I am happy to say that no Jamestown boys have been killed or wounded to date.

If anyone has information to the contrary, I would be grateful to have it, as I am keeping a record in my office of all Seventh District boys killed in the Viet Nam war.

I feel it is an honor and a privilege to share this platform with such distinguished veterans as Jamestown's General St. John, Colonel Wise and Captain Flessner. Their combat service and their decorations are so impressive that I feel like a Little Leaguer among Big League stars.

They can be justly proud, as well as their country, of their deeds of valor and their heroism in combat.

We also pay tribute to the some 400 veterans now estimated to live in the Jamestown area and extended our grateful thanks to them for the part they played in the cause of freedom.

Our thoughts today are also with the boys from the Jamestown area who are in Viet Nam, as their own thoughts must turn homeward on this 4th of July holiday.

As we pay tribute to the Jamestown veterans and servicemen here on this occasion, General Douglas MacArthur's tribute to the American fighting man in his farewell address to the cadets at the Military Academy at West Point on May 12, 1962, comes to my mind:

"Duty, honor, country: those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be.

"They are your rallying point to build courage, when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. . . .

"The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase.

"Every pedant, every demagogue, every cynic, every hypocrite, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them, even to the extent of mockery and ridicule.

"But these are some of the things they build. They build your basic character. They mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the nation's defense. They make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid."

In his speech General MacArthur also described the American fighting man:

"Their story is known to all of you. It is the story of the American man at arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago and has never changed.

"I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless.

"His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give.

"He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast.

"In twenty campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his stature in the hearts of his people.

"From one end of the world to the other, he has drained deep the chalice of courage. . . .

"I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory.

"Always for them: Duty, honor, Country." . . .

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, SESQUICENTENNIAL, "OLD-FASHIONED DAY," JULY 4, 1966

As we celebate this "Old-Fashioned Day" at the Jamestown Sesquicentennial, and the 190th Anniversary of the founding of our country, it is fitting that we pause to consider some of the "old-fashioned" virtues—such as love and honor for our flag, loyalty, honesty, courage, thrift, duty, and patriotism—which made our country great.

I am reminded of an essay by an unknown author entitled "I am the Nation" which is hanging on the wall in my office in Washington.

I would like to paraphrase it just a little to make it even more meaningful for those of us gathered here today.

I AM THE NATION

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered *freedom* to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the nation.

I am 195 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died *for* me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln.

I am Jamestown and her hardy pioneers who travelled over the Chiuxso (Shawnee) Trail from the Ohio River to the Mad River Valley.

I am the Browders, the Mendenhalls, the Moormans, the Strongs, the Watts, and the many others, who helped found Jamestown.

I remember the Alamo, the Maine, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and *stayed* until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rocks of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea and in the steaming jungles of Viet-Nam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the Ohio, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor and the Merrimac.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific . . . my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii . . . 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain, and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series, and Gary Bradds and a basketball court. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 320,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman. I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers, and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, and Albert Sabin.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Tom Paine.

Yes, I am the nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom, and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1966—one hundred and ninety years after I was born.

ARMCO AND JAMESTOWN, JULY 4, 1966

(Remarks by Samuel A. Noblet, supervisor, community relations, Armco Steel Corp., Middletown, Ohio)

To all of you who remember the late Ole Nelson, I wish to bring greetings from his son Bob who is a member of Armco Public Relations.

I am delighted to be here in Jamestown this afternoon to share in the celebration of this historic occasion. I carry with me greetings and good wishes to you from our president, William Verity, grandson of our founder George M. Verity. I am also here today to say a few words about the relationship between Armco Steel Corporation and Jamestown which has been made possible through our founder George M. Verity.

It was here some 90 years ago that the roots of Armco actually began to form. From this early beginning there is today an Armco that is the sixth largest company in the steel industry. The company has steel-making plants not only in the state of Ohio, but also in Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and Texas. Then too, there are the three divisions, Armco Metal Products, National Supply and Armco International. Armco Metal Products largely serves the construction industry and has a steel building plant right next door—Washington Court House. National Supply serves the petroleum industry world-wide. And Armco International is our overseas arm covering the free world.

This broad expanse, briefly described, represents a capital investment of well over a billion dollars and employment for 40,000 men and women.

Let me now turn to the real heart of Armco; the roots right here in Jamestown which helped to give birth to Armco Steel Corporation. These roots I speak of are the warm friendly relationships which Armco management work so hard to maintain among its employees, customers, shareholders and neighbors. These roots of understanding and cooperation began with the philosophy of our founder, George M. Verity, the man who spent his early formative years here on Verity Street, Jamestown.

At age 14 Armco's founder spent his summer with his father, a Methodist minister, in the harvest field on the nearby farm of Reverend James W. Smith, who was the great grandfather of Mrs. Leland Smith. It was here where father and son learned greater understanding and appreciation for each other. You know full well that work on the farm also is a good way to learn how to keep digging when times get hard.

Such experiences as these help to lay the true foundation for George M. Verity's philosophy in human relations. This philosophy helped to nurture the early days of Armco and later made it possible for George M. Verity to establish Armco Policies. I am happy to say they are still our guide today. In brief Armco Policies stand for: Faith in Men; A square deal always; A True Spirit of Co-operation; Pride in accomplishment; Proper incentives to work; Best possible compensation; Opportunity for advancement; Good living conditions; Fair treatment of customers and highest business ethics.

No doubt this same creed based on Christian principles has been applied by all of you in your business operations.

Our president, William Verity, just recently published objectives for the company. Here is what one of them has to say:

"To do business guided and governed by the highest standards of personal conduct and ethics, with Armco Policies as a constant guide."

To me, Armco Policies, an expression of George M. Verity's philosophy, had a great deal to do with the fact that the Middletown Works of Armco Steel Corporation, which now has over 7,000 employees, has never experienced a strike.

Your gift to Armco Steel Corporation includes not only a founder whose son became executive vice president before retirement and whose grandson is now our president, but, it also includes for Armco a way of life born from the philosophy of George M. Verity who once lived on Verity Street, Jamestown.

On behalf of myself and the 40,000 men and women of Armco, we say thanks to you good people of Jamestown for the contribution you have made to Armco and we wish you well on this historic occasion.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God most high, whose love endureth all things: draw us near to Thee in sincerity and truth—

Breathe on us, Breath of God,
  Till we are wholly thine;
Till all this earthly part of us
  Glows with Thy fire divine.
Breathe on us, Breath of God;
  Fill us with life anew,
That we may love what Thou dost love
  And do what Thou wouldst do.
Breathe on us, Breath of God,
  Until our hearts are pure;
Until with Thee we will have one will,
  To do and to endure.
Breathe on us, Breath of God,
  So shall we never die,
But live with Thee the perfect life
  of Thine eternity.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 18, 1966, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, July 19, 1966, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 8337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 489. An act to authorize the establishment of the San Juan Island National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 1310. An act relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 2948. An act to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3013. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents;

H.R. 5297. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the revocation of retired pay of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9916. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11671. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13374. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of trophies for the recognition of special accomplishments related to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14548. An act to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14838. An act to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14875. An act to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15712. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of expenses incidental to the transportation of motor vehicles of certain members of the Armed Forces; and

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 3093. An act to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 9, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; and

S. 3150. An act to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3013. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents;

H.R. 5297. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the revocation of retired pay of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9916. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13374. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of trophies for the recognition of special accomplishments related to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14875. An act to amend section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, and other laws, to authorize members of the uniformed services who are on duty outside the United States or its possessions to deposit their savings with a uniformed service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15712. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of expenses incidental to the transportation of motor vehicles of certain members of the Armed Forces; and

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11671. An act to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14548. An act to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 14838. An act to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COTTON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3523. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to undertake a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles International Airport (Rept. No. 1376).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 4665. An act relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining (Rept. No. 1377).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3623. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of installment sales when a taxpayer changes from the accrual to the installment basis of reporting profits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3624. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on certain granulated and ground cork and on certain natural and composition cork cut or molded into rods; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. Scott):

S. 3625. A bill to designate the dam being constructed on the Allegheny River, Pa., as the "Kinzua Dam," and the lake to be formed by such dam in Pennsylvania and New York as the "Allegheny Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3626. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend to all individuals who become disabled prior to attaining age 31 the same requirements for insured status as are presently provided in the case of individuals who become disabled on account of blindness prior to attaining such age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. Bennett) (by request):

S. 3627. A bill to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary.

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF INSTALLMENT SALES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in this age of the transportation revolution, there is a growing worldwide demand for jet aircraft. Well over 80 percent of these aircraft now flying are manufactured by the American aircraft industry. It is my hope that America can continue this predominance as it faces ever-increasing international competition.

One of these aircraft industries, the Douglas Aircraft Co., has the center of its operations in my own State of California. Employing over 75,000 people and operating with total net sales near the $1 billion mark, Douglas, like its brother industries, represents America's answer to the competition and development of the "jet age."

Today, however, the position of these industries in meeting the competition for domestic and foreign markets is threatened by an inequity in our tax laws. It is an inequity which was never intended by our laws, and one which is inhibiting the growth of a number of our industries that must deal largely in credit sales.

In recent years, owing to a basic change in the underlying economics of our competitive environment, various businesses and industries have found it necessary to make an increasing number of sales on credit. The effect of such transactions is to postpone the collection of cash proceeds from the time of sale to the time when future installments are received. Depending on the size of such sales, the installments may stretch over a number of years.

Fortunately, since 1921, the internal revenue laws have contained provisions permitting taxpayers the choice of reporting their income on an installment rather than an accrual basis. This method allows the taxpayer to report, in effect, only what he actually receives in that year, regardless of the size of the sale or number of future payments. The accrual method requires that he pay taxes on the entire amount of the sale in the year in which it is made; a method which may result in a substantial strain on present working capital.

Prior to the enactment of the 1954 code, however, taxpayers were required to pay a penalty tax for the privilege of changing from the accrual to the installment method of reporting income. Section 453 of the Internal Revenue Code was designed to eliminate this penalty tax and permit the taxpayer to freely shift his method of reporting. But these relief provisions introduced in 1954 contain a major defect which, in actual practice, severely hinders the shift to the installment method.

The code now recognizes, at least in principle, the inequity of taxing installment receipts attributable to sales made in earlier years. Such sales may have already been fully taxed under the accrual method. A formula for a tax credit is provided by the section. Its terms, however, preclude a credit large enough to prevent some degree of double taxation.

This double tax not only penalizes and discriminates against the taxpayer, but also may further place him at a severe disadvantage with competitors who are not burdened with the double taxation problem—including, I might add, competitors represented by foreign industry. In some situations, the additional tax, when added to the tax originally paid in respect to the sales concerned, would actually exceed the net profit which the taxpayer has realized from the entire sale. Many are, therefore, forced to continue the accrual method of reporting income, even though it burdens and restricts their economic growth.

Most important, this inequity impairs the ability of certain U.S. businesses to support an appropriate volume of sales abroad. American exporters are finding it increasingly necessary to utilize credit sales abroad. A typical illustration is the manner in which the export sales of jet aircraft are financed. Because of the high price of jet aircraft—approximately $8 million for a long-range plane and $3 million for the newer, short-range planes—many foreign customers are unable to pay the full purchase price of this equipment in cash on delivery, as was true in the past.

In such cases, U.S. manufacturers are finding it necessary to accept the customer's promissory notes for a portion of the purchase price. As I have indicated, the penalty tax under section 453 has the effect of preventing American exporters from utilizing the installment method of accounting. The continued use of the accrual method, however, can only place a burden on working capital and limit the extent to which we can continue to engage in the increasing foreign credit sales that comprise international trade today.

Mr. President, section 453, as it now stands, clearly discriminates against and threatens the competitive status and growth of some of our greatest industries. I introduce a bill today which would eliminate the double taxation problem through the application of a more equitable formula. I send this bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask that this bill be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. I also ask that it lie at the desk until Friday for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 3623) relating to the income tax treatment of installment sales when a taxpayer changes from the accrual to the installment basis of reporting profits, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 453(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to change from accrual to installment basis) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) CHANGE FROM ACCRUAL TO INSTALLMENT BASIS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—If a taxpayer entitled to the benefits of subsection (a) elects for any taxable year to report his taxable income on the installment basis then in computing his taxable income for such year (referred to in this subsection as 'year of change') or for any subsequent year, subsection (a) shall not apply to that percentage of the gross profit to be received after the close of the taxable year (computed as provided in paragraph (2)) on installment sales made during the taxable year which is the same percentage as the figure computed under paragraph (3) (relating to the past level of installment sales) is of such gross profit; and such percentage (but not more than 100 percent) of the gross profit to be received after the close of the year shall be returned as income for the year of sale under the accrual method of accounting.

"(2) COMPUTATION OF GROSS PROFIT.—The gross profit referred to in paragraph (1), with respect to sales or other dispositions of personal property on the installment plan during a taxable year, is the amount of gross profit which would be returned as income after the close of such year under subsection (a) (applied without regard to this subsection) if all unpaid installments at the close of the taxable year were thereafter paid in full.

"(3) PAST LEVEL OF INSTALLMENT SALES.—The figure referred to in paragraph (1) is the amount computed under subparagraph (B) or (C), whichever is the higher, determined as follows:

"(A) By computing, for each month in the period of 36 consecutive months ending with the close of the year of change, the amount of gross profit received during such month (on account of installment sales made before the beginning of the taxable year in which such month falls) which would have been returnable as income under subsection (a) if such subsection had been applicable to the taxpayer for such month and all preceding months.

"(B) By computing the aggregate of the amounts determined under subparagraph (A) for the last 12 months in the 36-month period.

"(C) By computing the aggregate of the amounts determined under subparagraph (A) for the first 24 months in the 36-month period and by dividing such aggregate by two.

For purposes of the computation under subparagraph (A), if the taxpayer prior to any taxable year sold installment obligations which had not been satisfied in full by the obligee before the beginning of such year any amount paid by the obligee after the beginning of such taxable year shall be taken into account as if the taxpayer had not sold such installment obligations."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall apply to the first taxable year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act in which the taxpayer changes from the accrual to the installment basis, and to subsequent taxable years. If the taxpayer changes from the accrual to the installment basis for a taxable year beginning before such date of enactment but ending after such date, the amendment shall apply to such taxable year and to all subsequent taxable years if the taxpayer so elects in filing his return for the first taxable year ending after such date.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say this, Mr. President, by way of repetition. Part of the future of American business will be its successful competition abroad, and the laws of this land with respect to taxation ought not to impede American industry in competing abroad, by the indefensible rule of double taxation.

PERMANENT NAME FOR THE KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators KENNEDY of New York, and SCOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to fix the name of a major new reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York. This facility will be dedicated in September. My colleagues from Pennsylvania and New York join me in sponsoring this legislation.

In 1936 Congress authorized the construction of the Allegheny Dam and Reservoir, as it is now known. Construction was started in 1959. This multipurpose dam will control a drainage area of 2,180 square miles. Its primary purpose is of flood control, but it will also offer great recreation opportunities.

Since 1959 I have received various proposals for the permanent name for the Allegheny Dam and Reservoir. I have referred these to the Allegheny Reservoir Advisory Council. The council is composed of representatives of the States of New York and Pennsylvania, local governments, and the various Federal agencies involved. On June 16, 1966, the Allegheny Reservoir Advisory Council unanimously recommended that the facility be permanently named the Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir. The Federal representatives did not vote on this question, because they felt it was primarily a local matter.

I completely agree with the council's recommendation. The dam has always been called the Kinzua Dam by area residents. I call it by that name myself. It is designated as such on State maps.

The dam came to be known as the Kinzua Dam because it was built near a town of the same name. That town was inundated by the reservoir.

I hope that Congress will act quickly on this legislation so that the new name can be used at the dedication ceremony on September 16, 1966.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3625) to designate the dam being constructed on the Allegheny River, Pa., as the "Kinzua Dam," and the lake to be formed by such dam in Pennsylvania and New York as the "Allegheny Reservoir," introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. Scott), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

MORE FLEXIBLE REGULATION OF MAXIMUM RATES OF INTEREST OR DIVIDENDS PAYABLE BY BANKS AND CERTAIN OTHER FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], I am today introducing, by request, a bill which was transmitted to me late last Friday by the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The bill's short title is, "To provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, and for other purposes."

The bill would accomplish these purposes by authorizing the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to limit, by regulation, the rates of interest and dividends which may be paid by institutions which are members of or insured by those agencies.

The bill would specifically authorize different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, for deposits of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment according to the nature or location of the institutions or their depositors or according to such other reasonable bases as the agencies may deem desirable in the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point together with the letter from the Federal Reserve Board recommending it and the Federal Reserve Board's press release announcing changes made under existing authority with respect to time deposits.

Since the House committee has held extensive hearings in the question of regulating interest rates, it will be its privilege to act first on this new proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and press release will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3627) to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson (for himself and Mr. Bennett), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of the thirteenth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371b) is amended to read as follows: "The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, limit by regulation the rates of interest which may be paid by member banks on time and savings deposits: *Provided,* That any regulation prescribed by the Board of Governors with respect to the payment of deposits and interest thereon by member banks in effect prior to the effective date of this Act shall continue in effect unless and until the Board of Governors, after consultation with the other agencies above named, shall modify or rescind such regulation. The Board may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, for deposits of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of member banks or their depositors, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest."

Sec. 2. The second and third sentences of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) are amended to read as follows: "The Board of Directors may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, limit by regulation the rates of interest or dividends that may be paid by insured nonmember banks (including insured mutual savings banks) on time and savings deposits: *Provided,* That any regulation prescribed by the Board of Directors with respect to the payment of deposits and interest thereon by member banks in effect prior to the effective date of this Act shall continue in effect unless and until the Board of Directors, after consultation with the other agencies above named, shall modify or rescind such regulation. The Board of Directors may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, for deposits of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of insured nonmember banks or their depositors, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board of Directors may deem desirable in the public interest."

Sec. 3. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act is amended by adding after section 5A thereof (12 U.S.C. 1425a) the following new section:

"Sec. 5B. The Board may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, limit by regulation the rates of interest or dividends on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts that may be paid by members, other than those the deposits of which are insured in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and by institutions which are insured institutions as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act: *Provided,* That any regulation prescribed by the Board with respect to the payment of deposits and interest thereon by member banks in effect prior to the effective date of this Act shall continue in effect unless and until the Board, after consultation with the other agencies above named, shall modify or rescind such regulation. The Board may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, for deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of such members or institutions or their depositors, shareholders, or withdrawable accountholders, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest."

The letter and press release, presented by Mr. Robertson, are as follows:

Board of Governors
of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, July 15, 1966.

The Honorable A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: On behalf of the Board of Governors, I am submitting a draft of legislation broadening existing authority to regulate interest rates payable by insured banks on time and savings deposits, and extending parallel authority to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board with respect to rates payable by savings and loan associations.

I am also enclosing a copy of a statement that will be released shortly, announcing action by the Board of Governors to amend Regulation Q so as to lower the ceiling on rates payable by member banks on certain kinds of "consumer-type" certificates of deposit. You will notice that a 5 per cent ceiling will apply to "multiple maturity" deposits of 90 days or more, and that a 4 per cent ceiling is imposed for "multiple maturity" deposits of less than 90 days. The purpose of this amendment is to help forestall excessive interest rate competition among financial institutions in conditions, such as those now existing, when monetary policy is aimed at curbing the rate of expansion of bank credit.

Separate ceilings are imposed on "multiple maturity" deposits in an effort to differentiate between money market CD's and consumer-type deposits. Obviously, the "multiple maturity" concept is not ideally suited for this purpose, but it is, in our judgment, the best alternative available under existing law. It may be that the only effective means for accomplishing the purposes we seek in the current situation is to differentiate on the basis of amount of deposit, even though, as you know the Board has reservations about such an approach except as a temporary expedient. Accordingly, we hope that your Committee will give prompt consideration to broadening the existing law as proposed in the enclosed draft.

At the same time, we doubt the efficacy of attempting to prevent a rate war by limiting rates payable only by banks. The draft legislation therefore includes authority for imposition of rate ceilings by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Under the proposal, ceilings for both banks and savings and loan associations would not be mandatory, but could be imposed or placed on a stand-by basis by the appropriate agency, after consultation with the others, in the light of existing conditions.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. Robertson.

JULY 15, 1966.

FEDERAL RESERVE PRESS RELEASE

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System today lowered the maximum rate that the System's member banks may pay henceforth on those time deposits that have multiple maturities.

At the same time, the Board asked Congress for broader authority—for itself, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board—than is now available to govern the rate practices of banks and savings and loan associations.

The purpose of both steps is to help forestall excessive interest rate competition among financial institutions in conditions, such as those now existing, when monetary policy is aimed at curbing the rate of expansion of bank credit.

The action taken under present legislative authority prescribes, effective July 20, 1966, a maximum rate of 5 per cent on new multiple maturity deposits of 90 days or more, and 4 per cent for those of less than 90 days. Outstanding multiple maturity deposits will not be affected by the lower maximum rates.

Previously, member banks were authorized to pay as high as 5½ per cent on multiple maturity time deposits. The term "multiple maturity time deposit" is defined in the Board's Regulation Q as: "any time deposit (1) that is payable at the depositor's option on more than one date, whether on a specified date or at the expiration of a specified time after the date of deposit (e.g., a deposit payable at the option of the depositor either three months or six months after the date of deposit), (2) that is payable after written notice of withdrawal, or (3) with respect to which the underlying instrument or contract or any informal understanding or agreement provides for automatic renewal at maturity."

No change was made in the ceilings respecting time deposits have a single maturity (now set at 5½ per cent) or passbook savings accounts (now at 4 per cent).

Prompt consideration of the legislative proposals to broaden the rate regulatory powers of the three supervisory agencies was asked by the Board in letters to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees.

These proposals would empower the three supervisory agencies to prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of accounts, for accounts of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, according to the nature or location of the institutions or the account holders or on any other reasonable basis.

In the letters to the Congressional Committee Chairmen, the Reserve Board pointed out that its action today under its present powers would cover only "consumer type" certificates of deposits ("CD's") in member banks.

"Separate ceilings are imposed on 'multiple maturity' deposits in an effort to differentiate between money market CD's and consumer-type deposits," the Board said. "Obviously, the 'multiple maturity' concept is not ideally suited for this purpose, but it is, in our judgment, the best alternative available under existing law. It may be that the only effective means for accomplishing the purposes we seek in the current situation is to differentiate on the basis of amount of deposit, even though, as you know, the Board has reservations about such an approach except as a temporary expedient. Accordingly, we hope that your Committee will give prompt consideration to broadening the existing law as proposed in the enclosed draft.

"At the same time, we doubt the efficacy of attempting to prevent a rate war by limiting rates payable only by banks. The draft legislation therefore includes authority for imposition of rate ceilings by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Under the proposal, ceilings for both banks and savings and loan associations would not be mandatory, but could be imposed or placed on a stand-by basis by the appropriate agency, after consultation with the others, in the light of existing conditions."

Attached is the text of the amendments to Regulation Q, Payment of Interest on Deposits, implementing the Board's action.

TITLE 12—BANKS AND BANKING

CHAPTER II—FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Subchapter A—Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

[Reg. Q]

Part 217—Payment of Interest on Deposits

Maximum rates of interest

1. Effective July 20, 1966, § 217.1 is amended by inserting a new paragraph (g) as follows:

(g) *Multiple maturity time deposit.*—The term "multiple maturity time deposit" means any time deposit (1) that is payable at the depositor's option on more than one date, whether on a specified date or at the expiration of a specified time after the date of deposit (e.g., a deposit payable at the option of the depositor either three months or six months after the date of deposit), (2) that is payable after written notice of withdrawal, or (3) with respect to which the underlying instrument or contract or any informal understanding or agreement provides for automatic renewal at maturity.

2. Effective July 20, 1966, § 217.6 (Supplement to Regulation Q) is amended to read as follows:

§ 217.6 *Maximum rates of interest payable on time and savings deposits by member banks.*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act and § 217.3, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System hereby prescribes the following maximum rates[1] of interest payable by member banks of the Federal Reserve System on time and savings deposits:

(a) *Time deposits.*—(1) No member bank shall pay interest accruing at a rate in excess of 5½ per cent per annum, compounded quarterly,[2] regardless of the basis upon which such interest may be computed, on any time deposit, subject, however, to the provisions of subparagraphs (2) and (3) of this paragraph.

(2) No member bank shall pay interest accruing at a rate in excess of 5 per cent per annum, compounded quarterly,[2] regardless of the basis upon which such interest may be computed, on any multiple maturity time deposit received on or after July 20, 1966, which is payable only 90 days or more after the date of deposit or 90 days or more after the last preceding date on which it might have been paid.

(3) No member bank shall pay interest accruing at a rate in excess of 4 per cent per annum, compounded quarterly,[2] regardless of the basis upon which such interest may be computed, on any multiple maturity time deposit received on or after July 20, 1966, which is payable less than 90 days after the date of deposit or less than 90 days after the last preceding date on which it might have been paid.

(b) *Savings deposits.*—No member bank shall pay interest accruing at a rate in excess of 4 per cent per annum, compounded quarterly,[2] regardless of the basis upon which such interest may be computed, on any savings deposit.

3a. The purpose of these amendments is to decrease the rate of interest that member banks are permitted to pay on time deposits with alternative maturities or with provision for automatic renewal at maturity, defined as "multiple maturity time deposits." Formerly, member banks were permitted to pay interest up to 5½ per cent per annum on any time deposit, irrespective of maturity. (A time deposit does not include a deposit contract that provides for payment in less than 30 days (§ 217.1).) Now, for multiple maturity time deposits with respect to which the depositor is permitted to withdraw his funds only after periods of 90 days or more, the maximum permissible rate is 5 per cent. For those such deposits with respect to which the depositor is permitted to withdraw his funds after periods of less than 90 days, the maximum permissible rate is 4 per cent.

b. The requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to notice, public participation, and deferred effective date were not followed in connection with these amendments because the Board found that the general credit situation and the public interest compelled it to make the action effective no later than the date adopted.

(12 U.S.C. 248(i), 371b, and 461.)

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 15th day of July, 1966.

By order of the Board of Governors.

(Signed) Merritt Sherman,
MERRITT SHERMAN,
[SEAL] *Secretary.*

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 672

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the foreign aid bill, S. 3584. This amendment would open the way, once again, for the sale to Indonesia of agricultural products under the Commodity Credit Corporation export credit sales program.

The amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should again take steps to encourage and facilitate the export to Indonesia of agricultural commodities as authorized by title IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

My amendment would permit Congress to acknowledge and recognize the change in regime which has taken place in Indonesia within the past year, a change substantially to the benefit of the Indonesian people, I believe, and to the cause of world freedom and peace.

Beginning on September 30 of last year, events were set into motion which have resulted in a decisive defeat for Indonesian Communists. On that date, Communists initiated a coup which they hoped would place Indonesia within the Communist bloc.

I am sure Senators are familiar with the details of the countercoup which freed Indonesia from substantial Communist influence and placed it once again with the community of nations which are relatively independent and moving toward constitutional government.

---

[1] The maximum rates of interest payable by member banks of the Federal Reserve System on time and savings deposits as prescribed herein are not applicable to any deposit which is payable only at an office of a member bank located outside of the States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

[2] This limitation is not to be interpreted as preventing the compounding of interest at other than quarterly intervals, provided that the aggregate amount of such interest so compounded does not exceed the aggregate amount of interest at the rate above prescribed when compounded quarterly.

The revolt launched on September 30 aroused public ire against the Communists and, with the help of Moslems and people of the countryside, the anti-Communist generals were able to wrest control of the government from subversives and from President Sukarno. Sukarno, it must be noted, had been adopting an increasingly anti-West attitude and is reported to have been aware in advance of a plot to wipe out the anti-Communist leadership in the army.

Back in January 1964, at the start of the 89th session of Congress, I introduced S. 328, a bill to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to Communist-dominated Indonesia. The introduction of S. 328 reflected my concern and the concern of several of my distinguished colleagues, who cosponsored the measure, that Indonesia was succumbing to the influence of Communists in high Government positions. The Senate later adopted my bill as an amendment to the foreign aid bill.

I am hopeful that the government presently in power in Indonesia will be able to rebuild the plundered economy which is the legacy of President Sukarno and of pro-Red elements formerly in influence in his government. Sukarno is no longer in power, not even as a figurehead.

Indonesia now faces a legacy of skyrocketing prices, scarcities of food and other agricultural products, and rising unemployment.

This nation of islands is both militarily and economically important to the West. It is my conviction that we should act now to strengthen the present regime, which seems to be of a persuasion able to deal effectively with the present problems.

American aid to Indonesia was halted at the time of Sukarno's frequent denunciations of the United States. It has not been the policy of the United States to restore that aid even in view of the changed situation which now prevails.

Last April 18, about a year after the United States aid was withdrawn, an announcement was made that we had agreed to sell 50,000 tons of rice on credit to the new Djakarta government. It was emphasized by the State Department, however, that the move was not to be confused with a general shift in policy toward Indonesia, but that it was a "one shot deal" to meet what State called an "emergency" rice shortage in certain areas.

Rice is not, however, the only thing Indonesia needs, and "one-shot" deals do not seem to me wise foreign policy with a struggling, friendly nation.

One of the commodities the Indonesians lack is cotton. One American firm has been trying to obtain credit approval for the sale to Indonesia of 40,000 tons of cotton. This amount of cotton would allow the opening of eight now idle spinning mills in the country, and would be a major contribution in allowing the country to reestablish its economic position.

Wheat also is a needed commodity.

It is of some concern to me that we seldom act swiftly enough to curtail aid when the situation demands it, and that neither do we act promptly to reestablish economic assistance to those countries who have demonstrated moves away from communism. There seems to be too great a lag in our reevaluation of these constantly changing situations. If we are going to have an aid program it should be effective and timely.

The time has come for us to recognize the change that has occurred in Indonesia. The governmental situation there is not all that is to be desired, by any means. The country is financially weak, and many problems face the new leaders.

At the same time, our aid there would be used to our advantage. The leaders are nominally pro-West and seem capable to deal with the present problems. There is much at stake to influence the cold war in this country with its 736,000 square miles and a population of about 100 million people.

Indonesia is one of the world's richest suppliers of tin, oil and coal. There are also vast supplies of bauxite, manganese, copper, nickel, gold, and silver.

I urge the Senate to consider the amendment, keeping in mind one of the key objectives of our foreign aid policy—to strengthen nations which demonstrate a striving for self-determination.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 673 AND 674

Mr. **DIRKSEN** submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 675

Mr. **COOPER** submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 676 AND 677

Mr. **MORSE** submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 678

Mr. **DOMINICK**. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the Foreign Economic Aid bill, S. 3584.

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the interest rates on development loans from not less than 1 percent to not less than 2 percent in the initial stage of the loan.

If this amendment is adopted, it will save the American taxpayers over $6 million per year, the exact savings depending upon the amount finally appropriated by Congress. It will eliminate the situation presently existing where foreign nations are able to borrow at lower interest rates than the lowest rates available to American investors and would reduce the present discrepancy between cost and return on such loans, bringing them more nearly in line with the market yield on present long-term Treasury bonds.

I reiterate that this amendment would affect only the first 10 years of an outstanding development loan during which the interest rates are much lower than subsequent years. The Foreign Relations Committee has already recommended a similar increase in the minimum interest rates for the second stage of outstanding loans from 2½ to 3 percent.

By reducing the subsidization rate during the first 10 years from the present 3⅜ to 2⅜ percent, three objectives are served: the taxpayer is relieved to that extent of the burden he has borne over recent years; foreign capital from the wealthier nations will appear relatively more attractive to foreign borrowers, thereby spreading the aid burden more equitably among our allies; and a clearer delineation between our aid grants and aid loan programs is created, which should point us in the direction of tightening up our heretofore excessively loose foreign assistance programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 678) is as follows:

On page 3, before the period at the end of line 24 insert a comma and the following: "and by striking out '1 per centum' and substituting '2 per centum' ".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 11, 1966, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. TYDINGS were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3598) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and other Senators) on July 11, 1966.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. **CARLSON**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3598) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] be added as a cosponsor to Amendment No. 638 to Senate bill 3164.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] be added as a cosponsor of Amendment 610 to S. 3164, a bill to extend the Economic Opportunity Act.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 19, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 3093. An act to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 9, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; and

S. 3150. An act to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2575, TO STRENGTHEN CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO BANKING

Mr. **ROBERTSON**. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on S. 2575, to strengthen certain laws relating to banking.

The hearings will begin on Thursday, July 28, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302 New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Winthrop Knowlton, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

"VIETNAM PROFILE"

Mr. **CARLSON**. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of Senators to a motion picture film, shot under incredible wartime dangers, which is vital to understanding the situation in Vietnam. The film is now available in this country, and it presents scenes, never before shown in America, of the civilian side of the war in South Vietnam. It was made by an accredited combat correspondent, Dr. Bob Pierce, president of World Vision, Inc., and an authority on the Far East of more than 20 years' standing.

The title of this 1-hour film is "Vietnam Profile." A series of public service television station showings across the country will begin with a presentation on WPIX-TV in New York City on Wednesday, August 3, at 10 p.m.

In "Vietnam Profile," Dr. Pierce shows the real story of civilian suffering: the story of destroyed villages, the orphaning of countless children, destruction of crops and other property, shortages of shelter and medical care, and the desperate need for help by the civilians. In his narration of the film, Dr. Pierce explains how World Vision, other agencies, and the U.S. Government are trying to help the people in South Vietnam maintain life and strength during the country's struggle with the Vietcong and communism.

The "Vietnam Profile" is visual evidence of the aspects of the war in Vietnam which the White House has been emphasizing.

I commend World Vision for its outstanding work in supplying emergency aid to distressed people in Vietnam, for its foresight in producing this dramatic, informative film; and I commend the dedication of its able leader, Dr. Bob Pierce.

THE NEED TO REVIEW THE ORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, the controversy over the west front calls our attention to a basic problem, the method of selecting the Architect of the Capitol.

Since 1792, the design of the Capitol and the actions of the Architect of the Capitol have been the subject of debate. There was considerable conflict over the very choice of an initial plan for the Capitol. It required 19 years to complete the Senate and House Chambers. During this period five different men served in the position now called Architect of the Capitol, and the plans were changed three times. The controversy over the Capitol continued until this building was finally finished in 1865.

For more than 80 years there was no permanent, statutorily appointed Architect of the Capitol. In 1876 Congress officially established the position in a rider to an appropriation bill. It provides that the Architect shall be appointed by the President and shall care for and superintend the Capitol.

This brief history demonstrates that for many years the Architect of the Capitol was an informal position and that no serious thought was given to its status in the governmental structure. For example, no provision was made for confirmation by the Senate or for a term of office. I think this problem is worthy of serious consideration by the President. Perhaps we need a reorganization plan to resolve the current controversy around the office of the Architect of the Capitol. Moreover, I suggest that we stop unnecessary enlargement of the west front until this matter has been thoroughly reviewed at the very highest level.

There is ample precedent for a reorganization plan to modernize the method of choosing an Architect of the Capitol. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965, for instance, changed the method of choosing customs collectors. In the early years of our country, customs collectors were appointed by the President. But as trade and commerce grew, Presidential appointment of these officials became a burden and cumbersome—if not unnecessary. So the President recognized the march of time and suggested a reorganization of the customs service which eliminated his role as the chooser of the collectors.

The same rationale was applied in Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965. Up to that time the President was still appointing steam locomotive inspectors. Now, if you thought about it, you would see that there was really no longer a need for Presidential appointment of certain locomotive inspection personnel. So this outmoded arrangement was changed.

We are doing other things in reorganizing the executive branch as well. Even the Washington zoo has come under the scrutiny of the White House. Over the years the government of the District of Columbia has reduced its interest in the National Zoological Park to a single remaining function. Plan No. 4 transfers this function to the Smithsonian Institution so that all responsibility for the zoo is vested in that agency. The reorganization power of the executive branch should extend to the Architect of the Capitol as well as to the zoo.

Executive reorganization is more than the creation of new departments. It is also smoothing out the sharp edges in governmental activities to be sure they are carried out properly; it is eliminating historical anomalies in the structure of government. There must be continual reexamination of government organization to keep it up to date and to make it conform to the latest management techniques and cost-saving procedures.

In the light of current needs and conditions, the organization of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol should be reconsidered with a view to providing the most efficient and affective performance of the function. I hope President Johnson will give this matter his attention. The Capitol is a vital part of our American heritage. It deserves the best care and management we can give it.

PRESIDENTIAL INTERVENTION THE ONLY PRACTICAL WAY TO END AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the airline mechanics strike, which has grounded five major U.S. airlines carrying 60 percent of the Nation's air traffic, is now dragging into the 12th day.

Every mail delivery and every daily newspaper from Hawaii brings fresh evidence of the rising financial plight of people and businesses in the Islands as a result of the strike.

Many people seem to think Congress should enact legislation to end the strike. This appears to me a very faint hope, for so far I have not heard one word from the majority leadership in control of Congress that they intend to initiate legislation to end the airlines strike or indeed to take any action whatsoever.

Neither have I heard any announcement that the appropriate legislative committees of Congress are working—or even studying—ways to protect the public interest in this costly labor-management dispute.

Today, therefore, I have written to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee urging steps toward standby emergency legislation should this become necessary. I have also asked the Labor Committee to undertake a comprehensive study of feasible alternatives to protect the public interest in such disputes affecting the national interest.

There are those who say the administration is doing all it can and that the Civil Aeronautics Board has taken steps to provide extra air service in this emergency situation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has authorized certain nonstruck domestic airlines to service additional points along their routes. However, these airlines were already operating at near capacity and cannot accommodate the large number of passengers now deprived of air service. Neither do these lines have sufficient additional aircraft and equipment to fill the huge gap left by grounding of five airlines who formerly carried 60 percent of the Nation's air traffic. Charter airlines cannot provide all the extra space either as most of them are already heavily booked.

Even though the Civil Aeronautics Board authorized nonstruck lines to lease equipment of the struck lines, we have seen how this move was in effect nullified by refusal of crews to service any equipment leased from struck lines.

It has also been suggested that the CAB suspend the cabotage laws so as to permit foreign airlines to render domestic passenger service in the United States. But the CAB advises this is not permitted by law. An act of Congress would be necessary and Congress is not likely to legislate at this point in this complicated area. Further, this would be very time consuming, when what is needed is a prompt settlement of the airlines strike.

Add it all up, and what the CAB has been able to do is negligible.

The only practical avenue that can achieve a prompt settlement is massive and determined intervention by the President, such as he used to prevent a steel strike last fall.

The need is obvious.

Because of the strike, Hawaii is losing 1,200 to 1,400 tourists a day and \$4½ million a week in revenue from tourism and related industries. In one of our islands, hotel occupancy is down 7 to 20 percent. Another reported 70 to 80 percent cancellations; another 50 percent. In Waikiki, where normally at this season all hotels are filled to capacity, there are 500 vacancies. Retail shops and tour groups are feeling the pinch.

The longer the strike continues, the worse everything will be.

Hawaii's tale of woe is repeated in many areas of the country. Economic losses and personal hardships are snowballing.

In my two Senate statements last week on this deplorable and intolerable situation, I cited these adverse repercussions of the airlines strike.

Today I call attention to the adverse impact on the Federal Government.

The strike is costing the Federal Government tax revenues—income desperately needed to help keep the Government from sinking further into the red.

No one knows yet exactly how much tax revenue is being lost, but we can perceive where losses are occurring: in the Federal income tax on earnings of the struck airlines, who are losing an estimated \$7 million a day; in the Federal income tax on earnings of employees now out of work as a result of the strike; and in the Federal income tax earnings of the tourist and allied industries and businesses whose sales and earnings are declining because of the strike.

In addition, the Federal Government is losing the 5 percent air transportation tax for every passenger who can no longer use the airlines. This must be a sizable amount by now.

Even though essential military passenger travel and cargo may be airlifted despite the strike, how are the thousands of defense contractors and subcontractors faring? Are their personnel, engaged in defense efforts, hampered by lack of flight space? I hear reports that these defense activities are indeed curtailed by the strike. Interference with private defense efforts, as distinguished from strictly military activities, will be more and more seriously felt as the strike goes on.

A further impact of the strike which should cause concern among Federal officials is the slowdown in the Nation's economy by a strike of these proportions. On Sunday, it was announced that the Nation's economic growth in the April-May-June quarter this year decidedly slowed down. The gross national product increased only \$10.8 billion, the smallest gain since the fall of 1964. More than half of this reflected inflation. The real gain was only \$4.8 billion.

As a result of higher taxes and lower economic activity, disposable personal income of the American people advanced only \$4.6 billion, less than in any quarter since 1963.

By allowing the airlines strike to continue, the administration is contributing to the downturn of our economy.

The American people would welcome a downturn in the high cost of living which continues to soar, but a downturn in productivity worries a lot of people. An economic setback could have a disastrous effect.

By allowing the strike to continue, the administration also is contributing to unemployment. More and more workers, apart from the striking mechanics, are being laid off. With each day, unemployment grows.

All these are compelling reasons for the President to move—and to move fast—to end the airline mechanics strike by calling the parties in continuous session at the White House, as he did in the steel dispute last September, until a settlement is reached.

Once again I appeal to the President to take these necessary—and inevitable—steps for the good of all America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD telegrams and letters which have been received by me in connection with this matter, and several newspaper articles.

There being no objection, the telegrams, letters and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOLULU,
July 16, 1966.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG,
Congress of the United States,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Crippling air transportation strike is hurting Dole because of difficulties in maintaining adequate personal contact necessary due separation production and marketing facilities located on mainland and in Hawaii anything adverse to Hawaii economy hurts all Hawaii business.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG,
U. S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Know you will use your good offices to bring pressure to bear providing legislation enacted to prevent devastating disruption of this kind. Kindest personal regards.

W. F. QUINN.

HONOLULU,
July 15, 1966.

Senator HIRAM FONG,
Washington, D.C.:

Entire membership Hawaii Hotel Association greatly concerned with present airline strike and adverse effect on economy of Hawaii. Your continued effort to alleviate situation imperative.

WILLIAM H. CHARLOCK 3D,
President, Hawaii Hotels Association.

HONOLULU,
July 16, 1966.

Senator HIRAM FONG,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike disastrous to hotel economy. Please help to terminate.

FOSTER TOWER HOTEL.

HONOLULU,
July 16, 1966.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In view impact airline mechanics' strike on economy of Hawaii, urge you do all possible towards expediting settlement.

W. M. BUSH,
Executive Vice President, Castle & Cooke, Inc.

Lihue Kaui,
July 16, 1966.

Senator Hiram Fong,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike disastrous. Welfare of 60 Grayline employees and families seriously affected by lack of tourist. Please help.

John S. Gilruth,
Achors Grayline, Lihue Kauai.

Honolulu,
July 16, 1966.

Senator Hiram Fong,
Washington, D.C.:

Your personal assistance urgently required to settle airline strike causing Hawaii visitor industry crisis.

Mahalo Waikikian,
Hotel Staff.

Hilo, Hawaii, *July 18, 1966.*

Senator Hiram Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Need urgent congressional action in airline strike. Unrecoverable loss to business mounting because of tourist cancellations. Other businesses suffering. Please, Kokua.

Slim Holt Tours and U Drive MacKenzie Tours, Arquero Tours and Udrive, Hawaii Transportation Co., Jack's Tours and Udrive, Duarte Orchard Island Tours.

Honolulu, *July 19, 1966.*

Senator Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Members of the Hawaii Restaurant Association ask all possible measures be taken immediately to stop airline strike seriously affecting restaurant and food service business. Economy of whole State being affected. Hawaii needs action now. Aloha.

John Felix,
President.

Honolulu, *July 18, 1966.*

Senator Hiram Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike extremely detrimental to Hawaiian economy. Please request Executive pressures for settlement.

George G. Gaugler,
Manager, Sears, Roebuck, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Maui Chamber of Commerce,
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, July 15, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Fong: For your information, the Maui Chamber of Commerce today sent the following message to President Johnson:

"Airline Strike Detrimental to Tourist Industry at Seasons Peak. Your Considered Intervention Urgently Requested."

Sincerely,

Webb Beggs, Jr.,
Manager.

Waikiki Jaycees,
July 14, 1966.

Senator Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Fong: The General Membership of the Waikiki Jaycees at its meeting on July 13, 1966 recommended that we write you regarding the paralyzing airline strike that has hit Hawaii. As you know, the only fast and efficient means of transportation between Hawaii and the mainland is by air and at present there is only one U.S. carrier transporting passengers.

The hotels are already complaining of numerous cancellations thus it is imperative that before this strike becomes devastating to our economy it is brought to an early settlement. We are in effect asking you to use the power of your office to take whatever action you believe might be necessary to cease this serious threat to Hawaii's economy.

Mahalo for your immediate attention to this request.

Sincerely,

George A. Morris,
President.

Bank of Hawaii,
Honolulu, Hawaii, July 14, 1966.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Mr. Edward A. Schneider is vacationing at the present time, but I know he would want to join our Management Team in expressing our bank's concern with the air line situation.

As we are all aware, the effect of a continuation of this strike will have a serious, even though temporary, impact on the economy of our State.

Knowing full well that you are exerting every effort to aid in the early solution of the problem, we wish to convey to you evidence of our support and appreciation.

Sincerely,

C. D. Terry, Jr.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, July 15, 1966]

Standby Line Keeps Growing Despite All of Pan Am's Efforts

(By James Cunningham)

Twelve Pan American World Airways jetliners left fully loaded for the West Coast yesterday, but the standby waiting line at Honolulu International Airport lengthened by the hour.

With the help of a 147-passenger extra section early yesterday, PanAm had whittled the standbys to 35 at 6:30 a.m.

By 5 p.m., however, there were 200 persons waiting.

Meanwhile, a false rumor demonstrated that there are many people who want to go to the Mainland, yet are unwilling to sit it out at the John Rodgers Terminal.

A radio announcer misread Pan American's morning announcement that it would operate 12 regular schedules yesterday. Instead, he broadcast that Pan American would fly 12 extra sections in addition to the regular schedules.

The carrier's switchboard promptly lit up as calls for space poured in.

Hotel occupancy continued near capacity in Waikiki. At the Hilton Hawaiian Village it was 90 per cent and is expected to soar to 100 per cent Monday on the strength of fresh bookings by passengers with confirmed space on Pan American.

Despite 40 no-shows at the Sheraton Hotels Wednesday night, occupancy was 98 per cent at the Moana-Surfrider, 98 per cent at the Royal Hawaiian and 84 per cent at the Princess Kaiulani.

In a move which might be interpreted as a sign that it fears a lengthy strike, United yesterday canceled a reception which the carrier's president George E. Keck was to have held at the Ilikai on July 22.

In a form letter to those who had been invited, Hawaii sales manager Bruce W. Bolton said:

"While we are hopeful of an early settlement of the strike, it would not now be possible for Mr. Keck to visit Honolulu next week. When he reschedules his trip at a later date, we will, of course, again extend our invitation."

Keck has been touring Australia and the Far East with two other top executives in connection with United's aspirations for transpacific routes.

Local United officials confirmed that Keck is now back on the U.S. Mainland, but declined to say when he returned, nor whether he was accompanied by the rest of his executive party.

The only servicing of United planes here is directed from headquarters of the striking International Association of Machinists.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, July 16, 1966]

Walkout Affects Big Isle

(By Walt Southward)

Hilo.—Reaction to the airlines strike here ranged yesterday from "no effect" at some hotels to "heavy effect" at others.

"It's been serious here," said Mrs. Leonetta Kinard, manager of the newly-opened Nalei Hotel. "We've had close to 70 or 80 per cent cancellations. Bookings had been good, until now."

At the Hilo Hotel, Leo Lycurgus said: "We've had about 50 per cent of our Mainland bookings cancel. We're feeling it very much. We had been booked heavily for the summer.

"Some reservations that were made four to five months ago have been canceled."

The Nahiloa Hotel said it still is maintaining about 90 per cent occupancy.

"We're getting some cancellations," Manager Bill Davis said. "We just hope we can maintain the 90 per cent figure. But even if the strike is over tomorrow, we'll still be affected for a few weeks."

At Volcano House, a spokesman said: "We still are holding steady. Our lunch count has been heavy."

"We can feel the effect," William Kimi, manager of the Hilo Bay Hotel said. "The last three days, we've had a lot of walk-in customers. But I can see the decline starting today."

At the Mauna Kea Beach Hotel, Manager Leslie Moore reported a 10 per cent drop in reservations.

"We're losing three of four couples a day," he said, "and I'm afraid it will get worse."

At the Hilo Hukilau, Manager Bill Brown said: "We're holding our own. The remainder of the week, we're booked to capacity. Most groups booked for next week are in the Islands already. But after that, who knows?"

A spokesman for Gray Lines-Hilo said: "So far there has been very little effect. We've had a few individual cancellations, and one large group, but we've been running pretty well."

At Slim Holt Tours, a spokesman said: "We've had a couple of tours cancel out. It's up to about 10 per cent, and starting to add up. The U-drive business is slow, too."

County Chairman Shunichi Kimura has written to all four Hawaii representatives in Congress urging them to push for quick settlement of the strike, and the Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce has sent similar wires to the Congressional delegation and to President Johnson.

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Advertiser, July 16, 1966]

They're Still Finding Plane Seats

Travelers willing to camp at Honolulu International Airport yesterday continued to find seats to the West Coast if they were patient enough.

Pan American World Airways, the only U.S. carrier flying there, moved 143 stand-by passengers on nine flights between 6:30 a.m. and 5 p.m.

But there were 350 other would-be passengers still on the waiting list. Pan American spokesman said they hoped to fine space for half of them on an additional five flights scheduled out last night.

Meanwhile, the mechanics' strike, which has idled United and Northwest Airlines operations between Hawaii and the West Coast for nine days, yesterday began to affect airmail deliveries here.

Post Office spokesmen reported that airmail between the Islands and the Mainland is moving normally—no hitches.

But some mailings which arrive here mornings from the East Coast failed to show up all day—indicating disruptions of airmail service across the continental U.S.

United Air Lines started laying off nonstriking employees on Thursday. By Monday, 87 will be furloughed, spokesmen said.

As of July 24, there will be 190 employees, mostly clerical, working only six hours daily and only 37 at full pay. Striking are 189 members of the International Association of Machinists.

[From the Honolulu Sunday Star-Bulletin, July 17, 1966]

For 700 at Isle Airport, the Waiting Continues

A pretty blonde fast asleep on a checking counter * * *.

Two elderly Spanish-speaking men, very confused * * *.

Three servicemen playing cards * * * another writing to his girl back home. * * *

These were some of the more than 700 persons waiting to board Pan American World Airways flights at Honolulu International Airport yesterday.

A similar crowd is expected today, the 10th day of the worst airline strike in history.

Pan Am, the only U.S. carrier flying to the Mainland, was busy trying to accommodate stand-by passengers by filling each outgoing flight to capacity.

"These two days (Friday and Saturday) have been the worst, in numbers of people at the airport," said Kaoru Watanabe, Pan Am's airport passenger-service manager.

"A lot of these people have had to stay here overnight, and it has been rough. But I'm simply amazed at how understanding people have been."

Pan Am sent 17 flights to the West Coast yesterday, including two extra sections. At one point, 300 names were on the stand-by list.

On Friday Pan Am accommodated 346 stand-bys, averaging 22 per flight.

Fourteen regular flights and one extra are scheduled today.

One of the patient stand-bys was Mrs. Irene Larson of Santa Barbara, Calif. She had waited at the airport for more than 36 hours before getting a flight late yesterday afternoon.

"It has been very uncomfortable and a bit trying, but the airport people have tried to help as much as they can," she said.

Another woman, stranded "only" 13 hours, said, "I'm furious, but I don't blame this on Hawaii."

Watanabe said United Air Lines employees offered to take passengers home for the night.

Interstate Hosts brought cookies to be served with coffee that's provided throughout each day.

The Honolulu Lions Club has a man on duty day-and-night to assist in any way he can.

Watanabe said the local musicians' union plans to provide entertainment.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 15, 1966]

Vacancies Increase in Waikiki

The strike of five major airlines made new inroads into Hawaii's visitor industry today as it lengthened into its eighth day.

By Sunday there will be about 500 certain vacancies in Waikiki hotels, said Robert C. Allen, executive vice-president of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.

There probably will be 200 to 300 other vacancies the H.V.B. doesn't know about, Allen said.

Waikiki hotels normally would be filled to capacity at this time of year.

The strike also has cut into the revenues of inter-Island carriers.

Hawaiian Airlines has lost about 4,500 customers worth at least $50,000, a spokesman said today.

Aloha Airlines reported that its mid-day and afternoon flights are running considerably lighter than they normally do at this time of year.

Hawaii ethnic chambers of commerce and Neighbor Islands chambers are joining the Honolulu Chamber in urging Federal intervention.

Frederic K. T. Chun, president of the Hawaii State Chamber of Commerce, yesterday asked President Johnson to aid in settling the strike.

"Hawaii economy critically affected on Statewide basis during air strike. Your help urgently needed," Chun's message said.

Major steamship companies serving the State reported many inquiries from stranded visitors, but few actual bookings.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke about the need of the Government to take some action with respect to the airlines strike. Today I contemplate making another statement, even though it may be somewhat repetitious of what I said yesterday.

At the beginning I wish to commend the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] for the declaration he has just made about the need of the Government to take some action.

In January, the President, in his state of the Union message said:

> I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, would enable us to deal effectively with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the Nation.

For the past several years, our national interest has intermittently been threatened and, in fact, damaged by strikes which have substantially tied up the economy of the Nation. I have in mind the strikes of the Maritime Union against the merchant marine of the United States, the strike in New York against the Metropolitan Transportation System, the threatened strike against the railroads, and the steel industry.

About 2 weeks ago, in convention assembled, the members of the Teamsters Union adopted a resolution giving full power to James Hoffa to declare a national strike against the trucking industry if and when he deemed it to be advisable.

The significance of that threat, when weighed, cannot help impress the people of the United States with the fact that we cannot continue stumbling and fumbling without adequate power being placed in the people—and hence the Government—to deal with these work stoppages which damage the entire economy of the country.

Two bills are pending in the Senate dealing with this subject. The President said that he would make a recommendation of a course to be followed, in order to cope with the problem, but that statement has not yet been forthcoming.

The two legislative committees, I am quite certain, will not set the bills down for a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not object—I suggest to the Senator that I should like to make a few remarks before 12:30 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Ohio, so would I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The two committees, in my judgment, will not set the bills down for a hearing until there is some word forthcoming from the White House that action should be taken.

I hope that such word will be forthcoming in the very near future.

THEFT OF DOCUMENTS IN DODD CASE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the Columbus Dispatch for July 6, 1966, there is published an article written by Alice Widener, entitled "Contemptible Act—Purloining of Documents Main Issue in Dodd Case."

The article analyzes the situation of allowing the theft of papers to go unchallenged, whether it be from public officials or any other citizen of this country, appropriate action being taken by the duly constituted authorities to deal with the subject.

What the merits of the complaint made against the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] may be, I do not know. I have trust in his integrity and in his character. However, the fact has been clearly established that theft of papers was committed by employees who had no right to take them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Contemptible Act: Purloining of Documents Main Issue in Dodd Case

(By Alice Widener)

As a result of three trusted employes' purloining of documents in the dark of night from the files of U.S. Sen. Thomas J. Dodd, their copying of these documents and delivering them to two newspaper columnists, prospects for vindictive snitching-on-the-boss as a career are brighter in America, though the contemptible act already has lowered its moral climate.

Judge Alexander Holtzoff of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia made the essential moral point during pretrial proceedings of Sen. Dodd's libel suit against columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson.

When the subject of legality of possession of the senator's documents came under discussion, Judge Holtzoff pointed out that the purloiners, if they suspected wrongdoing on a public official's part, were obligated to notify the duly constituted law enforcement agencies of the government, in this case, the U.S. attorney general or FBI.

The purloiners claim that had they done this, the law enforcement agencies would have informed and alerted Senator Dodd about the employes' allegations against him.

The purloiners claim such action would have thwarted proper inquiry.

But the very claim, in my opinion, reflects their own unworthiness for public service in positions of trust, because their claim is in itself a slur on our law enforcement agencies competence and discretion, and expresses the purloiners' basic mistrust of these agencies.

In any civilized nation, law enforcement is almost helpless without the cooperation of law-abiding citizens. There always is something dark and underhanded about the motives of people wanting to take the law into their own hands.

Moreover, it was not at all necessary for the employees of a U.S. senator to seek an inquiry into their allegations concerning the ethics of their employer via a third, outside party.

The senator's employees were on Capitol Hill, so was the Senate Ethics Committee; there was absolutely no need for them to seek access to the committee via the press.

The main point in the Dodd hearings, however, is the moral one involving the purloining of documents and the snitching of the contents.

Hasn't it been legally established for a long, long time that a letter belongs to the sender, or am I wrong?

Hasn't it been legally established for a long, long time that nobody has a right to purloin government documents and divulge their contents, or am I wrong?

If I am, then I hope sincerely that out of the base effort to "get Dodd" there comes some high-minded legislation protecting prominent persons' right to privacy.

Nobody should be immune from the grave consequences of illegal acts and I'm not suggesting so.

But everybody should be protected from vengeful employees mistrusting duly constituted law enforcement agencies and arrogantly trying to take the law into their own individual hands.

Breathes there a single man or woman in Congress with soul so dead as to encourage careerism by snitching on the boss?

Is there any man or woman in Congress or in any field of public life who could survive unscathed such snitching and one-sided presentation of his or her affairs?

APPALACHIA'S CIVIL AIRPORT NEEDS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the southern part of Ohio, in the southeastern part of Pennsylvania, and in the northern part of West Virginia, considerable discussion is going on concerning the building of an airport which would render tristate services.

The issue as to where the airport should should be located has not been determined. There are a number of problems involved and they are being discussed.

The Huntington Advertiser, on Wednesday, July 13, 1966, published an editorial on the tristate airport. It contains pertinent, factual information and views which have a relationship to the issue in question.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "Misleading Figures Used on Joint Airport Mileage" printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Misleading Figures Used on Joint Airport Mileage

In exploring Appalachia's civil airport needs the Appalachian Regional Commission is searching for the most advantageous means of speeding economic development.

The introduction to the report of Management & Economics Research, Inc., on the feasibility of a joint Huntington-Charleston airport said:

"The overall objective of the study is to develop guidelines for the use of the Appalachian Regional Commission in recommending the location and financing of airport projects within the region and, ultimately, to develop a comprehensive airport plan for the Appalachian Region."

The report said further:

"Transportation facilities have long been recognized as one of the most fruitful areas of public investment for stimulating economic development; the recent predominance of air in common carrier intercity travel makes airports increasingly important to economic development."

The survey pointed out that major airlines are preparing to turn chiefly to jets and warned that unless the Tri-State area and Charleston proceed with plans to expand airport facilities to accommodate such craft, their air service will steadily deteriorate in the future.

With these findings most informed citizens will doubtless agree.

But the discussion of the relative benefits of developing the proposed Sissonville site near Charleston, the available site of a joint airport near Hurricane and the Tri-State terminal now in operation will stir heated controversy.

The report is skeptical about the advisability of attempting a joint airport because of the distance between the Tri-State and Charleston.

And yet this conclusion vital to the entire study is apparently based on an incorrect statement of distances.

The report locates the ridge proposed for the joint development 2.5 miles east of Hurricane and 2.5 miles north of Interstate Highway 64. This information is on page 59.

But on page 62 a table places the site 35 miles both from Huntington and from Charleston and gives the driving time from each city as 40 minutes.

This is in glaring conflict with distances officially accepted by the West Virginia Road Commission.

An official of the commission said the distance from downtown Huntington to downtown Charleston is 50 miles. He frequently drives from here to the state office near the Capitol there in about an hour.

Hurricane is generally accepted as the midway point between the two cities, or 25 miles from each. If the proposed joint airport site is 2.5 miles east of Hurricane and 2.5 miles north of I–64, it would be approximately 30 miles from Huntington and not more than 25 from Charleston.

That would be only nine miles farther from Charleston than the 16 miles given as the distance to the proposed Sissonville site. Certainly Charleston residents interested in flying would not require 40 minutes to drive 25 miles.

Nevertheless, partly on the basis of this finding the survey leans toward developing the Sissonville site rather than the proposed joint location.

Furthermore, the report proceeds to the absurd conclusion that if the Appalachian Commission helps finance the Sissonville airport for Charleston, it should not support an immediate extension of Tri-State field.

In short, after emphasizing the importance of air service to economic development, the presumed specialists find that driving 25 miles to the joint airport would be too much for Charleston passengers but that the people of Ohio and Kentucky west of Huntington should be required to travel twice as far to Sissonville.

This aspect of the report should by all means be called to the attention of Senators Cooper and Morton, of Kentucky and Senators Young and Lausche, of Ohio, all of whom have expressed interest in the development of Tri-State airport.

The slight to the Tri-State is also in direct conflict with the statement of John L. Sweeney, Appalachian Commission cochairman, in an address here several months ago.

Mr. Sweeney said that in developing new job opportunities emphasis would be placed on Ashland, Huntington and Charleston. We don't believe he will be inclined to neglect the two angles of the important triangle and put all the effort on Charleston.

Although the MERI report seemed to favor the Sissonville development because of the distance of a joint facility from Huntington and Charleston, it further compounded confusion by suggesting that the Tri-State consider a joint terminal with Portsmouth.

That is as bad as its reference to eastern Kentucky as western Kentucky, for Portsmouth by U.S. Route 52 is 46 miles from Huntington, only four miles closer than Charleston.

In spite of the findings of the slipshod survey, the most economical and generally the most advantageous procedure seems to be to build a joint airport.

But if Charleston rejects that proposal the obvious course for the Tri-State is to push the expansion of its own airport.

An important step toward that end is being taken in the application of the Airport Authority to the Federal Aviation Agency and the Appalachian Regional Commission for aid.

Efforts will no doubt continue to assure support for these applications by influential Senators and Representatives from Ohio and Kentucky.

Proceeding with the Tri-State project as a means of providing service here that has been available only in Charleston is the surest way to convince Kenawha County of the advisability of a joint airport.

THE BRITISH ECONOMIC CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I promise the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] that I will take precisely 3 minutes and no more, so that we may both be able to speak before 12:30 o'clock.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate today to Britain's current economic crisis, one of the most portentous events in the history of Britain, concerning the breakdown of the British pound, which would do two things: One, it could herald a world depression. Second, it could seriously jeopardize the dollar, which would then remain the only international currency.

For this reason, I urge the President of the United States to do what J. P. Morgan once did on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange, and that was to "put his arm around Britain."

Mr. President, I think that is what the President of the United States should do. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Harold Wilson, is coming here on July 29 and I should like to see our President state to the world the following:

First, that we have a deep interest in what happens to Britain economically, and that we are going to try to help her. There are various ways in which we can help. Britain needs the benefit of a "modernization fund," financed by the United States and other OECD nations in order to become automated and to get abreast of modernization practices in business. I think possibly it would take $10 billion, at the rate of approximately $1 billion a year, but the economic health of Britain is well worth this sum. She certainly is credit worthy.

Second, we must get into some kind of trade deal with Britain and the European Free Trade Area. This is essential since Britain should be assured of an alternative if she cannot get into the Common Market.

It is long past the time that we had an international monetary conference to take the world off the "cross of gold" in respect to trade.

Therefore, I think that if the President of the United States would put his arm around Britain now, and stated to the world that we recognize the tremendous implications of the British crises to the whole world economy, that we intend to do something about it—not with palliatives to support the pound against speculators but by substantial long-range action—the job could be done effectively and would help Britain enormously in this crisis.

I feel that only new and imaginative long-term moves by Britain supported by the United States and other industrialized nations to modernize the British economy can prevent the steady recurrence of runs against the pound and sagging confidence in Britain's ability to help herself.

The forthcoming visit of Prime Minister Wilson provides a unique opportunity to open discussions on major and constructive arrangements for the modernization of the British economy. The U.S. willingness to rescue the pound every time a crisis arises, while temporarily helpful, has not and will not deal with Britain's fundamental problems.

I, therefore, recommend the following steps which, in my view, provide the basis for the revitalization of Britain and which I hope would become part of the discussions between Prime Minister Wilson and the administration:

First. There should be established a sizable "modernization fund" by the United States, the other OECD nations to help industrialized countries, such as the United Kingdom, with long-term structural economic problems. Assistance from the International Monetary Fund is available only to countries which have short-term balance-of-payments problems. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development today makes occasional loans to industrialized nations for electric power stations, ports and railroad construction but these represent only a small portion of its total loans. I would place this "modernization fund" in the IBRD and have the United States contribute at least one-third of a multibillion-dollar fund over a 5-year period—I would estimate that a fund of $10 billion would be required—other industrialized nations or international agencies to contribute the rest.

The purpose of this "modernization fund" would be to provide a source of capital for the modernization of British production and for the development of programs to effect such modernization. These funds would not be used to finance social welfare programs or to nationalize basic industries.

Second. I also propose a treaty for trade and economic cooperation between the United States, the United Kingdom, other EEC and EFTA nations, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and other industrialized countries of the OECD which agree to adhere to the rules of trade of such a Free Trade Area. This trade treaty would take the form of a commitment for lowering tariff and nontariff barriers on an across-the-board basis by 5 percent per year for manufactured products over each of the next 20 years. The aim of the treaty would be to achieve substantially free trade, subject to national security exceptions, on manufactured products among the industrialized countries by the end of the period. Associate membership should be offered to the developing countries, giving them the right of access to this market after a transitional period during which they would be permitted to retain, with appropriate safeguards, protection for infant industries.

The logical place for Britain is within the Common Market and it should make every effort to obtain entry into EEC and become part of an integrated Europe, however, should it become apparent within the foreseeable future that this effort would not bear fruit, the United Kingdom must decide on a realistic alternative, which I believe is the plan I propose.

Due to the relative competitive advantages of the United States in industrial production over that of the other prospective members, and due to the complicated problems involved in the reduction of trade barriers in the field of agriculture, this process would have to be gradual and special arrangements would have to be made to cushion the injury caused by adjustments that would be made in the process. To accomplish this, a multinational adjustment assistance fund could be established with financial participation by all members on a proportional basis.

Third. The United States and the United Kingdom should continue to press for the early convening of an international monetary conference to effect a basic reform in the international monetary system. The United States is already on record that it would participate in such a conference. The United Kingdom and the United States should now make a new and urgent commitment to an international conference at an early date to assure that procedural arrangements do not become an excuse for interminable delay.

The economic and security problems facing the United Kingdom today are serious ones. The need to modernize British industry and the heavy costs which this and maintenance of a modern defense establishment place on the British pound and its balance of payments cannot be but major concerns both for the United Kingdom and for its other transatlantic allies.

IN SUPPORT OF CREATION OF NEW COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I fully support the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations to create a new Committee on Intelligence Operations.

As the report clearly states, the effect of this resolution would be simply to authorize the appointment of three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the existing Senate committee which deals with the activities of the CIA. The members of the existing committee are drawn exclusively from the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

It cannot be denied that the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees have a legitimate interest in the activities of the CIA and a corresponding obligation to exercise congressional oversight. Nothing in the proposed resolution would derogate from this authority.

But it is equally clear that the great bulk of the work done by the CIA has profound implications for the conduct of this Nation's foreign policy. Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate plainly states that all matters relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations fall within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. Consequently it would seem to me that an arrangement of the sort contemplated by the resolution, which would permit the Foreign Relations Committee to play its proper role in overseeing the activities of the CIA, is long overdue.

A further consideration is the need of members of the Foreign Relations Committee to have at their disposal the intelligence necessary to permit them to make informed judgments on matters within the area of their responsibility. Through its three members on the proposed Committee on Intelligence Operations, the Foreign Relations Committee would be able to open a new channel for the transmission of pertinent information from the CIA to the committee.

It is symptomatic of the problem that not much is known about the means by which the CIA exercises its influence over the conduct of our foreign policy. However, it would seem safe to assume that decisions of a purely foreign policy nature, as well as military decisions with direct or indirect foreign policy implications are regularly made by the President and his foreign policy advisers on the basis of reports, estimates and analyses supplied by the CIA. And it does not require inside information to know that both in the collection and in the interpretation of intelligence data, judgment and selectivity are very much involved.

These considerations apply with far more force to the CIA's non-intelligence gathering activities—facetiously referred to as "dirty tricks." It is hardly necessary to recall the ill-advised Bay of Pigs operation to perceive the vast foreign policy implications of this kind of activity.

My argument is not that the CIA is insufficiently supervised by the Senate, but that it is supervised from a point of view which tends to place too much emphasis on purely military considerations and not enough on foreign policy considerations. The pending resolution is designed to correct that imbalance, and I strongly urge its adoption.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT R. BOWIE TO HIGH STATE DEPARTMENT POST

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Boston Globe, on July 9, 1966, entitled "A Brinkman to Washington."

The editorial has reference to the current nomination of Robert R. Bowie to a high position in the State Department, an appointment with which I am not in accord.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, July 9, 1966]

A BRINKMAN TO WASHINGTON

President Lyndon B. Johnson on Tuesday named a Harvard faculty member to a high State Department post, but it was not a nomination to please followers of the Kennedy line on foreign affairs.

The nominee is Robert R. Bowie, a professor of international relations and currently director of Harvard's Center for International Affairs.

Reports from Washington are that there will be a battle in the Senate over his confirmation. There ought to be.

Mr. Bowie will be returning to the State Department as counselor. In 1953 he became director of policy planning under then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and three years later was promoted to Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning. He traveled widely with Secretary Dulles and was closely associated with his policy of massive nuclear deterrence and brinkmanship.

Since then, as a frequent consultant to the State Department, he helped originate the proposal for a multilateral nuclear force (MLF) including West Germany, and has suggested that it might operate without an American veto. The proposal, fortunately, is now comatose.

Mr. Bowie, then, is a dedicated hard-liner. His nomination is fresh evidence of the new and harsher foreign policy evolving in Washington. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee ought to ask some probing questions about it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES CONVENTION OF 1949

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The hour of 12:30 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the protocols, Executive I—89th Congress, 2d session—Executive No. 7 on the Executive Calendar.

The Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocols (Ex. I, 89th Cong., 2d sess.) to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to measures of control, signed at Washington on date of February 8, 1949, which were read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES, RELATING TO MEASURES OF CONTROL

The Governments parties to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which Convention, as amended, is hereinafter referred to as the Convention, desiring to provide for national and international measures of control on the high seas for the purposes of ensuring the application of the Convention and the measures in force thereunder, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraph 5 of Article VIII of the Convention is amended by adding the following: "and may also, on its own initiative, make proposals for national and international measures of control on the high seas for the purposes of ensuring the application of the Convention and the measures in force thereunder."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph 8 of Article VIII of the Convention is amended by adding the following: "or, in the case of proposals made under paragraph 5 above, from all Contracting Governments."

ARTICLE III

1. This Protocol shall be open for signature and ratification of approval or for adherence on behalf of any Government party to the Convention.

2. This Protocol shall enter into force on the date on which instruments of ratification or approval have been deposited with, or written notifications of adherence have been received by, the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of all the Government parties to the Convention; provided, however, that Article II of this Protocol shall enter into force only if the Protocol Relating to Entry into Force of Proposals adopted by the Commission, done at Washington on November 29, 1965, has not entered into force and shall, in such case, continue in force only until that Protocol enters into force.

3. Any Government becoming a party to the Convention after this Protocol enters into force shall adhere to this Protocol, such adherence to be effective on the same date that such Government becomes a party to the Convention.

4. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention of all ratifications and approvals deposited and adherences received and of the date this Protocol enters into force.

ARTICLE IV

1. The original of this Protocol shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which Government shall communicate certified copies thereof to all the Government signatory or adhering to the Convention.

2. This Protocol shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of fourteen days thereafter, following which period it shall be open for adherence.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned having deposited their respective powers, have signed this Protocol.

DONE at Washington this twenty-ninth day of November 1965, in the English language.

For Canada: C. S. A. Ritchie, Dec. 13, 1965.

For Denmark: Torben Ronne, Dec. 1st, 1965.

For the Federal Republic of Germany: K. H. Knappstein, Dec. 8th, 1965.

For France: Bruno de Leusse, Dec. 13th 1965.

For Iceland: Pétur Thorsteinsson, Dec. 7, 1965.

For Italy: Sergio Fenoaltea, Dec. 13, 1965.

For Norway: Hans Engen, Dec. 13th 1965.

For Poland: E. Drozniak, Dec. 13th 1965.

For Portugal: Vasco Vieira Garin, 13th Dec. 1965.

For Spain: Merry del Val, December 8th 1965.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: A. Dobrynin, Dec. 2, 1965.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Patrick Dean, December 8, 1965.

For the United States of America: Burdick H. Brittin, Dec. 2, 1965.

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Relating to Measures of Control, which Protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 29, 1965 in the English language, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, DEAN RUSK, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this tenth day of January, 1966.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.
By BARBARA HARTMAN,
Authentication Officer,
Department of State.

PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES RELATING TO ENTRY INTO FORCE OF PROPOSALS ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION

The Governments parties to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which Convention, as amended, is hereinafter referred to as the Convention, desiring to facilitate the entry into force of proposals adopted by the Commission, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraphs 7 and 8 of Article VIII of the Convention shall be amended to read as follows:

"7. (a) Each proposal made by the Commission under paragraphs 1 or 5 of this Article shall become effective for all Contracting Governments six months after the date on the notification from the Depositary Government transmitting the proposal to the Contracting Governments, except as otherwise provided herein.

"(b) If any Contracting Government participating in the Panel or Panels for the sub-area or sub-areas to which a proposal applies, or any Contracting Government in the case of a proposal made under paragraph 5 above, presents to the Depositary Government objection to any proposal within six months of the date on the notification of the proposal by the Depositary Government, the proposal shall not become effective for any Government for an additional sixty days. Thereupon any other Contracting Government participating in the Panel or Panels concerned, or any other Contracting Government in the case of a proposal made under paragraph 5 above, may similarly object prior to the expiration of the additional sixty-day period, or within thirty days after receiving notice of an objection by another Contracting Government made within such additional sixty days, whichever date shall be the later. The proposal shall become effective for all Contracting Governments except those Governments which have presented objections, at the end of the extended period or periods for objecting. If, however, objections have been presented by a majority of Contracting Governments participating in the Panel or Panels concerned, or by a majority of all Contracting Governments in the case of a proposal made under paragraph 5, the proposal shall not become effective unless any or all of the Contracting Governments nevertheless agree as among themselves to give effect to it on an agreed date.

"(c) Any Contracting Government which has objected to a proposal may at any time withdraw that objection and the proposal shall become effective with respect to such Government, immediately if the proposal is already in effect, or at such time as it becomes effective under the terms of this Article.

"8. The Depositary Government shall notify each Contracting Government immediately upon receipt of each objection and of each withdrawal of objection, and of the entry into force of any proposal."

ARTICLE II

1. This Protocol shall be open for signature and ratification or approval or for adherence by any Government party to the Convention.

2. This Protocol shall enter into force on the date on which instruments of ratification or approval have been deposited with, or written notifications of adherence have been received by, the Government of the United States of America, from all the Governments parties to the Convention.

3. Any Government becoming a party to the Convention after this Protocol enters into force shall adhere to this Protocol, such adherence to be effective on the same date that such Government becomes a party to the Convention.

4. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention of all ratifications or approvals deposited and adherences received and of the date this Protocol enters into force.

ARTICLE III

1. The original of this Protocol shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which Government shall communicate certified copies thereof to all the Governments signatory or adhering to the Convention.

2. This Protocol shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of fourteen days thereafter, following which period it shall be open for adherence.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, having deposited their respective powers, have signed this Protocol.

DONE at Washington this twenty-ninth day of November 1965, in the English language.

For Canada: C. S. A. Ritchie, Dec. 13, 1965.

For Denmark: Torben Ronne, Dec. 1st, 1965.

For the Federal Republic of Germany: K. H. Knappstein, Dec. 8th, 1965.

For France: Bruno de Leusse, Dec. 13th, 1965.

For Iceland: Pétur Thorsteinsson, Dec 7, 1965.

For Italy: Sergio Fenoaltea, Dec. 13, 1965.

For Norway: Hans Engen, Dec. 13th 1965.

For Poland: E Drozniak, Dec. 13th 1965.

For Portugal: Vasco Vieira Garin, 13th Dec. 1965.

For Spain: Merry del Val, December 8th 1965.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: A. Dobrynin, Dec. 2, 1965.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Patrick Dean, December 8, 1965.

For the United States of America: Burdick H. Brittin, Dec. 2, 1965.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Relating to Entry into Force of Proposals Adopted by the Commission, which Protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 29, 1965 in the English language, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof, I, DEAN RUSK, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State, to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this tenth day of January, 1966.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
By BARBARA HARTMAN,
Authentication Officer,
Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the protocols will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the respective resolution ratification.

The resolution ratification of Executive I (89th Cong., 2d sess.) was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the following two protocols: Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, Relating to Measures of Control; and Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, Relating to Entry Into Force of Proposals Adopted by the Commission, dated November 29, 1965. (Executive I, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is detained on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 142 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Brewster
Case
Dodd
Gruening
Hart
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McIntyre
Mondale
Scott
Sparkman

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the current strike by the International Machinists against five major airlines is having a most disastrous effect on much of the Nation.

Miami and Dade County, Fla., alone are suffering an estimated total damage of some $18 to $20 million weekly in revenues lost as a result of the current strike. In addition, numerous layoffs in the various service establishments that cater to the tourist trade have resulted from the strike.

Mr. President, I shall read for the benefit of the Senate an editorial that appeared in the Miami Herald on July 9, entitled "The Strike Will Cost You":

> Whatever the merits of the case, the strike of airline mechanics against five principal carriers serving Miami and other cities could not have come at a worse time for this community.
>
> After years of striving the tourist industry has created this year a summer market of promising dimensions.

One airline reports an increase of nearly 37 percent in ticket sales over the same period in 1965.

Miami and mainland hotel and motel occupancy is up 13 per cent.

A good area barometer of general business conditions—postal revenues—registers seven and one half percent above a year ago.

Farther away from home, pursuant to a wage policy which exceeds economic guidelines is the unwitting pursuit of inflation.

First the building trades unions. Now the airline mechanics. And behind them craft after craft champing at the bit.

Inflationary wage increases are just what the term connotes. Unless we miss our guess the current wave of labor disputes rolling across the national economy will bid up prices of goods and services generally and cheapen the value of the dollar. No one is hurt worse by this than the contract wage earner.

Thus we urge patience, understanding and industrial statesmanship on the airlines and the striking mechanics.

The disruption of a great and growing industry in what is surely its most successful year will harm both industry and community.

An inflationary wage settlement just as surely would hurt the very persons who negotiate it.

Mr. President, the greatest sufferer in strikes, such as the machinist strike, is the general public which, through Federal, State, and municipal governments, has a tremendous stake in civil aviation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News on July 9, entitled "Greater Government Role Needed When Strikers Ignore Public Interests."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, July 9, 1966]

GREATER GOVERNMENT ROLE NEEDED WHEN STRIKERS IGNORE PUBLIC INTERESTS

Our modern civilized society becomes increasingly complex, year by year. Each of us becomes more and more dependent on services of various kinds for health, comfort, in fact even for the necessities of life. Without these services our life is seriously disrupted, our economy suffers severe setbacks, health, even our very existence, may be threatened.

The days of self-sufficiency ended when our nation became urban instead of rural.

A century ago a family living on a farm could provide for itself through its labor. It was able to produce its own food, clothing and shelter, and need look to the efforts of others for only luxuries, or perhaps medical care. That day has vanished and we now depend on the efforts of others to insure our needs for food, clothing and shelter will be met.

We have long recognized this dependence on services through powers we have granted our governments. These powers include regulation of operation of utilities providing vital services. We insist, through law, that utilities maintain service. We require them to obtain approval of a regulatory board, whether it be the Interstate Commerce Commission, a state board, or even a municipal body, before discontinuing service to an area. We regulate the rates they may charge and the return they may earn on investment.

All of this is done on the principle it is the duty of government to protect the public interest, to take action to protect the public welfare; on the principle that the public good is paramount to the rights of property ownership and use. As a result, there have been only a few instances of capricious suspension of service by a utility or service type of corporation.

Interruptions of service, except those due to natural disaster, such as flood or storm, have been the result of labor disputes. Perhaps the most blatant in years; the most callous flaunting of the public good was the strike on the New York Subway system several months ago. In that instance, the Transport Workers Union and their leader, the late Mike Quill, paid no attention to the public interest and rode roughshod over courts and elected officials.

The current airline strike has halted a transportation service which is vital to the public good, and necessary in the public interest. Suspension of service has disrupted the transportation of the mails and of air freight cargos. It has caused a dislocation of the current of our life.

Since we insist the utility and transport firms maintain service, unless granted approval by a regulatory body to suspend operations, should we also not require that vital transportation services remain in operation during the course of a labor dispute? Since we regulate the rates and return of the companies, requiring charges to be set by regulatory bodies and on presentation of evidence in support of a requested increase, may this same principle not apply to wage contracts as well?

In these days government has set guidelines on price increases for manufactured products and has taken swift action to roll back price hikes which are in excess of these guidelines. The guidelines are supposed to apply to wages, as well, the government said.

The airlines have offered a raise of 30 cents an hour. That is $12 more for a 40-hour week, or a pay raise of $624 a year. A government fact-finding board recommended 42 cents an hour, over three years. That is $16.80 more for a 40-hour week, or $873.60 increase for a year. The mechanics have asked 52 cents an hour more, which is $21.20 more for a 40-hour week, an increase of $1,102.40 per year. The present base pay for the mechanics is $3.52 per hour, $140.80 for a 40-hour week, $7,321.60 per year.

We wouldn't attempt to say who is right on the matter of pay scales. Our point is that the general public is being ignored in the matter. The public interest, the public good, the public welfare must be protected.

Continued interruptions of services vital to our national life will bring demands from the public for compulsory and binding arbitration of labor disputes in certain fields, such as utilities and transport.

The public interest is also at stake, and that stake is much greater and more vital than that of either the airlines or the mechanics.

JOHN C. GERARD.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall read a few short paragraphs from this editorial:

A century ago a family living on a farm could provide for itself through its labor. It was able to produce its own food, clothing and shelter, and need look to the efforts of others for only luxuries, or perhaps medical care. That day has vanished and we now depend on the efforts of others to insure our needs for food, clothing and shelter will be met.

We have long recognized this dependence on services through powers we have granted our governments. These powers include regulation of operation of utilities providing vital services. We insist, through law, that utilities maintain service. We require them to obtain approval of a regulatory board, whether it be the Interstate Commerce Commission, a state board, or even a municipal body, before discontinuing service to an area. We regulate the rates they may charge and the return they may earn on investment.

All of this is done on the principle it is the duty of the government to protect the public interest, to take action to protect the public welfare; on the principle that the public good is paramount to the rights of property ownership and use. As a result, there have been only a few instances of capricious suspension of service by a utility or service type of corporation.

Interruptions of service, except those due to natural disaster, such as flood or storm, have been the result of labor disputes. Perhaps the most blatant in years; the most callous flaunting of public good was the strike on the New York Subway system several months ago. In that instance, the Transport Workers Union and their leader, the late Mike Quill, paid no attention to the public interest and rode roughshod over courts and elected officials.

Continued interruptions of services vital to our national life will bring demands from the public for compulsory and binding arbitration of labor disputes in certain fields, such as utilities and transport.

The public interest is also at stake, and that stake is much greater and more vital than that of either the airlines or the mechanics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial taken from the Washington Evening Star of July 11, entitled "A Strike Against the Public."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC

The International Association of Machinists seems determined to press its strike against five of the nation's major airlines to the point where restrictive labor legislation will become a matter of urgent national policy.

The latest manifestation of the union's "public-be-damned" attitude was the announcement last night that IAM personnel would be forbidden to service any aircraft leased by the struck airlines to those still operating. The leasing plan could, under no stretch of the imagination, be considered a strike-breaking move. The legitimate economic pressure on the struck lines would have remained in full effect. The only result would have been to alleviate, in some small degree, the crisis in the nation's transportation system, war effort and economic life. Now, even that slender reed has been snatched away.

Even before this latest ill-considered action, the union put itself on shaky ground by spurning every attempt by disinterested parties to head off the strike. Every statutory means of avoiding the crisis was passed up. In addition, the union brushed aside the offer of the National Mediation Board for binding arbitration. A presidentially appointed emergency board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, probed the issues in dispute and came up with a recommendation for wage increases averaging 3.5 percent. The carriers accepted the package; the union rejected it. Despite the fact that the proposal exceeded the administration's economic guideposts, President Johnson hailed it as the basis for "a just and prompt settlement." The airlines' final offer was even more liberal than the proposals of the emergency board. But the union walked out.

The union's main contention is that the airlines are prosperous and that the workers should share in that prosperity. It is true that the airlines are prosperous. It is also true that the union membership already shares that prosperity in the form of high wages and an ever-increasing number of jobs available. But the suggestion that wage dispute settlements should be based directly on profits could be taken seriously only if accompanied by a proposal for a lower wage package for the less prosperous of the carriers and a decreased scale in the event profits should slack off. The union has made no such suggestion.

The threat of a strike and the strike itself are legitimate weapons in collective bargaining. But the thoughtless, capricious use of that weapon to create havoc in the nation's economy can only increase the demand for congressional action to curb abuses of union power.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall read two paragraphs from this editorial:

The International Association of Machinists seems determined to press its strike against five of the nation's major airlines to the point where restrictive labor legislation will become a matter of urgent national policy.

The threat of a strike and the strike itself are legitimate weapons in collective bargaining. But the thoughtless, capricious use of that weapon to create havoc in the nation's economy can only increase the demand for congressional action to curb abuse of union power.

Mr. President, an AP dispatch which appeared in the Miami Herald on July 9, entitled "Airline Strike Major Blow to Ball Clubs," indicates how the current strike affects all areas of our way of life. I shall not read it, but ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Airline Strike Major Blow to Ball Clubs

New York.—If the strike by mechanics against five major airlines continues, baseball may see the return of an institution that has long since gone the way of the legalized spit ball and Ebbets Field—the overnight train ride.

With tight travel schedules to meet and many of the major league teams relying on one or another of the airlines that have been struck, most clubs are working out alternate air or rail plans.

Chicago Cubs traveling secretary Blake Cullen, whose team has to be in Pittsburgh July 14, announced:

"We are looking into the possibility of chartering a plane, or, like old times, taking an overnight Pennsy sleeper."

Adding to the confusion is the All-Star game Tuesday in St. Louis. Players and officials scattered around the country have, in many instances, had to change travel plans.

Commissioner William D. Eckert said arrangements have been completed to get the entire All-Star cast to St. Louis and back.

Current series end with Sunday's games and there is no general action in the two big leagues until next Thursday.

The New York Yankees, for instance, found that the only plane it could book out of St. Louis leaves at 5 p.m., only four hours after the game begins.

If the strike is still on and the game is lengthy, second baseman Bobby Richardson or pitcher Mel Stottlemyre might disappear around the eighth or ninth inning.

The Giants All-Star group will have to fly from San Francisco to St. Louis by way of Chicago, using two different airlines. Then to get to their July 15 game with the Phillies, the Giants will fly to New York and take the bus to Philadelphia.

Other clubs who are looking into train travel are the New York Mets, due to come home from Pittsburgh Sunday; the Detroit Tigers, who must go from Minnesota to Kansas City; and the Washington Senators, who have definitely decided on a train from the capital to Minnesota next week if the strike is still on.

The traveling secretaries with the brightest smiles in baseball at the moment are the ones who work for the Los Angeles Dodgers, California Angels, Chicago White Sox and Atlanta Braves.

The Dodgers and White Sox have their own planes and the Angels have a charter agreement with Dodger owner Walter O'Malley. The Braves have a season-long charter with Delta Airlines, which has not struck.

Clubs such as Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Minnesota and Kansas City are home for a week or more and don't seem quite sure what to do if the strike is prolonged.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that an editorial appearing in the Tampa Tribune under date of July 12, entitled, "The Right to Travel," would be of interest to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Right To Travel

For no good reason, thousands of Americans are being forced to cancel or change travel plans and mail deliveries and express shipments are being delayed.

The strike of the machinists' union against five major airlines affects 60 per cent of the nation's passenger traffic—amounting to about 150,000 travelers a day—and 70 per cent of the airmail volume.

This constitutes a national inconvenience and, in many individual cases, a physical or financial hardship.

There's no justification for hitting those innocent bystanders with the machinist's wrench.

The National Mediation Board had proposed that the dispute be settled by binding arbitration. The union refused. A three-man Presidential Emergency Board then studied the points of disagreement and made recommendations for a compromise settlement. The airlines said the recommendations constituted the basis for agreement but the union rejected them.

Members of the Emergency Board denounced the strike as "unnecessary and unjustified"—a judgment in which air travelers would certainly concur.

Under the old contract, airline mechanics received a top rate of $3.52 an hour. The union wants an increase of 52 cents an hour, plus provisions for a cost-of-living raise and liberalized vacation and welfare benefits. The airlines originally offered a 30-cent raise, but upped it to 48 cents.

It does not appear that the airlines are being niggardly in their attitude; it seems, instead, that the union is making excessive demands.

But the merits of the dispute over pay and vacations are not really a matter for the public to judge or with which the public ought to be concerned.

The public interest is in having available the transportation service which has been duly licensed to serve the public.

If service can be shut down whenever a union chooses to exercise that power as a means of enforcing wage demands, then the public interest is sacrificed to profit a *private* interest.

Five airlines are grounded now. All commercial airliners could be forced down by strike action.

We do not believe that any service so importantly affecting public convenience and necessity should be subject to shutdown by either management or labor.

Binding arbitration ought to be required in disputes involving public transportation. This step, admittedly, runs counter to the principle of free collective bargaining. But carriers operate under government franchise and government regulation of prices, so they are outside the free-market area occupied by ordinary business enterprises.

Congress has the power to preserve the public's right to uninterrupted public transportation. It will do so only when it fears the wrath of stranded travelers more than it does the political muscle of the striking unions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read a few short paragraphs from this editorial:

For no good reason, thousands of Americans are being forced to cancel or change travel plans and mail deliveries and express shipments are being delayed.

This constitutes a national inconvenience and, in many individual cases a physical or financial hardship.

Binding arbitration ought to be required in disputes involving public transportation. This step, admittedly, runs counter to the principle of free collective bargaining. But carriers operate under government franchise and government regulation of prices, so they are outside the free-market area occupied by ordinary business enterprises.

Congress has the power to preserve the public's right to uninterrupted public transportation. It will do so only when it fears the wrath of stranded travelers more than it does the political muscle of striking unions.

Mr. President, I am informed that the Federal Government has invested more than $3 billion—$3 billion—in airports, maintenance and operation, subsidies and research since 1950. Aviation is completely controlled by the Government through its authority to determine routes flown, rate structures, mail subsidies, and the licensing of pilots and engineers.

I do not believe, in any utility in this Nation, a stronger case can be made for the need and the right of American people to have protection against a strike by so few which vitally affects so many. The present strike of the International Association of Machinists tends to impair or defeat the objectives of Government support of civil aviation. One of these objectives is the building of a strong civilian air structure which would become of unspeakable defense value in the event of a national emergency.

Mr. President, in my opinion, one of the foremost responsibilities of the Congress is the protection of the public interest and the current strike which is paralyzing air transportation throughout much of the Nation has sounded a call for immediate assumption of this responsibility.

Mr. President, I introduced S. 210 early in this Congress which is virtually the same legislation that I first introduced in 1959, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress and reintroduced in every succeeding Congress. If enacted, this legislation would amend the Railway Labor Act with respect to the settlement of labor disputes involving common carriers by air. My bill, if enacted, would require that all airline labor disputes which are not adjusted through the present processes of the Railway Labor Act be referred to the President and, if in the judgment of the President, any lockout, strike, or other concerted work stoppage resulting or threatens to result, would substantially interrupt commerce to such a degree as to deprive persons of normally available transportation by air within the United States and severe hardship would result, he, the President, may order the submission of the dispute to a three member board of arbitration. The President would appoint a public member and each of the disputing parties would be authorized to appoint one member. Awards of the board would become binding upon the parties when filed in the appropriate Federal district court as provided under the voluntary arbitration procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. President, unfortunately, I have been unable to obtain hearings before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to which my bills have been referred.

Mr. President, I believe very strongly that it is time for the Congress to come to grips with this problem. The public is entitled to be protected by actions of the Congress. Air transportation has become a necessity in this fast jet age in which we live and much of our economy is based upon the continued availability of air transportation.

Mr. President, the indignation of the public over the current strike is indicated by the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received and I am sure many of my colleagues have received similar ones.

My office estimates that we have received more than 1,000 letters and wires already, each of which protests against the existing strike and demands action by Congress to bring this strike to an end and to prevent the possibility of such a strike in the future.

In an effort to bring this strike to an early settlement I have wired the President urging him to use all the resources at his command to resolve this issue.

I have also written to the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator Hill, of Alabama, and to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of that committee, Senator Yarborough, of Texas, urging each of them early hearings on my pending bill, S. 210 which, if enacted, would prevent the type of chaos that has resulted from the current strike.

I hope that other Senators will join with me in insisting upon early hearings by this able committee of the Senate not only upon my bill but also upon the bill of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] and upon other bills which are pending on the subject.

I have no pride of authorship in the matter. All I want is to see this situation dealt with strongly and forcefully so that the public interest may be protected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record my bill, S. 210, now before the Senate, having been offered in January last year.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 210

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number, and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to common carriers by air.

"(b)(1) If a dispute between a common carrier by air and its employees be not adjusted under the foregoing sections of this Act the Mediation Board shall notify the President. If, in the judgment of the President, any lockout, strike, or other concerted stoppage of work resulting, or which threatens to result, from such dispute would substantially interrupt commerce to such a degree as to deprive persons seeking transportation by air to or from any point in the United States to and from which such transportation is normally provided by such carrier of such transportation, and severe hardship would result therefrom, he may order the submission of such dispute to a board of arbitration as provided in this subsection.

"(2) A board of arbitration under this subsection shall consist of one public member appointed by the President, and one member designated in writing by each of the parties to the dispute. If either party to the dispute shall fail or refuse to designate its member within one week after appointment of the public member, the President shall appoint such member in the same manner as the public member is appointed. Each member of the board of arbitration named by the parties to the dispute shall be compensated by the party naming him. Any arbitrator appointed by the President shall be paid reasonable compensation for his services in an amount to be fixed by the President, and shall be reimbursed for his necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence while serving as an arbitrator. The provisions of subparagraphs (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), and (h) of paragraph third of section 7 of this Act (45 U.S.C. 157, third, (b), (c), (d), (f), (h)), shall apply to the organization and procedure of a board of arbitration under this subsection.

"(3) A board of arbitration appointed under this subsection shall promptly hold hearings at which both parties to the dispute shall have an opportunity to be present, both personally and by counsel, and to present such oral and documentary evidence as the board of arbitration shall deem relevant to the issue or issues in controversy. The board of arbitration shall make written findings of fact and shall promulgate a written award upon the issue or issues in dispute. In making such findings the board of arbitration shall consider only, and be bound only, by the evidence submitted. When a valid contract is in effect defining the rights, duties, and liabilities of the parties with respect to any matter in dispute, the board of arbitration shall have power only to determine the proper interpretation and application of the contract provisions which are involved. Where wage rates and other conditions of employment under a proposed new or proposed amendment contract are in dispute, the board of arbitration shall establish rates of pay and conditions of employment which are fair and equitable to the parties. No award of the board of arbitration relating to wages or rates of pay shall be retroactive to a date before the date of the termination of any contract which may have existed between the parties. The findings and award of the board of arbitration shall be handed down within sixty days after its appointment, except that the President may for good cause extend such period for not to exceed thirty days. A decision of a majority of the members of the board of arbitration shall constitute a decision of such board. Upon the filing of copies of the award as provided in subparagraph (f) of paragraph third of section 7 of this Act (45 U.S.C. 157, third, (f)), such award, together with such agreements as the parties may themselves have reached, shall become binding upon and shall control the relationship between the parties from the date of such filing until the expiration of one year from such date, but such award may be changed by mutual consent or agreement of the parties.

"(4) Either party to the dispute may, within fifteen days from the date the award is filed as provided in subparagraph (f) of paragraph third of section 7 of this Act (45 U.S.C. 157, third, (f)), petition the United States district court for the district in which such award was so filed for a review of such award on the ground (A) that the parties were not given reasonable opportunity to be heard, (B) that the board of arbitration exceeded its powers, (C) that the award is unreasonable in that it is not supported by the evidence, or (D) that the award was procured by fraud, collusion, or other unlawful means or methods. Such court, without the intervention of a jury, shall hear the evidence adduced by the parties with respect to the issue raised by the petition and may reverse the award only if it finds that (i) one of the parties was not given reasonable opportunity to be heard, (ii) that the board of arbitration exceeded its powers, (iii) that the order is unreasonable in that it is not supported by the evidence, or (iv) that the order was procured by fraud, collusion, or other unlawful means or methods. The decision of the district court shall be final unless within ten days either party shall apply to the appropriate United States court of appeals for a review of such decision. If the district court reverses the award for one of the reasons stated in this paragraph and no appeal is taken, or the reversal of such award is affirmed on appeal, or if an order of the district court affirming an award is reversed on appeal, the Mediation Board shall promptly notify the President. Upon such notification the President may reconvene the board of arbitration or may appoint a new board of arbitration and such reconvened or newly appointed board of arbitration shall proceed to take such action as may be required by the court's decision.

"(5) It shall be unlawful during any period beginning with the date of issuance of an order by the President under paragraph (1) of this subsection and ending on the date on which an award of a board of arbitration under this subsection ceases to be in effect—

"(A) for any carrier which is a party to a dispute with respect to which an order was issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection to engage in a lockout,

"(B) for employees of such carrier to engage in a strike or other concerted stoppage of work,

"(C) for any labor organization representing the employees of such carrier to engage, or encourage such employees to engage, in any strike or other concerted stoppage of work,

"(D) for any carrier, labor organization, or individual to willfully fail or refuse to carry out any duty imposed by an award of a board of arbitration under this subsection, or

"(E) for either party to the dispute to make any change in the conditions out of which the dispute arose except as provided in the award or agreed upon by both such parties.

"(6) Whoever violates the provisions of paragraph (5) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"(7) In any case in which, during any period beginning with the date of issuance of an order by the President under paragraph (1) of this subsection and ending on the date on which an award of a board of arbitration under this subsection ceases to be in effect, a carrier which is a party to the dispute with respect to which such order was issued engages in any lockout, or a labor organization which is a party to such dispute orders or encourages the employees of such carrier to engage in a strike or other concerted stoppage of work, or a substantial number of the members of such labor organization engage in any concerted or simultaneous action, which results in an interruption in or suspension of the operation of such carrier, such carrier or labor organization, as the case may be, shall be subject to a penalty of not to exceed $10,000 for each day that such interruption or suspension continues, which penalty shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought by the United States for that purpose.

"(8) Any person adversely affected by reason of any violation of the provisions of this subsection may file an action in the United States district court for the district in which such violation occurred to restrain and enjoin such violation and to compel the performance of the duties imposed by this subsection. The provisions of sections 6 and 20 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 17; 29 U.S.C. 52), and the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101 and the following), shall not be applicable to proceedings commenced under this paragraph."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the able Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I still have some time remaining from the 20 minutes which I requested so that I might yield time to some of my friends who wish to express themselves.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida very much for allowing me to join him in underscoring the seriousness of the situation which the Senator has brought to the attention of the Senate.

Phases of the strike affect the scheduled operation of five air carriers directly—their employees, the communities, and the States of the Nation.

I wish to emphasize a point which perhaps has not been stressed in the Senate. There are presumably several States—an example is the State of West Virginia—in which some carriers which are not struck have reshuffled their schedules and have eliminated flights in order to effectuate a longer haul of passengers. Unfortunately, this is being done with Civil Aeronautics Board authorization to nonstruck airlines to revise schedules.

The problem is thus accentuated, even though some airlines operating in certain cities are not involved in the strike. For example, Lake Central Airlines has removed three scheduled flights daily from one airport serving Clarksburg and Fairmont, W. Va., and neighboring communities. This is done even though these communities served by Benedum Airport furnish very high seat occupancy to the carrier in question. We call it, in air transport language, the load factor.

In Morgantown, our growing State university city, where service also is curtailed, the load factor is very high on the Lake Central routes.

Notwithstanding, this airline is looking only at the short range of the situation, which it calls an emergency. It apparently overlooks the acute emergency—the true emergency—it has created by overflights of cities normally on and vital to its long-range operations day in and day out when there is not a strike emergency on other lines.

Other airlines also are operating certain nonstop flights over their systems at the expense of the traveling public, the movement of the mail, and the shipment of cargo into and out of West Virginia.

Travel by air over the mountains is important not only to the State of West Virginia, but similarly to other States—some in greater degree than others. Travel is important to our entire economic structure. The movement of people, products, and mail is vital. Time is the essence of the busy traveler.

One air carrier that is not struck at present has removed entirely its operations from the Ohio County Airport at Wheeling, W. Va. That is the Allegheny Airlines.

The strike situation is most serious and goes further than the dislocation of our economic system and the disruption of mails and travel patterns. I think that our defense posture is impaired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is this a change in the schedule of the airline in order to allow it to divert some of its planes to more lush fields?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is what it amounts to, very frankly.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is being done because travelers by the thousands want to get from place to place and the airline can make more money by using its planes at other places.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Florida may say it a little differently from the way I say it; but in effect I say that many of the nonstruck airlines, with authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to revise and reshuffle their schedules, are withdrawing service from cities that have a right to expect the continuance of the service they now have.

Mr. President, on July 14 I sent a vigorous protest on this subject to the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I have had no reply from him on the situation.

I said:

> I vigorously protest action of Civil Aeronautics Board which in effect authorized local service airlines to overfly and eliminate certain scheduled stops in West Virginia. Movement of travelers and mail to and from West Virginia is just as essential to the economy and flow of commerce as is handling of passengers and mail in any other part of the country. The West Virginia traveling public is entitled to continuation of scheduled passenger and mail service by non-struck lines. We are in emergency situation which is crippling business and industry, the postal service, and possibly defense efforts. Urge in strongest possible language immediate resumption of full schedule of airline service by non-struck lines to cities in West Virginia.

Mr. HOLLAND. I compliment the distinguished Senator. I believe he is doing exactly the right thing.

May I remark, before the Senator proceeds further, that this is one of the indirect results of the strike, which spreads its harmful effect to areas distant from the actual areas affected by the strike itself.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Florida has correctly phrased the actual situation. Not many people realize what has been happening, in the second level, as it were, and how it is affecting adversely and unjustly, as the Senator says, cities and States served normally by airlines not directly involved in the strike.

I have sent telegrams of a similar nature to the airlines in question. I have received replies from the two carriers, and I am not satisfied with their responses. They say, in effect, that they would like to assure me that "in reviewing the service pattern on a daily basis, in the event we find a serious problem developing in West Virginia points, we will, of course, take all possible steps to meet the situation."

Mr. President, the "situation" should not have arisen, and the schedules should not have been revised or reshuffled. The schedules in the State of West Virginia are necessary. The fact that the airlines had them in operation is proof that they felt that those schedules were needed in and out of the airports of West Virginia. A very high rate of seat occupancy exists at the airports where these "readjustments" have been made.

When I read in the RECORD earlier this morning that my colleague, the Senator from Florida, would discuss the situation of the airlines strike and its tragic impact on the country as a whole, I felt I should join him in the discussion. The strike is now in its 14th day. I desire to bring an element of the strike effects into the picture—an element which I doubt many Members of the Congress have realized. This has been my purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution.

May I, in the short time I have left, say that the indirect effect which is shown in various communities of West Virginia, which is a State I happen to love, for a very good reason, which the Senator knows——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, and I am appreciative.

I should add, Mr. President, that the only nonstruck trunkline—American—and the other local service carrier—Piedmont—serving West Virginia airports and meeting customer needs are maintaining the integrity of their normal schedules to the communities they serve in our State and we are genuinely grateful. They are faithful to their daily obligations and their long-range obligations and relations in West Virginia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Those indirect results are felt in the very areas where traffic has been suspended due to the strike.

For instance, complaints have been received from Hertz and other people who rent cars to the public at the airports in Miami, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Jacksonville, and Tampa, that they have been forced to lay off their employees in very large numbers and are not able to rent their cars, in which they have an investment, to aid and serve the traveling public.

Similar objections have been received from chambers of commerce, stating the numbers of people who are being laid off by the hotels, the motels, the restaurants, and the like, as a result of this strike. These indirect disasters which are visited upon individual business people and business interests are many. Nobody could calculate the sum of them.

To those indirect disasters must be added, of course, not only the direct loss upon the airlines affected, but also upon the pilots, copilots, engineers, stewardesses, and all the clerical workers who have to do with the operation of a great airline. These employees have no interest at all in this particular strike, and yet they find themselves without work for an indefinite period.

This is a terrible situation, Mr. President, and I hope that the Senate will adopt compulsory arbitration.

I have one more comment, and then I shall be through. Some people feel that compulsory arbitration is a terrible thing, and that the public will not stand for it.

In my State, some stoppages of local public utilities have occurred, and in my opinion the legislature has dealt with them fairly. The legislature has passed a compulsory arbitration act affecting local public utilities stoppages. The act was passed by the unanimous vote of one house of the legislature and by a nearly unanimous vote of the other house.

Not only has there not been vindictiveness against those members of the legislature, but also, they have been praised far and wide for taking a position which so obviously was in support of the private interest, rather than any private property interests or interest for employment.

I hope that the Senate will act promptly in this affair.

I thank my knowledgeable friend, the Senator from West Virginia, for his very great contribution.

NATURAL DISASTER AT ULAN BATOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on July 15, I called to the attention of the Senate a press report concerning a great flood at Ulan Bator, the capital of the Mongolian People's Republic.

Natural disasters of this kind evoke a sympathetic human understanding, regardless of distance and differences. The impulse is to try to help alleviate the distress.

I am delighted, therefore, to call to the attention of the Senate an announcement which has just been made by the Department of State:

> The U.S. Government, through its representative at the United Nations, has informed the representatives of Mongolia of the distress felt by the Government and the people of the United States over information concerning the serious flood disaster that has struck Ulan Bator and other areas of Mongolia. The United States representative made an immediate offer of $25,000 for emergency relief to those suffering from flood in the area, and indicated the United States willingness to discuss sympathetically the need for further assistance. The American Red Cross has offered to assist in furnishing help.

The announcement is, indeed, both welcome and appropriate and I would like to commend those in the executive branch who responded with this prompt initiative to the urgent situation in Mongolia.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT SUPPORT NEEDED NOW

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there is growing concern by the citizens of Utah with the construction delay of the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Upper Colorado River Basin Act of which the central Utah project is a participating project. Yet, 10 years later, we still are fighting to obtain funds for perhaps the most important participating project in Utah.

The Bonneville unit will take Utah's share of the water from the Colorado River and deliver it to the Bonneville Basin, which includes approximately 60 percent of the population and assessed valuation of the State. I cannot overemphasize the need to keep this project on schedule. We need construction now because we are approaching the time when we are going to have a shortage of water in the Bonneville unit area, not only for irrigation but also for industry. In order to assure the development of Utah we must have water available within the definitely foreseeable future.

Last year a total $3.5 million was approved for the Bonneville unit but the funds were diverted elsewhere in the reclamation States.

Now we are deeply involved in a fight to obtain a total $10 million for the Bonneville unit so that it can get back on the right track. It is difficult to understand and explain the pessimistic attitude and apparent lack of support toward active construction being given the project by Bureau of Reclamation officials both in Washington and Utah.

I fail to understand why the Bureau of Reclamation comes to Congress with its elaborate charts, graphs, and artistic renditions of projects and dams when we are talking about authorizations; but when the chips are down and it comes time to obtain the money the Bureau is either strangely silent or even goes in the opposite direction and fails to provide the needed support.

Shortly we will be called upon to vote on the Lower Colorado project. Any number of States will have projects in that proposal and I am sure the Bureau of Reclamation is making a fine case on behalf of the project. However, I hope that the necessary committees in Congress get complete assurance that monetary support will be given the program before any authorization bill is passed.

We in Utah have strongly supported the construction of other Upper Colorado River projects and it is only right that the same consideration and support be given by the Bureau of Reclamation and others to this vital Utah project.

Most of the members of the Public Works Committees which must rule on the $10 million appropriation request are sympathetic to Utah's cause and it is my hope that Congress will prevail over the Bureau and the Interior Department.

As evidence of the growing concern felt by my fellow Utahans, I ask unanimous consent to insert in full a resolution forwarded to me by the board of directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the central Utah Water Conservancy District has entered into a repayment contract with the Federal Government for the construction of the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project as set forth in the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Definite Plan Report dated August 1964; and,

Whereas, 3.5 million dollars were specifically appropriated by the Congress of the United States to start construction of the Bonneville Unit during fiscal year 1966 (of which a portion of these funds were diverted); and,

Whereas, the District has levied a tax, held an election, and employed a staff to coordinate conditions of the repayment contract; all of these will result in loss of public confidence, loss of momentum, and a financial loss to the District if a more active construction program is not carried out during fiscal 1967; and,

Whereas, the USSR has been assembling a construction staff and is moving forward with a construction camp which, without a realistic construction program during fiscal 1967, will result in a disbandment of staff and a loss of economy in construction; and,

Whereas, an official responsible for the Federal Reclamation Program has reflected a pessimistic attitude toward the use of funds during fiscal year 1967 on the Central Utah Project; and,

Whereas, the future of Utah is directly based upon waters from the Central Utah Project being made available at a date sufficiently early to avoid a curtailment in its growth and economy: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Utah Water Conservancy District appeals to its congressional delegation to exert a strong, continuing influence upon the Executive Departments and the Congress of the United States, stressing the vital importance of establishing and maintaining a reasonable and economic construction program on this water project so vital to the State of Utah.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted unanimously by the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District on July 8, 1966.

LYNN S. LUDLOW, *Secretary*.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM GROWS BY LEAPS AND BOUNDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the House-Senate conferees, who should meet soon on the agriculture appropriations bill, will decide to retain the Senate figure of $105 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren. As I have indicated earlier on the floor of the Senate, this sum may well not be sufficient to meet program needs. However, it is a certainty that the $103 million appropriated by the House will not be enough.

We need only look at the figures for program growth to verify this statement.

In fiscal 1964, when approximately $100 million was available for reimbursement to school districts disbursing milk under the program, 2,929 million half pints were distributed. In fiscal 1965 this figure jumped to 2,966 million half pints. In fiscal 1966 it is estimated at 3,115 million half pints. Yet again only $100 million was made available.

In other words, in the face of an increase in program participation from 1964 to 1966 of almost one-fifth of a billion half pints the amount of Federal funds available showed no increase. The result? A 10-percent cutback in the Federal share of program costs.

We can expect another big jump in program participation in fiscal 1967. The $105 million will not be enough to take care of this plus past increases. But it will be a step in the right direction.

SENATOR McGOVERN: THE WAR ON HUNGER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, increasingly in recent days our attention has been drawn to the impending crisis of the world food shortage.

The junior Senator from South Dakota has long been concerned by this problem, coming from an agricultural State and having served as Director of the food-for-peace program in the founding days of that program.

We were most honored recently to welcome the Senator to Missouri where he spoke to the Missouri Cotton Producers Association. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator McGovern's remarks, pointing out the tremendous potential of American agriculture in world trade, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Agriculture Can Be Prosperous

(Address by Senator George McGovern before the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, Popular Bluff, Mo., June 24, 1966)

There was a time in my boyhood in South Dakota when the cotton country was a strange and faraway land.

But during three and a half years on the Senate Agriculture Committee, I have found that you actually are a next-door neighbor, and a mighty good neighbor to have when such a critical matter as passing a combined wheat and cotton bill is involved.

I come from an area where the predominant political faith is not quite so Democratic as it is in Missouri. Sometimes I find myself in a situation similar to my Father's in regard to an old Dutch Lutheran in our community.

My dad was a Methodist minister, and the Dutch Lutheran townsman had a Methodist wife. When she died, dad attempted to console the old Dutchman by remarking on what a fine life he and his wife had had together.

"Yes," replied the Dutchman, "it was perfect except for one thing. We did everything together all week. Then on Sunday mornings we would dress, leave the house together, and walk together until we came to your Methodist place. Then she would stop there, and I had to go on to the House of the Lord by myself."

I can appreciate how the old Dutchman felt, in more ways than one. I have experienced denominational loneliness.

Too many of my fellow Dakotans belong to the wrong political denomination, and when I managed to get to Washington, by a whopping 597 vote majority, I found another kind of denominationalism, leaving me still in a minority group.

The majority of my fellow Congressmen belong to the urban congregation with little interest in rural America. Consequently, it is good to have friends like Stuart Symington, Ed Long, and your able Congressman, Paul Jones, with whom I served on the House Agriculture Committee. While their constituency here in Missouri is considerably more urban than mine, your Senators and your Congressman know that the well-being of agriculture is essential to a sound economy, and they continue to speak out with great force and effectiveness for the American farmer.

As a consequence of the decline in farm population, passing good agricultural measures in Congress grows increasingly difficult. The major farm bills enacted in 1964 and 1965 were so-called "cliffhangers," approved by margins too narrow for comfort.

I shall be optimistic about the agricultural outlook in my remarks this evening, but let me say that optimism is justified only on the premise that you and other agricultural organizations are going to preach the gospel of economic interdependence between urban and rural America and between America and the rest of the world.

We are all going to have to fight hard for a fair deal for agriculture and for expanding markets abroad. Sometimes—and I have had a little experience in this area recently—we may have to remind our own political leaders, both Democratic and Republican, that the American farmer is not a second class citizen even in an urban country. Your two Senators joined with me and 40 other Senators in co-sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 which makes it clear to every agency of the Government that no action is to be taken to freeze or roll back any farm commodity price that is below parity. That measure passed the Senate unanimously.

My relationship with Stuart Symington has been an especially valued one. When I was Food for Peace Director under the late President Kennedy, Jim Symington, the Senator's son, was my deputy. He has since become the nation's Chief of Protocol. Legislatively, I value my close relationship to your senior Senator because between us, we are working in Washington in the two areas of most crucial importance to agriculture.

American agriculture can be prosperous in the years ahead if we have two things: sound farm programs and a foreign policy which makes optimum use of our agricultural productivity to win the peace, and along with that peace a growing world market for our food and fiber. I value my role on the Senate's Agriculture Committee, but I know that the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which your senior Senator is a leading member, holds the key to new markets and new prosperity for American agriculture.

Cotton producers for generations have recognized the importance of world trade. In my area, we have had more isolationism. In the Twenties, some of our Upper Midwest agricultural leaders began to realize that surpluses available for export were depressing domestic farm prices.

The McNary-Haugen export certificate, or debenture, plan reflected an awareness of the overseas market problem, but even the so-called "Sons of Wild Jackasses" from the Midwest could not jar their party leadership into accepting the very real effect of export markets on our domestic situation.

In recent years, a realization of the effect of foreign markets and of the need for our products in the developing nations has changed many attitudes. There is growing support now for a Food for Freedom program, for payments to bring farm returns up to an acceptable level while keeping our products competitive in the world, and for trade development programs around the world.

The most challenging crisis for the rest of this century is the accelerating race between human want and population. Unless we can speed expansion of food and fiber production and reduce population growth, we will have misery on this planet in this century on a scale few can imagine.

Hunger today is a much more serious problem than is generally realized. It is killing and maiming far more people than is gunfire, and it is potentially a greater threat to the future of mankind than a nuclear bomb. Half a billion people do not have enough food.

Twice that many—a billion—subsist on improperly balanced diets, most notably a shortage of protein and vitamins. Three million children die each year from malnutrition and diseases induced by malnutrition. Countless individuals go through life permanently crippled physically, mentally and emotionally because of inadequate food. The ever-present companions of malnutrition—lethargy, disease and premature death—breed a vicious circle of listless human beings powerless to break out of their misery and yet capable of breeding more misery for generations yet unborn.

There is a parallel lack of two other basic wants: shelter and clothing. Given nourishing foods and clothing to protect their bodies from the elements, most of these people can meet their need for shelter from local resources and begin to build up an economy that will support the purchase of essentials in future years. Fourteen of the 27 nations we were aiding ten years ago are now our cash customers. But first, the circle of misery must be broken. First, the energy to do a day's work must be provided, along with at least the bare necessities of clothing and shelter.

This is our point of beginning for a War against Want.

Just one year ago, June 17, 1965, I introduced a bill in Congress to launch such an effort. I proposed that our nation increase its foreign food and fiber assistance program a half billion dollars annually each year for seven years, continuing at $3½ billion over current levels through the tenth year, in an effort to win the war against want throughout the free world.

The measure proposed to stimulate the construction of handling, processing and transportation facilities. It described as the most fundamental front in the war "the rapid acceleration of food production" in the countries involved because, with all our productive capacity thrown into the breach, we would not be able to meet the food requirements of the world's population in 1985, nor approach world requirements in the year 2000 when population, at present growth rates, will be more than 6 billion.

I made no effort for consideration of that target measure last year, but did a little testing of Congressional attitudes.

Although it had knocked more than $250 million out of the foreign aid authorization bill, the Senate accepted an amendment offered by Senator Symington and me to add $50 million to supplement our Food for Peace commodities with high protein foods, vitamins and essential minerals. The Agency for International Development subsequently agreed to finance this amendment out of its general authorization.

A little later, the Senate accepted and Congress adopted an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1965 authorizing purchase of dairy products in the open market when necessary to meet either our domestic or foreign food assistance requirements when surpluses are not available.

Early this year, as you all know, the President requested a Food for Freedom program—a five-year measure with funding for those first five years approximately equal to what I had previously requested. The bill, now through the House, authorizes $3.3 billion annual food and fiber volume—considerably above the present level of our overseas food and fiber programs.

In proposing the War against Want last year, I told the Senate that there is no escape from the challenge of want, saying: "Neither our national security nor our moral and political situation in the world will permit us to turn our backs on the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th Century."

In the year that has intervened, we have accepted the challenge. It is only a matter of days, I believe before the Senate will act and the President will sign a Food for Freedom bill. I find myself pleasantly surprised by the speed of the political decisions that are being made, for I am convinced that the effort not only will strengthen our moral and political position in the world and our national security, but will also help to solve many of our domestic agricultural problems.

We have already seen a ten per cent increase in rice acreage allotments, and a fifteen per cent increase in wheat. There may be further increases. The wheat crop outlook for this year now stands more than 100 million bushels lower than when the allotment was announced. We may see a further increase in the 1967 wheat acreage allotment before planting time.

There is no reason, in my judgment, why cotton surpluses cannot be worked off and an enlarged world demand developed under the assistance program.

The suggestion that India concentrate more on food production, and utilize more American cotton, makes good sense.

The 1965 report of the Food for Peace Program, soon to be released, will show that 868,000 bales of cotton went out under Food for Peace contracts last year. I am told that a million bales will be exported this year under this program. That volume should rise considerably with a resulting reduction of surpluses in the years ahead.

Here in the United States we used nearly 36 pounds of fibers per capita in 1963, the last year for which figures are available. Of that total, 22½ pounds per capita was cotton. The consumption in Japan was 25 pounds per capita of all fibers and 11 pounds of cotton. Western Europe uses 10½ pounds, which is nearly all cotton. Consumption then drops off in the poorer nations of the world to less than 5 pounds per capita in the Far East, 2½ pounds in Africa, and 6½ pounds in Latin America. Even these small per capita quantities are not evenly distributed. In most of these poorer countries a minority have enough and the poor and miserable have only cast-off rags to cover their nakedness and warm their bodies at night.

There are a number of countries where concessional arrangements are now helping to meet the fiber needs of domestic consumption. Among these are India, Korea and South Vietnam. The less developed countries will demand much larger quantities of food and fiber when their economies are raised above the subsistence level.

There is still another group of countries—Ghana, Morocco, Tunisia, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Bolivia, for example—which are on the ladder of development, taking small quantities of cotton. They will require increasing supplies from us as their economic development permits.

As world population burgeons, it is inevitable that every productive acre on this planet will be necessary to meet requirements, even allowing for technological advances and population control measures.

It has taken mankind since the Garden of Eden to reach a population of 3 billion. At present population growth rates, there will be more than double that number by the year 2000, just 34 years away.

I am firmly convinced that we are on the threshold of a sellers' market in agriculture. A few commodities are beginning to feel the effect of world food demand now. Cotton cannot be far behind, despite the sizable surplus now on hand.

In another generation we are going to be scratching for arable acres on this planet to meet the demands upon us. We cannot turn our back on the rest of the world even if we would. The alternative to assisting the peoples of the world would bring an end to misery by peaceful means are, in this nuclear age, unthinkable.

A foreign policy based on the conduct of the one war we can win—the War against Want—will build not only the foundations of world peace, but also the foundations for a permanently secure agriculture in our own land.

My association with cotton state Senators in the United States Senate has been a great pleasure to me, and I believe it has been fruitful for agriculture. I hope we will have an equally fruitful association in building a world of peace and abundance for ourselves and for our children.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—JULY 18–25

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, July 18 to 25 has been designated as Captive Nations Week. In 1959 I introduced the resolution providing for this occasion and I have supported its annual proclamation ever since.

At the end of the Second World War Eastern Europe was overrun by the Red army, and nations which had suffered under Nazi oppression were then subjected to the rule of Soviet Russia. The Russians promised a Marxian utopia and told the people of Eastern Europe that they should be proud to be part of the emerging workers paradise.

Now more than two decades have elapsed since the Communist takeover and it is important to see what life in Eastern Europe and the rest of the Communist sphere is really like. What is the lot of the Polish peasant, the Hungarian factory worker, or the Cuban canecutter? Are these people living as freemen in democratic countries or are they living in captive nations?

To answer this question one might look to the speeches of political leaders or to the reports of political scientists and sociologists. But I believe that particularly illuminating insights, into the lives of the people of Communist countries, can be found in the works of their poets and authors.

A profound discontent seems to be the message of the writers of the Communist world. They were promised utopia and they received only a dreary world dominated by the Communist Party and the secret police. Free expression is prohibited and freedom of religion is denied. The exercise of the right of dissent is punishable by long prison terms and even death. Because of this, the work of many writers is often restrained and ambiguous but their true feelings do come through.

A young Hungarian named Karoly Jobbagy describes the life of the peasant when he says:

> We don't believe much, not any more; no point to tell us they're thinking of us, remembering us, our needs. We live like this. In darkness in mud, far away.

The Polish poet Ignacy Krasicki wrote a poem which speaks directly to the questions of freedom and captivity.

The poem goes as follows:

The young thrush asked the old one
  Why he wept,
"There's comfort in this cage
  Where we are kept."

"Ah, you who were born here
  May well think that's so,
But I knew freedom once,
  And weep to know."

Gyula Illyes has fought both the Nazis and the Communists. In 1959 he wrote his most outstanding poem and one which probably best describes life under Communist rule. The poem, entitled "One Sentence on Tyranny," suggests that tyranny penetrates every aspect of a man's life and is not just manifest in the gun barrels and the prison cells of the police state. The poem's last lines go as follows:

Because where there's tyranny
  All is in vain,
Even the song, however faithful,
  Whatever the work you achieve,

For it stands,
  In advance at your grave,
It tells you who you have been,
  Even your dust serves tyranny.

The people of the captive nations have never accepted the Communist creed. They yearn for individual freedom and for national independence. The Poles showed this last month when they rioted for more religious freedom. Discontent is also seething in the rest of the captive world. The masses of the people may not express their will as articulately as their poets, but their feelings are just as intense. The literature of discontent has historically become the battle cry of freedom and the history of the captive nations will prove no exception.

The United States must stand by these people who treasure freedom and we must oppose those who would enslave their fellowmen. This is the message of Captive Nations Week. It is a period of renewing our commitment to those who know firsthand what communism does to a nation. And it is a time when we state clearly that the Communists are our enemies and that those who believe in democracy are our friends.

AUSTIN FEDERAL SCHOOL AID RESOLUTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in recent years, we have instituted a number of programs of financial aid to local education agencies. The result has been the inauguration of many separate programs—each with its own regulations, administration, and paperwork—which are becoming increasingly difficult to coordinate and which are resulting in a time-consuming bureaucracy within local school systems.

The Austin Independent School District has expressed its concern that educators should be left to educate, through passage on July 11 of a resolution calling for control of education programs to rest closer to the focal point of the program.

I ask permission that the resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Austin Independent School District be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

During the last two and one-half years the Federal Government has instituted many financial programs for education. There has been no uniformity in method of distributing the funds or in establishing Criteria for the instituting of such programs. Numerous federal offices, in addition to the United States Office of Education, administer the funds. In each instance, categorical purposes are spelled out in the language of the statute and, in most instances, are further restricted as to purpose and operation through the particular office or agency in Washington that administers the distribution of the funds. Consequently, the local school districts are circumscribed in their use of available federal funds, making it impossible for the local Board of Trustees and School Administration always to establish programs in keeping with their conception of community needs. Therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of trustees of the Austin Independent School District, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to replace categorical aid to education by general aid, all of which would be administered through the State Education Agency. These funds should emanate from Washington through the United States Office of Education; be it further

Resolved, That the present high state of public education in the United States has resulted from the grass roots' interest in and inventions for education in the local communities, and that it is imperative for such programing of public education to continue if the public schools are to maintain and improve their high level of efficiency, and retain the support of their communities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the United States Senators from Texas, and to the Members of Congress from Texas.

Approved and adopted this 11th day of July, 1966.

[Attest:]

CLINT SMALL, Jr.,
President, Board of Trustees, Austin Independent School District.

TOM BROWN, Jr.,
Secretary, Board of Trustees, Austin Independent School District.

AIRLINE STOPPAGE INTOLERABLE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, everyone is losing and no one is gaining from our costly and disruptive airlines strike.

Some 107,000 airline workers have stood idle since the strike began. Economic losses are reaching fantastic proportions.

But it is the public that really suffers.

It is the public interest that is being most seriously flouted. More than 150,000 travelers and 4,100 flights a day have been grounded; 231 U.S. cities have been affected, and 70 are now without any air service whatsoever. Domestic passenger volume has been reduced by 60 percent and airmail service by 70 percent. The result: countless individual frustrations and hardships, severe economic deprivations, and an overall endangering of the national health and safety. And yet the strike goes on.

It must go on no longer. The Presidential Emergency Board performed yeoman services under the able leadership of Senator MORSE, yet its recommendations have been rejected. Secretary Wirtz' informal efforts at mediation have apparently come to naught. And we now hear that yesterday's hopeful signs were only a false alarm. The parties, says Assistant Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds, are "again at a point of stalemate" on basic issues. Talks are once again bogged down. It is time for decisive action.

There is no reason why this strike cannot be settled. That reasonable men, or a reasonable Government, should permit such a deadlock to persist is incredible.

It is sometimes unclear, Mr. President, what constitutes the "public good." Surely it is anything but unclear in this case. Airline service must be resumed.

Mr. President, the Federal mediator, today in explaining the lack of progress that has been made, is quoted as saying, "The turtles have stopped to catch their breath."

The jets are grounded and the turtles are catching their breath.

This is intolerable.

NEWSDAY SUPPORT FOR S. 2275—TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was encouraged to see an editorial which appeared in Newsday for July 9, 1966. This editorial expresses the support of Newsday for truth in lending. It urges what I think millions of people now support; namely, action on my bill S. 2275. The Newsday editorial urges that the bill be brought to the Senate floor, debated fully, amended if necessary, and passed.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTIMIZING THE POOR

Esther Peterson, the President's special assistant for consumer affairs, has charged that Negroes and other poor are being victimized by inflated prices for credit purchases and inflated interest on personal loans.

The remedy is obvious, and has been pending in Congress since 1960. That is a "truth in lending" law, introduced by Sen. PAUL H. DOUGLAS (D-Ill.) but never acted upon because of opposition from the interests it would affect.

The Douglas bill would require merchants and loan agencies extending credit to disclose the total cash price of the article or service purchased, all service and financing charges and the total amount to be paid, expressed in dollars and cents and as a simple annual interest rate percentage. All too often people do not realize how much extra it costs for the privilege of paying on the installment plan. The bill should be brought to the Senate floor, debated fully, amended if necessary, and passed.

MAN IN HANDCUFFS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a column by Mr. Paul Harvey that appeared in the Wyoming State Tribune on June 21, 1966. Entitled "Man in Handcuffs," the column speaks of the demoralizing effects that recent Supreme Court decisions have had on the conscientious and dedicated law officers of our Nation.

At a time when the crime rate is increasing five times as rapidly as the population, Harvey contends, we cannot tie the hands of those who are to protect us and at the same time demand increased protection from them:

> If the police forces of our Nation become forceless, if pretty soon nobody will take that thankless job except a sadist on the muscle or a fink on the take or a thug on the make . . . it will be because the job has been made so difficult that decent, dedicated men will no longer volunteer.

Mr. President, I request that Mr. Harvey's timely article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN IN HANDCUFFS

(By Paul Harvey)

The man with the smoking revolver standing over the dead body says, *"I did it and I'm glad," yet he may go free.*

The policemen at the scene of the crime are now required to advise the man with the smoking revolver:

1. You don't have to say anything.
2. Anything you do say may be used against you.
3. You have a right to an attorney before I ask you anything.
4. If you can't afford an attorney, one will be provided free.

After he has been told all these things, if the man with the smoking revolver says he does not want a lawyer, is perfectly willing to be questioned, because, "I did it and I'm glad . . ."

He still may go free.

Because the Supreme Court's most recent decree in defense of the rights of the criminal states that his *decision to be questioned must be made "knowingly and intelligently," and any even half-clever lawyer can get almost any confession thrown out of court on those grounds.*

So the Supreme Court has further handcuffed the lawman.

Four justices on the Supreme Court dissented from this deplorable decision. Justice Harlan said, "The Court is taking a real risk with society's welfare."

Police Chief Henry Ashley of Garland, Texas, said, "We may as well close up shop."

Middlesex County, Mass., District Attorney John Droney, said, "A lot of innocent people are going to pay for this foolishness. A lot of witnesses are going to be killed or intimidated by hoods, gangsters and rapists."

If police abuses had necessitated clarification of the Fifth Amendment, there might be some justification for a Supreme Court decree, but the fact is that confessions under duress have long since been ruled unacceptable.

Further, with our crime rate increasing five times faster than our population is increasing—youth crime seven times faster—this is a most inopportune time further to shackle our law enforcers.

With street-rioting an increasing menace, much of it doubtless spawned by the leniency of our courts, it should appear to any objective observer that we have gone quite far enough in protecting the rights of the criminal; now we'd better give some attention to the rights of the law-abiding citizen who is presently terrified in the asphalt jungle, avoiding the streets, cowering behind locked doors and shuttered windows.

Henceforth, any crime with no witnesses will be virtually unsolvable.

My heart bleeds today for the lawmen whom we bind with red tape, then say, "Stand there and shield us from the lawless!"

If the police forces of our nation become forceless—if pretty soon nobody will take that thankless job except a sadist on the muscle or a fink on the take or a thug on the make—

If our police become what police already are in many Latin American nations—hired two-hat lackeys for precinct lawbreakers—

It will have been because we made the task of a conscientious cop so desperately difficult that no decent, dedicated man will volunteer anymore.

DOLLARED TO DEATH BY GIVEAWAYS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., there appeared an excellent article, written by Henry J. Taylor, entitled "Dollared to Death by Giveaways."

This article should be read by every Member of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLARED TO DEATH BY GIVEAWAYS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Down goes our gold again—down and out—while Washington still plays "Waltz me around again, Willie" with our balance-of-payments problem.

Free trade is the right goal and we must buy from the world, of course to sell to the world. But we're still often talked into letting this be a one-way street.

All citizens who have saved anything for a rainy day and the American economy as a whole depend absolutely on the security of the American dollar.

Our gold reserve is now lower than that of Europe's Common Market. It has gone down every year for 10 years while the reserves of the six member countries of the Common Market have gone up.

France and West Germany alone, between them, now probably control enough dollar credits to knock mighty America off the gold standard.

A quarter of a million Americans are in West Germany guarding the border against invasion and nearly a million are in 30 other countries protecting the free world. We foot the bill, and all this drains our gold.

Throughout Western Europe what is technically called the Euro-dollar market—involving U.S. dollars in deposit and loan transactions negotiated and completed abroad—has been growing. Euro-dollar deposits now come from about 25 countries and more than 400 commercial and private banks. Large amounts are used for much doubtful borrowing, notably by the two big Communist banks—the Moscow Norody Bank in London and the Banque Commerciale d'Europe du Nord in Paris.

A warning about the effect of this on America's foreign trade has been sounded by economist Oscar L. Altman of the International Monetary Fund, no less.

The U.S. foreign trade balance declined $1.5 billion last year to $5.2 billion—a figure announced, incidentally, on the same day that President Johnson asked Congress for a long-term global Great Society gift program totaling about $17 billion.

We've allowed foreign machine-tool manufacturers, for example, during the past three months to nearly double their sales here to an all-time high. This includes many machine tools we're allowing to come in from Iron Curtain countries. Czech-built tools are now advertised here "delivered, installed and test-run by experts" within 30 days. Japanese tool sales here have tripled in less than a year.

Meanwhile, our own government has so overbought machine tools that Washington is trying to liquidate some of the hoard by giving them away abroad. U.S. taxpayers have paid for more than 300,000 machine tools that cost more than $3.5 billion. All 1965 U.S. machine-tool shipments to foreign buyers were worth less than a third of this frozen mass.

If our steel industry today had the same import-export balance as in the late 50s, steel production would be enjoying its best year in history. It's just a question of who makes the steel—American or foreign suppliers.

Foreign leather is backing up on the prosperity of our taxpaying tanners and ranchers. We have lower leather tariffs than any leading nation, says the Tanners' Council of America, Inc. Yet we cannot sell a single bottle of American wine in any major European country at any price. They prevent us not by a tariff but by their quota system.

In our gold crisis the Washington spokesmen ask American companies, our summer vacation travelers and everybody but themselves to do something. Washington treats our own American market (which means our gold) like a chuckwagon cook calling to the cowpokes on the range, "Come and get it!" through an import policy that is a Mad Hatter's dream and a giveaway policy which is probably the quickest way still available to dollar us to death.

IN SUPPORT OF S. 3580, PROVIDING ADDITIONAL BENEFITS TO GI'S SINCE THE KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to join in support of S. 3580, providing some additional benefits to our Vietnam fighting men in order to bring them more in line with the benefits of the veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean war. The new GI bill, of which I was an ardent supporter, succeeded in narrowing the gap between veterans of the present conflict and those of other wars. However, there still remains work that needs to be done in this field.

Veterans of the Vietnam war are not accorded the same privileges of disability rates for wartime service, pensions for widows and children, and other basic benefits that are granted to wartime veterans. The veterans are not even entitled to the $250 burial allowance that has been standard for the veterans of all past wars.

Mr. President, this measure gives us an opportunity to correct the existing deficiencies in our system of providing for our veterans. I urge all my colleagues to join in support of this most vital measure and trust that we shall proceed to its swift consideration.

FREEDOM FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, only a few days ago millions of Americans joyfully celebrated the recurrence of the day when this country won its independence. Yet this date is important not only for us and the history of our country, but it is of fundamental significance for all nations and peoples of the world. For we are not merely recalling an historical event long past. On the contrary we celebrate this day because we reassert the validity of those principles which determined then—and continue to determine now—the course of our lives and the policy of our Nation.

The ideas of freedom and justice are as old as man; human history is a long struggle to make these ideas a political reality. Almost 200 years ago America succeeded in gaining its freedom; the will to self-determination could no longer be suppressed. Since that time every generation of Americans has had to renew its commitment to the ideas of freedom, justice, and self-determination, since the realization is never complete. We uphold and support the right of all people and all nations to determine their own course of action, to elect their own governments.

It is for this reason that we cannot be indifferent to the fate of the captive nations. Today their people are prevented from exercising the political right of self-determination. The history of the countries of Eastern Europe is marked by a long and brave struggle for independence. Foreign powers have interfered with their political and human rights for centuries, since they could command superior physical and material resources. After World War I, the countries of Eastern Europe finally gained their independence. But only two decades later they were subjected to brutal German aggression and conquest. Today these nations are still dominated by an outside power. They are still not free.

The fate of the captive nations deeply concerns us, Mr. President. We call on the peoples and governments of the world to let the ideas of freedom and justice become a reality, to let all peoples and nations express their political will freely.

WHO'S RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MONEY SQUEEZE?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, all of us are painfully aware that we are living in an era of tight money. Some say interest rates have reached their highest average level of the past 35 to 40 years. Yet we hear reports that interest rates are to be forced yet higher. It is becoming economically impossible or imprudent for people in modest circumstances to borrow money for their home financing, for expanding their farming operations, or for capital improvements in their business or industrial operations. Long continued, this situation can stimulate unemployment, weaken purchasing power, and decrease tax collections.

Incidentally, the old game of trying to pin all ills on the Eisenhower administration appears to be wearing a little thin.

It is important and informative to note that a majority—five—of the seven-member Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System were appointed either by President Kennedy or by President Johnson. Only one of the remaining two was an original Eisenhower appointment.

President Eisenhower's only original appointment is Charles N. Sheperdson among the current Board members. He reappointed William McChesney, Board chairman, but he was an original Truman appointee.

President Kennedy appointed J. Dewey Deane and George W. Mitchell. President Johnson appointed S. J. Maisel and Andrew F. Brimmer. He reappointed J. L. Robertson, originally appointed by Truman.

Thus for better or for worse the Democratic Party is responsible for the majority of the Federal Reserve Board and no twisting of the record can hold the Republicans or President Eisenhower responsible for who they are or what they do.

In the New York Times for Monday, July 18, 1966, M. J. Rossant has written an illuminating report on what he alludes to as "the money squeeze." Mr. Rossant is a member of the editorial board of the New York Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rossant column from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1966]

Who's Responsible for the Money Squeeze?

(By M. J. Rossant)

Democrats in Congress are finally beginning to express their uneasiness over the high cost and growing scarcity of credit. Their grumbling comes as no surprise. The party of Andrew Jackson and William Jennings Bryan, Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy has traditionally opposed tight money and high interest rates.

Credit was cheaper and more readily available in 1960, when Senator Kennedy was campaigning for the Presidency. He made a key issue of "dear money," calling interest rates damagingly high and warning that he would not tolerate a credit policy that discriminated against small business, homebuilders and farmers. And the 1964 Democratic platform boasted of ending the "high interest, tight money" policies of the Republicans and stressed "the importance of low interest rates" in assuring prosperity.

In the current monetary squeeze—the tightest in a generation—the Democrats must speak softly. After all, the squeeze is taking place with one of their own in the White House. So they are muting their criticism, while deflecting its aim.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, the most vocal and persistent advocate of easy money in Congress, has led the way by trying to pin the blame on the Eisenhower Administration, which he claims is responsible because it permitted the Federal Reserve System to pursue an independent monetary policy. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler has followed up by pointing to the independent action taken last December by the Federal Reserve, which he charges touched off the escalation in interest rates.

SNIPING AT THE SPOILSPORT

Sniping at the Federal Reserve comes naturally to Democrats. As the agency charged with maintaining the stability of the dollar, it has to play the role of spoilsport, taking unpopular decisions that make it an inviting and vulnerable target. But there are few objective observers who would side with Representative PATMAN and Secretary Fowler in accusing the Federal Reserve of really being the villain of the piece.

To be sure, the Federal Reserve has applied the credit brakes. Ever since last December it has sought to curb inflation at home and protect the dollar abroad. But it has pressed down slowly and reluctantly.

Earlier in the year, Federal Reserve officials made clear that they wanted tighter credit reinforced by tax increases. They argued that resort to fiscal policy (taxation) would have slowed demand, while relying on monetary policy (interest rates) to curb the supply of credit was more suitable for an economy operating close to its limits of capacity. Tax increases also would have helped avert the current financial distortions and convulsions.

Their plea and others like them went unheeded. Even though the Administration has hailed flexible fiscal policy as the key weapon for influencing the economy, equally valuable for stimulating or restraining activity, it hemmed and hawed about raising taxes as inflationary pressures mounted. The Administration ended up doing very little, which meant the Federal Reserve had to do most.

The fact is that the little that the Administration did do in the fiscal area has served mainly to make the credit squeeze worse. Its speedup in the collection of corporate income taxes and its initiation of a graduated withholding system for individuals, which added to the Government's tax take without reducing corporate or individual incomes, added to the already ebullient demand for credit. And its sales of participations in Government loans has contributed to the strong upward pressure on interest rates.

Interest rates would have climbed and credit become scarcer even if taxes had been raised. But the violent nature of the escalation, which has led to severe strains on commercial banks, on savings and loan associations, and on the home building industry and may painfully affect the whole economy, could have been avoided.

LEAP-FROGGING RATES

Failure to make use of fiscal policy has also handicapped the effort to reduce the deficit in the nation's balance of payments. Washington had hoped to close the gap between rates in the United States and Europe. But so long as the United States depends on high interest rates, Europe follows suit.

The Administration's approach does not invalidate the "new economics." It is the Administration's new economists, and President Johnson himself, who have ignored its precepts. The Democrats can rally around, indicting the Federal Reserve and charging that Wall Street bankers are conspiring against the farmer and the small businessman, but they will have trouble convincing anyone that Mr. Johnson is a supine and innocent victim of events. A tightening of credit was made inevitable by the increased spending on Vietnam; but the Administration has only itself to blame for the extreme—and potentially dangerous—monetary tightness that the Democrats are complaining about.

THE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has recently published an article on "The Prospects for Peace" in Orbis, a quarterly journal of world affairs published by the University of Pennsylvania. Since Senator CLARK has made the study of arms control and disarmament, a personal specialty, his probing article deserves the close attention of his colleagues.

I would like to draw particular attention to Senator CLARK's hopeful forecast:

> There can be measured optimism that the trend of public opinion in our country is turning away from belligerance toward support for a peace offensive in which the United States will take the initiative. We may well be closer to a breakthrough for peace than many would think.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Prospects for Peace

(By JOSEPH S. CLARK)

Few Americans would deny that the basic foreign policy objective of our country is a just and lasting peace. We contend that our national posture is not belligerent, that we seek no territorial acquisitions, that we are prepared to give up our foreign bases as part of a general peaceful international settlement and that we stand ready with economic aid to assist the underdeveloped nations of the world in solving their problems of misery and poverty.

We support the United Nations. We are prepared to move forward in the field of arms control and disarmament.

Our contention is that the intransigent aggression of international communism centered in Russia and China is the only deterrent to achieving our peaceful objectives. These belligerent policies of our adversaries, we claim, require us to arm to the teeth, to devote our best brains and a huge share of our Gross National Product to preparing for and actually waging war. We deplore this necessity for the added reason that it requires drastic cutbacks in our domestic programs to build a better America.

We tend to view with suspicion suggestions looking toward a relaxation of the Cold War and the establishment of peaceful coexistence with the communist states on the ground that our enemies are utterly untrustworthy. Agreements reached with them, accordingly, would be both meaningless and damaging to our ability to create and maintain freedom and democracy around the world.

It is the purpose of this article to examine the validity of this viewpoint and to suggest policies and programs which might contribute to the achievement of our basic objective: world peace.

I

Until the Spanish American War of 1898, the United States was a North American continent power with no serious international ambitions other than to be let alone to pursue our domestic Manifest Destiny of building the best and most prosperous nation-state the world had ever known. Then, in the course of a few years, we acquired Puerto Rico, the Philippines and a virtual protectorate over Cuba. We snatched Panama away from Columbia and built the Canal. We acquired the Hawaiian Islands. We moved into Guam and Samoa. We practiced "dollar diplomacy" in the Caribbean and South America. The Marines went into Haiti and Vera Cruz. Although we were never willing to admit it, our behavior became indistinguishable from that of the imperialist European powers bent on the acquisition of a colonial empire.

Then came World War I. We went to the defense of England and France to "make the world safe for democracy." Our economic and military strength turned the tide for freedom. Following Kaiser Wilhelm's defeat, President Wilson tried without success to put the United States into the League of Nations as a guarantor of world peace through the processes of international law and diplomacy. But in the end Senator Henry Cabot Lodge prevailed, we turned our back on our international responsibilities, brought the boys home from Europe and retreated into splendid isolation. Nevertheless, we held on to our own little empire.

In the interval between the two world wars, we were willing, generally speaking, to let the rest of the world go by. Unfortunately, the rest of the world refused to go by and insisted from time to time in intruding on our preoccupation with our own affairs. The international monetary and trade crisis in 1933, the Ethiopian and Manchurian Wars of the 1930's are examples. The "phony war" erupted in Europe in 1939. However, it was not until Pearl Harbor that we were forced by outside aggression to admit that the world had become so small and so complex that we had to play our part in keeping it from turning into the kind of community which free men could not tolerate.

So we went to war again. And, again, our military and economic strength turned the tide for freedom. We invented and used the atom bomb. The totalitarians were defeated—with the help of the most totalitarian nation of all, Soviet Russia. The United Nations was formed. We joined it. In 1945 the goal of a just and lasting peace seemed imminent.

But again our fondest hopes were dashed. Aggressive totalitarian fascism and nazism were succeeded by aggressive totalitarian communism. And this time we were unable, even briefly, to retire to spelndid isolation. As the only great democratic power untouched by the ravages of World War II, we were compelled to accept the responsibility as leader of the Free World.

II

The nature of international relations was drastically changed after World War II by reason of an equally drastic change in the methods of warfare. The advent of first the atomic, and later the hydrogen bomb, the dangers to all peoples of radioactive fallout from nuclear explosions, the coupling of the bomb with the rocket to create nuclear ballistic missiles, the development of frightening new methods of chemical, biological and radiological warfare, the beginnings of the exploration of outer space with its espionage and military potentials added new dimensions to war which, for the first time in history, threatened the sudden destruction of civilization. As the possession of nuclear weapons spreads—five nations now have a nuclear potential—so does the danger of a war which would kill hundreds of millions of people.

Grown men skilled in these new scientific techniques of havoc spend their lives in uniform, or under contract with governments, playing games like little children with tin soldiers intended to determine how much force of various kinds should be applied at different times in different places to destroy an enemy or to prevent destruction of one's own nation-state. A series of ever more complicated hypothetical situations confronts them in their efforts to prognosticate how many divisions, how many aircraft, how many missiles and how many bombs State X must concentrate on State Y to prevent State Z from conquering the world.

Surely, to a psychiatrist, the leaders of these nationalist military-industrial complexes must seem to have gone mad.

The result has been to establish, for a time at least, a precarious balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union accompanied by a series of relatively minor upheavals in parts of the world outside the immediate sphere of influence of either great power. In these upheavals tl two principal nuclear powers were not at first directly involved. A sort of unwritten ground rule has been established that wherever international controversy erupts into violence the dispute will be fought out by traditional methods of warfare. Korea, Cyprus, the Gaza Strip, the Congo, Yemen and Vietnam are examples. For a few horrible hours the ground rule seemed on its way to being broken in the missile crisis in Cuba, but in the end common sense prevailed.

III

Let us now consider the global position of the United States in the midst of this delicate balance of terror. How far have we moved in economic and military expansion since the outbreak of World War II? First, looking eastward from Washington:

(1) We restored Western Europe's economy with the Marshall Plan.

(2) We helped Greece and Turkey fight off communist aggression.

(3) We helped to create the NATO alliance designed to curb Russian military expansion across Western Europe.

(4) We recognized the new state of Israel and committed ourselves to support her against the Arab threat to drive her into the sea.

(5) We constructed a ring of air bases within and around the periphery of Western Europe, thus creating a threat which would further deter Russian aggression westward.

(6) We garrisoned Germany and West Berlin with five Army divisions, nuclear weapons and a substantial Air Force for the same purpose.

(7) We gave massive economic and military aid to Pakistan, Iran and India, to enable them to stabilize their societies and resist potential aggression from the communist giants. We organized the CENTO military alliance to contain Russian expansion southward.

Looking westward from Honolulu:

(1) We fought a bloody war resulting in the death and maiming of thousands of young Americans in Korea. The purpose was to prevent North Korea, aided by Communist China, from overrunning the entire Korean peninsula and thus pointing a dagger at the heart of our newly acquired ally and recent enemy, Japan. For the first time, we fought a land war on the ground mass of Asia. To consolidate our position in Korea we left a garrison of two Army divisions and poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the South Korean economy.

(2) We established ourselves with air and naval power on a string of island bases all the way across the Pacific from Hawaii. The Pacific Naval Command of Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp now consists of 600,000 men, 440 ships and 5,200 airplanes. It includes an immense nuclear deterrent. These island bases run from Japan in the north, southward through Okinawa, Taiwan and the Philippines. Our British allies are responsible for Borneo, Singapore and Malaysia. Australia and New Zealand are backstops for the other islands. In the process of doing this we conceived the SEATO and ANZUS pacts.

(3) Not content with this movement of air and sea power across the Pacific, we have now landed well over 200,000 men of our Army in South Vietnam, supported by another 100,000 Air Force and Naval personnel, for the purpose of preventing the extension of communist power into South Vietnam through a Viet Cong victory, aided and directed by Ho Chi Minh and Communist China.

(4) We are deeply engaged in supporting Thailand and Laos against communist subversion.

In short, despite the claims of Secretary of State Rusk to the contrary, there is hardly an area in the great arc sweeping southward from Norway and north again to Japan where we have not become the policeman and good provider of the Free World bent on containing the political and military expansion of Russia and China.

Meanwhile, substantial military and economic aid is going to Latin America and, to a lesser extent, to Africa for the same purpose.

Our total military budget for fiscal 1966 will run around $60 billion. Our economic commitments including hard and soft loans as well as grants amount to $2.6 billion for the same period.

It is the thesis of this article that the rationale behind our fantastic military and economic expansion since World War II is obsolescent and will soon become obsolete. Throughout history, "Holy wars against godless opponents" fought to "total victory," have rarely succeeded. Thus, the age-long struggle initiated with the Crusades by Christian against Mohammedan has ended in stalemate. The religious wars between Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth century settled nothing; neither did the pogroms or the Inquisition. Everybody is now living together, reasonably peacefully, about where they were before the slaughter started. Is it not likely that the same result will follow the fierce struggle between capitalism and communism or, if you prefer, freedom and totalitarianism?

It is time, I suggest, for us to reappraise our political philosophy. If we were to put as much of our national energy into building a world order based on friendship, law and disarmament as we are presently devoting to a belligerent posture toward the communists accompanied by a frenzied arms race in the nuclear, chemical, biological, radiological and conventional fields, we might well have a better chance of achieving that peace we all long for.

This is not to suggest that we should throw down our arms unilaterally. Nor is it to contend that world order and disarmament will be easily come by. Neither will it be easy to entice our Russian and Chinese antagonists into following our lead up the path of world law and peace. The Chinese have been particularly bellicose, at least in their propaganda, and the Russians have a traditional fear of so-called foreign espionage which makes them extremely difficult to bargain with. Anyone who has ever had to deal with the Russians across a negotiating table knows how tough and frustrating it can be.

But I do suggest that the efforts by our policymakers to build a peaceful international order should be substantially intensified. Moreover a public opinion should be encouraged which takes a dim view of those "gamesmanship" experts who look at the future as a mere extension of a past built on sterile efforts to outwit and perhaps to destroy an allegedly implacable enemy. In short, this is a plea to stop playing deadly games, to replace a diplomacy based on conflict and suspicion with a diplomacy based on international cooperation.

IV

In a sense American diplomacy has been schizophrenic since 1945. While we were engaged in the military and economic efforts described above, there was always another motif—a countervailing one. Let us review the efforts we and others have made to create the international institutions and to negotiate the treaties which could bring peace and world order under law.

For present purposes we can begin our story with 1945.

(1) At the end of that year the victorious allies created the United Nations, an international institution whose main purpose was to establish and maintain international peace and security.

The UN has had its victories and its defeats. Its charter is clearly inadequate to today's needs. But there are few intelligent men who would wish to destroy it or who would contend it has not served a useful purpose.

(2) One of the preoccupations of the UN has been disarmament. Its members, particularly those from the medium-sized and smaller states, are gravely concerned about the danger which threatens their peoples from the angry confrontation of the great powers armed to the teeth with lethal weapons which no longer respect national boundaries.

At the Fourteenth General Assembly of the United Nations in 1959, a resolution was unanimously adopted endorsing the "goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control," and calling upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem."

(3) In 1960, Secretary of State Christian Herter first publicly stated that the foregoing objective of the UN was also the goal of the United States. President Eisenhower told the Fifteenth General Assembly of the UN on September 22: "Thus we see as our goal, not a super state above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples."

(4) On September 20, 1961, the McCloy-Zorin 8 Point Agreement on General and Complete Disarmament was signed by the representatives of our country and the Soviet Union. Three days later, under the leadership of then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and at the urging of President Kennedy, Congress created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(5) President Kennedy brought the twin concepts of general disarmament and enforceable world law together at the United Nations on September 25, 1961, when he stated that we must create "worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons."

Russia had announced its support of general and complete disarmament under strict international controls some time before we had. However, in June of 1960 the United States and the Soviet Union produced preliminary proposals for a treaty of general and complete disarmament. Up to that point both sides had been content with generalities. The McCloy-Zorrin Agreement significantly narrowed the differences between the two countries, although it still left a wide and, to date, unbridgeable gap on matters of substance.

(6) The United States Plan for a World without War was published in September 1961. It called for achieving, in three stages, general and complete disarmament under strict international control. Implementation could take perhaps twelve years. The Russian plan was similar in broad outline but contemplated only four years to complete and was quite vague in terms of the verification process. It was also faulty in that it rejected as "espionage" any inspection of armaments retained during the various stages of the disarmament process. It ignored the specifics for enforceable world law except to the extent the phrase "strict international control" could be construed as meeting the requirement.

As a result of this activity in the fall of 1961, the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference was convened in Geneva in the spring of 1962. Elaborate discussions, at which the draft treaties tabled by the USSR and the United States came under scrutiny by all of the states represented at the conference, were initiated and have continued to date without much progress in narrowing the gap between the two documents. In all candor it must be admitted that both draft treaties are totally inadequate as definitive documents capable of achieving their purposes. The conference, stalled on its major objective, has increasingly turned its attention to nibbling away at arms control instead of attacking general disarmament with "barracuda bites."

(7) Nevertheless, President Kennedy, during his lifetime, continued to press forward. On June 10, 1963, in his American University address, perhaps the greatest speech he ever made, he said: "Our primary long-range interest is general and complete disarmament designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms."

And at his last appearance before the United Nations on September 20, 1963, shortly before his death, he called for a revision of the charter of the United Nations to permit the development of that body into "a genuine world security system."

To recapitulate, the heart of the United States and Russian plans for disarmament is a staged reduction and eventual elimination of all armaments down to the level of small police weapons required to maintain internal law and order, accompanied by the simultaneous evolution of international institutions which would create, administer and enforce the international world law of disarmament.

Chief among the international institutions called for in the United States plan are:

(1) An International Disarmament Organization charged with supervising and administering the process of disarmament;

(2) International juridical institutions to decide disputes arising in the disarmament process and also to determine political disputes of every nature which, after disarmament, would no longer be resolved by force; and

(3) An International Peace Force to enforce the findings of the IDO and the decrees, judgments, arbitration awards, and the like, of the international judicial institutions.

Although the United States plan makes no mention of the subject, it is clear that substantial international financing would be required to support the activities of these institutions. It is also clear that, under present conditions, the United Nations has no capability for raising the required funds. Perhaps a small tax on international trade possibly aided through annual payments of a part of the surplus of the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development would provide the necessary funds to carry the plan into effect.

The United States Plan for a World without War and the outline of a draft treaty tabled at Geneva are both in effect rather pale adaptations of a much more specific and elaborate plan prepared by Mr. Grenville Clark and Professor Louis B. Sohn of the Harvard University Law School, published in 1958 by the Harvard University Press and since translated into nearly all major foreign languages. Adlai Stevenson, several years ago, presented the Russian translation to Premier Khrushchev.

The authors detailed, article by article, a revision of the charter of the United Nations required to implement the disarmament treaty. Later they drafted and sent to the State Department the disarmament treaty itself.

The deficiencies of the UN as a vehicle for disarmament have become increasingly apparent. Notable among them are: (1) the veto in the Security Council; (2) the one-nation one-vote rule in the General Assembly; (3) the inadequacy of the money-raising capabilities of the UN; and (4) the lack of any adequate executive power.

Concerned with these problems and much influenced by the more recent thinking of Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, I introduced into the United States Senate in April 1965 a revised version of a "Planning for Peace" resolution which, in one form or another, I had been proposing since 1959. Co-sponsored by twenty-five of my colleagues, this resolution calls upon the President "to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two."

Sections 3 and 4 of the resolution call upon the President to make his proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally, and to transmit copies of the resolution to the heads of government of all the nations of the world, urging them to initiate studies of matters germane to the resolution and to formulate recommendations based on such studies.

Two days of hearings on this resolution were held by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in May 1965. It elicited strong support from all the public witnesses save two representing rightwing splinter groups. The testimony of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency witnesses was correct but cool.

Nevertheless, the resolution has not been acted on by either the Committee or the Senate.

V

General and complete disarmament under enforceable world law has been stalled both at Geneva and in the United Nations for the past four years, in part because of the deteriorating international situation, in part because neither France nor China has been present at Geneva (France, under the leadership of General de Gaulle, having refused to attend, and China not having been invited nor, indeed, having shown any interest in the project); but also in large part because neither the United States nor the USSR has made any real effort to close the gap between their separate approaches on means for reaching the agreed end of disarmament. Behind this want of progress lurks, of course, the innate suspicion and mistrust that has clouded the relations of these two great giants ever since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Until this mistrust between the rulers of the two countries is alleviated, there seems little chance of arriving at a just and lasting peace through the goal of disarmament under enforceable world law.

Yet, despite the eruption of the war in Vietnam, there are some hopeful signs. First among them is the successful negotiation and implementation of the limited test ban treaty. The danger of radioactive fallout has been virtually eliminated as a present worry for all mankind. The conclusion of the "hot line" agreement bringing the White House and the Kremlin into instantaneous communication with each other is another. A third is the continuation of the people-to-people cultural and technological exchange programs which have stimulated respect and friendship between the two nations. As this article is written, hope has not been abandoned for conclusion of a treaty eliminating the further proliferation of nuclear capabilities to nations not now having access to nuclear weapons.

Within Russia there are also hopeful signs. Our NATO partners are convinced that the Kremlin is no longer determined to achieve hegemony by force in Western Europe. Not long ago, on March 21, 1966, former West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer declared the "Soviet Union has entered the ranks of the nations that desire peace." The Russian satellites, with the exception of East Germany, have reasserted a measure of independence. They are conducting increasing trade with the West. Jamming of Western broadcasts ceased several years ago. Messrs. Brezhnev and Kosygin appear to be far more cautious in their international diplomacy than their predecessors. The widening breach between China and Russia almost inevitably tends to turn the thoughts of the latter westward to render its European front safe while it deals with its communist neighbor to the east.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, Russia has become a "have" nation. The upgrading of education, improvement in housing, the spread of the amenities, the ever-increasing distribution of consumer goods, all tend to blunt any remaining urge for war which might exist among a less satisfied people. There may be many hawks among the Russian leaders just as there are in our own country. But it seems reasonably clear that in both the United States and the Soviet Union, the overwhelming majority of the people are opposed to chauvinism and an aggressive and belligerent foreign policy. Russia has come a long way since the Bolshevik Revolution and the days of the Stalinist terror. It is well for us to recognize and take account of this new attitude in our diplomacy.

There remains the problem of American public opinion and the attitude of our government toward Russia and world peace. First, let us deal with the former. There is still vast skepticism among the American people about the possibility of friendly relations with Russia. There is further a widespread feeling that disarmament and world peace are Utopian goals incapable of being realized in the foreseeable future. Despite the earnest efforts of President Kennedy, there is still a big job to be done in bringing public opinion in the United States to the point where meaningful disarmament treaties can be negotiated and ratified by the Senate.

And yet, truculence and belligerence in the United States are, in my judgment, more apparent than real. The military-industrial complex against which General Eisenhower warned in his last speech as President has staunch allies in the press, among the columnists and certain radio and television commentators. Nevertheless, almost every poll of public opinion taken in the recent past ends with some such conclusion as this: We want peace, we want the arms burden lifted off the backs of the taxpayers, we want an end to the threat of our children being killed in war and of bombs dropping on our homes; but history has taught us not to trust the Russians or, for that matter, the Chinese either. We are accordingly both skeptical and fearful of the possibility of arriving at agreements to achieve the goals we so ardently desire.

It is obvious that changes in public opinion must precede the achievement of meaningful international agreements to obtain peace and disarmament. No one who sat through the long debate in the Senate over ratification of the limited test ban treaty could come to any other conclusion.

Yet, in the end, the treaty was ratified by a vote of 81–19 over the strenuous objection of some very able Senators who took the hard line of distrust. And there is presently in this country an on-going peace offensive which is likely to turn the country away from the antics of the "gamesmen" and to support a solid effort to achieve a pragmatic and workable agreement with our adversaries.

In the last twelve months this peace offensive has shown itself in a number of ways, among them:

(1) The celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco last June. At that meeting U Thant, Secretary General of the UN, asked: "Is it really only the scourge of war or the lash of terror that can move us to the goal of peace and justice in the world? Can we not make the effort to advance out of our own sense of responsibility and knowledge, rather than be driven like refugees before a storm which may be unleashed by our own inability to take hold of the future?"

(2) The Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law, in September 1965, was attended by 3,000 delegates, mainly jurists, presidents of bar associations and lawyers from 115 countries. These molders of world opinion returned to their own countries prepared to secure the cooperation of their governments in advancing the concept of world peace through world law.

(3) The visit of Pope Paul to the United Nations last fall had an immense impact on public opinion all over the world. His dramatic plea for a vigorous and relentless full-scale peace offensive ended with the simple but eloquent statement: "No more war, war never again."

(4) Thirty separate committees reported to the White House Conference on International Cooperation at the end of November on ways and means of increasing cooperation among the peoples of the world.

There can be measured optimism that the trend of public opinion in our country is turning away from belligerence toward support for a peace offensive in which the United States will take the initiative. We may well be closer to a breakthrough for peace than many would think.

VI

World power today is primarily in the hands of the United States and the Soviet Union. China may some day join them, but her time has not yet come. Despite the war in Vietnam, she has little offensive capability for making mischief outside her borders and has recently sustained a series of humiliating diplomatic defeats, notably in Indonesia.

The other countries of the world are, for the time being, too weak economically and militarily to have more than a peripheral influence on the behavior of the two superpowers.

NATO, having accomplished its primary purpose of restraining the western movement of Russia, has no offensive steam in it, although the potential for increased social, economic and political integration is still great. The Warsaw Pact powers, the Scandinavians, the Arab League, the countries of Latin America and Africa, indeed, all the rest of the world, while their views must be respected and while they will unquestionably exercise a temporizing influence on the unrestrained belligerence of both Russia and the United States are neither capable nor desirous of asserting claims to more than regional power.

The United Nations, hope of the past and perhaps also of the future, is presently incapable because of organizational defects and financial stringency of doing more than supplying help to put out international brush fires as they break out, and providing a useful forum for debate.

There are no major controversies between the United States and Russia incapable of solution by skillful diplomacy. The venom has been drained from both Russian communism and American capitalism. The differing attitudes toward individual freedom, while substantial, are not in themselves a *casus belli*. Fanaticism is out of date in both the Kremlin and the White House, although no doubt it still has its disciples at lower governmental levels in both countries.

What, then, stands in the way of a far-reaching *détente?* Vietnam and Germany.

With respect to the former, one may hope that Hanoi and the Viet Cong can be persuaded that a military victory is impossible for them, that American "hawks" can be turned into "owls," and that a settlement which is honorable without being unrealistic can be obtained at the conference table.

With respect to the latter, the breakup of NATO as a military alliance and the incipient flirtation of General de Gaulle wtih Moscow, coupled with the recently announced peace offense of the West German government, may well bring the German problem within the area of a feasible solution in the reasonably near future. Here the preoccuptaion of our State Department with West Germany is the principal stumbling block. The best example is our stubborn refusal to abandon the proposed Multilateral Force in order to secure a workable nonproliferation treaty with Russia. The recommendations for dealing with the German problem made by the Wiesner Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament of the White House Conference on International Cooperation may well supply a way to the solution.

In broad general terms, they called for a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw powers; the inspected withdrawal of Russian, American, French and British troops a suitable distance from Berlin; the stationing of observers at key points to prevent surprise attack on adversary territory; and the encouragement of the West German and East German states to increase their already substantial commercial contacts with a view to achieving a workable *modus vivendi*, perhaps in the form of a loose federation among themselves, without the intervention of either the NATO powers or the USSR.

None of this, of course, will come overnight. We cannot unfreeze the Cold War until we unfreeze our own government's thinking on the problems which separate Russia and the West and bar the path to better relations. Our foreign policy has been hampered by the persistence of fixed attitudes which were formed during the Stalinist era, but which have far less relevance now. Just as there is a "Senate establishment," about which I have commented elsewhere, I believe there is a "foreign policy establishment," both in the State Department and in the universities, which clings to old-fashioned and outmoded ideas and plans long after they have outlived their usefulness. The Multilateral Force, which I referred to earlier, is a prime example, but far from the only one.

Nevertheless, I suggest again that the problem is not beyond the capability of a skillful forward-looking diplomacy emanating from the Kremlin and the White House; and, once the superpowers had achieved a *détente*, the road would be open for persuading—through superior force if necessary—a presently belligerent China to turn its great capabilities inward toward building a Chinese Great Society and joining in the internationalization of world peace through disarmament under world law.

In short the prospects for peace are brighter than many think. What is needed as much as anything else is an aroused public opinion, international as well as American, and leaders in government persuaded that an initiative toward a peaceful settlement of the world's problems is good politics as well as good sense. Cooperation, not conflict, must be the wave of the future.

PROGRESS IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in many communities and counties of Illinois, the war on poverty is already shattering barriers which have kept some people in poverty. Continued progress is expected. An article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 22 suggests what the war on poverty means to some residents of St. Clair County.

I recently read an article written by Michael Dixon, of the Post-Dispatch staff. It is entitled "First Year of Antipoverty Work Brightens the Future for Many."

Mr. President, Mr. Dixon's article focuses upon the experience of one young woman named Candice Warden to demonstrate the program's impact. Miss Warden left high school to support her ailing mother, but was unable to find a good job because she lacked a high school diploma. Then the St. Clair County Economic Opportunity Commission opened offices in East St. Louis, and Candice won a nonprofessional staff position. Now she plays a valuable role in the local antipoverty effort, and faces the future with hope. In September, Candice will enroll in night school.

As Mr. Dixon points out, Mr. President, Candice Warden is 1 of 75 nonprofessional staff members of the county antipoverty agency who have been recruited from among the poor. Their salaries have totaled $288,660, while 15 professional staff members have been paid $113,730 for a year's service in a program which has expended $2 million to fight poverty in St. Clair County. These figures, I feel, tend to put the much-discussed antipoverty "salary issue" in proper perspective.

The many imaginative and highly promising antipoverty projects devised by the St. Clair County EOC include a year-round Headstart program, a reading clinic for 300 students, 6 neighborhood opportunity centers, a unique family-to-family program which directly involves more fortunate families in an effort to uplift their disadvantaged fellow citizens, 5 day-care centers, a job creation program for over 500 youths and adults, a legal service program, and a community beautification project under the amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act sponsored last year by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

In addition, Mr. President, the EOC has cooperated in developing a highly successful and effective neighborhood Youth Corps project for 1,800 teenagers, and an Upward Bound program which will open the doors to a college education for low-income high school students. Much of the credit for this outstanding record of antipoverty achievement, Mr. President, must go to Mr. J. Phillip Waring, executive director of the St. Clair County EOC, and his fine staff.

Mr. President, the war on poverty in St. Clair County, Ill., has a long way to go, but it is being waged with vigor and effectiveness. I commend Michael Dixon for bringing these facts to public attention, and I ask that his article be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First Year of Antipoverty Work Brightens the Future for Many

(By Michael Dixon)

Candice Warden, a high school dropout, and the St. Clair County Economic Opportunity Commission last week observed one year of antipoverty work. Miss Warden, 19 years old, started working with the commission three days after it opened offices in East St. Louis.

Miss Warden, a better than average student in high school, was forced to drop out in her senior year. Her mother suffered a heart ailment that made it impossible for her to work. The young woman became the sole provider for her mother. A brother was married and had a family.

To make ends meet, Miss Warden took a job as a part-time typist in a law office. She had learned to type in school. Her job paid $80 a month. Efforts to find a better job failed because she was a high school drop out.

NEAR SUBSISTENCE LEVEL

Miss Warden and her mother lived near a bare subsistence level for about a year until she began working for the commission. Her mother died last October.

Miss Warden is only one of many persons who previously were underemployed or unemployed and now are staff workers in the war on poverty, J. Phillip Waring executive director of the commission, said.

Projects which are being operated or which are awaiting federal funds include:

Six preschool readiness centers, operated year round, to provide training for 300 children.

A reading clinic serving 300 students.

The Neighborhood Youth providing work-training experience for 1,800 boys and girls, ages 16 through 21, both in and out of school.

Six Neighborhood Opportunity Centers to offer legal aid, counseling, health and recreational services.

A family-to-family program to serve more than 600 disadvantaged families by bringing them into contact with middle class families.

Upward Bound, a program to motivate lower income high school students to attend college.

Five day care centers serving more than 200 children whose parents work.

A program to provide jobs for more than 500 unemployed or underemployed youths and adults.

Other projects are free legal services to low income families and placing "hard-core" unemployed persons on community beautification projects.

TWO MILLION DOLLARS SPENT

The commission has spent about $2,000,000 since May 1965, on poverty alleviating programs, Waring said. Only $113,730 has been allocated for salaries of 15 professional staff members. An additional $288,660 has been paid to 75 nonprofessional persons, drawn from the poverty areas.

These include 15 clerical workers, 54 community-aid workers and six maintenance personnel. Many of these people were unemployed or underemployed before, Waring said.

Waring estimated that 30 per cent of the 315,000 persons living in St. Clair county are disadvantaged, either economically, educationally or culturally.

He believes that the poverty programs now under way are barely denting the shell which restricts people to living in substandard shelters, eating inadequate meals and being poorly educated.

However, the program has given Miss Warden a bright future. She plans to enroll in night school in September.

THE LATE POLICE CHIEF WILLIAM H. PARKER, OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it is with a great sense of personal and public loss that I draw the attention of my colleagues to the passing of a great and dedicated man whose high ideals of justice in the pursuit of law and order made the Los Angeles police force noted as among the best in the Nation. Police Chief William H. Parker died shortly after receiving an award from the Second Marine Division Association in Los Angeles—an award he more than justly deserved. He was respected by all and created a national reputation for honesty and integrity which should be the envy of law-enforcement officers everywhere.

Bill Parker was an extraordinary man who shuned personal glory and political ambition to devote himself to enforcing the law as written in the most efficient and just manner possible. He was an outspoken man who minced no words. He feared no man and frequently challenged those whose statements or policies conflicted with the enforcement of law and order.

Chief Parker assumed the command of a police force that was beset with scandal and low morale and in 16 years of hard work developed for that force the lofty reputation it now enjoys. He raised the standards for law-enforcement officers, streamlined the department's methods, and inculcated a sense of pride within the department, and consequently within the community, that had hitherto been conspicuously absent.

The death of the police chief followed a period of illness—and although aware of precarious health, he continued to push himself in his duties as a public servant. He died as a result of the great sense of responsibility he felt toward the public—a responsiblity he could not and would not abandon.

Bill Parker has left to the people of Los Angeles and the country a legacy that illustrates only too well his measure as a devoted public servant; a department with qualified and dedicated men who are prepared and determined to carry on the work he started.

Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues join me in extending regrets and condolences to Mrs. Parker.

At this time, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the Los Angeles Times editorial of yesterday appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF PARKER AND THE LAW

Los Angeles is in deep mourning for William H. Parker—the man who devoted his life to making this the best-policed city in the nation.

Police Chief Parker is dead, but his dedication, integrity, and professional ability live on in the great department he led and inspired.

"Law and order" was not a casual phrase to Parker. He believed devoutly that no community, no nation could govern itself without respect for the law and its authority.

Those who violated the law, who threatened the person or property of others were his sworn enemies. Chief Parker enforced the law with a single-mindedness and efficiency that led to controversy, but there was never a doubt as to his honesty and sincerity.

These were the very characteristics in a chief that Los Angeles desperately needed when Parker took over in the critical year of 1950. Scandals and low morale in the department had made the city vulnerable to criminal interests.

Before long, however, Parker developed a police force of great pride and outstanding professional competence. No large city has so successfully resisted the challenge of organized crime or won so high a reputation for over-all excellence.

Chief Parker thus epitomized the protection of the law to most citizens. To others he was the defender of the "status quo"—and the focus of resentment toward other law officers and toward laws that Parker enforced but had not enacted.

Yet, significantly, many of the tributes to the late chief came from those who had often differed with him, such as City Councilman Tom Bradley and John A. Buggs, executive director of the County Human Relations Commission. A. L. Wirin, attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union and a frequent critic of Parker, said "I have admired him through the years as an efficient and dedicated police officer."

Although William Parker cannot be replaced, a successor must be named. One of his legacies to the city is the number of outstanding police executives in the department eligible to assume the top post.

The new chief must be as dedicated to the enforcement of the law and the preservation of order as was Parker. The Times believes that within the ranks of the L.A.P.D. there is such a man, who will also be accepted by all elements of the citizenry—even those who in recent months have been critical of the department.

SHOULD McCLOSKEY CO. GET FEDERAL CONTRACTS?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I was surprised to note that despite recent questions relating to the professional and ethical standards of the McCloskey & Co. construction company, the firm had been awarded a sizable Federal contract for work on the Philadelphia Mint. I have today written the Administrator of the General Services Administration protesting the award of this contract, and I ask that my letter and GSA's press release be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
July 19, 1966.

Mr. LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KNOTT: I was surprised to learn upon my return from a trip to my state that the General Services Administration has concurred with the Treasury Department in approving the award of a $12,682,565 contract for construction of the superstructure of the new U.S. Mint at Philadelphia. The recipient contractor, according to your news release of July 1, is the politically powerful McCloskey & Company of Philadelphia. The purpose of this letter is to protest the award of this contract to McCloskey & Company.

I remind you that a civil suit is pending in Federal court to recover damages brought about by incompetent work on the Veteran's Administration Hospital near Boston. As I am sure you know, the siding of the hospital peeled off one day following completion of the project by McCloskey & Company.

Monuments to the professional excellence of McCloskey & Company have fallen into premature disrepair throughout the country. I think it is fair to assume on the basis of the record that the man who heads the company is far more a Democrat politician than a professional contractor. Matthew McCloskey is former Democrat National Treasurer and he has been accused of making an illegal $25,000 campaign contribution to Democrat war chests. He has also been accused of paying a $10,000 kickback so that he could obtain the construction performance bond on the D.C. Stadium for his son-in-law's insurance firm. McCloskey & Company is also involved in three housing projects in Florida which were covered by FHA loans totaling $28.8 million and subsequently defaulted. I am sure you are aware also that it was McCloskey & Company that constructed the most expensive office building in the world, the Rayburn House Office Building, at twice its original contract price.

It is quite possible that upcoming court action against former secretary to the Senate Majority, Bobby Baker, will involve Matthew McCloskey.

In my judgment, until the court action against McCloskey has been settled and until other questions relating to the man's ethical and professional standards are clarified, he should not be awarded Federal contracts and he should be denied the Philadelphia Mint project, which was the subject of your July 1 press release.

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

GSA NEWS RELEASE, JULY 1, 1966

The General Services Administration, with concurrence of the Treasury Department, today announced the award of a $12,682,565 contract for construction of the superstructure of the new U.S. Mint at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

GSA said the Government is accepting the low-price proposal of McCloskey & Company, of Philadelphia. The firm, which recently completed the Mint substructure, is to begin work immediately on the remainder of the building.

The overall project is scheduled for completion within 18 months.

WAR ON POVERTY DIGRESSION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in line with my remarks today I ask to be included in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Kansan dated Thursday, July 14, 1966, entitled "War on Poverty Digression."

This editorial plainly makes the point. The poverty program having involved itself in politics now is disturbed that it is a political subject but as the editorial editor so aptly points out:

> When the OEO begins to succeed in its main purpose it will deactivate the critics' ammunition.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR ON POVERTY DIGRESSION

The Office of Economic Opportunity "welcomes responsible review of the anti-poverty program but it resents the hit-and-run guerrilla warfare of Republican poverty memos and party pronouncements."

So states a comment by "OEO spokesmen" issued from the North Central regional office of the OEO located in Kansas City, Mo. This comment runs for more than a typewritten page attacking Republican tactics.

The Office of Economic Opportunity looks awkward in this latest political pitch. The OEO was organized to help the poor. It is not endowed with either any surplus of wisdom, experience or success which entitles it to involve itself deeper into politics than it already has involved itself.

The OEO has attacked Republican leaders because they have found fault with the OEO program. It isn't hard to find cause for finding fault with the OEO. That the OEO would take in after its accusers is strong evidence of its sensitivity to criticism. The OEO must have a guilty conscience. It very well could have.

Our suggestion is that the OEO mind its central business and get along with its plowing, letting the clods fall where they may.

The war on poverty has enough built-in troubles to begin with. It only adds to its tribulations by jousting with Republicans. When the OEO begins to succeed in its main purpose it will deactivate the critics' ammunition.

WICHITA FALLS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on July 11, the Wichita Falls Independent School District passed two resolutions relating to legislation affecting local educational institutions.

The first resolution expresses the sense of the board of trustees that programs of Federal assistance to education must not become vehicles for Federal control of education, a position I share most strongly.

The second resolution was drafted in opposition to H.R. 13712 as it would apply to the student lunch program.

I ask permission to have these resolutions inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the public schools are, and of right ought to be, the primary concern of the state and local agencies, and

Whereas it has been a matter of concern to this Board that the Federal Government is exercising increased control over the local schools through the categorical purposes stated in recent federal school support legislation, and

Whereas this Board has always subscribed to the premise that federal aid to education must not lend itself to federal control: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be made aware of our concern and be urged to share our concern in this matter so that local control of education shall not be placed in jeopardy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States resist further efforts to categorize federal aid to education and make every effort to replace such aid with general aid administered through the state education agencies which would free the various states to develop a program of education which will retain and increase the support of the local communities; and be it finally

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the United States Senators from Texas, and to the Members of Congress from Texas.

Adopted unanimously this 11th day of July, 1966.

IKARD SMITH, *President*.
MRS. LARRY J. DOING, *Secretary*.

Whereas the purpose of the school lunch program is to provide a hot meal for students at a minimum cost, and

Whereas many school districts, like our own, are still making every effort to provide such meals without support from the Federal Lunch Program so that some freedom of choice may be retained, and

Whereas increased food costs have made this independent operation increasingly difficult, and

Whereas H.R. 13712, introduced by Congressman JOHN DENT, will further increase the cost of food service to such an extent as to force all schools into the Federal Lunch Program: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to oppose H.R. 13712 so that local school districts may continue to conduct a feeding program in accordance with the wishes of its citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the United States Senators from Texas, and to the members of Congress from Texas.

Adopted unanimously this 11th day of July, 1966.

IKARD SMITH, *President*.
MRS. LARRY J. DOING, *Secretary*.

THE ESCALATION OF FRIGHTFULNESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post Mr. Walter Lippmann, whose credibility as a critic of American war policy in Vietnam should be beyond question, solemnly warns that the execution of American fliers, held prisoner by Hanoi, "would make the war, frightful as it is already, still more frightful." Lippmann pleads for an end to the vicious spiral of ever-mounting violence that threatens to make a desolation of Vietnam, carrying the war beyond the point of no return.

I pray that Hanoi will take heed of Lippmann's dire forecast. To give it added impact, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ESCALATION OF FRIGHTFULNESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Because the Vietnamese war cannot be decided by military means, it has become increasingly a vicious spiral in frightfulness. Because it is both a civil war of Vietnamese against Vietnamese and at the same time a war of Vietnamese against foreign white men, it is, as such wars usually are, increasingly ferocious and barbarous. Unable to subdue the other side by conventional military actions, each side tries to overcome the enemy by destroying his will to fight. Frightfulness begets frightfulness and anger demands vengeance, and all that remains is a fury which, insofar as it reasons at all, thinks that by topping frightfulness with more frightfulness, the enemy will be silenced and paralyzed.

The world is now confronted with this escalation of frightfulness. To the American threat to bomb closer and closer to the populated regions of North Vietnam, Hanoi is replying by increasing its mobilization, by evacuating the civilian population from Hanoi and Haiphong, and by threatening to try the captive American fliers, humiliate them, and use them as hostages in the war of frightfulness, and, in the end, perhaps even to execute them.

There is no doubt that this treatment of the fliers would evoke dire reprisals. The warning of Secretary General U Thant and the declaration of the senators who have dissented from the Johnson policy in the war are accurate. They are telling the truth in calling the attention of Hanoi to the fact that the punishment of the prisoners of war would make the war, frightful as it is already, still more frightful. For the ultimate weapons of frightfulness are in the hands of the United States, and no one who knows this country and the character of the President can be sure that they will not be used if the escalation of frightfulness continues.

In this escalation we are approaching the point of no return, the point where the war becomes inexpiable, where it becomes incapable of rational solution, where it becomes a war of endless killing, a suicidal war of extermination. The war is not yet at that point. But the war will pass that point of no return if the prisoners are executed and the North Vietnamese cities are destroyed in retaliation.

There is great honor and glory to be had by anyone speaking for the civilized conscience of mankind, who interrupts and breaks the vicious spiral.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the present airline strike is entering its 11th day with reports that these is no reason to expect a settlement this week.

The strike, called by the International Association of Machinists, has grounded five airlines at much cost and inconvenience to those immediately concerned and to all Americans.

The Chamber of Commerce of Amarillo, Tex., has expressed its concern over the matter through the passage of a resolution on July 13. I ask permission to have the text of the chamber's resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMARILLO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AMARILLO, TEX.

Whereas, the current machinists strike against five major United States Airlines has grounded approximately 60 per cent of the nation's total commercial airlift, and

Whereas, this strike came about despite lengthy negotiations between the parties, and

Whereas, the dispute was the subject of study and recommendations of an Emergency Fact Finding Board appointed by the President of the United States, and

Whereas, news media accounts of the strike indicate no progress is being made toward settlement, and

Whereas, airline passenger service at Amarillo has been curtailed by 760 seats daily inbound and outbound, and

Whereas, this curtailment is having a serious adverse effect upon the movement of passengers, property and mail in and out of Amarillo creating a hardship upon the daily lives and economy of the community: now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Amarillo Chamber of Commerce urges all those persons in positions of responsibility in this matter, both in labor and management, as well as in government, to exert every effort possible to bring about a prompt resumption of the normal level of airline service throughout the nation.

Recommended by the Amarillo Chamber of Commerce Aviation Committee, July 12, 1966.

Adopted by the Amarillo Chamber of Commerce Executive Committee, July 13, 1966.

CHARLES D. LUTZ, JR.,
President.

THE ORGANIZED CONFUSION OF EASY CREDIT—TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the current issue of the American Legion magazine carries one of the most thorough discussions published in recent years of the truth-in-lending issue. The article, by Mr. Maury Delman, is entitled "The Organized Confusion of Easy Credit."

Mr. Delman has very carefully reviewed the massive hearings conducted in each of 5 years by the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair. He has supplemented his understanding of this immense amount of data with interviews and other investigations. I did not know about this article, but I began to receive so many letters stirred up by it that I then requested it from the Library of Congress.

I do not think it is necessary to repeat or summarize Mr. Delman's findings. The article is well written, extremely interesting, and, overall, careful in its facts. It does actually understate the level of consumer debt in the United States. The Federal Reserve Board in its Bulletin for June 1966 states that as of the end of March 1966, taking all elements into account, total consumer debt in the United States stood at $313.3 billion. If one subtracts home mortgage loans of $207.5 billion, there remains a total short-term and intermediate consumer debt of $105.8 billion. This Federal Reserve account includes installment loans of $68.8 billion, noninstallment loans of $18.2 billion, security loans of $9.4 billion, loans on insurance policies of $8.4 billion, and "other" loans of $1 billion.

I have usually stated the level of consumer and real estate credit as it is revealed in the monthly Economic Indicator prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers. The June issue states a total for intermediate and short-term loans of $88 billion and mortgage debt of $216 billion for a total of $304 billion. As Mr. Delman reports, I believe that on the $88 billion of nonmortgage debt alone the public is now paying more than $11 billion a year in finance charges.

Mr. Delman's discussion, in my opinion, should help to set at rest the fictitious charges made by the opponents of truth in lending that it is impossible to state the approximate annual rate. Of course, it is easy to do this so long as you are not trying to determine the exact yield to three or four decimal points. Lenders, in fact, start with the annual rate but they, with few exceptions, decline to let the consumer know what it is. They refuse to do so because this would let the consumer know what he is being asked to pay in standard or "unit" terms. If he knows the annual rate, he can shop for the best buy, just as he can when he knows the price per gallon of gasoline, or per quart of milk.

I congratulate the American Legion magazine for publishing a major article on this extremely important matter. It is a signal contribution in the public interest, and judging from my own mail, it is being read widely.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the July issue of the American Legion magazine, including a chart entitled "Cost-Per-$1 Chart Helps Estimate Interest Rate on Installment Credit," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORGANIZED CONFUSION OF EASY CREDIT: WHAT A 6-YEAR DRAMA IN A SENATE COMMITTEE HAS REVEALED ABOUT THE HABITS OF LENDERS AND BORROWERS

(By Maury Delman)

Since 1961, massive testimony has been taken by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee based on the simple proposition that when the average consumer (that's you) borrows money or buys something on credit he has only the fuzziest notion of what he's doing, while the average lender seldom tells him in any way that makes easy sense.

To date, the printed testimony on the subject easily surpasses in volume the complete works of William Shakespeare. It exceeds 4,000 pages. A single copy of the whole record tips the scales of nearly ten pounds.

The cause of the hearings is a proposed law, known as the Truth in Lending Bill (Senate Bill 2275). It has led to the most expensive investigation ever by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The aim of the bill is to compel extenders of credit to consumers to tell the customers what the credit will cost in dollars and cents, and what that represents in annual interest rates.

The bill wouldn't allow any finagling over what is interest and what isn't. It avoids the word "interest" as assiduously as some lenders do. It would lump all charges that you pay for credit under the single heading of "finance charges," whether the lender or seller calls them "interest," "service charges," "placement fees," 'loan insurance" or anything else.

Hardly any of the testimony on the bill has been neutral. Witnesses were For it or Against it. Acknowledged leader of the For's is Sen. PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, though he is outranked in the For camp by the President, who has also consistently plugged the bill.

Acknowledged leader of the Against's is Sen. WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah. DOUGLAS and BENNETT are both on the main committee and on the subcommittee studying the bill. In the subcommittee they have assumed the roles of contending generals marshaling their forces against each other in long, open, verbal warfare during the years of hearings.

Lined up behind Senator BENNETT on the Against side is the bulk of that world of business which extends consumer credit in considerable volume. (The bill is not intended to apply to business credit.) The familiar small loan finance companies, the auto finance companies and many auto dealers, department stores, some mail order houses and The American Bankers Association (representing most commercial banks) rally against the bill behind Senator BENNETT.

Go ahead and require a statement of the dollars and cents cost of credit, says BENNETT. But a correct statement of interest rates on many forms of credit is a matter far too complex to be required by law.

Lined up behind Senator DOUGLAS in the For army is perhaps a larger, but so far less successful, array. It includes:

(a) The savings and loan associations. They believe that as much as possible you should save your money at interest and buy for cash when you've saved it, thus earning instead of paying interest, and cutting down credit costs.

(b) The labor unions. They take umbrage at the number of workingmen and costs, and who have paid excessive credit costs, and who have been talked into buying beyond their means by "easy credit" sales promotions which they didn't understand until too late.

(c) The nation's credit unions. As cooperatives, they have been making installment loans to consumers at 12% for nearly half a century and telling the open truth about it.

(d) Numerous professional and consumer groups; college economists (a few of the profs also have appeared on the other side), and some federal agencies and departments.

The Douglas camp marshals many arguments in favor of the bill. The most disarming of these is that the bill doesn't propose to regulate anything except the truth. They are quick to tell you that if the bill were passed, lenders could still do anything that the various state laws permit them to do today. They would just have to tell the customer in writing what the deal is, in figures and language that the customer should be able to understand—how many dollars and cents extra he will pay *in total* for the credit, over and above the amount of the loan or purchase, and what *all that* represents in simple, annual interest rates.

Where Sen. DOUGLAS has made the most hay in the testimony on the bill is in the lengthy and hair-raising citation of credit charges and practices that are exorbitant on the face of it, including examples in which well-educated people have gone for rates that by any standard are out of line. The terms as stated are often as untranslatable by the educated as by the uneducated.

A U.S. Office of Education study, charting total charges of various banks (which are far from the worst offenders) gave a range for a $4,000 student loan of credit costs varying from a low of $352.40 by a bank in West Hempstead, N.Y., to a high of $911.00 by a bank in Jackson, Mich.

Servicemen buying used cars have been charged as high as 100% interest on two-year installment purchases. A New York woman brought in bills which revealed that she'd been charged 49% interest on a 24-month furniture purchase. The furniture cost $389, and she had to pay $588, or $199 for 24 months' credit.

A Pittsburgh borrower got $900 from a small loan firm. When the interest on his 24 monthly payments of $58.10 was calculated correctly, the rate proved to be 52%.

A Harvard Law School graduate discovered a week after signing a $3,000 note that the rate was somewhere between 24% and 33%. An FBI agent in Washington, D.C., brought a car on a deal that looked like 4%. Figured by experts, it turned out to be over 20%.

A familiar practice of stores and small loan companies is to cite the monthly interest, which is a small-looking number even if the annual rate is high. You multiply by 12 to find the annual rate. A 1½% monthly charge is 18% per year. A 2% monthly charge is 24% a year. A 3% monthly charge is 36% a year. Some charges by licensed small loan companies run as high as 3½% a month. That's 42% a year on the unpaid balance. Credit union witnesses cited numerous cases of workingmen who'd come to them for help after they'd gotten into jams on purchases they couldn't pay for because the credit costs were far higher than they'd thought at the time of purchase. Many of them couldn't be bailed out on any reasonable grounds. The seller demanded a penalty for paying off the note in advance (with the proceeds of a new 12% loan from the credit union) which added to the woes of the buyer.

Among the vast collection of cases presented to the Senate subcommittee since 1961 was that of a woman with four children to support on $44 a week. Appealing to her parental pride, a local "conservatory" of music persuaded her to buy a $600 accordion for a daughter who was said to have "great talent." Within months the "conservatory" reported that the daughter had "such exceptional talent" that an $1.800 instrument would be necessary. The carrying charges alone came to $400—a simple interest rate of 20% if the original $1,800 price were correct. When the woman finally reached the edge of bankruptcy she discovered that she could have bought the same instrument elsewhere for only $400 and at half the interest rate. One witness had bought a TV set on installments over 30 months. The rate of interest turned out to be 143%!

The Lending bill is accused of being just one more step in the process of federal control of everyone's business, and in the further destruction of the American free enterprise system. Quite the opposite, say DOUGLAS and his followers. The cost of consumer credit today not only frequently takes the customer for all the traffic will bear, but all that ignorance will bear. The free enterprise system isn't working as it should in the credit field, they claim. Credit costs are so camouflaged and obscured that customers often have no idea what they are paying for it, and aren't apt to find out if many present lending obscurities continue. Pass this bill, they say, and the average Joe will be able to go into the market place and shop for credit the way his wife compares soap and food prices. Only then, they say, will credit costs find their true competitive level in a free enterprise system.

The reader can easily test his own price-shopping ability in the credit field. Let's say you want to borrow $100 and pay off the loan and the interest in 12 equal monthly installments.

A friend says: "I'll lend you the $100 and charge at an annual rate of 10% on the unpaid balance each month. I haven't figured what the equal monthly payments will be, but whatever they come to, I'll do it."

You tell him to wait a while. You stop in at a bank which offers to lend you the $100 in exchange for your note for $106 to be paid off in 12 equal monthly installments. (This is called an add-on loan. The total interest charge of $6 is added to the face amount of the note.)

Another bank says it will lend you the $100 "discounted." If you sign a note for $100, they'll subtract a $6 charge at the start. You'll leave the bank with $94 and promise to pay back an even $100 in 12 equal monthly installments.

Even though the discount loan will only put $94 in your pocket, instead of $100, you decide you'll choose that one of the three offers which gives you the lowest interest rate on the money you actually get. Which do you choose—the add-on, the discount or your friend's 10% offer?

If you are an average person you can't figure this out at all, though both the add-on and the discount are extremely common types of small loans, and the figures in our example are about as simple as any you might face in a real situation.

As a matter of fact, *nobody* can compare these loans *exactly*, and your friend can't work out an *exact* schedule of payments whereby he can charge you precisely 10%.

As long as payments are made in equal monthly installments, no schedule of payments can be set up to charge you any selected, simple, annual interest rate right on the nose. It will always come out in unpayable and enormously long fractions of cents, and it's not apt—even in round numbers—to be evenly divisible by the number of payments. By the same token, any attempt to figure the precise interest rate on any set schedule of payments will end up in answers to endless decimal places. But that is all academic. Any of the answers can be figured for *all practical purposes*, with nobody getting hurt more than a few cents. But the average person can't even come up with the *approximate* answers, and a pretty good hand at numbers can crease his brow over them unless he has a computer nearby.

These difficulties don't bother lenders. They work from printed tables which tell them what to charge each month at any useful interest rate on any likely loan amount over any reasonable period of months. Their tables are never exact, but are true for all practical purposes.

If Mr. Douglas' bill should pass, he would probably expect the enforcing agency (which, against its will, would be the Federal Reserve) to put out a set of Government interest-rate tables for time payments, and require lenders to tell borrowers where their loans stand on those tables. That would spare lenders the hardship of doing impossible mathematics and permit them to advise borrowers in the same manner by which they advise themselves.

If you had such a printed table you would see that your friend made you the best offer with his deal to let you have $100 at 10%. The $100 loan with the $6 add-on comes to a little more than 11%, and the $94 loan plus $6 discounted comes close to 12%. The woods are full of people who suppose offhand that a $6 charge on a one-year loan of $100 makes it a 6% loan. It would be if you kept the $100 for the whole year, then paid back $106. But when you pay back the money in monthly installments, you have the whole $100 for only a month. The average amount of the lender's money that you hold for a year is a little over $50, and the $6 charge comes to a little less than 12% interest.

There is no question that there have been many lenders who have been perfectly happy to let their customers deceive themselves that these are 6% loans. Back in the 1930's, some of the nation's leading auto finance companies openly advertised the add-on loan cited here as "the 6% plan." They stopped in the face of a federal charge of fraudulent advertising. They knew, as did the Government, that it was an "11½% plan."

This bit of history puts a small puncture in the objection to the Truth in Lending Bill that the average, reputable lender is not out to deceive the customers. The recent Senate hearings also brought out an instruction in a training manual for employees of a large-scale small loan company: "Once you get the customer answering questions, keep him going until you are through. If he breaks in, insisting on information, give him the minimum amount and say, 'If you will just give me a little more informaton, I am sure I can take care of you and better answer your questions.'"

A staff member of this magazine made a $600 discount loan at one of New York's most respected commercial banks. $28.50 was discounted in advance. He pledged to repay $600 in 12 monthly payments of $50 each and walked out with $571.50.

He called the bank back and asked what annual interest rate he was paying. The bank told him 4.75% That is what the bank calls the "add-on rate." It bears little resemblance to the simple annual rate—being barely more than half of it.

4.75% is the rate he would pay if he borrowed the full $600, kept all of it for a year, then repaid it all at once plus the $28.50 interest charge. Since he actually borrowed $571.50 and repaid $50 each month, his true simple annual interest rate when he was charged $28.50 comes to about 9.02% according to a formula for approximately the interest on installment loans published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. There is probably nothing wrong with charging 9.02% on such loans, but there is something wrong when a bank says it's 4.75%.

When this borrower makes his final $50 payment, he will have paid back the money he borrowed, and 4.75% interest of it, and $14 besides.

As a matter of fact, few lenders today voluntarily tell consumer borrowers what simple annual interest rate their finance charges come to. The stiffest resistance to the Truth in Lending Bill centers on that point. Generally, commercial banks state the rate on secured notes, but not on the newer forms of unsecured notes. Generally, the annual interest rate is properly stated in mortgage agreements, in loans against insurance policies, in credit union loans. It is not generally stated in a whole host of other forms of consumer credit. Among these are the loans of small loan finance companies, auto loans, special college education loans, and the big world of installment purchases and revolving charge accounts. The customer is sometimes told no more than "so much down and so much a month for so many months." In the shady area of outright swindles even this is not stated clearly, and the customer finds the actual payments to be higher than he'd though they'd be because of something he didn't understand in the small type before he signed on the dotted line.

In other cases an interest rate is stated, but other charges are added under different names, so that the rate on the total finance charges is far higher than that part separated as "interest" by the lender. A member of Senator Douglas' staff claims that any extra charge (unless it pays for extra value received by the customer) is really interest. To tack extras on under other names is as devious, he says, as if housewives flocked to buy bread advertised at 3c a loaf, only to find extra added to each loaf to satisfy store rental, haulage charges, yeast, cashier fee and packaging—bringing the 3c bread to 36c. Of course the proposed bill covers this subject by requiring all "finance charges" to be expressed in dollars and in annual rates.

These extras, not embraced in the stated rate of interest, are now creeping into the once "pure" mortgage field.

One effect of obscure lending practices costs consumers money without benefit to lenders. By law, you can deduct carrying charges on credit from your taxable income. Since very few lenders report to you what carrying charges you paid during a tax year, where do you stand taxwise if you have one of the forms of credit on which the charges are virtually unfigurable?

The Internal Revenue Service holds you, by regulation, to a maximum deduction of 6% annual rate on the unpaid balance each month "if the actual charges cannot be ascertained." If it enforced this rule strictly, borrowers would lose enormous sums in taxes paid but not owed. The country is full of people who are paying credit charges of 10% to 20%, and some who are being charged vastly more than that. Many are paying it on installment loans on which, in the absence of a statement from the lender, the "actual charges cannot be ascertained." Only if the period of payments on the whole loan falls entirely within a tax year can you easily figure how much interest you paid during that year. If you have, say, an auto loan calling for $76.80 over 36 months, you can crack your skull trying to figure—and prove—how much of the 12 payments you made last year was credit charges. Since the interest rate is probably in the range of 14% if the lender is a reputable one, a strict application of the Internal Revenue ruling would deny you more than half the interest you actually paid as a tax deduction.

We put this example to one of Sen. Douglas' aides. He phoned his tax man and said that it would be all right to figure the credit charges over the full 36 months and deduct 1/36th of them for each monthly payment made in any tax year. That answer was too informal to pass along to you as an official rule. It does not conform to the regulation, nor is it right, mathematically. The point is that as long as the actual facts are withheld from the borrower by the lender there isn't any right rule that Internal Revenue can apply. Not even the Truth in Lending Bill would require lenders to report yearly credit charge payments to borrowers or give them any other help in figuring interest paid in any tax year, so it wouldn't remedy this costly situation for borrowers that benefits lenders not a bit.

In an early version of his bill, Sen. Douglas ran into a difficulty with revolving charge accounts. These are the store accounts on which you only pay a fraction of your charges each month, letting the balance ride for a "small monthly service charge."

Store representatives armed Sen. Bennett with the information that it would be impossible to comply with the provisions of the bill requiring them to tell their customers in advance how much their credit would cost in dollars. The customers would first have to tell them how much they intended to buy in future months.

When Sen. Bennett clobbered Sen. Douglas with this, Douglas admitted to a technical error and had the bill revised so that the impending dollar cost of credit need not be stated on revolving accounts. But he didn't let up on the requirement that the "service charge" be expressed in terms of a simple annual interest rate.

The stores don't like this a bit. They generally couch their "service charge" in monthly percentages. Perhaps the commonest rate is 1½% per month—which is 18% per year. (But some are reported to run as high as 3% per month, which is 36% per year, and some do business at 1% per month, or 12% per year.)

The public, say the merchants, would think 18% a year to be outrageous, when in fact it isn't. An old notion handed down from the Middle Ages still prevails to the effect that any interest rate higher than 6% is usury, and a crime. Usury is actually fixed by state law, it is usually higher than 6%, and most state laws are so selective in what they control that there's plenty of room for legally charging more than the "usury rate" on many types of loans.

It is a fact that small, short-term, unsecured credit can hardly be granted at 6% in the United States today except at a loss to the lender. The fixed costs of granting it require charges in the vague area of somewhere between 9% and 20%. Heavily secured bank demand notes can still be had in the neighborhood of 6%, but the security and the "demand" features protect the banks and aren't found in most consumer credit. We have seen that unsecured bank loans disguised at 4% to 5% actually come to 9% or more. The credit unions' half-century rate of 12% on small loans gives another general idea of what's acceptable.

Administrative costs vary with different types of credit. Risks vary with different types of customers and different degrees of security. So there will never be a single "fair" interest rate on all short-term consumer credit. But today, according to the Douglas camp, nobody knows what's a fair rate for any form of it. Customer ignorance perpetuated by lender semantics has kept consumer credit cost from finding its true competitive level.

A former Sears Roebuck executive testified in favor of the Truth in Lending Bill in his present capacity as a Government executive. He told the committee that 18% a year is about right for revolving charge accounts, based on his experience with the cost of administering such accounts with Sears. As a guy who knows the merchants' side, yet is for the bill, that sounds like frank testimony. The same witness gave a quick answer to Sen. BENNETT's claim that the bill wouldn't keep exorbitant merchants from taking the public in. They could hold their admitted credit costs down by raising the prices of their goods, said Sen. BENNETT. The former Sears man said he'd love to open a competing store right next door to the fellow who raises his prices in order to conceal credit costs. He'd run him out of business, he implied .

Of course the exact opposite happens today. Ample testimony indicated that, especially in the used car business, some competing merchants underprice their goods, knowing they'll more than make up for the low list price with fancy credit charges. Lot A and Lot B have equivalent used Chevvies. Lot A's are priced $100 less than Lot B's. The customers flock to Lot A for the bargain used Chevvies. After they've signed on the dotted line, if ever, they learn that in total they'd have done better to have taken Lot B's at $100 more, because Lot B's credit costs are more than $100 less.

If you buy collision insurance as a required extra in buying a car on time, that would not be a credit extra. It would be a separate sale. But any loan insurance, in the view of members Sen. DOUGLAS' staff, is a credit extra which should be embraced in any statement of what you are being charged for credit. It is protection for the lender. It was brought out in the hearings that extras tacked on for loan insurance sometimes have no bearing on the actual cost of loan insurance, and repre- anything that the traffic and his ignorance sent one more area where the customer, having no access to the facts, may be charged anything that the traffic and his ignorance will bear. The Truth in Lending Bill would not require lenders to correctly state the cost of their loan insurance, but it would require them to include whatever they charge for it under the single heading of "finance charges" and lump it with the charges to be represented in their statement of the annual rate their customer is paying for credit.

Even in the area of buying collision insurance through an auto finance company, there is room for milking an innocent if he also borrows the cost of the insurance. A representative of one leading company offered a friend of ours a loan, added to his auto loan, to cover three years' collision insurance first to be taken out in 1964, at an annual rate of close to 14%. It took some inquiry to discover he would pay the company interest on the 1966 insurance for two years before the company put up the money, and on the 1965 insurance for one year before it did so. The customer would start paying back the borrowed insurance premiums for all three years (at interest) in 1964, but the finance company wouldn't pay the 1965 and 1966 premiums until they came due in those years. This, of course, adds up to paying a pretty fair rate of interest for nothing at all. Sen. DOUGLAS' bill would not protect borrowers less wary than our friend from signing for such a loan without understanding it.

On the subject of charges for loan insurance, Mrs. Martha O'Neil, appearing on behalf of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Advisory Consumer Council, cited the case of a man who was charged for loan insurance on an auto loan at the rate of $68 per year per $1,000. Such insurance can be bought for $8.80 a year, per $1,000, she said. Therefore the bulk of what he paid for insurance represented "a large profit for someone." It was about 700% overcharge.

Sen. BENNETT kept coming back to the revolving charge accounts even after Sen. DOUGLAS had amended the bill. As a matter of fact, he said, the stores can't even state the annual interest rate correctly.

It's too complex, he said. If the customer pays his bill early in the month, the rate figures one way. If he pays it late, it figures another way. He has held the store's money longer for the same "service charge" and gotten cheaper credit. A customer who makes his original purchase on the 20th of the month pays a higher rate than if he's made it on the 3rd, because he gets a shorter free ride on the store's money. The stores can't possibly stop everything they are doing and figure the exact annual interest rate paid by each customer, said BENNETT.

He regaled the hearings with the case of a customer who buys one item early in the month, returns it for a credit slip later, makes other purchases at different dates. Exactly what interest did he finally pay based on the exact amount of time he had held the store's money, asked BENNETT. Nobody could figure it.

Forget all that, said DOUGLAS. The stores charge interest only on the unpaid balance left over from the previous month. Everybody gets a free ride during the month of purchase. The stores have no trouble fixing the charge on the old unpaid balance at so much per month. Let them express it at an annual rate instead of a monthly rate. Nothing to it.

The law is the law, answered BENNETT. If you pass this bill they can't forget all that.

DOUGLAS answered to the effect that the enforcing agency could very well let them forget all that and just have them tell the customers what the monthly rate comes to as a yearly rate.

But sometimes it's less than that, when you figure it all in, including the free ride during the month of purchase, says BENNETT. Should a law require them to say they charge more than they do?

Until the President supported the bill, the Federal Reserve regularly testified that it didn't want to be the agency to enforce it if it becomes law. It controls money, not truth, its witnesses said. This subject on one occasion led to the following altercation between Senators DOUGLAS and BENNETT.

Sen. BENNETT suggested the possibility that the Federal Trade Commission might be found to be the proper agency. In that case, he said, the Senate committee that handles FTC matters ought to handle the bill in the first place.

DOUGLAS: "I anticipated this would be the move of the Senator from Utah."

BENNETT: "This is not the 'move.' I am just raising the question. I am not offering any motion to transfer [the bill]."

DOUGLAS: "This is a rumbling of the portent of the shape of things to come. I know the Senator from Utah will be desperately anxious to get this out from underneath the jurisdiction of this [Banking and Currency] committee, because he knows there will be a good chance it will be reported out by the full committee. He hopes to leave the infant exposed to the tender mercies of the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where he hopes it would perish of starvation and death."

BENNETT denied any intent to move the bill. And to date he has made no such motion.

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN (Mo.), a supporter of the bill and chairman of the committee that would handle it if it passes the Senate and comes into the House, likens the worst aspects of credit abuses to dope peddlers pushing heroin on addicts. The borrowing public includes what she calls "credit addicts." Unarmed and without the slightest knowledge of what credit is costing them, she says, they continue to use credit until they are so badly extended that personal bankruptcy awaits them.

Says she: "The credit addict would never reach his sorry state of the piling up of debt upon debt if there were not so many merchants and lending institutions willing to tempt him and play along with him, contributing to his addiction, in the knowledge that a garnishment or a suit in a magistrate's court will get the money back plus a usurious interest rate besides."

The familiar ads of lenders to lend you money to get out of debt (!) demonstrates that the lending business itself recognizes that the debt-ridden now number so many that they are a new, prime, national consumer group.

In the last 20 years, long-term consumer credit has increased 943%; short and intermediate term consumer debt has gone up 1,247%. Exclusive of mortgages, U.S. consumer debt is now 70 billion dollars, and the interest on it exceeds 10 billion dollars a year. Within this huge field is a considerable segment of outright abuse, largely attributable to the combination of the temptation to easy credit and the concealment of its cost in a semantic cloud. According to the Douglas camp the Good Guys will profit and the Bad Guys will suffer if all must tell the simple truth. According to the Bennett camp the Good Guys will be burdened with unnecessary technicalities, while the Bad Guys will find ways to take their victims in if the bill passes.

Sen. BENNETT has often reiterated his lack of objection to requiring lenders to state the full dollars and cents cost of finance charges (except in cases where, as with revolving charge accounts, that is impossible.)

But he adamantly opposes a legal requirement to state those charges as an annual interest rate, on the grounds that the complexity of reporting would place an unjust burden on lenders and merchants.

Sen. DOUGLAS as adamantly insists that the interest rates can and should be stated. Their complexity is quite real in the field of pure mathematics, he feels, but in the business world, where it is standard practice to round off unmanageable numbers, the complexity is too often a shield to conceal the meaning of credit costs from those who foot the bill, while the lenders know exactly what they're doing, complexity or no. He places his faith in the enforcement agency to see that the terms of enforcement wouldn't heap impossible or costly burdens on lenders or merchants. Sen. BENNETT, on the other hand, has made it plain that he feels that too many businessmen are already doing too much paperwork for the Government to permit him to share that faith.

Apparently the bill would pass if the interest-rate requirement were withdrawn. With the two camps at loggerheads on that point, the Truth in Lending Bill now looks forward to its seventh year in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

COST-PER-$1 CHART HELPS ESTIMATE INTEREST RATE ON INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The table (below), based on a formula published by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, shows the approximate cost-per-$1 (to 1/100th of a cent) on installment credit at various rates of simple annual interest, to be paid back over various numbers of months. From it, you can figure the approximate annual interest rate on any equal-payments-per-month credit to be paid back over 12, 18, 24, 30 and 36 months.

Divide the amount of credit extended to you (the cash you receive, or the purchase price less any down payment and/or trade-in) into the excess you will pay back over that amount. The answer is your credit cost per $1. Find the nearest figure to it in the column headed by the number of months you will make payments. The interest rate appearing on the same line is the approximate simple annual rate charged you.

Example: You are offered a loan of $551 to repay at $50 a month for 12 months. You'd pay back a total of $600, which is $49 more than you borrowed. Your loan ($551) goes into your credit cost ($49) about .0889 times. That's your credit cost per $1 over the whole payment period. Looking down the column labeled "12 months" you find the figure .0867 opposite "16%." The simple annual interest rate on your credit is slightly over 16%.

Cost per $1 on selected installment credit

Rate (percent)	Months				
	12	18	24	30	36
6	$0.0325	$0.0475	$0.0625	$0.0775	$0.0925
8	.0433	.0633	.0833	.1033	.1233
10	.0542	.0792	.1042	.1292	.1542
12	.0650	.0950	.1250	.1550	.1850
14	.0758	.1108	.1458	.1808	.2158
16	.0867	.1267	.1667	.2067	.2467
18	.0975	.1425	.1875	.2325	.2775
20	.1084	.1584	.2084	.2584	.3084
22	.1192	.1742	.2292	.2842	.3392
24	.1300	.1900	.2500	.3100	.3700
26	.1408	.2058	.2708	.3358	.4008
28	.1517	.2217	.2917	.3617	.4317
30	.1625	.2375	.3125	.3875	.4625
32	.1733	.2533	.3333	.4133	.4933
34	.1852	.2692	.3542	.4392	.5242
36	.1950	.2850	.3750	.4650	.5550
38	.2058	.3008	.3958	.4908	.5858
40	.2167	.3166	.4166	.5166	.6166

TRUTH IN LENDING: WHY QUIBBLE ABOUT A MERE $1,305?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, the well-known local essayist, Mr. Bill Gold, has an interesting commentary entitled "Why Quibble About a Mere $1,305." He gives an account of an advertisement for a small loan which was misleading, to say the least, about the true costs of credit. The friend who told Mr. Gold about his efforts to protest the misleading statement of credit costs reported that he received no satisfactory answer from the Federal Trade Commission or from anyone else.

May I suggest to Mr. Gold that his friend, and his friend's friends who are concerned about misleading statements of finance costs, apply to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency for relief. There resides in that committee, or perhaps I should say there is bottled up in that committee, the truth-in-lending bill. The truth-in-lending bill has a simple purpose. It would require that a borrower or one who buys goods on the installment plan, be told the true cost of the finance charges, both in dollars and as an annual rate on the unpaid balance.

In its current weekly bulletin, the American Bankers Association says that the truth-in-lending bill is dead. It is true that it is bottled up in the committee, but I would inform the ABA, Mr. Gold, and others—and there are millions of others interested in this question—that the bill is not dead. The day is very close when the rapidly growing demand of the public for this protection will awaken the bill from its committee-enforced slumber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, Mr. Gold's article from the Washington Post of July 19, 1966.

WHY QUIBBLE ABOUT A MERE $1305?

(By Bill Gold)

A circular from a local loan company came into the hands of a friend of mine. The advertisement offered to lend money at "a flat 6 per cent rate," with no hidden charges. So my friend accepted the invitation to phone for additional details. He said he'd like to borrow $2000 for five years and repay the loan with regular monthly installments. How much would that run per month?

The answer was: "That will be only $60.18 per month."

My friend multiplied 60 months times $60.18. "Goodness," he said, "I'd be paying back $3610.80 for the $2000. That's not 6 per cent."

"It's what is known as a 6 per cent discount loan," was the reply.

My friend asked for a breakdown of percisely how the credit charges were figured, and this is what he was told: Interest at 6 per cent for 5 years comes to 30 per cent of $3610, or $1083. "Closing costs" are $139. Life insurance is $180. Health and accident insurance is $135. And then there's a "service charge" of $72. This brings the total to $3610. Q. E. D.

My friend happens to be in the Government. He's one of the people President Johnson hopes is doing something to help low-income citizens. So he fired off a letter to the Federal Trade Commission pointing out that a true 6 per cent rate on the unpaid balance would cost $305 for five years, not $1610.

"This is an add-on loan, not a discount loan," he said, "and the effective cost of the credit is about 32 per cent of the unpaid balance per annum, not 6 per cent."

The United States Government Organization Manual says of the Federal Trade Commission: "Although the duties of the Commission are many and varied under the statutes, the foundation of public policy underlying all these duties is essentially the same: to prevent the free enterprise system from being stifled or fettered by monopoly or corrupted by unfair or deceptive trade practices."

However, the FTC has never been known as an agency that responds alertly to complaints of this kind. After due deliberation, the FTC decided to get rid of the complaint by forwarding it to the Post Office Department.

Nothing further has been heard from it since then. If President Johnson is interested in finding out what happened to the complaint, a good place to begin investigating might be in the Dead Letter Office.

THE ARID LANDS OF IDAHO AS A POTENTIAL FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the arid lands in my State of Idaho offer a magnificent potential for agricultural development. This has long been recognized. In the southern half of the State over 3 million acres have been developed for irrigation. Federal help through the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has contributed much of this development.

Continued interdependent development of our land and water resources is demanded to meet our future needs. Planning for this purpose must be as broad and as encompassing as our foresight will allow. In Idaho, the Bureau of Reclamation is now actively studying a wide range of proposals which when put into effect will move the Snake River Basin much closer to the goal of comprehensive land and water development.

However, I feel it should be pointed out that fully one-half of all the acreage in southern Idaho which has already been reclaimed has been brought under cultivation entirely through the efforts of private enterprise. Private development has added several hundred million dollars to Idaho's agricultural wealth. This new wealth has been produced without having to use tax money. Quite the contrary it has added new sources of tax revenue to the rolls.

Private enterprise should be allowed to go ahead immediately where it can complement public programs to make the desert land productive. With the effort to bring new Federal projects into being, it is shortsighted to obstruct private development. But such development in Idaho is being frustrated.

The Desert Land Act gives the private individual the opportunity to obtain entry on qualifying public land, to improve the land and ultimately to acquire a patent to it. There are hundreds of citizens in Idaho right now with pending applications for entries. They are ready and willing to develop the land through their own efforts with their own money. But these applications are being held up. They are being held up while the Department of Interior is engaged in a drawn-out procedure to decide whether to reverse itself on some entries it has already permitted.

Recently a hearing examiner for the Bureau of Land Management held that the Indian Hill project in Idaho violates the law. The examiner's decision is being reviewed by the Secretary. I have no desire to question or even evaluate the legal aspects of this case. But I do think it is proper to point out that the entrymen involved were initially given the go-ahead by the Bureau of Land Management and have already developed the land. The land is being farmed. Over a million dollars has been invested.

The applications for entry on the Indian Hill lands were filed in 1961. On August 21, 1964, Secretary Udall in giving approval to the entrymen of this development said:

> This project represents private initiative at work with State and Federal Governments in the best American tradition.

According to the Interior Department press release:

> Secretary Udall stressed that every such development proposal for public domain land will have to stand on its own merits. "Such factors as development plans and contracts between parties must be judged individually in each case," he said.

Now, nearly 2 years later, it is apparent there has been a retreat from this sound doctrine. Each application is not being processed expeditiously according to its own merits. Development plans and contracts are not being actively judged individually in each case. The Department is holding applications in abeyance while the merits of its own previous decisions are debated. Foreseen apparently is an eventual precedent setting legal decision. In this regard, Secretary Udall has more recently said:

> Legal determinations will have a widespread effect.

One widespread effect now is economic penalty to present applicants. Many of them have arranged development funds that are costing them money during this delay. Communities want to make plans for expansion so they may serve the new developers. Each year that these entries are held up is costing the people of Idaho $20,800,000 in crop production, $231,000 in tax payments and 3,478 jobs. Southern Idaho is not a high-income area.

Thus, the situation is a very unhappy one. But in a recent letter to me the Secretary notes that now the Department has "found it necessary to proceed against another group." The group to which he has reference are again entrymen who already have been allowed by the Department to bring a sizable development into being and have already expended a large amount of money.

One would think that a thorough examination of applications in the first place would reveal any possible legal complications. It would seem to me that the Department should be able to find out all the relevant facts at the outset. Furthermore, I seriously question that several years are needed to make a sound determination on a desert land application.

The law provides that men of good faith may obtain desert entry allowances. The intent in framing the law was certainly that each application be given prompt consideration. Between 500 and 600 cases in Idaho have been pending for over 2 years. Some relief is overdue.

At the very least, the Department should make its policy sufficiently clear to preclude men borrowing money with false expectations and then having to face serious financial hardship because of protracted delays.

Land qualifying for entry under the Desert Land Act can add immense productivity when development is allowed to move forward. Vigorous effort should be expended to remove the roadblocks in the way of such development as soon as possible.

Two recent editorials, one from the Idaho Statesman of Boise on June 12, and another from the Times News of Twin Falls on June 24, discuss this matter. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Sunday Statesman, June 12, 1966]

INDIAN HILL, SAYLOR CREEK RECLAMATION DELAYED WHILE GOVERNMENT DEBATES LEGAL TECHNICALITIES

A Bureau of Land Management hearing examiner declares the 3,700-acre Indian Hill desert land reclamation project near Hammett is illegal and should revert to the BLM under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior.

The bureau has filed contests against 12 desert land entrymen on the 3,500-acre Saylor Creek project near Glenns Ferry. The allegation similar to that of the Owyhee County project, states that the entrymen did not act in good faith and assigned their lands to a corporation.

Those involved have the recourse to appeal the hearing examiner's decision to the secretary of interior. A federal court test may result. There is also indication that the federal government may be performing an injustice to those who seek to reclaim the Indian Hill and Saylor Creek arid lands. A skeptic would also look for unforeseen political considerations.

Hearing Examiner Dent B. Dalby of Salt Lake City concluded that the intentions of the entrymen in the Indian Hill venture were good back in 1961 when they filed their claims. Their plan appeared practical and was supported with financial ability. According to Dalby, the entrymen decided originally to get their money for the development from the federal government. On Feb. 12, 1963, they abandoned their efforts and decided to follow another course through private financing.

In the Indian Hill case, Dalby found no evidence of written documents which showed that the entrymen would sell their land after patent for $10 an acre to a corporation. The examiner would leave to the courts the decision as to whether an informal agreement had been made, raising doubts as to the legality.

Once an application for land is granted by the BLM, the entryman has five years to develop his claim. If by that time he has not accomplished the proper work in getting water to the land, his claim reverts to the government.

The BLM understands that a cooperative effort is needed for such areas as Indian Hill and Hammett. Reclamation of a section of land is too costly for an individual to undertake. If the claimant can align himself with private capital furnished through corporate or cooperative holding companies, he can more readily develop his acreage.

Most of the expense involved in these two projects is in pumping costs. The water must be lifted from the Snake River to the acreage. This moved the private corporation into the picture, with ample finances, to install the costly pumping services without delay and bring water to the land.

If the legality of the Owyhee and Elmore reclamation projects is to be tested at this late date, then the BLM should not delay in allowing applications in other areas. And the government should satisfy applicants that their obligations can be met through private interests, including development companies.

If there is reason to doubt the validity of applicants' agreements with holding companies, then the Bureau of Land Management should provide more rapid service in testing the legality. The secretary of interior surely understands that few individual claimants—whether mining prospectors or reclamationists—can hardly pay the costs of appearing before the federal court.

This seems to be also a test case on the Great Society. People who are willing to work digging the soil and bringing water to 640 acres of arid land, thus contributing to the economy, are set back financially before the project even gets under way. If they must rely on the federal treasury for a loan, they are still shackled and face a mountain of red tape and vicious delays which tax the ability of any man to remain prosperous while investing.

If there is a doubt on legality, of course, the government is obliged to question. But the machinery must be run expeditiously.

The secretary of interior should show more interest toward private development and financing. Too many reclamation projects in other areas of the country have been successfully completed by the claimants within the five-year period, but the developers then find they are unable to get out from under financial encumbrances. Nor can they make a living farming on the section of land.

Some relief is due before these arid areas become marked as objects of the war on poverty.

The government must meet the same standards of reason and prudence as the applicants.

Undue delay cannot be tolerated.

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, June 24, 1966]

LAND DILEMMA

The Indian Hill desert lands case in Owyhee County poses a real dilemma. The Bureau of Land Management has determined that the development was achieved through illegal means. Basically, the case involves what the bureau has ruled is misuse of desert land entries. The bureau points out that the desert land entry was designed as a means for an individual to reclaim 320 acres of land, or a couple to reclaim a full section of land. In the Indian Hill case, some 3,700 acres of land are being operated as a single unit.

On the other side of the coin, those who filed the desert land entries have said they thought they were joining forces in order to cut down on high costs of reclamation. Water is pumped from Snake River to a point where it can be used for gravity irrigation in many cases. The pump installation is a huge, costly project that serves the land located on the plateau above Snake River.

Literally hundreds of desert land areas in the general region have been pending for months as the bureau works its way though the ins and out of the Indian Hill case. Those who filed the entries are understandably restive about the long delay in deciding whether they should get approval to start farming. Presumably most of the desert land entries would be developed in a similar fashion to the methods used in the Indian Hill district.

So what happens now? The giant farms already in operation on the Owyhee County plateau are being worked. Further litigation is a foregone conclusion and it's anyone's guess when the final court decision will be forthcoming. But if the final decision goes against those who filed the desert land entries, what happens? Certainly the government wouldn't order the productive acres abandoned to become desert again. Nor could the individual entrymen install individual pumping systems to lift water from Snake River.

These Indian Hill lands are being farmed because the Bureau of Land Management gave permission to entrymen to start farming operations. Presumably initial applications had to specify the source of water, so it could be assumed there was no attempt at subterfuge. However, the go-ahead from the bureau couldn't be construed as permission to violate any specifications of the desert entry law.

The Bureau of Land Management has been angling for return of these developed lands to control of the bureau. That would mess up the situation good and proper. Such action probably would lead to a new series of lawsuits as entrymen sought to regain their huge initial costs. Regardless of what happens, it's doubtful if everyone will be satisfied.

Perhaps the basic fault for such incidents as the Indian Hill case lies in the nation's outmoded laws dealing with public lands. A study on revising those laws has started, but results probably are still some distance in the future. In the meantime, the public will hear a lot about the Indian Hill land dilemma.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to note the progress made by the Department of Justice in initiating the programs set out in the Law Enforcement Assistance Act which we passed into law last year.

The act allows our Justice Department to work with State and local officers in the training of local law-enforcement personnel. It also provides for exchanges of advice and methods among the Nation's law officers so the effective measures of one jurisdiction will be shared with other jurisdictions.

The need for this program is clear. Today we are in an era when the enforcement of the law must be considered a profession and supported by the public as such.

Recent Supreme Court decisions and State criminal code provisions have introduced a degree of complexity heretofore unknown into the field of law enforcement. Technological innovations have become so important in the detection and prevention of crime, that an officer must be fully competent in their use if he is to be an effective law enforcer.

Since the modern law-enforcement officer is faced with the problems and obligations of a professional, it seems only reasonable that he be provided the training opportunities of a professional. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act will do much to make this needed training possible.

My State is both pleased and proud to be a part of this program. As a former frontier State, Texas always has appreciated the need for a trained and effective law enforcement body. A $37,350 grant to Rice University has already been approved for the establishment of a program for the detection of potential community violence.

Following is a list of applications made for assistance under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act in the State of Texas.

December 1965, a $34,285 application by the University of Texas Sociology Department for a juvenile delinquency research project.

January 1966, a $17,000 application by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers to study standards and education of personnel; a $47,000 application by the Texas Department of Corrections for a comprehensive study of inmates and how often they return; $50,000 application by the Houston Police Department to establish a center for the study of criminal law for officers;

February 1966, a $35,800 application by Howard County Junior College for the Southwest Academy for Law Enforcement, open to all law-enforcement officers in Texas, but especially in the southwest part of the State; a $50,000 2-year application by the Southwest Legal Foundation for the Southwest Law Enforcement Institute; a $37,800 application by Texas Southern University for a study of capital punishment in murder and rape cases from 1924 to 1965;

June 1966, a $15,000 application by Sam Houston State College for the establishment of a regular degree program for law enforcement as a profession.

FROM IWO TO DA NANG: CONTINUING SEABEE SAGA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the continuing saga of the Seabees, the Navy's construction battalion, was eloquently told in the pages of the June 27 National Observer.

The article was called to my attention by William Daffron, who is currently on civilian assignment with the Navy.

The author of the National Observer piece, Peter T. Chew, points out:

> There are 5,000 Seabees in South Vietnam who have been quietly building a reputation as hard workers and hard fighters (one Seabee has been nominated for the Medal of Honor) for being, like their forerunners, masters of improvisation and "scrounging" of materials and equipment to get the job done.

And indeed, getting the job done is their passion and their purpose.

I ask, Mr. President, that the National Observer article be printed in the Congressional Record with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From Iwo to Da Nang; Continuing Seabee Saga—With Their Old Friends, the Marines, They Battle Enemy While Building Bases

(By Peter T. Chew)

"The admiral just dropped around
to chat the other night.
Said he, 'Now boys you're here to work,
but you've been trained to fight.
So if there's any trouble, don't stop
to put on your jeans . . .
Just drop your tools and grab your guns
—and protect those poor Marines!' "
—Old Seabee Song.

Da Nang, South Vietnam.—Not long ago, some grimy, shirtless Seabees here were carving a road through dense jungle growth near the crest of Monkey Mountain, a sheer, 2,000-foot peak named for the outsized baboons who prowl its flanks, along with Viet Cong probers. It was 130 degrees Fahrenheit in the baking sun, and perspiration was streaming from the Seabees' salt-caked backs. Their weapons, as always, were close at hand. A crudely lettered sign, propped beside a rock crusher, read: "Your tax dollars at work. This road built by the Seabees for the convenience and comfort of the United States Marines."

Suddenly a shiny clean Huey helicopter swooped down in their midst in a swirl of hot dust. Out stepped Lieut. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, commander of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, who had come to inspect the Hawk antiaircraft batteries on the mountain and to check on the road's progress.

After a quick briefing, the general singled out a young Seabee on the edge of the group and asked with a straight face: "How do you tell these Seabees from the baboons?"

"No problem, sir," the Seabee shot back. "The Seabees are smoking cigars."

The general looked around him: Every Seabee in sight was smoking a cigar. The general smiled, climbed into his Huey and was gone.

ROUGH, TOUGH, LOYAL

The young man's insouciance was in the best Seabee tradition. During the second World War, Rear Adm. O. O. "Scrappy" Kessing said of the Seabees: "They're a rough, tough, loyal, efficient bunch of men who don't give a damn for anything but doing the job and getting the war over."

The same can be said of the 5,000 Seabees here in South Vietnam who have been quietly building a reputation as hard workers and hard fighters (one Seabee has been nominated for the Medal of Honor); for being, like their forerunners, masters of improvisation and "scroungers" of materials and equipment to get the job done.

Seabee enlisted men are members of the U.S. Navy's Mobile Construction Battalions or "MCBs," of which there are seven in South Vietnam: Four here in Da Nang, two in Chu Lai, and one in Phu Bai. There are also a number of Seabee technical assistance teams—"the Navy's Peace Corps"—composed of one officer and 12 enlisted men, working in isolated hamlets, building bridges, digging wells, training the villagers in construction techniques, and carrying out other civic-action programs.

These Mobile Construction Battalions are self-sufficient units geared to move at a moment's notice: They contain their own medics, paymasters, chaplains, and the like; they carry their own light construction equipment and weaponry.

THE PRIMARY JOB

Once the battalion reaches a job site, they dig and man their own bunkers, they patrol, and fight beside other U.S. troops when the occasion calls. Their primary mission, however, is to *build:* Air strips, piers, cantonments, roads, field hospitals, covered storage areas.

Each Seabee—be he steamfitter, steel worker, "construction stiff," plumber—must undergo Marine combat training so that he can, if he must, fight to protect what he builds. Partly because of this, the Seabee enlisted man more closely resembles the U.S. Marine than he does his counterpart in the fleet Navy. Then again, the Seabees' comradeship with the Marines has deep roots, stemming back to the violent island battles of the South Pacific during the last World War. Theirs is an enthusiastic mutual admiration society.

Early in May of 1965, Seabees landed with the Marines on the blinding hot sands south of here, at a spot the Marines were to name Chu Lai. Working night and day, the Seabees laid down a tactical airstrip of aluminum planking. Within three weeks, Marine fighter planes were whistling down the metal runway, screaming into the air just above the heads of Seabees toiling at the far end.

Because dysentery is such a serious problem, the Marines try to establish, whenever possible, temporary, cement-floored mess facilities, even in the midst of search-and-clear operations. Consequently, the Seabees often find themselves building these pedestrian structures while fire fights rage all around them.

A few weeks ago, a group of Seabees volunteered for such an assignment in the foothills north of Chu Lai where the 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, was heavily engaged with the enemy.

EVERYTHING WAS GOING OFF

"Our second morning on the job, the Marines trapped 200 Viet Cong on the far side of the hill where we were building the galley," recalls Bill Haven, a Seabee builder first class. "From 8:30 till noon, everything was going off: Mortars, recoilless rifles, howitzers. I had trouble with the men—they kept wanting to lay down their hammers and get in the action."

Haven is a tough 21-year Seabee veteran fom Bluefield, Va., with a chiseled face turned black-tan by the sun. Yet even for the likes of Haven, the heat was almost unbearable on top of the tinroofed structure at high noon.

"We took dozens of salt tablets all day long and every night our backs were white with salt crust."

Ensign John Wilkinson tells of leading a Seabee work gang to repair an eroding air strip at Kham Duc, a U.S. Army Special Forces camp 60 miles west of Chu Lai, near the Laotian border.

"I had read every word of *The Green Berets,*" said the spirited young officer, "and Kham Duc was it in every detail: A triangular-shaped fort with sandbagged walls nestled in a little valley high up in the mountains with peaks sticking up on all sides.

"We dug in with some Nung guards outside the main camp. It was foggy for the first few hours every morning and it was rather hairy out there when there was firing. In order to get sand for the runway, we had to drive down the mountainside to a stream bed. First we put out guards in the bushes all the way down. Then we'd race down, load the sand as fast as we could, and come flying back up."

Ensign Wilkinson and his men completed the job in three weeks, digging mortar pits and extra-deep bunkers for the Special Forces' men in what little spare time they had.

In March of last year, there were 500 U.S. Marines in South Vietnam, controlling an eight-square-mile region around the airstrip here. Today the more than 50,000 Marines of Gen. Lewis Walt's 3rd Amphibious Force control hundreds of square miles, including the mass of the population that lives along the coast. To support these men, four Seabee battalions of Capt. Nelson R. "Andy" Anderson's 30th Naval Construction Regiment (plus private contractors) are fast transforming the port of Da Nang.

The U.S. Naval Support Activity, a logistical unit, will spend nearly $100,000,000 in Da Nang this year, dredging three deepwater piers, constructing LST ramps in the Tourane River, building acre upon acre of Butler building covered storage areas.

You find Seabees everywhere you look, involved in an infinite variety of jobs. At the base of a high, bunker-laced hill, which gets constant Viet Cong attention on the far side, Seabees are building a 6,000-man amphitheater, a 1,000-man motion picture theater, an enormous swimming pool, Post Exchange, and other recreational facilities for the Marines fighting nearby. The Seabees have built a 400-bed air-conditioned field hospital, Butler buildings, mess halls, "hardback" tents by the hundreds, LST piers.

THE NIGHTLY FORAYS

Chief Petty Officer Claire Hazen, Jr., of Mobile Construction Battalion 10, was working last week with a group of men in one of the hottest spots hereabouts, headquarters of 2nd Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment, which sits in a patch of woods 13 miles south of Da Nang.

Every night the Viet Cong slip in and mine the dusty dirt road that winds from Route 1 to the headquarters. And every morning, the Marines sweep the road and dig out the mines. Even so, mines have blown up two trucks and a generator, and partially disabled a tank in recent weeks.

The headquarters area is a nasty-looking place, pocked with holes leading to underground tunnels that were once used by the Viet Cong. When the Marines took possession, they removed six booby traps, and the men still move cautiously down the center of the paths.

Two huge Marine tanks stand a quarter-mile away along another woodline, their barrels facing a sweep of open fields where most of the Viet Cong harassment has been coming from. Yet there they were the other afternoon: Hazen and his men, hammering and sawing away in the bright sunshine, constructing tropical huts, shower facilities, and a mess hall, creating a little enclave of sanity and permanence for the Marines.

"As soon as we get the floors down," Hazen noted with satisfaction, "the Marines move in off the ground; they don't wait for us to get the roofs on."

SUBJECT TO SNIPER FIRE

Chief Hazen and his men live in tents, with slit trenches nearby, into which they dive when sniper fire gets intense. "We are subject to sniper fire all the time," he says. "The Marines are making a big sweep."

Lieut. Col. William F. Donahue, the Virginian who commands the Marine unit, relaxed on a makeshift chair in the old ston house that serves as his HQ. He was wearing a T-shirt and fatigue trousers. In one corner, a creaky old fan stirred up the muggy air.

"Each of these hamlets around here, I'd say, has 2 or 3 or maybe 10 or 12 Viet Cong," said the colonel. "We just killed seven of them today. How do we know they are Viet Cong? The only way we can tell they're VC is if they commit a hostile act. When they shoot at us, we consider that a hostile act. In the daytime, we give them the first shot."

The colonel, an unsmiling, serious man, turned toward Chief Hazen. "The Seabees are doing a fabulous job for us. No other way to describe it."

Chief Hazen, mightily pleased, went back to work.

Another Seabee unit, Mobile Construction Battalion 1, which occupies a beautiful white sand beach on Da Nang Bay, has had some interesting times lately. By day they work, by night they man the bunkers and watch towers that ring their compound. Today's Seabees are far younger than their forerunners in the last war—they average about 23 years of age—and some of the Seabees in these bunkers must still be in their teens.

READY FOR AN ATTACK

Just about every night, the Marines "Whisky" and "Kilo" artillery batteries nearby shell the ridgeline of an adjoining mountain. Flares arc through the air. On the crest of one of the hills last week camped a gang of Seabees from MCB 1, there to build a Hawk missile site for the Marines. The two Marine batteries have them bracketed so that they can have immediate fire support in event of a Viet Cong attack.

The other day, the men of MCB 1 witnessed a characteristically ghastly little incident of Viet Cong terrorism. Seabee Lieut. Frank Adkins describes it this way:

"About 3:30 a.m., we heard explosions in the trash dump outside the gates where there are one or two pieces of equipment. Three ARVN soldiers were living out there in a tent with a 17-year-old mentally retarded boy.

"The Cong slipped out of the hills, caught the four guys sleeping, and threw grenades under their cots. The blast killed them all, throwing one through the air, his undersides torn out.

"We found the 17-year-old about eight paces outside the tent, lying face down in the mud. His elbow looked as though a meat cleaver had carved it off.

"One of the ARVN had taken grenade fragments in the head and chest: He had four separate holes in his forehead—as though someone had driven them with a ballpoint pen.

"It had been raining and when we reached them, the blood had collected in a concave section of tin; it was dripping like a pink waterfall. The first of our guys to reach the scene got sick. There were four dud Chinese grenades lying about. It all happened so quickly. The VC got away."

HELP FOR THE VILLAGERS

The Seabees cannot figure out the Viet Cong's reasoning: Except that the Seabees and the Marines have grown close to the people in the local villages through their civic-action programs. The Marines are treating the villagers for bubonic plague, which is nearing epidemic proportions. The Seabee doctor and dentist of MCB 1 also take care of the local people, and the South Vietnamese appear to appreciate it. Perhaps the Viet Cong were trying to tell the villagers something.

Every morning a little South Vietnamese boy and his sister join a bunch of other children by the camp wire fence to ask for candy and food, and to joke with the Seabees. "Their left hands were cut off by the Viet Cong," says Lieutenant Adkins, "because their parents refused to pay their 'taxes.'"

For all their hard work, the occasional grisly little vignettes of terror and suffering they witness, and their moments under fire, the Seabees' spirit is high. Which is even more remarkable when you consider that, as yet, they have no recreational facilities: Da Nang has been off-limits for months.

One night last week, a group of MCB 1 chief petty officers got together in a tent beside the beach and broke out a few cases of beer.

Most of them were in their late 40s or mid-50s. (MCB 1 boasts one enlisted man, Ray C. "Pappy" Crittendon, a Negro from Richmond, Va., who is 66 years old, and a great-grandfather. He was 42 years old when he first joined the Seabees in 1942.) There was Elbert "Boom Boom" Schloesser, a bearded, wise-cracking man whose nickname derives from the fact that he, like Captain Anderson, was an underwater demolition man during the last war, and explosives are the love of his life. There was Bob Teel and his monkey "Sam," who is quite a character in his own right. Sam bares his teeth angrily at everyone but Teel; he smokes cigarets and laps up warm beer.

TIME TO SING

There was Joe "Doc" Cassidy, a medical corpsman, and half a dozen others. And they sang songs with verses like: "Oh mother dear, won't you write our congressman and get me out of this * * *," and other songs whose words don't bear repeating.

On a recent Sunday morning, Captain Anderson drove me up Monkey Mountain in his Jeep. The captain is wise and he has seen a lot of war. I asked him how this particular war was going. His answer surprised me.

"If you want my personal opinion, which is all I can give you—I'm not sure we haven't already won it. You know the British had it won in Malaya two years before they realized it. Nobody comes out of the bushes to tell you they're licked, you know. Now the situation could change overnight, like it did in Korea. But I'm not convinced that we can't starve 'em out of the woods."

Then his sharp eye caught something of more immediate moment—a rock crusher by the side of the road that had broken down. Like his Seabees, that rock crusher is supposed to be operating seven days a week. Some one would doubtless get a rocket from the captain in the morning for not having it repaired.

It's to be hoped that the Viet Cong, peering through their binoculars at Captain Anderson's men hard at work, sometimes get discouraged. If they don't they should.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: 1966

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this week, July 17 through July 23 is of special significance to the American people and freedom-loving people throughout the world. The third week in July of each year has by resolution of Congress been set aside for the observance of Captive Nations Week.

In recognition of Captive Nations Week, last Sunday an impressive ceremony was held in Omaha's beautiful Memorial Park by people who escaped to America from nations that have fallen under Communist rule. Some of the participants appeared in their native costumes; flags of oft-forgotten nations were displayed in a solemn ceremony.

Omaha's observance this year honored not only the victims of communism but also our fighting men in Vietnam. One of the Members of this body, my close friend and distinguished colleague, CARL CURTIS, was the main speaker. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks his very appropriate and stirring speech, entitled "The Fight for Freedom," calling for a new birth of freedom for captive peoples everywhere, be printed in the RECORD.

Captive Nations Week is based upon a joint resolution approved on July 17, 1959, and enacted as Public Law 86–90, in which Congress has authorized and requested the President to—

> Issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Congress has thus sensed the importance of focusing the attention of the free world upon the plight of the captive nations. The compelling reasons which prompted it to take this action are pointed out in the body of the resolution.

The resolution recites the fact that the "imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence" of 22 countries. The countries listed are Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, and North Vietnam.

The resolution further recites that "since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to security of the United States and of all the free people of the world." It reminds us that "these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence."

These are not reckless statements, Mr. President. They cannot be discounted as exaggerated emotional charges of irresponsible alarmists. This is the Congress of the United States speaking the cold, hard, unpleasant truth. We must never forget it. The observance of Captive Nations Week helps us not to forget it.

Public Law 86–90 states the case for the millions of people who are now captives of the Communist empire. It reminds us that our apathy means their despair.

We now have 45 years of experience to guide us if we have any doubts about Communist Russia's aggressive, imperialistic intentions. By 1921 the Bolsheviks had already crushed the independence of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Armenia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, and Turkestan. In 1939 Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were overrun.

Following World War II Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania were pulled behind the Iron Curtain. The mainland of China was next, and in 1948 some 700 million Chinese were placed under the Communist yoke.

Then came East Germany, North Korea, Tibet, and North Vietnam. We are presently fighting so that South Vietnam will not be unwillingly added to the list.

At no time in history has so much misery and oppression been packed into so few years. Never has there been such a systematic, determined, and ruthless suppression of human freedom.

But, if nothing else, these shameful years furnish us our lessons for the future. And as we approach the challenges of the future, we know that human nature is on our side. Man has an inborn desire to be free. His freedom can be suppressed, but his desire to regain it cannot.

We also know, however, that man's desire for freedom will soon turn to frustration unless he has hope. The captive peoples must have reason to hope. They must know that although they have been silenced, they have not been forgotten. They must know that they will not be abandoned for the sake of the status quo and so-called peaceful coexistence.

So long as there is a spark of hope there is a spark of resistance, and that resistance, whether it be real or potential, means our security.

We know, of course, that the events of the past year have not brought freedom and independence to any of the captive nations. Millions of people in the Communist-dominated countries continue to be enslaved. They are still shackled under the tyranny and oppression which they have known for so many years. Their individual liberties and fundamental rights as human beings are still being denied. And, the United Nations Charter which proclaims the principle of "equal rights and self-determination of peoples" continues to be flouted.

We also know that the spirit of these oppressed peoples has not been broken. They have not given up their hopes for freedom. Neither concrete, nor barbed wire, nor armed threats have been able to stifle man's natural desire for independence.

In order to preserve this spirit and keep alive this spark of resistance, these people of the captive nations must know that they have not been abandoned. They must have the reassurance of the free world that they have not been written off as a lost cause. To this end, Captive Nations Week has made a vital contribution. It serves as an excellent means of focusing the world's attention on the plight of these peoples and gives the American people an opportunity to manifest their concern.

The remarks by Senator CARL CURTIS in Omaha last Sunday movingly expressed what Captive Nations Week means. I ask unanimous consent that "The Fight for Freedom" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

(Speech of Senator CARL T. CURTIS (Republican of Nebraska) in Omaha, Sunday, July 17, 1966, in connection with celebration of Captive Nations Week)

Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen, seven years ago Congress authorized and requested the President to designate the third week in July of each year as "Captive Nations Week."

In the first such proclamation, on July 21, 1959, President Eisenhower called attention to the fact that "the people of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their National independence and their individual liberties;"

—that, "citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent;"

—that it was "appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence."

Therefore, he invited the people of the United States of America to "observe such week with proper ceremonies," and urged them to "study the plight of the Soviet-dominated Nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."

It was the wish of Congress, formalized in the "Captive Nations Resolution," that a similar proclamation each year be issued until freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the Captive Nations of the world.

Once again, we commemorate the sad plight of the hundreds of millions of freedom-loving peoples still the captives of the Communist tyrants. It is most fitting that Captive Nations Week will be observed in July. This is an historic month for America. We also celebrate the anniversary of our great Declaration of Independence, flung out to a world in 1776 that at best was amazed at the presumptuousness of these Colonials in defying the power and might of Britain.

However, it was not just liberty-loving Americans who responded to this cry. Young men came from all over Europe to help these Americans to fight for their independence.

Encouraged and emboldened by victory in America they returned to their own lands, to France, Ireland, Germany, Poland, to fight against tyrannical government and foreign oppressors.

The right of all men to be treated with honor and dignity by their government, and the rights of those with a common culture and history to be self-governing—not part of a foreign empire—became of such paramount importance that Europe and the rest of the world were never the same again.

Nor was America ever the same. For the story of our struggle for freedom and the free society we created made our country a lodestar. Decade after decade, people from all over the world made the agonizing decision to leave their farms and villages and friends and come to America.

They came because they wanted freedom. They blended their heritage into America's. By some mysterious chemistry, they also kept alive the ideal of freedom in their native lands. They transformed America so that it seemed to have something of every race and nation in the world. We in America, because we are all immigrants or descendants of immigrants never forgot the corner of the earth from where our adventurous forefathers came.

This is what President Eisenhower meant when he said that "citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom on every continent."

The Baltic peoples, the Poles, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Croations, the Bulgarians, the Greeks, the Italians, the Germans, the Irish, all strove for independence in the 19th Century, and always found Americans supporting their cause.

We could not be true to the philosophy of the American Revolution, and be indifferent to the triumph of tyranny elsewhere.

In effect, the ideal behind "Captive Nations Week" has long been a part of the American tradition.

If we are true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, then we must turn from our enjoyment of the "blessings of liberty" to the other side of the coin: to deep concern for those who are denied such freedom—whose national aspirations and hopes still lie crushed under the heel of tyranny.

The 20th Century has seen the leap to independence of many, many nations but for some it was short-lived and followed by tragic repression. Out of World War I came a whole new group of independent nations in Central and Eastern Europe.

However, from 1938 onward, under the twin onslaughts of Nazism and Communism, one by one they were conquered. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania endured first the Nazi and then the Communist tyranny. They never regained their freedom and were swallowed up into the Soviet Empire. Poland was overrun and divided. It had a brief moment of independence at the end of World War II, only to be enslaved by a combination of duplicity and Soviet military force.

Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania all were conquered by the Nazis, and then reconquered by Soviet Union forces which established puppet Communist governments.

East Germany was added to the list.

The Iron Curtain rang down as far west as Czechoslovakia in 1948, when through terror, betrayal and murder, the duly elected Czech government was overthrown and the Russian trained Communists seized control with the backing of Soviet military might.

Thus, together with the Ukrainians, the White Ruthenians, the Georgians and other distinct nationalities within the Soviet Empire, hundreds of millions of peoples in Central and Eastern Europe became the captives of a minority of fanatics obsessed with the antihuman Marxist-Leninist doctrines for the management, control, and exploitation of mankind.

Using the "barrel of a gun" to enforce their beliefs, the Communist tyrants swept into control of Mainland China, North Korea, Tibet and elsewhere to expand slavery on a scale never before experienced by mankind.

We in the United States made desperate and bloody sacrifices to stem the tide of Communist totalitarianism, and succeeded in Western Europe and in South Korea. We are now attempting the same holding operation in Viet Nam.

Despite the cost in terms of resources and lives, we must never forget that we in America increased and prospered. We are still *the* free nation of the world.

It is this blessing that makes it important for Americans to recall the suffering of others. Theirs is a terrible story:

The denial of legitimate rights of self-determination to hundreds of millions;

The suppression of sacred religious beliefs, Christian, Jewish, Moslem and Buddhist;

The deliberate downgrading or actual destruction of rich and ancient separate cultural conditions;

The systematic economic exploitation of these captive peoples for the benefit of the ruling classes of the Soviet Union;

And the literal enslavement and slow death meted out to those who protested or failed to conform.

This is what we mean when we speak of Captive Nations.

The record of cruelties and degradations visited by Communist masters is so enormous and appalling as to defy belief. Indeed, we tend to push it into the back of our minds—to almost become accustomed to it because of the monotonous repetition.

The piling of misdeed upon misdeed, year after year, decade after decade, conditions us to almost take it for granted. We find ourselves almost turning away, justifying our indifference by saying, "That's the way it has always been."

We must restore our sense of proportion, our sense of outrage. Men were not meant to be treated as have these captive peoples. Captive Nations Week is the dash of cold water, the recall to reality we need each year to remind us of what is one of the brute facts of the world we live in.

And if we are accused of being international busy-bodies, of minding other nations' business, of upsetting the status quo, of endangering "peaceful coexistence" when Captive Nations Week is observed, let us simply reply that no one with the semblance of a conscience would not protest publicly at the plight of so many human beings in so many parts of our world.

It is a small enough action for us to take time from the peaceful, prosperous and free routine of our own lives in order to consider the condition of the men, women and children still under the heel of Communism.

We can take some comfort in the fact that the Communists are becoming increasingly sensitive to the exposition of their misdeeds and their misrule. The controlled press and propaganda ministries of their Communist rulers rave and rant whenever the veil is ripped aside exposing the unending exploitation of the captive people.

Each year, some little evidence comes to light of the increasing determination of the captive peoples to reassert their own culture and pride in their own nationality.

Intellectual and religious leaders alike still stand up to remind their compatriots of what it means to be a Lithuanian, or a Pole, a Hungarian, or a Czech, defying the efforts of those who would turn them into pieces of Communist machinery. We can only marvel at such courage, marvel at the tenacity of the desire of the human race for freedom.

It is for these reasons that we affirm our belief that the eventual victory will be to those people all over the world who cherish "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Our prayer for captive peoples everywhere is taken from the words of the immortal Abraham Lincoln—that these people under God shall have a new birth of freedom.

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, pending before the Senate Finance Committee at this time is a bill which would make a significant contribution to solving some of our national labor problems. I am referring to the Human Investment Act, S. 2509, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

It is my observation that there are many unemployed persons who would be most able and most willing workers, but who lack the skills necessary for meaningful employment in our increasingly complex technological society. Everyone hates to see human ability wasted.

It is said that a man makes his own opportunity in this world. I believe that is true. In a free market and in a free society, the man of personal ambition and drive, the man of ability, will win through. But I am also concerned that we have made mistakes which are resulting in a denial of opportunities to workers who genuinely want to work.

In addition to trying to solve these root problems which are the cause of unemployment, we can take action to alleviate the effects of these problems. Such an attack upon the effects of our problems is embodied in the Human Investment Act.

As I am sure my colleagues are aware, the Human Investment Act would provide a tax credit of 7 percent of the expenditures for businesses who agree to upgrade the skills of employees and prospective employees. The credit would apply to the following expenses:

First. Wages of apprentices in registered apprenticeship programs.

Second. Wages of employees enrolled in on-the-job training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Third. Wages of employees participating in cooperative work study programs with an educational institution.

Fourth. Tuition payments may be an employer to a college business, trade, or vocational school for employee training.

Fifth. Tuition payments made by an employer to an accredited home study school for employee training.

Sixth. The expenses of organized group instruction, including classroom instruction, covering such items as instructors' salaries, books, and so forth.

In order to claim the 7-percent credit, an employer would be required to keep the newly trained employee on his payroll for at least 3 months after completion of the training.

The proposal is, of course, similar to the Revenue Act of 1962, in which businessmen were allowed a tax credit for their investment in machinery and equipment.

It is my hope that the Human Investment Act will become law. The bill has a great deal of support in both the House and the Senate and I think it presents a wise and reasonable alternative to our present problems in the labor field.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN HOSPITALS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, more than 2 years ago, the President signed into law a bill which had the overwhelming support of both Houses of Congress and the vast majority of the American people—the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

That day was a proud one for this Nation because through that act, we made a promise to all Americans, of every race, religion, and national origin, that the U.S. Government would take effective steps to assure elimination of the oppressive discrimination which had scarred our history and obstructed our progress for more than 100 years.

The American people, through Congress, had spoken out against discrimination before, in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960—both of which had my wholehearted support. But the 1964 act was a landmark—unprecedented in its scope and detail.

All of us who worked and voted for that bill hoped and believed that we had forged a legal framework through which the promise of racial equality could finally and effectively be fulfilled in areas covered by the legislation.

I regret to say today that the promise made more than 2 years ago in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has not been fulfilled.

It has not been fulfilled because the tireless initiative and good faith required at all levels of our Government for full implementation of the Civil Rights Act has not been forthcoming.

I refer specifically to title VI of the act, which strictly prohibits discrimination in any federally assisted program, and its implementation with respect to our Nation's health and medical facilities.

When the bill was passed, not one person in the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW—had a complete list of all the hospitals and health facilities in the country. This condition still existed 5 months later, when regulations for the implementation of title VI by HEW were published in the Federal Register on December 4, 1964.

Those regulations included a list of no less than 36 different Federal assistance programs in the area of health and medicine to which title VI would apply, and for which HEW had full responsibility for civil rights enforcement.

The Department did send guidelines to as many hospitals outlining steps which should be taken in order to qualify for Federal assistance. But the critical task of enforcing compliance with title VI was casually passed along to an Assistant Secretary of HEW whose other responsibilities already ranged from such unrelated fields as air and water pollution to patents to international affairs.

Assisted by a staff of only three people, his job in the civil rights area was to oversee title VI compliance in schools, welfare, and all other HEW programs in addition to hospitals.

This was the first stage of the broken promise. The law stated that no discrimination was to be tolerated in any federally assisted program, yet HEW could not possibly begin the task of discovering who was, or was not, in compliance.

The result was that HEW's civil rights activity was almost exclusively reactive. With one exception, no initiative was ever taken, unless a complaint had been filed, to determine whether hospitals receiving Federal funds were in fact practicing discrimination.

The single exception was in the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, in which all new applicants for funds were checked for title VI compliance regardless of whether a complaint had been received.

The intent was laudable, and should have been applied to all HEW programs, but even here it fell short of meaningful implementation of the law. The investigating teams were made up of persons taken directly from the regional Hill-Burton field offices, and were staffed by local residents who were untrained in civil rights work. This was especially true in some Southern States, where recent events have demonstrated that discrimination in hospitals has been the accepted method of operation.

The medicare bill was passed almost a year after the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It can be said that at that point title VI compliance had been so meekly enforced with respect to hospitals that title IV of the act had little or no meaning.

The law stated that if an institution was believed to be practicing discrimination, a hearing should be held as a preliminary step to the cutting off of funds, if mediation efforts had failed to induce voluntary compliance with title VI.

Yet, in that first year of operation, hearing proceedings were not instituted against any hospital in the country. It would be naive to believe that this was a tribute to the effectiveness of mediation efforts because it has been demonstrated in recent weeks that hundreds of hospitals have been practicing wholesale discrimination throughout the entire period.

The passage of the medicare bill in April of 1965 provided a new opportunity—and an obligation—to eliminate the degrading discrimination which still existed in many hospitals. The medicare program provided new funds for thousands of hospitals around the country—funds which should not be distributed, as a matter of law, until and unless a recipient hospital eliminates all traces of discrimination.

The medicare legislation gave stronger enforcement powers to HEW than it had been able to exert under other established ongoing programs. However, during the first 7 months after medicare's passage, HEW failed to take any meaningful steps to broaden the effectiveness of its weak and ineffective title VI compliance program.

Although the department did not have a record to be proud of in the area of civil rights enforcement, someone in the HEW bureaucracy uncontradicted by anyone higher in the administration—apparently concluded that the status quo would be good enough to deal with the new civil rights responsibilities that arose under the medicare legislation.

However, the status quo came under severe attack from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and from responsible civil rights groups. In its report on title VI compliance, the Commission stated that "widespread segregation or exclusion of Negroes" still existed in federally assisted programs 1 year after the passage of title VI, "failed to take steps necessary to achieve compliance," and that inadequate procedures made it impossible for the Department to know whether discrimination was actually being eliminated or not.

In response to a barrage of criticism and pressure, the Department finally inched ahead. On December 15, 1965, Secretary Gardner announced the appointment of a Special Assistant for Civil Rights—a step which should have been taken a year and a half earlier. If such a step had been taken in July of 1964, it would have been timely, but coming in December of 1965, it was much too little and far too late.

The wheels of progress continued to grind slowly. In December 1965, the Attorney General sent to HEW and other departments and agencies, guidelines for the enforcement of title VI in the various Federal programs, including a recommendation that "regular, systematic inspections" be conducted to locate possible discrimination, and that reliance on the filing of complaints was not sufficient to insure compliance. It should not have taken 18 months to come to this conclusion.

The new Special Assistant for Civil Rights, Mr. F. Peter Libassi, took office in January of this year. His responsibilities included all other HEW programs in addition to medicare. There was still no agency specifically designed to handle title VI compliance in the thousands of hospitals scheduled to receive medicare funds.

With the start of medicare less than 4 months away, the Department finally announced on March 7, the establishment of an Office of Equal Health Opportunity within the Public Health Service. The long delay in taking such a step can probably be attributed to foot-dragging on the part of HEW's General Counsel in determining the applicability of title VI to the various parts of medicare, lengthy internal debate about whether the Public Health Service or the Social Security Administrator would enforce title VI compliance, and the usual shortage of personnel and money for civil rights enforcement.

By the time the Office of Equal Health Opportunity was established, the medicare countdown had already begun. The inexcusably long delay had catapulted the guardians of the status quo into a powerful bargaining position with HEW, now shackled by a severe shortage of time. The lines of compromise were coming into focus as a product of the confrontation between hundreds of hospitals which insisted on continuing discriminatory practices and an administration which desired the appearance of a smooth start for the medicare program.

On March 4 of this year, the Public Health Service sent to hospitals throughout the country guidelines for compliance with title VI and questionnaires to be filled out which presumably would indicate which hospitals practiced discrimination.

Predictably, the response from many hospitals which still discriminated was slow and evasive. Two more mailings followed the initial communication, urging compliance upon those who had not yet responded affirmatively. But by mid-April there were only a handful of investigators in the field and the complaints and pressure were mounting.

At a "grievance session" on May 11, spokesmen for the Public Health Service reiterated strong words to the effect that HEW would hold the line on compliance and promised civil rights groups that no hospital which failed to follow the guidelines would receive medicare funds. At that time, 120 PHS employees were in the process of being trained for inspection work, and other Federal employees, untrained in civil rights work, were being diverted from other agencies to carry out the last-minute crash program of hospital certification.

So great was the chaos in this sudden and long-overdue flurry of activity that few, if any, administrators in the Office of Equal Health Opportunity had a clear idea of just which hospitals were and were not certified. Furthermore, inspections were lagging far behind complaints, and were of necessity, hasty and superficial.

Such a massive undertaking as to the certification of the thousands of hospitals in the country is bound to include a certain number of mistakes and errors. But starting as late as it did, the resulting confusion bordered on the ridiculous.

In March, for example, Surgeon General Stewart reported that questionnaires had gone out to "the Nation's more than 10,000 hospitals," but HEW Secretary Gardner reported on April 14 that they had been sent to "the 8,500 hospitals throughout the Nation." On April 25 the figure was up to 8,550. It has been steadily decreasing since then and stands today at something less than 7,000.

A partial explanation of this inconsistency is that the original lists were substantially out of date, and the Public Health Service was constantly weeding out from its lists those hospitals which no longer existed or were children's hospitals and therefore not eligible for the medicare program.

But while the overall figure was dropping, new hospitals were evidently appearing, as a look at the individual State statistics demonstrates. On June 3, according to the Public Health Service, there were 292 hospitals in my home State of Michigan. By June 17, only 286; but by June 22, three new ones had turned up for a total of 289. This was only 2 weeks before the start of medicare, and the Public Health Service was still discovering new hospitals which were previously unknown.

There have been reports that in one hospital, a handful of Negro patients were wheeled briskly from room to room while Federal examiners were being distracted, in order to give the appearance of full integration.

In some hospitals, the investigating teams were made up of employees of local social security field offices who had been temporarily diverted to the hospital inspection program.

The tragedy of such a crash program, however, is not simply that there was confusion—it is rather that this confusion was not coupled with caution. For when it became clear to hospitals practicing discrimination that, as the July 1 deadline approached, tokenism would be acceptable as a substitute for performance, some of these hospitals proceeded to drag their heels on full compliance, confident that a last-minute compromise would be reached.

Therefore, on the eve of medicare's initiation, hundreds of hospitals still had not complied with the title VI guidelines. As a result, the administration found itself confronted with two embarrassing alternatives: it could withhold medicare funds from all such hospitals, or it could grant the funds to the less defiant of those hospitals, relying on their promise of eventual full compliance.

Hundreds of hospitals were certified after agreeing to some HEW demands in the last 2 weeks before the deadline. In Atlanta, for example, nine hospitals held to be in compliance in the closing weeks have been the subject of numerous complaints from civil rights groups for over a year. These hospitals had taken no action whatsoever to eliminate discrimination until the July 1 deadline approached. The solution which was finally reached was that the hospitals would be certified in exchange for compliance with all those antidiscrimination reforms which could be implemented immediately and a promise ultimately to achieve full compliance.

Of course, a hospital cannot integrate its staff of doctors overnight; it cannot dispense its staff privileges nondiscriminatorily overnight; it cannot even achieve fully integrated patient wards overnight, barring a sudden and immediate influx of the Negro patients who had been turned away in the past. In short, no matter how loudly the administration claims that it refused to accept tokenism in place of performance, it is clear that in reality the opposite was true.

The dilemma in which HEW has found itself during the last few months was spawned by inaction, aggravated by chaos, and resolved by expediency.

Great strides have been made. There is no question about that. While many hospitals slipped by in the compromise of expediency, many others did make positive and far-reaching reforms which are to their credit.

With almost 200 major programs dispensing more than $18 billion of Federal assistance annually, it should be of great concern that so little effort was made by HEW to enforce title VI before the advent of the highly publicized medicare program.

Oftentimes it requires courage to act, to take the initiative in sensitive areas of human concern. There will always be a measure of indecision and backsliding in the bureaucracies charged with grave responsibilities in our Government. But we cannot sit back idly and accept it. It is high time that the promises which are tossed so easily and frequently to the victims of discrimination be given top priority at every level of this Government.

LOSING THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in 1964, with the signing of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Johnson administration officially declared a "war on poverty." The accompanying political fanfare attempted to create the impression that this was the first major attack and generated the illusion that with the enactment of this legislation, poverty would forthwith be abolished. But in reality only the slogans were new. Poverty will not be eliminated with the stroke of a Presidential pen or the coining of a slogan.

Mr. President, criticisms of the administration's "war on poverty" programs have been many, varied and often intense. I have joined in this criticism in the past. The following comments will also be critical in certain respects. Yet, I want to make two things very clear at the onset. First, the elimination of poverty as it is known by too many millions of Americans today is not only wholly admirable, but absolutely necessary. Second, I have no doubt that if we as a nation are willing, we have the capability of bringing this goal to reasonable fruition within the lifetime of those who now suffer the deprivations and degradations of poverty.

During the 19th century a group of leading economists and philosophers argued that the ironclad laws of economics destined the majority of men to the lot of poverty and hardship, with only a few escaping in accordance with the natural laws of the survival of the fittest. But these gloomy prophets are long since dead and their ideas relegated to the dustbins of history. Our own experience is proof that the age-old dream of widely shared economic well-being need not always remain an unfulfilled promise.

But our experience also demonstrates that vestiges of poverty can persist in a society that is generally affluent and prosperous. In this, the richest nation in the world, several million families earn so little that they are deprived of many minimal physical necessities of life and have little real chance to participate in the social and cultural opportunities that are available to the majority of their fellow Americans. This, of course, is not the poverty known by the vast majorities of the peoples in the underdeveloped nations. But measured against the vast wealth of the Nation and in comparison with the relative affluence of the majority of individual Americans it is a form of economic deprivation that brings suffering and hardship to far too many.

The term "war on poverty" is new. But in a certain sense, although the conditions and problems have changed, the elimination of poverty has been a central part of the American dream since the first colonists established themselves in this the New World. The effort to reduce poverty's existence by direct action of the Federal Government is, of course, of much more recent origin, dating primarily from the 1930's.

Because of an expanding and increasingly productive economy, and because of numerous Federal antipoverty programs ranging from vocational education to area redevelopment, the poverty rolls have been greatly reduced. For example, 31 percent of all American families in 1947 had incomes of less than $3,000—the administration's test of poverty. By 1964 that percentage had been cut by almost half, to 18 percent.

Thus, the current effort is only another campaign in a long crusade. It must be judged from the perspective of how successful this new attack has carried forward the old effort to root out poverty and the evils of economic hardship.

Mr. President, the administration's antipoverty effort has come under increasingly heavy attack. There are several sources of this criticism, two of which can be noted and then discarded. First are those who in an ostrichlike manner either refuse to see the poverty around them or deny to government a legitimate role in eliminating it. At the other extreme are those who expect and demand the overnight elimination of this economic and social cancer from the American society. Both groups are perpetually and petulantly dissatisfied with any antipoverty effort; the former because of their insensitivity to the social ills around them and their irrational fear of government expansion; the latter because their dogmatic utopianism allows them no patience or understanding of the limitations of man and government.

But the mounting criticism comes from more substantial sources. The criticism has been generated by the growing evidence of too few really significant achievements and too many instances of mismanagement, waste, and political corruption.

In April 1965, Mr. Sargent Shriver stated:

> The war on poverty is a program which must and will produce results—quantifiable results—numerical results.

But now over 2 years after its inception and after the expenditures of several billions of dollars, the measurable results are few, and when judged against the expansive goals proclaimed in 1964, discouragingly inadequate.

For example, of the various programs administered by the OEO, the Job Corps, if successful, should be generating readily quantifiable results. Certainly the training and placement of the young unemployed is one of the most worthy goals of the antipoverty effort. But the record to date is grossly disappointing. Despite an expenditure of millions of dollars as of February 28, 1966, there were only 1,061 Job Corps graduates, and of these only 515 had obtained jobs in the private sector.

Mr. President, the documented examples of mismanagement, corruption, and waste are many and varied, and I will cite only a few by way of illustration:

First. As of April 18, 1966, the obligated funds for Job Corps enrollees averaged $13,791 per youth.

Second. Job Corps officials contracted to pay $94,800 a year to lease the Old Kanawha Hotel in Charleston, W. Va., spending an additional $225,000 for renovation. Reliable estimates place the hotel's value at $250,000. The president of the company owning the hotel is Angus Peyton, a Democrat and State commerce commissioner.

Third. Headstart kindergartens in the District of Columbia are costing at least $1,200 per child per school year; more than double the most expensive private kindergarten in the city.

Fourth. OEO paid out $87,000 to a private research group to compile a 414-page catalog of more than 170 Federal antipoverty programs. The Washington Post noted:

> Just why the Federal Government had to hire a private research firm to find out how many anti-poverty programs the government itself is operating and financing remained a bureaucratic mystery today.

Fifth. OEO spent $25,000 to print copies of a Li'l Abner comic book designed to advertise and promote the Job Corps, then changed its mind and canceled the whole operation. Placed in storage, Li'l Abner books are gathering dust in warehouses at a cost of $125 a month.

Sixth. On April 8, the FBI arrested a staff member of the Job Corps Center at Camp Atterbury, Ind., charged with soliciting a bribe from a bakery-equipment firm in return for contracts with the center. Investigations revealed the man had a criminal record with several convictions, one as recent as March 1964. At Camp Atterbury he was drawing a salary of $9,800 a year.

Seventh. An unemployed Detroit autoworker who used to earn $104, told reporters that since he lost his autoplant job, he had been clearing $160.23 a week, tax free, from two Federal antipoverty programs.

Eighth. In Kansas City 41 of 150 youngsters employed in the Neighborhood Youth Corps came from families whose income was higher than the criterion for the poverty program. And in Chicago, Headstart officials have admitted that 27 percent of the children in their program are from families whose incomes exceed the poverty standard.

Against the background of too few significant accomplishments, the examples of mismanagement, waste, and corruption increase the public's frustration and disillusionment. But in response to the resulting criticisms the administration offers the explanation, "you have to expect to make mistakes with a new program." No responsible critic expects this program to be free of mistakes, but the failures of the program are such as to render this ritual incantation a mockery of decent candor.

Mr. President, the examples of failures, waste, and corruption are individual illness of a general sickness. The problems that plague the administration's war on poverty are major rather than minor. They are permanent rather than temporary. These are the results of two principle factors, political expediency and ideological rigidity.

The war on poverty programs were doomed to difficulty from the very beginning. Because of the enormous political pressures to get an antipoverty program written into law prior to the 1964 elections, there was insufficient time for the necessary study and debate required of the development of sound programs and procedures. New agencies were created, overlapping and duplicating older, established agencies. To compound this duplication little or no effort was made to assure coordination of the old with the new, or to draw on the experience of tested programs. The resulting hodgepodge strains the imagination and makes efficient administration impossible.

Mr. President, another damaging consequence of the dictates of political expediency has been the creation of the illusion that proverty could be eradicated virtually overnight. Political expediency has inspired the public pronouncement of promises on which the administration cannot deliver.

Even if the current antipoverty programs were working with much greater success than they are at the present the gap between promise and result would be enormous. This gap between expectations and results is one of the inevitable results of a program too hastily conceived and too politically inspired, and it is one of the cruel ironies of the administration's war on poverty.

Because of the demands of political expediency, the war on poverty was assured a troubled beginning. But these problems could probably have eventually been minimized were it not for another major obstacle. As a result of an uncomprising rigidity of political thought a fatal defect was written into the antipoverty laws; the fundamental weakness of the administration's antipoverty effort stems from the assumption that organized efforts to combat poverty must be almost entirely financed and directed by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I fully agree that the Federal Government has a prime responsibility for initiative in this area. But although it is often necessary for the Federal Government to initiate public programs of this type it does not follow that the Federal Government has the obligation or should ever attempt to assume the full responsibility of financing, directing, and administering. This is particularly true in this case because the very nature of the problem demands local participation and local commitment if efforts to eliminate poverty are ever to be successful.

Mr. President, there still are those who echo the dictates of 19th century laissez-faire in arguing that all, virtually all problems are correctable by the private sector, or that where government intervention is necessary it must come only through the State and local units in accordance with doctrines of an outmoded States-rightism.

But this dogmatic unrealism is matched at the other extreme by those who argue that the private sector can make no contribution to the solution of public problems, and furthermore, that the participation by State and local units of government is neither desirable or worthwhile. Compounding the difficulties created by these ideological rigidities is the notion that the expenditure of Federal money is not simply a necessary condition but the sufficient condition for the solution of almost any socioeconomic problem.

But this is an equally outmoded view. The failures of the private sector and the inability or unwillingness of State and local governments do not force the conclusion that the Federal Government must do everything. And the obvious need for Federal expenditures in no way requires the assumption that the expenditure itself is capable of generating the solution.

The administration's antipoverty program, in bypassing the State and local governments, in ignoring or denying the possible contributions of private business, labor unions and local civic groups has resulted in a bureaucratic rigidity incapable of the flexibility needed to meet particular, localized needs. Moreover, excessive Federal domination in the antipoverty program has denied this effort a vital source of creativity and variety which any such effort must have if it hopes to achieve long range and lasting success.

Mr. President, the failures of the Job Corps is but one example of how too much Federal dominance and too little local initiative prevents the realization of admirable and worthwhile goals.

In the training and placement of the presently unemployed attention to local economic opportunities and needs is absolutely crucial. Moreover, a commitment by local business, labor and civic leaders is a vital ingredient to any successful effort. This principle has been demonstrated by several privately initiated job training and placement programs, the opportunities industrial center program in Philadelphia being one of the most dramatic examples. But the Federal Job Corps does little to promote this type of effort and, in fact, discourages it.

What then is needed to assure flexibility where there is now rigidity, creativity where there is now enforced mediocrity, local initiative and participation where there is now Federal monopoly, success where there is now failure? Mr. President, as a beginning I would urge consideration and enactment of the following.

To assure a more effective role of the States, I urge that the Governor's veto power under VISTA and community action programs be restored. To encourage greater State initiative and responsibility, I would recommend enactment of a bonus plan for those States willing to match Federal poverty funds on a 50-50 basis above the present level of funding. I would also urge a reduction of the present high ratio—90-10—of Federal to State and local funds for the community action program not only to encourage greater State and local initiative and responsibility but to assure that poverty projects more accurately reflect the particular priorities of the local community.

To encourage greater efforts on the part of private industry, I urge the enactment of a 7-percent tax credit for business firms which develop training programs for unskilled employees.

To further encourage local initiative by businessmen, labor unions, and civic organizations, I urge that in the allocation of OEO grants special steps be taken to encourage private and localized job training programs such as the Opportunities Industrialization Center of Philadelphia. To minimize duplication of Federal antipoverty programs, to more fully utilize the great reservoir of accumulated expertise, and to minimize the climate of political expediency and favoritism now encouraged by the present special and all-powerful status of the OEO, I recommend the transfer of training programs to the Department of Labor and educational programs to the Office of Education.

To reduce inefficiency and patronage I recommend setting realistic ceilings on salaries of poverty employees so as to eliminate waste of taxpayers' money and to discourage the present and ultimately self-defeating raiding of employees of existing local, State, Federal, and private antipoverty programs. To discourage other forms of political abuse, I recommend that all employees of OEO-sponsored projects, whose salaries are derived primarily from Federal funds, be brought under the Hatch Act's prohibitions on political activities.

To further, yet encourage, private initiative and local involvement, I recommend that appropriate legal and promotional steps be taken to encourage the creation of privately financed and privately run slum rehabilitation corporations. Such activities would stimulate local enterprise, foster a sense of local involvement, and through the employment of the slum dwellers themselves, help to reduce the unemployment lists and to slash charity costs.

To better provide for the needs of the aged, who are the "forgotten poor," I urge extensive revision to the present social security system in accordance with the recommendations of the minority members of the Senate Select Committee on Aging. Further, I urge the creation in the Department of Labor of a program dsigned to encourage and enhance part-time employment and earning opportunities among the officially retired but often highly skilled and productive senior citizens.

Considerable modifications to existing programs are needed. Project Headstart, which was originally proposed by Republicans, has been the most successful of the new antipoverty programs but to assure its full potential I urge that it be administered by the Office of Education and that its funds be approximately doubled.

In addition to the above recommendations on public training and placement, I would urge a more effective system of evaluation for Job Corps applicants, greater cooperation with local businesses, labor unions and civic groups, and improved discipline in the camps lest the growing number of unsavory incidents serve to endanger this whole endeavor by creating resentment and fear in the local communities.

In regards to the community action program, I recommend that the affected persons be given greater representation on the community action boards so as to assure the poor a fuller involvement in the solution of their problems. I would also urge more funds be made available for rural areas.

As the entire antipoverty effort could conceivably be discredited by a frustrated and disillusioned American public, I urge the establishment of a select committee of Congress to better assure congressional supervision of the antipoverty programs and to help restore public confidence.

Mr. President, enactment of the above recommendations will help to accelerate the effort to reduce poverty. But we need to be continually reminded that even the most skillfully designed antipoverty programs will go for naught if we fail to maintain a growing and stable economy. It is economic growth without spiraling inflation which provides the best opportunity for the ultimate eradication of poverty. However, at the moment, one side of this equation is dangerously out of balance.

Mr. President, I stated earlier that one of the cruel ironies of the war on poverty has been the creation of expectations that cannot be fulfilled by the administration's programs. Yet, Mr. President, there is another cruel irony to the administration's war on poverty. Within the past year the rate of inflation has been significantly accelerated. Inflation is harmful to all and damaging to the entire economy, but it strikes most cruelly at the poor. Thus, it is in recent months that the poor have seen the purchasing power of their already meager incomes steadily diminished. This inflation is primarily the result of the failures of the administration to manage this Nation's monetary and fiscal policies in the manner necessary to the maintenance of stable purchasing power.

This failure to control inflation serves to compound the frustrations of the Nation's poor who are increasingly disenchanted by the gap between promise and performance.

Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is but one of an impressively long list of legislative packages proposed and promoted by the Johnson administration. But I would suggest that the measure of a particular administration's contribution is not to be found in the number of bills it signs into law but how effectively it deals with the pressing problems of the day. To govern successfully an administration must be concerned not simply with the passage of laws but with the attainment of genuine solutions to genuine problems. The problems of our age are not to be solved by political proclamations.

The record of the war on poverty is but yet another example of the ever-present gap between words and deeds, between promises and results which tragically have become the hallmark of the administration. The administration's lack of credibility is not limited to Vietnam. The seeds of this growing crisis of confidence are to be found in a politically distorted view of government by consensus. Prolonged exposure to this type of performance not only magnifies the intensity of the administration's political opposition but increasingly alienates its potential supporters. Thus it is that in the war on poverty as with the war in Vietnam, many of the administration's early and most vigorous supporters have now become some of the most bitter critics, and the fact that those whom it is intended to help are increasingly open and bitter in their criticism of it, is damning evidence of its failure.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am today advised by the

Department of Labor that the next and last step, in any effort by the Government to settle the issues and end the airlines strike, is for the President, on his own initiative, to report to Congress on the strike and ask for legislation.

The airlines fall under the jurisdiction of the Railway Labor Act, which has a different procedure than that contained in the Taft-Hartley law. First, there is an attempt at mediation by the National Mediation Board, which reports to the President on its findings. The President then appoints a special panel to make recommendations. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] headed this body which recommended various solutions to the President. By law, there can be no strike during the time that this body meets. The union was not satisfied with the panel's recommendations and the strike began. That is as far as the Railway Labor Act goes in regard to labor-management differences.

Accordingly, I have today sent a telegram to the President stating that I stand ready to support any reasonable legislation which he considers appropriate for effectively resolving the issues in the airlines strike.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the telegram which I sent to the President.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

JULY 19, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge the use of all available resources in an effort to resolve the current strike by the International Machinists against five major airlines.

The strike, now in its eleventh day, is no closer to settlement, according to the press, than when it started.

Meanwhile, non-struck airlines, buses, and trains are overloaded, thus jeopardizing the safety of and greatly inconveniencing the traveling public, and the economy of the Nation is being disrupted.

The American people, who, through their own tax dollars, have supported and subsidized the airlines industry, have a right to protection against a strike which vitally affects the comfort and safety of everyone and which is destructive to the commerce and industry of the Nation.

I support the steps taken by the President's fact-finding board and government mediators, but if efforts to resolve the strike are not to prove fruitful, I stand ready to support any reasonable legislation which you and Department of Labor consider appropriate for effectively resolving the issues in the airlines strike.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

NORTH VIETNAM AND THE AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, North Vietnam will make a grievous mistake it will regret for a long time if it tries American prisoners of war.

North Vietnam signed the Geneva Convention, which forbids trials and inhuman treatment of prisoners of war. If North Vietnam even tries American prisoners, let alone punishes them, it is a gross violation of the treaty it has signed. But beyond that, it would be an unconscionable violation of civilized conduct.

It could provoke responses which would increase and increase into total barbaric conflict.

My major concern right now is for these men who are only there because they obeyed lawful orders in defense of our country.

The United Nations should assume its responsibilities. The Soviet Union—one of the cochairmen of the Geneva Conference on Vietnam—should assume its responsibilities to recall the Geneva Conference and not encourage war and such uncivilized treatment of war prisoners.

The possibility of a trial of these prisoners, and the unknown ultimate results of such a trial, should shock the conscience of the world, and ought to lead every country in the world to express its condemnation.

It ought to lead every country to assist the United States, the United Nations, and the International Red Cross in protecting the American prisoners.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that during the debate on the pending measure yesterday there were some questions raised as to whether or not the commitment of U.S. military forces may be implicit in the extension of U.S. assistance under aid legislation.

On Friday last I received a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, having to do with this question, in which he brings forth a most candid and welcome clarification of this question, which I read to the Senate at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, which clarifies the situation and which was brought to the attention of the Senate yesterday, dated July 15, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I have noted recent expressions of concern in the Senate over whether the Administration views the extension of aid to a country as a commitment to defend that country with United States troops if it is attacked. I think it important that any confusion on this issue be removed before the Senate considers the 1966 Amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and I would appreciate it if you would bring this letter to the attention of the members.

AID legislation relates to furnishing economic and military assistance to foreign countries. It has no bearing on commitments to employ United States forces to assist in the collective self-defense of other countries. Such commitments are made, pursuant to our laws and the Constitution, where the national interest so requires and not because the United States is or is not supplying the foreign country in question with foreign aid. In short, our aid program neither implies nor prohibits a commitment to use our armed forces in cooperation with the self-defense efforts of a foreign country.

This question has apparently arisen out of the discussion of Southeast Asia. I have stated to Congressional committees and elsewhere that each Administration since World War II has concluded, as a matter of policy, that the security of Southeast Asia was important to the security of the United States. This policy has been supported in a variety of ways. We have furnished substantial economic and military assistance to the countries in Southeast Asia. A specific security commitment was contained in the SEATO Treaty which applied directly to the signatories and to the protocol states. This commitment was reaffirmed by the Joint Resolution of Congress of August 10, 1964. The security commitment did not arise from the AID programs but from the formal and solemn action taken by the United States in accordance with its constitutional processes. I hope this distinction will now be clear.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish only to say that I have seen a copy of the letter. The Secretary has made at least two different statements—I think there have been three. There were two statements before the committee and one in Las Vegas, which, of course, was quite contrary to what this letter says.

Perhaps I should get those inserted in the RECORD, along with the letter, in order that all of the material will be available for those interested in drawing their own conclusions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it would be a good idea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Secretary's statements on this subject before the committee and his Las Vegas speech.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Hearings on Supplemental Aid Authorization Bill, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 28, 1966 (p. 8)

The Chairman. You say we are entitled to do this. Are we obligated to do this under the treaty?

Secretary Rusk. I would not want to get into the question of whether, if we were not interested in the commitments, policy and principle under the Southeast Asia Treaty, we have some legal way in order to avoid those commitments. I suppose that one could frame some argument which would make that case.

But it would seem to us that the policy, which was discussed and passed upon by the Executive and the Senate of that day, is that we are opposed to aggression against these countries in southeast Asia; both the members of the Organization and the protocol states.

In addition, to that, we have bilateral assistance agreements to South Vietnam. We have had several actions of the Congress. We have had the annual aid appropriations in which the purposes of the aid have been fully set out before the Congress. We have had special resolutions such as the one of August 1964, and we have had the most important policy declarations by successive Presidents with respect to the protection of South Vietnam against Communist aggression.

Excerpt From Speech by Secretary of State Rusk Before the National Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Las Vegas, Nev., February 16, 1966

We are committed to assist South Viet-Nam to resist aggression by the SEATO Treaty, which was approved by the Senate with only one dissenting vote; by the pledges of three successive Presidents; by the aid approved by bipartisan majorities in Congress over a period of 12 years; by joint declarations with our allies in Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific, and by the Resolution which Congress adopted in August 1964, with only two dissenting votes.

Excerpt From Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Foreign Aid Legislation, April 18, 1966 (P. 153–4)

The Chairman. But you just said yourself that the troops from the North didn't appear until 1964.

HISTORY OF VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT

What I am trying to do is to clarify this record as to what actually happened. You said that on February 18 of this year that—this is your quote, "It is that fundamental SEATO obligation that from the outset guided our actions in Vietnam." But that can't be true because we were there before there was a SEATO agreement. Your assumption of aggression by North Vietnam, it seems to me, is inapplicable to 1950 if you wish to go back that far. I agree that 1950 was the origin of our involvement and I regret it because it is the only time in history we have taken up for a colonial power and tried to maintain its domination of a colonial area and I think it was a mistake. You interpret this differently, I know it, but what I am trying to get at here—and I think it is important—is whether or not the aid program, and this one in particular, has not been a very important element in getting us involved in this situation I really think it is. You disagree; it was aid to France, you say; there was no SEATO then.

Secretary Rusk. That is correct, in that period, of course.

The Chairman. Then in 1954, President Eisenhower sent the letter which he later denied as being a valid basis for our involvement, although he approved of the involvement. But he did deny specifically and publicly that that letter is an obligation to do what we are now doing, didn't he?

Secretary Rusk. That letter was a commitment.

The Chairman. For aid, that is right.

Secretary Rusk. That is correct. But this was based on a policy which recognized our interest in the security of southeast Asia, just as was the SEATO Treaty which President Eisenhower presented to the Senate for its consent and which the Senate approved by a very large vote. They are all expressions of the underlying policy that we are deeply interested and concerned, as a matter of our own security, in the security and safety of southeast Asia.

The Chairman. This is what bothers me. You seem to interpret when we undertake an aid program we have therefore established this vague "policy attitude" which justifies the Government going into any one of these countries that we give aid to—I think there are now 82—as an obligation. You see, the lines get so fuzzy here. We no longer have a declaration of war in order to wage a major war and we ease into these situations that to me are very disastrous and damaging to our standing, if not threatening to the people of the world. I want to try to bring this down a little more specifically to where we understand each other about the nature of these aid programs. As of now, this is the main reason I cannot support an enlargement and continuation of bilateral aid if it is going to have this kind of a meaning—that it amounts to a "policy attitude," as distinguished from a clear-cut obligation under a treaty, to do certain things. I don't want to delay this; everybody is impatient but I would like to state it on the record. You will come back again and with this in mind we will continue this discussion.

Secretary Rusk. Yes, I don't want to delay the meeting, but I do feel I should comment very briefly on the remarks made by the chairman. I have not said that an economic assistance program carries with it a security commitment from the United States to put troops in a particular country if things go bad. The question of security arrangements is a separate subject which is worked out in other ways, particularly through alliances. We have had many economic assistance programs with countries with whom we are not alined, with whom we are not allies. It is true that we have economic assistance programs with countries we do have commitments with. The fact we help allies does not mean everybody we help becomes an ally, and we should not, I think, confuse those matters. We should be able to sort this out, and I am at your disposal for another meeting.

The Chairman. You haven't said this bluntly in these terms, but let me paraphrase what you have said which is very close to it. You said, in effect, to this committee on August 6, 1964: "There are several aspects of this. In the first place the President, we believe, has authority under the aid program, and under his own responsibilities as President and Commander in Chief to give assistance of the sort we have been giving there."

I mean it isn't exactly the words you used, but to an unsuspecting layman it could mean almost the same thing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I emphasize that the letter I have offered is the latest communication that was offered voluntarily by the Secretary, and I would assume that this would be the last word in the matter under discussion.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and joined by a number of other Senators, including the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], I am offering an amendment to provide a 2-year authorization for the economic assistance program, rather than the 1-year authorization provided in the pending bill.

I intend to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment before it is disposed of.

This proposal is an expression of the longstanding support of the Senate generally and of the Committee on Foreign Relations for an authorization of more than 1 year for the foreign aid program. It is consistent with previous Senate action supported by a bipartisan majority, with the position of every administration since President Truman, and with the recommendations of a wide variety of American leaders.

In an issue of the New York Times only last year, March 21, 1965, an article was published entitled "Foreign Aid? Yes, But With a New Approach." The article was written by an authority on this subject, and it states, even now, the best case anywhere for a multiyear authorization of economic aid. I quote, in part, from that scholarly article:

> Congress should cease its annual reviews of foreign aid and place the program under long-term authorizations. The case for doing so is both familiar and persuasive, and just about everybody involved with foreign aid agrees to it—except Congress.
>
> A long-term authorization would not, of course, remove the foreign aid program from direct Congressional authority; the funds authorized would still have to be appropriated annually. It might be possible, however, by putting the authorizing legislation, which sets maximum amounts and is intended to govern policy, on a three-year or four-year basis, to insulate the program from transitory waves of emotion.
>
> A long-term authorization might have the effect of reversing the pernicious tendency to write binding restrictions into law in response to some transitory irritation, such as an insult from Nasser or Sukarno or a vote in the United Nations that displeases us. Such annoyances are genuine enough but they are often forgotten very quickly as events move on, while the legislative proscriptions to which they gave rise remain to govern—or to frustrate—policy.
>
> Economic development is a long-term process which does not lend itself to the one-year legislative cycle of the American Congress. The conventional short-term approach greatly impedes planning by the aid recipient while the donor is denied the opportunity to offer incentives to recipients to make necessary internal economic reforms. There has been a tendency in the experience of AID and its predecessor agencies to hasten to commit funds as the end of a fiscal year approaches with the result that recipients may be pushed into premature commitments.
>
> The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which in my opinion was the best aid bill we have ever enacted, provided long-term authorizations both for the Alliance for Progress and for development lending to Asian and African countries. The Congress, most unwisely, has been tampering with these legislative provisions ever since, so that we are in effect back on a year-to-year basis.
>
> The very nature of the economic development process requires the casting of foreign aid in a new time perspective. The Congress of the United States could make an

> important contribution to this end by adopting foreign-aid authorization bills of four or three or, at least, two years.

Mr. President, that is a very persuasive statement. I only wish I could claim its authorship. I think it is the finest single statement yet made on this question. I feel certain that other Members of this body may have read the article or have listened to debates on this subject during past years have been much persuaded or convinced by it that the foreign aid program should be approved for more than 1 year at a time. The author of that statement is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and I pay tribute to him for the perspicacity he exhibited in its content. It had a singular impact on my own views on this question at the time.

Only last year, the chairman managed to persuade the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate to approve a 2-year authorization of the entire program with the exception of the authorizations for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress, which had already been approved for 5 years and 4 years, respectively. I was happy to support the chairman on that occasion, as well. The Senator from Arkansas should be commended for his efforts in contributing to constructive thought on this question, and in persuading Members of the Senate to go along with him—including, I may add, the Senator from Wyoming. But I am still persuaded. His arguments were so strong then that they remain with me now.

So what we ask in this amendment is to implement the longstanding efforts of the Senator from Arkansas to put the foreign aid program on a more businesslike, sounder footing.

I think it would be well in this connection to review briefly the background of the present amendment. In 1957, President Eisenhower requested a 5-year authorization with borrowing authority for the Development Loan Fund. In advance of this request, the Committee on Foreign Relations had established a special committee for studying the foreign aid program. As the Senate will recall, a number of studies were commissioned by this special committee. Based on the recommendations of these studies, the committee issued a report stressing the importance of long-term authorizations. It is significant to recall the recommendations made in those studies.

In January 1957, in study No. 1, "The Objectives of U.S. Economic Assistance Programs," by the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, prepared for the Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, U.S. Senate, January 1957, it was stated:

> Since economic growth is inherently a slow process, and since the economic and political results we seek from an economic development program will accrue only over a considerable number of years, the program must have continuity. As an instrument of short-term policy, development assistance is wasteful and ineffective. If we have any hope of achieving desirable results from a development-assistance program, we must be clear in our own minds and must make it clear to the rest of the world that this is a program which we propose to pursue consistently for at least 5 or 10 years and which we will not permit to be affected by changes in the international or domestic political climate. If we are not prepared to make this kind of long-term commitment, we should probably not support development assistance programs at all.

In March 1957, in study No. 3, "The Role of Foreign Aid in the Development of Other Countries," by the Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change of the University of Chicago, it was stated:

> Economic aid program must be conceived as a long-run enterprise and some guaranty of its duration is as important as is the total magnitude of the program. For, as was pointed out repeatedly in this report, the process of economic development takes time, and the execution of an effective development plan requires a fairly high degree of assurance that sufficient funds will become available as the program unfolds in coming years.

These recommendations and the report of the special committee were carried out, at least partially, when the Committee on Foreign Relations approved by a vote of 12 to 3 the capitalization of the Development Loan Fund without any fiscal year limitation and with borrowing authority for the following 3 fiscal years. In addition, the committee approved a 2-year authorization for military assistance and defense support.

On the Senate floor, several attempts were made to reduce the funds and eliminate the Development Loan Fund. These attempts were defeated on yea-and-nay votes, and the position of the committee was sustained. The final provision which came out of conference provided a 2-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund with annual appropriations.

In 1959, the Senate again considered a long-term authorization for the Development Loan Fund. Sounding the call for a more effective foreign aid program, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] earlier that year proposed five amendments to the Foreign Aid Act, one of which would have increased the capitalization of the Development Loan Fund to meet the growing needs in the underdeveloped countries.

Subsequently, the Committee on Foreign Relations approved a 5-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund with borrowing authority. During the Senate debate the Senator from Arkansas made a statement which pertained not only to the Development Loan Fund but to the entire foreign aid program itself, and I quote from the Senator from Arkansas:

> I am convinced that the long-term method of financing the loan fund will save the American people money. It will result in a sounder and a more efficient administration. It will be much more effective in its results. The most inefficient and wasteful use of the American taxpayers dollars has resulted from a program which has been administered on a hand-to-mouth basis, which cannot be administered efficiently, which results, as I indicated, in a drive to make loans at the end of the fiscal year in order to be in a position to ask for additional funds. This criticism is applicable not only to this program, but to all programs whose activities are often speeded up at the end of the year in order that the agencies concerned may be in a position to ask for further funds.

Then the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was asked by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]:

> It is the difference between a hurry-up program, working on an annual basis, and one that is well planned, in which we can look forward to a span of years in which to accomplish the purpose.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] replied:

> The Senator is correct. I think the fact that there were annual appropriations prevented the development of basic projects which would advance the solution of the most serious economic problems in other countries. That shortcoming tended to make the programs superficial. Because it was short term and because the recipient countries could not rely on the continuity of the program, they tended to make superficial requests. Projects having to do with communications, railroads, docks, irrigation—the types of projects which really involve basic growth—were shoved aside, because they were of a long-term nature. So in those countries there was a tendency to undertake superficial programs which could be easily financed, but which really did not make a great contribution to the nation's economic development.

I end the quotation from the dialogue between those two Senators.

Senators will recall the result of the conference in 1959 was again a 2-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund, with annual appropriations review.

In 1961, 2 years later, the Senate was again asked to provide a long-term authorization for the Development Loan Fund, and again with leadership from the Senator from Arkansas this request was granted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which stated in its report:

> The United States must be able to make long-term commitments to societies that have embarked on genuine economic and social reform. To deny this flexibility would amount to crippling the proposed program and perpetuating some of the serious deficiencies of past programs. An administration official recently stated the problem quite succinctly:
>
> "We know in our hearts that we are in the world for keeps, yet we are still tackling 20-year problems with 5-year plans, staffed with 2-year personnel working with 1-year appropriations. It's simply not good enough."

I think it is significant to note the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury at that time, Douglas Dillon, when he testified that year before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of long-term authorization:

> The new economic aid program set forth in the proposed Act for International Development emphasizes long-term authority for financing development lending. The President, in his letter transmitting the draft foreign assistance bill, stated that:
>
> "Real progress in economic development cannot be achieved by annual, short-term dispensations of aid and uncertainty as to future intentions."
>
> I am convinced from my earlier experience in the Department of State that long-term financing authority is an essential tool for the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. I am equally convinced as Secretary of the Treasury that this is the most

> efficient and least costly method of providing development assistance.
>
> Adequate authority for long-term financing as proposed in the bill will permit both orderly development and effective execution of development lending programs by the administrator of the aid progam. Without such authority there will continue to be insistent pressures for stopgap financing to meet crises which could have been prevented, at less cost, by adequate long-range programs.
>
> In my judgment, the inability of the Executive to make long-term commitments has diminished the effectiveness and increased the cost of the foreign aid program. Without adequate assurance of financing for long-term programs to deal with the basic needs of a developing country, there is less incentive for such a country to thoroughly organize its plans or to adopt appropriate measures of self-help. We urge the developing countries to undertake basic and difficult reforms that are essential to development. But such reforms take years to implement, and require the support of long-term development programs. Reasonable assurance of outside assistance extending over a period of years may often mean the difference between success or failure in the efforts of a developing country to carry out the measures requisite to effective development. Legislative authority to make multiyear commitments will for the first time put the United States in a position to effectively stimulate and cooperate in basic reforms. It will also provide an incentive to other industrialized countries to join with the United States in providing aid to developing areas.

Senators will recall that this recommendation for borrowing authority, supported then by very able men, was challenged on the Senate floor, and the result was a 5-year authorization with annual appropriations.

In 1962 another precedent was established when Congress approved a 4-year authorization for the entire Alliance for Progress, grants as well as loans.

This brings us up to 1965 when the Foreign Relations Committee reported an amendment for a 2-year authorization for the entire program except for the loan sections which had previously been authorized. This was accepted by the Senate but rejected in conference by the House.

In light of what is now being said just 1 year later I think it is important to remember what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said in 1965, a year ago, in its report on the subject of the 2-year authorization:

> To a considerable extent the necessity for lengthy and exhausting reviews of the aid program each year is preventing the committee from giving its attention to other equally important or even more significant foreign policy questions, and reducing the time which it can devote to legislative oversight of executive agencies. So long as there is so much criticism of the aid program—whether valid or not—the committee is unable to sponsor or approve a long-term authorization for this program, and is unable to break the dreary cycle of full-scale and time-consuming annual reviews.

That was from the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 1 year ago. I was not a member of the committee at that time, Mr. President, but in my brief tenure on the committee since, this has likewise been my observation—namely, that we repeat ourselves constantly as we rake through the same information and the same proposals time after time, and that there are many other and significant things that this committee has to do and should be doing. Therefore a case can be made, even as a simplified housekeeping improvement, to upgrade the procedures on this rather significant matter of foreign aid.

Although the argument is now being made that this action was taken only because the bill provided for terminating the program in 2 years after a thorough study of the new approach, it is clear that the 2-year authorization was merely an extension of steps previously taken by the Senate. Some may have thought it necessary at the time to link the two amendments in order to get the 2-year authorization passed, but Senators who have voted for long-term authorizations in the past were certainly considering the 2-year authorization on its own merits, and the case that had been repeatedly made for multiyear authorization by Members of this body still stands, and its substance should still prevail.

Again it is interesting to note that the comments heard on this floor, which give no indication of any feeling that the need of a multiyear authorization is not completely justified in and of itself without relationship to any other parts of the bill. All Senators will remember the excellent statement made last year by the Senator from Arkansas in support of the 2-year authorization when he said:

> There are two excellent reasons for the 2-year authorization called for by the committee bill. The first reason has to do with the Congress; the second has to do with the purposes of our aid.
>
> Annual aid bills require Members of the Senate to engage in meticulous, tedious, and repetitious reviews of programs which have been reviewed many times before and whose specifications are well known. The tendency has been to relieve the tedium by introducing into the annual foreign aid debate all sorts of interesting but extraneous matters. The foreign aid debate has become an annual occasion for the airing of grievances—many, to be sure, related in one way or another to foreign aid; most, at least, related to the country's foreign policy; a few, however, having to do with domestic problems that no amount of tortured logic could ever relate to foreign aid.
>
> Because of the introduction of all these extraneous matters, the annual debate on foreign aid has become in reality an all-year debate on foreign aid. This, of course, has certain educational benefits for Members of the Senate, but I am reminded just a bit of the story of the little girl whose aunt gave her a book about penguins. After she had read it, her aunt asked her if she had learned something about penguins. "Indeed, yes," replied the little girl, "much more than I care to know."

The Senator from Arkansas then continued in his defense of the 2-year authorization, a year ago, with his second reason for supporting it. He said:

> The second reason for a 2-year authorization is the nature of the development process itself. Economic development is a long-term process which does not lend itself to the 1-year legislative cycle of the American Congress. The conventional short-term approach greatly impedes planning by the recipient of aid while the donor is denied the opportunity to offer incentives to recipients to make necessary internal economic reforms. There has been a tendency in the experience of AID and its predecessor agencies to hasten to commit funds as the end of a fiscal year approaches, with the result that recipients may be pushed into premature commitments.
>
> The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which in my opinion was the best aid bill we have ever enacted, provided long-term authorization both for the Alliance for Progress and for development lending to Asian and African countries. The Congress has been tampering with these legislative provisions ever since, largely nullifying the policy benefits of the long-term authorization. We are thus, in effect, back on a year-to-year basis, which, whatever merit it may have from the viewpoint of congressional tradition, has no merit whatever from the viewpoint of sound and promising economic development.
>
> The very nature of the economic development process requires the casting of foreign aid in a new time perspective. The Congress of the United States can make a contribution to this end by adopting the 2-year authorization called for by the committee bill.

That concludes the statement that I wish to cite from the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee. I repeat it here because of the great strength and substance of its content and the persuasiveness of its points, in showing the wisdom of a multiyear authorization.

With that citation, we are brought up to date, to 1966 at least, again without any attempt to make any distinctions or to single out any Members in terms of what their views may be at the present time. I think it is important to note the comment, as late as April 1 of this year, by the chairman of the committee, who has been the chief proponent of the long-term authorization, when in a speech entitled "Suggested Basic Changes in Foreign Aid Program," the Senator from Arkansas said that:

> Three basic changes need to be made in the program. In no particular order of importance or priority, these are to separate military and economic assistance, to provide a long-term authorization, and to put the program more on a multinational, less on a bilateral, basis.

Despite this long history of Senate action and convincing argument about the need for a long-term authorization, we now are confronted by exactly the opposite position in the bill before us. It is useless, needless, and inappropriate to speculate on the reasons for this change on the part of those who previously have supported long-term authorization, for all of us change from time to time. But the substance of the case does not change, or has not changed to date. But let me say again that I was convinced by those who have championed this cause, and I remain convinced. Nothing said lately changes the real heart and crux of the case that has been made for the past 10 years in support of multiyear authorizations.

For this reason, and in view of the unquestioned importance of putting the foreign assistance program on a sounder, more businesslike basis, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I are offering an amendment to provide a 2-year authorization for the entire program.

This is an amendment which every Senator can support. It will provide greater stability and better planning without authorizing the program too far in advance. It will relieve the committee of some of the onerous burdens which the chairman has so eloquently described in the past, and make it possible for the committee to look into the foreign aid program in greater depth without having to review the entire program every year.

The committee, of course, is free to request whatever review of the program might be desired. If the committee chooses, it can at any time change the authorization for the second year in whatever manner it wishes. The authorization for the development loan program has been changed from time to time on the floor of the Senate during the course of the 5-year authorization, and the same changes can be made in committee or on the floor at any time next year should the committee or the Senate consider such changes necessary.

To argue that the international situation calls for a closer scrutiny of the foreign aid program is not an argument against a 2-year authorization. Whether or not there is an authorization bill next year, the committee can take whatever steps it might feel are desirable to control the program. To argue otherwise is to derogate the power of the committee to act independently of any proposal which might be put before it by the executive branch on an annual basis.

I shall not comment at any length on the improvements which a 2-year authorization would make on the foreign aid program itself. These advantages are well known to Members of the Senate who have voted for long-term authorizations consistently in the past. All one needs to do is read the statements through the year from members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and from the chairman of that committee in particular—whose leadership has been a paramount factor in the development of this concept—to be convinced that this is the only course to take in order both to make the foreign aid program more effective and make it possible for the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate to perform its foreign policy functions more efficiently. It might help, however, to point out the comments made in public testimony by some leading Americans during hearings on this year's bill. These are taken from the House hearings where considerable time was devoted to hearing public witnesses.

For example, Mr. John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States supported a 4-year authorization of the economic assistance program. Let me repeat, the chamber of commerce testified this year in favor of a 4-year authorization program for the entire economic assistance as well as the military assistance programs. This is twice as much as the amendment now being offered by myself and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would do. Mr. Teeter said:

> Long-range economic planning and development must be emphasized in foreign assistance programs. To accomplish this goal, a 4-year authorization of foreign aid funds, subject to annual appropriations and review by appropriate congressional committees, is desirable. We think this is consistent with what we in business would term good long-range planning.

Another public witness, John C. Lynn, legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation, testified, as follows:

> Let's decide what is in the best interests of the United States. Make this a 10-year plan or a 5-year plan, if this is what is required. Then each year the administrative agencies of Government would come before this committee and demonstrate to you what progress they are making on the plan that you and, let us say, the AID administrators develop for India.
>
> We would be for a 5-year plan, but the authorization would be based on the progress being made toward carrying out the plan.
>
> This is the same procedure that the Congress follows with regard to domestic programs. We see no reason why it shouldn't be done with the AID program.

John T. Caldwell, president, North Carolina State University, speaking for the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, testified:

> The institutions of a society which develop, undergird and replenish the individual and social competencies cannot be produced overnight. For this reason we applaud the proposal in H.R. 12449 for 5-year funding authorizations * * * but 5-year authorizations would add a measure of psychological stability to a foreign-aid program too often characterized in the past by year-to-year uncertainty. The 5-year authorization begins to recognize the desirability of choosing long-range goals and building programs toward their achievement.

Dr. Caldwell quoted presidents of other State universities and land-grant colleges, as follows:

> Earl Rudder, Texas A&M University: "One of the most common fallacies in foreign assistance thinking is the assumption that host officials responsible for development in newly developing countries are already committed to the action required for progress with specific development projects. This fallacy, plus short-term aid commitments results in projects getting underway without sufficient commitment on the part of the host government to secure the minimum in local participation and support required for success."
>
> Elvis Stahr, Indiana University: "Renegotiations of contracts annually or biennially have been known to take as much as 8 months * * * with corresponding uncertainty and loss of time."
>
> John T. Fey, the University of Wyoming: "Lack of predicable funding is a major deterrent for any university related program."
>
> F. L. Hovde, Purdue University: "The training of U.S. and foreign technicians and scientists is a continuing endeavor that cannot be mounted effectively with short-run fund authorization."

Similar testimony was received from many other organizations and sources, including the National Council of Catholic Women, the AFL–CIO, the National Council of Jewish Women and others.

Finally, Mr. President, let me note that there are related precedents for this amendment. The food-for-peace program, which has been authorized in the past for more than 1 year, as it has now passed the House, provides for a 2-year authorization for the new food-for-freedom program. I would certainly hope that the Senate would also approve a 2-year authorization for the food-for-freedom program. And I think it behooves us to put the economic assistance program on the same basis.

In addition, of course, Congress has voted multiyear subscriptions, ranging from 3 to 5 years, for every international lending agency. There is no logic in providing long-range planning and programing for international foreign aid programs and denying this same advantage to our own U.S. program.

In conclusion, I urge adoption of the amendment. In these troubled times the world needs to know that the United States is just as concerned about the peaceful development of other nations as it is about blocking Communist aggression. I know of no better way to demonstrate our intentions in this regard than to approve a 2-year authorization for the economic assistance program and to make it clear to all concerned that the United States cares enough about this program to support it for more than 1 year at a time.

Let me add that I have placed on each Senator's desk a brief statement concerning our amendment, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE AID PROGRAM FOR 2 YEARS

On behalf of myself and Senator SPARKMAN I have introduced an amendment to provide a two-year authorization for the economic assistance program in order to:

ALLOW SOUND AND SENSIBLE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS

Economic development is a long-term process. Continuity and long-range planning are vital elements of this process. Year-to-year planning and funding make effective use of funds more difficult and will result in greater total cost and length of aid programs.

John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, testifying on the foreign aid authorization bill, April 27, 1966: "Long-range economic planning and development must be emphasized in foreign assistance programs. To accomplish this goal, a 4-year authorization of foreign aid funds, subject to annual appropriations and review by appropriate congressional committees, is desirable. . . . We think this is consistent with what we in business would term good long-range planning."

CARRY FORWARD A TESTED PRINCIPLE

The Congress, in previously voting long-term authorization for development lending and the Alliance for Progress has already endorsed the principle. Last year the Senate voted a two-year authorization for the entire aid program. To reject that principle now would be a step backward, and could be interpreted as a weakening of U.S. support for economic and social development. Food for Peace has been authorized for more than one year in the past, and the new Food for Freedom bill as passed by the House provides a two-year authorization.

ENFORCE SELF-HELP STANDARDS

A long-term authorization would make it clear to aid recipients that if they undertake the tough, hard self-help measures the U.S. encourages, we are prepared to follow through with sustained support. In this way, the authorization will also make possible more effective planning of development efforts.

MAINTAIN EFFECTIVE CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

A two-year authorization will not lead to loss of Congressional control of the program because the annual review procedure and regular appropriations process will continue. The existing multiyear authorization for Development Loans and Alliance for Progress did not result in any loss of control.

PROVIDE LEADERSHIP IN EFFORTS TO SHARE AID BURDEN

A long-term authorization would be a demonstration to other free world donors that the Congress stands with the Executive Branch in seeking a greater commitment of resources by other more prosperous nations and greater sharing of the aid burden.

GALE MCGEE,
U.S. Senator.

JULY 18, 1966.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wishes to answer these arguments; but I address myself to him now in suggesting that perhaps he would rather have the whole affirmative case put in and then proceed, or I shall yield to him now; as he wishes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can wait.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to support the amendment which has been proposed, on behalf of a group of cosponsors of my own amendment to the same effect, which, with my consent, Senators McGee and Sparkman are sponsoring.

This is a longstanding struggle which has been waged to get more than a 1-year extension of the foreign aid program. As I am sure Senator McGee said in his speech, the Senate has taken the same action on previous occasions. In 1961 the Senate approved a 5-year extension for the development loan part of the foreign aid program. In 1962 the Senate approved a 4-year extension for the Alliance for Progress loan program under the foreign aid program. The Senate, in effect, has approved long-term authorizations in our subcriptions to the World Bank, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

The basic argument for a multiyear instead of a single-year authorization is the fact that the business affairs of the United States require it, just as the business affairs of the country require appropriations in respect of so many things done in the Senate for multiyear purposes, so that planning and certainty may be obtained. Business exigencies in respect of the foreign aid program, which is no less subject to business exigencies than other programs, require a multiyear authorization; and we are settling for 2 years because that is about the best that can be done. Three years would be better for some aspects of the program, and for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress the optimum seems to be the 5-year extension allowed by the House of Representatives.

I should like to confine my own advocacy of the proposed amendment to one other point which is critically important. The fact is that not enough aid is going to the underdeveloped areas of the free world, and that the failures of the foreign aid program are largely shortfalls.

The United Nations has found that, by and large, the program needs $5 to $6 billion more worldwide. The amount developing countries receive today is not enough—not even enough to narrow the gap between the developed and the undeveloped areas, which is widening all the time, because we are making much more progress than they are. So that the "have-nots" are getting relatively less, while the "haves" are getting more.

Mr. President, one of the big difficulties in this matter is the fact that adequate contributions are not being received from other parts of the world. Some of the other countries could do more. The Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, of which we are a member, the 10 major giver nations of the world, is a kind of a governmental consortium for the purpose of dealing with foreign aid. Our hands would be enormously strengthened in the activity and negotiations which take place in order to get greater contributions from other countries if we could have a greater sense of certainty than we have today as to the year-by-year operation of the foreign aid program. It is extremely difficult to make the necessary plea to other nations to increase their contributions, when our own authorization, let alone the appropriation, is at the hazard of the annual process which is undertaken at this time.

I am sure Senator McGee has already testified to the volume of work of the committee, both here and in the House of Representatives, which interferes with really giving the amount of legislative oversight that should be given.

But the main point, within my own experience—most Members know that I am very active in the affairs of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and the OECD and these operations in Europe—is that not having this authorization for more than 1 year materially hampers us in getting the urgently needed additional contributions from other countries. As we want the contributions and as the safeguards are complete about appropriations being required annually, et cetera, Congress is running no extra risks in this matter.

As we desire aid from others, I can testify to the Senate, not only as a Senator but also as a witness, that one of the major ways in which to get it is to have authorizations that can be bargained against with other countries for more than 1 year. Two years is not necessarily the optimum, but it is better than 1 year, and it gives this country a better chance to get other countries to help in other areas, and the situation urgently demands it.

In our own self-interest, I ask Senators to approve the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with everything that the distinguished Senator from New York has said.

I am cognizant of the fact that there has been criticism of this program and some of the inadequacies and deficiencies connected with it. I believe that, by and large, much of that inadequacy and deficiency can be attributed to the fact that the authorization is only for a 1-year period.

Also, because of the processes to which Congress is subject, this matter is rarely handled at the beginning of the fiscal year. Sometimes 2 or 3 months are consumed before Congress passes the authorization or the appropriation.

One thing to be borne in mind is that this extension has to do only with the authorization. It has nothing to do with the appropriation, which would have to come before the Senate yearly.

As one who has been interested in administrative law, as I was, as the Governor of a State, I realize that without an authorization period longer than 1 year, some projects cannot be promoted and the necessary efficiency cannot be engendered for the administrative process.

I hope that the Senate takes that into account and makes this an authorization of 2 years rather than 1 year, because I believe that in the long run a 2-year authorization would promote the efficiency of the program and would enable us to spend our money more wisely.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island, who not only is one of our most gifted Members, but also is a very important member of the Appropriations Committee, and who can also testify to this matter on a factual basis, as he has.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. It is to our advantage to have the other developed nations of the world help to participate in the building up of the underdeveloped nations and to help in every way to lighten the burden, especially those nations which have been the recipients of help from the United States.

The Senator from New York has stated that if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming is agreed to—that is, for a 2-year authorization—it would help convince other countries that they should participate with their contributions, and that it would put us in a better bargaining position. I wonder whether the Senator can specifically point to any country which has such a long-term authorization. What other developed nation has a long-term authorization similar to that which is proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. JAVITS. May I say, in response, that one country that immediately comes to mind is the German Federal Republic. The German Federal Republic has what is in effect a mixed public-private corporation which is capitalized. It is conducted on a capitalized basis, with its capital periodically refreshed, to deal with its aspects of foreign aid.

The foreign aid program in Germany is working quite well. We have some violent objections to it—and we are right—because of the fact that the Germans have tried to augment what they are actually doing in foreign aid by crediting to it a great many of the loans they make for exports, as we do in the Export-Import Bank, and generally for relatively short terms.

It is my understanding that both Canada and the United Kingdom enter into loan agreements with developing countries for periods up to 5 or 7 years without parliamentary approval.

So, laying aside the question as to whether their contribution to the world's problem is adequate—and it is not—I am the first to affirm that it does, however, operate on a periodic renewal capital basis and on a permanent basis, rather than on an annual basis, as we do.

Perhaps the chairman of the committee could help us with a statement of fact. Unfortunately, I cannot immediately give the answers for the other DAC countries, but as to the German situation, I know about it first hand.

Mr. HARTKE. I think that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will agree that the German situation is not comparable, where the Government is extending direct assistance in grants or loans with no agreement whatsoever that it has to be tied to the repurchase of goods. The fact is that the German proposition for aid is, in effect, a form of acquiring new markets for themselves.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot agree with the Senator on that. I stated the German situation, since the credit, as part of the foreign aid items, I do not think should be credited; but there are many other items and the fact is, considering the organization and the European economy, no private corporation in Germany would be a part of this corporation except that the Government wanted it to be. The Government, I understand, also makes contributions. I think that this is a system different from our own, but it does have the advantage of permanence which ours does not have.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator have any assurance from the German government that if we adopt a 2-year program they will be inclined to help other nations more?

Mr. JAVITS. I think, with all regard for the Senator, he is being rhetorical. The Senator knows that I do not negotiate with those nations and I have no promises. If I did, we would be in a stronger position.

I am pointing out from personal knowledge and experience—and the Senator knows that I have experience in this field because he has worked with me arm in arm in many of these matters—it is my belief, and that is how I represent it to the Senate, that our position will be strengthened if we have an authorization for more than 1 year. I do not contend that 2 years is better, but it is better than 1 year.

Mr. HARTKE. My fondness for the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would prohibit me from asking a rhetorical question.

I do not believe it would in any way make a valuable contribution. I do not think it would have any effect on their final decision. That is what I was trying to have the Senator from New York agree to.

Since I cannot elicit the answer that I want, I would like to ask another question. What other nations have indicated that they are interested, in any fashion, in assuming any part of this burden of providing for have-not nations on an increased basis as a result of the action of the Senate to adopt the position of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]?

Mr. JAVITS. As a practical matter other nations upgraded their participation in foreign aid and in some cases are contributing rather important shares of their gross national product.

I am trying to find the details. As I recall, the United Kingdom is about seven-tenths of 1 percent. The United Nations recommends that industrialized countries contribute 1 percent of the national income to foreign aid.

The United Kingdom is about the same amount as the United States. Italy is down the scale. They have been improving in foreign aid. Germany is near it. In fact, Germany had no foreign aid program until a few years ago. There have been contributions which have been increasing. This is the subject of negotiations in the Development Assistance Committee, where these matters are constantly being negotiated all of the time. We have a special consortium for a country like Turkey. That situation is always changing.

I think that I know about the operations of these agencies. This will have a material effect.

As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] pointed out, it does not hurt us and why should we not try to help ourselves? We can pass on the appropriation, we can cut it down, and we can do anything we like.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The important thing to consider here is that there is no attempt on the part of those who believe in this foreign aid program to give it life for a second year. We are living in a world where we know we will have this program next year anyway. Experience has already taught us that. The kind of world that we live in today has taught us that.

All that we are striving for is to promote efficiency so that this program can be better administered. We can thus adopt that kind of project to do humanity the most good in the long run. We ask only to make the authorization—not the appropriation—for a 2-year period. Thereby we can get into that kind of project which in the long run will do the most good and cost the least amount of money. That is the only reason for this.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to comment with regard to the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] in regard to the relationship between the point of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and getting greater participation among other nations in foreign assistance programs.

Again and again our own people have had heat put on them from the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress, to get more multilateral programs going.

As the chairman of this committee is recommending at the present time, one of the stumbling blocks in the conversation again and again that has been presented to us is that they cannot know for sure which way we are going in connection with projects at the present time. There are other stumbling blocks. One of those is this matter of stumbling along a year at a time.

We should make it easier to try to get other nations to cooperate with us in this massive world effort rather than impeding their effort.

This body has continually sought to make this program as successful a program as possible. There is no expansion in the foreign aid program. This is efficient application of the taxpayers' dollars that is already agreed to.

A part of that includes getting cooperation from other governments. This has intruded in other conversations as our negotiators tried to get the British, the French, and the Germans to come in with a great measure of participation.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I have the floor. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. If this is the situation, perhaps the Senator can answer the questions which I have asked the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Which countries have such long-term programs at the present time? Which countries have indicated that they would increase participation in the multilateral scheme if we would increase it to a 2-year authorization? Why cannot the same purpose be served by unilateral agencies in existence rather than this program before the Congress at the present time with bilateral approaches?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

Mr. McGEE. None of us is in the specific position of a negotiator. It is my understanding that this question has repeatedly cropped up in our conversations, not only with Germany, but with the British and French. There are some examples of the long-term kind of programs on the part of the French in West Africa and the British in some of their older colonial areas.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGEE. The point is that there is this recognition that it is good business, and all that this proposes to do is apply good business principles to ourselves and not let it impede us in our efforts.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it not true that the French aid to their colonies is really tight aid? Is it not true that in connection with their colony of Senegal they have to deal with the French merchants and they have a 25-cent per ton price which they allow on the production of peanuts to tie them back?

Mr. McGEE. That is something they tried; but so do we. It is irrelevant.

Mr. HARTKE. What underdeveloped nation, other than former French colonies, have the French agreed to increase participation in if we had a multiyear participation?

Mr. JAVITS. Let me answer that. If we could answer that question, we would not have to argue about this amendment. The Senator would lose it, and we would win it, or vice versa. The whole point and reason there is discussion on this amendment is that reasonable difference of opinion develops because we are estimating what can be done, given another tool. The strength of our argument is, we say it does not hurt the situation. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has made that clear. Therefore, if it can help—and we need it—let us try everything we can. This is not an aimless gesture. We point out that there is a chance, based upon experience, to do better.

I can give the Senator this information, that the French estimate putting up 1.26 percent of their national income for foreign aid, but they do aid only with their former French colonies. And our relations with them, of course, are not very cooperative. We are not getting any additional aid from the French, but we can from the Germans, we can from the Italians, and I think there is a chance we can do something with Japan. There is an even chance of doing something with Britain, not necessarily in money, but in kind—that is, in services, and so forth. In short, we cannot give the Senator a guarantee. If we did, we would not be arguing today. Here is something we can do that will not hurt us, but help us. We need help; therefore, let us try everything we can which will help us if it cannot hurt us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the purposes of the RECORD, I think we should recollect that in 1961, with respect to the development loan program, we gave it a 5-year tenure. In 1962, regarding the Alliance for Progress program, we gave it a 4-year life. With respect to all other forms of aid, we gave it a 1-year life.

The 5-year life on development loans, the 4-year life on the Alliance for Progress, has come to an end in 1966. Now, instead of readopting the 5-year and the 4-year plans, it is suggested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] that we make all of them 2 years.

I merely want to suggest that the drastic cut from 5 years to 1 year, and from 4 years to 2 years, cannot be justified. That is my point No. 1.

My second point is that all of these programs will substantially require the beneficiary nation to buy the goods it needs through the help we give in the United States.

The third point, with regard to what the other countries are doing, on page 13 of the book identified as "Proposed Economic Assistance Programs for Fiscal Year 1957," issued by AID, there is a tabulation of what the other countries are doing.

Let me identify them: France, $822 million—most of which goes to its commonwealth countries, or whatever they are called; Germany, $451 million; United Kingdom, $446 million; Japan, $169 million; and all other countries $359 million.

The total of the four principal countries, and all other countries, is: $2,247 million.

In this report, there is stated what will be a repetition of what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] has stated, that the United States continues to press for more generous and effective aid from the other free world donors and for the channeling of more aid through international agencies.

Mr. President, in conclusion, we should determine this issue on the basis of what we believe it to be in the best interests of our country. We should not allow it to be determined solely upon what other countries are doing. In my judgment, that would be a serious mistake.

If it is wrong to have it for 2 years, then it is wrong regardless of what the other countries are doing.

If it is right to have it for 1 year, it is likewise wrong, regardless of what the other countries are doing.

Finally, I think it is a drastic cut to take the 5-year development loan program and reduce it to 1 year, and to take the 4-year Alliance for Progress program and reduce it to 1 year.

In my opinion, that cut is too severe and will not be in the interest of the Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful for the contribution of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I want to come back to the points made by the Senator from Rhode Island, and repeated by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from New York. They say this does not hurt. This is the point I was driving at in the first instance. There are some other factors on the other side. If I had my way, and everything were normal in the world today, personally, I would be in favor of much more than 2 years.

I would be inclined to go along with the long-term development. However, things are not normal today. We are in an extraordinary situation with day-to-day changes.

For example, one problem on our hands which I have repeatedly tried to find out, is, what is the cost of the war in Vietnam going to be? I have been on the Finance Committee, on which I happen to serve—not on Appropriations or the Foreign Relations Committees which deals with this committee—but I have been there and asked for an estimate on the cost of the war. So far, they have not given us an estimate of the cost of the war. I have asked whether it is going to be a short or a long war—and every indication is that it will be a long war.

I have asked, where is the long-term financial plan, then, because we are going to have to concern ourselves with how much money we are going to spend, but that question has not been answered.

Today, we see in the news—finally—it is admitted a supplemental appropriation is being prepared. I asked that question of the Finance Committee, and at that time it was answered that to their knowledge no such supplemental appropriation was being prepared. Yet the headlines today say that the President is concerned about the 1967 budget. I am concerned, too. I am concerned over where we are going to get the money, under these abnormal circumstances. We must give consideration to these other elements. If the Senator does not want to go ahead, let the authorization be for 1 year and let the Foreign Relations Committee, which serves in this body, by definition of its purpose, concern itself with the foreign affairs of this country. Why should they not be allowed to look into this crisis again next year, as well as the Appropriations Committee?

Is there something that is different between the two? Why should not this body be allowed to look at it, as the Appropriations Committee is allowed? We have the statement made by the Secretary of State at Las Vegas, which is now in the RECORD, inserted by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that foreign aid commitments are one of the reasons we have a military commitment now in Vietnam. I think that there are many of us who seriously question whether we thought we were voting for a commitment of American boys in Vietnam when he went ahead and voted it, and put some foreign aid to help people be developed outside.

Thus, I say that it does hurt. The Senator says that it does not.

Well, on the wrong side of this coin, they say let us make it for 1 year rather than make it 2 next year. What are we afraid of? There is nothing unusual about this. As the Senator from Rhode Island has stated, this is a program which history dedicates to the future for as many years as we can look into the future.

Why are we so fearful? Why are we so worried about this, but not authorizing and appropriating the necessary funds. If we are going to have the program let us come on back and let us see what the changes are. We can trust this body. There are 100 Senators here. They are outstanding citizens. They take their responsibilities of Government seriously. We have as much responsibility in Government as the executive branch. It is high time that the division of responsibility within the Government be reasserted, and I think it is time, right now, to lay forever at rest the idea that we have to surrender every vestige of authority in the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the absolute, decisive answer to that question is that it fails to take into account the appropriations process. Everything that the Senator from Indiana has said can be dealt with, and is dealt with, in the appropriations process. So far as the authorization process is concerned, we are losing and on the short end, because we authorize only for 1 year and thereby hamper ourselves in the intelligence, efficiency, and economy with which we can plan the foreign aid program and, yes, within which we can get help from others.

That is the nub of the argument. Everything the Senator has said, every safeguard, every fiscal idea with respect to it, fits into what was said by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We do not authorize even for 1 year. Here it is July 19. By the time this bill is passed, it may be close to the first of August. By the time we appropriate for it, it may be close to the first of October. So, rather than a year, there are only 9 months in which to put pressure on the administrators to commit the money. They have to do it within a period of 9 months. We make a mistake in doing that, and we have not been able to conduct this program in a businesslike way.

If there is strong opposition to the foreign aid program, we ought to do away with it; but if we are to have it, we should administer it wisely. I say 9 months is not enough time to conduct the administration of it wisely.

Mr. JAVITS. I fully concur in what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. It is magnificent testimony to the point that has been made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senators who are proposing the amendment why they discuss and put in the same category all the different parts of the foreign aid program. It provides for the Development Loan Fund, technical cooperation, American schools, Alliance for Progress, grants to international organizations, supporting assistance.

As one who has sat on the Appropriations Committee on this subject for a good many years, it seems to me there is a great distinction as between the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress, which account for substantial amounts of this whole program, as opposed to supporting assistance, contingencies, and so forth.

I personally see no objection to the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress being for longer than the 2-year period, and providing for 3 years, or, if the House may prefer, 5 years, if that can be worked out satisfactorily; but as to contingency funds and supporting assistance, we have a responsibility to keep a close eye on them. I would prefer to see those fixed for 1 year and the others on a 3- or 5-year basis.

I wonder if the proponents of the amendment can tell us why they put the whole bill on a 2-year basis.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will give my reason first, and then yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] to make his statement.

My reason was to try to present the matter on an issue of principle, as the Foreign Relations Committee does deal with it across the board on a 1-year basis. As a point of principle, I wanted the amendment offered to see whether the Senate would go beyond the 1-year basis, having in mind that the matter will have to be settled in conference with the other body. My purpose was to have an amendment proposed which would commit the Senate to a principle, and then there could be reasonable action on the variants involved in the bill.

Now I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. The reason for my offering the amendment was essentially that of committing the Senate to a principle. That is the important thing. The House has already acted. The Senate must get into conference with the House on a realistic basis on a matter which involves our best national interest.

It seemed to me that, rather than stagger it, which would lead to some confusion, it would be simpler to confine ourselves to the fundamental, basic principle of the multiyear idea, 2 years being the lowest common denominator which we could arrive at in the bill.

For that reason, we chose this method in order to air the principle.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that some of these programs ought to be for a longer period; otherwise some of them will be encroached upon. But the question involved is whether we are going to administer it on the basis of annual review, or develop a reasonable and wise multiyear program in the interest of the program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we want to be realistic as well as express a principle, as the Senator knows, and as we all know, the loan program is completely different from a grant or an output of money program without any particular restriction on getting the money back.

It seems to me, if we want to put the issue on a question of principle, there is a great difference between loans and grants. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, of which the Senator from Wyoming is also a member, I think it would be much easier for me to vote for a longer period as to loans, but keep the other programs, the grant programs, on an annual basis, where they can be brought back under the scrutiny of Congress each year. When they are combined in one bill, it makes it difficult to change the committee's report.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] made a point which is extremely valid, which is that in this field, a 2-year authorization, considering the exigencies of time which he has described, is really basic. Even for Senators to do that which the Senator from Massachusetts wants done; namely, to keep a close eye on these programs, a pretty good measure of what ought to be done is a 2-year program, which boils down to 18 or 19 months, as a practical matter, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has pointed out.

We are hovering over this program far too much to permit the administrators to do the job with the greatest efficiency, when they cannot have peace of mind for more than a few months. We have gotten so fussy that we are hurting ourselves. We are dealing with a pretty basic minimum when we provide a 2-year period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me if this amendment were defeated, there would be justification for an amendment which would distinguish between loans and grants.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, rather than labor the point, the cumulative history of the debate in the Foreign Relations Committee has continued to be in strong terms in favor of a 2-year minimum across the board. The House has provided a 5-year period for one category and a 4-year period for another. Therefore, I am sure we would have a basis on which to negotiate in conference, if we could get a 2-year program, and adjust the basis for the variants in the program, and therefore make it possible to accomplish our objective in conference. But the cumulative history of the whole point in the Foreign Relations Committee has been rather overwhelmingly in support of a 2-year authorization.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one more question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is a question for information. The other bill which the Foreign Relations Committee has reported provides for $917 million. Is that based on a 1- or 2- or 3-year program? It is a 1-year program; is it not?

Mr. McGEE. I think so, but the staff member of the committee has that information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a 1-year program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if we extend the period for these loans and grants, would Senators in respect to the other bill ask for a further extension as to military assistance?

Mr. McGEE. That is not involved in this question. This bill has to do with economic assistance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When we come down to grants and supporting assistance, we are not far from military assistance. They are pretty much all together.

Mr. McGEE. Except they are being handled as separate bills.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purpose of the RECORD, I think it should be shown that the House bill has provided a 5-year period for development loans and a 5-year period for the Alliance for Progress, and 2 years on all other programs.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not believe I am betraying a confidence when I say that in the consideration of the action of our committee, some weight was given to the proposition that the matter would have to go to conference, and that in the conference there would be a compromise between the five and the one.

But, to repeat, the House bill provides 5 years for development loans, 5 years for the Alliance for Progress, and 2 years for all other programs.

Mr. JAVITS. That was the reason I explained to the Senator from Massachusetts that the essence of this vote would be to commit us to the principle that we were willing to go beyond 1 year. Without any question, the matter will have to be worked out in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I conclude by pointing out one other thing. Secretary Rusk, in testifying before the committee, pointed out that there had been some improvement, but not nearly enough, in the contributions of other countries. He pointed out, at page 102 of the hearings, that—

> Total bilateral aid commitments from other DAC donors—that is the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD—has grown from $1.8 billion in 1960 to $2.5 billion in 1964.

He added that we were making some progress, but that it was not nearly great enough. So I press upon the Senate the fact that in passing this amendment, we will not only be aiding ourselves in terms of the efficiency of the operation, but also very materially contributing to our negotiating posture in getting greater aid from other countries, which is so urgently required for the total situation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment.

This matter was considered thoroughly in the committee and the vote was 11 to 6 in favor of the 1-year authorization.

All the facts about former actions or discussions that have been cited by the various speakers are quite true. The statements by me which were cited by the Senator from Wyoming are quite true.

What he overlooks are very important and significant changes in our foreign relations, specifically in our attitude toward Asia.

In view of the consequences of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and other factors which have relation to our commitment in Vietnam, some of which have been called to the attention of the Senate this afternoon—such as the statement by the Secretary of State that the aid program was one of the reasons justifying our present activities in South Vietnam—I am much more skeptical about the long-term effects of the aid program than I was formerly.

In this morning's Washington Post, there was an article by one of the closest friends of the President, William S. White, in regard to a new policy for Asia. I shall read portions for it for the Record. It is significant to me in that I think it indicates a new development in our international relations. While I shall read only part of it, I ask unanimous consent that the entire column, entitled "Alliance of Free Nations Proposed," written by William S. White and published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, July 19, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Asian Doctrine: Alliance of Free Nations Proposed

(By William S. White)

President Johnson's newly proclaimed Asia Doctrine, in which the United States for the first time formally accepts its full responsibilities as the leading Pacific power-in-fact, has been in his mind for five years.

It rests upon a conclusion he reached as Vice President in a mission to Asia in May of 1961, undertaken for his then chief, the late President John F. Kennedy. Mr. Johnson returned here with a tough private report to Mr. Kennedy which declared without qualification; "There is no alternative to United States leadership."

He recommended both a relentless American military resistance to shooting communism—as is now illustrated in South Vietnam—and generous economic assistance to Asian countries prepared to take steps to help themselves in non-Communist political atmospheres.

He proposed, as well, "an Alliance of all the free nations of the Pacific and Asia who are willing to join forces in defense of their freedom." Though no new alliance has been formed in the legal sense, a partnership of reality is now in being with such nations as Thailand, Australia and New Zealand.

The unity and determination of this association has just been deliberately underlined by the President by honoring Prime Minister Harold Holt of Australia as his White House guest twice within a space of days.

In short, though the Asia Doctrine is indeed a big bite, asserting for the United States a Great Power role in the Orient no less demanding than is its long accepted leadership of the Atlantic world, it is at all events no hurriedly jumped up enterprise.

Historically, there is something of Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower in it, for the parallel with their programs both to revive postwar Europe and to shield it from Soviet expansionism is clear in principle. There is also something in it akin to Theodore Roosevelt's Big Stick. In this case, however, the Big Stick, though waved in the direction of Communist China, is accompanied also by a large carrot.

The President is clearly prepared to contemplate substantial future conciliation of China, if, but only if, China will move away from its present habit of aggression at second hand in Asia.

It is too early to obtain any useful reading of foreign reaction to all this. It is not, however, too early to take some measure of its probable meaning in domestic terms.

Administration men take the attitude that once burned is twice shy. Thus, they make no claim, even in private, that Mr. Johnson's great extension of our role in Asia, with its emphasis upon the possibility of future coexistence as well as on present American military resoluteness, will placate the Senate minority of the New Left in its long attacks upon Vietnam war policy.

Independent evidence, however, suggests that in this the Administration's people may be a little overcautious. Nobody should expect an end to the New Left's verbal dissent from Vietnam. But at least one observer—this one—believes there may be a small change anyhow. The President's suggestion that the New Left here is less humanly concerned for the agonies of colored Asians under Communist attack than with a white Europe under no such terror hits the ultraliberals where they live.

For, to most of them, their dogma of dogmas is their hostility to racial discrimination in any form. Some of them, therefore, are likely to re-think their position on Vietnam, if only a little bit and if only for domestic political reasons. In a word, this is a pretty solid blow against the new form of isolationism which is Europe First and Asia Never.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article from the Wall Street Journal of April 20, 1966, entitled "Humphrey Says Meaning of Honolulu Talks Is a Sweeping U.S. Commitment for Asia," and excerpts from an interview with Vice President Humphrey over the CBS network on April 19, 1966.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 20, 1966]

A "Johnson Doctrine"—Humphrey Says Meaning of Honolulu Talks Is a Sweeping U.S. Commitment for Asia

(By Philip Geyelin)

Washington.—Vice President Humphrey had stunning news for those in the U.S. Senate and elsewhere who have been bitterly condemning this country's past commitment to Vietnam and sharply questioning the future Asian role of the U.S.

Even while debate on these issues was raging before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee two months ago, it seems, President Johnson was propounding a new "Johnson Doctrine" as sweeping in its implications for Asia as was the U.S. commitment to Europe almost two decades ago. Or so the Vice President reported in a transcript issued in advance of a television interview to be aired last night on the Columbia Broadcasting network. Mr. Humphrey was discussing the results of the Honolulu meeting between Mr. Johnson and South Vietnamese leaders in early February.

"I would never want anyone to underestimate the meaning of the Honolulu conference or the Honolulu declaration," the Vice President declared. "If that is studied carefully, I think it has as much significance for the future of Asia as the Atlantic Charter had for the future of Europe."

At the time, no such interpretation was read into the joint statement issued by Mr. Johnson and the South Vietnamese. Mr. Johnson didn't talk of an Asian "doctrine" and neither did the document itself, whose precise terms dealt strictly with Vietnam. But it actually was intended as "a much broader declaration," the Vice President insisted last night. "It was directed towards an Asia, a modern Asia, an Asia to peace, an Asia with tremendous programs of social, economic betterment."

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPTS

Excerpts from the exchange that immediately followed are illustrative, at the very least, of how "doctrines" come into the geopolitical lexicon. But they also bear heavily on the very question currently disturbing Sen. Fulbright (D., Ark.), Foreign Relations Committee chairman: How is it that the U.S. gets committed to large international undertakings with hardly anybody being aware of it. In the CBS interview, which was taped last Wednesday, Mr. Humphrey says it would have been obvious if "more attention (had) been given to that declaration and a little less attention to the personalities involved."

This, then, was the "articulation of a Johnson Doctrine for Asia?" Mr. Humphrey was asked. "Yes, I think it was," he replied. "I hadn't heard it put quite that way, but as you have said it, that would be as I would envision it and see it." The Vice President noted that the declaration pledged the U.S. in general terms to "defeat aggression, to defeat social misery, to build viable, free institutions and to achieve peace." These are "great commitments," he went on. "I think there is a tremendous new opening here for realizing the dream of the Great Society in the great area of Asia, not just here at home. And I regret that we haven't been able to dramatize it more."

Q. (from CBS commentator Eric Sevareid). Mr. Vice President, there are immense implications, it seems to me, in what you are saying here.

A. Yes.

Q. You seem to me to be saying that the Johnson Doctrine, if we may call it that, is proposing a relationship between this country and Asia, far away as it is, and sprawling and diverse as it is, a relationship as fundamental, as long-lasting, intimate and possibly expensive as our historic associations with Europe. Is it of this scale, of this magnitude?

A. I think so.

REGIONAL APPROACH

The Johnson Administration's plans for exporting the Great Society to Asia and elsewhere, with emphasis on a regional approach to Asian economic and social development, aren't new. The U.S. played a major role in promoting the recently created Asian Development Bank, subscribing $200 million in capital out of the $1 billion total. The President has talked up plans for joint development of the Mekong River Basin in Southeast Asia and pledged heavy U.S. outlays to that end, too. Next week, former World Bank President Eugene R. Black is off on another Asian tour as the President's special representative to examine new projects on which the U.S. and Asian nations might collaborate; yesterday, Mr. Black conferred with the President on plans for this excursion.

But nothing as formal and high-flown as the Vice President's "Johnson Doctrine" concept had yet been put forth. Nor had the U.S. mission in Vietnam ever been described in quite the terms used by Mr. HUMPHREY last night—terms certain to sharpen the Congressional debate over this country's future Asian policy.

Vietnam, Mr. HUMPHREY declared, is "almost like the first voyage of an explorer into a new land. The ship has almost been storm-tossed on the shore, but we are there." And he added:

"We are going to be in Asia for a long, long time."

That, of course, is what the debate in Congress and in the public arena has been all about. Sen. FULBRIGHT and others have been arguing heatedly that the U.S. had no business getting bogged down in Vietnam in the first place, that it ought to disentangle itself as rapidly as possible, and that it shouldn't take on similar commitments in the future, especially in Asia.

Earlier this week, in committee hearings on foreign-aid legislation, Chairman FULBRIGHT hammered hard at the need to put foreign aid on an "impersonal" basis through wider use of multilateral agencies, just to avoid having broad political and military obligations grow out of seemingly narrow commitments to economic assistance. Senator FULBRIGHT contended this was how the U.S. got drawn into Vietnam, and he and others argued that it shouldn't be allowed to happen again elsewhere.

Yet, if the Vice President's statements are to be interpreted as firm policy, the enunciation of a Johnson Doctrine can only "personalize" the U.S. role. As for the thought advanced by Sen. FULBRIGHT and many other critics of the Vietnam War—that the U.S. has no real business being so deeply entangled in Asia—the Vice President seemed almost to be inviting argument. "That is what the (Senate) hearings are all about," he declared in stating categorically that "we can't be a world power with a half-world involvement."

It was impossible to determine precisely how much of a hand, if any, Mr. Johnson may have had in the Vice President's declarations. Late yesterday, officials who might have been expected to know professed ignorance. Some of them also conceded to some surprise that Mr. HUMPHREY had gone as far as he did in challenging the critics of current Asian policy.

"This will really make FULBRIGHT explode," said one who feared a rapid heating of Congressional and public debate as the result of the Vice President's remarks, whatever the President's role may have been.

Controversy is likely to be all the more inflamed by the Vice President's claim that "great commitments" to all of Asia were contained in a document that seemed to deal almost exclusively with the war in Vietnam.

EASE OF COMMITMENT

Already, deep concern is apparent about the ease with which the U.S. Government gets itself committed, as in Vietnam, by such seemingly innocuous documents as former President Eisenhower's original promise of economic assistance to the government of former South Vietnamese Premier Ngo Dinh Diem just after the signing of the 1954 Geneva accords. For years, the U.S. involvement in Vietnam was founded on this pledge, which included no reference to military support.

The Honolulu declaration, on its face, is equally innocuous, as far as mentioning the rest of Asia is concerned. Its four parts include a brief preamble, in which the governments of the U.S. and Vietnam jointly declare their "determination in defense against aggression," their "dedication to the hopes of all the people of South Vietnam," and "their commitment to the search for just and stable peace."

The next two parts are devoted to defining, respectively, Vietnamese and U.S. purposes in the war. The U.S. statement makes general reference to U.S. "pledges" to the principle of self-determination and to playing "its full part in the world-wide attack upon hunger, ignorance and disease," in explaining what the U.S. is doing in Vietnam.

In the fourth section, the two governments subscribe jointly to a common commitment to "defense against aggression, to the work of social revolution, to the goal of free self-government, to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease, and to the unending quest for peace."

It was in this last declaration, apparently, that Mr. HUMPHREY saw a "Johnson Doctrine"; his March report to the President, on his return from an Asian tour after the Hawaii meeting, did make vague reference to something grander in scope than a commitment to Vietnam. In that report, Mr. HUMPHREY said the Honolulu declaration "could represent a historic turning point in American relationships with Asia." He argued that Asian leaders were taking the Honolulu goals "very seriously."

But the notion that this amounts to a "doctrine" or a "great commitment" is new, and almost certain to raise the question of whether the Administration isn't once again reading profound obligations retroactively into documents that weren't billed as obligations, commitments or high policy at the time.

One practical effect could be more far reaching than the anticipated difficulty for the Johnson foreign-aid program. Mr. FULBRIGHT has already threatened to oppose it. The Foreign Relations Committee's second ranking Democrat, Senator MORSE of Oregon, has promised to battle for deep reductions, centering on funds for Vietnam. Conscious of this developing opposition, atop the usual Congressional resistance to foreign aid, most Administration officials have been taking a low-key, once-removed approach to Asian aid, playing up multilateral methods and the importance of Asian self-help. The Vice President's pronouncement last night may make this line somewhat more difficult to maintain.

EXCERPTS FROM "A CONVERSATION WITH HUBERT HUMPHREY" CBS NETWORK, APRIL 19, 1966

Vice President HUMPHREY. I would never want anyone to underestimate the meaning of the Honolulu Conference, and the Honolulu Declaration. If that is studied carefully, I think it has as much significance for the future of Asia as the Atlantic Charter had for the future of Europe.

Mr. AGRONSKY. What do you have in mind when you say that?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Because the Honolulu Declaration that came from that conference, while in terms of current history as directed towards Vietnam, it was a much broader declaration. It was directed towards an Asia, a modern Asia, an Asia with abundance, an Asia with social justice, an Asia at peace, an Asia with tremendous programs of social, economic betterment. That is the way I read the Honolulu Declaration and I have studied very carefully and frankly have been very much moved by it.

I regret that more attention has not been given to that declaration, and a little less attention to the personalities involved.

Mr. AGRONSKY. This was the articulation of a Johnson doctrine for Asia?

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes, I think it was. I really believe that sir. I had not heard it put quite that way, but as you have said it, that would be as I would envision it and see it.

Now, what was said in this declaration was a pledge to ourselves and to posterity to defeat aggression to defeat social misery, to build viable, free political institutions, and to achieve peace.

Now, those are broad terms, but these are great commitments. And then you add onto this, sir, our relationships with India and Pakistan, but particularly now India, where the discussions between our two governments have gone far beyond just food; they have gone into the whole matter of development of the economy, the social, political structure.

I think there is a tremendous new opening here for realizing the dream of the Great Society in the great area of Asia, not just here at home. And I regret that we have not been able to dramatize it more.

Mr. SEVAREID. Mr. Vice President, there are immense implications, it seems to me, in what you are saying here.

Vice President HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SEVAREID. You seem to me to be saying that the Johnson doctrine, if we may call it that, is proposing a relationship between this country and Asia, far away as it is, and sprawling and diverse as it is, a relationship as fundamental, as long-lasting, intimate, and possibly expensive as our historic associations with Europe. Is it of this scale, of this magnitude?

Vice President HUMPHREY. I think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I call attention to this statement:

> President Johnson's newly proclaimed Asia Doctrine, in which the United States for the first time formally accepts its full responsibilities as the leading Pacific power-in-fact, has been in his mind for five years.

Later in the article, he says:

> There is also something in it akin to Theodore Roosevelt's Big Stick.

This brings up memories of Manifest Destiny. I thought we had outlived the policies represented by Theodore Roosevelt and our attacks upon the colonies of Spain—at least there has been great criticism, over the past 50 years, about that expedition, which in a way has made its contribution to our present difficulties in Asia. When we took the Philippines, as a part of that policy of Manifest Destiny, in a sense we gave a hostage to Asia, and that was the first involvement, which has kept us involved, more or less, ever since the days of Theodore Roosevelt—much to our disadvantage, and possibly much worse if the situation in Asia continues to deteriorate.

The article states:

> There is also something in it akin to Theodore Roosevelt's Big Stick. In this case, however, the Big Stick, though waved in the direction of Communist China, is accompanied also by a large carrot—

The large carrot being the foreign aid program, I take it.

That raises the question: Is this foreign aid merely a tool and a part of a new policy of Manifest Destiny, designed to establish our paternalistic control in Asia, or is it not?

I do not know. But I think the question is sufficiently serious to warrant the consideration of the Senate, and that we should be very careful about expanding our aid commitment beyond a year. In fact, I am very reluctant about 1 year. I am not at all sure I can support the program for 1 year. I shall not, unless some of the other amendments approved and recommended by the committee are retaining, such as the 15-percent requirement for multilateral lending. If the Senate chooses to undo what the committee is recommending in this and other respects, I certainly will not support the program for 1 year.

Lastly, in the column to which I have referred, the final paragraph says:

> In a word, this is a pretty solid blow against the new form of isolationism which is Europe First and Asia Never.

Whatever that means—I do not know what it means; as far as I know, there is no new form of isolationism—I think what it is trying to do is to emphasize that we are now undertaking a great unlimited, as far as I can see—and vague commitment to bring the Great Society to Asia; certainly to non-Communist Asia—to Communist Asia only if they are willing to surrender and come in under the tent.

That is a very serious enlargement of our existing commitment.

This word "commitment" I have become allergic to. It has been used so often and with such repetition by the Secretary of State with regard to South Vietnam that I hesitate to use it.

But these commitments arise, apparently, not from solemn action of this body or of the Government, but from statements of some of our officials, which, if repeated often enough, become a commitment morally, if not legally, binding to the extent that authorizations or appropriations are requested and it is said that, "We are committed to do this." Now there is a commitment made in a recent speech by the President, echoed in several statements by the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and others, that we are committed to bring the Great Society to Asia.

Perhaps we should. I am not ready to pass upon that proposal, nor to approve it; and I am not ready to extend this program beyond a year until that type of commitment is clarified. I think it is very risky and a gravely dangerous matter to make a commitment of this nature without knowing where it will end up. I think that is one of the reasons we are in such serious trouble today. And we are in serious trouble.

Look at this morning's paper. The headlines on the front page of the Washington Post are enough to give anybody the willies. Not only is the President worried about the budget, but we have racial problems in practically every city of the country—Watts, Chicago, and now in the great State of Ohio which formerly had not been noted for its racial problems. This kind of strife seems to be spreading all over the country.

These are symptoms, I think, of the restlessness and the discontent in this country, not altogether unaffected by our very tragic involvement in a war in southeast Asia.

Someone mentioned the cost of the war a moment ago. The Senator from Indiana said that he had asked the Secretary of the Treasury about the cost of the war.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services—and there is no better informed man in the Senate on this subject—told me within the week that the war is presently costing us $2 billion a month, and it is escalating. The President is worried about the budget. Certainly, the administration is worried, because they are beginning to cut down and cut little projects. I spent a good part of yesterday talking about one little project involving $60,000 for operating a fish hatchery in my State. That fish hatchery was built only last year. It is a very small, modest project.

The administration is quibbling about the $60,000 it will take to pay a few employees to keep the hatchery in operation. This is almost ridiculous.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, does the Senator think that if we were to give a 2-year authorization we would automatically double the amount of money contained in the authorization bill? Are we not actually saying that it will be the same amount of money, but that they will have a 2-year period in which to commit this money wisely?

The point is that insofar as the money itself is concerned, it remains the same amount. What we are doing is allowing them a 2-year period within which to commit the same amount of money, rather than to commit it on a 9-month basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be double that amount.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not understand that at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming not consider that the amendment would commit us to twice as much money over a period of 2 years as against a 1-year commitment?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Wyoming understands that it does not involve a commitment at all. That has to be reviewed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean an authorization. We use the term "commitment" too loosely.

Mr. McGEE. The amendment would authorize the program for 2 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the authorization would entail twice as many dollars as would a 1-year authorization.

Mr. McGEE. I do not think so. Right now, we have two 1-year authorizations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be the same amount each year for 2 years.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it were $100 for the first year and $100 for the second year, it would be $200.

Mr. McGEE. At the present time, $100 for the first year and $100 for the second year, the authorization would cover that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. $200, or twice as much.

Mr. McGEE. There would not be another nickel involved, and the actual use of the money would still be subject to the review of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know that. The point that I failed to make to the Senator from Rhode Island is that I am having very serious second thoughts about the validity of the undertaking in Asia.

I am not about to furnish a tool with which to carry out that program until I know what it involves, and certainly I do not want to go beyond 1 year. I am not sure that I will agree to 1 year because of these recent developments and commitments or statements which imply commitments far beyond anything that I imagine this country would ever entertain seriously. We eased into this situation. There have been no treaties which commit us to take the Great Society to Asia.

No bill has been introduced or passed. Commitments seem to rise like Topsy because of statements made by officials of our Government. Later on it is said that we are committed. Our Vice President made a broad pledge at Bangkok in a communique issued after he had been sent there as a representative of the President. In an interview a few months ago he said that we had undertaken a very broad commitment to bring about social, economic, and political advancement in Asia. I have inserted pertinent portions of the interview and an article concerning it in the RECORD.

Senators may read for themselves if they think I am misinterpreting the statement of the Vice President. This was a very broad commitment made by the Vice President.

One might ask whether he has authority to commit us. I used to think that he did not have such authority, but I am not so sure now.

I think these commitments ought to be clarified. We ought to understand how it is proposed to bring the Great Society to all the non-Communist Asian countries.

According to Mr. White in the newspaper this morning, this is the old Theodore Roosevelt doctrine, plus a carrot. It is a big stick plus a carrot. We have a big part of the big stick out there, and now we want to give them the carrot. I do not know whether they want the carrot. I know that they do not want the big stick, but that is another matter.

I do not want to to be confronted by the Secretary of State a year from now and have him say to me that Congress voted for it, including the Senator from Ohio.

Therefore, I have reservations about extending it beyond 1 year, and I do not propose to vote for such an extension. I shall vote against the amendment; and if the amendment is agreed to, I shall vote against the entire bill.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I appreciate the Senator's position and the reason for his change of position in the last year. We all change as we go along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not everybody; many persons do not.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to ask about the Senator's statement made a year ago, in which he said there were two excellent reasons for a 2-year authorization. The first reason, the Senator said, had to do with the annual aid bills considered by Congress, requiring Members of the Senate to engage in meticulous, tedious, repetitious reviews of programs.

Is there anything in the Senator's misgivings concerning what has happened since last year that would alter that reason?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. The Senator from Wyoming has read all of that past statement, and I appreciate the attention he has given to it. He puts it down for historians to look at, and gets great pleasure out of trying to show an inconsistency.

I am quite willing to say that I feel different today—completely different—from the way I felt about the situation at that time. I feel different about a number of our involvements abroad. There has been a series of developments in recent months that disturb me.

I go back to the summer of 1964 and think of what I then thought was our foreign policy, and now observe what is happening. Is there any change in the Senator's mind between what he thought then that the party was going to do, and today?

Mr. McGEE. As a matter of fact, I was about to commend the Senator for any changes of mind. I think that only an ignorant man never changes his mind. I respect change. I only desired to have the Senator's reason for this change.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's intention. But I do not believe it is a profitable exchange at the moment. I already said that I have views about this program today that are different from my views about it a year ago.

Mr. President, I have nothing more to say about the program other than that I hope the Senate will not go against the committee. The Committee on Foreign Relations has a certain responsibility to work with foreign political relations. It is true that that Committee on Appropriations has taken over much of the legislative power of many of our other committees; and in wartime the activities of the Committee on Armed Services override nearly all other considerations.

There is, I believe, possibly a formulation of a policy involving commitments in Asia far beyond what any Member of this body dreams of at the moment. I have only become aware of it myself in the last few weeks and each day some new item appears that confirms a suspicion I have had as to how the rate of involvement is developing.

That is one of the main reasons why I will not vote for an extension of the program for more than 1 year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the real issue of this debate, it seems to me, is whether there should be single or multiyear authorization of foreign aid funds.

I think it is in order at this time to review and put on the record the pros and cons of the arguments. Perhaps, in doing so, some light will be shed on the question of foreign aid, a question which is becoming more and more of concern to the American taxpayer.

The legislative history we write during the current debate may have farflung and far-reaching repercussions on when and whether we should phase out foreign aid, whether a new approach to assisting other nations should be and must be devised, or whether we shall merely enlarge our program of aid without regard to the need for restrictions and strings.

In 1961, Congress authorized a long-term authorization for the Development Loan Fund as well as for the Alliance for Progress. Since then, however, it has balked at giving the State Department, through the Agency for International Development—AID—a multiyear dispensation to make commitments over a period of years instead of substantiating a new request for aid funds each year. The proponents of a long-term basis did win something of a psychological victory in getting the Senate to give approval last year of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 to be on a 2-year authorization period, provided that the aid program, as presently constituted, should be abolished and reassessed at the end of that period.

The Senate in its report—Senate Report No. 170, on S. 183, 89th Congress—authorized a total of $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1966 and $2.6 billion for fiscal year 1967 plus funds previously authorized.

The House, on the other hand, in its report—House Report No. 321, on H.R. 7750, 89th Congress—provided funds only for 1 year, namely fiscal year 1966.

During its deliberations on the authorization for aid funds, the abandonment of the 2-year period found many Senate proponents in that an amendment—No. 220—to delete the 2-year period from the bill was defeated by a vote of 63 to 26. This vote by 26 Senators showed the strong remaining sentiment in the Senate against extending executive influence over the aid programs without annual questioning of the total aid concept in all its various facets by the Committee on Foreign Relations and later by the Committee on Appropriation.

Later, after Senate and House conferees issued their report for only a 1-year extension of aid funds, the conferees on the part of the House contended that they were not irrevocably opposed to the multiyear authorization, but could not bind their colleagues in subsequent sessions of Congress. The sentiment of the conferees was expressed in the proposal that their colleagues in both Houses give careful consideration in subsequent submissions for foreign aid funds for periods covering 2 or more years. They particularly urged the President to inaugurate a review of the foreign aid program as presently constituted and to direct it more effectively toward the solution of the problems of developing countries.

It is noteworthy that in August 1965, when the conference report for the authorization of 1966 aid funds was discussed in Congress, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs stated categorically that on their side the House conferees had given assurance of full discussion during the next authorization request for 1967, but that they had not been asked for and had not given a commitment for a 2-year authorization.

In the discussion of the conference report by the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations noted that the previous Senate discussions might lead to fruitful reforms in the aid program and also that the House conferees had given assurance that future proposals for a 2-year or multi-year authorization would be examined with great care. The chairman said he hoped that, for the future, Congress would get away from the dreary cycle of 1-year aid programs.

MAIN ARGUMENTS

The main arguments of the proponents of multiyear authorization can be summarzied as follows:

First. Wherever multiyear commitments had been entered into, but unforeseen circumstances arose, as in Cuba, the foreign aid administrators would be honor-bound not to continue such commitments because to do so would be inimical to the national interest. The delegation of long-term authority would have assurance from AID officials that they would act very circumspectly.

Second. In the event of unforeseen circumstances, the relevant committees of Congress could reassume jurisdiction and make legislative recommendations before the expiration of the long-term authorization.

Third. The annual, meticulous, tedious, and repetitious reviews of programs would be obviated. After all, many programs had been reviewed ad nauseam, specifications were known in great detail, and all that was necessary was the final carrying out of the details.

Fourth. Currently, foreign aid planners, programers, and administrators are on a constant run to supply details to the various authorizing and appropriating committees of Congress. Time thus wasted in duplicating efforts could be spent more profitably in executing the programs if set up on a long-term basis.

Fifth. Proponents of longer authorizations contend that annual authorizations actually introduce hampering limitations on programs by changing requirements. Annual authorizations are vulnerable to the demands and pressures of certain domestic groups, such as shipowners and farm organizations, to change objectives and often the direction of aid.

Sixth. Proponents further contend that sometimes annual appropriations have contained reductions of crippling proportions, thereby negating some positive results achieved previously.

Seventh. Annual authorizations inhibit and thwart long-range efficient planning for economic development. To achieve positive, viable results in any underdeveloped country, continuous programs have to be considered over a period of time without major changes. Orderly planning and effective execution of development programs demand a consistent application of money and administration, and only long-range authorizations can assure these. Stopgap financing to meet crises only are inadequate for successful development programs.

Eighth. Proponents aver that long-term development and economic growth of underindustrialized areas should not be tied to the cycles of Congress. Changing Congresses set their own terms of reference, whereas economic development by the recipients of our aid should not be accelerated or retarded by the vagaries of outlook or intent of succeeding Congresses.

Ninth. Aid offers by the United States of America often are conditional on newer tax programs, social reforms and fiscal changes on the part of recipient countries and should not be interrupted by intermittent annual authorizations, which may be charged.

Tenth. Long-term authorizations would permit the effective procurement of items for long-range programs and phasing of orders for goods to be ready when needed. This is particularly true of military aid material.

Eleventh. Finally, annual control by Congress is retained by the necessity for annual appropriations of the money needed to fund the programs.

Opponents of multiyear authorizations utilize the following arguments to support their case:

First. There is no need for Congress to commit itself and succeeding Congresses to multiyear provision of funds, as it is obvious that Congress will provide the means to continue and finish programs underway. Since 1948, Congress has not reneged on its commitments for good projects.

Second. AID officials have objected to the so-called harassment of the annual scouting by Congress of their stewardship of public money. It has been proved time and again that wherever projects have been efficiently handled Congress has been more than willing to continue the funds for successful completion of viable projects. So-called annual, repetitious and critical appraisal may secure and insure better project management and objectives previously established.

Third. Time and again it has been proved that overplanning has resulted in the accumulation of unobligated balances of aid which could be diverted to other projects or eliminated.

Fourth. By means of an annual review, Congress keeps the officials administering the program on their toes. Dedicated officials have nothing to fear from this periodic scrutiny of programs and results.

Fifth. Congressmen try to be responsive to the wishes of their constituents. The general citizenry holds Congress responsible for the prudent use of tax moneys in our foreign aid ventures. Many taxpayers do not look favorably on long-term abdication of such responsibility by means of multiyear appropriations.

Sixth. Opponents aver that although foreign recipients might agree to institute certain reforms and changes in their own countries, once long-term funds are available from the United States, foreign governments either do not continue such reforms or even refuse to continue or cooperate on a reciprocal basis. In such cases the annual review can immediately result in a cutoff of funds that might be misused or misspent. Unless motivated sufficiently to continue their economic development, some recipients might rely too much on the funds authorized—although not appropriated—by the United States for some years to come.

Seventh. Opponents answer the charge of long-range planning being thwarted by short-term authorizations by contending that most foreign aid projects seem to be overplanned rather than showing a dearth of planning.

Eighth. In view of the ever-changing political orientation of many nations with continuous crises, it would be wise for Congress to retain its hand over programs which might conceivably be abused if authorized for a period of years. It is better for Congress to be responsive to crises than to establish programs regardless of possible changes of the conditions under which the funds were committed.

Ninth. The contention that the recruitment of responsible AID personnel under annual appropriations is difficult has merely pointed to the fact that responsible public officials, able and willing to do a good job, are sought by all executive agencies. All regular agencies of the administration get annual appropriations and have the same difficulty in recruiting. Since AID may have to recruit for specific projects and short terms, it might be harder to find suitable officials.

Tenth. The composition of Congress changes; new men get involved in the changing aspects of aid and in its very direction; and foreign governments change, so that in the final assesment, it might be better to keep appropriations short term in order to take care of a possible eventualities in the ever-changing kaleidoscope of world events.

Mr. President, these are the arguments. They should be weighed heavily. The American taxpayer looks to Congress to give direction to the course of foreign aid in the years to come. And what we do will be scrutinized carefully in light of an almost endless stream of dollars—some $120 billion in all—which have been channeled to foreign nations since 1948.

For my part, I supported the 2-year program last year, and I shall do so again today. I believe it represents a reasonable compromise, and the annual appropriation of money by Congress will still retain a reasonable amount of control.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that amendment be printed in the RECORD. I can rather quickly explain its purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, lines 5 and 6, strike out "for the fiscal year 1967," and insert in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968,".

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "year ending June 30, 1967," and insert in lieu thereof "years ending June 30, 1967 and June 30, 1968, respectively,".

On page 10, strike out lines 11 through 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) Strike out in the first sentence the words beginning with '1963, 1965, and 1966,' through the words 'year 1966' and substitute '1967 and 1968, not to exceed $543,000,000 which sums are authorized to remain available until expended and, except for not to exceed $87,700,000,'."

On page 10, strike out lines 19 through 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) In the final sentence, strike out 'June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966,' and substitute 'June 30, 1967 and June 30, 1968,'."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and other Senators contemplates the placing of a 1-year limitation on all programs of aid except the Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan Fund, which will be for 2 years.

In other words, it is identical with the proposal of the Senator from Wyoming, except that on the general programs for which there has always been a 1-year tenure, that 1-year tenure will continue.

The House of Representatives has adopted its bill fixing 5 years for the Alliance for Progress program, 5 years for the development loans, and 2 years for all other programs. As I have stated, the amendment I propose would fix 2 years for development loans, 2 years for Alliance for Progress, and 1 year for all other programs. In the committee, I voted for the 1-year program. I did so primarily to establish a base in disparity with that recommended by the House of Representatives, expecting that there would be a compromise that would be reasonably satisfactory in time.

I can say nothing more about my proposed amendment. Initially, I believed that reducing the 5-year tenure on Alliance for Progress and the 5-year tenure on development loans to 1 year was too drastic. I stand by that statement, and I suggest that instead of 1 year, it should be 2 years, in conformity with what Senator JAVITS and Senator McGEE have been arguing, but that on all other programs it should be 1 year.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to ask the Senator why he draws a line between development loans and development grants in the 2-year and 1-year programs; because, as I understand the proposed amendment of the Senator, it provides for 1 year under the grants and 2 years under the loans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. I wonder whether the Senator can give us his rationale for that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My rationale is that the loans are made on the basis of the programs that continue for a protracted period of time. Grants are made under technical assistance and in a number of other programs. That is the reason for the proposal which I have made, and, in substance, it is in conformity with what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] implied should be done.

Mr. PEARSON. Is the Senator saying that the development grants are for programs limited to 1 year?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In substance, they are and they have always been limited to 1 year, the committee and the Senate feeling that each year we should come back to the Senate and request renewed authorization.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a couple of questions?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I greatly respect the views of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, as he knows.

Two thoughts have occurred to me, and I should like to propound these questions about them.

The Senator from Ohio has separated in his proposed amendment the Development Loan Fund and the grant program. The loan program is increased to a 2-year authorization while the grant program would remain a 1-year authorization. Is it not true that many of the grants are used in connection with the development loans? In other words, in the instance of a development loan for a given country to help build a certain mining industry or cement industry, or something of that sort, many of the grants are used in connection with those projects. So that in that instance it does not make sense, does it, to separate the time element between the loans and the grants?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe it positively does make sense. Congress has in effect recognized the difference between the Alliance for Progress program and the development loan program, on the one hand, and all other programs, on the other.

In 1961 a 5-year tenure was fixed for the development loan program, considering the fact that it required a carryover. In 1962 a 4-year program was fixed in connection with Alliance for Progress loans and grants. But throughout each of the 5 years and the 4 years, all other programs were kept at 1 year.

The House of Representatives has likewise differentiated, and, in my opinion, with sound rationalization. In its bill, the House of Representatives provided 5 years for development loans, 5 years for Alliance for Progress, and 2 years for all other programs.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for his answer, although I must say that with respect to this one point I do not entirely agree with him.

Now, would the Senator answer this question for me. I am not sure that the differentiations that the Senator has mentioned—and he is entirely correct—have contributed to our troubles in many areas. So, in the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator it is proposed to make the Alliance for Progress a 2-year authorization—which is both grant and loan, I believe. Is it not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, it is.

Mr. ALLOTT. The substitute amendment proposes that both grants and loans be put on a 2-year basis, and it proposes that the rest be put on a 1-year basis.

Now, we recognize the great friendship of our Latin American neighbors. The Alliance for Progress is confined to Latin America. This is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. So, what we would do and say to the rest of the world in effect, is this: We would say to the rest of the world that these people are our neighbors; they are close to us. Therefore, we give them a preference. We would say to the rest of the world, "We put you in a second category, and you will only be considered on a year-by-year basis."

I do not wish anyone to read into this question any suggestion of what I intend to do on the proposed amendment, but it seems to me that it would present the possibility of creating an adverse feeling among other countries outside of Latin America, in setting up what is really an artificial differentiation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot agree with the Senator from Colorado.

In the development loan program, the beneficiaries are nations all over the world. We loan them the money to develop infrastructure institutions of the government, and my proposed amendment provides for a 2-year program. That is likewise provided for under the amendment proposed by Senator McGEE.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not talking about the amendment proposed by Senator McGEE. I am really directing myself solely to the amendment which the Senator from Ohio has offered. The Senator from Ohio is always constructive, and I agree with him on a great many things, as he well knows.

However, it seems to me that in passing a 2-year authorization for the Alliance for Progress, and then in saying to the rest of the world, "We only give you 1 year on this," a differentiation is made that is hard to explain to them. The difficulties of the State Department are compounded, and there is not any basis upon which to make this differentiation.

I should be happy to hear the explanation of the Senator from Ohio. I know this has been done in the past, but I do not believe that what has been done in the past is necessarily any criterion for what should be done in the future, because of the predicament we are in at present.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have already explained that the development loan program, which is a substantial one, would have a 2-year period. All nations which are the beneficiaries of that program would understand that they have a 2-year tenure. The same situation would prevail with respect to the Alliance for Progress. It would be 2 years.

Therefore, I take the position, with the Senator from Colorado, that the 2-year period would be rather uniformly operative and would be equally effective with all nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my proposed amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to call this brief statement to the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I expect to support his amendment for substitution.

If the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will read the loan criteria on page 7 of the report of the committee, and then read the additional criteria for technical cooperation and development grants on page 10, I think there is a strong distinction between the two.

The development loan funds are essentially to build up more of a business basis, to build up private enterprise, and industrial property rights, and so forth, and whether or not the activity to be financed thereby will contribute to the achievement of self-sustaining growth. That is what the development loan is for.

If Senators will turn to page 10, the additional criteria for technical cooperation and development grants are more of an idealistic approach where we hope to try to help them build up respect for rule of law, freedom of expression, and freedom of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise, and whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to the achievement of self-sustaining growth.

In other words, it is less a business loan than the development loan. The development grant is essentially a boost for the country, whereas the development loan is to help them build up their business ability.

I believe there is a distinction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. ALLOTT. In reply to the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I am completely aware of this. When a development loan is made it is made only once, whether it is made this year or next year.

Since many of these grants, these technical cooperation and development grants, are made in conjunction with development loans, it occurs to me that there is a question as to whether or not they should not be on the same basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am prepared to have the issue submitted to the Senate for a vote.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only 1 minute to suggest that I oppose the proposal of my friend from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

I believe it will tend to confuse rather than to clarify the issue across the board.

I believe the issue at stake is that of making our entire economical development a more businesslike organization and we cannot do it part way. We have to do it all the way.

I agree that some programs should have a longer span of time, but that needs to be worked out by wiser heads. I hope that the pending amendment will be defeated so that we can get to the vote on the multiyear authorization, the 2-year amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 143 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McGovern
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Pell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—64

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Brewster
Case
Dodd
Gruening
Hayden
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Morton
Neuberger
Scott
Sparkman

So Mr. Lausche's amendment in the nature of a substitute for Mr. McGee's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make this comment. The Senator from Wyoming has laid great stress on the fact that last year the Senate passed a 2-year authorization bill.

Let me invite the attention of the Senate to the reason why the Senate passed a 2-year authorization bill.

It passed a 2-year authorization bill because that was the program worked out to amalgamate the Fulbright amendment and the Morse amendment. The chairman of the committee, last year, was asking for the longer authorization because my amendment of last year brought to an end completely the entire foreign aid program. That is what the Senate voted. The whole program was all to come to a stop at the end of 2 years, at the beginning of fiscal year 1967.

In the 2-year interval, there was to be a thorough study of foreign aid from top to bottom by a select joint committee of the Congress. It was to bring in its recommendations for procedures and conditions which were to be followed in connection with a new foreign aid program after 1967.

In order to give that committee, or commission, the necessary amount of time to do the work, a 2-year authorization was provided. That is why the Senate adopted a 2-year authorization. It has nothing to do with the situation with which the Senate is confronted today.

In my judgment, we would be making a great mistake if we did not make certain the Congress of the American people will take another look at the program 1 year hence.

That, in my judgment, is what the people are entitled to, and the argument that we adopted a 2-year authorization last year bears no relevancy to the problem which confronts us this year.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I want to point out further, that times are not normal. In relation to the cost of the war in South Vietnam and what we can expect there, on July 12, 1966, in the Record, on page 15265, in answer to a question from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] gave this answer:

> Mr. President, that is—

That refers to the cost of the war in Vietnam—

> of course, a question that cannot be answered precisely.
>
> The Secretary of Defense made the statement yesterday that the war in Vietnam was increasing the expenditures of the Department of Defense by $1 billion a month. That would be $12 billion a year. It is my own opinion that the war in Vietnam is costing us a good deal more than that amount. I think that it will run closer to $2 billion a month, perhaps somewhere between $1.5 billion and $2 billion a month.

Mr. President, I want to have that in the Record today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, just one point. A new Director has just been appointed. I think that we should examine their work over the past year. I see little in the record to justify a 2-year extension. In the period since the agency was established as ECA in 1948—roughly 18 years now—there have been 11 Directors.

So no Director, on the average, has served even the 2 years. I do not think we should put a burden on the Director for a program that will last longer than he likely will serve.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the Directors of foreign aid programs and the periods of time they have served be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Agency Directors of Foreign Aid Programs and Term of Service

E.C.A. (Economic Cooperation Administration): Paul G. Hoffman, April, 1948 to September, 1950.

E.C.A.: William C. Foster, October, 1950 to September, 1951.

M.S.A. (Mutual Security Agency): W. Averell Harriman, October, 1951 to January, 1953.

F.O.A. (Foreign Operations Administration): Harold E. Stassen, January, 1953 to June, 1955.

I.C.A. (International Cooperation Administration): John B. Hollister, July, 1955 to September, 1957.

I.C.A.: James H. Smith, Jr., October, 1957 to January, 1959.

I.C.A.: James W. Riddleberger, May, 1959 to February, 1961.

I.C.A. (Held over as Director): Henry R. Labouisse, March, 1961 to November, 1961.

A.I.D. (Agency for International Development): Fowler Hamilton, September 30, 1961 to December 7, 1962.

A.I.D.: David E. Bell, December 21, 1962 to July 30, 1966.

A.I.D.: William S. Gaud, July 30, 1966 to —?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the other Senators who have expressed themselves in opposition to the amendment.

To my way of thinking, it is useless year after year after year to play this game of charades on foreign aid, as to whether it should be for 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years. The programs are always the same. The situation is the same. We ought to give the program a fair chance of working.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming will be agreed to.

There would be an annual review by the Appropriations Committee, in any event. That is all that is required.

So I hope we can go back to the multiyear program which is contemplated in the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want to confirm what the Senator from Oregon has said. The reason we brought the bill out last time with a 2-year commitment was that, by an overwhelming vote, it had a termination date; that with the 2 years having expired, the whole operation would expire; that it was time for a restudy of the situation as to what America's responsibility was overseas, and how we could best meet those responsibilities.

We now have an aid program which has grown up faster than Topsy ever hoped to grow. It started in 1948. This is its 19th year. It had an antecedent before that, because back in 1945 we had UNRRA. We had "Bundles for Britain." We even provided Britain moneys which allegedly were loans, but which developed into grants, to say nothing of lend-lease during the war.

So we have invested many billions in this kind of operation, under this type of authorization, without a reexamination, without a reexploration, without a high-level commission to determine how best to meet our various responsibilities, by doing the same monotonous thing, each year, and in each succeeding year probably doing it more ineffectively than in the year before. In this way we have now spent $117 billion in this program.

It is now proposed to examine this program 1 year at a time, rather than to extend it 2 years at a time, without taking any interest in the mistakes which we can examine into and eliminate.

In addition to that, we have spent $14 billion in other world war aid programs and $14 billion in later multilateral arrangements, for a total of $147 billion in this type of program.

All we ask is that at least Congress make sure that we face up to the responsibility we have to the American taxpayers to look at the program each and every year, to scrutinize it, to find out if there are not economies to be made and better procedures and methods to be followed.

No one is suggesting that we can eliminate entirely our foreign assistance program and abdicate our world leadership, but, at the same time, I would think every Senator would be uneasy about spending these billions of dollars with the paucity of information that is available to all of us.

We read in the newspapers that America is in a financial crisis. We read that there are proposals for higher taxes. We read about the high interest rates. We have the highest interest rates in more than three decades. Instead we get the answer, "Please do not bother us with the facts. Our minds are made up. We want to continue."

If we have any sense of responsibility, the least we can do is examine the program a year at a time. Who loses by that? Nobody loses anything. If there is merit in the program, we can appropriate for it. In that way we can authorize or appropriate greater or lesser amounts on the basis of the evidence. But by providing a 2-year extension, we lose the power and the right to correct mistakes that may occur.

We do something worse than that. We create an understandable expectancy in 40 or 50 or 60 or 70 foreign countries that they are going to have an entitlement to part of America's money in their budgetary processes. Those people can read and write. They know what we do. They can read that there is a 2-year promise and a 2-year pledge, and they know that America keeps its word.

I can visualize diplomats in the capitals of the world saying, "We will put so much income aside from taxes, we will put so much aside from license fees, we will borrow so much, but then we can add this much, more to our expenditures, because America will give this much money and Congress has authorized the program.

I cannot think of any more important thing to do, than to carefully scrutinize this AID program when America is in a financial crisis, when we do not know what is going to happen tomorrow, because the world is changing so fast, when we do not really know who our friends are going to be next week. To project this program for more than 1 year at a time under those conditions is to me irresponsibility magnified.

I plead with my colleague in this body to limit the program to a year, so we can look at the whole situation. There are many things wrong with the operation. We continue to do the same things for the same country year after year. It reminds me of the country doctor who prescribed the same medicine for every patient without diagnosis. That is what the McGee amendment proposes. It proposes that we should continue with the same prescription but eliminate the diagnosis. The difficulty is that when the patient is given the same medicine for too long, it loses its potency and effectiveness.

In area after area of the world this program is being run into the ground. In some places it is doing good work, but it needs examination. I think the program needs a whole new approach insofar as America's responsibilities to the rest of the world are concerned. In order to ascertain if the program is doing the necessary job, we ought to undertake to examine, explore, and scrutinize the program every year as to where this money is being spent and how it is being spent. How are we going to stop, for example, the foreign government which needs money for budgetary reasons and when they get their hands on the money and use it for reasons for which AID would deny it, they thumb their noses at the United States. They expect to keep getting the money.

If we give them legitimate reasons for believing that we are going to examine into this program, then there will be a chance to economize in this very expensive area of public expenditures.

When we are confronted with the vast expenses of the Vietnamese war, what is wrong with saying that we will look at this measure every year?

I hope the McGee amendment is resoundingly rejected.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would not want the idea to prevail that Congress shall abdicate its responsibilities under this program. I am as interested as anyone else in seeing that the program is tightened up and seeing to it that every dollar brings as much as possible. Congress does not abdicate its appropriation power by appropriating every dollar for this program in every appropriation bill every year. That power is not changed in one single respect.

Every single part of this program has to be reviewed by the Appropriations Committee before it allocates a single dollar. Therefore, it is not the reckless and irresponsible spending of money and the bypassing of Congress; there is no change in the amendment on that. It simply does what the committee itself recommended a year ago should be done—namely, to recognize that economic development can only be carried on reasonably and effectively, and with economy, if you can make an extended plan for that economic development. Most things are not economically developed in 12 months; it takes a long time. The effort and the planning are cumulative.

But in the proposal, we retain the judgment of Congress to determine whether the program is indeed working, whether it is a good investment, or whether it should be interrupted and money withheld. That power is completely retained by Congress.

I add that only to make sure we are not under any misapprehension as to what Congress is doing. Therefore, I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment, and accept the 2-year authorization principle.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

SENATOR RANDOLPH SUPPORTS 1-YEAR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID AUTHORIZATION; CITES WEST VIRGINIA VOTERS' INSISTENCE ON CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in this debate arguments have been advanced on both sides of the 1-year versus the 2-year authorization.

Mr. President, this matter has caused me genuine concern. I feel, however, that it is necessary for me to vote against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

I bring to the attention of my fellow Senators two considerations of particular importance to the citizens in the State of West Virginia. I believe these same two propositions could also be advanced for many of our people across the Nation.

First, I have heard from many West Virginia citizens a recurring theme, especially of late—and that theme is "congressional responsibility." It is always helpful when our citizens indicate an interest in and appreciation of our obligations to them and to our country. With reference to this point, the statements I have read, over and over in my mail on foreign aid, can be summarized by a quotation from a letter by a concerned constituent:

> We support more—not less—congressional control of the foreign aid program.

Second, it has been stated, and with some merit, that planning on an extended basis has certain advantages over the present 1-year program.

I think it is important that we realize that in planning, there is usually the argument made—and with logic—that we need a longer period of time if the planning is to be effective. But let us consider this particular problem, for, Mr. President, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, under the Economic Opportunity Act, under the National Defense Education Act, and under many of our other vital domestic programs, we allow our citizens, our own institutions, only 1-year proposals.

So, as I have studied these domestic legislative enactments, I have come to the conclusion that in the programs vital to our people here at home, we have been acting in terms of these domestic efforts and the developments within our institutions, usually on the basis of 1-year proposals. It would seem that until we are prepared, and Congress has acted, to extend authorizations for our domestic institutions, businesses and schools, we cannot defend long-term authorization and approval of foreign aid expenditures.

I do not agree with all of the comments in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations as they relate to congressional authority in other areas.

But I must take a firm position here. If we are to be conservative in our supervision of our domestic programs, we cannot then be overliberal with regard to foreign assistance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the last argument of the Senator from Wyoming. He argues now that we should have a 2-year authorization as far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, but only a 1-year program as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned.

The Appropriations Committee is not the authorizing committee. The Appropriations Committee does not have the same responsibility as the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee does not have the same responsibility as the Appropriations Committee.

But apparently, if the argument of the Senator from Wyoming is to be followed, the Foreign Relations Committee is to give up its annual authorization because the Appropriations Committee will act both as an Appropriations Committee and an authorization committee, by way of reviewing the program each year.

Mr. President, one of the reasons we have the specific functions of authorizing given to the so-called legislative committees, such as the Foreign Relations Committee, is to go into the facts and elements that should be considered in an authorization. That is not the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee should have the benefit of the authorizing considerations of the Foreign Relations Committee each year, when it comes to make its decisions as to what the appropriation shall be.

If we do not follow that course of action, then it seems to me the conclusion that must be drawn from the arguments of the Senator from Wyoming is that we ought to turn over to the Appropriations Committee the job of making the authorizing investigation each year, but deny to the Foreign Relations Committee the responsibility, which I think is clearly that of the Foreign Relations Committee, of conducting its hearings that determine what should be the recommendation to the Senate by way of authorization legislation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments of the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Oregon, and others.

It is apparent to me that if we authorize a dam in West Virginia, Oregon, Kentucky, or elsewhere, then we are somewhat at the mercy of the Appropriations Committee to build that dam.

I see no difference here. I think that the administration should have the power to authorize these projects, backed by Congress, as long-term projects, and if we decide to veto them, we always have the Appropriations Committee available to veto them, as they do any project in any State.

I shall support the amendment.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I say to my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, that when we authorize a dam in Oregon or anywhere else, we have to authorize it on the basis of the proof, by the Army Engineers, of the cost-benefit ratio. But we throw millions and millions of dollars away in the foreign aid programs, without any proof of cost-benefit ratio. I submit that what we need to do here is to make a review each year of every part of the program, to implement some of the findings of the Comptroller General, which year after year show the shocking waste of the funds provided in our foreign aid programs.

Mr. MORTON. The proof is required before the authorization. I trust the Appropriations Committee to be sufficiently astute, if sufficient proof is not offered, to cut off the aid.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, could not be more grievously wrong when he thinks that the Committee on Appropriations is getting the benefit of the same kind of evidence on the projects which we authorize abroad that we insist on getting for every single project which we authorize and appropriate money for at home.

As the Senator from Oregon pointed out, those projects are studied by the Corps of Engineers. They are examined by witnesses. We insist on a cost-benefit ratio, and we have a mathematical calculation as to what is to be done. This is not done with respect to foreign aid. Someone comes up with generalities and says that some country ought to have some money and that we will build some projects for them. Most of us do not even know what the projects are. There is not enough time to examine them item by item by either the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Foreign Relations.

When we have another chance to look into the matter and have a longer period of time, we do begin to find out some of the facts, as we did in the India steel mill loan. We finally rejected that because we had time enough and opportunity enough to find out how many fallacies were involved in that project.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator would certainly find out about the cost-benefit ratio involved in a dam in South Dakota and I would do the same thing for a dam in Kentucky.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORTON. Why can we not find out about one in India?

Mr. MUNDT. We did finally find out after a great deal of quibbling. We did get some kind of calculations on the steel mill. If we had only one in India we could perhaps do so, but when we are shoveling the money out by multibillions of dollars a year all over the world and beginning to shore up some of the projects that we are already involved in, it becomes an impossibility.

I am very much surprised by my congenial friend, the Senator from Wyoming, who believes in traffic safety, but who is proposing that we run this expensive foreign aid machine by the use of the old-fashioned two-wheel brakes instead of four-wheel brakes. He wants to eliminate part of our check. He want to cut big holes in the screen. Instead of having the Foreign Relations Committee, which specializes in these projects, take a look at the matter, he states that they will do it every 2 years, and that the Appropriations Committee will assume the annual responsibility.

I have had some experience as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I happen to be the only member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who also serves on the Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with the State Department.

I know something about how that operates. They resolve the issue in the Committee on Foreign Relations by saying, "We do not have to worry. We will authorize so much and the Committee on Appropriations will cut it down."

Then I sit on the Committee on Appropriations, and I put on my other hat. The argument then from the administration is, "You have already authorized the amount. We have a commitment with foreign countries. It must not be reduced."

In such a case I am caught in a withering crossfire like a green wing Teel, on a duck pass on the opening day of the hunting season. I feel that what we need is more, not fewer, available brakes.

Let us not go back to the old-fashioned two-wheel brake automobile in these days of traffic safety. Let us apply to this situation now all of the good judgment, all of the prudence, and all of the opportunity for examination that we can bring to bear as we deal with this very vexing problem of seeing how we can meet our foreign obligations abroad most economically and most effectively.

I think the Senate will act in good conscience and will meet its responsibilities best by voting against the McGee amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, together with Senators FONG, HARRIS, INOUYE, MOSS, NELSON, and DOUGLAS, I sponsored the 2-year amendment.

I was very glad to have the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] take over as members of the committee. However, now that the amendment is challenged in this way, I think it is only fair that I speak a word in behalf of the amendment. I believe that our discussion has gone rather far afield. Although my beloved colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] says that elementary and secondary education is provided for 1 year, we have half a dozen programs that are multiyear programs. We have higher education, manpower training, and many other smaller programs, such as aid to delinquent youth and other programs, that extend for 2, 3, or 4 years.

I have been a member of many conference committees which have authorized such a time limitation.

This is done for efficiency of operation. The two-wheel argument that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] advances involves forecasting the plans for 1 year. Senator PASTORE has already pointed out that when we finish the process, we have about 8 or 9 months remaining.

We are thus crowding our administrators with enormous amounts of money that we want them to spend with judiciousness, but we give them no time to be judicious and no amplitude to work with other countries to make the program judicious. We are defeating ourselves.

Mention was made of business. I am supposed to know something about the operation of business. American Telephone & Telegraph, General Motors, or any other important corporation would not do what we do in dealing with these authorizations. They would not let their people plan ahead for 8 or 9 months. They forecast their programs for 10 years. That is what the big corporations think of the way in which to run a railroad. They deal with business in terms of years ahead.

The Committee on Appropriations has a duty. The authorizing committee has a duty. We have granted multiyear authorizations on foreign aid on previous occasions for very good reasons. We did it in the development loan fund and in the Alliance for Progress.

We have come down to the 1-year basis as an expression of dissatisfaction. That is what the distinguished chairman of the committee says in effect. He says, "I am unhappy with this program. I do not like what somebody said out in Asia." It happens that the occupant of the chair is the one who made the remarks, but that is not the issue.

The issue before us is not whether we are happy or unhappy with the program. If we are unhappy, we will vote against it. If we are happy, we will vote for it.

The issue is the most efficient way to administer the program, and the most efficient way is not to provide for an 8- or 9-month basis. It is not to be suspicious that the Committee on Foreign Relations is improvident and that the Committee on Appropriations is also improvident. If that is the case, we are all wasting our time. We have no business to pass any legislation.

I must assume that I have enough brains to vote yea or nay if someone moves to cut the appropriation. I will demand proof, and I will not go to sleep and become somnambulant because this is a 2-year program. When it comes to negotiations with foreign countries—and that is really what the Senator has in mind—those countries are very much handicapped on foreign aid. We cannot even tell them what we will do after the next 8 or 9 months. That is unfortunately the situation at the present time.

For those reasons, because the checks and balances are maintained by appropriation and by legislative oversight and my shaking our finger at the administration—which we often do and get very good results—we ought to be reasonably efficient and request some kind of a multiyear authorization. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for a long time. However, I should like to make a couple of comments.

I have been one of those Senators that through the entire time that I have been in the Senate have supported foreign aid, and more vigorously than some of my colleagues.

I have also been one of those who have from time to time supported multiyear authorizations.

I think that something needs to be said to clear up the matter with respect to the argument of the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Oregon, and others with respect to this matter.

I believe that there is no one who feels basically that this program is entirely on the right track. Questions come up every year with regard to this matter, questions which give grave concern to all.

I think we need to understand that the proposition we are discussing here has become confused. The functions of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations are two entirely different things. It is not, for example, the province of the Committee on Appropriations basically, though it may do so, to go into matters of policy.

How has the administration of foreign aid affected our policy with respect to Latin America or with respect to European countries or with respect to Near Eastern countries?

This is not the basic function of the Committee on Appropriations. I say this without in any way detracting from the extensive responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations: We do not have the staff to perform the functions which should be performed in the supervision of this appropriation. If we are going to perform this function, if we are in fact going to take the place of the Committee on Foreign Relations for 1 year out of 2, a drastic change would be necessary in the staffing, in the meetings, and in the investigation of the Committee on Appropriations.

That can be done, of course. But I believe it is the function of the Committee on Foreign Relations to determine whether loans, for example, were made properly, whether they were not made properly, whether more money should go to another area. This is their function. And then it is the function of the Committee on Appropriations, after that, to decide how much shall be appropriated, subject to the consent and the will of the Senate.

It has been said that we would be handicapped in our dealings with other countries if the 2-year authorization is not granted. That is not so. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota brought this out very ably. If a 2-year authorization were in effect, Congress almost inevitably would be put in the position of appropriating and supporting that authorization with funds. If the Department of State, in dealing with country X, said, "Well, we have this much money authorized for next year," and then it took particular action, how could Congress turn around and say to the Department of State, "We are sorry, but we are not going to give you the money for it"?

Actually, I believe our bargaining position with other countries could be strengthened without the 2-year authorization, at least until the whole foreign assistance program had progressed to the stage where we felt that we had it under control, where we felt that it would be a vital instrument in the foreign policy of this Government, and where we felt that it would be a vital instrument which the President could wield for the benefit of the foreign policy of this country. That foreign policy, of course, is for the benefit of the American people.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am compelled to vote this year against the proposed amendment, because I have changed my mind and my feeling from past times.

I might also add that last year the 2-year authorization that was adopted by the Senate was contingent upon a study of the whole foreign aid program, and that the present foreign aid program terminate at the end of 2 years. It was anticipated that a new and completely revised foreign aid proposal would be presented to Congress at the end of 2 years, and the primary function of 2-year authorization was to grant the study commission time to do a thorough analysis of our present foreign program and formulate a new proposal. However, that provision was deleted in conference.

If we are not to have such a study, I should like to see this whole matter gone into thoroughly year by year by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe we would come up with a policy, with respect to our foreign assistance, which would be of far more aid to this country and to the President in the implementation of his foreign policy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the 2-year authorization, chiefly upon the grounds which have been so well argued by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported a bill abolishing foreign aid, nor has it recommended that its bill be defeated. I assume that what the Committee on Foreign Relations is attempting to do is to assure the most economical, the least wasteful, and the most useful and effective operation of the foreign aid program—and with this purpose I agree.

But, I believe the 1-year authorization which the committee recommends will have exactly the reverse effect. I say that for these reasons. I do not believe that a foreign aid program attempting to secure maximum economic and agricultural growth can be operated successfully upon a 1-year authorization. Economic growth and development plans call, in their large sense, for hydroelectric plants, dams, reservoirs, iron foundries, concrete factories, the development of highways and railroads, and all such facilities that are essential for the economic growth of a developing country.

No enterprise in our own country could possibly develop a program for its own industry upon such a basis as 1 year.

Today, the President, Congress, and many private associations throughout our country are talking about the shortage of food in the world and the necessity for speedy agricultural development. For the United States cannot supply the world with food indefinitely. But to develop agriculturally, fertilizer plants must be constructed, chemicals purchased abroad. Provision must be made for the importation of oil or other fuels to run the plants and all this cannot be done in a year.

The United States has a persistent balance-of-payments problem, although with rather adequate resources so far as our normal trade is concerned. But the developing countries have small reserves, and they must manage their limited reserves carefully and look beyond 1 year. It is beyond reason to think that a country would commit its reserves to the construction of an industrial project of any magnitude or to agricultural development when it did not know that the project could be completed.

A 1-year authorization is self-defeating, if our purpose is to have an effective aid program. In past years, I have spoken for an effective aid program. A year ago, I argued that it would be best to discontinue the aid program for 6 months or a year, to review its operation country by country. In 1964 I proposed an amendment, which was adopted by the Congress, addressed to the very point the Senator from South Dakota spoke of a while ago: my amendment recommended that the President establish an independent commission composed of outstanding citizens, some from the administration, and some from private life, to examine specifically our aid programs in every country and to recommend whether the aid program in each country should be abolished, continued, and how improved. Congress adopted the amendment, the President appointed a committee, and I hope that committee will make its report to Congress, as well as to the President.

If we want to abolish the aid program, that is one thing. If we want to reduce the authorization, that is one thing. But I do not believe, from some experience and commonsense, that we can have an effective aid program based upon a 1-year authorization. I say with great respect for the Committee on Foreign Relations that if the committee can tell us specific countries that should not be aided, I believe we would listen to the committee with great respect and strike the countries. If it can pursue its investigations—and I think it can—and tell us in what respects aid should be prohibited or improved in any country, I know that we would listen to the committee. But it does neither. It will accomplish nothing, except to make the program more ineffective, to maintain it for 1 year.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, continuity and unity of purpose must be the hallmarks of an effective foreign assistance program. If that program is to achieve its goal of a better world tomorrow—it must move with persistence to change many of the social and economic conditions of today.

Three Presidents, numerous presidential study commissions, and at least several congressional committees have recognized this necessity which they translated into forceful recommendations. Let me give you some examples.

President Eisenhower said in 1957:

> I believe our common objective can best be accomplished through a long-term authorization of appropriations . . . obviously sound economic development is not a year to year undertaking, but a continuing process.

A study prepared in 1957 at the University of Chicago for the U.S. Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, stated:

> An economic aid program must be conceived as a long-run enterprise, and some guaranty of its duration is as important as is the total magnitude of the program. For . . . the process of economic development takes times, and the execution of an effective development plan requires a fairly high degree of assurance that sufficient funds will become available as the program unfolds in coming years.

In the Economic Assistance Programs and Administration, published in 1959, we find this statement:

> The effectiveness of economic aid can be greatly increased if the principal programs aimed at development—Development Loan Fund lending, technical assistance, and surplus agricultural commodity aid—are authorized and funded on a longer-range basis than at present. . . . The present annual authorization for technical assistance does not provide an adequate basis for a continuing program, and continuing legislative authorization is desirable.

The Agency for International Development was established in 1962 because of these recommendations and others that were equally strong. Yet, for the past 4 years, we have ignored the main reason for creating that Agency: To foster a continuing and coherent program of foreign assistance.

Last week, the House of Representatives fulfilled a promise to the Senate. For in last year's conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, the House managers promised to review with special care the concept of multiyear authorizations for the 1966 AID bill. The House did this—and after long consideration, decided that the Senate had charted a wise course the year before.

I agree. I think the Senate acted wisely last year. I am anxious that we follow through on the course we charted earlier.

By its very nature, an economic aid program is incredibly complex. For such a program is aimed at bringing to less developed societies the advantages of the 20th century just as rapidly as possible. To do this, an economic aid program must employ the latest techniques of management and planning. Like a modern business, both the nation giving assistance and the developing nation that receives it must have the opportunity to plan for the future with purpose and foresight. In fact, both must work and plan together. For successful development can only be the product of partnership—a partnership in planning and working for the world of tomorrow.

Mr. President, a foreign aid program that is less efficient—and therefore less effective—than it need be, goes contrary to our national interest. It means a waste in time, money, and energy—a waste the United States and the world can ill afford.

The job of helping the developing nations become self-sufficient is urgent and essential. To lend the most useful helping hand, we must discard antiquated methods—and especially the single-year authorization to which we have clung. Indeed, a multiyear authorization for our aid program will allow for necessary planning ahead. This is why I support the amendment for a 2-year authorization that is before the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FANNIN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HARTKE (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] would each vote "yea."

The position of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] has been previously stated.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 144 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Fong
Harris
Hart
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—48

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Canon
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Bass
Brewster
Case
Dodd
Fannin
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Neuberger
Scott
Smathers
Sparkman
Tydings

So Mr. MCGEE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in announcing the overall budget results for fiscal 1966, today, the President warned against excessive spending in 1967. The deficit for fiscal 1966 was more than $4 billion below the level predicted in the January budget document. This is a tremendous accomplishment in the space of 6 short months. But unless we in the Congress exercise restraint, the 1967 deficit, far from being reduced, will be sharply raised.

The President sent up a budget calling for $112.8 billion in expenditures. Several major additions have already been made to that budget: the cold war GI bill added $255 million to the budget proposals; the July 1 effective date of the civilian and military pay bills added almost $500 million.

The two appropriation bills which have been enacted call for small cuts in the President's budget. But other appropriation and authorization actions are now underway which could add billions to the President's budget.

Various committees of the House and Senate are in the process of adding large amounts—as much as $4 to $5 billion—to the President's budget requests in education, water pollution control, agriculture, and in other fields.

If you subtract from the President's 1967 budget, defense expenditures and expenditures for such noncontrollable items as interest on the public debt and veterans' pensions, there are only some $22 to $23 billion left. If we add $3 to $5 billion to the budget, there just is not room in this total to make offsetting reductions elsewhere.

We all know that it may be necessary to provide extra funds for the conduct of the war in Vietnam. If, in addition, we add to the budget billions of dollars in civilian programs, we have voted ourselves either inflation or a large tax increase. One of those two consequences is sure to follow.

In recent months the economy has grown a little more slowly than it had last winter and early spring. Some of the inflationary pressure has been removed by the decline in auto sales and housing starts. Prices have risen more slowly—primarily because the rise in industrial prices has been masked by the fall in farm prices. But these economic developments provide no warrant for raising budget expenditures and increasing budget deficits.

The President has asked businessmen and labor leaders to exercise restraint in their wage and price policies. He has asked business firms to defer some of their investment plans in the interest of easing inflationary pressures. He has also asked the Congress to refrain from adding substantial sums to his budget.

I urge all of my colleagues to heed the President's request. Congress, of course, will and must exercise its prerogative of reviewing the President's budget requests and making adjustments in his proposals. But let us make balanced adjustments. Let us exercise responsibility along with prerogatives. Let us join with the President in developing a fiscal policy which meets the needs of the times. And in view of the inflationary pressures in the economy, the times call for prudence, for restraint, for responsibility.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and I ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new subsection:
>
> "(f) (I) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:
>
> " '(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country is indebted to any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, and such government, government agency, or government subdivision fails to consent, within six months after the making of a request therefor, to have the claim of such United States citizen or corporation, partnership, or association submitted to arbitration under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes ratified by the United States on June 1, 1966.'
>
> "(2) The provisions of this subsection shall take effect immediately upon the date the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes shall enter into force with respect to the United States."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is a great many years ago that I came before the Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with a claim of an American citizen against the Republic of Haiti. In this case, it happened to be an engineering and architectural firm which had not only completed 300 houses in Porto Prince but the houses had also been accepted by the Government, which was collecting rents from the properties but refused to pay the architect and the engineer what was rightfully due them, including interest on borrowed money.

I do not know how long we shepherded that claim through the State Department before it was finally adjudicated, because the former President of Haiti, as everyone remembers, absconded with the funds of his country and has not been heard from since. However, that was no reason why Haiti should not pay its just debts.

It so happens that was an adjusted debt. The claim had been fully ascertained and, therefore, there was nothing else to do except to pay it. But it was difficult to secure payment, and at that time I authored a proposal in the nature of an amendment to the Foreign Aid Act making a provision that aid should be withheld until they paid their just claims. These claims have arisen from time to time.

Some time back, another one came to my attention which does not happen to be from my State. I am rather reluctant always to get too deeply into claims of that kind, but this one had some merit. I think something should be done to prevent our citizens from being harassed and to prevent the inconveniences constantly imposed upon them.

This latter case happens to be one where Federal money in the form of an AID loan and grant was used in Iran for the purpose of building a sawmill. They built a perfectly good sawmill, but could not find anyone to operate it; and so the project became something of a fizzle. They finally discovered a man in California by the name of Fairhurst, but he insisted on having a contract for the operation of the mill.

This was the contract under which he was to receive 50 percent of the profits. He knew all about lumber, timber, how to saw it up into usable sizes in dimension lumber. The net result was that it became something of a gold mine, and I am afraid a few folks in Iran decided that this was too much of a one-way street and the question became: What to do about Mr. Fairhurst. At long last, they made life rather miserable for him. They refused to pay him all or any part of his claim.

Now I think there is merit on both sides, in the sense that probably the original claim was entirely too high. I presume Mr. Fairhurst made some token capital investment, perhaps $300,000 or $400,000. Generally speaking, the money was AID money, so that is where it was left.

When Mr. Fairhurst was compelled to terminate his contract, all he requested was reimbursement and compensation. That was not forthcoming, so that he had to make trips from California to Iran and back with no results. I think on one or two occasions they told him that if he came back they would put him in jail. Of course, if he were so immobilized, he would be in very difficult circumstances indeed. Well, it was about that time when this claim came to my attention, and I began to discuss it with the State Department. I do not know how many times we discussed it. I have discussed it with AID officials, including Mr. Bell, who came to my office only last week.

Now it appears that the Iranian Government recognizes that there is a claim. They have made an offer. Mr. Fairhurst, on the other hand, has come down in his demands, but he does not believe that the Iranian Government will pay him quite enough.

The question then is, When one cannot bring the parties together, where does he go to arbitrate the claims? One might go to the International Court, but that is a long drawn-out controversy. One might go to the International Chamber of Commerce. I do not know whether they have been too successful in the arbitration of these claims. My understanding is that during the past year they have had but a single claim before them.

But now, on the 1st of June of this year, the Senate approved a convention which deals with the settlement of international disputes and which sets up an arbitration board in the World Bank. That would be ideal because nearly every country is a participant and subscriber to the capital stock of the World Bank.

If, then, they have an arbitration board, that would be the logical place to go. Thus, the amendment states that if there is a request to go to that board for an arbitration of the claim, and if within 6 months there is a refusal on the part of either party to do so, then, of course, the interdiction upon aid from this country comes into play and we stop giving aid until that claim is adjusted. That works no hardship on either side. I think it is perfectly fair. It is not a threat particularly. It is only that a country should pay its proper debts to a citizen of the United States when that citizen has been willing to go before an arbitration board which, by a vote of the Senate, in a convention of a class B treaty has already given its approval. That is all it says.

I am rather distressed, I regret to say, that these things have to be done. I wish they could settle the differences without having to appeal to governments. But in this case it happens that the sawmill was built with AID money and it was built for the Iranian Government.

Certainly, under the circumstances, Mr. Fairhurst has no choice except to make an appeal to some branch of government for assistance.

Now, Mr. President, that is the whole story. I earnestly hope that the chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference, and if it needs any retouching or repair I will be very glad to concur, provided of course, that it does not destroy the substance and the effect of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to endorse the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I have yielded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted the Senator from Illinois to yield to me first. I heard about this case before. The Senator knows that on general principles, I have objected in the past to using aid to accomplish an ulterior and irrelevant purpose.

We have engaged in some severe arguments on various other amendments—not this one, which is a little more closely related to the operation of AID than some of the agencies referred to. There is some difficulty about it, in that I do not suppose Iran—I do not know—but it is not yet a member of the convention of settlement of investment disputes. The Senate ratified it only recently.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know whether the people feel that this was being arbitrary in bringing it in. In other words, it is a question of, does it answer the purpose. That is a matter on which I do not have an opinion at the moment. This was not submitted to me. I know about the claim, but I am not sure that this is the wise way to go about collecting it. However, I agree with the merits of the claim and what the Senator has told me, that it should be settled. It is a valid claim. I am in favor of doing anything reasonable that would help to get it settled. Speaking for myself, I would be willing to take the amendment to conference, and have further consultation on it, if it is a wise way to proceed. If not, then with an amendment on investment disputes, or perhaps some other section can be thought of, if the Senator has any additional thoughts. But I think it may be inappropriate if they are not members.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Somebody may suggest a different course, but in examining the available courses, this one looks like the one more readily accessible. It takes a given number of ratifying countries before it comes into effect, even if Iran does not ratify. Then there is actually a world arbitration board, where an interested person can go. I think the convention will be ratified.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I heartily endorse the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. In fact, I shall be happy to join as a cosponsor of the amendment, if the Senator will so honor me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would be happy to have the Senator sponsor the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Illinois is offering the amendment not solely because of the fairness of the case he refers to; he is offering it because some foreign countries refuse to pay just debts to American investors, yet ask AID money to carry out programs very similar to programs we are urging private investors to invest their money in.

I shall have something to say about the Fairhurst case in a moment.

We often hear statements about international procedures through international law, through making use of the law, for the settlement of good-faith disputes that arise between the United States and other governments, or between governments and citizens. This is in the same family of problems, it seems to me, that was contemplated when the Hickenlooper amendment was under consideration and was adopted in regard to the obligations of foreign governments in expropriating American property in their countries without paying just compensation therefor.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made a very constructive suggestion with this amendment. I am happy to endorse and sponsor it.

It is no new position for the Senator from Oregon. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Oregon has always backed the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] with regard to the Hickenlooper amendment. I have from time to time on the floor of the Senate sought to expand the objectives of the Hickenlooper amendment in cases of private investors.

There are many trouble spots in the world where we have let down our own American investors in not doing everything that can be done to collect the fair amount of money due them. If this country continues to pour out foreign aid by the billions of dollars, it is not right, and it gives more and more cause for legitimate criticisms of AID.

In my judgment, AID has not been at all cooperative in these problems. As I have raised these questions with AID, I have felt AID took the attitude that these were problems involving American citizens that had at best nuisance value, because it made it difficult for AID in its diplomatic relations with the country which was going to get aid. In my opinion, in many cases it was aid that was foisted on the country, rather than given on the basis of a record that the country really needed it.

I think the pending amendment is sorely needed in order to improve AID practices, if not AID policies. It has become the unusual policy of AID not to be of assistance in these cases as it should be. We must have this kind of restrictive legislation that leaves no room for doubt as to how Congress stands with regard to investments of American investors.

This is no new position for the Senator from Oregon. Last year, when we were considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, I brought to the attention of the Senate a new type of expropriation instigated by the Government of Venezuela. It was with reluctance, but out of necessity and conviction, that I proposed that the Alliance for Progress program be reduced by $100 million, in order to bring about a change in attitude in Latin America, in regard to sitting down and trying with us to arrive at a better understanding. As I have long mentioned, if a sovereign foreign government wishes to condemn property, that is its right of sovereignty. However, such condemnation should be compensated for and the private owner should be paid just and reasonable compensation.

I recall that last year, in Senate Report No. 708, relating to the foreign assistance and related agencies appropriation bill of 1966, the attention of the Appropriations Committee had been "directed to a situation in Iran where there had been a flagrant violation of the rights and interest of an American concern by the Iranian Government."

The Senator from Illinois speaks of the problem on the floor of the Senate today, but it was a problem that was with us last year. As Senators know, the AID people had their attention called to it last year. The fact of the matter is that the AID people did not show any willingness to take those administrative steps that would be helpful in this problem.

The Senate Appropriations Committee at that time expressed their desire that the State Department vigorously pursue this matter and secure a prompt and equitable settlement. Mr. President, this concern of Congress was expressed nearly a year ago. Since that time I understand that the Iranian Government has continued to refuse to arbitrate the claim of Fairhurst Technical Services International, a California corporation, wholly owned by American citizens. Nevertheless, it is a lumber concern with a history of operations in my State. I am very familiar with the concern and the part it has played in the development of the American lumber industry. It was an appropriate company for the Iranian Government to seek to bring to Iran its techniques and technology for the development of a sawmill in Iran.

In my minority views that I have attached to the Foreign Relations Committee report on S. 3584, I stated:

> The only realistic test of sound economic aid is results. The major way to test results is to measure them against what was planned or anticipated when an aid program was begun. When the results fail to measure up, Congress must write corrective measures into the program, for the American people will not support permanently a multibillion dollar program that does not reduce what is advertised for it.

The expropriation of the property interest in Iran of Fairhurst Technical Services International, which has again been brought to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished minority leader, is an excellent example of a previous aid program which has not produced what had been advertised. A sawmill project in northwestern Iran on the Caspian Sea was initiated in 1954 with approximately $1 million in U.S. grant support.

The Senator from Illinois has pointed out this is AID money. It is by way of getting AID money that the Iranian Government seeks to deny just compensation for the seizure of the property concerned. AID is in this over its neck. It has had a responsibility to make it perfectly clear to the Iranian Government that it is not going to get the cooperation of AID while this act of banditry is practiced over an American concern by the Iranian Government.

Construction of a complete and modern sawmill was near completion in 1959. However, between 1959 and 1964 the mill was never more than barely operational, because the Iranians were inexperienced in sawmill operations and management. During 1962 and 1963 AID attempted to persuade expert and experienced U.S. lumber and sawmill operators to come to Iran and insure that the sawmill plant was operated properly. To this end AID officials persuaded the Fairhurst group to negotiate with the Iranian Government and to operate under contract the sawmill which had essentially not been operating, but for the most part standing idle for nearly 4 years.

I wish to point out that AID was a part of this whole arrangement, provided the money in the first place, sought out the Fairhurst people of California to go over there and try to salvage the operation.

There was no question about a sound plant being developed, but the difficulty was that the Iranians just did not have the skill and the ability, among the people put in charge of the plant, to operate it efficiently and profitably.

The Fairhurst group is a well-known name in sawmill operations throughout the State of Oregon, and at one time were constituents of mine. They have moved to California.

On May 4, 1964, the Fairhurst group entered into a long-term contract with a wholly-owned entity of the Iranian Government. From June 1964 to January 1965, the Fairhurst group completed the construction of this sawmill, began an extensive training and management program of Iranian citizens, and had the sawmill operating efficiently and productively. However, on January 20, 1965, the Iranian Government unilaterally canceled their agreement with the Fairhurst group, expropriated their property and took physical control of the plant by use of armed Iranian troops in flagrant violation of their contract. They just moved in and took over. The Iranian Government has since refused to arbitrate this matter in violation of every accepted principle of international law. They just want to keep what they took. I do not think we ought to be pouring more AID money into Iran, when we are dealing with what I have properly referred to as that type of international banditry, in this instance, against a reputable American investor.

Mr. President, this case is an example of an AID project which in theory is sound but which in practice is unsound, as well as an example of a gross violation of international law by the Government of Iran. It would appear to me that this is an instance where section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may have to be invoked by the President.

I, for my part, would hope and trust that the Iranian Government would see fit to offer full and adequate compensation to the American Fairhurst group. In addition, I would urge that AID officials take note of this unfortunate case history and would insure that moneys would not be spent in the future on building plants in underdeveloped countries, without strong assurance and provision for efficient and productive operation of such plants once they have been built. As I have often mentioned, our aid to underdeveloped countries should be designed to be an integral part of their economic development program, and not white elephants that may dot remote countrysides throughout the world.

Now the Senator from Illinois comes forward with a proposed amendment to this bill. I think it is completely sound in its objectives. It is not an amendment offered merely to meet the Iranian situation. It is an amendment that provides for an arbitration procedure, under the existing convention, that is perfectly sound and gives at least some hope, may I say, to American investors, that they will not have their pockets picked by a foreign government which at the same time is filling its pockets with AID money.

I think this is a fair amendment from the standpoint of the protection of our American investor. I think it is a needed amendment also in order to serve clear notice on the AID people that Congress does not intend to stand by and see AID approving projects in countries that are following the type of international banditry to which I have referred.

We owe that to our American investors; but we owe something else. I think we owe a restatement of our belief in the need for exporting economic freedom to these underdeveloped countries—which is our private enterprise system—and we cannot, in my judgment, justify exporting it unless our investors know that we will back them up by an amendment such as this.

I heartily endorse the amendment, and I certainly hope the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, under whom I serve on that committee, will, as already indicated, take this amendment to a conference, and that the Senate will approve of that action.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have been familiar with this claim for more than a year. I have, on a number of occasions talked to our authorities about it, in an effort to find some way to require the Iranian Government to make a settlement.

If I am correct, as I recall one of the positions the Iranian Government takes, when we undertook to try to settle on the basis of the contract that they entered into, they took the position that the contract is invalid, and therefore they are merely condescending to even consider any kind of a claim.

I certainly associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I join the sponsor of the amendment, the distinguished minority leader, in supporting it. I must say that I hope—I do not wish to just make a plea that it be taken to conference—that it is adopted. If it is worth anything, let us not say merely "take it to conference." I say, let us agree to the amendment, and keep it in the bill. If it is just a matter of taking it to conference to make another idle gesture, we are simply wasting our time. If we are going to help these countries, when we talk about exporting freedom and the free enterprise system, in dealing with such problems I think we should try to export a little integrity of government as well—that when they make a contract, they should live up to it. If they are not going to live up to it, I do not think we should have a disposition to grant further aid.

Mr. MORSE. May I say to the Senator from Arkansas, when I referred to taking it to a conference, I meant that we should fight for it, and that it stay in the bill. I believe this is a must amendment, if we are to have a foreign aid bill at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator. But remarks have been made here that we take it to conference, with the implication that that would satisfy our obligation in the matter. I do not think so. I think we ought to enact it into law, and then I think the law should be observed.

As to this idea, when we give aid to foreign countries when they cannot operate a project, and sending our people over there under a contract to try to show them and train them how to operate it, and to develop their resource—which would have been done, as I understand it—and develop it for them profitably, and doing profitably, not only for them, but for the American investor who is over there, and then have them simply go out there with bayonets and take over the property and drive the American investor away, without offering any compensation, and take the position that "If we even talk to you about it, or even consider a claim at all, we are condescending to do it, we do not owe anything"—I think it is time for the American Government to step in, and it is time for Congress to express itself on these matters, and let the record show that we do not intend and do not propose to give aid to countries that cannot have greater respect for their integrity and their obligations, and cannot show some consideration to our Government, when we have citizens who look to our Government to protect their rights.

I completely support the amendment. I hope it will be agreed to, and I hope it will be retained in the bill. As has been said here, it not only applies to this claim, but is applicable to others that may arise, and will serve as a warning in our dealings with other governments in the future—a warning to them that we expect them to meet their obligations and to be responsible in receiving our aid and in dealing with American citizens.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have known of this case for 2 years. I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and, if possible, become a cosponsor of the amendment. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon, who spoke so eloquently.

This is a good solution in this particular case. It also seems to me that the Senator from Illinois has found an instrument that we have long needed in order to settle so many of these claims which arise from time to time.

Over a year and a half have passed since the Government of Iran expropriated its contract with Fairhurst Technical Service International. Since this is a California corporation, I naturally have a great interest in this case, but even if it were not a California corporation, it would be of concern to me.

If we are to be successful in our foreign aid program, it is clear that we will need the help and cooperation of private enterprise. Yet, it is also clear that if we tolerate the kind of action by a foreign government as occurred in this case, private industry will not be inclined to make further ventures in assisting foreign countries, nor will the taxpayers of our country look kindly on sending aid to countries which shut the door to American investment.

Last year the Senate Appropriations Committee expressed its deep concern with the Fairhurst incident when it stated in Senate Report No. 708:

> This incident has disturbed the Committee. The rights and interests of American nationals are being prejudiced. The Committee is determined that these rights of American citizens dealing abroad must be respected. The Committee expects the State Department vigorously to pursue this matter and to secure a prompt and equitable settlement.

Unfortunately, as of this date, and despite efforts on the part of many Members of this body, the Fairhurst Corp., the State Department, and AID, the Iranian Government, remains adamant and refuses to make a fair and equitable settlement.

We in the Congress are therefore left with a difficult decision. Are we going to permit the expropriation of American property, insofar as I know, without justification? If we answer this question in the negative, and I am sure my colleagues will agree, then we again have the unpleasant duty of taking steps to see that our Government expresses its disapproval in a tangible way by denying to the Government expropriating the property of American private firms any benefits of our foreign aid program.

I, therefore, strongly support the amendment denying foreign assistance to the Government of Iran, and I hope this amendment will pass.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I join in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I am quite interested in the protection of American investment, especially because we, as a country and as a government, have encouraged American investors to go abroad in many of these countries and invest their funds. Then, when they have their property confiscated, we do not go to their rescue.

The amendment referred to by the Senator from Oregon as the Hickenlooper amendment is the amendment which refers to the withdrawal of aid from a country which confiscates the property of American citizens without proper compensation.

There is a provision in that amendment that refers not only to the seizure or confiscation or expropriation of physical properties, but also to the abrogation of contracts. That provision is already in the law.

I believe personally that the law covers this situation. If we succeed in getting AID and the State Department and the administration to apply the law, which we have been trying to do for some time, there will be no problem. I have had some familiarity with this case.

I think that the Senator from Illinois has been extremely helpful in establishing a new mechanism for the speedy determination of the damages or loss involved in the abrogation of a contract or the seizure of property under a contract.

For that reason I think it is a further step in the right direction and an essential step. We do hope that, some day in the perhaps dim, distant future, we can get the administrator of this program and the State Department itself to do something to give American enterprise and American investors in a foreign country an even shake. They have failed to do it so far.

I think this amendment is essential, along with the other amendment. The Senator from Oregon referred a moment ago to the so-called Hickenlooper amendment. There is a provision contained in that amendment which includes action in the event of the abrogation of a contract.

I think the situation is already covered in the law from the standpoint of statutory provision, but the Senator from Illinois has gone a step further and provided a more usable mechanism, a mechanism to arrive more quickly at the amount of damages and the assessment of damages in this case.

I think it is very constructive. I give every assurance that if I happen to be on the conference committee on this bill, I will be right in there holding out for the retention of this provision in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 653

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], Amendment No. 653.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:
>
> "(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "'(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds and reports within thirty days of such finding to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and further that such assistance will neither directly nor indirectly assist aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic.'"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is exactly the language of the provision which was agreed to in the other body with relation to the United Arab Republic.

I debated this at great length yesterday when the question arose as to the various amendments I would offer to the bill. I hope very much that the Senator from Arkansas will be able to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

This amendment, if agreed to, would give the President the latitude for which the President has already contended in this matter. At the same time, it would meet the urgent feeling of many of us that such action is needed. It is really unbelievable what President Nasser and the United Arab Republic do to us. They act in defiance of all our policies. They maintain large troop strength at Yemen and are the bane of existence for all their Arab neighbors.

I went into great detail yesterday on this subject, and I shall not detain the Senate any longer by detailing it again.

This amendment would put the Senate and the House on record as to our deep feelings over the fact that there is a very sharp challenge as to the wisdom of extending any aid to the United Arab Republic, and the President would be put to the responsibility of justifying the extension of such aid. He has done it before, and he may do it again. It would keep the pressure on, and the situation requires it very urgently.

I hope very much under the circumstances that the amendment will be agreed to. This is exactly the same provision that was agreed to in the other body. I hope that the Senator from Arkansas will be able to accept the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have opposed in the past amendments of this character on the general principle that the legislative body ought not to take gratuitous slaps at any foreign country, because such action would have more of a permanent nature. We should not do these things. Obviously, our executive branch and its diplomatic service can bring about changes in the policy of such countries:

President Nasser has done things in Yemen of which I am sure all Senators disapprove. There are many valid reasons for this, but nonetheless it seems to me that the report of the findings of the President should be to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, rather than to the President of the Senate.

The President of the Senate, after all, is the Vice President of the United States, and practically a part of the administration.

I think that to make the provision useful at all, in conformity with the usual requirements, it should provide that the President should report his findings to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JAVITS. That is agreeable with me. It would have to conform to the House language. If we were to do that, there would have to be a change in the House bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is customary for the President to report to the Speaker of the House. That is customary in nearly all of their bills. However, in our practice, it is customary to report to the appropriate committee. The Speaker of the House is a Member of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I modify my amendment as follows:

> In line 7, strike the word "Senate," and insert the words, "the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, not the chairman—the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JAVITS. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly, to insert between the word "the" and the word "Senate," on line 7, the words "Committee on Foreign Relations of the".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas feel that I should do the same thing as to the House provision? Otherwise, there will be a problem of dignity, and so on.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I do not believe the Senator from New York should bother with the House provision. That is for the House to determine.

The difference is that the Speaker is a Member of the House, a full-fledged Member, and the Vice President is not a full-fledged Member of the Senate. He has that equivocal position in the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be guided by the Senator from Arkansas. I believe the modification is perfectly proper, and it will also require the striking of the words "President of" on line 6.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That will be stricken, and "Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate" will be substituted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I add the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] as additional cosponsors of the amendment.

I believe we are ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 653, as modified, of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wonder whether any other amendments of a more or less noncontroversial nature could be disposed of at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, and if it is consistent with his program, I should like to put on the table and call up the so-called military junta amendment, so that it will be the pending business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would be perfectly all right, but the Senator will want a vote on that.

Mr. JAVITS. I imagine we will need one.

I might say to the Senator from Arkansas that we have been attempting to get together with the Department of State on that matter. I think we are very close.

As a matter of fact, I do not see any great difference between what we want and what they want, and I am rather hopeful that overnight the matter may be resolved.

In any case, we will want a vote if we are unable to get together. It is a meaningful and important amendment. I understand that Senator MORSE proposes to amend it in some respects, so that it is substantive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas, I should like to make that the pending business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I should like to dispose of that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment will be brought to me in about 2 minutes. May I suggest, for the moment, the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 641, and ask that the clerk report it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert a new subsection as follows:
>
> "(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "'(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any member state of the Organization of American States the government of which came into power by the unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government which had been acting in accordance with its constitutional mandate, unless (1) the President finds that the prohibition against furnishing such assistance is contrary to the national security interest of the United States, or (2) the President is satisfied that the government of such member state has agreed to take appropriate steps, within a reasonable time, for the restoration of constitutional government, the holding of free elections, and the application of human and civil rights and liberties within such member state.'"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall have another version of this amendment in the morning. It has not yet been brought to me, and I do not wish to detain the Senate. But the amendment as printed will be adequate for the purpose of calling it up tonight. I did not intend to discuss the proposed amendment tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not intend to discuss the proposed amendment tonight. I already set it out in a preliminary way in my speech yesterday, so I am prepared to wait until tomorrow in order to discuss the amendment in detail.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Pardon me.

Mr. JAVITS. I just said that I have called it up, it is now the pending business, and I am not prepared to discuss it tonight.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will be the pending business. It will go over until tomorrow. It will be the first thing taken up tomorrow.

I should like to give notice that I should like to have as many votes as possible. I should like Senators to call up their amendments. A great many amendments were filed overnight, many more than I had expected. So we shall have to stay in session tomorrow and try to move along.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the Senator from Arkansas in that request. I believe we have begun to make a little progress. I hope that we shall make more progress in the days ahead, and that as many Members as possible will remain on the floor, so that there will be a possibility of disposing of the matter. It will take some days yet.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have made a good start, and several of the preliminary speeches are out of the way. I think we will move much more rapidly on the bill from here on.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further votes tonight.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 822) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2450. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3313. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; and

H.R. 5380. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2450. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 3313. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5380. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1337 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILLIAM LANGER JEWEL BEARING PLANT

The bill (S. 3466) to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant was announced as next in order.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am most greatful to my good friend, Mr. MANSFIELD, the distinguished majority leader, for bringing up my bill, S. 3466, which will honor our late colleague, Senator William Langer by naming the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant, located at Rolla, N. Dak., the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant. No one in this body more admired or respected the late Senator Langer than the majority leader.

Honoring this important facility in his honor is recognition the late Senator Langer richly deserves. He almost single-handedly secured this plant for North Dakota. This plant is our sole domestic source of jewel bearings for our defense and space programs. It had its inception in the late 1940's when Mr. John Hart, then executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, came to Washington to enlist Senator Langer's help in getting some industry to locate on or near the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation to provide badly needed employment for the Indians. Senator Langer's first thought was of some industry to assemble watches or other similar intricate instruments widely used by our defense industry. He had in mind utilizing the Indians' particular aptitude for native handicraft skills to this delicate work.

Senator Langer very effectively sought help from every level of government, from the White House on down. Securing this facility involved meetings with many important Cabinet officers and executive agencies, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Bureau of the Budget, and the National Security Council. Senator Langer very effectively coordinated activities of all these departments and agencies in an effort to establish this important industry. To him must go the credit for the establishment of this industry. Had it not been for his determined, effective, and untiring efforts, there never would have been a jewel bearing plant at Rolla and, very likely, there would not have been one in this country.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to approve this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1372), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., in memory of the late Senator William Langer of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3466

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Jewel Bearing Plant operated and maintained by the General Services Administration at Rolla, North Dakota, shall hereafter be known as the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such plant is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such plant under and by the name of the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER FOR PEACE IN 1967

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 167) to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other concerned departments and agencies, are authorized to take all necessary steps to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in Washington, District of Columbia, in 1967.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed $1,200,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to organizing and holding such an international conference. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenses incurred on behalf of the United States as host government, including personal services without regard to civil service and classification laws, except no salary rate shall exceed the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; employment of aliens, printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, of principal foreign delegates in the United States and of United States personnel and foreign technical experts; rent of facilities by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; official functions and courtesies; and design, construction, and display of exhibits. Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available for obligation until December 31, 1967.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior are authorized to accept and use contributions of funds, property, services, and facilities, including the loan of articles, specimens, and exhibits for display, for the purpose of organizing and holding such an international conference.

SEC. 4. The head of any department, agency, or establishment of the United States Government is authorized, on request, to assist with or without reimbursement the Department of State and the Department of the Interior in carrying out the functions herein authorized, including the furnishing of personnel and facilities and the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1373), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. PROVISIONS OF THE RESOLUTION

Senate Joint Resolution 167 authorizes the United States to sponsor an International Conference on Water for Peace in Washington, D.C., in 1967. Authorization is made for a sum not to exceed $1.2 million for expenses incident to organizing and holding this international conference. Responsibility for promoting the conference rests with the Secretaries of State and Interior. They are authorized to accept other contributions and facilities in connection with the conference.

2. BACKGROUND

At a White House symposium on desalination on October 7, 1965, President Johnson announced his intention of calling for an International Conference on Water for Peace (see app. II). On May 30, 1966, the Vice President received from the Secretary of State a request for the Senate to consider this proposed joint resolution. It is felt by the executive branch that such a conference would be the most effective way of focusing worldwide attention on all aspects of water problems. On June 15, 1966, Senator Fulbright introduced this joint resolution. Senator Moss became a cosponsor on July 12, 1966.

3. COMMITTEE ACTION

A public hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 167 was held on July 12, 1966. Appearing as witnesses for the executive branch were Mr. William Buffum, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organizational Affairs, Department of State, and Mr. Robert Nelson, Deputy Assistant Secretary (Water and Power), Department of the Interior. (Their testimony is to be found in app. I of this report.) In reporting this joint resolution, the committee takes note of the title of this Conference, and hopes that the term "Water for Peace" does not divert attention from the important technical aspects of water problems on which delegates should forcus their interest.

The preamble was agreed to.

IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION FOR CONVENTION ON THE SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES

The bill (S. 3498) to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between State and Nationals of other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. The President may make such appointments of representatives and panel members as may be provided for under the convention.

SEC. 3. (a) An award of an arbitral tribunal rendered pursuant to chapter IV of the convention shall create a right arising under a treaty of the United States. The pecuniary obligations imposed by such an award shall be enforced and shall be given the same full faith and credit as if the award were a final judgment of a court of general jurisdiction of one of the several States. The Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) shall not apply to enforcement of awards rendered pursuant to the convention.

(b) The district courts of the United States (including the courts enumerated in title 28, United States Code, section 460) shall have exclusive jurisdiction over actions and proceedings under paragraph (a) of this section, regardless of the amount in controversy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1374), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

S. 3498 is designed to assist the United States in carrying out its obligations under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes (Ex. A, 89th Cong., 2d sess.), which was approved by the Senate on May 16, 1966, by a vote of 72 to 0. The convention itself is explained in the committee's report (see Ex. Rept. No. 2, 89th Cong., 2d sess.).

Briefly, the bill authorizes the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the Administrative Council of the International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes and to designate four persons to the Panel of Conciliators and the Panel of Arbitrators to be established pursuant to the provisions of the convention. S. 3498 also provides that U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction to enforce the pecuniary obligations of arbitral awards rendered under the terms of the convention. A more detailed explanation of the bill is contained in the statement of Mr. Fred B. Smith, General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, which is appended to this report.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on S. 3498 on July 12, 1966, at which time testimony in support of the bill was received from Mr. Fred B. Smith, the General Counsel of the Treasury Department. No other witness testified on the bill and the committee is not aware of any opposition to it.

As is pointed out above, the Senate has already approved the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes. In addition, it was ratified by the President on June 1, 1966. The enactment of S. 3498 is the next step required to complete U.S. membership in the Convention. Accordingly, the committee recommends that it be passed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1375), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

This bill provides that the manufacturers excise tax on tires (10 cents or 5 cents a pound) and inner tubes (10 cents a pound) in the case of manufacturer-owned (or importer-owned) retail stores is to be imposed at the time of delivery to these stores, rather than at the time these tires or tubes are sold. This change is to be effective as of the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this bill. This bill also imposes a floor stock tax, at the regular tax rates, on inventories on hand in these stores on the date the new provision referred to above becomes effective.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

Under present law (sec. 4071(a)), a tax of 10 cents a pound is imposed on highway-type tires and 5 cents a pound on other tires, and a tax of 10 cents a pound is imposed with respect to inner tubes, at the time they are sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer.[1]

In the case of tire and inner tube manufacturers (or importers) maintaining their own retail stores or retail outlets, this means that no tax is imposed until the manufacturer makes a sale at retail; i.e., to the consumer. As a result, where a manufacturer has his own retail store, this means that no tax is paid on his retail inventory. With manufacturers who maintain large retail stores carrying several hundred different types of tires in stock, the tax-free status of this inventory represents an important factor. On the other hand, the independent tire dealer, because the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer occurred prior to, or at the time of, his acquisition of the tires and tubes, can have only tax-paid inventory. With the present tax rates of 10 cents a pound on highway tires and on inner tubes, information available suggests that independent tire dealers may have slightly over 10 percent of their inventory investment tied up in these taxes, and investment which their competitors, the tire manufacturers, with their own retail oulets, need not make. In addition to the investment tied up in inventory, the independent tire dealers, because of this higher inventory cost, also are faced with somewhat larger insurance costs with respect to this inventory.

It has been suggested to your committee that although the independent tire dealers are billed for the tax at an earlier time than in the case of the retail-owned stores of manufacturers, nevertheless, because of liberal credit terms extended by the tire manufacturers, the independent tire dealers in fact were not bearing the burden of the tax for any appreciable length of time. A study made by the tire manufacturers with retail-owned outlets indicated that in the average case the independent dealers do not pay for their tires until 86 days after receiving them. It was also indicated that in the average case they sell the tires wihin 95 days after receiving them. This suggests that the independent dealer bears the burden of the tax in the average case for only about 9 days. In order to determine whether the independent dealers did in fact bear the burden of the tax for any appreciable length of time as well, as to obtain other information with respect to this bill, your committee held one day of public hearings on it. The hearings disclosed that passenger car tires generally are sold under what is called spring dating, winter dating, or under regular terms. In the case of spring and winter dating, an "anticipation discount" generally is allowed based on the value of the tires excluding the Federal excise tax. This discount is one-half of 1 percent a month or on an annual basis amounts to a 6-percent interest rate. The effect of this is that the independent dealer who buys under spring or winter dating, and pays cash at the time of shipment, pays less than the dealer who makes use of the credit extended to him. The fact that he pays less means that the dealer who obtains credit is in effect paying interest for the period during which the credit is being extended at something approaching a normal interest rate. This suggests, therefore, that in such cases the independent dealer, although in the average case making use of credit, is in fact bearing the burden of the tax in the same way as he would be if he paid cash at the time of shipment for the tires and borrowed the money for this payment from a bank and paid approximately a 6-pecrent interest rate on it. While spring and winter dating, where the anticipation discount is available, do not account for all the sales to the independent dealers, nevertheless they appear to account for something like two-thirds of the sales.[2] Although the anticipation discounts referred to do not include the Federal excise tax itself, a proportional share of any payment received from a dealer is allocated to the excise tax. As a result, it is impossible for the dealer to obtain the benefit of the anticipation discount without also paying the Federal excise tax in advance.

This bill removes the competitive discrimination against independent tire dealers by providing for the imposition of the tire or inner tube tax at the time the tire or inner tube is delivered to a retail store or retail outlet of the manufacturer, producer, or importer. By "retail store or retail outlet," your committee means one where the manufacturer, producer, or importer sells tires or inner tubes at retail, and deliveries to such stores or outlets include deliveries made in the immediate vicinity of the stores or outlets primarily for future delivery to them. Tax would apply in these cases to all tires and inner tubes delivered to a "retail store or retail outlet," even though a portion, or all, for the tires or inner tubes of a particular delivery to the store or outlet may be intended for sale at wholesale.

The bill adds language to make sure that the imposition of tax when tires or inner tubes are delivered to a retail store or retail outlet does not result in double taxation. Thus, the bill provides that if the tax is applied at the time of delivery, it is not again to apply at the time of sale, and conversely, if the sale occurs first and the tax applies at that time, it is not again to apply at the time of delivery.

The provision added by the bill is to take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this bill.

The bill also provides for a floor stocks tax on tires and inner tubes held at manufacturer-owned (or importer-owned) retail stores or retail outlets at the time the new provision becomes effective. The floor stocks tax imposed in this case is the tax which would otherwise be imposed at the time the tire or inner tube is sold.

It is estimated that this bill will result in a nonrecurring revenue gain of something like $10 million because of the speedup in the timing of the imposition of the tax in the case of these manufacturer-owned (or importer-owned) retail stores or retail outlets.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD so that they will be available to be called up at the appropriate time.

These amendments are really in the alternative. Both amendments deal with the proposal to restrict aid to any Latin American country whose constitutional government has been overthrown by a military junta or a military coup.

I shall consider them when the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] brings up his amendment on the same subject matter.

I wish to have them printed because I have not decided which amendment I shall call up; and it is possible, depending upon the outcome of the vote, that I may find myself in a parliamentary situation in which I would want to call up both amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be printed in the RECORD. I shall reserve until the Javits amendment is called up any explanatory statement in regard to the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 676

On page 10, after line 21, add the following:

"(c) Add the following new section:

"'SEC. 254. RESTRICTION ON AID TO LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—None of the funds made available under authority of this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country covered by this title in which the government has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections, until the President is satisfied that a government, so chosen, has been restored and so notifies the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.'"

AMENDMENT No. 677

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this or any other Act to any country in the Western Hemisphere the government of which came to power through the forcible or unconstitutional overthrow of a prior government which had been chosen in free and democratic elections, except that such assistance may be furnished to such country if

---

[1] A tax of 5 cents a pound is also imposed on tread rubber, and a tax of 1 cent a pound is also imposed on non-highway-type laminated tires.

[2] The Rubber Manufacturers Association reports that the average credit terms are 86 days. Since it appears from the information submitted by the association that under regular billing the credit terms on the average are something like 40 days, the spring and winter dating, which provide substantially longer credit terms, must account for the bulk of the shipments, perhaps something like two-thirds.

(i) the President shall have submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report stating that the furnishing of assistance to such country is in the national interest and giving his reasons therefor, and (ii) each such committee shall have adopted a resolution approving the furnishing of assistance to such country. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.' "

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record certain articles that pertain to the issue of military governments in Latin America. The first appeared in the New Leader of April 25, 1966, entitled "Letter From Brazil," by William Lineberry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Letter From Brazil

(By William Lineberry)

Rio de Janeiro.—Two years have now passed since the Brazilian military jumped into the political arena by replacing Leftist President João Goulart with Marshal Humberto Castello Branco. According to the original "revolutionary" time table, Brazil was to return to democratic civilian rule at about this time—its economy healed and its political system purged of corrupt and subversive elements. But the generals have found that getting into the Brazilian political arena is a lot easier than getting out, and in effect have extended their "revolutionary mandate" until March 1971, when the term of the new President, to be named by Congress this October, expires. Presumably, it will take that long to revive Brazil's tattered economy and to establish a political framework immune to the menace of Leftist demagoguery.

These have been a rough two years for the Army, which prides itself on its professionalism, its adherence to legality and its apolitical tradition. Not only has its economic recovery program met with considerable resistance, but its political policies have opened serious fissures within the ranks of the military establishment itself. And since the Army must give final approval of the President chosen in the indirect election next October, the ugly spectacle of generals running against one another has become the likely eventuality.

The so-called "hard line" faction of field commanders is pushing the already announced candidacy of War Minister Artur Costa e Silva, to the obvious consternation of President Castello Branco, who represents the so-called "Sorbonne School" of military intellectuals and made the mistake of declaring himself ineligible to serve again in the top office. Two other generals have also entered the race, Amauri Kruel and Oswaldo Cordeiro Farias. Meanwhile, a sizeable faction of lower ranking officers is said to be grumbling in favor of a "return to the barracks" where they belong.

In marked contrast to the usual loathing accorded politicians in Brazil, the Army has long enjoyed the respect and admiration of civilian opinion. It builds the bridges, maintains the roads and offers a modicum of law and order in the vast frontier regions, as wild and wooly as the U.S. West in its own era of cavalry versus Indians. Unlike many self-serving Latin American "gorillas," moreover, Brazilian military men have a tradition of serving constitutional governments rather than themselves. A colonel earns about $200 a month, and even generals are financially embarrassed by tours of duty in high-priced cities like Rio.

In the past, the military has intervened in politics only to insure the preservation of legality and constitutionalism. It toppled the Vargas dictatorship in 1945, demanded Vargas' resignation in 1954 (after he had been popularly elected), assured the installation of President Juscelino Kubitschek in 1955, and demanded in 1961 that Goulart's powers remain within the limits set by the Constitution. But on each of these occasions the Army was careful to withdraw in favor of civilian rule as quickly as it had intervened.

In April 1964, saddled with the chaos unloosed by Goulart, it decided to stay on and straighten things out once and for all. This is perhaps the biggest mistake it could have made, for after being ground up in the Rube Goldberg machinery of Brazilian politics, it will be lucky to emerge with even a tattered shred of its old respectability intact—and it may well find itself shorn of the unity it sought to preserve by intervening against Goulart in the first place.

When Castello Branco assumed the Presidency two years ago he was promptly hailed by Washington as a new, progressive, reform-minded and professional variety of military strongman, wholly removed from the self-serving *caudillo* type of old. Here, according to the State Department, was a prime example of the patriotic and responsible new military class emerging in Latin America—a class dedicated to national economic development and the protection of democratic institutions from extremists of the Right and Left. Trained in the U.S. or under U.S. advisors in their own countries, possessed of middle-class values, untainted by corruption—these men have been singled out by U.S. officials like Ambassador-at-Large W. Averell Harriman as cornerstones of future Latin American stability.

And, indeed, the Marshal remains the very antithesis of that peculiar blend of charisma and brute force which constitutes the successful *caudillo's* image. He is a humble, pensive man given to self-deprecating jokes about his squat, undistinguished appearance. (Even now the Marshal's image on the screen evokes titters of laughter among Rio moviegoers.) He reads widely in several languages and is undoubtedly one of the most distinguished graduates of Brazil's Superior War College (the so-called Sorbonne School), where the nation's complex economic, social and political problems are subject to as thorough an analysis as problems of military command.

During the twilight hours of Goulart's rule it was Castello Branco who, torn between fealty to the Constitution and disgust with the mounting chaos and leftward drift in evidence around him, finally came down on the side of those pressing for a military revolution, carrying a number of fence-sitting generals along with him. When he took office as President in April 1964, it was with the pledge that Brazil would soon return to popular democratic rule and stable economic growth. These goals were to be realized by a series of drastic reforms which would halt spiralling inflation, curb runaway spending by corrupt bureaucrats, tax the rich into a sense of responsibility for the country's future development, and assuage the multitudinous poor with programs of better education, housing and land reform. In fact, the Marshal was proposing to do in moderation much of what the wild-eyed Goulart had been threatening to do in excess.

Professionals themselves, the new soldier-statesmen called upon other professionals, such as economist Roberto Campos, to man the ramparts of reform. In came U.S. and International Monetary Fund experts to advise on monetary and fiscal policies. Out went the old and discredited politicians in an extensive purge. At the same time, the revolutionary government ended official anti-Americanism and opened the door to close and cordial relations with Washington. The welcome mat went out to foreign investors and the regime let it be known that the Alliance for Progress, ignored by Goulart, was now considered a bulwark of hemispheric solidarity.

For its part, Washington could not have been more pleased. It had become a cliché of U.S. opinion that if reforms were not soon carried out in Brazil by responsible elements, they would most certainly be carried out—and in the most painful manner—by irresponsible ones. As a token of U.S. esteem for the new government, the State Department promptly promoted Brazil to the rank of number one aid recipient in Latin America, and U.S. technicians began to help draft the great changes that were to be made.

Certainly, Brazil had been crying out for change. During Goulart's last months in office, inflation had been running at the rate of 144 per cent a year and economic growth had ground to a virtual halt. Even now some 60 per cent of the country's rapidly expanding population of 85 million people is illiterate, the bulk living a hand-to-mouth existence outside the money economy altogether. Although three-fifth of all Brazilians make their living in agriculture, 75 per cent of the land is concentrated in the hands of 8 per cent of the population, while the nation's rural conditions are as squalid as any in the Hemisphere. And the luxury-loving upper classes, alarmed themselves by the structural inequities and social ferment around them, have been shipping their capital to New York and Switzerland, where it can do capital-hungry Brazil no good whatsoever.

The revolutionary government's reform program, however, was shot through with contradictions from the start. It sought to halt inflation through rigidly enforced austerity while pledging costly improvements in education, housing and land tenure. It promised to uphold democracy while threatening, and sometimes imprisoning, entrenched and powerful elements in Brazilian society and proposing drastic changes harmful to their interests. It tossed out Goulart, who had preached radical reform, while keeping in office the Congress which had so successfully blocked Goulart's program. (It still sits.) It talked of a new deal for Brazil's poor, but put political police in charge of their labor unions, banned strikes, and put the squeeze on wages in the name of fighting inflation. It also has allied itself with some of the most conservative elements in Brazilian politics.

Last October, when Castello Branco decreed the abolition of Brazil's 13 old political parties, those politicians who had not been purged by military tribunals were ordered to group themselves into the two new parties created by government fiat—the government-backed ARENA (National Renovation Alliance) and the MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement), representing the loyal opposition. Curiously, Castello Branco chose to build the new ARENA around a hard core of politicians belonging to the old UDN (National Democratic Union), which had been one of the three strongest parties under the old system.

This was curious because the UDN had been the party of conservative and traditional interests in Brazil—the party of Right-winging Carlos Lacerda, for example, the dynamic ex-governor of Guanabara state—and it seemed strange that a "revolutionary" government committed to "drastic reforms" would purposefully ally itself with such unenthusiastic instruments. But the generals were also in revolt against the twin evils of Communism and corruption, each of which they saw embodied in the two other dominant parties of the old system—the Brazilian Labor party of Goulart (PTB) and the Social Democratic party of ex-President Juscelino Kubitschek (PSD). Hence ARENA, which was after all to be the majority party, had little place else to turn except to the UDN.

The UDN, of course, was delighted. It had never won the fruits of Brazil's patronage-rich Presidency in a popular contest, and now it foresaw not only obtaining these delectables by riding khaki coattails but stifling all this wild talk about reforms.

The result of all this is that inflation remains an unsolved problem, the economy continues to lag, reforms have been sabotaged in some cases and slow to start in others, and the political course has been away from rather than toward the restoration of popular democracy. Perhaps the one solid accomplishment of the regime has been thoroughly to debunk the notion that generals make good, progressive reformers.

True, two years is a short time in which to coax an economy as vast as Brazil's back from the brink of ruin. But it has been ample time for the regime to show its colors. The battle against inflation, which continues to occupy so much of the government's energies, is indicative. Wage rises have lagged behind price rises by government design, and the working classes have borne the brunt of official austerity measures. General wage levels are set by official action, but in the name of "free enterprise" the government has sought to hold down prices through "voluntary" schemes.

Time and again Planning Minister Roberto Campos has issued optimistic statements to the effect that the inflation problem has very nearly been resolved, and time and again the upward swirl of prices has belied his optimism. Retail prices rose 45 per cent in 1965 by one authority's count, 65 per cent by another's. According to government plans, prices for the entire year 1966 were to rise no more than 10 per cent, but in January alone they jumped 5.1 per cent, against a 4.8 per cent rise during January 1965. Quite naturally, Brazilians are asking what all their sacrifices have been for.

In mid-February an opposition deputy rose in the Brazilian Congress to recite some figures compiled by the Getulio Vargas Foundation (Brazil's most reliable data gathering organization). Until 1963, the Foundation reported, the consumption of meat in Brazil was 250 grams (a little over half a pound) per capita a week, while between 1964–1965 this average fell to 180 grams. Milk consumption in the same periods fell from one soupspoon to one teaspoon per person a day. Bread descended from 100 grams a day to 80 grams and eggs from two to one a day per person.

The people have literally been paying with emptier bellies for the regime's stabilization efforts. But since most of the old labor leaders, who were allied with Goulart, have been jailed, exiled or removed from office, and since union activities are now under the control of political police, effective channels of worker protest have been silenced. A recent strike of dock workers over wages, for example, was broken up by government troops.

The situation might be understandable if the social reforms pledged by the Castello Branco government were being carried through as promised. But except in the fields of banking and taxation, where far-reaching reforms have been initiated if not wholly implemented (the rich are actually being threatened with imprisonment for income-tax evasion, though no one is yet known to have spent a night in jail for it) there is distressing evidence of the old political run-around—the gap between promise and performance—which has made talk of reform in this country the special province of demagogues in years past.

In the case of land reform, for example, the government has effectively overseen the emasculation of its own program. Under the direction of Campos, the professional, the land reform bill was designed to tax potentially productive but unused lands on large estates at progressively higher rates, the aim being confiscation and redistribution to the landless poor. They key to the bill's enforcement was a section transferring taxing powers from the hands of state and municipal authorities, where they had traditionally rested, to the hands of Federal authorities, where they would be effective. The transfer was deemed essential because in states where land reform really counts, local taxing authorities tend to be in the pockets of the big landowners.

In the name of "states' rights," however, Castello Branco's conservative allies in the UDN objected strenuously, and while Campos was out of the country the tax-transfer provision was quietly removed from the bill. Not quietly enough, though, because members of the old PSD and PTB in Congress caught wind of what was going on and gleefully voted the original taxing scheme back in before passing the bill. A slightly embarrassed Castello Branco then issued a decree "temporarily" returning the taxing powers to state and municipal authorities "for administrative reasons." And there they rest.

Meanwhile, conditions in the poverty-stricken, rural Northeast of Brazil continue to fester. One U.S. official recently returned to Rio from two years in that area reports privately that, if anything, conditions are worse than in the past. SUDENE, the much touted Northeast Development Superintendency, is said to be almost wholly ineffective in its work—a *bagunça,* as the Brazilians say, meaning an impossible bureaucratic mess. This is the same Northeast which a few years back was the subject of much sensational attention in the U.S. press for its grinding poverty and its Communist-influenced peasant leagues. The grinding poverty is still there, but the troublemakers are in prison or exiled—hardly cause for rejoicing in the "new stability."

Since the policies of the revolutionary government have made eating difficult and voting in popular elections next to impossible, and since Brazilians are fond of doing both, it is safe to say that the Castello Branco regime has failed to arouse any notable enthusiasm among the people. Accordingly, the Marshal himself has taken to posing as a sort of modern-dress Coriolanus, refusing to pander to the popular will while studiously rigging the nation's political system to insure that the popular will cannot be expressed.

In a series of three so-called "Institutional Acts," the government has armed itself with dictatorial powers, crushing several of the old political parties, providing for the indirect election of the President and state governors, and in other ways overriding the Constitution to assure the continuation of revolutionary rule, at least through the next Presidential term ending in March 1971.

According to the new schedule, state governors will be elected by their respective legislatures on September 3 of this year (somewhat of an irony, since state legislatures have been recently criticized by the regime for being infested with corruption); the President of the Republic will be elected by Congress on October 3; and direct popular elections will be held for Federal senators and deputies and state deputies on November 15.

The prospect, of course, is for a divided government, since the old Congress is bound to appoint a President loyal to the revolution (*i.e.,* agreeable to the military), while the people are expected to vote in a new Congress overwhelmingly in the opposition. But the regime has many cards to play and does not appear overly concerned about the prospect. Under the Institutional Acts its powers to purge "subversives" and "corrupt elements" are vast. Very early in the revolution Congress was picked clean of such undesirables, and the process is now going forward at the state legislature level. Military "boards of inquiry" are still in operation throughout the country, and thus far about 500 Brazilians (including all three living ex-Presidents) have had their political rights suspended for 10 years while some 3,600 others have been purged from Federal or state office.

It is likely, then, that the range of candidates open to popular approval will fall within bounds considered "decent" by the authorities. And the power to purge will continue even after the new Congress is installed—a sword of Damocles over obstructionists. Finally, there is nothing to prevent the current government from issuing a Fourth Institutional Act tossing out congressional elections or even abolishing Congress itself altogether.

About the only thing that can seriously disrupt the government's program is a falling out within the military itself, a matter widely talked about in Rio, along with rumors of another *golpe,* but discreetly played down, thus far, by military top brass. Should hard-living, hard-lining General Artur Costa e Silva patch his differences with Castello Branco and gain the ARENA nomination for president, he is expected to assure the Armed Forces better pay, the people a relaxation of current austerity measures, and the "corrupt and subversive elements," whom the hard-liners have been out to get much rougher treatment than they have received from Castello Branco in the past.

The War Minister has been much quoted for his famed response to a senator who congratulated him on his political strength: "I am not strong, Senator, but my party is" (meaning the Army). But there seems to have been more bravado than substance to this remark. Castello Branco and the Sorbonne School are said to distrust him on the grounds of economic ignorance, impulsiveness and general immoderation (the general likes to bet on the ponies and is the type of funloving Latin who wears dark glasses into the shadiest night spots).

In fact, the President is said to have told his War Minister that he will not have ARENA's nomination unless he pledges to keep Campos and agrees to a scheme for unifying the Army, Navy and Air Force under a single ministry of defense. General Costa e Silva has so far been unwilling to promise these things. But never mind. The next President may well be none other than Humberto Castello Branco himself, who, when the time is ripe, is expected by some to renounce his previous renunciation of another term and patriotically heed the call to continued national service.

Whichever general finally wins, it seems clear that somewhere along the line the progressive, reform-minded new military class got lost in the political shuffle. For this reason it seemed strange for retiring U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Lincoln Gordon (now Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs) to heap praise upon the Castello Branco government before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year and declare, "I think they have made tremendous headway." In so saying, he perpetuated a myth that was badly tarnished from the start. For professionally trained, life-long soldiers make poor saviors of democracy, particularly from an internal threat, in any society. And as social revolutionaries in Brazil they obviously have a long way to go.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is a very penetrating letter. I urge that the Senate, particularly the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, give it very careful consideration.

As the Senate knows, I highly disapprove of the course of action that was taken by the Branco government. I do not think it can be justified as far as supporting constitutional government is concerned. That has a bearing on what I think our relationships to Brazil should be by way of loans and grants and other forms of aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article written by George Natanson, published in the Los Angeles Times of March 13, 1966, entitled "Guatemala Elections Solved No Problems."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUATEMALA ELECTIONS SOLVED NO PROBLEMS

(By George Natanson)

GUATEMALA CITY.—The Guatemalan presidential elections held here last Sunday have settled none of the political, social and economic problems endemic to this country.

If anything, the situation here has worsened.

Under the military regime which has governed Guatemala for the last three years there has been some semblance of political stability—even if it was maintained through repression and the iron fist. But accusations of electoral fraud from all three participating parties and irresponsible threats of violence emanating from the country's political leaders, military and civil alike, have obviously brought Guatemala to the brink of chaos.

NO OFFICIAL RESULTS

Still, no official results have been announced. Instead, the three contesting parties, including the official party, have lashed out at each other, threatened to take their partisans to the streets, and have claimed victory for themselves while declaring they will recognize no results other than their own.

Added to the muddle is the jumble of the radically conflicting returns which each party has released. This has led to a student declaration made Friday morning that if the issue is not settled by Tuesday night, university students here will declare a strike and take to the streets. These developments clearly raise the possibility of a disastrous civil war.

At best the Guatemalan people can expect little from the party that eventually wins control of the country. This includes the military party which might manage to remain in power.

A study of the platforms of all three contesting parties in last Sunday's race leads to the conclusion that none has an ideological base. All make vague promises of urgently needed social and economic reforms, but pledge that the old order of Guatemala's government structure will undergo no change.

No matter which faction eventually takes power, Guatemala's leadership will remain essentially unchanged.

Even leaders of the so-called mildly leftist Revolutionary Party (PR) blanche at the mention of agrarian reforms, probably the most pressing issue which confronts this country's new government.

"In this respect we are ultra-conservative," said Gregorio Prem, member of the Revolutionary Party and one of the few candidates for Congress whose victory is believed assured.

In an interview with The Times, Prem declared: "With the PR in power, we will not touch any privately held lands (it is estimated that more than 75% of Guatemala's arable and accessible land is owned by 27 families). Instead, we can open vast land tracts owned by the government and encourage migration."

While the plan has practical merit it calls for large outlays of money, believed to be beyond Guatemala's financial capabilities. Prem made no suggestion that the PR had any detailed plan for financing its agrarian program. Like many other members of his party, Prem is among Guatemala's largest landowners.

ISSUE DODGED

When control of the Guatemalan armed forces was broached, Prem said with an uneasy laugh, "I don't think the party wants to get involved in that issue. It's too hot."

Their program appears to have been written to allay the fears of the country's businessmen rather than to strike at the heart of the social and economic problems which beset the nation. But however mild the platform might be, the two remaining parties go further to the right with conservative principles of tight credit, strict inflationary controls, wage ceilings, a free price market and tightly controlled labor.

Above all, both the official Institutional Democratic Party (PID) and the National Liberation Movement (MLN) have a campaign of anti-communism; both PID and MLN accuse the PR of Communist leanings. It is generally agreed among diplomatic observers here that Communist elements in Guatemala are few in number and totally lacking in popular support. It is believed that even if a popular uprising were to occur here as post-election confusion becomes more chaotic, the Communists could do little more than contribute to the general chaos.

Many observers here believe the anti-Communist campaign has helped rather than harmed the Communists, first by crediting them with powers they do not have, and secondly by giving communism publicity it could never have otherwise received.

Politics in Guatemala appears to be bent more on instilling fear in the people than on encouraging hope. All parties, including the government, are contributing to electoral confusion.

The way is seemingly being paved for a small band of ragged, ignorant Communist guerrillas whose only strength lies in the growing hopelessness here to reap rewards of sympathy and hope from an apathetic and disillusioned people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of July 18, 1966, entitled "Twenty-eight In Guatemala Reported Slain by Police in Peralta's Regime."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-EIGHT IN GUATEMALA REPORTED SLAIN BY POLICE IN PERALTA'S REGIME

GUATEMALA, July 17.—Twenty-eight Guatemalan students and leftists, missing since their arrest in February and March, were shot by firing squads of the head of the former military government, Col. Enrique Peralta Azurdia, two former police agents told the University Students Association last night.

Among the victims, the association was told, were the former Communist party leader, Victor Manuel Gutierrez; the former farm labor leader, Leonardo Castillo Flores, and Fernando Arce Behrens, a law student on vacation from the University of Mexico.

The former police agents, whose identity was withheld, said the three men were tortured in the police headquarters in the capital, then driven to a military base near Pacific coast and shot. Their bodies were sewn into burlap sacks and dropped into the ocean from an army transport plane, according to the informants.

The former policemen also told the association, which has been conducting an investigation of missing-persons cases since March, that "many others" besides the 28 people known to be missing were also killed by the police.

WOMAN REPORTED SLAIN

Those killed were said to include Kris Yon Cerna, the niece of the guerrilla leader, Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, and Eunice Campiran de Aguilar Mora, wife of a Mexican student David Aguilar Mora, who disappeared after his capture in Guatemala last December. She had come to Guatemala to search for her husband. Both young women were said to have been beaten to death with clubs and buried in shallow graves near the Zacapa military base.

The former police agents told the student association's investigators that most of the police killings had been ordered by Alberto Barrios, who was chief of the judicial police under the former military regime. He is believed to be outside Guatemala.

In another development, the guerrilla organization Rebel Armed Forces declared war anew against the Guatemalan army despite the advent of a civilian Government under President Julio César Méndez Montenegro, who was inaugurated July 1. In a statement issued last night and signed by the rebels' 24-year-old commander, Luis Turcios, and their political adviser, Bernardo Alvarado Monzon, the leftist guerrillas set their policy toward the new Government.

The statement said that "despite the popular extraction of the new regime, the army retains most of the effective power." "The Guatemalan Army is still the same reactionary tool of native plutocracy and foreign companies and therefore must be fought to the bitter end," it added.

The statement, while avoiding any direct challenge to President Mendez, said in effect that the guerrillas were not going to fold their tents and go home. But, there has been no significant guerrilla action since the new Government was inaugurated.

To many, the rebels' statement reflected their apparent dilemma with respect to the new Government. Their criticism of the Peralta regime as unconstitutional and rightist cannot be used against President Mendez, who won election against the Peralta forces.

But the guerrillas apparently feel that their movement remains necessary and will die if it becomes inactive. Hence their attack specifically on the army, not the civilian Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times under date of July 14, 1966, entitled "Argentine Junta Weighs U.S. Stand—Delay in Recognition Said To Puzzle Ongania Regime."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGENTINE JUNTA WEIGHS U.S. STAND—DELAY IN RECOGNITION SAID TO PUZZLE ONGANIA REGIME

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

BUENOS AIRES, July 13.—Preoccupation with Argentina's standing abroad dominated the first cabinet meeting of the new military Government today.

The delay in the recognition of the Government by the United States is said to be puzzling members of the junta that overthrew the elected Administration of President Arturo U. Illia June 28.

"We thought the Pentagon favored a grand anti-Communist alliance between the military Governments of Brazil and Argentina," a Government House aide said.

Although recognition is expected shortly, aides of President Juan Carlos Ongania are reliably reported to be more concerned with the refinancing of about $600-million of Argentina's over-all foreign debt of $2.1-billion before the end of the year.

A high Government mission was to have left this Friday for the United States and Europe to seek the financing, but the trip was postponed pending recognition from Washington. Officials here believe recognition has been delayed because of articles in the foreign press concerning the extremist views of several members of the regime.

MEETS JEWISH LEADERS

Yesterday, President Ongania received a group of Jewish leaders and sought to call the uneasiness in the half-million-member Jewish community over the extreme right-wing complexion of the new military regime, which includes several persons with anti-Semitic reputations. Notable among them are the President's brother-in-law, Enrique Green, a retired navy captain, who was given a high police post, and Gen. Eduardo Argentino Senorans, now head of the Secret Service.

The Jewish leaders declined to comment on their 30-minute meeting at Government House beyond saying that they were "very pleased" and that the President's aides were preparing a statement. The statement, after stressing the need for unity, concluded:

"As a practicing Catholic and President of Argentina, it is my sincere decision to stimulate the generous efforts of all citizens for the common good. We will proceed to fight extremism, whether of right or left, that may threaten the peace and labors of our people."

JEWISH LEADERS LISTED

The Jewish group included Isaac Goldberg, Gregorio Faigon and Zion Cohen Imach, leaders of the Delegation of Argentine Jewish Associations; Egon Glucksmann, President of the Argentine B'nai B'rith, and Rabbi David Kahame and Tobias Kamenstein, heads of the Argentine Jewish Mutual Aid Society.

None of the leaders cared to discuss a meeting held Monday between the new Minister of the Interior, Enrique Martinez Paz, and the secretary general of the anti-Semitic Tacuara terrorist group, Patricio Errecalte Pueyrredon. It was the first time that a leader of the Tacuara (which means lance in Spanish) had visited Government House since the group was founded in 1958.

After conferring with the Interior Minister, Mr. Errecalte told reporters, "The military revolution has begun, founded on the ashes of the liberal system." He would not disclose what had been discussed, but declared: "Tacuara unreservedly supports the patriotic efforts of the Government."

Some observers thought Mr. Errecalte had sought the release of three members of his group who were sentenced last month for the murder of a Jewish student two years ago. The sentences were the first imposed on Tacuara members.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have already commented upon my disapproval of American recognition policy vis-a-vis Argentina in a speech which I made on the floor of the Senate on yesterday. I think that it was a grievous policy mistake on the part of the Johnson administration, in the same class of mistake that the Johnson administration made when it recognized the military junta in the Dominican Republic.

As we continue this policy we are losing friends among the rank-and-file masses of people of one Latin American country after another because it is another demonstration of our really not supporting freedom in Latin America when we have an opportunity to meet the test of supporting freedom. Too frequently I have heard it said that when the chips of freedom are down in Latin America, the United States turns its back, walks in the direction of embracing totalitarianism in the form of one military junta after another.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 20, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 19, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Winthrop Knowlton, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.—Galatians 5: 13.

Almighty God, Father of all men, who art ever seeking entrance into our lives, forever knocking at the door of our hearts—we open our spirits to Thee in prayer this moment.

We pray humbly and sincerely for our country—this land where we can speak our minds without fear, where we can pray as we choose and where we can elect those who govern us. May she now and ever be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

We pray also for the captive nations of the world—the oppressed people of our planet. Grant that they may keep alive their outreach for liberation and may we as a nation of free people play our full part in bringing light to those who sit in darkness, and those who walk through the valley of the shadow of death—may the consciousness of Thy presence bring courage to endure and strength to overcome.

During these trying days help us to think clearly, to make decisions wisely and to courageously do what is right and good for all. Above all may we put our trust in Thee and keep this faith as long as we live. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HON. JAMES BUTLER HARE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of one of our distinguished former colleagues, the Honorable James B. Hare. Mr. Hare represented the Third South Carolina District in the 81st Congress. He was the son of a distinguished and illustrious father, the Honorable Butler B. Hare, who served in the Congress for more than 16 years.

James Butler Hare was born in Saluda, S.C., September 4, 1918. He attended the public schools in Saluda and was graduated from Newberry College in 1939. In 1941 he did postgraduate work at Erskine College in Due West, S.C., He enlisted in the U.S. Navy in August 1940 and was released to inactive duty in the Naval Reserve as a lieutenant commander in January 1946 with 32 months in the Pacific theater. He participated in the battles of Midway, Guadalcanal, Munda, Bougainville, Philippines, and Okinawa. Mr. Hare was graduated from the law school of the University of South Carolina in 1947 and was admitted to the bar the same year. He commenced the practice of law in Saluda, S.C. He was a member of the board of trustees of the University of South Carolina.

Mr. Hare was elected as a Democrat to the 81st Congress, January 3, 1949, to January 3, 1950. He was recalled to active duty in the U.S. Navy January 1, 1950, and served as law specialist until released to inactive duty as a commander in May 1952. He then resumed the practice of law in Saluda.

Since 1952 he was associated with his renowned father in the practice of law in Saluda, S.C. He is survived by his mother and his father and by his lovely and charming wife, Margaret.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues here today remember with admiration and affection Adm. Robert Hayne Hare, the only brother of Congressman Hare, who served here with such distinction as an officer in the U.S. Navy representing the Navy before the Congress. Admiral Hare is presently stationed in the Pentagon.

James Butler Hare passed away quietly in Columbia, S.C., Saturday morning and was interred yesterday in his hometown, Saluda, S.C. Mr. Hare is remembered here with the highest of esteem and respect as a great public servant, a great lawyer, and a Christian gentleman epitomizing the traditions, heritages, and ideals of our beloved Southland. He was associated with a family that served this Nation in peace and in war with fidelity, courage, and integrity that might well be emulated during these times of the Vietnamese struggle for freedom in which this Nation is deeply committed.

James Butler Hare, Adm. Robert Hayne Hare, and their distinguished father, Congressman Butler B. Hare, are connected with some of the greatest patriots in the history of South Carolina and indeed the history of the United States. Gen. M. C. Butler, a Confederate major general, U.S. Senator, and major general in the U.S. Army, is typical of their illustrious forebears. Pierce Butler, Governor of South Carolina, who later fell in Mexico at the head of the famous Palmetto Regiment, is another famous American, after whom this great and noble family patterned their hopes, their lives, and aspirations. James B. Hare will always be remembered by me as friend, a dedicated American, and a devoted South Carolinian.

Mrs. Dorn, my family, and my mother, who was born and reared in Saluda County, and countless friends here and throughout South Carolina join me in an expression of deepest sympathy to Mrs. James B. Hare, to Congressman and Mrs. Butler B. Hare, and to Adm. Robert Hayne Hare.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS].

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], in expressing regret at the passing of James B. Hare, my good friend and a former Member of this House. He was an illustrious son of an illustrious father, and I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to his family.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished gentleman and former Representative to the U.S. Congress passed away on Saturday, July 16, 1966. James Butler Hare served as Representative from the Third Congressional District of South Carolina from 1949 until 1951. He was the son of Butler Black Hare, a distinguished Member of Congress from 1925 to 1933 and again from 1939 to 1947, who is still living and will be 91 years old this November.

James Butler Hare served in the U.S. Navy during World War II from 1940 until 1946 and participated in the Battles of Midway, Guadalcanal, Munda, Bougainville, Philippines, and Okinawa, with a total of 32 months in the Pacific theater. He was released from the Navy holding the grade of lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve.

He was a graduate of Newberry College in 1939, did postgraduate work at Erskine College, and became an attorney in his native city of Saluda, S.C., upon graduation from the Law School of the University of South Carolina and admittance to the bar in 1947. He served as a member of the board of trustees of the University of South Carolina. He was recalled to active duty from 1950 to 1952 in the U.S. Navy where he served with distinction as a law specialist and was released as a commander.

James Butler Hare impressed me with his courtesy and kindness to others and his extremely likable personality. He was a credit to the State of South Carolina and I am proud to honor him and his outstanding record as a native son.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved to hear of the death of the Honorable James B. Hare, one of our distinguished former colleagues and a dear friend. It was my privilege to serve with James Hare when he represented the Third District of South Carolina in the 81st Congress and to enjoy a warm friendship with him. Congressman Hare served his district with distinction and ability. He comes from a family of dedicated and loyal Americans who have given long and able service to our Nation. His father is the Honorable Butler B. Hare, with whom I also had the privilege and great pleasure of serving in Congress and who is still living.

Many of my colleagues here today will also remember with affection Congressman Hare's brother, Adm. Robert Hayne Hare, who served here with great ability representing the U.S. Navy in Congress and who is now in the Pentagon.

I consider it a privilege to add my praise to his memory, and I extend my condolences, as a longtime friend, to the members of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of the Honorable James B. Hare.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 923, Rept. No. 1707) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES 923

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed eight hours to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CHICAGO HOMEBUILDERS BEING FORCED OUT OF BUSINESS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, our economy is experiencing a serious crisis due to the very tight money market and the drying up of mortgage money. We are again witnessing the alarming situation of the homebuilding industry taking the brunt of restrictive monetary policy. This industry, Mr. Speaker, provides homes for our American citizens and provides hundreds of thousands of jobs. Now we see the mortgage market collapsing, meaning no new funds for prospective homeowners; we are beginning to see thousands of laborers of the homebuilding industry, plumbers, carpenters, electricians, and roofers being forced out of work. The suppliers of the homebuilding industry, such as the lumber dealers and building contractors, are being severely pinched by the mortgage situation.

The Home Builders of Chicago have written me expressing their deep concern over the present mortgage crisis. The president of the Home Builders Association of Chicagoland, Mr. George Arquilla, told me:

> A substantial number more builders in the Chicago Metropolitan area will be forced out of business, in addition to those who have already had to terminate their businesses.

The Federal Reserve Board has already served notice on Congress and the Nation that they will do nothing to aid the housing industry. If we are to provide aid for the homeowning public, Congress must take action and force the Federal Reserve Board to act. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I urge my colleagues to report out forceful legislation to correct the crippling of the homebuilding industry and that the House act quickly to help the public.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT PICKETING WITHIN 500 FEET OF ANY CHURCH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am having prepared and hope to be able to introduce tomorrow a bill which will prohibit picketing within 500 feet of any church in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Committee on the District of Columbia will act expeditiously on this legislation.

I have voted for every civil rights bill during the 18 years I have been here. But I believe picketing a wedding has nothing whatever to do with civil rights, especially when the participants have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Speaker, I recall being berated and vilified when I called Castro a Communist in the early days of the Cuban revolution. This Stokely Carmichael is certainly following the Communist tradition and I believe time will prove, beyond any shadow of doubt, that he is influenced by the Communists and is probably one of the Communist leaders in this country.

I feel it is time that Congress should stand up and be counted and show this fellow that he is not running the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will be passed before the 6th of August.

DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 27 TO DECEMBER 1, 1966, AS NATIONAL DAIRY FARMERS COOPERATIVES WEEK

Mr. **STALBAUM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STALBAUM**. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution designating November 27 to December 1, 1966, as National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week. This is in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Milk Producers Federation.

Prior to my election to Congress, I was privileged to serve for 14 years as executive secretary of a dairy cooperative in Wisconsin. As such, I had two prime responsibilities.

First, our association represented its farmer members in price negotiations with milk dealers. This also included appearance at Federal milk market order hearings.

Second, we provided the dealers in our home community of Racine, Wis., with an adequate supply of milk at all times. When one recognizes that the production of milk varies by 25 percent or more during the year, this at times became a real challenge to us.

These two items are mentioned here because, in my mind, they typify the role of dairy cooperatives throughout our country.

They have represented the majority of America's dairy farmers, in efforts to obtain an adequate return for their product. While this return is below par—or parity—it would be much lower without the dairy cooperative's efforts.

Along with this, they have provided a constant supply of dairy products at reasonable cost for the consumer.

I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize this contribution made by the dairy cooperative movement by passing this resolution.

LET US HAVE A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. **FINO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FINO**. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to observe last week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] polled his New York constituency on the question of whether there should be a national lottery. Of those responding, 73.1 percent favored a national lottery, and 21.6 percent opposed. The rest did not answer or had no opinion.

I urge others among my colleagues to poll their constituents on this question. I think they will find that the people of the United States overwhelmingly support the idea of a national lottery. New York State is going to demonstrate its support of the lottery idea in November by voting in overwhelming support of the referendum proposal to set up a lottery. I am sure other States will follow suit.

What is more, if national public opinion could find adequate expression on this issue here in Congress, I am sure that it would not be long before we had a national lottery in the United States.

In closing, let me again urge the Members of this House to poll their constituents on the lottery idea. I think the voice of the people will be loud and clear.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. **O'BRIEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs may meet during general debate this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER**. Has that request been cleared with the other side?

Mr. **O'BRIEN**. Yes, at the committee level.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE HEAVY COST OF THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. **KORNEGAY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KORNEGAY**. Mr. Speaker, the current airline strike is approaching the 2-week mark. Assistant Secretary Reynolds has described the negotiations as a venture in futility. The President has stated that he has done all that he could under the law. In the meantime, the people of my district—and I am sure the people in the districts of many of the Members—are suffering tremendously. In my district we are totally deprived of any trunkline service. The economy is suffering. Many thousands of employees of the airlines have been involuntarily furloughed. Many other damages are coming from this strike.

Today I am requesting that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Honorable HARLEY STAGGERS, commence, at the earliest possible moment, hearings for the purpose of exploring what can be done and what should be done in connection with this situation.

Mr. Speaker, in view of all the facts, it is high time for Congress to act. Something must be done to relieve this intolerable situation.

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **KORNEGAY**. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **HALEY**. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina because I think this has gone along long enough and some action should be taken. If necessary, action should be taken by Congress.

Mr. **KORNEGAY**. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

DISASTER IN THE HERCULES POWDER PLANT AT CARTHAGE, MO.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, while considering the foreign aid bill on the floor of the Congress, I was notified by the Office of Civil Defense of a disaster, which is unexplained, in the Hercules Powder Plant southwest of Carthage, Mo., which has resulted in the loss of life and many injuries. It was a miracle that, because of safety devices established by this company, more life was not lost.

I was subsequently kept informed by the Pentagon "War Room" in excellent fashion. I was on the scene early the next morning. I have continued in touch with company officials and their neighbor explosive manufacturers, the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, Headquarters 5th Army, and county, State and local officials. I am proud Hercules, Inc., has announced assumption of all legitimate damage claims in the vast area.

Today there appeared in the Wall Street Journal, on page 7, a statement that they—Hercules, Inc.—will rebuild this plant. I understand a similar announcement is being made in a press conference by the president of the corporation in Carthage, Mo., at high noon c.d.s.t.

This is particularly vital because of its employment of many people in southwest Missouri and its association with other chemical plants from which it gains prills, chemicals, and acids necessary to carry on this extensive explosives industry. This is in the area of the old lead and zinc mining, smelting, and refining area that made the tristate area famous, and has supported both World Wars.

I certainly want to compliment the officials of Hercules, Inc., for their plans to rebuild at the expense of some $7 million. I strongly urge they coordinate the existing devastated facilities with those in being, in order to continue this work in the tristate area. They might well, as an interim measure, include a shutdown explosive and dynamite plant of Dupont, Inc., at Carl Junction, Mo., nearby; as well as possibly the use of facilities of Solar Nitrogen or Atlas Chemical Corp., in the immediate area of their own complex.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Speaker, I consider it vital that we continue this capacity, lest we have strikes in any areas which could completely shut down the powder production of this Nation, in this time of an overseas war.

I strongly compliment the company for its ongoing vision and safety precautions and compliment the people for their tolerance of this blast and disaster. We are thankful the damage was no greater than it was.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER**. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

WON LOY JUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1822) for the relief of Won Loy Jung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Won Loy Jung may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHERINE NABOKOFF AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10846) for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10846

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized, under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, to compensate Katherine Nabokoff, Emil Homoceanu, Elvira Olteanu, Sanda Panaitescu, Peter Grant, and Calliope Ghinopol, each of whom has been imprisoned by a foreign government as a result of his, or her, employment by the United States. The compensation may include an amount not exceeding the salary the alien would have earned during the period of imprisonment, including normal within class increases, grade promotions, and related fringe benefits.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Katherine Nabokoff, the sum of $40,182.50, and to Emil Homoceanu, the sum of $17,228.23, as gratuities for sacrifices they sustained as the result of imprisonment by a foreign government as the result of their employment by the United States. In each case the period of imprisonment may be considered for the purposes of all other employee benefits to be a period of employment by the United States and shall be determined to be creditable service for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251, et seq.). *Provided,* That the individual makes the required employee contribution.

"SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2914) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RENE HUGO HEIMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1336) for the relief of Rene Hugo Heimann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1336

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rene Hugo Heimann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND IN WYOMING TO CLARA DOZIER WIRE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5226) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **BOLAND**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 822, a similar Senate bill, be considered in lieu of H.R. 5226.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue a patent under the Small Tract Act (52 Stat. 609) as amended (43 U.S.C. 682a–682e), to Clara Dozier Wire for the public land described as lot 19, section 22, township 19 north, range 105 west, sixth principal meridian, Wyoming, containing approximately 3.67 acres.

SEC. 2. Such patent shall be issued only if, within one year after the date Clara Dozier Wire is notified by the Secretary of the amount of payment required, she pays to the Secretary the sum of (a) the fair market value of the land as of August 16, 1955, exclusive of any value resulting from the development or improvement of the land by Clara Dozier Wire or her family, and (b) the administrative costs of making the conveyance, as determined by the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5226) was laid on the table.

Mr. **BOLAND**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

ACTION BY THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE IN THE CASE OF SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BINGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's decision by the International Court of Justice was a tragedy, not only for the people of South-West Africa, but for the whole world. In the efforts of mankind to achieve a world in which the rule of law will take the place of international anarchy and the morality of the jungle, yesterday's decision was a long step backward. For technical legal reasons of dubious validity, the Court refused to consider the merits of the most important litigation yet presented to it. By a majority of one, the Court turned its back on the claims for justice of the people of South-West Africa; it also turned its back on those around the world who had hoped that this Court would respond to the challenge to contribute to the enforcement of international standards of morality. In the history of the development of the world's institutions, yesterday will be recorded as a black day.

The failure of the International Court to take any action means that the full burden of devising and carrying out ways and means to see that the people of

South-West Africa are freed from the cruelties and indignities of apartheid and are guaranteed the right of self-determination will fall more than ever on the United Nations and its member states, including the United States. I trust that the President, the Secretary of State, and Ambassador Goldberg will take urgent steps to develop a U.S. policy calculated to achieve these objectives.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 167]

Baring
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Cabell
Callaway
Celler
Conyers
Cramer
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Fogarty
Fraser
Gathings
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hamilton
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Henderson
Hull
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Mills
Mink
Morrison
Murray
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Poage
Powell
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio
St Germain
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Wright

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion I would like to make a brief statement and a request.

In view of the magnitude of the pending bill, the committee would like for Members who wish to discuss it to have an opportunity to do so. I doubt that all of the time to be requested will be utilized, but I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 5 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] and myself.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15941, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Mr. Keogh in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] will be recognized for 2½ hours, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] will be recognized for 2½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am not naive enough to believe that Members will sit rigidly in their seats and listen to every word of discussion of the pending Defense appropriation bill. I know that the great majority of the Members of the House are in favor of a strong defense program. I am thankful for the feeling, also, that the Members of the House trust their colleagues on all committees—Appropriations and others—when it comes to dealing with matters having to do with the survival of the United States.

Nevertheless, while not all Members may sit all the time and listen to the discussion of this bill, members of the Committee on Appropriations cannot absolve themselves of the responsibility of laying it on the line with respect to the purposes of the bill and its general content. Then those who do not hear, friend and foe alike, will have an opportunity to read and interpret the intentions and the motives of the elected representatives of the people.

I should like to make reference to a number of collateral things which are interesting to me and which relate directly or indirectly to the bill, before getting into a discussion of the details of the measure.

FEDERAL SPENDING

I have in my hand a clipping from the morning paper, entitled: "Budget Endangered, L.B.J. Calls for Cuts."

I have in my hand a wire story of the Associated Press of today, from which I quote in part:

> WASHINGTON.—President Johnson appealed to Members of Congress today to keep nondefense spending in line with his recommendations, saying one alternative is a tax increase.
>
> Johnson himself briefed newsmen after Members of the House and and Senate Appropriations Committees had returned to Capitol Hill after conferring with Johnson for more than an hour.
>
> Earlier, one of the conference participants, Senate Democratic leader Mike Mansfield of Montana, said Johnson told them that if Congress did not cut back on appropriations he would be forced to increase deficit spending or ask for a tax increase.
>
> Johnson said add-ons to his recommendations already amount to about $1 billion and budget estimates indicate this could reach $5 billion to $6 billion, bringing the budget close to $120 billion compared with the budget request of $113 billion.

If this situation should develop, in my opinion it would be most damaging to the welfare of the country, economically and otherwise.

I continue to read:

> While saying a tax increase is one alternative to a hold-down in non-defense spending, Johnson said there will be no decision by him on this until the appropriation bills are further along in Congress and after it has been determined how much additional spending will be required in Vietnam.
>
> He—

Meaning the President—

> said there will be a request for a substantial supplemental appropriation for Vietnam—

There will be a substantial additional request for defense. I might interpolate, it could be $10 billion. I do not know how much it will be, and neither does the President—

> but that it is impossible at this stage to tell how much it will be.

That is the end of the story.

Let me review for Members who are interested in the fiscal affairs of the country and the economic stability of the country—and you are interested—what we have done thus far in the House.

In appropriation bills passed thus far in the House, we are below the President's budget request by $280 million.

What the President really was talking about, in my judgment, was the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, which the House increased far above the President's budget, making it unnecessarily high, in my judgment.

What he was further talking about, in my judgment—and I was there at the meeting—was the threat that this Congress may authorize vastly more than he has requested for the education program.

This would certainly throw the budgetary plans of the Government very much out of balance, and this step should not be taken, I for one shall not support an authorization or an appropriation bill that does any such thing. Neither will I support a poverty bill which goes far above the large sums requested by the President.

My colleagues, I say to you that it is time for Members of the House to stand on their two feet and take the responsibility for undertaking to hold spending within decent and reasonable limits. In the face of this kind of admonition, however, we have merrily gone on our way authorizing far more than has been requested and, in my judgment, the President has already requested too much for many of these nondefense programs.

Now, what about this bill? You can point your finger and say, "Mr. Mahon, is this bill not $900 million above the budget?" If you do, I would have to say, "Yes." I will discuss that as we go along, and I will give you the reasons why it is. I have said to those in the places of highest authority in the country, and I say to you today that you cannot expect elected officials of the Government, certainly in an election year, to appear to be unwilling to appropriate every dime that might possibly be needed for the defense and security of the United States.

Now, I make a sharp distinction here between defense and nondefense spending. Generally speaking, not many Members are going to go home and boast about cutting defense programs, even those they think may be of doubtful validity.

IMPORTANCE OF BILL

In a war, speeches and official pronouncements are often necessary and quite important. Legislation is often necessary and important. However, a modern war cannot be fought without money, without big money. This bill before us today provides the money, an all-important ingredient for action and success in the war. Without this bill, without the money appropriated in this bill, all of the official pronouncements and legislation otherwise would be little more than scraps of paper. Insofar as fighting the war successfully is concerned, they would be futile.

This pending bill, then—and I say this without fear of contradiction—is the most important bill of this session of Congress. Without it this session of Congress would be a dismal, a tragic, and an utter failure. I make this statement not to enhance the bill which I have the honor to present but in order to put the facts in proper perspective.

This is the largest single defense appropriation bill presented to Congress since World War II. This huge defense bill is not spoken of boastfully or capriciously. I speak of it with deep regret. Even without the anticipated supplemental request, the Department of Defense will have available to it during the current fiscal year, which began on July 1, the sum of $100 billion.

Think of that amount of money and the responsibility of those who must administer the expenditure of it.

Mr. Chairman, it would take too long to catalog what this money could do if expended for peaceful purposes on the local, State, and National level.

So, of course, it is unfortunate that we have to take so much of our Nation's resources and such a heavy tax bite from the citizens, but we have no alternative.

Mr. Chairman, our Government has concluded that the immediate and long-range safety and well-being of the people of the United States are involved in this war. It must, therefore, be brought to a successful conclusion.

The American people have put their shoulders to the wheel, their hand to the plow, and there is no turning back.

The approval of this bill is one of the strongest possible indications that Congress supports a policy which calls for the successful prosecution of the war. All of the diverse voices in the country to the contrary—and there are a few, relatively few—this represents a determination to win on the part of the elected representatives of the people.

It is a signal to the whole wide world. Will Hanoi misread the signal? I do not know, nor does anyone else know, nor can any one individual predict the turn in the war and how long it will last.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that certainly it would be the height of folly for Hanoi to ignore the implications of the bill which this House will pass today or tomorrow. No vacillation or appeasement is written into the measure pending before us today. There is no encouragement here to opponents who hope the United States will get tired and quit.

Mr. Chairman, while the pending bill is important and it takes a huge bite out of the income of the taxpayers, it is, fortunately, relatively noncontroversial.

Although the war is of deep concern to all Members of Congress, there is little dispute over the necessity for providing adequately for our military forces.

There is some difference of opinion as to the timing of our financial support. Some say we ought to add additional billions now, giving the Defense Department, more or less, a blank check, because we know large sums will be needed later. But many of us feel, "Well, why should we add these large additional sums now, since we cannot clearly define what the requirements may be? Why not wait until the Executive can come forth with a budget estimate and make a formal request, documenting the needs?

Mr. Chairman, I believe the no-blank-check approach is better. But be that as it may, this is procedural; it is not very important.

POLICY OF FIRMNESS

Mr. Chairman, some will disagree with the level of funding in several programs contained in the bill. Some may disapprove of the antiballistic missile program which we are recommending here, and there are other differences of opinion. But I would say that probably 95 percent of the funds provided in this bill are hardly in disagreement at all. The important fact is that we are united in our support of a firm and effective policy. But, frankly, we must confess to each other that we are not quite sure in every respect just what that firm and effective policy should consist of.

We hear statements to the effect that certain actions, such as the blockading of a port or the bombing of a target, would quickly end the war. Unfortunately, the war in Vietnam is a difficult, complex problem which does not lend itself to instant solutions. Along with our men and our material, perservance on the part of Americans is essential to eventual success.

World War II ended more than 20 years ago, but today we have more than five divisions in Europe. The Korean war ended more than 10 years ago, but today we have two divisions in Korea. If the fighting stopped in South Vietnam today, we would probably be required to maintain a substantial military presence in that country for quite some time.

The immense value of the firm position of the United States in southeast Asia becomes apparent when we look at recent developments in Indonesia. The Communist Chinese had long sought to subvert and gain control of the Government of that country. Recently the people of Indonesia have been able to overcome these efforts and have broken the back, at least for the time being, of Communist power in Indonesia. If the United States had not been willing to back up its expressed support of freedom in southeast Asia with active military intervention when the situation seemed to demand it, it is most probable that the people of Indonesia would not have dared to make their bold stroke against communism.

Other nations and other peoples watch the progress of the conflict between communism and freedom very carefully. They want to pick a winner. They want to be on the winning side, and the people of Indonesia seemingly have demonstrated who they think will be the ultimate winner and it is not the Communists.

The willingness of the United States, in defense of its security, to make sacrifices to defeat communism in southeast Asia has bolstered the Government and the people of Thailand in their resistance to Communist aggression. There is no substitute for firmness and action in opposing Communist aggression. Pronouncements and debates will not suffice.

The achievements of the Communists have not been too impressive in recent times.

The reversal in Indonesia is not the only setback. The Soviet adventure in Cuba is of great concern to us but to the Soviets it is an expensive deadend which is costing Moscow about $300 million each year. Their subversive efforts in Venezuela, Guatemala, Peru, and in the Dominican Republic have all failed as of this date.

In Africa, where the many problems facing the new governments seem to offer fertile fields for Communist subversion, the two most prominent friends of the Soviets, Nkrumah and Ben Bella, have both been overthrown.

The people of captive countries in Eastern Europe continue to strive for more national independence and more individual liberty and are winning some degree of freedom from Soviet domination.

The Chinese Communists have thus far failed in east Africa, failed in their effort to mobilize the young nationalist nations at the Algiers Conference, and failed in their callous efforts to exploit the unfortunate war between India and Pakistan.

We have had our problems in foreign policy, but our opponents have had serious problems themselves. In our free country, we hear about the real or imagined errors and frustrations which we suffer in the field of foreign policy. We should be careful to balance this picture with the facts on our opponents' reverses. The cause of freedom has gained in the world and the cause of communism has been weakened, and we should recognize this fact.

CONTROL OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara is a much discussed man who has the responsibility for the management of the $100 billion available to the Department of Defense and wants to prevent overspending. He wants to prevent uncontrolled spending.

Mr. Chairman, we have had experience with uncontrolled spending in previous wars in this century, and we all know that when war is in progress or when war clouds are hovering, there is a tendency to abandon the necessary controls over expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, this is a time when many financial restraints are loosened and a lot of people in Government and out of Government, in various capacities, see an opportunity to get the money for projects which would not have a chance under normal conditions.

There has been and will be a lot of competition for the $100 billion. I think you know that. We all know that.

DANGER OF OVERSPENDING

Secretary McNamara is trying to monitor defense programs, screen requests, and prevent excesses in the midst of war. This is no easy task, but I think the American people feel that it should be earnestly undertaken. It is true that we have a tendency to say in wartime, "Who cares about money? It is victory we want, at a minimum cost to human life."

This is a worthy impulse, but there is no good reason why we should not strive for victory at a minimum cost in lives, but at the same time with a cold, dispassionate concern about overspending.

Does not everybody know that we could be defeated in a measure on the home front by waste and overspending? Big spending is a major threat to our growth and stability and if we are not worried about it we ought to be.

I do not have it in my heart to stand before the House of Representatives and condemn unreservedly any man who, with good intentions, seeks to monitor the expenditures of huge sums and keep some control over a massive operation.

This is not to intimate that Secretary McNamara is a piker when it comes to defense spending. From some of his critics one would think that he is not much of a spender in defense, but I would say to you that he is far and away the biggest spender who ever occupied the position of Secretary of Defense.

A lot of dust over certain controversial matters has seemingly obscured from some the huge magnitude of the spending which is now being handled under the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Let me point this out: During the last 4 years, 1962 to 1965, Congress provided the Department of Defense huge sums of money, averaging over $47 billion a year, for functions which are covered in the pending bill. This represents an increase of slightly more than $10 billion a year over the average of appropriations during the previous 4 years. How can anyone, in the face of facts like that, shout that we are not spending a considerable sum on the defense programs?

For the current fiscal year, we are being asked for a sum of nearly $60 billion to finance the defense program, and we are being told, and correctly so, that a number of additional billions of dollars will be required when the needs can be better identified, assuming that the war continues.

DEFENSE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE LAST 4 YEARS

If it had not been for the large defense appropriations of the past several years—and mark these words well—we would not have been able to cope with the crisis in Vietnam without declaring a national emergency. It would have been impossible.

I asked the Department of Defense to provide me with a summary of these accomplishments and will include the statement furnished to me at this point.

WHAT DID THE NATION RECEIVE FOR THE INCREASES IN DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS IN FISCAL YEARS 1962–65?

For the four fiscal years 1962–65, the Congress provided for the military functions of the Defense Department a total of $198.2 billion, compared with the $156.8 billion provided for the four fiscal years 1957–60. (FY 1961 is omitted from this comparison because it was the transition year between the Republican and Democratic administrations. FY 1965 is used as the terminal date because it immediately preceded the major deployment of U.S. troops to Vietnam.) This is an increase of more than $41 billion over the FY 1957–60 level. What did the nation receive for this increase in the Defense budget?

As shown on the attached Table, the costs of active duty military personnel were $5.8 billion more in FY 1962–65 than in FY 1957–60. A large part of this increase was required simply to pay for pay raises and other benefits provided by the Congress to our military personnel. As a result, the average cost per military man increased from $4,295 in FY 1961 to $4,762 in FY 1965. The balance of the increase, however, went to pay for additional military personnel. For example, the active duty strength of the Army was increased from about 860,000 at the end of FY 1961 to about 970,000 by the end of FY 1965, an increase of 110,000. With this increase, the Army was able to round out the manning and make combat ready three of its divisions which in 1961 were being used for training and to add two new divisions, thereby raising the total number of combat ready divisions to 16. In the Marine Corps an additional 15,000 men were added to round out the manning of its units and the authorized strength of the Navy was increased by about 50,000 men to support the addition of about 100 active ships to the Fleet. Another $2.1 billion of the $41.4 billion increase was required for the pay of the growing number of military personnel on the retired roles, an additional expense which would have had to be incurred in any event.

Operation and maintenance costs, which are closely related to numbers of military personnel and the overall size of the force, required $7.1 billion more during FY 1962–65 than in the FY 1957–60 period. Included in this sum were pay increases for most of the civilian employees of the Defense Establishment, whose compensation is funded in these appropriations.

Thus, the increase in our military forces and in the compensation of the Defense Department's military and civilian personnel accounted for $15.3 billion or 37 percent of the total increase in Defense appropriations, FY 1962–65 over FY 1957–60.

Another $13.6 billion of the $41.4 billion increase was in the area of major procurement. The largest part of this increase, almost $5.9 billion, went for ordnance, vehicles and related equipment, principally for the General Purpose or Limited War Forces. This is precisely the category of procurement most closely related to the kind of military effort in which our forces are now engaged in Vietnam. These are the funds required for the procurement of ground ammunition, aircraft, bombs and Army and Marine Corps weapons and equipment of all types. Similarly, most of the $1.8 billion of additional funds provided for electronics and communications equipment was for our ground forces.

For construction of ships $3.7 billion more was provided, not only for Polaris submarines, but also for a large increase in the shipbuilding program of the Navy's General Purpose Forces.

The increase of $3.3 billion for missiles reflects the vast increase in our strategic missile forces which took place in the FY 1962–65 period. On June 30, 1961, we had a total of only 108 strategic missiles in place; by June 30 a year ago we had 1,318, notwithstanding the fact that 126 Atlas and 54 Titan missiles had been phased out of the forces in FY 1964–65.

The small reduction in appropriations for aircraft obscures several important changes in the types of aircraft being procured. While funds for strategic aircraft declined sharply in the FY 1962–65 period as compared with FY 1957–60, funds provided for tactical aircraft and airlift aircraft were significantly increased. For example, in FY 1961 a total of $362 million was provided for 180 Air Force tactical fighters. During the FY 1962–65 period, an average of more than $865 million for 360 aircraft a year was provided. With regard to airlift, the original FY 1961 Budget request provided only $70 million for 25 aircraft. During the FY 1962–65 period, an average of about $450 million for about 120 airlift aircraft a year was provided. Our airlift capacity in being was actually doubled from FY 1961 to FY 1965, with a far greater increase in prospect when all of the new aircraft funded in the FY 1962–65 period are delivered. Finally, a total of 3,566 helicopters were financed in the FY 1962–65 period for the Army alone, compared with 1,139 in FY 1957–60. It has been this more than three-fold increase in the helicopter procurement that has made possible the tremendous mobility of our forces now in South Vietnam.

One of the most dramatic increases was in the research and development program, with $14 billion more being provided in FY 1962–65 than in the FY 1957–60 period, an increase of more than 100%. A significant part of this increase was for the military space program which, during most of the FY 1957–60 period, was in its infancy. Another large part of the increase was required to bring to fruition the advanced Polaris and Minuteman missiles which now constitute the bulk of our strategic missile forces.

Most of the increases in the Defense program which took place during the FY 1962–65 period long had been urged upon the Defense Department by the House Appropriations Committee e.g. the acceleration of the Polaris program, the expansion of the airlift, the increase in procurement for the Army (for which $9.7 billion was appropriated in FY 1962–65 compared with $3.1bil in FY57–60), as well as the strengthening of our limited war forces generally. In retrospect, it is perfectly clear that without these increases in the Defense appropriations, particularly for the expansion and strengthening of our limited war capabilities, we would have been unable to cope with the crisis which developed in South Vietnam a year ago, short of declaring a national emergency, calling up the reserve forces and initiating a crash production program, just as we had to do during the Korean War. With only 4 combat ready Army divisions in the central reserve (including one in Hawaii) we could never have deployed into combat 100,000 men to Vietnam, some 10,000 miles away, in 120 days. And, without the great increase in the procurement of ordnance and other consumables, we could not have sustained them in combat as well as we have.

The bulk of the additional Defense appropriations which were required for FY 1966 and 1967 are going to pay for the actual costs of the conflict in Vietnam, that is, for the ground ammunition, air-delivered ordnance and other consumables required to support combat expenditure rates, for additional aircraft and other equipment to replace combat attrition, and for the additional personnel needed for the rotation of troops in Southeast Asia to spread the risks of combat. In this connection it should be noted that one of the basic concepts of our military operations in Vietnam is to maximize the utilization of firepower and mobility in order to minimize the loss of American lives. And this, by itself, accounts for a very major part of the increase in funds required in FY 1966-67.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of new obligational authority, fiscal years 1957-60 and fiscal years 1962-65*

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal years 1957-60	Fiscal years 1962-65	Difference	
			Total	Percent
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION				
Military personnel:				
Active Forces	$42,155	$47,948	+$5,793	+11.4
Reserve Forces	2,538	2,759	+221	+8.7
Retired pay	2,437	4,573	+2,136	+87.6
Total	47,130	55,280	+8,150	+17.3
Operation and maintenance	40,459	47,563	+7,104	+17.6
Procurement:				
Aircraft	24,600	23,130	−1,470	−6.0
Missiles	10,221	13,490	+3,269	+32.0
Ships	6,141	9,871	+3,730	+60.1
Ordnance, vehicles, and related equipment	1,585	7,459	+5,874	+370.6
Electronics and communications	3,179	4,943	+1,764	+55.5
Other procurement	2,556	3,000	+444	+17.7
Total	48,282	61,894	+13,612	+28.2
Research, development, test, and evaluation	12,827	26,862	+14,053	+109.4
Military construction, family housing	6,749	6,039	−710	−10.6
Civil defense		600	+600	(1)
Revolving and management funds	292		−292	
Total, military functions	156,840	198,238	+41,398	+26.4
DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY				
Department of the Army	34,473	48,288	+13,815	+40.1
Department of the Navy	43,816	59,787	+15,971	+36.5
Department of the Air Force	72,638	78,357	+5,719	+7.9
Defense agencies, Office of the Secretary of Defense	3,871	9,893	+6,022	+155.6
Civil defense		600	+600	(1)
Transfers from prior years	+2,042	+1,312	(1)	(1)
Total, military functions	156,840	198,238	+41,398	+26.4

[1] Not applicable.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of expenditures, fiscal years 1957-60 and fiscal years 1962-65*

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal years 1957-60	Fiscal years 1962-65	Difference	
			Total	Percent
Military personnel:				
Active Forces	$41,760	$47,890	+$6,130	+14.6
Reserve Forces	2,391	2,605	+214	+8.9
Retired pay	2,408	4,502	+2,094	+86.9
Total	46,559	54,998	+8,439	+18.1
Operation and maintenance	39,849	47,749	+7,900	+19.8
Procurement:				
Aircraft	31,442	23,962	−7,480	−23.8
Missiles	10,653	12,932	+2,279	+21.4
Ships	5,182	8,219	+3,037	+58.6
Ordnance, vehicles, and related equipment	1,881	5,708	+3,827	+203.4
Electronics and communications	3,180	4,727	+1,547	+48.6
Other procurement	2,975	2,805	−170	−5.8
Total	55,314	58,354	+3,040	+5.5
Research, development, test, and evaluation	12,486	25,952	+13,466	+107.8
Military construction, family housing	7,295	6,150	−1,145	−15.7
Civil defense		493	+493	(1)
Revolving and management funds	−1,561	−2,693	−1,132	(1)
Total, military functions	159,944	191,000	+31,059	+19.4
DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY				
Department of the Army	36,973	46,576	+9,603	+72.7
Department of the Navy	44,672	55,184	+10,512	+23.5
Department of the Air Force	74,946	80,207	5,261	+7.0
Defense agencies, Office of the Secretary of Defense	3,352	8,542	+5,190	+254.8
Civil defense		493	+493	(1)
Total, military functions	159,944	191,000	+31,059	+19.4

[1] Not applicable.

It seems that the noncrash program which has been followed has been a most prudent and effective course to follow insofar as expenditures are concerned. We could afford to follow a noncrash program because we have spent at a high level over a number of years for defense in order to be prepared. This has been better for the war effort and better for the economy. Efforts have been made to procure as much as possible through the competitive bid method, rather than engage in costly crash programs on a cost-plus basis, as has been done generally in wartime heretofore.

I applaud this more reasonable, methodical, and efficient approach, as I believe you do. We cannot, of course, have it both ways.

In my view it would not be wise to channel huge, unnecessary funds from the Treasury into the Pentagon, knowing full well that a few years hence critics will be in a position to do again as they have done so many times before, soundly berate our military officials for inordinate and extravagent purchases.

I do not have to remind you that this sort of thing has happened in the past.

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON DEFENSE

I would like to make another corollary statement in regard to the problems before us. My colleagues on the subcommittee in the minority have come forward with a proposal of which I have not previously taken note, but which I feel I should discuss at the moment.

The additional views found on page 34 of the report begin by stressing a lack of confidence in our defense programs and officials. It calls for something to be done about what is called a very serious situation.

I quote:

> It is for these reasons—and because only an objective third party can impartially arbitrate such a grave matter—that the undersigned—

And we are seeking apparently here an arbiter of these grave matters—

> that the undersigned propose enactment of a Joint Resolution calling for the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission, made up of the highest calibre experts from both the civilian and military communities, to conduct an independent and objective evaluation of the projected defense posture of this country.

I have been somewhat intrigued and a bit dismayed by the projection into this bill on the part of some of the minority members of a proposed Blue Ribbon Commission.

To tell you the truth, I have been so fed up and disgusted with the proliferation of commissions and study groups for so long a time, and I was so startled at this suggestion, that it took me some time to recover and make an observation about it. What I think we need generally is fewer commissions and not more.

The proposed Blue Ribbon Commission would be charged with conducting "an independent and objective evaluation of the projected defense posture of this country." This would not be a congressional Blue Ribbon Commission. According to the report, it would be made up of "the highest calibre experts."

The commission of experts would inevitably be required to investigate the war as a part of the study of the defense posture; otherwise, the commission would be derelict in its important duties.

I note at this point that there has been a growing tendency on the part of officials in the executive branch to pass the buck on important matters by hiring consultants and nonprofit corporations and firms outside the Government to make studies and, in effect, at least in part, to make decisions that we are paying Government executives to make. I do not want any commission made up of experts taking the responsibility of my colleagues in the House of Representatives when it comes to dealing, as elected representatives of the people, with the survival of the United States.

We have been critical at times of people in the Department of Defense who attempt to dodge hard questions put to them by members of the committee by saying, "We are having a study made of that." That is one of the dead-end answers that we sometimes abhor.

I believe you will agree with me that Congress must not join the buck passers. We must stand up and face our responsibility, and we will.

We must not ask someone else to do the work that the House has assigned to its appropriate committees. I know that the hearings are long, the work is arduous, and that Members are pressed for time and have many other things to do, but I believe that the elected Members of the legislative branch must do their own work and make their own decisions, or the people of this country will be deprived of the representative government which is theirs to claim under the Constitution.

The operation of the seniority system is a rather effective management tool in the House, although it is not always perfect. It enables the Members to sit on committees and subcommittees for the number of years which are required to obtain some experience which is so necessary to making intelligent decisions. For instance, the eight members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations have served a total of 111 years in processing defense appropriations.

Let us explore a little more deeply the background and experience of congressional committees which deal with defense. I see some of the Members here who deal with it on the legislative committee, some of the important Members—and they are all important. The members of the House Armed Services Committee have served a total of 398 years on their committee. I have not checked the figures for the Senate Armed Services Committee, but it is a very experienced group. I did check on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in the other body. The total period of service for all members of the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is 243 years.

Let me add a footnote here. If we do not know something about what is going on, we have nobody to blame but ourselves. Mostly at the taxayers' expense, and properly so, 115 Members of the House and Senate, visited Vietnam in the last year and a half.

Do the sponsors of the blue ribbon commission approach wish to downgrade these committees and subcommittees and the members thereof? How long would it take the experts of the blue ribbon commission to acquire the background and experience and knowledge and judgment which are already possessed, I feel, by the committees of Congress which deal with vital military matters?

Of course, it may be contemplated that the blue ribbon commission would be made up of military men. I can see no special good that would come from having a committee of former expert military men, who no longer have the responsibility for making decisions, to come forth and tell the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Congress what should be done about present defense needs.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The conduct of the war is the responsibility of the President and of the Congress. We cannot evade this responsibility. We are elected officials. The blue ribbon commission would be an appointed group. Nor can the executive branch evade responsibility for the military posture and the long-range security of the United States. I for one do not want to escape that responsibility. We do not need to be reminded of our duty. We simply need to do our duty, and this I believe we are doing.

One of the complaints in former years has been that the country starved the military during times of peace and gave them a blank check during times of war. That is not the way to run the Military Establishment, and that is not the way we run the Military Establishment. We have had a strong Military Establishment ever since the buildup which began with the Korean war in 1950. I propose that we continue as Members of Congress to see to it—and we can—that we have a strong military program, a program sufficient to give the President complete freedom to take whatever steps he deems necessary to defend the best interests of the United States in any corner of the earth.

One is at liberty to find fault with our military and international policies, and we all find some faults—and we should, because constructive criticism is good—but one cannot point a finger to the U.S. Congress and correctly say that we have failed in our responsibility to maintain and support the most powerful military force in the modern world.

As a sidelight, I should like to point out that a great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, was saddled during the War Between the States with a Committee on the Conduct of the War. That committee has been categorized by historians in less than complimentary terms. The committee's habit of asking subordinate military officers to testify as to the effectiveness of their superior officers complicated already existing problems confronting the President and the Army.

The appointment of such a committee was, of course, an expression of lack of confidence in President Lincoln; and, in my opinion, the passage of a resolution by Congress appointing a blue ribbon commission would be an expression of lack of confidence in the Commander in Chief, an elected official of the Government, and a lack of confidence in the Congress to do the job assigned to it under the Constitution.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

So much has been said in and out of the House of Representatives about Secretary of Defense McNamara that I shall take advantage of this opportunity to say a few words about him—not in praise and not in defense, but simply in regard to the facts of the situation.

A lot of people who want a blank check would like to destroy Robert McNamara.

A lot of people with the sincerest of motives would like to see the Secretary removed because they question the validity of his decisions.

I would say this about the Secretary: He has cooperated somewhat at times with his critics. He has the misfortune of never having run for a political office, and he does not realize, to the extent that some of us do, that a statement can be taken out of context.

What I am trying to say is that while the Secretary has made some mistakes, he has been given credit for making mistakes which he actually did not make.

The Secretary will have under his control this year, as I have said, $100 billion, and that does not include the supplemental which will come forward later.

What kind of man do the American people want to handle funds of this unbelievable magnitude? An indecisive man? A weakling?

We do not need a "yes man" as Secretary of Defense. What we need is a combination of a "yes and no man," who cannot be stampeded, who does not run for cover when attacked, and who is dedicated to the public interest. That is the kind we need, I believe.

We need a man who works day and night to be of service to our fighting men and to the taxpayers of the United States.

We need a man who is loyal to the President, his boss, who is elected by the people and who, under our Constitution, is the Commander in Chief of our military forces.

There does not quickly come to mind at the moment a man who would be superior to Secretary McNamara as Secretary of Defense, although, of course, there are others who are qualified to be Secretary of Defense. The job is really an impossible job, anyway. No man can do the job without making a lot of enemies. What man among us could do a good job as Secretary of Defense, making all of the necessary hard decisions, and still keep all of the admirals, all of the generals, all of the defense contractors, and all of the columnists happy all of the time? I just do not think it can be done.

You cannot push this man around. I am not so sure that the American people want a man who has the responsibility for the handling of $100 billion pushed around by a selfish group, or by an unselfish group for that matter.

Without a strong man as our Secretary of Defense there would be chaos, I mean even more chaos, in the Pentagon than we already have. Every service would be fighting its own private war.

I leave it to you and to the American public to determine whether or not the present Secretary of Defense measures up reasonably well to the requirements of the job he has to do. The Secretary of Defense, as I say, is brilliant, but he is not infallible. At times I sharply disagree with him and I do not hesitate to tell him so.

Now, if you will turn to pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, you will find evidence of the viewpoint I have just expressed. For example, I did everything I could to get the Secretary to support an additional supplemental budget estimate, before we brought in this bill for $600 million to pay the salaries of all the servicemen who were already in uniform as of June 30. Their salaries have to be paid, and I thought that our committee should not bring a bill to you which did not even cover the pay cost of all of the men in uniform. This request was not forthcoming. It should have been. The money request could have been passed over until a later date and the Department could have used up the money available at a faster rate and later come back to Congress for more. But, in the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, State, and elsewhere we provide the funds at the beginning of the year to pay the personnel on board for the entire year. I thought we should do the same for the actual number of men in service.

Moreover, I felt that if we had an additional budget estimate for defense we would highlight the astronomical cost of the war, and it would enable those of us who are trying to hold the lid down on spending and on overauthorization to do our job a little better. It would tend to shock the country and the Congress into a greater realization of the magnitude of the money cost of this war, not to mention the cost in the lives of our citizens.

We bring before you today a bill providing $58 billion for the defense of the country.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I have permission to insert in the RECORD page 2 of the report, which gives a very clear statement of the money involved.

Summary of appropriations

Title	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967	Recommended in bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967
Title I—Military personnel	$17,039,491,000	$18,675,700,000	$19,299,344,000	+$2,259,853,000	+$623,644,000
Title II—Operation and maintenance	14,973,962,000	15,675,094,000	15,722,794,000	+748,832,000	+47,700,000
Title III—Procurement	18,423,400,000	16,408,200,000	16,652,600,000	−1,770,800,000	+244,400,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	6,721,150,000	6,905,359,000	6,928,959,000	+207,809,000	+23,600,000
Title V—Emergency fund, southeast Asia	1,700,000,000			−1,700,000,000	
Title V—Special foreign currency program		(1)	7,348,000	+7,348,000	+7,348,000
Total	58,858,003,000	57,664,353,000	58,611,045,000	−246,958,000	+946,692,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:					
Army	15,727,989,000	16,925,794,000	17,441,038,000	+1,713,049,000	+515,244,000
Navy	17,267,524,000	16,813,200,000	16,933,200,000	−334,324,000	+120,000,000
Air Force	21,298,085,000	20,686,300,000	20,965,400,000	−332,685,000	+279,100,000
Defense agencies, Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,864,405,000	3,239,059,000	3,271,407,000	+407,002,000	+32,348,000
Emergency fund, southeast Asia	1,700,000,000			−1,700,000,000	
Total, Department of Defense	58,858,003,000	57,664,353,000	58,611,045,000	−246,958,000	+946,692,000

[1] The original budget estimates were submitted in local currency amounts which were equivalent to $11,975,000. The original amounts were subsequently reduced to $7,348,000 at the request of the Department of Defense.

This bill does not quite reach the total amount appropriated last year for defense in the several bils. It is a quarter of a billion dollars below that. But it is the largest single appropriation bill since World War II. In addition we will very likely have a big supplemental coming along early next year unless the war concludes, which most of us do not anticipate.

The table shows recommendations for each service. It shows that we recommend $946 million above the budget. If we turn to page 3, we find out why we are above the budget:

Scope of the bill

The bill contains funds equivalent to all of the program and activity amounts proposed in the budget estimates. A major readjustment, and several suggestions as to realignment of priorities as between programs of relatively minor consequence, are noted elsewhere in this report	$57,664,353,000
The bill contains funds for continuing personnel, functions, or activities, which either were not proposed for continuation in the budget, or were proposed for reduction or major reallocation, as follows:	
Military personnel already on duty above the strength estimated as of July 1, 1966	569,000,000
Retaining separate Army National Guard and Army Reserve organizations	67,044,000
Retain all 25 Air National Guard heavy airlift units	4,300,000
Continue B-52 fleet at 600 aircraft	6,000,000
Continue "Claims" as regular annual appropriation	$25,000,000
Provide appropriation in lieu of foreign currency authorization	7,348,000
Subtotal, revisions	678,692,000
New programs deemed desirable for our military security, not proposed in the budget are provided for as follows:	
1. NIKE-X anti-ballistic missile system (net after deleting a classified item of $4,600,000)	163,300,000
2. Additional OH-6A light observation helicopters	19,900,000
3. One nuclear powered frigate (net after deletion of two conventional destroyers)	
4. Provision for production capability for the F-12 interceptor aircraft	55,000,000
5. Procurement of aeromedical transport aircraft	16,000,000
6. Augmentation of Deep Submergence program	5,000,000
7. Additional funding for Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (net after reducing another item of $3,000,000, as described elsewhere)	8,800,000
Subtotal additions	268,000,000
The total appropriations recommended	58,611,045,000

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Mr. Chairman, we are above the budget to the extent of $569 million because of the necessity for including money which was not budgeted for the pay of the men and women in uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we provided $67,044,000 to keep the Guard and Reserve separate because legislation has not been passed resolving this question.

We added $167 million above the budget, offset by a $4 million reduction in another program, with which to provide the beginnings of an antimissile program, a defense against Soviet ICBM's or prospective Red Chinese ICBM's. The $167 million makes the appropriation for the so-called Nike-X system run to about $600 million, including the $417 million requested in the budget and provided to continue research and development.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we recommend for the continuation of the line for the manufacture of the hottest interceptor aircraft known today, the F-12, $55 million.

Then, we have certain other items involving smaller amounts.

So, Mr. Chairman, in total, we are above the budget in the amount of about $946 million. But, this is relatively unimportant, because we are going to be above the amount in this bill before the fiscal year ends, if the war continues.

ADEQUACY OF THE BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union the matter of the adequacy of the budget. That discussion begins on page 4 of the report and I shall insert that into the RECORD:

Adequacy of the Estimates

The formulation of the financial programs of the Federal Government for a given fiscal year must of necessity be based on a number of arbitrary assumptions. A year is an arbitrary fiscal period. The Budget must be submitted to Congress prior to an arbitrary point in time. Arbitrary positions must be taken as to whether or not possible future events will come to pass.

In determining the Defense budget requests for fiscal year 1967, the basic arbitrary decision was made to finance wartime rates of operation in Vietnam throughout fiscal year 1967. This decision should not be construed as a prediction as to when the war will end. It simply provides guidelines for the calculation of the funds that may be required. The date of the termination of the war is, of course, impossible to predict.

In the preparation of the Defense budget, other assumptions were made as to the levels of manning; the rates of utilization of military supplies; the rates of the operation of aircraft, ships, and other major military equipment, and so forth.

The Committee wishes to make it clear that as the fiscal year proceeds, if combat operations continue at a high level, substantial additional funds will be required. The Defense Department has advised the Committee that if the Vietnam war continues a substantial supplemental request for additional funds will be made when the requirements can be more accurately computed. These decisions will have to be made months prior to June 30, 1967 and will materially affect both the fiscal year 1967 and 1968 Defense budgets. The Committee feels that such additional requirements would undoubtedly total several billion dollars. It is not possible at this time to calculate with certainty just what the additional requirements may be and no specific date has been determined for submission of a supplemental request. The Committee feels however, that such a request cannot be postponed beyond January or February of next year. It will be recalled that the Supplemental Defense request for the current fiscal year was sent to Congress on January 19, 1966.

When the Budget for fiscal year 1967 was submitted to Congress in January, it was estimated that the total military personnel strength on June 30, 1966, would be 2,987,300. In the intervening five months military manpower has been increased at a more rapid rate and it is now estimated that our military manpower will total 3,095,700 at that time, an increase of 108,400. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $569,000,000 above the Budget estimate for the pay and allowances of additional personnel. The assumption is made that no manpower reductions will take place during the fiscal year and that funds will be required for at least this many personnel for the entire period.

It should be added that if pending legislation, providing pay increases for military and civilian personnel, is enacted into law, a supplemental sum will have to be added during fiscal year 1967 to cover the cost. It will be recalled that during the current fiscal year pay increase legislation enacted last year required a supplemental appropriation. A budget request was submitted on March 8, 1966, and Congress completed action on May 10, 1966.

The Department of Defense estimates that at the end of the current fiscal year, on June 30, 1966, the Department will have on hand in unexpended funds nearly $42 billion. If the sum recommended in the accompanying bill is approved, the Department of Defense will have on hand for expenditure in the coming fiscal year a total sum of just over $100 billion—this is not to say that this total sum will or should be expended during fiscal year 1967.

The Congress follows a full-funding practice in financing major weapons systems for the Department of Defense. Much of the money is for long lead-time items such as aircraft, ships, and missiles and will not be expended for two or three years, thus the large carryover sums.

Of course, much of this huge total is already obligated and the Department of Defense estimates that by June 30, 1967, all of the available funds will be obligated except $8.4 billion.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who say that the $100 billion of availability is not enough. Of course, $100 billion is not going to be spent in the current fiscal year. Much of it is for long leadtime items such as aircraft and ships, which will not be spent for a much longer time.

Is the bill adequate? I will say to you frankly, as the President said in his press conference today, it is not adequate for the full fiscal year, but insofar as I know it is adequate for the next several months until we can see a little clearer the turn of the war.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we can turn to page 10 of the report and find out what the military personnel requirements are and what personnel are supported by this bill:

Active duty military personnel strengths (excluding reimbursables)

[In thousands]

	Actual strength		Fiscal year 1966 (end) planned [1]	Fiscal year 1967 (end) estimate
	June 30, 1965	Dec. 31, 1965		
Army	968.3	1,074.5	1,211.0	1,233.7
Navy	671.0	725.0	740.5	727.9
Marine Corps	190.2	214.5	257.4	278.2
Air Force	823.6	841.2	886.8	853.4
Total, Department of Defense	2,653.1	2,855.1	3,095.7	3,093.1

[1] Unofficially revised.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to total due to rounding.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, the defense appropriations bill supports over 1 million civilian personnel, not to mention the employees of the huge defense industry.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is considerable information in regard to the details of the legislation available in the report, as well as in the six volumes of committee hearings.

In closing, I want to say to you, my fellow Members of the House, it is a pleasure to serve in a body where men and women are so united in their determination to keep this country strong.

And, Mr. Chairman, the step we take today, or tomorrow, I say again, will be a signal which I hope and pray will not be unheeded by the enemies of freedom in Hanoi or elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for their attention.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Seventy-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 168]

Aspinall
Baring
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Cabell
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Denton
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Farnsley
Fisher
Fogarty
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Henderson
Hull
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McEwen
McMillan
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller
Mills
Mink
Morgan
Morrison
Murray
Nedzi
Olson, Minn.
Passman
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Udall
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Younger

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15941, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 364 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House of Representatives today, H.R. 15941, will provide appropriations of new obligational authority in the amount of $58,611,045,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1967. This bill covers appropriations for regular military functions of the Department of Defense and includes our Nation's military assistance support to Vietnamese and free world forces in South Vietnam. The bill does not include other military assistance, military construction, military family housing, or civil defense. These requirements are considered in other appropriation bills.

The fiscal year 1967 defense budget as submitted to the Congress by the President was $57,664,353,000. The Appropriations Committee, after lengthy hearings and after exploring all the categories of our military programs, has found that to maintain a superior military posture it was necessary to add to the President's request $946,692,000 which makes a total bill now before the House $58,611,045,000.

I am in support of H.R. 15941, as revised and modified by the committee and recommend favorable action on this bill by the House.

However, as we consider this vital measure, it is important in my opinion for the House to be aware of various far-reaching and significant aspects of this legislation and the defense program which have a close bearing on our future preparedness and the welfare of our Nation.

One of these is the size of the bill itself. The tremendous sum it includes still does not reflect accurately all of the escalating costs of the war in Vietnam or the additional funds needed to maintain our superior military capability in future years responsibly, adequately, and decisively.

It is my view, and I believe that the Congress has amply demonstrated that it is in accord with this position by its solid support of defense appropriations year after year, that the full amount necessary should be appropriated to give our Nation a superior defense posture which is required as a bulwark against the forces of aggression and for the protection and security of our citizens and the free world.

This bill as was the case with the fiscal year 1966 defense appropriation bill which the House passed a year ago, is not adequate to support fully the escalated activities in Vietnam for fiscal year 1967, even with the committee amendments. Unless there is a drastic and dramatic change in the situation a sizable supplemental request must come before the Congress.

Even though it is known that Vietnam and our worldwide commitments will require additional funding, the Secretary of Defense has not at this time given the committee the necessary Department calculations of additional requirements, production rates, inventories and so forth. In their absence it is not feasible for the committee to add amounts to meet these needs.

Congress should have a full opportunity to know what the requirements are and an opportunity to consider and vote on them. The American public is entitled to know what our defense costs are. The President and the Secretary of Defense should submit their estimates before action on this bill is completed by the Congress.

The matter of financing the war in Vietnam should be squarely faced. Supplying the needs of our military men in combat should not be done through reliance on authority contained in the law to meet emergency situations such as that which gives the Secretary of Defense transfer authority, or through use of emergency funds, reprograming actions, or other financial juggling techniques which mortgages other needs and programs. If the President and the Secretary of Defense would come to Congress now with a budget estimate of their needs while we are in session, I believe Congress would act decisively on the request and the military services could utilize to better advantage the time they are now required to spend trying to make all financial ends meet.

A prime example of the inadequacy of the defense budget as submitted was the request for funds to support military personnel. Once the overall size of the military forces is established, it should be essentially a mechanical calculation to figure out what the cost is going to be. The funds for military personnel were understated by well over a half a billion dollars in the budget by the Secretary of Defense. Though the current estimate of our military strength is 3,095,700, military strength for fiscal year 1967 was budgeted at 2,987,300, a difference of 108,400. The committee in this case recognized this gross deficiency in the budget and has added $569 million to support this miscalculation in our manpower strength. Without this added appropriation the military services personnel funds would have been in serious financial trouble.

Why the President and the Secretary of Defense have never brought this to the attention of the House in a regular formal request—or why they did not include it in the regular budget is unknown. Surely the Secretary's computers could not make this half-billion-dollar mistake on a simple calculation.

One of the problems encountered has to do with such matters as undue classification of information and controls over freedom of expression. The committee has spent literally hundreds of hours over the course of about 4 months of hearings to explore the lengthy and involved Defense budget and the Administration's policies and decisions on which the Defense budget request is based. The hearings produced much interesting, productive and revealing testimony. The hearings are all in executive session and, as anyone who reads the six volumes of printed hearings can see, they are heavily censored for security purposes.

In my opinion at times they are censored unreasonably and it is difficult to determine the reason for the classification of information.

Some witnesses at times were not as frank and candid with the committee as I believe they should have been. To get to the real problem and issues in every area in an area as complex as the Defense program is difficult under ordinary circumstances. To make our congressional problem even more difficult as far as getting the facts and the opinions of experts is concerned, we are faced with a policy, and an order, of the Department of Defense which is designed to restrict freedom of personal expression on the part of the Department witnesses.

The policy memorandum issued over the signature of Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, reads:

[For official use only]

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

Memorandum for The Secretaries of the Military Departments, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Assistant Secretaries of Defense, the General Counsel, the Assistants to the Secretary of Defense, the Directors, Defense Agencies.

Subject: Congressional Appearances by Department of Defense Witnesses.

I have been asked by prospective witnesses to provide guidance for the benefit of personnel of the Department who, in the course of congressional hearings, are required to give their personal opinions on matters concerning which a Department of Defense position has been established by the Scretary of Defense with the approval of the President. *If pressed* for his personal opinion, the witness should make clear:

1. that his personal views were expressed (if such be the fact) to appropriate authorities within the Defense Department before the departmental position was established;

2. where his views are not in accord with the departmental decision, that notwithstanding his personal views, he has accepted and will abide by the departmental position; and

3. the consideration or factors which support the decision in other words, the pros and cons on the issue involved.

CYRUS VANCE.

When during the course of the hearings the committee members did press the civilian and military witnesses for their own personal views the answers in many instances are deleted in the printed record, deleted for so-called "security reasons." This is a growing practice that must be watched closely and it must be reduced to a minimum.

The basic assumptions on which our overall defense planning rests obviously are of great importance to our defense effort. It is clearly understood that in today's world it is necessary that foreign and defense policies of a country not only be integrated but must be treated as inseparable. Our foreign policy defines our basic position and approach to world affairs. Our defense policies are the means to assure our ability to implement those foreign policies. A superior defense posture by its very existence not only acts as a deterrent to aggression but also assures the immediate means to respond should hostilities occur.

We need, therefore, to consider these policies which provide the framework in shaping the Defense budget and the basic direction in administering the defense program. This is and has been a major area of concern for I believe various policies being followed and advocated are seriously wanting and that we will be paying a high price for them in the 1970's.

The basic administration defense decisions reflect more of a policy of seeking for the future to achieve a defense standoff or parity between the Communist bloc and the free world, not a decisive superiority on our part.

The Defense budget submitted to the Congress again this year and the testimony received by the committee during the course of the hearings indicate that action is being taken toward this end. I have grave reservations about the implications of such an approach in determining our defense needs.

Efforts to carry out this policy are continuing and include such major programs as the proposed continued cutback in our Strategic Air Command; decisions to delay production and deployment of the Nike-X antiballistic missile system; the proposed low level of effort to develop the follow on manned bomber, and the proposed low-level effort on the manned orbital laboratory; lack of adequately funding aggressive new weapons in research and development and others.

Mr. Chairman, these actions taken collectively certainly are not based upon a realistic appraisal of and do not recognize fully the nature and magnitude of the Communist threat and Communist thinking on vital matters relating to East-West relations.

We must not fail to recognize that communism continues to seek world domination by any and all avenues that may be available to it. It stands to reason that any sizable slowing down of our efforts and reductions in our defense forces is one of the things that Communists would welcome.

BUDGET REQUEST INADEQUATE

Mr. Chairman, the requests for fiscal year 1967 funds submitted by the Department of Defense are generally acceptable as far as they go. In some instances where amounts requested were inadequate or insufficient, and in some cases where they were overstated and needed change, the committee has taken note of these and has made appropriate changes.

The major concern stems from the items, projects, and programs not included which should be funded or programs which were originally requested by the services and subsequently drastically reduced by the Secretary of Defense before they were submitted to the President and then to the Congress.

To indicate the magnitude of the Secretary of Defense's cuts from the original services requests, it can be pointed out that the original requests of the services for what they believed to be their needs were cut over $11 billion for military functions alone. To me it seems almost unbelievable that the experts, military and civilian in each of the military services, could have so overstated the estimates of their financial needs. If our military experts and their civilian counterparts in each of the services are that inaccurate in their estimated needs maybe we should take a good look at their procedures. Our committee action in restoring many of their requests however indicates they were not so inaccurate. The Secretary of Defense, for reasons best known to himself has reduced the military request too deeply, not only this year but in previous years and the results of those cuts are showing up daily.

I do not argue that the military or any other department in government should be given every dollar they think they might be able to use. Everyone knows that historically the budget requests of the military services have been, except where expressly precluded by the imposition of ceilings on initial requests, consistently higher than the amounts allowed in the President's budget. This is undoubtedly a proper reflection of the action of the President in allocating priorities among and between functions for the use of the Nation's resources.

The problem today is that the substantial cuts are being made at a time when it should be known what funds are or will be needed. The administration appears to be cutting our defense requirements in order to carry on business as usual or to expand or start new nondefense programs.

Unreasonable and unnecessary cutbacks in military preparedness at a time when the United States is in an active war and Communist aggression is beseiging the world at every turn seems to be a poor policy.

COMMITTEE INCREASES IN VITAL AREAS

The Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations and the full Appropriations Committee, which are both led by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], have taken recognition of a number of deficiencies in the Secretary of Defense budget as submitted to Congress by the President and have deemed it necessary to make a number of additions in important areas.

The major additions which the committee made are:

Military pay, $569 million to support the current estimated strength of the military services.

Nike-X, $167.9 million for preproduction activities directed toward the deployment of an antiballistic missile defense system—$153.5 million procurement plus $14.4 million research and development.

AMSA, $11.8 million to support added development work on an advanced manned strategic aircraft.

The F–12 interceptor, $55 million for engines and other related long leadtime items for this improved interceptor.

LOH helicopter, $19.9 million for additional light observation helicopters.

Nuclear frigate, $150.5 million for the construction of a nuclear frigate.

The B–52 bombers, $6 million to retain 3 squadrons—45 bombers—which were scheduled to be phased out in fiscal year 1967.

Air National Guard, $4.3 million to retain 3 Air National Guard airlift squadrons which were scheduled to be inactivated by October 1966—25 heavy airlift units.

Deep submergence program, $5 million to support a more vigorous deep submergency program for rescue and recovery of deep diving submarines and related requirements.

Aeromedical transport aircraft, $16 million to procure four modern CX–2 aeromedical transport aircraft.

Army National Guard and Army Reserve organizations, $67 million to retain as separate organizations the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve organizations.

These major additions, together with other lesser increases, are offset by various reductions and financing adjustments, making a net increase of $946,692,000 in the President's budget.

There are other current projects and programs in the bill which are underfunded or whose added requirements had arisen subsequent to the budget submission to the Congress. These will in all probability require additional funds for fiscal year 1967. It was stated that these funds would have to come from other available resources, through reprograming actions or through use of the emergency fund or in a supplemental budget request at a later date.

This procedure in my judgment should be used to the minimum. To use reprograming actions and emergency funds for projects to excess means that the direct control of the Congress is very substantially lost.

SUMMARY

The bill provides for a total of $58.6 in new obligational authority for the Department of Defense.

Though there exist certain questions concerning various aspects of financing the overall defense program, the amount provided will maintain our Defense Establishment strongest in the world, as it must be for the welfare and security of our citizens and the free world.

Our strategic offensive forces are designed to deter a deliberate nuclear attack on the United States or our allies and to limit damage in the event of attack. The forces consist of such items as land- and sea-based ballistic missiles, long-range bombers, strategic reconnaissance aircraft, and their associated forces and command and control systems. A total of approximately $4.6 billion is included in the bill for offensive forces. The committee has provided funds above the proposed budget to provide for the continuation of 600 B–52 aircraft during fiscal year 1967, instead of a decrease to 555 aircraft.

The general-purpose forces represent the largest area of our Defense Establishment in terms of the basic missions, the cost, and military personnel involved. It includes most of the Army combat and combat support units, most Navy units, all Marine Corps costs and tactical units of the Air Force; $25.6 billion is included in the bill for the general-purpose forces.

The job of continental air and missile defense forces is to detect, identify, track, and destroy enemy forces approaching our continent and also to contribute to the objective of limiting damage to our population and industry in case of nuclear attack. These forces contain such items as manned interceptors, missiles, warning systems, and a variety of associated items. H.R. 15941 contains $1.6 billion for the continental air and missile defense forces. An important action taken by the committee in this area is the action to provide for preproduction activities for an anti-ballistic-missile system. Also funds are provided above the budget estimate to produce an advanced interceptor, the F–12 aircraft.

Our airlift and sealift forces are designed to provide the capability of moving U.S. forces quickly to trouble spots. The bill provides $2 billion for air and sealift, including funds to start procurement of the giant new transport aircraft, C–5A. Funds are also included to increase the number of cargo ships.

For Reserve and National Guard the bill provides $2.4 billion; for research and development, $5.4; and for retired pay, $1.8 billion. Under the category of general support, H.R. 15941 proposes an appropriation of $15.8 billion. This includes diverse items such as individual training and education, logistics, support, communications, medical services, weather services, and other activities.

The Army under the bill would receive a total of $17.44 billion. This is to support an increased force, totaling 1,233,693 active duty personnel by the end of the fiscal year. The Army would go from 16 to 17 divisions, from 4 to 5 armored cavalry regiments, and is to have strengthened Special Forces groups. The aircraft inventory is to raise 9,298 by the end of the fiscal year. The funds will provide for the procurement of 1,761 aircraft of various kinds. Over 38,000 missiles will be procured and procurement levels of ammunition, weapons, support and combat vehicles, and other equipment will be high.

The amount included in the bill for the Navy, $16.93 billion, will support an active fleet of 939 vessels and 8,300 aircraft during the fiscal year. The funds will provide for construction of 46 new ships and conversion of 13 more and for the procurement of 620 aircraft. Included in the ship construction program are a new nuclear powered carrier, 5 attack submarines, 10 destroyer escorts, 1 nuclear powered guided missile frigate, 5 mine warfare vessels, amphibious and other ships. Large quantities of missiles, vehicles, and ordnance will be bought. The Navy is to have a total of 1,006,057 active duty military personnel.

During the year the fleet will receive various new ships including 4 Polaris submarines, 11 attack submarines, 1 nuclear powered and 5 conventionally powered guided missile frigates, and 8 escort types.

For the Air Force the bill provides $20.96 billion. The active duty military personnel level for the Air Force at this time is 886,800. The inventory of active aircraft at the end of fiscal year 1967 is slated to be 13,785. This bill will provide for the procurement of more than 600 aircraft, including the first FB-111 strategic bombers, F-111s, F-4s, A-7s, and OV-10s. There will be substantial procurement of Minuteman ICBMs, rockets, missiles, bombs, and other weapons. During the year the Air Force is scheduled to receive 1,000 new planes including fighter, reconnaissance aircraft, and transports, tactical missiles, and bombs.

SUMMARY OF TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

The bill provides appropriations for military personnel, covering the major programs of pay and allowances, subsistence, clothing, permanent change of station travel, and various other military personnel costs totaling $19,299,344,000.

The amount recommended by the Committee is $623,644,000 above the budget estimates. Other than minor adjustments, the two major causes for a net increase was the necessary Committee action which added the funds to support the additional military strength which the President's budget did not include and the Committee action to provide the funds for the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard as separate organizational units.

PAY INCREASE

On Tuesday, June 14, 1966, the House by a vote of 356-2 passed S. 2950 which included a 3.2-percent increase in the basic pay of the uniformed services personnel. On July 12 the House and Senate approved the conference report on this bill which also included the pay increase. The bill was signed into law, Public Law 89-501, on July 13, 1966.

This appropriation bill does not include any funds to meet this pay increase for fiscal year 1967. The Committee on Armed Services in their report on S. 2950 estimated the cost which applied to the Department of Defense to be over $350 million.

A supplemental appropriation later this fiscal year or an amendment to this bill in the Senate will be necessary to cover the pay increase after it becomes law and proper estimates and details are available.

The same situation existed in fiscal year 1966. The Congress in 1965 passed the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 but no appropriation to cover the costs was passed until the second supplemental appropriation bill which was not signed into law until May 13, 1966.

The military services can get by in meeting the pay obligations by using the funds in this bill until they are used up. The problem of adequate funds will have to be met before the last quarter of fiscal year 1967 if not before, or the Secretary of Defense will have to use emergency deficiency actions, which in my view is poor policy.

PROBLEM OF RETAINING EXPERIENCED CAREER PERSONNEL

The complex weapons systems which we have today demand high caliber personnel. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps all have stated that the major personnel problem in the services today is the problem of attracting and retaining skilled, highly qualified people to do the jobs at hand. Looking into the future, the problem seems to grow even more acute as we can expect an increase in retirements of our more experienced people coupled with further increases in the complexities of our weapons systems.

The pay increase of 1965 and the increase just voted will help, but more is needed. The Department of Defense is now engaged in a review of the total pay structure, which will include a reexamination of the total range of pay and career incentives needed to attract and retain the numbers and types of skills required at every level, enlisted men and officers. The Department of Defense should complete this review as rapidly as possible. Personnel problems are long standing and effective new approaches must be made.

ARMY RESERVE—NATIONAL GUARD

The Defense appropriation bill as in previous years provides separate appropriations for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. The budget request was again submitted to the committee as it was last year on the basis of the Secretary's plan to reorganize the Army Reserve and National Guard into one unit within the National Guard. Before the committee can act on such a proposal legislation is required to revise existing law.

The committee bill provides $67 million additional funds and appropriate language to maintain the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard as separate organizational units which will be programed to attain an average strength at not less than 640,000 men—260,000 for Army Reserve and 380,000 for National Guard.

It would seem that the Secretary of Defense would offer his proposal in the proper legislative form and let the proper committees of Congress and the Congress as a whole work its will.

After 2 years of attempting to reorganize the Reserves without the proper authority in law to do so, he should realize that until Congress sepcifically acts on a change he should continue the Army Reserves and the Army National Guard as separate organizational units and make them strong and ready. His continuous moves to reorganize are only breaking down Army National Guard and Reserve effectiveness and their morale as well.

RETENTION OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD SQUADRONS PROGRAMED FOR PHASEOUT IN FISCAL YEAR 1967

The committee has restored $4.3 million to maintain three Air National Guard squadrons active, one in Pittsburgh, one in White Plains, N.Y., and one in Van Nuys, Calif.

Why the Secretary of Defense ordered inactivation of these airlift squadrons, to take effect October 1966, at a time when our airlift capability is sorely stressed is hard to understand.

Since the Vietnam war escalated, the Air National Guard has performed outstanding service. For instance, in the 14 months, January 1, 1965, through February 28, 1966, the Air National Guard contributed aircraft augmentation to Military Airlift Command of over 2,100 overseas trips which carried over 19,000 tons of cargo. This is about twice the Air National Guard normal program. This is all done on a voluntary basis.

The Military Airlift Command is building up its ability to handle more. However, today it is hard pressed to meet its requirements. General Estes, commander, Military Airlift Command, in answering questions on the program makes this very clear. The following colloquy is from the Committee hearings on the Defense appropriation bill:

> Mr. LIPSCOMB. All of this makes it appear that at this time our capability to handle more than one emergency makes your operation pretty tough.
>
> General ESTES. We don't really have the capability today, Mr. Lipscomb, to meet the needs of one contingency operation to the extent we would like to, as I have already stated, much less two. If we had another contingency, JCS would simply have to make priority determinations as to how the available airlift is going to be employed.
>
> Further, we would certainly have to do such things as activate the Reserves, federalize the Guard, activate CRAF.
>
> As I have said, however, looking forward to future time periods, the C-141, C-5-A force has been figured on the basis of the airlift required plus pre-positioning to give us a national capability of rapidly responding to contingencies in two areas, both in Europe and in the Pacific simultaneously. (Part 3 of the Hearings—Page 591.)

The Air National Guard has been and is filling in the gap that military airlift command needs. When Gen. W. P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau was asked if the proposed inactivation of the three bases takes place the Air National Guard capability would be such that they could still handle what they are now supplementing for the Military Airlift Command, he answered:

> General WILSON. It will definitely reduce our capability on a voluntary basis to meet this. All three of these units are manned, capable, and they have the equipment. The people can't understand why they are being eliminated while still being asked to perform additional airlift missions. (Part 2 of the Hearings—Page 237.)

The inactivation of these three airlift squadrons would be a specific loss of airlift capability at the very moment we need it the most.

The Committee action in restoring these funds to maintain these bases in an active status, $1.2 million for personnel and $3.1 for operations and maintenance, is a worthwhile and necessary action.

TITLE II—OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For the operations and maintenance of our military forces for fiscal year 1967 $15,722,794,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is an increase by the Committee of $47,700,000 above the budget estimates. These funds are for operating costs generally for the Department of Defense except military personnel costs. This embraces financing the operation of force units in training and combat and otherwise supporting our overall military operation. These appropriations provide for training of personnel in basic military and specialized training, medical care, troop housing, supplies, transportation, material maintenance, communications, operation of bases, and related functions.

ADEQUACY OF THE BUDGET TO SUPPORT OUR COMMITMENTS IN VIETNAM

The fiscal year 1967 budget contains insufficient funding for the Vietnam war effort. Since the time the budget was formulated in the office of the Secretary of Defense and subsequently submitted to Congress many changes in our situation in Vietnam and the southeast area have occurred.

The appropriation bill now before the House will finance only a gradually increasing deployment in Vietnam up to December 1966, and the maintenance of that level through the end of fiscal year 1967. For the purposes of preparing the estimates of costs for financing for military operations in Vietnam the Secretary of Defense has asked for and the Committee is only appropriating funds to carry operations through June 1967. If combat operations continue at a relatively high level, which unfortunately appears probable, or if the war is not over by June 30, 1967, serious financial difficulties will arise if a supplemental appropriation request is not submitted soon. Many items which are needed involve long leadtimes for delivery so procurement must be made as long as 12 months or longer in advance. If the Secretary of Defense does not take action soon and reevaluate his assumptions we could be confronted with added problems.

Even though this budget provides for high rates of expenditures of ammunition, the Secretary of Defense cut certain consumable supply estimates below the consumable levels predicted by the services for the size of the force estimated in the budget requests.

Secretary McNamara in explaining this said:

> Should it later prove the services' initial estimates were correct, inventories can be drawn down to cover the difference or additional funds can be requested.

This policy of drawing down inventories is of serious concern. War mobilization reserve stocks have already been considerably reduced and are in the process of being gradually replaced. Equipment and material priorities for Vietnam must not be permitted to so deplete active force inventories as to impair the readiness of our forces not committed to Vietnam. Our forces, no matter where they are located, must be adequately equipped to respond to any emergency. Reserve stocks are for the purpose of having available a sufficient inventory to take care of the unknown unpredictable events that could occur all over the world.

It is a fact that we are carrying out added activities in Vietnam and they must be funded. This should be accomplished in a timely, reasonable manner, completely in keeping with the right of Congress and the public to know how much is being spent and for what purposes.

The Department of Defense should have a realistic budget estimate to support the known deficiencies in the original estimates and at least request the Senate to amend the bill. This was the approach the administration took last year. This procedure practically bypasses the House but, again, it may be necessary to adequately finance our activities.

RETENTION OF B-52 AIRCRAFT PROGRAMED FOR PHASEOUT IN FISCAL YEAR 1964

The committee has restored $6,000,000 for the retention of 45 B-52 aircraft programed for phaseout in 1967. This action is vital and necessary to correct the cut in funds which Secretary McNamara made to carry through his decision to reduce our B-52 forces below the 600 which are currently active in the fleet.

In view of the uncertainties in the world situation today, it is premature to reduce further the strategic bomber force in fiscal year 1967. Retention of the three B-52 squadrons—45 aircraft—scheduled for phaseout is necessary.

These aircraft would provide an additional hedge against any surprise lessening of the effectiveness of our planned Minuteman and Polaris missile force, due to such factors as operational deficiencies and/or improved enemy defenses. In addition, if we fail to demonstrate that our goal is strategic superiority, our opponents may be led to believe that we are accepting a state of mutual deterrence as inevitable. It is difficult to forecast the kind of war we may be called upon to fight in the future. Therefore, we should maintain the best options against a threat we cannot predict with any high degree of confidence. Our experience in Cuba and Vietnam has shown us the value of maintaining flexibility in the choice of options.

Should the requirements for SAC bombers in nonnuclear roles expand beyond the current area of operations, the need for the B-52 force would become increasingly more important. Due to the large number of tactical forces deployed to the southeast Asia area, the B-52 forces could be the only conventional strike capability available. Implementation of certain types of attack may require large nonnuclear payloads at extended ranges and the distances involved could preclude the operational feasibility of using other type aircraft than the B-52.

There are certain roles and missions assigned to the Air Force concerning collateral responsibilities: First, to interdict enemy seapower through air operations; second, to conduct antisubmarine warfare—ASW—and to protect shipping; and third, to conduct aerial mine laying operations.

As recently as the Cuban crisis, the Air Force was called upon to fulfill collateral support functions. Specifically, these functions involved sea surveillance and sea reconnaissance missions by B/RB-47 and KC-97 type aircraft. Inasmuch as these aircraft have been phased out of the inventory—without aircraft replacement—there is an implicit Air Force inadequacy to discharge an assigned mission. Therefore, it appears we are faced with two alternatives—drawdown of forces that we would not want to divert for this purpose—or fail to do the job. The retention of the B-52's is the most logical solution in meeting these collateral obligations.

An important intangible, with respect to the phaseout of B-52 aircraft, is the capability represented by the know-how of knowledgeable people working as a team. If the collective ability of these aircrews and supervisory personnel is dissipated, they could not be effectively replaced in a short period of time, if the situation so warranted.

The retention of the three B-52 squadrons now programed for phaseout in fiscal year 1967 will provide a more effective and flexible bomber force.

AIRBORNE ALERT INDOCTRINATION TRAINING

The Secretary of Defense had eliminated the funds for fiscal year 1967 for the airborne alert indoctrination training program. The Joint Chiefs of Staff objected to eliminating all of the air alert and the Secretary had indicated the Air Force could carry on whatever airborne alert that was consistent with the regular training program and would not require additional funds.

Included in this bill are funds for Strategic Air Command training, of which a portion can be used to maintain a reduced airborne alert program as the Secretary indicated he would approve. The Air Force has proposed such a program.

Airborne alert in our bomber force provides a direct contribution to our defensive posture. Although warning time of an enemy missile attack has improved greatly in the past few years, there is still a possibility of surprise attacks, particularly from submarine-launched missiles. Airborne alert provides a secure force against such surprise attacks. Additionally, discontinuance of airborne alert will simplify the U.S.S.R. defense problem.

Airborne alert is also a unique method of providing a show of force during periods of crisis with a portion of our nuclear capable forces. At the time it is in operation, those aircraft airborne are not subject to a surprise attack from either the ICBM or SLBM threat. As such, they constitute a force capable of immediate attack, if required.

The magnitude and complexity of the complete operation is such that to be certain that it can be effectively instituted it must be constantly exercised at an expandable level. This expandable level is termed "airborne alert indoctrination training." Indoctrination training includes not only the training of air and ground aircraft and weapon-loading crews but includes the exercise of facilities, equipment, and supply procedures. Another aspect of indoctrination is the familiarity of air crews and ground control station personnel in domestic and foreign air traffic agencies of the routes and control procedures including tanker task force operations. Realistic day-to-day training and the skeleton framework from which to expand are particularly important when the payload contains nuclear weapons. The necessary agreements to overfly foreign nations with nuclear weapons, and to initiate flight clearances that take priority over the air traffic of other nations are involved matters. It is more practical to expand operations on existing agreements, than it is to initiate new agreements on very short notice.

The ability to expand an airborne alert in a crisis situation is important because it overcomes a deficiency of a strategic missile force. Since missiles are maintained at a very high alert readiness, it is not feasible to show an increased readiness rate for missiles. Increased alert rates are possible for bombers, and therefore, they can be used for show-of-force purposes, or to assist in crisis management. For example, during the Cuban crisis, SAC initiated a high force level of airborne alert. The route structure, tanker bases, and refueling areas for airborne alert indoctrination operations provided the basis for expanding to a significantly increased alert posture. For about a month, SAC maintained an effective and secure airborne deterrent comprising a significant part of its B-52 fleet. Both the airborne and ground alert forces of the Strategic Air Command, during the Cuban crisis, constituted an unprecedented level of combat readiness and preparedness. This show of force and the resolve to use it, if necessary, illustrated the effectiveness of the Strategic Air Command's military capability and was an important factor in influencing favorable resolution of the Cuban crisis.

It is essential to retain airborne alert indoctrination training to maintain the secure offensive strike capability of this force, and to preserve the capability to expand the full airborne alert rapidly and efficiently during times of crisis. The continual exercise of facilities, procedures, equipment, and personnel insures the ability to provide this capability in minimum time.

The Air Force proposal to continue an airborne alert program with the funds provided in this budget is a valid and necessary program and the Secretary of Defense should approve their proposal.

The full committee expressed approval of airborne alert and states in the report:

> In connection with strategic aircraft, the Committee favors the concept of continuing an airborne alert as a part of the training program of the Strategic Air Command.

SUMMARY OF TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

The committee recommends appropriations for procurement totaling $16,652,600,000 which is an increase of $244,400,000 above the budget.

MULTISERVICE PROCUREMENT

For the past several years, the committee has encouraged the multiservice utilization of major items of equipment, including aircraft, missiles, electronics, and other items. Multiservice procurements enable the services to take advantage of larger procurements, including spare parts, and serve to help minimize various logistical support and training difficulties.

At the present time, the F-4 aircraft, developed by the Navy, is utilized in large quantities by the Air Force as well as the Navy. The familiar UH-1B helicopter, developed and used extensively by the Army, is also being utilized by the Marines.

The fiscal year 1967 procurement program places even greater practical emphasis on multiservice utilization of aircraft. In addition to continuing procurement of the F-4 and UH-1B types, funds are provided for the procurement of two other multiservice aircraft, the A-7A and OV-10A.

The A-7A Corsair is a light, jet attack aircraft to be procured by both the Air Force and the Navy. Its range, load carrying capabilities, and high degree of operational reliability make it a valuable addition to the tactical airpower of both services.

The OV-10A Coin is to be a lightly armed, highly maneuverable aircraft with short field operating ability. Its multimission capabilities of light armed reconnaissance, limited close air support, forward air control, helicopter escort, and light transport make it an invaluable addition to the airpower inventories of the Navy and Air Force.

The Defense Department is attempting to secure multiservice utilization of the F-111 type aircraft. Although the Air Force is programing extensive procurement of their model of this aircraft—F-111A—the Navy is encountering difficulty with the development of the Navy version—F-111B.

For the past several years, multiservice procurement of various missile systems has been accomplished. Such procurements are continued in the fiscal year 1967 program, including Navy and Air Force procurement of the Shrik antiradiation missile, Sidewinder type air-to-air missiles, and Air Force procurement of the Navy developed Bullpup air-to-surface missiles. In addition, funds for procurement of the Redeye and Hawk missile systems are provided for the Army and Marine Corps.

F-111 TYPE AIRCRAFT

Included in this appropriation under procurement is about a billion dollars for the F-111 type aircraft, formerly known as the TFX. The amount includes funds for the Air Force version of the F-111A which will buy 117 planes and related items, funds for items related to the airborne missile control system and other support equipment on the Navy version, the F-111B, and funds for the FB-111 bomber version which amount will procure 10 test and evaluation aircraft and related parts and equipment.

It should be pointed out that the costs of these planes is increasing and the costs are considerably above original estimates.

Difficulties are being encountered in meeting the specifications on the F-111B Navy version. The schedule for the F-111B Navy version aircraft has slipped from a year to 18 months or more.

The F-111A Air Force version could be a significant addition to our forces providing it meets its mission requirements.

The FB-111A is to meet the Air Force interim requirement to fill in for the aging B-52 C/F fleet. This model will have to be watched and monitored carefully. It is proposed to utilize the basic F-111A airframe and engines and the F-111B wing tips. This aircraft cannot remove the necessity for an advanced manned strategic bomber and plans should be aggressively pursued for the follow-on to this FB-111A.

C-5A AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The first procurement for the new C-5A airlift aircraft is included in this bill.

The C-5A is to augment the military airlift capability to provide rapid response for peacetime, general war, limited war, and contingency requirements. This is the first system to be designed specifically around the deployment loads it will carry. The aircraft will be able to carry very heavy and bulky loads of over 220,000 pounds for a range of 2,700 nautical miles or, 110,000 pounds for 5,500 nautical miles at high subsonic speeds. Despite its weight and size it will be able to operate from relatively unimproved airfields. This will be the largest airplane ever built and is one of the most dramatic developments in airlift.

In terms of flight design gross weight, the C-5A at 728,000 pounds is approximately twice the weight of the C-141 and almost four times that of the C-130. This aircraft's design payload of 220,000 pounds is more than three times that carried by the C-141. This system's ability to airlift troops and extremely large and heavy cargo to virtually any area in the world will add significantly to our airlift capability. The bill provides funds for 8 aircraft in the amount of $395.6 million.

SUMMARY OF TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

The recommended appropriation for fiscal year 1967 for research, test, and evaluation is $6,928,959,000 which is $23,600,000 more than the amount requested.

Our Nation's level of effort in advanced weapons developments is the area of major concern in our defense posture. Military effectiveness is largely determined by the state of scientific and technological advancements. New weapons systems must be aggressively pursued, based upon both the assessment of the threat and the pace of technology.

We have the capability to make large-scale, meaningful advances if research and development is pursued aggressively and purposefully. The pace of advanced developments must be a reflection of both a realistic assessment of the threat and the advances in science and technology.

If these considerations do not govern our decisions we will become increasingly vulnerable in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

The fiscal year 1967 budget request by the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation was austere and in my opinion does not face up to the great needs which face our Nation in the future.

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, made the following statement to our subcommittee:

> Our review this year was so intensive as to leave us much less flexibility than in fiscal year 1966, and hence our ability to cope with unforeseen eventualities during the coming year from within available resources will be very limited. I feel that the funds we have requested represent an austere amount required to meet our most important needs.

The committee has added a net amount of $23,600,000 to the Department requests to correct some of the deficiencies.

NIKE-X

The committee has added $14,400,000 for research and development effort related to the preproduction funding of the Nike-X antiballistic missile system for fiscal year 1967. Total funding in the bill for the Nike-X system is $584.9 million, $431.4 million research and development and $153.5 million in preproduction activities in the procurement section of this bill.

By providing these added funds in the fiscal year 1967 budget to begin a production base for the eventual manufacture of the extremely complex components of the Nike-X antimissile system could possibly save a year's time.

The Nike-X system will be a very expensive project and the funds in this budget are only a part of the initial step forward in the program.

I am in support of the Nike-X antiballistic missile system program and encourage the Department of Defense to pursue the program.

These added funds should prepare the way for the most effective defense against ICBM missiles that can be achieved.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

Another area of this bill which is not adequately funded is antisubmarine warfare. As was the case last year, witnesses this year again told the committee that the ASW budget was very tight.

It is a recognized fact that one of the most critical and difficult threats that faces this country in the future is submarine warfare, both offensively and defensively.

The Navy research, development, test, and evaluation antisubmarine program needs adequate funds to explore potential concepts that might provide some of the solutions being sought. The Navy needs adequate funds to aggressively seek new techniques for application to existing systems. A tight budget does not permit flexibility for quick action.

The Secretaries of Defense and the Navy should take a better look at the requests of the civilian and military experts in this field so Congress can be assured that our efforts in this field are properly pursued with adequate financing.

Our Nation cannot afford to be complacent about the growing threat from the sea. We must place high priority on new programs and ideas in the area of ASW. It is our only way to maintain superiority in this critical area of our Nation's defense.

DEEP SUBMERGENCE PROJECTS

The committee increased the funds for the deep submergence project by $5 million, which makes a total of $26.5 million available in this bill.

This program encompasses four distinct but related efforts: submarine rescue, object location, and small object recovery, large object salvage, and the man-in-the-sea program. Because of prior and current fiscal year funding limitations, there was a $5 million deficiency in the areas of materials and sensor equipment development.

The sensor development would give the submersible rescue vehicles a small object search and location capability in mid-1968. This could not be accomplished if these funds were not added to this budget.

This is a worthwhile addition as the operational need for early achievement of deep sea search and location capability, as well as the submarine personnel rescue capability is vitally needed.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill before us today provides needed funding for our military programs during fiscal year 1967 and should be supported by the House.

The Appropriations Committee has made various far-reaching, needed changes to the administration budget request to provide for an improved defense posture and enable us better to fulfill our defense commitments.

More needs to be done. The administration should see to it that timely action is taken so that our defense effort is not underfunded and also to be assured that we are in a position so that our defense effort may advance properly in the critical years ahead. There is need for improved funding for southeast Asia, for our worldwide commitments, and for our future preparedness.

In this regard I would like to draw attention to the additional views in the report on the Defense appropriations bill submitted by the minority members of the Defense Subcommittee expressing concern with regard to certain aspects of the funding of our current operations and relating to planning for our future security.

As stated in the additional views, we are concerned in particular about the time frame of the 1970's and beyond. In our opinion the defense policies and projected programs over recent years have not adequately taken into account the defense needs that the capabilities of our adversaries, real and potential, indicate will be required in the future.

We therefore propose enactment of a resolution calling for the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission, made up of top civilian and military experts, which will conduct an independent and objective evaluation of the projected defense posture of the Nation.

The goal of the Commission is to secure a comprehensive reassessment of our defense posture now and for the future in order to be assured that we possess the very best defense consistent with the long-term best interests of the United States and its citizens.

The minority members of the Defense Subcommittee have introduced this proposed resolution.

I solicit the interest of the entire membership of the House in this resolution in the hope that it may be enacted soon so this important work can get underway.

The text of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 1183

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide a foundation for the comprehensive reassessment and re-evaluation of the defense posture of the United States now and for the future, in order to be assured that this Nation possesses the very best defense consistent with the long-term best interests of the United States and its citizens.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1, there is hereby established a nonpartisan commission to be known as the Commission on National Defense Policy (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of sixteen members as follows:

(1) two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) two appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(3) two appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate;

(4) two appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(5) one appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and one appointed by the ranking minority member of such committee;

(6) one appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and one appointed by the ranking minority member of such committee;

(7) one appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and one appointed by the ranking minority member of such committee; and

(8) one appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the

Senate, and one appointed by the ranking minority member of such committee.

(b) FIELDS FROM WHICH MEMBERS TO BE DRAWN.—The membership of the Commission shall be composed of individuals from both civilian and military life, excluding those currently serving in the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, who qualify as experts and have general experience and competence in the field of national defense.

(c) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Nine members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as such officers or employees; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The members of the Commission who are appointed from private life shall each receive $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to cary out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the policies of the Federal Government relating to the national defense, including the effect of various foreign policy assumptions and objectives on our national defense policies, with the view to providing an independent and objective evaluation of the threats to our national security and to determine whether:

(1) a realistic assessment of the threats to our national security is being provided;

(2) a return to greater participation by and acceptance of military judgment in what are predominantly military affairs is indicated;

(3) a more aggressive pursuit of research and development, especially in the area of advanced weapons is needed; and

(4) an objective assessment of the role of the Congress in the area of national security is called for in the light of recent developments in executive-congressional relations.

(b) Where the Commission finds in its judgment that deficiencies exist in the policies of the Federal Government relating to national defense in any of its aspects it shall wherever possible make recommendations in its report to the Congress on procedures to correct those deficiencies.

(c) REPORT.—Within 12 months after the Commission is convened and organized, it shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

(d) EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION.—Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in subsection (c), the Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or any member thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, as the commission or such member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or any duly designated member of the Commission and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of the failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or by any combination of two members of such Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in closing that I support the defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967 and respectfully recommend passage by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MAHON. I sometimes think that we overdo this business of making complimentary references to our colleagues. But be that as it may, I should like to have the Members know, particularly on the majority side, of the fine job of cooperation which the gentleman from California has given the Committee on Appropriations in dealing with these important matters of national defense. We have not always agreed, but the devoted, intelligent, and indefatigable labors of the gentleman from California have been most helpful.

I just wish the RECORD to show that.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman.

I would just like to say that I appreciate the comments of my chairman. I must say that working under his leadership is a privilege, and I appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the Washington Evening Star of June 16 carried the breathtaking headline, "18 Marines Fight Off 250 Reds." The saga which followed that headline must surely have filled every one of us here at home with pride in our fighting men in Vietnam. For 5 interminable hours in the darkness of early morning, those 18 brave marines fought and held off an encircling force of more than 250 Communist Vietcong. When their supply of ammunition was almost exhausted, our valiant fighters resorted to knives, bayonets and rocks with which to beat back the enemy. And by the time reinforcements arrived at dawn and drove off the Vietcong attackers, 16 of the 18 were either killed or wounded and they were down to their last 8 rounds of ammunition.

I pray that those who escaped with their lives can be made whole again and may someday soon return to the peaceful pursuits of a normal life here at home.

For those who gave their lives in the defense of freedom and human dignity that day and every other day throughout this war, I pray we can reassure their families that their supreme sacrifices were not made in vain.

If we are to decisively overcome the enemy and restore peace to a confused and troubled world, then our first order of business here in the Congress should be the adequate provision of manpower and materiel needed to do the job. That is precisely what is intended in H.R. 15941, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1967.

The provisions for our national security that are proposed here today will keep faith with our fighting men in Vietnam and elsewhere throughout the world. Moreover, they will reflect that we have faced up squarely to the Constitution's mandate that Congress shall raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make rules for the Government and regulation of land and naval forces.

THE BILL BEFORE US

The administration's budget request for defense in fiscal 1967 totals $57.7 billion. The committee has recommended an appropriation of $58.6 billion, or an increase of $947 million above the budget estimate. Detailed explanations of the committee's recommendations with respect to the bill have been made by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB]. For that reason, I shall not discuss details of the bill; I do want to say to you that our Defense Subcommittee has worked diligently and almost constantly on this bill since last February. Its members have weighed all of the evidence that was presented and they have concluded that the funds requested were not sufficient to support an adequate defense posture. They have concluded that additional funds are needed. The committee has sustained their decisions to increase the level of defense funding and I support that action without reservation.

So long as we are at war and our troops are fighting and dying on behalf of freedom and human dignity, I stand ready to support them in every conceivable way.

We in Congress have a never-wavering obligation to provide our fighting men with the weapons, the food, the clothing, the attendant materiel, and the moral support that are needed to—

Win the war as quickly as possible;

Keep our casualties at the lowest possible number;

Bring our troops back home to their families as soon as practicable; and

Without undue delay, return them to their normal economic pursuits in society.

I am heartened by the President's June 18 comments about the war, when he said in part:

> I want our men in the field and our people at home to know that our course is resolute, that our conviction is firm and we shall not be diverted from doing what is necessary in the Nation's interest and the cause of freedom.
>
> We must continue to raise the cost of aggression at its source.

Our course in Congress should also be resolute. Our conviction should be firm. And we should not be diverted from providing the funds that are necessary to win the war and keep the peace.

DEFENSE UNDERFUNDING AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

For more than a year now and in the face of continuing escalation of the Vietnam war, the administration has followed a piecemeal policy in requesting funds for our defense.

The original budget for fiscal 1966 deliberately understated defense needs by several billion dollars to pave the way for enactment and funding of Great Society spending proposals and to keep the facade of a $100 billion budget. We called this underfunding of defense needs to the attention of the House last year and our judgment in that regard was vindicated by the following three defense funds requests, all of which were made subsequent to submission of the January 1966 budget:

First, a $700 million 1965 supplemental which was requested in May of last year and immediately approved by Congress;

Second, a $1.7 billion 1966 budget amendment which was submitted just 3 months later in August and approved by Congress as a part of the regular 1966 defense appropriation bill; and

Third, a $13.1 billion supplemental which was submitted in January of this year and approved by Congress in March.

To pave the way for expansions of Great Society programs this year and to support the fiction that we would spend only $112.8 billion in 1967, last January's budget obviously also underestimated our defense needs. Even with the increased funds for defense that have been proposed by the committee in this bill and the committee's recognition that an additional supplemental request will have to be submitted by next January or February, we may very well be called upon to provide additional defense appropriations before this session of Congress is concluded.

This piecemeal approach to our defense needs has deceived the American public by implying that we can afford to simultaneously indulge ourselves with Great Society programs and fight an all-out war in Vietnam—or have our cake and eat it, too.

Now, we all recognize that no one knows precisely when the war in Vietnam will be concluded, but, based upon present assumptions, it appears that the conflict may continue for some time to come.

In time of war, no nation can afford to indulge itself in unbridled spending without encouraging runaway inflation, the imposition of additional taxes, and, as a last resort, the enactment of statutory wage and price controls.

WHAT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE

We can avoid these extreme burdens and still successfully prosecute the war if the administration and Congress will begin now to exercise some restraint with respect to low priority or nonessential spending.

To date, only two regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1967 have cleared the Congress. Although the House has acted on four others, those bills must still be considered by the Senate and be taken to conference for final House and Senate action. Six additional regular bills and the usual supplemental are yet to be considered by both bodies.

The initiation, extension, or expansion of a number of Great Society and other nondefense spending programs also are awaiting authorization by the Congress. Thus, we still have an ample opportunity to either hold the line or make substantial reductions in Great Society and other nondefense spending programs.

If the administration and the Congress are to be responsible and responsive to the trust placed upon each for the welfare of our great Nation, then we have absolutely no choice but to curtail or eliminate low priority or nonessential spending for the duration of the Vietnam war. We followed such a course during World War II and the Korean conflict, and we should not deviate from such a prudent policy during the present conflict.

To that end, I urge the administration to initiate an immediate review of each of its nondefense programs and appropriation requests and to promptly inform the Congress which of them can be reduced in size or deferred, at least for the duration of the war.

I also urge each committee of the Congress to initiate a similar review, and thereafter effect the cutbacks or deferrals which are demanded by the war situation and the inflationary pressures now at work in the economy.

If we do otherwise, the unabated demands for goods and services will generate further serious price inflation which, in turn, will generate the demand and necessity for a "Vietnam tax increase." These unconscionable burdens will adversely affect every American but to add them to the sacrifices which our fighting men and their families have been called upon to make would be a culpable tragedy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Forty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 169]

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Aspinall
Baring
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Cabell
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Conyers
Craley
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Farnsley
Fascell
Fogarty
Garmatz
Gathings
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Henderson
Hull
Ichord
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
McEwen
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Mills
Mink
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Murray
Nedzi
O'Brien
Ottinger
Passman
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Wright

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15941, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 370 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to provide forces and weapons for U.S. defense commitments for the ensuing year. Even more it is a bill for the survival of the free world for that is why we fight in Vietnam. It will support the war in Vietnam, at least in part, during that period. We are heavily committed in Vietnam, and the war there is costing a minimum of a billion dollars a month. In addition we have troops throughout the world. We have been able to maintain our worldwide obligations without a general mobilization. If there should be another confrontation on another front, this situation would no longer be possible. To carry on the conflict in Vietnam, there has had to be a drawdown of equipment from active forces and from Reserve and National Guard units. There has been a similar drawdown of skilled personnel. It has been necessary to recall 15,000 of these from Europe, thus further weakening the defenses of an area whose security already is jeopardized by the defections of the French from NATO. The NATO story has been glossed over—but it is not a healthy one. The United States and Germany constitute its principal strength. There are serious shortcomings elsewhere.

The defense situation, particularly for personnel, could have been alleviated had the Pentagon seen fit to turn to its Reservists for help. In Vietnam there is a serious need for Reserve units, engineer units, construction units, support units—and a need for the specialists who are skilled from long practice in private life in those areas where specialists could bridge the gaping needs in construction and logistics which now exist in Vietnam. We know from testimony given to congressional committees that the Joint Chiefs have repeatedly asked that the Reserves be used to support the war effort in Vietnam, but it is not present policy to use them.

The situation also could have been alleviated had there been more help from our allies. Now, first, let me say with greatest respect and appreciation that the Koreans have performed magnificently in the common cause in Vietnam. They have a very substantial force already convened there, with a commitment for additional troops. Their help has been the shining light of allied participation. It must be said also that the Australians are helping in a most commendable way. This, despite the fact that until very recent weeks they were actively and seriously engaged on the side of Malaysia against Indonesian aggression. Presumably, additional help will be forthcoming from Australia soon.

There is some assistance, most of it token, from other allies and a promise of more material help from still others. But what about Great Britain and France whom we have twice saved from conquest, then aided with billions of the taxpayers' money? What about those present allies, Germany and Japan, whose nations we have rebuilt to unprecedented prosperity? What about the Philippines, whose promise, not yet fulfilled, is for only 2,000 construction forces? So many nations have been, and are, our beneficiaries. So few of them show in a material way more than the barest measure of appreciation, and some of them are actually supplying materials of war to our enemies. The United Nations, which gave its name to the cause in Korea a decade ago, now bickers and does nothing monumental.

It is definitely true that the war has taken a turn for the better. There is reason for the optimism which we hear expressed. The pressure of manpower and firepower which is being brought to bear against the Communists is such a powerful thing that the enemy has been badly hurt. His principal efforts now lie in small engagements intended to harass rather than to defeat our forces. He is quick to break off those engagements when U.S. reinforcements and air strikes are called in. He is harder pressed for supplies than at any previous time. And it is more difficult for him to maintain strong operating bases from which to launch his attacks.

In typical American fashion, many of our writers and commentators have taken this to mean the war is about over. This is not true. Communists fight for keeps. They still take comfort from the division among our own people and from the criticisms of the war effort which frequently are heard. Nevertheless, there is a growing despair behind enemy lines. They know the tide of victory is running for the U.S. forces and that only massive help from other countries can change the picture. On the other side of the coin, the Communists still control half of South Vietnam. They still have in hand, or they have access to, substantial supplies. They have a strong, well-disciplined force. They can carry on warfare for a long time if they will it.

The Vietcong have largely controlled the roads and the railroad within Vietnam and this has been a serious handicap to the Allied supply effort. It is gradually being improved.

There continues to be reason to believe that the conflict in Vietnam can be concluded without the involvement of other countries. In particular, this means Red China. Despite heavy bombing on oil dumps in Hanoi and Haiphong and a general escalation of the war, there is nothing to indicate a serious military move by the Chinese Communists. This situation is being checked daily by intelligence sources, including photographs which would show troop movement or significant military preparations. The number of Mig fighters in the area immediately adjacent to North Vietnam remains at about the same level as about a year ago. Chinese troops are not moving in significant numbers in any area. There are substantial numbers of Chinese soldiers near the China-North Vietnam border, and a fair number of Migs, but there is no evidence of buildup or preparation for early use of either. The number of Chinese labor group volunteers in Vietnam has shown a major increase since the first of the year. It is estimated there now may be 40,000 work force personnel who are helping principally to repair bomb damage to roads, railroads, and bridges. Add to this situation the fact that careful efforts are in progress by the administration to maintain conversations between the United States and Red Chinese officials at appropriate levels. This serves as a further safeguard against a massive involvement by the Red Chinese.

I trust that everyone recognizes the outstanding quality of the effort being made by U.S. personnel in the southeast Pacific. The caliber of the leadership in our forces has never been surpassed. The type of fighting in which we are engaged calls in particular for high standards of leadership by the noncoms and by the junior officers. Our personnel there have proven time and again the effectiveness of the training given our personnel.

Jungle fighting is a lonely, unhappy, uncomfortable, dirty business. Every individual has a responsibility, and failure to live up to that responsibility can endanger an entire unit. The men who fight our battles in that faraway part of the world have covered themselves with glory. The individual soldier, the noncom, the junior officer, who fight in the jungle; these are the real heroes of the Vietnamese war.

Military forces cannot operate without supplies and the logistics problem has been an unbelievably difficult one. The supply lines which must reach our forces extend halfway around the world. We are fighting in an area where initially there was only one good port, supply handling facilities were almost nil; and bases, cantonments, and warehouses were nonexistent for our forces. Those that were left by the French during their disastrous conflict in the area were insufficient, even for the Vietnamese forces. We had to start from scratch to build bases, ports, and supply facilities. Major problems were encountered from the very beginning. Mistakes inevitably were made. Some things were left undone which could have helped materially; for instance, the number of Army Engineer and Navy construction battalions could have been quadrupled and this would have been a tremendous help. In the sometimes confusing policies laid down by the Pentagon, this was not done. Nevertheless, the logistics program is now well in hand, and an almost insurmountable series of problems have largely been overcome. And by superhuman effort, with great reliance upon airlift, every U.S. unit has been supplied. Sometimes more could have been desired and sometimes substitutions had to be made, but the troops have been supported. It has not been an easy thing and no credit should be denied those who have borne the burdens. This includes the civilian contractors who had the primary responsibility to design and provide ports and bases in the shortest possible time where none existed before.

One of the brightest pictures has been the unparalleled competence with which medical facilities have operated. U.S. personnel in charge of these programs have improvised, substituted, begged, borrowed and stolen, but whatever was needed has been done in an effort to insure that the sick and wounded were given the very best of care. The result has been the highest percentage of recoveries from wounds in history. Tropical illnesses, notably malaria, have compounded the problem. There have been more cases of malignant malaria than there have been battle casualties. Medical personnel have had to fall back upon quinine which is a repressant but not a cure. Extra efforts are being made, even today, to solve this problem which still defies solution.

Let us not forget the Vietnamese themselves. They have been in turmoil since 1940, and much of the time, in battle. They are a kindly people, whose allegiance is to their family and their village. They have little conception of nationalism. Nevertheless, they have overcome problem after problem, ignoring danger—even torture and death—and they have continued to fight. Let us not overlook the sacrifices they have made or the spirit which they have maintained. Had they folded during the dark days of a year ago, this war would have been over.

One of the uglier pictures has been the manner in which shipping has been handled. American shipping generally is in chaotic condition. We have all but priced ourselves out of the maritime picture. Only heavy subsidy payments are making it possible to maintain precariously an American merchant fleet. This situation adds to the confusion of the logistics problem in southeast Asia. Shipping schedules were not well planned. Costs of shipping have been monumental. This situation, too, has improved very greatly, but it does not eliminate responsibility for sending out ships to wait for weeks, or even months, in the harbors or estuaries of Vietnam for a place to unload. While they waited in the harbor many of the ships were drawing demurrage and most of the crews were receiving double pay for being in dangerous waters. This resulted in a fantastic and, I believe, totally unnecessary waste of the taxpayers money. And you can be certain that eyebrows have been raised around the world about the inadequacy of our own shipping to back up larger oversea commitments if our national policies should lead us into them.

I pay high tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee for his outstanding leadership in this field.

In this bill the committee has faced up to a number of very important items. In this I consider that the committee has acted with high courage and has shown a degree of leadership unsurpassed in any previous defense appropriations bill. For instance, money is provided which will gain us a year toward providing an antiballistic missile system. It sounds almost futile to attempt to perfect a defense against ballistic missiles. Time and again this has been referred to as trying to shoot down a bullet with a bullet. But feasible or not, the Russians are building such a system. They are well along toward the completion of the program around some of their principal cities. They are using a new concept which can be likened to shooting down a bullet with a shotgun charge. Presumably, we will use the same concept. Some experts say that such a system would save the lives of 70 million Americans in the event of a nuclear attack. I do not feel that I want to accept responsibility for refusing to give to the people of America the same kind of protection the Russians are giving to their own people. It would be asking people to accept an unnecessary and dangerous risk. This is the downpayment only. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended this action.

The committee recommends two steps which are intended to insure our air superiority in the years ahead. I do not believe the day of the aircraft is over. Nothing that has happened in Vietnam would lead to such a conclusion. In the Y2–12 the Air Force has developed an amazingly efficient interceptor with a working weapons system. This service already has tomorrow's follow-on interceptor. It needs perfecting, and the Air Force needs to get a production line into operation. This we do in the bill before you. Coupled with this is the decision to press forward with the advanced manned strategic aircraft, the follow-on bomber. The B–52 is still a great aircraft, but it is aging. The B–111 is at best an interim aircraft. It has neither the range nor the load-carrying capability of the B–52. It will be a useful aircraft, but it is definitely not tomorrow's bomber.

This calls for additional comments on aircraft. One has to do with the continuation of three airlift squadrons of the Air National Guard, which were scheduled for phaseout. These units have rendered yeoman service to our cause in Vietnam. They have done it in spare-time assignments, but the sum total of their contributions has been significant. It seems to make little sense to kill effective forces such as this when we are still in the midst of war.

Another item has to do with the Navy follow-on interceptor. For some reason the Navy simply is not defending its own interests. It is doing virtually nothing toward obtaining a follow-on interceptor. It is stuck with the Navy version of the TFX. This aircraft is costing a great deal more than was anticipated. It is far behind schedule. It is too heavy to use on carriers and the things that must be sacrificed in order to make it work will probably result in a second rate aircraft. Add to that the fact that thus far the fire control system will not work. Presumably, all of these things can, in time, be ironed out, but at great cost and after much delay. At this stage it is a lemon and the Navy knows it.

The bill provides for the continued operation of the B–52 bombers which were scheduled for phaseout. Again, it makes little sense to weaken our military effectiveness when we are fighting a war. The B–52 is giving effective service in the southeast Pacific. If there were guarantees of no additional involvement anywhere in the world, it might make sense to eliminate a part of the force, but there certainly is no such guarantee today.

The continuing importance of maintaining an effective and modern bomber fleet with the assurance of a follow-on bomber when needed is strikingly borne out by the failure of Communist surface-to-air missiles to prove a serious deterrent to U.S. bombing attacks against North Vietnam. It will be recalled that on a day early in July when U.S. aircraft carried out a record number of bombing missions against North Vietnam, there were also a record number of Soviet-supplied SAM's fired. They failed to bring down a single U.S. plane. By contrast, conventional ground fire has continued to take its toll of U.S. aircraft. The antimissile procedures used by U.S. pilots against surface-to-air missiles has effectively nullified the SAM system and is one of the significant breakthroughs of the war. All in all, 375 SAM's have been fired. They brought down 14 U.S. aircraft. This is less than 5 percent effectiveness.

Exotic defense developments do not always constitute success in warfare. Here is a classic example. There is not a direct parallel, of course, between the failure of surface-to-air missiles to deter U.S. bomber attacks, and the need for follow-on aircraft, but there is enough similarity concern. The SAM's, like our missiles, were supposed to be the last word in effective weapons. They are failing, but conventional weapons are continuing to prove effective. We do not know what is going to happen with our vaunted missile capability until we try it. We expect it to operate successfully. We hope it will. But it does not make sense to put all our eggs in one basket when that means depending only upon untried weapons and disposing of those weapons which are tried and proven.

There is no funding beyond the budget level for antisubmarine warfare. Nor is there authorization for additional funding. To that extent, our hands are tied. It may be that this is the most serious omission in the bill. I fear that the improvement in submarines and submarine-launched missiles in the hands of the Russians is greater than the improvement in antisubmarine warfare measures. Their nuclear-powered, missile-equipped submarines operate in every ocean. This is a most difficult field in which to make significant progress. Breakthroughs and leaps forward have been commonplace in many fields of military endeavor, just as they have been in space. But ASW continues to be a plodding, slow, tedious, exacting science which simply will not respond to demands for monumental steps forward. Some of our best brains have applied themselves to the task, and progress definitely has been made. But the progress on the other side is, I think, greater. Submarines and submarine-launched missiles definitely constitute a threat to U.S. security. It is a threat which is seldom discussed, and for that reason it may be all the more dangerous. I feel that we should be doing more to counter it. In another area, however, we are taking strides toward a nuclear surface fleet. This has long been needed and we still have far to go.

I must express some concern about the adequacy of the educational processes in some of our military acadamies. I find that the Naval Academy recognizes that there is need for improvement and is attempting to make these improvements. I believe they could be speeded up. But I do not find any such recognition at West Point that these are changing times which require the most modern educational standards. This is a somewhat harsh indictment, but I stand on it. At West Point, 40 percent of the curriculum is taken up with social sciences and humanities and 60 percent in math, science and engineering. But at MIT, 80 percent is in the field of technology and only 20 percent in social science and humanities. Yes, the young men at each of the academies get a good education. But these young men are to fill some of the most exacting jobs in the world. Theirs is the responsibility in the years ahead of insuring that the United States can maintain an adequate defense against the best that can be devised. A good education is not enough. It will have to be the very best. It will have to be as good as any that can be obtained in private institutions. I believe the Air Force is attempting to do just this. The Air Force is a new service. It did not have to shed tradition in order to become fully modern. I submit that this entire area is one with which the Congress should concern itself much more than it has in the past and that the necessary prodding be administered to accomplish the desired results.

At long last the military services are making a more realistic utilization of the capabilities of enlisted personnel as a source of officer personnel. The Army has been the worst offender in this field.

Despite a constant need for junior officers, the Army has shown a strange reluctance to turn to its own ranks for talent. Yet it would appear that here is one of the best sources for officer material. I have always been convinced that a man is a better officer for having served both as an enlisted man and an officer. Particularly is this true for those men who have seen combat service in Vietnam. In any event, the Army will expand its officers school program by 150 percent during the next 12 months. The former 1,400 per month now will be increased to 3,500. New OCS schools have been established at Aberdeen for Ordnance, Fort Lee for Quartermaster, and Fort Eustis for Transportation. As a part of this program, the Army is making much broader use of college graduates for OCS enlistees, and here, too, the Army was the last service to take advantage of the opportunity to secure educated young men.

In this bill the merger of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard is again rejected. Unless legislation is enacted to bring about the merger, it is the feeling of the committee that the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard should be maintained separately and at their approximate strength as of June 30, 1966. The individuals training in each component should be assigned on a paid drill status to units of combat, combat support and combat service types. The committee recognizes the necessity of reorganization or adjustment in unit type and structure within the Army Reserves and the Army National Guard respectively. We emphasize, however, that major changes in organization or mergers should be made only after full consultation with and advice from the Congress.

It is our strong feeling that all units should be provided the personnel, training, equipment, technician, and facility support necessary for them to achieve a meaningful standard of combat readiness within a reasonable time. We are cognizant of the desirability of maintaining unit personnel strength at a high percentage level, perhaps 80 percent or higher for most units, but we underscore the need for maintaining a broad base such as now provided by units of the reinforcing reserve, training divisions, and mobilization base units. Such a base is necessary for rapid expansion, for maintaining trained personnel and for providing encouragement for career reservists. Any change in this base structure should be made in such a way as to cause the least amount of personnel turbulence and to retain as many trained personnel as possible.

Should funds in an amount over and above that contained in this bill be necessary to accomplish the objectives set out herein, it is expected that the Secretary of Defense will present to the Congress the additional funds required and/or the authorizing legislation needed.

I am very pleased that there is a new awareness in responsible committees of Congress of the need to insure dignity and to provide recognition and to give a respectable standard of living to those who serve in the Active Forces. Those who wear our uniform must be prepared to give of themselves whatever is required, whenever the security of our Nation demands it. This can mean separation from loved ones, exposure to hazard, discomfort, and frequently danger—even death. For too long America has failed to properly provide for those who wear the uniform, either in pay scale commensurate with that available in civilian life or a comfortable and pleasant place in which to live. Now I can say that this picture is changing and changing for the better. All that we desire cannot be accomplished overnight, but we are making positive strides. We are demonstrating to America's servicemen and their families that we are indeed proud of them; that we do appreciate them, and that we intend for them to be able to enjoy a standard of living as high as the one they are asked to fight for. This bill carries forward that concept. We reiterate our will and our determination to win.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes; I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his statement. How much have the taxpayers dropped on TFX F–111 failure? Is it somewhere between $2 and $3 billion, or $1 or $2 billion?

Mr. SIKES. The additional costs which have resulted from the slowdown and the necessity for changes in the aircraft and in its weapons system are very difficult to assess with accuracy. There have been varying estimates. Some have said the final add-on costs will be as great as the savings which originally were claimed for the TFX concept. Additional costs for changes to date are probably somewhat beyond the range of $400 million. I would not care to estimate the final additional costs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that the current research and development effort for the F–111 is somewhere between $1 and $2 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say $2 billion?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; something below $2 billion. The current estimate is $1.5 billion.

Mr. SIKES. However, that figure is for the total program; not for the changes that have been necessary. Most of the problems which generated additional costs have been in the Navy version.

Mr. MAHON. The additional costs above the original research and development estimates are currently estimated to be $416 million. The F–111 procurement program is forced to go far higher as we acquire more of the F–111 planes. As to the TFX planes, whether the naval version will ever work nobody can tell at this time. It was an effort to provide a defense at a lower cost, but whether it will work you cannot tell yet, as has been already pointed out by the gentleman from Florida. Whether they will be able to configure the Navy version so that it will be sufficiently light to operate from carriers is a question which is still in doubt.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to be certain that we are differentiating between legitimate costs of development and those costs which are necessitated by the failure of the Navy version to perform satisfactorily.

The TFX program as a whole is a very costly program, as has been pointed out. But we do have in the Air Force version a very useful interceptor. The bomber version, the B–111, presumably also will be a very useful aircraft. It is the Navy version which has been a costly disappointment in its development to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if it is not the fact that you had testimony before your committee which practically seals the fate of the F–111 as a plane to be operated by the Navy off carrier decks?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. There are those in the Navy who feel that the Navy version of the TFX or the F–111 will never be an effective aircraft. We cannot tell whether it will be or not. We have a big investment in this aircraft. It is a big step forward as an aircraft; but it may be that this will turn out to have been a mistake. We cannot tell yet. I hope it can be made into an effective airplane. Certainly the Air Force version, which is land based, gives promise of being a very superior plane.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but this plane was supposed to be a two-way plane. It was supposed to operate land-based as well as carrier-based.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That was the basis for the award. It was on that basis that McNamara made the award to General Dynamics at Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. MAHON. It was a very noble idea, but it may be like many other ventures in defense. It may turn out to be a failure.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and who had the noble idea other than one Robert Strange McNamara? Everyone else was opposed to it, and the gentleman knows it. The Source Selection Board was overruled. The military was overruled.

Mr. MAHON. I am just saying that, in my opinion, this was a very honest decision made with the interests of the defense and the taxpayers in mind, and we hope it works. It may not.

Mr. GROSS. I would say that it is one of the most costly mistakes that has been made in my time in the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. This is a matter of point of view.

Mr. SIKES. I share the gentleman's concern about the additional cost. It is a serious matter. Even more serious is the fact that the Navy does not have a new and fully modern interceptor to be phased into inventory at this time. There is no way to predict with certainty when it will be available—or at what cost.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to commend in the warmest way my distinguished colleague and the eminent dean of our Florida delegation for the excellent statement he has made and for the contribution he has made to our country, of which all the House, I am sure, is proud. Under the able chairman of his committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and with the help of his colleagues on the committee, he has made a most significant contribution to the strengthening of the security of our country and the furtherance of the highest objectives of our Nation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard the distinguished gentleman from Florida give a very thorough review of some very basic questions which affect the future defense needs of this country. The gentleman raised serious longtime questions of major significance about the preparedness of this country in several major fields—in antisubmarine warfare, for example; in the field of offensive and defensive weapons systems; in the area of long-term planning procedures of the Department of Defense such as placing primary reliance on missiles, and in several other major areas. The gentleman also raised many very basic questions about the problems which we face in southeast Asia, in Europe, and in other places throughout the world where this country, as Secretary Rusk has told us, has over 40 solemn commitments.

FIRST INSTALLMENT

We who serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Republicans and Democrats alike, support this bill as it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives today. We support it as the first installment on the 1967 defense bill for this Nation—and it is merely the first installment.

THE 1966 BUDGET

When the 1966 appropriation bill was here on the floor of the House, I made a similar statement, that the 1966 bill as submitted by our committee was merely a first installment on the 1966 defense costs. Our distinguished chairman, in defense of the Secretary of Defense and of the administration, had to take exception to that statement at the time, and he introduced a letter in the RECORD which said:

> The fiscal year 1966 defense budget request now before the Congress would provide all of the funds we need at this time . . . to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months.

But all of us know what happened. There was supplemental after supplemental which came from the Department of Defense, totaling at the close of fiscal year 1966 more than $14½ billion, to cover the costs of the Department of Defense in 1966, because we were going forward on a partial-funding basis.

We were following the principle in the Department of Defense of fighting now and financing later so far as major segments of our defense program were concerned. We were willing to draw down stocks in Europe, in the United States, and in other places in the world, so that we would not have shortages in Vietnam. And we do not have shortages there, but we have been able to avoid shortages merely because of the drawdown in stocks of ammunition, clothing, and other supplies from the defense needs of this Nation.

Only a few years ago we used to believe we had to have *x* number of days—and it was a classified figure—so far as supplies were concerned to support the fighting forces of the United States. Today I want the Members to know that that *X* figure has been cut in half. It has been cut in half because we have had to draw down on stocks and materials from our worldwide inventory. The *X* figure is one-half *X* today so far as backup supplies and equipment, clothing, and other items, are concerned.

BLUE-RIBBON COMMISSION

We on the minority side of the committee made several suggestions. Almost every one of the amendments which were offered in the committee was adopted. But we did make a suggestion in the committee that perhaps the time had come for a long-term, long-range study of manpower, personnel, defense strategy, defense planning in this Nation, a study on behalf of the Congress of the United States, in short, a Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense.

This bill authorizes a study in the Department of Defense, in the executive branch of our Government, which will be financed by them in the amount of some $50 million in expenditures for studies alone, and which will be the sole and complete property of the executive branch of our Government. As a matter of fact, when we suggested this Blue Ribbon Commission to report to the Congress of the United States and not to the executive branch, we made this suggestion because we felt that the Congress should have this kind of assistance in order to resolve the differences that exist between the Congress and the executive branch in this important area of defense planning as we go forward into the time period of 1970–75. At the conclusion of my remarks I will insert in the RECORD statements from the House Committee on Armed Services, statements from the Senate Committee on Armed Services, statements from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and from other major committees of this Congress which are in direct variance with the statements made by the Secretary of Defense in his opening statements before our committee.

NONPARTISAN

It seems that this is not a partisan issue. Congressional committees are controlled by the same party that is currently in charge of the executive branch of the Government. This is not a partisan issue. This is an issue that all Americans should be interested in, namely, to resolve these conflicts and these differences that currently exist between the congressional branch and the executive branch.

The distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, in his remarks a few minutes ago referred to the fact that the Congress would be giving up some authority here. That is the same kind of an argument that was made against the establishment of the Hoover Commission and it reads very much like the statement made by the gentleman from Texas.

Everyone in this Congress knows what a grand job the Hoover Commission did, both the first commission and the second commission, in bringing forth the facts and in shedding light on these areas and in bringing public opinion to bear and focusing public attention on the activities of the executive branch of our Government. I was shocked that this kind of attention should not be focused on the executive branch of the Government, particularly in view of these congressional committee reports which I will insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I say that because there are basic questions that must be resolved.

VIETNAM

For example, what have we learned from Vietnam? What has Vietnam taught us? How much attention has the administration given to what our policy should be toward other wars of national liberation should they occur?

Mr. Chairman, there is little public evidence that the administration has given any thought to what its response would be in the event another crisis similar to Vietnam erupts somewhere else. Would we undertake another 10- or 15-year war of attrition or are we considering some other response?

If we are not considering some other response, should we be? This is a very vital question the Commission should explore.

The question of have we learned anything in Vietnam and are we planning to face up to wars of national liberation in the same fashion as in the future is very important. Let us say that the problem of Vietnam is solved. What is the defense strategy and the defense planning in Thailand where today we have just as many troops as we had in the year 1965 in Vietnam? That was only a year ago. We have as many troops in Thailand today as we had in Vietnam in 1965. Are we going to prepare to fight that war of national liberation should the Communists move in in exactly the same fashion there? Are not these questions that need to be resolved as we go down the road? Yes. I think all Americans realize that there are all of these questions and the President of the United States 1 week after we came out with our report called for a Blue Ribbon Commission and established a Blue Ribbon Commission in the area of manpower and has under serious consideration at the present time a long and detailed study of these various important points which were brought out in our report. No, my friends, here in the House of Representatives we have this responsibility not for 1967, not for 1968, not for 1969, but for the time period beyond.

In order to establish defense weapons and defense weapons systems, a leadtime of from 5 to 7 years is needed on every single weapons system of a major nature that can be used by our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, our Marine Corps.

NATO

Mr. Chairman, another question that deserves the most careful attention of the Blue Ribbon Commission is NATO.

The breakdown of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is one of the biggest tragedies that we have faced in the 1960's.

Mr. Chairman, Vietnam occupies the center of our attention today, but future historians a few years from now will more likely consider the breakup of the free world's first line of defense—NATO—as a far more significant and tragic development than even Vietnam is today.

The bonds between the United States and our most powerful and important allies—the nations of Europe—have been weakening for several years. Preoccupied with attempts to placate our enemies, the administration has neglected our friends. Now our oldest friend and our first ally—France—is no longer a full participant in the alliance that has shielded Western Europe since 1949.

The alarming disintegration of NATO does not stem from any single cause. Conditions have changed in Europe since 1949, lessening the fear of an imminent overpowering armed attack by the Soviet Union. The fear that impelled the NATO nations to band together no longer impels them to close cooperation. The nations of Western Europe have grown stable and strong since 1949, and their feeling of utter dependence on the United States no longer cements the alliance.

But, beyond these factors which have assuredly contributed to the weakening of the alliance, beyond the visions and the personality of De Gaulle which have imposed strains on the alliance, the administration must be charged with a substantial share of the blame for what has happened and is happening to NATO.

Too often the administration has taken actions that led our NATO allies to doubt this Nation's constancy and reliability. Too often has it shown more interest in wooing enemies than in standing by friends. Too often has it failed to consult with the Nation's allies before adopting policies that have an important impact upon them. Too often has it appeared to attach low priority to European problems in comparison to problems of other areas. Too often has it been hesitant and confused about its foreign policy goals.

One French observer Rene Dabernat has written:

> The Atlantic crisis gives the Soviet Union the greatest victory it has ever won without war.

Former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer 2 months ago said:

> The Americans have not carried out their duty of leadership as the strongest NATO power.

Last October he declared, according to the New York Times, that it was not a very agreeable feeling for West Germany to see its friends and partners, the United States and Great Britain, meeting in Geneva to form a select club of nuclear powers.

Other German spokesmen have expressed uneasiness about the negotiations at Geneva. A member of the Bundestag, Karl Theodor von und Guttenberg, wrote, in a letter published in the New York Times October 18, 1965:

> There is concern in Germany over recent American proposals at the Geneva Conference.
>
> There has been dismay in Europe at William C. Foster's statement that the United States must push for a non-proliferation treaty even at the risk of a certain "erosion of alliances," which means, of course, NATO.

Not only De Gaulle and German leaders have publicly expressed dissatisfaction with administration policy toward the NATO allies. The leaders of Portugal, too, have been equally critical.

In an interview with Tad Szulc in the New York Times on March 24, 1966, Premier Salazar declared that the Western powers should no longer expect automatic cooperation from Lisbon. He also stated that he felt NATO was inadequate and a source of disastrous results. He then went further in proposing bilateral agreements for countries who felt the same way. Salazar according to Szulc was disillusioned with the United States and NATO, accusing the United States of undermining the positions of allies, especially Portugal's. Salazar also in this interview hinted at terminating the agreement for U.S. naval bases in the Azores. He indicated orally to Mr. Szulc that in the light of France's new position, Portugal might review the terms of her membership in the Atlantic Alliance:

> We do not see, by the way, why the Portuguese cooperation with any country should be considered guaranteed only because that country is Western.

The Prime Minister of Canada, Lester Pearson, speaking in Springfield, Ill., on June 11, 1966, clearly pointed the finger of blame at the United States for its immobility during the past 2 years as the disintegration of NATO became an ever more real and imminent threat. Mr. Pearson said:

> In December '64 Canada proposed in NATO a reassessment of the nature of the alliance in the light of these changing conditions. Little was done.
>
> Unhappily, it is man's weakness to cling to the ideas, the institutions and the habits of the past—even the recent past—instead of adapting them to the needs of today and tomorrow. So it was with NATO. The weight of inertia and a vested interest in a new status quo, felt especially among the most powerful governments of the alliance, made it difficult to find anyone in a responsible position on either side of the Atlantic who was prepared to come forward and specify in any detail what should be changed . . . Then abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us. Crisis-as-always forced our hands.
>
> We should have acted earlier and not under the compulsion of events. We should have tried to move forward together to a closer international association in order to remove the risk of sliding backwards. In these matters, there is no standing still. Surely the course that should have been taken—should be taken—is clear.

It would be a grave error to believe that the NATO nations that have refrained from public criticism of the policy of the United States are in agreement with American policy. As Henry Kissinger writes in the Reporter of July 14, 1966:

> To test allied cohesion by a formal counting of votes is misleading. Within NATO the 14–1 lineup against France may prevail on technical issues; it will not hold together in a prolonged political contest—even over strategic doctrine. Within the Europe of the Six, de Gaulle has never been as alone as some like to believe.

The failure of the administration to provide clear and consistent leadership in NATO was pointed out in 1964 by the critical issues council of the Republican citizens committee. This council was made up of a distinguished group of citizens headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University. In its report on NATO, the critical issues council declared:

> This nation must bear a share of responsibility for the failure of some European nations to meet the force requirements set by NATO. In part, the allies have been lulled into complacency by overreliance on the United States—on our support, our aid, and our deterrent. The words and action of the United States which exaggerate some new era of "reconciliation" with the Soviet Union have helped to foster a sense of "euphoria" and relaxation. The United States has failed to convince its allies that the military efforts demanded of them would add substantially to their security.
>
> . . . even so honorable a nation as the United States cannot expect to be taken wholly on trust by other honorable nations in matters involving their very existence. Then, too, for many in Europe—and not just the French—some participation in the control of nuclear weapons has become a symbol of sovereignty.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We must now translate the concept of collective defense into a workable solution—into practical terms of how and by whom authority and control are to be exercised, and extended to cover all forces and all weapons, conventional and nuclear. In the last three years, there has been no real progress toward this goal. In fact, we have clearly retrogressed.

Many Members of Congress of both political parties have severely criticized the administration for policy deficiencies which have stimulated and intensified the centrifugal forces at work in the Atlantic Alliance. I offer below a sampling of such criticism.

Congressman QUIE—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 16, page 21674:

". . . in the military field, we are telling our NATO allies to do one thing and then are doing, for ourselves, another. At the very moment we are considering cutting back our own land forces in Europe out of necessity of the drain on our gold supply, we are chastising our NATO allies for failure to build up their land forces. At the very time we were urging our allies to accept an expensive surface-vessel fleet of 25 vessels, we were considering reducing our own surface fleet. . . ."

Congressman Findley—Congressional Record, volume 109, part 17, page 23028.

"As our allies review recent U.S. policy they may be wondering if we would actually defend Europe's cities without nuclear weapons. Witness our weak follow-through in Cuba, withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, the test ban treaty, cancellation of Skybolt."

Senator Prouty—Congressional Record, volume 110, part 3, page 3285.

"The dispute with Britain arising from the cancellation of Skybolt could not help having an impact on NATO as a whole. For one thing, it gave added force to the position of De Gaulle, who could point to the dangers of pinning one's defense on the United States. For another, it undermined the British claim to a special relationship with the United States, a claim deriving in part from Britain's possession of a nuclear capability.

"Since its inception, a number of political disputes have arisen within NATO. The one issue that most consistently entangled the United States was colonialism, with the United States favoring independence for particular areas when such independence was opposed by the metropolitan power, which also happened to be a NATO member. . . . For the past 3 years such a clash has infected relations between this country and Portugal.

". . . The United States has never fully extricated itself from this predicament."

Congressman Gerald R. Ford—Congressional Record, volume 110, part 12, page 15284.

"The United States has refused to recognize the dynamic transformation of Western Europe which has brought our NATO partners to unprecedented levels of strength. Instead, while demanding unilateral controls inside the alliance we have often ignored NATO to seek unilateral agreements with the common enemy without consulting our friends.

* * * * *

"The discord which has arisen between the United States and France flows from the administration's failure to grasp the marked improvement in the positions of our allies. That France should build its own national deterrent—force de frappe—to serve not only its own political and military strategies but ours as well perplexes the administration.

* * * * *

"The insensitivity of the 'Why win policy' to problems of the alliance is displayed in the Skybolt affair. In scrapping our plans to fit the British V-bomber force with a standoff missile capability, the administration gave no heed to the inevitably unfavorable political impact on both the Macmillan and De Gaulle governments.

"These and other episodes related to the military strategies and structure of NATO have sown doubts among our friends about the credibility of our commitments. The administration introduced the theory of the 'pause,' which proposes to meet a Russian onslaught into Western Europe with conventional weapons alone in the first stages. Despite the objections of General Norstad, former NATO Supreme Commander, the administration persisted in its course, thus weakening confidence in our solemn pledge to use nuclear weapons in defense of Western Europe. . . ."

Senator Church—Congressional Record, volume 111, part 12, page 16451.

"Because this military alliance has endured and because Western Europe has staged a remarkable general recovery under its umbrella, we Americans sometimes take the future of NATO for granted. I think we assume that, when it falls open for NATO countries to leave the alliance in 1969, none will do so.

"I do not think NATO will survive so easily, unless we move to strengthen and broaden the Atlantic partnership. . . .

"To me, the difficulties over the MLF illustrate a long-held belief that we cannot solve basic political and psychological problems by military contrivance. We must reach behind the military problems, and deal with the fundamental questions."

Congressman Findley — Congressional Record, volume 111, part 20, page 27013.

"France has repeatedly stated that the present command structure is not acceptable. In fact, these complaints were first voiced before DeGaulle's return to power. Today, the complaint comes principally from France. Tomorrow, it may be from Germany, Britain, or others.

"We should ask ourselves how we would feel if the situation were reversed, with U.S. officers never permitted to hold more than one lonely subordinate command post in the entire structure.

"President Johnson recently said of NATO: 'We must maintain its strength and we must continually update it to serve the common aspirations of all.'

"But the only action his administration has taken is negative—preparations in anticipation of French withdrawal.

"This totally negative response tends to strengthen French complaints and more than cancels out the affirmative words. It directly contradicts the partnership spirit of NATO. If pursued, it will tend to give substance to DeGaulle's charge of U.S. domination. And, perhaps most dangerous of all, it unwittingly plays into the hands of the long-term scheme, often attributed to De Gaulle, to establish French dominance over Western Europe, in substitution for what De Gaulle calls Anglo-Saxon hegemony."

Congressman Zablocki—Congressional Record, volume 111, part 21, page 28504.

". . . the United States must take dramatic and determined steps toward convincing European nations that we conceive our future as being inextricably intertwined with theirs. We must demonstrate our willingness to join with them in fruitful collaboration."

Congressman Quie—Congressional Record, volume 111, part 12, page 16710.

". . . the United States has frequently embarked on a unilateral course, without consultation with our allies. While we have expressed interest in the military strength of NATO, we have done nothing to develop the economic and political cohesiveness of the Atlantic Alliance. Yet, there are fundamental economic and political problems which, unless resolved, have tended and will increasingly tend to weaken the military aspects of the alliance.

"This weakening must be avoided and the alliance must be strengthened if it is to continue to stand as a bastion against Communist subversion, propaganda and military oppression."

Senator Clark—Congressional Record, 2nd Session, 89th Congress, March 15, 1966, page 5898.

"The search, in my judgment, should be begun at once, and without panic or rancor, for a further evolution in the organizational structure which will preserve the essence of the treaty.

". . . It is obvious that Europe is in a position to take much better care of its own general defense than a few years ago. In an economic sense, the situation is drastically changed for the better for Western Europe. . . ."

"I would hope that the State Department is giving active and prayerful consideration to the change in our situation in Western Europe. I would have some fear that it is not. In all too many instances in the recent past, the attitude has been frozen, despite the fact that the situation itself is fluid and flexible."

Congressman Horton—Congressional Record, 2nd Session, 89th Congress, April 5, 1966, page 7697.

"For too long now, it seems to me, our Government has allowed affairs in the Atlantic world to drift. It is almost as if we took the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for granted, confident that problems in relations between Europe and the United States would take care of themselves in the long run. Our policies have been narrowly conceived to preserve what exists; they have lacked the boldness and imagination that should be displayed by the most powerful nation of the North Atlantic Alliance. Above all, we have been overcautious in defining future goals toward which the Atlantic nations could work.

"One consequence of our policies has been to leave the initiative to others.

". . . A new U.S. initiative in Atlantic affairs is overdue. It is my conviction that we must stop reacting and begin leading, lest the crisis we face today lead to the peacemeal dismantling of all that has been built up over the past 17 years."

Congressman Halpern—Congressional Record, 2nd Session, 89th Congress, April 6, 1966, page 7802.

". . . It is most unfortunate that the United States, the prime military force, has not moved to officially study the developing differences and to offer, long before this date, realistic proposals by which this country and the Europeans could institute acceptable alternatives. This opportunity has now been lost.

"The prime target of French policy is not strictly the alliance, but the integrated defense structure which accentuates the paramount position of the United States and prejudges French decision making."

Congressman Holifield—Congressional Record, 2nd Session, 89th Congress, May 3, 1966, page 9767.

"I believe that there has been a failure on the part of every nation including the United States, to develop the Alliance to a high level of competence and effectiveness."

Congressman Frelinghuysen—"The Crisis in NATO"—Hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, March 22, 1966, pp. 27–28

"The situation, it seems to me, is partly our own fault. We have seen the proposals of the French shaping up for years, yet we have not taken any steps to avoid the consequences which now may well develop."

Congressman Morse—"The Crisis in NATO," Hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, March 22, 1966, pp. 27–28

". . . I can think of three instances in the last 7 years in which it seems to me, we indeed provoked and encouraged the kind of posture that France has assumed.

"The first . . . was the speech made by Secretary McNamara at Ann Arbor in April 1962, in which he announced the nuclear policy of the United States to be a "no cities policy."

"You said that the second of the two threads of De Gaulle's reasoning was that he wasn't sure about the reliability of the United States' nuclear capability as a device for the defense of Western Europe. It seems to me that the 'no cities' policy announced by Mr. McNamara at Ann Arbor almost 5 years ago certainly gave him reasonable cause to make the inference that he has made.

". . . It seems to me the 'no cities' policy announced by the Secretary of Defense, mind you 4 years ago, which purported to be a definitive statement of U.S. policy, was incredible. . . .

"The second question: You recall the instance which occurred after the rather clumsy handling of the Skybolt cancellation in which the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, was invited to confer with the then President and Mr. McNamara in Nassau. It seems to me that this certainly antagonized De Gaulle.

"It also seems to me that the MLF, which came out of that meeting, has contributed to this antagonism . . .

(p. 29) "I think that we are so totally preoccupied with Vietnam that we are not paying sufficient attention to other matters throughout the world."

Mrs. KELLY—"The Crisis in Nato" Hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe of the the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, March 22, 1966, p. 30

"I have to be very frank Mr. Secretary. I am terribly pessimistic about what we are doing. I feel we are dragging our feet more than anybody else."

Congressman GALLAGHER—"The Crisis in NATO," Hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representative 89th Congress, 2nd Session, May 5, 1966, p. 120.

"We saw—or should have seen—the writing on the wall. What could we have done to head off the consequences? We appear to have left the initiative completely in General de Gaulle's hands. Even now, with the inevitable staring us in the face, we seem to be wedded to the same course which we have pursued with respect to NATO over the past 17 years. . . .

"Are there no acceptable alternatives to our present course—alternatives which would, on the one hand, enable us and Western Europe to check the threat from the East, and, on the other hand, advance the long-term goal of European unity?

"Are we incapable of proposing initiatives directed at those goals—initiatives which would, simultaneously, attempt to bring France back into the community, so to speak?"

The Atlantic Alliance: Basic Issues. A study submitted by the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations (Pursuant to S. Res. 181, 89th Congress) to the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate. 89th Congress, 2nd Session, February 18, 1966, pp. 10–11.

"In the happiest circumstances, crisp decisions by a group of governments are hard to come by, and the accommodations made in arriving at agreement should be treasured, not lightly discarded. Continuity with a second-best policy may be better than to push a better one at the cost of not agreeing on any policy at all. As General Norstad testified:

"'We should not destroy the foundation under which we are working until we know we can produce a better one. Not that there is not a better one, because there is always a better one, but the criterion against which we judge this is not whether or not there is a better policy, a better plan, or a better strategy. The criterion must be: Can we get a better one accepted?'

"Unfortunately, the United States government has not always taken this view.

"A case in point: in 1962 the United States abruptly shifted to a strategy of flexible response.' There was little or no consultation with our allies, and the shift was explained in terms which, to say the least, caused doubt and confusion about what kind of counterblows the United States might be planning in the event of a Soviet attack on Europe. To some in Europe it looked as though the United States would rather switch than fight. The change in American doctrine forced modifications in allied military doctrine as well, thus painfully underlining for the allies how little influence they had on American policies of life and death importance to them. . . ."

Mr. Chairman, one of the primary roles of a Blue Ribbon Commission studying the defense posture of the United States would be a thoroughgoing review of how and to what extent the changed strategy on the part of the United States with regard to our commitment to NATO has contributed to or exacerbated the crisis in that alliance today and, in particular, what changes in attitude or policy might yet salvage the free world's first line of defense.

NATO is of paramount importance to the future security of the free world and I hope to see the problems of NATO given major attention by the Blue Ribbon Commission.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is another reason why we should ask for the best kind of help here in the Congress, a commission appointed by our distinguished Speaker, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and others, as provided in the resolution which we have offered to bring in men like Admiral McNeil, Dean Acheson, and men of great stature who can give the kind of study necessary to this problem and who can make recommendations to the Congress that are so needed, and to evaluate these basic differences in defense planning. And, Mr. Chairman, we should treat their recommendations much as we treated the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this idea that a Hoover Commission or a Blue Ribbon Commission should only be created by the President of the United States and the executive branch of the Government, as has been done in the area of manpower within the last few weeks, after our report came out by the way, and as they are prepared to do in the State and Defense Departments at the present time as I understand, is absolutely a mistake, and the Congress is abdicating its responsibility by failing to have these programs evaluated and to focus public attention upon them.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Chairman, our belief that there is a vital need for the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission is predicated on our belief that far-reaching changes have taken place in the thinking of our defense and foreign policymakers in recent years.

The defense structure of any nation is determined by that nation's foreign policy.

The Secretary of Defense has said that the development of our defense structure should be guided by U.S. foreign policy.

With this principle there is no disagreement.

Yet, many of us do disagree with much that is being done in the Defense Establishment today especially in those areas that directly affect our present ability (Vietnam) and our long-range ability to deter potential aggressors.

Our basic disagreements, therefore, derive in part from basic foreign policy assumptions of the current administration and in part from the assumptions the Secretary of Defense uses to justify his force structure projections.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To summarize the views that were contained in our additional views to the committee report, we believe that certain basic changes have taken place in the defense policy of the United States since 1961. These changes need immediate evaluation by this impartial Blue Ribbon Commission. Among the changes we would list the following as particularly significant:

First, a changed attitude toward the cold war and, as a result, a different assessment of the potential and current threat;

Second, a changed attitude toward the desirability or necessity of pursuing advanced weapons development as vigorously as possible; and

Third, a changed attitude toward those areas of defense and defense planning which should receive priority.

In the intervening 5 years, we have had an opportunity to observe the consequences of these and the other changes that have been introduced. Based, therefore, upon actual experiences and not merely upon theoretical musings, there is, in our view, substantial reason to question both the correctness and the effectiveness of the new approach.

In foreign policy, the basic assumptions upon which this administration appears to base its defense strategy include the following:

First, that there has been in recent years a reduction in tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc—except China—and that further accommodations in the future can be anticipated and should be encouraged;

Second, that our military force structure should be related primarily to the "visible" threat posed by potential adversaries;

Third, that nuclear war is unthinkable to the Communists as it is to the United States and the free world and that therefore, the balance that has been achieved between the Soviet Union and the United States with regard to strategic forces should not be upset;

Fourth, that the United States should continue to assume a posture of response both in the area of "crisis control" such as Vietnam and in the area of weapons development; and

Fifth, that the threat from world communism has, in fact, eased during the course of recent years and, therefore, any attempt to maintain a decisive superiority in the years ahead would reverse this trend.

In Defense policy, the basic assumptions would include:

First, that the aggressive pursuit of advanced weapons development such as the antiballistic missile system—ABM—or the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA—would lead to a "reaction" on the part of the Communists that would accelerate the "arms race" and that, therefore whenever, possible, such decisions should be stretched out, studied to death, or postponed;

Second, that the level of effort in new weapons systems should be tied, predominantly, to what the potential enemy is doing and that the determination of what "the other side is doing" must be based on "visible" information; and

Third, that the Defense Establishment must be prepared to execute and implement a strategy of "flexible response," one that permits the United States to gradually escalate any conflict and that will not force us into the dilemma of "humiliating retreat or nuclear war."

Mr. Chairman, it is our belief that many of these assumptions that guide our foreign and defense policy are largely unrealistic and incorrect and that the experience of the past 5 years bears out this contention. The importance of a complete evaluation of these assumptions cannot be underestimated.

We believe that there has not been a reduction in tensions but rather a reduction in our desire to recognize Communist actions for what they are.

We believe that our military force structure should not be related to the "visible" threat but rather to the capabilities of the Communists and to the fulfillment of our own national objectives.

We believe that nuclear war should be "unthinkable" to the Communists but that this country should not base its plans on that illusive hope.

We believe that the strategy of response both with regard to crisis situations and with respect to weapons development should give way to a strategy of initiative. We would define a "strategy of response" as one in which this Nation permits a situation to become so serious that it must take extraordinary steps even to return to the status quo, and a "strategy of initiative" as one in which this Nation, when it first sees the possibility of a situation developing, will take steps to prevent its becoming a crisis situation either with respect to potential conflicts or to new advances in weapons development.

We believe that the threat from world communism has not eased and that, therefore, it is of the utmost importance that this Nation maintain a decisive superiority in offensive and defensive weapons.

We believe that the Soviet Union is not "leveling off" its effort in advanced weapons development and that it is, as a matter of fact, aggressively pursuing new developments both in outer space and inner space.

Finally, we believe that under the policies of the past 5 years, rather than escape the dilemma of "humiliating retreat or nuclear war," we have actually enlarged that possibility by, in effect, adopting policies that have reduced rather than increased our options.

To reverse this situation, four basic requirements are necessary:

First. A more objective and realistic assessment of the threat coupled with a thorough reevaluation of our foreign policy;

Second. A return to greater participation by and acceptance of military judgment in what are predominantly military affairs;

Third. A more aggressive pursuit of research and development especially in the area of advanced weapons; and

Fourth. A reassessment by the Congress of its own role in the area of national security.

There is, in our judgment, little possibility that these requirements can or will be fulfilled unless the initiative comes from the Congress. It is for this reason that we have called for and strongly support the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission of military and civilian leaders to reassess and reevaluate the defense posture of this Nation now and for the future.

Only in this way can the American people be reassured that this Nation is buying the very best defense consistent with the long-term best interests of the United States.

MISTAKES IN DEFENSE

Mr. Chairman, still another reason for this Blue Ribbon Commission is the unequalled record of mistakes that the present Secretary of Defense has managed to amass.

Consider, for example, the following:

On October 2, 1963, the Defense Secretary predicted that the major part of the U.S. military task could, in his judgment be completed by the end of 1965 "although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel." At that time, the United States had some 16,000 "advisers" in Vietnam. Today, that figure has risen to well over 260,000 and is still growing.

On January 27, 1964, Secretary McNamara told the Nation that the successor to the Diem government "has considerably more popular support than its predecessor." Two days later, that government was overthrown.

On his return from each of several trips to Vietnam in the past 2 years, Mr. McNamara gave glowing, optimistic reports of the situation which left the American people tragically unprepared for the bitter realities of the present situation. In many cases, his own later statements as well as those of other administration officials contradicted the earlier optimistic reports.

Mr. McNamara has repeatedly told our committee and other committees of Congress than we had 16 Active Army divisions, fully equipped and ready for sustained combat. The hollowness of these statements has since become apparent from the Army's struggle to maintain and support what amounts to less than four divisions in the field in Vietnam, not to mention the fact that the four divisions referred to earlier have been relegated to the status of training divisions and are not, in fact, combat ready.

After repeated assurances that the combat readiness of U.S. forces was extremely high and that the United States was capable of conducting a stepped-up war in Vietnam without seriously interfering with the readiness of the strategic Reserve, Mr. McNamara has seriously impaired the readiness of combat forces within the United States, and now as an example, must withdraw at least 15,000 highly skilled and/or experienced troops from Europe both to train what supposedly were combat-ready troops in the United States and to bolster our forces in Vietnam.

Mr. McNamara overrode the recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and four source selection boards on the question of the TFX award. Apart from the conflict-of-interest questions that have been raised regarding this award, there are now serious doubts that the aircraft can meet the needs of both the Air Force and the Navy at the same time and there is substantial evidence that the cost of the aircraft will greatly exceed the original estimates.

The Secretary's continual refusal to push ahead with development of a follow-on strategic bomber to replace the aging B-52's and B-58's which are being phased out has compelled him to place first reliance on a bomber version of the F-111—TFX. Most military experts who testified on this subject saw the FB-111 as, at best, an interim, stopgap bomber.

The Secretary's delay in acceding to the Navy's requirements for nuclear-powered ships such as the aircraft carrier and the guided missile frigate—DLGN—has made it impossible for the Navy to develop and deploy the type of surface ships it has considered essential. Two years ago he sought and obtained authorization to construct a conventional carrier, the *John F. Kennedy*. His present request for three nuclear-powered aircraft carriers to come into the inventory at a later date indicates that he has belatedly recognized the correctness of the Navy approach; however, the decision was overdue and means that the Navy will be given a capability several years later than was deemed necessary, not to mention the fact that the United States is saddled with a second-best, conventional carrier.

With regard to air and sealift capabilities, the Secretary was quick to criticize what was available when he took office and has since claimed that he effected a 100-percent increase in airlift capacity but is notably silent on what increases, if any, have occurred in amphibious Marine Corps or general sealift capacity. Unfortunately—considering the demands of Vietnam and the potential of other contingencies—the real increase in airlift capability lies in the future, notably the C5A and the remainder of the C-141's while the sealift capability remains unsatisfactory.

In the fiscal year 1966 budget, the Secretary denied that the important C-141 cargo aircraft was underfunded—yet within months he reprogramed additional funds for the C-141.

Mr. Chairman, a most disturbing feature of these mistakes is that they are all one sided. They are dominated by reductions in our military capability, by a downgrading of military expertise which leads to low morale, and by the imposition of civilian judgment and power.

In testimony before our committee on the fiscal year 1966 defense bill, the Secretary assured our committee that—

> While our fiscal year 1966 budget request does not include all of the forces or force modernizations recommended by the military departments and individual service chiefs, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that the program supported by this budget *will increase our overall combat effectiveness* and will

> provide effective forces in a high state of readiness for the defense of the vital interests of the United States.[1]

Many of the foregoing points refute this statement.

Mr. Chairman, let us look for a moment at the basic assumptions which seem to guide this administration's foreign and defense policy.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS—FOREIGN POLICY

As we stated in our "Additional Views," the defense posture of a nation is largely determined by the foreign policy of that nation. Secretary McNamara has been very free to admit this in testimony before our committee.

No one would question the validity of the President's instructions to Mr. McNamara to "Develop the military force structure necessary to support our foreign policy without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings" and to "procure and operate this force at the lowest possible cost."[2]

Two questions need to be examined regarding the President's instructions. What basic assumptions with regard to foreign policy appear to govern the thinking of Mr. McNamara in his assessment of the force structure necessary for the security of the United States; and has he, in fact, adhered to the President's guidelines?

In his testimony on the fiscal year 1967 program, Secretary McNamara insisted that in carrying out the President's instructions "our military strategy and plans should be related to the threat, that the forces to be acquired and maintained should be related to the strategy and the plans, and that the forces should be adequately supported, not only with men, equipment, and facilities needed in peacetime, but with war reserve stocks as well, so that they could engage in combat for sustained periods of time."[3]

Mr. Chairman, these are commendable objectives as far as they go. They were not created by Mr. McNamara, but are a part of the traditional philosophy of the Department of Defense and have been supported historically by the Congress of the United States.

The weakness of Mr. McNamara's statement is contained in what he omitted; not what he said.

ASSESSMENT OF THREAT

In relating strategy and plans primarily to the threat as he views that threat and not to the fulfillment of national objectives, Mr. McNamara has committed himself and the United States as well to an essentially defensive and reactive philosophy.

American purposes thereby become secondary and American strategic posture depends primarily upon what Mr. McNamara actually sees the enemy is prepared to do against the United States rather than what that enemy is capable of doing.

This procedure is fraught with hazards. The Soviet Union—and for that matter, Communist China—are closed societies and take elaborate steps to prevent outside observation of what is being developed.

A. INTELLIGENCE

In discussing intelligence activities as they relate to the defense posture of this Nation, it would be well at this point to express my deep concern over the growing centralization of intelligence activities that has been fostered by the Secretary of Defense during the past 5 years. This centralization has taken three main forms:

First. The reduction of responsibility and authority of the separate intelligence groups under the direction of the services and their virtual integration into a single unit, the Defense Intelligence Agency—DIA—under the direction of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

An obvious effect of this centralization has been to reduce dissent and rational debate within the Department and increase the incidence of conformity with, in some cases, preconceived or predetermined conclusions.

Second. The large numerical increase in the number of personnel, primarily civilian, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Third. The growing practice at the highest levels of a situation in which the Joint Chiefs of Staff are less in evidence at policy conferences with the Commander in Chief on highly sensitive issues. In effect, the Chiefs' recommendations more and more often are filtered up to the Chief Executive via the Secretary of Defense.

With these factors in mind, it is of particular interest that Secretary McNamara appears consistently to have taken the position that the intelligence information upon which we should base our defense planning must be in the form of "hard" or "visible" information.

There are two basic pitfalls in this posture.

On the one hand, the "visibility curve" on hard intelligence is a fluctuating factor. Like any other scientists in any country, Soviet scientists are prone to publish their findings and theories in scientific journals. These indications of Soviet future potential capabilities are "visible" to U.S. intelligence analysts.

However, after a decision is taken to go into the more advanced research and development phase in the Soviet Union or any other "closed" Communist society, an "iron curtain" descends over such activity and is not lifted in most instances until after the system reaches the hardware stage, when it may be displayed to the world during, for example, May Day celebrations or tests.

If at that stage, the system in question was not anticipated or "seen" by U.S. intelligence analysts and acted upon by the proper officials, the United States could find itself years behind in the development of a system to counter the Soviet system.

Such could well be the case with respect to the antiballistic missile, a follow-on strategic bomber, military systems for use in outer space, and quantum advances in the uses of inner space such as undersea technology.

B. SUBJECTIVE POLITICAL ANALYSIS

The other pitfall is the tendency on the part of Secretary McNamara and other high administration officials to "mix" hard intelligence analysis with subjective political analysis.

The assessment by high administration officials during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 is a case in point. At that time, for several weeks prior to the official announcement by President Kennedy that there were indeed missiles being placed in Cuba, intelligence information was received and analyzed which indicated the very definite probability that missile components were being shipped into Cuba.

The political judgment of the highest administration officials was apparently interjected for a period of time to the effect that the Soviets would not, during this era of reduced tensions, be engaged in the introduction of such missiles into Cuba.

In short, intelligence estimates often appear to be developed with a view toward supporting predetermined conclusions and policies.

U.S. OBJECTIVES SHOULD GOVERN

By relating the development of our country's strategies and plans primarily to the "visible" threat, and not to the capabilities of the potential aggressors in accord with the fulfillment of national objectives, Mr. McNamara, as has been said, has committed himself and the United States to an essentially defensive and reactive philosophy.

In this sense, Mr. McNamara has given away the initiative and has in effect permitted the Communist world to occupy the driver's seat.

America's interests and those of our free world allies should be the guiding force behind the development and maintenance of our military posture. This does not mean the adoption of a policy of militancy and aggressiveness. It would, however, indicate that the United States has legitimate interests and intends to use its military power in the defense of those interests whenever they are endangered.

The evaluation of the threat, that is, the military capabilities of potential enemies to thwart achievement of national objectives, is certainly an integral part of the determination of military needs but not the whole of it as Mr. McNamara's statements and actions would seem to indicate.

A reorientation of strategy would place the potential aggressor on the defensive, would limit his freedom of movement and initiative, would inhibit his willingness to take risks, and would restore the initiative to the United States and free world interests.

U.S. PREPAREDNESS TODAY

The Secretary of Defense in his testimony before our committee, hurls a charge against the defense posture of earlier years that much more aptly describes the situation facing the United States today after 5 years of allegedly correcting these deficiencies:

> For many years our military plans far exceeded the forces available to support them,

---

[1] Hearings, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1966 before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Part 3, Page 5-6.

[2] Hearings, ibid. (1967), Part 1, P. 8.

[3] Ibid.

> and even the forces available were not in proper balance with one another. There was not enough tactical air power to support the existing number of Army divisions. In addition, although the concept of a mobile central Reserve had been generally accepted, the airlift required to move these forces was completely inadequate, and there was not enough amphibious lift to move the Marine Corps forces. Although a great deal of attention had been paid to nuclear weapons, stocks of ammunition and other combat consumables required for nonnuclear war were grossly deficient in many categories.[4]

What is relevant here is that the exigencies of an actual conflict situation have put Mr. McNamara's theories to the test and they have been found wanting in several major respects. For example, our airlift capacity is strained heavily at the present time. Air Reserve and National Guard aircraft are being utilized. Virtually every bit of commercial aircraft presently available to the Department of Defense has been contracted for to increase our capability. All of this was necessary to sustain what is really a relatively small conflict—Vietnam—to which we have committed so far the equivalent of less than 4 of the 16 standing Army divisions.

As to stocks of ammunition and other combat consumables, the picture is clear and disconcerting. What is of particular concern to the Congress in addition to the temporary shortages that have arisen and will arise in Vietnam is the serious drawdown of our worldwide inventory which would be crucially needed if one of our more than 42 other commitments around the world should require American military assistance in a conflict situation.

The relevant question is whether Mr. McNamara's "new" military posture is adequate to support U.S. objectives and to stay ahead of the Communist efforts to nullify those objectives.

A more fundamental question—whether Mr. McNamara is really qualified to act as the final arbiter of U.S. military strategy, using the much celebrated technique of cost effectiveness as the criterion—must also be asked and answered. A corollary of this is whether and to what extent Mr. McNamara has used the cost effectiveness argument as a means of misleading Congress and American opinion on the true reason for some of his decisions. A possible example would be his decision 2 years ago to buy a conventional rather than a nuclear powered aircraft carrier.

Admiral Rickover phrased it very well in his discussion of the advantages of a nuclear powered surface ship over conventionally powered ones:

> The cost analysts do not see that a nuclear surface warship is not the same as an ordinary surface warship. Members of this committee can see it, the public can see it, but the cost analysts cannot see it because they only deal in things that can be put in numerical form. They only consider those features they can qualify.

In every cost-effectiveness study I have seen, far more effort is spent on studying the cost than is devoted to determining the true military effectiveness.[5]

Should cost effectiveness determine strategy, or should cost effectiveness be the servant of strategy? Are there elements of the situation which Mr. McNamara is overlooking, deliberately or otherwise, and if so what are the risks that the United States is therefore taking?

These are the legitimate questions for a blue ribbon commission to appraise objectively, thoughtfully, and deeply.

CHINESE: GREATER THREAT?

Though Mr. McNamara does not make any comprehensive comparison between the Chinese and Soviet threat, his view by implication at least is that the Chinese and Asian Communists impose a greater threat than the Soviet Union.[6] The reasons for this assessment can be found in his opinion that the Chinese are more militantly carrying out the Communist doctrine of "wars of national liberation" and secondly, the Chinese are aggressively seeking a nuclear weapons capability.

Both actions stem from a complex set of circumstances intimately involved with the newness of the Chinese revolutionary success and its need to compete with the Soviet Union for leadership in the Communist world. While no one would accuse Mr. McNamara of denying that the Soviet Union constitutes a major continuing threat, it is obvious that to him the Soviet threat now is growing less and less immediate. He believes that—

> The Soviet leaders appear to share with us a desire to avoid wars which might lead to a direct U.S.-U.S.S.R. military confrontation.[7]

Moreover, with respect to the United States and the Soviet Union, "the threat of nuclear war, and even of large-scale conventional wars, has become more latent."[8]

In effect, Mr. McNamara claims that U.S. posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is relatively satisfactory in that the United States is deterring the Soviet Union. At the same time, he implies that the U.S. posture vis-a-vis the Chinese Communists has not yet reached a satisfactory state, since the Chinese have embarked upon a policy of expansion in southeast Asia in particular, but not limited to that area.

The tendency on the part of Mr. McNamara to "play down" the Soviet threat has led to policy and program decisions that could have dire consequences if his assessment proved at some point in the future to have been incorrect. This is particularly serious since the Secretary's assessment seems to be based upon a subjective interpretation of intentions rather than an objective assessment of capabilities.

For example, even in the face of a growing Soviet capability in submarine warfare, Mr. McNamara has decided to retire the straight-decked aircraft carrier, the *Lake Champlain* from the Atlantic and to pull one other angle-decked carrier out of the Atlantic. This has severely reduced our ASW capability in the Atlantic and coupled with other actions in the ASW field displays a complacency on the part of the Secretary of Defense regarding the need for a superior ASW capability.

If his assessment of the Soviet threat is valid, his actions could certainly be justified; if wrong, they may prove to be irretrievable mistakes.

COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

Mr. McNamara's point of view seems to assume that the Soviet and Chinese objectives are not sufficiently related in any real sense. More fundamentally, it assumes that the Soviets and the Chinese are pursuing different objectives and will continue to do so. For him the two Communist powers are engaged in internecine competition and hostility in which the Soviet Union has found itself unable to work cooperatively with the Chinese in the question of support of revolutionary wars in southeast Asia at the same time it was attempting to improve relations with the West.

WARS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

Moreover, in the United States-Communist confrontation, Mr. McNamara prefers to emphasize the Chinese commitment to "wars of national liberation." As a result, in his view, the war in South Vietnam has become "a test case of the Chinese Communist version of the so-called wars of national liberation, one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world,"[9] in which the Soviet Union is playing a secondary role and in which Soviet involvement has been limited to demonstrating "that Peiping's charges of Soviet 'capitulationism' and 'connivance with U.S. imperialism are false'."[10]

Because of this secondary involvement, the United States must "expect a harsh anti-American tone in Soviet policy pronouncements"[11] and in the absence of any statements to the contrary, no direct support of the Soviets to the non-Chinese Communists in Vietnam and elsewhere in the Far East.

Were it not for the Chinese Communist' "wars of national liberation," one might conclude from Mr. McNamara's statement that communism would not constitute a major problem for the United States or the free world. Only Chinese-Soviet competition for primacy in the world Communist movement forces the Soviet Union to engage in any such wars, for it is "the pressure of competition from the Chinese Communists that drives the Soviet leaders toward a cold war approach to foreign policy questions, leads them to give high priority to military programs, and, thus, to compound further their chronic economic problems."[12]

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Quoted in House Report No 1536, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 49.

[6] Hearings, op. cit., Part 1, P. 12–15.

[7] Ibid., P. 38.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., P. 12.

[10] Ibid., P. 17.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

B. SINO-SOVIET IDEOLOGICAL GOALS

Mr. McNamara's view of Soviet-Chinese relations fails to give proper appreciation to the overall identity of Soviet and Chinese ideological goals and concentrates upon tactical differences which have arisen in the Soviet and Chinese choices of the paths which best lead to the ideological goals. He fails to take into account the special relationships which would exist between the Soviet and the Chinese in the event of nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, or between the United States and China. Such an interpretation enables the Secretary of Defense to decide against developing a posture which would or could save millions of casualties in a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, were this to occur, and on the other hand to consider favorably for future deployment a less costly system which would protect against estimated Chinese capabilities in the 1970's. This decision is defended in terms of cost-effectiveness language, but the underlying assumption appears to be that the Chinese threat is more likely to materialize; for Mr. McNamara the Soviets are more rational than the Chinese. Otherwise, one would be forced to conclude that Mr. McNamara is placing the cost of a defensive system above the probability of saving U.S. lives.

C. NUCLEAR WAR UNTHINKABLE

A corollary of this appears to be Mr. McNamara's assumption that nuclear war is as unthinkable to the Soviet Union as it is to the United States and the free world. Thus, because the Soviet Union, unlike the Chinese, is "rational," it has a common interest with the United States in seeing to the prevention of a nuclear exchange.

We can certainly hope that this is the case but wishing it so will not necessarily make it so if the Soviet Union finds itself one day in a decisively superior strategic position to the United States. To base defense structure decisions for the future on such a "hope" would be dangerous in the extreme. And though the Secretary of Defense will deny that the U.S. force structure of the 1970's and beyond has been planned with this unverified "hope" in mind, the evidence, in my view, is heavily weighted in that direction.

PRINCIPAL ASSUMPTIONS: FOREIGN POLICY

As we point out in our "Additional Views," the principal foreign policy assumptions upon which defense policy seems largely to be guided are as follows:

> (1) That there has been in recent years a reduction in tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc (except China) and that further accommodations in the future can be anticipated and should be encouraged;
>
> (2) That our military force structure should be related primarily to the "visible" threat posed by potential adversaries;
>
> (3) That nuclear war is as unthinkable to the Communists as it is to the United States and the free world and that therefore, the balance that has been achieved between the Soviet Union and the United States with regard to strategic forces should not be upset;
>
> (4) That the United States should continue to assume a posture of response both in the area of "crisis control" such as Vietnam and in the area of weapons development; and
>
> (5) That the threat from World Communism has, in fact, eased during the course of recent years and, therefore, any attempt to maintain a decisive defense superiority in the years ahead would reverse this trend.

If these premises are valid, then the defense posture of the United States today, and more especially as envisaged for the future, contains all the necessary elements for insuring the safety and integrity of this country and the free world.

If invalid, a series of Soviet or Chinese Communist technological "surprises" in the years ahead would place the United States in an untenable position from which it is doubtful it could recover.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS—DEFENSE STRATEGY

In all areas of potential conflict—whether of a general or limited war nature—there is cause for concern.

In this complicated technological age, a nation's ability to sustain its preparedness depends in large measure on that nation's commitment to continued advanced developments in the areas of weapons systems and their potential uses.

It should be clear that there is no substitute for military superiority as the best insurance against aggression or the possibility of a nuclear exchange. To build our future defenses on the imagined goodwill of the potential adversary or on the belief that he shares a common interest with the free world in avoiding a nuclear exchange at all costs is, it seems to me, a grave mistake that gambles with the future security of the United States.

It is, of course, possible that such reasoning is valid. But the mere possibility that it is not demands that our future force structure not be governed by such a rationale.

Nevertheless, it seems clear that the present leadership in the Department of Defense bases many of its decisions on just such a rationale.

NATO

The crisis that envelopes NATO at the present time and the deterioration of that alliance which has been obvious and growing for several years is very directly related to any consideration of a Defense appropriation bill.

Many feel that the public statements and often surprise actions of the Secretary of Defense in the past 5 years have been a significant contributory factor to NATO's deterioration and to the recent unfortunate decisions on the part of the De Gaulle regime.

As the Secretary pointed out in his statement, concerning NATO, "in the military area, the principal issues revolve around nuclear policy and the future organizational structure of the Alliance." [13]

One of the primary roles of a Blue Ribbon Commission studying the Defense Posture of the United States would be a thoroughgoing review of how and to what extent the changed strategy on the part of the United States with regard to our commitment to NATO has contributed to or exacerbated the crisis in that Alliance today.

NATO is of paramount importance to the future security of the free world and I hope to see the problems of NATO given major attention by the Blue Ribbon Commission.

THE PROBLEM OF GENERAL WAR

The McNamara concept of general war breaks down into two basic requirements or strategies for the United States; deterrence of a nuclear attack upon the United States and its allies by possessing the ability under all circumstances of inflicting an unacceptable degree of damage upon the attacker; and secondly, in the event of an attack, to limit damage to the population and industrial capacity of the United States.[14]

In McNamara's view the level of the Soviet threat is such that—

> It will be virtually impossible for us to be able to insure anything approaching complete protection for our population, no matter how large the general nuclear war forces we were to provide including even the hypothetical possibility of striking first.[15]

Any one of the Soviet offensive systems in itself can inflict severe damage on the United States; thus a defense against only one type of weapon system is of limited value. Further:

> The Soviets have the technical and economic capability to prevent us from achieving a posture which could keep our fatalities below some tens of millions; they can increase their first strike capabilities at an extra cost to them substantially less than the extra cost to us of any additional damage limiting measures we might take.[16]

From an economic standpoint, Mr. McNamara believes that the greater the attempt to improve our damage limiting posture, given a certain level, the less effective and therefore more costly is each successive addition to the posture.

Under the circumstances existing between the United States and the Soviet Union, the McNamara strategy has been to develop a strike force which would be able to absorb a first strike from the Soviet Union and still respond with unacceptable damage to the Soviet Union. In McNamara's opinion:

> Even if the Soviets in the 1970 period were to assign their entire available missile force to attacks on our strategic forces (reserving only refire missiles and bomber-delivered weapons for urban targets) * * * a very large proportion of our alert forces would still survive.[17]

Even then, "one-fifth of the surviving weapons on Soviet cities would destroy about one-third of the total population and half of the industrial capacity of the Soviet Union." McNamara does not indicate what destruction use of all the United States' remaining capability would bring upon the Soviet Union, however, he admits that—

> Our strategic offensive forces are far more than adequate to inflict unacceptable damage on the Soviet Union * * * Indeed it appears that even a relatively small portion

---

[13] Ibid., P. 34.

[14] Ibid., P. 41.

[15] Ibid., P. 42.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid., P. 44.

> of these forces would furnish us with a completely adequate deterent to a deliberate Soviet nuclear attack on the United States or its allies.[18]

Mr. McNamara's criticism of U.S. military posture at the time of his assumption of the Office of Secretary of Defense was that U.S. forces available were not sufficient to meet planned requirements and that the forces available were not in proper balance with one another.

Yet, Mr. McNamara claims that the strategic offensive forces for assured destruction today far exceed what is needed even under the most austere circumstances—that of a surprise attack by the Soviet Union—a view that we can perhaps accept as it pertains to U.S. capabilities in the immediate future. That many of us are concerned about our continued capability for the longer term future has already been made abundantly clear.

MISSILE TECHNOLOGY

Both in offensive and defensive missile systems, it is my belief that the Secretary of Defense has, in his more recent budgets, determined that the level of effort in misile technology should not be pushed much above a subsistence level.

A. ASSURED DESTRUCTION CAPABILITY

The Secretary of Defense claims a substantial buildup of forces particularly in the area of nuclear warheads for the "assured destruction mission," of U.S. forces. However, primary reliance is now placed upon ICBM's, the actual reliability of which fortunately have not been fully tested under conditions of combat. It is certainly possible that the increase in nuclear warheads under Mr. McNamara's term of office does not represent as large an increase in assured destruction as he anticipates, especially if the Soviets proceed with an effective antimissile defense system. Intelligence on the Soviet antimissile system points to some deployment of the system, and if there is validity to the indications, a continuous improvement and deployment of the Soviet system over the next 5 years could degrade the U.S. assured destruction capability considerably, if not to the point that the Soviets would consider the damage acceptable, then at least to the point where they might feel that their society might ultimately be able to be revived. In such a situation they could feel that should a general war occur, their relative chances of survival after an attack would be better than those of the United States.

B. NEED FOR A "MIX" IN STRATEGIC SYSTEMS

Those who argue for placing primary reliance in the strategic field on our missile capability rather than a "mix" of manned and unmanned strategic systems would do well to recall the early experience of the Sidewinder air-to-air missile in its first combat tests in Vietnam.

After several initial "failures" in encounters with Soviet Migs, it was reported in the press that the Air Force had launched an investigation to determine the reason for Sidewinder's apparent failure in combat operations. Fortunately, there was both time and alternative systems available to accomplish our operational requirements in Vietnam.

In the context of a nuclear exchange at some possible future date, there will be no time for an investigation, should one prove necessary, of the "failure" of our ICBM's to operate effectively and reliably.

It seems to me that the offensive missile systems developed and deployed by the United States will, in the unhappy event it becomes necessary, prove both reliable and effective and that they will accomplish their programed objectives based upon available evidence.

At the same time, it should be apparent, I believe, that to rely solely or predominantly on one particular type of system for such a crucial mission is to gamble recklessly with the future security of this country.

C. AMSA

The Secretary of Defense has consisttently held that the manned bomber has now become a supplementary capability in the assured destruction mission and because of this "large expenditures on the development and production of a new advanced strategic aircraft (AMSA) do not appear to be warranted at this time." [19] Instead he proposes to procure "a force of 210 (U.E.) FB–111A's configured as closely as possible to the fighter version so that it would, indeed, be a dual purpose aircraft—strategic and tactical—and this is what we propose to do at a total investment cost of about $1.9 billion." [20] He fails to point out that what he is proposing is an interim stopgap bomber, a combination of the F–111A and B, that his early cost estimates turned out to be quite wrong, that the overall TFX program requires additional funds, and that precisely because he cannot foresee with assurance the Soviet threat to the future, the development of a supersonic heavy strategic bomber should be accelerated.

D. DAMAGE LIMITING CAPABILITY

The damage limiting capability of the United States includes that portion of the strategic offensive forces which are not used to perform the assured destruction mission, the U.S. area defense forces, terminal defense forces, and passive defense. The role of the strategic offensive forces is to "contribute to the damage-limiting objective by attacking enemy delivery vehicles on their bases or launch sites, provided that our forces can reach them before the vehicles are launched at our cities." [21]

According to McNamara the area defense forces—composed of manned interceptors, longer range anti-ballistic-missile missiles, and antisubmarine warfare forces—and the terminal defense forces—antibomber surface-to-air missiles and shorter range anti-ballistic-missile missiles—would be unable to protect the United States against a determined attack, since the United States now has "no defense against the major threat of Soviet ICBM's and our antibomber defenses alone would contribute very little to our damage limiting objective and their residual effectiveness after a major ICBM attack is highly problematical." [22]

One might add that the antisubmarine warfare forces are underdeveloped and would not in all probability prevent the Soviet Union from delievering SLBM's—submarine-launched ballistic missiles—against the United States.

In spite of Mr. McNamara's somewhat esoteric references to "assured destruction" and "damage limitation," he is talking about the offensive capabilities of the United State to destroy the Soviet Union and the defensive capabilities of the United States to lessen casualties and damage to the United States in the event the Soviet Union attacks. What he has said is that the United States now must rely almost entirely for its defense on the hope that the United States will deter the Soviet Union from attacking because it possesses the capability of massive retaliation. Under the posture developed by McNamara if the Soviet Union should attack, the United States now has no alternative than to suffer tens of millions of casualties and to destroy the Soviet Union in return.

E. NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

When first enunciated, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence of the United States was a workable strategy, primarily because the Soviet Union had only a limited nuclear capability against the United States. In addition the Soviet delivery system consisted primarily of aircraft against which the United States had deployed an extensive air defense system. The strategy recognized that the air defense system would not be able to insure anything like complete protection of our population. But it did insure considerable protection and made the Soviet problem of attack doubly difficult. The Soviets could not guarantee that they could strike a telling below against the United States with the forces they had available to penetrate our defenses, and, secondly, they could not protect themselves with their own defense system against the forces the United States had available.

The Soviet deployment of an ICBM system against the United States and IRBM's against Europe radically changed the balance and gave the Soviets a much stronger position. To counter the ICBM's the United States under McNamara has deployed a much larger ICBM system against the Soviet Union. However, it was not lost upon major European allies that the IRBM threat to Western Europe was not countered directly, but that total reliance was placed upon the U.S. capability to deter the Soviets.

F. MISSILE DEFENSE

An additional flaw in the present American strategy is the lack of aggressiveness in the development of an antiballistic missile defense system—ABM—to counter Soviet ballistic missiles and lessen the number of casualties the United States might suffer—the ultimate

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., P. 42.

[22] Ibid., P. 58.

As we said last year:

> We . . . have a situation where, in one of the most difficult and critical areas, the Research and Development budget, is both "tight" and emphasizes primarily operational improvements. Although we do need improvements on existing operational systems, an evaluation of the threat clearly shows our needs become even more crucial in the late 60s and early 70s, for which we need new concepts and new systems. A "tight" approach does not permit the flexibility to explore potential concepts that might provide some of the solutions being sought. We are not implying that money should be wasted on projects that are not needed, but when faced with problems in an area that is both crucial and extremely complex, new ideas and new programs cannot be straitjacketed by either a lack of funds or a lack of encouragement to explore new avenues.[28]

Our views have not changed since last year's report. In fact, concern has been increasing; for another year has in effect, been lost in a period when the Soviet Union is clearly placing great emphasis on developments in the ASW field.

In addition, there should be some concern about the reduced ASW capability that has arisen in the Atlantic as pointed up by the following colloquy:

> Mr. LIPSCOMB. What is happening to our ASW capability? We are taking this straight deck (Carrier, *Lake Champlain*) out of the service, and we have also transferred another one of our ASW angle deck ships (Carrier, *Intrepid*) to another area. What happens to our ASW capability?
>
> Admiral MCDONALD (Chief of Naval Operations). Our ASW capability as far as the hunter-killer force in the Atlantic is concerned, *is reduced by two-fifths*.[29]

There is a clear and growing threat posed to this country in the area of antisubmarine warfare capabilities. Certainly, a much greater level of effort in the research and development aspects of ASW must be pursued if this country is to sustain its ability to fulfill in the future the five basic purposes for U.S. antisubmarine warfare forces that were defined for this committee by the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald:

> To defeat enemy submarines.
>
> To reduce the direct threat to the United States from enemy missile-launching submarines.
>
> To prevent isolation of the United States or its possessions from vital overseas resources.
>
> To allow U.S. Forces to operate freely on the seas in support of U.S. policies.
>
> To maintain inviolable our Nation's ability to supply all military forces deployed overseas, and to support our allies in accordance with treaty obligations.
>
> This involves the transport of vast quantities of material overseas by ship. Over 98 percent of the equipment and provisions required by our forces in Vietnam has gone by sea.

As Admiral McDonald said:

> The Soviet Union has a total force of about 400 submarines, more than half of which are modern, long-range types, including a steady increasing percentage of nuclear powered units. The Chinese Communists have over 30 available submarines, the vast majority being diesel submarines of the older W type.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The only available counter to the submarine threat, in any of its forms, is our ASW forces.
>
> Russian submarines have begun deploying in ever increasing numbers throughout the world. Worldwide "unidentified" submarine contacts, that is, out-of-area type contracts, have more than doubled in the past 2 years.[30]

Clearly, the United States cannot afford to be complacent about the growing threat from the sea. Only by placing high priority emphasis on new programs and new ideas in the area of ASW can the United States hope to maintain its superiority in this critical area of our country's defense.

NUCLEAR CARRIERS

The Secretary of Defense discusses Navy attack carrier forces under the general purpose forces without bringing to the fore the role such forces would have in the strategic offensive mission. In fact he removed carriers from the strategic mission category. He has been opposed for some time to the development of additional nuclear-powered aircraft carriers on the basis of their additional cost. Yet the Navy has shown that the dollar cost of nuclear-powered carriers is more than compensated by the additional mobility and operational characteristics such carriers possess. In the present program, Mr. McNamara has requested authorization of one such carrier with two more follow-on carriers later. Mr. McNamara's failure to understand Navy strategic requirements has delayed the building and deployment of this system unduly.

SOVIET FUTURE CAPABILITIES

Mr. McNamara's treatment of the general war problem assumes that the Soviet Union will remain relatively static in its posture. He makes no adequate provision for the possibility that the Soviets are pressing for a breakthrough, or even that the Soviets will radically improve their present ballastic missile capabilities. His reliance is entirely on the credibility of the American nuclear deterrent with respect to the Soviet Union.

U.S. POSTURE TOMORROW

The future of the American posture as projected by McNamara will consist in technical refinements of the present missile systems—development of decoys, better penetration aids, more reliable command and control structure, perhaps better intelligence though this is not stressed. The posture follows more or less a gradual improvement curve without anticipating any unusual developments. Implicit in his considerations is that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached a technological plateau in which no unforseen changes will change the balance as has happened with extreme regularity during the past 25 years.

Much of the confidence which Mr. McNamara has in the American posture stems from his feeling that the Soviet Union has reached a point of being a satisfied nation and that therefore the possibility of general war has become more remote.

Given these assumptions, Mr. McNamara is willing to gamble in areas where the United States possesses relatively little information—the future long-range development plans of the Soviet Union. To do so however entails high risk, for war always contains the elements of surprise and uncertainty, just as Mr. McNamara has most recently been finding out in Vietnam where "material is being used in ways and quantities which were never anticipated."[31]

In all of these areas—missiles technology, strategic bombers, military uses of space, surface, and undersea technology—it seems to me clear that the present leadership of the Department of Defense has curtailed rather than encouraged a level of effort that would insure the maintenance of U.S. superiority in the years ahead.

It is my further belief that much of the motivating factor which lies behind this situation stems largely from the basic assumptions I have attempted to explore in these remarks both as regards foreign policy and defense strategy.

Rather than relying upon his own intuition and the slide rule to determine how much his posture will cost, Mr. McNamara could well afford to be guided by the experience of his military advisers who have learned from hard experience how expensive surprise can be. If he were to do this, he would place a very high priority on the antiballistic missile system, accelerate the AMSA program, and devote considerably more energy to and support for the research and development program.

WHITE HOUSE MEETING

Now, Mr. Chairman, we on the minority side and those on the majority side of the Committee on Appropriations attended a White House meeting this morning in which we were admonished, we were warned, we were counseled, and there were many suggestions made that as we go through the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1967, we are going to have to tighten our belts; that there were three alternatives offered and open to the American people and to the Congress:

First. Further inflation.

Second. Higher taxes.

Third. A reduction of domestic expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, these were the three avenues that were open to the Congress, as set forth by the leaders in our executive branch; these three, because, for the first time it was spelled out to all of us to see that the full funding of the war in Vietnam and the full funding of the Department of Defense is not included in this bill of $58 billion-plus which we have before us today, that within a matter of a few months the Department of Defense will be and it is already preparing supplemental budget requests.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of doing business as usual and fighting a bloody jungle war was just not in the cards as far as the American people were concerned. Many of us have felt that the people throughout America were willing to make sacrifices at this time. Any time that this Nation has been involved in a war in reason for having a defense system. At present and for the foreseeable future the military posture adopted by Mr. McNamara relies almost completely upon offensive strategic missiles to deter a missile attack launched by the Soviet Union. The development and deployment of an antimissile defense system remains a matter for the future, in spite of the fact that recent gains in ballistic missile defense capabilities have made the deployment of such a system technically feasible. It is for this reason that the Defense Appropriations Committee included additional funds in the bill for preproduction activities for the antiballistic missile system, the Nike-X. Utilization of these funds would shorten by at least a year the time necessary for deployment of the system once that decision is reached.

---

[28] House Report No. 528, op. cit., P. 64.

[29] Hearings, op. cit. Part I, P. 675.

[30] Ibid., P. 595.

[31] Ibid., P. 9–10.

In Mr. McNamara's discussions about the deployment of the ABM, he points out that the possibility of developing an area missile defense has been enhanced. However, his considerations about the development and deployment of such a system are primarily in terms of meeting a potential Chinese Communist attack, rather than gearing the defense to the present and probably continuing major threat, the Soviet Union. Mr. McNamara's decision not to request deployment of an ABM system rests on uncertainties about a complete defense—uncertainties that stem in part from the anticipated Soviet reaction to an American all-out damage limiting effort, in part again from the technical and cost problems of such a development. Yet, the question at issue should not be the Soviet reaction nor the cost involved in terms of dollars, but the fact that even a modest capability in ballistic missile defense could save millions of American lives. The additional fact that significant developments have resulted from a limited effort to solve the problem is overlooked. These developments should be taken as an indication that very great improvements could be made were a major effort put into the program.

Mr. McNamara's decision to continue funding the development of the ABM at a relatively low level insures that rapid progress will not be made. Funding at a much higher level could materially limit damage to the United States and were a workable system deployed, it could be used also for the defense of Europe, where the credibility of American intentions to defend both Europe and the United States is being seriously questioned. If his concern is primarily China—which it should not be in this time frame—even then his posture is questionable, for early deployment of the ABM against China could convince the Chinese that the development of an ICBM capability against the United States was not worthwhile, because of the added difficulty in penetrating American defenses.

Secretary McNamara has made clear his belief that even though recent developments have made deployment of such a system feasible and even though there are indications the Soviets have begun deployment of such a system in Russia, this country will not press forward at this time with deployment of the ABM system. Indeed, in testimony before our committee, the Secretary of Defense insisted:

> With respect to the antiballistic missile system, I would not recommend deployment of such a system directed against the Soviet threat even if the Congress were to approve a full fallout shelter program.

Mr. Lipscomb then commented:

> I do not believe people understand if we can save millions of American lives, why we do not go ahead with a system that would accomplish this. They believe we are just not doing it because of the costs involved.
>
> Secretary McNamara. We are not doing it for the two reasons I gave. Regardless of cost, whether low or high, to us, the Soviets can offset the additional protection we buy, whatever it may be, at but a small percentage of the cost of that protection to us * * *.
>
> The second reason I would recommend against it is not simply that it is costly, although it is, but rather that, *after having expended the funds we would still face the prospect of some 50 million or more fatalities.*[23]

On the question of fatalities, the Secretary in his prepared statement gave the following assessment of what the Soviet Union could do to the United States in a nuclear exchange:

> The ranges of fatalities estimated in the table reflect some of the possible variations in Soviet targeting doctrine * * *. The higher end of the ranges of fatalities shown for each case represents the full damage potential (a well-planned, well-coordinated attack to maximize fatalities) under the assumed conditions. The lower end of the ranges of estimates represents possible degradations in execution and targeting.
>
> The first line on the table shows the Soviet damage potential against the currently approved U.S. program in 1970. It illustrates the projected performance of the currently approved bomber defenses, the civil defense program and the strategic offensive forces. Without these programs, the damage potential could be 160 million or more U.S. fatalities in a mixed Soviet attack on military and civilian targets * * *.
>
> As shown on the second line of the table, the situation is not substantially changed by the assumed Soviet build-up (Threat I) between 1970 and 1975. A full fallout shelter program, at a cost to the Government of about $3.4 billion, would reduce fatalities by about 15 to 20 million in both cases. Damage-limiting posture A (cost $22.5 billion) might reduce fatalities to somewhere between 80 and 95 million and posture B (cost $30.1 billion) to between 50 and 80 million in an early urban attack. But the benefits of these damage-limiting programs could be substantially offset, especially in the case of a Soviet first strike, if the Soviets were to increase their offensive forces to the levels assumed in Threat II.[24]

It seems clear from Secretary McNamara's statement that the deployment of an effective ABM system would probably result in the saving of tens of millions of American lives in the event of a nuclear attack.

It would seem that the potential saving of such a vast number of American lives in the event of a nuclear attack would warrant pushing ahead with development and deployment of the ABM system. The fact that our committee and the Armed Services Committee of the House included additional funds for preproduction items would seem to bear out the strong feeling of Congress in this respect.

MILITARY USES OF SPACE

In our "Additional Views" last year we said:

> Testimony on the military use of space revealed a lack of positive direction. The Committee was told that military applications of space were being pursued, but at the same time it was said that many of the military requirements in space had not been established. As a result, there was considerable evidence of delays in programs, a hesitation to start others, and an overall reluctance to pursue this new field vigorously.
>
> * * * * *
>
> As an expression of concern that the military uses of space are not proceeding at an expeditious pace, the Committee placed a limitation on the funds for the Manned Orbital Laboratory Program. This limitation provided that the funds would not be utilized for any other program. *Far too many delays have already been incurred in getting this program started, particularly considering that it is the only major program directed toward utilizing the military man in space.*
>
> The overriding concern in the space field should be to overcome the military lag in space technology.[25]

When the President announced to the world on August 25, 1965, just 2 months after these additional views were submitted, that he had authorized the Department of Defense to proceed with development of the MOL, he indicated his awareness of its importance. In assigning MOL to the Air Force, he said:

> We fight Communism by maintaining superiority in every field of science and technology which does or can affect the security of our Nation. This applies to the exploration of outer space. We dare not leave this area of our universe to become a monopoly in the hands of those who would destroy freedom. We must therefore obtain and maintain a leadership for the free world in outer space and we are trying to do that.[26]

Unfortunately, the President's words went unheeded by the Secretary of Defense, for the funds allocated for MOL in fiscal 1966 went largely unutilized.

One can only deplore the complacency with which the leadership in the Department of Defense appears to view the necessity for making significant strides in the military applications of space.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE (ASW)

As was the case last year, witnesses this year again told the committee that the ASW budget was very tight and that the emphasis once again has been very much at the operational level.

Rear Adm. E. W. Dobie, from the Office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Development—was asked the following question by Mr. Lipscomb:

> Is this $355.4 million budget a tight budget for ASW?
>
> Admiral Dobie. It is very tight.[27]

It is a recognized fact that one of the most critical and difficult areas that faces this country in the years ahead is antisubmarine warfare both offensively and defensively.

---

[23] Ibid., P. 114–15.

[24] Ibid., P. 48.

[25] House Report No. 528, op. cit., P. 64.

[26] Quoted in House Report No. 1536, op. cit., P. 20

[27] Hearings, op. cit. (1967), Part 5, P. 342.

> tendency has slowed up decision making, established an intermediate layer of paper shuffling, and otherwise resulted in delays, which it is believed are seriously endangering many of our vital defense programs.[36]

In regard to the "Muzzling of the Military" controversy in 1961, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, said on the Senate floor:

> Mr. President, my review of the speeches submitted by the Department of Defense has substantiated the fact that penetrating statements about communism, particularly communist ideology and methods, are either deleted or softened. I have noted sufficient of the censorship actions in these speeches to substantiate this beyond equivocation.[37]

Senator Stennis, in commenting upon the instruction by the Defense Secretary to a subordinate not to reveal the names of those who actually censored the speeches, reportedly said:

> I do not think an executive officer, even a member of the Cabinet, can stop a legislative inquiry merely by saying he takes full responsibility.

Senator Saltonstall, ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services and Senate Appropriations Committees, was reported to have said that Mr. McNamara's move "extends executive privilege way beyond what I thought it was." [38]

Senator Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee during debate on the Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1963, said:

> My only regret in this matter is that I fear that the Department (of Defense) will not spend the money. We appropriated the money last year, and they did not spend it. I regret very much that they did not spend it.
>
> I told the distinguished Secretary of Defense, for whom I have great and unbounded admiration, that no man has yet been born of woman who cannot make some error of judgment. I think an error has been made in regard to the decision not to prosecute development of this manned bomber.[39]

The House Armed Services Committee has raised several serious questions regarding the future posture of this country with particular reference to AMSA, a nuclear Navy, and the ABM. The committee commented:

> Too often, it is feared, the almost obsessional dedication to cost effectiveness raises the specter of a decisionmaker who, as it has been said, knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. In a matter of such great moment as our military posture, the very key to our survival, the Congress must not be a who-body: something halfway between a nobody and a somebody. It must call the shots as it sees them.[40]

The House Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee No. 2 reporting on the "Department of Defense Decision To Reduce the Number and Types of Manned Bombers in the Strategic Air Command" was sharply critical of this decision and urged that "plans for the phaseout of the B–58 bomber be immediately abandoned." [41]

Senator Gordon Allott, of Colorado, in discussing Vietnam on the Senate floor, July 25, 1962, said:

> Mr. President, yesterday, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara returned from yet another Pacific conference, and said he is encouraged over progress of affairs in South Vietnam. Mr. President, I wonder just what Mr. McNamara means by progress.[42]

On November 6, 1963, Representative Melvin Price, of Illinois, was reported as saying that development and research programs have been marked by a lack of meaningful objectives, poor estimates of costs, and ill-defined management responsibilities. In the New York Times account, Price cited the Defense Department and its refusal, "despite overwhelming weight of evidence" to equip the next aircraft carrier with nuclear power. "To me," he said, "this is like the board of directors of Union Pacific Railroad deciding to purchase a steam engine despite the proven experience with diesels." [43]

On February 5, 1963, Representative P. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana, was reported in the New York Times in reference to the manner in which Secretary McNamara overrode a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Skybolt missile and the RS–70 bomber, as saying he fears Congress has given the Secretary of Defense too much power to override generals and admirals and might have to take back some of this authority.[44]

The Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, in a 1964 report, called McNamara "too timid and uncertain" in exploiting satellite technology for military communications.[45]

In remarks on the House floor on June 14, 1966, Representative William Bates, of Massachusetts, said:

> Despite the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy," the Department of Defense has refused to consider the positions which the Congress has set into law. In our opinion, this is a serious matter.[46]

Admiral Rickover, in testimony before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on May 11, 1966, commented regarding a nuclear surface Navy:

> Our country is rich, and can afford it, if the errors we make are merely in wasting money. But when an error in our national defense is made, money cannot undo it. There is then a period of years during which the mistake cannot be corrected by merely appropriating money.[47]

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, following their hearings on nuclear propulsion in surface ships, issued a special report in December 1963 in which they recommended:

> That the United States adopt the policy of utilizing nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships.[48]

In its hearings on January 26, 1966 on naval nuclear propulsion program, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pointed out:

> If the two conventional aircraft carriers and the nine conventional frigates authorized since 1960 had been provided nuclear propulsion, the United States would now have in being or under construction three nuclear-powered carrier task groups instead of only one. These nuclear-powered task groups would have given the United States a much stronger Navy with which to face the uncertain and perilous future that lies ahead.[49]

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee reported on the combat readiness of certain Army divisions.

In his letter of transmittal, the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, Senator John Stennis, of Mississippi, said:

> I would like to take this occasion to express a few personal thoughts with respect to the problems which have confronted us and will confront us with respect to the war in Vietnam and the demands which it has imposed upon our military Armed Forces.
>
> First, I am convinced that time has worked for us and been a saving factor in this matter. As pointed out in the subcommittee report on Army readiness, dated July 27, 1965, there were then serious deficiencies and inadequacies in Army readiness which could be corrected only by increased funding and additive procurement.
>
> Fortunately, we have had the time to do this. During the interim, even though our fighting men have been called upon to engage in sharp and bloody fighting, and have responded magnificently, the fact is that the nature of this war is such that we have not been faced with large scale and sustained ground combat as was encountered in past land wars such as World War II and Korea. Thus, we have had the time to gear up our production facilities, let contracts and obtain deliveries of vitally needed equipment, repair parts, and supplies, and to acquire and train additional manpower. *We might have been in grave difficulty if this time had not been available.*
>
> *Second, I believe there is a lesson to be learned from our commitments in South Vietnam. The requirement of Vietnam have shown how delicately we are balanced between military strength and weakness in the light of our worldwide commitments.*
>
> The fact that a relatively small and underdeveloped country such as North Vietnam has been able to tie us down and make necessary such a substantial commitment of our military resources should show us what we can and must expect if similar wars of aggression against small and helpless nations should occur at other points around the world . . .[50]

---

[36] House Report No. 574, 87th Congress, 1st Session.

[37] Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 15, p. 19983.

[38] New York Times, Feb. 2, 1962.

[39] Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 8, p. 10377.

[40] House Report No. 1536, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 9.

[41] Report No. 60, op. cit., p. 6588.

[42] Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 11, p. 14696.

[43] New York Times, Nov. 6, 1963.

[44] New York Times, Feb. 5, 1963.

[45] "Satellite Communications," Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, October, 1964, P. 105–6.

[46] Congressional Record, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, June 14, 1966, P. 13060.

[47] Hearings, op. cit., part 6, p. 83.

[48] Report, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, op. cit., P. 5.

[49] Hearings, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 89th Congress, 2d Session, or "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program," Jan. 26, 1966, P. V.

[50] Report on the "Combat Readiness of the
I. 4th Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Wash.
II. 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized) Fort Carson, Colo.
III. 1st Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

the history of this country, when the short-term aims and the long-term objectives of our country were clearly spelled out, the American people have always rallied behind their Chief Executive, their flag and their country, and they have been willing to make certain sacrifices at home in order to support our fighting men abroad, in order to maintain the soundness of our dollar and our economy, and in order to keep America moving forward in a very critical period.

In the minority report on the second supplemental bill for 1966 which was brought to the floor of this House at the close of the session last year, we pointed out almost word for word the choices which were spelled out to Democrats and Republicans alike by the President of the United States in his meeting today.

We felt we were right then. We feel the President is right now. The problem involved here is a question of timing. The handwriting was on the wall 12 months ago, but to push a panic button today is not enough.

As I pointed out when we were debating the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill and an amendment was offered in the education field for a $267 million cutback in accordance with the President's budget, there was no one from the White House, the Postmaster General was nowhere to be seen moving among the Members here on Capitol Hill because it was cutting down on the amount of money that was in an appropriation bill. But when a reduction is made in some program that has the stamp of approval in the domestic area, the full force of the executive branch, the Postmaster General, the White House, and everyone else is here working to see that any cut in a program is immediately restored.

We are willing to establish clear priorities, but so far as our Federal Government is concerned, the major call in time of war on the tax dollar must be to support the American fighting men and our national security. Because if we do not support them then this Nation is indeed in trouble.

So the priorities that we called for last year are here to haunt us today, and in these particular bills as we review them we should not be misled by the fancy bookkeeping of the Secretary of Defense, who would lead one to believe that each day he is saving millions of dollars, and at the same time his appropriation requests are going up by billions.

The other day it was amusing to note that they pointed out before the Armed Services Committee that they had saved $400 million because they had not purchased some tanks. The only problem involved there was that the $400 million in tanks had never been authorized, and were not on any shopping list.

It would be like my coming by the Cadillac garage this morning and saying that I saved $5,000 because I did not purchase a Cadillac. Or if I did not purchase two Cadillacs this morning on my way to the Capitol I would have saved $10,000. I am rounding that figure out, as I understand from one of my colleagues that a Cadillac will cost a little bit more than $5,000. But I think the point is clear.

This is the same kind of "savings" we are talking about here. No, the committee had to show that this budget for the Department of Defense was not realistic and, with all due apologies to my distinguished chairman, I will not use the word "phony," I will use the word "unrealistic," and it is unrealistic inasmuch as the day this budget was sent to this Congress it was out of date in the personnel account alone by over $569 million.

Mr. Chairman, it did not take any computer in the Pentagon to figure what it would cost for 108,000 men when that budget bill was submitted here. They knew the manpower level. The bill before the House does not include any of the increases in pay and allowances brought about by the pay increase bill. But just to price out the number of men in personnel alone this budget was off by $569 million. Our committee—Republicans and Democrats alike—would not have been fair to Congress if they had not put that money in. So we put it in over and above the budget. It was absolutely needed. It was absolutely necessary.

But the point I make, and the point I made the day this budget was submitted—and I pointed out this personnel figure on the very day the budget was submitted to the Congress—was that these additional millions would be needed. In a television interview just outside the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of Defense said that I did not know what I was talking about. He indicated there was plenty of money in the personnel account.

There was not plenty of money in the personnel account. They were proven incorrect. We put the money in here by unanimous vote of our committee to fund all the manpower for the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has shown leadership and courage in many of the very tough decisions that it had to make in this Defense appropriation bill for 1967. But let us not fool the American people that this is the total bill for defense for national security in fiscal year 1967 because it is just not so. At least $7 billion more will be required to finance the Department of Defense activities in fiscal year 1967, and it may be that this supplemental request will be delayed until January. But the request will be over the heads of every member of this committee and every Member of the Congress between now and January.

As we look at the long-term program for the Department of Defense, if you will read over the committee reports to this Congress, which I am going to put into the RECORD at this point. I think you will see in those reports—the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and the Armed Services Committees of both Houses—the need for an objective, long-term evaluation—not a short-term evaluation for 1968, 1969, and 1970—but for a long-term evaluation of where this country is headed as far as defense strategy is concerned and as far as our national security program is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill, but it should be understood that this is only installment No. 1 on the 1967 defense budget.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORTS

The unanimous report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in December 1963 with regard to nuclear propulsion for naval vessels, stated:

> The committee concludes that the decision announced by the Secretary of Defense on October 25, 1963, against the utilization of nuclear propulsion in the next aircraft carrier, CVA–67, was incorrect. If this carrier, with a life expectancy of up to 30 years, is built with conventional power it will reduce its capabilities from now until the 21st century. . . . It is fundamentally illogical and wasteful to fit our new first line warships with power plants that are perhaps already obsolete.[32]

The report of the House Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee No. 2 concerning the bomber version of the TFX:

> Regrettably the statistics used by the Secretary of Defense to illustrate the claimed superiority of the FB–111A over the B–52 C to F series and B–58 aircraft were based upon markedly different nuclear bomb loadings which had the net effect of significantly misrepresenting the comparative capability of these aircraft.[33]

Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, quoted Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, on the TFX contract. Speaking on the floor of the House Mr. GROSS called attention "to the warning by Arleigh Burke that the TFX warplane contract investigation discloses practices that could result in the "destruction or political perversion" of our entire military procurement system.[34]

Report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, concerning the award of the X–22 V/STOL research and development contract. Under "Summary of Major Findings," the report contained the following:

> We conclude from the evidence that:
>
> (a) Convincing and compelling reasons did not exist for overturning the source selection recommendation in the X–22 case.
>
> (b) Secretary Gilpatric (Deputy Secretary of Defense), in making the ultimate decision, acted prematurely and at a time when he was not in possession of all material, pertinent and important information.
>
> (c) In this case there was a reversal of the source selection recommendation without full, thorough, and adequate consultation and without knowledge by the decisionmaker of all material and important facts. Reversals under such circumstances threaten and jeopardize the integrity of the source selection system.[35]

The 1961 report of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House was critical of general practices in the Defense Establishment:

> The Committee, as it has reviewed defense operations over the years, has become increasingly concerned with trends in management, organization, and procedures toward more and more centralization of authority for decision making on minute details. This

---

[32] Report, Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Vessels, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Dec. 1963, P. 3.

[33] Report No. 60, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 6557.

[34] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 11, pp. 14653–14654.

[35] Report, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of Senate Armed Services Committee, Jan. 31, 1964.

The committee report itself states that "the four divisions covered by this report are not combat ready today," and reiterates the difficulty committees of Congress have experienced in "obtaining requested material." [51]

Senator STENNIS, in a speech on March 30, 1966, made the following comments:

> While the present unsatisfactory combat readiness condition of the only four full divisions that would be available for commitment in other emergencies was brought about, at least in part, by the decision not to call selected reserve units, nevertheless the Congress and the public were repeatedly reassured that these divisions were combat ready.
>
> On August 4, 1965, the Secretary of Defense assured the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations that "all divisions are ready to go to combat. We have 16."
>
> The four divisions now in question are part of the 16.
>
> He was further asked if the divisions "have all they need." His answer was "Yes, sir; without any qualification whatsoever."
>
> The investigation conducted by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee showed that at the time that statement was made one of the four U.S. divisions was at barely 55% authorized strength and another was barely more than 70% of authorized strength. I am certain that the Secretary had not been advised of the actual condition of these divisions when he made the statements quoted above.[52]

The report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee "on the personnel, training, equipment, and readiness status of Army Reserve components" stated, among other "findings and recommendations" that:

> One available solution to the problem of the untrained REP (Reserve Enlistment Program) backlog would be the calling of the USAR training divisions to active duty. Calling such training divisions to active duty would not only assist in eliminating the REP training backlog (some 127,400 on June 30, 1966), but would reduce the overload upon the *Active Army training centers and relieve the Active Army combat divisions from their current basic training missions.*
>
> The action by the Secretary of Defense in disestablishing, in defiance of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, approximately 750 USAR units, including all six USAR combat divisions, has resulted *in a needless loss of trained manpower from a paid drill status,* has resulted in an excessive assignment of displaced personnel to other units as overstrength, and has made it difficult, if not impossible, for the USAR to achieve the congressionally mandated strength of 270,000 at the end of fiscal year 1966 in a meaningful and realistic manner. (Emphasis added.) [53]

The House Armed Services Committee in discussing civil defense fallout shelters in 1965, commented:

> The committee was faced during its hearings with somewhat of an anomaly with respect to civil defense fallout shelters. Repeatedly throughout the testimony of Secretary of Defense McNamara, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, and Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance, references were made to fallout shelters as being a top priority program. On the other hand, the program being presented to the Congress this year cuts down radically from last year the amount of funds being requested for this purpose. Indeed, no specific legislation such as was submitted in the 88th Congress for fallout shelters is even being proposed this year. So we are faced with a "top priority" fallout shelter program with neither budget requests nor other legislation to support it.[54]

The House Armed Services Committee, discussing strategic bombers for the future, commented in 1964:

> Suffice it to say that our bomber force will be very substantially reduced in the not very distant future.
>
> It should be borne in mind also that the last deliveries of the B-52 and B-58 bombers were in October of 1962. No new bomber has been designed, much less in the process of production, and it is a simple and easily understood fact that we will have no bombers if we do not start on the road toward bomber production at this time.
>
> The B-52's and the B-58's will fly for some time to come but common sense tells us that they will wear out. This is inevitable.
>
> There is a strange anomaly in this situation. Although there are no definite plans for a new bomber, Mr. McNamara in his statement before the committee said:
>
> "We plan to continue a mixed force of missiles and manned bombers throughout the entire planning period, fiscal years 1965-69. Although most of the aiming points in the Soviet target system can be best attacked by missiles, *the long-range bombers will continue to be used in the followup attack, particularly against hard missile sites and against the targets which need not be attacked within minutes,* for example, weapon storage sites."
>
> The committee is constrained to ask what the plan will be should war not occur during the life of the B-52 and B-58 bombers. What, then, will be used, under present planning, to attack hard missile sites and weapons storage sites? [55]

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, commenting on the need for development of AMSA:

> Secretary McNamara has carefully attempted to leave the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are part of the "we" who today "still cannot see a clear need for a new strategic bomber." That impression is not only misleading but completely untrue.
>
> The American public has a right to know what recommendations have now been made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on this vital question—the Secretary of Defense has himself raised this issue—let him therefore resolve it by releasing to the American public the precise language used by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in expressing their current position on this controversial question.
>
> If the Secretary refuses to accept my challenge to release the present position of the Joint Chiefs on the question of the advanced manned bomber, then the American public will know who has distorted the facts.[56]

Report of House Armed Services Committee discussed the authorization for a nuclear frigate—DLGN:

> Although the Congress last year authorized a nuclear-powered, guided-missile frigate and appropriated $20 million for this frigate as one escort ship for one of the nuclear-powered carriers, and although the Navy requested permission to proceed with this ship, the Department of Defense has never released the funds for this frigate. Nor would the Department of Defense permit the Navy to request any new nuclear-powered frigate this year.
>
> *Responsibility for this loss of time and experience must rest solely with the Secretary of Defense.*[57]

Representative HÉBERT, commenting on the difficulty of getting complete information:

> Never in the course or history of my service have I found it so difficult to get full and complete answers as I have since you have been Secretary of Defense.[58]

Newspaper comment on congressional reaction to Army Reserve reorganization:

> Congressional leaders are furious with Mr. McNamara for defying their wishes on the Army Reserve reorganization. In the face of their specific rejection of his plan to merge the Army National Guard and Reserve, he went ahead with a plan that accomplished much of his purpose.[59]

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, commenting on the Secretary's refusal to spend appropriated money:

> Mr. President, the computers used by our brilliant Secretary of Defense in arriving at military decisions do not give the National Guard, the Army Reserve, or the ROTC units a high rating. He, therefore, desired to curtail all of those activities in a major way. Congress, however, was not willing to put all of its defense eggs in the one professional military basket and, therefore, continued to appropriate sums for the full continued operation of all three activities. But the Secretary of Defense in his rapid climb to power learned some years ago, in refusing to carry out the congressional mandate to continue the production of long-range bombers, that he could strangle and gradually kill any particular program merely by refusing to spend what the Congress had appropriated for its operation. He has applied that technique to the ROTC units in preparatory schools or junior colleges.[60]

Remarks of Representative THOMAS PELLY, of Washington:

> Of course the Secretary of Defense has done more to confuse the American people as to the true situation in Vietnam than almost seems possible.[61]

Remarks of Representative DURWARD HALL, of Missouri:

> There is not better testimony to the Secretary's success in the Public Relations field, than the fact that the image still has credibility, in spite of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. If any military commander—serving under Mr. McNamara—had been

---

IV. 2nd Armored Division, Fort Hood, Texas."

89th Congress, 1st Session, P. 111.

[51] Ibid., p. 2.

[52] Statement issued by Senator STENNIS, March 30, 1966.

[53] Report of Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, May 12, 1966, PP. 2, 3.

[54] House Report No. 271, 89th Congress, 1st Session, April 29, 1965, P. 60.

[55] House Report No. 1138, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, Feb. 16, 1964, P. 6.

[56] Quoted in House Report No. 1536, op. cit. P. 21.

[57] Ibid., p. 31.

[58] Hearings, Military Posture and H.R. 4016, House Committee on Armed Services, 89th Congress, 1st Session, P. 279.

[59] New York Times, Nov. 22, 1965, p. 12. (Column by Jack Raymond).

[60] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 7, pp. 10020-10021.

[61] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1966, p. 466.

proved so wrong, so often, by so far, he would long since have been kicked upstairs, or put out to pasture.[62]

Statement of Representative Hébert:

> I am gratified that the Secretary of Defense, at his press conference on May 12th, conceded that the confusion in the public's mind over the Joint Chiefs of Staff's position on a future mannned bomber was caused by misleading documents emanating from his office.
>
> It is clear now that there was no "shockingly distorted" picture given to the public by my subcommittee's report. I take the Secretary's statement on May 12th as a willingness to admit he was wrong. I excuse his earlier excess of language.[63]

Additional views of minority members of House Defense Appropriations Committee, 1965:

> In light of the President's decision to escalate the war in Vietnam in recent months, the Defense Appropriations Committee interrogated witnesses on the adequacy of the fiscal year 1966 budget request. The questions were primarily directed at the effect of the Vietnam situation on the budget request for such items as Procurement, Operations and Maintenance, Personnel, and other areas.
>
> Subcommittee questions, in one form or another, sought to determine *whether or not the fiscal year 1966 budget request was adequate in view of the escalated activities in Vietnam*. In response after response from principal witnesses, the devastating point was made that the budget was inadequate, that it did not take into consideration the increased activities in Vietnam, and that no budgetary adjustments occurred after the escalation began. This means that while our international prestige and thousands of American servicemen were committed in this area of the world, the fiscal requirements to back them up were not forthcoming.[64]
>
> ### ADVANCED DEVELOPMENTS
>
> Of particular concern in our defense posture is the level of effort in advanced developments. Military effectiveness is largely determined by the state of scientific and technological advancements. New weapons systems must be aggressively pursued, based upon both the assessment of the threat and the pace of technology. Testimony during the course of the hearings reflects an approach falling far short of what we believe must be done in this vital area.[65]

In the same report, the following comment was voiced:

> Secretary McNamara's policy produces a minimum force structure and a less vigorously pursued research and development effort in the area of advanced weapons developments. Under this approach, there is a greater risk that we will face future challenges without adequate means to deter aggression or prevail in any conflict that might develop.[66]

The following was contained in the House Armed Services Committee report for fiscal year 1967:

> Whether in the enumerated field of base closures, deferral of construction, nuclear propulsion, or an aircraft such as AMSA, the committee asks whether there are not instances in which what are called military decisions are actually judgments colored by a certain intransigence, an intransigence which holds that a decision made cannot be changed; a stubbornness which refuses to concede the possibility of error. This naturally raises the question as to whether the strong hand at the helm is also a deft hand. Does it hold a course in the trough of the waves when a change of a few degrees would give greater assurance of the ship's safe passage? These are questions that the committee intends to ask again and again until it has received satisfactory answers.[67]

The committee also said:

> The committee is disturbed because the manner of the Department of Defense's presentations indicated startlingly that the program is not properly related to the future needs of the Defense Establishment and the support of defense systems for the long haul.[68]

In debate on the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1965, Senator John Tower, of Texas, had this to say:

> The facts of the case are that the current administration has apparently decided to depend entirely upon missiles to protect America. It has embraced a "uni-weapon" concept that totally departs from all the lessons of military history. It acts as if Americans should accept such a radical plunge with obedience and with silence. Everyone with the audacity to challenge the administration's dependence on missiles alone has been duly chastised in public.
>
> But the administration cannot expect silence from concerned Americans. The administration wants to depend solely upon missiles, and we have a right to question the wisdom of that dependency. We have a right to question it before our manned air force is completely phased out.[69]

Representative Chet Holifield, in discussing nuclear propulsion for naval vessels, commented:

> The Department of Defense has vacillated and procrastinated, studied and restudied nuclear power for surface warships in what appears to me and to many of my fellow Members of Congress to be an attempt to kill nuclear power for the Navy by studying it to death.[70]

Senator Stuart Symington, commenting on the effectiveness of limited bombings in North Vietnam:

> There is a consensus of opinion all over South Vietnam today, in all the military forces, not just the Air Force, or naval air or Marine air, everywhere, and also in the civilian setup, that if we don't eliminate this target limitation, it isn't right to send these men (air crews) out to risk their lives in an expensive airplane, to bomb just an empty barracks or a bus.[71]

Representative Leslie C. Arends, of Illinois:

> Of course, no law will be satisfactory unless it is administered in accordance with the intent of Congress. I am not at all sure the present Secretary of Defense cares what Congress intends. He and his civilian aids presume to know all the answers, military as well as economic.[72]

Hearings on U.S. Army combat readiness, May 1966. Senator Stennis, in commenting on these hearings, said:

> 1. General Johnson confirmed that the Joint Chiefs of Staff on three occasions unanimously recommended calling certain segments of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard forces to active duty as the escalation of U.S. forces in South Vietnam increased and the pinch on U.S. forces at home became more acute. The Joint Chiefs made such recommendations in the spring of 1965, in the fall of 1965, and early in 1966. As a result of the failure to call the reserves, the active Army in the United States suffered substantial turbulence in order to provide General Westmoreland with the necessary combat forces and the logistic, combat support, and service support units to back them up and support them in the field.
>
> 2. The testimony established that the active Army alone did not have 16 combat divisions which were capable of sustained combat, even though the Congress had been frequently so advised in the past without any qualifications being put upon it. The statements that there were 16 combat ready divisions, General Johnson said were based on certain assumptions, including the time of deployment, the availability of shipping, and, more importantly, a declaration of emergency and an extension of terms of service of personnel. . . .
>
> 3. Testimony by General Johnson revealed that the Army may be encountering shortage of funds despite the $12.7 billion supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966 approved by the Congress earlier this year. The record shows that the Army has estimated an additional requirement from $900 million to $1 billion to carry on its operations for FY 1966. At the present time the Army and the Department of Defense are currently reviewing this matter.[73]

The above are but examples of the deep concern expressed by individual Members or by the committees of Congress charged with the responsibility of authorizing, appropriating, and overseeing the continued maintenance of a defense posture equal to the obligations and requirements of this country now and for the future.

The Congress, through one forum or another has consistently warned the Nation that Mr. McNamara's programs could lead to trouble. The heart of the trouble lies in Mr. McNamara's basic foreign policy assumptions, his disregard of the professional military advice available to him and in his reliance upon his own judgment reinforced by the recommendations of his cost-effectiveness-oriented civilian advisers.

Some obvious results of Mr. McNamara's program are serious deficiencies in personnel and equipment: up until just recently nearly all Regular Army units were unprepared for combat and are, in effect, training units; few of the National Guard or Reserve units are ready for combat; serious shortages in supplies and equipment have developed; some equipment cannot be used because trained maintenance personnel are missing; sortie rates of combat aircraft are cut because aircraft lack suitable ordnance; deployment of troops and equipment has become unbalanced in Alaska, Europe, and elsewhere. Similar deficiencies in both the Navy and the Air Force might well be uncovered should the Congress turn its attention to these forces as well as to the Army situation.

---

[62] Congressional Record, Jan. 27, 1966, p. 1392.

[63] Congressional Record, June 14, 1966, p. 13072.

[64] House Report No. 528, 89th Congress, 1st Session, June 17, 1965, P. 60.

[65] Ibid., p. 63.

[66] Ibid., p. 68.

[67] House Report No. 1536, op. cit., p. 14.

[68] Ibid., p. 60.

[69] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 3, pp. 3833–3834.

[70] Remarks by Congressman Chet Holifield, at keel ceremony for USS Narwhal SS(N) 671, January 17, 1966.

[71] Hearings before Subcommittee on Department of Defense and Committee on Armed Services on Appropriations on S. 2791, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, P. 151.

[72] Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 8, p. 10190.

[73] Senator John Stennis, News Release, June 20, 1966.

The steps taken by Mr. McNamara have not been sufficient to maintain a strong and strategic Ready Reserve. U.S. military posture has suffered both at home and abroad. Recognition that the United States will respond piecemeal without punishing the sources of external aggression has encouraged dissidents to take the initiative for they know they do not suffer the risk of grave losses. The show of weakness rather than strength has undermined the confidence of the allies, and forced them to consider alternatives unpalatable to the United States and eventually contrary to their own best interests.

Mr. McNamara has had well over 5 years to learn that the economics of war differ in many significant respects from the economics of industry. Perhaps the lessons of Vietnam and of NATO will have their effect: the cost of his education is still too high.

As we said in our "Additional Views":

> We believe there is no question about the need for the immediate establishment of an impartial, objective Blue Ribbon Commission to review and evaluate the defense structure of this country both as to its effectiveness and capability today but far more importantly, as we face the future in an uncertain and troubled world.
>
> In our Additional Views last year, we said:
>
> "On the basis of the information and the testimony generated during the hearings, we have serious doubts about the premise that changes in policy, capability or defense efforts have taken place in the Communist bloc (that) would warrant reductions or a general leveling of our defense effort.
>
> "Available evidence strongly indicates that the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc as a whole are not reducing their efforts.
>
> "We must cease, therefore, viewing conditions in the world as we would like them to be, and view them as they are.
>
> "We must view the world realistically, recognizing that an aggressor does exist, who seeks to dominate the world, and is building up a capability to do so. This recognition demands an approach which dictates superiority—military, economic, technological and political.
>
> "To do less, based upon the progress of events in the world, would be to invite disaster rather than assure peace.
>
> "Our primary concern at this time involves the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is during that time period and beyond that the effects of today's decisions will be felt. It is up to our leaders today—in foreign and defense policy—to make realistic assessments of the needs of tomorrow. It is up to Congress to see that they do."

Mr. Speaker, there is obviously a clear need for the immediate establishment of a blue ribbon commission. Its importance at this critical juncture cannot be overstressed. I therefore commend it to the urgent attention of my colleagues.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out earlier, it has been my privilege to serve with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and of this subcommittee, George Mahon, of Texas, for many years. It has been my privilege to serve with other members of the subcommittee both on the minority and majority sides. It has been my experience that never has there been a time throughout all these years when this country and this Congress could not look to these gentlemen to see that finances are provided to enable this Nation to meet its national defense needs in any military area where we might have to exercise our might. Mr. Chairman, George Mahon, provides funds beyond the budget where needed.

As to my friend, Bob Sikes, of Florida, I do not believe anyone could have discussed in more accurate detail or more effectively the actual conditions existing in Vietnam. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], conducts many of the hearings since the chairman of the subcommittee is the Chairman of the Whole Committee.

I could go down the line of all my colleagues, on the Republican side as well as the Democratic side, and list the many contributions each has made toward the defense of our Nation, but I want to take a few minutes to present some facts which we should not lose sight of.

Certainly if we have erred through the years, it has been on the side of making absolutely certain that adequate funds are available. May I say that our hearings have always been full and in great detail. So that there will be no misunderstanding here, I would repeat again that you know and I know that all of us, without exception, will be supporting and defending our men in service, whatever policy our Government decides upon in Vietnam.

I might say further, as I pointed out last year in our report, the matter of full funding of approved requests of the Defense Department has many weaknesses. But it has some advantages. Last year, for instance, as our committee reported, and as it exists today substantially, we have $30 billion in unexpended funds to the credit of the Department of Defense.

During World War II, we followed the practice of contract authorization, where we authorized the Defense Department to contract for what we needed and paid as payments became due. There we had the opportunity, every year, to review each contract and cut off each contract where we no longer had a need.

However, some years ago the leadership on both sides—and may I say that while I opposed such course, I was very much in the minority—started "full funding." Full funding means that we appropriate initially the total amount that a contract may sometimes finally cost though the money is not withdrawn from the Treasury until actually spent. It means that under this practice which we now follow, all the talk about whether this budget is adequate or not has to do with the planning that is included in this budget for there is now approximately $9 billion to the credit of the Defense Department—not even obligated. The Department has approximately $30 billion not expended.

Under these circumstances, with that kind of cushion, it is hard for my colleagues to make an issue as to whether we are not providing enough money. If the funds I refer to are used, though we would have to come back and replace them, they certainly are sufficient to meet any need. Such argument as they present is out the window as far as this bill is concerned.

I feel sympathetic to the viewpoint of my Republican colleagues on this Blue Ribbon Commission they recommend. They are somewhat like I am. I certainly have sufficient doubts, with reasons, not to underwrite many decisions in this war. In fact, as I remember, they said they wanted to present minority views before they even found out what our majority views were. I asked to see the minority views because I might agree to them.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that there was no opportunity, as far as the minority was concerned, to see the majority views. We had an opportunity to see them the day before the report was submitted. Now, if the gentleman wants to, we would be very happy to show the gentleman our views at any time.

The only exception we took on this particular bill, as the gentleman knows—and I pointed this out in the full committee—was the fact that we needed this long-term study and evaluation because of the conflict that exists between the Congress and the executive branch in this area.

I hope the gentleman will read these committee reports over. I am inserting them in the Record. They are from the various committees of the Congress, and they are most critical.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my colleague, I was a district attorney before coming here, and I know the gentleman, my friend from Wisconsin, can take care of himself anytime because he handles himself so well.

I said his situation and mine were somewhat the same. I did not see the minority views which is usual. I did not have a chance to see them. That has been the case since I have been here. It doubtless will continue. This was not said in criticism.

The point I wish to make is that I have sympathy for your feelings, because I personally feel I do not want to be held responsible as an individual for many of the things I see in this overall situation, which is most disconcerting.

I would like to point out that in my opinion it is high time that we do as we are doing here today on the Appropriations Committee, backed by the Congress, in providing funds for carrying on this war.

I believe it is high time for the leaders of both parties to begin to review our overall foreign policy. We have gotten around to the point that none of the folks we have aided through foreign aid come to our side in a situation such as we face today.

Take France, where we have spent billions of dollars to build pipelines and everything else, which contributed much to their economy that we are no longer needed. Russia is now the fair-haired nation.

As it has developed in Vietnam, nearly every major country which should be our friend is continuing to ship to North Vietnam.

In most of the underdeveloped countries around the world which we have aided, we have made competitors out of our customers; and we have found that the men we put in charge could not control, even as we are finding the situation here, and it was necessary to call in the folks that we insisted get out.

Yes, my friends, I am talking about what has happened under two or three administrations. When we look at Vietnam, we realize we first went in there on a relief basis under President Eisenhower.

I know that the Secretary of Defense has made some mistakes, as others have. Many perhaps, because in his judgment, as he said in 1963, this would be a war of short duration. In 1964 he said we would soon have the boys back home. In 1965 he made similar statements, and he made plans accordingly.

I asked—and Members will find it in the RECORD—"Now, Mr. Secretary, since your judgment has proved to be bad, can you explain wherein your judgment has been wrong?" The answer, if anything, was not completely satisfying.

The point is that we are making our test about 10,000 miles away, and the records will show that these people we are trying to free have never in history submitted to a central government. Are we sound when we demand that they do?

This is not a Democrat or Republican war. Leaders of both parties have contributed.

Insofar as a blue ribbon committee is concerned, may I say that the Appropriations Committee has the authority, and exercises it, to have an investigation of anything it may wish in connection with the military. I remember when Mr. Wilson was Secretary of Defense. We had an investigation of procurement then. The findings were so bad that he said it made him "sad and mad" to realize he had any such department, but when our investigators' reports disclosing these facts came up, the Department had marked on them "classified." Now, Mr. Wilson had nothing to do with that.

We have throughout this record plenty of blank spaces where Defense witnesses took their statements out in the interest of national security.

I remember, at least once in times past, when an outstanding man in the Defense Department said, "I will answer you, but if you go to the public and tell it, I will deny having said it."

That sounds terrible, does it not? But, my friends, with a war on, can any other Member, or can I, risk telling that which may make our situation worse or which may lead to the death of more and more of our men? Of course we cannot. We are all somewhat in the same predicament.

There is nothing we cannot ask for. We have been assured that we will get it. But there is plenty that a blue ribbon committee, the Appropriations Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, or any other committee cannot afford to take the responsibility for making public.

If I do say so, and this is my own personal opinion, our mistakes are on the side of making too much public. For that reason, instead of repeating off the cuff things which disturb me, which happened in these hearings, in the extension of my remarks I shall put the questions and the answers in the RECORD, for to me they are wholly inadequate.

I agree that we need to thoroughly review our whole situation. We need to do it from A to Izzard. Involved is our whole foreign policy, the United Nations, and all the rest.

That certainly is not a party matter, because I know that the leadership of both parties has been involved. Though I frequently differed with them, I am sure they exercised their best judgment, but we are looking at the United Nations, foreign aid after years of experience. When our other partners are not carrying their share of the load but are giving aid and comfort to our immediate enemy.

We need to review the whole shooting works, if I may use those words, and not just this war, though it is noticeable that here we are carrying 99 percent of the burden.

There is not a question our committee can ask to which they are not entitled to an answer, but there are a whole lot of answers they are not going to print because of national security.

Mr. Chairman, I feel pretty much like my colleagues do. I want the public to know and the membership to know that all of us are sorely disturbed. In the meantime there is only one thing to do, that is, back our men in the service; back our Government and try to differ with them for the purpose of improving the situation, if we can. This we certainly do in our hearings though we cannot always print the answers.

We need to review it all. The countries whose economic prosperity we made are turning their backs on us. They call for our gold while owing us. They undersell our manufacturers and our farmers. In foreign aid they get the goods; we add to our money with resulting inflation. We loaned them our money on a long-term basis. They do not owe us now, but demand immediate payment from us.

Mr. Chairman, we had some $9 billion not even obligated a year ago. All of that money would be subject to the decision of the Congress to be reappropriated, or to be simply transferred by the Department.

The point I make is that any planning and any actions that may have been taken by the Department of Defense have been for reasons other than that funds were not available, because they have been and are now available.

There is a substantial need for the bill that is before you, not because the money is not available if handled through channels, but this represents a projection of the action expected to be taken by the Defense Department in connection with Vietnam for which we are making funds available in this bill.

Again, it is not because there is no money—it is because these projects, the acquisition of materiel and other actions, will cost money, and we are providing the money to do this job as we go along.

There are many causes. I have served on this committee most of the time since 1943, or at least one segment of it, and I think this matter of going into the cause, while it is academic in some respects, in many ways would be well insofar as deciding where we go from here. It is my personal view, and may I say the leaders on both sides of the aisle differed with me then and they differ with me now—but if I were to look for the cause for our situation, I would go back to the period after World War II when we went around the world telling practically every nation which would listen, "we will take care of you—we have the atomic bomb." We made those commitments in many places where, subsequently, it has become apparent we simply cannot carry out such promises, especially since others now have the atomic bomb.

Yes, if I were to look for the cause, I would remember that we went through a period when the Congress and the American public thought all we needed was the atomic bomb. To a great degree we quit producing conventional weapons, and we reduced our efforts for maintenance of our defenses to the point where one of the top people in our Air Force said we were giving little training to our flyers in dropping ordinary bombs, because we had been lured into feeling we could drop a big bomb and that would be it. Unfortunately, today we are in the midst of a war, and we are using conventional weapons.

If I were to look further as to the responsibility, I would see that the leaders of both parties have followed a common foreign policy through the years right up until this moment.

If I looked at Cuba, I would realize there is enough fault to be found, looking backward, to include both parties and their leaders.

If I looked at many other areas, I would see somewhat the same situation.

A STALEMATE IS NO VICTORY

But what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is more serious than that. The question is, Where are we and what are we going to do about it? Here we are half way around the world, with a 10,000-mile supply line and engaged in battle in an area where human life means very little to the enemy, and where they can carry sufficient supplies for guerrilla warfare on their backs. We are engaged in a deadly conflict at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line. Both parties have followed policies which have ended in this situation, though I am sure no one intended it.

We find—and the record will support this—that Haiphong Harbor in North Vietnam is an open harbor. Through Haiphong Harbor 80 percent of the supplies being used by our enemy in South Vietnam are passing and, with the exception of several small countries, along with Communist nations our so-called friends are continuing to ship to our enemies through Haiphong Harbor.

Yes, if we carry the matter a little bit further, on the question of winning the war I agree we must win; but we must decide what it is to win. What does to win mean to us?

To me it cannot be a maintenance of the status quo. Here is a little 100th-rated power, North Vietnam, pulling the biggest power in the world around by the nose day after day. It leads me, as an individual, to feel that the Vietcong may be winning as long as they can maintain the status quo and actually feel that they are. This we must stop and the first start, to me, appears to be to stop the inflow of materiel to our enemy.

We will supply this money. We argue about financial budgets. We want to keep waste down. We want to be economy minded in handling appropriations. But in World War II I well remember that when our materiel was sent to forward theaters, it was marked off then and there. That is not the major problem that we have. We are reconciled to the fact that these funds will be spent.

We are in an engagement at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line, with our troops slugging it out, fighting in swamps, attacked by mosquitoes and suffering from malaria; fighting under the most trying conditions where it seems we do not know who our friends are, but where our leaders feel we must remain to show that we will be in southeast Asia.

Speaking for myself alone, if we are to keep our young men there—and our leaders and our country feel not only a commitment but a present necessity to keep our forces there—we owe it to them to do those things that would cut off the supply line of their enemy, a supply line that to a great degree is fed by folks who are supposed to be our friends.

FOREIGN POLICY DETERIORATES

I repeat, the record will show that the only countries which have cut off shipping to North Vietnam are a relatively few minor ones. We are not stopping that shipping because we think these other countries might not give us the support we want in NATO or so I surmise. But look what has happened, already France has virtually announced her withdrawal from NATO. If you want to second-guess our policy in the last number of years, look at Africa. The men who had some know-how and brains to govern were forced out by us. It has drifted back to where the men with strength to run these little countries, the men we shoved out, have had to be returned for such order as they can effect.

We started on our present course a long time ago. If we look in every direction we can see the mortar cracking. We can see the high hopes of many of our people running out. We can see member nations failing to put up their share in the United Nations.

But all that is beside the point. We have young men fighting in a war that is as much a war to them as World War II, and we are here wondering whether we should do anything to cut off the supplies of the opposition, supplies which are being transported by people supposedly on our side. To me the answer is, we must.

My friends, there is only one side to this appropriation bill. As I have said, the Defense Department has money that could have been used. They have money that they could now use. But we are financing the projection of contracts to supply material that it is apparent they are going to need.

There are two or three other things we might say. If we need a base in southeast Asia, might not we have the courage to say so and supply a base as against saying that we are trying to let people follow the path of their own determination, with all the mixed-up information that we can get on that subject?

I wish to say again that I am for this country, and I know the Members of the Congress are, too. I do feel an obligation, having questioned the Secretary of Defense and various others, and I shall put those questions and answers, where they exist, in the RECORD, to question present actions or lack of determination to put up.

I feel we have an obligation to question a war in which we are engaged as the result of a foreign policy participated in by both parties. As we do that, we do not have to be hawks or doves. We are in a quagmire, and we need to get out of it. It is not for me to say or for you to say, but it is for all of us to insist that we take appropriate action, as long as we are in it, to back the men who are there, to determine what we must have for them and take action to see that an untenable situation does not simply go on and on, with resulting loss of life.

If our friends in other parts of the world will not stand by us, it is better to find out such fact. To support my views, I believe questions and answers of the Secretary, pages 51 through 91 of the hearings on the supplemental bill in March, would be of interest to you. I read them here:

ADEQUACY OF MILITARY FUNDING

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Secretary, we all are interested in the overall aspects of this matter, but there are two or three things I think might well appear in the record.

I know last year when you were before us and afterward there was quite a difference of opinion and a difference in statements as to whether the reduction in the military funds for the Defense Department would result in perhaps some injury to our defense capabilities.

The committee, in view of that, provided or stated in its report and I read from last year's report on page 9:

"Appropriations to finance any such items of urgent need continue available from prior years in staggering totals. For example, the budget in January 1965 indicated $30,529,379,000 total unexpended carryover into fiscal 1966, of which a total of $9,624,627,000 would be unobligated."

I am certain this committee will back your request here. I am not saying it critically in the least.

I think it is well you are here. The point I make here is that the military effort has not suffered from the lack of available funds if you had seen fit to request the use of these funds to meet your need problem up to this point.

Secretary McNAMARA. I fully support that conclusion, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. You were before us last year in connection with the regular defense bill and again on several supplementals, and Defense Department witnesses have been before us numerous times when we have approved a reprograming request. If you had foreseen the need of the money you are asking for now, you would have asked for it, would you not?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes. I stated to the committee in August that we foresaw the need for additional funds but for a number of reasons were not requesting them: (1) we could not predict our needs with certainty, (2) we knew that it would be possible to return in January with a better estimate of those needs, and (3) we felt that the funds which would be available to us in the original fiscal year 1966 budget and the August amendment would carry us through the early part of this calendar year.

Mr. WHITTEN. The point I make is that the defense effort has not suffered from lack of funds either on your part or on the part of Congress.

Secretary McNAMARA. I fully support that conclusion.

EFFECTS OF BOMBING ON NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. Now carrying it one step further, General Wheeler, I am trying to make clear in my mind, as I understood you in enumerating the targets in North Vietnam, that in effect you indicated that insofar as the present military effort is concerned, where we are having this guerrilla type warfare, they were what might be termed secondary targets, in that none of them are sufficiently vital as to cripple the Vietcong in their efforts against South Vietnam, is that correct?

General WHEELER. That is essentially correct, Mr. WHITTEN. I pointed out the other day when I ran over the entire target system—I believe in response to a question from Mr. SIKES—that when we talk of industrial targets in North Vietnam, we are really talking about something that essentially does not exist.

Even so at the levels of conflict in South Vietnam, and with the number of Vietcong and PAVN troops that must be supported, we cannot completely cut off the introduction of supplies. We can hurt them. We can make it cost them more. We cannot cut off the flow of supplies completely.

Mr. WHITTEN. As I understood it either you or the Secretary said, that while there are some changes as a result of the lull in bombing, really it was not as significant as we might think. That, notwithstanding our bombing, due to the fact it is guerrilla warfare they could supply the troops they had even by human beings on trails. As long as that was true the bombing was not—in line with what you just said—sufficient to strangle their supply system. In other words, their capability of supplying so far exceeds the actual need for the present operation that they would probably have that much if we had kept up bombing. Am I recalling it approximately correct?

General WHEELER. I think Mr. McNamara said the greater part of the statement you made, Mr. WHITTEN.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am asking this to clarify it if my recollection is not correct.

General WHEELER. (Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Is the chief value of bombing to prevent an enlargement of the Vietcong operation as of now?

General WHEELER. (Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not trying to play on words but if I could reduce it to this———it is very important to keep them from supplying a much larger force.

General WHEELER. That is my judgment, Mr. WHITTEN.

ABILITY TO PROTECT LOCAL POPULATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. On Wednesday, I believe it was stated that we had received some benefit from the bombing in that the North Vietnamese had become convinced that they were not safe.

In other words, that the North Vietnamese Government could not protect them from air attacks. At that time, I could not help but have the thought that the South Vietnamese, by this time, should be equally convinced that we cannot protect them.

Yesterday's Washington Post—and I am quoting the testimony as I remember it over a series of years—carried a story by Jack Foisie of the Los Angeles Times—and I would have to say that this story reflects the impression I have gotten from witnesses on your side of the table, and I read it here:

"SAIGON, January 26.—A U.S. spokesman today described the terrorism and sabotage that goes on in South Vietnam every night. He emphasized the havoc the VC inflict on innocent villagers in the belief that they are pro-Government. But in most areas the villagers would stay neutral if they could. The spokesman also wanted to show what damage has been done by the Vietcong to communications that keep the Government-held areas in touch with one another.

"The spokesman in doing this also revealed the Vietnamese-American inability, despite the substantial U.S. buildup that began 10 months ago, to improve the situation in the countryside for the uncommitted peasant. Reading from a summary of reports by American field representatives, the spokesman estimated that no more than 10 percent of the entire Vietnam railroad system is operative because of guerrilla cuts in the line. If true, this is worse than the previous low point of last July, when it was officially reported only 30 percent was so protected."

Is that approximately correct?

General WHEELER. Mr. WHITTEN, that article is a series of generalized statements drawn from (off the record).

Mr. WHITTEN. General, that is all right. I do not mean to appear to be abrupt. We have been briefed at the White House. We have been on this committee listening and we have had details. I have yet to hear witnesses say that there is any place where people are perfectly safe. It may be that you are willing to so state. I am asking these questions after listening to a lot of people and I have yet to hear anyone say that there is any place there where we are safe from the guerrilla warfare or from bombs or anything else. Are you willing to say it?

General WHEELER. I am not saying that, sir.

But what I am saying is that this article is an overstatement, a generalization of things that can happen anywhere, the same thing that can happen in Washington, D.C. When you go out here at night to get into your car, you can get mugged. But generally speaking, Washington, I believe, is a reasonably safe area.

Mr. WHITTEN. Lots of folks in my area kind of draw an analogy between Washington and Vietnam though I am somewhat surprised at your drawing the same one.

USE OF HUMAN TRANSPORT

There is no need of pursuing that further. I was trying to get this quite clear. It is my understanding that this supply line which we were talking about to the north is something like a thousand miles long.

Of course, one man could not carry 50 pounds a thousand miles. How many points of exchange would there be if the supply lines are so much as a thousand miles long, or do we know?

General WHEELER. We have a feel of it, let me say that.

(Discussion off the record.)

GOVERNMENT DESIRED BY PEOPLE OF VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. Carrying that one step further, now, I keep hearing that our purpose in Vietnam is to allow—and I believe I quote correctly—allow people to seek their own destiny. The testimony uncontroverted insofar as I recall is that Vietnam has a series of villages———. We have been told that the people in a village do not know of anything, usually, except their village and the one next to them and do not care. They never have subjected themselves to a central government, do not know what it is, and do not want one.

Now, when we insist that they subject themselves to a central government, how can you say that is permitting people to seek their own destiny?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Mr. WHITTEN, a very substantial percentage of the people do not live in villages. I would guess that at least 15 percent live in large metropolitan areas, perhaps more than that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will limit my question to the other 85 percent.

Secretary MCNAMARA. I would say at least 15 percent. It may well be more.

Second, I do not think it accurately reflects the situation in Vietnam to say that the people, generally, do not know of anything other than the affairs of their own village plus the affairs of the adjacent village.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may have oversimplified my words.

Secretary MCNAMARA. I am sure that is not the situation there.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to change the meaning of witnesses who are supposed to be equally well informed.

Secretary MCNAMARA. I do not know which witnesses you are speaking of, but I would be happy to review their testimony. Based on my own knowledge of the situation that is not an accurate assessment of the breadth of concern and awareness of the people in the countryside. I have visited literally hundreds of villages there, and I can testify from personal experience that some of the people in the villages, at least those that I have talked to, are informed of and aware of affairs far beyond the limits of their villages. In particular, they are aware of the kind of an environment in which they would live were North Vietnam to come to dominate their area, and they do not wish to live in that kind of environment. We have other evidence to support that conclusion, not the least of which is the movement of people out of these villages when the Vietcong come into the area.

There are hundreds of thousands of refugees who have left Vietcong-controlled areas because they do not wish to live under that kind of control.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it well to say right here that the specific witness I was quoting was———.

I want to say again I am speaking from recollection. I would not want to tie preceding witnesses to the impression or the understanding I have, but that is where my understanding came from. I also would like to say to you, as Secretary of Defense, I doubt that you saw too many villages in person.

Secretary MCNAMARA. On the contrary, I have seen a large number of villagers. I visited Vietnam six times in the last 5 years, and I have visited the countryside widely. I do not pretend to be an expert on Vietnamese affairs, but I do say that based on my personal knowledge it would not be correct to state that the typical villager's knowledge of his national government or its programs is negligible or that his knowledge is limited to the affairs of his own and nearby villages.

ADEQUACY OF BOMB INVENTORIES

Mr. WHITTEN. I probably should have prefaced what I said by saying that I just want to understand this.

I am trying to find out where we are and where we are going, and I think the American people are, too. I have the utmost sympathy for you folks because it is your prime job. Is there any credence to the claim that we stopped this bombing because we were short of bombs?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Absolutely none. I will give you the bomb inventories.

(The information requested is classified and was furnished to the committee.)

SUPPLY SHORTAGES

Mr. WHITTEN. Or other supplies?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Absolutely none.

General WHEELER. May I add something to that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I asked the question so you can get the answer in the record.

Secretary MCNAMARA. I appreciate that.

General WHEELER. I would like to make a comment, if I might, because I think it is pertinent.

I spent 5 days during the Christmas season visiting Vietnam. I visited Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine units both in Vietnam and in Thailand, and I also visited one of the carriers, staying overnight.

I asked every responsible commander that I saw—and I saw a great many of them down to battalion level—if their operations had been hampered by shortages or deficiencies in consumables. I am talking about ammunition, POL, et cetera. The answer invariably was no, that they had been able to carry out their combat operations.

Secretary MCNAMARA. May I make a further comment, Mr. WHITTEN, in order to throw light on this subject? I issued an order to the commanders ———. So every bomb that we would have consumed had we continued to bomb North Vietnam has been consumed. It is our estimate or it was our plan, I should say, that during the month of January we would drop 150,000 bombs ———.

That plan was not limited in the slightest degree by bomb shortages.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask one very brief question? I asked the same question of many field commanders and in each instance I was told that there was no essential operation that had been prevented or hindered by lack of supplies.

It was stated, however, that the level of supplies in some areas or in some fields was dropping significantly because of the heavy consumption of supplies and the difficulty of resupplying.

Has that situation been reversed?

General WHEELER. I would not say it is reversed yet, Mr. SIKES. I know that with the improvements that we have obtained over the last couple of months in unloading and in port clearance and so on, the situation is being corrected and we should get up to a very satisfactory operational level of backup in the very near future. In fact, I am thinking in terms now of March for some items and probably June for others.

MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. WHITTEN. We have been going to great limits to let the world know that if the Vietcong do not make peace we are prepared to go all out for whatever is required to get them to the peace table. I listened to Secretary Rusk Sunday afternoon. I have listened here. Since it is very apparent that we are putting on a show of force and a threat of force and a willingness to use it, is there any concern that when you announced a cutback of military bases, that it had any bad effect upon our image in the world?

At that time there were many people, including me, who, whatever the merits and however it might have been done, wondered if to announce this curtailment to the world would indicate that we were weakening.

Did you see any sign of that result?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Mr. WHITTEN, I have seen no evidence of such a feeling on the part of any foreign power or in the foreign press.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to cut you off but let me ask you one thing that you might reply to. Is that possibly one of the reasons that they have refused to take advantage of our lull in bombing and come to the peace table. Could that be one of the reasons?

Secretary McNamara. No sir, it could not be one of the reasons.

Mr. Whitten. Why do you say it so flatly?

Secretary McNamara. Because we do have indications of the kinds of information getting through to them and the kind of information that influences their actions. I have seen no evidence that the elimination of surplus and obsolete military bases—at a time when we are rapidly expanding our budget by announcing a supplemental of $12.3 billion to the existing budget—has, in any way influenced them.

Mr. Whitten. Couldn't they take it that we are now waking up and rectifying a mistake?

Secretary McNamara. Are you speaking about the base reduction program as rectifying a mistake?

Mr. Whitten. And planes, et cetera.

Secretary McNamara. I do not see how it would be possible for them to interpret closing obsolete bases as rectifying a mistake. In any event, I can tell you, Mr. Whitten, that no expert that I have talked to has ever even raised this point much less put any weight on it. As a matter of fact, I had one brought over here from London just last week to discuss with me the reaction of the North Vietnamese.

PREVIOUS JUDGMENTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. Whitten. Let me ask two or three questions and then I shall pass the witness on, Mr. Chairman. Last spring we saw no need for this supplemental. I have in front of me your prior statements, Mr. Secretary. I would not want to read them to you. I would not want mine read to me. I know they were sincere and honest and based on the best information you had. This has not worked out like you folks hoped it would and we had hoped it would. Where have we miscalculated, in your opinion?

Secretary McNamara. There is an indirect reference, and I know you were very gentle even in the indirect reference. With respect to my prior statements——

Mr. Whitten. Let me say this, that this committee has backed your judgment so we are in it, too. I am just asking now with hindsight, where can you point your finger and figure that we miscalculated as a group, not just you?

Secretary McNamara. Mr. Chairman, because of the reference to prior statements and in anticipation of such a reference, I went through my prior statements a few weeks ago, and I have extracted all the pertinent parts relating——

Mr. Whitten. That is all right. Where would you say we miscalculated? That is my question. Don't get away from my question.

Secretary McNamara. I will come to the question. But the question carries an implied reference to prior statements, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I would ask the permission of the committee to introduce into the record my previous statements on the war in Vietnam. There are 59 of them.

Mr. Whitten. I have no objection to that.

Mr. Mahon. Yes. They will be included at this point.

(Note.—This information appears in vol. I, pp. 57 to 87 of the hearings.)

Mr. Whitten. I am making no condemnation for prior opinion.

Secretary McNamara. I understand. I appreciate that your reference was gentle. Mr. Chairman, the question was, Where was it that we miscalculated?

Mr. Whitten. In your opinion.

Secretary McNamara. I do not know if you should call it a miscalculation. I think it is perfectly clear that the North Vietnamese have continued to increase their support of the Vietcong despite the increase in our effort and that of the South Vietnamese. I say that I do not know whether or not this was a miscalculation. If you go through these statements that I have just inserted in the record, or the statements of President Kennedy or those of President Johnson, you will find that they repeatedly refer to this point, namely, that the response required from us will depend to a considerable degree upon the action taken by the aggressor, in this case, the North Vietnamese. We simply cannot predict their actions accurately. We cannot, therefore, predict the amount of force that we will have to bring to bear in order to achieve our political objective. What has happened is that the North Vietnamese have continually increased the amount of resources, men, and material that they have been willing to devote to their objective of subverting and destroying the political institutions of South Vietnam. Whether or not you describe the evolution of the situation in Vietnam as a miscalculation, I think is a question of semantics.

Mr. Whitten. It has not turned out like we thought it would. That is a homely way of putting it, but it has not turned out like we thought it would. Where were we wrong in our thinking? That is bringing it down to a level where we all can understand it.

Secretary McNamara. I think it was hoped that the South Vietnamese by their own efforts could contain the insurgency that the North Vietnamese has initiated inside South Vietnam. Later, when it became very clear they couldn't, it became necessary for us to supply advisers and substantial amounts of equipment to improve their capability for containing the insurgency. Even with this assistance they couldn't contain the Vietcong, because the North Vietnamese were continuing to expand their program of sending men and material into the south.

Mr. Whitten. Let me ask one other question.

(Off the record).

Secretary McNamara. Let me go back because I did not finish——

Mr. Whitten. What is the plan for winning?

Secretary McNamara. Let me go back to the previous question because I did not finish my statement with respect to the changes that have occurred during the past several years which in turn, affected the amount of effort that we have had to put into the struggle.

Mr. Whitten. Don't let us forget my question.

Secretary McNamara. I won't. I want to answer one question at a time, however.

I think that one event that significantly influenced the course of the conflict was the overthrow of Diem which was the result of many forces, most of them not within our control. But the Diem overthrow, as much as anything else, affected the course of the conflict in the following year or two.

This factor, plus the continuing increase in the amount of effort that North Vietnam applied to their objective caused a continuing increase in the amount of force which we have had to apply in South Vietnam.

Now your second question, How do we hope to win?

Mr. Whitten. How do we plan to win?

Secretary McNamara. I am answering the question as it was phrased.

PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR

Mr. Whitten. Let me change my question, What is our plan to win?

Secretary McNamara. All right, what is our plan to win? We plan with the help of the South Vietnamese to apply sufficient force against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese military units in the south to prove to them that they cannot win in the south. While doing so, we have applied bombing to the north to increase the cost of their operations in the south and to reduce their capability for expanding their operations in the south.

Mr. Whitten. Have we not already tried that and failed, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNamara. No. We have not failed, we have not lost.

ECONOMIC COST OF THE WAR

Mr. Whitten. We have not lost, but we certainly have not won. I think you are doing as well as you can with what you have to do in the situation we are in, so I am not being critical—I have yet to find anybody who has a plan to win. We cannot do it by bombing these targets in North Vietnam. I do not know what the relative cost of the war per day in money is to us as compared to them. I do know their standard of living. They carry supplies on their backs. Human beings are almost unlimited in that area of the world. I know it is way around the world from us. Let me interrupt to ask, Have you any comparative dollar cost?

Secretary McNamara. No.

Mr. Whitten. You do not figure war in money, but I am talking about the drain on your economy. Could you give us any kind of comparison as to the relative per day cost to the United States as compared with them?

Secretary McNamara. There is no possible means of developing that financially.

Mr. Whitten. It would be tremendously greater, would it not?

Secretary McNamara. The cost in economic terms is far greater to them than it is to us. One simple indication is that the intelligence estimators conclude that they have diverted from ——— thousand men from other pursuits to rebuild the roads and the bridges which our bombing has destroyed. And that particular diversion of the work force is but a minor part of their cost of carrying on their operations against the south. Out of a society that has a total adult male population of perhaps 4 or 5 million, that is a tremendous drain for just one part of their war activity. So there is no question but what the relative economic cost to them is far greater than it is to us.

PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR

General Wheeler. May I answer your question about what is our plan? You said you do not know of a plan.

Mr. Whitten. I would be glad to have you do so.

General Wheeler. Before I do, though, I would like to put in one remark that is perhaps not completely germane to this. (Off the record.)

Mr. Whitten. The closing of bases and cutting back of the military.

General Wheeler. No, sir.

That is my point. Now let me go to the other one if I might. We have actually had in South Vietnam substantial numbers of U.S. and free world combat forces for about 6 months. You should recognize that even then the weight of effort has been available only within about the last 2 months.

The Republic of Korea division, for example, was only available to General Westmoreland in a combat configuration late in the month of November. General Westmoreland has achieved to date, precisely what we estimated he would have achieved with these accruals of force; namely, he has reversed an adverse trend of military events. While he has not yet achieved a momentum which will give him "victory," he actually has just begun his campaign. His concept, which is, I believe, a sound concept and one to which I subscribe, is this——

Mr. Mahon. You mean the South Vietnamese?

General Wheeler. Yes, sir. (Off the record.) It is not going to be a quick process, but it has been successful to date.

Mr. Whitten. You use the word "win" the war, and it is natural. What do you mean by "win" the war?

General Wheeler. I mean, sir, the political objective set for us by the President; namely, a free and independent Vietnam which can pursue its own destiny unhampered and unpressured by outside forces, has been met.

EVENTS WHICH WOULD FOLLOW PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. Whitten. This is the last question, Mr. Chairman. As you can imagine I could go on all day and we all could. What if tomorrow Hanoi and the North Vietnamese Government would say that we will agree that the South Vietnamese may go their own way and follow their destiny, whether it is in a local village or in a central government; we will agree that each village that does not want to be subjected to any central government be like it wants to be? If they send us that message through channels and it reached you and it reached the White House, what would we do?

Secretary McNamara. I am not clear what you said about each village.

Mr. Whitten. I said if they agree.

Secretary McNamara. Pardon me?

Mr. Whitten. You said you did not understand. I want to make it clear, Mr. Secretary. If they agreed that they would do what we claim we want them to do.

Secretary McNamara. That is not the way it was phrased.

Mr. Whitten. I will change it because I am not playing on words. This situation is serious and I think the American people are like me, I do not think they believe that we have a plan to win.

Secretary McNamara. Let me say this: If tomorrow, North Vietnam says they will agree to do what we want——

Mr. Whitten. What will we do?

Secretary McNamara. Then, we would plan to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as soon as the North Vietnamese demonstrated that they were sincere and had a real plan of action for the withdrawal of their subersive forces and would allow the South Vietnamese Government to develop, unhampered, stable political institutions in areas now controlled by the Vietcong. As soon as it was evident that the North Vietnamese were carrying out such a pledge, we would withdraw our forces and allow the Government of South Vietnam to work with its people as any other government does.

Mr. Whitten. Pending that time we would insist keeping our people there to enforce it.

Secretary McNamara. To enforce what?

Mr. Whitten. To enforce the carrying out of the agreement.

Secretary McNamara. We would stay only to protect the Government and the people of South Vietnam against a violation of the agreement.

Mr. Whitten. At this stage, and this is my last question: Haven't they convinced you that there will never be any agreement as long as a part of it is that you insist that you keep your people there to enforce such agreement?

Secretary McNamara. No; I do not think that this is a major element of the problem.

Mr. Whitten. What is your feeling based on?

Secretary McNamara. In the first place we do not insist that we keep our forces there, as you put it. The enforcement of an agreement is not part of our proposal, nor have we ever made any public statement to that effect.

Mr. Whitten. I thought you told me that is what you would do.

Secretary McNamara. No, I simply said——

Mr. Whitten. Mr. McNamara, what would we do then?

Secretary McNamara. I said that if tomorrow the North Vietnamese pledge that they will do what we want them to do, we will withdraw our forces as we see evidence in their actions that they are carrying out that pledge. The actions that we would like to see are: the withdrawal of their military units from South Vietnam and the cessation of their direction and support of the Vietcong and the guerrillas who are attempting to subvert the political institutions in the south.

INDICATION OF NORTH VIETNAMESE STOPPING AGGRESSION

Mr. Whitten. At this stage, having had your experience and having at least been thwarted in our high hopes—if you do not like the word "miscalculate"—what evidence is there in the actions of the Vietcong, Hanoi, or the North Vietnamese Government, that leads you to have any hopes that they will change their attitude?

Secretary McNamara. We see signs of dissension among the political leaders of the north. We see signs of strain on their economy. We know that they see the buildup as General Wheeler mentioned a moment ago, of our capability to inflict even higher levels of casualties on the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. I think it is a reasonable conclusion that at some point these rising casualties, and these higher costs, and these increasing strains are going to become so great that they will conclude that they cannot win in the south. When they reach this conclusion, they will be unwilling to continue to bear the costs of a program that cannot achieve their objectives.

Mr. Whitten. I keep wanting to end my questions because I am taking too much time. You say they cannot win and you say we can win because we have not lost.

This testimony was given early in the year in connection with supplemental request for appropriations. The picture has not improved, as is shown in the following testimony which appears in volume 6, pages 20 to 25 of the hearings on the bill before us:

DELIVERY OF WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. Andrews. General Lassetter, you and your staff told us this afternoon that many modern lethal weapons have been found in South Vietnam in the hands of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. You have shown us the weapons. You have shown us some very lethal ammunition pieces that have been found in South Vietnam in the hands of enemy troops or abandoned by enemy troops. You have told us that these weapons are being produced by Communist China.

General Lasseter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. ———.

General Lasseter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Can you tell us how these weapons of war are being delivered from Communist China and North Korea into North Vietnam and into the hands of the enemy troops?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir. I will take a shot at that, sir.

They come down from China through the railroad system or by sea and are off-loaded in Haiphong Harbor. They are put into the North Vietnamese distribution system out of Hanoi. They go south by road, by truck, by every means possible to their distribution point at Vinh, which is in the southern part of North Vietnam. From there they move either by truck or other means over the Ho Chi Minh trail, or the alternate routes that have been built, as we have destroyed parts of the trail. There are many routes up through the mountains, through Laos, where they funnel right off to the east into southern Vietnam.

Mr. Andrews. But this town or city of Vinh in North Vietnam is the concentration point?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir; it is the distribution point.

Mr. Andrews. After they are sent into North Veitnam either by rail or by water through Haiphong?

General Lassetter. Or by truck.

Mr. Minshall. How do you spell that town?

General Lassetter. V-i-n-h.

Mr. Minshall. Is this town in the so-called sanctuary or quadrant we are not allowed to do any bombing in?

General Lassetter. No, sir; it is in the southern part of North Vietnam and can be hit.

Mr. Andrews. Has it been hit?

General Lassetter. It has been hit repeatedly.

Mr. Andrews. How many times?

General Lassetter. Repeatedly, sir. I do not know how many times. It is on the target list and it is hit repeatedly.

Mr. Sikes. If I may interrupt, what do you know about the movement of weapons and supplies across the demilitarized zone?

General Lassetter. Actually, I do not think they move too much through the demilitarized zone. It is mostly up through the mountains to the west of the demilitarized zone through Laos.

Mr. Sikes. We understand that is the normal procedure. But intelligence recently is that they are crossing the demilitarized zone with troops and supplies in this recent heavy buildup.

General Lassetter. You are quite correct, sir, but not to the extent as the more westerly route.

Mr. Andrews. How many times has this city of Vinh been bombed, if you know?

General Lassetter. I really do not know how many times, but just repeatedly. It is on the target list. I would not say they go over it daily, but it is repeatedly hit to try to disrupt the rails, the bridges in the area. No matter how many times you knock out the rail bridges, they have bypass routes, the truck routes. Even if the bridge is knocked out, they bring up a truck, off-load to a truck on the other side and continue to move the suppiles.

Mr. Andrews. You would consider Vinh a very, very strategic target?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir. It is a key distribution point in their system.

Mr. Andrews. I am wondering why our great Air Force cannot knock it out. I will not ask you that question.

General Lassetter. They try very hard.

Mr. Andrews. Let me ask you this. How many rail lines are there going from Communist China into North Vietnam? Are there not two?

General Lassetter. Two; yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. How many times have they been hit? I mean really hit.

General Lassetter. Repeatedly. As our experience in Korea has shown, you cannot just knock out a bridge and stop the flow of supplies because even if the bridge is knocked out you bring a train down or trucks down, they off-load and carry it across by back or ferry and put it on other trucks on the other side. The supplies are slowed up but they continue to move.

Mr. Andrews. You say some of the stuff is going in by water through the Port of Haiphong?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. That has not been hit, mined, or blockaded. That is a sanctuary?

General Lassetter. That is right.

Mr. Andrews. Unless and until this city of Vinh, those two railroads, and that harbor have been effectively bombed, then there is no hope of keeping the enemy troops in South Vietnam from being supplied abundantly with modern weapons of war which you have described as being most effective; is that right?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir. All we can hope to do is slow it down.

Mr. Andrews. From what we have been told here this afternoon, I have concluded there has not been any slowing down.

General Lassetter. We have made it more difficult for them.

Mr. Andrews. They are still getting weapons?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. They are getting good weapons, made in China?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Delivered through North Vietnam to our enemies in South Vietnam, and unless and until some action is taken to stop that supply route we can expect those weapons to be delivered in the future and put into the hands of our enemies. As you say, they are high quality weapons, most effective, and are being used effectively killing our troops down there.

General Lassetter. You are very correct, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Thank you, General, I will not ask you any other questions.

Mr. Whitten. You have said that what we are doing would not work. Why do we keep trying to do it this way, General?

Mr. Andrews. If the gentleman will yield for one question, nothing I have asked you and none of your answers are considered classified, are they?

General Lassetter. The whole meeting, I believe, is on a classified confidential level.

Mr. Andrews. I understand that. But these questions—where these weapons are coming from?

General Lassetter. No, sir, I do not think there is anything classified?

Mr. Andrews. Leave it in the record.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. As you have testified what we are doing will not work, why do you keep limiting yourselves to this?

General Lassetter. It will not completely stop it, sir. It does slow it down.

Mr. Whitten. You mean it keeps it from reaching its potential, or is it being slowed down? And if it is slowed down, how much less are they doing now than they were doing? Which do you mean: this prevents a build-up, or are you cutting it down?

General Lassetter. May I give my personal opinion, sir?

Mr. Whitten. I believe I would rather have your personal opinion than that which somebody gives you.

General Lassetter. We make it more difficult for them.

Mr. Whitten. That is a nice statement.

General Lassetter. We make it much more difficult for them. They still have the capability of getting all of the ammunition, the weapons, the troops into South Vietnam that they feel is necessary to do the job. Not until a complete block is made with control of the ground will we really stop it.

Mr. Whitten. That is very nice. We will go back to my question.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. I think in a way you have answered it, but you have said after we hold it down or make it more difficult for them, they are still able to get through all they need for their present operation.

General Lassetter. Yes. sir.

Mr. Whitten. Tell us what the limits are that are imposed on you as to the size of weapons and the kind of strikes you can make.

General Lassetter. Sir, I am not qualified to answer that at all.

Mr. Whitten. Who is qualified to answer?

What is the restriction? What is the limit now in the field that you have on size of bombs, on the kind of weapons, on the kind of strikes that you now have?

General Lassetter. I do not think we have any one.

Mr. Whitten. We will word it the other way.

What are you using?

General Lassetter. Speaking only from the ground, sir, from the Army side.

Mr. Whitten. Tell us what you are using and by process of elimination we will find out what you are not using.

General Lassetter. We do not have any troops in North Vietnam.

Mr. Whitten. So you are not dropping any troops on them?

General Lassetter. We are not dropping any troops on them. Every division has its complement of artillery, and we use the artillery when we engage the enemy.

Mr. Whitten. As I understand it, that means guns and what else? Give us something about the size.

General Lassetter. We have the 105-millimeter howitzers. We have the 155's.

(Off the record.)

USE OF 75-MILLIMETER HOWITZER BY NORTH VIETNAMESE

Mr. Flood. Mr. Chairman, I understand that you had asked the principal witness about my question of about a month ago about the Chicom having a 75-millimeter pack howitzer, and I understand that you said this witness did not know or was not aware of it, although he was aware of a 70-millimeter. We know about that. This expert here, what do you say, this marine?

Mr. Johnson. The Chinese allies of World War II were furnished large quantities of 75-millimeter pack howitzers; many were left on the mainland.

Mr. Flood. They were furnished by who?

Mr. Johnson. The United States to the Chinese Nationalists. These were left on the mainland when the Nationalists went to Formosa.

Mr. Flood. So then we have reasonable cause to believe this could be packed down the trail?

Mr. Johnson. It is a possibility that these pack howitzers could be used there.

Mr. Minshall. This is very old U.S. equipment?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir. Very old. They have been obsolete since World War II.

Mr. Flood. It is a beautiful gun. I saw the French fire those things like machine-guns.

COORDINATION OF MILITARY EFFORT

Mr. Whitten. General, I note you are Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. As such you are part of the intelligence community

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. And as such you know what the other branches of the services are using?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. What is the Air Force and the Navy using in the way of weapons, size-wise?

General Lassetter. I do not know the exact size of the ordnance, since it is Air Force and Navy; however, I know they use 500-pound and 750-pound bombs.

Mr. Minshall. ———.

General Lassetter. Very frankly, I do not know.

Mr. Whitten. You are not aware of any orders that limit the size and type that can be used?

General Lassetter. I personally am not.

Mr. Whitten. You mean you individually?

General Lassetter. As an individual, yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. It is available to you, sir, if you sought it?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Flood. You heard what Mr. Minshall said.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Whitten. You do not mean your intelligence has come from members of this subcommittee?

General Lassetter. This particular item has. I was not aware that we were——

Mr. Whitten. We are kind of busy but if you come back we may tell you several things that you need to know.

General Lassetter. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Minshall. That is not the only thing we are out of.

Mr. Whitten. That is a real reflection on your operations, if I may say so. How can you use weapons effectively in the type of situation you have? You are not permitted to use your forces on plants that are manufacturing these weapons being used against us?

General Lassetter. No, sir. They are in Red China.

Mr. Whitten. That is right. You are not authorized to target in that direction?

General Lassetter. That is right, sir.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Whitten. What do you have?

General Lassetter. 105 and 155.

(Off the record.)

Mr. Whitten. Do you have any planes over there under the control of the Army?

General Lassetter. We have reconnaissance type planes only, sir.

Mr. Whitten. Do you report back information to our common cause or do you limit yourself to the Army? I mean does your intelligence inform just the Army, or does that information become available to the Air Force?

General Lassetter. It becomes available to all, through, sir, General Westmoreland's staff which is a joint integrated staff, Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. Whitten. Do you have any limitations or restrictions on you where you can reconnoiter? Are you limited to South Vietnam or can you fly over North Vietnam provided you stay away from these real targets?

General Lassetter. In our light planes, sir, we are pretty well restricted to South Vietnam, and can observe a little along the border into both Cambodia and Laos.

Mr. Whitten. Do you have any heavier craft?

General Lassetter. No, sir; we do not. The Air Force has a reconnaissance mission with the high performance aircraft in North Vietnam.

Mr. Whitten. General, I do not want to belabor this because I realize I got in here late for reasons I could not avoid. What kind of coordination of effort do we have over there between the services? You are in intelligence. You are a little different from the others. If the intelligence officer does not know what these others are doing, it is a sad commentary on something.

I realize you do not want to get into this.

General Lassetter. It is not a question of this; no, sir.

Mr. Whitten. We thought on the committee that certain people were keeping the public unaware of facts, and that certain people were keeping us unaware of some of the facts. If the intelligence is kept unaware of the other operations, that is bad.

General Lassetter. Sir. we are not kept unaware. I as an individual did not know the answer to that. In MACV headquarters it is a very fine integrated staff and everyone is privileged to all the information that the other services come up with so that there is an integrated effort.

Mr. Whitten. What targets are off base to you and what weapons are off base to you? I will just ask it flatly.

General Lassetter. I do not know the exact boundary that we cannot hit.

Mr. Whitten. Just approximate it.

General Lassetter. We do not hit Haiphong and we do not hit Hanoi. We do not hit within a certain number of miles of the Chinese border.

Mr. Whitten. How about trails?

General Lassetter. The trails that lead down to South Vietnam, all the trails are hit.

Mr. Whitten. The big trails are hit along with the little trails?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Flood. What about the railroad?

General Lassetter. The railroad south of Hanoi to Vinh is.

Mr. Flood. No; north of Hanoi to China. That is west.

General Lassetter. It is hit. How far north I do not know, from Hanoi. It is hit.

Mr. Whitten. General, you mean to tell us with the weapons you are permitted to use or that you have that you cannot knock bridges out or trails out to the point of stopping the movement now?

General Lassetter. That is absolutely correct, sir; we cannot.

Mr. Whitten. You do not have any weapons in your arsenal that would do that if permitted to use them?

General Lassetter. To my knowledge we do not.

Mr. Andrews. If the gentleman would yield, General, we were told here recently that air cargo going into North Vietnam from Russia and Red China was increasing. Do you know whether or not any of these weapons are being airborne into North Vietnam?

General Lassetter. The weapons we have discussed here this afternoon?

Mr. Andrews. Yes.

General Lassetter. I do not think they are being airlifted in. Perhaps they are, sir. What would most likely be airlifted in is some of the SAM equipment.

Mr. Andrews. That is even worse then anything you have shown us.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. We were also told that those planes going into North Vietnam, landing, only on airstrips that were in sanctuary.

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Do you know anything about it?

General Lassetter. The main jet strips are in the Hanoi area and we are not hitting those; no, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Leave that in the record too, please, sir.

Mr. Whitten. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sikes. You said there is nothing in your arsenal which would effectively deny the enemy the use of roads, bridges, and trails. You did not mean to include atomic weapons in that, did you?

General Lassetter. No, sir.

Mr. Sikes. These would deny them?

General Lassetter. These would, completely.

Mr. Sikes. You, of course, have no power to use those without a Presidential order?

General Lassetter. That is right.

Mr. Sikes. ———. Historically, the only real way to deny the enemy the ability to transport some tonnage of supplies is to seize and hold the territory over which they move; is that not right?

General Lassetter. That is right, sir.

Mr. Sikes. Otherwise, he can get some supplies through?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Flood. Take the high ground.

Mr. Sikes. Are there further questions on my right? If not, on my left?

THE BUDGET—NOT THE MAJOR CONCERN

So far as arguments about budgets are concerned, I served in my State legislature when I was 21. I learned then that a budget represents the highest hopes of the administration for income from taxes and the greatest expectation for holding down expenditures; and the other side never accepts such estimates and is usually right. I have not seen any difference here in Congress, either under the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. It works the same as State administrations.

This argument has very little to do with this bill before us now, where we are in trouble up to the ears and where we are going to have to take firm steps to back the men in the service. This money will be gone when we appropriate it, but it will be used for an absolutely essential and necessary purpose.

As we conclude this debate, I respectfully submit, we must review our situation on all sides and at all points acknowledge our failures, determine and define our objectives and proceed to obtain them. We cannot afford a war with no plan to win. We must provide such plan or take alternative action on the best terms possible.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall], a member of the committee.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, those who have preceded me today have pointed out that there will be no element of surprise when the administration comes to us next January with a demand for many more billions of dollars to supplement today's money bill.

Despite all disclaimers coming from the office of the Secretary of Defense and despite his proposal to cut back defense production, there is no doubt in any of our minds that one of the first things the new 90th Congress will be asked in 1967 will be for upward to $10 billion to supplement the budget we now are considering.

This is where we came in. It is practically a replay of last year with a new cast of figures. Last years supplemental for defense was nearly $13 billion. McNamara scenarios all have the same theme—"Operation Coverup," piecemeal planning and budgeting to cover up the real costs of the war.

When history is written there won't be any Oscars awarded for this latest rendition of McNamara's Band.

As a member of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I am one of those privileged with the duty of reviewing the defense budget at a time when our military is committed to action. It is our responsibility to see that our men in Vietnam are given the strongest possible support in training and equipment and to continue doing so as long as the Communists continue their aggression.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that it is my foremost desire and I know it is the feeling of my colleagues available that we use all means to find a way to negotiate an honorable peace in Vietnam, stop the bloodshed, and bring home our troops. However, there is no denying that peace is as bilateral as war. As long as one side wishes to continue fighting, peace is impossible. This is the situation today.

It should not discourage our strong, sincere, and relentless endeavors for peace and I shall continue to urge and support all genuine and just efforts to shorten the conflict. I do not need to be reminded of the horrors of war. I served 5 years with the Army during World War II and saw combat in Europe. I have twice visited our troops in the front lines in Vietnam. And, further, I have a very personal concern as the father of three teen-age sons, so I am no stranger to the realities of the present conflict and its possible consequences to my own family.

But, while endeavoring to bring about peace without the loss of human liberty, we must not fail our American troops in Vietnam through confusion, lack of leadership, moral laxity, or timidity at home.

This is why the present defense budget disturbs me. Last year we minority members of the subcommittee warned that the budget was underfunded for expenditures which were entirely predictable.

We said additional money would be necessary before the end of the fiscal year. Just as we predicted, the Pentagon last January demanded an emergency supplemental of $12.3 billion.

The pattern is the same this year despite the fact that the administration has accelerated the war in Vietnam and our commitment will be heavier than ever.

During the 13 months since the last Defense budget was approved, the American people have become more and more disturbed and confused by the turmoil of uncertainty, contradiction, and lack of candor at the highest levels of government.

They have watched their Government run the gamut of tactics in Vietnam. One day our national leaders call for United Nations' intervention in the war. The next day we resumed bombings.

As Washington Star reporter Mary McGrory sums it up, the doves are supposed to "focus on the appeal to the U.N., the hawks on the bombs. When the President was talking peace last winter, some people did not believe him. Now that he is talking war, they shudder. The consensus is that if he is to rally public opinion, he must take a high and consistent line and stick to it."

On last January 21 the Defense Secretary told the Senate Armed Services Committee that, and I quote:

> The targets that are influencing the operations in Vietnam, I submit, are not the power, the oil, the harbor or the dams. The targets that are influencing the operations in the South are the roads, and the war material being moved over these roads. There is every likelihood that we could take all of their power systems, all of their oil, all of their harbors, destroy their dams and they could still carry on the level of infiltration of the men and equipment necessary to support some level of operations in the South. This is not to say they would not be hurt if we were to destroy their harbors, electric power, dams, et cetera, but it is to say that they are not military targets of fundamental consequence to the carrying on of their operations in South Vietnam.

As all the world knows we are hitting the identical targets which Secretary McNamara brushed off as of "little fundamental consequence" just 6 months ago. Today we are told that these targets are of tremendous importance.

Which Secretary McNamara are we to believe?

Or, perhaps I should say, will the real Secretary McNamara please stand up.

Next to the loss of our American men, the biggest casualty in the Vietnam war has been the credibility of the U.S. Government.

For the first time in his life the average citizen wonders if he can put faith in anything his national leaders tell him. His Government says one thing one day, does something completely different the next.

A poll conducted by National Analysts, Inc., in May for the National Broadcasting Co. revealed that almost 60 percent of persons sampled in Philadelphia thought the White House had not been telling them the truth about Vietnam.

The Columbia Broadcasting System had Opinion Research Corp. make a survey at Princeton University this spring. Results showed that 67 percent felt the Government tells them the truth about Vietnam only "sometimes," while another 13 percent replied, "almost never."

Closer to home is the poll I took in the 23d District of Ohio, the suburban Cleveland area I represent. I mailed 125,000 questionnaires to the home of every registered voter in my district. This included Republicans, Democrats, and independents.

Some 18,000 voters returned their polls. In response to my query, "Do you feel the administration is giving the public adequate information concerning Vietnam?" 73 percent answered "No."

Nearly three-quarters of these people, who have access to the best newspaper and radio-television coverage in the Nation, feel they are not getting all the facts.

The lack of credibility reaches beyond the boundaries of the United States. Anatole Shub of the Washington Post foreign service, in a May 7, 1966, dispatch from Bonn, reports:

> The "credibility gap" which has affected the Johnson Administration's pronouncements on Vietnam appears to have spread to this part of the world. A few West German officials still profess to know what U.S. policy here is going to be over the next year, but even these officials show no great confidence in their beliefs.

The lack of credibility has spread to Capitol Hill, where top-secret sessions of our military committees are supposed to provide a forum for the free exchange of plans and ideas in the most sensitive and critical areas of national defense.

That free exchange is virtually nonexistent.

Witnesses who must testify, do so under a directive handed down by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R. Vance. It is included in the additional views subcommitted to this year's committee report.

The Vance memorandum, dated January 11, 1965, was sent to secretaries of the military departments, the director of defense research and engineering, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the assistant secretaries of defense, the general counsel, the assistants to the Secretary of Defense, and the directors of the Defense agencies.

The subject is congressional appearances by Department of Defense witnesses. The memorandum reads:

> I have been asked by prospective witnesses to provide guidance for the benefit of personnel of the Department, who, in the course of Congressional hearings, are required to give their personal opinions on matters concerning which a Department of Defense position has been established by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President. If pressed for his personal opinion, the witness should make clear:
>
> 1. that his personal views were expressed (if such be the fact) to appropriate authorities within the Defense Department before the departmental position was established;
>
> 2. where his views are not in accord with the departmental decision, that, notwithstanding, his personal views, he has accepted and will abide by the departmental position; and
>
> 3. the consideration or factors which support the decision; in other words, the pros and cons on the issues involved.
>
> CYRUS VANCE.

Admiral Rickover told our subcommittee:

> . . . If you believe everyone in the Defense Department who has a valid opinion and the requisite knowledge on a given subject is heard before a "consensus" is reached, you are mistaken. . . . If you are working on the basis that a decision of the Department of Defense is truly a consensus, then you are not right. . . . Bureaucracies do not make decisions on the basis of consensus. They decide them at top levels. In some cases, decisions appear to have been made ahead of time and subsequently justified.

This virtual gagging of valuable testimony has lowered a curtain of skepticism between Department of Defense witnesses and the military committees on Capitol Hill.

It makes our task immeasurably more difficult in obtaining a true and complete picture of the military situation and requirements.

As Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. LAIRD, and I put forth in our additional views, there are serious questions about the Executive's willingness to present the full facts to the Congress concerning our Defense Establishment. Without cooperation, candor, and the realization that both branches of government should be working for the same goals, it is not possible for Congress to assure itself that its actions will provide the maximum insurance for the security of our Nation now or in the future.

Let me present a few examples of the type of subterfuge and evasive tactics this Congress has encountered in its dealings with the Defense Department.

Late in April this year the Hébert subcommittee report charged that the Secretary of Defense had overruled his top military advisers on the role of future manned bombers for the Strategic Air Command.

The report quoted testimony showing that the Secretary had misled the subcommittee regarding the views of both the Secretary of the Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff by using the pronoun "we." The report branded some of the Pentagon testimony as a "truly masterly demonstration of language to conceal fact and possibly thought."

Mr. McNamara called a news conference at which he vigorously denied the accuracy of the report. Congressman HÉBERT very properly exercised his authority and declassified some of the secret testimony and on May 12 again charged that the Secretary of Defense had tried to conceal the views of his military advisers on the need for the $6 billion advanced manned bomber program.

The Defense Secretary finally declared that badly drafted office memos had caused the misunderstanding and admitted that the record showed utter confusion.

During our Defense Subcommittee hearings this spring the Pentagon tried to expunge from the public record any reference by Mr. McNamara to his plan to eliminate the airborne alert of our Strategic Air Command bombers. Further Air Force testimony on the matter was also stamped classified.

This radical departure from long-established policy would have remained secret from the American public had it not been for the insistent pressure of Mr. LIPSCOMB that Americans had the right to know that this line of their defense was to be wiped out.

Late in February our subcommittee had the experience of hearing the Defense Secretary release classified information to the press, including weapons figures right down to the exact number of nuclear warheads on strategic alert. Yet only a few days earlier he had censored this information out of our subcommittee transcripts, denying us the use of the testimony.

He shows no hesitancy in declassifying information to defend himself in public, nor does he have the slightest compunction about striking from the record any testimony which may be politically embarrassing to himself or to the administration.

One of the most flagrant examples of the Pentagon's pursuit of sanctuary under the "Top Secret" stamp is the blanket censorship of the entire July 1965 Report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

Even after his assembly line of security officers had obliterated a sizable share of testimony under their overused red pencils, the Secretary refused to release the cleared portion.

It is now known why. The report contained a flat contradiction by Mr. McNamara of testimony he gave on August 4, 1965, to the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee regarding the strength of four U.S. Army divisions.

He told the Senate Defense Committee that "all divisions are ready to go to combat," and when asked if the divisions had everything they needed, he answered, "Yes, sir, without any qualifications whatsoever."

Chairman STENNIS of the Preparedness Subcommittee said on March 30 this year:

> The investigation * * * showed that at the time McNamara's statement was made, one of the four U.S. divisions was at barely 55 percent authorized strength and another was barely more than 70 percent of authorized strength.

This can be described as nothing less than a complete crisis of confidence between the executive and legislative branches.

This crisis extends as well to the press, which is becoming increasingly vocal and hostile to governmental dishonesty.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD a sampling of editorial opinion on the matter of Government credibility.

The New York Times' eminent columnist, Arthur Krock, was among the first to diagnose the symptoms of news management. In an article written for Fortune magazine in March 1963, Mr. Krock said:

> Active management of the news by government consists of attempts by any official unit or individual in an area of authority to influence the presentation of the news. This can be done by suppression, concealment, distortion and false weighting of the facts to which the public is entitled. (This excludes the areas in which national security is plainly or potentially involved.)
>
> As Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester frankly pointed out, management of the news of the activities of the Military Establishment is one of the weapons essential to national security, a weapon made more vital to our arsenal by the current world tensions than ever before. But its proper use in a democracy is a limited one of concealing from the enemy the military plans and movements by means of which power is created to force his retreat or subjugation. The improper use is as propaganda in behalf of the establishment, to inflate its success or gloss over error after both the military plans and movements have been revealed to the enemy in action. But this is one of the ways in which the weapon has been employed in the aftermath of half-won showdowns.

In the 3 years since Arthur Krock wrote this article, the sentiments he expressed have swollen to a chorus among disenchanted Washington news correspondents.

Listen to a few random statements from some of them during just the last few months:

Saul Pett, Associated Press, Washington Star, March 6, 1966:

> In a town of passing prose favorites, the year's phrase so far is the "credibility gap" in government. Does it in fact exist? It does, or seems to, and seeming to, it exists.

Edward W. O'Brien, St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 2, 1966, Washington dateline:

> . . . even the basic facts about the war seemed to have been lost in the fog of confusion and contradition coming from Washington.

James Reston, New York Times, July 1, 1966:

> This question of confidence in the good judgment and good faith of the U.S. government is really more important than anything else . . . a great deal does hang on whether the American people can trust the pronouncements of their government, whether they can remain united on purposes they understand and respect, whether the allies believe Washington really wants a compromise settlement in Vietnam, or merely a surrender on its terms.

Washington Star editorial, January 20, 1966:

> Now, in 1966, the country certainly could do with a little more truth in government.

Walter Cronkite, CBS News, February 22, 1966, in a speech to the Inland Press Association in Chicago:

> The very foundation of the democratic system is built on honesty and the belief in the honesty of our fellow men. Yet the political lie has become a bureaucratic way of life. It has been called by the more genteel name of news management. I say here and now, let's call it what it is—lying.

The Wall Street Journal, December 1, 1965:

> A government, like a man, can be caught in only a few misrepresentations before people refuse to believe anything it says. Much of the current clamor against the U.S. Vietnamese policy is probably based on such a feeling. A democratic government has a moral obligation to be candid with its citizens; and a lack of candor poisons the open discussion often necessary to sound policy and public support . . .

The quote of the year surely belongs to Bill Moyers, the President's right-hand man, who touched a new low in cynicism when he told newsmen early this year:

> The crisis of credibility has gotten so out of hand that we don't believe our own leaks.

When you tell people they are stupid to believe anything you say, when you tell people that your own untruthfulness has reached such proportions that even you do not know what to believe—people are going to take you at your word.

This is what has happened to our Government.

This is why people are referring to Vietnam as a "yo-yo war," and "a shell game, now you see it, now you don't."

The faith of the American people is badly shaken. Every Member of the House knows this from the mail we are receiving.

The shadow of national doubt which covers the executive branch must not be permitted to lengthen over Capitol Hill.

People look to us as their one source of truth.

Congress must steer a straight course of action which the Executive will follow in planning the defense of our Nation. We must restore the confidence of our citizens.

In this context let us examine the Defense Secretary's decision to cut back the monthly production rate of air munitions—bombs, rockets, and aircraft shells and bullets—by 30 percent within the next 90 days.

In his June 5 report to the President recommending a cutback in production, Secretary McNamara minimized reports that shortages had hampered our effort in Vietnam. He declared that by cutting back production of war material he could "avoid the carryover that was represented by $12 billion of surplus and worthless material" after Korea.

He neglects to point out that some of that surplus, such as 750-pound bombs, are being used in Vietnam now. Production of the bombs was renewed only last month.

The Secretary carefully skirts any reference to the fact that in supplying troops and material to the Far East conflict he has seriously drained military units which should be at full strength to meet possible outbreaks of trouble in other parts of the world.

Shortages in manpower and military supplies are silent enemies of our global effort to maintain peace, not only in Vietnam but in sensitive areas from Berlin to Latin America to Africa.

On June 26, 1966, New York Times Correspondent Philip Shabecoff reported from Stuttgart that the 7th Army in West Germany has been hard hit. Some units, Shabecoff says, mostly at the company level, are reduced in troop strength to 50 percent. Unit commanders are gravely concerned, he writes, about the loss of experienced officers, noncommissioned officers, and highly trained specialists. These men are being sent to Vietnam and are being replaced by raw recruits.

Gen. John P. McConnell, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Gen. Gabriel P. Disoway, commander of the Tactical Air Command, both have told Congress that TAC is not able to cope with a second emergency, outside Vietnam, should one arise. The Air National Guard will have to be called up if trouble erupts elsewhere.

When General McConnell appeared before our subcommittee, I asked him for his recommendations for meeting other global contingencies.

He told me that "acceleration of production lines would certainly be a precautionary measure." I asked him if this would not be a good precautionary measure. He agreed that it would.

"Have you recommended this or have you talked it over in your shop?" I asked him. He replied, "We have not recommended it. We have talked it over on a considerable number of occasions."

Our colleague, Mr. Sikes, interjected at this point:

> Very probably the reason that you have not recommended such a course of action is because of budgetary considerations—

General McConnell added:

> And the labor considerations.

Let me at this point read a brief excerpt from the Defense subcommittee hearings: We are interrogating Air Force Secretary Brown.

> Mr. Sikes. If you were to take into account all of these possibilities and start planning for them, what kind of a budget request would you necessarily have to make?
>
> Air Force Secretary Brown. It depends on how many contingencies you want to take care of. I can see making up a list of contingencies that would at least double the budget. I do not consider them likely enough to be worth doing that. It is quite important for us, it seems to me, to put our forces where the most likely problems are, and clearly there is a problem in South Vietnam. Just adding more munitions, starting up a munitions line, will not by itself provide us with a very rapid response capability. I do not think that is a very good idea because I do not think, on balance, that is the kind of contingency we should prepare for in that way.
>
> Mr. Minshall. Do you not think we should err on the side of security?
>
> Secretary Brown. We do.
>
> Mr. Minshall. You are not when you come out and say it would be a precautionary measure. The general just said this, Mr. Secretary.

This colloquy took place on February 23, 1966. On May 27, 1966, the Christian Science Monitor carried the following item:

> * * * in the early days of the stepped-up bombing in Vietnam the Air Force actually had to borrow iron bombs from the Navy. At one point there wasn't a single 750-pound iron bomb in all of South Vietnam.
>
> Now the B-52's flying out of Guam have plenty of them. But the tactical aircraft flying sorties from Vietnam and Thailand are still short.
>
> Officially the Pentagon describes this situation as "maldistribution." But Pentagon officers smile. "It's a shortage," says one.

On June 25, only 23 days ago, just a week before Secretary McNamara's report calling for a cutback in production was issued, Preparedness Subcommittee Chairman Stennis stated that the Pentagon had to "impose ammunition conservation measures" on our troops in Vietnam.

Senator Stennis indicated that the Pentagon is underestimating needs. He said:

> The record shows that the inventories computed as sufficient for total forces in sustained combat against powerful opposition appears relatively small when compared with the actual requirements of a fraction of those forces engaged in Vietnam against lightly-equipped hit-and-run guerrilla forces.

Last fall I went to Vietnam on assignment for my Defense subcommittee. When I returned I issued this statement to the press:

> One officer told me some units are short of supplies that they could get at the corner garage back in the states. I personally saw rusty bombs with a 1945 date on the nuclear aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. These bombs are effective but the question is, how long will the supply last?

Since I asked that question Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown stated to my subcommittee that no shortage of bombs existed. Subsequently in March and in early April, the Defense Secretary himself denied that there was such a shortage.

Then, later in April, the Air Force finally admitted that it had been forced to buy back more than 5,000 750-pound bombs sold in 1963 to a West German fertilizer firm. Our selling price had been $1.70 each. Our repurchase cost was $21 per bomb.

The argument was advanced by the Pentagon that the bombs would have cost several hundred dollars apiece had they been purchased new.

This only serves to underscore the point—Why did we not have these bombs either in inventory or in production? And the answer is that the civilian military experts in the Pentagon did not foresee this contingency.

Secretary McNamara and his computors have clearly established that they are incapable of predicting what our military needs will be, or where new world trouble spots may develop. They continue to shrug off the need for preparing for future contingencies.

The key to this reluctance lies in an almost fanatical desire for tight budgeting, to avoid what McNamara dreads most, a "carryover that was represented by $12 billion of surplus and worthless material with which we concluded the Korean war."

It is false and dangerous economy to disregard the many perilous uncertainties of this most uncertain world. It imperils our position in the many critical areas of the world, it could prolong the war in Vietnam, it could cost additional American lives.

The May 2, 1966, Aviation Week & Space Technology editorial by Robert Hotz states the case brilliantly:

> If Mr. McNamara really believes it is possible to fight and win a war killing the last enemy with the last bullet as the last soldier eats the last can of beans in the quartermaster's stores, this nation faces serious trouble ahead.
>
> Events have already proved that some of Mr. McNamara's military judgments have not been as sound as he imagined. But if he persists in trying to budget the Vietnam war or any other confrontation with the goal of emerging with no surplus materiel, he will actually be budgeting shortages in combat equipment for the future. War is an illogical and wasteful enterprise that inevitably defies the efforts of man to calculate its fury precisely.

Ammunition is not the only thing in short supply my subcommittee learned during its hearings this year. Tropical combat boots, lightweight uniforms, certain clothing allowance items, tentage, refrigeration equipment, concertina wire, barbed wire, sandbags, and landing mats have been listed as "major problem items" by the Defense Supply Agency.

After a meeting in my office on June 27, 1966, I received a report from Capt. C. F. Palmer, chief of the Supply Management Division of DSA. I now insert it in the Record:

[In reply refer to DSAH–OS]

Defense Supply Agency,
Headquarters, Cameron Station,
Alexandria, Va., June 28, 1966.

Hon. William E. Minshall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Minshall: In accordance with your request, following is a summary of the Defense Supply Agency "material shortage" matters discussed in your office on Monday, 27 June 1966. Accompanying me from DSA Headquarters during this meeting were Lt. Colonel Francis R. Munt, USA and Commander T. J. Pawlowski, SC, USN.

a. In general, DSA has performed well in the first real test of its ability to respond in an emergency. However, we have had and continue to have supply problems on certain items.

b. Basically, our supply "shortage" problems have been caused by the sudden and dramatic upsurge in requirements resulting from increased force levels and recruit input, and large deployments to Vietnam. Added to this is:

(1) The relatively long lead time involved in the large volume procurement and production of many items.

(2) The fact that some items, such as the direct molded sole tropical combat boots and the lightweight tropical uniforms, were new-development items formerly used only by certain Special Forces. Thus, it has become necessary to build up a production base for such items.

(3) The fact that some items such as heavy tentage had very little peacetime usage, and therefore the dwindled production base had to be expanded.

(4) The fact that mobilization reserve assets of many items were not stocked in the depth required to meet the sudden and huge demands actually experienced, which demands drew down stock levels before new production could satisfy all requirements.

c. The Defense Supply Agency experienced its most serious difficulties in the areas of clothing and textile items, field fortification items and certain repair parts. Major problem items have been:

Tropical combat boots.
Tropical combat lightweight uniform.
Certain clothing allowance "bag" items (about 40 items).
Tentage.
Refrigeration equipment.
Concertina wire.
Barbed wire.
Sandbags.
Landing mats.

d. In the clothing area, it was necessary to effect temporary reductions in some of the allowance items issued to the new men at the reception centers. Relatively few items were subject to such reductions, however, and these only for the Army (7 items reduced) and the Marine Corps (6 items reduced). For some items, supplies have since become adequate to allow a reversion to full recruit issue allowances, and by late Fall this year all recruits should be back on a full allowance basis. With a few exceptions, DSA wholesale stocks of all clothing items should be in good position by the end of this calendar year. The exceptions are the lightweight tropical combat uniform (coat and trousers) which will be in a satisfactory supply position by February 1967 or earlier, the tropical combat boot and the regular black combat boot by February 1967. In the meantime, essential requirements of combat troops in Vietnam are being met from current production.

e. Of the tentage items, the General Purpose Medium (GPM) tent is in the most serious difficulty. Distribution from production of this tent was placed under allocation decision of the Joint Material Priorities and Allocations Board of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on 15 February 1966. The "get well" date on this item for Southeast Asia requirements is anticipated for December 1966, and for the total system requirements in late 1967 or early 1968.

f. There are eleven different items of refrigeration equipment (reach in/walk in boxes) that have given us difficulty. By November 1966, all items should be in a satisfactory supply position.

g. Barbed wire will be in a satisfactory supply position next month (July 1966), and concertina wire by January 1967.

h. Sandbag requirements are now being met in Southeast Asia, and it is expected that total system requirements will be satisfied by February 1967. It is noted that two types of sandbags are being procured; the burlap/cotton bag which has a service life of 3–4 months, and the polypropylene bag which is reputed to have a service life of 18 months. This latter item is being tested in the field.

i. The M8A1 (solid steel planking) landing mat will be in a satisfactory supply position by March 1967. The T–17 taxiway and runway mats (membrane of nylon cord fabric) will be in a satisfactory supply position by December 1966.

The above list covers our major areas of concern. With over 1.3 million separate stock numbered items in the DSA wholesale supply system, we can expect to experience temporary shortages of other items from time to time as supply and demand fluctuates. Our primary mission is to furnish prompt and full support to the Military Services; we treat any shortage as a matter of grave concern and act promptly to eliminate it.

If we can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me or any other element of the DSA organization.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. Palmer,
Captain, SC, USN, Chief, Supply Management Division Supply Operations.

I strongly urge Members of this House to carefully read the additional views which Mr. Lipscomb, Mr. Laird, and I have appended to the committee report on the bill before us today.

We must bring a halt to piecemeal spending for our national defense.

We must work to restore the credibility of our Government.

We must not budget ourselves at the high price of American lives in conflicts abroad or at the expense of the national security of our citizens at home.

This is where we came in last year—Operation Coverup. Operation Coverup plays on with McNamara's band supplying the discords, the American taxpayer as the angel.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest and some considerable alarm to the remarks by my very dear friend and colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], a very devoted member of the committee. I am a bit disappointed at some of the references which he has made. After listening to such a compilation of criticism, of disagreement, I had almost thought that we were fighting a war against Mr. McNamara, when I had contemplated that this was a bill for the further prosecution of the war against the Communists in Vietnam. My very dear friend said, in effect, I believe that the faith of the American people in our Government leaders is badly shaken, pointing out that in his opinion the people look at us in Congress as one source of truth. I do hope that they will look at us with some degree of tolerance and compassion. If they do look at our actions, not necessarily our words, as a source of truth, they will be heartened, I think, at the agreement which they will find among the Members of the Congress in defense matters.

The Democrats and Republicans on the committee have declared that they are supporting the pending bill. The chief architect of defense programs which the pending bill will finance is the Secretary of Defense.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is the result of a budget submitted to the Congress, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] is supporting it—that is, 98 percent of it or more—and the committee is supporting it, 98 percent or more, because we have only varied from the standpoint of dollars, less than 2 percent from the figures that were originally submitted in the budget.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe all Americans who look to us when they seek a "moment of truth," will be heartened and encouraged to find that while we make some complaints about our officials and their shortcomings—and they do have some and we have some ourselves perhaps—they will find we are almost unanimous in supporting the recommendation in the Defense budget of Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to needlessly tear down, even in an election year, the credibility of the officials of the United States, elected or not elected.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the American people, despite a series of criticisms from some of our friends as to what is wrong, will be aware that there is much right with the United States and with our leadership and with the President and members of the Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we keep things in proper perspective, and I trust that the words I have spoken are in keeping with the requirements of the moment. It would not be appropriate for me to try to comment on all the criticisms that have been leveled but a general statement such as I have made seems to be in order.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], expressed his views very clearly. I believe it is helpful, not only for the Congress, but for the citizens of the United States to hear what our concerns are. His views are valid. The gentleman has documented them. I believe it is up to the Congress and to the people to evaluate them.

Mr. Chairman, so that there is no misunderstanding about the nature of our support of this bill.

I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and with his permission, I would like to read what we say in our minority views. These views are signed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] and by myself:

> The undersigned intend, as in the past, to support the Department of Defense Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1967 though we do not agree with several aspects of its makeup.
>
> Where we disagree, we believe that the current bill is inadequate for fiscal year 1967, especially with regard to our worldwide commitments, to future preparedness, and Southeast Asia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is where we disagree. We have stated it on the floor all afternoon and, in fact, in listening closely to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] I believe that the gentleman reiterated some of the same points that we have pointed out here in our additional or minority views.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from California, who has been most objective in his presentation on this bill.

But the point I was making is that this bill, which is so warmly supported by the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin, is a bill to support a military program of which the Secretary of Defense is to some very considerable extent the architect. If the program is so bad how can the gentleman from Ohio support the legislation which the Secretary of Defense is to a very considerable extent recommending?

Mr. Chairman, this is the point I undertake to make.

I agree that it is well to make constructive criticism and point out the things that are wrong, but I doubt that we should belabor too heavily a Secretary of Defense who apparently is doing everything in his power to protect the interests of the taxpayers, the lives of our fighting men, and the interests of the country in prosecuting the war. I do not think we can impugn or should impugn the motives of Cabinet members or military officers or Presidents who are doing the best they know how to promote the welfare of the people of the United States. This does not preclude abundant room for differences of opinion.

I do not believe the gentleman from California will disagree with these remarks.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. No, I do not disagree with your remarks in the context that you have put them, but we still have to realize that the bill that is before us today is still inadequate, it is not completely funded on all of the items that are necessary. The Secretary of Defense to this time has not given us an estimate or even filled us in as to what is necessary in the future.

The best example that I can state here is the miscalculation in additional military manpower costs to support the military personnel that we now have on Board in the Department of Defense. The Secretary has not yet come up with a factual statement. Now, this is the kind of information that I think we should have—factual, timely, and completely.

Mr. MAHON. I think that the Secretary has made an error in judgment in failing to submit a request for a budget estimate through the regular channels for these additional men, the 108,000 men who were not budgeted for, but who were actually in service on June 30 at the beginning of the new fiscal year.

I by no means agree as our report shows, and as the bill shows, with all of the views of a strong-minded Secretary of Defense. But I do think we all agree we need leadership, and that a leader in the expenditure or in the handling of a $100 billion program cannot be all things to all people, and please everybody all the time. This is one of the things that I undertook to point out earlier.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, hold you in the highest regard, as do all the other members of the subcommittee. We have spent many, many hours together in the 8 years that I have had the privilege of working with you on defense matters.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say that this feeling of high regard is mutual. The gentleman is a very important member of the committee.

Mr. MINSHALL. The thrust of my remarks had two main spearheads, Mr. Chairman. One was the fact that we on the minority did not feel that this budget was adequate. Last year's regular budget was not adequate. It was proven to be inadequate.

The other thrust of my argument was the confusion of the American people and their right to know all of the facts. That was all I attempted to bring out. There have been so many confusing and contradictory statements that have come out of the White House and out of the Pentagon that it is no wonder that the American people are confused. This is exemplified by the polls that I cited here, including the one I conducted in my own district, where 73 percent said that they did not feel they were getting all of the facts from this administration. I sent out 125,000 questionnaires. I do not think at this time, a time of national crisis, that we should stick our heads in the sand and just pretend that this situation does not exist.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I realize that at times remarks that are made in the press, and by columnists, and by the executive branch, and in the Congress, and even today, can prove to be confusing to the American people. But I do think that the American people have the hard commonsense to know we are in a war in Vietnam, and that we propose to win that war, and that the Congress is supporting a firm policy and is providing the funds necessary. We have provided $10 billion a year more during the last 4 years than we provided during the previous 4 years for defense.

Last year's budget was, insofar as I know, when finally submitted, adequate or reasonably adequate under the guidelines in which it was submitted. I believe that our hearings support this view.

With respect to the current fiscal year the Secretary of Defense says that he does not want to ask us for a blank check now for additional funds because he cannot predict with sufficient accuracy just what will be needed at a later time in this fiscal year. So he said that he will be in a position to present a more accurate request later on. Let me say this; he has $100 billion at his disposal now, or he will have when this bill is passed, and it does seem to me that he will be able to make do for a time. It does seem to me he will be able to make do with the availability of $100 billion until we can see a little further ahead and know more precisely what the requirements are. While we can have differences of opinion on that subject, I cannot offer an amendment to take care of needs which I cannot now anticipate, and I do not think the gentleman from Ohio would offer an amendment under these circumstances. It is true that we passed the pay raise bill and we do not have money in here for it. We did not include pay raise money in the annual bill last year or on previous occasions. We are going to try to get the Department, I hope, to absorb as much of the pay increase as possible, and then later on we will provide the additional sums which are absolutely required.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, this is a good bill, in my opinion. It is unanimously supported by the eight members of this subcommittee, each of whom is an old veteran. The junior member of our committee has served on the committee 8 years. I would not tell you how long the senior member has served, but it is many years. I have been on this subcommittee 20 years.

This bill provides $58 billion plus to finance the Defense Department during the fiscal year 1967. The bill comes to you unanimously from our subcommittee, and the only complaint or criticism of the bill that I have heard has been criticism of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and criticism of the fact that this might be financing the war effort on the installment plan.

Prediction has been made that in January the Secretary will come back and ask for a supplemental. Frankly, if he does not I will be surprised. I hope and pray, however, that by January this vicious war will be ended and it will not be necessary for him to come back.

I want to say I have been on this committee 20 years. I have seen Secretaries come and go. I have seen some good ones over there and I have seen some mediocre Secretaries. In my opinion, the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, is the best Secretary we have had during those 20 years. I wonder how many of you have thought what an almost impossible job Mr. McNamara has. Why, he is head of the Defense Department of the United States, the biggest department in Government. Millions of civilian employees are under his control. Millions of servicemen are under his control.

In this bill we are giving him $58 billion to spend during fiscal year 1967, and it has been said that he has roughly $40 billion on top of that that he can expend during 1967.

I say that in my opinion there is not a man in this Chamber who could come as near doing as good a job as he has. There are very few people in America who could do as good a job as he has done. I would hate to have to pick his successor. Of course, he has made mistakes. Of course, he has done things that I did not approve of. But I say that in my opinion his mistakes have been mistakes of the head and not the heart. I like to see a man who will say "Yes," and stick by his answer of "Yes." I like to see a man who has the courage to say "No," and stick by that "No" decision.

I believe Mr. McNamara has done a good job, a far better job than I could do. And if I cannot do a better job than he, I will not be so critical of him.

What is wrong with financing a war on the installment plan? As I said, I hope Mr. McNamara does not come back in January for a supplemental. But, if he does, and if it happens to be for $5, $10, or $15 billion, I can assure you that these eight old "pro's" on the defense subcommittee will bring a bill unanimously before this House for approval.

A great deal is being said now—not as much as in the last few months, but still the question is being asked: Why are we in Vietnam? That is an academic question without this war, and we have on our hands a dirty jungle war, a war that could last 40 years. The French stayed there 10 years, and they left without winning.

I believe the leaders of our country—the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense—have leaned over backward trying to get the people of Hanoi to the conference table. It looks now as if that is impossible. So there is only one thing to do, and that is fight to win. I am happy to say that in my opinion during the last week in June our leaders pitched in and began fighting this war to win by escalating the bombing of Vietnam.

Many people now are complaining about that. I wish you would get this little part 6 of our hearings, and turn to page 21 and read the colloquy that occurred between me and Maj. Gen. R. Lassetter, Jr., who is Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence. It was on the afternoon of April 4, 1966. Our committee room was filled with weapons and they were sophisticated weapons. They were weapons that had been captured by our forces in South Vietnam.

The question was asked whether these were good weapons. The answer was "Yes." The question was then asked whether these were as good as our weapons, and the answer was "Yes." In certain instances, they were better weapons because the recoilless rifles that we were shown, which had been captured from the enemy, could use the same shell that their machineguns could use, which in the field was a decided advantage.

The question was asked where those weapons were made. The answer was "They were made in plants in Red China." The question was asked, "Have those plants been bombed"? The answer was "No." We knew the answer, but we wanted to get it into the record. Then we asked how those weapons were transported from China down into Vietnam. We were told it was by railroad. We asked then if those railroads had been bombed. The answer was "No."

We were told the weapons were also going by ship through the harbor of Haiphong, which had not been bombed or blockaded or mined at that time.

They also went to Vinh, a little city north of the 17th parallel, and from there they were distributed into South Vietnam.

So I asked this question:

Mr. Andrews. That has not been hit, mined, or blockaded. That is a sanctuary?

General Lassetter. That is right.

Mr. Andrews. Unless and until this city of Vinh, those two railroads, and that harbor have been effectively bombed, then there is no hope of keeping the enemy troops in South Vietnam from being supplied abundantly with modern weapons of war which you have described as being most effective; is that right?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir. All we can hope to do is slow it down.

Mr. Andrews. From what we have been told here this afternoon, I have concluded there has not been any slowing down.

General Lassetter. We have made it more difficult for them.

Mr. Andrews. They are still getting weapons?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. They are getting good weapons, made in China?

General Lassetter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Delivered through North Vietnam to our enemies in South Vietnam, and unless and until some action is taken to stop that supply route we can expect those weapons to be delivered in the future and put into the hands of our enemies. As you say, they are high quality weapons, most effective, and are being used effectively killing our troops down there.

General Lassetter. You are very correct, sir.

This testimony was published June 23. The next week our forces started bombing those railroad tracks and started bombing the POL facilities around Haiphong. They started bombing.

That is the way to win this war. If a great country like ours, with all the power and might it has at its command, cannot whip a country like North Vietnam, we have no business in the war.

The bill before us today will give our troops in Vietnam and the South Vietnamese troops the tools with which to get the job done. If we will continue relentlessly to bomb these strategic points in North Vietnam, I say to my friends, I hope and I pray that in January Mr. McNamara will not come back up for a supplemental, but if he does I shall vote to give him every dime he asks for.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, before voting on the DOD appropriations for 1967—Report No. 1652 of H.R. 15941—I wish to again express my personal concern that this bill does not include the total money required for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory for this fiscal year. The committee of conference authorized a total of $200 million for the MOL program; whereas, the bill before us today provides appropriations only in the amount of $150 million. This amounts to a deficiency of $50 million in the funds required in 1967.

The manned orbiting laboratory program represents the first and only opportunity the Department of Defense has had to build a space system which takes maximum advantage of man's unique qualifications to operate in the space environment. Since John Glenn's initial demonstration, the NASA has been gathering proof of man's ability to survive and function effectively in space. From the earliest days of our space program, we have been testing man's skills to determine basic physiological or psychological limitations to his performance in space. We have found none; nor do we expect to find any in the future.

On the basis of this fundamental knowledge, the Department of Defense has proposed a program which will capitalize upon the results we have obtained to date. Since the NASA efforts have provided such a broad base of proven experience, both in the Government and industry, the MOL program is not considered one involving high risk. Basic, proven systems and subsystems such as the Gemini and Titan III have been chosen to provide an early demonstrated capability.

The use of these previously developed components and subsystems, some of which are off the shelf, will cause the procurement costs during the initial year of the program to be substantially higher than might otherwise be the case. In other words, on this program we will "bend hardware'" earlier and incur hardware costs earlier than we would in an R. & D. program. This has caused the costs for fiscal year 1967 to be higher than those anticipated in the President's budget submitted in January.

Although efforts to obtain these extra funds were unsuccessful during the Defense appropriations hearings last April, the Armed Services Committee recognized their need and authorized $80 million additional funds. The joint committee of conference authorized $50 million of this amount.

What would this money buy us? In essence, it would buy us time. Without the money, we will lose this time.

But can we afford to lose it? On July 6, the Russians launched a proton satellite. This huge satellite, weighing more than 24,000 pounds, is large enough to sustain a complete manned orbiting laboratory. This Russian effort was not the first of a series. It was not even the second of a series. This is the third proton satellite that the Russians have launched.

I support this bill, but I wish to voice my concern that we have not gone far enough in providing support for the MOL program. After the substantial support provided in past years by the Congress to NASA for the development of the basic knowledge and equipment for manned space flight, I hope that history does not record that we were inadeqate in responding to the challenge of translating this knowledge and capability into systems so essential for a proper and adequate defense of our country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken today on the Defense Department appropriation bill may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and to include pertinent additional material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF A NATIONAL CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the South Vietnamese Government has announced that elections will be held throughout South Vietnam on September 11 for the purpose of electing a national constituent assembly. Regulations governing the election were promulgated by the present South Vietnamese Government on June 19. All of us in this House, and our constituents, desire that these elections be fairly and freely conducted, and that the delegates elected fully, freely, and wisely exercise the authority conveyed to them by their people. However, Mr. Speaker, disquieting reports, from a variety of sources, aver that the nominations of candidates in this election may have been, or are being, perverted to the point that the election may be meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, these elections are of enormous significance to every citizen of the United States, as well as to every Vietnamese citizen.

First. The elections have the potential of offering the Vietnamese people a first chance to express their will as to the role of the American Government, in South Vietnam.

Second. The elections, if honest, will represent a positive, specific benefit which the presence of our forces has made possible for the Vietnamese people.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported our actions in Vietnam for many, many months. I have supported the President out of a sense of responsibility to the interests of our Nation, and what I have seen to be the interests of the South Vietnamese people. However, it will be most difficult for me to continue this support, if I find that the South Vietnamese people are being cruelly deprived, by their current Government, of this crucial opportunity for self-expression. The South Vietnamese people, who have suffered much, deserve an opportunity to be heard.

However, in the past few days, reports have reached me from Vietnamese citizens protesting that the present military government is pushing its trusted military officers into the election slates, and is simultaneously exerting pressure to prevent those who disagree with the directorate from becoming candidates. Correspondents write that the military government intends to turn the election into a show of strength for its policies rather than a test of its acceptance. Members of the British Parliament with whom I have met tell me that they have learned that the present military government intends to remain in office and is rigging the election to insure this result. Sizable groups among the electorate claim that they intend to boycott the election because they distrust the authorities controlling the selection of candidates.

As those who have read the regulations promulgated for the election are aware, the regulations themselves clearly specify that all funds and communication facilities permitted to be used during the campaign must be financed only by the Government. Campaign contributions apparently are prohibited. Furthermore, only 22 days were given between the day the election regulations were issued, until the closing date for filing. This is an exceedingly short period of time in a nation of slow communications. It would be a short period of time even in this country.

The preceding observations are, to say the least, disquieting. However, not all the comments which I have received on the election have been unfavorable. One member of the press, very recently returned from Vietnam, today stated to me that, despite the harsh criticisms being heard, he expected the election to be far more meaningful than many persons seem to believe. He has talked with various Vietnamese who intended to become candidates, and is convinced that quite a number of individuals will run who have the respect of the public, yet who are not identified with the current military directorate, and further, that these individuals have confidence that they can be elected. Representatives of the Department of State with whom I have spoken indicate that they are reasonably satisfied with election procedures, and expect that the election will be a free election. The Vietnamese Government has asked United Nations observers to report on the conduct of the election. Thus, expressions of both apprehension and confidence can be found.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it essential that we in the Congress, and the constituents we represent, have a clear view of the events taking place in Vietnam these next few weeks. We must know whether or not these elections allow the expression of the will of the Vietnamese population. It would be tragic if the American public were deluded by rigged elections into demanding further commitments. Similarly, it would be tragic if, because they had been influenced by propaganda efforts to doubt the elections, the American people were to discount the results of valid elections. Either situation could present grave problems for our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am distressed that neither the American press nor most Members of this Congress appear to be well informed concerning the events taking place. I ask, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House direct its attention to this subject, and hold hearings, preferably public, here and possibly in Vietnam, both to manifest its concern and to inform the public of the events taking place.

Mr. Speaker, this subject is one on which we should not delay action. According to the official schedule for the election, a copy of which I shall append to the end of my remarks, the date for candidates to file has already passed. Under the electoral procedures, the names of any of these candidates may be struck from the list in the next 2 weeks, by action of the current South Vietnamese Government. It is essential, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress, as well as members of the press, and officials of our administration, be fully and intimately informed of the events which take place in these next few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, all too often in the past, in Asia, efforts to enhance the tradition of democracy have been stifled by intolerable manipulation of the procedures of elections. It would be tragic if our commitment of lives and material wealth in Vietnam were wasted because of lack of attention by the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD several articles pertinent to this subject:

CHRONOLOGY OF ELECTORAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

(Article 4) December 31, 1965: All electors must be 18 years old by this date in order to vote.

(Article 1) April 14, 1966: Decree law 14/66 provided for the election of deputies to the National Constituent Assembly.

(Article 10) June 25, 1966: Deadline for appeal to Council for permission to run for office if person was sentenced for criminal or light offences of political character or for political reason before November 1, 1963.

(Article 5) July 8, 1966: Electors who have changed their residence and wish to vote in a new electoral district should make declaration to local authorities by this date.

(Article 12) July 11, 1966: Applications for candidature should be submitted to city, municipality or provincial office by this date.

(Article 13) July 14, 1966: The list of candidates will be posted at administrative offices on this date.

(Article 14) July 15–18, 1966: Candidates and electors may file complaints on candidates' qualifications at Saigon city, municipality or province administrative office.

(Article 5) July 18, 1966: The list of electors will be posted in Saigon, municipalities and provinces.

(Article 14) July 19, 1966: List of candidates and complaints will be sent to the Council stipulated in Article 15 for examination and decision.

(Article 16) July 20–22, 1966: Council stipulated in Article 15 will examine names and decide to inscribe or strike names from list.

(Article 16) July 22, 1966: The Council will call a meeting of the candidates and announce the inscription or the refusal to inscribe candidates' names on the candidate list.

(Article 16) July 25, 1966: The local administration and candidates must send complaints to the Council by the end of this day.

(Article 16) July 28 (18?), 1966: Council will transmit to the Central Council a list of approved candidates and files of candidates subjected to complaints and complaints received.

(Article 7) August 2, 1966: Citizens fulfilling all voter qualifications and not appearing on the voter lists must file complaints with city, town or provincial administrative offices by this date.

(Article 7) August 7, 1966: Mayors or chiefs of province must dispatch complaints and voters lists to committee stipulated in Article 15.

(Article 17) August 7, 1966: Deadline for Central Council to complete study of complaints about candidates and return to concerned administrative officials the list of candidates it has approved.

(Article 17) August 12, 1966: Second posting of list of candidates for all constituencies.

(Article 19) August 13, 1966: Candidates and candidate lists must inform local authorities about the name and addresses of their representatives, if any, by this date.

(Article 20) August 15, 1966: Local authorities will convene first meeting of Election Campaign Committee.

(Article 7) August 20, 1966: Administrative authorities will post lists of voters for second time.

(Article 27) August 26, 1966: Earliest date that campaign may begin.

(Article 30) September 8, 1966: The location of the polling places will be announced by mayors and chiefs of province.

(Article 27) September 10, 1966: Campaign will end at 12:00 noon.

(Article 2) September 11, 1966 (Sunday): The election of deputies to the National Constituent Assembly.

(Article 48) September 14, 1966: Complaints should be submitted to the courts by this date. The concerned court may only make a judgment and announce its verdict no earlier than one day and no later than 10 days after election day.

(Article 48) September 14, 1966: Complaints made on good grounds must be submitted to office of local council stipulated in Article 15 no later than this date.

(Article 46) September 15, 1966: The local council stipulated in Article 15 will examine irregularities and announce the official result on this day.

(Following Articles taken from Constituent Assembly Law:) *

(Article 8) September 26, 1966: The chairman of the National Leadership Committee will convene the first plenary session of the National Assembly no later than September 26.

(Article 16) March 26, 1967: The constitution must be approved by the National Assembly by this date.

(Article 19) April 1, 1967: The draft constitution will be transmitted to the chairman of the National Leadership Committee for promulgation no later than April 1.

(Article 20) May 1, 1967: The chairman of the National Leadership Committee will promulgate the constitution by this date.

(Article 22) November 1, 1967: No later than November 1, 1967 the National Leadership Committee is responsible for establishing the national institutions decided on by the constitution.

FIFTY MILITARY MEN SEEK ELECTION TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE ASSEMBLY

(By Eric Pace)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 16.—Incomplete data indicate that about 50 South Vietnamese military officers have filed for election to this fall's constitutent assembly, Government officials reported today.

They said most of the officers were entered in constituencies where they stood a good chance of being elected—and thereby of providing Saigon's military Government with powerful support in the assembly, which is to frame a new constitution for South Vietnam.

Under the rules laid down for the assembly, the ruling junta can amend the constitution that the assembly draws up unless it is overruled by two-thirds of the 117 delegates

Thus the junta would need the support of only 40 delegates to make sure any amendments were put through.

Any officers elected as delegates are expected to respect the wishes of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky and the other military leaders who dominate the junta, although as candidates they are required to go on leave of absence from military service.

Air Vice Marshal Ky has said he hopes the assembly will pave the way for national elections that will produce a government with a democratic base "like in the United States."

The military took over power last summer from a civilian Government that failed. Marshal Ky has declared, "I don't want power." But observers think he would like to keep it.

Information about candidacies throughout the country was still being compiled, four days after the filing deadline, in a beige

---

* The following dates are maximum.

stucco Government building heavily guarded against Vietcong attack.

The new Minister of Justice, Tran Minh Tiet, said he had no evidence that the Vietcong would try to disturb the elections, which are scheduled for Sept. 11.

"But I assume that they will try to disrupt them," he said. "Their policy is to keep us from doing anything that helps the people." He has been presiding over preparations for the political campaign, about 720 candidates—roughly 170 running alone and the rest grouped into about 160 slates—have registered for assembly seats that are up for election. Nine seats are reserved for hill tribesmen who are to be chosen by traditional tribal processes, presumably overseen by the Government.

Aides to Mr. Tiet said almost none of the country's traditional parties had entered official candidates in the campaign, which opens formally Aug. 26.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 15, 1966]

VIETNAM ELECTION EVOKES FLOOD OF CANDIDATES, RISING PROTEST

(By John Dillin)

SAIGON.—Despite loud protests from dissident elements, South Vietnam is beginning a quick countdown toward the Sept. 11 elections for a national assembly.

The final, extended deadline for candidates to file rolled by here on July 13. The latest word was that more than 1,000 candidates have entered their names in the provinces and several major cities.

The 117-man assembly will be charged with the task of writing this country's basic constitution. It will have six months to do the job.

However, unrest is in the wind. A number of religious and political groups have branded the coming elections a fraud and have announced they will boycott them.

The dissidents dub themselves the All-Religion Citizens Group and Political Organization. The group is headed by the Rev. Hoang Quynh, rebellious leader of many of the 800,000 Roman Catholic refugees from the Communist north.

GAPS IN OPPOSITION

It is difficult to judge the degree of support for the dissidents. It includes the militant wing of the Buddhist Institute, elements of the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao faiths, some Protestants, some Southern Buddhists, and a scattering of political and labor organizations.

But some important groups are absent from the list. Moderate elements of the Buddhist Institute under Thich Tam Chau, for example, have not joined the boycott. Nor has the powerful Roman Catholic bloc, even though some of its members attended earlier meetings of Fr. Quynh's group.

Following a press conference at which the dissidents listed their grievances, observers estimated that they might influence up to 20 percent of the country's voters. But that was mere speculation. One leading Saigon editor said: "I'm confused myself."

SURGE OF CANDIDATES

With the filing date past, two things are clear about the elections.

First, there is no lack of candidates. In Saigon, some 200 people are running for 16 seats in the assembly. These include several members of the Saigon City Council. In nearby Gia Dinh Province, with only two seats at stake, there are 28 candidates, including Dr. Phan Quang Dan, who some observers think might someday become premier or president in an honest, nationwide election. Some women also have filed.

Second, especially in the rural provinces, it appears there will be a large number of military candidates. This is a reversal of the practice in last year's provincial elections, when military candidates were barred.

This tendency for the military to thrust itself into politics is a major irritant to the Quynh group. Fr. Quynh says he has heard from reliable sources that the local government in one province has been given orders that the military candidates are to win the election there.

As a result, the dissidents' communiqué states that they will:

1. Reject and boycott the coming election of the constituent assembly.

2. Demand the immediate formation of a provincial civilian government . . . to take charge of the election. . . .

GOVERNMENT CRITICIZED

3. Appeal to the people and the Army to stand united . . . to defeat the Communists. . . .

Their communiqué argued:

"In the present ideological war between nationalists and Communists, the prime condition of victory . . . is to win the support of the people. . . . After a year in power, the present military government has succeeded in establishing a dictatorial rule, playing one party against another . . . but it has utterly failed in winning the support of the people, especially that of the Buddhists and in central Vietnam."

In addition, they charge that election laws are full of flaws. Among examples cited in a 2,400-word study are:

CONTROL QUESTIONED

Any proposal of the government must get top priority for discussion by the constituent assembly—a provision dubbed "a way of exercising pressure on members of the assembly."

The chairman of the National Leadership Council can rewrite any part of the constitution which the assembly proposes, and his changes are final unless two-thirds of the assembly votes to override him. The study notes that this means one-third plus one can defeat the will of a clear majority—"a gross malpractice."

The foregoing provisions and others make the assembly little more than a "drafting committee."

The electoral laws were published in the country's official journal on June 28, and released to the public June 30. This, the study says, left only 12 days to qualify for the elections, which is not enough." (The regime later extended the filing date to July 13, however, and allowed candidates until July 17 to complete the necessary documents.)

SUPPORT APPEARS

No mention is made of lifting press censorship, of freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, or security for candidates who criticize the government.

But the major objection, the study says, is that the assembly is to be a "worthless institution." In that sentence the group has expressed a widespread disappointment here that the assembly is to have no real governing power.

However, despite these drawbacks—some of which are conceded by the government—the elections are drawing support from influential citizens. Dr. Dang Van Sung, for example, the influential publisher of Chinh Luan, says the Buddhists and others are showing a negative attitude by boycotting the election.

A spokesman for the Catholics said they are leaving it up to individuals to decide whether to run. But at the same time, the church is conducting regular classes for its parishioners on the methods of voting.

The spokesman said he expected the elections to be quite free, especially in city areas.

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION WEEK

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, Americans, of all people in the world, should not have to be reminded that democracy imposes heavy responsibilities on each citizen. We must face, however, the hard fact that less than 65 percent of voting-age American citizens have voted in past general elections. The actual percentage of voting citizens is more like 50 to 52 percent. My 65-percent figure is an estimate allowing for those disqualified for various reasons.

Whichever figure we use, we must be appalled at the low voter turnouts in a country which is looked upon by peoples of the world as the most perfect democracy. In looking for the reasons, we must attribute some of this voter inactivity to insufficient leadership on the part of elected officials in stimulating civic awareness.

Today I am introducing two resolutions to encourage larger voter turnouts. One of these is a resolution to proclaim the first week in September of each year "National Voter Registration Week." In most States, registration is a prerequisite to voting; yet, there has been no nationwide effort to encourage registration. My resolution would focus attention on voter registration and encourage the exercise of our greatest civic responsibility. It would encourage employers to observe National Voter Registration Week by making necessary arrangements for their employees to register to vote.

The second resolution I am introducing, like those introduced by several of my colleagues, would declare general election day a national holiday. Other democracies recognize the importance of suffrage by making voting the primary business of a national election day. In the interest of truly representative government, we cannot afford to do less.

These resolutions are, of course, only a beginning in stimulating greater voter turnouts; but, at least, they would convey our national commitment to involving each citizen in the election of his officials. A concurrent task is voter education to insure that each vote is not merely a vote, but an educated vote. Under previous permission I insert in the RECORD, along with my remarks, a fine editorial by Mr. J. H. Terry of the Geneseo Republic in my congressional district. Mr. Terry's editorial is an eloquent plea for citizen awareness of candidates and issues and should be read by the electorate and elected alike. Citizen awareness begins in our villages and cities, but it can be encouraged by elected officials themselves on the local level and certainly here on the national level:

When you mark your ballot in your polling booth this November, it is a little late to evaluate the issues and candidates you are called upon to support or reject. Now is the time for every eligible voter to gather information and discuss with others the issues and their effect on the people, the community and the nation. Now is the time to take an interest in public affairs and support those candidates and measures that appear to offer the best long run solutions to the problems before us.

The United States plays a central role in a world of unprecedented change. This fall every voter will be expressing his opinion of policies and proposals that involve war, freedom and the stability of our economy to name a few. Our federal constitution established a balance of power between the federal government and the state and local governments which requires vigilence if it is to be maintained. An active and informed electorate is more vital than at any other time in our history to the future of a free society under representative government.

THE UNITED STATES IS FAILING TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES WHICH SPAIN OFFERS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted a dispatch from Madrid from the pen of John M. Hightower, AP correspondent in that city. I wish to compliment Mr. Hightower for his sound analysis of the situation. It will be noted that his statement generally parallels mine which was made to the House on June 20. Mr. Hightower's story is not only well written; it has a solid foundation of fact, and I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

I think it should be clearly noted that the Spanish bases have been one of the outstanding bargains for the United States of the postwar period. The expiration date of 1968 is approaching rapidly and it is highly important that base rights be renewed.

The Spanish Government no doubt anticipated assistance from the United States toward the reestablishment of that country as a member of the Atlantic Alliance with membership in NATO and with help in joining the European Common Market. This help has not been forthcoming. The United States has taken a cautious approach to the question and as a result there is an understandable measure of unhappiness on the part of the Spanish Government. It very definitely is to our advantage to have Spain, with its strongly anti-Communist leanings, firmly ensconced in the European community of nations.

I would hope that the committees of Congress would adopt a more vigorous interest in this situation. I would hope that appropriate committees would initiate inquiries regarding the tardiness that our Government has shown toward taking fullest advantage of the opportunities which are ours in Spain. We should be making a much more vigorous effort to further cement an alliance which is profitable and highly worthwhile to the United States.

The dispatch follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 14, 1966]

SPAIN UPS PRICE OF U.S. BASES

(By John M. Hightower)

MADRID, July 13.—For a dozen years, the United States has relied on air and naval bases in Spain to help support American forces committed to the defense of Western Europe. Today Spain's price for continuing these bases is going up, not in terms of economic and/or military hardware but in terms of diplomatic support.

In its foreign policy, Spain aims at establishing new economic and defense links with its neighbors in Western Europe and with the Atlantic Alliance. To achieve these goals, Spanish leaders want Washington's help. Failure to get it could jeopardize the renewal of the base agreement, which comes up for negotiation again in 1968.

Though no Spanish policy maker puts it in such precise terms, the Spanish government is looking to the Johnson Administration to:

Help overcome strong political opposition in some West European countries, dating back to the Spanish civil war 30 years ago, to accepting Spain as a member of the Atlantic Alliance.

Support Spain's now active interest in joining the six-nation European Common Market, which Spanish leaders consider vital to their booming economy.

Adopt a sympathetic attitude toward Spain's claim for sovereignty over Gibraltar, a British bastion at the Atlantic entrance to the Mediterranean for 250 years.

The U.S.-Spanish base agreement, made in 1953, partially broke this country's isolation from the West. American economic aid in the years immediately following helped to begin the modernization of the Spanish economy. Initial political changes have been undertaken more recently, and in the view of foreign diplomats here are likely to be accelerated in the future.

Spanish officials believe the time is at hand for other countries to make a place for Spain in the Western European and Atlantic communities. They argue that the civil war, which put Generalissmo Franco in power, has been over 27 years and their pro-Axis neutrally in World War II ended more than 20 years ago.

RAISING THE FEDERAL MAXIMUM PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the keynote to the success of our Nation's social security programs has been their dynamic nature to adapt to the change in times. This responsiveness has come from Congress' continuing examination of the programs. Last year, in response to rising needs of our aged poor, Congress raised the Federal matching share of public assistance programs to assist States in increasing coverage and payments to these individuals. As a result of this upgrading, the present Federal share of State public assistance payments is $31 of the first $37. For amounts in excess of $37, the Federal Government reimburses the States for payments up to $75 for each recipient. This reimbursement is based on a matching formula varying from 50 to 65 percent, depending upon the State's per capita income. Thus, for example, in a State where maximum 65 percent matching is available, a State will receive a total Federal payment of $55.70 for its $75 payment to elderly poor. However, the State does not receive any Federal matching for payments in excess of $75. Consequently, States desiring to increase payments above $75 a month for their aged poor presently have to bear the entire cost, and with the great strain already on State budgets and tax systems, they are unable to voluntarily upgrade their welfare programs.

Historically, it has been demonstrated that when Congress increases the maximum level for Federal matching, as we did in 1962 from $65 to $70, and in 1965 from $70 to $75, the States' average payments have increased. Unfortunately, the Federal maximum for matching has, in effect, become a ceiling over which the States are reluctant to go. At the present time there are many States whose average payments to the aged poor are very close to $75 monthly.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon us to reexamine our aid to the aged in the light of today's circumstances. To remedy this situation and encourage States to increase their public assistance payments to the aged and provide benefits more in line with today's living costs, I am introducing a bill which would raise the Federal maximum from $75 to $100 a month and provide Federal matching for the additional $25 on a 50–50 basis. Thus a State where assistance payments are eligible for the maximum variable matching of 65 percent would receive $68.20 from the Federal Government for a $100 monthly assistance payment to its aged recipients. I feel that this additional amount will encourage States to increase their aid to these persons. I am advised by the Welfare Administration that the cost for providing this incentive by increasing the Federal share, as I propose in my bill, would be approximately $45.4 million a year on the basis of present welfare payments. There would also be some added cost due to the increased incentive.

In the last 2 years we have cut Federal income and excise taxes by approximately $15 billion. We have helped the large corporate and individual taxpayer—we have assisted individuals who can well afford the luxuries of life. But the benefits of these reductions do not inure to aged persons on welfare. They receive none of these benefits. But they will get some benefit from my proposal. I believe that this additional cost is little enough on our part to provide the needed stimulus to States to increase their monthly welfare payments to its aged poor. It is little enough when you consider that this cash assistance will provide more food, clothing, and everyday necessities to these persons in adverse circumstances. It is certainly little enough that we do for our fellowman to update our programs in a way which is wholly consistent with our traditional Federal-State partnership.

THE CRIPPLING AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's airline industry is still in the throes of a nationwide labor dispute which has tied up the operations of five major trunklines. Negotiations in this strike have repeatedly been broken off, but mediation attempts are continuing after recommendations of fact-finding panels have not brought about a voluntary settlement. The machinery of the Railway Labor Act has not proved effective, and we now find ourselves in that helpless period during which the American public's only hope is for an eventual settlement of the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I have today written to our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers], the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce suggesting that he consider the appointment of a special subcommittee to "study in depth the issues and facts involved in this current dispute with a view toward developing an early settlement and to consider measures that might be recommended to prevent recurrence of these costly and disrupting nationwide strikes in our Nation's transportation industry."

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I am concerned that this crippling strike has not been brought to a satisfactory settlement, and I would hope that the action I have recommended to our chairman would receive his considerate attention.

I insert my letter to Chairman Staggers in the Record at this point in my remarks:

July 19, 1966.

Hon. Harley O. Staggers,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Since July 8 transportation services of five of our nation's major trunk airlines have been at a standstill due to a labor dispute. The five carriers involved haul about 60% of the nation's passenger traffic, substantial amounts of air freight and almost 70% of all air mail. Travel plans of millions have been disrupted and travel inconveniences has resulted to countless others. Meanwhile, thousands of non-striking airline employees have experienced or face future layoffs.

In terms of economic damage, the struck airlines are counting a $7 million a day loss in revenue. New York City estimates a $500,000 a day loss in tourist revenue, and Miami, $400,000 a day. Hawaii puts its losses at $2,225,000 a week and so it goes all over the country.

Currently prospects for settlement of this devastating work stoppage are not good, and after July 27 an additional trunk line faces shut-down if a new labor contract is not negotiated by that time. I refer to the vote of American Airlines employees to strike on or after that date if an agreement is not reached between the Transport Workers Union and the company by that time.

In the dispute between the International Association of Machinists and the five major carriers negotiations have reportedly broken off, mediation attempts have failed and fact-finding panels have made recommendations but no settlement is in view. All settlement means provided in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and we are now in that helpless period during which the public's only hope is for an eventual voluntary settlement of the strike.

The executive agencies of our government apparently are unable to bring about a settlement of this labor dispute but the Congress is not powerless to act. I respectfully suggest your considering the appointment of a special subcommittee of our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to study in depth the issues and facts involved in this current dispute with a view toward developing an early settlement and to consider measures that might be recommended to prevent recurrence of these costly and disrupting nation-wide strikes in our nation's transportation industry.

Your early consideration of this matter will, I am sure, be greatly appreciated by the long suffering American public.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

Ancher Nelsen,
Member of Congress.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, dozens of responsible business people in the Columbus, Ohio, area are feeling the impact of the continuing IAM strike against five key commercial airlines.

The President remains strangely silent, although whenever management was involved with guidelines, he did not hesitate to threaten reprisals.

Accordingly, I directed a telegram to the President yesterday as follows:

Dear Mr. President: Your democratic leadership in the House has frequently referred to you as "our courageous President." Recently, however, this phrase has not been used particularly as it relates to your lack of action in the current disastrous strike against the five key commercial airlines.

My constituents express great concern about your guideline in the steel industry, aluminum industry, etc., with possible reprisals against management, however, when unions such as IAM completely disregard your guidelines you are strangely silent even though millions of persons are seriously inconvenienced and the economy suffers multimillion dollar losses daily.

It is respectfully urged that you take action immediately to resolve this matter within the bounds of your emergency powers.

Samuel L. Devine,
Member of Congress.

It is hoped the Chief Executive will take courageous action promptly.

The following are some of the telegrams received by me on this important subject:

Columbus, Ohio,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. Samuel L. Devine,
2453 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Present airline strike causing extreme hardship to all our 125 member company. In many cases strike preventing air shipment of emergency parts and supplies necessary to filling Government orders required for war effort. All members will appreciate any assistance you and other Members of Congress can accomplish to end airline strike.

Board of Trustees,
Columbus Industrial Association.

Columbus, Ohio,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. Samuel L. Devine,
Representative to Congress,
2453 Rayburn House,
Washington, D.C.:

We are contacting you sir to advise you of the affect the present airlines strike is having upon business in general and Cryovac Incorporated in particular in addition to the inconvenience we are finding it impossible to meet certain negotiation commitments not knowing all the details concerning the labor-management dispute, am not suggesting the solution, however the public interest is not being served during this period and we are respectively requesting you to take whatever action you can to bring this to a quick settlement.

Very truly yours,

J. G. Pierce,
Cryovac, Inc.

Columbus, Ohio,
July 14, 1966.

Samuel Devine,
2453 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: Each day air strike prolonged additional thousands of dollars business lost by our company. Would appreciate whatever you can do to expedite settlement.

D. Neff,
American Express Co.

Columbus, Ohio,
July 14, 1966.

Representative Samuel Devine,
Washington, D.C.:

Flowers depend on air transportation. We are seriously affected by the airline strike. This should be terminated at once.

Roman J. Claprood Co.,
R.J. Claprood, *President.*

Columbus, Ohio,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. Samuel Devine,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please use your best influence to settle the air line strike as is it disrupting our operations.

H. U. Andreae,
President,
Jeffrey Manufacturing Co.

Columbus, Ohio,
July 14, 1966.

Congressman Samuel L. Devine,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative that legislative and/or executive action be taken to settle airline strike. Devastating effects being felt by all travel agencies and traveling public alike. We implore you to exert all influence necessary to achieve results.

Regards,

RICKLEW.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
July 15, 1966.

Hon. SAMUEL DEVINE,
2453 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you to use all available means to end airline strike. Country has been hampered long enough.

W. C. BLOOM,
Traffic Manager,
Marble Cliff Quarries Co.

MARYSVILLE, OHIO,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
2453 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a concern of national distribution our sales and marketing travel is greatly affected because of airline strike. We strongly urge every effort be made to bring striking union and airlines to speedy settlement.

O. M. SCOTT & SONS CO.,
F. LEON HERRON, JR.,
Executive Vice President.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
July 14, 1966.

Hon. Congressman SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
2453 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Present airline strike causing our company great inconvenience by restricting and some cases nullifying our personnel air travel and our many air shipments of necessary replacement parts. Airline strike also preventing air shipment of emergency replacement parts and supplies necessary to filling Government Service Administration contracts expedient for war effort.

JAEGER MACHINE CO.,
A. C. THOMAS,
President and Chairman of the Board.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
July 14, 1966.

Congressman SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
2453 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Will appreciate any effort you can make to bring an end to the crippling airline strike which is affecting our business and that of so many others in central Ohio.

PAUL W. NORRIS,
President, Denison Division, Abex Corp.

WAGE BOARD LEGISLATION

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 18, 1966, I introduced H.R. 16302, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Title I of H.R. 16302 is a declaration of policy title, and defines the purpose of the act. Summarized, the purpose of this act is to establish in the Government of the United States and of the District of Columbia a uniform system of determining and adjusting the rates of basic compensation of employees in recognized trades and crafts, or other skilled mechanical crafts, or in unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual-labor occupations, and other employees including foreman and supervisors, in positions having trade, craft, or laboring experience and knowledge as the paramount requirement.

There have been no significant changes in the original wage board legislation since it was first enacted in 1862. The proposal which I have introduced may not be perfect, but I believe that it is a step in the right direction. There are manifest inequities in the existing law, and my primary purpose in introducing this legislation is to correct such inequities insofar as they are correctable.

The wage board program as administered by the Navy Department was originally predicated upon legislation. In 1862 legislation was enacted to establish pay rates for the several crafts and trades in the Navy yards based upon prevailing rates for comparable work in the immediate vicinity of each yard. This legislation is the only specific legislative authority for administration of a wage board program. Although the heads of the several Government departments and agencies have responsibility through various pay bills, there is no specific uniform legislation to insure uniformity and consistency between departments in administration of the respective wage board programs.

In 1955 the various Government departments and agencies exercised their responsibility for administration of the wage board program within their respective departments. As the wage board program was expanded it was evident that a number of inconsistencies and differences in terms of methods of acquiring wage survey data, establishment of grade structures, and variance in pay rates for comparable positions developed. During the past 10 years these inequities have multiplied to the point where there is no comparability of pay for comparability of work for the same position between Government agencies. Consequently, employees performing identical work receive as much as 60 cents an hour difference because they work for different Government agencies within the same town.

The Government agencies also expand or contract the geographical wage survey areas to reflect to a degree the adjustment of the wage rates for wage board personnel employed in a given locale by that particular agency. Further, that upon establishment of a wage board program certain wage rates were frozen by the agency because the salary paid at that particular time in 1955 exceeded the going rate for comparable work in the private industry. Consequently, many Government employees have not received an adjustment in their pay rates during the past 10 years. There are also inconsistencies in the application of wage survey data within the defense departments and between defense and nondefense agencies. This truly reflects the major inequity within the Government service.

Without legislation it is impossible to rectify these inequities because of the reluctance of the various Government departments to adjust their rates. Each agency considers the wage board program it administers to be proper and that other Government agencies should consider adjusting their practices to meet its particular system. Further, it is evident that the creation of a uniform wage board program, governmentwide, to insure that all employees are properly compensated based upon prevailing rates for the work that they are performing, regardless of agency, can only be accomplished through the legislative process.

Using the Classification Act of 1949, as an analogy, the Government has recognized that white collar workers have assurance of uniformity and consistency in their wage rates because of enactment of the bill. Further, under the Classification Act General Schedule employees also receive additional step-increases because of longevity of service in a given position and grade level. This, however, is not afforded a substantial number of employees identified as the blue collar workers. We believe that such inequity should be rectified at the earliest possible date.

The proposed bill would eliminate many of the current inequities now practiced by the various Government departments and agencies. Further, it would insure uniformity in the treatment of all Government employees with respect to the adequate pay rates for their work and would eliminate substantially all if not all of the discrepancies now being followed in the administration of the wage board program by the Government departments and agencies. Some of the key features of the proposed bill are as follows:

It will provide for a uniform night differential of 10 percent above the day rate for wage board personnel identical to that now followed for Classification Act personnel. The present practice followed by the agencies ranges from a pay adjustment of 3 to 4 cents per hour to a 10 percent of the wage rate for night work by one agency.

It will reduce the number of wage board survey areas now being utilized under the different systems in use. It will also insure that wage survey areas are extended to include a major metropolitan area within the wage survey area to insure that there is adequate coverage of comparable work, thus insuring the proper pay rate for Government workers to that established in the private sector. Under the present system, geographical areas are changed at the discretion of individual departments and does not always reflect comparability of work and pay rates.

This bill will provide the various employee organizations equal representation in the development and administration of the wage board program. This no doubt will nullify if not completely reduce the large number of complaints about inequities of pay rates, the lack of representation, or participation from the local level to the national level as stated by these organizations.

The present system only permits employee organizations to make suggestions and recommendations which can be accepted or disregarded at will of the local wage committees and their respective departments.

The bill will insure the development of uniform position classification standards, governmentwide, and will insure that the application of such standards, regardless of department, is being followed. This is considered absolutely essential, otherwise classification standards as now developed are not consistent and are not comparable across department lines. Further, departments now follow a practice of adjusting classification standards for their own respective department without considering the impact on other classification standards administered by different departments. These changes frequently lead to differences in grade levels for comparable positions between departments and correspondingly reflect differences in rates of pay for the same class of work.

This bill will insure uniformity in the rates of pay authorized for specific positions where the same class of work is being performed in a given locale regardless of department or agency. There is no uniformity or consistency in the current system of wage board administration between the several government departments. If we are to follow the principle of equal pay for equal work it is mandatory to uniformity of pay rates across government department lines be followed. This is only possible through enactment of this bill. There are a number of existing examples whereby the same position involving substantially the same duties and responsibilities is now allocated at different grade levels ranging to three or four grades depending upon the particular department or agency administering its program. This leads to inequity in pay and extreme difficulty in any attempt to resolve such discrepancies because each department at present is insisting that its program is correct and should be strictly followed.

ECONOMIC STRENGTH PRODUCES GROWING FEDERAL REVENUES

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the budget results for the fiscal year 1966, announced today, reveal the great contribution that a strong, healthy economy can make to the productivity of our revenue system. Vigorous economic growth helps produce the Federal revenues so vital for meeting the needs of our Nation.

Since the first quarter of 1961 the average annual rate of increase in the gross national product has been nearly 6 percent, compared with only about 1½ percent during the preceding 5-year period. In the 5 years since 1961 unemployment has dropped from 6.8 to 4 percent of the labor force; the plant utilization rate in manufacturing has risen from 78 percent to 92.5 percent of capacity.

These and other factors—including the proposed tax legislation enacted promptly by the Congress in this session—have helped contribute to a record total of administrative budget receipts of $104.6 billion in fiscal year 1966, which is an impressive increase of more than $11.5 billion over 1965. This revenue increase contributed greatly to the sound financing of our defense requirements in Vietnam and our national needs at home.

It is quite evident that the vigorous economic growth in all sectors of our economy and the related increase in Federal revenues stem from the economic policy pursued by President Johnson and by President Kennedy before him. The extensive tax reductions of recent years, the investment tax credit, and the liberalization of business depreciation allowances have all contributed to strengthening business and consumer confidence in the Nation's economy.

I am certain that we can anticipate that President Johnson will continue to pursue a program of fiscal action—including close control of Federal expenditures—which is as economically sound as it has been in the past and which will help, in the months ahead, to promote economic growth and prosperity. We in the Congress should help him in this task, and not complicate the many problems ahead by adding unnecessarily to Federal spending. In this way we can help the economy continue to produce the revenues that will be needed during the months ahead.

OKLAHOMA CHEROKEE HILLS RESOURCE, CONSERVATION, AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT GAINS FREEMAN APPROVAL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I was present when Secretary of Agriculture Freeman approved the Cherokee Hills Resource, Conservation, and Development project for operations.

This marks a new era in resource development opportunities for the people in northeast Oklahoma—one they have been working toward for many years.

The project area of 1,325,440 acres covers three counties, Adair, Cherokee, and Delaware, in the Ozark highlands area in Oklahoma. It is located entirely within my congressional district and is, therefore, of vital concern to me.

Primary purposes of the project are to conserve, develop, and utilize the plant, mineral, soil, water, and human resources in order to improve the economic conditions in the area.

The plan Secretary Freeman approved was developed by the local people in the three counties of the area. It reflects the desire of our people to move ahead economically. Some specific objectives of the plan are:

Accelerate pastureland program.

Speed up conservation measures to prevent erosion and excessive runoff of water.

Encourage the development of location of industry in the area to provide additional job opportunities.

Provide recreational and tourism facilities.

Expand and improve livestock enterprises.

Improve woodland income.

Upgrade existing housing.

Establish research activities aimed at tick eradication, brush control, horticultural crop production, and fishing water management.

And enlarge and improve the paved road network.

These are long-range and ambitious undertakings. I know the people of this area—backed by local leadership and Government cooperation—can and will succeed. I commend the local people and the soil and water conservation districts of Adair, Cherokee, and Delaware Counties that are sponsoring the project. They have my full support.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. NARAYANAN AND HIS FAMILY

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing a private bill for the relief of Dr. C. H. Narayanan and his family. Formerly a professor of zoology at Christian College in Madras, India, in 1961 Dr. Narayanan received a Fulbright travel grant for study in the United States. In 1964, he received his Ph. D. from the University of Kansas, and returned to India to continue his teaching and research. Dr. Narayanan's field of special interest is concerned with the growth and physiology of the nervous system in embryos. The doctor's research has involved microsurgery on chick embryos; this sort of experimentation deals with fundamental issues of the relation of the nervous system to behavior. It is hoped that such research can be eventually useful for an understanding of human normal and pathological nerve function.

It is obvious that Dr. Narayanan's field is a very sophisticated one; and upon his return to India, he found that there were virtually no opportunities for him to employ his technical knowledge and skills in neurobiology within his own country. Consequently, he began to explore opportunities for productive work in his field outside India. Washington University in St. Louis anticipated a key vacancy in its department of biology in the summer of 1966, and it seemed that Dr. Narayanan was one of the few men in the world who could fill this vacancy with competence. Dr. Narayanan accepted the appointment from Washington University, and planned to come to the United States in 1966, 2 years after he had returned to India. However, the doctor's reentry to the United States was hastened a year when he accepted, at the urgent request of the University of Kansas, an appointment as a visiting professor there during the academic year 1965–1966. Evidently an unexpected vacancy had arisen in the doctor's special area of competence; and Dr. Narayanan felt that to refuse the University of Kansas at that time would have been sheer disloyalty on his part. The doctor planned to return to the United States a year early, and did so in August 1965. To finance his family's trip over here, he had to sell all his property, and quite effectively cut his ties with India. He anticipated permanent residence in the United States, since he had accepted a permanent position with Washington University after his two semesters at the University of Kansas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is where the problems started. Since Dr. Narayanan had not resided in his native country for 2 years after leaving the United States in 1964, he was not legally eligible for a permanent resident visa. However, he was unaware of this restriction, and his communication with the U.S. consulate did not reveal this difficulty. The doctor and his family came over here, and he has spent the last year at the University of Kansas. He is now residing in St. Louis and working at Washington University. His wife is also a scientist, and is working on a research assistantship in biochemical genetics toward her Ph. D. People who have worked with the doctor and who know him and his family attest to his fine character and to the significant contribution which he is making in a vital field of research. Yet, because he spent only 14 months in India before returning to the United States, he and his family are now scheduled for deportation on August 13, 1966.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this action is causing undue hardship to Dr. Narayanan. His competence in a highly specialized field is not in demand in India. While he could resume his teaching career there, as he attempted to do, he would remain frustrated and would undoubtedly continue his efforts to leave the country for a place where he could practice his specialty. India would undoubtedly gain little by his forced return. On the other hand, his technical skills are in demand in this country, and could be put to good use. Washington University houses a laboratory which is both a pioneer and a major world center for this type of research; it is one of three such laboratories in the country, and is providing leadership in this area. The importance of its work is attested by major support from the National Institutes of Health over a long period of years. There is substantial reason to believe that these embryological studies of the nervous system and motility in prenatal stages will shed light on congenital failures of the human nervous system in spastic dysfunction and on disorders of the muscles and joints such as in muscular dystrophy. Since the benefits deriving from such research are applicable worldwide, Dr. Narayanan can make no greater contribution than to apply his competence at this strategic center. His continued research there would be of undoubted benefit to this country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would grant to Dr. Narayanan and his family permanent residence in the United States. I am certain that they could make a very fine and worthwhile contribution; my bill would allow the doctor to continue to employ his talents in a field of research which is vital to us all.

IRS RULING WEAKENS EFFORTS TO UPGRADE NATION'S SKILLS

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recent news reports on a proposed change in the tax treatment of educational expenses vividly illustrates how one agency of the Government can undermine an important national policy objective.

The need to upgrade the quality of education in our country and to broaden educational opportunities has been recognized as essential in order to minimize unemployment, reduce poverty, and make civil rights legislation meaningful. Our Government is spending billions on education, including manpower training, vocational education, military training, and general assistance to both public and private schools.

In spite of these billions of direct Federal aid, the most important aspect of education is what individuals can do for themselves. Currently educational expenses by individuals have been deductible from income tax, although only under highly restrictive and, in my opinion, inadequate circumstances.

Instead of moving to encourage self-education, however, the Internal Revenue Service now proposes to stiffen the rules even further. Prentice Hall Federal Taxes Report Bulletin said the effect of the proposed rules would be "devastating," with teachers among those who would be dealt "the most telling blow." How ironic that this comes precisely at the time when general agreement exists on the need for more and better trained teachers.

It is still not to late for the IRS to reverse its stand. Hearings on the proposal will be held August 6 in order to receive comments from interested parties. I hope my colleagues who feel as I do and others who may read these remarks take advantage of this opportunity to make their views known. If the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are sincere about their wish to upgrade skills and encourage education through our society, and then I would expect that they too could lend some useful influence to killing this proposed change in the rules.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD news stories from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times of July 13, 1966.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 1966]

TAX REPORT: A SPECIAL SUMMARY AND FORECAST OF FEDERAL AND STATE TAX DEVELOPMENTS

Educational-expense deduction rules will be tightened by the IRS.

The Service proposed new rules aimed at clarifying and stiffening its policy on the deductions. Its position has long been generally to allow deductions for schooling expenses to improve a taxpayer's skills in a present job but not to prepare for a better one. The Service now specifies, among other changes, that beginning next Jan. 1 it will generally disallow educational expenses leading to a degree on the ground that such academic achievement will either meet minimum reqirements for a taxpayer to keep a job he has obtained without fully meeting its requirements; or qualify him for a better job even if he didn't originally have that in mind.

The IRS also clarified that expenses incurred to meet minimum educational requirements of a job similarly won't be allowed as a deduction even if the taxpayer was hired on this condition. For example, a teacher hired during a teacher shortage without the minimum educational background couldn't write off the cost of bringing himself up to the minimum, the Service says. On the other hand, the revenuers add, teachers required to take further courses periodically to retain their status in a school system will still be able to deduct the expense.

The IRS has invited comments on the proposed rules by Aug. 6 and will hold a public hearing.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 13, 1966]

A TAXING SITUATION

The Internal Revenue Service agent who took his employer to court and won the right to deduct his law-school expenses would be among the last to win this deduction if new regulations stick.

Alarmed over the growing number of taxpayer victories in this area, the tax agency has revised its regulations. Tough new rules would have "devastating" effects on most taxpayers seeking educational-expense deductions, while teachers and those taking law-school courses would be dealt the most telling blow, according to the Prentice Hall Federal Taxes Report Bulletin.

Most educational expenses, the future would appear to be limited to relatively short courses. Write the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Attention: CC: LR: T, Washington, D.C. 20224 by Aug. 8, if you wish to comment at a later public hearing. Some experts think the current rules will not be significantly changed.

OUTLOOK UNFAVORABLE FOR THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, the prospects for an improvement in our balance-of-payments position this year have faded and the likelihood now is that the deficit will almost double from the 1965 level. The estimate was made recently by the National Foreign Trade Council, which is composed of major corporations engaged in foreign trade or having foreign operations.

The council has estimated that the deficit for 1966 will total $2.5 billion, up from $1.3 billion in 1965. The most discouraging note is that our trade surplus is expected to shrink substantially. With imports expected to increase by 15 percent over last year while exports increase only 9 percent, the surplus on our trade account probably will drop to about $4 billion, the lowest since 1959.

Is this the "approximate" balance in our international accounts which Treasury Secretary Fowler promised earlier this year?

Under unanimous consent I place an article from the July 5 Wall Street Journal and another from the July 5 New York Times, both reporting the council's predictions, in the Record at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 5, 1966]

Foreign Trade Council Sees Widening of U.S. Payments Deficit in 1966—Total Forecast at $2.5 Billion, Up Sharply From January Estimate and $1.3 Billion Figure in 1965

New York.—The National Foreign Trade Council, revising an earlier forecast, predicted the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit would widen in 1966 to $2.5 billion from $1.3 billion in 1965.

In January, the council predicted that the 1966 payments deficit—the excess of funds flowing abroad over all money received from foreigners—would run between $500 million and $1.2 billion, the smallest in nine years.

Significant factors in the revision, according to some 40 economists and financial executives who make up a council balance-of-payments study group, are the "increasing rate of imports and increased military costs."

The council's latest report anticipates that imports during 1966 will total $24.7 billion, up from $23.7 billion in the original estimate and a 15% increase from last year's import total of $21.5 billion. The council estimated in its latest report that exports would amount to $28.7 billion in 1966, revised downward from $29.1 billion in the earlier report, but a 9% increase from exports of $26.3 billion in 1965.

The council also had originally estimated that U.S. exports in 1966 would grow at a faster rate than imports, resulting in a merchandise-trade surplus—an excess of exports over imports—of $5.4 billion for the year. However, the revised figures indicate a trade surplus of only $4 billion, $1.4 billion below the council's earlier prediction; it also would be the smallest trade surplus since 1959.

In the area of military expenditures abroad, the council increased its estimate to $3.5 billion from $3.3 billion after taking note of the Vietnam situation and possible added costs in the relocation of NATO installations in Europe. Spending abroad for military purposes totaled $2.9 billion in 1965, the council noted.

The council is composed of major corporations engaged in foreign trade or having foreign operations.

Forecast of Gain in Trade Reduced—National Council's Estimate of 1966 Surplus Cut by More Than $1 Billion—$4 Billion Margin Seen—Excess of Exports by United States Over Imports Would Be Smallest Since 1959

(By Gerd Wilcke)

The National Foreign Trade Council, a nonprofit group with more than 600 corporate members, announced yesterday it had lowered its estimate of this year's United States export surplus by more than a billion dollars.

In a revision of its annual outlook report, the council's balance-of-payments group estimated that United States commercial merchandise exports would total $28.7-billion in 1966 and that imports would run to $24.7-billion.

This would leave a trade surplus of $4-billion, the smallest since 1959 and $1.4-billion below the group's original projection made in January. Last year, the surplus was $4.8-billion.

Administration officials concerned with the problems resulting from the nation's unfavorable international payments position had hopes earlier this year that the trade surplus might reach $6-billion in 1966. However, in the first quarter, the surplus shrank to an annual rate of $4.4-billion.

EXPORT GROUP'S PROPOSALS

The new Trade Council estimates are expected to lend weight to recommendations made recently by the National Export Expansion Council.

These recommendations called for greater utilization of credit and financing resources, more realistic administration of tax regulations that now cause United States parent companies to supply their overseas subsidiaries from foreign sources instead of exporting materials from this country, and a reduction by the Federal Maritime Commission of disparities in ocean freight rates.

Although exports and imports are still expected to set records this year, the Trade Council increased its import estimate by $1-billion and trimmed its export forecast.

The revised projections, made by about 40 financial specialists representing companies with heavy overseas interests, indicate a 15 per cent increase in imports from last year's $21.5-billion, but only a 9 per cent increase over last year's $26.3-billion export volume.

OUTLOOK ON PAYMENTS

In their original outlook report, the Trade Council's experts projected an international payments deficit ranging from $500-million to $1.2-billion.

At its midyear meeting last week in New York, the group revised this estimate to a deficit of $2.5-billion. It blamed increases in imports and military costs.

In assessing the nation's total international transactions, the group estimated that over-all United States payments this year would amount to $46-billion. While receipts from foreigners would total $43.5-billion.

The group anticipated that the growth in exports would accelerate in the second half of the year. This optimism was based on a survey of the council's members that indicated shipments would increase to Australia, New Zealand, Europe and the Far East. The group also predicted the import expansion rate would level off.

UNUSUAL "ARMY" OF INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS ENGAGES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY—PART 4

Mr. **SMITH** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CRAMER**. Mr. Speaker, following is the final in a series of six articles which have been published in recent editions of the St. Petersburg Times. Part 1 appeared in the Record of July 12 at page 15362, part 2 appeared in the Record of July 13 at page 15484, and part 3 appeared in the Record of July 14 at page 15774:

Legal Services: More Soldiers for Hardeman Regiment

(Editor's Note.—Times Staff writers Jack Nease and Bette Orsini today continue their inquiry into the fiscal affairs of a $2.36-million complex of anti-poverty operations run by Thomas P. Hardeman. So far the reporters have been denied access to records of programs supported wholly by public funds and denied knowledge of the true ownership of the land leased by these organizations with public funds.)

(Sixth of a series)

(By Bette Orsini and Jack Nease)

Sometime soon a "Help Wanted" sign will go up for 21 attorneys and twice that many secretaries and clerks to provide legal aid for Florida's migrant farm workers.

On the surface they will be hired by Migrant Legal Services (MLS) Inc., a new non-profit corporation formed to handle the $806,000 program as part of the national administration's "War on Poverty."

But when the attorneys and others go to work they'll probably find their paychecks signed not by an MLS officer but by Thomas P. Hardeman.

And if the legal aid program follows the path of another migrant aid program set up in the same way, Hardeman will be the real boss.

Hardeman, who is both vice president of the Community Service Foundation (CSF) of Largo and president of the Community Action Fund (CAF), now of Bradenton, added the legal care program to his anti-poverty complex only recently.

He apparently did it by convincing federal officials it would be cheaper and more efficient to handle bookkeeping for the new program through his own CAF.

But CAF's bookkeeping appears to fall far short of that ordinarily required for public funds.

CAF checks are kept helter-skelter in the bottom drawer of a file cabinet. There's no systematic way of relating checks to the bills they are supposed to pay. And the woman who writes the checks is paid not by CAF but by CSF.

The chain works this way:

Hardeman is employed by CSF and paid—according to the only records available for public inspection—from federal funds allotted CSF for training of Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA).

Hardeman in turn employed Jack Mansfield, who is also paid by CSF presumably from the same VISTA training funds.

Together Hardeman and Mansfield help run a $610,000 program through CAF to help educate migrants and improve their housing.

They employ a director to run this program, but it is apparent from watching office operation that Hardeman and Mansfield have been running things since the original program director was fired. CAF employes confirm this.

Now Mansfield has turned up as president of the new MLS group. The original application to the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) listed Howard Garrett, a Tampa attorney, as president but Garrett has since been moved over to chairman of the board.

William Garcia, another Tampa attorney who is secretary-treasurer of MLS, has said the group will let CAF handle all checks and other accounting in the interest of economy.

Garcia noted this was contemplated in the original CAF application. That application was prepared by Hardeman and Mansfield.

The application anticipates hiring of an executive director for the new program at a salary between $16,000 and $20,000 a year.

Two assistant directors at $15,000 to $17,000 a year each, six regional directors at $14,000 to $16,000 each and 12 associate regional directors at $7,000 to $15,000 each also will be hired.

All must be attorneys.

In addition there will be 20 secretaries, 26 "service assistants," three investigators and a driver. Law students and professors will be paid for part-time work. The students will get a maximum of $3 an hour and the professors a maximum of $10 per hour.

The application to OEO said the new program will be a "component" of CAF but would have a separate board of directors "to preserve its autonomy in matters of policy and personal hiring, and to insure that the lawyers employed by the program will be free to devote their primary duty of loyalty to the clients served by the program.

"It is expected, however, that there will be the closest possible cooperation and coordination between the Legal Service Program component and all other component programs of the CAF.

"The central administrative staff (of MLS) will have offices adjacent to the administrative offices of CAF in St. Petersburg and, where possible, the pilot legal service offices in the field will be established in or near the centers established or used by CAF.

"The legal service program will also utilize the central purchasing, bookkeeping and other resources of CAF," the application said.

At present CAF bookkeeping is handled by Walt Neiger but checks are signed only by Hardeman and Hazel Ramsey, who works for Hardeman on the CSF payroll.

The new program will be experimental in that various approaches will be tried. In one region, for example, attorneys, will maintain regular office hours at places close to migrants. In another region attorneys will be taken from place to place in a trailer.

The application said migrants need legal aid to protect their children against violation of child labor laws, to insure that their employers make Social Security payments for them, to make sure they are treated fairly by "crew leaders," to help secure welfare services, to secure voting rights, and to represent them in court in criminal cases when no public defender is provided.

They also need legal aid, it said, to help enforce housing codes and other laws designed to protect them and others.

The program will be conducted in Hillsborough, Manatee, Sarasota, Hardee, Lee, Hendry, Collier, Highlands, Okeechobee, St. Lucie, Palm Beach, Martin, Broward and Dade Counties.

James C. Cordell, regional legal services representative for the OEO in Atlanta, was quoted earlier this week by the Associated Press as saying the program was initiated by the federal government but Wednesday he denied this.

Cordell said CAF initiated the program.

A LAWYER'S COMMENT ON TITLE IV

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are receiving a considerable amount of mail as it relates to President Johnson's current civil rights bill, H.R. 14765, and specifically expressing concern over title IV as it relates to housing.

Among the many letters on this subject I have received from the 12th Congressional District of Ohio was one I thought to be worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress. It appears to be objective and unemotional based on the thinking of a responsible lawyer from Columbus. The letter follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
July 5, 1966.

Re Title IV of the civil rights bill—H.R. 14765; S. 3296.

Congressman SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEVINE: I write to you as an Ohio lawyer and citizen with this consolation to you—that I have never written before to a Congressman or even a newspaper editor.

I have been glad to see Negro progress and, indeed, I feel that they have made progress in the last two or three years. Further, I believe that although this progress exceeded their previous gains since the Civil War in this country—that they have a long, hard trip ahead.

The day should never occur again that the American Negro is not considered man by man along with all other races where public accomodations are concerned. However, this has no application to private ownership of a home or any other private matter not withstanding race, color or creed. The cause of the American Negro will be set back if Title IV of the above mentioned legislation is passed and later implemented.

There are many situations in this country and elsewhere where the right to belong to a given club, church or other organization is denied some nationality, race, creed or religion. This is as it should be so long as the right of private property exists and so long as the right to access to public property exists.

Even though I am a white American citizen of the largest ethnic background in this country—I, too, am not permitted to join every club or organization in my home community and I see no real reason why I should need legislation to force entrance into these organizations that do not want me for some reason or another.

I want to learn and I am learning to accept the Negro in public places and I am ashamed of my thoughts to the contrary. The process is one of education. However, the right to sell or rent private property should remain inviolate. The resistance to Title IV would be so great, I predict, that it would be impossible to implement and therefore would become a farce.

No doubt there will be strong pressures placed upon you in your political position and you will receive many threats concerning your continuance in office, but I should like to tell you that whether or not you vote for this legislation I will not change my opinion of you on a long run basis.

Sincerely,

STANTON G. DARLING.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MODERN REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the dynamics of freedom which were unleashed by the American Revolution must never be permitted to abate—lest the genius of our forefathers be lost forever.

Each American should regularly renew his dedication to preserving the elements of freedom which the American Revolution brought to fruition in our land.

We must also work to frustrate the forces of tyranny—both within and without—which hope to retard our Revolution only two centuries after its successful inception.

Both the House and Senate have adopted a joint resolution, cosponsored by 10 Members of this body, to create an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. On July 4, 1966, the legislation received Executive approval.

Those of us who cosponsored this resolution were mindful that it places special emphasis upon developing scholarly and historically accurate research and reports which will help to focus world attention upon the history, culture, and political thought of our incipient Revolutionary period. Thus, we hope to promote a renewed awareness of our Revolution, and new insights into its meaning.

The true significance of our Revolution has never been thoroughly understood or appreciated. This was the genius of our Nation; the foundation of our Republic; a landmark time in the development of the science and art of government by the people.

Our Revolution is at once historical and contemporary. Our Revolution is, or should be, continuing and progressing. We cannot allow it to wane. Tragically, other nations, other ideologies, are attempting to usurp and plagiarize our Revolution. Even the Communists are stealing, practically verbatim, many of the most fundamental principles of the American Revolution for their own deceitful purposes.

We are already in the bicentennial period of the American Revolution because the movement began more than a decade before that immortal shot "heard 'round the world" was fired at Concord Bridge in 1775.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself a "revolutionary" in the sense that I welcome change. I seek to continue the inherent vitality and want to promote the basic concepts of our Revolution. The forces it set in motion, the ideas it introduced, must never subside if we are to retain our freedoms, our opportunities, and our independence.

I resent the vulgar, bearded, unbathed imposters who fancy themselves as "revolutionaries" and who profess a superficial concern for their fellow man while within range of a camera, but who debauch themselves and their community else times. Their true goal is destruction of the American dream.

During our bicentennial, I am not interested in merely reenacting the pageantry of a bygone age, or in trying to "guild the lily" with pedantic dissertations, or in developing new interpolations of history. I am anxious to review the great moments, to rethink the revolutionary thoughts, to revive the magnificent ideas, and to rekindle the revolutionary spirit in the minds and aspirations of our citizenry—especially among our young people—who seem hungry for valid ideas and who are groping for the security of worthwhile values.

Liberty of inhabitants, individual freedom, equal opportunity, free enterprise, belief in God, private ownership of property, limited and constitutional republican government—all are noble principles which sparked the greatest revolution in history and forged dramatic change. I believe we are beginning to stagnate because we have disdained change, become complacent, and have abdicated our own Revolution. We must maintain the revolutionary attitude—that change is essential in a dynamic society. Our Constitution was not a "limiting" force—it was a document to free people from oppression and domination by governments and tyrants.

The bicentennial celebration is appropriate for an introspective review of the meaning of our Revolution, and a national and personal rededication to the principles upon which it was based.

To be historically accurate, the 200th anniversary cannot be a celebration wholly planned, executed and dominated by government—especially the Federal Government. State governments, private associations and individual citizens should participate. Schools of all levels, the news media, churches and service organizations should become involved early.

The culmination of all effort on July 4, 1976, can be coordinated by the Bicentennial Commission, but it should include everyone who considers himself an American.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission will develop a program which not only commemorates our Revolution, but which honors the principles of our Revolution, and regenerates its spirit and goals in a manner which not only inspires our own citizenry, but which favorably impresses the developing nations of the world.

I trust that not only our distinguished historical societies and our learned students of history will participate, but that every thinking citizen—particularly our youth—will become personally involved in the celebration, commemoration and rededication to the greatest revolution known to man.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, our current struggle to repel Communist aggression in Vietnam may have caused many of us to momentarily forget that there are other millions of people who once enjoyed freedom but who now live under the iron glove of totalitarian control.

Back in 1959, President Eisenhower signed the first proclamation that set aside the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. In that proclamation, it was stated that the President was further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation "each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Today, 7 years later, the captive nations listed in that first proclamation remain captive—nations such as Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. One of the captive nations listed in 1959 was North Vietnam, where we battle today in an effort to keep yet another nation from being added to the growing list. Since that first Captive Nations Week 7 years ago, Cuba has been added to the list, a glaring example of Communist subversion and subjugation a mere 90 miles from our shores.

It is unfortunate that none of the fundamental political and human rights for which mankind has struggled through the ages have yet been restored to any of the nations dominated by Communist imperialism. That bare fact should stir within us a desire to renew our pledge to those captive peoples who still look to us as the real hope of freedom in the world. We must not forget these people for one instant or be misled by those who would tell us that there are different types of communism and that some types are softening and can be trusted. All are pledged to the subjugation of mankind and their goals have not diminished one bit over the years.

Mr. Speaker, the free world must commit itself openly and with vigor to the principles of self-determination so that the captive people of the world can take new hope in the promise that we will not digress from these stated goals. During this Captive Nations Week, let us renew our pledge.

DISASTER THREATENS TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Wyatt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, an imminent and a real disaster threatens the timber industry, the economy of Oregon, the economy of the Northwest, and indeed could have a widespread and far-reaching effect upon the economy of our entire country.

Despite the desperate needs for housing in many areas of this country, the high interest rates on mortgage loans are putting a virtual brake on new commitments for home construction. Because of the widespread use of wood and wood products in home construction, this drastic decline is being felt now and will be felt much more by the lumber industry in the Northwest, and particularly in my home State of Oregon.

Surface inspection could easily lull those not directly involved in this critical industry into a complacent attitude, but the warning signals are plainly visible to anyone who is willing to look. Thus far the full effects of the current high interest rates for mortgage money are not as visible as they will be in another 4 to 6 weeks. Commitments made prior to the present money market conditions have helped sustain the home building industry to date. However, as these commitments expire, renewals are being made at a greatly diminished rate.

The high interest rates in the mortgage market are not peculiar or unique. The whole spectrum of rates has been rising steadily in recent months, reflecting the tight money policy that is effected in times of inflationary pressures.

But in an economy as complex as that of the United States, a general rule such as a "tight money policy" is seldom felt generally. Because of the delicate balance and structure of the various money markets, relative shifts in rates affect different sectors of the economy with varying degrees of force. I am certain that I am not exaggerating in saying that in the case here at hand, the home construction industry has been virtually hit by a truck, while many other private sectors continue on relatively unscathed, at least directly.

National income figures show that private investment in the United States will increase from the record $52 billion last year to almost $62 billion this year, the highest level ever. And yet at the same time, the housing industry figures have slipped to the lowest levels since 1954.

It is bad enough that desperately needed housing is not being constructed. The White House Commission on Civil Rights has suggested that 2 million homes a year are a bare minimum in new starts if we are to make a real imprint on this Nation's housing requirements. Based on current projections, the annual construction rate will be down from 1.5 million units last year to 1.1 million units by the end of this year. Figures released just today reveal that, on a seasonally adjusted basis, building permit applications are down 15 percent from the May to June level this year and over 25 percent from last year's level. One expert has stated that this decline is one of the most drastic that has been experienced in a number of years. At a time when the rate should be increasing to meet the growing needs of the Nation, these figures are indeed discouraging. It is almost certain that the decline will continue into 1967 unless prompt, effective remedial actions are taken.

Even the decline to the projected 1.1 million units means the loss of 800,000 jobs directly in new home construction. To the lumber industry, it means a decrease in the lumber market of nearly 5 billion board feet with an untold loss of jobs directly involved here. The cumulative, multiplied effect upon the rest of our economy, both in Oregon and in the balance of this country, is almost beyond belief.

We in Oregon face a potentially genuine recession of most serious proportion this fall unless this problem is given immediate and concentrated attention by the administration.

I do not wish to get into a discussion of whether or not the Federal Reserve Board is responsible for today's high interest rates. That is another question. But certainly the genesis of our problem is the decision made in January 1966 by the Johnson administration that, despite the ever-broadening war in Vietnam, we would continue to operate our domestic economy not only upon a business-as-usual basis, but on an expanded basis. Our domestic expenditures have increased very substantially. New and expensive social welfare programs, some quite experimental in nature, have been undertaken in spite of the clear warnings that many of us have sounded. Other such programs have been greatly expanded. The implementing of this series of programs with a seeming disregard for their economic overtones could only lead to the dangerous threshold upon which this country is now standing.

It has been the overheating of the economy, the continuation to appropriate and spend money at a substantially greater rate than we have received it, which has resulted in the present inflationary spiral. Immediate steps should be taken and policies announced to correct the cause of our present difficulty. New and experimental spending programs adopted by the Congress should be suspended until this emergency has been coped with effectively. A specific example is the Sales Participation Act of 1966, which I voted against for this very reason. The offering of these Government securities at the proposed high interest rate on the money market today will cause further chaos and will compound our difficulties.

An indication of the present status of the magnitude of our problem is the situation of the savings and loan institutions in this country. Examination of their deposits compared to last month and to last year, show that the depositors are ceasing to be attracted by the interest rates which the savings and loan have been offering. Raised ceilings on rates allowed by commercial banks have given them other more attractive uses for their money. So the interest war prospers.

Firm, wise leadership by this administration is the only tool available to avert this disaster. This is not the first situation where problems, either because of indecisiveness or oversight, are handled only after they have become crises. It may be that a problem nipped in the bud does not draw as much attention as a disaster which can be treated with flourish.

Unless the basic fiscal policies of this administration are corrected at once, then at best only patchwork remedial action can offer any hope at all to alleviate the present situation. Nonetheless such actions should at once be undertaken.

To illustrate, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or "Fannie Mae," which since its creation has been about the most effective tool in maintaining equilibrium in the general secondary market for home mortgages, is currently in dire straits. During 1966, FNMA's mortgage-buying activities, which reflect the varying degrees of tightness in the money markets, have reached unprecedented levels. This is a sign of the critically dwindling supply of available mortgage funds. To curtail the demand on its funds, which are limited by law to a certain ceiling amount, FNMA has been forced to impose certain arbitrary restrictions and limitations on loan requirements, all of which are selective and discriminatory in nature. Unless market conditions are improved drastically, FNMA will be forced to apply new buying restrictions or face a discontinuation of its operations as early as October. These consequences simply cannot be afforded by the home building industry or the American public.

To handle this problem temporarily, the Congress is now considering two bills which would increase the borrowing authority of FNMA in order to ride out the storm.

But this patchwork, "finger-in-the-dike" action, will not get to the root of the trouble, nor will it do much more than to slow the impact of the irresponsible fiscal policies which have been followed. Action must be taken now, with efficient haste and with definite firmness. Token, half-hearted efforts devised to appease all sides and interests will only worsen the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the warning signs are very clear. I call upon the President and the administration and I call on the Congress to take the action I have indicated to prevent this disaster at once.

FAILURE OF VICE PRESIDENT TO EXERCISE RESPONSIBLE JUDGMENT

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States reached the pinnacle of irresponsibility yesterday when he departed from his prepared text in speaking to the National Association of Counties meeting in New Orleans and said:

> I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt.

Unfortunately, his remarks were carried in the press and as I rode in this morning, I heard them repeated over the air on several occasions.

Mr. Speaker, this untimely comment will be seized upon by leaders of the lawless hordes as a virtual license to riot and revolt against authority. The need for restraint has never been greater than at this moment in history and one would think that we could expect from the second highest office in the land a clarion call for respect of law and order. Instead we hear from him remarks which can be interpreted only as condoning and encouraging violence in the streets.

Future outbreaks of violence and demonstrations of contempt for law and order will be attributable in some measure to Hubert Humphrey's reckless disregard of commonsense and his failure to exercise responsible judgment. Only the President can say anything to offset the Vice President's remarks and I have just sent him the following telegram:

> Dear Mr. President: I urge you, as strongly as I know how, to issue a statement immediately which will counteract Vice President Humphrey's unfortunate remarks in New Orleans yesterday. Only you can negate the effects of this irresponsibility as his utterance gives license to pillage and plunder, rob or kill. Respect for law and order is at the lowest level in our history. The time demands the most unequivocal statement from the leader of our nation assuring all Americans that your Administration stands on the side of the law-abiding citizen and for the protection of his life and property.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Albert Watson.

I trust that the President will be disposed to act in line with my request for otherwise I fear for the safety of every citizen of this land.

VICTIMS OF THE RISING COST OF LIVING

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today the Veterans Committee of the House begins hearings on legislation to improve the non-service-connected pensions of this Nation's veterans. While this type of pension was increased in 1964, the increase has not offset the loss of part of the veteran's dollar due to the present inflationary trend. Of course, it is conceded that inflation is a most brutal form of taxation, especially in the case of those who rely on fixed-income sources. Well over 100 bills to correct this problem have been submitted, and it is hoped that some form of relief will be forthcoming from the committee's deliberations.

Various devices to improve the financial status of low-income groups are making the headlines these days. For instance, much is being said about a guaranteed wage for those earning $3,000 or under. In addition, the rent-supplement idea utilizes Federal funds to help the less fortunate with their housing problems. In contrast to these controversial vehicles, proposals for veteran relief, such as H.R. 6455, which I have introduced, would not entail the outright grant of Federal funds but would remove the penalty now in force regarding amounts paid to a veteran under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs. These various sources of income to which the veteran is now entitled would be excluded from consideration as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension.

Veterans benefits have long been accepted as a form of appreciation for the sacrifices rendered by former servicemen. This Nation's listing of many thousands of war dead attest to the total commitment expected of those who served in the Armed Forces. I believe it is only fitting that this Nation reciprocate in providing for those veterans in need the wherewithal to enjoy a future complete with the basic needs of life.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MAY ASK VICE PRESIDENT TO DEVELOP NEW MARITIME POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, if it is true, as reported in the Baltimore Sun of July 17, 1966, that President Johnson has asked Vice President HUMPHREY to develop and coordinate a new maritime policy, it could be good news.

The new policy promised in the President's 1965 state of the Union message is long overdue, and I think the Vice President might be a happy choice for this assignment.

A plan to revive this badly deteriorated industry is sorely needed and the Vice President's understanding and persuasive powers might make him an excellent choice.

The members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on both sides of the aisle, would, I am sure, view his selection with confidence if Vice President HUMPHREY is selected for this important assignment.

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's Washington Post, the Vice President of the United States went into one of our largest Southern cities last night, while major outbreaks of lawlessness were deeply scarring several other of our big cities, and expressed what seemed to be sympathy for mob disregard of law and order.

Mr. Speaker, may I read from the article, datelined New Orleans, July 18, in this morning's Washington Post:

> NEW ORLEANS, July 18.—Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY said today that if he had to live in a city ghetto with rats nibbling on his children's toes, he might "lead a mighty good revolt" himself.
>
> Addressing the National Association of Counties conference here, he called for a national drive to wipe out slum housing.
>
> Without rent supplements or rent subsidies for the poor, he said, "We will have open violence in every major city and county in America . . ."
>
> "People will not live like animals," HUMPHREY said in departing from his prepared text.
>
> "I'd hate to be stuck on a fourth floor of a tenement with rats nibbling on the kids' toes—and they do—with garbage uncollected—and it is—with the streets filthy, with no swimming pools, with little or no recreation."
>
> HUMPHREY told the county officials that if he were forced to live under such conditions, "I think you'd have more trouble than you have had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions."

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House deplores slum conditions, and every Member—regardless of party—deplores riot, revolt, and rebellion. I sincerely hope that this almost incredibly irresponsible statement by the second highest official in our Nation, the man who stands one heartbeat from the White House, was incorrectly reported by the Washington Post.

If not, I sincerely hope that President Johnson, who I understand is holding a news conference tomorrow, will repudiate such inflammatory statements by his Vice President before more tragic damage is done.

The golden virtue of silence would be helpful in this crisis. The Vice President's verbal spark is well known. I hope this latest spark, which did not shed much light, will not ignite conflagrations which even he cannot blow out. This is no time for incitement to riot from any source, and certainly not from the Vice President of the United States.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS—"PRESERVE THE GRAND CANYON"

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as the American public becomes more aware of the plot to impair the grandeur of the Grand Canyon, opposition rises against the proposed Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams. Everyone who has enjoyed the canyon's incomparable beauty wants succeeding generations to share the experience; those who have not yet had an opportunity to visit this wonderland have every reason to protest the impairment of such an invaluable natural heritage.

I am pleased to report that the General Federation of Women's Clubs has joined forces with those of us who seek to preserve the Grand Canyon in its native state. The organization's position is stated in the following letter from Mrs. E. D. Pearce, president:

> GENERAL FEDERATION
> OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
> *Washington, D.C., June 17, 1966.*
>
> Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
> *Member, Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Your responsibility in making the correct decision with reference to the construction of the two proposed dams in the Grand Canyon is heavy indeed and I cannot presume to tell you what the "correct decision" is—but certainly I can urge you to investigate any and all alternative solutions to the Arizona water problem. Surely there must be a solution which would preserve the Grand Canyon.
>
> In writing to you now, and in quoting our own policy, I speak for the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs who "oppose very strongly any efforts to commercialize any national park or monument except such developments as may be demonstrated clearly to be necessary to the national defense."
>
> We believe that "our national parks and monuments are administered by the National Park Service under policies which are intended to ensure permanent preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historical features they contain, and which prohibit grazing, logging, mining, and engineering, or any other projects which will destroy their natural character."
>
> We urge you to do whatever you can to preserve the Grand Canyon so that future generations may also know its splendor.
>
> My best regards to you.
> Most sincerely,
> MRS. E. D. PEARCE,
> *President.*

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit while the House is in session during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RESULTS ACCOMPLISHED BY THE NEW IMMIGRATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor today to give the Members of the House a preliminary report on the operations of the Immigration Act of 1965. The principal objective of that legislation was to end forever, by abolishing the discriminatory national origins quota system, a situation under which relatives of U.S. citizens or resident aliens, and skilled professionals and technicians, were obliged to wait as long as a decade before they could come to the United States. This resulted from their misfortune in being born in a country which had been allocated a very small annual quota of immigrants to the United States under a system which, in effect, had proclaimed the superiority of certain races of peoples over others in their desirability as immigrants. This was true even though the alien immigrant had been granted a technical preference in immigrating by reason of his relationship or skill.

The Department of State has informed me that on July 1, 1966, at the beginning of the new fiscal year and only 7 months after initial operation under the new law, backlogs and waiting lists have been wiped out and an immigrant visa is immediately available to any alien immigrant for whom a preference has been authorized by reason of relationship or skill. The single exception relates to Italian-born brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, where there has been an extraordinarily heavy demand. Over 50,000 close relatives of U.S. citizens and persons with high skills urgently needed in the United States were admitted for permanent residence during the first 7 months of operations under the new immigration law.

There had been some concern over the so-called labor provisions of the new law. Bills have been introduced to repeal these provisions. They were originally put into the new law to insure that immigrants not entitled to preferences would not be admitted to the United States if their admission could displace American workers or adversely affect wages and working conditions in the United States. I have been watching the operation of this new section closely and became convinced that the interpretations of the law had been unnecessarily restrictive. The requirements of a specific employer in each case had almost completely nullified any distinction between preference and nonpreference immigrants. Overly complicated forms and too many review stages within the State and Federal Departments of Labor had unnecessarily delayed the processing of applications.

Three weeks ago I met with Labor Secretary Willard W. Wirtz and a number of his top assistants and suggested changes in interpretation and procedure. Secretary Wirtz was most cooperative and assured me that these corrective steps would be taken. In the Federal Register of July 9, I was pleased to note the publication of the first of these proposed new regulations which, without sacrificing in any way the labor safeguard provisions of the immigration law, will result in better, prompter service to industry and business as well as the intending immigrant whose talents and skills will fill gaps in our available labor supply.

I commend Secretary Wirtz for his leadership and compliment him for his timely action.

For over 30 years, Presidents of the United States have been urging the repeal of the national origins quota system. Platforms of both political parties have proclaimed the need for its early demise. After 2 years of hearings, and the testimony of over 100 witnesses, I had the great privilege almost 1 year ago today of announcing that the Subcommittee on Immigration, which I have the honor to chair, had written a bill which became the Immigration Act of 1965. In just 7 short months, thousands of families who were separated for many years have been reunited in this country as a direct result of this law. Too, physicians and surgeons, scientists, and teachers have been able to come to many of our hospitals, universities, and private institutions urgently in need of their services. It is, therefore, with considerable satisfaction that I make this preliminary report on the actual results of the Immigration Act of October 3, 1965.

CAPTIVE NATIONS—FORGOTTEN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important events of the annual Captive Nations Week observance is the discussion of the week and the captive nations over the award-winning "Georgetown University Forum." It has been my privilege and pleasure to appear on this nationwide forum, as I know it has been for many others in Congress. Transmitted over 250 radio stations, the media of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, the Armed Forces Radio and the Voice of America, the "Georgetown University Forum" is under the able direction of the Rev. Francis J. Heyden, S.J., and the Rev. Daniel E. Power, S.J. The forum is also televised over NBC and the educational television network.

As part of the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week, the Georgetown Forum recently presented the program titled "Captive Nations: Forgotten?" The panel of the program consisted of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee and a professor of economics at Georgetown University; Lt. Col. Philip J. Corso, military analyst and assistant to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and Mr. Frank Van der Linden, author and syndicated newspaper correspondent. The moderator was Mr. Wallace Fanning, of NBC news. Because of its illuminating character regarding the captive nations, I include the full transcript of the program in the RECORD:

CAPTIVE NATIONS: FORGOTTEN?

(Georgetown University Forum, Washington, D.C., June 28, 1966; panel: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, professor of economics, Georgetown University; Lt. Col. Philip J. Corso, military analyst, and assistant to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy; Mr. Frank Van der Linden, author and syndicated newspaper correspondent; moderator: Wallace Fanning, NBC News)

MODERATOR. Since 1959, when the Captive Nations Week resolution was passed by the United States Congress, Moscow, and its Red totalitarian associates have persistently denied the resolution, and called for its repeal. Year after year Khrushchev vehemently condemned the resolution which is known also as Public Law 86–90.

During the 1965 Captive Nations Week Observance, the top Russian ideologist and member of the Soviet Presidium, Mikhail Suslov, had this to say: "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defending of nations that have escaped from their yoke."

Is one an "imperialistic chieftain" in the United States when he supports an act of Congress directed towards the eventual freedom of all captive nations? What is it in the resolution that has produced this unprecedented scare in Russia's Kremlin over this entire period? How is Captive Nations Week related to current developments in the Red Empire, to Vietnam, to the so-called policy of building bridges of understanding, and to America's posture in the Cold War? These are fundamental questions to which our panel addresses itself today.

And I think equally fundamental, Dr. Dobriansky, and the Communists notwithstanding, is the question of how successfully has the observance of Captive Nations Week been proceeding.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Well, since 1959, the Captive Nations Week observance here in the United States has, I would say, progressed by leaps and bounds. Last year, for example, in addition to the president issuing the proclamation, over half of the Governors of our States issued proclamations and these States are very neatly distributed, so to speak. The Governor of Arkansas, the Governor of New Hampshire, the Governor of Florida, the Governor of Washington State, each issued a proclamation.

Likewise, all the major cities conducted Captive Nations Week observances. The mayors in these cities, from Boston all the way down to Los Anegeles, from Seattle down to Miami, across the country, issued proclamations.

Many local Captive Nations committees have been established, so that today there are close to about 75 in various parts of the country.

In addition, the Congress of the United States, annually, has been on record observing the Week, and a Congressional display of speechmaking etc. marked the affair last year.

So that one finds here a steady growth, year by year, and as I said, sometimes, leaping ahead. The Week has even taken an international dimension, in that certain countries, for example, the Republic of China, Sweden, Turkey, West Germany, Australia, and a few others likewise observe the Week, despite the fact that they do not have a law such as we have, Public Law 86–90, which is the Captive Nations Week resolution.

And I might say this, that in addition to all of these aspects of the Week's observance, we had last year, as in early years since 1959, rather vehement denounciations of the Week from behind the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtain, and also the Sugar Curtain. So that the Red totalitarians in Moscow, in Warsaw and elsewhere have been rather shaken by this observance and would like to have it eliminated.

Moderator. What is there in the nature of the observance that causes the reaction? Is it the idea behind it, or is it the nature of the observances themselves?

Dr. Dobriansky. Well, both. The idea being that this really is a deep thorn in the side the strategy being pursued by Moscow and the Red capitals in Eastern Europe. In the past, out of Peiping there were similar denunciations, but I didn't see anything out of Peiping last year. So that in the main the Week symbolizes the continued captivity of all of these nations, and actually serves as an impediment to the type of strategy of "Peaceful Coexistence" pursued by the Red totalitarians and really the general acquiescence on the part of the United States as well as many other Western countries to these captive areas.

Colonel Corso. Dr. Dobriansky, I would like to add that the Captive Nations Week Resolution and the Captive Nations Week itself strike right at the heart or basis of Soviet Russian policies and ambitions. And what I mean by this is their policy of World Revolution. If these captive nations begin to break away from them, their revolution is given a setback and their whole empire and their system might collapse.

The reason that Suslov speaks in this manner is because he is really the man responsible for holding the nations in captivity. His position has been for almost twenty years head of the Foreign Section, with Foreign Directors of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Under him are his two Chief Lieutenants, Parmarov and a man named Andropov. Parmarov controls the foreign Communist parties and Andropov controls the satellite or the captive nations' Communist parties. These are no longer the old time revolutionaries; they are very clever, intelligent, scientific types. They make very few mistakes. They run the system of controls over the captive nations, and they keep this with an iron hand. The control spreads not down, but mostly on the top levels of military control and the police.

Mr. Van der Linden. Dr. Dobriansky, I would like to ask you, don't you think that this whole idea of building bridges to Eastern Europe is a dangerous policy and that it seems to give the Communist nations the advantage over us? They are trying, it seems to me, to weaken Western Europe and NATO with the idea that if we would just dismantle some of our troops over there they would go through the motions of watering down the Warsaw Pact forces, which as we know would just be a bait, because the Russian Army would be right there behind them. Isn't this building bridges policy pretty dangerous in your opinion?

Dr. Dobriansky. Well, I would say yes. Of course it could be worked another way. We are on record, for example, calling for the building of bridges of understanding with many captive nations in the Soviet Union. In other words, what I am saying is that we are testing the sincerity of those who are advocating this particular policy in connection, as they call it, with the satellite areas, meaning Poland, Hungary, Rumania. Now, we are contending; well, you want to build bridges of understanding, let's build these bridges with the many nations, the peoples themselves, in the Soviet Union meaning the non-Russian Georgians, Ukrainians and so forth. So this can be used, you see, one way or the other. I am inclined to agree with you that if we build these bridges of understanding, let's make sure that the bridge doesn't end with the unrepresentative Red totalitarian government. Unfortunately, all these bridges that they speak of will end with these totalitarian governments, whether in Bucharest, in Warsaw, Prague and the like, and will lead to the further entrenchment of these regimes, and really to the solidarity and strength of the Red Empire.

The assumption that is made here is fallacious. I may say this, Mr. Van Der Linden, you speak of "Communist nations." I can't see any nation, and I would even say the Russian nation within the U.S.S.R., being "Communist". There is no nation that had popularly accepted this thing called Communism . . . and a distinction always has to be made between the peoples and the regimes. When you hear people say "Communist nations" and/or "Communist State," only in the case of state would it be acceptable, because you differentiate again between the state and the people. Now, this distinction, incidentally, Moscow and the Communists use when they try to divide us, namely the American people—say, in connection with Vietnam—as against our Government, or the State.

So here, they find it very disturbing when this distinction is made and used between the totalitarian Red government in power and the oppressed and captive people.

Colonel Corso. You spoke about policy and control. I'd like to address myself for a few minutes to that. In 1953–57 I spent four years on the Operations Coordinating Board of the National Security Council, and I saw developing during that period what we call now the policy of fragmentation. The monolithic Communist bloc is fragmenting, and the satellites are building up independent Communist parties—so it is said.

Now I want to address myself specifically to those two points. The Communist parties of the captive nations are run from the Central Committee in Moscow. They always have been from the days of the Comintern, which Stalin claimed he dissolved, but which he never did. They just moved to other positions. And to show you how tight the control is I served also during the Korean War as a member of the truce delegation at Panmunjom. Across the table the chief delegate was a Lt. General of the North Korean Army named Nam Il. He was really a general in the Russian Army, and there were at least three others that I knew who were generals in the Russian Army, who came to North Korea to lead their armies and their political apparatus.

Today, in Poland, we have a Lt. General Bojolevsky. He is Deputy Minister of Defense and Training. He is a Soviet Officer, really. He was transferred to the Polish Army in 1953. He was a graduate of the Frunze Academy and was recently back for refresher courses. General Komar, he is Minister of Internal Affairs, which is the K.G.B. This man is a veteran of the Spanish Civil War, is a graduate of a Soviet military institute, and he is a Soviet officer. Yet, right now he is a Polish General. General Alexander Kosokyn is a commander of internal troops, and he is a Russian officer. General Dojskovsky is a commander of the border troops, and he is a Russian officer.

In East Germany, there is Army General Heinrich Hoffman. He is now Minister of Defense. He is a veteran of the Spanish Civil War, and he graduated from the Frunze Academy. He is a Soviet citizen. General Otto Mylk is one of the most treacherous men of all. This man was a chief executioner in Spain during the revolution. He attended the Soviet Ministry Institute, and he is a Soviet citizen.

This is the manner of control which they have today. And I am not speaking about a few years back; this is today. The Communist parties in those countries cannot fragment or break away under this tight, strict control of Soviet officers and Soviet citizens who control the Police and the Military.

Dr. Dobriansky. I am glad you brought that up, Colonel, because the feeling that we have always expressed year in and year out, during the Captive Nations Week observances—and these observances actually provide a nationwide, and even as I indicated, an international forum—has been that it doesn't make common sense to think that you could have, let's say, a Rumania, under the domination of the Rumanian Communist Party, break away from Moscow, or, for that matter, even let's say Castro, and his Party, in Cuba.

What I am saying here is that if one looks at this with some degree of sobriety and logic, he cannot but arrive at the conclusion that all of these Communist parties—and really they are the ones that control all these governments, including the Communist Party in Yugoslavia—in the ultimate sense depend for their survival and existence upon the Soviet Union.

This would even apply to the Communist Party in mainland China because if, hypothetically, something were to happen to the Soviet Union and it were to collapse, then I think it would be reasonable to deduce and conclude that none of these Communist parties elsewhere would exist for long.

Mr. Van der Linden. Dr. Dobriansky, it's very interesting to note, in connection with your remarks, that our ambassador to Poland, John Gronouski, is quoted very recently as peddling this same propaganda line that you are exposing here. He is quoted as saying that he hopes that evolutionary changes in the economic system of the satellite countries would permit the development of a relaxed social system, and that he also hopes that within each of these satellite countries there can be developed a liberal and a conservative wing, and we should realize, as he said, that Eastern Europe is not monolithic.

Now, this is one of the highest officials in the Administration, certainly, dealing with the satellite countries, and yet we find him expressing this kind of hope of working up, or fragmenting the satellite countries.

It also reminds me of a remark that Dr. Richard Starr told the House Foreign Affairs Committee recently. The old Russian proverb that "Hope is the mother of Fools." I wonder if you don't think there should be something done to awaken the Administration to realizing that they are just following the will of the wisp here.

Dr. Dobriansky. Well, of course, this has been going on for several years, since the Kennedy Administration, and into the present, and I personally believe that this will be one of the grand illusions of our period.

Let's recall that people like Allen Dulles and others, during the Eisenhower Administration, thought in terms of evolutionary development within the U.S.S.R., and this, after all, is the center of the Red Empire, of what we call World Communism. No question about it; from the economic, political, scientific and every other respect, it is the U.S.S.R. which is the very foundation of this entire empire, and the source, really, of all of our major global problems concerning peace and war.

Now, in the U.S.S.R. over these years we have found that instead of a mellowing process, instead of this evolutionary process, you have forces really that continue to be genocidal, continue to be Russifying and this has been brought out publicly but by the United States Senate. Unfortunately, many people don't read some of these works. The Committee on the Judiciary came out last year with an excellent work, and yet I think they just scratched the surface, called "The Soviet Empire". It deals, you see with developments within the U.S.S.R., and actually establishes the continuity of what transpired under Stalin. In fact, in certain respects with regard to this matter of Russification and genocide of the various nations within the U.S.S.R., the present regime even outstalinizes Stalin.

Well, here you have many captive nations in the U.S.S.R. I think our people should recognize that this is not a nation-state, as you have in the United States. This is another assumption that unfortunately is made, and really is the very assumption upon which the Consular Treaty with the U.S.S.R. is based. You see, we strike at that assumption.

Actually, in the U.S.S.R. there are these many captive nations: you have the three Baltic ones—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania. Then there is Byelorussia, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan.

Then, in central Asia, the whole area of Turkestan; then, of course, the Idel-Ural, North Caucasia and others. Now, these people make up close to half of the population in the U.S.S.R. It's very disturbing when you have a man like President De Gaulle going there, just as we had our Vice-President Nixon a number of years ago, and he goes to Novosibirsk and says, well, this is really a booming town, at the same time injecting certain notions about Siberia being an extension of the Russian nation, which is untrue. Actually, there are many captive peoples in this area; so that while we talk about bridges of understanding, about evolutional changes, yet the facts are clear in the area of anti-Semitism, in the area of continued oppression of these various peoples and nations, in the area of colonialism, economic colonialism. This work that I just cited has an excellent chapter showing the extent of economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. We don't bear on that dominant phenomenon. Instead, we content ourselves with this illusion, this hope that somehow things are going to improve and they, the Red totalitarians, are going to mellow; they are going to become fitting partners in the international arena.

Colonel CORSO. Doctor, I'd like to diverge a little from the military and the K.G.B and address myself to economic controls over the captive nations.

This has been one of the great fallacies of our time, when we think that the captive nations are free to trade with the rest of the world. They are not. The State Planning Commission of the Soviet Union has extensions within each captive nation. These State Planning Commissions are very closely supervised and control the entire, almost 100%, economic life of the country. Over the last five or six years there is a balance of payments deficit in favor of the Soviet Union against the captive nations, of close to $5 billion. The way this is done by the Soviets, and Kosygin recently called this—which our economists still haven't come up with the total answer—the "planned circle of economy".

What he means by this is very simple, oversimplified, but this is what he means: the Soviet Union will want certain raw materials from the satellite states, or the captive nations. They take those at a price below the world market. They will take them to the Soviet Union to manufacture them possibly into finished goods. Or, vice versa, they will give the captive nations certain raw materials, and the latter will manufacture machinery.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. May I interrupt, Colonel? I don't think you want to use the term "captive nations" exclusively for those in central Europe. We have them, you know, in the U.S.S.R. and in Asia, and even Cuba is a captive nation.

Colonel CORSO. Or even including parts of Ukraine that border on Rumania, where there is oil drilling going on. And the way they operate, they will sell to the captive nations, and even exploit their own people, on prices above the world market, and then they would buy back from them at prices below the world market.

As a result, the captive nations are kept at a certain level of economy which they do not want to raise. For example, we always talk about consumer goods. This "consumer goods in the Soviet Union" is one of our great fallacies, of raising consumer goods production. This is not so. The Soviet Union for years, and most of the captive nations, have planned consumer goods production at a level between 17 and 22%, and is not planned to raise it any further. The rest is capital goods production. And this goes throughout the empire.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. While the producer goods emphasis has always prevailed in the present plans announced a few months ago, in connection with the Soviet Union, it was stated by Kosygin that they at least planned within this five year plan to have a rate somewhere about 40% for consumer goods, as against 60% for capital goods.

At least that was verbally announced.

Colonel CORSO. I consider communist words from Kosygin of that type as propaganda. The true figure shows half of that figure.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. It's also true that these same captive nations, for example Czecho-Slovakia, which aren't able to feed themselves, are at the same time sending weapons to aid North Vietnam and the Vietcong in fighting us. If there is any merit at all to trading with these countries in supposedly non-defense goods, wouldn't there be some way we could require these nations, as a condition of this trade, to cut off some of those supplies. In other words, if we are going to let Rumania have oil drilling equipment, shouldn't we say, quit sending oil over to these people who are fighting us, and say to Czecho-Slovakia cut off these arms shipments.

Otherwise, we would in effect be subsidizing the very forces that are fighting our boys in Vietnam.

Colonel CORSO. Mr. Van Der Linden, that agreement has to be made in Moscow, not in Prague or in Bucharest or any other city.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. That's quite true. And shouldn't our Administration begin to realize then, that instead of encouraging this type of unrestricted trade with no strings, at least try to reach some common agreement on it?

Colonel CORSO. Then you get back to the unthinkable, which is always at this stage of the game, when you ask a question of that type of our policy makers on why should we go to the Soviet Union and tell them to do this. Then you get into the policy of the unthinkable. That's the trouble; they always use the atomic bomb, this is the scare. It's always thrown in when you have them back into a corner.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. In other words, if we have a showdown with the Russians, if we quit pretending that they are friends and quit hoping for coexistence, then the scare is that we will have a nuclear holocaust.

Colonel CORSO. I have watched the Soviets for over twenty years and two Wars. I have met them face to face, and when you present them with determination, they will back away.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN. That's the same thing that happened in Berlin, where they quit rattling the missiles lately.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Of course, there are a number of points that have been brought up as concerns, for instance, the matter of saber-rattling. I think it's very significant to bear in mind that since the Cuban crisis actually the policy of the Soviet Union toward the West has been one of pretending to be mellow, to be more peaceable and the like. And actually it's part of their policy of fragmentation, not through saber-rattling, but really through these pretensions to bring about a fragmentation of Western Europe. And you see that they have done so very well diplomatically.

Colonel CORSO. There is one thing I would like to clarify very quickly there. There are two divisions in the Soviet Government, one is the Government and the other is the Central Committee of the Union. And the Government is put forward just to deal with us. Their promises are not to be kept, like when Gromyko went to the White House to tell Kennedy there were no missiles in Cuba. As far as the Government is concerned that was true, but not as far as the Central Committee was concerned.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. We have many of these problems, and they are brought up during Captive Nations Week observances. During July, the third week in July, many of these questions will be discussed in various parts of the country, and I think it's just as well.

Should we go ahead, have liberalized East-West trade? Should we proceed to really bring about a general education here in the United States concerning the U.S.S.R. and the many captive nations in the U.S.S.R. And a host of similar questions are things that people talk about in this nationwide forum. I think for this reason Moscow and the other Red capitals just don't care to have such things talked about. It doesn't fit in with their whole strategy of "peaceful coexistence."

MODERATOR. Thank you very much gentlemen.

THE 1966 BUDGET RESULTS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1966 budget results announced today provide continuing evidence of President Johnson's determined efforts to keep the Government's finances on a sound basis. For the third year in a row, the budgetary deficit has been held below the estimates made in the budget 6 months earlier and in the original budget for the year submitted 18 months earlier.

In fiscal year 1964 the actual deficit of $8.2 billion compared with an estimate of $10 billion made 6 months earlier.

In fiscal year 1965 the actual deficit of $3.4 billion compared with an estimate of $6.3 billion made 6 months earlier.

Now, in fiscal year 1966, the actual deficit of $2.3 billion compares with an estimate of $6.4 billion made in the budget sent to the Congress last January.

Thus, the deficit in the year just ended was cut by almost two-thirds—a steeper reduction than was accomplished in either of the preceding 2 years.

In his original 1966 budget message, President Johnson said:

> Government fiscal policies must promote national strength, economic progress, and individual opportunity.

The budget outcome for 1966 demonstrates that this has been done. During the year our national defense effort has been significantly bolstered. We have also moved forward in a number of high priority domestic programs such as education, the war on poverty, health, urban renewal, and others. And the unprecedented economic expansion which began 66 months ago stimulated by Federal tax action has continued.

The substantial increase in economic activity has generated Federal revenues considerably greater than anticipated even 6 months ago. Coupled with unrelenting efforts to hold down all expenditures of less urgency, the Government has emerged from the fiscal year just ended with a deficit roughly one-quarter the size of the deficit 2 years ago. This is certainly a significant achievement.

TAX REDUCTIONS HAVE GIVEN US HIGHER REVENUES

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the budget results for fiscal year 1966 reinforce our belief that President Johnson, and President Kennedy before him, have pursued wise fiscal policies. Administrative budget receipts in fiscal year 1966, announced today, were $104.6 billion, an increase of over $11.5 billion from the preceding fiscal year. This increase is particularly encouraging when we view it in light of the policy actions taken during the preceding 5 years.

We are all familiar with the oft quoted phrase "they said it couldn't be done." Well, we need only have to look at the fiscal results during the past few years to see that it could and it has been done—that we could cut tax rates and still end up with more revenues than we started with. Further, that tax rate reductions would move us toward a balanced budget.

Since 1962, major tax changes—including the investment tax credit, liberalized depreciation allowances, personal and corporate income tax reductions, and various excise tax reductions—have helped us achieve 66 months of uninterrupted prosperity and economic growth. In fiscal year 1966 private wage earners and investors benefited from these tax reductions to the amount of $20 billion.

Despite these massive tax reductions, administrative budget receipts were nearly $27 billion greater in 1966 than they were 5 years earlier in 1961. This increase is nearly 2¾ times the increase during the previous 5 years when there were no significant tax reductions. Certainly, this is vivid proof of the direct relationship between Federal tax policies, economic growth and Federal revenues. In the months ahead I am certain that we will continue to reap the benefits—in terms of greater economic activity and higher Federal revenues—of this enlightened fiscal and tax policy.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET RESULTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the President today announced the budget results for fiscal 1966. Those results are gratifying in that they reflect a very considerable reduction in the earlier deficit projection.

Last January, the administrative budget predicted a deficit of $6.4 billion. The actual deficit, announced today, was $2.3 billion. In 6 months the deficit was cut by more than $4 billion.

This deficit is the smallest in a good many years. In fact, the budgetary result has been better than this only 4 times in the past 16 years.

The following table shows the basic figures:

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget estimate	Actual results	Change
Expenditures	106.4	106.9	+0.5
Defense	(54.2)	(55.3)	(+1.1)
Nondefense	(52.2)	(51.6)	(−.6)
Revenues	100.0	104.6	+4.6
Deficit	6.4	2.3	−4.1

I think it noteworthy that expenditures for civilian purposes—nondefense—were reduced by some $600 million.

The President and his associates labored long and hard and submitted what they considered a very tight budget last January. Holding expenditures $600 million below that in nondefense areas undoubtedly required continuous watchfulness. This decrease in civilian outlays offset nearly half of the rise in defense spending associated with Vietnam. As a result, total administrative budget spending amounted to $106.9 billion. This is 15 percent of our gross national product—the same proportion, approximately—as in 1965. One has to go back 15 or 16 years, to a period before the Korean war changed the nature and size of national defense programs, to find a smaller budget in relation to the size of the Nation's economy.

In each year of the Johnson administration the administrative budget deficit has been reduced below the prior year. Each year the final results show a smaller deficit than earlier predicted. At the same time, we have had to gear up to fight a major conflict in Vietnam. And a host of new civilian programs have also been undertaken. Lowering the budget deficit in the face of these facts is a noteworthy achievement and was made possible by the unprecedented national economic boom of these last few years.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING HAS BEEN REDUCED

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that preliminary budget results for the fiscal year 1966, which ended on June 30, show that apart from defense and space programs, expenditures were held almost $1 billion below the estimates in the budget last January. This result is the fruit of tireless effort by the President to reduce expenditures to the lowest possible level.

During and since the budget was prepared, the President has given all the agency heads strict instructions to restrain their spending. Directives were issued to defer the start of construction projects whenever possible, to hold back on the filling of employee vacancies, to curtail employee travel, and to refrain from the customary bunching of yearend purchases. The vigorous formal cost reduction programs which the President required all agencies to initiate have reduced the costs of operating the Government by several billion dollars in 1966.

The 1966 budget results demonstrate the success of the President's determination to give the taxpayer his money's worth and to help dampen inflationary pressures in this time of heavy added military costs. This, indeed, is responsible Government. Combined with responsible actions by other sectors of the economy, our objectives at home and abroad can be fostered in a setting of continued economic growth while avoiding the pitfalls of inflation.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT ACTS TO PROTECT U.S. CERAMIC TILE INDUSTRY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Secretary of the Treasury has issued a formal order to the U.S. customs appraisers at all points of entry directing them to withhold appraisement on glazed wall tile from Japan. This action has great significance for the U.S. tile industry. By its action, the Treasury Department recognizes that extensive charges in a dumping complaint filed on December 9, 1965, by the Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States warrant action now to prevent further injury to the domestic industry in case the charges are substantiated.

I have personally followed these developments closely, as there are significant producers in Texas and a plant located in my district assisted by Economic Development Administration funds.

The industry is made up of small manufacturers scattered across the country. The alleged dumping of imports of ceramic tile from Japan has caused great harm to many American workers and inflicted severe hardships on their communities.

The plight of the tile industry has been serious, as import penetration of wall tile rose from virtually none in 1947 to 25.5 percent in 1965. Japanese tile accounts for 70 percent of all ceramic tile imports in the United States since the Japanese industry and trading companies have concentrated on the growing American market using dumping and other unfair methods of competition.

It is reassuring to know that the U.S. Government is taking positive action to thwart what otherwise might be the takeover of another market which has been served so effectively by small American businessmen.

In 1961 the U.S. industry secured a unanimous Tariff Commission decision that ceramic mosaic tile imported from Japan was injuring the U.S. industry. Since then, their market penetration has more than doubled, to a point where they now have two-thirds of the U.S. market.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that at that time a Japanese delegation petitioned the State Department saying that the phenomenal growth of imports of ceramic mosaic tile was only a temporary situation. Since then, imports have risen even faster. The same pattern is being experienced in wall tile and I am afraid we are learning that much of the import increase has probably been the result of predatory dumping by Japanese manufacturers and trading companies.

All these small American manufacturers ask is that Japanese manufacturers and giant trading cartels obey our laws when competing in our markets.

Congress, I am sure, will follow developments in this case with great interest.

GOVERNMENT WORKERS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO SEE THE AMERICAN LEGION PARADE IN WASHINGTON, AUGUST 29, 1966

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a resolution which would allow Government employees in Washington to attend the parade on August 29, 1966, to be held in connection with the national convention of the American Legion. I would like to take this opportunity to strongly urge that this resolution be passed, and I would also like to urge that all citizens of the area, as well as Government employees, make plans to attend this huge parade.

All of us here are aware of the fine work of the American Legion. The activities of this organization range from combating juvenile delinquency through boys baseball clubs, to promoting good citizenship by sponsoring meetings for teenagers throughout the country to learn how government works, to a wide range of programs and platforms designed to promote the strength and solidarity of our great Nation. Any community in which there is an American Legion Post has richly benefited from the selfless work of the Legionnaires. Certainly, the Nation as a whole owes a vote of thanks to the American Legion for its steadfast work in the cause of patriotism.

It is indeed Washington's privilege to be host to the American Legion this year. This privilege is a valued one in that the Legion has not held its convention here for many years. I would like to join with my colleagues in welcoming the American Legion to the Nation's Capital, and urge all citizens of the area to welcome the Legionnaires as they come in from all parts of the country.

I feel that it would be a fine tribute if Washington could have the largest turnout in the history of the American Legion for its parade on August 29.

EDITORIAL ON FLAG DAY BY LARRY O. HOLDEN, THE DAILY REVEILLE, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Flag Day, the Daily Reveille, the student paper at Louisiana State University, published a moving editorial by Larry O. Holden. In case we think our young people are losing respect for the flag, I suggest that we all read this editorial which, I feel, represents the thoughts of a great majority of America's youth today.

The editorial follows:

Editorial by Larry O. Holden, the Daily Reveille, Baton Rouge, La.

It is 1776. The month is June—late June. The glow of day fades softly away, as the placid summer air flows gently through the open door of the two-story colonial home in Philadelphia and then out through the partly opened window on the opposite side of the now-darkened room. Sitting in the high-backed walnut chair and squinting in the dim light given off by the dancing flame of the newly purchased whale oil lamp, is a twenty-four-year-old, nimble-fingered woman with an off-white chocheted shawl clinging lazily to her tired shoulders.

Around her feet, in a hapazard mound, is a mass of red, blue and white cloth, now stitched into a single object— the first flag of the new nation. Putting the finishing touches on the sole remaining five-pointed star, the woman chuckles to herself as she remembers that Mr. Washington wanted the stars to have six points each. Such is the legend of Betsy Grissom Ross and the making of the first American flag.

Certainly the first time that this flag was unfurled in the air over the young, aspiring nation, everyone who saw it viewed it with awe. There is was—the symbol of the new nation—now the greatest nation on earth.

But what about today? What does the presence of this banner mean to the Americans of 1966? What does this standard mean to Americans when it passes before them in a Fourth of July parade or appears on the television screen just after the late movie? We cannot speak for them, but we can say what the flag means to us.

When the Stars and Stripes stream past us as we stand on a crowded street corner watching the gay parade, we experience a mingling of emotions and thoughts. We believe that one of the reasons we stand a little taller, become a little quieter, and act a little prouder is simply out-and-out tradition. However, this is merely the basis or foundation for our actions, feelings and thoughts; other things affect them, too.

One of the most natural, and thus most common feelings that we experience after seeing the flag is pride. Unquestionably we are proud of this prosperous country and the very principles—freedom, justice, equality, and humanity—upon which it was established.

A logical follow-up to the emotional quality of pride is respect. If a person is proud of another person, he generally shows esteem or consideration for that person. The same idea holds true for the flag. We are proud of it; thus, we respect it.

The emotion that is probably the most deeply and most sincerely felt by many people, yet usually unexpressed, is love. Most people who are ardent believers in democracy and America (which have come to be practically synonymous) actually express love for these two beliefs and for the Star-Spangled Banner. We express such love. This love is not like that of a mother, nor like that of a father, not yet like that of a sweetheart. It is a child-like love, embodying a child-like faith in God and the principles of government from which this country stemmed.

That same child-like faith is present in another facet of this country that the flag symbolizes: the fathers of this country—those statesmen who huddled around the table and inscribed their names on the Declaration of Independence and those who gathered at the Constitutional Conventions to work out the problems that confronted the new nation. The brain children of that unique assemblage of brave, loyal, unselfish leaders—The Declaration and the Constitution—gave birth to America, the land of the free.

Whenever we see the flag, the symbol of our country and of all who have loved it and have died—and are dying—for its principles, we feel two emotions which may not be evident, or even present, in many Americans today; humbleness and gratitude.

Humbleness may seem somewhat out of place when speaking of the flag; but when the flag appears, it unfurls in such majestic splendor that we cannot help feeling warmly small. It represents such power and force never before conceived and never before witnessed by mankind. In presence of this representative of such overwhelming might, we naturally feel humble.

The flag represents all the things for which we are grateful—Every time we see the flag being raised on the silver-colored pole that stands unbothered on the campus of Louisiana State University, we are grateful. Why were we not born in Russia, Cuba or Red China? Whatever the answer is, we are thankful that the Great Physician saw fit to deliver us to our parents in the shadow of the American flag. Without having been born in that shadow, we could not be grateful for the countless array of things which we are always adding to our lists of "Things to Be Grateful For," such as: living in a democracy (or to be more specific, a democratic republic), dwelling in a happy land, being able to obtain an adequate education, having the personal right to pray in a house of God and being able to stroll calmly down the street without fear. Our gratitude is all-enveloping and ever-growing.

We are proud of the American flag, and yet we are humble in its presence. We respect it and love it. We are grateful for the principles, people, and power which it represents. We stand up when the flag passes before us just as an Englishman rises for the Queen when she passes by or appears on the screen just before a movie. She symbolizes for him tradition and the high way of life known as royalty.

The flag symbolizes for us tradition, also, but it does not stand for a single way of love. It represents America and every phase of the American way of life. It represents us and over 190 million other Americans like us with their hopes and dreams and fears.

This is what the American flag means to us.

ADDING YEARS TO LIFE AND LIFE TO YEARS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are experiencing an era of outstanding and significant scientific discoveries and advances. The entire field of scientific research is dedicated to the purpose of "adding years to life and life to years." One of the laboratories responsible for these momentous scientific strides is Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., of Nutley, N.J., a pharmaceutical firm within my congressional district. Its president, Dr. V. D. Mattia, has written a most enlightening article on this subject which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of July 17, 1966, and I include it in the RECORD following these remarks:

HEALTH: DRUG RESEARCH PIONEERS IN PROMISING NEW AREAS

(By V. D. Mattia, M.D.)

The winds of change are gathering momentum in pharmaceutical research. Expanding the traditional search for new and better drugs, scientists are now exploring other fields which may have far-reaching implications in man's search for better health and longer life.

For example, more sensitive and dependable tests for recognizing the earliest stages of threats to health are now being developed. Advances in diagnostic agents will hasten the day when the physician will be able to emphasize prevention rather than treatment of disease. Recently there has been considerable progress in the search for new methods to recognize early disturbances in body chemistry.

In particular, changes in the levels of enzymes (substances which initiate and control chemical processes within the body) can reveal the very earliest stages of threats to health; new tests designed to facilitate early recognition of these changes will greatly help the practising physician.

In addition, the increasing use of automation for the performance of a wide variety of tests holds great promise. For instance, a new device which was introduced recently can perform 12 separate tests on a single blood sample in 2 minutes. Increasing automation of laboratory tests will widen their use in the practice of medicine.

Some of the most dramatic scientific advances in recent years have been in the field of heredity.

Research has produced a far better understanding of the role of DNA and RNA (dexyribonucleic acid and ribonucleic acid) which are found in each body cell where they act as "messengers of heredity." The importance of heredity factors not only in disease but in the organism's ability to adapt to stress and to environmental changes has become increasingly obvious.

There is reason to hope that pharmaceutical research will, before long develop substances capable of altering hereditary potential and strengthening the body's ability to fight off threats to health.

Few subjects have made greater progress recently than medical electronics and biophysics. The electrical aspects of cell and organ activity are becoming better understood. As a consequence, electronic means of monitoring body functions (continuously following vital functions, like heart rate, respiration, blood pressure and others) are rapidly assuming great importance. Electronic monitoring of women during delivery will, in all likelihood, considerably reduce the incidence of serious threats to the health of newborn babies.

Much remains to be done in the fight against heart disease, high blood pressure, mental disease, arthritis, malignant tumors and virus infections. A great deal of research in these fields is now being done by research laboratories all over the world. Past experience indicates that such major efforts are bound to result in progress.

The science of immunology which studies the ways in which the body reacts to foreign substances has recently made impressive forward strides. We now know that many diseases involve an abnormal response to factors which are ordinarily well tolerated. Not only allergies but diseases of the joints, kidneys, skin, lungs and other organs are responding to this approach.

Just as tremendous advances in the field of atomic physics have revolutionized many branches of science, they have opened exciting new vistas in pharmaceutical research. By attaching radioactive isotopes (special forms of elements which can be identified by the small amounts of radiation which they give off) to drugs, their fate in the body and their action upon various cells and organs can be studied in a most revealing manner. The use of isotopes holds a great promise for future pharmaceutical research.

The major objective of pharmaceutical research is two-fold: To add years to life and to add life to years . . . a fuller richer life, especially for our senior citizens whom science can help to spend their sunset years in an active, productive and satisfying manner.

AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT—GILBERT BILL

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation. My bill would also authorize the Federal Aviation Agency, with cooperation from industry as needed, to carry out necessary study and research programs concerning the methods and devices for aircraft noise abatement.

My bill is along the lines of the recommendations made by the Jet Aircraft Noise Panel of the Office of Science and Technology. This Panel concluded that:

> Initiative for solving problems of jet aircraft noise can effectively come only from a source not compromised by economic interests in conflict with those of the major groups now involved—engine and aircraft manufacturers, airline operators, and local governments. And there is only one source meeting this constraint which can be functionally effective—the Federal Government.

The Panel further pointed out the need for a Government program of research into the technical and economic aspects of the aircraft noise problem, and urged that the Federal Government involve itself more deeply in the attendant legal problems.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, higher performance and noisier aircraft have entered the airlines. This situation will become increasingly worse if the Federal Government does not take action. I have received many letters complaining about aircraft noise at La Guardia and Kennedy Airports in New York City. I am more aware of this nuisance since I happen to live in the vicinity of La Guardia Airport, but it is not a problem only in my city; it exists in cities throughout the country which are adjacent to airports. We have a responsibility to millions of Americans whose way of life is greatly disturbed by excessive aircraft noise at all hours of day and night.

The Federal Aviation Agency should be given the authority to establish aircraft noise standards similar to existing safety standards for civil aircraft, and the Federal Aviation Agency should be given the power to set standards for limiting aircraft noise in the certification and operation of civil aircraft. A research of the overall problem should include a study of suppression devices on the aircraft themselves, preferential runway systems, procedures for aircraft noise abatement through local zoning regulations, and compatible land usage in airport site selection.

It is my belief that every citizen has the right to live in peace, free from the disturbance of undue aircraft noise. I, therefore, recommend early action on my bill.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CARLTON R. SICKLES

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, a number of our colleagues have established a tradition of submitting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement detailing their personal finances. It is a tradition with which I fully agree, and in keeping with that tradition, I submit the following statement:

Carlton R. Sickles and Simone S. Sickles, his wife, statement of financial condition, June 30, 1966

ASSETS	
Cash:	
American Security & Trust Co., Washington, D.C.:	
Checking account	$196.39
Savings account	8,044.11
Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.—Checking account	725.42
Cash on hand, approximate	100.00
Total	9,065.92
Salary receivable:	
Salary (net) for month of June, 1966—U.S. House of Representatives	1,730.62
Investments (note A)	27,070.66
Real estate:	
Personal residence, Lanham (Prince Georges County), Md., at estimated market value	42,500.00
Other assets:	
Deposits with U.S. Civil Service retirement fund (available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations)	6,736.83
Cash surrender value of life insurance policies	2,208.00
Automobiles (1963 Chevrolet and 1964 Corvair)	1,720.00
Household goods and personal effects (approximate)	4,000.00
Total	14,664.83
Total assets	95,032.03
LIABILITIES	
Note payable—Citizens Bank of Maryland, due July 25, 1966	507.42
Household bills and other miscellaneous recurring obligations, approximate	500.00
Due Carday Associates, Inc	903.45
Mortgage payable on personal residence, Maryland State Savings & Loan Association, amortized balance	25,606.51
Total liabilities	27,517.38
Net assets (note B)	67,514.65

Notes to statement of financial condition, June 30, 1966:

A. Investments held are shown below:

	Market value
Citizens Bank of Southern Maryland, Waldorf, Md. (common) (3 shares)	$81.00
Disc, Inc., Washington, D.C. (common) (128 shares)	320.00
Disc, Inc., Washington, D.C. (preferred) (5 shares)	35.00
State National Bank, Bethesda, Md. (common) (2 shares)	110.00
Women's Investment Group, Chevy Chase, Md. (partnership interest)	948.76
Carday Associates, Inc., Wash., D.C. (common) shown at book value (50 shares)	25,575.90
Total	27,070.66

Carlton R. Sickles and Simone S. Sickles, his wife, statement of financial condition, June 30, 1966—Continued

B. Not included in statement of financial conditions are:

1. Savings account of Simone Louise Sickles (daughter) in the amount of $898.26.

2. U.S. savings bonds, series E, in the face amount of $4,525.00 owned by Louise E. Sickles (mother) and held in joint name with CARLTON R. SICKLES.

Salary income (gross):	
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C	$29,322.82
Carday Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.	5,000.00
Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.	450.00
U.S. Army Air Force Reserve	369.00
Total	35,141.82
Investment income	373.14
Miscellaneous other income	443.00
Total	35,957.96
Less excess of office, travel and transportation expenses over reimbursements received	3,854.75
Net income	32,103.21

NOTE A.—The information shown above was taken from the Federal income tax return filed for the calendar year 1965.

A BILL INTRODUCED CALLING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION TO BE KNOWN AS THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a bill I have introduced today calling for the establishment of a Commission to be known as the Federal Advisory Commission on Law Enforcement. It is the purpose of this legislation to establish an Advisory Commission to study the impact of certain recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court dealing with the constitutional rights of individuals in criminal proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, the impact of these recent Supreme Court decisions is historic, and they do present a serious challenge to the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that efficient enforcement of our criminal laws can be achieved in the light of the narrow interpretation of them by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Miranda case. Rightly so, judges, prosecutors, criminal lawyers, and aroused and concerned citizens point out with great validity that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by this ruling, severely hampered effective and efficient law enforcement. They contend that the general right of society to be secure from criminal elements has been undermined.

The High Court decision makes it hard for policemen to interrogate suspects, makes it difficult for them to obtain confessions, and limits police ability to search cars and seize stolen property, weapons, and evidence. Indeed, the Miranda decision raises concern in every police department in America as to how a police officer might make an arrest that would be constitutional and legal, and would stand up in court.

One interesting reaction of the recent Supreme Court decision came from Ohio's Cincinnati Police Chief Col. Stanley Schrotel, who said:

> In essence, these rulings have taken from the police the tools that are essential to do an effective investigative job.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with Police Chief Schrotel.

Mr. Speaker, the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, in the majority opinion, indicated that the Court encourages the Congress and the States to continue their laudable search for increasingly effective ways to protect the rights of the individual while still promoting efficient enforcement of our criminal laws. This statement by the majority of the Court certainly is an invitation for the Congress of the United States to probe constitutional ways and means to accomplish this very laudable end, and this is precisely the reason why I have today introduced a bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on Law Enforcement, a Commission, Mr. Speaker, that would be charged with the responsibility of investigating the gravity of the Supreme Court decisions and their relative impact upon individual liberty and the right of society generally to enforce law.

The purpose of this bill is to establish an Advisory Commission to conduct a study of the impact of the Supreme Court decisions in an effort to determine if amendments to the Constitution of the United States, or in the alternative, legislation by the Congress, is timely, appropriate, and advisable.

Mr. Speaker, amendments to the Federal Constitution on this subject, which so vitally affect the constitutional rights of us all, certainly should not be carried out in an atmosphere of hysteria. It must be carried out thoughtfully and upon the recommendations of constitutional experts familiar in the field of criminal law. Certainly such a Commission should undertake to define the rights of every individual under the Constitution, in the context of, first, the investigations of crime; second, the arrest, interrogation, detention, and trial of an individual in connection with the commission of a crime; and, third, other aspects of the enforcement of criminal law, and the Commission should weigh those individual rights as so defined and the interests of society in efficient and effective enforcement of its criminal laws.

The Commission, Mr. Speaker, will propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions, which in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. The Commission membership shall be composed of the following: the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Member of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a U.S. Senator appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one appointed by the President from a panel of at least three State attorneys general submitted by the National Association of Attorneys General, one appointed by the President from a panel of at least three county prosecutors submitted by the National Association of County Prosecutors, one appointed by the President from a panel of at least three municipal officials submitted by the National Association of Municipal Officials, one appointed by the President from a panel of at least three attorneys submitted by the American Bar Association, one appointed by the President from a panel of at least three police chiefs submitted by the National Association of Police Chiefs, one appointed by the President from a panel of at least three individuals submitted by the American Civil Liberties Union, one dean of a prominent law school of the United States who shall be appointed by the President.

The proposed Commission would report its recommendations and findings to the President within a period of 1 year and then disband.

Mr. Speaker, the calling for such a Commission to study this important law-enforcement problem becomes extremely important as I sense there is a growing alarm being registered throughout the land concerning the crime menace. Many have suggested that the High Court of the land, by reason of five liberal members of the Court, is misusing its power to interpret the Constitution, and many citizens are rightfully blaming the High Court for the creation of the problems facing law-enforcement officials. Policemen and prosecutors point out that these decisions have been handed down as the Nation's crime rate in the cities, suburbs, and rural areas alike, soars. Americans everywhere are asking themselves the question, "Are we really being protected in this society?" Are we safe on the streets of New York, Philadelphia, here in the Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., Cleveland, Chicago, or Los Angeles? I believe that Justice Clark, former Attorney General of the United States, in his dissenting opinion characterized the recent decisions of the Supreme Court with regard to the admissibility of confessions as, "strict constitutional rulings that inserted at the nerve center of crime detection may well kill the patient." Justice Clark points out in his opinion that the police agencies, all the way from the municipal and State forces to the Federal bureaus, are responsible for law enforcement and public safety in this country, and that he is proud of their efforts which in his view are not fairly characterized by the Court's majority opinion in the Miranda case. Justice Clark states that detection and solution of crime is at best a difficult and arduous task, requiring determination and persistence on the part of all responsible officers charged with the duty of law enforcement. Questioning of suspected criminal offenders is undoubtedly an essential tool in effective law enforcement.

It appears that now in one sweeping decision, the U.S. Supreme Court has changed traditional rules of custodial interrogation which that same Court has for so long recognized as justifiable and a proper tool in balancing individual rights against the rights of society. The U.S. Supreme Court, in my opinion, has paid a great and particular emphasis to the protection of individual constitutional rights of criminal elements of our society without corresponding concern for the rights of victims of crime and the general right of society to expect effective, efficient enforcement of our criminal laws.

Mr. Speaker, we do know that some crimes cannot be solved without confessions, and it now appears that the U.S. Supreme Court is willing to take a substantial risk insofar as society's welfare is concerned by imposing its new regulations and rules on the country.

Mr. Speaker, the social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules enunciated by the Supreme Court anything less than hazardous experimentation and disastrous to the great national interest. What this Court has done is to reject without notice 70 years of experience and to sweep away old rules without first knowing what the attendant effect upon law enforcement in the Nation will be.

The Supreme Court decisions, in my opinion, amounts to a deliberate effort to preclude law enforcement officials from obtaining any confession whatsoever under any circumstances whatsoever, notwithstanding the pious contentions to the contrary as spelled out in the majority opinion in the Miranda case. An approximation of the gravity of the situation is contained in the comment of Justice Clark in the dissenting opinion to the effect, "I have no desire whatsoever to share the responsibility for such an impact on the present criminal process." Already in a large number of reported cases, the Supreme Court ruling has made it possible for killers, rapists and other criminals to return to the streets and the environment which produced them and to repeat their crimes whenever it pleases them.

This decision will not be a gain; it will indeed be a loss for the American society. The easier it is to get away with rape and murder in America, the less the deterrent effect upon the criminal who is inclined to attempt major crime. This is not only good criminal legal experience, this is good basic commonsense. The American Bar Association Journal in its issue of May 1965 pointed out very properly that when America has a situation in which law-abiding citizens are unsafe in their homes and businesses and are denied the privilege of using public streets and parks for fear of their personal safety, we then in this Nation are approaching paralysis in the first duty of government at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Congress understands clearly that it is our national duty to protect the citizen in his person and property from criminal conduct wheresoever its source or cause. We must ask ourselves, in the light of the challenge of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, what are we doing to undertake appropriate governmental action to remedy the conditions which promote crime. Already throughout the land, we can detect a partial breakdown in the processes of law and order.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States of America cannot await the millennium when crime will wither away because its underlying causes have been removed through education and better housing and all the benefits of the Great Society. We must act now to protect decent citizens from criminal molestation of their person and property. No less a person than J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is closer to this problem than any American, has urged "stiffer laws and sterner policies," particularly in dealing with hardened and vicious criminals. This is the most uniform view of the police officers of America who are responsible for the preservation of law and order.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that the Congress and the courts safeguard the rights of all accused in criminal proceedings and to protect their right to a fair trial. But I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time is now at hand, for the general right of society, and each individual in particular, to be protected from crime and that their rights never be subordinated to other rights. The pendulum indeed has swung too far and there is good reason today for criminals in America to believe sincerely that crime does pay and that slow and uncertain justice can be evaded and penalties for criminal behavior avoided.

The criminal elements of America today are particularly well organized and flourishing in our major cities despite the major effort and progress of law enforcement. Each State in this Union has proposed an anticrime program including revisions of their various codes and statutes. There is a definite need, therefore, for the modernization and strengthening of our criminal laws and for development of improved enforcement methods even if those approaches involve amendments to the Federal Constitution.

Law enforcement officers, police, prosecutors and judges deserve and should be accorded professional status and far wider public support. The dramatic reinterpretation of the U.S. Supreme Court of constitutional safeguards of criminal offenders has rendered the process of law enforcement far more difficult, if not indeed impossible. It is essential that a remedy for this most unsatisfactory situation be found without impairment to constitutional rights.

Mr. Speaker, the need for more effective criminal justice and an amendment to our Constitution, if found to be necessary, can await the final report of the Federal Advisory Commission on Law Enforcement which I propose by the introduction of my bill today. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to see the day dawn on America when efforts along these lines are delayed and we mollycoddle young criminals and release unreformed hoodlums to prey anew upon the American society.

The bleeding hearts of our times, and many among the judiciary, have exhibited an indifference to the rights of law-abiding citizens. If we are to effectively stop the spread of serious and dangerous crimes against America we must have in this land judges with courage and high sense of their duty to protect the public and adequately penalize the criminal elements.

In short, it seems to me that we must adopt a most realistic attitude toward this critical problem for we in America have tried the lenient approach and it has failed miserably.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a captive nation is not a new phenomenon in world history. Imperialism, with its consequent abridgments of individual freedom, is as old as the very origin of nations. Since the dawn of modern history, Russia has been expansionist. Yet, in 1917 the Bolshevik revolution combined this traditional expansionism with the new imperialistic ideology of communism, and an expansionist Russia became an imperialistic Soviet Union.

Although Americans have not experienced the imperialism of the Communists, hundreds of millions of the world's population have. Tyranny, oppression, and subjugation are the way of life for many people. We have witnessed this in our lifetime in the Eastern European countries of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany; in the Asiatic areas of Russia, China, North Korea, and North Vietnam; and, close to our own shores, in Cuba. Captive Nations Week, inaugurated by a joint resolution of the Congress in 1959, commemorates the plight of nations held captive by the Communists. In solemn observance we pay tribute to once free nations.

Soviet imperialism has brought political, economic, and cultural stagnation to once flourishing societies. To an American who enjoys individual liberty and expression, who may pursue his own politics, occupation, and religion, it is difficult to imagine the condition of these captive peoples.

But Captive Nations Week can have a greater significance than reminding Americans of the plight of other peoples. Every year at this time we might rededicate ourselves to the democratic principles our country was founded upon. Only an America based on freedom and liberty, as the leader in the free world, will serve as the obstruction to the spreading of the despotism and severity of the Communists. Let all captive peoples take heart in viewing our democratic way of life. Our country must serve as the light of hope against the darkness of autocracy.

VICTORY OF LOWER TAXES FOR NEW JERSEY AND OTHER STATE RESIDENTS WHO WORK IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to note that the efforts of several Congressmen from the metropolitan area to reduce the income tax to be paid by New Jersey and other State residents who work in New York City, were successful.

These Congressmen contacted leaders of the New York City Council, the State legislature, and also conferred with Mayor Lindsay on April 11, 1966.

They pointed out that nonresidents employed in New York City certainly do not receive the same services as New York City residents and that nonresidents should pay lower taxes.

An examination of the tax tables announced in the press yesterday shows that nonresidents will pay considerably lower taxes.

For instance, a New York City resident with a gross income of $8,000 will pay $46, but a salaried nonresident will pay $12.50. A New York City resident with a $15,000 gross income will pay $114.80, with a nonresident charged $32.50. These are substantial differences and those who took part in the campaign to provide relief to nonresidents, deserve a great deal of the credit.

There are thousands of Middlesex County, N.J., residents working in New York City who urged congressional support and the amounts they will save will be considerable.

As a matter of principle, I object to any income tax by a city, because it is in conflict with the financial structure that has helped this Nation and its people do so well. Income taxes are essentially the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Members of Congress who helped achieve the victory of lower taxes for out-of-State commuters. It was a notable triumph.

They were Representative DONALD J. IRWIN, of Connecticut, who led the campaign, Representative LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York, and four of my colleagues from New Jersey, Representatives PETER W. RODINO, JR., CHARLES S. JOELSON, JAMES J. HOWARD, and HENRY HELSTOSKI. I also want to thank Joseph A. Giuffre, of Perth Amboy, a certified public accountant who specializes in tax matters, for representing me at the conference held in Mayor Lindsay's office. I was unable to attend because of a previous commitment.

TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR DISABLED PERSONS AND SPOUSES

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to offer legislation designed to aid persons who, in many instances, have done all they may ever be able to do to aid themselves.

This bill would provide tax exemptions for persons who are disabled and for their spouses under certain conditions. The bill would also permit a deduction not to exceed $600 for expenses paid during the taxable year for transportation to and from work for these disabled persons.

Today, while we are making notable strides in our efforts to provide training and job opportunities for the disabled and handicapped, it is a cruel but hard fact that many of these individuals can never compete equally with the many more fortunate who are not physically impaired.

And this is indeed a share, because in too many instances it is the individual's inability to perform certain motor functions and this inability alone—not a lack of desire or mental aptitude—that prevents him from ascending the economic ladder.

The provision for deduction of expenses paid for traveling between home and work is especially important to persons disabled by maladies such as cerebral palsy, polio, stroke, and other similar afflictions. Through my work in the United Cerebral Palsy of Tennessee, I know of the expenses suffered by persons who cannot use the common modes of travel for getting to and from work. Often these expenses include the cost of taxies. In addition, cerebral palsied have heavy expenditures for special equipment such as braces and wheelchairs. Additional expenses include the cost of special physical therapy and other health services which the nondisabled person does not have. These costs are all above and beyond the normal day-to-day living expenses which he shares in common with the nonhandicapped person.

The bill I am sponsoring would provide, in addition to the $600 deduction for transportation expenses, an additional $600 exemption for the taxpayer if he is a disabled individual and an additional $600 exemption for the spouse of the taxpayer if the spouse is a disabled individual and the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation might cost the Treasury a small amount in revenues but not a great deal I would venture to guess. However, it would provide for these disabled persons a retention of earned income which would, in turn, give them a sense of self-reliance and self-support that no governmental subsidy or welfare check could ever offer.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALL, for 30 minutes, July 20; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. MCCLORY in two instances.

Mr. BOW.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.

Mr. FOGARTY in two instances.

Mr. MCVICKER.

Mr. SWEENEY.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

Mr. JARMAN.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3093. An act to amend the acts of March 3, 1931, and October 9, 1962, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind so as to authorize the furnishing of such books and other materials to other handicapped persons; and

S. 3150. An act to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 20, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2575. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of survey of internal audits and inspections relating to U.S. activities in Vietnam, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2576. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Glen Canyon damsite in Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Ariz., pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 923. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15111, a bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2412. An act to terminate use restrictions on certain real property previously conveyed to the city of Kodiak, Alaska, by the United States (Rept. No. 1733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3249. An act to consent to the interstate compact defining the boundary between the States of Arizona and California (Rept. No. 1734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13982. A bill to amend the act of August 14, 1964, to authorize payment of any amounts authorized under the act to the heirs or devisees of persons who would have been eligible for payments under the authority of the act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to settle and pay certain claims arising out of the taking of the 1960 decennial census (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14615. A bill for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army on whose behalf erroneous payments were made for storage of household goods (Rept. No. 1737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 16074. A bill to cancel certain unpaid interest accrued after September 30, 1931, on loans made to World War I veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September of each year as "International Literacy Day"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 15098. A bill to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 15785. A bill to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.J. Res. 1169. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor (Rept. No. 1742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1375. An act providing a method for determining the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them due to the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force (Rept. No. 1708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr; with amendment (Rept. No. 1709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Glenn D. Humes; with amendment (Rept. 1710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raisla Stein and her two minor children; with amendment (Rept. No. 1711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2016. A bill for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader (Rept. No. 1712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2146. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras); with amendment (Rept. No. 1713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3275. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mrs. Melba B. Perkins against the United States, with amendment (Rept. No. 1714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3557. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U. S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi (Rept. No. 1715).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4077. A bill for the relief of Jean A. Quaintance; with amendment (Rept. No. 1716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 1717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4582. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani; with amendment (Rept. No. 1718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5912. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; with amendment (Rept. No. 1719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6035. A bill for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6039. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Harwell (Rept. No. 1721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7546. A bill for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired) (Rept. No. 1722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8694. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight; with amendment (Rept. No. 1723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8727. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger; with amendment (Rept. No. 1724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11312. A bill relating to certain Indian claims; with amendment (Rept. No. 1725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12512. A bill for the relief of Carl V. Elliott (Rept. No. 1726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13682. A bill for the relief of Donald E. Auseon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13683. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Ivins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13909. A bill for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr., with amendment (Rept. No. 1729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13910. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Arnold; with amendment (Rept. No. 1730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14514. A bill for the relief of Vernon M. Nichols (Rept. No. 1731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14379. A bill for the relief of John R. McKinney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 16318. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 16319. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 16320. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16321. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by, or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance pursuant to, such titles must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 16322. A bill to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16323. A bill to designate the Allegheny River Dam and Reservoir on the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as the Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 16324. A bill to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 16325. A bill amendment of title XVIII of Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16326. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 16327. A bill to provide compensation to survivors and dependents of local law enforcement officers killed or disabled while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 16328. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 16329. A bill to establish the Federal Advisory Commission on Law Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 16330. A bill to provide for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 16331. A bill to increase the amount of Federal financial participation in State programs established pursuant to title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 16332. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 16333. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16334. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16335. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 16336. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 16337. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 16338. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 16339. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the aircraft noise abatement research and regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 16340. A bill to prohibit picketing in the District of Columbia within 500 feet of any church, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 16341. A bill to authorize an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 16342. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 16343. A bill to authorize a program of Federal assistance to sea grant colleges in order to establish or expand programs in marine sciences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16344. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.J. Res. 1213. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the first week in September of each year as "National Voter Registration Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1214. Joint resolution declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Con. Res. 832. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 833. Concurrent resolution urging the Bureau of the Budget to avoid delay in submission of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H. Con. Res. 834. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H. Con. Res. 835. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 836. Concurrent resolution urging the Bureau of the Budget to avoid delay in submission of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H. Con. Res. 837. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H. Con. Res. 838. Concurrent resolution urging the Bureau of the Budget to avoid delay in submission of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 16345. A bill for the relief of Col. Thomas F. McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 16346. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandrasekarapuram Narayanan; his wife, Yamuna Narayanan; and their three children, Manoj Narayanan, Vinodh Narayanan, and Pramilla Narayanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16347. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Fidilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 16348. A bill for the relief of Chin Wing Teung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 16349. A bill for the relief of Alfredo I. Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 16350. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elba J. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 16351. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertie P. Welborn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Retirement of Lt. Gen. Charles B. Duff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of this month—July 1966—one of this Nation's distinguished military leaders will retire from active duty after 35 years of commissioned service. I refer to Lt. Gen. Charles B. Duff, a 1931 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, who has commanded the U.S. Army Air Defense Command, with headquarters at Ent Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Colo., since September 3, 1963. In an appropriate ceremony on August 1, at Fort Carson, Colo., he will hand over the responsibilities of that vital command to a West Point classmate, Lt. Gen. Robert Hackett.

Many of the gentlemen of this House, especially those who have served on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, will recall with pleasure, I am sure, those times when General Duff appeared before the committees to give expert testimony on Army financial matters.

Although I was not privileged to be a Member of this House and its committees at the time, my colleagues have kindly pointed out to me that they remember General Duff as a very cooperative witness, an expert in the usually tricky field of finance who had reduced typical financial terminology into language that could be understood by all members of the committees. Certainly his expert and understandable testimony assisted the Members of this House in performing the legislative functions incident to the Army's vital role in our national defense.

Among his many assignments in the Army, General Duff served for over 8 years in the Department of the Army budget and financial offices. Before becoming Comptroller of the Army in 1962 he served as Assistant Chief of the Estimates and Funding Division for the Army and later as director of the Army budget.

General Duff and his wife, the former Miss Sallie Edmondson of Anniston, Ala., plan to make their home in the Colorado Springs area following retirement. I am pleased that the Duffs will become permanent residents of Colorado's Third Congressional District.

National Airlines Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more certain to today's fast moving American public than the fact that a major transportation strike is both inconvenient and intolerable.

Our dependence on the airlines presently being struck has reached such proportions that even their temporary shutdown causes serious repercussions. Not only are the airlines themselves the only parties injured by this strike. We are now tightly bound together, in all parts of the country, by the air. We depend on it for freight, for business travel, and for the tourist trade. A strike against airlines, Mr. Speaker, is a strike against the public, for all the population is inconvenienced in some way.

Other employees of the airlines must be given leave, the hotel industry depending on convention and tourist traffic suffers, movers of air freight must turn to slower means of transportation or line up for the remaining facilities. Bus and train terminals became congested, and more and more people are forced onto our crowded urban highways.

Settlement of this strike at the earliest possible moment should be urged in a single coordinated demand by the public, the Congress, and the President, acting together in what has become an emergency situation to restore these vital air services.

The time has come also for the Congress to carefully review present emergency strike legislation under the Taft-Hartley Act to consider whether revisions are necessary to assure that our urban and industrial society will never again be deprived of its essential transit links.

Vietnam Poll Results Tabulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am including here the results of a poll I conducted in the Second Congressional District of Colorado. I would like to thank the more than 14,000 citizens who took the trouble to inform me of the views they have on the Vietnam war, for my poll was devoted entirely to that subject.

Mr. Speaker, one reason for devoting the entire questionnaire to the subject of Vietnam was that as I conducted a districtwide series of town meetings, I discovered that the war was of such vital interest to my constituents that I should delve deeper into their opinions, giving them a better individual opportunity to express their views on the subject.

One especially gratifying aspect of this questionnaire is that so many persons added comments elaborating their views on one or more of the questions of concern to them. Of those answering, 35.5 percent were Democrats, 30.2 percent Republicans, and 34.3 percent independents. I also intended the questionnaire to point up the complexity of the problem and the difficulty of our decisions. I think the questionnaire served that purpose.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn from these answers is that a great majority of those answering felt that our Nation has a vital interest in southeast Asia, that our Vietnam intervention was justified, and that we must resist Communist aggression with force if necessary. These conclusions must be tempered however, by the fact that recent political disturbances in Vietnam have created uneasiness and distress among many people.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in representing one of the most educated, literate and informed constituencies in the Nation. I am certain that the views of the citizens of Colorado's Second Congressional District will be of particular interest to this House.

The results of my poll follow:

McVicker Vietnam survey compilation

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Responding to question
1. Do you think the United States should be involved in Vietnam?	78.4	21.6	99.3
2. Have we expanded the war in Vietnam more than was necessary?	20.0	80.0	99.7
3. Do you think it is vital to the United States to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover?	80.3	19.7	97.6
4. Does the United States have a vital interest in the future of southeast Asia?	87.5	11.5	97.6
5. Accepting the fact that we are now involved in Vietnam—			
(a) Do you think we should further expand our involvement in the war?	70.9	29.1	92.0
(b) Should we bomb the industrial cities of North Vietnam, knowing that many civilians will be killed?	56.9	43.1	94.3
(c) Should we expand the war by attacking the Vietcong refuge bases and supply routes in Cambodia and Laos?	70.1	29.9	93.6
(d) Should we begin a naval blockage of North Vietnam?	76.7	23.3	96.5
(e) Do you think the United States should officially declare war on North Vietnam?	40.9	59.1	91.6
(f) Would you approve of destroying the agricultural economy of North Vietnam by bombing their dikes and dams and flooding their crops?	50.7	49.3	92.6
6. Would the following decisions be acceptable to you as part of an effort to end the war:			
(a) Consider this a good time to cut losses, cease fighting, and withdraw our troops now	11.1	89.9	99.9
(b) Pull our troops back to defend the coastal cities and air bases and let the South Vietnamese do their own fighting	13.3	86.7	97.8
(c) Confine our military operations to South Vietnam (do not bomb North Vietnam)	13.2	86.8	93.2
(d) Withdraw all American troops immediately after a peace agreement is signed	16.4	83.6	96.4
(e) Withdraw all American troops only after we are sure South Vietnam can defend itself and any peace agreement will be kept by the Communists	78.2	21.8	87.1
(f) Withdraw our troops if requested by the Government of South Vietnam	69.4	30.6	94.0
(g) Keep our troops in South Vietnam. Retain strong military bases in the Far East	63.5	36.6	90.3
(h) Permit one government for both South and North Vietnam to be selected in a free supervised election, even if it seemed probable that the Communists would win	51.6	48.4	92.5
(i) Permit one government for both South and North Vietnam under a "neutral government" guaranteed by the major powers such as Red China, the Soviet Union, France, Great Britain, and the United States	43.7	56.3	88.7
(j) Keep South Vietnam independent from North Vietnam, but permit the Vietcong to run candidates in free elections	42.0	58.0	85.9
(k) Keep South Vietnam independent from North Vietnam with a non-Communist form of government guaranteed by the United States	50.8	49.2	88.1
(l) Expand U.S. participation in the war in an attempt to insure victory	72.9	27.1	94.6
(m) Continue the war at its present level until North Vietnam is defeated, even if it takes years	25.7	74.3	88.4
(n) Use tactical nuclear weapons against the Vietcong	34.4	65.6	92.1
7. Should we bomb strategic targets in Red China—			
(a) Now?	11.1	88.9	88.6
(b) Under no circumstances?	15.1	84.9	71.4
(c) If Chinese "volunteers" enter the war?	49.7	50.3	80.8
(d) Only if China officially enters the war?	26.7	73.7	86.1
8. Do you believe that if Vietnam falls to communism, then all of southeast Asia eventually will become Communist?	69.6	30.4	93.6
9. If we pull out of South Vietnam, do you believe North Vietnam would take over the country?	90.4	9.6	85.2
10. Do you believe that Red Chinese troops are fighting in South Vietnam?	49.4	50.6	83.9
11. Do you think that North Vietnam is—			
(a) Controlled by the Soviet Union?	22.6	77.4	77.5
(b) Controlled by Communist China?	71.6	28.4	87.1
(c) Independent?	31.3	68.7	73.8
12. Some people believe that if South and North Vietnam were united, even under communism, they would pursue an independent policy from that of Red China and the Soviet Union (as Yugoslavia has done):			
(a) Do you believe this is a reasonable possibility?	35.3	64.7	95.7
(b) Would you prefer this to continued war in South Vietnam?	44.8	55.2	96.4
13. Should we continue the war until we achieve an acceptable result, regardless of the cost?	76.1	23.9	97.1
14. Do you believe the United States should press to reassemble the 1954 Geneva Conference as a basis for reaching a Vietnam settlement?	58.3	41.7	90.7
15. Do you think the President has made every reasonable effort to bring the Vietnam war to the negotiating table?	68.5	31.5	96.9
16. Do you think we should turn over the search for a solution to the Vietnam war to the United Nations?	53.3	46.7	89.2
17. Do you think a negotiated peace settlement in Vietnam is possible?	58.6	41.4	92.3
18. Do you think the war will end only when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese are militarily defeated and unable to continue to fight?	60.5	39.5	93.5
19. Do you think that the war will end only when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese are convinced that the United States will continue to fight in support of South Vietnam?	61.9	38.1	94.1
20. If the North Vietnamese agree to peace talks, would you prefer—			
(a) A cease-fire during the negotiations? (as in Korea)	51.0	49.0	87.9
(b) Continuing the military pressure during negotiations to prevent a buildup of Communist forces during the peace talks?	65.3	34.7	86.8
(c) To refuse to negotiate until the Communist forces are defeated and driven out of South Vietnam?	25.5	74.5	83.1
21. As an incentive to peace negotiations, should the United States offer to share in joint North-South Vietnam food, health, electricity, and water development programs after the war is over?	63.3	36.7	94.8
22. If a peace agreement is reached in the near future, do you think meaningful free elections will be possible?			
(a) In South Vietnam?	64.8	35.2	89.5
(b) In North Vietnam?	18.7	81.3	84.6
23. Do you feel that our purpose and policy in Vietnam have been adequately explained by our Government?	49.1	50.9	98.3
24. As you understand President Johnson's present policy in Vietnam, are you in general agreement with that policy?	63.8	36.2	89.5

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to our observance of National Drum Corps Week, during the week of August 21 through 27, designated as such in honor of the 1 million teenagers in the United States who are a part of this colorful and decent activity.

On this occasion, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in Congress to show our respect and admiration for these fine young people and to extend my best wishes to them for their continued participation in this meaningful and wholesome activity. The description, "an expression of order, color, symmetry, and beauty," accurately portrays the wonderful marching and maneuvering, the bugling and drumming in which these drum corps units participate.

Certainly this activity deserves the seal of "Juvenile Decency," as a clean, interesting, and inspiring activity for our youth. Unfortunately, in this confused world, where youth is struggling to find a place for itself and an outlet for its zest and energy, many of our young people get off on the wrong trail and fail to find worthwhile activities, ending up as juvenile delinquents or in the world of crime.

I am pleased to note the continued growth that this activity has experienced in the past few years, and hope that the numbers of our young people now participating multiply manifold in the future. National Drum Corps Week is aimed at bringing to the attention of the

American people the importance of this youth activity, and serves as an encouragement to our youth and to the fine contribution they are making to our way of life. This movement deserves the cooperation and support of all Americans. The spirit fostered within these organizations adds to the spirit that makes this Nation the leader in today's world.

Fort Sheridan Bids Col. Ben Chapla Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Col. Benjamin C. Chapla, commanding officer at Fort Sheridan, Ill., for the past 4 years, is leaving this post on July 28 to become deputy post commander at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1929, Colonel Chapla distinguished himself as an Infantry battalion commander during World War II, taking part in five combat campaigns including the Normandy and Brest Peninsula engagements in France, the Ardennes breakthrough in Luxembourg, and the Hurtgens Forest assault in Germany. He had become executive officer of the 28th Infantry, 8th Infantry Division, at the time our troops made contact with the Russian forces north of Berlin, where the Germans surrendered. Colonel Chapla also served in South Korea and in many other posts.

In addition to his career as a combat officer, Colonel Chapla served during 1952 as a professor of military science and tactics at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn. Later he was assigned to the Pentagon as executive secretary in the Secretariat of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, where he was in charge of career planning in the Army.

Colonel Chapla's military service has been recognized by the award of many honors and citations. He was decorated three times for bravery in combat and, in addition, received the French Croix de Guerre avec Etoile. As a result of his service in the Korean conflict he was decorated by the Korean Minister of Defense with the Ulchi Medal with Silver Star.

Mr. Speaker, I have observed conditions at Fort Sheridan since Colonel Chapla assumed his command there in 1962. During this period I have noted the excellent care given to the physical surroundings at Fort Sheridan, as well as to the high morale of the military and civilian personnel at this historic Army post. Fort Sheridan celebrated its 75th anniversary last year. At about the same time the Department of Defense, with the approval of this Congress, authorized a transfer of the 5th Army Headquarters from the south side of Chicago to Fort Sheridan. The able assistance provided to the Department of Defense and to the committees of the Congress, as well as the reputation of Fort Sheridan under Colonel Chapla's command, contributed substantially to this result.

The officers and men at Fort Sheridan have come to admire and respect this courageous infantryman and able administrator. In addition, the citizens of the surrounding and nearby civilian communities have developed an affection for Colonel and Mrs. Chapla which will endure long after their departure from Fort Sheridan.

Many friends of Colonel Chapla, including an outstanding group of governmental, military, civic, and business leaders, will be joining together to pay tribute to him on July 26. Under the general chairmanship of Mr. Arsene J. Denoyer and representatives of the Waukegan-North Chicago Chamber of Commerce, the military liaison committee of the Association of the U.S. Army, Lt. Gen. Joseph A. Teece, retired, and many other residents of the 12th Illinois Congressional District will gather at 6:30 p.m. at the Glen Flora Country Club, Waukegan, Ill., on Tuesday, July 26, at a reception and dinner honoring this outstanding man of the Army.

I am proud to include Colonel Chapla as one of my good friends, Mr. Speaker. I take this occasion to express to him my appreciation for a job well done at Fort Sheridan and to convey to him and his wife, Opal, my wishes for a pleasant and successful tour of duty at his new post in the War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week by the American people. It is a week dedicated to note the yearning for freedom and independence in the hearts of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

The bonds which unite us with these people are strong. But it is difficult for us in these United States to comprehend fully what it means to live without the basic freedoms that are so much an integral part of our way of life—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom to worship as one pleases.

But I am convinced that the desire of man to be free will ultimately prove more powerful than brute force.

Ireland gives the world an example of a country that for 800 years never relinquished her zeal and determination to be free and independent. As a boy I well remember the many tales told to me by my late grandfather Charles McCarthy, a native of County Cork, Ireland, of those eight centuries of oppression. Although denied their religion, their language, their customs, their rights, these courageous people never lost the love of freedom of independence that their tenacity and determination finally won for them.

Freedom, indeed, is the wave of the future.

The peoples of Eastern Europe have not lost their spirit or yearning for freedom. In East Germany in 1953 and in Poland and Hungary in 1956, these courageous people dramatically showed the world their valiant determination to live under governments responsive to their needs and wishes.

And even more recently, we have learned of Rumania's attempts to introduce some flexibility in the tightly controlled eastern bloc and Warsaw Pact. In many of the other satellite states including Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and East Germany one can find signs of a deep yearning for peace, freedom and independence.

Just this week we learned of sharp differences between the Soviet Union and its satellites over fuel and raw materials. The Eastern European countries are convinced that the Soviet Union is charging them excessive prices for these goods. The Soviet Union has taken cognizance of this situation, and Soviet economist I. Dudinsky has even broadly suggested that the Eastern European countries would do well to begin looking toward Asia, Africa, and Latin America for much of their future increased raw material and fuel needs.

Czechoslovakia recently expressed its belief that it pays almost twice as much for Soviet oil as does Italy.

Some observers believe that this squabbling could forecast the eventual end of the Communist economic bloc and perhaps even the dissolution of the Comecon.

Western sellers of raw materials and fuel may have new opportunities for sales to Eastern European countries on a scale never before considered possible.

There are many other indications that the United States and the other Western nations can assist the movement toward independence in the Eastern European countries by increased trade, cultural exchanges, tourism and moral encouragement. These, in my view, are the best ways for us to encourage the freedom and independence of the present Soviet satellites.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 17–24 marks the eighth consecutive commemoration of what is known as Captive Nations Week. During this week, Americans will gather to manifest their concern for the plight of the freedom-loving people of the world who today find themselves the captives of aggressive totalitarian imperialists. Certainly Captive Nations Week stands as a reminder to all of us who enjoy the benefit of freedom and liberty that the long-range goal of self-determination and freedom is yet to be achieved by countless millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains of the world.

Certainly those of us who have any historical appreciation of the world situation in Europe and in Asia understand that no amount of occupation by Communist puppet governmental leaders can still the burning desires of the freedom-loving peoples of these enslaved lands. These peoples, no matter how long the term of their occupation by outside forces, still look to the United States of America as their hope for once again reclaiming their freedom and independence. Every intelligence report, every diplomatic contact confirms without doubt that there is strong aspiration for free, democratic, consitutional government in the occupied countries of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the area of the Ukraine.

Captive Nations Week gives us cause to pause and reflect upon the horrors of Communist enslavement that have been visited upon these peoples and to rededicate ourselves to the task of sympathetically pursuing ways and means of bringing these enslaved people their natural right of self-determination. Captive Nations Week is the week in which the United States of America should record for the world once again its long-range intention to work for the interests of the enslaved peoples of the world who suffer under the oppressive yoke of Communist occupation.

The liberation of these people, our fellow human beings of different national identities, creeds, and colors, should be the mission of this Republic for this Republic was born in a spirit of resistance and rebellion to tyrannical imperialism and it should pledge in the world forums to help all peoples in their difficult struggle for freedom and national independence.

Bill To Create a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this Chamber who does not realize the gravity of the crime problem. Directly or indirectly it affects all of us. Statistics released recently by the FBI show that in the first 3 months of 1966 there was a 6-percent increase in the number of crimes over the same period of last year. In the next 24 hours over 7,000 major crimes will be committed in the United States. The FBI estimates the total cost of such crimes to be over $27 billion annually—or $143 for every man, woman, and child throughout the Nation. Even more unfortunate is the fact that this rate appears to be ever increasing. Projections based upon present statistics indicate that by 1985 1 American in every 15 will be the victim of a major crime.

I am certainly not one to be smitten with "imaginary horribles"; however, the fact does remain that at this moment we are experiencing an unprecedented wave of lawlessness which should be dealt with now and not sometime in the future when the problem may be of uncontrollable magnitude. The present crime rate reflects a real need for updating many of our criminal laws. Problems of lawlessness, particularly organized crime, are crying for solution.

Despite the increase in nearly all types of crime, our Federal criminal laws have not undergone a major revision in 18 years. We, as legislators, have clearly not kept pace with the new horizons which are being discovered daily by psychologists, sociologists, criminologists, and penologists in the study of crime and its causes. It is sad, indeed, that our law enforcement agencies must struggle to maintain law and order, and our courts must attempt to dispense evenhanded justice with a Federal criminal code which needs modernization of language and remedies, and elimination of overlapping provisions. In addition, recent Supreme Court decisions relative to criminal safeguards demand a complete review by the Congress with a view toward revising certain fundamental concepts of the federal system of criminal justice.

Recently, I introduced several bills to strengthen the arm of law enforcement agencies in the investigation and prosecution of violations of our Federal criminal code. Also, I have joined with several of my colleagues in urging creation of a National Commission to study the existing laws and to recommend to Congress legislation which would improve our present system of criminal law and procedure.

The Commission would be comprised of 12 members—3 appointed from the House of Representatives, 3 from the Senate, 3 from the Federal judiciary, and 3 from private life. In performing the work of the Commission, the Commissioners will have the assistance of an expert staff, headed by a Director who will act as reporter to the Commission. In addition, the Commission may hire experts in fields requiring special study.

The Commission will have the advice and counsel of an advisory committee, the members of which will be selected from such groups as: defense lawyers, legal aid attorneys, U.S. attorneys—that is, prosecutors—law professors, criminologists, penologists, and others who deal with criminal behavior and the applications of the Federal criminal law. Also the Commission may draw upon the experiences of several States which have revised their criminal codes in recent years.

The great strength in this bill is the fact that the advisory committee would be drawn from a community of men who know the criminal law best—men who live it from day to day. These are the men who develop new ideas and approaches to the law and who may utilize their wealth of talent and experience in producing recommendations for the Commission and ultimately for the Congress. This advisory committee is vital to the work of the committee—vital in the sense that it will be a life force and creative element behind the work of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to study and support this measure. I deem it to be the next major step in our fight against crime and a first step toward preparing the best laws that can be written to curb the antisocial behavior of the criminal and to provide a full measure of justice for those who would transgress our Federal criminal laws.

Remarks of Congressman Fogarty at the Catholic Hospital Association Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, CLEVELAND, OHIO, JUNE 16, 1966

I am happy to be here today with so many of the members, friends, and well-wishers of the Catholic Hospital Association. I welcomed Father Flanagan's invitation to talk briefly with you about civic and political climates, the necessity for social legislation, and the potential impact of some of that legislation on basic values and its relationship to the provision of health services in a pluralistic society. I welcomed his invitation because I am convinced that the Association and its member hospitals must seek an increasingly important role in providing health care under the changing philosophies that have surfaced in recent and pending legislation.

As you know, your representatives in Washington are doing their utmost to obtain the widest cooperation of our public and private forces in remolding the health aspects of our society. In the process, important questions are raised and important decisions must be made at many levels.

As one of the forces whose support must be marshaled in this effort, the Catholic Hospital Association represents one of these levels. When an organization of this nature meets in plenary session, major questions of public as well as of internal policy come under the gavel and controversy abounds in the give-and-take of discussion. Under our democratic system, this is as it should be and an entirely healthy situation.

When Father Flanagan invited me to participate in your 1966 convention, he was kind enough to send me an information copy of your planned program. As I read it over, your choice of "Commitment to Values" as the convention's theme struck me as both happy and logical.

It is a happy choice because the Hospital Apostolate is firmly rooted in commitment to values, practical as well as religious and humanitarian, values whose dimensions grow ever largar as your hospitals assume greater responsibilities.

It is a logical choice because it brings to a focal point a quality that has characterized the Association from its very beginning. As evidence I might cite:

Father Moulinier's initial commitment to hospital standardization and his later concept of educational commitment;

Father Schwitella's commitment to the voluntary hospital;

Monsignor Griffin's commitment to emphasis on the human side of the hospital;

Monsignor McGowan's commitment to community involvement; and

Father Flanagan's commitment to determine the role of the Catholic hospital in a society that grows more complex day by day.

I was also pleased to learn of the Monsignor McGowan Memorial Address, which will be delivered later today.

Monsignor D. A. McGowan, or "Father Luke," as he was affectionately known to most of us, was a close friend of mine for many years. His personal attributes and everything his life stood for have already made him a candidate for unofficial canonization by those of us who knew him well. But we have been unable to find a "devil's advocate."

There is no need to list Father Luke's achievements for this audience. When Cardinal Cushing preached at Father Luke's silver jubilee as a priest in 1959, he declared that the monsignor's "accomplishments are too numerous to mention." I will abide by Cardinal Cushing's judgment.

I recall Father Luke's significant contribution to the Catholic Hospital Association's publication, "A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program," written in conjunction with Monsignors John O'Grady and George Louis Smith. When it appeared in 1949 this document presented a "positive statement of Catholic social principles concerning the individual, the state, society and the place of government in relation to the health care" of people. By providing a crystal-clear statement of Catholic thought on current health proposals it brought those concepts back into the mainstream of contemporary health philosophy. In addition, it spared no words in pointing out certain obligations under the principles of social justice first expressed by Pope Leo XIII.

Father Luke had a compassion for all humanity that enabled him to find something likeable and admirable in everyone he met. And, no matter their differences, no one who met Monsignor McGowan could fail to react to him.

None of us who knew this wonderful priest will ever forget him; now that he is forever on the side of the angels, the Monsignor McGowan Address will serve as a fitting memorial to Father Luke.

In my 25 years in the House of Representatives, I have been exposed to a variety of civic climates. If I can indulge in a bit of oversimplification, some were hot enough to establish the validity of President Truman's famous remark about ". . . getting out of the kitchen." Others were sufficiently frigid to banish certain proposed legislation to a permanent deepfreeze. But, in any case, their influence is undeniable.

It is important to recognize that civic climate arises from the manifold changes that occur in the socio-economic-political conditions present during a given period of time in our country—changes which affect any consideration of our nation's health needs. Today's civic climate involves such variables as population explosion and population shifts, urbanization and ex-urbanization, the breathtaking explosion of knowledge triggered by scientific and technological advances, automation and its implications, and changing patterns in age groups, with increasing numbers of very young and very old people.

As a result of the pressure of these factors, the focus of health services has changed. As communicable diseases decrease, prime attention is paid to chronic diseases. And, in addition to insisting upon stronger preventive health programs, our people want protection from an environment that is being increasingly contaminated with disease-producing substances.

In brief, we have witnessed in this country since World War II the birth and coming to maturity of a national philosophy of health, expounded by an increasingly health-conscious and increasingly sophisticated citizenry. Our citizens have come to recognize the need for comprehensive personal and environmental health services, and they have acquired the means toward realization by a favorable combination of social, economic, and political events.

Now, while Mark Twain is quoted as saying that nobody ever did anything about the weather, the same statement does not hold true with reference to "climate," civic or political. Let me give a few examples from history—incidentally, two of them were physicians, and both of them were significantly able to alter the "climate" of their times.

Consider Dr. Thomas Wakley, an English physician of a century ago. Here was a man who was certainly outside the Establishment as it then existed—yet, because his livelihood was threatened by the conservative "climate" of the College of Royal Physicians in London, he entered politics and was elected to Parliament. During his career, his legislative efforts won him much prestige, but he remained proudest of his "Bill for Registration of Qualified Practitioners . . ." which led to the passage of the Bill of 1858, the present legal basis for English medical practice.

Consider Rudolf Virchow. This young pathologist, even before banishment from Berlin and subsequent fame in Wurzburg, dared to challenge the "climate" of the Prussian government for what he termed "centuries of neglect and corruption which were the foundation for the poverty and ignorance of the people." Virchow's efforts were instrumental in bringing about the Revolution of 1848, in which he was a leading figure. Despite the fact that the government was overthrown, Virchow realized—and persisted in stating—that the Revolution was "essentially social." An objective appraisal will substantiate his claim.

But let us move closer to home—right here to Ohio in our own time. I have in mind the case of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. This national organization came into existence because one man, Mr. Edgar F. Allen of Elyria, Ohio, was shocked by his son's tragic death and distressed by the pitiful inadequacy of our knowledge about and facilities for the care of crippled youngsters. Through his personal dedication and effort, Mr. Allen created a civic climate that was favorable to crippled children. That climate spread from his own community of Elyria to cover the state of Ohio, and ultimately it blanketed the entire nation.

The Catholic Hospital Association's own history indicates no lack of ability to recognize climate, and to do something about it by winning friends and influencing people—and legislation. When certain by-products of the flood of legislation that appeared during the great depression posed a threat to the voluntary hospitals of America, these institutions signaled their common interests by establishing a Joint Committee to represent them in hearings on Federal legislation dealing with health and hospitals. With Father Schwitella as its spokesman, the Joint Committee achieved outstanding results:

It won exemption for voluntary hospitals from the National Reconstruction Administration Code and a proposed excise tax on voluntaries.

It secured Federal help for payment for care of the medically indigent for voluntaries without sacrifice of their autonomy.

It "insisted upon the philosophical and ethical implications of the indigent patient," calling these people wards of society rather than of government.

It fostered the idea and ideal of cooperation and partnership, rather than competition, between private and public health agencies.

In this regard, who has not heard the story—perhaps more than once—of President Roosevelt's famous letter to the Catholic Hospital Association on the occasion of its Silver Jubilee, wherein he assured the Association of his appreciation of the work for the nation accomplished by the private institutions and particularly by the sister's hospitals, and further described that work as ". . . for him the chief argument for the maintenance of public and private institutions which is so characteristically American in pattern."

But perhaps the best example of the necessity for hospital people to involve themselves in influencing legislation, and an indication of the results that can be achieved by meaningful involvement, is found in the story of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, more familiarly known as the Hill-Burton Act:

It marked the first time that consideration was given to a measure providing for both tax-supported and voluntary hospitals;

It marked the first time that safeguards were provided for the rights of individual institutions in a sizable statewide program; and,

Most significant of all, it marked the first time that a bill had been initiated, developed, and perfected by the hospital associations of America acting in concert.

These are only a few examples, but I believe they waive necessity for further proof of the desirability for understanding and helping to form—and thereby to influence—civic climate; and the desirability for influencing—and thereby helping to form—legislation.

The development of legislation is a legitimate concern of any citizen or group of citizens in America. Laws are made to answer needs and, since no lawmaker can be aware at one and the same time of all the needs of his own constituency, or his own geographical area, or the nation, there is a requirement that these needs be known. It would be difficult to find a Senator or a Congressman who has not benefited from a few spoken words, or a letter, or as a result of a visit from citizen's groups or organizational committees. All of these agencies are able, in their own way, to offer convincing arguments for the need of a particular piece of legislation, and this is a legitimate use of personal or group influence.

In the face of the problems inherent in the mass of recently-enacted health legislation and of that yet to come, it is easy to understand the concern of those responsible for the management of our Catholic hospitals. Central to that concern is the necessity to maintain present values so that the principles for which the Catholic hospital stands will not be sacrificed.

I share the commitment of the Hospital Apostolate to those values, but I certainly can offer no panacea, nor would I, realizing that for some time your best minds and deepest thinkers have focused considerable energy on the problems involved.

While there is no disposition here to attempt to illuminate even a single facet of one problem, I do believe that an article I read in a fairly recent issue of your publication, "Hospital Progress," provides a starting point for the accommodation that must be made. This thoughtful article pointed out that "We have entered an era of new relations between the Church and the world . . . with new organizations, new institutions, new fields of action with their new dimensions . . . [that] have brought about new roles for the clergy, bishops, religious, laity and the whole Church."

The accommodation between Church and world initiated by the recent Ecumenical Council is swiftly being reflected by the actions of its leaders and agencies. This suggests to me that it is time for our Catholic hospitals to take a hard and realistic look at the future and what it may bring.

There will be . . . there can be . . . no impact on that future without planning. Some nameless genius has epitomized this by saying that we must do more than improvise plans for the future—we must begin to plan our very improvisations. It is obvious to the discerning eye that unless more of our Catholic hospitals move from calm waters directly into the mainstream of hospital affairs, they will be forced to react to situations and circumstances not of their own choosing, and this is disastrous in strategic planning.

If Father Luke were here with us today, I am confident that he would transmit the same message—those Catholic hospitals not presently engaged in community dialogue and community services must become engaged, and those who are already involved must expand the dimensions of that involvement.

What I am trying to say is that even as each generation is born and passes away, it leaves an inevitable legacy—Change. The face of the hospital apostolate itself is changing to reflect the presence and pressures of socioeconomic factors almost unknown only a few years ago. As a result, the activities and functions of our religious men and women are reflecting a similar change.

Of course, we know that it will always remain the "Apostolate of Competency" of which Father Flanagan so often speaks.

The Catholic Hospital Association has met here this week to focus attention on the many problems facing our Catholic hospitals and to establish a means of operation that will guard against any lessening of basic values as it moves toward their solution. When I meet our religious people today, I sense that they have the same qualities that motivated religious men and women in ancient times to minister to the sick and needy, and I have complete faith in their ability to cope with the complex health picture of tomorrow—and to do so with none of our basic values diminished.

We cannot resolve the unresolvable, but with a full measure of dedication, selflessness, and patience, plus vigorous and imaginative pursuit of our goals, we can fashion the instrumentation—human and administrative—to win through to those goals. The real threat may well come from those who view the need for adjustment as someone else's struggle.

I believe that our denominational hospitals have a great service to render in tomorrow's health panorama. Come what may, I can visualize no circumstances that will deny the need for the particular zeal demonstrated by our religious people in medical service. And the other tangibles the Catholic hospital provides its patients in meeting the continuing health needs of modern society help to provide a balance in our pluralistic society—the same kind of balance the government recognized so many years ago when it entered its first cooperative agreement with the voluntary hospitals.

Perhaps I could best advise you in whatever efforts you see fit to make with regard to legislation deriving from the civic climate of today by repeating the oft-spoken injunction of Father Moulinier, the Association's "Founding Father." Father Moulinier's counsel was to "Find the facts—filter the facts—fix the facts—and face the facts fearlessly." Fifty years of Association experience indicate that action taken after following that formula has rarely, if ever, failed to be appropriate.

Meanwhile, your organization is performing an outstanding service by stimulating among our people an understanding of the processes and problems inherent in our free society and its government; by encouraging more active participation and appearing in the van of that movement at practical levels; and by advancing the art of involvement, thereby aiding the public—and Congress, as its representative—in meeting the many problems confronting us in the health field.

Only with the help of organizations such as yours and the assistance of public-minded citizens in every walk of life can we continue to ferret out and do something about this nation's health needs and aspirations. Given that kind of help, your Congress can move to the fulfillment of one of its own commitments, its determination to make the Great Society a means to a full life for all of our citizens.

Arnold Toynbee, in his special "Study of History," has asserted that "The twentieth century will be chiefly remembered not as an age of political conflicts or technical inventions, but as an age in which human society dared to think of the welfare of the whole human race as a practical objective." I believe the Catholic Hospital Association has many contributions to make toward that objective, and I wish you Godspeed in their accomplishment.

Opinion Survey of Residents of Bergen County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, late last spring I polled the residents of Bergen County in my district on some of the issues currently facing Congress and the Nation.

Over 12,000 of my constituents in 28 communities responded to the survey, many of them sending along extensive comments with their cards. Students in 21 high schools in Bergen County used this poll as an extension of their studies in history and government by reviewing background information on the issues, compiling the results of the adult survey, and polling themselves on the same questions. This project provided a unique educational experience for the students involved, as well as a valuable service to me, and I was pleased to receive many favorable comments from the schools which participated.

The results of this poll have been distributed to the press, and will be circulated among the adults and students in my district. I believe they would be of interest to my colleagues as well.

The results of both the adult poll and the student poll follow:

Congressional questionnaire, 1966—Final results

	Adult voters			Students		
	Yes	No	Did not answer	Yes	No	Did not answer
1. Based on personal experience, do you believe that food, clothing, and other basic living costs have increased to the point where this should be a matter of national concern?	*Percent* 77	*Percent* 19	*Percent* 6	*Percent* 57	*Percent* 39	*Percent* 4
2. If Vietnam expenditures continue to rise, would you favor—						
(a) A cutback in Federal domestic programs?	65	18	17	36	53	11
(b) An increase in taxes?	19	38	43	16	70	14
(c) Federal Government wage and price controls?	30	33	37	40	42	18
3. To assist in solving the problems of the commuter, would you favor—						
(a) Direct Federal subsidies for operating losses?	17	37	46	30	55	15
(b) Formation of public transportation authorities?	49	27	24	56	30	14
(c) State and local tax relief for railroads?	32	24	44	27	58	15
(d) Tax credits for commuting expenses?	34	26	40	46	41	13
4. Should parents be allowed to deduct college expenses for income tax purposes?	66	27	7	83	13	4
5. Do you favor laws requiring carmakers to put more emphasis on safety?	72	23	5	80	17	3
6. Should the $1,500 annual income limitation on persons receiving social security benefits be raised to $3,000, the general income guideline for the antipoverty program?	78	17	5	51	34	15
7. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage of—						
(a) $1.60 by 1968 as recommended by the President's economic advisers?	45	27	18	53	32	15
(b) $1.75 by 1968 as recommended by the AFL–CIO?	18	46	36	39	38	23
8. Do you feel you are being kept adequately informed by your Government on developments in Vietnam?	30	65	5	47	49	4
9. In Vietnam, should we—						
(*a*) Increase our military effort?	46	21	33	42	31	27
(*b*) Negotiate (with the Vietcong) and get out?	29	31	40	24	41	35
10. Should the Constitution be amended to permit States (with the approval of the voters) to apportion 1 House of the legislature on factors other than population?	42	43	15	25	61	13

11. What do you feel are the three most important issues or problems facing our Nation today?

Adult voters:	*Percent*
Vietnam	49
Inflation	37
Government spending	19
Civil rights	16
Welfare state	13
Foreign policy	12
Taxes	12
Crime	9
Communism	8
Foreign aid	8
Education	8
Labor	7
Poverty	7
Morality	7
World peace	4
Narcotics	4
Patriotism	3
Pollution	3
Population	3
Commuters	2
Students:	
Vietnam	78
Civil rights	38
Inflation	30
Communism	18
Poverty	17
Education	11
World peace	9
Foreign policy	9
Crime	8
Population	7
Foreign aid	7
Government spending	7
Taxes	7
Patriotism	6
Narcotics	6
Labor	5
Welfare state	4
Morality	3
Pollution	3
Commuters	1

Protection of Veterans Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of a statement I submitted today to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on my bill H.R. 10557. The committee is currently holding hearings on legislation dealing with veterans' pensions.

My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 19, 1966

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to present my views on the bill now under consideration before your Committee, H.R. 10557, which seeks to amend title 38 of the United States Code to protect any veteran against a loss of pension as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. As sponsor of this measure, I wish to express my deep gratitude to all of you for scheduling these hearings.

The enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 increased Social Security benefits by 7%. In the case of veterans who were receiving pensions, this increase was treated as an addition to their "income" by the Veterans' Administration for purposes of determining what pension would be paid. This increase in "income" has brought many veterans (an estimated 30,000) over the allowable income limit, at which point their pensions are either decreased or discontinued altogether. Each of the 30,000 veterans lost considerably more than they gained by the increases in Social Security benefits.

Just to give one among many examples in my district, I cite the following: A World War I veteran, who had previously received a pension of $105 a month, ended up with a net loss of $300 a year when his income was raised to over $1,000 by an increase in his Social Security benefits which amounted to $84 a year. Because of the small increase in Social Security benefits his pension was decreased by $25 a month. In a case such as this, common to many veterans, a $300 cut in a yearly income of barely $2,000 could mean a complete and drastic change in one's way of life. A change of this sort at an elderly age is not an easy chore. It can be avoided by the passage of this legislation.

Even though it is true that the 88th Congress authorized a 10% retirement income exclusion for pension purposes and the beneficiaries are receiving more pension in 1966 than they did in 1964, the fact remains that the pension rates for 1966 have been substantially reduced from those of 1965. The fact is that the increase over the 1964 rate resulted from a general increase in pension rates voted by the 88th Congress, and would have been received whether or not the Social Security increase had adversely affected veterans' pensions.

Also, the veterans who were not on the rolls in 1964 became entitled to one rate of pension in 1965 and then, a few months later, it was reduced substantially because of the receipts of a few extra dollars in Social Security payments. Surely, Congress did not intend to deprive these people of all or part of their VA benefits by increasing Social Security payments. These are people who have demonstrated their patriotism beyond the call of their duty as citizens; many have given their lives to their country, and have left widows and children.

On July 7, 1965, the Senate approved, without dissent, an amendment by Senator Miller of Iowa, which would have prevented any cut-back in veterans' pension payments because of the 7% Social Security increase. Senator Long, the manager of the Social Security Bill and majority member of the Senate Finance Committee, accepted the amendment after pointing out that there was no intention of having any harsh results by having any veterans deprived of any portion of their pension because of Social Security increases. The amendment went to conference, but unfortunately it was eliminated. This resulted in the situation which now exists, and which my bill, H.R. 10557, seeks to correct.

H.R. 10557 is not identical to the Miller amendment, but it will correct the same unjust condition. If enacted into law, it would eliminate from consideration as income (for purposes of determining eligibility for a pension paid by the Veterans Administration) the increases in monthly Social Security benefits paid to an individual by enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

The question regarding the effects of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 on veterans' pensions is: "Have you killed me with kindness?" For those directly involved, the increase in Social Security benefits would appear to be a cruel hoax, and the whole intent of the VA pension program and the new Social Security legislation would seem to be defeated. It was a mistake to have overlooked this flaw in the law passed at that time; this can be proven by the present situation. All of the members of this Committee have undoubtedly heard from their constituents regarding this matter. Many veterans are being hurt and will continue to be hurt if the situation is not corrected promptly. This is not a just way to treat our veterans and widows of veterans who have served our country in every war and remained loval to our democratic ideals.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge you and the members of your Committee to approve the proposed bill, H.R. 10557, so that those most deserving of aid will receive that to which they are entitled. The impoverished state of many of these people does not warrant any cuts in the low yearly income they receive now, and the intent of Congress was certainly not toward this end in the passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Congress and University: A Partnership in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

CONGRESS AND THE UNIVERSITY: A PARTNERSHIP IN HEALTH

(Address by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, University of the Pacific, June 15, 1966)

President Burns, Dean Tocchini, University Regents, Members of the Graduating Class, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I want to do, of course, is to extend my congratulations and best wishes to those of you who have just now received your doctorates in dentistry. As one who has long had a deep, personal interest in your new profession, I have some idea of the rigors of your past four years in dental school, not to speak of the lengthy period of preprofessional education. The degree you have received symbolizes an accomplishment in which you and your families can take great pride. It marks, as well, the beginning of a promising future for each of you. No one, naturally, can promise that the future will be entirely innocent of complications and frustrations. Indeed, any one of you could take over this lectern and give the rest of us chapter and verse on what some of the problems might well be. On graduation day, nonetheless, it seems to me permissible for you to take a laissez faire attitude toward the future and, if only for twenty four hours, concentrate on the pleasures of the present. This may well be the last day of your life when you, your family and friends can all agree on how wholly admirable you are and you should make the most of it.

I want, as well, to express my deepest gratitude to the officers of the University of the Pacific and its dental school for the high honor you have done me this evening. It has been said that "science promises us neither peace nor happiness; it promises only truth." Such a promise, it seems to me, is value enough and if this doctorate in science you have so generously bestowed holds the key to the truth in any way at all, it is worth a dozen trips across the continent, not the mere one I have in fact taken.

According to the program you have received, the topic toward which my brief remarks will be directed is "Congress and the University: A Partnership in Health." I do not, of course, mean to imply by that title that health is the only matter of common concern Congress and the University have, though certainly it would be a simpler and more pleasant world if that were so; if, indeed, we could reasonbly say that the question of health could be dealt with in the abstract and without reference to any of the other challenges facing our society today. Were that true, there would be no end to the noble predictions that could be made. There would be no need to have the slightest hesitancy about the future.

Regrettably, such a view would be a pretense; would be futile; would be, in the long run, impossible. The question of health, like every other fundamental consideration with which we must deal, is woven deeply and inextricably into the fabric of our society. Decisions taken in health affairs inevitably interact with decisions taken in other areas of concern. If a priority is given to health, then it cannot be given to something else. Money spent on health cannot at the same time be spent on something else. A man who devotes his life to health affairs cannot at the same time devote that life to business or politics or the fine arts. We are faced, as always, not with the easy decision of choosing the good in preference to the bad.

We are faced with the hard decision of choosing them among a variety of good things and arranging them in an order that reflects a fundamental social decision concerning our relative need for them at a precise time in our history. We must talk about health matters at the same time as we talk about our commitment to the underdeveloped nations or the war on poverty or the war in Vietnam.

This question of the standing of health on the scale of the cultural, economic and political facts of modern life has been of concern to me for some years. It has been, indeed, inescapable since the life of a Member of Congress centers about the necessity of standing up and being counted a dozen times a month on this business of sorting out America's priorities and deciding which ones we need to emphasize, which ones we need to meet first. And, to complicate matters a bit further, the process is carried out in a public forum with all the pressures inherent in such a method. It is something like a dentist standing in the town square surrounded by a crowd of people clamoring for his services and needing to decide which one or two or three patients he will care for that day and which ones will have to wait until tomorrow or next week or next year when it may be too late to really help them.

Out of this kind of experience, which in my case began in 1940, has evolved a set of convictions. One is that our nation has, in the past, underestimated and, to some extent, misunderstood the impact health has on our total progress as a nation. We have as a consequence, been needlessly diffident about devoting to health matters a sufficient share of our resources such as to enable us to realize our full potential in this area. There are some, I know, who would disagree with this analysis but the facts, I think, are not with them.

At the present time, only about six percent of our Gross National Product is being spent in the health field. And most of that represents payment from a member of the public to a private practitioner for personal health service. Less than one percent of the Gross National Product is being devoted to health related research, education and public health activities. Surely, this is not over-emphasis.

Believing as I do, then, it has been pleasing to see this diffidence beginning to dissipate; to see us, at length, coming to a fuller understanding of how significant to our daily life and to our basic strength as a nation is the work being carried out in our laboratories, clinics and private practices. It seems to me that we are today on the threshold of a totally new public attitude, one that holds out to us more promise than any other in our history. This change has had and will continue to have its effect on many institutions but it seems to me that its impact is especially clear on Congress, on the University and on the partnership they have formed. Before commenting on why I think this is so and what it means to these two institutions, however, let me offer briefly some evidence to document what I call this change in our concern for health matters.

A convenient starting point in offering evidence is the National Institutes of Health. This bureau of the Public Health Service is, as you know, the major health research arm of the federal government. Nearly all federal funds devoted to health research are distributed through it. From its beginnings in 1798, the Institutes had progressed by 1946 to a point where its annual budget totalled $3 million. In the twenty years since that time, growth has been much swifter. In early May of this year, the House of Representatives passed a fiscal 1967 budget bill that allots $1.4 billion to the National Institutes of Health.

Incidentally, in the same post-war span of years, the National Institute of Dental Research has progressed from an annual budget of $510,000 to an allocation in the recently passed House bill of $28 million.

Only a small percentage of this money is used intramurally by the National Institutes of Health. Almost all of the $1.4 billion is instead distributed by means of grants and contracts to the universities of the nation to support their ongoing investigations. Some of the money, as well, is used to provide fellowships for those preparing themselves for a research career and, finally, a segment of it is devoted to support universities in the renovation or construction of health research facilities.

At the same time as this growth has been readily discernible in health research, new national emphasis has also been brought to bear to meet the shortage of health manpower, a shortage that already exists in some specialties and is clearly impending everywhere else. The key piece of legislation in this effort is the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act that the Late President Kennedy first signed into law in 1963 and that has been, subsequently, revised and expanded. The law has a three-fold purpose: first of all, it provides assistance for construction of health educational facilities; secondly, it provides loans and scholarships to students of the health professions, and, finally, it provides direct grants to health schools for curriculum improvement. A number of people—the leaders of the American Dental Association and myself included—long urged such legislation. One of the most active and effective dental educators doing so was Dean Tocchini. It is appropriate, then, that when the law was passed one of the first grants made under its provisions was for a new dental school here at the University of the Pacific.

The third segment of the health field in which new stirrings can be detected is that of provision of care. Here there is no central agency, such as the National Institutes of Health, nor no single, key piece of legislation, such as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. The pace of activity nonetheless has perceptibly increased. This present Congress, for example, has passed legislation that broadens significantly the kind of health services made cooperatively available to the indigent and the medically indigent by state and federal governments. This legislation is shaped, properly I believe, to place special emphasis on needy children.

This same emphasis on the young can be seen in the health aspects of the War on Poverty, particularly with regard to Project Headstart, which is designed to assist three and four year old children from impoverished families and to prepare such children for their school years in a more adequate way than has been possible ever before. Since Project Headstart has begun, incidentally, those directing it have discovered how accurate the dental profession has been over the years in pointing out that oral disease is the single most serious health problem these youngsters suffer from.

Closely related to individual well being is the area of public health. Again, we are seeing an increase in the pace of activities. In environmental health, for example, programs combatting air pollution and water pollution are being mounted. In dentistry, at the National Dental Health Center located here in San Francisco, there has begun a notable series of research investigations on cleft lip and palate and on periodontal disease.

Taken as a whole, then, this outline of the new level of effort being mounted by this nation in the health field is most significant. Some of us might wish that this effort would have been mounted sooner, would have been mounted, say five or ten years ago. But the future is clearly too complex and challenging for us to worry about what might have been. Instead, the question that we now must face is how best to master this widening spectrum of health activities, how to keep control of it so that such resources as are devoted to it will be used as meaningfully and fruitfully as possible.

It is here that we arrive at the concept of partnership between Congress and the University. The concept is, I would submit, a key one in any plan we may devise to define and guide our progress toward a more effective, more efficient and more readily accessible health research, health education and health care system of tomorrow.

The indications that this is so are overwhelming. Consider the field of health research. It is founded precisely on this partnership concept. There is a well defined division of effort in health research. The Universities of the nation, for their part, have undertaken to supply the ideas and the workers in this field. Congress and the rest of the federal government, as its part of the partnership agreement, provides coordination to preclude undesirable duplication, reviews applications to assure that previously agreed upon standards are maintained and provides most of the funding. There are exceptions to this but by and large it is a fair description of how we proceed in health research.

The burden of this arrangement, it seems to me, lies most heavily on the universities, not the government. Certainly, most university officers of my acquaintance are quick to say so. But one doesn't have to be a university official to recognize that ideas are rarer, harder to come by, more precious than our dollars. You can't buy that combination of imagination, insight and industry that leads to the kind of research breakthroughs we have experienced in the United States since World War II. To achieve them, you must develop a man who shows promise, give him the room and tools he needs and have faith in his ability to produce. Ultimately, it is the university that must welcome and shelter such men.

Much the same is true, in terms of the balance of partnership obligation, in the field of health education. Congress is in a position to recognize that support of health education is imperative, to recognize that more health professionals must be graduated annually than we are able to do today. Congress can authorize new programs to meet the situation and then move to fund such programs adequately. But Congress cannot graduate a single physician, dentist or nurse. In fairness to Congress, I should point out that I don't mean to deny it can be highly educational in many ways, its just that the practice of dentistry or medicine is not included in its broad curriculum.

This partnership concept, as I have just delineated it here, is not totally a creation of the post-war era. But, I would submit, the events of the past twenty years have so transformed it that, in the practical sense, it is new. There is today an interchange between the man in the University and the man in Congress that has never really existed before in this country. There is, I think, a greater feeling of trust flowing from both parties. The cliche professor who didn't understand the urgent realities of life has pretty well disappeared. So too, I hope, has the Congressman who lacked respect for academic endeavor and its longterm contribution to the quality of our society. There has been, from time to time, a sense of strain and of misunderstanding. This will still occur in the future. But today such misunderstanding is an isolated incident, not an intrinsic characteristic of the partnership.

I have no hesitation in saying that the partnership has been of benefit to Congress and, certainly, to this particular Member of Congress. Aside from my general responsibilities, I have, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for health expenditures, the obligation of deciding annually how billions of dollars of public funds are going to be invested. Such an annual expenditure, obviously, does much to shape the direction and thrust of our effort in the health field. I need to have, in discharging that obligation, the candid, expert advice of those who are professionally involved in health. I couldn't do the job without it.

By the same token, if I may say so, I think the University has benefitted from this more active and intimate partnership that has developed since World War II. I think it has spurred more than one such institution to rethink its posture in relation to the society surrounding it. I think it has spurred more than one such institution to shoulder willingly a more active and responsive role in combatting the ills that plague that society.

It is to be hoped, in any case, that my estimate of the partnership as having achieved a sound and lasting character is accurate since the demands of the future are going to exert heavier pressure than ever on the bond that links Congress and the University.

We need, I believe, to continue to step up substantially our commitment to health research. We need, I believe, to continue to pay greater attention to the health manpower problem. We need, I believe, to continue to search for new and better methods for distributing our health care so that it is as readily accessible as possible to all our citizens.

In all of these instances, the University will play a vital part. The academician will be needed both as an advisor and and as an implementor. The University itself will be needed to serve as the laboratory in which new ideas are studied, not just for their pragmatic effectiveness and for the larger implications they may hold.

All of this, as I have already said, will have to be pursued while at the same time we continue to pay attention to the national and international context within which health problems must be viewed. Neither institution will be able to retire from the arena where health needs clash with the many other pressing needs of this country's people. Neither institution will be able to shirk the responsibility of helping to set priorities for meeting these problems.

I have great confidence, however, that both institutions, in partnership, will be able to continue this work and will be able to make greater contributions in the future than we have thus far. It is for this reason that I am so pleased to be here with you this evening to share my thinking on this subject. It is because I look to the University so often for advice and support that your generous action in honoring me holds such meaning. Let me close, then, by again offering my best wishes to those who have begun tonight their professional careers in dentistry. I look forward to being with you again some time in the future. Thank you.

Let's Have Some Lightning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I met with a group of business and industry leaders interested in Federal fiscal problems, at which time I made the following remarks:

LET'S HAVE SOME LIGHTNING

As much as some of us may disagree—and I do—with certain facets of his philosophy of Government, Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently expressed some telling observations about our Federal system. I refer to his series of Christian Herter lectures at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, during which he said:

"In a democracy, dissent is an act of faith. Like medicine, the test of its value is not its taste but its effects, not how it makes people feel at the moment, but how it inspires them to act thereafter.

"Criticism, in short, is more than a right—it is an act of patriotism, a higher form of patriotism, I believe, than the familiar rituals of national adulation . . .

"It is only when Congress fails to challenge the Executive, when the opposition fails to oppose, when politicians join in spurious consensus behind controversial policies, that the campuses and streets and public squares of America are likely to become the forums of a direct and disorderly democracy . . ."

To the Senator's conclusions I would add that when an enlightened and intelligent public fails to demand from the Executive and the Congress a strict accounting of their stewardships, then our campuses and streets and public squares also are likely to become forums of a direct and disorderly democracy.

The 89th Congress not only has failed to challenge the Executive—it has given rubber-stamp approval to most of the administration's Great Society programs. Moreover, it has done so even though we are engaged in an extended and expensive hot war in Vietnam.

While the administration and Congress have been marching down the Great Society's primrose path, the general public has maintained an ominous and—to me—incomprehensible silence about the tremendous proliferation of Federal programs. This has resulted in greatly expanded Federal spending, the acceleration of Federal tax payments, a considerable amount of inflation, and the utilization of manipulative budget devices to support the fiction that Federal spending is smaller than it really is.

INFLATION TO CONTINUE

I ask you, "what does all of this add up to?" While you may disagree with me on the interim results, I think all of us probably would agree that the eventual outcome will progressively encompass all of the following:

First, we shall continue to have price inflation, which may reach serious proportions in the months ahead. The demand for goods and services has continued to be robust.

I am told that manufacturers' backlogs of orders have increased substantially and steadily in recent weeks. An even more serious situation is the fact that the wait between ordering and delivery of goods is being extended with almost every order. Thus, it would seem to me that pressures on capacity to produce will remain critical for some time to come.

Moreover, competition in the labor market for skilled help is also increasing steadily. To the extent that industry is unable to hire competent workers, pressures on capacity will become more critical. So, we can certainly expect an unabated demand for goods and services which will result in price increases throughout the economy.

Second, we can expect a demand from the administration for a tax increase, which would be expected to ease the inflationary pressures that are at work in the economy and which would be used to finance continuation of Great Society and other nondefense spending. Of course, the administration has not told me when we may expect a tax message, even though I sit in the President's meetings with the leadership in Congress. I would hazard the guess, though, that we can expect such a request no later than next January.

However, we could get it before the end of this congressional session if the administration concludes that such an increase would not become too much of a political liability in the November elections.

Third, if the Vietnam war continues and there is further escalation of our war efforts and if the administration and Congress fail to exercise substantial restraint in the area of nondefense spending, we may very well see the administration's "voluntary guideposts" replaced by statutory wage and price controls, and I might add that except for a 1930's-type depression I cannot think of anything that would be more devastating to our economy than the statutory imposition of such controls.

In time of war, and make no mistake about it, we are at war, just as we were during World War II and Korea, no nation can afford to indulge itself in unbridled spending without running the risk of incurring irreparable damage to its economy.

And that is especially true in our free enterprise economy, which has made this the greatest Nation in recorded history. At least, until this war is over, we desperately need to stop trying to be all things to all men.

APATHY AIDS SPENDERS

So, I think the time has come when we must have dissent and criticism and challenge of the Executive by Congress. But, the only way we can have adequate and wholesome dissent and criticism and challenge is when an aroused public demands as much from the Congress.

Now, I did not come over here today to be purveyor of gloom and doom. And I did not come to give you a case of the jitters.

But, I say to you with all of the sincerity and feeling that can come from a human heart, we must somehow and in some way arouse the public from its lethargic unconcern for the state of our Federal fiscal affairs.

Just 18 months ago the administration made a great to-do and for weeks the press reported in detail the administration's efforts to hold the budget below the level of $100 billion. What was the result of that effort? I can tell you we are now well on the way to a $200 billion budget and with little prospect for calling a halt unless business, responsible labor leaders and the general public rise up in righteous indignation over the squandering of our tax dollars.

Together, George Mahon, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I, as ranking minority member, have accomplished some modest gains this year for economy with our subcommittees—only to have our hopes bashed and our efforts overturned by either the full committee or the House.

Early this year, I initiated what is now known as the Bow expenditure limitation amendment. When applied, it would have limited the administration's spending in fiscal 1967 to 95 percent of what the President had proposed to spend in his January budget for items covered by a specific appropriation bill. You and I know full well that, except for defense, there isn't a single agency which could not absorb a 5 percent cut in spending without adverse effect upon its programs. But what was the outcome of my efforts—a resounding rejection.

After I tested the House and found no sentiment at all for effecting substantial reductions in requested new spending authority, I made repeated efforts and offered amendments which would have cut appropriations back only to the level requested by the President. These amendments were rejected too.

Let me turn now to some individual items which to me, at least, point up the need for a concerted effort on behalf of economy at the Federal level.

Every time the second hand of your watch makes a full sweep, it has cost us $28,000 just for servicing the public debt.

A few days ago Sargent Shriver, who heads the Office of Economic Opportunity, acknowledged that the administration's war on poverty program is expected to cost upwards of $40 billion in ten years. Almost two thousand years ago in the village of Bethany our Lord said: ". . . the poor you shall have with you always." Certainly, we should do for those who are sick and in need and unable to do for themselves, but I am convinced that poverty cannot be abolished by legislative fiat and the indiscriminate and often purposeless distribution of Federal largesse.

At least in Tennessee, representatives of the Agriculture Department have mailed post cards to local farmers, urging them to lay down their hoes and sickles, sign up for the cropland adjustment program and then go fishing—as their neighbors are doing.

In ten short years, the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has increased by five-fold from $2.1 billion to $10.4 billion and a leveling off of its budget still is not in prospect.

WAR GROWS MORE COSTLY

Our defense efforts in southeast Asia alone are now costing us $2 billion a month. These costs certainly will increase sharply as our war efforts are intensified.

On July 11 Secretary of Defense McNamara held one of his "economy news conferences" at which he announced a 30 percent cutback in the planned rate of air munitions production. At that same conference he announced savings in fiscal 1966 of $4.5 billion in defense costs. He also said that over the last five years since July 1961, he has managed to save $14 billion in defense.

Of course, Mr. McNamara is not doing any more in running a "tight ship" than would be expected of any good administrator, whether he be a businessman or a public employee. But, one thing the Secretary failed to mention were increased costs which he has incurred by the initiation of crash programs to meet our Vietnam war needs. There have been reported shortages of military clothing, materiel, bombs and small arms ammunition and the Department has had to "rob Peter to pay Paul" with respect to some of our military needs.

I will be delighted if he can manage to see the Vietnam war through to its end without accumulating the $12 billion surplus in supplies and equipment which were on hand at the end of Korea, but he has shaved our security might close. He cannot substantiate a good many of his reported savings, but neither can anyone else disprove them because they fall in the area of intangible speculation on what defense would have cost, had he not followed his course of action for the last five years.

In the five and one-half years that Mr. McNamara has been the Secretary of Defense, he has spent $266 billion for our defense and I cannot help but wonder why we were not fully prepared when the Vietnam war began.

The President has complained that Congress is increasing his budget for 1967 by more than $3 billion. After he made that statement I challenged him to veto some or all of the bills that exceeded his requests. To date, he has not seen fit to accept the challenge, but he will still have opportunities to do so in the days ahead. President Eisenhower vetoed appropriation bills which exceeded his requests and President Johnson can and should do the same.

I have chided the administration for sending Postmaster General Larry O'Brien and his legislative liaison troops to the capitol to do battle on behalf of funding the rent supplement program and the national teacher corps, but then failing to send them to help those of us who have been trying to hold the budget down to the level proposed by the President.

DEMAND FOR ECONOMY

So far this year, including the defense appropriation bill which will be debated today, the House has considered $97.9 billion of budget request for 1967. It has approved appropriations of $905 million more than was requested. That $905 million does not tell the whole story, however, because increases in spending authority, as contrasted to appropriations, and meaningless cuts in some bills have increased the actual total to $1.2 billion above the budget.

The House still has a total of about $17.5 billion of budget items to be acted on before the sessions ends. That amount does not include almost $14 billion of permanent appropriations but it does include funds for foreign aid, public works, a variety of education programs, the war on poverty, economic development and for a number of other programs. An opportunity still exists for Congress to effect some economies, but not much will be accomplished in that regard unless there is a demand from back home for economy.

If the demand for economy fails to materialize, I will estimate now that this session of Congress, alone, will approve new appropriations of about $145 billion. Of course, that $145 billion includes the supplementals for fiscal 1966 and the regular bills for 1967, but it is a staggering amount. Moreover, it will come close to the all-time record total of $147 billion which was provided in the second session of the 77th Congress during the thick of World War II.

Mark Twain once said: "Thunder is good, thunder is impressive, but it is lightning that does the work." I close with the admonition that concerned Americans will be well advised to generate some lightning in Washington with respect to where and why the administration, with the acquiescence to Congress, is needlessly dissipating the public's hard-earned tax dollars.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Bishop Edward J. Herrmann, vicar general, archdiocese of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Lord, Provident Master of all things, who have said through the mouth of the psalmist: *Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who built it* (Psalms 126: 1), we come to Thee at the opening of another session of this Congress to seek Thy divine assistance. In these Halls some of the most important decisions which affect this Nation are made. The social and economic wellbeing of other nations are also under their careful and fraternal interest. Grant that each and every action which finds its origin in this Chamber may be a reflection of Your divine love and in some way a participation in Your good providence.

May their efforts here establish a political, social, and economic order which will serve all men and individuals, and assist here and abroad to affirm and develop the dignity proper to them.

May all their actions be in harmony with Your divine knowledge so that as this Nation prospers and the individual citizen participates in the affairs of government through them, peace, justice, sincerity, and true charity may prevail and that all will redound to Your honor and glory and for the good of mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant;

S. 3498. An act to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 9:27 p.m. on July 19, 1966, and said to contain H.R. 2035, "An act to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices," and a veto message thereon.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

H.R. 2035, AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS IN STAR ROUTE CONTRACT PRICES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 460)

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will read the veto message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning H.R. 2035 without my approval.

I am returning it because the principle it embodies is inflationary.

I am returning it because it would set a bad example, not only in Government, but throughout our economy.

This bill provides that whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by at least 1 percent a year, the costs of more than 9,600 star route postal contracts would be automatically and arbitrarily increased.

Such a blanket adjustment of Federal contracts, based on the Consumer Price Index—or any price index—is dangerous. It substitutes an arbitrary rule for the need to judge each case on its merits.

Often, an increase in the Consumer Price Index does not mean that the contractor's actual operating costs have gone up. Yet, under this bill, the contractor would be automatically entitled to price increases.

This is not sound fiscal policy. It is not fair to those who do business with the Government, and it is not fair to the taxpayers.

The principle of this measure, if approved, would not stop with the star route postal contracts. It would spread to other post office contracts—and ultimately to contracts throughout the Federal Government.

This would open the door for similar actions throughout the private sector of our economy. The resulting automatic and, often unjustified, wage increases would fuel the fires of inflation.

Thus, we would be caught in an endless chain—a chain that would imprison the wage earner behind the bars of inflation.

I do not intend to let that happen.

We are now in the sixth year of sustained prosperity. This prosperity was not achieved by accident. It was achieved by responsibility and restraint on the part of American business, American labor, and your Government. We imperil that prosperity if Government itself breaks the line.

I recognize that adjustments in contracts may be necessary from time to time. And it is the policy of this Government to make these adjustments whenever they are justified.

I also share the concern of the Congress that we should do everything possible to reduce the burden of paperwork which is now required of our star route contractors. But we must not attempt to achieve that goal by setting into motion arbitrary contract increases which can only contribute to a wage-price spiral with its disastrous impact on our economy.

Accordingly, I have withheld my approval from H.R. 2035. But I have directed the Postmaster General to take immediate steps to eliminate unneeded and unnecessary paperwork of these small contractors.

I believe that the purpose intended by the Congress in the enactment of this measure can be fully served in that manner without jeopardizing our sustained prosperity.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1966.*

The **SPEAKER**. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message together with the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17–JULY 23

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, this week, in observing Captive Nations Week, the people and the Congress of the United States give recognition and support to the yearnings of the brave citizens under alien domination to once again secure their rightful place among the community of free nations.

Their desire is both simple and just—to develop both as individuals and as independent nations in an atmosphere filled with warmth and affection, not fear and repression.

Obstacles have all too often been thrust between these peoples and their aspirations. But the awesome force of totalitarian power has continually failed to extinguish the flame of liberty found deep within these hearty people.

The tactics of the oppressors have changed. They have become more subtle and less obvious. However, to those who claim that the yoke of oppression has lessened, I remind them that no nation can be free until all its peoples are free. And only when all the citizenry of a nation can work to shape their own destiny can a nation be truly welcomed into the world community of free states.

For those among us who may be complacent in the freedom we enjoy in our own great land, it must be remembered that as no nation is free until all its citizens are free, neither can there be a truly free world community until all nations are able to follow their sovereign aspirations unencumbered by the threat or reality of totalitarian domination.

Therefore, it is imperative that we once again dedicate ourselves to a future in which there will be no captive nations—a future in which all men, in all nations, enjoy the freedom to determine their own destinies.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. **VIGORITO**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **VIGORITO**. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join today with my colleagues in voicing support for the aims of the National Captive Nations Week observance. It is my fervent hope that we shall soon see these efforts come to a successful conclusion.

That conclusion can only mean an end to the oppressive rule under which these brave people have suffered for so long. This yoke of oppression must be removed, and if men—brave men—continue to have hope, we shall succeed.

This week marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week and each year the momentum which is generated continues to grow and grow. The weight of world opinion is behind the drive to free the people of these nations from Communist rule. We must persevere so that all people will become acquainted with our efforts.

I think it is good during this observance of Captive Nations Week to remember the words which President Johnson spoke earlier this year in his state of the Union message. He said that the never-ending urge of people "toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world." He therefore pledged that this country's foreign policy would support the desire of people for national independence and "the right of each people to govern themselves—and shape their own institutions."

Therefore, let us here rededicate ourselves now to continue the fight. Success never comes easily. It is the result of dedication, and this Nation is dedicated to helping those who have so often and so vocally shown they want to help themselves.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program may be permitted to sit today and the balance of the week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the ranking minority member?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. It has been cleared with the gentleman from New York [Mr. McEwen].

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the current airline strike is a strike against the entire public and there can be no question about that. The dispute betweeen the International Association of Machinists and the five airlines involved has grounded 60 percent of the domestic airlift in the United States.

Much has been said about the damage being done to business; hotels and resorts are losing millions of dollars daily. The transportation of perishable products is severely retarded.

Our great concern, also, must be for the young men in the military. GI's who have a few days' leave before shipping out on uncertain missions to southeast Asia. Men who have just returned, anxious to rejoin their families. A delay in their travel must be regarded as intolerable.

In his state of the Union message early this year, the President promised to propose legislation dealing with emergency strikes. To date, however, we have seen no action on his part either to resolve this dispute or recommend legislation to insure against future tieups.

Today I join a number of my colleagues in informing the President that we stand ready to work for and support any reasonable legislation which he and the Department of Labor consider appropriate to effectively resolve the issues in national strikes of this type.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as the airline strike drags on I am receiving an increasing number of protests from residents of Iowa, who advise me of mounting economic losses in the State. Serious damage is being suffered by many Iowa businesses and individuals.

It is also a matter of concern to me that servicemen trying to get home on leave have been stranded in airline terminals. And a mother in my district tells me that mail to and from her marine son, who was wounded in Vietnam and who is hospitalized in Japan, has been seriously delayed.

For the life of me, I can conceive of no justification for continuation of this crippling strike. The recommendations of the Presidential Emergency Board for settlement of the dispute have been accepted by the airlines. Secretary of Labor Wirtz advises me that the proposed settlement is acceptable to the administration.

Under the circumstances, the responsibility for the great losses being suffered rests on the shoulders of the union negotiators. The adamant position they have taken is inexcusable. In the national interest, the time is long overdue for them to recognize their responsibility to the public.

ARMED SERVICES—SELECTED EXTENDED TENURE PERSONNEL PROGRAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced what I term a "selected extended tenure personnel program" for the armed services. This would allow members of the Armed Forces to take up permanent residence after 20 years or more of active duty and still remain in the service. Participants could continue their service jobs until the age of 62. The plan would be completely optional for servicemen, be they officers or enlisted men. They would have to volunteer in order to be eligible.

I have a special order during which I will elucidate on this subject, and I invite all Members to participate. I believe this is a good plan, based upon the personnel needs of the service. It would provide a means through which men who have devoted years of service to our Nation could continue the skills they have acquired in the Armed Forces and at the same time could take up permanent residence without fear of being transferred.

Many retirees are failing to find jobs which even partially utilize the skills and experience they gained at great training costs to the Government. This problem will increase as World War II retirees continue their exodus. The services logically should be able to use the skills of their retiring people better than most other employers.

It would solve a retraining problem. Besides, it would be a saving of over $437,500,000 annually to the services.

I invite all those who may to be present and participate.

SHOCKING ATTITUDE OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this House the shocking attitude of the Federal Aviation Agency toward people and property in the path of the low-flying jets recently routed into New York's La Guardia Airport.

Thanks to FAA callousness or negligence, low-flying jets are screaming into La Guardia Airport on routes which bring them only a few hundred feet above the residential areas of the northeast Bronx and Westchester. The residential area of my district—Clason Point—just across the sound from the airport, is being blasted out of existence by these jets.

Jets awake the people at 5:45 a.m. Jets leave soot all over local buildings and fixtures; jets blast the area with a volume and intensity of noise that frightens the young and very old for their lives.

When I sent a polite letter to the FAA, hoping to be reasonable, I received doubletalk about the President's belief that "there is no single or swift solution to these complex problems." Then the FAA told the gentleman from New York, Congressman Reid, and myself that some "change" was being considered. But the date has come and gone. They are still stalling.

I am tired of this game. I want action. The people of my district are being jolted out of their skins.

Recently, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Wydler, out of concern for the aircraft noise in his suburban Long Island district, offered an amendment to the NASA authorization bill to provide for research into means of controlling aircraft noise. All the New York area Republicans voted for the amendment, but the administration gave its supporters orders to oppose it, so it lost.

I am getting a little suspicious of FAA routing of jet aircraft. It seems that the jets only come in low over Republican districts. If the FAA cannot solve this problem, then there is something wrong with them. There are plenty of commercial areas and water routes the jets might fly over.

If this problem is not straightened out, I am going to take a very dim view of FAA appropriations next time. There are too many people getting too few results. Problems like the La Guardia runway system need action, not talk. And now is the time for action.

SUPPORT FOR THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I usually make it a practice not to introduce legislation which is already pending before this body, but due to the increased activity in Vietnam and the fears inherent in such an escalation, I broke this self-imposed restraint on June 9, 1966, to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 703, which would establish a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force. I did this because I felt Congress should reiterate its interest in peace and its desire to support those organizations which might help achieve this goal.

Today, I wish to make another exception to my usual practice and I offer for the consideration of the Congress a resolution to assure the people of South Vietnam that we are sympathetic to their desire to hold free, fair, and open elections and that our Government, through the leadership of the President, will honor the results of that election as representative of the desires and aspirations of the people of South Vietnam.

We must be faithful to our commitment to defend Vietnam. At the same time, however, we must underscore the very principles of democracy to which we are dedicated, giving the Vietnamese people the right to determine their own destinies through free participation in elected government.

PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL AND RANKIN SMITH

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the opening kickoff for the 1966 professional football season is but a few weeks away, and for the first time the roar of the hometown crowds will be heard in the southeast. It has been a year since Atlanta obtained a franchise to play in the National Football League. Before this happened the man most responsible for bringing pro football to Atlanta was a successful, but little known, insurance executive. Today, the name of Rankin Smith is known in every Georgia household. He is viewed with the regard that most Georgians reserve for Eddie Mathews or Mack Jones.

This admiration is well deserved. He worked long and hard to bring pro football to Atlanta. No sacrifice—personal or financial—was too great for Rankin Smith. He persuaded and cajoled, and now we have a team—the Falcons. When it was announced that Atlanta had received a franchise, the city was thrown into a happy delirium. Over 45,000 season tickets were sold in a record 54 days—indicative of the enthusiasm of this football-minded town. Despite all of this frenzy of activity, Rankin Smith had the task of building a team and an organization. He has done both. His many years in the life insurance business taught him the value of good business—never lose an account. This determination enabled Rankin Smith to sign all but one of the Falcon draft choices.

The southeast is now welcomed into the full ranks of professional football. We have waited a long time. The credit for this achievement is due in large part to the untiring efforts of Rankin Smith—native Atlantan, wise businessman, football enthusiast par excellence.

WILLIE HUNTER'S MARCH

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, Willie W. Hunter, 17 years old, arrived in Washington last night, completing his journey from Atlanta. Traveling alone, he walked over 75 miles of the way carrying an American flag to show his love of country, and support for our difficult and trying position in southeast Asia.

I attach a copy of an editorial in the July 25 issue of the Atlanta Journal, which well states appropriate sentiments:

WILLIE HUNTER'S MARCH

Willie Hunter, 17, an Atlanta Negro high school student, is walking down to Washington to demonstrate his support for U.S. involvement in Viet Nam.

He is carrying an American flag and a knap-sack and he hopes to cover about 75 miles a day.

"I'm tired of hearing about the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Congress of Racial Equality make statements opposing U.S. participation in Viet Nam," he says. "Our country has its faults, but it's one of the best in the world."

Wouldn't it be nice if people all along Willie Hunter's route of march would join up and walk with him at least a little way to show they approve of what he is doing?

But they probably won't. The old fashioned positive support of America and America's policies doesn't seem to attract many people these days.

But at least motorists who pass him along the road the next few days can give him a smile and a wave as they go by and they might even want to stop and offer him a ride.

Meanwhile, the people who live in Atlanta can be as proud of Willie Hunter as he is of his country.

CAPITOL VISITORS' CENTER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, during the passage of the legislation authorizing the third Library of Congress building last year, a number of Members of the House brought to our attention the need for a visitors' center in the Nation's Capital, particularly a Capitol visitors' center. The House Committee on Public Works, Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds has passed out a bill creating a 21-member commission to study the need for a Capitol and/or a national visitors' center in the Nation's Capital. It will be my purpose tomorrow, if recognized by the distinguished Speaker, to bring this bill up under unanimous consent. Therefore, I hope all members who are interested in a national and/or Capitol visitors' center can be on the floor and express their sentiments on this legislation. The legislation which I will ask to bring up tomorrow will set up a 21-member commission to study the matter and report back to Congress by March 15 of next year. We welcome the advice and support of all members.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, "FISHBAIT" MILLER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the House may at this moment be in the mood for something in a little lighter vein and certainly something in a happier vein. It just happens that on today, one of the outstanding employees of the House, one of the finest friends that any of us has ever had, a man who gives the very best service possible and some of the best ever known in this Chamber, is observing a birthday. I know that you join me in wishing a very happy birthday to one "Fishbait" Miller, or more formally, the Honorable William M. Miller, Doorkeeper of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 170]

Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Cabell
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Conyers
Corman
Cramer
Dorn
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Farnsley
Ford, William D.
Gathings
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hawkins
Henderson
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Martin, Ala.
Miller
Mills
Morrison
Murray
Nedzi
Ottinger
Passman
Powell
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Scott
Senner
Smith, Va.
Toll
White, Idaho
Willis

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. **MAHON.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 15941, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN.** When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] had 46 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] had 1 hour and 10 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. **MAHON.** Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] yield some time at this time.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. **BOW.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BOW.** Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning the President held a conference at the White House with House and Senate leaders and with members of the Appropriations Committees of both bodies.

In short, the purpose of the meeting was to let us know that Congress is exceeding the President's budget request for fiscal 1967 by $5 to $6 billion and if an effort is not made in Congress to cut back the result will be either a monumental deficit or a tax increase.

According to news stories on the President's background briefing of the press after our meeting with him, he indicated the following courses of action that might be taken to curb our already overheated economy:

First, the imposition of wage and price controls;

Second, the reduction of Federal expenditures; and

Third, face the alternative of a monumental Federal deficit or a tax increase.

These are precisely the same hard choices that I have pointed to here in the well of the House ever since January 24, when the President submitted his fiscal 1967 budget to us.

I have tried to cut the budget for 1967 and failing that effort I have tried to reduce appropriation bills back to the level of the President's requests. Republicans have supported my efforts but I am sorry to say that most members of the President's own party have rejected his leadership on budget matters and have failed to support my efforts to curtail 1967 appropriations and spending. They have even refused to follow the thoughtful admonitions uttered by our distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], when the budget was submitted to us.

The Bow expenditure limitation amendment has been offered on three bills this year. Simply stated, this amendment would have limited Federal spending to 95 percent of what the President had proposed in his January budget to spend on items included in these three bills. If the amendment had been adopted each time it was offered, Federal spending in fiscal 1967 would have been reduced by $1.5 billion.

Let me tell you just how much support I got from members of the President's own party each time this amendment was offered.

On the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, the amendment received the support of 30 Democrats.

On the Departments of Treasury and Post Office bill, Democrat votes totaled only 16.

On the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare bill, Democrat votes for my amendment went up to the grand total of 36.

With a present House membership of 294 Democrats and 139 Republicans, it is a pretty sorry economy effort when only 30 Democrats, and 16 Democrats, and 36 Democrats vote to support a modest cut of 5 percent in Federal spending on three bills. We all know very well that such a cut could be absorbed by almost any Department or Agency of the Government without adverse effect on any essential program.

On my motion to recommit the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 to the House Appropriations Committee with instructions to eliminate the initial funding of the rent supplement program, only 65 Democrats voted in the affirmative. Of course, the initial funding of the rent supplement program, as well as the National Teachers Corps was much desired by the President and, as a consequence thereof, Larry O'Brien and his legislative liaison troops marched up here and twisted enough arms to assure its approval.

On six economy rollcalls in the House this year, an average of 82 percent of the Democrats voted for more spending while an average of 93 percent of the Republicans voted for cuts or savings. A tabulation of the percentages on these six rollcalls appears at the end of my remarks.

After I had tested the temper of the House and had found almost no support among Democrats for cutting the appropriation requests for 1967, I offered amendments to cut individual appropriation items back to the level of the President's requests. And even then, the majority party refused to support my efforts.

I have suggested here in the well of the House that the President veto those authorization and appropriation bills that exceed his requests. And, I might note, that he failed to mention that alternative at his press briefing yesterday. Up to this time, he has not seen fit to follow my suggestion but I do hope that in the days ahead he will give this serious consideration. Earlier Presidents have vetoed such bills and, insofar as I am concerned, there is no reason why President Johnson should not do so.

The President has taken great pride in the fact that the budget deficit for fiscal 1966, which ended 2 weeks ago, was only $2.3 billion. That small deficit did not come about as the result of any general economy efforts by the administration, or the Congress. It was occasioned instead by growth in the economy and by the acceleration of corporate and individual tax payments.

In the calendar quarter that ended just 2 weeks ago on June 30, the gross national product increased by only $10.8 billion, the smallest gain since the fall of 1964. But more alarming than this small gain, is the fact that $6.5 billion of the gain was eaten up by inflation. Thus, the real gain in the output of goods and services in that quarter was only $4.3 billion. What do you think is causing this alarming increase in the inflation of prices? Well, I can tell you the greatest single cause is the astronomical Federal spending binge which we have been on for the past 2 years. And that binge has been made worse by the fact that we are now incurring rapidly and sharply rising expenditures for the war effort in Vietnam.

If the majority party in this House sincerely wants to curtail nondefense spending and will offer amendments to effect such economies, I am certain members of the minority party will give overwhelming support to such efforts. But, these efforts will have to go down the line on all nondefense spending because we can ill afford a policy of political picking and choosing which programs are to be fully funded or which are to be cut back.

This afternoon at 4 o'clock, the President will be holding a press conference with live radio and television coverage. I would like to suggest that during that conference he make an appeal to the public to write, wire, or call their Members of Congress and demand across-the-board economies in nondefense spending. Such an appeal might awaken the big spenders here in Congress to the fact that we cannot spend and spend and tax and tax without doing irreparable damage to the economy of our beloved country.

6 economy rollcalls in the House, 1966

	Democrats voting for spending more (82-percent average)	Republicans voting for cuts or savings (93-percent average)
	Percent	*Percent*
5-percent cut in Interior appropriations, Apr. 6, 1966	88	95
5-percent cut in Treasury-Post Office appropriations, Apr. 6, 1966	93	89
$12,000,000 supplemental for rent subsidies, Mar. 29, 1966	75	95
$750,000 new authority for H.H.H. house, Mar. 22, 1966	76	95
$4,600,000 new authority for Alaska Centennial, Mar. 2, 1966	79	94
$9,500,000 new authority for Florida "Interama," Feb. 3, 1966	83	87

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Appropriations for those remarks and simply comment that I am possibly one of the few Members who has actually been voting against appropriation bills. I have been very lonely. It comes from my deep feeling and I want to express it here that unless we do something in this area of Federal expenditures, we are going to continue to undermine the strength of our society in its ability to carry forward its foreign policy as well as undermine the ability to continue the onward march of the increased standard of living for our people.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend this committee, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on defense expenditures. This year I seldom have had an opportunity to be able, I felt, to commend a committee for good work. I want to commend the committee for its report and for the debate that went on on the floor of the House yesterday and on an exchange between both sides. I must regrettably make the comment, and I do so in order that the RECORD will show it, seldom were there as many as 50 Members of the House present during the debate. Lest the news media of this country takes that as chastisement, and indeed it is of the Congress, the attendance of the news media during the debate was even less.

How indeed can our people follow the deep issues that face our society if we who are their representatives fail to express these points of view and bring forward the information. And then even if this has been done, if the news media fails to report these issues as developed in debate to the people. Yet, that is the sad picture that we face today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. In the old days, the gentleman will remember, often on a relatively minor appropriation bill we would require 2 or 3 days, sometimes as many as 4 days, to consider the bill. It is hard to explain why there seems to be such apathy now as to money bills, because we know that everyone is interested and concerned. But would you not think that probably this is brought about by the feeling on the part of the Members that they are going to support the legislation anyway, and as a result of the fact that there are so many demands now on the time of Members? It is a very disturbing situation.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate the comments of the chairman. Yes, I think it is because, regrettably, the Members of Congress are voting labels. Again this goes back to the news media. If all that is reported to the people is a label, like "defense," "poverty," or "antipoverty" or "truth in packaging," whatever the label might be, if it is an attractive label and if that is all that is reported to the people, how indeed can a person who is in the political arena vote against that label? He has a difficult time. Some of us do, but we know at the time we do that we are undertaking a real burden back in our own community of explaining to the people that we are really concerned about the defense of the country. We really are concerned about the poor people. We really are concerned about honesty in the marketplace. But the labels themselves sometimes may be mislabels, and the job of the Congress and the job of this committee—and I again commend them—was to get into the details behind the label.

Everyone here is for defense, but we all must exercise our judgment in relation to how much, when, where, and so forth.

The report of the Committee on Appropriations sets out appropriations of $58.6 billion. As has been brought out in the debate, there is going to be in addition a supplemental running from $7 billion to $10 billion, and it seems to me that it is more apt to be $10 billion than $7 billion.

I am a member of the Joint Economic Committee, which, I must say, has not been doing its job this year. We have not been meeting since we held our hearings on the President's economic report. But as a result of our hearings then, I made the remark that, indeed, our society was strong enough so that we could have both guns and butter. I said that we could not have rancid butter, and that I felt a great many of the programs that we had put on the books for which money was being spent constituted rancid butter.

But in the light of the report of this committee of $58.6 billion, needed for defense with a $7 billion to $10 billion additional deficit, in light of the revenues that are going to come in—and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have to be concerned about that side—and in light of the actual picture we have today of inflationary forces, not merely in the offing, but with us as we see in our interest rates, and so forth, it is my sad duty to say that our society cannot now afford both guns and butter. It is about time the President of the United States said this to the people of this country. I hope that in his newscast this afternoon he will have the courage to do so. That means the main offender in spending in our society in the past year, namely, the Federal Government, has to shape up.

The President can do all he wants to about criticizing the Congress about appropriation bills, but everyone knows that this is only future spending.

The President already has power to spend, which has been granted to him by previous Congresses, in amounts to over $100 billion this year, to which we have already added almost $50 billion. If this bill is added, he will then have a total of well over $200 billion power to spend.

This is the power the President has. The President can cut the spending rate tomorrow. He could have cut it yesterday. He could have cut it a month ago. But he chose not to.

He has chosen, instead, to urge the housewife to buy cheaper cuts of meat, to urge businessmen to exhibit restraint. Now he comes to tell the Congress to exercise restraint in granting him more power to spend. He does not have to spend it.

There is only one place to exercise self-discipline, and that is in the Presidency itself. The President has it within his power now—not tomorrow, not depending on what is done here today, but right now—to cut back the amounts of Federal spending.

It is too late really to stop some of the damage that will ensue from the inflationary forces already created. He has permitted all the restraint to be imposed through monetary policy which has resulted in rising interest rates. Earlier today I heard the gentleman from California castigating his own administration for the situation we find in housing. Indeed, he is so right.

These high interest rates need not have come about, if there had been expenditure restraint. Even the next best step—and it is not a good step—of increasing taxes would have been preferable to putting this total load on monetary policy.

So here we have a situation where the war against poverty has been lost, because the poor are hurt the most by inflation. The war on poverty already has been lost, I am here to tell the President, and the battle to maintain the present standard of living is now going on.

This is underlying the air strike, and it will underlie strikes next year. The standard of living of our working people has actually not gone up, because of inflation and increases in payroll taxes. Inflation actually has eaten up their increases to the point where they are standing still and some are slipping behind. So we are now in the battle to maintain the present standard of living. Here again there is too little too late.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very learned statement on the state of our economy. It seems to me—and I hope the gentleman from Missouri will agree with me—that it is important for the President of the United States to tell the American people, before too many days pass by, what the estimated cost of our national security program will be for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, the bill that is before us today in the personnel account alone includes over $500 million for which there was not even a supplemental request submitted, but it was underestimated, and it took no great computer to figure this out. It costs $500 million just to cover the pay allowances of military personnel in the Army and Navy and Air Force during fiscal year 1967.

The most conservative estimate I have heard in the last week on the amount of supplemental requests already prepared in the Department of Defense, already estimated in the Department of Defense, is approximately $7 billion. However, I have heard estimates—and some Members of Congress were privy to an estimate—that ran somewhat higher than that.

The American people have not been told about this either by the Secretary of Defense or by the President of the United States. This has a major bearing on the state of our economy and on the nondefense programs during fiscal year 1967. If we do not do something about these danger signs, which are all over, we are really headed for the kind of trouble that was predicted in our minority views of August 19 on the first supplemental appropriation bill. Everything was laid out there almost sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph.

When I heard the President speak at the White House yesterday, it seemed to me he had just read that report of August 19, 1965.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I must say I agree.

Let me say something which is even more serious, if there can be such a thing. Our balance of international payments, particularly in light of the weakened position of Great Britain, has put us in a position internationally in which it is difficult for us to carry through our foreign commitments, and still the people of this country have not been told by the President of the United States what has been the result of these policies he has been following.

Early this year, I remember, the Democratic leaders—and Mr. Albert was one—took the floor on a couple of occasions to boast about this being the greatest and longest peacetime prosperity we ever had had. Finally I interjected, "Let us not talk about peacetime prosperity. There is blood on the dollar. This is not peacetime prosperity and has not been for some time."

I am glad to say that there has not been much talk of that at the White House since those days, but that is the way this Congress started out.

I remember that the gentleman from Oklahoma also referred to the cries of "inflation" as being Republican shibboleths. I should like to hear what he has to say about it now. They were not Republican shibboleths. We were doing our best—and Democrats were joining us, and there were many—to point out that this was serious, that it was not something to kid about, that it was not anything to play politics with.

I would make this accusation: The President is playing politics with the future of this country when he fails to take the people and the Congress into his confidence. He did not call any members of the Ways and Means Committee down yesterday to the White House, yet we have the responsibility of raising the money. But that is not the way the President should be reporting to the Congress. This Congress is an independent body. If the President wants to address us, let him come up here or send his people up to the congressional committees to speak out in public hearings and not behind closed doors. This kind of consensus is undermining representative government in our society.

Only recently the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], took the floor to refer to remarks I had put in the Record, to a newspaper article about an administration policy of trying to conceal price increases. I am happy that this news item has had the beneficial effect that the Labor Department will not issue these reports on a Friday afternoon in the future. I was very interested in the lengthy explanation of why there was nothing ulterior in the Friday afternoon release.

I wish that the next time they dream up something it will not have to be hit in this fashion.

Finally, let me say that I believe the proposal of the Republicans for a blue-ribbon commission to study the full extent of our defense on a long-range basis and to get the basic relationship of our military expenditures with our civilian or economic strength is quite necessary. This would be a congressional committee, not one of the executive committees.

Yes, we had one of these executive study commissions when some of us were trying to get Congress to study the problems of the draft and the great costs and inefficiencies of the manpower procurement system and the failure to relate it to the civilian economy. We wanted the Congress to do the studying, so the President to stall off the Congress had Secretary McNamara make a report, which was due—and was in, I suppose—about April of 1965.

This report remained supressed, and it remains suppressed to this day. I have been trying to get a copy of that report, to find out who testified and what were the arguments. It was made over a year ago in April of 1965. Finally the Armed Services Committee, to its credit, started public hearings on the draft. Even then this Executive report was not given to the Armed Services Committee or to those of us who testified before the Armed Services Committee so that we could comment on it.

Then, as the hearings ended, the Executive issued a report on the report; not the report, thus fooling a great deal of the news media, I might say, who still think, apparently, and so do many of the people in this country, that the President's report was released. It was not. I will use the word "phony." There was a phony report on the report, and if we never see the report itself, I think that will establish the fact that the report on the report is a phony. Then the President, I suppose to forestall further congressional study, goes and appoints a blue-ribbon commission to look into the draft. This is supposed to take the heat off the issue. I hope that the Committee on Armed Services continues on this job, because it is the people's business and it needs to be done in public hearings. So this need for a blue-ribbon commission to look into this problem of where we are going defensewise is obvious and it must be done under congressional auspices. When we consider the tremendous moneys that we have been spending in recent years for defense and find that we do not use the defense we have, or maybe we do not have it. I do not know. This raises questions of basic policy. How do we relate defense to our foreign policy, if anyone can tell us what that foreign policy is? So, I do hope that the majority will join in the Republican suggestion of creating this blue-ribbon commission to study defense so that we can go forward with the business of the Nation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I do not want you to think that I am sailing under false colors with these dark glasses. I am not a gangster nor a fugitive from Hollywood, and I could not disguise myself as long as I carry this mustache, anyhow. I broke my glasses early yesterday and they are not repaired.

This has been a very interesting 2 days; very interesting. There is barely a corporal's guard here now, as the gentleman from Missouri indicated, and this is a $59 billion bill. There are not 59 Members on the floor. Last year we had the identical situation. That is about $1 billion for each one of you who are here now.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, under the House rules, that is one way to take you off your feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona insist on his point of order?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. My purpose is to get the gentleman an audience and not to take him off his feet.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman from Arizona will stay, that is all the audience I need.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Arizona will be very attentive to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as always.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. You are very kind indeed. An old friend of mine.

I might say this, Mr. Chairman: I have heard great difficulty expressed here in trying to take this bill apart, and my friends on the other side have been straining, really straining, so to do. The distinguished gentleman from New York who has been presiding over this bill since "the war between the States," I think, asked me before the session started, "Are you going to say something on this bill?" I have been saying something for 20 years and he thought that I should. I said, "Well, I do not know. I am not mad at anybody. Everything I want is in the bill." Of course, any member of the subcommittee who cannot get into a $60 billion bill what he wants, after 20 years on the subcommittee, should hand in his uniform. Of course, usually, I am an "aginner." I am better when I am against something. Now, I am for this thing from beginning to end, and that makes it very difficult even to talk for 5 minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I got the impression here that somebody is trying to be unhappy about this situation.

About what are you unhappy? You are winning the war. Does anyone doubt that? How far do you want to go to win? I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] on his feet. I yield to the gentleman; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I do question whether you are winning.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, you have now questioned. I say we are winning the war, period; and we will use all the necessary power and force, as the occasion requires.

Now, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no doubt in the mind of any enemy or anybody else that we will so do, if and when the occasion arises.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to bomb Haiphong and Hanoi, as the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations knows, some time ago.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am a smalltown lawyer—I am no general; and the terrible import is that we have men here who are also smalltown lawyers, real Americans, who have never heard of "Monday." On Tuesday they are elected to Congress. On Wednesday they go before the Rotary groups in their hometown, and they are the Secretary of State, they are the Secretary of Defense, they are the Secretary of the Treasury, they are the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, within a period of 24 hours. Quite a tribute, if you can do it, and they do.

Mr. Chairman, there are 115 Members of this Congress—that is more than a corporal's guard—115 Members went to Vietnam, with military transportation and jeeps and escorts, with classified briefings, fatigue uniforms, and cameramen. And, Mr. Chairman, I underscore that word "cameramen." One hundred and fifteen. For what? Oh, you did go because it is the sacred right of every Member of this House to see? Oh, yes, I am for that; sure.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that I have been advised I can report to the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the distinguished chairman, the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], and his colleague, his opposite number on the minority side, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates], wrote the Secretary of Defense protesting a "candidates' war" or being in Vietnam at Government expense and getting in the way generally.

And, now, Mr. Chairman, about the news media. Somebody indicated that the people ought to know what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, I have been through three wars and God forbid that I shall never see another one. You can turn on any news media and take your place and will find that this place is full of veterans. Did you ever, in your life, see a war where you turn on the television and here is a marine rifleman, in a miserable pit in the jungle, and the television cameraman is pushing him with a microphone, "Won't you tell us what is going on in the very front rifle pits?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. This I never heard of before. I have heard about the Ecumenical Conference being carried on, but I never heard of this.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to yield some additional time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. Over the years his mark on the Defense appropriation bill has helped the posture and the stature of our defense policies a great deal. As a man of great integrity on our committee—and I have watched the gentleman, of course, for a good many years—he has accomplished much for our country.

Mr. FLOOD. Is not that nice?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, just let me echo those remarks.

Mr. FLOOD. If you do not mind, I come from a Republican district and would rather have the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] on my side.

Mr. Chairman, I understand those hegiras to the Far East are to be discontinued and, knowing my brothers like I do, I do not think any of them will go there at their own expense because that is a long way to go.

What is the matter with this thing? There has never been better leadership in this field, in the combat areas and the command zones in any war. I have seen and you know and have heard, never in the history of this great Nation has the morale of the combat troops been higher and better; never. What is the matter with that?

The logistics—I will not bother you with that—the logistics performance by the responsible people to put these troops in the field halfway around the world, where they are, is a miracle. It is a miracle. How in the world they have been able to do this, I cannot understand and I have been in this business for a long time. It is miracle.

Does anybody wish to debate that?

Oh, a couple of marines are short a pair of pants in their first issue bag and a couple of marines do not have summer raincoats. We had to buy a couple of hundred iron bombs from Germany—blah, blah, blah. And they say we got stuck about $10 or $15 apiece on them when they cost five times that much when new. Is that bad? A couple of pup tents became moldy. So we are losing the war.

Why, this is unadulterated nonsense. This is nitpicking.

Let me tell you this about Secretary of Defense McNamara. Now, you read those hearings—if you do you are crazy because there are almost 3,500 pages—and if I may say to my friend from Missouri, and by the way, about 90 percent of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] says, I think was right. You are a good, angry man, a good angry man. As to the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], he has been on this committee with me for years. I agree with a lot of that.

As to McNamara, has there been anybody in this House who has ever taken on McNamara more often, tougher, gut punching than me? Nobody—nobody.

But I will tell you this, he is the best Secretary of Defense that has ever sat in that building since we created the Department and the job and that goes back to my old and revered friend, Jimmy Forrestal. I have seen them come and go like Greyhound buses, some good, some not so good. What can you do about it? This includes all administrations. Why, even I can remember when I have known a Democratic administration to make a mistake over there once in a while. What time is it? They will probably make another one in an hour.

This is going to ruin the war effort? Oh, no.

This is what most of the people think. Do you want to send out questionnaires to your district with loaded questions to get the answers back? When they come back, so many are for it and so many are against it? Oh, now, look who wants to write that? That can be done. Confusion—did you ever know a war in which there was not confusion on top of confusion?

Why, you know what we used to say in the Pacific—and I will have to change the words a little bit—"Boy, those Japs must be messed up because we sure enough are."

Did you ever hear that one? Certainly, you did—from Guadalcanal on down. And it is true now. I will bet you that some kid in the jungle in the air cavalry is saying that and he probably never knew that it had been said before, but I will bet you there is some kid sitting there eating his rations in that hole in the ground, up to his you know what in rain, and I will bet he is saying to his sergeant, "Boy, those Vietcong must be messed up because we sure are, sergeant."

Certainly they will say that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman and I will use the time for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the controversial measures in this bill actually have nothing to do with the Vietnam war at all. The big controversial measures in this bill are not directly related to the war at all. One is the nuclear-powered frigate. Are you not for that? The gentleman from Wisconsin and I went down the line for that, did we not?

Mr. LAIRD. Right.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I say right here and now that by the grace of God, as long as I serve on this subcommittee, I will never, never again vote for a conventional-powered fighting ship in the Navy—never, never again.

Look at the carrier *John F. Kennedy* down there. I was against that project. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] was against it.

Mr. LAIRD. Obsolete before it was built.

Mr. FLOOD. It is obsolete now. They are working on the keel—the great carrier *John F. Kennedy*. I stood here for an hour and pleaded and begged you people to support my amendment on that and, just like at home, where we have a dog, a parakeet and Mrs. Flood, nobody pays any attention to me at all. So you got the *John F. Kennedy*. You made a mistake. You made a mistake, all of you. You made a bad mistake. It is obsolete now. It is too bad.

This is the way we find these things. The lead-on bomber, the lead-on fighter, the dispute about antiballistic missiles—all the big issues in this bill actually are not related to the war in Vietnam and will continue with us years and years ahead.

You do not think there is enough money? What is the matter? Can you not fight a war on the installment plan? What is the matter with that? You and I know that if the President asks for $5 billion, $10 billion, or $15 billion in January, with the exception of two or three people in this House, you are going to vote it for him.

You just do not like the bookkeeping. You want it in this bill. Why, you should be tickled to death that he did not put it in; otherwise you would have nothing to argue about—nothing at all. You would be naked.

I do not know why. I say, if it will make you happier, put it in. How much will it be? Nobody knows. My friend says they are marking it up now. This I do not know. He has better spies at the Pentagon than I have. I do not know. I do not think it is. It will be soon. It certainly will be in a couple of months. I know that. So what? The way you are going you will still be sitting here at the time they mark it up. You are not going home for quite awhile yet.

This is an idea about bookkeeping. I am no bookkeeper, but I know you, and everything that I have said here, Mr. Chairman, has a finish. All these great things that have been done were done by you people. You are the people who did them. You are the Members of the House of Representatives. I am not concerned about the other body. You. And no matter how you beat your breasts and tear your hair and bemoan and wail, I know that you are, first of all, Members of the House and you will go right down the line, if my friend from Missouri does not.

One thing I learned here years ago—and I tell you young men this—never, even in the restaurant, criticize the vote of any of your colleagues in this House on any bill. You have no right to. The reason is that you have the only office under our Constitution that makes you responsible to the people in your district.

There is no vice president to succeed any Member of this House. There is no Governor to appoint the successor of any Member of this House. The only way that a Member's seat can be filled regardless of how the vacancy arises, is by the vote of the people in his district.

May your conscience be your guide. This is a good bill.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I pose as no expert on this bill. I do not believe I have to be an expert to disagree with at least one thing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has said—that the generals have been making the top decisions in fighting the war in Vietnam. I do not believe anything of the kind, and I do not think the Members of the House believe the generals have been making the decisions. Oh, sure, they have been making the decisions as to whether they should capture this village, or that village, and send out search-and-kill missions. But they have not been making the top decisions in Vietnam, or this war would have been fought far differently than it has been fought. Those decisions have been made at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

They have not been making the vital decisions in Vietnam any more than the generals made the decision that stopped the invasion of Cuba and turned that invasion into one of the worst military fiascoes in which this country has ever been involved. No, the military commanders have not been given the job of fighting the war in Vietnam yet, of making the top decisions, and everybody knows it.

I listened to the debate on this bill all of yesterday afternoon and again this afternoon. I have heard it said by a Democrat spokesman that the President has already requested too much for some programs that have been brought before Congress. I thoroughly agree. I have been convinced of that for a long time. I thought that was especially true last week. I will say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, when we had a foreign aid handout bill before this House, which in time and money—in time and money—exceeded anything that this Congress has known, certainly in my time in Congress. That has been 18 years. Yet this House approved that bill for $13,800 million, or approximately that amount.

Some of those who talked yesterday afternoon and today, especially in opposition to exceeding the budget; about the dangers of inflation and so on and so forth, stepped right up and voted for that program.

Oh, yes, and I also heard about the obligations that we have around the world. What are those obligations? Are we obligated to police and try to finance the entire world? Is that our obligation? I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], for their statements yesterday, calling attention to the fact that we have spewed $140 billion in handouts around the world. Where today are the friends that we are supposed to have around the world?

What is our obligation? Is it to spend hundreds of millions of dollars now to relocate NATO in Europe? Is it our obligation to station thousands of troops in Europe when the British and French refuse to give us any help at all in Vietnam? Is it our obligation to bankrupt this country and spend the blood of our youth around the world on all kinds of nefarious enterprises?

I wish somebody would tell me.

Mr. Chairman, I really arose to go a little further with this TFX fighter plane business, which we discussed briefly on the floor yesterday.

On Monday of this week, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Charles and Assistant Secretary of the Army Brooks appeared before a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee and were questioned concerning claimed "savings" by Robert S. McNamara in the Defense Department.

Assistant Secretary Brooks said that on a competitive bid contract the Defense Department formula calls for an arbitrary 25-percent claim of "savings" even though the contract may be given to the highest bidder.

The TFX contract, now known as the F–111, which McNamara arbitrarily awarded to General Dynamics at Fort Worth, Tex., for reasons best known to himself, initially involved some $7 billion and it is noteworthy that the Boeing Co.'s bid for a successful dual-purpose plane was $400 million less than the General Dynamics bid.

Assistant Secretary Charles and other Air Force witnesses said they did not credit McNamara with a 25-percent "savings" on the TFX contract. They described it as an "incentive" contract rather than a regular negotiated contract and for this reason would take an arbitrary claimed "savings" of 10 percent.

This could mean that McNamara will claim a 700 million saving for giving the contract to the highest bidder.

Under questioning Charles admitted that through the arbitrary formula for claiming 25-percent "savings" on bids and 10-percent "savings" on "incentive contracts, the highest prices and costs result in the best Defense Department box score on alleged savings.

I repeat, the higher the costs, the more "savings" are claimed.

As an example, on a bid contract, if there were two bids, one for $100 million and another for $80 million, the McNamara formula would result in "savings" of $25 million in taking the $100 million bid but only $20 million in taking the lower $80 million bid.

Likewise, with the McNamara formula applied to an "incentive" contract, the higher the price the greater the claim of "savings."

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman Hardy of the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee and other members of that group including Representatives Lennon, Pike, Pirnie, and Gubser for bringing to the surface, so the taxpayers can smell it, this latest hocus-pocus on the part of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert Strange McNamara.

I expect to support this bill—the defense appropriation bill—in the interest of national security but I am seriously concerned as to how this $58½ billion will be disbursed by the executive branch of Government in the light of these manipulations, which I have just related.

Following are newspaper articles on this subject as written by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff and published in the Des Moines Register, giving further details on this subject:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 15, 1966]

ASSAILS DEFENSE SAVINGS CLAIMS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Washington, D.C.—General Accounting Office auditors testified Thursday that a spot check showed that more than $449 million of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's much heralded "savings" for last year does not meet his own standards.

Harold H. Rubin, a GAO auditor on loan to the House Armed Services Committee, testified that his team of auditors did a spot check on cases involving claims of savings of about $1.3 billion.

Only about one-third of this sum could be justified and documented under the criteria that McNamara has claimed his department used in claiming savings of about $4.5 billion in the last year.

According to Rubin, the detailed study showed that 37 per cent of these claims of "savings" under McNamara's costs effectiveness program didn't measure up to the standards that required that they result from actions taken since McNamara initiated this program in July, 1961.

Rubin testified that in fact a number of these claimed "savings" came as a result of actions initiated under the Eisenhower administration. In other instances they were simply "normal management actions" that represented nothing unusual, Rubin testified.

THIRTY ADDITIONAL

Rubin stated that his audit of the records disclosed that in addition to the more than $449 million it did not meet the qualifications for savings, there was another 30 per cent that the Defense Department simply able upon which any reasonable judgment could be made.

Even the one-third of the claimed "savings" that the GAO auditor said met the McNamara criteria did not escape criticism. Representative Porter Hardy (Democrat, Virginia) and other members of his armed services subcommittee lambasted many of these claimed savings as "fictional" and "ridiculous."

Representative Alexander Pirnie (Republican, New York) declared that the Defense Department was claiming that it made savings "simply by not buying."

Isn't that going to be a ridiculous criteria to apply," Pirnie asked Robert A. Brooks, assistant secretary of the army for installations and logistics.

"THE EMPHASIS"

Brooks conceded that some of the claimed "savings" did not amount to savings in a manner that would be regarded as reasonable by the public. However, he defended McNamara's program on grounds that "the emphasis" on savings has resulted in some so-called "savings" that would not have taken place if it were not for his much publicized program.

The comments by Pirnie and Hardy were characteristic of the comments of all of the members of the subcommittee as they grilled Army and Navy witnesses for the second day in exploring the facts that have gone into McNamara's claims of savings of $14 billion in the last five years, and $4.5 billion in the last year.

Hardy and other committee members ridiculed the claimed savings of hundreds of millions of dollars on contracts in which there was bidding after it was revealed that the Defense Department arbitrarily claims a savings of 25 per cent on all contracts let by bidding.

Under questioning by Hardy, Assistant Navy Secretary Graeme C. Bannerman testified that all contracts on which there is bidding are lumped together and the Defense Department simply claims a 25 per cent saving. He justified this on grounds that some studies McNamara has had made indicate that in the past there has been a savings of around 25 per cent where bids are sought by the Defense Department.

Hardy asked him if the Defense Department would include contracts where the Defense Department disregarded the low bidder and gave the contract to a high bidder. Bannerman replied that even such contracts would be included.

ASSAILS DEFENSE SAVINGS CLAIMS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Washington, D.C.—A House committee Wednesday assailed Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's claims of billions in "savings" as unjustified "window dressing."

The sharp comments by Chairman Porter Hardy (Dem., Va.) and other members of his House armed services subcommittee came as Navy Department witnesses said that some of the claimed "savings" probably should not have been included in recent press releases.

M'NAMARA'S CRITERIA

Hardy declared that McNamara has developed "criteria" that are "questionable" for figuring savings, and then has not applied those criteria in a proper manner. The results, according to Hardy, are claims of a $4.5 billion savings in the last year which constitutes "bragging" for simply correcting errors and for engaging in the "prudent management we should be able to expect."

Hardy also declared that McNamara's so-called "independent audit" of the alleged savings is really "only a management survey" by an accounting firm that made no effort to validate the claims of savings and said so in the report.

Hardy claimed that most of the "new program" that McNamara originated in 1961, is merely a continuation of practices to try to eliminate duplication and waste that had existed for years.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Graeme C. Bannerman, who is in charge of installations and logistics, testified that the Defense Department was probably in error in claiming a $1,617,000 savings for fiscal year 1964 on six engineering changes made in a contract for the A–6A aircraft with the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.

He said that the Defense Department should have been "more cautious" in its claims of "savings" than to claim savings for these changes, which were initiated in 1960 and in January, 1961, before McNamara was in office as defense secretary.

CONTRACTOR SAVINGS

The Defense Department criteria set out for claiming savings had stated that there would be no claim for savings originating with the contractor, and had stated that June 30, 1961, would be the earliest date for compiling the savings.

Harold H. Rubin, a general accounting office auditor assigned to the House Armed Services Committee, testified that the savings did not fit the Defense Department criteria because it was not started under McNamara's regime and because it was originated by the contractor.

He testified that the Defense Department has been taking credit for "savings" on the A–6A planes ordered each year since 1961 as if McNamara's "cost effectiveness program" had resulted in the savings.

Hardy and other committee members ridiculed the claimed savings of hundreds of millions of dollars on contracts in which there was bidding after it was revealed that the Defense Department arbitrarily claims a savings of 25 per cent on all contracts let by bidding.

Under questioning by Hardy, Bannerman testified that all contracts on which there is bidding are lumped together and the Defense Department simply claims a 25 per cent savings. He justified this on grounds that some studies McNamara has had made indicate that in the past there has been a savings of around 25 per cent where bids are sought by the Defense Department.

Hardy asked him if the Defense Department would include contracts where the Defense Department disregarded the low bidder and gave the contract to a high bidder. Bannerman replied that even such contracts would be included.

Washington, D.C., July 19.—The House Armed Services Committee Monday heard about the "McNamara mathematics" under which the Defense Department can claim greater "savings" by paying a higher price.

Chairman Porter Hardy, Democrat, of Virgina, declared the methods under which defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara claims $4.5 billion in savings in the last year is "preposterous."

The outspoken Virginia Democrat, Representative Otis Pike, Democrat, of New York, and Representative Alexander Pirnie, Republican, of New York, accused the Defense Secretary of "figure juggling" to create a favorable "public image."

The testimony on the "McNamara mathematics" came from Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Robert H. Charles and Assistant Secretary of the Army, Robert A. Brooks after a General Accounting Office auditor had gone into details on more than $200 million in claimed "savings" that he said could not be justified.

It was Representative Pike who pinned Charles down on the method of claiming costs on the highly controversial TFX warplane (now known as the F–111) which McNamara awarded to the high-bidding General Dynamics.

Brooks had explained that on a bid contract, the Defense Department criteria calls for an arbitrary 25-percent claim of "savings" even though the contract may be given to the highest bidder. Bidding is better than negotiated contracts.

Brooks didn't know anything about whether the Defense Department was claiming a 25-percent "savings" even in giving the contract to the highest bidder. The Boeing

Co. had bid $400 million less on the overall contract that was initially estimated to be about $7 billion. Brooks said the Air Force had the responsibility.

Charles and other Air Force witnesses said that they didn't credit McNamara with the 25-percent "savings" on the TFX contract but classed it as an "incentive" contract rather than a regular negotiated contract and in this manner would take an arbitrary claimed "savings" of 10 percent. This would mean that McNamara can claim a $700 million savings on giving the contract to the highest bidder.

Chairman HARDY and PIKE found the whole formula "ridiculous" since the higher the cost, the more savings McNamara will be able to claim on all contracts where there is bidding or on all contracts that are "incentive" as TFX is.

Under questioning, Charles admitted that under the arbitrary formula for claiming 25 percent "savings" on bids and 10 percent savings on "incentive" contracts, the highest prices result in the best Defense Department box score on savings.

For example, on a bid contract, if there were two bids—one for $100 million and one for $80 million—the McNamara formula would result in "savings" of $25 million in taking the $100 million bid but only $20 million "savings" in taking the lower $80 million bid. Likewise, if the McNamara rules are applied to an "incentive" contract, the higher the price, the more the claim of savings.

Representative PIKE, fascinated by "the possibility for savings" under this formula, told Assistant Air Secretary Charles that he had heard reports that the TFX warplane contract with General Dynamics might be "double" the initial contract with the Texas firm. He asked Charles if this would mean that the Defense Department will claim a 10 percent "savings" on the doubled cost.

Charles said that it would, and when Chairman HARDY and PIKE chided him for the strange "financial manipulations" he argued that if it hadn't been an incentive type contract that "it might have cost 10 percent more."

Chairman HARDY and PIKE declared that the Assistant Air Secretary and the Defense Department did not have "one solid figure" upon which to make such an assertion. And Charles replied that there was no way the committee could prove that they wouldn't save 10 percent even if the cost with General Dynamics doubles the $7 billion initial estimates.

"You might have saved more if you had picked a different contractor," Chairman HARDY declared.

The discussion of Defense Secretary McNamara's arbitrary formula for claiming "savings" were only a part of the day's testimony in which Harold Rubin, an auditor for the General Accounting Office, testified of investigation that resulted in determinations that more than $200 million in claimed Air Force "savings" were unjustified under McNamara's criteria.

While Defense Secretary McNamara has claimed that outside auditors have "validated" his claims of $4.5 billion in savings in fiscal 1965, Rubin testified that even the auditors for the Air Force and the Army disagreed with many of the "savings" claimed by McNamara's office.

In one instance, the Air Force auditors had eliminated $167 million of a claimed "savings" on grounds it represented "duplication" of other claimed savings. It was McNamara's office that ordered $151 million of the $167 million reinstated as a "savings" on grounds that the Air Force had probably engaged in reutilization of equipment and supplies that had not been credited as savings.

It was the thorough lack of documentation of "savings" in cases involving hundreds of millions of dollars that infuriated Chairman HARDY and other members of the Armed Services Subcommittee as much as any other factor.

Assistant Air Secretary Charles and his aids continually contended that there must have been documentation for "programed" millions or the programs would not have been approved by the Defense Department or the Bureau of the Budget.

It was claimed that the lack of documentation was a result of a loss of files, or the destruction of files. Chairman HARDY declared that in some instances it appeared that the Defense Department officials were merely "grabbing figures out of the air" as having been "programed." Then when these unsubstantiated programs were eliminated, the Defense Department claimed savings to that extent.

In a House speech, Representative PIKE declared: "Nothing which we found is going to inspire great confidence in the taxpayers of America that the 'savings' are going to lower their tax bills."

While granting that McNamara's claims of savings seem "overwhelming," that an examination of the evidence has left "at least one Congressman . . . underwhelmed."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 15941, and I support the total appropriated amount of $58,611,045,000, and I support it without reservation or equivocation. I support it because the security of the United States of America and the defense of freedom on this planet depends upon it. I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his generous allocation of time to me and for assigning this time immediately following the members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

The subject matter of this bill is not questioned by any Member of this House. I hope that it will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, if the bill provided a greater or a lesser amount, my support of this appropriation bill would be equally strong. The easier course of action would be to commit my remarks to writing and to extend them in the RECORD at this point. However, I subscribe to the words of Edmund Burke:

> All that is necessary for the forces of evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing or to remain silent.

I have no question about the need for the amount contained in this bill, but I do have certain questions which should be asked. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have that right, and this is the proper forum for such questions to be asked. The first question—and it is of a general nature—is what is our policy and what is our objective in our present military commitment and our involvement in war in Vietnam.

In an old cemetery near my hometown there is a gravestone which has an epitaph which reads:

> Where I am now, you soon will be; prepare yourself to follow me.

One of our local citizens came through that graveyard one night and stumbled over this particular stone. After reading the epitaph, he took a piece of chalk and wrote:

> To follow you I'll not consent until I know which way you went.

We shall follow our troops and our flag in any direction, but we are entitled to know our destination and the purpose of the trip.

There have been certain decisions which have led to our massive commitment in Vietnam which I have opposed. If I had been called upon to make the original Vietnam commitment, I probably would not have made a military commitment in Vietnam under the unstable political conditions which existed. Yet, when the Commander in Chief, and indeed three separate Commanders in Chief, committed our men at arms and the flag of our country, he committed me at the same time. It is my purpose as a citizen of America and as a Member of this body to support this country and this Government in every way that I can.

When the bullets are flying, and the honor and prestige of this country are committed on a foreign battlefield, politics should properly end at the waters' edge.

It is the responsibility of each of us in the official capacity in which we serve to make certain that the members of the armed services committed in Vietnam receive the unreserved support of the Congress of the United States and of the American people.

Especially, it is the responsibility of us to make certain that the funds which are appropriated in this general appropriation bill for the Department of Defense, are expended wisely in such a manner that the commitment and honor of the United States are upheld.

Therefore, I renew the question which I have earlier raised: What is our policy in Vietnam, and where is it going to lead?

In the early part of this year, in a conference participated in by a number of my colleagues and myself, with a number of our counterparts from the House of Commons of Great Britain, we received there a substantial consensus of the thoughts of officials, businessmen, and private citizens, of probably the greatest ally that this country has, Great Britain.

There were those who spoke quite frankly during this conference. There were those who were alarmed by the lack of a definite, stated policy of our position in Vietnam, and where that policy will lead.

Mr. Chairman, there were those, including various senior members of the House of Commons—and there was one who had served as Prime Minister and another who was formerly a Minister of Defense in the British Government—who were outspoken in their belief that unless the United States of America took such action as might be necessary to promptly terminate this military involvement in Vietnam and with a military victory, that the alternative might be a 30-year land war on the continent of Asia. These men know from experience and their own national history what is involved in military operations in Asia.

Each of us deplores the possibility of a 30-year land war in Asia or a prolonged military involvement in warfare there.

It is extremely doubtful that this, or any other Western power, could survive a land war in Asia of the duration and magnitude that such a contingency would require.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the time is not only present, but it has long since passed, that our military objective in Vietnam be announced and that it be announced in language so clear that it can be understood throughout the world by friends, foes, and uncommitted nations alike.

Many of my friends at home as well as many of our colleagues feel—and with this I must agree—that a military solution alone does not hold the complete answer to what is taking place in Vietnam. However, just as I recognize that fact, I firmly believe that we cannot achieve the other and equally great solution without first achieving a military victory in the same way that every military force of the United States through World War II has always achieved victory when committed to warfare, declared or undeclared.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB.** Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 5 additional minutes.

Mr. **FLYNT.** I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, during the past few weeks I have had the opportunity to meet with and to discuss in both small and large groups, the war in Vietnam. As a result of those conferences and meetings, I think that there is absolute assurance that the people with whom I have talked, the people of the Sixth District of Georgia, and as near as I can ascertain, all of the people of our great State not only love our country, but they support it and its policy. They support our Government, right or wrong, and whether they agree with the administration or not, they support the policy of the United States and our Armed Forces engaged in Vietnam. However, I am convinced that this support would be more enthusiastic and 10 times as strong if there were a definite announced and stated policy of terminating this war with dispatch, with honor, and with victory.

Mr. **SIKES.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FLYNT.** I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **SIKES.** I have listened to my distinguished friend from Georgia with a great deal of interest. He is making a profound statement and one of the soundest that I have heard during this debate. He is a valuable and distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations and I appreciate the work that he has done on the committee and the soundness of his logic here today.

Mr. **FLYNT.** I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FLYNT.** I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. **GEORGE W. ANDREWS.** Mr. Chairman, I too want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for the fine statement that he has made and express my appreciation for the work that the gentleman has done as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is one of the senior members of the committee, respected by all members of the committee on both sides and I have enjoyed working with the gentleman throughout the years. He represents the Sixth District of Georgia which adjoins my district, the Third District of Alabama. We have worked together on river and defense projects. It has been a pleasure to work with him and I know no man for whom I have a higher regard than the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who is now addressing the House.

Mr. **FLYNT.** I am grateful to my neighbor from Alabama.

Mr. **FLOOD.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FLYNT.** I am always pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. **FLOOD.** I do not know whether a kind word from a Pennsylvanian will do you any good or not. But many years ago at the Los Angeles convention, you treated Mrs. Flood and me to a hominy grits and ham breakfast with the Georgia delegation and I think that it is about time that I acknowledge that kindness by joining with the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Alabama—which gives you a majority on the majority side.

Mr. **FLYNT.** I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania before I conclude my remarks that I want to associate myself with the outstanding and fine remarks that he made a few moments ago. However, I disagree with one thing that he said. The gentleman said that he was at his best when he was against something. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not an "aginner"—he is a positive advocate. He is one of the greatest advocates in the House for a strong and effective National Defense Establishment. The House of Representatives and the Nation are indebted to him for the contributions which he has made over 20 years for a strong and invincible United States.

Mr. **YATES.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FLYNT.** I gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. **YATES.** I found the speech of the gentleman from Georgia very interesting and constructive. His definition of purpose in Vietnam and his delineation of our military objectives are very sound and constructive suggestions. I hope that the administration does take the gentleman's suggestions and states what our objectives are there. I congratulate the gentleman for raising the point.

Mr. **FLYNT.** I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I was distressed, as I know many here were distressed, when a few days ago we heard and read that the Government of North Vietnam had made threats to try and execute certain captured American airmen as war criminals.

The very fact that North Vietnam would make such a threat is an insult to the United States of America and its Government.

Immediately upon learning of the contents of this threat, which constitutes a horrible insult to this country, I respectfully asked the President of the United States to issue an ultimatum, through whatever channels he deems appropriate, to the Government of North Vietnam that they shall not, under any circumstances, treat a single American soldier as a war criminal for the purpose of trial or execution.

Mr. Chairman, if such a trial should take place, then no longer would the greatest, most powerful nation on earth have the right, as we have now, to enjoy the respect and the confidence of the other members of the family of nations. I can think of nothing worse than for the United States to permit the farce of a kangaroo court trial and execution of an honorable American prisoner of war to be tried and executed as a war criminal. If that should happen and be tolerated—and God forbid that it should—it might be appropriate to strike the colors of the United States and to raise in its place a yellow standard bearing the symbol of a white feather.

This country has the industrial, economic and military capability, and its people have the courage and the determination to bring the military involvement in Vietnam to an early close. It is my hope that when the announcement of our military objective and our national policy, for which more than 290,000 American men at arms and the flag of our country are committed in southeast Asia, that such announcement of purpose and policy shall include the words "with dispatch, with integrity, with honor, and with victory."

The people of the world, our friends and allies, our enemies and foes, as well as those who are committed to neither a policy of friendship nor hostility, are watching to see if the word of the United States of America made in an honorable commitment is going to be kept by the Government of the most powerful country on earth.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD a verbatim copy of my communication to the President of the United States, setting forth my requests relating to his position on the treatment of captured airmen by North Vietnam and to the policy and purpose of our military commitment in Vietnam.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 18, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Today I have requested an appointment for a brief conference with you to fulfill a commitment which I have made during the past week to many Georgians. These Georgians are devoted to this country and support it and its foreign policy.

This support would be 10 times as strong for an announced policy of victory in Vietnam, to include the destruction of both the will and the ability of the Vietcong and the Government of North Vietnam to wage the war of aggression against South Vietnam and the American Armed Forces committed there.

These Georgians, including my two sons, are willing to make any sacrifice, including the supreme sacrifice if necessary, to insure a victory and to fulfill the honorable commitment heretofore made by the Government of the United States. We are not willing, however, to commit ourselves to a possible 30-year land war on the continent of

Asia unless there is an announced determination to destroy the will and ability of the enemy to wage war.

The United States and our people have the capability, the courage, and the determination required to force North Vietnam and the Vietcong to stop their war of aggression and beg to come to the conference table.

I respectfully call upon you to use this Nation's power, courage, and intelligence to terminate this war with dispatch, honor, and victory.

I respectfully call upon you to issue an absolute ultimatum to the Government of North Vietnam, through such channels as you deem appropriate, that it must not under any circumstances treat captured airmen and other military personnel as war criminals for the purpose of trial and punishment.

I had hoped that I might present this to you in person, and I have requested such a conference with you through Mr. W. Marvin Watson, special assistant to the President.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
Representative, Sixth District of Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the funds which are contained and provided in this general appropriation bill will be used to continue the sound, strong defense policy of this country, and that the portion of it which will be used in the conduct of the war in southeast Asia will be used in such a manner as will reflect complete honor upon this Government and our people.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], has said his substantial piece in his usual dramatic and effective way. Among many thoughtful things he said, he identified the real problem with this bill. There are several controversial features in this bill. I am going to talk today about one of them that I know most about.

We have discussed our homework problems as Congressmen. This is a huge bill, and it is hard for most of us to comprehend the details and the difficulties associated with making judgments on highly technical scientific and strategic problems.

Being on the Appropriations Committee for these last 2 years, but not on the Defense Subcommittee, I have not had the benefit of the most recent briefings. However, I served for 6 years on the Armed Services Committee and sat through many hearings on research and development on the very problem of the Nike-X, which I will talk about today.

So I am not without some background knowledge on the subject. It is indeed a very complicated and difficult system and strategic problem.

There are many reasons which will appear in what I hope will be the course of the debate and argument. What I am trying to do is to call the attention of the country to the scale and magnitude of this project. If we remain silent in Congress, the country is not going to know what is involved.

We are talking not just about a $160 million add on here. We are talking about a program that can go as high as $40 billion. We have General Wheeler's testimony on this. Incidentally, there will have to be a massive fallout shelter program to match.

At the outset I want to say that I voted against the authorization conference report last week, as I announced that I would, for one reason: I was trying to direct attention to this very issue of the Nike-X.

Today I intended to vote for the appropriation bill, as I have in the last 8 years I have been in Congress, because I believe it would be folly of the highest order to shortchange our national security or our contributions to the defense of the free world.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas—and I hope he will stay on the floor—stated the situation, I believe, quite correctly yesterday when he said that we are united in support of a firm and effective defense policy. But I also agree with my chairman when he said, and I quote from his remarks of yesterday:

> We must confess to each other that we are not quite sure in every respect just what that firm and effective policy should consist of.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I, for one, do not believe that it calls for an anti-ballistic-missile system at this time. I am opposed to the addition which the committee has made, but which was not requested by the Department of Defense, of $163.3 million for preproduction of the Nike-X.

My vote against the defense authorization bill last week was a vote against this specific expenditure, which I continue to believe is premature and unwarranted. At the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to strike these funds from the bill.

Incidentally, in my statement on the authorization bill last week I asserted incorrectly that the Senate did not include these funds. This in no way, however, detracts from the merit of my opposition to these unrequested and unrequired funds.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the Nike-X would be one of the most expensive single procurement decisions that we have ever made. The estimates for its total cost range from $25 billion to $30 billion, and possibly higher. But we are taking the first step, if we vote for this today, in the procurement of this costly weapons system, without adequate public debate, without adequate consideration of the system's effectiveness or reflection on its consequences.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As I understand the gentleman's point, he is not objecting to the inclusion within the appropriation bill of the research and development appropriation for the Nike-X, but what he is objecting to is the additional appropriation for preproduction expenses for the Nike-X.

Mr. COHELAN. Precisely. I will touch on that point, if the gentleman will permit, as I go on.

The Department of Defense has good reasons for not requesting funds for preproduction of the Nike-X system in its budget. I feel that these same good reasons will lead the Department not to implement this program at this time.

I want to say to some of my good friends on the Armed Services Committee who are here—where, oh, where, are the "fearless five"?—we went through this once before on the B-70 program. That is the same kind of thing we are talking about today.

In the first place, there is no concrete evidence, sufficient to warrant an expenditure of this nature, that the Nike-X would be an effective defense against enemy missiles. On the other hand, there is considerable evidence to indicate that a defense system of this nature could be offset by a massive attack utilizing sophisticated decoy and penetration aids.

The Federation of American Scientists, a distinguished group of 2,500 scientists and engineers, has described the Nike-X—and I quote them—as "an immensely complicated system of dubious efficiency."

The very able Secretary of Defense—and we have heard testimony throughout this House in the past 2 days as to his superb qualities—told the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations:

> There is no system or combination of systems within presently available technology which would permit the deployment now of an anti-ballistic missile defense capable of giving us any reasonable hope of keeping U.S. fatalities below some tens of millions in a major Soviet nuclear attack upon our cities.

A second reason for opposing this anti-ballistic-missile system at this time has to do with the consequences, which I believe have not been given adequate consideration. The Nike-X, for example, would require a massive fallout shelter program. Without it the detonation of nuclear warheads would distribute nuclear fallout with great devastation across the country.

General Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and this is all in the hearings—has testified that a full fallout shelter program is a "prerequisite" to the deployment of the Nike-X.

However, a full fallout shelter program entails a major policy decision, which I submit neither the Congress nor the country has been asked to make.

Third, a very real question remains as to whether technically the Nike-X is the best system we can develop at this time. We have already spent—and mark this—we have already spent more than $2.8 billion in research and development on the anti-ballistic-missile system. This year we are going to spend another $447 million, or 6.3 percent of the total research and development funds, plus the Defender program with penetration aids, for further testing and evaluation of the Nike-X program. So nobody is standing up here knocking the Nike-X as a research and development program. What we are talking about is the preproduction money which is the add-on money that the President does not want, the Defense

Department does not want, and which I predict they will not spend.

I support this continued research and development. I believe it should go on to insure that we are always prepared with adequate options. But I believe it is completely premature to commit ourselves to the first step of procurement before the research and development is even completed. We would be forcing a decision of great significance which we are not now fully prepared to make.

Mr. Chairman, I want to plead with my colleagues. I have not just done this idly. I have talked to some of the most eminent scientists in this country on this point. They are in complete agreement on this topic. I have talked to them at the University of California, I have talked to them here in Washington, and I have talked to them in other areas close to this problem. On this particular point they say over and over again that if we do this, we are forcing a research and development decision prematurely.

Fourthly, this preproduction step is being rushed, it seems, because there are intelligence reports that the Soviet Union is developing an antiballistic missile of its own. Surely this is not a sound reason by itself for building a tremendously expensive system that would have no more than marginal value at this time.

As a matter of fact, the preponderance of evidence indicates that we would get far more for our money if we would concentrate on increasing the capabilities of our offensive weapons by adding to their penetration effectiveness.

Secretary McNamara said it pointedly earlier this year when he told the subcommittee:

> You do not protect yourself against their defensive system, or their potential for deploying a defensive system, by deploying one of your own. You protect yourself against their potential defensive system by strengthening your offensive system, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Fifth and finally, Mr. Chairman, what impact would this decision have on the course of world events?

There is no question in my mind that the production and deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system at this time would increase international distrust and tensions. It would add fuel to the arms race. It would spur the competition between offensive and defensive weapons systems. It would increase the difficulties of concluding the nuclear nonproliferation treaty now pending at Geneva. It would, in brief, make the present balance of nuclear terror even more precarious.

Mr. Chairman, preproduction of the Nike-X goes beyond our present defense requirements. It is not a priority item. It would not add measurably to our security. As a matter of sound finance and sound military planning it should be deferred.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, action on poverty and housing and education cannot be deferred. These are not marginal items. They demand our immediate attention. If we are bound and determined to add this sum to the budget, let us add it in one of these areas where the need is great, the cause is just and the time for action is the present.

In his column in the New York Times this morning, James Reston has commented on and confirmed many of the points I have just made. I include this analysis for the attention of all Members:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 20, 1966]

WASHINGTON: McNAMARA AND THE ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Great political and military events have a way of starting in quiet ways with small commitments that are scarcely noticed in the beginning. America's Cuban and Vietnamese policies illustrate the point, and we may be on the verge of slipping into another commitment—this time against the will and intention of the Administration.

The frustrations of the war in Vietnam, the opposition of the Soviet Union to a treaty to control the spread of nuclear weapons at the Geneva conference, and the development of nuclear weapons by the present anti-American regime in Communist China are all reviving the pressure among influential members of the Congress and the military staff in the Pentagon for the production of an enormously expensive U.S. anti-ballistic-missile system.

THE OPPOSITION

President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara are in favor of continuing scientific research in this field, but they are opposed to a commitment to develop a large defensive nuclear system, partly because they believe it would start one more long round in the world arms race, and partly because they believe the Soviets would match whatever we did and in the end leave the balance of nuclear power about where it is.

Nevertheless, the Congress has voted $195 million more than the Administration has requested to speed up the antimissile-missile-project, without even indicating to the Secretary of Defense what kind of antiballistic system they have in mind.

The Administration estimates that the development of a sophisticated antimissile system that could identify and destroy a nuclear missile from among all the decoy missiles that would probably be fired at the same time would cost between $20 and $30 billion plus an annual additional cost of $2 billion a year to keep such a program going.

SHELTERS TOO

Also, such a system, depending upon the creation of a vast defensive "cone of fire" at high altitudes above the United States, would require the construction of an immense shelter program in all the populous centers of the nation. Without that, the offensive weapons could be exploded outside the defended population center and thereby endanger the lives of the presumably protected populations with massive fallout.

Even if the financial and political cost of the antimissile system and the shelters were far below official estimates here, Secretary McNamara is said to believe that the development of increasingly sophisticated offensive weapons that could penetrate any Soviet antimissile system provides more of a deterrent to nuclear attack at far less cost.

According to this view, the offensive intercontinental ballistic missiles are likely to be developed faster in the foreseeable future than the defensive weapons, so that even if an antimissile system were developed here, the offensive weapons are likely to retain the lead over the defensive.

Yet this is a hard argument to make in political terms, for it seems to suggest that the Administration is putting a price tag on the safety of the American people. The proponents of the antimissile system argue that the Administration should do everything it can in the development of both offensive and defensive systems, especially since they believe they have information that the Soviets are working on an antimissile system of their own.

Here then is one of those "quiet commitments" that, if taken, could easily lead to another "race," another diversion of astronomic expenditures.

The Administration may very well agree to a more primitive antimissile system to deal with the possibility that China will have the capacity to deliver nuclear weapons against this country by 1975, but the estimates for this are around $8 billion rather than $20 billion to $30 billion.

THE COMPROMISE

No doubt, too, the Administration will go forward with a "hard point" system for defending our own missile sites from nuclear destruction, but a decision to go forward with the big anti-missile system is regarded by the Administration as something more than a mere military decision.

It is seen here as a major political problem, as well. Once a small commitment is made, McNamara fears that the project will develop a life of its own and be expanded year after year, leading to new counter-programs by the Soviets, and still others to counter theirs. Yet the pressure on him is very great. He may have another B–70 controversy on his hands—with the Congress pressing him to build it against the judgment of the executive branch, and insisting that the Congress and not the President should have the power to determine what is to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] for the statement he has just made with regard to the Nike-X program. I share his view that it is premature for us to embark at the present time on the preproduction phase of this program, and I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

As I have suggested before, I believe it would be not only wasteful for us to start now on these preproduction activities, but I believe the effect of our doing so might present a positive danger to our national security, since it might well result in great intensification of Soviet activities in this same field.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I support the proposed amendment. Out of the welter of debate, a few simple points seem to emerge.

First, we are considering a program which, General Wheeler testified to the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee—page 89—would require a full-scale fallout shelter program and cost $45 billion over the next decade—making this surely, the largest single military procurement decision in the history of man.

Second, Secretary of Defense McNamara told the Senate Armed Services Committee that, in his views, the proposed antiballistic system would not "add measurable to our safety." He further testified before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that:

> There is no system or combination of systems within presently available technology which would permit the deployment now of an anti-ballistic-missile defense capable of giving us any reasonable hope of keeping United States fatalities below some tens of millions on a major Soviet nuclear attack upon our cities. (P. 61, hearings.)

So, the effectiveness of this appallingly expensive program is in clear question.

Third, if this amendment passes, the defense appropriations bill of 1967 would without question continue the ongoing full-scale research and development program on anti-ballistic-missile schemes, which has already proved effective in speeding the development not only of defensive, but also of offensive, weapons systems. There is impressive evidence that development of the latter, rather than the former, will ultimately provide our most effective and compelling deterrent power.

Fourth, an inevitable result of our embarking on this enormous program, utterly unprecedented in scale and cost, would be the most expensive game of weapons development leapfrog in history—a fantastic competitive escalation of military expenditures, which in the end would inevitably result in a sterile standoff between ourselves and the Soviet Union, but stabilized at an enormously higher annual cost burden.

The decision to trigger such a program could well produce a Gresham's law which would drive from the seats of power and influence, the moderates in our country and abroad in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, who urge a policy of caution, moderation, and if not, deescalation, at least some mindful limitation of escalation. It will make more difficult the problems of effecting gradual arms control, and ultimately, disarmament by the major powers. And other nations, seeing the inevitable course of escalation of military commitment by the major powers, will feel compelled to follow suit, thus painfully aggravating the problems of nuclear proliferation.

I urge my colleagues to defer decisionmaking on the extraordinarily important issue until the facts are in. And that must mean until the present ongoing research and development program gives us the answers which we need to make thoughtful decisions in workmanlike fashion on a policymaking decision of awesome proportions.

One last point, Mr. Chairman, just yesterday, the President exhorted the House Appropriations Committee not to exceed his budget requests, not to approve hasty and ill-conceived programs not considered essential by the administration. In no other department of the executive branch has there been as high a level of professionalism in the application of cost effectiveness analysis as in the Department of Defense. Secretary of Defense McNamara has made a uniquely valuable contribution to the operations of the Defense Department by the skill and leadership he has shown in bringing discipline, order, and reason to the proliferating and frequently competitive, inconsistent, and overlapping programs of the Defense Department. He has brought the science of business management into the most costly operation of our Government with great effectiveness.

This Congress in recent months has made painful decisions and indulged in unhappy belt tightening in allocating to our antipoverty, education, medicare and other social welfare programs, far less than the dimensions of the need require. How urgently are these $4½ billion needed over the next decade to infuse our domestic economy with fresh strength, life, hope and accomplishment for millions of Americans. How sad it would be to dissipate these vast funds in a monumental exercise in thoughtlessness, futility, and waste.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, since I have been in Congress, I have taken each occasion when voting for defense appropriations to enter a caution about the conflict in Vietnam. I do this because considerable amounts in the military appropriations represent funds to be spent on U.S. military action in Vietnam. Such an occasion is with us, and I want to speak again.

The extent of combat in Vietnam is widening with each passing day. Bombing of the oil plants at Haiphong is a most alarming form of escalation.

Let us all admit that the attack by U.S. planes on major oil depots was a well-executed maneuver from a military point of view. The depots were largely destroyed. So far, so good—apparently. The limited war was proceeding according to plan. The new venture did not harass China, it did not harm Russian ships, it did not add to the war's inhumanity by any appreciable killing of more civilians.

However, the attack on the depots resulted in the creation of a further danger that no one foresaw. It roused the North Vietnamese to a state of viciousness where they threaten trial and execution of imprisoned American fliers. Now why call this a danger? Certainly, it is a danger to our flyers themselves. All of us must warn Hanoi not to commit the evil of killing these prisoners. But the greater danger is that such trial and execution would take us to still another rung on the ladder of escalation.

If our flyers should be executed, then an aroused America might proceed to take measures of force far wider than any before. So what is the danger in that—for us, at any rate? The danger is that retribution could swing back against us. We cannot foresee what it would be, any more than we foresaw the threat of death to the flyers as the answer by North Vietnam. But if we extended the violence, then we could expect some consequence in return. It might be war with China. It might be war with Russia. It might be an uneasy truce with the United States seizing a part of China, while Russia seized the other. It might be a long and costly occupation of southeast Asia by the United States. It might be a nuclear catastrophe with fallout sweeping across skies to all parts of the earth. We do not know what it would be.

We could certainly accept these risks in self-defense of our existence. However, we are risking worldwide danger by fighting far away in a nation where we do not know if they really want us to be. We are risking world danger in order to stop communism in one small place in the world when it might appear in a hundred places—anywhere, anytime. We are risking world danger in the delusion that naked force will compel some people like the Vietnamese to bow down and capitulate. Why stake any case of ours on the blind guess that the people of Vietnam will act so differently from the way we would in a similar situation. Remember that they are rugged human beings, just like us.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM].

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, on Monday of this week, I submitted for the RECORD the annual report to the President on the cost reduction program of the Secretary of Defense. I put this report in the RECORD, even though a copy is sent to each Member, because I feel that it is important that we all realize the significant contribution this program is making to our efforts to keep the cost of Government down.

All too frequently we drift into a negative and perhaps cynical approach toward programs which are designed to conserve resources. It is easier to criticize and find fault than it is to constructively suggest and encourage ways and means to improve management of our Government agencies. As I said on Monday, we hear very little praise when money is saved and, for all of us, July 8 was a truly historic day for economizing. Secretary McNamara reported savings of $4.5 billion during fiscal year 1966 and cumlative savings of over $14 billion.

Yet, as I have listened to the debate on the appropriation bill, I cannot help but be somewhat discouraged to hear my colleagues criticize and even ridicule the cost reduction program. Now, I have had considerable experience in reviewing and auditing Government operations and I know it is not difficult to find mistakes if that is your only intent. In a perfect world mistakes would not happen but this is not a perfect world and we need to keep the right perspective. Again, it is always easier to criticize than it is to constructively encourage a worthwhile improvement.

I am not a member of the Defense Subcommittee but I took the time to study this report, and to go over to the Pentagon and talk with the people who are actually doing the work under the program. I looked at actual examples of savings and, based on my own experience, I know these savings do not just happen. Many people have to be motivated and encouraged to think imaginatively and realistically. These people should be congratulated and not criticized.

It is important that we all know the concept, intent, and background of the defense cost reduction program. It was initiated by Mr. McNamara in the spring of 1961 after he personally reviewed GAO reports, congressional reports, Hoover Commission studies, and other analyses of defense operations. The initial program was designed to provide a systematic, organized approach to improve management through identification of functional areas with potential for improvement, establishment of goals to be reached, promulgation of guidelines, and reporting procedures.

The initial 5-year goal of the cost reduction program was to reduce costs by at least $3 billion per year. Each year since then the goal has been raised until the goal is now $6.1 billion, a striking indication of its success in motivating defense personnel.

Secretary McNamara has from the outset insisted upon the inclusion of only valid, audited savings. He asked the Comptroller General to audit the program but for reasons he felt sufficient, the Comptroller General did not feel it to be appropriate. An independent internal audit procedure has been in effect since the beginning of the program with more than 200 man-years of audit effort being devoted each year to assure the integrity of the program.

A leading firm of public accountants, Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart, was asked by Secretary McNamara during this past year to give him an independent, outside assessment of the true savings to the Nation produced by the program and to recommend further improvements. The firm's report concluded—

First. That the rules established by the Defense Department to assess the savings resulting from the cost reduction actions "have been logical and reasonable."

Second. That the reporting system which applies these rules to the classification, validation, and summarization of the cost reduction actions "has produced a reasonable overall monetary expression of savings achieved under the program."

I can personally attest to the reputation of Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart because as auditor general of the State of Michigan I had many occasion to work with this prestigious organization.

For those who might question whether these savings were at the expense of military capability, it should be noted that during this same period our military effort in southeast Asia has been increased by 240 percent in the number of military personnel deployed, 235 percent in the number of helicopters, 110 percent in the number of land-based attack aircraft, and 145 percent in air ordnance expended.

All of this military buildup has been accomplished without imposing the usual wartime controls on wages, prices, and civilian production and consumption, without calling up the Reserve Forces; and without imposing wartime tax burdens, and while holding Defense expenditures in fiscal year 1966—as a percent of GNP—at a level lower than that of 4 of the past 5 years.

Secretary McNamara has revolutionized the management structure of the Pentagon in the past 5 years. He has instituted scientific planning, programing and budgeting systems, consolidated common operations, eliminated unnecessary operations—862 unneeded base closure decisions have been made—and, at the same time, built a military force ready for any emergency which has moved faster, farther, and has been better supplied than any force in this century.

In reviewing the cost reduction program, I looked at specific examples picked at random which illustrate the three board categories of savings which are included in the program.

The first category covered in the program is called, "buying only what we need." In one example in this category the Army Munitions Command saved $5,889,576 in fiscal year 1966 by modifying 270,288 projectiles used in the obsolete 155-millimeter field artillery gun. An employee suggested that the projectile be modified to the configuration of the projectile used in the 155-millimeter howitzer. This projectile has a heavy and continuing demand. Modification costs were $2.34 each, compared with a new procurement cost of $24.13.

Now it can be alleged that this is a fictitious savings because the claim is based on something that wasn't bought—270,288 projectiles. The first is that they did not buy these new projectiles because, by the imaginative action of one individual, obsolete material was modified and updated at less than 10 percent of new material cost. And if you think this is an unusual, sporadic instance, let me point out that under this program the use of excess material at full value rather than sale as surplus at .05 cents on the dollar has increased 60 percent since 1961—from less than $1 billion per year to more than $1.5 billion. Such improvements do not just happen.

Another example in the first category of savings involves the application of current automated management techniques to a problem that had grown too big to handle manually. This is the type of savings I know is real because I have introduced many of the same kind in the State of Michigan and I have personally seen the results. The Navy Ships Parts Control Center at Mechanicsburg, Pa., saved $587,440 in fiscal year 1966 in the support of new shipboard equipment. This saving resulted from the use of a computer to calculate the average life of repair parts used in different but similar applications and using the resultant factors to develop the quantitative repair parts needs for the new equipment. Previously the Navy had been estimating the quantities of repair parts needed based on the technical consideration by responsible supply technicians. The complexity of modern equipment and the immense increase in the number of supporting repair parts made the old method completely infeasible and uneconomical.

A further example—five special purpose, high heat resistant bolts were used by the New Cumberland Army Depot to install armor on CH-47A helicopters. The cost of the bolts was $34 each. The production controller, making $9,000 per year, considered the unit cost to be excessive and conducted a search of similar items in the supply system that might meet the required specification. A bolt costing 40 cents each was found, and was approved by the technicians. This action on the part of one alert individual, who could have just as easily used the $34 bolt, saved the Army $13,104 in fiscal year 1966.

In still another example of a very real savings, a comprehensive value engineering study was conducted on the 2.75-inch rocket motor tube by personnel at the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif. As a result, the tube was redesigned, eliminating three of four components, thereby simplifying manufacture. Unit cost was reduced from $5.08 each to $3.73 each, and produced savings in fiscal year 1966 of $760,522.

Again, it can be alleged that these employees were only doing what they were paid for and that no one should be given credit for something that is a part of his daily job. Such critics do not understand either management or personnel motivation. Without stimulation, encouragement, credit and goals, none of us perform at our maximum. The increased level of cost savings accomplishment in the Defense Department in the past few years is proof that dynamic management is the cause.

The second category in the cost reduction program is "buying at the lowest sound price." We all know that competition in procurement stimulates producers to find better and less expensive ways to manufacture items. Here again, the efforts of all procurement personnel in Defense have increased the level of competitive procurement by 40 percent since 1961.

One striking example of the effect of competition on prices involves adapters for bomb and ejector racks. These adapters were first produced by the contractor who designed, developed, and fabricated them under a Bureau of Weapons contract. For the fiscal year 1966 requirement it was determined that enough data was available to procure the item competitively. Fifty-seven bidders were solicited and 13 qualified producers submitted price bids. The previous sole source price was $667.30 each. The low bidder, a different contractor, received the award at a price of $300.72 each, a unit saving of $366.58 or a reduction of 55 percent. The interesting point about this action is that the developer who was also the previous sole source producer of the item, submitted a bid of $731 each—an increase of $63.70 each over his previous sole source price. Savings on this one contract in fiscal year 1966 amounted to $197,953.

In another case in the procurement savings category, fuel tank assemblies for the F-4 aircraft had been procured on a single year competitive basis by the Air Force at a unit cost of $950 each. By using multiyear procurement procedures in fiscal year 1966, which combines

2 or more years' procurement requirements into one for bidding purposes, the Air Force obtained a unit price of $780 each. This is a reduction of 18 percent and resulted in actual savings of $1,744,540 in fiscal year 1966 with additional savings anticipated in fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968.

The third broad category covers "reducing operating costs." Again I looked at actual examples and I was impressed with the creative and progressive thinking that led to very real savings. The entire management approach to this immense Defense job as well as the individual urge to find better ways to do required operations have combined to produce results the like of which we have never seen before.

For example, communications lines and circuits previously were leased separately by the individual military departments and Defense agencies. The Defense Communications Agency now consolidates requirements for all Department of Defense components and the integrated use produces savings to the Department of $93.4 million in fiscal year 1966.

Everyone knows that first class air travel is more expensive than coach travel and we know that it is Government policy not to travel first class when coach is available. However, policy is one thing and practice is another. In 1961, 62.7 percent of air travel in Defense was by first class. Under this program, in 1966 it is 6.2 percent. Who can allege that the annual savings of $16,139,000 are not real?

Annular rings, which are integral components of a data processing display system which projects aircraft track data on a projector screen, have a silver coating which cannot be duplicated due to company patent rights. In the past damaged rings were discarded and new rings purchased at a cost of $13 each. After extensive research a new process was developed to remove the original coating after it became damaged and a commercial solution was found to be an excellent coating material. The new process cost 20 cents for each ring. After amortizing the cost of the processing equipment, savings of $17,787 were realized in fiscal year 1966. Savings of $235,847 are expected to be realized annually in future years.

The Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, N.C., previously discarded worn main nozzle and shroud assemblies used on pneumatic gas turbine engines to provide auxiliary power and air conditioning for aircraft on the ground. Personnel in the overhaul and repair departments conducted a detailed analysis of the assembly. It was determined that the assemblies could be repaired and necessary procedures were developed. Costs to repair amounted to $42 each versus $678 each to buy new assemblies; $28,476 was saved in fiscal year 1966 by this new procedure. Perhaps it is easy to say this should have been done long before but so can you say that Edison should have invented the incandescent lamp years earlier than he did.

These examples I have talked about today, I have looked into personally and I think I can speak with some knowledge.

I have spent a number of years in Government administration. To be a good administrator you have to be able to separate the real from the fictitious and you learn to recognize good methods, systems, and programs. I have had comprehensive personal experience with program budgeting, systems analysis, data processing, and advanced management techniques. I have evaluated operations and instituted management changes which have saved 15 to 20 percent of the resources previously required. I say this in order that you will know that I think I am qualified to recognize good management when I see it. And I have seen it in the Department of Defense.

What is happening in the DOD should be adopted throughout all Government agencies. I know the President has directed a Government-wide cost reduction program but I also know that if we do not actively support and encourage such a program it will not prove to be very successful. As a Congressman and a taxpayer I am convinced that we must adopt a positive approach to this program and encourage its spread to all other agencies. I earnestly enlist your support.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARNUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. We have provided high salaries for people in the Department of Defense and we try to get the best people possible. Why do these things not come about just under the human way of operating things and be expected of the Department of Defense, without going into a big publicity campaign? Why should it not be handled that way?

Mr. FARNUM. That is not hard to explain. My experience has proven that you must have goals established. You must create incentive. You must help stimulate initiative. You must let the personnel be part of the decisionmaking and the daily working processes in the administration of government. This is what this program does.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Should we not expect this to be done?

Mr. FARNUM. We can expect it, but it just does not happen that way. Through the process of this kind of a program we do accomplish these things.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Do you have any idea how much the Secretary of Defense is spending on this program or how many man-hours he is taking from other projects to do this job of cataloging cost reductions?

Mr. FARNUM. No, I do not; but they do have a considerable number of people working on it in terms of promotion. I think it is an exceptional program and can only succeed if we give it good positive support.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Do you know that the pamphlet that was published last year on the cost reduction program cost over $60,000?

Mr. FARNUM. Yes, I also know that communication within the DOD is necessary and this is one of the good methods. It stimulates other employees to participate in the program. I include documentary evidence referred to in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

155MM PROJECTILE

Function: Ammunition item used with the M59mm, 155mm Field Artillery Gun. This is a towed weapon which is now obsolete.

Situation: Obsolescense of the 155mm M59 Gun left the Army with 1.2 million M101 Projectiles for which there was no known requirement. These projectiles had a catalog value of $24.13 each.

Action: A study was made by supply management and ordnance specialists to find ways to utilize excess or obsolete ammunition by modification into another type of ammunition which has a current requirement. The study group found that there was a heavy and continuing demand for M107, 155mm Projectiles used in the 155mm Howitzer. A member of the group suggested the idea of modifying the obsolete M101 Projectiles to the M107B1 configuration by machining off part of the rotating band and replacing the grommet cover which goes over the rotating band. Tests proved that the rounds could be modified at a cost of $2.34 each to meet all specifications for the M107B1.

Result: Modification of the obsolete projectile was expedited and rework operations are expected to continue through the 3rd Quarter, FY 1967.

Savings computation

	Quantity	Unit cost	Amount
M-101 projectiles	270, 288	$24. 13	$6, 522, 049
Rework costs	270, 288	2. 34	−632, 473
Fiscal year 1966 savings			5, 889, 576

Source: Ammunition Procurement and Supply Agency, Army Munitions Command.

SUPPORT FOR NEW SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT

Function: Under the "old" procedures, Navy had been estimating quantities of repair parts for system stock to support new equipment placed onboard ship on the basis of technical consideration of responsible item supply technicians.

Action: A new procedure was developed called "Mean Family Replacement Factor." This procedure uses a computer to calculate the average life of repair parts used in similar applications, and employs the resultant factors to determine the quantities of repair parts to support the new equipment.

Result: Use of the new method produced savings, averaging $174.39 per new item, or total savings of $587,440 during FY 1966.

Savings computation

Spare parts:	
Quantity	3, 368
Average item savings	$174. 39
Amount	$587, 440
Fiscal year 1966 savings	$587, 440

Source: Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

BOLT, ARMOR INSTALLATION

Function: Used for installation of armor on the CH–47A aircraft.

Situation: New Cumberland Army Depot was processing 78 CH–47A aircraft through their maintenance shops for installation of critical Component Armor Protective Kits. Five special purpose, high heat resistant bolts were required for each installation. The cost of the bolts was $34.00 each.

Action: In the course of requisitioning the bolts, the Production Controller considered the unit cost of the bolts to be excessive and conducted a search of similar items in the supply system that might meet the required specification. A bolt costing $.40 each was found to meet the required specifications, and upon approval by Aviation Command technicians, was substituted for the $34.00 item.

Result: All CH-47A aircraft processed through the Maintenance Shop used the less expensive bolts. Additional savings will be realized on all future processing.

Savings computation

	Quantity per aircraft	Unit cost	Cost per aircraft
Bolt (NAS K86-4-12/15)	5	$34.00	$170
Bolt (NAS 464-P4-12)	5	.40	$2
Savings per aircraft			$168
Aircraft processed			78
Fiscal year 1966 savings [1]			$13,104

[1] Savings per aircraft multiplied by aircraft processed.

Source: New Cumberland Army Depot, Army Materiel Command.

THE 2.75-INCH ROCKET MOTOR TUBE

Function: The Rocket Motor Tube is the housing for the rocket propellant.

Situation: The original design consisted of four components and was relatively difficult and expensive to fabricate.

Action: A comprehensive value engineering study was made of the tube design. An integral bulkhead motor tube was designed to replace the old tube. The solid bulkhead tube eliminates three components of the old design: the head closure, one lockwire, and one O-ring.

Result: The new design is easier to manufacture and can be produced at a saving of $1.35 per unit over the cost of the old design.

Savings computation

	Units	Unit cost	Amount
Old design	585,572	$5.08	$2,974,705.76
New design	585,572	3.73	−2,184,183.56
Offset cost (development)			−30,000.00
Fiscal year 1966 savings			760,522.20

Source: Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake.

ADAPTORS FOR BOMB AND EJECTOR RACKS

Function: Used on Aero 21 A and B bomb skids for stowage and transporting bomb racks and ejector racks aboard aircraft carriers.

Situation: Washington Technological Associates, Inc., designed, developed, and fabricated one adaptor under a Bureau of Weapons contract. The first production contract was not considered suitable for competitive procurement due to lack of technical documentation and need for design modification because of damage experienced in fleet operations.

Action: For the FY 1966 requirement, it was ascertained that the design was now firm, documentation was available, and time would permit a new source to produce and deliver. 57 bidders were solicited and 13 qualified producers submitted price bids.

Result: American Chain and Cable Co., Inc., the low bidder received the award. Savings on 540 units procured were based on a comparison of the successful bid price with the previous sole scurce price. No adjustment was made for the fact that the sole source price was for only 60 units, because the sole source had also submitted a competitive bid of $731.00 each on the 540 units.

Savings computation

Source source unit price	$667.30
Competitive unit price	−300.72
Unit savings	$366.58
Units purchased	×540
Fiscal year 1966 savings	$197,953.20

Source: Navy Purchasing Office, N.Y.

FUEL TANK ASSEMBLY

Function: Item is a Pylon Tank Assembly having a fuel capacity of 370 gallons, and is an integral part of the F-4 aircraft.

Situation: The procurement responsibility for this item was originally assigned to the Navy, but was transferred to the Air Force in Calendar Year 1964. The initial procurement made by Air Force was a competitive contract for 5,006 tanks, and included the requirement for the contractor to furnish a complete data package. It was necessary to procure an urgent follow-on procurement sole source for a quantity of 13,832 each, prior to receipt of the data package. Additional requirements were delayed until the data package became available.

Action and result: By delaying procurement, except for the urgent follow-on requirement, until the data package was received, the Air Force was able to prepare a bid package utilizing multiyear procurement procedures that resulted in a maximum calculated savings of $4,828,000.

Savings computation—Fuel tank assembly

Unit cost:	
Last procurement	[1] $950
Multiyear	$780
Unit savings	$170
Quantity	10,262
Fiscal year 1966 savings [2]	$1,744,540

[1] Last procurement unit cost adjusted from $970 to $950 due to quantity increase on multiyear procurement. Estimated savings: Fiscal year 1967, $2,287,860; fiscal year 1968, $795,600.

[2] Unit savings multiplied by quantity.

Source: Ogden Air Materiel Area, Air Force.

One of the most productive techniques applied under the Cost Reduction Program is an improved telecommunications management concept identified as TELPAK. This is a short-title designation for the consolidation of all commercially leased communications requirements into a single telecommunications package. Under this concept there is centralized control of the management and leasing of communications facilities, lines and circuits which had formerly been contracted for or on individual need basis by the separate Departments. By the consolidation of requirements, integrated use of facilities and centralized leasing the Defense Department has saved $93.4 million in Fiscal Year 1966.

USE OF NON-PREMIUM AIR PASSENGER SERVICE

Action: Travel by air coach accommodations in lieu of first class air accommodations wherever practicable was directed by the Department of Defense as an economy measure in April 1962. This administrative restriction offers an exception to the basic entitlement for first class accommodations and thus produces an economy in every instance in which it is possible to apply the established criteria. However, the exercise of traffic management judgment is still the basis for determination as to whether the economy can be realized in any given situation.

Savings computation

Travel data	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1966
Passenger miles……billion dollars	1.2	2.0
Percent 1st class	62.7	6.2
Percent less than 1st class	37.3	93.8
Cost reduction……million dollars		16.1
Average cost per passenger mile:		
1st class		$0.0753
Less than 1st class		$0.0618

Source: Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service.

RECOATING ANNULAR RINGS

Function: Annular Rings are used as a scribing surface for the AN/FYQ-9 Display System to project the track data on the projector screen.

Situation: The original annular rings have a silver coating that cannot be duplicated due to company patent rights. Also, the rings cannot be recoated with another substance because removal of the original coating causes the glass surface to be scratched.

Action: Extensive research was initiated to find a better method for removing the old coating and to find a commercially available resurfacing solution. A buffing process was developed which removed the old coating without damage to the glass. A commercial solution, "Aerolon G," was found to be an excellent coating material.

Result: One thousand and five hundred rings have been recoated by the new process, resulting in savings of $17,787. Estimated annual savings of $235,847 are expected to be realized from use of this procedure in subsequent years.

Savings computation

	Quantity	Unit cost	Amount
Cost of new annular rings	1,500	$13.00	$19,500
Cost of recoating rings:			
Recoating machine			−1,403
Labor and materials			−310
Fiscal 1966 savings			17,787

Source: Alaskan Air Command.

NOZZLE AND SHROUD ASSEMBLY

Function: Item is a component of GTCP 100-52 pneumatic gas turbine compressor used to provide auxiliary power and airconditioning for aircraft on the ground.

Situation: Defective nozzle and shroud assemblies were replaced with new assemblies during regular engine overhauls at a cost of $720 each.

Action: A detailed analysis of the assembly and its structural and performance requirements indicated that overhaul and repair criteria were too stringent, causing an abnormally high rate of rejection and replacement during overhaul. This was due to minor cracks in the assembly or other defects which could be corrected.

Result: Revised repair limits and procedures were developed which permitted acceptance of minor defects not affecting operational efficiency and repair of cracks in the assembly by the microbrazing process. Assemblies are repaired at an average cost of $42 each. Tests have substantiated the integrity of the revised limits and repair procedures.

Savings computation

	Quantity	Unit cost	Total cost
New assemblies	42	$720	$30,240
Reworked assemblies	42	42	1,764
Fiscal year 1966 savings			28,476

Source: Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my full support for the Department of Defense appropriations bill now being considered. H.R. 15941 is the end product of hard work and sober consideration by every member of the Appropriations Committee, and I believe that the best way for this body to express its gratitude for a job well done is to vote favorably for this legislation.

When H.R. 15941 is compared to the budget estimates for fiscal year 1967, we see that nearly $1 billion in additional funds is recommended by the Appropriations Committee over administration estimates. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, no one on this floor is more concerned about this increase than I. No one would be more anxious to seek constructive and less expensive alternatives if this were possible than I. After sober reflection, however, I see no choice but to vote for this bill as an expensive but absolutely necessary expedient.

H.R. 15941 is a singular example of the price that we must pay for military preparedness and security. The very fact that liberty does not come cheaply—either in terms of men or dollars—makes it all the more precious. Nothing could be more disastrous to our interests than to place the security of ourselves and our allies in jeopardy by short-sighted attempts at economy. Nothing could be more foolish than to balance the books today and lose the peace tomorrow.

We must never lose sight of the Constitutional responsibility that we have for financially supporting the Military Establishment. The United States can afford to pay for the best defense in the world—today and tomorrow. We would be irresponsible if we did any less. Winston Churchill once said that he did not become Prime Minister of Great Britain to oversee the dissolution of the Empire. I say that we share a similar responsibility in insuring that this Congress and this administration do not oversee the dereliction of our military responsibilities. I believe that passage of the Department of Defense appropriation bill will provide this guarantee.

Mr. BOLAND. Chairman, our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLOOD, in his very eloquent address to the House on the Defense Department appropriations bill, commented on the high spirit, loyal dedication, and true bravery of American fighting men in Vietnam. I want to associate myself with Mr. FLOOD's remarks, because our servicemen deserve the gratitude and commendation of the American people for their sacrifices in southeast Asia.

Many persons in the high councils of the U.S. Government have explained why the United States is fighting in North Vietnam, but the most persuasive and straightforward reasons I have read were written by an Air Force pilot from my congressional district who was shot down over North Vietnam early this week and survived.

He is 30-year-old Capt. Frank D. Moruzzi, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Moruzzi of 62 Suffield Street, Agawam, who bailed out of his Air Force jet after it was hit by groundfire 10 miles north of the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam last Sunday, and, along with his companion, Air Force 1st Lt. John Preston, of Los Altos, Calif., was rescued from the waters off the North Vietnamese coast by a Marine Corps helicopter.

In a letter written to his niece recently, Captain Moruzzi told the young girl why Americans are fighting in Vietnam:

> I sincerely feel that we, as a nation, have no designs on what belongs to North Vietnam or to Communist China. If they only wouldn't force their ideas on those people that are still free, they would be left alone to struggle along under their own problem.
>
> Well, we are here and they are going to have their problems in trying their "War of Liberation" in this country. I bear no personal malice against the people of North Vietnam, but when they carry their tons and tons of war material along the many jungle trails to the south so as to increase the struggle for communist expansion, I have no qualms in bombing these trucks and boats. The same feeling prevails in striking their mountain passes or their bridges or weapons stockpiles.
>
> We shall continue to stop the flow of men and material from the north to the south, if its possible. And, perhaps after a while, the communist leaders in North Vietnam and Communist China and Russia will begin to see our determination to contain the expansion of communism and decide it would be better not to waste anymore time in getting people together for a talk about these problems.
>
> With these thoughts I find no difficulty in being an idealist, even when some one is shooting at me.

Mr. Chairman, I include with my remarks a story on Captain Moruzzi's rescue and the above excerpts from his letter, taken from the Springfield Daily News of July 18, 1966:

AGAWAM PILOT RESCUED AFTER PLANE DOWNED

A 30-year-old Agawam Air Force pilot is reported unharmed after being rescued by a Marine Corps helicopter as he and another airman bobbed in the waters off North Vietnam within range of Communist shore batteries when shot down during an air strike.

Capt. Frank D. Moruzzi, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Moruzzi of 62 Suffield St., Agawam, and Air Force Lt. John Preston of Los Altos, Cal., were the targets of intense fire from recoilless rifles, mortars and automatic weapons, but neither they nor two rescue helicopters were hit, according to an Associated Press dispatch today from Saigon.

BAIL OUT

Moruzzi and Preston bailed out of their F4C Phantom jet after it was hit by groundfire 10 miles north of the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam yesterday.

The Marine Corps' role began aboard the aircraft carrier Princeton, which intercepted a distress call from a plane. Officers aboard the Princeton, which carries a Marine Helicopter squadron, saw a flaming plane plunge into the Gulf of Tonkin.

Two helicopters flown by Lt. John C. McDonald of Petrolia, Tex., and Lt. Michael H. Humes of Latham, N.Y., went to the scene.

ESCAPE FIRE

The airmen were within range of shore batteries. They ducked behind their life raft to avoid gunfire.

The rescue helicopters saw sampans moving towards the pilots, but they swooped down and picked up the two men. They were taken aboard the Princeton, where they were reported in good condition.

Capt. Moruzzi recently expressed his feelings concerning the war in Vietnam in a letter to his niece.

GIVES VIEWS

"I sincerely feel that we, as a nation, have no designs on what belongs to North Vietnam or to Communist China. If they only wouldn't force their ideas on those people that are still free, they would be left alone to struggle along under their own problems," Capt. Moruzzi wrote.

"Well, we are here and they are going to have their problems in trying their 'war of liberation' in this country. I bear no personal malice against the people of North Vietnam, but when they carry their tons and tons of war material along the many jungle trails to the south so as to increase the struggle for Communist expansion, I have no qualms in bombing these trucks and boats. The same feeling prevails in striking their mountain passes or their bridges or weapons stockpiles," he said.

Capt. Moruzzi added: "We shall continue to stop the flow of men and material from the north to the south, if it's possible. And, perhaps after a while, the Communist leaders in North Vietnam and Communist China and Russia will begin to see our determination to contain the expansion of communism and decide it would be better not to waste anymore time in getting people together for a talk about these problems.

"With these thoughts I find no difficulty in being an idealist, even when someone is shooting at me."

AGAWAM HIGH GRAD

A 1953 graduate of Agawam High School, Capt. Moruzzi joined the Air National Guard right after graduation, according to his mother.

While stationed at Barnes Airport, Capt. Moruzzi attended Western New England College. When he was 19, he was assigned to pilot training in Texas and returned to his Air Guard unit on graduation.

In 1960, he was called to active duty and assigned to France during the Berlin crisis. In France, he married his wife, Marlyse. She and their two children are now in France.

Capt. Moruzzi has been in Vietnam since February and has flown more than 60 missions. He is stationed at Da Nang Air Base and is scheduled to return home next February.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, supporting and voting for H.R. 15941, the bill now before us and making appropriations for the Department of Defense for at least some portion of fiscal 1967.

As has already been noted by our chairman and others who have spoken on this measure, H.R. 15941 calls for the appropriation of some $900 million for defense and related purposes over and above the amount requested for the same by the President.

Since I was one of those attending the Presidential conference at the White House yesterday morning, at which Mr. Johnson expressed his concern to the members of the Appropriation Committees of this and the other body over the propensity of this particular Congress to "add on" moneys over and above the budgetary requests this year, and since

I have already publicly pledged the President my support in doing what I can to hold the budgetary line, some explanation of my vote for this bill may be in order.

As has been previously predicted by the minority, this bill cannot accurately be described as "the" defense appropriation bill for 1967—rather, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] pointed out on yesterday, this bill can only be considered as the "first installment" on the 1967 defense bill for the President has now confirmed the fact that sometime in the near future—though probably after next January 1—he will be required to send us a supplemental budgetary request for defense purposes, the lion's share of which will, of course, represent the continuing cost of our military effort in Vietnam.

At yesterday's meeting, the President was rather careful not to disclose the probable size of that supplemental request but, from what he implied, it would seem as certain as anything can ever be around here that it would be upwards of $7 billion and even perhaps in the neighborhood of $10 billion. That being the case, then, the "add on" the committee is recommending, here, is in the nature of a "paper" addition to the overall 1967 budget in that the Congress will, at this particular time and in advance of any formal request for more funds, undoubtedly be providing the President with some of the same moneys he will eventually have to ask us for. It is also true that, in so doing, the committee—and now the House, since passage of this measure is assured—has exercized its own judgment as to where and for what purposes additional moneys are needed and that this judgment may not necessarily conform with the independent judgment of the President and his Secretary of Defense, when that is eventually expressed to us.

However, I—for one—am perfectly willing to take that risk for I believe it is time for Congress to reassert itself in this all-important area in the same way that it has begun to do, though unfortunately still to a very limited degree, in the equally important and related area of clarifying and shaping foreign policy.

As our distinguished and extremely capable and dedicated chairman [Mr. MAHON], stated at the opening of debate yesterday, this is not only the largest single defense appropriation bill presented to Congress since World War II but is also—as he phrased it—the most important bill of this session of Congress.

Although he did not carry out his thoughts in this regard much beyond that statement, I gather from what the gentleman from Texas implied that this bill is that important because—whether all of us like it or not—our approval of H.R. 15941 is, in his words now:

> One of the strongest possible indications that Congress supports a policy which calls for the successful prosecution of the war (in Vietnam) (and) represents a determination to win on the part of the elected representatives of the people.

It is difficult to quarrel with our chairman's assessment of this bill's importance from that point of view—and I do not intend to. But I would like the record to show that I am voting for this bill with a considerable measure of regret—for how much better it would be if this same enormous sum of money could be diverted to some useful, human purposes at home or abroad—and with sorrow over the certain knowledge that the hidden cost of this bill, insofar as it relates to the tragic conflict in Vietnam, is something that can only be measured in human life and human suffering.

Carrying on somewhat further with the chairman's thought, I am sure that this Congress—as its vote hereon will demonstrate—does share a near-unanimous desire to see the war in Vietnam "successfully prosecuted" and a near-unanimous determination to "win" it, if win we can.

However, in saying that—which I believe accurately reflects the attitude of the vast majority of the American people toward the war at the present time—I would like to ask you, as I am asking myself, if there can, in fact as well as in theory, be a purely military solution—or "victory"—in Vietnam.

I have always supposed that our military power was more than adequate—if we were to apply it in full force—to achieve a conventional military victory in Vietnam; unless, that is, our effort to do so brought either Red China or even Soviet Russia more actively than heretofore into the conflict in which case, to use the vernacular, all bets would have to be off.

But, assuming this will not happen, and accepting the optimistic present assessment of the Secretary of Defense and others that the ground war, as presently limited, is now going rather well and that the recent extension of bombings in the North to new targets that, only a few months ago, the Secretary was telling us were—in his words—"not military targets of fundamental consequence," will still further dampen the enthusiasm of the Vietcong and hamper their ability to carry on their aggression, is not our problem in Vietnam still primarily a political one?

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the case, and that, therefore, the appropriation of this huge sum of money—with still more to come—is, while necessary, no guarantee of victory in Vietnam—for the major war there, and the one we are still far from winning, is a war to win men's minds similar in nature to all prior confrontations with totalitarian aggression regardless of the name thereof.

Our primary goal in this other war ought to be that of helping the South Vietnamese erect a viable government of their own which would have their confidence and to which they could give their loyalty.

Helping them build a nation, under the given circumstances, is well-nigh an impossible task but one that, given our total commitment, must be attempted by us, using the tools of nation-building—land reform, rural development and the creation of democratic institutions—with the same skill and ingenuity that our fighting men will use the conventional weapons of battle with which they will be provided, in part, by the moneys now being appropriated.

It has seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have rather sadly neglected this "other war," with our preoccupation with the military side of our overall commitment. Perhaps, indeed, we have not even recognized, many of us, that there was such an "other war," which is also being carried on between the Communists and ourselves in the Vietnamese hamlets, rice paddies and in the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people.

But my own awareness of this fact—for I believe it to be such—is the reason why I have placed as much stress as I have in the past on the great importance, to us and to the South Vietnamese, of the election now projected for South Vietnam this September. This is why I have expressed the hope that we were using all our influence on Premier Ky to insure, as far as may be, that such election be free and meaningful, and the integrity of its result guaranteed if at all possible through some measure of international supervision.

At the moment, we, here in Congress, are receiving only fragmentary information through the news media—and so far as I know we have been given no information beyond that afforded the general public—concerning the preparations for that election. In view of the potentially great importance of this event—and its ultimate impact on the future course of events not only in Vietnam but throughout southeast Asia—it would seem essential that the appropriate committees of this or the other body should inquire into what is taking place in Vietnam in this respect, so that we would know whether or not the administration was doing all it properly could to make this a true opportunity for self-expression on the part of the South Vietnamese, and to secure, if possible, both a cease-fire period preceding and during the election as well as some kind of international supervision of its conduct and result.

The time factor is becoming increasingly important, here, so I would hope that this suggestion—which echoes that expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] on yesterday—will receive favorable consideration.

To digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, the last paragraph in the last speech prepared for delivery by our late President John F. Kennedy, contained these words:

> We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve for our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, good will toward men. That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength.

President Kennedy mentioned two things—you note—power and responsibility. I am sure that all Americans—whether they ever stopped to consider themselves as somehow being "watchmen on the walls of world freedom"—are well aware of the relationship between the two, and of the continuing need to "exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint."

The bill now before us—and on which we will soon vote—is designed to add to our military strength; but there is no provision in that bill, nor could there be, requiring that strength to be used with wisdom and restraint. For that, we are dependent, in turn, on the wisdom and restraint of the President to whom, under our Constitution, that strength is entrusted.

I am well aware—as are we all—of that not insubstantial body of public opinion in our land that questions whether the course upon which we have been set by the President in Vietnam is a wise one, and is now full of concern over whether or not the restraint he has heretofore shown in the application of our strength there will continue to mark his future actions in the face of an evidently growing public desire to get this war over and done with, somehow, and almost regardless of the consequences.

Who can say, with certainty, that our course in Vietnam has been wise or unwise?

Even those who believe, and with deep conviction, that it has been unwise are hard put to suggest any acceptable alternative.

For my part, while reserving to another time such critical observations as I might make concerning the President's conduct of both the military and that "other" political war in Vietnam, I continue to believe that the grounds on which we originally based our intervention into the affairs of the Vietnamese are proper ones.

It has been our belief, and mine, that we had a responsibility—borrowing the late President's key words again—to use our power to help the people of South Vietnam, as we have helped other peoples, to defend themselves against conquest through subversion or as the result of overt aggression by a hostile power bent on destroying their right to self-determination.

To this somewhat idealistic view of our responsibility for others, the President has evidently taken into consideration—as the Fulbright hearings brought out—our own self-interest in containing the influence of an imperialistic Red China, so that it would not spill out through South Vietnam into all of southeast Asia and lead to an ultimate confrontation between the United States and Red China at a time and under circumstances even more dangerous and difficult than those presently confronting us in Vietnam.

Of these two principle grounds for justifying our intervention in Vietnam, this latter one—for all to whom the war has posed a moral dilemma—has been the hardest to hold onto for we Americans are not, by nature, a selfish people, and if our only role on the world stage should ever become one of merely defending, anywhere and everywhere, our own self-interest, I suspect such a policy would fail for we are not nearly cynical enough to play that kind of a role well.

Thus, under the complex and confusing circumstances that have attended our effort to "help" the South Vietnamese, and in view of the difficulty so many of us experience in finding some evidence of a deep committment or a firm philosophy underlying the President's own expositions of his policy in Vietnam—though both may well be there—it is little wonder that this war, which has become so much an American war, has also become so hard to understand and so unpopular with so many of our people.

I have searched for the reasons for this—and for the answer—and it seems to me that the war is misunderstood and the necessity for it unappreciated because it has lacked, for too many of our people, the "power of an idea," so to speak.

The "power of an idea," in the sense that any American foreign policy that is understandable to, and will receive the patient and resolute support of, the American people must needs be one that is rooted in the same humanistic traditions that support our own society.

The task of building a nation for the South Vietnamese—or, rather, helping them to do so for they must do it—is such a idea. It is a goal and an ambition worthy of our best efforts, and it is one to which, it seems to me, we can all give our support. And, finally, it is the kind of goal and ambition that, given the priority it deserves, would help us convince both ourselves and a world that has become as uncertain as we about our own motives, that—in President Kennedy's words again—"the righteousness of our cause underlies our strength," in Vietnam as it always heretofore has throughout our history.

Mr. Chairman, with the thought in mind that this bill is necessary to buy us the time and to clear the air for getting on with this, our larger task, I have no reservations in voting for it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that I cannot support H.R. 15941, the Defense appropriation bill, which we have before us today. Out of respect for the views of my colleagues, most of whom do support this measure, and of my constituents who are entitled to an understanding of my actions so that they may judge more intelligently on returning me to office in November, I wish to explain my reasons for this conclusion.

The bill appropriates nearly $59 billion for the Defense Department for fiscal 1967. It is almost a billion dollars higher than requested or budgeted by the President and the executive department. Unfortunately, it is only the first appropriation for the Defense Department this year, and will be followed by one or more supplemental appropriations as requested by the President. It contains funds for several military projects which the Secretary of Defense had advised against. I voted against the legislation authorizing these unwanted projects when it was presented to us several weeks ago, not only because the projects were unwanted by the Executive but because they represent important policy decisions to which I am opposed. In part, my reasons for voting today against the appropriations for these projects are the same as for voting against the authorizations already passed.

Fundamentally, however, there are larger reasons for my action. Today this country is in crisis both at home and abroad. After nearly 6 years of unparalleled domestic prosperity, the highest standard of living in the world, the greatest economic growth rate in our history—we still find ourselves with manifold problems in our society and in our economy. Our cities are rotting at the core—our traffic and mass transit problems are rapidly growing worse and are strangling urban development; pollution, both of air and water, is making a mockery of human progress by rendering our environment unlivable; our health and education services for our citizens are inadequate. Riots today are sweeping many of our cities, for reasons we profess not to understand.

Yet the reasons are not difficult to find, if we have but eyes to see and minds to think. In our society, just as in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, there is a revolution of rising expectations. The segregated, unemployed, unrespected Negro in a big-city ghetto may be 10 times better off than an African black farmer. But, he does not weigh his condition against an African black farmer. He weighs it against the promise of the United States of America, the richest country in the world. And he, and the poor Mexican-American farm worker, and the displaced white families of Appalachia, and all the others alienated from our communities, and from our flaunted material affluence, are unhappy—deeply unhappy and turning to revolutionary violence.

One recent estimate has been made that every American in poverty could be raised above that level with the expenditure of $15 billion per year. Just by coincidence, that is approximately what we are spending on Vietnam per year. To eliminate poverty in the United States this year is well within the capacity of this country. Yet to secure the approval of a public policy to achieve this end is literally impossible in the U.S. Congress.

Even so, the President directs that we spend $15 billion for an undeclared war in Vietnam this year, without even securing the prior approval of Congress. Some of that $15 billion is in the bill before us today. The remainder we will be asked to appropriate when the President knows for sure whether $15 billion is enough, or whether perhaps $20 or $25 billion would be better.

Another estimate has been made that this country could solve its air and water pollution problems in 20 years, at a cost of $100 billion or $5 billion per year. Such a tremendous figure leaves most of us gasping in unbelief—surely that is beyond our capacity, despite our wealth. Yet it is less than 10 percent of the amount contained in this bill, on an annual basis.

If our vast military expenditures were bringing security to this country and the world, I would not hesitate to cast my vote for this bill. But in addition to our crisis in domestic progress, we face a crisis today in our relations with the rest of the world—a crisis not unlike and not unrelated to our domestic crisis. And these military expenditures, much of them the fruit of an obsolete and erroneous foreign policy, contribute, not to our security or that of the world but, instead, to an ever-increasing possibility of world destruction.

To a world that needs food and education and health, and a vision of peace and justice under law, we flaunt the hardware of the greatest military concentration in human history. And we say to them, "This is what you need: We will give you all the guns and tanks and airplanes you want. Use them to prop up the status quo—to keep the revolutionaries in their places. This will maintain security."

The money in this bill would add 25 percent to the standard of living of three-quarters of the human race.

The so-called takeoff point for underdeveloped economies could be brought to reality for these three-quarters of the human race in 10 years with the resources we commit to the pursuit of a false security. I am not so unrealistic as to believe that we will use the great resources of this country for the goals I have suggested here. But the time has come to recognize the giant power for constructive good that this country has—as well as the power of destructive evil. We must at least think about these things and perhaps take a few tentative steps in the right direction, both at home and abroad.

Instead, this bill goes even further than the President has asked. If some of the Members of this House had their way, it would go even further. And we hear the suggestions made that perhaps the war on poverty is too expensive—possibly it can be eliminated—or that we can cut back on education—or on funds for pollution control or rebuilding our cities.

Mr. Chairman, the entire trend of foreign and domestic policy represented by this bill, by the factors that brought it into being, by the arguments for its passage and the suggestions as to how it can be financed, run counter to democratic goals for this country and the world. I hope that these conditions will soon change. Until they do, I must oppose them in every way possible—voting against this bill is one of those ways.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; $3,736,100,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas will be recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is virtually impossible in a debate on a highly complex and technical matter to respond in detail to all of the arguments and allegations which may be made by the opposition. I certainly did not undertake to reply to all of the charges and criticisms which were leveled at the Department of Defense yesterday, and I certainly shall not attempt to reply to all of them today, but I would like to comment on a few specific points.

On yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] undertook, it appears to me, to indicate that the Secretary of Defense attempted to mislead the Congress as to the probable requirement for supplemental defense estimates for fiscal year 1966 and that I was to some extent a party to this effort.

The gentleman from Wisconsin quoted yesterday from the last paragraph of a 3-page letter which was written to me as chairman of the committee last year by the Secretary of Defense. The letter is dated June 9, 1965.

The first sentence of the last paragraph—the one the gentleman quoted in part—is as follows:

> The fiscal year 1966 defense budget request now before the Congress would provide all of the funds we need at this time . . . to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months.

The second sentence, which the gentleman from Wisconsin did not quote, is as follows:

> The special transfer provisions contained in the Bill and the reprograming arrangements approved by the Committees provide sufficient flexibility to meet all foreseeable requirements until the Congress reconvenes next January and can act on a possible fiscal year 1966 supplemental.

So, in the next sentence—the one I just quoted—the Secretary referred to "a possible fiscal year 1966 supplemental."

Yesterday was not the first time that the gentleman from Wisconsin quoted the one sentence from the letter. In June 28, 1966, in connection with the debate on the continuing resolution, he placed it in the RECORD as a part of the "Additional Views" contained in House Report No. 1652, including the following:

> In Additional Views submitted by the undersigned to the fiscal year 1966 regular defense appropriation bill, we said:
>
> "It is our judgment, based on the testimony before this Committee, that the fiscal year 1966 budget request reflects inadequate funding for the Vietnamese effort." (H. Rept. 528, 89th Cong., 1st sess.)
>
> We then went on to recommend that—
>
> "* * * the President should immediately revise this fiscal year 1966 defense budget with a view toward requesting the Congress to provide for the unplanned and unprogramed expenditures which have resulted from his decision to assume a greater role in Southeast Asia."
>
> This the President and the Secretary of Defense refused to do. Instead, elaborate attempts were made to leave Congress with the impression that all the funds needed for fiscal year 1966 were contained in the original budget submission. The Secretary of Defense, in a letter to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee which was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD June 23, 1965 during debate on the bill, stated in part:
>
> "* * * the fiscal year 1966 defense budget request now before the Congress would provide *all the funds we need* at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture and to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months." [Emphasis added.]

Here again, Mr. Chairman, only the first sentence of the last paragraph of the 3-page letter was quoted; the second sentence, again reading as follows, was omitted:

> The special transfer provisions contained in the bill and the reprograming arrangements approved by the Committees provide sufficient flexibility to meet all foreseeable requirements until the Congress reconvenes next January and can act on a possible fiscal year 1966 supplemental.

Further, on the question of whether an elaborate attempt—or any attempt—was made to leave Congress with an erroneous impression as to the adequacy of the 1966 defense budget, let me cite three other places in that same 3-page letter of the Secretary—these are in addition to the second sentence of that last paragraph:

> . . . a fiscal year 1966 supplemental may be required next year—depending on future developments in Southeast Asia and possibly elsewhere in the world.
>
> * * * * *
>
> . . . If we do decide to increase the presently planned production rates for Navy and Air Force aircraft, additional new funds may be needed before the end of fiscal year 1966.
>
> * * * * *
>
> . . . depending on how the situation in Southeast Asia may develop, additional funds for these same purposes may be required in fiscal year 1966. But it seems to me that these additional requirements might best be submitted to the Congress later in the fiscal year, when we will be in a position to determine them with greater precision.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, there can be no serious claim that the Secretary's letter did not make it abundantly clear that any, or all, of several developments calling for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1966 might arise.

Moreover, I tried to make it very clear in the report on the bill, in my remarks on the floor, and by including the Secretary's letter in my remarks.

We stated in the House report on the 1966 bill, beginning on page 5:

> Nor is there any assurance that supplemental appropriations will not also be required next year. They very probably will be, but this will depend on the course of events in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world in the coming months.

And in the debate on the 1966 Defense bill, on June 23, 1965, I told the House:

> Likewise, I say without hesitation that the bill does not provide all of the funds that will most likely be needed for the entire fiscal year which this bill covers, the period from July 1, 1965, through June 30, 1966.

I further said:

> When the requirements are clearer, a formal request will be presented to the Congress. We will evaluate the request and act promptly and in an orderly way. This seems to me to be in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I fail utterly to see how anyone can reasonably say that the House, the Congress, and the country were not clearly on notice that supplements to the regular 1966 Defense bill might well be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, since it has been referred to several times, I am again including the full text of the Secretary's letter of June 9, 1965—I had previously entered it into the Record of June 23, 1965:

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable George Mahon,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman: In your letter of June 4, 1965, you request my views as to the present adequacy of the fiscal year 1966 Defense budget in light of the developing situation in Southeast Asia and the $700 million supplemental to the fiscal year 1965 budget which was approved last month.

To assess the adequacy of any Defense budget, we should keep in mind that it must provide for several levels of requirements: (1) initial equipment for the forces and initial stocks to fill the pipelines; (2) peacetime consumption; (3) wartime consumption. The requirements for the first two categories can be determined with a relatively high degree of precision and, with respect to them, I can assure you again that our fiscal year 1966 budget request, submitted last January, is still fully adequate.

The requirements for the third category, however, are completely dependent on whether and to what extent our forces actually engage in combat during the fiscal year for which we are budgeting. Since we have no way of knowing, six to eighteen months before the fact, what the situation will then be, we must provide for a very wide range of contingencies; and, indeed, we do. But our war reserve requirements are not based on any one or two contingency plans but rather on a composite of all of the plans. In other words, our objective is to provide sufficient war consumption stocks to support all of our forces in combat for sustained periods of time under a variety of different circumstances. As you know, we have substantially increased our procurement of war consumables during the past four years and we are now in much better shape than we were in 1960 or 1961.

However, the purpose of the war reserve stocks is not to support our forces in combat indefinitely, but rather to tide them over the period until additional supplies can be delivered from new production. That is why we call them *"reserve"* stocks.

Therefore, as soon as we actually start to consume the war reserve stocks in combat in any significant quantities, we must promptly provide for their replacement so that at all times we have adequate stocks on hand to support our forces in combat until production can be expanded sufficiently to meet our wartime consumption requirements. If it were possible to forecast with some reasonable degree of precision all combat operations in which our forces would be engaged over the next twelve months, we could budget in advance for actual combat consumption. But we cannot forecast with such precision, so instead we depend on a general war reserve which we replace as we actually consume.

Thus, the fact that we have requested and the Congress has appropriated additional fiscal year 1965 funds for the procurement of such a typical war reserve requirement as ordnance and ammunition, in no way means that the original fiscal year 1965 budget request or the amounts originally appropriated for that fiscal year were inadequate. Such supplemental requirements are inherent in the way in which we compute our war reserve requirements in the first place. By the same token, a fiscal year 1966 supplemental may be required next year—depending on future developments in Southeast Asia and possible elsewhere in the world. But again, this does not mean that the fiscal year 1966 budget request now before the Congress is inadequate. It is adequate at the present time. But, if we draw on our war reserves in any significant amounts during fiscal year 1966, we will have to replace them in order that we always have sufficient stocks on hand to support our forces in combat until additional supplies can be produced and delivered.

With regard to such major end items as aircraft, the Defense Department, at least since the end of World War II, has not attempted to provide war reserves. I understand that this possibility was considered during the Korean War but was rejected as being infeasible because of rapid obsolescence and unnecessarily excessive cost. We do, however, procure additional aircraft to replace peacetime attrition. If combat losses exceed the peacetime attrition rates by any significant amount then eventually we have to take steps to replace the extra losses caused by combat.

But, as I pointed out to your Committee in discussing the $700 million 1965 Supplemental, our aircraft losses in Southeast Asia have been quite small in relation to current production. Nevertheless, we did include in the 1965 Supplemental some funds for aircraft, principally for the advance procurement of long leadtime components so that we would be in a position to increase promptly the production of selected aircraft if that should become necessary. If we do decide to increase the presently planned production rates for Navy and Air Force aircraft, additional new funds may be needed before the end of fiscal year 1966. I believe this is the most practical way to deal with combat losses of aircraft under the present circumstances.

One final point. When our forces are actually engaged in combat, other additional expenses also arise—for the transportation of men and equipment, for the provision of facilities in the areas in which the forces are required to operate, for higher rates of operation (i.e., steaming hours and flying hours), and to a lesser extent for special pay and rations. The 1965 Supplemental includes funds for most of these purposes, and depending on how the situation in Southeast Asia may develop, additional funds for these same purposes may be required in fiscal year 1966. But it seems to me that these additional requirements might best be submitted to the Congress later in the fiscal year, when we will be in a position to determine them with greater precision.

To summarize, the fiscal year 1966 Defense budget request now before the Congress would provide all the funds we need at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture and to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next twelve months. The special transfer provisions contained in the Bill and the reprogramming arrangements approved by the Committees provide sufficient flexibility to meet all foreseeable requirements until the Congress reconvenes next January and can act on a possible fiscal year 1966 supplemental.

Sincerely,
Robert S. McNamara.

I should like now to comment on another criticism. An attack was made in the minority report and on the floor of the House yesterday on the credibility of Defense officials who appear before the committees of Congress. This attack on the credibility of Defense officials has been widely circulated and often repeated.

The target of much of the criticism has been a memorandum from Deputy Secretary Vance which undertook to provide guidance to Defense Department witnesses appearing before congressional committees on the defense budget. There must be some discipline, some orderliness, in any organization, especially a military organization. The alternative is chaos. Let me point out that there is nothing new in the Vance memorandum. Similar instructions have been issued by every administration in recent memory and, indeed, are codified in a longstanding Bureau of the Budget Circular, A–10, a current copy of which I will place in the Record. I will include a few brief extracts from that circular at this point:

Officials and employees will be guided by the following policies pertaining to budgetary matters when testifying before any congressional committee or communicating with Members of Congress.

a. Frank and complete answers will be given to all questions of fact.

b. Personal opinions will not be volunteered which reflect positions inconsistent with the program and appropriation requests the President has transmitted to the Congress.

c. In expressing personal opinions relating to such program and appropriation requests in response to specific requests therefor, witnesses will refer to the extent, if any, to which these opinions differ from the President's recommendations, and should make clear that the expression of the opinions is not a request for additional funds. Witnesses typically bear responsibility for the conduct of one or a few programs, whereas the President must weigh all of the needs of the Federal Government against each other and against the revenues available to meet such needs; where appropriate, witnesses should call attention to this difference in scope of responsibility.

d. Where a written submission is requested which will involve a statement of opinion relating to program and appropriation requests the witness will arrange for a reply to be provided through the head of his agency.

The full text of the circular follows. I think it deserves printing in the Record in view of the questions which have arisen:

Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1964.

Circular No. A–10, Revised

To the heads of executive departments and establishments.

Subject: Responsibilities with respect to the budget.

1. Purpose. This Circular revises Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–10 dated April 15, 1954. Coverage of the Circular and the policy on support of the President's budget are clarified, but without significant change in substance from instructions previously issued (paragraphs 2 and 6). A statement is added on discussing the possible need for supplemental appropriations (paragraph 5). Changes in appropriation language or amounts, and significant changes in program not requiring a change in appropriation language or amounts, are to be cleared with the Bureau of the Budget (paragraph 7).

2. Background and applicability of Circular. The Budget and Accounting Act provides that there will be presented to Congress for its consideration and action an executive budget for which the President is responsible. The law requires that the

budget represent the judgment of the President with respect to the financial requirements for all parts of the Government except the legislative branch and the judiciary.

In addition to the budget documents submitted by the President to Congress annually, this Circular is applicable to budget amendments, supplemental estimates, and other proposals for the granting of new obligational authority, which are transmitted or revised after the presentation of the original budget each year. Furthermore, this Circular relates to estimates for the year for which the budget is presented and for the year then current, but not to factual data pertaining to past fiscal years.

3. Restrictions on disclosure of agency estimates. All budget estimates and supporting materials submitted to the Bureau of the Budget are privileged communications. Their confidential nature must be maintained, since they are the basic data and worksheets in the process by which the President resolves budget problems and arrives at conclusions with respect to his recommendations to the Congress. The head of each agency is responsible for preventing disclosure of information contained in such estimates and materials except on request in formal appropriation hearings and when requested by Members of the Congress in connection with their consideration of the budget after its transmittal.

4. Restrictions on premature disclosure of Presidential recommendations. The decisions of the President as to his budget recommendations and estimates are administratively confidential until made public by the President. The head of each agency is responsible for preventing premature disclosure of information as to such recommendations and estimates. This rule does not apply, however, to the presentation of data on the President's budget to the Appropriations Committees, pursuant to arrangements made in specific instances by the Bureau of the Budget, in connection with any formal hearings on the budget which may be held prior to the actual transmittal of the recommendations of the President.

5. References to supplemental appropriation requirements. Paragraphs 3 and 4 relating to restrictions on disclosure of agency estimates and Presidential recommendations apply to supplemental as well as to annual estimates. However, if a supplemental request is being considered but has not yet been recommended by the President, a witness may appropriately mention the fact, but should not state the amount which he thinks is needed, unless this information is explicitly requested. An agency witness may also refer to the following:

a. Amounts in the budget document which indicate the probable need for additional appropriations;

b. Facts which have been laid before Congress in connection with apportionments made by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which anticipate additional appropriations; and

c. Cost data which have been submitted to Congress on proposed legislation in accordance with the Act of July 25, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 642a).

6. Agency testimony and communications on budgetary matters. In answering questions about appropriations and budgetary matters, care must be taken by officials and employees of the agencies to avoid conflict with the terms of the Acts quoted below.

The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 provides in part that:

"No estimate or request for an appropriation and no request for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request . . . shall be submitted to Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee of any department or establishment, unless at the request of either House of Congress." (31 U.S.C. 15.)

The 1948 revision of Title 18 of the United States Code provides that:

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, *through the proper official channels*, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business." (18 U.S.C. 1913, emphasis supplied. This section also provides penalties for its violation or attempted violation.)

Officials and employees will be guided by the following policies pertaining to budgetary matters when testifying befre any congressional committee or communicating with Members of Congress.

a. Frank and complete answers will be given to all questions of fact.

b. Personal opinions will not be volunteered which reflect positions inconsistent with the program and appropriation requests the President has transmitted to the Congress.

c. In expressing personal opinions relating to such program and appropriation requests in response to specific requests therefor, witnesses will refer to the extent, if any, to which these opinions differ from the President's recommendations, and should make clear that the expression of the opinions is not a request for additional funds. Witnesses typically bear responsibility for the conduct of one or a few programs, whereas the President must weigh all of the needs of the Federal Government against each other and against the revenues available to meet such needs; where appropriate, witnesses should call attention to this difference in scope of responsibility.

d. Where a written submission is requested which will involve a statement of opinion relating to program and appropriation requests the witness will arrange for a reply to be provided through the head of his agency.

7. Clearance of changes in program under budget requests. If an agency desires to propose changes in appropriation language or limitations recommended in the budget prior to their enactment, such proposals are to be presented to the Bureau of the Budget in writing for appropriate clearance. When it is found possible to reduce the amount of a request for appropriations before action has been taken by either Appropriations Committee, the head of the agency will promptly inform the Bureau of the Budget. If significant changes are planned in the amounts or conditions relating to one or more programs, without changing amounts on which Congress has been requested to act, the agency will inform the Bureau of the Budget, and after appropriate clearance, should place the matter before the Appropriations Committees. This procedure applies not only to appropriations, but also to budget estimates not necessarily involving appropriations, such as budget statements under the Government Corporation Control Act.

8. Reductions made in appropriation bills. The final authority for appropriations rests with the Congress. Its action is based on extended hearings and recommendations by the Appropriations Committees and is taken only after consideration by each body as a whole. Any decision by an agency head to request restoration of a reduction should be carefully considered, taking into account the reasons for the reduction, the circumstances under which it was made, its significance from the standpoint of the President's program, and other factors which may be relevant.

9. Control of expenditures. The processing and implementation of the budget falls under the terms of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1–24), and of the Antideficiency Act (Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended). The requirements of these acts should be familiar to all departmental and agency officials whose duties are related to budget preparation, submission, and implementation.

Particular attention is directed to the report of the House Committee on Appropriations on the General Appropriation Bill of 1951 (House Report 1797, 81st Congress) which contains the reenactment of the Antideficiency Act and indicates the intent of the Congress. This report states, in part:

"Appropriation of a given amount for a particular activity constitutes only a ceiling upon the amount which should be expended for that activity. The administrative officials responsible for administration of an activity for which appropriation is made bear the final burden for rendering all necessary service with the smallest amount possible within the ceiling figure fixed by the Congress. Every official of the Government who has responsibility for administration of a program . . . [has] responsibility to so control and administer the activities under his jurisdiction as to expend as little as possible out of the funds appropriated."

Kermit Gordon, *Director*.

The date of the revised circular A–10, it will be noted, is January 18, 1964. But it should also be noted that the circular is not the original but is rather a revision of an earlier circular A–10, dated April 15, 1954, during the early part of the Eisenhower administration. I have not checked the records, but I suspect that there was an A–10 circular of sorts many years prior to 1954.

Budget Director Stans, in a memorandum to Secretary of Defense McElroy, dated December 31, 1958, called attention to this circular. I will also submit the memorandum for the Record.

Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1958.

Memorandum for the Honorable Neil H. McElroy.

The President will shortly present his budget for the fiscal year 1960 to the Congress. As you know, the normal process of budgeting results in recommended amounts that in many cases are less than the agency head had requested.

It is understandable that officials and employees will feel strongly about the importance of their own agency's work, and will sometimes believe that a larger budget might be in order. Such feelings, however, must be related to an awareness that our budget resources are not adequate to accommodate in any one year all of the things that might be desired. The President is responsible for reviewing the total needs of the executive branch in the light of tax and debt policy and for deciding among competing requests for priorities. Executive branch personnel are expected to support the President in his budget recommendations.

As you and your staff prepare to justify your portion of the budget before Congress, you will want to observe the requirements set forth at the President's direction in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–10. It is expected that witnesses will carefully avoid volunteering views differing from the budget, either on the record or off the record. While direct questions at hearings must be answered

> frankly, it is expected that a witness who feels that he must set forth a personal view inconsistent with the President's budget will also point out that the President's judgment on the matter was reached from his overall perspective as the head of the Government, and in the light of overriding national policy. The witness should make it clear that his personal comments are not to be construed as a request for additional funds.
>
> Please see that a reminder of this reaches all officials and employees who participate in hearings on appropriations and on legislation directly related to budget proposals, including civil functions of the Corps of Engineers.
>
> Maurice H. Stans, *Director*.

On February 18, 1960, Secretary of Defense Gates issued a memorandum to the staff on this same subject. He said:

> With regard to subjects on which they expect to testify before Congressional Committees, it is the responsibility of officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to be familiar with the policies of the Department and with previous testimony given by me, the Service Secretaries, and the members of the JCS. Responses to Congressional inquiries should also be consistent with established policy and previous testimony.

It has been my experience that these instructions have not either in this administration or in former administrations, prevented witnesses from providing the information requested by congressional committees. There has been no real problem in getting information or individual judgments when these were asked for. The members would be incompetent if they lacked the ability to interrogate witnesses and get desired information. Congress, with the power of the purse at its disposal, is not helpless in this field, and the record of the hearings through the years will so show.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Does not the chairman of our committee agree that it is the responsibility of the committee and of the Congress to finance the war effort regardless of cost?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman agree with me further when I say that at this time it is impossible for the Secretary of Defense to determine whether or not an additional appropriation request of any certain amount will be made?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct. The President of the United States said yesterday, with respect to the current fiscal year, at a press conference, words to the effect—and I will get this correctly for the Record—that:

> If we carry on the war at the present rate that it is going—if the war goes beyond June 1967—there will be (a) substantial supplemental for Vietnam.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I have not talked with any person at the Pentagon or in the administration about this, but I know full well that if this war continues throughout the entire fiscal year 1967 there will be a need for additional appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Laird was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss the statement made by the distinguished Chairman of our Appropriations Committee in which he alluded to one statement which was made by me in which I quoted from the summary paragraph of a letter sent to him used in the debate last year when the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense was under consideration. I took from the last paragraph, which was the summary paragraph of the Secretary's letter, that statement, and I should like to read that summary paragraph in full at this time:

> To summarize, the fiscal year 1966 Defense budget request now before the Congress would provide all the funds we need at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture and to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next twelve months.

This sentence, I believe, is not open to too much interpretation. The sentence is very clear.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr LAIRD. I would be happy to. I would like to finish the complete paragraph, but I yield to my distinguished Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. This particular sentence—the first sentence—is a key sentence, because the Secretary did say that it was all the money that was needed "at this time." If he will, the gentleman should underline "at this time."

Mr. LAIRD. I will point it out in detail.

Mr. MAHON. Then in the next sentence the Secretary indicates a possible supplemental in January.

Mr. LAIRD. I will develop that point later. I will include the whole paragraph of this letter.

But the chairman himself, during yesterday's debate made the point I have been trying to make very well when he said "last year's budget was, insofar as I know, when finally submitted, adequate or reasonably adequate under the guidelines in which it was submitted."

That statement was made by the distinguished chairman of our committee during yesterday's debate and can be found on page 16230 of the Congressional Record.

The operative phrase in the chairman's statement is "under the guidelines in which it was submitted."

The gentleman is quite correct and, in fact, I would agree with the gentleman that the budget was "adequate" or "reasonably adequate" under the guidelines in which it was submitted.

But let us look at those guidelines. In our additional views last year we made the point that the guidelines used in preparing the original fiscal 1966 defense budget were guidelines that were at least 18 months old.

I would like to quote from those additional views submitted on June 17, 1965, where we said—pages 62 and 63:

> But perhaps of even greater importance than the fact that there are inadequate funds in this budget is the realization that the services were given outdated "guidelines" which had to be followed in preparing their budget requests and which did not anticipate increased needs in Southeast Asia. These "guidelines" were established by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. As an example of this, the following colloquy took place:
>
> Question by Mr. Lipscomb, March 26, 1965:
>
> "In view of the fact that this budget was prepared sometime ago, did the figures for Vietnam, or Southeast Asia get into this budget?"
>
> Response by General Gerrity, Deputy Chief of Staff, Systems and Logistics, March 26, 1965:
>
> "The guidelines in the budget did not fully reflect the increased activity that has occurred out there. We put the budget together based on the guidelines which were within our program activities * * *"
>
> Question by Mr. Mahon, March 26, 1965:
>
> "Would you have any refinement, General Crow, of the statement which has been made by General Gerrity?"
>
> Response by Maj. Gen. Crow, Director of Budget, Comptroller of the Air Force, March 26, 1965:
>
> "The statement that General Gerrity has made, generally reflects the situation as we developed the budget. The guidelines for the preparation of the budget as they pertain to Vietnam were actually a carry forward of the guidelines that were used in the preparation of the 1965 budget, and they did not anticipate increased activity, per se, in Vietnam * * *."
>
> It should be noted in the latter comment by General Crow that the "guidelines" he refers to were formulated in calendar year 1963. This means, in effect, that we are financing today's war in Vietnam with "guidelines" that are at least 18 months old. It should not be forgotten that the fiscal year 1965 "guidelines" were formulated at a time of apparent detente and mellowing, at a time when a test ban treaty was negotiated and at a time when Secretary McNamara was predicting we could pull our "advisers" out of Vietnam within a year or so. Budget "guidelines" based on these premises do not lend themselves to the demands of a war situation.
>
> Aside from inadequate funding, we would like to express our deepest concern that our planning did not more fully anticipate these developments. Inadequate planning not only affects the budget but, more importantly, the actual operations of the conflict itself. Events in the past few weeks, we believe, bear out this concern. We would also caution very strongly that equipment and material priorities for Vietnam must not be permitted to so deplete active force inventories as to impair the readiness of our forces not committed to Vietnam.
>
> ### RECOMMENDATIONS
>
> It is our firm belief that appropriations must be sufficient to carry out successfully United States commitments anywhere in the world.
>
> American personnel in Vietnam must be equipped and supported in such a degree as will give maximum assurance of safety and a capability to carry out their duties. We believe the President should immediately revise this fiscal year 1966 defense budget with a view toward requesting the Congress to provide for the unplanned and unprogramed expenditures which have resulted from his decision to assume a greater role in Southeast Asia.

It should be clear, then, Mr. Chairman, that the original budget submitted in January 1965, for fiscal year 1966, was inadequate and that even the modifying phrase used by the Secretary of Defense, "at this time," was not a statement that reflected the actual needs of the moment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last year, when this defense appropriation bill was up before this Congress, when the President submitted his budget, he was hailed all over this country because he had submitted a budget of less than $100 billion for fiscal year 1966. Several of us took the floor of the House of Representatives at that time and said that this expenditure level of $100 billion that he talked about down on his Texas ranch was not a true estimate of what the spending needs of this Nation would be if we were going to meet the commitment which was made by this country and by our Commander in Chief as far as national security was concerned. In the budget request which came before this Congress, in the estimate of the expenditures, there was not a single dollar to cover the escalated cost of the war in Vietnam. Now, why did we want to make this point in 1966? We wanted to make this point in 1966 because there was an attempt made to fund all of the Great Society programs and all of the new spending programs and all of the new legislation that was proposed in 1966 before fully funding the cost of the war in Vietnam. The bill for the full cost of national security and defense was held off until such time as all of the programs, the new domestic spending programs, could be passed by the U.S. Congress. So what did the Congress do? We went ahead and passed this program and that program and went ahead with all of the new domestic spending programs. Then we waited until January before we got the real big defense supplemental.

Now, the point I was making yesterday is just as valid today, and I challenge the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations on the floor of the House today to dispute my statement that the same thing is going to happen in fiscal year 1967 that happened in 1966—that we will have another huge supplemental appropriation bill in January and that that bill will total several billion dollars, but that it will not be submitted to this Congress until all of the programs, the domestic spending programs, have been funded in regular appropriation bills.

The point here is that when we are at war it is necessary for us to establish some degree of priority. It was reported that the President of the United States said in a closed meeting with Members of Congress at the White House that it will be from $7 billion to $10 billion more that will be required in January for defense appropriations. If this is true, it seems to me that the American public should be told in this month of July that those requests will be forthcoming.

It seems to me that the American public today in this debate should have a full disclosure of what these overall national security costs are going to be in the year 1967 and not wait until January before we receive any estimate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know of anybody in the United States—who tries in even a modest way to keep up with what is going on—who does not know that if the war continues, we are going to have to have additional funds. The President said it yesterday. I have said it many times during this session, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has said the same thing, and others have said it, also. There is no secret to the fact that there will be a supplemental next year. I do not know how big it will be, but it will be very substantial.

Mr. LAIRD. You know that it will be at least $7 billion.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know that, but I want to say this: I was present at the closed meeting at the White House to which reference has been made. I did not understand the President to say that the supplemental next year would be in the range of $7 to $10 billion. It may very well be but I do not believe the President made an estimate of what he thought the figure would be. I do not believe that the President at this time knows what the figure may be.

That, it seems to me, would be the reason we do not have the bill before us today, because we do not know sufficiently well what the requirements are to be.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do want to keep the record straight.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not going to argue the point with the gentleman from Texas, but I want to tell the gentleman one thing in this little colloquy: It should be brought out that in this budget we have pending before us certain contingency estimates which are included in this budget document. Let us take a look at the overall budget.

Mr. Chairman, when one takes a look at the overall budget, one will see that for military and civilian pay, the contingency estimate in that budget document is $350 million as an estimated expenditure contingency. This is based upon what the projections were in the budget at the White House as to what both military and civilian pay increases would amount to both in fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967.

Mr. MAHON. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. Just let me proceed.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense comes down here and appears before the Committee on Armed Services. He appears in favor of a pay increase for military personnel, a pay increase of about 3 percent. Yet, there has not come before us any budget document or any supplemental appropriation request amending the President's budget document as submitted here in January of this year. This is merely an estimated budget.

Mr. Chairman, once the administration comes in and supports such legislation before a committee of this Congress, we know that a supplemental appropriation request will have to come forward. This was agreed to by the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, take for instance the area of military personnel——

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. Let me finish.

Mr. Chairman, in the area of military personnel, in January of this year, I made the statement that the Secretary of Defense was wrong in his estimate insofar as military personnel was concerned.

Mr. Chairman, within the span of 24 hours the Secretary of Defense made a public statement in which he said that the military personnel account, as submitted to this Congress, was correct.

The majority report, agreed to by members of our committee—both Republicans and Democrats alike—proved that the Secretary's estimate was off to the extent of some $569 million.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] joined with the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] and others, in making those figures available in this particular bill.

My point is—and evidently I am not getting the point across—the point is that we should effectively estimate as nearly as we can the defense and national security needs now and we should let the American people know what these costs are going to be.

This bill is merely the first installment in fiscal 1967 on national security costs, just as the bill of 1966 was merely the first installment insofar as national security and defense costs are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], as well as the vast majority of the Members of this House, will join together in supporting the additional funds that will be needed to support the national defense effort of this country in fiscal year 1967.

But the important thing for us to bear in mind is that when we consider other programs, we should know what these budget costs are, and this idea of holding back on the supplemental needs, the holding back on the needs of the military personnel and the holding back on the supplemental for procurement, and holding back on the needs for research and development and holding back on all of these accounts, the Department of Defense is not giving the contingency estimates which are available and which are being worked on with respect to this particular matter in the Department of Defense and which could cause a serious miscalculation insofar as the overall fiscal planning and fiscal program of the needs of this entire country are concerned.

So with the panic button being pressed as it was by the President the other day in trying to curtail the domestic spending now, it is most important that we have these estimates for these contingencies at this time. They are available. I am sure the gentleman from Texas knows that these estimates are being worked on in the Department of Defense right now.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman if it is his purpose to debate the appropriations bill or to score political points?

Mr. LAIRD. I would just as soon do both if the gentleman from New Jersey has no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. I do have objection when we are faced with something of this magnitude and of this gravity, to any Member of the House, on either side of the aisle, trying to score political points. I do have serious objection.

Mr. LAIRD. You see I do not happen to look down on politics. I think politics is a pretty good business to be involved in. Webster defines it as the art and science of government and that is the way I look at politics.

If you are trying to put a partisan tinge on it, then you are out of order.

Mr. JOELSON. I do not agree.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey for him to inject partisan political debate into this defense bill. We are unanimous in our support of this bill—Republicans and Democrats alike. We are trying to do what we can to support the President of the United States in his efforts to reduce domestic spending at this time. But in order to reduce domestic spending at this time, it is important and incumbent upon the executive branch of the Government to level with the American people and to set forth what the defense and the national security contingencies are now and not wait until January as they did last year. This is not being fair to the American people. It is not being fair to Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Would you read the last sentence of that two-sentence paragraph?

Mr. LAIRD. I would be happy to put the whole letter in the RECORD if the gentleman from Texas has not already done so. The letter proves my point, it seems to me, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including repair of facilities, maintenance, operation and modification of aircraft; transportation of things; hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law for the Air National Guard of the several States, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; $253,300,000, of which not less than $2,500,000 shall be available only for the maintenance of real property facilities: *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U.S.C. 709) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Air Force and such caretakers may be employed without regard to their military rank as members of the Air National Guard: *Provided further*, That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have several perfecting amendments which I offer at this time, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MAHON:

Page 12, line 13, after "District of Columbia" strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 18, line 3, after "therein" strike out the comma and insert a comma after "acquired".

Page 42, line 2, after "shall be" insert "available".

Page 46, line 19, after "as may be" strike out "transferred" and insert "determined".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee if there are any funds provided in this bill for the operation of the two Presidential yachts? If so, where is the money in the bill?

I have been hearing a lot of White House talk about frugality and economy. Here is a good place, if there is money in this bill for the purpose of operating yachts on the Potomac River, with arm-twisting sessions held aboard them, as I understand the operation, to strike a blow for economy.

Mr. MAHON. The funds for the operation of Navy ships, boats, are included under "Operations and maintenance, Navy"; and, of course, under "Military personnel, Navy." Insofar as operation and maintenance is concerned the total amount is shown on page 7 of the bill and on page 2 insofar as the pay of the personnel is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. What is the cost of operating these yachts? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have the figures before me. Two of these boats were modified somewhat in recent months. They are operated from time to time on the Potomac River and have been used for years. They are quite old, indeed. They have been used by various administrations. The gentleman, of course, is familiar with the use of them.

Mr. GROSS. This is something that could be dispensed with in these times of suggested austerity and in behalf of spending money for necessary projects.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, there are many things in the Government that could be dispensed with. We could cut out a lot of expenditures, but I do not think it would be desirable to eliminate the use of these boats. They are used on official business for various conferences and meetings, and I believe their use is in the public interest.

Mr. GROSS. A moment ago, I suggested that they make secluded and excellent gathering places for arm-twisting sessions. I thank the gentleman, but I still do not have the answer as to the cost of operation.

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to ask the Navy to give me a figure on that. I had the figure, but I cannot find it in all the papers we have accumulated over months of hearings. But I will put in the RECORD at this point, the cost of operation of these two boats.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I advise the gentleman that the Navy informs me that it costs $130,000 to operate these two boats during fiscal year 1966.

This figure includes funds for pay of naval personnel. The Navy operates at a certain personnel strength and, in my opinion, there is no likelihood that the personnel strength of the Navy would be reduced should these two boats be decommissioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, ammunition, equipment, vehicles, vessels, and aircraft for the Army and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; purchase of not to exceed two thousand one hundred and seventy-five passenger motor vehicles (including seventeen medium sedans at not to exceed $3,000 each) for replacement only; expenses which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are necessary in providing facilities for production of equipment and supplies for national defense purposes, including construction, and the furnishing of Government-owned facilities and equipment at privately owned plants; and ammunition for military salutes at institutions to which issue of weapons for salutes is authorized; $3,484,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $153,500,000 shall be available only for the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: On page 16, strike out all after the semicolon in line 7 down through the period in line 9 on page 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$3,331,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple but important amendment. It would strike from the bill the $153,500,000 for preproduction of the Nike-X antiballistic missile system that was added by the Committee but which was not requested by the Department of Defense.

Let me emphasize this last point, Mr. Chairman. This money for preproduction of the Nike-X was not requested by the Department of Defense and it was not requested for good and sufficient reason. I have already cited several of these arguments but let me review them again briefly at this point.

The very able Secretary of Defense has said that the construction of an antiballistic missile system would not "add measurably to our safety" at this time. As a matter of fact, there is considerable evidence to indicate that a defense system of this nature could be offset by an enemy attack utilizing sophisticated decoy and other penetration aids.

The Federation of American Scientists, which is made up of 2,500 scientists and engineers, many of whom have great expertise in this field, has pointed out that the Nike-X is an "immensely complicated system which will remain of dubious efficiency."

Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that a "prerequisite" to deployment of the Nike-X would be the construction of a full fallout shelter program. Yet neither the Congress nor the American people have been asked to make this major political decision.

This Nike-X antiballistic missile system would be one of the most costly procurement programs we have ever undertaken. The estimates for its total cost range in the neighborhood of $30 billion. Yet we are being asked to take the first procurement steps before the research, development, test, and evaluation of this system have even been completed. We are forcing a decision that we are not yet fully prepared to make, and we are taking this costly step at the very time the President has made a special plea to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress to hold down on spending.

Mr. Chairman, we should continue our research and development work on the Nike-X. We should learn all we can about this and other systems, so that we are always prepared with adequate options.

But the Nike-X is not a priority item at this time. It is premature. It would not add measurably to our defense. The fact of the matter is that we would get far more for our money by concentrating on increasing the capabilities of our offensive weapons by adding to their penetration effectiveness, and this is what we are doing.

The Nike-X, however, would add new fuel to the arms race. It would increase the competition between offensive and defensive missiles. It would add new strains to the existing balance of terror. It should be deferred as a matter of sound finance, sound military planning, and sound foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that my amendment be adopted, and that these unnecessary and unwarranted funds be struck from the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, none of the major important additions to this bill, such as the nuclear frigate, the AMSA, the Y-12 interceptor, were requested by the Secretary of Defense. The committee in its judgment has recommended them; prior to this action the Committees on Armed Services recommended them. The House and Senate voted for them in the authorization bill, and the President has signed the authorization bill. That should be ample precedent.

We cannot wait until there is a missile attack before we start building a defense against missiles. It takes years. I do not want to expose the American people unnecessarily to the possibility of attack.

The statement has been made that if we undertake to build an antiballistic missile system, a defense against missiles, we will simply provoke the Russians to a greater effort, and we will find ourselves in an arms race. What do they think we are in now? If we are going to operate on the premise that we cannot undertake the defense of this country because it might make the Russians angry or it might cause them to build more weapons than they have before, or might even cause them to attack us, then we had best vote down this bill and disband our military forces and sit with our hands folded and hope for the best.

No, we do not provoke the enemy to attack by defending ourselves. We deter attack. The only real security the free world has is in our military strength and defensive capability, in the invulnerability of this Nation to attack; not in hopeful pronouncements by diplomats, and even less in the wishful thinking of those who believe that all problems can be settled through negotiation.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed this subject very closely for a number of years. I know something about it. I know how difficult it is to perfect an antiballistic missile system. It may not even be possible to perfect one. But that does not mean we should not try. It does not mean we should not take advantage of the best knowledge we have. That is what the Russians are doing; they are taking advantage of the best knowledge they have.

There is a new concept which has just been known for a short time, which greatly simplifies the problem of developing an anti-ballistic-missile system. For years we talked about shooting down a bullet with a bullet, and how hard it would be to do this. Of course it would. It is not quite that way now. Under the new concept we are talking about shooting down that bullet with a shotgun charge, and that means the problem will be simpler and less expensive to overcome.

It is known—and no one attempts to deny it—that the Russians are building an ABM system around their principal cities. This has been reported by the press. It has been confirmed in our own hearings. That is why our Joint Chiefs have recommended that we begin advance procurement, just as they recommended most of the other important steps that are contained in this bill which were not in the budget.

Since the Russians are building such a system and since they are ahead of us—and that is where they are today; 2 or 3 years or perhaps more ahead of us—as long as that situation exists, they have an advantage in defense which we do not have. Their people will soon have a safeguard which our people do not have.

It has been estimated that as many as 70 million American lives may be saved if we have an effective anti-ballistic-missile system. Does anyone want to throw away that chance? Does anyone here want to say to those 70 million Americans, "No, I do not care whether you live or die, and I will not vote to appropriate $155 million to help you have a chance to live."

I do not. I do not want to take that step. We are trying to gain a year by starting procurement now. A year. We are trying to catch up a little time. The Russians are ahead. We are trying to keep them from getting so far ahead that we would be hopelessly outdistanced. I think that the American people want this done.

We do not know what it is going to cost eventually. It may cost as much as $30 billion. Nobody knows. This is a new field at this stage. It is all an estimate. It may cost as much as $30 billion to save 70 million American lives, or it may not cost but $10 billion. The estimates in our hearings vary greatly. It may cost more or less than these estimates as we get further into the program and know more about it. There are refinements which indicate reduced cost. But whatever the cost, the Russians apparently can afford it. They are building such a system. I think that the United States can afford it. I think the people would want us to do it.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat that the Committee on Armed Services of the House under the leadership of the very distinguished and able gentleman from South Carolina who has done so much for the Nation's defense and for its military personnel, brought this recommendation before us. The House approved it; the Senate approved it; the President has signed it. Now are we going to turn around? We have marched up the hill. Are we going to march back down the hill?

Yes, we have in this bill $417 million for research. We want to add $153 million for advance procurement. If the House does not want this project, then why not take out the whole amount? Why not eliminate the $417 million item as well? Until we start procurement we do not have a thing in the world to show for the expenditures on research and development. We can spend billions of dollars on research and development, but until we start building the system itself, we have absolutely no defense in this field. I say that it is time. I say, why delay? I say, why lose another year? The Russians are far along already.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is not suggesting to the House that we are not capable of penetrating any of the defenses that the Russians have at this time, is he?

Mr. SIKES. I do not know whether we are capable of penetrating all of their defenses or not. We have not tried. They have sophisticated defenses and they are building other sophisticated defenses. I am seeking to save lives, not just to kill. I do not want to take the chance of exposing our people to the danger of nuclear attack with the knowledge that we are not even trying to give them a defense.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I want to support the gentleman in his statement. I think it is forthright and clear as to the intent of what the Committee on Appropriations recommended. I am firmly against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I do not think that there is any dispute by the proponents of this amendment with the gentleman from Florida who opposes it. I think all of us want the protection that is afforded by the Nike-X missile system. The only question presented is whether we are ready for the preproduction expenses yet. There are funds in this bill for research and development. The argument of the gentleman from California is that we have not yet emerged from the unexplored areas of research and development to the point where production can be undertaken.

The gentleman, whom I recognize as an expert in this field, having served on this committee for a great many years, should be able to answer this. The question I would like to ask him is whether there is a sufficient definition of research and development to the point where the program is ready to move into the field of production?

Mr. SIKES. My friend's question is reasonable and sound. May I say unqualifiedly, "Yes." There is ample evidence in the hearings of our committee. It is shown in the records. There is sufficient assurance of success in the program to proceed now with it.

There is question in some areas about the degree of success that can be obtained with any ABM system; yes. There are always questions in a new, complicated and advanced field like this. We cannot know in this or in any new area whether we will attain the degree of capability that we would want, but yes, we are ready to start. We can start as well now as next year, and by doing so we gain a year in the defense of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the very wise remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. Chairman, I would much rather have a Nike system than to want one.

Mr. Chairman, this country which is now bordering upon a trillion-dollar gross national income—that is what the Department of the Treasury says, and the Department of the Treasury ought to know—a GNP now of over $750 billion, what is a few hundred million dollars to get started on the expenditure of $20 billion in order to save hundreds and thousands and millions of American lives?

Mr. Chairman, the records of the Committee on Armed Services are replete with reams of testimony on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, we need a Nike-X. We had better get one before it is too late.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the statements that have been made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] are certainly borne out by the testimony which was presented before the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I interrogated the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or representatives of that able body, when they were before our committee.

Mr. Chairman, there was not anything equivocal about what they said. They indicated that this is one of the major things in which they were interested and they believed something should be done about it. They indicated a line of thinking which I believe might be well worth thinking about for just a moment today.

Mr. Chairman, they indicated that they felt this program should not be regarded as just a be-kind-to-people program, but as a protection of our country and as a security program.

Mr. Chairman, they indicated that the presence of such a system would deter some aggressor from trying to strike our country; the very thought that we have such a system would be a deterrent against a war and, therefore, they strongly urged that we have such a program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], for whom I have the highest regard and with whom I have served for so many years on the Committee on Armed Services, does not mean to imply that we are not adequately in a position where we can protect ourselves or that we do not have such a balance of forces or such a strategic capability which would respond and deter any aggressor?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not suggesting that we do not have that facility?

Mr. BENNETT. The gentleman from California is a dedicated American and an able legislator. I am not suggesting that we do not have any way of deterring an enemy, but I am suggesting that the presence of this program could deter an enemy, in this way——

Mr. COHELAN. Well, is not it true——

Mr. BENNETT. If the gentleman wants to ask a question on my time, the gentleman should not interrupt my answer.

Mr. COHELAN. I understand, but I want to point out that we have an enormous defensive capability and, admitting that this is true, would it not be sensible, on the basis of testimony submitted to the committee that the gentleman has received from equally eminent authority, that we concentrate on the offensive instead of concentrating on the defensive?

Mr. BENNETT. I would not want to engage in a debate on this question in order to see who is the greatest lover of peace, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] or myself, but I believe that this program is directed in the direction of peace. I do believe our offensive procedures are also valuable. But I do believe that this type of program might deter an opponent from making an attack.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman degrading our present system by saying that?

Mr. BENNETT. Not at all.

Mr. COHELAN. Do we not have a strategic deterrent today?

Mr. BENNETT. Just because we have an airplane does not mean we should not have a ship.

Mr. COHELAN. How about all those missiles?

Mr. BENNETT. They are there but, of course, these missiles are offensive as you have observed. The program I endorse provides another deterrent. It subtracts nothing.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. It is much simpler than that. What the gentleman has said is that insofar as we can determine we have a missile and airborne nuclear capability sufficient to kill many millions of the enemy, and they have a similar capability to kill millions upon millions of Americans. God forbid that that day should ever come.

What we are saying is that the Russians are building a defense against our missile system and that we should now start building our own defense against their missile system. It is an effort to provide for our people as much protection as the Russians will have.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the gentleman has very well stated that. I should like to conclude by saying that I feel in addition to what he has said that the presence of such a system in the United States does act as a real deterrent against offensive operations against the United States.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on three aspects of this particular amendment:

First, the efficacy of the system which might evolve.

Second, the strategic significance of any such defense system.

Third, the question as to when we must be ready to act.

First, as to efficacy. Over the past 20 years, I have spent thousands of hours in research on missile systems, both offensive systems and defensive systems. I have participated in numerous tests of ballistic missile defense equipment, including reentry tests far at sea and elsewhere. The matter before us is a familiar one.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation has an extremely powerful offensive missile system in operation today. With each passing day improvements are incorporated which make it more potent, a more certain deterrent. But we have virtually no ability to defend ourselves against a comparable offensive force, such as the force that the U.S.S.R. possesses. If we start today to construct a defense against this force, we can expect to buy at best a very weak defense, and even that at enormous cost.

Do not be deluded into believing that we can simply spend dollars and attain an effective defense.

Secondly, as to strategic significance. I think we all realize that when two nations such as the U.S.S.R. and the United States each possess an unstoppable offense, a certain balance of terror exists. It is an inhuman balance of terror, I acknowledge, but it is a balance. It is similar to having two men facing each other, each holding a loaded and ready shotgun. They are even. But as soon as one of those men puts on what he thinks to be a bulletproof vest, then life for both becomes extremely unstable. The stress of our current balance of terror is great. It is the greatest stress that the world has ever faced. But some balance remains.

Under the circumstances then, it is evident that it is not necessarily true that by starting this defense system we will increase our security at all.

Third, as to the time for decision. Perhaps a time will come when this decision must be made; and perhaps the time is now. If it is, I will probably feel obligated to vote for all the funds needed—for the missiles, for the fallout shelters, for the medical supplies—for an unending list of items.

But our most important authorities, our most informed authorities should make this decision. Only the President is in a position to make this decision, in my opinion. And I presume he would act through the Secretary of Defense. And I assume that he would not make any such decision until he became convinced that some other nation had progressed far enough, in either installation of equipment or readiness for installation, so that he was convinced that we could soon be in danger. If and when that time comes, we have little choice but to face the hazards of that course. Perhaps a hundred billion dollars will be needed, not likely less. But I say that today is not the day to do that, unless the President lays his name right on the line and says that we have to do so.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIVIAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan and I join with him in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

I would also like to commend my distinguished colleague from California for bringing this matter in issue and giving us an opportunity to express ourselves on this matter of such great public concern.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIVIAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. During your statement you mentioned that you would like to have the option given to the President and the Commander in Chief as to when to go ahead with this problem. Is that correct?

Mr. VIVIAN. That is correct.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. That is exactly the purpose of this amendment.

The committee has provided $153,500,000 for preproduction activities directed toward the potential deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system.

The decision as to whether or not to produce and deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system in this country is one of major significance. Such a decision involves consideration of an almost indescribably complex combination of factors including psychological, political, financial, technological and strategic ones. It is a decision in which military, the civilian personnel working in the military departments, our State Department, the President, and the Congress must participate. The final decision, under our form of government, rests with the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief.

Congress has the responsibility to act in a responsible fashion and in a cooperative manner so as to make available to the President the legal authority and funds necessary to implement the decision to deploy such a system.

It has a responsibility to the people of America to make its views known on this matter and to act in a manner which is in the best interest of this Nation.

Research and development efforts in the Nike-X anti-ballistic-missile system have progressed to such an extent that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and congressional committees charged with the oversight of our defense program believe that it can afford significant protection against a variety of potential ballistic missile threats to this country. These efforts have also succeeded in developing this system to the point where it would be capable of deployment in a timeframe which might save millions of American lives in the event of an enemy attack.

In making these funds available, the committee is not attempting in any way to define the ultimate type or scope of the deployment of a ballistic-missile defense. These funds merely make it possible for the President to achieve a savings in time of almost 1 year in the time required between a decision to deploy this anti-ballistic-missile system and the attainment of operational capability. In other words, Congress in this action is buying life insurance for millions of American people.

Failure of the Congress to take this action at this time would merely serve to force the executive branch to delay for a year the time required for operational capability to be achieved with this system should the decision be made to produce and deploy it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIVIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not true that the spokesman of the President of the United States, Secretary of Defense McNamara, has not recommended inclusion of these funds within the bill?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I might point out to the gentleman that the President has signed the bill authorizing this amount of money to be appropriated.

Mr. YATES. Did the President make a statement in which he requested the Congress to put this money in the bill?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I do not know what the act of signing of the bill does other than approve the authorization. We are following the authorization.

Mr. YATES. You put it in the bill before he signed the authorization bill, did you not?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Of course.

Mr. YATES. Of course you did, which was before the subsequent action of the President.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I think your point is moot.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VIVIAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I merely wish to cite the statement of Secretary McNamara on that point. I think it is very clear that the administration has not asked for the money. I agree with my colleague from California. This is a presidential matter. When the President wants the money, he will ask for it. I quote Secretary McNamara:

> Secretary MCNAMARA. They may be doing what we have decided not to do. If they are, we will respond to their action as we think they might respond to ours. Specifically, if they are developing anti-ballistic-missile systems—we will respond to those Soviet defensive systems by increasing the capability of our offensive weapons, in particular, by adding to their penetration capability.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The question of the deployment of an ABM system, or anti-ballistic-missile system, is, of course, an important question and worthy of discussion on the floor of the House. Hostile intercontinental-ballistic missiles, capable of reaching the United States in, say, 30 minutes, are pointed toward the United States today. They are in existence. American intercontinental-ballistic missiles are capable of delivering their weapons against the Soviet Union. This, of course is a very dangerous condition in which we find ourselves, but it is a fact.

The best judgment, apparently, in our government is that the Soviet Union may be—we cannot prove it conclusively—building an ABM system now. I personally believe that the Soviet Government is undertaking at this time to deploy or begin to deploy an ABM system, an anti-ballistic-missile system. It seems to me that we can do no less than to take the necessary steps to get into the position to build and deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system, and this is the preproduction money that is involved here.

There is nearly $600 million in the bill for the ABM system. We have provided here in Congress, in this and previous appropriation bills about $3 billion for the anti-ballistic-missile system. We have gone a long way with it. We have not solved all the problems, but we are making progress.

There are those who believe that probably one of the most effective counters to the ABM system is more ballistic missiles. What we have been trying to do over a period of years—and have been spending millions to do it—is to make our ballistic missiles so sophisticated that they cannot all be destroyed by a defensive system in the Soviet union or elsewhere. I think we have made a great deal of progress in sophistication of these warheads. I have no doubt that our ICBM's could reach their targets.

No doubt the Soviet Union is trying to improve its missile systems and is doing so. Since the best judgment, as I see it, is that the Soviet Union is undertaking to build a defense against the ballistic missile, I do not see how we can fail to move along with this program in which we already have such a heavy investment.

If we could get some kind of agreement, some sort of foolproof treaty that neither side would use nuclear weapons, that would be a matter to consider. But certainly we could never get an agreement to that effect if we would permit the Soviet Union to build an ABM system and not have one ourselves.

So under all these circumstances I think we need to make this start. But I warn you that if we go forward and fully finance an ABM system, it will probably cost in excess of $30 billion over a period of years. It will be very expensive if we are to have a reasonably effective system.

Frankly, I do not have too much faith in any of these ABM system proposals in this Nation or elsewhere. Maybe eventually we will have something that will be reasonably dependable. I feel that we have to do the best we can under the circumstances. With that in mind, I would suggest to the House that we vote for these additional funds—$153.5 million—for further progress. This is a further down payment on the deployment of a system.

Of course, we will have to come along later with a shelter program. We are confronted with a long and tedious and tortuous road to follow. I think it is the road we must follow under the circumstances. There is no completely safe road. I think it is the best road, the most prudent road to follow.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished chairman would comment on whether or not, he thinks if we vote this money, the administration will spend this money?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, I hope the Secretary will proceed with the program. I feel it is my duty to help make this money available. If the executive branch feels that enough progress has not been made on the ABM and that we are not ready to go forward with this program, then it can withhold the money. Whether or not he is within his constitutional rights is subject to debate, but this has been the traditional method. We discharge our duty when we make funds for this program available to the executive branch.

Mr. COHELAN. What I would like to establish, Mr. Chairman, is that there is some doubt that this money will be spent. Is this a fair understanding?

Mr. MAHON. I would say there is some doubt that it will be spent during the current fiscal year, that it will all be obligated during the current fiscal year. But I have no doubt that the Secretary of Defense, who has been the principal person to recommend the $3 billion to date on this program, is serious about perfecting the system. When he thinks that sufficient development has taken place, I believe he will want to go forward with the system, unless some sort of accommodation can be reached—which most of us consider unlikely—that will make the construction of the system unnecessary.

(On request of Mr. LAIRD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Texas will yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the point the distinguished chairman of our committee is making here is that this is the responsibility of the Congress, which is the important thing for us to bear in mind—not what the decision of the executive branch will be, but what the decision of the Congress should be, based on our hearings and testimony which has been given to the legislative branch.

We have made decisions like this in the past, during the time of another administration, when we put in money for the Polaris submarine program at a higher level than was recommended by the executive branch and a higher level than was recommended by the Secretary of Defense. Fortunately, the executive branch took advantage of this option that our committee gave them with the funding and went forward. We were able to move ahead our Polaris program many months in advance.

That is the kind of option we want to give the executive branch with this amendment, which is clearly earmarked for this one purpose.

I join the gentleman from Texas in supporting the position of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very sound statement.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. In its simplest terms, does not the issue amount to our trying to give our people the same protection the Russians are trying to give their civilians?

Mr. MAHON. So far as we know, the Russians are not giving their people any real protection yet. They probably are trying to give them the protection of such a system.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. We are trying to give our people the same anticipated protection that the Russians are trying to give their people. We do not know whether either system will work.

Mr. MAHON. There is a lot to be said for the correctness of the gentleman's statement. The gentleman from Alabama is very knowledgeable in defense matters and has made a great contribution in this field to the Nation's welfare.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should merely like to summarize the argument I have advanced in support of my amendment. I believe it is pretty clear that preproduction of this Nike-X program is contrary to what the administration wants at this time and, furthermore, to what we are ready for.

I have summarized the arguments, but I believe it would be worth while for Members to read what is in the hearings, because I believe they will find there is ample authority in support of my position. There has been a great deal of discussion. Each Member, in his wisdom, has a right to make his judgment on the basis of the facts presented.

The record is replete with information on this particular topic. One of the absolute requirements of predeployment of this system, of course, is a full-scale fallout shelter program.

I quote from page 87 of the hearings, a statement by Secretary McNamara:

> First, I would emphasize that moving ahead with the Nike X by itself is of relatively little value. If you wished to increase our defensive posture in relation to a Soviet nuclear attack, the first and by far the most important action to take, and certainly the cheapest action to take, would be to support a full fallout shelter program for the Nation. The Congress, and in a very real sense I think the people, have turned down such a program on a number of occasions.

One of the reasons I have raised this issue is that the country does not know this, and I do not believe the country wants this.

I quote again from Secretary McNamara:

> Unless the Congress and the people were to accept such a program, I would strongly recommend against deployment of Nike X because Nike X itself can be completely negated by an attack outside of the effective zones of that defensive system. Such an attack would be succesful if we did not have a widespread fallout shelter system because the detonation of the warheads outside of the effective range of Nike X would allow fallout to be distributed across the country by the prevailing west-to-east winds.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish the gentleman would read from page 114, where it is stated that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chief of Staff of the Army recommended the ABM system to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I concede that point, but General Wheeler makes very clear at that point in the hearings that his support of an ABM system is coupled with a full fallout shelter program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get to the question put by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] and others, on why there should be research and development.

The record is replete with these questions which have been put by my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] asked that question on "why all the R. & D. if we do not deploy it?", and Secretary McNamara replied:

> For two reasons. One, regardless of what benefit may eventually accrue to us from that expenditure to develop defensive technology, we are also gaining very important information about potentially desirable modifications in our offensive weapons systems which gives those offensive systems a greater capability for penetrating Soviet defensive systems. The penetration aids that we are introducing into our offensive weapons system, the improvements in the reentry vehicles and many of the other modifications of our offensive systems are direct derivatives of our work on the defensive systems. The results from the $400 or $500 million a year we are spending—actually it is closer to $550 or $600 million—on development of antiballistic missile systems and related projects would be worth it if we got nothing more than the foundation for these modifications of our offensive systems.
>
> We do, however, continue to advance the art of the defensive systems, and we feel that we should continue to probe the potential for more advanced systems. It is possible that we will discover some technology or achieve the performance characteristics in some system that will so protect us as to warrant deployment, or the situation may change in some presently unforeseen way so as to make its deployment desirable.

Finally, on the question of the Soviet threat, my colleagues on the committee have constantly raised this question with the responsible authorities who have come before our committee. On this Secretary McNamara said, on page 116:

> Let us assume it is a dangerous position for the moment.
>
> How do you protect yourself against it? You do not protect yourself against their defensive system, or their potential for deploying a defensive system, by deploying one of your own. You protect yourself against their potential defensive system by strengthening your offensive system, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Finally I want to say that this information that is contained in some profusion in the hearings has been verified by me in many cases from very eminent scientists that I have already referred to in my main argument.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The distinguished gentleman from California read us in detail from Secretary McNamara's statement. The record contains a great deal of testimony from other eminent witnesses who say it is time to move ahead. It has been recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. May I submit, if the gentleman wants a full fallout shelter system—and, of course, it is needed—it takes much less time to construct than an anti-ballistic-missile system. Now is the time to start on the anti-ballistic-missile system. We can think of the fallout shelter system next year and the next and still catch up.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the matter before us, I think we are all interested in the discussion that has been had. However, I do think there is only one side to this argument, that is, to go along with the committee's action. We are all aware that Mr. McNamara is very conscious of budgets and the money that he says he has saved. We know that the President and many others are conscious of the publicity given as to whether the budget exceeds the expected national income and things of that sort. Still we need to keep in mind that these funds in this bill will not be withdrawn from the Treasury and expended unless the President and Mr. McNamara do so. The committee gives the benefit of its ideas here, but in the event that the funds are not in here, Congress is taking the responsibility for defeating or holding back in this area where it may be dangerous in the future. I think, as a Congress, and we thought as a committee, that we should recognize what Russia is likely doing in this field and make our own position clear and make it possible to go ahead with this program. That is all this does, is make it possible to go ahead with this program. I cannot see under the circumstances we have here that we should accept the responsibility of saying "No" when we know that the folks who have said we cannot say it now are pressed as to the public reaction to a figure-keeping basis, which is how many dollars you have here and how many you have there as a bookkeeping matter. This money will not be withdrawn from the Treasury and spent except by the folks who have raised some question in the hearings.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Do I understand the point the gentleman is making is—and I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] made the same point—that it is the intention of the committee to make these funds available to the President; if in his discretion he wishes to go ahead and decide to use them, then it is his decision and, if not, he will not be subject to congressional criticism?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois that whatever your intent may or may not be through the years, that is the way the system has worked, as the gentleman knows very well, and that is the way it will work again. But the committee did make it quite clear how we felt about it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. May I call attention to a comment by General Johnson on page 451 of the record in response to a question by me which reads as follows:

> It is my view as Chief of Staff of the Army that the most significant gap we have in our defense forces is in the area of a ballistic missile defense.

Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that this argument comes a little late. Congress acted on this question when the military authorization was before us. There was only one vote against it in the House. The Senate approved it. The President has signed it. It does not make sense to turn our backs on this action and start going the other way.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I do not think that the dispute is on the question as to whether or not this system should be approved. Those who followed the lead of the gentleman from California say that they favor the expenditure of funds for research. There is testimony to the effect that the program has not yet advanced enough for preproduction expenditures. That is the basis for this argument.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he make an appointment with the executive department or with the representatives of the Department of Defense and be heard. Certainly, we should not take the responsibility here of saying "No," when the situation is as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I take this time to propound a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MA-

HON]. Earlier this year, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], appointed a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services for the purpose of investigating commercial air travel for servicemen who are traveling on a military standby fare basis.

Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege of serving as chairman of that subcommittee. One of the first steps that I took in beginning the investigation was to have the representatives of the General Accounting Office make an investigation at all of the major air terminals of the United States as to the difficulties which the servicemen were having while traveling on emergency and other leave status.

The General Accounting Office made an excellent study and identified over 1,400 cases where servicemen had trouble in traveling on a military standby basis.

Mr. Chairman, many of these cases were quite shocking, involving such things as "bumping" at intermediate points. For example, if a serviceman were traveling on a half-fare basis from Washington to Los Angeles, he might be bumped in St. Louis and lose many precious hours, and even days, of leavetime. Other cases involved rude and insulting treatment of airline personnel, failure to give proper priority and refusal to serve servicemen meals in flight.

Mr. Chairman, one of the possibilities that we have studied in the committee as a way of solving or helping to alleviate this problem, is the matter of using planes and pilots of the Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve for the purpose of transporting servicemen on emergency leave.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the authority is contained somewhere in the bill for such an operation, but I would like to have the assurance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the funds would be available for the next fiscal year to carry out such an operation.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that at the present time, during the airline strike, the Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Reserves have established air routes all over the country for the purpose of transporting servicemen on emergency leave and also on leave, returning from southeast Asian combat areas.

As of Monday of last week over 5,000 boys had been transported by these military airplanes.

It may not be necessary for the committee to recommend legislation for the continuance of the airlift. But if it becomes necessary to solve the problem, I would like to have the assurance of the gentleman from Texas that this authority is contained in the bill and that the money has been appropriated therefor.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very able, interesting, and helpful statement. The funds are in this bill which would make possible the type of operation which the gentleman has suggested. But, of course, as to any specific statutory authority, that is not contained in this bill. I would think the gentleman from Missouri, the able chairman, may have looked into the matter of legal authority, but I assume that there is no legal barrier. I feel that we should cooperate to the ultimate extent with our servicemen under the circumstances which have been related here by our friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Missouri on a magnificent job. He undertook this position under all kinds of difficulties and he now has an airlift set up which is transporting our fighting men all over America. The gentleman deserves the thanks and deep appreciation not only of the House of Representatives but of the entire Congress for the magnificent job that he and his fine committee have done in this respect.

Mr. ICHORD. I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina and to the House that if we continue to make the progress we have made thus far, it may not be necessary for the committee to recommend that the airlift be continued. But all the members of the committee are vitally interested in this problem and we are determined to see that what has occurred in the past does not happen again. Much has already been done. For example, several airlines have filed an application for tariffs that will guarantee assured seating for servicemen while traveling on leave at a discount fare. The CAB has stated it approves of the airlines having guaranteed seating on a half-fare bases for men while on emergency leave. Also the Department of Defense has established an ad hoc committee that is looking into the problem at the present time. I would state that the airlines have given the committee very commendable cooperation. They have recognized that they have the moral duty of providing our servicemen improved accommodations. The airlines have requested of CAB authority to meet and discuss their military standby fares. The authority was granted by CAB but the meeting has not been held on account of the airline strikes. I am hopeful that out of this meeting and the actions resulting therefrom, and the other steps already taken will come the solution to the problems. I see no reason why most of the problems can not be solved without the necessity of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT AND MISSILES, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, missiles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands, and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public or private plants; $1,789,900,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: On page 16, line 20, strike out "$1,789,900,000" and all of line 21 and insert "$1,801,900,000, to remain available until expended, of which $12,000,000 shall be available only for additional aircraft and electronic equipment to be used for expanded airborne television transmission capabilities."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not at all complicated.

Nor does it involve much money in relationship to the more than $58 billion appropriated by this bill.

This amendment simply makes $12 million available for additional aircraft and electronic equipment for airborne television transmission capabilities should the administration decide to modernize and expand facilities presently being used in South Vietnam.

One week ago today the Congress accepted the proposition that this was sound and approved $12 million in the authorization bill for this purpose.

So it is not a question of the merit of the program for this was considered by the House Armed Services Committee, by this House itself, by the conferees, and by both bodies when they approved the conference report and nowhere have I heard any Member of either body come forward and take issue with the television program in South Vietnam and what this amendment would do to expand and further that program.

That this project withstood the closest scrutiny of the conferees is evidenced by the fact that in their wisdom they reduced the amount authorized from $20 million as first accepted by this House to $12 million. The conference report, on page 7, states:

> The Conferees agreed that through the utilization of some P3A aircraft now in the inventory it would be possible to achieve the results desired by the authorization of a lesser sum. The Conferees agreed that authorization in the amount of $12,000,000 should be granted.

This conclusively demonstrates how carefully this program was considered.

Last Tuesday this Congress, with only three dissenting votes, approved the authorization bill. We said, without a single word of protest, that $12 million was needed to do the television job in Vietnam right.

Today, just 1 week later, are we going to refuse to put up a single cent to provide what we agreed last Tuesday was needed?

Of course, it is not expected that every item in an authorization will be funded. But it should be remembered that we are dealing with a matter that has had the microscopic attention of the House and

Senate conferees and all of them and the whole House and the whole Senate agreed to the amount in this amendment. To refuse these funds will make the Congress appear devoid of consistency—and even capricious. Are we going to say today that what we did last Tuesday was not sound?

I do not think that is what we want to say.

Are we going to say that the program that we thought good last week is no good this week?

I do not think that is what we want to say.

Are we going to say that we do not have money to do a first class job with this program?

I do not think that is what we want to say.

Are we going to say that we can provide more than $58 billion to insure our security and resist aggression by force, by shooting, by bombing, by killing, but that we have lost faith in trying to reach the minds of men with the truth?

Are we going to say today that we cannot afford to tell the people of South Vietnam about how much the American people are doing to help them?

Last January I was aboard both our Blue Eagle planes here at Andrews as they were being fitted out. While in Vietnam just 3 months ago during the Easter recess I flew a mission with one of our Blue Eagle television planes. We circled Saigon for 5 hours sending television signals on two channels, one in Vietnamese and one for our own troops. I have faith in this program. I sincerely believe that we have a great national asset that we have not really begun to utilize in this war.

Why, I ask, do we have to crawl through the jungles of Vietnam shooting everything that moves to convince the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong of our intentions? We all know that television can and does influence human conduct here in the United States and that it can also influence human conduct in South Vietnam; that we can reach the minds of men with words—yes, and even with music.

Again, are we going to say today to crews flying those old superannuated Constellations that we know their signals could reach a vastly greater area if they could fly at 30,000 feet, instead of 11,000 but that we cannot afford a first-class plane?

I do not think that is what we want to say.

Are we going to say today, that even though our only two television planes in Saigon were damaged by the mortar attack at Ton Son Nhut, there is no merit in having airborne television platforms with the range and speed to be based in more remote areas for security purposes should the need arise?

Are we going to say that just because we may some day have a ground station that it is not possible that it could be the target of bombing such as the Embassy in Saigon, the hotels where our boys are billeted and the air terminal to mention only a few sensitive targets?

Are we going to say today, as we look around the world about us, that there is no merit in having an "on the shelf" asset such as this, capable of being sent anywhere the world situation might require, whether the Dominican Republic or Cuba or Panama or anywhere else. Are we going to say let us wait for first-class equipment we will gamble that we will have the time to put together a crash program?

No, I do not think we want to say any of these things by our action today.

If we can afford $58 billion for bombs and bullets, we can afford $12 million to spread the truth.

We do not want to say that last Tuesday we were overwhelmingly for a first-class televison program in Vietnam, but this week we are not. If this job is worth doing. It is worth doing well.

If you felt this was a good project last Tuesday, I ask you to help fund it today. Twelve million is a lot but it would not keep the war going for one forenoon. I urge you to join me in putting just a little something in this bill to try to win the minds of men with words and truth rather in relying solely on bombs and bullets.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. Some weeks ago we had the opportunity of going to Vietnam to report to our Committee on the Armed Services as to the progress of the war over there. I had the honor to be the chairman of that subcommittee. The gentleman from Michigan was one of the members on the minority side, a very active member, I must say. As he has already indicated, our subcommittee unanimously recommended to the full committee and to this House that the television program in Vietnam be improved and expanded as a matter of the greatest urgency.

We all know that this is not exclusively a military war. We are also fighting the war for the support of the people and for the minds of the men and women of Vietnam. Television in that area is one of the most effective ways of doing this educational job. As the gentleman has indicated, I believe it makes great sense to spend $12 million for this important political aspect of the battle at the same time we are spending $58 billion to win the purely military aspect.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the very able and distinguished former Governor of Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of our subcommittee, who did go to Vietnam last spring. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is very good and I urge its adoption.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his support.

I believe this is clearly a case where the House should indicate that we do believe there are other factors besides the military in Vietnam. We have to win the people. Many of them cannot read. Many of them have never seen General Ky. Many of them have never seen General Westmoreland. Here is an opportunity to let these people see and hear what is going on, what the struggle is all about, what we are doing for them. The funds in the gentleman's amendment are small indeed.

I believe the gentleman's amendment would serve a good purpose and I warmly support it.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VIVIAN. I would like to take this opportunity to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I agree with the gentlemen that the television system he advocates is an essential means of disseminating vitally needed information in Vietnam. I believe we should support this amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in order that I personally can vote intelligently on this, I would like to ask the author one or two questions on his amendment. First, has the USIA been consulted on this program and do they approve it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, the program that is now being utilized for South Vietnam today is being operated by the USIA. The planes that are doing the transmission of the television signals are being operated by the Navy, but the programing is by USIA.

Mr. JOELSON. This would be an extension of the very minimal program presently being conducted?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. This would provide the physical capability. This would give them an Electra airframe, so that they could fly higher and so they could be based in remote areas.

When the gentleman from New York and I were at the airfield, both the planes were mortared, were knocked out. The one I flew in had 40 holes in it when we were circling Saigon. If we had better equipment, we could base it at another field and fly in and get out. We do not have the equipment today to do it. We are only on the air 1 hour.

If the country is unstable, it is because the people of Vietnam do not know what is going on.

Mr. JOELSON. The people in Vietnam do not have receivers. Do they watch the programs from central places?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has put his finger on a very sensitive point. There are 25 sets now, and more of them are being made available. The Premier has just recently loosened up on foreign exchange to permit the sets to come into the country. This will snowball. It is growing fast. We will have more sets in there soon.

What we have to do is provide the equipment to get the signal in onto the screen.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey and I have frequently flown down from New Jersey together before the air strike. The gentleman will remember when we used to fly down in the beat-up Constellations. Until the recent unpleasantness, they were replaced by the Electra aircraft. We had a much better flight and we came down in a more refreshed condition. This is what the gentleman's amendment would do. It would replace the beat-up aircraft with more modern aircraft. In Saigon and elsewhere they have the television receivers set up on the street corners, as they do in San Juan, so the people can join in the community areas and get this reception.

We just want to keep them on the air a little longer so that they can get the message across more effectively.

Mr. JOELSON. I agree with the gentleman from New York that it is important we get our point of view across to the people and the civilians, if there are any such any more, in Vietnam.

I believe this is a good amendment, and I will support it.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman's support will be very valuable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this matter is as controversial as it may appear from some of the discussion. We have had aircraft for quite some time cooperating this radio and television broadcasting program. I for one am not opposed to it. I do not know anyone on the Committee on Appropriations who is opposed to providing television broadcast service to our military.

There are some 2,500 to 3,000 television sets among the people in South Vietnam, and they are being taken care of at this time. It just so happens that on the first of this month, July 1, they were scheduled to have secured a replacement aircraft.

There is no prohibition against the transfer of any planes which our military officials wish to transfer to the area to be used for this purpose.

I feel there is no need whatever for this amendment.

I believe the need is being met as well as it can be met under the circumstances.

The officials claim that the introduction of the P–3 to the TV-radio aircraft fleet would introduce different operating bases, logistical supply lines, and the like; and this is one of the reasons for the Department of Defense not proposing to change the type of aircraft.

I ask Members to listen to this. The Department of Defense is programing the construction of eight ground TV stations in Vietnam at the present time. We need those stations—not the aircraft, but stations broadcasting on the ground. They are now programing eight of them for use in Vietnam.

Another thing is that this amendment would call for the procurement of only two or perhaps three planes. The P–3 aircraft are known commercially as the Electra. But they are not under order. If we were to order them, I am advised that it could take a year to get them.

The Navy has need for this type of aircraft, according to the statement which has been given to me, for antisubmarine warfare.

I believe that our fighting men in Vietnam will be satisfied with the service, which is being improved by the new ground stations and the mobile stations which are being provided. They are more interested in winning the war. They are interested in having an adequate anti-submarine-defense program in operation in that area, because their lives are involved in this matter.

I merely say, let us encourage, as we do in this discussion, the continuation of this program, and let us hope it will be improved.

But this amendment will not do a thing for them for almost 12 months, and the Navy would probably rather have the planes for the anti-submarine-warfare program.

Let us encourage them. The money is available. Certainly they can find whatever money may be necessary for the operation of additional aircraft, and if they can spare P–3 aircraft let them do so. If it is their judgment that they can spare aircraft for this purpose, certainly there is nothing in this bill or in any legislation to prevent it.

The gentleman has made his point. He wants TV service in South Vietnam. They are getting it now. They will get better service, both for the South Vietnamese people and our own people.

I do not see any reason for the amendment, and I strongly oppose this addition.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The memorandum the gentleman read indicated that a Lockheed aircraft would be available July 1, 1966? What was the date of the memorandum? Is the aircraft available?

Mr. MAHON. A Lockheed aircraft, yes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. As I understood it, it said July 1, 1966.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. RUMSFELD. So it is available.

Mr. MAHON. They already have made available one aircraft, as of this month, an additional aircraft.

Officials in charge of this program are trying to give better service. They, the people running the Department of Defense and the war in Vietnam, are not disloyal. General Westmoreland is not against the servicemen in South Vietnam. They are doing the best they can for them. To order these planes and delude ourselves into believing that we are doing any additional good for them in Vietnam is simply bad judgment, in my opinion.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding. I would simply like to point out that I have anticipated what the chairman of the committee might say with respect to the availability of Lockheed P–3-type aircraft. I was advised by representatives of the Lockheed Corp. just yesterday that should a plane be ordered in August pursuant to funds being made available in this appropriation, that that plane would be available in January 1967 and this would be without interfering whatsoever with the anti-submarine-warfare program. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I was told that if two planes were ordered, one would be available in January of 1967 and the other one would be available in February of 1967. If three planes, one would be available in January, one in February, and one in March of 1967, and the anti-submarine-warfare program would not be interfered with.

I would like to say this, also: The gentleman is very proper in pointing out that we are trying to get a ground network available in South Vietnam. Would that we had it there 4 or 5 years ago. Maybe we would not have the problems that we have there today. I would point out also to the gentleman that the U.S. Embassy has been bombed in South Vietnam and so have several of our American billets. When I was at Tan Son Nhut Airbase a year ago they blew up the air terminal. If we get an effective ground station in Vietnam transmitting television signals, it may be bombed, too, one of these days. So I say what we are after is a first-class backup capacity that we can have available to do the job and do it right not only for Vietnam but anywhere else it might be needed around the world.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I understood the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations to say a moment ago that there would be another Lockheed aircraft, which would make three of them. The Constellation is a Lockheed aircraft but it is obsolete. As a matter of fact, there have been three airplanes, three Lockheed Constellations, involved in this TV operation in Vietname, but as the gentleman from Michigan indicated a moment ago, one of them was very seriously damaged in April. So I assume the memo that the gentleman from Texas is referring to is simply saying that as of the first of July we were back on the same schedule of three obsolete planes that we had before the mortar attack of the 13th of April, and I think, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out, we do need to do better than we were doing then. We need improved planes, and an improved one would be a Lockheed Electra.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I understand one of those planes was out of service. General Westmoreland is doing the best he can to take care of the needs in the area. If we let our people in South Vietnam continue to try to give them this service and draw on the resources of the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and other Government agencies, and attempt to provide it, I think our chances for improving the service are far better than to undertake to cause them to try to buy separate aircraft which Lockheed may say it can get next January, but the Navy says it may take a whole year to deliver. So let us not swap the possibilities of an improved program already approved for an order of aircraft which will give an excuse for some further delay. It does not seem to make sense.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield 1 minute further, I think the point here is whether we in this House want to leave this decision up to the Department of Defense as to whether they will switch airplanes or not, or whether we want to exercise our own proper constitutional authority here in Congress with regard to the Armed Forces and put the money in the bill in order to make sure that the Pentagon will do what is needed to make this program go full blast.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations one or two questions that were on my mind when the gentleman's time expired.

The ground units will amount to a total of eight. What will be the approximate cost of this operation?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not know what the cost will be. But the mobile units are being provided. Additional mobile units may have to be provided. We need better and improved communications in Vietnam. This is one of the problems.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Am I not correct in my assumption that the cost of seven mobile units and one fixed station will be considerably less than the aircraft?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would think so.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Does the gentleman know the time schedule as to their completion—when they will be operational?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know the time schedule at the moment, but I believe that they would be more effective. There is no reason why the television program will not be improved. The ground stations are more effective in all kinds of weather.

Does the gentleman feel that an effort is being made presently to provide for this need and that the ground station will be quite helpful in support of this program?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am very much a supporter of this program and do personally feel that the ground stations will very likely provide a better solution to the problem.

Mr. MAHON. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am also impressed by the problem of the cost involved and particularly the fact that the aircraft proposed are now desired for use by the Navy because they are short of that particular aircraft and they will very likely want to give the first ones off the production lines to their units anyway; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and I had the opportunity of viewing and studying the details of the operations of this television program.

Is there not a greater need, really, insofar as the civilian population is concerned, for a supply of better quality receiving equipment, with better amplification, in order that it would better serve the objectives of the program?

We did not find serious deficiencies in transmittal equipment but, rather, the deficiency is in the receiving equipment which would have to be dealt with probably in the budget, under the control of Mr. Zorthian in the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman has made a good point. Also, one of the difficulties involved in this program is the language difficulty in Vietnam. We saw one large group of people watching a set where the sound was not even on.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The USIA representatives tried to get the sound turned on but they could not speak Vietnamese and the Vietnamese could not speak English. The result was that it was some time before they could get the sound turned on.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There are seven mobile TV vans under procurement. These vans will be available in September 1966 and will be stationed at key locations throughout the country. A conventional regular studio type permanent station will be operational in Saigon in October 1966.

Mr. RUMSFELD. That is the present schedule, is it not?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. MOSS. That answers my question. I appreciate the information.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply say that I agree that the ground station is best and I also agree with the gentleman from California that we need the receivers, and that we need them desperately.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that we have no assurance whatsoever that the ground stations will not be knocked out, and when they are, we have no first-class backup capability.

Mr. Chairman, the Constellation plane out there will fly at 11,000 feet and the Electras will fly at 30,000 feet and do the job right.

Mr. Chairman, why when we are spending $58 billion a year here for defense and personnel, we cannot get a microscopic $12 million with which to tell the truth, is beyond me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) there were—ayes 20, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make some very brief remarks about the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program and to address a question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in charge of the defense appropriations bill.

In a report submitted to the Congress more than a year ago, the Committee on Government Operations called upon the Department of Defense, without further delay, to commence full-scale development of the MOL project. See "Government Operations in Space," House Report No. 445, 89th Congress, 1st session, June 4, 1965. This report, prepared under my direction by the Military Operations Subcommittee, noted that there was a great deal of "hesitancy, confusion, and delay" in preliminary studies and planning for manned orbital projects, with both NASA and the DOD parties at interest. The Secretary of Defense had declared in favor of the MOL project in December 1963, inviting NASA participation, but the months seemed to pass without any decisive action. That is why our report in June 1965 tried to cut through the hesitancy and confusion with a forthright recommendation, which I know was consistent with positions taken by both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. Soon afterward, on August 25, 1965, the President announced that he authorized the Department of Defense to proceed with the MOL project.

In another report, submitted March 21, 1966, the Committee on Government Operations carried forward its analysis of DOD/NASA relationships in this field and pointed out that mutual program objectives could be achieved, with large money savings, if the MOL program were designed to accommodate NASA experiments, obviating the need for a separate and costly NASA effort for a manned space station. See "Missile and Space Ground Support Operations," House Report No. 1340, 89th Congress, 2d session, March 21, 1966.

I am not one who favors a variety of multibillion-dollar space projects when so many needs go unattended here on earth. If we really want to save millions of dollars, then we should have one space laboratory station program, and not two. This program should be the MOL because it is important and urgent from a military standpoint, to determine manned capabilities in space. I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and his committee share this conviction about the importance and urgency of the MOL. Therefore, I am somewhat puzzled to note that no mention is made of the MOL project in the report of the Appropriations Committee in connection with H.R. 15941, the bill before us.

The funding situation for MOL, as I understand it, is this: The Air Force, which is responsible for carrying out the project, asked for considerably more money for fiscal year 1967 than Secretary McNamara approved. The approved budget item for MOL for fiscal year 1967 was $150 million. It was the Air Force position that the "bare bones" funding requirement for the MOL for fiscal year 1967 was $230 million. When the Armed Services Committees were considering the authorization bill, the House authorized the additional $80 million sought by the Air Force, and in conference with the other body, the additional amount authorized for MOL came out at $50 million, in addition to the $150 million in the budget.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] why there is no funding in accord with this added authorization. I am concerned that this program, which has been dragging on for too long, will be further stretched out. When Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, was before our committee in late January 1966, he said that the Department intended to carry out the MOL program as aggressively and efficiently as possible. See "Missile and Space Ground Support Operations," hearings before the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2d session, January 1966, page 73. The question is whether the present funding, without the additional amount requested by the Air Force, will permit the program to be carried out aggressively and efficiently and within the 1969–70 time scale set for the program.

I understand Secretary McNamara's reluctance to approve more funds than can be wisely and properly spent. This is a complicated project, involving a group of major contractors. By now, the contract definition studies have been carried out. The project is well defined. I believe we can rely on the Air Force estimate of its requirements for funds which will make possible a timely launching of the MOL. Dr. Harold Brown, whom I have known for a long time, is the Secretary of the Air Force and he stands behind the request. I recall that when he was Director of Defense Research and Engineering, he was one of those in Secretary McNamara's orbit who did much soul searching and took quite some time to make up their minds about the need for a MOL. Dr. Brown's mind is made up. Now he can see things from the standpoint of a department head in charge of great projects and with many operating responsibilities. He is in the fortunate position of having viewed the problem from both sides of the table—where the Secretary of Defense sits and approves or disapproves, and where the Air Force sits and has responsibility for execution of the program.

Therefore, I ask the gentleman why the report makes no mention of the MOL, and why no consideration is given to the action of the authorizing committee.

Mr. MAHON. I would be happy to discuss the matter of the Manned Orbiting Laboratory. As the gentleman knows, there is about $1,600 million for military space programs of one kind or another in this defense bill. Of course, this is in addition to $5 billion-plus in the NASA program. There has been some considerable uncertainty as to just what the Air Force program for the MOL may eventually be. The Air Force asked for more money than was included in the budget. Officials have studied and reviewed this matter and they now indicate that they might like to have $80 million in addition to the $150 million budgeted. But this is not yet fully agreed upon and does not have the approval of the Secretary of Defense or the Budget Bureau.

The program has nothing directly to do with the war in Vietnam.

Everybody has said that we are going to have a supplemental bill next year. This is undoubtedly true. It will be inevitable if the war continues. So it is the position of the committee and my own personal position to let them solidify their program a little better and come back to us.

Secretary McNamara has assured us of his support of the program. He has said, and it is his position, that to provide additional money at this time would be to overfund the program. So I think it would be more orderly for us to proceed with the budget estimate at this time and then later on lend a friendly ear to an additional requests.

The Air Force is making some headway in better definition of its requirements.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I appreciate the explanation and my question was not directed in a critical way. I know that the gentleman feels about this particular item I think very nearly the way I feel. I am not going to associate him with what I am going to say, but I am not one of the Members of the House who is too enthusiastic about spending some $5 billion or $6 billion in our space effort. As the gentleman knows, I have mentioned this to him before. But I do say that if there is any real gain for the United States in man in space, it is going to be along the line of the military and I am not sure that there is that possibility.

But I was concerned, and my Subcommittee on Military Operations was concerned, and we have had hearings on this subject and over the years we have produced three different reports. I am convinced that if we are going to have a program, we should have one program on this subject and not a program by NASA and a program by the military, because I believe any kind of information that can be obtained on the Manned Orbital Laboratory can be obtained in the military experiment which has already been authorized. Therefore, I have only asked the question from the standpoint of obtaining the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; $1,751,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign shipyards for the construction of major components of the hull or superstructure of such vessel.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 17, line 9, strike out "$1,751,300,000" and insert "$1,756,700,000".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think the prevailing view in the House of Representatives is that in the construction of the major fighting ships we ought to resort to nuclear power. That is certainly my view, and undoubtedly it is the view of the Appropriations Committee; I know it is the view of the Committee on Armed Services, headed by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

When we originally and tentatively agreed on the provisions of this bill in the Committee on Appropriations, the terms of the authorizing legislation were still in doubt. The other body had provided for one nuclear frigate. The House had provided two, plus two conventionally powered destroyers. The final outcome of the matter was that authorization was provided for one nuclear frigate and for $20 million for long leadtime items for a second.

Subsequently members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations concluded that it would be wise to provide these additional funds for a second nuclear frigate—not that we want the second nuclear frigate to be an exact pattern of the first, because we want the second to be an improvement over the first—but this money would go for the nuclear propulsion of an additional ship.

This is, of course, above the budget. It is true that the Navy has had all manner of trouble with its weaponry and missiles for these ships. But the ship itself is an essential part of a Navy force. We have agreed to recommend it to the House, and I have offered the amendment to provide, that an amount of $20 million be available for the purpose.

Now, $20 million for the long leadtime items would be above the bill which is pending. The amendment proposes an amount above the present figure of only $5,400,000 because there is $14,600,000 available in the appropriation already which can be used for this purpose. The intent of the amendment is that the total sum of $20 million will be made available for the long leadtime items for the second nuclear frigate.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the minority members of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriation firmly support this amendment to add $5.4 million to the "Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy," section of this bill.

This $5.4 million, plus the $14.6 million, which the committee by its previous action had retained in the bill for high priority activities, will make available $20 million for the procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear guided missile frigate, DLGN, which has been authorized.

The Department of Defense and the Navy should proceed with the procurement of the long leadtime items for this ship during fiscal year 1967 and to include funds for its construction in the fiscal year 1968 shipbuilding program request.

The Secretary of Defense has testified to Congress that he has determined that the Navy needs two more guided missile ships. He has said that whether or not the total number of missile ships should be increased beyond these two in future years will require further study. The net effect of the Defense appropriation bill with the proposed amendment is to substitute one DLGN fully funded and a second DLGN partially funded in lieu of two conventional DDG's. This will provide the two new guided missile ships required in the force level approved by the Secretary of Defense and the President.

The funds in this bill, as reported, and including this amendment will make available $150.5 million to fully fund one DLGN—$130.5 million in this bill plus the unused $20 million in the fiscal year 1966 Appropriation Act—and $20 million will be available for long leadtime items for the second nuclear powered frigate.

Each of the nuclear frigates substituted for a conventional destroyer will have the same general types of antiair and antisubmarine weapons systems as would the new conventional destroyer proposed by the Department of Defense, but the nuclear frigate will be larger and will have considerably more military capability. Specifically, the new frigate—in addition to being nuclear powered—compared to the destroyer—will have twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines, will have a helicopter landing area and facilities and accommodations for a screen commander which the destroyer would not have, will have more complete naval tactical data system facilities, and will have twice the number or torpedo tubes.

Public Law 89-213 appropriated $20 million in the fiscal year 1966 Defense Appropriations Act for advanced procurement of long leadtime items for one nuclear frigate. The House Appropriations Committee report on this bill included the following comments:

> The committee believes in the future of nuclear propulsion for surface vessels of the Navy. The proposed DLGN will enhance the Navy's surface capabilities.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The committee will expect the Department of Defense and the Navy to proceed with the preparation of contract plans and specifications and the procurement of the long leadtime items for this ship during fiscal year 1966 and to include funds for its construction in the fiscal year 1967 shipbuilding and conversion program.

The Senate Appropriations Committee also included the $20 million for long leadtime procurement for the DLGN in the fiscal year 1966 program and their report included the following statement:

> The committee urges the Department of Defense to include funds in the budget for fiscal year 1967 for the construction of the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate (DLGN). It is the view of the committee that we must proceed with the construction of more nuclear-powered surface ships for the Navy.

However, the Department of Defense and the Navy did not proceed with the procurement of the long leadtime items for this ship during fiscal year 1966. This same thing should not occur relative to the appropriation for long leadtime items for an additional nuclear-powered frigate contained in the proposed amendment.

The language contained in Public Law 89-501 which was signed by the President on July 13, 1966, states:

> The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized under Public Law 89-37, and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1967, shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest.

The Department of Defense and the Navy should apply this same policy to these long leadtime items appropriated for in this amendment.

The proposed amendment will help to achieve the earliest practicable delivery of the second new DLGN to the fleet. Further it will allow the procurement of the nuclear propulsion plant components for both DLGN's to proceed simultaneously which will lead to minimum cost.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's position in this matter is well known. We are in agreement. It is true that we were agreed, I believe, on striking out the funds for the two conventional-powered destroyers.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to me to provide funds for the frigates is a wise step to take. I do not know of any controversy about it in the House. The Armed Services Committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has been very active and instrumental in this respect. I believe their position is sound, and I ask that the amendment be approved. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I will take only 1 minute, and I take this time to ask the chairman a question, if he will respond, please.

I notice in the report, it is stated that an amount is added to "retain all 25 Air National Guard heavy airlift units" in operation.

It is my understanding that the Secretary of Defense planned to phase out three Air National Guard units. It was the purpose, as I understand it, of the committee in including these additional funds to provide sufficient funds to retain all 25. This would eliminate the phasing out of the three, if the wishes of the committee and the Congress are followed. Am I correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct. The Members of Congress would be foolish indeed to agree in total with all of the recommendations made by the executive branch. We have our individual responsibilities. We do not always agree with officials of the executive branch. We should not. We felt that it was a mistake to eliminate these three squadrons, as proposed by the Secretary. There are three of them—one in California, one in New York, and one in Pennsylvania. So we provide for full funding for the continuation of this heavy airlift.

We do not know what will happen in the war in Vietnam. We ought to keep these heavy airlift planes and keep them operational in these units. This is the objective of the committee. I believe we are on sound ground.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I fully concur in the views expressed by the chairman of the committee. That is my position exactly. Frankly, I do not know what we would have done if it had not been for the Air National Guard airlift capabilities that we have.

I have received hundreds of cards from Air National Guard officers from all over the world, who have sent me these cards upon completion of a flight to assist in the southeast Asia operation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, these units are highly efficient. The gentlemen who operate these aircraft are doing a good job. I believe Congress has a right to be proud of what it has done through its committees and the whole body of Congress, to improve the airlift capability of the Nation.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I took this time knowing what the answer would be. I hope this colloquy and the record we are making will be read by the Secretary of Defense and that he will act in accordance with the wishes of the Congress, if this is approved.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I fully concur.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 392, nays 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—392

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers. Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Wagonner
Waldie
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Brown, Calif.

NOT VOTING—38

Baring
Beckworth
Burton, Calif.
Cabell
Celler
Chelf
Conyers
Cooley
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Everett
Farnsley
Gathings
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Henderson
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Martin, Ala.
Miller
Mills
Morrison
Murray
Nedzi
Powell
Roncalio
Saylor
Scott
Senner
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
White, Idaho
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Miller with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Baring.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Farnsley with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Mills.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include pertinent excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks, and to include pertinent excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Speaker, we have two conference reports for consideration tomorrow:

S. 602, the Small Reclamation Projects Act.

H.R. 14324, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization, 1967.

In addition, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], has announced that he will undertake to call up, under unanimous-consent agreement, H.R. 14604, having to do with the establishment of a visitors' center.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1966, UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 25, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I hope I will not have to object——

Mr. ALBERT. I share the gentleman's hope.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could give us the slightest indication as to how much longer this session of Congress is going to last?

I ask this question in view of the statement made by President Johnson August 25, 1965, in which he said:

> But we look forward to the Congress being able to get out of here early next year, I would say certainly far ahead of the end of the fiscal year in June, so that the Members could be at home and could report to the people.

I wonder if we are going to have the opportunity to report to our people, as the President suggested. Obviously, the end of the fiscal year has passed.

Mr. ALBERT. I hope we have that opportunity, but, like the gentleman, I believe in the separation of powers. I think the question of when we should adjourn rests primarily with the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from Oklahoma believes in the separation of powers, I have one other little item to read to him. It will take only a few seconds. The President, in his speech out in Des Moines, Iowa, only recently—I believe on June 30——

Mr. ALBERT. Is the gentleman concerned about anything the President might have said in Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. He said, and I quote:

> While I don't speculate, I anticipate we are going to pass some more of the 90 (bills) before I let them (Members of Congress) come back to campaign for re-election.

Now, I too believe in the separation of powers, but here the President is saying that he is going to dictate to the Congress as to when we come back to campaign for reelection. You can take your choice of either of these statements, I say to the distinguished majority leader, but I would like you to tell me which one we are to believe.

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the gentleman that I think Congress will decide when it will go home.

Mr. GROSS. You think the Congress will?

Mr. ALBERT. I think so. I think when we finish our business, there will be no problem with the President in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker, but I think we do have a problem.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the minority leader yield further to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of the week of July 25 be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. ALBERT, on behalf of Mr. MILLER, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was just called I did not hear my name called although I was in the Chamber. Had I heard my name called, I would have voted "yea." I would like to have the RECORD show that.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION ENCOURAGES MEMBERS TO VIOLATE SERVICEMEN'S RIGHTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, the Department of Defense put into effect a directive which, for the first time, sets up guidelines for companies doing business with servicemen. The directive is aimed primarily at companies making loans or extending credit to servicemen and later seeking military assistance in collecting the debt.

A highly important section of the directive sets forth standards of fairness in credit transactions and also calls for a full disclosure of all terms of the contract, including the listing of the annual rate of interest. Proper use of the directive will enable servicemen to make an intelligent decision when dealing in the area of consumer credit.

Unfortunately, the American Bankers Association has refused to endorse the directive and ABA President Archie Davis has advised the Department of Defense that the "directive may well result in a diminution of loan credit which otherwise would be available to military personnel."

BANKS ANTIMILITARY LENDING

Mr. Davis' statement is not surprising since many banks have long been opposed to lending money to servicemen. Recently, an Army officer wrote me saying that when he applied for a loan from a large New York bank, one of the loan officers informed him, "We do not lend money to servicemen."

It is indeed unfortunate that the American Bankers Association and its president have taken such an antagonistic position toward servicemen, especially faced with the situation in southeast Asia.

I sincerely wish that the ABA's attitude of "our members will not lend money to servicemen if we have to make full disclosure," were the only area in which banks have sought to take advantage of servicemen. But in recent months other incidents have occurred that point out the banks' lack of concern for servicemen.

One of the fastest growing problems for military legal assistance officers concerns banks and other credit extenders who do not comply with the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. The act, in part, provides that companies extending credit to a civilian, who later enters the Armed Forces while the contract is still in effect, cannot take legal action, including repossession, without a court order. The lender must also inform the court that the debtor is in the military services. In no case can any action be taken unless the debtor is present in court or represented by a court-appointed attorney. Violations of this provision carry a maximum penalty of a $1,000 fine and up to a year in jail.

A bank in the Pacific Northwest is currently involved in a serviceman's repossession case being investigated by the U.S. district attorney's office. The serviceman involved was a farmer prior to his induction. He purchased two pieces of farm machinery and financed the purchases with a local bank. After he was called into the service, he notified the bank that he would not be able to make the full monthly payments because of his pay grade in the military. He asked the bank for a reduction in payments during the service term. Such an arrangement is contained in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. The bank refused, contending that the act did not apply. One piece of machinery was then repossessed by the seller without a court order. Military authorities immediately notified the seller that the repossession was in violation of the law. However, the seller also repossessed the second piece of machinery, again without a court order.

The American Bankers Association is openly helping banks violate the spirit of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, so it does not come as a surprise that some banks may now be violating the legal provisions of the act.

subcommittee that would consider the subject to which the gentleman refers. You have discussed the matter with me.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. On repeated occasions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I told you you could have a hearing, did I not?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am hopeful.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did I not tell you that you could?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Yes, you told me you would have hearings 3 or 4 weeks ago.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. At the same time you know that there are 48 or 50 States that have laws dealing with this problem, including your own State?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Yes, and I realize that this is the American flag we are discussing, which is a proper subject for consideration by this Congress.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Recognizing that all these States do have laws on the subject, do you recognize that if we do have the hearings in connection with this problem we must face the question of whether the Federal Government would preempt the entire field?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I do not think the Federal Government would preempt the entire field of our States when it comes to the preservation and the protection of our beloved U.S. flag.

Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further.

ANHEUSER-BUSCH CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the case of the President's Club and Anheuser-Busch, the plot thickens.

A spokesman for Anheuser-Busch has stated that "members of the Busch family have been consistent contributors to the Democratic Party since repeal of prohibition." The records of the Clerk of the House, however, reveal that none of the individuals associated with Anheuser-Busch, who suddenly dropped $10,000 into the President's Club in May this year, were reported to have made any significant contributions to any national political committee or candidate in the presidential campaign years of 1960 or 1964 or to the President's Club prior to 1966. At a critical stage in negotiations over their antitrust case, $10,000 was paid out in 1966.

At the conclusion of my remarks today, I will include the sequence of events within the Justice Department which are now a matter of public record, on the authority of Justice Department officials in responding to queries from the press.

If the public is to believe that the President's Club does not seduce contributions with inferences of influence peddling, its officials had better come up with some honest answers that do not overtax the credulity of the American public. I cite the following situations that demand direct explanation:

First. Mr. Alfred Fleishman, public relations man for Anheuser-Busch, states that he got the idea of joining the President's Club when he "dropped in to say hello" to Clifton Carter in April. It was in April that Anheuser-Busch attorneys proposed dismissal of their antitrust suit. What advantages were suggested by Mr. Carter or others to Mr. Fleishman that would result from President's Club membership? To whom was the invitation to join the club extended? By whom? When? Where? To whom were the membership fees for the eight persons associated with Anheuser-Busch paid? By whom? In what form? When and where?

Second. How could the President's Club have spent $560,000 more than it received in 1965? If they borrowed money, it was not reported, as required by law. The club's surplus from 1964 was reported as less than $3,000. Official filings show an expenditure of $939,238.75 in 1965 against receipts of $378,244. Dr. Herbert Alexander, executive director of President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs, reports in his book, "Financing the 1964 Election":

> Since the President's Club did not file before 1964, and reported receiving and spending $2.7 million in 1964, it could not have legally retained $560,000 from 1964 and stayed within the $3 million committee limitation. Thus, the source of its expenditures in excess of its receipts remains unknown, since filings do not itemize the origins of the funds. The lack of credibility in some Democratic filings is without precedent in recent years.

Third. The reliable, respected, and distinguished columnists, Evans and Novak, reported on June 9 that the President's Club is moving for $10,000 contributors as a new "L.B.J. elite." The law specifically restricts to $5,000 any contributions by an individual to any national political committee. Congressmen striving to write an effective election reform law this year would be interested in the technique by which the President's Club plans to evade present law. What do they offer $10,000 contributors in their relationship to Government officials not offered for $1,000?

Fourth. How does the President's Club explain the fact that supposedly "consistent contributors to the Democratic Party," who appear to have made no significant contributions to national commitees or presidental candidates in 1960 or 1964, contributed $10,000 at a critical moment in the making of policy decisions on the antitrust case?

Mr. Speaker, the President's Club raises serious public issues that cannot be lightly brushed aside if the people are to have confidence in the rectitude of public officials.

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS IN THE ANHEUSER-BUSCH ANTITTRUST CASE

January 1962: Justice Department files antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch Corporation's acquisition of a portion of the Rahr Malting Company, on the grounds that "Rahr will be substantially curtailed as a vital source of supply for independent breweries in competition with Anheuser-Busch; Anheuser will be eliminated as a customer for other malting companies; and Anheuser's advantage over smaller competing breweries may lessen competition."

April 1966: Lawyers for Anheuser-Busch suggest to the antitrust division that the suit be dismissed. The suit was scheduled for trial in September.

Alfred Fleishman, head of a public relations firm with the Anheuser-Busch account, comes to Washington and calls on Cliff Carter, executive director of the Democratic National Committee and one of President Johnson's closest political operators. Fleishman says he merely dropped in on Carter whom he had known for many years. Carter suggests that Fleishman and the Busch family members join the President's political club at $1,000 each.

May 9, 1966: The Justice Department trial staff, headed by John F. Hughes, recommends against dismissal of the Anheuser-Busch suit and states that the action against the brewing firm should be continued.

May 19, 1966: Alfred Fleishman reportedly arrives in Washington.

May 20, 1966: The evaluation section of the antitrust division recommends that the Anheuser-Busch case be dismissed.

May 24, 1966: At the suggestion of Fleishman, contributions totaling $10,000 are made to the President's Club from members of the Busch family, representatives of the Busch firm and Fleishman.

Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., president of the firm, and Mrs. Busch, give $2,000 each. Contributions of $1,000 each come from August Busch, III, vice president; Mrs. August Busch, III; Richard Meyer, executive vice president, and Mrs. Meyer; and Fleishman and Mrs. Fleishman.

May 26, 1966: The antitrust division policy planning staff headed by Robert Hammond concurs in the recommendations for dismissal and forwards it to Turner.

June 5, 1966: Stephen Breyer, special assistant to Turner, concurs in the decision for dismissal of the suit.

June 8, 1966: Turner recommends dismissal of the suit to Attorney General Katzenbach.

June 11, 1966: Katzenbach agrees to dismiss the suit, and on June 17, the Justice Department announces it in a 4-paragraph press release stating only that "it was concluded that further prosecution of the case was not warranted."

July 12, 1966: Assistant Attorney General Turner goes to the All-Star baseball game in St. Louis as a guest of Anheuser-Busch on an invitation extended by Vice-President HUMPHREY.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago during a routine inquiry involving the National Cemetery at Pinelawn, N.Y., it came to my attention that a policy was recommended to the executive department that the national cemetery system be phased out, and that no further additions to or enlargements of existing cemeteries be made.

I thereupon introduced legislation opposing this policy and espousing a continuance and enlargement of the system. Since that time a number of the members have introduced legislation affecting this program. Several committees

Some months ago, the ABA circulated among its members a suggested form for obtaining waivers from cosigners of loans to civilians who might be subject to military call. Under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Act, cosigners are granted the same protection as the borrower. Bank form is called "Waiver of Benefits Under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act." There is a provision in the act which provides for the possibility of such a waiver, but it was never contemplated that the waiver would be required by a bank before it would lend money.

SOME BANKS MISUSE WAIVERS

And some banks are apparently misusing the form to obtain waivers from servicemen of their rights under the act. A New York State bank this spring wrote the Department of Defense asking if borrowers who signed the waiver would be protected by the new standards-of-fairness directive. The Department informed the bank that not only would the borrower still be protected by the directive, but that such a waiver was illegal as far as the borrower was concerned.

I want to remind the ABA and its president, Archie Davis, that there are criminal provisions in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. It is bad enough to deal unethically with servicemen, but quite another matter to work in an illegal manner. And I want to also call the attention of civilian-servicemen to their rights under the act. Consult your legal affairs officer as soon as you feel you are being treated unfairly. In addition, contact the U.S. district attorney's office since this is the agency charged with enforcing the act.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee has been investigating the operations of loan and finance companies that specialize in loans to servicemen. The methods of some of these companies are vicious and can easily ruin a serviceman's career. Yet, we have found that the operational funds for most of these loan sharks are being supplied by banks. In fact, the biggest portion of loan company funds is obtained from banks, hundreds of millions of dollars. These banks do not ask the companies how they operate or if they are taking advantage of the servicemen. Evidently the banks do not care. They seem to only worry about a fat interest rate on their loans to these companies, plus a healthy compensating balance, which increases the interest rate even more.

ABA PRESIDENT DENIES KNOWLEDGE

One of these sharp-practice loan companies—Federal Services Finance Corp.—borrowed some $95 million from 89 banks over a 5-year period. Included in the loan amounts were sizable loans from Puget Sound National Bank, whose chairman of the board is Reno Odlin, the past ABA president. When Mr. Odlin testified before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee last year, he claimed he had never heard of Federal Services and knew nothing of the loans to the company. It seems strange that the chairman of the board of a bank would not know of a half-million-dollar loan and another half-million-dollar line of credit.

I informed Mr. Odlin that, among other things, Federal Services was using bank money for relending to servicemen at rates that sometimes reached as high as 60 and 70 percent.

But perhaps the best example of how banks treat servicemen can be summed up by a report from a repossessor to a large New York City bank concerning a car financed by a serviceman. The bank had purchased the automobile loan contract from a finance company. Bear in mind that the bank had not contacted the serviceman when it tried to repossess his car, nor did the bank make a bona fide effort to locate the serviceman. In part, the report reads:

> We drove to ——— yesterday, and after asking questions of one of the neighbors, we found that Mr. ——— is in Vietnam as you stated you thought he was. However, his wife is a native of Germany, and it seems that she returned to Germany during the month of September. It seems ———'s mother is now married to a man by the name of ———. The mother and stepfather have been driving your car.
>
> As a matter of fact, they were not at home when we got to ———. We had to wait until quite late in the evening before the car was available. According to our informants, ——— does not work at all, and it seems that he and his wife are living on a $105 per month pension, and they have no means of transportation other than your automobile. After learning the facts, it was the opinion of the writer that we should steal the car, which is exactly what we did.

I do not for a minute question the right of the bank to repossess an automobile. But the bank should at least make an attempt to inform the borrower, particularly if he is a serviceman, of intended action. And I seriously question if it is proper for a bank to hire companies to "steal" automobiles. Perhaps the fact that the serviceman was fighting in Vietnam did not matter to the bank.

I am shocked to think that the Department of Defense would publish regulations designed to protect servicemen from loan sharks and other sharp-practice operators and yet could not gain an endorsement of this directive from the American Bankers Association. While, perhaps, nothing can be done to gain the endorsement of the ABA for the directive, I want to make it clear that I do plan to seek changes in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act to make certain that servicemen are fully protected. In the near future, I plan to introduce legislation which would close the loopholes which those uninterested in servicemen's welfare have used for personal gain.

PROHIBITING THE PUBLIC DESECRATION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a discharge petition before the House today which would provide legislation prohibiting the public desecration of the American flag.

This bill, H.R. 13942, was originally introduced on March 23, 1966, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Since that time I have diligently sought hearings on this legislation, but have been unsuccessful. It is my belief that at this late date attempts for hearings will be unsuccessful and without the discharge petition procedure, this bill will not be acted upon during the second session of the 89th Congress.

The importance of this legislation is reflected in the fact that several other Members have also introduced similar bills this session.

The bill also has the support of veterans' organizations in the United States, and other patriotic groups.

My particular bill was introduced as the direct result of an incident at Purdue University last spring.

At that time, a campus organization known as the Students for a Democratic Society, invited a man from Chicago as their speaker.

During the course of his speech he produced an American flag, ripped it, spat upon it and then trampled the flag on the stage before his audience.

This event was witnessed by scores of students and there is no dispute on the facts of the exhibition.

However, Indiana State law is lax in this area and such an act is a misdemeanor, punishable by a small fine. Because only a misdemeanor was involved, the offender from Chicago could not be brought back to Indiana to be prosecuted for his actions.

The entire affair caused a reevaluation of our laws governing the flag and it now appears likely that Indiana will seek more stringent State laws during its next general assembly.

However, there appears to be a general lack of unformity among the States in this area of criminal law, and Federal legislation would provide national protection for a flag which is national in scope.

Since the incident at Purdue there have been other cases involving the desecration of the flag. I believe at a time when anarchy and disrespect for law and order are becoming the vogue in some quarters, Congress could clarify the regard it has for the American flag by protecting it from those who would choose the flag as their target to flout authority or draw attention to themselves or their "cause."

We are also aware that hundreds of thousands of young Americans are serving their Nation under this same flag, and if they can fight and die for this symbol abroad, we can surely preserve its respect and dignity at home.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly solicit and urge all Members to sign this petition and help give our flag the prestige and respect it deserves.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As the gentleman knows, I am chairman of the this is the whirlwind we are about to reap.

No one listened when, tirelessly, over and yet over again, we have tried to show that this day of open rebellion and insurrection was inevitable. I, for one, take no satisfaction in saying, "I told you so." I would rather the record show that my prayer was, instead, "God help us."

> The American atmosphere this summer is heavy with warnings of an oncoming national crisis. It could easily prove the worst internal crisis this country has experienced since the Civil War; so it is about time to face the hard facts.
>
> The first hard fact to note is the radical change that has come over this country's agonizing racial problem. The stage is long past when the great majority of Northern white people strongly backed nonviolent Negro leaders, who were merely begging the Southern white supremacists for the right to vote, for the right to eat in restaurants, and so on and on.
>
> The epicenter of the racial problem has in fact moved from the South to the North, quite largely because of the emigration of over 12 million Southern Negroes to the great Northern cities. Furthermore, the Negro leaders dedicated to nonviolence are on the defensive and para-military organizations openly dedicated to violence, are even beginning to appear in the grim urban ghettoes of the North.
>
> In Chicago, members of three armed gangs known as the Black Cobras, the Vice Lords and the Roman Saints apparently played a key part in the frightening recent outburst of violence in the West Side ghetto. After days of Molotov cocktail-throwing and sniping at the police from the rooftops, the leaders of these groups were called in by the Rev. Martin Luther King. They were persuaded, according to one newspaper, "to try nonviolent methods to achieve their aims." And this was publicly hailed as the beginning of the end of the trouble.
>
> Developments like this might be dismissed as a rather special and ugly kind of police problem, if they did not produce such an acute political problem. The nature of the political problem is most easily demonstrated in California, where the whole present pattern of state politics is dominated by last year's rioting in Watts.
>
> It is a dreadful pattern, precisely because that Northern white majority that once backed the nonviolent civil rights leaders has turned into a majority of foolishly frightened, increasingly prejudiced people. Both sides are arming and, among both whites and Negroes, the terrible "us-against-them" emotions are plainly on the rise.
>
> In the aftermath of Watts, the thinly masked Goldwaterite, Ronald Reagan, won a knock-down victory in the Republican primary, and the almost openly anti-Negro Mayor Samuel Yorty of Los Angeles left Gov. Pat Brown looking pretty sad in the Democratic primary. Because of Watts, Reagan is an odds-on favorite to beat Brown in the election.
>
> For that very reason, the normally liberal Governor Brown has signed a new antiriot bill not very far from the Alien and Sedition Act that our forefathers rejected with disgust. And the police arrangements to contain any new outbreak in Watts are of such a character that there is talk—one hopes not serious talk—of the purchase of armored personnel carriers for police use.
>
> Similar political reactions can now be expected in Illinois, in full force. Throughout all the Northern states the trend is pretty clear, though it is not very far advanced in most states as yet. Thus the nature of the crisis that threatens this country is only too clear already. We are threatened with a crisis of race-hatred.
>
> Concerning this crisis, two things needs to be said with utmost clarity. On the one hand, the more extreme civil rights leaders must somehow be persuaded that they are not at the head of an anti-Colonial movement. The injustices the Negro people have suffered perhaps excuse what may be called anti-Colonial postures and emotions.
>
> But among political leaders, nothing on Earth excuses impracticality. The Negro people in this country are a small minority—hardly more than 10 percent. It is impractical and self-defeating, therefore, to mouth slogans and make gestures that are bound to alienate and frighten the overwhelming white majority. Just before he died, the anti-Negro police chief of Los Angeles, William Parker, told a reporter bleakly:
>
> "The majority rules in this country, and I've got a majority behind me."
>
> Chief Parker was right, alas. But in quite large measure, Chief Parker was right because the leaders of the white community have also failed in their task, perhaps even more miserably than the most drama-prone Negro leaders. The white community has the means to alleviate the ghetto situations. The white community has the resources and the apparatus to get to work on the basic problems.
>
> Yet hardly any white leader, national or local, has been ringing the alarm bell in recent months except for Senator Robert Kennedy (D-N.Y.). The liberals have continued to indulge in the usual public masochism. But the liberal politicians have in the main been silent, and the conservative politicians have been far worse than silent. So we have drifted onwards, towards trouble that hardly bears thinking about.

HUSH-HUSH ON PRICES JUST NOT SO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], inserted in the Record an article which appeared in the June 4 issue of the Washington Daily News entitled "Hush-Hush on Prices." This article purported to discuss an alleged new policy of the present administration relating to the release of economic data. This supposed new policy is that all members of the Government have been told not to discuss prices. I have checked into this matter and it is clear to me that the allegations contained in the article are without foundation.

The one piece of alleged evidence on a new "hush-hush" policy on prices contained in the article is as follows:

> Under new policy, consumer price index is released on short notice, usually late on Friday. (Saturday papers have limited circulation.) And economists no longer interpret statistical trends for reporters.

This is not true. Here are the facts on the release of data. The new Commissioner of Labor Statistics, when he assumed his duties last fall, found that it had been the policy to announce a fixed schedule for the release of the consumer price index months in advance. This schedule provided for the usual lag between scheduled completion of field work and the completion of tabulations. It also provided an allowance for possible delays at either stage. The result of this policy was that data were frequently available for release several days prior to the preannounced schedule.

The Commissioner takes the position—one which I know is supported by this House—that important data should be given to the public as soon as they are available. Consequently, he has abandoned the fixed schedule and now releases the figures as soon as the work has been completed. On one occasion this new policy has resulted in a release on Friday afternoon. This was in accordance with the new policy to make the information available as quickly as possible.

It is interesting to note that Labor Commissioner Ross is also revising procedures for the collection and processing of the data so that it may be ready even sooner.

The further allegation that "economists no longer interpret statistical trends to reporters" is ridiculous. The Commissioner of Labor Statistics, as a matter of policy, has made substantially fuller comment and interpretation of the data than his predecessor has ever done. This continues to be his practice. There is no evidence there will be any change.

HORTON PRAISES LIONS FOR THEIR LEADERSHIP IN EYE RESEARCH; URGES CREATION OF NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 of this year I introduced a measure which would set up a separate National Eye Institute for the purpose of conducting intensive research into the critical problem of blindness. I do not exaggerate when I refer to this matter as critical. More than four hundred thousand people in this country are legally blind, according to the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. Ten times this many—three and one-half million persons—suffer from some chronic, permanent noncorrectable visual defect. Still another 45 million suffer from myopia or nearsightedness. And this large group of Americans live in a nation that possesses the resources and the scientific sophistication to provide the best protection against diseases anywhere in the world. It is painfully clear to me, as it is to many of my colleagues, that when fully 80 percent of the cases of serious visual impairment are attributable to eye diseases, not to accidents as is often thought, then there must exist a real deficiency in the present program to prevent blindness.

in the House are concerned, but no progress has been made in the direction of reversing this policy.

It seems to me sadly inconsistent that we can commit a quarter of a million servicemen to the deadly dangers of jungle warfare 10,000 miles from home and deny them the privilege of burial in a part of America especially set aside in their honor.

It is a cruel decision which deprives veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict of this final tribute which their patriotism and devotion to America have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I feel there is no time for delay. An immediate expression of confidence in our servicemen and veterans is in order.

Accordingly, I have today asked the President to assert his leadership in this matter and to reverse this unfortunate policy.

My letter to the President reads as follows:

JULY 20, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the administration prior to yours a special study commission recommended that the Federal Government phase out its National Cemetery operations for reasons of expenses and inequitable distribution and access.

The great majority of Congressmen disagree, I am sure, with the policy and the reasons upon which it is based, and feel that the traditional honor and privilege of interment in especially dedicated land should not be taken from our United States serviceman, nor the comfort from his bereaved family.

Responsible legislative committees have been studying this matter for several years but I hope that you, Mr. President, as our Commander-in-Chief, and as a veteran, will reverse this policy at once in tribute to the valor of our servicemen today and the contributions of our veterans of all wars.

With all good wishes.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES R. GROVER, JR.,
Representative in Congress.

THE SOCIETY OF INVENTORS AND SCIENTISTS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I am inviting your attention and the Members of the House to a new organization in southern California—the Society of Inventors and Scientists. This organization, which is shooting for national interest and membership, dramatizes the problems of the lone inventor who contributed so much to the early scientific growth of our Nation and who finds, in this modern corporation and educational world, difficulty in getting his idea to the attention of the Government, manufacturers, and sources of development.

These inventors, as their predecessors, have most important ideas and inventions for our future. They need the aids which institutions of higher learning are able to give to their associates. Many times, the inventor, no matter how important his invention may be, believes he is denied a hearing or the opportunity to explain his idea, let alone develop it.

All of us will agree that in entering the new cybernetic world of tomorrow we need all of these ideas. For this reason the Society of Inventors and Scientists came into being to provide assistance to the inventor and aid him to become a professional. The inventive mind is not a breed apart. In fact, the new organization finds men from many different professional and laboring crafts among its membership.

The Government has a stake in the handling of these inventors and the new society can be of great help. The skill, unusual gifts, and genius of the individual noncorporation inventor is of great importance to our Nation's well-being. He is a "resource" which cannot be wasted and is vital to our technical state.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY paid recognition to the individual inventor in remarks published in the June 1966 issue of the Popular Science magazine. The Vice President's remarks dealt primarily with the Inventors' Fair program, but he also discussed the general need to encourage the individual inventor and commented that "brainpower is one of our greatest treasures." Part of his remarks are as follows:

> Our population is expanding. Industries are changing. Automation is wiping out some jobs—largely in the unskilled category. America needs new ideas, new products to expand employment, create new wealth, raise standards of living.
>
> Is there somewhere in the mind of an unknown American a new invention as beneficial and revolutionary as the automobile, airplane, refrigerator, air conditioner? If not, how about inventions which would substantially improve these and other—now commonplace—necessities? And what about the possibility of new products or processes like the mercury battery, xerography or the shrinkproofing of knit goods?
>
> These last three inventions might not occur offhand to many people. But one of the most striking facts about these particular inventions is that they all came from independent inventors.
>
> These inventors—the so-called "lone wolves"—are a tremendous national asset.
>
> Independent inventors accounted for 40 to 61 important inventions made since 1900. This was the conclusion of a study cited in a classic analysis, "The Source of Invention." Without the support of organized laboratories, these independent inventors changed scientific and technical history.
>
> Times have changed. Development of an invention often requires massive team effort and sizable sustained investment. But the basic idea of an invention—the original concept—and at least its early stages of realization, can still be the province of brilliant lone inventors.

The organization of the Society of Inventors and Scientists merely states a recognition that times have changed and that the development of an invention often requires massive team effort and a sizable sustained investment. The organization recognizes that the basic idea of an invention, its original concept and early stages of development are still the province of the brilliant, lone inventors. But the information, collaboration, and experience of an associated group of these lone inventors can be helpful in getting ideas ready for marketing.

Committees of the House and Senate have been holding hearings on automobile and highway safety. The hearings indicate need for changes in technology and improvement in the design of highways, lighting, and vehicles. Somewhere now there is an inventor or team of inventors who, with some encouragement, will come up with the necessary communications, warning, or stabilization development that will aid in cutting the terrible death toll on our highways. The genius of these men is needed and the organization of the Society of Inventors and Scientists will help publicize the ideas and the creation of the new devices which spring from these fertile minds.

The founding of the new society will enable the lone inventor to have some of the benefits of larger associations; to have a forum where the specialist in the field of inventions can advise on patent law and related areas; and to have attorneys who can give general counsel and accountants to discuss the financial procedures.

The membership of the Society of Inventors and Scientists is now over 250 in my congressional district and with the manifest interest I prophesy an extension of their idea into other areas of the Nation. I compliment Douglas Q. McMasters, the society's first president, and Alvin D. Pinkney, the executive secretary, for their organizational effort.

THE ONCOMING NATIONAL CRISIS

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial column by Joseph Alsop in this morning's Washington Post so completely echoes what so many of us have been saying for so many years concerning the special privileges, suprarights, and favoritism being lavished upon the Negro by the Federal Government, that it should be required reading by every Member of this body.

Next week we will be called upon to give more special privileges, more money, more so-called rights to the Negro for no reason other than that they demand it. This ever-spiraling outpouring of favoritism is getting this Nation nowhere and for the simple reason that the Negro demands are insatiable. No amount of millions, such as we have poured into the Watts area of California, will make responsible citizens of the rioters there. The U.S. Mint cannot print dollar bills fast enough to keep up with the demand.

The Supreme Court, this administration, and previous ones and Members of this and the other body have urged the Negro to take to the streets in rampages of bloodshed, pillage, and destruction and

A little investigation into the current expenditures of the public sector might offer us some explanation as to where this deficiency actually lies. There are admittedly great sums of money being spent on the support of blind or partially blind individuals. Public assistance payments to the blind average close to $100 million annually. The Federal Goverment's share accounts for half of this amount. The Federal Government also awards an additional $8 million for State rehabilitation programs. The Veterans' Administration spends yet another $26 million in pensions to the 10,000 veterans who are totally blind. That these are worthwhile programs cannot be disputed. But when we compare these figures with the amount of money being used by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness on research into visual disorders, the discrepancy appears alarming. In fiscal year 1965, that Institute spent a little over $10 million for vision research, and a total of $14.3 million for all vision activities including training programs. Since then, this sum has been increased by only small amounts. In fact, the Appropriations Committee has recommended that another $1 million be added to the 1967 budget for the specific purpose of accelerating the Institute's work on all aspects of blindness. This is one recognition of the inadequacy of the present program. It is not an answer to the real problem, however. We cannot effectively combat blindness with stopgap tactics.

The crucial need that exists in this area of disease prevention is a concentrated, well-supported effort to discover the causes and the best method of treating eye defects. This is the sort of intensification that would be achieved by the creation of a separate National Eye Institute. The disadvantages which might result from administrative fragmentation caused by putting vision research into a distinct institute under the National Institutes of Health would be greatly overshadowed by the promise of progress in the prevention of blindness which a full-scale operation could accomplish. Such an Eye Institute would attract the most talented and dedicated men of the ophthalmic science because it would offer them the unique opportunity to be effective in the struggle to wipe out the causes of visual defects. Such an institute would also bring about a more realistic balance between financial support of the blind and vision research for prevention of blindness. No change could offer more hope for the improvement of a situation which is now only becoming worse every year.

At this point I would like to point out that there has been recognition of the drastic need for more intensive research into diseases leading to blindness. But the leaders in this fight do not include the Federal Government, which still clings to its outmoded emphasis on assistance after the fact rather than on primary prevention. The leaders in the field of visual research are private groups such as the Lions International, who are in fact the prime instigators of the notable eye bank movement in this country. Seventy-five percent of the 80 eye banks located throughout the country are sponsored financially by Lions Clubs.

As a matter of fact, the Lions operate a vision care center in my home community of Rochester, N.Y. Through their activities there, the Lions provide needed services and health assistance to individuals throughout the central New York area. I know that all of us here in the Congress are well aware of the outstanding work being done by institutions such as the vision care center in Rochester. We all owe a great debt of gratitude to these operations and to the local Lions Clubs which support them.

Since this movement began in New York City in the late 1940's, there has been considerable progress made in the use of corneal tissue to restore sight to the blind. Here is an organization which is effectively seeking a means for the cure of visual defects, especially through its research into the causes of glaucoma and retinal detachment. In the many Lions-sponsored institutes affiliated with hospitals and universities, research scientists are working on ways to make more effective use of valuable eye tissue.

Such an example as this should not be lost on the Federal Government. It could give this worthy endeavor a needed boost by recognizing a greater responsibility in the field of eye research. The fact is we cannot afford to ignore this responsibility, or to deny that it exists. According to one estimate, there are a quarter of a million blind people today who could benefit from tissue transplants. The sight of many more thousands could be saved. But the private sector cannot assume this burden alone. It is time that the Federal Government stepped into the picture in more than a token fashion. It is time now to establish a National Eye Institute. It is my sincere hope that the necessity and the wisdom of such a move will be perceived by all the Members of Congress.

MEDICARE

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material and tables and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with the implementation of the medicare program this month our Nation is witnessing the effectuation of one of the most important—and one of the greatest—pieces of social legislation ever to be enacted by the Congress of the United States.

I was one of the earliest sponsors of medicare. I gave my wholehearted support to the program when I first came to the Congress in 1953, and witnessed the long uphill battle we had to wage in order to make the program the law. It was especially gratifying to me to see medicare become the law of the United States last year. That day—when President Johnson signed the medicare bill at President Truman's home in Missouri—marked the beginning of an entirely new era in the history of medical care for the elderly. It provided that the elderly would be insured proper medical treatment; that their life's savings would not be wiped out by an expensive and often unforeseeable illness.

Medicare was truly a great bill. It was great because it was a bill of and for the people. It made our Government more responsive to the needs of the people and more humanitarian. But, as we are all aware, administering a program of this magnitude requires a great deal of planning, effort, and most important of all, a great deal of money.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill designed to save our Government a good deal of the money which we plan to spend on medicare. Based on planned expenditures of the Government during the present fiscal year, as estimated by committees studying this problem, the Government will save between $100 million and $150 million for the year. All these millions will be saved without lowering the quality of the medicare program one iota. The program will be just as good, safe, and effective if my bill is passed.

My bill will require that drugs prescribed or supplied under any program financed or assisted by the Federal Government will be provided on the basis of their generic instead of their trade names. This is actually a very simple bill and it is easy to understand once a few of the basic principles concerning the prescribing and naming of drugs are understood.

Every drug sold in this country is given a generic or nonpropriety name. This generic name is the "official" name of the drug, the name by which chemists and doctors identify its active ingredients. Now, every private manufacturer of a drug is allowed to give that drug his trade name. The trade name will be different from the generic name, but both names will refer to the very same drug. Other companies may manufacture this drug and each one of them will probably give the drug they manufacture their own trade name. So we often have the situation where many companies produce the same drug, each of them identifying the drug by its trade name. The same drug is bought under many different trade names on the market. To illustrate, suppose we have a drug which has the properties XYZ. The generic name of that drug might be XYZ. Company S comes along and manufactures the drug under the trade name "Superdrug." Company W comes along and manufactures the same drug under the trade name "Wonderdrug." Company M comes along and manufactures the drug under the trade name "Miracledrug." And on it goes. So we have all these names—"Superdrug," "Wonderdrug," "Miracledrug"—for the generic drug XYZ. All the drugs have the same active ingredients—they are, in effect, the same.

My bill would require that drugs ordered in connection with federally financed or assisted programs be ordered on the basis of their generic names—XYZ in the above example. That is all there is to it.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the following charts, indicating the cost to the druggist of some of the most prescribed drugs when ordered under trade names and generic names, at this point in the RECORD:

Price comparisons of some drugs on the list of the 200 most prescribed drugs—Price to druggist

Trade name [1]	Price	Generic name [2]	Price
Achromycin (Lederle), 250-milligram capsules, 100's	$14.96	Tetracycline	$2.75
Pentids (Squibb), 400,000 unit, tablets, 100's	14.15	Penicillin G	1.50
Dexedrine (Smith Kline & French), 5-milligram tablet, 1,000's	22.60	Dextroamphenamine sulfate	.75
Meticorten (Schering), 5-milligram tablets, 100's	17.90	Prednisone	.69
Tedral (Warner Chilcott), 1,000's	24.00	Theophylline-ephedrine phenobarbital	3.50
Chlor-Trimeton (Schering), 4-milligram tablets, 1,000's	20.59	Chlorpheniramine	1.40
Gantrisin (Hoffman-La Roche), 5-gram tablets, 1,000's	25.30	Sulfisoxazole	10.90
Noctec (Squibb), 7½-grain, 100's	4.20	Chloral hydrate	1.20
Serpasil (Ciba), 0.25-milligram, 1,000's	39.50	Reserpine	.69
Miltown (Carter Products)	61.20	Meprobamate	20.80
Equanil (American Home), 400-milligram tablets, 1,000's	62.40		
Butisol (McNeil), ½-grain tablets, 1,000's	18.45	Butabarbital sodium	1.63
Seconal Sodium (Lilly), 1½-grain tablets, 500's	18.30	Secobarbital sodium	4.70
Peritrate (Warner Chilcott), 10-milligram tablets, 1,000's	20.00	Pentaerythritol tetranitrate	.98
Dilantin (Parke-Davis), 1½-grain, 1,000's	10.08	Diphenylhydantoin sodium	4.25
Raudixin (Squibb), 50-milligram tablets, 1,000's	30.78	Rauwolfia serpentina	1.10
Dexamyl Spansule No. 2 (Smith, Kline & French), 1,000 capsules	86.62	Dexamo No. 2	7.10
Desoxyn (Abbott) 5-milligram 1,000 tablets	15.00	Desoxyphedrine HCl	.85
Decadron (Merck), 0.75-milligram, 100 tablets	14.50	Dexamethasone	6.75
Feosol (Smith, Kline & French), 3-grain, 1,000 capsules	9.00	Ferrous sulfate	1.20
Mandelamine (Warner-Chilcott), 0.5-gram, 1,000 tablets	29.15	Methenamine mandelate	5.80
Nembutal Sodium (Abbott), 1½-grain, 1,000 capsules	16.20	Pentobarbital sodium	3.79
Sudafed (Burroughs-Wellcome), 60-milligram, 1,000 tablets	26.40	Pseudoephedrine HCl	8.90
Synthroid (Flint), 0.1-milligram, 1,000 tablets	10.72	1-thyroxine sodium	3.75
Teldrin (Smith, Kline & French), 8-milligram, 250 capsules	10.90	Chlorphenilamine maleate	3.25
Azo-Gantrisin (Roche), 100 tablets	4.13	Sulfisoxazole with phenazopyridine	2.00
Neo-Polycin (Pitman-Moore), 12½-ounce tubes	12.60	Triple antibiotic	3.00
Proloid (Warner-Chilcott), 1-grain, 1,000 tablets	7.65	Thyroglobulin	3.60
Cort-Dome (Dome), 1-percent, 1-pound creme	60.00	Hydrocortisone	11.50
Neo-Synephrine (Winthrop), 0.25-percent, 16-ounce nasal solution	5.76	Phenylephrine HCl	1.95
Premarin (Ayerst), 1.25 milligram, 1,000 tablets	59.78	Conjugated estrogens	24.50
Benadryl (Parke-Davis), 50-milligram, 1,000 capsules	12.84	Diphenhydramine HCl	4.95

[1] 1966 Red Book.

[2] Drug catalogs.

One may ask why we should require that drugs be supplied by their generic names when it is just as easy to order them by the trade names. The charts just inserted in the RECORD supply the answer. The difference in price between the drugs ordered by generic name as opposed to trade name is patently obvious. Take for example the drug, reserpine. It is a type of tranquilizer used for agitation and emotional disorders; it is used over a period of several weeks, often for as long as many years. When purchased under the generic name, reserpine, druggists pay the manufacturers of the drug $0.69 for 1,000 0.25-milligram tablets. When purchased under the trade name, Serpasil, 1,000 of the same 0.25-milligram tablets cost the druggist $39.50. In this case the druggist pays more than 58 times as much for the drug when it is ordered under its trade name.

Look at dextroamphenamine-sulfate. It is a type of stimulant, used generally over short periods of time. When used to treat narcolepsy, a sleeping disease, it is usually used several times a day for life. Under the generic name it costs the druggist 75 cents per thousand. Under the trade name, Dexedrine, it costs the druggist $22.60 per thousand. Predisone, often used for asthma and skin diseases, costs druggists 69 cents for a thousand pills under the generic name. Under the trade name, Meticorten, it costs the druggist $17.90 per thousand.

Think of the patient who has to use one of these drugs for a long period of time. Think of how much more money he spends for trade name drugs than he would be spending for the same drug if it were ordered by its generic name.

My bill will cover all drugs ordered for patients under the medicare program. This proposed legislation does not stop with medicare, however. It goes beyond medicare to include all programs which are financed or assisted by Federal funds.

The proposed legislation will cover all programs set up under title XIX of the Social Security Act as amended. Title XIX provides for the creation of State medical programs by July 1, 1970. It is a good guess that by that time most, if not all, the States will have medical programs of their own. All of these State programs will come within the scope of my bill. The result of requiring drugs ordered under State programs to be filled by their generic names will be additional savings to the Government, very considerable savings. Furthermore, as each of these programs grows in size, the savings to the Government will grow.

Under my bill it will be compulsory that prescriptions be filled on the basis of the drug's generic name; this applies even if the prescription specifies a trade name drug. I can sympathize with doctors who are often faced with the choice of prescribing a drug on the basis of the drug's trade name, which is generally very simple, and the drug's generic name, which is often long and very complicated. Take, for example, the drug "Theophyllinephedrine phenobarbital." The trade name for the drug is a very simple one: "Tedral." It is much simplier for the doctor to prescribe the drug by its trade name. Perhaps it is asking too much to expect that doctors order drugs by their generic names. For this reason my bill provides that if the Federal Government is going to contribute to the cost of the drug, the druggist is required to supply the lower priced generic drug, even if the physician prescribes the drug on the basis of its trade name.

It is worth noting that under the Drug Amendments Act of 1962 the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to have a review made of the official names by which drugs are called. If "in the interests of usefulness and simplicity" the Secretary finds that revisions are necessary to simplify the procedure by which drugs are prescribed, he has the power to change the official name to a more simple one. Possibly this bill will serve as a stimulus to the Secretary to act. To my knowledge, no Secretary has conducted a review of the official names of drugs to make them less complicated.

The bill will help to bring about, in an indirect way, other important benefits as well. I am not at all sure that most physicians are aware of the generic names of the many drugs they prescribe. The drug companies are the principal source of a doctor's information about the drugs he prescribes. They are none too anxious to familiarize the doctor with lower priced generic names of drugs they can sell for much greater profits under trade names. By encouraging physicians to order drugs under their generic names, this bill will tend to make doctors more familiar with the generic names of drugs. Also, the bill will help to give the medical profession a better awareness of the different characteristics and indications of drugs. Right now a physician's principal source of information about a drug is the drug company itself—and that source does not always give the doctor as much information about the drug as it should. My bill does not provide any magic formula for making the medical profession separate the science from the trash, but it should help to make physicians aware of the fact that the drug companies are not the only source of information about drugs. Clinical reports are available to every physician. By ordering drugs under their generic names, physicians will hopefully be made to rely more on clinical reports for their information. In addition my bill will, in a modest way, help to make the people aware of the fact that there is no real difference in quality or effectiveness between generic name drugs and trade name drugs—the only real difference between them is their cost.

Furthermore, the bill will serve as an antidote to an illness which appears to strike the drug industry more often than some others—price fixing and monopoly. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has been a courageous and determined battler of monopoly and price fixing in the drug industry. I make reference to his speech of February 10, 1966, on the Senator floor in which he exposed one of the most cruel, most reprehensible, and most inhuman price-fixing conspiracies of our times; a conspiracy which affected all the people of the world in need of the antibiotic tetracycline, rich and poor alike.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the arguments which probably will be brought to bear against this bill by the drug companies. First of all, it will be argued that trade name drugs are better, safer, and subject to higher standards of quality control. It is well known that the drug companies spend a great deal of money, through the use of mass advertising and detail men, in order to create a distinction in the minds of the medical profession between generic name and trade name drugs. Unless the companies can get physicians to prescribe drugs by their trade names, the higher pricing of trade name drugs will have been to no avail.

There is absolutely no truth in this contention. First of all, as indicated by Food and Drug Administration recall lists covering the period from October 1, 1962, to July 5, 1966, both generic name and trade name drugs are recalled with similar regularity. It is simply not true that generic name drugs are more frequently defective, or of a lower quality, than trade name drugs. Secondly, a glance at Food and Drug Administration publications concerning actions initiated against drug companies for failure to maintain a current good manufacturing practice will reveal that both large and small companies, both the makers of trade name and generic name drugs, fail to meet the required standards of good practice. This is not something peculiar to the small companies, or to those companies which produce generic name drugs. Indeed, in order to survive the small companies have to take extra precautions to make sure they are not considered manufacturers of substandard or unsafe drugs.

Third, Mr. Speaker, every Government employee, every member of the Armed Forces, every Senator, and every Congressman who is given medical attention at a Government hospital is supplied generic name drugs. When a Congressman goes to Bethesda Naval Hospital, his drugs are supplied on the basis of their generic names. The same is true for any Senator who should go over there. I am quite sure that we Congressmen and Senators are not being supplied inferior quality or unsafe drugs. The drugs prescribed for us are every bit as good as trade-name drugs.

Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy all used generic name drugs. When President Johnson, who receives the very best of medical treatment, goes to the Bethesda Naval Center or Walter Reed Army Hospital for medical care they use generic name drugs. What's good enough for the President—and Senators and Congressmen—should be good enough for the people.

In a recent appearance before the Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and HEW of the House Appropriations Committee the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Goddard, was asked by Chairman FOGARTY whether prescribing drugs on the basis of their generic names would subject the public to second-class medical treatment. Dr. Goddard's answer was: "If this is aimed at the question of whether the drugs that are thus prescribed are second class, no." Dr. Goddard was not asked specifically whether generic name drugs were in any way less effective or safe than trade name drugs, but I am confident that his answer to that question would have been that they are not. If generic drugs are not as safe as trade name drugs I think the President, and those Congressmen and Senators who go over to Walter Reed for treatment, would be pretty anxious to find out why the drugs they use are not as good as those sold on the open market to the public. That, of course, is not the case at all. I might mention, in this connection, that the company which sells Serpasil to the druggist at $39.50 for 1,000 tablets sells the same drug to the Government under the generic name, Reserpine, at 47 cents for 1,000 tablets.

We can also expect the drug companies to argue that they spend a great deal of money on research, and that this cost of research must be embodied in the price at which they sell their drugs. I could see how research expenses might justify slightly higher prices to the consumer. But when you look at the differential between the price of most drugs under the generic and trade names, it is easy to see that research has little to do with these exorbitant prices. Take the drug Resperine. When sold to the druggist in bottles of 1,000 under the trade name Serpasil, it costs the druggist 58 times more than when sold under the generic name. Fifty-eight times more! How can the cost of research be embodied in that price? The company which produces the generic name drug at a price of $0.69 per thousand to the druggist is happy to sell the drug for this price. This company is making a profit, and it is happy with that profit.

Actually the cost of research to drug companies is very little. As pointed out by the late Senator Kefauver in his report of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee—June 27, 1961, page 12:

> Even under the liberal interpretation of "research" allowed by the Internal Revenue Service, research costs of the twenty major drug companies represent only 6.4 percent of the total sales dollar.

In chapter IX of that report it is stated:

> The data submitted by the 22 largest drug companies to the subcommittee show that approximately 24% of drug receipts of these companies is expended for promotion. On the average, selling expense constituted the single largest item for all of these companies, often exceeding the cost of goods sold. The latter category averaged only slightly above selling expenses, with a figure of 32%. In comparison, research and development accounted for 6%; general and administrative, 11%; taxes, 13%; and net profit after taxes, 13%. . . . It is difficult to think of any other manufacturing enterprise in the country where the sales staff would constitute such a large proportion of total employees.

The situation in the drug industry has not changed much in the time since then. Tremendous amounts of money are being expended on advertising and promotion of drugs—much, much more than is being spent on research. Research expenditures are no justification for the outrageous prices being charged for some of these drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to serve the interests of the people who put us in office, not the interests of the private pressure groups. It will save the Government millions of dollars each year if enacted into law. It will make the medical programs financed or assisted by the Federal Government less expensive. And it will help to show the people how they can save money, too.

THE VETERANS' APPRENTICESHIP ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced new legislation to authorize on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs under the recently enacted cold war GI bill program of educational assistance.

As you know, the GI bill as it was passed in the Senate and introduced by many of us in the House contained provision for the inclusion of apprenticeship programs.

The Veterans Affairs Committee, however, struck those provisions from the measure, fearing that they might impede the speedy passage of this needed legislation. The statute as it now stands, therefore, contains no authority for on-the-job and apprenticeship programs for our returned veterans.

My bill, the Veterans' Apprenticeship Assistance Act of 1966, seeks to remedy that situation.

Admittedly, there were instances in which on-the-job training and apprenticeship provisions in previous GI bills were subject to abuse. Far more important, however, were the benefits of such programs to millions of Americans.

For example, under the World War II GI bill and the GI bill which followed the Korean conflict, more than 43,000 veterans in my home State, Wisconsin, received skilled training. These veterans now make up the nucleus of Wisconsin's skilled work force.

According to the Wisconsin State Apprenticeship Council, well over 300 young State residents have entered military service in the past 16 months, either by enlistment or through the draft from their registered apprenticeship programs.

These young men will not be able to obtain any Federal assistance for post-service training if they return to their apprenticeships. Only if they abandon vocational instruction for academic schooling will they be able to benefit.

This situation is indeed unfortunate and promises to have drastic effects on our Nation's future well-being. Never before in history has this country had so short a supply of skilled manpower and so large a demand for such abilities.

Our greatest national resource—the one which has made the United States the world's industrial giant—has been the training and skills of our people.

Yet the new GI bill appears to ignore that important fact. It must, therefore, be amended soon in order to reinstitute vocational training as an integral part of our benefits to returning veterans.

I believe that my bill provides for such a program while spelling out safeguards adequate to prevent possible abuses by those who would take unfair advantage of the availability of Federal funds for such purposes.

The bill spells out in considerable detail the requirements which a program would have to fulfill before a veteran enrolled in it would be eligible for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, here are just a few of the criteria:

The training content of the course must be adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

There must be a reasonable certainty that a job will be available to the veteran in his learned skill at the end of the training period.

There must be in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructors to provide satisfactory training.

Adequate records must be kept to show the progress made by each veteran toward his job objective.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence in remedying this situation. I am hopeful, therefore, that the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will soon give consideration to including authority for apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs in veterans' educational assistance.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD the text of my bill and copies of letters which I have received from individuals and groups who are concerned about this problem. These letters provide further enlightenment on the situation and I urge the attention of my colleagues to them:

H.R. 16395

A bill to authorize on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs under the veterans' educational assistance program embodied in title 38 of the United States Code

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Apprenticeship Assistance Act of 1966."

SEC. 2. Section 1673 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out in subsection (c) "any course of apprenticeship or other training on the job."

SEC. 3. Section 1682 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Any eligible veteran may receive the benefits of this chapter while pursuing a full-time program of apprenticeship or other training on the job approved under the provisions of section 1777 of this title. The training assistance allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing such an approved program shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his training assistance allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic training assistance allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay a training assistance allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive a training assistance allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four. The terms 'program of apprenticeship' and 'training assistance allowance' used in this subsection and section 1777 shall, for the purposes of the other provisions of this chapter and chapter 36, have the same meaning as 'program of education' and 'educational assistance allowance', respectively."

SEC. 4(a) Subchapter I of chapter 36 is amended by redesignating sections 1777 and 1778 as sections 1778 and 1779, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 1776 thereof the following new section:

"§1777. Apprenticeship or other training on the job

"(a) Any State approving agency may approve a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job if the training establishment offering such training is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily requested by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training."

(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 36 is amended by striking out "1777" and all that follows down through "courses." and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"1777. Apprenticeship or other training on the job.
"1778. Notice of approval of courses.
"1779. Disapproval of courses."

SEC. 5. Subsection (c) of section 1662 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of any eligible veteran who was discharged or released from active duty before the date of enactment of the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program Amendments of 1966 and who pursues a course of apprentice or other training on the job, within the provisions of section 1682(f) of this chapter, the eight-year delimiting period shall run from the date of enactment of such amendments, if it is later than the date which would otherwise be applicable."

WISCONSIN'S APPRENTICESHIP GENERAL POLICY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STATE APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL),

March 23, 1966.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: It has been brought to our attention that the new GI Bill, signed into law by the President, has omitted an area of veteran's training that will have drastic effects on everyone concerned with the training of skilled manpower.

This committee, representing employers and employees of all skilled trades in the State of Wisconsin, was shocked to learn that registered apprenticeship and on-the-job training was removed immediately prior the bill's final passage. Not in the history of this committee has a piece of veterans' legislation been passed by Congress that has so clearly discriminated against the veteran who wishes to learn a trade. Under the World War II GI Bill, and the GI Bill following the Korean War, over 43,000 Wisconsin veterans received skilled training, and these veterans now make up the nucleus of Wisconsin's skilled work force.

In the past sixteen months, well over 300 of our young men have entered military service either by enlistment or through selective service directly from their registered apprenticeship programs. We view the new GI Bill as an active deterrent to these young men ever returning to these programs when they find themselves ineligible for training benefits. Furthermore, while young men learning a trade through apprenticeship have always been eligible for the draft, they have now been declared ineligible for training benefits.

Skilled manpower is in shorter supply today than possibly ever before in the history of our country. Constant emphasis must be placed on the training of the skills desperately needed by our industries. We sincerely request that you give immediate consideration toward legislation that will provide training benefits for veterans who enroll in registered apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs.

We would appreciate your reply to this report.

Very sincerely yours,

W. C. Van Cleaf, Director of Industrial Relations, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; J. E. Leuenberger, Director of Industrial Relations, Consolidated Papers, Inc.; Stephen E. Gaund, Manager, Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.; George A. Haberman, President, State AFL–CIO; John A. Heidenreich, Director, District No. 10, International Association of Machinists; Daniel W. Jones, Executive Secretary, Printing Industries of Wisconsin; E. E. Kasal, Executive Vice President, Electrical Contractors' Association; Stanley J. Gregory, Administrative Assistant, Region 10, UAW; Carl Sorcic, Building Trades Representative, State AFL–CIO; Al E. Redman, Member, Milwaukee Typographical Union, Local 23.

MILWAUKEE AREA JOINT APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING COMMITTEE FOR THE ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY,

March 29, 1966.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have been informed that the recently enacted 1966 G.I. Bill or Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 excludes assistance to returning veterans in apprenticeship programs.

Because the demands of the military have increased, some of our one and two year apprentices are entering active military service from the Armed Forces Reserves and by means of the draft. Our industry has a large investment in each apprentice and is anxious to restore the returning veteran to his previous status. However, it is believed many of these veterans may be pirated by assistance programs in this 1966 G.I. Bill. Also by excluding assistance to returning veterans interested in apprenticeship programs, the promotion of apprenticeship will be drastically curtailed and would seriously affect our effort to train a sufficient number of skilled mechanics so badly needed by industry. Wisconsin has always considered the training of skilled mechanics through apprenticeship a most important function of our State.

We believe that Congress intends to help the returning veteran, as they did following World War II and the Korean War, and not impose rigid restrictions on certain trade training programs.

Anything that you can do to correct this situation by having Congress amend this 1966 G.I. Bill to include apprenticeship programs registered with the U.S. Dept. of Labor, will be greatly appreciated. May we hear from you on this matter.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM LEICH, *Chairman.*

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS' ASSOCIATION,
MILWAUKEE CHAPTER,

April 22, 1966.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: We have been informed that the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–358) has omitted veterans training in apprenticeship programs.

Some of our electrical apprentices are entering active military service from Reserve status and by means of the draft. This leaves a serious void in our training program. We have a large investment in our apprentices, who are the nucleus of our skilled work force. Therefore, by excluding assistance to these returning veterans and potential applicants, we look upon this new G.I. Bill as a "road block" to train a sufficient number of skilled mechanics so badly needed by our industry. The present Legislation will encourage them to enter other fields where training will be subject to wage subsidies.

We sincerely request that you give immediate consideration toward amending this 1966 G.I. Bill to include apprenticeship programs registered with the U.S. Department of Labor.

May we hear from you on this request.

Yours very truly,

WM. DWYER, *President.*

THE PROBLEM

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
March 21, 1966.

"Why cannot the education portion of the GI Bill which serviced the World War II veteran be renewed to fulfill the following reason":

1. Those veterans who took advantage of the education portion of the bill immediately after the Second World War, are now faced with the automation problem.

a. These GIs learned their trade or skill from this education.

2. Should this portion of the bill be renewed, they could learn to cope with automation, which has made the trade or skill they learned under the bill obsolete.

3. Though most companies in industry offer automation training to a man whose job has been automated, this individual could learn still another skill should his own job become obsolete.

4. It is not yet time for these veterans to retire.

a. Fifteen to twenty-five years of productivity yet remain to a World War II veterans' working capability.

STANLEY L. WITKOWSKI,
Chairman, Lodge No. 78 AFL–CIO,
Allen-Bradley Co.

WHERE IS THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT?

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that this country is in the midst of the gravest crisis in housing in its history.

But where, in the face of this, is our brandnew, much-heralded Department of Housing and Urban Development?

A basic understanding of English would lead one to logically suppose that Congress established the Department of Housing and Urban Development to deal with housing and housing problems. From its performance to date in the face of the current crisis, however, it appears instead that we have discovered a new form of inert gas and named it HUD.

Mr. Speaker, even the most cursory perusal of the enabling legislation reveals that this Congress did not intend HUD to be a new inert element in the chemistry of the Government. We established that Department among other things, and I quote from Public Law 89–174, "to encourage the maximum contributions that may be made by vigorous private homebuilding and mortgage lending industries to housing, urban development, and the national economy; and to provide for full and appropriate consideration at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them."

Mr. Speaker, what encouragement have private homebuilders and mortgage lenders had from the agency that is supposed to give it to them. They have had none. What indications are there that HUD is providing full and appropriate consideration at the national level of the needs of the homeowner, the home seller, and the homebuyer in their time of crisis. There are none. The sphinx roars back its silence and mocks the law that conceived it.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress created the post of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and entrusted its holder with specific duties. Again, I quote Public Law 89–174:

> The Secretary shall * * * advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; develop and recommend to the

President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen no policies. We have experienced no leadership, and if the Secretary has been advising the President on this critical matter, the President has kept that advice a well-guarded secret.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Public Law 89-174 to the Secretary. It makes excellent reading and will provide him with some useful pointers for carrying out the intent of this Congress. Maybe—we can always hope—the sphinx will yet come to life.

The Secretary of HUD may be expected to strenuously object to faultfinding which points to no positive suggestions. In anticipation of such reaction, we are glad to provide the following:

We need a strong statement on home construction. The industry needs to know what the policy of support is going to be in housing. How many units does the Secretary feel the needs of the Nation dictates? Will the level of our building be sustained at the average established over the last 3 years of 1.5 million units? Or does the Secretary have some other guideline figure to propose?

The policy to encourage homeownership needs reemphasis. The Secretary should make it clear that his Department is committed to the proposition that homeownership continues to be viewed as a valuable influence in building better citizens, more stable communities, and, consequently, a stronger America.

Plans to allow for reasonable sale and purchase of existing homes should be in the making. The homeowner's present plight should be vocally made known by the Department charged with this Nation's concern for the homeowner. That plight is presently one approaching desperation. The tight money situation has been having harsh effects on the homeowner wanting to sell his home either because he wants to move on to something better or because he is forced to do so by circumstances. Tight money has raised the discount on his mortgage and added to his cost in refinancing the new owner. This has placed substantial new burdens on the seller in the past few months—first to find a market and second to protect his equity.

Clearly this situation threatens the concept of homeownership itself. If the average homeowner feels that he may not be able to readily sell his house, he may rightly feel that the risks of homeownership in a mobile society outbalance the advantages.

Likewise, a family not only puts a substantial proportion of its real resources into a piece of property, it also adds what I call "sweat equity"—that is the weekend and odd-hour toil which builds the fences, broadens the walks, constructs the patio, and creates the landscaping. These investments are hard to sacrifice on the altar of high interest and tight money. Over the past 30 years we have carefully fostered a policy which has favored housing as an economic activity. We have consciously and gladly turned away from the citizen-tenant civilizations of earlier times and made of America a nation of homeowners.

Will the Secretary not now come forth and voice a firm commitment to the maintenance of that value for the future?

The American people as well as the allied industries in the home construction field need and expect the Secretary and the Department to be a vital force in urging a balance in our monetary policy—a balance which protects the long-term paper position in the market as well as the short paper position. Mortgage money is the mother's milk of the homebuilding industries which contribute directly and indirectly over $100 billion to the gross national product.

Speak soon and strongly, oh mighty sphinx.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the current airline strike is approaching the 2-week mark. The Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. James J. Reynolds, has described the negotiations as a venture in futility. In the meantime, the people of my district—as well as in all areas of our country—are suffering tremendously. The economic loss is very great. The inconveniences are increasingly serious. Veterans returning from Vietnam, some permanently, some on leave, are delayed in reaching their homes. Businessmen and women are unable to keep schedules. It is a shocking and intolerable situation.

I find it difficult to understand why the President has not used his far-reaching powers to resolve this matter. Since the executive branch has failed to exercise its powers, possibly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should and could get into the situation immediately with a view toward developing an early settlement.

The following are some of the telegrams I have received on this important subject:

Cleveland, Ohio,
July 20, 1966.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Bolton: I read this morning that veterans returning from Vietnam are unable to reach home because of the airline mechanics strike. Add to this the cost to industry and inconvenience to all citizens and it is inconceivable that the Government should not take prompt action to end this strike against the public interest.

Eaton Yale & Towne, Inc.,
W. R. Eames.

Cleveland, Ohio,
July 19, 1966.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Airline strike is current No. 1 problem hampering the economy of the country. We urge all out effort to effect immediate settlement.

Oglebay Norton Co.,
Walter C. Mayo,
Director of Traffic.

Cleveland, Ohio,
July 18, 1966.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton,
Representative in Congress,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Current airline strike has gone beyond the ridiculous. In the public interest, strongly urge President powers be used to resume vital transportation system. Negotiate while working, why victimize the public.

Westinghouse Electric Corp.,
B. A. Everly.

Cleveland, Ohio,
July 19, 1966.

Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This wire is to convey my deep concern as executive vice president of Arthur G. McKee and Company about the current serious disruption in airline service. McKee is heavily dependent upon the airlines since it is a major construction and engineering company engaged in a number of projects throughout this country and the rest of the world. This disruption is causing delay and cancellation of travel and transportation of goods required in connection with our current projects. Aside from the burdens imposed on us directly we believe that the airline stoppage will delay the completion of projects necessary to continuing prosperity of the economy of this country. Accordingly in accordance with your continuing interest in all aspects of the national welfare, we urge that you press all the parties involved including Government officials to use maximum efforts to obtain a fair and immediate settlement to end this intolerable situation.

Arthur G. McKee & Co.,
D. C. Reynold,
Executive Vice President.

Cleveland, Ohio, *July 14, 1966.*

Hon. Frances P. Bolton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are respectfully urged to do everything possible to terminate the strike of the International Association of Machinists against five of the Nation's airline companies.

With the strike ending the operations of four of the airlines serving Cleveland and leaving but one trunk airline company to carry on the burden of transporting airline passengers and property, this community and its vast area have suffered from its serious economic impact and the traveling public has sustained many inconveniences.

Your efforts to effectuate an early settlement will be greatly appreciated.

Cleveland Chamber of Commerce,
Curtis Lee Smith, *President.*

Cleveland, Ohio, *July 14, 1966.*

Hon. Frances P. Bolton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Airlines strike seriously affecting our industry and service to customers. Strongly urge drastic action to restore this vital service to industry and public.

NATIONAL ACX CO.,
T. LAURENCE STRIMPLE,
Chairman.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *July 15, 1966.*

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congress must act promptly to prevent the economic paralysis and human tragedy being imposed by the arbitrary and extreme position of few unionists on the people of this Nation in the airlines strike.

MEDUSA PORTLAND CEMENT CO.,
ELLERY SEDGWICK, Jr.,
Chairman.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *July 14, 1966.*

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

American Greetings Corp. seriously handicapped by airline strike. Urge you to prevail upon President Johnson to use all powers necessary for an early settlement.

AMERICAN GREETING CORP.,
J. STEPWITH,
Transportation Manager.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *July 14, 1966.*

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

If air travel our only major source transportation and airline management fair in negotiations trying keep within Presidential guidelines, it seems time to stop this unnecessary expensive interruption of our tax-producing business.

THE E. P. HAUSERMAN CO.,
BEN M. HAUSERMAN.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *July 15, 1966.*

Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hope you will use every possible amount of your influence toward bringing about settlement of present airline strike. This situation is very costly to a nationally operating business such as ourselves and I believe a way should be found for operations to be resumed during negotiations.

WHITE TRUCKS,
H. J. NAVE, *President.*

STRIKES AGAINST THE PUBLIC

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased with the St. Louis Globe Democrat editorial of July 18, 1966, which picked up the essence of my remarks made in the House on July 12, that is the importance of the distinction between the right to strike against management and the right to strike against the public.

By making it illegal for one union to have more than one contract expire at substantially the same time the Congress could sharply reduce the danger of strikes against the public.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> CURTIS: END STRIKES AGAINST PUBLIC
>
> Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS of Webster Groves, in a House speech criticizing the Johnson Administration for its inaction in the airlines strike, has urged that a joint House-Senate committee undertake a probe of crippling national strikes.
>
> Representative CURTIS made an important point when he said he would like to see such a committee study the distinction between labor's right to strike against management as opposed to striking against the public.
>
> "Labor has the right to strike against management which I have defended and will continue to defend," said CURTIS. "However, there is no economic justification for labor to strike or otherwise bring pressure to bear on the public through secondary boycotts or other means for their grievance is properly directed against management alone."
>
> As a solution to nationwide strikes, CURTIS proposes prohibiting any contracts by the same union in the same industry from coming up for reconsideration at substantially the same time.
>
> This would protect labor's right to strike but would prevent unions from using the present "public misery—public pressure" technique that now victimizes millions of innocent third parties and inflicts great damage on the nation's economy.

A FURTHER REBUTTAL TO CHARGES MADE AGAINST THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during my debate on July 11 with the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, I indicated my interest in placing supplementary material in the RECORD designed to further refute some of the charges made against the Federal Reserve. Some of the charges frequently made, along with material submitted in rebuttal, appear below.

First. Charge: President Johnson is unable to select a Board of his own choosing and thus has little or no control over monetary policy.

Rebuttal: It is true that President Johnson is unable to appoint his own Board. The reason is that Congress, by establishing long terms for Board members, sought to isolate the Federal Reserve from shifting political currents.

It is nevertheless a fact that the present Board is largely a Kennedy-Johnson creation. Five of the seven members currently serving were appointed or reappointed since 1961. The only exceptions are William McC. Martin and Charles N. Shepardson. And while Mr. Martin was last appointed by President Eisenhower as a Board member, he was reappointed Chairman by President Kennedy. Information on the present Board members appears below:

Name	Date of initial oath of office	Other dates and information relating to membership
William McC. Martin.	Apr. 2, 1951	Reappointed for term beginning Feb. 1, 1956.
J. L. Robertson	Feb. 18, 1952	Reappointed for term beginning Feb. 1, 1964.
Charles Shepardson.	Mar. 17, 1955	
George W. Mitchell	Aug. 31, 1961	Reappointed for term beginning Feb. 1, 1962.
J. Dewey Daane	Nov. 29, 1963	
Sherman J. Maisel	Apr. 30, 1965	
Andrew F. Brimmer.	Mar. 9, 1966	

Second. Charge: The Federal Reserve System is a banker-dominated, banker-oriented autocracy which can control interest rates for the benefit of the commercial banks.

Rebuttal: George W. Mitchell, a Governor of the Board appointed by President Kennedy, has given an effective response to this charge. Writing in "A Critique of Central Banking in the United States," published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston in 1964, he said:

> Now a word on the charge of excessive solicitude on the part of the Federal Reserve for the banking industry. The Federal Reserve has a multitude of operating connections with banks, and, of course, does have to stay constantly alert to insure that these transactions remain at arm's length. Moreover, Federal Reserve operations affect interest rates, hence the Federal Reserve is sometimes charged with controlling interest rates for the benefit of commercial banks. Other regulatory government agencies have the same general type of problem; the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, etc. About all one can say, except as the allegation is examined on a case by case basis, is that all of the regulatory agencies are in position to have an informed understanding of the public and private interest in any given action and should be accountable for steps taken.
>
> Is there evidence that the presidents (those members of the Open Market Committee said to be most influenced by private interests) perform differently from Board members on the Open Market Committee? I do not find such evidence in the voting record of the Open Market Committee in the past two or three years. In a period when the Committee was moving toward higher interest rates one finds more presidents than Board members dissenting from the policies adopted by the majority. Of course, it was the majority's view that the public interest required such action.

Third. Charge: The Republican Party is the party of high interest rates.

Rebuttal: The fact is that the present severe tightening of credit is the result of the Johnson administration's action and inaction, as the New York Times pointed out in the following editorial of July 1, 1966:

> BRAKE ON CREDIT
>
> The credit brake is being pressed down with increasing vigor. The new move by commercial banks raising interest rates for the third time in little more than six months followed on the heels of Federal Reserve action that placed further restrictions on the availability of credit. So money will be scarcer and more expensive than ever.

There has been no response from the Johnson Administration to this latest tightening action. It seems to have overcome its initial opposition to high interest rates. It also has discarded its strictures against applying the brakes too hard or too fast. The Administration may try to absolve itself of responsibility, but the fact is that the severe tightening of credit is largely due to its own action and inaction.

Its failure to make use of flexible fiscal policy early this year left the main job of curbing inflationary pressure to the monetary authorities. President Johnson felt committed to pursue expansive spending policies to pay for the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty. But he could have offset this stimulation by asking Congress for temporary increases in taxes to curb business and consumer spending. If he had done so, the Federal Reserve could have followed a much gentler and less painful course.

The Administration has also contributed to monetary tightness by positive action. In speeding up corporate tax collections and in selling participation in Government assets to the public, it has stimulated demand for credit and boosted interest rates. These steps have not only triggered an unhealthy rate war among credit institutions domestically; they have led to an escalation of rates internationally without reducing the deficit in the nation's balance of payments or stemming the outflow of gold.

European experience suggests that aggressive application of the monetary brake is not necessarily fatal. But it has proved in the past to be a dangerous weapon, usually resulting in recession when used to excess. The economy is already responding to monetary tightness. If economic conditions demand additional action, then fiscal policy rather than monetary policy must be called into play.

A column by M. J. Rossant from the July 18, 1966, edition of the New York Times also develops the point that the cause of high interest rates today lies not so much in the Federal Reserve's policies as in the administration's failure to put proper emphasis on fiscal policy. I include the article in the Record at this point:

Who's Responsible for the Money Squeeze?

(By M. J. Rossant)

Democrats in Congress are finally beginning to express their uneasiness over the high cost and growing scarcity of credit. Their grumbling comes as no surprise. The party of Andrew Jackson and William Jennings Bryan, Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy has traditionally opposed tight money and high interest rates.

Credit was cheaper and more readily available in 1960, when Senator Kennedy was campaigning for the Presidency. He made a key issue of "dear money," calling interest rates damagingly high and warning that he would not tolerate a credit policy that discriminated against small business, homebuilders and farmers. And the 1964 Democratic platform boasted of ending the "'high interest, tight money" policies of the Republicans and stressed "the importance of low interest rates", in assuring prosperity.

In the current monetary squeeze—the tightest in a generation—the Democrats must speak softly. After all, the squeeze is taking place with one of their own in the White House. So they are muting their criticism, while deflecting its aim.

Representative Wright Patman, the most vocal and persistent advocate of easy money in Congress, has led the way by trying to pin the blame on the Eisenhower Administration, which he claims is responsible because it permitted the Federal Reserve System to pursue an independent monetary policy. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler has followed up by pointing to the independent action taken last December by the Federal Reserve, which he charges touched off the escalation in interest rates.

SNIPING AT THE SPOILSPORT

Sniping at the Federal Reserve comes naturally to Democrats. As the agency charged with maintaining the stability of the dollar, it has to play the role of spoilsport, making unpopular decisions that make it an inviting and vulnerable target. But there are few objective observers who would side with Representative Patman and Secretary Fowler in accusing the Federal Reserve of really being the villain of the piece.

To be sure, the Federal Reserve has applied the credit brakes. Ever since last December it has sought to curb inflation at home and protect the dollar abroad. But it has pressed down slowly and reluctantly.

Earlier in the year, Federal Reserve officials made clear that they wanted tighter credit reinforced by tax increases. They argued that resort to fiscal policy (taxation) would have slowed demand, while relying on monetary policy (interest rates) to curb the supply of credit was more suitable for an economy operating close to its limits of capacity. Tax increases also would have helped avert the current financial distortions and convulsions.

Their plea and others like them went unheeded. Even though the Administration has hailed flexible fiscal policy as the key weapon for influencing the economy, equally valuable for stimulating or restraining activity, it hemmed and hawed about raising taxes as inflationary pressures mounted. The Administration ended up doing very little, which meant the Federal Reserve had to do most.

The fact is that the little that the Administration did do in the fiscal area has served mainly to make the credit squeeze worse. Its speedup in the collection of corporate income taxes and its initiation of a graduated withholding system for individuals, which added to the Government's tax take without reducing corporate or individual incomes, added to the already ebullient demand for credit. And its sales of participations in Government loans has contributed to the strong upward pressure on interest rates.

Interest rates would have climbed and credit become scarcer even if taxes had been raised. But the violent nature of the escalation, which has led to severe strains on commercial banks, on savings and loan associations, and on the home building industry and which may painfully affect the whole economy, could have been avoided.

LEAP-FROGGING RATES

Failure to make use of fiscal policy has also handicapped the effort to reduce the deficit in the nation's balance of payments. Washington had hoped to close the gap between rates here and in Europe. But so long as the United States depends on high interest rates, Europe follows suit, raising rates to maintain the gap.

The Administration's approach does not invalidate the "new economics." It is the Administration's new economists, and President Johnson himself, who have ignored its precepts. The Democrats can rally around indicting the Federal Reserve and charging that Wall Street bankers are conspiring against the farmer and the small businessman, but they will have trouble convincing anyone that Mr. Johnson is a supine and innocent victim of events. A tightening of credit was made inevitable by the increased spending on Vietnam; but the Administration has only itself to blame for the extreme—and potentially dangerous—monetary tightness that the Democrats are complaining about.

The Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee pointed out in the committee's 1966 annual report that unless the administration took some of the load for fighting inflation off monetary policy by placing greater reliance on fiscal policy the result would be skyrocketing interest rates and a severe financial squeeze. That prediction is now being borne out. The administration's failure to alter the mix between fiscal and monetary policy has led to a serious slump in the housing industry, a competitive war between commercial banks and thrift institutions, and severe hardships for small business and State and local government borrowers.

Fourth. Charge: High interest rates help the bankers and hurt the little man.

Rebuttal: High interest does work inequities on various borrowers. However, it is oversimplified to say that bankers benefit while everyone else is hurt. If we were to follow the rule that interest rates should always be low, monetary policy would be crippled in its attempts to deal with fluctuations in economic activity.

The Federal Reserve Board has submitted a statement to the Joint Economic Committee which shows the impact of interest payments and receipts in the U.S. economy. The conclusion of that study is that consumers as a group enjoy a net surplus in the net balance of interest payments. The article appears below:

Interest Payments and Receipts in the U.S. Economy*

Many individual households and businesses owe debt and own interest-earning financial assets at the same time. Persons who pay mortgage debts, for example, frequently are earning some interest at the same time from holdings of savings accounts and indirectly, from their equity in life insurance and pension plans. Even governments, Federal as well as State and local, are both debtors and holders of interest-earning financial assets. Data on total interest payments by U.S. nonfinancial sectors thus overstate the magnitude of funds transferred from debtors to lenders, since a part of these payments are a transfer from one pocket to another of the same person or government unit. In some cases this transfer does not result in a cash receipt labeled as "interest"; recipients of life insurance and pension benefits, for example, are receiving the interest earnings of life insurance and pension reserves without ever getting a check labeled as "interest."

As can be seen from tables 1 and 2 attached, households in the United States paid out a little over $19 billion in interest in 1964, but in the aggregate received a little over $20 billion in interest earnings on their savings. (It should be noted that these tables show only those payments and receipts classed in the national accounts as interest, and do not include insurance and pension benefits.) In the net balance of interest payments, consumers as a group definitely enjoy a net surplus. And so, of course, do the finanical intermediaries, which receive interest on the savings they invest, and pay out this interest directly or in other forms such as insurance benefits and pension checks. Since many financial intermediaries are mutual organizations—owned by their depositors, shareholders, or policyholders—much of the net surplus on interest payments shown for the financial sector also accrues to individual households. As the tables indicate, the sectors paying out more in interes than they receive are the nonfinancial business groups and the Federal and State and local governments.

---

*Source: Federal Reserve Board.

Current data on interest flows by income class of recipient are not available. The most recent surveys, relating to the years 1960–61, show that more than 40 percent of all the monetary interest received by consumers was earned by families whose total income (after taxes) amounted to less than $6,000. Families with incomes between $6,000 and $10,000 got about one-quarter of all consumer monetary interest income. Families earning more than $10,000 a year received the remaining 35 percent of the total interest that was paid out to consumers.

These data are shown in detail in table 3, and they are further developed in table 4. The latter table shows the average amount of income received in various income groupings, and it shows the percentage of total income that is made up of monetary interest receipts. Relative to their total income, interest receipts are most important to the lowest income group; namely, the 4 percent of consumer units who earn less than $1,000 a year. In this lowest income group 6.5 percent of income consisted of monetary interest, while for the average of all consumer units interest receipts accounted for only 1.2 percent of total income. The proportion of income received in the form of interest was also above the average for the families in the $1,000–$3,000 income group.

The importance of interest receipts to lower income families, a factor often overlooked in discussions of the impact of changes in interest rates, is explained in part by the large proportion of retired people whose income is low because they are living on pensions and the earnings from savings accumulated during their working years. Preliminary results from surveys conducted recently by the Federal Reserve, and now in process of being tabulated and analyzed, show that elderly families account for about one-fifth of the lower- and middle-income groups, but hold about two-fifths of the interest-earning assets owned by these groups. But these older folk account for only one-twentieth of the debt owed by lower- and middle-income classes.

TABLE 1.—*Monetary interest payments in the United States, calendar years 1959–64*

[In billions of dollars]

	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
A. Total payments by U.S. nonfinancial sectors	32.7	36.9	38.7	42.8	47.2	51.6
B. Household sector [1]	11.8	13.4	14.4	15.7	17.4	19.2
C. For debt on owner-occupied houses	5.4	6.1	6.8	7.6	8.4	9.2
D. For other debt	6.5	7.3	7.6	8.1	9.0	10.0
E. Unincorporated business and co-ops [2]	5.1	5.8	6.3	7.3	8.3	9.3
F. Corporations [3]	6.7	7.6	8.1	9.0	9.9	10.6
G. State and local governments	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.9
H. Federal Government [4]	7.3	8.1	7.6	8.4	9.0	9.6
MEMORANDUM: TOTAL MONETARY INTEREST PAYMENTS IN U.S. ECONOMY						
I. Total payments by U.S. nonfinancial sectors (line A)	32.7	36.9	38.7	42.8	47.2	51.6
J. Plus payments by foreigners to U.S. sectors	.8	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7
K. Plus payments by U.S. financial sectors	6.4	7.7	8.4	10.1	11.8	13.5
L. Equals total monetary interest payments in U.S	39.9	45.6	48.2	54.2	60.5	66.8

[1] Includes nonprofit institutions.

[2] Includes mortgage interest payments by individuals who are landlords.

[3] Excludes banks, other credit agencies, security and commodity brokers and dealers, and insurance carriers. The interest payments by these financial businesses for both incorporated and unincorporated institutions are shown on line K.

[4] Excludes intra-Federal Government transfers.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals, due to rounding.

Source: Department of Commerce and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

TABLE 2.—*Sector distribution of monetary interest receipts in the United States, calendar years 1959–64*

[In billions of dollars]

	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
A. Total monetary interest receipts (line N, table 1)	39.9	45.6	48.2	54.2	60.5	66.8
Received by:						
B. Foreigners [1]	.4	.5	.4	.5	.7	.8
C. Federal Government [2]	.9	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.2
D. State and local governments	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.1
E. Financial sectors	24.0	27.2	28.8	32.0	35.5	39.4
F. Nonfinancial corporate business	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.7	3.0
G. Households and nonprofit institutions	11.7	13.3	14.2	16.3	18.4	20.3

[1] Interest receipts from claims on United States.

[2] Interest receipts from public including foreigners. Excludes intra-Federal Government transactions.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals, due to rounding.

Source: Department of Commerce and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TABLE 3.—*The distribution of total income and interest income among consumers in different income groups, annual averages, 1960–61*

After-tax income groups	Number of families [1]	Relative distribution		
		Number of families	Total income [2]	Interest income [3]
	Millions	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Total	55.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $1,000	2.1	3.7	0.3	1.8
$1,000 to $2,999	11.7	21.2	7.1	13.2
$3,000 to $5,999	20.9	37.8	29.8	26.2
$6,000 to $9,999	15.8	28.5	39.0	24.4
$10,000 and over	4.9	8.8	23.7	34.5
$10,000 to $14,999	3.7	6.8	14.7	15.4
$15,000 and over	1.1	2.0	9.0	19.1

[1] Families or consumer units.

[2] Total money before taxes.

[3] Includes interest received (or credited to account) from bonds, savings accounts, notes, mortgages, etc. Interest on U.S. savings bonds is recorded when these bonds are cashed in rather than when it accrues.

The underlying data are estimated on the basis of information gathered in surveys. Such surveys may suffer from an underreporting of total interest income. It is not known whether a tendency toward underreporting introduces a bias in comparisons by income groups.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Consumer Expenditures and Income (BLS Reports Nos. 237-38 and 237-88); and unpublished data from Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 4.—*Average total income and average interest income of consumers—and percent of families reporting interest income and paying premiums for private life insurance, annual averages, 1960–61*

After-tax income groups	Number of families [1]	Average total income before taxes	Monetary interest income [2]			Families paying premiums for private life insurance [3]
			Average amount	Percent of total income	Families reporting interest income	
	Millions	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Total	55.3	6,245	78	1.2	34	50
Under $1,000	2.1	573	37	6.5	19	19
$1,000 to $2,999	11.7	2,103	49	2.3	23	37
$3,000 to $5,999	20.9	4,931	54	1.1	29	59
$6,000 to $9,999	15.8	8,542	67	0.8	43	75
$10,000 and over	4.9	16,841	307	1.8	59	80
$10,000 to $14,999	3.7	13,581	178	1.3	56	80
$15,000 and over	1.1	27,752	737	2.7	70	81

[1] Families or consumer units.

[2] For definition and comments, see footnote 3, table 3.

[3] Excludes group insurance policies.

Source: See table 3.

Fifth. Charge: The Federal Reserve has gone its own way and has never coordinated its activities with other Government programs.

Rebuttal: The record shows that the coordination of economic policies has generally been very good. Professor James Tobin of Yale University, a former member of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, has written as follows in the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston's 1964 annual report:

> Since the Accord there has been very little evidence of conflict between Federal Reserve and Administration policies. Through thirteen years of administrations of both political parties the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have seen eye to eye, with few exceptions. Their disagreements have not been larger in magnitude than the normal disagreements among agencies within the Executive branch. It is true of course that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury together do not always see eye to eye with the rest of the Administration. Sometimes from the point of view of the Council of Economic Advisers I have been worried that it is the Treasury that is too independent of the Executive!
>
> Seriously, I think it is a fact of life that almost every agency of the federal government, even within the Executive branch, has a certain degree of independent power stemming from its constituency—the people with whom it deals, and whom in a sense it represents. The power of financial officials in governments, whether in the central bank or in the Treasury, stems from their constituency. The same is true of the power of many other officials—the Secretary of Agriculture in our government, for example. The independence of the Federal Reserve comes from the political power of the financial community. How far can and will the President and the Congress go in pursuing policies opposed by powerful and respected financial lenders? What if the financial community loses confidence?

In that same report, Governor Mitchell, a Kennedy appointee to the Board, wrote as follows:

> It seems to me that at the highest policy levels there is a clear recognition that U.S. economic policy must be, and is, integrated; monetary policy is not excepted from this integration. Evidence of this, just to take an example, was the Administration balance of payments program in the summer of 1963 involving substantial Federal Reserve participation. This participation was negotiated within the government. Some might say it would have been easier for the Administration simply to tell the Federal Reserve what its role was to be. But I think there are important advantages to permitting the Federal Reserve a quasi-independent consultive role. It has a special expertise; it is insulated from the bias of transitory political squabbles; it has outstanding staff resources and a long record of constructive cooperation within government.

Secretary Fowler and Budget Director Schultze have also testified that coordination between the Federal Reserve and administration policymakers has been good. In their appearance before the Joint Economic Committee this spring, the following exchanges took place:

> Senator Jordan. How would you describe the pattern of day-to-day coordination which now exists between the Federal Reserve Board and the officials of the executive branch? Do you have any suggestions on how that coordination might be improved?
>
> Mr. Schultze. I think over the period of the past 5 years that coordination has been in general good. As you, of course, know, we think there was a fall from grace, if you will, in December. We think this was primarily a matter of bad timing. We think the mechanisms for coordination are good. The Federal Reserve Board is an individual body, and even with good coordination judgments will differ. I have no specific suggestions for better mechanisms of coordination.
>
> Naturally, I would hope that we would be able to coordinate our timing better in the future.
>
> Senator Jordan. In you opinion does the administration favor the continuation of the independence of the Federal Reserve Board or would it like to see the Federal Reserve Board under the control of the executive branch?
>
> Mr. Schultze. I believe that the present arrangement, which, I guess, is best described as independent, should be continued.
>
> Representative Curtis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Now, Mr. Secretary, you are a member of what has been called the Quadriad; are you not?
>
> Secretary Fowler. Yes.
>
> Representative Curtis. I understand that a great deal of the criticism of the Fed's action is geared to the fact there was not coordination; am I correct in that observation?
>
> Secretary Fowler. Well, to clarify the coordination point, I want to make very clear that comments I have made regarding coordination have been addressed to another aspect; namely, the publicly expressed feeling I had that it would have been better to make any decision in the monetary field at the time the budget, the state of the Union message, and the Economic Report were at least in hand—particularly the budget. I have not complained of any failure of coordination in the process of communication back and forth.
>
> Representative Curtis. That is what I was going to ask.
>
> Secretary Fowler. Oh, we have had very excellent communication—frequent, frank, and full. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I have no complaint on that score.
>
> Just so the record may be complete on that, on November 28, in a public statement a week in advance of the Fed action, I said that there may be room for honest differences of opinion among well-informed and unprejudiced persons on this issue; however, it is my strong belief that any orderly adjustment of a procedural coordinated mix of fiscal and monetary policies to deal with the period ahead calls for that policy mix to be determined only with the full knowledge of the President's new budget.
>
> That has been my only comment on coordination.
>
> Representative Curtis. In other words, what it really is, is a difference of opinion.
>
> Secretary Fowler. As to timing and nature.
>
> Representative Curtis. But not as far as communications are concerned?
>
> Secretary Fowler. None whatsoever.

Sixth. Charge: Because the Federal Reserve fails to coordinate its activities with the rest of the Government, its independence should be curtailed sharply.

Rebuttal: A strong case for the independence of the Federal Reserve has been stated before the Joint Economic Committee by Prof. Henry Wallich of Yale University. In testimony last December, Professor Wallich said:

> The independence of the Federal Reserve is of a peculiar kind. Its independence is within the Government, not from the Government.
>
> The conflicts of opinion that have arisen from time to time between the Fed and the executive branch are of a sort that may also arise within the executive branch itself. They are likely to be differences about means, not ends. This I believe to have been the case also in the latest disagreement. The difference is that if the Federal Reserve had been set up as a regular Government department, or as part of an existing department, the President could resolve such conflicts.
>
> Lack of unified command, however, is not unusual in our presidential system of government. The President has no means of controlling fiscal policy either, taxes and expenditures being determined by Congress. President Kennedy's request for some administrative discretion over tax rates, which would have given the President a tool for stabilization policy comparable to monetary policy, was not accepted. Unified control over most economic policy instruments is usual in countries with a parliamental form of government. But even in some of those, and not the economically least successful

ones, the central bank has been given a certain independence. In our own system of checks and balances, there seems to be no anomaly in the kind of independence that the Federal Reserve enjoys.

The justification for some degree of central bank independence seems to me twofold. One is to take the unpopular task of occasional credit tightening out of the political arena. The other, which has become more important since prices ceased to have flexibility downwards, is to give decisions that have long enduring effects to any agency with a greater degree of continuity than that of a regular Government department. Business cycles come and go, but a price increase, once it has occurred, is virtually irreversible under today's conditions. In decisions affecting the price level a very long-term point of view should be taken, and an agency with some independence is best qualified to do that.

It is probably true that in such decisions, if there is a difference of opinion, the central bank is more likely to be on the side of price stability than the executive branch. But as I look at the price record of our economy over the years of the Federal Reserve's existence, I do not have the impression that the defenders of price stability have had an unduly strong voice. Such voice as they have I should like to see preserved.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It should also be noted that President Johnson and President Kennedy both reaffirmed their belief in and support of the independence of the Federal Reserve. A statement issued by President Johnson on October 26, 1964 follows:

Presidential Statement No. 2 on Economic Issues: Monetary Policy for Stability and Growth, October 26, 1964

1. Monetary policy is one of our crucially important tools for maintaining a healthy and noninflationary economy. The job is never easy. But the results over the past 4 years have been remarkable:

Ample but not excessive credit has been available to businesses, home buyers, and State and local governments.

At the same time, short-term interest rates have been pushed up to reduce capital outflows and help correct our balance-of-payments deficit.

Yet long-term interest rates, which are so important to domestic borrowers, have remained moderate; in fact, home mortgage rates and the rates paid by State and local governments are lower today than in early 1961.

2. All this has been made possible by close ties between our monetary and our fiscal and debt management policies, and close harmony among the men responsible for these policies: We have maintained the Federal Reserve's traditional independence within the Government.

Yet the Federal Reserve and the administration agree entirely on the practical need for informal coordination among the various economic programs of the Government.

The President meets periodically with a group consisting of Secretary Dillon, Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, Budget Director Gordon, and Chairman Heller, of the Council of Economic Advisers, and they in turn are in close and continuous contact.

These efforts have resulted in government by consensus, not by conflict, in economic policy.

3. In the future as in the past, our monetary system must remain flexible, and not be bound by any rigid, mechanical rules:

In an atmosphere of private and public moderation, monetary policy has been steadily expansionary for 4 years.

With continued moderation, there can be the continued monetary expansion essential to economic growth.

But if inflation develops, or if excessive outflows of funds occur, the Federal Reserve System is in a position to do what is necessary.

On October 31, 1960, Senator Kennedy said:

Third, we must have a flexible, balanced, and, above all, a coordinated monetary and fiscal policy. We do not, let me make it clear, advocate any changes in the constitution of the Federal Reserve System. It is important to keep the day-to-day operations of the Federal Reserve removed from political pressures, while preserving the President's responsibility for longer range coordination of economic policies.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION AND HIGH INTEREST RATES: NOT NEW NOR OLD BUT BAD ECONOMICS

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, I have argued on the floor of this House that the inflationary expenditure policies of the Johnson administration have resulted in interest rates which were too high and very damaging to our economy and to the welfare of many individual citizens.

Last week, in a colloquy with the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I pointed out that the administration's reliance on monetary policy to combat inflation by allowing interest rates to rise to a dangerously high level was actually contributing to the inflationary spiral. It is obvious that when interest rates go up, the prices of goods and services go up as well when we have expanding markets and a boom economy as we have at the present time.

This weekend, the Federal Reserve Board, realizing the dangers of such high interest rates, moved to lower rates on certificates of deposit in an attempt to hold back the rising cost of money. This is, as we know, only a stopgap measure, as only the use of a more restrictive expenditure policy can adequately deal with the inflationary situation we are now facing.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to see this problem explained and discussed by the Washington Post's economic columnist Herbert Rowen in his column of July 17, 1966. Mr. Rowen clearly illustrates the failure of the "new economics" to realize the dangers that are inherent in a deficit-spending, high-interest-rate policy.

Because Mr. Rowen's article gets to the heart of the interest-rate problem, I am inserting it into the Record today for all concerned Members to study. As this columnist so aptly says, "What we have here is not 'new' nor 'old,' just bad economics." It is time for this message to get across to those now making the economic policy of this Nation.

L.B.J. To Blame for Churning Interest Rates

(By Hobart Rowen)

More than it cares to admit, the Johnson Administration is worried about price inflation, which resumed a dangerous upward course last month. Yet, the President stubbornly resists a tax increase that would slow the boom, especially in business investment.

As Gov. Sherman J. Maisel of the Federal Reserve Board said in a speech last week, that would have been "the simplest . . . the most direct" way of holding things in check.

Instead, President Johnson—who was supposed to have had a Populist abhorrence of high interest rates—has allowed monetary policy to carry the ball.

We have had, as a result, a disastrous "rate war", with interest charges leap-frogging out of sight. Banks, savings institutions, and Uncle Sam himself are in a mad competition for money.

Interest and dividend rates of 5¼ and 5½ per cent are now common. One Alaska savings bank offers depositors 5.65 per cent. Shrewd investors can get around 5.7 per cent on some Government issues. Home mortgage rates under 6 per cent are almost nonexistent.

And the end is not in sight, although on Friday, the Federal Reserve moved to clip back some of the more tantalizing rates banks have offered small depositors.

While money is "tight", in the sense that interest rates are high, the traditional impact of costlier money has been absent. The money supply, since the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate last December, has actually been increasing faster than before.

The classic expectation was that costlier money would discourage borrowing. But it simply hasn't worked out that way. Convinced of good markets and boom times, businessmen have willingly paid the price—higher interest rates—to expand their operations and build up inventories.

So what we have is an economy crying for restraint through fiscal policy or monetary policy—and getting neither. The only restraint that L.B.J.'s present policy (or non-policy) is enforcing is excessive trouble for the housing and construction industry.

At some point in this process, unless the Administration acts on the fiscal side, the Federal Reserve Board may be tempted to do what it has resisted so far—and that is to make interest rates frighteningly high.

The discount rate is now 4½ per cent. In the present circumstances, one could justify a 5 or 5¼ per cent discount rate. The banks' prime lending rate, now 5¾ per cent, could go to 6¼ or 6½ per cent. Loans to smaller customers could go to 7 per cent.

All of this could also knock the economy into a cocked hat, and the FRB fears it may be tagged with responsibility for a recession.

But what are the other options?

The administration seems to be sitting around waiting for "good news" in the form of a slow-down in some important sector of the economy. For example, officials take cheer that the Gross National Product apparently rose only $10–$11 billions (at annual rates) in the second quarter, compared with $17 billions in the first.

But the drift of the war in Vietnam—and perhaps, ultimately elsewhere in Asia—leads everyone in Washington to the conclusion that arms spending will move up, not down in the year ahead.

Thus, the "comfort" from a slower-paced GNP in the second quarter may dissipate with a new bulge in the third.

Nevertheless, high-placed insiders in the administration told me in the past few days, that there will be no move toward higher taxes at this time.

They profess to fear that Congress might stall on a tax bill, and pass it only after the peak of inflationary pressure has passed.

The only anti-inflationary action which the administration has summoned courage recently was a roll-back of a 5 percent increase in the alloying metal, molybdenum.

There, it had a sitting duck in a two-company industry where the leader had an outstanding profit record. In thousands of other situations, more meaningful to the consumer, prices are escalating, and the administration has no plan or program to keep them in check.

The economy today is a complex of record profits, rising prices, record interest rates. There is an open invitation to labor to translate 1966's price inflation into 1967's wage inflation.

It's not anything this administration can be proud of. What we have here is not "new", nor "old", just bad economics.

THE PROPERTY TAX—A NATIONAL DIALOG NECESSARY

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the forward to a study of the property tax written by Prof. Dick Netzer of New York University, published by the Brookings Institution, it is stated that this is the first comprehensive analysis of the property tax to be undertaken since 1931. I am happy that at long last such a study has been made. However, it is only a first step to developing a dialog in this vital area. It is a tragedy that for over 35 years this area has been so neglected by the scholars.

Mr. Speaker, the property tax has responded in noble fashion to the demands of local governments for revenues to finance education and other community facilities, throughout our history and has made unusual contributions since World War II during the education and population explosion. I am convinced that properly updated, developed and enforced, the property tax can continue to support expanding educational services, under the control of local governments, and remain a principal source of local government revenues.

It is disturbing when scholars both inside and outside of the Congress ignore and pass off the property tax as inadequate for modern needs without even an attempt to make a thorough study to understand fully its capabilities or its basic economic theories. Much creative innovation has gone into making adjustments in the tax by various local communities to keep it progressive and a spur to economic development. However, these innovations have gone unstudied and unheralded and therefore have not been adopted by other communities throughout the United States to the extent that they could and should be adopted.

Incidentally, the development of a modernized real estate property tax is the basic land reform needed by almost all the so-called economically underdeveloped countries.

Last week in an editorial of the July 11 edition of Newsweek magazine Raymond Moley contributed to carrying forward a national dialog which is urgently needed on this subject. I am inserting Mr. Moley's editorial into the Record to bring it further to the attention of my colleagues and others:

Property Tax Reform

(By Raymond Moley)

The income tax has so monopolized public attention that, until recently, the property tax has been noted only as a local or personal issue. But this tax yields approximately $23 billion, which about equals the yield of the corporation income tax. And without the property tax, the income tax would become an insupportable burden.

The property tax, with its inequities and its mode of collection, touches substantially every business and millions and millions of homeowners and tenants. Its reform thus becomes a great national problem which only recently has been publicly recognized and commented upon.

At the root of the operation of the property tax is the assessor. But his office, a political plum tree, generally operates under antiquated and unfair laws and methods.

A year ago in Claremont, Calif., I attended a conference of assessors of a number of American communities who exchanged views about the improvement of their work with several of their counterparts (valuers) from Australia and New Zealand, where assessment is highly professionalized. What emerged was the critical need in the United States for reform in the method of selecting assessors, in the rules and laws under which they operate and in the qualifications for the chiefs and their staffs.

CORRUPTION

It is a deplorable commentary on our civilization that the need for reform is seldom recognized until scandal and crime are unearthed. This awakening has recently come to three California cities.

The need for revenue for San Francisco, Oakland and San Diego suddenly threw the light upon the county assessors there. Grave irregularities were revealed and published in the press. The assessors in San Francisco and Alameda counties were indicted and convicted. The death of the assessor in San Diego brought about a change in the office. The major charge was wholesale bribery. Before all this happened, a new assessor in Los Angeles, Philip Watson, had instituted fundamental reforms, and his office is recognized as competent and clean.

In California, as in many other states, assessors are elected. This introduces politics and with it some of its familiar evils. For the assessor has such potential over taxpayers that the temptations are very great to show favoritism at a price.

The best opinion is that assessors should be appointed, perhaps by a bipartisan state board, that high qualifications should be imposed and that their staffs should be up to civil-service standards.

A second reform should be the imposition, by law and practice, of standard valuations on all property at a specified percentage of the market value and subject to constant review.

HIGHER LAND ASSESSMENTS

But a still more basic reform should be a correction of the present disparity in the valuation of building improvements and of land.

In San Francisco the Arthur D. Little consulting firm was recently employed by the City Planning Commission to study property-tax policies. A major feature of its report was the disparity between the tax burden upon land on the one hand and improvements on the other. It pointed out that over a period of ten years the assessed valuation of the land had actually dropped from 30 to 25 per cent. "Thus, the burden of taxation has been falling more heavily on improvements on the land than on the land itself. With this trend and the threat of a growing tax rate, owners will be reluctant to improve their property, lest the increase in taxes nullify the benefits of the improvements . . . Furthermore, the disparity in assessed value between new and old buildings selling at the same price discourages new construction and the replacement of old buildings."

This verdict today confirms what was said by David Ricardo, the great British economist, a century and a half ago. He said that what is good for the landowner is bad for every other element in the economy.

Moreover, a land tax is almost completely shielded from corruption.

Sit on the land. Don't improve your property, and you will profit. But build and improve, and the tax gatherer will pounce upon you as if you were an enemy of the republic.

CURRENT U.S. POLICY AND THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, our continuing and currently growing balance-of-payments deficit demands that we consider all soundly developed remedies. As a result of a 2-year study, the International Economic Policy Association has recently published a book entitled "The United States Balance of Payments: An Appraisal of U.S. Economic Strategy."

An appraisal of this work by Henry Hazlitt in Newsweek is worthy of my colleagues' attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Congressional Record.

[From Newsweek, July 4, 1966]

Business Tides: Shortsighted Remedy

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The latest and in some ways the most thorough study that has ever been made of "The United States Balance of Payments" has just been published in a large book of 200 pages by the International Economic Policy Association. This is a private research group whose membership includes twenty major U.S. corporations. It makes, altogether, 33 recommendations for solving the payments deficit. Most of these are in the right direction, and some of them are excellent.

The most important recommendation is negative: the Administration should abandon as soon as possible its restraints on foreign investment.

By trying to restrain and penalize foreign investment, the government is in effect treating such investment (which even in total accounts for less than 10 per cent of our outgoing payments) as if it were actually the cause of the payments deficit. Making foreign investment the scapegoat is completely arbitrary. It happens also to be foolishly shortsighted.

WHOSE DEFICIT?

The IEPA study, in fact, points out that for several years the private sector as a whole, as a result of export surpluses and income on private investments abroad, has generated a payments surplus, while Federal spending (foreign aid, military outlays, etc.) has been "consistently in deficit by over $3 billion a year, notwithstanding tied aid and military-hardware sales." The study calculates that exports to affiliates of U.S. manufacturing corporations account for 35 per cent of total U.S. exports of manufactured goods. In addition, direct investments abroad by U.S. companies return earned income which exceeds the outflow of capital in nearly every industry and in practically every area of the world.

The government insists that its foreign aid, even though it is given away, does not seriously add to the payments deficit. This is because, it argues, 80 per cent of AID's economic assistance has been in the form of goods and services procured in the United States. The IEPA study admits that this device of "tying" aid to purchases in the U.S. may curtail the *direct* adverse impact on the payments balance. But it points out that the government's calculation fails to allow for the "substitution" effect. The aid-receiving country, in other words, may use its aid dollars merely to buy goods it would otherwise have bought here commercially with dollars it already owned. It is then able to transfer its earned dollars for purchases in other countries.

SUBSTITUTION EFFECT

Strong evidence that this is happening on a large scale is provided by a comparison of our aid to and trade with Latin America. U.S. net disbursements to Latin America almost doubled from the level of the 1956–1960 period, when they averaged roughly $360 million, to an average of about $652 million over the 1961–1964 period. Total Latin American imports went up from an average of $7,650,000,000 a year between 1956 and 1960 to an annual average of $8,060,000,000 during 1961–1964, an average increase of $413 million. Yet total Latin American imports from the U.S. *declined* by an average of $100 million, despite the doubling of total aid and the "tying" of such aid.

There is reason to think that the "substitution" principle has an even wider application than the IEPA study estimates, but there is not space to consider its ramifications here. If the study has a serious weakness, it is in not giving sufficient emphasis to the effect of inflation and our chronic budget deficits in making the deficit in the balance of payments inevitable.

But the great merit of the study is its proof of the harmfulness of governmental restraints on foreign investment. A substantial part of our exports depends upon such investment. The study urges the government to give assurances that, in addition to maintaining the gold value of the dollar, it will not try to restrict or control the movement of capital. "The only really long-run factor working in the direction of eliminating deficits," the study insists, "is the growth in exports, income, royalties and fees which are related to direct private investments abroad. Any prolonged limitations in this area can serve only to weaken whatever long-range strength there is in the U.S. position."

CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES' TRIPS TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, several Members have requested that a copy of the letter of the Honorable Mendel Rivers and the Honorable William H. Bates, chairman and ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the subject of congressional office seekers going to South Vietnam to which reference was made during the debate on the Defense Appropriation Act be placed in the Record.

I am happy to do so. The administration's actions in encouraging and accommodating this kind of politicking are hard to understand.

The letter is as follows:

House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1966.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: We, the undersigned, the Chairman and the ranking Republican of the House Armed Services Committee, are advised that there have been, and are presently, congressional office seekers in Viet Nam, dressed in military attire, being briefed by our top military leaders, being transported in military vehicles, aircraft and naval vessels and, in general, consuming the time of our key personnel of our Armed Forces. In our judgment, this political junketing should be banned forthwith. Even if such trips were advisable, it is difficult to see how we can accord such privileges to a few without extending the same opportunity to all. This would result in an utterly impossible situation.

Some Members of Congress, for investigative and legislative purposes, need to travel to war zones. We have been urged by the Administration, and privately by military leaders, to keep these visits to a minimum and we concur and have complied with these expressed desires of the Executive Branch of our government.

On the other hand, we deplore the excursions of those who have no responsibility in this area and who only serve to clutter up our limited facilities and impose upon the time and patience of our hard pressed commanders who are trying to protect the lives of American men who have been sent there.

Political bally-hoo has no place in an area where Americans are dying. Some of the statements which we have read border on or are breaches of American security and should not be countenanced.

Very truly yours,

Mendel Rivers,
Chairman.
William H. Bates,

BILL INTRODUCED TO PROHIBIT THE MAILING OF UNSOLICITED SAMPLE DRUGS AND OTHER POTENTIALLY HARMFUL ITEMS TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 16391 to amend title 39, United States Code to prohibit the mailing to the general public of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items.

The problem this bill covers, was brought to my attention by one of my constituents, Mrs. Victor R. Struber, which is that unsolicited commercial items that are potentially dangerous to children and others, are being sent through the mail.

Numbered among the products involved are razor blades, drugs and chemicals.

While the senders of these articles may not be conscious of the accidents that could result, I feel it is a bad business practice and should be stopped. As in many other areas, what is good or not harmful to adults may be bad and harmful to children.

The bill I have introduced today will put an end to this type of commercial advertising, and the items involved will still be available in the normal course of business.

OFFICE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK OPENED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege this morning of attending the opening of the Office of the City of New York in Washington, D.C., at 1730 K Street NW.

This is a major step forward for urban areas, a first of its kind, and acknowledges the fact, long honored only by sufferance, that the activities of this Congress and of the agencies of the Federal Government have a major significance in the future of urban centers.

Not until the election of a former Member of this House, my predecessor, the Honorable John V. Lindsay, as mayor, however, did New York City accept this obvious fact.

Mayor Lindsay is to be commended on his perspicacity.

Members of the Congress from New York City attending the opening included: Senator Jacob K. Javits, and Congressmen Joseph P. Addabbo, Jonathan B. Bingham, Leonard Farbstein, Seymour Halpern, Eugene J. Keogh, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, and James H. Scheuer.

I set forth here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the announcement by Mayor Lindsay of the opening of the New York City office in Washington, D.C., and his statement with respect thereto.

Office of Mayor John V. Lindsay, City Hall,
New York City

Mayor John V. Lindsay today officiated at the opening of New York City's Washington office.

Members of the New York City Congressional delegation were expected to attend the opening at 9 A.M. Both New York Senators were also invited.

The four-room office is located at 1730 "K" Street, N.W. The Mayor said its purpose was to develop "an effective working relationship between the City and the Federal Government in matters of common interest."

In announcing the office opening, Mayor Lindsay said, "We are in sight of a new era—an era of urban renaissance which can be brought about through the joint efforts of the Federal Government and the Cities. But this new era will not occur automatically."

"Cities must fully understand and learn to work with Federal programs and the Federal Government must fully appreciate and learn to work with the problems of the Cities.

"In view of the fiscal straight-jacket in which regions like the New York City area today find themselves, it is essential that we do all we can to make maximum use of available resources. The establishment of a New York City office here in Washington will do much to achieve this end."

Mayor Lindsay outlined the functions of the City's Washington office as follows:

1. To serve as a liaison office between the City and Federal Agencies.
2. To coordinate the City's dealings with the Federal Government in order to take maximum advantage of Federal programs.
3. To assure that the Federal Government is kept informed of the problems, needs, and views of the City.
4. To keep the City fully informed of relevant Federal legislative and administrative developments.
5. To formulate necessary legislative proposals.

The Mayor also announced that he had asked Murray Drabkin, a long-time associate, to set up the office and to get it under way.

Mr. Drabkin, a lawyer, has had extensive experience in Washington, where he served as counsel to the House Committee on the Judiciary. More recently, as Mayor Lindsay's Special Consultant on Tax Policy, Mr. Drabkin was chiefly responsible for formulating the Mayor's overhaul of the City's tax system.

Miss Marian G. Clow, former administrative secretary to the Mayor when he was a Congressman in Washington, will serve as office manager of the New York City office in Washington.

Mayor Lindsay was present at the opening of the office and later gave a talk at the Sheraton-Park Hotel analyzing his approach to the problems of Federal-city relationships.

This address is here set forth in full.

Text of Remarks by Mayor John V. Lindsay at International Platform Association, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1966

I'm in Washington this morning for two purposes: To address this gathering and to open the first full-time, professionally-staffed office in Washington for the representation of New York City. The major purposes of the office are to provide New York City timely, continuing information about legislative programs and executive actions; to pursue City applications for Federal assistance and to maintain closer liaison with the New York City Congressional delegation, and, for that matter, all delegations.

The office has a name, a street address, desks, letterheads and a telephone number. The office, however, symbolizes much more than what may seem to be a pressure group working in behalf of the nation's largest city; the office stands for a conscious, reasoned objective of New York:

It is to achieve a creative federalism—one which operates vertically as well as horizontally. Heretofore, federalism has been interpreted as a division of powers and a separation of functions at the highest level, which is to say, the Federal level.

Our belief is that the cities are not wards of the Federal government, that they neither seek nor appreciate the hand-me-down status that is sometimes assigned to them, and that the stronger the relationship between those of us who serve the nation and those of us who serve its political subdivisions, the better the principles of Federalism will be fulfilled.

I should like to document that somewhat generalized viewpoint with specific examples of what New York City now is doing to simplify, to expedite and to solidify its relationship with the Federal Government.

First, we are consolidating over 50 municipal departments and agencies under twelve administrations. The Federal Government operates with 11 cabinet-level departments; we intend to operate New York City in much the same way.

Early this month, for example, we established an Administration of Health Services. It brings together under one command our 21 municipal hospitals, our nurses, our research staff, and all of the City's programs directed toward the protection of New Yorkers against illness and disease.

On the face of it, an apparently simple administrative reorganization is less than exciting. The realignment, however, has been termed by Dr. Howard Rusk as "a milestone." He said of the new Administrator, Dr. Howard J. Brown: "He is a magnificent choice to chart the new courses in administrative procedures and patient-centered philosophy . . . With the help and understanding of all New Yorkers a new era of health services in New York City should emerge."

We also have consolidated the City's budgeting and bookkeeping under one head, the Administrator of Finance. It is his assignment to coordinate the preparation of the budget, the collection of revenues, the assessment of taxes, and other City fiscal responsibilities.

We are bringing together under a single Administration of Human Resources those City programs concerned with what I believe to be New York City's greatest single problem: The plight of the poor. Under this administration, a top executive will be charged with the formulation and the execution of programs and policies concerned with welfare, the anti-poverty program, youth work, and job development.

I think that in some respects our plans surpass the functioning consolidation achieved on a Federal level. For example, we are establishing a transportation administration to correlate the movement of people and goods within New York City, which involves a stoplight in a residential neighborhood as well as the construction of a new subway tube beneath the East River. The Federal Government has not yet given transportation departmental status. I would predict, however, as such interstate transportation problems as jet airplane noises and the abandonment of passenger service are magnified, that Federal Government will be compelled to give transportation an equal voice at the cabinet table with other departments.

Second, we in New York have conscientiously sought out men and women with an interstate or national viewpoint for positions in this administration. We feel this is valuable because in our developing relations with the state and Federal governments—relations which will to a large degree dictate the eventual ability of New York and other cities to meet the difficulties and travails imposed upon every urban center.

Accordingly, we have been able to recruit to New York City many prestigious staff members:

J. Lee Rankin, former Solicitor General of the United States, is serving as the City's Corporation Counsel;

Howard R. Leary, former Police Commissioner in Philadelphia now directs New York's 28,000-man police force;

Austin Heller, formerly with the Air Pollution Division of the United States Public Health Service in Cincinnati, is our new Commissioner of Air Pollution;

The City's Transportation Administrator is Arthur Palmer, who once served as Assistant General Counsel of the Lend Lease Administration;

Dr. Efren Ramirez, who achieved remarkable successes in the treatment of drug addicts in Puerto Rico, has joined the City as our Narcotics Coordinator;

The new Chairman of the Housing and Redevelopment Board is Jason R. Nathan, a former regional director of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration;

George F. McGrath, the well-known Commissioner of Correction for the State of Massachusetts, is serving in a similar capacity in New York;

My chief advisor on the reorganization and reform of the City's archaic and insufficient tax structure was Murray Drabkin. Mr. Drabkin was Chief Counsel for a sub-committee of the House Judiciary Committee that wrote an extensive report on state and local taxation policies. He will direct the Washington office we opened this morning.

In addition, New York City has been served in a consultant capacity by Mitchell Sviridoff, the nationally-respected expert on social problems from New Haven, Connecticut, and Edward Logue, who in Boston created a fresh, humanitarian approach to the development of more handsome, more constructive neighborhoods within the City.

It is common knowledge in Washington that my administration has called upon the Bureau of the Budget for both advice and talent.

We have borrowed from the Federal Government in other areas. Our Department of Purchase has been given enomously helpful advice from its federal counterpart, the Supply Service of the General Services Administration. As a result, we are buying more cheaply, and we are making better use of warehouse space. The Department also has established a motor pool based on the G.S.A. policies for the assignment of motor vehicles to government officials and employees.

Perhaps every mayor who has addressed a Washington audience has devoted a portion of his talk to a plea for greater Federal assistance in the solution of the varied and manifest problems he confronts. I shall not be an exception.

First, however, I think it proper to take note of the Federal Government's increasing interest in cities—most importantly, the creation of the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Medicare, specifically, is important to New York. Heretofore, New York City has carried the full burden of providing medical and hospital care for the aged who could not afford private treatment or hospital care. Medicare is relieving New York and other cities of a great portion of that burden. In the wake of the passage of the Medicare Act last year, many states have undertaken supplementary plans, one of the most ambitious being the "Medicaid" program in New York State. Medicaid will provide state financing to those unable to afford private health services regardless of age. Inasmuch as New York City this fiscal year is spending in excess of $550 million on hospitals and health services, State and Federal assistance is welcome. It is sensibly directed toward the needs of the cities, where a great majority of the indigent are living.

As I said, mayors who come to Washington customarily pack with them a standardized appeal for additional financial help. I won't belabor this gathering with a repetitive recital of these entreaties. I should say, however, on behalf of myself and other mayors, that we believe Federal assistance should be more directly allocated to the cities. Our reasoning is not complex; it is based upon the undisputed statistic that two of three Americans live in or around a city and the percentage is growing daily. In other words, when we speak of the Federal Government's responsibility to its citizens, we in effect are talking about those who live in our urban centers.

Yet the stated goals of our national government often seem to run contrary to the clear and uncontradicted needs of our urban society. All of us are conversant with those needs—the need for better schools, the need for safety in the streets and in the parks, the need for livable housing, the need for modern transportation systems, the need for available, reliable medical care.

Almost all of these needs arise from a single source. That source is poverty. It is mystifying that Congress did not approve a supplementary appropriation of $250 million in the Anti-Poverty Program for the last fiscal year—an increase which I urged the Congress to approve on behalf of the National Conference of Mayors. The United States spends more than $7 billion a year on agriculture, it has programmed upwards of $20 billion to explore the moon, and Defense Department spending approaches $60 billion a year. The same Federal budget provides only token funding for The President's Demonstration Cities Act.

As the astute Washington correspondent of the New York Times, James Reston, has noted:

> ". . . a Great Society . . . could, the way things are going, end up first in peace, first on the moon and last in the big American city slums."

I should make it clear in this rather somber report that we in the cities do not seek a dole. We realize that a search for individual self-sufficiency should precede any justifiable requests for aid.

New York City has done so. We realistically evaluated our financial capabilities this year. We found them wanting. Consequently, we developed and fought for a tax reorganization program we believe will equip the City with the money to cope with the many demands which a progressive City government must meet.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the tax program is an income tax on New York City residents and earnings tax on non-residents who work in the City. The tax on commuters goes beyond the simple mechanism of deriving from those who earn their livelihoods in the City some contribution toward the maintenance of that City; it represents governmental acceptance of the fact that the health of a metropolitan city and the well-being of its surrounding communities—although they may be in other states—are interdependent.

New York City has been the heart, the stimulus, the lifeline of the region surrounding it. It can continue in that role only if a viable relationship is achieved with its jurisdictional satellites. At the National Conference of Mayors in Dallas, no other subject was discussed more in the corridors than regionalism—the struggle of the central cities to maintain an identity while afflicted with a disproportionate share of the social, economic and physical adversities of an entire urban region.

The agreement on a city and state level to require commuters to pay a relatively small but needed tax to the core city represents a breakthrough. In transportation, in housing, in parks, the cities and suburbs must find newer, cooperative ways to serve not the residents of a singular jurisdiction, but all of the people who make up a metropolitan complex.

In this development we must have the encouragement, the direction and the financial assistance only the Federal government can give. For in many cases only the Federal government can resolve the individual conflicts which bar the way to the solution of common problems. This is not to say that the cities must of necessity surrender their initiative or their prerogatives to the Federal government; it is a recognition that New York City cannot combat air pollution arising from New Jersey . . . that Connecticut cannot unclog the traffic arteries into Manhattan . . . that it is unfair that a Negro child grow up in a ghetto, and that in many ways it is unfair that a child grow up in an all-white, well-to-do, amorphous environment.

Pessimists predicted that New York City may become a vast ghetto. I do not believe it. Historically, New York has welcomed everyone. That welcome has not been circumscribed by an intolerance based in jealousy or fear. New York, as the first point of entry to the United States, has taken in the Dutch, the Germans, the Irish, the Italians, the Poles, the Chinese, the Jews, the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans.

Our attitude has always been: This is the City. Make of it what you will. It is up to you.

That spirit has given New York an eclectric, dynamic composition which has been achieved by no other city. It has made New York the greatest city in the world—at once the most frustrating and intoxicating.

In a single phrase, New Yorkers have learned to live together under the most arduous and abrasive circumstances. We have not only managed, we have thrived; we always have been able to overcome the enormous difficulties which an open and free city of 8 million people unavoidably imposes upon itself.

In concluding, I return to the past for a prediction of what lies in the future, for anything I might forecast for New York was said long ago by Aristotle:

> "It is plain that the State is not merely determined by community of place and by the exchange of mutual protection from harm of good offices. These things must, indeed exist, if there is to be a city, yet the existence of all of them does not at once constitute a State; there must be, both in households and in families, a sharing of the good life, in a form at once complete and self-sufficient."

Thank you.

My colleagues should know, especially those from urban areas but not limited thereto, that New York City will welcome your visit to its office in Washington, D.C., and we all look forward to working together in the interest of greater more viable cities.

WHO'S RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MONEY SQUEEZE?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schneebeli] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment from Mr. M. J. Rossant in the July 18 edition of the New York Times deserves broad readership and wide circulation.

Who's Responsible for the Money Squeeze?

(By M. J. Rossant)

Democrats in Congress are finally beginning to express their uneasiness over the high cost and growing scarcity of credit. Their grumbling comes as no surprise. The party of Andrew Jackson and William Jennings Bryan, Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy has traditionally opposed tight money and high interest rates.

Credit was cheaper and more readily available in 1960, when Senator Kennedy was campaigning for the Presidency. He made a key issue of "dear money," calling interest rates damagingly high and warning that he would not tolerate a credit policy that discriminated against small business, homebuilders and farmers. And the 1964 Democratic platform boasted of ending the "high interest, tight money" policies of the Republicans and stressed "the importance of low interest rates" in assuring prosperity.

In the current monetary squeeze—the tightest in a generation—the Democrats must speak softly. After all, the squeeze is taking place with one of their own in the White House. So they are muting their criticism, while deflecting its aim.

Representatives Wright Patman, the most vocal and persistent advocate of easy money in Congress, has led the way by trying to pin the blame on the Eisenhower Administration, which he claims is responsible because it permitted the Federal Reserve System to pursue an independent monetary policy. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler has followed up by pointing to the independent action taken last December by the Federal Reserve, which he charges touched off the escalation in interest rates.

SNIPING AT THE SPOILSPORT

Sniping at the Federal Reserve comes naturally to Democrats. As the agency charged with maintaining the stability of the dollar, it has to play the role of spoilsport, taking unpopular decisions that make it an inviting and vulnerable target. But there are few objective observers who would side with Representative Patman and Secretary Fowler in accusing the Federal Reserve of really being the villain of the piece.

To be sure, the Federal Reserve has applied the credit brakes. Ever since last December it has sought to curb inflation at home and protect the dollar abroad. But it has pressed down slowly and reluctantly.

Earlier in the year, Federal Reserve officials made clear that they wanted tighter credit reinforced by tax increases. They argued that resort to fiscal policy (taxation) would have slowed demands, while relying on monetary policy (interest rates) to curb the supply of credit was more suitable for an economy operating close to its limits of capacity. Tax increases also would have helped avert the current financial distortions and convulsions.

Their plea and others like them went unheeded. Even though the Administration has hailed flexible fiscal policy as the key weapon for influencing the economy, equally valuable for stimulating or restraining activity, it hemmed and hawed about raising taxes as inflationary pressures mounted. The Administration ended up doing very little, which meant the Federal Reserve had to do most.

The fact is that the little that the Administration did do in the fiscal area has served mainly to make the credit squeeze worse. Its speedup in the collection of corporate income taxes and its initiation of a graduated withholding system for individuals, which added to the Government's tax take without reduction corporate or individual incomes, added to the already ebullient demand for credit. And its sales of participations in Government loans has contributed to the strong upward pressure on interest rates.

Interest rates would have climbed and credit become scarcer even if taxes had been raised. But the violent nature of the escalation, which has led to severe strains on commercial banks, on savings and loan associations, and on the home building industry and may painfully affect the whole economy, could have been avoided.

LEAP-FROGGING RATES

Failure to make use of fiscal policy has also handicapped the effort to reduce the deficit in the nation's balance of payments.

Washington had hoped to close the gap between rates in the United States and Europe. But so long as the United States depends on high interest rates, Europe follows suit.

The Administration's approach does not invalidate the "new economics." It is the Administration's new economists, and President Johnson himself, who have ignored its precepts. The Democrats can rally around, indicting the Federal Reserve and charging that Wall Street bankers are conspiring against the farmer and the small businessman, but they will have trouble convincing anyone that Mr. Johnson is a supine and innocent victim of events. A tightening of credit was made inevitable by the increased spending on Vietnam; but the Administration has only itself to blame for the extreme—and potentially dangerous—monetary tightness that the Democrats are complaining about.

DRUM CORPS WEEK

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schneebeli] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in these long and hot summer months, Americans everywhere in this great land of ours, will pause to listen once again to the Nation's drum corps, beating out that old familiar rhythm.

Their sound is not a new one in our history; it began when a drummer boy beat the "call to arms" on Lexington Common. We heard it again at Valley Forge, the bloody battlefields of Gettysburg, and its spirit resounded over the trenches of World War I and World War II, the rocky terrain of Korea and now in the jungles of South Vietnam.

Let us all now pay tribute to our Nation's youth engaged in this fine activity. Arrayed in their gaily colored uniforms, marching across America, they truly represent our heritage and our future. They are the pulse beat of America.

The week of August 20–27 is being observed this year as National Drum Corps Week.

HOW THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FEEL ON CURRENT PROBLEMS

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Curtin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentelman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel there may be some interest in the results of an opinion poll which I have just concluded in my congressional district. Annually, I attempt to place a questionnaire in every home in Bucks and Lehigh Counties and the returned results from this year have just been officially tabulated by a data computing company. I hope that this may be of general interest due to the fact that Bucks and Lehigh Counties make up a very diversified congressional district. The questions and the answers to the said poll are as follows:

1. With the deepening involvement of the U.S. in Vietnam, what do you think our country should do in this Southeast Asia conflict?

(a) Withdraw all U.S. forces from South Vietnam? No answer, 39.4 percent. Yes, 24.1 percent. No, 36.5 percent.

(b) Step up our military activity there? No answer, 44.9 per cent. Yes, 38.1 percent. No, 17 percent.

(c) Keep ground forces at present strength but accelerate use of air and sea power? No answer, 43.5 percent. Yes, 43.8 percent. No, 12.7 percent.

(d) Withdraw to more easily defended coastal area? No answer, 56 percent. Yes, 8.8 percent. No, 35.2 percent.

2. There is growing talk in certain Washington quarters to pursue a more conciliatory policy toward Red China. Do you favor this? No answer, 5.5 percent. Yes, 35.9 percent. No, 58.6 percent.

3. Do you support the Administration's goal of expanding our commercial trade with Russia and other European Communist Nations? No answer, 4.2 percent. Yes, 46.7 percent. No, 49.1 percent.

4. President Johnson has expounded his belief that key elements of the Great Society program should be extended to certain other countries—things like health, education, welfare benefits, etc. Do you share this view? No answer, 5.6 percent. Yes, 20.6 percent. No, 73.8 percent.

5. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage of $1.25 per hour to:

(a) $1.40 an hour, 38.1 percent.
(b) $1.60 an hour, 22.6 percent.
(c) $2 an hour, 8.2 percent.
No answer, 31.1 percent.

6. Do you favor extending the minimum wage to farm labor? No answer, 5.4 percent. Yes, 64.4 percent. No, 30.2 percent.

7. How do you feel about Federal legislation that would impose stricter controls against strikes deemed contrary to the public interest, such as in transportation, public utilities, etc. No answer, 4.6 percent. Favor, 58.7 percent. Do not favor, 36.7 percent.

8. Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act—commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Law—continues to be a controversial subject. How do you feel about repealing this Section 14(b), the so-called "Right-to-Work" law? No answer, 9.8 percent. Favor, 28.3 percent. Do not favor, 61.9 percent.

9. The President wants a constitutional amendment that would increase terms of Members of Congress from the present 2 years to a new term of 4 years. How do you feel about this? No answer, 3.9 percent. Yes, 49.4 percent. No. 46.7 percent.

10. There is legislation proposed to allow the several states to have one House of its State Legislature apportioned within certain limits on some basis other than strictly population, if a majority of the people of any State so express themselves. Are you in favor of Congress passing such a law? No answer, 11.7 percent. Yes, 45.1 percent. No, 43.2 percent.

11. Do you favor the Administration's proposal to have taxpayers subsidize rental supplements to low-income families? No answer, 3.8 percent. Yes, 15.1 percent. No, 81.1 percent.

12. How do you feel about the continued support of farm prices by the Federal Treasury? No answer, 6.7 percent. Favor, 24.6 percent. Do not favor, 68.7 percent.

13. What is your view on the allocation of money for our space program aimed at landing a man on the moon?

(a) Should continue spending for space at present levels, 43.6 percent.

(b) Should increase spending, 13.7 percent.

(c) Should decrease spending, 8.8 percent.
No answer, 33.9 percent.

14. Are you in favor of legislation that would have the Federal government set standards for States regarding the length and amount of benefit payments for unemployment compensation? No answer, 5 percent. Yes, 28.8 percent. No, 66.2 percent.

15. Foreign aid, so-called, continues to cost several billions of dollars each fiscal year. Do you believe this program should:

(a) Continue at present cost levels? No answer, 49.7 percent. Yes, 15.1 percent. No, 35.2 percent.

(b) Be expanded? No answer, 54.8 percent. Yes, 6.4 percent. No, 38.8 percent.

(c) Be lessened? No answer, 14.9 percent. Yes, 74.3 percent. No, 10.8 percent.

16. Should tax credits be allowed to parents of college students for some portion of the cost of their education? No answer, 3.7 percent. Yes, 71.3 percent. No, 25 percent.

17. There is growing concern about the threat of inflation. Do you think steps should be taken to combat this danger by:

(a) Increasing taxes? No answer, 45 percent. Yes, 11.8 percent. No, 43.2 percent.

(b) Cutting down on Federal spending? No answer, 14.2 percent. Yes, 77.2 percent. No, 8.6 percent.

(c) Enforce stricter Government authority to regulate wages and prices? No answer, 34.1 percent. Yes, 33.8 percent. No, 32.1 percent.

18. The President's objectives in domestic legislation and administrative goals have been generally termed "The Great Society" program. Do you favor these Great Society aims, generally speaking? No answer, 7 percent. Yes, 32.7 percent. No, 60.3 percent.

19. The Federal Reserve Board is one of the relatively few Federal agencies that is virtually independent of any controls imposed by the Executive and Legislative branches of government. Its policies on interest rates, etc., occasionally create a demand for less independence. Do you think the Board should be brought under more restraint by other branches of government? No answer, 10 percent. Yes, 27.9 percent. No, 62.1 percent.

20. Do you feel that domestic "Great Society" programs should be curtailed during the period of large costs for military expenditures made necessary by the Vietnam situation? No answer, 5.8 percent. Yes, 72.1 percent. No, 22.1 percent.

AUTOMATIC SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASES

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide automatic increases in social security benefits whenever the consumer price index has risen 3 percent or more since the date of the last increase. This proposal is patterned after similar "escalator provisions" contained in the civil service pension and military retirement laws. These provisions are also very prevalent in labor agreements.

As soon as possible after the beginning of each calendar quarter, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to determine the amount by which the average consumer price index during the preceding calendar quarter exceeds the average consumer price index during the base period. If the average consumer price index has increased 3 percent or more over the base, period, social security benefits will be increased by a corresponding amount.

The first base period established by my bill is the calendar quarter that commenced July 1, 1965. After each increase granted under the provisions of my bill, a new base period is established, consisting of the calendar quarter on which the increase was based.

The increases in benefits are effective for months beginning after the calendar quarter during which the Secretary determines that an increase is required.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has always been guided by the philosophy that when the cost of living increases significantly, social security benefits should be raised. Congress has periodically increased benefits through the years to maintain the purchasing power of social security beneficiaries. In view of the increasing congressional workload and to insure prompt adjustment of benefits, I propose that Congress provide for these periodic increases through an "escalator provision," such as we have already provided in the civil service and military retirement laws.

Actuaries for the social security trust fund have advised us that the revenue received from the social security tax increase in relation to increases in the wage structure and the cost of living. Therefore automatic increases in the social security benefits can be provided by law without the necessity of amending the tax structure. No additional financing is required.

Increases in the cost of living create a special hardship for our retired elderly citizens who are living on a small fixed pension. During the period from 1958 until 1965, the Consumer Price Index increased over 8 percentage points. The cost of services, which elderly people are more likely to need than our younger citizens, increased over 16 percentage points. When services exclusive of rent are considered, services increased 18 percentage points. Yet, during this 7-year period, social security beneficiaries received no increase in social security benefits.

This administration must bear the responsibility for the plight of our older citizens during these years. While inflation robbed our social security beneficiaries of a decent standard of living, this administration prevented a benefit increase by insisting that any increase be delayed until the medicare program could be enacted. If the social security laws had contained an "escalator provision" such as I am now proposing, this delay would have been avoided.

The Republican coordinating committee, recognizing the hardship imposed on our elderly by the rising cost of living, recently recommended that the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Act be amended to provide automatic cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable. I am introducing this bill to carry out the recommendations of the coordinating committee in regard to social security.

Mr. Speaker, with the increasing workload Congress is encountering in recent years, it would be sound procedure to enact an escalator clause in the social security law, thus relieving the Congress of the necessity of periodic action. For reasons of sound administration and individual equity to our social security beneficiaries, I urge prompt enactment of this measure.

SLANTED REPORTING—EXAMPLE NO. 2: NEW YORK TIMES REPORT SHOWS BIAS IN STORY ON HOUSE FOREIGN AID VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, page 12188 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I took the Washington Post to task for its biased reporting on the Narcotic Addicts Rehabilitation Act. In a supposedly straight news story it characterized passage of an amendment sponsored by Republicans as having weakened the bill. In the opinion of the majority, the amendment strengthened the bill and strengthened the war against dope peddlers. At the very least, the subject is open to debate. While the newspaper is entitled to its opinion on the effect of the amendment, my point was, and is, that it ought not to intrude these opinions in its news columns. They belong solely on the editorial page.

Now I find the same offense in the news coverage by the New York Times of the House passage of the foreign aid bill last week. In the Friday edition of July 15, Reporter Felix Belair, Jr., begins his report of the House action thus:

> By a margin of only two votes, the House of Representatives averted today a crippling blow to the $4.1 billion foreign aid authorization bill.

This so-called crippling blow was in fact the Republican amendment to cut this large authorization bill by $250 million and provide for continued annual review of the foreign aid program. Far from crippling the program, this makes eminent sense and I dare say that the annual review provision will be retained before congressional action is complete. Be that as it may, there is a considerable body of expert opinion that believes the amendment is a good one and should have prevailed.

I know that the New York Times does not agree with this position and that it belongs to another considerable body of opinion which advocates authorization for periods greater than 1 year.

My point again is that this is debatable; the paper is entitled to take a position and fight for it—but not in the news columns on which the public relies for an unbiased, uncolored, unslanted account of what actually transpired on the floor of the House.

To put highly opinionated adjectives in the body of straight news stories is just bad reporting and, when repeated, gravely undermines the value of the particular publication as a reliable source of factual material.

I shall continue to comment on these practices as long as they occur and I find them. I do not mind arguing the merits of an issue or having my own position criticized. All I ask is straight coverage and a freedom of prejudice in news reporting, which is supposed to convey the news, not mold it.

The article referred to follows:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1966]

HOUSE VOTES AID MEASURE, REJECTING CURB BY 2 VOTES

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 14.—By a margin of only two votes, the House of Representatives averted today a crippling blow to the $4.1-billion foreign aid authorization bill. The vote was 193 to 191 on a Republican-sponsored motion to reduce the two-year authorization to a single year and to trim $250-million from the $1-billion ceiling on long-term loans for economic development.

The deftly contrived counterattack came just before the 237-to-146 vote for final passage and after a smoothly functioning Democratic majority had cut down a series of efforts by individual Republican members to scrap the multi-year features of the bill and to cut major economic aid categories.

The Administration had asked for a five-year authorization of "such amounts as may be necessary" for both economic and military assistance programs.

It proposed an actual appropriation for the current fiscal year of $3.4-billion, including $2.4-billion for economic aid and $917-million for military assistance.

The Foreign Affairs Committee balked at the "blank check" approach and wrote into the bill specific ceilings for all aid categories. All categories were authorized for two years for the first time in the aid program's history, except for development loan funds and the Alliance for Progress with Latin American countries.

Both of these programs were authorized for a period of five years on the ground that this would provide greater incentive for self-help and economic reforms by recipient governments than would a single year's commitment by the United States.

Before bringing the authorization measure to the floor, however, the committee cut the Administration's asking figure for development lending from $1.25-billion to $1-billion in each year. It left untouched the Administration's request for an $850-million authorization for the Alliance for Progress.

It was the committee's decision on a two-year authorization for all categories other than development lending, including military aid, that almost proved its undoing.

Four Republicans voted with the Democrats against the motion to recommit the bill. They were former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN of Massachusetts, OGDEN R. REID of Westchester, SILVIO B. CONTE of Massachusetts and STANLEY W. TUPPER of Maine.

ROUTINE PASSAGE EXPECTED

Throughout the afternoon it appeared that the bill was headed for routine passage. There was only desultory debate of restrictive amendments and all were rejected by comfortable margins.

On the first amendment reached—an attempt to shorten the period of development loans from 40 to 25 years and the present 10-year grace period to five—by Representative GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat of Texas, was beaten 52 to 32.

Then Representative E. Ross Adair, Republican of Indiana, who engineered the ultimate motion to recommit, was beaten, 63 to 35, on a proposal to cut the development loans to $750-million and the authorization period to three years.

Then Representative H. A. Gross, Republican of Iowa, opened an attack on "these chiseling foreigners" who were able to borrow under the aid program for 40 years at 2½ per cent, including a 10-year grade period at 1 per cent, "while good American citizens wanting to build a house have to pay 6 or 7 per cent for their financing."

The Iowan proposed that the grace period for development loans be eliminated completely and the interest rate increased to the average annual rate on all outstanding obligations of the United States Government, about 4⅜ per cent. His proposal was shouted down and there was no demand for a standing division.

With the House sitting at this stage as a legislative committee, there were no record votes, and usually fewer than a hundred members participated.

When the big test came, Democratic leaders rushed about to round up straggling supporters from offices and homes.

The effect the ensuing "near miss" will have on the conference negotiations between the House and Senate was conjectural, but it can only weaken the position of the managers for the House.

The Senate takes up its own version of the legislation next week. It extends all programs for a single year and is loaded with administrative as well as policy restrictions.

RESPONSIBLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently, to illustrate the wealth of reliable information available from the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, I inserted in the Record the views of two professors of political science regarding the work of these two investigative committees.

On April 28 of this year there appeared in the Record an article by Prof. Kenneth Colegrove, of C. W. Post College of Long Island University, entitled "The Use of Congressional Committee Materials." Dealing primarily with the above-mentioned committees, Dr. Colegrove stated:

> An honest appraisal of the committee reports will show that they fully meet the canons of scientific method in the social sciences. In fact, the committee reports are deliberately prepared in conformity with the canons of modern scientific method. The research staffs of the committees do not engage in name calling, card stacking, question begging, glittering generalizations, and other propaganda tricks. On the contrary, the research staffs of the committees employ approved standards of research in testing the creditability of evidence, in the verification of sources, in the analysis of data, and in the formulation of conclusions.

Later, on July 11, I placed in the Congressional Record remarks by Prof. Benjamin E. Lippincott, of the University of Minnesota, from his book, "Democracy's Dilemma, the Totalitarian Party in a Free Society." Dr. Lippincott's book was favorably reviewed in the Washington Post by one of his former students, Vice President Hubert Humphrey. Commenting on source materials provided by the two committees, Dr. Lippincott observed:

> The author approached, at the outset of this study, the hearings and the reports of the Congressional investigating committees with considerable misgivings, but was surprised to find a wealth of data that was most useful in understanding Communist activity, personnel, and organization in the United States. These sources, obviously, must be used with discrimination but anyone who is knowledgeable with respect to the Communist movement, especially if he has had direct experience with it, will find the reports and hearings richly rewarding.

More recent appraisals of the current work being done by the House Committee on Un-American Activities was forthcoming today when the committee began hearings on legislation designed to curb the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other terrorist organizations. Over a period of 13 months information on the Klans was gathered through field investigations and by means of 36 days of hearings in which 187 witnesses appeared and in which a transcript of over 4,000 pages was compiled. The first witness to testify today on proposed legislation, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, declared in part:

> Terrorism and intimidation are an intolerable affront to the spirit and meaning of our democratic system. Though the Ku Klux Klan no longer has as pervasive and malignant an influence as it once did, we have found that it still possesses considerable and in some areas growing strength. Its activities remain a serious blight and threat.
>
> This Committee has clearly revealed a number of vital facts.
>
> That the strength of Klan membership is well above the common estimates;
>
> That Klans have frequently employed deceptive "cover" arrangements to conceal existence of their Klaverns and bank accounts;
>
> That many Klan officers and members have criminal records; the involvement of the Klan in several brutal killings such as that of Mrs. Liuzzo is clear;
>
> That within the Klan there are a number of secret organizations formed for the express purpose of carrying out acts of terrorism and violence;
>
> That generally members of the Klan have easy access to a variety of weapons and to training in their use, that Klan members purchase weapons from other Klan members licensed as gun dealers and that citizen band radios are often used by the Klan for communication purposes.
>
> Mr. Chairman, you and your colleagues have brought to public scrutiny a compelling and disturbing account of organized terrorist activity.
>
> The facts you have developed in your hearings have had the closest attention of my department. In drafting Title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1966, which seeks to deal with terror and violence, we have been conscious of your work and your findings. The Department of Justice has drawn much benefit from these searching hearings and has been pleased to cooperate. From the Committee's efforts the public now has a much fuller awareness of the structure and activities of the Klan.
>
> As presiding officer, you have, Mr. Chairman, set an example both by your courage and the judiciousness of your approach. May I observe that you and the Committee have shown a full concern for due process and rules of fairness in the hearings. The Department of Justice had your complete cooperation in not prejudicing the rights of any individuals in pending criminal prosecutions.

In addition to the statement by the Attorney General, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman Emanuel Celler, requested that his letter to Chairman Willis of the House Committee on Un-American Activities regarding the hearings on the Ku Klux Klan be made a part of the record of the hearings. His letter follows:

House of Representatives,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C. July 19, 1966.

Hon. Edwin E. Willis,
Chairman, Un-American Activities Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am addressing this letter to you trusting that you will see fit to introduce this into the record of the hearings on H.R. 15678, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

I followed most carefully this Committee's investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. I did so because many had expressed to me misgivings about the purposes of the Committee on Un-American Activities and had questioned its objectivity. Indeed, many had asked me as Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to undertake these investigations because of their misgivings of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Having spoken to you prior to the commencement of these hearings, I had no hesitancy in advising those with whom I spoke of my conviction that the hearings would be thorough, productive, and objective. I am more than pleased to be able to say that my conviction was completely justified. When the record is printed, this country will be supplied with authoritative information on the who and what and how of the Ku Klux Klan, and with this record no individual can absolve himself by saying he did not know of the Klan's terroristic activities and the degree of hatred and violence for which it stands.

The sincerity of this Committee and its wish to reach at this evil are now firmly established.

Sincerely yours,
Emanuel Celler,
Chairman.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rostenkowski). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain extraneous material and certain resolutions, immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks and the extraneous material that I shall introduce, that certain Members be permitted to include their remarks, together with extraneous material, following this same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years it has been my privilege to lead the Captive Nations Week observance here in the House of Representatives. Invariably, year after year, many have asked me: "Why Captive Nations Week?" My answer to this question has not required too much revision over these years. And it is this that I wish to discuss for our own clarification about the Achilles Heel of the totalitarian Red empire and, I might say, for the necessary edification of uncounted fellow citizens.

The answer to the recurring question is a multiple one. We observe Captive Nations Week because it is legally provided for in Public Law 86–90. Moreover, the week is a tremendous moral symbol signifying that we Americans will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their permanent captivity.

It also concentrates on our nuclear spiritual weapons, offering the most powerful paramilitary deterrent against overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression in Europe, the Middle East, or Asia.

Furthermore, it is a stimulating and effective educational medium about all the captive nations, Sino-Russian imperiocolonialism, and the cold war.

The week also affords a countrywide forum for the discussion of issues affecting our national interest and security. And, finally, it consistently leads to the crystallization and advocacy of concrete measures of action. These reasons constitute, in essence, the answer to the question: Why Captive Nations Week?

THE FAMILY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

As all of you know, it was with ample cause that Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution. For the first time our Government recognized the existence of all the captive nations, meaning the majority of them in the Soviet Union and in Asia. In effect, it recognized the crucial fact that the threat confronting the free world did not emerge in 1940 or in 1947, but had originated in 1917–18 with the first conquests by Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. By this act Congress also recognized communism as an instrument, a tool of ideologic deception which this force exploits in part for its takeovers of free and independent states.

A TOWERING MORAL SYMBOL

All of us should recall the words of President Kennedy:

> This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations.

On the basis of the resolution, it is not only those behind the Iron Curtain but also the captive nations behind the Bamboo and Sugar Curtains that we must support in the cause of freedom.

Anyone who has followed closely Moscow's deceptive "peaceful coexistence" policy over the past 10 years cannot but be impressed by one of its chief goals, namely, our acquiescence to the permanence of the Red empire. It has pursued this goal so successfully that many in the free world talk as though Poland were independent, Kadar a popular hero of the Hungarian people, Ho Chi Minh a George Washington of Vietnam, and the U.S.S.R. a rapidly capitalist-bound "nation." One of the main obstructions to the free generation of these and other myths has been the Captive Nations Week observance, which Moscow and some in this country seek to eliminate

It has been known for a long time that Moscow, Peking, and their respective underlings have vehemently opposed the week and have worked toward its abolition. However, President Johnson stated explicitly in his 1965 Captive Nations Week proclamation that:

> The United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity.

This means toward all the captive nations—in central Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia, and Cuba. Despite the propaganda and diplomatic pressures of the Communist regimes, we will stand pat on these principles.

My friends, the week is also a massive expression of what some have called our nuclear spiritual weapons. The first theme of the 1966 Captive Nations Week observance is "Peace With Justice and Freedom." An observed concentration on all of the captive nations serves this primary goal more than any other nonmilitary action, including even the economic. If one views the captive nations in toto, approximating 1 billion people, he can then begin to appreciate the source of insecurity and threat they represent for the various totalitarian regimes in the Red empire.

POWERFUL DETERRENT AGAINST GLOBAL WAR

It is no exaggeration that the captive nations in toto, in the aggregate, constitute our most powerful paramilitary deterrent against open Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and thus a hot, global war. A psychopolitical concentration on all of the captive nations would mean a grave deepening of the insecurity of all the totalitarian regimes in the empire and also a long stride toward the avoidance of a worldwide conflagration. But it would also be a major strike for justice and freedom. We have not even really begun to take up the challenge of the Red cold war as concerns the terrain of the Red empire. Unstinted and methodical support of the continuous pressures for freedom in that empire would result in a complete hopelessness of so-called Socialist and potential Communist management that in time a genuine revolution for freedom and national independence would inevitably spread from the Danube to the Pacific. Moreover, it would greatly undermine the subversive cold war operations of Moscow and Peking in the free world and preclude situations where, as in Vietnam, some 275,000 Americans find themselves already in a shooting stage, but few Russians or Red Chinese can similarly be found.

AN EDUCATIONAL MEDIUM

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy emphasized the need for an intensive study of the captive nations. The week's observance continually reemphasizes this need and stimulates a great deal of educational interest in all of the captive nations, in the fundamental phenomena of Sino-Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, and in the numerous aspects of the cold war itself. Truly as an educational medium, it throws an annual spotlight on certain dangerous myths concerning the Red empire and brings into balanced focus the major developments in that vast empire.

For example, one of the most colossal myths is that we can wean the totalitarian Red regimes in central Europe from the domination of Moscow. This grand illusion is propped by subsidiary myths which hold that the so-called satellite regimes are becoming increasingly "nationalistic," that their states are growing more "independent," and that a "polycentrism" prevails in the "Communist" world, with Titoism and revisionism gripping several of the "satellite" regimes.

Some even go to the extent of imputing a widespread popular base for the regimes of Tito, Kadar, Gomulka, Mao Tse-tung, and others. Wishfully, they envision a pervasive fragmentation of the Red empire and simplistically bid us to be patient, to perceive the "good" in some of these totalitarian rulers, and to assist them in overcoming many of their economic and political problems.

The fundamental trouble in all this myththinking is that those guided by gestures and appearances have no comprehension of the Russian nationalities technique which was applied to the non-Russian Republics in the U.S.S.R. even under Stalin. The technique is one of exploiting nationalist symbols and forces for the accomplishment of Red totalitarian objectives and the reduction and perhaps elimination of the persistent cold war between the people and the regime. For years Khrushchev flounced about the U.S.S.R., telling Azerbaijani, Georgians, Ukrainians, Turkestani, and others how nationally "independent" and "free" they are. Because of legalistic differences, the technique is being used even more effectively in the so-called satellite area of the empire.

Realism demands that we face some stern facts.

First, on the scale of total power, the U.S.S.R. has been and for some indefinite time will continue to be the center, the power base, of the Red empire.

Second, every other totalitarian Red regime, including Peking and Belgrade, depends for its ultimate survival on Moscow.

Third, the appearances of liberalization in central Europe are well checked by the realities of totalitarian rule and control in each of the Red states, with evidence mounting daily as to new oppressive measures in the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and elsewhere in this game of check and countercheck.

Fourth, these liberalizing appearances are also designed for the acquisition of necessary free world economic assistance in the further rapid buildup of the cold war economies of the Red states, both individually and collectively.

Lastly, when the chips are down anywhere, as in Vietnam, the basic, indispensable unity of this empire pattern shows itself clearly as practically all parts of the Red totalitarian network rush to the aid of its besieged members.

This eighth observance of Captive Nations Week is a most fitting occasion to express overwhelmingly our support for the President's positive actions in Vietnam. Had he not taken these courageous steps, we would certainly have more victims added to the long list of captive nations. The President's decisions have precluded Communist imperialist takeovers.

Captive Nations Week projects a totalistic concept of the captive nations, which is anathema to both Moscow and Peking and beyond the comprehension of some of our opinionmakers.

The record on this is perfectly clear. To mention some examples:

In 1963, Moscow's the New Times implored:

> Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States?

Pravda, that year, excoriated President Kennedy and stressed:

> The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared a "week of the Captive Nations" and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation.

In 1964, Izvestia railed:

> With every passing year Captive Nations Week becomes a nuisance.

Not mentioning to whom. Khrushchev again could not resist another condemnation of the week when on the eve of his removal he shouted:

> In the United States a farce entitled "Captive Nations Week" is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years, but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of "liberating" the nations of Eastern Europe.

Speaking of "imperialists," it should be noted that one of the main themes in the 1966 observance deals with the last remaining imperio-colonialist systems in the world. Indeed, Captive Nations Week provides a forum for discussion. The themes this year do credit to the National Captive Nations Committee, both for their formulation and dissemination.

First, we urge peace with justice and freedom, knowing that the support of all the captive nations is one of our most formidable deterrents against a hot global war.

Second, we stand in full support of U.S. actions in Vietnam, but we also stress: "What about the freedom aspirations of 17 million North Vietnamese?"

Third, we advocate a poltrade policy toward the Red empire, that is, trade based on political concessions.

Fourth, we seek a complete exposure of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the United Nations, urging a much-needed concentration on the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Fifth, we continue the fight to create a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, which is more necessary now than ever before.

The ramifications of these and other themes in terms of concrete and forthright action are extensive, to say the least. Many of the themes propose just the first steps that must be taken if we are to obviate more "Vietnams" in what the Red totalitarians call "holy wars of national liberation." The techniques used have been employed over and over again against countries that today form the long list of captive nations. By concentrating on the captive nations, how they became what they are, we cannot but learn more and more about Red techniques of political warfare which defy both nuclear armaments and economic aid.

World developments demonstrate more and more the urgent need for us to support to the maximum psychopolitical extent the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations. Whether behind a facade of "peaceful coexistence" or not, the avowed enemy must not be allowed to enjoy any psychopolitical sanctuary in his imperial domain. A virtually guaranteed security there means an increased insecurity in the free world and as he relentlessly pursues his strategy of supporting so-called wars of national liberation. One of the most effective paramilitary means of curbing this pursuit and thus preserving global peace is to further the freedom goals of all the captive nations.

I have absolutely no doubt that the future rests with us—provided we continue the good fight, with conviction, faith, and perseverance. For we know, deep in our hearts and minds, that the captive nations, in toto, are the Achilles' heel of the Red empire.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks today I would like to include a copy of the President's proclamation designating the week of July 17, 1966, as Captive Nations Week.

Also, Mr. Speaker, as in previous years, the Governors and mayors of our States and major cities have issued proclamations of the 1966 Captive Nations Week. I include several of them to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

Gov. William A. Egan, Alaska; Gov. Edmund G. Brown, California; Gov. John Dempsey, Connecticut; Gov. John A. Burns, Hawaii; Gov. J. Millard Tawes, Maryland; Acting Gov. Maurice V. Brady, New Jersey; Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, Missouri; Gov. William L. Guy, North Dakota; Gov. William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania; Gov. Robert E. McNair, South Carolina; Gov. Frank G. Clement, Tennessee; Gov. John Connally, Texas; Gov. Philip H. Hoff, Vermont; Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon.

Mayor Elmer Rasmuson, Anchorage, Alaska; Acting Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, Baltimore, Md.; Mayor Marian S. Erdmann, Great Falls, Mont.; Mayor Robert High, Miami, Fla.; Mayor Victor H. Schiro, New Orleans, La.; Mayor Thomas R. Byrne, St. Paul, Minn.; and Mayor Ralph S. Locher, Cleveland, Ohio.

JULY 8, 1966.

[Office of the White House Press Secretary, San Antonio, Texas]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America, July 8, 1966)

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples; and

Whereas these basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and

Whereas, in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 8th day of July in the year of our Lord 1966, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 191st.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Proclamation by Gov. William Egan, of Alaska)

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Coratia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of the State of Alaska, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Alaska, and call upon my fellow citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of Alaska to be affixed, this thirteenth day of July in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

William A. Egan,
Governor.

Attest:

Hugh J. Wade,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation by Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California

As Governor of the State of California, I call to the attention of all citizens the observance of Captive Nations Week, to be celebrated this year July 17 through 23.

As citizens of a free state and nation, it is fitting that we take this time to remember our fellow men whose lives are not blessed with national independence and human liberty. During this week, we express our opposition to slavery throughout the world.

The quest for peace and freedom must be the concern of all men. We must not forget the heroic efforts which, over the years, have deterred aggression and tyranny. And we must continue to strive for peace and goodwill among all men.

Californians join free peoples throughout the world in prayer that political subjugation and human suffering will soon end. To this end, I urge all citizens to join with me in the observance of Captive Nations Week, and to thereby reaffirm our basic belief in liberty and freedom for all men under governments of their own choosing.

Edmund G. Brown,
Governor.

Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1966

(Proclamation by Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut)

The observance of Captive Nations Week, which takes place this year from July 17 through 23, is a tangible sign of the free world's opposition to Communist oppression.

It serves, also, as an indication of our recognition of the plight of the freedom-loving peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania who are denied their rightful status as citizens of independent nations.

Past experience has shown that the celebration of Captive Nations Week stimulates popular pressures which can lead to changes beneficial to the residents of the European captive nations, and helps to sustain the morale of captive peoples.

I urge the citizens of Connecticut, therefore, to take note of the ceremonies and special activities scheduled in connection with the celebration of Captive Nations Week in 1966.

Let us also, at this time, reaffirm our support of the captive peoples in their efforts to regain independence and human liberty.

John Dempsey,
Governor.

Proclamation by Governor Burns, of Hawaii

Whereas, by Public Law 86-90 (73 Stat. 212) the Congress of the United States provided for designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," and also for the observance thereof by the people of the United States; and

Whereas, many nations have lost their national independence directly and indirectly through the policies of world communism, the peoples of those nations losing their individual freedoms in the process; and

Whereas, many of the people of Hawaii are linked to those in such nations by ties of culture, and of family;

Now, therefore, I, John A. Burns, Governor of the State of Hawaii, do hereby designate the week of July 18–25, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Hawaii and urge the people of the State of Hawaii to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations for national independence and individual liberty.

Done at Iolani Palace, Honolulu, State of Hawaii, this 1st day of July 1966.

John A. Burns.

Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1966

Whereas, Silenced but unconquered, the enslaved peoples of Central-Eastern Europe have never ceased their fight for a free life, and;

Whereas, The United States possesses a warm understanding and sympathy for these subjected nations, and;

Whereas, The cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration, and;

Whereas, At a time when anti-colonialism and recognition of the right of freedom for small nations is sweeping the world, a movement which the Communists are trying to turn against the West, it is vital for the United States to combine sincere support of independence for the new nations with the demand for the restoration of independence in the old nations of Eastern Europe, and;

Whereas, It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and of the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations,

Now, therefore, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Maryland, and I urge my fellow citizens to offer prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of these countries so they may once more stand with the free nations of the world.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the City of Annapolis, this 28th Day of June, in the Year of Our Lord, 1966.

J. Millard Tawes.

By the Governor:

Lloyd L. Simpkins,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation by Acting Governor of New Jersey

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Slovenia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Maurice V. Brady, Acting Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim that the week of July 17–23, 1966 as Captive Nations Week in New Jersey, and call upon the citizens of this State to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Given, under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Jersey, this fifteenth day of July in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six and in the Independence of the United States the one hundred and ninetieth.

Maurice V. Brady,
Acting Governor.

By the Acting Governor:

Robert J. Burkhardt,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation by Governor of Missouri

Whereas, all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas, these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas, Missouri has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas, it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of Missouri to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I Warren E. Hearnes, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966, as Captive Nations Week and invite the people of Missouri to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Missouri, in the City of Jefferson, this 17th day of May, 1966.

Proclamation by Governor of North Dakota

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in North Dakota, and call upon the citizens of this state to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the Great Seal of the State of North Dakota this 29th day of June, 1966.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18–24, 1966

(Proclamation by Governor of Pennsylvania)

Whereas, By a joint Resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas, The President of the United States of America has by such proclamation invited the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas, The citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are fully aware of and grieve the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of Communism; and

Whereas, It is our purpose to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, It is deemed appropriate to call for a public observance of this occasion so that our knowledge and sympathies may be declared;

Now, therefore, I, William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Pennsylvania.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State, at the City of Harrisburg, this twenty-third day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six, and of the Commonwealth the one hundred and ninetieth.

WILLIAM W. SCRANTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:

W. STUART HELM,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE

Whereas, The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Frank G. Clement, as Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Tennessee, and call upon the citizens of Tennessee to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed at Nashville, this twenty-ninth day of June, 1966.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROBERT E. MCNAIR ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of many countries in our world.

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence.

The Congress of the United States has passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week. I encourage South Carolinians to join in giving appropriate recognition to this observance.

ROBERT E. MCNAIR.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM BY JOHN CONNALLY, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

In its thrust toward world domination, communist imperialism has deprived many millions of people of Central and Eastern Europe, Asia and even the Western Hemisphere of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Silenced, but unconquered, these people will never cease to struggle for their inalienable right to a free life.

The national security and well-being of the citizens of the United States is dependent on the continued desire for liberty and justice on the part of the peoples of these captive nations.

By action of Congress, the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we observe this period in tribute to the fight for freedom and in recognition of the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Texas.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this 11th day of July, 1966.

JOHN CONNALLY,
Governor of Texas.

PROCLAMATION BY PHILIP H. HOFF, GOVERNOR OF VERMONT

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Where, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with the support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Philip H. Hoff, Governor of the State of Vermont, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Vermont, and call upon the citizens of Vermont to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Given under my Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Vermont at Montpelier, this twelfth day of July, A.D. 1966.

PHILIP H. HOFF.

By the Governor:

THOMAS J. KENNEY,
Secretary of Civil and Military Affairs.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF OREGON

The right of all people to choose their form of government and to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development is one dear to all Americans; but it is a right denied to millions of persons in countries made captive by the Communist conspiracy.

It is fitting that we in the United States recognize and honor those oppressed citizens of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Yugoslavia, Tibet, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba and elsewhere who are presently denied freedom.

Captive Nations Week, which will be observed during the period July 17–23, 1966, under Authority of Public Law 86–90, provides a means whereby all Americans may remember the peoples of these once free countries.

I urge each of our citizens during Captive Nations Week to join with the National Captive Nations Committee and others in appropriately observing this period, through the offering of prayers and otherwise supporting efforts toward peaceful liberation of oppressed people.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor of Oregon.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now therefore, I, Elmer Rasmuson, Mayor of the City of Anchorage, State of Alaska, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966 be observed as Captive Nations Week in Anchorage, Alaska, and call upon the citizens of Anchorage to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

ELMER RASMUSON,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY ACTING MAYOR THOMAS J. D'ALESANDRO, III, DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JULY 17, 1966, AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" IN BALTIMORE

The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others.

The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war.

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence.

The Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas J. D'Alesandro, III, acting mayor of the City of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as "Captive Nations Week" in Baltimore, and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Baltimore to be affixed this seventh day of July, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

THOMAS J. D'ALESANDRO III,
Acting Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Marian S. Erdmann, Mayor of the City of Great Falls, Montana, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the City of Great Falls and call upon the citizens of Great Falls to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Great Falls, Montana, to be affixed, on the 12th day of July, 1966.

MARIAN S. ERDMANN,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF MIAMI, FLA.

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of many nations throughout the world including one closest to our shores, Cuba, and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

Whereas the citizens of Miami by their welcoming of thousands of Cuban refugees to this city have felt a personal involvement in the struggle for freedom, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Robert King High, Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 17, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Miami.

In observance thereof I urge the people of Miami to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause the seal of the City of Miami, Florida, to be affixed.

Done in the office of the Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, this the 13th day of July in the year of Our Lord, 1966.

ROBERT KING HIGH, *Mayor.*

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Communism have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, Mayor of the City of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, to be Captive Nations Week in New Orleans.

Given under my hand and the Seal of the City of New Orleans on this the 6th day of July, 1966.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Whereas, many nations today are restrained within the sphere of Soviet influence and the peoples of these nations are being deprived of their national independence and in many cases their individual liberties, and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States took recognition of the need for these peoples to receive our strong moral support and by joint resolution on July 17, 1959, approved proclamation of Captive Nations Week throughout the country,

Now, therefore, I, Thomas R. Byrne, Mayor of the City of Saint Paul, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

In Witness Whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Saint Paul to be affixed this fifth day of July in the Year of Our Lord 1966.

THOMAS R. BYRNE,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JULY 17–23, 1966, AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" BY MAYOR OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

Whereas, by act of the United States Congress and by Proclamation of the President, the week of July 17–23, 1966, will be celebrated as "Captive Nations Week" throughout the entire country; and

Whereas, "Captive Nations Week" provides an occasion for all Clevelanders to show that their friends, relatives and allies in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet and Cuba, have not been forgotten, and it presents an occasion for us to recall the sufferings of these enslaved peoples and the plight with which they are presented; and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Ralph S. Locher, as Mayor of the City of Cleveland, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, as "Captive Nations Week" in Cleveland, and invite and urge all our citizens to give renewed devotion to the aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Corporate Seal of the City of Cleveland to be affixed this 8th day of July, 1966.

RALPH S. LOCHER.

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS

Whereas, It has been requested by the Captive Nations Week Committee, Chicago Branch, that the third week in July be designated as a period to reaffirm our determination to assist those who are living in the fear and dread of virtual slavery throughout the world, and

Whereas, The people of these United States have been invited by Presidential Proclamation and Congress Public Law 86–90, to demonstrate their support for the policy of President Lyndon B. Johnson toward Vietnam and those millions caught in the iron grip of communist colonialism, and

Whereas, Appropriate ceremonies to shore up public opinion in favor of those unfortunate persons enslaved in the captive nations is deemed altogether fitting at this time,

Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the third week in July, 1966, as Captive Nations Week throughout Illinois, and request the appropriate observances and ceremonies during this important and patriotic occasion.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol, in the City of Springfield, this 15th day of June, in the Year of Our Lord 1966, and of the State of Illinois the 148th.

OTTO KERNER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

PAUL POWELL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who has been with me in sponsoring this resolution during these several years and always participates here. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include several proclamations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has shown a great determination in his leadership over the years in the question of the captive nations. It is, I think, especially appropriate that we discuss the issue at this time and recognize that rather than having an easing of tensions in this world, the international Communist conspiracy directed from Moscow is growing even more belligerent and when we know the facts about even incidental matters such as stopping the track meet between teams of volunteers from the United States, Poland, and the U.S.S.R. being canceled as a propaganda item by the Communists, you see the complete diabolical nature of their offense.

As the gentleman points out, the Achilles' Heel of the Soviet Union is in the captive peoples of the world. The gentleman provides not only leadership here in the House but leadership throughout the world in furthering the cause of the captive people.

If the gentleman will permit me one other observation, I would like to point out that it is especially appropriate that we have in the Chair at this time the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] who has been especially militant in this regard.

Mr. FLOOD. You have taken the words out of my mouth. Go ahead.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, so that he may in his very eloquent fashion extoll further the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois who occupies the chair.

Mr. FLOOD. No; I am not going to get in the middle between two Members from Illinois under any circumstances. However, I do appreciate what you say. It was simply a coincidence. Since in your veins, sir, and the veins of the acting Speaker from Illinois flows the proud blood of Polish ancestors, I am satisfied that one of the great reasons why the Soviet does not move against Western Europe is not so much because of our missiles and not so much because of our armed might but they would have to cross Poland. You and the Acting Speaker know perfectly well what would happen to any Russian logistic system that would have to cross Poland. The Poles would tear it apart with their bare hands and the Soviet knows this.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in the observance of Captive Nations Week this year. On this occasion when we rededicate ourselves to the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples suffering under Communist oppression, I would like to once again urge that the administration adopt a positive policy for this purpose rather than the present negative and misguided course of aid and subsidized trade to the Communist governments which suppress the freedom the captive peoples want and deserve.

One specific area in which United States efforts to help maintain the spirit of freedom among the captive nations need improvement is the operations of USIA, especially the Voice of America. The number of hours we broadcast to the people behind the Iron Curtain should be greatly increased. Our programs should be expanded not only to the countries of Eastern Europe, but to the non-Russian nations of the the U.S.S.R.

Members have noted, I am sure, Soviet usage of the propaganda technique when, with great fanfare, they cancelled the planned trip to the United States by the Soviet and Polish track teams. Certainly, some legitimate counterpropaganda directed by USIA is in order in this instance.

I am especially pleased to note the major interest that Captive Nations Week has aroused at the grassroots level across the country. As evidence of this, I ask leave to include as a continuation of my remarks the resolutions which have been passed by various communities in my district.

OFFICE OF MAYOR,
Robbins, Ill., July 11, 1966.

MAYOR MAXEY PROCLAIMS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others: and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I Ernest Maxey, mayor of Robbins, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Robbins, and call upon the citizens of Robbins to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

ERNEST MAXEY, *Mayor.*

VILLAGE OF THORNTON, ILL.,
July 12, 1966.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Delbert C. Emerick, village president of the village of Thornton, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the village of Thornton, and call upon the citizens of Thornton to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Delbert C. Emerick,
Village President.

Village of Merrionette Park,
Chicago, Ill., July 15, 1966.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the peoples of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Weeks and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Lawrence J. Kohaus, president of the village of Merrionette Park, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Merrionette Park, Illinois, and call upon the citizens of Merrionette Park to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of the Village of Merrionette Park aforesaid, at the said Village, in the County of Cook and State of Illinois, aforesaid, this 13th day of July, A.D. 1966.

Lawrence J. Kohaus,
Village President.

Village of South Holland, Ill.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Harold J. Gouwens, Village President of South Holland, Illinois, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in South Holland, Illinois, and call upon the citizens of South Holland to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Harold Gouwens, *President.*

Captive Nations Week Proclamation

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Edward L. Kipley, mayor of Riverdale, Ill., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Riverdale, and call upon the citizens of Riverdale to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is most inspiring and encouraging to read the dozens of Captive Nations Week proclamations issued by our Governors and mayors of other cities. I request that the following proclamations be printed in the Record: Gov. George C. Wallace, Alabama; Gov. Orval E. Faubus, Arkansas; Gov. Harold E. Hughes, Iowa; Gov. Otto Kerner, Illinois; Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, Kentucky; Gov. John A. Volpe, Massachusetts; Gov. John W. King, New Hampshire; Gov. Dan Moore of North Carolina; Gov. James A. Rhodes, Ohio; Gov. Calvin L. Rampton, Utah; Gov. Warren P. Knowles, Wisconsin; Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago, Ill.; Mayor M. E. Sensenbrenner, Columbus, Ohio; Mayor Henry W. Maier, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mayor Arthur Naftalin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mayor John V. Lindsay, New York City; Mayor Morrill M. Crowe, Richmond, Va.; Mayor J. Bracken Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Mayor John E. Babiarz, Wilmington, Del.

State of Alabama.

Proclamation by the Governor

Whereas, the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas, the cause of individual rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas, this nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom everywhere; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

Now, therefore, I, George C. Wallace, Governor of the State of Alabama, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Alabama and invite the people of our state to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the Great Seal of the State of Alabama to be affixed by the Secretary of State at the Capitol in the City of Montgomery on this the 6th day of July, 1966.

George C. Wallace, *Governor.*

Attest:

Mrs. Agnes Baggett,
Secretary of State.

State of Arkansas Proclamation

To all to whom these presents shall come—Greetings:

Whereas, 1966 marks the Tenth Anniversary of the Polish and Hungarian Revolutions with the increased freedom which these countries have recently experienced due in large part to the heroes who risked their lives ten years ago; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom; and

Whereas, the people of China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet and Cuba have fallen victim to the Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas, in accordance with Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted by the 86th Congress, the third week in July has been established as Captive Nations Week;

Now, therefore, I, Orval E. Faubus, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim that the week of July 17 to 23, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Arkansas, and call upon the people of this state to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities to assure the freedom-seeking nations of the world that they are not forgotten.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Arkansas to be affixed. Done in office in Little Rock this 29th day of June, 1966.

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

STATE OF IOWA.

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, the United States and the State of Iowa have an abiding commitment to the principles of self-determination and human freedom; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Harold E. Hughes, Governor of the State of Iowa, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in Iowa, and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Iowa to be affixed. Done at Des Moines this 1st day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred sixty-six.

HAROLD E. HUGHES, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL] GARY L. CAMERON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS: PROCLAMATION

Whereas, It has been requested by the Captive Nations Week Committee, Chicago Branch, that the third week in July be designated as a period to reaffirm our determination to assist those who are living in the fear and dread of virtual slavery throughout the world, and

Whereas, The people of these United States have been invited by Presidential Proclamation and Congress Public Law 86–90, to demonstrate their support for the policy of President Lyndon B. Johnson toward Vietnam and those millions caught in the iron grip of communist colonialism, and

Whereas, Appropriate ceremonies to shore up public opinion in favor of those unfortunate persons enslaved in the captive nations is deemed altogether fitting at this time,

Now, therefore, I Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the third week in July, 1966, as Captive Nations Week throughout Illinois, and request the appropriate observances and ceremonies during the important and patriotic occasion.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol, in the City of Springfield, this fifteenth day of June, in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and forty-eighth.

OTTO KERNER,
Governor.
PAUL POWELL,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come:

Whereas, the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the capitive nations the support of the government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations;

Now, therefore, I Edward T. Breathitt, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week and invite the people of our state to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies.

Done at the Capitol in the City of Frankfort this 11th day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred sixty-six and of the Commonwealth of Kentucky the one hundred seventy-fifth.

EDWARD T. BREATHITT,
Governor.
THELMA L. STOVALL,
Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION: 1966

Whereas, The basic rights of freedom and justice are circumscribed and denied in many areas of the world, depriving countless persons of their national independence and their individual liberties of religion, speech and communication with their friends and relatives who live in the free world, and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these subjugated nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitons of tyrannist leaders to initiate a major war, and

Whereas, We of the United States are the fortunate inhabitants of a citadel of human freedom. We are proud that we are giving asylum to many refugees from oppressed countries who are linked by family bond to many American citizens. In point of fact, we have benefited from their presence as they are valued neighbors, and are loyal and industrious members of our State and Nation, and

Whereas, Our country's abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty and human dignity makes it appropriate and proper that we manifest to the peoples of the captive nations our sympathies and prayers for their freedom and national independence, and that we recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of these rights;

Now, therefore, I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim the week of July 18–24, 1966 as Captive Nations Week and urge all citizens of the Commonwealth to take cognizance of this observance, in recognition and support of the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Given at the Executive Chamber in Boston, this twelfth day of July, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and ninety-first.

JOHN A. VOLPE.

By His Excellency the Governor.
KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armeni, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, John W. King, Governor of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in New Hampshire and call upon the citizens of New Hampshire to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Given at the Executive Chambers in Concord this twelfth day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and ninetieth.

JOHN W. KING, *Governor.*

By His Excellency the Governor.
Attest:
[SEAL] ROBERT L. STARK,
Secretary of State.

JUNE 28, 1966.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR DAN MOORE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The President of the United States, in accordance with Public Law 86–90, is expected soon to proclaim the week of July 17 to 23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week 1966.

This observance again provides an occasion for all Americans to assure their silent allies in Eastern Europe that they have not been forgotten. I am pleased therefore to encourage the citizens of North Carolina to take special note of Captive Nations Week 1966. This will provide another tangible sign of the free world's opposition to Communist refusal to give ear to the just aspirations to liberty not only in middle Europe but anywhere in the world.

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17–23, 1966

Whereas, the republican form of government—based upon "the consent of the governed"—which has existed in the United States of America for 190 years, has resulted in the development of a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations for freedom of peoples everywhere and in the recognition of the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes an impediment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas, since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of vast military despotisms of International Communism have resulted in the creation of a constant threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of the Communist regimes have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, it is vital to the national security of the United States and the other free nations of the world that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive:

Now, therefore, I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate the week of July 17-23, 1966 as Captive Nations Week and urge that all citizens support this annual recognition of the intent and purpose of the Communist dominated and oppressed peoples of the world to regain their freedom.

[SEAL]

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 8th day of July, in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Six.

JAMES A. RHODES, *Governor*.

STATE OF UTAH: DECLARATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independene:

Now, therefore, I, Calvin L. Rampton, Governor of the State of Utah, to hereby declare that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the State of Utah, and call upon the citizens of Utah to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

CALVIN L. RAMPTON, *Governor*.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN: A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hunargy, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17 through July 23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Wisconsin and call upon the citizens of this state to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in the City of Madison this eleventh day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

WARREN P. KNOWLES, *Governor*.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF CHICAGO.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovena, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the City of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas, these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas. the peoples of these communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the City of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communication to observe the plight of the communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 16 at 12:00 P.M. and at the assembly following in Grant Park.

Dated this 5th day of July, A.D., 1966.

RICHARD J. DALEY, *Mayor*.

CITY OF COLUMBUS, OHIO.

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, imperialistic policies of Russian and Chinese Communists have led to the enslavement of many nations of Eastern Europe and North and Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of people in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterent to Communist aggression; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving people of the Captive Nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the "All-American City" of Columbus as among the leaders in seeking a new era of freedom and understanding; and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has decreed that the third week of July, each year, be observed as Captive Nations Week:

Now, therefore, I, M. E. Sensenbrenner, Mayor of the City of Columbus, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17, 1966, Captive Nations Week in Columbus.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Columbus, Ohio to be hereto affixed, this 15th day of July, 1966.

[SEAL] M. E. SENSENBRENNER,
Mayor of the City of Columbus.

CITY OF MILWAUKEE.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas: The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkenstan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, By its unanimous action, the Congress of the United States has established the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week.

Now, therefore, I, Henry W. Maier, Mayor of Milwaukee, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14–23, 1966 as Captive Nations Week in Milwaukee, and I call upon the citizens of our community to observe this period with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities and be dedicating their efforts toward the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

July 14, 1966.

[SEAL] HENRY W. MAIER,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to intiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Arthur Naftalin, Mayor of the City of Minneapolis, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the City of Minneapolis, and call upon all citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

ARTHUR NAFTALIN, *Mayor.*

Whereas: The Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the 3rd week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas: The people of Eastern and Central Europe, as well as those in other parts of the world, are being denied fundamental human rights in pursuing their own destiny; and

Whereas: The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to tyranny and aggression; and

Whereas: The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the people of the United States for leadership in attaining their freedom and independence,

Now, therefore, I John V. Lindsay, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17–23, 1966, as Captive Nations Week in New York City, and call upon our citizens to observe this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed.

JOHN V. LINDSAY, *Mayor.*

CITY OF RICHMOND, VA.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Veitnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Morrill M. Crowe, Mayor of the City of Richmond, Virginia, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Richmond, and call upon the citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

MORRILL M. CROWE, *Mayor.*

JULY 11, 1966.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, J. Bracken Lee, Mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah, do hereby proclaim the week of July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week in Salt Lake City, Utah, and call upon the citizens of our city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereby set my hand and caused the seal of Salt Lake City. Utah, to be affixed this 8th day of July, nineteen hundred sixty-six.

J. BRACKEN LEE, *Mayor,*
HERMAN J. HOGENSEN, *Recorder.*

CITY OF WILMINGTON, DEL.

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, Through direct and indirect aggression, the Russian Communists have subjugated and enslaved the peoples of several Communist countries; and

Whereas, The surging desire for liberty and independence which is paramount among the large majority of these peoples, constitutes a firm effort in deterring Communist ambitions toward initiation of any major war; and

Whereas, The United States stands as the lighthouse of freedom in the dark sea of oppression and as the only hope for these subjugated peoples; and

Whereas, The United States Congress did, by unanimous vote, pass Public Law 86–90 which established the third week in July of every year as Captive Nations Week:

Now, Therefore, I, John E. Babiarz, Mayor of the City of Wilmington, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Wilmington, and call upon all the citizens of Wilmington to join others across the land in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of the oppressed peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and Seal of Office this 6th day of July, 1966.

[SEAL] JOHN E. BABIARZ, *Mayor.*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual occasion on which we commemorate Captive Nations Week. Originally proclaimed in 1959 following a joint congressional resolution, the observance has grown in both meaning and content. I am truly privileged to associate myself with the goals of Captive Nations Week and I take pride in joining my colleagues in these ceremonies.

My hope is that we do not make the fateful error of thinking that during this period of cold war or coexistence that the peoples held captive are resigned to their existence under communism. That would be a tragic error and would negate the sacrifices made by the heroes of the East Berlin uprising, the Hungarian revolt, and other such protests. The victims of the infamous Berlin wall would have died in vain were we to assume that those in the grips of communism were not willing to sacrifice for their freedom. It is my strong belief that the people of the captive nations are fully determined to regain the liberty of their beloved homelands.

Today we are involved in a bloody struggle to preserve the freedom and rights of the people of Vietnam. Our being there is further proof of our determination to halt the spread of communism in South Asia. It indicates our commitment to continue our role as the free world's leader in the fight against violent Communist aggression.

And yet, our commitment in South Vietnam could possibly lead to some doubts or anxieties among the captive peoples of Europe. They may wonder if the United States has forgotten them in its struggle in the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. Their anxieties can be laid aside. There is no wavering of the American determination that they shall be free. Just as we are committed to freedom in Vietnam, so we are committed to eventual freedom for all mankind, including the captive peoples. Their quest for liberty will not be abandoned. They deserve to be free just as the residents of Saigon deserve the preservation of their independence.

It must continue to be our solemn goal to do all in our power to assist these nations in their battle for freedom. We have made a firm beginning, but much more remains to be done. The Congress should continue to play a leading role in mobilizing public sentiment as to the true conditions under which more than a hundred million men, women, and children, once free, are now forced to eke out an existence. The free world does not have to look far for a just cause which deserves its complete support. Mr. Speaker, we in America are proud to lend our continued support to the liberty of these captive nations.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that today the great opponents of colonialism, the Communists, are the only remaining colonialists. Anyone who knows history, however, knows that communism inevitably leads to colonialism because no nation lives under a Communist dictatorship voluntarily and these Communist regimes can only continue in power with the assistance of the Soviet Union or Communist China.

In the past 50 years the Soviet Union has built up a colonial empire rivaling any in history. The roll of captive European nations is, regrettably, a long one. Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and East Germany are all under the domination of Moscow; while Albania, Tibet, North Vietnam, and North Korea are forced to accept communism by the might of Communist China.

It is fitting that the Congress in 1959 adopted a resolution designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week to commemorate the enslavement of the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and to remind the free peoples of the world that the record of communism is a record of failure. The hard truth is that none of these governments would survive a free election.

It is fitting at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD the 1966 Captive Nations Manifesto issued by American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of European Captive Nations.

The manifesto follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO 1966

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

Although the eyes of the world are at present focused on Asia, the issue of the captive East-Central European nations clearly belongs in the forefront of international attention. The intrinsic importance of the problem of East-Central Europe to mankind is aptly dramatized by the continuing concerted efforts by the Communists to maintain their sway over the captive countries.

East-Central Europe today is a showcase of Communist failures. In spite of decades of Communist indoctrination, the people of East-Central Europe refuse to embrace the Communist creed. They have remained nationalistic in their outlook and still profess allegiance to the Western ideals of human dignity and political democracy. Even the Communist leaders in the captive countries have been compelled to heed the rising tide of nationalism by paying it lip service and sometimes trying to identify themselves with some of the national aspirations. The status quo in East-Central Europe cannot be perpetuated except by force. Consequently, captive Europe is on the move.

But progress in the captive countries is laborious and too slow to satisfy popular demands. The "liberalization" of the totalitarian rule in East-Central Europe is held firmly in check by the Communist regimes, which invariably draw the line the moment the Communist Party's monoply on power and ideas has been threatened. The overwhelming desire of the East-Central European peoples, on the other hand, is for a more rapid and more meaningful evolution—climaxed by self-determination and freedom to chart their own future. The gap between these contrasting desires and aims of the regimes and of the people appears unbridgeable and is likely to generate more tensions in the months and years to come.

The evolution in East-Central Europe, whatever its extent may be in the individual countries, has yet to lead to the restoration of fundamental human rights, as defined in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The war of attrition against religion goes on unabated; only recently Pope Paul VI and many American bishops were prevented by the Polish Communist regime to attend festivities of Poland's Millennium; clergymen of various faiths, including a number of bishops in Rumania, remain in prison. Culture remains shackled and under strict regime supervision, and freedom of the press, of speech and of movement is non-existent or severely restricted.

Economic experimentation by some Communist regimes in East-Central Europe is primarily motivated by pressing economic problems and the requirements of power politics—the basic needs of the people play a minute role, if any. The concept of the economy, as conceived and put into practice by the Communists, has failed. The main reasons for this demonstrable, and in some countries regime-admitted failure have been outdated, unimaginative thinking and planning, and the lack of cooperation, and resistance from the people. The current trend of cautious experimentation is little more than an attempt to use some Western techniques in economies that have been seriously impaired by Communist mismanagement. In an effort to bolster their economies, the Communist regimes are seeking long-term credits from the West. It must be noted that long-term government credits extended by Western governments to the Communist regimes would strengthen the hand of the regimes and make them less receptive to popular pressures for economic and other reforms.

Current developments in East-Central Europe and the problems confronting Communist regimes do not necessarily mean, however, that the menace of international communism has been blunted or removed. In this context we must reiterate our appeal to Western governments to continue to stand fast by their solemn pledges to defend freedom and self-determination where it still exists and to help extend it to wherever it is possible. We urge a vigorous political and moral offensive to compel the Communists to uphold their treaty obligations and implement their promises of self-determination for the captive peoples.

It is our conviction that a policy of peaceful evolution must not digress from the primary objective—an East-Central Europe unfettered by totalitarian regimes. It is equally important that the captive peoples be aware of the steadfast determination and willingness of the free world governments to lend their full moral and political support to this paramount national objective. In these days of swift historic changes, when East-Central European Communists are themselves beginning to speak out, even by inference, of the illegality of Soviet imperialistic annexations, the free peoples and their governments have an added duty of being heard clearly and forcefully on this key problem.

In commemoration of this year's Captive Nations Week:

We accuse the Soviet Union of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during or after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also accuse the Soviet government of colonial exploitation of these captive countries;

We respectfully urge the Secretary General of the United Nations to present a report on Soviet suppression of the Hungarian people's right to self-determination, pursuant to the U.N. Resolution of 1962.

We appeal to the governments of the United States and its allies:

1. To use the tremendous bargaining power of the West's economic strength to exact meaningful political concessions for the captive peoples and for the entire free world.
2. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;
3. To recognize that there can be no end to the cold war as long as Europe remains half slave, half free, and to raise the question of free elections in the captive European countries at all major East-West conferences;
4. To refuse to sign any non-aggression pact with the Communists based on the present status quo, since such an act would legitimize and perpetuate present injustices and would be interpreted by the captive peoples as abandonment by the West;

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest, during Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1966, their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Communist-subjugated lands to the worldwide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help them in their struggle for freedom and independence.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman,
American Friends of the Captive Nations.
VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS,
Chairman,
Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, think, for a moment, of the feeling you have when you look at our flag, or when you walk alone in an untouched forest. The feeling is moving and profound. The feeling is freedom. In the United States of America, freedom began in 1776, and its history is one of victory. However, the history of freedom behind the Iron Curtain is one of defeat—not a single defeat, but a continuous daily trampling.

The man of a Communist country lives with a wall around his heart. This wall contains his spirit, and it imprisons the truth, just as the Communist government prisons contain those who would speak the truth. The emotions of a man are locked up. Those who rise against tyranny in their countries are removed. The people are trampled, their spirits are crushed.

We, all, base our lives on freedom, which thrives on truth. The spirit of truth must be kept alive in the captive nations of the world; and during this week, which has been designated as "Captive Nations Week," the captive peoples of the world are looking to us for the hope which they alone cannot sustain.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the week of July 17–23 Americans everywhere will join together in paying tribute to the more than 120 million unfortunate people who are isolated from freedom by the Iron Curtain. This year marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, established in 1959 to give official sanction to the acute sympathy and bonds of friendship between Americans and the captive peoples of the world.

The significance of Captive Nations Week for each American citizen springs from the very roots of our national heritage. A few weeks ago we celebrated our own Independence Day, reaffirming at that time our dedication to the principles upon which this Nation is founded. Outstanding among these are the beliefs that all people are entitled to the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that all people have the right to determine their own form of government.

Almost 40 years ago that great American Woodrow Wilson stood before the Congress, asking for a declaration of war. In that solemn moment he reasserted our beliefs:

> We shall fight for the things which we have have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have.

As we look about us in this tension-filled era of the sixties, we realize that President Wilson's stirring words are as relevant today as they were in 1917. Captive Nations Week allows us all to join in an important reminder to the captive peoples that we Americans have not forsaken them. Through rallies, religious ceremonies, through our individual prayers, and many other appropriate ceremonies and activities Americans everywhere will reassert their sympathy with our enslaved brothers.

And our voices will be heard, for the Iron Curtain is not impenetrable. They will be heard by the aged, who cherish memories of what a free society is like. They will be heard by the young, who have never drawn a free breath, but in whom live the forces of self-determination and the will to be free. And our voices for freedom will be heard by the tyrannical Communist rulers, who will quake with the knowledge that Americans are pressing forward in defense of the right.

Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week affords a great opportunity for American citizens to rededicate themselves to the great cause of liberty for all peoples. By word and deed, not only during this week but throughout the year, we will remember the plight of those less fortunate than we who languish in the grip of Marxist tyranny. It is thus a rare privilege for me to join in observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week comes at a time when the basic principles set forth in Public Law 86–90 are under attack in various parts of the world. When Congress enacted Public Law 86–90 in July of 1959, authorizing this annual observance, there was relative calm in the world. A spirit of optimism was then prevelant that a means could be found for the "coexistence" of free nations and nations subjugated by force to the new colonialism within the vastly expanded empire of Moscow.

How different things are in our world of today, during a short span of 8 years. There is open warfare in Vietnam brought on by the implementation of a basic policy and strategy of Moscow—"wars of national liberation." That policy and strategy seeks to overthrow all nations and civilizations and to subject them to the dictatorship of the new colonialism. Those nations which oppose this drive for world conquest are charged with aggression and being warmakers when in reality they are forced to a position of fight or be overrun and subjugated.

President Johnson, in his Captive Nations Week proclamation issued on July 8, 1966, set forth our policy in the face of these threats to peace as well as our hopes for the subjugated nations, in these words:

> "Whereas, the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and
>
> Whereas, in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1966 I introduced H.R. 813, the purpose of which is to authorize a House Select Committee on Human Rights and Peaceful World Order. I have long been convinced that a peaceful world order is dependent upon the fulfillment of human rights which are the basic values of our civilization. When these rights are denied entire nations by alien forces of oppression, a dangerous threat to peace is present. We see this dangerous threat to peace today in the plight of the hundreds of millions of peoples living in the captive nations of the world.

It is well known the the captive nations set forth in Public Law 86–90 are the victims of armed aggression followed by the imposition by force of regimes not of their choosing. It serves no useful purpose to detail that process here because Members are well acquainted with the facts. It is useful, however, to remember that unless a determined stand is taken against armed aggression the list of captive nations will grow longer and our hopes for a peaceful world order will be shattered.

In my explanatory remarks on H.R. 813 I stated in part on April 5, 1966:

> The leaders of the Soviet Union have been more than candid in their boasts that they are in the process of developing a Soviet man. An examination of the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus will reveal clearly the intent of Soviet official policy toward the peoples under its control. Under that doctrine the Soviet man will be devoid of all attachment to religious beliefs, devoid of all attachment to longstanding cultural heritages, devoid of all attachment to longstanding traditions and customs, devoid of a sense of national origin and the historical aspirations associated with that origin.
>
> Such a man will, in the meaning of that doctrine, lack all the human feelings held dear within the multicultural, multinational population of the Soviet Union. The developers of this new type man intend that he be denied the civilizing influence of 2,000 years of Judeo-Christian values and be reduced to the unchecked will of the masters in the Kremlin.
>
> Mankind must face up to this new threat against the establishment of a peaceful world order. The doctrine of Homo Sovieticus practiced upon the diversified peoples and nations of the Soviet Union carries with it the seeds of violence and war. The spread of that doctrine to other lands beyond the Soviet Union has already begun and unless it is checked it will plunge the world into a holocaust.
>
> In these circumstances I believe it is both proper and urgent that the House of Representatives take the initiative to establish a means through which the doctrine of Homo Sovieticus may be put under a global spotlight and examined as a threat to world peace.
>
> What can the proposed select committee do to meet this urgent problem?
>
> It can get all the facts from competent witnesses and much documentary evidence can be produced by scholars and students of the problem. Those facts have not been gathered and made available to the American people.
>
> It can seek the advice of experts on the threat thereby presented to world peace and obtain advice from other experts on what steps can be taken to remove the blocks thus presented to a peaceful world order. There is expert opinion available on these issues and it should be sought out and presented to the public.

> It can examine the evidence and opinion gathered and formulate positive and practical recommendations for the consideration of our Government.
>
> It can provide the kind of public forum these vital issues deserve.
>
> It can develop public opinion on an international scale which even the most hardened leader in the Kremlin cannot afford to dismiss.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of the captive nations which we observe today depends upon the outcome of our national effort to make a peaceful world order a reality.

This national effort is being carried forward through a wide range of governmental and intergovernmental programs. Congress has played a vital role in authorizing many of these peace seeking programs. In my judgment Congress could play an even more direct and decisive role in advancing the national effort toward a peaceful world order through the work of the select committee I have proposed. I urge my colleagues and all others interested in the cause of the captive nations to examine the purposes of H.R. 813, which I outlined and which will be found on pages 7713 and 7714 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1966.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the imperialistic and repressive policies of communism which enthrall the freedom-loving peoples of eastern and central Europe will again be the object of worldwide attention and condemnation as millions of Americans conduct their annual observance of Captive Nations Week, July 17 to 23, 1966.

Since this year also marks the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, the significance of this forthcoming observance will be heightened by recalling this striking example of the vitality of the captive nations' resistance to tyranny as well as the persistence of their Communist captors.

During my service in Congress as a member of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have always been keenly aware of the indefensible colonial exploitation of central and eastern Europe at the hands of the Soviets. I have taken an active part in the continuing efforts of the Congress to assure the 100 million people of eastern and central Europe as well as their Soviet overlords of the United States steadfast determination and willingness to lend its full moral and political support to the captive nations' enduring struggle for national independence.

While Vietnam holds center stage at the present time, we must not forget the plight of the millions of Eastern Europeans enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. The principles for which we are fighting in Vietnam—national integrity, personal and political freedom—apply equally in Eastern Europe.

President Johnson in his state of the Union message on January 12, 1966, stated that the most important principle of American foreign policy was "support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves—and shape their own institutions," because, "the insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world." The people of central and eastern Europe are not nationally independent nor do they have the right of self-government. Rather, they are saddled with Communist regimes whose methods of operation are based more on a system of indoctrination and repression than education and persuasion.

The de-Stalination which has taken place over the last 15 years brings small solace to the political prisoners, to the Catholics in Poland, to the Jews in Russia, or to the intellectuals who feel the vise of an all-permeating policy of censorship.

No doubt some progress has been made in Eastern Europe since the death of Stalin. However, much more needs to be done. The dignity and integrity of the individual must and will prevail. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the free world and the United States as the leader of the free world to chart a course that will provide political and moral support for the captive peoples of central and eastern Europe as well as to evoke social and political concessions from the Communist governments through economic and political pressures.

We as a nation are indebted for the contributions made by our immigrants from Eastern Europe. Indeed, our strength and viability as a nation are directly related to the diverse complexion of our society. We cannot, we must not forget our origins. Until the people of Eastern Europe are free to determine their own destiny, our course is clear. We must lend them whatever political and economic support which is ours to command.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join in the observance of Captive Nations Week. Originally initiated and promoted by joint resolution of the Congress in 1959, Captive Nations Week has been observed during the third week of July, each succeeding year, as a rededication to the goals of national independence and freedom of the captive peoples of the world.

It has been a quarter of a century since the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in Baltic countries, Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians in central Europe, Bulgarians and Rumanians in the Balkans, and Ukrainians, lost their sovereignty and were deprived of their right to self-determination. Only apathy or forgetfulness on our part will discourage our friends, not oppression or time. Their problem is timely. Americans must not lose sight of 100 million East Europeans, even though our focus today is on the people of southeast Asia to choose their own future. The people of the captive nations must always know that we are aware of the restraints that have been levied on their freedoms and that we are vitally concerned with their human rights and destiny.

During Captive Nations Week the American people pause to reassert that we care, and share with the people of captive nations their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence. I know from the experience of the past years that this manifestation of our support is not lost on the governments and peoples of the captive nations.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, more than a hundred million people in Eastern Europe live under the bondage of communism. Many of them are linked by ties of kinship to citizens I represent in my suburban Cleveland district. I know the anguish that their families suffer over their plight.

These enslaved captive nations are in fact linked to all of us who love freedom and justice. Since 1959 when President Eisenhower first proclaimed Captive Nations Weeks we have watched the steady and determined march of communism around the globe in Europe, Africa, and Asia. A new captive nation lies just 90 miles from our own shoreline. We are fighting on the other side of the world to prevent all of Southeast Asia from slipping behind the Bamboo Curtain. An incredible total of 1 billion people live under communistic regimes.

Each year since 1959 we in Congress have risen to express our sympathy, our grave concern, and our devotion to the common cause of freedom for all men. Yet we have taken no action on the many captive nation resolutions which have been introduced, such as my House Resolution 487, awaiting action since July 21, 1965, a year ago. I hope that before this Congress adjourns, we will act to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It would give new heart and new encouragement to victims of communistic tyranny everywhere.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual observance by the United States of Captive Nations Week. It is a sad occasion not only for those Americans whose origins are in Communist-dominated countries, but for freedom-loving people everywhere who believe in self-determination and human rights.

The 1959 law which established Captive Nations Week further authorized and requested the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. Our celebration, this year and every year, will continue to greatly perturb the totalitarian Russian Communist rulers in the Kremlin for whom the captive nations were and still are a prime source of unrest and perennial weakness.

This is, first, a time to unite our prayers with the oppressed nations of Europe and the Far East that their independence will be restored. It is, far more significantly, a time to reexamine and renew our efforts to bring about the restoration of this freedom.

The U.S. policy toward these countries has been one of friendship and care. In February of this year, Secretary of State Rusk wrote that we support continuing efforts to marshal world public opinion and to bring it to bear on the issue of self-determination. Our policy of building bridges to the East is as important as ever. In the area of cultural relations, President Johnson declared in May of this year that we will encourage every constructive enrichment of the human, cultural, and commercial ties between Eastern Europe and the West. The United States has continually emphasized the need for expanded exchange programs with the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

On June 21, 1965, I introduced House Resolution 428, to create a permanent Congressional Committee on Captive Nations. The existence of such a committee would symbolize our determination that the truth emerge regarding the oppression which is endured daily by these brave people; in great measure, its work would be concerned with unravelling the misconceptions which circulate among our own citizens about these countries.

In these critical years the United States must not reject her obligation; the subtle aggression by the Communists in Eastern Europe will prove as costly as the flagrant aggressions in Korea in 1950, and in southeast Asia at this very moment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the world has witnessed the birth of numerous independent nations in Africa and Asia. In contrast to this picture of emerging freedom throughout the globe, the continued subjugation of the more than 25 Communist-dominated nations can only be a blot on the world's record. In light of this situation the issue of captive nations, therefore, belongs in the category of the most serious and important international issues; it cannot be overlooked.

One of the ways in which this issue is being met by the United States is through Captive Nations Week. Inaugurated by a unanimous resolution of the 86th Congress as an annual observance, the purpose of Captive Nations Week was to manifest to the peoples of these ill-fated nations "the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

Thus Captive Nations Week, which we commemorate today, serves to renew our spiritual ties with the oppressed nations, who have been subjugated by communism. This situation, of course, exists not only within the satellites of Eastern Europe, but also in Cuba, a number of territories now enclosed within the U.S.S.R., and many areas of Asia.

By assuring the people of these nations that their resistance is not in vain, we are demonstrating to the world our determination that Communist oppression is never to become an accepted fact. Totalitarian imperialism shall not halt the advance of world freedom; resistance to tyranny will not cease.

Thus it is that in recognizing Captive Nations Week, the United States is recognizing the undying spirit of justice and liberty that prevails among the peoples of these captive nations. Though gradual improvements have contributed to some amount of liberalization, the actual status of these enslaved nations has not changed; and the denial of their inherent freedom and sovereignty continues to occur. To adequately confront this denial of freedom, we must labor through communication, education, and all other practicable means; we must prove the strength of our commitment to freedom. This is a position which we must never weaken or abandon, for only through a diplomacy of truth will we achieve our goal of self-determination for all peoples of the world.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as in previous years, Captive Nations Week can now mark a period of deep concern for and evaluation of the status of the 100 million East Europeans whose burden since the late 1940's has been an ideology and organization of society imposed by a foreign government, the Soviet Union.

Let us here in Congress recall how this came about. In a common effort to free Europe of Nazi aggression, both the United States and the Soviet Union joined a multinational coalition. Having achieved our objectives and seen hopeful signs for the free development of all European nations, the Armed Forces of the United States were allowed to return to this country and their peacetime vocations. By contrast, massive Soviet units were preserved intact on the soils of nations liberated from Nazi occupation. Clearly, the leaders of the Soviet Union were determined to insure that Eastern and Central Europe be so politically and militarily controlled that nothing but pro-Soviet activities arise in that area.

The United States has deeply regretted and condemned the Soviet tutelage in Eastern Europe since that time. Yet the frustration of our visions for a free and peaceful Europe was matched with lack of success for the Soviets as well. For their eventual goal was a Communist Germany, France, and Italy as well. The aspirations of those nations for independence were dramatically upheld by the United States in particular crises over Berlin and in the general development of a balancing defense system, NATO. The unified efforts of the various Western European nations for democratic and non-Communist societies proved a severe disillusionment to the hopeful Soviets.

In Eastern Europe small groups of Communists, supported by the might of a foreign army, did succeed in obliterating the diverse groups having political and social ideas irreconcilable with the monolithic Communist system. Eastern Europe became a shadow of its former self—it lost its European interplay of ideas and concern with individual freedom. The cultures of this important area of Europe were submerged. Only faintly and intermittently have the people of these nations been able to express their natural points of view and inclinations.

But let us continue to evaluate each year the conditions in Eastern Europe—for even under the influence of a disagreeable ideology societies do evolve and political patterns do change. It has recently become clear to all observers that economic difficulties in the various Eastern European states have led to an erosion of dogma; a pragmatic approach to economic theory and organization has begun to appear. Furthermore, nationalistic tendencies have weakened Soviet control, particularly in Rumania.

This is not to say that civil liberties are no longer abused, that dictatorship of a small Communist group no longer belies their claims of democracy. In Poland this year a dramatic struggle revealed that the Communist leadership is fearful of the dissenting views of the Polish clergy. The main issue was the problem of Germany. While the religious leaders demonstrated a rational and amicable attitude toward German-Polish relations, the regime displayed its implacable hostility and sensitivity.

We in this Chamber can commit ourselves to the activity of peace which is being championed by nonregime elements in Eastern Europe today. As a Europe of peaceful interaction begins to take shape—and it must—the welfare of all Europeans will be furthered. The highest American interest lies in that evolution.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has consistently introduced, advocated, and supported congressional resolutions and other efforts designed to encourage and promote the restoration of freedom to captive nations, I am, indeed, very happy to again participate in this further and most worthy salute to the courageous peoples still suffering under the suppressive yoke of Communist domination.

The people of these United States and this Government very deeply regret, and most earnestly urge the Communist leaders to give up, their unlawful dictatorship over all these captive peoples and permit them to resume their right to self-government. The captive countries that suffer under the oppressive rule of these dictators have the continuing, pledged support of our Government and our citizens in their just aspirations for personal freedom and national independence.

Through this annual formal observance of Captive Nations Week, we shall continue to work and urge and hope that the Communist regimes may be persuaded and convinced that subjugated nations should be granted their God-given right to freely govern themselves as they see fit.

Let us persevere in our cause and may the good Lord speed the day of our common success in united effort to promote the liberty of the heroic peoples of the captive nations.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and proud to participate in this most appropriate Captive Nations program, which commends itself to all true lovers of freedom, and I want to compliment the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for reserving this special time in the House for these most appropriate exercises to mark the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week, first inaugurated by Congress in 1959.

Surely the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain should and must be encouraged and helped to recover their hard-won freedoms and it is good that this House should manifest its active interest in the cause of freedom for the millions of enslaved peoples who are the victims of Red imperialism.

Let it be known throughout the free world that America has not abandoned these helpless oppressed peoples to the tyranny of communism and that their long bitter struggle for freedom and self-determination has not been forgotten. Members of this House are well aware of the significant contributions that the captive nations have made down through the centuries to the cause of freedom and enlightened free government. Though now under the yoke of tyranny and oppression, these peoples have demonstrated in the past their determination to be free men and women and it is well that we recognize today their aspirations and commend their struggles in the cause of personal liberty, democracy, and freedom.

The peoples of the captive nations, Mr. Speaker, are freedom-minded and God-loving and all their hopes for liberation and freedom should be sustained and encouraged. This Nation must stand firmly with the oppressed peoples and grant them every encouragement and assistance in reaching their heartfelt goal of self-determination and governments of their own choice.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in observing Captive Nations Week.

President Johnson is to be commended for his action in proclaiming this week one during which the American people should, in a special way, turn their attention to the enslaved peoples of the world.

Captive Nations Week serves a valuable purpose for three principal reasons:

First, it serves to remind us of the millions of people throughout the world who live under the yoke of Communist domination. In Europe, in Asia, and in Latin America, we see with sorrow the plight of men who must live under the domination of those imbued with a dehumanizing, atheistic Marxist ideology.

Second, Captive Nations Week reminds us that the eyes of these enslaved are turned most particularly toward the United States, as the leader of the free world. The captive peoples have turned to us for hope and assistance.

Third, this week serves to reaffirm our own responsibility to help these captive peoples achieve freedom, self-determination, and a way of life consistent with the inherent dignity of the human person.

Although the captive peoples are alike in their loss of liberty, their individual circumstances vary greatly and require us to use a broad range of techniques in assisting them.

In Vietnam, for example, the United States is repelling with armed force the drive by communism to enslave the people of South Vietnam. Together with the South Vietnamese and our allies we are engaged in a struggle to stop Communist aggression and to release from the grip of the Vietcong guerrillas those people whom they now control.

We have used different tactics to assist the captive peoples of Cuba. There we have enforced an economic blockade which has resulted in severe economic dislocations promoted instability in the ruling regime, and has kept alive the hope of an internal overthrow of Castroism.

In Eastern Europe, the United States wisely has adopted another course, that of "building bridges" to the people of those nations. Pursuing enlightened policies, President Johnson has held out the prospect for fruitful and mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet bloc countries and the United States.

The reaction which has been forthcoming from Eastern Europe indicates that the bonds of Soviet domination may be loosening and that the United States can play a role in furthering and hastening that process.

It seems to me, therefore, that the situation in Eastern Europe demands effective action by our Government, by the Congress. This opportunity is before us in the form of the East-West Trade Act which President Johnson has sent to us.

Here is our opportunity to take effective measures at assisting the captive nations of Eastern Europe gain some freedom of action from the Soviet Union.

We in Congress have reacted with dispatch to give the President the authority and funds which are necessary to effectively repel aggression in Vietnam.

We in Congress have given the President our full backing on the policy of restricting trade with Cuba.

Now we in Congress should provide the President with the instruments which he has requested to assist in the process of bringing new hope and renewed independence to the peoples of Eastern Europe.

I urge, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this Captive Nations Week be given a special place in the history books as the one in which action was taken in Congress toward the establishment of a new era in the trade relations between East and West.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the current situation in Vietnam should not be allowed to shift our attention away from the appalling situation that exists in many other countries around the world where millions of people who once lived under freedom continue today to live under the iron hand of totalitarian control.

The first proclamation that set aside this week, the third week of July, as Captive Nations Week was issued in 1959 under the administration of President Dwight Eisenhower. Each year since 1959 the President in line with the language contained in the proclamation has issued a captive nations proclamation. The language contained in the original proclamation authorized and requested the President to issue a similar proclamation:

> Each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 years since the first proclamation and in those 7 years not a single one of the nations that were named in the original proclamation have been set free. They are nations like Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, and Estonia. We should not lose sight of the fact that one of the captive nations listed in 1959 was the very nation we are fighting today, North Vietnam, and we are engaged in a struggle with North Vietnam attempting to prevent its conquest of yet another free and independent state. In addition, as we are painfully aware, Cuba has been added to the list.

Mr. Speaker, during this special time that is set aside to remember and reflect upon the fate of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, it is especially fitting to rededicate ourselves openly and with vigor to the principles of self-determination so that the captive people of the world can take new hope in the promise that we will not deviate from our stated goals.

It is unfortunate and tragic that none of the fundamental, political, and human rights for which mankind has struggled down through the ages have yet been restored to any of the nations that now live under the iron glove of totalitarian Communist control.

We in the free world should never lose sight of this fact and should once again during this special Captive Nations Week renew our pledge that these nations once again shall live under freedom and self-determination.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we note the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is good that the world is reminded every year that over 100 million people are held against their will in the ideological prison of communism. This week also reminds the world, and us, that almost one-quarter of Europe is denied the basic rights of man as spelled out in our founding documents and those of the United Nations.

Many of the captive nations became so as a direct result of World War II. Too late did they realize, as they sought to recover from the disastrous effects of the war, that Red help meant Red rule. But we should not have been surprised for the Communist timetable has been a relentless one. In 1920 it was Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, and the Ukraine that were subjugated by the Russians. In 1922 it was Turkestan and the Far Eastern Republic. In 1924, the Mongolian People's Republic. In 1940 Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In 1946 the Red tide rolled over Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The following year Poland and Rumania fell under Russian domination and in 1948 Czechoslovakia and North Korea became part of the Communist sphere. In 1949, Hungary, East Germany, and mainland China went the same way. In 1951, it was Tibet; North Vietnam in 1954; and in 1960, Cuba. I think we are all too familiar with the price we are now paying to stop the further spread of communism in the Far East.

It is hard for us in this country to imagine an entire nation held in captivity. It is harder still to imagine what it must be like not to be free. Only when one seriously thinks about what the loss of freedom really means does the heinous nature of the Communist crime of enslavement become comprehensible. God willing, it is a burden we shall never experience. But that does not mean that we can afford to ignore the plight of the unfortunate people who live under the Red yoke. We must provide them with the inspiration to resist their captors as they have been doing since they were subjugated. And above all, we must keep our own freedom intact and be ever ready to help those who find theirs threatened.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include with these remarks the proclamation issued by President Johnson marking Captive Nations Week, 1966:

Captive Nations Week, 1966

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples; and

Whereas these basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and

Whereas, in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples:

Now, therefore, I Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 8th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 26 years since the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania lost their freedom to the insatiable appetite of Soviet imperialism. This infamous and tragic deed perpetrated upon the fiercely independent people of those nations was the result of that exercise in diplomatic duplicity by the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, the Molotov-Ribbentropp pact. That agreement was the forerunner to Russia's equally tragic treatment of the people of the other nations of Eastern Europe now known collectively as the captive nations. It is one of the ironies of history the people of Eastern Europe who fought so valiantly against one form of tyranny during World War II would have their desire for freedom and independence thwarted through the imposition of an even harsher system of tyranny, if that is possible, by force of Soviet arms.

Desire for freedom, however, still burns fiercely in the hearts of those oppressed people. Yet as fire needs fuel for sustenance, so also does hope. We, Mr. Speaker, can supply that fuel for focusing the attention of the free people of the world upon the plight of the nations of Eastern Europe.

We have ample evidence that manifestations of concern for Russian domination of Eastern Europe strengthens the resolve of the people to fight for freedom. The recent events in Poland centering around that country's celebration of 1,000 years of Christianity show that when world opinion takes cognizance of the fact that a peoples' heritage is in danger of destruction, the determination of that people to fight back is strengthened immeasurably.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to connect myself with the sentiments of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. It is altogether fitting that in commemoration of Captive Nations Week that the Congress provide this visible evidence of the support of the American people for the legitimate desires of the people of the captive nations of Europe.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we have come once again to the week in which we commemorate the captive nations of Europe, a commemoration authorized by the Congress itself in Public Law 86–90. It is a time to remember in a particular way the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Ukraine, all of whom are under Communist domination in Eastern Europe.

It is a tragic fact, though, that while these are the officially constituted captive nations, there is an additional roll of nations under communism—White Ruthenia, East Germany, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and Cuba. And we see other nations threatened with engulfment by communism, in South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, and Thailand.

There is little consolation that any of us may take in considering this long list of captive nations. They represent more than a billion human beings now under the control of communism all over the world. They represent a loss of dignity for these people, and a loss of so many of the values which we take for granted—things like our basic freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, religious freedom. For some, they have been under the power of communism since 1920. For others, the night of communism has come upon them as recently as 1960, when communism engulfed Cuba in our own hemisphere.

These are the people whom we remember in a very special way during this Captive Nations Week.

It is not a popular week behind the Iron Curtain. There is an endless stream of vituperations which could be presented to the Congress over the establishment of Captive Nations Week and over the annual commemoration of this week by distinguished Members of Congress. It is hated behind the Iron Curtain, because it is an annual reminder to the whole world that their instruments of rule are still death and terror, that communism is the worst imperialism the world has ever known. This week represents an annual holding of the mirror up to communism, and there is a very great unhappiness when they look at their own images. But I hope that the Congress will hold the mirror up each year, as long as these nations remain captive.

I firmly believe, however, that we in the Congress might do more than merely commemorate these captive nations annually. I have said to you in the past, and I say it again now, that we should establish a Committee in the Congress called the Captive Nations Committee.

The value of this committee would be great. We are beginning to hear more and more about the many faces of communism. We are being told that some of the Communists are hardline, some softline. Some want to coexist, some are opposed to coexistence. Some are anxious to expand trade with the West; some are not so anxious. But there is no committee in the Congress acting as a clearing house for all those items concerning the captive nations about which all of us should be constantly informed.

I am aware of the fact that the administration and the Department of State are opposed to the creation of such a committee. I do not see why the Congress cannot act on its own in this matter. There is a clear need for such a committee. There is a definite function for such a committee. I urge the whole Congress to face this need boldly and to establish a Captive Nations Committee.

We are all witnessing the restlessness of the Communist world. Each week we see the messengers of communism flying across the world to shore up the relations which exist between these nations. There is clear evidence that communism is in trouble in many nations. We must do all in our power to assist the people of these nations to achieve freedom. Our observance of Captive Nations Week is certainly a reminder to all of these people that the highest legislative body in this land has not forgotten them. But the creation of a Committee on the Captive Nations, or the creation of a subcommittee in the Committee on Foreign Affairs would certainly be a tremendous psychological stroke on the part of the Congress. It is my hope, and certainly the hope of many of my colleagues here today, that such a step will be taken in the near future.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a time set aside for Americans to remember those millions of people in the captive nations of Eastern Europe and Asia. In a world that is increasingly becoming imbued with the spirit of freedom and independence, it is indeed tragic that so many people should be cut off from the advantages and privileges of freedom by the restrictive ideology of communism.

A penetrating look by all Americans at the plight of these captive people can only lead to a saddening but hopeful reaction.

We are sad that these people do not enjoy the individual liberties that are taken for granted in the United States and much of the rest of the free world. We are sad that these people are frustrated in their search for lives which are free from state control by the Communist insistence on the people's devotion to the state and the Communist Party. We are sad that these people are cut off from any extensive contact with the

West by the physical and spiritual barriers that have been erected by the Communists, the reasons for which are obvious.

However, one can also be hopeful, even though the enslavement of these captive nations may seem permanent to some. There is an increasing amount of evidence that these nations are rebelling against the stranglehold which the Communists are trying to keep on them. Intellectuals especially are refusing to succumb to the Communist ideology. Some of these nations are bravely demonstrating that they are not mere submissive satellites, but nations seeking to express their identity. Some are showing that they are definitely interested in establishing meaningful ties to the West.

We must not let these overtures go unnoticed. Instead, let us look forward to the day when these nations will no longer be captive.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one needs only to review recent world political events to realize that there is a growing need to renew our efforts to lower the restrictive curtains of communism.

And there is no more proper time to register this determination than now, during the observance of Captive Nations Week.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations should be much applauded for its continuing endeavors to mobilize world opinion against the oppressive Communist doctrine that holds sway over millions of persons now living under Communist domination.

At this point in time, when there is much unrest on the part of these captive peoples, the Assembly of Captive European Nations seeks to combat Communist ideology so alien to freedom-seeking individuals.

It behooves the House of Representatives to strongly add its voice and support to these causes of self-determination, and it is with pride and pleasure that I join with other Members of Congress in urging this renewed effort.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, behind the Iron Curtain in many nations of Eastern Europe, Asia, and the Caribbean, languish more than 120 million non-Russian captives. During the week of July 17–23, designated as Captive Nations Week, it is to these unfortunate human beings that we will address our thoughts and prayers.

Captive Nations Week was established by the 86th Congress in 1959 to give official recognition to the many historical, personal, and cultural ties between Americans and captive peoples. We shall continue to observe this occasion until such time as freedom and independence have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Two weeks ago we Americans joined in the stirring commemoration of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, an act which kindled a revolution in the hearts and minds of men that lives to this day. Our great forebears declared:

> We believe these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As we join in the thrilling commemoration of Captive Nations Week, Americans everywhere, from Maine to California, from Florida to my own great State of Pennsylvania, reaffirm these magnificent principles. And we reassert them for all peoples, whether they be American, Polish, Czech, or Cuban. For we believe with all our hearts that all of God's children are entitled to personal liberty.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, as we join in observance of this important occasion, we experience a new birth of freedom, and we say to our brothers enslaved by Communist tyrants that they are not forgotten. We realize that until all men are free, no "free" man is really free. It is a great privilege to join with my colleagues in observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate paradox that Americans are currently enjoying the greatest prosperity and freedom known to mankind at a time when hundreds of millions of people are living the depths of despair because their lives cannot be reconciled with the lack of freedom. We have been endowed with the freest, most mobile and flexible society in history, while those engulfed by the chains of thoughtless totalitarian tyranny are compelled to live a dreary and monotonous existence, one that produces a robotlike submissiveness to the state and stifles the channels of individual creativity.

It is indeed tragic, Mr. Speaker, that the continuing resurgence of political despotism among the imperialistic Communist states is based upon the perverted hope that a new and brighter tomorrow is contingent upon the refutation of democracy as a vulgar and degrading institution.

It is therefore to our poignant concern, Mr. Speaker, that this distinguished House observes the eighth annual Captive Nations Week so we can express our firm belief in national independence and the right of self-government.

The plight of the captive nations must not go unnoticed because the totally negative grounds on which communism rests are contrary to the basic tenets of human decency, morality, freedom, and opportunity. Today, Mr. Speaker, the imprisoned peoples of the captive nations are understandably engulfed by a stark pessimism that has been brought about by the realization that the human condition is a hopeless one because of the unrelenting malignancy of the incomprehensive power that dictates from above. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is mandatory that we find ways to encourage those under the yoke of Communist imperialism to find the strength to endure their forced oppression until the day comes when history reveals the fatal flaws of this inherently decadent system.

One of the great tragedies of contemporary civilization is the peoples of the captive nations find themselves in great personal peril if they continue tenaciously to cling to the vestiges of a happier and more rewarding past. The past weeks, for example, have seen the brave people of Poland attempt to mark the millennium of the establishment of their Catholic Church. Yet, the observance was stymied by that country's government because the belief in God is contrary to the secular and moral atheism of their scientific system. Still, I cannot help but feel that the Polish people, as well as all the other oppressed peoples, possess an awareness of their condition.

None of us wants to see the prophency of George Orwell become a reality. In the classic work, "1984," he is warning mankind that the loss of consciousness of the personality will be an intrinsic factor in man's descent into a sterile oblivion. Let there be no mistake, that the perverted genius of Orwell can be transformed into reality by the tide of communism because this way of life is founded upon the sacrificing of the individual will to a morally cynical system that is shrouded by myths.

It is implicit, Mr. Speaker, that as free men we must take steps to restore to the victims of oppression a sane philosophy of self-respect and freedom; for if we do not we, too, may be swept up by the ominous waves of a fatally predetermined future.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this week we pause to commemorate the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. President Johnson has asked that we set aside July 17–23 to consider the plight of those peoples forced to live under communism.

Our country has a tradition of championing the right of all nations to choose their own form of government. We have been involved in two World Wars to protect this right. Today the Communists threaten to deprive the people of South Vietnam of this right.

The tragedy of the captive nations of Eastern Europe is that shortly after they ceased to be vassals of the giant European empires, they became puppets of the Soviet Union. An Iron Curtain was imposed which divided East and West. With the fall of Czechoslovakia in 1948 more than 100 million people had become captives behind this curtain of tyranny.

Despite more than 20 years of Communist rule, demands for national independence and political liberty continue to frustrate the Communist rulers of the captive nations. The Soviets are being forced to realize that the same forces which have operated to dissolve the strongest empires in the past are operating to promote polycentric tendencies within the Communist empire. Even small steps toward national independence from the top are usually reflective of pressures and demands from below for much greater change.

Rioting and unrest continue in many countries.

Our country has often been called a melting pot, because many of the builders of our great Nation left their original homelands to seek greater freedom and opportunity. Many of our fellow citizens are friends and relatives of the oppressed peoples of the captive nations. These Americans often learn firsthand of the suffering and deprivation endured by those they love.

Thus, we have two strong reasons for supporting the cause of these gallant peoples. Not only are they struggling for that which is central to our own tradition and beliefs, but also they are linked by strong ties to millions of our own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot abandon the cause of the captive peoples. For as long as a man in Eastern Europe is denied the right to vote our own right to vote will not be secure. When a writer in a Communist nation is jailed for his political views, our own freedom of expression is threatened.

The oppressed peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as a citadel of freedom and as a champion of national self-determination. They look to their American friends and relatives to support their struggle for liberty. Above all, they expect our Government to continue to assume leadership in the campaign for international justice and independence for all peoples.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago Captive Nations Week was established as a time when this Nation soberly observes the tragic plight of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. In 1966, Captive Nations Week is July 17–23, and during these 7 days I hope that all Americans will remember that the freedoms which they enjoy are not shared by the people of the countries that have fallen under the specter of communism.

Since the Second World War, the world has witnessed the birth of many new nations. This period has also witnessed the elimination of other nations from the community of the free world by Soviet and Chinese Communist imperialism.

Societies which looked forward to a new era of freedom at the end of World War II were instead subjugated by the oppressive rule of Communist governments directed from Moscow. The puppet leaders of these governments depended on support from Soviet Russia to remain in power. Cultural and intellectual freedom became virtually nonexistent, as these regimes quashed anything which threatened the Communist Party's monopoly on ideas. The Communists insisted on being allowed to spread their dogma while they censored any efforts to spread ideas of individual freedom, national independence, and social justice.

Although the people of the captive nations are temporarily subjected to rule by the Communist minorities, the natural love of freedom of people everywhere must eventually win there too. Americans must not forget that these people look to the United States as the embodiment of human liberty and for leadership in helping them regain their freedom and independence.

It is vitally important that we do not let this hope for liberty and this belief in independence die in the hearts and minds of these subjected nations of Eastern Europe and Asia. Captive Nations Week is a pledge to these people that our sympathy for their aspiration will not die. It is a symbol of our conviction that the yearning of people to free themselves from the bondage of oppressive foreign rule will not allow them to live long as captives.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress and the Nation pause to devote attention to our traditional observance of Captive Nations Week. This is an excellent gesture on the part of the American people, and serves to reaffirm our faith that someday those victims of Communist tyranny and captivity will be liberated.

It is a remarkable state of affairs when we consider that since the end of World War II, more than 50 new countries have gained their independence and have taken their places in the community of free and sovereign states. But on the other hand, we witness especially in Eastern Europe, many countries which have fallen victim to Communist control, and the history of those countries goes back hundreds of years.

Today the world is witnessing several situations in which oppressed people are demanding and gaining their freedom. While this is not taking place among the captive nations, that struggle is still being waged. It is being carried on in the hearts and minds of the people whose cries for freedom and self-determination even the Communists have been unable to stifle completely. Our support of Captive Nations Week—whether as Members of Congress or as ordinary citizens—is an important medium through which the countless millions may gain courage and perseverance. It would be a tragic mistake for the free world to think that since there is no open rebellion or insurrection taking place in those countries that they are satisfied with their Communist masters. We should know that this is simply not so. The time may well be at hand when they can rise up and tear down the veil which communism has stretched over their rights and liberties. Let us do our part to help hasten that time and constantly remind each other that the freedoms we enjoy are denied to millions behind the Iron Curtain.

It is my sincere hope that the good we seek to do through our observance of Captive Nations Week will soon bear positive and substantial results. In this endeavor we simply cannot afford to grow weary or capitulate.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the occasion of the eighth annual Captive Nations Week. As established by Public Law 86-90, it is intended to show the captive peoples of the world that the United States shares their desire and hope for eventual emancipation.

The history of the captive nations is not a pleasant one. Ever since the Russian revolution of 1917, they have fallen, one by one, directly or indirectly to Communist aggression and subversion.

The 1920's witnessed the subjugation of the free peoples of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, the Ukraine, Far Eastern Republic, Turkestan, and the Mongolian People's Republic.

In 1940 the Soviet Union brutally and illegally annexed the free Baltic States, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Before the decade was over communism had come to dominate the free peoples of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Hungary, East Germany, and mainland China. Since 1950, Communist tyranny has been forced upon Tibet, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

All these nations were overcome by the most ruthless and violent means. Whether the aggression that finally subdued them was direct or indirect, it was always opposed by the vast majority of people.

Although Communist oppression is felt by all the citizens of the captive nations, it has not stifled the will of these freedom-loving peoples to be free again. It could not prevent uprisings in East Germany and Poland. It could not prevent a revolution in Hungary. It could not slow the flood of refugees from Communist to free Berlin before a wall was built to do so. It will never be able to blot out the hopes and prayers of millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains for the freedom and human dignity of which they have too long been deprived.

It is for us during this Captive Nations Week to retell and relive the history and plight of the captive peoples of the world. We must at this time renew our pledge to work toward and for the liberation of these brave peoples. To do less, Mr. Speaker, would be to renounce the principles and ideals for which this Nation stands.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the first week in July finds us joyously celebrating our national independence and individual freedom. Yet, this third week in July finds Americans solemnly observing the captivity of many nations and hundreds of millions of people. Freedom and independence are essential to the life of every American, and sometimes we are prone to forget that for so many peoples in Eastern Europe and Asia the democratic way of life is only a dream. "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," is nothing but a hollow phrase to the peoples living under the oppressive rule of the Communists.

During Captive Nations Week let every American take time out to consider the plight of proud peoples everywhere who are denied their freedom. Let every American who enjoys political, social, economic, and religious freedom consider the plight of the many peoples who have lost their freedoms.

In 1959, the Congress passed a joint resolution requesting the President to designate the third week in July every year as Captive Nations Week. Unlike a joyous celebration this week must remain a solemn observance as long as nations are prohibited from "deriving their just power from the consent of the governed." The conscience of this country and, in fact, the entire free world cannot rest peacefully as long as peoples are subjugated to the oppressive rule of the Communists. Especially disheartening is the plight of the Eastern European nations. Since World War II and the subsequent Soviet takeover, these once-free peoples have borne the worst that communism brings, and only in recent years has there been any appreciable amelioration of their condition.

Captive Nations Week must serve to remind all subdued peoples that the United States will not shirk her responsibilities as the leader of the free world. The hallowed words of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address have become a reality in this land, and we are sure that in the future the present captive nations also, "shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to express my support for the wonderful goals which surround the Captive Nations Week observance.

While I greatly regret the circumstances which have necessitated such an event, I am confident that those unfortunate victims of Communist oppression will someday emerge as free men and women to take their place in a world of justice and self-determination.

It seems only proper that we in America should be leading in this program of recognition of the hundreds of millions of souls held captive by the Communists. As we commemorate another Captive Nations Week, let us make a firm determination to work even harder for the realization of liberty for those of our fellow human beings now unable to partake of the benefits of freedom.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in 1959 President Eisenhower, with a unanimous resolution of the Congress, proclaimed the third week of each July as Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

This is the continuing goal of the captive nations of Eastern Europe and southeast Asia—as well as of the free nations of the world. Sadly enough, however, their number has not decreased, and the free world lives in constant fear that it may increase through the aggression of Communist nations. We are fighting at this very moment to prevent the addition of South Vietnam to the unfortunate and too-long list of these subjugated countries. In other ways, but with the same determination we must continue to press for the return of the national and individual liberties of those nations who suffered the loss of these freedoms in the past.

Although the peoples of the captive nations are weighted down by the oppression of their Communist conquerors, their undying devotion to and desire for freedom stands as the rallying point for the efforts of the free world. We must ever continue to support and join in their struggle until, in truth, their freedom and independence has been regained.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, July 17, 1966, marks the beginning of the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a time when the United States should solemnly reaffirm to the millions of people in the captive nations of Eastern Europe our pledge that we are vitally concerned for their plight as the victims of Soviet domination. With the eyes of the world currently focused on the crisis in southeast Asia, we must be sure that the people of the captive nations are aware that we are constantly looking for ways of strengthening East-West lines of communication and ties of friendship.

However, because of new challenges in Asia, we must not forget older challenges in Eastern Europe. It is here that national integrity and freedom to which we have so ardently devoted ourselves, have been crushed by the surge of Soviet expansionism and its accompanying suppression of intellectual and cultural freedom.

The extent of the tyranny which has been imposed on these subjugated but brave people may be symbolized by the ugly and saddening wall in Berlin. It stands for the separation of the people behind it and throughout captive Europe from their inalienable rights as human beings. It stands for the separation of loved ones and families—and for the division of a nation, one side free and prosperous and one side captive and poor.

In spite of this, the Berlin wall also demonstrates that man loves his freedom above all else. The fact that it had to be built to contain the exodus to freedom and that still brave people risk their lives to cross, climb over, or dig under it, is a poignant symbol of the empty claims of Communist ideology. The plight of these captive peoples and possible Americans means of alleviating it must remain a primary concern of U.S. foreign policy.

The public declarations of hopes and ideals during Captive Nations Week are an attempt to bring to the public mind a greater awareness of the tragic enslavement of these people. As Americans, we want to do everything possible to keep alive their love of liberty with the fervent hope they may someday be free.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this week of July 17 to 23 marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Throughout this great land of ours Americans will gather to pray together and to mark this solemn occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities. Our goal will be to say in word and deed to the enslaved people of the Captive Nations, "Take heart in your fight against tyranny, for you are not the forgotten ones. We who were fortunate enough to be born in a land where individual freedom is held in reverance have not forsaken you. We continue to pray for your deliverance."

For Captive Nations Week reminds each American to search his heart and to give thanks for the liberty that he enjoys. We who possess the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as inalienable rights must never take our good fortune lightly. May we ever be aware of the great sacrifices of our ancestors to make our freedom possible. May we be ever mindful of the sacrifices of our sons today in the defense of freedom.

The Russian tyrant Stalin strove to hammer the nations he dominated into a single monolithic bloc. Although he allowed no manifestation of the forces of national consciousness and self-interest among the satellites, he could not erase the forces themselves. Combined with the basic urge to enjoy freedom and the desire for a better life, these forces have now cracked the monolith. The countries under Soviet rule are becoming less and less isolated from the West. Their natural and national diversities are becoming more and more apparent.

We are told of the "winds of change" whistling through the captive nations. According to many observers, these winds are warm enough to thaw much of the tyranny of these countries. It is true that the conditions in the captive nations can no longer be thought of in simplistic terms. Certainly we can no longer speak of the region in broad generalizations.

Yet despite these warm breezes of liberalization, we know that the individual in the captive nations is denied the essence of personal freedom. His leaders do not respect the sanctity of individual dignity. He continues to be an "unperson" in the sense that he does not enjoy the life that we of the free world believe belongs to every one of God's children.

Today the citizen of the captive nations wears better clothes and eats better food. Yet let us look deeper. Let us look at the soul and mind of the citizen. He must continue to submit to the doctrine of communism. He is not free to travel as he pleases. He cannot speak freely about domestic politics or about international affairs. He is not free to compose poetry as it comes from his heart, or to write what he feels, or to worship where he pleases. Thus I remind my fellow Americans that we must not be deceived by the higher standard of living of the people of the captive nations, for that is on the material plane. Intellectually they thirst after the liberty to pursue all knowledge and to push back the frontiers of the mind, without the fetters of Communist doctrine. Spiritually they are deprived and hungry for freedom.

Captive Nations Week thus affords each of us a great and wonderful opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom. It is a real privilege for me to rise with my colleagues in observance of this grand occasion.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nation's Week, 1966, comes at a time when the attention of the American people—and in fact the world—is centered in Asia. It is centered there because we are engaged in a great and bloody struggle to halt Communist aggression in this area of the world and to prevent them from overthrowing the legitimate government of South Vietnam by brutal, foreign-based force. Although our attention is rightfully there, it should not be and cannot be, an all-consuming attention—for the rest of the world still exists and most of the same great issues that faced the rest of the world before Vietnam still exist today. It is because of this that Europe, Latin America, and Africa still deserve our constant and vigilant consideration even in these troubled times—or perhaps, to be more accurate, especially because of these troubled times.

The connection between the Vietnamese conflict and this celebrated week becomes obvious when we stop and consider our aim in this present conflict. Although it is undeniable that self-interest has a great deal to do with our position, it is also obvious that our concern for the South Vietnamese people's right of free progress and self-determination is exceptionally strong. We are there principally to allow the people in that nation to chart their own future without the threat of Communist takeover and terror. In so doing we are reasserting our long-held stance with regard to the captive nations of Europe and Asia. That stance, put simply, is that we cannot condone the methods of international communism—either in the manner in which they achieved control in these nations, or in the way that they presently rule these nations.

The denial of free expression, of natural rights, of all measures of personal liberty is deeply appalling to us who appreciate the spirit and the flavor of freedom that still runs deep in the minds and souls of the vast majority of citizens in these lands. Theirs is not an easy lot in these days—but there remains hope; principally because the United States has not forgotten them and their dreams for a free future. And we have not forgotten each year to remind them and the world that we are as eager for their freedom as they themselves, and that freedom eventually shall be theirs to enjoy; for freedom is the only path for human progress. It is inevitable in the end.

My concern for this area of the world and its concurrent difficulties has led me to sponsor legislation to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations. I have reintroduced my bill again in this Congress. I have done this because I feel that such a committee could fully explore the many aspects of the captive nations and thus strengthen America's role in the cold war. I have done this also because it appears to me that the House should have a special committee exclusively devoted to the same considerations that prompted the establishment and observance of Captive Nations Week.

In essence, the committee, if created, would conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the satellite countries and captive non-Russian nations, which include those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedoms.

Since this basic idea has the support of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am indeed hopeful that it will be given every possible consideration by the House this year.

In any event, this week puts the spotlight anew on enslaved people, and places our Nation and our people squarely behind their personal aspirations for eventual freedom. I am happy to play even a small part in this support.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are now observing our eighth Captive Nations Week. Since the first one in July 1959, aggression has overrun Cuba and has flared into a major war in Vietnam. Under the false banner of peaceful coexistence, Communists are pushing forward through active encouragement and support of class warfare and revolutionary wars of liberation. Earlier this year, a revolutionary council backed by the Kremlin was established in Havana, Cuba, just 90 miles from our shores, to foment revolutions throughout the Western Hemisphere.

After 8 years, Captive Nations Week remains even more significant than ever before because the cold war continues as a political fact of life. The desire to end our independence and bury our way of life is now, as it always has been, the touchstone of Communist policy. For those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains the cold war continues, too. Never has religious persecution been more intense, nor literary censorship more cruel. Russian Communist economic exploitation of her east-central European colonies has reached such a degree that even the Communist satellite rules are forced to object.

Our dedication to the freedom of mankind must escalate as the pressures of Communist aggression accelerate, and not for ourselves alone, but for all freedom-loving mankind.

In this struggle, which began with us in 1776 and continues even today, we have millions of silent allies behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Through pressures for greater individual freedom, through criticisms of Communist efforts to liquidate national patriotism and religious faith, it is apparent that they are working out a formula for successful struggle against Communist tyranny.

Through Captive Nations Week, this year we join to express our continuing faith in man's indomitable spirit, in his growing rejection of violations of human rights, and in his dedication to a world of independent nations and free peoples. We must keep in mind that the people of captive nations have not lost their desire for freedom and independence. We must not allow their spirit to succumb to despair; we must keep their spirit alive. With this in mind, I was one of over 30 Members of the House who introduced a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I am hopeful we can secure action on this resolution in this Congress.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this crucial era of international relations it is particularly important that we observe this week, which is designated as Captive Nations Week.

We celebrate this week throughout the United States to show our support of the right of all people to self-determination as to their form of government and freely to pursue their economic, social, and cultural development. Today, these are rights denied to millions of subjugated and enslaved people throughout the world.

It is fitting that we in this country who enjoy complete freedom, and who are often guilty of taking that freedom for granted, should set aside this 1 week of the year to devote special attention to the deprived people who desire liberty and independence, but who are now struggling under the tyrannical Communist yoke.

During Captive Nations Week, we reaffirm our determination to work toward the establishment of democratic processes and eventual freedom in these subjugated areas. I could not more fully endorse the underlying principles of Captive Nations Week, and I trust that through our observance of it we can show the peoples in these oppressed nations our concern for them, and give them confidence that the free world is constantly striving to achieve their liberation.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, America's concern over the plight of the captive nations will always be predicated on the conviction that if this can happen to other peoples, it can also happen to us.

Admittedly, this is a selfish analysis of the situation, but our concern goes much deeper since our entire history has running through it our determination to remain free. Indeed, our military involvement outside of the continental limits of the United States, including our current operations in Vietnam, stem from our hatred of aggression.

The original Captive Nations' proclamation by President Eisenhower, based on the unanimous resolution of Congress, was specific and precise in its denunciation of those totalitarian powers that had aggressively subjugated their neighbors. Since then, succeeding administrations have tended to water down the clear intent of the Congress in its original resolution, and as a result, we have seemed to compromise in our espousal of freedom for all people.

Aggression is increasingly on the loose and we remain virtually the only nation that can speak with armed authority. Let us, then, reaffirm our commitment—stated so clearly on July 4, 1776—that we hold to the self-evident truth that all men are endowed with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let us have no traffic whatsoever with any nation that keeps another in thralldom and let us make meaningful our original determination that independence shall be achieved for every captive nation throughout the world.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it was 7 years ago this month that we in Congress passed a resolution to designate a week each year as "Captive Nations Week." Subsequent to the unanimous passage of the resolution, President Eisenhower set aside the third week in July in observance of this occasion.

This year, July 17 through July 23, is being observed as Captive Nations Week. It centers the attention of the world upon the gross enslavement of 22 European and Asian nations under the iron fist of the Communists. The people of these nations, including those in North Vietnam, are still under Communist domination. They have no freedom or national independence.

By the recognition we give to Captive Nations Week, I am hopeful it will again picture to the world the ruthless militaristic power of the Communists. While we are engaged in a cold war and a hot war in southeast Asia, I believe that Captive Nations Week will successfully point out a serious condition that is being overlooked by many nations of the free world. That is the fact that the Communists are not giving up. Everywhere they continue to create turmoil and strife and are grasping for more territory. We see it in Vietnam. I am sure the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, and the other nations now under the heel of the Communist know what is going on. Moreover, the Russians have promised to "bury us." When the Communists are so clear with their intentions, it is incredible that India, England, and France are now trying to negotiate with the Communists.

Perhaps this year's Captive Nations Week will reexpose the Communist scourge for what it is and what it is attempting to do to the free world.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1961, the Radyanska Ukraina newspaper of Kiev declared:

> All progressive mankind greeted the news of the so-called "Captive Nations Week" with a feeling of anger and indignation. With foaming mouths the imperialist predators insist on the fantastic idea of restoring the capitalist order in the lands of the peoples' democracies and Soviet socialist republics.

Speaking of the same celebration, Pyongyang Radio of North Korea, on July 10, 1963, referred to the late President Kennedy as a third-class clown conducting a despicable animal campaign.

Such words, dripping with hatred and vituperation, are rare, even for the ideological and propaganda organs of the Communist Party. The sole conclusion which we can conceivably draw from these examples of the Soviet outpourings of invective and execration is that the celebration of Captive Nations Week genuinely and deeply worries the Russian Government.

Why is this? Let us examine the recently issued "Manifesto for Captive Nations Week" of the Conference of Americans of Central and East European Descent. It takes no trouble to hide its aims:

> We accuse the Soviet government of violating the solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nations made captive during and after World War II . . .
>
> We accuse the Soviet government of forcibly depriving the nations within its own borders of the promised right of self-determination . . .
>
> We urge . . . that the United States declare its support of the right of self-determination of all peoples held in captivity by the Communist regimes and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;
>
> We appeal to the people of the United States of America, during Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1966, to manifest their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Soviet subjugated lands of Central and Eastern Europe and Asia in the world-wide conflict between the forces of freedom and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help these allies in their struggle for freedom and national independence.

It is pledges like these—from people who will not rest until the enslaved nations are freed from the yoke of Communist oppression that cause outcries such as those I cited earlier. It is statements like these which force the Soviet Union to admit to itself that its policies of suppression and incarceration are hopelessly doomed to failure.

The rulers of the U.S.S.R. know that the peoples of these countries will not submit endlessly to the police-state measures employed by the Communist regimes. They know that the longer these people must suffer, the more worldwide indignation will mount and the more the world will be fully aware that the brutality which marked the Stalin regime in Russia is by no means a memory of the past.

Speaking in Vilna, Lithuania last year, Soviet ideologist Mikhail Suslov defamed Captive Nations Week as "villainous demagogy." No lie could be more stark; no insult to the Western World more vicious. We who serve as lawmakers for the free world must never allow these challenges to go unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week, we must pledge ourselves to continue in our campaign to alert the world to the dangers of totalitarianism under the nefarious banners of "People's Republics." In this fight, we have no time to rest.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has again complied with the request from Congress made 8 years ago to annually designate the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. This year the proclamation was made on July 8 and I would like to have it included as part of my remarks.

The proclamation follows:

Captive Nations Week, 1966

(By the President of the United States of America)

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples; and

Whereas these basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and

Whereas, in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this eighth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

By the President:
[SEAL]

George W. Ball,
Acting Secretary of State.

The observance of this week was intended to focus upon the attention of the American people, and indeed all peoples of the world, the plight of the nations held in bondage to their gargantuan eastern neighbor and the regimes which that state placed upon their destinies.

We in this country are now in the midst of the season when our people take to the roads, beaches, and skyways of this wondrous land. We know that millions of Americans are busily enjoying the fruits of their labors. They are able to do so within the context, frequently little realized, of law and justice. They are free to go where they wish with no need for elaborate papers and passes. They may go abroad if they so desire. In short, this time of year is one which allows special expression of the dream of a way of life which Americans hold to be the right of all men.

Yet, at this very moment, there are many men and women rotting in dungeons, slaving in work camps, and undergoing other horrors because they dared to express a desire for the freedom of choice in making one's own future which we so casually accept. These brave, unfortunate souls live in the countries which are called in the President's declaration, the captive nations.

These nations show to mankind the other side of the picture of our era—the unpleasant side which jars the image of hopeful progress under the knowledge gained by the wonders of science. These nations show the ruthless urge to power which lurks within the human animal. They are called captive because a group of men have conspired to and succeeded in capturing absolute power over the lives of the people.

The advent of the present Communist dictatorships of these several historic nations was no miraculous event, nor some foreordained expression of historic inevitability. It was the result of a calculated plan and program of aggression and imposition of unrepresentative minorities. Nowhere behind the Iron Curtain did the present regime come to power of a free choice of the populaces. Nor did the current group of oligarchs seize power by the brilliance and courage of their conspiratorial activities. Nor did they simply prove more adept at gaining control in the conditions of upheaval and uncertainty which existed at the end of the Second World War.

The present group of petty tyrants came to power on the bayonets of the Soviet Army. Some, it is true, are successors to the groups of Communists who first arrived in the baggage of the Soviet military. But they are still Communists who achieved their exalted positions because no Communist leadership has ever allowed a free election. So long as the iron behemoths of the Red army, the terrible destroyers of Hungarian freedom in 1956, still remain the final arbiter in politics behind the curtain, the struggle for power yields only new Communists to replace the old ones.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, the governmental apparatuses of these states are the progeny of a conquest by a rapacious alien power. They are not the product of indigenous forces freely expressing competing native wills and interests. The captive peoples are thus a glaring demonstration of the terrible forces of oppression and arbitrary rule still alive in our supposedly enlightened era. In contrast to the myriad of new, free nations which have appeared in the wake of the great changes caused by the last war, the nations of Eastern Europe seem some relic of a barbarous and despotic previous age.

It is thus especially fitting that just when our people are most enjoying the benefits of the hopeful side of or epoch, we remind them of the horrid alternatives which actually exists. Let there be no mistaking, the spectre of an arbitrary dictatorship, is a real fact of life. The danger is here, today, for all to see.

Not only is the terrible vision of a domestic Communist tyranny a fact, but it is combined with an even older form of oppression—alien conquest. The two sorry expressions of the worst in human beings have been combined in the brutal conquest of the small nations on Russia's western borders and the imposition of sordid copies of the undemocratic, police state which is the Soviet Union. The Soviet leadership clique, which itself has never been tested in a free election, installed Communist rule in Eastern Europe by fear, executions and deportation of opponents.

As soon as this had been done the imperial features of the new relationship appeared. The war-torn countries behind the newly built Iron Curtain were bled white to provide for the speedy reconstruction and development of the Soviet Union and its gigantic war machine. The basis for constructing newer and stronger Red armies to conquer more independent nations for the greater wealth and glory of communism and the Soviet Union was partially created by the rape of the small east European countries. Some were so terribly treated as to be forcefully incorporated within the huge concentration camp called the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, more voices should be raised against this shameful chapter in the history of man's inhumanity to man. Millions did not die to destroy "the dark night of barbarism" which was Hitler's vision for mankind, just to see it occur immediately under communism. They would surely oppose it today as they did the Nazi legions before. They should not be so dishonored that the cause for which they fought and died—human and national freedom and independence—is soon forgotten by those who follow them. If we do not cry out against the evil which still exists in the captive nations, if we do not remind our fellow Americans and peoples of all the world in the most forceful terms that the horror of despotism still exists, then we will not be keeping faith with those who have given so much over the centuries to eradicate the sickness of oppression in human society.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of this great land must never cease to proclaim that it remembers the victims of crime which is communism. We need to consistently remind our fellow citizens that there is an area to the east of the free world where over 100 million other human beings live in fear of their self-perpetuating rulers.

The present injustices must some day pass, for freedom and national self-determination are the goals of the masses of people. The crushing force of alien military might will not always stifle the desire for a new and better order in the countries now held in bondage in the Soviet Empire. We have been told that some small changes have taken place in at least the forms of organizing the economies of those countries. But the real, basic change in the political order has not been allowed at all. So long as there is no change in this sad state of affairs we must never relax our efforts to keep this tragedy before the attention of mankind.

I wish to add my voice to the call being issued during this week of remembrance of the existence of the captive nations to encourage the peoples in those lands to keep strong the hope for a better life which will surely come. I can only add my deep hope that such a happy day will not be long in coming.

Just recently I have made a tour of the countries behind the Iron Curtain under the control of communism and, from firsthand experience, I can relate that there is a frustration obviously evident that can only be erased by the knowledge that their people can once again have the freedom to choose their own way of life and determine their own destiny.

The point of Captive Nations Week is not just for the Baltic States or Eastern Europe. It covers all once-free nations now under the Communist yoke in Europe and elsewhere. The people held in captivity in their native lands will never accept the fact that this is to be of a permanent nature.

Captive Nations Week is America's way of saying, "We are with you."

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, July 17, Captive Nations Week was celebrated at Kenosha, Wis., in my district. Over 1,000 people, primarily of Lithuanian heritage, joined together in holding a special program under the capable chairmanship of Jonas Milisauskas.

It was my privilege to introduce my good friend and colleague, U.S. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin. His comments on the need for a Captive Nations Week observance, and the impact which it has had on the Soviet Union, deserve wider attention. I am, therefore, pleased to include them at this point in my remarks:

REMARKS OF SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON, KENOSHA, WIS., JULY 17, 1966

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss a foreign policy problem that has the attention of most Americans only one week out of every year . . . yet deserves the continuous concern and attention of free peoples everywhere.

Our normal approach to foreign affairs these days tends to be "crisis-oriented." Any problem that isn't accompanied by a "crisis" simply doesn't get on the front pages, doesn't stir up the State Department or the Congress, and doesn't get the public discussion that it deserves.

The long-standing problem of continued oppression of captive peoples in Eastern Europe is this kind of problem.

The plight of these captive peoples doesn't seem to most Americans to be a "pressing" problem because it doesn't get this crisis reaction that we have grown so accustomed to. This is why the observance of Captive Nations Week is so important.

This observance obliges us to take another close look at the conditions of millions in Eastern Europe who still are denied even the most basic freedoms. It encourages us to resolve again to work toward a solution that will end Soviet domination of this important area of the world. And it throws some light on some of the myths regarding the makeup of the empire controlled by the Kremlin.

Our government's policy, as you know, is to continue to search out ways to cooperate and live in peace with the Soviet Union.

Most Americans are encouraged by cultural exchanges, relaxation of travel restrictions, and other signs that seem to indicate a higher level of understanding between this country and the Soviet Union. We are encouraged by evidence of a growing split between the Soviet Union and the present government of Red China.

The result is development of an uncritical attitude toward much of what the Soviet Union does.

This situation makes it even more necessary that we remind ourselves that full cooperation is impossible until the Soviet Union releases its hold on millions of people in Eastern Europe—still forced to live under one of the most oppressive systems of modern times.

This complacency didn't develop by accident. Lulling Americans to sleep on the Eastern Europe issue has been a clear objective of Kremlin co-existence policies the last 10 years.

Anyone who has followed Moscow's policy in this area knows that one of its main objectives is acquiescence of Americans to the permanence of the Soviet satellite system.

Whenever we are forcefully reminded of the political and economic conditions of the captive nations, we agree that this continued oppression isn't right and that it should be stopped. But we have a tendency to avoid getting too deeply involved.

A totalitarian government, of course, is unthinkable for most Americans. We take it for granted that freedom and independence are fundamental to our way of life and to our belief in the basic rights of man. We insist on the right to dissent from government policies. We believe that "rocking the boat" occasionally is a good thing.

Yet we forget that these essentials of liberty are denied to the millions forced into the so-called Soviet orbit in Eastern Europe before and during World War II.

The Congress called attention to all these things when it established the Captive Nations Week observance a few years ago. This action led President Kennedy to spell out our policy on this issue with these words:

"This country must never recognize the situation behind the Iron Curtain as a permanent one, but must, by all peaceful means, keep alive the hopes of freedom for the peoples of the captive nations."

There are some who say that merely "keeping alive the hopes for freedom" isn't going to help the situation very much. The young people, they say, have all been brainwashed in the schools and have learned to accept conditions imposed before they were born.

This position completely ignores what is going on in these countries.

Reports from Eastern Europe tell of continuous political and cultural unrest and ferment, mainly among the young people. They want to travel, to learn about the West, to read books by Western writers, to participate in a genuine political process, and to control their own destinies. They are tired of stereotyped state-run cultural exercises and political and economic bosses appointed by the regime.

There's little open dissent of course. When a writer in one of these countries comes out with something that is controversial or slightly nonconformist—when he rocks the boat a little—he's in instant trouble with the state.

It's significant, however, that in most cases he's also an instant hit with the young people.

These young people particularly resent the regime's restrictions on travel. If capitalism is so bad, they say, why don't they let us see it for ourselves?

These freedom aspirations are promising and significant, in my judgment, and they deserve our attention and full support through whatever peaceful means are available.

We also have a responsibility to bring more direct pressure upon the Soviet Union in our attempts to obtain freedom and independence for the captive nations.

We should adopt a steady campaign to convince Soviet leaders that no meaningful or realistic relaxation of the tensions that divide the world is possible without full and final freedom for these countries.

That means Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and all the others forced into the Soviet-satellite category over the last 26 years.

The Soviet Union must not be allowed any letup in the reminders that the hold on these countries, first taken over in the confusion of wartime conditions, simply goes against the grain of the free people of the world.

The Soviet Union must not be allowed to pose as a modern, civilized nation until it relaxes its hold on these captive peoples and treats them as respected and sovereign neighbors.

And the Soviet Union must not be allowed to escape continuous exposure to the forces of world opinion regarding the takeover and continued oppression of Eastern Europe.

We should not under-estimate the effect of such observances as Captive Nations Week on the Kremlin. It is not the sort of thing that the Soviet Government feels it can safely ignore year after year.

One Moscow newspaper in 1963 charged that President Kennedy was "losing his sense of reality" in declaring strong support for the observance of Captive Nations Week.

In 1964 the Soviet newspaper, Izvestia, complained that Captive Nations Week had become a serious nuisance.

And Nikita Khrushchev, just before he was pushed from power, took a crack at this observance.

"In the United States a farce entitled 'Captive Nations Week' is held every year," Khrushchev said. "The People's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years, but the imperialists still rumble on this nonsensical idea of 'liberating' the nations of Eastern Europe."

So you see this observance does help press the case for an Eastern Europe based on freedom, justice and due recognition of the rights of the individual. This is what Americans have, and value highly. And it is what the people of the captive nations value highly, and still hope some day to have.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague, Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, and commend him for setting aside this 60-minute period for Members to jointly remind the Congress and the people of the necessity of keeping fresh in our minds the fact that millions of people in a number of countries are still enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy.

It has now been approximately a quarter of a century since the leaders of Soviet communism through force, military destruction, devastation, slave labor camps, massacres, and other methods inflicted its tyranny on smaller nations in central Europe. It is fortunate that this Congress set aside Captive Nations Week 6 years ago for an annual period to remind older people and also the younger generations who were not born at the time of this horrifying period when the Communist tyrants started their campaign to enslave mankind.

In the pioneer days of Communist aggression, their leaders sent out worldwide propaganda and made glowing promises of the freedom and prosperity which people would enjoy if they came in under the Communist banner.

During the past years millions of people throughout the globe have observed the complete failure and rejection of these glowing Communist promises and have witnessed unemployment, slavery, and starvation in nations under the domination of the Soviet and Chinese Communist economy. The Soviet leaders, including Stalin and Khrushchev, have disappeared from Communist leadership under the stigma of discontent and starvation by millions under their domination. Today in Communist Russia and China their agricultural and food production has been a monumental failure. The promises which they made to their victims have never materialized. Discontent is becoming rampant among the enslaved people in captive nations in central Europe today. In southeast Asia some of the nations have begun to realize the truth concerning the false Communist utopia and have already rejected Communist control.

Several years ago the Chinese and Russian Communists were very optimistic and jubilant over their campaigns to enslave the newer countries in Africa and most of the discontented countries in South America. Millions of people in backward countries throughout the globe realize the true facts concerning the Communist propaganda, failing economy, and false security.

Our Nation has been the No. 1 spearhead for world freedom during the last quarter of a century and has protected and saved the world against complete Communist enslavement. Our battle is not yet won. It must continue to persevere, for as each year passes the international Communist conspiracy is being gradually exposed and the real truth of their leaders' intentions is being inculcated into the minds of millions of newer nations throughout the world.

Captive Nations Week is fittingly observed by the Congress of the United States as well as various groups and organizations throughout the Nation. This commemorating period was set aside by the Congress to remind the people of the world that the fight against Communist aggression and world enslavement must not cease until the captive nations under Communist tyranny have been freed and self-government restored.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during this week of July 17–23, the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week is being held throughout this Nation as well as in many free-world countries.

During these 8 years, much has been said, more has been written on the subject of the captive nations. From the year of 1959 until this moment we have waited and hoped, worked and prayed with our fellow freemen on behalf of the more than two dozen nations whom we sadly refer to as the captive nations.

Since 1920 we have watched nation after nation fall prey to the juggernaut of communism. Our neighbor, Cuba, was the last to be added to this list, but who dare not say whose name will be added—this year, next year, the following year? Will it be in this hemisphere or in the south Pacific? Asia? Africa?

Mr. Speaker, this eighth observance is not a matter for rejoicing or for rationalizing. Rather it is a time to clear our vision and strengthen our resolution to renew the efforts we make on behalf of freedom, liberty, and justice for all—within and without the boundaries of the United States of America.

We pledge anew our devotion and dedication to the just aspirations of all mankind who seek human dignity and the liberty of independence, trusting that there need not be a 9th, 10th, or 12th observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, this week we mark the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is fitting at this time to pay tribute to all those nations now dominated by communism, because by doing so we call attention to the tyranny that oppresses these peoples.

The creation of the captive nations was one of the most tragic consequences of World War II. Nearly all of the countries of central and Eastern Europe were made part of the Soviet sphere, and an Iron Curtain was imposed dividing East and West. By 1948, some 100 million people were captives behind the Iron Curtain.

Since that time we in the United States have persisted in our efforts to keep the cause of the captive nations alive. We have urged these nations to maintain their hope and belief in a better tomorrow. By 1959 we felt it was time to formalize our expression of sympathy and our peaceful efforts to promote the growth of independence, on a higher and more official level. So in July of that year we officially inaugurated the annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

We must continue to do all we can to promote the freedom and independence of the brave peoples of the captive nations.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 17 to 23 has been earmarked to call world attention to the plight of the captive nations. On this occasion, Americans who cherish freedom and the democratic process will pause to express their wishes that these principles will be restored to the people in the captive nations. We deplore the continued rule of a totalitarian philosophy over the 100 million peoples of Eastern Europe.

It has been more than two decades now since Sir Winston Churchill first called attention to the fact that an iron curtain had descended over these historic lands. It was a decade ago that the pent-up pressure for freedom burst forth in a series of incidents and revolutions. We have not forgotten the anguished cries that we heard then, nor has attention fallen from the plight imposed upon that area.

This observance in which we are engaged is a reminder to the people of the captive nations, to the American people, and to the people of the world. It recalls the historic development of these nations, of the conditions of tyranny which have grown there since the end of World War II, and of the way in which foreign domination festers. It recalls the progressive loss of freedom and of the precious rights of peoples imprisoned within these countries. The narrative is long of the exercise of whim and illegal power by individuals who have assumed direction of states unbound by any constitutional authority. That same narrative can be written in Eastern Europe today.

This week is an occasion to protest such disregard for human freedom, and to reiterate the policy as stated by Assistant Secretary of State William Tyler:

> The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries.

We have not forgotten the plight of our fellow humans. We hear their cries. As long as they continue to suffer under the domination of Communist dictatorship, we, too, will suffer. But we have hope and confidence that they will again enjoy the freedom that is theirs by birthright.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in 1959 when President Eisenhower issued the first Captive Nations Week proclamation, it contained the provision that the people of the United States would recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

Now in 1966 I think we have lost sight of the real meaning of Captive Nations Week. The reason it was established was to remind us that those of us here in the United States should help keep alive the hope of freedom for the captive peoples of the world.

I think the time has come for the free world to take the initiative. We must do everything we possibily can to enable those countries which once knew freedom, but which today are slaves of the Communists, to regain their liberty.

Captive Nations Week was established to remind us that we should not be complacent in our attitude toward these countries. The Communists most of all want us to accept the fact that these countries will forever be Communist controlled. They want us to believe that the present situation is the only situation. Yet this must not be the case.

As is typical of Socialist societies, the Communists are depriving these peoples of their individuality, their nationality, and their national heritage.

The Communists want the people on the glittering side of the Iron Curtain, our side, to accept the fact that these people are irretrievable. The Communists want the people on the dull side of the Iron Curtain, their side, to forget they ever were free.

They want free people to forget that these were independent nations; that they are willing and able to run their own affairs. But now the Communist trick is working. We are gradually accepting the fact that these countries belong to the Soviet Union.

But as Captive Nations Week reminds us, these countries were once independent. The populations today are striving to regain their freedom, but they look to us for help.

The emphasis in Captive Nations Week should not be placed on captivity, but on nationality, for we must work to help them throw off their captivity, and regain their nationality.

For "these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence."

Let us not forget this fact.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are observing Captive Nations Week which has been observed throughout the United States the third week of July since 1959.

Congressman ED DERWINSKI, of Illinois, in his July newsletter made the following excellent statement on the observance of Captive Nations Week:

> The oppressed peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom, and they maintain faith in the ultimate restoration of their freedom and independence. It is a fact that the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in Communist-controlled nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Red leaders to initiate a major war. The international Communist conspiracy is the great threat to world peace and stability. True peace and freedom, which is the legitimate goal of all mankind, will come to Viet Nam, Cuba, and other oppressed lands only when peoples are represented by governments of their own true choice.
>
> It is my strong personal conviction that the United States should reassert its leadership in the free world rather than follow the present policy of appeasing the Communist dictatorships in Europe. We can mount an effective propaganda, economic, and psychological offensive against the Communist dictatorships. It is a tragedy to see young Americans being sacrificed on the battlefields of Viet Nam while the Administration attempts to subsidize the Communist dictatorships of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe through trade channels. This tragic inconsistency is one of the many reasons why we have lost face abroad and witnessed a deterioration in our foreign affairs.

Congressman DERWINSKI could not be more right.

The United States must maintain a hard and determined line to meet Communist aggression on every front. There can be no weakening of our national resolve—no appeasement—no retreat.

During this Captive Nations Week, the people of the United States join with the peoples of the captive nations in reaffirming their faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom, and the restoration of their liberty and national freedom.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, on this eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, I welcome the opportunity to join with our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in rededication to the goals of national independence and freedom of all the captive nations in the Communist empire.

This year we are actively fighting against Communist aggression to prevent the subjugation of the people of South Vietnam, which would add them to the list of captive nations. Nothing can more clearly demonstrate the United States determination to protect freedom-loving peoples than does this Vietnam effort. We hope this gives encouragement to those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who long for restoration of their independence and freedom from the "blatant hypocrisy" of Red "totalitarian imperialism," as described in the resolutions, including one I introduced, pending before Congress to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

The President has said in proclaiming this week as Captive Nations Week 1966:

> The United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty. In keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples.

The voices raised and the words expressed in this House of Congress today reaffirm that we do not forget the captive peoples of the world, nor the suffering and regimentation under which they live. Captive Nations Week emphasizes to all nations that Americans are committed not only to preserving their own freedom, but to helping the peoples of other countries to rise from under the yoke of repressive domination.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our Nation today is engaged in a brutal, dangerous, difficult effort to persuade a Communist-dominated aggressor in Vietnam to cease aggression.

We are involved in a military, political, and economic battle in defense of the right of South Vietnam to shape its own destiny free of outside control, and we are so engaged in defense of other non-Communist peoples from Manila to San Francisco and from Bangkok to Chicago.

We are paying a heavy price for this effort, in terms of lives, treasure, and national energy. It is right that we should ask why it must be.

In the lexicon of aggressive communism an action is termed justified if it works. An act of aggression is right if the aggressor can get away with it. This kind of morality is not the unique property of Marxism but is rather the hallmark of aggressors anywhere.

One big reason why Communist aggression exists in Vietnam today is that the aggressor thought that he could get away with it. He had every right to believe it. He believed it to such a depth of conviction that even now, in July of 1966, with our determination expressed in military and diplomatic terms time and time again over a long period, he evidently still believes that aggression in Vietnam can be accomplished.

What is the reason for this great depth of conviction? The reason is that Communist aggression has succeeded in the past. It has succeeded in many cases without a significant response from non-Communist nations, or without any response at all.

We, in a position of world leadership, along with other non-Communist nations, have watched while millions of persons have fallen under the heels of Communist aggression. From 1920 when Armenia, the Ukraine, and others were overwhelmed by aggressive communism, until 1960 when Cuba became a Communist satellite, aggression has been allowed to succeed.

Since 1960 our Government's policy has appeared to be one of trying to ignore the unpleasant picture of Communist aggression which has succeeded. Instead, we have tried to "build bridges" with the aggressor.

In Laos we had to threaten the non-Communists with a halt to U.S. aid in order to encourage them into an agreement with the Communist Pathet Lao—an agreement which in essence was a guarantee to the Communists that their aggression had succeeded to that point.

This week has been set aside as a week in which to recognize the nations which have fallen to Communist aggression. It is entirely proper that we do this. In my judgment this is not only a very moral effort, but it is highly practical.

Surely a very effective way of encouraging aggression is to overlook it; perhaps make some brave-sounding words in defense of independence, but then forget it after it is over and pretend that nothing has happened.

One way to discourage aggression, and thus minimize the chances of more Vietnams, is to express U.S. support for the people of captive nations, and give recognition to their continuing wish for national integrity and for independence.

The effectiveness of this annual U.S. observance of Captive Nations Week is perhaps best measured in terms of the sensitivity it meets in Moscow.

And there is ample evidence to show that Moscow is not only very much aware of it but is also highly vocal in its denunciation of it.

This Nation rightfully moves into a position of leadership when we proclaim the wish of this Government to hold alive the hopes of freedom in the hearts of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe and elsewhere.

We rightfully put ourselves on record as in protest against Communist tyranny which has enslaved millions of freedom-loving people.

The principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity are the same principles held in high esteem by the people of the captive nations, and by Americans. It would be tragic indeed if we were to turn our backs on them.

The search for freedom is a continuing and essential fact of our world today. We are a part of it. We recognize the hopes of others to share in the kind of freedom we already enjoy. We join hands with them in common cause.

We salute the people of the captive nations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again Captive Nations Week is being observed by the American people to remind us that millions of people are not free to choose their own way of life. We deplore this denial of freedom that prevails in every land behind the Iron Curtain. We must continue to send forth our ideals of free thought and action through the mediums of trade fairs, cultural exchange programs, photographic exhibits, radio broadcasts, theatrical tours, and any other method that seems feasible.

An example of the way these countries and their regimes meet any kind of free flow of ideas is illustrated by a recent New York Times article which describes what happens to such an innocuous item as a postage stamp. Hungary in 1958 turned back mail with stamps honoring Lajos Kossuth, 19th century Hungarian statesman, as a "champion of liberty." Two years later, Czechoslovakia reacted against the stamp in the same series showing Thomas G. Masaryk, founder of the Czech republic. This mail was delivered only after the stamps were removed. A few years earlier, Iron Curtain states rejected mail bearing the slogan cancel "Support Your Crusade for Freedom." And now Poland threatens to reject U.S. mail bearing the American stamp commemorating the Polish Christian Millennium. They are displeased with the crowned eagle and will issue six stamps for the millennium identifying the issue only as "1,000 Years of the Polish State."

The Communists will not admit that their totalitarianism has been breaking down, that mankind is born with the inherent desire for freedom. Rumania's recent break with the Warsaw Pact is proof that absolute rule and power over mind and body will never survive as long as man has the power to think.

It is only when we keep the idea of freedom alive to all peoples that the population of captive nations believe someone has not forgotten them, that someday they and their children will be able to be free to choose their own government and live their own lives. Our proclamation of our annual Captive Nations Week observance reinforces to the Communist world that our commitment to the ideals of freedom of choice and self-determination for all peoples is constant, firm, and immovable.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the eighth annual commemoration of Captive Nations Week to be observed in America.

Since the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution by Congress in July 1959, these observances are steadily expanding with each succeeding year. It is gratifying to see the enthusiasm and increased vigor with which Americans demonstrate their concern for these captive peoples.

During this week we call attention to the plight of the enslaved millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It is well that we do this each year and think of fellow humans who are in or near actual slavery, whose spirits are trampled upon by Communist oppressors, and whose only hope for liberty lies with those who still live in freedom.

During this week, we reaffirm our willingness to assist them in their struggle to gain individual freedom.

The age of Western imperialism and colonialism is long since past. Our country has stolen no nations as a result of the wars that have plagued us over the past half century. Although victorious, we have extracted no price in land or peoples. We have not played the role of a conqueror, seizing the spoils of war, but instead tried to help nations, friend and foe alike, to regain a democratic way of life and improve their living conditions.

The same powerful human aspirations of our forefathers are manifest in the hearts and minds of the people of both the captive and newly independent nations.

If we fail to stand up against the Communist usurpation of power, or if we recognize the present Communist domination as either permanent or right, we are denying both our heritage and ideals.

We must do all that we can to foster ultimate liberation of those people already enslaved. But we must also be on guard against further encroachments by the Communist powers.

On the occasion of Captive Nations Week, we should not only recognize our duty to promote the cause of freedom within the captive nations, but we should also be mindful of the contributions of the captive peoples to our own way of life. Our country has been greatly enriched by the labor, skill, and culture of the men and women who have migrated to our shores from these now captive nations.

I hope that the enemies of freedom and individual liberty are listening to what is being said at these observances. It is these expressions of concern which truly speak the honest convictions of the vast majority of the American people.

May our commemoration of Captive Nations Week give captive peoples everywhere added moral strength and inspiration to carry on under the weight of their burden until that day when liberty and freedom come again to their beloved lands. We pray that that day will not be far off.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is the man who conceived the idea of Captive Nations Week. He is a professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and is economics editor of the American Security Council Washington Report. That report for July 18 appropriately carries the following article on the subject of Captive Nations Week written by Dr. Dobriansky:

FORGET THE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

(By Lev Dobriansky [1])

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But this will never happen!"

These are the words of Mikhail Suslov in reference to the 1965 Captive Nations Week observance, uttered on July 17, 1965 in Lithuania with reference to all captive nations.

Who is Suslov? He is the secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and a member of its ruling Presidium. He has weathered all political storms in the Soviet Union and he has served in the highest echelon under Stalin, Malenkov and Khrushchev and now serves under Brezhnev and Kosygin. In sort, Suslov has been the chief thinker and ideologist under successive totalitarian regimes in colonialist Moscow. He knows the psycho-political significance of Captive Nations Week, even if some of our leaders and many of our citizens have given it scant attention.

Suslov was not alone in his denunciation of the Week. He merely voiced again the fear and concern of Moscow, which Khrushchev first enunciated in 1959 on the occasion of Vice President Richard Nixon's trip to Russia. Mr. Nixon, in his book *Six Crises*, stated, "The Captive Nations Resolution was the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour."

---

[1] Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is the man who conceived the idea of Captive Nations Week. He is a Professor of Economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. and is Economics Editor of the American Security Council *Washington Report*.

As in every previous year, a whole chorus of Red denunciations rose in connection with last year's observance. Here are two selected ones which were generally overlooked outside the Soviet bloc.

"They are beating the drums again across the sea, filling columns in newspapers and delivering long hypocritical speeches. For the umpteenth time the governing circles of the United States are holding the so-called Captive Nations Week. And the machine of propaganda is deafening the citizens with the 'atrocious' inventions about the fate of nations who are 'suffering under the yoke of the Kremlin regime.'" (Radyanska Ukraina, July 25, 1965.)

By contrast, in Polish blast, the writer sought to downplay the observance.

"An annual pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke . . . if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S." (Trybuna Ludu, July 27, 1965.)

Skilled in timing their propaganda, the Russians seized upon the 1965 Week as an occasion for sentencing Gerald Brooke, a 28 year old British teacher to five years of hard labor for propagating anti-Soviet literature. This was to be a warning to anti-Communist groups of what to expect.

WHY THE SENSITIVE REACTION?

Americans who are unfamiliar with these and similar accounts invariably ask, "Why the sensitive reaction?" The answer is simple. From the very start, Captive Nations Week has been a thorn in the side of Communist psycho-political strategy toward us and the industrial West. A cardinal objective of Moscow's deceptive policy of "peaceful coexistence" has been to establish our politico-moral acceptance of the Soviet Empire. The Soviet Russians and their collaborators insist that if we really want to coexist peacefully, we must forget about any captive nations. Moscow and its associated Communist regimes even demand that in order to achieve a real lessening of tensions—thus giving them a necessary breather for their consolidation efforts—we must show our good faith by forgetting the whole history of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and Communist conquests since 1918.

The Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by the U.S. Congress in 1959 and now Public Law 86–90, counteracts all this deception. By stressing the very essentials that Moscow and the Red Syndicate would have us forget, both the law and the annual Week stand as a major obstacle to the Red psycho-political design. Moreover, the two are a source of grave apprehension to the cold barriers of Moscow and other Communist capitals because they persistently point to one of the Soviets' most exposed areas of vulnerability.

The Captive Nations Week has great educational value. Its observance clearly outlines the perfidy, deception, and long-run dangers of Moscow's "peaceful coexistence" strategy. This strategy has four dimensions: 1) to lull the West into a state of confusion, friction, and demoralization, 2) with this advantage of a breather, to consolidate the Communist empire through necessary economic changes, the elimination of all remaining resistance, the suppression of patriotic "bourgeois nationalism," and the strict maintenance of totalitarian power in the various Communist Parties within the Soviet orbit, 3) to pursue "wars of liberation" in the underdeveloped areas of the Free World, and 4) to strive to attain a scientific breakthrough in military and space technology that would facilitate a political blackmail of the West into surrender.

The existence of U.S. nuclear arms does not deter a Kosygin, visiting Egypt, from harshly maligning Americans as "Hitlerites" and "imperialists"; nor does it frighten a Brezhnev from greeting the Tri-Continental Havana Conference, held last January in these words: "Today, Havana attracts the attention of all fighters against the forces of imperialist aggression and colonialism and for the national and social liberation of peoples . . . The U.S. imperialists are challenging all progressive forces." Repeated often enough without adequate challenge, all these blatant untruths will doubtless poison the minds of millions. Yet there are many in our country, in high places and low, who resist speaking the truth openly about the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R. itself.

THE TRUTHS AND THE GROWING WEEK

Fortunately, since 1959, the nation-wide observance of Captive Nations Week has steadily grown, and the basic truths about Soviet Russian imperialism, genocide and colonialist exploitation in the U.S.S.R., as well as the oppression of all the captive peoples by their totalitarian governments, are reaching more and more Americans. Although the White House unfortunately has played down the Week in recent years, our Governors, Mayors and citizens have broadened the annual observance.

By 1965, half of our States issued official proclamations, and practically every major city did likewise. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate have become members of the National Captive Nations Committee, which guides the annual observance. Local Captive Nations committees have sprung up in every section of the country. The Week is now observed overseas in the Republic of China, West Germany, Turkey, Sweden and Australia.

This year, the third week of July marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. During this week Americans will again raise their voices to honor the enslaved half of the world. They will emphasize again the things that must be done if the long list of captive nations—from Cuba to Hungary to Ukraine to North Vietnam—is not to be extended and if our sins of omission today are not to result in unnecessary sacrifices of American life and treasure tomorrow.

BUILDING BRIDGES OF UNDERSTANDING

One of the chief themes of the 1966 Week is the building of bridges of understanding with the captive nations—the people themselves, rather than with the illegitimate regimes that hold them in bondage and politico-economic slavery. The bridge of understanding can only be one link in the mutual struggle for freedom—their freedom regained and ours preserved. To believe that by arriving at "understandings" with the Communist rulers we shall be furthering the freedom of the captive nations is not only an illusion but also an affront to common political sense. In addition, our wishful thinking about the early end of the Cold War—in itself a striking achievement of Moscow's "peaceful coexistence" policy—has blinded us to the realities of the Red Empire and has exposed us to further illusions about "mellowed Communists in Moscow and Warsaw", "independent Communists in Bucharest and Belgrade", and "the growing nationalism among satellite Communist regimes".

On the contrary, a little exercise of logic itself would demonstrate that the power center of the Red Empire is the Soviet Union and all other parts, even including Red China, depend for their ultimate survival upon this center. Moreover, if more of our people took the trouble to read the U.S. Senate study on "The Soviet Empire" (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965) they would find these illusions shattered as the story of current Russian genocide, colonialism, and basic Stalinism is unraveled for them.

The crucial fact is that our people are not being told the full truth about people of the captive nations and their plight in the totalitarian Red states. Unpardonable ignorance, a morally irresponsible indifference, and restraining fears are frequently the ingredients of omission that in the long run exact a disproportionate cost. On May 26, 1966, President Johnson unequivocally stated, "The United States cannot condone the perpetuation of racial or political injustice anywhere in the world." Nowhere in this world is such injustice greater and more ruinous than in the Red Empire of captive nations.

Those of us who have been active in Captive Nations Week have opposed measures which tend to perpetuate the control of Communist regimes over the Captive Nations. Such measures would include the liberalization of trade with Eastern Europe, the promulgation of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty and proposals to admit Red China to the U.N. The 1966 Captive Nations Week is an appropriate time to stress our support of positive measures concentrating on the freedom of the captive nations. Among them, we might include the support of public and private "Freedom Academies", creation of a special Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations and the focusing of world attention on Sino-Soviet imperio-colonialism. We will further the cause of world freedom by never forgetting all the Captive Nations—those in the Soviet Union, in Central Europe, in Asia and Cuba.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are now commemorating Captive Nations Week from July 17 to 23. This is an important occurrence in our legislative year because it is a significant reaffirmation of our continuing policy of freedom from forceful domination. There are 32 captive nations existing in our world today. The great majority of them are within the sphere of Soviet domination but we may also include Vietnam, Tibet, Korea, and the illegitimate takeover of mainland China by the Red Chinese. Historically, we often associate forced domination with the early 20th century imperialists, with the supernationalists of World Wars I and II, and with the postwar Russian Communists. We now also associate such tactics with the Red Chinese but in this instance we are fighting such encroachment before it may take its final steps and engulf its victims. The era of appeasement is forever bygone. We have seen the degradations that Czechoslovakia experienced at the hands of Chamberlain and his contemporaries and worse still, we have seen the great turmoil that arrived from those very actions at Munich. We will never permit this to occur in any part of the world again.

We must be aware that in this historical period we are faced with a world that is integrally interconnected through the field of mass communications. Never before has an event in one part of the world had such an immediate reaction in any other part. If a failure were to occur in southeast Asia on our part, then the loss of that part of the world would be quickly implemented. Of course we will not lose in Vietnam but the point to be made here is that the new forms of subjugation are not only those of physical extension but also those that rely heavily on communicative implementation.

Our aim during this week must be reaffirmation of our beliefs as we expressed them in our various documents ranging from the Declaration of Independence right through our numerous condemnations of North Vietnamese aggression. We must always remember those who have been ruthlessly crushed and who are being treated so deceitfully by their oppressors.

Integration within the Soviet bloc or the Red Chinese unity, if it had occurred by common consent, would have been disappointing but acceptable by most diplomatic standards, but the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are artificial entities and what must enrage the believer in separatism of nationality is the fact that the Soviets insist that these restricted countries have engaged themselves within the Soviet system by desire. The totality of such contradictions is unacceptable and degrading. The very instances of Polish and Hungarian dissent, although the most publicized, are not unique. Within the actual political framework of these subject nations purges and internal strife has occurred. East Germany, supposedly Russia's showcase of Eastern Europe, has had workers' riots. Food lines still exist in these areas and all the natural freedoms that we take for granted are forcefully disciplined. As Americans we must never fear to publicly denounce those who dare play demigod with other people's existence.

We have witnessed Tito recently conduct a "reorganization" of his party and its higher officials. Tito has obviously profited from this more than anyone but although we may be misled into thinking that Yugoslavia is becoming more Western or gaining limited yet ever-expanding freedoms we must not confuse the subjugation of the official party system with expansion of the individual's freedom. There can exist no parallel. We can never expect any land under the domination of communism to be truly free.

Originally Marx called for the ideal state which would require leaderless society. In effect the subjugated peoples are now leaderless. They have no one to speak out for them—only those to suppress them in their opinions. It is our responsibility to bring this to the attention of the emerging nationalities. We cannot permit Africa or Asia to become fettered. We would not tolerate a Communist Vietnam and we will not tolerate forced communism anywhere else in the world. Through worldwide pressure and through American leadership we can hope to see some decrease in the restrictions placed upon many subjugated peoples but only through the constant vigilance of the free world can we prevent subjugation from ever occurring in the future.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is a yearly reminder to the world of the hundreds of millions of unfortunate people of central and eastern Europe. Repressed in action, they still strive for freedom of thought and expression. Their dignity and courage are a spur to all freemen.

In this Congress, I have introduced a resolution which would establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee would inquire into means by which the United States can assist, through peaceful process, the people of these nations in their just aspirations to regain individual and national freedom. On the observance of this 8th annual Captive Nations Week, let us reaffirm our great concern for all nations subjugated by totalitarianism.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues who this week have risen to express their renewed sense of obligation to the people of the captive nations of the world. Certainly if any principle is basic to America it is that the people of every nation must be able to freely determine their own destiny without coercion from outside powers. Where they are not, then America must help, through efforts such as those made in Congress this week, to maintain the spirit of freedom in the oppressed peoples.

We know, of course, Mr. Speaker, that there are other captive nations in the world besides those in Eastern Europe where the Soviet Union's power stands as an ever-vigilant guard against meaningful self-determination. Countries such as Rhodesia and South Africa, where a small white minority refuses political and economic freedom to the majority of the inhabitants of the nation, can just as rightly be called captive nations and, as Senator KENNEDY of New York has shown in his recent trip, even in these countries America can function as a symbol and hope for a better, freer life. If America is to fulfill her true "manifest destiny" it will be by ever raising her voice to salute freedom and to encourage those who would create nations where the rights of the individual would be free from government coercion, where the will of the majority would be able to determine the political direction of the country.

I would also like to comment, Mr. Speaker, that the dedication to freedom and self-determination expressed in Congress this week gives me renewed hope that we will move this session to end the last vestige of outside rule in our country and approve meaningful home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our colleagues and other freemen throughout the world in participating in the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, authorized by an act of Congress in July 1959.

Although this one week is set aside for sober reflection and a rededication to purpose, we must continually strive to keep alive the ideals of freedom and independence which burn in the hearts and souls of the valiant people behind the Iron Curtain. We must never digress from our efforts to assist these people in gaining their political, economic, social, and cultural independence and to take their rightful place as full members in the society of freemen.

We are not only speaking about Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Eastern European nations but Cuba, mainland China, North Vietnam and all other nations which have been subjugated by the force of arms, conspiracy, subversion, and deceit of international communism.

I believe all of us have been heartened by the action of several Soviet satellites over the past few months in asserting their own national sovereignty and political and economic independence. I feel we are beginning to see a change which will eventually prevail in all of the countries now under the whip of international communism. No matter how hard Moscow and Peking may try to dominate these people and make them helpless pawns in their own design, their free spirit cannot be permanently subdued by armed force. However, this change will not occur overnight and other countries are being continually threatened. We must stand ready, therefore, to assist the captive nations in their present plight by peaceful processes and in their aspiration to throw off the yoke of totalitarianism and to regain their national and individual freedom.

Last year at this time I was privileged to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in introducing House Resolution 484—which calls upon Congress to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I would like to urge the Rules Committee to take expeditious and favorable action on this and similar resolutions so that force will be given to our moral support of the captive nations. Definite action must be taken to make known our desire to promote the return of the people of the captive nations to the state whereby they can freely determine their own social, political, and economic institutions.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, having supported this annual recognition since it was first proclaimed by the 86th Congress, I am pleased to act as temporary House Speaker during this year's observance.

In the 86th Congress I cosponsored a resolution in the House which stated that "the Soviet Union have repeatedly declared their determination to pursue relentlessly their political, economic, and ideological drive for a worldwide victory for communism" and "in its efforts to attain that objective through force of arms, subversion, infiltration, and other methods has imposed puppet Communist regimes upon the people of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe and exerted tireless effort to crush their spirit" and "that the people of the captive nations are still being denied the opportunity to solve their problems by democratic means and to choose, through free and unfettered elections, national governments of their own free choice." It was this understanding that brought Congress to declare "its belief in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice" and "urge the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the captive nations."

In observing Captive Nations Week this year, we, in America, continue to recognize the human bondage of 1 billion people in the world who are being denied the most basic human right of self-determination. Therefore it is necessary for the free world this year to renew our faith in the cause of freedom for the people of the captive nations. We must continue to encourage them to resist the Communist tyranny which rules their destiny. These people are a deterrent against the Communists' desire for world rule. Whatever resistance they offer will keep the Communists off-balance in carrying out their plans.

In view of the Communist aggression in southeast Asia and recent Communist resistance to friendly gestures by our country to ease tensions in the world, it becomes apparent they are trying to solidify their position to regain the control of people in captive nations who are slowly making progress in breaking the bonds that hold them. However these people will not give in to complete domination by Communist tyranny if they are certain that the free world supports their cause in every way possible. The moral support we offer to these people in observing this week as a reminder to the captive nations that we Americans have not forgotten them, will add strength to their determination to once again become free people.

I am proud to join with the voices of the free world in rededicating ourselves in the great cause of liberty for all peoples. Although this week is set aside for this purpose, our words and deeds should continue throughout the entire year so that we can realize a day of world freedom in the not too distant future.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to be able to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in observing Captive Nations Week. While properly welcoming the many new countries that have joined the family of nations during the present generation we tend to forget that, while old-fashioned colonialism is ending in Africa and large parts of Asia, a new kind of colonialism has taken its place in Europe and the Orient.

Likewise, when we do remember such Soviet colonies as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and so forth, we overlook the fact that the first victim of communism was Russia and we fail to realize that the peoples of both Russia and China are as much the victims of Communist colonialism as are the Baltic peoples, the Magyars, Poles, Bohemians, and so forth. Soviet Russia is a huge conglomeration of ethnic groups whose independence has been as ruthlessly exterminated by the Communists as it was earlier by the czars.

At the same time that we are expressing our sympathies for the peoples who live behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, some powerful voices are urging closer contacts with Communist China and its recognition by the United States. The same voices call for stepped-up trade with the Reds.

There are some who say that "you just can't ignore 700 million Chinese." Have these people forgotten that the Peking Communist regime has, during its 17 years in power, liquidated many millions of people and placed other millions in slave labor camps?

It is certainly inconsistent to welcome new and free countries to the family of nations and simultaneously invite such a destroyer of individual freedom as Red China to sit down and help celebrate. Let us hope that the new nations can maintain their freedom and let us hope that the captive nations will someday soon regain their independence, but let us not defeat the purpose of Captive Nations Week by calling for recognition of Communist China and advocating more trade with Communist Russia.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this week—the eighth annual Captive Nations Week—provides us with an important opportunity to keep the light of truth focused on the plight of the millions of once-free people who now live under Communist domination and on the fact that their freedom and their countries' independence were the victims of aggressive communism.

The purpose of our commemoration of Captive Nations Week in the House this year remains what it has been since the 86th Congress, in which many of us were privileged to serve, unanimously adopted the first captive nations resolution in 1959. That purpose is twofold: to convince the people behind the walls and curtains of communism that the free world has not forgotten nor abandoned them and shall never acquiesce in their illegal captivity; and to rally the free people of the world to a greater understanding of our obligations toward those who have been forcibly deprived of their freedom and of our responsibilities in the preservation and the strengthening of freedom everywhere.

It is a mark of the significance of our effort and of the sensitivity of Communist leaders to this issue that today, as in 1959, Captive Nations Week continues to be greeted with cries of outrage in Communist capitals. Their objections are understandable, for Captive Nations Week exposes international communism as a most brutal form of imperialism. It identifies the Soviet Union as the world's most oppressive colonial power. And it proclaims the free world's conviction that, like all of history's oppressors, communism must ultimately succumb to man's powerful instinct for freedom.

This year's observance, Mr. Speaker, should serve to remind us that we can do more than talk about the captive nations. The shifts and uncertainties that seem to characterize so much of today's Communist world present a challenge to our capacity to understand and to take reasoned action. The situation requires the most careful attention of the Congress as well as of the executive branch. For this reason, several of us in the House have been sponsoring legislation to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, a committee whose job it would be to study changing conditions in the Communist world, especially in Eastern Europe, to understand more fully the meaning of those changes, and to recommend ways in which we can use those changes to encourage the growth of freedom there.

A concrete example of such an opportunity exists in the apparent desire of Communist-bloc nations to increase their trade with the United States. We shall miss this opportunity if, on the one hand, we abruptly slam the door or, on the other, too readily, and without qualification, open the door to whatever arrangements they may desire.

Communist countries desire to trade because they need to trade. We should trade if it is worth our while to trade, and we can determine whether trade is in our best interests by exploring the possibilities of a political quid pro quo which could bring at least some measure of relief to the peoples of the captive nations.

I have no specific formula to suggest, Mr. Speaker, but I do suggest that this question is one which administration officials should consider seriously and one to which a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, should it be established, could devote some expert attention.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in July America celebrates the recurrence of the day of its independence. In the same month we also observe Captive Nations Week. On both occasions we assert the same principles: the rights of peoples and nations alike to determine freely their own course of action.

Ever since our independence, generations of Americans have committed themselves to the defense of freedom and justice in their own country; again and again they have given support to the cause of liberty and independence for other peoples and nations.

On our Independence Day we do not merely remember a historical event of the American past but we assert that the ideas we upheld almost 200 years ago are of universal importance and relevant also to the rest of the world. For these reasons we cannot remain indifferent to the fate of the nations of East and Central Europe, and that is why Congress adopted the resolution calling for the third week of July to be designated Captive Nations Week.

In the first decade after World War II the countries beyond the Iron Curtain were Soviet satellites, subject to continuous Russian interference in their internal affairs. They were not allowed to conduct a foreign policy of their own, they were forced to adhere to the doctrine of international communism as interpreted in Moscow. Disobedience was punished, often by direct physical intervention. Today, while from outward appearances conditions have changed somewhat, the hold of the Soviet Union on the 20 captive nations remains intact and remains brutal.

It is for this reason that we must rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom of the captive peoples, and to their right to self-determination.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, just 2½ weeks ago the citizens of the United States celebrated the 119th anniversary of their Declaration of Independence, and reaffirmed their faith in the principles set forth in that declaration. During the course of this summer, many new nations in Africa and Asia will also observe anniversaries of their achievement of independence. In our celebrations, and in their celebrations, we may see proof that the flame of liberty still burns bright, that in the year 1966 the principles of self-determination and independence for peoples bent on shaping their own destinies and on managing their own affairs have lost none of their force.

But in this year 1966 we must also recognize that there are large areas of the world where these principles are denied, large areas of the world where peoples who were once proud and independent now see the liberties that they cherished trampled upon, and large areas of the world where a new and ominous kind of colonialism holds sway. There are those in this country and elsewhere who think that we must learn to live with this situation, that we must practice the principles of peaceful coexistence even if those with whom we are asked to coexist deny the ideals we hold most dear, and that the world is imperfect and there is not much of anything we can do about its imperfections.

Fortunately, those who hold these views are few. This is the eighth year in which the leaders of this country and the great majority of its citizens have set aside a week designated as Captive Nations Week to show that they care about the fate of millions of people in other parts of the world who have been denied their freedom, to show that the true foundations of peaceful coexistence are self-determination and liberty for all peoples who seek to exercise these rights, and to show that we will never resign from efforts to right the imperfections of the world in which we live.

It is right that Captive Nations Week should follow so closely our annual celebration of the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. For we thereby make it crystal clear that we see the safeguarding of our own independence as linked with the achievement of independence by peoples now enslaved, and that we see our own liberties threatened through the denial of liberty to others. Equally important, through what I hope will be an annual observation of Captive Nations Week, we send a vital signal to the captive peoples in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia, and in the Caribbean.

We show them that we have not forgotten them, that we will not be deluded by talk of polycentrism and de-Stalinization in the Soviet bloc, and that we will not mistake apparent liberalization for real freedom. These peoples must not give up hope. By observing Captive Nations Week, we help to strengthen their faith in eventual freedom. Their faith in their future freedom, we all must know, is part of our strength.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in this body and with my fellow Americans everywhere in deeply sympathetic participation in the eighth observation of Captive Nations Week.

I am mindful of the fact that Captive Nations Week, which now has become an American institution of powerful protest marshalling the free world to the continuing battle for complete liberation of the captive nations, is the conception of my good and distinguished friend, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, world-renowned professor of economics at Georgetown University. I have read with deep interest and applauding approval the article by Dr. Dobriansky, entitled "The Traditional Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope," in the summer, 1966, number of the Ukrainian Quarterly and with this article I will conclude my remarks after some observations on the developments of fundamental significance that have taken place in the Soviet bloc over the last decade. In the course of Khrushchev's de-Stalinization policies the countries of Eastern Europe have begun to assert their political rights of self-determination. Centrifugal trends have broken the unity of the once monolithic Communist bloc. The forces of polycentrism have promoted the growth of independence among states and parties within the Communist camp.

The Soviet Union has come to acknowledge that individual countries cannot be forced indefinitely to act according to undifferentiated dogmas of international communism, and that cultural heritage and national peculiarities make it mandatory for Eastern European countries to have greater freedom of action. The Soviet Union can no longer completely subject the peoples and nations of east-central Europe by virtue of its superior physical force. Compromise and negotiations are gradually taking the place of suppression and coercion. These important changes have filled us with new hope.

Polycentrism has not only affected the international relations of the countries in the Soviet bloc, but it has deeply affected the internal conditions of the countries concerned. The human and political rights of the people are respected to a much greater degree; artists and writers are allowed to speak up more freely than had been the case in the Stalinist era. There is a new openness to outside influences; the people are no longer as sealed off from the rest of the world as before. We hope that these liberalizing tendencies, limited though they may be, will continue to benefit the peoples and nations of East and Central Europe. Only when nations are allowed to determine their own course of action, independent from outside interference, can there be true peace. No man and no country can hold the free will of a people and the political will of a nation captive forever.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of the countries of Eastern Europe has always deeply concerned us; we cannot be indifferent to their striving for freedom and justice. We welcome the progress of greater external and internal freedoms. Yet we have only witnessed the beginning of a movement in the right direction. Much remains to be done. We will continue to support the peoples of the East European nations until that time when they will have gained complete freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I now conclude with the article by Dr. Dobriansky in the Ukrainian Quarterly, as follows:

THE TRADITIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: RED NIGHTMARE, FREEDOM'S HOPE

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Confusion, misdirected thinking, and the repetition of old errors dominate the current scene in the United States and thus much of the Free World. These dominant trends are, in part, the logical consequences of the superb maneuver engineered by Moscow in the last decade under the deceptive banner of "peaceful coexistence." Continue to build and strengthen the empire within, while all feasible forces are utilized to undermine the enemy without has been the practical essence of this highly successful maneuver. The functionaries in Moscow's *Agitprop* have good reason to gloat over the results and doubtless are banking on even phenomenal successes in the near future.

The needless mess in Vietnam, the NATO rupture, self-paralyzing absurdities about "arrogant power," "escalation," and "containment" again, the steady over-all Red penetrations in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, the repeated softening-up process on communism in our own body politic, and the insidious deterioration of our national will for positive victory, whether military or psycho-political, are only a few evidences of the new pattern of confusion and old errors. As though the lessons of U.S. trade with the Axis powers into World War II were never learned, the present drive for easy trade with the Red Empire is another point of evidence. Self-nurtured illusions about "national independence" among the so-called satellites in Central Europe, "the evaporation of the Cold War," a materially explosive Peking-Moscow showdown, and the spread of peace-orienting "capitalism" in the empire also have their able precedents in the illusions of the 30's, when the nature of modern imperio-colonialist totalitarianism eluded the understanding of that generation.

What in all these years has been a cardinal objective of the totalitarian Red Syndicate is a progressive Free World disinterest in the genuine liberation and independence of the captive nations, the oppressed peoples themselves as against the Red states dominated by totalitarian Communist Parties. The enormous advantages of achieving this should be obvious: easier consolidation of the empire, stronger posture for Cold War successes in the Free World, and the moral and political demolishment of Free World democracies. This Red objective, shared by all in the syndicate, is a crucial and integral part of Red psycho-political warfare which Brezhnev, in his report to the 23rd Party Congress last March, lauded as the prime, unsurpassed weapon wielded by a "political army of revolutionaries for class struggles."[1] The heavy emphasis placed at the Congress on the "great, complex art" in "leadership of class struggle"—meaning the imperio-colonialist art of psycho-political warfare—is unmistakable as to what we can expect in the years ahead.

High on the priority list in Red psycho-political warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week. This has been evident since 1959, and unfortunately some in this country have sought to assist Moscow and the syndicate in realizing this aim. One major element that they hope to capitalize on is a protracted American ignorance of the many captive nations in the Red Empire, particularly in the USSR. Another is the significance of the Week in the current struggle, measured especially by their own reactions. The mountain of evidence formed since 1959 clearly shows that Captive Nations Week is a deep thorn in the side of the Red totalitarians and their efforts to expand the Red Empire chiefly through the art of psycho-political warfare. As in many other cases, they depend on apathy, distraction, indifference, ignorance, and even educated stupidity to accomplish their work for them.

THE ABC'S OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When this writer wrote the Captive Nations Week Resolution in June, 1959, little did he appreciate the extent to which elements of misunderstanding and cultured ignorance can contribute to Moscow's ends. A sterling example of this was an editorial in a Washington paper that was promptly refuted by the writer.[2] In 1964, another editorial attack against the captive nations in the same organ evoked delight and praise in Moscow.[3] To identify the misleading and disinforming sources among us and, at the same time, to prevent Red manipulation of such misguiding opinions, it is most essential for every American to become familiar with the ABC's of Captive Nations Week.

---

[1] Leonid Brezhnev, Report to 23rd Party Congress, *Pravda,* March 31, 1966.

The Week is sponsored each year by the National Captive Nations Committee with headquarters at 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover was the honorary chairman of the Committee from 1960 to 1964; Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has occupied this position since 1965. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate are members of NCNC. Every year half of the Governors issue Captive Nations Week proclamations, as does every Mayor in each of our major cities.

NCNC is supported by voluntary contributions from individuals and organizations. Its activities are mainly supported by local Captive Nations Committees that extend from Boston to Miami, Washington, D. C. to San Francisco. Almost every major city has a committee made up of citizens who are quite versed in the ABC's of the Week. In the past few years the movement has extended overseas so that observances now are held in Free China, West Germany, Turkey, and Sweden. Much of this steady growth is regularly noted in the U.S. Congress which legislated the Week in 1959.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

It is often curious that some commentators who write about the Week give every evidence of never having read the resolution and law upon which it is based. For example, one writer has this to say: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."[4] As I pointed out in another article, this comment is "a gem of fact, illogic, and fiction."[5] Fact, the Russian's violent denunciation; illogic, the supposed innocuousness of the resolution; fiction, Congress' passing it every year to attract minority votes. Now, to see how writers can misguide, read the resolution which is Public Law 86–90, one of the ABC's:

CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

"*Whereas*, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

"*Whereas*, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"*Whereas*, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"*Whereas*, since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"*Whereas*, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others; and

"*Whereas*, these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas*, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"*Whereas*, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"*Whereas*, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

"*Now, therefore*, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

"*The President* is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: WHO'S NEXT?

The reader will observe that in its fifth paragraph the resolution contains an open-end clause as concerns the enumeration of captive nations. In 1959, after a year of disputes with certain House members who were offered the first opportunity to consider the measure, the writer found it necessary to insert "and others" in order to allow for new captive nations, such as Cuba in 1960, and to gradually familiarize many segments of our public with some old ones. Here, too, the force of stubborn and narrow preconception had to be combatted.

Perspective is the usual, lacking quality in the thinking of those who draw mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, "liberal" and "doctrinaire" Communists, and "independent" and "Soviet-dominated" Red states. Similar distinctions were concocted in the 30's with respect to the imperio-colonialist totalitarians of that period, and easy trade, cultural exchange and other devices were also employed then in the interest of world peace. The list below clearly shows the unitary base of the Red Syndicate; it shows the phenomenal success of the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians, building an unprecedented empire in the span of less than fifty years and with strikingly inferior resources; it also indicates the poverty of U.S. foreign policy, which committed two colossal political blunders in this century (contributing to the power of the Soviet Russian Empire both after World War I and during World War II) and is now on the brink of committing another with East-West trade plans, the Consular Convention and other myopic measures.

There is nothing like success, and this list is the roll call of Red success, primarily in psycho-political warfare. Given the same course of U.S. foreign policy and the pathetic absence of psycho-political warfare training, this list is bound for extension. Read it carefully and think:

The captive nations—Who's next?

Country and people:	*Year of Communist domination*
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc. in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czecho-Slovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's Next? South Vietnam? Guinea? Colombia? Congo? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand?

REPRESENTATIVE RED REACTIONS

A most important part of the ABC's of Captive Nations Week is the three R's, representative Red reactions to the Week. Accumulated since July 1959, they can fill several volumes. Be they the Khrushchevs, the Maos, Gomulkas, Titos, Castros, and all other squabbling or non-squabbling members of the Syndicate, the Red totalitarians screech at the list of captive nations and vituperatively condemn the Week. There's no mystery as to why they react so. The two mirror their wretched past and their deceptive present—and perhaps their doomed future. Conquest, terror, tyranny, genocide, totalitarian oppression, Cold War operations, the USSR as an "imperium in imperio," illegitimacy, imperio-colonialism, philosophical fraudulence and many other things are reflected by the mirror.

The following, selected at random, scarcely require comment:

"This resolution stinks." (Then, according to Vice President Nixon, "he spelled out what he meant in earthy four-letter words.")[6]

—NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV, July, 1959.

It represents an "hysterical campaign of petty provocation, proving that panic-stricken monopolists are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions."[7]

—N. S. KHRUSHCHEV, July, 1959.

---

[2] "Irritating the Bear," *The Washington Post*, July 24, 1959; author's reply, July 29, 1959.

[3] *Izvestia*, July 15, 1964.

[4] Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," *Saturday Evening Post*, December 16, 1961.

[5] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism and the Free World," NATO's Fifteen Nations, September 1963.

[6] Richard M. Nixon, *Six Crises*, 1962, p. 252.

[7] *The Washington Post*, July 24, 1959, p. A 8.

"The resolution is a new American provocation and a hostile act."[8]

—Protest of Red Czech regime, 1959.

"I would not be telling the full truth if I did not say that the adoption of this ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation."[9]

—Khrushchev, August, 1959.

"Take, for instance, the much-to-be-regretted decision of the American Congress to hold the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' and to pray for they liberation. In this case words other than 'rolling back' were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other people's affairs."[10]

—Khrushchev, October, 1959.

"When in July of this year American Senators officially shed crocodile tears over the captive nations, they did not forget to cry for Ukraine . . . It would appear that the Ukrainian people are enslaved."[11]

—Red publication, August, 1960.

"Some members of the U.S. Congress, who apparently are not too busy with state affairs, deliver 'moving' speeches, using the same mimeographed crib concerning the so-called 'week of captive nations' . . ."[12]

—Nicholas V. Podgorny, U.N., October, 1960.

"It is not at all fortuitous that this time the farce presented by the 'Captive Nations Week' should coincide with the hullabaloo created by American propaganda around the West Berlin question."[13] (Khrushchev again denounced the Week at the Communist Party Congress in October, 1961.)

—Moscow, 1961.

"All progressive mankind greeted the news of the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' with a feeling of anger and indignation. With foaming mouths the imperialist predators insist on the fantastic idea of restoring the capitalist order in the lands of the peoples' democracies and Soviet socialist republics."[14]

—*Radyanska Ukraina,* July, 1961.

"The Americans who invented the 'Captive Nations Week' are like those proverbial thieves who are yelling 'Catch the Thief,' while they themselves are living off the exploited masses in many countries of the world."[15]

—Petro Panch, poet, USSR, August, 1961.

"On the basis of the 'weeks' held in the past, we already know what these appropriate ceremonies represent—unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-communist slander. * * * Yes, it is only thanks to American bayonets that oppressors of freedom and blood-thirsty dictators are sustained in power in a number of countries of the Latin American continent and Southeastern Asia."[16]

—Moscow, 1962.

(In 1962 the Russian imperio-colonialists scored a victory in getting UNESCO to publish the scandalous and fraudulent *Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the USSR.*)

"Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question.'"[17]

—Moscow, January, 1963.

"The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared 'a week of the Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."

—*Pravda,* Moscow, July 8, 1963.

"Kennedy is a third-class clown proclaiming Captive Nations Week, which is a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles."

—Pyongyang Radio, N. Korea, July 10, 1963.

"With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance. The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the U.S.A."

—*Izvestia,* Moscow, July 15, 1964.

"In the United States a farce entitled 'captive nations week' is held every year. The people's democratic system has been in existence for 20 years but the imperialists still ramble on with nonsensical ideas of 'liberating' the nations of eastern Europe."[18]

—Khrushchev, August 1964.

"An annual, pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke . . . One could treat it like that, if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S."

—*Trybuna Ludu,* Poland, July 27, 1965.

"They are beating the drums again across the sea, filling columns in newspapers and delivering hypocritical speeches. For the umpteenth time the ruling circles of the United States are holding the so-called 'Captive Nations Week.' And the propaganda machine is deafening the citizens with 'atrocious' inventions about the fate of nations which are suffering under the yoke of the Kremlin regime."

—*Radyanska Ukraina,* Ukraine,
July 25, 1965.

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But that will never happen."

—Mikhail Suslov, chief Russian ideologist, Vilnius, Lithuania, July 17, 1965.

One can go on and on with these denunciations, drawn from Red China, Cuba, Hungary and elsewhere in the Red Empire. The most important place is, of course, the Soviet Union, which in every respect is the central power base of the empire. In ultimate calculation, every other Red regime, including the Chinese, Yugoslav, Rumanian, and Cuban, depends for its survival on the USSR. No amount of inter-Party squabbles and rifts can hide this supreme truth. So, when Vice President Nixon candidly reported "The Captive Nations Resolution was the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour," what in effect he was saying was that the resolution's ideas tore into the whole tenuous psycho-political fabric of this power center of "world communism." It opened up a fundamental and promising opportunity that we haven't even begun to explore and cultivate.

THE PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS

Another integral part of the ABC's of Captive Nations Week is the successive Presidential Proclamations. Prepared by the restraining and unimaginative hand of the State Department, the general content of these proclamations explains in part why we are still faced with fear and reluctance to seize this opportunity. The reader will find it a most productive exercise to read these proclamations carefully, compare a number of them, and then compare all of them with the resolution upon which they are based. Your comparisons should reveal the essence of our foreign policy plight in the most recent period. They should also motivate you to fight for the elimination of this plight. Read them carefully:

"CAPTIVE NATIVES WEEK, 1959—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1952, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"*Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1959, and of the independence of the United States of America the 184th.

"By the President:

"(Seal)

"Dwight D. Eisenhower.
"Christian A. Herter,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

---

[8] *Associated Press,* Prague, July 24, 1959.

[9] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "On Peaceful Coexistence," *Foreign Affairs, October* 1959, pp. 6–7.

[10] *N. S. Khrushchev's Report to Supreme Soviet,* Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, November 2, 1959, pp. 1–2.

[11] *For the Return to the Homeland,* No. 57/444, August 1960.

[12] Address, U.N. General Assembly, New York, October 4, 1960.

[13] *Pravda,* July 21, 1961.

[14] "Dirty Provocation," *Radyanska Ukraina,* Kiev, July 25, 1961.

[15] *Visti z Ukrainy,* No. 63, August 1961.

[16] *Izvestia,* July 17, 1962.

[17] *The New Times,* Moscow, January 23, 1963.

[18] *Reuters,* Banska Bystrica, Czecho-Slovakia, August 29, 1964.

"*Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

"By the President:
"(Seal)

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
"CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1961—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week,' and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

"*Whereas* it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest their interests in the freedom of other nations:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1961, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 14th day of July in the year of our Lord 1961, and the independence of the United States of America the 186th.

"By the President:
"(Seal)

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1962—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 1, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* there exist many historical and cultural ties between the people of these captive nations and the American people; and

"*Whereas* the principles of self-government and human freedom are universal ideals and the common heritage of mankind:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 15, 1962, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 13th day of July in the year of our Lord 1962, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

"By the President
"(Seal)

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1963—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"*Whereas* justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

"*Whereas* this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom:

"*Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 5th day of July in the year of our Lord 1963, and of the independence of the United States of America the 188th.

"By the President:
"(Seal)

"JOHN F. KENNEDY.
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1964—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

"*Whereas* this Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

"*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations:

"*Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 12, 1964, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

"By the President:
"(Seal)

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1965—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"*Whereas* the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"*Whereas* all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

"*Whereas* these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

"*Whereas* the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

"*Whereas* it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of national independence and human freedom:

"*Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"*Done* at the city of Washington this 2nd day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 190th.

"By the President:
"(Seal)

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
"DEAN RUSK,
"*Secretary of State.*"

THE ABC'S AND SOME BASIC ISSUES

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly on the issues basic to the security and freedom of our nation. Some of these issues deserve mention here. One is an intelligent, concentrated effort focussed on the fundamental reality of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In the U.N. or elsewhere we have done virtually nothing in this fundamental respect. The more the Red totalitarians prattle about "American imperialism," the more millions of minds about the world will believe it.

One would think that Goebbels taught us something thirty years ago.

A second basic issue is the formulation of a sensible liberation policy as the best guarantee against both a hot global war and an interminable string of guerrilla wars. This policy, with its almost exclusive emphasis on psycho-political activity and skillful paramilitary engagement, wasn't sufficiently understood in the 50's, and with the reemerging discussion on "containment" today, not to speak of further communist takeover tomorrow, it stands as the real and winning alternative to the policy of patched-up containment. How unrealistic the proponents of containment are can be gleaned from the evident fact that the Red Syndicate leaped over the Maginot-like containment wall years ago, into Cuba in our hemisphere, into the Middle East, into Africa and Asia. All this through means of calculated, psycho-political warfare, which is even being applied forthrightly in our own country today.

Thirdly, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is necessary for obvious symbolic, legislative, and educational reasons. Equally necessary is the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy for psycho-political warfare training. Had this been in existence ten years ago, with a do-it-yourself course for foreign nationals, I am convinced that we wouldn't today be sacrificing American lives and treasure in Vietnam. Last-minute recourse to military arms is not the answer to the Red-staged conflict of our day; nor is economic aid and welfare the answer.

Other significant issues are the Consular Convention with the USSR, which should be repudiated by the Senate because it plays into Russian imperio-colonialist hands, and liberalized East-West trade, which should be strongly opposed as a blind repetition of our errors of the 30's and falling into the trap of an over-all Red economic strategy that by now should have been honestly portrayed to our people. Representative Mills of Arkansas has earned the praise of all sober-thinking Americans who refuse to be stampeded into the Syndicate's trap.

THE UNITARY REALITY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Through all the foggy and murky talk about "East European independence," "the nationalism of Rumanian Communists" and other such ghosts, "containment," "building bridges of understanding" (with whom?), "detente with the Russians," and similar figments of confused minds, there is one massive, unitary reality that cannot be beclouded by these illusions and exercises in self-deception—the captivity of close to a billion people. These are the people who constitute the captive nations. They are in Red states, but they are not of these states.

Our primary appeal, our foremost efforts should be directed toward the freedom of the captive nations, and not the freedom of action of their unrepresentative Red regimes which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the expansion of the Red Empire. The mistakes being made today are in great measure a repetition of those committed in yesteryear. Real, progressive change demands revisions of thought, policy, and action; an ever-broadening knowledge of all the captive nations, particularly those in the USSR, propels such change—a change for a more secure peace, expanded freedom, and positive victory in the Cold War.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation is observing Captive Nations Week. Twenty-two separate nationalities have lost their independence in recent decades through direct and indirect aggression of Communist forces. We are now fighting a war to preserve the freedom of another nation against Communist aggression. Although the eyes of the world today are on Asia, we cannot forget the totalitarian rule that still holds in bondage the people of east and central Europe.

Man's yearning for freedom has been a driving force throughout the history of the human race. Those who have once known freedom and lost it realize full well how precious is this inalienable right. The forces of liberty in the captive lands continue to fight Communist tyranny and to look to the free world to help maintain their faith in their struggle for freedom and independence. The people of this country who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as a priceless possession give recognition and observance to the aspirations of these oppressed people. We stand here to reassure them that we remain firm in our policy of self-determination of nations and of individual dignity and justice.

Mr. Speaker, man's yearning for peace cannot be fulfilled until every nation is free to determine its own destiny and until every individual lives in the full knowledge that liberty and justice prevail. Today we bring hope and courage to those still struggling under the yoke of tyranny and new determination to those who remain free to guard their freedom. We hope and pray that the day will soon come when the cause of liberty will triumph—as it must—and all captive people will once more lift their heads as free men.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, again this Nation and freedom-loving people everywhere join in observing Captive Nations Week. I feel honored to again have the opportunity to join in this observance.

Today we are fighting in southeast Asia to preserve the rights of a people to their sovereignty and to live under a government of their own choosing. While this fight is going on with military weapons of war, there is a quiet but persistent fight of many people to again obtain the freedom to which they are entitled. I refer to the many countries, the captive nations, now under the yoke of communism which came about by forceable action on the part of the Soviets. These nations look to us for support in their unceasing quest for self-determination.

As we live up to our commitments in southeast Asia, we are in effect reaffirming to all nations the fact that a pledge by the United States will be honored. As we stand against the spread of communism in southeast Asia, we give courage to the courageous people of the captive nations in their determination to stand free of the tyranny of that ideology.

While we set aside this one week of the year to renew our pledges of support for these nations, we must keep them in the forefront of our minds and in our deeds throughout the year continue our efforts in their behalf.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the eighth annual response to a unanimous resolution of the 86th Congress, the President has designated this week as Captive Nations Week.

The United States is justly concerned with the aggressive efforts of the Communists throughout the world today, but far too little attention is given to those countries who have already been caught in the constricting vice of Communist oppression. Captive Nations Week duly focuses on those countries who formerly had their own form of government and whose people have since been unwillingly subjugated by the Communists; this deplorable situation, of course, exists not only in Eastern Europe, but also in Cuba, a number of territories now enclosed within the U.S.S.R., and many areas of Asia. Through the various ceremonies and activities scheduled for this week, Americans will again display their dedication to the reachievement of personal dignity, freedom, and independence by these peoples.

The objective of Captive Nations Week is thus to demonstrate the American determination that Communist subjugation is never to be recognized as a permanent situation; the resistance of the courageous peoples in dominated countries and of their valiant relatives and friends elsewhere cannot go unaided or unassisted.

Therefore, it is in a spirit of encouragement and action that we should observe Captive Nations Week, recognizing the duty of the free world to release the bonded from their captivity under despotism. We are in pursuit of freedom; and we shall not lose.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to express my support for the aims of the Captive Nations Week observance. I consider it a deep tragedy that at a time when colonial empires all over the world have virtually disappeared, the colonial status imposed by communism has retained its grip over the lives of more than a hundred million souls. Following events in eastern and central Europe today, one is almost led to believe that genuine freedom and justice does exist. However, this is certainly not the case, and we must make certain that the world knows the truth of Communist deception.

By the end of World War II, Soviet Russia was well on the way to becoming a great power, and at the same time, she was demonstrating attitudes as barbaric and negative as those of the Nazis who had just been defeated. Few acts perpetrated by the Soviets were as blatant and loathsome as was the capture and enslavement of the large number of East European nations. That was, and remains to this day, a most shocking and heartrending case of international banditry.

Prior to the war these nations had constituted independent, sovereign states in their respective lands with a culture and past of their own. As a result of the war, and in its wake, all of them were quickly overwhelmed by the Red army, and then gradually enslaved as satellites of the Soviet Union.

The fate of these people must be of vital concern to each of us. We must do all in our power to encourage and hasten the day when these people will join us in working for a better world in which to work and live.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the observance of the Captive Nations Week.

Two decades have passed since the Allied victory in World War II, but millions of people in eastern and central Europe are still awaiting the day when they will be able to exercise fully their right to self-determination.

In all of those countries—from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia on the north, to little Albania on the south—freedom has not been made secure. Ruled by Communist regimes, the people of those countries are denied the opportunity to shape the destinies of their nations in a manner consistent with our Western tradition. Neither are they able to exercise their basic human rights—even in instances where such rights as freedom of conscience, of speech, and so on, are ostensibly guaranteed to them by their constitutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has conducted hearings relating to the conditions in eastern and central Europe. The record of those hearings amply documents the plight of those people and exposes the hypocrisy of Communist professions of respect for the dignity and worth of all human beings.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress and our Chief Executives have for years observed this Captive Nations Week. The whole purpose of this observance is to focus attention on conditions prevailing in eastern and central Europe and to reaffirm our refusal to accept them as permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing our hope that the day will soon come when the people of such countries as Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and of all the other countries currently dominated by communism, will once again enjoy the full blessings of freedom.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 49 years since communism won its first victory by overthrowing the Kerensky government in Russia. Since then Communists have seized power in Eastern Europe, parts of Asia, and most recently Cuba. Nowhere have the Communists come to power through free elections. Force and violence have been the hallmark of their success. The Congress which is elected by freemen has taken note of these misdeeds and others in the captive nations resolution of the 86th Congress and since then during Captive Nations Week.

We hope that things are getting better, that the era of suppression is passing. Still we read that the Lutheran Church is being prevented from holding its convocation in East Germany. The Polish Catholic hierarchy is being challenged by the Communist government as it attempts to celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to Christianity and Poland's birth as a nation.

In the Soviet Union itself, dissenting writers are being suppressed as illustrated by the trials held recently for two authors who dared to criticize the regime in their works.

These are but a few recent examples of how freedom is still being suppressed. We in the West know of them only because they involved famous people or large organizations. The plight of the common man is probably just as great for he is caught in conflicts between his inner strivings to be free and the world in which he must live.

Mr. Speaker, we can hope that someday these people will be able to live in a world which will not suppress their desire to be free. Until that day we shall demonstrate through actions such as the proclamation of Captive Nations Week that we know of their plight and desire as much as they do to see a world which knows only freedom for all of its inhabitants.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, before World War II had even ended, the Soviet Union according to its plan for world domination began its tyrannical takeover of the nations of Eastern Europe. Czechoslavakia lost its independence in 1939. Swiftly, taking the Western democracies by surprise, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, and Rumania were subjugated to the Communist onslaught.

These nations and East Germany which the Russians have never released from bondage following their defeat, comprise close to 100 million people. Most of these nations had during the two decades since the First World War enjoyed freedom and independence and were valued members of the community of free nations, although they were in constant fear of the growing threats of nazism and communism.

World War II halted and defeated nazism but left in its wake the confusion which laid the groundwork for the Communist's startling and devastating conquest. These nations joined many others, Armenia and the Ukraine included, who had been crushed and absorbed into the Soviet bloc.

Twenty-one years have passed and these countries remain, under the guise of people's democracies, Soviet satellites exploited for the benefit of the Soviet Union. But the leaders of the free world and the government of this Republic in particular have not forgotten this enslavement of a large part of the world's population. During this week, observed and declared as Captive Nations Week, we renew our resolution to foster the growth and eventual independence of these countries and remain determined to see the freedom of these captive nations.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to rise in the commemoration of the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a week dedicated to bolster the determination and longing for freedom of the peoples in those many nations which have been tightly yoked under Communist oppression and intolerance. Compassion for the plight of these captive peoples is difficult for us Americans to fully feel, I fear, Mr. Speaker. The heritage of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom to worship is taken all too nonchalantly nowadays. It is easy for us to let our memories and our hearts gloss over the blood and the sweat and the tears that have embossed the pages of American history with our world fight for freedom.

As a sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 395, which I introduced on April 3, 1965, to give hope to the Baltic States in their sorrowful predicament, I am convinced that the annual Captive Nations Week can be a highly effective assistance in the movement toward independence in the Eastern European countries.

The various totalitarian Communist governments do not represent the downtrodden, underlying captive nations. A force that can help to penetrate this Communist barrier which separates the captive peoples from the realization of their long quest for freedom is an institution like Captive Nations Week. This week and others like it over the years will give courage to those who might otherwise lose all hope. It will serve as a reminder of freedom where heretofore the only reminder of freedom lay deeply submerged in the consciousness of a generation which once knew the joys of freedom but is rapidly aging under the yoke of totalitarianism.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week, and indeed the purpose of all free nations, should be the construction of a bridge of understanding sympathy. We should provide moral support and exert all possible efforts to help set free from Communist colonialism these oppressed and tyrannized captive nations.

When one reads of the shameful accusations by the Sino-Soviets of Yankee imperialism and compares them with the facts that are so incontrovertible, it is perfectly clear that Russia and China are the last two remnants that remain of the world's backward centers of colonial conquest.

The free world and those in bondage who learn for the free exercise of their former freedoms, look to the United States for leadership. They look upon the United States as their last citadel of hope, their last bastion for the cause of freedom. While we continue to remain strong, and champion the cause of those who are free and those who yearn to be free, we must continuously assert our leadership in that respect. Such leadership lies not only in the diplomatic and foreign policy efforts of free governments around the world but also in commemorations of freedom such as Captive Nations Week. This I believe to be the chief raison d'etre of the principles upon which this great Nation of ours is constructed.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that it is necessary for us to observe Captive Nations Week. In this age, human slavery should be an anachronism—a condition of the forgotten past. Although we wish that all men were free, millions live enslaved.

In 1917, the Kerensky government of Russia fell victim to the Communists. Since then, the shackles of totalitarianism have bound 22 nations in Eastern Europe, Asia, and the Caribbean. The once free people of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Cuba, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, the Ukraine, and several other East European nations no longer breathe the sweet air of liberty. In not one of these countries did the Communists gain power through free elections. Subversion, deception, and "Gestapo" tactics are their tools for conquest. In sharp contrast, the Western nations have freed over 50 former colonies since World War II. Only a blind fool could mistake the Communists for anything but imperialistic aggressors.

Since 1958 our Government has set aside the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. First, we should observe this week to mourn the dead who lost their lives attempting to throw off the chains of captivity.

Even more fervently, we mourn the living who yearn to be free. To these millions who look toward the West as a beacon torch of liberty, we must continually renew our pledge that we refuse to accept their plight as a permanent condition. We must demonstrate that self-determination is not a hollow cry, but a guiding principle.

I hope that the people of the emerging nations, in their search for freedom of the press, religion, assembly, and speech, listen attentively to the cries of these brave people. It should be difficult for any man to ignore the exodus from Communist East Berlin which had to be stopped with barbed wire, machineguns, and a forbidding wall. If the newly independent countries fail to heed such signs, the destiny of mankind will rest on shifting sands.

Today, it is impossible to disconnect foreign policy and domestic happenings. The events occurring in our cities and towns are seen by the whole world. The premises of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence must be fulfilled as soon as possible.

In the long run, our ability to aid and succor fellow men of the world in search of freedom is dependent on our own vitality. The dignity and worth of freemen must be preserved. The flame of liberty must never be extinguished.

Thomas Jefferson's historic statement should become a universal oath: "I swear before the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in earlier remarks, there was a great nationwide surge of interest in Captive Nations Week this year. I am pleased to call the attention of the Members to proclamations issued by the mayors of Forest Park, Flossmore, and Tinley Park, Ill., in the congressional district I am privileged to represent. In addition, an editorial in the July 15 edition of the New World, publication of the archdiocese of Chicago, on Captive Nations Week, came to my attention, and I insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Bernard G. Cunningham, Village President (Mayor) of Park Forest, Illinois 60466, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Park Forest, Illinois, and call upon the citizens of Park Forest to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Village of Park Forest to be affixed this 17th day of July, 1966.

B. G. CUNNINGHAM,
Village President.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, W. Robert Riggs (Mayor) of Village of Flossmoor, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as Captive Nations Week in village, and call upon the citizens of Flossmoor to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth J. Fulton, Mayor of the Village of Tinley Park, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966, be observed as "Captive Nations Week" in Tinley Park and call upon the citizens of Tinley Park to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Dated this 16th day of July, 1966.

KENNETH J. FULTON,
Mayor of the Village of Tinley Park.

CAPTIVE NATIONS DESERVE OUR WHOLEHEARTED SUPPORT

Speaking of Freedom Rallies, I can think of none more deserving of support than that planned for Captive Nations Day, Saturday, July 16. There is no doubt that the general public here in the United States has become very short of memory or, worse still, apathetic to the past and present sufferings of those who have been enslaved by Communism. On Saturday, 20 national groups, representing enslaved nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar curtains, are taking part in a parade starting at noon at Wacker Drive and State Street. Many of these people are refugees from the 20 nations represented. They would not be in this country unless they loved our nation and the freedoms we have here, and unless they looked to our nation as the last freedom-loving people who would be willing to help them help their homelands to restore freedom.

The list of captive nations reads almost like a litany—Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Lithuania, East Berlin, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba, to mention only a few. The source of captivity can clearly be pin-pointed in Soviet Russia and Red China. As long as these nations continue their imperialistic programs of infiltration, insidious revolution and ultimate world domination, none of us can hope for any true freedom.

Our Nation is not getting much self-deserved support from our traditional allies in working toward this goal. We are being subjected to heavy criticism, often hypocritical, from our enemies and even from those whom we would call our friends. Many voices have been raised within our own nation to criticize the support that we have been giving to the relatively small nation of Vietnam. Today (Wednesday) is called the "Day of Shame" in Vietnam. It is the day on which that nation was divided at the Geneva Conference in 1954—the northern half being turned over to Communist rule and the southern half remaining as a free nation.

Those among us who would prefer not to consider the situation should know more about some of the peoples involved. The puppet governments in Poland and Cuba have never ceased their oppressive harassment of their own people who want freedom. Red China has liquidated hundreds of thousands of its own citizens for the same reason. The goal of the Communists is quite clear. If we fail to secure true peace and freedom in Vietnam, we will be giving up just one more frontier of freedom.

Thailand, Laos, Cambodia—you name the place—it's been on the list for Soviet aggression for years. If we don't stop it soon, there will be no free area left beyond our own shores, and big and strong and resourceful as we may be as a nation, we may not be quite big enough to undo the damage that has made millions of people captives and has tortured and murdered millions more.

Captive Nations Day should be heralded and supported by all Chicagoans. Most of us, or our parents and grandparents, come from such nations. The less fortunate are still captive. Let's keep them in our prayers and pledge them our constant support. If we don't we don't deserve the freedom we enjoy.

J. M. KELLY.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on this same subject.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARMED SERVICES—SELECTED EXTENDED TENURE PERSONNEL PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the many problems facing the Armed Forces today is the tremendous turnover in personnel, especially in the critical skills. Much of this problem is the result of early retirement permitted by tradition and regulation, not by law. The average age of military retirees is 43 to 44. Many of these retirees must be replaced with a highly trained individual. As a result, about 17 percent of the service's manpower is tied up in training. In order to correct this situation, I have proposed a selected extended tenure personnel program, which would create a new category of military personnel.

Both officers and enlisted men would be eligible for SETP. Applicants for the program must:

First, be eligible for retirement or be retired;

Second, be a volunteer for the program;

Third, relinquish any further consideration for promotion;

Fourth, accrue no further seniority in grade;

Fifth, serve in a stabilized assignment up to age 62 if the requirement for his services continues and his performance standards are maintained.

After acceptance into the program, participants will:

First, enjoy all the benefits available to active duty personnel;

Second, be allowed to volunteer for an overseas stabilized assignment;

Third, be allowed to transfer to another installation if his job is discontinued, or if such a requirement exists;

Fourth, be rated on the same basis as officers or enlisted men, with regard to performance and physical condition;

Fifth, be dismissed under simple administrative rules if his performance falls below standards;

Sixth, remain under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and be responsive to military discipline;

Seventh, be excused from most time-consuming collateral military training;

Eighth, not be sent to school for training or retraining, except for very short refresher courses in his field;

Ninth, not be given a commander's assignment;

Tenth, not be transferred without his consent, except in time of emergency;

Eleventh, be allowed to go on retired status on 30 days' notice, except in time of emergency;

Twelfth, be counted against the military manpower ceiling but not under the grade ceilings imposed on the services; and

Thirteenth, accrue only minimal retirement benefits after completion of 30 years' service, such as those available to permanent professors at the service academies.

Jobs to be available through this program will be identified by the Secretary of each military department. A special board, established by the respective Secretaries and composed of both officers and enlisted men, will have the duty of determining which volunteers for SETP are to be accepted. Participants will be selected on a highly competitive basis. The number of people participating cannot, at any time, exceed 5 percent of the services' strength. Such 5 percent is to be phased in slowly, by limiting the input to no more than 1 percent of active duty strength in any 1 year.

Perhaps the most desirable characteristic of this proposal is that SETP will encourage skilled officers and enlisted men to continue their careers in the Armed Forces. As a result, these valuable individuals will not be lost to the civilian world. The program, while serving this valuable function for the Government, will also be very attractive to the men themselves, who do not relish the thought of embarking on a second career. Many persons who are approaching retirement age would prefer to remain in the service if they could establish a permanent residence and settle down with their families. Besides providing this incentive for the military personnel involved, SETP will:

First, reduce the current waste of manpower through early retirement;

Second, reduce the costs of training replacements for retirees;

Third, reduce overall personnel costs by avoiding payment of retired pay to a retiree and simultaneous payment of salary to his replacement;

Fourth, increase retention of young officers who do not relish the thought of two careers;

Fifth, reduce the extremely high loss rate of World War II experience over the next 10 years;

Sixth, increase in-house technical capability;

Seventh, give good selectivity because of the number of personnel that will be available for selection;

Eighth, improve the image of the service as a career.

This would provide a means through which men, who have devoted years of service to our Nation, could continue the skills they have acquired in the Armed Forces. At the same time, they could take up permanent residence without fear of being transferred.

Many retirees are failing to find jobs which even partially utilize the skills and experience they gained at great cost to the Government. This problem will increase as World War II retirees continue their exodus. The services logically should be able to use the skills of their retiring people better than most other employers, especially new ones.

If early retirement poses so many problems, why then do people retire at such an early age as 43 to 44? There are two basic reasons. First, if they wait much longer it will become nearly impossible to obtain another job—especially one which will utilize their skills. Second, most men of age 43 or older desire to establish a permanent residence rather than continue to travel throughout the world and face the possibility of transfer at any time. Many servicemen would be eager to remain with the Armed Forces if it were not for these facts.

The following excerpt from a letter written by Chief M. Sgt. Roy J. Curran is typical of the feeling of many people who will be affected by the new program.

> My reaction (to S.E.T.P.) is that I am an enthusiastic volunteer for the first slot! In my case the Air Force would have a transient maintenance superintendent for an additional 14 years at a saving of $420.00 per month or a total saving of $70,560.00.
>
> No, I am not a complete idiot—and my patriotism is not causing me to make a gift of $420 per month to the Treasury. I view the plan as a practical approach to the retirement problems facing many of us.
>
> I am a healthy, active, efficient Chief Master Sergeant, 47 years old with 29½ years of active service. I have never had an efficiency report below outstanding. I have the equivalent of two years of college. I am a licensed aircraft and engine mechanic.
>
> I must retire in six months or face another tour overseas—with retirement mandatory three years from now. Upon retirement I must immediately go to work at a minimum of $351 per month just to break even with my present position.
>
> I have faced the fact that the only jobs I can be fairly certain of are as a janitor,

> light vehicle operator, or in the Post Office. I am well aware of the fact that industry—aviation in particular—is not waiting for me to retire! Younger people are preferred and I can find no argument with this practice.
>
> As you can see, the alternative of continuing in my present position is much more attractive than the thought of retiring at 48 with 30 years of service.
>
> My position as transient maintenance superintendent is common to all Air Force bases. The position requires a Senior Master Sergeant or a Chief Master Seregant, AFSC 43190, or an officer (reference T.O. 00–20A–1). Many positions such as this could be efficiently and effectively filled by "old folks" such as I—at great savings and added continuity to many of these fast turnover jobs.
>
> I have discussed your extended tenure proposal with quite a number of men near retirement. You could fill a one-third quota with better than average men if the extended tenure could be offered or accepted at any time between 20 and 30 years of service. As you know, one of the prime reasons for many of the early retirements is that many of us get a pretty strong desire for a permanent home after 20 or 30 years of wandering. Your extended tenure proposal would give both the Air Force and some of us a bargain.

Selected extended tenure personnel could obviously serve a valuable function for the armed services and the Nation. The people involved would be much better satisfied with their work, extensive training provided by the Government would be utilized to the fullest possible extent, and tax dollars would be saved for the American public. The entire program, however, is a relatively new idea and one which has not been studied in great detail. It is quite possible that hearings, Department studies, and investigations may reveal a need for changes or alterations in the program as it is designed in the bill.

I welcome your suggestions, questions, companion bills, and perfection, and sincerely hope that the bill will be favorably reported by the committee.

FUEL ON THE FIRES OF RACIAL DISCONTENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, there are at work today certain forces in the Congress bent upon the destruction of the war on poverty. By their actions, they are throwing fuel on the fires of racial discontent.

There are those in the Congress who say that they really want to help improve the Economic Opportunity Act, but in reality, by their tactics of delay and confusion, it is becoming increasingly clear that the prime concern on their minds is the complete emasculation of the war on poverty.

Racial unrest is exploding in one major city after another. It is becoming crystal clear to most intelligent observers that the Negroes in the ghettos of large cities want above all else—jobs. When the weather gets hot and there is nothing to do with their time, it should be understandable that young Negroes take to the streets and seize whatever weapon may be at hand to express their utter frustration and hopelessness at the existing order. In the past 21 months of the Johnson administration's war on poverty, significant beginnings have been made in working with these hard core unemployed, most of whom lack even basic education and job skills. But, in spite of this good beginning, we have only been able to reach 30 percent of the children of the poor, and only 15 percent of the youth in the slums of our cities.

At the heart of the unrest in the urban ghettos is an unfortunately increasing unemployment rate among young Negroes in the 16- to 21-age group. It is sometimes difficult to perceive this since unemployment figures for this group are lumped in with totals for other segments of our population, resulting in a low rate of unemployment for the U.S. population as a whole of only 4 percent. The fact is that while the unemployment rate for white young people in the 16-to-21 category has been steadily dropping from 17.5 percent in June of 1965 to 15.1 percent in June of this year, unemployment among Negroes in this same category has been steadily on the rise. Last June, it stood at 25.4 percent, but in June of this year, it had gone up to 26 percent.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps established in the heart of urban ghetto areas is already playing a significant role in providing training to the hard-core unemployed and maintaining peace and hope in those areas. It is a fact that in those cities where sufficient funds and programs have been in operation, long enough to make a meaningful start, the long hot summer dreaded by all responsible persons has not taken place.

It is a fact, that as far as I know, there has only been one instance of any Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees being arrested or charged in any of the recent riots in cities like Chicago and Cleveland. It is a further fact that during last summer's destructive Watts riots, not one young person in the Neighborhood Youth program was arrested or charged with an offense by the Los Angeles police. In fact, many of them attended their job assignments regularly. In the Huff section of Cleveland, which is the Negro area, there just has not been enough progress to date in providing similar opportunities to young people age 16 to 21. In fact, because of fund shortages, there have only been 2,686 Neighborhood Youth Corps training slots provided for the whole city of Cleveland.

We have in the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966, now pending before the Congress, the tools to effectively solve many of the social and racial ills which we have been watching burst into flame day after day in our large cities. Those cities which already have in operation effective antipoverty programs are compiling a remarkable record of racial harmony and are relatively calm. Our bill would increase this activity where it can do the most good.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out in many of our large cities and we cannot tolerate further congressional intrigue and harassing tactics which allow the fuses on urban ghetto time bombs to burn dangerously low.

What we are doing in the war against poverty is more important than petty partisan politics. We are engaged in a war against social ills backed up for decades. Today, we are reaping a bitter harvest of unrest requiring only the best efforts of the Congress to solve. The weapons are at hand in the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966. We do not have time for congressional footdragging. I urge immediate action on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966. They offer hope and, more importantly, basic skills required for jobs. The Negroes in these ghettos understandably want jobs and the self-respect they help bring.

A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH SIX FEDERAL MAXIMUM SECURITY RESEARCH CENTERS FOR THE CRIMINALLY INSANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the Legislative Reference Bureau to prepare for me appropriate legislation which would provide for the establishment of six regional maximum security research centers for the criminally insane.

This action is being taken in the wake of the monstrous crime which was committed in Chicago last week when eight student nurses were murdered in their dormitory.

Following this horrible tragedy, I have made a study of what facilities are available in the United States for early detection of people capable of committing such an act of violence.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply concerned to learn of the fantastically meager facilities that are available in this country for research in early detection of the criminally insane and those with violent criminal tendencies.

The National Institute of Mental Health advises me that during the fiscal year of 1966, the Institute spent a total of only $9.4 million for research programs in crime and delinquency—or only 4 percent of the total Institute's program.

I believe this Nation has waited much too long in providing an all-out, crash program of research and establishment of adequate facilities to deal with the problem of the criminally insane.

It is my hope that this horrible tragedy which struck Chicago last week will jar the sensitivities of our entire Nation and will bring about in this Congress appropriate action to start, even at this late date, an effective program for dealing with this problem.

There are in the United States, according to figures compiled by the National Institute of Mental Health, 17 million people suffering some form of mental or emotional problems.

This means that approximately 10 percent of the American population or 1 out of every 10 people is suffering from some form of mental illness.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that mental illness is the No. 1 problem facing the United States today.

There is no question in my mind that the mounting crime rate—and the shocking tragedy which occurred in Chicago last week is but one example of this problem—is directly related to the increase in mental illness in America.

My Subcommittee on Select Education has heard testimony that 10 percent of the schoolchildren in this country suffer from some form of mental retardation.

Yet, we are currently spending only $90 million of Federal aid for research in all forms of mental illness; only another $90 million in aid for training personnel; and only another $90 million of Federal aid in support for State programs to build mental health centers.

It appears totally illogical to me that a nation which today has a gross national product in excess of $700 billion, cannot spend more than $270 million of Federal aid to help reduce the Nation's most pressing problem, that of mental health.

I am proposing today the establishment of six regional maximum security research centers, which will have as a primary purpose intensive research into behavior patterns and early detection of the criminally insane.

I propose that one of such centers shall be constructed in the Northeast section of America, another in the Southeast, a third one in the Middle West, a fourth in the Southwest, and the fifth in the Northwest.

The sixth maximum security research center for the criminally insane would be established here in Washington, possibly at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

These maximum security institutions would be operated jointly by the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Public Health Service with very close cooperation and financial support from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Local and State prisons do not have adequate facilities for conducting effective research on the criminally insane. Under my proposal, the facilities of these six Federal research centers would be made available to State institutions for housing prisoners convicted either under Federal laws or State laws for the purpose of intensive research into their past behavior patterns.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that society, in order to receive the kind of protection it needs from the increasing threat of the criminally insane, needs this kind of a program without any further delay.

I have made no effort to estimate the cost of this program at this time, but who, Mr. Speaker, can put a value on the lives of those eight student nurses in Chicago who were murdered in cold blood or the many other victims of crimes committed by those with serious mental deficiencies.

We can learn a great deal about behavioral patterns from those convicted of crimes and from such research we can devise techniques for early detection of the potential criminal.

I am including with my remarks today programs and goals in the area of research on crime and delinquency currently being conducted by the National Institute of Mental Health.

I am also including a separate list of crime and delinquency studies specifically in the Chicago area.

It is my hope that this material will serve as a basis for a discussion long overdue in this serious problem of the criminally insane which reeks such tragic havoc in our country.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that other Members of Congress will join me in this proposal for early construction of these Federal maximum security research centers for the criminally insane. I believe that from this research we can develop standards and guidelines for police enforcement officials throughout our Nation, and perhaps in this way we can help to prevent future tragedies such as the one which shocked the conscience of the entire world last week.

The National Institute of Mental Health's material follows:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH GRANTS RELATED TO CRIME AND DELINQUENCY—INCLUSIVE TO MARCH 1966 NAMH COUNCIL

(Compiled by the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency Consultation and Special Services Branch National Institute of Mental Health, May 20, 1966)

Additional information relating to the listed projects can be obtained by consulting *Current Projects in the Prevention, Control, and Treatment of Crime and Delinquency*, a continuing publication of the National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

I. MENTAL HEALTH PROJECT GRANTS (MH–R11)

Special Group Program for Acting-Out Children; Laufer, Maurice W., M.D., Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, Riverside, Rhode Island, 21.[1]

Assessment of Group Treatment in Correction Agencies; Kassebaum, Gene G., Ph.D., University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024, 89.

Day Care Treatment Center for Adolescents; Rafferty, Frank T., M.D., Mental Health Services, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, 104.[1]

Psychiatric Service to Young Inmates in a County Jail; Marsh, Elias J., M.D., Connecticut State Department of Mental Health, Hartford, Connecticut, 127.[1]

Assessment of Group Processes in Temporary Detention; Beckley, Loren A., Mr., The County of San Mateo, Redwood City, California, 109.[1]

Institution to Community-Continuum of Group Therapy; Sadovnikoff, Vsevolod, M.D., Rhode Island Mental Hygiene Services, Providence, Rhode Island, 210.[1]

Team Treatment Aftercare in a Community Parole Hostel; Breslin, Maurice A., Mr., Prisoner's Aid Society of Delaware, Wilmington, Delaware, 248.[1]

Studying Child Rearing in Low Income Areas; Lewis, Hylan, Ph.D., Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, Washington, D.C., 278.[1]

Mental Illness and the Law; Hazard, Geoffrey C., Jr., Mr., American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Illinois 60637, 302.[1]

Efficacy of Social Group Work in Limiting Delinquency; Page, James D., Ph.D., The Lighthouse Settlement, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 318.[1]

Foster Homes: A Treatment Resource for Disturbed Boys (see 1551); Sargent, Douglas A., M.D., Wayne County Juvenile Court, Detroit, Michigan, 327.[1]

Conference on the Court Treatment Clinic; Guttmacher, Manfred S., M.D., University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland, 361.[1]

Insanity Procedures Under Federal Law; Heller, Melvin S., M.D., Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 366.[1]

Fitting Social Work into One Type of Prison Setting; Peterson, Martin R., Mr., North Carolina Prison Department, Raleigh, North Carolina, 397.[1]

Mobilization for Youth—Action Grant; Beck, Bertram, Mr., Mobilization For Youth, New York, New York, 426.

Work with Non-Conforming Youth in Gangs; Schwartz, Eugene P., Ph. D., Metropolitan Youth Commission, St. Louis, Missouri, 437.[1]

North Shore Adolescent Project; Young, Arthur K., Ph. D., North Shore Child Guidance Center, Manhasset, New York, 451.[1]

Juvenile Delinquency in the Japanese-American Population; Kitano, Harry H. L., Ph. D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 476.[1]

Demonstration in Individualized Milieu Therapy; Studt, Elliott, D.S.W., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 479.[1]

Neighborhood Improvement Project; Krisberg, Jane, Ph. D., Community Council of Greater New Haven, Inc., New Haven, Connecticut, 510.

Kansas City, Mo. School Behavior Project (became Special Areas Project 2303), 535.[1]

Program for Detached Workers, Cooper, Charles N., Mr. YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 541.[1]

An Evaluation of Community Treatment for Delinquents; Warren, Marguerite G., Ph. D., California Youth Authority, Sacramento, California 95817, 598.

Differential Action Study of Delinquency; Freedman, Lawrence Z., M.D., Center for Advanced study, Stanford, California, 622.[1]

Effect of Social Group Work on Delinquents, Ikeda, Tsuguo, Ph. D., Seattle Atlantic Street Center, Seattle, Washington, 624.[1]

Formulation of Training Program for Child Care Development; Goldsmith, Jerome, M.D., Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, New York, 631.[1]

School Services for Culturally Handicapped Children; Liddle, Gordon P., Ph. D., Quincy Youth Development Commission, Quincy, Illinois, 633.[1]

Individualized Treatment in a Staff-Inmate Community; Selznick, Philip, Ph. D., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 635.[1]

Therapeutic Treatment of Children in Custody; Howell, O. D., Honorable, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Tampa, Florida, 655.[1]

Eau Claire County Youth Study; Thurston, John R., Ph. D., State Department of Public Welfare, Madison, Wisconsin 54701, 672.

Work Therapy for Adolescent Delinquents; Porter, Hercules, Mr., Jewish Vocational Service, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, 674.

New Techniques for Training and Rehabilitation; Preston, Harley O., Ph. D., American Institute for Research, Washington, D.C., 688.[1]

To Develop a Program Research Service; Adams, Stuart N., Ph.D. Los Angeles County Probation Department, Los Angeles, California 718.[1]

Juvenile Judges Institute (became T-10294); Ellingston, John, Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 721.[1]

Juvenile Officers' Institute (became T-10294); Ellingston, John, Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 722.[1]

Follow-up of Delinquents in Federal and State Prisons; Wilner, Daniel, Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 724.[1]

---

[1] Completed project.

From Gang Violence to Heroin Use Among Adolescents; Preble, Edward, Mr., New York School of Psychiatry, New York, New York, 728.[1]

Training Police in Juvenile Delinquency Work; Brennan, James J., Ph.D., Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York, New York, 732.[1]

Research-Information Center on Crime and Delinquency; Scanlon, John C., Mr., National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, New York, 735.[1]

Mental Health Program for Juvenile Delinquents; Hurley, Daniel J., M.D., State Health Department, Reno, Nevada, 736.[1]

Inservice Training of Prison Officers; Fogliani, Jack, Mr., Nevada State Prison, Carson City, Nevada, 743.[1]

Families of Children in Residential Treatment; Minuchin, Salvador, M.D., Wiltwyck School for Boys, Inc., New York, New York 10010, 745.

Training School Visitation Project; McGehee, Lloyd, Mr., Columbia Training School, Columbia, Mississippi, 751.[1]

An Evaluation of a Juvenile Court Resource Unit; Jaso, Hector, M.D., Providence Child Guidance Clinic, Providence, Rhode Island, 768.

Youthful Delinquent Behavior of Respectable Men; Robinson, Sophia, Ph. D., Adelphia College, Long Island, New York, 781.[1]

An Insterstate Approach to Juvenile Delinquency; Kroepsch, Robert H., Mr., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, 807.[1]

A Halfway House for Narcotic Offenders; Geis, Gilbert, Ph. D., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 808.[1]

Juvenile Delinquency Demonstration Training Project; Gardner, George E., M.D., Judge Baker Guidance Center, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, 811.

Protective Supervision of Children Before Family Court; Trimble, Benson, Honorable, Fourth Circuit Court, Nashville, Tennessee, 812.[1]

Youth Rehabilitation Via Individual Planning and Care; Wheatley, Spencer B., Mr., Children's Home Finding and Aid Society of North Idaho, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho, 813.[1]

Community Education for Delinquency Prevention; Sigurdson, Herbert, Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 815.[1]

Rehabilitation of Retarded Delinquents; Madison, Blaine M., Ph. D., North Carolina Board of Correction and Training, Raleigh, North Carolina, 821.[1]

A Strategy for Study of Social Agency Effectiveness; Gottfredson, Don M., Ph. D., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 823.[1]

Problem Prevention in the Primary Grades; Clark, Kenneth B., Ph. D., Northside Center for Child Development, New York, New York 10026, 830.

National Juvenile Court Institute Planning Project; Gomberg, Ephraim R., Mr., National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Kansas City, Missouri, 845.[1]

Local Pastor Rehabilitating Juvenile Delinquent; Furst, Philip, Reverend, The Presbytery of New York, New York City, New York, 846.[1]

A Pre-Project Study for Work With Gangs; Farris, Buford E., Mr., Wesley Community Centers, San Antonio, Texas, 854.[1]

Training Police in Delinquency Prevention and Control; Brennan, James J., Ph. D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 868.[1]

Demonstration Project for Defective Delinquents; Reed, Amos E., Mr., Oregon State Board of Control, Salem, Oregon, 878.[1]

An Experiment in Casework in Probation; Shireman, Charles H., Ph. D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, 881.

Effectiveness of Social Work on Acting-Out Youth; Ikeda, Tsuguo, Ph. D., Seattle Atlantic Street Center, Seattle, Washington 98144, 882.

Antisocial Behavior in Early Childhood; Reiser, David E., M.D., James Jackson Putnam Children's Center, Boston, Massachusetts 02121, 892.

Study of the Program of the George Junior Republic; Pittenger, Robert E., M.D., George Junior Republic, Freeville, New York, 894.

Community Services for the Unwed Pregnant Adolescent; Visotsky, Harold M., M.D., Chicago Board of Health, Chicago, Illinois, 900.

Continuity of Treatment in a Community Resident House; Elias, Albert, Mr., New Jersey Reformatory, Bordentown, New Jersey, 904.

Residential School for Disturbed Children; Hobbs, Nicholas, Ph. D., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee 37203, 929.

Realizing the Potential of Underprivileged Youth; Smith, Doris, Mrs., Contra Costra Council of Community Services, Lafayette, California 94596, 963, 970.

(See 2529), 976.[2]

An Experimental Study of Services for Fatherless Boys; O'Brien, Thomas E., Mr., Big Brothers of America, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 978.[1]

A Conceptual Framework for Juvenile Delinquency; MacIver, Robert M., Ph. D., New School for Social Research, New York, New York, 979.[1]

Middle Class Delinquent Youth, a Study of Families; Goolishian, Harold A., Ph. D., University of Texas, Galveston, Texas, 988.[1]

Guidance Through Indentification; Goodman, Gerald M., Mr., University YMCA, Berkeley, California 94704, 992.

Exploration of Psychosocial Pathology and Treatment; Polsky, Howard, Ph. D., Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, New York, 993.[1]

National Juvenile Court Judges Training Project (became T–10295); Gersey, Gerald B., Mr., National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Chicago, Illinois 60637, 998.[1]

The Adolescent Girl in Conflict; Konopka, Gisela, D.S.W., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1055.[1]

Arriba Juntos—(Forward Together); Foley. Matthew F., Reverend, Catholic Charities, Brooklyn, New York 11201, 1060.

Neighborhood Approach to Mexican-American Gangs; Farris, Buford, Mr., Wesley Community Center, San Antonio, Texas, 1075.

Retrospective Study of Peace Officers' Personnel Records; Bissell, Dwight M., M.D., City of San Jose Health Department, San Jose, California, 1089.[1]

(See 1662), 1112.[2]

Methodology for Uniform Social Agency Data Collection; Sigurdson, Herbert R., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1130.[1]

Mobilization for Youth; Cloward, Richard A., Ph. D., New York School of Social Work, New York, New York, 1178.

Research in Crime and Mental Illness; Wiseman, Frederick, Mr., Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1218.[1]

Extent and Character of Delinquency in an Age Cohort; Sellin, Thorsten, Ph. D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1252.

An Experimental Demonstration and Evaluation Project; Reckless, Walter C., Ph. D., Ohio State University Research Foundation, Columbus, Ohio, 1304.

Probation Study Feedback; Sigurdson, Herbert R., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1319.[1]

A Community Oriented Halfway Home for Local Offenders; Kirby, Bernard C., Ph. D., San Diego State College, San Diego, California, 1320.

Effect of Variation in Probation Supervision Practice; Lohman, Joseph, Dean, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, 1341.

Police Handling of Mental Patients (Two half hour films, "The Mash" and "Under Pressure"), Rowland, Loyd W., Ph. D. The Louisiana Association for Mental Health, New Orleans, Louisiana. (Two additional films, "Booked for Safekeeping" and "The Cry for Help" funded by NIMH contract), 1401.[1]

Training School Study Project, Sult, William M., Mr., Florida School for Boys, Okeechobee, Florida, 1453.[1]

Education Programs for Juvenile Correctional Workers; Kroepsch, Robert H., Mr., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, 1457.

A Community Residential Treatment Program; Manley, Harry A., M.D., Bureau of Rehabilitation, Washington, D.C., 1466.

Foster Homes: A Treatment Resource for Disturbed Boys; Sargent, Douglas A., M.D., Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Michigan 48201, 1551.

Volunteer Community Services; Leenhouts, Keith J., Honorable, Municipal Court, Royal Oak, Michigan, 1554.

Social Change as a Function of Community Education; Sigurdson, Herbert R., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90008, 1570.

Group Psychotherapy for Probationed Sexual Deviants; Peters, Joseph J., M.D., Philadelphia General Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19139, 1585.

Developing Offenders for Crime and Delinquency Work; Grant, J. Douglas, Mr., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California 95814, 1616.

Berkeley Workreation Program; Saalwaechter, Gene, Mr., Berkeley Workreation Council, Berkeley, California 94702, 1662.

Special Development in a Maximum Security Setting; Chertok, Eli, Ph. D., Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington, 1914.

Coordination of Psychotherapy Programs for Criminals; Gomberg, Ephraim, Mr., Crime Commission of Philadelphia, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107, 1934.

Systematizing Cottage Treatment of Delinquent Wards; Beker, Jerome, Ed D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210, 2006.

Study of Resident Treatment Programs for Delinquents; Samuelson, A. F., M.D., North Dakota Department of Health, Bismarck, North Dakota, 2007.[1]

Maturational Reform and Rural Delinquency; Polk, Kenneth, Ph. D., Lane County Youth Project, Eugene, Oregon 97403, 2008.

Improving Correctional Decision Making Through EDP; Hill, Harland L., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California 95814, 2092.

Application of a Treatment Typology to Delinquents; Jesness, Carl F., Ph. D., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California 95814, 2093.

Social System Research-Demonstration in Child Care; Polsky, Howard W., Ph.D., Jewish Board of Guardians, New York City, New York 10532, 2121.

Changes in Role Concept of Police Officers; Watson, Nelson A., Mr., International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C. 20036, 2155.

A Study of Half-way Houses for Juvenile Parolees; Eikleberry, Kara Lee, Mrs., Department of Public Institutions, State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska 68502, 2193.

National Survey of Youth; Gold, Martin, Ph. D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104, 2311.

Uniform Parole Reports Pilot Project; Gottfredson, Don M., Ph. D., National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, New York, 2315.

The Police and Sex-Related Crime; Brown, William P., Ph. D., Research Foundation of

---

[1] Completed project.

[2] Project continued under new grant number.

State University of New York, Albany, New York 12224, 2334.

Establishing a Narcotics Register; Philp, John R., M.D., Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc., New York, New York 10013, 2342.

Treated and Untreated Potential Delinquents—Follow-Up; Reckless, Walter C., Ph. D., Ohio State University Research Foundation, Columbus, Ohio 43212, 2353.

Differential Treatment Environments for Delinquents; Look, Loren W., Mr., California Youth Authority, Sacramento, California, 2396.

A Self-Instructional Program for Youthful Offenders; McKee, John M., Ph. D., Rehabilitation Research Foundation, Elmore, Alabama, 2529.

II. REGULAR GRANTS (MH–R01)

Intra-Personal Factors in Juvenile Delinquency; Sarbin, Theodore R., Ph. D., University of California, Los Angeles, California, 575.[1]

Psychiatric Aide Selection in an Institution for Mental Defectives; Tarjan, George, M.D., Pacific Colony, California, 585.[1]

Development of Social Adjustment; Hathaway, Starke, Ph. D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 724.[1]

The Psychotic Murderer; Kurland, Albert A., M.D., American University, Washington, D.C., 733.[1]

Rehabilitation Process in Reformed Offenders; McKay, Henry D., Professor, Chicago Area Project, Chicago, Illinois, 761.[1]

Emotional Disorders of Childhood; Gardner, George E., Ph. D., M.M., Judge Baker Guidance Center, Boston, Massachusetts, 826.[1]

Personality Patterns in Adolescent Boys; Hunt, David E., Ph. D., Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 955.[1]

Follow-Up Study of Personal and Social Adjustment; Wirt, Robert D., Ph. D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1151.[1]

Delinquency and Slow Learning in School; Bowman, Paul H., Ph.D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1319.[1]

Follow-Up Study of a Child Guidance Clinic; O'Neal, Patricia, M.D., Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, 1400.[1]

Corner-Group Worker Method of Delinquency Control; Miller, Walter B., Ph.D., Boston University Boston, Massachusetts, 1414.

The Sex Offender Heterosexual—Homosexual Balance; Gebbard, Paul H., Ph.D., Indiana University Institute of Sex Research, Bloomington, Indiana, 1633.[1]

Psychosocial Development of Aggressive Behavior; Eron, Leonard D., Ph.D., Rip Van Winkle Foundation, Hudson, New York, 1726.[1]

Relation of Family Patterns to Child Behavior Disorders; Bandura, Albert, Ph.D., Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1734.[1]

Interaction in Families with an Antisocial Child; van Amerongen, S. T., M.D., Douglas A. Thom Clinic for Children, Boston, Massachusetts, 1795.[1]

Follow-Up of 500 Delinquents and 500 Non-Delinquents; Glueck, Sheldon, Ph.D., Harvard University Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1817.[1]

Personality and Treatment of Runaway Youth; Weinreb, Joseph, M.D., Worcester Youth Guidance Center, Worcester, Massachusetts, 1821.[1]

Peer Group Determinants in the Delinquent Process; Stafford, John W., Ph.D., Catholic University, Washington, D.C., 1917.[1]

Parent and Peer Orientations of Adolescents; Bowerman, Charles K., Ph.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 2045.[1]

Social Organization and Institutional Treatment; Vinter, Robert D., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2104.[1]

Juror Reactions to Legal Definitions of Insanity; Strodtbeck, Fred L., Ph. D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 2202.[1]

Personality Characteristics of Unwed Mothers; Hines, Ruth B., Ph. D., Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon, Portland, 2260.[1]

Drug and Cognition Studies in Disturbed Children; Eisenberg, Leon, M.D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 2583.

Standford Personality Development Research Project; McCord, Wm. & Joan, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 2647.[1]

The Social Reintegration of Juvenile Offenders; Ohlin, Lloyd E., Ph. D., New York School of Social Work, New York, New York, 2742.[1]

Causes of Conformity and Nonconformity of Adolescents; Hamblin, Robert L., Ph. D., Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, 3039.[1]

The Early Identification of Maladaptive Behavior; Conger, John J., Ph. D., University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colorado, 3040.

Antecedents of Adolescent Behavior in the Lower Class; Whiting, John W. M., Ph. D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 3082.[1]

Intrapersonal Factors in Juvenile Delinquency; Sarbin, Theodore R., Ph. D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 3180.[1]

A Method for Studying Family Relationships; Murray, Edward J., Ph. D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 3209.[1]

Continued under 7158, 3301.[2]

Continued under 6830, 3344.[2]

Personality Patterns in Adolescent Boys; Hunt, David E., Ph. D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 3517.[1]

Gradual Community Reintegration of Delinquents; Toby, Jackson, Ph.D., Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 3873.[1]

Personality and Symptoms in Pre-Adolescent Delinquency; Kaufman, Irving, M.D., Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, 3958.[1]

Comparative Research on Delinquency; DeVos, George A., Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 4087.

Psychological Assessment of Street Corner Youth; Cartwright, Desmond, Ph. D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 4303.[1]

The Stimulus in Thematic Perception; Murstein, Bernard, Ph.D., Interfaith Counseling Center, Portland, Oregon, 4698.[1]

Continued under 5627, 4909.[2]

Criminal Law and Psychiatry in the District of Columbia; Arens, Richard, Mr., Washington School of Psychiatry, Washington, D.C., 5009.[1]

Dimensions of Personality in Juvenile Delinquency (formerly 4909); Quay, Herbert C., Ph.D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 5627.[1]

Attributions of Delinquency and Their Impact on Youth; Piliavin, Irving, D.S.W., University of California, Berkeley, California, 6328.[1]

Probation and Treatment in Delinquency; McEachern, A. W., Mr., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 6597.

The Administration of Justice to Juveniles; Matza, David, Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 6613.[1]

Southern California Records Matching Project; Van Arsdol, Maurice, Ph.D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 6729.

Delay of Gratification in Choice Situations (formerly 3344); Mischel, Walter, Ph.D., Stanford University, Stanford, California, 6830.

Patterns of Criminal—Victim Relationship in Crimes with Violence; Schafer, Stephen D.J.P., Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 7058.[1]

Childhood Predictors of Mobility and Criminality; Robins, Lee N., Ph.D., Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, 7126.

Street Corner Groups and Patterns of Delinquency (formerly 3301); Short, James F., Ph.D., Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, 7158.[1]

Delinquency, Dropout and Social Milieu of the School; Elliott, Delbert S., Ph.D., San Diego State College Foundation, San Diego, California, 7173.

Early Identification of Behavior Problems; Dailey, John T., Ph.D., American Institute for Research, Washington, D.C., 7274.

Typology of Juvenile Delinquents and Recidivists; Glueck, Sheldon, Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 7286.

Psychosocial Study of Rural Adolescents; Himelhoch, Jerome, Ph.D., Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont, 7287.

Predictability of Symptoms from Diagrammatic Analysis; Bucklew, John, Ph.D., Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, 7492.[1]

Psychiatric and General Population Arrest Rates; Rappeport, Jonas R., M.D., Friends of Psychiatric Research, Inc., Baltimore, Maryland, 7571.[1]

Subcultural Delinquency in Five Industrial Societies; Toby, Jackson, Ph.D., Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 7620.

Peer Culture Among Institutionalized Delinquent Girls; Toigo, Romolo, Ph.D., Rip Van Winkle Foundation, Hudson, New York, 7634.[1]

Study of the Community Context of Delinquent Behavior; Lohman, Joseph D., Professor, University of California, Berkeley, California, 7677.

Small Town Delinquency; Hurwitz, Jacob I., Ph. D., New York University Medical Center, New York, New York, 7712.[1]

The Nature and Roles of Female Delinquent Gangs; Klein, Malcolm W., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 7993.

Dimensions of Personality in Juvenile Delinquency; Quay, Herbert C., Ph. D., University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 8437.

Self-Role Theory and Antisocial Conduct; Sarbin, Theodore R., Ph. D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 8565.

Role Theory, Role-Taking Aptitude and Test-Taking Behavior; Sarbin, Theodore R., Ph. D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 8676.[1]

Interpersonal Strategies in Violent Behavior; Grant, J. Douglas, Mr., California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, California, 8970.

Values of Gang Delinquents; Gordon, Robert A., Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 10698.

Parole Prediction Development; Gottfredson, Don M., Ph. D., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 10716.

Further Validation of a Parole Prediction Scale; Gottfredson, Don M., Ph. D., Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 10717.[1]

Resocialization of Offenders Through Parole; Studt, Elliot, D.S.W., University of California, Berkeley, California, 10996.

Familial Correlates Delinquency; Hetherington, Eileen, Ph. D., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 11323.

Self-Concepts, Dependency, and Delinquency; Schwartz, Michael, Ph. D., Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 11390.

Social Organization and Culture Change; Shepardson, Mary, Ph. D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 11641.

III. SMALL GRANTS (MH–R03)

Exploratory Study of Institutional Role Relationships; Vinter, Robert D., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1332.[1]

Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in a Delinquent Gang; Miller, Walter B., Ph.D., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, 1342.[1]

Role of Child Rearing Patterns in Adolescent Disorders; Bandura, Albert, Ph.D., Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1349.[1]

A Mental Health Study of the Mescalero Tribe; Ross, William T., Ph.D., Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1915.[1]

Juvenile Delinquency at Jamez Pueblo; Jones, John A., Ph.D., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 3018.[1]

A Study of Unreached Youth; Kallen, David, Ph.D., Baltimore Council of Social Agencies, Baltimore, Maryland, 3098.[1]

Prejudice and the Offenses of "Criminally Insane" Man; Morrow, William R., Ph.D., State Hospital No. 1, Fulton, Missouri, 3503.[1]

Reformation and Recidivism in Two Ethnic Groups; McKay, Henry, Professor, Chicago Area Project, Chicago, Illinois, 3790.[1]

Bases of Prestige in Delinquent Corner Gangs; Miller, Walter B., Ph.D., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, 4010.[1]

Pilot Exploration of the Delinquent Theft Subculture; Spergel, Irving, Mr., Columbia University, New York, New York, 4351.[1]

Four Scales for Measuring Early Juvenile Delinquency; Dentler, Robert A., Ph. D., University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 4802.[1]

Continued under 11158, 6095.[2]

Self Perceptions Among Female Offenders; Kay, Barbara A., Ph. D., Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois, 6464.[1]

Racial Group Membership and Juvenile Delinquency; Segal, Bernard E., Ph. D., Goucher College, Towson, Maryland, 6576.[1]

Prison IBM Unit as a Research Resource; Johnson, Elmer H., Ph. D., North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina, 6893.[1]

Adolescent Values and Deviant Behavior; niques; Lefever, D. W., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 7010.[1]

Study of Child Rearing Measurement Techniques; Lefever, D. W., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 7011.[1]

Organizational Change in a Juvenile Institution; Perrow, Charles, Ph. D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 7719.[1]

A Comparison of Delinquents with Their Siblings; Richardson, Harold, Ph. D., San Jose State College, San Jose, California, 8265.[1]

Patterns of Adjustment in Contemporary Society; Yamamura, Douglas, Ph. D., University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, 8640.[1]

Cross-Cultural Delinquency Study; Wolfgang, Marvin E., Ph. D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 8726.[1]

Relation of Social Class and Types of Delinquency; Arnold, William R., Ph. D., University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 11033.[1]

Juvenile Arrest and Nonarrest in Philadelphia (formerly 6095); Monahan, Thomas, Ph.D., State University of New York, Oswego, New York, 11158.

Predictors of Delinquent Control; Sterne, Richard S., Ph.D., University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, 11277.

Types and Patterns of Juvenile Delinquency; Shannon, Lyle W., Ph.D., University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa, 11367.[1]

Adolescent Group Aggressions Phenomena; Bernstein, Saul B., Mr., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, 11396.

A study of Interpersonal Violence; Wallace, Samuel, Ph.D., Columbia University, New York, New York, 11411.[1]

A Study of Child Rearing Practices (Chinese-Americans); Sollenberger, Richard, Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts, 11437.

Non-Urban Attitudes Toward Formal Social Control; Stratton, John R., Ph.D., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 11621.

Rehabilitation of Delinquent Boys, Stephenson, Richard M., Ph.D., Douglass College, Rutgers, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 11945.

Identification and Processing of Social Deviants; Chambliss, William J., Ph.D., University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, 11978.

Selective Factors in Prisoners Self-Injuries; Johnson, Elmer H., Ph.D., North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 12032.

Configurational Approach to Program Evaluation; Frumkin, Robert M., Ph.D., Community Action for Youth, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, 12578.

IV. SPECIAL GRANTS (MH–R12)

Incidence and Distribution of Juvenile Addiction in Chicago and Its Related Social Aspects; Shaw, Clifford R., Chicago Area Project, Chicago, Illinois, 9030.[1]

Exploratory Survey and Conference on Juvenile Drug Addiction in New York; Glock, Charles Y., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York, New York, 9033.[1]

Factors Affecting Drug Addiction Among Minors; Chein, Isidor, Ph. D., New York University, New York, New York, 9048.[1]

Evaluation of Mental Health Films; Beck, Lester, F., Ph. D., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 9066.[1]

A Pilot Study of Families of Antisocial Young Children; Rexford, E. N., M.D., Douglas A. Thom Clinic for Children, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts, 9094.[1]

Social and Psychological Factors in Juvenile Delinquency; Lippitt, Ronald, Ph. D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 9109.[1]

Community Mental Health Aspects of Juvenile Delinquency; Hutcheson, B. R., M.D., Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, Boston, Massachusetts, 9110.[1]

Clinical and Community Studies of Juvenile Delinquency; Hutcheson, B. R., M.D., South Shore Mental Health Association, Inc., Quincy, Massachusetts, 9149.[1]

Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency and Narcotics Use; Chein, Isidor, Ph. D., New York University, New York, New York, 9150.[1]

Mobilization for Youth; Cloward, Richard, Ph. D., Columbia University, New York, New York, 9168.[1]

Epidemiologic Vectors of Delinquency and Its Controls; Chein, Isidor, Ph. D., New York University, New York, New York (new proposal submitted as R11 02520), 9171.

VI. FELLOWSHIPS (MH–F)

Role of the Phychiatrist in Criminal Responsibility; Daniels, Arlene K., University of California, Berkeley, California, 8885.

Formation of Attitudes in the Delinquent Gang; Schwendinger, Herman, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 11061.[1]

Role of the Juvenile Police Officer; Pizzuto, Carmen S., Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, 11112.[1]

Middle-Class Delinquency; Hansen, Donald A., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 12298.[1]

Social Structure & Evaluation of a Therapeutic Milieu; Beker, Jerome, Berkshire Farm for Boys, Canaan, New York, 13256.[1]

Delinquent Activity Among Girls; Schwendinger, Julia R., University of California, Los Angeles, California, 13678.[1]

Social Learning Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency; Allen, Vernon L., University of California, Berkeley, California, 14535.[1]

Research in Delinquency; Rochelle, Phyllis A., University of California, Berkeley, California, 16832.

Ambition & Offense Among Mexican-American Youth; Heller, Celia S., Columbia University, New York, New York, 16987.[1]

Factors Mediating the Development of Delinquency; Kuykendall, Delman L., University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 19007.[1]

Decision-Making in Juvenile Delinquency Planning; Zweig, Franklin M., Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, 20516.

Comparative Research on Delinquency in Europe; De Vos, George A., University of California, Berkeley, California, 21490.[1]

Criminology-Delinquency Research Project; Schaeffer, Judith A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 21502.[1]

Research and Administration in Juvenile Delinquency; Keller, Oliver J., Jr., University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 21686.

Differential Treatment of Juvenile Delinquents; Warren, Martin, University of California, Berkeley, California, 21833.

Sociological Analysis of Occupational Crime; Robin, Gerald D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 22748.

Subcultural Study of Deviant Behavior; Irwin, John K., University of California, Berkeley, California, 22933.

Research on Adjudicated Delinquents; Hirschi, Travis W., University of California, Berkeley, California, 23077.[1]

Parole Organization and Program; Bluestein, Victor, University of California, Berkeley, California, 23190.[1]

Consequences of Law in Action for Deviants; Woodworth, J. Richard, University of California, Berkeley, California, 23413.[1]

Group Treatment of Delinquent Girls; Murray, Ellen M., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 24262.[1]

Etiology of Crime and the Correctional Process; Cook, William E., University of California, Berkeley, California, 24327.[1]

Moral Attitudes, Guilt and Control in Delinquents; Polk, Frank F., University of California, Berkeley, California, 24975–0.

Morals, Guilt, and Controls in Juvenile Delinquents; Polk, Frank F., Tavistock Clinic, London, United Kingdom, 24975–1.

Study of Violent Behavior; Einstadter, Werner J., University of California, Berkeley, California, 28204.

Deviant Behavior—Delinquency; Hartnagel, Timothy F., Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 29505.

Pretrial Release—A Study of Legal Reform; Dill, Forrest D., University of California, Berkeley, California, 29720.

The Group Nature of Male Delinquency; Erickson, Maynard L., Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, 29721.

VII. RESEARCH CAREER AWARD (MH–K)

Resocialization Through Parole; Studt, Elliot T., University of California, Berkeley, California, 22635.

VIII. HOSPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MH–R20)

Improving a Program for Criminal Sexual Psychopaths; Morton, David P., M.D., Dr. Norman M. Beatty Memorial Hospital, Westville, Indiana, 1756.

Improving Patient Care of Maximum Security Unit; Kreimeyer, James H., M.D., Rusk State Hospital, Rusk, Texas 75785, 1956.

Comprehensive Treatment for Maximum Security Patients; Kozberg, Oscar, M.D., Arkansas State Hospital, Little Rock, Arkansas, 2050.

Sublimation and Activation in a Security Setting; Lund, J. Benjamin, M.D., Minnesota Security Hospital, St. Peter, Minnesota, 2074.

Intensive Socialization Program for Mildly Retarded; Roos, Philip, Ph.D., Austin State School, Austin, Texas 78763, 2167.

Habilitation of Disturbed Adolescent Male Retardates; Shelton, James T., M.D., Porterville State Hospital, Porterville, California, 2178.

Rehabilitation through a Psychodynamic Work Program; Hamilton, John N., M.D., The Clifton T. Perkins State Hospital, Jessup, Maryland, 2248.

Patient Preadmissions, Discharge-Aftercare Services; Hamilton, John N., M.D., The Clifton T. Perkins State Hospital, Jessup, Maryland, 2268.

---

[1] Completed project.

[2] Project continued under new grant number.

The Rehabilitation of Delinquent Retardates, Elliott, James F., M.D., Murdock Center, Butner, North Carolina 27509, 2270.

Rehabilitation through Recreation; Rednour, Bert, M.D., Illinois Security Hospital, Menard, Illinois, 2443.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS IN CRIME AND DELINQUENCY IN CHICAGO, SPONSORED BY NIMH

RESEARCH AND PROJECT GRANTS—NIMH

Social Organization and Culture Change; Mary Shepardson, University of Chicago, $13,578.

Mental Illness and the Law; Stason E. Blythe, American Bar Foundation, $23,464.

An Experiment in Casework in Probation; Charles Shireman, University of Chicago, $86,157.

Total, $123,199.

TRAINING GRANTS—NIMH

Loyola University

Discipline: Social Work, $38,064.

University of Chicago

Discipline: Social Work, $37,644.

University of Illinois

Discipline: Social Work, $24,853.

Total, $100,561.

CIVIL RIGHTS—DOUBLE STANDARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a Negro man, a former Mississippian but now a resident of New York City, entered upon a 200 mile hike from Memphis to Jackson. Every effort was made to fan his walk to the front pages of the big daily press but the hike was begun with little or no notice and with only five or six tenderfooted compatriots.

A light-minded citizen of Memphis, Tenn., decided for some reason that he either did not like the Negro or his long walk. So the Memphian grabbed his old bird gun, filled it with bird shot, drove south on Highway 51 over into De Soto County, Miss., which is only a mile or so south of the Memphis border. From a point of hiding near the highway, this Memphian sprayed the bird shot at the hiker, resulting in a few superficial wounds.

Immediately much of the national press, television, radio, cameramen, and many Americans became terribly incensed, not with the man from Tennessee who did the shooting but with the entire white population of the State of Mississippi. And the only thing white Mississippians had done was to provide the hiker with some protective company in the persons of several State highway patrolmen, along with several agents of the FBI.

Under the leadership of the Washington Post, a national news feast was on. The Post, Newsweek, Life, CBS, NBC, ABC, and the Communist Daily Worker and others, even the Washington Evening Star, flooded the Magnolia State with reporters and photographers. The President for the time dropped important duties to sorely lament what had happened in poor little ole Mississippi and again pledged himself not to let up until he had removed all bias and forms of discrimination from throughout the Union. Of course, nothing was said or done about eliminating the bias and discrimination practiced against white Mississippians.

Our Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, who devotes such a bountiful share of his time to this cause, also deplored the conduct in Mississippi—not the conduct of the man from Tennesssee but that of Mississippians who were guilty of no harm at all to the injured one.

He promptly dispatched his civil rights expert, John Doar, to the State to observe the conduct of Mississippians and to gather evidence for the purpose of bringing such law suits and prosecutions against them as might be satisfying to the so-called civil rights movement.

Grasping the opportunity to make headlines and rake in more money, civil rights bleeders and leaders swarmed into the State. One of these, by the way, was referred to yesterday by a Member from Ohio as very probably being a Communist. Goateed riff-raff and just plain junk and punks from all over the Nation swelled Mississippi's visiting horde to even greater proportions. Incidentally, it was quite interesting to note that the civil rights leaders wound up quarreling among themselves as to whom among them would be the "big leader" of the March. They voted the NAACP folks completely out of the privilege of participating.

Several Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans, after being assigned a plane under orders from the White House, flew away to Mississippi, saw the sights, released indignation reports to their respective constituencies—the principal purpose of their trip—and returned as conquering heroes to fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with extended lamentations on what they saw and heard down in poor little ole Mississippi.

To sum it up, a considerable segment of Washington's officialdom, as well as much of the national news media, had themselves what I would call an old fashioned fieldday kicking Mississippi. It all wound up as no more than a big puff of wind, with the march leaders stuck for thousands of dollars in expenses and begging for contributions to pay off the deficit.

It is quite strange that these Washington civil rights experts, the news media and all, are this day so quiet, so extremely quiet. Why all their silence at a time when racial trouble, incidents, riots, brick throwing, window breaking, looting, shooting and, yes, the killing of Negroes are taking place from California to Chicago, to Cleveland, to New York, and down to Florida?

Two Negroes were killed by whites about 2 weeks ago in some California city, Sacramento, I believe. Where were the protestors, the alarmists, those who were so horrified when a Negro got sprayed with bird shot by a Memphian in Mississippi? The California killings hardly made a ripple in the national news media. They buried the report in the back pages of the few papers that did carry it, and it received similar treatment by radio and television.

Several Negroes have been killed in northern cities in the last few days—within the last 24 hours in Cleveland, Ohio. Katzenbach has not opened his mouth. Doar is tied to his desk. The President has been completely silent. And not one Congressman has slipped out of town to investigate, or made one speech, or demanded that the Federal Government intervene. No one has demanded a new civil rights law or urged Federal occupation, as they do when something comparable happens in the South.

Compare this, Mr. Speaker, with the abuse that was heaped upon us Mississippians when a Negro got sprinkled with bird shot, not by a Mississippian but by a Tennessean.

What is the matter with you civil righters around here? You are so quiet over the riots and killings of the hour in the northern and western cities. Why do you not demand Federal action, Federal intervention, more Federal laws?

We are anxiously waiting. And listening. Listening. Listening.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this week we have the sad but proud honor of commemorating Captive Nations Week, a tribute to those nations which at this very moment lie under the fist of Communist oppression.

Some of the more striking examples are: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, North Korea, East Germany, and Rumania. These nations have lost their independent standing within the world community. Most of these at one time or another tasted freedom and the liberty to determine their own course. Most were relatively successful in their attempts at modern government. But each is now suffering in common with the others a denial of the right to determine what form of government is best for the people of that nation.

We face a situation in the captive nations that is as if a Berlin Wall had been erected around each of the citizens. This invisible wall is the restriction of those basic freedoms recognized as essential to human dignity.

The rights of national independence and self-determination have become rampant throughout the world in recent years. The outdated colonialistic measures used to force and keep dependence are no longer valid in the 20th century. Yet, they exist and continue to be inflicted on the nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Technologically, Russia is a modern nation. But in her relations with the countries of east-central Europe, Russia employs the means ordinarily associated with the age of colonialism.

Certainly the methods have become more sophisticated—tanks, rifles, barbed wire—but the basic concept of forced colonialism remains as it was in the 17th and 18th centuries. Colonialism is out of place and alien to the modern world. Colonialism stifles human progress and initiative.

The United States should take clear and energetic steps to assure the countries of the world that we do not accept the status quo in Europe. We do not accept the dominating influence of Soviet Russia over the captive nations of east-central Europe. We do not accept the present division of Germany. We deplore the continuing denial of the right of self-determination to the captive nations by both Russia and Red China.

In the past, various Communist leaders have attacked the celebration of Captive Nations Week in the United States as unrealistic and naive. If the Communists are so confident in their derision of Captive Nations Week, it should be a time for them to hold free, U.N.-supervised elections in each of these nations. The results of a free election in any captive nation would demonstrate anew that no nation has ever freely chosen communism in a national referendum.

I take just pride in having been able to join with my colleagues in saluting the proud and noble peoples who live today without the basic rights and freedoms we in America have had for so long.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week was established in July of 1959 through a joint congressional resolution and a Presidential proclamation. By that long overdue act both Congress and the President implemented the wholehearted wishes of the people of this country.

For many years a number of nations have been trapped behind the Iron Curtain and enslaved under the tyranny of Communist totalitarianism. These captive nations comprise a good portion of Europe's total population of 100 million. They occupy areas in central and eastern Europe, and were sovereign states before World War II. Most of these countries regained their freedom for a while after the First World War, and all of them became valued members of the world community of free nations.

During the interwar years, many of them were in real danger of losing their freedom. Unfortunately, their worst fears were justified very early in the war. All were engulfed in the world catastrophe and all suffered the loss of their priceless independence. Yet they endured the ordeal with courage, hoping that they would regain their freedom at the end of the war.

But these hopes were never realized. Instead of freedom, they found Communist totalitarianism. And today, after more than two decades, these tens of millions of peoples who enjoyed a real measure of freedom before the war, are still prisoners in their homelands, and their Communist captors continue to hold them behind the abominable Iron Curtain. While it is true that in recent years the Communist hold over some of the European nations has been ostensibly relaxed, none of these peoples actually do enjoy the true liberty that the peoples of the free West do.

It is our ardent desire to see the captive nations freed of tyranny. We are reminded this week to renew our determination to continue the fight for their freedom. It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that through peaceful means this freedom may be attained, and that these capitive nations may once more regain their sovereignty and independence.

UNSADDLE OUR SEAWAY—LEGISLATION TO MAKE PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLL INCREASES UNNECESSARY BY GIVING SEAWAY RELIEF FROM ITS BACKBREAKING FINANCIAL BURDEN

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today 15 Lake States Congressmen have introduced identical bills to give the St. Lawrence Seaway relief from its present backbreaking financial burden. This relief would make unnecessary the 10 percent increase in St. Lawrence Seaway tolls for the 5-year period, 1967 to 1971, inclusive, now being considered by the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation—a toll increase to which we are strongly opposed.

I submit a joint statement by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Blatnik], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Olson], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Race], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki], and myself issued today in connection with the introduction of House bill Nos. 16374 to 16388.

Statement Opposing Proposed Toll Increases for St. Lawrence Seaway and Presenting Legislation Relieving Seaway of Backbreaking Financial Burden

We are in imminent danger of losing our investment in the St. Lawrence Seaway by attempting to extract excessive financial returns from it.

Proposed increases in Seaway toll charges are now being considered by the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation. Hearings were held in early June in Chicago. A decision is expected by August 15.

Proposed, first, is a flat 10 percent increase raising present toll rates of 4 cents per gross registered ton, 40 cents per ton of bulk cargo, and 90 cents per ton of general cargo, to 4½ cents, 44 cents, and $1.00, respectively. These increases would go into effect in 1967 and continue through 1971.

In addition, there would be charged for one-way transit of the Welland Canal, a tariff of $160 per vessel in 1967, rising to $800 per vessel in 1971, and twice these amounts for a round trip, whether a ship is loaded or proceeding under ballast. By 1971, under the proposed set of tolls, a small bulk cargo vessel loaded to capacity would have to pay 60 percent more per one-way passage of the Seaway than it does at the present time. A medium-sized vessel, similarly loaded, would have to pay 26 percent more per one-way passage, and the largest vessel able to negotiate the Seaway, 17 percent more. In the case of ships carrying general package freight, a category in which the Seaway faces the closest competition from alternative transportation routes, the proposed tolls would increase one-way transit cost per vessel from 100 percent in the case of the smallest to a minimum of 46 percent for the largest ships. Ships returning through the Welland Canal under ballast would have to spread additional return voyage charges per vessel over caroges in some manner.

We are opposed to these toll increases because:

1. Toll increases of any kind would retard growth of Seaway traffic before capacity operations are attained—the increases will cut the ground out from under the Seaway's progress to date and precipitate a major drop in traffic.

2. Present toll rates are adequate to cover all reasonable operating and capital costs.

TOLL INCREASES WILL CUT SEAWAY TRAFFIC

From 1959 when the Seaway opened through 1962, Seaway traffic was substantially below the optimistic predictions of earlier years. However, beginning with the 1963 season, there has been a most encouraging growth in traffic—in 1963, tonnage increased 21 percent; in 1964, 27 percent; and in 1965, 10 percent. In the most recent season (1965), a record 43,382,000 tons were carried on the Seaway, 92.3 percent of an earlier optimistic prediction of 47 million tons thought possible for the year.

Despite the excellent showing of the last three years, the Seaway has not yet reached the 50-million-ton level which was originally considered to be full capacity operations. The proposed combined toll increases, raising present tolls to a minimum of 17 to 100 percent higher for a complete transit of the Seaway, could cause a disastrous downturn in traffic, much less permit the Seaway to attain and to maintain capacity operations.

The huge increases for small vessels could very well eliminate most small barges and lakers from Lake service, and, with those, the traffic they carry. For example, New York State barges proceeding from the Barge

Canal to Three Rivers and then via Lake Ontario to Lake Erie might no longer be able to offer competitive transportation.

Traffic carried in medium-sized and large vessels would also suffer. There is hardly an example of Seaway cargo movement which could not be and is not moved by alternative methods of transport. Where traffic moves on the Seaway now, it does so because at present toll rates, the Seaway is more economical and shippers have found out about it—not because there is no other way to get cargo out to domestic or international markets. There is a huge complex of rail, barge, and pipeline systems serving most important midwest centers. If cost were not a consideration, the Seaway in fact would not have been able to more than double traffic between 1959 to 1965, from 20,600,000 tons to nearly 44,000,000 tons.

In terms of tonnage, the two most important commodities shipped through the Seaway are grain and iron ore. In 1965, 17,500,000 tons of grain and 11,700,000 tons of iron ore were shipped, two-thirds of the total traffic for the year. Increases in Seaway transportation costs would, without doubt, result in major shifts of both of these bulk commodities to alternative routes and modes of transportation.

The Stanford Research Institute, retained by the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation to study the effect of Seaway toll increases on future traffic, warns in its November 1965 report that toll increases would be damaging to Seaway traffic in both commodities.

The Institute had this to say on grain: "The quantities of grain moving to export via the different (Seaway) ports are highly sensitive to shipping charges from alternate sources via alternative routes. Grain trading is extremely competitive, and large volumes swing on price differences of a fraction of a cent per bushel . . . the general pattern of shipments and the general orientation of inland shipping areas to ports will reflect efforts to minimize shipping charges."

And here is what the Institute states will happen if tolls on iron ore shipments are raised:

"Transportation charges from Quebec source to the Pittsburgh area currently are nearly equal via the Seaway and via the Atlantic Coast, and an increase in the toll might immediately affect the routing of a million tons or more."

Moreover, the Institute states future traffic losses could be much greater because high Seaway transit costs would discourage technological investment in the Labrador ore mines:

"Over a longer run, a toll increase could affect the close balance of delivered costs between Lake Superior and Labrador-Quebec sources, influencing investment in future pellet plants and thereby affecting a larger share of the projected traffic."

These conservative estimates of the Stanford Research Institute of an unstated loss in grain traffic and sizable losses in iron ore shipments were based on an assumption of *moderate* upward revisions in tolls. The Institute was not asked what would happen in the case of huge increases in the range of 60–100 percent or more, affecting a portion of the present movements through the Seaway. The conclusion seems inescapable that these proposed increases would cut into present traffic in a major way.

THE PRESENT TOLL RATES ARE ADEQUATE TO MEET REASONABLE SEAWAY COSTS

Even with under-capacity traffic of 43,382,000 tons in 1965, the Seaway yielded a huge surplus of revenue over operating expenses. Out of total revenues of $6,372,000, operating expenses including major maintenance costs came to $1,766,000, leaving $4,606,000 for return to the United States treasury. Why is this impressive operating profit considered inadequate?

The answer is that a huge capital burden is now required by the St. Lawrence Act to be charged against operating profit. First, there is an interest charge of about $4,500,000 on the Seaway's capital debt of $130,982,000. Second, there is another interest charge of some $390,000 charged for $10,737,000 of interest deferred from 1959 onward—interest on interest. Third, there is a bookkeeping charge for depreciation of $1,686,000. Fourth, there is the obligation to pay back the capital debt in fifty years.

The present toll structure applied to the 1965 below capacity traffic level of 43,382,000 tons, by yielding an operating profit of $4,606,000 failed only by $284,000 to cover the extraordinary total interest burden of $4,890,000. If traffic had attained a 50,000,000-ton level (and operating costs remained substantially the same), operating profit at present toll rates would have risen to about $5,500,000, and excess over interest cost of some $600,000.

If toll increases or other disasters are not imposed on the Seaway, there is every indication that traffic can and will expand well above the 50,000,000-ton level.

There will be no capacity bottleneck at the 50,000,000-ton level, once thought to be the practical maximum for the Seaway. Recently, at House Appropriations Committee hearings for fiscal 1967, Mr. Joseph McCann, Seaway Administrator, estimated that traffic up to 65,000,000 tons could be handled, as both Seaway and port facilities improve.

The Seaway Corporation estimates that the average annual traffic for the years, 1967–1971, will be 52,500,000 tons. At this level of operations, careful control over operating costs, should permit earnings in excess of interest costs to pass the $1,000,000 per year level, without any increase in toll rates.

But under the federal government's bookkeeping practices, the actual 1965 loss is not $284,000 but $1,970,000. At the 50,000,000-ton traffic level, there would not be a net profit of $600,000, but a loss of $1,086,000. The difference is due to a depreciation charge of $1,686,000. Everything except land is being depreciated—the locks, roads, bridges, channels, and canals, as well as operating equipment. This would be entirely appropriate if these funds were being reserved to pay for replacement or retirement of facilities which could not be replaced. But the fact is that replacements and major maintenance expenses are already charged to current operating expenses. In 1965, for example, $713,000 spent on navigation aids and plant and equipment was so charged. Some of the so-called depreciation charge may, therefore, be double counting of the same costs.

Moreover, unless it is assumed that, at the end of the depreciation period, the Seaway will be worthless, the government's bookkeepers are asking us to pay for the Seaway twice—once, to repay the money invested, and, the second time, to accumulate additional funds equal to the original cost of the Seaway.

The most onerous and grossly inequitable financial burden placed upon the Seaway is the repayment in fifty years of capital cost of its construction. The St. Lawrence Seaway is virtually the only transportation system which is by law required not only to cover its own operating and maintenance costs but also to pay interest at the going rate and to amortize the capital investment over a relatively short period. How onerous and inequitable this burden is can be judged by looking at the transportation subsidies which have been or are right now being given to other parts of our transportation system.

Ocean ship channels: The Seaway is very like the ocean ship channels in that it serves a particular geographic area. Yet the ocean ship channels have not even had to pay operating and maintenance costs, to say nothing of interest and capital investment costs. For example, through the fiscal year 1965, the federal government has paid on behalf of the Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to the sea, $54,631,336 in construction cost and $113,346,844 in operating and maintenance costs; the Houston Ship Channel, $34,449,257 in construction cost and $32,605,276 in operating and maintenance costs; the Sacramento Deep Water Channel, $39,551,254 in construction cost and $10,740,586 in operating and maintenance costs; and the Mobile, Ala., Channel, $14,275,026 for construction and $15,221,599 for operating and maintenance costs.

The railroads: In the period from 1850 to 1871 the nation's railroad companies received government land grants of about 183 million acres. According to a Joint Economic Committee study, the value of this aid given to railroads came to nearly $1.3 billion. The arrangement was that this subsidy would be paid off over time by giving the government special low shipping rates. This form of "payment," still being made to the federal government, can in no way be considered analogous to the Seaways' interest burden and requirement to retire capital invested. There is no way to measure its adequacy in terms of a return on federal investment or in liquidation of the investment itself.

It is also appropriate to note that while the railroads demand that Seaway tolls cover all costs, including financial costs, they are themselves permitted by the ICC to reduce rates on commercial traffic to meet competition down to a theoretical out-of-pocket cost minimum.

The airlines: The nation's commercial airlines are beneficiaries to the extent of at least $250 million of the $750 to $800 million appropriated each year to build airports, maintain and operate airways, provide navigation and landing aids, communications facilities, and weather advisory services. For all of this, commercial prop transport planes pay only a 2-cents-per-gallon tax on gasoline, and jets, which do not use gasoline, pay nothing. Air passengers pay a 5-percent excise tax on their tickets, but no toll or charge is assessed on air freight.

When these indirect subsidies to the airlines do not suffice, the Civil Aeronautics Board stands ready to pay operating subsidies. These have been running at around $80 to $85 million per year.

The merchant marine: U.S. shipping lines receive about $330 million per year from appropriated federal funds as subsidies, about one-third for construction and two-thirds to make up deficiencies in operating revenues. They enjoy a federally guaranteed monopoly on U.S. coastwise shipping, on all defense cargo, all exports purchased under government loans, and half of all other government cargo.

Inland waterways: A statutory prohibition against ever charging tolls on our inland waterways which has its origin in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 was specifically reaffirmed in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1909. This act is still in force. Without arguing the merits of the matter, it must be recognized that the bargelines operating on the Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers have an immense cost advantage over competing modes of transport. Their cargo is toll free despite the fact that over $2 billion of federal funds have been invested in waterway capital improvements in addition to some $113 million annually appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the inland waterways. Thus, railroad lines in cooperation with bargelines have time and again been able to quote lower rates and thus to divert traffic which might otherwise have been shipped via the Seaway.

Trucking lines: While trucking lines, like other users of federally financed toll highways and bridges, presumably pay for their share of these new facilities, they are free to use all other highways, streets, and bridges in their business operations. It seems highly debatable whether their present payments in license fees, gasoline taxes, and other taxes would adequately cover their share of the interest and capital cost of past public investment as well as current operating and maintenance costs.

Outside the field of transportation, the federal government has been equally generous in projects where a long developmental period is required. For example, the TVA power facilities were permitted to go along for 27 years, from 1933 to 1961, without a definite program for interest payments and for repayment of capital. In this period, TVA power operations got well enough established not only to plow back substantial net operating revenues but to be able to issue their own bonds in the private capital market for expansion purposes. In another area, the government makes loans to irrigation districts on which it charges no interest and sets 100-year terms.

The Seaway, far from being subsidized, is practically the only major national development project in which the government has thus far failed to see the need for long-term, if not permanent, investment. The attempt to make an exception of the Seaway is not only shortsighted economics. It is also in serious conflict with principles which govern federal policy on other transportation facilities.

THE PROPOSED RATE INCREASES ARE A SELF-DEFEATING REMEDY FOR THE SEAWAY'S FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

The two-part toll rate increases are proposed for the five-year period, 1967–71. Their dampening effect on traffic will be felt by both Canada and the United States. However, the benefits, if any, go mainly to Canada. The United States will receive only its share—28 percent—of the 10-percent portion of increase, or 2.8 percent of any increases in toll revenues. The bulk of the 10-percent portion goes to Canada. In addition, all of the additional proposed increases, ranging from 7–90 percent are for lockage fees on the Welland Canal, wholly owned by Canada. These fees would, therefore, go in their entiretv to Canada.

On the dubious assumption that traffic will continue to increase, the Seaway Corporation estimates that with the increased tolls, revenues will average around $8,200,000 annually in the 1967–71 period. At the same traffic levels, present tolls would yield around $7,600,000 per year. For the sake of an unlikely potential gain of $600,000 per year, and $3,000,000 for five years in toll revenues, therefore, we would be risking much more probable revenue losses through major reductions in traffic volume.

Since the toll rate increases are proposed for a five-year period, the intention is no doubt to reduce them if traffic falls or fails to achieve the desired volume increase. But restoration of present rates will not mean an equally prompt restoration of traffic.

We have learned to set income tax rates low so that a full-employment balance in the economy produces expanded federal budget revenues. The old rule of raising taxes to increase revenue in times of under-employment is dead and buried, because it didn't work. In like manner, we should seek higher Seaway revenues from expanded traffic, stimulated by low tolls. We should bury any notion of raising tolls to increase revenues at under-capacity traffic levels, because this will equally fail to work.

PRINCIPLES WHICH SHOULD GOVERN FEDERAL POLICY ON SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway ought to be governed by three financial principles, as opposed to those which now govern:

First. Investment cost: Since the Seaway together with the Great Lakes is quite literally a fourth seacoast of the United States, the federal government should retain ownership of the U.S. share of the Seaway in perpetuity. The government should not try to amortize the cost of its investment over any fixed period—it should, instead, seek to be paid returns which will in time pay for the investment many times over. The form which the government's investment should take is capital stock, not revenue bonds with a fixed term as at present. An example of a wholly owned federal agency in which the government's investment is held in the form of capital stock is the Export-Import Bank. The Bank's capital stock has a value of one billion dollars.

Second. Return on investment: It seems reasonable that private users who benefit from the canal should pay, as part of their tolls, a return on the investment of the federal government. This should be, as at present, equal to the weighted average cost of actual borrowing by the federal government in the open market at the times that capital funds were actually invested in the Seaway. But these returns to the government should cumulate much as dividends on preferred stock rather than as interest on bonds. Such dividends should be allowed to cumulate and be paid by the Seaway when earnings permit. No interest would be charged on deferred dividends.

Dividends payable for the indefinite future, rather than interest cost which ceases when capital is amortized, seems a fairer basis for setting Seaway tolls so far as competitive modes of transport are concerned. The latter could result in an abrupt decline in tolls as financial costs were eliminated, a decline which could not be met by Seaway competition.

Third. Cost basis for setting tolls: In general, a cost basis for setting Seaway tolls appears the most acceptable. However, in view of the fact that other forms of transportation regulated by the government are permitted to meet competitive rates where such rates are not below out-of-pocket operating costs, far greater latitude to reduce rates than is at present possible should be permitted, particularly in the present developmental period. Moreover, tolls should be fixed at a level where they will cover return on the government's investment as well as current operating and maintenance costs at full capacity operations. It makes no more sense to set Seaway tolls at traffic levels achieved in the initial development period than it would be to set federal bridge or road tools on the basis of the first few vehicles which happen to pass through toll points.

The principle of setting user charges at full capacity operations rather than in the early years of a project when traffic is so slight that enormous tolls could be necessary to yield sufficient revenues, received strong support by an Eisenhower administration study conducted by the Commerce Department in 1959. The study states:

"Recovery of federal expenditures through user charges might be below full cost in the interests of the economic objectives of the program. Examples might be charges during the early years of a project before traffic develops, or charges based on full capacity use rather than on existing traffic in projects with very large capacities and traffic potentials. Such policies are not incompatible with a cost recovery doctrine. Where a low charge promotes a large use, total income over the longrun period may more successfully achieve the cost recovery goal than a high initial charge with low traffic. (U.S. Department of Commerce, User Charges on Inland Waterways, January 1959, p. 41)."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEAWAY ACT

Accordingly, in order that Seaway financing and Seaway tolls can be in full accord with the principles we have cited, we propose certain changes in the Seaway Act. The bills, which we have introduced today, embody these changes. They will better reflect the government's true interest in having a conservative form of capitalization, a surer method of insuring a return on its investment, and lower toll charges if needed to stimulate traffic naturally suited to use the seaway. The changes follow:

First. Consider all revenue bonds outstanding and accrued interest charges as original investment, to be converted to an equivalent dollar amount of capital stock.

Second. Require an annual dividend of 3.45 percent—the weighted average cost to the government on capital invested in the Seaway as of December 31, 1965—on the capital stock, payable from the date of issuance of the stock, cumulative if not paid in any year.

Third. Require that tolls be set which will, at full capacity operations, recover all current operating and maintenance costs—save depreciation—and the 3.45 percent annual dividend on capital stock. The present tolls are to constitute the maximum permissable rates. Maintenance is to be considered sufficient to preserve the asset value of the Seaway without any additional depreciation charges.

The text of the proposed amendments to the St. Lawrence Seaway Act of 1954 introduced by the 15 Congressmen follows:

A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5 of the Act of May 13, 1954 (Public Law 358, Eighty-third Congress; 33 U.S.C. 985), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 5.".

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In order to protect the investment of the United States in the Corporation's assets, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Corporation are authorized and directed to convert the revenue bond obligations referred to in subsection (a) hereof to capital stock in an amount equivalent to the outstanding principal amount of said revenue bonds and accrued interest. The Corporation shall pay a cumulative dividend on such capital stock of 3.45 per centum per annum."

Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph (4) of section 12(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 988(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) That the rates prescribed shall not exceed those in effect on January 1, 1966, and shall be calculated to cover, as nearly as practicable, at full capacity operations, all costs of operating and maintaining the works under the administration of the Corporation, payment of interest on the obligations of the Corporation, payment of 3.45 per centum per annum cumulative dividend on the capital stock of the Corporation, and payments in lieu of taxes."

(b) Paragraph (5) of such section (33 U.S.C. 988(b)(5)) is repealed.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year I distributed a questionnaire among my constituents in an effort to elicit their views on some of the critical issues which face our Nation and the Congress.

Because I consider the war in Vietnam to be the most critical of these issues, a question about it headed the list of topics covered.

The answers indicate that the majority of people in my congressional district favor the administration's course in Vietnam. Of the 40.3 percent who said they did not approve, the majority indicated they would prefer a stronger military course of action.

It is interesting to note that my questionnaire was distributed and returned prior to the recent bombings of Hanoi and Haiphong. I feel that support of administration handling of the Vietnam situation would be considerably higher than the 53.6 percent scored on my questionnaire if the poll were taken now.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS SUPPORTED

Most of the people who returned my questionnaire feel that the Nation's domestic programs should not be sacrificed in order to meet the dollar needs of the war in Vietnam. Although 37.8 percent said domestic programs should be cut back, 59.2 percent hold the opposite view, with 39.6 percent indicating they want to see domestic programs at their current level and 19.6 percent saying they should be increased.

FOUR-YEAR TERMS

The idea of a 4-year term for Congressmen appears to meet with favor in Maine. This is favored by 69.6 percent of the people who responded to my poll. Only 22.3 percent indicated opposition to 4-year terms.

Also favored by 54.9 percent are tax deductions for political contributions up to $100.

TABULATION

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following tabulation of responses to the questions covered in my questionnaire:

[Results in percent]

1. Do you think we should follow the present course in Vietnam?

Yes	53.6
No	40.3
Undecided	6.1

2. Assuming the Vietnam war continues, do you believe that U.S. domestic programs should be—

(a) Increased	19.6
(b) Maintained	39.6
(c) Cut	37.8
(d) Undecided	3.0

3. Should Red China be admitted to the U.N.?

Yes	43.4
No	50.5
Undecided	6.1

4. Do you favor the U.S. foreign aid program in general?

Yes	47.8
No	47.9
Undecided	4.3

5. Should the United States relax its restrictions on trade with Communist countries?

Yes	37.8
No	58.8
Undecided	3.4

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

1. Do you favor stricter controls in the purchase and possession of firearms?

Yes	58.4
No	36.0
Undecided	5.6

2. Do you favor a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation?

Yes	48.2
No	33.4
Undecided	18.4

3. Do you favor Federal legislation to ban discrimination in the sale of housing?

Yes	41.1
No	52.3
Undecided	18.4

4. Do you favor the revised version of the amendments to the Unemployment Compensation Act?

Yes	34.6
No	27.9
Undecided	37.5

5. Do you favor a $100 maximum income tax deduction for political contributions?

Yes	54.9
No	36.1
Undecided	9.0

6. Do you favor revising the Selective Service System?

Yes	57.4
No	28.9
Undecided	13.7

7. Do you favor a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives?

Yes	69.6
No	22.3
Undecided	8.1

8. Do you favor the Situs-Picketing bill?

Yes	9.8
No	17.4
Undecided	72.8

9. Which, if any, of the poverty programs should be maintained or cut back?

Headstart:	
Maintain	40.9
Cut back	24.3
Undecided	34.8
Community action:	
Maintain	28.8
Cut back	28.2
Undecided	43.0
Job Corps:	
Maintain	36.3
Cut back	37.2
Undecided	26.5
Vista:	
Maintain	26.2
Cut back	27.4
Undecided	46.4
Adult basic education:	
Maintain	51.0
Cut back	31.8
Undecided	17.2

10. Do you favor U.S. efforts to put a man on the moon?

Yes	48.2
No	31.8
Undecided	20.0

GENERAL

1. Regarding the worldwide population increase, do you favor:

(a) Technical assistance to nations requesting birth-control aid	56.5
(b) Requiring U.S. foreign aid recipients to adopt birth-control programs	16.1
(c) No U.S. governmental involvement in this matter	26.7

2. What do you consider our most important problem?

Education	36.5
Civil rights	26.7
Employment	12.5
Housing	5.2
Other [1]	21.4

[1] Votes in the other category were scattered over many topics with the following receiving a significant endorsement: Vietnam, 5.6 percent; foreign affairs, 1.59 percent; inflation, 1.51 percent. Unemployment, crime and federal spending each were indicated as the major problem on 0.83 percent of the questionnaires returned.

3. Do you believe that most legislation enacted by this Congress has been beneficial to Maine?

Yes	44.5
No	20.2
Undecided	35.3

RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE ON NATIONAL ISSUES TAKEN IN THE 25TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I circulated to the approximately 160,000 families in the 25th Congressional District of New York a questionnaire inviting them to express their opinions on what I considered to be the major domestic issues at that time.

More than 18,000 constituents took the time to sit down, review the issues and answer 35 questions dealing with such diverse topics as "Taxes" and "Federal Spending," "Civil Rights," "Consumer Protection," "Employment," "Conservation," "Veterans Affairs," and "Congressional Reform." In addition, a very high proportion took the time to write detailed and thoughtful comments on many of the issues.

A tabulation of the results of this questionnaire is here reported in the hope that they may be helpful and informative to my colleagues in Congress who must make important decisions on many of these questions. I only wish that time and space permitted me to include as well the thoughtful and perceptive comments that many respondents volunteered:

A questionnaire from your Congressman, Richard L. Ottinger, 25th District, New York

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Taxes, spending and inflation control. Do you favor—			
(a) Restoring auto and telephone excise taxes?	30	64	6
(b) Increasing withholding provisions?	40	45	15
(c) Accelerating corporate tax collections?	58	28	14
(d) Excess profits tax to recapture defense contract windfalls?	64	23	13
(e) Raising other taxes?	15	67	18
(f) Cutting social programs such as aid to education?	32	62	6
(g) Cutting other programs, such as space effort?	43	48	9
2. Employment. Do you favor—			
(a) Setting minimum standards for State unemployment compensation laws?	63	28	9
(b) Raising national minimum wage to $1.75 an hour?	23	71	6
(c) Raising national minimum wage to $1.50 an hour?	55	39	6
(d) Extending Taft-Hartley settlement provisions to all strikes affecting national interest?	83	11	6
(e) Permitting nonindustrial States to continue banning collective bargaining and elections for contracts requiring union dues payments by retaining sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act?	55	29	16
3. Civil rights. Do you favor—			
(a) Making it a Federal crime to commit violence against civil rights workers?	47	40	13
(b) Providing Federal standards for Federal and State jury selection?	66	28	6
(c) Prohibiting discrimination in sale and rental of housing?	50	42	8
4. Gun control. Do you favor—			
(a) Prohibiting all private interstate mail shipments of guns?	60	36	4
(b) Permitting shipment of guns only after notice to local police?	55	38	7
(c) Permitting shipment, but making it Federal crime to knowingly sell guns to criminals, children, narcotic addicts, and mentally ill?	69	25	6
(d) Providing stiff penalties for using guns in any crime?	93	5	3
(e) No restriction?	8	87	5
5. Consumer protection. Do you favor—			
(a) Requiring all packages to state contents clearly and accurately?	95	4	1
(b) Requiring loan instruments to state true total cost and interest?	95	3	2
6. Veterans and civil service. Do you favor—			
(a) Giving GI education benefits to Vietnam war veterans?	96	3	1
(b) Increasing Government pay scales to match industry levels?	52	35	13
7. Conservation. Do you favor—			
(a) Federal-State-local cooperation to realize Hudson River's scenic, commercial, and recreational potential?	87	9	4
(b) Providing incentives and research to place powerlines underground?	79	13	8
(c) Expanding antipollution programs so entire river basins can be cleaned up?	96	2	2
(d) Preserving California redwoods?	88	4	8
(e) Preserving Nation's wild rivers?	88	4	8
8. Congressional reform. Do you favor—			
(a) Encouraging broad public participation in campaign financing with tax credit or tax deduction for contributions?	55	36	9
(b) Eliminating unrealistic campaign expense limits and substituting effective disclosure requirements?	81	10	9
(c) Increasing term of U.S. Representatives to 4 years?	55	40	5
1. All to run in presidential elections years?	24	66	10
2. Half to run in presidential years, half to run in off-years?	61	29	10
(d) Transfer of proper functions of House Un-American Activities Committee to Judiciary Committee?	45	31	24

LADY BIRD JOHNSON'S BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Mrs. Johnson for the invaluable services she has rendered through her beautification program. As we all know, she has spent many long, hot, work-filled days in support of this cause, traveling tirelessly from big city slum areas to small country towns in her efforts to spread the concept of a truly beautiful America. Through her concern and avid participation, she has become a symbol for American awareness of conservation and beautification.

As a result the conscience of a whole nation has been stirred. She has awakened us all to the joys and fulfillment of constructive conservation work, as well as to the lurking dangers to our natural resources if we should ignore the facts. By sacrificing her own time and comfort, she has caused all citizens to have an eye for the natural components of comfort and pleasure for ourselves and future generations of Americans.

Most important of all, however, is the pride in our country which Mrs. Johnson has restored. The tree plantings and flower growing are only representative of this larger mood. Her energy and vivacity have served as inspiration to people throughout the land, and rescued the idea of scenic charm from the waste and hurry of a modern industrial society. She has given us all a lift in spirit for which we are duly grateful.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent permission, I include with my remarks at this point an interesting article written by Hugh Sidey in the current issue of Life magazine concerning Mrs. Johnson's beautification program.

I join with the distinguished and able writer of this article in the sentiments he so well expresses. I congratulate the First Lady of this country on her continuing magnificent contribution in making this great land of ours more attractive, more liveable, and more beautiful:

LADY BIRD, SAYS L.B.J., "WILL BEAUTIFY US OUT OF EXISTENCE"

(By Hugh Sidey)

There is a little confusion about who climbed on whose train. Lady Bird Johnson says that the natural beauty movement in this country had up steam and was rolling when she got aboard. The gardeners, ornithologists and picnickers say that she laid out the track, stepped up to the throttle and made it all go. Everybody, just about, agrees that it is a high-balling train this summer. It may be, in fact, that the natural beauty program is the single most successful Great Society venture so far. And it is quite plain that Mrs. Johnson in the years ahead will be identified with natural beauty in the way Jackie Kennedy is remembered for the restoration of the White House.

The response to Lady Bird's first plea to preserve and nurture the land was instantaneous and is continuing. At least 200 letters a week come to Lady Bird asking her to settle highway location problems, thanking her because a neighbor was inspired to share her rose bush, and, once, enclosing a batch of delphinium seeds which poured out over the desks of the startled secretaries. The mail is called "quality mail" by the White House, which means it comes on nice paper and is often typed. Some of it is "dollar mail," the true measure of a successful campaign. These are letters like the one from G.E. offering advice about burying transmission lines to give neighborhoods a neat look.

The phones ring too. One Washingtonian figured that Lady Bird could handle any problem, and when he saw a plant wilting in one of the parks he called and urged some sprinkling. Such confidence is not misplaced. When one Ohioan wrote complaining of some unsightly airplane hulks at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Mrs. Johnson brought the letter to the Secretary of Defense, who was dining at the White House that evening. In 24 hours the planes had been ordered behind a grove of trees.

The movement has been notably free of partisan politics. Republican Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN was one of the first in line to ask Lady Bird to give a beauty speech in his home state. Laurance Rockefeller heads a Johnson advisory committee on natural beauty and has been a guest of Mrs. Johnson at the ranch when the spring flowers were in bloom. Robert Gray, who used to be the secretary of Eisenhower's Cabinet, rose at a dinner and toasted the program which makes "every good Republican feel guilty when he plants a geranium."

There have been suprisingly few mishaps in the program, although there was one scare from Peoria. The cherry tree that Lady Bird planted last year beside the courthouse in the new downtown plaza turned sickly, and dispatches to the White House despaired of its living. But this spring the April rains brought forth new leaves and wide rejoicing. Builders in the Washington areas suddenly discovered this spring that they could not get a decent-sized azalea bush within 70 miles of the capital: the beautification program had cleaned out the markets. Some statistical-minded naturalists insist that the landscape flower and shrub population has reached an alltime national high, just like the human population.

Lady Bird has long been known for her shrewd financial instincts. And she hasn't forgotten them in her pursuit of beauty. She is quick to remind people what Shell Oil discovered—that attractively landscaped filling stations in many instances outsold those decorated with balloons and pennants. Ladies apparently determine a large number of the motor stops and figure that stations with shade trees probably have more appealing rest rooms too. Factory owners have reported that landscaping has helped cut down on personnel turnover. Not long ago Lady Bird stood in front of the Walker-Jones public school in a tough Washington neighborhood and counted 28 broken windows. Since then school and grounds have been beautified with the full involvement of the students, parents and faculty. There has not been a broken window and a few weeks ago Mrs. Johnson, in the Jacqueline Kennedy Garden at the White House, called up 9-year-old David Evans, who started the whole project with a plaintive letter asking for a bush, and gave him a special award for his school.

Beauty across this land is such a diffuse project that Lady Bird has had to become more of a symbol than an on-the-spot beauty aid. But she does bring considerable personal experience to her role. She recalls one of the gratifying things in her past life was ending the day hot and tired from work in her garden. She jokes that a fitting epitaph for her would be, "She planted three trees," referring to three trees she lovingly planted and cared for in her Washington backyard in the days her husband was still a Texas senator.

All 5 feet 3 inches of Lady Bird are in this fight. She selects her wardrobe with an eye to her beautification tasks. She needs dresses with the A-line design so that she can get her foot up on a shovel. The others are too tight for these earthy tasks, so she always chooses a few she calls her "tree-planting dresses." Because planting season seems to come with rain, the Lady Bird entourage goes forth on its beauty trips each year equipped with umbrellas and slickers. Local residents can generally distinguish a beauty safari when it sets out from the White House because the end of the line is often brought up by a well-muscled Secret Service man carrying a potted White House seedling to be planted somewhere.

Lady Bird has one nagging worry. She wants words that better express the movement, which she thinks has touched a deep sense of duty to this country. Natural beauty, beautification, conservation—those terms are part of it but not all of what the movement is after. New York's Mary Lasker got close when, commenting on Mrs. Johnson's campaign, she said, "She's lifted the spirits of everyone." And the President himself had a good thought one day as he surveyed the acres of wildflowers his wife had sown all over his ranch and remarked with gruff delight, "She's going to beautify us right out of existence." What a way to go.

INTEREST RATE WAR INTENSIFIES—ONCE AGAIN FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ACTS CONTRARY TO PUBLIC INTEREST—BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CALLED TO PASS ON MATTER MONDAY, JULY 25

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last December 6 the Federal Reserve Board moved quickly and secretly to drastically raise interest rates across the board. This is nothing new for the Federal Reserve, as Members will certainly recall the three recessions within the 8 years of the last Republican administration—all caused by the Federal Reserve's big banker-inspired tight money, high interest policies. We all recognize, of course, that it is the Federal Reserve—and only the Federal Reserve—which controls the availability and cost of credit to every man, woman, and child in America, including the Federal and State and local governments as well.

But the Fed's defiant move—it was defiant because they have assumed power they do not legally possess by law—had the effect of kicking off a vicious, senseless, and destructive rate war between our financial institutions. High Federal Reserve officials have admitted before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, as well as our Committee on Banking and Currency that the reason for these high rates—they raised the top rates that banks may pay on certificates of deposit a startling 37½ percent—was that the large money market banks would lose $3.5 billion of corporate deposits in December 1965 alone unless permitted by the Fed to hike their interest payments on these deposits.

Immediately many commercial banks began paying up to 5 percent, and even more, on small, short-term deposits, causing a serious drain of funds from thrift institutions. This has had the terrible result of drying up funds for home loans already in short supply and with interest rates bumping up against the usury laws in many States. In the meantime, American families are finding themselves unable to afford adequate housing, and the building and mortgage industry—already in a serious slump—faces an out-and-out depression. Builders are in a very bad situation now with housing starts way down; in a few months they face complete disaster. This is no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, and it is all because of the Federal Reserve's December action to bail out a few large banks which had overextended themselves in financing inflationary plant and equipment expansion by their larger corporate clients.

The July 1 dividend date threatened further withdrawals of funds from savings institutions into the commercial banks, but because of the July 4 congressional recess, your Committee on Banking and Currency found it absolutely impossible to report out a bill and get action on the House floor—assuming we would be fortunate enough to immediately secure Rules Committee approval—and action by the body before July 1.

Instead, your committee approved a strongly worded resolution calling upon the Federal Reserve Board within 30 days to put an end to the current rate war which may well trigger another terrible and tragic recession. The Fed started the rate war; they can stop it. If they again prove themselves defiant to the people's elected officials, your committee has promised positive and vigorous action.

The resolution approved by your Banking and Currency Committee on June 23 makes perfectly clear that in the considered judgment of its members there presently exists excessive interest rate competition which is not merely unsound, but will very likely lead to disastrous results. This resolution which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that same day calls upon the Federal Reserve Board "within 30 days to put to an end this excessive interest rate competition and to forestall the threat of such further competition."

Action the Federal Reserve Board should take to end this terrible state of affairs includes, in addition to the obvious necessity of rolling back its drastic increase in interest rates payable on time deposits, prohibiting automatic renewal of consumer "CD's," prohibiting multiple maturity dates, increasing minimum maturities, and increasing required reserves. Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatever that the Federal Reserve has adequate authority to end this costly rate war. The Reserve Board already possesses adequate legal authority for every single one of the adjustments I have just mentioned necessary to restore the situation prior to December 6.

So it was with a feeling of tremendous disappointment, though not surprise, Mr. Speaker, that I learned of the Federal Reserve's reaction to your committee's plea for a return to financial and monetary sanity. The Reserve Board cast a crumb from the rich man's dinner table by announcing an increase in reserves on time deposits to 5 percent, up from 4 percent. This increase, Mr. Speaker, is worse than no action at all because standing alone it will not stem the savings outflow or help a starving money market at all. It will have the effect of giving the big banks another excuse to once again hike their already usurious interest rates. This action only makes money a little bit tighter and a little bit more expensive. It will have the effect of making the next recession caused by the Federal Reserve come just that much sooner and be just that much more severe.

This July 15 action limiting to 5 percent the interest payable on multiple maturity time deposits will be equally ineffective. Even the bankers themselves have accused the Federal Reserve of an exercise in futility. The most you can say about these moves is that they constitute, finally, a confession of error on the part of the Federal Reserve. Mr. Speaker, the 33 members of your committee on Banking and Currency have labored long and hard on this problem. We bent over backward to give the Reserve Board an opportunity to correct their own mistake. Their response is on the verge of arrogance. Instead of wishing to assist your committee in the public interest by relieving a terrible situation, the Federal Reserve has taken action which can only make it worse.

This is a cruel joke on the thousands of builders, real estate people, and home buyers. It is a shame and a disgrace that time after time after time the Federal Reserve is able to take action harmful to the American public. The public certainly deserves better treatment than they are getting. It is high time that Congress met its responsibility and I can assure all my colleagues that this will be the Banking and Currency Committee's first order of business Monday of next week, July 25, upon expiration of the 30-day period specified in our June 23 resolution.

We must make sure that last December's attempt by the Federal Reserve Board to take sole control over the Nation's economic reins can never happen again.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS IS ONE ANSWER

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as the House deliberates on this matter of an extension of the Economic Opportunity Program and its benefits to those impoverished in our large urban centers, I urge that we also bear in mind the diminishing opportunities that have plagued our rural areas for some years now. That 100,000 farmers find it necessary to leave the land each year is convincing evidence of the lack of opportunity in rural America.

I wonder how long America can stand this migration? The demands on our great agricultural industry are constantly increasing to a point where the era of farm surpluses in this Nation is rapidly drawing to a close. We seem to have overlooked the outstanding contributions agriculture has made to this Nation, at least in the matter of incentives and rewards.

For a long time I have watched with great interest the dialog on food prices and their impact on our rising cost of living. We now have ample proof that the fault does not lie with the farmers and cattlemen. My concern, of course, is prompted by the fact that large numbers of my constituents are engaged in the production of grain and livestock.

In recent years, I have devoted a great deal of energy on legislation that will bolster, rather than depress farm prices. It would appear that we have not done enough. My premise, then and now, is that our farm population, that has made American agriculture the miracle of the civilized world, is still the least rewarded of any segment of our affluent society.

I submit that my concern for a better way of life for our rural population is right, and I will continue my fight for higher farm incomes. We should strive for parity, and in the process resist any moves that will curtail, or depress farm prices. They should go up.

Our farm economy is entitled to more adequate rewards for several reasons:

First, agricultural productivity has outpaced industrial productivity in this Nation by a factor of three to one, and has resulted in a $44 billion farm industry;

Second, our farm output provides 25 percent of our exports netting over $5 billion in cash receipts;

Third, the application of our scientific know-how on the land is not equaled by any other nation;

Finally, the American people only have to spend 18 percent of their disposable income for food, the lowest rate in the world. As a matter of fact, it is approximately 3 percent lower than it was in 1960. The prospects for a reduction to 17 percent are excellent. Further, our percentage of income requirements for food is more than 10 percent below that of most countries of Western Europe.

There are many other reasons, but these are the principal ones. Yet, despite these vast contributions to our general welfare, the rewards for our rural population are meager indeed.

In 1965 our farmers earned 35 percent less than what nonfarmers received.

In 1965 farm prices were 14 percent below their 1952 level, and in this same year, the farmer's share of the food market basket was 39 percent—the same as it was in 1939.

We now have the National Commission on Food Marketing's Report which fixes responsibility for increasing food prices squarely on the shoulders of food processors and distributors. The farmer and the cattleman are not responsible for runaway food prices, or their inflationary spiral.

In our program to increase farm prices, several factors having to do with increased production are significant:

On the authority of the Vice President and the Department of Agriculture, surpluses are dwindling, as for example, wheat and feed grains. We no longer refer to them as "surplus," rather they are now called "reserves." We have recently released 10 million acres of farm lands to increase production.

World population is exploding and much of the world is underfed. For example, in 1965 there were 63 million more mouths to feed, yet total worldwide food production remained the same as it was in 1964. Exports of American farm products will reach a record of $6.5 billion in 1966 and it is estimated that this will grow to $8 billion by 1970. There seems to be widespread recognition now that farmers should be permitted to organize marketing cooperatives on all commodities in order to increase their bargaining power.

Increased demand for farm products both here and abroad will provide the farmer with a more adequate return on his investment and hard work. I believe our greatest hope lies in increased exports that will be encouraged, both by our food-for-freedom legislation, and by our efforts to make other nations of the world more self-sufficient. We have found that, as incomes in foreign lands increase by 10 percent per capita, the imports of U.S. farm products go up 10 percent.

The United States currently exports only 4 percent of its gross national product. The greatest proportion of this is farm produce. Herein lies a great challenge to our Federal Government and industry alike, that jointly they may develop foreign markets where our goods and products are in growing demand. Herein lies a healthy solution to the problems resulting from the current depression in farm income. Herein lies real economic opportunity for our rural population that has given America so much.

We must not cease in our efforts to bring farm income up to parity. Our rural population must have greater incentive, if they are to meet the challenges of the future.

TRIBUTES TO THE SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH HOSPITAL, POLSON, MONT.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two splendid tributes that were made to the Sisters of St. Joseph Hospital, Polson, Mont., on the golden anniversary of the establishment of their great humanitarian service to that community.

The verse of the songs spoke eloquently for those devoted women of the religious hospitallers of St. Joseph.

GOLDEN JUBILEE

(Words and music by John F. Martin, in appreciation for the religious hospitallers of St. Joseph, golden anniversary, July 16, 1966)

FIRST REFRAIN

Jubilee, Jubilee, sing it gaily
For The Ladies In White, on The Hill.
What a wonderful day when they came here to stay
On persuasion of Father O'Maley.
Jubilee, Jubilee, in their honor,
Let the people rejoice full and free
For the love and good will, and the care of the ill,
Jubilee, Golden Jubilee.

LEGEND

They came from the Land of the Maple Leaf
To the Land of the Big Blue Sky
To serve in the name of their patron Saint
With their hopes and their vision high.
They toiled through the years for humanity
Like St. Joseph would have them do.
Gentle Ladies In White, through the day, through the night,
To their mission of love ever true.

SECOND REFRAIN

Jubilee, Jubilee, in thanksgiving
For the Temple of Hope on The Hill,
For the people who cared, for the wealth freely shared,
For the Sisters who made life worth living.
Every breeze through the trees seems to say it,
And the children at play dance with glee.
What a glorious day, every heart glad and gay,
Jubilee, Golden Jubilee.

SO LIKE AN ANGEL

(A tribute to "The Dedicated Nurse," by John F. Martin, presented at the golden jubilee, Religious Hospitallers of St. Joseph, Polson, Mont., July 16, 1966)

VERSE

Each day and night your light is shining there.
In garments white, you seem an angel fair
To tend our ills, to take our fears away,
And hope that all may have a brighter day,
With each tomorrow.

CHORUS

So like an Angel, in white flowing gown,
So like "The Angel" of nursing renown.
Watching and waiting, tending wit' care
Whispering the right words, sometimes a prayer.
So like the sunshine that follows the rain.
Changing grey skies to blue.
Some say that angels have bright golden wings,
But we think they must be like you.

DECISION OF WORLD COURT ON SOUTH-WEST AFRICA

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the World Court on South-West Africa represents a victory of narrow legalism over the clear dictates of international justice. It is a blow to the prestige of the Court, a blow to the oppressed of southern Africa, and a blow to all those in the world who seek the peaceful and legal elimination of oppression.

There will be those who will rightly refuse to accept the decision as the final word on South-West Africa, South Africa and apartheid. I urge the United States to join that group and to take the lead in proposing new initiatives for self-determination through the United Nations—an international institution of more proven willingness to accept its obligations and take risks in the cause of world peace.

REBUILDING AMERICAN RURAL SOCIETY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, today more than ever before, the remaining healthy and vital areas of rural America are threatened with extinction. We are all concerned with the excessive drain of manpower and ability from the countryside to the already overburdened cities. If this trend continues, the country will face the unfortunate prospect of larger, less governable city ghettos and depopulated, withering, rural ghost towns. Further, the people who are most likely to migrate to the cities are precisely those that rural areas urgently need. The young, the intelligent, the educated, the ambitious, and the talented move from the country to seek their fortune in the city. When they leave we all suffer.

To reverse the trend, we must bring about the rebirth, the renaissance, of the towns and villages of the countryside. Mayors, civic planners, churchmen, bankers, businessmen, and in fact almost all thoughtful people in this Nation recognize the necessity of rebuilding a vital rural society in America. I agree with these people and I am introducing a bill which I call the "rural renaissance" bill as an amendment to the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

The rural renaissance bill will provide long-term capital and credit to developers of small and medium-sized industries in rural America. It will create a sound, solvent credit program that can pump credit into rural areas, thus making capital and credit equally available to cities and rural areas. With the resource of capital, industrious and capable businessmen will be able to provide challenging jobs and new opportunities for the youth of rural America.

The bill provides for an authorization not to exceed $200 million in any fiscal year and that no applicant shall have unpaid principal indebtedness above $3 million. Further, the depreciation deduction under the bill will be based on a useful life of 6 years thereby allowing rapid depreciation under existing Federal law.

If we are to best utilize the resources of our countryside, we must do something soon. And our most valuable resource, people, can only be put to use if we start now to make life in rural America meaningful and rewarding. To this end, we must create a Rural Renaissance, the rebirth intended by this bill.

I consider that this bill will help revitalize rural America and thereby stem the damaging flow of people and resources to the cities. The rebirth of rural areas will return them to prosperous membership in the American economy, and thus benefit the entire Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. Green of Oregon (at the request of Mr. Duncan of Oregon, for the period from July 15, 1966, to August 1, 1966, inclusive, on account of attendance at Conference of World Council of Churches at Geneva as official U.S. delegate from the Church of the Disciples of Christ.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Abernethy, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Keith, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Carter (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York), for 30 minutes, on July 21, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Cameron (at the request of Mr. Adams), for 40 minutes, on July 25; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morse, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Williams in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain newspaper articles in connection with the debate this afternoon.

Mr. Cameron.

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.

Mr. Cohelan to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Farnum (at the request of Mr. Adams) to include extraneous matter and tables with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bell.

Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Corbett.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Adams) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fogarty in two instances.

Mr. Farnum.

Mr. Wright.

Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Monagan.

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Rees.

Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Grider.

Mr. Patten.

Mr. Sweeney.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3466. An act to change the name of the Rolla Jewel Bearing Plant at Rolla, N. Dak., to the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant; to the Committee on Government Operations.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 822. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2577. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the reinstatement and renewal of term policies of national service and U.S. Government life insurance, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11880. A bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem; with amendment (Rept. No. 1744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 13825. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROYBAL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the special study mission to Chile, Peru, and the Dominican Republic, November 6–19, 1965; (Rept. No. 1746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15485. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain fluorspar and ferromanganese held in the national and supplemental stockpiles; with amendment (Rept. No. 1747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14324, an act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1748). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11979. A bill to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 16352. A bill to establish temporary ceilings on the rates of interest which may be paid by certain institutions, and to provide relief to the mortgage market; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 16353. A bill to establish a Board of Higher Education to plan, establish, organize, and operate a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16354. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 16355. A bill to promote and foster the development of a modern merchant marine by encouraging the orderly replacement and modernization of merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 16356. A bill to provide for settlement of labor disputes which are subject to the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 16357. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish a selected extended tenure personnel program so as to permit the retention in the Armed Forces of certain highly skilled officers and enlisted personnel and, in this manner, reduce personnel costs and increase efficiency in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 16358. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 16359. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 16360. A bill to incorporate Recovery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKIE:

H.R. 16361. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 16362. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 16363. A bill for the relief of the city of Pawtucket, R.I.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16364. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 16365. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 16366. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase to $500 the amount paid by the U.S. Government in connection with the funerals of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 16367. A bill to extend the benefits of the war orphans' educational assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippines Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 16368. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year, extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16369. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 16370. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16371. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16372. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16373. A bill to provide additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16374. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 16375. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 16376. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16377. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 16378. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 16379. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 16380. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 16381. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16382. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 16383. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 16384. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 16385. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 16386. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 16387. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 16388. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 16389. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16390. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 16391. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 16392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16393. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by, or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance pursuant to such titles, must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 16394. A bill for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 16395. A bill to authorize on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs under the veterans' educational assistance program embodied in title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 16396. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 16397. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 16398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 16399. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 16400. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act in order to permit the construction of classrooms under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 16401. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 16402. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to finance and participate with State and local interests in the financing of recreational enterprises and industrial establishments needed for the economic development of rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 16403. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 16404. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 16405. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 16406. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.J. Res. 1215. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning November 27, 1966, and ending December 1, 1966, as National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 1216. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in October of each year as National Grandmothers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 839. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 840. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H. Con. Res. 841. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 842. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 843. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Con. Res. 844. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H. Con. Res. 845. Concurrent resolution relating to the submission to committees of Congress of watershed improvement plans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 16407. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the Danville Junior College, Danville, Ill.; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 16408. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ali Mazugi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 16409. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix Hurtado Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16410. A bill for the relief of Col. Robert R. De Guglielmo; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 16411. A bill for the relief of Clarence G. Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16412. A bill for the relief of Hae Ung Kyang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Donald O. Wilson, rector, St. James Protestant Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of earth and sky, who in Thy power rulest our universe, we are grateful that humble mortals may come to Thee and call upon Thee to be our aid as we attend to the affairs of men. So we who are assembled here address ourselves to Thee and petition Thy presence and guidance in all we think and say and do.

Make us humble: in our humility make us hard to the dictates of selfish wills and the dictates of mortal minds, but establish within us a deep sensitivity to the leading of the divine will that is always concerned about the good of our country and people.

Make us wise: in our deliberations, help us to value our intellectual pursuits of objective truth that decisions may be based on revelation coming from divergent points of view so that we spend little time in conflict about nonessentials. Help us to be so intent on serving our country and our fellow men that we receive with joy such decisions that, while they may not be pleasing to an individual point of view, are, to our knowledge and faith, pleasing to Thee.

Make us courageous: we pray Thee, direct the course of our Government through these persons entrusted with the task of governing. Fill them with courage to decide and lead not only for the short time of the present, but for the enduring future. We lay before Thee the complex problems of our time, that, directed by Thee, we may be led to their proper solutions, not for reason of pride or vainglory, but that mankind may enjoy the proper fulfillment of their human potential as they live in Thy world, with their fellow men in freedom, prosperity, love, and happiness.

Grant that we may labor so diligently that we have joy in full measure, knowing that in serving, we are instruments of Thy will.

Bless the President of these United States, and all those in authority. Grant them Thy gifts of health, wisdom, and courage and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve Thee by serving all, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 19, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 18, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2266) to authorize the Attorney General to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to certain objects of art.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Bruce L. Moore to be postmaster at Bear Lake, Pa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1336. An act for the relief of Rene Hugo Heismann;

H.R. 1822. An act for the relief of Won Loy Jung;

H.R. 10633. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Quileute Tribe of Indians, including the Hoh Tribe, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 822) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1336. An act for the relief of Rene Hugo Heismann;

H.R. 1822. An act for the relief of Won Loy Jung; and

H.R. 10846. An act for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff and Emil Homoceanu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10633. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Quileute Tribe of Indians, including the Hoh Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Deletion of Interest Rate Limitation on Debentures Issued by Federal Intermediate Credit Banks

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Approval of Loan to Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., Grand Forks, North Dakota

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the approval of a loan to the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., of Grand Forks, N. Dak. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Liberalization of Provisions Relating to Reinstatement and Renewal of Term Policies of National Service and U.S. Government Life Insurance

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the reinstatement and renewal of term policies of national service and U.S. Government life insurance (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of CIA Under Public Law 85–934

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, during fiscal year 1966, that Agency made no grants under the authority of Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on significant problems in the administration of right-of-way acquisition activities for the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Utah, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated July 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of procurement of equipment for implementing automation of water data records, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, dated July 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through greater use of available Government gasoline outlets, Department of Defense, dated July 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available by use of conventionally designed airport traffic control towers at low-activity airports, Federal Aviation Agency, dated June 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on survey of internal audits and inspections relating to United States activities in Vietnam, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, dated July 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT AT GLEN CANYON DAM SITE, ARIZONA

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract at the Glen Canyon Dam site in Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Ariz. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT UNDER SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, for the year ended May 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON PETITIONS OF CERTAIN ALIENS ACCORDING THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the petitions of certain aliens according third preference and sixth preference classifications to said aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Citizens' Action Committee, Inc., Erie, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to appropriate sufficient moneys to enable antipoverty efforts to continue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of John L. Horn, assistant professor of psychology, University of Denver, Denver, Colo., remonstrating against any plan to expand conscripton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the prohibition ordered by the Federal Aviation Administration against the landing of flights at National Airport, Washington, D.C., originating at points outside a radius of 500 miles of the Capital; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Metropolitan Airports Commission, St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and promulgate a maximum standard of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the British Honduran Freedom Committee of New York, N.Y., remonstrating against the claim of Guatemala to British Honduras; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Minnesota Council of State Parks, St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish the Voyageurs National Park in the Rainy Lake-Kabetogama Peninsula area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the North Dakota Pharmaceutical Association, Bismarck, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant commissions to pharmacists entering the armed services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DESIGNATION OF FLAG DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Resolution No. 24 of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania, together with a letter of transmittal, signed by the Secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania, Mark Gruell, Jr.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
July 13, 1966.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GOOD MORNING SENATOR SCOTT: At its session on July 11, 1966, the Senate of Pennsylvania unanimously adopted Resolution, Serial No. 24.

In accordance with the directions contained therein, I am forwarding a certified copy to you.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,
MARK GRUELL, Jr.

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA RESOLUTION

"Pennsylvania is the only State to observe Flag Day as a legal holiday, yet the symbol of American freedom should be honored by all the states through appropriate ceremonies.

"Presently before the United States Congress is H.R. 1675 which makes Flag Day a national holiday. This bill, which was sponsored by the Honorable WILLARD S. CURTIN, a member of Congress from our own State of Pennsylvania, is worthy of support; therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the United States Congress to enact H.R. 1675 which will make Flag Day a national holiday; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania and to our two United States Senators."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution, Serial No. 24, introduced by Senator John T. Van Sant and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the eleventh day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 1681. A bill to provide for uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs (Rept. No. 1378).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Frank C. Di Luzio, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 3628. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacques Charbonniez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3629. A bill to make certain expenditures by the city of Hartford, Conn., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 3630. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3631. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRIFFIN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committee and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Public Works.

The Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee and the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

THE OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, when the Johnson administration first proposed its so-called war on poverty program, it was with great reluctance that I was forced to oppose the hastily contrived proposals. I felt that the poverty program, though completely laudatory in principle, was unacceptable on a number of grounds: it bypassed State and local governments, it was subject to political manipulation, and it relied too heavily on Government handout-type programs instead of genuine self-help, opportunity-generating programs.

Plenty of evidence has been produced to indicate that my concerns were well founded. In the past 3 years we have seen a gigantic program waddle from one mistake to another while dollar bills escaped in every direction—landing here in a politician's pocket, there in a public relations budget, but providing genuine opportunity for few people.

After 3 years of experience with the so-called war on poverty, we have seen evidence of mutiny in the ranks and dissatisfaction among the lieutenants. There is no doubt in my mind that the time is long overdue for the serious and thoughtful look at the poverty program which the Nation was denied when the program was so hastily presented and rubberstamped by Congress in 1963.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill entitled "The Opportunity Crusade of 1966." I believe, and I think a majority of Americans agree, that our duty and responsibility is to provide opportunity to the extent possible for those Americans who are economically or socially disadvantaged.

The opportunity crusade would mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide a complete substitute for the President's lagging war on poverty. It would begin the imperative task of coordinating thousands of activities that today account for well over $100 billion annually in the poverty war. The bill would enlist State and local governments as partners in the opportunity crusade. It would infuse new vitality and new realism into programs for training, educating, and motivating the tired, the cynical, and the hopeless in our midst.

Following are the main features of the opportunity crusade:

1. JOB CORPS

A revised and redirected type of Job Corps program would be established in the Department of Labor to be administered under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The new Job Corps would select those qualified youths who require a change of family or community environment to respond to training and for whom no other feasible program is available. Three distinct types of training centers would be available to meet the needs of enrollees:

First. Skill centers operating in cooperation with industry to provide vocational training for more advanced enrollees.

Second. Conservation centers providing training in basic education and "conservation" vocations.

Third. Military career centers giving those enrollees who volunteer the kind of training that will equip them for a career in military service for which they would not otherwise be qualified.

Standards of conduct would be established and the Job Corps director would be empowered to dismiss and discipline enrollees who breach standards of conduct.

Counseling and placement services would be available to assist in the transition from the Job Corps to employment.

2. NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

A Neighborhood Youth Corps program would be established in the Department of Labor to be administered under the manpower, development, and training programs. Enrollees in the programs would be limited to those youths whose family incomes meet a fixed standard of poverty or whose families are on welfare. Two types of programs would be available to meet the special needs of this group:

First. An in-school program designed to provide employment for those youths who are in need of employment in order to resume or continue their education.

Second. An Industry Youth Corps established for those youths who would not profit from further regular academic training. Enrollees in this program would be employed by private, profit-making enterprises while receiving personally oriented vocational training. Two-thirds of the wages of the enrollee would be paid by the employer and one-third would be paid by the Labor Department.

3. COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

The community action program should have great potential in the commitment to combat poverty. The opportunity crusade sets out basic criteria for the selection and qualification of community action boards. The criteria would eliminate much of the conflict that has marked community action programs in the past. The unique and distinctive needs of rural areas would be met by special provisions for the establishment of community action programs in those areas. Recognizing the present inequity in the distribution of community action funds, which has resulted in underfunding for the rural areas, the bill would earmark separate funds for rural areas. Fiscal controls would be established by requiring preaudits, audit controls, and salary limitations.

4. STATE BONUS PLAN

Present poverty programs have almost completely ignored the important contribution that can and should be made by the States. Under the opportunity crusade, the States would join as partners with the Federal Government in community action programs.

5. HEADSTART

As the original sponsors of a preschool program, Republicans in Congress have been disturbed to see this important program become entangled in bureaucratic confusion and deprived of necessary funds. My bill would transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education to be administered under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

6. ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

This program would be transferred under my bill to the Office of Education. The emphasis would be directed to programs of functional education in the basic subjects of the English language and mathematics. Neighborhood programs specifically adapted to the customs and practices of the residents would be encouraged.

7. RURAL LOANS AND MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Authority for the loan and migrant programs would be granted to the Secretary of Agriculture to be administered by the Farmer's Home Administration. Loan provisions for low-income rural families would be liberalized.

Special programs would be operated for migrant laborers to develop their skills for permanent employment, and to provide minimum standards of housing, transportation, and other conditions.

8. SMALL BUSINESS LOANS AND INCENTIVES

This program would be under the authority of, and operated by, the Small Business Administration. Funds are provided specifically for this title to prevent a repetition of the starvation of small business during the past year when the program was brought to a disappointing halt by a lack of funds.

9. WORK EXPERIENCE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have authority and responsibility for the work experience program. HEW is particularly equipped to administer this program which is designed to train adults caught in the cycle of public assistance and welfare.

10. JOB SURVEY

Under my bill, the Labor Department would institute a long-overdue national skill survey to pinpoint the thousands of skilled job categories for which qualified applicants cannot be found.

11. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AUTOMATION

The employment service would be automated to provide high speed, reliable joining of individuals with jobs.

By involving private enterprise as well as State and local governments, $2.4 billion would be committed to fight poverty under the opportunity crusade—only $1.4 billion of which would be Federal funds. This is contrasted to the $1.75 program, all Federal funds, now proposed by the administration.

Comparative proposed expenditures of opportunity crusade and the war on poverty

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Opportunity crusade commitment [1]	Opportunity crusade authorization	Administration proposal
Total	2,434	1,462	1,745
Job Corps	170	170	228
(Skill)	----------	(80)	----------
(Conservation)	----------	(40)	----------
(Military career)	----------	(50)	----------
Neighborhood Youth Corps	382	225	300
(Industry Youth Corps)	(150)	(50)	----------
(Summer Youth Corps)	(106)	(80)	----------
(In-school)	(80)	(60)	----------
(Out-of-school)	(46)	(35)	----------
Community action	867	700	466
(Urban CAP)	(360)	(324)	----------
(Bonus)	(108)	(54)	----------
(Rural CAP)	(307)	(276)	----------
(Bonus)	(92)	(46)	----------
Earmarked community action programs	----------	----------	121
Employment service	25	25	----------
(Skill surveys)	(5)	(5)	----------
(Automation)	(20)	(20)	----------

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative proposed expenditures of opportunity crusade and the war on poverty—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Opportunity crusade commitment [1]	Opportunity crusade authorization	Administration proposal
VISTA	25	25	26
Headstart	644		327
(Regular)	(444)		
(Bonus)	(200)		
Adult basic education	44	40	30
Rural loans and migrants	55	55	65
Small business incentives	12	12	5
Work experience	200	200	160
Administration	10	10	17

[1] Federal, State, local, and private funds.

The opportunity crusade would require involvement of the poor in community action programs. No one knows the problems of the poor better than the poor themselves. If we do not give them the opportunity to help in the solution of their own problems, we are not likely to find real solutions. The poor should be involved in the first stages of policymaking at the local level. This approach is not new. It was the approach written into the first poverty bill. The 1964 act provides that community action programs are to be formulated with the "maximum feasible participation of the poor." However, Mr. Shriver and the Office of Economic Opportunity have refused to give effect to this language. In fact, when the guidelines were first established, they did not even mention representation of the poor.

Why is it important that the poor be involved? Involvement generates motivation. And, motivation is a serious problem with many of those who are poor.

Involvement also means responsibility. When a person is given no say in decisions that affect him, it is likely that he will feel no responsibility with respect to the implementation of those decisions.

By involving the poor in the war on poverty, there is hope that they will become motivated to improve their own situation. As its name implies, the opportunity crusade provides opportunity for the poor to participate in programs to help themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3630) to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor, introduced by Mr. GRIFFIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3630

***Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966".**

Findings and Declaration of Purpose

SEC. 2. It is the finding of Congress that, in spite of the impressive historical record of this Nation in offering unrivaled opportunities for advancement to our citizens, much remains to be done. Artificial barriers and indigenous backgrounds too often inhibit the full development of individual potential. It is not enough, however, simply to launch a program with compelling and persuasive objectives. A realistic program to help restore dignity and hope to those who are unable to sustain themselves in modern society is our urgent imperative. A program which merely raises expectations and administrative salaries without meaningful results fails to meet the dynamic requirements of our society. Those citizens who are to be served by government programs must have a significant role in helping themselves. Expenditures by government to do things to beneficiaries, rather than in partnership with beneficiaries, is a miscarriage of the true congressional purpose of dignifying human lives.

It is therefore the policy of the United States to provide these individuals at low levels of income and education with the power and hope necessary to raise themselves above the levels of poverty.

To accomplish this objective it is the intent of Congress that the needs of the very young be given first priority. Sensible and diverse programs emphasizing education, health, strengthening of the family and productive jobs must have maximum local and individual participation. Community action, involving the poor at policymaking levels with officials and citizens of talent and experience, is the indispensible ingredient of success. Permanent, productive jobs, with personal dignity and independence must be provided primarily by private enterprise. It is the role of government to stimulate, educate and provide incentives. All levels of government must participate in a meaningful way. It is the intent of Congress that this Act shall launch an opportunity crusade for the isolated Americans imprisoned by poverty.

TITLE I—JOB CORPS

Part A—General

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 101. The purpose of this title is to provide residential centers to assist young men and women who are unable to cope with their present family or community environments to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship, to increase their skills for employment, to enhance their ability to respond to programs of education, training, and work experience, and to prepare themselves for jobs in a free enterprise economy.

Job Corps

SEC. 102. In order to carry out the purposes of this title there is hereby established a Job Corps in the Department of Labor to be administered, in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary").

Composition of the Job Corps

SEC. 103. (a) The Job Corps shall be composed of young men and women who—

(1) have, at the time of enrollment, attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-two,

(2) are permanent residents of the United States or are natives and citizens of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as nonimmigrants or as parolees under section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

(3) meet such other standards of enrollment as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and

(4) have agreed to comply with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) No person may be an enrollee in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Secretary may determine in special cases.

Allowance and Maintenance

SEC. 104. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Secretary may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

(b) Upon termination of his or her enrollment in the Corps, each enrollee shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed $50 for each month of satisfactory participation therein as determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That under such circumstances as the Secretary may determine a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding $25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a member of his or her family and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Secretary. In the event of the enrollee's death during the period of his or her service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

Application of Provisions of Federal Law

SEC. 105. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, an enrollee shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(b) Enrollees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

(c)(1) Enrollees under this part shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For purposes of this subsection:

(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Corps.

(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be $150, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of twenty-one, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS–2 under the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), and section 6(d)(1) of the former Act (5 U.S.C. 756(d)(1)) shall apply to enrollees.

(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the enrollment of the injured enrollee is terminated.

(d) An enrollee shall be deemed to be an employee of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

(e) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Secretary for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

Part B—Skill centers

Establishment of Centers

Sec. 111. The Secretary shall provide for the establishment and operation of skill centers at which enrollees assigned thereto will be provided, wherever possible, under simulated or actual employment conditions, education, training, and other activities designed to develop the motivation, work discipline, and the skills necessary for the successful pursuit of a vocation after leaving the Jobs Corps.

Operation of Centers

Sec. 112. (a) To the extent possible, the Secretary shall establish and operate skill centers provided for in this part through contracts with private industry.

(b) Contracts entered into under this section shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to insure that the profits accruing thereunder are reasonable and subject to renegotiation in the event they are excessive for any reason, as determined under standards which shall be established by the Secretary.

Part C—Conservation centers

Establishment of Centers

Sec. 121. The Secretary shall provide for the establishment and operation of conservation centers in rural areas at which the Secretary shall provide, in coordination with other manpower development and training programs under his jurisdiction, for basic education, training, motivation, and work discipline of youths who (1) are so deficient in education, skills and work habits, that they are unable to qualify for acceptance in skill centers or other applicable manpower development and training programs, or (2) indicate a special interest in conservation or outdoor recreational activities as a continuing pursuit and are unable to qualify for other programs because of educational deficiencies.

Operation of Centers

Sec. 122. The Secretary shall establish and operate conservation centers through agreements with Federal, State, and local agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas. Enrollees in conservation centers shall be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility, and including agreements for a botanical survey program involving surveys and maps of existing vegetation and investigations of the plants, soils, and environments of natural and disturbed plant communities.

Part D—Military career centers

Establishment of Centers

Sec. 131. The Secretary shall provide, through agreement with the Secretary of Defense, for the establishment and operation by the Secretary of Defense of military career centers at which enrollees assigned thereto will be provided education, training, and other activities to prepare them for military service. Such centers shall be so operated as to equip the enrollees for a successful military career.

Enrollment in Centers

Sec. 132. Enrollees in military career centers shall be persons who (1) have evidenced an interest in the possibility of qualifying for a military career or have expressed a special preference to become an enrollee in the military career center and (2) are not qualified for military service, but who show promise of becoming qualified for such service through preparation received in a military career center.

Operation of Centers

Sec. 133. The Secretary of Defense shall have full and complete authority to design, program, and administer the military career centers and shall have complete authority over enrollees in said center. The Secretary of Labor's sole responsibility in connection with the military career centers shall be the screening and referral of applicants.

Part E—Administration

Selection and Assignment of Enrollees

Sec. 141. (a) The Secretary shall provide for the selection of persons for service in the Job Corps. He shall select for enrollment only persons he believes are unlikely to be able to benefit from education or training in any other facility or program and require a change of family or community environment in order to respond adequately to such education or training.

(b) The Secretary shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

(c) Each applicant for the Job Corps shall undergo physical and mental examinations under standards prescribed by the Secretary. Inquiries shall be made of appropriate State bureaus of identification to determine any parole or probationary restrictions that may apply to individual applicants. Applicants shall be finger printed in accordance with procedures followed for military inductees, and inquiry shall be directed to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other appropriate agencies to determine criminal violations by said applicant, criminal charges pending against said applicant, or other similar information. Criminal violations by said applicant shall not disqualify the applicant from the Job Corps but special evaluation of the distinctive nature of said applicant's problems shall be made and provision made for suitable treatment and handling.

(d) The Secretary shall report to the Congress any time a Job Corps center established more than six months has more staff personnel than it has enrollees.

(e) Job Corps officials shall, wherever possible, stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life.

Community Advisory Groups

Sec. 142. The Secretary shall promote the formation of community advisory groups to develop community programs which will provide appropriate job opportunities or further training for graduates of Job Corps programs. Wherever possible, such advisory groups shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action board.

Job Counseling and Placement

Sec. 143. The Secretary shall provide testing and counseling for each enrollee at appropriate intervals and at least three months prior to the enrollee's scheduled termination date. Data derived from such counseling and testing shall be sent to the agency of the Department of Labor situated in the area in which the enrollee proposes to reside, as well as to the community advisory group provided for under section 142, for that community. Upon the termination of an enrollee's service in the Job Corps, all records pertaining to such enrollee (including data derived from his counseling and testing) shall be made available immediately to the officials of the Department of Labor administering the program nationally. Such agency shall develop suitable job opportunities for the enrollee or, where appropriate, shall make arrangements for further education or training for the enrollee.

Regulations: Standards of Conduct

Sec. 144. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to govern the conduct of enrollees in the Job Corps, subject to the limitations and special provisions in this title. The Secretary shall also establish standards of safety and health for enrollees, and furnish or arrange for the furnishing of health services.

(b) In the case of Job Corps enrollees charged with violation of State criminal statutes, the Job Corps shall provide the cost of attorney and other legal services only in circumstances where adequate provision for such representation of indigent defendants is not provided under applicable State law.

(c) Any enrollee in the Job Corps who is convicted of a felony committed during his enrollment shall be immediately dismissed from the Job Corps.

(d) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissal from the Corps or transfers to other locations should be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

(e) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in Job Corps centers, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority as provided under regulation set by the Secretary.

Relationships With State

Sec. 145. (a) No center shall be established under this title within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor of the State and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this title. The Secretary may, pursuant to such regulations as he may adopt, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

(c) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that the transfer of Job Corps enrollees from State or local jurisdiction shall in no way violate parole or probationary procedures of the State. In the event procedures have been established under which the enrollment of the youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Director shall make provisions for regular supervision of the enrollee and for reports to such State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State.

Use of Local Public and Private Education and Training Agencies

Sec. 146. Wherever practicable education and vocational training for enrollees in the Job Corps shall be provided through local public or private educational agencies or by vocational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training unless such education or training can be provided within the Job Corps more effectively or with reduced Federal expenditures.

Discrimination Prohibited

Sec. 147. In the selection of enrollees or staff in the Job Corps, and in the administration of the Job Corps program, no discrimination shall be permitted on the basis of a person's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Oath of Allegiance

Sec. 148. Each enrollee (other than an enrollee who is a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 103(a)(2) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required by this section.

Limitation on Administrative Costs

Sec. 149. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that for any fiscal year the cost of operating Job Corps centers (exclusive of capital costs including costs of construction and renovation) shall not exceed $5,000 per enrollee in such centers.

Authorizations of Appropriations

Sec. 150. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE II—NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Part A—General provisions

Statement of Purpose

Sec. 201. It is the purpose of this title (1) to enable needy young men and women to continue their education at the secondary school level through in-school programs, carried on by public and other nonprofit agencies, which contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or contribute to the conservation and development of natural resources and recreational areas, and (2) to provide programs of out-of-school on-the-job training for needy, unemployed young men and women to enable them to return to school or assist them to become self-sustaining while obtaining the training necessary for a successful career in a vocation.

Establishment of Neighborhood Youth Corps

Sec. 202. In order to carry out the purpose of this title there is hereby established a Neighborhood Youth Corps in the Department of Labor, to be administered in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to in this title as the "Secretary").

Development of Programs

Sec. 203. The Secretary shall encourage and assist qualified community action boards (as defined in section 328) in the development, through contracts, of in-school programs and out-of-school programs which will qualify for assistance under this title. In the absence of a qualified local community action board, the Secretary shall, where appropriate, develop such programs through direct contracts with qualified applicants.

Selection of Enrollees

Sec. 204. (a) Selection for enrollment in programs assisted under this title shall be made by qualified community action boards or other qualified applicants, in accordance with agreements with the Secretary.

(b) No person may participate as an enrollee in programs under this title unless—

(1) he has attained age sixteen but has not attained age twenty-two;

(2) his income and his family's income does not exceed the standard of poverty established by the Secretary that takes due account of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of individuals and families to be self-sustaining;

(3) in the case of in-school programs he is in need of remunerative employment to resume or continue his education;

(4) in the case of out-of-school programs, he is unemployed and in need of interim remunerative employment;

(5) in the case of out-of-school programs, he has not regularly attended school for a period of at least six months, and the local authorities after pursuing all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling; and have concluded that further school attendance by him in any regular academic or vocational programs is no longer practicable under the circumstances.

(c) Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(d) Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and referral services to youths through public agencies or private nonprofit organizations.

Payments

Sec. 205. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out purposes of this title shall be used within any one State.

Oath of Allegiance

Sec. 206. The provisions of section 149 shall apply with respect to enrollees in programs assisted under this title and to all officers and employees any part of whose salaries are paid from sums made available under this title.

Part B—In-school programs

Sec. 211. (a) Any qualified community action board, or in any community in which there is no such board, any public or private nonprofit agency which the Director determines to be qualified, desiring assistance for an in-school program shall submit an application to the Secretary which shall contain such information as the Secretary may require.

(b) The Secretary shall approve an application under this section only if he finds that—

(1) Enrollees in the program will be employed under a contract or agreement between either a qualified community action board or the Secretary and a public agency or a private nonprofit organization (other than a political party) either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

(2) The program will enable student enrollees to resume or to maintain school attendance;

(3) The program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreational areas;

(4) The program will not result in the displacement of employed workers, jeopardize the potential employment of workers not aided under this title, or impair existing contracts for services;

(5) The rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical area, and proficiency of the employee, and in no event shall exceed the rate of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

(6) The program will be coordinated to the maximum extent feasible, with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State or local public educational agencies: *Provided, however,* That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or, where appropriate, pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) The employer shall pay at least 10 per centum of the enrollee's wage during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and shall pay at least 25 per centum of his wage during each succeeding fiscal year.

(c) In approving applications under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications for projects with high training potential.

Part C—Out-of-school programs

Applications

Sec. 221. Any qualified community action board, or in any community in which there is no such board, any public or private nonprofit agency which the Director determines to be qualified, desiring assistance for an out-of-school training program shall submit an application to the Secretary which shall contain such information as the Secretary may require.

Industry Youth Corps

Sec. 222. (a) There is hereby established under the Neighborhood Youth Corps a program to provide employment of youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two in private, profitmaking enterprises. The Secretary is empowered to make such regulations as he shall deem necessary to insure that private employment of such youths shall be under such conditions and terms as to meet all requirements of public and private non-profit programs, and to insure that participating youths benefit from their employment without exploitation or unreasonable profits by the employer.

(b) Programs to provide employment for youths under this section shall only be approved if they are implemented through contracts between a qualified community action board and employers under conditions of supervision and regulation by such said qualified community action board.

Approval of Applications

Sec. 223. The Secretary shall approve an application under this part only if he finds that—

(a) Enrollees in the program will be employed under a contract or agreement between either a qualified community action board or the Secretary and a public agency or a private nonprofit organization (other than a political party) either—

(1) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or

(2) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or

(3) on local projects provided under section 222 of this part by contract between the qualified community action board and the employer.

(b) Enrollees in the program will be employed under a contract or agreement between either the qualified community action board or the Secretary and an employer under which the enrollees will be provided on-the-job training that meets the following requirements:

(1) The training content of the program is adequate, involves reasonable progression, and holds promise that it will result in the qualification of trainees for suitable employment.

(2) The training period is reasonable and consistent with periods customarily required for comparable training.

(3) Adequate and safe facilities and adequate personnel and records of attendance and progress will be provided.

(4) The enrollee will be compensated at such rates, including periodic increases, as may be deemed reasonable under regulations of the Secretary, considering such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, proficiency of the employee, and in no event shall exceed the rate of pay for regular employees performing similar services.

(5) No enrollee will be permitted to participate in the program for more than a year, except that an enrollee may be permitted to participate for one additional year if it is ascertained that (A) he will benefit from an additional year under the program, (B) his employer is making adequate provision for his possible long-term employment, (C) he is unable to qualify for suitable employment without part of his wages being paid from sources other than his employer or for other training suitable to his needs, and (D) consideration has been given to the feasibility of the employer paying a larger portion of his wages in view of his experience and training.

(6) Adequate provision is made for supplementary classroom instruction where appropriate.

(7) The training will increase the employability of the enrollee in occupational skills or pursuits in which the Secretary finds there is a reasonable expectation of his permanent employment.

(8) The employment of the enrollee must not displace employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

(9) In the event the employer is a private, profitmaking concern, the employer shall pay at least 66⅔ per centum of the enrollee's wage.

(10) In the event the employer is a public or nonprofit agency, the employer shall pay at least 10 per centum of the enrollee's wage during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and at least 25 per centum of his wages during each succeeding fiscal year.

Part D—Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 231. The Secretary shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purposes of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, of which $50,000,000 shall be reserved to administer and conduct the program provided under section 222, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE III—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Part A—Urban community action programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 301. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for new and imaginative programs for urban communities to mobilize and coordinate their resources to combat poverty through total involvement of individuals and groups concerned and meaningful communication, planning, and implementation at the local community level.

Qualified Urban Community Action Boards

SEC. 302. A community action board shall be qualified to conduct, administer, or coordinate programs under this Act, or any other provision of law, only if—

(a) the membership of the board contains representatives of local government, social welfare and public service agencies, local school systems, the general public, and representatives of the poor comprising at least one-third of the membership of the board;

(b) the representatives of the poor are selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor; and

(c) in communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision is made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree.

Approval of Community Action Programs

SEC. 303. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Director may approve a community action program for support under this part if he determines such program—

(1) includes component programs all of which are focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and which provide expanded and improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith;

(2) has, if policy is determined by smaller constituent groups of the community action board, such as an executive committee, true representation of the poor proportionate to that attained on the community action board itself;

(3) provides that any component board which exercises jurisdiction only in a single impoverished area or neighborhood of the community, is representative primarily of and selected by the residents of such area, and is given power to initiate and disapprove programs for that area;

(4) includes provisions for reasonable access of the public to information including, but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, and reasonable public access to books and records of the board engaged in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with regulations of the Director;

(5) is organized and designed to coordinate, to the extent feasible, all programs at the community level primarily affecting the poor, and to eliminate duplication, conflict, and waste in such programs as well as to assist in altering or eliminating ineffectual programs;

(6) includes arrangements with a reputable private, and independent auditing firm to preaudit all grants and programs under this title to insure that adequate records are kept and fiscal control enforced; and

(7) includes provision for a complete audit of the books six months after the initiation of a program and annually thereafter.

(b) The Director shall not approve a community action program to be carried out without the approval of a qualified community action board already serving an area unless he determines that—

(1) the proposed program is of a demonstration or experimental nature and does not conflict with any component program being carried on by the community action board,

(2) the program is of such a nature as to be unsuitable for inclusion in the overall community action program, or

(3) the program is required to meet an urgent and temporary emergency need of the poor.

(c) The Director may approve a community action program to be carried out by a public or private nonprofit agency which is not a qualified community action board in any area which is not served by a qualified community action board (or, if served by such a board, the program meets the requirements of subsection (b)) and the proposed program would qualify as a component of a community action program.

Definition

SEC. 304. For the purposes of this part, the term "urban community" means an area determined by the Director, on the basis of the latest information available from the Bureau of the Census, to have a population of more than seventy-five thousand, except where the Director, under authority of section 314, designates an area having a population of more than seventy-five thousand and less than one hundred and fifty thousand as a rural area.

Part B—Rural community action programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for new and imaginative separate programs to meet the unique and distinctive problems of the rural areas in mobilizing and coordinating their resources to combat poverty through total involvement of individuals and groups concerned and meaningful communication, planning, and implementation at the community level.

Qualified Rural Community Action Boards

SEC. 312. A community action board shall be qualified to conduct, administer, or coordinate programs under this Act, or any other provision of law, only if—

(a) the membership of the board contains representatives of local government, social welfare and public service agencies, local school systems, the general public, cooperative extension service, technical action panels under rural community development, and representatives of the poor comprising at least one-third of the membership of the board;

(b) the representatives of the poor are selected by a process such as neighborhood meetings in areas of concentration of poverty in which the poor participate to the greatest degree possible in light of the special problem of separation, isolation, and communication which prevail in rural areas.

Approval of Community Action Programs

SEC. 313. Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Director may approve a community action program for support under this part if he determines such program—

(a) meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), (6), and (7) of section 303(a), and 303(b).

(b) provides that any community action board operating within established county or municipal borders under a qualified overall board with broader geographical jurisdiction shall meet the requirements of section 312 and is given power to initiate and disapprove programs for that area.

Definition

SEC. 314. For purposes of this part, the term "rural areas" means any area determined by the Director, on the basis of the latest information available from the Bureau of the Census, to have a population of seventy-five thousand or less, except that in exceptional circumstances he may designate as a rural area any area having a population of less than one hundred and fifty thousand.

Part C—Administration

Allotments to States

SEC. 321. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Director shall reserve the amount needed for carrying out sections 322 and 323. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Director among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. Twenty per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted among the States as the Director shall determine. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of public assistance recipients in such State bears to the total number of public assistance recipients in all the States;

(2) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the annual average number of persons unemployed in such State bears to the annual average number of persons unemployed in all the States; and

(3) the remaining one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with incomes of less than $1,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with incomes of less than $1,000 in all the States.

(c) The Director shall divide each State's allotment under subsection (b) into two parts, one of which may be used only for urban community action programs, and one of which may be used only for rural community action programs. Each such part shall bear the same ratio to the amount allotted as the urban population or rural population, as the case may be, of the State bears to the population of the State, as determined on the basis of the best data available from the Bureau of the Census.

(d) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this title; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced: *Provided*, That any amount originally included in that part of the State's allotment reserved for use for urban community action programs may be used only for such programs when reallotted, and any amount originally included in that part of the State's allotment originally reserved for rural community action programs may be used only for such programs when reallotted. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(e) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Financial Assistance for Development of Community Action Programs

SEC. 322. The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs.

Financial Assistance for Conduct and Administration of Community Action Programs

SEC. 323. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with qualified community action boards to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this title, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this title except that where the Director approves a program under section 303(c) he may make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies to pay part or all of such programs.

(b) No grant or contract authorized under this title may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system, or provide for any preschool or early-school program, whether or not designed to prepare educationally deprived children.

(c) In determining whether to extend assistance under this section the Director shall consider among other relevant factors the incidence of poverty within the community and within the areas or groups to be affected by the specific program or programs, and the extent to which the applicant is in a position to utilize efficiently and expeditiously the assistance for which application is made. In determining the incidence of poverty the Director shall consider information available with respect to such factors as: the concentration of low-income families, particularly those with children; the extent of persistent unemployment and underemployment; the number and proportion of persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; the number of migrant or transient low-income families; school dropout rates, military service rejection rates, and other evidences of low educational attainment; the incidence of disease, disability, and infant mortality; housing conditions; adequacy of community facilities and services; and the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency.

Technical Assistance

SEC. 324. The Director is authorized to provide, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance thereunder through grants to, or contracts with qualified community action boards, or, in communities not served by such a board, through grants to or contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies.

Research, Training, and Demonstrations

SEC. 325. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private organizations for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations pertaining to the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That no such program shall conflict in any way, in any area, with any existing community action program. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not exceed $30,000,000.

Limitations on Federal Assistance

SEC. 326. (a) Assistance pursuant to sections 322 and 323 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs referred to in those sections, respectively, and for each fiscal year thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

(b) The expenditures or contributions made from non-Federal sources for a community action program or component thereof shall be in addition to the aggregate expenditures or contributions from non-Federal sources which were being made for similar purposes prior to the extension of Federal assistance. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

Participation of State Agencies

SEC. 327. (a) The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on the development, conduct, and administration of such programs.

(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

Qualified Community Action Boards

SEC. 328. The Director shall certify the name, and area served, by each board which is a community action board as defined in section 302 and which he finds to be competent to carry out the functions assigned qualified community action boards by any provision of this Act.

Part D—Volunteers in service to America

SEC. 331. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train and—

(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers shall be on such terms and conditions as the Director may determine, but volunteers shall not be referred or assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

(c) The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training and to volunteers assigned pursuant to subsection (a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed $50 per month, such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

(d)(1) Each volunteer shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 149 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(2) All volunteers during training and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 105 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 105 (c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be received under the entrance salary for GS–7 under the Classification Act of 1949.

Part E—Voluntary assistance program for needy children

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 341. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children, in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

Authority To Establish Information Center

SEC. 342. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to establish a section within the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children.

(b) The Director shall appoint an administrator whose full-time duty shall be to give effect to this program.

(c) It is the intent of the Congress that the section established pursuant to this part shall act solely as an information and coordination center and that nothing in this part shall be construed as interfering with the jurisdiction of State and local welfare agencies with respect to programs for needy children.

Part F—Office of economic opportunity

Establishment of Office

SEC. 351. (a) The Office of Economic Opportunity established by section 601 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby continued as an agency of the United States. The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall also be in the Office one Deputy Director and two Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director and the Assistant Directors shall perform such functions as the Director may from time to time prescribe.

(b) The compensation of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(c) The compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(d) The compensation of the Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Assistant Secretaries of the Executive Departments.

Authority of Director

SEC. 362. In addition to the authority conferred upon him by other sections of this Act, the Director is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this title to—

(a) appoint in accordance with the civil service laws such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions and, except as otherwise provided herein, fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), except that, of the personnel so appointed, not more than one in every one hundred and fifty shall be in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949;

(b) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however,* That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(c) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this Act; and members of such committees, other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Director, shall be entitled to receive compensation and travel expenses as provided in subsection (b) with respect to experts and consultants;

(d) with the approval of the President, arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any of his functions under this title and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this title and authorize the redelegation thereof;

(e) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies without reimbursement, and, with the consent of any State or a political subdivision of a State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such State or subdivision without reimbursement;

(f) accept in the name of the Office, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purposes of this title, any money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise;

(g) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b));

(h) disseminate, without regard to the provisions of section 4154 of title 39, United States Code, data and information, in such form as he shall deem appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;

(i) adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(j) collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(k) expend, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, funds made available for purposes of this title (1) for printing and binding, and (2) for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this clause (A) except when necessary in order to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this title, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and (B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) or the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of such Committee) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and

(l) establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, prescribe such rules and regulations, enter into such contracts and agreements with public agencies and private organizations and persons, make such payments (in lump sum or installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments), and generally perform such functions and take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

Information Center

SEC. 363. In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this title are utilized to the maximum extent possible, and to insure that information concerning such programs and other relevant information is readily available in one place to public officials and other interested persons, the Director is authorized as he deems appropriate to collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute such information, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset to such cost), and make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation.

Part G—State bonus community action program

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 371. It is the purpose of this part to provide assistance to the States to enable them to join as partners with the Federal Government in programs carried out under this title.

Allotments to States

SEC. 372. (a) From the sums available to carry out this part for a fiscal year, the Director shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount being allotted as the amount allotted such State under section 321 (other than subsection (d) thereof) bears to the amount allotted all the State under such section for such fiscal year.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced.

State Plans

SEC. 373. (a) Any State which desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit to the Director a State plan which—

(1) provides for the creation of a State office of economic opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") which shall be the sole State agency responsible for carrying out the State plan;

(2) provides that in formulating its program to be carried out under this part, priority shall be given programs to meet the special needs of the State;

(3) provides for carrying out, or supplementing the financing of, community action programs which are eligible for assistance under other parts of this title, but are not being, or are being inadequately, assisted thereunder;

(4) provides for the establishment of a commission in the State to make a study to determine means by which programs carried on under this title may be effectively coordinated with other local, State, and Federal programs, and to report its recommendations to the State agency within one year;

(5) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Director to perform his duties under this part and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Director finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(6) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this part;

(7) provides for the establishment of a program to insure that salaries of professional staff personnel shall be reasonable with due consideration of salary incomes of said individuals in previous employment.

(b) The Director may approve any State plan which meets the requirements of subsection (a), but he shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Payments

SEC. 374. (a) The Director shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this part, from its allotment under section 372, an amount equal to the expenditures of the State in carrying out such plan. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Director; and may be made in such installments as the Director may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously made overpayments or underpayments.

(b) The Federal share for each State shall be 50 per centum, except that with respect to expenditures on account of the State commission provided for in section 373(a)(4), the Federal share shall be 90 per centum.

Operation of State Plans; Hearings and Judicial Review

SEC. 375. (a) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering a State plan approved under this part, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 373, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Director shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this part (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(b) A State agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under section 373 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Director may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

Part E—Authorizations of appropriations

SEC. 381. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than parts D and G thereof) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. For the purpose of carrying out part D of this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for such fiscal year; and for the purpose of carrying out part G of this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE IV—PRESCHOOL, EARLY SCHOOL AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Amendment to Title II of Public Law 874

SEC. 401. Title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Special Bonus Grants; Preference for Preschool and Early-School Programs

"SEC. 213. (a) The Commissioner shall, in carrying out his duties under this title, require that preference over grants for all other programs shall be given to grants for carrying out preschool and early-school programs designed to prepare educationally deprived children, aged three through seven, in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families to undertake successfully the regular elementary school program.

"(b) Each local educational agency shall be eligible to receive a special bonus grant under this section in any fiscal year if (1) it received a basic grant for the preceding fiscal year, and (2) more than 65 per centum of the funds expended in carrying out the programs provided for in the application submitted under section 205 were expended for carrying out preschool and early-school programs designed to prepare educationally deprived children, aged three through seven, in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families to successfully undertake the regular elementary school program.

"(b) The amount of a grant under this section shall be equal to the amount by which the expenditures for such preschool and early-school programs exceeded 65 per centum of the amount expended in carrying out the programs provided for in such application.

"(c) If the sums appropriated or made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year are not sufficient to pay in full the total amount which all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such fiscal year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably: *Provided*, That in no event shall the aggregate grants under this section for a fiscal year exceed $100,000,000."

TITLE V—ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to assist the States to develop programs of functional instruction in the English language and mathematics for individuals who have reached the age of eighteen, but whose deficiencies in these subjects are such that they are prevented from obtaining permanent employment, commensurate with their real ability, or entrance into other education or training programs; and to promote new approaches to the special needs of those who have poor employment possibilities because of such factors as inadequate education, lack of motivation, poor attitude or appearance, and other significant disabilities related to their derivation in poverty; and to, wherever appropriate, provide a new type of specialized, functionally oriented basic education through the use of nonprofessional, noncertified personnel teaching limited curriculums as prescribed by the State.

Establishment of Adult Basic Education Program

SEC. 502. In order to carry out the purpose of this title there is hereby established an Adult Basic Education Program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be carried out in coordination with other programs under the direction of the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commissioner").

Grants to States

SEC. 503. (a) From the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this title, the Commissioner shall make grants to States which have State plans approved by him under this section.

(b) Grants under subsection (a) may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, to—

(1) make grants to qualified community action boards, or where a community is not served by such a board, to a local educational agency, to assist in establishment of pilot projects by local educational agencies, and private school agencies, relating to instruction in public schools, or other facilities used for the purpose by such agencies, of individuals described in section 501, to (A) demonstrate, test, or develop modifications, or adaptations in light of local needs, of special materials or methods for instruction of such individuals, (B) stimulate the development of local educational agency programs, and private school agency programs, for instruction of such individuals in such schools or other facilities, and (C) acquire additional information concerning the materials or methods needed for an effective program for raising adult basic educational skills;

(2) assist in meeting the cost of local educational agency programs, and private school agency programs, for instruction of such individuals in such schools or other facilities; and

(3) assist in development or improvement of technical or supervisory services by the State educational agency relating to adult basic education programs.

State Plans

SEC. 504. (a) The Commissioner shall approve for purposes of this title the plan of a State which—

(1) provides for administration thereof by the State educational agency;

(2) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title (including such funds paid by the State to qualified community action boards, private, nonprofit agencies, and local educational agencies);

(4) provides for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority looking toward provision of such health information and services for individuals described in section 501 as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided under programs conducted pursuant to grants under this title; and

(5) sets forth a program for use, in accordance with section 503(b), of grants under this title which affords assurance of substantial progress, within a reasonable period and with respect to all segments of the population and all areas of the State, toward elimination of the inability of adults to read and write English and conduct elementary arithmetic computations, and toward substantially raising the level of education of individuals described in section 501; and

(6) provides for maximum utilization of nonprofessional, noncertified teachers of limited curriculums, as prescribed by the State, of a functional, as distinguished from academic, nature.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Allotments

SEC. 505. (a) From the sums allocated for grants to States under section 503 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. The remainder of the sums so allocated for a fiscal year shall be allotted by the Commissioner on the basis of the relative number of individuals in each State who have attained age eighteen and who have completed not more than five grades of school or have not achieved an equivalent level of education, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $50,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $50,000. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out its State plan approved under this title; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

SEC. 506. (a) From a State's allotment available for the purpose, the Federal share of expenditures, under its State plan, for the purpose set forth in section 503(b) shall be paid to such State. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner; and may be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously made overpayments or underpayments; except that no such payments shall be made for any fiscal year unless the Commissioner finds that the amount available for expenditures for adult basic educational programs and services from State sources for such year will be not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such sources during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 504(a) and in which the State educational agency is not authorized by law to make grants to a community action board or a private nonprofit agency as provided for in section 503(b), the Commissioner shall arrange for making grants to such board or agency on an equitable basis from the State's allotment under section 505.

(c) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum, and for each succeeding fiscal year shall be 80 per centum.

Operation of State Plans; Hearings and Judicial Review

SEC. 507. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 504, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this part (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under section 504 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

Teacher Training Projects

SEC. 508. The Commissioner shall allocate funds from graduate and teacher training programs assisted by the Federal Government under the National Defense Education Act and other applicable provisions of law to make grants to colleges and universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide training to persons engaged or preparing to engage as instructors for individuals described in section 501, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Commissioner may by or pursuant to regulation determine.

Small Neighborhood Programs

SEC. 509. In carrying out this title, special consideration shall be given to the support of small neighborhood programs adapted to the customs and practices of the residents that normally produce resistance to participation in more formal programs of adult basic education.

Miscellaneous

SEC. 510. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if different, the agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of adult basic education in public schools whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the Governor or by State law;

(2) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, except that if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of adult basic education in public schools therein, it means such other board or authority;

(3) The term "private school agency" means an association or corporation operating or conducting programs of adult basic education, no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully incur to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 511. The Commission shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VI—RURAL LOANS AND MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 601. It is the purpose of this title to provide a separate program of specialized assistance to residents of rural areas relying substantially on agricultural pursuits for income, who show promise of maintaining their livelihood in agriculture, or, with the liberalized benefits provided herein, show promise of ability to supplement their income or maintain or support themselves in nonagricultural enterprises.

Part A

SEC. 602. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, acting through the Farmers' Home Administration, to make loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not exceeding $3,500 outstanding at any one time to any low-income rural family where, in the judgment of the Secretary, such loans have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them to—

(1) acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon,

(2) operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized, including but not limited to the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, and equipment, or

(3) participate in cooperative associations; and/or to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income.

(b) Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

(c) In carrying out this part in areas served by qualified community action boards, the Secretary shall utilize the services of such boards in developing programs under this part.

Cooperative Associations

SEC. 603. The Secretary is authorized to make loans to local cooperative associations furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families.

Limitations of Assistance

SEC. 604. No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part unless the Secretary determines that—

(a) the providing of such assistance will materially further the purposes of this part, and

(b) in the case of assistance provided pursuant to section 603, the applicant is fulfilling or will fulfill a need for services, facilities, or activities which is not otherwise being met.

Loan Terms and Conditions

SEC. 605. Loans pursuant to sections 602 and 603 shall have such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) There is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) The credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) The amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) The loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Treasury may determine to be consistent with its purposes;

(e) With respect to loans made pursuant to section 603, the loan is repayable within not more than thirty years; and

(f) No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part to, or in connection with, any corporation or cooperative organization for the production of agricultural commodities or for manufacturing purposes: *Provided,* That packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance.

Part B

Assistance for Migrant, and Other Seasonally Employed, Agricultural Employees and Their Families

SEC. 611. (a) The Secretary is authorized to develop and implement programs of loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which aid migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families, by bettering or helping them to better their present living conditions and providing programs which develop individual skills for permanent employment as well as developing permanent employment possibilities.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants under this part to States to encourage them to develop a program, coordinated through regional arrangements or State compacts, to provide minimum standards of housing, sanitation, education, transportation, and other environmental conditions.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make grants under this part for special programs (1) that will operate on mobile basis, following a migrant community through its entire seasonal flow, or (2) that provide return transportation and other appropriate assistance for migrants employed in seasonal operations who remain in an area after termination of their seasonal employment with the expectations of permanent employment, but are thereafter terminated from such employment.

(d) From the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part, the Secretary may reserve up to $1,000,000 to be used to conduct a study of methods of decasualizing the labor market, including, but not limited to, studies of the migrant labor streams and alternate occupations for migrants which will effect considerable reductives in the distance traveled by the worker, of training programs to adapt the worker to mechanized agricultural processes, and of training programs to prepare workers for complete removal from the migrant stream.

Part C

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 621. The Secretary shall carry out the program provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VII—SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS LOANS AND INCENTIVES

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to supplement the Human Investment Act of 1966 by assisting in the establishment, continuation, expansion, and strengthening of small business concerns owned by individuals who qualify under poverty standards set by the Director, and to assist in the establishment, or expansion of small business concerns which, by the nature of their business, hold substantial and continuing promise of employing substantial numbers of individuals with inadequate backgrounds of educational experience or skills.

Loans, Participations, and Guaranties

SEC. 702. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to make, participate (on an immediate basis) in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than fifteen years, to any small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and regulations issued thereunder), or to any qualified person seeking to establish such a concern, when he determines that such loans will assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, with particular emphasis on employment of the long-term unemployed: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made, participated in, or guaranteed if the total of such Federal assistance to a single borrower outstanding at any one time would exceed $25,000. The Administrator may defer payments on the principal of such loans for a grace period and use such other methods as he deems necessary and appropriate to assure the successful establishment and operation of such concern. The Administrator shall encourage, as far as possible, the participation of the private business community in the program of assistance to such concerns.

Coordination With Community Action Programs

SEC. 703. No financial assistance shall be provided under section 702 in any community for which the Director has approved a community action program pursuant to title III of this Act unless such financial assistance is determined by him to be consistent with such program.

Loan Terms and Conditions

SEC. 704. Loans made pursuant to section 702 (including immediate participation in and guaranties of such loans) shall have such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) There is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) The financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) The amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) The loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Administrator may determine to be consistent with its purposes: *Provided, however*, That the rate of interest charged on loans made in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) shall not exceed the rate currently applicable to new loans made under section 6 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2505); and

(e) Fees not in excess of amounts necessary to cover administrative expenses and probable losses may be required on loan guarantees.

Limitation on Financial Assistance

SEC. 705. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another or in financing subcontractors to enable them to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 706. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VIII—WORK EXPERIENCE

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to train and equip individuals inured to the perpetual cycle of public assistance and welfare to become self-supporting and capable of sustaining their families. In carrying out this purpose the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall have exclusive Federal authority and shall utilize and coordinate the facilities and programs available at State and local levels, including, to the extent possible, those in the private and voluntary sector. The Secretary shall give special emphasis to equipping individuals with the motivation, discipline, and training necessary to hold permanent jobs in private, profit-making enterprises.

SEC. 802. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall determine eligibility for programs under this title with due consideration to meeting the following criteria;

(a) Training offered to participants shall be constructive from the standpoint of upgrading the employability of individuals;

(b) Eligibility for public assistance of individuals and families shall continue without diminution during periods of participation;

(c) Participants may engage in gainful employment without pay from their employers for limited periods up to a maximum of two years: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall determine that they are not being exploited as a source of free labor;

(d) Participants employed under this title shall not displace or adversely affect regular employees (including substitute workers) or additional workers who would otherwise be hired by employers participating in the program;

(e) Employment by private, profitmaking enterprises, or public or private nonprofit agencies, shall be approved by the Secretary only if the Secretary determines that there is a reasonable chance that the employer will hire the individual participant upon successful completion of the agreed upon training;

(f) All participants in the program shall be provided basic education as an integral part of their training if they have need for such education;

(g) To the extent possible, the Secretary shall utilize all existing Federal, State, local, and private programs to provide training and education to participants;

(h) In the event there is no existing program of education or training available to participants, the Secretary is authorized to make grants or contracts to provide such programs of assistance;

(i) In determining eligibility under this title, special emphasis shall be given to individuals with less than eight years of formal schooling who lack the background for effective performance as employees and citizens.

Payments for Experimental, Pilot, and Demonstration Projects

SEC. 803. In order to stimulate the adoption of programs designed to help unemployed fathers and other needy persons to secure and retain employment or to attain or retain capability for self-support or personal independence, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to use funds appropriated or allocated to carry out this title to make payments for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315), subject to the limitations contained in section 409(a) (1)-(6), inclusive, of such Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a) (1)-(6)), in addition to the sums otherwise available pursuant thereto. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purposes of this title. The costs of such projects to the United States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be met entirely from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title.

Authorization of Applications

SEC. 804. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE IX—AUTOMATING THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

SEC. 901. Section 103 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), as amended is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of Labor is directed, using every appropriate facility, to develop, compile, and make available information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, area, or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act. In the administration of this Act, the Secretary shall give the highest priority to performing the duties prescribed by subsections (a) and (b) of this section with particular emphasis on identifying and publishing those occupations, skills, industries and geographic areas in which the supply of qualified workers is insufficient to meet existing and foreseeable future needs. The sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor is further directed to develop and establish in the United States Employment Service a program for matching the qualifications of job applicants with employer requirements on a local, interarea, and nationwide basis. Such program shall be designed to provide a quick and direct means of communication among local offices of the Service in the interarea and nationwide referral, recruiting, and placement of unemployed and underemployed workers, and the referral of workers to industries which need them wherever located throughout the Nation. In the development of such program, the Service shall establish a network utilizing electronic data processing and telecommunication systems for the storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information. The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection."

SEC. 902. Section 104 of said Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as are appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1967) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training. Such reports shall contain a specific and detailed account of the administration, utilization, and operation of the functions and activities prescribed by section 103 of this Act."

TITLE X—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Repealers; Effective Dates

SEC. 1001. (a) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby repealed, effective June 30, 1966.

(b) This Act shall become effective June 30, 1966.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), during the period between June 30, 1966, and January 1, 1967, the authority granted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 may continue to be utilized to the extent necessary to permit the orderly transformation of programs being carried on under that Act into programs to be carried on under this Act. The authority to carry on a program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 until January 1, 1967, shall be exercised by the officer charged with carrying out a similar program under this Act.

Economic Opportunity Council

SEC. 1002. (a) There is hereby established an Economic Opportunity Council, which shall meet at least quarterly to consult and devise methods to insure that antipoverty efforts conducted by all segments of the Federal Government are coordinated.

(b) The Council shall include the Director, who shall be Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of Selective Service, and each other agency who has primary responsibility for a program being carried out under this Act.

Labor Standards

SEC. 1003. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating of projects, buildings and works which are federally assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133—133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

Reports

SEC. 1004. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, each officer charged with carrying out a program under this Act shall prepare and submit to the President for transmission to the Congress a full and complete report on the program he carries out for such fiscal year.

Definitions

SEC. 1005. As used in this Act:

(a) The term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title III such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and the term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the foregoing and all other places, continental or insular, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) The term "agency", unless the context requires otherwise, means department, agency, or other component of a Federal, State, or local governmental entity.

(c) The term "family", in the case of a Job Corps enrollee, means—

(1) the spouse or child of an enrollee, and

(2) any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee.

Preference to Community Action Programs

SEC. 1006. To the extent feasible and consistent with the provisions of law governing any Federal program and with the purposes of this Act, the head of each Federal agency administering any Federal program is directed to give preference for any application for assistance or benefits which is made pursuant to or in connection with a community action program approved pursuant to title III of this Act.

Political Discrimination; Political Activity

SEC. 1007. (a) No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or belief of any person whose compensation is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any person whose compensation is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act because of his political affiliations or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

(b) No person whose compensation is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act shall take an active part in political management or in political campaigns, and no such officer or employee shall use his officials authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. This section shall not apply to officers or employees of the United States.

(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated subsection (b), it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the person concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective action.

Limitation of Staff Salaries

SEC. 1008. No person whose compensation exceeds $6,000 per annum and is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act shall be employed at a rate of compensation which exceeds by more than 20 per centum the salary which he was receiving in his immediately preceding employment, but the head of the agency who is charged by this Act with the program in which he is employed may grant exceptions for specific cases.

Prohibition of Federal Control

SEC. 1009. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

TITLE XI—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

Public Assistance

SEC. 1101. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

(1) the first $85 plus one-half of the excess over $85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under title, I, II, or III of this Act or any program assisted under such title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan;

(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under such title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual; and

(3) no grant made to any family under title VI of this Act shall be regarded as income or resources of such family in determining the need of any member thereof under such approved plan.

ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. LABOR COURT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to abolish the National Labor Relations Board and to establish in its place a 15-man U.S. Labor Court, similar in many respects to the U.S. Tax Court.

Let me say at the outset of my remarks, Mr. President, that I firmly believe the National Labor Relations Act should be interpreted by a judicial body that would not be subject to continuing day-to-day political and special interest pressures.

At the present time, NLRB members are appointed by the President for 6-year terms. Two of the five members of the present Board are not even lawyers.

Instead of operating as a court, the NLRB looks upon itself, in the words of one of its members, as a "policymaking tribunal." Too often, in my opinion, the NLRB undertakes to write the labor laws instead of exercising the restraint of a judicial body with the limited function of interpreting and applying laws made by Congress in accordance with the intent of Congress.

It has become common practice for the NLRB to overturn and reverse its own decisions. Neither congressional intent nor the doctrine of stare decisis has much standing with the NLRB policymakers. The situation is such that lawyers in the field have great difficulty in advising their clients concerning the state of the law at any particular time.

The bill I introduce today would establish the U.S. Labor Court which would have 15 judges who would serve for a period of 20 years at an annual salary of $33,000 each. The original appointees would serve staggered terms.

If enacted, I believe this legislation would bring about a number of desirable and necessary changes. By raising the NLRB to the status of a court and giving the members 20-year terms, there would be more reason to expect decisions based upon congressional intent and proper respect for stare decisis.

In addition to enlarging the membership from 5 Board members to 15 judges, the bill would authorize the establishment of divisions, consisting of 1 or more judges to narrow and eliminate the lag in case handling which has long characterized the activities of the NLRB.

The bill also provides for appointment of an Administrator who would serve at the pleasure of the President, and for appointment of not more than 90 Commissioners—who would have to be lawyers—to replace the present NLRB trial examiners. The tenure of Commissioners would be at the option of the court.

Under this bill, the duties and functions of the National Labor Relations Board and the General Counsel would be performed by the new U.S. Labor Court and the Administrator.

I should like to point out that the bill I introduce today generally follows recommendations which have been made in the past by the American Bar Association.

Mr. President, while I would not contend that this legislation provides the final or the perfect answer to every problem in this field, I am confident that it points in the right direction toward reforms that are sorely needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3631) to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRIFFIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Labor Court Act".

SECTION 1. Title 28, United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," is amended by inserting in the analysis of part I, preceding chapter 1, after the item

"11. Customs Court.................. 251"

the following new item:

"12. Labor Court...................... 271".

SEC. 2. Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately following section 255 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 12—LABOR COURT

"Sec.
"271. Appointment and number of judges; character of court.
"272. Chief judge; designation.
"273. Precedence of judges.
"274. Tenure and salaries of judges.
"275. Principal seat and terms.
"276. Assignment of judges; hearings; divisions; quorum.
"277. Seal.
"278. Sessions.

"§ 271. Appointment and number of judges; character of court

"The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, fifteen judges who shall constitute a court of record known as the United States Labor Court. The term of office of judges of the United States labor court shall be twenty years, except that (1) of the judges first appointed, four shall be appointed for a term of office of five years, four shall be appointed for a term of office of ten years, four for a term of office of fifteen years, and three for a term of office of twenty years from the date of enactment of the Labor Court Act, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, (2) any judge appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the judge he succeeded, and (3) a judge shall continue to serve until the judge who succeeds him is appointed and has qualified.

"§ 272. Chief judge; designation

"The Labor Court shall, at least biennially, designate a judge of such court to act as chief judge.

"§ 273. Precedence of judges

"The chief judge of the Labor Court shall have precedence and preside at any session of the court which he attends.

"The other judges shall have precedence and, in the absence of an order of designation by the chief judge, shall preside according to the seniority of their commissions. Judges whose commissions bear the same date shall have precedence according to seniority in age.

"§ 274. Salaries of judges

"The judges of the Labor Court shall receive a salary of $33,000 a year.

"§ 275. Principal seat and terms

"The principal seat of the Labor Court shall be in the District of Columbia. The court may sit at such times and places within the United States as the court may fix by rule.

"§ 276. Assignment of judges; hearings; divisions; quorum

"The Labor Court may authorize the hearing and determination of cases by separate divisions, each consisting of one or more judges.

"The chief judge, pursuant to rule of court, shall assign judges to the respective divisions.

"A majority of the judges of the Labor Court shall constitute a quorum of the court but a majority of the number of judges assigned to a division shall constitute a quorum of such division.

"§ 277. Seal

"The Labor Court shall have a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"§ 278. Sessions

"The time and place of the sessions of the Labor Court and its divisions shall be prescribed by the chief judge, pursuant to rule of court, with due consideration being given to the expeditious conduct of proceedings and the convenience of the parties."

SEC. 3. (a) Title 28, United States Code, section 331, first paragraph, is amended by inserting after "Patent Appeals," the following: "the chief judge of the Labor Court,".

(b) Title 28, United States Code, section 331, third paragraph, is amended by inserting after "Court of Claims" the following: "the chief judge of the Labor Court".

SEC. 4. Title 28, United States Code, section 373, first paragraph, is amended by inserting after "Virgin Islands," the following: "or of the Labor Court,".

SEC. 5. Title 28, United States Code, section 376, subsection (q) is amended by inserting after "Virgin Islands" the following: ", the judges of the Labor Court,".

SEC. 6. (a) Title 28, United States Code, section 451, second paragraph, is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'court of the United States' includes the Supreme Court of the United States, courts of appeals, district courts constituted by chapter 5 of this title, including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Customs Court, the Labor Court, and any court created by Act of Congress the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior."

(b) Title 28, United States Code, section 451, fourth paragraph, is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'judge of the United States' includes judges of the courts of appeals, district courts, Court of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Customs Court, Labor Court, and any court created by Act of Congress the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior."

SEC. 7. Title 28, United States Code, section 456, second paragraph, is amended to read as follows:

"The official station of the Chief Justice of the United States, the justices of the Supreme Court and the judges of the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the Labor Court, shall be the District of Columbia."

SEC. 8. Title 28, United States Code, section 610, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 610. Courts defined

"As used in this chapter the word 'courts' includes the court of appeals and district courts of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Customs Court, and the Labor Court."

SEC. 9. The analysis of "Part III—Court Officers and Employees", immediately preceding chapter 41, title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item

"55. Customs Court.................. 871"

the following:

"56. Labor Court...................... 911".

SEC. 10 Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after section 873 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 56—LABOR COURT

"Sec.
"911. Clerk and employees.
"912. Law clerks and secretaries.
"913. Commissioners.

"§ 911. Clerk and employees

"(a) The Labor Court may appoint a clerk, and may appoint or authorize the appointment of other officers and employees in such number as may be approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"(b) The clerk shall be subject to removal by the court. Other officers and employees shall be subject to removal by the court or, if the court shall so determine, by the clerk or other officer who appointed them, with the approval of the court.

"(c) The clerk shall pay into the Treasury all fees, costs, and other moneys collected by him. He shall make returns thereof to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts under regulations prescribed by him.

"§ 912. Law clerks and secretaries

"Each judge may appoint a secretary and, upon certification and necessity by the chief judge, a law clerk. Upon further certification of necessity by the chief judge a judge may appoint one additional law clerk for the period of necessity: *Provided,* That no such additional law clerk may be appointed for a period longer than one calendar year from the date of appointment.

"§ 913. Commissioners

"(a) The Labor Court may appoint not more than ninety commissioners who shall be subject to removal by the court and shall devote all of their time to the duties of the office. Each commissioner shall be an attorney at law.

"(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $26,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in sections 835–842 of title 5, United States Code, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia.

"(c) The chief judge shall assign commissioners as the business of the court may require."

SEC. 11. (a) The analysis of chapter 83, immediately preceding section 1291, title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"1292. Interlocutory decisions."

the following:

"1293. Labor Court decisions."

SEC. 12. Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new section immediately after section 1292:

"§ 1293. Labor Court decisions

"Except as otherwise expressly provided herein, the courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction to review on appeal final orders of the Labor Court in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury."

SEC. 13. Title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by inserting "(a)" preceding the first paragraph and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(b) An appeal from a reviewable decision of the Labor Court may be taken to the court of appeals for any circuit in which the unfair labor practice in question occurred, or wherein the party against whom the proceeding in the Labor Court was instituted resides or transacts business; or an appeal may be taken to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by stipulation of the parties.

"(c) An appeal from a reviewable decision of the Labor Court may be taken by any person aggrieved thereby. The term 'person aggrieved' as used herein shall include and be limited to (1) any person against whom the decision is rendered, (2) the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, and (3) the person filing the charge upon which the proceeding is based, if the court has dismissed a complaint in whole or in part.

"(d) The Administrator shall be a party to any appeal taken as provided herein from any decision of the Labor Court."

SEC. 14. The analysis of "Part IV—Jurisdiction and Venue", immediately preceding chapter 81, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"96. Labor Court.................... 1621".

SEC. 15. Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately following section 1583 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 96—LABOR COURT

"Sec.

"1621. Jurisdiction.

"(a) The Labor Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear proceedings, render judgments, issue decrees including decrees granting injunctions, and issue certifications under the following:

"(1) Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended (U.S.C., title 29, sec. 158) and as further amended by section 19 of the Labor Court Act.

"(2) Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended (U.S.C., title 29, sec. 159), and as further amended by section 19 of the Labor Court Act.

"(3) Section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended (U.S.C., title 29, sec. 160) and as further amended by section 19 of the Labor Court Act.

"(b) The decisions and certifications of the Labor Court under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 29, sec. 159), and as further amended by section 19 of the Labor Court Act shall not be subjected to review in a court of appeals or elsewhere, except upon a review of a judgment under section 8 thereof which is based in whole or in part upon such decision or certification. In such case the record of such representation proceeding shall be included in the transcript of the entire record filed in the court of appeals, and thereupon the decision of the court of appeals shall be made upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript."

SEC. 16. The analysis of "Part VI—Particular Proceedings", immediately preceding chapter 151 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item

"169. Customs Court procedure...... 2631"

the following:

"170. Labor Court procedure........ 2651".

SEC. 17. Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new chapter immediately after section 2642:

"CHAPTER 170—LABOR COURT PROCEDURE

"Sec.
"2651. Proceedings before commissioners generally.
"2652. Proceedings, findings, and opinion of division; review.
"2653. Procedural rules.
"2654. Finality of orders.
"2655. Stay pending appeal.
"2656. Rules of practice.

"§ 2651. Proceedings before commissioners generally

"(a) In accordance with rules and orders of the Labor Court, commissioners shall fix times for hearings, administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses, receive evidence, and report findings of fact and their recommendations for conclusions of law and decision in cases assigned to them.

"(b) The rules of the court shall provide for the filing with the court of the commissioner's report of findings of fact and recommendations for conclusions of law and decision, and for opportunity for the parties to file exceptions thereto, and a hearing thereon before the court within a reasonable time. If no exceptions are filed to a commissioner's report, the findings of fact and the conclusions of law and decision recommended therein shall become the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decision of the court. Unless on remand to the commissioner, the court shall not consider any issue of fact not raised by exception to the commissioner's report. The court shall by rule provide for the weight to be accorded to findings of fact by commissioners including findings based on credibility.

"§ 2652. Proceedings, findings, and opinion of division; review

"A division of the Labor Court shall hear and determine any matters assigned by the chief judge.

"The decision of the division shall upon publication thereof become the decision of the court. Within thirty days following publication thereof the chief judge, either on his own motion or on motion by one of the parties, may order a review by the court in accordance with its rules, or within such thirty days three or more judges may order such review; and in either case the chief judge may enter an order staying the decision of the division pending such review. Such review shall be by a court of at least five judges, before which the parties shall have the right to appear, and the decision of which shall become the decision of the court.

"§ 2653. Procedural rules

"The trials and proceedings before the Labor Court, divisions of the court, and commissioners, shall be conducted in accordance with such rules of practice and procedure as the Labor Court may prescribe, such rules to conform as nearly as practicable with the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States.

"The rules of evidence applied in the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury shall be applied in trials and proceedings of the Labor Court, its divisions, and commissioners."

SEC. 18. Provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to be applicable except as specifically provided herein, all of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect, except that, wherever that Act refers to the National Labor Relations Board or the General Counsel of the Board, it shall be deemed to refer to the United States Labor Court or the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, as the case may be.

SEC. 19. The National Labor Relations Act, as amended, shall be further amended as follows:

(1) Section 2. Definitions, is amended by striking therefrom subsection (10).

(2) Section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3 (a) There shall be an Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The Administrator shall receive a salary of $30,000 a year. The Administrator may appoint such deputies, attorneys, and clerical assistants and employees as are necessary to perform his duties.

"The Administrator shall have authority in respect of the investigation of charges and in respect of the institution of unfair labor practice proceedings before the Labor Court.

"Subject to adjudication by the Labor Court as provided herein the Administrator shall also have authority to investigate representation petitions, conduct elections, and take other steps in connection therewith

"(b) The Administrator shall have the exclusive authority to institute unfair labor practice proceedings in the Labor Court to enforce compliance with section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

"(c) Whenever a petition shall have been filed as provided in section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the Administrator shall have the exclusive right to investigate such petition, and if he is unable to dispose of the petition by withdrawal or by consent procedures, and finds that a question of representation is presented which should be adjudicated by the Labor Court, he shall certify the petition to the Labor Court for the decision of such question of representation subject to the provisions of and in the manner provided by section 9 of of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

(3) Sections 4, 5, and 6 are hereby stricken.

(4) Section 8(a)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it: *Provided*, That an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay;"

(5) Section 8(a)(3) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(6) Section 8(b)(4)(D) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(7) Section 8(b)(5) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(8) Section 8(b)(7) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(9) Section 8(d) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(10) Section 9(b) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(11) Section 9(c)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Whenever a petition shall have been filed with the Administrator, in accordance with such rules as may be prescribed by the Labor Court—

"(A) by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a substantial number of employees (i) wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the representative defined in section 9(a), or (ii) assert that the individual or labor organization, which has been certified or is being currently recognized by their employer as the bargaining representative, is no longer a representative as defined in section 9(a); or

"(B) by an employer, alleging that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative defined in section 9(a); the Administrator shall investigate such petition and unless disposed of by informal agreement of the parties, the petition shall be certified to the Labor Court by the Administrator for the purpose of hearing and appropriate decision. If the Labor Court finds upon the record of such hearing that a question of representation affecting commerce exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot to be conducted by the Administrator who shall certify the results thereof to the Labor Court."

(12) Section 9(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) In determining whether or not a question of representation exists the Labor Court shall make no distinction in its decision because of the identity of the persons filing the petition or the kind of relief sought, and in no case shall the Labor Court deny a labor organization a place on the ballot by reason of any prior decree (or prior order of the National Labor Relations Board) with respect to such labor organization or its predecessor not issued in conformity with section 10(c)."

(13) Section 9(c)(3) is amended by striking the words "under such regulations as the Board shall find are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act".

(14) Section 9(c)(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of a hearing by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations of the Administrator and applicable decisions of the Labor Court."

(15) Section 9(d) is hereby stricken and section 9(e) is redesignated "(d)".

(16) Section 9(e)(1) is amended by substituting the word "Administrator" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(17) Section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The Labor Court shall have jurisdiction, as hereinafter provided, and unaffected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that had been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise, to enjoin any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in section 8) affecting commerce.

"(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Administrator, or any agent designated by the Administrator for such purpose, shall investigate such charge and if, after such investigation, there is reasonable cause to believe such charge is true, the Administrator or his agent shall issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect, and shall file such complaint in the court. No complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than six months prior to the filing of the charge and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the six-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge. In determining whether a complaint shall issue alleging a violation of section 8(a)(1) or section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, no distinction shall be made because the labor organization affected is or is not affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope. The charging party shall, and any other person may, in the discretion of the court, be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to present evidence. Where the Administrator or his agent refuses to issue a complaint pursuant to a charge alleging the commission of an unfair labor practice, the charging party may appeal to the Labor Court which shall have authority to require the Administrator to issue and cause to be served and filed a complaint based on such charge.

"(c) If the court finds that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the court shall state its findings of fact and shall enter a decree requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this Act: *Provided*, That where a decree directs reinstatement of an employee, back pay may be required of the employer or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination suffered by him. If the court finds that the person named in the complaint has not engaged in or is not engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the court shall state its findings of fact and shall dismiss the said complaint.

"(d) Upon the filing of a complaint, the court shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Administrator, to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which it is alleged and there is reasonable cause to believe that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party is threatened: *Provided, however*, That no temporary restraining order shall issue without notice to the person named in the complaint: *Provided further*, That a motion for a temporary restraining order shall not be denied where the complaint alleges violations of sections 8(b)(7), 8(e), or of the paragraphs (A), (B), or (C) of section 8(b)(4) and the court has reasonable grounds for believing such allegations to be true: *Provided further*, That no restraining order shall issue with respect to allegations in the complaint of unfair labor practices under section 8(b)(7) if a charge against the employer under section 8(a)(2) has been filed and after the preliminary investigation the Administrator, or any agent designated by the Administrator for that purpose, has reasonable cause to believe that such charge is true, and issues and causes to be served and filed a complaint based on such charge.

"(e) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph 4(D) of section 8(b) of this Act, the Administrator shall not issue a complaint if, within ten days after such charge has been filed, there is submitted to the Administrator satisfactory evidence that the controversy giving rise to the charge has been settled, or that effective methods for the voluntary adjustment thereof have been agreed upon and that such adjustment will be enforced.

"(f) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of sections 8(b)(7), 8(e), of the paragraphs (A), (B), or (C) of section 8(b)(4), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred.

"(g) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of subsection (a)(3) or (b)(2) of section 8, such charge shall be given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred and cases given priority under subsection (f)."

(18) Section 11 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. For the purpose of all investigations which, in the opinion of the Administrator, are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in him by section 9 and section 10—

"(1) The Administrator, or his duly authorized agents, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. The Labor Court shall, upon application of any party to such investigation or proceedings, forthwith issue to such party subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such investigation or proceedings requested in such application. Within five days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Labor Court to revoke such subpena, and the Labor Court shall revoke such subpena if it finds that the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if it finds that such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing;

"(2) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Labor Court, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(3) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Labor Court, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person requiring to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Labor Court, a division thereof, or commissioner, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(4) All process of the Labor Court may be served anywhere in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof."

(19) Section 12 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with the Administrator or any of his agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both."

(20) Section 14 is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(21) Section 18 is hereby stricken.

SEC. 20. TRANSFER OF PROCEEDINGS TO THE LABOR COURT.—

On the effective date of this Act, proceedings pending before the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or before the National Labor Relations Board shall be suspended and thereafter transferred as expeditiously as possible to the Administrator or to the Labor Court in the following manner:

(1) Proceedings pending before the General Counsel in which no formal action has been taken shall be transferred to the Administrator, who shall dispose of them in the manner prescribed herein and in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

(2) Proceedings pending before the National Labor Relations Board shall be transferred to the Labor Court for hearing and decision, de novo: *Provided, however,* That the Labor Court may, at the discretion of the trial judge, treat any intermediate report and recommendation issued by a trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board as if it were a report and recommendation made by a commissioner of the Labor Court.

(3) Any decision and order issued by the National Labor Relations Board prior to the effective date of this Act which has not as of the effective date of this Act been enforced or reviewed by a court of appeals having jurisdiction under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to enforce and review such decision shall have full force and effect and shall be subject to enforcement or review in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act as heretofore amended. In respect to the enforcement or review of any such case in the courts of appeals, the Administrator of the Labor Court shall exercise the function and have the authority and responsibility vested in the National Labor Relations Board by the National Labor Relations Act, as heretofore amended.

SEC. 21. This Act shall take effect on the one hundred and eightieth day after the day of its enactment.

THE MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 679

Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. PEARSON) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3583) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. LAUSCHE which appears under a separate heading.)

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 680

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. JAVITS which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 681

Mr. McGOVERN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 682

Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 683 THROUGH 688

Mr. GRUENING submitted six amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. GRUENING, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENTS NOS. 689 THROUGH 693

Mr. HARTKE submitted five amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Wednesday, July 27, 1966, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, vice F. Ryan Duffy, retired.

Ted Cabot, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, Southern District of Florida, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON S. 2479

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, has scheduled a public hearing on S. 2479. This bill would amend section 4 of the Clayton Act to treat as a penalty judgment imposed upon defendants in treble damage suits by the United States for violations of the antitrust laws.

These hearings will be held on Tuesday, July 27, and Wednesday, July 28, commencing at 10 a.m. in room 1318, New Senate Office Building. There will be further hearings at a later date to be announced.

Anyone who wishes to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate with the office of the subcommittee, room 412, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-5573.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself.

OUR OBLIGATION TO TREAT PRISONERS OF WAR HUMANELY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the United States is signatory to the Geneva Convention requiring humane treatment of prisoners of war. It has been our policy and practice throughout all of our involvement in the miserable civil war raging in Vietnam to surrender and turn over to officers of the ARVN forces all Vietcong prisoners of war we have taken. Our officers in the field in South Vietnam and our officials in Washington, in the name of humanity and decency, should rescind this policy and practice. It is well known that not only are these prisoners of war taken by Americans in combat mistreated following the time they are turned over to South Vietnamese authorities, but also the facts are, and they are well known, that many of these prisoners of war are executed. Probably more of these prisoners of war are executed than are permitted to survive. How can we Americans evade responsibility for the mistreatment of these war prisoners? The Geneva Convention, which had the all-out support of our Government when the provisions were written relative to humane treatment of prisoners of war and agreeing to those provisions, makes us responsible.

The Convention terms this a contingent responsibility. Article 12 of the Convention provides that the transfer of prisoners of war may be made to allies, with a contingent responsibility that such allies—in this particular, the South Vietnamese—do not mistreat the prisoners of war.

Article 12 specifically states:

> Prisoners of war are in the hands of the enemy Power, but not of the individuals or military units who have captured them. Irrespective of the individual responsibilities that may exist, the Detaining Power is responsible for the treatment given them.
>
> Prisoners of war may only be transferred by the Detaining Power to a Power which is a party to the Convention and after the Detaining Power has satisfied itself of the willingness and ability of such transferee Power to apply the Convention. When prisoners of war are transferred under such circumstances, responsibility for the application of the Convention rests on the Power accepting them while they are in its custody.
>
> Nevertheless, if that Power fails to carry out the provisions of the Convention in any important respect, the Power by whom the prisoners of war were transferred shall, upon being notified by the Protecting Power, take effective measures to correct the situation or shall request the return of the prisoners of war. Such requests must be complied with.

An argument has been made by some that were the United States to declare war against the Government of North Vietnam, then we would be obligated to treat humanely all prisoners of war taken by us. I assert that even without a formal declaration of war, the demands of humanity and the provisions of the Convention apply to us and should be respected by civilian officials of the U.S. Government and our military officers in the field in Vietnam. This regardless of whether or not there is a declaration of war by us against the Government of North Vietnam.

It is urgent, it seems to me, that we reverse our policy regarding treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam and accept our responsibility to treat all war prisoners we take with decency and humanity. May I say that the conscience of the world would find it revolting were those governing North Vietnam to place on trial our airmen who have been taken prisoners of war and execute any of them. I would favor the gravest reprisals against any such inhumane action. The lives of our airmen are precious indeed. As members of our Armed Forces, bombing installations in faraway Vietnam, responsive to orders and in accord with their duties as officers and enlisted men in our Armed Forces, they were acting under orders. In every sense of the term, they are prisoners of war, and are entitled to treatment as such, in accord with the Geneva Convention.

I had hoped for an honorable settlement of our involvement in this tragic war in Vietnam—a country which is of no strategic importance whatsoever to the defense of the United States. As stated in a letter termed "A Plea for Sanity," which I signed along with 18 other Senators of the United States, if members of our Armed Forces taken prisoner by those fighting under orders of the Hanoi government should be tried as war criminals and executed, then we indeed would have reached the peril point of no return, and the conflict would become, as stated, "a raging inferno burning away the last barrier of restraint."

The rulers of Hanoi should know that if, by perpetrating such threatened act of cruelty and brutality, they close the door and bar the path of moderation that could lead to a negotiated peace, then truly all Americans would unite behind our President in whatever course of action he might take in such event.

Men in uniform the world over, when captured in the performance of their duty, are entitled to be treated as prisoners of war. They must not be humiliated or mistreated. To try them and then execute them as criminals would be an outrage and in itself a crime against humanity. If the Hanoi government carries out the cruel threat it has made, it is as certain to follow as the night the day that our 7th Fleet and our airpower will destroy Haiphong, its docks, airfields, and missile sites, and then our forces will go on and wreak destruction throughout the Hanoi area.

Here is a sad situation almost too horrible to contemplate. Unfortunately, in the course of our operations in Vietnam, with our tremendous firepowers and napalm bombing, it has been authoritatively stated that for every Vietcong fighting man killed, doubtless four civilians—men, women, and children—have been killed. That ratio will be widened instead of diminished, were the rulers of Hanoi to place in execution and threaten execution of our airmen prisoners of war.

Historically, there is no such thing as North and South Vietnam. The Geneva Accords of 1954 provide:

> The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political boundary.

The entire area of what is termed North and South Vietnam is 2⅓ the size of the area of my State of Ohio. There is this great difference. In Ohio we have no mountain ranges, swamps, or jungles. The population of Ohio is approximately 10 million. Yet Vietnam, which contains mountain ranges that are uninhabitable, thick jungles that are uninhabited, and vast areas of swamps and rice paddies, has a total population of some 32 million, or did have that total population until our tremendous firepower killed so many thousands of Vietcong and civilians.

The escalation of this conflict is bound to result in the deaths of many more civilian women, children, and men in addition to those in the combat forces, formerly termed the Vietminh and now termed the Vietcong.

Let us hope that the rulers of Hanoi will take no action—such as trying our captured airmen as war criminals—which would make such escalation of the war inevitable and would make the deaths of many, many Vietnamese nationals inevitable.

THE FACTS WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senior Senator from Minnesota inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Saigon Takes Reins of CIA School," which had appeared the previous day on the front page of the New York Times, and asked that a member of one of the CIA subcommittees inform the Senate as to the purported facts in this article.

The Senator from Minnesota described the article as "confused." He is right. The article deals with the South Vietnamese Government's training school for their revolutionary development training program. Much of it is inaccurate in implication as well as in fact.

In passing, it is noted that the Senator misquotes the article when he lists the article's final paragraph. The words "not happy" are used instead of "not unhappy." We are sure this change in the meaning as expressed in the article was inadvertent, and only mention it in the case someone reads the purported quote of the last paragraph but not the last paragraph itself.

The training school in question is not in Saigon. It is in Vung Tau, in the delta. The school was established in 1964 by the Central Intelligence Agency in order to train Vietnamese from the rural areas to defend themselves and their fellow villagers against the political and terrorist incursions of the Vietcong.

The prime objective of this program was to reestablish contact between the villagers and the local authorities, to revive the confidence of the villagers in their local government, and to enlist the active participation of the latter in the war against the Vietcong.

Since its inception, the training at this school has been done by the Vietnamese. The direction and control of the teams, once they return home to begin work, is entirely in the hands of the local district and province chiefs of the South Vietnamese Government.

From its inception, the Central Intelligence Agency has provided the logistic and financial support to the effort. The CIA has also provided civilians who advise provincial officials of the South Vietnamese Government on political and civil problems. This is done in much the same way that American military personnel advise the same officials on military matters.

As soon as the school was set up and running successfully, the Central Intelligence Agency initiated negotiating to turn over the entire program, including the school, to the South Vietnamese Government. These negotiations were concluded in November 1965, and the South Vietnamese took control in early February 1966.

The South Vietnamese Government thereupon revamped its Rural Construction Ministry and appointed General Thang the Minister of Revolutionary Development. General Thang took over the entire CIA-sponsored cadre as the core of his new Ministry's effort. At that time the general issued a series of decrees which formalized his country's direction and control of the school and the entire program.

The South Vietnamese Government specifically requested that the Central Intelligence Agency continue its logistic and financial support, as well as its advisory role, during this transitional period. That is the way the relationship stands today.

As for the situation described in this article in the New York Times, what took place recently was an internal dispute among the Vietnamese staff at Vung Tau, touched off by Minister Thang's replacement of the commander he himself had appointed last February. As a result there was an element of the old staff which resented the changes that had taken place; and accordingly demonstrated against the new management. Seven instructors out of a total of some 400 were dismissed, including the director of training.

There is nothing secretive whatever about this training program or the affiliation with it of the Central Intelligence Agency. Both have been discussed at length, in the press and on radio and television.

Ambassador Lodge and the U.S. mission council, in concert with their appropriate counterparts in the South Vietnamese Government, are studying intensively the entire rural development cadre program, including the best methods of assistance.

At this point, let me emphasize that the CIA has done nothing, and is doing nothing, except what it has been formally asked to do by the appropriate officials of the United States Government and the South Vietnamese Government.

In other words, the Times article is more than "confused." Much of it was untrue. The implied charge that the CIA was hoodwinked into sponsoring an anti-South Vietnamese Government "third force" movement does not square with the facts.

Major Mai is an active duty officer in the Vietnamese Army. He did preach a dynamic message of intense nationalism, and his relations with his Vietnamese colleagues and superiors have not been free of friction. But the charge that as a "result" of his activities the South Vietnamese Government was forced to "take over" the Vung Tau school from the CIA is totally inaccurate.

In this connection, the author of this article, Mr. Charles Mohr, appears either to have changed his position, or to be confused himself.

In this article that he wrote on July 18, Mr. Mohr states:

> The change-over of the training program (from the Central Intelligence Agency to the South Vietnamese) took place in mid June.

And—

> As a result, Saigon government officials have taken control from the Central Intelligence Agency of the program for training the "Revolutionary Development Cadre"—armed experts in political propaganda.

But 2 months earlier, in an article he also wrote for the New York Times as of May 21, and directly contrary to this his article of July 18, Mr. Mohr gave the facts as they actually are when he said:

> The cadre training school at Vungtau, a coastal town near Saigon, lasted for 13 weeks. The school is run by the Vietnamese but is known to be financed by an American agency and has a number of American advisers.

In other words, if Mr. Mohr felt the school was being run by the Vietnamese in May, how can he now say that it was taken over by the Vietnamese from the CIA in June?

In a classified report made to the Senate upon my return to this country from the Far East earlier this year, I presented the details of a visit to Vung Tau with Major Mai—then captain—and others at the training school in question.

I ask unanimous consent that the declassified part of this Senate report on this school be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the declassified part of the Senate report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Vung Tau, Monday, January 3.—The first thing this morning was a briefing at the U.S. Embassy. Then we flew to Vung Tau.
>
> On the flight we were accompanied by Captain Le Xuan Mai, Director of the Vung Tau Farm.
>
> On arrival we were taken to the Farm, where political action teams are trained. On arrival, Captain Mai first briefed us.
>
> They take in natives, bringing in people who other people with whom they have contact say they know and trust. They operate on the coast where such a large part of the people live. The PAT are represented in each province.
>
> The class they had going down there at this time had 3,200 people. The next class is programmed for 3,800 people. They train 40 man political action teams, equipped with three medics each. The class also included 150 girls who were being trained primarily as midwives. It was essentially a large "civic action" course. They tried to teach the students a strong spirit concerning what they were fighting for. Vietnam has been at war for 25 years.
>
> Ever since the Japanese came, people had been influenced by Communist-Viet Cong propaganda. Most thought it was all right, customary to contribute to the Viet Cong. When many if not most come to Vung Tau Farm, they have a bad attitude; therefore, Captain Mai said they concentrated on orientations.
>
> When they arrived, the students often used expressions like "American imperialists," along with "French colonialists." At Vung Tau these young ones were taught there are absolute enemies and relative enemies. China, for example, it was constantly stressed, is an absolute enemy.
>
> The students were also taught that they had friends whose interests in South Vietnam were as dear as their own. Such were the United States, Korea, Australia, plus the other nations who were supporting the South Vietnamese.
>
> Those North Vietnamese fighting for the Chinese Communists are absolute enemies, and those who are mistaken, and have joined the Viet Cong, are absolute enemies if they won't come back when they have the chance.
>
> During phase I of the course, ———, Special stress is laid in creating confidence in the Vietnamese youth. The students are allowed, encouraged, to speak their minds fully about any problems there may be in the Vietnamese government, or anything else they may have on their minds. There is discussion of such problems as corruption, poverty, misery, and fatalism. They want them to talk about it, and they want to change it. They try to imbue them with a revolutionary spirit. Phase I is a three week intensive training period.
>
> During phase II there is special emphasis on the importance of a strong will. They formerly made a fourteen kilometer march, everyday. Now that is reduced to eight kilometers a day. The student is asked if he is ready to accept hardship, and the life of a revolutionary. They have a ceremony incident to issuing the black suit. The student must wear it willingly. The black suit is the traditional peasant black pajamas. An individual, once he is a member of a political action team, stays on the payroll indefinitely.
>
> During phase III they teach the student to accept the challenge of war. They teach him that he cannot stay around and do nothing, that much of the country is overrun by the Viet Cong, and that they cannot relax and put the whole future and destiny of the Republic of Vietnam in the hands of friends. They must do something for themselves.
>
> In phase IV the students are taught how to fight, and urged to fight. They are taught the use of various arms and explosives; but the main weapon is political action, propaganda, how to help peasants fix houses, promote literacy, and care for the sick. They learn to send medics out to the sick, instead of asking the sick to come to the medics. Captain Mai observed they didn't need much medicine; usually a friendly word and an aspirin was very good propaganda.
>
> During the course the students are given complete freedom to speak. In the beginning they generally resolutely criticize or accuse Americans, but then they are shown that they have no substantial basis for their arguments. They come to realize that the United States does not take from them, rather gives assistance. They are taught that if the Viet Cong are not present in the land, and the South Vietnamese can produce more rice, automatically there will be more wealth for all.
>
> In teaching the students at Vung Tau Farm, the instructors go back deep in Vietnamese history, because the ancestors pass the spirit from one generation to another. They remind the students of the story of the fairy and the dragon. In this Vietnamese story, the fairy represents spirit, and the dragon represents matter. Materialism is only 50% of life. So the students should not follow the Marxist way of 100% materialism, rather it should be a 50–50 proposition. They also use other legends, such as the one about the three-year-old boy who became a young man when the aggressor struck. They show why the people must unite if they are to defend themselves.
>
> At the Vung Tau Farm School there are seven steps in conducting a complete lesson.
>
> First, there is individual study, in a five-man cell.
>
> This is followed by a group lecture, at which the students take notes.
>
> Third is a period when the students discuss the lesson among themselves, and elect a secretary to take notes.
>
> The instructor then talks to the class, and corrects any mistakes, or mistaken ideas he feels they may have about the subject matter in question.
>
> The fifth step is students themselves volunteer to address, and carry on the lesson with the class.
>
> The sixth step is a summing up by the instructor of major points in the lesson.
>
> The seventh step is the examination.
>
> Each of the first six are two hour periods. The examination lasts one hour, so there are thirteen hours per lesson.
>
> Throughout the course the instructors use the technique of instilling strong faith. They keep repeating and emphasizing that South Vietnam will be victorious.
>
> There are five men in each cell of students. Eight cells go to make up a team. They teach parliamentary procedure and form a mock village government
>
> One half of their studies are in the school buildings, one half in the jungle. They set up defenses around villages, and defend against mock Viet Cong attacks.
>
> Before bed each night the student makes a pledge to be loyal, to discipline himself, to have no self interests, to help the sick, to help the poor and the aged, and to fight the Communists. In the morning again they make the same pledge.
>
> The students are taught that they can and will win with love and sincerity. From this has been derived a symbol which, in block letters, is the letter "T", super inscribed on the letter "H". These two letters, TH, form the first two letters of the three words in Vietnamese meaning Victory, Love, Sincerity, Thank, Thuong, Thanh.
>
> I asked Captain Mai to give me one of these "symbol" pins. It was interesting to watch the pride in his face as he pinned it on. They teach the student that this symbol, Victory, Love, Sincerity, blots out the hammer and sickle.
>
> The students are trained in the use of weapons, the submachine gun, the Browning automatic rifle, the M–1 rifle, carbines and grenades.
>
> The students are issued weapons when they get into the area where they plan to set up their permanent team.
>
> The ages of the students are from 15 to 56. The total training course is ten weeks.

Captain Mai and his Deputy then took us on a tour of the school.

At one student class we heard the student instructor ask, "Why do you think the people of Vietnam do not agree with President DeGaulle?" A very young student rose and replied, "First of all President DeGaulle is for a neutral South Vietnam for his own self-interest. He plans to later move in and re-colonize it, or at least regain his economic control."

The students are trained for eleven hours a day, six days a week. This does not include their physical training, before 8:00 in the morning, nor their study period from 7:30 to 11 o'clock at night.

When they graduate, they form "People's Action Teams", sometimes referred to as "Political Action Teams." The Vietnamese words for these teams are Biet Chinh. It means special political.

Captain Mai joined the Army by going to the Military Academy at Dalat in 1952. He is 39 years old, had a year at Benning.

Captain Mai says that there are now many cadres in the provinces. Sometimes they get discouraged, but the overall is improving. Every now and then he gets a letter from someone who becomes disillusioned. He received a letter from Saigon the other day in which one of his students said he had seen people beaten by the police. The individual was shocked, asked Captain Mai to help.

In Vietnam there are 44 provinces. Each has about seven districts. Beneath the district are the villages.

We listened to some more classes. In one two students got in an argument. Captain Mai or Captain Phac said one had asserted, "England dominates the Afro-Asian block." Another student challenged him and said, "You should give names to justify your position." This from youths from the villages.

We then went with Captain Mai on an automobile tour around the training farm. Captain Mai explained that only one course or one class could be taught at any one time. After the faculty rested for ten days, then started on a new class. The reason they didn't have several grades going on at one time was lack of instructors.

Captain Mai explained they had had a variant of the school with Montagnard students up in Pleiku. Captain Mai said 25% of the students go on leave after the 4th week. Those who stay are urged to go out and help the villagers.

We saw a camp of refugees by the Farm, with the students at Vung Tau helping them out.

We said we were amazed at the depth of the political questions and political interests of the students. Captain Mai explained that the villagers for years had been harassed by the Viet Cong, that this had forced them to think politically.

One of the various things done to defy the Viet Cong was to put the national colors on little T-shirts, then hand them out to five-year old children. In effect, they were defying the Viet Cong to take the shirt off of a five-year old child.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Sunday, on the well-known television program "Meet the Press," a great American, Adm. William F. Raborn, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, accepted questions with respect to the structure and functioning of that Agency. The interrogation panel consisted of Mr. John Steele, of Time-Life magazines, Mr. Max Frankel, of the New York Times, Mr. Robert Goralski, of NBC News, and Mr. Lawrence Spivak, permanent panel member.

Because the questions and answers incident to this program in turn furnish the replies to many questions about the Agency that have been brought up in the past, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Meet the Press

(Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak, Sunday, July 17, 1966; guest, Adm. William F. Raborn, former Director, CIA; panel John Steele, Time-Life magazines, Max Frankel, the New York Times, Robert Goralski, NBC News, Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member; moderator, Neil Boggs)

Mr. Boggs. This is Neil Boggs, inviting you to "Meet the Press."

* * * * *

Mr. Boggs. Our guest today on "Meet the Press," is Admiral William F. Raborn, recently retired Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Admiral Raborn is widely recognized as the developer of the Polaris missile system. He succeeded John McCone as head of the CIA in April, 1965. Now we will have the first question from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. Spivak. Admiral Raborn, the Senate is engaged in a controversy over the question of adding members of the Foreign Relations Committee to the committee that now oversees the CIA. Would you say that it makes much difference to the CIA what Senate committees oversee it?

Admiral Raborn. It has been the position of the agency, and it was my position too, Mr. Spivak, that the oversight activities of the Congress were distinctly the business of the Congress.

Mr. Spivak. May I have your opinion. You are out of the CIA at the present time. What is your personal opinion, does it make any difference?

Admiral Raborn. Well, I stated my opinion. My opinion is that this is a matter which the Congress itself would want to resolve and it is not a matter of conjecture by me.

Mr. Spivak. Do you mean to tell me, Admiral, now that you are a private citizen, you have no opinion on a matter of that importance that might be of great help to the American people if you did give an opinion?

Admiral Raborn. As a private citizen I would make my views known to the people who have to do with such matters, namely the Congress, and I think I must be appropriately reticent about commenting on the responsibilities of responsible people.

Mr. Spivak. Admiral, it was reported that you refused to give members of the Foreign Relations Committee any information on sources and methods. Can you tell us why you refused?

Admiral Raborn. Yes. I am directed by the Congress, the Congressional Act that set up the Agency, Public Law 80–253 of 1947. It specifically charged the Director of Central Intelligence with safeguarding methods and sources of intelligence and it has been the practice of all previous Administrations since then and under the current Administration, that we would report fully on these activities to the Oversight Committees set up to oversee the activities of the intelligence agencies and bodies of the United States government.

Mr. Spivak. Admiral, as you know there has been a good deal of criticism and even hostility in recent years against the CIA. Would you say that any of the criticism has been justified?

Admiral Raborn. Oh, I am sure that none of us lead a blameless life. I think there has only been one Person I believe in the history of mankind who has lived a blameless life, but by and large I would say that the criticisms have been largely based on inaccuracies and are not justified at all.

Mr. Spivak. What is your explanation for the rising tide of criticism against the CIA in recent years?

Admiral Raborn. Well, I think that this is in the nature of the organization. It, of course, has to be secret and this fact that it has to be secret was recognized even by General Washington in an original letter that I have in which he stated that secrecy in intelligence matters was a primary essence of intelligence.

I think that the American people have not had the Central Intelligence Agency and other intelligence activities of the United States government properly explained to them and this is one reason why I gladly accepted your kind invitation to appear on this program because it is a wonderful organization, one that is extremely vital to the United States, the security of the United States, and one which they can not do without.

Mr. Spivak. Now may I give you an opportunity to make an explanation on one matter of great importance: Senator Stephen Young of Ohio was recently reported as charging that the CIA has become an invisible government answerable only to itself. Now how would you answer that charge?

Admiral Raborn. I would say that this is a complete fallacy.

Mr. Spivak. What about his charge that the CIA was employing a small army in Vietnam?

Admiral Raborn. I would say also this is a complete fallacy.

Mr. Spivak. You are not hiding behind CIA secrecy when you make these general refutations, are you, Admiral?

Admiral Raborn. No, I am just answering them directly. Trying to.

Mr. Spivak. The CIA has been charged also with stirring up insurrections and sometimes running little wars. Would you say that that too is a false charge?

Admiral Raborn. I would say that the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the clandestine activities, are relatively small by comparision to the major weight of their activities in other fields and that any activities of this sort is in conformance with the approval of the National Security Council and in furtherance of United States policy.

* * * * *

Mr. Frankel. Admiral, since so relatively small part of the Agency's work is, as you say, clandestine, since much of it is analytical, scientific, collecting well-known information, do you think that part of the trouble and misunderstanding of your critics is due to the fact that there is too much secrecy surrounding the Agency?

Admiral Raborn. This could be so, but I rather doubt it. As a matter of fact, I doubt it sincerely. The nature of our work is that we of course make these reports, as you say, to the Administration authorities and to the Congress, that we make it on a "need to know" basis, give it to the people who have a need for it.

Obviously it would be unwise to make this general knowledge because of the delicacy of the matters.

Mr. Frankel. For instance, the total budget you operate under, the total number of employees that you have. You have been in secret projects before, Polaris—the Pentagon has many secrets. Yet the overall activities, the extent of them are known. And I know that law forbids you now to talk about the budget and the number of employees, but is this really necessary, is so much mystery necessary?

Admiral Raborn. Yes indeed it is. If we knew, for instance the exact—I am not saying we don't—the exact numbers that the KGB, we will say, employs, and their budget, it is quite possible for one intelligence service to determine the effectiveness of the other and their capabilities, if you know these salient factors. You can work it out, piece it together, little by little. So this is a very tightly-held secret.

Mr. Frankel. Let me ask you about another aspect of the secrecy: When we tried to determine from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and other universities who have done, I understand, very good work for the agency, they told us that you insist that they not tell us the size of the subsidy they get from the Agency, that often they can publish material, but they can't identify government money behind it. Why does that have to be so?

Admiral Raborn. Well, I think this is not necessarily restricted to the CIA. This is common practice in many classified projects from all departments of the government. It is just information that we don't want loosed to the hands of foreign intelligence services.

Mr. Frankel. In connection with that there has been another controversy recently. The United States Information Agency, for instance, is forbidden by law to propagandize within our country. Yet some people have suggested that you have allowed your men to write in American magazines, that you have supported books that are published in the United States, magazines that circulate in the United States, without ever telling the reader that they are getting government material, that they are getting official points of view.

Do you think that is right for the CIA when, say the USIA is not allowed to do it?

Admiral Raborn. Well, let's put it this way: The Agency is accused of many things and quite a bit of it is most inaccurate. Specifically, now, as to permitting the scholars who are a large part of the Central Intelligence Agency, they feel a need to publish objectively information on situations existent around the world. To the extent that they can be cleared from a security point of view, they add to the general understanding of the public, and this goes back to your problem of secrecy, now, a general understanding of the public of the actual facts in a matter under scrutiny, and it is a public service. Whether or not a writer should be identified as a member of a government agency I think that is a matter for the Department concerned to make up their minds upon. It has been the past policies of the Central Intelligence Agency not to trade on a name but to let the work stand on its own merit, which is the way scholars like to have their work considered.

Mr. Frankel. Don't you think it is important that we the readers know that when a scholar comes with material that this is really material that has been cleared as officially acceptable at least by an agency of government?

Admiral Raborn. "Acceptable" connotes something that I can't buy. Let's say that they represent facts or objectives. If they are objective and factual that is the thing that should be brought out. The Central Intelligence Agency does not write articles in support of administration policies or anything of that kind, so I don't like to get that connotation in there.

I think it is an open question whether or not scholars in the future should identify themselves. As a matter of fact, I rather perhaps think they should. I like to think that the Central Intelligence Agency can be more widely accepted as a good, worthwhile member, church-going member of the family of departments that make up our fine government.

Mr. Steele. Admiral Raborn, you told Mr. Spivak a minute or two ago that a lot of the criticism of CIA stemmed from inaccuracies. I want to ask you if perhaps there isn't a different kind of criticism that is stimulated, one perhaps stemming from our enemies on the other side of the so-called Iron Curtain. Are you conscious of any attempt to undermine the CIA, to question its validity from not-sympathetic sources?

Admiral Raborn. Yes, indeed, Mr. Steele. The Communist intelligence services are working night and day, twenty-four hours every day around the world, to undermine the effectiveness of the Central Intelligence Agency and of democratic processes and institutions around the world. We know that, for instance, there is a "Department-D" known as the "Department of Disinformation." And the KGB, Lt. General Yagayansi, I believe, is the head of it—this is no secret—who spends their time in trying to undercut truly democratic institutions and agencies.

Mr. Steele. What does this Department D do about the CIA? What activities are you aware of?

Admiral Raborn. They float stories around the world and then the Communist press picks it up immediately and puts it on the air and prints it in the newspapers. Generally these stories are completely false and they have just enough truth in them to be twisted all out of shape.

Mr. Steele. Has this activity of this Soviet department made things more difficult or is it really more of a joking matter around the world?

Admiral Raborn. I don't mean to just single out the KGB. All foreign intelligence services that are opposed to the democratic way of life and the true democracy such as the United States represents, engage in these activities and it is part and parcel of their work and they, of course, are out to discredit anything that tends to thwart their nefarious activities.

Mr. Steele. Well, it has been said quite often by outsiders that the CIA really is locked in a deadly battle with this Department-D and the KGB. Do you feel that is going too far or is the competition such that it really does amount to a serious battle?

Admiral Raborn. I think that the Central Intelligence Agency is but a small part of the national effort to perpetuate truly democratic ideals and freedoms around the world. We do have a significant part to play but I think we shouldn't overdo it.

Mr. Goralski. Admiral, aren't you unwittingly helping the KGB by not denying some of the stories that they are circulating? Every time we call the CIA, we, as newsmen, we always get nothing but a "No comment."

Admiral Raborn. Well, sir, this is the policy, which is long established and it has generally been recognized over the years that you deny no stories, good or bad, you accept no praise and you try to ignore criticisms. Because they are largely uninformed, in both cases, and you never know when to stop once you get into the practice.

There are those in the United States government that from time to time—such as the Secretary of State, such as the Congressional oversight committees, knowing the facts, get up and do, for the record, straighten things out. Unfortunately they don't get quite as much publicity in the news media around the world as some of the accusations do.

Mr. Goralski. In the light of this criticism of the CIA of late, are you having trouble recruiting Americans to work for the Agency?

Admiral Raborn. No. Let me say this. This is one of the real wholesome things that I can say. The fine, patriotic, really outstanding men and women who apply for lifetime employment with the Agency every year. The people of the Agency come from more than 600 universities. Seventy-seven percent of them have college degrees and about 20 percent have a Masters or a Doctorate.

Mr. Goralski. I wonder if I could ask you a question on Vietnam. One of our concerns is that we don't really have enough information on what Hanoi is thinking or for that matter Peking as well. Do you feel we know enough about their own attitudes right now or could we get a better insight?

Admiral Raborn. I would say, Mr. Goralski, no intelligence service is ever satisfied with the amount of information that they have and in a closed society where the efforts of a nation are closely controlled in the hands of ten to 12 hard-lined, close-mouthed men, it is quite difficult to get into the minds of those men. You have to read their actions in order to get their line.

Mr. Spivak. Admiral, one of the grave concerns in this country is that Communist China might enter the war in Vietnam if the U.S. furthers its escalation. Can you give us an opinion on that, your own opinion?

Admiral Raborn. I guess this would be a very difficult thing to do because the spectrum of things that could trigger off such an action is very wide and I perhaps should not try to conjecture on it. I do have my own personal views, but these are matters which I think are best left to the policy makers.

Mr. Spivak. Admiral, in a speech you made when you were head of the CIA, you said this, and I quote: "I can assure you that we deserve the confidence and support of the public."

Now can you tell us just why?

Admiral Raborn. Well, I certainly can. Going back to President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson, all have expressed their thoughts on the Central Intelligence Agency as an extremely essential part of the United States government. Now having been at the head of the Central Intelligency Agency and as Director of Central Intelligence, which includes responsibility for the coordination of the rest of the intelligence activities of the United States government, I can say proudly—and I am not a Johnny-Come-Lately around Washington—that the Agency deserves the unbounded admiration, the respect and support of the United States citizens everywhere and of the Free World everywhere. I have greatest admiration for them. The breadth and depth of competence, the integrity, the loyalty, the willingness to serve the government under adverse conditions sometimes and under criticism is something that I thought perhaps was the sole property of the military.

Mr. Spivak. Well, Admiral, we did pretty well in this country without a CIA, which was set up in 1947. What do you think would happen if the CIA were abolished?

Admiral Raborn. May I suggest, sir, that your statement is not correct. Before Pearl Harbor there was no CIA. We had a Pearl Harbor. And I think if there is a motto of CIA, it is "There will never be another Pearl Harbor," and Pearl Harbor caused this country to go to a Central Intelligence Agency type of intelligence work.

Mr. Spivak. You think with a half hour warning time that we have the CIA is sufficiently informed on countries that have missiles so that there can not be a surprise attack against this country again?

Admiral Raborn. I would say you are far better off with it than without it.

Mr. Frankel. I would like to touch on the clandestine part of your activity—I think I am not going to get very far if I ask you to discuss it in detail, but CIA activities in this area over the years have raised some questions almost of a philosophical nature and I think from what little I know about the Agency it isn't always necessarily the Agency that has to answer, it is the President of the United States himself who does. But being a part of that machinery, what are your thoughts on just how far we Americans really ought to go in this world in terms of meddling in other people's business? In terms of throwing money into elections, into helping the people we like and resisting the people we don't like, some of which at least crudely stated might resemble some of the activities of our Communist opponents. But we of course think we are doing it for better purposes. But how far do you think we ought to go?

Admiral Raborn. Mr. Frankel, I think it is the thrust of the entire United States government, through its diplomacy and through its U.S. aid programs and the security apparatuses to safeguard first the security of the United States and assist in the safeguarding of the Free World, and to promote our way of life, vis-a-vis the active efforts of the Communist movement to undermine the free institutions. I think we should go far enough to win, and this includes military action, and unfortunately sometimes it comes. You have to say, do we let them rule the world or are we going to stand up for what we know is a better way of life?

Mr. Frankel. It is usually that question: Is a Communist going to profit from this fellow winning an election or this government coming to power or this government falling? That should be the decisive point?

Admiral Raborn. I wouldn't like to get too specific, but I think the main thrust of the philosophy of the United States Government is what I was trying to speak to and the CIA is just a part of that.

Mr. Steele. Admiral, it has been said that a very small percentage of your activity and energy is devoted to so-called clandestine or covert activity, is that correct?

Admiral Raborn. Only a very small fraction of the entire effort of the Central Intelligence Agency has to do with clandestine activities, Mr. Steele.

Mr. Steele. Admiral, many people don't understand what a national intelligence estimate is. Can you tell us in a very few words what it is and how it is made?

Admiral Raborn. Yes, sir, I will try. The national intelligence estimate is the general views of the entire intelligence apparatus of the United States which includes of course the Central Intelligence Agency, the Intelligence Department of the Department of State, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and the Atomic Energy Commission. They are formulated in weekly meetings in which these are put out in formal pamphlets and signed by the Director of Central Intelligence. Exceptions from what is printed in there are also freely entered so that the reader can have the benefit of both points of view on a particular point.

Mr. Steele. Is it for the President of the United States?

Admiral Raborn. It is for the President and for the members of the Administration who have need for them.

Mr. Steele. And as such that is used in the making of foreign policy?

Admiral Raborn. As such they are part of the information that goes into whatever actions are taken.

Mr. Goralski. Can you tell us if any changes were implemented at CIA as a result of the Special Committee that was appointed by President Kennedy?

Admiral Raborn. Yes, I think so. It has been an extremely efficient and effective Committee, Mr. Goralski. In my view it has been most helpful. They give us an objective point of view from really a distinguished panel.

Mr. Goralski. But there were obvious changes that did take place within the organization as a result?

Admiral Raborn. And continually so. We are trying to improve always.

Mr. Goralski. You couldn't tell us what some of those areas are?

Admiral Raborn. No, not without getting into security matters.

Mr. Spivak. Admiral, it was reported that you refused to tell the Foreign Relations Committee whether the CIA ever used the Fulbright Scholarship Program as a cover for your agents. Why did you hesitate to say you didn't, if you didn't?

Admiral Raborn. Well, this came at the end of a series of questions which had to do with sources and methods which, of course, were quite private, and I did answer it, although I understand it didn't get into the—this is one exception I made because of the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Chairman Fulbright. I did answer it, but there were four of five other people talking at the same time and I understand it didn't get into the record. I said categorically No.

Mr. Boggs. Thank you, Admiral Raborn, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR THE RAILROAD AND THE PUBLIC

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on Monday, July 18, I pointed out to the Senate certain contradictory findings by the ICC in the case of the New Haven and Boston & Maine Railroads.

This situation is not an isolated instance of favoritism to the railroads, but appears to be part and parcel of an overall pattern of Government designed to meet the desires of the railroads to the detriment of other forms of transportation and the public.

I am not alone in reaching this conclusion.

The National Governors' Conference was held in Los Angeles on July 4–7 this year.

The elected Governors of their States took note of this situation.

The conference adopted a resolution calling on the President and Secretary of Labor to take action to ward off the airline strike.

To date, no effective action has been taken, and the railroads have been the beneficiaries of this lack of action.

The Governors also noted the almost complete shutdown on inland navigation projects, calling attention to the fact that "not a single major navigation project has been approved since November of 1964," which is a very significant date, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIII—Inland Navigation Projects

Whereas through the years in waterway developments involving navigation one of the chief benefits of a project has been "transportation savings;" and

Whereas historically these benefits or potential savings have been computed on the basis of freight rates, or the difference between typical barge rates and actual railroad rates; and

Whereas on November 24, 1964 the Corps of Engineers, at the direction of the Bureau of the Budget, issued new guidelines which changed the criteria for evaluating navigation projects and which compel the Corps of Engineers to speculate on how much the railroads might lower their rates if the waterway is built and in addition guess how much traffic will be diverted from the waterway to the railroads due to this reduction; and

Whereas on May 4, 1966, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget recognized the difficulties involved in projecting rates for the evaluation of navigation projects and stated that guidelines establishing a cost basis of evaluation navigation benefits would soon be issued, based on long run marginal costs; and

Whereas accurate cost data are difficult to obtain and dependable techniques for determining such costs are lacking, and thus a cost basis analysis may be even more restrictive than the so-called "water-compelled rates;" and

Whereas not a single major navigation project has been approved since November of 1964, when the new navigation benefit criteria were first adopted and the new criteria even affect all projects presently authorized; and

Whereas navigation projects in all areas of the nation have been adversely affected by the application of new criteria such as the Yazoo River, Mississippi to Lake Erie-Ohio Canal, the Missouri River Sioux City to Yankton, the Red River, the Trinity River, the Santee River System South Carolina and the Central Oklahoma Canal; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Governors' Conference urges the Congress of the United States to establish, by law, the standards and criteria for determining navigation benefits based on the historic, time proven, current freight rate method and that no revision to such adopted criteria be permitted except by specific approval of the Public Works Committees of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a perusal of this resolution will indicate that the Bureau of the Budget—an agency of the White House—in effect has directed a closing down of inland waterway developments.

Those Governors who supported this resolution and who support the public interest rather than the ambitions of a few are to be commended.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in today's New York Times, showing the great advantages of waterways to the industrial development of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1966]

Transport Notes: Waterside Sites—Sharp Expansion Reported in Industrial Locations

There was a sharp expansion in industrial waterside plant locations in the second quarter of 1966, Braxton B. Carr, president of the American Waterways Operators, Inc., reported yesterday.

Production industries constructed, expanded or announced plans to construct or expand 165 plant facilities during April, May and June, compared with 119 such facilities constructed during the same period of 1965.

The largest previous quarterly construction figure came in the third quarter of 1962, when 189 plant facilities were built or announced, according to the announcement.

Mr. Carr said that 88 of the 176 production industries that had announced construction or expansion programs along or adjacent to navigable waters reported investments expenditures totaling $1.88-billion.

We pointed out that while all of these industries might not use water transportation, the availability of commercial barge service and the effect this service had on the general freight structure were factors in plant locations along the nation's 25,380 miles of commercially navigable waterways.

Metal-producing industries led all other industries, with the construction or expansion of 44 plants. In addition, 33 chemical plants, 25 general manufacturing plants and

22 docks, wharves and terminals were among the 165 new projects.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement which I issued on March 8, 1966, following an adverse report on a proposal to improve the Hudson-Champlain-Richelieu Waterway—by the International Champlain Waterway Board, headed, I believe, by personnel of the Army Engineers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator George D. Aiken today issued the following statement on the Champlain Waterway Board's adverse report on the Champlain Waterway:

"This report comes as no surprise but I must admit to disappointment over the findings.

"It is significant that not a single new waterway proposal studied by the Army Corps of Engineers in the last one and one-half years has been approved.

"The findings show the impact of the railroad interests opposing the Waterway.

"Reasonable people will find it difficult to understand how the Champlain Waterway Board could cite the railroads' claim that 7 million tons of freight would be diverted if the Waterway is built, and also conclude that insufficient new commerce would be generated to justify construction of the Waterway.

"If trucking were to benefit from the diversion, as the Report claims, it would have done so already. It is therefore clear the tonnage potential has been grossly underestimated.

"Reasonable people may also ask how the Board could conclude that insufficient traffic would be available for the Waterway when the Associated Industries of Vermont, in a survey of its members, found that 25 percent of these industries in Vermont would use the Waterway.

"The same old arguments were used to oppose the St. Lawrence Seaway.

"The Vermont State Railroads Association, representing 12 lines operating in New York and New England, presented testimony to prove that 'development of the Champlain Waterway would have disastrous effects on the common carrier railroads in the immediate area and the entire New England district.'

The Boston and Maine claimed it would lose $1 million worth of business annually and the Central Vermont estimated its freight loss at $1.3 million.

"The Delaware and Hudson said it would lose 4,444,580 tons of traffic worth $11.3 million and would have to abandon freight service in northern New York and Vermont.

"The New York, New Haven, and Hartford foresaw the loss of almost $3 million freight and the Bangor and Aroostook predicted the Waterway would cost them $897,000 in business.

"The long history of waterways development shows again and again that the railroads gain rather than lose business in the long run, as low cost Waterway traffic generates new industrialization and greater demand for rail, truck and water transport.

"Once a waterway proposal is turned down, there is little or no chance that rail rates will be reduced. The railroads are free to continue to operate without waterway competition and may adjust rates upward for every extra dollar the traffic will bear.

"In the long run, this can only mean higher freight rates in the Champlain Valley Basin, if the International Joint Commission lets this adverse decision stand, and the railroads will have scored a signal victory over the public interest."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, granting that railroads are important to the economy, it is my contention that agriculture, inland industry, recreational development and the national security are also important and should receive the unbiased consideration which is both needed and deserved.

SENATOR McGOVERN PARTICIPATES IN ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON CHINA POLICY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last February, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], participated in a 3-hour roundtable discussion on American policy in the Far East.

For many months, Senator McGovern has been working diligently for better relations between the United States and China. I wholeheartedly agree with his basic premise that "the more diplomatic and economic contact there is between China and the outside world, the more likely it is that China will move in a less belligerent course." If we are ever going to achieve a peaceful world, we must find a way to draw China into the mainstream of ongoing arms control and disarmament negotiations.

Mr. President, I found this roundtable discussion on China most illuminating, and I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the proceedings, which appeared in the May 1966 issue of Commentary magazine, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONTAINING CHINA: A ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION WITH BERNARD B. FALL, RICHARD N. GOODWIN, GEORGE McGOVERN, AND JOHN P. ROCHE

Last February, Commentary asked Bernard B. Fall, Richard N. Goodwin, George McGovern, and John P. Roche to participate in a three-hour round-table discussion centering on the question of whether the purpose of American policy in the Far East is to contain Chinese expansion or to halt the spread of Communism. The discussion, moderated by Norman Podhoretz, editor of Commentary, was entirely spontaneous and held before an invited audience which participated during the third hour. What follows is an edited transcript of the entire proceedings.

Bernard B. Fall, a native of France, is professor of international relations at Howard University, and the author of The Two Vietnams; his new book, Vietnam Witness, will be published later this month. Richard N. Goodwin, a former special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is currently a fellow of the Center for Advanced Studies at Wesleyan University. George McGovern is the junior United States Senator (Dem.) from South Dakota. John P. Roche is Morris Hillquit professor of history and politics at Brandeis University and a former national chairman of ADA; his books include Quest for the Dream and Shadow and Substance.

Norman Podhoretz: Unfashionable as it is at this moment to have a discussion of American foreign policy that doesn't focus specifically on Vietnam,[1] I nevertheless think that there may be some value in trying to set the issues that concern all of us so urgently today into a somewhat broader context—the long-range conflict between the United States and China. In terms of that conflict, the war in Vietnam may perhaps be seen—and apparently is seen by the present administration—as a tactical element within an overall strategy. For despite all the official talk about preserving the freedom of South Vietnam, one gathers that what the United States actually thinks it is doing in Vietnam is containing China in Asia, much as it contained the Soviet Union in Europe from 1947 on.

The best brief statement I myself have seen of this particular interpretation of American policy was made by Adlai Stevenson shortly before he died, in reply to a group of writers who had appealed to him to resign his post at the UN in protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam. Here is what Stevenson said:

"I would like to send you my reasons for believing that whatever criticisms may be made over the detail and emphasis of our foreign policy, its purpose and direction are sound . . . . The period from 1947 to 1962 was largely occupied in fixing the postwar line with the Soviet Union. It is not a very satisfactory one, since it divides Germany and Berlin, but the Russians respect it in Europe. So do we . . . .

"We have no such line with the Chinese. Since they are in an earlier, more radical stage in their revolution, it may be more difficult to establish one. Should we try? And is the line we stand on halfway across Vietnam a reasonable line? Should we hold it? . . .

"The line inherited by the Democratic administration is the 17th Parallel. History does not always give us the most convenient choice . . . . Since this is the line, should we hold it? The answer depends on the assumptions made about Chinese power. In the past, some Chinese dynasties have been aggressive, claiming sovereignty over wide areas of Asia, including all of Southeast Asia and even some of India. So far the new Communist "dynasty" has been very aggressive. Tibet was swallowed, India attacked, the Malays had to fight twelve years to resist a "national liberation" they could receive from the British by a more peaceful route. Today, the apparatus of infiltration and aggression is already at work in North Thailand. Chinese maps show . . . the furthest limits of the old empire marked as Chinese. I do not think the idea of Chinese expansionism is so fanciful that the effort to check it is irrational.

"And if one argues that it should not be checked, then I believe you set us off on the old, old route whereby expansive powers push at more and more doors, believing they will open until, at the ultimate door, resistance is unavoidable, and major war breaks out . . . My hope in Vietnam is that relatively small-scale resistance now may establish the fact that changes in Asia are not to be precipitated by outside force. This was the point of the Korean War. This is the point of the conflict in Vietnam. I believe Asia will be more stable if the outcome is the same in both—a negotiated line and a negotiated peace. . . ."

Now interestingly enough, George Kennan, who, of course, was the architect of our containment policy in Europe, recently said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam—Senator Fulbright's "teach-in," as James Reston called it—that the same measures which worked in Europe could not, for a variety of reasons, work in Asia. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that President Johnson and his advisers do believe that, with certain modifications, China *can* be contained by a combination of military, political, and economic force. Vietnam, according to this reasoning, is Greece in 1947. It is also, one gathers from some of Secretary Rusk's pronouncements, Czechoslovakia in

---

[1] This discussion took place on February 14, before the China hearings opened up the question of American policy toward China for the first time in many years.—Ed.

1938. Thus, as Stevenson suggested, American policy toward the Communist world in the postwar period can be regarded as perfectly consistent—not only in itself, but in its continuous and unwavering determination not to repeat any of the mistakes of the 1930's which presumably led to World War II.

Now I would like to propose, if only for the sake of argument, that we agree here as to the *ambitions* of China in Asia, and that we further agree as to the fact that, for the time being at least, it is mainly American power that stands in the way of these ambitions. Once we have agreed on those two propositions, we can move on to the really difficult questions which have to be examined. First of all, *should* the United States be trying to contain China at all? Or, to put the same question in another way: is China really a threat to the United States? And if so, in what sense?

Secondly, *can* China be contained in Asia as the Soviet Union was contained in Europe?

Thirdly, even assuming that China both can and should be contained, does containment require absolute American opposition to a Communist regime in Vietnam, or Laos, or Thailand? Would such regimes necessarily pose a threat to the United States? In what sense would they constitute a threat to American national interests?

During the Dulles era, the rhetoric of American foreign policy was militantly, even religiously, anti-Communist. The assumption was that there existed an international Communist conspiracy directed from a single center, and dedicated to the overthrow of the West by any and all means. Since 1960—and largely, I suppose, in response to the fragmentation of the Communist world, the Sino-Soviet dispute, the growth of "polycentrism"—the rhetoric has changed. Communism is no longer spoken of in official circles, and certainly not in public pronouncements, as an absolute evil, or as a temporary aberration which is destined to fall of its own internal contradictions. That kind of inverse bolshevism is gone. But the irony is that our actions nowadays seem at odds with the assumptions behind the new, rather more sophisticated, rhetoric, and far more in tune with the assumptions behind the Dulles rhetoric than the actions of the Eisenhower administration itself were. And this, I think, is perhaps the major source of the general confusion over the issues we are going to try to throw some light on in this discussion.

Mr. Goodwin, as a former adviser to both Presidents Johnson and Kennedy, you are probably in the best position of anyone here to tell us whether the Stevenson statement I just read actually represents the thinking of our government.

Richard Goodwin: I don't believe that the United States government has a clear China policy. Over the next years, though, I think you will see one emerge. It is true, after all, that policies like the containment of Russia, or relations with China, emerge out of conflict and experience; they are not imposed on a situation in advance. China, although an immediate enemy in Korea, has not up until this moment been, or been felt to be, a physical threat—which is perhaps why a clear policy toward China has not yet evolved. But then we had no consistent policy toward the Soviet Union either until the late 40's, when, out of our experience in Greece and Turkey and other countries, we became clearer about what we felt were Soviet intentions.

I think it is important for us to try to get at the ultimate and very rarely answered questions of foreign policy, such as why we want to help the underdeveloped world, or why we want to contain the Soviet Union. These questions are rarely answered, and for a good reason, which is that they involve enormously difficult and chancy predictions about history—predictions that depend upon a whole series of assumptions and judgments which, like judgments about literature, are highly fallible. Any good foreign policy, therefore, has at least to observe two cautions. First, at every step you have to leave as many options open as possible and decide as little as possible; because you may be wrong, you have to leave yourself with opportunities to change your mind, to make different decisions in the future. Secondly, since almost all important policy judgments are speculations, you must avoid risking too much on the conviction that you are right. At the same time, while trying to do all this, you cannot allow yourself to be paralyzed in action; you still have to meet specific situations and circumstances.

Observing those cautions, let me take a quick look at the ultimate question of whether we want to contain China at all. What difference does it make to us if China takes Southeast Asia, and the rest of Asia for that matter? Why should we care if China takes Manchuria and Burma? Or, in the most extreme case, would it be in our interest to act if Chinese armies marched into India, and the Indian government asked us for help? Should we respond, or should we let China have India?

These are not easy questions to answer—although what our actual response would be is very clear: we would, of course, respond immediately and fight China in India. But whether or not we should, it seems to me, is a more difficult problem. What would the harm be to the United States if all or most of Asia fell to China?

Well, there is first of all the simple proposition that we don't want to allow people to be conquered by other people when ours is the only power that can prevent it. This is a motive with an idealistic basis, but it can't be overlooked as part of the answer. Secondly, a Chinese conquest of Asia would enormously strengthen elements hostile to the United States—I avoid the word "Communism"—in other parts of the world, and weaken our position in Latin America, Africa, and everywhere else, just as Soviet successes operated to weaken our position throughout the world for a period of time. It would put enormous pressure on the Soviet Union itself to move or else completely lose control of the Communist world. Therefore the likelihood is that were China to be left unchecked, we would be faced with a militant Soviet Union (unless the militancy were directed toward China, which is unlikely). Moreover, it would immeasurably strengthen a country which is already a nuclear power, and which within half a decade, or a little more, will also have intercontinental missiles and all the other paraphernalia of destruction, aimed at us, the declared enemy.

Perhaps most important, the impact on American society itself of such an enormous gain to a hostile power would be immeasurable. If the fall of China to Communism contributed to McCarthyism, or Soviet gains to the militarization of the United States, a victory of this scale by a hostile nation like China would, I think, seriously erode the civil liberties and non-military traditions of this country to an extent that we have never experienced before in our history. As a nation, we would be put very much on the defensive, and the result would be an undermining of the principles of our own society.

Those considerations are what lead me to think that it is essential, not to contain the Chinese—because to contain them means to stop them right where they are, and there are places, such as the Russian border, where we don't care about stopping them, and there are places, such as Tibet, where we don't have enough interest to try to stop them—but to keep China from absorbing all of Asia. The basic question for American foreign policy, then, is not whether, but how and under what circumstances.

Podhoretz: Senator McGOVERN, does it seem to you that we have a vital interest to defend in Asia?

GEORGE McGOVERN: I think our greatest interest in Asia is in the prevention of a war with China. I would view a military conflict between the United States and mainland China as the worst possible catastrophe that could develop in the rest of this century, and in my opinion the prevention of that war ought to be the number one task of American statesmanship for as long as we can look down the road.

I think it's desirable to prevent Chinese military power from expanding across the face of Asia, but I don't regard that as the principal challange China presents to the world today. There may be a stage as we move along when China will, in fact, become militarily engaged with our principal allies in the Far East, but I don't see that as an immediate probability. The greatest danger that it will happen, in my view, comes from the policy we are presently following in Southeast Asia and in other parts of Asia—the policy being one, first of all, which attempts to isolate China diplomatically from contact either with ourselves or with other great powers. We have used all the influence we could muster since 1949 to cut off diplomatic contact between China and the western world and the other countries of Asia. I personally think that has been a dangerous and ill-advised course for us to follow.

I have no idea whether or not at this point the government of China would permit us to install an ambassador and an embassy on their soil, but I can't think of any place in the world where we so desperately need a competent ambassador backed up by a good staff, as we do in China. One of the great problems about our relationship with China, and about discussions of this kind, is that we begin from ignorance. If we can imagine where we would be today with reference to the Soviet Union if we had had no diplomatic contact with that nation for the past twenty years—no conferences at the United Nations or in other assemblies where we had an opportunity to hear the Soviet point of view firsthand—we get some idea of the problems that we are up against when we try to carry on an informed discussion about China, and what her probable course of action will be.

I think, too, that it is not in our interest to try to boycott China economically. However belligerent, maddening, and—as some people would say—hysterical the Chinese leadership may be, I don't believe we contribute to a more moderate course of action on their part by trying to isolate them economically. For example, our policy of doing what we can to prevent normal commercial intercourse between the Japanese and the Chinese makes no sense at all. Japan is in a position to carry on an active trade with the Chinese, and to offer some degree of economic assistance that would be beneficial to both countries, and my impression is that there is a mounting tide of resentment within Japan itself over the fact that our policy has been lined up against that kind of development. The more diplomatic and economic contact there is between China and the outside world, the more likely it is that China will move in a less belligerent course.

In my opinion, we have no interest in Asia that demands our adoption of a unilateral containment policy. If we accept the argument that China needs to be contained, we should also accept the corollary argument that this should not and cannot be done unilaterally. We have no responsibility, we have no mandate, to take charge of Asia for the years ahead. What we do have is an obligation to work with other countries to preserve the peace. Certainly, with reference to China, that includes the close cooperation of other major Asian powers—Japan, India, Pakistan, and the other principal countries there, who presumably know at least as much about China and how to handle her as we do.

I think the course that we are now following is one that is calculated to aggravate all the worst features of the Chinese government and Chinese society. In addition, I fully agree with George Kennan, Senator FRANK CHURCH, and others who have said that trying to set up military strongmen on the borders of China is bound to increase Chinese pressure on those areas rather than to decrease it.

I would hope, then, that if we decide a policy of containment is in our interest, that it will be a broadly-based policy which does not rely excessively on military power, which does not rely on the creation of puppet regimes along the border, but which seeks to encourage strong and independent states wherever possible in Asia and elsewhere in the world. I would also hope that, insofar as possible, our efforts will be directed through the international community rather than unilaterally.

Podhoretz: Mr. Roche, Senator MCGOVERN seems to believe that our present policies in Asia are not calculated to avoid a major war with China. Others have put the case even more strongly, saying that we are on a collision course with China, that war is almost inevitable. Do you agree?

John Roche: Let me try to get at the question under three headings. First of all, what are we dealing with? Second, has our policy toward the Red Chinese been sound in the past? And third, what options do we have?

On the first point, it seems to me that we are dealing with a red-hot, simplistic ideology composed in equal parts of traditional Chinese imperialism and messianic Communism. We are faced, also, by the largest underdeveloped nation in the world, which may have an *absolute* net decline in standard of living: that is, it may be—the statistics are very hard to get—that every year that goes by, the standard of living in China in terms of population declines. But whether or not that is the case, it is surely true in the relative sense: there is a greater and greater gap between China and the more advanced industrial societies—the Soviet Union, the United States, and so on. And we are faced, finally, by what amounts to a ferocious theological brawl—unlike anything that has been seen since the Reformation—between the Stalinist Soviet Union and the Trotskyists in China.

The Soviets, who are good Stalinists despite the fact that they are vilifying Stalin, are today in a profoundly isolationist phase, and have, in effect, imposed socialism in one country on the Chinese. The Chinese, standing on the principle of permanent revolution or, in Trotsky's phrase, combined development, expected the Russians to provide the technological base for the Chinese primitive accumulation of capital. That is, they expected the Russians to give them the means to jump from the pre-capitalist to the socialist phase of historical development. In short, the Chinese demanded socialism on the cuff from the Russians, and the Russians, who were doubtless appalled by the fantastic burden involved in this (which could, of course, destroy the internal priorities of consumer goods and the rising expectations of affluence within Soviet society), told the Chinese that they would have to earn their own way to socialism. As best as we can discover, the Russians have, in fact, given more economic aid to East Germany than they have to China.

The Chinese today, it seems to me, are desperate, and they are old (the average age of the Chinese Communist Plenum is around 66). They are old men, they are the men who came up inside. Now a great many suggestions about dealing with China are based on the assumption that these people can be bribed. I don't think that they are bribable. I think that they are driving ideologues who are not going to call off their offensive against American imperialism in return for, say, an annual subsidy of wheat or industrial goods from the United States. If Secretary McNamara had made the statement that war is a testing-ground for character, we would all be leaping up and down and shrieking, and yet this is precisely what Marshall Lin said in his statement several months ago. We are dealing here, in other words, with men who are ideologues and who are not subject to simple, old-fashioned capitalist bribery. In fact, I think they are the Anabaptists of the Communist "Reformation"; they are striking out wildly at all those who will not accept their own particular chiliastic vision.

On the practical level, the reason I don't panic much about the problem of China is that they seem to be almost utterly incompetent to deal with reality—which, of course, is a common characteristic among Anabaptists. One might indeed suggest that Mao and his followers be brought before the Committee on Un-Marxist Activity. If Mao were President of the United States, he would have been impeached six months ago for having been responsible, internally and externally, for one disaster after another, with Indonesia as the culmination. I think what has happened in Indonesia is probably the most important development in Asia since the fall of mainland China to Communism—and the turn of events in Indonesia was a matter of sheer bungling by the Communists. Mao, then, is no Lenin or Trotsky. Indeed, he sounds like a caricature of the Marxist tradition, a kind of Red Goldwater with a little bit of Billy Graham thrown in. I do not find the philosophical specific gravity of Chinese Communism any great threat to the West nor, for that matter (speaking strictly as a clinician), to the Soviets.

To come now to my second heading: Has our policy been sound? Before we can answer that, we have to ask what our policy has been. Since 1950, we have had about four competing China policies within the American government. There has been this phony issue of recognition, for example. If you look at the world as I do, you say that recognition does not mean recognition of the legitimacy of a government, it simply means recognition of its existence. I recognize the existence of the Red Chinese, and I think the American government's policy on this has been silly. But would any alternative policy that anyone could have devised have made much difference, given the driving, messianic quality of the Chinese? This seems to me the crucial problem. The same reasoning applies to the National Liberation Front in Vietnam. In 1954, at the Geneva Conference, when the time came to find someone to initial the Accords for the Pathet Lao and the Khmer Resistance Forces, the Hanoi man, Ta-Quong Buu simply said, "I'll sign for them," and he did. The moral of the story, of course, is that legalistic approaches to the problem of the recognition of Red China, or the recognition of the National Liberation Front, are essentially diversionary. Whether we could have devised an alternative policy toward China, one with a strategic design, I don't know. It is clear that the policy, or several policies, we did design had no particular set of priorities (which, in a sense, undermines the notion that there is a great capitalist conspiracy at work).

Finally, what are our options? It seems to me that we have three options. They are the familiar ones: unilateral disengagement; escalation to the point of bombing China; a holding of the line. I want to make it clear that I am neither a hawk nor a dove; I am a slightly frightened robin who wants to avoid a war with Red China, as any sane man does. My basic position is that we have to play for time; that we cannot plot some grand plan for dealing with Red China, because we don't know the variables; that we should not attempt any great rollback of Red Chinese power, but on the other hand, that we should attempt to the best of our ability to maintain the frontiers essentially as they are today in Asia.

Podhoretz: Mr. Fall, do you agree that American policy ought to be dedicated to holding the frontiers of Asia constant?

Bernard Fall: The real question is whether Washington agrees. As we look at statements made by the administration over the last four or five months, there seems to be a new thread running through all of them. It started perhaps with the speech by Secretary McNamara before the NATO Council of Foreign Ministers a few months ago, when those good Europeans were treated to a rather surprising lesson in geopolitics which went back to Hearst's "Yellow Peril"—Europe is about to be overrun by hordes of Chinese, and it is therefore about time the Europeans woke up to their obligations in Southeast Asia. The same theme was sounded in a speech by Under Secretary George Ball a few weeks later, and then again in California by Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy: the Chinese are the real danger and it is they who have to be stopped. I am reminded by this of the manufacturer who was losing five dollars on every dress, but expected to make his profit on volume. We have a policy that doesn't work too well in Vietnam, but if we apply it to China and all of Asia, it might come out all right.

The results, of course, are rather curious, because you also find in every one of those speeches some repetition of the well-known fact that the North Vietnamese hate the Chinese, and that only in the very worst of circumstances—circumstances, as I myself would say, that can only be created by our military pressure on North Vietnam—will the Chinese come in; and if they ever should come in, the North Vietnamese will receive them with the greatest of misgivings.

So you have here an inherent contradiction in the whole official American approach to China, which in large part is a consequence of the "capture" of Washington by Red Chinese propaganda. If there is anyone in the whole world who actually believes that the Chinese are likely to overrun Asia militarily, it's Washington; at the same time, Washington believes that China is hated by all its neighbors. But if the Chinese are so aggressive—they certainly say aggressive things—why do they allow most of their aggressive schemes in Asia to fall apart without even the slightest reaction?

Obviously, for example, the Chinese have not done very much to help the Pathet Lao. American aircraft operate quite openly all over Laos, and there has been very little evidence of Chinese retaliation on the ground—say in the form of shipments of effective anti-aircraft artillery to the Pathet Lao. Nor have the Chinese tried to pick a fight with the United States over Quemoy. If the Chinese want to win a cheap victory over the United States, all they have to do is to try to occupy Quemoy, which they can do any day of the week. Nor have they intervened against American aircraft carriers in the Tonkin Gulf, which operate in an extremely narrow sea area, about ten or fifteen minutes by jet from Hainan.

Then came the great disaster in Indonesia. Indonesia, after all, has—or had—the largest Communist party outside the Sino-Soviet bloc. The Chinese have stood by in stony silence while upward of 100,000 Indonesian Communists were being slaughtered. To abandon a major Communist party in that way obviously bespeaks either self-control or fear—fear of American retaliation.

I do not doubt for an instant that the Chinese have ambitions in Southeast Asia. So do the French have ambitions in Latin America, which only indicates that the word "ambition" by itself doesn't mean very much. Some ambitions may be welcome. For example, if the Chinese would like to run a few rice-growing programs in some of those countries or would like to build railroads, as they are doing in North Vietnam, that would be unobjectionable. But what about the kind of ambitions that are going to hurt us—the West—in Southeast Asia?

Well, take the case of Burma. Burma is a small country, about 23–24 million people, directly abutting on China. Now the Burmese and Chinese had some border problems, and about five years ago they sat down and literally traded off border areas, and we haven't heard of these problems since. The Burmese government, moreover, proceeded to eliminate its Communists by the normal methods of fire and sword, but there is no evidence that the Chinese sent major forces into Burma to liberate their oppressed fellow party members.

Then there is the case of India. Here again the record will show that the Chinese attacked in India only after a long, embroiled border dispute about which any fair-minded person must agree that they are right. The MacMahon Line was a British-imposed boundary which no Chinese government ever ratified. The Chinese could have taken an additional piece of territory which was abandoned in panic by the Indians, but after moving in, the Chinese moved right back to their proper boundary; they didn't even hold the advance tracts which they could have held, let's say, for negotiating purposes.

This leaves, of course, the Korean War, where there certainly was Communist aggression. Of course, Chinese propaganda will tell you very loudly that the Russians put them up to it. The Chinese didn't lose 900,000 casualties in Korea lightly, just one year after winning their own war on the mainland: they fought the war with Russian equipment and Russian instructors and Russian training. So even in Korea, you have a slightly ambiguous situation if you are talking about *Chinese* adventurism.

All we can say when we look at the record, in other words, is that the Chinese undoubtedly have ambitions in Southeast Asia, and that they may, beyond a certain point, intervene in Vietnam—there is no question in my mind about this—but I don't think they are quite ready to do so. Interestingly enough, General Maxwell Taylor, who is not exactly uninvolved in the area, recently said just that: he didn't believe the Chinese were going to intervent in Southeast Asia for very good military reasons.

I have flown over the area often enough: it looks like the Creation-plus-seven-days—wild, impassable, no roads, no anything. How can you bring in and feed 500,000 troops under American aerial interdiction?

Let me, then, come back to the basic point. Speaking in *Realpolitik* terms, I think the United States can very well interdict Chinese penetration or Chinese influence or Chinese ambitions on the island parts of Asia and on India. But to pretend, as Under Secretary Ball has done, that the Chinese have no historical claims in Southeast Asia, is to fly in the face of history. Even the French at the height of colonialism recognized that the Chinese did have historical claims in the area—the French in 1885 fought a war with China merely to get China's signature on the annexation treaties with Vietnam. If what we want is not only to keep the Chinese back from their "outside" ambitions, but to push them back beyond their own "legitimate" claim line, then, of course, we are preparing ourselves for the kind of imperial wars that the French and the British fought for a hundred years, successfully at certain times, less successfully at others. If the decision is that the Chinese must be contained on the Southeast-Asian equivalent of the Polish-Russian border, that, of course, is a policy—I don't say it is the best, but it is a defined policy. But the policy of containing the Chinese deeper in Southeast Asia would, in my opinion, have a better chance. Suppose, for example, that the Kennan containment policy of 1947 had meant pushing Russians back to the Soviet boundary, with American troops being stationed in Warsaw. I am sure this kind of containment wouldn't have worked as well as the policy of stopping them at the border of their "natural zone of influence."

Just a last anecdote. When I was in North Vietnam in 1962—that is one of the residual privileges you have as a Frenchman here and there—the North Vietnamese very proudly showed me their national museum, which contained a room with a permanent exhibit on the theme of the heroic historical struggle of the Vietnamese people against the Chinese invaders. As I went through it, I saw a whole class of first- or second-graders with little red scarves, being marched through and shown how their country had for two thousand years held off the Chinese. The sight of these children reassured me considerably as to the future fate of Southeast Asia.

Goodwin: I don't think it's true that the United States has been obsessed with preventing the Chinese from moving, or with the Chinese threat. The United States has, in fact, been much more obsessed with the Russian threat, and even with the Cuban threat, than with China throughout most of the postwar period, and even today. Interestingly enough, for example, most people in the American government once accepted the fact that Indonesia would soon fall under the domination of a Communist party closely allied with, or sympathetic to, Peking, and yet there was, as far as I am aware, no intention of stopping that internal movement because we knew of no way to stop it short of invading Indonesia. And no one contemplated doing that.

It may be a legitimate position, logically, to say that it is perfectly all right for Russia to dominate Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and East Germany, because of some abstract conception that we call a sphere of influence, and that by the same token it is legitimate for the Chinese to dominate Thailand, Malaysia, Laos, Vietnam, etc. I don't see that myself, and I don't think that the people of those countries, or the governments of those countries, would agree that they were naturally within the Chinese sphere of domination; nor, for that matter, do the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc. feel that they naturally belong to the Russians. So far as Chinese ambitions are concerned, we know what they say, we know what other nations which have been aggressive have said. We don't know whether they mean it, we don't know whether they will do what they say, but I think that at least we ought to take them seriously.

I don't think the word containment is accurate in describing our policy. Resistance to Chinese expansion would be a better description. And that policy simply says that we will oppose the Chinese if they move under certain conditions. Clearly, an invasion of India would be opposed by the United States; or if the Chinese sent an airborne division into Indonesia, I have no doubt that we would feel it necessary to act. But the resistance to Chinese expansion does not have to rest on a firm belief that they are going to overrun Asia and try to take it over. *If* they move into a given area, we have to decide whether we should respond, and in what ways.

Podhoretz: But the difficult question is that almost any insurrection anywhere is interpreted as an instance of China on the move. It seems to be assumed that the war in Vietnam is a case of Chinese expansionism; it seems to be assumed that any kind of uprising, whether clearly dominated by a local Communist party or not, is to be taken as an act of Chinese expansionism. Isn't that the problem?

Roche: I don't know any serious observer of the war in Vietnam who has argued that this is a Chinese operation. The argument is that what you are dealing with here is an indigenous, North Vietnamese Communist imperialism, which would presumably implicate the Chinese if we went North on the ground.

Podhoretz: Yes, but then the question becomes, in what sense is an indigenous North Vietnamese Communist imperialism any concern of the United States?

McGovern: I would like to comment on that. I think John Roche's interpretation of American policy is overly optimistic. I remember being disturbed a year or so ago about the confusion on this very point that exists in our government. After a flurry on the Senate floor in which a number of Senators were involved, we were invited to discuss administration policy with some high officials in the government, to give us a better understanding of the policy. In the course of that discussion, I asked one of these men—who, I can assure you, is very high in our government—if we were involved in Vietnam primarily because we wanted to stop a Communist take-over on the part of the National Liberation Front, backed by North Vietnam, or because we feared Chinese power in the background, pulling the strings on this and other "wars of national liberation" that are supposed to develop in different parts of the globe. After thinking about it for awhile, this official said that he felt our primary purpose was to stop a Communist take-over from whatever source, to preserve the possibility of freedom of choice by the people of South Vietnam against Communism, whether installed by the National Liberation Front, or Hanoi, or China.

That very night, I asked another equally high, maybe slightly higher, official in our government the same question: whether we were there to prevent an internal Communist take-over in Saigon, or whether we were concerned about Chinese military and political aggression in that area. He said: There is no question about it—if not for China, we would not be involved in Vietnam at all; we are there because if we don't hold the line against China's technique of "national liberation" in South Vietnam, we will have to face the same Chinese-inspired activity in Laos, in Thailand, Cambodia, and so on, until eventually the threat becomes so great that we are confronted with World War III.

I think, in fact, that we *have* been folllowing the so-called domino theory in Southeast Asia, that we have seen China in the background manipulating the strings, that we have blamed them for what's taking place in South Vietnam, and that we would not be there were it not for what I regard as an exaggerated fear of Chinese danger to our interests in that part of the world. I quite agree with most of what Bernard Fall said earlier: we have exaggerated the extent of the Chinese threat to our interests, and we have grossly underestimated the force of nationalism in Asia.

Nationalism, in my view, is the strongest single force operating in Southeast Asia, and everywhere else in Asia as well. While we may be primarily motivated by a fear of Communism, the greatest dislike of the people of that area—their greatest fear and the thing they most want to get rid of—is outside control from whatever source. When we identify with regimes that have little national support and are opposed to revolutionary change, we do so at great peril to our own interests.

Roche: I believe the probelm of Chinese power is remote at the moment; it's still ten or fifteen years away. In the meantime, all kinds of things can happen in China. A whole new generation can come along, the bureaucratic complexion of the Chinese Communists party can change—already it is apparent that there are conflicts between the army in China and the party people. They fired one Minister of Defense because he suggested that the generals knew more about fighting wars than the political commissars did, and apparently right now they have another dispute going between the Norman Vincent Peales, who are saying that people armed with sickles can fight off the imperialists, and the generals who are saying: No fellows, those guys have got real bombs.

My theory is that by and large the last twenty years have indicated that the Communists are better at making big mistakes than we are, so we should stick to making small mistakes, and let them make the big ones. That means essentially a policy of playing for time and holding on.

Podhoretz: Holding on to what?

Roche: Well, the perimeter—essentially Japan, Taiwan, India. The problem in Vietnam is confused, as Professor Fall knows far better than I do, by the fact that you have there an autonomous Communist imperialism, which is itself interested in taking over the former borders of French Indochina. Wouldn't you say that that is the objective of Hanoi?

Fall: That's right.

Roche: As a consequence, I don't think the problem of China in Vietnam is an imminent problem—unless we should invade North Vietnam, which at the moment is about as remote a contingency as I could conceive of.

Goodwin: I disagree with a little bit of what Senator McGovern said. I don't think we went into Vietnam because of China. I think we got into Vietnam almost by accident. A commitment grew because at every stage we were under the illusion that we could buy a very cheap and easy victory there. In fact, I doubt if you will find China mentioned in the statements of any American President on Vietnam until the last six or eight months. It was a forbidden word.

Fall: It certainly isn't now.

Goodwin: No, it certainly isn't now, because at the present level of commitment, China proves to be the only rational reason for our presence there at all. Whether or not it *is* a rational reason, there is no doubt that the Chinese are much more aggressive in Vietnam today than they were, the Russians are much more aggressive in Vietnam than they were, and we are much more aggressive, because the issue has begun—very unfortunately, I believe—to transcend Vietnam itself. It has become a testing-ground of American power and will in that country and that part of the world. But I don't think this was at all the initial impulse that brought us there.

Podhoretz: What I would still like to know—and maybe the question I have asked is not a question that can really be answered, especially from the vantage-point of Washington—is the exact nature of American interests in Southeast Asia.

Fall: Well, that again brings up the contradiction I was talking about earlier. The build-up in Southeast Asia—the air bases in Thailand, the so-called enclaves in Vietnam, the deployment of 200,000 and ultimately even 400,000 more troops—is obviously not intended simply to crush 200,000 guerrillas and break even with the North Vietnamese. I am very much afraid that definitely now, whatever the case was in the past, Washington does look at China as a very serious potential factor in the conflict.

Roche: In 1950, Walter Lippmann wrote: "It would be an intolerable settlement, of course, if the North Korean army conquered South Korea, but it will not be a decent settlement if at the end of the Korean fighting, the American army finds itself at the 38th Parallel, and is invested for the indefinite future with the task of defending South Korea. There is no use pretending that South Korea, as we know it, can be set up again and maintained as even a quasi-independent state. But on the other hand, there are too many other things to do in the world to wish to govern an Asiatic dependency and to tie up three or four American divisions."

Yet, fifteen or sixteen years later, we have got what is a pretty workable solution in Korea. There is, in fact, a quasi-independent, viable South Korean state which within a year or two will hopefully reach the economic take-off stage. We simply have to realize that sometimes you get caught in situations. I don't like the idea of fighting a war in Vietnam, or anywhere else for that matter. But the fact is that at this point, as George Kennan recently said, withdrawal would be intolerable. So the question then becomes: what are the real options? The real options are a big war, or a limited war. If we can achieve in Vietnam a solution which involves no "liberation" North, and no rollback South, I think that it would work probably about the way the Korean thing is working, and I think that is the best we can hope for in the circumstances.

McGovern: I hope we can all agree that there are some other lessons to be learned from our experience in Korea, and one of them is not to be too reckless about these so-called "limited engagements." I assume that we went into Korea sixteen years ago to reestablish the 38th Parallel. The trouble is that when we got to the 38th Parallel, we kept going."

Roche: Over my objections, among others.

McGovern: Well, I hope that that lesson hasn't been forgotten, because while it may, as John Roche has said, only be a remote possibility that we will invade North Vietnam on the ground, we are already attacking her from the air, which certainly is a form of invasion, and one that is not calculated to produce forever a limited action on the part of Hanoi. In spite of our intelligence estimates, we did involve China in the Korean conflict. It cost us many thousands of casualties, and in the end, we finished with about the same kind of settlement we could have gotten had we stopped with a limited objective at the 38th Parallel.

Podhoretz: Senator McGovern, what is your impression of sentiment in the Senate, both about the Vietnam war, and about the longer-range questions that I have been raising—that is, the question of the extent to which American interests are actually involved, and the extent to which we are either trying, as Mr. Goodwin put it, to resist Chinese expansion, or whether we are carrying on what is essentially an anti-Communist crusade?

McGovern: It is my own judgment that strong support does not exist in the Senate for the policy we are now following in Southeast Asia, if for no other reason than the fact that the repeated predictions of what was going to happen, which have come to us from top officials in the government, have been consistently wrong; and each time those predictions have proved wrong, we have simply doubled the prescription of what we were doing. Consequently, there has been a growing disenchantment in the Senate about our Vietnam policy. I would say that certainly a majority of the Senate is opposed to any further escalation of this war.

Podhoretz: An actual majority?

McGovern: Yes, an actual majority. I think that perhaps ninety out of the one hundred Senators think that we made a mistake in ever becoming involved in the first place. There are a good many Senators who will say that privately, but who will then say, "Here we are, so mistake or no mistake, we have to see it through as best we can." Certainly, some of those Senators who have been advertised in the press as great hawks are among those who think that it was a disastrous mistake for us to have ever become involved in a combat role in Vietnam. Our involvement there actually goes back to the end of World War II, almost twenty years ago, when for some reason or other, we decided to back the French in their efforts to reestablish their control in Southeast Asia. We didn't make that mistake in most parts of Asia. We recognized the force of revolution, we recognized the power of nationalism, and we identified our policy in most parts of Asia with the revolutionary currents that were moving there. We urged the British to get out of Malaya and the Dutch to get out of Indonesia, we encouraged the liquidation of the British hold on India, and we ourselves got out of the Philippines. But when it came to Vietnam, for some reason or other, we threw in with the French, in what turned out to be a losing effort. I think that we have been on a losing course there ever since.

Fall: I have done quite a lot of research into this particular question, and frankly, I still don't understand why the United States backed the French at the last moment. In 1946, the U.S. sent a rather interesting mission under Major-General Philip E. Gallagher to Ho Chi Minh, and the French got pretty well perturbed. Then, out of a clear blue sky, there was a literal disappearance for about three years of any American effort in Vietnam. Just think, however, of the fascinating "might-have-been" of an American position in Vietnam consistent with American policy in Indonesia, Malaya, and India. Ho Chi Minh would have been president of all of Vietnam since 1946. This is why the North Vietnamese feel that the Americans are actually attempting to turn back the clock of history.

I would be the last person to guarantee that Ho Chi Minh would have become a Tito under these circumstances. I have spoken to the man himself, and to all his associates. I don't know whether Ho Chi Minh would have "turned Tito," but what I do know is that he has been anti-Chinese ever since the Chinese arrested him in 1941 and kept him in the stocks for eighteen months.

Goodwin: If I can get back for a moment to the longer-range possibility of Chinese expansion, and the possibility of resisting it, I think that one of the great lessons to be learned from the European containment is that it was not basically military; it was economic and political, through the Marshall Plan and so on. I think we have to pursue that kind of policy in Asia as well. Some time within the next five or ten years, China will be able to hold the major cities of North America hostage to nuclear power, and this is bound to increase the degree of risk they may be willing to take. To prepare for that, we need to make a massive and very large-scale effort to try to build—in Inida, in Pakistan, in the Philippines, in Southeast Asia—viable states which can stand on their own economically and which have some capacity to resist internal threats. We will also have to be willing to come in at least against an immediate invasion. At the same time, we have to make an effort to open up relations with China, if only to get a greater knowledge of what they might do and of their capacities, and to give them a greater knowledge of us: I think their ignorance of us is one of the great problems in their approach to the world. In addition to all this, we also have to work with the Soviet Union so that eventually we can get into the position of acting together on what is in fact a common interest—the containment of China. I don't believe that this is a possibility at the present time, but it may become one as the seriousness of the Chinese threat and the concomitant seriousness of the common interest grows. I think only if we pursue all these tracks at once—which, of course, leaves open the question of what China might actually do, but prepares us for any contingency—is there any real hope of containing China.

Roche: This brings up a very important point that is easily overlooked—namely, the extent to which the containment of China is really a Russian problem more than an

American one. After all, the Chinese already have maps that show large sections of Soviet Central Asia and so on, as part of China. I think the Russians are probably going to be confronted with Chinese power on the *ground* much more realistically than we are confronted with it at this point.

I suspect, by the way, that one interesting by-product of the last year has been that the American obsession with Vietnam may have helped in our not getting mixed up in Indonesia. In other words, we were so busy worrying about Vietnam that our cloak-and-dagger men didn't get a chance to monkey around in Indonesia.

McGovern: Isn't there some clue in that? Where the Chinese have intervened in a heavy-handed way, they got a bad reaction; and where we are intervening in a heavy-handed way, things are going badly for us.

Roche: There is one difference: the Chinese can't walk on water. In other words, the geographical situation of Indonesia is such that the Chinese could not possibly come to the rescue of the PKI there, whereas in Southeast Asia, on the mainland, they are in a position to intervene.

But I would like to make a point on this business of creating Titos. In 1947—the time, as we now know, when the Yugoslavs and Russians were engaged in really rough inside fighting, which led eventually to the split—the United States was practically at war with Yugoslavia. The Yugoslavs had shot down our airplanes, and we were issuing ferocious pronunciamentos. But as far as anybody can discover, the fact that we put the arm on Yugoslavia in 1947–48 did not have the slightest impact on the internal dynamics of what was, in fact, a theological dispute; our behavior had no influence one way or the other on the split. If you want to play these games, you can argue, then, that the best way to turn Ho Chi Minh into a Tito would be to put more and more weight on North Vietnam. North Vietnam would then turn to China and ask for help. The Chinese would say, "We're sorry, we can't help you because the Americans will bomb us." The North Vietnamese would then ask the Russians for help, and the Russians would say, "We're very sorry, we're too busy putting a basketball team in space." At that point, the leaders of Hanoi would decide that since they couldn't get any help from their loyal allies, they might as well make a deal.

Now I am not favoring this scenario nor suggesting it: I am simply saying that in terms of the logic which is going around these days on the care and nurturing of Titos, this is a perfectly valid position.

Podhoretz: Mr. Roche, you've been talking a good deal about theology as though there were only one set of theologians in this whole picture. But isn't there a good deal of theologizing going on in the United States in relation to the Communist world? What I mean is this: so long as it was possible to believe—and so long as this belief more or less corresponded to reality—that there was a monolithic international Communist conspiracy which operated in various ways and through various subterfuges which were not always easy to identify as aggression (internal subversion and the like), an anti-Communist foreign policy obviously made some sense. Under those circumstances, stopping the spread of Communism could be taken as within the American national interest. But just at the point where it is no longer possible to speak of a monolithic international Communist movement, we do seem to be pursuing an anti-Communist foreign policy, not because the advance of Communism—which today really means Communisms, in the plural—is demonstrably against the *concrete* interests of the United States, but almost as though we were fighting a religious war in which the goal is to prevent the opposing religion from spreading to any other country. Nobody in the government talks in these terms any longer, but this is how they seem to be acting.

Roche: Of course there is a good deal of chiliastic rhetoric on the anti-Communist side. But don't identify anyone who takes a hard liberal anti-Communist line with Senator Goldwater or with people who say that we are fighting a holy crusade. I myself, for example, was among those who argued against the concept of a monolithic Sino-Soviet bloc as early as 1954.

Nor do I think that a fair view of American foreign policy suggests that a holy crusade has actually been the decisive motivating factor. For example, President Johnson has made it perfectly clear that we are not interested in a rollback in Vietnam. That is to say, there is to be no "liberation"—we are not living with Dulles and the notion of "liberating" Communist countries. Johnson has, in effect, said that we will settle for a status quo at the 17th Parallel. The North Vietnamese will maintain their Communist state, and even though we don't like it, we are not attempting to overthrow it. This is anything *but* messianic anti-Communism. I think it is, in fact, a perfectly legitimate horse trade.

Fall: Well, granted, then, that America isn't pursuing an anti-Communist policy, can we speak of a straight anti-Chinese policy? You could, for example, have a straight anti-Russian policy: in other words, if Russia were ruled by the Czars, we might still oppose a Russian move into Greece. Similarly with the Chinese in Southeast Asia. The Chinese may be misruling Tibet—they have always misruled Tibet—but so are some people misruling Mississippi. This is no reason for calling it "aggression."

Roche: But in fact some people do call it "aggression." That is precisely the point. In Mississippi, a great many of us have been out there trying to stop it, whereas to my knowledge there have been no "Freedom Riders" in Tibet.

Fall: Still, if the U.S. had wanted to follow a straight anti-Communist policy instead of a straight anti-Chinese one, then South Vietnam should have been made a fortress as soon as the 1954 Geneva Accords had gone by the board—a full-fledged fortress like Formosa, in 1956; with 200,000 American troops right off the bat, and the place militarized exactly like South Korea. At the same time North Vietnam might have been bought off. Washington could have said, "All right, we're sorry, we won't hold elections, you know Diem won't hold the elections, but if you need a half-million tons of rice, you can have a half-million tons of rice."

But the truth is that nobody has really made up his mind in Washington as to whether it is a straight *Chinese* expansionist threat that has to be contained, or whether it is militant Communism that has to be contained. This perhaps explains why the Vietnam problem is such a muddle.

Goodwin: I don't think that's accurate. How can you speak of an anti-Communist policy, in the old sense of the term, when we are trying to expand East-West trade, and trying as much as we can in the present situation to move forward in our relations with the Soviet Union?

Fall: Anti-Chinese, then.

Goodwin: No—it isn't anti-Chinese, it is opposed to Chinese expansion. That is a very different thing. I don't think the policy is to overthrow the government of China.

Fall: Would you say the Chinese can't expand because these people hate them?

Goodwin: I didn't say that they hate them. I don't know how they feel about them at all, and I don't know whether that is even relevant. It's possible for the Chinese to expand into areas where the people hate them.

Fall: I think it was Jerome Bonaparte who said that you can do almost anything with bayonets except sit on them. The Russians proved this in Hungary.

Podhoretz: I think it's time to open the floor to questions.

Trumbull Higgins: [2] I wonder if I might ask the speakers to consider the possibility of an irrational explanation for the American intervention and the presumed Chinese hostility. That is, the U.S., having blundered into this war in Vietnam contrary to most expectations, now must engender a Chinese hostility in order to justify the ever-growing war. In short, is not an irrational explanation perhaps more valid here than the desperately rational explanations the speakers are looking for to account for our policies toward China?

McGovern: I for one agree with that interpretation almost one hundred percent. I think Mr. Goodwin hinted at it earlier in our discussion, when he said that at no time did we make a calculated, clearly-defined decision on what our policy in Southeast Asia should be. We did become involved, for reasons that aren't clear to me, in backing the French effort out there from 1946 through 1954, but from there on out, I think the policy emerged pretty much along the lines that Mr. Higgins has suggested. As more and more American forces were committed, and the results of those efforts proved more and more disappointing and more and more frustrating, our policy makers began to depict a larger threat in the form of China as the reason for our heavy involvement. I think that helps to explain a lot of the confusion about why we are there.

Podhoretz: That's like Macaulay's explanation of how the British acquired their Empire. He said that they did it in a fit of absent-mindedness.

Roche: Well, I don't want to inject an empiricist note into this discussion, but the reason we got involved in Indochina, in a word, was Korea. We were playing around the edges until the Korean War broke out, and then at that point we began to commit ourselves more and more heavily to anti-Communism in Indochina. Whether it was rational or irrational, is a question I don't think we want to discuss at this point, but that's how it happened.

Fall: I would like to be able to agree with you on this, because it would make things neat. But the fact is the United States did recognize the Bao Dai government on February 6, 1950 which was six months before the Korean War, and the American MAAG Mission to Vietnam was appointed on June 12th, also before the Korean War. You are perfectly right, though, that the real effort, the $485 million-a-year effort, only began after the Korean War broke out.

Maurice J. Goldbloom: [3] I want to talk about this matter of the parallel with Greece and Yugoslavia. It is important to recognize that the Communists in Greece never had more than about a quarter of the population, and Greece was a country in which there were very strong traditional political forces of the kind that France prevented from ever developing in Vietnam. That is, there were always real alternatives with mass popular support there. The second thing is that although the Communists in Greece were dependent on and received far more material aid from Yugoslavia than the South Vietnamese ever got from North Vietnam, we made it a point to avoid any crossing of the Yugoslav border, or any attack on Yugoslavia during the entire period of the Greek civil war. I think that if we had bombed Yugoslavia, or if we had trained guerrillas to go into Yugoslavia, as we trained them in South Vietnam to go unsuccessfully into North Vietnam, that might have had a very important effect in tying Yugoslavia to the

---

[2] Mr. Higgins is a noted military historian.

[3] Mr. Goldbloom is a frequent contributor to COMMENTARY and a former Foreign Service staff officer in Greece.

Soviet Union, in forcing her to accept Soviet dictates.

Roche: I agree with that. That's why I opposed the bombing of North Vietnam.

Fall: By the way, I don't know how many people remember the very eloquent speech made by Adlai Stevenson in 1964, after the British retaliated against Yemeni guerrillas for having ambushed a British column in Aden. Stevenson said that even under provocation a major power should not retaliate against a weaker country. The then Senator John F. Kennedy also condemned the French in 1958 for bombing a Tunisian border city from which they had been shelled in Algeria, and the then Senator Humphrey at that time demanded that all American aircraft be withdrawn from the French Army. So there has been a great change in the last few years in American attitudes on retaliation against neighboring countries.

Hannah Arendt:[4] Mr. Goldbloom just knocked out Greece and Yugoslavia as a parallel: I too am a little worried about this parallel business, because it runs like a red thread through the justification of American policy in Vietnam. If you think about the other parallel which was mentioned here, the third one, Czechoslovakia in 1938, the absurdity of the whole business can be shown very clearly. It is as if France or England would have tried to stop Hitler, not by making war on him, but by making war on Slovakia as being somehow in collusion with the Nazi government against the Czech government. They would have started bombing Bratislava and intervening in what could only have been a civil war in Czechoslovakia. If anyone in 1938 had thought that this would have helped to stop Hitler, he would not have been very realistic. This is true for all such parallels. Once you really pursue them, they explode. If we say we want to contain China, then we have to take the problem in its own terms; no parallels will help, we have to look at China itself.

There is a second point I would like to bring up. I think it was Mr. Goodwin who mentioned the possible boomerang effects of defeats or victories in Asia. I am perfectly sure that this is a very serious question, and even one of the most serious. Not even our own military experts today talk about victory any longer. It used to be said that there was no alternative to victory, but in our time there are many alternatives, and victory is one of the worst. But I want to ask Mr. Goodwin what he thinks the boomerang effect on this country will be if we have to fight a six-year war of attrition. Also, taking into consideration the so-called domino theory, what will the boomerang effect on other Asian countries be when they see what can happen to a country once America intervenes?

I am glad that this discussion has centered squarely on the containment of China rather than on the war in Vietnam. I am against the war in Vietnam, I don't see how any good can come from it whatsoever, but I would agree that China is going to be one of the major problems of American foreign policy in the next thirty years. But to pursue this policy in Vietnam of all places, in Indonesia of all places: this is not to see the reality of the whole situation. It is very significant that the Chinese went back voluntarily after they established their old boundaries in India. I doubt that anybody in China even thinks of attacking India. What shall they do with India? They have enough headaches. Should they take India when they already have 700-million people, and as Mr. Roche pointed out, a declining standard of living? That is true, of course, of India as well, and of all these countries because of the population explosion. The Chinese, I recently saw in the papers, are trying to institute birth control, and very cruelly. They simply don't want to give ration cards to every third or fourth or fifth child born. If they actually do that, they will become the strongest nation in Asia, which today they are only potentially. But if we think about China in these terms—that is, the terms in which they themselves must think—isn't it obvious that the real danger zones are Siberia, which is underdeveloped and underpopulated, and perhaps Australia?

Goodwin: I agree fully on the question of parallels. I don't think that any of the historical parallels, Munich and the rest, are meaningful at all. As Miss Arendt said, you have to take China on its own terms. I would even carry that a step further by saying on the other side that you can't talk about polycentrism as the wave of the future—in this case using Eastern Europe as the parallel—in order to show that inevitably these countries, once dominated by the Chinese, will then become independent or nationalistic. They are very different societies from the societies of Eastern Europe. They are much thinner at the top, as underdeveloped countries tend to be, and therefore, the overthrow of governments comes a lot easier. Moreover, the long-run structural forces within a country that make for nationalistic stability don't exist to the same degree: we see this very clearly in places like Latin America. Beyond that I don't think the domino theory in its crudest sense applies in Asia—or anywhere else, as a matter of fact.

Nevertheless, serious American defeats in parts of Asia would, in my opinion, have an impact on other countries: they would strengthen forces which are hostile to the United States and close to Communist China, and they would tend to weaken those forces which are trying to maintain governments of another kind. What this would mean in any individual country is very hard to say. There is no doubt, for example, that Cuba did give an impetus to Communist movements in Latin America—though that has died out considerably by now.

I think the Chinese *are* basically hostile to the United States. They may not be able to do anything about it. They may not have the military force for a long time to do anything about it, or even after that, the skill. But they are supporting revolutionary movements in Latin America, for example. I have talked to students in Latin America who have told me that they are receiving funds from the Chinese. In other words, there is a movement, or an effort, going on.

Miss Arendt, I think, is right. Russia does have the most to fear from China in terms of immediate territories. It is by far the most logical target for Chinese expansion. However, we also at least have to keep in the back of our minds the possibility that they may not act rationally. It is often pretty hard to tell what the people in our own government are going to do, much less what Mao Tse-tung is going to do. I don't think the Chinese will invade India, and of course it isn't logical for them to do so, but that doesn't mean they won't, and you have to take that possibility into account in shaping your own policy.

Roche: The immediate cause of the Chinese invasion of India was the border dispute, but I don't think that was the sufficient cause at all. I think that what the Chinese did there was a political-military masterpiece—it was out of Lenin by Clausewitz. Essentially what they did was at one blow to destroy India's standing as a first-rate Asian power. You will recall that this was after the Russians refused, as we now know, to give any nuclear guarantee to the Chinese at the time of the Quemoy crisis. The Russians were then going to have some kind of summit meeting to which Nehru would be invited, and it was at that point that the Chinese decided to destroy India's standing as a first-rate power, which they did in two weeks. Obviously, they didn't invade India to conquer it. They simply wanted to destroy its reputation as a power, and that they did successfully.

Goodwin: In my opinion, what has done most to prevent World War III in the last twenty years has not been the pursuit of rational self-interest, but fear: and I am not sure that the Chinese share that fear to the same degree as we and the Russians. That, I think, is the danger.

McGovern: I think Miss Arendt put her finger on what may be our most crucial blunder in recent years, and that is our tendency to try to use the same course of action in Asia in the 1950's and 60's as we used in Western Europe at the end of World War II. The conditions, of course, are entirely different. In 1945, in Europe, there was a group of Western countries with a background very similar to ours, with a common fear of Soviet encroachment, and a desire to rebuild their economies and reestablish themselves as independent powers. Whereas in Vietnam, it seems to me, we intervened on the side of a political force in Saigon that had very little popular support, and no common heritage with us; we intervened against a popular political leader, Ho Chi Minh, who, at the time we first went in there, had, according to President Eisenhower, eighty per cent of the people of the country behind him. That in itself draws the distinction between Munich and Vietnam. Unfortunately, while those of us around this table can readily discard the Munich parallel, the Secretary of State doesn't draw that distinction. He continues to talk as though we were standing at Munich, and as though all will be lost if we don't continue what we are doing.

Roche: It's curious that the only statement by President Eisenhower that the American Left has ever taken seriously is the one Senator McGovern just quoted.

Podhoretz: That, and his farewell speech about the military-industrial complex.

Frank Armbruster:[5] I would just like to draw attention to a point Dr. Fall made, which is, I think, a very valid one and has a lot to do with what has happened around the periphery of China. He mentioned the very primitive areas on the perimeter of China to the South, but this is also important when people talk about a Chinese attack on Russia. You really have to look at the areas they are claiming and look at what their logistic capability is over there. I think it's wrong to say that China didn't want India because of economic reasons. You could make the same argument about Tibet. I don't really think these things fall in that way. Without getting into theology, there is a dynamism which goes along with this type of Communism, and it has to do with vacuums, if you will, on the borders of Communist countries. The Chinese did pull out of India—that is, they pulled out of the Assam plain area. They had one small division down there which, with the snowfall coming in the mountains, would have been trapped there all winter, and so they went back. But in the Ladak area they did not go back. They kept the road which went through the traditional caravan pass that connected Tibet with Sinkiang.

If we are going to talk in geographic terms—and it always comes down to that when you talk about Chinese military capability—you really have to look at a map: I couldn't agree with Mr. Fall more. If you look at a map, you will see why they aren't taking the Russians on in the area that is in dispute.

---

[4] Miss Arendt is the author of, among other books, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* and *Eichmann in Jerusalem*.

[5] Mr. Armbruster is an expert on military affairs and a member of the Hudson Institute.

So far as Vietnam is concerned, I don't think it's a question of Chinese expansion in that area; Ho Chi Minh also has a drive that is drawn, at least to some extent, from Communist ideology. But China counts too, simply by virtue of the fact that it is there, a large power to the north with a feeling of kinship. To get back to Czechoslovakia—even though the Secretary of State has been much belabored for making the parallel—the reason the Sudeten-German leader, Henlein, felt strong had a lot to do with the fact that a large Nazi state existed to the North. This is not a matter of sending troops necessarily; it has to do with the drawing of power. So that a large dynamic force like China in the North does, I think, lend strength to Ho Chi Minh even though he doesn't like the Chinese.

Senator McGovern said earlier that he believed a conflict with China would be the greatest disaster that could happen in the rest of this century. Yet the Chinese simply don't have any capability to expand; I just can't see this great danger. On the other hand, I just came back from Europe recently, and it was pointed out very clearly to me by the Germans—these were students, government people, businessmen—that our military commitments in Southeast Asia are being watched very closely by people in Europe to see how we live up to them. They are very anxious that we be efficient down there. In other words, there could be a domino effect in Europe. The domino theory also works, at least in part, in Asia. There is no military threat from China to speak of, but we still have to worry about the people in Asia taking an attitude such as Cambodia says it has today. Cambodians tell you point blank that they see the trend, and therefore they have to be neutral and sort of pro-Communist in order to make sure that when the Communists take over they won't have been in sharp conflict with them. Now if we wish to avoid that kind of thing, there is something to be said for America living up to its commitments.

Roche: I suspect that wherever Asian statesmen meet today, they talk about the inscrutable Americans. In 1955 or thereabouts, Sihanouk of Cambodia went to see Dulles and asked whether he could depend on American protection in case of trouble. Dulles said no. So Sihanouk took out insurance. Now, of course, Sihanouk is getting all kinds of hell for his quite rational policy, and he is probably rather upset because we changed the rules. This going back and forth by us has made life very confusing for people caught on the periphery.

McGovern: In response to Mr. Armbruster's comment on what I guess you would call our credibility in Western Europe and other parts of the world, my own impression from what limited observations I have been able to make and what I have read, is that there is very little enthusiastic support for the course we are on in Southeast Asia. I don't see that we have had substantial concrete support from our allies in Western Europe for our policy in Southeast Asia, nor have we had any great clear-cut moral support for our position in Vietnam, either from the Europeans or from countries in Asia. Our ambassador in Japan has indicated that there is great apprehension there about our policy. We know that kind of apprehension also exists in India, Pakistan, and other important countries in Asia and Western Europe. So I fail to see where American prestige would suffer if we should do what George Kennan suggested in his statement to the Fulbright Committee—that is, to liquidate some of these untenable positions.

Armbruster: Of course, Kennan was not suggesting that we pull out of Vietnam.

McGovern: I'm not suggesting that either, except after acceptable negotiations. I'm suggesting that our current policy has not improved our prestige either in Western Europe or anywhere else in the world.

Sidney Morgenbesser: [6] I would like to ask Mr. Roche whether he disagrees with Mr. Fall's analysis of what Chinese action has actually been, not what it might potentially be. If he doesn't disagree, why does he think we need a special foreign policy in relation to the Chinese? After all, the policy he advocates—holding the line and playing for time—is what we generally should do everywhere. I take it that behind all this "wait and see," there is a special foreign policy toward China. . . .

Roche: No, no, I was speaking specifically against the background of the great recent emphasis on China.

Morgenbesser: But do you think Mr. Fall's description of what the Chinese have actually been doing is right?

Roche: I think it's essentially right.

Morgenbesser: If it is right, why do we need a special foreign policy for China?

Roche: The discussion here is about China.

Morgenbesser: But what in your view is unique about China?

Roche: I think because the issue has been raised in such stark terms, that we should de-emphasize the immediate threat of Red China, that we should cool off our our ideological blood pressure, so to speak, on the subject of China—in short, that we should play it cool. That's what it comes down to.

Ernest van den Haag: [7] Do the members of this panel think that the recent change in Indonesia would have come about if we had not pursued pretty much the policy we have pursued in Vietnam?

Fall: All I can say is that the Indonesians very efficiently murdered another set of Communist leaders in 1948 without the United States being present. In other words, where there is internal pressure, it is bound to erupt regardless of what the United States does. It's like the man who marries the boss's daughter. No matter what he does on his own initiative, it will always be credited to the fact that he married the boss's daughter. That seems to be the case here. I would say that the American presence in Southeast Asia, which does, in fact, give the Asians a certain amount of comfort is probably not the presence of forces on the ground; it is the presence of the Seventh Fleet. Two hundred thousand American troops and six hundred thousand South Vietnamese troops bogged down in a fight against lightly-armed guerrillas, is not exactly a demonstration of power. But the Seventh Fleet is another matter.

van den Haag: But what about resolution?

Fall: I don't see how the American presence increases the resolution of Indonesia, unless the Indonesians believe that the Americans are ready to land in Indonesia.

Roche: Now wait a minute. First of all, until quite recently the number of American troops that have actually been engaged in combat operations in Vietnam was not very great. Also, although I opposed the bombing of North Vietnam last Spring—mainly because I find it hard to believe anything the Air Force tells me—it is my judgment, based on some research into the question, that while it hasn't had anywhere near the effect it was supposed to have on the military situation in Vietnam, it did play a very significant role in Indonesia in stiffening the will of the generals against the PKI.

Joseph Starobin: [8] Could I ask the members of the panel to venture an opinion as to the source of China's hostility to the United States? What is eating these fellows? It seems to me that in any discussion of containing China, one has to arrive at a certain estimate of what it is that makes the Chinese act as they do. The Secretary General of the UN, who is Burmese, suggested the other day a sort of psycho-political interpretation of their behavior, and I think it behooves us before we contain them to find out what it is that is bothering them. Is it that they don't like our long noses? Are we the white foreigners? Is it that they expect somehow to overthrow the United States and isolate us? Do they really intend to land troops anywhere near our borders?

McGovern: Well, keeping in mind Mr. Goodwin's warning that it is difficult to know what is motivating our own government, let alone what motivates the Chinese, I think there are certain considerations that might shed some light on the question of what is bothering them. It begins with our very real effort to prevent the Chinese Communist success in their own country. We failed in that in 1949, but only after we had invested a considerable amount of aid and military equipment trying to keep them from coming to power. I suppose, then, that they took over with a rather sour attitude toward us at the very beginning, and that resentment, it seems to me, was then further compounded by the policy of diplomatic isolation of China that we tried to put into effect after 1949. My memory is that there was some serious consideration given to recognizing China, either late in '49, or early in 1950, but then came the Korean War. The Chinese warned that if we approached their frontier they would intervene. We chose to ignore the warning and they did come in. Everyone knows that the war seriously embittered the Chinese toward us, but it worked the other way too. Those many thousands of American casualties poisoned American public opinion toward China. From that time until this, there has been very little effort to bring China into the family of nations. Professor John K. Fairbank of Harvard thinks that the fact that the Chinese, a proud people, have been treated as outlaws and as gangsters has a lot to do with the enraged attitude they have toward the United States and some of the other Western powers. For all these reasons, I would hope that, rather than a policy of containment as defined in the traditional sense of that word, we will work on a policy of reconciliation that is designed to face up to some of these resentments which the Chinese feel.

Goodwin: I don't think you can explain Chinese hostility wholly on the basis of their exclusion from proper society. I think there are a lot of other important drives. One is clearly ideological. If you are really serious about building some sort of Communist world, then naturally your greatest enemy is the great bastion of imperialism and capitalism, the United States. Secondly, the United States happens to be the only power which can oppose whatever ambitions or intentions the Chinese may or may not have in Asia. We had the same position in relation to the Japanese in 1941, which led them to attack us. The Chinese have stated what their long-run strategy is: whether they really believe in it or not is impossible to tell. But the Chief of Staff of the Chinese Army, Marshal Lin Piao, has said that they are going to encircle the United States through revolutions in Africa and Latin America, much as the Chinese Communists encircled the cities from the countryside. I don't think that is a very realistic strategy, or even one they intend to follow, but it *is* the one they have stated.

In any case, there is no doubt that the Chinese are engaged in supporting Communist revolutionary movements all over the world. They are funding insurgency groups and terrorist groups in Latin America and in Africa; that is one of the reasons they have been kicked out of a few African countries. They have been very heavy-handed about it, and very unsuccessful. But when I was in Latin America recently, I discovered that the Russian Communists have become the conservatives of the Left, and that among the young people and the students, if you believed that Moscow was going to help you, you were a sort of status-quo sellout, whereas if you believed in Peking, you could really belong to the new revolutionary generation. There *is* something going on.

---

[6] Mr. Morgenbesser is professor of philosophy at Columbia University.

[7] Mr. van den Haag is a well-known sociologist and social critic.

[8] Mr. Starobin is a Senior Fellow at the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University.

Roche: Aren't the Russians financing movements in Latin America?

Goodwin: Oh, the Russians are active, but they aren't doing a very good job. They no longer have a hold on the imagination of the young. The Chinese have it much more; or even beyond the Chinese, there is a kind of nationalistic, anarchistic leftism coming into vogue.

Roche: There is one point I would like to make in this connection. One of the favorite occupations of people these days in talking about Vietnam is to engage in what amounts to an elaborate denunciation of history—of all the tragic and fearful mistakes we have made. But denouncing history is no substitute, unfortunately, for confronting its realities. I feel much the same way about these psychodramas. If you are interested in this, you might read the first edition of E. H. Carr's *Twenty Year Crisis*—not the second, which was modified a bit but the first edition, which explains Nazism in terms of the paranoid drives that arose out of the feelings the Germans had of being trapped; it also represents Munich as a triumph of the peaceful solution of international differences. In other words, when U Thant gets through explaining the Oriental mind to us, I always want to ask, so what? The sins of my fathers burden me down, but they do not in one whit alter the objective structure of the reality that confronts us right now.

Steven Marcus:[9] I would like to ask Mr. Goodwin what he thinks the effects on American society, on American morale, on American politics would be if this peculiarly brutal war continued for another three or four or five years? That is the first part of my question. The second part is, having made such a judgment and given the American temperament, do you think that America could go on with a war of attrition of this particular kind for three or four or five more years?

Goodwin: I'll take the second part first. I think it might be possible to sustain a low-keyed effort for a long time—low key not in the sense of numbers of troops, but in terms of numbers of casualties, numbers of American soldiers killed—without very serious effect on American society. If the war gets a lot bigger, of course, it will have a serious effect on American society, in the way that Korea did and World War II did.

Podhoretz: Could I rephrase that question? I suspect Mr. Marcus was talking about moral and spiritual effects, just as the French intellectuals did as the Algerian War proceeded. The idea is that this war is bad for us, morally and spiritually, quite apart from its political and social implications, and that it will get worse if it goes on.

Goodwin: No. It may have serious effects, but all war is brutalization.

Marcus: That's not a proper discrimination. There are brutalizations and brutalizations. We all know that the brutalization that took place in Germany and Russia was different from the kind of brutalization that has taken place elsewhere. There are moral discriminations to be made.

Goodwin: I don't see any moral distinction between our involvement in this war and our involvement in Korea. But maybe there are other people who do.

Fall: I was in Vietnam last summer, and all I can say is that in the particular moral context in which Mr. Marcus speaks, the Americans are going down the same path as the French did. That is the kind of war it is. I was in the French underground for two years. As the "counterinsurgent," you finally get frustrated, you get shot at from behind, you get shot at by people to whom you just gave candy. And you react.

And then, of course, there is the real and very serious problem of torture. You have to face up to it. For example, you catch somebody who has just planted bombs in a department store—this happened in Algeria. An officer told me: "Look, I knew the man had two bombs; one we found, and the other we didn't. I knew the bomb would explode at 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon and sixty-five women and children would get killed. What could I do? If I stood on my lily-white honor as an officer, and on the Geneva Convention, and didn't torture him, I would have sixty-five women and children on my conscience. If I tortured him, I could save sixty-five women and children." You and I would just as soon not have to make such a choice. Of course, you could say that in Vietnam there are more lie detectors, so one doesn't have to use torture that often. They have sodium pentathol, the truth drug, so they don't have to use electrodes against testicles or on women's breasts. But it does happen. In Vietnam you get the Vietnamese to do it half the time, or three-quarters of the time, or even ninety-five per cent of the time, but the fact is that the man who has participated in this is not going to be the same. What happens when he gets home?

There is a wonderful book which was never translated, by a man I admire very much, Professor Paul Mus, who is a strong French liberal and whose son was drafted into Algeria. Young Mus didn't like it one bit when he went in, but within a year he had reenlisted. He had become a paratroop brute, the regular who shot civilians. His father was shocked. If this could happen to a boy from a nice liberal professorial family, what about all the others? So after his son was killed, Mus published his letters, in which you can see the very subtle change that progressively turned the boy into a brute.

There are some long arguments in Washington on the subject; people say it can't happen to Americans. That's nonsense. Of course it can happen. It can happen to anybody. If you get caught in a war like this for four or five years, that is what it will do to you.

Marcus: I agree. One cannot predict what is going to happen to the society at large when this kind of war is being fought, when there is knowledge, general knowledge, that this is the kind of thing that is done in the course of a day. I don't think one can predict the social, or moral, or personal, or cultural consequences of it.

Fall: In a way that's why I am in favor of using draftees in this kind of war. The difference between Algeria and Vietnam was that in Vietnam you had only the French professional army, whereas in Algeria, there were 500,000 draftees out of 760,000 men. When the French generals in Algeria decided to rise up against the government in Paris, the draftees, to the great disappointment of the generals, remembered that they were citizens first. Good citizens are very much needed now in Vietnam if you are intending to win back the Vietnamese as human beings.

Theodore Solotaroff:[10] I would like to ask Mr. Roche how he proposes to arrive at a "Korean" solution of the Vietnam war without fighting another Korean War—a land war involving five-hundred, six-hundred thousand men. Such a war has already been fought once in that country by the French, with what results we know.

Secondly, how can we "cool it" with respect to Red China, without getting involved in a total reeducation of the American public about the realities of politics in the Far East while prosecuting this war? Yet as we have seen in the last year or two, the war has tended more and more to corrupt and pollute public opinion about these realities.

Roche: I would support, and do support, and indeed have supported, a planned action in South Vietnam on the order of 250-, 400-, or 500,000 men if necessary to achieve precisely a Korean solution. On the second point, the American people have what is without doubt the shortest historical memory in the history of man. It is one of our great assets that we are historical nominalists, we think that every problem starts at sunrise on the day we find out about it. After all, within three years after the end of the Second World War, we were rearming the Germans. The whole American attitude toward the Germans and also toward the Japanese had changed. So I don't think that this is one of these permanent poisons that is going to infect the American spirit. I might add here, by the way, that I share Mr. Goodwin's view that there is nothing *sui generis* about the violence in South Vietnam.

Goodwin: On this matter of public opinion, I think the resistance to relations with China is really overstated and that an American President could in fact recognize China, or even support their entry to the UN, with very little political kickback after the first thirty or forty days.

Podhoretz: Would you please tell that to Lyndon Johnson the next time you see him?

Goodwin: But I don't think it is politically or psychologically possible for that to happen while the Vietnam war continues.

McGovern: I think Mr. Marcus touched on an important problem here in mentioning the byproducts of this war. I think it is probably true that the United States has enough military power to defeat North Vietnam. But what does victory mean? It may be a very hollow victory indeed. If we commit four- or five- or six-hundred thousand men to a little country like that, we are going to destroy it. There won't be enough left to pick up the pieces.

One of the most dramatic—and yet I think most accurate—assessments that I have seen of the war, was by a *Times* reporter who was out there for about a year and a half. He said that when he went to Vietnam he didn't think the war could be won, but he thought it so important for us to win that it was worth trying. After staying there for a year and a half, he decided that we probably could win the war, but it wasn't worth the price we would have to pay. We would have to kill two or three innocent civilians in South Vietnam for each Vietcong soldier we could wipe out. A policy like that, he said, would make more sense if South Vietnam were the enemy instead of our ally.

Take the case of the Japanese. It is regrettable that we killed so many Japanese in World War II, but at least they were a clearly defined enemy, whereas the people who are going to get killed in South Vietnam are the people we say we are trying to defend. It seems to me that this is one cost that explains some of the moral concern that we feel here in our country. There are other costs we are going to have to pay, not the least of which is neglecting a lot of the things we ought to be doing here in the United States to improve the quality of our own life. We are also going to have to neglect such important problems as nuclear proliferation and our relations with Latin

---

[9] Mr. Marcus is associate professor of English at Columbia University and an editor of *Partisan Review*.

[10] Mr. Solotaroff, formerly associate editor of COMMENTARY, is now editor of *Book Week*.

America and with the Soviet Union. Many of these things are going to get shoved into a secondary position because of the necessity of focusing our immediate attention on Vietnam.

Podhoretz: We have time for one last question.

William Phillips:[11] My question is really addressed to Mr. Roche. He said earlier that he advocates a policy of biding our time and playing it by ear, and I kept waiting and listening for some concrete implementation of these general attitudes. If I read him correctly, he now seems to be saying that the implementation of these general attitudes consists of sending more troops into Vietnam, or into any troubled area. Is this his notion of what a viable and decent American policy might be?

Roche: I start out with the assumption that the war in Vietnam is not a Chinese war. I look on the situation in North Vietnam as North Vietnamese expansionism, or Vietnamese Communist imperialism. My position, as I indicated earlier, is that we should hold on in the South without going North, without enlarging the war, while attempting, of course, to use our military power in the South as a shield behind which to build the social and political and economic institutions which alone can make any kind of long-range solution viable. But I don't see any contradiction between this and playing it cool with China, because I am certain that the Chinese will not intervene in Vietnam unless we go North on the ground—unless we in fact do what we did in Korea, which was to threaten their control directly. I don't at all believe we are likely to do this.

Goodwin: I disagree with the assumption that I think both Mr. Roche and Senator McGovern have made, which is that victory in Vietnam is somehow possible. I don't think that victory in Vietnam is likely at all. A Korean-type solution would mean a total defeat of the Communist effort to take over South Vietnam, which is what the war is about. So to speak of that solution is only another way of talking about victory.

A half-million men may seem like a lot of men, but I don't doubt that we will have that many men or more in there very shortly. But you can't win the manpower game. There are 300,000-plus regular troops in the North Veitnamese forces. I have no doubt that those troops will come down, and that when we get a half-million men in there we will find that we haven't got anywhere near enough. Nor has the bombing of the North ever been shown to have anything but the most marginal military value in terms of interdiction of supplies. During the last bombing attack before the pause, there was still a constant build-up by the Vietcong guerrillas. The bombing makes it harder. It means they have to walk at night, it means they have to take ferries instead of bridges. But there are a lot of unemployed people in North Vietnam who can do repair work.

The administration doesn't talk in terms of victory. If we ever did push it to the point of victory, I think the Chinese might well come in. This is a very good argument against pushing it to the point of victory.

I think we are getting into an Alice-in-Wonderland situation in Vietnam. Rhetorically, almost everyone is beginning to agree with everyone else in opposing withdrawal, in doubting that we can win, and in wanting an intermediate position—and all the while the war steadily escalates. My own feeling is that it's going to escalate further. Yet no military expert has demonstrated that victory is possible short of completely obliterating that piece of the peninsula from the earth's surface.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID BELL, DIRECTOR OF AID

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when David E. Bell resigns on July 31, after 3½ years as head of the Agency for International Development, to become vice president of the Ford Foundation, the Federal Government will lose one of its most able, intelligent, and effective administrators.

David Bell came to Washington from Harvard in 1961 to be President Kennedy's Budget Director and quickly established himself as a teacher who is also very much of a doer. His mastery of the vast AID bureaucracy, which had baffled and frustrated many of his very talented predecessors, is an achievement in the field of public administration that stands virtually without parallel.

As one who has had the privilege of working closely with him, and who has the greatest respect and affection for him, I wish him well in his new job. His years in Washington have involved a great personal sacrifice for him, and we are all very much in his debt.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials on David Bell, one from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and another from the Hartford Courant, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1966]

"Bushed and Broke"

No matter how valuable their services to the country, a time seems to come when all but a few who can stand the financial strain feel they must leave the federal government's service. David E. Bell, the able administrator of the Agency for International Development, is the latest to resign "bushed and broke."

President Kennedy brought him to Washington in 1961 as budget director and shifted him a year later to the foreign aid agency, where he quickly won congressional confidence and praise for his no-nonsense approach to this important wing of foreign policy. He emphasized self-help on the part of receiving countries, avoided providing assistance that would allow people to sidestep facing up to their own problems. Congress learned to expect that the sums he asked for would be a bare minimum with the fat pretty well trimmed out.

This was an achievement that eluded previous administrators in the aid program's rather stormy history. As Mr. Bell's deputy for two years, William S. Gaud, who will succeed him, has had good schooling which should enable him to carry on until he too becomes "bushed and broke."

[From the Hartford Courant, July 1, 1966]

Mr. Bell Resigns

David E. Bell has served three and a half years as head of the Agency for International Development. This notable service as administrator of a foreign aid program so vast that it had troubled his predecessors will end July 31 when his resignation takes effect. He will become vice president of the Ford Foundation where he will have charge of its international operations.

Mr. Bell's remarks upon his resignation again raise the question of the price that many men pay for their government service. He said he was bushed and broke, but pleased by the work done by his agency. No one will feel sorry for a man who is tired after such a struggle in a good cause. To accept a challenge, to give everything one has, and to see final success is an experience that is worth while in itself. Still, it is not right that men of high caliber be asked to pay too high a price financially.

The man in line to succeed Mr. Bell is William S. Gaud, the deputy administrator, who worked in harmony with him and can be expected to carry on the work. Mr. Gaud is a Greenwich resident, a graduate of the Yale Law School, and a former New York lawyer. The $3.4-billion foreign aid bill is expected to go through Congress by the time Mr. Bell leaves. It is an important measure in the nation's foreign policy program.

WAR ON POVERTY'S LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, many of the most distinguished members of the bar have spoken out in recent months on behalf of the war on poverty's legal services program. The eloquent and learned support of these leaders of the legal profession has been a crucial factor in providing impetus to this exciting new program.

In this connection, I invite the attention of the Senate to a speech by the distinguished Washington attorney, Howard C. Westwood, before the alumni association of the University of Pennsylvania Law School on May 12, 1966. Mr. Westwood, who is a partner with Covington & Burling, entitled his remarks, "A Stir in the Land," which quite aptly suggests the ferment and creative response which OEO's legal services program is causing in community action efforts across the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Westwood's speech printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Stir in the Land

(By H. C. Westwood)

There is a great stir in the land.

Legal aid has come to the fore.

Although legal aid societies have existed for many decades and gradually have grown in number, until recently only a small fraction of the bar and a very tiny segment of the rest of the community have known much about them, the need for them, and the operating problems they encounter.

The situation in Washington, D.C., just ten years ago was typical.

A legal aid society in Washington had been functioning diligently for nearly a quarter century. Yet the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Bar Association, upon looking into legal aid in 1955, found that even among many of the leaders of the local bar there was scant understanding of the work of the society. Moreover, a vast number of lawyers did not know that the legal aid society existed, or, if they had heard of it, had only the vaguest impression of it and of the needs it was trying to meet. Yet the bar in Washington had always been forward looking and concerned with the responsibilities of the profession.

The main reason for that situation was the very human tendency of busy people to "let George do it." Nor were Washington lawyers unique. Inquiry in other cities disclosed the same condition.

Much has happened in Washington and in the nation in these ten years that has wrought a change. Of great importance has been the program of the Ford Foundation, administered by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, to finance various criminal legal aid projects in selected cities.

---

[11] Mr. Phillips is editor of *Partisan Review*.

This and other developments set minds to working.

Gradually it has been realized that a comprehensive and vigorous legal aid job requires a great deal of money. A handful of the veterans in the legal aid movement had appreciated this for a long time, but so limited were available funds that even they were reluctant to recognize what was really needed. In many, many communities revenues for legal aid of a few thousand dollars a year were so hard to achieve in the face of lethargy and ignorance and prejudice that sights had tended to become very short. Then the Ford Foundation offered large sums for legal aid. But it was found that such riches merely scratched the surface. Only then, I suspect, did even the veterans begin fully to face up to the fact that a wholly new financial dimension had to be accepted.

In Washington there was a most significant experience during this decade. The Bar Association's Directors, after their look at legal aid ten years ago, provided for a special commission to recommend an adequate legal aid program for the capital city. After thorough study, a landmark report was issued in 1958.[1] It proposed that a comprehensive legal aid program, covering the entire civil and criminal field, should be undertaken by an enlarged legal aid society; it was estimated, after detailed analysis, that the expense would amount to $225,000 a year.[2] That seemed, then, a huge amount.

A first result of this recommendation was the creation by Congress of an agency to function in the criminal, mental health, and juvenile field with a staff of full-time lawyers and investigators.[3] Despite most efficient operation under a hard working board of directors composed of lawyers in private practice and with the budgetary oversight of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the agency has been able to meet only a small part of the need even in the field of its limited jurisdiction. Yet in 1965 its operations cost $255,000.[4]

Obviously the 1958 estimate that the full civil and criminal legal aid job could be done in Washington at an expense of only $225,000 a year was so far off target as to seem, in retrospect, almost ludicrous.

It was experience such as this, as well as experience with the program of the Ford Foundation, that demonstrated so that even the most fearful had to face it that adequate, comprehensive legal aid would require so much money that it could not possibly be financed by reliance only on traditional revenue sources—community chests, contributions by lawyers, and occasional payments by city governments. The only possible way to do the job properly would be for the federal government to step forward with its financial help.

Just as this stark fact was beginning to sink in, the federal government did step forward. The Economic Opportunity Act was adopted in 1964, to be administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its program was formulated late that year; it included, most happily, provision for help in the financing of legal aid projects in those communities having the wisdom and initiative to seek them.

Then, indeed, did things begin to stir.

The OEO, of course, could not simply hand out funds without inquiry. It had to draw up some general specifications for the projects that it would help finance. In doing so it has performed a great service by emphasizing elements that the pauperized legal aid budgets of the past have had grievously to neglect.

One such element is that of bringing legal aid service physically closer to the people who need it. A most obvious means, in the great metropolis, is through organization of neighborhood offices. Very limited experience in New York City, and even more limited experience elsewhere, demonstrated years ago the compelling need for this kind of organization. But nowhere had funds been available for a truly neighborhood type of operation.

A second element is that of use of the test case and other means for effecting improvement in the law in fields having special impact on the poor, such as in the area of consumers' protection. Lawyers for business enterprise and labor unions have performed distinguished service for their clients in shaping the law to their clients' interest. On occasion legal aid societies also have demonstrated what a great contribution they could make to the suiting of the law to their clients' needs. They have instituted and won notable test cases. They have drafted and won adoption of enlightened administrative regulations and even legislation. But this kind of work, to be consistently and fully effective, requires large resources. However legal aid societies may have yearned to do this job, none of them ever has had the means sufficiently to concentrate upon it, and most of them have been able to address themselves to it only fitfully if at all.

A third element is that of educating the humble people in a community as to their legal responsibilities and rights and as to the value of a lawyer's service to them, and, incidentally, to everyone. Here again legal aid societies have yearned for resources to undertake this mission; inability to do so has been one of the glaring defects in skeletal legal aid programs heretofore.

A fourth element is that of involving the poor people themselves in the legal aid project by having their representatives on the governing board. This is designed to carry out a requirement of the Economic Opportunity Act.[5] It is significant that such a requirement is even more explicit in a substitute for the Act recently proposed by Republican leadership in the House of Representatives.[6] Hence it cannot be shrugged off as a left-wing, crack pot notion. Whether, in the long run, the requirement will prove feasible is somewhat in doubt. But steps to comply with it in the meantime are having desirable consequences. For, among other things, they have led to a re-examination of the makeup of governing boards of legal aid groups, providing an occasion for the infusing of new blood that has been long overdue.

One aspect of the OEO program is much more prosaic than the things I have mentioned, but it may prove of most abiding benefit. That is the hard headed planning that is called for, and the challenge that is presented to the administrative capacity of legal aid society boards and staffs.

Those in charge of the OEO program are practical people. Quite properly they have been demanding that a local legal aid society seeking OEO's help put together concrete plans, with detailed budgets solidly backed up. In the case of many communities this is a new experience; often legal aiders have been operating on scales so modest that planning and budgeting have been called for, if at all, only to the most elementary degree. In facing the need for genuine planning, a number of communities have run into irritating delays as the formulation of projects for OEO has had to undergo repeated revision and refinement. But in this process there has been more thinking about the problems of legal aid and how to meet them, and more participation by more different people, during the last few months than during many years preceding.

In addition to the elements to which OEO has required attention, two points are emerging about which even OEO has not yet given much thought, but which have long cried for notice and for action.

One point is perplexing and delicate. It is accepted, of course, that legal aid service should not be provided to one who can afford to retain private counsel. OEO has been particularly faithful to that limitation. But the limitation as thus stated, if applied literally, has a grave fault. For in some areas of the law and in some communities there are lawyers in private practice who are available at very low cost but whose service is so bad that its availability should not bar the provision of legal aid. Bar associations sometimes incline to sweep this state of affairs under the rug.

The problem can be illustrated by what happens in misdemeanor courts in nearly every city of considerable size—the operation of the so-called "mourners' bench." Lawyers attend the court, picking up so-called "assignments" where defendants appear without counsel. Some of those lawyers are superb for the job. But some simply prey on the poor. Yet they can be "retained" for whatever few dollars the defendent has in his pocket. Literally applied, the usual limitation would bar the provision of legal aid where such a lawyer is at head.

In Washington a judge in misdemeanor court recently took action that came dramatically to front page notice. He let it be known that there were certain lawyers who had been in daily attendance at the court whom he would not "assign" to cases.[7]

The problem in misdemeanor court could be coped with without too great difficulty—although it is shocking that little has been done about it in any city. But the essentials of the problem exist elsewhere in the practice of law. Were the problem compounded only of lawyers' unethical conduct it would be serious enough. But it is compounded as well of sheer incompetence that a bar examination does not expose. That is what makes it perplexing and delicate. But perplexity and delicacy will not excuse sweeping it under the rug.

Another point is looming. That is the extent of the fundamental right of the layman to a lawyer's service, a right so fundamental as to be of constitutional proportions. The constitutional right to counsel has been recognized in criminal cases, even, recently, in some misdemeanor cases.[8] A similar right seems to be recognized in certain types of mental competency cases.[9] Something closely approaching such a right has been recognized in juvenile cases.[10] Thus far there seems to have been an assumption that the right is limited to cases involving personal liberty. This is careless. Is not property, also, constitutionally protected? And since when did equal protection of the laws—a principal forged in the fires of Civil War and which should pervade a democratic society—concern itself with the application only of some and not all process of the state? If a man who can pay for a lawyer can effectively defend himself against an unconscionable contract, is it not constitutionally requisite that a man who cannot pay for a lawyer be enabled also effectively to defend himself? Or, if a man who can pay for a lawyer can invoke judicial process as a plaintiff to protect his legal rights, is it not constitutionally requisite that a man who cannot pay for a lawyer be enabled also effectively to protect his legal rights?

---

[1] Report of the Commission on Legal Aid of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia (October, 1958).

[2] *Id.*, pp. 163–82.

[3] Act of June 27, 1960, 74 Stat. 229, D.C. Code § 2–2201, *et seq.*

[4] Information furnished by Kenneth D. Wood, Director, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia.

[5] Legal aid projects are financed under the "community action" provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, and Section 202(a)(3) of the Act (78 Stat. 516, 42 U.S.C. § 2782(a)(3)) requires that a "community action program" be "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served. . . ."

[6] Section 302(a) of H.R. 13378, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. (1966) would require that "representatives of the poor" comprise at least one-third of the membership of a "community action board." And see Section 303(a)(2).

[7] See The Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1966, p. A1, Col. 1.

[8] See Harvey v. Mississippi, 340 F. 2d 263 (5th Cir. 1965); McDonald v. Moore, 353 F. 2d 106 (5th Cir. 1965).

[9] See People v. Breese, 213 N.E. 2d 500 (Ill. 1966) (mental commitment proceeding following term of imprisonment); People v. Olmstead, 205 N.E. 2d 625 (Ill. 1965) (proceeding to obtain release after commitment).

On these questions legal aid societies have been strangely silent. Until they begin to ask such questions and to demand the answer that the professed principles of our society so plainly dictate, they are, I submit, derelict in the safeguarding of those in the community who are supposed to be in their charge. Even though legal aid societies have been mute, I would have thought that long ere this some law school, or at least some law review, would have given voice to this demand. But there has been a great silence. I suggest that the day is not distant, as a result of the stirring in the land, when such questions finally will be posed. When they are, the answer will be forthright, for equality before the law is too precious a principle not to be implemented in the only way that can make the principle real.

All this stir in the land is propelling legal aid forward with jet speed as compared with the snail's pace of only yesterday. It is being brought home to thoughtful people that this legal aid job is, indeed, an enormous one. No longer can it be treated as some George's pet charity. Evidence is accumulating that the full legal aid job, civil and criminal, in a city of, say, a million people, requires an annual expenditure of far more than a million dollars, and with skill and efficiency in administration with which legal aid societies and bar associations have been quite unfamiliar. Challenged as never before is the old leadership of the bar and of legal aid.

One well may wonder, and question, whether old leadership is up to meeting the challenge. If not, we need not greatly worry. For coming along in nearly every city is a generation of young lawyers ready and eager. If present leadership falters, stronger hands are reaching to take hold.

In many law schools todays students are beginning to think of legal aid as offering a career—a career, moreover, at least as honorable as, and perhaps far more stimulating than, a career in the service of corporate clients. In another way, also, the younger generation is glimpsing an opportunity. That is the opportunity for constructive service to legal aid by lawyers in private practice, both individual lawyers and lawyers in law firms. Obvious enough, even to the older generation, is the opportunity for participation by becoming a missionary for greater financial support for legal aid. Becoming obvious also is the opportunity for participation through service on boards, committees, and in other capacities concerned with the difficult problems of successful legal aid operations. Rich is opportunity of this sort—for example, the opportunity to participate in intensive training courses for legal aid staff lawyers. But most interesting—and what is seen, I am sure, more clearly by younger lawyers than by their elders—is the greatly enlarged opportunity for volunteer legal aid work. Quite properly OEO discourages reliance upon volunteer or part-time work for legal aid staffing in the larger communities. But there is a great opportunity for the use of the volunteer to take by referral from a legal aid society cases that are especially taxing either in time required or in the expertness demanded. In providing this resource the practicing private bar, if it has the will and the imagination, can give legal aid a scope and effectiveness of incalculable value. This sort of thing has been done to some degree on a hit or miss basis in the past. What is greatly needed is the bar's full scale and enthusiastic support with careful programming. That has never been done. It will come, I dare say, only as the younger lawyers seize leadership.

All this stir in the land is no passing matter. Legal aid is on the march, its ranks swelling each month. For behind it all there is the appeal of an idea that will never down. It is an idea that has stirred men for more than three hundred years. It can be expressed today no better than it was in earliest times when, at the grand council of officers of Cromwell's army, it was stated in these pregnant terms: ". . . the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the richest he." [11]

SARGENT SHRIVER'S GOAL: TO ELIMINATE POVERTY IN AMERICA BY 1976

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Honorable Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has made what could become a historic pronouncement: his goal for the elimination of poverty in this country is 1976, 10 years from now. The distinguished journalist and analyst, Mr. Hobart Rowen, has written an article presenting the economic background of this 10-year goal. Mr. Rowen's article, which appeared on July 10 in the "Business and Finance" section of the Washington Post, focuses attention on the key factor behind this antipoverty goal: economic growth. By 1976, the deadline for poverty, the economy should reach the $1 trillion mark. That is almost twice the size of the economy in 1960, when the gross national product was $503 billion. This growth is where the money to finance the war on poverty is expected to come from. The will to finance that war must come from the Congress.

Like any other war, the antipoverty program will require sacrifice and ingenuity. The Office of Economic Opportunity is considering various forms of income maintenance as a new attack against poverty. Our economy should be great enough to keep the fight against poverty going while we prosecute the war in Vietnam. As Mr. Rowen's article points out, we have the money and the tools to fight poverty: our most important need is the will to win.

Mr. President, the war on poverty can be won by 1976, but no one imagines it will be an easy victory. Some quarters have greeted this target date with total disbelief. Mr. Shriver has been accused of predicting with "rose-tinted glasses." Although this country is about to achieve a wealth unmatched in the history of the world, we are assured that the poor will always be with us. Such an attitude, Mr. President, may make its own shameful prediction come true. Not in 10 years, not in 100 years, will poverty vanish unless we have the will to destroy it. Mr. Shriver's schedule is realistic in terms of our economy. The will to do something about poverty must be made realistic in terms of our problems. If the Congress does not assume its responsibilities to the poor, then Mr. Shriver's prediction will indeed become a mere "figment." This so-called figment, however, is not the product of a lively imagination. It is the product of a belief in the social responsibility of American government. It is a belief that we will use our economic and institutional tools to change the destiny of poverty for 32 million Americans. Such a belief has been called whimsical. If this is whimsicality, it is more an indictment of Congress than a criticism of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Rowen for his contribution to informed discussion of the war on poverty and ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHRIVER'S POVERTY GOAL; REAL OR PIPE DREAM?

(By Hobart Rowen)

One needs blinders to ignore the sharp contrast between affluence and poverty on almost every side in this country. The lush rewards of an economic boom, in part fueled by war in Vietnam, pour into the lives of the many, while the tragedy of poverty continues to dominate "The Other America."

Our society is replete, on the one hand, with two-car families enjoying color TV, good food, long vacations, heat in the winter and air conditioning in the summer—and on the other, the nonfamilies, underfed and sickly, unemployed or scavenging for a few hours work, cold in winter and steamy in the summer, dying slowly in their garbage-laden hovels.

The more sensitive correspondents covering last week's Governor's Conference in Los Angeles cringed at the embarrassing lushness of a new hotel-city, a scant few minutes from the unbelievable excrescence that is Watts.

It is the same in every big city in the U.S.; the ghettos exist almost side-by-side with the fancy hotels and tower apartment with their roof-top pools and tennis courts.

Yet, when Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity proposed, that as a goal, poverty be wiped out by 1976, some scoffed. Shriver must be wearing "rose-tinted glasses," the *New York Times* harrumphed.

Well, regardless of the *New York Times'* editorial position, the only thing wrong with Shriver's goal is that 10 years may be too long to expect the poor to wait, docile and patient.

---

[10] In the District of Columbia it has been held that a juvenile is entitled by statute to the assistance of counsel in proceedings before the Juvenile Court; the reasoning suggests a constitutional right. Shioutakon v. District of Columbia, 236 F. 2d 666 (D.C. Cir. 1956); Black v. United States, 355 F. 2d 104 (D.C. Cir. 1965). In Kent v. United States, 34 U.S. L. Week 4228, 4232 (U.S. March 21, 1966), amici curiae argued that constitutional guaranties, including the right to counsel, applicable to adult defendants should be applied in juvenile court proceedings even though these proceedings are said to be "civil" in nature. The Court, holding for the juvenile on other grounds, found it unnecessary to decide this question.

[11] Quoted in Lindsay, The Essentials of Democracy, p. 13 (U. of Penn. Press, 1929).

This big, rich country of ours can well afford to spare the resources necessary to meet Shriver's goal, and to do anything less would be immoral.

The economic basis for our ability to do the job lies in the expectation that we will have a one-trillion-dollar economy in 1976. That is the figure 1 with 12 zeroes after it: $1,000,000,000,000.

This is no wild guess. In recent weeks, Walter W. Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr, and the National Planning Association—among others—have all come up with estimates around the trillion mark for Gross National Product ten years hence.

Heller, for example, calculates with some precision that given a 3.5 per cent growth rate, GNP in 1976 will be $978,000,000,000. If a more desirable 4.5 per cent growth rate is achieved, the total will be $1,078,000,000,000.

These box-car numbers are a bit unwieldy for ordinary comprehension. A more simple way of putting it is that a trillion-dollar country in 1976 will be fully *twice* the size of the economy as recently as 1960.

If on that basis, then, enough can't be spared to eliminate poverty, there's something wrong somewhere. The National Planning Association warns that everything can't be done at once. True. But as Heller says, "nothing else should have a priority higher than eradicating poverty."

Heller's views on this whole question, detailed here for the first time, deserve close attention. It was his imagination, after all, that first inspired President Kennedy to launch the antipoverty planning and convinced President Johnson to carry it forward as his own program.

The Minnesota economist is certain that Shriver's 1976 goal is realistic. "We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, considering our affluence, if we plan on anything else," Heller told me.

He agrees readily that there is more to licking poverty than just providing the money. "It is a question of ingenuity and our institutional capacity to get at the real roots of poverty," he says.

But in terms of being able to finance the effort, Heller rightly insists that the resources are there. This country can do anything it commits itself to do.

Shriver did not pluck the 1976 date out of the air. His target was based, first, on an interim goal for 1972 that would cut the existing poverty population of 32,000,000 to 12,000,000.

To do this, Shriver has laid before the Budget Bureau a five-year projection of spending beginning with fiscal 1968 that may shock the dollar-watchers in this country. But would they be less shocked by bloody revolutions in the ghettos?

OEO officials are not giving out these confidential estimates, but some good guesses can be made. One starts with the President's proposal in the budget for fiscal 1967 (the year which just began on July 1) for cash expenditures of about $24 billion to help the poor.

This includes not only OEO's own budget of $1¾ billion, but all the money to be spent for poor people through social security, veterans programs, public assistance and so on.

For fiscal 1968, this column learns, Shriver wants to add between $5 and 10 billion to the $24 billion figure, then boost the total by successive substantial (but lesser) increments each year through 1972.

That means a fiscal 1968 antipoverty budget in the vicinity of $30 billion or more, rising to $40 billion or more by fiscal 1972.

Does the number sound overwhelming? Can we afford it? Government sources indicate that by 1972, the Gross National Product will probably be around $850 billion, up $150 billion from the rate at the start of this year.

Thus, a $40 billion antipoverty program would mean allocating a slightly higher percentage of our wealth out of an $850 billion economy than we allowed when we spent $24 billion out of $700 billion.

But that is just the point: we must do better, or the antipoverty effort will be a mere holding operation, and actual eradication of poverty will be an unreachable hope.

Shriver says that if the poor can be reduced to 12,000,000 by 1972, the rest of the job can be completed in the four following years.

The war against poverty will need boldness of concept as well as money. Shriver and others talk of "income maintenance," a heavy phrase which means adding cash to the incomes of those who are not able to swing it despite all other forms of help.

One form of income maintenance is the controversial "negative income tax." Another, being investigated by the Council of Economic Advisers, is improved public assistance programs, which would involve minimum standards set by the Federal Government.

The form is less important than the final result, that is, boosting the income of the most unfortunate. Shriver calculates that to meet his first five-year goal, some seven million of the 20 million to be removed from poverty will need this kind of direct aid.

But how about the Vietnam war, some will ask. Can we afford all of this when the war costs so much?

If there is a major escalation of the war, other expenditures will have to suffer some. But unless Vietnam blows up into a total war, the huge American economy can still provide a better shake for its poor at home.

Top economists estimate, for example, that the war cost could increase by $2.5 billion each quarter without requiring additional taxes—the growth of the economy itself would cover that much of an escalation.

If the cost of the war should remain constant, there might actually be a sizeable surplus in fiscal 1967.

And looking hopefully to the day the Vietnam conflict ends, vast outlays to whip poverty will be needed not only for the social and humanitarian purposes involved, but to replace in part the vast war budget.

On balance, Shriver's goal is reasonable and desirable, and deserves the support of all thinking people.

NONVIOLENT CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for several years now, we have witnessed in this Nation a virtual social revolution going under the name of nonviolent civil disobedience.

This movement took it upon itself to scorn and bypass the ordinary processes of the law and to go into the streets in great numbers and take the law into its own hands. It spread with increasing momentum from places like Montgomery, Ala., and Greensboro, N.C., to cities and towns all across the country. Injected into the American vernacular were new terms, such as sit-in, wade-in, and kneel-in.

In a struggle for power, influence, and money, there grew from the movement various organizations, with varying degrees of militancy and areas of concentration. Their aim purportedly was to secure civil liberties, constitutional rights, and a redress of grievances—many of which were real and just as many of which were imagined. Nonviolence allegedly was its philosophy, but coercion, intimidation, and inflammatory mass action were its tactics.

What first was heard as a distant rumble soon reached deafening and frightening proportions. The emotions of the American people were captivated.

And Congress reacted.

In response to the demands of what was tantamount to a howling mob and under great pressure, the Congress acted decisively. In 1964, there was enacted into law the most all-encompassing and far-reaching so-called Civil Rights Act in 100 years. Some of us in the Senate opposed this legislation.

We did so because we believed it conflicted with the requirements and restrictions of the Constitution.

We did so because we were convinced that this legislation deprived American citizens of more rights and immunities than it granted to anyone.

We resisted this bill because we did not feel that certain rights guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution should be subverted in an alleged attempt to grant certain other rights to certain classes of our citizens.

We opposed the 1964 bill for the reason that many of the problems it sought to resolve were matters primarily addressing themselves to the mind, the heart, and the conscience of the individual. We did not believe such matters should be made the subject of force legislation.

We did not speak against this legislation with the intent to deprive any citizen of his rights under the Constitution or statutory law. We did then and do now deplore any attempt to do so, whether it be at the local, State or Federal level.

Whenever and wherever deprivations of rights exist—and some do—there are more than ample avenues for remedial action within the orderly processes of the law and our courts. And certainly no one would say that the Federal courts have been lax in this regard.

Nonetheless, the Congress passed the 1964 bill. The President signed it into law. It was said to be a civil rights bill to end all civil rights bills. It carried with it a promise by its advocates that this problem would be taken out of the streets.

Then last year there was placed on the books a punitive law to extend protection over the right to vote.

In addition, millions upon millions are being spent by the Federal Government under a vast array of expanded programs designed to improve the health, education, and welfare of our citizens, particularly the underprivileged. Although I do not subscribe to the theory, the right to a certain level of income, a certain standard of housing, and protection against poverty has been regarded by some as a civil right guaranteed by the Constitution.

Well, recently we heard a leader of one of the more militant civil rights pressure groups say that the 1964 Civil Rights Act is not worth the paper it is written on.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is scoffed at, and many of the welfare programs have been made the object of scandal and inefficiency.

Demonstrators are still in the streets, in greater numbers and with new slogans. Race hatred is being shouted from street corners all over the Nation. People are goaded and incited by such slogans as "burn, baby, burn!" and "black power."

This is rabble-rousing of the worst sort. Black supremacy is just as repugnant to our society as the doctrine of hate spewed forth by the Ku Klux Klan. The leader of the Congress of Racial Equality, the principal exponent of "black power," shouts to his followers that nonviolence is dead. The head of the so-called Snick organization recently addressed an audience in Atlanta and declared that he didn't think that the rioters of the Watts district acted in an extreme way. Said this erstwhile civil rights leader:

> I have had so much "law and order," I swear to God, I want a little chaos.

Is it any wonder, then, that mobs are storming in the streets, pillaging and killing?

If ever this movement was civil and nonviolent—and I do not concede that it was—it surely is not so today.

I submit, Mr. President, that it has degenerated into outright criminality and mob violence. As the Washington Evening Star stated editorially in April of this year, a tiger has been loosed in the streets of America.

As fearsome as this situation is, it should come as no surprise to anyone, least of all to those who have made a career of going about the country preaching disrespect for established authority.

What we have witnessed in city after city is without a doubt a creature of the misguided philosophy that there is no moral or legal obligation to obey all the laws all the time, but only some of the laws some of the time. This of course amounts to an open invitation to take the law into one's own hands, as former Supreme Court Justice Charles Whittaker has so eloquently pointed out on many occasions.

We have seen the fruits of this disrespect for authority and law and order in city after city, community after community throughout America. We witnessed it last week in Chicago, where it became necessary for military vehicles armed with machineguns to patrol the streets. We witnessed it last August in the Watts district of Los Angeles, where 36 died, almost 900 were injured, 209 buildings were destroyed by fire, and looting ran into the millions.

And just the other night, three more cities—Cleveland, Jacksonville, and New York—were torn by mob violence. One person was killed, a mother as she called from a window for her child.

Mobs are running amuck. People have been killed. Millions upon millions of dollars in property damage has been suffered. There has been no letup. To the contrary, mob violence and racial disorder is spreading like cancer throughout America. It is tragic but true, in my opinion, that the outlook at the present time is for more rioting, bloodshed, and property damage. And equally tragic is the wedge of racial division and dissension that is being hammered deeper and deeper into the heart of our country at a time when national strength and unity are imperative.

I am thankful, Mr. President, that the responsible leaders of our some 20 million Negro citizens likewise view this situation with great alarm. They have rightly denounced the "black power" movement, and they are to be commended for doing so. I hope other Negro leaders will speak out. Now is the time for responsible action, not mob action.

Mr. President, this is a matter of great national concern. Many regard it as the most critical domestic problem of the day. Civil strife such as we have seen sweep the country must be checked, or ours will no longer be a strong nation of laws in which the law is supreme over the whims of man, and not vice versa. Mobocracy will reign supreme.

It is time for the apostles of discord to cease and desist.

The hour has come for the President of the United States to give this situation his immediate attention. I urge him to make a personal appeal as Chief Executive for a restoration of law and order. It is fully appropriate for him to take such action as he may deem necessary, and to do so at the earliest possible time. Moreover, in the interest of preserving the peace and insuring domestic tranquillity, it falls his duty to do so.

I hope he will exert his leadership and make his voice heard.

I hope he will not mince words and that those who have preached disrespect for law and order will be called down from their soapboxes and made to account for the lawlessness and turmoil which now grips America.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17–23

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, with the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week, our attention is focused once again on the problems and courage of the peoples in the Communist-controlled areas of the world. This week has acquired added significance during the last year as the plight of those under Communist governments or threatened by Communist aggression becomes more striking. In Vietnam, we see the continued attempts by the North Vietnamese, aided by other Communist bloc countries, to subject South Vietnam to a Communist form of government. In Eastern Europe, we see the growing desires by the peoples of that region to obtain some degree of freedom, even within the Communist system. In both cases, the examples emphasize the need for firmness in our fight against Communist aggression throughout the world and our duty to recognize and encourage constuctive attempts to escape Communist suppression.

The major fact of any Communist domination is the loss of freedom for those living in the region. Communist governments impose an all-encompassing control over all ways of life. The means of economic growth, the manner of cultural expression, the form of government—all are dictated by a central governing body which claims to act for the people, but really acts only for itself and the Communist Party. The freedoms which have always motivated men's hopes—the freedom to think what one wants, the freedom to write what one pleases, the freedom to choose one's own elected officials from several choices in an open election, the freedom to worship one's God publicly—are taken from the peoples of the captive nations and not returned. These freedoms, in fact, cannot be returned, for their reinstatement would undermine the entire framework of Communist dominations.

Captive Nations Week gives us an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to opposition against those who would remove the principle of individual freedom under governments of law. It allows us to recall attention of the entire world to the injustices under Communist rule and the repeated violations of basic human rights. These acts against the liberty of man have been committed throughout the world—in Cuba, in Eastern Europe, in Asia, and in Russia itself. The result of Communist domination serves to reinforce the spirit, including our own, of all those who are now guarding against Communist subversion in the newly developing nations in the world. It is important to continually emphasize to these young nations the immense price in human freedom and scope of individual activity which accompanies any Communist takeover. We must warn those who would adopt communism as the easy means to national power.

The initial resolution passed by Congress in 1959 to commemorate this week mentions some 20 nations who have been robbed of their freedom and national independence. This entire list represents many millions of people throughout the world who are now held in straitjackets by the Communist governments. The resolution also recognized the simple fact that these peoples aspire to national and personal self-determination and that these goals are unobtainable only because of the force of Communist arms and occupation, a means of power alien to any principle of self-determination.

With our national interest presently captivated by the recent Asian developments, Captive Nations Week also reemphasizes the problem of the east-central European nations. The peoples of that area continue to express their allegiance to the ideals of human liberty and an open society, although living under Communist forms of government for almost 20 years. In recent months, the leaders of these lands have paid token recognition to the undercurrent of discontent and proclaimed "liberalizations" of their regimes. This so-called "liberalization," however, is merely a facade, for it does not give the desired goals of political self-determination or human liberties. It is also interesting to note that the Communist regimes invariably draw the line in cultural matters whenever the Communist Party's monopoly on ideas is threatened. Even Marshal Tito, theoretically one of the more "liberal" leaders, jailed Milovan Djilas when Djilas' calls for cultural freedom seemed to threaten Tito and Communist Party domination.

For the peoples of the captive nations, the attempts to regain basic human rights is thwarted. Yet, for the number of those who escape to the West still attests to the strength of their underlying desire for personal liberties and a freer way of life. Our foreign policy should stimulate this feeling of independence and support moves to restore it. As the 1959 resolution stated, "It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive."

As a major step in that direction, we should reevaluate the recently proposed concept of building bridges through trade and aid with the nations of east-central Europe. At a time when we are at war in Vietnam against Communist aggression aimed at overthrowing a free and sovereign state, we should not aid those who are helping our enemies. We should stop all aid or trade which goes to support Communist power structures unless we receive significant political concessions in return.

In the peoples of the captive nations we have a great bulwark against the Communist attempts to dominate all of us. Their calls for freedom serve as a prime example to remind the world of the conditions in Communist-controlled areas. Captive Nations Week also allows us to reassert our obligation to help these people in their fight for self-determination. I hope that all of us will use this week to reaffirm our support of basic human rights, so important to our way of life and the true source of our strength.

Many of these sentiments were expressed in a recent resolution by the Captive Nations Council of Colorado—a group representing Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Ukraine, and headed by a highly respected, dedicated, and knowledgeable person, Mr. Joseph Lataitis.

Since this resolution does so aptly describe the desires of the peoples of any captive nation, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Captive Nations Council of Colorado Resolution 1966

Captive nations is the name given to those nations which found themselves behind the Iron Curtain, against their own choosing, as a result of communist imperialism. They fell under the direct influence and domination of the Communists without even having been represented or consulted at the Allied Conferences at which their fate was decided—Teheran, Yalta.

They are not free today because they can not freely steer their own course based on the actual will of their peoples, as guided by Christian morality. They must comply, by persuasion or coercion, with the dictates of communist ideology as interpreted by the party, for whom the end sanctifies the means. The fact remains that the communist strategy and aims have never changed: to conquer the world and to establish its own brand of justice, based on the dictates of the party, therefore

We declare to the free world and the USSR that the people of the captive nations believe in the right of self-government and the basic inherent freedoms of man;

We accuse Russia of illegal occupation, armed oppression and illegal incorporation of nations into the Soviet Union;

We accuse the Soviet Union of brutal massacre of human dignity and rights of man in the captive nations;

We demand that the Soviet Union be dissolved and Russia withdraw all its troops, agents, colonists and controls from all captive nations;

We demand that the freedom of the captive nations be restored according to the will of the people;

We request the governments of the free world to use all peaceful means to restore and protect the rights of peoples freedom of choice in all corners of the world;

We request the United Nations De-Colonization Committee to fulfill its duty and take up the case of Soviet Colonialism in the world;

We appeal to the people of the free world to support the captive nations in their struggle toward free determination and justice;

We pledge to maintain the existence of this problem before the people of all free nations;

We pledge to avail ourselves and our organized activities to combat comunistic imperialism on all moral and legal grounds, as spokesmen for the oppressed, until the captive nations are free again.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD PRESS INSTITUTE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, last month the World Press Institute held its annual forum and dinner, at which the Pulitzer Prize winners in journalism were the special guests. More important, however, the occasion also marked the commencement for the 15 visiting foreign newsmen, who have studied this year as fellows of the World Press Institute. I take this opportunity to salute this unique experience in international communication, which is based on the laudable faith that the best way to show foreign journalists the American way of life is to allow complete freedom to wander, freedom to observe and explore, and freedom to write without restrictions.

Sponsored by Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn., and a number of cooperating corporations, the World Press Institute brings 15 foreign newsmen from all parts of the world to this country every year. For example, this year's group included men from Brazil, Ghana, Lebanon, and Pakistan. During their stay, the journalists study at Macalester, intern on a major American daily newspaper, travel widely, and do independent research on various aspects of American life. In the process of this varied program, the visitors gain increased knowledge—and, we hope, increased appreciation—of our people, our society, and our governmental process.

In case after case, the journalists return home with a more objective understanding of the American scene. This wider perspective helps them give accurate reporting on our activities at home and abroad. As a result, foreign readers gain a greater insight and more realistic view of news developments involving the United States. In addition, their broader journalistic training inevitably assists their role as responsible opinionmakers in their own countries.

The World Press Institute is now entering its sixth year of operation. It illustrates the continued commitment of private colleges, foundations, and businesses to promoting increased international understanding. I am sure that all of us hope that this role will continue to expand at this time when American commitments in many areas of endeavor are worldwide. We should actively encourage this sort of program so that our world image is presented objectively to all parts of the world. I am sure that such a presentation will gain us new friends, will aid us in self-examination, and will enhance our efforts to promote freedom and human liberties throughout the world. As one visiting journalist said at the end of his year with the World Press Institute, "In a world growing tragically short of this virtue, your openhearted friendliness is the one thing that will, if given a chance, help bring our nations together."

Mr. President, I congratulate the World Press Institute for its forward thinking in this area.

FULL HEARINGS SHOULD BE HELD ON THE PRAYER AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on March 22 of this year, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools. That resolution was referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The chairman of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], has scheduled hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 148. Those hearings are scheduled for the days of August 1st through 5th, and 8th through 10th—a total of 8 days of hearings.

I welcomed this announcement of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 148, for it offers an opportunity to explore this constitutoinal question, which has been a matter of significant national concern since the first Supreme Court decision on school prayer in 1962. I wrote to Senator Bayh last Monday, suggesting a number of witnesses who might be called to testify on this proposed school prayer amendment. The witnesses I suggested for the hearings include some of the most prominent churchmen and constitutional lawyers in our Nation.

Therefore, I was surprised and disappointed to see in yesterday morning's Washington Post an article entitled "DIRKSEN Will Bypass Committee on Prayer." This report indicates that Senator DIRKSEN intends to seek to discharge Senator BAYH and his subcommittee from further consideration of the proposed amendment on prayer. The article further states that, if the discharge effort fails, Senator DIRKSEN plans to bypass orderly Judiciary Committee procedures and move directly on the Senate floor to substitute Senate Joint Resolution 148 for Senate Joint Resolution 144, a join resolution now on the Senate calendar, to authorize the President to designate October 31 as National UNICEF Day.

Quite aside from the merits of Senator DIRKSEN's proposal to amend the Constitution. I was surprised and disappointed by this report, for I had assumed that Senator DIRKSEN would want the fullest exploration of all the implications of his proposed amendment, especially since it would modify the guarantees of freedom of religion embodied in the first amendment to the Constitution.

I am aware that 18 days of hearings were conducted by the House Judiciary Committee in 1964 on other suggested modifications of the first amendment to deal with school prayer. But surely Senator DIRKSEN would not suggest that these hearings provide a substitute for hearings on his proposed amendment, since those hearings led to the conclusion that no school prayer amendment should be approved. In fact, the 1964 Congressional Quarterly Almanac reported, in summarizing the House action:

> The prayer decisions receded as a congressional issue as it became clear that many religious organizations opposed any action to reverse the Court decisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Nor can I imagine Senator DIRKSEN would suggest that the 2 days of hearings on other school prayer proposals conducted by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1963, provide any basis for assessing his new proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 148.

I am sure most of us agree than any proposal to amend the Constitution's freedom-of-religion guarantees deserves the most thorough consideration by both Houses of the Congress. Senate Joint Resolution 148 deals with freedom of religion, a central tradition in our American life, and with the question of prayer in schools, a significant national concern. I cannot believe that after nearly 180 years without amendment, the first amendment must be amended for the first time in a matter of days, without any hearing by the appropriate Senate subcommittee. Nor can I believe that, after 4 years, the Supreme Court's decisions under the first amendment concerning prayer in schools must be modified before hearings on the meaning of the proposed amendment can even be held.

As an official of my church, as a father of three children, and as an individual raised throughout his life in strong religious tradition and practice, I share the concern of every Senator in preserving and encouraging the religious orientation of our Nation, and in strengthening the moral fiber of our people. But as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as a member of its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, as a Senator, and as a lawyer, I am not prepared to see our venerable first amendment to the Constitution modified, except after the most thorough hearings on the scrutiny of the proposed amendment before the appropriate Senate subcommittee.

I think our churches and churchmen should be heard on the questions raised by Senate Joint Resolution 148. I think our Nation's leading constitutional lawyers should be heard as to is precise meaning. And I think prominent laymen and school administrators ought to be heard on the Supreme Court decisions and the effect of this proposed amendment on religious activities in the schools.

I intend to urge my fellow members of the Judiciary Committee to insist on full and comprehensive open hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 148, where all the responsible leaders of our Nation's churches will be permitted to testify. I can conceive of no reason why we must rush to amend the constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion before hearings on the proposed amendments can even be held.

Moreover, I am deeply concerned by the procedure which Senator DIRKSEN has indicated he will utilize if he cannot get the Judiciary Committee to discharge its Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 148. There is no reason to bypass the normal time-honored procedure of the Senate for considering any bill, in order to rush to the Senate floor with this proposed amendment to our guarantees of religious freedom.

There certainly can be no doubt of a favorable reception for Senate Joint Resolution 148 in the hearings to be conducted by the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee. Five of the nine members of that Subcommittee are cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 148.

In short, it appears that the only thing to be feared from hearings is that serious questions might be raised about the meaning of the amendment, or grave reservations might be raised as to its import.

I have no desire to delay the Senate's consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 148. In fact, I have told Senator BAYH I will help him chair whatever hearings prove necessary on the resolution. But I must oppose any attempt to ramrod this proposed modification of the first amendment through the Senate without normal, orderly, and full committee consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "DIRKSEN Will Bypass Committee on Prayer," written by Robert C. Albright, and published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN WILL BYPASS COMMITTEE ON PRAYER

(By Robert C. Albright)

Miffed at Senate Judiciary Committee inaction on his controversial "prayer amendment," Sen. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (R-Ill.) said yesterday he won't wait for already scheduled judiciary subcommittee hearings.

Instead, he told newsmen, he plans to move in the committee on Thursday to "discharge" a subcommittee headed by Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) from further consideration of the resolution.

If that effort fails, DIRKSEN said, he plans to move directly on the Senate floor to substitute for already pending legislation his amendment "permitting the voluntary participation of students or others in prayer."

The bill he has picked as the "prayer" vehicle is a joint resolution, already approved by the House, designating Oct. 31 of each year as "National UNICEF Day."

DIRKSEN's strategy thus would parallel his efforts last August to substitute his ill-fated reapportionment amendment for a House bill designating "American Legion Baseball Week." That maneuver failed for lack of the required two-thirds majority.

BAYH announced only last Friday that he will hold eight days of hearings on DIRKSEN's amendment, starting Aug. 1. But DIRKSEN said he wants the hearings held down to two days, lest his resolution get snagged in the adjournment rush. BAYH, however, stood firm on his eight-day hearing notice.

HOW TO SUCCEED IN SELLING U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Succeed in Selling Savings Bonds," published in Life magazine for July 8, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO SUCCEED IN SELLING SAVINGS BONDS

President Johnson has taken on a new job—that of dictating the savings habits of 5.8 million federal employes. Some of them may never be able to untwist their arms again.

Declaring that "there is no better investment than U.S. savings bonds," and that their purchase is "both prudent and patriotic," the President decreed that federal employes, who were already signed up 60% strong, for payroll savings bond deductions, must set a better example.

He cast around for the closest ones to hand—the employes at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue—and promptly managed to increase the bond-buyers there from 57.4% to 100% of the staff. Delighted, he set out after the rest of the federal employes. With considerable logic, his choice for campaign enforcer was Postmaster General Larry O'Brien, a major-league arm-twister in his own right.

While the President carefully watched the progress of the campaign on two charts set up in his Cabinet room, O'Brien was telling agency heads, "The President . . . will accept nothing less than the minimum immediate goal of 75%, will consider adequate nothing less than realization of our long-range goal of 90% and will be satisfied with nothing less than achievement of the 100% record established by the White House."

Department heads down to the level of postmasters in one-man post offices got the message. Reading, Pa. postal workers were told by an official, "Buy bonds or bye-bye." While Civil Service status protects most federal workers from firings, other pressures can be applied. A New Jersey postal worker was refused two weeks' leave that he planned to spend with his Vietnam-bound son until he knuckled under and signed a saving bond pledge.

The campaign has paid off. Bond sales to federal employes have jumped from $206 million to $410 million, and the percentage of workers signed up from 60% to 76.5%. But the campaign has also paid off in widespread and justifiable bitterness among the employes.

Complaining about the uproar his tactics had caused, O'Brien claimed, "A few cynics who have attempted to tarnish our savings bond campaign seem to have lost sight of the fact that the responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy such as ours are as great as the freedoms our democracy guarantees."

While the purchase of savings bonds *can* be an excellent idea, it is an investment decision which is up to the citizen himself, including the citizen who works for the U.S. government. The President and his Postmaster General should call off their shabby campaign of coercion.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this week marks the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

It was so designated by the Congress in 1959 to remind Americans of those peoples to whom freedom and national independence have been denied.

It is a week set aside to focus public attention on those nations deprived of liberty because of the global and aggressive ambitions of others.

Our expressions of support will serve as beacons of hope to these nations that one day they again will be free of the yoke of oppression.

PRESERVATION OF MIGRATORY BIRD REFUGE ON LAKE ERIE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on July 26, the Migratory Bird Commission of the United States will hold a meeting at which it will determine whether or not it will proceed with the purchase of 535 acres of marshland on the shores of Lake Erie in Ohio. I sincerely hope that the Commission will act favorably upon that proposal.

The marshlands, in all, consist of about 15,000 acres. 10,000 acres have already been acquired by the State government and the Federal Government. 5,000 acres remain in private hands. My hope is that eventually either the State or the Federal Government will acquire the entire 5,000 acres.

However, the issue before the Migratory Bird Commission on July 26 will be merely the acquisition of 535 acres, at a cost of $450 per acre, or a total cost of $240,750.

In my judgment, it would be a serious mistake, a violation of the rights of nature, to allow that marshland on the shores of Lake Erie—which now is a refuge for migratory birds—to become used for commercial purposes or otherwise. We owe it to posterity to acquire that land. I believe the entire 5,000 acres should be acquired eventually, and immediately the 535 acres under consideration. I urge the members of the Commission to proceed with the acquisition of the land.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes. I made this request of the majority leader, and it was agreeable to him.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD CHINA

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, President Johnson's speech of July 12 on U.S. Asian policy was both positive and firm in addressing the problems we face in that part of the world. The tone of the President's message was clear: if we are to seek and find peace and security in Asia, if that continent is ever to be more to us than simply a place of confrontation and battle, there must be a "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies." But the President was also realistic in outlining our role as a Pacific power in the future of Asia. He said that aggression by military force against free and independent Asian states will not be permitted, and that the best defense against future aggression lies in the building of viable Asian societies and economies.

It is my hope that this excellent address will mark the beginning of a meaningful discussion in this country of U.S. foreign policy goals in Asia. I am sure that these goals will not preclude our taking of steps leading to ever more normal relations with China.

For the last few months we have been witnessing the outward manifestations of severe political turmoil on the Chinese mainland. Intellectuals have been denounced, heroes have become villians, in the classic pattern of a Communist purge. It would be premature to even guess at the final outcome of China's internal struggle. While we know that in the near future China will experience a change in leadership, we can only hope that her hostile attitudes toward the world will also change with the passage of time. The veterans of the Long March to the caves of Yenan are now aged; their experiences and their resulting devotion to a cause are not the experiences of 700 million other Chinese. Utopian promises have faded, a Great Leap has stumbled, and a self-imposed isolation is having its toll on industrial and scientific progress—to say nothing of the intellectual unrest created by the absence of new ideas and the internal control of thought.

In this setting it is possible that China will find it to be in her own interest to reach an accommodation with her Asian neighbors and the powers of the world. This may come about when it becomes clear to her that in foreign affairs blustering militancy and repeated threats of violence will not cause the resolve of other nations to collapse. It may come about when she finds that the solution of domestic problems involves much more than exhortation. Then China may conclude that what she must do with her energies and resources within will demand more stable and peaceful relations without.

None of this is to say that the Communist government of China will pass away or even change significantly in the foreseeable future. Rather what this shows is that China today is susceptible to change, and the characteristic ingredients for internal moderation are present.

In monolithic societies opportunities for other nations to affect change appear in periods of succession and unrest. If we are, in the words of the President, to "discourage a hostile China," if we are to "encourage a misguided China" to a greater understanding of the world, if we wish to see a "peaceful China as the center of a peaceful Asia," we must be prepared to take advantage of these opportunities resulting from transition. We must do all we can to make sure that the new leaders of China have the largest number of peaceful options. To the extent that her relations with the United States and the world are now the subject of internal argument we should take positive steps to insure that such questions remain high on China's agenda of dissent.

On May 3, both Senator McGovern and I suggested the creation of a blue-ribbon commission to both study and inform the American public of the problems we face in our China relations. We hoped, and still do hope, that such a body would investigate many of the steps that the President alluded to: the exchange of scholars, businessmen, and reporters, as well as the question of trade; but, above all, the ways in which greater communications can be established between us and the most powerful state in Asia. I have been extremely heartened by the reaction both within the administration and the country to our call for a new discussion of China.

I also suggested that highest priority be given to the question of China's membership in the United Nations. This question deserves priority not because of its overwhelming significance, but because within 3 months it will come up again as the General Assembly gathers in New York City. In past years we have undertaken an enormous diplomatic effort to convince our allies and the neutral nations that the admission of mainland China is detrimental to the best interest of the free world.

There is little doubt that this yearly effort has been costly to us. We have expended precious diplomatic capital. Not all nations—indeed it can be said that less than a majority—today view China's admission to the U.N. as disastrous as we do. We have retained their support in other ways, in some instances yielding to these member states on other issues. In most instances we have been forced to send our emissaries to argue a position again and again to nations that find our position quite unrealistic in the light of world events—even nations living on the rim of China. Perhaps this annual diplomatic activity was justifiable in the past. But its continuation depends on a new judgment that success on this issue is worth the price we have been paying. I am no longer convinced that our best interests continue to lie in this direction. I do not believe that an unyielding negative approach to the China question serves the best interests of the United States, Formosa, our Asian friends, or the United Nations in the world today.

I suggest that, if we are to follow up on the recent positive view of Asia outlined so clearly by the President, now is the time to fully review this matter. I am sure that a different and more positive position can now be taken by our Government, and that such a position will be better received by our fellow members of the U.N. while at the same time preserving the truly vital concern we have in this entire matter. It has been stated that "He who moves not forward goes backward."

The major concern of the United States is, or should be, the commitment we have to our friends on Formosa, that, regardless of international events, their presence and the voice of the 12 million Nationalist Chinese citizens will be preserved in the United Nations. It appears that we are endangering that commitment by our continued emphasis on obstructing the usual China resolutions. All of the resolutions that have been proposed to date have called for the expulsion of Formosa. Thus, in this diplomatic effort, we have allowed others to choose the issue and control the setting. Our position has been purely defensive. Many of our traditional allies—Great Britain, France, India, the Scandinavian countries, to mention but a few—have opted in the past for the exclusion of Formosa and the presence of Red China. And the rollcall on this question over the years has shown our position to be deteriorating, our persuasion less compelling.

A simple majority of the U.N. decides whether or not the ultimate vote for admission of China will be a two-thirds vote or simply a majority vote. In 1961, 61 countries voted to make this issue an "important question," requiring the two-thirds vote, while 34 were opposed. The final vote on admission was 48 to 37, with 19 abstentions. In 1965 only 56 nations called for a two-thirds vote on the issue, with 49 opposed. On the final question the vote was 47 to 47 with 20 abstentions. Clearly the favorable votes are being eroded, and last year's final tie vote raises serious questions as to how long this issue will remain an "important question." It is on this slim thread that Formosa remains in the United Nations.

I would suggest that if we are to preserve the presence of Formosa in the United Nations, we would be well advised to take the initiative in drafting and supporting a resolution that would allow both the presence of China as well as the retention of Formosa. While it is quite likely that this proposal would be considered unacceptable at first, by both Formosa and China, I feel it has many advantages that would serve our position well. First, we would, in effect, be placing the burden of China's absence from the U.N. on the Chinese themselves as well as their supporters in that body, should China object to our attempts or subsequently refuse the invitation of the member state.

Second, we would be shifting the emphasis of the annual discussion from the question of why China should be included or excluded to the question of the preservation of Formosa.

Finally, we would be informing the United Nations that we are prepared to labor for the goal of the United Nations being a universal body, with representation for all the people of the world.

The question of preserving Formosa, and our support for universality in the U.N., will, I am sure, have an impact on the many small nations of the General Assembly. Many of the new U.N. members should be asked if they are anxious to negate this principle by continuing to move for the expulsion of a fellow member. Formosa is a country of 12 million people. She is one of the most advanced economies in Asia, having just raised her per capita income by 50 percent in 10 years. She carries on over a billion dollars in world trade and has formal diplomatic relations with 57 nations. There are few new member nations in the U.N. of this size or growth with such comparable success in the world scene. What can guarantee these new states their own presence in a world body if Formosa can be so easily expelled?

Mr. President, I would not take it upon myself to state what any specific resolution should contain, or whether or not it should be combined with other matters of U.N. representation or membership. There have been situations in the past where former single states split and the United Nations had to handle the admissions problem. This occurred in 1947 when Pakistan separated from India, and in 1961 when Syria withdrew from the United Arab Republic.

In the China case, however, we have an additional complexity that must be recognized. The Nationalist Government holds one of the five permanent seats on the Security Council. Those in the past who have supported the usual resolutions for the entry of the People's Republic of China to the U.N. have assumed that China would be entitled to take the Formosan seat on the Security Council, also. I would be strongly opposed to this development at this time, and view the possibility of this occurring as another substantial reason for a U.S. initiative on this question.

It is true that, since the 1961 uniting-for-peace resolution, most of the meaningful U.N. activities, at least in peacekeeping matters, have shifted from the Council to the General Assembly. Even so, China today does not seem to be able to agree on any matter with anyone in the world. The kind of disruptive activity we could expect from China in the short run—not unlike the Russian experience—would seem to preclude her presence on the Council. One need only imagine what the presence of China on the Security Council would have meant during the recent India-Pakistan dispute, when a Malaysian cease-fire resolution was unanimously adopted by the Security Council and then accepted by the parties to the dispute as the basis for a peaceful settlement. Clearly, this matter would have received a Chinese veto, regardless of, or perhaps because of, the agreement by the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the necessity for U.N. action.

I would suggest, therefore, that part of the United States effort also be directed toward a review of the current Security Council arrangements. The five permanent members of the Council—the United States, U.S.S.R., Great Britain, France, and China—were entitled to their favored position on the basis of their leadership of victory in World War II. The world, and the powers that affect the world, have changed considerably since that time. We are now committed to former enemies. We have had serious confrontations and differences with our former allies. It would seem only appropriate that the basic Security Council composition reflect who has the most potential to preserve peace today, rather than who won the war 20 years ago.

Without endorsing any one solution to the Security Council problem, certain alternatives can be suggested, that I am sure are apparent to those expert in these matters.

The basic Security Council problem centers on which China should have the permanent China seat and the accompanying veto power. The most obvious solution is that neither China be seated on the Council permanently at this time. This could be accomplished by a revision of the Charter reducing the number of permanent seats from five to four.

More realistic, perhaps, would be the retention of the five permanent seats, with the fifth position going to one of the dominant underdeveloped states of the southern half of the world—such as India.

This move would reflect the concern of the U.N. in the developing world while recognizing that world power and a voice in peace is not a function of armaments alone. India represents the great experiment of our generation—a struggle toward freedom and democracy against all the negative forces generated by problems of population, poverty, underdeveloped resources, and geography. To the extent that such a proposal for one nation would be unacceptable to others, this fifth seat with its permanent seat privileges could rotate among developing world members.

The Covenant of the League of Nations contained a provision allowing for the expansion of the League's Council, without constant amendment to the covenant. Similarly, the Charter of the U.N. could be so amended to introduce the needed flexibility in Council membership. This would allow for future representation of China on the Council, if she displayed by her behavior after admission that she deserved such a position. This basic change in the Charter could also be accompanied by revisions in the veto procedure, as, for example, reserving the use of the veto only on binding decisions of the Council with majority votes controlling the nonbinding recommendation of the Council to the General Assembly.

The point remains, however, that, regardless of the construction of the U.S. proposal, our efforts and the abilities of our statesmen should be directed toward new approaches to old problems. We should be exercising, in international affairs, the same ingenuity with which we have attacked our problems on the domestic scene.

Mr. President, this course would be profitable to our interests, not only because Formosa's presence would be preserved. It has been repeatedly stated by Secretary-General U Thant that the United Nations can have no influence in the Vietnam crisis, since only one of the major powers involved is present in the United Nations—the United States. As the Secretary-General said in May of this year on the question of Vietnam:

> If the Security Council is to be usefully involved in finding a solution to any problem threatening international peace and security, one prerequisite is that the Security Council must be in a position to hear both sides of the question. In my view this is a must. Without this prerequisite I do not believe the Security Council should be involved in any question.

The same argument could be made for the General Assembly. It may well be that the presence of China would not assist the solution in Vietnam. But if we ever expect the United Nations to play its proper role in the future of Asia and world peace, we should recognize the need for all powers to be present within the organization.

Admission of China to the United Nations would also help maintain communications among nations in this age. It is absolutely necessary that one nation should be fully aware of the intentions of another, in keeping the peace and protecting vital interests. To whatever extent an isolated China miscalculates our desires and aims in a peaceful Asia, and acts on this misinformation to the detriment of the Asian people, we will have failed our friends and allies.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a United States effort to construct a solution reflecting our best interest to the China-United Nations question will bear immediate fruit. But I do believe that if we take the initiative as I have proposed to preserve Formosa, work for the universality of the United Nations by recognizing the need for all nations to be included in its work, without allowing for the disruption of the organization, we will mark a new beginning in our Asia policy, and make it where most important—in the eyes of our Asian friends and allies.

When they observe that our policy is constructive; when they observe that our policy approach is flexible enough to encompass their own needs and aspirations, we shall be well on the way to undertaking the basic task of assisting in the development of a stable Asia. It is Asia that must first live with the future China, and the President has rightly committed us to our Asian friends in their efforts. So, too, we must now move to meet the challenge of China, not on the battlefields of our Asian friends, but initially in the international forum created for peace.

How well we move, how long it will take, is impossible to say. But it is my hope that beginning with this September in the United Nations we will take the initiatives in the diplomatic arena for future peace and understanding.

For, as the President has said:

> The peace we seek in Asia is a peace of conciliation between Communist states and their non-Communist neighbors; between rich nations and poor; between small nations and large; between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white; between Hindus and Moslems and Buddhists and Christians.

This, too, defines the hope of the U.N. It is time to begin.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts for the fine statement he has made today. He was kind enough to give me a copy of his prepared text, which I have read. It is a thoughtful, prudent, and courageous statement, and one that I hope will be carefully considered by the Members of Congress and the executive branch.

I was pleased to join with the Senator from Massachusetts on May 3, in an appeal for more discussion and more consideration of this important question of our relations with the largest country on the face of the earth—mainland China.

I am pleased that the Senator has quoted the President's call for "a reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies." I believe that no diplomatic challenge is more significant or more urgent than a reconciliation between the United States and the people of China, this largest of all countries.

The view in some quarters is that, because of the belligerent statements that have been emanating from China in recent years, a conflict is inevitable. But we know, as the Senator has said, that times change, that yesterday's enemies become tomorrow's friends. I believe that time often works in a healing manner in the affairs of nations. So I hope that we use this opportunity that we have, both in the United Nations and in other councils, to move in a more positive and more constructive direction.

I believe that the United States is powerful enough and wise enough so that we can afford to take the lead and provide some initiative and some direction looking toward a more hopeful policy.

The suggestion of the Senator for possible changes in the Security Council certainly merit consideration. Nothing about the U.N. Charter removes it from the possibility of reconsideration and change, looking toward the settlement of some of these difficult questions. I do not know whether the specific formula the Senator has suggested here today is the right one or not, but, as he has indicated, we cannot stand still. We must consider new possibilities when we get into the kind of diplomatic dead end that we seem to be in today with reference to China.

Like the Senator from Massachusetts, I have been heartened by the public reaction—as well as some of the administration reaction—to our discussion in the Senate some 2½ months ago. I checked with my staff this morning on the mail reaction that has come into our office, and almost all of it has been favorable. Not everyone agrees with the specific suggestions that were made here, but general agreement prevails that new approaches need to be tried, that this issue should not be swept under the rug. This matter should be brought out where Congress and members of the executive branch and the American people can discuss it openly.

I do not believe that any reasonable person regards the United Nations as a place simply for people who agree on all issues. It is a place where nations in disagreement—and sometimes in conflict—can get together across the conference table and talk not only about their differences but also about possible areas of accommodation.

Again, I commend the Senator for the excellent statement that he is making here today, and for his continued leadership on this important question.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. One of the more important sections of the excellent speech of the Senator from South Dakota on May 3 was the concern he expressed regarding our attitude toward China's membership in the United Nations.

I am interested in whether the Senator is convinced now that this issue will be before us in a few months and the United States will be confronted once again with a major policy decision in the United Nations, that the Senate and the executive branch are giving this question the kind of thought that is necessary to develop a constructive policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. I definitely share the concern of the Senator about the position this country has taken in the United Nations. As the Senator points out in his remarks today, the vote on the China issue has been getting closer and closer all the time, until a virtual tie occurred on the last test of strength in the United Nations.

For the last few days, we have been debating the question of how much of our resources we can afford to allocate to foreign aid. It has been my understanding that at times in the past the United States has frequently used its foreign assistance program as a device to persuade countries to vote with it on the issue of China in the United Nations. I believe a more constructive and more positive course for the United States would be to regard this as a matter to be decided by the international community, and to come in with a positive and constructive position that might be regarded by some of the other countries of the world as a little more rational.

I believe that is the merit of the suggestion of the Senator here today. The Senator is not proposing any final answer to this problem, but simply that the United States give consideration to new approaches and new policy suggestions that it might make in the United Nations to increase the effectiveness of our leadership.

The Senator's proposal for a two-China solution to the U.N. admission problem seems to me to have considerable merit.

His proposal for changing the composition of the Security Council is one that should be carefully considered.

The Senator made reference to the growing importance of India in Asia. This is a tremendously significant country. I have often thought that the crucial issue of Asia is whether that great continent will go the China way or the India way.

Those are all considerations which should be weighed, looking toward a positive strengthening of our position in the United Nations.

Mr. **KENNEDY** of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. He is one who has given a great deal of thought to this subject. I know that he has researched these issues and talked with many knowledgeable people about it. I appreciate the comments of the Senator today.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. **PELL**. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on drawing our attention to a problem that, as a rule, we have always sought to avoid.

There are two ways whereby we may seek to eliminate the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. One is by blasting and war; the other is by gradualism and erosion. Obviously, the latter course is preferable.

It is, incidentally, in this context that I take some pride in having been instrumental in securing the validation for travel in mainland China of the passport of William Miller of my own State for the purpose of visiting there and simply seeing what he could see. I have sought here to do just what Senator KENNEDY has sought to do with his speech—to put the onus of refusal and standpattism upon the back of the Chinese—and not on us.

Many of us recognize that mainland China, a nation containing one-quarter of the world's population, may well eventually be a member of the United Nations. The question we have to weigh is whether we, the United States, should change our own policy opposing her admission, and, if we did change the policy, what we would lose in connection with the support and respect of such of our Asian friends as Nationalist China, the Philippines, Japan, and Malaysia. At this time, I still think an abrupt change in our own policy would lose us more than we would gain, not by the result that mainland China would become a United Nations member, but by the spinoff results affecting our own bilateral relationships with other countries in the area.

Most important, I believe we should never acquiesce in the admission of mainland China, unless some proper provision is made to cover the continued membership in the United Nations of Nationalist China.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has done an excellent job on drawing the attention of this body and of our people to this problem and its various dimensions. It is a problem that cannot be swept under the carpet. It is a problem that must be scrutinized and wrestled with by our administration and by our people.

I must add that, drawing from my own participation in the San Francisco Conference and familiarity with the legislative history of the Charter of the United Nations, I doubt whether there would be any general acceptance within the United Nations of changing the present formula composition or voting pattern with regard to the permanent members of the Security Council. However, I believe that this, too, is a problem that should be raised and examined.

In conclusion, then, I congratulate the junior Senator from Massachusetts on a provocative, interesting, and courageous speech.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, I have a number of amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I ask unanimous consent that I may submit them now, together with a brief statement supporting each of them. This will save time when we proceed to the regular business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 683

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, a report of the General Accounting Office on its audit of the economic assistance program to Thailand shows the need for further tightening up of the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to insure that development loans made by the Agency for International Development are supplemental to other available free world financing.

The General Accounting Office report discloses that AID entered into an $11 million loan agreement with Thailand for the construction of three irrigation projects although the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development had expressed an interest in financing these projects. The report notes that such a loan, when other assistance was available to Thailand on reasonable terms, was not in consonance with a basic intent of legislation pertaining to development loans but that the loan was made at the request of the Thai Government, which appeared to desire it principally because of more favorable repayment terms than were obtainable from other sources.

Section 201(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provides that in evaluating the need for development loans, consideration be given to the availability of financing, in whole or in part, from other free world sources on reasonable terms. This provision is in line with a basic purpose of development loans, which is to make funds available on favorable terms to economically underdeveloped countries that would otherwise have difficulty qualifying for loans from traditional international financing sources.

At the time the AID loan was made Thailand held foreign exchange reserves of about $506 million, much of which was invested in U.S. financial institutions and had made substantial use of assistance from other free world nations and international organizations. At that time Thailand had an excellent credit rating, a strong and stable currency, a low rate of debt service to current foreign exchange earnings and an excellent capacity to service its external debt.

AID, in justifying its actions, stated that the legislation does not restrict AID lending to those countries where a prospective borrower cannot obtain funds from any other free world source but rather involves a responsibility to consider what other recourse the borrower may have and that AID did consider the availability of World Bank financing.

I ask that the amendment which I am submitting be printed and lie on the table as I propose to call it up at a later date. It would do more than require AID to consider World Bank and other free world financing before it offered more favorable loan terms to countries which are shopping around for the best bargains.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed until I have presented the amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, the amendment would require that no loans for economic development could be made unless the Administrator of the Agency for International Development had made a finding that other means of financing have been explored and it was found that such financing was not available to the country on reasonable terms. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this amendment to S. 3584 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

On page 2, between lines 14 and 15 insert the following:

"(1) In the second sentence strike out clause (1) and substitute the following: '(1) whether financing could be obtained in whole or in part from other free world sources on reasonable terms, including private sources within the United States: *Provided*, That, where such financing could have been obtained but was not, the President shall in writing notify the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs within sixty days of the reasons why such alternate financing was not utilized,'."

On page 2, line 15, strike out "(1)" and substitute "(2)".

On page 3, line 8, strike out "(2)" and substitute "(3)".

AMENDMENT NO. 684

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, section 201(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, has prohibited the commitment of development loan funds by the United States in any country unless an application is made with sufficient information and assurances to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner.

This requirement is one which any prudent lender would insist on to protect his investment and in practice has proven to be a sound requirement which makes those countries desirous of borrowing funds from the United States face up to their financial responsibilities at the time they submit a loan application. However, a major loophole exists in that section 201(e) applies only to loans made in dollars and does not apply to loans made in foreign currencies owned by the United States.

The United States has acquired very large holdings of foreign currencies in recent years through the sale of agricultural commodities overseas pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly known as Public Law 480. These currencies are given or loaned to the same countries in which the agricultural sales were made to be used for military assistance and economic development. In 1965 over 700 million in U.S.-owned foreign currencies were loaned to foreign countries for their economic development programs.

I believe it important that these foreign currency loans be made subject to the same requirements as dollar loans, insofar as the United States obtaining assurance that they will be used in an economically and technically sound manner. There is an all too prevalent attitude among the officials of the executive agencies that foreign currencies do not represent assets of real value to the United States, and I have noted instances in which these currencies are used in a manner which would never be contemplated for U.S. dollars.

The purpose of my amendment is to stop this practice and to require a change in attitude. U.S.-owned foreign currencies can be every bit as valuable as dollars if properly managed and effectively utilized. Indeed they can go a long way in substituting for dollars and in favorably affecting our balance of payments.

I therefore submit an amendment to section 201(e) to correct this situation. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table until I call it up at a later date.

I request unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment be printed in the Record at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, after line 24 insert the following:

"(c) Section 201(e), which relates to the making of loans from the Development Loan Fund, is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) In carrying out this title, the President shall not allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside, funds, including foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States, aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country together with sufficient information and assurances to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner, or (2) the President determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.'"

On page 4, line 1, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(d)".

On page 4, line 11, strike out "(d)" and substitute "(e)".

AMENDMENT NO. 685

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, paragraphs (A), (B), and (C), of subsection (e)(1) of section 620(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, direct the President to suspend assistance to the governments of those countries which have acted directly, or through subsidiaries, to nationalize, expropriate, or seize ownership of U.S. citizens' property, or have acted in other discriminatory ways, which would have a similar effect of taking control of such property.

The application of my amendment would cause the voting power of the United States in international lending organizations to be directed against requests by those countries to which the President has suspended U.S. assistance pursuant to the above-directed conditions.

I am, therefore, submitting such an amendment to be printed and to lie on the table until I call it up at a later date.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment be printed in the Record at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, line 23, before the quotation marks insert the following: "With respect to any dollars herein provided, the voting power of the United States shall be exercised for the purpose of disapproving any loan for any project, enterprise, or activity in any country during any period for which the President has suspended assistance to the government of such country because of any action taken on or after January 1, 1962, by the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country as specified in paragraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (e)(1) of section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the failure of such country within a reasonable time to take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations or provide relief in accordance with the provisions of such subsection."

AMENDMENT NO. 686

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the commodity import program provides, under the supporting assistance provision of the Foreign Assistance Act, imports of capital goods, raw materials and consumer goods to developing countries. The objectives of the program are to save foreign currency reserves by cutting down on the necessity for foreign expenditures, to provide additional foreign government revenues to balance the budget and to help combat inflation in the recipient countries. One of the more significant program guidelines outlined by the administering Agency for International Development is that the program be so constituted as to "stimulate domestic production where possible by reducing imports purchased with aid funds as rapidly as domestic production could be developed." High priority raw materials were to be made available to stimulate domestic industrial growth in order to achieve the long-range goal of a viable self-supporting economic base in each country involved.

The program operates by letting foreign commercial importers determine what goods are to be brought into their country with AID financing. This is hardly conducive to producing a demand for goods necessary for sound economic development.

Several weeks ago, in this Chamber, my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan, made some salient remarks about the administration of the commodity import program in Vietnam. He cited "serious mismanagement and ineffective controls" as causes of the failure of the program in that country, where black-market profiteering and inequitable license allocations have been the rule, rather than exceptional occurrence. Senator Griffin found that instead of open licensing, there is a list of approved importers maintained by the Saigon Government; these firms attain this position by "under-the-table payments to the appropriate local officials." Once goods are obtained, the importer has free rein over their distribution. In addition, it was said that the importers received kickbacks from sales, and frequently, by using false documents, purchased goods with our credit that were not produced in the United States.

Unfortunately, this story is not a new one. General Accounting Office reports, for as far back as 1962, about commodity import programs in several Asian nations report comparable failures, where major portions of the aid funds are not used in a way conducive to long- or short-term economic growth. These reports found the program of the Agency for International Development tended toward financing consumable, and even luxury goods, rather than investment capital or raw materials for domestic industry. The GAO reports that synthetic yarns were used for luxury fabrics instead of for tires and fishnets; that fine, highly priced fabrics were produced instead of less costly wool and synthetic cloths of equal durability.

In Turkey and Korea, as well as Vietnam, the early years of this program were rife with evidence of collusive auction bidding for licenses, and commodity imports. In the absence of a valid priorities system, some areas, such as cotton textile and flour, were highly overexpanded to the point that there were surplus supplies in warehouses, while fishing net and fertilizer production were inadequate, though the raw materials were available for use. There are many cases where the method of allocation caused higher prices than necessary to be paid for goods; for example, had fertilizer been bought in the off season, an estimated $240,000 could have been saved in 1 year, in one country.

Purchase of goods that countries could have produced themselves or for which there were resources available for the development of industry, have occurred regularly, in contrast to the guidelines which would encourage domestic industrial growth.

It appears that we would be wise to require greater control on the part of the Administrator of AID for the determination of commodities which will be financed by the Agency for International Development, and for the determination of the part these items will play in the country's economic development plan to assure their proper utilization. In view of the fact that the commodity import program takes the largest amount of the supporting assistance allocation, and has shown itself to be in need of revision, I propose the following amendment to S. 3584.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in full and lie on the table until I call it up at a later date.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 14, line 18, before the quotation marks insert the following: "No commodity shall be furnished pursuant to this chapter unless the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall have found with respect to each such commodity that there is substantial need therefor in order to make a planned contribution to the economic development of the country to which the commodity is to be furnished."

AMENDMENT NO. 687

Mr. **GRUENING.** Mr. President, section 605(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides that funds realized by the Agency for International Development from filing claims against foreign countries and foreign importers can be reused by AID for the same general purpose. AID has established numerous requirements concerning its financing of economic assistance and has developed procedures for monitoring transactions to insure that these requirements are adhered to. For example, AID regulations prescribe that commodities which are bought by a foreign importer and which AID finances under the economic assistance program are to be purchased at prevailing market prices. If AID auditors find that a foreign importer has purchased commodities at inflated prices, with AID paying the U.S. supplier a premium price, AID will process a claim against the foreign importer.

In practice it is very difficult to obtain a refund from a foreign private importer because of the difficulty of pursuing the claim in a foreign court. As a practical recourse, AID seeks recovery of any amounts which have been improperly included in its financing from the foreign country involved, which, by agreement, has undertaken to reimburse the United States for such amounts. It has also been AID's practice to reprogram any funds realized from claims by making such funds available to the country for economic development program.

Thus we have seen situations in which a foreign importer conspires with a supplier to fix the price of an AID-financed transaction. AID subsequently discovers that it has overpaid and attempts to obtain an appropriate refund from the importer. This proves to be impossible so AID asks the country government for a refund. The foreign government makes out a check for the amount of the overcharge and AID promptly turns the money back to the country. All of this is permitted under section 605(c).

But what purpose does all of this serve? The foreign importer and the supplier who have conspired to fix the price of the commodity retain their exorbitant profit; and the foreign country has paid for the overcharge out of one pocket and received it back in another pocket. The United States has been the loser and is powerless to do anything about it. Meanwhile AID keeps a large staff of auditors and investigators busy finding instances of overcharges and other improprieties in AID-financed transactions, and another large staff engaged in processing claims.

The only purpose achieved by all of this, as far as I can discern, is that AID is enabled to state that it does not finance any transaction which it finds to be improper. True enough, but the United States does not save a nickel in the process.

My amendment attempts to introduce some rationale into this Alice-in-Wonderland procedure by requiring all funds collected by AID from claims resulting from the inclusion of improper amounts in transactions which it has financed to be deposited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. If AID desires to reuse these funds, it will be required to seek authority to do so in its annual request for authorization and appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the table until I call it up at a later date, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 18, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"(b) Section 605(c) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'"

On page 18, line 6, strike out "(b)" and substitute "(c)".

On page 18, line 10, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(d)".

On page 19, line 9, strike out "(d)" and substitute "(e)".

On page 19, line 15, strike out "(e)" and substitute "(f)".

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I inquire of the Senator from Alaska how many amendments he intends to read in the morning hour?

AMENDMENT NO. 688

Mr. **GRUENING.** I have only one more amendment. I refer now only to the economic aid program. I have some others with respect to the military program, which I shall present at a later date.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the foreign economic aid bill (S. 3584) and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The United Arab Republic has been consistent in its misuse of foreign assistance furnished by the United States.

The United Arab Republic has used our economic assistance to fill its coffers with foreign exchange that enables it to carry on its aggressive policies in the Middle East.

Our continued support of Nasser despite his belligerent policies in the Middle East has cast the State Department in the role of supporting a double standard in the Middle East.

On one hand we are clamoring for peace and we say that our policy is aimed at supporting peace in the Middle East, but on the other hand, we continue to feed the warmaking machine of President Nasser.

United Arab Republic policy is at variance with our stated foreign policy goals in virtually every department. Violations of her economic assistance agreements with the United States have enabled Egypt to support the economies of countries behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, support the Cuban economy by shipping more than 62,000 metric tons of rice to Cuba in 1964 alone, adversely affect the U.S. balance of payments at the rate of more than $15 million a year, expand Nasser's brand of economic and political socialism, deprive the people in Egypt of food intended for them, and carry on an aggressive war in Yemen at a cost of over $2 billion.

My amendment will enable the State Department to establish and carry out a meaningful policy aimed at establishing peace in the Middle East. It will put an end to the bungling, vacillating, totally inadequate policy of the State Department in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed and lie on the desk until I call it up.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act to the United Arab Republic. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this or any other Act.'"

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, regardless of the 3-minute limitation, I be permitted to proceed until I complete my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in France there is a saying that the only sure and permanent cure for a headache is the guillotine.

But there is no known record of any sufferer from headaches who voluntarily sought this cure. The reason is simple. The cure is worse than the affliction.

For the next few minutes, Mr. President, I should like to discuss another instance in which the proposed cure is worse than the affliction.

The affliction of which I speak, Mr. President, would be inflicted upon this Nation by enactment of the provisions of title IV of the so-called administration civil rights bill, H.R. 14765.

The proposed cure which is worse than the affliction is the amended version of this bill which was reported to the other body from its Committee on the Judiciary on June 30 of this year.

During the period of recess by which the Congress observed the Fourth of July holiday, I have had the opportunity to examine this amended version of the bill, the compromise, which it is called in the House of Representatives; and truly, this cure is worse than the ailment. I want to point out to my colleagues some of the reasons why this is so.

But first, to avoid misunderstanding, let me say that I have already expressed myself with regard to title IV of this bill, in the original version, and I shall not take time today to repeat any of the things I have said before. Today I shall discuss only the new language proposed by the committee of the other body, and the effect of the changes which are embodied in this new language or would be brought about by it.

But I want it clearly understood that all of my original objections to the bill apply just as strongly to the amended version. None of these objections, which I have already voiced, has been met by the revised version. None of the serious evils of the original bill, which led me to speak out against it, has been ameliorated in any substantial way by the revisions recommended by the committee in the other body.

On the contrary, the proposed revisions make the bill worse, far worse, in various respects, which I shall explain in detail. The revised bill is not one whit more acceptable, not one iota less dangerous, not one degree less virulent an attack upon the right of private property, than was the original version.

Now, Mr. President, I want to be fair about this, so let me point out right here that there are five places where the revised bill appears to constitute an improvement over the original version.

The first of these is in subsection 402(b), where the new language involves a slight narrowing of the definition of "dwelling."

In the original bill, the definition of "dwelling" included specifically "any vacant land that is offered for sale or lease for the construction or location" of any building, structure, or portion thereof which is in, or is designed, intended, or arranged for, residential use by one or more individuals or families.

The revised version eliminates this specific inclusion of vacant land within the definition.

The resulting improvement in the bill is, relatively, very slight indeed. This is so because, in the first place, the inclusion of vacant land within the definition of "dwelling" was very weak, from an enforcement standpoint. This inclusion of vacant land also raised serious problems of proof, since more frequently than not land is sold subject to the purposes of the buyer, whether disclosed or undisclosed, and without any necessity for recitals or commitments with regard to such purposes.

Most importantly, any property that would have been brought within the definition of "dwelling" by the specific inclusion of the provision with respect to vacant land will be brought under the revised definition anyhow, in due course, by or before the time when any substantial question of alleged discrimination in housing could be expected to arise.

Let me explain that.

If vacant land is in fact offered for sale or lease for the construction or location of a dwelling, as defined in the act, then the instant construction starts the property will be covered by the definition of "dwelling" as it stands in the revised version of the bill. Even assuming the original clause with respect to vacant land could be enforced, which is certainly questionable, it seems clear that coverage of vacant land before any construction starts could not constitute more than a very unimportant part of the whole area of discrimination in housing, which is supposed to be the subject matter of this bill.

Another place where the revised bill appears to represent an improvement over the original version is in subsection 406(c), where the original bill specifically authorized to award to a plaintiff, in a housing discrimination case, of "damages for humiliation and mental pain and suffering, and up to $500 punitive damages."

The revised version of the bill strikes out this language, and provides instead for the award of "actual" damages to the plaintiff. But the new language goes on to provide that "in the alternative, if the defendant has received or agreed to receive compensation for services during the course of which the discriminatory housing practice occurred, the court may award as liquidated damages an amount not exceeding the amount of such compensation."

Taking the normal real estate commission as 5 percent, this means that, in any transaction involving more than $10,000, the "liquidated damages" which may be awarded against a real estate agent or broker under the proposed new language would be greater than the $500 limitation on "punitive damages" fixed by the original bill. As we all know, most individual housing transactions today are substantially in excess of $10,000.

Let me point out a small gimmick which makes this proposed change with respect to damages even less important than appears at first glance.

To a layman, it may seem that substitution of "actual damages" for "damages including damages for humiliation and mental pain and suffering" is a limitation, a reduction in the authority of the court. Those of my colleagues who are lawyers will recognize that this is not so. The term "actual damages" does not mean actual cash damages, or out of pocket costs, as a nonlawyer might think. In legal contemplation the term actual damages means simply damages awarded for a loss or injury actually sustained, as distinguished from damages implied by law, or awarded by way of punishment. Both mental and physical pain, suffering, and humiliation are all recognized elements of damage for which compensation may be awarded; and if a court found that a plaintiff had suffered, for instance, mental damage valued at $10,000, or humiliation valued at $5,000, awards of $10,000 and $5,000, respectively, would be possible under the "actual damages" clause of the revised bill. The proposed new language does not close the door to any award which might be made under the original language. So there is no improvement in the subsection by reason of this change. The revised version is at least as bad as the original, and in most cases will be found to authorize payment of higher damages.

The third provision of the revised bill which might be considered on its face as an improvement over the original version is subsection 403(b), beginning on line 19, page 64. This subsection provides:

> Nothing in this section shall apply to an owner with respect to the sale, lease, or rental by him of a portion of a building or structure which contains living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other if such owner actually occupies one of such living quarters as his residence.

This is the language which is touted as eliminating "Mrs. Murphy" from the sanctions of the proposed law. As far as it goes, this is probably all right. I shall point out in a moment how it only meets part of the problem because it deals only with owners, not with renters. In principle, of course, this subsection is absurd and unacceptable, because surely the right of private property is not reserved solely for owners of small buildings containing quarters for no more than four families living independently of each other. Nor can it be said that the right of property adheres to the owner of such a building if he himself lives in the building but not otherwise.

The major deficiency in this subsection is that it does nothing whatsoever for the millions of Americans who live in rented homes. That is the part of the problem it does not meet.

Under this provision, an owner of a small building who lives in his own building can be selective of his tenants; but a renter of a house would not be permitted to exercise similar selectivity.

Basic to the right of private property is the right to dispose of the property at the free will of the owner. If a man owns land in fee, he may dispose of the fee or any lesser estate in the land to whomever he may choose. If he has an interest less than the fee, he has the same breadth of power with respect to the interest he has, or any lesser interest which may be carved out of it.

Subsection 403(b) ignores this basic principle of law, and treat owners of the fee in one way, and owners of lesser estates in an entirely different and vastly more restrictive manner.

The fourth instance in which it may be said the new version of H.R. 14765 is an improvement over the original bill.

The original version of this bill provided, in subsection 406(b), that upon application by the plaintiff and in such circumstances as the court may deem just, a court of the United States in which a civil action under section 406 has been brought may appoint an attorney for the plaintiff and may authorize the commencement of a civil action without the payment of fees, costs, or security. The revised version of the bill substitutes for the words "the plaintiff," where they first appear, the words "any party", and substitutes for the words "the plaintiff" the second time those words appear, the words "such party or parties." The subsection appears as its face to be a movement in the direction of equitable treatment of both sides of the dispute.

In actual fact, however, very little comfort is to be gleaned from this proposed change.

The crux of this provision in both versions of the bill, lies in the grant of power to the court to authorize the commencement of a civil action without the payment of any fees, costs, or security. Where this is permitted, usually it would follow as a matter of course that the court would also appoint an attorney.

But actions are instituted only by plaintiffs, not by defendants or persons charged with alleged violations of the law. Therefore the mere change in words from "the plaintiff" to "any party" does very little, if anything, to accomplish real reform. The "party" who is to be allowed, without cost to himself to commence a civil action against a private individual, drag him into court, subject him to untold harassment, will be the plaintiff, whether he is called "the plaintiff" or "any party."

Now we come to the fifth and final instance in which it may be claimed the revised version of H.R. 14765 is better than the original.

Subsection 406(d), beginning at line 11 on page 67, gives the appearance of being headed in the right direction.

This is a long subsection, which I will not read, but I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the subsection, beginning with line 11 on page 67 and continuing through line 15 on page 68, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. Senators may read it for themselves.

To sum up, this is a subsection apparently designed to provide an opportunity for the operation of State or local laws prohibiting discriminatory practices.

Upon analysis, however, we find that this subsection actually is a restriction upon the Federal courts, rather than a grant of power, although it is couched in terms which make it appear to be the latter.

This subsection does, in terms, provide that a Federal court having before it an action brought by an individual under subsection 406(a) "may stay proceedings in such civil action for a period not exceeding 30 days pending referral by the court or the complainant, as appropriate, to such State or local authority."

But there is a condition attached to this seeming grant of power. The subsection says the stay may be granted by the Federal court "upon issuance of a temporary injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order preserving the complainant's right to obtain all relief, including the opportunity to buy or rent the specific dwelling with respect to which alleged practice occurred."

Since any court having a case before it may stay the proceedings in its discretion upon any conditions it sees fit to impose or without conditions, the net effect of subsection 406(d) is directly the reverse of what its affirmative language indicates. It is actually a prohibition against the granting of a stay for purposes of referral to a State or local authority without first granting broad injunctive relief to the plaintiff.

While it is true that subsection 406(d) provides for a further extension of the stay after the expiration of a 30-day period, and purports to authorize the withdrawal by the Federal court of orders previously entered if it deems the interest of justice to require this, the fact is that here, again, what is actually provided for is a restriction upon the power of the court to act. Without this particular provision of the subsection, the Federal court would be free to dissolve or withdraw any prior order it may have entered, and to do so unconditionally; but under the language of subsection 406(d), for at least 30 days the temporary injunction or restraining order will be in effect. Absent the language of subsection 406(d), the court not only might withdraw any order it may have previously entered; it would never have been required to enter the temporary injunction or temporary restraining order in the first place. The mandatory 30-day duration of the restraining order, under subsection 406(d), should be long enough to kill most real estate deals, so that the blackmail value of an action of subsection 406(a) is not substantially depreciated by the proposed new language of subsection 406(d).

Again we find our hopes darted. If section 406(d) embodies any improvement at all, it is so slight as to be of no substantial importance.

Now, Mr. President, that ends the rollcall of instances in which the proposed revised version of title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 is an improvement, in any degree whatsoever, over the original version. So let me turn to some of the instances in which the revised version, the cure proposed by the committee of the other body, is far worse than the ailment which would be inflicted upon property owners throughout this land, and upon all of us by curtailing our basic freedom through the blow that would be struck at the right of private property, by enactment of the bill H.R. 14765 as originally introduced.

Under that original version of the bill, Mr. President, the machinery of enforcement was a sort of two-headed hydra. On the one hand, individuals could bring actions in the Federal courts seeking injunctions or damages, or both, for alleged housing discrimination. On the other hand, the Attorney General of the United States could initiate an action in any U.S. district court whenever, in his sole discretion, he has "reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons" was engaged in "a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights granted by this title." The Attorney General might also intervene in any action commenced by a private individual, either in his own name for the United States or actually in the name of the United States, if he is willing to certify the action as one of general public importance.

The revised version of this bill which has come to the other body from its committee adds a third head to the hydra. This new head is even more horrible to contemplate than either of the earlier ones, hideous though they are.

Section 408 of the revised bill provides for enforcement by a Fair Housing Board, which it also creates.

Before we consider how it is proposed that this Board shall enforce the provisions of title IV against alleged discrimination in housing, let us look at the Board itself, and then at its powers.

Under the revised bill, this would be a five-member board, with members appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation. The President would designate the Chairman of the Board. Terms of office of Board members would be staggered, so that while all members, except in the case of original appointees, would be named for terms of 5 years, there would be one vacancy coming up each year. Obviously, this is intended to be a permanent Board. This is a matter of some importance, because although it is called a Board by the revised bill, in fact this proposed five-man body will be a sort of court, with very substantial judicial functions.

The bill provides that no more than three members of the Board may be of the same political party.

Pay of Board members would be at the rate of $25,000 per year, with $25,500 for the Chairman.

Already, Mr. President, I have heard praise for this proposed new Board as a "real bipartisan body," because of the provision that not more than three of the members, out of five, may be of the same political party.

But things are not what they seem. At this point in the revised version of the bill there is another gimmick, which needs to be explained.

The revised bill provides in paragraph 4 of subsection 408(a), beginning at line 4 on page 70, that three members of the

Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Then, beginning nine lines farther down, there is a provision that the Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more of its members any or all of the powers it may itself exercise.

Now do you see how it is rigged? With every member of the Board present, three members would constitute a majority, and the action of that majority would be deemed the action of the Board. So three of the Board members could act to delegate to themselves all of the Board's powers. After that had been done, any two of those three members would constitute a quorum for the transaction of the Board's business. The two-man minority on the Board could be pushed right out of the picture, without any voice at all in the conduct of the Board's affairs.

For that matter, any three members of the Board could meet, in the absence of the other two, even without notice to the other two, and those three would constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, so that any two of them could act to delegate all of the powers of the Board to themselves and any other member of the Board as a third person. If one of the members present opposed this, and the two absent members opposed it, still it could be done. If all the Board's power should be thus delegated to a group of three members, the opponents of the delegation would be split, two and one, with two of them isolated from the powerbase and the third outrated by the other two members who, though actually a minority of the Board could cling to control at least until a meeting could be held at which all five Board members would be present.

The Board's powers to delegate its authority go even farther, Mr. President. The second sentence of subparagraph (2) of subsection 408(c) authorizes the Board to delegate the authority to conduct hearings; and this authority may be delegated to any single member of the Board, or any group of members. This authority to conduct hearings may also be delegated, under this provision of the revised bill, to "any agent or agency."

Note carefully that this delegation of authority is not limited to hearing officers or other responsible officials of the Board's staff. It is not even limited to Board employees. The Board is left free to choose its own agents, or to designate any agency it may select, and then to delegate to such agent or agency the authority to conduct hearings. The Board could grant this authority to the NAACP, or to CORE, or to the SNCC, or to any other individual or group or organization without limitation.

This is tremendously important because the authority to conduct hearings, this authority which may be delegated to "any agent or agency" under the provisions of the revised bill, is a very potent power, very far reaching, very easily abused.

The revised bill provides, in subsection 408(e) beginning on line 3 of page 71, that the Board shall have, for purposes of hearing, the same powers, subject to the same conditions and limitations, as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board under section 161 of title 29, United States Code. Remember, the powers thus granted to the Board may be delegated by the Board to any one of its members or to any agent or agency it may select.

Undoubtedly there will be some who will say that this grant of the same powers, subject to the same conditions and limitations as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board, must be all right because the National Labor Relations Board has been in operation for a long time. This is a mistake. Remember, the National Labor Relations Act was written with a view to bringing all of the substantial employers of labor in this country's business and industry under complete subjugation and regimentation by a Federal regulatory agency.

Perhaps it may be that this device of conferring powers by reference, rather than by precise statement, may be successful; but it will not be, Mr. President, if Senators will take the time to turn to section 161 of title 29, United States Code, and read the language defining the scope and nature of the powers there granted, and consider them one by one with emphasis, in each instance, on the question of whether identical or completely comparable powers should be given to the proposed new Fair Housing Board.

As an inducement to Senators to do this, let me call attention to some of these powers, in terms of what authority it is proposed to grant to the new Fair Housing Board.

By importation from subsection 160(b) of title 29, United States Code, the new Board would have the power to issue a complaint of alleged housing discrimination against any person on the basis of a mere charge filed by a single individual, and unsupported by evidence; and the Board could order the person charged to appear at a hearing—in effect, to stand trial—in Washington, D.C., or anywhere else in the country that the Board might choose, at any time not less than 5 days after service of the complaint.

Remember, now, any power with respect to hearings granted to the Board by this revised bill could be delegated by the Board to any agent or agency of its choice.

Under the revised version of H.R. 14765 the Board or a group of any three members to which the Board's power had been delegated, could amend the complaint in its discretion at any time. Even if the person charged produced a good answer to the original complaint, the Board could amend it, and this process could go through amendments without limitation.

The Board, or the member, or agent, or agency conducting any hearing, could in its or his sole discretion, allow any other person or persons to intervene in the proceeding and to present testimony.

The Board—or the member, agent, or agency of the Board which is holding the hearing—might take further testimony after the original hearing, but would not be required to do so.

By importation from subsection 160(c) of title 29, the Board would have the power, if it decided that upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the person named in the complaint had engaged in housing discrimination, to issue an order requiring such person to cease and desist from the alleged discrimination, and also to take whatever affirmative action the Board—or its member or agent or agency—may decide is necessary to effectuate the policies of title IV.

By importation from subsection 160(d) of title 29, the Board—or just three members, if the power had been delegated—would have the power by majority vote to modify or set aside any finding or order it had made, at any time up until the moment when the record in the case has been filed in a court.

Thus, while a person aggrieved by a final order of the Board would have a right, by importation from subsection 160(f) of title 29, to seek review of the Board's order in a U.S. court of appeals, his petition to the court of appeals would have to be transmitted to the Board before the record in the proceeding could be filed with the court, and the Board could amend the order in such a way as to render the petition ineffective.

By further importation from subsection 160(f) of title 29, when a U.S. court of appeals takes jurisdiction of an appeal from the Board, the proceedings will be the same as if the Board itself had petitioned the court for enforcement of its order, which the Board has power to do by importation from subsection 160(e) of title 29. In any such proceeding in a court of appeals, whether brought by the Board or by the party charged with housing discrimination, findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive under the provisions of the revised bill.

By importation from subsection 160(g) of title 29, the commencement of proceedings under an appeal from an order of the Board would not operate as a stay of the Board's order, which would remain in effect unless specifically modified by the court. Since a court is not to be presumed likely to modify an order of the Board without at least taking testimony, this means that the person whom the Board found guilty of an alleged housing discrimination, and who is appealing to the court, will remain subject to the Board's order, notwithstanding his appeal, during at least a substantial part of the appeal procedure.

By importation from subsection 160(j) of title 29, as soon as the Board shall have issued a complaint against a person charged with a housing discrimination, the Board could petition any U.S. district court within any district in which the alleged housing discrimination occurred, or in which the person charged resides or transacts business, asking for whatever temporary relief or restraining order the Board shall deem appropriate. Remember, all this could be before any hearing on the case, and following the issuance of a complaint based only upon an unsupported charge. The Board then becomes at once not merely a judicial or quasi-judicial body to hear and decide a case, but also a moving party seeking action from a Federal court to afford relief on the basis of a complaint which may be, up to that time, completely unsupported by any evidence.

This is by no means the end of the Board's powers.

By importation from subparagraph (1) of section 161 the Board, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, is given a power of access to any evidence of any person being proceeded against if such evidence relates to any matter under investigation or in question.

The Board is specifically given this access, for the purpose of examination, and is also given the right to copy any such evidence.

The Board, or its duly authorized agent or agency, is given a very broad subpena power. Not only may the Board subpena individuals to testify, or to produce information or evidence; the grant of power, by importation from section 161, title 29, goes much further. Upon application of any party to a proceeding before the Board, the Board or any member of the Board may issue and deliver to such party subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of evidence, as requested in the application. This includes the power to issue subpenas for the taking of depositions by one party to the proceeding, in advance of the Board's own hearing.

While the person subpenaed is given 5 days after being served to petition for revocation of the subpena, the Board is only required to revoke such a subpena if it finds that the evidence required to be produced does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if in the opinion of the Board, the subpena does not describe the required evidence with sufficient particularity.

Any member of the Board, or any agent or agency of the Board designated for such purposes will have the power to administer oath, to examine witnesses, and to receive evidence.

Attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any territory or possession of the United States, at any place designated for hearings.

By importation from subparagraph 2 of section 161 of title 29, the Board is given the right to court enforcement of its subpenas and orders for the appearance of individuals or for the production of testimony.

By importation from subparagraph 4 of section 161 of title 29, complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Board, its agent or agency, may be served either personally, or by registered mail, or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served.

By importation from subparagraph 5 of section 161 of title 29, process of any court to which the Board may apply for enforcement of its process or orders may be served in the judicial district in which the person charged, or other person required to be served, resides or may be found.

By importation from subparagraph 6 of section 161 of title 29, all the departments and agencies of the Government are required, upon direction of the President, to furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board. The power of access to information which is encompassed by this provision is very broad. For instance, this is the standard language under which, with Presidential assent, access may be had to income tax returns. Undoubtedly, the new Fair Housing Board would be able to look at any respondent's income tax returns. If the President directed, it could also have access to Social Security records, perhaps even FBI files.

It is not spelled out in the language of the revised bill, but it seems quite clear that many of the powers granted to the Board by importation from section 161 of title 29 of the United States Code also are granted to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with any case under investigation by him involving alleged housing discrimination. The specific provision in subsection 408 (e) of the revised bill is that "For purposes of investigation, the Secretary shall have the same powers and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as are provided for the National Labor Relations Board under section 161 of title 29, United States Code."

It would appear that the powers thus granted to the Secretary would include the provision imported from subparagraph 1 of section 161 of title 29, so that he shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, the evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against, that relates to any matter under investigation or in question.

Almost certainly, the powers granted to the Secretary would include, by importation from section 161, the power to "administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence." It is not entirely clear what other powers are intended to be granted to the Secretary.

Now, Mr. President, for what purpose is the Secretary to be given these very substantial powers? Under subsection (b) of section 408, the Secretary is authorized "to direct and supervise, under such rules and regulations as he shall establish, investigations or violations of sections 403, 404, and 405." Section 403 recites the various acts which are to constitute unlawful discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. Section 404 defines the crime of discrimination in the financing of housing. Section 405 is the provision against intimidating, threatening, coercing, or interfering with any person "in the exercise of enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed or on account of his having used or encouraged any other person in the exercise or enjoyment of any right granted by sections 403 or 404."

Subsection 406(i) of the revised version of H.R. 14765 specifically authorizes the Secretary to delegate "any power or duty herein granted or imposed to a duly designated representative." It is notable that this subsection does not authorize delegation of power only to "persons" or "individuals." We must presume, therefore, that the Secretary is being authorized to delegate his power, in part, or even in whole, not only to an individual, but at his discretion, to an organization or institution which he may duly designate as his representative. We have no way of knowing what may be planned here, or what organization or organizations the Secretary may have in mind to be designated as his representative or representatives, and to receive from him, by delegation, some or all of the powers granted to him by the new language of the revised version of H.R. 14765.

Now, Mr. President, let me refer to some of the other changes which would be brought about by the revised version of the Civil Rights Act of 1966 proposed to the other body by its committee.

One of them is to be found in a new subsection 402(d) which begins at line 15 on page 62 of the Union Calendar print of the bill, which accompanied House Report No. 1678. This subsection provides:

> A person shall be deemed to be in the business of buildings, developing, selling, renting or leasing dwellings if he has, within the preceding twelve months, participated as either principal or agent in three or more transactions involving the sale, rental, or lease of any dwelling or any interest therein.

In passing, let me say it seems clear that the word "buildings" is a typographical error, and that this word should be "building."

If you think this definition in subparagraph 402(d), which I have just read, is a reasonable one, stop and consider for a moment how it would work out.

Assume the case of a Government employee who is transferred to a new post in another city. He sells his present home or puts it up for sale or for rent, for lease or sublease. That is one transaction. He goes to the place to which he has been transferred and becomes a short-term renter of a furnished apartment so as to have a place for himself and his family to stay until their furniture arrives, and while they look around for a new home. That is a second transaction. Eventually, if he is lucky, he finds a place more or less to his liking and buys or rents a new home. That is a third transaction. He has become, under the language of the revised Civil Rights Act of 1966 a person deemed to be in the business of building, developing, selling, or renting dwellings. He cannot question or appeal this arbitrary assignment of status, since it is a matter of definition.

Now, what is the significance of this? It lies in the fact that under section 403 any person in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, or any employee or agent of any such person, unless within the exemption of subsection 403(b) is prohibited from doing a great many things.

Some of these prohibitions are the same under the revised bill as under the original bill, but something new has been added.

Subparagraph 3 of subsection 403(a) declares it to be unlawful for any such person to make or cause to be made any oral or written statement, with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling, that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

Now revert to the case of the Federal employee who was required by a job transfer to move from one city to another and found himself dragged, willy-nilly, within the definition of persons deemed to be in the business of building, developing, selling, renting or leasing dwellings. Suppose now he finds that his new neighborhood is not congenial, and he wants to move. If he and his family are members of the Roman Catholic Church he may go to a real estate agent and ask to look at houses in a Catholic neighborhood, near a parochial school. If he does that, clearly he is making a statement indicating a preference based on religion, which is a violation under the new language in subparagraph 3 of subsection 403(a).

Suppose the Federal employee is a person of Czech origin; if he inquires about a house in a Czech neighborhood, he is clearly indicating a preference based upon national origin.

Suppose he is a Negro; if he inquires about housing in a Negro neighborhood, clearly he is indicating a preference based on race.

It is possible to multiply, almost without limit, examples of how the doing of a normal action, an action completely within the protection of the right of private property, could constitute a violation of subparagraph 3 of section 403 (a).

This subparagraph should be declared void, as a criminal statute, because of its improper infringement of the right of private property; but if we are foolish enough to write it into law, we cannot be sure that the Supreme Court of the United States will save us from our folly.

From another standpoint, also, this subparagraph is unconstitutional. It is unconstitutional as an infringement of the right of free speech, because it prohibits the making of a mere oral statement indicating a preference. It may be that a bemused Congress and an opinionated Court could combine to force a man to live in a neighborhood he does not choose, to accept restrictions on his right to dispose of his own private property, perhaps even to accept boarders or roomers not of his own choosing; but I do not think the time has yet come, in this country, when a man can be required to like it, or prohibited from saying that he does not like it.

Any statute which purports to prohibit the mere making of an oral statement of preference, with respect to any matter, is an unconstitutional interference with freedom of speech, and void.

Subsection 403(b), which I have previously discussed, would exempt our hypothetical Federal employee from the provisions of section 403(a) if he lives in property owned by him and not containing living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by more than four families living independently of each other. The exemption will not apply if he merely rents his home.

Thus, the man who owns the fee, if he lives on the property, and if the dwelling is small enough to qualify under the exemption can be as choosy as he may wish about his tenants or subtenants, his lodgers or his boarders. But the man who rents a home, and wants to take in a roomer or a boarder, will be able to exercise hardly any freedom of choice without doing something which, under the revised version of H.R. 14765, is defined as unlawful discrimination in housing.

There is still a third constitutional basis for declaring subparagraph 3 of subsection 403(a) unconstitutional. This subparagraph would penalize the making, printing, or publishing of any notice, statement, or advertisement with respect to the sale, rental or lease of a dwelling which indicates an intention to make a discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

Leaving aside all questions about the constitutionality of a prohibition against a mere oral statement, we are still confronted here with the fact that an indication to discriminate is defined as a crime.

The Supreme Court has held that a statute against teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence may not be enforced against any individual without a showing that his teaching and advocacy moved someone to overt action in the direction of such overthrow. How, then, can the mere indication of a preference based on race, color, religion, or national origin, without any accompanying overt act, be upheld as the gravamen of a criminal statute?

Under our system of law, no mere intention to perform any deed, no matter how heinous, can be a crime. Even if the prospective criminal, with the darkest of criminal intent in his heart, has begun to move toward the scene of the crime, he is not yet a violator. There is still time for him to turn away from his evil path. There is still time for the finger of the Lord to touch his heart, for the memory of a good mother to weaken his criminal resolve, for the ghost of some childhood lesson to enter his thoughts. There is still time for him to repent. If he does repent, if he turns away from his criminal purpose before he has actually committed the crime, he is saved. The mere intent cannot, by itself, be made a criminal act; nor can a criminal intent be substituted for the necessary overt action which alone can constitute the commission of a crime.

Subparagraph 4 of section 403(a) is more new language proposed by the committee of the other party. This proposed subparagraph lists several types of actions which, if performed by any person who is in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing, and who is not exempted under 403(b), are designated as crimes.

Under this subsection it would be a crime for such a person to fail or refuse to show any dwelling which he is authorized to show to prospective buyers, renters, or lessors, because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

It would be a crime under this subparagraph for any such person to fail to submit promptly to his principal any offer to buy, rent, or lease because of race, color, religion, or national origin. It would be a crime for any such person to fail or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of the race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental, or lease.

This subparagraph appears to require a person who lives in a rented home to show the house to any person who comes to the door and expresses the desire to rent a room; for clearly, such a visitor is by definition a prospective renter, and if he is a member of a minority group, or of a different race, color, religion, or national origin, than the man to whose door he has come, he could easily claim a housing discrimination if he should be turned away.

From a constitutional standpoint, subparagraph 4 of subsection 403(a) is bad because it does not measure up to the standard of certainty required of a criminal statute under the due process of law clause of the Constitution. This subparagraph as I have pointed out, makes it a crime for a person who is in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, and who is not exempted under 403(b), to fail or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental or lease. How is it to be determined what constitutes an individual's best efforts? There would always be room to say that he might have done something more, or might have done something sooner, or might have done something in a different way, which would have had a different result. Is the mere failure to have done things in a different way, or sooner, to be made the basis for a criminal prosecution?

That is what we will be getting to if we approve subsection 4 of subsection 403(a), as recommended by the committee of the other body.

There is at least one more unconstitutional provision in subsection 403(a). It is to be found in subparagraph 7 of that subsection, which makes it a crime for any person in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, and who is not exempted under 403(b), to engage in any act or practice, the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person or group of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

This provision is unconstitutional because it purports to make an act criminal simply by reason of the purpose with which the act is done.

This is bad, in the first place, because evidence with respect to purpose is extremely difficult to establish, purpose being a subjective matter, so that except on the basis of the direct testimony of the person charged with the offense, it would be virtually impossible to prove purpose with a sufficient particularity to meet the standards for a criminal statute.

Entirely aside from this point, however, subparagraph 7 of subsection 403(a) is void because purposes are thoughts, and only acts, not thoughts, can constitute crimes.

Subparagraph 7 does not require that the act or practice be successful in accomplishing the prohibited purpose. The subparagraph does not even require that the act or practice be reasonably calculated to serve the prohibited purpose. It makes the mere holding of the purpose, and the performing of any act or the engaging in any practice, pursuant to that purpose, malum prohibitum.

Under this subparagraph the act or practice is bad because of the nature of the act or practice.

The absurd results which would come about if this language should be enacted into law can be shown by a single example. Under the provisions of subparagraph 7 of section 403(a), as recommended by the committee of the other body, all of the good people who last year wrote letters to editors, protesting the sale of a particular dwelling to the Soviet Union for use as an embassy and living quarters for members of the U.S.S.R. diplomatic staff, would have been guilty of criminal acts, because unquestionably their purpose in writing the letters was to limit or restrict the availability of that particular dwelling on the basis of national origin.

How silly can you get?

Subsection 403(c) of the revised version of H.R. 14765 is also new language, and may be regarded by some as involving an improvement over the original bill. But it is not. This is a very puzzling provision. The subsection reads as follows:

> Nothing in this section shall bar any religious or denominational institution, or any charitable or educational institution or organization which is operated, supervised or controlled by or in conjunction with a religious organization, or any bona fide private or fraternal organization, from giving preference to persons of the same religion or denomination, or to members of such private or fraternal organization, or from making such selection as is calculated by such organization to promote the religious principles or the aims, purposes, or fraternal principles for which it is established or maintained.

It is easy to vision certain situations in which this subsection would apply, but it is hard to see exactly where it would stop. It could be contended that this subsection might operate as an invitation to the Ku Klux Klan to go into the property management business. If the KKK can be deemed a bona fide private or fraternal organization, then it would appear that subsection 403(c) would operate as a license to the Klan to make such selection of its tenants as it calculates would promote the aims, purposes, or fraternal principles for which it was established and is maintained. Most likely, that would be completely segregated housing.

Similarly, under this subsection, the Black Muslims, being a religious organization according to their own claim, certainly would be authorized to operate all-Negro housing projects, pursuant to their religious principle of racial segregation.

On the other hand, a neighborhood citizens association in an area of Maryland or Virginia suburban to Washington, not being religious, or denominational, charitable, or educational, would have to establish to the satisfaction of the court, or of the new Fair Housing Board, that it was a bona fide private or fraternal organization, in order to be able to resist encroachment upon its neighborhood of what its members might deem to be undesirable neighbors.

The ruling would be, of course, that the citizens association was neither private nor fraternal and that any action it might take in the direction of selectivity in housing would be deemed improper discrimination.

Section 403(c) is confusing as well as puzzling. If it should be enacted, it might raise enough problems to hamper enforcement efforts, and perhaps it is, in that sense, an improvement over the original bill. But it is not good legislation. It is not well drafted. It rests on a false principle, for it says in effect that religious or denominational institutions, or charitable or educational institutions operated, supervised, or controlled by or in conjunction with religious institutions, or bona fide private or fraternal organizations, have the right of private property to a greater degree than individuals. This I cannot accept, for it is false. I do not count subsection 403(c) as one of the five instances in which it may be claimed the revised version of the bill is an improvement. It is not.

Under subsection 408(d) of the revised version of H.R. 14765, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is to undertake investigations of alleged violations "either upon the receipt of a written statement of a person alleging to be aggrieved or his representative, or on the basis of information available to the Secretary indicating that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a violation may have occurred."

Since this language is stated in the alternative, it seems quite clear that while the Secretary must have available to him facts indicating reasonable grounds to believe that a violation may have occurred, in order to act upon the basis of his own information, there is no such requirement of reasonable grounds when the Secretary receives a written statement of a person alleging to be aggrieved, or a written statement of a representative of a person alleging to be aggrieved.

Mr. President, whatever may be the decision of the Congress with respect to the need for new legislation against discrimination in housing, assuredly we do not need a new court, by whatever name, to provide enforcement machinery. We do not need a new quasi-judicial body for this purpose.

State courts and the Federal courts are open. Enforcement of any proper legislative purpose can be achieved through these courts. Necessary adjudication under any constitutional law can be provided by these courts. It is not necessary for the achievement of any proper objective to legislate special and discriminatory remedies, or arbitrary procedures, or vast inquisitorial powers and vast regulatory powers combined in the same hands.

It is not necessary, Mr. President, to create a body which partakes at one and the same time of the attributes of administrator, enforcer, prosecutor, adjudicator, and litigant. But this is what the revised version of H.R. 14765 would do.

Far from being an improvement, Mr. President, this bill which has been reported to the other body by its committee is substantially worse than the original. I would not have thought that possible, but they have managed it.

THE ESCALATION OF FRIGHTFULNESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a very thoughtful and timely column by that distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, entitled, "The Escalation of Frightfulness." It speaks for itself. I would like to read it in full. However, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, and I hope that people pay careful attention to what is pointed out in the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today and Tomorrow: The Escalation of Frightfulness

(By Walter Lippmann)

Because the Vietnamese war cannot be decided by military means, it has become increasingly a vicious spiral in frightfulness. Because it is both a civil war of Vietnamese against Vietnamese and at the same time a war of Vietnamese against foreign white men, it is, as such wars usually are, increasingly ferocious and barbarous. Unable to subdue the other side by conventional military actions, each side tries to overcome the enemy by destroying his will to fight. Frightfulness begets frightfulness and anger demands vengeance, and all that remains is a fury which, insofar as it reasons at all, thinks that by topping frightfulness with more frightfulness, the enemy will be silenced and paralyzed.

The world is now confronted with this escalation of frightfulness. To the American threat to bomb closer and closer to the populated regions of North Vietnam, Hanoi is replying by increasing its mobilization, by evacuating the civilian population from Hanoi and Haiphong, and by threatening to try the captive American fliers, humiliate them, and use them as hostages in the war of frightfulness, and, in the end, perhaps even to execute them.

There is no doubt that this treatment of the fliers would evoke dire reprisals. The warning of Secretary General U Thant and the declaration of the senators who have dissented from the Johnson policy in the war are accurate. They are telling the truth in calling the attention of Hanoi to the fact that the punishment of the prisoners of war would make the war, frightful as it is already, still more frightful. For the ultimate weapons of frightfulness are in the hands of the United States, and no one who knows this country and the character of the President can be sure that they will not be used if the escalation of frightfulness continues.

In this escalation we are approaching the point of no return, the point where the war becomes inexplable, where it becomes incapable of rational solution, where it becomes a war of endless killing, a suicidal war of extermination. The war is not yet at that point. But the war will pass that point of no return if the prisoners are executed and the North Vietnamese cities are destroyed in retaliation.

There is great honor and glory to be had by anyone speaking for the civilized conscience of mankind, who interrupts and breaks the vicious spiral.

ANOTHER DOWNTURN IN DAIRY PRODUCTION HIGHLIGHTS NEED FOR EARLY ACTION ON SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in years past the special milk program for schoolchildren has been championed as a means of keeping dairy income up by encouraging schoolchildren to drink milk that otherwise might become surplus. Today there is no substantial milk surplus problem. In fact dairy production has dropped off substantially. The reason? Dairy farmers, who have to invest a great deal of time and money in their business, are not getting enough of a return on their investment to make it worthwhile for them to stay in the dairy business.

Some have pointed to this reduction in milk production as a reason for cutting back on the school milk program. Yet the school milk program can serve a very valuable purpose by raising dairy farm income and thus keeping many dairy farmers from selling their farms.

The milk program accounts for approximately 2.5 percent of the milk consumed in the United States. If this valuable tool for keeping milk demand high were dropped, even more dairy farmers would be forced out of business as prices plummeted. The ultimate result would be a frightening increase in dairy prices as fewer producers struggled to meet the needs of a young and ever-expanding population.

The need for early action by the House on legislation extending the school milk program was highlighted this week by the release of figures indicating that June milk production hit a 27-year low. Milk production was the smallest for any June since 1939. It is noteworthy that at the same time as absolute production hit a 27-year low, milk production per cow was up 3 percent over June of 1965. This simply means that dairy herd sales are so great that, despite fantastic increases in productivity over the past 25 years, total production has gone down.

Consequently I deeply hope that the House will reaffirm its support for the school milk program and at the same time give dairy farm income a shot in the arm by approving legislation extending the school milk program.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. FRED BUZHARDT, SR., OF McCORMICK, S.C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 6, 1966, I suffered a deep personal loss in the death by heart failure of a longtime friend and former law partner, the Honorable J. Fred Buzhardt, Sr., of McCormick, S.C.

Earlier this year he was unanimously elected by the South Carolina General Assembly to the bench of the 11th judicial circuit and would have been sworn in this November.

He would have made an outstanding judge, just as he had made an outstanding citizen, attorney, and legislator. He would have brought to the bench that rare quality of a great legal mind, tempered by deep compassion and understanding for all his fellow men.

A kind and unpretentious man, Judge Buzhardt began his career in the offices of my father and myself in Edgefield, S.C. Later he moved to McCormick where he and I founded a branch law partnership, maintained jointly until I resigned to become a State judge in the same circuit to which he was later elected. He continued his law practice in McCormick until the time of his death.

During his life in McCormick, Judge Buzhardt served as town and county attorney and as chairman of the board of trustees for the McCormick schools. He also served as vice chairman of the South Carolina Board of Corrections, member and associate counsel of the Clarks Hill Authority, and as a member of the board of directors of the South Carolina Penitentiary. A member of the South Carolina House of Representatives since 1963, his record of public service reflects singular and worthwhile contributions to his State and Nation. A dedicated and astute legislator, his death came at the climax of his legal career when he would have become one of the last self-taught attorneys to assume the bench of a South Carolina court.

A profound student of the Constitution, Judge Buzhardt understood its true purpose and upheld it with great zeal and vision. He strongly valued the great heritage handed down by our forefathers, and throughout his life he directed his efforts toward preservation of those hard-won liberties. His community, State, and Nation are better places because of the services he rendered during the past 40 years.

J. Fred Buzhardt, Sr., was also a man of great personal qualities. He possessed tremendous courage, unquestioned integrity and was a tireless worker. He applied his immense ability to numerous problems, large and small, and, if an equitable solution was possible, he found it. He gave freely of himself in many worthwhile causes, and only a few who knew him intimately were aware of hundreds of acts performed outside the limelight and of the many lives his hand had touched.

Possessed of a deep basic faith in God, his stewardship was an example for all to follow. He used his talents in the service of his church, and through this work favorably influenced the lives of many young persons as well as others who passed his way.

Judge Buzhardt left a loving mother, a devoted wife, and one child, a capable son, J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., four fine grandchildren, one brother, and three sisters, and other family connections. His son, J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., has been a member of my staff for the past 9 years and is now serving in the top position in my office, as administrative assistant. This worthy son is possessed of a brilliant mind and is a patriotic and dedicated citizen like his fine father. To all of the members of his family I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

In the passing of Judge Buzhardt the State of South Carolina and our Nation have lost an able legislator, a profound lawyer, a patriotic and public-spirited citizen, and a fine Christian gentleman.

Judge J. Fred Buzhardt was one of the closest friends I ever had, and I feel a special and singular loss in his death. I ask unanimous consent to insert a series of newspaper articles and editorials, and the sermon given at his funeral, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These articles and my remarks reflect in a small measure the high esteem in which Judge Buzhardt was held.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNERAL SERVICE FOR FRED BUZHARDT

(By Rev. Henry J. Gambrell, pastor McCormick Baptist Church, July 8, 1966)

We are gathered to express our love and esteem for Fred Buzhardt who has been for many years a constructive citizen and leader in this community and a devoted member of this church. Words are not needed to express the confidence and trust placed in him by the many friends—that love having been expressed by selecting him to serve them in the legislature of our state and also further being selected by that body to serve as circuit judge.

The presence of this large number of friends simply attempts to say what our lips find unable to utter. While our hearts beat in sympathy with his loved ones we wish to pause and express our gratitude to God for his many useful years of service to the people of this county, for his home which has given us a fine dedicated Christian son and public servant, and for his many charitable benevolences and personal favors, which though often done in secret have been made known by those who were helped.

Paramount in his life was a deep basic faith in God. This was evident by his willingness and quickness to witness of his faith to his fellow man. Not only did he believe in God, but he talked of God. This faith was also seen in his work. In all of his service he lived as a steward of God who had entrusted him with all of his gifts and endowments. If he had flowers, they were given to him for others to enjoy. If he had strength, it was used in service for his fellow man. If he had talent, it was God's gift to be helpful to others. This faith was also manifested in his home life and personal conduct. I have observed him under varied circumstances; and whether under fire in sickness or under pressure, he was always a gentleman.

His faith in his Lord was portrayed also in his active support of his church. One of the hymns selected by the organist was the Royal Ambassador hymn, "The King's Business." This music was selected because of the intense interest and work rendered by Mr. and Mrs. Buzhardt for many years among the young boys of our community. He has supported also with his means the continuation of this work until the present. Having observed this faith at work in his service, his home, and his church, we are confident that he could say with the poet:

"I know three things must always be
To keep a nation strong and free;
One is a ready heart and hand
To love and serve and keep the land.
One is a hearthstone bright and clear
with busy, happy loved ones near.
One is a worn and beaten way
To where the people go to pray.
So long as these are kept alive
Nation and People will survive."

Fred Buzhardt lived also with a sense of deep obligation to the rich heritage of liberty into which he was born. With the apostle he could say: "I am a debtor." He was aware that he was born into a nation where others had molded and shaped concepts of liberty and freedom, and he felt he was indebted to hand that liberty down to his succeeding generation, sensing the Old Testament command: "Proclaim ye liberty throughout the land."

He believed firmly that this freedom was relative to the Constitution of our nation. It was his conviction that goals, however laudable and desired, must not be obtained by shortcuts, holding that the goal always partakes of the means by which it is produced thus making it impossible to secure liberty by illiberal procedures and democracy by undemocratic methods. He worked for a government that carried its checks and balances.

The liberty that he proclaimed was also relative to others. In his concept liberty was a gift to and a right of individuals—not organizations or mobs—but to individuals with full dignity under God and such individuals possessed that right as long as it did not infringe upon the rights of others. This liberty could only be cherished as long as it operated within law that described it and kept it from degenerating into license. With the writer of the hymn he could sing: "Confirm thy soul in self-control, Thy liberty in law."

It was his first conviction that our liberty was relative also to God Who was its Author and Giver. He believed that beyond all concrete law there was a Lawgiver to prescribe the right and proscribe the wrong and that this Supreme Lawgiver worked His will into the laws of man. He was aware that freedom unbridled and unchecked, and knowing no higher allegiance before which it must bow, tended at last to stultify the ego until one claiming such liberty became sick of it like the prodigal who has misused and abused it and came home asking for slavery.

Fred Buzhardt lived as a free man under God with a deep sense of obligation to serve his fellow man. Jesus said: "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." Such was his portrayal of God—that of redhot energy and unceasing activity in the face of need. Those words depict to us the restlessness of God. In this respect Fred Buzhardt resembled his Master. In professional and public service, in community and civic endeavor, in the work of the government, or as Training Union director of this church in earlier years, and later as deacon and Sunday School teacher, he was busy always in service. Quite often he took time not only to advise, but to go with his pastor on errands of help. Of David, it was said: "He served his generation by the will of God." Even so Fred Buzhardt served his church, his community, his county, his State, and his Nation to the best that was in him.

Our minds cannot comprehend all that God has in store for us beyond this world. I do not fully understand heaven or paradise, but Jesus said: "Today thou shalt be with me." It is enough to be with Him, and wherever Fred Buzhardt may be, you may rest assured he is with his Lord and that he is busy still serving there, even as he served here. With the poet we can say of this servant:

"Not cold beneath the grasses,
Not close-walled within the tomb,
Rather in my Father's mansion
Living in another room.

"Living like the one who loves you,
Like your child with cheeks abloom
Out of sight at desk, or school, or book,
Busy in another room.

"Nearer than the youth, whom fortune
Beckons where the strange lands loom,
Just beyond the hanging curtain
Serving in another room.

"Shall I doubt my Father's mercy?
Shall I look at death as doom,
Or the stepping o'er the threshold
To a bigger, better room?

"Shall I blame my Father's wisdom?
Shall I sit enswathed in gloom,
When I know my loved is happy,
Waiting in another room?"

In all these ways the passing of this fine public servant leaves a vacant spot on our horizons. As for me, as also with many of you, I shall miss him most as a friend with deep loyalties and abiding attachments. May God bless to our good the sacred memory of this man and the giant strides with which he walked in our midst.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, July 7, 1966]

SOUTH CAROLINA REPRESENTATIVE BUZHARDT, 62, DIES

GREENWOOD.—Rep. J. Fred Buzhardt, judge-elect of the 11th Judicial Circuit and former law partner of U.S. Sen. STROM THURMOND, died here early Wednesday in Self Memorial Hospital.

Funeral services for the 62-year-old lawmaker will be held in the McCormick Baptist Church at 3 p.m. Friday. Burial will be in the city cemetery.

Buzhardt was unanimously elected judge of the 11th Circuit by the General Assembly last January to replace Judge T. B. Greneker, who had planned to retire in November.

Greneker said Wednesday he did not know what would be done about filling the judgeship, but "I will be more than happy to continue to serve this state if I am asked."

The judge said he talked to Buzhardt last week in his home. "Though he was sick, he was still so happy because he was going to fulfill his lifelong ambition—to sit on the bench," Greneker said.

"He said he desired to render service to his state, and I'm sure he would have done just that," Greneker added.

Rep. Buzhardt, if he had taken office as judge, would have been one of the last jurists in the state able to attain a judgeship without attending law school.

A native of Greenwood, he attended Furman University in 1920–21 then dropped out because he had no money. He went to work as a weaver in Greenwood Mills.

In 1931, he went to Edgefield and for three years studied law under J. William Thurmond, father of Sen. STROM THURMOND. He was admitted to the bar in 1934. In that year, Buzhardt and the younger THURMOND formed a partnership with law offices in McCormick and Edgefield.

The partnership lasted until 1938, when THURMOND was elected to the 11th Circuit bench—the same post to which Buzhardt was named.

Wednesday, Sen. THURMOND said, "South Carolina and our nation have lost one of their distinguished sons in the death of J. Fred Buzhardt."

Calling Buzhardt a strong advocate of constitutional government, THURMOND said Buzhardt was "a man of unquestioned integrity and an able lawyer who would have made an outstanding judge."

House Speaker Solomon Blatt said, "Judge Buzhardt was an outstanding statesman. He served his county and state well and would have made an outstanding judge. He was my friend and I regret so much his death."

Blatt announced he is asking the entire House membership to serve as a committee to attend the services.

He was a member of Mine Lodge 117 AFM, Hejaz Shrine Temple and McCormick Baptist Church, where he had served as deacon for many years.

Surviving are his mother, Mrs. Sara Terry Buzhardt of Greenwood; his widow, Mrs. Edna Hardin Buzhardt; a son J. Fred Buzhardt Jr. of Fairfax, Va., attorney and administrative assistant to Sen. THURMOND; three sisters, Mrs. Fred W. Phillips of Greenville, Mrs. O. C. Lewis of Allendale and Mrs. Carl E. Williams of North Little Rock, Ark.; a brother, O. F. Buzhardt of Vicksburg, Miss.; and four grandchildren.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 7, 1966]

JUDGE-ELECT DIES OF HEART AILMENT

MCCORMICK, S.C.—Rep. Fred Buzhardt, judge-elect of the 11th Judicial Circuit, died Wednesday in Self Memorial Hospital at Greenwood where he was admitted last month after suffering a heart attack. He was 62.

He was unanimously elected by the State General Assembly in January to succeed Judge T. B. Greneker, and was scheduled to assume the position in November when Greneker retired.

Funeral services will be held Friday.

A one-time law partner to Sen. STROM THURMOND, Rep. Buzhardt was held in high esteem by officials from all over the state.

Sen. THURMOND issued a statement Wednesday morning which echoed the sentiments of others. Said THURMOND:

"South Carolina and our nation have lost one of its distinguished sons in the death of J. Fred Buzhardt.

"He, like his son, J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., on my staff was a strong advocate of constitutional government and had the vision to see that the preservation of our Constitution means the preservation of our national liberty and the freedom of the individual citizen.

"He was a man of unquestioned integrity and an able lawyer who would have made an outstanding judge.

"A former law partner and close friend of mine, I feel a deep personal loss in his passing."

House Speaker Solomon Blatt of Barnwell said "Judge Buzhardt was an outstanding statesman. He served his country and state well and would have made an outstanding judge. He was my friend and I regret so much his death."

Blatt announced that he is asking the entire House membership to serve as a committee to attend the funeral services.

A native of Greenwood, he was the son of Mrs. Sara Terry Buzhardt, Greenwood, and the late Joseph C. Buzhardt. He had served in the House since 1963.

He attended Furman University, studied law in the offices of Thurmond & Thurmond, Edgefield, from 1931–34, and began his own law practice after moving to McCormick in 1935. He had served as town attorney since 1936, as county attorney since 1937, and was a member of the American and South Carolina Bar Assns.

He was a member and former vice chairman of the South Carolina Board of Corrections, served as chairman of the McCormick County Democratic Executive Committee from 1942 to 1966, was a member of the Clarks Hill Authority, a former member of the McCormick School Board of Trustees and served as chairman of the board for eight years.

He was a member of Mine Lodge No. 117, AFM, Hejaz Shrine Temple, and was a member and deacon of the McCormick Baptist Church.

Funeral services will be held at 3 p.m. Friday at the McCormick Baptist Church with the Rev. Henry J. Gambrell officiating. Burial will be in the McCormick City cemetery.

Survivors in addition to his mother, include his wife, Mrs. Edna Hardin Buzhardt; a son, J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., Fairfax, Va.; three sisters, Mrs. Fred W. Phillips, Greenville, S.C., Mrs. O. C. Lewis, Allendale, S.C., and Mrs. Carl E. Williams, North Little Rock, Ark.; a brother, O. F. Buzhardt, Vicksburg, Miss., and four grandchildren.

The body is at the Strom Funeral Home in McCormick, and will be taken to the residence on Augusta Street at 3 p.m. Thursday. The family is at the residence.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 8, 1966]

J. Fred Buzhardt, Sr.

In the death of J. Fred Buzhardt Sr. of McCormick, the entire state of South Carolina has lost an outstanding member of its General Assembly, and his wide circle of friends has lost a man of ability, integrity, and striking devotion to duty.

Fred Buzhardt had made a secure place for himself as a member of the South Carolina Bar, practicing first with J. W. Thurmond Sr.'s law firm in Edgefield in the early 1930s, and later from his own office in McCormick. It was in recognition of his solid professional background that he was named to the General Assembly.

Mr. Buzhardt always carried his part of the extra duties which are expected of the leadership in any community and state. He had devoted time to penal matters as chairman of the state Board of Corrections, to educational tasks as member and chairman for eight years of the McCormick School Board of Trustees, to duties in the Church as deacon of the First Baptist Church, and to economic progress as a member of Clark Hill Authority.

His devotion to the public welfare was rooted in a firm conviction of the necessity of constitutional government. In the words of U.S. Sen. J. Strom Thurmond, with whose father he studied law, Mr. Buzhardt "had the vision to see that the preservation of our Constitution means the preservation of our national liberty and the freedom of the individual citizen."

Mr. Buzhardt had been elected in January to the bench of the 11th Judiciary Circuit, and was scheduled to assume that post in November when the present judge retires. He would have made an outstanding judge, just as he had made an outstanding legislator, attorney and citizen.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, July 9, 1966]

J. Fred Buzhardt

The loss to his county and state in the death of Rep. J. Buzhardt, a good citizen, able public servant and legislator, is doubly tragic.

A Furman graduate who studied law in a law office, an almost unused path to the bar nowadays, Mr. Buzhardt last spring was elected by his colleagues in the General Assembly to succeed in November Judge T. B. Greneker of the 11th Circuit who had submitted his resignation effective at that time.

It was a position to which Fred Buzhardt had long aspired, and he approached the task of sitting as a state judge with the utmost humility and dedication. He would have made a good judge—fair, humane, compassionate, restrained and yet firm.

But death at age 62 after an illness that lasted only weeks deprived him of that climax to a useful life and the state of the services of a man who truly wanted to serve.

Mr. Buzhardt, however, leaves behind him a fine record of public service accomplished. Long before he ever entered the political arena personally, he had for years been active in the campaigns of many able holders of public office and had served as friend and adviser to them after they took office.

Among these was Sen. Strom Thurmond who acknowledged his own debt in his personal tribute.

Prior to his election to office, he had served as a member and vice chairman of the State Board of Corrections, which runs the penal system, during a time of great change and improvements in the institutions which confine and attempt to rehabilitate those convicted of crime.

We regret that this good man's life ended before his career was crowned with its greatest highlight, but most of all we regret the loss of a genuinely public-spirited citizen who served so long in so many ways with no thought of personal reward.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, July 8, 1966]

J. Fred Buzhardt

Lawyer and patriot, J. Fred Buzhardt of McCormick was an able defender of the U.S. Constitution in a time of constant assault. Both as a private citizen and as a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives, he cast his lot with those who prefer to keep the kind of Republic which made America great.

For years Mr. Buzhardt was associated in the practice of law with U.S. Sen. Strom Thurmond. His son, a member of Sen. Thurmond's staff in Washington, is one of the best informed men in the United States on subversion and other forms of eroding the Constitution.

Mr. Buzhardt had been elected judge of the 11th Judicial Circuit, covering McCormick, Lexington, Saluda and Edgefield Counties. He would have made a superb judge. His intelligence, integrity and humanity would have set an example for bench, bar and public. As a longtime admirer of this good man and strong citizen, we are deeply grieved by his death at age 62. The state has lost a devoted and useful son.

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index, July 7, 1966]

J. Fred Buzhardt

J. Fred Buzhardt had a long and varied public career, climaxed when he realized an ambition of long standing to be elected to the circuit judgeship.

His service ranged over a wide area, from local positions such as school trustee to legislator and active member of the South Carolina Board of Corrections. He took a keen interest in all public issues, serving as chairman of the McCormick County Democratic Party for years and as an influential member of the state party.

While his association for most of his adult life was with McCormick, he was a native of this city and retained a deep interest in its affairs.

Not many people these days devote the time to public affairs that Fred Buzhardt did. Few South Carolinians, in fact, have had their lives touch on so many different areas of public concern.

He will be missed not only in McCormick, but throughout the state to which he gave so fully of his time and talents.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last month, Russell K. Berg, president of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, testified before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I can say with all sincerity that no one has fought harder for the buildup of the American merchant marine than President Berg. He has as fine a grasp as anybody of the myriad problems facing the merchant marine today.

Mr. President, I am sure that the testimony of Russell Berg will be of interest to many of my colleagues. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Russell K. Berg, President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, Before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Washington, D.C., June 14, 1966

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, my name is Russell K. Berg. I am president of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, which represents Construction Work, embracing Erection, Dismantling, Conversion and Repair, and Contract Maintenance—Industrial Plants or Shops, embracing Production and Maintenance Units; Craft Units (production); Craft Units (maintenance); Railroad Craft Units (manufacture, maintenance and repair of railroad equipment); Office and Technical Units; and Diversified Units and Business Equipment—Shipbuilding and Marine Work, embracing Commercial Yards; Naval Yards and other Marine Work.

I am appearing before this Committee as a representative of 35,000 shipbuilding members who work in shipyards throughout the entire United States of America.

I should like to compliment Chairman Garmatz and the members of this fine Committee for their outstanding devotion to the maritime industry and for their unstinting efforts to solve the present maritime dilemma. Realizing that the Committee has been conducting intermittent hearings since February 8th, and has heard volumes of testimony on this subject, I shall attempt to be as brief as possible.

"The United States must be prepared today—and throughout the foreseeable future—to deal immediately and effectively with any emergency that may be forced upon us. We must be ready at all times to fight limited wars, or general war, or to support our foreign policies under tense conditions short of actual conflict.

"The prosecution of war might employ the full range of our nation's resources. Our entire industrial capability is available to be integrated into our over-all national defense effort. To support sustained combat operations and to project our military power overseas, our armed forces would rely heavily upon American industry. Our maritime industry would play a central role transporting essential materials, not available in the national stockpile, to feed domestic industries and carrying the major portion of our troops, their equipment, and supplies to overseas areas.

"The strategic objectives of the United States in wartime dictate that the United

States have under its control sufficient active merchant type shipping to promptly meet our sealift requirements.

"In an emergency situation involving the NATO Alliance, some reliance might be put on NATO nations to assist in providing our emergency shipping needs. It is probable, however, that the total combined shipping requirements of the NATO nations will exceed the total shipping capabilities available. Additionally, some delay is to be expected before allocation of shipping on an international basis can be fully effective. Of utmost significance is the fact that the interests of the United States are global, and emergencies may well arise wherein our interests would not be identical with those of our European Allies.

"In an emergency situation not involving the NATO Alliance, privately owned shipping under the flags of NATO nations and other free world nations could possibly be chartered. Charter rates and insurance costs would in all probability be very high."

The statement that I have just read is the introduction from a report entitled "Current Appraisal of Ocean Shipping to Support the Defense of the United States" made by Vice Admiral John Sylvester, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics) on April 24, 1963.

In my opinion, this statement is just as true today as it was in 1963. In the broadest sense, our national strength is indeed formidable. It is without parallel. We can meet almost any domestic or international crisis.

But, we live in a changing world. Those who would destroy liberty and freedom are becoming stronger. They are expanding their national strength in many ways. Their determination, though for entirely different reasons, is equal to ours in intensity. Their objectives are devious. That is the nature of Communism.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain, the evidences that the Soviet Union is moving to control the oceans of the world—just as she would control the minds of men—are everywhere. The Russians are engaged in what might well be called a lop-sided ocean space race, which on the basis of present entries and at present odds they can hardly fail to win.

The Communists are building ships at levels of construction far exceeding those in this country—the citadel of freedom. That they plan sooner or later to challenge the waning sea power supremacy of the United States is predicted as inevitable. Thus, a contest between conflicting ideologies may occur on the high seas—without a single shot or missile being fired. It will be an economic tug-of-war. And, the outcome could well affect the destiny of Western Civilization.

"Control of the seas can mean peace. Control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security." These words by the late President Kennedy suggest the enduring importance of sea power as a taproot of freedom. But, not only is the national security of the United States at stake in the coming race on the high seas; so, too, is the collective security of the entire Free World.

This morning, I shall endeavor to place shipyards and sea power in perspective in terms of national prestige and the national economy.

I should like to suggest that no war, little or small, is ended with the same hardware with which it was begun. This was dramatically demonstrated in World War II. It is being demonstrated in Vietnam even now. Ships in being are of course important, but shipyards to repair or reconstruct damaged vessels or to build new ones must also be inbeing. And, they must be under our own control and maintained at all times in a satisfactory state of readiness.

The Defense Department and the Maritime Administration have refused to withdraw any more vessels from the reserve fleet because they say reactivation costs of approximately $400,000 are too great. Let us picture for a minute where we would have been in the present Vietnam situation if our shipyards had not been available, not been ready to do the reactivation work they were called upon to do. I am sure that if, in this emergency, we had been forced to rely on foreign yards, the cost would have been much greater.

No one can predict with absolute certainty or reliability the "scenario" of the coming race on the high seas. We should not become committed to fixed assumptions that shipyards, for example, are not needed or that national security would not be jeopardized through reliance on foreign construction and repair for our merchant and naval ships. As the distinguished Admiral H. G. Rickover puts it: "A war, small or large, does not follow a prescribed pattern that was laid out in advance. If we could have predicted the sequence of events accurately, we could probably have avoided the war in the first place." He went on to say: "Our weapons are used to the greatest effectiveness possible under the circumstances in which they are employed." Shipyards, then, to be effectively utilized as a weapon of sea power must be available, fully capable of expansion to meet any emergency however severe, and to engage in whatever consequent rehabilitation might be necesary.

I mention shipyards in the context of national security for two reasons. First, because there are apparently those in official quarters who have become committed to the fixed assumption that shipbuilding and ship repair is no longer essential to national defense. Despite the latest policy declaration of the Congress (1946 Ship Sales Act) which prescribes that "It is necessary for the national security . . . to have an . . . American-owned Merchant Marine . . . supplemented by efficient American-owned facilities for shipbuilding and ship repair . . ." The evidences of an officially-inspired campaign to abandon this Congressional mandate have become increasingly evident in recent months.

Secondly, because national security, which of course goes far beyond national defense, is very definitely interconnected and interrelated with national prestige and the national economy.

We have of late been told that arguments in favor of any actions based on national prestige "have the sticky consistency of cotton candy, and are as hard to nail down." These statements have been made by the Maritime Administrator. On the other hand, our participation in the Vietnam situation has been characterized by other Administration spokesmen as a "War of Honor." Our national prestige is very much at stake—and I believe we would all agree—in halting the flow of Communism in Southeast Asia. And our government with the aid of industry is strenuously trying to schedule our limited and neglected shipping capability to protect our honor in a distant and remote country. We have even witnessed the duplicity of some of our usual allies who prefer to serve the cause of the Communists rather than ours.

The history of our great country is filled with instances of national policy being shaped around national prestige. These are not hard to pin down. They are the fabric of the American way of life. They are a part of our rich heritage. And, contrary to the words of the Maritime Administrator, "they do not have the sticky consistency of cotton candy."

One need only begin with the inspiring words of our National Anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner." The Great White Fleet which went around the world many years ago to "display the flag" is another illustration. Along with the national strength which goes with it, national prestige accounts for the existence and the continual modernization of our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. It is reflected in our industrial and economic progress. Our trade and commerce could be a spectacular manifestation of national prestige, but there are still no realistic programs to lift the volume of our exports and imports carried aboard U.S. flag vessels above the present level of about 9%.

Our massive and expensive expeditions into outer space today are largely justified for reasons of national prestige. But, it is never stated that our space programs are totally subsidized by the Federal Treasury. I have yet to hear any public official or private citizen refer to our subsidized outer space efforts. It is rarely pointed out that the annual cost of these programs is in the neighborhood of $5 billion—or approximately 5% of the national budget.

These programs are designed to beat the Soviet Union in the race to the moon—an objective wherein it is suggested our honor and prestige are also at stake. Representatives of the Federal Space Agencies have consistently—and very successfully—pleaded that "You cannot put a price tag on national prestige." Many of us agree with that position, though we also believe that the same rationale, with equal force, should be applied to winning the ocean space race. To do so, more ships—both merchant and naval—will have to be built in our shipyards—but the cost must be approved, without haggling, in the same spirit that the far greater costs for space projects are accepted. Such a disposition has yet to be developed.

It seems to me there is an additional aspect of national prestige in the sea power picture. Panama, Honduras and Liberia have many merchant ships registered under their flags, but none of these countries could hardly qualify as a sea power. Why? Because without—shipyards, resources, naval vessels and manpower under their own control—they have neither sea power, nor standing or prestige as a world power.

Similarly, the relationship between sea power and our national economy should be self-evident. The seas of the globe are some 35 times the size of the United States. Seventy per cent of the earth's surface is water. In times of conflict, these waters belong to the power that can control them. History proves the truth of that maxim.

Freedom of the seas and their control, under hot or cold war circumstances, cannot and never should be taken for granted. Naval power guards the oceans—the 70,000 miles of sealanes that are the arteries of our national bloodstream. If these arteries are cut, the heart of our economy will stop, for we are not a completely self-sustaining nation. We depend on the sea for trade. We need the seas to keep our industry going. We are self-sufficient in terms of only 12 of 77 essential strategic materials required for survival. 65 must be imported by sea.

It follows that in addition to a naval fleet to preserve the sealanes, a U.S. merchant fleet to carry these strategic materials to our shores is essential. It also follows that the American Merchant Marine makes a substantial contribution to the national economy and the balance of international payments. Let us examine for a few moments the impact of shipyard activities as an element of sea power.

During the past year, there have been many inferences, mostly from governmental sources, that utilization of foreign shipyards for the building and repair of U.S. flag ships would create no severe economic disturbances. In all of this, there has been a tendency to minimize the loss of job opportunities for shipyard workers and the resulting repercussions in other supporting industries. There has been a tendency to scoff at the importance of shipbuilding and ship repairing in times of emergency. And, there has been a tendency to discount the effects of foreign ship procurements on the balance of payments.

It should be noted here that shipyards of the Free World actively solicit Russian shipbuilding orders despite the subsequent effect in terms of military, political and economic advantages gained by the USSR with each ship delivery. Our tax dollars—yours and mine—were used to reconstruct and rehabilitate foreign shipyards damaged or destroyed during World War II. Under mutual security and foreign aid programs more than $1 billion U.S. dollars were spent in this endeavor. In contrast only $700 million in federal funds have been spent in this country for merchant ship construction since the end of the war.

Using the Merchant Ship Construction Program, in which federal funds are invested as an example, there is sufficient economic data to demonstrate that 10,000 workers are directly employed in the shipyards on this work and that another 70,000 jobs in supporting activities are traceable to this program. If the program were to be doubled over the present level of 10 to 13 ships annually—a not unrealistic goal under existing circumstances—these employment figures would also be more than doubled, and the inclusion of repair work would of course result in an even greater increase in direct and consequential employment.

It should be pointed out here that every state of the union provides a component, resource or service that goes into the construction of every ship in a U.S. shipyard. This trend may very well have had its beginning with the actions of the Congress in 1883 and 1886 which led to the creation of a modern Navy. By insistence upon naval armor of American manufacture, the government—through the then Secretary of the Navy, William C. Whitney—encouraged the development of domestic steelworks capable of producing heavy ship plates and huge naval guns, thereby eliminating American dependence upon European steelmakers and other suppliers. No less should be true today. We should continue to encourage primary reliance on domestic production and never be placed at the mercy of foreign sources for instruments of national security.

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that almost 30%—not 5% which has been erroneously advertised—of the aggregate shipyard market for merchant ship construction is attributable to governmental sponsorship and statutory requirements.

The Interagency Maritime Task Force Report, among other things, calls for the construction and repair of U.S. flag ships in the shipyards of other countries. The report has been the subject of much controversy. We have analyzed its recommendations, in some depth, and find that the potential impacts on U.S. shipbuilding and repairing are quite startling.

The Task Force proposes to add an average of 54 merchant ships per year to the merchant fleet in the 1966–1975 period. Of this number, 17 ships would be built in this country, and 37 in foreign shipyards. In other words, shipyards of other countries would be given the opportunity to build more than twice the number of ships for our own merchant marine than would be constructed in the United States. With the inclusion of foreign repair work which inevitably would follow, the loss of work in terms of ship equivalents could be as high as 30 additional vessels per year or more.

It should not be too difficult, at least to this Committee, to equate this loss of work to the loss of job opportunities which will ensue. Obviously, adoption of the foreign building and repair proposals of the Task Force will result in a staggering and likely permanent reduction in market potentials for U.S. shipyards and employment for U.S. shipyard workers which will have repercussions throughout the country. Surely, these proposals will not contribute to economic growth, and every dollar spent for shipyard activities abroad will aggravate the balance of payments problem.

The Maritime Administrator and members of the Task Force, with little appreciation of the consequences of their statements, have promoted the highly improbable idea that perhaps the United States can get by without an American flag merchant marine or without our own shipyards. They seem to be saying, get rid of maritime subsidies, and we will be budgetary heroes—we will have saved less than 3 tenths of 1% of the national budget.

It is in this area of 3 tenths of 1% that all of the recent dialogue with respect to maritime subsidies has taken place. Roughly, 8% of the Federal Budget last year, or $8 billion, represented payments of subsidies of all types. Farm support programs totaled $5.6 billion, or 5% of the National Budget, or 70% of all subsidies. Payments for merchant ship construction totaled $80 million, or 1% of all subsidies. These are not my figures, but those of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee.

The Maritime Administrator and the Interagency Maritime Task Force argue that foreign shipbuilding is warranted just as other modes of domestic transportation are permitted to obtain foreign-built airplanes, trucks, railroad cars, locomotives, and so on. This statement fails to take into account the very special correlation between ships, shipyards and sea power and is typical of the meaningless generalities which have for too long surrounded discussions of shipyard problems. It fails to recognize the role of the shipyard in the sea power equation.

According to published Government statistics, in the years since 1960, the imports of railway locomotives and cars, trucks and buses, and aircraft have been negligible. In each year, in each case, the ratios of imports to domestic production has been less than one-tenth of one per cent. This low level of imports may result from the fact that transportation equipment is subject to customs duties in the range of 9 to 19 per cent. Interestingly, foreign built ships can be brought into this country duty free.

On the contrary, in 1964 alone—the last year we have complete figures on—American shipping interests or their foreign affiliates placed contracts for the construction of 44 ocean-going vessels with shipyards abroad. By comparison, U.S. shipyards receive contracts for only 18 commercial vessels in 1964. The ratio of foreign construction of ships for U.S. interests to domestic construction was thus almost 245 per cent, and there appear to be those who would make this ratio even more devastating—to nearly 400 per cent.

These detractors of U.S. shipyards are not solely in the Maritime Administration or on the Interagency Maritime Task Force. The Department of Defense is perhaps more responsible because of Secretary McNamara's influence with the Administration and his announced affection for transportation by air power.

Together or separately, each of these efforts would weaken U.S. sea power. Taken together or separately, these developments would adversely affect the shipyard capability of our nation and our ability to preserve essential crafts. Together or separately, these possibilities reflect a tendency to sacrifice U.S. shipyards on the altar of expediency without a full appreciation of the potential harm and ultimate consquences which are involved. The implied threat in these developments, has created a state of confusion in the U.S. shipyard industry. Management, labor, suppliers, investors, bankers, naval architects, marine engineers, customers and many others are beginning to view the future with apprehension insofar as our shipyard capability is concerned.

It is extremely probable that one of the oldest and best-equipped shipyards in the United States, the New York Shipbuilding Corporation of Camden, New Jersey will close its gates at the end of this year because of the uncertainty and mass confusion in the industry.

Gentlemen, this means that the 3,500 skilled team of craftsmen that built the NSS nuclear ship *Savannah* will be among the unemployed.

Manpower is a vital asset. Manpower cannot be put in mothballs. Perfection of the state of the art of shipbuilding and repairing requires skilled craftsmen as well as facilities and available work. Productivity of U.S. shipyard workers is at this moment at least equal to and perhaps even better than their foreign counterparts.

A balanced labor force, with ever-increasing productivity, in U.S. shipyards can only be preserved through the availability of job opportunities and assurances of continued employment in the future. This labor force, once dissipated, can only be replaced after costly periods of recruitment and training.

All of the production and natural resources of the United States contribute to the building of ships in U.S. yards. Every trade and skill—from mining and transportation to printing and decoration—are involved. Lower levels of ship construction obviously have far-reaching effects throughout the entire country.

The finest ships in the world are built in the United States. This is no idle comment. It reflects the high standards of workmanship and design which are a by-product of the American way of life. Many of these standards are required by law to guarantee safety for U.S. citizens and U.S. cargoes. The same standards, in most cases, do not prevail abroad.

Ship construction in U.S. yards is governed by the following requirements: Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, Work Hours Act of 1962, Convict Labor Provision, Buy American Act, Small Business Subcontracting Program, Labor Surplus Area Contracting Program, Renegotiation Act of 1951, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, Examination of Records Provisions, Equal Opportunity, Armed Services Procurement Regulations.

Ship construction in foreign yards cannot be guaranteed as meeting these requirements without added costs—and added costs destroy at once the illusion that a bargain is possible through use of foreign shipyards.

The art of shipbuilding is on the brink of dramatic changes and improvement. New concepts and new ideas are being developed. Future progress must not be placed exclusively in the hands of other countries whose political objectives may, in the long run, be different than those in the United States.

Of this subject, the Chief of Naval Operations has said: "We all know that the more ships we have constructed for us in other lands and the more foreign bottoms we use to transport our exports and imports, the less need we have for shipyards in our own country. This, of course, means slow but certain death of those precious skills and know-how so essential to any sea power industry. This we cannot afford. We must become vitally—let me repeat, vitally—concerned with preserving and maintaining our repository of trained manpower resources found in our shipyard facilities."

Our International Union, in searching for a solution to the existing maritime dilemma, sponsored the National Shipbuilding Conference last November, here in Washington, D.C. This Conference was attended by representatives of over 50 labor and management organizations. At the conclusion of the Conference, those in attendance adopted a Consensus Report entitled "U.S. Shipyards, A Vital National Asset", a copy of which is submitted for the record. We feel this Consensus Report outlines the foundations of a program for stimulating the construction of the merchant and naval shipyards of our country.

Though our purpose is to create expanding job opportunities for our workers with resulting benefits to the national economy and the defense structure, it should also be noted that representatives of management joined in the formulation of this consensus.

The discussions with regard to the nation's shipbuilding requirements and needs for merchant shipping and naval support have for too long been marked by generalities and speculation. There has been a reluctance—either by design or coincidence—to get down to the specifics of effective solutions. There has been too much faintheartedness and pennypinching with respect to the costs of effective solutions. And in the alternative, there has been a quickness to advocate expedient measures which ultimately would destroy the shipyard capability of the United States sea power.

Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson has been the principal advocate of expedient actions. His wholly destructive proposal for the construction and repair of U.S. flag merchant ships in foreign shipyards has never been accurately assessed in terms of consequences on the national economy, the loss of employment for shipyard craftsmen, the contraction of essential shipbuilding and ship repairing capabilities to meet national emergencies, and the balance of international payments.

Instead, he has engaged in a mish-mash of erroneous or misleading statistics, curious arithmetic and outright hocus-pocus. He would place shipyard contracts abroad—to the impairment of our national interests—and to the detriment of our shipyard workers. He brands as "too expensive" something which our great nation must have to survive.

For a nation that values dearly freedom and security for all, a price tag should never be placed on anything that contributes to, or strengthens, those prized possessions. Each day, we make a distinction between necessary and unnecessary expenditures, and no informed authority would relegate ships and shipyards to the category of unnecessary. Through the years, it has been proven, time and again, that ships—both naval and merchant—plus shipyards are vital to our survival and to the preservation of our precious liberties.

From the standpoint of things which are necessary and essential, a few comments on the costs of each are important.

Within the framework of our "Consensus Report", we conservatively estimate that an annual expenditure of approximately $200 million could enable construction of ships in U.S. shipyards toward attainment of an American flag merchant marine which could carry an increasing share of our nation's trade and commerce. Included in this amount would be the requirements for domestic shipping. Is this too high a price to pay in an expanding economy and with an ever-increasing trade pattern? We say "no", especially when the expenditures will also have the consequential effects of gainful employment for our people, stability for our shipyards, and yields to the Federal Treasury in the form of personal and corporate taxes.

Certainly, a program in the magnitude of $200 million annually "to enable the construction in United States shipyards of sufficient vessels to accomplish the carriage of not less than 30% of the exports and imports of the United States aboard United States flag ships by 1975", as recommended by the Maritime Advisory Committee of which I am privileged to be a member, must be carefully conceived to permit optimum utilization of facilities and manpower. The program should be divided into logical yearly increments so as to achieve a realistic build-up and so as to achieve desired objectives in a reasonable period of time. On this basis, we firmly believe that Congressional approval will be forthcoming.

In the area of research and development for maritime and shipbuilding purposes, the pitiful level of governmental support in the last decade can only be explained by an absolute failure of federal leadership and bureaucratic bungling. No such mismanagement has been associated with the allocation of federal funds and national resources for aircraft and aerospace research and development, and there is no question about our nation's superiority in these fields. A fraction of what is spent for space research and development would vastly strengthen the American Merchant Marine and we therefore believe that an annual appropriation of $100 million for 5 years for maritime and shipyard research and development is not unrealistic or unreasonable. Here again, a careful program, incorporating the best ideas of labor, industry and government must be devised so as to take advantage of advancing technologies and new concepts. Opportunities for nuclear propulsion and complete transportation systems must be fully explored. Such an effort, however, cannot succeed without government leadership and financial support.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I believe I speak most candidly when I say that the shipyard workers of this country—and their counterparts in other American industries—strenuously resent the harangue of a single governmental official—the Maritime Administrator—who would take away all or part of their livelihood through foreign shipbuilding and ship repairing. We are also disturbed by the fact that he continues on this course despite statements of other Administration officials to the contrary. In this sort of vacuum, the Congress must exert leadership—if not, we are fast approaching the point of no return beyond which retrieval of an essential maritime capability will be many times more costly than we presently anticipate—if not almost impossible. We, of the labor movement, are therefore deeply gratified by the Committee's searching scrutiny of the present serious situation—and we are fully confident that your decisions, recommendations and actions will be in the right direction.

Summary of direct and indirect assistance

Country	Direct		Indirect		
	Operating subsidy	Construction subsidy	Tax benefits	Loans and interest on loans	Other
Argentina	X[1]	X[2]	X[3]	X	X.
Brazil	X[1]	X	X	X	X.
Canada	X[4]	X[5]	X		X.
Chile	X[1]		X		X.
Colombia	X[1]		X[1]		X.
Costa Rica			X		X.
Ecuador	X[1]				
Guatemala	X[1]				X.
Haiti					X.
Honduras					X.
Mexico	X[1]				X.
Nicaragua					
Panama					X.
Peru	X[1]	X[6]	X[3]		X.
United States	X	X	X	X	X.
Uruguay	X[1]		X[3]		X.
Venezuela	X[1]				X.

[1] Consists of meeting deficits incurred in the operation of ships owned by the Government or in which they have an interest. No operating subsidy is granted to private companies.
[2] The Government owns and operates the major shipyard.
[3] The Government owned or controlled steamship line is exempt from taxes.
[4] Coastal trade only.
[5] Suspended February 1965.
[6] The Government owns the controlling interest in the major shipyard.

Summary of Government aids to maritime industries

Country	Direct		Indirect			
	Operating subsidy	Construction subsidy	Tax benefits	Depreciation	Loans and interest on loans	Other
Denmark				X	X[1]	X.
France	X	X		X	X	X.
West Germany			X	X[2]	X	X.
Greece			X			X.
Italy	X	X	X	X[2]	X	X.
Japan	X	X	X[2]	X	X	X.
Netherlands				X[2]	X	X.
Norway	X[1]		X[2]	X	X	X.
Sweden	X[1]	X[1]	X	X	X	X.
United Kingdom	X[1]		X[2]	X	X	X.
United States	X	X	X	X	X	X.

[1] Domestic only.
[2] Not exclusively to shipping.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam is rapidly degenerating to the point where brutal reprisal encourages brutal reprisal, and neither side will any longer be in complete control of its own actions.

The aggressor government of North Vietnam has threatened to escalate hostilities by brutality and threats against captured American airmen, contrary to all international agreements. At the same time, the righteous anger of the American people may well demand retaliation beyond the design of our policymakers in Washington.

And once again, civilization will have retrogressed to the level of "an eye for an eye—a tooth for a tooth."

All Americans pray that U.S. leadership will be able to bring about the termination of hostilities in Vietnam, at the earliest possible date. I believe that our citizens, as well as most of the free world, look to Washington to supply the kind of initiative, both military and diplomatic, that will rule out reprisal, and rule in a peace settlement.

Unfortunately such initiative has too often been lacking. Unfortunately the Pentagon and the State Department too often react to crises and opportunities rather than showing the initiative that might bring about an early peace in Asia.

For instance, many of us urged the administration months ago to strike at strictly military targets near Hanoi and Haiphong in order to blunt increasing aggression in South Vietnam, and to persuade North Vietnam to negotiate. If the objective is to save lives and to end the conflict, why were such actions wrong in January but right in July?

Last January, the administration appealed to the United Nations to play a role toward a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war, and sent its representatives to the four corners of the earth in order to establish a broad basis for peace negotiations. If new initiatives toward negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war were worth trying then, is it not now more important than ever before that the United States exhaust every possibility in the pursuit of an early and meaningful peace?

While I advocated increased air strikes at military targets in January, and I support those actions taken on June 29, there is a mounting danger today that continued military acceleration without an equal acceleration of peace-seeking efforts may well result in the eventual negotiations over a wasteland. If the present situation continues, we may win a military victory—but what will we have won?

Hanoi has made it patently clear that direct negotiations with the United States, at this time, are out of the question. But recent developments in Asia offer a timely opportunity to investigate a new approach to a Vietnamese settlement, one that may overcome Hanoi's objections to direct U.S. involvement, and yet an approach that would guarantee consideration of U.S. interests.

The newly organized Asia and Pacific Council—South Korea, Philippines, Thailand, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Republic of China, Malasia, South Vietnam, Laos-observer—might well be the instrument through which a new and aggressive peace offensive could be launched. On July 2, Charles H. Percy, Republican senatorial candidate in Illinois, suggested that an Asian attempt at reaching a settlement of the Vietnam conflict might be a valuable addition to the diplomatic arsenal that has so far been unable to breach the wall of Hanoi's obstinance.

In short, I have long objected to a military policy of trying to stem aggression with one arm tied behind our back. At the same time, I am deeply concerned that we are permitting a similar handicap to hinder our efforts to find a just peace.

Mr. President, the statement of Charles H. Percy is the type of imaginative thinking desperately needed, in and out of Government, if our goals are to be realized. Therefore, I ask consent to have his statement inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America's escalation of the war in Vietnam in recent days makes it imperative that we now quicken and intensify our efforts to seek a just peace. By bombing within 900 yards of a large civilian center, we have multiplied the risks of this war—the risk of Chinese intervention, the risk of enemy escalation, the risk of still more casualties among innocent men, women and children. If we must accelerate the war—as the Administration believes we must—then let us also accelerate the pursuit of peace.

As we all know, the enemy has indicated that he is not prepared to negotiate directly with the United States. Therefore, I urge a new approach to end this tragic war.

I earnestly suggest that a conference of all Asian nations be called to work toward a settlement of the Vietnam war. I further suggest that such a conference could be called by U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations. Himself an Asian, U Thant, enjoys the confidence of both East and West, and would exert an influence clearly free of national self-interest.

An all-Asian "peacemaking" conference would allow those most directly endangered to deal directly with the problem at hand. Its recommendations would reflect an understanding of the region which is essential to the restoration of peace. It would serve to find an Asian solution to a problem in Asia which threatens the peace of the world.

No one could guarantee the success of such a conference, but it is an approach worth trying. Perhaps an Asian conference would be only a beginning. But let us begin.

WHIRLWIND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a thought-provoking and timely editorial titled, "Whirlwind—Dr. King May Reject It but He Helped Sow the Wind That Bred It," appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer, on July 18. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHIRLWIND—DR. KING MAY REJECT IT BUT HE HELPED SOW THE WIND THAT BRED IT

That is a fine and deceptive line the Rev. Martin Luther King draws between racial violence and civil disobedience.

In the King formula you make certain demands on Government in the name of a minority group. The demands may be, frequently are, beyond the legitimate power of Government to bestow. So you "demonstrate" in support of them. You march en mass. You lie down in the streets and block traffic. You overrun a Court House. You obstruct the public in use of sidewalks. You interfere with the transaction of legitimate business. You court arrest.

Your conduct is deliberately provocative. It inspires rebellion by those you represent. When tolerated it leads to new excesses on the part of those into whose consciousness has been hammered the notion that they are an oppressed people. Its inevitable fruit is violence. And when it comes and the authorities try to restore order you shout of police brutality.

Dr. King may preach non-violence, but it is hardly coincidence that wherever he moves, violence follows. He may talk of peace, but his exhortations and demands breed riots.

Never before in the history of this or any other Country has so small a minority won so many concessions in so short a time from so large a majority.

In successive years Congress enacted sweeping laws in behalf of our Negro citizens which, in the judgment of many legal authorities and fair minded citizens, go far beyond both constitutional authority and a realistic concept of civil rights. And at the moment the lawmakers have under consideration in the name of racial justice a third piece of legislation in this series that unquestionably does violence to even a rudimentary sense of property rights.

In spite of all of this, indeed perhaps because of it, there is less satisfaction in the Negro community today than ever before, as witness such outbreaks as that now rocking Chicago and less spectacular manifestations in other parts of the Country. The appetite for concession is insatiable.

It all raises the very serious question, a question which should command the thoughtful consideration of every citizen in the land whose sense of justice has not been warped, whether or not it is possible within the framework of an orderly society to satisfy these people at all.

Back in 1964, when racial disorder had not yet reached the peaks it since has attained, there was an ominous phrase that fell from many lips. It was "White Backlash."

Today, a phrase more often heard is "Black Power."

Dr. King and those who join him in public rejection of Black Power and its connotation of violence may be sincere. They may have fathered something they cannot control. But if the excesses of this offspring bring down on them and on the Country the full fury of the thus far controlled Backlash, thus setting back a full generation the conquest of racial intolerance in this land, on them will fall a major part of the responsibility.

CHUCK THOMPSON: VOICE OF THE BALTIMORE COLTS AND ORIOLES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, every sports fan in Maryland knows the voice of Chuck Thompson. He broadcasts the games of both the Baltimore Colts and the Baltimore Orioles. He is the only television newsman in the country to handle both major league baseball and football in the same city.

Many indelible memories are etched in the minds of Baltimoreans with the voice of Chuck Thompson as an accompaniment. Those who watched it will never forget the great sudden-death playoff of 1958, when the Colts beat the New York Giants for the National Football League championship. Chuck Thompson called that game for the nationwide audience.

This summer, Chuck Thompson seems to be successfully cajoling the Orioles toward their first American League pennant. We Marylanders hope that the Nation's viewers will again hear his voice in October during the World Series.

In recent years, Chuck Thompson has won recognition as one of America's best sportscasters. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from the April 1966, issue of Baltimore magazine, which describes his outstanding achievements.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Magazine, April 1966]

WHY MISS AGNES WENT TO WAR

(By John C. Schmidt)

Here's the TV announcer doing a pro football game, all but chained to his seat in front of a microphone for three hours on a Sunday afternoon. A million or more people in his home town and along five or six regional networks are hanging on his every word as he describes the fast-moving game unfolding on the field. Most of the time, however, he doesn't look at the field—his eyes are on four TV monitors arrayed in front of him. To do the job he has to be able to instantly associate names and numbers for up to 80 men, half of whom are relative strangers. As a further test of his concentration, he wears bulky earphones through which the program director talks to him in one ear and the producer in the other, passing along upcoming camera shots, commercial roll cues and directions for station breaks. At times it's enough to make you throw up your hands and shout: Go to war, Miss Agnes!

Chuck Thompson, the name inseparably joined with that usually jubilant cry in Baltimore, has been the play caller for the Colts since 1949, and for the Orioles since 1955. He is the only sportscaster in the country to do both major league football and baseball in the same city. He is probably on the air longer than any other broadcaster in the region, in terms of actual time on mike, since he does the full slate of 165 Oriole games and 14 Colt games during the regular season, as well as most of the two teams' exhibition contests. On fall weekends when the two sports overlap, he'll do them both when jet travel makes this possible. In the off-season, he may sandwich in an occasional basketball game, hockey game or golf match. No matter where he goes or what he does, he's recognized by a colorful topper—the hat section of his wardrobe contains about a dozen specimens at any given time, not including straws.

Chuck's finest hour on the air to date has to be the 1958 sudden-death playoff for the National Football League championship between the Colts and the New York Giants, a clash which has unashamedly been called The Greatest Football Game Ever Played. It was seen all over the country, and its high points were recorded and distributed by his employer and sponsor, the National Brewing Company. In addition, he has been named Outstanding Maryland Sportscaster for four of the last five years by his local contemporaries. In a national poll several years ago, Chris Shenkel, who broadcasts for the New York Yankees, and Chuck finished 1 and 2 among all the sportscasters in the country.

Such stature suggests permanent entrenchment in the sports life of Baltimore, but Chuck is realistic enough to admit that there is no security in his line of work. "None whatsoever, and that includes my arrangement with National, which I think is one of the finest anywhere. For everybody in this business, whether you work for a sponsor, an agency, a network or a ball club, how long you last depends on how the public accepts you. If the public likes you, you work. If they don't, you're not going to work very long."

While it lasts, though, it's a great life—isn't it? Take the year as a whole. From mid-January to mid-March, he doesn't have to go on the air once. Of course, there is the Colt highlight film to do and some commercials to make, plus a lot of personal appearances along the rubber-chicken circuit, since this is the only time when the people who like to hold banquets and luncheons can get baseball and football personalities together at the same time. "And so they have quite a few banquets," says Chuck. "The brewery tries to limit me to about three appearances a week, but it seldom works out that way. Take a week in the middle of February for example, Monday night I went with the baseball caravan to Gettysburg. Tuesday I was in Norfolk for a dinner with the Sportsmens Club there. Wednesday I had a luncheon in Baltimore during the day and the Football Foundation Scholarship Athlete Awards banquet at night. On Thursday, I m.c.'d another luncheon, this one for the brewery's salesmen. Friday I didn't have a thing."

At the end of February, Chuck and his partner, Frank Messer, take off for the Orioles' spring training camp in Florida. There they broadcast exhibition games, renew acquaintances with team regulars and get to know promising newcomers well enough to fill in the hometown fans on those who make the squad. The regular season will bring a game averaging 2½ hours in length almost every day—twice on Sunday—from mid-April to the end of September. Half of them are in Baltimore, the others on a road that runs all the way to the West Coast. In the course of a season, Chuck will travel 75,000 miles.

Then comes the interesting part, the time when baseball and football overlap. Says Chuck: "That's the time of the year when you're more tired than any other. You drop off the baseball club on Friday or Saturday and go do football on Sunday. Then back to baseball on Monday, maybe in a city 2,000 miles away from where you were. This goes on for up to three weeks. Believe me, it's a tough schedule to carry."

There's no letup when baseball ends, because by then the NFL schedule is hitting its stride and usually getting more and more hectic as the weeks go by. Besides sending the Colt away games back to Baltimore, Chuck does TV for opposing cities when the Colts are home, as well as two or three games not involving the Colts. By the time it's all over in mid-January, he admits, you're really tired.

As true as this may be, it's not an impression that listeners to Baltimore baseball and football are likely to get from tuning in. Chuck is regarded as one of the most glib and pleasant announcers in the business, not to mention colorful. "Go to war Miss Agnes" is by now a classic—it came from a former neighbor and golf partner of Chuck who would yell it every time he missed a putt; since he was a pretty bad putter, Chuck heard it a lot and it stayed with him. "Ain't the beer cold" means things are pretty good for our side, and when an Oriole home run ties a game at 1–1, it makes the folks as good as the people. A tense Colt situation might give Chuck goosebumps as big as hard-boiled eggs, and they might not make that first down by more by more than the length of his nose. On a hot night in D.C. Stadium, you can get warm just shaking hands, and the opposition might take the lead with a bleeding-heart single that wasn't hit hard enough to break a paper cup. When right-fielder Bowens chases a high fly ball toward the seats, Chuck won't allow him a chance at it, at least not without a ticket.

Without this knack of Chuck's for bringing the game down to earth, listening to broadcast sports would be a lot less fun for the Baltimore fans. And without a lot of behind-the-scenes legwork and a firm set of ground rules which the veteran sportscaster has developed, his relaxed yet informative delivery might be altogether different. There's a lot more to it than meets the ear.

Before a game, both Chuck and Frank Messer make up lists of the opposing team members and their corresponding numbers. In the case of football, they carry this list with them all week and in spare moments, such as sitting at a red light or waiting for service in a restaurant, they'll take it out and study it. Chuck also makes up what amounts to his own spotting board, containing any important records the players may have achieved or be about to achieve, whether or not a man has been All-Pro, his hometown and any unusual personal traits. "This is entertainment, you know, and you've got to sell it. You can get too cute, but I try to keep it a little light whenever I can."

Chuck's basic play-by-play style goes back to Reading, Pa., where he learned the ABC's of play-by-play from Les Quailey, a representative of the N. W. Ayer Agency. Ayer had the Atlantic Refining Company account to sponsor high school and college football throughout the East, and Quailey had worked some years before with Ted Husing in the days of broadcasting's infancy.

"Quailey's golden rule in football was 'down, yardage and team possession'," recalls Chuck. "Not just once in a while, but every time they break the huddle. He was also a firm believer, in baseball, that you identify by position first, name second. You never assume that every one of your listeners knows that Jerry Adair is a second baseman, and so it's not a ground ball hit to Adair—it's a ground ball hit to second and Adair fields. Also in basketball, Quailey always felt it was extremely important that your possession be determined by team: Johnson doesn't rebound—the Bullets rebound with Johnson in possession.

"These are little hard and fast rules he made us abide by, and I still do to a great extent because I believe they're sound. He also insisted that when doing a football game, you chart the game. So I have a downs chart that I make up on which I write every play, so I can keep the yardages straight. This is very important if you have to recap the game. Not many years ago I did a Thanksgiving Day game between Detroit and the Green Bay Packers. The game ran just long enough for us to run about two minutes into a new quarter-hour segment. Now whether you use two minutes of the segment or all of it, you have to pay for the whole thing, so naturally you're going to use it. I had a recap of about twelve minutes that day, and without the chart I couldn't have done it."

The easiest sport to call, as far as Chuck is concerned, is basketball. Football is next, and the toughest is baseball. "The baseball season is so long. You're on the air every day for up to 3 hours, and so much of the game is repetitious. An average pitcher will throw—if he has a pretty good game—say 120 pitches. Well, the other guy's also throwing 120 pitches, so you're going to have the very same thing happen maybe 250 times per game. If you were to describe it the same way 250 times, you'd drive your audience right out of their minds. So every spring, I sit down with Frank and we try to think up as many different descriptive phrases for the pitcher delivering the ball as we can. A master at this was a fellow I had the great advantage of working with some years ago in Philadelphia, Byrum Saam. I took notes on him one afternoon and in the course of the game he used 86 different descriptions for the pitcher throwing the ball to the plate. This variety is most important when you're on radio, of course."

Another problem occasionally posed by baseball is how to fill time on TV when a game is delayed by rain. The longest fill Chuck ever did was an hour and 45 minutes (TV does not revert to local stations during such delays because cable charges must be paid whether the facilities are used or not, and it is also more difficult for a television station to fill an indeterminate period of time than for a radio station). Frank Messer describes Chuck as a real master at filling, because of his fund of stories about players and his broad knowledge of sports in general. The hardest thing to do in baseball is call a game in which one side has an overwhelming lead, both announcers agree. On the other hand, you never mind an overtime game—it's got to be tense and an attentive audience is a sure thing.

Football presents a whole set of different problems, in that it is a much faster-moving game and it is covered on television with a lot more electronic showmanship than baseball. When Chuck does an NFL game, he has two monitors which show the picture going over the air. He keeps his eyes on one of these and makes all his call from what he sees on the screen, with two exceptions—when the ball is thrown or kicked. This is in accord with another cardinal rule: never talk about anything that isn't on the monitor; it makes your audience furious. You have to watch the live action on a pass because the cameras do not always catch what goes on between passer and receiver, and it would be easy to miss a deflection or interception.

In addition to these monitors, there is one on which videotape replays are usually given a quick preview before being aired, and another screen for the stop-action feature that was introduced last year. These monitors aren't 21-inchers such as you have at home, either. They are less than half that size and can sometimes be in a position where the sun reflects off them. So if Chuck occasionally calls a tackle by Stonebreaker and it was really Gaubatz, it doesn't mean his eyes are going bad.

With so much to watch and with the various instructions coming in on earphones, Chuck says calling a football game reduces itself to 2½ hours of absolute, all-out concentration. It's so intense, in fact that after a game he will find it impossible to recall specific plays, unless they were positively sensational, without first going over his chart or reviewing the game films. And this can be embarrassing at post-game cocktail parties.

Any announcer gets to know a lot about the sport he does, but Chuck has found that there is danger in becoming too knowledgeable, because then you begin to anticipate, "I don't want to know before a ball game any specific play that Don Shula and Unitas may have prepared, because if I know that this play is available, and this is something they've never used before, I'll begin to look for it, and then I get myself in trouble. You've got to let it hit you the way it hits the listeners, so you are just as surprised as they are."

Like other broadcasters, Chuck gets his share of criticism for being biased, but in his case, more often than not he'll be called down by Baltimore fans for not being enthusiastic enough about the Colts or Orioles. What these fans don't know is that most games, especially televised football, go to a large area of the country and are seen by people who wouldn't know Gary Cuozzo if you hung a neon sign on him. Colt games seen in Baltimore are usually relayed as far south as Florida and sometimes as far west as Mississippi. The broadcaster has to be impartial and give credit to both sides when due.

Something else in baseball telecasting that most fans don't realize is that out-of-town games are picked up by crews from the city of origination. Chuck gives an example of the headaches this can create. "Let's say you're in New York and you're televising. Well, Joe Garagiola, the New York announcer, may have talked to Mantle of Kubek or Pepitone before the ball game and set up some little gimmick that he'd like to try, something he can talk about to *his* audience. Well, that's fine. Here we are doing the game, using the New York crew and New York pictures, and all of a sudden we get the whole screen full of Pepitone's shoe. This is great if I know what Garagiola and Pepitone have talked about, but I haven't got the slightest idea. So what am I supposed to say about Pepitone's shoe? It's a size 10½?"

Pitfalls like these are legion to a sports broadcaster. There are situations in baseball where the bunt is all but mandatory. Chuck can suggest the possibility of a bunt but he'd better not say any more, because if he says it's a bunting situation and they *don't* bunt, then 10,000 fans are instantly angry: "Thompson said they should have bunted and they didn't and now they're out—what the hell's the matter with them?"

Everybody talks about the weather? The sports announcer had better not. It may be 90 degrees at 8 o'clock when Steve Barber takes to the mound, his shirt soaked with sweat before he throws the first pitch, and the natural inclination is to talk about how uncomfortable it is at the old ball park tonight. But this is not in the best interests of the ball club or the sponsor, so restraint is in order. Similarly, when the club has been playing good ball and only 3,500 fans turn out for a home game, it's hard to keep from chiding the stay-at-homes. Chuck pleads guilty to this occasionally, even though he knows it violates another ground rule—you never tell the public what to do.

Savvy like this is the product of long evolution—it was nearly 30 years ago that Chuck broadcast his first football game. He was paid $5 for it and was overpaid at that, he says. He was born in Palmer, Mass., grew up there and got his first job driving a milk truck, which he believes responsible for his being able to get along on 4 to 5 hours sleep a night even now. In 1927, the family moved to Reading. Not until his last year in high school was Chuck able to persuade his mother to let him play football—she wanted him to be a singer. He did do some singing with his high school band, then on a dare took a radio audition and got a job at WEEU at $14.20 a week.

There was something about radio in Reading in those days, because at one time, between two local stations the personnel included—as Chuck would say—the likes of Bailey Goss, Galen Fromme, Mel Quinn, himself and an announcer now on network TV whose professional name is Charles Stark. Thompson stayed in Reading until 1942, then moved to Philadelphia as staff announcer for WIBG. World War II intervened, and he saw infantry service in Europe before it was over.

He went back to Philadelphia and began doing play-by-play for both the Phillies and Athletics in baseball, Eagles' football, Warriors' basketball and Rockets' hockey. His first network crack at play-by-play came by accident in Baltimore in 1948. He was hired to do the color and commercials for a Navy-Missouri game at the Stadium, and when he finished his opening color bit, he said, "Now here's your play-by-play announcer, Connie Desmond." But Desmond had been taken suddenly ill and said, "Thank you, and now, here's your play-by-play announcer, Chuck Thompson." Chuck's call of the game amounted to an on-the-air audition for the agency handing the Gunther beer account, and as a result of it, Chuck was hired to do the International League Orioles, replacing Bill Dyer.

For the next three years he was also the voice of Naval Academy football games, and in 1955, he joined the National Brewing Company's team of sports announcers to do the Colt games and those of the new American League Orioles. Since that year, Chuck and his wife, Rose, have lived in the Dulaney Valley section. They have three children: a married daughter, Sandy; Susan, who is 18, and Craig, 14.

Chuck has seen the broadcasting of sports come a long way since the days of telegraphic reconstruticon of baseball, and he did his share of this, too. Some of the greatest changes have been in the last few years since the television networks have dominated the picture. Television has done a great deal to build today's sports, particularly pro football, Chuck says, and some of the new techniques like instant replay can add a great deal to the enjoyment and understanding of the games. But they must be used with discretion, he believes, something which is not always the case now.

How far can you go with gimmicks? He tells where *he* would draw the line: "Take the business of wiring the quarterback. I'm a little bit of a hero worshipper and even though I've been in the game a long time, these professional athletes never cease to amaze me. I think there should be some areas that are sacred to these men. Only a professional football player should ever be allowed into a huddle. Television and the public, I think, have no right to be there. Only that man who has the unique ability to play professional sports belongs in a clubhouse, or on the bench. Suppose you took the public into every huddle, into every conference on the mound. Pretty soon they'd be as knowledgable as the professionals, and then who'd watch it? With parabolic microphones, you now hear the quarterback's call. So you hear it. What does it mean to you? The public should always have a little bit to wonder about, I believe."

He also thinks there is some danger of overexposure to sports via television. "The major leagues, when they undertook their Game of the Week series, would not allow the telecasts in any major league city, but they sent them into minor league cities all over the country. So what happened? The fan, rather than pay his money to support the local team, stayed home and watched the big league teams on TV. This contributed as much as anything else to the downfall of minor league baseball.

"The football people, under Bert Bell, had a very sane television policy. Bell would not allow any home game to be televised locally, and this is now being relaxed somewhat. Next season, the network that controls NFL television will send another game into the Baltimore area on Sunday afternoons when the Colts are playing at home. I don't think this is wise. One reason why they're doing it, of course, is to compete with the American Football League game that is on locally at the same time. I think the NFL wants an all-out conquest of the AFL. They've been much more successful in signing their college draft choices, and the TV ratings have greatly favored the NFL. Now, by televising every week in NFL cities, they will have head-to-head competition with the AFL on television. It would seem to me that the fan who has the right to buy one of the 10,000 Colts tickets that are put on sale for every home game, and even the season ticket holder to an extent, when a Sunday comes up that's going to be cold or uncomfortable, I feel that he'll be content to stay home, listen to the Colt game on radio and watch the other game on television."

Chuck feels there is plenty of room for two leagues in pro football and that the AFL is here to stay, but that sooner or later, there will have to be some kind of merger with the NFL. It could start, he thinks, with a common draft, which would relieve the clubs of having to pay the fantastic bonuses for unproven players which have become fashionable lately. Beyond a common draft, he foresees the possibility of something similar to what happened when the All-American Conference went out of existence; certain of the teams, including Baltimore's, joined the NFL.

For baseball, he predicts a great future, says the sport has weathered some of its toughest times in recent years. As exemplary, he cites the efforts of Gabe Paul and the Cleveland Indians' ownership to rebuild their organization, win back the fans and emerge as a fine ball club. "Here in Baltimore, we can be grateful to Lee MacPhail for building one of the most solid baseball organizations in the league. I truthfully think that the new ownership and the new front office people are going to reap the harvest of what MacPhail has done for a long time to come."

And it is baseball that is occupying Chuck's attention at this time of the year at least, most of his attention. It is the best time of all for a sports announcer, he says. You work only three days a week, do very little traveling, enjoy the warmth of Florida while the north worries about late snowstorms. And you fish—it's his main recreation now (he used to golf constantly with Bailey Goss, but since Bailey was killed in an automobile accident four years ago, Chuck has just about quit the game).

Now it's fishing. "I fished a lot with my dad when I was young but gave it up when I got married. Then, when Frank joined me two years ago, he got me started again, and I've got it worse now than I ever did. During the baseball season when I'm home, I'll fish Loch Raven four times a week. When I'm down south I fish Okeechobee, Biscayne, the Everglades. The thing about fishing—once the boat leaves the dock, there's no recall. They can't bring a caddy cart out to get you and take you back, and there are no telephones. Plus the excitement of the unknown. You fish Key Biscayne or Flamingo in the Everglades—son-of-a-gun you don't know what's going to hit your line. It could be a sea trout, or a kingfish, a bonefish, any number of different fish. I dearly love to fish, and I love the warm weather. Believe me, there's nothing like it."

And ain't the beer cold.

PROPOSED BRIDGE CANYON AND MARBLE CANYON DAMS ON THE COLORADO RIVER

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the proposed plan to build two power dams in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado has stirred an intense national debate.

News stories as well as editorials have been written in profusion. In addition, thousands of individual Americans have been moved to write to their representatives in Congress.

My own mail box has been bulging with constituent mail on the Grand Canyon dams and, I might add, this stream of mail has been running overwhelmingly against the proposal.

It is clear, I think, that the American people are opposed to any dams in the Grand Canyon and, in fact, wish this unparalleled national treasure to remain inviolate.

In a recent article carried by the Washington Post, columnist Marquis Childs provided a most interesting analysis of the modern-day pressures on the canyon, as well as an even-handed summary of the pros and cons of the controversy over the proposed dams. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Child's column of July 15, 1966, be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 15, 1966]

GROWING PRESSURE ON GRAND CANYON

(By Marquis Childs)

GRAND CANYON, ARIZ.—Down at the bottom of the canyon is the dark impenetrable rock that is at least a billion years old. To a crowded room full of tourists of every age the ranger is giving the daily lecture on the story of the earth as written in this astonishing spectacle like nothing else made by nature or by man.

"You know," he says in conclusion, "our time on this earth is very short. I have just one suggestion for you. Try to find a little place on the rim where you can be alone and there for a little while think about how long this process has been going on."

Since tourists are coming into Grand Canyon National Park at the rate of up to 15,000 a day this advice is not easy to follow. It suggests the struggle to preserve a sense of wonder—the majesty of this phenomenon defying these puny newcomers to earth—in the face of a mass invasion. And just now something new has been added with the proposal to build two high dams at each end of the canyon.

The powerful forces driving for Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams have touched off a classic combat between the conservationists and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of Interior. The Bureau, with the backing of every political figure in Arizona, including Barry Goldwater, is pushing the project with what the conservationists charge is propaganda defrayed by taxpayers' money.

Gov. Samuel Goddard of Arizona, a Democrat, belittles the conservation argument. He says that the reservoirs to be created by the dams would affect only a few miles of the Colorado River as it flows through the national park. And the reservoirs would not be visible at any point to which tourists now come. Moreover, he says that the lake created by Bridge Canyon dam would eventually attract 600,000 visitors.

But for the passionate conservationists, led by David Brower of the Sierra Club, it is the living river itself that is threatened with destruction. They hold sacred every mile of the canyon whether visible to the average tourist or not. If the two dams are built—to help arid Arizona solve its water problem—they will be a precedent and no national park will be safe from the dam builders and the exploiters.

As the combat reached a critical stage the Bureau of Internal Revenue cracked down on the Sierra Club, ruling that contributions to the club were not tax deductible, since it was trying to influence legislation through newspaper ads. Conservationists are convinced the crackdown was inspired by the two Udalls, Secretary of Interior Stewart and Congressman MORRIS K., both Arizonans. Bower says the ruling is costing the club $5000 a week as contributors cannot afford to give unless the gifts are tax deductible.

People versus nature—that is the frame in which the conflict over the dams belong. Mobile America is on the move. They come with every kind of trailer and house caravan, tents and camping equipment, to occupy sites prepared by the National Park Service. Space is always short even though camp sites and motels are constantly being expanded.

On the whole, the Park Service seems to have done a good job here. The camp sites and the motels are set in stands of ponderosa pine, back from the rim of the canyon so that they are more or less concealed. The rangers do all they can to keep the tourist invasion from overwhelming the natural setting of one of this Nation's greatest scenic treasures.

But the time is not far off when restrictions will have to be imposed on the mass movement that each summer swells in volume. The three most crowded national parks—Yosemite, Yellowstone and Grand Canyon—each had last year around 1,700,000 visitors. About 90 per cent came in their own cars, making at the peak for bumper-to-bumper traffic which hardly fits the concept of the great open spaces.

Here at Grand Canyon the increase this year is running at about 18 per cent. They are talking of requiring tourists to leave their own cars outside the park and come in on buses. While this would relieve the congestion it would bring an outcry from hardy travelers carrying their own camping equipment.

Secretary Udall has gone further than this. He suggested recently that in the not-too-distant future a reservation system must be imposed. If you want to visit Yellowstone or Grand Canyon you will have to make a reservation several years in advance and perhaps pay a deposit to insure a camp site or a motel room.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD GARMATZ, OF MARYLAND, AT GRADUATION EXERCISES AT U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, is one of the greatest experts on merchant marine problems to serve in Congress for a long time.

Not long ago, Congressman GARMATZ delivered the main graduation address at the Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, N.Y.

As on past occasions, he delivered a succinct, timely analysis of the crisis facing the American marine transportation industry today.

I should like to point out one especially significant passage in Congressman GARMATZ's speech:

> To provide the United States with a merchant fleet adequate to transport a reasonable percentage of our peace-time commerce and to support our military forces in time of need, we must embark on a large-scale shipbuilding program in American shipyards now.

In simple terms, this is the crux of the merchant marine issue facing Congress. Nobody understands this issue better than Congressman GARMATZ. Nobody has the interests of the American merchant marine, and of American overseas commerce and defense, more sincerely at heart than he.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Congressman EDWARD GARMATZ at the Kings Point graduation ceremonies be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HONORABLE EDWARD A. GARMATZ, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT GRADUATION EXERCISES, U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, KINGS POINT, N.Y.

Gentlemen of the Graduation Class, Admiral McLintock, distinguished guest, relatives and friends of the graduates, it is a great pleasure to be heard today.

I bring with me the greetings and best wishes of my colleagues in the Congress, who represent as you do all areas of our great nation. On their behalf, as well as my own, I take pleasure in extending congratulations to you young mariners of the Class of 1966 and to those who have guided, taught, and counseled you in preparation for this day—your parents and your teachers.

The world of today is one of shifting power alliances among nations, exploding populations, and social revolution. We are living in a period of great and rapid change in every aspect of life and endeavor. The great technological achievements of recent years give promise of even greater progress in the years to come toward the goal of providing a better life for the people of the world.

In the field of marine transportation during the past decade, we have witnessed the successful application of nuclear energy to power an American merchant ship, the development of hydrofoil vessels and the general acceptance of new methods of transporting cargo by sea. Examples are vehicle carriers of roll-on, roll-off design and the large scale movement of general cargo in containers. A number of new semi-automated cargo ships have been placed in service carrying the flag of the United States on the trade routes of the world.

Oceanography—a field of rapidly growing importance—is the counterpart of space exploration. It is perhaps even more important to our economy as we seek methods of obtaining more minerals and food from the world's surface. With modern oceanographic research vessels, manned by merchant mariners and scientific personnel, we are probing the ocean's depths.

Yet, in this period of technological accomplishment and research, it is surprising that the merchant marine of the United States has steadily declined and the problems facing the marine industry have grown in number and gravity. Seventy-two percent of our present merchant fleet is composed of obsolescent, inefficient, and un-economical ships built during World War II. Our one nuclear powered ship, the Savannah, and the other ships built during the past decade show what can be done. Nevertheless, the world's most powerful nation, our country, has a fifth rate merchant marine because of too little, too late.

Instead of replacing our merchant fleet on a realistic basis, we have built a hand-full of new ships annually and allowed our shipbuilding industry to shrink to fifteenth place among the nations of the world—an all time low.

Nearly three-fourths of the surface of the globe is covered by water. Ships plying the seven seas still, and will for the foreseeable future, transport the majority of raw materials and finished products that must move from nation to nation. Commerce is the lifeblood of our economy and every citizen of this great nation is affected by the type and volume of our imports and exports. We must export our manufactured products and our agricultural surplus if our domestic economy is to flourish.

To facilitate our commerce, we have been blessed with some of the world's finest coastline and endowed with natural deepwater harbors. We are proud of our ports on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, on the Gulf of Mexico and on the shores of the Great Lakes. Yet, less than nine percent of the tonnage moving through these harbors comes or goes on United States' flag ships. This is where we were in 1909. It is unbelievable that a nation so amply provided by nature with all that is necessary to be the leading maritime power would be content with being fifth rate.

The United States has historically been a maritime nation. After the Revolutionary War, when we found ourselves excluded by the European nations through shipping cartels and discriminatory navigation laws, we undertook a strong merchant marine building program at the direction of Congress. Early in our history a number of laws were enacted to protect and support our commercial shipping endeavors. And so our merchant marine flourished under sail in the ear of the clipper ships. Unfortunately, even though we invented the steamship, we ignored its promise and lost our lead.

If we need a commercial shipping capability in time of peace how much greater must our need be in time of hostility?

In every major and most minor conflicts in which the United States has been engaged since the Revolutionary War, the American merchant marine has had a major role in the transportation and support of our military forces. Recent history has recorded "The Bridge of Ships" of World War II fame with which the United States merchant marine transported the materials of war, not only to our forces overseas, but to our allies. Since that time, these same ships have provided the essential sea-life capability needed in the conflicts in Korea, Lebanon, and today in Vietnam. In fact, over 90 percent of the men and material in Vietnam today arrived by sea.

Yet, because of obsolescence, the majority of the American merchant ships used should be scrapped within the next five years. They will no longer be economic units. It is inconceivable that we should permit the United States to be dependent upon foreign shipping in time of peace or war.

To use a popular phrase of today "would you believe" that American shipyards delivered sixteen new ships in 1965 while over one hundred ships were delivered to the Russian merchant marine? It is a startling and depressing fact that Japan with a large shipbuilding program will construct a single tanker of 300,000 tons while the entire merchant ship program of this country will produce only 13 ships totaling less than 200,000 deadweight tons in 1966.

We live in a period of specialization and the ships of recent construction and those to follow will reflect this fact. In addition to modern cargo liners, we require ships to carry containers and other to transport vehicles. We must also have new bulk carriers for the transportation of ore, coal and grain and tankers for the carriage of liquid gas as well as petroleum products.

To provide the United States with a merchant fleet adequate to transport a reasonable percentage of our peace time commerce and to support our military forces in time of need, we must embark on a large-scale shipbuilding program in American shipyards now.

I believe I speak for the vast majority of my colleagues in the Congress when I say that such a program will be welcomed and have bipartisan support. The hearings of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, have clearly shown that the present U.S. flag shipbuilding program is totally inadequate.

A few years before the outbreak of the second world war, in a situation much like the present, Congress recognized the need for a revitalized merchant fleet, and passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This year marks the 30th anniversary of this law which still reflects the will of our Congress, but which unfortunately, is not being fully implemented at present.

The provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 for the development of a merchant fleet may be expressed as follows:

(1) sufficient to carry the domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the foreign commerce of the country;

(2) capable of serving as a naval auxiliary in the time of war;

(3) owned by and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States;

(4) composed of the best equipped, safest and most suitable types of vessels; and

(5) manned by trained and efficient citizens of the United States.

These objectives are as valid today as they were in 1936.

We need more ships, and we need them now! The United States of America is the wealthiest, most powerful, nation in the world, and it has the technical know-how and capability to produce the fastest, most productive, and efficient vessels in the world. I can assure you that the Congress of our great nation, as represented by my Committee, as well as myself, will not sit idly by and allow our merchant fleet to disappear from the trade routes of the world.

United firmly in pursuit of our goals, and with the skillful hands of qualified and competent seamen like yourselves manning our merchant ships, we can forge ahead with the kind of maritime program needed to keep the American flag participating proudly in its traditional and rightful role as a leader on world commerce.

I do not wish to give the impression that all of the problems besetting the American Merchant Marine will disappear with a ship building program, but it is my conviction, which is shared by many of the leaders of the maritime industry, that this would be the most important step forward that could be taken at this time.

Problems of crew reductions brought about by automation introduced in new ships have caused labor unrest and resulted in ship "tie-ups." I believe any reasonable evidence of a forward looking program would cause these problems largely to disappear. Naturally, ships are of little use without skilled officers and seamen to man them.

The United States Merchant Marine Academy had graduated only two small classes when World War II commenced. Yet, 10,000 Kings Pointers moved through this young institution during the war years to our Merchant Marine as deck and engineering officers, and in many instances to ultimately command these same ships.

Today, in another period of hostilities, you join the Alumni of this Academy and the thousands of other Merchant Marine officers and seamen who are transporting on American flag ships the supplies needed by our military forces in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. Others are engaged in the carriage of grain, petroleum, and a myriad of other products throughout the world.

You young men have been trained by your Government for the Merchant Marine. I look to you to fulfill your obligation to the service for which you have studied—to show your dedication to and belief in our great seaborne heritage. Your service afloat in this essential adjunct to our naval forces will justify the nation's faith in you and provide you with the experience and knowledge essential for future leaders of the marine industry.

Consider yourselves fortunate to be coming into the industry when it is on the verge of dramatic rebirth—when the promise is bright for our Merchant Marine to go forward and play a powerful role in our national destiny.

I wish each of you fair winds and following seas on the many voyages ahead of you.

I sincerely hope that each of you deck officers graduates will rise to your own command, and each of your engineering graduates will become the Chief Engineer of a modern, automated merchant ship flying the flag of the United States.

When added to the excellent theoretical training that you have obtained here at Kings Point, the experience afloat that you will obtain during the next several years will permit you to make a significant contribution to the growth and progress of the United States Merchant Marine, and thus to the continued greatness of this nation.

In conclusion, I think that I could find no finer thought to leave with you than the words of the late Dag Hammarskjold, a great world citizen who gained international respect and admiration while serving as Secretary General of the United Nations. He wrote, and I quote:

"Do not look back, and do not dream about the future. It will neither give you back the past, nor satisfy your daydreams. Your duty, your reward—your destiny—are *here* and *now*."

RESPONSIBLE BUDGET ESTIMATES OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, once again the White House has sent us good news on the budget.

For the third year in a row the year-end budget deficit is smaller than originally forecast.

It was not always thus.

For many years the budget seemed to follow a consistent pattern—it gave us good news in January and bad news in July when the books were closed. The deficit estimates were always optimistic, but the final results proved embarrassing.

Nobody expects budget estimating to be accurate to the dollar. The President proposes, while Congress disposes. Between those events, a lot can happen and usually does. In a $100 billion budget, a variance of 1 percent can throw the estimates off by a billion dollars.

We understand this. But the arithmetic of previous administrations always seemed to tilt the uncertainties in favor of underestimating the deficit when the budgets were presented to Congress.

What is so striking is how much more credible the budget estimates have become in the present administration. If the President thinks his proposals will produce a large deficit, he is frank to say so. I think we in Congress strongly prefer his approach. We respect him for it.

I suppose the historic low point in budget estimating was reached when the budget for 1960 estimated a surplus, only to end up in the red to the tune of $12½ billion. That record will stand for a long time.

But even if we take a period as long as the 10 years prior to fiscal 1964, we find that underestimating of the deficit was consistently practiced. Over those 10 years, the actual budget outcome averaged $2.9 billion worse than the original budget estimates.

Look at what has been happening since then.

In fiscal 1964 the actual deficit was $3.7 billion smaller than the original prediction.

In fiscal 1965 it was $1.5 billion smaller.

And now the President reports that for fiscal 1966 the deficit is the smallest since 1960. Eighteeen months ago when the 1966 budget was submitted to Congress, it estimated a deficit of $5.3 billion. This past January, the 1966 estimate was revised to take Vietnam hostilities into account, and the estimate of the deficit was upped to $6.4 billion. The President laid it on the line as he saw it. But the final outcome is very good news indeed. The deficit for 1966 is just under $2.3 billion—$4.1 billion smaller than he expected only last January, and $3 billion lower than he estimated 18 months ago.

Some will say it is just a bookkeeping fluke.

But that is not the explanation.

The deficit is this low, despite the heavy burdens of Vietnam operations, because—

First, the economy is getting stronger every year and tax revenues are rising more rapidly than before.

Second, the President has held spending below authorized levels in order to minimize the deficit and restrain inflation.

Third, he has pushed harder than any previous President for cost reduction and efficiency—and he has made it pay.

This is the kind of careful and responsible fiscal management that we have come to expect from President Johnson.

We are all taxpayers—and there can be no more welcome news than to discover that the Government's deficit has been cut 65 percent below the January estimates.

"DIRECT" RETURN OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX TO LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTION BY COMMON COUNCIL OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of Resolution No. 207, relative to "'Direct' Return of Federal Income Tax to Local Units of Government," which was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., at its meeting held on June 28, 1966.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City Clerk's Office,
City Hall,
Buffalo, July 8, 1966.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify, That at a Session of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, held in the City Hall, on the 28th day of June 1966, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"No. 207.

"By Mr. Franczyk:

"Re: 'Direct' Return of Federal Income Tax to Local Units of Government.

"Whereas, the City of Buffalo and many other cities within the United States are in dire need of additional financial assistance to meet ever growing personnel payroll needs, educational and urban renewal costs; and

"Whereas, the Federal government is the only governmental enterprise capable of providing this badly needed financial help; and

"Whereas, the current methods of distributing Federal aide funds result in the creation of costly Federal bureaucracy and unjust allocations for cities of different sizes; and

"Whereas, a per capita or percentage distribution of a portion of the Federal income tax directly to local units of government would alleviate these problems and provide a greater measure of local control over the use of such funds; and

"Whereas, the Mayor of Dearborn and Ann Arbor, Michigan and the respected City Councils involved have already gone on record in favor of this plan; and

"Whereas, this plan was favorably received by a Presidential Task Force when it was studied under the origination of Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers of President John Kennedy and President Lyndon Johnson; and

"Whereas, the United States Conference of Mayors endorsed this program at their convention this year; and

"Whereas, this type of 'Direct' Federal Tax return plan would be of great benefit to the City of Buffalo: be it

"*Resolved*, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo does hereby urge the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to adopt the necessary legislation to provide for an equitable return of government funds on an annual basis; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the City Clerk is hereby directed to certify passage of this resolution and send copies of it to the President of the United States, the Clerks of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Robert Kennedy, Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski and Congressman Richard McCarthy, as soon as possible.

"Adopted."

Attest:

Stanley Molih,
City Clerk.

A FRIEND OF THE THIRSTY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is indeed an honor for me to rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the career of a truly remarkable man, Dr. Abel Wolman. Dr. Wolman, professor emeritus of sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins University, has spent most of his lifetime solving problems of water supply and pollution all over the world. Dr. Wolman is one of the world's leading authorities on water problems. He had never shirked civic responsibility and has consistently accepted the challenges placed before him. Dr. Wolman's 73 years have been extremely active and productive ones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a recent article from Baltimore magazine which illustrates Dr. Wolman's many accomplishments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Abel Wolman: "Friend of the Thirsty"

(By John C. Schmidt)

Baltimore is privileged to be one of the few large cities in the United States which is not today facing a problem of water supply. With the completion of the Susquehanna River pipeline in January, water needs of both the growing population and expanding industry of the area can be met without foreseeable difficulty until at least the turn of the century.

Key responsibility for this enviable state can be traced to the expertise and persuasive power of one of Baltimore's most distinguished citizens: Dr. Abel Wolman, professor emeritus of sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins University. He has served under many offices and won numerous accolades, but his personal favorite is the way the New York *Times* summed him up in a profile last year. The *Times* called him "a friend of the thirsty."

Dr. Wolman is indeed a friend of thirsty people not only in Baltimore and New York, but across the country and around the world. A simple list of consulting jobs and advisory posts he has held runs to five pages. He has served such government agencies as the Public Health Service, TVA, War Production Board, U.S. Geological Survey, Atomic Energy Commission and Defense Department. He has lectured at Hopkins, Princeton, the University of Southern California and the University of Chicago. New York, Richmond, Seattle, Detroit and Indianapolis are among the U.S. cities which have sought his help. He has worked for the governments of Israel, Thailand and Ceylon. For the United Nations World Health Organization he has led teams of water experts to India, Brazil, Chile, Formosa and other countries.

He spent last December in Geneva, updating for a 120-nation W.H.O. conference a series of proposals he had made several years ago relating to water supply on a global scale. He is intimately involved with the International Hydrological Decade, a ten-year period similar to the International Geophysical Year to coordinate efforts on the long-neglected science of hydrology.

Along with these activities, Dr. Wolman still does some specialized teaching at the Hopkins' School of Public Hygiene and Health. His biographical summary lists membership in 26 technical and professional associations, as widespread geographically as the Faraday Society in England and the Mexican Society of Hygiene. His desk in his Homewood campus office is piled so high with to-be-read papers and journals that he cannot see over it sitting down. Consulting assignments and other duties keep him on the road about 70% of the time, and his calendar is booked up a year in advance. All this is taking place in what he calls his third retirement—he is 73 years old.

"I've been doing more recently because of certain emergency situations which take up the slack time I had set aside for my recovery," he says with an undertone of humor. "I've done more since my retirement than I ever did before. People have the strange theory that when you retire you ought to have more time, and therefore why shouldn't you be willing to do this or that. Between these two situations—one that you've retired and the emergency—I've just been working like the devil."

The emergency he refers to was his appointment last year by Mayor Wagner to a four-man panel to investigate New York City's water problems and recommend corrective measures. It was the second time he had been summoned to New York's aid. In 1949, he served on a board of consultants which recommended, among other things, that the city tap the Hudson River and institute conservation measures by going after underground leaks. Neither was done.

His view of the present difficulties is different from the way they have generally been presented in the press and popular journals, as he is quick to point out. "The situation in the northeast last summer was greatly overdramatized. People of Saudi Arabia look at us with utter astonishment when we speak of an 'emergency water shortage' in the northeastern United States. This is one of the richest water resource areas in the country, if not in the world. You're down to 30 inches of rain this year, these people say. They have less than six!"

As Dr. Wolman sees it, the "emergency" in the northeast is not one of resource but delayed use of a resource—delayed planning and delayed execution. He points out that at the very time President Johnson was expressing such concern late last summer, New York City had flowing by it in the Hudson all the water it could conceivably use but which it had failed to put into service. At the time Governor Hughes of New Jersey was asking Washington for help, that State's reservoirs were overflowing, but political obstacles had delayed completion of a pipeline and the water was just running way. "The northeast *is* in a drought," says the Hopkins expert, "we accept that. But water is there. You and I had simply neglected to provide a tin can to carry it to the consumer. Despite the impression given in many articles, our country is not running out of water. Of course, if you were in Death Valley or the Sahara Desert, you'd have a water problem. But my contention is that if I really *needed* water in Death Valley, I could get it."

The panel working on New York's problem had the initial objective of devising and implementing conservation measures to prevent waste of existing supplies—to find drops of water to keep you in motion, as Dr. Wolman put it. At a news conference, a reporter asked what would happen if all the water in New York were turned off. The Hopkins professor replied that he could not think in terms of that kind of chaos—it would make the power blackout seem like a paradise by comparison. The aim, he said, was to prevent such a thing, and he expressed confidence that they could do it.

"The first step was to re-evaluate the existing resources—what were they good for in terms of what we call a reasonable safe yield? Then, what do you need over the next 20, 30, 50 years? If the two don't match, where else can you go, and there are plenty of places to go. There's the Hudson to turn to, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, the St. Lawrence—prodigious amounts of water. The obstacles? They are physical, financial, legal. But they don't worry me too much because we always have those. They are negotiating situations, and our business is how to resolve them. You have competitive uses and forces, but what I say, and what our board says, is get at it."

Water supply, although the dominant interest in his life, has not been the exclusive interest. He describes his work as embracing the total environmental field, including waste disposal, problems of disease in relation to water, problems of housing in relation to health. For the Air Force during the Korean War, he toured Korea, Okinawa and Japan, studying operational bases from the standpoint of environmental control to see how well our troops were being protected from such hazards as typhoid, cholera and malaria—hazards virtually eliminated in this country years ago.

But the problem of finding and delivering water at a cost man is willing and able to pay is one of the great issues of our time, and one which has absorbed a great amount of Dr. Wolman's energies over the years. "I would remind you that the United States and a few west European countries are practically the only places where you can turn on a spigot and have water that is safe to drink. That is rare. Our people, of course, don't realize it, but in most places in the world, the bulk of the people—hundreds of millions of them—simply don't have easy access to water. They've got to carry it, and they may carry it two blocks or two miles, just to be able to drink. Our country has this major distinction which is not often pointed out; namely, that it has developed over 20,000 local community water systems which serve a little short of 170,000,000 people. This is on a scale that no other country in the world has done, and it was done here largely through local forces, almost completely through local money. Someone, a foreigner, once suggested that we ought to export this concept along with all the high principled ideas we try to get across to other nations."

Through his many consulting and advisory posts—which at last count have taken him to 37 countries—Dr. Wolman has actually done this exporting job on a one-man basis. For example, many of the vast water development projects undertaken in Israel since that nation came into being were either originated or worked on by the Baltimore expert. As a result of such measures as nationalization of water, strict rationing, tapping the Sea of Galilee and creating a network of modern wells and pipelines, 98% of the population today enjoys running water. By contrast, in nearby Iraq, water is so scarce that the penalty for maliciously damaging irrigation works is death. Dr. Wolman deplores personally the fight now going on between Israelis and Arabs over the River Jordan, but observes that men have been fighting over water since pre-Biblical times.

Some progress is being made on an international approach to water problems, however, best illustrated by the International Hydrological Decade, for which Dr. Wolman has served on a committee for international cooperation. "What we are suggesting is that our country participate in a variety of activities which have international implications in the field of hydrology," he explains. "One obvious one, of course, is the meteorological area. To the surprise of many people, weather is rarely generated in the United States. If you look at a weather map, what you see is either Canada-generated or Siberia-generated, or comes from the Gulf of Mexico or way out in the Atlantic. We are the beneficiaries, as well as the victims, of this truly international behavior, which at the moment is uncontrolled."

Also on the international level is the Hopkins professor's work for W.H.O. Late last year, the conference at Geneva reviewed and updated his original proposals and considered programming necessities for the next five years. Dr. Wolman says, "This is all mixed up with the whole institutional problem, and by institutional I mean how do you *do* these things in India, how do you do them in Formosa? Where is the money coming from? I deal in a field where the capital money involved is enormous—the United States alone spends $10 billion a year in this field. So how do I get the money, and more important, and I insist on this, how is it repaid?"

He continues, "And this is the key—this is where we've had some very important success: *pry 'em loose from free water.* This is almost a universal conception. Even in New York City, no politician has been willing to insist that you've got to pay for what you get, and except for industry, water is unmetered and paid for at a flat rate. This is part of their problem, because when you don't do it and run a deficit all the time, it forces you to delay your execution. It's unpalatable. Each mayor tends to push it off on his successor—it's a simple game."

With the world's fresh water supply needs destined to double in the next two decades, and with 40% of the total already going to industry, there has been much interest in building desalinizing plants and tapping the oceans themselves. Dr. Wolman does not share the belief that desalinized ocean water will become a major competitor for natural fresh water, at least for many years. He agrees that in places like Aruba where there is no fresh water, or Israel where the supply is extremely limited, desalinizing will have to be resorted to. But it is very expensive water, he notes, probably too expensive to use for agriculture or irrigation. In areas like the United States and Europe, he believes it will be much cheaper to transport natural fresh water from sources as distant as 500 miles than go to desalinization. He recently completed a survey of all the plants now in operation and found they produced a total of less than 50,000,000 gallons a day. Compared to the consumption of a city like New York—a billion gallons a day—desalinization plants are presently producing a tiny drop in a very large bucket.

The extensive global and national commitments which Dr. Wolman has undertaken have not prevented him from keeping an eye on the needs in his own back yard. He has served the Baltimore Board of Public Works as consultant since 1931, and was chairman of the consulting board which recommended tapping the Susquehanna. "I'm kind of proud of the fact that here our availability of water has been ahead of the demand. Of course, we have been criticized by some for proceeding five years ahead of the event, but it has put us in a position in this drought—which is the worst the east has had in 100 years—that we don't have to worry about it. If you look over the record, you will find a whole series of programming for Baltimore which we were able to sell to the mayors and to the electorate. Once or twice we were set back, but fortunately, not too much. Delay was costly to us, because any year you delay in our kind of society, it costs you more the following year. But we're ahead of the game now. The Susquehanna on our present estimate will carry us until 2000 or 2005, and if we grow faster than expected, we have a built-in answer: duplicate the pipeline. Our source is good to 2050 and beyond. That's as far as my visibility can take me."

Baltimore enjoys another distinction which is the result of a Wolman proposal in the 1940's: it has the largest system for re-use of a city's waste water in the world. Virtually all of the treated sewage water from the Back River plant, an average of 130,000,000 gallons a day, is used in cooling and processing operations by Bethlehem Steel's Sparrows Point plant. These mills use as much as 45,000 gallons of water per ton of product, a total of about a billion gallons a day or four times as much as the entire metropolitan area. Without the city's treated waste, which is of excellent quality for the purpose to which it is put, this amount would have to be made up from wells and other sources. The arrangement also saved the city the expense of building an elaborate pipeline to carry its waste into the Chesapeake Bay, since the Back River area has nowhere near the dilutant capacity to handle. On Dr. Wolman's recommendation, the company does not take this water free but pays an average of $100,000 a year for what it uses. This avoids what he calls a lot of political monkey business. The plant could use more, he notes, placing the city in the unique position, in a sense, of needing more sewage.

The consultant has been involved in another important re-use project for the city of Tel Aviv, where the sewage will be reclaimed, treated and used to replenish ground water in the sand dunes along the Mediterranean coast. "The same thing's beginning to be done in California," he says. "For years, I have argued with them about bringing their water in from 500 miles away, using it, then running it as fast as we can out into the Pacific Ocean. And where do we run it? Right through the industrial section that is now having trouble getting water. I say, don't throw it away. At least use it to replenish the ground water. Then you will not only be able to reclaim it at a later time, but you establish a fresh water barrier against the Pacific. The ocean never sleeps—you pull too much on your wells and it will come in. This is what was happening at Sparrows Point—the ground water was getting salty—and this is why we recommended what we did."

Dr. Wolman's frequent use of "we" is partly editorial, partly modesty, for through his career as advisor and consultant, he has by and large been a lone worker. He stepped into the consulting field in 1927, having graduated from City College and Johns Hopkins and done several years of teaching. He returned to Hopkins again to teach in 1937, at which time he had Lawrence Fowler, chairman of a board of architects for the Homewood campus, design a town house for him and his wife, Anne, across Charles Street from the university. "For this I think we ought to get a distinction and a medal," he jokes, "for it was the only town house built in the inner city in decades. We chose the location because it was near the university, near the Pennsylvania Railroad station and not too far from the airport. Those three considerations, as you may guess, determine my existence."

Time is a precious luxury to a man in his position, and he estimates that conferences and committee meetings and the like take up easily 25% of his year, about equally divided between this country and abroad. "One is always caught in the question of whether you have the right *not* to participate, on the assumption—which is usually pressed on you—that if you've lived through 40 or 50 years of this experience, you ought to share it. This is an impressive reason for doing it, but often when you come through a three or four-day meeting exhausted, you can't escape saying to yourself, I wonder whether it's worth all this energy. I suppose it is—I'm not sure. But you continue to do it, as you know.

"Now and then you're in for a surprise, because at an off moment, somebody will turn up and say, 'Well, you said nine years ago that we ought to build this way, and we tried to pursue it.' And this sets you back a little bit in your feeling of resistance. It's the same kind of thing that happens in teaching. Many people have the feeling that perhaps the most useful thing you can do is spend your time in teaching, because here you're dealing with young people, and they're the ones who are going to do the job. Perhaps you get your greatest impact, your greatest return, via those young people. I've always been torn between whether that should take up most of the energy or whether something else should take up most of the energy."

If you can catch up with him between jets to Latin America or the West Coast, train trips to New York and weekend walks in Gwynns Falls Park, he will admit that his supply of energy is not what it was five or ten years ago. "There was a time when I could keep going all day at this and a large portion of the evenings, but I need more recovery periods now." His wife is a great help with his elaborate travel schedule, he says, and she goes practically everywhere with him. He says she is an excellent traveler who makes her way easily with other people. Still another factor that eases the burden of travel is that they can land at practically any major airport in the world and have friends or former students waiting to greet them.

Having worked and seen conditions in so many parts of the world over the past half century, Dr. Wolman has reached a conclusion for which he almost feels a need to apologize, because it sounds too much like a cliche. Still, he expresses it rather eloquently: "There is no place in the world I would choose to live over this, because there is no country that has what we have. I don't mean material wealth, which is one of the ingredients, but which has the natural beauty, the freedom, the opportunities. And I've never come back that I'm not again impressed with that difference.

"This is not to say that I don't find England beautiful; I do, and it's one of my favorite countries. Or that I don't find France exciting. Or that I don't find completely fascinating the drive downtown from the Calcutta airport; it's one of the few places where you're completely overwhelmed by humanity. But you can't escape the fact that ours is in many many respect a blessed land. It's an amazing country—a country which in many ways is envied, and we seem to generate dislike or even hatred on occasion. I think part of it is due to the fact that here we sit: rich, relatively happy, with certainly all the more obvious material things that everybody would like. But move around amongst people who have never been anything but half-starved, who no day in the year have enough food, who don't have enough clothes, who've never had a job. One looks at it and wonders: what can we do about that? In my work it's always puzzled me. I'm in a sense a perennial optimist, or else I wouldn't be able to stand it. I'd have to quit."

Besides optimism, patience is another essential ingredient in Dr. Wolman's outlook and in his resistance to quitting. As he tells his students, in his field he measures the time between idea and execution in geological terms. "People ask me, do you find any difference throughout the world in the last five or ten years? I say yes. To me, it's quite measurable and quite gratifying. Not as fast as I'd like, but I've seen many very important, almost quasi-revolutions in my field. And since I battled for that, I say it's all to the good."

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, as the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure continues its study and investigation of invasions of privacy, it is extremely encouraging to learn that we are receiving support from all walks of life. Recently, the Communications Workers of America, meeting in the Kiel Auditorium in St. Louis, Mo., passed a number of resolutions out of their 28th annual convention.

One of these resolutions dealt with the area of "invasions of privacy." The 28th convention of the CWA went on record as opposing the "spreading use of wiretapping and eavesdropping equipment by Government and industry, and supports the efforts of those congressional leaders who advocate strong legislation to license the manufacturer, regulate the sale, and prohibit the indiscriminate use of eavesdropping and wiretapping equipment."

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the Record, the resolution of the 28th Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America issued in June of 1966.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Invasions of Privacy Resolution

Big Brother is not only watching, he's listening, too. Mounting evidence of widespread wiretapping has been gathered by Congressional committees. Senator Edward V. Long has charged that the "net effect of the widespread use of wiretapping and eavesdropping equipment unfortunately is to create an atmosphere of fear on the part of our citizenry."

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Senator Long has probed deeply into the invasions of privacy which have become so commonplace a threat to democratic principles and individual privacy.

"During the course of hearing," Senator Long has said, "we discovered that many people—both in and out of government—resort to tapping of telephones for the purpose of obtaining information. Sometimes the phone tap is used for industrial espionage purposes. And, more often than not, our police and federal agencies resort to eavesdropping and wiretapping in criminal and national security cases."

Senator Long and others have pointed out that the interpretation placed on current legislation by the Justice Department gives little or no practical protection against wiretapping.

Since many of our members work in the telephone industry, where wiretapping techniques are readily at hand, the Communications Workers of America has a complete and historic awareness of the threats posed by the ease with which such invasions of privacy can be accomplished.

Also, our own members often are subjected to surveillance by means of monitoring devices which are now available to organizations outside the telephone industry. And our own members occasionally have been approached by unscrupulous operatives who have sought skilled technicians to tap the phones of telephone company subscribers.

It is well over a year since CWA President Beirne's Senate testimony on wiretapping drew national attention. Since that time, major magazines, frequent newspaper features and a national television documentary have highlighted the problem. Nevertheless, corrective action has been slight and sporadic.

The moral fabric of American society is being steadily corrupted by the temptations created by wiretapping and other snooping devices that are both simple in application and sophisticated in effectiveness. The time has come to call a halt. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 28th Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America opposes the spreading use of wiretapping and eavesdropping equipment by government and industry, and supports the efforts of those Congressional leaders who advocate strong legislation to license the manufacture, regulate the sale and prohibit the indiscriminate use of eavesdropping and wiretapping equipment.

Further, we urge the enactment of legislation prohibiting the use of monitoring equipment in connection with any employer-employee relationship.

ADDRESS BY W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, BEFORE ASSOCIATED HARVARD ALUMNI

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador at Large, recently gave a most perceptive speech before the Associated Harvard Alumni in Cambridge, Mass. He recognized in his speech that we live in a most extraordinary century—at a time, in the words of John Kennedy, in which "if we cannot help the many who are poor then we surely cannot save the few who are rich."

The Ambassador said in his speech:

> The great task—the overriding challenge—for mankind in the rest of the twentieth century is to do in the world what we began to do a generation ago in the United States: to help build a world society where everyone can start to hope for a better life, if not for himself at least for his children and his children's children.
>
> We cannot survive as an island of safety and prosperity, aloof from poverty, wretchedness and strife elsewhere on this small planet. We must offer a helping hand to those who ask our aid to fulfill their hopes. . . .

Mr. President, the world is in a revolution. This Nation must share in the hopes, the passion, and the action, the imagination, and the peril of this revolution.

Ambassador Harriman pointed out in his speech that George Woods, President of the World Bank, recently stated that by the turn of the century at the present growth rates the poorer countries will increase their per capita annual income by no more than $50 while we will add $1,500.

We cannot allow this disparity to grow, Mr. President. Yet Ambassador Harriman recognized the danger present today. He said:

> Unfortunately I detect a new mood in some quarters today—a retreat from the idea of larger responsibility, a desire to return to our own concerns, almost a neo-isolationism. One can understand the causes of the mood because the burdens have been heavy, the problems intractable, the results slow. Yet we cannot let frustrations become the ruler of our judgment, or fatigue the arbiter of our policy.

Mr. President, something like this is happening today with the retreat by some from the concept of foreign aid. Our aid alone will not capture the imagination of the peoples of the world, but our failure to carry on a useful aid program in the midst of our prosperity would condemn us in their imaginations, and would severely hamper us politically.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of Ambassador Harriman's speech in the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, BEFORE THE ASSOCIATED HARVARD ALUMNI, HARVARD YARD, CAMBRIDGE, MASS., JUNE 16, 1966

I come before you as a Yale man who has spent the best years of his life working for Harvard Presidents.

But, now that you have made me a Harvard man today, at last, I am beginning to feel legitimate.

The nation has owed a good deal to Harvard in these years—not only two great Democratic Presidents but any number of Democratic brain trusters on the faculty—as well as even more Republican voters, I am reliably informed, among the alumni.

But one thing stands out: in one way or another this university seems to have taught its graduates that there are more important things in life than purely personal gain. It has held out an ideal of public service and established a record of public achievement. Its graduates work for the community, the nation and the world—who knows how many governments, beside our own, are influenced by Harvard men?

No men in our time have better exemplified this tradition of public service than Franklin D. Roosevelt, Class of 1904, and John F. Kennedy, Class of 1940. It has been my good fortune to have served them both.

Both these Harvard Presidents were distinguished, among other things, by their precise and vivid understanding of history. They understood that change in the world was inexorable, that the velocity of history has never been greater, and that our nation can keep abreast of history only as it presses ever forward to new deals and new frontiers.

They knew also that the changes were not only in man's machines and his institutions but, even more, in his aspirations and values. They understood that the towering fact of the 20th century has been the awakening around the planet of the masses of humanity, so long the victims of misery, exploitation, and oblivion.

President Roosevelt used to speak of "the forgotten man." In our own country we have begun to remember the forgotten man: the unemployed and the impoverished; the sick and the aged; the man whose color consigned him to second-class citizenship; and the man whose lack of education denied him opportunity.

As President Kennedy said: "For one true measure of a nation is its success in fulfilling the promise of a better life for each of its members. Let this be the measure of our nation."

In the more than thirty years since I first went to work for Franklin Roosevelt in the National Recovery Administration—the old NRA—our country has made steady progress in widening the promise of American life. Today President Johnson's determination to make all American citizens full members of the national community—to strike down the barriers which hold men and women back for reasons beyond their own control—is carrying this effort toward its fulfillment in the goals of the Great Society.

In so acting in our own society, we are recovering the sense of public purpose—we are reclaiming our moral heritage.

Yet, even as we make progress at home, we find ourselves confronted by the same problems on a far larger scale in the world outside.

In the thirties Franklin Roosevelt told us that the nation as a whole could not move ahead so long as one of its parts lagged behind in poverty and underdevelopment. In the sixties John F. Kennedy told us that the world could not move ahead if one part lived in affluence and the rest in squalor.

The great task—the overriding challenge—for mankind in the rest of the 20th century is to do in the world what we began to do a generation ago in the United States: to help build a world society where everyone can start to hope for a better life, if not for himself at least for his children and his children's children.

We cannot survive as an island of safety and prosperity, aloof from poverty, wretchedness and strife elsewhere on this small planet. We must offer a helping hand to those who ask our aid to fulfill their hopes for a better life, in freedom from outside interference.

At this same gathering nineteen years ago, General Marshall pointed to the needs of a war torn Europe, and proposed a cooperative plan for European recovery. This combined with the North Atlantic Treaty made possible the revival of the genius and vitality of Western Europe. Now Western Europe is more vigorous and dynamic than ever.

Today we are reviewing the relationship within the North Atlantic Community and the role of NATO which has served us so well in the past. In looking ahead, we find a wide measure of unity of purpose among 14 of the 15 allies. It is agreed that our integrated strength continues not only to give essential security but greater opportunity for progress. In the political field this unity can contribute to breaking down the unnatural barriers of the Iron Curtain—the strong desire of the peoples of both East and West. It can provide, as well, combined economic resources needed to assist the developing countries of the world "in attacking the fundamental problems confronting" them.

Nineteen years ago the acute problem compelling our concern was a stricken Europe. Today it is the plight of the underdeveloped countries. Many of these have only recently attained their independence.

I vividly recall President Roosevelt pressing Prime Minister Churchill during the war to grant India independence. This advice, I might add, was not at the time fully appreciated. Roosevelt's influence and the example of our actions in the Philippines have contributed to the rapid emergence of 57 new nations from colonial status.

President Kennedy stated our position in the United Nations in unequivocal words: "My country intends to be a participant, not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals."

These 57 newly independent nations are now faced with the staggering problems of self-government combined with the need for rapid economic development. These are formidable tasks and outside help is needed to deal with them.

In recent years we have undertaken to give a helping hand both through our support of international organizations as well as through bilateral assistance. Much constructive work has been accomplished, but the dimensions of the problem are greater than the means provided to meet it.

Unhappily the gap between the poorer countries and the richer is increasing. Countries which have about half the population of the free world have an average per capita gross national product of $100 or less, compared to ours of over $3,000.

The President of the World Bank, George Woods—a product of Boston—recently pointed out that by the turn of the century at present growth rates the poorer countries will increase their per capita annual income by no more than $50 while we will add $1,500. Similar comparisons are applicable to the other industrialized nations. Mr. Woods, therefore, calls for a sharp increase in the flow of capital to the developing nations and on better terms, together with greater consideration for the acute problems created by the instability in the terms of trade.

A former World Bank President, Eugene Black is taking the lead in formulating plans for the cooperative development of Southeast Asia and the new Asian Development Bank.

It may be reassuring to some to realize that these two men are not academic brain trusters but hard-headed successful bankers with whom I used to work during the years I was involved in international banking.

Clearly, both moral obligation and political necessity require us to do all we can to join in helping the awakening peoples to move as rationally and quickly as they can into the 20th century. Unfortunately, I detect a new mood in some quarters today . . . a retreat from the idea of larger responsibility, a desire to return to our own concerns, almost a neo-isolationism. One can understand the causes of this mood because the burdens have been heavy, the problems intractable, the results slow. Yet we cannot let frustration become the ruler of our judgment, or fatigue the arbiter of our policy.

I feel that something like this is happening today when men who have previously fought for foreign aid now regard these programs with indifference or reject them with indignation. For foreign assistance is one essential way in which we can meet our responsibilities to the developing world and thereby protect our national interest.

No doubt the aid programs have had their defects and failures—though they have never been better directed than they are by a Harvard man today. Certainly they have not wrought magic or passed miracles, although the Marshall Plan was in fact a miraculous success. Yet they are the means by which we can join in partnership with brave and patriotic men in other lands, working for the modernization of their countries. To cast off this hope of a constructive relationship would be a blow not only against our national security, but against our moral identity.

Economic aid, I have said, is one indisputable way by which we can associate ourselves with those seeking national and social fulfillment.

There is one other way, even more profound, and that is the influence of our democratic ideals. Our leadership in the world does not rest ultimately on our material wealth or on our military power. It rests—in any enduring or significant way—on the extent to which our society and our policies embody aspirations which touch the minds and hearts of the rest of mankind.

I was in Moscow when Franklin Roosevelt died—and I will never forget the shock and sorrow of the Russian people, the weeping in the streets, the sense of desolation. Roosevelt represented a hope of peace and friendship, even in Stalin's Russia.

And no member of the class of 1966 will ever forget when and where he heard about the death of John F. Kennedy.

Yet yours was not a private grief. Shock and grief encircled the world. Today, in hovels and shanties in Latin America, Africa, Asia, I am told, photographs of President Kennedy, torn from newspapers, still hang, recalling the faith forgotten men everywhere had in his purpose and leadership. Even behind the Iron Curtain, people still feel and speak of his loss.

This, I would like to think, is the Harvard heritage, the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. It is a challenge to self-satisfaction and complacency. It is a summons to generosity and magnanimity. It is a call to action—bold action, gallant action. It carries us beyond the narrow confines of our personal lives and private concerns, into a realm of higher and deeper fulfillment. It reminds us that we live in the most extraordinary century in history—and that, as another Harvard man, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said: "As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

This is the meaning of the lives of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. They shared the actions and passions of their times. They knew there was nothing to fear but fear itself. They asked not what humanity could do for them, but what they could do for humanity. As Harvard men, you inherit an inspiring tradition.

Let us recall the words John F. Kennedy, while still a Senator, used at Hyde Park in tribute to President Roosevelt:

"It is essential, from time to time, that we pay tribute to past greatness and historic achievement. But we would betray the very cause we honor if we did not now look to the future as well. We would be unfaithful to the man we honor if we did not look beyond his work to the new challenges—the new problems—the new work which lies ahead. For the last public message he ever wrote, on the morning of his death, closed with these words to the American people: 'The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.' "

MAN, AIN'T THIS GREAT?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a news story appeared in this afternoon's Washington Star carrying the headline "Looters Go on a Spree." I ask unanimous consent that the story be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN AIN'T THIS GREAT?—LOOTERS GO ON A SPREE

(By Austin Scott)

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—"You know, said a man at my elbow, "I bet this riot is the first time in a long while that some people have had enough to eat."

As he spoke, a dozen young Negroes, many in their early teens, were struggling to twist the metal grating from the door of the Sav-Mor food store, a dingy building in the rubbish-strewn heart of the Hough Negro slum.

Rioters had smashed all windows in the one-story brick building the night before, and the plywood panels that had taken their places provided good cover for those bent on looting.

After a brief struggle, the metal grating gave way. The young Negroes shoved the door open and rushed inside, cheered on by a crowd of perhaps two-dozen neighborhood residents behind a line of cars across the street.

They stopped first at the check-out counters to grab shopping bags, then ranged quickly up and down the aisles, loading their arms with canned and baked goods, paper products and household accessories. As each bag filled, it was brought across the street and placed on the ground behind the line of parked cars. In less than three minutes the number of bags had grown to more than a dozen.

"Get some of them cans of beer," a woman shouted to a youth who looked to be about 16. He smiled at her, danced on tiptoe across the street, and returned with a bag full of cans, which he deposited on the ground at her feet.

"At your service," he said, smiling and taking an exaggerated bow. "Anything you want, Madam, just you ask."

A man in his 30s sporting a bright red shirt smiled and commented, "Man, ain't this great!"

The line of shopping bags kept growing. A man in his 20s stuffed the rear seat of his car full of looted merchandise. Another piled bag after bag on an overloaded shopping cart. Children shouted with excitement as the looters ventured farther and farther toward the back of the store.

"Don't y'all get too far back," a teen-aged girl yelled. "That's the way the cops catch you."

Almost all the spectators were smiling with approval, enjoying the spectacle, when a siren suddenly shrieked nearby and two police cars roared around the corner. Instantly the looters scattered, but many weren't fast enough.

One policeman grabbed his gun, headed straight for the store door and trapped five looters inside. Another leveled his revolver at a fleeing man in his early 20s, who ran the other way, only to discover a rifle barrel poking into his stomach.

The spectators scattered, too, leaving in such haste that they knocked over several of the shopping bags, spilling the contents.

"They got my sister," said one girl who looked to be no older than 14. "My sister is in there. I told her not to go out, but she went anyway. I wonder what they'll do to her?"

A policeman came over and began carting the shopping bags back across the street to the store.

"Don't they know they're just makin' trouble for themselves?" he asked. "They do that, and all of their friends have got to suffer the consequences."

THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA AND THE RECENT VISIT OF HIS EMINENCE JOSEPH CARDINAL BERAN OF PRAGUE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to speak of the Czechoslovak National Council of America and the recent visit in this country of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Beran of Prague.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America is a nonprofit organization of people dedicated to halting Communist suppression of democratic freedom.

The visit of Cardinal Beran was a significant event for the crusade of the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

Cardinal Beran—then Archbishop Beran—spoke out courageously for freedom of mind when the Nazis overran Czechoslovakia in 1939 and when the Communists took over in 1948.

Cardinal Beran survived the threat of death plus 12 years of arrest by the Communists.

The cardinal's survival of these trials is significant to the freedom of mind from Communist domination for which the Czechoslovak National Council of America is constantly working.

I am appreciative of the efforts of the Czechoslovak National Council of America particularly because of my work in establishing the American Consulate General in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, and my duties as Vice President of the International Rescue Committee heading their Hungarian refugee program in Austria.

I am very pleased to support the dedicated work of the Czechoslovak National Council of America in its determined effort to relieve the burdened minds of people suppressed under communism in Eastern Europe and, with a full heart, welcome Cardinal Beran to our country.

MASSIVE GRASSROOTS SUPPORT FOR SENATE VERSION OF H.R. 13881—THE ANIMAL PROTECTION BILL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Thursday of this week the appointed conferees from the Senate and the House are scheduled to meet to work out a final wording of H.R. 13881, the much-publicized animal protection bill.

As you may know, Mr. President, I am vitally interested in this legislation. As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee I was privileged to give my support from the very beginning to the wise amendments of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

In essence, the Monroney amendments extended H.R. 13881 to cover research animals in the laboratories while they are waiting to be experimented on, and while they are recovering from an experiment. Not a syllable of the Monroney amendments referred to the period of actual experimentation, to the time when the animal is on the operating table, so to speak.

It seems to me that without the Monroney amendments, which were, fortunately, incorporated into H.R. 13881 by an 88–0 vote of the Senate, H.R. 13881 would be a halfhearted and inadequate piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I am encouraged to find that the vast majority of the American people agree with me on this point.

If the quantities of mail that I receive can be taken as an accurate indication, most of the people interested in animal welfare want to see the Senate version of H.R. 13881 become law. I am hopeful that the conferees from the House, in response to massive grassroots interest, will view the Senate-passed Monroney amendment as an improvement to their very praiseworthy bill.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a brief but poignant editorial that appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald on Saturday, June 25. This editorial points out that—

> If humane treatment is the goal it is senseless to exempt the laboratory facilities. Certainly there should be no interference with the research itself. But crowded, dirty, ill-tended kennels are as inhumane in a laboratory as they are elsewhere and should be forbidden.

Mr. President, I recommend this sensible editorial to my colleagues, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, June 25, 1966]

KEEP THE MONRONEY AMENDMENT

The long uphill fight for a law to insure humane treatment of laboratory animals is nearly won. Both House and Senate have passed bills, differences in which now must be ironed out in joint conference.

Both bills authorize the Agriculture Secretary to draw up standards for humane treatment by dealers, to license dealers in dogs and cats, and to require both dealers and research facilities to keep records of their animal purchases.

But the Senate bill contains an amendment by Senator MONRONEY of Oklahoma providing also for standards of humane treatment in the laboratory itself—not, of course, during experimentation but while the animals are kenneled before and after. If inspectors find evidence of inhumane treatment a cease-and-desist order could be issued.

The House rejected any such provision in response to arguments that it would hinder research. The Senate by an 85 to 0 vote this week adopted the Monroney Amendment. The Senate was right.

If humane treatment of laboratory animals is the goal it is senseless to exempt the laboratory facilities. Certainly there should be no interference with the research itself. But crowded, dirty, ill-tended kennels are as inhumane in a laboratory as they are elsewhere and should be forbidden. The conference committee should keep the Monroney Amendment in the bill.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 10 years ago this month, the Communist Party organ Pravda clearly restated the totalitarian philosophy of the Soviet rule when it said:

> The Communist Party has been and will be the only master of the minds and thoughts, the spokesman, leader and organizer of the people in their struggle for Communism.

Ten years ago the people of Poland answered 30,000 strong when they stood up to tanks, artillery, and troops of the Polish Communist regime in the city of Poznan, and let the world know that they abhorred the Communist philosophy and domination. The story has been the same in East Germany and Hungary. There is no universal political doctrine under which one power can subjugate another people without eventual insurrection by those oppressed people.

The Communist doctrine cannot endure. In its 21 years of hegemony in Eastern Europe, it has failed to establish the political control and economic success predicted by its leaders. In other parts of the world, in Ghana, the Sudan, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia, the people have actively rejected communism, whether Soviet, Chinese, native, or of any other origin.

These events dramatize a weakening in the foundations of the supposed Communist monolith. President Tito of Yugoslavia has continued to take actions inconsistent with Communist doctrine. Rumania will no longer meekly comply with the Moscow-dominated Warsaw Pact. The Kremlin must still turn to the capitalist nations for grain to make bread for the Russian people.

Although signs of disenchantment with communism are becoming widespread, the dream of the freedom of all mankind is far from being achieved throughout the world.

Since 1917 many nations have been forced to become part of the Soviet Union. Although these people were supposedly accorded full Soviet citizenship and privileges, the majority of top jobs and governmental positions were given to "Great Russians"—those people from around Moscow. Aside from this more subtle methods of systematic discrimination, antireligious, and virulent anti-Semitic feeling have been widely practiced by the Soviet Government. Racial discrimination has been experienced by African students who have attended schools in Communist countries.

America must make its position clear that it respects the rights of all the people under Communist rule. Last year I cosponsored in the Senate Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, calling for national independence and self-determination for the brave Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. I urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to deal favorably and expeditiously with this bill.

The United States must pursue our course with an awareness of the complexities of the realm of international relations, and with a perceptive and steadfast foreign policy. It must help insure the freedom of weaker nations, and continue every meaningful effort to keep alive the spirit of freedom among the people living under the ironclad domination of the Communist bloc.

SENATOR McGOVERN SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the March 1966 issue of Mademoiselle magazine contains an excellent article on Vietnam written by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

During the course of the article, Senator McGOVERN points out that our military action in Vietnam may alienate more people than it helps.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPINION: GEORGE S. McGOVERN ON VIETNAM—OUR MILITARY ACTION IN VIETNAM MAY ALIENATE MORE PEOPLE THAN IT HELPS

(ED. NOTE.—In January, Mlle presented "An Opinion" that discussed the whys and wherefores of our Vietnam position. Mlle here presents on opposing view. GEORGE S. McGOVERN (Dem., S.D.) was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1962—the first Democratic senator from that state since 1936. He is also the author of War Against Want: America's Food for Peace Program (1964).)

There is an old tale of a hopelessly lost traveler who inquired of a farmer the directions to Junction City.

"Mister," said the farmer, "if I were going to Junction City, I'd never start from here."

I suppose that President Johnson and every other American who has grappled with the problem in Vietnam would readily agree that the path to solution does not begin from a very desirable vantage point.

Vietnam has been torn by conflict continuously for a quarter of a century. A part of the French colonial possessions, it was occupied by Japan during World War II. With the end of the war in 1945, France launched a long and bloody struggle to reassert her control—financed largely by the United States—which ended in victory for the Vietnamese under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh.

The Geneva settlement, which ended this conflict in 1954, provided for a temporary military demarcation line at the 17th parallel, with elections to be held two years hence to determine the leadership of a united Vietnam. It was generally anticipated that Ho Chi Minh, the hero of the war for independence, would easily win the election, and that was doubtless a major reason why he agreed to the settlement.

The prospect of such a Communist victory disturbed Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and American policy planners, as well as some Vietnamese. So, with strong U.S. support, Ngo Dinh Diem was brought back from a monastery in the United States to head an anticommunist government in Vietnam. Assisted economically, and advised by U.S. military officials, Diem avoided trade relations and political contact with the North. Supported by the U.S., Diem refused to go through with the election that was to be held in 1956.

Frustrated by the breakdown of the Geneva settlement and Diem's oppressive political tactics, dissident elements in South Vietnam, supported by Ho Chi Minh, began in 1959 to harass the Diem regime. This was the beginning of the Viet Cong guerilla movement now in control of two-thirds of the terrain and a third of the population of South Vietnam.

Until early 1965, the United States limited its military assistance to the Saigon government to a gradually increasing advisory role, embracing some 25,000 Americans. Beginning in February of 1965, however, U.S. bombing attacks on both North and South Vietnam and a buildup of combat troops have brought American forces to a total of some 200,000, with another 60,000 in naval units offshore.

Why are we now involved so heavily in this struggle? What are our goals? Does our interest there justify such a massive commitment of American life and treasure—a quarter of a million men and expenditures of $2 billion per month.

It is appropriate to state before answering these questions that I have never accepted the foreign-policy assumptions behind our deepening involvement in Southeast Asia.

Our policy planners say we are in Vietnam in defense of freedom. One wonders, however, how American troops can strengthen the cause of freedom by intervening on behalf of a government which has never had the broad support of its own people, which abolished local village government, and which seemed to have no more appeal to its citizens than the guerrilla forces that challenged it.

Administration spokesmen also say we are in Vietnam to honor the commitments of three American Presidents. It is true that shortly after the Geneva settlement in 1954, President Eisenhower offered economic assistance to the government of South Vietnam, *providing* it would undertake substantial political reforms. But those reforms were never carried out.

President Kennedy insisted that our effort be limited to an advisory role. "In the final analysis," he said, "it is their war. They are the ones who have to win or lose." This view was held also by President Johnson, Secretary McNamara, and other Administration officials until the various regimes in Saigon demonstrated repeatedly their inability to secure sufficient popular backing to win either a political or a military victory without massive U.S. military intervention. We have clearly gone far beyond our offer of 1954 and the advisory role that we played for ten years thereafter.

Perhaps the most vigorously expressed explanation of our present heavy involvement is the danger that Chinese power and influence would otherwise topple the countries of Southeast Asia like so many dominoes. To be sure, China speaks with a belligerent voice, but it is also a poverty-stricken country, beset by enormous problems at home and a bitter dispute with the Soviet Union for leadership of the Communist world. Furthermore, the countries of Southeast Asia have resisted Chinese interference for centuries. Countries are not dominoes—in Southeast Asia or in any other area. They are proud nationalistic powers, jealous of their sovereignty.

I do not believe that Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam, or the volatile Sihanouk of Cambodia, or Thailand, or any other government in Southeast Asia will be a patsy for Peking. At one time we assumed that Yugoslavia and the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe would be manipulated by Moscow. Instead, those countries have moved steadily toward an independent course. We have demonstrated that even a Communist government such as Tito's can be influenced toward independence through intelligent diplomatic, political, and economic policies on our part.

There is no reason why similar U.S. policies could not encourage the nationalistic tendencies of countries in Southeast Asia to remain free from Chinese manipulation. Furthermore, Russia, and likewise Japan and India—the two key noncommunist powers of Asia—have a desire to foster independent states in Southeast Asia. All of these countries oppose our increasing military involvement in Vietnam as the very course that may pull China into a more aggressive interference in their affairs. They see American military pressures forcing North Vietnam into a closer dependence upon China rather than acting as a natural buffer against Chinese penetration.

It is possible that we could win a military victory of sorts in South Vietnam. But to do so would require us to pay a price in blood and resources out of all proportion to our interests. The Viet Cong guerrillas are so completely intermingled with the civilian population that to destroy them would require killing the very people whose support we seek. Furthermore, some of our greatest generals—Matthew Ridgway, Douglas MacArthur, and Omar Bradley—have all warned that it would be disastrous to our security for U.S. troops to be drawn into a major war on the Asian mainland. Senator MANSFIELD and his colleagues warned after their recent tour that such a war would involve our soldiers in a conflict that is open-ended—where each new commitment of American soldiers would be offset by additional forces from the limitless manpower of the enemy.

Recognizing that, like the lost traveler, we were not in a very desirable place to begin a journey, I took the Senate floor last July to describe the alternatives:

(1) Do we continue to accelerate the struggle toward a major war?

(2) Do we call it off and withdraw our forces? Or:

(3) Do we consolidate our present position, keep our casualties at a minimum, and hold out indefinitely for a negotiated settlement?

I strongly recommended the third course.

Now, seven months later, after increased military efforts, the testing of diplomatic and political strategies, and a personal tour of war-torn Vietnam, I again suggest the third alternative as the most realistic.

I recommended last July, as I do now, that we stop the bombing attacks in both North and South Vietnam. In the North, they have not been effective in halting the flow of soldiers and equipment southward. They tend to unify the enemy and prompt him to put more forces into the fray. In the South, the bombing missions frequently kill or maim innocent civilians, as I saw all to painfully last December in the crowded hospitals of South Vietnam.

We ought also to stop our offensive ground operations. Those actions subject our soldiers to ambush and jungle engagements advantageous to the enemy.

Instead, let us consolidate our military position in the cities and the coastal enclaves that we now hold. We can defend, supply, and patrol these areas, with a minimum loss of life. They would offer a haven for the anticommunist, pro-Saigon forces standing with us.

Such a strategy faces up to present political reality, which finds us in control of the cities and the other side dominant in the sparsely populated jungle and rural areas. It minimizes the risk that we will be drawn into endless war in Asia, involving eventually the armies of mainland China.

While I believe that our unilateral involvement and its recent acceleration has been a mistake, we have made public and private commitments that must be considered. A holding action, which reduces the loss of life and protects our position for whatever time is necessary to secure an honorably negotiated settlement, is now the most realistic strategy.

Such a policy requires patience and restraint, qualities not easily summoned in wartime. But the alternative may be an incredibly bloody, inconclusive war that would claim the sons of America and of Asia for years to come. In the end, such a conflict could create conditions of hatred and chaos that would insure the tyranny it is designed to prevent.

In Korea, our efforts to drive the North Korean aggressors back to the 38th parallel succeeded with a moderate loss of life until General MacArthur pressed an offensive action far into North Korea toward the borders of China. Then came the intervention of Chinese troops—a million strong—and the resulting years of bloodshed and death. All of this might have been prevented and a more favorable settlement secured had we remained with our original limited objective.

I pray that by the time these words appear in print we will be moving in the direction *not* of an escalating war but of an escalating peace offensive. It will not be easy to negotiate a satisfactory end to this tragic struggle. It will be even more difficult to assist effectively the building of institutions of political stability and freedom. There are enormous problems, too, of poverty, illiteracy, and disease that the Communists will attempt to exploit, but we are not powerless before such problems. We have the agricultural skill, the food abundance, the medical knowledge, the technical know-how to influence the course of Southeast Asia toward a better life for its people. This is the war we ought to wage in that troubled land.

Although it hurts our pride, we need to recognize realistically that there is very little support around the globe—even among our oldest friends—for our present course in Vietnam. But, a war-weary world would applaud our initiative for peace.

And however slow the road, we may get to Junction City after all.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ROODHOUSE, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the city of Roodhouse, located in my home

State of Illinois, is this week observing its centennial anniversary.

The history of this energetic community is brief but, indeed, brilliant. Located in the richly fertile and rolling prairieland of west central Illinois, Roodhouse seemed destined to maintain a pastoral way of life for its inhabitants. But a select group of able and ambitious men, including the city's founder, John Roodhouse, harbored far grander aspirations for this infant community. Aroused by the intriguing possibilities and potentialities of the railroad, these men sought to secure its advantages for Roodhouse. The railroad was at that time, it will be remembered, swiftly transforming the complexion of this Nation, aiding the westward movement and establishing thriving and bustling centers where quiet and meek communities had existed but shortly before.

These foresighted men did indeed acquire the desired railroad facilities for their community, and Roodhouse quickly became a railroad center. Expanded population, new and flourishing business, and marked improvement in the quality of existence attended the arrival of the railroad and flourishes till this day.

And, Mr. President, I am proud to observe that the same energetic, foresighted, and industrious attitude which characterized the early history of this community still prevails undiminished to this day. I welcome this opportunity to congratulate these fine people and wish them continued success and prosperity.

FORCED HOUSING BILL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BILL—RESOLUTIONS OF RICHARDSON, TEX., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the board of directors of the Richardson, Tex., Chamber of Commerce was kind enough to furnish me with copies of resolutions it approved recently.

In view of the fact that they pertain to matters of national legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions be printed in full in the Record so that Senators may be informed of their nature and content.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Richardson, Tex., Chamber of Commerce Resolution of the Board of Directors

On June 27, 1966, the Board of Directors of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce duly considered and unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Richardson Chamber of Commerce publicly register its opposition to the proposed legislation now being considered by the Congress of the United States, under the title of H.R. 14765, Title IV, and sometimes called the "Bill for Relief against Discriminating Housing Practices" and sometimes called the "Forced Housing Bill" and a part of the "Civil Rights Act of 1966"; and,

That, all available means to inform appropriate congressional representatives be used to fully relate this Chamber of Commerce's views on this subject to such distinguished legislators.

E. G. Gatlin,
President, Board of Directors, Richardson Chamber of Commerce.

Richardson Chamber of Commerce Resolution of the Board of Directors

On June 27, 1966, the Board of Directors of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce duly considered and passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Richardson Chamber of Commerce publicly register its opposition to the proposed legislation now being considered by the Congress of the United States, under the title of S. 2934 and H.R. 12466, and sometimes called the "Community Development Bill"; and,

That all available means to inform appropriate congressional representatives be used to fully relate this Chamber of Commerce's views on this subject to such distinguished legislators.

E. G. Gatlin,
President, Board of Directors, Richardson Chamber of Commerce.

HOW TO CREATE POVERTY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record a thought-provoking talk "How To Create Poverty" by Walter Hoving, chairman of Tiffany & Co., delivered at the commencement at Long Island University last month.

Long known as one of America's most successful businessmen, Mr. Hoving is also a profound student of the American way of life.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How To Create Poverty

(Commencement address at Long Island University by Walter Hoving, Chairman, Tiffany & Co.)

President Johnson has made poverty a major concern in this country today. I believe he will go down in history as the first head of a great nation to even mention the word. The word "Poverty" has been taboo for hundreds of years.

So let's take a look at poverty. How did it start? What causes it? And what can we do about it?

Under the hunting and nomadic civilization, there was no such thing as poverty. It came into being with the advent of the agricultural civilization about four or five thousand years ago. Men who wanted to be rich and powerful in those ancient times could become so only by forcing other men into poverty. This was first accomplished by the inauguration of the Slave System.

After being the prevailing system for two thousand years, slavery began to disappear with the gradual spread of Christianity and the fall of the Roman Empire. This resulted in a transition period called the Dark Ages. But the age-old urge of some men to be rich and powerful was always present and a new system to achieve this end was created—The Feudal System. As the land was the main source of wealth, the noble families who possessed land created serfdom and ground the peasants under their heels for their own benefit.

The termination of the feudal system began about two hundred years ago when the industrial revolution started with the invention of the steam engine. Of course, the evolution was slow, but the world gradually, nevertheless, passed into another transition period, which we are still in today. It is hoped this period won't last as long as the Dark Ages before the next system finally crystalizes, but it will probably last another fifty or one hundred years.

So let us look at the misconceptions, which are largely the remnants of the feudal system, that plague us today. They all tend to perpetuate and create poverty.

1. Under-education

The first one, I am sure we all agree, is under-education. There is no question that this is and has always been one of the main reasons for poverty. Under-education was a deliberate policy under feudalism and it still is today in many places. There is also a great deal of education that is not relevant to present day needs. Nor have we learned how to exaluate people and tailor their education to their abilities and aptitudes. Much needs to be done in this field.

2. Death Control Without Birth Control

One of the important causes of poverty is lack of birth control. We have, however, made great progress in death control. Through sanitation and through medical science, we have prolonged the life of man. We have, however, largely underplayed the fact that, if we don't do something about the intake, we are going to have more people than we can feed. And this is already true in many places. China today has 200,000,000 more people than it had ten years ago, but its agricultural output is exactly the same. Many prejudices and beliefs need to be modified before we can make significant progress in this field.

3. State Capitalism vs. Private Capitalism

Another problem is the belief held by many people that state capitalism is better than private capitalism. I call it state capitalism advisedly because actually all systems, whether they be communist or private, use capital. It is only a question of who owns it. If the Government owns it, it is state capitalism; if people own it, then it's private capitalism. There isn't any question that after forty years of experimentation in Russia, state capitalism, whatever else it might do, breeds poverty. But many other variations of state capitalism are practiced today. Socialism or modified socialism is evident in most countries in Europe, and almost all the new nations in Asia and Africa are believers in state capitalism in one form or another. Until we explode this misconception, we will make very little progress in preventing poverty.

4. The Resentment Against Profit

Number four is the resentment against profit. There is widespread misunderstanding about profit. Most people don't really comprehend what it is. Surveys were taken in several factories in America, Europe and South America. Workers were asked how much profit they thought their company made after taxes. The answers were astonishing. The United States averaged 21 per cent, Europe 32 per cent, and in South America the replies were as high as 72 per cent.

Now it is common knowledge that the average net profit for all reporting corporations in the United States is slightly over 3 per cent. If employees feel that net profit runs as high as 21 per cent or 32 or even 72 per cent, obviously they have a right to be resentful. Few seem to realize that all wages, salaries and taxes come out of gross profit.

It is amazing that not only in the communist states, but even in the United States, people show such hostility about profit. This is unfortunate because without profit the capital needed to put people to work would not be created.

5. The Fear of Machines.

Many people think the machine is their enemy. So few seem to have any comprehension that the machine is the most important factor in the gradual demise of feudalism. For the first time in human history it has become possible for people to be well off without exploiting others. Without machines, you cannot have general prosperity.

Right now there is a newspaper strike in New York and one of the key points of disagreement is that the unions do not want typesetting machines. Labor is fighting this because they feel it will put their members out of work. It will, of course, put some of their members out of work temporarily, but in the long run, it will create much more work and many more jobs. So the fear of machines has always been one of the real causes of poverty.

6. The Obsession with Production.

Number six is the obsession with production. People feel that production is all important and that all other economic factors are just rather unnecessary. Some of you might not know that today there are many more people employed in distribution and the service trades than in production. About thirty years ago, there was something like 40 per cent of the workforce in the United States employed in production; today it's under 20.

However, when a union talks about retraining people, they invariably want to retrain them for other production jobs. This sort of ignorance is one more reason for poverty.

7. Monopoly Practices.

Number seven is monopoly practices. I don't need to say much about this. We have laws against monopoly in this country. Sometimes businessmen feel they are enforced unfairly, but they are, nevertheless, constructive laws. But in other countries monopolies are still the rule rather than the exception. This again is another leftover of the feudal system.

8. Restrictive Labor Practices.

Restrictive labor practices are an important cause of poverty. So-called featherbedding, overmanning, slowdowns, restrictions against taking on apprentices and 30 or even 25 hour weeks tend to restrain trade. For instance, union rules that prevent a man from taking a package from one side of the aisle in a department store to the other if he happens to be an executive will restrain trade. Such practices make for waste, inefficiencies, high costs and inevitably cause unemployment and, therefore, poverty.

9. Social Rigidities

Number nine is social rigidities. By this I mean race prejudices, religious prejudices and class prejudices. The caste system in India is one of the biggest factors in preventing that country from going forward and creating jobs for more people. And in this country, of course, we have prejudices against Negroes by both employers and unions.

In Spain, for example, Protestants cannot hold office in the state, are often prevented from owning property and are even denied the right of legal marriage. This has mitigated against Spain's economic expansion.

Superstitions such as sacred cows which eat the grain that the people themselves sorely need in India also add to the pathetic poverty in India.

All such social rigidities produce poverty.

10. Inflation

Inflation, of course, should be included in our list because it is one of the most devastating forces producing poverty. All fixed incomes are affected by inflation. Inflation has ruined more economies and created more poverty over the years perhaps than any other cause.

11. Restrictive Tax Devices

Restrictive tax devices often prevent legitimate business expansion and trigger poverty. In England they are just imposing a new tax of $3.50 on each worker. But they are going to pay back $4.50 per worker if they are employed in production, thereby penalizing the service and distribution sector of the economy.

This is one of these unintelligent taxes that tries to turn back the clock. It is bound to dislocate the economy of Britain and do people out of work.

Sales taxes in such areas as New York City also produce poverty by driving business away from the city, thus causing less employment in many industries.

Minimum wages that are set too high cause unemployment among new workers. Unquestionably the high unemployment rate among Negro teenagers is largely caused by our minimum wage laws.

12. The creation of Mini-Nations

Number twelve is the creation of small nations. There are many of these so-called nations in Africa and Asia, and they are created for sentimental and ethnic reasons, or because some tribe wants to be autonomous.

This is already creating great economic havoc and poverty. A mini-nation can exist only as long as it gets help from us. But they are not constructive and realistic entities and cannot last.

What is the solution?

The solution is that we must makeup our minds that fighting poverty is not just a question of sticking a finger in the dike in Harlem, Watts, or Appalachia, or simply appropriating money and parceling it out in certain places. We must try to stop doing the things that create poverty if we want to make progress, and do those that create wealth and well-being for all.

It is my judgment that we must realize that socialism and communism were created out of the inherited resentments of the past and that capitalism contains too many flaws which we have carried over from the days of exploitation. The answer is that we must try to accelerate the transition stage we are now going through and get all nations to realize that "The Freedom System" is the only one that can produce the maximum well-being for the largest number of people. And that is the Herculean task which all of you must face up to for a better future.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the observance of Captive Nations Week reminds us that we must not relent in our efforts to provide every political and moral encouragement to the heroic peoples of the captive nations in their struggle for freedom and independence from Communist tyranny.

In the past year, the so-called liberalization of Communist policy toward the captive east-central Europeans has, in effect, been characterized by increased repressive measures and a toughening of the Communist line. In a determined effort to keep the captive peoples under the restrictive harness of the state, the Communist regimes have attacked intellectuals in Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, arrested dissident citizens in Hungary, and intensified their crusade against the religious hierarchy in Poland. Under the guise of "liberalization," the Communists have instead reaffirmed and reinforced the old policy of regimentation, tyranny, and suppression of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We in America cannot and must not stand by silently as long as the ruthless oppression of our eastern European friends continues. Rather, it is our duty to press forward in a united effort to assure the right of national independence, self-determination, and freedom for all men and all nations.

When I, like millions of free men everywhere in World War II fought for freedom, I did not then nor do I now, take the principles and commitments of the four freedoms or the Atlantic Charter, lightly. Yet, the four freedoms and all other international agreements to which the Soviet Union was a party, were soon made a mockery by tyrannical action on the part of the Communist regime. And, the captive peoples' freedom, purchased at the cost of blood and sacrifice, flickered but a moment before it was extinguished by the Soviet aggressors. The subsequent captivity of these freedomless peoples must lie heavily on the conscience of every freedom-loving American. We cannot ignore our historic commitment to over 100 million people who have proven, time and again, their own deep commitment to the very principles we cherish.

Nationalist sentiment in east-central Europe has not been deterred or softened by the lack of response by the respective regimes to the need for a more rapid and meaningful national evolution. Rather, there is a wealth of evidence that nationalist sentiment has been strengthened and encouraged. It is, therefore, especially imperative that we reaffirm our steadfast determination to lend our moral and political support now, while the polarity between the ambitions and aims of the captive peoples and the ambitions and aims of the Communist leadership is becoming more pronounced.

The observance of Captive Nations Week is an appropriate time to affirm and strengthen our dedication toward seeking all peaceful means to the end of eliminating the specter of totalitarianism from the captive world.

OPERATION HEADSTART

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be considering the appropriations for the war on poverty for the coming year. There have been successes and failures in this program. One of the brightest successes has been Operation Headstart, the program to provide preschool training for needy children.

A recent editorial in the Baltimore Evening Sun points out the achievements of this project. As the editorial very accurately states:

> The biggest shortcoming of Head Start must be measured in the quantity, not the quality, of its success.

In other words, the program needs to be extended to reach more of the 4 million children who could profit from it. Before Senators decide on the amount of funds they will earmark for this vital purpose, they should read the editorial carefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO FEW OFF THE MARK

"Reports on last summer's Head Start program abound in case histories of children who had never seen book, a pencil, a grapefruit or a doctor before they were enrolled; children who did not know how to play or laugh or eat with utensils; children who were virtually mute because of a lack of conversation at home and who risked being misdiagnosed as mentally defective when they entered school."

So writes Erwin Knoll in the *Southern Education Report*.

Operation Head Start, the most widely acclaimed of the Government's anti-poverty campaigns, has been conspicuously successful in dealing with such children. Even the Republicans like it, for in a recent critique of Poverty War programs they claimed to have originated the idea four years before the first pre-school classes were held in 1965.

There is abundant evidence that Head Start children have experienced a marked rise in I.Q., that they have learned better how to get along in groups and in many cases have been found by first-grade teachers to be "more proficient in learning, more intellectually curious and better adjusted to the classroom than children who had not participated in the program." Another measure of Head Start's success is that its example has stimulated many school systems to initiate or expand pre-school programs.

The program is not without its shortcomings, of course. There have been enough administrative mistakes, confusion, and delays in processing project applications to lend at least some support to the Republicans' recommendation that Head Start be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. Mr. Knoll also says there has not been enough "follow-through" in treating the physical and emotional defects of Head Start children after the initial treatment.

But the biggest shortcoming of Head Start thus far must be measured in the quantity, not the quality, of its success. For it is a sad fact that fewer than one sixth of the nation's 4,000,000 children who could benefit from Head Start are able to do so under its present scope.

SAFE-DRIVING CAMPAIGN OF THE NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to offer support for the efforts of the National Automobile Dealers Association to encourage safe driving habits among teenagers.

The National Automobile Dealers Association is running a series of advertisements in the Saturday Evening Post concerning the problem of teenage driving.

The Saturday Evening Post is an excellent publication in which to run these advertisements in view of its strong editorial policy toward safety.

The National Automobile Dealers Association and the Saturday Evening Post are to be commended for this new effort to understand the critical safety problem on our Nation's highways and how young people can be functional in helping to improve upon the present situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a recent advertisement be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Gee, Dad, you're gonna take my license away for one lousy ticket?"

The young man is 16. He was doing almost 80 when they caught him. His father went to juvenile court with him. The judge said next time the boy's license would be suspended. His father didn't wait for a next time.

The boy didn't like the idea. "O.K., so I was speeding a little. I knew what I was doing."

He missed the point. Sure, he knew what he was doing. He's young, he has perfect vision and quick reflexes. He knows he reacts faster than many others on the road.

But perfect vision or not, he's blind to the most important rule of the road: responsibility!

The responsible teenage driver knows his limitations. He knows he lacks experience, and drives accordingly. He drives carefully. And with judgment.

By just being 16, he's earned the privilege to drive. Now he has to earn the right to drive.

If he violates that right, even once, he's got to see the wrong of it. A ticket and fine aren't enough. Take his license away, and he'll see.

Sure it's a hard way to learn traffic safety. But it's a lot easier than learning it by accident.

Your teenager's driving can be one of the biggest problems you'll ever face. It's a problem that can't be solved by rules alone. He must *want* to be a safe driver. Your neighborhood new car dealer hopes this series will help you to help him. The National Automobile Dealers Association commends the *Saturday Evening Post* for their cooperation.

THE CAUSES OF INFLATION—ADDRESS BY BEN H. CARPENTER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there have been charges and countercharges concerning the causes of our present inflationary problems. Steel producers have been blamed, union officials have been blamed, the President has been blamed, Congress has been blamed, agriculture has been blamed, big retail outlets have been blamed, even the housewife has received a drubbing for not being budget conscious enough.

About the only thing clear to all concerned is that prices are rising, our currency is declining in buying power, and some Americans on fixed incomes are being hurt.

Inflation is a tragic thing; presently it is an American tragedy. Other countries—both friendly and unfriendly—are experiencing monetary problems of even greater magnitude. But inflation in the United States today is a symptom that we are pursuing wrong policies of some sort.

It has been demonstrated time and time again that inflation is the result of certain ill-advised fiscal policies of Government, since the Government is the sole and exclusive manager of the currency.

I think it is a very great error to assign the cause of inflation to those who must simply adjust to its effect. The businessman who must market the finished product to consumers can no more act against a general rise in prices than can the consumer cease all buying until price levels subside.

Food prices have not been exempt from the present rash of incriminations. Food producers have been attacked by those who do not understand the situation, for the increasing cost of living. But food producers—farmers, packagers, and retailers—have had their own rising costs to pay, including increased labor costs. Because meat is a major factor in food budgets, those who raise cattle and who market meat products have received a certain amount of criticism recently—criticism which is unjust and which I believe reflects a lack of basic economic understanding.

At a meeting last month in Wichita Falls, Tex., the president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattleraisers Association delivered some comments in relation to this problem. The president of the association is Mr. Ben H. Carpenter, and I believe his comments to be quite germane to this problem and worthy of the attention of every Member of the Senate who is concerned over the increasing cost of living, as I certainly am.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Carpenter's remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments by Ben H. Carpenter, President, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association at Its Board of Directors Meeting, June 18, 1966, Wichita Falls, Tex.

I am sure you are aware of the wave of publicity that has recently been sweeping the nation regarding food prices. Meat prices have been singled out as a major contributor to higher consumer costs and inflation. Spokesmen for government bureaus and agencies have contributed to a rash of inaccurate statements and inadequate comparisons in newspaper stories throughout the nation referring to so-called high costs of meat.

Even the President of the United States was widely quoted as urging housewives to purchase only the lower priced cuts of meat in order to hold down the food bill and combat inflation. Typical of some of the headlines recently seen are these, "Meat's the Black Sheep of Food Costs, Budget Brigade Finds" and "Rocketing Food Costs May Beat Man to the Moon."

In spite of the fact that readily available government statistics refute the statements that recently improved beef prices are major contributors to the current inflationary trends in the country, these articles and comments have implied that the farmers and ranchers of the nation should be condemned by the consuming public.

A recent report on food costs and farm prices released last week by the House Committee on Agriculture reveals some most interesting statistics that refute completely the popular contention that agricultural prices in general, and those of meats in particular, are major contributors to inflation. Let's examine some of these facts and figures contained in this report which made comparisons over the period of the last 18 years.

Prices received by farmers and ranchers in 1965 were 10% lower than those received 18 years ago, while prices paid at retail by consumers for food increased 33% in these same 18 years.

While retail food prices have risen relatively steadily over the past 18 years, none of the increase in retail prices accrues to the farmer and rancher. In fact, prices received by farmers and ranchers in 1965 were 10% less than in 1947 and 13% less than in 1952. Retail food prices, however, in 1965 were 11% higher than in 1952 and 33% higher than in 1947.

The net income of farmers and ranchers declined by 18% from 1947 to 1965 even though the volume of farm produced foods sold to consumers had increased by 44% during that same period of time.

Compare this to the fact that salaries and wages to employees in all manufacturing industries increased by 113% from 1947 to 1965.

A part of the 33% increase in overall food prices paid at retail by consumers over the past 18 years has resulted from the development of new food products, new techniques of processing and packaging and changes in family food buying habits.

In 1947, most housewives selected their beef from a refrigerated, glass case and the grocer weighed and wrapped it on the spot. Now they find several pieces of the same cut of beef neatly placed on the individual trays, transparently wrapped, weighed and priced, in advance.

Brightly lighted, air conditioned stores with wide aisles and attractively displayed products processed with new techniques are what the food shopper expects and demands. These demands from the consumer, not the producer, account for much of the increase of food prices.

However, a statistical study by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicates that the average household paid 17% more and farmers and ranchers received 7% less in 1965 for the same kinds and quantities of foods purchased in 1947, 18 years ago.

With regard to specific food items the report reveals that, in the 18 year period studied, the farm price of wheat has dropped 3% while the retail price of cereals and bakery products has increased 47%.

When city families purchase bread and prepared cereal products, they pay mostly for processing, packaging, and distributing the products; very little goes to the farmer for raw materials. For example, there is only 2.6¢ worth of farm-produced corn in a 29¢ package of corn flakes. The one pound loaf of bread that sold at retail for an average price of 20.9¢ in 1965 contained wheat having a farm value of 2.7¢.

In 1965, the farm price of dairy products was 6% below 1947 and the retail price of dairy products during the same period increased by 19%.

During the 18 year period from 1947 to 1965 retail prices of meat products increased by 16%. The farm value of meat products in 1965 was 5% less than the farm value in 1947. Much attention has been focused on the fact that prices paid to farmers and ranchers for animals producing meat products have increased substantially since 1956. However, there has been a tendency to overlook the fact that the farm value of meat products in 1956 had fallen 29% below 1947 prices. Current prices of beef cattle, while substantially higher than the low point reached in 1956, are still considerably below the price levels 15 years ago in 1951.

While the general economy of the nation was prosperous and advancing, the beef cattle industry suffered a serious price depression during the five years of 1952 through 1957 and again during the last part of 1963, 1964, and into the early part of 1965. The cattlemen of the nation operated during those periods taking severe losses as they were squeezed between higher costs of production and lower prices for their cattle. The recent price improvement in beef cattle does not represent a full recovery and the profit balance is still very delicate.

The evidence is very conclusive that prices received by the farmer and rancher have not contributed whatsoever to the increases in food prices paid by consumers. A comparison of the 10% decline in prices received by them during the last 18 year period with other economic trends is most interesting.

The report reveals that rail freight rates on farm products increased 45% during the same period. Prices of such services as rent, property insurance, property maintenance, and telephone services increased an average of 69% during the same period and unit prices of new plant and equipment were up 55%. Salaries and wages of employees in manufacturing industries increased during the same period by 113%.

In the nine years since 1957 prices paid by farmers and ranchers for clothing has increased 15%, for motor vehicles 17%, for farm machinery 22%, for advalorem and miscellaneous taxes 65%, and interest payable on farm real estate debt 132%.

Therefore, if viewed in the correct perspective the prices paid by consumers for food products cannot be singled out as a major contributor to inflation. U.S. consumers have available the highest quality food products in the world, and the important fact is that they can obtain this food by working less time than persons living anywhere else on earth.

During 1965, American consumers spent 19% of their take-home income for food. Twenty years earlier this figure was 26%. Pay for one hour's factory labor today will buy 2.4 pounds of round steak, whereas, in 1942 it would buy only 2 pounds, and in 1932 1.5 pounds. One hour's factory labor today will buy 3.2 pounds of bacon, whereas, in 1942 2.2 pounds and in 1932 1.8 pounds. Pay for one hour's factory labor today buys 12.5 loaves of bread, whereas, in 1942 only 9.8 loaves, and in 1932 6.3 loaves.

In the light of these facts one may wonder why certain government bureaucrats and politicians single out the farmers and ranchers of the nation to be the scape-goats upon whom inflation is blamed. Why is it that agriculture seems to continue to be the easiest target on which to blame the inflationary spiral that has been existing for the last 15 or 20 years, even though there are no real facts or evidence to support this contention? The answer probably lies in the fact that a lesser percentage of the people of the nation are directly involved in agricultural production, and therefore, agriculture is losing its political significance.

As the country's population has grown during the last few decades a situation has developed in which an extremely small percentage of the people of the country are familiar with the actual conditions existing in agriculture. For example, in 1950, although 64 percent of the country's population was urban and 36% was rural, only 42% of the rural population was actually involved on a farm or ranch, in other words only 16% of the total was involved in agricultural production.

Ten years later, in 1960, 69.9% of the U.S. population was urban, 22.6% was rural-nonfarm, and only 7.5% was actually involved on a farm or ranch. This trend has continued in the 1960's.

In this atmosphere a great deal of misleading and erroneous information has appeared in newspapers and other publications throughout the country, much of which is harmful to the farmers and ranchers of the nation.

For example, many consumers and taxpayers generally are led to believe that the total annual appropriations to the Department of Agriculture are subsidies. The report released by the House Committee on Agriculture last week reveals that actually nonfarmers participate in a larger share of the Department's expenditures than farmers themselves, and that about two-thirds of Department of Agriculture expenditures, in the 1967 budget, are for services which are of primary benefit to the general public. Most housewives and urban consumers are unfamiliar with the fact that the cattle industry itself has vigorously opposed price supports and subsidies for beef cattle and has done so successfully thus far, in spite of the efforts of federal administrators in the past to apply them.

The American cattle producer has confidence in the free enterprise system which has made this nation so significantly different from the other nations of the world. He doesn't want any price subsidies from the American taxpayer, but he does expect a fair and profitable price for the beef cattle he produces. However, he doesn't expect federal agencies, whose purpose it is to safeguard his interests as an American Citizen, to instead take actions, such as was witnessed earlier this year to drive down the price of beef, when it is still substantially below price levels of fifteen years ago.

Above all, the cattle producer doesn't deserve to be falsely accused of contributing to inflation. The real major cause of inflation is the federal government itself, as currently being administered. The real culprits of the inflationary spiral of the present and of the future are gigantic federal programs like the unnecessary and unneeded medicare program recently authorized, titles 18 and 19 of which it is now estimated will cost more than a billion dollars a year in the state of New York alone, federal programs of accelerated unemployment compensation, and federal programs designed to blanket the country with built-in wage increases. Giant federal programs of this type pump literally billions of dollars into the economy, yet they do not create to any degree new permanent plant capacity which can add to the total productive output of the nation, and therefore they only create taxspenders instead of taxpayers.

This is the area in which restrictions should be urged to combat inflation, instead of government officials urging the American housewife to restrict her purchases of meat at a time when the average price of beef cattle is only 85% of parity.

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL FREDERICK C. BELEN AT DEDICATION OF COLUMBIA, S.C., POST OFFICE

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, the fine, modern, new post office in Columbia, S.C., was dedicated on Sunday, July 17. I consider it a measure of the growth and progress of Columbia and South Carolina.

We were privileged to have with us on that occasion the distinguished Deputy Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Frederick C. Belen. I take great pleasure in placing in the Record the text of Mr. Belen's remarks on this occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Deputy Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen at the Dedication of the Columbia, S.C., Post Office, 3:30 P.M., Sunday, July 17, 1966

Governor McNair, Senator Russell, Mayor Bates, Reverend Clergy, Postmaster Callahan, members of the Johnston family, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It's good to be back in South Carolina again.

You know, I've visited your state so often, I'm beginning to feel like a native. And I like the feeling.

It occurred to me the other day that I have spent more time in South Carolina in the past five years than I have in my own home state of Michigan.

In fact, I've been here so often, some people can't tell whether I'm coming or going! As I arrived at the depot early this morning, a young man saw me standing on the platform with my suitcase and said, "Good morning, Mr. Belen. Are you taking a trip?"

I've traveled the length and breadth of your wonderful state—sometimes on business, sometimes purely for the pleasure of it—and at no place in the world have I been treated so hospitably.

I've spoken at conventions at Clemson and Charleston, dedicated the post office in Sumter, attended a dinner in Columbia with former Postmaster General Farley not too long ago, and, just last month, I attended a wedding in Anderson.

And I've fished at Hartwell, Clark Hill and Santee-Cooper.

There's an old saying—probably coined by a fisherman's wife—that the size of fish a man can catch depends upon the length of his arms. Well, I have relatively short arms, but I'll tell you I've caught some big ones down at Santee-Cooper!

Your home town of Columbia, and my home town of Lansing, Michigan, have something in common. They were both among the first cities in the United States to get four-hour, downtown mail service.

Now, some pundits have reasoned that more than mere coincidence was responsible for this development, and perhaps they were right.

We had to try out Accelerated Business Collection and Delivery somewhere, to see if it would work, and if it was economically feasible to provide this type of service.

Your late Senator, Olin Johnston, who was chairman of our Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, said: "Well, don't use my state for a guinea pig. Experiment in your own state!"

So that's what we did.

After the Lansing experiments proved that the four-hour mail service would work, Senator Johnston said, "Now I want you to establish this service in South Carolina—in Columbia, Greenville and Charleston!"

So we did that, too!

Your Senator Johnston just wasn't the type of man you said no to, without a very good reason.

During my recent trip to Anderson, I made a pilgrimage to Senator Johnston's grave at Barker's Creek Cemetery, to pay my respects to a man whose total impact upon the civil affairs of the nation will be studied by your grandchildren.

While I was there, thinking back over the many years of personal friendship I shared with Olin Johnston, I tried to place him in his proper historical position.

It occurred to me that perspective is like a gigantic cone, and your opinion of the person you're looking at depends upon which end of the cone you're looking through.

If you look through the large end, you see the man alone, and you make a judgment, based upon what you see, as to whether he is a good man or a bad one; a kind man or a ruthless one; an industrious man or a dawdler.

If you look through the small end of the cone, you get the big picture—you see the man in relation to his time and place in history; his impact upon his contemporaries; the esteem in which he is held by his countrymen and what he has done to improve their lot. You see not only the man, but his works and the potential effect of those works upon mankind.

Olin Johnston is one of the few men I have ever known who stands the test of analysis from both ends of the cone.

The Washington Daily News once commented that Olin Johnston had sponsored more legislation to improve the lot of the common man than anyone who ever served in the United States Senate.

That's quite a tribute.

And I'm sure there's not a federal worker in the United States who did not regard Chairman Johnston as a knight in shining armor, where the welfare of civil servants was at stake.

Olin Johnston labored long and hard to secure for Columbia this magnificent new Post Office. Time and again, he and your distinguished mayor, Lester Bates, were on the telephone to the Post Office Department, or were firing off letters to us, or were making personal visits to us, to argue the merits of larger, more modern facilities to handle Columbia's mounting mail volume.

The fact that we are gathered here today attests to the persuasiveness of those arguments.

You beautiful new post office stands for progress. It symbolizes the growth of your community and the steady expansion of a postal system that today processes a volume of mail about equal to that of the rest of the world combined.

Our national mail volume this year is more than 75 billion pieces. By 1980, your Post Office Department will be handling over 100 billion pieces of mail a year.

This means that unless we devise new programs and new techniques—unless we speed mechanization and modernization of the postal system—we will literally be buried under an avalanche of letters.

In this rapidly moving world, with the galvanic development of its economy and its dramatic changes in population and transportation patterns, we cannot hope to get by with the horse and buggy methods of the 18th or 19th or even the 20th century.

We live in a computer age, and we must adapt to the technological advances that are available to us if our postal system is to survive and flourish.

Fortunately for all of us, we have in Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien a restless man and a no-nonsense Administrator, whose background and temperament equip him well to undertake the gigantic job of moving the government's largest civilian department into the mainstream of space age progress.

Unlike most of his predecessors, Mr. O'Brien came to the Post Office Department with a ready-made national reputation for his outstanding work as a key personal advisor and organizer for two Chief Executives—President Kennedy and President Johnson.

This is an important factor, because it has affected his approach to postal problems. He is not in the Office of the Postmaster General to establish a name for himself. He is there to improve the postal service.

Thus he can devote his considerable talents to long-range planning which may not take full effect until years after he leaves office.

Postmaster General O'Brien has attacked our immediate problems—the day-to-day bottlenecks that impede mail delivery—with a tenacity unequalled in our time. But he has also been willing to inaugurate programs which may not bear fruit for five or ten years—programs from which some of his predecessors shied away because there were no obvious, immediate advantages.

This proclivity for long-range programming and budgeting—this willingness to invest in plans that will pay future dividends—is what, I believe, will distinguish Larry O'Brien as one of our great Postmasters General.

And it is this same approach which will ultimately provide you with the finest postal service you have ever known, and the finest the world has ever devised.

Former Postmaster General John Gronouski—Mr. O'Brien's immediate predecessor—established the goal of overnight delivery of 95 percent of the nation's first-class mail as the paramount objective of the postal establishment.

Everything that he did as Postmaster General, and everything that Mr. O'Brien is now doing, is aimed at reaching that objective. And we are making slow, but decided progress.

Already, in your own state of South Carolina, 95.1 percent of all first-class letters destined to addresses within the state are delivered overnight.

With facilities such as this ultra-modern post office that we are dedicating today, we hope to improve even that record.

Yours is one of the largest post offices in the South—comprising 200,000 square feet of building floor space, a 9,279 square foot garage, and 276,758 square feet of parking and maneuvering area—not including this fine parking lot erected by the City of Columbia. That's nearly a half-million square feet of space you have in your new post office! Compare *that* with your living room!

But that's only part of the story.

When the new Eau Claire postal station is finished, about September 1, your city will not have one postal facility in the metropolitan area more than five years old. And, come to think of it, that's how long Bill Callahan has been Postmaster of Columbia.

I doubt that there is another city in the country of comparable size that could make such a claim.

I believe this gives the Post Office at least some right to share in your pride in having been selected as the All-America City.

And I hope you will share with us the great pride we have in your magnificent new post office.

I'm sure Senator Johnston would be delighted if he could see today the end result of his efforts.

I think it only fitting that we dedicate this fine building as a living memorial to one who dedicated his life to the people of South Carolina and to the welfare of his country—the late Senator Olin D. Johnston.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr HART. Mr. President, "It is true that liberty is precious—so precious that it must be rationed." The words are Lenin's to more than 100 million Europeans now living under Communist domination. Lenin's meaning is clear.

We who enjoy freedom counter this philosophy with our own—that liberty is not the exclusive property of a few. And to these millions of captive people we offer words of sympathy—fully cognizant that no mere words can comfort—and tender our expressions of hope that one day their hope for freedom will be replaced by its actuality.

During the observance of Captive Nations Week all Americans—in fact all freemen everywhere—are solicited for their "support to the key objective of an east-central Europe free of totalitarianism." Of equal importance, I feel, is the need for us to continue to express our support throughout the entire year. Only then, can we discharge fully our responsibility to these enslaved nations to see that their desire for freedom remains our constant concern.

SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY CALLS ATTENTION TO THE NATIONAL SHORTAGE OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Congress took a great step toward providing decent medical care for our older citizens when it enacted medicare last year. That program, among other things, provides that citizens over 65 may receive as a social security benefit convalescent care in a qualified nursing home.

But the promise of nursing home care held out by the Medicare Act will turn out to be an empty promise to too many Americans. The fact is that there exists today a shortage of nearly half a million nursing home beds—a shortage that will surely be aggravated by the coming of medicare. What is worse, many of the existing homes provide so few or such poor medical services that they will fail to meet the minimum standards laid down in the act.

The shortages and inadequacies of nursing homes in this country are eloquently set forth by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY in a speech delivered at the Judy Holliday memorial dinner in New York City on May 15.

The Senator reaches the conclusion that a massive Federal program is needed to alleviate the nursing home shortage. In enacting medicare Congress made a promise to the American people—a promise that the medical care covered by that act would be available to those who need it. In this speech Senator KENNEDY sketches out a challenging program for keeping that promise.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, AMERICAN MEDICAL CENTER, JUDY HOLLIDAY MEMORIAL DINNER, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 15, 1966

I am delighted to be with you. Tonight is a very special occasion, as the presence here of so many of those who loved Judy Holliday indicates. We have gathered to honor both a very special person and a distinguished medical center. We mark with pleasure a combination of events—the fact that those who were close to Judy Holliday chose the American Medical Center at Denver as an appropriate place to honor her memory; and the fact that the officials of the American Medical Center chose so fittingly in wanting to name their new wing after Judy Holliday.

The American Medical Center is notable for both medical and humanitarian reasons. Long one of the outstanding tuberculosis treatment centers in the country, it has in recent years become a leader in cancer treatment and research. This terrible disease, which now claims the lives of 300,000 Americans every year, took Judy Holliday from us while she was still in the prime of her life. So it is most fitting that a new wing for cancer treatment and research will bear her name. And it is appropriate for another reason. Those who knew Judy Holliday knew a warm, kind, generous person. It is fitting that the hospital which honors her is a hospital that charges no fees, treats only those in financial need, and does these things without regard to coloration of skin or belief.

But if those close to Judy Holliday chose well, the American Medical Center did so, too. If the atmosphere in the Judy Holliday wing is at all influenced by the memory of the woman it honors, it will be filled with her warmth and generosity. She made audiences glow night after night on Broadway—they would stand in Shubert Alley after her performances, basking in the warmth she gave them, their lives brightened just by having spent the evening with her in the theatre. If care in the Judy Holliday wing is rendered with the same warmth and tenderness—and I know it will be—it will truly be a living monument to the talented lady who has been taken from our midst.

The Judy Holliday wing will help in satisfying the need for long-term care beds in our country. But the fact is that as we meet tonight we are on the eve of a national crisis in medical facilities. A historic enactment in the medical care field—I refer, of course, to Medicare—will go into effect on July 1. With it will come an immediate, marked increase in the demand for medical treatment. There are already great shortages of doctors and nurses and beds in our nation. The implementation of Medicare will intensify the shortage—particularly in nursing home beds—to a critical level.

It is this impending crisis that I want to discuss with you this evening. Medicare fulfilled a dream of a generation's standing, for social progress moves slowly and statutory reforms often lag behind scientific achievement and popular will. Its enactment took time, but it finally came, reflecting once again, as the Social Security Act did thirty years before, a recognition by twentieth century Americans that old age should be a golden span, an ever-lengthening period of health, happiness and productivity.

But Medicare also imposes a great responsibility on us. It summons us to the task of ensuring not only that the cost of medical care is no longer a burden upon those who need but cannot afford it, but that good medical care itself is available. The bright hopes of Medicare can be dashed if we fail to achieve this availability.

What, after all, is the value of offering medical treatment to our aged if there are no doctors available to administer it? What is the value of offering nursing home care to our old people if there are no nursing homes where they can go? What is the value of offering hospital treatment to those aged who are seriously ill if there are no hospital beds waiting for them? The dream quickly becomes a nightmare; the bright promise becomes a dreary broken pledge; the loud trumpets announcing victory slide into a lower key of despair. Unless we as a nation are prepared, right now, to ensure that we have the facilities needed to implement the Medicare legislation, we would almost have been better off to have done nothing. If we are not prepared to move forward, energetically and imaginatively, to build on the blueprint of the Medicare legislation, then we had better be prepared for some very serious problems.

Let us take our stethoscope to Medicare and check up on those symptoms which suggest oncoming problems. Loud and clear, we hear the word, "shortage." The root problem is insufficient doctors, nurses, hospital beds, and facilities.

Machines and management engineering, computers and automation, can help to a limited extent in meeting some of these problems, but the major need is a massive long-range program of education, training, and building. There is an immediate and desperate need for expanded and additional medical schools, for a stepped up recruiting and training program for other medical personnel, for hospital expansion and the building of new hospitals, and for creating nursing home facilities.

What is needed will be partly supplied by money, but that is not the whole answer. There must be imaginative and intelligent planning and administration, and there must be vigorous action to insure a high standard of care.

There is already a doctor shortage in many communities in the United States today. We have read about it and we have experienced the jammed waiting rooms and the difficulty of finding doctors to make house calls, particularly at night. Medicare will only increase the patient load.

Merely to maintain the presently existing population-physician ratios by 1975, we will need to be graduating doctors at a rate of 11,000 a year. In 1964 we graduated 7300. In 1959, the Surgeon General's Report stated that we needed twenty new medical schools. Since that time, only ten have opened or are on the drawing boards. Experts in medical manpower have examined the picture and have concluded that, at best, with the new medical schools and expansion of older schools now projected, we will still be 2000 graduates a year short of the 11,000 needed annually by 1975. In other words, at our present pace, the doctor shortage that does exist will be multipled by 1975.

Further compounding the problem is the marked change in physician practice. In 1930, seven out of ten new physicians entered family practice; today the rate is four out of ten, with two of these four being internists. Over 60 percent of doctors now practicing are specialists, and only 18 percent of the fourth year medical students indicate they will become general practitioners, an accumulation of figures which makes it all the more unlikely that we will be able to provide enough doctors for our people at the present rate of growth.

We have an equally pessimistic report on nurses. An American Nursing Association study shows that at typical hospitals around the country, 20 percent of the positions for professional nurses are vacant, and there is an 18 percent vacancy rate for practical nurse positions. In New York City, one-half the openings for professional nurses in public hospitals are unfilled. In 1962, there were 550,000 professional nurses in practice. The Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing reports that we need another 300,000 nurses in the next five years. Even if we settled for half that, we would have to achieve a 50 percent increase in admissions to nursing schools within the next two years.

These statistics refer only to registered nurses. Practical nurses and nurses aides, who require far less training, are in equally short supply. And there are similar shortages of clinical psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and social workers.

Many of these shortages are compounded by the loss of people who quit in protest against low salaries and unsatisfactory working conditions. For example, 25,000 registered nurses quit their field every year for these reasons. And two out of three change their jobs annually. This 67% turnover rate reflects the low morale in the profession, contrasted to a turnover rate of 18% among women school teachers. The churning, unsettling, interrupting aspects of nursing job changes suggest that hospital efficiency is lower than even the shortage in numbers would suggest.

The nursing situation is particularly serious. Hospital administrators striving to cut down spiralling costs are often guilty of treating nurses as second class citizens. Doctors swamped with patients have delegated to nurses many of the duties they used to perform, an acceptable medical delegation, but an unacceptable numerical one because nurses are just not available for these extra duties. Hit from both sides, by both administrators and doctors, the nurse suffers doubly. She cannot maintain the image of a perfect nurse who "must feel like a girl; act like a lady; think like a man; and work like a horse".

And nurses themselves have sometimes resisted new techniques designed to employ hospital facilities more efficiently. Team nursing, arising out of the need to concentrate attention on critical cases without neglecting other patients, has not been readily adopted by all registered nurses. They are sometimes reluctant to yield traditional prerogatives to practical nurses who would thereby seem to intrude on the professional status of the registered nurse.

Nor is nursing any more the only career with a professional status open to women. Other careers, more rewarding materially and less wearing physically and spiritually, beckon to otherwise dedicated women. Our health conscious society seeks more and better medical care, but it persists in refusing to accord even minimum recognition to the material and spiritual needs of a key group of participants in the provision of that medical care.

In New York City at this moment, unsatisfactory working conditions in the public hospitals have brought the nursing situation to a state of crisis. Registered nurses, who are professionally trained people with three years of schooling, start at $5100 a year in the city's hospital—$396 less than a garbage collector receives—and can only reach a maximum salary of $6500. The city gives no credit for experience outside of its own hospitals, so every new nurse, regardless of her prior experience, starts at $5100. Working conditions are very bad. It is no wonder that the city hospitals are understaffed by a third. And now, because of a dispute over pay, 20% of the already inadequate nursing staffs have submitted their resignations, effective next week. As a result, a number of the city hospitals are asking to be allowed to limit their new admissions to emergency cases. This is what the nursing situation has come to in New York City. The payment of more adequate wages will hardly solve the entire problem, but it would be a good beginning.

The Federal government has tried to cope with one problem in the nursing situation by authorizing appropriations of $283,000,000 during the next five years for new schools, grants to graduate nurses, scholarships and loans. This will help attract more nurses, but if our needs are going to be adequately met, the public must be willing, through taxes, to establish tuition free courses in community colleges. And we must be willing, through voluntary contributions and fees, to permit higher wages so that we can hold the nurses we do attract in their profession.

The blunt fact is that some of the most attractive benefits of Medicare will be nullified by the shortage of registered nurses. Under the law, everyone over 65 is entitled to 100 free visits at home each year by nursing personnel. An additional 100 visits will be available, the bill says, to those who pay $3.00 premium. It is absolutely predictable that to many thousands of older people, both the free and the insured visits are an empty promise.

The nursing shortage will affect the nursing home services available under Medicare, too. The fact is that many existing homes—let alone those that will be built to satisfy future needs—do not have even a single registered nurse on their staffs. And the regional heart disease, cancer, and stroke centers authorized by Congress last year may well have to operate at far less than capacity owing to unavailability of nurses.

But despite the shortage of nurses, the single most acute problem for Medicare is in the inadequacy of facilities for longer term medical care. I refer primarily to nursing homes, although long-term care also includes facilities like the American Medical Center. And if all voluntary institutions had shown the initiative and the dedication of the American Medical Center, the problem would be far less pressing.

As it is, however, the picture is bleak. There are a little over half a million long-term care beds in the country, and only three fifths of these are acceptable by any minimum standards. The Federal government estimates that we need another half a million beds right now.

The shortage of nursing home facilities has repercussions all around the cycle of medical care. The patients eligible for non-existing nursing homes are too sick to live at their own homes unattended, and yet not sick enough to require acute care in a general hospital. But they do need care, they will often occupy hospital beds under Medicare, and behind them the long line will form for other patients, of all ages, who require hospital treatment.

And the quality of the nursing home care now available is appalling. By 1961, after exposé, scandal, and shock, all of the States had enacted licensing regulations. However, these regulations were for minimal provisions dealing mostly with building requirements rather than the physical and psychological needs of patients. Even today, and even in the enlightened state of New York, public authorities have called many of our nursing homes "shocking and almost medieval in their lack of respect for human dignity". One New York Health Department investigation on nursing homes turned up conditions so deplorable that the patients were ordered evacuated in 48 hours.

I have looked into these deplorable conditions. The other day, for example, I visited a privately operated nursing home where there is one nurse for the 86 patients, where a doctor visits once a month, where there is no laboratory and almost no recreation facilities. The residents patiently wait out their lives, slumped in chairs, unattended. The overcrowding is spectacular—one 16 by 20 foot room had six beds—none of them hospital beds and all of them inaccessible on three sides. And the whole building is not fireproof.

By contrast, I also visited another home the other day, this one run on a non-profit basis, this one with 15 nurses for its 500 patients and a full-time staff of 10 physicians. Here there is a full recreation program, a full range of social services, a complete physical therapy plant, a vocational rehabilitation program. A band composed of the residents playing "Seventy-six Trombones" as I walked in. There are paintings on the walls. The place is cheerful.

Four-fifths of the patients in both places are paid for by public funds. The privately run home gets a little over $12 a day per patient, and makes a profit of about $2 a day, or $700 a year per patient. The non-profit home gets nearly $16 a day in public funds for its needy patients, and loses about $2.50 a day on each patient, which it must make up from other sources. The difference is in the quality of care. And the sad thing is that about half the nursing homes in the country are like the first one that I visited.

While I have spoken mainly tonight about our medical needs as they will be swelled by Medicare, I would emphasize that adequate facilities and personnel to care for the aged are by no means our only health problem. Our prenatal and child care, for example, are shockingly inadequate for the richest nation in the world. More than ten countries in the world have lower infant mortality rates. As one writer put it, "Belgrade, which was bombed to rubble twenty years ago, has an infant mortality rate of 30 per thousand while in wealthy New York the rate is 38.1 and in Washington it is 35.2." These disparities are directly related to the quality of prenatal care. It is estimated that mental retardation could be cut in half if we adequately applied what we already know about such hazards as faulty metabolism and German measles. And child care is equally deficient. Half of our youngsters reach the age of fifteen without ever seeing a dentist. The vast majority of children are never given a simple visual test to detect a condition that had damaged the vision of 4 percent of our draftees in World War II.

The problem is not one of medical knowledge. It is one of facilities and access to facilities, and, even more basically, one of prevailing philosophy. As one doctor put it, "American medicine at its best is not available to a large proportion of the 194 million people in this country." We have grave shortages, but in addition we have as a people never quite accepted the idea that those in financial need should get care as a matter of right. The quality of care for the poor and the attitude of those who treat the poor too often reflects this almshouse attitude.

We have a responsibility as a nation to rectify these shortcomings. I am presently studying legislation on some of these matters, and I will shortly submit a bill which deals particularly with the shortage of nursing homes and the scarcity of nurses for these kinds of facilities.

This bill will, first, encourage the construction of long-term care beds through grant assistance. By these grants, the federal government would allocate, over a 10 year period, $1,800,000,000 to non-profit, voluntary organizations for the construction of facilities for 200,000 long-term care beds.

The bill will make it easier financially for the poorer States to participate, since they lag even further behind on both facilities and personnel. First priority for aid in all states will go to voluntary non-profit hospitals and voluntary non-profit nursing homes wishing to expand or replace present long-term care facilities. A high priority will also go to non-profit voluntary health organizations established by unions, and farm or fraternal groups which have established programs for their aged or infirm.

A final aspect of the bill would be $200,000,000 in research and education funds for study and development of new long-term care practices, experimental architectural nursing homes, establishment of criteria to evaluate the quality of care and the cost, and the training of nursing home directors and their staff of nurses and technicians. This training would be conducted by schools of medicine, nursing, public health and hospital administration. Funds would also be available to help these schools establish departments in long-term medical care, with the objectives of acquiring top faculty and developing training programs in a master's and where appropriate, the doctoral level.

Critical to the entire legislation will be the authority it gives to the Secretary of HEW to determine standards of construction and care and to conduct follow-up reviews of the quality of care in those institutions that avail themselves of the grant funds.

My bill, I believe, would solve the most pressing problems of nursing home care and the nursing shortage related to that care.

Victor Hugo once said, "Do you realize what progress is . . . call it tomorrow." We cannot afford to wait until tomorrow to remedy the problems I have raised with you this evening. We must care enough to act today.

Old age is something that happens to everybody, and if we are wise enough and unselfish enough and effective enough, then we can make those years a time in which to live, not just linger. If we can all develop the commitment that the American Medical Center has had, if we can all act out of the warmth that characterized Judy Holliday, I know we will do the job that has to be done.

AN EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on June 23, I made a report to the Senate concerning certain deficiencies and shortcomings in the administration, control, and auditing of the U.S.-financed commodity import program in Vietnam. My remarks were based on my observations and upon evidence gathered during a factfinding mission which I made to Vietnam in mid-May as a member of the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.

In that report to the Senate, I made several recommendations for improving our civilian economic aid programs, particularly in Vietnam. One of my recommendations called for establishment of an Executive Service Corps, patterned somewhat along the lines of the Peace Corps, which would offer recognition and incentives to stimulate more American businessmen to serve their country overseas in civilian capacities.

As I stated when I first discussed this proposal: "The U.S. Government needs to put to work the best talents and genius of American enterprise in the administration and implementation of our economic assistance programs. Such an infusion of talent would provide a real 'shot in the arm' for our aid program in such critical areas as Vietnam and, at the same time, could open the way for more meaningful cooperation between the business community and Government in the whole field of economic development."

Mr. President, in the Foreign Aid Authorization Act of 1963, the Congress provided for establishment of an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. This Committee was charged with the responsibility of coming up with recommendations for a larger role of American private enterprise in the foreign assistance field.

In July 1965, the Committee issued an excellent report, setting forth its recommendations in considerable detail and urging, in the words of its chairman, Arthur K. Watson, that the U.S. Agency for International Development—AID—"put increasing stress on its role as catalyst and energizer for private effort" in our foreign aid endeavors.

One of the Watson Committee's recommendations came close to the proposal I have made for establishment of an Executive Service Corps.

The Committee's report in 1965, stated, and I quote:

> One measure which the Committee regards as indispensable is the strengthening and extending of the present (AID) private enterprise staff, both in Washington and in the field, so that it is effectively represented throughout the administration of the aid program. The difficulty in carrying out such recommendations in the past has principally been one of recruitment: With a few notable exceptions it has been extremely difficult for AID to secure men with the appropriate background from the nongovernmental sector.
>
> We believe that business organizations, labor unions, foundations, and other organizations would be prepared to assist in the recruitment of such personnel, in a framework in which the men involved were rotated back to their respective organizations after a period of time in the service of AID. Such tours of duty would be of value not to AID alone, but also to the organizations and individuals concerned. Further, we believe that this need is particularly urgent in relation to foreign enterprise development and that recruitment of seasoned business executives with broad international experience should be given particular emphasis.
>
> Accordingly, the Committee proposed that:
>
> * * * AID expand and improve its organization both in Washington and in the principal missions abroad so that it be appropriately staffed with persons who by experience and competence are capable of acting as an effective conduit between the private sector and the official AID organization. In this connection, we urge AID to take steps to establish a basis for co-opting men from the private sector for rotation back to their permanent organization after a tour with AID.

What has been done to carry out this important recommendation by the Watson Committee?

It is clear from an AID statement inserted in the RECORD on Monday of this week—July 18—by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that, while AID has taken nominal steps to expand its private enterprise staffing, little real headway has actually been made.

AID complains—perhaps justifiably—that, "to be fully satisfactory, a system of co-opting men from the private sector should protect accumulated pension rights and other fringe benefits derived from their permanent organization." The Agency notes that "this creates difficult to resolve conflict of interest problems."

In light of AID's apparent inability to satisfy the Watson Committee recommendation, I wholeheartedly welcome the recent action of the Senate in accepting the amendment of the Senator from New York to the pending bill to create an International Private Investment Advisory Council. As the Senator explained when offering his amendment, the Council would have a statutory base as well as a mandate to see to the implementation of the Watson Committee recommendations.

Once in existence, it would be my hope that such a Council would give immediate attention to the special problems involved in co-opting men from private enterprise for service in our foreign aid programs—particularly in Vietnam. I hope the Council will carefully weigh my proposal for an Executive Service Corps which should provide for incentive, prestige, and recognition to encourage the enlistment of businessmen in the service of their country.

The Council could recommend that the President establish an Executive Service Corps on a temporary pilot basis by Executive order. Such action should then be followed by a Presidential request for legislation to authorize such a corps on a permanent basis.

President Kennedy did just that in 1961, when he created the Peace Corps on a temporary basis by Executive order. After the pilot project had demonstrated merit, the Congress enacted legislation to put the Peace Corps on a more permanent basis financed with appropriations under the Foreign Aid Act.

Mr. President, as the Watson Committee said in 1965:

> Economic development depends, above all, upon the upgrading of human resources and the improvement of institutions through which development is achieved.

I would add that efforts to upgrade and improve human resources and institutions must begin within AID itself. An Executive Service Corps, wisely planned, adequately financed and efficiently managed, would be a major step forward in this area and would add a positive and constructive new dimension to the administration of our foreign aid program.

THE PROBLEMS OF OUR PRISONS AND REHABILITATION OF PRISONERS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many of us have taken the occasion, either as Members of the Congress or as concerned citizens, to visit some of the penal institutions in this country, to meet with and discuss the problems of probation and personnel with officials involved in the administration of these programs. During the period I was permitted to serve as the Lieutenant Governor of Michigan, I made particular effort to see and better to understand the problems of our prisons and the rehabilitation efforts involved in programs of probation and parole.

At that time, it struck me forcefully that here was one area of human concern to which our country's youth could very well address themselves, that is a career devoted to the rehabilitation of criminals, especially the young who are cruelly susceptible to the despairing pattern of periodic confinement. The figures show that the younger a person is when first sent away for a crime, the more likely he is to be returned to prison. Certainly this is a discouraging statistic and in my book there can be no more rewarding work than attempting to guide a youngster back from delinquency and violence to a useful and constructive life.

I am aware there is a critical shortage in the staff people who deal with criminals, especially those concerned directly with rehabilitation efforts. Last year, the Congress took note of this serious situation by approving a bill providing funds for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, a private, nonprofit organization whose task is to provide an increased number of well-trained personnel in the field of rehabilitation of public offenders.

On June 27 and 28, the Joint Commission held a Conference of its 90 affiliated national organizations which was sent an address by the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Senator CLARK, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, was one of the chief sponsors of the Commission's funding legislation.

Unfortunately, Senator CLARK could not personally deliver the address at the June 28 luncheon of the conference because he was kept on the Senate floor as manager of the manpower development bill which was under debate at that time. However, his address was made available to the conference and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD because of the insights that it presents into this most important effort to alleviate one of the most serious problems of our time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOINT COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND TRAINING, LUNCHEON MEETING AT SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 28, 1966

This is undoubtedly the most distinguished group of correctional experts which has been assembled under one roof since June, 1964 at Arden House.

I am privileged to have this opportunity to share a few less than expert thoughts with you.

I have occasionally referred to the correctional professions as representing everything from the prison psychiatrist to the prison guard, but it is evident that that focus is too narrow.

You have quite rightly included in your membership the widest possible range of interests. The Joint Commission has enlisted the active support and cooperation of nearly every significant public and private association in the country, including, according to my quick calculations, more than half the Federal bureaucracy.

A little more than two years ago, I am told, few of you ever spoke to each other. In fact, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare doesn't often speak to the Department of Labor, and neither speak to the Office of Economic Opportunity. While that may be an exaggeration, the very fact that you have joined in an effort to draw a blueprint for the future correctional manpower and training is in itself a singularly significant event. It is significant not only for the future of correctional manpower and correctional rehabilitation. It is significant also because your approach to solving the problems of correctional manpower is one which has been too often neglected in the recent past.

There was a time when the Federal establishment thought that only it could muster the resources and talent to solve the Nation's problems. More recently, however, we have come to realize that partnership with private enterprise and state and local government is a more effective approach to National problem-solving.

I think the history of the Joint Commission and the way in which the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act developed illustrates the point.

Your efforts began, as you know, two years ago at Arden House when those of you who were most intimately concerned with correctional manpower decided to get together and do something about it.

But what you did not do at that Conference was important. You did not decide to pass the buck to the Federal Government. You asked for Federal financial help and cooperation, but you did not ask for the establishment of another Federal bureau or agency.

Quite the opposite. When I first read the Joint Commission's proposed legislation, I was struck by the fact that the bill amended the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and that the Vocational Rehabilitation Office was the proposed funding agent. The Vocational Rehabilitation Office seemed an unlikely candidate to deal with the problems of staffing our penal institutions. Why not the Office of Juvenile Delinquency or some other bureau in the Welfare Administration? Why not the Bureau of Prisons or some division of the Justice Department?

Your Executive Director, Dr. Prigmore's quite candid answer was simply that you did not want to be tied to any entrenched Federal agency and that all those agencies connected with law enforcement or criminal rehabilitation represented some particular point of view.

You didn't want the Welfare Administration telling you that social workers were more important than psychiatrists or teachers, or Justice saying that more cops on the beat would solve the problem.

That was an understandable point of view, but I still did not see the connection with vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

So some of us on the manpower subcommittee thought we had better find some correctional experts to advise the experts on the physically handicapped how to spend two million dollars studying correctional manpower. The only problem was that all the correctional experts were already on the Joint Commission, and it didn't seem quite proper to have the Joint Commission advising the Vocational Rehabilitation Office how to grant money to the Joint Commission.

Nevertheless, we wrote in a requirement that an advisory council of correctional experts be set up and I have no doubt its members are all affiliated with the Joint Commission and that you have been giving your Federal benefactors the best of advice.

Despite this anomaly and despite your Director's aversion to entrenched bureaucracy, you have maintained through your member organizations the kind of public-private partnership which is so necessary to the success of your project.

The Joint Commission's work, however, will not end three years from now when your final report is filed. It will take many more years of continuous effort before the critical shortage of qualified correctional manpower is eliminated. The partnership will have to be continued to assure that your research and recommendations result in manpower training programs, educational reform, career development in every field of endeavor concerned with correctional rehabilitation. All that no doubt will require more Federal help. And that help can come without the controls which you have so far successfully avoided, provided you maintain the spirit of cooperation which began at Arden House.

The task of the Joint Commission is one upon which it is not easy to focus. Your assignment is to deal with but one aspect of two much broader problems.

The first is the critical shortage of trained professional and subprofessional personnel in all the disciplines which are concerned with correctional rehabilitation.

With the multitude of health, education, job training, poverty and other welfare programs enacted in the past six years, it has become increasingly evident that the key to success of all our efforts lies in our ability to produce the necessary qualified manpower in the human services or "helping" professions represented here today.

We cannot hope to educate future generations without an adequate supply of teachers and school administrators.

All the money in the world will not eliminate poverty without the help of trained, dedicated, well-paid staff at the state and local level.

The elderly might as well forget medicare if we cannot provide enough doctors and nurses to fulfill their needs.

In our attempt to bring order out of chaos in our cities, we are confronted at every turn by lack of trained city planners and administrators.

There are many other examples of Federal and State programs where skilled manpower is in short supply.

Unfortunately, I think the tendency in Congress has been to deal with each such shortage on an ad hoc basis. There is seldom an education act or health bill enacted into law that does not have a provision for training the professional people to staff the program. Yet no one, so far as I am aware, has taken a comprehensive look at the whole area of human services manpower.

The Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty is going to do just that next year, if not later this year.

It is precisely the kind of study which the Joint Commission has been called upon to perform that is needed for practically every major service provided by every professional discipline represented here today.

Let me take a moment to list the areas for research set forth in the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act:

Personnel practices and current and projected personal needs;

The availability and adequacy of educational and training resources and educational opportunities;

The effectiveness of present methods of recruiting personnel; and

The extent to which personnel are utilized in the manner which makes the best use of their qualifications.

Each of these areas could, I think, profitably be examined within the context of each of your own professions and for each of the multi-disciplinary fields in which many of you are engaged.

The studies undertaken by the Joint Commission, I hope, will stimulate other assessments of skilled manpower shortages and training needs throughout the human service occupations.

I am sure most of you are acquainted with the manpower shortages in your own professions. I suspect the most difficult problem you face is that of trying to carve out from each correctional profession, enough trained people to staff the needs of correctional rehabilitation without jeopardizing someone else's pet project. How are you going to find, for example, enough social workers to staff correctional institutions and services when schools of social work ought to be graduating 12,000 more a year to fulfill the need for social workers nationwide?

The needs of your own specialties must be kept in mind as you study correctional manpower.

Correctional manpower is also but one aspect of the second broader problem of correctional rehabilitation. And it is important to distinguish the job of the Joint Commission from that of the National Crime Commission and other Federal and non-Federal groups.

Their task is to study new approaches to the prevention and treatment of crime and delinquency.

Your task is a prerequisite to the success of any program of criminal rehabilitation.

Even if there were some magic formula for changing criminal behavior, all the services in the world would be for naught without qualified people.

No matter how many modern correctional institutions are built, no matter how good the programs and services provided in those institutions, as in any human endeavor the people who direct and staff these activities are the key to their success.

Your job is a formidable one, but I am confident that you will find the solutions and point the way to successful correctional rehabilitation.

WE MUST NOT DEFACE THE NATION'S CAPITOL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong opposition to the ill-conceived proposal to spend $34 million to extend the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

While it may well be that strengthening and restoration is necessary in order to preserve the west front, I do not believe there is any justification for the extravagant and unesthetic proposal which has been advanced.

This beautiful and historic shrine of our Nation's democracy must not be destroyed in a mad rush to provide more offices, auditoriums, and restaurants. Surely the architectural restoration can be done at considerably less expense and with an eye to preserving the historic and architectural heritage of our Capitol.

To the best of my knowledge no one has ever proposed to streamline Rome's Colosseum, or build restaurant facilities in the Sistine Chapel, or add additional columns to the Parthenon. I do not want history to record the fact that only in the United States of America do questionable new facilities take precedence over architectural genius.

Because of my deep concern over the ill-considered proposal which has been made, I have joined the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] in introducing a bill to preserve the historic U.S. Capitol. This legislation provides that no work could be carried out which would alter the proportions, change the size, or modify the U.S. Capitol Building in any substantial manner unless such a project is specifically authorized by the Congress. It would also provide for a U.S. Capitol Building Commission to make a year-long study of present and anticipated future needs of the Congress with respect to the Capitol. The Commission would be directed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development of the Capitol, preserving, to the greatest extent possible, the historical integrity and proportions of the building, with particular emphasis given to preserving the existing architectural design.

Mr. President, permit me at this time to extend a deep vote of thanks also to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] who for many days now has been waging an effective battle to enlighten the American public to the absurdity of the proposed $34 million extension.

I am confident that through the efforts of millions of Americans our Nation's Capitol can be saved.

Mr. President, an excellent satirical commentary on the proposed extension written by Alfred Friendly appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that this article, as well as other articles and materials documenting the folly of the $34 million proposal, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1966]

THE WEST FRONT? ONLY A BEGINNING

(By Alfred Friendly)

As Stewart George, Architect of the Cosmos, explained it, progress began only when the principle of escalation was throughly understood. He dated the magic moment as sometime in the late sixties.

Relaxing in his office, a kind of tree-house perched high in the stockade of minarets surrounding the Taj Mahal, "Mr. Extender," as he was fondly nicknamed, told of the early troubles of his predecessors with the East and West Fronts of the Capitol. Once those brave pioneers pushed through to victory, the rest was easy, he recalled.

To be sure, he admitted, there was a terrible fight about the Parthenon. According to contemporary reports, the opposition to adding four columns to each end was tremendous, with standpatters insisting that it would give the temple a double-concave effect, like Lillian Russell cinched in at the waist. But now that the facade has been moved down the hill a bit, so that its columns are five feet below the level of the rest, no one worries about the sides.

"It was clear that the structure was crumbling—it was awfully old, you know—and they had to do *something* about it," he noted.

The history books show that extending both transepts and the apse of Notre Dame to the length of the nave, and erecting six more towers to match the two on the West Front, seemed to have stirred up another hard fight, Mr. George said.

Although the Ile de la Cite was obviously too small to accommodate the extensions, there was the most ridiculously intransigent opposition to rechanneling the Seine to its present course just north of Le Bourget airfield. It took years to overcome and might never have been bested except for the appeals to French "grandeur" by a prominent politico-military figure of the time. His name, unfortunately, has been lost in the cobwebs of history.

There was another bad moment in 1978, George conceded, when the dome of St. Sophia was lowered 20 feet. Opponents of the change pointed out that that would bring it back to the proportions of 558, when it collapsed, and that in rebuilding it, Isadore of Miletus had made it higher so that the thrust was manageable.

"Darned if it didn't collapse again," the Cosmic Architect recounted with a jolly twinkle. "The fellows who redesigned it had their heart in the right place, but they forgot the basic principle: Escalation!"

The problem was solved, as everyone knows, by abolishing the dome altogether. Today's St. Sophia, with its acres of flat roof, is now the showplace of the Middle East, surmounted by a fine golf course, chop suey restaurant, roller coaster and a charming cluster of orange and light blue Howard Johnson gazebos.

The turning point in the whole struggle, the Great Architect believes, was when the American Congress bowed to the demand of the Speaker of the House and legislated that the square on the hypotenuse of a right triangle equalled the sum of the squares on the other four sides. From there to $E=Mc^3$ was only a step.

The Elizabethan Theater in the Folger Library was quickly extended to a stadium and the mansion at Mt. Vernon was placed in its present sensational setting atop the Pan American Building. The colonnade around the Lincoln Memorial—"It was crumbling," Mr. George said—was replaced by glass brick walls, and the North and South Memorial Annexes were built.

"Yes, sir," the Architect reminisced, "great things began to happen after that. We extended every one of Shakespeare's sonnets—every last one of 'em crumbling, by the way—to 17 lines. Extended O. Henry's "Gift of the Magi" to a full-length novel. You seen The Last Supper lately? It goes around all four walls of Santa Maria della Grazie and has more Disciples than you can shake a stick at."

The strains of the Minute-and-Seventeen-Second Waltz drifted over the night air from a distant radio. The clock struck 13. The radio switched to Taps, rearranged for the 32-note scale and orchestrated for symphony, electric guitar and Dudelsachs.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1966]

WEST FRONT OPPOSITION

The Council of the Institute of Early American History and Culture has written a letter to Speaker John W. McCormack urging reconsideration of the plan to destroy the West front of the Capitol. They correctly assert that the proposed extension will "result in the destruction of all the original external architectural details which make the Capitol one of the country's historic landmarks."

The Council, membership of which includes some of the foremost historical scholars in America, acknowledge that the Capitol is not a museum but a working forum, but they describe it as a "three dimensional lesson in the history of our country."

While the scholars were appealing to the Speaker, Senator RIBICOFF appealed for an examination of the office of the Architect of the Capitol and a delay in construction until that can be completed. He rightly said the matter is deserving of the consideration of the President.

The overwhelming majority of American architects and scholars and a substantial number of Senators and House members oppose the destruction of the West front. No proponent of this costly and wasteful project has put forward a good reason why a Government beset by budgetary crisis must undertake at this juncture an un-needed unwanted, un-necessary and unwise re-modeling of the Capitol.

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1965]

A CAPITOL ATTEMPT TO DEFACE HISTORY

(By Edward P. Morgan)

After the British redcoats burned the U.S. Capitol in 1814 in the War of 1812, Congress had to move to a tavern called Blodgett's Hotel. Presumably this could have served the legislators as a permanent meeting place since, as legend has it, politicians most comfortably gather in smoke-filled hotel rooms. Blodgett's had a cloakroom too. Lobbyists traditionally contact lawmakers in cloakrooms. So everything was fine and dandy.

But then some busybody insisted on restoring the Capitol building and there has been nothing but trouble ever since. Additions here, alterations there; all very unsettling. So I, for one, simply cannot see what the fuss is all about when an ex-Congressman from Delaware named J. George Stewart steps courageously forward and starts to bury all this history under a facade of freshly cut marble.

Nobody, of course, is more eminently qualified for this delicate but heroic task than Stewart. He is not now and never has been a card-carrying architect and, as far as I know, never intends to be one. He does operate with the title of Architect of the Capitol and it was under that cover that he executed—one might even say, murdered—his most famous work, the Rayburn Building, named in travestied memory of the late Speaker of the House. Into this crypto-Fascists-style mausoleum, jestingly referred to as a Congressional Office Building, Stewart poured all of his supervisory talents and by some reports, considerably more than $100 million.

The result, naturally, was a happy combination of superlatives—the ugliest and most expensive edifice of its kind ever erected on the face of the earth. Perhaps the happiest note of all was the fact that it cost only approximately twice as much as Stewart originally said it would. With such a monument around the Great Society doesn't need urban renewal; it needs a camouflage corps.

But now, oh let joy be unconfined, we are about to be treated to another sterling Stewart contribution to the beautification of Washington. At a starting price of just $34 million—a steal, really—he is going to stick the West Front of the Capitol out a maximum of 88 feet so it can house more offices, two big auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms seating more than a thousand people and an information lobby to take care of the tourist explosion. The sheer beauty of the Stewart plan is that in one fell swoop it will destroy the Capitol's historic vestiges—the last traces of the original work of Thornton, the West Indian doctor who won the $500 first prize for the building's first design; the embellishments of Latrobe, the contributions of Bulfinch, the famous Boston architect, and the terrace with its majestic flights of steps designed by Frederick Law Olmstead. You don't hardly get a demolition job like that anymore.

Indeed, while he's at it, Stewart might well consider razing the whole structure, including his other handiwork, the East Front, which cost $22 million, the customary double of his beginning estimate. Then the space could be used for a parking lot, which Washington needs anyway and the Congress could move down the street to Union Station.

An alternative plan, which I like better, would be to let Stewart run rampant on a field of bad taste across the entire face of L'Enfant's famous city. Thus with his ravenous appetite for eating places, we could hope to see a Stewart restaurant revolving around the tip of the Washington Monument to rival the space needle in Seattle. The lethal hydroplane races could be shifted from Hains Point to the reflecting pool, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials could be converted into public rest rooms and shoe shine parlors.

Don't be so timid as to think all this is impossible. The Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, including those well-known aesthetes and city planners, Vice President HUMPHREY. Speaker MCCORMACK and Minority Leaders FORD and DIRKSEN, has already blithely gone along with Stewart's West Front job. All he needs now is money.

He figures he can easily wheedle that out of the Congress with the argument that the Front's ancient sandstone blocks are crumbling and a jet's sonar boom may bring the whole building down, dome and all. After careful study, the Fine Arts Commission reports the Capitol can be repaired, restored and its priceless architectural history preserved, all at a trifle of the cost of Stewart's folly. That would be the sensible way to do things. But thank Heaven that's not the way things are done in this crazy, wonderful town. Ask George Stewart.

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1966]

"TRAGIC DISFIGURATION" SEEN FOR CAPITOL

(By Wolf Von Eckard)

The proposed deformation of the National Capitol is an act of juvenile—or is it senile?—delinquency that the people of this country ought not tolerate.

We are growing up.

And that painful process includes a growing respect for our past. We are beginning to learn that we can not childishly tamper with natural and cultural resources.

It also includes a growing sophistication about the techniques of preserving old buildings and accommodating present and future needs for space.

J. George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol, and his consultants, have, however, not even pretended to consider them.

Ever since 1957 Stewart and his friends have been hell-bent on extending the West Front of the Capitol, not as a matter of reasoned necessity but as an act of vainglory.

They have persisted despite the late Speaker Sam Rayburn's promise in 1958: "We are not going to do anything with the west end."

If the old sandstone walls are indeed crumbling, as Stewart claims, they can be easily shored up for far less than $34 million.

If the Capitol needs more space now, how much more space will it need 20, 30 or 50 years hence? Are we going to keep puffing out the Capitol into an utterly shapeless monster?

For it is simply not true, as is claimed, that the marble desecration of the West Front would "maintain the present configuration of the Capitol."

In contrast to earlier, even worse plans, the original width of the central portico, will, to be sure be maintained.

But the immense, 88-foot extension of the center wings of the building turn this alleged non-configuration into a tragic disfiguration.

Add to this the silly and unnecessary changes in the terrace with their great flight of steps designed by Frederick Law Olmsted and a nole structure is irreparably destroyed. This is assassination.

There is, however, little point in discussing the details of the plans. The Capitol has grown with our history. On its West Front there is still visible evidence of the original work of Thornton, Latrobe and Bulfinch. There are still portions of first Capitol, which the British burned in 1812.

The very idea of burying these 150 years of history in Stewart's marble mausoleum is repugnant.

Anyone, let alone any legislator, who would propose to thus "remodel" the House of Parliament in London or the Arc de Triomphe in Paris would be laughed out of town.

What this country now needs is a National Committee to Save Our Capitol!

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1966.
Re West Front of the Capitol.
Hon. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: The American Institute of Architects is deeply concerned that proposals for the extension of the West Front have been approved by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

We are unalterably opposed to this extension. We are cognizant that the facilities of Congress must grow with the Nation and the increased demands upon the Congress. However, it is patently obvious that this *one* building cannot be continually extended and expanded until it is shapeless and functionally impractical. At some time this construction must stop. We urge that it be now, while the quality and uniqueness of the creativity of Thornton, Bulfinch, and Olmsted still remain as examples of our national heritage.

The AIA recognizes the state of disrepair and structural weakness that exists and that the West Front must be strengthened. This can be done and the West Front can either be restored or rebuilt without destroying the beauty of proportion and detail that comprise the Capitol's present aesthetic appearance.

We ask that you oppose this extension, and urge your support of comprehensive planning for the future needs of Capitol Hill so that these needs can be planned and provided with the advice of an impartial, professional group constituted to render such service to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
MORRIS KETCHUM, Jr.,
President.

OFFICERS ATTACKED FOR DOING THEIR DUTY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a news story appeared in today's Washington Post carrying the headline, "Two Policemen Injured in Fight; Crowd of 300 Is Dispersed." I ask unanimous consent that the item be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TWO POLICEMEN INJURED IN FIGHT; CROWD OF 300 IS DISPERSED

Two Thirteenth Precinct officers were attacked with bottles and fists yesterday during their arrest of a man who allegedly shouted an obscenity from the corner of 14th and T Streets nw.

Pvt. Eugene A. Fitzsimmons, 29, required ten stitches for a scalp cut at the Washington Hospital Center and Pvt. Robert E. Freto, 29, was treated for leg cuts.

The assault on the officers resulted in their radioing a "policemen in trouble" call that drew at least ten cars of white policemen to the scene. The sirens and flashing red lights attracted more than 300 Negroes, police estimated.

The precinct stationhouse gave this account of the incident:

Fitzsimmons, a plainclothesman with the Vice Squad, was cruising the area in an unmarked car with Freto about 3:15 a.m.

A man who recognized Fitzsimmons shouted at him, using profane language, and Fitzsimmons decided to make a disorderly conduct arrest.

As he took the man into custody, the man and a companion struck Fitzsimmons and Freto while a bystander called the officers names.

One of the first policemen to respond to the radio call was Insp. Otto P. Fuss, acting chief, who immediately sent most of the arriving officers away.

When about nine policemen remained three men were arrested. Some 50 Negroes followed them to the stationhouse, shouting, "This is our street."

A Negro patrolman, Pvt. Charles C. Henson, talked to the throng and persuaded them to disperse.

Charged with assault and disorderly conduct were Harvey Cooper, 24, of 1725 Willard st. nw.; Clifton Carey, 22, of 1763 Willard, and Walter Ferguson, 24, of the 500 block of 7th Street ne.

They were held on $1000 bond each for a preliminary hearing July 29 in the Court of General Sessions.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this week, July 17–23, is the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week. It is at this time that we should renew and strengthen our efforts to aid those repressed countries, so long contained behind the iron curtain's wall of silence.

Too long the nine countries made captive by the U.S.S.R.-Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania have been robbed of their right of self-determination. Since World War II we have fought intensely to permit these nations and all oppressed countries to live in freedom. But the fact is that they are not free. Their Communist masters have controlled them and their lives. Religious, press, speech, assembly, and travel rights are vitually nonexistant. These years of silence and censorship must be broken.

Our goal should be the pursuit of independence for these captive nations. We must not overlook these nations which in our concern for their totalitarian taskmasters are often accepted as mere appendages of an unfortunate situation of the cold war.

Almost 1 billion people are victims of the plight of totalitarianism. We, as Americans, with our bountiful good fortune of living in a free country where all may live and act as they please must extend a hand to these aspiring peoples of captive nations. It is an obligation not to be shirked or ignored. To forget that there are individuals in this world living under the heavy hand of a dictatorial regime, suppressed in all their basic rights, is to deny our own American heritage.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to speak today at this occasion of Captive Nations Week. Through this commemoration, we are able to signal support to our friends behind both the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We are able to tell them that they are not forgotten, nor is their cause lost.

A FAIR SHAKE FOR THE FARMER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, editorial comment in the Nebraska press in recent weeks reflects the growing resentment by

America's farmers of the policies of the Johnson-Freeman administration.

Perhaps "resentment" is too mild a word. Glenn Buck, the highly respected publisher of one of Nebraska's leading farm publications, the Nebraska Farmer, puts it more emphatically:

> Farmers and ranchers of this central western region are fighting mad at the Johnson Administration. This is not an expression of opinion but simply a report of my observations these past several months.

It should be noted, Mr. President, that Mr. Buck is not a rabid partisan, eager to make political capital for one side or the other. He writes:

> When Lyndon Johnson first became President, there were many comments from farm people—Republicans and Democrats—to the effect that here was the first President in our times who really knew agriculture. At last we would get fair treatment, many thought.

But, as Mr. Buck observes, the opposite has been true. He recalls the administration action on hide exports which cut the price of cattle about $3 a head, the Defense Department's 50-percent reduction in pork purchases, at the urging of Secretary Freeman, Mr. Freeman's "pleasure" at announcing lower farm prices and the President's own appearance on national television urging housewives to thwart inflation by buying cheaper cuts of meat.

Expressions similar to those of the Nebraska Farmer have appeared in dozens of Nebraska papers, as indeed, they have throughout rural America.

FARMER DOES NOT SHARE PROSPERITY

The plain fact is, Mr. President, that while the Nation generally enjoys a high period of economic well-being, the farmer does not. Even Secretary Freeman concedes that the per capita income of farm families is only two-thirds that of nonfarm families.

Put another way, the parity ratio for June of this year lagged at 79, unchanged over the past 3 months and down from 86 in June of 1956—a decade ago.

This is not surprising when the details of the farm income picture are examined.

Cattle prices have not gained more than a few pennies per pound for the past 10 years. The price of choice steers in Chicago in 1956 was 22 cents a pound. Now it is 25 cents. Cattlemen have been able to survive only because they have scrambled for efficiency or foregone returns on their investment. At the time the flood of administration-sponsored foreign imports threatened to wreck the cattle market completely, many stockmen suffered financial losses from which they are still recovering.

The same picture is true in other commodities. Ten years ago, a bushel of corn brought $1.42, or 80 percent of parity. Today the price is $1.19, down to 75 percent of parity. The cash price of wheat in 1956 to the farmer was at 80 percent of parity at $1.93; today, it is $1.59—only 62 percent of parity.

With some exceptions, the picture is the same throughout the whole range of agricultural products. The farmer is still getting approximately the same number of dollars or less for his product now that he did 10 years ago.

PROSPERITY OF OTHERS

But what has happened elsewhere in the economy? A steelworker in Pittsburgh in 1956 received an average weekly wage of $101.25. Today it is $140.82, up 39 percent. A carpenter in San Francisco, 10 years ago, had an average hourly wage of $3 plus 10 cents in fringe benefits. Today, he makes $4.87½, plus 70 cents in fringe benefits. Even the average permanent employee in Mr. Freeman's own Department of Agriculture received $5,020 a year in 1956 and, under the terms of the bill the President has just signed, will receive $8,350.

No one begrudges these higher wages, but while all about him the farmer sees increased prosperity, he has been held back, barred from winning his fair share of the booming economic gains.

Mr. Freeman's apologists plead that he is doing all he can to help the farmer. This simply does not square with the facts.

First of all, he could stop doing some of the things he is now doing, like dumping Government-held grains in order to "stabilize" prices. "Stabilize," Mr. President, is Mr. Freeman's word for "lower."

On the affirmative side, as the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has pointed out, there are several provisions in the law permitting the Secretary to increase price supports. One permits him to take such action if, after public hearings, he finds this is necessary to protect shortages and assure supplies which are adequate to protect the national welfare and security. This applies to both certificate and noncertificate wheat. There are other provisions permitting him to provide a higher blended price support.

In other words, Mr. President, by a stroke of his pen, Mr. Freeman could undertake actions to improve the economic lot of the farmer, just as by a stroke of the pen the President granted a pay raise to Mr. Freeman's employees, and all other Federal employees, on July 18, by signing the pay-raise bill.

FARMER IS NOT THE CAUSE OF INFLATION

The question then must be asked, Why does he not?

The reason is that this administration has some strange notion that it can combat the worrisome inflation which its reckless spending policies have spawned by holding down on farm prices and thus, on food prices. Politically, this is felt by the administration to be the "smart" thing to do. After all, there are a lot more "consumers" than there are farmers and the latter's political muscle has been atrophying for some time, anyway.

This, Mr. President, is plain nonsense. First of all, there is no such thing in America as a class of consumers. We are all consumers, including the farmer who, because he lacks the income to buy all the things he needs, is not fulfilling his potential toward strengthening the economy.

The Pittsburgh steelworker of whom I spoke a moment ago might well produce steel for a farm tractor. Unless the farmer is able to buy the tractor, the steelworker's job is jeopardized.

The Johnson administration with all its handwriting on behalf of this nebulous "consumer" seems to forget, or never realized, that while the American housewife is a keen shopper and will hunt for a bargain, she does not want it at the expense of a man ill-paid for his labors. She does not want a dress, no matter how cheap, made with sweatshop labor. We have passed the sweatshop era in this country.

We have also passed the era where men worked long hours each day under the ground in unsafe mines and with inadequate ventilation for company-dictated wages.

We have passed the era where children must work to meet the family budget.

We have come a long way in improving the lot of the worker—but we have made much less progress in improving the lot of the man who makes his living from the soil.

The equivalent of sweatshop conditions still exist on the farm and that, Mr. President is too high a price to pay merely to provide lower prices to the consumer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial by Mr. Buck from the July issue of the Nebraska Farmer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FREE CHOICE

(By Glenn Buck)

Farmers and ranchers of this central western region are fighting mad at the Johnson administration. This is not an expression of opinion but simply a report of my observations these past several months.

When Lyndon Johnson first became president, there were many comments from farm people—Republicans and Democrats—to the effect that here was the first President in our times whc really knew agriculture. At last we would get fair treatment, many thought.

What, then, makes farmers and ranchers fighting mad at the Johnson administration now? First, there was a gradual loss of confidence by farm people as well as all other Americans because of the Viet Nam mess. Not only is there deep and serious concern about the loss of lives of American boys every day, but there is puzzlement about what our objectives really are in that far away land. People are wondering about a war involving hundreds of thousands of our boys and there is the small matter of a cost to us taxpayers of some 30 million dollars per day.

Also, there is quite a disenchantment with the entire Great Society. The Poverty program is developing quite a bad odor, as are other factors in the program.

All of these things made agricultural people and other Americans begin to lose faith in the Johnson administration, but the fighting mad stage of farmers came about principally because of four events. First was the Department of Commerce ruling relative to hide exports which is reported to have reduced the price of cattle to the tune of about $3 per head and benefited no one except the manufacturers of leather products who gained in profits.

Then came the Secretary of Defense with an order directing the Government to cease pork purchases because prices were too high. The price of hogs declined $5 or so per 100 pounds in a week.

No one who depends upon agriculture for his livelihood will forget Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's nationally broadcast statements to the effect that he was pleased to announce that hog and cattle prices had ceased to rise and would be declining. (Why shouldn't they be declining with all of the tremendous pressure of the United States government pushing them in that direction?)

No doubt the greatest factor in the farm people being fighting mad at the Johnson administration resulted from a public appearance of the President himself. When he appeared on the national networks and urged housewives of the country to help stop inflation by buying the cheaper cuts of meat, that was the end of the line for many who live on the land. The inference was that agricultural prices were causing inflation. Farmers and ranchers who are getting no higher prices for their products than they received 15 years ago are conscious of the fact that every thing they buy has doubled in price. They know well that the only segment of our economy which is not inflated is agriculture. Labor, which includes many more votes than agriculture and has doubled its wages, has not been criticized by the President or his aides.

The result of all of this will be the defeat next fall of many good Democrats who are running for Congress and lesser offices in the agricultural country.

TROUBLE IN THE FHA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article by Frederic Sherman, entitled "Trouble: A Permanent FHA Tenant?" which appeared in a recent issue of the Miami Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Trouble: A Permanent FHA Tenant?

(By Frederic Sherman)

If you were to choose a theme song for the Federal Housing Administration, a likely candidate is "Nobody knows the trouble I've seen."

The once-proud federal agency, created to meet the nation's critical housing needs three decades ago, has been battered and bloodied by a post-war cycle of foreclosures. One man trying to reform the FHA programs is Sen. John J. Williams, Republican of Delaware, who hates to see the taxpayer's money wasted.

Sen. Williams is a careful man with figures. He has counted up the FHA inventory of bankrupt properties valued at more than $1 billion. This inventory includes 63,114 apartment units in the amount of $589 million and 44,580 homes in the amount of $512 million.

Here in South Florida, the FHA director inherited a first-class mess when he took over the job. Billy Wilcox has struggled to keep his own reputation from being damaged by debris from collapsing subdivisions and bankrupt apartment houses.

The Miami foreclosure record has justified a virtual freeze on the Section 207 rental housing and the Section 213 cooperative program. Home builders are under a rein on mortgage commitments and credit reports are given close scrutiny.

But now Director Wilcox has a new problem with the Section 221d-3 program that gives a developer mortgage money subsidized by the taxpayer in exchange for providing nice housing for those who can't afford it.

The mortgage money is subsidized to enable a developer to offer apartments 28 percent below the normal market rentals. As the law reads, "This section is designed to assist private industry in providing housing for low and moderate income families and families displaced from urban renewal areas or as a result of government action."

There are specific guidelines established for eligibility: income, age and number of persons living in a unit.

There are only two Section 221d-3 apartment projects in Miami. Both were opened this year.

Both have already been found in violation of the federal regulations on tenant eligibility. As far as known, no person displaced by urban renewal or the expressway program is living in either one of the apartment houses.

Park Tower at NW 2nd St. near the Miami River is owned by J. I. Kislak, the mortgage banker, and Martin Fine, the attorney and chairman of the Miami Housing Authority. It is a 13-story building with 145 apartments.

FHA Director Wilcox said his own investigators made an initial check and discovered that 39 of the apartments were rented to persons who do not qualify. In 23 violations, the tenants make too much money to be eligible.

The other project is the West Flagler Apartments at 39th Ave. The owners are Harry Markowitz and Morris Lomaskin, builders of rental property in the central Negro district and the northwest section. The West Flagler Apartments is a three-story building that has crowded about 110 units on less than two acres.

The FHA probe has turned up 16 ineligible families and is continuing.

What happens now? Director Wilcox said the violations have been reported to Washington. He says also that he is doing more than the normal spot checking of tenants because Washington has told him that he is responsible for seeing that subsidized mortgage program works as Congress intended.

For the benefit of the taxpayers, the owners of the two apartment projects have been ordered to pay to FHA the 28 percent difference between the subsidized rentals and the open market price. This is a lump sum for past months and will continue monthly until the tenants are evicted.

Wilcox is asking Washington for instructions on the status of the ineligible tenants. Are their leases to be honored even though they violate federal law? One woman installed wall-to-wall carpeting. Yet the application she filled out makes it plain she is not allowed to enjoy a subsidized rental.

Why was she allowed to move in? Is she to be charged with violation of federal regulations along with the owners?

Home builder groups and the real estate lobby argued for rent subsidies as a better alternative to public housing. But the Public Housing Administration has a proven record of tenant certification and the program has competently done the job of providing decent housing for those who can't afford it and moving them out into the private housing market as their income climbs.

What is already happening with the subsidized mortgage program under FHA raises a question of how many investigators FHA will need when President Johnson gets his direct rent subsidy program cranked up.

LAUSCHE SCORES DOUGLAS MARRIAGE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last Sunday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] delivered an excellent address at the dedication of the New Bethany Lutheran Village at Dayton, Ohio, in which he calls attention to the manner in which a member of our highest court flouts the dignity of the American home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Flouts Dignity of Home

(By Doug Walker)

Sen. Frank J. Lausche (D-O.) told a Dayton audience yesterday that U.S. supreme court Justice William O. Douglas is "flouting the dignity of the home."

Without mentioning Douglas by name, Lausche told a sundrenched crowd at the dedication of new facilities at Bethany Lutheran Village that "it is frightening to observe the conduct of one of the men on our supreme tribunal."

The grey-haired Lausche contrasted what he said were signs of moral deterioration to the dedication of a $2.1 million project at the church's old people's home.

The 67-year-old Douglas took a 23-year-old bride Friday, his fourth. His third wife, 26-year-old Jean C. Martin, divorced him after 2½ years of marriage.

Lausche cited the pioneer spirit, then touched on the supreme court judge, morals of youth, obscene pictures, drinking orgies, persons "who say there is no God" and public officials who debauch their office.

"This home for the aged on this hillside (6451 Far Hills Ave.) is the creation of lofty, spiritual-minded individuals who hope to live in accord with decency and justice," the senator said.

After the speech, Lausche declined to elaborate on his feelings about Douglas. "I've made my speech," he said, but added that projects like Bethany Village are the "reflection of the true spirit of our people."

But the popular Democrat had many supporters in the crowd.

Robert Kline, Republican candidate for county commissioner, approached him after his speech and said, "I enjoyed your speech, keep up the good work."

U.S. Rep. Rodney M. Love (D-Dayton) said of Lausche's statement, "I agree. Having been a judge myself and knowing that Lausche has been a judge, I couldn't agree with him more."

"People have problems," he said, "but this goes too far."

Love's opponent, State Senator Charles W. Whalen was also in Lausche's corner. "I have the same feeling," he asserted. "It's unbecoming a member of the court. Everyone has a right to live his own life, but in public life you have an added responsibility."

State Rep. Clara Weisenborn, a Republican candidate for the state Senate and a member of the choir at the program, said that "it's his (Douglas') business, but it reflects very badly. I think it sets a bad example for the youth of our country."

ABUSES OVER EXISTING FHA POLICIES IN APPROVING MORTGAGES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have been calling attention to abuses that have developed over the existing policies of the Federal Housing Administration in approving mortgages, ofttimes in excess of actual expenditures and ofttimes with sponsors who had a previous record of bad credit payments not only with the FHA but with other Government agencies. I suggested that the FHA, as a lending agency of the Government, have a master file of the names of all previous borrowers who had defaulted on Government loans in any area of the country and that all applicants or sponsors of the new project be checked against this master list to determine their previous records. I advocated a similar policy being adopted by every other agency of the Government making or guaranteeing loans and that such master lists of poor credit risks be interchangeable and the information available to all such agencies of the Government.

I am glad to report that on June 28, 1966, the Federal Housing Administration issued a new regulation, MF-80, in which it announced that in the future in order to provide a central source of information on participants in multifamily and land development projects all principals in any such FHA project must submit to the FHA a report fully disclosing their past experiences in FHA multifamily and land development programs as well as their interests in the proposed venture.

Under this procedure each principal will be required to list every FHA-insured multifamily or title X project in which he has been or is involved, identifying the name, location, FHA case number, and so forth. The principals will also be required to indicate whether any project in which they have been involved heretofore has been in default or received mortgage relief.

As a critic of the past policies of the Federal Housing Administration I now compliment Mr. Brownstein upon the adoption of this far-reaching proposal, but I am suggesting one additional requirement to be added to this list; and that is, that the principals signing these applications also list similar information as to their experiences with any other Government lending agencies. I recommend that a similar policy be adopted by the Small Business Administration and all other lending agencies of the Government.

It should be noted that this is the second step which the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration has taken in the past few weeks to tighten up the practices of this agency. The first was the recent issuance of a regulation requiring the developer to place in escrow all funds received as downpayments on homes or apartments until such time as title is transferred to the buyer. This was an important decision, and it protects the home buyers who were making these downpayments against loss in case of failure of the builder or promoter of the project.

Upon the issuance of both of these new regulations I compliment the Commissioner, but it should be emphasized that these regulations alone will not correct all of the abuses that have heretofore been found. For example, when an individual buys a home the man and his wife must both sign the mortgage, pledging all of their assets, future earnings, et cetera, toward the payment thereof. As a contrast, when a promoter or builder sponsors a multimillion-dollar multifamily project he can form a separate corporate entity for each project in which he is identified, and none of his personal assets are involved or pledged toward the repayment of such loans. In fact, with builder's fees, attorney's fees, and promoter's profits on overappraised land he ofttimes can withdraw a substantial windfall profit from the mortgage proceeds. A builder with three to five projects can keep the profitable projects and default on the unprofitable ones with the Government assuming all the risk and taking all the loss.

I recommend that the following additional rules be adopted:

First. Promoters of multifamily projects obtaining these Government loans or Government guarantees on the mortgages should not have a mortgage approved in excess of 90 percent of actual cash investment—not appraised valuation which can readily be inflated.

Second. The sponsor should also be required to endorse these mortgages pledging their individual assets toward the repayment thereof in the same manner as is presently required of the single homeowner.

Third. No multifamily project should be approved in any area where existing vacancy rates show such venture not to be economically feasible. The present practice of subsidizing overbuilding is bankrupting the private building industry in addition to resulting in heavy losses to the Government.

The Federal Housing Administration was first established by the Congress for the noble objective of aiding the individual families to obtain homes or apartments at reasonable interest rates on mortgage terms, but it has departed far from that original goal. Congress has a responsibility to move it back on the proper track.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the regulation, No. MF-80, issued by the Federal Housing Administration under date of June 28, 1966, along with a copy of Commissioner Brownstein's letter to all approved mortgagees under the same date.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

To: Insuring Office Directors, Multifamily Housing Representatives.

Subject: Implementation of FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate.

Series and Series No.: MF-80.

Control No.: F-1155.

Date: June 28, 1966.

In order to provide a central source of information on participants in multifamily and land development projects, FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, has been developed. Use of the form will eventually produce readily accessible historical data identifying those who have been successful in previous ventures, those who may be over-extending themselves by a multiplicity of ventures, and those whose past experience is unsatisfactory. Such information will be particularly useful in instances where approval of a new venture should be accompanied or preceded by corrective action on an existing project involving the same participants. Although an interleaved carbon, snap-out form is being prepared, the single page certificate, a sample copy of which is attached, is being placed into effect immediately upon receipt of this letter.

All principals in any multifamily or land development (Title X) proposal submitted to the FHA will be required to complete FHA Form 2530, fully disclosing their past experience in FHA multifamily and land development programs, as well as their interest in the proposed venture. Each principal, as defined in the certificate, must list every FHA-insured multifamily or Title X project in which he has been, or is, involved; identifying the name, location, FHA case number and the nature of the principal's interest. The principal must also indicate, by an asterisk in the appropriate column, whether any project has been in default or received mortgage relief, as those terms are defined in the certificate. If any project listed has been in default or under mortgage relief, the involved principal must prepare and attach to the certificate a signed explanation of the circumstances of each such default or relief. Each packager or consultant signing a certificate must attach a signed statement disclosing the type of services to be rendered in the new proposal, as well as the fee to be received.

If a particular principal has previously filed a certificate with an FHA insuring office, a completely new listing of past experience is not necessary. The applicant need only identify, on the face of the new certificate, the date and place where previously filed. Any additions to, or changes in the status of, projects previously listed, must be reported on any new certificate.

When signing the certificate, each principal must enter his Social Security Number (Employer's Identification Number, provided by the Internal Revenue Service, if the principal is a corporation). These numbers will be used to place the information provided into our automatic data system.

When the snap-out form is printed, it will provide an original and 4 copies with a cover sheet of instructions. Until such time, however, we will require the preparation and submission of an original and 3 signed copies with each 2012 (3550 where proposal is under Title X) filed with an insuring office. Upon receipt by the office, the original certificate is filed in the project file; the first copy forwarded to the Assistant Commissioner-Comptroller, Attn: Data Processing Operations Section; the second copy, together with attached statements, to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, and the last copy to the Multifamily Housing Representative. Thereafter, format letters B and C (B-X and C-X for Title X) or commitments to insure may not be issued until authorization has been received from the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations. Processing, however, may proceed as far as possible. If format letter A is issued or the request for preapplication analysis withdrawn, prior to receiving a reply from the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, he should be so notified immediately. It is important that these steps be taken expeditiously so as to avoid delays in the processing of proposed projects.

The following procedures are effective upon receipt of this letter:

1. *Requests for Preapplication Analysis*—All Forms 2012 (3550 if Title X) must be accompanied by a properly completed Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate. Any request not accompanied by a certificate will be returned to the sponsor as on incomplete submission.

Upon receipt of a request for preapplication analysis, together with Form 2530, the first copy of the certificate is transmitted to the Assistant Commissioner-Comptroller, Attn: Data Processing Operations Section, the second copy and any statements submitted by the principals are transmitted to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, together with a description of the proposal and any pertinent information regarding the principals which the Director may have.

Analysis may then proceed, but format letter B or B-X may not be issued without written authorization by the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations.

2. *Cases Now in Office on Which Commitments Have Not Been Issued*—Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, must be obtained immediately from all principals involved in any multifamily or

Title X proposal now being considered where a commitment has not yet been issued. Format letter B or C (B–X or C–X if Title X), or a commitment to insure, cannot be issued in any case under consideration until receipt of the required certificate and authorization by the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations, as in No. 1 above.

3. *Multifamily Housing Representatives*—Immediately upon receipt of their copy of Form 2530, the Multifamily Housing Representatives will inform the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations of any information they may have regarding the previous operations of any principal listed on the certificate.

Procedures for making an unsatisfactory risk determination or taking a debarment action under Section 512 remain in effect and should be utilized wherever warranted. Proposals involving principals appearing on the URD or debarment list will be rejected by the insuring office without referral to the Associate Deputy Commissioner for Operations.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL
HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1966.

To: All approved mortgagees.

Subject: Implementation of FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate.

In order to provide a central source of information on participants in multifamily and land development projects, FHA Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, has been developed. Use of the form will eventually produce readily accessible historical data identifying those who have been successful in previous ventures, those who may be over-extending themselves by a multiplicity of ventures, and those whose past experience is unsatisfactory. Such information will be particularly useful in instances where approval of a new venture should be accompanied or preceded by corrective action on an existing project involving the same participants. Although an interleaved carbon, snap-out form is being prepared, the single page certificate, a sample copy of which is attached, is being placed into effect immediately upon receipt of this letter.

All principals in any multifamily or land development (Title X) proposal submitted to the FHA will be required to complete FHA Form 2530 fully disclosing their past experience in FHA multifamily and land development programs, as well as their interest in the proposed venture. Each principal, as defined in the certificate, must list every FHA insured multifamily or Title X project in which he has been, or is, involved; identifying the name, location, FHA case number and the nature of his interest. Each principal must also indicate, by an asterisk in the appropriate column, whether any project has been in default or received mortgage relief, as those terms are defined in the certificate. If any project listed has been in default or under mortgage relief, the involved principal must prepare and attach to the certificate a signed explanation of the circumstances of each such default or relief. Each packager or consultant signing a certificate must attach a signed statement disclosing the type of services to be rendered in the new proposal as well as the fee to be received.

If a particular principal has previously filed a certificate with an FHA insuring office, a completely new listing of past experience is not necessary. The applicant need only identify, on the face of the certificate, the date and place where previously filed. Any additions to, or changes in the status of, projects previously listed, must be reported on any new certificate.

When signing the certificate, each principal must enter his Social Security Number (Employer's Identification Number, provided by the Internal Revenue Service, if the principal is a corporation). These numbers will be used to place the information provided into our automatic data system.

When the snap-out form is printed, it will provide an original and 4 copies with a cover sheet of instructions. Until such time, however, we will require the preparation and submission of an original and 3 signed copies with each 2012 (3550 where proposal is under Title X) filed with an insuring office.

All Forms 2012 (3550 if Title X) must be accompanied by a properly completed Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate. Any request not accompanied by a certificate will be returned to the sponsor as an incomplete submission.

Form 2530, Previous Multifamily Participation Certificate, must be obtained immediately from all principals involved in any multifamily or Title X proposal now being considered.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Assistant Secretary-Commissioner.

[FHA Form No. 2530]

(Form Approved, Budget Bureau
No. 63–R1061.2)

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

PREVIOUS MULTIFAMILY PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATE

(Submit Original and Three Copies to FHA Insuring Office)

The purpose of this certificate is to provide FHA with a full disclosure of past multifamily experience of all principals involved in the proposal so that FHA may determine the feasibility of considering the proposal involving these principals. Any doubts concerning applicability should be resolved by a full disclosure of all previous participation.

FHA Insuring Office ------------------------
Case Number ------------------------
Proposed Project Name------------------------
Location ------------------------

The undersigned request consideration of a multifamily housing or Title X land development proposal (identified above) to be financed with a mortgage insured under the National Housing Act. The undersigned, individually and collectively, represent that to the best of their information and belief they are the sole "Principals" in the project and they have not had any "Interest", by way of financial interest, employment, or otherwise, in an FHA-insured multifamily or land development project, except as shown below. The undersigned agree that any change of the "Principals" listed herein, or additions thereto, will be reported to FHA and they will inform and advise new "Principals" of the requirement to file a similar certificate with the appropriate FHA insuring office.

DEFINITIONS

The term "Principals" includes, but is not limited to, corporations, partnerships, joint ventures, general contractors, sponsors, "packagers," or "consultants." It also includes architects and attorneys who have any interest in the project other than the normal, "arms-length" fee arrangement for professional services to be rendered, other than as a "packager" or "consultant", and stockholders having more than 10% financial interest in the proposed project.

The terms "Packagers" and "Consultants" mean a person or firm, including attorneys, engaged to furnish advisory services in connection with the financing, construction or operation of a multifamily project, including, but not limited to, the selection and negotiation of contracts with a general contractor, architect, attorney or managing agent, securing financing and meeting FHA requirements.

The term "Interest" is not limited to a financial interest in the sense of profits, dividends, fees, and legal guarantees, but also includes nonfinancial interests such as a pledge of support, not constituting a legal or financial obligation, given by a parent organization to its member groups or a pledge of other nonfinancial support designed to convince the FHA that a proposal will be feasible.

The term "Default" includes any FHA-insured mortgage transaction which is or has been in breach of a regulatory agreement or delinquent for failure to meet required mortgage payments or, which has resulted in assignment of a mortgage to the FHA, foreclosure of a mortgage or a deed in lieu of foreclosure.

The term "Mortgage Relief" includes any FHA insured mortgage transaction which involved a modification of the mortgage, forbearance agreement or other similar relief.

Previous Project: Name & Location-------
FHA No. ------------------------
Name of Principal------------------------
Type of Interest------------------------
Default ------------------------
Mortgage Relief------------------------

(*With respect to each listed project which resulted in "Mortgage Relief" or "Default," as identified above by an Asterisk in the appropriate column, the interested principal must attach a signed statement explaining the relief or default. "Packagers" and "Consultants" must attach a signed statement describing the services they have rendered or will render in the proposed transaction and stating their fee. They must also include a statement that they have not and will not receive any fee or other compensation, direct or indirect, from any party connected with the proposed project, except as reported.*)

		EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NO. OR SOCIAL SECURITY NO.
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐
Date	Signature and interest in proposed project	☐☐☐ ☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

WARNING: Section 1010 of Title 18, U.S.C., "Federal Housing Administration transactions," provides: "Whoever, for the purposes of * * * influencing in any way the action of such Administration * * * makes, passes, utters, or publishes any statement, knowing the same to be false * * * shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? There being no further morning business, morning business is closed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. I have at the desk the amendment which is the pending business before the Senate, relating to military juntas. I have agreed with the manager of the bill and with the leadership to withdraw that amendment and to offer another in its place. I think I have the right to withdraw my amendment and submit another in its place.

For that reason, I withdraw the amendment which I have at the desk and ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of morning business——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator cannot withdraw his amendment at this time because the unfinished business has not been laid before the Senate.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I yield for the purpose of having the unfinished business laid before the Senate, as soon as the manager of the bill is ready.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 680

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President I withdraw the pending amendment and ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the morning business and the disposition of whatever may be the pending amendment before the Senate, if any, I be recognized in order to call up the amendment which I now send to the desk.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment is withdrawn. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I ask that the amendment be printed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ADMINISTRATION RIGHT TO RESIST TAX INCREASE

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, on Monday the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I were about to engage in a colloquy, and we were unable to do so because it was necessary to move forward on this foreign assistance bill.

Since that time, we have cleared an agreement with the majority leader—and I have talked to the minority leader about it this morning, as well as to the manager of the foreign aid bill, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—to enable us to engage in a short colloquy now.

However, I understand that my good friend, the Senator from New York, must leave the floor because he has a commitment he must keep.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I shall proceed with my statement, but I understand why the Senator cannot be present.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I yield.

Mr. **JAVITS**. In the first place, I thank the Senator for his customary courtesy, and I appreciate the position the Senator proposes to take. I shall say just a word about that, and explain briefly my own position.

I think we face an extremely serious situation, both in the country and in the world; in the country, because we can avoid neither the inflationary impact of taking roughly $15 billion out of the civilian economy for the Vietnam struggle, nor other influences here which have emphasized monetary as against fiscal policy as a way in which to deal with the overheating of the economy, which in my judgment have resulted in high interest rates and in a tight money situation.

I submit that that tight money situation is very serious. I shall state my case, so that, while the Senator may speak the other way, at least both points of view will be of record.

The seriousness of the tight money situation is in its cost to the normal consumer, especially in such fields as homebuilding, and to small business. A second aspect of it is the fact that we have essentially entrusted to the banks the selectivity of where credit should go; and they are making their own decisions, one would assume not on the basis, necessarily, of the national interest—although I am sure they are as patriotic as anybody else—but on the basis of what is the prime credit.

If one talks to them, they will say they are distributing credit pretty equitably. They say the small man, the small business, the homeowner, and so forth receive a fair break.

But as we all recognize, when credit is administered by a bank, whose job is to earn interest on money and to get its money back, it does not have the same connotations we would put on it if we were doing it here as the Government, or as the U.S. Senate.

The administration's most recent response to the problem of rising interest rates has been to suggest that the House Banking and Currency Committee begin work on legislation to limit temporarily the amount of interest which commercial banks and other financial institutions can pay on certain types of deposits. Should Congress act on this recommendation, it would be like clamping the lid on a boiling pot without turning down the heat. If study by appropriate congressional committees indicates, however, that this would be an appropriate action to take, it is my view that this action must be coupled with basic fiscal action to moderate the demand for credit, which is one basis of our high interest structure.

Credit demand for marginal projects can be reduced by a more restrictive fiscal policy. Improving the mix between fiscal policy and monetary policy would result in reducing the overall level of demand but at a lower structure of interest rates than in the present situation where emphasis is placed on restrictive monetary policy alone.

While the rate of increase in the price level appears to have diminished in recent weeks, the inflation hazard is by no means a thing of the past. We are in the midst of a guideline-jettisoning machinists' strike against one-half of the major domestic airline carriers, right now. Next year, labor contract negotiations are scheduled involving 3 million workers in a number of key industries, such as rubber, trucking, communications, paper, construction, and automobiles. Vietnam costs are certain to increase before the year is out, and capital spending is not diminishing. The administration cannot permit any further delay in adopting a policy mix that will permit continued economic growth in the United States without inflation.

This policy mix, in my view, calls for an easing of credit and lowering of interest rates balanced by an increase in both individual and corporate tax rates totaling about $6 billion. If the administration would take the lead in fiscal policy, the Federal Reserve Board would, I believe, be ready to adjust monetary policy accordingly. If administration-Federal Reserve Board coordination has any meaning whatever it means just such cooperation and Congress has every right to expect this from the Federal Reserve Board.

It is fair to say that our current economic outlook is cloudy and there are no quick or easy policy solutions. Nevertheless, the administration's abdication of economic leadership over the past 6 months has aggravated the uncertainty about the economic outlook and made the selection of an appropriate policy response more difficult and hazardous than would have been the case early this year.

Further delay in making hard economic decisions would be the worst solution. A modest increase in individual income taxes—1½ or 2 percentage points—coupled with an increase in corporate income taxes—2½ to 3 percentage points—would yield $5.5 to $7 billion in Government revenues and would affect the economy across the board more equitably than a tight-money policy; a policy which is essentially nonselective except as individual banking institutions carry out selectivity. A corresponding easing of credit and a fall of interest rates would at the same time improve the situation of those credit institutions and businesses which today are carrying the main burden of the administration's unwillingness to "face the music."

In addition to all those reasons, I foresee other demands. For example, there is a very grave and serious financial crisis in Britain, which could very seriously and adversely affect not only the economic situation of the world, but also of the United States, as well as Britain's defense responsibilities.

Yesterday I advocated here that we ought to give Britain some pretty drastic help in these circumstances, not for its welfare programs or to nationalize business, but to enable it to navigate this gale in which it finds itself.

For all of those reasons, I felt we had to be willing to face a tax increase, and I did not feel—and this was the essence of my difference with the Senator—that the slowdown we had seen in the gross national product's rate of increase in the second quarter of this year was a sufficient reason why we should forgo that position. I know the position is politically difficult and indeed politically unpopular, but I think the exigencies of the economy demand a modest across-the-board tax increase for individuals and corporations, sufficient to produce something in the area of $5.5 billion to $7 billion a year. Correspondingly, it is my view that the Federal Reserve Board should ease the credit situation and help lower interest rates. The reduction in the rate of increase in the gross national product in the second quarter was not a sufficient reason against my recommendation, first, because it was a temporary phenomenon, whereas other very much deeper phenomenon were occurring right around us which would have a contrary effect; and secondly, because I pointed out the tremendous result of the increase by reason of inflation, which was only, to me, an added danger. Increased Vietnam costs and the forthcoming labor contract negotiations in a number of key industries could contribute to further serious inflationary pressures.

I hope the Senator will forgive me, because I must leave now, but I welcome a juxtaposition of our two structured ideas, both for the edification of the Nation and for our governmental agencies.

I say to the Senator that there is no one with whom I would rather have this kind of effort to depict two different points of view, arriving at exactly opposite conclusions on the same set of facts—which often happens—than my beloved fellow Senator, the Senator from Wisconsin.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record an article written by Hobert Rowen in the Washington Post of July 19, 1966, on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 19, 1966]

Brimmer Asks for Tax Action, Bank Restraint

(By Hobert Rowen)

The newest Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Andrew F. Brimmer, yesterday warned the nation's bankers that they must say "no" to more of their customers, and he came out flatly for tax action to dampen the boom.

"The crying need today is for more effective bank restraint on loan expansion," Brimmer said in a speech in Boston. "Something should be done—and soon."

Although he said he could not speak for his associates, Brimmer implied that the first action might come from the Fed itself through a reduction in bank reserves. This would sharply reduce the banks' ability to make loans.

Brimmer pulled no punches in criticizing the Administration for failure to raise taxes earlier this year, and insisted that action on the fiscal front "still seems in order."

Brimmer thus becomes the fourth member of the seven-man FRB to say publicly that monetary policy is being asked to carry too much of the burden of fighting inflation. Similar statements have been made by Chairman William McChesney Martin and Govs. Sherman J. Maisel and J. Dewey Daane.

SPOKE IN BOSTON

The Brimmer speech, text of which was released here, was delivered to a businessman-financial leader luncheon at the Boston Federal Reserve Bank.

An economist and former Commerce Department Assistant Secretary who was named to the Fed in February, Brimmer is considered a moderate, with leanings to the modern, or "new" school of economics.

The speech, although not Brimmer's first as a member of the Fed, provided his first general assessment of today's economic problems since moving to the Board.

Coincidentally, Senator Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) blasted the President for "unwillingness or inability to stop the present drift in economic policy." Javits called for a $6 billion across-the-board tax boost.

WITHDRAW STIMULUS

Brimmer did not go that far. But he was more specific than other FRB members have been by suggesting withdrawal of the stimulus to the economy provided by the 7 percent investment credit.

Because the need for restraint is "immediate," Brimmer recommended "a suspension measure that would affect business decisions to begin spending." The method: disallow the tax credit for new capital goods ordered after a given date.

But whatever is done or not done in this field, Brimmer vigorously insisted that bankers had better reduce the levels of their lending which—in blunt terms—he said were getting out of control.

He said that the bankers were feeding an "unsustainable level of demand for our limited resources."

Brimmer pulled together figures which for the first time show where the big expansion in bank loans is going. From reports by 200 large city banks that give the Fed an industry break-down of their loans, Brimmer evolved the following:

Loans to metal producing and fabricating firms have tripled over the second quarter 1965 rate.

Other large borrowers include textile makers, and petroleum and chemical companies.

But loans to the construction industry are rising less rapidly, as are loans to transportation, communication, and other public utilities.

Over-all, city banks made loans totaling nearly $3 billion in the second quarter, almost 70 per cent higher than the same period of 1965.

BALLOONING LOANS

At this level of expansion, Gov. Brimmer said, loans were ballooning faster than the banks' total assets. "Clearly," he said, "we must ask just how long can banks expand their loans to business beyond the expansion of deposits."

Brimmer's analysis also showed that there has been a dramatic rise in the number of country banks borrowing from the Fed—about one in 7 during the past three months. This is twice as many as earlier in the business expansion.

Moreover, many of these country banks have been "frequently" indebted to the Fed, a trend which Brimmer says shows that the demand for loans by big corporations is so big it is spilling over from the bigger to the smaller banks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York, and I appreciate very much his remarks. What he has said certainly states his side of the case very fairly.

I think it is an illusion, and a great illusion, that our economy has been moving too fast, growing too rapidly, with the illusive result that there is a tremendous growing pressure which will push prices up.

I say this is an illusion, because not only the GNP figures, but all the figures taken together, including the Vietnam war pressures in the aggregate, show there is no such pressure.

The Senator from New York referred to the gross national product. What is the gross national product? It is the measure of all the goods and all the services in this country.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT GROWTH DECLINES SHARPLY

I think we can get a good overall picture of whether or not the economy is growing by seeing what is happening to the gross national product. I have here figures from the Department of Commerce, just made available on Monday, which show that if we put the gross national product in real terms—and I submit this is the best way to measure it by far, because it corrects for inflation and shows how much real increase there has been in the actual physical production of all our goods and services—the real use of our men and machines—it shows that in the fourth quarter of last year, there was a 2.1 percent increase in the gross national product in that one quarter, or an annual rate of about 8 percent, which is a very sharp increase. However, in the first quarter of this year, the rate declined to 1.25 percent, an annual increase of about 6 percent—still a very rapid rate. But in the second quarter of this year—April, May, and June—the increase was only six-tenths of 1 percent; in other words, an annual increase of about 2.4 percent, a very sharp drop; and measuring it from the fourth quarter of last year, it seems that the growth in the economy has slowed down by about two-thirds. This is a figure we must not forget in determining whether to have a tax increase.

I ask the Senator from New York or other Senators: Does it make sense, when the economy is slowing down—and the record is very clear that it has slowed down; there is no better measure of that than the gross national product—to say that this is the time for a tax increase? I say it does not.

UNEMPLOYMENT UP SIGNIFICANTLY

Let us take some other measures. Let us take unemployment. Most of us are more familiar with unemployment statistics than with any others. What has happened with respect to unemployment? In April, it was 3.7. It had been 3.7 in February. The rate had been approximately stable for 3 months. Then what happened? In May, unemployment increased to 4 percent, a significant increase. Any statistician or economist would agree that such an increase is significant. Unemployment remained at 4 percent in June.

Is this the time for a tax increase, when unemployment has increased, when unemployment is at 4 percent, when the gross national product has slowed down?

PRICES MORE—NOT LESS STABLE

Let us take another index. This is one that those who advocate a tax increase rely on most heavily. Consider what has happened to consumer prices. In February of this year, admittedly, there was a big increase in the price index. Incidentally, this index showed a big increase in December, January, and February. Since February, however, the wholesale price index has been stable. There was no increase in March, one-tenth of 1 percent in April, none in May, and one-tenth of 1 percent in June.

Once again, does it make sense to say that this is the time to increase taxes?

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators who share his view have advocated that although the wholesale price index is not rising, although wholesale prices are stable, we should increase taxes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Merely for information, could the Senator from Wisconsin give us an indication of what the consumer price index was at that time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was just coming to that. There is a lag between the wholesale and consumer price indexes. As we might expect, there was a substantial increase in the consumer price index in March and April. But in May, the latest month for which a figure is available, the consumer price index went up only one-tenth of 1 percent. Once again, that is virtual stability. I concede that 1 month is not enough to make a firm and final judgment. We shall probably get later figures tomorrow or Friday on the consumer price index. I think it will go up, perhaps substantially. But it is becoming clear that excessive demand will not drive prices up. Demand is clearly declining in relation to supply, not increasing. Powerful labor and business bargaining power will drive prices up, not demand. What does that mean? That means a tax hike would increase unemployment. It would slow down the economy; but it would not stop bargaining power price increases.

Once again, the indexes caution us that a tax increase now might be exactly the wrong medicine for the economy, because the leading indicator of the economy, the wholesale price indicator, has not increased but is stable, and the sensitive commodities selected by the Bureau of Labor statistics as the best indicators of future prices has declined. So it does not make sense for us to say that now is the time to have a tax increase.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION GROWTH RATE DECLINES

According to the Federal Reserve index of industrial production, in January, February, and March industrial production increased at a monthly average rate of 1.5 percent. But now that increase also has slowed down, and about two-thirds of the increased growth rate has been lost. It its increasing now at a rate of one-half of 1 percent. Once again I ask: Is it time to raise taxes when the rate of growth of the industrial production index is going down?

GROWTH IN INVESTMENT DECLINES SHARPLY

Mr. President, the phase of our economy which has been most inflationary in the judgment of most economists has been business investment in plant and equipment, overall investment. It is said that this has been very inflationary. It had been increasing at a very rapid rate in the second, third, and fourth quarters. In the third quarter of last year there was a big increase of 3.4 percent, a huge 13.6 percent annual rate. There was a 5.4 percent increase in the fourth quarter or a 21.6 percent rate of annual increase. In the first quarter investment growth dropped to 4.2 percent or 16.8 percent on an annual rate. And this past quarter the growth fell to only 1.7 percent or a 5.6 percent annual rate. So a huge three-fourths of the fourth quarter investment growth rate disappeared by this immediately past quarter that ended 20 days ago, on June 30.

This slowdown is most significant because investment is what the economists call the accelerator factor in the economy. The steam has gone out of the economy. On the basis of these indices, not just the GNP, but on each of these significant indices and allowing for Vietnam, with a Vietnam war making far greater demands on the economy than in previous quarters—the fact is that our economy in this most recent quarter was generating not more demand, not more rapid growth, but less.

Demand in relationship to supply has declined. This is precisely what economic analysis and what the historical perspective would lead us to expect. We are pouring 1½ million people each year into our labor force. We have had in the past 3 years, by far the most rapid increase in our production facilities in all our history.

In the last 3 years there has been terrific investment made in equipment and plant. We have never had anything comparable with this growth in capacity to produce in our economy before. We have a capacity to meet demand that is far greater than in the past.

That is why I would conclude—in disagreement with my good friend, the senior Senator from New York—that this is not the time for a tax increase. Furthermore, I think there is other action that Congress can take that would be more sensible than a tax increase, action such as cutting spending, the space budget for example.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that our monetary policy has in the past—and I stress the words "in the past"—borne the full burden of restraining inflation. However, on the basis of what is developing in our economy now, I submit that inflation pressure is not now what it has been in the past.

I agree that high interest rates have had a serious effect and have been a great burden on the home building industry. We have had a home building recession. What would happen to this depressed industry if we were to increase taxes? Can the Senator from New York seriously contend that the way to build homes is to increase taxes? Would people paying more in taxes be better able to buy homes?

What the home industry needs is for the monetary authorities to consider easing off a little on monetary tightness.

We must be very careful about this. We must not do it precipitately. But there should be a real effort to try to make it more possible for people to buy homes.

This is an area that has been seriously depressed. I point out that two of the ablest members of the Federal Reserve Board are Governors Brimmer and Maisel. I enthusiastically supported their appointments. I studied economics at Harvard with Governor Maisel. Both he and Andy Brimmer have viewpoints contrary to mine. Brimmer wants to suspend the investment credit. Maisel wants either to cut spending or increase taxes, or both. I do not blame them for wanting to do something to ease the terrific pressure they have felt as two of the Nation's seven top monetary authorities. However, I think we should recognize that there are other economists who disagree with Brimmer and Maisel.

Paul Samuelson, formerly President of the American Economics Association, has reversed his earlier position. Early this year he favored a tax increase. He no longer does. And he changed his position even before the devastating figures of the past quarter showed the sharp slowdown in our economy. Recently 51 outstanding bank economists, industrial economists, Government economists, and academic economists in the country were asked what they expected to happen to the economy over the next 18 months. Did these experts expect a booming surging economy, with soaring prices? Their overwhelming conclusion was that the economy is slowing down and tapering off and will continue to do so over the next 18 months; and that prices will rise at the moderate rate of between 2 and 3 percent per year during this period. And they did not assume a tax increase.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Wisconsin speaks on a subject of which he is a great authority. Therefore, I appreciate the opportunity to have the benefit of his views.

The bankers in my State, especially the relatively small bankers, are becoming increasingly worried about the tight money market, increasing pressures on interest rates, and the problems the average businessman has in borrowing money with which to conduct his normal business activity.

As the able Senator knows, our imports are increasing tremendously now because of the war in Vietnam. The ratio between imports and exports is narrowing. Under these circumstances, if we do not increase taxes, what can be done to stem inflationary pressures? I ask the question because of my respect for the knowledge of the Senator on the subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri very much for his question. What I have been saying is that the economy has slowed down in the last 3 months. The gross national product increased at a much smaller rate, one-third of the rate than it had been increasing before. Industrial production, investment growth have slowed dramatically. Prices have started to level off.

The point I am making is that the economists suggest that the steam is going out of the economy, the demand pressure on prices is diminishing, and the prospects for inflation are less than they were before. Prices may rise and sharply as they did in the late fifties in the face of rising unemployment and growing excess capacity, but obviously a tax increase would not improve the situation, it would make it worse. It would increase unemployment, without reducing prices. It would do this because such a price increase is obviously not the result of excessive demand, and this is all a tax hike could affect. As I will show later we have had a record national experience of rising prices while demand fell and unemployment increased because of big labor and big business bargaining power. I think that a tax increase might very well head us toward a recession. I think that the President should be commended for resisting the tax increase proposals. A lot of pressure has been put on him to increase taxes. He was very wise, in my judgment, not to do so. That is something that he should be commended for. It would be unwise for him to agree with those who favor a tax increase.

In any event, there are other things that we could do that would be more likely to restrain prices than would a tax increase. One would be the institution of credit control.

IN PURCHASE OF CONSUMER DURABLES

We could do as we have done in the past, and require a larger downpayment and a shorter period of amortization. This would be a much more moderate approach. It would not mean that we would be increasing costs which is what we do when we increase interest or taxes. Consumers would pay less. Their interest would be less. Their economic position would in many cases be strengthened.

The House Banking and Currency Committee has considered this matter very seriously. A tax increase does not seem to me to be necessary now because our economy is so immensely productive. And so rapidly growing in productivity, it can meet rising demand. We tend to underrate our economy.

There has been a tremendous increase in new business and great expansion in plant and equipment. However, we are able to meet the demand without inflation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of tabulations to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gross national product

	Current dollars		1958 dollars		Percent of current dollar gain to price change
	Rate	Percent change	Rate	Percent change	
1965:					
I	660.8		600.3		
II	672.9	1.8	607.8	1.2	38.0
III	686.5	2.0	618.2	1.7	23.5
IV	704.4	2.6	631.2	2.1	27.4
1966:					
I	721.2	2.4	640.5	1.5	44.6
II	732.0	1.5	644.2	.6	65.7

Employment and unemployment

	Changes in employment (percent)	Unemployment rate
1965:		
September		4.4
October	0.4	4.3
November	.5	4.2
December	.7	4.1
1966:		
January	.4	4.0
February	–.3	3.7
March	–.1	3.8
April	.5	3.7
May	–.8	4.0
June	1.0	4.0

Changes in major price indexes

[Percent change]

	Consumer Price Index	Wholesale Price Index	Implicit Price Index
1965:			
July-August	–0.2	0	
September	.2	.1	
October	.2	.1	
November	.2	.4	
December	.4	.6	
1966:			
January	0	.5	
February	.5	.8	
March	.4	0	
April	.5	.1	
May	.1	0	
June		.1	
1965:			
I-II			0.7
III			.4
IV			.4
1966:			
I			.9
II			1.0

Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production

	Total index	Percent change	Auto	Percent change
1965:				
September	145.9		178.1	
October	149.9	2.7	181.1	1.7
November	148.1	–1.2	182.5	.8
December	146.6	–1.0	182.4	0
1966:				
January	148.3	1.2	180.3	–1.5
February	151.9	2.4	177.8	–1.4
March	153.4	1.0	183.8	3.4
April	153.7	.2	180.6	–1.7
May	155.0	.8	167.5	–7.3
June	155.8	.5	168.0	.3

Nonresidential investment

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	Nonresidential gross private domestic investment	Percent change	Change in business inventories
1965:			
I	$66.7		$9.5
II	67.9	1.8	7.6
III	70.2	3.4	8.7
IV	73.9	5.3	10.4
1966:			
I	77.0	4.2	8.9
II	78.3	1.7	12.0

Average weekly hours of production workers in manufacturing

1965	Hours per week
September	41.0
October	41.3
November	41.4
December	41.7
1966	
January	41.2
February	41.3
March	41.4
April	41.2
May	41.5
June	41.5

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we have had experience with this kind of inflation in the past. We had the boom in 1955, 1956, and 1957, primarily a capital goods boom like the present with an immense increase in plant and equipment. We then had increasing unemployment. Consumer prices rose between 1955 and 1960 by 10.5 percent. Since 1961 consumer prices have increased only 8 percent, although unemployment and excess capacity has been falling rapidly during this longer period of time. This was the best price performance of any industrialized country in the world. Why was that? That occurred because in the latter period the administration met and stood up to the bargaining power of big labor and big business. In 1955–1960 the big boys pushed the prices up in the face of declining demand. Unless we have an administration like the present administration, which has put and will put strong and effective pressure on all parties to prevent such increases, there will be trouble. That is why the successful molybdenum price rollback won by the administration should be applauded. The President should be commended for the effort to keep prices down in the steel and automobile industries, to keep them in line.

I think that we are on the right track. I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 679

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the military assistance phase of the foreign aid bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the foreign aid bill contains a proposed change in the law. My amendment deals with military assistance to the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

In the law there is a limitation of $55 million that can be granted by way of military assistance to the 19 South American countries. The Committee on Foreign Relations this year changed the $55 million limitation applicable to grants and made the limitation also applicable to sales. In other words, under the existing law, our Government could not grant more than $55 million in military grants.

The change in the law provides that now not more than $55 million shall be granted for either grants or sales. That means that if a South American country wants to buy military equipment from our Government, we cannot sell it if the total amount of grants received and the sales made exceeds $55 million. That means that these South American countries, if they deem it necessary to strengthen their military side of the government, will not be able to buy from the U.S. Government, but will have to go somewhere else in the world.

I believe the provision is ill based, improper, and inimical to the interests of the United States, and for that reason I offer the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. I should appreciate it if we would add my name to the amendment as a cosponsor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent to do so, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to point out that with the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, the interests of the Federal Government are still well protected. My understanding is that this portion of the bill contains a provision that the President must make a finding that it would be in the national interest for any of these activities to be undertaken. I am quite sure that the President would not make such a finding if a particular sale was inimical to our interests.

I also point out that the limitation that is now in the bill virtually eliminates the sales program of the United States, and with the $55 million limitation on grants and sales with all the Latin American countries, the sales would just about fall out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They would fall out. They would go to other countries to make the sales.

Mr. MILLER. I might say further, Mr. President, that I happen to know that at least two of these countries have already set up programs for follow-on sales and for regular sales programs—not necessarily to buy new equipment, but to buy spares and replacement parts. If this limitation is left in the bill, that activity will be greatly curtailed. I recommend that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio be considered favorably. I hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why can it not be deferred to the next bill? It is not pertinent to this bill at all. A debate can take place and it can be considered in connection with military assistance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reason I introduce it now is so that the Members of the Senate will be able to read in advance what my proposed amendment means, so that they will be familiar with it when the military assistance bill comes before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That will be next week.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 657

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 657, with modifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 4, line 5, strike out "$620,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$370,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the net effect of the amendment would be to reduce the Development Loan Fund by $250 million below the figure which was authorized by the committee.

Last year we authorized $618,225,000, and this year, for fiscal 1967, the committee authorized $620 million.

I first had in mind an amendment that would apply in part to the Development Loan Fund and also to supporting assistance, but it occurred to me that the entire amount should be taken out of the Development Loan Fund and that is what the modification amounts to.

Mr. President, this is not just a gesture. I am not particularly interested in gestures. This is not an effort to seek a headline. This is not done in a partisan spirit, for behind this effort and behind the other amendments which we propose to offer, there lie a good many weeks, and in fact months, of rather patient and painstaking effort to determine how our foreign assistance program should be operated and how it should tick.

Mr. President, it was on June 5, 1947, that George Catlett Marshall, the distinguished late Secretary of State, stood before an audience at Harvard and included one paragraph in his speech. That paragraph suggested that if European countries, then racked, shattered, and torn as a result of the conflict, would assess their needs to prevent chaos and bankruptcy, the chances were that the United States would be glad to assist.

Well, they did assess their needs and we did assist, and we have been assisting for 19 years, because it was 19 years ago last month that George Marshall made that speech.

Now, Mr. President, the so-called AID program has been before the Congress every year since that time. It has come under first one caption and then another. But whatever the name, whatever the title, and whatever the contents, it has flowed on ceaselessly like Tennyson's brook.

However, there is a distinction between Tennyson's brook and foreign aid because that brook chattered on and chattered on and found its way to the reservoir of the river. Foreign aid, however, comes out of the river of our resources, so to speak, and it flows into channels in every section of the whole wide world.

I point out in the beginning that this amendment would have no effect upon military appropriations. As far as Vietnam is concerned, we are making complete and adequate preparation for and supplying everything that is necessary to Vietnam under the defense bills, so that Vietnam would be in no wise affected.

It is inspired, in part, by the fact that this country is confronted with a very serious situation. In that connection I was quite intrigued to note from the ticker today that Prime Minister Wilson has ordered a massive crackdown on domestic credit buying as part of his crash program to save the pound from devaluation and to rebuild Britain's economy.

Among other things, they have upped the down payment on automobiles, motorcycles, and trailers from 25 percent to 40 percent. They have upped the downpayment on other items. He has also frozen wages and prices for a period of 6 months, in the hope that the devaluation can be avoided.

There are other items in his program, some of them quite intriguing, but here he has come to grips with a monetary and fiscal credit situation that in some respects is not unlike that which confronts us today: The very fact that there has been a series of conferences at the White House in the last few days, one of which I attended when the President had the joint leadership there to discuss this entire problem and ascertain what could be done.

So I think today, as we consider a cut in the so-called AID bill, we should have that whole matter quite in mind. I am not so sure, Mr. President, but that the countries that have been the recipients of our largess have developed for themselves an outlook that could be called a way of life. Perhaps they are constantly looking to our Nation's Capital, for aid and assistance, when there is no other place to look. Perhaps they have developed an attitude that somehow it has hardened the feeling that when you are in difficulty make a journey to Washington with your mendicant's cup and there present your plea and you are bound to receive some assistance.

Well, perhaps this can go on forever. I doubt it very much. I think the time has come now to speak the piece, and, regardless of criticism, and regardless of circumstances, to see whether or not we cannot give a few kind thoughts to the solvency and the stability of our own country, and to some assurances that our dollar will not be in the same fix that the pound was getting into before this austerity program was announced in Great Britain last night.

First, let me point out that we checked back on the AID figure, and when I use the word "AID," I mean all of its predecessor agencies. I mean the mutual assistance program; I mean the Marshall plan; I mean the technical program; and everything that has happened in this field since the fifth of June 1947.

I believe this is a quotable figure and I think we can stand on it. Many a figure has been bandied about as to what the aid program has cost. I think the figure ranges all the way from $110 billion to $144 billion. We come up with a figure, on the basis of consultations with the Comptroller General's office, with the AID people, and with the Federal Treasury, that at this good hour aid has cost us $117,019 million.

In addition to that, there have been a good many other aids of a kind, whether in the form of loans or grants.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand some tables that I believe should be printed in the RECORD. First of all, I should add that the AID assistance to all countries, including the World War I debt, which reflects what assistance we have rendered to countries which found themselves in difficulties, amounts to $14,408 million.

Interestingly enough, Finland was the only country that finally paid interest and kept up its obligations on the World War I debt. No wonder, at a gridiron dinner a good many years ago, when the Finnish Ambassador was introduced, the rafters fairly shook with applause as a measure of the appreciation and gratitude of America to a country which somehow had a feeling that it should fulfill its obligations and requite its particular obligation to this country.

Now, in addition, we go to the World Bank, another form of aid, which was kind enough to send me its latest report. It is quite impressive and—shall I say—a very colorful piece of work. Usually, annual reports are. If I do not get any other kick out of it, I love to look at the pictures, but they also have tables galore. Finally, I got through it and discovered that we have subscribed to 63,360 shares of stock of the World Bank. We plumped down—that is a good term—laid on the line, $635 million. But that is only a very small part of the story because when we subscribe to all these shares of stock we make a token payment, but we are callable any old time—when they need the money—for another $5,715 million.

Thus, if we are thinking of aid as some kind of reservoir to be tapped, well, there is the World Bank, and it has been making loans all over the universe. Already, it has made $5 billion worth of loans. I do not believe there is any country under the canopy of heaven that does not have a loan, with the exception of one country—and that happens to be the United States of America. We subscribe to 29 percent of the capital stock. Everyone else can get a loan. We have got no loan.

Then we have another kind of aid. I like its abbreviation. It is called IDA. I remember, coming in from the hospital this morning, I was driven by Ida's Department Store out on Georgia Avenue, so it is easy to remember.

We make contributions to IDA, and thus far we have made contributions to the extent of $635 million. That is 32 percent of all the contributions made to sweet IDA. It is pretty nearly in line with the 33⅓ percent we contribute to the United Nations and all of its subordinate and auxiliary agencies.

I see before me a most interesting article published in the New York Times, on July 18, and it has a most entertaining headline: "World Bank Seeks $1 Billion To Lend to Poor Countries. Rich Nations To Be Asked To Quadruple Contributions To Provide 'Easy' Loans."

I guess "soft loans" is a better term, but I will get around to those soft loans after a while.

I believe at this point, Mr. President, I should ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article to which I have just referred, because evidently someone has an idea that we have not done enough, that the contributions should be quadrupled—and, of course, that means Uncle Sam rather than anyone else.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1966]

WORLD BANK SEEKS $1 BILLION TO LEND TO POOR COUNTRIES—RICH NATIONS TO BE ASKED TO QUADRUPLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROVIDE "EASY" LOANS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The United States and the other industrial countries will shortly be asked to quadruple, to $1-billion a year, their contributions to the World Bank for "easy" loans to the poor countries.

The request will probably be made this week by George D. Woods, the president of the bank. The formal title of the World Bank in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The contributions, now running at $250-million a year, would go to the bank's easy-loan subsidiary, known as the International Development. Association. The bank itself raises funds by selling bonds on the world's capital markets.

FIFTY YEARS TO PAY

The United States share of the contributions to the association would remain at about 40 per cent, or $400-million a year instead of the present $100-million. The money is lent to the world's poorest countries with no interest and 50 years to pay.

The Woods request will pose a major choice for the United States and the other rich countries. It will bring to a head the question of whether a much larger portion of economic aid to the poor countries should be given through international institutions instead of bilaterally.

It will also pose dramatically the question of the willingness of the rich countries to increase the total volume of aid to the developing countries. The World Bank has calculated that the developing countries are now in a position to absorb usefully from $3-billion to $4-billion more a year than they are currently receiving.

In 1964, the last year for which figures are available, total government aid was $5.9-billion and private capital flow was $3.2-billion.

Mr. Woods has chosen this week to make his formal request for additional funds for the I.D.A. because the top foreign aid officials of 15 countries will be here for a meeting not directly connected with the World Bank.

NO HINT OF AMOUNT

This is a meeting of the Development Assistance Committee, an arm of the 21-country Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The committee seeks to coordinate the aid programs of individual aid-granting countries.

The member nations of this committee are also the main contributors to the I.D.A.

The bulk of support for the association comes from the United States, Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan and Canada.

Mr. Woods will speak to the meeting, but he is expected to make his formal request for funds for the I.D.A. separately.

Th donor countries have known for months that a request for a new round of contributions for the I.D.A. was impending because its association funds are running out. The last round of contributions was $750-million over a three-year period.

Mr. Woods has given no hint, however, of how much he will ask. His asking figure of $1-billion was learned from highly authoritative sources.

What the United States reaction to the request will be is not known. Top officials have indicated a definite sympathy with the idea that the rate of aid given by the association should be increased, but whether they will go along with a quadrupling of the aid is uncertain.

Furthermore, the United States is eager to find a device by which its contributions to the I.D.A. would not further worsen its deficit in the balance of international payments. I.D.A. loans are disbursed by the bank on the basis of competitive worldwide bidding, and thus many of them eventually flow by way of the poor countries to other developed countries.

Mr. Woods is known to have strong reservations about two possible ways that the United States, or other donor countries, could be protected against any adverse balance-of-payments effect.

RIGHT TO REDUCE

One would be to give a nation in balance-of-payments difficulty the right, at the time the money is disbursed by the I.D.A. several years from now, to reduce its contribution by some specified amount for the year in question. This poses for Mr. Woods the problem of not knowing precisely how much money he could commit for loans.

The second would be a requirement that the bank "tie" its disbursements to goods procured in the nation suffering payments difficulties. Dollars would have to be spent in the United States, for example. This would require a sharp revision of the bank's current practice.

Another suggestion has just begun to be explored. This would be an agreement among the donor countries that the total pledge for each year would be "firm," but that members of the donor group in payments difficulties might pay less while their problem lasted. The difference would be made up temporarily by those in payments surplus.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have agencies running out of our ears. There is the International Monetary Fund. There is the International Finance Corporation. There is the Bank for Asian Development. There is the Inter-American Bank.

We have gone to some pains to put all these commitments together to see what we are liable for. The commitments now aggregate the tidy little sum of $14,519,000,000. Accordingly, we see that when there is a call from needy people, whether it is in Vietnam, the Congo, the Transvaal, Iceland, or wherever it is, and the World Bank runs out of dough—and that is a good term, too—why, we are callable for money so that these poor creatures will not have to suffer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Our total commitment is $14,500 million?

Mr. DIRKSEN. $14,519 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator's document show what part of the commitment has actually been paid in, and what part is callable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, on the World Bank, we paid in $635 million. We are callable for $5,715 million. Under sweet IDA, those are contributions, and we are not callable for an amount there. But on some of the other agencies, we are; I do not have all of the detailed figures here, although we did put them together. I am interested in this very impressive total.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would suggest that we get into the Record what amount we paid in and what amount was callable. I think it would be very informative for the Senate to have that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me also emphasize what the United States got out of it. Nothing.

Now, World War I, $14,408 million. Total commitments now for loans, $14,519 million. AID and its predecessor agencies, $117,019 million.

That adds up to—if my figures are correct—approximately $145 billion.

Mr. President, we do not stop there, bless us. We have a new program soon to come to the Senate floor. It is called food for freedom. That is a mouth-filling term. It is also an ear-filling term. It is going to be a purse-depleting term, too, before we get through.

Let me tell the Senate what we are going to do under the food-for-freedom program:

Under title I, $2,500 million every year.
Under title II, $800 million every year.
Under title III, $33 million every year.

Now, if I am any good at arithmetic—as Aristotle or someone else said, arithmetic is the greatest of the sciences and the mother of all invention—that figure should add up to $3,333 million annually. That is just another commitment of aid.

The singular thing is that we thought, as we went along giving all this aid during the years, that somehow we could stimulate the enterprise system in the countries which were receiving benefits from the United States. But, if it has happened, I see no evidence of it.

I do not know to what country one can point and say the enterprise incentive, the vigor and energy for self-help, is the kind that has energized or sharpened it. That is one of the distressing things about this whole program.

The other is that I have seen very little resource development. If anything, there has been less development than there was before. Before the ruckus in the Congo, the Belgians were in there and were doing a pretty tolerable job of developing the mineral resources of the country. What has happened since that time? There have been assortments of killings and self-appointed leaders who have been at each other's throat. How much stability there is there at the present time is a question of grave doubt. I see nobody getting back to the enterprise system or developing the resources of that country.

Mr. President, just think of the countries in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere, where the Lord has planted some of those things that have enriched and developed mankind. Yet where are the developments? Only in a few countries have we seen them.

So one wonders to what purpose our aid was directed in the first instance To be sure, when the program was first started, it was designed to give relief to people who were the victims of war.

There has been some success, not only in the development of a country's resources, but in the reestablishment of their economic systems. That has happened in some instances. It has happened in Germany. What was the result? A stable currency and a country that peddles its merchandise practically all over the globe. West Germany has practically no unemployment.

When the Chancellor of West Germany was in this country, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, or one of the distinguished members of that committee, had a luncheon for him. I went to the luncheon and I asked the Chancellor about unemployment in his country. He said, "We could use a million extra people right now."

So that country has done it. It has followed a pattern tested by time and found not to be wanting.

Are we to be in the fix of the ancient Greek runner, who collapsed when his goal was in sight, finally bit on his wrist, sucked his blood, won the race, but fell exhausted and died at the end? Does that have to be the end of a program of this kind, after all the good will we have invested, together with our funds? Must that be the reward for our country?

I go a little bit further in this picture if, in this melee and assortment of material, I can find where I placed my note. There are other factors that should be discussed here and now with respect to the AID program. Mr. President, I am about to call for a seventh inning stretch until I can find what I did with my note.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, while he is looking for his paper?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a matter of information, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record an article written by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the New York Times, entitled "Aid to the Poor Nations Soared to Record $10.98 Billion in 1965."

The article breaks down overall foreign aid into various categories: bilateral aid, private capital, through international lending agencies, and so forth. I think it will be of interest to the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1966]

Aid to the Poor Nations Soared to Record $10.98 Billion in 1965

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, July 19.—The total flow of aid to the less developed countries, public and private, reached a record figure of $10.98-billion last year, up to $1-billion from 1964.

This was disclosed today on the eve of a two-day meeting at the high official level of the 15-nation Development Assistance Committee, a group that attempts to coordinate the flow of aid.

The figure of $10.98-billion represents disbursements of funds, not aid commitments or loan agreements. It is a net figure, with repayments of the principal of past loans to the poor countries subtracted from gross disbursements.

The $10.98-billion had these main components:

Bilateral aid from the 15 industrial countries making up the Development Assistance Committee to the less developed countries, totaling $5.8-billion. This includes food shipments by the United States.

Private capital flow from the rich to the poor countries of $3.6-billion. This includes both investments in mines and factories and exports on credit terms with more than one year to pay, usually guaranteed by governments.

Aid from the international lending agencies of $290-million. With money raised from both governments and private capital markets.

Aid from nations not members of the Development Assistance Committee, mainly the Communist countries, of about $670-million.

The committee is an arm of the 21-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with headquarters in Paris. The meeting here this week is the annual gathering of top foreign aid officials of the 15 nations that account for practically the entire flow of aid outside the Communist bloc.

The total aid flowing from the countries that are committee members, including private aid and money flowing by way of international lending agencies, was $10.15-billion last year.

Officials said this came to almost exactly 1 per cent of the combined national income of the 15 countries, the figure originally set as an informal target for aid.

However, the United Nations has since set a target of 1 per cent of the gross national product of the industrial countries, a figure larger than national income. Last year's aid total was about 0.85 per cent of gross national product.

This week's meeting is expected to review the general aid picture and to take up in some depth for the first time the special problem of an expected world food shortage.

The statistical report today put the total of aid flow at $7.7-billion in 1960, $8.97-billion in 1961, $8.6-billion in 1962, $9.4-billion in 1963 and $9.9-billion in 1964.

The members of the Development Assistance Committee are Australia, Belgium, Austria, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. The executive commission of the European Economic Community, which disburses some aid, is also a member.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was going to offer one or two comments with regard to the case the Senator from Illinois made on the amendment which he has proposed. The authorization asked for by the administration was $1.25 billion, but it asked for only $665 million in appropriations for the 1967 fiscal year. In other words, it has asked for a 5-year program, apparently contemplating a carry-over from unappropriated funds under the authorization for future years. The fact is that the administration has said it needs only $665 million.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is adopted cutting the authorization to $370 million that would leave a difference between the Senate and the $1 billion authorization approved by the House of $630 million.

If the conference compromised it 50-50, as we have done almost without exception on questions of amounts of money in the past, we come out with a figure of $685 million. Following the usual practice the figure could be higher than the actual appropriation request of the administration.

While this looks like a deep cut in the authorization compared with that of last year, in my opinion the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, if the traditional pattern of the past is followed this year, would not result in a serious cut at all. It would be merely trying to maintain something in the way of what the Senate committee contended for.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The House came by its figure long before we were summoned to the White House to discuss fiscal affairs with the President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He pointed out the difference between domestic expenditures and the demands for military purposes. We know the military requirements must be met. There is nothing to be done about it. If General Westmoreland sends a cablegram and says, "I need this or that," we are dutybound to fill it. We do not leave our boys 12,000 miles from home, fighting in a dismal battle, without making available to them what their commanding general, whom we regard as the cream of the crop, thinks he ought to have. So our military demands must be met.

Therefore, we have nowhere else to look except to the economic picture. There are not many places where we can cut the budget in substantial sums. We cannot cut the cost of interest on our debt. The cost of paying interest on our debt is now $12 billion a year. We cannot cut funds for our veterans. Every appropriation bill has its sacred cows. I have my own, I suppose, but I am not going to let the cows stand in the way if that is the only way to take action that must be taken to put this country on a sound and stable basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suppose the Senator's amendment is in pursuance of the President's request, as explained yesterday before the Appropriations Committee, and he is asking to cut some money out of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly correct. The day before, the President had the leadership at the White House. We know what the facts are in the entire picture. We have our money supply. There are great demands for it. If there is anything to the classic definition of inflation, all one has to do is to equate it with the goods and the prices one sees on those goods in the marketplace.

Last Saturday I had an opportunity to go to the market with Mrs. Dirksen, to look around at the price tags, and buy a few things.

Being an old baker, when I buy bread I sometimes like to buy the pullman loaf. It is square, and makes good sandwiches.

So I picked up a loaf of pullman bread, and when we got it home, I noticed the price tag, and I was surprised. I thought, well, now, wait a minute; last week that loaf was 25 cents. This week it is 30 cents. So it has gone up very considerably.

I know it, because I take a look at the price tags.

So that is what we have in the country today; and people are beginning to get just a little excited and just a little concerned about this inflationary feeling. So there you have a factor.

Your second factor is this fierce money competition among all the thrift institutions, the savings and loan associations, the banks, the mutual savings banks. The question is, how much will they offer on certificates of deposit, for instance, in order to get a man's money?

Well, they bid one against another; and I think the latest figure I saw was that they were up to 5⅞ in the mutual banks in New York, and they thought they would go through the 6-percent ceiling easily. It may be higher in other places.

But just take a look at the advertisements in the papers from day to day, and see what these savings and loan associations in Washington are doing. They start with 4 percent.

"We are going to give you 4¼."

"We will give you 4½, if you come to our association."

Maybe now they are up to 4¾. But that is bidding for the available money.

And then, of course, we have this unending demand for credit. I do not wish to get into the question of the payments in balance. I would rather leave that to my distinguished and scholarly friend the Senator from Tennessee. But it is a factor in this picture.

Then we have the vast holdings of the Federals. I saw a figure this morning, reasonably current: It is right at $42 billion of Federal securities. That is a hoard for you. And of course the Open Market Committee can operate back and forth—you plow securities into the market, and sponge up cash, or you put out cash and pick up securities—and so they try to gage it as best they can.

But do not think for a moment that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board is not worried and deeply concerned about what he sees in the fiscal and monetary picture today.

Here is the Prime Minister of Britain, worried about the pound sterling. What does he do? He gives his country an austerity program. We ought to be equally concerned about our own dollar, to make sure that its value will remain.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Those are other considerations in the domestic picture that we must take into account, and it becomes part of the motivation for trying to find some place among 13 appropriation bills and the authorizations to go with them where we can cut out some money, and take a little of the heat out of this economy.

I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator referred to the British economy, and how they are trying to cut back with an austerity program. I am sure the Senator is aware that one of the places they pinpointed to cut was on their foreign aid program. They are making it the No. 1 item to which they point.

I might point out that as long ago as August 31, 1965, a man with whom I have always been in agreement, William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, said that the aid burden was too heavy. He told this to Senators:

> The Chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve System said yesterday—

This was August 30—

> the United States is "carrying too large a load" in the area of foreign aid and international development.
>
> He said "we have got to rely on our friends to do more than they have been doing in that field."

I should like to point out, just for a little local information, to the Senator from Illinois, since we are neighbors—the State of Indiana is very close to Illinois—that we have just completed an analysis of a sampling of public opinion in Indiana on foreign aid. This is a part of an in-depth survey we have been doing—a cross section of 1,116 respondents. All of these replies have come in between July 5 and July 19 of this year.

Question No. 8 on that poll was:

> Do you think that America's foreign aid—economic assistance—has been valuable in achieving the friendliness of foreign nations?

"Yes," replied 20.5 percent and 69.1 percent said "No"; 10.4 percent were undecided.

Question No. 9 was:

> As concerns our economic assistance program, AID, which of the following do you prefer: (a) increasing foreign aid.

That was the preference of 13 percent.

> (b) continuing at present levels.

That was the preference of 14.8 percent.

> (c) reducing foreign aid.

Thirty-eight and eight-tenths percent indicated that as their preference.

(d) ending the foreign aid program.

That choice was the preference of 27.8 percent; 7.6 percent were undecided.

In other words, we had a total of those who are for increasing foreign aid or continuing it at present levels of 27.8 percent, while those who are for reducing or ending it totaled 64.6 percent, or almost two-thirds of those responding.

I wish to include two more figures from this questionnaire.

Question 10:

> On the assumption of a continuance of foreign aid, would you place it on a selective basis to friendly nations only, or would you also include neutral nations?

The responses were as follows:

Friendly nations only, 49.8 percent.
Also include neutrals, 35.9 percent.
Undecided, 14.3 percent.

The question on military aid I shall not include at this time, but the figures are still more overwhelming.

Therefore, I commend the Senator from Illinois for this amendment, and I hope the Senate will agree to it. I think in the abnormal situation we are involved in at the present time, which the Senator has referred to, certainly a little bit of economy for those overseas is in order. It would not hurt them to share some of the problems we have here at home. That is not saying that in future days we may not change our minds. But at this stage, we ought to cooperate with the President in cutting down the expenses of the Government. We ought to follow his suggestions. If we do not follow the same path, we will come out with the same end result. If he is fearful of a budget deficiency in 1967, I think we should support him.

The question is not whether or not we are going to buy two or three boxes of paper clips, but of cutting out $250 million. As I commented earlier to the Senator from Illinois, I think maybe his cut is a little too small, but I intend to support him and vote for his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have always thought forbearance is a virtue. When I first toyed with the figure, I think it was twice that amount. I felt I would rather be reasonable about it, and submit a figure that probably the Senate would approve, and that could be retained in the bill in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point, since he has been interrupted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me make this one comment.

I notice one other thing in this British picture. They have not touched loans for modernization and expansion of hotels. The idea is to get our folks over there, so that they can spend some money. That is a very laudable ambition on their part, I must say, but I do not know that it contributes particularly to our own stability.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has reduced his figure from $620 million to $375 million, if I am correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. $370 million, according to my figures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right; I had to modify it. We did not take out the foreign assistance fund. The entire $250 million cut comes under the development program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the Senator has taken none out of the supporting assistance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, and I am glad. My question is, how much is unobligated and unspent of funds on hand for the development loans?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had that looked up, and they gave me a figure of $228,900,000 that is available for the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition to this other amount?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right, because that amount is left from last year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois contemplate introducing or having a vote on any other amendments involving cuts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no other amendments that involve cuts. I have many amendments that deal with procedure and administrative practice. This amendment is the only one of that kind, and I thought this was a logical place to do it because of the number of loan agencies in which we participate today, and the commitments by which we are presently bound.

Mr. President, I think another of the factors that we must have in mind with respect to this program is the conduct of the program. I do not know whether those who have been running the project get a little weary of well-doing. It is hard to say. However, I do not think you can be in this kind of a program for 19 years without getting into a kind of groove. The program will have to have a good look-see to see whether we cannot get it straightened out.

I am not going to belabor all of these items at length, but I do wish to call attention to a few. I call attention to the failure of AID to report interest delinquency.

When we went over those records we found that they took the ones where interest was due and delinquent and just folded them into the capital and recapitalized the loans.

There were some of those, probably not a great many. However, we are now coming to the point at which we will have a great many of these loans on which the grace period and the low-interest rate are coming to an end. Then the delinquencies are bound to arise.

One of the truly intriguing things is the fact that where they carried the so-called maintenance of value cost in the AID contracts heretofore, that somehow was eliminated, and the figure that we have presently is that our loss or exchange loss as a result of failure to maintain the value amounts to $351,200,000. This was on the basis of, I expect, a very close investigation. It is borne out, I think in large part, by the observation that the General Accounting Office made to this effect. They said:

> Additional, substantial exchange rate losses on foreign currency assets will be sustained in the future.

AID has amended the six loans in the fiscal 1963–64 in which it eliminated the maintenance-of-value provisions. General Accounting Office found that in these six loans the immediate exchange rate loss was $91.7 million.

We discovered that there was a country which made a loan for supporting its budget, and then, after the loan was made, we found that the country actually did not need the budget support loan. They had sufficient money with which to do it. They then used their own money on a project on which they tried to get AID funds and failed. The funds were denied. However, once we made the budget support loan, they then took their own money to do the very thing that we tried to keep them from doing.

Those are rather quaint and interesting practices. I do not know how anyone can justify them.

Mr. President, I shall have printed in the RECORD later a whole series of tabulations to implement the remarks I have been making here.

Mr. President, the tabulations include, country by country and region by region, the loans that have been made in total by all our so-called assistance agencies since June 5, 1947, or a date rather close to that date. They also include the commitments we made and the World War I loan. They include the figures, broken down by country, that were submitted to Congress, ostensibly for loan purposes, but which finally turned out to be grants rather than loans.

That becomes rather important because we have worked year in and year out in the hope that we would get this program on a loan rather than a grant basis.

As a result, we want the figures to speak for themselves. I think I should permit the committee members to have the benefit of the total right now.

Mr. President, I want to be sure this caption is correct, because if for any reason in discussing some of these items with the press yesterday after our policy meeting, they got an inaccurate idea, it could have been my own feeble and inadequate way of making it clear to them. Perhaps they misunderstood. However, it reads as follows:

> Figures reported to the Congress by AID as loans when in fact they are grants.

The amount is in millions, and if $10,178.7 means anything in my book, it means that they have submitted figures to us to show what they were asking for in loans, when in fact they became grants, to the tune of $10,178,700,000. I have checked with the staff and that figure is correct.

Probably 30 or 35 countries, and perhaps more, are involved here. I need not encumber the RECORD with the names except to have the tabulations printed and let them speak for themselves.

Other tabulations here indicate these totals, but I want to be sure that these figures will stand up against any criticism.

Mr. President, we went to the trouble of getting everything we could from the General Accounting Office by way of reports.

Many of these reports were highly critical, and may I say in that connection that we have been very careful not to include any classified material, so that this can be used anywhere, any time, any place.

I ask unanimous consent that the reports with the subheads on these reports that are tabulated here be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reports and the subheads were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Résumé of U.S. Foreign Assistance Programs

	Millions
Total assistance to countries	$117, 019. 1
World War I debt	14, 408. 4
Grand total	131, 427. 5

Summary as of June 30, 1965

[U.S. fiscal years; in millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding	Interest due and unpaid	Principal and interest due and unpaid
Loans:						
AID and predecessor agencies	9, 880. 6	898. 3	860. 7	8, 982. 3		
Food for peace	5, 720. 1	156. 4	289. 6	5, 563. 7		
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	9, 015. 2	4, 084. 4	1, 759. 3	4, 930. 8		
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	7, 635. 9	2, 761. 1	1, 341. 9	4, 874. 8		
Military assistance	555. 6	295. 1	6. 8	260. 5		
Total loans	32, 807. 4	8, 195. 3	4, 258. 3	24, 612. 1		
Grants:						
AID and predecessor agencies	30, 149. 2					
Food for peace	7, 505. 5					
Other U.S. economic programs	11, 536. 5					
Military assistance	34, 091. 3					
Total grants	83, 282. 5	8, 195. 3	4, 258. 3	24, 612. 1		

Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	1, 954. 4
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	14, 408. 4

[1] Includes Social Progress Trust Fund.

NOTE.—Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965, $6,176,000,000.

U.S. contributions to international agencies 1946–66

[In billions of dollars]

	U.S. expenditures and commitments	Callable capital and future U.S. commitments to international agencies	Total U.S. foreign economic obligations
World Bank (IBRD)	[1] 0. 635	[2] 5. 715	6. 350
International Development Association (IDA)	[3] . 632		
International finance	[4] . 035		
Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)	[5] 1. 050	[6] . 612	1. 662
Asian Development Bank (ADB)	[7] . 020	[8] . 180	. 200
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	[9] 5. 160		
Peace Corps	[10] . 480		
Grand total	8. 012	6. 507	14. 519

[1] Capital subscriptions to international organizations are subtracted from the total because these are listed separately in the table.

[2] World Bank/IDA Report, fiscal year 1965, p. 26—$5,715,000,000 represents the U.S. subscription to the callable capital of the World Bank. This subscription is callable proportionately in the event of default on IBRD bonds resulting from the failure or inability to borrowers to repay. It is this backing which permits flotation of IBRD bonds in United States and other capital markets with triple A status. The World Bank, as of fiscal year 1965, has sold $1,183,000,000 of its bonds, net of redemptions, in the U.S. market.

[3] World Bank and IDA Annual Report 1964–65, p. 41.

[5] With the appropriation of $250,000,000 requested for fiscal year 1967, the total U.S. contributions to the fund for special operations of the IADB—the "soft" loan window of the Bank—will be $900,000,000; $75,000,000 of the U.S. commitment of $150,000,000 to paid-in capital has been paid in; the remaining $75,000,000 was paid to the IADB in the form of non-interest-bearing Treasury notes. None of these notes has been encashed as of Oct. 1, 1965. See "The United States Balance of Payments; An Appraisal of U.S. Economic Strategy," published June 13, 1966, by the International Economic Policy Association, pp. 116–118.

[6] $612,000,000 represents the U.S. subscription to the callable capital of the Inter-American Development Bank. This subscription is callable proportionately in the event of default on IADB bonds resulting from the failure or inability of borrowers to repay. It is this backing which permits flotation of IADB bonds in U.S. and other capital markets with triple A status. See Six Annual Report of IADB, p. 35.

[7] Asian Development Bank message o: the President—Jan. 18, 1966—$20,000,000 is the 1st of 5 installments.

[8] See footnote "7"; $100,000,000 represents the U.S. subscription to the callable capital of the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The other $80,000,000 difference represents the U.S. commitment to paid-in capital of the ADB over the next 4 years (fiscal years 1968–71).

[9] Internationa. Financial Statistics of the IMF—July issue—p. 3.

[10] Includes 1967 appropriation request of $110,000,000; fiscal years 1962–66 appropriation figures obtained from the House Appropriations Committee.

Figures reported to the Congress by AID as loans when in fact they are grants

[In millions]

Greece	$440. 1
Nepal	37. 8
Iran	4. 6
Pakistan	74. 6
Turkey	5. 4
India	6. 9
Brazil	17. 5
Colombia	15. 8
Haiti	2. 7
Honduras	8. 1
Mexico	99. 4
Uruguay	2. 0
Peru	14. 5
China	406. 8
Ecuador	10. 5
Indonesia	$4. 8
Japan	1, 694. 9
Korea	834. 4
Philippines	756. 5
Ryukyu Islands	255. 6
Thailand	5. 7
Austria	316. 4
Belgium	1. 1
Czechoslovakia	183. 4
Finland	1. 8
France	314. 7
Germany	1, 411. 5
Hungary	2. 4
Italy	961. 7
Netherlands	$1. 9
Norway	. 8
Poland	364. 0
United Kingdom	8. 4
Sweden	. 5
Liberia	8. 0
Nigeria	13. 8
Ethiopia	10. 6
Australia	. 3
Pacific Trust Territory	106. 2
Latin America regional	2. 9
Nonregional	1, 769. 8
Total	10, 178. 7

Subscriptions to international organizations

[U.S. fiscal years, millions of dollars]

	Total 1946–65
U.N. technical assistance	402.1
U.N. Relief Works Agency	288.5
U.N. Children's Fund	147.5
Indus Basin Development Fund	111.1
U.N. Emergency Forces	24.8
Malaria Eradication (WHO)	17.5
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	13.4
U.N. for Congo-Technical Assistance	16.9
U.N. Peace Keeping, Cyprus	14.6
International Atomic Energy Agency	4.4
FAO world food program	5.0
Medical research (WHO)	2.5
Community water supply (WHO)	.9
Other	.1
Total	1,451.5

Other U.S. economic programs

[U.S. fiscal years, millions of dollars]

	Total 1946–65
U.N. headquarters loan and bond issue	141.3
UNRRA grant and miscellaneous expenses	377.2
International Refugee Organization	237.0
International Children's Emergency Fund	80.8
Migration and refugee assistance	36.1
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	3.7
Peace Corps	44.4
Civilian supplies	5,315.0
British loan	3,750.0
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Post-UNRRA and Interim Aid	3,442.0
Surplus property credits	1,492.0
Philippine rehabilitation	634.0
Civilian relief in Korea	420.0
Peace Corps	246.0
International Refugee Organization	237.0
India wheat loan	190.0
United Nations loans	141.0
Inter-American and related highways	134.0
Greek-Turkish aid	122.0
Korean aid program	122.0
Development and support (trust territories)	98.0
Foot and mouth disease eradication	94.0
UNICEF (U.N. Children's Fund)	81.0
Philippine War damage claims	73.0
Pakistan wheat	67.0
Lend-lease (including silver)	61.0
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	60.0
European Atomic Energy Commission	56.0
Institute of Inter-American Affairs and other Technical Assistance (non-AID)	52.0
Yugoslav emergency relief	38.0
Philippine funding (Treasury Department)	38.0
Migration and refugee assistance	36.0
Libyan special purpose funds	33.0
Administrative area development	19.0
Berlin investment fund	13.0
Other	70.0
Total	18,054.5

World War I debt, principal and interest due and unpaid, June 30, 1965

Armenia	$39,350,997
Austria	23,376,661
Belgium	457,219,078
Czechoslovakia	177,612,052
Estonia	26,237,301
Finland	5,071,000
France	4,688,478,840
Great Britain	6,837,659,302
Greece	36,840,335
Hungary	$2,893,071
Italy	1,005,083,409
Latvia	10,807,540
Lithuania	9,636,136
Poland	325,541,224
Rumania	77,133,611
Russia	640,680,535
Yugoslavia	44,784,469
Total	14,408,355,560

Total assistance, by country, from June 30, 1946, through June 30, 1965, including agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts

[In millions]

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	
Afghanistan	$307.1
Ceylon	92.2
Cyprus	20.9
Greece	3,685.8
India	5,941.5
Iran	1,550.3
Iraq	102.6
Israel	1,133.1
Jordan	512.3
Lebanon	93.0
Nepal	86.1
Pakistan	2,944.9
Saudi Arabia	136.9
Syrian Arab Republic	84.0
Turkey	3,752.4
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	1,100.3
Yemen	39.1
Central Treaty Organization	52.4
Near East and south Asia regional	1,119.5
Near East and south Asia total	22,754.4
LATIN AMERICA	
Argentina	712.9
Bolivia	435.9
Brazil	2,871.5
British Guiana	17.1
British Honduras	3.8
Chile	1,130.3
Colombia	734.7
Costa Rica	136.3
Cuba	57.6
Dominican Republic	207.9
Ecuador	248.8
El Salvador	99.9
Guatemala	210.7
Haiti	110.6
Honduras	74.8
Jamaica	40.3
Mexico	1,055.1
Nicaragua	112.0
Panama	159.6
Paraguay	90.2
Peru	675.2
Surinam	5.0
Trinidad and Tobago	43.3
Uruguay	112.6
Venezuela	388.1
Other West Indies	3.3
ROCAP	84.1
Latin American regional	740.1
Latin American total	10,561.7
FAR EAST	
Burma	114.6
Cambodia	343.1
China	4,778.2
Hong Kong	55.7
Indochina, undistributed	1,535.2
Indonesia	875.9
Japan	4,138.7
Korea	6,315.9
Laos	418.6
Malaysia	39.1
Philippines	1,914.8
Ryukyu Islands	325.7
Thailand	442.8
Vietnam	2,383.7
Far East regional	2,723.9
Far East total	26,405.9
AFRICA	
Algeria	$163.7
Burundi	72.4
Cameroon	25.1
Central African Republic	2.8
Chad	4.2
Congo (Brazzaville)	2.4
Congo (Léopoldville)	317.4
Dahomey	8.7
Ethiopia	247.6
Gabon	4.8
Gambia	.1
Ghana	170.4
Guinea	70.2
Ivory Coast	26.0
Kenya	36.4
Liberia	237.0
Libya	217.3
Malagasy Republic	7.9
Malawi	8.7
Mali	15.8
Mauritania	2.8
Morocco	529.4
Niger	8.8
Nigeria	163.7
Rwanda	1.7
Senegal	25.0
Sierra Leone	27.2
Somali Republic	47.6
Republic of South Africa	167.4
Southern Rhodesia	7.1
Sudan	91.5
Tanzania	44.0
Togo	9.9
Tunisia	470.3
Uganda	17.3
Upper Volta	5.5
Zambia	30.2
East Africa regional	11.2
Regional USAID/Africa	1.0
Africa regional	54.1
Africa total	3,354.6
EUROPE	
Albania	20.4
Austria	1,257.1
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,107.3
Czechoslovakia	193.0
Denmark	933.7
East Germany	0.8
Finland	146.7
France	9,465.1
Germany (Federal Republic)	5,149.0
Berlin	131.9
Hungary	31.5
Iceland	76.4
Ireland	195.9
Italy	6,089.4
Netherlands	2,617.7
Norway	1,283.4
Poland	573.6
Portugal	531.1
Spain	1,908.7
Sweden	125.2
United Kingdom	9,269.8
U.S.S.R.	186.4
Yugoslavia	2,761.4
Europe regional	2,796.5
Europe total	47,852.0
Canada	40.0
Australia	142.6
New Zealand	21.5
Trust Territory of Pacific Islands	107.4
Nonregional total	5,779.5
Total	6,090.5
Total assistance to all countries	117,019.1

Balances of foreign currencies acquired by the U.S. Government without payment of dollars, as of Dec. 31, 1965

[In millions of dollars equivalents]

	Available for U.S. use	Available for country use	Balance on hand
Excess currency countries:			
India	586.2	732.0	1,318.2
Poland	492.8		492.8
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	121.3	139.9	261.2
Pakistan	125.4	124.9	250.3
Yugoslavia	41.7	90.9	132.6
Israel	25.9	29.4	55.3
Burma	23.7	15.3	39.0
Guinea	4.5	19.6	24.1
Tunisia	6.7	15.4	22.1
Ceylon	2.1	12.8	14.9
Total excess currencies	1,430.3	1,180.2	2,610.5
Near-excess countries (11 countries), total	25.8	108.9	[1] 133.1
Nonexcess currencies (67 countries), total	40.3	132.4	[1] 133.7
Grand total (all currencies)	1,496.4	1,421.5	[1] 2,877.3

[1] Total balance on hand for near-excess and nonexcess countries is less than the sum of the available use columns because of advances made of unfunded currencies which are still kept on the books as available for U.S. use.

Source: Treasury Department Fiscal Service, Bureau of Accounts, C.Q.

U.S. contributions to multilateral programs

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1965 actual	Fiscal year 1966 estimated	Fiscal year 1967 proposed
U.N. development program	$60,000	$65,000	$70,000
U.N. Children's Fund	12,000	12,000	12,000
Indus Basin Development Fund	32,336	30,684	33,000
U.N. technical and operational assistance to the Congo	5,000	5,000	5,000
International Atomic Energy Agency operational program	1,000	1,000	1,000
U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization world food program	1,362	2,000	2,000
International Secretariat for Volunteer Service	22	50	65
U.N. peacekeeping operations:			
U.N. emergency force (Near East)	850	1,456	6,838
U.N. force in Cyprus	[1] 5,248	9,060	
U.N. Relief and Works Agency	[2] 16,000	[2] 14,000	[2] 14,000
U.N. Institute for Training and Research		400	500
World Health Organization medical research		75	150
U.N. education and training program for South Africans	75		
Total	134,393	140,725	144,553

[1] In addition, $5,052,000 funded from Contingency Fund.

[2] Total pledge, including surplus agricultural commodities: Fiscal year 1965, $23,500,000; fiscal year 1966, $22,900,000; fiscal year 1967, $22,900,000.

National debt as of:	*Billion*
June 30, 1947	$258.4
June 30, 1965	317.9
June 30, 1966	320.4
Total U.S. gold stock (per Federal Reserve Board):	
June 30, 1947	$21,266,000,000
June 30, 1965	13,934,000,000
May 31, 1966 (preliminary)	13,582,000,000

(The above figures include Treasury holdings, also stabilization fund holdings which vary from month to month.)

Gold owned as of June 30, 1966 ---------- $13,433,471,708.37

(From Treasury Daily—does not include gold in stabilization fund as there is a delay of a month in reporting this.)

Agency for International Development—Summary of delinquent loan installments by loan program, as of Dec. 31, 1965

Loan programs	Amounts delinquent			Outstanding principal on delinquent loans
	Interest	Principal	Total	
Aid loans from dollar appropriations:				
New development loan fund	$10,093.62	0	$10,093.62	$3,704,920.48
Alliance for Progress Fund	136,540.15	0	136,540.15	40,214,419.44
Other AID loans	951,585.38	$259,598.76	1,211,184.14	15,850.257.44
Subtotal for AID	1,098,219.15	259,598.76	1,357,817.91	59,769,597.36
DLF liquidation account	2,897,190.74	5,637,491.90	8,534,682.64	65,004,582.17
Public Law 480 loans:				
Country loans (sec. 104 (d) and (g))	147,056.17	19,215.26	166,271.43	57,827,190.18
Cooley loans (sec. 104(e))	1,138,999.62	1,087,379.58	2,226,379.20	25,219,525.06
Subtotal for Public Law 480	1,286,065.79	1,106,594.84	2,392,650.63	83,046,715.24
Predecessor agencies (excluding DLF):				
Regular programs	1,036,689.01	304,036.92	1,340,725.93	61,262,809.66
Basic material programs	0	0	0	0
Subtotal for predecessor agencies	1,036,689.01	304,036.92	1,340,725.93	61,262,809.66
Grand total	6,318,154.69	7,307,722.42	13,625,877.11	269,083,704.43

Defaults on loans of Export-Import Bank and international lending agencies

Agency and date of information	Principal amount in default [1]	Interest in default [1]
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, June 30, 1966	0	0
International Development Association, June 30, 1966	0	0
International Finance Corp., June 30, 1966:		
Colombia	3,000	(2)
Greece	30,000	15,900
Peru	318,600	33,000
Inter-American Development Bank,[3] June 30 1966: Brazil	[4] 325,225	(2)
Export-Import Bank,[5] [6], Mar. 31, 1966:		
Bolivia	17,974,000	9,597,000
Cuba	12,040,000	11,493,000
Argentina	3,159,000	-------
Costa Rica	1,429,000	58,000
Nigeria	-------	-------
Chile	-------	-------
Colombia	-------	-------
Peru	-------	-------
Uruguay	-------	-------
Iran	-------	-------

[1] Excludes funds in transit and similar temporary remittance delays.

[2] Not available.

[3] Defaults 30 days or more.

[4] Dollar loans only.

[5] Direct loans held by Eximbank.

[6] Defaults 90 days or more.

Economic assistance, fiscal year 1967; request for new authorizations and appropriations

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorization		Comparable fiscal year 1966 appropriations [1]	Fiscal year 1967 appropriations requested
	Authorization ceiling	Length		
Development loans	1,250	5 years	618.2	665.4
Technical cooperation	(2)	do	202.4	231.3
Alliance for Progress:				
Development loans	750	do	435.1	455.3
Technical cooperation	100	do	75.0	87.7
Southeast Asia multilateral and regional program	(2)	do	-------	-------
Supporting assistance:				
General	200	do	684.2	197.2
Vietnam	(2)	do	-------	-------
Contingency fund	150	do	[3] 239.0	70.0
Contributions to international organizations	(2)	do	144.8	140.4
American schools and hospitals abroad	(2)	do	7.0	11.0
Surveys of investment opportunities	(2)	do	-------	-------
Administrative and other expenses, State	(4)	(4)	3.1	3.3
Total	-------	-------	2,463.0	2,469.0

[1] Comparable fiscal year 1966 appropriation column includes supplemental request for $415,000,000 ($315,000,000 supporting assistance; $100,000,000 contingency fund).

[2] Such funds as may be necessary.

[3] Includes $89,000,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1966 for southeast Asia contingency fund.

[4] No new authorization needed; existing law provides for a permanent authorization for such funds as may be necessary.

Military assistance program

[In millions of dollars]

	1965	1966	1967
Total obligational authority (less Vietnam)	967.7	1,051.3	1,027.0
Recoupments and reappropriations	−140.5	−121.3	−110.0
New obligational authority (less Vietnam)	827.2	930.0	917.0

NOTE.—The $917,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 does not include funds for Vietnam, where support will be provided by the Department of Defense appropriations.

OTHER U.S. ECONOMIC PROGRAMS

Civilian Supplies.
British Loan.
United Nations Relief & Rehabilitation.
Surplus Property Credits.
Philippine Rehabilitation.
Civilian Relief in Korea.
Peace Corps.
International Refugee Organization.
India Wheat Loan.
United Nations Loans.
Inter-American & Related Highways.
Greek-Turkish Aid.
Korean Aid Program.
Development & Support (Trust Territories).
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication.
UNICEF (UN Children's Fund).
Philippine War Damage Claims.
Pakistan Wheat.
Lend-Lease (Including Silver).
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
European Atomic Energy Commission.
Institute of Inter-American Affairs and Other Technical Assistance.
Yugoslav Emergency Relief.
Philippine Funding (Treasury Department).
Migration & Refugee Assistance.
Libyan Special Purpose Fund.
Administrative Area Development.
Berlin Investment Fund.

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan, Ceylon, Cyprus, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Republic (Egypt), Yemen, Central Treaty Organization, Near East and South Asia regional.

Near East and south Asia—Total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4,625.1	192.6	232.2	4,432.5
Food for peace	3,370.8	22.4	169.8	3,348.4
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	987.4	323.1	157.0	664.3
Other U.S. economic programs	383.0	156.9	57.3	233.0
Military assistance	118.5	56.9	0.2	61.6
Total loans	9,484.8	751.9	616.5	8,739.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4,478.1			
Food for peace	2,940.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	538.7			
Military assistance	6,145.9			
Total grants	14,103.1	751.9	616.5	8,739.8

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	[1] $194
Fiscal year 1967 program	799
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	4,651

[1] This figure includes a total of $323,000 to Aden, Bahrein, Kuwait, Mauritius and Qatar.

Afghanistan

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 14,200,000; area, 254,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $85]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	24.8	0.3	1.8	24.5
Food for peace: Loans to governments	.6			.6
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	39.3	7.4	16.9	31.9
Total loans	64.7	7.7	18.7	57.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	153.6			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	82.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	1.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	2.3			
Military assistance	3.1			
Total grants	242.4	7.7	18.7	57.0

Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$8,000
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	587,000,000
Fiscal year 1967 program under Public Law 480, title II	30,600,000

NOTE.—Other assistance classified

Ceylon

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,800,000; area, 25,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $144]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.7	0.9	0.9	4.8
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	5.3			
Loans to governments	11.1			
Subtotal	16.4		0.8	16.4
Total loans	22.1	0.9	1.7	21.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	16.3			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	5.3			
Emergency relief and economic development	10.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	36.7			
Other U.S. economic programs	0.5			
Total grants	68.8	0.9	1.7	21.2

Ceylon—Continued

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.3
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	124.0
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Under Public Law 480, title I	4.2
Contingency fund loan	7.5
Subtotal	11.7
Fiscal year 1967 program under Public Law 480, title I	10.0

NOTE.—1967 lending will depend on Government's performance in financial affairs in fiscal year 1966.

Cyprus

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 600,000; area, 4,000 square miles; GNP per capita (estimated) $555]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	0.6			0.6
Loans to governments	1.1			1.1
Total loans	1.7			1.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1.5			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	15.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	.6			
Other U.S. economic programs	.3			
Total grants	17.4			1.7

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.8

NOTE.—Fiscal year 1966 assistance estimated at $200,000; fiscal year 1967 assistance proposed at $200,000.

Greece

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 8,400,000; area, 50,000 square miles; GNP per capita, 1962 prices, $594]

	Total 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	117.4	5.5	11.9	111.9
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	12.0			
Loans to governments	56.3			
Dollar credit sales	17.9			
Total, food for peace	86.2	2.7	9.5	83.5
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	38.3	7.5	6.9	30.8
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 96.6	86.5	26.4	10.1
Total loans	338.5	102.2	54.7	236.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	962.3			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	10.0			
Grants for economic development	7.3			
Emergency relief and economic development	3.7			
Voluntary relief agencies	128.0			
Other U.S. economic programs	440.1			
Military assistance	1,779.9			
Total grants	3,331.3	102.2	54.7	236.3

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$16
World War I debt, June 30, 1965: Principal and interest due and unpaid	37

[1] AID carries this amount as $536.7; $440.1 of it is a grant. (See report, p. 10.)

NOTES

GAO's opinion of ineffective and inefficient administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military assistance program for Greece (classified): "Unnecessary training and poor utilization of trained personnel." Date issued June 29, 1965.

GAO's opinion of a review of the military assistance program for Greece (classified): "Various supply management deficiencies." Date issued Feb. 21, 1962.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Greece (classified) report to the Secretary of Defense: "Suggestions for improving controls, determining and disposing of excesses, and developing long-range cost estimates." Date issued Sept. 8, 1958.

India

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 490,000,000; area 1,260,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $85]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	2,101.0	88.5	9.20	2,012.5
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	202.6			
Loans to governments	1,505.6			
Total	1,708.2	5.0	70.1	1,703.2
Export-Import Bank: long-term loans	406.4	30.0	41.0	376.4
Other U.S. economic programs	[2] 230.1	38.2	28.3	191.9
Total loans	4,445.7	161.7	231.4	4,284.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	384.7			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	788.2			
Emergency relief and economic development	21.9			
Voluntary relief agencies	229.0			
Assistance from other country agreements	6.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	6.9			
Total grants	1,436.8	161.7	231.4	4,284.0

[1] Excludes $20.2 million loan in fiscal year 1959 financed under Asian Economic Development Fund.

[2] AID carries this figure as $237, $6.9 of it is a grant.

	Million
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954 through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$59.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	12.5
In early 1966 a loan was authorized for purchase of raw materials and spare parts essential to economic development	100.0
In December 1965 a loan was negotiated for fertilizer	50.0
In May 1966 an agreement was made (after Mrs. Ghandi's visit) for food under Public Law 480	313.5
Total	476.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	12.2

NOTES

Public Law 480 deliveries will be 50 percent greater in 1967 than the average level in recent years, but will be contingent on Indian performance in improving agricultural production.

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance program for India, fiscal years 1955–58: "Nonutilization of equipment and need to revise project agreement for a powerplant." Date issued Sept. 14, 1959. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $247.

Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965, $1,299 million.

Iraq

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1964, 7,000,000; area, 173,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $255]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	14.8	0.9	0.1	13.9
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	7.6			7.6
Other U.S. economic programs	0.9	0.9		
Total loans	23.3	1.8	0.1	21.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	19.0			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	6.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	4.3			
Military assistance	46.4			
Total grants	75.7	1.8	0.1	21.5

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$3.6

Iran

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 23,400,000; area 636,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $220]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	218.2	37.3	29.2	180.9
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	4.7			
Loans to governments	34.1			
Dollar credit sales	11.8			
Total	50.6	.4	1.8	50.2
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	97.2	45.7	15.6	51.5
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 25.8	2.4		23.4
Total loans	391.8	85.8	46.6	306.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	378.7			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	5.9			
Emergency relief and economic development	37.3			
Voluntary relief agencies	19.0			
Other U.S. economic programs	4.6			
Military assistance	712.2			
Total grants	1,157.7	85.8	46.6	306.0

[1] AID carries this amount as $30,400,000; $4,600,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.8
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	376.0
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical assistance	2.4
Food, Public Law 480, title IV	7.5
Total	9.9
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Technical assistance	1.4
Food, Public Law 480, title IV	7.5
Total	8.9

NOTES

Other assistance classified.

Excerpt from book entitled "Foreign Assistance Act of 1966—Objectives and Proposed Fiscal Year 1967 Program": "Iran's oil revenues, now exceed $500,000,000 a year compared to $350,000,000 3 years ago, and it can finance foreign loans at conventional interest rates."

Excerpt from book entitled "Proposed Economic Assistance Programs, Fiscal Year 1967": "Rising oil revenues, exceeding $500,000,000 this year (compared with $350,000,000 4 years ago), are now financing the development program. Government expenditures for development average $250,000,000 annually."

GAO's opinion of unnecessary dollar grants to Iran under the foreign assistance program (classified report): "Grants used by Iran to procure wheat, valued at $12,500,000, from Australia whereas surplus wheat was available in the United States." Date issued, Feb. 26, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts, $39,000,000.

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance program for Iran, fiscal years 1956–60: "Improvements needed in various administrative practices and procedures of U.S. agencies." Date issued, June 27, 1961. Pertinent dollar amounts, $169,000,000.

GOA's opinion of administration of U.S. assistance program for Iran, fiscal years 1952–55: "Recommends consolidation of common support functions of the Embassy and the mission, and that counterpart withdrawals be subject to prior approval by the mission." Date issued, Mar. 15, 1956. Pertinent dollar amounts, $205,000,000.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance training program for Iran (classified report to the Secretary of Defense): "Lack of in-country training, insufficient personnel trained, nonutilization of trained personnel, and unnecessary transportation costs to the United States." Date issued, Dec. 10, 1965.

GAO's opinion of inadequate consideration given to utilizing reserve fleet ships in lieu of providing new ships to Iran under the military assistance program (classified): "Reluctancy of responsible officials to ask for congressional approval and use of unrealistic cost data." Date issued, Feb. 3, 1965.

GAO's opinion of inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to Iran under foreign assistance program (classified): Date issued, July 30, 1963.

GAO's opinion of ineffective maintenance and utilization of equipment furnished under MAP (classified): "Lack of U.S. assistance to overcome maintenance and utilization problems." Date issued, July 16, 1963.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Iran (classified): "Suggesting the development of usage standards and the use of end item utilization inspections, the suspension of deliveries pending a study of requirements, and better controls over disposal activities." Date issued, Jan. 9, 1959.

GAO's opinion of waste of funds in construction of Shahabad Depot in Iran under the military assistance program (classified): "Iranian Army neither needed nor wanted depot from the start, resulting in negligible use and present plans for dismantling." Date issued, Mar. 22, 1965.

Israel

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,600,000; area, 8,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $1,257]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	226.0	10.8	19.2	215.2
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	48.1	--------	--------	--------
Loans to governments	179.9	--------	--------	--------
Assistance from other country sales agreements	2.5	--------	--------	--------
Total	230.5	6.1	27.7	224.4
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	221.0	145.6	56.3	75.4
Military assistance	27.6	7.2	.1	20.4
Total loans	705.1	169.7	103.3	535.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	278.0	--------	--------	--------
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	32.2	--------	--------	--------
Emergency relief and economic development	1.5	--------	--------	--------
Voluntary relief agencies	56.5	--------	--------	--------
Other U.S. economic programs	.1	--------	--------	--------
Total grants	368.3	169.7	103.3	535.4

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$59.7

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of administration of U.S. assistance program for Israel, fiscal years 1952–55: "Reporting action taken by agency to correct earlier program deficiencies." Date issued Sept. 20, 1956. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 233.2.

Jordan

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars

[Population in 1965, 1,900,000; area, 37,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $240]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4.1	1.7	0.4	2.4
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	1.6	--------	.2	1.6
Total loans	6.7	1.7	.6	4.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	389.8	--------	--------	--------
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	.8	--------	--------	--------
Emergency relief and economic development	58.5	--------	--------	--------
Voluntary relief agencies	17.5	--------	--------	--------
Other U.S. economic programs	1.3	--------	--------	--------
Military assistance	37.0	--------	--------	--------
Total grants	504.9	1.7	.6	4.0

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.7
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	4
Supporting assistance	32
Total	36
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Technical cooperation	3.6
Supporting assistance	30.0
Total	33.6

NOTE.—Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 is classified.

Lebanon

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,500,000; area, 4,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $392]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.4	0.9	0.5	4.5
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	2.4	.4	.5	2.0
Other U.S. economic programs	1.8	1.6	.1	.2
Total loans	9.6	2.9	1.1	6.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	52.6	--------	--------	--------
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	17.5	--------	--------	--------
Military assistance	8.7	--------	--------	--------
Total grants	78.8	2.9	1.1	6.7

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$4.6

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of administration of U.S. assistance program for Lebanon, fiscal years 1952–55: "Discloses need for improvements in various administrative practices and procedures, and questions desirability of employing American University of Beirut." Date issued July 7, 1956. Pertinent amounts, $21,400,000.

Nepal

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 10,100,000; area 54,000 square miles; GNP per capita $70]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.4	--------	--------	2.4
Food for peace: Assistance from other country sales agreements	[1] 1.0	--------	0.1	1.0
Total loans	3.4	--------	.1	3.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	36.9	--------	--------	--------
Food for peace:				
Assistance from other country sales agreements	37.8	--------	--------	--------
Emergency relief and economic development	5.4	--------	--------	--------
Other U.S. economic programs	2.6	--------	--------	--------
Total grants	82.7	--------	.1	3.4

[1] AID carries this amount as $38.8, $37.8 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	$60.0
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	3.6
Food, Public Law 480	10.0
Total	13.6
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Technical cooperation	3.4
Food, Public Law 480	8.0
Total	11.4

Pakistan

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 13,300,000; area, 365,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $85]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,091.7	34.0	44.8	1,057.7
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	51.3			
Loans to governments	255.6			
Total loans	306.9	1.4	24.7	305.5
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	35.7	6.6	2.6	29.1
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] .1	.1		
Total loans	1,434.4	42.1	72.1	1,392.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	638.2			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	79.3			
Grants for economic development	551.9			
Emergency relief and economic development	107.5			
Voluntary relief agencies	51.2			
Other U.S. economic programs	74.6			
Military assistance [2]	7.8			
Total grants	1,510.5	42.1	72.1	1,392.3

NOTE.—Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965, $182,000,000.

[1] AID carries this amount as 74.7; 74.6 of it is a grant.

[2] Military assistance is classified with exception of $7,800,000 which is essentially a transfer on an indeterminate basis.

NOTES

Project loans totaling $39,200,000 which were recently released were authorized in fiscal year 1965.

Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation, $7,800,000.

Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation, $9,100,000.

Fiscal year 1967 program contingent on relations between United States and Pakistan.

Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices, $56,000.

GAO's opinion of review of the mutual security program presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1961 for economic assistance to Korea, Pakistan, and Vietnam: "Suggestions for revealing more meaningful data in budget presentations." Date issued Mar. 29, 1961.

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance program for Pakistan, fiscal years 1955–57: "Need to adjust aid program to more realistic levels and to determine causes of unclaimed commodity imports." Date issued Mar. 31, 1959. Pertinent dollar amounts, $307,500,000.

GAO's opinion of administration of U.S. assistance program for Pakistan, fiscal years 1952–54: "Need to evaluate status of lagging projects, improve program planning, and improve procurement and contracting policies and practices." Date issued Dec. 27, 1955. Pertinent dollar amounts, $45,500,000.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Pakistan (classified): "Suggesting the development of usage standards and the use of end-item utilization inspections, the consideration of existing country assets, and the country's disposal practices, and the development of long-range cost estimates." Date issued Jan. 12, 1960.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program to Pakistan, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified). Date issued Aug. 30, 1957.

GAO's opinion of excessive ocean transportation costs incurred under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: "A disproportionate percentage of shipments made at U.S. expense were routed to high-rate ports in East Pakistan, whereas most of the shipments made at Pakistan's expense were routed to lower-rate ports in West Pakistan." Date issued Oct. 30, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $850,000.

GAO's opinion of inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to Pakistan under the foreign assistance program (classified). (Additional details are classified.) Date issued Sept. 25, 1963.

Saudi Arabia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 8,000,000; area, 870,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $190]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	14.8	14.8	3 2	
Other U.S. economic programs	4.4	4.3		0.1
Military assistance	56.4	48.7	.1	7.7
Total loans	75.6	67.8	3.3	7.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	27.4			
Food for peace: Emergency and economic development	.8			
Military assistance	32.3			
Total grants	60.5	67.8	3.3	7.8

Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$800,000

Syrian Arab Republic

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 5,700,000; area, 200,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $155]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	18.2	0.5	0.3	17.7
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	6.6			
Loans to governments	22.8			
Dollar credit sales	1.8			
Total	31.2		.3	31.2
Total loans	49.4	.5	.6	48.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1.7			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	29.7			
Voluntary relief agencies	2.4			
Total grants	33.8	.5	.6	48.9

NOTE.—No programs for fiscal years 1966–67.

Turkey

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 31,000,000; area, 296,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $245]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	670.4	10.5	25.4	659.9
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	68.6			
Loans to governments	194.1			
	262.7	5.2	13.8	257.5
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	75.3	44.5	6.9	30.8
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 12.2	12.2	2.5	
Total loans	1,020.6	72.4	48.6	948.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	937.6			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	100.9			
Grants for economic development	2.2			
Assistance from other country sales agreements	1.8			
Emergency relief and economic development	31.2			
Voluntary relief agencies	20.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	5.4			
Military assistance	2,635.3			
Total grants	3,734.8	72.4	48.6	948.2

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$17.6

[1] AID carries this amount as 17.6; 5.4 of it is a grant.

Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965, $218,000,000.

Fiscal year 1966 program (under negotiation): Technical cooperation, $4,700,000; Food, Public Law 480, $18,000,000; total, $22,700,000.

Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation, $4,400,000.

NOTES

GAO's opinion of examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey, fiscal year 1958–62: "Failure to follow an overall plan based on country's resources and highest priority needs." Date issued June 30, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $1,750,000,000.

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey (June 3, 1957): "Improper practices in deposits of local currency sales proceeds and improper obligating procedures." Date issued July 24, 1958.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program in Turkey (classified). Date issued May 31, 1962.

GAO had a similar opinion of the military assistance program for Turkey, January 29, 1960, and August 30, 1957.

GAO's opinion of the review of the administration of the mutual defense assistance program for France and Turkey (classified report to the Assistant Secretary of Defense): "Programing based on unverified data from the countries, plus other classified matters." Date issued June 19, 1956.

United Arab Republic (Egypt)

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 29,800,000; area, 386,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $150]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	103.2	1.0	4.5	102.2
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	77.7			
Loans to governments	582.3			
Total, food for peace	660.0	.7	26.1	659.3
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	47.8	20.6	6.9	27.2
Other U.S. economic programs	11.1	10.7		.4
Total loans	822.1	33.0	37.5	789.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	68.1			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	25.0			
Emergency relief and economic development	25.8			
Voluntary relief agencies	140.0			
Total grants	258.9	33.0	37.5	789.1

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$19.3
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	1,664.0
Fiscal year 1966 program: Technical cooperation	2.2
Fiscal year 1967 program: Technical cooperation	2.2

NOTES

Other assistance classified.

The new Public Law 480 agreement negotiated in fiscal year 1966 is for 6 months' duration and limited to $55,000,000, ¼ of which will be title IV payable in dollars.

GAO's opinion of administration of the U.S. assistance program for Egypt, fiscal years 1953–55: "Discloses need for improvements in programing and in administrative practices and procedures." Date issued Apr. 11, 1956. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 59.8.

GAO's opinion of displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic (including a classified supplement): "Title I, Public Law 480 program sales displaced commercial sales of $5,500,000." Date issued July 20, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 17.073.

GAO's opinion questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: "Grant based on anticipated need that did not materialize. Much was sold commercially in the United Arab Republic." Date issued, July 16, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 23.7.

GAO's opinion of understatement of claims against the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia for recovery of excessive ocean transportation costs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued, Mar. 13, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 0.278.

Yemen

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,000,000; area, 75,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $90]

	Total, 1959–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	29.0			
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	10.1			
Total grants	39.1			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$39.1
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance, cumulative through 1965	141.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, supporting assistance	2.9
Fiscal year 1967 program, supporting assistance	2.4

Central Treaty Organization (Cento)

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1957–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	18.3			18.3
Total loans	18.3			18.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	34.1			
Total grants	34.1			18.3

NOTES

CENTO projects have been financed by supporting assistance funds. No new AID funds are required for these projects.

GAO's opinion of followup examination on certain aspects of U.S. assistance to the Central Treaty Organization for a rail link between Turkey and Iran: "Loan for equipment known to be unneeded." Date issued Apr. 29, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $0.543.

GAO's opinion of examination of certain economic development projects for assistance to Central Treaty Organization fiscal years 1957–62: "Defects in the projects and in their administration resulting in a questionable need for over $8,000,000 of program funds." Date issued Mar. 5, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $28.7.

Near East and South Asia Regional

[In millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	18.3	0.7	1.3	17.6
Military assistance	34.5	1.0		33.5
Total loans	52.8	1.7	1.3	51.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	68.6			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	103.2			
Voluntary relief agencies	11.6			
Military assistance	883.2			
Total grants	1,066.6	1.7	1.3	51.1

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$2.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.5

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, British Guiana, British Honduras, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Surinam, Trinidad & Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, other West Indies, Rocap, Latin America regional.

Latin America, total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
AID and predecessor agencies	1,929.5	21.4	33.1	1,908.1
Food for peace	686.1	21.0	25.5	665.1
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	3,568.6	1,580.6	717.4	1,998.0
Social progress trust fund—Other economic programs	530.8	54.7	16.1	476.1
Military assistance	131.8	54.3	5.1	77.5
Total loans	6,846.8	1,732.0	797.2	5,114.8

Latin America, total—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,080.6			
Food for peace	[1] 703.8			
Other U.S. economic programs	925.2			
Military assistance	793.4			
Total grants	3,503.0	1,732.0	797.2	5,114.8

[1] Includes $6,100,000 made available to American Red Cross in connection with Cuban prisoner exchange.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	[1] 244.6
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Supporting assistance	33.0
Alliance for Progress:	
Technical cooperation	95.0
Loans	500.0
Total	628.0

[1] This figure includes assistance to Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, Canal Zone, Netherlands Antilles, Virgin Islands, Barbados, British West Africa, Masquat and Oman, Portuguese Guinea, and Puerto Rico.

NOTES

GAO's opinion of additional interest costs to the United States because of premature releases of funds to the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank: "The title is self-explanatory. The interest costs identified total as much as $60,000 annually." Date issued, Sept. 8, 1964.

Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965, $303,000,000.

Argentina

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 21,700,000; area, 1,084,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $523]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	137.4	9.6	8.2	127.8
Food for peace: Loans to governments	18.2		0.2	18.2
Export-Import Bank long term loans	[1] 434.7	194.8	102.9	239.9
Social Progress Trust Fund	38.5	0.3	0.1	38.2
Military assistance	5.9	4.5	0.8	1.4
Total loans	634.7	209.2	112.2	425.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	10.3			
Military assistance	62.5			
Total grants	72.8	209.2	112.2	425.5

[1] Excludes refunding of $72,000,000 in fiscal year 1963.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$5.1
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	119.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	1.9
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.4

NOTE.—AID has not scheduled new loan commitments for fiscal year 1967.

Bolivia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,200,000; area, 424,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $173]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	73.7	0.7	0.9	73.0
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	4.1			
Loans to governments	25.3			
Dollar credit sales	4.3			
Total	33.7		.5	33.7
Social progress trust fund	14.6	.1		14.5
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	26.4	2.6	5.5	23.8
Total loans	148.4	3.4	6.9	145.0

Bolivia—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	211.6			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	20.7			
Voluntary relief agencies	16.6			
Other U.S. economic programs	16.9			
Military assistance	13.0			
Total grants	278.8	3.4	6.9	145.0

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$8.7
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	3.6
Contingency fund	1.0
Mining Bank of Bolivia (to encourage expansion in medium-sized private banks)	4.3
Nationalized Mining Corp. (development loan)	1.1
Total	10.0

NOTES

Fiscal year 1967 will mark end of AID dollar support.

Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

GAO's opinion on examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Bolivia, fiscal years 1954-59 (classified report): "Action needed to evaluate status of projects in process, to recover usable equipment from defunct projects, and to follow up on trainee program." Date issued May 17, 1960. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 114.6.

Brazil

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 82,200,000; area, 3,280,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $177]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	521.4		2.7	521.4
Food for peace: Loans to governments	341.2	0.1	5.4	341.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	[1] 1,163.8	538.2	289.8	581.6
Social Progress Trust Fund	62.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	[2] 38.8			
	100.9	39.2	9.5	61.7
Military assistance	23.4			23.4
Total loans	2,150.7	621.5	307.4	1,529.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	112.3			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	121.9			
Emergency relief and economic development	53.6			
Voluntary relief agencies	86.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	17.5			
Military assistance	246.1			
Total grants	637.7	621.5	307.4	1,529.2

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$83.1
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	184.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	14.4
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	15.8

[1] Excludes refunding of $304,700,000 in fiscal year 1961; $85,900,000 in fiscal year 1964; and $6,600,000 in fiscal year 1965.

[2] AID carries this amount as $56,300,000; $17,500,000 of it is a grant.

NOTES

Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

GAO's opinion of examination of economic and technical assistance program for Brazil, fiscal years 1955-59: "Recommends integration of common support functions of the Department of State and ICA, and comments on other practices and procedures." Date issued, May 27, 1960. Pertinent dollar amounts, $28,400,000.

British Guiana

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 700,000; area, 83,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $291]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.5	---------	---------	5.5
Total loans	5.5	---------	---------	5.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	10.1	---------	---------	---------
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	1.4	---------	---------	---------
Total grants	11.5	---------	---------	5.5

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.1
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.6
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.5

NOTE.—Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

British Honduras

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 100,000; area, 9,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $360]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1.0	---------	---------	---------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.3	---------	---------	---------
Voluntary relief agencies	1.7	---------	---------	---------
Other U.S. economic programs	.8	---------	---------	---------
Total grants	3.8	---------	---------	---------

Total economic assistance	$3,800,000
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	64,000

Chile

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 8,500,000; area, 286,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $471]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	377.0	1.2	3.9	375.8
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	.8	---------	---------	---------
Loans to governments	53.0	---------	---------	---------
Dollar credit sales	41.9	---------	---------	---------
Total	95.7	6.6	4.9	89.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	[1] 359.7	130.0	70.4	229.7
Social Progress Trust Fund	33.9	.4	.3	33.5
Military assistance	1.1	.5	---------	.6
Total loans	867.4	138.7	79.5	728.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	59.5	---------	---------	---------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	4.9	---------	---------	---------
Voluntary relief agencies	72.1	---------	---------	---------
Other U.S. economic programs	11.2	---------	---------	---------
Military assistance	109.9	---------	---------	---------
Total grants	257.6	138.7	79.5	728.7

[1] Excludes refunding of $40,400,000 in fiscal year 1965.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$5.3
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	3.3
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	3.2

NOTES

Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967, classified.

GAO's opinion of deficiencies in the administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile (including classified supplement): "Inadequate planning, inadequate staffing of AID mission, and failure to obtain maximum exchange rate for dollars." Date issued, June 29, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $120.

Colombia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 17,000,000; area, 440,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $306]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	213.2	0.3	5.7	212.9
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	13.1	---------	---------	---------
Loans to governments	42.5	---------	---------	---------
Dollar credit sales	6.9	---------	---------	---------
Total	62.5	2.9	4.3	59.6
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	201.1	108.4	38.2	92.7
Social Progress Trust Fund	49.9	---------	---------	---------
Other U.S. economic programs	[1].8	---------	---------	---------
Total	50.7	1.5	.7	49.2
Total loans	527.5	113.1	48.9	414.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	36.4	---------	---------	---------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.5	---------	---------	---------
Voluntary relief programs	66.1	---------	---------	---------
Other U.S. economic programs	15.8	---------	---------	---------
Military assistance	78.4	---------	---------	---------
Total grants	197.2	113.1	48.9	414.4

[1] AID carries this amount as $16,600,000, $15,800,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$10
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	4.0
Contingency Fund	5.1
Total	5.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	4.6

NOTES

All other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

GAO's opinion of improper payment of port charges on shipments to Columbia of food donated under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: "Tariff rates did not reflect terms of agreements covering the distribution of food." Date issued May 20, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts $393,000.

GAO's opinion of improper payment of port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: "Tariff rates did not reflect terms of agreements covering the commodity sales." Date issued Nov. 17, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $234,000.

Costa Rica

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,400,000; area, 20,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $383]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	35.8	0.2	0.5	35.6
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	[1] 23.9	8.0	3.8	15.9
Social Progress Trust Fund	12.6	.1	.2	12.5
Total loans	72.3	8.3	4.5	64.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	17.6	---------	---------	---------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	4.1	---------	---------	---------
Voluntary relief agencies	1.7	---------	---------	---------
Other U.S. economic programs	37.6	---------	---------	---------
Military assistance	2.0	---------	---------	---------
Total grants	63.0	8.3	4.5	64.0

[1] Excludes refunding of $2,600,000 in fiscal year 1963.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.1
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.1

NOTES

GAO's opinions on Inter-American Highway:

"Unauthorized expenditures for the repair and construction of a section of the Inter-American Highway in the Republic of Costa Rica; $376,000 unauthorized." Date issued, Oct. 20, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts, $1,128,000.

"Questionable validity of $32,000,000 estimates of funds needed to complete Inter-American Highway." Date issued, Dec 8, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $32,000,000.

"Unnecessary costs resulting from deficiencies in construction activities of the Inter-American Highway program in Costa Rica. Unnecessary costs of $125,000." Date issued, Sept. 14, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $85,000,000.

"Unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of right-of-way activities of the Inter-American Highway program in Costa Rica. Unnecessary costs of $1,100,000." Date issued, May 27, 1964.

Cuba

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank long-term loans (total loans)	37.5	1.3	7.0	36.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.8			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.7			
Other U.S. programs	.5			
Military assistance	10.6			
Total grants	14.6	1.3	7.0	36.2

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Feb. 7, 1962, at export market prices	$5.5

NOTES

No activity subsequent to 1961.

General embargo on all trade to Cuba effective Feb. 7, 1962.

General license revoked on May 15, 1964, on all shipments of foodstuffs to Cuba and were made subject to specific license approval. It has since been the policy of the Department of Commerce to deny all such license applications.

Dominican Republic

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3, 600, 000; area, 19,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $246]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	42.6		.04	42.6
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	19.1		.1	19.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	20.7	0.3	.3	20.4
Social Progress Trust Fund	10.3	.2	.1	10.1
Total loans	92.7	.5	.9	92.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	67.3			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	7.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	18.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	4.4			
Military assistance	14.2			
Total grants	111.3	.5	.9	92.2

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$3.9
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	4.4
Contingency Fund	7.3
Total	41.7
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	4.1

NOTES

Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

An excerpt from U.S. News & World Report of June 6, 1966: "The Dominican Republic has received $131,000,000 U.S. aid in the 13 months from the start of the revolution to the time of election June 1, 1966."

Ecuador

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 5,000,000; area, 112,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $215]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	70.8	2.5	2.6	68.3
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	1.2			
Loans to governments	7.2			
Dollar credit sales	8.8			
Total	17.2	.9	1.0	128.5
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	31.6	12.3	7.0	19.3
Social Progress Trust Fund	24.8			
Other U.S. economic programs	[1].5			
Total	25.3	.7	.1	24.6
Total loans	144.9	16.4	10.7	128.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	36.6			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.9			
Voluntary relief agencies	13.0			
Other U.S. economic programs	10.5			
Military assistance	42.2			
Total grants	103.2	16.2	10.7	128.5

[1] AID carries this amount as $11,000,000; $10,500,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.7
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	4.3
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	4.7

NOTES

Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

GAO's opinion on financial statement: "Questionable aspects of budget support loans made to the Government of Ecuador (loans made without insisting that the foreign government develop or utilize other domestic financial resources)." Date issued, Apr. 29, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts, $15,000,000.

El Salvador

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,900,000; area, 8,200 square miles; GNP per capita, $285]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	28.4	0.2	0.1	28.2
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	2.0	.3	.1	1.7
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	9.4	4.0	1.2	5.4
Social Progress Trust Fund	22.0	.3	.4	21.7
Total loans	61.8	4.8	1.8	57.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	20.4			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	0.2			
Voluntary relief agencies	9.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	3.3			
Military assistance	4.3			
Total grants	37.3	4.8	1.8	57.0

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contract from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.8

NOTE.—No program for fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Guatemala

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,400,000; area, 43,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $293]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	24.8	0.8	1.0	24.0
Export-Import Bank long term loans	18.0	3.2	0.6	14.8
Social progress trust fund	14.3			14.3
Military assistance	0.1			0.1
Total loans	57.2	4.0	1.6	53.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	86.1			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	3.2			
Voluntary relief agencies	7.6			
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	40.3			
Military assistance	9.9			
Total grants	147.1	4.0	1.6	53.2

[1] Includes $34.9 for Inter-American Highway.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$6.4
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.6
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.7

NOTES

Other assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

GAO's opinion of examination of economic and technical cooperation programs for Guatemala for fiscal years 1955-59: "Reveals corrective action taken in various administrative areas, including planning prior to project agreements." Date issued Mar. 22, 1960.

Haiti

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,600,000; area, 11,000 square miles GNP; per capita, $73]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4.8	0.1	0.2	4.7
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	25.0	.8	5.1	24.2
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] .3	.1		.2
Total loans	30.1	1.0	5.3	29.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	52.1			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	3.5			
Voluntary relief agencies	9.9			
Other U.S. economic programs	2.7			
Military assistance	4.3			
Total grants	72.5	1.0	5.3	29.1

[1] AID carries this amount as $3,000,000; $2,700,000, of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$8.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, supporting assistance	1.4
Fiscal year 1967 program, supporting assistance	1.4

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Honduras

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,300,000; area, 43,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $282]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	21.6	2.5	1.2	19.1
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	3.2	1.7	.6	1.5
Social Progress Trust Fund	7.6			
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] .1			
Total	7.7	.2	.1	7.5
Total loans	32.5	4.4	1.9	28.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	24.2			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.2			
Voluntary relief agencies	4.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	8.1			
Military assistance	4.4			
Total grants	41.3	4.4	1.9	28.1

[1] AID carries this amount as $8,200,000; $8,100,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.1
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.1

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Jamaica

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,800,000; area, 4,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $421]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	11.6			11.6
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	5.0			5.0
Total loans	16.6			16.6
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4.9			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	1.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	12.5			
Other U.S. economic programs	1.4			
Military assistance	.6			
Total grants	20.4			16.6

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$3.3
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.8
Fiscal year 1967 program technical cooperation	.9

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Mexico

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 40,900,000; area, 760,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $419]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	66.5		0.1	66.5
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	6.3			
Loans to governments	11.4			
Total	17.7	6.6	4.1	11.1
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	736.6	350.5	103.6	386.1
Social Progress Trust Fund	35.5			
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] .3			
Total	35.8	.6	.2	35.2
Military assistance	5.4	4.6	.3	.8
Total loans	862.0	362.3	108.3	499.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	9.4			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	3.5			
Voluntary relief agencies	50.0			
Other U.S. economic programs	99.4			
Military assistance	5.6			
Total grants	167.9	362.3	108.3	499.7

[1] AID carries this amount as $99,700,000; $99,400,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$25.1
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.2
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.2

Nicaragua

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,600,000; area, 57,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $325]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	28.0	0.3	0.5	27.7
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	14.3	6.8	2.4	7.5
Social Progress Trust Fund	13.1	.1	.1	13.0
Total loans	55.4	7.2	3.0	48.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	17.2			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	5.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	25.9			
Military assistance	7.6			
Total grants	55.8	7.2	3.0	48.2

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.8
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.2

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Panama

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,200,000; area, 29,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $488]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	37.5	0.7	1.2	36.8
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	29.8	6.7	3.1	23.1
Social Progress Trust Fund	12.9	.2	.4	12.7
Total loans	80.2	7.6	4.7	72.6
AID and predecessor agencies	31.5			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	8.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	37.6			
Military assistance	1.6			
Total grants	78.8	7.6	4.7	72.6

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954 through Dec. 31, 1965 at export market prices	$0.6
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	1.5
Contingency fund	3.5
Total	5.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.1

NOTES

All other assistance classified.

GAO's opinion of questionable validity of $32,000,000 estimate of funds needed to complete Inter-American Highway (title self-explanatory). Date issued Dec. 8, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $32,000,000.

GAO's opinion of unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of the Inter-American Highway program in the Republic of Panama: "Unnecessary costs of $175,000." Date issued Mar. 24, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts, $60,000,000.

Paraguay

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,900,000; area, 157,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $208]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	18.2	1.2	1.4	17.0
Social Progress Trust Fund	7.8			7.8
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	2.0			
Loans to governments	7.5			
Dollar credit sales	.2			
Total	9.7		.4	9.7
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	10.4	3.1	3.4	7.3
Military assistance	.2			.2
Total loans	46.3	4.3	5.2	42.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	25.4			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	3.4			
Voluntary relief agencies	6.5			
Other U.S. economic programs	2.8			
Military assistance	5.8			
Total grants	43.9	4.3	5.2	42.0

	Thousands
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$2,300
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2,300
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	8

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Peru

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 11,700,000; area, 514,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $280]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	69.9	0.7	0.7	69.2
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	4.5			
Loans to governments	24.4			
Dollar credit sales	2.0			
Subtotal	30.9	2.4	3.1	28.5
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	250.6	126.8	44.6	123.8
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 5.5			
Social progress trust fund	36.0			
	41.5	6.0	2.0	35.5
Military assistance	18.9	16.0	2.2	2.9
Total loans	411.8	151.9	52.6	259.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	45.8			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	29.6			
Voluntary relief agencies	22.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	14.5			
Military assistance	106.6			
Total grants	218.9	151.9	52.6	259.9

[1] AID carries this amount as $20,000,000; $14,500,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$44.4
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	4.9
Contingency fund	0.9
Total, fiscal year 1966 program	5.8
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	5.4

NOTE.—All other assistance classified.

Surinam

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 400,000; area, 55,100 square miles; GNP per capita, $340]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1.0			1.0
Total loans	1.0			1.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3.0			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	0.1			
Voluntary relief agencies	0.9			
Total grants	4.0			1.0

Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$15,000

Trinidad and Tobago

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,000,000; area, 2,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $632]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	13.0	0.6	0.8	12.4
Total loans	13.0	.6	.8	12.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	29.2			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.3			
Voluntary relief agencies	.5			
Other U.S. economic programs	.2			
Total grants	30.2	.6	.8	12.4

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.1
Fiscal year 1966 program, supporting assistance	5.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, supporting assistance	5.0

NOTE.—In consideration for the right to maintain a U.S. Navy base in Trinidad, the United States agreed in 1962 to furnish the Government of Trinidad and Tobago $30 million in economic assistance. Specifically, the agreement called for supporting assistance allotments of $10 million in fiscal year 1963 and $5 million in fiscal years 1964–67.

Uruguay

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,700,000; area, 72,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $518]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	17.8	0.3	0.9	17.5
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	9.1			
Loans to governments	15.2			
Total	24.3	1.2	1.4	23.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	9.7	2.7	0.4	7.0
Social Progress Trust Fund	10.5			
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 2.2			
Total	12.7	1.5	0.4	11.2
Total loans	64.5	5.7	3.1	58.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.8			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	3.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	2.0			
Military assistance	35.4			
Total grants	46.3	5.7	3.1	58.8

[1] AID carries this amount as $4,200,000; $2,000,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965 at export market prices	$1.8

NOTE.—Assistance for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 classified.

Venezuela

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 8,800,000; area, 352,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $833]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	55.0	0.1	0.8	54.9
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	13.9			13.9
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	119.2	30.8	16.8	88.4
Social Progress Trust Fund	73.0	3.2	1.5	69.8
Military assistance	76.8	28.7	1.8	48.1
Total loans	337.9	62.8	20.9	275.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	8.7			
Foor for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	16.2			
Other U.S. economic programs	7.1			
Military assistance	16.1			
Total grants	48.1	62.8	20.9	275.1

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$2.1
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	1.7
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	1.4

Other West Indies

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1955–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
None				
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	2.9			
Other U.S. economic programs	.4			
Total grants	3.3			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$3.3

Regional programs in Central America covering Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama, ROCAP

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	67.0		0.1	67.0
Social progress trust fund	2.9			2.9
Total loans	69.9		0.1	69.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	14.2			
Total grants	14.2		0.1	69.9

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$3.9
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	4.1

NOTE.—Proposed AID assistance in fiscal year 1967 through bilateral programs in 5 Central American countries comprises $10,400,000 in technical cooperation and $36,000,000 in development loans.

Latin America regional

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	25.0	3.0	9.9	22.0
Total loans	25.0	3.0	9.9	22.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	137.2			
Food for Peace: Voluntary relief agencies	1.3			
Social Progress Trust Fund [1]	14.3			
Other U.S. economic programs [2]	550.0			
Military assistance	12.3			
Total grants	715.1	3.0	9.9	22.0

[1] AID has a footnote (see report, p. 55) stating that $2.9 million of this figure is a loan. The full amount is a grant.

[2] Represents subscriptions to Inter-American Development Bank.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$14.9
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	16.3

AFRICA

Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Malagasy Republic, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somali Republic, South Africa, Republic of, Southern Rhodesia, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Upper Volta, Zambia, East Africa Regional, Regional USAID/Africa, Africa Regional.

Africa, total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 263,000,000; area, 11,300,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $145]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	724.3	11.1	37.9	713.2
Food for peace	150.2	.3	.6	149.9
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	379.5	161.1	57.5	218.4
Other U.S. economic programs	31.3	24.2	4.7	7.1
Military assistance	10.7	2.8	0.5	7.9
Total loans	1,296.0	199.5	101.2	1,096.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	958.9			
Food for peace	701.8			
Other U.S. economic programs	105.4			
Military assistance	175.4			
Total grants	1,941.5	199.5	101.2	1,096.5

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	[1] $76.5
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Supporting assistance	27.0
Technical cooperation	94.0
Development loans	100.0
Total	221.0
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	1,121.0

[1] This figure includes Angola, Canary Islands, Madeira, Mozambique, and São Tôme.

Algeria

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 11,000,000; area, 920,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $225]

	Total, 1956–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3.9			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	102.1			
Voluntary relief agencies	55.9			
Total grants	161.9			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$161.9
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	1.8
Grand total	163.7
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	302.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	0.6
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	0.9

Burundi

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,800,000; area, 11,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $50]

	Total, 1962–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	0.6			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	3.8			
Voluntary relief agencies	3.0			
Total grants	7.4			

(1) No loans.

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$7.4
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1964, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	.1
Grand total	7.5
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.3
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.1

NOTE.—AID currently suspended due to treatment of U.S. officials.

Cameroon

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,700,000; area, 183,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $125]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest due and unpaid	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies (total loans)	12.4			12.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	9.3			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	2.7			
Total grants	12.4			12.4

	Thousands
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$58,000
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	600,000
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	900,000

Central African Republic

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,300,000; area 238,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $90]

	Total, 1962–65	Principal repayments	Interest due and unpaid	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
None				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.8			
Total grants	2.8			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$2.8
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	.8
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.6

NOTE.—In 1964 Central African Republic received Communist commitments of economic aid amounting to $4,000,000.

Chad

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,400,000; area, 49,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $70]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3.0			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	1.1			
Voluntary relief agencies	.1			
Total grants	4.2			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$4.2
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	1.1
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.8

Congo (Brazzaville)

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,000,000; area, 132,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $135]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans (total loans)	0.2			0.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.0			
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	.2			
Total grants	2.4			.2

NOTE.—Mistreatment of U.S. officials became so flagrant the United States withdrew its Ambassador and suspended the small aid program.

Congo-Léopoldville

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 15,900,000; area 906,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $80]

	Total, 1953–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	15.0			15.0
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	3.4			
Loans to governments	20.1			
Total	23.5			23.5
Total loans	38.5			38.5

Congo-Léopoldville—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	192.9			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	3.4			
Grants for economic development	36.8			
Emergency relief and economic development	17.6			
Voluntary relief agencies	9.6			
Military assistance	15.3			
Total grants	275.6			275.6

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$3.3
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	1.3
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.8

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Dahomey

[U.S. fiscal years, millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,250,000; area 45,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $70]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	0.1			0.1
Loans to governments	.1			.1
Total loans	.2			.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4.3			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	1.9			
Voluntary relief agencies	2.2			
Military assistance	.1			
Total grants	8.5			.2

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$0.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.6

Ethiopia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965. 20,200,000; area 457,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $49

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	36.5	1.4	2.4	35.1
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	.2			
Loans to governments	.5			
Dollar credit sales	1.4			
Total	2.1	.1	.1	2.0
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	20.5	7.7	2.2	12.8
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] .4	.4		
Total loans	59.5	9.6	4.7	49.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	68.2			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	10.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	2.6			
Other U.S. economic programs	10.6			
Military assistance	95.6			
Total grants	187.0	9.6	4.7	49.9

[1] AID carries this figure as $11,000,000; $10,600,000 of it is a grant. Other assistance classified.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market price	$1.1
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	119.0

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of furnishing of military assistance to Ethiopia in excess of the country's ability to effectively utilize the equipment (classified). (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued, May 6, 1964.

Gabon

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 454,000; area 103,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $275]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.5	----	----	----
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.1	----	----	----
Other U.S. economic programs	2.2	----	----	----
Total grants	4.8	----	----	----

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$4.8
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	.7
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.4

Gambia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 300,000; area, 4,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $85]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	0.1	----	----	----
Total grants	.1	----	----	----

Total economic assistance	$100,000
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	58,000
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	50,000

Ghana

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 7,700,000; area, 92,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $251]

	Total, 1949–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	82.0	0.1	0.7	81.9
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	65.0	----	1.1	65.0
Total loans	147.0	.1	1.8	146.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	9.0	----	----	----
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	1.6	----	----	----
Voluntary relief agencies	4.9	----	----	----
Other U.S. economic programs	3.0	----	----	----
Total grants	18.5	.1	1.8	146.9

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$5.0
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	231.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	1.4
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	1.2

NOTES

Other assistance classified.

In fiscal year 1967 AID will continue to discharge its loan obligations to the Volta Dam and aluminum refinery projects under commitments made several years ago. Other capital projects are not contemplated.

Guinea

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,500,000; area 95,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $70]

	Total, 1959–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.5	----	0.1	5.5
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	3.6	----	----	----
Loans to governments	21.5	----	----	----
Total	25.1	----	----	25.1
Total loans	30.6	----	.1	30.6
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	34.9	----	----	----
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	2.0	----	----	----
Other U.S. economic programs	1.9	----	----	----
Military assistance	.8	----	----	----
Total grants	39.6	----	.1	30.6

	Millions
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance, cumulative through 1965	$120
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	3.3

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Ivory Coast

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,800,000; area, 125,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $215]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	6.7	----	----	6.7
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	.6	----	----	----
Loans to governments	1.9	----	----	----
Dollar credit sales	4.0	----	----	----
Subtotal	6.5	----	----	6.5
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	4.6	----	0.1	4.6
Total loans	17.8	----	.1	17.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.4	----	----	----
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.1	----	----	----
Other U.S. economic programs	2.6	----	----	----
Military assistance	.1	----	----	----
Total grants	8.2	----	.1	17.8

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$0.2
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.9

Kenya

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 9,400,000; area 225,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $88]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.8	----	----	2.8
For for peace: Dollar credit sales	3.8	----	----	3.8
Total loans	6.6	----	----	6.6

Kenya—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars,

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	17.4			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	8.8			
Voluntary relief agencies	1.7			
Other U.S. economic programs	1.2			
Total grants	29.1			6.6

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.7
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative 1965	62.0
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	.3
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.3

Liberia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,100,000; area 43,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $175]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	48.3	0.2		48.1
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	8.6	.2		8.4
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans [1]	101.9	14.5	15.6	87.4
Other U.S. economic programs	[2] 7.0			7.0
Military assistance	1.1	.3		.8
Total loans	166.9	15.2	15.6	151.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	55.3			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	1.9			
Other U.S. economic programs	8.0			
Military assistance	4.6			
Total grants	69.8	15.2	15.6	151.7

[1] Excludes refunding of $13,200,000 in fiscal year 1963.

[2] AID carries this amount as $15,000,000; $8,000,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural Commodity Exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965 at export market prices	$0.3
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical assistance	.7
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical assistance	.7

Libya

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars

[Population in 1965, 1,600,000; area, 680,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $365]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	7.1	0.8	0.9	6.3
Total loans	7.1	.8	.9	6.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	130.6			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	27.5			
Voluntary relief agencies	7.8			
Other U.S. economic programs	33.4			
Military assistance	10.6			
Total grants	209.9	.8	.9	6.3

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.3

NOTE.—No funds requested for Libya for fiscal year 1967, which no longer receives AID.

Malagasy Republic

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 6,200,000; area, 230,000 square miles; GNP per capita $95]

	Total, 1959-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.7			2.7
Total loans	2.7			2.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3.3			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	1.9			
Total grants	5.2			2.7

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	$0.9
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.6

Malawi [1]

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,200,000; area, 46,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $39]

	Total, 1956-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
None				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.0			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.1			
Voluntary relief agencies	.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	3.0			
Total grants	8.2			

[1] Data shown includes assistance to Nyasaland during years prior to becoming the independent state of Malawi.

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$8.2
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	.5
Grand total	8.7
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	1.7
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.2

Republic of Mali

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,600,000; area, 465,000 square miles; GNP per capita $65]

	Total, 1961-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3.2			3.2
Total loans	3.2			3.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	9.5			
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	.9			
Military assistance	2.2			
Total grants	12.6			3.2

	Millions
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative 1965	$98.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	1.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	1.0

NOTE.—All other assistance classified.

Mauretania

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1963, 800,000; area, 419,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $138]

	Total, 1953–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1.4	------	------	1.4
Total loans	1.4	------	------	1.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	.4	------	------	------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.3	------	------	------
Voluntary relief agencies	.7	------	------	------
Total grants	1.4	------	------	1.4

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical assistance	$0.2
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical assistance	.2

Morocco

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1963, 13,400,000; area, 171,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $191]

	Total, 1949–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	270.1	2.2	27.0	267.9
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	3.5	------	------	------
Loans to governments	23.2	------	------	------
Total	26.7	------	------	26.7
Military assistance	6.0	------	------	6.0
Total loans	302.8	2.2	27.0	300.6
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	19.4	------	------	------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	104.8	------	------	------
Voluntary relief agencies	60.6	------	------	------
Other U.S. economic programs	2.6	------	------	------
Military assistance	25.9	------	------	------
Total grants	213.3	2.2	27.0	300.6

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$13.3
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	17.0

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Niger

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,300,000; area, 489,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $75]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.3	------	------	2.3
Total loans	2.3	------	------	2.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.1	------	------	------
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	.2	------	------	------
Other U.S. economic programs	1.1	------	------	------
Military assistance	.1	------	------	------
Total grants	6.5	------	------	2.3

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$0.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	1.2

Nigeria

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 43,500,000; area, 357,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $102]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	57.6	0.4	0.5	57.2
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	6.7	1.3	.3	5.4
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] .2	.2	------	------
Military assistance	.3	------	------	.3
Total loans	64.8	1.9	.8	62.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	79.2	------	------	------
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	2.2	------	------	------
Other U.S. economic programs	13.8	------	------	------
Military assistance	.7	------	------	------
Total grants	95.9	1.9	.8	62.9

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$3.0
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance through 1965	14.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	18.3
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	18.3

[1] Includes $13,800,000 for Peace Corps; $200,000 for strategic materials.

[2] AID carries this amount as $14,000,000—$13,800,000 of it is a grant. (See report, p. 97.)

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Rwanda

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,000,000; area, 10,166 square miles]

	Total, 1962–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	0.8	------	------	------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.8	------	------	------
Voluntary relief agencies	.1	------	------	------
Total grants	1.7	------	------	------

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$1.7
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	.5
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	.2

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Senegal

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,400,000; area, 76,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $200]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1.3	------	------	1.3
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	.6	------	------	------
Loans to governments	2.0	------	------	------
Total loans	2.6	------	------	2.6
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	.3	------	------	.3
Total loans	4.2	------	------	4.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	7.2	------	------	------
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.3	------	------	------
Voluntary relief agencies	2.6	------	------	------
Other U.S. economic programs	2.3	------	------	------
Military assistance	2.6	------	------	------
Total grants	15.0	------	------	4.2

Senegal—Continued

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$5.8
In 1964 Senegal received Communist commitments of economic aid amounting to	7.0
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	.4
Supporting assistance	.2
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.6

Sierra Leone

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,300,000; area 28,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $115]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	1.8			1.8
Export-Import Bank long term loans	10.2			10.2
Total loans	12.0			12.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	7.2			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	2.8			
Other U.S. economic programs	5.1			
Total grants	15.1			12.0

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.1
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.3
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.1

Somali Republic

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 2,000,000; area, 246,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $50]

	Total, 1954-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	6.2		0.1	6.2
Total loans	6.2		.1	6.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	32.2			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	6.8			
Voluntary relief agencies	.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	1.9			
Total grants	41.2		.1	6.2

	Millions
Agricultural Commodity Exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.2
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	85.0
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	3.5
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	3.3

Republic of South Africa

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 17,900,000; area, 500,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $36]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	152.8	133.8	32.7	19
Other U.S. economic programs	1.3	1.3		
Total loans	154.1	135.1	32.7	19
NO GRANTS				
Total	154.1	135.1	32.7	19

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$13.3

Southern Rhodesia [1]

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,800,000; area, 150,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $224]

	Total, 1954-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.0	2.2	2.0	2.8
Total loans	5.0	2.2	2.0	2.8
GRANTS				
AID and prececessor agencies	2.1			
Total grants	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.8

[1] These figures include assistance to Southern Rhodesia during the period this was part of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

Sudan

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 13,500,000; area, 967,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $102]

	Total, 1953-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	15.8			15.8
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	3.6			
Loans to governments	8.3			
Total	11.9			11.9
Total loans	27.7			27.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	55.3			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	4.6			
Emergency relief and economic development	1.7			
Voluntary relief agencies	.1			
Military assistance	.4			
Total grants	62.1			27.7

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.7
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	32.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	4.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	4.5

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Tanzania

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 10,500,000; area, 363,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $73]

	Total, 1958-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	12.9	0.1	0.1	12.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	8.7			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	14.7			
Voluntary relief agencies	3.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	4.6			
Total grants	31.1	.1	.1	12.8

	Millions
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	$51.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	2.5

Togo

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 1,700,000; area, 22,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $90]

	Total, 1959–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3.6	---	---	---
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	2.5	---	---	---
Voluntary relief agencies	1.8	---	---	---
Other U.S. economic programs	1.9	---	---	---
Total grants	9.8	---	---	---

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$9.8
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	.09
Grand total	10.7
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	1.2
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.8

Tunisia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 4,700,000; area, 48,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $176]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	118.2	1.3	1.9	116.9
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	6.7	---	---	---
Loans to governments	30.8	---	---	---
Total	37.5	---	.5	37.5
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	4.8	.8	.2	4.0
Military assistance	3.3	2.5	.5	.8
Total loans	163.8	4.6	3.1	159.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	110.2	---	---	---
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	7.2	---	---	---
Emergency relief and economic development	160.6	---	---	---
Voluntary relief agencies	7.8	---	---	---
Other U.S. economic programs	3.1	---	---	---
Military assistance	16.1	---	---	---
Total grants	305.0	4.6	3.1	159.2

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.5
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	48.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	2.6
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Technical cooperation	2.4
Food, Public Law 480	15.0
Total	17.4

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Uganda

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 7,600,000; area, 93,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $80]

	Total, 1954–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4.8	---	---	4.8
Total loans	4.8	---	---	4.8

Uganda—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	10.8	---	---	---
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.5	---	---	---
Voluntary relief agencies	.8	---	---	---
Other U.S. economic programs	.4	---	---	---
Total grants	12.5	---	---	4.8

	Millions
Sino-Soviet Bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	$31
Fiscal year 1966 program—Technical cooperation	2.4
Fiscal year 1967 program—Technical cooperation	2.7

Upper Volta

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965. 4,500,000; area, 106,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $45]

	Total, 1961–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	4.0	---	---	---
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	1.4	---	---	---
Military assistance	.1	---	---	---
Total grants	5.5	---	---	---

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$5.5
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.7

Zambia [1]

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,700,000; area, 288,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $167]

	Total, 1953–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	5.0	2.2	2.0	2.8
Other U.S. economic programs	22.4	22.4	4.7	---
Total loans	27.4	24.6	6.7	2.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2.7	---	---	---
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	.1	---	---	---
Total grants	2.8	24.6	6.7	2.8

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical assistance	$1.2
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical assistance	1.3

[1] Figures include assistance to Northern Rhodesia during years prior to becoming the independent state of Zambia.

Far East, regional

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1961-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies (total loans)	1.5	---	---	1.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies (total grants)	9.7	---	---	1.5

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$2.7
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	3.0

Regional, USAID-Africa

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1964–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies (total grants)	1.0			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$1.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.7

Africa Regional

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	[1] 12.5	2.9	5.2	9.6
Total loans	12.5	2.9	5.2	9.6
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	30.3			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.4			
Voluntary relief agencies	1.9			
Total grants	41.6	2.9	5.2	9.6

[1] Loan to Portugal for Mozambique.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	$9.6
Contingency Fund	1.0
Total	10.6
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	17.4

FAR EAST

Burma, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, Indochina (undistributed), Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Ryukyu Islands, Thailand, Viet Nam, Far East regional.

Far East, total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	703.6	43.7	47.7	659.8
Food for peace	499.2	5.1	25.5	494.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	895.8	238.6	130.8	657.2
Other U.S. economic programs	823.9	268.0	70.2	555.9
Military assistance	34.8	14.3		20.5
Total loans	2,957.3	569.7	274.2	2,387.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	7,821.3			
Food for peace	1,481.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	3,967.0			
Military assistance	9,878.0			
Total grants	23,147.4	569.7	274.2	2,387.5

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$301.2
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	101.0
Fiscal year 1967 program	799.0

NOTES

Supplemental appropriation requested in 1966 for $89,000,000 to southeast Asia contingency fund, also $415,000,000 in supplemental appropriations, $200,000,000 subscribed to Asian Development Bank.

Burma

[U.S. fiscal years, millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 25,000,000; area 262,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $67]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	33.7	0.2	2.7	33.5
Food for peace: Loans to governments	30.1		.8	30.1
Other U.S. economic programs	5.0	4.5	1.2	.5
Total loans	68.8	4.7	4.7	64.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	25.8			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	7.9			
Assistance from other country sales agreements	5.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	3.4			
Tota' grants	42.1	4.7	4.7	64.1

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market pric^s	$3.8
Sino-Soviet bloc assistance cumulative through 1965	101.0
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	.3
F'scal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	.2

NOTE.—Other assistance classified.

Cambodia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 6,000,000; area, 67,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $132]

	Total, 1955–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	253.0			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	2.9			
Voluntary relief agencies	.1			
Military assistance	87.1			
Total grants	343.1			

	Thousands
Total economic and military assistance	$343,100
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	38

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Cambodia (classified report to the Secretary of Defense): "Suggestions for improving controls and developing long-range cost estimates of the program." Date issued, Sept. 30, 1958.

Republic of China

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 12,900,000; area, 14,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $189]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	219.9	14.1	21.7	205.8
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	13.9			
Loans to governments	34.4			
Dollar credit sales	39.2			
Total, food for peace	87.5	1.3	1.7	86.2
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	36.0	5.3	3.1	30.7
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 95.5	26.3	3.9	69.2
Total loans	438.9	47.0	30.4	391.9

Republic of China—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,155.2			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	110.4			
Emergency relief and economic development	31.1			
Voluntary relief agencies	82.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	406.8			
Military assistance	2,530.8			
Total grants	4,316.6	47.0	30.4	391.9

[1] AID carries this amount as 502.3; 06.8 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$22.8

NOTES

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance program for China (Taiwan), fiscal years 1955–57: "General evaluation of the program plus specific needs for improved administrative practices and procedures." Date issued Aug. 29, 1958. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $225.

GAO's opinion of unofficial use and overstated needs of commercial-type vehicles by the Military Assistance Advisory Group and the Headquarters, Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China. (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued July 31, 1964.

GAO's opinion of review of the maintenance and supply support of Army equipment furnished under the military assistance program for Taiwan (classified). (All details are classified.) Date issued May 24, 1962.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Taiwan (classified). (All details are classified.) Date issued June 27, 1961.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Taiwan (classified report to the Secretary of Defense). (Details are classified.) Date issued Oct. 3, 1957.

Hong Kong

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,900,000; area, 400 square miles; GNP per capita, $392]

	Total, 1953–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	3.9			
Voluntary relief agencies	36.2			
Total grants	40.1			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$40.1
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	15.6
Grand total	55.7

Indochina, undistributed[1]

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1949–60	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	825.6			
Military assistance	709.6			
Total grants	1,535.2			

[1] Aid to Indochina after partition shown separately on tables for Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

	Millions
Total economic and military assistance	$1,535.2

Indonesia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 106,000,000; area, 576,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $80]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	58.1	12.0	7.8	46.1
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	9.8			
Loans to governments	201.8			
Assistance from other country sales agreements	2.2			
Total	213.8	.6	1.2	213.2
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	162.1	75.0	36.1	87.1
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 63.6	28.9	18.8	34.7
Total loans	497.6	116.5	63.9	381.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	221.6			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	30.7			
Grants for economic development	24.6			
Emergency relief and economic development	3.4			
Voluntary relief agencies	16.6			
Other U.S. economic programs	4.8			
Military assistance	68.9			
Total grants	370.6	116.5	63.9	381.1

[1] AID carries this amount as $68,400,000—$4,800,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$7.7

NOTES

GAO's opinion of inadequate planning, programing, and contracting for a fixed communications system for the Government of Indonesia under the military assistance program (classified). (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued, Apr. 26, 1965.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Indonesia (classified). (Details are classified.) Date issued, May 6, 1964.

Japan

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 97,000,000; area, 143,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $651]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Food for peace: Loans to governments	105.5	2.3	20.6	103.2
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	467.4	94.5	69.3	372.9
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] 504.0	94.9	28.5	409.1
Military assistance	34.8	14.3		20.5
Total loans	1,111.7	206.0	118.4	905.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	21.8			
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	.6			
Emergency relief and economic development	37.0			
Voluntary relief agencies	27.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	1,694.9			
Military assistance	1,040.8			
Total grants	2,822.4	206.0	118.4	905.7

[1] Includes civilian supplies $2,184.6 million; surplus property credits $14 million; and post-UNRRA $6.2 million.

[2] Aid carries this amount as $2,198.9; $1,694.9 of it is a grant. (See report, p. 63.)

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$204.6

NOTES

Military assistance excludes $540 million of materiel provided from Department of Defense stocks.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Japan, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretarary of Defense). (Details are classified.) Date issued Oct. 3, 1957.

GAO's opinion of unnecessary payment by the United States of costs properly chargeable to Japan for administrative and related expenses of the MAP for Japan. (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued June 27, 1963.

Korea

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 28,400,000; area 38,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $120]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	151.9	3.6	1.6	148.3
Food for peace: Loans to private industry	7.2	.6	.2	6.6
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2]24.9	4.0	2.5	20.9
Total loans	184.0	8.2	4.3	175.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2,351.3	---	---	---
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	419.0	---	---	---
Emergency relief and economic development	68.8	---	---	---
Voluntary relief agencies	163.7	---	---	---
Other U.S. economic programs	834.4	---	---	---
Military assistance	2,290.7	---	---	---
Total grants	6,117.9	8.2	4.3	175.8

[1] Includes (in millions) CRIK $420.2, civilian supplies $292.1, Korean aid program $121.6, surplus property credits $24.9, and UNRRA $0.6 million.

[2] AID carries this figure as 859.3; 834.4 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954 through Dec. 31, 1965 at export market prices	$14.0

NOTES

GAO's opinion of an examination of economic and technical assistance program for Korea, fiscal years 1957–61, pts. I and II: "Assistance exceeded country's economic and administrative capacities." Date issued Nov. 21, 1962. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 1,200.

GAO's opinion of review of contracts with McGraw-Hydrocarbon for the construction and operation of a fertilizer plant in Korea: "Recommends use of fixed-price contracts, incentive provisions in cost reimbursement-type projects, and more effective penalty provisions." Date issued Apr. 19, 1960. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, 43.9.

GAO's opinion of mutual security program presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1959 economic assistance for China, Korea, and Vietnam: "Recommendations for including more meaningful data in future program presentations." Date issued June 8, 1959.

GAO's opinion of administration of U.S. assistance program for Korea, fiscal years 1954–56: "Discloses general problem areas in program planning and implementation." Date issued June 24, 1957. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $845.9.

GAO's opinion on overprocurements resulting from ineffective supply management in Korea under the military assistance program. (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued May 28, 1965.

GAO's opinion of review of the local currency military budget support program for Korea: "Weaknesses in U.S. controls over the program and deficiencies in its administration by the Republic of Korea Army." Date issued Jan. 8, 1963.

GAO's opinion of review of maintenance and supply support of Army equipment furnished under MAP for Korea (classified): "Some inefficiency of maintenance and supply of army vehicles." Date issued June 8, 1962.

GAO's opinion of review of military assistance program requirements for the Army and Air Force of Korea (classified). "Unneeded items requisitioned and program overstated."

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Korea, Mar. 31,1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense). (Details are classified.) Date issued Oct. 4, 1957.

Laos

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 3,000,000; area, 91,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $60]

	Total, 1953–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	414.9	---	---	---
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.9	---	---	---
Voluntary relief agencies	2.7	---	---	---
Total grants	418.5	---	---	---

	Thousands
Total economic assistance	$418,500
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	74
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	12,000
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	16,000

NOTES

All military assistance classified; other economic assistance classified.

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance program for Laos, fiscal years 1955–57: "Improvements needed in various administrative practices and procedures, including the negotiation of a realistic exchange rate." Date issued, Oct. 8, 1958. Pertinent dollar amounts, $134,400,000.

GAO's opinion of review of military assistance program for Laos (classified report to the Secretary of Defense): "Suggestions for improving controls and developing long-range cost estimates of the program." Date issued, Oct. 30, 1958.

GAO's opinion of the followup review of economic and technical assistance program for Laos, December 1958: "Observations on various administrative practices and procedures." Date issued, July 31, 1959.

Malaysia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 10,853,000; area 28,000 square miles: GNP per captia, $284]

	Total, 1953–56	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	20.0	4.4	1.3	15.6
Total loans	20.0	4.4	1.3	15.6
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	9.2	---	---	---
Other U.S. economic programs	8.3	---	---	---
Millitary assistance	.1	---	---	---
Total grants	17.6	---	---	---

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1.5

Philippines

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 32,000,000; area 6,000 square miles; GNP per capita $153]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	47.5	6.7	3.6	40.8
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	9.1	---	---	---
Loans to governments	15.4	---	---	---
Total, food for peace	24.5	.2	.6	24.3
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	178.9	55.0	16.3	123.9
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2]106.7	103.1	14.2	3.6
Total loans	357.6	165.0	34.7	192.6
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	226.6	---	---	---
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	10.1	---	---	---
Grants for economic development	2.9	---	---	---
Assistance from other country sales agreements	.5	---	---	---
Emergency relief and economic development	1.5	---	---	---
Voluntary relief agencies	65.5	---	---	---
Other U.S. economic programs	756.5	---	---	---
Military assistance	467.7	---	---	---
Total grants	1,531.3	165.0	34.7	192.6

[1] Includes Philippines rehabilitation grants, $634,000,000; RFC loans, $60,000,000; debt funding, $37,500,000; civilian supplies, $28,300,000; surplus property credits, $9,200,000; UNRRA, $7,700,000; Philippine war damage claims, $73,000,000; Peace Corps, $13,000,000.

[2] AID carries this figure as 863.3; 756.5 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$26.0
Fiscal year 1966 program: Technical cooperation	3.7
Fiscal year 1967 program: Technical cooperation	3.4

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of review of economic assistance provided to the Republic of the Philippines for development purposes (classified report): "Limited accomplishments of specific projects reviewed." Date issued Apr. 21, 1965. Pertinent dollar amounts, $70,200,000.

Ryukyu Islands

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] 18.0		0.3	18.0
Food for peace: Dollar credit sales	21.1			21.1
Total loans	39.1		.3	39.1
GRANTS				
Food for peace:				
Assistance from other country sales agreements	4.4			
Emergency relief and economic development	8.3			
Voluntary relief agencies	17.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	255.6			
Total grants	285.6		.3	39.1

[1] Includes relief and economic aid in liberated and occupied area, $255,600,000; and administrative area development, $18,000,000.

[2] AID carries this amount as $273,600,000; $255,600,000 of it as a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.9

Thailand

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 29,000,000; area, 198,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $114]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	74.2	1.9	6.5	72.3
Food for peace:				
Assistance from other country sales agreements	1.9			
Loans to governments	1.8			
	3.7		.3	3.7
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	51.4	8.7	6.0	42.7
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 6.2	6.2	.8	
Total loans	135.5	16.8	13.6	118.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	291.4			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	.2			
Voluntary relief agencies	.9			
Other U.S. economic programs	5.7			
Military assistance	4.6			
Total grants	302.8	16.8	13.6	118.7

[1] AID carries this figure as $11,200,000; $5,700,000 of it is a grant.

Other military assistance classified.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$4.5
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	13.0
Contingency fund (southeast Asia programs)	7.5
Total	20.5
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	13.5

NOTES

GAO's opinion of examination of economic and technical assistance program for Thailand, fiscal years 1955–60: "General evaluation of progress made in selected projects and of practices followed in importing commodities." Date issued Aug. 21, 1961. Pertinent dollar amounts in millions, $214.

GAO's opinion of ineffective and overly costly aspects of military and economic assistance provided to Thailand (classified report). (Title describes the unclassified aspects of the report.) Date issued Feb. 17, 1965.

GAO's opinion of review of the utilization and maintenance of Army equipment furnished under the MAP for Thailand (classified). (Details are classified.) Date issued Aug. 31, 1962.

Vietnam

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

[Population in 1965, 16,000,000; area, 66,000 square miles; GNP per capita, $115]

	Total, 1954–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	88.0	0.7	1.7	87.3
Food for peace: Loans to private industry	5.7			5.7
Total loans	93.7	.7	1.7	93.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,996.5			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	141.0			
Emergency relief and economic development	69.7			
Voluntary relief agencies	76.6			
Military assistance	6.1			
Total grants	2,289.9	.7	1.7	93.0

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.1
Other military assistance classified.	
Fiscal year 1966 program:	
Technical cooperation	9.1
Supporting assistance	[1] 475.0
Contingency fund (southeast Asian program)	57.0
Commercial imports supplemented by sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480	75.2
Total	616.3
Surplus food committed for fiscal year 1966 obligated for fiscal year 1966 to improve economic conditions	161.0
Total	813.3
Fiscal year 1967 program:	
Supporting assistance	550.0
Commercial imports supplemented by sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480	79.3
Total	629.3

[1] Includes $275,000,000 of fiscal year 1966 supplemental request.

NOTES

GAO's opinion of certain problems relating to administration of the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam for 1958–62: "Inability or unwillingness of the foreign government to use country resources to support activities being supported by the United States plus ineffective administration by AID." Date issued, July 24, 1964. Pertinent dollar amount—$763,000,000.

GAO's opinion of review of the administration of assistance for financing commercial imports and other financial elements under the economic and technical assistance for Vietnam: "Unjustified assistance and unnecessary costs." Date issued, July 24, 1964 (see related report above).

GAO's opinion of review of economic aspects of loan for construction of water supply system in Saigon, Vietnam: "Nonexistent basis for evaluating a choice between 2 water supply systems." Date issued, Sept. 17, 1963. Pertinent dollar amount—$17,500,000.

GAO's opinion of review of the mutual security program presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1961 for economic assistance to Korea, Pakistan, and Vietnam: "Suggestions for revealing more meaningful data in budget presentations." Date issued Mar. 29, 1961. Same opinion of review on the above date June 8, 1959.

GAO's opinion of economic and technical assistance programs for Vietnam fiscal years 1955–57: "General evaluation of program practices, and need for realistic exchange rates." Date issued, May 22, 1958. Pertinent dollar amount in millions—$787,200,000.

GAO's opinion of summary of reviews of the maintenance and supply support of Army equipment furnished to Far East countries under the MAP: "Maintenance and supply deficiencies resulting in defective equipment plus planned procurement of vehicles in excess of requirements." Date issued, Aug. 31, 1962.

GAO's opinion of management of spare parts for Army equipment provided to Far East countries: "Supply management deficiencies." Date issued, Oct. 13, 1961.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Vietnam (classified report to the Secretary of Defense): "Suggestions for improving controls and developing long-range cost estimates of the program." Date issued, Nov. 26, 1958.

Far East regional

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies (total loans)	10.3		0.6	10.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	37.6			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	4.5			
Military assistance	2,671.5			
Total grants	2,713.6		.6	10.3

	Millions
Fiscal year 1966 program, technical cooperation	$1.0
Fiscal year 1967 program, technical cooperation	15.0

NOTES

Other assistance classified.

U.S. will finance 50 percent of the Nam Ngum hydroelectric dam on a tributary of the Mekong at Laos which will amount to $11,800,000 out of fiscal year 1966 funds.

EUROPE

Albania, Austria, Belgium-Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, East Germany, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic), Berlin, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, Europe regional.

Europe—total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,876.7	619.4	502.8	1,257.3
Food for peace	1,013.9	107.7	68.3	906.2
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	3,158.6	1,758.0	689.7	1,400.6
Other U.S. economic programs	5,605.2	2,193.2	1,189.2	3,502.0
Military assistance	125.6	100.8		24.8
Total loans	11,870.0	4,779.1	2,450.0	7,090.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	13,353.0			
Food for peace	1,320.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	4,124.0			
Military assistance	16,066.0			
Total grants	34,863.8	4,779.1	2,450.0	7,090.9

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$1,124.0
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	14,408.4

NOTES

GAO's opinion of U.S. contributions to European Payments Union (succeeded by European Fund): "Factual summary of the background, purpose, operating mechanism, and terms of the U.S. contribution." Date issued Nov. 6, 1959. Pertinent dollar amounts, $350,000,000.

GAO's opinion of examination of $100,000,000 loan to European Coal and Steel Community: "Informative summary of broad policy matters involved in the project." Date issued Mar. 13, 1958. Pertinent dollar amounts $100,000,000.

GAO's opinion of lack of effective action by the military services to obtain NATO cost-sharing of military construction projects in Europe (classified). Title is self-explanatory. Date issued, June 4, 1965.

GAO's opinion of inefficient utilization of personnel to administer the MAP in advanced Western European countries (including a classified supplement): "Overstaffing in relation to substantially reduced programs." Date issued Apr. 2, 1964.

Albania

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
[NO LOANS]				
GRANTS				
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	20.4			
Total grants	20.4			

[1] United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$20.4

NOTE.—No activity subsequent to fiscal year 1947.

Austria

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Food for peace: Loans to governments	25.5	0.4	2.9	25.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	62.9	20.5	8.3	42.4
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 11.7	11.4	2.3	.3
Total loans	100.1	32.3	13.5	67.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	726.1			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	28.1			
Voluntary relief agencies	27.4			
Other U.S. economic programs	316.4			
Total grants	1,098.0	32.3	13.5	67.8

[1] AID carries this amount as $328,100,000; $316,400,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$59.0
World War I debt June 30, 1965: Principal and interest due and unpaid	23.4

NOTES

All military assistance classified.

The Federal Republic of Germany has recognized liability for securities falling due between Mar. 12, 1938, and May 8, 1945.

Belgium-Luxembourg

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	68.0	16.9	21.5	51.1
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	139.8	116.6	38.1	23.2
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 31.0	25.3	3.4	5.7
Military assistance	8.4	7.5		.9
Total loans	247.2	166.3	63.0	80.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	492.0			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.2			
Other U.S. economic programs	1.1			
Military assistance	1,246.2			
Total	1,739.5	166.3	63.0	80.9

[1] AID carries this figure as $32,100,000; $1,100,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$120.6
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	457.2

Czechoslovakia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] 7.6	2.7	0.7	4.9
Total loans	7.6	2.7	.7	4.9
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development [3]	2.0	-------	-------	-------
Other U.S. economic programs	183.4	-------	-------	-------
Total grants	185.4	2.7	.7	4.9

[1] Includes UNRRA, $183.4 million; and surplus property credits $7.6 million.

[2] AID carries this figure as $191,000,000; $183,400,000 of it is a grant.

[3] Danube flood assistance through the Red Cross in fiscal year 1955.

	Millions
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	$177.6

Denmark

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	33.3	3.3	10.3	30.0
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	20.0	18.7	6.0	1.3
Other U.S. economic programs	1.0	1.0	.1	-------
Total loans	54.3	23.0	16.4	31.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	247.5	-------	-------	-------
Military assistance	621.3	-------	-------	-------
Total grants	868.8	23.0	16.4	31.3

[1] Does not include loan of $2,300,000 from fiscal year 1955, sec. 402 program which is included in Europe regional.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$10.6

East Germany

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development (total)	[1] 0.8	-------	-------	-------

[1] Danube flood assistance through Red Cross, fiscal year 1955.

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$0.8

Finland

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	4.5	-------	-------	-------
Loans to governments	24.5	-------	-------	-------
Total, food for peace	29.0	0.8	3.3	28.2
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	77.7	30.4	37.4	47.3
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 24.8	17.4	5.9	7.4
Total loans	131.5	48.6	46.6	82.9
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	2.2	-------	-------	-------
Other U.S. economic programs	1.8	-------	-------	-------
Total grants	4.0	48.6	46.6	82.9

[1] AID carries this figure as $26,600,000; $1,800,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$11.2
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	5.1

France

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	225.6	225.6	51.2	-------
Food for peace: Loans to private industry	7.8	3.2	1.5	4.6
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	1,221.4	1,035.8	434.7	185.6
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 394.4	193.0	118.3	201.4
Military assistance	80.4	80.0	-------	.4
Total loans	1,929.6	1,537.6	605.7	392.0
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	2,964.7	-------	-------	-------
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	12.2	-------	-------	-------
Other U.S. economic programs	314.7	-------	-------	-------
Military assistance	4,180.4	-------	-------	-------
Total grants	7,472.0	1,537.6	605.7	392.0

[1] AID carries this amount as $709,100,000; $314,700,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$63.5
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	4,688.5

Germany (Federal Republic)

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	216.9	2.6	66.1	214.3
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	2.3	2.3	1.9	-------
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] 1,016.9	1,006.0	174.9	10.9
Total loans	1,236.1	1,010.9	242.9	225.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,255.5	-------	-------	-------
Food for Peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	3.4	-------	-------	-------
Voluntary relief agencies	136.9	-------	-------	-------
Other U.S. economic programs	1,411.5	-------	-------	-------
Military assistance	951.6	-------	-------	-------
Total grants	3,758.9	1,010.9	242.9	225.2

[1] Includes civilian supplies $2,205,700,000; surplus property credits $216,900,000; and UNRRA and post-UNRRA $5,700,000.

[2] AID carries this figure as $2,428,400,000; $1,411,500,000 of it is a grant. (See report p. 123.)

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$154.0

NOTES

GAO's opinion of review of administrative costs of the U.S. military assistance program chargeable to the Federal Republic of Germany: "Failure to collect costs due the United States." Date issued Feb. 29, 1960.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for the Federal Republic of Germany, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense). (Details are classified.) Date issued Aug. 30, 1957.

NOTES

GAO's opinion of review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS-11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States (classified): "Questions the need to pay the fees." Date issued Feb. 15, 1963.

GAO's opinion of review of payments made by the United States for the construction of airfields in France (classified): "Failure to claim reimbursement from NATO for airfields constructed by the USAF." Date issued Aug. 13, 1962.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for France, March 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense). (Details are classified). Date issued Aug. 30, 1957.

GAO's opinion of review of the administration of the mutual defense assistance program for France and Turkey (classified report to the Assistant Secretary of Defense): "Programing based on unverified data from the countries, plus other classified matters." Date issued June 19, 1956.

Berlin

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1953–55	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	119.0			
Other U.S. economic programs	12.9			
Total grants	131.9			

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$131.9

NOTE.—Berlin received substantial assistance under a variety of programs: GARIOA, the blockade and stockpile programs, and various counterpart and U.S.-owned foreign currency programs. These programs are not identified in the report used for this study (the one used for these figures) as benefiting Berlin because of "double-counting" problems. Total assistance to Berlin in the postwar period including all the various programs was $1,094,000.

Hungary

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–57	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Other U.S. economic programs[1] (total loans)	[2] 15.9	9.0	5.1	6.9
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Emergency relief and economic development	[3] 13.2			
Other U.S. economic programs	2.4			
Total grants	15.6	9.0	5.1	6.9

[1] Includes UNRRA, $2,400,000; and overseas surplus credits, $15,900,000.

[2] AID carries this figure as $18,300,000; $2,400,000 of it is a grant. (See report, p. 125.)

[3] Includes $6,100,000 in Danube flood assistance through the Red Cross in fiscal years 1955 and 1956, and $7,100,000 in relief assistance to Hungarian refugees in fiscal year 1957 through Catholic Relief Services, Church World Services, and other charitable organizations.

	Millions
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid*	$2.9

* Interest payments from Dec. 15, 1932, to Jan. 15, 1937, were in pengo equivalent.

NOTE.—No activity subsequent to 1957.

Iceland

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies[1]	24.7	5.5	4.9	19.2
Food for peace:				
Loans to governments	12.5			
Dollar credit sales	2.6			
Total	15.1	.4	1.2	14.7
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	.5	.1		.4
Other U.S. economic programs	.4	.2		.2
Total loans	40.7	6.2	6.1	34.5

Iceland—Continued

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	35.5			
Food for peace: Grants for economic development	.2			
Total grants	35.7	6.2	6.1	34.5

[1] Excludes $600,000 of local currency loans obtained from sales of surplus agricultural commodities to Denmark and the Netherlands. This was credited as "assistance" to Europe regional ($1,300,000 in fiscal year 1955) and Netherlands ($400,000 in fiscal year 1954).

Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$15,000

Ireland

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–55	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	128.2	14.9	40.5	113.3
Total loans	128.2	14.9	40.5	113.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	18.3			
Total grants	18.3	14.9	40.5	113.3

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$49.4

NOTE.—No activity subsequent to fiscal year 1955.

Italy

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	95.6	95.6	21.1	
Food for peace:				
Loans to private industry	3.6			
Loans to Governments	92.8			
Total	96.4	94.6	3.1	1.8
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	461.7	178.5	29.5	283.2
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 209.3	191.4	59.4	17.9
Military assistance	.4	.2		.2
Total loans	863.4	560.3	113.1	303.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	1,554.7			
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	91.6			
Voluntary relief agencies	271.3			
Other U.S. economic programs	961.7			
Military assistance	2,310.9			
Total grants	5,190.2	560.3	113.1	303.1

[1] AID carries this figure as $1,171,000,000; $961,700,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$35.8
World War I debt June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	1,005.1

Netherlands

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	152.5	87.0	40.8	65.5
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	202.2	202.2	43.9	
Other U.S. economic programs	[2] 34.1	34.1	4.6	
Military assistance	2.2	2.2		
Total loans	391.0	325.5	89.3	65.5
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	839.1			
Other U.S. economic programs	1.9			
Military assistance	1,240.3			
Total grants	2,081.3	325.5	89.3	65.5

[1] Excludes $101,400,000 of fiscal year 1949 and 1950 aid to Indonesia channeled through the Netherlands.

[2] AID carries this figure as $36,000,000; $1,900,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$145.4

Norway

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total 1946-65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	39.2	14.2	10.9	25.0
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	100.0	45.8	14.3	54.2
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 24.2	24.2	4.0	
Total loans	163.4	84.2	29.2	79.2
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	237.6			
Other U.S. economic programs	.8			
Military assistance	852.6			
Total grants	1,091.0	84.2	29.2	79.2

[1] AID carries this figure as $25,000,000; $800,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$29

Poland

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	61.0	5.2	17.0	55.8
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	40.0	24.3	16.2	15.7
Other U.S. economic programs [2]	[3] 37.7	23.2	11.7	14.5
Total loans	138.7	52.7	44.9	86.0
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	45.5			
Other U.S. economic programs	364.0			
Total grants	409.5	52.7	44.9	86.0

[1] Excludes $10,400,000 in grants to the Krakow Hospital shown as a nonregional program.

[2] Includes UNRRA, $364,000,000 and surplus property credits, $37,700,000.

[3] AID carries this amount as $401,700,000; $364,000,000 of it is a grant.

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of ineffective administration of U.S. assistance to Children's Hospital in Poland by the Agency for International Development and the Department of State: "Agency responsibility was not defined and Congress was not informed of need for appropriation to complete project." Date issued, June 17, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $10,500,000.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$25.4
World War I debt, June 30, 1965—Principal and interest due and unpaid	325.5

Portugal

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	36.1	9.5	10.6	26.6
Food for peace:				
Loans to governments	3.4			
Dollar credit sales	24.1			
Total	27.5	3.8	1.7	23.7
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	59.1		3.2	59.1
Total loans	122.7	13.3	15.5	109.4
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	15.0			
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	45.3			
Military assistance	333.7			
Total grants	394.0	13.3	15.5	109.4

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$14.4

NOTES

GAO's opinion of followup review of Department of Defense action to cancel excessive procurement and redistribute aircraft spare parts programed for or delivered to Portugal under the military assistance program: "Action is being taken to cancel procurements and redistribute excesses." Date issued August 14, 1964.

GAO's opinion on ineffective programing, delivery and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Portuguese Air Force under MAP (classified). Date issued Sept. 17, 1963. (Additional details are classified.) (Reaffirmation of May 29, 1963, report.)

Same opinion as above issued on May 29, 1963.

Spain

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	99.2	31.8	25.6	67.4
Food for peace: Loans to governments	239.0	.6	22.3	238.4
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	278.9	37.9	29.0	241.0
Total loans	671.1	70.3	76.9	546.8
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	477.8			
Food for peace:				
Grants for common defense	9.9			
Emergency relief and economic development	3.8			
Voluntary relief agencies	171.5			
Military assistance	583.8			
Total grants	1,246.8	70.3	76.9	546.8

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$44.8

NOTES

GAO's opinion of deficiencies in the military assistance program for the Spanish Army (classified). (Details are classified.) Date issued Sept. 28, 1964.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Spain (classified). Date issued June 27, 1961.

GAO's opinion of review of the military assistance program for Spain, Mar. 31, 1957. (Classified report to the Secretary of Defense.) (Details are classified.) Date issued Aug. 30, 1957.

Sweden

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	20.4	20.4	4.7	----------
Other U.S. economic programs	[1] 1.6	1.6	.2	----------
Total loans	22.0	22.0	4.9	----------
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	86.5	----------	----------	----------
Other U.S. economic programs	.5	----------	----------	----------
Total grants	87.0	22.0	4.9	----------

[1] AID carries this figure as 2.1; 0.5 of it is a grant. (See report p. 134.)

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$109.0
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	16.2
Grand total	125.2

United Kingdom

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	384.8	44.3	117.0	340.5
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	252.1	2.1	.1	250.0
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] 3,828.5	652.7	797.6	3,175.8
Total loans	4,465.4	699.1	914.7	3,766.3
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	3,450.1	----------	----------	----------
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.3	----------	----------	----------
Other U.S. economic programs	8.4	----------	----------	----------
Military assistance	1,034.6	----------	----------	----------
Total grants	4,493.4	699.1	914.7	3,766.3

[1] Includes British loan, $3,750,000,000; surplus property credits, $60,000,000; and lend-lease silver credit, $18,500,000.

[2] AID carries this figure as $3,836,900,000; $8,400,000 of it is a grant. (See report, p. 135.)

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$311.0
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	6,837.7

U.S.S.R.

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
(NO LOANS)				
GRANTS				
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	186.4	----------	----------	----------
Total grants	186.4	----------	----------	----------

[1] United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$186.4
World War I debt, Jan. 1960, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	640.7
Grand total	827.1

Yugoslavia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies	188.2	14.5	24.4	173.7
Food for peace:				
Loans to governments	399.9	----------	----------	----------
Dollar credit sales	173.7	----------	----------	----------
Total	573.6	4.0	32.2	566.6
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	105.0	42.8	26.5	62.2
Military assistance	1.7	1.3	----------	.4
Total loans	868.5	62.6	83.1	805.9
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	386.3	----------	----------	----------
Food for peace:				
Grants for economic development	188.2	----------	----------	----------
Emergency relief and economic development	47.2	----------	----------	----------
Voluntary relief agencies	213.5	----------	----------	----------
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	335.7	----------	----------	----------
Military assistance	693.9	----------	----------	----------
Total grants	1,864.8	62.6	83.1	805.9

[1] Includes UNRRA $298,100,000; and emergency relief, $37,600,000.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$23.1
World War I debt, June 30, 1965, principal and interest due and unpaid	44.8

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of understatement of claims against the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia for recovery of excessive ocean transportation costs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. (Title is self-explanatory.) Date issued, Mar. 13, 1964. Pertinent dollar amounts, $278,000.

Europe regional

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	103.0	28.3	36.3	74.7
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	135.0	----------	.5	135.0
Other U.S. economic programs [2]	56.1	----------	1.0	56.1
Military assistance	32.5	9.6	----------	22.9
Total loans	326.6	37.9	37.8	288.7
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies	447.6	----------	----------	----------
Food for peace:				
Assistance from other country agreements [3]	.8	----------	----------	----------
Voluntary relief agencies [4]	4.8	----------	----------	----------
Military assistance	2,016.7	----------	----------	----------
Total grants	2,469.9	37.9	37.8	288.7

[1] Includes fiscal year 1954 loan of $100,000,000 to Coal & Steel Community; fiscal year 1955 sec. 402 program in Denmark, $2,300,000 being serviced by Denmark, $300,000 by Iceland.

[2] Loans under the EURATOM Cooperation Act.

[3] Aid to San Marino from Italian Lira.

[4] Represents aid to Malta.

CANADA-OCEANIA

Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Trust Territory of the Pacific, regional.

Canada

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	17.5	17.5	1.3	-----
Export-Import Bank: Long-term loans	5.7	5.7	0.7	-----
Total loans	23.2	23.2	2.0	-----
GRANTS				
Military assistance	13.1	-----	-----	-----
Total grants	13.1	23.2	2.0	-----

[1] Represents $6,000,000 for defense mobilization development; and $11,500,000 for strategic materials development.

	Millions
Total economic and military assistance	$36.3
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	3.7
Grand total	40.0

Oceania—Total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank long term loans	19.6	17.4	6.2	2.2
Other U.S. economic programs	12.9	12.5	.1	.4
Military assistance	119.4	66.0	1.0	53.4
Total loans	151.9	95.9	7.3	56.0
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.4	-----	-----	-----
Other U.S. economic programs	106.4	-----	-----	-----
Military assistance	3.0	-----	-----	-----
Total grants	109.8	95.9	7.3	56.0

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$9.8

NOTE.—GAO's opinion of review of central rebuild of World War II vehicles and assemblies in the Pacific Area Command under the military assistance program (classified): "Suggesting improvements in the assembly rebuild program." Date issued Apr. 27, 1962.

Australia

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank long-term loans	7.4	6.0	3.1	1.4
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[2] 7.8	7.8	-----	-----
Military assistance	117.7	65.3	1.0	52.4
Total loans	132.9	79.1	4.1	53.8
GRANTS				
Other U.S. economic programs	.2	-----	-----	-----
Total grants	.2	79.1	4.1	53.8

[1] Includes surplus property credits $7,800,000, and UNRRA $200,000.

[2] AID carries this figure as 8.0; 0.2 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$9.5

New Zealand

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Export-Import Bank, long-term loans	12.2	11.4	3.1	0.8
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	4.3	3.9	-----	.4
Military assistance	1.7	.7	-----	1.0
Total loans	18.2	16.0	3.1	2.2
GRANTS				
Military assistance	3.0	-----	-----	-----
Total grants	3.0	16.0	3.1	2.2

[1] Represents surplus property credits.

	Millions
Agricultural commodity exports under barter contracts from July 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1965, at export market prices	$0.3

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
Other U.S. economic programs (total loans)	[1] 0.8	0.8	0.1	-----
GRANTS				
Food for peace: Voluntary relief agencies	.4	-----	-----	-----
Other U.S. economic programs	106.2	-----	-----	-----
Total grants	106.6	.8	.1	-----

[1] AID carries this figure as $107,000,000; $106,200,000 of it is a grant.

	Millions
Total economic assistance	$107.4

Nonregional, total

[U.S. fiscal years; millions of dollars]

	Total, 1946–65	Principal repayments	Interest collected	Principal outstanding
LOANS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	[2] 21.4	9.2	7.0	12.2
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	[3] 141.3	34.2	3.0	107.1
Military assistance	14.8	-----	-----	14.8
Total loans	177.5	43.4	10.0	134.1
GRANTS				
AID and predecessor agencies [1]	[2] 2,457.3	-----	-----	-----
Food for peace:				
Emergency relief and economic development	26.2	-----	-----	-----
Voluntary relief agencies [4]	331.5	-----	-----	-----
Other U.S. economic programs [1]	1,769.8	-----	-----	-----
Military assistance	1,016.7	-----	-----	-----
Total grants	5,601.5	43.4	10.0	134.1

[1] Excludes subscriptions to International Monetary Fund of $2,750,000,000 in fiscal year 1946, $1,375,000,000 in fiscal year 1959, and $258,800,000 in fiscal year 1965. The latter was a gold subscription for a U.S. quota increase not yet effective.

[2] Data excludes $10,500,000, $10,000,000, and $9,600,000 in fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965, respectively of Alliance for Progress funds obligated for nonregional programs.

[3] AID carries this figure as $1,911,100,000; $1,769,800,000 of it is a grant.

[4] Title III ocean freight paid from title II funds.

General Accounting Office reports issued to the Congress July 1, 1955, through Dec. 31, 1965, relating to foreign aid programs (incorporating information requested by Senator Everett M. Dirksen)

	Reference	Date issued	Pertinent dollar amounts (in millions)
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Examination of financial statements of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1965 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Nov. 29, 1965	(1)
Questionable aspects of budget-support loans made to the Government of Ecuador (loans made without insisting that the foreign government develop or utilize other domestic financial resources).	B-146998	Apr. 29, 1965	$15.0 (a)
Followup examination on certain aspects of United States assistance to the Central Treaty Organization for a rail link between Turkey and Iran (loan for equipment known to be unneeded).	B-146849	do	.543(a)
Review of economic assistance provided to the Republic of the Philippines for development purposes (classified report) (limited accomplishments of specific projects reviewed).	B-146984	Apr. 21, 1965	70.2 (c)
Ineffective utilization of excess property in the foreign assistance program (procurement of new equipment instead of utilizing available excess property).	B-146995	Apr. 12, 1965	3.5 (b)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1964 (opinion on financial statements and disclosure of increased interest expense to U.S. Government).	B-114823	Mar. 8, 1965	(1)
Unnecessary dollar grants to Iran under the foreign assistance program (classified report) (grants used by Iran to procure wheat, valued at $12,500,000, from Australia whereas surplus wheat was available in the United States).	B-133258	Feb. 26, 1965	39.0 (c)
Additional interest costs to the United States because of premature releases of funds to the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (title is self-explanatory. The interest costs identified total as much as $60,000 annually).	B-146937	Sept. 8, 1964	(1)
Improper retention of dollar collections on loans made by Corporate Development Loan Fund (title is self-explanatory. Report covers collections totaling $43,000,000.)	B-133220	Sept. 3, 1964	(1)
Certain problems relating to administration of the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam for 1958–62 (inability or unwillingness of the foreign government to use country resources to support activities being supported by the United States plus ineffective administration by AID).	B-133001	July 24, 1964	763.0 (c)
Review of the administration of assistance for financing commercial imports and other financial elements under the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam (unjustified assistance and unnecessary costs).	B-133001	do	(2)
Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey, fiscal years 1958–62 (failure to follow an overall plan based on country's resources and highest priority needs).	B-133026	June 30, 1964	1,750.0 (c)
Deficiencies in the administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile (including a classified supplement) (inadequate planning, inadequate staffing of AID mission and failure to obtain maximum exchange rate for dollars).	B-146754	June 29, 1964	120.0 (c)
Ineffective administration of U.S assistance to Children's Hospital in Poland by the Agency for International Development and the State Department (agency responsibility was not defined and Congress was not informed of the need for appropriation to complete project).	B-146787	June 17, 1964	10.5 (c)
Examination of certain economic development projects for assistance to Central Treaty Organization fiscal years 1956–62 (defects in the projects and in their administration resulting in a questionable need for over $8,000,000 of program funds).	B-146849	Mar. 5, 1964	28.7 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1963 (opinion in financial statements)	B-114823	Feb. 20, 1964	(1)
Review of economic aspects of loan for construction of water supply system in Saigon, Vietnam (nonexistent basis for evaluating a choice between 2 water supply systems).	B-133220	Sept. 17, 1963	17.5 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1962 (opinion on financial statements and disclosure of increased interest expense to U.S. Government).	B-114823	May 15, 1963	(1)
Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Korea, fiscal years 1957-61, pts. I and II (assistance exceeded country's economic and administrative capacities).	B-125060	Sept. 21, 1962	1,200.0 (c)
Audit of Development Loan Fund, fiscal year 1961 (opinion on financial statements plus related observations)	B-133220	June 25, 1962	(1)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1961 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Jan. 22, 1962	(1)
Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Thailand, fiscal years 1955–60 (general evaluation of progress made in selected projects and of practices followed in importing commodities).	B-133258	Aug. 21, 1961	214.0 (c)
Economic and technical assistance program for Iran, fiscal years 1956–60 (improvements needed in various administrative practices and procedures of U.S. agencies).	B-133258	June 27, 1961	160.0 (c)
Negotiation and administration of selected construction and technical service contracts (improvements needed in the selection of contractors, the inclusion of incentive and penalty provisions, and the establishment of fees).	B-133355	Mar. 30, 1961	189.0 (c)
Review of the mutual security program presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1961 for economic assistance to Korea, Pakistan, and Vietnam (suggestions for revealing more meaningful data in budget presentations).	B-133175	Mar. 29, 1961	(1)
Audit of Development Loan Fund, fiscal year 1960 (opinion on financial statements and related observations)	B-133220	Mar. 27, 1961	(1)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1960 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Jan. 19, 1961	(1)
Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Brazil, fiscal years 1955–59 (recommends integration of common support functions of the Department of State and ICA, and comments on other practices and procedures).	B-133283	May 27, 1960	28.4 (c)
Examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Bolivia, fiscal years 1954–59 (classified report) (action needed to evaluate status of projects in process, to recover usable equipment from defunct projects, and to follow up on trainee program).	B-133271	May 17, 1960	114.6 (c)
Review of contracts with McGraw-Hydrocarbon for the construction and operation of a fertilizer plant in Korea (recommends use of fixed-price contracts, incentive provisions in cost reimbursement type projects, and more effective penalty provisions).	B-133290	Apr. 19, 1960	43.9 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1959 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Mar. 23, 1960	(1)
Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Guatemala, fiscal years 1955–59 (reveals corrective action taken in various administrative areas, including planning prior to project agreements).	B-114845	Mar. 22, 1960	58.6 (c)
Audit of Development Loan Fund, fiscal year 1959 (opinion on financial statements and related observations)	B-133220	Feb. 29, 1960	(1)
U.S. contributions to European Payments Union (succeeded by European Fund) (factual summary of the background, purpose, operating mechanism, and terms of the U.S. contribution).	B-133221	Nov. 6, 1959	350.0 (c)
Economic and technical assistance program for India, fiscal years 1955–58 (nonutilization of equipment and need to revise project agreement for a powerplant).	B-114845	Sept. 14, 1959	247.0 (c)
Audit of Development Loan Fund, fiscal year 1958 (opinion on financial statements and related observations)	B-133220	Aug. 31, 1959	(1)
Followup review of economic and technical assistance program for Laos, December 1958 (observations on various administrative practices and procedures).	B-133003	July 31, 1959	(1)
Mutual security program presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1959 economic assistance for China, Korea, and Vietnam (recommendations for including more meaningful data in future program presentations).	B-133175	June 8, 1959	(1)
Economic and technical assistance program for Pakistan, fiscal years 1955–57 (need to adjust aid program to more realistic levels and to determine causes of unclaimed commodity imports).	B-114896	Mar. 31, 1959	307.5 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1958 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Jan. 15, 1959	(1)
Economic and technical assistance program for Laos, fiscal years 1955–57 (improvements needed in various administrative practices and procedures, including the negotiation of a realistic exchange rate.)	B-133003	Oct. 8, 1958	134.4 (c)
Economic and technical assistance program for China (Taiwan), fiscal years 1955–57 (general evaluation of the program plus specific needs for improved administrative practices and procedures).	B-133074	Aug. 29, 1958	225.0 (c)
Economic and technical assistance program for Turkey (June 30, 1957) (improper practices in deposits of local currency sales proceeds and improper obligating procedures).	B-133026	July 24, 1958	(1)
Economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam, fiscal years 1955–57 (general evaluation of program practices, and need for realistic exchange rates).	B-133001	May 22, 1958	787.2 (c)
Examination of $100,000,000 loan to European Coal and Steel Community (informative summary of broad policy matters involved in the project).	B-132966	Mar. 13, 1958	100.0 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1957 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Feb. 4, 1958	(1)
Administration of U.S. assistance program for Korea, fiscal years 1954–56 (discloses general problem areas in program planning and implementation).	B-125060	June 24, 1957	845.9 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1956 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Feb. 19, 1957	(1)
Administration of U.S. assistance program for Israel, fiscal years 1952–55 (reporting action taken by agency to correct earlier program deficiencies).	B-125029	Sept. 20, 1956	233.2 (c)
Administration of U.S. assistance program for Lebanon, fiscal years 1952–55 (discloses need for improvements in various administrative practices and procedures, and questions desirability of employing American University of Beirut).	B-125021	June 7, 1956	21.4 (c)
Administration of the U.S. assistance program for Egypt, fiscal years 1953–55 (discloses need for improvements in programing and in administrative practices and procedures).	B-125010	Apr. 11, 1956	59.8 (c)
Administration of U.S. assistance program for Iran, fiscal years 1952–55 (recommends consolidation of common support functions of the Embassy and the mission, and that counterpart withdrawals be subject to prior approval by the mission).	B-125009	Mar. 15, 1956	205.0 (c)
Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1955 (opinion on financial statements)	B-114823	Jan. 13, 1956	(1)
Administration of U.S. assistance program for Pakistan, fiscal years 1952–54 (need to evaluate status of lagging projects, improve program planning, and improve procurement and contracting policies and practices).	B-114896	Dec. 27, 1955	45.5 (c)
Audit of Institute of Inter-American Affairs, fiscal year 1954 (administrative policies and practices requiring improvement)	B-114837	Nov. 25, 1955	(1)

See footnotes at end of table.

General Accounting Office reports issued to the Congress July 1, 1955, through Dec. 31, 1965, relating to foreign aid programs (incorporating information requested by Senator Everett M. Dirksen)—Continued

	Reference	Date issued	Pertinent dollar amounts (in millions)
MILITARY ASSISTANCE			
Review of the military assistance training program for Iran (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (lack of in-country training, insufficient personnel trained, nonutilization of trained personnel, and unnecessary transportation costs to the United States).	B-133134	Dec. 10, 1965	
Ineffective and inefficient administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military assistance program for Greece (classified) (unnecessary training and poor utilization of trained personnel).	B-133055	June 29, 1965	
Lack of effective action by the military services to obtain NATO cost sharing of military construction projects in Europe (classified) (title is self-explanatory).	B-156489	June 4, 1965	
Overprocurements resulting from ineffective supply management in Korea under the military assistance program (title is self-explanatory).	B-125099	May 28, 1965	
Inadequate planning, programing, and contracting for a fixed communications system for the Government of Indonesia under the military assistance program (classified) (title is self-explanatory).	B-146839	Apr. 26, 1965	
Review of military assistance provided to the Republic of the Philippines (classified report) (details are classified)	B-133359	Mar. 26, 1965	
Waste of funds in construction of Shahabad Depot in Iran under the military assistance program (classified) (Iranian Army neither needed nor wanted depot from the start, resulting in negligible use and present plans for dismantling).	B-133134	Mar. 22, 1965	
Ineffective and overly costly aspects of military and economic assistance provided to Thailand (classified report) (title describes the unclassified aspects of the report).	B-132913 B-133258	Feb. 17, 1965	
Inadequate consideration given to utilizing reserve fleet ships in lieu of providing new ships to Iran under the military assistance program (classified) (reluctancy of responsible officials to ask for congressional approval and use of unrealistic cost data).	B-133134	Feb. 3, 1965	
Review of the military assistance program for a Far East country (classified) (waiver of normal U.S. control over assistance, plus lack of cooperation by the country to establish a sound program).	B-146941	Sept. 29, 1964	
Summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program (ineffective U.S. controls led to use of funds for nonapproved and nonessential purposes).	B-146943	Sept. 28, 1964	
Deficiencies in the military assistance program for the Spanish Army (classified) (details are classified)	B-125086	Aug. 25, 1964	
Followup review of Department of Defense action to cancel excessive procurement and redistribute aircraft spare parts programed for or delivered to Portugal under the military assistance program (action is being taken to cancel procurements and redistribute excesses).	B-146785	Aug. 14, 1964	
Unofficial use and overstated needs of commercial-type vehicles by the Military Assistance Advisory Group and the Headquarters, Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China (title is self-explanatory).	B-146907	July 31, 1964	
Review of the military assistance program for Indonesia (classified) (details are classified)	B-146839	May 6, 1964	
Furnishing of military assistance to Ethiopia in excess of the country's ability to effectively utilize the equipment (classified) (title is self-explanatory).	B-146887	May 6, 1964	
Inefficient utilization of personnel to administer the military assistance program in advanced Western European countries (including a classified supplement) (overstaffing in relation to substantially reduced programs).	B-133280	Apr. 2, 1964	
Followup review of DOD actions to obtain reimbursement from foreign countries for administrative expenses under the military assistance program (reports on recoveries and identifies additional eligible recoveries).	B-146749	Mar. 18, 1964	
Unnecessary or premature procurement and delivery of Sidewinder missile training systems to foreign countries under the MAP (including a classified supplement) (inability or unwillingness of certain countries to use the systems).	B-146762	Mar. 12, 1964	
Inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to Pakistan under the foreign assistance program (classified) (additional details are classified).	B-146815	Sept. 25, 1963	
Ineffective programing, delivery, and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Portuguese Air Force under MAP (classified) (reaffirmation of May 29, 1963, report).	B-146785	Sept. 17, 1963	
Inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to Iran under the foreign assistance program (classified) (additional details are classified).	B-133134	July 30, 1963	
Ineffective maintenance and utilization of equipment furnished to Iran under MAP (classified) (lack of U.S. assistance to overcome maintenance and utilization problems).	B-133134	July 16, 1963	
Unnecessary payment by the United States of costs properly chargeable to Japan for administrative and related expenses of the MAP for Japan (title is self-explanatory).	B-132913	June 27, 1963	
Excessive costs incurred for rehabilitating to original appearance and serviceability military equipment donated to foreign nations under the MAP (unreasonably high standards of appearance and serviceability for material given to foreign countries).	B-133280	May 31, 1963	
Ineffective programing, delivery, and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Portuguese Air Force under MAP (classified) (title is self-explanatory).	B-146785	May 29, 1963	
Review of the programing, delivery, and utilization of selected missile system equipment delivered to European countries under the military assistance program (classified) (details are classified).	B-146762	Feb. 27, 1963	
Review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS-11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States (classified) (questions the need to pay the fees).	B-146766	Feb. 15, 1963	
Review of the local currency military budget support program for Korea (weaknesses in U.S. controls over the program and deficiencies in its administration by the Republic of Korea Army).	B-125099	Jan. 8, 1963	
Summary of reviews of the maintenance and supply support of Army equipment furnished to Far East countries under the MAP (maintenance and supply deficiencies resulting in defective equipment plus planned procurement of vehicles in excess of requirements).	B-132913	Aug. 31, 1962	
Review of the utilization and maintenance of Army equipment furnished under the MAP for Thailand (classified) (details are classified).	B-132913	do	
Review of payments made by the United States for the construction of airfields in France (classified) (failure to claim reimbursement from NATO for airfields constructed by the U.S. Air Force).	B-146738	Aug. 13, 1962	
Review of maintenance and supply support of Army equipment furnished under the MAP for Korea (classified) (some inefficiency of maintenance and supply of Army vehicles).	B-125099	June 8, 1962	
Review of the military assistance program for Turkey (classified) (details are classified)	B-125085	May 31, 1962	
Review of the maintenance and supply support of Army equipment furnished under the MAP for Taiwan (classified) (details are classified).	B-125087	May 24, 1962	
Review of central rebuild of World War II vehicles and assemblies in the Pacific Area Command under the military assistance program (classified) (suggesting improvements in the assembly rebuild program).	B-132913	Apr. 27, 1962	
Review of the military assistance program for Greece (classified) (various supply management deficiencies)	B-133055	Feb. 21, 1962	
Management of spare parts for Army equipment provided to Far East countries (supply management deficiencies)	B-132913	Oct. 13, 1961	
Reservation of Army excess material for the MAP (failure to reserve excess equipment parts needed by MAP, reserving that not needed, and MAP overcharged for delivered material).	B-133363	July 31, 1961	
Review of the military assistance program for Spain (classified) (details are classified)	B-125086	June 27, 1961	
Review of the military assistance program for Taiwan (classified) (details are classified)	B-125087	May 22, 1961	
Review of the military assistance program for the Philippines (classified) (need for improvement in supply management controls).	B-133359	Apr. 12, 1961	
Review of delivery and utilization of tactical air navigation equipment under the MAP (classified) (ineffective utilization of some equipment).	B-133353	Feb. 28, 1961	
Review of military assistance program requirements for the Army and Air Force of Korea (classified) (unneeded items requisitioned and program overstated).	B-125099	Jan. 31, 1961	
Review of programing and delivery under the military assistance program of equipment for vehicles already equipped (classified) (additional details are classified).	B-125086	June 30, 1960	
Administration of the military assistance program—Department of the Air Force (poor programing and provision of spare parts plus overcharges to MAP).	B-125061	Mar. 21, 1960	
Review of the military assistance program for Italy (classified) (details are classified)	B-125091	Feb. 29, 1960	
Review of administrative costs of the U.S. military assistance program chargeable to the Federal Republic of Germany (failure to collect costs due the United States).	B-125084	do	
Review of the pricing of material delivered to the military assistance program by the military departments (inequities in the pricing policies).	B-133280	do	
Review of the military assistance program for Korea (classified) (suggesting administrative improvements)	B-125099	Feb. 26, 1960	
Review of the military assistance program for Japan (classified) (details are classified)	B-132913	Feb. 25, 1960	
Review of the military assistance program for Turkey (classified) (details are classified)	B-123085	Jan. 29, 1960	
Review of the military assistance program for Pakistan (classified) (suggesting the use of austere standards and end-item utilization inspections, the consideration of existing country assets and the country's disposal practices, and the development of long-range cost estimates.)	B-125090	Jan. 12, 1960	
Administration of the military assistance program, Department of the Navy (new basis needed for spare parts requirements)	B-133128	Dec. 18, 1959	
Review of the military assistance program for Iran (classified) (suggesting the development of usage standards and the use of end-item utilization inspections, the suspension of deliveries pending a study of requirements, and better controls over disposal activities).	B-133134	Jan. 9, 1959	
Review of the military assistance program for Vietnam (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (suggestions for improving controls and developing long-range cost estimates of the program).	B-133006	Nov. 26, 1958	

General Accounting Office reports issued to the Congress July 1, 1955, through Dec. 31, 1965, relating to foreign aid programs (*incorporating information requested by Senator Everett M. Dirksen*)—Continued

	Reference	Date issued	Pertinent dollar amounts (in millions)
MILITARY ASSISTANCE—continued			
Review of the military assistance program for Laos (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (same as above)	B-133080	Oct. 30, 1958	
Review of the military assistance program for Cambodia (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (same as above)	B-133085	Sept. 30, 1958	
Review of the Military Assistance Program for Greece (classified) report to the Secretary of Defense (suggestions for improving controls, determining and disposing of excesses, and developing long-range cost estimates).	B-133055	Sept. 8, 1958	
Review of the military assistance program for Taiwan (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified)	B-125087	Jan. 29, 1958	
Administration of the military assistance program, Department of the Army (accounting and reporting system needs updating)	B-125097	Jan. 13, 1958	
Review of the military assistance program for Korea, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125099	Oct. 4, 1957	
Review of the military assistance program for Japan, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-132913	Oct. 3, 1957	
Review of the military assistance program redistribution of programed excesses, December 1956 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125088	Aug. 30, 1957	
Review of the military assistance program for Turkey, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125085	do	
Review of the military assistance program for Spain, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125086	do	
Review of the military assistance program for Pakistan, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125090	do	
Review of the military assistance program for Italy, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125091	do	
Review of the military assistance program for France, March 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125086	do	
Review of the military assistance program for the Federal Republic of Germany, Mar. 31, 1957 (classified report to the Secretary of Defense) (details are classified).	B-125084	do	
Examination of the military assistance program, as administered by the Department of Defense, Mar. 31, 1957 (general evaluation of entire program).	B-125098	Aug. 29, 1957	
Review of the administration of the mutual defense assistance program for France and Turkey (classified report to the Assistant Secretary of Defense) (programing based on unverified data from the countries, plus other classified matters).	B-125011	June 19, 1956	
FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM			
Insufficient amounts claimed from foreign governments for recovery of ocean transportation costs financed under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (failed to claim $5,700,000).	B-152538	July 30, 1965	$367.8 (c)
Significant dollar savings available in financing foreign sales agents' commissions on surplus agricultural commodities exported under title I Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (unnecessary disbursements in fiscal year 1963–64 of $2,400,000).	B-146820	July 23, 1965	2.7 (c)
Displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic (including a classified supplement) (title I, Public Law 480 program sales displaced commercial sales of $5,500,000).	B-156922	July 20, 1965	17.073(c)
Questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic under title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (grant based on anticipated need that did not materialize. Much was sold commercially in United Arab Republic).	B-146820	July 16, 1965	23.7 (a)
Improper payment of port charges on shipments to Colombia of food donated under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (tariff rates did not reflect terms of agreements covering the distribution of the food).	B-146820	May 20, 1965	.393(b)
Unnecessary costs resulting from an inflexible policy of donating flour instead of wheat to voluntary relief agencies for distribution abroad under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (unnecessary costs of $3,700,000 applicable to a $24,000,000 program in 1 country, but the policy is also applicable to other countries).	B-146971	Mar. 19, 1965	3.7 (b)
Weaknesses involving primarily the disposition of surplus nonfat dry milk (losses resulting from infestation, excessive allowances for transportation costs, unnecessary transportation costs, failure to use U.S.-owned foreign currencies, and acceptance of unverified manufacture dates; plus unauthorized sales by overseas recipients).	B-148254	Feb. 2, 1965	3.7 (b)
Weaknesses in controls over dollar refunds due Commodity Credit Corporation for adjustments in amounts financed on cotton exported under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (failure to claim refunds and delays in collecting claimed refunds).	B-146820	Nov. 23, 1964	.198(b)
Summary of organization and procedures for the operation and administration of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480 or food for peace) pts. I and II as of December 1963 (title is self-explanatory).	B-137856	Nov. 19, 1964	(1)
Improper payment of Colombian port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (tariff rates did not reflect terms of agreements covering the commodity sales).	B-146820	Nov. 17, 1964	.234(b)
Excessive ocean transportation costs incurred under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (a disproportionate percentage of shipments made at U.S. expense were routed to high-rate ports in East Pakistan, whereas most of the shipments made at Pakistan's expense were routed to lower rate ports in West Pakistan).	B-146820	Oct. 30, 1964	.850(a)
Understatement of claims against the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia for recovery of excessive ocean transportation costs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (title is self-explanatory).	B-146820	Mar. 13, 1964	.278(a)
Inadequate controls for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (no assurance that commodity sales do not result in the increased availability of same or similar commodities to countries unfriendly to the United States).	B-146820	Oct. 7, 1963	9,500.0 (c)
INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY			
Unauthorized expenditures for the repair and reconstruction of a section of the Inter-American Highway in the Republic of Costa Rica ($376,000 unauthorized).	B-118653	Oct. 20, 1965	1.128(c)
Unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of the Inter-American Highway program in the Republic of Panama (unnecessary costs of $175,000).	B-118653	Mar. 24, 1965	60.0 (c)
Questionable validity of $32,000,000 estimate of funds needed to complete Inter-American Highway (title is self-explanatory)	B-118653	Dec. 8, 1964	32.0 (c)
Unnecessary costs resulting from deficiencies in construction activities of the Inter-American Highway program in Costa Rica (unnecessary costs of $125,000).	B-118653	Sept. 14, 1964	85.0 (c)
Unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of right-of-way activities o the Inter-American Highway program in Costa Rica (unnecessary costs of $1,100,000).	B-118653	May 27, 1964	(3)

[1] Not applicable.
See related report above.

[3] See above.

EXPLANATIONS OF DOLLAR AMOUNTS

To the extent possible, the dollar amounts represent the portions of the assistance programs reviewed rather than monetary measures of what was found to be questionable or deficient within those programs. Identification in these terms was not possible in every case, however, since some reviews were directed to an appraisal of apparent problem areas and restricted to indicated areas of deficiency, often on the basis of illustrative tests, instead of encompassing measurable program activities. In these cases, therefore, the dollar amounts represent the portions of the programs identified as questionable or deficient in some respect, some of which illustrate larger findings of undetermined amounts. Accordingly, each dollar amount has been identified by one of three letters which are explained below:

(a) These dollar amounts are the portions of the program or activity identified as questionable or deficient in some respect.

(b) These dollar amounts are also the portions of the program or activity identified as questionable or deficient in some respect, but are illustrative, we believe, of larger findings of undetermined amounts.

(c) These dollar amounts are the values of the programs reviewed, and should not be interpreted as any indication of what was considered to be questionable or deficient. In those cases where identified deficiencies have been reduced to dollar amounts, these amounts are revealed in the narrative descriptions under the report titles.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that is the case for a general reduction in the Development Loan Fund. What we are doing in so many fields, the commitments that we have made, and on which we rely, the conduct of the program, the presentations to Congress, and what they may have lacked in careful accuracy, the fiscal and economic condition that confronts the country today, the lack of area in which we can cut in substantial amounts so that it will really register in the fight against inflation—these and other factors conjoin with exactly what has been happening in Great Britain in the last 24 hours and ought to be, in my judgment, a stimulus for a hard look-see and a reduction of this Development Loan program in the interest of our own solvency and stability.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator to say that AID asked for money in the amount of approximately $10 billion for loans and then used that money for grants.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it was only a kind of presentation.

Mr. COTTON. After they used this money, it was earmarked for loans by Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I cannot quite say that that would be absolutely true, but the impression was left here by AID that this was to be loan money. That is the important point.

Mr. COTTON. My real question is this: After using this money for grants—whatever may have been the representation before—was that fact reported by them to Congress, or did it have to be dug out?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It had to be dug out. And we asked their representatives right here in the Capitol what the justification for it was. They said, "Well, you gave us authority to make grants and loans. Therefore, we felt that we had a kind of discretionary authority to make a grant or a loan, depending on the circumstances and the conditions that obtained in the country."

But we had a different impression. For a number of years we have been assailing this idea of doling this money out so freely, without any return whatsoever.

Mr. COTTON. But they did not voluntarily report that to Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Everything we have here, we had to dig out, and it was like pulling turkey teeth to do it.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that is the case for a cut of $250 million in the Development Loan Fund, and I am willing to rest it on that basis. I hope the Senate will support the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Merely for the further information of the Senate, I ask the chairman of the committee and his staff adviser whether the administration did not ask for $665,400,000 under the development loan program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the appropriation requested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. And by how much did the committee cut the amount requested?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To $620 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the committee cut it $45,400,000?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would cut it another $250 million?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I said—I do not believe the Senator from Ohio was here at the time—the House has allowed $1 billion. There is a difference of $630 million. If we compromise it, as we have done in practically all cases, on a 50–50 basis, that would mean a restoration of $315 million, coming out with $685 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we remain firm on that figure——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, if we accept his cut.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

I do not believe the Senate should take the position that it ought to go to conference with the House on a question of foreign aid and compromise it at a halfway mark. I believe that the time has come for the Senate, particularly, acting through the Committee on Foreign Relations, to exercise the constitutional primacy of the Senate in foreign policy. The Senate should establish a level of authorization for foreign aid which it believes ought to stand up in Congress.

When we go to conference with the House on a question of taxation of raising revenue, which is a case in which the House has primacy of jurisdiction, I am inclined to say that the Senate ought to make concessions to the House position. There is no question about the intent of the Constitution to give the House primary responsibility with reference to the raising of revenue; this was a part of the Revolution of 1776, and I believe we ought to honor it.

But the Constitution, in my mind, is just as clear in imposing primary responsibility for foreign policy and an international program upon the Senate.

I believe that to say that we should authorize $625 million while the House has authorized a billion dollars, and that we should go to conference and give them half of what they voted, is to give up and to yield an authority and a power which properly belongs to the Senate.

As Senators know, I have been one who has been insisting recently, with reference to foreign policy, that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate ought to assert their authority and their responsibility with reference to foreign policy, to the Central Intelligence Agency, and to the sale and distribution of arms around the world. I believe the same issue is involved before the Senate today.

We should decide on the floor of the Senate, how much money we believe ought to be spent in foreign aid, and insist on that amount. We ought to go beyond the question of the amount and lay down procedures whereby that money will be spent. I am much more concerned about procedures, about control, about direction over our foreign aid program, than I am about the amount.

The device of cutting authorization or of cutting appropriations belongs to the House of Representatives primarily. It is also a device which is used when one is desperate. It goes back to the disputes between the kings and the parliaments in England in the 16th and 17th centuries. I believe we have moved beyond that, and that we should try to settle these differences on a somewhat more rational basis, giving recognition to the proper procedure and the assignment of authority and responsibility.

Every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations knows that I have been as willing as anyone on the committee to set limitations upon the authority of the executive branch, to insist that the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting for the Senate, be consulted; that it give advice; that it exercise real authority with reference to the foreign policy on this bill and every other bill.

I do not believe that at this point we ought to be pushed into the position of saying that the only way the Senate can control or direct or influence foreign policy is by refusing to authorize the expenditure of money. I do not believe we have come to that desperate point. I believe we can still consider procedures, that we can still give advice and can still give consent.

We should not take the position that the only way the Senate can exercise any influence on our foreign aid program is the negative one of saying, "We will not give you any money." This is the argument that is being made in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois: "Do not give them any money." This is not the constitutional conception of the U.S. Senate. It may come close to the conception of the prerevolutionary conception of a House of Representatives. But the Senate was conceived as having a different function—of developing ideas, giving direction, forming policy, and bringing that policy and determination to bear on the actual decision.

In my judgment, the technique proposed here of cutting by almost 50 percent the authorization for foreign aid is the kind of action that we should take only in an extreme case, and I do not believe that we have reached that point.

Therefore, I suggest that we not agree to the proposed amendment. Rather, we should deal with procedures, processes and methods by which the advice and the consent of the Senate on foreign policy are to be made effective, and not resort to the desperate device of cutting appropriations and accepting for the Senate the methods which may be justified for the House of Representatives but which are not justified for the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that the House bill cut the figure from $1.2 billion to $1 billion for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971; that the Senate bill struck out the words "$1,200,000,000" and the words "subsequent fiscal year," and authorized $620 million for the fiscal year 1967; and that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois would cut that $620 million by $250 million more.

Mr. McCARTHY. To $370 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To $375 million. So the difference would be a billion dollars in 5 years, in the House bill, and

$375 million for 1 year, in the Senate bill. Am I correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is approximately correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with the figure given by the Senator from Illinois, that $228 million of funds are available now under previous acts?

Mr. McCARTHY. As far as I know that is the exact figure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think that it has much bearing upon the decision to be made here with reference to an authorization.

I take slight issue with my friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. I was surprised to find him defending William McChesney Martin on foreign aid since I know that he disagrees with William McChesney Martin in one area he has competency: To determine the interest rates of the country. I know that the Senator from Indiana rejects almost every position that William McChesney Martin has taken on interest rates and fiscal policy through the years.

I am distressed to find that the Senator is quoting William McChesney Martin on foreign aid. As far as I know, nobody has ever credited him with competency in that field.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to point out to my dear friend from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] what I am trying to do is to put in focus what the administration said is a very important program. William McChesney Martin is one of our chief monetary officers. If we are to accept the recommendation of the admintration on foreign aid, there should be accepted the opinions of some of their chief supervisors. I am not accepting his supervisor, but I would reject proposals of the administration. I would do this to show the conflict in the administration on this policy and how they find themselves in conflict.

This was no more vividly portrayed than it was by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives at page 16185 of the RECORD of July 19, 1966, in which Mr. MAHON points out something that I have been trying, and I know that the Senator from Minnesota has been trying to find out for some time: whether there is to be a supplemental request, how big it is going to be, and, if we are going to spend this money, how much it will be.

Mr. MAHON states:

> If this situation should develop—

Speaking about the increasing cost of Federal expenditures—

> in my opinion it would be most damaging to the welfare of the country, economically, and otherwise.

Mr. MAHON quotes from the news story about the President in which the President said:

> While saying a tax increase is one alternative to a hold-down in non-defense spending, Johnson said there will be no decision by him on this until the appropriation bills are further along in Congress and after it has been determined how much additional spending will be required in Vietnam.
>
> He [meaning the President] said there will be a request for a substantial supplemental appropriation for Vietnam.

I might call to the attention of the Senator that when I asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Budget Director that same question about 2 weeks ago they said that they knew of no such supplemental request being prepared. Now, here is an interesting fact. Mr. MAHON says:

> There will be a substantial additional request for defense. I might interpolate, it could be $10 billion. I do not know how much it will be, and neither does the President "but that it is impossible at this stage to tell how much it will be."

He said:

> This is the largest single defense appropriation bill presented to Congress since World War II. This huge defense bill is not spoken of boastfully or capriciously. I speak of it with deep regret. Even without the anticipated supplemental request, the Department of Defense will have available to it during the current fiscal year, which began on July 1, the sum of $100 billion.

If we want to cut down nondefense spending, which the President said we should do, I share the view of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Here is the place to start.

My comment on the words of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], even ignoring the wisdom of William McChesney Martin, or the nonwisdom of his statements, the truth remains, that if we are going to cut any place, except in the defense budget, it will have to be in foreign aid. I think that it is a good time to start.

I hate to see my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], led down the paths of expenditures, but if that is his choice, we will have to let him go.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator There is a rather strong tradition in this country with regard to using a man who has proved himself in one field, in every other field. An astronaut, because he has done well in space, becomes an expert in politics; a baseball player, because he has done well, becomes an expert in another field; or a movie actor, even if he was a bad actor, is considered competent in other fields.

The Senator from Indiana proposes that a man, who in his judgment has been proved wrong in the area of his competence, and having accepted that he was a failure, or at least that he was not a reliable judge in his field of competence—the Senator from Indiana has said that we should use him in a field in which he claims no competence. I am apprehensive that this would establish a new trend. People would run for office because they would not be competent in their own field.

The Senator is today opening up a new approach to political office: that if a man can prove he has not been competent in his own field, then he should be consulted with respect to his judgment in fields foreign to his field of competence; that this is a justification for his advice and being accepted in another field.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I did not put those tags on Mr. Martin, even though they may be appropriate.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator disagreed with the interest policy of Mr. Martin.

Mr. HARTKE. I do not wish to disagree——

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator disagreed with his tax proposals.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to make it clear that I did not put the tags on him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall.

Mr. HARTKE. I shall be glad to join in putting those tags on him.

As far as Mr. Martin is concerned, I think that perhaps we could put him in charge of the AID program. This might make him more of an expert.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are spending up to $3 billion a month in connection with the Vietnamese war. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would cut our total development loan program down to $370 million a year. This is approximately 15 percent of the amount we are spending, not on an annual basis, but every month, in connection with the Vietnamese war.

I think that we should run some risks and take some chances on losing some money in development loans, and that we can afford to authorize up to $620 or $650 million a year, when at the same time we are prepared to spend roughly $3 billion a month in pursuit of the Vietnamese war. Even though we lose some of it, it is the kind of premium or risk investment that we should be willing to take.

I urge the Senate to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

LAND TO BE SET ASIDE IN MONTANA FOR CERTAIN INDIANS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2948, to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 2948 to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the 487 acres, more or less, described below are hereby declared to be held in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
>
> PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, MONTANA
>
> Township 18 north, range 21 west, section 8, lot 7; section 17, lot 2.
>
> The areas described aggregate 86.54 acres.
>
> Township 19 north, range 23 west, section 31, northeast quarter southwest quarter.
>
> The area described contains 40 acres.
>
> Beginning at the southwest corner of southeast quarter southeast quarter section

14, township 18 north, range 20 west, principal meridian, from the initial point—

north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 660 feet, east 330 feet,

north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 1,320 feet, east 990 feet,

south 0 degrees 01 minutes east, 275.9 feet,

south 59 degrees 0 minutes west, 849.6 feet,

south 45 degrees 33 minutes east, 43.1 feet,

south 58 degrees 50 minutes west, 96 feet,

south 31 degrees 10 minutes east, 130 feet,

south 56 degrees 37 minutes east, 298 feet,

south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 72.7 feet,

north 56 degrees 37 minutes west, 377.6 feet,

south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 462.8 feet,

north 89 degrees 35 minutes east, 314.3 feet,

south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 589.5 feet,

west 858 feet to the point of beginning.

The tract as described contains 28.66 acres, more or less.

Township 21 north, range 20 west, section 36, southeast quarter southeast quarter, east half east half east half northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, north half southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, east half east half southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter.

The areas described aggregate 58.4375 acres.

Beginning at the northwest corner of section 1, township 20 north, range 20 west, principal meridian, Montana.

Thence from the initial point, east along north line of said section 1,660 feet, south 0 degrees 01 minutes east, 396 feet, west 660 feet, north 0 degrees 01 minutes west, 396 feet, to the point of beginning.

The area described contains 6 acres, more or less.

Township 22 north, range 24 west, section 33, southeast quarter southeast quarter.

The area described contains 40 acres.

Township 21 north, range 20 west, section 11, east half southeast quarter northeast quarter, section 12, northeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter.

The areas described aggregate 137.5 acres.

Township 16 north, range 19 west, section 16, west half east half southwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter.

The area described contains 80 acres.

Beginning at the southwest corner of section 16, township 16 north, range 19 west, from the initial point—

north 0 degrees 02 minutes west 1,320 feet, east 1,317.36 feet, south 0 degrees 02 minutes east 528 feet, west 462 feet, south 0 degrees 22 minutes east, 792 feet, west 857.34 feet, along section line to point of beginning, excepting east half northwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter and west half west northeast quarters northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 16, township 16 north, range 19 west.

The area described contains 29.725 acres, more or less.

The areas of the tracts listed above aggregate 486.8625 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. This Act shall become effective when the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes by resolution accepts the transfer of the property involved.

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission. The Court of Claims is directed to make the same determination in connection with any claim against the United States adjudicated by it.

Mr. METCALF. The House has amended S. 2948 in only one technical way—that is, to correct the total acreage to be conveyed by this bill. As passed by the Senate, a total of 526.8 acres would have gone to the Flathead Indians, but the correct figure is 487.8. I have discussed this change with the members of the Interior Committee, and it is agreeable to the chairman. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 2948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, unless there are other speakers, I suggest the absence of a quorum for a short time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment. I have an amendment that I intended to offer which would cut the development loan fund by $200 million. It is my belief that the pending amendment should be adopted, but if it is not, then I will offer the one I intended to present.

Unfortunately, I was not in the Chamber to hear all of the debate, and I am sure that some of the facts I will present about the development loan program have been made available to most Senators. In any event I want to document the evidence to support the pending amendment.

Last year, the Development Loan Fund had available for expenditure, a total of $780,212,000. For the fiscal year 1967, the year for which funds are being currently authorized in the pending measure, there will be available $848,862,000 in the aggregate when the amount authorized by the committee for development loans; namely, $620 million is added to the carryover, reimbursements, repayments, and recoveries from appropriations of past years.

If the sum recommended by the committee is permitted to stand, it will mean that we will be making available to the Development Loan Fund, in fiscal year 1967, almost $70 million more than was made available last year.

In my opinion, for Congress to lavish these funds on the Development Loan Fund amounts to waste to the nth degree. Especially, in view of the fact that AID was unable to obligate more than half of the funds available to the DLF in fiscal year 1966.

As of May 31, AID had only obligated $360 million out of the $780 million available. More than 50 percent of the obligational authority was still available to the Development Loan Fund when the last month of fiscal year 1966 arrived. But, lo and behold, during the last month of fiscal year 1966, the AID obligated $367 million of development loan funds.

Mr. President, there is no question that Congress has consistently made more money available for development lending than can be used for sound economic projects, and the amount reported by the committee for fiscal year 1967 is no exception.

I am convinced that most of the $367 million that has been obligated in June of 1966 will be deobligated because the commitments are not firm.

But this is the normal way for operating the AID program and it is no wonder because Congress makes excess funds available. AID cannot find good projects, so in the closing days of the fiscal year they proceed to obligate funds helter skelter and the taxpayers' funds go down the rathole.

I wish I were able to give the countries involved, in which obligations were made during June of 1966. I could almost certify, from past experience, that the obligations were made without there being any idea what the money was going to be used for. It is because of this method of excess financing that these programs have been so costly, and really why there has been so much waste.

Furthermore, the excess amount of money available in the Development Loan Fund has caused AID to institute unsound practices in general. Foremost among these are the so-called program loans.

Mr. President, it was never intended that the Development Loan Program should be used for the purchase of commodities. The program was designed for project-type aid that would enable the developing country to enjoy self-sustaining growth.

But during the past few years there has been instance after instance where loans are made in order to give the host country the opportunity to buy food and other consumable goods. When the Development Loan Fund was first created in 1958, under the Mutual Security Act, and later, when it was revised under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, it was contemplated by Congress that development loans would be applied to specific projects, either of a public or private nature, that were found to be feasible on economic grounds. But there has been a shortage, so to speak, of these economic projects because the developing nations have encountered obstacles in trying to conceive projects that meet development criteria and, consequently, development loan funds have been piling up and have been left begging. To rid itself of these huge unobligated balances, AID, in my opinion, has devised the program loan system.

Through this loan system, dollars are made available to finance essential imports, and the recipient country commits itself to particular economic policies at the behest of AID. As the country implements these policies to AID's satisfaction, funds under the loans are released intermittently. The local currency generated by the sale of the commodities that have been imported under the program loan are placed in a special account by AID and made available to the country for mutually agreed upon projects or sectors in the recipient nation's budget. Thus, Mr. President, it might be stated that program loans made from the Development Loan Fund are quite similar to title IV loans made under Public Law 480.

Mr. President, development loan funds should not be used to finance commodity imports because the payout on development loans is long term, usually 40 years. Commodity imports are normally quickly consumed and should be financed on a short-term basis, usually a maximum of 10 years but preferably for 3 to 5 years. In any event, the criteria for development loans spelled out in section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which is quoted below, in my opinion, precludes the use of development loan funds for program loans.

SEC. 201. GENERAL AUTHORITY.— * * *

(b) The President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in order to promote the economic development of less developed friendly countries and areas, with emphasis upon assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities. In so doing, the President shall take into account (1) whether financing could be obtained in whole or in part from other free-world sources on reasonable terms, including private sources within the United States, (2) the economic and technical soundness of the activity to be financed, including the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest, (3) whether the activity gives reasonable promise of contributing to the development of economic resources or to the increase of productive capacities in furtherance of the purposes of this title, (4) the consistency of the activity with, and its relationship to, other development activities being undertaken or planned, and its contribution to realizable long-range objectives, (5) the extent to which the recipient country is showing a responsiveness to the vital economic, political, and social concerns of its people, and demonstrating a clear determination to take effective self-help measures, (6) the possible effects upon the United States economy, with special reference to areas of substantial labor surplus, of the loan involved,

I shall quote further from the same section, but I want to point out that the Committee on Foreign Relations has added prerequisites 7, 8, and 9, and I shall also read them.

I shall do so because, as I have said, it was never intended that the Development Loan Fund should be used for any purposes other than those designated and outlined in section 201. In my opinion section 201 provides for project loans that enhance the economic development of the newly emerging and underdeveloped nation.

I shall now read prerequisites 7, 8, and 9 which have been added to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by the committee in the pending measure.

(7) The degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression, and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise;

(8) The degree to which the recipient country is taking steps to improve its climate for private investment, both domestic and foreign, through the encouragement of maximum private ownership in new and existing industry, through nondiscriminatory treatment between national and non-national and between public and private enterprises and products, through adequate protection of industrial property rights (such as patents and trademarks); and

(9) Whether the activity to be financed will contribute to the achievement of self-sustaining growth. Loans shall be made under this title only upon a finding of reasonable prospects of repayment.

Mr. President, these three added requirements show further that it was not the intent of Congress that a development loan should be used to finance the purchase of any commodity for immediate consumption. Yet, in case after case during the past few years exactly that has been done. I wish I could state to the Senate the countries that have been afforded loans during June of 1966. Practically all of these loans have been so-called program loans wherein commodity imports will be financed.

By using development loan funds to finance commodity imports, AID is merely exacerbating the ability of the developing nations to service their debts. The extent of the severity of this problem has long been of concern to the World Bank, as is indicated in language that I shall now read.

According to information contained in the justifications furnished the Senate Appropriations Committee by AID, the total debt of developing countries has now reached $35 billion, and probably is as much as $40 billion, or almost seven times the annual value of net aid from DAC countries in recent years.

This debt includes a good deal of short-term, high-interest debt, which does not appear in the statistics of AID.

Statistics prepared by the World Bank illustrate the degree and the nature of the debt problem. According to the World Bank, its lending to developing countries of $500 million resulted in net lending of less than $200 million in 1965, because of the payments by borrowers on amortization, interest, and charges on outstanding loans with the World Bank.

Needless to say, the same thing may be applied to aid furnished by us. A good portion of our aid is being used, Mr. President, not only to take care of the interest that may be due us on past loans we have made, but more so to pay the interest on loans that have been made by our prosperous allies of Western Europe which are member of the DAC. Mr. President, I say in passing that, in my opinion, this is one other reason why we have been granting 40-year loans, with a 10-year grace period.

I note further in passing, Mr. President, that usually the loans that are made by our prosperous allies from Western Europe are not made for 40 years nor for 30 years, but usually for from 5 to 10 years, and the interest rate they extract ranges from 4 to 6 percent. Indeed we are paying them well.

When anybody tells me that the underprivileged people of Asia and other parts of the world are getting a good deal of assistance from our rich allies, I say they get it, but we pay for it, through the grants and soft loans we make available out of the Development Loan Fund. I think it is ridiculous.

Mr. President, a second unsound practice by AID, which surfaces because of the presence of excess funding in the Development Loan Fund, is the granting of loans that should be financed in a businesslike manner by the Export-Import Bank.

The most conspicuous example of instances of this type is the nation of Israel. Here is a nation—in sound economic condition—which is well able to pay on regular commercial terms for what it gets, still on the loan list of the Development Loan Fund in fiscal year 1966.

It would seem that Israel will never get off the soft-loan dole. In fiscal year 1962, development loans aggregating $45 million were made. In fiscal year 1963, the congressional presentation indicated that loans amounting to $20 million would be made. Actually, loans totaling $45 million were again made in 1963, or $25 million more than the amount presented to the Congress. In fiscal year 1964, $20 million was programed according to the presentation made to the Congress and the same amount, $20 million, was actually made available. In fiscal year 1965, the program presented to Congress indicated that loans would be made in the range of $0 to $10 million. Actually, loans aggregating $20 million were made in 1965.

In other words, every loan made in the last 4 or 5 years to Israel exceeded the amount that was presented to Congress.

One again in fiscal year 1966, it was contemplated that loans would be made in the range of $0 to $10 million. Actually, loans of $10 million were made in fiscal year 1966, and to make matters worse, they were for commodity imports. And I repeat, these loans, or this form of a loan, should be made for the economic development of the country; but here we have a classic example of this loan fund being used to buy consumable commodities for Israel as well as many other countries.

The astounding fact is that Israel receives any soft loans at all. This nation is well off and should be able to get along with regular financing through either the Export-Import Bank or the World Bank.

Mr. President, I have here two exhibits, which give the details on program loans that we have made to Israel during the past 2 years and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Status of development loans*

[In thousands of dollars and equivalent]

Country: Israel.

Title and number of loan: Program loan (IV); AID loan No. 271-H-096.

Date authorized: May 25, 1964.

Date signed: October 22, 1964.

Loan status as of Dec. 31, 1964:	*Amount*
Authorized	$8,000
Disbursed	-----------
Repayments	-----------
Interest collected	-----------

Loan terms:	
Duration	20 years.
Grace period	5 years.
Interest rate	3½ percent.
Currency of repayment	U.S. dollars.

PURPOSE OF LOAN

To assist the Government of Israel to meet the foreign exchange costs of imports of capital equipment and materials for the country's investment program.

Eligible commodities include equipment for chemical, plastics, pharmaceutical, and metals manufacturers, construction and earth-moving machinery, and automotive and railway vehicles.

The growth of Israel's economy has been very impressive, and in recent years GNP has increased about 10% per year. Israel's development program consists of well-conceived priorities and operates through an elaborate system of fiscal, monetary and other controls designed to provide maximum stimulus to the economy by encouraging the most productive enterprises.

FINANCIAL STATUS

The documentation to meet the conditions precedent to disbursement has only recently been submitted by the Government of Israel. This is under review. It is expected that requests for reimbursement for eligible expenditures will result in most of these funds being disbursed during CY 1965.

PROCUREMENT SOURCES

All equipment, materials and related services to be financed by the loan will be procured in the U.S.

TABLE IV.—*Status of development loans*

[In thousands of dollars and equivalent]

Country: Israel.

Title and number of loan: Commodity financing, 271–H–120.

Date authorized: June 23, 1966.

Loan status as of June 30, 1966:	
Authorized	$10,000
Disbursed	----------
Repayments	----------
Interest collected	----------

Loan terms:	
Duration	20 years.
Grace period	5 years.
Interest rate	3½ percent.
Currency of repayment	U.S. dollars.

The essential purpose of the loan is to assist the Government of Israel to meet the foreign exchange costs of imports to carry on the investment and production necessary for continued development of the Israel economy.

All goods and related services financed with loan funds will be procured in the United States. The loan is subject to such other terms and conditions as the A.I.D. may deem advisable, including approval of the specific categories of imports to be financed from the loan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, funds available for foreign assistance are limited and they should be made available to those nations that are truly in need, if they are to be made available at all.

For a number of years now, Congress has been told that Israel, like Greece and Taiwan, was a transitional country in which aid is expected to be ended over the next several years. Well, both Greece and Taiwan—neither of which is as well off as Israel—have been taken off the economic aid list but, somehow, Israel manages to remain on the dole, getting the advantage of soft loans from the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. President, I am told that exhibits E and F, which I hold in my hand, are classified, and therefore I shall not ask that they be printed in the RECORD, nor shall I read them. But again, they show, Mr. President, that the funds borrowed will be used in order to finance the purchase of commodities.

The amount recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee for the Development Loan Fund should be reduced by the $250 million called for in the pending amendment. I am confident that if this is done, there may be a slim chance of getting the Development Loan Fund on a sound economic footing. I want to remind Senators that if the pending amendment is adopted, there will still remain $598,862,000 for development lending in fiscal year 1967, which could be devoted hopefully to sound economic projects in the developing nations rather than to wasteful program loans, as has been done by AID during the past few years.

If the AID fund is reduced by the $250 million called for in the pending amendment then AID may get the message.

It may stop obligating funds in the last month of the fiscal year. It may stop making so-called program loans for commodity imports. It may conform with the intent of Congress by making loans for projects that are economically feasible.

At least, Mr. President, these are my hopes.

I shall vote for the pending amendment and I urge Senators to do likewise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 145 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—34

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Case
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Ribicoff
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—7

Bass
Dodd
Magnuson
McClellan
Pearson
Scott
Sparkman

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] proposes amendment No. 678, as follows:

On page 3, before the period at the end of line 24, insert a comma and the following: "and by striking out '1 per centum' and substituting '2 per centum' ".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to get the yeas and nays on the proposed amendment, because it is my understanding that a vote will be required.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. The proposed amendment is very simple. It would provide that in the development loans, which have now been set at $370 million, the interest rate would be raised over the first 10-year period, which is given as a grace period in the development loans, from 1 percent, which is provided in the committee bill, to 2 percent.

I shall not discuss the proposed amendment at length, but I wish to call to the attention of Senators the fact that an interest rate as low as 1 percent is not available to any American citizen, in any way whatsoever, on any loan program affiliated with the Federal Government. The lowest interest rate generally in effect for anyone in this country is under the REA loans, at 2 percent.

With our deficit financing, it is costing us 4⅜ percent to borrow money from our citizens, and we are then asking our Government to give it away for 10 years, with no principal payments, and at only 1 percent interest.

It does not seem correct to me that we should go forward in this way.

Mr. President, while we have a sufficient number of Members present, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as I said, I am not going to take a long time, but I do call the attention of Senators to page 9 of the committee report.

In the committee report, for the second portion, after the grace period, the interest rate is raised from 2½ to 3 percent, but nothing is done on the first 10 years of the interest rate.

We have an SBA disaster loan for our own people, but we ask our own people, when they are trying to get help from their own Government to help overcome disasters in their areas, to pay an interest rate of 3 percent.

It seems to me only proper, with this kind of interest situation facing our own people in the United States, that the very least we can do is to say to other nations: "You can pay at least 2 percent interest in the process of getting money from the Treasury of the United States."

I would cite college housing as an example in the point I am trying to make. We have established the improvement of our educational system and facilities as part of our national policy yet 3 percent is required to be repaid into the Treasury for college housing loans. The same thing is true in connection with academic facilities. The Economic Development Act rate is 3.75 percent to 4 percent; under the National Defense Education Act it is 3 percent; and under the Farmers Home Loan it is 3 to 5 percent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand the Senator's presentation, his amendment would establish an interest rate not more than the lowest interest rate known in this country, on any basis, of any kind whatsoever—specifically, the REA interest rate—and also it would be 2⅜ percent less than the current cost of money to the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. I believe that this explains the entire situation in a nutshell.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I say to my friend from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] that I think his amendment is sound, therefore I look forward to voting for it.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I appreciate his support and I hope that the amendment is adopted.

I think that we are all taking a new look at the fiscal situation in this country. I think it has been intensified, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said in the process of debate on the previous vote, by the British situation at this time in which they are taking drastic action to prevent devaluation of the pound. This matter is accentuated even more by the recent conference which the President had with certain Senators and the leadership of the House, in order to say to Congress, as a whole, that we have to do something to put our financial situation in order. This is one way we can do something about it.

I am not so naive as to believe that every nation that receives this money is going to pay us 2 percent interest. I suspect that we will find the situation as in the past. In the past the AID program has folded interest money, which is not being repaid, into the principal amount and then has gone ahead and refinanced it.

In view of the fact, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] pointed out, we have had over $117 billion already expended on this program to date with commitments beyond that to the international agencies, it seems to me proper that when these countries come to us for money—which our taxpayers cannot get anywhere—that we should make them pay at least 2 percent for the privilege of those funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator if we cannot get something better. I do not think that it goes far enough. I shall support it if we cannot get something better.

This has been a matter of considerable discussion for several years in our foreign aid debates and there are some facets of it that I believe the Senate should take into account.

I believe that 2 percent for the first 10 years is too low, and that paying 3 percent after the first 10 years is too low.

I certainly think that after the first 10 years, the so-called grace period, if the projects for which the money was loaned were worthwhile at all, the American people ought to get back, if possible, the use of the money, which is, of course, an interest rate far below the legal rate of interest in most of the countries in which we are making the loans.

I would have the Senator from Colorado consider the desirability of a rate of 3 percent, which is still below the cost of the use of money for the first 10 years, and the cost of the use of the money, or the interest rate, thereafter. I have urged this proposal for some years past, and in broad summary my reasons are as follows:

Although there are differences in the interest rates charged by other countries in their foreign aid loan programs, Canada, for example, charges an interest rate lower than ours; but let us face it: she does not make loans, even in relation to her national wealth, anywhere nearly comparable with the loans the United States makes.

France, I say in all fairness, makes a great many grants rather than loans; but as is also characteristic of the French foreign aid program, most of the aid from France goes to her former colonies, rather than to the areas of the world that have not had a French colonial interest in years gone by.

West Germany has an interest rate of 5 percent. It will be found that although the rates are somewhat spotty, by and large, other countries charge higher interest, I am advised, than does the United States.

But there is another facet that I should like to have the Senator from Colorado consider, and that is the effect of the low-interest-rate psychology upon the government we seek to benefit. In our debate yesterday in connection with another amendment, it was pointed out that the Agency for International Development does not have the salutary checking requirement that is imposed in our own country upon Government agencies that seek appropriations from our Government for the building of various projects; to wit, the Corps of Army Engineers, in connection with dam, reclamation, and flood control programs; or, for that matter, in connection with other public works programs. We have a benefit-cost ratio requirement that must be shown. But we have not insisted upon such a requirement in the expenditure of American funds in connection with the AID program. I have carefully analyzed the Comptroller General's reports of criticism of our AID program over the years. In my judgment, what stands out as one of the causes of much of the inefficiency that characterizes some of the AID program is the very fact that loans are not sufficiently considered in order to assure the American people that they will go into good projects.

Mr. DOMINICK. I feel sure that the Senator from Oregon remembers that in the past I have supported amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska raising the interest rate. We went up that hill and we came down that hill several times. I am trying to exercise forbearance.

I have great sympathy for the point the Senator from Oregon is making. His point is well taken. But if we can at least get the rate up to the lowest level at which our own citizens can borrow it, we shall be making one step up the hill and be making a footprint that will give us enough leverage to go forward next year.

Mr. MORSE. I understand. That is why I will support the Senator's amendment if that is the vote I am called upon to cast.

But I should like to speak a little longer, if the Senate will permit, in regard to the effect of the low interest rates on other countries. It has a tendency for the submission of projects not so strong as they would have been had the country known it would have to pay a higher interest rate. Some pretty slipshod work has been done over the years in connection with the making of AID loans. I think that a fair interest rate has a good chance to help guarantee to the American people that there will be a sounder program of projects than is likely to be the case if it is almost a giveaway interest program.

Furthermore, I cannot escape taking note of what the fiscal policies of some of these countries are in regard to some of the loans they make. When we make this AID money available at a low interest rate, what it amounts to, as I pointed out in the analysis I gave yesterday in connection with another amendment, is greater economic savings to these countries using this AID money in relation to the economic resources of the country.

And what is their interest rate?

It is 12, 13, 14, 15 percent—in some instances, the record shows it goes up to 34 percent.

That is why we often hear criticism that we are soft in regard to the handling of our own taxpayers' money. These governments do not do it with their own money. It seems to me that we should not let them make excess profits off the American taxpayer by way of saving on the interest rate, as a result of the savings we make available to them so that they will have more capital to loan out at their exorbitant interest rates.

The last point I should like to make, which is one of our most serious problems in connection with the Alliance for Progress program, is trying to get them to adopt interest reform, to bring down their interest rates to a reasonable amount so that their people will not be gouged by excessive interest rates which the countries charge. I think we have an opportunity to teach a good lesson here. We say to them that we want to make sure that the project will be one which will pay off, that if it is a sure loser we should not be making the loan in the first place. If it is a project that has a favorable benefit-cost ratio, then we should make the loan.

That is the kind of foreign aid I want to support. That is why Senators hear me say that I would increase foreign aid for that kind of program. If they are sound projects, the American taxpayer should be entitled to repayment and also to the cost of the use of the money interest rate.

I think that this is a lesson we should teach in connection with the whole system of a sound program of economic freedom, or private enterprise. We cannot reconcile the interest rate program we have been following, in my judgment, with what I think is the responsibility we owe the people who invest their money in sound projects and expect them to pay a fair interest rate.

I know that the Senator from Colorado has already answered my question, because I was going to suggest to him if he would be willing to make that 3 percent for the first 10 years and the cost of the use of the money interest rate after 10 years. Apparently, the Senator feels that the proposal which I have made from time to time in past years could not pass this session of Congress—although I should like to try—and he feels that he should settle for the 2 percent and do nothing about the interest rate after 10 years. I would at least plead with him to modify his amendment so that after 10 years interest rate it would be 3 percent but the cost of use of the money interest rate would be left at 2 percent for a starter.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his support and thank him also for the cogent comments he has made concerning these problems.

I would suggest that the question of the interest rates after 10 years could come up in a separate amendment. One of the things my proposal would do on the first 10 years, would be to make sure that each country knows that the development loan is in fact a loan and not a grant. This is part of the problem we have had in the past, and part of the reason, I suspect, why AID administrations over a period of time have taken the authority which has been given to them and given over $10 billion worth of grants which Congress at least was led to believe were loans originally. I think, by putting this up to 2 percent, we can really make an impact by showing the people who are coming in and asking for this money that we do consider this as an obligation, that this is a debt that they will have to repay, that this is a loan and not a grant, and that we do not intend to fold it back in again and refinance it in the form of a grant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to point out that in the past we have had three categories of loans. One, hard current interest rate loans. Two, loans that did not bear the current rate, nor were bound in length of tenure to current provisions. The third category was not a loan but a grant.

This policy was developed in trying to choose a midway ground. One, current rate of interest and current tenure. Two, grants. Thus, there was chosen a midway ground, and that is what the Senator from Colorado is speaking about.

I do not completely eliminate the midway ground. We should keep it in existence. I will support the proposal of the Senator from Colorado to make the interest rate 2 percent in the first 10 years, and continuing the 3 percent interest for the remainder of the time allowed to amortize the entire debt. But I do think it would be a mistake to eliminate this midway ground which has been in existence for the past 10 to 15 years.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I deeply appreciate his support. I am inclined to agree with him.

The problem, of course, is that by the development loan, what we are trying to do in part is to get the economies of the other countries built up so that they can improve the total world market, in order, thereby, to become a market for the United States. We do not wish to take a position which would be self-defeating by imposing tough terms so that countries could not build themselves up. This is one reason why I brought the rate up to only 2 percent at this time, although I know what a burden it will be on our taxpayers in order to provide the funds, and to have to borrow it at 4⅜ percent and loan it out again at only 2 percent.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the United States has been solidly committed to the effort of raising the level of economic and social development in southeast Asia for the past 20 years. While assistance levels have risen considerably—from only a few millions annually just after the end of World War II to the present rate that represents more than 25 percent of all U.S. economic assistance worldwide—the aims have not appreciably altered. Basically, they remain American efforts to help the people help themselves. Throughout its history, our AID program's primary purpose has been to eradicate the conditions which make South Vietnam a fruitful field for Communist subversion.

We have devoted our efforts toward lifting the living standards of that unfortunate nation's 16 million people. Rather than improve, the per capita share of South Vietnam's gross national product of barely $115 million a year can hardly keep up with the almost 3 percent annual growth rate in population. To survive economically, the Government must count on receiving more than half of its total revenues from foreign grants.

In fiscal year 1966 this meant approximately $725 million in economic aid from the United States, including surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. The current year program is planned to cost about the same.

From the start, this program has not committed the United States to military action. On the contrary, they have commited us to assist in the economic and social development of the Vietnamese nation. The military commitment is a separate subject, related to the aid program only in the sense that they both proceed from a single U.S. policy. When, as a result of the Geneva Conference, Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel in June 1954, the northern half held almost all of the available natural and industrial resources. It also held almost 1 million persons who refused to live under communism and immediately started their refugee trek to the south.

South Vietnam's existence was fragile indeed, but nevertheless, with the help of American aid, considerable progress was made. In the first 5 years after partition, rice production was doubled. The malaria eradication program had expanded to protect 83 percent of the people, and other endemic diseases such as cholera were being brought under control. An industrial base was in the making with the establishment of new industries ranging from food processing to textiles and pharmaceuticals. Mining was being developed and communications were moving forward.

When the Vietcong set out to destroy this young nation, South Vietnam became a battlefield, with its most skilled people the deliberate targets of assassination. The subversion by the Communists, which had begun right at the beginning in 1954 with an estimated 10,000 of them fading into the peasant population, according to Senator MANSFIELD's report to the Foreign Relations Committee, was stepped up. More cadres and soldiers moved in from the north, bringing more insecurity and more terror.

In 1965 alone, 354 Vietnamese civilians engaged in rural development programs were murdered and another 500 were wounded. Since 1958, the Vietcong have assassinated or kidnaped 61,000 village leaders and local representatives of the Government. In the past 5 years, 13 malaria control workers have been killed and more than 150 have been wounded or kidnaped.

While this subversion was infecting the nation, the United States was trying to help the Government build effective economic and social programs for the people. Four-fifths of the population are farmers or fishermen. Agrarian reform has long been recognized by both the Government of South Vietnam and the United States advisers as an essential need. Large landholdings in this predominantly agricultural country had traditionally been the rule. In the Mekong Delta, for example, 2½ percent of the owners of property held title to about half of all the cultivated land. High rentals, high fees for irrigation, uncertain rights to renew leases—all these contributed to the dissatisfaction that the Government sought to mitigate.

Beginning in 1955, a land reform program was developed with these principal features: to limit rental fees to 25 percent of the main crop, to provide for 5 years' tenure security, to purchase and distribute to the farmers French-owned riceland, to limit Vietnamese-owned riceland holdings to about 250 acres, to provide for distribution of land to former tenants, and to establish a farmers' association. While the increasing insurgency has made more difficult the land reform program, still some million and a quarter acres of arable land are presently being distributed to the farmers of South Vietnam.

We have a right to ask ourselves: "What has all this aid done for Vietnam?" In terms of people, we see many favorable signs, such as the increase of elementary school enrollment three times over since 1954; the distribution of 7 million elementary textbooks with a goal of double that number by the end of next year; the construction of 6,200 rural classrooms; and a teacher-training program that is graduating almost 3,000 new elementary school teachers each year.

These are things that have meaning for people. So does our program to help improve the health facilities of this nation. There are approximately 1,000 doctors in South Vietnam, but more than 600 of them are in the armed forces. This means 1 doctor for every 40,000 people; the U.S. ratio is better than 10 times that. With American assistance, the Government of Vietnam has built a training center designed to graduate 200 new doctors annually. Village and hamlet health stations have been established and stocked with medicine in 12,500 rural areas—about the number of hamlets in all of South Vietnam.

To make all this possible, the AID program must provide large quantities of commodities—such as $21 million worth of paper, pulp, and newsprint partly to assist with the schoolbook publishing program, $17 million worth of fertilizer to increase the rice yield. All these commodities and many more arrive in Vietnam through AID's commercial import program, the C.I.P. The C.I.P. has three interlocking objectives. In the first place, it helps counter inflationary pressures by putting more goods on the market. In the second place, the C.I.P. makes available to the Government of Vietnam the foreign exchange it lacks but needs for essential imports. Finally, the C.I.P. generates counterpart revenues additional to the Government's own taxing potential.

This is a big program. How it can help alleviate a price squeeze can be seen in a recent example with cement. AID provided C.I.P. for the import of more than $13 million worth of cement last year, but still the price rose as demand increased. Six months ago, an acute shortage, with military commanders vying with farmers and contractors for every bag, drove the price for a 100-pound sack up to 300 piasters. Efforts on the part of AID personnel to move more cement into the country under the C.I.P. succeeded in driving the price down 40 percent, so that today the same bag sells on the open market for 180 piasters.

At Honolulu last February, Premier Ky said of the social and economic programs his Government was putting into effect: "We are 12 years late—but we are not too late." In the same way, our aid to that country, while it has been consistent in its purpose of building a viable country strong against internal subversion and external aggression, has not until recently been provided in such large quantities. But it is hopefully not too late to bring about the changes that we have been striving for ever since we started providing aid to South Vietnam.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am going to work toward the passage of a reasonable foreign aid bill and will try to sustain the committee in the decision that our Foreign Relations Committee reached.

It has been almost 20 years since the Marshall plan was established. The plan was a major American commitment of moral support and material wealth to the rebuilding of war-torn Western Europe. I had some involvement in that program as Secretary of Agriculture. My primary responsibilities, however, were in the worldwide food relief program. The devastation of war and severe weather had left scores of millions suffering from acute hunger; famine was stalking India, China, and other lands. Those were the days of the Combined Food Board, which was a multinational organization based here in Washington to allocate scarce food among the hungry nations. By 1948—after a strenuous effort here and abroad, the food crisis has been eased.

It is with a feeling of dismay that I view the global food situation today and see that in many parts of the world the situation is as critical or more so than it was two decades ago. In the past 5 years population in Asia has climbed 5 percent; in Latin America population is up 17 percent. But food production has risen by only 10 percent, so that per capita food conditions in Latin America and in Asia are worse today than 5 years ago. I mention this food crisis simply because some 20 years ago I had a day-by-day involvement with famine—and today famine and malnutrition still plague many lands.

Shipments of surplus food and the food-for-peace program are only part of our assistance program abroad. Since the Marshall plan the United States has provided over $65 billion in aid. That figure may be startling to some, but it should be kept in proper perspective. In the post-World War II period we were contributing 2 percent of our gross national product to foreign economic assistance. The aid bill now under consideration authorizes about one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product—although I am aware that there are other contributions which the United States makes for foreign economic development through loans and grants apart from the present authorization. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee have far more initimate knowledge of the aid program than I do, and some of them have been critical of the assistance policies and the conduct of the program.

There have been instances where aid commitment has been too small to have significant impact, or where the receiving nation has used our help to perpetuate incompetency, corruption, and social injustice. There is no intention on my part to be an apologist for those conditions. But I think it is important that the committee, despite, its criticism, declared:

> Finally, the committee deems it appropriate to reaffirm its view that, despite the irritations, frustrations, and disappointments, the foreign aid program remains an essential instrument of American foreign policy and is likely to be so for some time to come. It is necessary and will continue to be necessary, for a transfer of resources to take place in one form or another between rich countries and poor countries.

Barbara Ward has written:

> If you do not change agriculture you will not change the economy.

There have been countries which have ignored agriculture and instead have assigned too much of their limited resources to premature schemes for industrialization, or for the trappings of a highly developed society. But agriculture is basic in the underdeveloped lands. Most of the population lives on the land and it is the starting point of wealth. While the Communists have attempted to lure the underdeveloped areas of the world toward the left, it is in this area of agriculture that they can hold out little hope because of their own lack of success. Before the war the Soviet Union, the Communist bloc countries, and mainland China were exporters of food. Today they are importers, and the Soviet Union—with 50 percent of its people on the farms—is not self-sufficient and mainland China must turn to other areas to meet food deficits.

A portion of the mineral resources of New Mexico is going into an increasing effort to raise world food productivity. And, at the same time, New Mexico's economy is the beneficiary.

In 1965 foreign aid export orders in New Mexico totaled over $6 million for potash fertilizer, according to the Agency for International Development. Approximately one-third of the potash fertilizer exported was obtained through the AID programs. In addition, a number of foreign nations made direct purchases of potash fertilizer, and those countries were able to do so, in part, because they had been recipients of American aid and had reached the point where their growing economies required additional purchases in this country. Sometimes, I think, people forget that aid recipients are large customers for American products.

I am heartened by the international and regional approach to economic problems which seems to be growing in Central America, in Africa, and in southeast Asia. It is a new but vitally essential way to approach development as we are discovering in the United States.

On April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins, President Johnson declared this Nation's support for an intensive development of the resources of the lower Mekong River to provide water and power for a watershed embracing Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. Twenty million people live in that vast basin; this number will double in the next 25 years. After hearing that speech I immediately wrote to the President to declare my support for this undertaking in cooperation with a number of other nations because, as I wrote, "it would be far more constructive to use the money in building up the economy of the area involved."

But we have more than dollars to offer this area. We have talent as well. The United States has years of experience in developing huge multipurpose water projects here at home.

I was quite interested on Monday in the Bureau of Reclamation announcement that it was creating a special technical staff to investigate the Pa Mong project on the Mekong River between Thailand and Laos. Pa Mong would produce more hydroelectric power than the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as having the potential for irrigating more than 2 million acres of land. I think all Americans can be proud of this effort, undertaken at the request of the Agency for International Development.

We must not undertake these projects simply to be anti-Communist or anti-any-other hostile ideology. To do that would be to open the way to being continually blackjacked into assistance programs neither in the real interest of the foreign nation or our own.

I recall a meeting in Paris with the Premier and members of the Cabinet of a certain European country which was threatened by internal political turmoil and virtual civil war. The Premier told me that unless we met his full demands for food that the government would topple and the country would go Communist. My suggestion to him was that he and his cabinet look around for other jobs because we simply could not meet his demands. When he calmed down I discussed with him what we could do and he recognized that there are limitations to any country's resources and commitments, and we were then able to arrive at a level of help which, in part, helped preserve a free nation.

We should recognize that even if there were no threat from communism in the less developed lands their economic and social plight would create mass discontent. We need to continue foreign aid.

THE 1966 BUDGET DEFICIT PARED BY $4.1 BILLION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, yesterday, together with several of my colleagues from the Senate and also from the House, it was my privilege to attend a meeting called at the invitation of the President of the United States at the White House.

I came away with a very deep and abiding feeling that the President and his administration are to be congratulated for their superb performance in reducing the budget deficit for the fiscal year just ended. Only last January, the gap between receipts and expenditures was estimated at nearly $6½ billion; today, we know that the actual deficit for the year turned out to be $2.3 billion.

Thus, the estimated deficit has been pared by $4.1 billion—it has been cut by two-thirds. This achievement constitutes an important milestone along the path to a balanced budget.

The shrunken deficit for 1966 is even more impressive when placed in the perspective of recent history.

It is the smallest deficit in 6 years.

Even more striking, it is an improvement of about a half billion dollars per year in the average budget result for the past 20 years beginning in 1947.

This latest fiscal feat attests to the basic strength of our economy, and the close rein the President has held on Government spending. It gives added stamina to our prolonged prosperity. It occurred despite the added costs of defending the freedom and integrity of the Vietnamese people. In fact, because of these demands on an already vibrant economy, the reduction in the deficit is a welcome sight. It reflects the administration's commitment to exercise the restraint necessary to protect the value of the dollar and future economic progress.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE—POSSIBILITY OF LEGISLATION TO RESUME OPERATION OF PLANES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the 13-day-old airline strike has become an intolerable burden on the American public.

Because of an unresolved dispute between five major airlines and 35,400 members of the International Association of Machinists, millions of citizens with no direct interest in the negotiations have had their lives—and in many cases, their livelihoods—severely disrupted by the grounding of 60 percent of the Nation's domestic airliners.

More than 150,000 travelers and 4,100 flights a day have been affected by the machinists' walkout; 231 cities in the United States and 23 foreign countries have had their air service limited in some degree. Seventy of the cities now have no commercial traffic at all.

The struck airlines normally carry approximately 70 percent of all airmail shipments, and currently, airmail is flowing from hours to days behind schedule.

In my State of Florida alone, 534 daily flights that carried an estimated 20,000 passengers in and out of our three largest cities have been canceled.

Mr. President, this strike would be serious enough if it did nothing more than keep a businessman from a meeting, a family separated, or a relative from the bedside of a dying patient. But its effects are far wider and more devastating than these.

The five airlines—National, Eastern, Northwest, TWA, and United—have been forced to furlough without pay more than 20,000 nonstriking workers.

Allied industries, such as hotels and motels, taxicabs, tourist attractions, and retail stores have also felt the economic pinch brought on by a partially immobilized America.

In the larger picture, the present strike—if allowed to continue much longer—could prove to be the catalyst that sets off a general economic downturn. For, even without idle airlines, there are ominous indications that the period of sustained growth could be beginning to give way.

Second quarter retail sales for this year are off 2.6 percent from the preceding quarter. The gross national product registered the smallest increase in the second quarter since the fall of 1964. Personal income gained less than in any quarter since the spring of 1963.

The severe shortage of money in the lending market and the consequent spiraling interest rates have braked expansion substantially in several areas of the economy.

These factors, coupled with a prolonged stalemate between 5 corporations and 35,000 employees, could ultimately mean incalculable losses to all Americans—losses stretched over a considerable length of time.

Mr. President, with the passing of each hour, the situation grows more desperate, and the need for a remedy grows more desperate, and the need for a remedy grows more urgent. But a remedy through the normal processes of collective bargaining does not appear to be close at hand.

While progress toward a settlement moves at a turtlelike pace, the Nation stands on the sidelines, helpless to do anything but watch in agony as the slow drama unfolds. Our sole legal recourse, the Railway Labor Act has been exhausted—and found wanting.

Under these circumstances, several Senators and I are at present exploring the possibilities of introducing legislation to put the planes back in the air while Federal arbitrators decide the issues in contention. We are not thinking in this instance in terms of a broad, general bill requiring compulsory arbitration of all major strikes. Rather, we have in mind a bill to deal only with the airline strike now confronting our citizens. It would be a limited measure to correct this particular set of circumstances.

We are not without precedent for such a move. On August 28, 1963, the late President Kennedy signed into law a bill requiring arbitration of the railroad work rules dispute. This was a law tailored to a specific situation and designed to protect the interests of the general public against the potentially disastrous effects of a stalemate between labor and management.

There are some differences between the work rules fight of 1963 and the airline strike of 1966, but there are also clear similarities.

The railroad industry and the airline industry are two of the cornerstones of our Nation's transportation system.

Allowed to go unresolved, strikes in either industry could hamstring the economy.

In each instance, the machinery of the Railway Labor Act was exhausted without producing tangible results.

Mr. President, even if Congress is forced to take the action necessary to end this particular strike, there will be no guarantee that future deadlocked labor disputes, whether in the airline industry, or the steel industry, or on the docks, or in the subways, will be settled without first causing hardships for millions of innocent Americans.

Experience has proven that neither the Taft-Hartley Act nor the Railway Labor Act provides adequate machinery to deal with major disputes between labor and management that adversely affect the national interest. Yet, year after year, Congress fails to take remedial action, and year after year the public is subjected to the inconveniences and losses that invariably accompany important strikes.

On February 8 of this year, I introduced S. 2891, a bill to establish a U.S. Court of Labor-Management Relations. This court would have jurisdiction in labor disputes—such as the current airline strike—which harm the public interest and would, after first making every effort to persuade the parties to effect a settlement through the traditional processes of collective bargaining, be empowered to hand down binding decisions on the points in dispute.

The need for such a court—where differences between employer and employee could be settled in an impartial and judicial atmosphere—has long been evident to many persons. The late Bernard Baruch had advocated a labor court at least since the close of World War I.

But the New York transit strike earlier this year, and now the airline strike, have served to make clear to everyone the glaring inadequacies of our present labor laws. Now, while the painful memories of the days without transportation are vivid in the minds of the people, we must move to make certain that such memories will not recur.

The time for talking has passed. The time for action is here.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was interested in the statement just concluded by the Senator from Florida. His statement indicates that the Senator has given considerable thought to this matter. It appears strange to me that the President has not acted with the same vigor, with respect to the unions and airlines to end the strike, that he carried on with respect to the steel industry when industry raised its prices. I am not for increases in prices, but will the Senator tell me why he thinks the President has not acted with the same coercive influence with respect to the labor unions and management of the struck airlines as he did with reference to the price rise in the steel industry?

Mr. SMATHERS. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is asking a question and making a statement at the same time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course I am.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think the President, in his press conference which started at 4 o'clock this afternoon, will answer the question as to what he must do, if anything, with respect to the struck airlines. I am sure we can expect him to give a particular answer to that question. The statement I have made is my statement, and my statement only, as to what should be done and what I would expect to do, in conjunction with several other Senators, if the dispute is not resolved shortly. Specifically answering the distinguished Senator from Iowa's question, I feel confident and in fact know that the President is as much concerned about the impact of the pending strike as all of us. I am confident too that he is doing all he can to resolve the matter. I am sure his actions are in the public and national interest. Unfortunately perhaps, the action which he is taking and the methods he is using are not publicized. As the Senator knows this is a delicate situation but knowing the President I am sure that the prestige of his office is being exerted in the national interest.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think, in fairness to the President, it should be said that the present strike is not the same as the steel price increase, because the price increase involved only one party, and that was the steel industry. Here we have a dispute between two parties, management and the union, who are using collective bargaining. So this is not the same kind of a situation. The Senator from Iowa can be assured that the President will do everything he can to bring the dispute to an end. I hope the strike will be brought to a conclusion before there is further damage. The President has gone as far as he can under the law when he appointed a Commission to look into the matter. It is simply tragic that the parties have not been able to agree, but I do not think anyone should say that the situation is the same now as it was at the time of the steel price increase.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me first reply to what the Senator from Rhode Island said. Then I shall yield to the distinguished majority leader.

I agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. I think the President has done everything he can possibly do under the law. He has appointed a commission, I believe it is called a panel, which is headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which has made recommendations to the President. The recommendations have not been accepted. The President is aware of what the situation is and as to what he must do about it. All I have done by my statement is indicate what I think is desirable and what may be necessary to be done. That is the reason I made the statement I have made. I am certain, if the strike is not settled, legislation will have to be considered as a solution to the problem.

Now I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to follow up what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has said, the President did fulfill his obligations in appointing a three-man panel, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who, I think, is the most qualified man, not only in this Chamber but in the United States, on labor-management relations.

The Taft-Hartley Act does not apply in this instance; it is the Railway Labor Act which applies to airline strikes. I think a good job was done by the panel headed by the Senator from Oregon, but up to now, neither party seems ready to accept its findings.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have the deepest compassion for the President of the United States in the trials to which he is subjected. I just now saw him on television, and I could not help but feel deeply sympathetic toward him, because of his wan and troubled look. He has problems confronting him on all sides.

I do, however, think that he could relieve himself to a great degree of one worry if he carried into effect the promise or the statement which he made in his message on the state of the Union. He said:

> I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, would enable us to deal effectively with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the Nation.

Mr. President, he is faltering with respect to that commitment. Someone has indicated to him, in my judgment, that it would be unwise to make a specific recommendation. I repeat that his worries could be lessened, his political strength could be increased, and the interest of the Nation would be promoted if he would boldly state, "I propose a law that will, in an effective manner, make possible the termination of these management-labor disputes which cause irreparable damage to the Nation.

He is vacillating. He is not carrying into effect the commitment which he made in his January statement to Congress.

Mention has been made of the Senator from Oregon. I listened to his statement of about 1 week ago, and my recollection is that he said that the recommendation of the committee went to the ultimate extent possible in granting increased benefits, marginal and direct, in the labor dispute.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, due to the fact that the President's position has been brought up, I only wish to say that in my judgment, the President has been doing everything he can in an attempt to try to get this case settled.

There are various ways for the President to act. The President, it has been brought out, has followed the Railway Labor Act, and every part of the Railway Labor Act. A board was appointed. The Board conducted a quasi-judicial hearing.

An emergency board, under the Railway Labor Act, is not a mediation board. It meets as a quasi-judicial tribunal, to take evidence on the issues. We had 48 issues in the case.

The representatives of the union protested the hearing, served notice on the Board that they did not want the hearing, made clear that they considered it a waste of their time and of the taxpayers' money, and stated as their first argument that the Board was handcuffed, that a decision, in effect, had already been rendered by the 3.2-percent guidelines. That surely indicated their antagonism to the emergency board procedure under the Railway Labor Act. In fact, the first exhibit filed by the representative of the union was a wire to the Board from the international president of the union, protesting the hearing and making clear that the union considered it a waste of their time and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

That is not the most auspicious atmosphere under which to start a quasi-judicial hearing, may I say. I said that the reflection upon the Board was immaterial, but the reflection upon the President was very material, and that the Board wanted the parties to know that the case had not been decided, and that the President would not think of appointing a Board to function as the union had intimated the Board would be required to function. I told the parties that the 3.2-percent guideline was not a factor in the dispute at all; the only factor in the dispute would be the evidence that the parties put in the record, issue by issue.

The Chairman made it very clear that the proponent of a given issue would have the burden of proof on that issue, and that the Board's recommendations would be based upon the application to the transcript of the preponderance of the evidence rule.

In some of the issues, the union completely failed to sustain its burden of proof, and the Board's report shows that when that was found to be true, we decided that issue by saying, "It is the recommendation of the Board that the issue be withdrawn, because the union has failed to sustain its burden of proof."

There were some issues on which the finding was made that the carriers had failed to sustain their burden of proof. But we made our recommendations on the basis of that judicial process.

The Railway Labor Act provides that after such a report has been handed to the parties, then the parties do have 30 days in which to decide whether or not they wish to accept or reject the report. Within a matter of 2 or 3 days, the carriers did accept the report. In accepting the report they said, in effect, that there were some things that they did not like about it.

But if anyone who was ever involved in a labor dispute involving 48 issues issued a report which pleased both sides on each issue, there must have been something wrong with the report. You cannot, in controversies such as a labor-management dispute, satisfy both parties on every issue.

But the carriers did accept the report. Not only that, but in the mediation that has followed, they have agreed to modify the report to the extent of another $2 million.

The report increases the benefits to the union by $76 million. I gave an analysis the other day of the past history of this union in regard to wage rates, and shall not take time now to repeat it. But it is not a low-paid union. This is a union whose wages, for the last 10 years, have averaged far above the national average. But the companies concerned, for the last 10 years, as the evidence put in the record shows, have had an average 5.1-percent return on their investment. So they will have some difficulty, between now and 1972, buying new jet planes that will cost from $9 million to $13 million each, to say nothing about what is on the drafting boards now—another plane that, within 10 years, will be very common for long distance hauls, which will cost a minimum of $20 million.

Who buys those planes? In effect, the traveling public buys them, through the rates it pays, and the investors buy them, through the investments they make in stocks and bonds. But if you offer investors only 5.1 percent income, you will have considerable difficulty in obtaining the necessary investments to re-equip these airlines that the public interest calls for.

The Senator from Oregon insists that these men receive good wages. They are employed in an industry which operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. They are performing a great public service.

But we granted them wage increases, in our recommendations, which continue to keep them in the blue ribbon class among American workers.

Do not forget also that they are working in a regulated industry. It is an industry vested with the public interest. That is of great economic value to them, for they are given greater assurance than are employees in nonregulated industries that Government attention will be paid to their income.

Furthermore, because they are in this type of regulated industry, they have a pretty good assurance of continued employment. This is not a seasonal industry. A large body of these workers have employment available to them the year round.

There is another facet that needs to be kept in mind. Regulated industry means that a public interest is involved and that the public is entitled to some benefit in reduced rates when this industry makes large profits.

The last 2 years have been very good years in this industry; but that has been true for only 2 out of the past 10 years, as the report shows and as the material that I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when I discussed it the other day proves.

The propaganda of the union concerns the profit of the last 2 years, but nothing is said about the financial obligations the industry will undertake, or the right of the public to some reduction in rates. After all, one of the responsibilities of the CAB is to take a look at the rates that are charged for passengers, express, and freight to determine whether, with all of the benefits that the industry, and through the industry the workers, have obtained from the Treasury of the United States—which means the taxpayers of the United States—that taxpayer interest is taken into account.

There is no question about the huge sums of money that the Federal Government has poured into the industry by way of various forms of subsidy, to say nothing, for example, about the hundreds of millions of dollars that the taxpayers contribute to the building of the great airports in this country. Those airports are of vital concern to those workers. Those airports bear a relationship to the security of their jobs and the availability of their jobs.

There is the public contribution that the taxpayers are making to the workers in giving them an economic environment that provides them with their wage-earning opportunity.

Let me say again that we are not talking about workers that are getting just the average income. We are talking about workers who are above the average income. There is a great public interest in this industry, and the workers have an obligation to that public interest.

That is what we tried to get them to see. They are entitled to a fair settlement. We gave them, we are sure, a fair settlement.

I am going to say something about legislative proposals in a moment. I did not intend to do so, but the President's name has been brought into this. I have worked very closely with him, but he can speak for himself. The Emergency

Board has no place in this dispute now. That does not mean, however, that the members of the Emergency Board have not made themselves available night and day for advice to the White House and to the Department of Labor in respect to anything that transpired during the 3 weeks of hearings in regard to this case.

The President has been following this case very carefully day in and day out, and sometimes late into the night, and I can so testify.

Mr. President, labor has a great responsibility here to make mediation work. Labor has a great responsibility to come to a reasonable settlement in this case. Unfortunately, I do not think the union is following that course of action. In fact, when the Board finished the hearings, about 20 minutes to 1, counsel made their closing arguments. Both sides were very generous at that point and asked for an informal meeting with the Board.

I set the informal meeting for 3 o'clock that afternoon. The Board met with counsel. Counsel for the carriers said that he had had a conference with representatives of the union and he would speak for both sides. The representatives of the union said that the Board ought to know that the probabilities were great that the union would not ratify any report that the Board had adopted.

It is not the practice of this union to ratify emergency board reports. They usually use the 30-day period for further discussions and mediation. But they were so pleased with the way the board had handled the case that both sides were suggesting that the board make itself available for mediating disputes that might arise from the report the board might write. The board had not yet gone into executive session to analyze the evidence.

I said good naturedly, "I have heard everything now. In my 32 years of settling labor cases, this is the first time I have ever been told, before the report has been written, that a report to which I am a party is not going to be accepted. What makes you think the probabilities are that you will not accept the report?"

The representatives of the union boasted that this was the most autonomous union in America at the local level, and that it was not the practice of the local to ratify a report. Such a report was rejected in 1963; and there have been other instances in which it has been done.

I said, "Of course, we could not accept your proposal, because both of you have become very knowledgeable of the details of the Railway Labor Act during the 3 weeks of hearings; but you have missed this one. I suggest that you reread it, because if you do, you will discover that when we hand in our report on June 5, this board will go out of existence. There will be no board for you to have further relationships with. Your relationships will be between the President and the agency."

The next day the board went to the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Reynolds, who I consider has no peer in America as a labor mediator, and said they had decided to have the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor ask the President to appoint the chairman of the board as a special mediator of any differences that might develop between them as a result of the report which the board had the legal obligation to hand down.

When the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor advised us of this request, I said we could not accept it; that we could not be a party to it; that whatever further might happen, we had nothing further to do with the case.

I also made clear, when we handed in the report, that we were through, and that other forces should be used for mediation.

That leads me to the final point I wish to make. It is perfectly obvious to me that this union sought from the very beginning—and under the law, it has the right—to use the 20-day period following the filing of the report to see if they could not get a better settlement. Whatever settlement we gave them, they would want a better one. That is understandable.

But in my judgment, in this instance, they do not deal objectively with their public responsibility. They have a great public responsibility. They have a great public responsibility to face up to the economic effects on this country of what their demands would lead to. But if they should succeed—and I cannot believe that the Government would stand by and let them succeed—by the use of economic might to force upon the taxpayers of the country and upon a regulated industry such a grossly inflationary wage program as they are insisting upon, they will have failed, in my judgment, to carry out what I call their clear obligation to the public.

Their demand is so far above a reasonable demand, that it would open the floodgates of inflationary demands for all the other potential disputes in the wings, waiting to come out onto the stage, to proceed to play their act, in an attempt to use this hour, this time of great concern and crisis in our country, to force inflationary wage demands upon the American people.

So, as occurred at the beginning of World War II, we may have to come to grips with the necessity of working out the necessary economic controls. I should like to avoid it. I should like to see it avoided; I think it can be avoided. But it can be avoided only if the leaders of this union and every other union in this country carry out their responsibilities of industrial statesmanship. That applies to every corporation and business in the country, also; for they have a corollary obligation, in regard to prices, to see that the flood of inflation in this country is not fed by unjustifiable and unconscionable price increases.

We may have to resort to legislation. I hope not. But I believe that if we resort to legislation, it should be broad legislation which faces up to the reality of inflation control, and not legislation which would face up to it piecemeal, case by case.

However, if we must resort to piecemeal legislation, then I make a tentative suggestion—I shall not even bind myself to it. I believe it would be well to have it out and to have a little discussion of it and a little thought about it.

In my judgment, if the facts are as I believe them to be, if the course of action followed by this union is creating a national emergency—and I think it is—if as a result of this strike a great loss is suffered, not only by this particular industry but also by industries that are dependent upon the operation of the airlines for their economic welfare, if a serious problem is developing in regard to our national security and defense—and I believe there is—then I do not see how Congress can avoid declaring that a state of emergency exists in respect to this particular case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Amen.

Mr. MORSE. And if the situation results in that course of action, then I am inclined to believe that the slate ought to be wiped clean, that the Government should then declare a state of national emergency, with legislation implementing it and authorizing court enforcement of that declaration for a period of time. The parties should then be given the opportunity to start all over again, at work—at work—trying the case.

In my judgment, if the union had a second chance to try its case, it would come forward with a better record. I do not believe it would come forward with a position on issues where a quasi-judicial body can say, "You did not sustain your burden of proof." The union would come in with the necessary evidence. Under that new procedure, both sides would be given an opportunity to establish their case, at work.

I close by saying that in all my work in the field of labor disputes—I have settled many of them over the years on the west coast, as the west coast arbitrator of maritime disputes—I have never sat with a strike gun at my head. When I was called into a case, the parties always knew that I would first issue a temporary order that put them back to work. They would work under that temporary order, and then I would hear their evidence.

The difficulty in this situation is that in this hour of great national crisis and concern, this union in fact is holding a strike gun at the head of the best interests of this country. And the union is not at stake. If this were a case of an attempt to deny this union to exist, if this were a case of an attempt to prevent this union from existing, of denying these workers the right of collective bargaining no one would support more than I, even in that kind of crisis, the right of free men to organize for the precious right to collectively bargain. But that is not involved here at all. The existence of this union and its representation as the bargaining agent for these workers is not threatened at all. It is one of the strongest unions in America; and being one of the strongest unions in America, it has an increased responsibility to the public.

If they are not willing to mediate reasonably and agree to a settlement that is noninflationary, we may be on the threshold of legislation declaring an emergency, providing for enjoinment of a work stoppage for a given period, and letting the courts rule as to whether or not a national emergency exists. If a national emergency did exist, then all that would be required would be a court order. The union would have to decide whether it desired to continue to be a legal union or an outlaw union. That would put it up to the union squarely. Then they would go back to work.

I would have the legislation provide for wiping the slate clean and permitting the parties to come in and present their case again. I believe that the members of the union would then understand the situation better than they now do, and it would be made clear to the members of the union, on that second go-round, that they go back to work and that they stay at work on the basis of a fair settlement, noninflationary in nature.

I have talked quite informally. I have lived with this dispute; and I do not believe that this union should be allowed to get by with the course of action that it is following in this hour of crisis in America.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the very distinguished Senator from Oregon for his statement. I do not know when I have heard a statement made in the Senate which has added so much clarity and light to a very complicated problem as the statement which the Senator has just made.

Certainly, everyone who knows the able Senator and knows of his record in labor-management dispute—a record extending over some 32 years—knows that he knows much about the procedures in this type and character of problem. Let me also add that during his long record of public service he has never failed to recognize the rights and equities of the laboring man.

When the distinguished Senator from Oregon arrives at the conclusion he has arrived at, we know that he has done so on the basis of facts and his own objectivity, and that it certainly is an impartial conclusion.

I told the Senator from Oregon, before I rose to speak this afternoon, that some Senators were considering drafting some type of legislation which would have the effect of at least temporarily settling this strike. However, none of us expected to move until we had conferred with him, because we recognize that he knows more about this subject than does anyone else, and that still goes with me.

The only purpose of the statement which I made today—and repeat now—is that we all have a responsibility in this matter. It seems to me that the strike has attained proportions of such a serious nature that it is impairing the public interest and damaging the economy of our country. As legislators, who have a responsibility in this field, we must begin to concern ourselves with what we should do to resolve the crisis in the national interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether we could proceed with the business under consideration. We have been here all day today and have had only one vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should be happy to yield the floor at this point.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just 1 minute?

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit me to yield to the Senator from Hawaii, I shall do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Go ahead.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished and able Senator from Florida for bringing this matter to the Senate floor this afternoon. I commend him for his excellent statement.

I know how damaging the airline strike has been to the State of Florida. The airline strike also has been very damaging to the State of Hawaii. With two out of three domestic airlines on strike, our tourist business is suffering greatly.

As everyone knows, our tourist business brings in an income of over $200 million a year, which is much larger than the income derived from either sugarcane or pineapples. Estimates indicate that the economy of the State of Hawaii is now losing approximately $4.5 million a week because of the nonflow of tourists into our State. I am aware of the extent to which the airline strike has affected the tourist business in the State of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I understand that it is causing a loss of approximately $300,000 a day.

I am very happy that the distinguished Senator is intending to introduce a bill dealing with the current phase of the present strike. He said that he is going to limit it only to this strike and not deal with strikes in general.

I hope that the appropriate committees will look into the matter promptly. Yesterday I asked the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor to look into the strike situation to see what alternatives they can bring forward to end the strike.

It has been said that the President has done all that he can in connection with this strike. I disagree.

Under the Railway Act there are no more powers left to him. But he has not used the prestige, influence, and the full weight of his high office to call the disputing parties to the White House and make them bargain around the clock until they arrive at a decision.

It has been said that the rolling back of the price of steel, the rolling back of the price of molybdenum, and the rolling back of the price of copper were not in the same category as this dispute because this is a dispute between labor and management.

When the steel strike was imminent last September, the President, using his tremendous power, prestige, and influence, called the disputants to the White House and made them remain there. He had lunch brought in and dinner brought in. They sat there until they resolved their differences.

Certainly the President can use the prestige, influence, and weight of his high office to bring the airline mechanics and the five airlines to the White House and make them do the same thing. I think that if he used the prestige of his office and brought them to the White House, he could resolve the strike.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I have previously pointed out, the President is as much concerned about this crisis as all of us here. I am confident that he is doing everything possible to bring an early end to the strike and is using the prestige of his office undoubtedly in many ways though, by virtue of the delicate situation, his action is not publicized. I have complete confidence in the President and feel sure he is working toward an early settlement of the issues involved.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in complimenting the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the outstanding job which he has done, first, in sitting on the Presidential Emergency Board, and second, in outlining today to the Senate the issues involved.

I think it is no secret that the Secretary of Labor has been meeting regularly with the President to try to resolve this difficult situation.

It is my understanding that after such a meeting today the Secretary of Labor made, in substance, the following statement:

That the proposals of the IAM to attempt to ratify something that has never been agreed to is a pointless gesture; that the price demands of the union are intolerable; that the union to date has made a farce of competitive bargaining.

The Presidential Emergency Board does not set up a binding final agreement, but provides the framework for a fair and just settlement. The President has said that the Morse report provides a proper framework and the public is now entitled to expect the union to give some responsible consideration to this problem and bring about an immediate end to this strike.

In conclusion, it is my understanding that the Secretary requested the parties to sit down at a bargaining table and stated, "Let's start negotiating around the clock beginning now."

If those remarks attributed to the Secretary of Labor are correct, I commend him and I suggest to him that he should cause these parties to bargain in this very important matter.

Mr. President, the strike against major airlines by the Machinists Union is now nearly 2 weeks old.

The strike is harming the traveling public, the national economy and the national interest.

It is time, Mr. President, that firm and vigorous steps be taken to end this costly strike which is affecting countless industries and the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of individuals.

The foregoing suggestion and other similar proposals made on the floors of the Senate and House during the last week are not radical. Indeed, they are proposals to return to normal operation an industry that is not only federally regulated but subsidized by the American people through their tax dollars. The people who are paying the subsidies have the right to protection from a strike that is adversely affecting their convenience and economic well-being, as well as the financial health of their city, State, and Nation.

The history of the present strike is well known. The parties have been negotiating for nearly 1 year. The existing agreements expired on December 31, 1965. The National Mediation Board, unable to bring the dispute to a successful conclusion, offered arbitration. This proposal was rejected.

On April 21, the President appointed an Emergency Board to ascertain the facts and recommend a settlement. The Board, headed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon who is nationally known as a friend of labor and the public interest, made its recommendations. The terms were accepted by the airlines, but rejected by the union leaders—just as the union leaders refused to work within the wage-price guidelines recommended by the President. Since the Emergency Board's actions, the carriers have, in fact, offered even more than the settlement recommended by the Board; but this, too, has been rejected by the union leaders. One wonders, Mr. President, if these leaders are subjecting the national interest to personal interests and ambitions.

In his state of the Union message this year, the President stated that he intended to ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, would enable us to deal effectively with strikes threatening irreparable damage to the Nation. To date, no proposals have been received, although several bills dealing with such situations have been introduced.

There is no doubt that the present strike does, indeed, threaten the national interest. My State, especially, is feeling the effects of the strike. Hotels, motels, restaurants, travel agencies, and other tourist-related businesses have advised me of the adverse impact the strike is having at the peak of the tourist season. Some of these firms are considering layoff of employees unless the strike is settled soon.

Other States, not only those in which tourism is a major industry, but all those dependent upon adequate airline service for business and commerce, are experiencing sharp economic hardship. Income losses to individuals are incalculable.

It is estimated that the revenue loss to the airlines is now approaching $100 million. The Federal Government is losing badly needed tax revenue on these earnings, in addition to taxes on the salaries of airline employees, the earnings of businesses whose volume and sales are slumping because of the strike, and the 5-percent air transportation tax for airline passengers.

Last week, Mr. President, I appealed to the chief negotiators for labor and management to submit the dispute to binding arbitration. I also requested that the President use his fullest power in resolving the strike. I am confident that either approach would result in a fair and equitable settlement.

Since the public interest in our modern civilization demands that steps be taken to end the strike, I again appeal to the President to employ the full resources of his office to bring the dispute to settlement.

I recall his positive action last fall in calling the parties in the steel dispute to the White House for continuous sessions, and his constant appeals for negotiations to proceed in an atmosphere of cooperation and respect.

I would also welcome the President's legislative proposals for dealing with this and future strikes involving the national interest.

Traditionally, both labor and management have expressed opposition to compulsory arbitration, but demands are increasing daily for action to resolve the problem of costly and disruptive strikes in which the general public is the biggest loser. I believe that if the day comes when compulsory arbitration legislation is enacted by the Congress, it will be inspired by such situations as we are presently experiencing. The immediate, short-range problem demands Presidential impetus if the strike continues. The long-range problem requires a thorough congressional study of methods to protect the national interest in disputes affecting the traveling public and the national economy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a statement concerning the airline strike I issued to the press yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From the Office of Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat, of Virginia

Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat of Virginia, warned airline machinists today that a continuation of their strike against five major airlines may force Congress to consider legislation making labor unions subject to the anti-trust laws.

The Senator said, "It would pay labor leaders to take notice of the unjustified loss being inflicted on the business interests of the nation, as well as on the traveling public, by the stubborn refusal of a relatively small group of airline employees to accept a very fair settlement offered by a fact-finding board headed by Senator Morse of Oregon."

"If the strike continues much longer, Congress, in defense of the public interest, will be forced to act on legislation that would make labor unions subject to the anti-trust laws when they use their bargaining power to threaten the general welfare of the nation," Senator Robertson continued.

The Virginia Senator said he has received complaints from all of the major cities of his State, which he promptly brought to the attention of the President and Secretary of Labor. He said the President had indorsed the fairness of the report of the Commission he appointed to arbitrate the wage issue, and the Senator said he personally feels it would be inexcusable on the part of this union to continue its demand for still higher wages under the circumstances.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. I wonder if we might get to a vote on his amendment. The Senator from Colorado has made his statement. I wish to say a few words in connection with the amendment.

I shall oppose the amendment.

This aspect of the development loan program is essential if we are to carry on this kind of assistance program. There are already a number of sources for high-interest-rate loans. We have the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, and there are the regular commercial banks.

Loans under the development loan program are subsidized loans and especially tailored for underdeveloped countries.

These countries already devote a very high proportion of their income to the repayment of loans and the payment of interest. There has been much public discussion about this problem. Mr. Woods of the World Bank has made statements on two or three occasions recently. I had them printed in the Record recently and I will not delay the Senate by reviewing them now.

The increases in the burden for servicing existing loans are going up rapidly. Adopting this amendment is a practical way of stopping this aspect of our loan program. As long as we are going to have this type of development assistance it should be on soft terms.

Statements were made about much softer terms being extended in smaller amounts, it is true, by Canada and England. But their programs are not at all comparable to ours. The existing approach is the correct one.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. So that the record may be clear will the Senator repeat how this percentage figure would apply to the Development Loan Fund and the inter-American lending program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I understand it, Alliance for Progress loans and development loans are both made at 1 percent for the first 10 years. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] wishes to make the interest rate 2 percent for that period.

Mr. KUCHEL. Are they 1 percent administratively or by statute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. By law. The law provides for a minimum of 1 percent for the grace period and 2½ percent afterward. But the bill increases the interest rate on the second stage to 3 percent, not with my approval, I might say. I opposed that but the committee, in its wisdom, approved an increase to 3 percent.

Mr. KUCHEL. How long is the grace period?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. 10 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator says that the bill provides after a 10-year grace period, the period for repayment is pegged in the bill at 3 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The bill reported by the commitee increases the rate for the second stage to 3 percent.

Mr. KUCHEL. The existing law is 2½ percent during the repayment period and the bill would change it to 3 percent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to make one statement. The committee report increases from 2.5 percent to 3 percent the interest rate during the period of the loan after the 10-year grace period. This could go on for as long as another 20 years. In other words, the loan could go for 30 years.

In fixing the interest rate, the report states as follows:

> In view of the significant increase in the cost of government and private borrowings since then, the committee believes that the increase of one-half of one percent is fully justified.

I suggest that raising this in the prerepayment period from 1 to 2 percent, when they do not have to pay any principal at all, and putting them on a par with the cheapest form of borrowing that our citizens can obtain in this country—under REA—is equitable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 146 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Allott
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hartke
Hill
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McIntyre
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—38

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Carlson
Church
Clark
Douglas
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Ribicoff
Smathers
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson
Bass
Dodd
Javits
Magnuson
McClellan
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Sparkman

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. HRUSKA moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the foreign aid bill, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 6, line 9, strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof, "subsections".
>
> On page 6, line 16, strike out the quotation marks.
>
> On page 6, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following subsection:
>
> "(e) In any developing countries or areas where food production is not increasing enough to meet the demands of an expanding population, or diets are seriously deficient, a high priority shall be given to efforts to increase agricultural production, particularly the establishment or expansion of adaptive research programs designed to increase acre-yields of the major food crops. Such research programs, to the greatest extent possible, should be based on cooperative undertakings between universities and research institutions in the developing countries and United States universities and research institutions."

ADAPTIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AMENDMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, my amendment is very simple. It would amend the title dealing with technical cooperation and development grants by adding a declaration of congressional policy stressing the importance of adaptive agricultural research in nations facing serious food shortages.

I have been impressed, Mr. President, by the overwhelming agreement in the administration and the Congress on the need to increase emphasis on agricultural development in our foreign assistance programs. We are all recognizing, as never before, that agriculture is the foundation of a nation's development, and that unless it can produce enough to feed its people, or earn enough foreign exchange to buy food in international commercial markets, it cannot hope to achieve sustained economic progress.

But it is not enough to increase emphasis on agriculture. We must also make sure that we are doing all the right things in our farm aid program.

And in the past, supporting practical farm research is one of the "right things" that we have not been doing nearly enough of. As Prof. Theodore W. Schultz, the distinguished agricultural economist at the University of Chicago, said in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee earlier this year:

> Although we have developed an outstandingly productive agriculture in the United States, we have not done well as builders of agriculture abroad. We have long been hampered by what I would call the extension bias, and as a consequence, agricultural research has been postponed, put off, and grossly neglected. When research has been undertaken, altogether too little attention has been given to the development of viable agricultural research centers.

And if we look at what others have said, we find that experts in foreign agriculture join overwhelmingly in the verdict that such practical farm research has been seriously neglected in aid programs of past years.

As one example of this neglect, we can look at the statistics for Latin America. In the period from 1960 to 1962, the U.S. Government and international and regional agencies together spent less than $8 million on agricultural research in tropical Latin America. At the same time, we spent nearly $2 billion—about 250 times as much—on adaptive agricultural research in the United States.

Such research is essential to adapt seeds, fertilizers, techniques, farm equipment, and methods which have worked in other locations to the particular soils and weather conditions in hungry lands. My amendment would require that it be given the high priority it deserves in our aid program.

My amendment would, in addition to stressing agricultural research, urge that research and educational institutions in the United States play as great a role as possible in our foreign aid programs in this area. Our land-grant colleges have been the key to farm progress in America. We must draw more fully upon their know-how in helping overseas agriculture.

Mr. President, I hope that this amendment can support the changes being proposed in our foreign aid program, and in the Food for Freedom Act now before the Senate Agriculture Committee, to give proper attention to agricultural assistance in our foreign aid. Too often in the past we have shortchanged agriculture in favor of glamorous industrial projects which have little impact on the lives of the common people. And when we have assisted agriculture, we have been too inclined to use short-term, crash programs, without a serious effort to develop the knowledge needed to increase farm output through continuing research.

My amendment, if adopted, would put the Congress clearly on record to remedy these past deficiencies, and to support strong, practical farm research programs in developing countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the committee considered this amendment. We thought it was a good amendment and we put the language in the report concerning it. I approve of the objective of the amendment. If the Senator from Minnesota feels very strongly that it ought to be in the law, I have no objection. I am perfectly willing to take the amendment, since the Senator feels very strongly that it should be in the law as well as in the report.

Mr. MONDALE. The reason why I would prefer to have the language in the law as well as in the report is that, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows, we have had difficulty in persuading those who administer the program to give enough emphasis to adaptive agriculture research. They are beginning to move in that direction, and I feel sure that this language would be more effective in persuading them to emphasize research if it is made a directive in the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 658

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 658.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:
>
> "(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "'(p) No loan shall be made to any country under the authority of this Act for use in any manner by such country in meeting all or part of its obligations to the United States under any other loan made to such country under this Act.'"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent AID from making loans where there has been a delinquency in interest and it has undertaken on its own to fold interest into the loans and then recapitalize it. We submit it is a bit of bad practice. I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee. I think it should be made part of the bill. It will forestall that kind of practice on the part of AID.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as a matter of administrative policy, of course AID does not now make loans to pay off other loans. I think the amendment is objectionable, because that is not the policy. On the other hand, it should not be done. I agree with the Senator on that. The AID officials say they do not do it, but I admit that the amendment carries out a good principle. I think it is good policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only difficulty is that AID does it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know how the Senator could prove it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had the AID people up here and we went over the books. AID can say that they do not do this, but in the first instance there should be an interdiction of that kind of practice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to the principle. AID should not make loans which are used to pay off others. That is not a development loan by any stretch of the imagination. AID says it is against its policy to do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The officials told me they do it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They told me something else. Apparently the wires got crossed somewhere. At any rate, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 659

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 659.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 20, between lines 3 and 4 insert the following:
>
> "(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended by adding the following new subsection:
>
> "'(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which is in default, during a period in excess of six calendar months, in payments to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to such country under this Act, unless such country meets its obligations under the loan or unless the President determines that assistance to such country is essential to the national interest and notifies the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of such determination.'"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this amendment simply meets the problem of default on the loans. But we do put in an exception clause, so that the prohibition could be waived on notice to the Speaker and to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that a loan would be essential in the national interest. Obviously, we do not wish to prohibit loans of that character.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. According to our calculations, this amendment would affect only one country presently, Indonesia. It might affect others at other times.

Inasmuch as we are not now providing aid to Indonesia, and I do not recommend that we do so, I have no objection to the amendment, particularly since there is the proviso that loans could be made if the President determines that it is in the national interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 660

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 660, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 4, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:
>
> "(d) Amend section 204, which relates to the Development Loan Committee, by inserting '(a)' after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "'(b) No loan shall be made under this title until (1) the application therefor shall have been submitted to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development with a request for recommendations concerning the need for the loan, the propriety of the proposed terms thereof, and the likelihood of repayment, and (2) such recommendations shall have been received and considered, or a period of sixty days shall have elapsed following such request and no such recommendations shall have been received.'"
>
> On page 4, line 11, strike out "(d)" and substitute "(e)".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the rate the facilities of the World Bank are expanding, it is quite fair to assume that, as an appraisal instrumentality, it will probably be the best that we shall ever have.

I do believe that before we put the people's money out on loan in some far-off place, there ought to be an assessment or an appraisal of the conditions far better than what we receive today.

This amendment merely proposes that it be done by the World Bank, and that there be a waiting period of 60 days.

However, AID can still go ahead and make the loan, notwithstanding an adverse appraisal by the World Bank. But at least we shall be fortified with basic information on the character of the loan, and whether it is worthwhile and will be put to a good purpose, or whether it is an unnecessary risk for our people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think this is a good amendment. I am sorry I did not think of it myself. It is in the direction, as the Senator knows, of bringing the

World Bank with its knowledge and judgment into this area. It is quite consistent with what I have been urging upon the Senate for a long time—that we take advantage of the most efficient and effective organization in this field.

In addition, particularly on important loans, there should be coordination between these two major organizations. They should not be competing, for example, for a loan; they should be coordinating their efforts.

I think it is a good amendment, and I favor it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 662

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 662, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(f) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(p) No recipient of a loan made under the authority of this Act, any part of which is outstanding on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, shall be relieved of liability for the repayment of any part of the principal of or interest on such loan."

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, the simple purpose of this amendment is to prevent AID from converting loans into grants, and thereby relieving the recipient country of its liability for repayment of interest or principal at a later period.

I must say that this has been done only to a limited extent. But we must remember that now we are coming to grips with a great many of these aid loans made by a predecessor agency, and it will be a different story in the future. I am quite confident that hereafter they may want to convert from loans into grants.

I believe that would contravene the very spirit of the Senate, and the point we have tried to make for years, that wherever possible, these funds would be put on a loan rather than on a grant basis, and the money retrieved for our Treasury if possible.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I yield.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. There is, under existing law, no authority to do that. The present law on the development loans and the Alliance for Progress requires that the loans be repaid in dollars, at minimum interest rates fixed in the law. In other words, there is no authority to make such conversions in existing law. It is possible that it can be done with some loans made under other authority, such as under Public Law 480. Perhaps that is what the Senator has in mind.

In any case, it would have no effect on loans made under the Foreign Assistance Act because there is now no authority to do it.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. It is anticipatory to a considerable extent.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Well, in the sense that it is anticipatory, on principle, of course, I cannot disagree with it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 663

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 663, and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read, as follows:

On page 20, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"(b) Section 634 (which relates to reports and information) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate semiannual reports showing as of June 30 and December 31 of each year the repayment status of each loan theretofore made under authority of this Act any part of the principal or interest of which remains unpaid on the date of the report.'"

On page 20, line 21, strike out "(b)" and substitute "(c)".

On page 21, line 1, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(d)".

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, in our exploration of this entire operation, we had some difficulty in obtaining accurate and very recent figures. We have gone to the Treasury, we have gone to the General Accounting Office, we have gone to AID. In some cases, they either did not have the figures or they did not wish to disclose them.

We do believe that, on the basis of a 6-month period, there should be an agency in Government where a report would be made, so that the information would be available to us.

What this amendment would do is simply to say that the Secretary of the Treasury is required to report, on June 30 and December 31 of each year, on the repayment status of every loan made under the authority of this Act; and to show the delinquent interest and principal. We will then know exactly what the score is, what our commitments are, what we collect, and what the status of the loan is.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I yield.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], about 2 or 3 years ago, raised such a fuss about these statistics that the Department of Commerce has undertaken and is now presently making such reports on an annual basis—more extensive, in fact, than the Senator's amendment would require.

There is no objection, of course, to having the Treasury make such reports, but I would submit to the Senator that if he has not seen these reports made by the Department of Commerce, which cover not only aid under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act, but also other Government loans—such as through the Export-Import Bank, for example—that these are very extensive statistics. I really do not believe the additional reports called for by the amendment are necessary.

Of course, there is no objection to having the Treasury provide this information, except that if we do that, I would think we should then tell the Department of Commerce to cease doing it. They are doing it now without a requirement of law, but in response to a request—I would say a very urgent request—initiated by the Senator from Delaware.

I do not know whether the Senator is thoroughly familiar with this publication or not. I think it is quite adequate.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I am. I might say frankly that the Treasury would like to have this amendment. We have discussed the amendment with the Treasury Department.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I have no objection to the Treasury doing it.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. They have a little difficulty getting the figures on their own, strange as it may seem.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I have no idea why they should have.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Neither do I.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. These are very adequate figures. We have only been receiving them recently. That is the history of it. I have no objection to the Treasury taking this over if they wish to do it. I do not speak for Commerce. I have not investigated that phase of it.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. In our conversation with the Treasury officials, they said they would like to have it.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. In any event, we will take this amendment to conference. I cannot see any disadvantage to the proposal. It is a question of which is the more economical and effective way to present this material to Congress.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 665

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 665.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 19, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Section 613, which relates to accounting, valuation, reporting, and administration of foreign currencies, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) In addition to any other terms and conditions which may be applicable with respect to any loans made from funds made available under authority of this Act, each such loan shall include a provision or provisions whereby the recipient of such loan shall (1) express the par value of its currency in terms of the United States dollar at a rate of exchange between those currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury finds to be reasonable and (2) agree to maintain, notwithstanding any changes in the foreign exchange value of its currency, such initial par value of its currency for purposes of all computations relating to those currencies in connection with such loan. No provision of the terms of any loan heretofore or hereafter made from funds made available under authority of this Act, which requires the maintenance of the value of the currency of the recipient of such loan in relation to the United States dollar during the period such loan is outstanding, may hereafter be altered.' "

On page 19, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)".

On page 19, line 15, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been a practice by AID off and on to have a provision in these loan agreements by which the value of a country's money would be maintained so that we would not be losers as a result of a modification of the exchange rates. Sometimes it was included and sometimes it was left out.

I read here from the General Accounting Office report to the effect that AID amended six loans in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 that eliminated the maintenance-of-value provision.

These loan agreements totaled $158.8 million and were originally entered into in 1956, 1958, and 1959 with three countries under the authority of section 104 (d) of Public Law 480 and very promptly we lost a good many millions of dollars.

I pointed out this afternoon that, on this whole transaction, by virtue of the fact that the maintenance-of-value provision was not maintained in this contract, we lost somewhere in the neighborhood of $350 million. The General Accounting Office gives it as their opinion that they anticipate future losses unless this is done.

I think our people are entitled to a safeguard against this practice. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it has been since 1961 that Development Loans and Alliance for Progress loans must be repaid in dollars.

The Senator has reference to loans made prior to that time, or loans made under Public Law 480, because now all the loans are repayable in dollars. It would be inappropriate to include a maintenance-of-value provision in the loans because they do not deal with local currencies.

They make such loans under Public Law 480, but not under this act.

Therefore, I think the amendment is superfluous. But if we wish to make it cover the contingency, or the possibility I might say, that a supporting assistance loan might be made for local currency in the future, I certainly approve of having this provision in the loan agreements as we have done in the past.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, AID evidently feels that way also. They forgot to include these maintenance value provisions, and the result is that we are renewing a loss of somewhere around $350 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator sure that these are from AID loans or are they from Public Law 480? For example, the ones in India were revalued recently, and were not most of them made under Public Law 480?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, they can be either one, as a matter of fact. The Accounting Office says that on June 30, 1964, AID records showed that the net aggregate AID loss on the loan program, after AID was established in November 1961, has the dollar equivalent of $351.2 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator sure that is not under Public Law 480?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They do not say that it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My impression is that it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want to quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to quarrel either. I thought the proposal was superfluous, since the present loans under AID are all repayable in dollars and we do not have that problem.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have just listened to what the Senator from Arkansas said about Public Law 480 loans. We deal with these loans on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We always have these Public Law 480 bills come up. We have one now.

I do know that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has been very vigorous in the treatment of the rate of exchange. The committee has written into the bill that the actual rate, rather than a fictitious rate, should be applied, and provisions are made to assure that that rate of exchange would be maintained.

I should think it would be very helpful if we could postpone action on this amendment until the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry comes to the Chamber. I think it must relate in some way to the Public Law 480 program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be in conference.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct, but we spend a lot of time on this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I meant the way the act as it is now. I did not mean that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois applied to the Public Law 480 loans, more than that was the way it would work out. It was that it would apply to loans made from funds accumulated under Public Law 480. I do not object to the principle at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Comptroller General makes a distinction, of course, and sets up one group here.

He refers here to section 104(g) of Public Law 480. On those, the loss was $91.7 million. In another part of the report, he sets up these other AID loans. He says that our aggregate loss is $351.2 million.

I did not make the distinction. The Comptroller General did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He must have been referring to losses arising from old loans and not from the current ones. Since 1961, all of the Alliance for Progress and the Development Loan loans have been repayable in dollars.

Now, some of the old ones were not repayable in dollars. It could refer to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He said as of June 30, 1944.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They could be the old ones.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They could be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

If this amendment were taken to conference, it would not in any way affect Public Law 480?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, it would not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 673

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, No. 673.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 21, after line 7, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) At the end of such chapter add a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 640A. AUDIT BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.—(a) The General Accounting Office is authorized and directed to conduct an audit of any program of assistance to any country being conducted under part I of this Act for any fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1966, for which the United States has expended or obligated in excess of $500,000 for such program.

" '(b) For the purpose of aiding in carrying out its duties under this section, the General Accounting Office shall have access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other material of the agency of the United States Government administering part I of this Act. Such agency shall cooperate with the General Accounting Office and furnish assistance upon request to the General Accounting Office in aid of its responsibilities under this section.' "

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to imply by the proposed amendment that General Accounting does not audit AID, nor would I ever imply that AID does not ask General Accounting to come in. But too many instances have occurred in which this has not been done, and today I put into the RECORD the titles of I do not know how many GAO reports, many of them highly critical.

It occurs to me that if this is to be a regularized program and is to be effective, these loans over $500,000 ought to be audited by General Accounting, even though considerable staff would be required. But we can afford to hire a considerable staff, in view of the amount of losses in this field. I believe this would be an assurance to the American people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator from Illinois has said about the need of auditing. But I believe even more important is the right of Congress and the American people to be able to read these audit reports when we receive them. Now, when we find that they are embarrassing to the administration, they are marked secret, and therefore we are not allowed to release them to the public.

I know that some of the reports that have been brought to our committee stamped "Secret" or "Confidential" would embarrass no one except the officials of AID and of the agency administering the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had the same difficulty. A report was sent out, and in big letters it was marked "classified." Well, we respected classification as circumspectly as anybody could; and in the material we put out we did not intrude upon classified material or military material. But when they hand it to us and we know some paydirt is in it and it says "classified"——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point I make is that some of these reports should not be classified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Many of these reports do not even deal with the military. They merely deal with the abuse and waste and extravagance in the handling of our AID program in some of these countries. Nothing in the reports would in any way jeopardize the security of the United States if it were revealed. It may jeopardize the security of a couple of officials responsible for handling the program. Other than that, I know of no reason why they have been classifying these reports in that manner, except that they are ashamed of what is in them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the independent offices appropriation bill comes to the Senate, it will contain provisions for money for the General Accounting Office. If perchance they are the culprits in the case—I do not say they are—I believe that probably a limiting proviso could be put in, to make sure that they do not classify things that ought to come to the attention of every Member of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad the Senator raised that point. It is not the responsibility of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not say it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They do not classify any of these reports. They prepare the reports and submit them to the respective agency, and then the agency stamps them "Confidential" or "Secret," and the General Accounting Office has neither the responsibility nor the authority to declassify them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not care what agency it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of the fact that the agency which would be embarrassed if the reports were released then.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Illinois has pretty well covered the subject. Two questions occur to me. First, the GAO has authority to do this now. Whether or not it has the manpower to do this on every program of $500,000 without a very substantial increase, I do not know. At present, I do not know how many programs would be involved or what a burden it would be on them to do it. They do it now, as I understand, on a kind of selective basis.

The Inspector General of Foreign Assistance also has responsibility in this field. These activities ought to be coordinated. They ought not to overlap or duplicate each other. I am in favor of GAO performing this duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just how much would be involved in requiring them to do this with every program of $500,000 or more, I do not know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that we accept the amendment, and out of it may come a recommendation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was about to say that we accept it, and then the GAO would respond and tell us how much of a burden it would be on them. They could tell us the number of additional men that would be required, and so forth, and we could consider it in the conference. On principle, I certainly do not object to it. They have the authority now to do it, so I have no basis to object to it, other than if it would appear to be superfluous and cost too much for the GAO to make it do every one of them, and they object to it. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Those are all the amendments for tonight, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that earlier the Senator from Illinois had an amendment accepted which would instruct the Department of the Treasury to submit to Congress annually a list of all our foreign debts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Semiannually.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Semiannually. That would not affect the reports we are now receiving put out by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, it would not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like it to be clearly understood that we are still getting this report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is entirely independent of that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We had experienced a lot of trouble in receiving this information, and it was as a result of an amendment offered a few years ago, which was accepted by the chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have such a report, and it is available to anyone who wishes it. It is a list of every loan that is outstanding with every country, the present status, rates of interest, and so forth. I wish to be sure that we keep this report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Delaware was not here earlier.

In commenting on this matter, I said that I have no feeling whether the Department of Commerce or the Department of the Treasury should do it. Preparing this information costs a good deal of money. I submit that it is hardly necessary for both Departments to do it. This is a matter I should like settled between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois. I would just as soon have it from Treasury as from Commerce. Commerce is doing it, and I believe the Senator agrees that it is satisfactory, that a thorough job is being done. The only comment I have is that I hesitate to say that we should make them both do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree that Commerce is doing it satisfactorily. I have no objection whether it is done by Treasury or Commerce. I believe one is enough to do it. But I wish to be certain that this report will continue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This goes further than the amendment of the Senator, because it includes agencies other than AID.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The proposed amendment provides that payments on interest and repayments on principal would not be made to the agency that made the loan. They would be made to the Treasury. That is where the record would be, and that is where one could find out what the real score is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will not argue as to where the records are. They are being compiled and put in this report. I request that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] examine these reports.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My office is full of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection whether the report comes from the Treasury Department or the Commerce Department, or whether AID puts it out, so long as we get a complete report, and get the report started.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I called the Senate's attention to the Senator's interest in it and that he started it. It has been adopted. Pending the conference there should be consultation between the Commerce Department and the Treasury Department. I do not care which one prepares the report, but both of them should not have to do it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand an order has been entered into to adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no morning hour tomorrow, and after the prayer and reading of the Journal, the Senate will resume the pending business.

STUDY OF GROUND TRANSPORTATION TO DULLES AIRPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1341, S. 3523.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3523) to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to undertake a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles International Airport.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "International", to strike out "Airport", and insert "Airport, the Friendship International Airport," so as to make the bill read:

S. 3523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is hereby authorized and directed to undertake a comprehensive study of the desirability, practicability, and feasibility of construction of high-speed ground transportation systems to meet the needs of the public with respect to the Dulles International Airport, the Friendship International Airport, and the Washington National Airport.

(b) In the conduct of such study, the Administrator shall consult and cooperate with the National Capital Transportation Agency, and such other Federal, State, local, and District of Columbia agencies as he deems desirable.

(c) The Administrator shall submit to the President and the Congress a report on the study authorized by subsection (a) of this section, together with his recommendations and conclusions, not later than July 31, 1967.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No, 1376), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to undertake a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles International Airport, as well as to Washington National Airport and the Friendship International Airport at Baltimore. The study would consider the desirability, practicability, and feasibility of a rapid transportation system connecting the airports with major traffic generation points in the Washington, D.C., area, which could lead to an easing of congestion at Washington National Airport and easier access to Dulles and Friendship.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The arrival, on April 24, of the jet air age at Washington National Airport has brought with it a host of new problems, arising chiefly from a rapid increase in both the number of flights and the number of persons using the terminal.

During May, the first full month during which jet aircraft used the Washington National Airport, National handled 15,000 more passengers than during the previous month. The swollen crowds have jammed the facilities of the terminal, crowding gates, hallways, and baggage counters. Customers have been stacked up nearly 10 deep at ticket counters during peak periods.

One of the most frustrating aspects of congestion involves the lack of adequate parking space. Nothing infuriates and panics a passenger more than to arrive at the field in reasonable time for a flight and find that there is no place left to park his car. Such a situation has become common since the introduction of jets in April (except for the period when a labor dispute ended the operations of five major airlines).

Gen. William M. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, has characterized the congestion in the terminal and parking areas as "intolerable."

Congestion on the ground has been reflected in the air. Total airline flights at National on April 24 numbered 630, with 102 of them jets. By June 1, the total number of flights increased to more than 650, of which some 138 were high performance jets. The increase in traffic in the air is bound to increase the margin of danger to some degree, and has contributed to delays to takeoffs and landings which have added as much as 2 hours to some flights.

In sharp contrast with the congestion at Washington National Airport, the Dulles International Airport still resembles a ghost town. While Washington National will handle more than 7 million passengers this year, Dulles will handle scarcely more than 1 million.

While National Airport is straining at the seams, Dulles is operating at only 25 percent of its present capacity of 4 million passengers a year. Furthermore, the facilities at Dulles can readily be expanded, when the need arises, to serve 14 million passengers a year.

The disparity in use among these airports is clearly evident, too, in the number of flights. As of July 1, 1966, Dulles had only 89 flights a day, while Washington National had 673 and Friendship 210.

The committee regards this as inadequate usage for a modern, fully equipped facility in which the Federal taxpayers have invested more than $108 million.

The boom in air travel has bypassed Dulles, and Baltimore's Friendship International Airport, because of their distance from downtown Washington and from other points in the metropolitan area. Dulles Airport is 27 miles from the city; Friendship is 32 miles away, and both are considerably farther by car. On the other hand, Washington National is only 4 miles from the heart of the city.

Fundamentally, however, the problem is not just distance, but accessibility. Getting to Washington National is a quick, easy 15-minute trip for most. But for the journey to Dulles or Friendship the traveler must allow an hour or more from most parts of the Washington metropolitan area. Not only are these airports at a much greater distance from the city than Washington National, but ground transportation facilities are much more expensive and less convenient. Taxi fares from Washington to either Dulles or Friendship run between $12 and $15, very nearly a prohibitive rate. Furthermore, the downtown airport transportation terminal is poorly located with respect to Dulles, requiring an expensive and time-consuming backhaul for many passengers. Limousine service at a reasonable cost to the residential areas is badly needed from both airports.

All of these factors tend to increase the congestion at Washington National and inhibit the usage of Dulles and Friendship.

The committee believes that if the Dulles Airport is ever to carry its share of the Capital's air commerce, getting to it must be quick and easy, with some type of high-speed ground transportation system. If the Federal investment of $108 million in Dulles Airport is to be effectively employed, more convenient means of access there must be fully and carefully reviewed, and now rather than later.

DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

Under the terms of the bill, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized and directed to undertake a comprehensive study of the desirability, practicability, and feasibility of construction of high-speed ground transportation systems to meet the needs of the public with respect to the Dulles International Airport and the Washington National Airport. Both airports are, of course, owned by the Federal Government and operated by the FAA. The committee has amended the bill to include Baltimore's Friendship International Airport within the scope of the study. While Friendship is not federally owned, and not the direct responsibility of the FAA, the committee believes a study of airport access in the Capital area must of necessity take account of the need for transportation there, recognizing that any recommendations with respect to Friendship must take account of the fact that it is municipally owned.

In the conduct of the study the Administrator is required to consult with the National Capital Transportation Agency, because of that Agency's responsibility for the new subway system for the District of Columbia. The committee believes any transportation system to Dulles, or Friendship, must tie into the new subway system. The Administrator is also directed to consult, as he deems desirable, with other Federal, State, local, and District of Columbia agencies. The committee expects that the Administrator will seek the advice and counsel of Federal agencies, like the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation, of the Department of Commerce, whose responsibilities are similar, as well as affected units of Government whose support and cooperation are obviously desirable.

The committee recognizes, of course, that responsibility for this study could have been conferred on any of a number of interested Federal agencies. It is convinced that the Federal Aviation Agency is the best choice because of its clear, specific, and statutory responsibility for both Dulles and Washington National. The committee has no question as to the competence of the FAA to undertake the study required by the bill.

As far as the scope of the study is concerned, the committee believes the review must take a broad systems approach to the problems of transportation to and from the affected airports, and the effects of transportation systems on air traffic operations, passenger convenience, employment opportunities and other factors. The study should not necessarily be limited to systems exclusively for use of those going to and from the airports. The desirability of intermediate stops, in both directions, should be fully reviewed. The study must also take account of the potential for air transportation between the airports and between the airports and downtown Washington. The Civil Aeronautics Board, of course, has authority to certificate helicopter or other types of vertical lift air service. The FAA would, of course, consult the CAB with respect to the possibilities and potentials of such service. The committee does not foresee any conflict between the study authorized in this bill and any proposals for such air service which would, of course, be a premium service in terms of both speed and cost.

The bill requires the Administrator to submit to the President and the Congress a report on the study, together with his recommendations and conclusions, not later than July 31, 1967.

COST

No specific authority for appropriations is contained in the bill because the Federal Aviation Agency has present statutory authority for the appropriations necessary to carry out the study authorized by S. 3523. The committee believes that the cost of the study can be held to $100,000, although more funds could be provided on the basis of appropriate justifications.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to undertake a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes."

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 3584.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there not an amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the purpose of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] making a statement today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is to be recognized in the morning. He will submit a modified version of his amendment tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 AM. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 20, 1966:

Bruce L. Moore to be postmaster at Bear Lake, in the State of Pennsylvania.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at the Graduation Exercises of St. Mary's Academy, Bayview, June 10, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF ST. MARY'S ACADEMY, BAYVIEW, JUNE 10, 1966

I was not only honored but also sincerely grateful to Sister Marie Andre when I was asked to speak on this very happy occasion. It is an event to which all of us who are here have been looking forward, for this is a moment filled with the memories of growth and achievement as well as with great hopes and expectations for the future. And it is also a moment that provides us who have watched and shared in the growing up of the young ladies of the graduating class to express our thanks and appreciation to the good Sisters of Mercy.

I am sure that I speak not only for the parents and friends of the graduates, but for all of the people of Rhode Island when I say that the Sisters of Mercy make a contribution to the educational life of our State which can never be measured. For almost a century and a half, they have held a place of service to our youth which is unsurpassed, and their presence among us has been a blessing for generations.

Consequently, as we all join in congratulating the very lovely young ladies of the graduating class upon the completion of their high school years, I am sure that all of their happiness is shared by the Sisters, who together with parents and friends, have looked forward to this happy event. The graduates know, perhaps better than anyone, that their teachers at Bayview will always follow their progress through life with the same devoted personal interest which has marked their concern for their students during the past four years of school.

A graduation is not a time for long speeches. It is a time when the happy focus of attention should fall upon those who are graduating. And for the moment, I would like to address them and to speak of one or two things that seem to me to have an important bearing upon the future in which they will be called upon to make use of what they have learned at Bayview.

Now one of the things which must be very clear to every member of the graduating class is the simple fact that the world is changing at a rate that is unprecedented in all of history. It is hard for a person living in 1966 to imagine what the world was like in 1866, or even 1926. The musket used in the Civil War was not very different from the weapon that won the battle of Waterloo. And the Civil War musket was not really much of an improvement over the hand firearms of the fifteenth century. A sailor of Roman times, who might have sailed on a ship that took St. Paul on his missionary journeys, would not have found it difficult to work on board many of the sailing ships that still dominated the seas less than a hundred years ago.

There is no parallel in history to compare with what has resulted from the invention of the steam engine, the modern smelting of metals, the telegraph, the introduction of electric power, the airplane, the electric valve and the release of atomic energy. Travel in space, once the subject of fiction, is a fact of our times. Plagues and diseases which wiped out whole populations in the past are seldom heard of in the present.

In my own years in Congress, it has been my good fortune to share in bringing government aid to medical research and if I had the time to tell you of the advances that have been made in the last few years, I am sure that you would see that the expression "the miracle of modern medicine" is no exaggeration. Even as I am speaking to you, the men of medical research are making great new breakthroughs in the fight against such scourges as cancer and heart disease.

Change is indeed the keynote of our times. Nations that lived for centuries in the backwash of history are today emerging as powers in the world. Asia, which once seemed so remote, is now very much a part of our daily lives. Civil rights, so long denied to many Americans, are today written firmly into the law of the land.

In the Church, too, there is moving the spirit symbolized by good Pope John and the Vatican Council. And today we see the sisters and the lay people taking roles of responsibility which were almost unheard of a generation ago.

Here at Bayview the students of the graduating class—all of you who are receiving your diplomas—you have been well prepared to live and work and grow in a world of change. You are well prepared for such a world, not only because you have been taught the things which will help you to understand the changes but also because you have been taught to understand that there are some things which will never change. You have learned of the eternal truths of faith and of the enduring principles of right living that are as true today as they were when God gave the Ten Commandments to Moses and the people of Israel in the desert.

I would, therefore, believe that no word of advice to the graduates could have more importance than this: Live happily and courageously with changing times and keep faith with the changeless truth that is in you.

That, I am sure, is the spirit of Catholic education today. And some of its leading exponents are religious sisters who, as teachers and administrators, are among the foremost pioneers in American education.

Because of the special role which they have as the bearers and guardians of growing human life, women have a unique role to play in the modern world. In an age of computers and machines of many kinds, women have a special sense of the importance of the personal, human values. And it is this sense of the personal that must be preserved and respected if we are not to become the victims of our own technical progress. Charity, regard for the individual, creativity, and the opportunity for each person to develop his own abilities—these are all things which must never be brushed aside as unimportant or insignificant. On the contrary, they are vital to human survival. And only those who hold fast to the eternal values of faith and morality can be the kind of women who will know how to preserve and promote these humane qualities.

In concluding my remarks to you today, I would like to say one final word about the progress which has been made in bringing equality of educational opportunity to all of our people. The series of legislative acts relating to education which have been passed since the National Defense Education Act have made the Federal government a real partner in American education at every level. And I believe that we have made real progress in doing this in such a way that aid has been made available not only to the public, but also to the private sectors of education.

This is a matter of the greatest importance, for it is privately supported schools, colleges, and universities which are the guarantee that our educational system will always have that variety which reflects our free society and is the major bulwark against the domination of education by the government.

I am, however, by no means satisfied that we are yet doing all we can to assure true freedom and equality for parents and students who choose to attend privately supported institutions.

There is, in my opinion, much to be said for the suggestion made by Dr. John D. Millett, the chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. Dr. Millet has recommended that the state should give tuition grants to college students whose parents have effective incomes of less than $10,000. Certainly such a plan should be seriously considered, for it would serve to strengthen the role of those independent institutions upon which so much of the variety and freedom of American education depends.

One thing is perfectly clear: Education for every American to the fullest degree of his or her potentiality ought to be recognized as part of the American birthright. And we cannot achieve this goal and preserve the freedom and rich variety of our schools if we do not consistently make aid to the student a guiding principle of policy.

The members of this graduating class are taking their places in the long procession of young women who have gone out from Bayview—and hundreds of other fine schools like it—to make their contribution as Catholic women to the progress and infinite variety of life of a free America. Let us, therefore, not only thank God and His dedicated teachers for the work which they have done. Let us also firmly resolve that this good work of education for God and country will continue to grow and flourish in the years to come.

There has always been a need for the ideals of Christian womanhood to be exemplified in our nation. That need, and the opportunities for service that go with it, is ever more urgent in the rapidly changing world of the latter part of the twentieth century. As we share in the joy of this commencement day and in the happiness of the graduates, I am sure that in them we can see the symbols of a future that is bright with promise. And I know that all here will join me when I say that the future which belongs to them will be better because of the contributions which they will make to it.

Outstanding Legislative Assistant: Terry Segal's 24th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this distinguished body to the 24th birthday of my outstanding legislative assistant, Terry Philip Segal.

Terry Segal, a graduate of Amherst College and now a 3d-year student at Yale Law School, has been with me for four summers.

Mr. Speaker, Terry Segal is an invaluable addition to my office—keeping me informed on key legislative developments, handling press relations, and supervising my summer intern program.

It is truly a pleasure and comfort to me to have such an outstanding person as Terry Segal on my staff; I wish him many more happy birthdays.

Veterans' Pension Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement which I presented to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs under date of July 19, 1966, relative to a bill I introduced, H.R. 11886, which proposes to amend Public Law 664 of the 88th Congress:

VETERANS' PENSION AMENDMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the committee for allowing me to make a brief statement concerning a bill I have introduced, H.R. 11886, to amend the laws relating to pensions for veterans and their survivors.

A number of amendments to liberalize and improve the pension laws were enacted in 1964 under Public Law 88–664. Other deficiencies and injustices in these laws, however, remain in need of correction. The bill I am proposing would make several important corrections in this area of veterans' legislation, particularly with respect to the types of income that are included in applying the income limitations of the pension laws.

The bill provides, first, that the retirement income of a pensioner shall be excluded in computing his income for the purposes of the income limitations of the pension laws. This means that income received from social security, civil service retirement or a private pension plan could not, as it now may, be used to reduce the amount of veterans' pension or to completely disqualify him from receiving a pension.

The enactment of this provision would eliminate the possibility of another anomalous situation from arising such as arose last year when the enactment of a cash benefit increase by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 resulted in some 27,000 veterns and veterans' widows having their V.A. pensions reduced or cancelled.

Under existing law, 10 percent of a pensioner's retirement income is disregarded in determining his pension. This makes very little sense and adds complexity to the law. I believe that a total exclusion of such income should be enacted.

I am aware that the Senate has passed H.R. 14347 with committee amendment to eliminate the 1965 Social Security increase and future increases as a determining factor in the amount of pension a veteran may receive. But does this take care of the situation when private, railroad retirement, or civil service retirement pensions increase their benefits? The enactment of my bill excluding retirement altogether would eliminate the possibility of such a similar situation from recurring.

The second amendment contained in the bill is intended to add simplicity and uniformity to provisions of the pension laws that are now overly complex and discriminatory. This amendment would allow the entire income of a veteran's spouse to be disregarded in determining his income. Under existing law there are two pension programs in operation. One of these is for those who were on the pension rolls prior to July 1, 1960. The other pension system, established by Public Law 86–211, is for those whose pensions were initiated since that date. Pensioners under the old pension system may elect, if they so wish, to come under the new system. The rules that apply with regard to the income of a spouse are different under the two systems. All of such income is disregarded for those under the old system, while under the new system the law provides for the exclusion of all of the spouse's *earned* income, or $1200 of her *other* income, whichever is the greater. This change in the bill would merely apply the same rule—the one that now applies to those under the old system—to all pensioners. This is not a great change in terms of dollars and cents, but it would improve the law by ridding it of its present confusing provisions.

The third section of the bill would similarly provide uniform treatment for those under the two pension systems. It would eliminate the "net worth" test which applies to pensioners under the new system but not to those under the older system. This test allows the V.A. to consider the total assets of a pensioner, not merely his income, in determining his eligibility for, or the amount of, his pension. The present "net worth" test should be abolished because it tends to penalize veterans who have had the foresight and initiative to provide some savings or a home for themselves and favors those who have not.

The last section of the bill eliminates a provision of the law that requires a veteran's pension to be reduced while he is a patient in a V.A. hospital. This is another provision that applies only to those under the new pension system. As with the two changes preceding it, this amendment would merely apply the same rule that now applies under the old pension system to all pensioners.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' pension rolls are made up predominantly of aged veterans and their widows. Monthly pension payments are small in relation to today's living costs, ranging from $43 to $100 a month for a veteran with no dependents and from $27 to $64 a month for a veteran's widow. These payments are circumscribed by stringent income limitations. The bill I am offering would grant a moderate amount of relief to those in need of pension assistance. I do not think it is too much to ask for them.

The Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the current strike of machinists against five airlines is costly—costly to the companies, costly to the men on strike and their families, costly to other airline employees and, most of all, costly to many businesses and the traveling public.

We, the people, are paying too high a price to protect somebody else's privileges. I do not know who is the privileged one in this instance, the companies or the union. Inasmuch as the union has been unwilling to accept the terms proposed by the Emergency Board, however, it seems to me it must bear most of the blame for this strike. At least, the burden of proof falls to the union.

Every strike involving a public utility means that collective bargaining has failed as a method of settling labor disputes, and reemphasizes that, some day, the people are likely to do away with the bargaining process and the strike. They will be replaced by compulsory arbitration in some form.

I do not think that will be good for either side; but it might be better for the people—who want labor peace—and the economy—which wants production.

I urge that both sides in this dispute go to the bargaining table with this larger issue in mind.

Shorten the Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see that General Eisenhower in a recent magazine article has renewed the suggestions which he made after the presidential conventions in 1964 to regulate and control the quadrennial party nominating sessions. In an article in the July 6 Reader's Digest he rightly criticized the tumult and chaos of the conventions and their increasing lack of dignity. He stressed the fact that these are now internationally televised proceedings and carry a message for the whole world and that we must eliminate the tawdry and the cheap.

In my judgment, there were two faults in the General's article. In the first place he took too sober an attitude toward the legitimate controversial, funmaking, and combative aspects of the convention. In the second place, he failed to note the really objectionable point about current tendencies, the elimination of the delegate as a person of significance. In today's conventions, the delegates simply go along for the ride in equal or even subordinate rank with television technicians, youth demonstrators, and sundry visiting firemen.

General Eisenhower, unfortunately, fails to address himself to one other regretable aspect of our presidential campaigns which cries for reform and that is the inordinate length of these national canvasses.

Practically no other civilized country in the world subjects its citizens to the deluge of nonsense that accompanies a presidential campaign in the United States. At any rate, in other countries the electoral antics are limited to a period usually less than 30 days. In Canada and in England elections were recently held on a national scale and completed within such a period with complete satisfaction to all.

Why can we not do the same?

If any real purpose were being served by prolonging the agony, I would cheerfully remain quiet, but I have never seen a campaign where interest could be maintained at a constant pitch for more than a month. Beyond that all the money spent, the advertising bought, and the television preempted is just so much waste.

The long campaigns waste time, waste money, and waste the nervous energies of the candidates themselves. At the same time, the public becomes bored and apathetic and the informative purpose of a campaign is no longer served.

I sincerely hope that by the time the next campaign rolls around the American political parties will have seen fit to limit their elections to the reasonable space that adequately serves the other nations of the world. Otherwise I think that Congress should take action and pass bills such as H.R. 96 and House Joint Resolution 16 which I have introduced to establish reasonable controls.

Remarks of Congressman Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland, Har Sinai Congregation, Baltimore, May 29, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Har Sinai Temple in my city of Baltimore retired a historic U.S. flag, and replaced it with a new one. That temple houses America's oldest continuous Reform Jewish congregation and is a beautiful edifice in a city noted for the striking architecture of its churches.

The new flag presented to the temple was flown over our Capitol on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the writing of "The Star Spangled Banner."

One of the speakers at Har Sinai Temple on May 29, 1966, was my distinguished and able colleague, Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, who has ably served his city, State, and Nation. We, here, in the Congress of the United States are indeed, proud of him and his invaluable contributions as a legislator and statesman. When I read my colleague's statement, I was so favorably impressed that I wish to have it inserted in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, believing it to be of general interest and worthy of further notice.

Congressman FRIEDEL's remarks are as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, MARYLAND, HAR SINAI CONGREGATION, BALTIMORE, MAY 29, 1966

Dr. Shusterman, Rabbi Simon, Cantor Cooper, officers and fellow members of Har Sinai Congregation:

We are gathered here today to retire our historic flag and replace it with a new one. This banner which has flown over this house of God will long be remembered as the one which was actually flown over our Capitol in Washington on the 150th anniversary of the writing of our national anthem—The Star Spangled Banner.

It is, therefore, proper that this ensign be placed among the archives of our temple and forever treasured for its historic significance. The Har Sinai Congregation, America's oldest continuous Reform Jewish religious organization, has at all times placed patriotism for the United States immediately after duty and love for the Lord.

The story of the origin of our national flag parallels the story of the origin of our country. As our country received its birthright from the peoples of many lands who were gathered on these shores to found a new nation, so did the pattern of our stars and stripes rise from antiquity. The star is a symbol of the heavens and the divine goal to which man has aspired from time immemorial; the stripe is symbolic of the rays of light emanating from the sun. Its colors also inspire us—red stands for courage, white is the symbol of purity, and blue is the color of justice.

Here, in the presence of representatives of all Har Sinai activities, its officers, board of trustees, brotherhood, sisterhood, Boy Scout organizations, youth groups, and the entire temple family, we respectfully retire this flag and replace it with a similar flag that has also flown over our Nation's Capitol in Washington.

New Kensington, Pa.: 75 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, New Kensington, Pa., in my 21st District of Westmoreland County, has an historical heritage dating back to Kensington, England. This setting, which is just a few miles away from my childhood home on the Allegheny River at Johnetta, became an early center of activity for the Allegewi Indians along the trails and shores of the Big and Little Pucketos Creek forming the Allegheny.

This area rapidly developed as part of the star of the west and presents a history rich and important because of its strategic position as the gateway to the West. During the years of colonial life the location invited the stout in heart and stalwart in courage to come to the green hills and fertile valleys.

Industrial development began almost simultaneously with the incorporation of the town and this city became the home of the aluminium industry—the Aluminium Co. of America and the Wear-Ever Aluminum Co., Inc.—and gained a national reputation for business and manufacturing.

New Kensington rapidly became the hub for commerce, industry, and trade to become known as the Allegheny-Kiski Valley Leading Shopping Center.

This city is now celebrating its diamond jubilee to commemorate 75 years of progress. Along with the celebration of its past comes plans for educational, research, renewal, and industrial expansion for continued growth and development of the community.

I take this opportunity to offer tribute to the fine historical heritage of New Kensington and salute the community and its many fine citizens.

I also extend congratulations and success for the diamond jubilee celebration of July 21 and 31 and offer best wishes for the future.

It is communities such as this which have and will continue to make America great.

A New Century—A New Challenge—Address by Vice President Humphrey Before Tennessee Education Association in Memphis

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, this spring some 9,000 members of the Tennessee Education Association gathered in Memphis for their annual meeting.

The highlight of the 3-day event was an address by Vice President Humphrey, who completely captivated the city during his brief visit. It was my great privilege to introduce him to members of the Tennessee Education Association.

I would like to include at this point in the Record the text of the Vice President's magnificent address:

Address by Vice President Hubert Humphrey to the Tennessee Education Association, Memphis, Tenn., April 1, 1966

Thank you Congressman Grider for your gracious and eloquent introduction. I thank you especially because you didn't let yourself be confined by Washington protocol and just say: "The Vice President." You took a little time to talk me up, and I want you to know that I appreciate it.

I shall address my remarks today to this year's theme for your organization: "A New Century—A New Challenge." It has a special meaning for you as an organization, because last year you celebrated your own centenary. But it has a wider significance, for the entire South and for the nation. For it marks the beginning of a new century—the second century—since the end of the War Between the States.

It is a time to close the books once and for all on the past, and to look bravely and hopefully to the future. You yourselves took an important step forward last year, when you opened your membership to teachers of all races. I am sure you will be even more effective in reaching your goals when all your forces are united in the cause of better education for all of Tennessee's children.

For, as Thomas Jefferson wrote soon after the founding of our Republic, our task must be to "educate and inform the whole mass of the people" . . . to "enable them to see that it is to their interest to preserve peace and order . . . they are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty."

This new century holds great promise for Southern education and the people of the South. I say this for two reasons.

First, because of the far-reaching legislation enacted last year, with the invaluable help of Congressman Grider and the other members of the Tennessee Congressional delegation. This legislation puts us at the threshold of a new era for *all* American education.

And second, the South itself is clearly in the opening of a new cycle of economic growth—a new renaissance. This forward thrust will in large part be fostered and sustained by its educational resources.

The American people have always pinned their hopes for the future—the future of the nation and the future of their own children—on education. This has been particularly true in the South. But, while the desire for good education in the South has always been strong, harsh economic realities have limited educational opportunity. But times are changing, and changing for the better. The South is moving out of its old agricultural economy and into an industrial era. The gap between the South and the rest of the nation is closing. The economic gap is closing. We must also close the educational gap.

If I seem all wrapped up in this subject, it is because I am still a teacher at heart. More importantly, this is an "Education Administration" that I am privileged to represent. There are a great many teachers in the Executive Branch and in the Congress. President Johnson is a former teacher, and proud of it. Senator Mansfield, the Majority Leader, was a professor of history at the University of Montana. Congressman Carl Albert, the Majority Leader of the House, was a Rhodes Scholar. You can go through the top echelons of our government and find teachers in place after place.

This Administration, I want you to know, will not rest until every American child, wherever he may live, whatever his race, religion, or national origin, has all the education he can usefully absorb. The legislation which Congress enacted last year will result in profound changes not only in education, but in our whole future social and economic life. The new programs are going to give fresh impetus to people and communities hitherto left behind the rest of our nation.

Under these new circumstances, you as professional educators will occupy key roles in your communities. The financial headaches of your schools are not over—in the nature of things, they never will be—but for the first time many of you will be able to "think big."

You will find that, in the councils of government, the educator will no longer be sitting below the salt. Instead, he will be moving a lot closer to the head of the table. In the state house, educators will no longer risk being regarded merely as supplicants. Tomorrow, the educator will be seen as a man who brings wealth into his community—and not just federal aid to education. For quality education attracts and holds business and industry, creating new payrolls and new resources. Indeed, a recent survey of 500 of our leading corporations showed that they base their decisions on the location of new plants first of all upon the educational facilities of a community and its commitment to their further extension.

I congratulate you on your new—and abundantly deserved—status in our society. If I can offer one word of advice, it is this: Let no feelings of false modesty induce you not to press your advantage to the utmost.

This new generation needs—and deserves—the best education we can give them. They are fine young people, with a great potential. Just as Tennessee is the Volunteer State, this is the volunteer generation. Whether serving in uniform or in shirt-sleeves, at home or overseas, they are giving generously and willingly of their best.

A nation that can produce the kind of young men and women who serve this nation in our armed forces, the Peace Corps, our government missions overseas, in the CARE program, and in the relief services of our great religious denominations—a society with this degree of voluntarism is a society that has something to commend itself to history. Never at any time has a nation given so much in the cause of peace and humanity, and expected so little in return, as the United States.

In the years immediately ahead, our young people will be confronted with new challenges which will call upon ever ounce of their energy, intelligence and dedication.

They will have the task, first and foremost, of building an enduring peace—a peace which will have to be built by a hundred thousand individual, positive acts. For peace will not be built by any grand gesture or magical formula. It will be built in the hot streets and muddy fields of countries which did not even exist 20 years ago. It will be built in long months of tireless, patient negotiation over the most minor of international issues. It will be built by people possessing adequate knowledge of their world and its complexities.

Our young generation will have the responsibility, too, of making technological progress the servant rather than the master of humanity.

They will have the privilege of waging the war against poverty which President Johnson has launched—an undertaking without precedent in the history of the world.

But there is one piece of unfinished business we must not and cannot leave to them, because it is far too urgent. We must make good, in fact as well as in law, without delay or equivocation, the pledge of our Constitution that all Americans, everywhere, shall have equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of our Republic.

The greatest single contribution we can make to the future of America is to see to it that each individual is given every opportunity to make the most out of his life. We bear heavy responsibilities in this world, and the denial to anyone of the right to participate in shouldering them weakens this country. A century ago Abraham Lincoln called America "the last, best hope on earth"—and it still is.

Congress has recognized its responsibilities to our new generation in the historic school legislation it adopted last year. Members of Congress from the South—and particularly Senator Bass, Senator Gore, Congressman Grider and other Tennessee Congressmen—worked hard to achieve this.

Under the formulas adopted, the Southern states will, as a group, gain the most. We expect the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to bring 1.2 billion dollars to education throughout the country during the first year of its operation, and 1.3 billion in its second. Roughly a half-billion of this will be channeled each year into the elementary and secondary schools of the South. They will receive more than their proportionate income tax contributions.

This is as it should be. All the same, I think we should pay tribute here to the many legislators from high-income states who have consistently, over the last 25 years, worked to enact programs which would cost their taxpayers more than they bring into their own states.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act will help approximately seven million educationally deprived children from low-income families.

Now for a few words about what the Act means to Tennessee. As you know, it includes several different programs.

First and most substantial in dollars, it provides aid to low-income districts—that is, districts with a substantial number of families with incomes of less than two thousand dollars. Our estimate is that this can mean over 32 million dollars for Tennessee. The indications are that some 300,000 children in this state will benefit from this part of the Act in the current fiscal year.

Next, the Act provides funds for school libraries and textbooks. Our estimate for this is over 1.8 million dollars for Tennessee.

Further, it includes grants for supplementary educational centers and services, estimated for Tennessee at almost 1.5 million dollars.

Also, it offers grants to strengthen state departments of education—estimated at almost 300,000 dollars for Tennessee.

Another provision of the Act authorizes the Office of Education to step up the improvement of education through research and development activities. Experts from all parts of the country have been involved in the planning of the National Program of Educational Laboratories, the largest single effort under this authority. Developmental contracts for nine such laboratories were approved and announced on March 1. Of these, two include parts of Tennessee in the areas they serve—the Appalachia and the Central Mid-Western Regional Educational Laboratories.

Here, certainly, is opportunity for creative innovation in the schools of Tennessee, as in schools throughout the nation. Here, to revert to your theme for this year, is a new challenge for a new century.

Those in our society who most need education too often have been the ones least likely to receive it. Here I can speak out of personal experience. When I was Mayor of Minneapolis, one thing that perplexed me was why the best public services were in the areas of the city that needed them the least. The newest schools were located where people had the highest incomes; the best playgrounds, where families had memberships in country clubs. Actually, the best schools, playgrounds, and other facilities ought to be in the areas that can least afford them. Otherwise, students whose home environment is drab and dulling all too often find their schools equally so.

We must make our schools lively and challenging to these youngsters. We in Washington can't tell you how to do it, and we don't intend to try. But we do hope and expect that you will come up with new and effective teaching techniques which will make the schools so interesting that there won't be any drop-outs. We can't afford them, because we need well-educated people in our modern, technologically advanced economy. Every school drop-out is a potential liability to himself and to the community.

In conclusion, I should like to direct your attention to the international implications of education.

In his message to Congress on this subject a few weeks ago, President Johnson said:

"Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations."

Of course, I am sure you have felt this all along. But it is new—a real landmark in the history of American education—to have it stated as national policy.

The proposed International Education Act of 1966 also embodies that high commitment.

The keystone of the new program is the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a Center for Educational Cooperation. This will bring into being for the first time a general headquarters for coordinating our work in international education.

The President has directed that funds be earmarked to strengthen and enrich the curriculum relating to world affairs in elementary and secondary schools. There is a provision also for establishing a placement service to put our teachers in posts abroad, so as to add to their international experience.

The proposed International Education Act will help our smaller colleges so that they can better equip their graduates with knowledge of the outside world. It will also support the further strengthening of the larger universities as the nation's leading centers of advanced training and research in international affairs.

In this connection, I want to congratulate Memphis State University—many of whose graduates, I understand, are here—on its plans to establish an Institute for the Study of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. I am pleased, also, to hear that the University hopes in the future to add a number of courses on China, and make the Institute a major center for the study of Sino-Soviet affairs.

I came back from my recent trip to Asia with a clear and strong feeling—which, not being reticent by nature, I have frequently and forcefully shared—that we Americans need to know much more about the world in which we live—and particularly about Asia, with its two billion people. We are a world leader, but we have only half-world knowledge.

It took World War II to bring us to the realization that we could no longer ignore Europe. It took Vietnam—the sorrow, the pain, and the misery of that terrible struggle—to awaken us to Asia.

Education will become an increasingly important part of our aid program in Asia. Already, for example, we have helped the Government of South Vietnam more than double its classrooms, nearly triple enrollment in primary schools in its first decade of independence, and step up its enrollment in secondary schools by a factor of better than six over the same period. More and more, we see education as the keystone in the building of nations.

I like to think that mankind will come to regard the United States, not as a gendarme among nations, but as a global center of enlightenment and learning.

I want us to understand that, important as nuclear power is, the power of the mind and the spirit is more important. I want the world to know that the America of the 20th Century is not only a nation that steadfastly fulfils its commitments, it is a nation that inquires, that seeks to learn, that honors the scholar and the teacher.

The educator is already as vital to our international relations as the diplomat or soldier. I can foresee a time when he will be even more important—the time when cooperation rather than conflict is the rule in human relations and when, in the words of the prophet Isaiah, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor shall they learn war any more."

Hats Off to the Champ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys in connection with my service as a Member of the 89th Congress has been the opportunity afforded me to develop a friendship with one of New York's greats. It has been my observation that men of the Empire State go to extraordinary extremes to lead the way in many fields. That great State has produced the John Pierpont Morgans in the field of finance, the Franklin Roosevelts in the field of government, the Babe Ruths and Lou Gehrigs in the field of sports, and HUGH CAREY in the field of paternity.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but admire our colleague's excellence in the field of paternity and to reflect with awe when I learned today of the fact that he had become the father of his 14th child—9 boys, 5 girls—a magnificent record indeed.

In the field of paternity here in the House and perhaps someday in the Nation, he is truly our leader, and we are proud of his accomplishments.

I am sure all of us in the House join in extending warm congratulations to our gifted and most able colleague and his lovely and most capable wife on this happy occasion.

Suicide and Alcoholism: Americans Look the Other Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I gave at the 74th annual banquet of the East Providence Chamber of Commerce, on June 11, 1966:

SUICIDE AND ALCOHOLISM: AMERICANS LOOK THE OTHER WAY

(Remarks by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Second Rhode Island District, before the 74th annual banquet of the East Providence Chamber of Commerce, Metacomet Country Club, June 11, 1966)

Judge Weisberger, I'm pleased to be home again this evening, to celebrate with you at the seventy-fourth annual dinner of the East Providence Chamber of Commerce.

As toastmaster, you are presiding at a very special event, because I doubt if there are many towns and cities across the breadth of the United States whose Chambers of Commerce have an unbroken history of almost three quarters of a century of civic leadership. I hope you will invite me back next year, for your diamond jubilee.

I am especially pleased to be able to salute your guest of honor as he completes his term as President of this Chamber. Jim Reilly and I went to school together and even after all these years, we are still friends. I know that his stewardship in the past year has brought the affairs of this organization forward, and that his successor will take over the guidance of a strong and effective group.

I am going to talk about two subjects tonight that are not usually discussed at banquets and social events. But I am going to do it anyway, because the time has come when all of us, from East Providence, Rhode Island to West San Diego, California, must admit failure and—what is much more important—get some civic programs going at the National, State, city and even neighborhood levels, if we are to change the situation I want to discuss with you here.

I am talking about suicide and I am talking about alcoholism.

We have suicides in East Providence and we have alcoholics in East Providence. And we don't do very much to help the man who is finally driven to kill himself, or the person whose life is wrecked by the bottle.

The whole point is that East Providence is not alone in this neglect. In most parts of this Nation, these are facts of living that are—at worst, simply ignored and swept under the rug, or—at best, given lip service rather than effective consideration.

The thing that infuriates me is the fact that we know enough to prevent many suicides and we are beginning to collect some knowledge about controlling alcoholism. But we don't put what we know to use.

You know that I am deeply involved, in the Congress, with securing good health legislation and appropriating the money necessary to make that legislation work.

It is no platitude to say that the mental health of the people in any town and in the entire country is our greatest resource. I propose that we put the knowledge and the funds available to us to work immediately to stop this human waste.

Let's look first at suicide and suicide prevention.

The rate of suicide in the United States is ten suicides for every hundred thousand residents. That means that every 24 minutes, another person kills himself. Suicide in this country is the tenth leading cause of death.

The facts are even more shocking when you begin to find out who these people are.

In the armed forces, suicide is the second cause of death.

A current suicide study conducted at the National Institute of Mental Health indicates beyond doubt that adolescents of college age present the highest potential suicide risk group within the population. The number of adolescent suicides is low, in relation to the total population, but the risk is high.

In the 15-to-19 age group, suicide is the third-ranking cause of death, exceeded only by accident and cancer.

In the collegiate group, suicide is the second ranking cause of death, with the rate for boys twice as high as the rate for girls.

I know you agree with me that tragic as the suicide of an adult may be, it pales beside the tragedy of the child who is so lost and lonely and confused that he takes his own life.

In a study of the 41 children in the New Jersey school system who committed suicide between 1960 and 1963, we have some information that can and should be acted upon.

In going back over the lives of these youngsters, the investigators found out that suicidal children are often those who do not take part in school activities outside the classroom—the athletic teams, the orchestras, the dramatic clubs or any of the usual after-school activities most children like.

Thirty of these 41 youngsters were seriously retarded in reading, even though they had better than average intelligence ratings. But the most significant factor related to suicide among school children was that in every case of suicide in the study the child had no close friends.

In every instance, the difference between the child who threatened suicide but did not and the child who took his life was the presence, or the absence, of someone to whom that kid felt close; someone he could talk to and someone who liked him the way he was.

You know, it should not be difficult to change that situation; all that takes is time and interest in these youngsters.

The statistics go on and on; and so do the suicides. But the most tragic part of the whole sad story is that most suicides are unnecessary. We already know how to prevent many of them, if we wanted to.

Dr. Stanley Yolles, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, tells me that within 5 years, given adequate support, we could cut the number of suicides in half. And he adds that this can be done with the knowledge we already have—to say nothing of the things we could learn as we went along.

I am happy to report to you that we are making a beginning in establishing a national suicide prevention program this year. The National Institute of Mental Health is establishing a Center for the Study of Suicide Prevention. This, as I say, is a beginning, but the success of any such center rests in the long run with the local communities.

Through this Center, the Federal Government can support research, pilot studies, training and consultation. But the actual prevention programs must be set up in East Providence and in San Francisco and in rural areas, if we are to put that Federal support to work for us.

More doctors must be told how to recognize a person's cry for help when he first indicates that he is in deep trouble.

In over half the suicide deaths, the individual who killed himself had indicated to someone that suicide was on his mind. Sometimes he did it directly, by saying "I'm going to shoot myself." Sometimes he hinted at it by, for example, asking "how do you leave your body to the medical school." But in half the cases, the suicide had asked for help in one way or another. What we need to know is how we can recognize those cries for help and how we can do something when we hear them.

The new community mental health centers which are being built and organized now, with grants from the Federal Government, can help to reduce the number of suicides. One of the services required, if a center is to receive Federal funds, is a psychiatric emergency service; and such a service is a necessity for hundreds of people in a suicidal crisis.

Very few communities today have anything like an adequate service for any kind of psychiatric emergency. If you doubt me, just try to get professional help for someone who says he's going to commit suicide in the middle of the night, or on a weekend, or—for that matter—at any time of the day in a lot of places.

This, to me, is a shocking situation: especially since we know what to do. I would suggest that this Chamber of Commerce membership take a look at the situation here; it isn't the responsibility of the doctor or the policeman or the priest alone. Simply from a dollars-and-cents point of view, it is a civic question and a civic problem. I hope that Rhode Island takes some leadership in availing itself of the help that the new Suicide Prevention Center at the NIMH is prepared to provide us. Some communities are going to leap at the opportunity and some are going to let it go by. It's a brand new national suicide prevention program and our State should participate at its beginnings.

The suicide problem is big enough, but the woe and trouble and waste of men's lives caused by the misuse of alcohol in this country is so much greater that it is almost impossible to visualize it in the national sense. I think that is one reason we have failed so dismally up to now in this area.

I am not talking about the person who likes his drinks and handles them. I'm talking about the men and women who let alcohol wreck their own lives, the lives of their families and cause trouble wherever they work.

There are at least 5 million alcoholics in this country and nothing has been done about them.

Oh, I know. There has been some research, some treatment and some effective attempts at rehabilitation, but these are extremely insignificant when you place them beside the total problem.

I have argued and pleaded and cajoled—from the floor of the House, in Committee, and at many a gathering in and outside Washington, and up until now, I'm afraid I haven't achieved much. But I am happy to tell you this evening that the National Institute of Mental Health has *finally* organized a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism.

Now this, too, is just a beginning, and I'm sorry to say that we do not know as much about preventing alcoholism as we do about preventing suicide. But we know more, even about the control of alcoholism, than we are putting to use.

This new Center, if it does what it is supposed to do, can put the pieces of our knowledge together in a usable package so that community services can do a lot more than to throw a drunk into jail and hope that he will sleep it off and then leave town.

Research into the cause and control and treatment of alcoholism has improved in the past ten years and many more competent investigators are becoming interested in the problem. If we give them the money and the trained personnel they need, we can speed things up because the new Center can pull the knowledge together and get it out to the community where it can do some good.

I do not mean to imply that the mere establishment of such a Center will solve our problems, but at least it can exert some national leadership in developing and coordinating a scientific program.

The NIMH can put a number of experts to work on various parts of this program, to accelerate activity in everything from basic research in the biological effects of alcohol on man to the kinds of treatment and counselling that can be provided to alcoholics and members of their families in their home communities.

In the long run, it will take more money and more trained personnel to do this job, because this is only a beginning.

If the new National Center can come up with some answers—even on a trial basis—communities can test them out.

Here again, the community with a new mental health center may have the best opportunity to solve at least part of its alcohol problem.

Some of the new Centers plan to provide emergency treatment and rehabilitation services to alcoholics in the same facilities where persons with other psychiatric problems are treated. Others are planning separate services for alcoholics. However, no matter what the pattern for treatment may be, the new National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism will be able to provide support for community programs in several ways.

The Institute's Regional offices will handle local requests for help in setting up treatment and educational programs. It will take more trained people to do this job, and Federal funds available for grants to training facilities can make this possible.

I shall not go into further detail this evening on the mechanics necessary to make these two new Centers effective. But I did want to tell you about them so that East Providence and other Rhode Island communities can take advantage of the help they will have to offer.

Because we can all be sure of one thing. Suicides and alcoholics will not disappear, even if we look the other way. We have done this so long that today, no matter where we look, we see the tragic results of the uncontrolled use of alcohol, and in too many directions, we see the headlines on suicide or the man jumping off the bridge. And then we see what the fact of that unprevented suicide does to the family, the friends and the colleagues left behind.

As modern Americans—even though we, personally, may never have been affected by someone's self-inflicted death, or never have been hurt by the alcoholic tragedy of a personal friend—we know that a healthy community is made up of healthy individuals.

Health and health services are now community business and a civic concern. So, only with a personal investment on all our parts can this or any other community in the United States become a healthy place in which to live.

The Late Police Chief William H. Parker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Police Chief Parker was one of our Nation's great law-enforcement officers and one of the new breed of men who helped to revolutionize the police profession in the United States.

He will be remembered both for the efficiency and effectiveness of his department and for the personal standard of integrity which he maintained.

He was equal to the challenges of the unique period in which he lived. He distinguished himself during a time of great tension and strife in American society.

We hope that he was not irreplaceable. But to his great credit there is much evidence to suggest he was.

Free Postage to Combat Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which would provide for free postage on first-class mail, newspapers, and small parcels for all citizens sending that mail to members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in combat zones.

I was surprised to discover that no Members of Congress has introduced legislation of this sort before; I would certainly hope that H.R. 16389 is given immediate and serious consideration so that this situation can be quickly alleviated. Under this bill, mail will be sent by air on a space-available basis on U.S.-flag carriers to combat zones, as designated by the President.

On November 1, 1965, Public Law 89-315, giving free postal privileges to soldiers in combat areas and providing for air service on the free mail, was signed by President Johnson and enacted into law. On March 21 of this year, the House passed H.R. 13448 which would provide for airmail from the United States to combat zone areas at surface continental rates. This measure has not yet been acted upon by the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Although it was encouraging to see the public law signed and it was heartening to see the House pass the latter measure, neither goes far enough in terms of giving servicemen the maximum opportunities to receive mail.

I received a letter from a constituent in South River, N.J., who told me:

> I am thinking of older people who depend on social security for their only income. For people in this category and people on relief it would sometimes almost be impossible to send even a small package to Vietnam.
>
> Why must it be so costly to send a small box of hope, love and a bit of home to the GI's who are so bravely sacrificing their lives for our country.

Now, it may cost up to $4.08 to send a 5-pound parcel air mail from New York to San Francisco, the point of embarkation for Asian mail. To many families, this may prove to be a heavy financial burden.

Here is a situation where some 300,000 soldiers are engaged in a fight for their very lives—the least we at home could do would be to insure these men some small measure of the comforts of home. It is unfair both to the members of the Armed Forces and their parents who may be prohibited by costs from sending them news from home or small packages.

It is bad for morale as well. In a communication to Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, the President has said:

> Mail is the vital link that bridges vast distances, bringing warmth and news and, most important, easing the pain of separation. To have mail delivered sooner is to bring home that much closer.

It goes without saying that, to paraphrase the President, to have mail delivered more often is also to bring home that much closer.

It is a well-known fact that mail call is one of the few bright spots of the day of a soldier in combat. If we in Washington can make this moment a bit happier, then, I think that we can say that we are doing our part.

What is more, this bill will not be a burden on the taxpayers. I have been informed by Mr. Eugene B. Crowe, Acting Assistant Postmaster General of the Post Office Department, that revenue loss on first-class letters and small parcels going to Vietnam—based on a survey made at the San Francisco Post Office—terminal for all U.S. mail going to Vietnam—will be only $1.6 million. Although $1.6 million is not a figure which one usually precedes with "only," we must put the cost in the proper perspective of the entire war. Although official figures are not available, it is likely that we are spending $20 billion a year or more in Vietnam. In comparison to that figure, $1.6 million is but a minute fraction.

Eric Sevareid has pointed out that it costs about $1 million for each member of the Vietcong that American forces kill in action. This additional cost of $133,000 a month will not be great at all.

In addition, we have set precedents in past wars of giving soldiers mailing privileges home. Now, I feel that an extra measure is necessary so that soldiers are not faced with the problem which was reported by Mrs. Walter Glynn, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary:

> A serviceman in Da Nang portrayed the plight of those who receive little mail when he wrote "Although I would like a hometown newspaper, I have a friend who needs one more than I do. He does not receive much mail; in fact, if he receives a letter once every two weeks, he's lucky. Some time ago he told me that if he had his hometown newspaper, he would not miss mail so much.

Certainly, if there is any body of American citizens which ought to receive special compensation from the Government, it is those soldiers serving in combat areas. I believe that my bill, H.R. 16389, by giving these men the added "bonus" pleasure of hearing from loved ones and friends, would help provide a needed and vital service for our men in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for speedy and positive action on my legislation.

Address by Congressman Graham Purcell at the Conference of the Americas on "Malnutrition as a Vital Factor in Development," at the Hotel El Continental, Panama, June 20, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate the Food For Freedom Act of 1966. Within days after the House action, a very exciting demonstration of Latin America on the move in the war against hunger was given in Panama when more than 175 Latin American leaders representing 17 countries, from government, business, church organizations, and other voluntary groups met under the auspices of the Bureau for Latin American Affairs of the Agency for International Development. The purpose of the Conference was to build an action program for a campaign against malnutrition. The theme of the Conference was "Malnutrition—A Vital Factor in Socio-Economic Development." At the conclusion of this Conference, a document was prepared which has become known among those who participated as the "Charter of Panama for Children."

Mr. Speaker, life in Latin America continues to be very grim. Recently the World Health Organization released some tragic facts:

> Among children aged one to four, about half the deaths are attributable to malnutrition.
>
> From the Rio Grande to Cape Horn in every second coffin carried toward a grave is the body of a child who could live no longer than five years.

Added to this is the recent report by some leading nutritionists in Latin America that by any standard acceptable in the United States, 7 out of 10 people in Latin America would be considered malnourished.

Action is indeed needed. It is for this reason that I am very proud to announce that a fellow Texan and good friend, the distinguished Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, addressed that Conference and brought to the Latin American leaders the strong conviction, presented just a few days before when the vote was taken on the Freedom From Hunger Act, that the American people are committed to freedom from hunger for all men. Surely he spoke for all of us when he said:

> We pledge our best efforts to support those governments and those people who are committing their own resources to the War Against Hunger.
>
> Carry home to your countries the message that the Members of the United States Congress . . . and all our fellow countrymen, are committed to that battle.

I believe his speech is a message not only for the Latin American leaders present in Panama, but I believe this

speech is truly a useful message to all peoples who have a national will and determination to help themselves in the struggle against want.

Congressman PURCELL's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM PURCELL AT THE CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS ON MALNUTRITION AS A VITAL FACTOR IN DEVELOPMENT, PANAMA, JUNE 20, 1966

I welcome this opportunity, and consider it a great privilege to share with you, the leaders in the campaign against malnutrition, some of the concern of the people of the United States and some of the legislative activities of the United States Congress which are planned to help those who are underfed and undernourished.

President Johnson has taken a bold lead in the fight against hunger. He has made the position of our people clear in his messages to the Congress . . . and the Congress has responded. They have indicated by their actions and speeches that this is the kind of fight the people of my country prefer to respond to . . . The War against Hunger.

While the United States is generally thought of as being affluent and its people as being well-fed, our Congress has recognized that we are not without our own problems involving hunger and malnutrition.

Mindful of this, and of the economic advantages that accrue to a society where each and every member is properly nourished, President Johnson recently proposed the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The Congress, fully aware that children are one of our most valuable assets, is currently working on this proposal.

Specifically, the Congress is trying to expand the National School Lunch Program to reach more needy children. The program already is serving 18 million children on a regular basis. The Special Milk Program is being expanded to provide more milk for children who need it. We are experimenting with the concept of a Pilot School Breakfast Program which will be tried in low-income areas. Grants are being made to schools to develop additional food service facilities and better staffing of these facilities.

The Food Stamp Plan is another domestic program designed to fight malnutrition. Through this program, recipient families have increased their consumption of quality foods, such as meat, fruits, and vegetables, by more than 80%. President Johnson now visualizes that more than 1.3 million people will be receiving Food Stamp help a year from now.

Legislation which has been receiving a growing amount of enthusiasm in my country these past few months is the Food for Freedom Program.

For the past eleven years, the United States through the Food for Peace Program under Public Law 480 has delivered 150 million tons of food, valued at more than $15 billion, to nations needing more food. Seventy million children now receive United States food, and yet, the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

On this premise . . . that the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before . . . the Food for Freedom program was conceived. I had hoped to be able to share the details of our program with you at this Conference, but they are still being formulated by the United States Congress. An emphasis on self-help and the elimination of the "surplus" concept in food aid will, however, be the main features that distinguished this new program from its predecessors. By the elimination of the "surplus" concept, I mean we will begin to produce for recognized needs rather than shipping only foods which are in surplus. Also, under the new program, there will be increasing stress on nutrition . . . especially for young people.

In our work on the problems of hungry people, there is one item in particular which is having great impact. That is the so-called "world population explosion." This problem, and the related threat of famine, have been the quiet concern of many of us in the Congress for several years.

Suddenly, however, the problem has been brought into focus by the interest of the public press, by the famine in India, by the heavy purchases of wheat by communist bloc countries that cannot under their system develop a productive farm program, and by the reduced stockpiles in my own country.

The problem is a complex one, and one which deserves lengthy and intensive study. But unfortunately we do not have time to give it the study it needs. The problem is here—now—and time is fleeting.

Certainly at the heart of the problem is the fantastic growth rate of our world's population. I know many of you are more familiar with the staggering statistics than I am, for you face this problem in your own countries. To show how serious it is, however, total world-wide food production in 1965 was about the same as it was in 1964. But, in 1965, there were 63 million more mouths to feed than the year before—more than enough to populate a good-sized country.

Today, there are more human beings in the world who are underfed and undernourished than the population of the entire world in 1900.

Another part of the problem of growing populations and less food for each person lies in the fact that some of the old answers are no longer available. When the United States was developing, the answer to our increasing population was for people to move on to new territory and to open virgin land for farm production. There are no longer such promising frontiers in the United States, and very few in the rest of the world.

All over the world, the most valuable land is already under cultivation. Much of the land which is not in use, or only slightly used, is either too cold, or too dry, or too rough, or too hot, or too wet, or too remote, and does not offer the immediate potential we need.

With the increasing population, and an inability to find new land readily available for easy production, the less-developed areas of the earth are losing their battle to feed themselves. Before World War II, these less-developed regions exported an average of eleven million tons of grain per year to the more developed areas. Since then, the situation has been reversed and these less-developed regions, which are now the areas of highest population growth, have to import more than 20 million tons annually from the developed regions.

A third problem is the increasing number of people who are living in the cities where they cannot supply even a portion of their own food. They are becoming increasingly dependent upon the extremely complex marketing distribution system.

Although half of the world's population still is classified as agricultural, people are beginning to pile up at a faster and faster rate in our cities. This may contribute to economic growth and industrial progress, but—in the case of food—it means that many, many millions of people are at the mercy of imported supplies. It also means that the ability of the rural areas to expand food production easily and quickly under conditions of crisis is more limited than it might be otherwise.

Another problem area which needs study is that of increasing productivity of land already under cultivation. Increasing the yield, the nutritive value, efficiency of harvest, storage, and distribution are problems which must be solved. Unfortunately, answers to these problems will not solve our immediate situation, but do hold great promise for the future.

Along this line I want to report a major breakthrough in developing the nutritive value of food. Purdue University has just recently identified a new genetic component which nearly doubles the protein level of corn and other grains. AID is now initiating a project to make this discovery available in Latin America. This is one of the most exciting food discoveries in recent years and is a real triumph in our struggle against malnutrition.

Another consideration to the problem is the fact that people all over the world are seeking and expecting better diets. Those who do not have the benefit of adequate nutrition see others around them eating their fill. We, in the Congress, know that our citizens will not tolerate a program which might reduce the availability of reasonably priced food in our own country. We also know that people in any other part of the world are no different in this respect. When they become accustomed to a diet of good food, they tend to react strongly to any reduction. Friendly governments can get into serious difficulties with their people when their food supply is curtailed, for any reason.

In short, temporary programs which merely whet the appetite of our people must be avoided unless we are also prepared by means of long-range programs to be sure the people will be fed equally well in the future.

There is another problem which I feel has been a significant contributor to the international food crisis. For centuries, it has been an economic truth that industrial societies can be built only on a sound agricultural foundation. Too many of the developing countries have ambitions of becoming industrial nations and have failed to understand that they must first develop a sound agricultural base. Too many national economic plans have milked the agricultural sector of the economy of necessary capital to spend it on unnecessary, or poorly planned, industrial adventures . . . or both . . . and some have even squandered their national resources and economic resources on petty external or internal wars. This reduces both the total food supply, and the incentive for production.

These are only a few of the problems which must be faced if the people in our hemisphere, and in the rest of the world, are going to be properly fed. There are many other problems of a political, economic, and social nature. I have not even discussed the serious marketing and distribution difficulties. I have not mentioned the physical problems of many of the receiving countries, such as inadequate port facilities. This discussion has not considered the more immediate problems, like drouth. Furthermore, we must recognize the political motives and self-interests of the governments with which we will be working. And, in looking for solutions, we must take into consideration the fact that the countries most in need of food assistance are also the countries least able to pay for it.

There are no easy answers to these problems. There is no neat little legislative package available to us which can solve the world's hunger problem. And so, the United States Congress has been looking for new approaches to a solution of the growing international food crisis.

Massive foreign aid has, in the past, been one of the solutions adopted by the United States. Now, however, it has become very difficult to get approval of these programs in the Congress. It is difficult to explain to our people that they must be taxed to pay for donated supplies of food and other items going to countries who then spend their money for military and other purposes rather than for the development of agriculture. This is particularly true when the military purposes are contrary to the best interests of the United States. It is equally difficult to explain to our constituents that they are being taxed to make up for shortages based on the inability of some recipient nations to collect their own taxes.

Massive foreign aid has other shortcomings. It has a tendency to lead countries to become dependent on donated supplies, rather than encouraging the recipient countries to develop programs for themselves.

Also, such a program tends to develop an appetite of the people for a continuing supply of better food. This, in turn, can create some serious political difficulties between our governments.

And, we do not want to bury a people's pride in an avalanche of well-meaning United States charity. Instead we want to extend a helping hand wherever possible in a manner which will encourage friendly developing countries to work out their own solutions to their individual problems.

We are not looking for dependencies. We are looking for independent partners who will work with the United States to make a better life for men of good will, wherever they may be.

Certainly our solutions must be more than answers to temporary needs for more food. We must also concentrate on finding solutions which show promise of being long term.

First, we must face up to the problem of a rapidly growing population and work on population controls. I recognize that any program in this area will be loaded with economic, political, religious, and social conflict . . . but work must begin.

Last year, for the first time in my country, a Congressional committee held extensive hearings on population controls. The study will be resumed. For the first time, a President of the United States is speaking on the problem. Encouragement has been given by the actions and words of the Pope who is giving new study and thought to the problem.

Within recent months, public attention in the Americas was focused on a significant discussion meeting, held in Cali, Colombia, on problems of population. All these indicators offer hope that positive actions will be taken in the near future to help cope with the population crisis. If you and I have any concern for hungry people, we must press for these answers.

Secondly, people from all the Americas must work together to establish sound agricultural programs. United States food production will not eliminate the food shortage. At best, it can only be a temporary answer to the present food shortage. We want to assist your efforts with our technology and skills in agriculture because we believe, working together, we can find more lasting answers to far greater food production in our hemisphere. In connection with these considerations, President Johnson stated that, "There is one characteristic common to all who have increased the productivity of their farms: A national will and determination to help themselves."

This increase in production will require more fertilizer, technical services, tractors, and other equipment, resulting in new industries and more jobs for your workers. Of course, the United States wants to help supply the needs which you cannot produce at home. Such progress will mean stronger economies, and in all candor, stronger economies and increased trade make better neighbors. It is no secret that crime, disease, and revolution breed and multiply where there is hunger and poverty.

Now, for the first time in our history, my country is in a position in which it can work with you in making real progress against the scourage of hunger. We have a new farm program which gives us much needed flexibility. My fellow countrymen are ready to accept the challenge, for it gives us an opportunity to demonstrate the compassion and concern of our people, a free people, for our fellow man.

We believe that all the American Nations . . . joined together in efforts to conquer our own problems . . . can join together to help others who have even greater problems.

Our creed is simple. Ours is a nation of people concerned about the problems of individual people. Ours is a government which, under God, seeks to serve people rather than be served by people. We cannot, and will not, deny to our citizens either the freedom of opportunity, or food for their bodies. We cannot be true to these principles, and at the same time, ignore the problems of hungry people elsewhere in the world.

President Johnson has told us:

"There is a great moral principle at stake. It is not right . . . in a world of such infinite possibilities . . . that children should die of hunger, that young people should live in ignorance, that men should live in misery, shrouded in despair.

"If we truly mean our commitment to freedom, we must help strike at the conditions which make a mockery of that hope.

"We have the skills and resources to improve the life of men. I do not believe we lack the imagination to find ways to shatter the barrier between man's capacity and man's needs."

When the President presented the Food for Freedom program to the Congress, he pointed out that when "men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace."

For Americans of both North and South America, there is only one answer. We must turn our collective, creative abilities loose on the problem of food production and together develop the great agriculture productive capacity we possess to feed hungry people wherever they may live.

You, the leaders assembled here today, have accepted this challenge. Your presence at this Conference makes this clear.

You know we will not have an easy victory. The struggle will be long and arduous, but I ask you . . . what better war could mankind be engaged in than one to achieve "Freedom from Hunger" for all men?

As a member of the United States Congress, I believe I speak for all my colleagues when I say "We pledge our best efforts to support those governments and those people who are committing their own resources to the War against Hunger."

Carry home to your countries the message that the Members of the United States Congress . . . and all our fellow countrymen, are committed to that battle.

A 4-Year Term for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to enclose the testimony that I presented before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in support of my House Joint Resolution 412, a 4-year term for Congressmen. Even though my term of office expires this year, I feel that a 4-year term for Congressmen will mean better service on the part of a number of dedicated public servants, and I surely hope that my colleagues who agree with me will continue to work for this goal. My testimony follows:

A 4-YEAR TERM FOR CONGRESSMEN

(Testimony of Hon. D. R. "Billy" Matthews, before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in support of House Joint Resolution 412)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in behalf of H.J. Res. 412, a proposed constitutional amendment providing for a four year term for Members of the House of Representatives. My resolution is similar to H.J. Res. 394, by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Chelf, which provides for half of the Members of the House of Representatives to be elected each two years, as nearly equal as possible. Half of the Members would be elected for two years and half for four years, by lot, after the first election or changes. My resolution further provides that incumbent Members of the House may not resign to seek any other elective office unless vacant when sought.

The present two year term for Representatives was instituted by the framers of the Constitution in the belief that such a term would be sufficiently long to enable Members of the House to come to grips with public issues and to give the best of themselves to the resolution of these issues, and yet sufficiently short so that they would be placed under the necessity of keeping the rights and legitimate interests of their constituents in the forefront of their thinking and acting.

The factors involved in public issues have changed so completely and have become so enormously complex and highly technical that the two year term for Members of the House has not only ceased to further the aims that the Founding Fathers had in mind but actually frustrates their attainment.

Consider, if you please, some of the public issues with which Members of the House are concerned and which were not their concern during the early days of the Republic. Today, Congress must confront the problem of unemployment caused by technological innovation. It has allocated to itself the review and evaluation of the needs of our public schools. It must seek constant resolution of the conflict between management and labor. It must determine the future of our technological effort in space. It must judge the needs of our urban centers with respect to such things as housing and mass transit. It must respond to the problems of agriculture. It must determine the role of government in experimental research in the physical sciences. It must pass laws in the area of our national security that are becoming tremendously more complex. It must evaluate the mounting problems of banking and currency. It is being urged to consider more and more legislation in the area of civil rights.

We could continue with examples of the responsibilities of Congress today, which did not confront our forebears in the early days of the Republic. I maintain that, if Congress is to continue to fulfill the duties assigned to it by the American people, each and every Representative in the House, from the freshman member to the most senior, must be enabled to acquire a comprehensive grasp of social factors and an insight into the moral obligations implicit in complex social situations, which are indispensable to the work of legislation. I maintain that a four year term for members enhances their opportunity in the House of Representatives to acquire that practical grasp and moral insight. Our representative form of government envisaged lawmakers who would be able in a reflective and objective attitude to consider the vital issues of the day. Two years is simply too short a time.

Consider the situation of the new Congressman. He must, first of all, familiarize himself with the procedure by which Congress conducts the public business. He must necessarily do this before he gets down to the public business itself. This procedure must become second nature to him and he must become a real member of the family before he can begin to realize his potentialities as a legislator. He must organize his office staff, hire assistants and assign jobs in such a way as to provide himself with the best possible service. It is no small task and requires a considerable amount of time, especially in the beginning. The new Congressman has been sent to Congress by his constituents to deal with national issues and to perform the public business. Two years, I believe, even without considering the time required to get an office staff in motion, is not enough time to acquire the understanding of the great issues that face this Republic.

Now, no sooner has the new Congressman been elected, no sooner has he arrived to undertake his legislative duties, than he is compelled to face up to the necessity of re-election. With a two-year term, the very next year is an election year for the Representative during the First Session of Congress. His whole political future, in order to remain in a position to represent most effectively his political spectrum, depends on his re-election. Can it be expected of him that he will not feel pressured to devote a good part of his energy to maintaining the support of his constituents?

During my fourteen years as a Member of Congress, I have only had opposition in three primary elections and I have had no opponent in the general elections. It was necessary for me during my fourth year in Congress to absent myself for six weeks to campaign and, again, after ten years in Congress it was necessary for me to absent myself for approximately the same amount of time, while this last year I was away for approximately four months in a primary campaign that, I regret to say, was unsuccessful.

For the record, may I be permitted to point out that when the Florida State Legislature combined my Eighth Congressional District with the Ninth Congressional District, represented by my friend and opponent, I had ten thousand less registered Democratic voters in my district than he had in his. This was a disadvantage that I could not overcome. To go on, however, with the problem of absence from Congress, both I and my opponent, let me repeat, were away for approximately four months of this Second Session of the Eighty-Ninth Congress. We, in Florida, are fortunate in that our primary elections are over in May and we have a chance to be present for the debate and votes on most of the critical issues facing Congress. From January of this year through May 3, the date of our first primary election in Florida, there were 82 quorum calls and yea and nay votes in the House. Since then, as of July 1, there have been 75, and there probably will be at least that many more before this session of Congress is adjourned. However, those of my colleagues in Florida who have Republican opposition must concern themselves about the campaign before the November election.

Let me emphasize that, in my opinion, one of the most stressing problems of a Congressman is how to campaign and remain an effective Member of Congress during that period of campaigning. There are those who say that campaigning should be done the year around. The question is, that since Congress now meets ten, eleven, and even twelve months a year, at what time of the session would you get official permission to go home and campaign? The adjournment dates of Congress during the past six years have been as follows: in 1960, on September 1; in 1961, on September 27; in 1962, on October 13; in 1963, on December 30; in 1964, on October 3; and last year, 1965, on October 23. This year most of us, I believe, would agree that we are certainly going to be here for several more months.

Let me emphasize the negative effect of a Congressman's absence, due to campaigning, on his committee work. In Congress, as we know, legislation is largely by committee. The precise and tedious details of legislation are the responsibilities of the committees. The Congressman's presence is as essential in a committee meeting as it is during the debate and final vote on an issue on the Floor of the House.

So, certainly, if a Congressman could be elected for a four year term, the fact of absenteeism should be tremendously reduced.

I believe that a four year term would give a Member of Congress a more secure feeling which, in turn, would give him a freedom which he must have in order to devote himself, heart and soul, to his legislative duties. I do not mean to imply that concern for political success and devotion to legislative duty are necessarily contradictory. They may or may not be. The motivation involved in one is likely to be different from that involved in the other. Elected Representatives are not meant to enjoy absolute political security. That would contradict the meaning and efficacy of representative government, but the relative political insecurity and apprehension engendered by too frequent elections are obstacles, I maintain, to wholehearted devotion to the public business. I say this in the knowledge of the numbers of Congressmen who, much to their credit, have risen above such insecurity and have demonstrated complete dedication to the public business to be done in Washington.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that both the future role of Congress in national affairs and the fundamental interests of constituents would be enhanced by the four year term for Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the fundamental interests of our constituents are, first, the preservation of genuinely representative government. By this, I mean that the rights and interests of constituents are put forward and effectively represented in the very process by which we formulate law. If Congressmen are handicapped in acquiring a comprehensive grasp of difficult and complex problems so that effective power begins to pass to the Executive Branch, to that extent, the rights and interests of constituents will not be properly represented in the process of making decisions which affect their lives. The second fundamental interest of constituents is the public interest as it incorporates their own legitimate interests. Certainly it would be to the advantage of the American people, as constituents of the House of Representatives, for each member to be given a better chance to contribute a comprehensive knowledge of factors and a deeper moral insight toward a furtherance of the public interest. With a better chance to deal with the public issues which a four year term would afford, every Member of the House would be able to demonstrate more conclusively his qualifications as a lawmaker and constituents would be able to judge his qualifications more effectively.

I believe that a four year term for Members of Congress would reduce expenditures for political purposes and to me this is one of the most necessary problems which demands our attention as we consider this important matter. I believe that on the average a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, to be re-elected when he is opposed, has to spend fifty thousand dollars. Some Members of Congress have to spend two or three times this amount. Others spend less. Up until this current year, during my fourteen years in Congress, I have only had to spend a little over thirty thousand dollars in all my campaigns. My expenditures for the primary campaign this year amounted to approximately fifty thousand dollars. The adequate financing of a political campaign is, let me repeat, one of the greatest problems that confronts us.

If only Americans would individually give a small amount to the candidate of their choice without extracting from him any political promise! But, seemingly, they are not going to do this. It means then that if you have a campaign every two years you are going to have to spend a tremendous amount of time seeking campaign contributions, that do not obligate you, in sufficient amounts to carry on the necessary advertising program that is essential to being elected. Surely I believe we can agree that to run a campaign every four years would be less expensive than to run one every two years. I recognize that this matter is of basic interest to the candidate and not to the constituent. I maintain, however, that with less worry about the financial aspects of campaigning, the Congressman can apply himself to the problems of his constituency in a much more effective fashion.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that a four year term would advance the interests of Congress, as such; the interests of Congressmen; and the interests of the American people as constituents of the House of Representatives. Let me add that as a defeated Congressman a four year term will be of no help to me. It will, though, in my opinion, be of tremendous value to a number of dedicated public servants whose service to our country will be greatly enhanced.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, we have completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. The district embraces most of Allegheny County north of the city of Pittsburgh. It is basically residential and industrial, and contains a large variety of ethnic groups. The district also varies from wealthy areas to economically distressed areas, but at present unemployment there is low.

The total number of citizens replying to the questionnaire was gratifyingly large, and probably sufficient to represent a referendum on each issue. The tabulated results with some observations are included below. I sincerely hope many will find them interesting and informative.

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED JUNE 1966

1. What should we do about Vietnam? (Please select only one.)

(a) Continue our present course, 8%.

(b) Mount an all-out effort (not including nuclear or chemical weapons) for a military victory, 55%.

(c) Hold key defensible positions and try to negotiate a settlement, 19%.

(d) Withdraw as soon as possible, 18%.

Practically all your replies were received before the U.S. bombing of oil depots in North Vietnam, so it is evident that most of our people favored the decision to do so before it was made. In our February poll 81% of our respondents agreed that we were doing the right thing in fighting to preserve the independence of South Vietnam.

2. Which do you think would be the one best step to fight inflation and the rising cost of living?

(a) Increase personal and corporate income taxes, 4%.

(b) Reduce domestic Federal spending, 77%.

(c) Impose Federal wage, price, and credit control, 19%.

Our people realize that inflation is the cruelest tax of all and they clearly feel that the best way to fight it is to cut the amount of Federal domestic spending which is already seriously eroding the value of our dollar. However, spending Federal revenues for pet projects continues to be so popular with the voters that reducing the bulging budget is not as easy as it would appear In the February poll 81% indicated that they expected a 10% increase in inflation within 2 years.

3. Do you think the "War on Poverty" has been worth the cost? Yes, 12%; No, 88%.

There can be little doubt that, regardless of the ideals embodied in the "War on Poverty," the agency in charge has done a poor job and that the chief beneficiaries of this big money spending project have been the officials selected to administer the programs instead of the needy.

4. Would you vote for substantial cuts in our foreign aid program? Yes, 87%; No, 13%.

For many years our people have been voicing increasing disenchantment with our foreign aid expenditures. It is interesting to note that in February of this year 85% answered Yes when we asked the limited question, 'Should the U.S. withhold foreign aid from nations that do not generally support our foreign policies?" 15% answered No.

5. Do you favor the crash program to be the first nation to land a man on the moon? Yes, 38%; No, 62%.

Our race with Russia to be the first nation to land a man on the moon is primarily a matter of pride and prestige. Our current crash program is costing many millions of dollars and demands the time and skills of hundreds of scientists and technicians that could be saved if we were to proceed at a more measured pace. In fact, many believe that a joint effort by all nations capable of helping would be good and that we should try to bring about such a cooperative effort.

6. Do you favor the proposal that all American youths be drafted for two years of Federal military or civilian service? Yes, 66%; No, 34%.

Several years ago our respondents voted definitely in favor of universal military training, so the results here are not surprising. There is also a general feeling that the present draft regulations result in too many injustices. This was illustrated in our February poll when 79% said that they thought the draft regulations exempted too many young men on physical, mental, and educational grounds.

7. Do you favor Federal standards for packaging and labeling of consumer products? Yes, 86%; No, 14%.

This is the first time that we have included a question on this subject, and the results here suggest that the great majority of consumers feel confused or deceived by the multiplicity of sizes and weights that are displayed on the shelves or are advertised. Although standardization of packaging and labeling will put some companies to considerable expense, it is likely that action in this direction will be made by the Congress.

8. Would you vote to permit political contributions of up to $100 to be allowable income tax deductions? Yes, 45%; No, 55%.

The results on this question were the closest on the poll and do not reflect a clear cut pro or con decision. With the terrific increase in the cost of political campaigns something must be done to help candidates financially, or only the rich will be able to run for important offices. Perhaps if President Johnson had asked for an allowable deduction of less than $100 (say, $50) more would support the proposal.

9. Would you favor uniform traffic regulations, automobile safety devices, and driver's license requirements throughout our fifty states? Yes, 89%; No, 11%.

The variety of speed laws, drivers' qualifications, automobile inspection regulations, traffic signs, road markings, etc. that exist in our several states have resulted in much bewilderment to drivers and have probably caused some accidents. Uniformity of all such items should have been established long ago.

10. Do you believe that the Administration releases enough accurate information to keep the press and the public adequately informed on the actual state of the nation? Yes, 23%; No, 77%.

The Administration has not kept the press and the public adequately and accurately informed on what is going on regarding the policies of our country. While certain information must be classified and kept secret, this power has been abused. In fact, the phrase, "Credibility Gap," is very commonly heard and its existence is too often true.

11. Do you feel that the Executive and Judiciary have encroached too much in the field of legislation: Yes, 82%; No, 18%.

There results here indicate that the public is as aware as the Congress that the Executive and the Judicial branches of the government have so encroached on the powers of the Legislative that the balance of power between the three branches should be restored. The trouble here can be partly traced to the present ineffectiveness of the two party system.

12. How would you rate President Johnson's over-all performance in office to date? (a) good, 12%; (b) fair, 48%; (c) poor, 40%.

Here we have three sets of figures available for comparison. In June 1965 the responses indicated Johnson's performance good, 28%; fair, 58%; and bad, 14%. In February 1966 the rating was good, 22%; fair, 54%; and bad, 24%. In the current question we used the word "poor" instead of "bad," but even this milder definition does not detract much from the conclusion that the President's standing with the people has gone down fast.

New Era in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, we are all thrilled by success stories—accounts of the underprivileged who have improved their lot through hard work, forward thinking, perseverance, and ingenuity. Today, I want to relate a success story which deserves national attention.

Earlier this year, the Deposit Guaranty National Bank of Jackson, Miss., sponsored an economic symposium on "The Year Ahead in Mississippi." Leaders in government, agriculture, business, industry, research, finance, and distribution outlined in detail the economic progress of the past few years in Mississippi and the outlook for the future.

The reports of this group of dynamic leaders completely dispel the myth of a backward Mississippi plagued by the pangs of economic despair. Instead, they make it quite clear that a sustained pattern of growth is pushing Mississippi to the forefront in the field of economic development.

The spectacular progress was underscored by Nat S. Rogers, Deposit Guaranty National Bank president, who pointed out, for instance, that during the past decade total resources of Mississippi banks increased by more than $1 billion, or over 107 percent, while the average increase for the Nation was approximately 60 percent. Last year, he noted for the first time total deposits of all banks in the State exceeded $2 billion, total loans exceeded $1 billion, and total capital accounts passed the $150 million mark.

The new vitality is reflected in mushrooming industrial development which has broken all previous records in the State during the past 2 years. More than $385 million in new capital was invested in 275 new and expanded plants which created over 21,000 new job opportunities. Last year alone there were 155 new and expanded plants and over 12,000 new job opportunities.

By last November, it was noted, those gainfully employed in manufacturing reached an alltime record high of 158,300. This was an increase of more than 13,600 over the previous year. Total nonfarm employment soared to a new high of 613,000, an increase of 24,600 over the previous year. These figures assume added significance when we compare them with the growth rate between 1950 and 1961 which showed an increase in manufacturing jobs in Mississippi of an average of just 3,000 annually. From 1961 through 1964, the annual gain averaged 7,000 jobs—a rate of increase of 250 percent. This increased manufacturing employment by a healthy 17 percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, our State leaders view this recent economic progress as merely a beginning. Already, imaginative new programs are being initiated to enhance further development and growth. A community revitalization program has been inaugurated to guide our smaller towns and rural communities into activities which will put new pep into their economies and increase local employment. Most significant, perhaps, is a bold new research program under the dynamic leadership of a national authority in this field—Dr. Kenneth C. Wagner. The Mississippi Research and Development Center will provide technical data and produce a flow of feasibility studies which will be used to plan and prepare for a better tomorrow in the State.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a sharp contrast between the vibrant Mississippi of today and the Mississippi of yesteryear when a one-crop economy spelled financial despair and frustration.

The bustling business activity, coupled with diversification in agriculture, is providing spectacular new opportunities in Mississippi. The progress has not been accidental. It is the result of the combined and determined efforts of the business, civic, educational, governmental, and religious leadership.

Mississippi and Mississippians are better organized, more knowledgeable, and more determined to secure broad economic gains than at any point in history. A continuous flow of fresh ideas and fresh leadership is breaking the barriers that block the path to growth. The effects of this creative energy will be even more evident in the months ahead as Mississippi prepares to enter a new era of unparalleled prosperity.

Rees Announces Results of 1966 Questionnaire to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this May I sent to my constituents in California's 26th Congressional District my annual congressional questionnaire. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and I would like to thank the more than 12,000 citizens who were sufficiently concerned to take the time to complete and return this poll.

My congressional district is in the western section of Los Angeles County and includes the cities of Beverly Hills and Culver City; the Los Angeles City communities of Rancho Park, Venice, Mar Vista, Westdale, West Los Angeles, Cheviot Hills, Beverlywood, West Adams, and Fairfax Avenue; as well as the Los Angeles County areas of Marina del Rey, West Hollywood, and the Sunset Strip. Incomes range from lower middle to upper; a majority of my constituents are homeowners, and their educational level is higher than average.

The questions were written to reflect issues of particular concern to my district, as well as the current major national and international issues. In the multiple-choice questions many respondents chose several alternatives. Because of this some percentages add up to more than 100 percent.

Particularly gratifying was the high degree of respondents who further elaborated their views with notes and letters. I regret that space limitations make it impossible for me to share these comments with my colleagues as I can testify to the worthwhile nature of the overwhelming majority of the statements.

Knowing that my colleagues in Congress will be interested in the response of my constituents to the vital issues of the day, I include here the tabulated results of this poll:

Rees 1966 congressional questionnaire survey compilation

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Vietnam: Which policy do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?

	Percent favoring
(a) Continue the administration policy of supporting the South Vietnamese, including limited bombing attacks in the north, while actively seeking a peaceful solution to the situation	23
(b) Expand the war to achieve a complete military victory	25
(c) Restrict our military efforts with the view to pulling out in the near future whether a peaceful solution can be developed or not	17
(d) Push for immediate elections in South Vietnam and let the new government negotiate its own solution with all essential elements involved	45

2. Communist China: Our policy should be to:

(a) Oppose admission of Communist China to the United Nations	27
(b) Extend United States diplomatic recognition to Communist China	37
(c) Initiate such programs as trade in non-strategic goods, cultural exchanges and exchanges of news reporters with the Communist Chinese	43

3. The Middle East: Arab League nations, led by Egypt, have refused to sign a peace treaty with Israel and have harassed her with constant threats of war, worldwide economic boycotts, and the closing of the Suez Canal to Israeli ships. The United States should:

(a) Continue to supply arms to Arab nations to lessen their dependence on Soviet arms	4
(b) Continue to supply arms to Israel to maintain an arms parity in the Middle East	18
(c) Refuse any aid, including wheat, etc., to countries engaging in aggressive acts toward Israel	36
(d) Demand that an international meeting be called to draft a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab League nations	55

4. Latin American policy: The United States last year sent American troops to the Dominican Republic when it was suspected that far left and possibly Communist elements might be taking over the Government.

(a) The United States should not have acted unilaterally, but should have operated through the Organization of American States or through the United Nations	32
(b) The United States should send troops to any Western Hemisphere country where Communist takeover is suspected	29
(c) In the future, the United States, or the international body through which it is acting, should be far more careful to ascertain the true nature of the elements involved before stepping into such a power struggle	43

DOMESTIC POLICY

1. Vietnam and the President's domestic program: There have been some congressional demands that domestic programs be curtailed because of the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam. Such programs would include the War on Poverty, aid to education, and urban area aid, such as housing and transit. Would you favor—

(a) Maintaining these programs and the war in Vietnam, even if a tax increase becomes necessary?	22
(b) Curtailing these programs to provide additional funds for the Vietnam struggle?	37
(c) Expanding these programs?	31

2. Transit: Recently I introduced legislation which would authorize the use of Federal gas tax funds, now being used exclusively for highways, for local rapid transit development.

Would you favor this proposal?

	Percent
Yes	75
No	18

3. Air pollution: There are currently many bills before Congress dealing with air pollution, including proposals for mandatory installation of anti-smog devices on all new cars, the establishment of national air purity standards, and a special tax on industries creating air pollution.

Would you favor this type of more active Federal participation in the fight against smog?

Yes	80
No	15

4. Federal aid to urban areas: Do you feel that Federal aid to metropolitan areas for projects such as open spaces and parks, rapid transit, housing and community development should be withheld from cities which refuse to participate in minimal cooperative regional planning?

Yes	70
No	20

5. Civil rights: Recently the President proposed minimal legislation to combat racial and religious discrimination in the sale and/or rental of housing.

Would you favor such a proposal?

Yes	55
No	38

Legislation has also been introduced to prohibit racial discrimination in the selection of juries.

Would you favor such a proposal?

Yes	85
No	13

6. Bills are presently pending before Congress offering solutions to the following problems. Which do you feel should receive the most immediate attention? (Constituents were instructed to rank 12 alternatives in order of importance. Percentages are shown for those five preferences ranking the highest.)

Education	65
Civil Rights	52
Unemployment	50
Crime	48
Air Pollution	42

Mississippi Dairy Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, dramatic economic progress is being achieved in Mississippi through a bold industrialization program which has accelerated growth at an unprecedented rate. But agriculture—long the heart and soul of the State's economy—continues to play a vital role in this upsurge as our farmers work with renewed enthusiasm to build a better way of life for themselves and for their respective communities.

The flourishing Mississippi dairy industry is an example of a segment of agriculture which is adding momentum to our upsurge in prosperity. The spectacular progressive development in dairying in Mississippi is particularly significant at a time when the dairy industry is experiencing a sharp decline in many other sections of the Nation.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, Mississippi was the only Southern State which produced enough milk to fill the demands of its own residents. For a number of years now, our dairy farmers have exported about 40 percent of their grade A milk into adjoining States. The total production last year rose to more than a billion pounds of good quality milk and the industry, both directly and indirectly, is now contributing $130 million annually to the State's economy.

Dairy dollars are earned and spent in every county in Mississippi. Dairying generates employment. An estimated 25,000 people in Mississippi are primarily employed in producing, processing, manufacturing, and selling dairying foods. They include about 8,000 dairy farmers, managers, and employees of 25 pasteurizing plants, 4 butter and dry milk plants, 4 condenseries, 8 cheese plants, 22 ice cream manufacturing, and 380 retail ice cream establishments. In addition, many allied industries in Mississippi depend entirely or in part on dairying including dairy equipment dealers, manufacturers and dealers in feed, fertilizer, seed and general farm equipment, pesticides and building materials; dealers in petroleum products; transportation and other services.

The remarkable increase in both productivity and earnings in the past decade illustrate best the dynamic new significance of dairying in Mississippi. Last year, for instance, our grade A dairy farmers marketed 787 million pounds of milk—an increase of 36 percent in the 10-year span. Cash receipts in this category rose by 39 percent and producer milk exported increased by 22 percent in those years. In the past year alone production per cow increased 6.4 percent over 1964.

What has been responsible for this unique record of progress? Of course, favorable climate, temperature and natural resources have each had a hand. But the real key to this progress is the improved management and techniques of Mississippi dairy farmers who are meeting the challenge of keeping pace with progress.

Walthall County in my congressional district is known as the "Cream Pitcher" of Mississippi because it produces more milk than any other county in the State. A recent edition of the Tylertown Times published in the county outlines the impact of the dairy industry in the area economy.

Here is the nutshell story from the Times:

Walthall County has a population of 13,512 people and 10,000 dairy cows. Dairying accounts for a whopping $4 million annually—or one-third of $12 million total. Dairying there has grown from a million-dollar industry in less than 25 years. The growth stands as a monument to farm and business leaders who worked hand in hand to improve the entire economic life of the county.

The exciting Walthall County story is typical of what is happening throughout the State. Mississippi will undoubtedly enjoy continued progress and the State's dairy industry will be a part of that growth as new production goals and income advances are achieved.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has set aside July 17 to July 23 for the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a great personal privilege for me to be able to participate in an event concerned with the future of millions of our fellow human beings, now under Communist domination.

Already numerous measures calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations have been introduced in this Congress. I hope my colleagues will vigorously support this effort, for the creation of such a committee would be living proof of our dedication to those liberties denied to captive peoples.

So long as other peoples are denied the right to vote, our own freedom is insecure. So long as nations are denied the right to self-determination we cannot have a truly peaceful world.

Soon after the nations of Eastern Europe achieved their independence after decades as vassals of the giant European empires, they were engulfed in a new form of imperialism, enforced by the Red army.

Despite more than 20 years of Communist rule the spirit of liberty and national independence lives on in the hearts of the peoples of Eastern Europe. Rioting and unrest continue to frustrate the plans of the Communist puppet regimes.

We in the United States have a strong stake in the future of these brave peoples. Our Nation has often been called a "melting pot" because it was built by men and women of many nationalities who came here to escape from tyranny and limited opportunity. The peoples of the captive victims of despotism in far-off lands. They are the broken families and relatives of many of our own citizens.

But as Americans we have another reason for supporting the cause of these brave people. Ours is a Nation founded on the principles of political liberty, national self-determination, and government through representative institutions. These ideals are part of the definition of our American nationality. We must continue to do all we can to promote the spread of freedom and representative institutions to all of the countries of the world.

For both these reasons, the peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the champion of their deepest aspirations. Although the United States was initially reluctant to abandon its traditional isolationist role, our record since the war in stemming Communist tyranny is commendable. Greece and Turkey remained stanch allies of the West while Austria and Finland retained their independence as neutrals. New challenges have been met in Berlin, Korea, and now Vietnam. But while we direct our attention to Communist aggression in one part of the world, we cannot turn our backs on Communist tyranny in another.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to do all we can to promote the growth of freedom and national independence in the captive nations. There are many signs that the Communist rulers are less and less able to impose their will on the gallant peoples still beholden to Communist imperialism.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, after their "liberation" by the Red army in those momentous days following World War II, the nations of Eastern Europe entered a long period of brutal oppression directed from the Kremlin. We correctly termed these once-proud nations "satellites."

Today there are encouraging signs that the Communist bloc has been fragmented and is now in a state of disarray. A struggle is underway to determine who will provide the orthodox line of Marxist-Leninist precepts. Eastern Europe is feeling effects from the dialog of dissent and we in the free world continue to hope that these states will regain the precious freedoms so long denied them.

The right to worship one's own God in his own way is a basic tenet of any free society. The peoples of Eastern Europe have been chafing under the conspicuous absence of this right. Communist leaders refuse to allow the national churches of Poland, Hungary, and the Ukraine, to name but a few, to compete with their tired doctrines of dialectical materialism.

So, even as there is cause for cautious optimism for the future of the states of Eastern Europe, we must remain constantly aware of the many instances of tyranny which continue to oppress these proud peoples.

Captive Nations Week is an appropriate time for Members of the Congress to again articulate their great concern for the cause of political self-determination for the millions of people living behind the rusting Iron Curtain.